
La Vimārsinī de Kṣemarāja est un des ouvrages les plus importants de l'école sivaïte cachemirienne du Spanda. Déjà en 1946 Mlle Lilian Silburn en avait présenté une traduction comme thèse de l'École pratique des Hautes Études. Le présent travail est le fruit d'une longue familiarité avec les textes sivaïtes du Kaśmir. L'ouvrage de Kṣemarāja n'est pas facile à lire car il essaie de décrire une expérience mystique plutôt qu'un système philosophique. Mlle Silburn s'est efforcé de traduire le plus exactement possible la terminologie qu'il emploie. La traduction annotée est suivie d'un commentaire détaillé qui analyse et explique le texte. Les termes techniques sanskrits accompagnés d'une traduction française sont consignés dans un index qui est très utile surtout pour le lecteur non-spécialiste.


Les traductions de Mlle Silburn et de M. Singh sont toutes les deux excellentes. Il y a évidemment ici et là de petites différences dans l'interprétation du texte mais on ne trouvera guère de divergences majeures. La comparaison de ces deux traductions est instructive, car elle aide à comprendre les difficultés devant lesquelles les traducteurs se sont trouvés. Mlle Silburn et M. Singh suivent de près le texte à quelques exceptions près. Mlle Silburn montre quelquefois une certaine tendance à adhérer au sens étymologique d'un mot. Par exemple, elle traduit le verbe *un-mīs* par "ouvrir, dessiller les yeux". Dans l'introduction le texte lit: *saktipātavaṇṇimaśvavardhahyatiśayāt*. M. Singh traduit: "owing to excess of devotion to Mahēśvara, which (devotion) blossomed forth by divine grace" (p. 4). Mlle Silburn traduit: "en raison de son extrême Amour envers le Seigneur, ses yeux furent dessillés sous l'influence de la grâce divine" (p. 31). C'est la dévotion qui surgit par le pouvoir de la grâce divine, et le sens primitif d' *un-mīs* n'a rien à faire ici. Kṣemarāja emploie aussi ailleurs le verbe *un-mīs* au sujet du pouvoir de la grâce divine (*saktipātavaṣa*), cf. III.35 et III.40 et les traductions de Mlle Silburn (pp. 102 et 107). Dans I.15 se trouve l'expression *cittasamghanṭha: hṛdaye cittasamghaṭṭāḥ dhṛyasvāpadarśanam*. Kṣemarāja explique: *tatra cittasamghaṭṭaḥ calatās calatas tadekāgraḥbhāvanāt*. M. Singh traduit: "cittasamghanṭṭāḥ means the concentration of the flicker mind on that (foundational consciousness)" (p. 59). Mlle Silburn traduit: "qu'en lui la conscience empirique naturellement très instable fond par friction quand elle se centre sur ce seul point" (p. 50). Quand l'esprit instable se centre sur un seul point il ne fond pas par friction mais il s'unit et se concentre.

En expliquant le mot *citta* Kṣemarāja écrit: *cetyate vimṛṣyate anena param tat tvam iti cittam* (II.1). M. Singh traduit: "cittam in this context means that by which the Highest Reality is cognised" (p. 82). M. Singh ne traduit pas *vimṛṣyate*. Mlle Silburn traduit: "La conscience est ici ce par quoi la suprême Réalité est 'touchée', conscience réalisée, perçue par un acte conscient" (p. 59). Mlle Silburn semble omettre le mot *cetyate* et expliquer 'touchée' par 'conscience réalisée' et 'perçue par un acte conscient'. Cette traduction est plutôt une paraphrase. Ici et là on rencontre d'autres exemples de traductions qui ajoutent beaucoup au texte. Dans I.10 Kṣemarāja explique le mot *saṣuṣṭam: yas tv aviveko vivecanābhāvo khyātih, etad eva māyāriṣam mohamayaṃ saṣuṣṭam*. Mlle Silburn traduit: "L'état de sommeil profond est non-perception, inconscience, absence de discrimination, illusion, car on s'égare quant à la nature véritable; c'est la non-perception des choses et aussi l'obscurcissement" (p. 45). M. Singh, au contraire, omet plusieurs mots du texte sanskrit: "That which is a state of aviveka i.e. complete lack of awareness is delusive deep sleep" (p. 42).

Le passage suivant n'a pas été compris par Mlle Silburn: *yo 'yam avivekaḥ, prthaktvābhimataḥ*ām

evāprthagātmatvena pratipattih, sā māyā. Elle traduit: "c'est cela l'absence de discernement qui tient à la conviction erronée que ces catégories sont séparées du Soi alors qu'elles en sont inséparables. Telle est l'illusion" (p. 77). M. Singh traduit: "Māyā is non-discrimination (avīveka) i.e. taking as identical those which are considered to be separate" (p. 133). Dans son commentaire M. Singh explique que c'est par la Māyā que les kaṇcuka, etc. qui sont séparés du Soi sont considérés comme en étant inséparables (cf. p. 134).

C'est par la Māyā que l'on obtient un pouvoir surnaturel: māyā, tatktād āvaranat proktadhāraṇādikramasamāsādīta tattattavahogarūpā siddhir bhavati (III.6). Mile Silburn traduit: "par le voile qu'elle [Māyā] impose, on possède un pouvoir surnaturel qui consiste à jouir de choses variées et qui est dû à l'acquisition graduelle, à la concentration et aux autres moyens mentionnés" (p. 80). M. Singh traduit: "There occurs supernormal power in the form of control and enjoyment of the various things brought about by dhāranā, etc. — in succession which have been mentioned above owing to the veil drawn by māyā" (p. 144). Il nous paraît qu'il faut comprendre ainsi proktadhāraṇādikramasamāsādīta: "[un pouvoir surnaturel] obtenu par les méthodes mentionnées telles que la concentration, etc." Le texte ne mentionne nulle part que ces méthodes sont employées successivement. Kṣemarāja cite ici un vers du Laksānikaulārṇava: svayambhū bhagavān devo janmasamkāravartyāḥ / /, etc. Mile Silburn traduit: "Le Dieu, Bienheureux, Svyambhū, est libre des tendances résiduelles et des naissances". M. Singh traduit janmasamkāra par "the residual effect of any previous life". Cette interprétation est certainement préférable.

Dans son commentaire sur III.45 Kṣemarāja cite le vers suivant du Svachchandatantra: unmanā parato devi tatātmānam nyojayet / tasmin yuktas tato hy ātma tamayaś ca prajāyate / /. M. Singh traduit: "O Goddess, beyond the samanā, there is the unmanā stage; one should join one's self to it. The self united with that, completely becomes that very unmanā" (p. 232). Mile Silburn traduit: "Que tout adonné à l'énergie apaisée par-delà la pensée, Ō Déesse, il y , fixe le Soi; et ainsi fixe, le Soi s'identifie à elle" (p. 111). Mile Silburn semble avoir mal compris le premier pāda: unmanā parato devi: Ō Déesse, l'unmanā est au delà (de la samanā).

Nous devons nous féliciter du fait que l'ouvrage important de Kṣemarāja a été traduit en même temps par deux spécialistes du Śivaisme du Kāśmir. Ci-dessus nous avons surtout étudié la traduction de Mile Silburn et nous avons signalé quelques passages qui nous semblent être mieux rendus par M. Singh. Nous ne voulons pas créer ainsi une fausse impression; le travail de Mile Silburn est extrêmement méritoire et, dans plusieurs passages, elle a indubitablement mieux réussi à rendre exactement la teneur du texte. Il faut ajouter que sa traduction est rédigée dans un style lucide et élégant alors que l'anglais de M. Singh n'est pas toujours libre de raideurs.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG


The essence of devotional Hinduism, bhakti, is a personal, direct experience of the divine. Consequently, the ideal of the worshipper attuned to the bhakti approach is to participate as intimately as possible in the life or līlā of his or her chosen deity. An obvious way to establish contact with this līlā is to present it as a play and it is therefore not surprising that a vigorous dramatic tradition has taken shape under the stimulus of bhakti in northern India. What is cause for wonder is the tenacity which this tradition has shown in surviving in the

Deutlich ausgesprochen werden muß aber auch die Wertschätzung für die von Chlodwig Werba angelegten Register, die einer wiederholt erhobenen, aber immer wieder unerfüllten Forderung entsprechen: sie berücksichtigen auch die Fußnoten! Im übrigen sind die Register sinnvoll gegliedert und wirklich umfassend. Wir finden einen Wortindex (Altindisch, Altiranisch und Altgriechisch), einen Stellenindex sowie einen als Generalindex gearbeiteten Namen- und Sachindex. Damit sind die Register dem eigentlichen Werk kongenial.

Der überaus sorgfältige Druck des schwierigen Textes weist kaum Fehler auf; allenfalls sollte in Anm. 336 J. GELDNER in J. VAN GELDER verbessert werden.


Daß die so fähige und begabte Wissenschaftlerin bereits im 34. Lebensjahr ihre irische Laufbahn beschließen mußte, ist für die internationale Indologie ein schwer verwendbarer Verlust. Doch nicht zuletzt in ihrer grundlegenden Studie über das Ritual der Feuergründung hat sich Hertha Krick selbst ein bleibendes Denkmal gesetzt.

Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig

KLAUS MYLIUS


In 1839 John Muir (1810–1882) published a small treatise in 379 anuṣṭubh verses, entitled *Matapariṣṭā: A sketch of the argument for Christianity and against Hinduism*. A revised and enlarged version containing 1032 verses appeared in 1840. Muir’s treatise provoked counter-attacks from three Hindu authors who published the following works: the *Mataparikṣṭā* written in 1839 by Somanātha, a pseudonym for a pandit by the name of Subājī Bāpu living in Sehore near Bhopal; the *Mataparikṣottara* written in 1840 by Haracandra Tarkapaṭcānana, a Calcutta pandit; the *Śātratattvavinirnaya* composed in 1844 and 1845 by a Benares pandit, Nilakaṇṭha Goreh (1825–1885). In his book Young studies the Matapariṣṭā Controversy as a chapter in Hindu apologetics. In the second chapter he quotes from discussions between Bartholomāus Ziegenbalg (1682–1719) and Hindus, and between John Wilson (1804–1875), a Scottish Missionary, and several Maharastrian pandits in Bombay in the 1830s. The following chapter is devoted to the attempts by William Carey (1767–1837) and William Hodge Mill (1792–1853) to create a Christian terminology in Sanskrit. Chapter four examines the participants in the Matapariṣṭā Controversy in order to provide the necessary background information for understanding their respective viewpoints. The contents of the three anti-Christian treatises are studied from the point of view of apologetics in chapter five, in which Young translates extracts which set out the arguments put forward by the pandits against Christianity and those advanced in defense of Hinduism. The sixth chapter examines the different ways in which the pandits viewed Christianity as a dharma. In the epilogue Young

sketches the later changes in Muir’s theological opinions under the influence of the German school of biblical criticism and describes Nilakaṇṭha’s career after his conversion to Christianity in 1848.

Young’s book draws attention to an interesting and neglected chapter in the history of Hindu apologetics. The information which he provides on Protestant theology in the nineteenth century and the attempts to create a Sanskrit terminology for Christian concepts, will be of great assistance to Indologists. Young’s comments on the Hindu tradition are, in general, useful and to the point, although it would have been possible to probe deeper into the sources and traditions which inspired the three pandits in their anti-Christian polemics. The greatest disappointment, however, is the fact that the author’s knowledge of Sanskrit appears to be inadequate to prevent him from committing elementary blunders in his translations. For instance, on p. 107 (note 102) the text reads: śṛaddhā paramakalyāṇī mātevāvati mānavaṁ, “Faith protects people like a very good mother”. Young translates: “Faith is most beneficial; an honorable man guards it as he would a mother”! The meaning of pūrvaka at the end of a compound has escaped him completely. On p. 129 one finds “before acquiring knowledge” as the rendering of vidyāgrahanapūrvakaṁ, and on p. 108 pūrvaka is translated as “previous narrative” in śāstraśraddhāvayakatātākathanaupūrvakaṭarakāpratishțhānanirūpaṇaṁ, “Investigation of the Instability of Argumentation in the Previous Narratives and the Necessity of Faith in the Scriptures”. In several instances the text has been completely misunderstood by Young. Nilakaṇṭha writes: yady apiśvararūpasya yathārthaṁ jñānam ekaikāṁ / mukteḥ sādhanam ity bhur na prakārāntaram kvacit (p. 124, note 134, lines 1–2). “Although they state that accurate knowledge of God’s nature is the only requisite for deliverance and that there is no other way at all”. Young translates: “Although there is one accurate knowledge of God’s nature, they never say that the attainment of mukti has no other mode.” Haracandra Tarkapaṇḍitana writes that the scriptures enjoin a greater pṛāyaścitta for a brahman than for a śūdra: yatra kusitakārīye ‘sti pṛāyaścittan tu yādṛṣam // śūdrasya brahmaṁ sasmad adhikām śāstracoditam //. Young translates: “But, when a contemptible act is committed, there is some sort of expiation [for it]. The superiority of the brahmin over the śūdra is, therefore, enjoined by the scriptures” (p. 125). There is no point in listing all the mistakes committed by Young in his translations. It must, however, be pointed out that many passages, some of which are far from easy to understand, have been translated quite satisfactorily. Probably, Young has received a considerable amount of assistance and one can only regret the fact that no competent scholar seems to have read the entire manuscript of Young’s book before publication.

The texts of the Matapaṇṭīka Controversy are practically inaccessible. Nilakaṇṭha Goreh’s Śāstrasattvavinīrṇaya was published in a critical edition by S. L. Katre in 1951, but Somanātha’s work is still unedited and Haracandra Tarkapaṇḍitana’s Matapaṇṭīkaṭottara seems never to have been reprinted. According to Young it was printed in Bengali script, but he does not mention the place of publication or the name of the publisher. It would be very useful if all three tracts were edited in one volume. The same applies to the three editions of Muir’s Matapaṇṭīka (1839, 1840, 1852–1854). The publication of all three editions in one volume would be very welcome. Muir used to revise his works very thoroughly, as can be seen if one compares the first and the second editions of the four first volumes of his Original Sanskrit Texts. Young gives some information on the first and second editions of the Matapaṇṭīka, but does not say anything about the changes brought about in the third edition. According to Auguste Barth, who testified to his high regard for Muir in an obituary which is not mentioned by Young (Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, t. V, 1881–1884, pp. CVII–CXXVIII; reprinted in Oeuvres, t. III, Paris, 1917, pp. 416–434), the third edition of the Matapaṇṭīka was published both with and without a preface and English translation (Oeuvres, T. III, p. 422, n. 4).


Le don est un sujet souvent traité dans les textes jains et on trouve des histoires relatives au don dans plusieurs recueils. Mlle Balbir fait remarquer qu‘il n‘y a que très peu d‘ouvrages qui, tels que les Dānāṣṭakakathā, sont uniquement consacrés à ce sujet. Dans l‘introduction elle étudie quatre recueils parallèles dont trois en sanskrit et un en vieux-gujarati. Ce dernier dont le texte est édité dans l‘appendice I sur la base d‘un seul manuscrit, est, selon Mlle Balbir, une traduction tantōt littérale, tantōt abrégée des Dānāṣṭakakathā. Les trois recueils sanskrits sont le Dānapradīpa composé en 1442 ap. J. –C. par Čārettaratanagni; le Dānaprakāśa composé en 1599 ap. J. –C. par Kanakakusūlagani; le Dānadhārma composé au début du XVIIe siècle par Pūryakusāla. Mlle Balbir est d‘opinion que les Dānāṣṭakakathā soient la source à partir de laquelle se seraient développés indépendamment le Dānapradīpa et, ultérieurement, le Dānaprakāśa et le Dānadhārma ou bien que les quatre recueils remontent à un original commun, ancien et extensif, qui a été condensé par les Dānāṣṭakakathā (cf. p. 36).


Mlle Balbir suppose que le texte ait été composé d‘abord en prakrit et elle suggère que le Panoy a soit probablement constitué par des stances prakrites accompagnées par un développement en prose (cf. pp. 13, 35 et p. 195, note 4).

Bien que les Dānāṣṭakakathā ne soient pas un ouvrage étendu, le texte contient des traits grammaticaux caractéristiques et un nombre de mots spécifiquement jains ou comportant des nuances de sens inhabituelles. Parmi les premiers Mlle Balbir relève l‘emploi du présent passif avec une valeur modale: impératif ou optatif.

Dans les trois dernières sections de l‘introduction Mlle Balbir étudie l‘enseignement religieux du texte, le rôle du merveilleux et le développement de la littérature narrative concernant le don.

L‘édition du texte (pp. 113–163) s‘accompagne d‘un apparat détaillé énumérant les variantes d‘une dizaine de manuscrits. Des mots qui ne se trouvent pas dans tous les manuscrits sont mis entre crochets obliques. La traduction (pp. 165–226) est pourvue de notes signalant des thèmes folkloriques, des lieux communs et des difficultés d‘interprétation.

L‘ouvrage de Mlle Balbir montre l‘importance de l‘étude approfondie d‘un ouvrage qui, au premier abord, ne semble pas être très intéressant car des récits exaltant le don abondent dans l‘Inde. La longue introduction qui occupe plus de cent pages est une contribution excellente à l‘étude de la littérature narrative des Jains. L‘édition et la traduction sont faites avec beaucoup de soin et il n‘y a que très peu de passages que l‘on pourrait interpréter d‘une manière différente.


P. 186: ‘Beau, paré, incomparable, un homme est partout entouré d‘honneurs.’ Le texte a

La stance indique la différence entre un don insignifiant donné à temps (avisara) et un don important donné trop tard (pacchā). La deuxième ligne dit: “A quoi bon, ma belle, donner plus tard l’eau de cent jarres à des morts.” La stance se retrouve plus loin (p. 142) où elle est suivie par les mots kim punah karinaḥ “Combien de plus (le don) d’éléphants”. Mlle Balbir traduit aussi bien kim que kim punar par “que dire”. Ainsi le don des éléphants dépasserait encore en importance le don de l’eau de cent jarres à des morts!

P. 197. Mlle Balbir traduit sārdha-dvādaśa “douze et demi” par “dix-huit”.

P. 217. Bien que Simha ait été dit être comme un père (pitr-sama) pour la fille du roi, on ne peut guère traduire ici tāta par “père”.


Mlle Balbir n’ose pas sa rendition de maṅgala dans maṅgala-sampūñrām (!) kalaśam (p. 153.10) par “jasmin”. D’après les dictionnaires, le sens “fragrance de jasmin” se trouve dans des kośa. On ne voit pas bien pourquoi maṅgala ne peut avoir ici le sens ordinaire de “chose auspicieuse”.


NOTE

1 Sur le titre de l'ouvrage voir p. 22. Il vaudrait probablement mieux adopter le titre Dānāṣṭakakathāsamgraha "Recueil de récits sur la huitaine des dons" puisque le mot samgraha se trouve dans plusieurs manuscrits (cf. pp. 5, 6, 8, et 10) alors que Dānāṣṭakakathā ne se rencontre que comme titre marginal dans un seul manuscrit (cf. p. 5).


It is not easy to describe briefly the contents of this book in which so many topics are studied. In the preface Halbfass writes that the twenty chapters of his book examine India's role in European philosophical thought since classical antiquity, as well as the reception of European philosophy in Indian thought together with the tension in India between traditional and modern understanding of its own self. The table of contents lists the titles of these twenty chapters, of which the first ten are devoted to the search for India in the history of European philosophy and the second ten to the Indian tradition and the appropriation of European philosophy. However, only a detailed table of contents listing the topics treated in the 368 sections of this book would fully indicate the scope of Halbfass's work.

The first part, dealing with the knowledge and understanding of Indian philosophy in Europe, begins with classical antiquity and ends with some remarks on recent developments which indicate a greater willingness to take into account the Indian tradition of philosophy. For instance, a new edition of Überwieg's Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie will contain a comprehensive treatment of Indian philosophy by Halbfass (cf. p. 9), whereas the previous edition (12th ed., 1926) contained only bibliographical information on Indian philosophy (cf. p. 175). The exclusion of the Indian philosophy by most histories of philosophy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as described by Halbfass in chapter nine (Zur Ausschliessung Indiens aus der Geschichtsschreibung der Philosophie) is in great contrast with the attitude of Hegel and Schopenhauer whose entirely different reactions to Indian philosophy are carefully analysed by Halbfass in chapters six and seven.

In his comprehensive survey of the European discovery of Indian thought up to the most recent period Halbfass pays particular attention to the different ways in which Indian thought has been studied. The names of al-Birûnî, Roberto de' Nobili, Anquetil Duperron and Friedrich Schlegel are well-known in the history of the study of Indian philosophy, but it would be difficult to find more precise and well thought-out characterizations of their attitudes towards Indian philosophy than in the pages devoted to them by Halbfass (cf. pp. 38–43, 54–60, 80–85 and 92–100). In the forty pages of notes (pp. 443–482) the number of publications
mentioned is overwhelming and very few seem to be unknown to the author. On the relations between Buddhism and Gnosis (cf. p. 447, n. 84), Conze’s article is worth mentioning because it contains the most detailed treatment of the similarities between the two without any hasty conclusions (‘Buddhism and Gnosis’, Le origini delle gnosticismo, 1967, pp. 651–667; reprinted in Edward Conze, Further Buddhist Studies, Oxford, 1975, pp. 15–32).

In the introduction to the second part of his book Halbfass explains that it is not possible to write the history of India’s search for and discovery of Europe. On p. 193 he outlines the plan of the second part of his book as follows: “Wir haben zunächst auf grundsätzliche und allgemeine Befunde im indischen, d.h. vor allem hinduistischen Selbstverständnis und in der hinduistischen Einstellung zum Fremden, Anderen einzugehen, die statt zur Suche nach dem Anderen zu seiner Ausklammerung, Ausschliessung führen. Sodann soll die geschichtliche Situation der ‘Öffnung’ für den Westen durch eine kurze Darstellung Rammohan Roy und seiner hermeneutischen Situation bestimmt werden. Die folgende Entwicklung des ‘modernen indischen Denkens’ wird nur skizzenhaft vorgetragen; stattdessen sollen die hauptsächlichen Entwicklungen und Zusammenhänge am Leitfaden der Entwicklung und Neudeutung der Begriffe darśana und dharma und ihres Bezuges auf die westlichen Leitbegriffe Philosophie und Religion dargestellt werden.” This long quotation highlights the importance of the second part of Halbfass’s book. It deals with many Indological problems which hitherto have not been studied from the same point of view and with the same degree of penetration.

The eleventh chapter, entitled “On traditional Indian xenology”, studies the Indian attitude in the past to foreigners. Halbfass explains that the reactions of the Indians can only be understood in the context of the caste-system and the concept of dharma. He draws attention to the interesting discussion of the language of the mlecchas in Kumārila’s Tantra-parārtika (pp. 204–208) and briefly discusses the different attitude of the Buddhists. As to the famous passage in the Pāli Vinaya (vol. ii, p. 139) in which the Buddha permits his followers to recite the word of the Buddha sakāya niruttiyā he refers only to Geiger’s Pāli Literatur und Sprache (Strassburg, 1916), p. 5. In recent times most scholars are of the opinion that “the own language” is the language of the disciple and not Buddha’s own language as Buddhaghosa and Geiger maintained (cf. John Brough, ‘Sakāya Niruttiyā: Cauld kale het’, Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung, Göttingen, 1980, p. 35).

In the three following chapters Halbfass examines the reactions to the West by Rammohan Roy and by some prominent Indian writers and philosophers such as Debendranath Tagore, Keshab Chandra Sen, Ramakrishna, Vivekananda, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, Dayānanda Sarasvati, Aurobindo and Radhakrishnan. In chapter fifteen (Darśana, ānvikṣikī, Philosophie) Halbfass analyses the meaning of the terms darśana and ānvikṣikī in Sanskrit texts. Hacker objected to Jacobi’s interpretation of the latter term as meaning ‘philosophy’. Halbfass also rejects Jacobi’s interpretation, but he stresses the critical-methodological potential of the concept ānvikṣikī (cf. pp. 318–9 and 324) which, however, has not developed into a concept of autonomous, critical philosophy. As to the word darśana which, as Halbfass points out in chapter sixteen, is being used by modern Indian scholars as the equivalent of the word philosophy, in its traditional meaning it indicates fully developed philosophical systems and it refers to that which others have thought in the past and have passed on to the present (p. 309). Halbfass adds: “die Perspektiven eines noch im Progress befindlichen, zukunfts- und problembezogenen Denkens fehlen gänzlich, und methodologische Implikationen hat der Begriff kaum.”

Chapter seventeen is devoted to a study of the meaning of the word dharma in traditional and modern Hinduism. According to Halbfass, in ancient India dharma is “der in sich differenzierter ‘Brauch’, der die Lebensform der Ārya konstituiert, der ihre Identität gegenüber den Mlecha gewährleistet, der zugleich die Vorzugsstellung des den Dharma lehrenden und par excellence bewahrenden Brahmanen legitimiert” (p. 366). Halbfass pays particular attention to the interpretation of the concept dharma by Kumārila for whom the Veda is the basic source of dharma (cf. pp. 376–382). Although modern Indian thinkers use the word dharma as
equivalent of the word “religion”, they stress the universality of Hinduism as the sanātana-dharma (p. 399).

In the following chapter Halbfass illustrates the a-historical attitude of Indian thinkers which is evident in the doxographies written by Haribhadra (8th century) and later authors. Halbfass points out that they are symptomatic of a tendency to relate one’s own philosophy to that of others and to place both within a traditional frame (p. 411). Of particular interest in this context are the ideas of concordance (samanvaya) and different levels of qualification (adhikāra). Halbfass points out that these two ideas are related to an a-historical approach to philosophical thought. He stresses, however, that this is not a characteristic innate to Indian thought but is itself a result of a historical process (p. 427).

In the nineteenth chapter Halbfass quotes Hacker’s remarks on inclusivism and tolerance and draws attention to the fact that inclusivism is not unknown to non-Indian traditions. In the epilogue he raises the question of the possibility of a meeting between the Indian and European philosophical traditions in the present day, but prefers not to suggest an answer.

Wilhelm Halbfass has written a book which is extremely interesting both for the general reader and for the specialist in Indian philosophy. The first will undoubtedly appreciate the effort made by the author to explain clearly problems and attitudes which are unfamiliar to the European philosophical tradition, whereas the second will learn much from the treatment of many aspects of Indian thought by a scholar who is equally at home in both European and Indian philosophy. It is a great pity, however, that, being written in German, this excellent study will probably not receive due attention from readers in India and in the Anglo-Saxon countries. It is undeniable – whether regrettable or not – that at present English is the only lingusitic medium available for a future dialogue between European and Indian thought.


The Saṅkhepatthajotani is a brief commentary on the Visuddhimagga composed for those who have not the time to study Dhammapāla’s great commentary (Mahāṭikā), the Paramatthamaññjasā (cf. the opening verses, p. XIV). The name of the author is unknown and also the date and place of composition (cf. pp. XV–XVI). Abe has consulted eleven manuscripts which are preserved in the National Library, Bangkok. According to him no manuscripts of this work have been found elsewhere. However, Helmer Smith refers to A. Cabaton’s catalogue of Pâli manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris for a Cambodian manuscript of a Visuddhimagga-cullaṭṭikā (cf. A Critical Pâli Dictionary, Epilegomena p. 46*).1

Abe explains in his introduction that Sj. [= Saṅkhepatthajotani] is not a mere digest of Dhammapāla’s commentary but contains explanations which are not found in it. Moreover, Sj. mentions opinions which are not discussed by Dhammapāla. In the first two chapters of Sj. the opinions of keci and apare on respectively the atthaṅga and the sattanagaraparikkhāra are to be found. Abe examines these passages in his introduction which also contains a study of the explanations of the words sila and dhutaṅga and an examination of the criticisms by Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla of the views on dhutaṅga by the Abhayagiri school.

According to Abe Chapada’s Visuddhimaggagāṇâṭhi has no similarity with Dhammapāla’s commentary and Sj. as far as the first two chapters are concerned. Abe does not mention the Visuddhimārga-sanne by Parākramabāhu II (1236–1271), a Sinhalese translation of the Visuddhimagga with detailed comments and expositions (cf. C. E. Godakumbura, Sinhalese Literature. Colombo, 1955, pp. 43–45). If Sj. is identical with the Visuddhimaggacullaṭṭikā mentioned in the Gandhavamsa, it would probably have been composed in Ceylon between

1200 and 1500 (cf. p. XV), and it would be important to know whether the Sj. has made use of Parākrāmabāhu’s work.

In Abe’s critical edition of the first two chapters of Sj. the words quoted from the Visuddhimagga are printed in bold type, those from Dhammapāla’s commentary in italics and those only to be found in Sj. in roman. The variant readings are carefully listed in the critical apparatus. Two appendixes list the Pali texts quoted in the Visuddhimagga and Sj. A third appendix is a comparative table enumerating the paragraphs of the Harvard Oriental Series edition of the Visuddhimagga, the corresponding pages of the PTS edition and the paragraphs or folio numbers of the three commentaries (Dhammapāla’s commentary, Chapada’s Visuddhimagga ganthi and Sj.).

Abe’s work is a useful contribution to the study of the commentaries of the Visuddhimagga. Sj. has never been published in the past and it is to be hoped that Abe will edit the other chapters in the same way. His introduction points out the importance of Sj. even though it is mainly based on Dhammapāla’s commentary.

Abe refers in his abbreviations to Rewatadhamma’s recent edition of Dhammapāla’s commentary. However, the passages quoted on p. XXIII differ from the text found in this edition which reads siraṭṭho ti for siraṭṭho pi and does not have the word tassa before sabbam guṇasariram. The same edition reads pavesārahasālā and not pavesārāhā sālā as found on the same page (line 8 from below). Abe says that the meaning of uddāpa is not clear and refers to the dictionary of the PTS (p. 135: uddāpa). No reference is made to the critical Pāli dictionary (cf. Vol. II, fasc. 9, p. 410a).

NOTE

1 I have not been able to consult Cabaton’s Catalogue.


Several indexes to Pāli texts have been published in the past. Extremely useful are the very detailed indexes compiled by Hermann Kopp. However, the present index to the Kathāvatthu is to our knowledge the first complete index of a Pāli text. The index lists each word in the form in which it occurs in the text. Compounds have been separated into their various components: words followed by a hyphen occur at the beginning of compounds; words both preceded and followed by a hyphen occur in the middle of compounds; words preceded by a hyphen occur at the end of compounds. The alphabetical index lists words occurring at the end of a compound but not those found at the beginning of a compound. These are listed only in the reverse index. For each occurrence of a word references are given to page and line in the PTS edition (2 vols 1894–1897, reprinted 1979).

According to the foreword “the compilers have here listed each word (with the exception of a few very common words) in form and use”. A list of these words ought to have been given. The indication and passim is found under atthi, but other very common words have been exhaustively listed, for instance, pe (p. 105a–110b), vattabbe (p. 137b–142b). The foreword points out that “compound words have been separated into their various components, such as noun and noun, adjective and noun”. However, many compounds have not been separated into their components. For instance, in the case of avayayibhāva compounds one finds -bhutānī as

second element of *yathābhūtāṃ* but not *mohāṃ* as second element of *samohām*. Verbal compounds such as *bahuḷikaratī, manasikaratī* and *pāṭubhavanti* have not been separated into their components.

Apart from these inconsistencies the index seems to have been very carefully compiled. It is not surprising that an index of such a voluminous text as the Kathāvatthu contains a few errors. For instance, *attabhāvo* and *attribhāvo* are listed but not *bhāvo*. One finds *brahma-cariyavāsō* and *cariya*-, but not *vāsa*. Lomakūpehi is listed but not *kūpehi*. Likewise *samasamo* but not *samo*. The index contains *vivattacchando* but not *chando*. It is therefore useful to consult both the alphabetical and the reverse index. Misprints are very rare. On p. 234b read *cariyabrahmacariyō* for *cariyabrahmacariyō*.

This index of the Kathāvatthu will be of great use to Pāli scholars and it is to be hoped that other Pāli texts will be indexed in the same way.

---


The second volume of Jaini’s edition of the Burmese recension of the Paññāsa-Jātaka (PJ) contains jātakas 26–50 and an introduction. In the preliminary remarks to the first volume Jaini promised a critical introduction to the entire work, dealing with literary sources and linguistic peculiarities of the language. The present introduction contains only a few remarks on sources (p. xi). For linguistic peculiarities the reader is referred to G. Terral’s research on the vocabulary and grammar of the text of the Samuddaghosajātaka, which was published in volume XLVIII of the *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* and not in volume XLIX as indicated in the bibliography. However, Jaini has added an index of words, forms and spellings peculiar to the text; an index of words and forms needing minor additions; an index of emendations; an index of variant readings in the printed edition (R) and the manuscript used by the editor (M). The greater part of the introduction is occupied by an analysis of the fifty jātakas, indicating also connections between these stories and other stories in Pāli and non-Pāli literature. The introduction also deals briefly with place, date and authorship of the PJ. The oldest manuscript in Laotian characters dates from A.D. 1589. On the West Peteik pagoda at Pagan the Velāmajātaka is illustrated and an inscription bears the words ‘Velāmajātaka 497’. Jaini writes: “Assuming that the title of the inscription does refer to our Velāmajātaka (or at least its original source, now lost), we can set the lower limit of our compilation to that of the inscription, circa twelfth century, A.D.” However, even if this inscription does indeed refer to the story found in the PJ, this would prove only the existence of that one story at that time, but not of the entire compilation.

In the preliminary remarks to volume one Jaini mentioned three Pāli versions of the PJ, originating in Cambodia, Thailand and Burma, respectively. In the introduction to the second volume he mentions three recensions, namely, the Burmese, Cambodian, and the Laotian. In a note (p. xli) he refers to the Cambodian/Thai recension. It is indeed probable that there is only one Cambodian/Thai recension. George Coedès remarked that the expression “Cambodian manuscripts” is used for Pāli manuscripts written in Cambodian script by the Siamese.1 The manuscripts used by Mme Terrall are all written in Cambodian script.2 In a recent article on the PJ in Thailand K. Tanabe describes five manuscripts in the National Library in Bangkok. According to him the manuscripts are written in ‘Khmer’ script.3 This probably refers to the mūl script. Regarding the Laotian version Jaini refers to his bibliography for H. Deydier’s 1952

publication (p. xl, note). The title of Deydier’s publication, which is omitted in the bibliography, is *Introduction à la Connaissance du Laos*, Saigon, 1952. It is to be hoped that the Cambodian/Thai and Laotian recensions will be edited in the near future with the same care which P. S. Jaini has bestowed on the edition of the Burmese recension.

NOTES

1 *The Vajirañāna National Library*. Bangkok, 1924, p. 20. Large extracts from Coedès’s publication were copied by H. Saddhatissa in his article ‘The Dawn of Pali Literature in Thailand’ in: *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*. Colombo, 1976, pp. 315–324. No reference to Coedès’s work is to be found in it.


In his obituary of Erich Frauwallner (1898–1974), Gerhard Oberhammer has pointed out the importance of the contributions made by Frauwallner to the study of the history of Indian philosophy (*WZKS* 20, 1976, pp. 5–17). It is therefore greatly to be welcomed that the publication of this volume will make a great part of his work more easily accessible. The *Kleine Schriften* consist of 38 articles and 4 reviews which were published for the first time in the years 1925–1962. With very few exceptions, all articles written during these years are contained in this volume. They are published in chronological order in three groups: Allgemeines (2 articles); Zur Philosophiegeschichte des Hinduismus (13 articles); Zur Philosophiegeschichte und Geschichte des Buddhismus (23 articles). The second group contains such important publications as Frauwallner’s studies on epic philosophy in the Moksadharma, and on the older Upaniṣads, an article on bhavana in Maṇḍanamīśra’s philosophy, and a detailed study of the theory of cognition in the classical Sāṃkhya system. In the nineteen-thirties Frauwallner wrote a series of articles on Buddhist logic in which he studied difficult texts by Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara in Tibetan translation. They are all reprinted in this volume in the third group which also contains several articles relating to the history of Buddhism and more recent publications on Buddhist logic. The four reviews reprinted in this volume deal with the following publications: E. H. Johnston, *Early Sāṃkhya* (London, 1937); D. H. H. Ingalls, *Materials for the Study of Nyaya-ya Logic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1951); *A complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons* (Sendai, 1934); and *Pramāṇavārttikabhashyam* or *Vārtikālaṅkāra* of Prajñākaragupta, ed. by Rāhula Sāṅkrityayana (Patna, 1953).

Frauwallner planned to write a history of Indian philosophy in several volumes but was able to publish only two volumes: *Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie* (Salzburg, 1953–1956), in which he describes the philosophy of the older period (Veda, epic, Buddha, Jina), Sāṃkhya, classical Yoga, Vaiśeṣika, Jain philosophy and materialism. Several of his articles are preliminary studies for this work and deal in greater detail with problems which are studied only briefly in these two volumes. Other articles examine topics which Frauwallner planned to treat in later

Not reprinted in this volume are the articles published by Frauwalner since 1962, which all appeared in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*. They comprise a series of articles on Abhidharma and another one on Rāghunātha Siromani. Probably only very few specialists will be able to read Frauwalner's articles on Rāghunātha Siromani, but among students of Buddhism there is undoubtedly a great interest for his Abhidharma studies and a separate publication would be very welcome.

This volume does not contain a complete bibliography as found in other volumes published in the same series. The editors refer to the bibliography of Frauwalner's publications in volume 20 of the *WZKS* (pp. 19–36), and list two additions to the section "Würdigungen". An item missing in this bibliography is Frauwalner's Introduction (pp. 1–6) to Muni Jambūvijayaji's edition of the first part of Mallavādin's *Nayacakra* published in Bhavnagar in 1966 (cf. *IIJ* 13, 1971, p. 145).

Daniel Henry Holmes Ingalls (born 4.5.1916) is mainly known as the author of two books of outstanding merit: *Some Materials for the Study of Navya-Nyāya Logic* (Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 40, 1951) and *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry* (Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 44, 1965). As Wales Professor of Sanskrit he has been an inspiring teacher for several generations of students at Harvard University. This volume is a fitting tribute to a great scholar and guru.

The fourteen articles in this volume are written by former students of Ingalls and by scholars who have been closely associated with him. The topics studied belong to various branches of Indian studies. Buddhist philosophy is represented by three papers: Masaaki Hattori, *Aposha* and *Pratibhā* (pp. 61–73); Musashi Tachikawa, *A Logical Analysis of the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (pp. 159–181); Masatoshi Nagatomi, *Māṇasa-Pratyakṣa*: A Conundrum in the Buddhist *Pramāṇa* System (pp. 243–260). Indian philosophical problems are studied in the following two papers: Bimal Krishna Matilal, Double Negation in Nyaya-Nyāya (pp. 1–10); Karl H. Potter, *Was Gaudapāda an Idealist?* (pp. 183–199). The remaining nine papers deal with poetics: J. Mousis, *Masson, Authorship Problem of the Dhvanyaloka* (pp. 11–31); grammar: S. D. Joshi, *The Contribution of R. G. Bhandarkar to the Study of Sanskrit Grammar* (pp. 33–60); Vedic ritual: Frits Staal, *Ritual Syntax* (pp. 119–142); Vedic litany: J. Gonda, *The Sāturudriya* (pp. 75–91); mythology: Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, *Death as a Dancer in Hindu Mythology* (pp. 201–216); semasiology: Minoru Hara, *Hindu Concepts of Teacher, Sanskrit Guru* and *Ācārya* (pp. 93–118); astronomy: David Pingree, *The Khetamuktāvali* of Nṛsiṃha (pp. 143–157); Tamil literature: George L. Hart III, *The Little Devotee: Čekiḷaṟ's Story of Čiṟuttaṉṭar* (pp. 217–236); Bengali literature: Edward C. Dimock Jr., *On Impersonality and Bengali Religious Biography* (pp. 237–242).

The great diversity of topics in this volume reflects the many interests of Ingalls. Only a few articles require from the reader a more specialised knowledge of the topics treated by their authors. For instance, David Pingree's contribution has remained a closed book for the reviewer. However, most of the articles can be read with profit even by those who are not specialists in a particular field of study. It is to be regretted that many Sanskrit texts quoted in this volume are disfigured by misprints. This is the case in particular with regard to Potter's article in which the following misprints have to be corrected: p. 186 – II.17 read *Sarpadhārādibhir*; II. 18 read
Nîścitāyāṁ; p. 187 – III.32 read Amanastāṁ for Ātmanastāṁ; p. 191 – III.19 read etan; III.24 read māyābhīr; p. 192, line 2 read māyābhīr; III.28 read Vamdhyaśputro; IV.69 read jīva ami for jīva āmi. Also on p. 192 one finds such strange spellings as va api (III.28) and ca uccedi (IV.59). Potter’s translations are often careless. On p. 186 he translates bhāva by ‘state’ (II.13). He is only able to maintain this rendering by mistranslating II.17: anīścitā yathā rajjur anadhakāre vikalpiṭaḥ sarpadhāradibhir bhāvais tadvad atmā vikalpiṭaḥ. Potter translates: “Just as a rope, not fully ascertained in the dark, is wrongly-interpreted to be a snake, a stream, etc.; so the self is wrongly-interpreted as states.” The rope is wrongly imagined to be such things (bhāva) as a snake, a stream of water, etc. In IV.73 he interprets paratantra as paraśāstra (other theories) as in Śaṅkara’s commentary, but in the following verse he renders the same word by ‘dependent’. In the translation of II.13 the word ‘vyavasthitān’ is entirely omitted by Potter. In other articles Sanskrit texts are quoted without specifying the editions that have been used. For instance, J. Moussaiieff Masson quotes Abhinavagupta’s Dhvanyālokālocana but does not explain to which edition he refers.

The most serious reproach which has to be addressed to the editors of this volume, however, concerns the bibliography of the works of Professor Daniel H. H. Ingalls on pages 261–263. In the first place articles and reviews are listed without indication of page-numbers. Furthermore, there are many errors and omissions. It seems therefore appropriate to append to this review a revised bibliography of the articles and reviews. Professor Ingalls supervised a great number of theses. Professor Allen W. Thrasher has been so kind as to compile a list which he believes may not be completely exhaustive. This list, which comprises no less than fifty theses, abundantly shows how great a contribution Professor Ingalls has made in his capacity as supervisor to the furtherance of Sanskrit and Indian Studies.
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David Seyfort Ruegg, _The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India_ (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. VII, fasc. 1). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1981. IX, 146 pp. DM 84.-.

Seyfort Ruegg’s book on the literature of the Madhyamaka is the first modern history of this Buddhist school. In Winternitz’s _A History of Indian Literature_ the whole Madhyamaka literature is treated in twelve pages (Volume II, Calcutta, 1933, pp. 341–352). Although much work has been done in this field by both Western and Japanese scholars, many problems remain to be solved. Important texts which are available in Tibetan and Chinese translations have been studied only cursorily, or not at all. The authorship of several texts is often difficult.

to determine because the tradition attributes the same text to different authors or because different authors bear the same name.

The first chapter deals with the early period which witnessed the formation of the Madhyamaka school. More than forty pages are devoted to Nāgārjuna’s works and to his philosophy. Of special importance are the detailed analysis of the MMK (Mūla-Madhyamakakārikās) and the section entitled “Some methodological and theoretical issues in Nāgārjuna’s philosophy” (pp. 33–47). The second chapter examines the works of the philosophers of the middle period which are divided into two main divisions, the Prāsaṅgika and the Svātantrika, which go back to Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka. Seyfort Ruegg takes care to point out that these apppellations are found for the first time in Tibet in the eleventh century and that they refer to a single feature of each of their doctrines, namely their methods of ascertaining reality through reasoning. The chapter that follows is entitled “The Yogācāra-Madhyamaka synthesis” and is mainly concerned with Sāntaraksita and Kamalaśīla. The last three chapters deal with the Madhyamaka-Prajñāpāramitā synthesis (Ārya Vimuktisena, Bhadanta Vimuktisena, Haribhadra, Buddhajñāna, Dharmamitra and Abhayākaragupta), Madhyamaka and Vajrayāna, and, finally, the last period of the Indian Madhyamaka school (Bodhibhadra, Dharmakīrti and Dīpankarāśrijñāna; Jayānanda; Abhayākaragupta; other later Madhyamikas.)

Appendix I examines the works on practice in the Madhyamaka section of the bsTan-gyur ascribed to Astaghosa, Ārya-Sūra, Dharma-Subhūti (ghoṣa), and Mātṛceta and Appendix II Ratnakaraśānti’s ‘Vijñapti-Madhyamaka’. The bibliography is divided into two sections: Modern editions of the Sanskrit texts of the Madhyamaka school and Modern editions of the Tibetan versions of works of the Madhyamaka school. There are four indices: I. Titles; II. Names; III. Sanskrit key-words; IV. Tibetan terms.

In his preface Seyfort Ruegg remarks that a comprehensive historical treatment and systematic analysis of the Madhyamaka in its entirety will have to await much larger publications. However, this book is much more than an outline based on the Sanskrit sources, as Seyfort Ruegg too modestly characterises his work. It is difficult to see how it would have been possible to be more comprehensive within the scope of less than 150 pages. Several texts available only in Tibetan translation have been analysed in this work for the first time. With regard to such a well-known text as the MMK, Seyfort Ruegg’s analysis of some important philosophical problems is in itself an important contribution to the study of Nāgārjuna’s thought and deserves to be closely studied by all those interested in Madhyamaka philosophy. Seyfort Ruegg has a profound knowledge not only of the Sanskrit and Tibetan sources of the Madhyamaka school but also of the voluminous Tibetan literature on the history, the exegesis and the doctrines of the Madhyamaka texts. For many years to come his book will be absolutely indispensable, both as a masterly survey of the Madhyamaka literature and as a basis for further studies.

In conclusion I would like to make a few remarks on some very minor points.

P. 8. The title Madhyamakaśāstrastuti ought to be preceded by an asterisk, because it is only found in lines probably added by a copyist.1

P. 9. Seyfort Ruegg points out that the MMK number 447 or 449 verses according to whether the two introductory stanzas are included or not. Recently Tilman Vetter has stated as his opinion that they do not belong to the original work.2 However, Chr. Lindtner does not agree with him and includes these two verses in his edition of the MMK.3 The Tibetans seem to have considered these two verses to belong to Nāgārjuna’s work because the ldan-dkar-ma Catalogue states that the MMK contains 449 ślokas.4 How far this indication is based upon a genuine Indian tradition is impossible to know.


P. 54, n. 155. Seyfort Ruegg writes: “J. W. de Jong, AM 17 (1971), pp. 107–108, seems to incline to the view that Rāhulabhadra preceded Nāgārjuna.” In reviewing Lamotte’s Traité III I remarked that the testimony of Chinese authors from the seventh and eighth centuries is not sufficient to consider Rāhulabhadra “un successeur proche ou lointain” of Nāgārjuna.
I refrained from venturing an opinion as to whether Rāhulabhadra preceded or followed Nāgārjuna because the available evidence seemed too contradictory. In a recent article Seyfort Ruegg adduces weighty arguments for considering Rāhulabhadra to have been Nāgārjuna's successor.5

NOTES

3 Nāgārjunas filosofiske værker (København, 1982), p. 39. According to Lindtner the MMK contain 448 stanzas distributed over 27 chapters (op. cit., p. 27). However, his edition contains 447 stanzas: the two introductory stanzas and 445 stanzas. Lindtner omits XII, 6 and XXXIII, 20.
5 'Towards a chronology of the Madhyamaka school', Indological and Buddhist Studies (Canberra, 1982), p. 511.


The temples of the Alchi monastery and their mural paintings have been described in great detail by D. L. Snellgrove and T. Skorupski in The Cultural Heritage of Ladakh (Vol. One, Boulder, 1977, pp. 29–80). The inscriptions were edited and translated by Philip Denwood (op. cit., Vol. Two, Warminster, 1980, pp. 119–153). According to Pratapaditya Pal's preface, several books have been published on Alchi, and those published in Japanese are richly adorned with numerous colour reproductions. However, his bibliography does not mention any of these Japanese publications and the only book listed which contains a detailed study of Alchi is the above-mentioned work by Snellgrove and Skorupski. Pratapaditya Pal refers to "Professor Tucci's discussion (written in the Thirties) on Alchi and related monuments of Western Tibet", but without indicating where this was published. Snellgrove and Skorupski point out that in Tucci's Indo-Tibetica one will find detailed descriptions of temples in Western Tibet contemporary with Alchi (op. cit., Vol. One, p. 143) and Philip Denwood writes that Tucci visited the temples at Alchi and occasionally referred to them (op. cit., Vol. Two, p. 119). One wonders where Pratapaditya Pal has found Tucci's discussion on Alchi.

Pratapaditya Pal's Introduction to this volume seems to have been written mainly in order to accompany the beautiful photographs taken by Lionel Fournier. The splendid colour plates in this volume will be enjoyed by all those who are interested in the murals of the Alchi temples. The Introduction is much less satisfactory. Most of it deals with a discussion of artistic styles and of the dates of the murals. The section entitled "Religious Background" shows that Pratapaditya Pal is not very well acquainted with Buddhist literature. It may suffice to quote one example. On p. 37 he writes: "One of the most important texts for Yogatantra is the Tatvasamgraha which was compiled in India, probably in the seventh century and apparently by Sāntaraksita whose portrait is included in the Lhakhang Some (LS 19). It was a text of special significance for the Kadampa order and was jointly translated into Tibetan by Śraddhākavarman and Rinchen Sangpo." Pratapaditya Pal is blissfully unaware of the fact that
Sāntarakṣita's *Tattvasamgraha* is a critical study of the different schools of Indian philosophy and has nothing whatsoever to do with Yogatantra. The text translated by Śraddhākavaran and Rin-ch’en bzan-po is an entirely different text, the full title of which is *Sarvatasthāgatata-ttvasamgraha*. The Sanskrit text of it was recently edited by K. Horiuchi (cf. *IJJ* 19, 1977, pp. 125–127). The fact that Sāntarakṣita is depicted on a mural at Alchi is no sufficient reason to assume that his *Tattvasamgraha* was of special significance for the Kadampa order.

**NOTE**


The story of the prince who became a cuckoo is a well-known legend. The complete title in Tibetan is *Byan-chub-kyi sems mna’-ba’i bya mgrin-snoi zla-ba’i rtogs-pa brjod-pa ’khor-ba mtha’-dag la sfin-po med-par mthon-ba rams-kyi rna-rgyan*, “Story of the bird mGrin-sion-zla-ba who possesses the thought of awakening (*bodhicitta*), Ear-ornament of those who see that the entire transmigration is without essence.” In 1937 Jacques Bacot translated a section of the fourth chapter (ff. 48b–55a) and edited the corresponding Tibetan text (La Vie de Marpa le “traducteur” suivie d’un chapitre de l’Avadāna de l’oiseau Nilakantha, pp. 63–71 and pp. 108–115). Recently Dieter Schuh published a detailed synopsis of the story (*Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke*, Teil 8, Wiesbaden, 1981, pp. 23–38). Schuh also presents text and translation of the prophecy on the writing of the story and of the colophons. The colophons were also translated by Jacques Bacot (*Titres et colophons d’ouvrages non canoniques tibétains*, *BEFEO* 44 (1954), pp. 309–310). Schuh shows that the date mentioned in the colophon is 1737. Lama Geshe Wangyal states in his preface that the story was written in 1857. This is of course impossible because a Mongolian translation was published in 1770 (cf. Schuh p. 26). Both Bacot and Schuh refer to a blockprint edition of the text in 133 folios. Although many Tibetan texts have been published in recent years in India, Nepal and Bhutan, this text does not seem to have been reprinted. If one compares Bacot’s and Lama Geshe Wangyal’s translation on ff. 48b–55a, it is obvious that Lama Geshe Wangyal has not tried to translate accurately the Tibetan text, whereas Bacot’s translation follows closely the Tibetan text. Lama Geshe Wangyal’s translation is very free and omits phrases or parts of phrases. In some instances, his translation is entirely wrong. The chapter begins by telling that during the day (*sit-gyi dus-su*) the king, the prince, the ministers, and the queens occupied themselves with amusements and with discussions on the Dharma. Lama Geshe Wangyal translates: “The days passed and the king, his son, the queens and ministers lived happily together, passing the nights in discussing the Dharma.” When the princess Svarasvati and the prince Laganana are conspiring against prince Darmananda, the followers of Makaradhivaja (i.e. Kāmadeva) gathered like clouds behind Laganana (*de’i dus-su chu-srin rgyal-mtshan-gyi sder gtogs-pa rnam-kyis la-ga-a-na’i phyi-na spirin-ltar ’thibs-te gnas-so*). Lama Geshe Wangyal translates: “As she said these words, dark clouds gathered over the banners of victory upon the palace walls” (p. 77, lines 14 and 13 from below). Bacot’s translation is not entirely correct: “A ce

moment des signes funestes du peuple des Makaras enveloppèrent Laga ana comme des nuages accumulés."

It is to be hoped that the text of the story of the prince who became a cuckoo will be edited. Lama Geshe Wangyal's translation will be useful for those who are interested only in the story and not a precise translation of the Tibetan text.

G. W. Houston (tr.), *Wings of the White Crane. Poems of Tshangs dbyangs rgya mtsho (1683–1706)*. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna, Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. XXI, 53 pp. Rs. 50.-

*The Songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama* is a famous work in Tibet and well-known to Western Tibetologists. The text was published for the first time outside Tibet by Sarat Chandra Das in his *An Introduction to the Grammar of the Tibetan Language* (Darjeeling, 1915), Appendix IX: The love-songs of the 6th Dalai Lama Tshang-yang Gya-tscho, pp. 33–35. According to Das, the Tibetan title of the love songs is Tshaṅs-dbyaṅs rgya-mtsho'i mgul-glu sīnan-'grugs-kyis bkod-pa btsugs-so. Recently the Songs and the Secret Biography of the Sixth Dalai Lama were published in Peking. Rig-'dzin tshaṅs-dbyaṅs rgya-mtsho'i gsun-mgur dan gsal-ba'i nam-thar (Peking, 1981). In the preface the title of the Songs is given as Tshaṅs-dbyaṅs rgya-mtsho'i nam-thar sīnan-'grugs-kyis bkod-pa ces bya-ba btsugs-so. The Peking edition reproduces the text of a Lhasa print of the Songs and adds 59 songs selected from more than 360 found in a manuscript entitled Tshaṅs-dbyaṅs rgya-mtsho'i mgul-glu. It is to be hoped that the other songs of this manuscript will also be published. In 1981, K. Dhondup published the text and translation of the Songs as the *Songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama* (Dharamsala, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives). In his introduction, Dhondup mentions two complete translations in English of the Songs, by Yu Dawchhyuan 1 and by Marion H. Duncan. 2 Yu Dawchhyuan’s edition of the Songs is based upon a Tibetan blockprint from Lhasa and Das’s edition. I have not been able to consult Duncan’s book, which was also published in London by the Mitre Press in 1961.

In his book *Tibetan Folk Songs from Gyantse and Western Tibet* (Ascona, 1966), Tucci wrote that Western literature on Tibetan folk songs is rather scarce. Tucci gives a bibliography of songs published either in translation or in the original text *op. cit.*, pp. 13–14. As far as I know, no bibliography of Tibetan folk songs has been published since 1966.

In his introduction to Houston’s book (pp. ix–xxi), Helmut Hoffmann translates a passage on the Sixth Dalai Lama from the index volume of the Lhasa edition of the Kanjur, and another from the report of the Manchu general Funingga which was edited and translated by Eva Kraft. 3 The latter text, a detailed study of which is being prepared by Helmut Hoffmann, 4 gives some interesting information on the heresy of the Sixth Dalai Lama. Helmut Hoffmann also draws attention to the Secret Biography of the Sixth Dalai Lama. Probably more information on the Sixth Dalai Lama and his religious practices will be found in the forthcoming studies on this work by Piotr Klaśkowski and Yonten Gyatso. 5

Helmut Hoffmann writes that Yu Dawchhyuan’s translation suffers from a lack of adequate materials concerning the songs and that this is all the more reason to appreciate Dr. Houston’s decision to produce a new translation based upon an original Tibetan block-print. Houston does not state which block-print he has used. He edits the text in Tibetan characters and in romanisation. In his notes he often mentions the readings of Das without explaining that he is referring to Das's edition of the Songs. It is not clear as to how far the materials used by Houston are more adequate than those used by Yu Dawchhyuan who, like Houston, had at his disposal a Tibetan blockprint and the edition of the Songs by Das. Yu Dawchhyuan reproduced the readings of the Tibetan blockprint with great care. From Houston’s edition it is impossible to know the readings of his block-print. Often we find different readings in the Tibetan script and the romanised texts. For instance, Song 2, line 3, *rgas-pas* — *rgyas pas*; Song 6, line 2, *mtshan* —

mtshon; Song 8, line 3, *ki – kyi*; Song 14, line 1, *stobs – stoṅ*. In some very few instances Houston indicates a correction of the text. For instance, in Song 10 the text in Tibetan script reads ‘khrl-ḥzuṅ, the romanised text *khrl-bzuṅ*. In a note Houston writes: ‘Das: khrel; read: ‘khril.” The correct reading is of course khrel-ḥzuṅ. which is found in all four editions of the Songs mentioned above. In Song 8 both texts read ’brel-mtshams byed-mkhan. However, Houston translates *bral* which is found in other editions. Only Dhondup’s edition which is not always very careful also has *bral*.

Yu Dawchuyuan remarked that although the language used in the songs is plain and simple, even Tibetans do not understand every phrase in them (op. cit., p. 37). One would have expected from a new translation that the style and the vocabulary would have been analysed carefully by the translator. For instance, several Songs end with the word dan, cf. Songs 13, 14, 24, and 40. In his grammar of the Tibetan language, Michael Hahn noted the use of dan after an imperative, but only when followed by another sentence: “Ein Imperativsatz kann mit Hilfe der Soziativpartikel mit einem folgenden Imperativ- oder Aussagesatz verknüpft werden. Die Imperativpartikel des Vordersatzes darf hierbei vor dan ausfallen!”

Songs often end on an imperative followed by dan: one can find examples in the folk songs from Gyantse edited by Tucci (op. cit., pp. 30–31). The last two lines of Song 13 are khrel dan gzun gi the’u / so so’i sems la skyon dan / . Yu Dawchuyuan translates: “Please stamp the seal of faith / On the heart of each of us.” Dhondup has: “Better it is to seal one’s heart with the seal of truth and justice.” Both translators have seen correctly that skyon is an imperative. Houston translates: “The small seal stands blameless. There is fault in every mind.” It is obvious that he has not realised that the word preceding dan must be an imperative and not a noun.

The Songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama deserve to be studied carefully. Houston’s edition and translation are both unsatisfactory. We still await a serious study which will do justice to these interesting and intriguing Songs.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTES

1 Love Songs of the Sixth Dalailama Tshangs-dbyangs-rgya-mtsho. Translated into Chinese and English with notes and introduction by Yu Dawchuyuan and transcribed by Dr. Jaw Yuanrenn (Y. R. Chao). Peiping, 1930.


Anyone even cursorily reading Sanskrit medical texts will not fail to notice that they contain much matter that we usually term “magical” and not “scientific”: incantations, rites, sacrifices, amulets, precautionary “magical” measures etc. Thite’s book is a study of these, not only in texts professedly medical, but also in other, especially Vedic texts in which we find such “magical” medical matter. The book also deals with subjects allied to the above.