

Die Buddhistische Briefliteratur Indiens. Siglinde Dietz. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert (Asiatische Forschungen, Band 84). Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1984. XV + 590 pp. DM 220.

In the Buddhist literature the *lekha* 'letter' is a literary genre which seems to have been popular since Nāgārjuna in the second century A.C. The Tibetan Tanjur contains thirteen letters, nine of which are edited and translated by Dr Dietz. She has omitted Nāgārjuna's *Suḥrillekha*, Candragomin's *Śiṣyalekha* and Mātrceṭa's *Mahārājakanīśalekha*, which have already been edited and translated. Dietz intends to publish the text and translation of Padma-vajra's *Prajñālekha* in a future publication.

The letters in this volume contain doctrinal, moral and political teachings. Most of them are addressed to lay followers and are mainly concerned with instructing them in correct moral behaviour. Two of the letters in this volume were probably written in Tibetan : Buddhaguhya's and Śrīghoṣa's letters to the Lord of Tibet and his subjects. Buddhaguhya is a well-known Tantric scholar. He was invited to Tibet by King Khri sroṅ lde btsan who reigned from 755 to 797. In his letter he gives some interesting information on the genealogy of the Tibetan king and the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet. The author of the second letter, Sba Dpal dbyaṅs (Śrīghoṣa), was one of the first seven Tibetans ordained in 779 by Śāntarakṣita in the monastery Bsam yas. In his letter Sba Dpal dbyaṅs addressed himself to the king in the second chapter, to the ministers in chapter 4.2 and to the ecclesiastics in chapter 4.3. Other chapters are addressed to all Tibetans. Among the authors of the other letters, we also find some well-known scholars such as Jitāri, who lived in the second half of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh. His *Cittaratnaviśodhanakramalekha* is addressed to a king who is not identified. His famous pupil Atīśa, whose life and activities are well-known thanks to the studies published by Helmut Eimer in recent years, is the author of a letter entitled *Vimalaratnalekha*, addressed to King Niryaṇpāla, a Pāla king known in the Indian tradition under the name *Nayapāla*. Kamalaśīla, the author of the *Madhyamakāloka*, the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, *pañjikā* and other philosophical works, wrote the *Dukkhaviśeṣanir-*

deśa for a Tibetan called Lho za mo Tshaṅs p'ai dbyaṅs about whom nothing is known. Kamalaśīla came to Tibet at the invitation of King Khri sroṅ lde btsan. Sajjana, the author of a letter to his son 'Putralekha', is known as a translator of *Vijñānavāda* texts and lived in the eleventh century. Mitrayogin, who sojourned for eighteen months in Tibet around the year 1200, addressed a letter, entitled *Candrarājalekha*, to a King Candra, probably a king of *Vārāṇasī*. A letter addressed to a monk, Rab gsal g'zön nu, is attributed to the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. Another letter, the *Gurulekha*, is written by a monk, Dgon pa pa, who is perhaps identical with a Dgon pa pa from Kaśmīr who lived in the eleventh century.

In the first part of her work Dietz carefully examines the letters one by one and discusses the identity of the author of each, the addressee, its occasion and purpose, the nature of its contents, the date of writing, and the sources used by the author. In a special chapter she studies the characteristics of the *lekha* as a literary genre and also analyses the *parikathās* and *nirdeśas* which are included in the same section of the Tanjur. The main part of her work contains the edition of the Tibetan text of the letters, on the basis of four Tanjur editions, and an annotated translation. The notes discuss difficult expressions and reproduce the sources quoted in the letters. Extremely useful are the detailed indices : an index of quotations, a list of German translations of Buddhist terms, lists of Sanskrit terms, Tibetan words, Indian names and Tibetan names. The bibliography occupies no less than twenty-three pages.

Dr Dietz's work is a major contribution to both Buddhist and Tibetan studies. She has taken great pains to identify the quotations and to determine the meaning of words and expressions. Most of the letters are written in verse and it is not always easy to translate Tibetan versions of Sanskrit verses in the absence of the original text. Even more difficult to translate are the letters written directly in Tibetan, because the Tibetan language of that period is not very well known. Further study of these letters will certainly lead to different interpretations in several places. It will also be necessary to try to trace the sources used by the authors which have not been identified by Dietz. For instance, in verses 4 and 5 of chapter 4 of the

Gurulekha, the author enumerates twenty-four synonyms of the impurities (*kleśa*). These synonyms are listed in the same order in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (ed. P. Pradhan, Santiniketan 1950, p.44, 15-18). Pradhan's text enumerates only twenty-three items but, as pointed out by Walpola Rahula in his translation, one must add *upāyāsā* after *paridāhā* (*Le compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga*, Paris 1971, p. 71, note 3). Very similar to this list is the one found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (ed. V. Bhattacharya, Calcutta 1957, pp.166-7). With the help of these two lists it is possible to correct the edition of the Tibetan text and the translation. The third verse of the letter by Avalokiteśvara contains several difficulties. Avalokiteśvara writes that the way which all *munis* have gone is 'subtle, difficult to understand and beyond the domain of words'. Dietz's interpretation of this line is different: 'die-ser Weg... nicht Bereich subtiler und schwer zu begreifender Worte ist'. The real difficulty is in the third line: *phyogs tsam rtog pas sgro btags rgyal ba'i mthus brjod na*. Dietz sees in this line an allusion to the philosophy of Dignāga and translates: 'wenn [man ihn dir] mit der Kraft eines siegreichen [Buddha] erklärt, nachdem man ihm mittels des Bildens von Vorstellung nur einen Aspekt beigelegt hat?' Probably *phyogs tsam* renders Sanskrit *dīnmatra* 'a mere indication'. *Sgro btags* is a philosophical term for attributing reality to something which is not real. Here it must have a more general meaning, such as 'to imagine'. The author says that he explains the way with the help of the Jina after having imagined having understood a mere indication of its real meaning. In *Cittaratnaviśodhanakramalekha* 4.3.3, it is said that one must successively practise compassion (*sñiñ rje*), joy (*dga' ba*) and equanimity (*btañ sñoms*). These are the second, third and fourth of the four infinitudes (*apramāṇa*). The first is kindness (*byams pa*) and the text explains that it is impossible for compassion to act if one has not first paid attention to kindness: ... *byams pa yid la ma byas par... sñiñ rje ga la 'jug ste*. This passage has been misunderstood by Dietz (cf. p.177). Another passage which can be interpreted differently is *Sārasamgrahalekha* 4.3.15, where the text says that one must listen to somebody who has meditated a little even if he is not learned (*thos pa mañ po*; Sanskrit *bahuśruta*). Dietz ren-

ders *thos pa mañ po* with 'wenn das Gehörte nicht viel ist'.

These few remarks show that it is possible to arrive here and there at different interpretations, but they are not in the least meant to diminish the merit of Dr Dietz's achievement, for which one can have nothing but praise.

J.W. de Jong

(Dept of S. Asian and Buddhist Studies,
The Australian National University,
Canberra)

Buddhist Formal Logic. A study of Dignāga's *Hetucakra* and K'uei-chi's Great Commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa*. R.S.Y. Chi. Royal Asiatic Society, London 1969; revised edition, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1984. lxxxii + 222 pp. Rs. 100.

To open a book on Dignāga's system of logic and find it full of tables of figures and other symbols is an intimidating experience if you are not familiar with the techniques of twentieth-century symbolic logic. However, if you are ready for this sort of treatment you will find the book a treasure both of symbolic logic and of Buddhist thought. In a way it is as if the author wanted to produce a study of the principal systems of modern symbolic logic, comparing them, relating them to each other and even developing them to further lengths of subtlety, using Dignāga as material on which to produce their application. A very good and striking example of his methods is the list of sixteen Venn diagrams on p.58 illustrating the sixteen possible relations between two classes - inclusion, exclusion, overlap combined with the possibilities of being empty or not empty - classes filling between them or not filling between them the whole field of enquiry. Reference is even made to two empty classes in an empty-field of enquiry, perhaps in one sense incubi and familiars as classes of evil spirits. The number sixteen is arrived at by pure mathematical necessity once the Venn diagram is accepted as a good symbol for two related classes. The author then goes on to show how many of these relations are found in Dignāga's and other systems of formal logic and how far they are properly distinguished. The mathematically minded will appreciate the beauty of his devices and the clarity of his tables.