

REVIEWS

Einführung in die Indologie. Stand, Methoden, Aufgaben. Herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert und Georg von Simson. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979, XIV, 272 pp. DM 43.50.

It must seem almost impossible to give an adequate survey of the present state of Indian studies in a book of less than 300 small pages. However, this very difficult task has been successfully carried out by the editors of this volume in collaboration with seventeen scholars. The *Einführung in die Indologie* is not a popular introduction but a guide to the present state of Indian studies. In the first chapter Bechert remarks that in Europe the name 'Indologie' has replaced older names such as 'Sanskrit-philologie' and 'indische Altertumskunde'. The present volume extends the scope of 'Indologie' to the study of the cultures, languages and literatures of the Indian subcontinent (including Nepal and Sri Lanka) from the earliest times up to the present.

The chapters of this book carry the following headings: I. Geschichte und Begriff der Indologie; II. Allgemeine und bibliographische Hilfsmittel; III. Sprachen und Schriften; IV. Literaturen und Metrik; V. Religionen; VI. Philosophie; VII. Einheimische Wissenschaften; VIII. Gesellschaft, Recht und Staat; IX. Geschichte; X. Kunst und materielle Kultur; XI. Kulturbeziehungen Indiens. Most chapters are subdivided into sections. For instance chapter VII is subdivided into three sections: Philologische Disziplinen (Grammatik, Lexikographie, Metrik, *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, *Nāṭyaśāstra*); Medizin und Nachbarwissenschaften (*Āyurveda*, Pharmakologie, *Kāmaśāstra*); Andere Wissenschaften (Mathematik, Astronomie und Astrologie, *Śilpaśāstra* und sonstige einheimische Wissenschaften).

As indicated by the subtitle, *Einführung in die Indologie* outlines the present state of Indian studies, points out the methods employed by scholars and their different points of view, and, finally, draws attention to neglected fields or topics of research. Important publications are listed and particular attention is paid to the more recent literature. In many instances the bibliographical indications are followed or introduced by brief critical comments. The usefulness of the book is enhanced by the many cross-references in the text and in the bibliographies.

The book is the fruit of the collaboration of nineteen scholars who are specialists in the various topics studied by them. A critical examination of their contributions ought to be undertaken by a group of specialists and not by a single reviewer. The latter can only declare that he has read this book with great admiration for the amount of information contained in it and for the way it has been presented. There is no doubt that this book will be often consulted by students and scholars. It is impossible to imagine a better guide to Indian studies and it is to be hoped that it will be regularly reprinted and brought up to date. With a view to future editions I would like to conclude this review with a few marginal remarks mainly relating to the bibliographies. On p. 11 a number of 'Kleine Schriften' is listed. Add: *Oeuvres de Auguste Barth*, Tomes I–V (1914–1927); *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (1937); R. L. Turner, *Collected papers 1912–1973* (1975). For Zacharias read Zachariae. P. 13: Add L. Boulnois, *Bibliographie du Népal*, 1, Sciences humaines. Références en langues européennes. Supplément 1967–1973, Paris 1975. P. 30: T. Burrow's translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents was published in London 1940 (not Cambridge 1937). P. 41: read M. B. Emeneau and J. Vacek (not Vaak). P. 44: For a detailed review of Shafer's *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan* see R. A. Miller, *Monumenta Serica* 27, 1968, 398–435. P. 47 Kharoṣṭhī. Add Brough's review of Das Gupta's

Indo-Iranian Journal 23 (1981) 219–244. 0019–7246/81/0233–0219 \$02.60.

Copyright © 1981 by D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, Holland, and Boston, U.S.A.

book (*BSOAS* 22, 1959, 593–4) and Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London, 1962, pp. 55ff. P. 49: Add a cross-reference to O. Botto (ed.), *Storia delle letterature d'Oriente*, vols. 2–3 mentioned in § 65. P. 54: Haas's "Recurrent and Parallel Passages, etc." is also included in the second (O. U. P., 1931) and later editions of R. E. Hume's *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. P. 58: Read R. Shafer, *Ethnography of Ancient India*. The Pāda-index (Baroda 1961–66) is not based on the critical edition of the Rāmāyaṇa, but on the Vulgate (Gujarati Press, Bombay, 1912–1920). P. 67 mentions the names of Japanese scholars who have edited Buddhist Sanskrit texts. The name of U. Wogihara certainly ought to be added. His *Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary* (Tokyo, 1964–1974) is rich in Buddhist Sanskrit words, but is not mentioned on p. 24. P. 68: Yamada's *Bibliography*, etc. was published in a provisional form in 1957 in the *Annual Report of the Faculty of Letters, Tohoku University* 8, 1–189 (not 1–85) and appeared as a book in a revised and enlarged form in 1959 (*Bongo butten no shobunken*, Kyoto). P. 103: H. Oldenberg, *Vedaforschung* is mentioned but not L. Renou, *Les maîtres de la philologie védique*, Paris 1928. P. 117: read W. E. Soothill. In my "A Brief History of Buddhist Studies" no definition of Buddhist Studies is given (cf. *EB* 7, 56). The same work was published as a book with the addition of an index (Varanasi 1976). P. 122: Har Dayal's *The Bodhisattva Doctrine* appeared in 1932. P. 258: I-tsing departed in 671, not in 689.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Claus Vogel, *Indian Lexicography* (A history of Indian literature; Vol. 5, Fasc. 4), pp. 301–401. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1979. DM 48, —.

Since the publication of Theodor Zachariae's *Die indischen Wörterbücher (Kośa)* in 1897 (Grundriss I, 3 B) much progress has been made in the study and the publication of Indian lexicographical works. New information is to be found in R. Śarmā's study ('A Brief Survey of the History and Development of Indian Lexicography', *Kalpādrakośa of Keśava*, Vol. 1, Baroda, 1928, pp. VII–LXII). Claus Vogel's work contains a mass of information which is not to be found in these two publications. After having briefly characterized the organisation of the India lexica, Vogel examines the kośas one by one in chronological order, beginning with the fragments of the lexica compiled by Vācaspati, Vyāḍi and Vikramāditya and ending with Kṣemendra's Lokaprakāśa. Two sections are devoted to special dictionaries and to bilingual and multilingual dictionaries. It is sufficient to compare the table of contents of Zachariae's work with that of Vogel's work in order to see at one glance how many more kośas are known at present. A great number of editions and studies have been published since 1897 and it must have been an enormous task to collect all the information available and to sift it critically. Each kośa is briefly described and its sources examined. Particular attention is paid by Vogel to the exact determination of the dates of works and authors. The numerous notes (262) contain detailed bibliographical information on editions, studies, etc. Vogel has carefully examined previous studies and often arrives at new results which are briefly summarized. His work will certainly be for many years to come the standard work on Indian lexicography. Only in one respect does it not entirely replace Zachariae's work. More detailed information on the arrangement of kośas is to be found in the latter (cf. pp. 8–16).

On p. 312 Vogel mentions the pandit of Situ. His dates are 1700–1774, cf. Gene Smith's foreword to *The Autobiography and Diaries of Situ paṇ-chen* (Śatapīṭaka, vol. 77, New Delhi, 1968), pp. 9–11. P. 313, n. 41 Vogel discusses a Chinese version of the Amarakośa which would have been translated by Chū-na-lo-t'o according to St. Julien. The name of the translator is not Chū-na-lo-t'o (Guṇarata) but Chū-lo na-t'o which renders Kulanātha, another name of Paramārtha (500–569), cf. Paul Demiéville, *Choix d'études bouddhiques* (Leiden, 1973),

p. 16, n. 3. St. Julien based his opinion on an entry in a Chinese Buddhist catalogue which Vogel renders as "translation from the language of a foreign country in seven books now called Miscellaneous Matters [Samyuktavastu] and now called Matters of Cause and Reason in the Kośasāstra [Kośasāstrahetupratyayavastu]". The Chinese text says: "Translation of foreign words. Seven scrolls. One name is Miscellaneous section; another name is Section on cause and reason in the Kośasāstra." On p. 379 Vogel mentions Līlāvajra's Nāmasaṃgīṭīkā. Bendall's catalogue also lists a ṭippanī called Amṛtakaṇikā, cf. C. Bendall, [ABCIM 61], p. 29.¹ Both Līlāvajra's commentary and the Amṛtakaṇikā were translated into Tibetan, cf. P. Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 2e partie (Paris, 1909), pp. 265 and 25. On p. 382 Vogel mentions parts 1 and 2 of Csoma de Kőrös's edition of the Mahāvīyūtpatti, but omits part 3 which was edited by D. C. Chatterjee in 1944. As to the Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary (11), the text of the colophon was published and translated by Jacques Bacot, 'Titres et colophons d'ouvrages non canoniques tibétains', *BEFEO* 44 (1954), pp. 294–296. On the same page Vogel lists only one late Chinese-Sanskrit vocabulary but does not mention the Sanskrit-Chinese vocabularies, published in volume 54 of the Taishō Issaikyō, which are much older, cf. P. C. Bagchi, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois: Fa yu tsa ming de Li yen et Fan yu ts'ien tseu wen de Yi-tsing* (Paris, 1929–1937); R. H. van Gulik, *Siddham* (Nagpur, 1956).

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTE

¹ For other manuscripts of these two commentaries see Akira Yuyama, *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints* (Canberra, 1967), pp. 59–60.

Peter Thomi, *Cūḍālā*. Eine Episode aus dem Yogavāsiṣṭha. Wichtrach, Institut für Indologie, 1980. 509 pp.

The Yogavāsiṣṭha is one of the most voluminous works in Sanskrit literature and has been very popular in India. However, both in India and in the West relatively little attention has been paid to it. Helmuth von Glasenapp who analyzed the main philosophical doctrines found in this work, has listed editions, translations, and studies (*Zwei philosophische Rāmāyaṇas*, Wiesbaden, 1951, pp. 18–20). In 1955 T. G. Mainkar published a book entitled: *The Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa. A Study* (second edition: New Delhi, 1977), in which he examines in detail the opinions of other scholars. On p. 16 of his study von Glasenapp refers to a series of articles by P. C. Divanji which are not mentioned in Thomi's bibliography. Mainkar mentions one article by Divanji in his bibliography: 'The Date and Place of origin of the Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha', *Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference* (Baroda, 1933), pp. 15–30, and on p. 180 refers to two other articles without giving their title: *The Poona Orientalist*, III.1, pp. 29–44; *The New Indian Antiquary*, I.12, pp. 697–715.

Almost all the books and articles on the Yogavāsiṣṭha study its philosophical ideas or the problems connected with its date. Peter Thomi's work deals with one episode, the story of Cūḍālā, which occupies sargas 77–110 of the first half of book six of the Yogavāsiṣṭha and one sarga of book six (6.9) of the Laghu-Yogavāsiṣṭha. In his introduction Thomi examines the relation between the great and the small Yogavāsiṣṭha. He draws attention to the fact that usually the small Yogavāsiṣṭha (L) is attributed to Gauḍa Abhinanda and is considered to be an

extract from the great Yogavāsiṣṭha (M). Thomi has compared the printed edition of L (LN) with five manuscripts (LMa–e), of which one (LMa) contains both the text and a commentary.¹ Thomi points out that the three last chapters of LN (6.16–18) are not found in MS LMa and that the commentary in LN and LMa ends with chapter 6.15. Two recensions can be distinguished, one accompanied by the commentary and the other which is without commentary. The first contains 4840 verses and the second about 500 verses less, whereas the printed text contains 5013 verses. The name Gauḍa Abhinanda is found only in manuscripts which contain an additional chapter (6.16). In the manuscripts consulted by Thomi the names Laghu-yogavāsiṣṭha, Yogavāsiṣṭhasaṃkṣepa and Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra are not found. In them the most common name is Mokṣopāya. Other names mentioned in the colophons are Vāsiṣṭha, Vāsiṣṭharāmāyaṇa and Mokṣopāyasāra. L is not to be confused with another work, the Yogavāsiṣṭhasāra, an epitome in about 220 verses of M, on which commentaries were written by Pūrṇānanda (Thomi writes Pūrṇānda) and Mahīdhara. Thomi announces a critical edition of this work.

Thomi does not believe that L is an extract of M. According to him it is more probable that L, or rather the original version of L has been expanded throughout the centuries until it reached the gigantic proportions of M. With regard to the story of Cūḍālā he distinguishes four successive stages: “A. Urfassung der Cūḍālā-Episode (vielleicht nicht vollständig erhalten), B. Urfassung von L, C. die bekannte kürzere Fassung von L, D. M-Version. Die Urfassung des Yogavāsiṣṭha ist möglicherweise mit Ebene B identisch.” (p. 24, n. 1). According to Thomi the printed edition of M (Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1937) contains 28241 verses² and the printed edition of L (Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1937) 5013 verses. Curiously enough, Thomi does not indicate that in the episode of Cūḍālā the ratio of expansion must have been considerably less than in other parts of the work, because LN contains 638 verses and MN (the printed edition of M) 1634 verses. It will be necessary to compare carefully the other parts of L and M before drawing any definite conclusions.

The main part of Thomi's work is a translation of both recensions (M and L) of the episode of Cūḍālā (pp. 35–354). In the notes (pp. 359–473) Thomi lists variant readings. With regard to M, Thomi's main source is a manuscript (MMa) belonging to the Bodleian Library. The readings of two other manuscripts (MMb/c) are given in a ‘Nachtrag’, but only for so far Thomi considered it useful to mention them (usually when they confirm a reading of MMa or a conjecture). For this reason it is not possible to obtain a complete picture of the readings of all three manuscripts as compared to those found in the printed edition. In many instances MMa has better readings and Thomi's work clearly shows the necessity of a critical edition of the Yogavāsiṣṭha based upon a large number of manuscripts of both L and M. There is no doubt that Thomi has been able to establish a text which is much more understandable than the one found in the printed edition, although several verses are still hopelessly corrupt, especially in the philosophical parts. Thomi refrained from attempting to translate verses which he did not understand. Perhaps he could have been even more careful in this respect because sometimes it is not easy to discover any clear meaning in the translation he gives. Let us quote only one example. In 101.38cd MN reads: *bhāvābhāvair upārūḍhaṃ sthitādhigatavedanam*. Thomi translates: “Das zum Bestehen gekommene Empfinden ist von Werden und Vergehen begleitet.” In the notes Thomi suggests reading *sthitā-*. Whether one reads *sthitā-* or *sthitā-*, it is difficult to understand either the Sanskrit text or Thomi's translation. In his preface Thomi remarks that he did not attempt to analyse the philosophical ideas, because this can only be done in connection with a translation of at least the whole of L. A careful analysis of the philosophical terms would certainly be useful. Although relatively much attention has been paid to the philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha, detailed studies based upon a close scrutiny of the text and its terminology have not yet been undertaken. For instance, the remarks of S. N. Dasgupta (*A history of Indian Philosophy*, Volume II, Cambridge, 1932, p. 231) on the resemblance of the philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha to the idealistic school of Buddhism have often been quoted, but so far no attempt has been made to examine more closely the influence of Buddhist

philosophy. As far as I know, for instance, it has not yet been pointed out that the term *arthakriyā*, which occurs several times in the Yogavāsiṣṭha goes back to the writings of Dharmakīrti and later Buddhist philosophers. As shown by Nagatomi, with Dharmakīrti *arthakriyā* meant epistemologically ‘the fulfilment of a human purpose’ and ontologically ‘causal power’ (‘*Arthakriyā*’, *ALB* 31–32, 1967–1968, p. 72). In his book (p. 130) Mainkar quotes the following verse (VIB. 99.47) from the Yogavāsiṣṭha:

*bhaved bhramātmakam api kiṃcid arthakriyākaram /
svapnāṅganāpi kurute satyām arthakriyām nr̥ṇām //*

In the episode of Cūḍālā *arthakriyā* occurs in the following verse (95.1):

*ābrahmastambaparyantaṃ yad (so MMA; MN yady) ayaṃ bhāsate bhramah /
arthakriyāsamārthaś ca tāt kathāṃ duḥkhakāraṇam //*

Thomi translates: “Die Illusion, die vom Brahmā bis zum Grasbüschel alles umfasst, ist (wie eine Fata Morgana) nicht in der Lage, die Bedürfnisse zu erfüllen. Wie kommt es zu dieser Ursache des Unglücks?” Here *arthakriyā* certainly has the meaning of ‘causal power’. If everything, from Brahmā up to a tuft of grass, is only an illusion, how can it then be capable of causal power and be a cause of suffering? The expression *arthakriyā* is also found in the following verse (98.25):

*ittham ālakṣyamāṇam tat tad evaṃ satataṃ mune /
na ca nārthakriyākāri bhaven nettham idaṃ jagat //*

The text is not well established. In a MMA reads *san tad*; in b *na cedam nāvabhāsate*; in d *na caivetttham idaṃ jagat*. There is, however, no reason to change *ca nārtha-* to *padārtha-* as proposed by Thomi. It is, of course, not certain that the author of the Yogavāsiṣṭha took this term directly from Buddhist texts because the term *arthakriyā* is also found in the works of Vedāntic opponents of Dharmakīrti (cf. Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 and 108). The verses quoted seem to indicate rather the influence of later Vedānta ideas.

The episode of Cūḍālā has already been translated twice, by Mitra in his complete translation of the Yogavāsiṣṭha (Calcutta, 1891–1899) and by H. P. Shastri in a work mentioned by von Glasenapp: *Yogavāsiṣṭha. The Story of Queen Chūḍālā and Sermons of Holy Vasiṣṭha, translated by H. P. Shastri*. London, 1937. Both works were not at my disposal and the following notes are based only upon the text of M (Nirṇaya-Sāgar edition) and on Thomi’s work.

77.29 *vanānteṣu* is not ‘am Rande des Vana’, cf. J. Gonda, ‘Altind. ° anta-, ° antara-, usw.’, *Bijdragen TLV* 97 (1938), pp. 462–464.

78.4ab *hīmāśanir ivāmbhoje jarā nipatanonmukhī*, “old age is ready to swoop down as lightning in winter on a lotus”. Thomi translates: “das Alter auf sie zukommen und in sie eindringen würde wie die Pfeilspitze der Kälte in zwei Lotusblumen.”

79.1 *dinānudīnam ity eṣā svātmārāmatayā tayā / nityam antarmukhatayā babhūva prakṛtisthitā*. Thomi prefers to read with LMa—c *prakṛtasthitiḥ* (ihr gewöhnliches Leben), but the reading *prakṛtisthitā* is certainly preferable.

79.4cd *sarvopamātītātayā jagāmvāvyapadeśyatām*. Thomi translates: “gelangte sie in einen Zustand der Nichtmehrbenennbarkeit, indem sie die Besten sämtliche übertraf.” She did not surpass the best ones (*upama*) but all comparisons (*upamā*).

80.29 MN has *vistārah kṛtārtha prakṛtārthahā*. In a note Thomi says: “*kṛtārtha*; ich folge MMA: *kriyoktaḥ* “zum Tun gesagt” (!).“

80.37 MN has *lipyārdhomaḥkārasamsthānā*. In his note Thomi says: “ist etwa *lipyārdhaumkāra-* zu lesen?”. This is of course not possible on account of Pāṇini’s rule (VI. 1.95) which is always carefully observed by Indian authors. Cf. also 104.4 *tadom iti*.

84.9ab *rātrimdivam mahān eṣa śuṣyaty eva kṛṣānunā*. Thomi translates: “Tag und Nacht litt der Grosse, mit krankem Gesicht.” In a note Thomi proposes to read *dinam* for *divam*. He does not explain why he translates *kṛṣānanah*. According to his note MMA has *śuṣyañ śokakṛṣānunā* which is probably a better reading.

88.14ab *aham alpatapāḥ sādhuvarāko mānuṣaḥ kila*. Thomi reads with MMA and LN *sādhur vārako* and translates: “Mein Tapas ist gering, mit einem Sādhu verglichen, bin ich ein armseliger Mann.” Read *sādhu varāko*: “Certainly I possess little tapas, I am a miserable man.”

90.17cd *śabdasaṃśravanenāṅga yathā grānavihamgamah*. Thomi translates: “wie eine Schar von Vögeln, die von Geräuschen aufgescheucht wurde.” He adds in a note: “Wahrscheinlich steht aber *grānavihamgaḥ* für *vihaṅgagrāmah*.” However, *grānavihamgama* (not *vihaṅga*) can be translated very well as ‘a domestic bird’.

90.26cd *na labdhavān bhavān sādho sphaṭikasyāpi khaṇḍikām*. In his note Thomi says that *sphaṭika* is here *sphutikā*. However, this passage refers to 88.20ab *dadarsātha kacadrūpaṃ kācakhaṇḍam akhaṇḍitam*. According to the dictionaries *kāca* can mean both ‘glass’ and ‘crystal’.

91.8cd *tat tatyāja bhavān bhogabhūmiṃ rājyaṃ akaṇṭakam*. Thomi translates: “so steht das für dich, der du unbehindert die Genüsse, deine Stellung und dein Reich verliessest.” *Akaṇṭakam* is not an adverb but qualifies *rājya* “a kingdom without thorns, i.e. free from troubles.”

91.14–16 *yadā vanam prayātas tvam tadājñānam kṣatam tvayā / patitam san na nihataṃ manastyāgamahāsina // tena bhūyah samutthāya smṛtvā paribhavam kṛtam / tapaḥprapañcakhāte 'smin gahane tvam niyojitaḥ // tadaivāghātayiṣyas tvam yady ajñānam tathāgatam / rājyatyāgavidhau tat tvām nāhaniṣyat kṣayam gatam //*. Thomi translates: “Als du dich ins Vana begeben, da wurde das Nichterkennen durch dich verletzt. Obgleich es aber gefallen war, blieb es verschont vom grossen Schwert der Allaufgabe [M: des Aufgebens des Gemüts]. Es erhob sich wieder, gedachte der angetanen Schmach und band dich in dieser tiefen Grube, in der Illusion der Askese fest. Wenn du es damals gleich niedergeschlagen hättest, wäre es mit dem Nichterkennen ebenfalls vorbei gewesen. Als du das Königtum verliessest, hätte es dir, da es verschwunden gewesen wäre, nichts mehr anhaben können.” The commentary explains verse 16 which has been misunderstood by Thomi: *rājyatyāgavidhau tadaiva tathāgatam patitam ajñānam yady aghātayiṣyas tat tadaiva kṣayam gatam sat tvām tapaḥkhātapātena nāhaniṣyad ity arthaḥ*, “If, then, when you abandoned your kingdom, you had destroyed the nescience which was in that state, i.e. fallen, then it, being destroyed, would not have struck you by throwing you in the pit of tapas.”

92.1ab *yad uktam nayaśālinyā tayā veditavedyayā*. Thomi reads *tava* for *naya* and translates: “(Das Wissen), von welchem die zur Erkenntnis gekommene Cūḍālā, auf die du stolz sein kannst, damals sprach.” (!)

94.33c *jaḍam tv asadrūpatayā*. The commentary explains: *asadrūpatayā prasiddham iti śeṣaḥ*. It is indeed not possible to translate: “Das Stumpfe aber ist nichtseiend, weil es (nichts als) Form ist.”

94.37cd *yatra bhāvāḥ svayam hy ete* (MN *svadante te*) *nirṇīyante ca yena vā*. Thomi translates “(Ich bin reines Bewusstseins) . . . worin und wodurch die Dinge von selbst weggeführt [zum Verschwinden gebracht?] werden.” *Nirṇīyante* means ‘are determined’.

94.42ab *kāraṇāj jāyate kāryam yat tat sarvatra saṃbhavet*. Thomi translates: “Eine Sache, die aus einer Ursache hervorgeht, besteht überall.” Here and in the following passages Thomi always translates *kārya* by ‘Sache’ instead of by ‘effect, result’.

94.46cd *tatas tvām bodhayiṣyāmi kāraṇākāraṇakramam*, “Thereupon I will explain to you the way of the cause and the non-cause.” The commentary gives a farfetched explanation: *tatas tvaduktyanantaram tvadabhipretam kāraṇam akāraṇam eva yena kramena sampadyate tam kramam tvām bodhayiṣyāmiṣy arthaḥ*. Thomi translates accordingly: “Dann werde ich dir zeigen, dass [oder: wie] die Ursache eine Nichtursache (und damit aufgehoben) ist.” It is impossible to explain these two pādas in this way. The word *krama* has here a very weak meaning and can be left out in the translation.

94.52 *yasyopalabhyate kiñcit svarūpaṃ kalanātmakam / asadrūpaṃ katham tat syāt prakāśaḥ syāt katham tamaḥ* // . Thomi translates: “Wie kann etwas vorhanden sein, dessen Wesen man als vorgetäuscht, als nichtseiend erkennt? Wie kann Licht Dunkelheit sein?” (for *kalanā*, ‘Täuschung’, see Thomi’s note on 78.23). The meaning of this verse is: “How can that of which an essence (lit. ‘some essence’) is perceived be made of illusion and be non-existent? How can light be darkness?”

99.21 *chāyāpuruṣavat spandī śāntaṃ nirmananaṃ jagat / jagacchadbārtharahitaṃ yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati*. Thomi translates: “Die mit Bewegungen wie eine Schattenfigur versehene Welt ist ruhig und ohne Denken. Der sieht, der die Welt ohne all das sieht, was man mit Worten bezeichnet.” This śloka is one single sentence: “He sees who sees the world which moves as a shadow and which is appeased and without thinking as deprived of that what is indicated by the word ‘world’.”

100.7 *akartṛkarmakarane nāsti kāraṇatā śive / tasmād akāraṇam* (MN *tasmāt tatkāraṇam*) *nāsti jagacchadbārthavedanam*. Thomi translates: “Im Glückseligen, das ohne Tätiges, Taten und Tun ist, gibt es kein Ursachesein. Als ursachenlose gibt es darum das, was man als Welt bezeichnet, und das Empfinden nicht.” The second half of the verse explains that, being without cause, there is no experience of that what is indicated by the word ‘world’. The reading of MN is also possible: “Therefore there is no experience, etc. caused by that (i.e. *śivam*).”

103.5a *vatsaratritayenātha*. Thomi translates: “Nach achtzehn Jahren.” Here again, as in 78.4 and in 79.4 Thomi adopts a meaning which is not found in classical Sanskrit.

105.10cd *abhisārikayā tulyaṃ dhārādhautāṅgacandanam*, “the sandal of his body being washed away by a shower, he resembled an *abhisārikā*.” Thomi translates: “aussehend wie eine Abhisārikā, die Glieder statt mit Sandelpaste mit Regengüssen herausgeputzt.”

It is one of the merits of Thomi’s work to have drawn attention to the many textual problems found in the text of the episode of Cūḍālā. It is to be hoped that more work will be done in this direction. Critical editions of summaries of the Yogavāsiṣṭha, of the small Yogavāsiṣṭha and of sections of the great Yogavāsiṣṭha would be very welcome. It is obvious that the Nirṇaya-sāgar Press edition of the great Yogavāsiṣṭha is not a sound basis for further study of this important text.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTES

¹ For a detailed examination of the two printed editions of L (Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay 1888 and 1937) and of several manuscripts see P. C. Divanji, ‘The text of the Laghu Yogavāsiṣṭha’, *New Indian Antiquary* I (1939), pp. 697–715.

² According to Atreya (*The Philosophy of the Yoga-vāsiṣṭha*, Madras, 1936, p. 79) M contains 27687 verses, cf. von Glasenapp, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions

The Yogavāsiṣṭha of Vālmīki with the commentary Vāsiṣṭhamahārāmayaṇatātparyaprakāśha.

Ed. by Wāsudeva Laxmaṇa Śāstrī Paṇṣīkar. Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1911. 2nd ed., 1918.

Third edition, revised and re-edited by Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya Kāvya-tīrtha, 1937 (Two other editions are mentioned by Thomi, p. 496).

Laghuyogavāsiṣṭhaḥ Vāsiṣṭhacandrikāvyaṅkhyāsahitaḥ. Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1888.

Second edition, revised by Wāsudeva Laxmaṇa Śāstrī Paṇṣīkar, Bombay, 1937.

Translations

The Yoga-vāsishtha-mahārāmāyana of Vālmiki. Tr. by Vihārīlāla Mitra. 4 vols. Calcutta, 1891, 1893, 1898, 1899.

Indian wisdom, or readings from Yoga Vasishta. By N. K. Ramasami Aiyar. Vellore, Victoria Press, 1903.

The Yoga-vasistha Ramayana. Tr. by D. N. Bose. Vol. I Vairagya (Renunciation) Mumukshu-Vyavahara (Discipline) and Srishtitattwa (Creation) Prakaranas. Calcutta, n.d. Vol. II Sthiti (Preservation) and Part of Upasam (Cure) Prakaranas. Calcutta, n.d.

Yogavāsishtha. The Story of Queen Chūdālā and Sermons of Holy Vasiṣṭha, tr. by H. P. Shastri. London, 1937. Fifth edition, London, 1975: *The World Within the Mind (Yoga-Vasistha)*: Extracts from the Discourses of the Sage Vasishta to his pupil, Prince Rama, and the Story of Queen Chudala. The Laghu-yogavāsishtha was translated by K. Narayanswami Aiyar (Madras, Minerva Press, 1896), cf. von Glasenapp, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

Studies

Atreya, B. L.: *The Yogavāsishtha and its Philosophy*. 1932. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Morabad, 1966.

—: *The Philosophy of the Yogavāsishtha*. Madras, 1936.

—: *Vasiṣṭha-darśana*. Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Texts, Vol. 64, 1936.

—: *The Essence of Yogavāsishtha*. Morabad, 1962.

Bhattacharya, Siva Prasad: 'The Yogavāsishtha Rāmāyaṇa, its probable date and place of inception', *Proceedings and Transactions of the Third Oriental Conference 1924* (Madras, 1925), pp. 545–554.

—: 'The Emergence of an Ādhyātma-Śāstra or the Birth of the Yogavāsishtha (sic) Rāmāyaṇa', *IHQ* 24 (1948), pp. 201–212.

—: 'The cardinal tenets of the Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha and their relation to the Trika system of Kaśmīra', *ABORI* 32 (1951), pp. 130–145.

—: 'The Siddhas in the Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa and a peep into their creed', *Indian Culture. Mahendra Jayanti volume* (Calcutta, 1951), pp. 91–112.

Dasgupta, Surendranath: *A History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. II (Cambridge, 1932), pp. 228–272.

Divanji, Prahlad C.: 'The date and place of origin of the Yogavāsishtha', *Proceedings of the Seventh All-India Oriental Conference, Baroda, 1933* (Baroda, 1935), pp. 15–30.

—: 'Further Light on the Date of the Yogavāsishtha', *Poona Orientalist* 3 (1938), pp. 29–44.

—: 'The text of the Laghu Yogavāsishtha', *New Indian Antiquary* I (1939), pp. 697–715.

—: 'Yogavāsishtha on the means of proof', *A volume of Indian and Iranian studies presented to Sir E. Denison Ross* (Bombay, 1939), pp. 102–112.

Glasenapp, Helmuth von: *Zwei philosophische Rāmāyaṇas*. Wiesbaden, 1951.

Karmarkar, R. D.: 'Mutual relation of the Yogavāsishtha, the Laṅkāvatārasūtra and the Gauḍapada-kārikās', *ABORI* 36 (1955), pp. 298–305.

Mainkar, T. G., *The Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa: a study*. 1955. Second ed., New Delhi, Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1977.

Pendse, S. D., *Śrī-Jñāneśvarāṇce Tattvajñāna* (Bombay, 1941), pp. 315–331 (cf. Mainkar, *op. cit.*, p. 175).

Raghavan, V., 'The Yogavāsishtha and the Bhagavadgītā and the place of origin of the Yogavāsishtha', *JOR* 13 (1939), pp. 73–82, 161–163.

—: 'The Date of the Yogavāsishtha', *ibid.*, pp. 110–128.

—: 'The Yogavāsishtha quotations in the Jīvanmuktiviveka of Vidyāranya', *Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society* 12 (1939), pp. 149–156.

—: 'The Date of Yogavāsishtha', *JOR* 17 (1947–1948), pp. 228–231.

Satyavrat, 'Un-Pāṇinian forms in the Yogavāsishtha', *VII* I (1963), pp. 247–266.

—: 'Some anomalies in the language of the Yogavāsishtha', *Sanskrit and Indological studies, Dr. V. Raghavan Felicitation Volume* (Delhi, 1975), pp. 325–329.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ABORI – Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
 IHQ – Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
 JOR – Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
 VIJ – Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, Hoshiarpur.

Mervyn Sprung, *Lucid Exposition of the Middle Way*. The Essential Chapters from the Prasannapadā of Candrakīrti. Translated from the Sanskrit by Mervyn Sprung in collaboration with T. R. V. Murti and U. S. Vyas. London and Henley, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, xvi, 283 pp. £ 7.50.

According to the preface, the present translation of seventeen chapters of the Prasannapadā's twenty-seven is the result of close collaboration with Indian and Japanese scholars over a period of some ten or twelve years. Mervyn Sprung is solely responsible for the translation of the first chapter which he has subdivided into three chapters, the fifth, the sixth, the ninth and the twenty-third chapters. Several passages of the seventeen chapters translated have been omitted or abridged (cf. pp. xii–xiii, Table I). Mervyn Sprung has made use of the existing translations. He expresses his admiration for Jacques May's translation. Stcherbatsky's translations are characterized by him as sometimes quixotic, but always inspired. However, Mervyn Sprung is critical of what he calls literal translations which, according to him, "tend to obscure the sense of the original, being unfaithful to the sense through being lexicographically exact" (p. viii). He particularly objects to the practice of bracketing, and quotes as an example a passage from Stcherbatsky's translation of the first chapter. It would have been appropriate to point out that Stcherbatsky's translation is not a literal one. He tried to bring out the meaning of the text, including everything which is implied but not expressly stated. Whenever he considered it necessary, Stcherbatsky added literal renderings in footnotes. Other translators of the Prasannapadā have tried to avoid this practice by adhering as closely as possible to the original text. Mervyn Sprung has added only very few and brief footnotes to his translation. According to him "the translation itself says as clearly as I am able what I think the text means" (p. x). Previous translators of the Prasannapadā had a different opinion in this respect. For example, May's translation of twelve chapters is accompanied by no less than 1096 notes of which several are quite lengthy.

So far the only chapters of the Prasannapadā translated into English are chapters one and twenty-five. Stcherbatsky's translation appeared in 1927 (*The conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, pp. 69–212). His work comprises the first chapter which is by far the most difficult. One cannot but have the greatest admiration for the way in which he translated it. There are very few places where Stcherbatsky misunderstood the Sanskrit text but his interpretation is sometimes marred by a tendency to read into the text ideas which are not there. Stcherbatsky even went so far as to make changes in the text in order to bring it into line with his interpretation, as has been pointed out by de La Vallée Poussin (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques I*, 1932, p. 390, n. 1). A new English translation of chapters 1 and 25 is therefore fully justified. However, when one compares Sprung's translation with the Sanskrit text, it is only too obvious that his knowledge of Sanskrit is not sufficient to translate such a difficult text. Let us take, for example, a passage of which the meaning is completely clear: P. 14.1–3 *ācāryabuddhapālitas tv āha / na svata utpadyante bhāvāḥ / tadutpādavaiyarthiāt / atiprasaṅgadoṣāc ca / na hi svātmanā vidyamānānām padārthānām punarutpāde prajñānam asti / atha sann apī jāyeta / na kadā cin*

na jāyeta / . Sprung translates: “Indeed, Buddhapālita says: ‘Things do not arise of themselves because such spontaneous origination would be purposeless and because it entails an absurdity. There would be no purpose in the repeated origination of things which are in existence already. That is, if something exists it would not arise again and yet there would never be a time when it was not arising.’” Sprung has made complete nonsense of the last part of this section beginning with *atha*: “But if something would arise although it exists already, there would never be a time when it was not arising”. The word *atha* or *atha vā* is often used by Candrakīrti to introduce the second member of an alternative, a fact which, of course, has not escaped previous translators of the Prasannapadā. Words which are very common in Sanskrit philosophical texts are sometimes completely misunderstood by the translator. For instance, on p. 64 the Mādhyamika asks his opponent, the logician, the following question: *yadi jñānam karaṇam viśayasya paricchede kaḥ kartā*. “If knowledge is an instrument, who, in discerning the object, is the agent?” Sprung translates: “If an act of perception (*jñānam*) is a means, and the object (*viśaya*) is separate from it, who is the agent?” On p. 71 the text explains that the word *pratyakṣa* (perception) is used both for the object which is actually present (*sākṣādabhimukha*) and for the knowledge which discerns it (*tatparicchedakam jñānam*). Sprung translates this latter term with “the act of knowledge distinct from the object”. On p. 13 Candrakīrti quotes a verse from the Mādhyamakāvatāra (VI.8): *tasmād dhi tasya bhavane na guṇo 'sti kaścit / jātasya janma punar eva ca naiva yuktam*. L. de La Vallée Poussin translated it as follows: “Il n’y a aucun avantage à ce que ceci naisse de ceci; il est inadmissible qu’une chose née naisse à nouveau” (*Le Muséeon* 11, 1910, p. 280). Sprung translates: “Therefore, if something, of whatever kind, has arisen there can be no point at all in a subsequent birth of this birth: it would be nonsense.” This translation is indeed utter nonsense!

It is not surprising to see that the translator goes completely wrong when a passage presents a real difficulty. In his introduction Sprung points out that Nāgārjuna declares that he advances no thesis (p. 8). Sprung quotes Candrakīrti’s explanation: “But the Mādhyamika brings no reason or ground (*hetu*) against his adversary: he makes no use of reasons and examples but pursues his own thesis only until the opponent gives up his.” Obviously, Sprung has not seen any contradiction at all between Nāgārjuna’s statement and Candrakīrti’s explanation, the first declaring that he advances no thesis but the second explaining that the Mādhyamika pursues his own thesis. It is perhaps useful to examine Candrakīrti’s explanation because it seems to me that not only Sprung but also Stcherbatsky has misunderstood this passage. The Sanskrit text is as follows: *tasmād eṣa tāvan nyāyaḥ / yat pareṇaiva svābhyupagatapratiññātārthasāadhanam upādheyam / na cāyaṃ param prati [hetuḥ] / hetuḥ prastāntāsambhavāt pratiññānusāratayaiva kevalam svapratīññātārthasāadhanam upādatta iti nirupapattikapakṣābhyupagamāt svātmānam evāyaṃ kevalam viśamvādayan na śaknoti pareṣāṃ niścayam ādhātum iti / idam evāyaṃ spaṣṭataradūṣaṇam yaduta svapratīññātārthasāadhanāsāmarthyam* (p. 19.3–7). Sprung translates: “Of course anyone making a positive assertion must establish his argument with his adversary and the latter should be persuaded to accept it. But the Mādhyamika brings no reason *against* his adversary; he makes no use of reasons and examples but pursues his own thesis only until the adversary gives up his. He proceeds on assumptions which are not provable claims; he goes so far as to contradict himself and is not capable of convincing his opponent. This is, surely, a clearer refutation that the opponent’s own thesis is not adequately established.” Sprung did not find it necessary to add a note. One wonders how he made sense of this passage according to which the Mādhyamika contradicts himself, is incapable of convincing his opponent, but, nevertheless, shows that the opponent’s thesis is not adequately established. Candrakīrti would have been a poor thinker if he had said what Sprung makes him say. La Vallée Poussin inserted in the text the word *hetu* on the strength of the Tibetan translation. It seems to me that it has to be left out. The opponent is a Sāṃkhya philosopher who declares without giving any arguments that things arise of themselves. I would like to suggest the following translation of this passage: “Therefore there is the general rule that it is the opponent who must adduce proof

for the thesis adopted by him but in the opinion of the opponent this rule is not valid. As he is unable to advance reasons and examples, he tries to prove his own thesis only by clinging to it. By adopting a thesis which is not based on logical arguments he is only contradicting himself and is not capable of convincing his opponents. The fact that he is not capable of proving his own thesis is certainly the clearest refutation of him." The Tibetan translator probably found it necessary to be more explicit in translating *na cāyaṃ paraṃ prati* and added the word *gtsan-tshigs* 'reason, argument': 'di ni gzan-la gtan-tshigs kyaṃ ma yin-no "but according to the opponent this is not an argument." However, it is wrong to add *hetu* or another word in the Sanskrit text because *ayaṃ* clearly refers to the general rule (*nyāya*).

Since the publication of Stcherbatsky's book in 1927 considerable progress has been made in the study of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and it is therefore possible to correct in several instances his renderings of passages written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. On p. 91 Candrakīrti quotes the following verse:

*yo na pi jāyati nā cupapadyī / no cyavate na pi jīryati dharmah /
tam jinu deśayati naraśimhah / tatra niveśayi satvaśatāni //*

Stcherbatsky renders this as follows: "This one Reality (eternal) has been revealed by the Victorious (Buddha), the lion of this mankind: it is not born, it does not live, it does not die, does not decay, and merged in it are all the beings!" Stcherbatsky explains *dharmā* here as *dharmakāya*, *dharmatā*, *tathatā*. This is again an example of his tendency to interpret Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti as proclaiming an absolute reality. It is preferable to translate *dharmā* here as 'doctrine'. The last *pāda* has been misunderstood by Stcherbatsky because he did not see that *niveśayi* is a 3 p. sg. aor. of *niveśayati* 'to establish'. The meaning of this *pāda* is: "In it (i.e. this doctrine) he established hundreds of beings." The last *pāda* of the following stanza has to be interpreted in the same way: *tatra niveśayi nāthaḥ* "The Lord established (the beings) in it." Stcherbatsky translates: "But everywhere is present our Lord." Sprung closely follows Stcherbatsky in his translation of these two *pādas*: "In it are merged all living beings" and "the lord is realized everywhere."

It is not possible to discuss other passages in the first chapter which were misunderstood by Stcherbatsky. Although his translation contains a number of errors and tendentious renderings, it is far superior to Sprung's translation. Stcherbatsky was a great scholar who had an excellent knowledge of Indian and Buddhist philosophy. His translations of difficult philosophical texts both Brahmanical and Buddhist will always be of the greatest assistance to serious students.

In translating the twenty-fifth chapter on Nirvāṇa, Sprung enjoyed the assistance of T. R. V. Murti, the author of a book entitled *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism* (London, 1955). However, Murti's collaboration, which is expressly mentioned on the title-page of this book, has not produced a good translation. It is superfluous to point out all the wrong renderings found in it. Well-known Buddhist terms have been completely misunderstood. For instance *anavarāgra* (p. 535.6) is rendered as "the highest existence". On p. 523 the Sautrāntikas are said to deny the existence of the *avijñapti* and the *viprayuktasamskāra*-s. The text has *vijñapti* but already Stcherbatsky has indicated that one should read *avijñapti*. Sprung translates (a) *vijñapti-viprayuktasamskāras* as "innate dispositions which are meaningfully related and intelligible." These well-known Abhidharma terms were explained by Stcherbatsky in his *Central Conception of Buddhism* (London, 1923) to which he refers in the notes to his translation (p. 189, notes 5 and 6). Also very strange is the rendering of *avyabhicāritā* (p. 525.15; cf. p. 607) by 'impropriety'. On p. 541 we find the expression *svākhyāte dharmavinaye pravrajya* "having taken up the religious life in the doctrine and discipline which are well-taught." This expression is well-known from the Pāli texts, cf. Vinaya, vol. I, p. 187.23: *svākkhāte dhammavinaye*. Sprung translates "having taken up the spiritual life in some popular religious order." Probably he was misled by Stcherbatsky who seems to have misunderstood *sv-ākhyāta* as *sva-ākhyāta*

“imagined by them” (p. 211). On p. 526 Candrakīrti quotes a half-verse: *nāsamṣkrto hi vidyate bhāvaḥ kva cana kaścana*. He continues: *kva canety adhikaraṇe deśa kāle siddhānte vā / kaścanety ādheye ādhyātmiko bāhyātmiko vety arthah*. Stcherbatsky translates: “Nowhere and none the entity is found which would not be produced by causes. The word ‘nowhere’ refers to location, the place, or the time. It might be also taken (as referring to) a philosophic system. The word ‘none’ refers to the located thing, whether it be an object of the external world or a mental phenomenon.” In one point this translation has to be rectified: “The word ‘nowhere’ refers to the locus, i.e. the place, the time or a philosophical system.” Sprung translates this passage as follows: “No ontic existent whatsoever exists anywhere which is not compound.” The expression ‘anywhere’ refers to place, time, or philosophical argument. The expression ‘no ontic existent whatsoever’ refers both to the subject realm and the object realm. This is his meaning.” It is obvious that even with the help of his Hindu collaborator Sprung was not capable of producing a correct translation of this chapter.

It would be easy to point out many other errors in the other chapters translated by Sprung in collaboration with T. R. V. Murti or U. S. Vyas. The translation of one chapter (XVIII; XIV in Sprung’s book) is much better. In reading this chapter Sprung was assisted by two prominent Japanese specialists, G. M. Nagao and N. Aramaki. In several places Sprung’s English translation is an improvement upon the French translation published by the reviewer in 1949 (*Cinq chapitres de la Prasannapadā*, Paris, pp. 1–36). However, it is not possible to agree always with Sprung’s translation of which the final version was probably not seen by the two Japanese scholars. P. 351.13: *dharmam samāsato himṣām varṇayanti tathāgatāḥ* “The perfectly realized ones hold, in brief, that the Buddhist truth is harmless (Sprung, p. 173). P. 356.3: *mūlaudanodakakinṇvādiravyaviśeṣaparipākamātrapratyayotpannamadamūrcchādisāmarthya-viśeṣānugatamadyapānopalambhavad* “even as the gestation of various substances like roots, boiled rice and water results in intoxicating drink, anal wind and so on” (Sprung, p. 175). P. 356.7: *sattva upapāduka* “individual creature” (Spring, *ibid.*). P. 356.8: *satatasamitam akuśalakarmābhisamskaraṇapravṛttā* “they incessantly and forever perform ill deeds because of their innate disposition” (Sprung, *ibid.*). P. 356.9: *caturaśīticittacaritasahasra* “8,400 categories of creature” (Sprung, *ibid.*). P. 366.5: *bahuvidhabuddhinalinīvanavibodhinī* “he awakens the lotus of enlightenment in its many forms” (Sprung, p. 179). It seems to me that the French translation of these passages is still preferable to Sprung’s renderings (*Cinq chapitres*, p. 16, line 22 read “quatre-vingt quatre mille états d’esprit différents”). On p. 370 Candrakīrti declares that for pedagogical reasons Buddha taught that the *skandhas*, etc. are real (*tathya*). He did this not “with an eye on the higher truth” (Sprung, p. 181) but “out of regard for their views” (*taddarśanāpekṣayā*), i.e. the views of the people to be converted (*vineyajana*). On p. 376 Candrakīrti explains that if the seed and the sprout were identical this would have unacceptable consequences: *ananyatvāc cāṅkurāvasthāyām aṅkuravad bījagrahaṇam api syāt*. Sprung translates: “If there is no difference one would take the seed to exist in the sprout phase, i.e. as sprout” (p. 185). The meaning is as follows: “If there is no difference one would find in the sprout phase not only the sprout but the seed as well.” On p. 379 Candrakīrti says that a wise man ought even to give up his life in the search for the truth of the true doctrine (*arhati prājñāḥ prāñān api parityajya saddharmatattvaṃ paryeṣitum*). Sprung translates: “it is possible for the man of wisdom to turn his back on the everyday world and to go in search of the way of the truth of truths” (p. 186).

Sprung’s translation of the ‘essential chapters’ of the *Prasannapadā* is not a book to be recommended to ‘philosophers who read English’. There is undoubtedly a need for a good English translation, if not of the entire *Prasannapadā*, at least of the more important sections. It is much to be hoped that such a translation will be undertaken by a scholar who possesses the necessary qualifications.

Buddhist Research Information, Number 1 (April 1979), 30 pp.; *Buddhist Text Information*, Number 20 (June 1979), 13 pp.; *Sikh Religious Studies Information*, Number 1 (July 1979), 28 pp. Published by the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, Melville Memorial Library, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, New York 11794, U.S.A.

Buddhist Text Information has been published since 1974. Recently R. A. Gard has explained the editorial policy: "In each Number an attempt is made to include Buddhist texts in Pali, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese, and Japanese or other Asian languages. The selection policy is to list a text on which someone reportedly is working (editing, translating, studying, etc.), add whatever information is available about its other Asian language versions or translations and relevant Western and Asian publications, and then describe the author's current work in his own words" (*The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. I, no. 1, 1978, p. 88). *Buddhist Text Information* combines a bibliography of Buddhist texts with a report on current projects. One wonders whether this combination is advisable. A text is selected because somebody happens to be working on it. There is therefore no attempt to compile a systematic bibliography of Buddhist texts. A further drawback of this system is that bibliographical information continues to be added in later issues so that it becomes necessary to consult several issues for information on one text. The twentieth issue contains the first part of a bibliography of the Ratnakūṭa texts which begins with general information on this group of texts and subsequently enumerates the titles of the first seventeen texts, first the reconstructed Sanskrit title followed by the titles of the Chinese, Mongolian and Tibetan translations. It seems superfluous to list in detail the titles of the translations because it would have been sufficient to give references to the number of the translation in existing catalogues of the Taishō daizōkyō (*Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais*), the Tibetan Kanjur (*Ötani Catalogue*) and the Mongolian Kanjur (*Ligeti Catalogue*). More detailed information is given on the Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā of which the Sanskrit text was published by L. Finot in 1901. No mention is made of the important review of this edition by Louis de la Vallée Poussin (*Muséon*, N. S., IV, 1903, pp. 306–312). The information given on the Chinese translations comes from Kenneth Ch'en's review of Ensink's translation (*HJAS* 17, 1954, 274–281). However, Ch'en's information is not complete, for there are not two but three translations of the Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā into Chinese, as was pointed out in a review of Ensink's translation which is not mentioned (*Journal asiatique*, 1953, p. 545). Kenneth Ch'en's review is the only one listed (for Volume 47 read Volume 17), although other reviews are of greater relevance for the study of the text and the translation (cf. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *JRAS*, 1954, pp. 79–82; F. Edgerton, *JAOS* 73, 1953, pp. 169–170). Finally, an article published in 1968 has been entirely overlooked ('Remarks on the text of the Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā', *Adyar Library Bulletin* 31–32, pp. 1–7). Ensink's translation is listed under item 1.17.4 and Ch'en's review in the following item. It is certainly unnecessary to repeat again the title of Ensink's book under 1.17.5. It seems also completely superfluous to indicate the full title and place of publication of the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*.

It seems to me that it would be far preferable to separate the two functions of this bulletin and to produce two annual publications, the first containing information on editions, translations, and studies of texts published during the previous year and information on current projects, the second a systematic bibliography. Such a bibliography ought to be carefully planned. *A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literaturé* is being published by Heinz Bechert. The first fascicle appeared in 1979 (Akira Yuyama, *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*. Erster Teil: Vinaya-Texte. Wiesbaden). Yuyama's meticulous and exhaustive bibliography shows that it is possible with the help of an ingenious system of abbreviations to accumulate a maximum amount of information in a relatively limited space. The fact that this project is already being undertaken, makes it advisable to concentrate on a different topic, for instance, the Pāli literature and to undertake a systematic bibliography under the following headings: I. Vinaya; II. Sutta; III. Abhidhamma; IV. Later Pāli literature.

Number 1 of *Buddhist Research Information* is based upon bibliographies of doctoral dissertations. One of the sources is *Theses on Asia. Accepted by Universities in The United Kingdom and Ireland, 1877–1964*. The first item is taken from this bibliography: “1. Reference works: MALALASEKERA, G. P. (1) *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. (2) *Vamsaṭṭhappakini*, [sic!] or *Commentary on the Mahāvamsa*. (3) *The Extended Mahāvamsa*. D. Litt. University of London (London), 1938”. Of these three works only the first can be classed as a reference work. All three have been published but this is not mentioned. It seems completely contrary to common sense to list theses submitted in the U. K. and Ireland in the period 1877–1964 without indicating which ones have subsequently been published. In many cases it would be sufficient to give references to existing bibliographies, such as Shinsho Hanayama’s *Bibliography on Buddhism* (Tokyo, 1961) and the *Bibliographie bouddhique*. On page 1 of this issue the following advice is given to the reader: “To determine whether a manuscript, conference paper, or dissertation/thesis listed in *BRI* has been published as a monograph, periodical article, or in other form, please consult relevant bibliographies, periodical indexes, publishers’ trade catalogues, National Union catalogues, or ask the author.” It is, of course, the task of the compilers of this bulletin to furnish this kind of information.

According to the editors, the information given in this Bulletin is intended to supplement that provided by other bibliographies. There would seem to be, therefore, no reason at all for including theses which were later published and listed, for instance, in the two bibliographies mentioned above. It is very much to be hoped that the present editorial policy for this Bulletin will not be continued.

The first number of *Sikh Religious Studies Information* lists reference works, general works and introductory works. Other categories will be listed in future issues. It must be left to specialists in Sikh religious studies to give their opinion on the usefulness of this bulletin.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke, Teil 7. Beschrieben von Friedrich Wilhelm und Jampa Losang Panglung (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XI, 7). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1979, XIII, 195 pp. DM 90. —.

The seventh volume of the catalogue of Tibetan manuscripts and blockprints describes the Tibetan collections in the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Berlin, the Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens der Universität Hamburg and the Indisch-Ostasiatisches Seminar der Universität Marburg. The three collections together contain 523 items (blockprints, manuscripts and pictures). The catalogue is divided into the following sections: A. Texte aus dem Kanjur; B. Rituelle und tantrische Texte; C. Wissenschaften; D. Geschichte und Ortsbeschreibungen; E. Lieder; F. Erzählende Literatur; G. Abbildungen; H. Sonstiges; I. Sammlungen und zusammengehörige Handschriften. The second section contains the greatest number of texts (nos. 17–223) but most of them are very brief rituals. In this section there is a great number of manuscripts belonging to the Staatsbibliothek. The authors of the catalogue do not give any information on the history of the collections as Taube did in his introduction to the first volume (pp. XI–XII). It would be useful to know how the Staatsbibliothek acquired such a great collection of Tibetan manuscripts. The Staatsbibliothek possesses also a Kumbum blockprint of Mkhas-grub’s great Kālacakra commentary, the *Dus-’khor ṭik-chen* (nos. 312–322). Another interesting item in this catalogue is the collection of songs by the Karmapa Mi-bskyod rdo-rje (nos. 261–264).

According to the preface this catalogue has been arranged in accordance with the principles adopted in the first four volumes. However, the information given in the earlier volumes is more detailed. One regrets in particular the fact that colophons have not been reproduced. Even though all important details from the colophons are said to be included in the description of each text, this is certainly not the case. The catalogue describes two blockprints of the *bKa'-thañ sde-lña*, both printed in the Potala, and consisting of five parts (53, 95, 48, 81 and 77 ff.), cf. nos. 243 and 244. Although according to the catalogue the dimensions are slightly different (no. 243. Format 56 × 9 cm; Druckspiegel 48 × 7 cm; no. 244. Format 55 × 9 cm; Druckspiegel 49 × 7 cm), they must both be copies of the same edition. The catalogue does not indicate the date of publication, although this is mentioned in the colophon of the first part, the *Lha-'dre bka'-thañ*. Mrs. A.-M. Blondeau, who has made use of a copy of the same edition, informs us that according to the colophon it was published in 1889 by the order of the *srid-skyoñ* De-mo chos-kyi rgyal-po, the teacher of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama ('Le Lha-'dre bka'-thañ', *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, Paris, 1971, pp. 29 and 117). Even if the compilers of this catalogue had given all the information contained in the colophons, it still would have been desirable to reproduce their complete text.

The bibliographical information in this volume is often inadequate. For instance, Mrs. Blondeau's important article on the *Lha-'dre bka'-thañ* is not mentioned at all. Sections of the *bKa'-thañ sde-lña* have been edited and translated by F. W. Thomas (*Tibetan literary texts and documents concerning Chinese Turkestan* I, London, 1935, pp. 264–288) and G. Tucci (*Minor Buddhist Texts* II, Roma, 1958, pp. 68–102). There are many references to it in the works of R. A. Stein (*Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet*, Paris, 1959; *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines*, Paris, 1959) and G. Tucci (*Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, Roma, 1949, pp. 110–115, etc., cf. Index p. 779). Very important is the recent discovery by Obata Hironobu that a section of the *Blon-po bka'-thañ* is based upon Chinese Ch'an texts ('Chibetto no zenshū to rekidaihōbōki', *Zenbunka kenkyūjo kiyō* VI, 1974, pp. 139–176). The compilers of this catalogue have not even made sufficient use of the bibliographical works which they consulted. For instance, with regard to the chronicle of the Fifth Dalai Lama (no. 245) there is a reference to p. 78 (a mistake for 62) of Vostrikov's book but no reference to the table of contents of the chronicle on pp. 196–197. mKhas-grub's *Dus-khor ṭik-chen* was analyzed by Vostrikov (p. 239), who also indicated the dates of the *Žaṅ-žuṅ-pa* Chos-dbañ grags-pa (1404–1469) and Blo-grōs chos-skyoñ (1389–1463) who completed mKhas-grub's work. No. 246 is the dKar-chag of the Derge Kanjur. This is not mentioned by the compilers, although they refer to p. 127 of Vostrikov's book. Their description contains the following passage: "Verfasser gCug lag ṣ'oṣ kyi snañ ba, im Wasser-weibl. Rind Jahr. Die letzten neun Blätter enthalten einen kurzgefassten Index zum Derge bka' 'gyur und bstan 'gyur, Verfasser: Si tu pa (vermutlich ein anderer Name für gCug lag ṣ'oṣ kyi snañ ba), im Holz-männl. Tiger-Jahr." It is strange that the compilers have any doubt about the identity of the author for Vostrikov has already given his name as Si-tu gtsug-lag chos-kyi snañ-ba. When Situ was recognized as the Si-tu incarnation by the 8th *Žva-dmar*, the name Chos-kyi 'byuñ-gnas phrin-las kun-khyab ye-śes dpal-bzañ-po was bestowed upon him. When he received the vows of an upāsaka, he was given the name Karma bstan-pa'i ñi-byed gtsug-lag chos-kyi snañ-ba. He was born in 1700 and died in 1774, according to Gene Smith in his foreword to *The Autobiography and Diaries of Si-tu paṇ-chen (Śata-piṭaka)*, vol. 77, New Delhi, 1968, pp. 9–11). Recently Josef Kolmaš mentioned 1775 as the year of his death, but without indicating his source (*The Iconography of the Derge Kanjur and Tanjur (Śata-piṭaka)*, vol. 241, New Delhi, 1978, p. 19). The contents of the Derge Kanjur dKar-chag were described briefly by Vostrikov (pp. 127–8) and in more detail by Kolmaš (*op. cit.*, pp. 20–21). These descriptions do not tally with the information given here. The Derge Kanjur dKar-chag has 171 folios and the catalogue proper is found on ff. 113–157, whereas the Derge blockprint described has 269 folios of which the last nine contain a brief index of both the Kanjur and Tanjur. In order to explain these discrepancies it would be necessary to compare this blockprint with a copy of the Derge Kanjur dKar-chag.

The biography section lists the biography of Rva lo-tsā-ba and the combined biographies of Tilopa, Nāropa, Marpa, Milarpa and Dvags-po lha-rje (nos. 248 and 252). Copies of the same editions of these two works were described by J. Bacot ('Titres et colophons d'ouvrages non canoniques tibétains', *BEFEO* 44, 1954, pp. 286 and 291). The Karmapa Mi-bskyod rdo-rje, the author of the songs mentioned before (nos. 261–264), is the eighth Žva-nag Karma-pa who lived from 1507 to 1554 (cf. H. Richardson, 'The Karma-pa Sect', *JRAS*, 1958, pp. 151–154; 1959, p. 18). No. 266 is a copy of Kha-che Pha-lu's well-known work which was studied by Johan van Manen. He edited the first seven chapters and translated the first five ('Khacche Phalu: a Tibetan moralist', *Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes*, Vol. III, Part 2, Calcutta, 1925, pp. 147–185). The catalogue characterizes it as the "Lustige Lebensanweisungen des Muselmanen P'a lu". The chapters translated by van Manen do not strike the reader as being 'lustig'. Van Manen writes: "Together with much which is exceedingly matter-of-fact and practical, bluntly worldly-wise, we also meet here with genuine *Weltschmerz*, renunciation, such as we find in the pessimism of Christians or Buddhists" (p. 149). This very interesting little work ought to be edited and translated in its entirety. No. 268 is a copy of the drama *gZugs-ky ŋi-ma*. No mention is made of Bacot's edition and translation (*Zugñima*, Paris, 1957) a detailed review of which appeared in this journal (vol. 4, 1960, pp. 203–207).

One is surprised to see that the compilers of this catalogue quote as an authority Schulemann's *Geschichte der Dalai-Lamas* (Leipzig, 1958). The many imperfections of this work were pointed out by L. Petech in a lengthy review (*T'oung Pao* 46, 1958, pp. 465–483). Schulemann's work is quoted for the dates of the Dalai-Lamas but no reference is made to Petech's study ('The Dalai-Lamas and regents of Tibet: a chronological study', *T'oung Pao* 47, 1959, pp. 368–394).

It is to be hoped that future volumes will reproduce the texts of colophons and be more complete and accurate in the bibliographical notes on the texts.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Heinz Zimmermann, *Wortart und Sprachstruktur im Tibetischen* (Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie, Band 10). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1979. XVIII, 153 pp. DM 68. —

Zimmermann's book is an attempt to explain how the Tibetan language functions. In the preface the author remarks that he undertook this study as he was unable to find in any existing Tibetan grammar an explanation of the structure of the Tibetan sentence. However, it proved to be impossible to study the order of words without first examining the nature of the word in Tibetan.

In his analysis of the Tibetan word Zimmermann takes as his leading principle the meaning of the syllable as phono-morphematic unity. The two main categories are 'Sachsilben' and 'Leitsilben'. The first are syllables which express something by themselves, the second are bearers of units of information and indicate how the first are to be used. In the introduction the author writes that, once these two categories were established, it was not difficult to make further divisions. However, in doing so the author felt obliged to create an entirely new terminology. It would be impossible even to explain briefly the terms used by the author without repeating more or less his own explanations.

The author declares in the preface that his book is not meant to be a textbook of Tibetan grammar. According to him "Wer sich jedoch im Tibetischen einigermaßen heimisch fühlt, dem

wird ein gelegentlicher Blick in das vorliegende Buch gewiss den oder jenen Nutzen bringen.” This is an understatement if ever there was one. An ‘occasional glance’ will not be of any use to the reader. I am afraid that it will be necessary for him to study Zimmermann’s book very carefully from the first to the last line in order to ‘obtain some profit’ from it. It is not only the new terminology which makes the reading of this book difficult. The author uses systematically abbreviations which are listed on p. X. It would have been easier for the reader if the author had avoided using the same letters for different abbreviations. For instance, A stands for Aussage in AK (Aussagekomplex), but for autonom in AS (Autonome Sache), R for Rahmen in RK (Rahmenkomplex), but for relationsbestimmend in RLS (Relationsbestimmende Leitsilbe). This could have been avoided, for example, by using always Ra for Rahmen, as in RaLS (Rahmenleitsilbe). Also rather confusing is the fact that S stands for both Sache and Silbe. By writing s for Silbe the distinction between Sache and Silbe would have been obvious. Another difficulty is the absence of an index. If one forgets the exact meaning of a term, it is far from easy to find again the place(s) where it is explained. Apart from the terms listed under the abbreviations the author also uses terms which are not abbreviated, such as *monotrop*, *diatrop*, *einpolig*, *zweipolig*, *Thema*, *Rhema*, *Relationierung*, *Funktionalisierung*, etc. An index of technical terms in the form of a glossary and including examples would have been very useful for the reader who is obliged to make his own index and glossary.

The study of this book demands a considerable effort on the part of the reader. He is strongly advised not to be discouraged by the difficulties inherent in an approach which is fundamentally different from that found in traditional Tibetan grammars. The new terms and concepts are essential to the enterprise of the author. In the second and main part of his book (pp. 30–143) he examines the principles which govern the structure of the Tibetan sentence. The main principle is a functional dichotomy which consists in a structure of two cells and their relation. As the author remarks in the preface: “sie [die Stellungsgesetze] entpuppten sich als ein ungeheuer raffiniertes System allereinfachsten Ordnungselemente.” He shows how complicated sentences can be constructed by means of minimal elements. The two fundamental types of sentence structure are the fan structure (Fächerstruktur) and the circular structure (Ringstruktur). An example of a fan structure is the following sentence: *nas khyod la gtoñ ño* (p. 91). The two branches of the fan are *na-s gtoñ ño* and *khyod la gtoñ ño*. An example of a circular structure is the following sentence: *rgyal po des thos nas smras pa* (p. 102) in which *rgyal po des* stands in a twofold relation with the second part of the sentence: 1) *rgyal po de-s smras pa*; 2) *rgyal po de-s thos nas smras pa*. These two basic structures are illustrated by diagrams which clearly show the difference between them. The diagrams are also very helpful in showing how more complicated sentences are constructed by combining these two basic structure in a sentence.

Of special interest is chapter II.3.2.3. (pp. 110–132) in which the author analyzes several constructions which are common in Tibetan such as genitive pairs (*chen po'i rta*), appositions, contractions (*chos-skyoñ* for *chos-kyi skyoñ-ba*), the so-called adverbs and postpositions, elliptical constructions, interrogative sentences and the modal accusative (*blo mkhas pa*).

Zimmermann’s book is not only of great interest to the Tibetologist but also to the linguist. In his introduction he points out that his work presents to a certain degree a synthesis of the theories of Chomsky and Tesnière. His interest in linguistic and theoretical problems is evident in such sections as that dealing with the role of grammar (pp. 36–37) and in three excursions: 1. Aussagepaare in indoeuropäischen Sprachen. Die Kopula als Umweg über die verbale Sache; 2. Zum Begriff “Aussage”; 3. Zur Frage der Wirklichkeitskompetenz von Spracherzeugnissen.

This important work deserves to be carefully studied. The analysis of the structure of the Tibetan sentence deals with one of the most important and most neglected aspects of Tibetan grammar. Much more attention has been paid to the Tibetan verb but without positive results. It is perhaps useful to draw attention to Zimmermann’s remarks on the Tibetan verbal system: “Hinter dieser scheinbaren Simplität der Verhältnisse verbirgt sich vermutlich ein ausgedehntes und äusserst raffiniertes Informationssystem, das durchaus nicht nur Zeitaspekte

vermittelt, und es ist nicht auszuschliessen, dass heute nur noch die Reste dieses Systems greifbar – und wirksam, – sind” (p. 10). He adds that a study of the problems connected with the Tibetan verbal system is outside the scope of his present work. Let us hope that Zimmermann who has done such brilliant work in elucidating the structure of the Tibetan sentence will now direct his attention to these problems.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Annemarie von Gabain, *Einführung in die Zentralasienkunde*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979, X, 187 pp., 2 cartes, 7 ill. DM 38.00.

Since the end of the nineteenth century Central Asian studies have become very important as a result of the discoveries made by several expeditions. Documents in many languages, some hitherto unknown, have been discovered, and many archaeological remains have been unearthed. Scholars of different disciplines have made important contributions to the study of Central Asia. It is almost impossible to keep oneself informed about the research in this field. It is therefore with the highest expectations that one welcomes the publication of an introduction to Central Asian studies. However, the preface warns us not to expect a comprehensive work. The author states that she intends to treat only a few themes as examples. The scope of her work is not indicated with any precision. The only subject specifically mentioned is Central Asian Buddhism. The author also remarks that prehistory and the Islamic domain are not treated, the first on account of its special methods and the second because it will be treated elsewhere. The author promises to select “einige Höhepunkte des kulturellen Schaffens der Völker Zentralasiens” and to indicate “interessante, weiterweisende Einzelheiten”. This suggests a rather unsystematic, impressionistic approach. The premonition, alas, is fully confirmed by a perusal of the work.

The book contains the following chapters: I. Der geographische Raum und sein geopolitischer Charakter; II. Literarisch bekannte Völker; III. Die Art der literarischen Quellen; IV. Die Völker Zentralasiens in der Gegenwart; V. Religionen; VI. Philologie; VII. Archäologie: Einleitung; VIII. Archäologie: Architektur; IX. Archäologie: Plastik und Malerei; X. Zeitrechnung; XI. Aufgaben und Methoden. On p. 2 the author explains that ‘Central Asia’ comprises Afghanistan, West and East Turkistan, Mongolia and Tibet. Since the prehistorical period up to the Islamic period this immense territory has been occupied by many different peoples which are briefly examined in the following chapter.

The author divides the sources into two groups: foreign sources (Chinese, Moslem, Armenian, Syriac, Byzantine, travellers) and indigenous sources (inscriptions, manuscripts and blockprints). The most important in the pre-Islamic period are certainly the Chinese sources and one would expect the author to indicate the nature of each of them and to give full bibliographical information on translations and studies. She mentions the twenty-five dynastic histories but refrains from giving any bibliographical information. Two histories are mentioned by name (p. 30), but the only information given in the notes is that the *Pei-shih* and the *Sui-shu* are dynastic histories. On p. 32 she refers to the travel account of Chang K'ien.¹ A note informs us that it is to be found in Ssü-ma Ts'ien's *Shih-ki*, the first of the 25 dynastic histories. No mention is made of the translations of this chapter, the 123rd of the *Shih-chi*, by Hirth and de Groot (cf. O. Franke, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, III, Berlin-Leipzig, 1937, pp. 185–6). More important is the fact that the inauthenticity of this chapter has been

demonstrated convincingly by A. F. P. Hulsewé in 1975 (cf. *T'oung Pao* 61, pp. 83–147). The author's treatment of other sources is likewise unsatisfactory. Important publications are not mentioned at all. How is it possible to discuss the Byzantine sources on Central Asia without mentioning Gyula Moravcsik's monumental work: *Byzantinoturcica* (Berlin, 1958)? Among the inscriptions one of the most important is without doubt the Sino-Tibetan treaty of 821–822. This inscription is mentioned in the following words: "Vor dem Potala-Palast in Tibet steht eine tibetisch-chinesische Inschrift aus dem 8.-9. Jh. Sie enthält den Wortlaut eines Vertrags mit dem damals ziemlich geschwächten China" (p. 33). The only reference given is to an article by H. Hoffmann ('Tibets Eintritt in die Universalgeschichte', *Saeculum*, 1950, p. 258). This important inscription, which was characterised by Demiéville as "un des monuments épigraphiques les plus insignes de l'Asie" (*Le concile de Lhasa*, I, Paris, 1952, p. 32), stands in front of the Jo-khañ, the so-called "Cathedral" of Lhasa. It has been translated into English by H. E. Richardson (*Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa and the Mu Tsung / Khri Gtsug Lde Brtsan Treaty of A.D. 821–822 from the Inscription at Lhasa*. London, 1952) and Li Fang-Kuei ('The inscription of the Sino-Tibetan treaty of 821–822', *T'oung Pao* 44, 1956, pp. 1–99). Recently Richardson published a new edition and translation ('The Sino-Tibetan treaty inscription of A.D. 821/823 at Lhasa', *JRAS*, 1978, pp. 137–162). The treaty was concluded in Chinese territory in 821, in Tibetan territory in 822 and inscribed in 823 (cf. Li, pp. 10 and 65). The author's information on Tibet seems to be based entirely on two articles by Hoffmann, the one mentioned above and another published in 1938 (*ZDMG*, 1938, p. 345ff.; cf. chapter VI, note 34). On p. 34 she writes: "Das tibetische Li-yul informiert über die Geschichte von Chotan." A note refers to the Li-yul annals from the Kanjur, edited and translated by R. E. Emmerick, *Tibetan texts concerning Khotan*. London, 1967. The author does not explain why she prefers to write *jul* for the generally adopted *yul*. In Sanskrit words also she always replaces *y* by *j* which results in such strange spellings as *Maitreja*, *Maja* (i.e. *Māyā*) and *Mahajana* (i.e. *Mahāyāna*). Tibetan Li-yul is not the name of a text but the name of the country (*yul*) *Li* (Khotan). Emmerick's book contains text and translation of the *Li-yul lui-bstan-pa*, a text from the Tanjur, and an edition of the *Li-yul chos-kyi lo-rgyus* of which a manuscript was found in Tun-huang. The author does not mention at all F. W. Thomas's *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan I* (London, 1935) which contains translations of other texts concerning Khotan. It is a fortunate circumstance that recently G. Uray published an excellent article on the old Tibetan sources on Central Asia ('The old Tibetan sources of the history of Central Asia up to 751 A.D.: a survey', *Prolegomena to the sources on the history of pre-Islamic Central Asia*, Budapest, 1979, pp. 275–304).²

The author is badly informed, not only in the field of Tibetan studies but also in other fields of research. Her information on the Hsi-hsia empire seems to be based upon one article by Kyčanov (cf. chapter II, note 17). Consequently, the only information she is able to give on the Hsi-hsia literature is that Hsi-hsia texts deal with problems of legislation (p. 23)! Very curious is the fact that the author repeatedly mentions 'kutschisch' and 'tocharisch' as two languages (cf. p. 17 and p. 45) although on p. 14 she distinguishes Tokharian A and B. W. B. Henning's article ('The name of the "Tokharian" language', *AM* 1, 1949, pp. 158–162) is known to the author (p. 14) but she does not seem to accept his conclusions. No reference is given to Henning's article. His initials are W. B. and not B. (p. 14) or B. W. (p. 154).

It would be possible to continue enumerating many instances in which the author gives insufficient or wrong information but this would take up too much space. However, some attention has to be paid to her treatment of Central Asian Buddhism to which she attaches particular importance. Her knowledge of Buddhism appears to be inadequate and erroneous. In order to show this a few examples may suffice. On p. 42 the author mentions that Fa-hien, the Buddhist pilgrim, found traces of Buddhism in the year 475 among the Jou-juan because one of their rulers carried the name Po-lo-men (brāhmaṇa). This is a very strange reasoning. Moreover, Fa-hsien left China in 399 and returned in 414. Almost sixty years after his death he reappears in the country of the Jou-juan! On p. 43 the author identifies Hīnāyānists and

Theravādins. On p. 44 she states that Pāli texts are preserved only in a very fragmentary state. On p. 46 it is said that the second half of the Lotus sūtra contains entire chapters which bring almost nothing new but are identical even as far as the name of the reciters are concerned. On p. 47 the 'Zuwendung des Verdienstes' is considered to be a characteristic feature of Central Asian Buddhism, although it is well-known that the transference of merit is found even in Ceylonese Buddhism (cf. Gregory Schopen's references, *IJJ* 21, 1979, p. 16, n. 8; Heinz Bechert, 'Buddha-Feld und Verdienstübertragung: Mahāyāna-Ideen im Theravāda-Buddhismus Ceylons', *Bull. de la Cl. des Lettres et des Sc. morales et politiques de l'Ac. R. de Belgique*, 1976, pp. 27–51). On p. 66 the author states that Hybrid Sanskrit arose in the basin of the Tarim. On p. 114 she mentions the three bodies of the Buddha: "den unvorstellbaren, wirklich seienden (*dharma-kāya*), den verherrlichten (*nirmāṇa-kāya*) und den irdischen (*sambhoga-kāya*)."

It is a pity that the author has tried to deal with many subjects on which she is obviously not well informed. There is no doubt that she could have written an excellent book on the Turkish peoples in Central Asia, for in that field she is one of the leading specialists. Several chapters in her book contain useful information such as Chapter VI (Philologie) which studies in some detail such topics as materials used for writing, paper and book sizes, writing instruments, scripts, etc. Also the chapters dealing with archaeology contain much information, but here also there are too few references to recent publications. As an introduction to Central Asian studies in the pre-Islamic period this book is entirely unsatisfactory and one can only wish that it will be replaced by a publication which is as carefully planned and written as the *Einführung in die Indologie*.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTES

¹ When referring to passages in this book, I follow the author's transcription.

² I have not yet been able to consult the other contributions in this book on which see also *IJJ* 22, 1980, pp. 174–175.

Burmese Manuscripts, Part 1. Compiled by Heinz Bechert, Daw Khin Khin Su and Daw Tin Tin Myint (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII, 1). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1979, XLII, 223 pp., 5 pl. DM 110, —.

In the preface to this volume Heinz Bechert draws attention to the fact that it is the first catalogue of Burmese manuscripts to give detailed descriptions. Burmese language and literature have been little studied in the West and the information given in the introduction on the history of the literature of Burma and on previous studies of Burmese literature is therefore very welcome. Bechert mentions that no more than five larger works of pre-modern Burmese literature are translated into European language. The first work which was translated is a biography of the Buddha, the *Mālālaṅkāravatthu*, composed in 1798 A.D. A manuscript of it is described in the catalogue (no. 109). This work was translated by an American Baptist missionary, Chester Bennett (*JAOS* 3, 1853, pp. 1–164). Better known in the West is *The Life or Legend of Gaudama the Buddha of the Burmese* by Bishop Paul Ambrose Bigandet

(Rangoon, 1858; second enlarged ed., *ibid.*, 1866; third edition, London, 1880; fourth ed., London, 1911–1912; popular edition, London, 1914). According to Bechert, Bigandet's work is a translation of the *Tathāgata-udāna-dīpanī* of Dīpaiyaṇ³ Sirisaddhammābhilaṅkāra (1772 A.D.). In a previous publication Bechert stated that Bigandet's work was based on the *Mālālaṅkāravatthu* (*Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft in den Ländern des Theravāda-Buddhismus*, Dritter Band, Wiesbaden, 1973, p. 58). The same source is mentioned in other publications (M. B. Emeneau, *A Union List of Printed Indic Texts and Translations in American Libraries*, New Haven, 1935; p. 364; Hla Pe, 'L'letteratura Birmana', *Storia delle letterature d'Oriente*, Vol. IV, Milano, 1969, p. 280). However, Bigandet himself wrote that the first edition of his book was based on the *Malla-linkara-wouttoo*, but that for the second edition he availed himself of a manuscript of the *Tathagata-oudana* (4th ed., vol. 2, p. 149). It would appear therefore that the second and later editions of Bigandet's work are based upon two Burmese biographies of the Buddha, the *Mālālaṅkāravatthu* and the *Tathāgata-udāna-dīpanī*. I do not know whether the sources of these two works have been studied. The author of the latter work declared that his work is a translation from the Pāli (*op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 4). In his *Buddhismus* (*loc. cit.*) Bechert indicated the following dates for the birth and death of Bigandet: 1812?–1894. Bigandet was born on 13 August 1813 and died on 19 March 1894 (cf. *Dictionnaire de biographie française*, vol. 6, Paris, 1954, col. 425). Henri de Lubac mentions two articles published by Bigandet in the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*: *Principaux points du système bouddhiste* (t. XXVII, 1843); une traduction du *Ka-ma-wa-tsa* ou *Livre des ordinations des prêtres bouddhistes* (t. XXXVI, 1848), cf. *La rencontre du bouddhisme et de l'occident* (Paris, 1952), p. 148, n. 173. The confusion as to the sources of Bigandet's work is a good indication of the state of knowledge on Burmese literature in the West. Important works seem to have been published in Burma in recent years, but already in previous centuries bibliographical works were compiled by Burmese authors. Well-known is the *Piṭakat samuīṇī*³, composed in 1888 A.D., which lists 2047 titles. A manuscript of an older unpublished bibliographical work is described in the catalogue (no. 116). The compilation of this work was undertaken on the order of King Maṇ³ Rai³ Kyo² Thaṇ of Ava (1673–1698 A.D.) in 1681 A.D.

The Burmese manuscripts described in the catalogue contain mainly canonical Pāli texts, mediaeval Ceylonese Pāli works, Pāli texts composed in Burma and works in the Burmese language including nissayas of Pāli texts. The introduction gives a short historical survey of the works of Burmese origin. In the catalogue itself the manuscripts are classified under the following headings: manuscripts with mixed contents; Buddhist texts; classical Burmese poetry (one manuscript. A poetical version of the *Vessantarājātaka* composed in 1799 A.D.); history of literature (No. 116, see above); secular historical literature and documents; grammar, lexicography and orthography; astrology, alchemy, medicine, occultism, charms and spells, and popular cults. With regard to texts which are not available in print, very detailed information is given on the author, the date, the contents, etc., including quotations of the beginning and the end of the manuscript and the text of the colophon. The system of transliteration is fully explained on pp. XXI–XXIV. Very useful are the lists of abbreviations found in Burmese manuscripts (pp. XXV–XXXII). Catalogues of printed books and manuscripts, reference works on Pāli and Burmese literature and general works relating to Burma are listed on pp. XXXVI–XLI.

In the preface Bechert points out that the number of Burmese manuscripts in German collections is rather large. We can therefore expect the complete catalogue to be of the greatest importance for a better knowledge of the Burmese literature. This first volume has been compiled according to very exacting standards, which constitute a useful guideline for similar undertakings in other countries. Heinz Bechert and his Burmese collaborators deserve our greatest thanks for this splendid volume.

Robert Klaus Heinemann, *Der Weg des Übens im ostasiatischen Mahāyāna*. Grundformen seiner Zeitrelation zum Übungsziel in der Entwicklung bis Dōgen. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1979. XII, 189 pp. DM 82, —.

According to biographies of the Zen master Dōgen (1200–1253), his mind was filled with doubt with regard to the doctrine of the awakening from the beginning (*hongaku*): “Wie kommt es, dass trotz dieser ursprünglichen Buddhanatur [im Menschen] die Erleuchteten (*shobutsu*) noch den “Gedanken” (Entschluss zur Erleuchtung) fassen (*hosshin*) und den Weg des Übens bis zur vollkommenen Erleuchtung gehen?” (p. 13). Heinemann points out that Dōgen’s question raises the problem of the relation between practice and its goal. Are practice and its goal separated in temporal succession or do they coexist at the same moment? In his examination of this problem the author concentrates on those writings and schools the influence of which is clearly evident in the Buddhism of the Kamakura period.

The author examines first the teachings of the *Hua-yen ching* which relate to the practice of the bodhisattva; the *pāramitā*-s, the *bhūmi*-s, faith as origin of the path, and the practice of the bodhisattva in the seventh *bhūmi*. The *Hua-yen ching* is translated from the Sanskrit and it is therefore important to see to what extent the Chinese translation corresponds to the Sanskrit original. The author points out that only two sections of the *Hua-yen ching*, the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* and the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, are preserved in Sanskrit. However, the author also quotes from the 363 verses in which the bodhisattva Hsien-chou explains how faith operates. A great part of these verses are quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (ed. C. Bendall, Bibliotheca Buddhica, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1897–1902, pp. 2.16–5.6 and pp. 327.6–347.11). It is interesting to note the difference between the Sanskrit text and the Chinese translation of the verse quoted on p. 24: “Der (Glaube (*hsin*) ist der Ursprung (*yüan*) des Wegs (*tao*), die Mutter [aller] Verdienste (*kung-tê*). Er fördert alles Gute (*shan-fa*).” The Sanskrit text has: *śraddha pūrogata* (MS. *pūrvaṅgamu*) *mātrjanetrī pālikavarddhikā sarvagūṇānām*, “Faith is the guide, the mother, the producer, the protector and increaser of all virtues” (trad. C. Bendall and W. H. D. Rouse, London, 1922, p. 3). The author remarks: “Es ist gleichgültig, ob *tao* hier in der Bedeutung von “Weg” (d.h. Üben) oder “Erleuchtung” steht (beide Deutungen finden sich in der modernen Sekundärliteratur); auf jeden Fall handelt es sich um eine Stufung, die in ihrer konkreten Verwirklichung auf ein Nacheinander hindeutet” (pp. 26–27). The idea of faith as origin of the path is absent in the Sanskrit original and the interpretations of this verse in China and Japan are therefore based upon a Chinese rendering which does not correspond to the original Sanskrit text. However, in other places, the correspondence between the Sanskrit original and the Chinese translation is very close, as, for instance, in the passage on the seventh *bhūmi* which the author examines in a section entitled ‘Überschreiten der Zeitlichkeit’. According to Sanskrit text the bodhisattva enters into *nirodha* but without realizing it (*bodhisatvo nirodham samāpadyate . . . na ca nirodhaḥ sāṅgāt kṛta iti vaktavyaḥ*, *Daśabhūmikasūtra*, ed. J. Rahder, Leuven, 1926, p. 61). In the third chapter, entitled “Das Prinzip des “vollkommenen Verschmelzens” der Hua-yen Lehre”, the author pays particular attention to some of the principal doctrines of the Hua-yen school as expressed in the writings of Fa-tsang (643–712), the third patriarch of the Hua-yen school. Of particular importance are the doctrines of “the fusion of the six aspects” (*liu-hsiang yüan-jung*) and of “the ten mysterious principles” (*shih hsüan-men*). The author remarks that the six aspects are mentioned in the Sanskrit text of the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* but that it is difficult to determine their exact meaning. According to Rahder’s edition of the Sanskrit text the six aspects are: *sāṅga*, *upāṅga*, *salakṣaṇa*, *vilakṣaṇa*, *saṃvarta* and *vivarta* (*Daśabhūmikasūtra*, p. 15). In the Sanskrit text, quoted by the author, one must read *-bhūmipariśodhanasāṅga-* (cf. Megumu Honda, ‘Annotated translation of the *Daśabhūmika-Sūtra*’, *Studies in South, East, and Central Asia*. Śatapiṭaka, vol. 74, New Delhi, 1968, p. 131, n. 29). The author quotes the opinion of K. Kimura who remarked that in Kondō’s edition of the *Daśabhūmīśvara* (p. 20) only five expressions are mentioned: *salakṣaṇa-vilakṣaṇa-savitarka-saṃvarta-vivarta*. However, both *sāṅga* and *upāṅga* are found in Kondō’s text

and, as Kimura pointed out himself, the Chinese translations correspond to the text as established by Rahder. The word *śaṅkṣā* does not seem to occur in the original Sanskrit text and is probably only found in one or more of the recent manuscripts used by Kondō. The six aspects are translated in different ways in the old translation by Buddhahadra (359–429) and in the new translation by Śikṣānanda (652–710). In the old translation *śalakṣaṇa* and *vilakṣaṇa* are rendered into Chinese by *yu-hsiang* and *wu-hsiang*. The author remarks: “Auffallend sind die beiden mittleren Glieder *yu-hsiang* (wörtl.: “Aspekt des Seins”) und *wu-hsiang* (wörtl.: “Aspekt des Nichts”), die mit den entsprechenden Gliedern (*t’ung-hsiang* und *i-hsiang*) der “neuen” Übersetzung inhaltlich nichts Gemeinsames zu haben scheinen” (p. 51). However, Buddhahadra’s translation corresponds closely to the Sanskrit original if one translates *yu-hsiang* and *wu-hsiang* by ‘with aspect’ and ‘without aspect’. There is no doubt that both the old and the new translation (*t’ung-hsiang*, “Aspekt der Gleichheit”; *i-hsiang*, “Aspekt der Verschiedenheit”) render Sanskrit *śalakṣaṇa* and *vilakṣaṇa*. The difference between the two is that the new translation renders more accurately the meaning of the Sanskrit terms: ‘having the same characteristics’ and ‘having different characteristics’. Heinemann points out that the renderings *t’ung-hsiang* and *i-hsiang* are already found in Bodhiruci’s translation of Vasubandhu’s *Daśabhūmividyākhyāna* in which the six aspects are applied in the exegesis of a passage of the *Hua-yen ching*. In Fa-tsang’s doctrine the fusion of the six aspects is taught. Heinemann translates a section of Fa-tsang’s *Hua-yen wu-chiao chang* which clearly shows how Fa-tsang’s doctrine is different from the one taught by Vasubandhu.

Chapter IV, “Ansätze zu einer Systematisierung”, examines several theories relating the problem of the relation between practice and its goal in the writings of Fa-tsang and Chih-hsiang (602–664), in an apocryphal Sūtra, the *Chan-ch’a shan-ê yeh-pao ching* (Taishō no. 839), and in the *Mo-hê chih-kuan* (Taishō no. 1911) of the T’ien-t’ai patriarch Chih-i (538–597). In the following chapters (V–VIII) Heinemann studies the Mahāyāna precepts as taught in the Hua-yen school, in the *Fan-wang ching* (Taishō no. 1484) and in the writings of Chih-i. Chapter five explains the general characteristics of the Mahāyāna precepts and the importance of “the practice for the sake of others” (*li-t’a hsing*). In chapter VI Heinemann arrives at the following conclusion: “In den Kommentaren zu den Geboten dieses Sūtras [i.e. the *Hua-yen ching*] findet sich kein Hinweis auf die Komplizierung (und deren Lösung) der zeitlichen Relation zwischen Üben und Übungsziel, die sich aus dem zweiten Gebot der “Dreiergruppe der reinen Gebote” (*san-chü ching-chieh*), dem Gebot, “sich [aller] Wesen anzunehmen”, ergibt” (p. 107). The *Fan-wang ching*¹ teaches that “bei der Gebots-Übertragung ein gewisser Grad der Erleuchtung realisiert ist und der Übende durch die Ausübung der Gebote sich bis zur vollendeten Erleuchtung hocharbeitet” (p. 131). According to Chih-i’s doctrine “Üben auf der höchsten Ebene ist kein Üben zum Ziel mehr, sondern ein Üben in der Vollendung” (p. 140).

In chapter IX the author returns to Dōgen and explains his teachings concerning practice and awakening. According to Dōgen’s doctrine, with the ordination the monk obtains the supreme awakening but awakening and practice are inseparable. Practice is a continuous practice, as is shown in the image of the “Path-Circle of continuous practice” (*gyōji dōkan*). “Practice for the sake of others” is implied in all practice, because to conceive the thought of awakening (*bodai shin*) means that one pledges oneself to liberate all beings before liberating oneself and to remain actively engaged in this pursuit (cf. pp. 162–163). In the final chapter the author sketches briefly how the ideas of the path and the goal were transformed successively in Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism in China and in Japan.

Heinemann’s book is, as the title indicates, mainly concerned with East-Asian Mahāyāna but the student of Indian Mahāyāna will undoubtedly discover many stimulating ideas in this work. The Chinese Buddhist schools such as the Hua-yen and T’ien-t’ai schools which arose in the sixth and seventh centuries represent Chinese developments of Indian ideas. These schools have been rather neglected by Western scholars even though they are of very great importance for the history of Sino-Japanese Buddhism. To what extent the doctrines of, for instance, the Hua-yen school are Indian and to what extent Chinese, is a problem which can

only be solved through a detailed study of the *Hua-yen ching* itself and the interpretations given by the Hua-yen patriarchs. Several parts of the *Hua-yen ching* have been preserved in Sanskrit and a complete Tibetan translation of the original Sanskrit text is found in the Kanjur. It is therefore possible to examine critically the two Chinese translations and to determine to what extent they reproduce faithfully the Indian original. Heinemann shows clearly that Dōgen's system is the result of a long historical development. It would be an interesting task to trace back the first beginnings of it to Indian Mahāyāna.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTE

¹ Heinemann's detailed bibliography omits J. J. M. de Groot, *Le code du Mahāyāna en Chine. Son influence sur la vie monacale et sur le monde laïque* (Amsterdam, 1893) which contains a translation of the *Fan-wang ching* (pp. 14–88).

A. F. P. Hulsewé, *China in Central Asia. The early Stage: 125 B.C. – A.D. 23*. An annotated translation of chapters 61 and 96 of the History of the Former Han dynasty. With an introduction by M. A. N. Loewe (Sinica Leidensia, vol. XIV). Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1979, VII, 273 pp. D.Gld. 70, —.

Chinese historical records are of great importance for the study of the history of Central Asia and India. Chapters 61 and 96 of the History of the Former Han dynasty (*Ch'ien Han shu*) and chapter 123 of the Records of the Historian (*Shih-chi*) have been translated several times from 1828 onwards. However, the existing translations are far from satisfactory. One of the main reasons is that previous translators did not subject the texts translated to a critical scrutiny. A crucial problem in this respect is the relation between *Shih-chi*, compiled by Ssu-ma Ch'ien (145–87 B.C.) and probably finished shortly before 90 B.C., and the *Ch'ien Han shu*. The *Shih-chi* is a general history of China, starting from remote antiquity and continuing until 90 B.C. Chapter 123 is entitled 'The monograph on Ta Yüan' but contains information on many more states in the Western Regions than the one specifically mentioned in its title. This chapter has in the past been considered as one of the prime sources on the history of Central Asia. However, its authenticity has often been called into question. In a very thoroughgoing textcritical study Hulsewé recently showed that the present 123rd chapter of the *Shih-chi* is a reconstruction (cf. 'The Problem of the authenticity of *Shih-chi* ch. 123, The Memoir of Ta Yüan', *T'oung Pao*, 61, 1975, pp. 83–147). In his introduction to the present book, Loewe briefly recapitulates Hulsewé's arguments (cf. pp. 12–25). He remarks on p. 25: "The conclusion of this long, but necessary digression is therefore that *Han shu* ch. 61 is primary, and that *Shih-chi* ch. 123 was practically lost, to be reconstructed out of *Han shu* material — chiefly *Han shu* ch. 61 —, in which a few fragments of an earlier text, perhaps of the original *Shih-chi* chapter, which had fortunately been preserved were inserted. This reconstruction may have been made some time during the 3rd or 4th century of our era."

The *Han-shu* (or *Ch'ien Han shu*) is the history of China during the Former, or Western, Han dynasty; and in principle it covers the period from the foundation, in 202 B.C. (including the earlier career of the founder, from c. 210), to the fall of Wang Mang in A.D. 23 (p. 11). The compilation of the *Han-shu*, which was started from A.D. 36, was probably completed between

A.D. 110 and 121 (p. 8). Chapter 96 'The monograph on the Western Regions' contains a series of entries describing the communities and states which were settled along the two routes that led round the Taklamakan desert or which were situated further to the west (p. 4). Chapter 61 'The memoir on Chang Ch'ien and Li Kuang-li' relates the information obtained by them on the Western regions. Chang Ch'ien was sent as an envoy to the Yüeh-chi in 139 or 138 B.C. (p. 209, n. 774) and to the Wu-sun between the spring of 118 B.C. and 115 B.C. (p. 145, n. 390). Li Kuang-li led a campaign against Ta Yüan in 104–101 B.C. (pp. 43, 76 and 228). After the Ta Yüan expedition, Li Kuang-li was three times sent on campaigns against the Hsiung-nu, in the summer of 99 B.C., in the spring of 97 B.C. and finally in 90 B.C. He was put to death by the Hsiung-nu in 89 B.C. (pp. 236–237, n. 926).

According to the introduction, the information concerning the Western Regions in chapters 96 and 61 is based on the (verbal ?) report presented by Chang Ch'ien and other envoys and the reports submitted from the office of the Protector General, and, perhaps, on the ancient text included in the present chapter 123 of the *Shih-chi* (p. 31). The office of the Protector General was founded in 59 B.C. Loewe assumes that much of the statistical and factual information in chapter 96 derives from reports that were submitted to the central government from the office of the Protector General during the period when a Protector General was actively in this post in the Western Regions, i.e. some time between 59 B.C. and A.D. 16 (pp. 10–11). It is not known when chapters 96 and 61 were compiled. Loewe points out that, in the early decades of the Christian era, Chinese influence in Central Asia practically disappeared and was not effectively re-established until after A.D. 73 (p. 26). In a note he refers to an article by Pulleyblank who adduces reasons for the possibility that these two chapters were finished after A.D. 74.

In order to give the reader a better understanding of the historical background, Loewe devotes a section of the introduction to a sketch of relations between China and the peoples of central Asia during the Former Han dynasty. He remarks that from c. 65 B.C. the emphasis of Chinese policy changed. Governments now directed their efforts to founding static colonies as a means of maintaining the Chinese position rather than to displaying strength on the field of battle (p. 50).

The lengthy introduction (pp. 1–70) to which we have made frequent reference fully explains the importance of the two chapters translated by Hulsewé and Loewe (despite the title-page it appears from the preface that they prepared the translation together). The literature relating to them is very voluminous. Chinese scholars have written notes and commentaries probably already from the second century A.D. onwards. In recent times much work has been done by scholars in China, Japan and the West. The correct identification of geographical names still remains a problem. In the past this was often done on the basis of a superficial resemblance between Chinese sounds and names found in non-Chinese sources (p. 70). In the notes to the translations the identifications suggested by various scholars are listed, sometimes accompanied by critical remarks. For the reconstruction of the ancient pronunciation of the Chinese characters the translators have adopted Bernhard Karlgren's reconstructions of Archaic and Ancient Chinese – i.e. those of approximately the 7th century before and of the 7th century after the beginning of the Christian era. It is important for the non-sinological reader to realize that these reconstructions can only imperfectly reflect the Han pronunciation and that serious criticisms have been directed in particular against Karlgren's reconstruction of Archaic Chinese. With regard to the Han pronunciation of proper names, the work of Pulleyblank is of special relevance and his reconstructions are carefully listed in the notes. The non-sinological reader will be extremely grateful to the translators for having added such a copious annotation. They have made every effort to render the translation accessible to specialists in other fields by explaining carefully such difficult matters as technical expressions and official titles. Useful comments made by Chinese scholars are summarized in the notes. The extensive bibliography (pp. 240–256) lists all the publications referred to in the introduction and the 930 (!) notes to the translation. The translators deserve special praise for the detailed index in which heavy type has been used to indicate where detailed information is

to be found. A sketch map lists the modern names of place names identified in the notes. Figures on the map refer to the notes. The map is accompanied by three lists: 1) an alphabetical list of modern names, followed by their degrees of latitude and longitude; 2) an alphabetical list of ancient names, preceded by the number of the notes where they are discussed; 3) a numerical list of the notes, followed by the name of the ancient locality discussed there, and by a brief indication of the suggested identification.

A detailed discussion of the translation and of points discussed in the introduction and the notes must be left to sinologists. The non-sinologist will be glad to know that, at last, an adequate translation of these important historical documents is at his disposal. The book is the fruit of the collaboration of two eminent specialists in the history of the Han period. Their work will be of great use to both sinologists and non-sinologists. Let us hope that their example may stimulate other sinologists to translate and explain later Chinese historical sources on Central Asia in the same exemplary way.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG