

REVIEWS

Inde et littératures. Études réunies par Marie-Claude Porcher (Collection puruṣārtha no. 7). Paris, Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1983. 320 pp. 160.00 F.

Dans la présentation Marie-Claude Porcher écrit que ce volume est inspiré par le désir de confronter les vues de chercheurs issus d'horizons divers et de présenter conjointement différentes approches de l'étude du champ littéraire. La variété des sujets traités nous force d'indiquer brièvement le sujet de chaque contribution et de laisser aux spécialistes dans ces divers domaines de recherche d'entrer en discussion avec les auteurs. L'article de Charles Malamoud étudie la structure du sacrifice de douze jours dans l'Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (Exégèse de rites. Exégèse de textes, pp. 17–38). L'auteur analyse les *rūpa*, les symboles ou les indices, qui caractérisent chaque journée. Marie-Claude Porcher analyse les deux principes de pluralité dans la poétique: l'ambiguïté ou double-sens (*śleṣa*) et la suggestion (*dhvani*) (Le déploiement de l'implicite dans la poétique sanscrite, pp. 35–56). L'auteur s'efforce de dissiper notamment le halo de mystère et d'irrationalité qui s'attache trop souvent au *dhvani*. Ānandavardhana et Mammaṭa décrivent les conditions nécessaires à l'appréhension du sens suggéré. Les théoriciens distinguent une suggestion non poétique d'une suggestion proprement poétique. Le véritable *kāvya* est celui dans lequel le suggéré est jugé plus beau que l'exprimé et donc supérieur à lui. Jonathan Katz étudie la relation entre les traités musicaux et la pratique musicale (Indian Musicological Literature and its Context, pp. 57–75). Il remarque que la distinction entre l'histoire de la musique et celle des traités musicaux n'a pas toujours été faite de manière adéquate. Il souligne le conservatisme de la théorie, et exprime l'espoir que des changements dans les conditions sociales et culturelles et l'influence des travaux des musicologues occidentaux aideront à développer une musicologie utile pour la pratique musicale. Dans sa contribution François Gros essaie de situer la littérature du Sangam dans son milieu culturel (La littérature du Sangam et son public, pp. 77–107). Il fait ressortir le fait que le Sangam est d'une part inséré dans un réseau historique et culturel qui le fait participer au mouvement général de la civilisation de la Péninsule indienne, et d'autre part fortement caractérisé par un milieu littéraire aux conventions très élaborées. François Gros écrit que l'idéologie du Sangam n'est exprimée qu'à travers une tradition poétique, dont l'objet n'est pas de refléter exactement les fluctuations de la société mais d'en sublimer la vision. Gregory Bailey montre que les souffrances de Draupadī et de Yudhiṣṭhira ne s'expliquent qu'à la lumière de la structure du Mahābhārata telle qu'elle s'exprime dans ses thèmes fondamentaux: le destin, le *dharma*, l'*adharma*, le *karman* et la royauté (Suffering in the Mahābhārata: Draupadī and Yudhiṣṭhira, pp. 109–129). France Bhattacharya examine les passages concernant la préparation des aliments et leur consommation dans le *Caṇḍī Maṅgala*, poème bengali composé autour de 1589 (Les mets et la cuisine dans le *Caṇḍī Maṅgala*, pp. 131–175). Elle remarque que ces passages se différencient assez nettement les uns des autres pour que leur comparaison et leur mise en rapport fournissent la clef d'un début de déchiffrement symbolique.

Les trois contributions suivantes éclairent divers aspects de la réponse du monde occidental à la civilisation indienne. L'étude de Catherine Weinberger-Thomas s'occupe des théories et des spéculations relatives aux Veda dans l'oeuvre de Pierre Sonnerat, auteur du *Voyage aux Indes orientales et à la Chine*, Paris, 1782 (Les mystères du Veda. Spéculations sur le texte sacré des anciens brames au Siècle des Lumières, pp. 177–231). Sonnerat

reconnaissait que l'Ezour-Vedam publié par Sainte-Croix en 1778 était un apocryphe chrétien destiné à servir la propagande missionnaire. Ses spéculations sur l'origine indienne des civilisations aboutissent à la création d'un roman que l'auteur appelle "La guerre des Veda". Sylvia Murr examine comment entre 1700 et 1782 Jésuites, savants et Philosophes ont eu des réactions différentes vis-à-vis de l'Inde (Les conditions d'émergence du discours sur l'Inde au Siècle des Lumières, pp. 233–284). Elle analyse les discussions qui se déroulent autour des trois thèmes de l'âge du monde, de l'origine du peuplement de l'Inde et de l'origine de la religion et/ou de la civilisation des Indiens. Sylvia Murr remarque que les textes sur l'Inde sont un prétexte dans le combat entre les apologistes chrétiens et les Philosophes au sujet de l'histoire du monde. Catherine Champion étudie l'image littéraire du *sahib* dans la littérature anglo-indienne (Du *nabab* au *sahib*. De l'utopie à l'utilitarisme: promenade à travers les clichés de la littérature anglo-indienne, pp. 285–310).

Marie-Claude Porcher et ses collaborateurs ont montré dans ce travail que l'étude des littératures indiennes pourrait profiter beaucoup de l'application de différentes méthodes de recherche. Il n'y a aucun doute que les études réunies dans ce volume méritent d'être lues par tous ceux qui s'efforcent d'obtenir une idée plus vraie et plus variée de la culture indienne que celle que l'on trouve dans beaucoup de publications.

Mahābhāṣyapradīpavyākhyānāni. Commentaires sur le Mahābhāṣya de Patañjali et le Pradīpa de Kaiyaṭa. Edition par M. S. Narasiṃhācārya. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 51, 1–10. Pondichéry, Institut Français d'Indologie, 1973–1983. Vol. I: Adhyāya 1 Pāda 1 Āhnika 1–4. 1973, xxii, 397 pp.; Vol. II: Adhyāya 1 Pāda 1 Āhnika 5–7. 1975, 367 pp.; Vol. III: Adhyāya 1 Pāda 1 Āhnika 8–9. 1976, 315 pp.; Vol. IV: Adhyāya 1 Pāda 2–4. 1977, v, 383 pp.; Vol. VI: Adhyāya 3 Pāda 1–4. 1979, vi, 420 pp.; Vol. VII: Adhyāya 4 Pāda 1–4. 1980, vi, 398 pp.; Vol. VIII: Adhyāya 5 Pāda 1–4. 1981, 254 pp.; Vol. IX: Adhyāya 6 Pāda 1–4. 1982, vi, 408 pp.; Vol. X: Adhyāya 7 et 8. 1983, cli, 503 pp.

La publication du dixième volume de l'édition des *Mahābhāṣyapradīpavyākhyānāni* marque la complétion d'un des ouvrages les plus importants entrepris par l'Institut Français d'Indologie. Ces dix volumes publiés de 1973 à 1983 contiennent le texte complet de l'*Uddyotana* d'Annambhaṭṭa et des fragments de cinq autres commentaires. Les auteurs de ces commentaires ont tous vécu avant Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa qui, au 18^e siècle, composa son célèbre commentaire, intitulé Uddyota, sur le Mahābhāṣyapradīpa de Kaiyaṭa, rédigé avant 1550. A part Annambhaṭṭa les auteurs de ces commentaires ne sont pas bien connus. Dans son introduction sanskrite, que M. Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat a rendue en français, l'éditeur, M. Mēlpākkam Śrīnivāsa Narasiṃhācārya, donne tous les renseignements qu'il a pu réunir sur les titres et les auteurs des six commentaires. La plus grande partie de son introduction est vouée à l'étude des points marquants des commentaires. Dans sa préface M. Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat écrit qu'à sa demande M. Narasiṃhācārya a adopté un style d'exposé plus simple qu'il n'est accoutumé pour ce genre scolastique, et ceci dans un but pédagogique.

Un tableau des parties des commentaires publiées dans *Mahābhāṣyapradīpavyākhyānāni* (vol. I à X) permet de voir d'un coup d'oeil l'étendue des commentaires fragmentaires (p. ix). Espérons que dans sa quête de manuscrits M. Narasiṃhācārya réussira à découvrir quelques unes des parties manquantes. Déjà M. Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat annonce la publication d'une nouvelle série de fragments d'autres commentaires.

Ce dixième volume contient plusieurs index: un index des *nyāya* (pp. cxi–cli), un index des sujets (pp. 482–491) et un index alphabétique des *sūtra* (pp. 492–501).

La publication de ces commentaires sera accueillie avec joie par tous les spécialistes du

vyākaraṇa pour l'aide qu'ils apportent à l'interprétation du *Mahābhāṣya* et du *Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa*. Un des premiers à profiter de ces textes est M. Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat dans sa traduction du *Mahābhāṣya* avec le *Pradīpa* de Kaiyaṭa et l'*Uddyota* de Nāgeśa dont ont paru jusqu'à aujourd'hui quatre volumes qui contiennent les deux premiers *pāda* du premier *adhyāya* (cf. Y. Ojihara, *IJJ* 23, 1981, pp. 45–51). M. Narasiṃhācārya et l'Institut Français d'Indologie à Pondichéry ont rendu un grand service aux études indianistes par la publication de ces commentaires.

NOTES

¹ Le volume cinq nous est pas parvenu.

² Cf. volume I, p. IV.

N. R. Bhatt (éd.), *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha* (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 61). Pondichéry, Institut Français d'Indologie, 1979, clxiv, 236, 2 pp.

N. R. Bhatt (éd.), *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha* (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 65). Pondichéry, Institut Français d'Indologie, 1982. cxli, 531, 2 pp.

N. R. Bhatt (éd.), *Rauravottarāgama* (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 66). Pondichéry, Institut Français d'Indologie, 1983. cxx, 190 pp.

Dans l'introduction à son édition du *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama* Monsieur N. R. Bhatt écrit que les Śaivāgama sont une branche de la littérature peu abordée par ailleurs et dont l'étude jettera une lumière nouvelle sur la religion et la philosophie de l'Inde ancienne.¹ Depuis sa fondation l'Institut Français de Pondichéry a entrepris de rassembler des manuscrits et de les éditer. D'après Jean Filliozat l'Institut possède une collection de 1400 manuscrits sur feuilles de palmier et quelque 750 copies.² L'édition des textes a commencé en 1961 avec l'édition du premier volume du *Rauravāgama* par M. Bhatt.³ Le même volume contient une introduction sur les āgama śivaïtes par Jean Filliozat (pp. v–xv). L'édition de la littérature āgamique fut confiée à M. Bhatt qui a édité successivement le *Rauravāgama* (vols. I–II, 1961–1972), le *Mrgendrāgama* (*Kriyāpāda* et *Caryāpāda*) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (1962), l'*Ajitāgama* (vols. I–II, 1963–1967)⁴ et le premier volume (*Vidyāpāda*) du *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama* avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha.

Le *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama* est une des nombreuses recensions du *Kālottara*, texte dérivé (*upāgama*) du *Vātulāgama* (vingt-huitième āgama du śivaïsme siddhāntin). Dans une longue introduction sanskrite (pp. xlvii–xcv) dont la préface française (pp. v–xlv) est un résumé, l'éditeur étudie les différentes recensions du *Kālottara*, les auteurs et les textes cités dans le commentaire, et les enseignements particuliers au texte. Le texte n'est pas divisé dans les quatre sections traditionnelles (*jñāna*, *kriyā*, *yoga* et *caryā*) mais en 27 chapitres (*pāṭala*) dont l'éditeur donne une analyse détaillée. En ce qui concerne *Rāmakaṇṭha* il renvoie à l'introduction de son édition du *Vidyāpāda* du *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama* (pp. viii–xviii). L'édition est établie principalement sur la base de deux manuscrits qui contiennent texte et commentaire mais l'éditeur a aussi utilisé plusieurs manuscrits qui ne contiennent que le texte, ainsi que l'édition

du texte par Raffaele Torella (RSO 50, 1976, pp. 279–318). Un appendice contient une liste des vers parallèles et des variantes dans trois recensions du Kālottara: Dviśatikālottara, Kālottara et Bṛhatkālottara. Ajoutons que l'ouvrage contient un résumé anglais de l'introduction (pp. xcvi–cvii).

Le deuxième volume de l'édition du Maṭaṅgapārameśvarāgama contient les trois autres sections de cet *upāgama*. L'introduction est divisée en trois sections: une introduction française (pp. v–lxxviii), une introduction sanskrite (pp. lxxix–cxxxviii) et un résumé anglais (pp. cxxix–xxli). Le commentaire de Rāmakaṇṭha s'arrête au vers 13 du onzième chapitre du *kriyāpāda* qui comporte 15 chapitres. Malheureusement, le commentaire des autres chapitres du *kriyāpāda* et des deux autres sections (*yoga*- et *caryāpāda*) manque dans les deux manuscrits utilisés par l'éditeur. Dans l'introduction M. Bhatt étudie les auteurs et les ouvrages cités dans le commentaire et les enseignements du texte et en donne une analyse détaillée. On trouvera une description des manuscrits à la fin de l'introduction sanskrite (p. cxxxvii).

Le Rauravottara est un *upāgama* du Rauravāgama. M. Bhatt a pu consulter cinq manuscrits qui, tous, contiennent vingt chapitres. Toutefois, ces chapitres ne traitent pas tous les sujets annoncés dans le premier chapitre. Selon M. Bhatt il est possible qu'une partie de la matière manquante soit dans les chapitres qu'on trouve dans divers manuscrits où ils sont attribués au Rauravottara et parfois au Rauravāgama. L'éditeur a publié le texte de ces chapitres dans un appendice (pp. 108–151). L'introduction étudie les enseignements du texte et donne une analyse des vingt chapitres du texte même et des chapitres publiés en appendice. Le livre se termine par l'index des demi-vers, la bibliographie et une table des matières détaillée.

Depuis la fondation de l'Institut Français de Pondichéry M. Bhatt s'est occupé de la collection et de l'édition de textes āgamiques. Toutes ses éditions se signalent par le soin avec lequel il a établi les textes. Loin de se contenter de les éditer et d'étudier les problèmes textuels qui sont souvent très compliqués de par la nature des traditions āgamiques, M. Bhatt s'est efforcé d'en examiner en profondeur les doctrines et les enseignements. C'est largement par les seuls efforts de ce savant dont la puissance de travail ne semble pas avoir de limites, que les textes du Śaivāgama commencent à devenir accessibles aux indianistes. N'oublions pas non plus que M. Bhatt n'a pas épargné son aide aux savants qui ont entrepris de traduire des textes appartenant au Śaivism du Sud de l'Inde, tels que la Somaśambhupaddhati et le Mrgendrāgama. De la traduction de la Somaśambhupaddhati par Madame Hélène Brunner trois volumes ont déjà été publiés.⁵ Récemment, Monsieur Michel Hulin a traduit les sections *vidyā*- et *yogapāda* du Mrgendrāgama (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No. 63, Pondichéry, 1980). Espérons que M. Bhatt qui a publié une édition critique des sections *kriyā*- et *caryāpāda* de ce texte, préparera également une édition critique des deux autres sections.

NOTES

¹ Cf. aussi Hélène Brunner, 'Importance de la littérature agamique pour l'étude des religions vivantes de l'Inde', *Indologica Taurinensia* III–IV (Torino, 1977), pp. 107–124.

² Jean Filliozat, *Travaux et perspectives de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient en son 75e anniversaire* (Paris, 1976), Introduction, p. 8. Voir aussi sur les Śaivāgama, dans le même ouvrage, François Gros, 'L'EFEO, domaine indien 1951–1976: vingt-cinq ans de philologie', pp. 57–60.

³ Cf. Paul Hacker, *IJJ* 8 (1964–65), p. 228.

⁴ Cf. K. Rüping, *IJJ* 19 (1977), pp. 294–296.

⁵ Cf. *IJJ* 23 (1981), pp. 159–161.

The Bhagavad Gītā. Translated by Winthrop Sargeant. Revised Edition Edited by Christopher Chapple. Foreword by Swami Samatananda. Albany, State University of New York Press, 1984. xxiv, 739 pp. Paper \$10.96, Cloth \$39.50.

Winthrop Sargeant's translation was first published in 1979 by Doubleday. It was highly praised by A. T. de Nicolas in *Philosophy East and West* (vol. 31, 1981, pp. 98–101). It now appears in a revised version in the SUNY Series in Cultural Perspectives, edited by Antonio T. de Nicolas.

In his preface the translator explains that his excuse for adding one more to the numerous translations of the Bhagavadgītā, is the absence of a translation which presents the original Sanskrit with an interlinear arrangement that permits the reader to learn the sound as well as the meaning of each word. Each page of this book contains one verse of the Gītā. The text is given in *devanāgarī* script and in romanisation accompanied by a word-for-word interlinear translation followed by an English translation which aims at being as close as possible to the literal meaning. On the right-hand side of the page each word is explained and translated.

There are many romanised editions of the Bhagavadgītā which the author of this book could have followed. For instance, Zaehner's romanisation separates all the words and adds a very useful punctuation. W.S. (= Winthrop Sargeant) bases his romanised text on the text in *devanāgarī* script and writes, for instance: *aśnan gacchan svapañśvasan* (5.8d). In 11.12 Zaehner punctuates his text in the following way:

*divi sūrya-sahasrasya bhaved yugapad utthitā
yadi bhāḥ, sadrśī sā syād bhāsas tasya mah'ātmanah.*

If W.S. had adopted Zaehner's punctuation he would probably not have translated this verse as follows: "If there should be in the sky – A thousand suns risen all at once, Such splendor would be – Of the splendor of that Great Being." Finally, Zaehner's separation of the words in compounds (*sūrya-sahasrasya*) is not followed by W.S.

The explanations and translations of the words would have been useful for beginners if done carefully and correctly. However, a random test shows that W. S. is not at all equipped for the task he has undertaken. In many cases the difference between nominative and accusative seems to have escaped him. For instance, *ekaṁ* is declared to be an accusative in 5.1cd: *yac chreya etayor ekaṁ tan me brūhi suniścitam*. *Ekaṁ* is said to be a nominative in 5.4c: *ekaṁ apy āsthitah sarṇyag*. Likewise *cakṣus* in 5.27ab (*sparsān kṛtvā bahir bāhyāṁś cakṣuś caivāntare bhruvoḥ*) and *bījaṁ* in 7.10ab (*bījaṁ māṁ sarvabhūtānāṁ viddhi pārtha sanātanam*). *Nimittamātram* in 11.33d is said to be an accusative (*nimittamātram bhava savyasācin*).

Likewise *sāumyavapur* in 11.50d (*bhūtvā punaḥ sāumyavapur mahātmā*). Interesting is the treatment of 9.4cd and 9.5a: *matsthāni* (n. nom. pl.) *sarvabhūtāni* (n. acc. pl.) *na cāhaṁ teṣv avasthitaḥ* // *na ca matsthāni* (n. acc. pl.) *bhūtāni* (n. acc. pl.). In 11.24 *tvāṁ* is qualified by five words the first three of which are said to be masculine and the following two neuter: *nabhaḥsprśaṁ* (m. acc. sg.) *dīptam* (m. acc. sg.) *anekavarṇaṁ* (m. acc. sg.) *vyāttānanaṁ* (n. acc. sg.) *dīptaviśālanetram* (n. acc. sg.) *dr̥ṣtvā hi tvāṁ* In 11.49 a W.S. has discovered a 2nd aorist subjunctive *vyathās* (*mā te vyathā mā ca vimūḍhabhāvo*). Also the compounds have given him great problems. For instance, in 6.15cd *nirvāṇaparamāṁ* is explained as a *karmadhāraya* compound meaning 'nirvāṇa supreme' (*śāntiṁ nirvāṇaparamāṁ matsarīsthām adhigacchati*).

In his preface W.S. remarks that he has consulted numerous previous translations. He mentions those of Franklin Edgerton, S. Radhakrishnan, Eliot Deutsch, Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood, and Swami Chidbhavananda, Juan Mascaro and P. Lal, a rather mixed bag to say the least. Nevertheless the number of mistranslations is still considerable. A few examples may suffice: 5.16cd *teṣāṁ ādityavaj jñānaṁ prakāśayati tat param*: That knowledge of theirs — Causes the Supreme to shine like the sun. 6.13ab *samaṁ kāyaśirogrīvaṁ dhārayann acalaṁ sthiraḥ*: Holding the body, head and neck erect, — Motionless and steady. 7.21ab *yo yo yāṁ yāṁ tanuṁ bhaktaḥ śraddhyayārcitum icchati*: Whoever desires to honor with belief — Whatever worshipped form. 7.27ab *icchādveṣasamutthena dvandvamohena bhārata*: Because of the coming forth of desire and hatred, — Because of the deluding (power) of the opposites, Descendant of Bharata. 8.8ab *abhyāsayogayuktena cetasā nānyagāminā*: With a mind disciplined by the practice of Yoga, — Which does not turn to anything else. 8.20ab *paras tasmāt tu bhāvo 'nyo 'vyakto 'vyaktāt sanātanaḥ*: But higher than this state of being — Is another unmanifest state of being — Higher than the primaeval unmanifest.

W.S. is also not very successful in giving good English equivalents, although he could have easily found them in existing English translations. For instance, in 5.13b *vaśī* is not a 'ruler' but one 'in full control' (Zaehner's translation) or 'in control' (Edgerton's translation). In 6.29d (*sarvatra samadarśanaḥ*) *sarvatra* is 'in everything' (Zaehner's translation) and not 'at all times'. In 5.24b (*tathāntarīyotir eva yaḥ*) *tathā* does not mean 'as a consequence' but 'likewise'.

It would not have been necessary to point out a few of the many imperfections of this work if the author had not made such ambitious claims for it. In the preface he writes: "As a Sanskrit scholar I am largely self taught, but am certainly competent for the task in hand. Moreover, the present translation has been read and approved by the highest authority." W.S. does not explain who is the highest authority, but he states his indebtedness to J.A.B. van Buitenen for reading the manuscript and making innumerable small (*sic*) corrections and many suggestions.

This statement probably occurred also in the original edition which I have not seen. As a consequence A. T. de Nicolas wrote in his review mentioned above: "It may be argued against linguistic purists who think that knowledge is only legitimate if sanctioned by academic institutions, that the whole manuscript was refereed before publication by the late van Buitenen." Alas, van Buitenen is no more and one feels rather ill at ease in seeing his name being used to guarantee the excellence of this work. If van Buitenen did indeed read the manuscript from beginning to end, one can only regret the fact that he did not make many more corrections, big or small.

Gustav Roth, *Mallī-jñāta*, Das achte Kapitel des Nāyādharmakāhāo im sechsten Aṅga des Śvetāmbara Jainakanons herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, Band 4). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1983. 230 pp. DM 88,-.

Roth's study of the Mallī-jñāta was completed in 1952 but remained unpublished until now. The only part published was the appendix on Mohanagrha (pp. 202–220) which appeared in the *Festschrift Friedrich Weller* (Leipzig, 1954, pp. 535–552). It is due to the Stiftung Waldschmidt that after more than thirty years this important dissertation is now at last published.

In the lengthy introduction Roth studies the editions and manuscripts he used for his edition of the text. He points out that the absence of variant readings which result in a different meaning (Sinnvarianten) does not prove that the traditional text has been faithfully handed down, as affirmed by N. V. Vaidya who edited the text of the Nāyādharmakāhāo (Poona, 1940), but only that the normalisation of the canonical text was consistently carried out. Recent studies by Colette Caillat have shown that "real variants" are not absent in the Jain Canonical texts and that Roth's conclusion cannot be extended to other texts of the Śvetāmbara canon.¹

As to the date of the text, Roth draws attention to words which are found also in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra (*mohanaghara*, *saṃdāsagam chindāvei* and *uvappayāṇa*) and concludes as follows: "Aus diesen Kriterien scheint mir die Schlussfolgerung zulässig, mit einer gewissen Wahrscheinlichkeit die Herkunft des Mallī-jñāta in einer Zeit anzunehmen, die von der Entstehung des Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra nicht allzuweit entfernt ist, und Material enthält welches in vorchristlicher Zeit weist" (p. 22). Another indication of the early date of the text is the frequent occurrence of the *vedha* or rhythmical prose. The chapter on the *vedha* contains a long excursus on the screen (*javanīyā*, *javanikā*, *yavanikā*). Roth writes: "Die vorliegende Untersuchung hat gezeigt, dass der *yavanikā*-Vorhang

um die Zeitwende oder gar schon früher höchstwahrscheinlich aus dem Iran, dem Lande der Gewebekunst, nach Indien kam und in der Jaina Literatur seinen Niederschlag gefunden hat" (p. 31). Other chapters of the introduction deal with the language of the text, the context, the Digambara versions and the Śvetāmbara versions in Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-caritra* and Śīlāṅka's *Caupaṇṇa-mahāpurisa-cariya*.

Text and translation are printed on opposite pages (pp. 66–143) and the variant readings are given in an appendix (pp. 144–153). The translation is accompanied by foot-notes, and more detailed explanations are given in a separate chapter (pp. 154–201) in which several matters relating to the grammar or the contents of the text are discussed in greater detail: e.g. *jaṃ navaraṃ*; *vāhinīyaṃ sīyaṃ* "palanquin"; the 20 *kāraṇa-s* "causes" which determine the name and *gotra* of a Tīrthakara; the *disākumārī-s* "goddesses of the quarters"; the names of Mallī; the story of the hall of statues. As to the *disākumārī-s*, Roth disagrees with Alsdorf, according to whom the oldest nucleus consists of the 32 goddesses of the four quarters to whom were added two new groups of four each.² Roth remarks: "Ich möchte deshalb folgende Vermutung wagen: In vorbuddh. und vorjin. Zeit wird es im kosmographischen System den vier lokapālas entsprechend, vier weibliche Gottheiten gegeben haben, die mit dem Titel *mayahara* in ihrer dominierenden Stellung besonders bezeichnet waren" (p. 184). In another excursus Roth shows that in the original version of the story of Mallī she was punished for her curiosity by having her toe cut off (cf. pp. 198–199).

The translation follows the text closely.³ The notes quote from the commentary which we have not been able to consult. In section 63 (p. 85) a ship is loaded with *āvaraṇa-s* and *paharaṇa-s*. Roth renders *āvaraṇa* with "Bekleidungsstück" and quotes in the note the commentary: *āvaraṇānām aṅgarakṣakādīnām bodhisthaprakṣarānām ca*.⁴ In combination with *praharaṇa āvaraṇa* is a shield rather than a garment, cf. for instance *Mahābhārata* (crit. ed.), I.17.1: *athāvaraṇamukhyāni nānāpraharaṇāni ca pragṛhyābhyadravan devān sahita daityadānavāḥ*. Van Buitenen translates: "Now the Daityas and the Dānavas massed together and, grasping their best shields and striking weapons of all sorts, rushed upon the Gods" (*The Mahābhārata. I. The Book of the Beginning*, Chicago, 1973, p. 75).

The monster is described as *ghaḍa-ubbhaḍa-raiya-bhīṣaṇa-muham* (p. 90). Roth suggests the following translation: "Dessen Gesicht durch fürchterliche Zerstörung schrecklich zugerichtet war" (p. 91, n. 35). This translation is based upon the first explanation given in the commentary: *ghātāya puruṣādivadhāya ghātābhyām vā mastakāvayava-viśeṣābhyām udbhaṭam vikarālam racitam ata eva bhīṣaṇam mukham yasya sa tathā tam*. According to Sheth's *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo*, *ghāḍa*⁵ here means *mastak ke nīce kā bhāg* which Roth renders as "unterer Teil der Stirn". Roth writes that neither the text nor the commentary

supports this interpretation. However, the commentary refers to parts of the *mastaka* (*mastakāvaya*) and the word *ghātā* (Pāli *ghātā*; Prākṛit *ghāda*) is well attested in Indo-Aryan.⁶

On p. 190 Roth quotes the explanation of *ohi* as *ātmano'rtha-sākṣāt-karaṇa-vyāpāra*, which he renders as “Die Beschäftigung mit der Vergegenwärtigung des Gegenstandes des Selbstes”. Obviously *ātmano* refers to *vyāpāra*: “one’s activity in making the object present”.

NOTES

¹ Cf. Colette Caillat, ‘Notes sur les variantes dans la tradition du *Dasaveyāliya-sutta*’, *Indologica Taurinensia* VIII–IX (1981), pp. 71–83; ‘The recent critical editions of the Jain Āgama’, *ZDMG Supplement V; XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag* (Wiesbaden, 1983), pp. 234–240.

² “Further contributions to the history of Jain cosmography and mythology”, *New Indian Antiquary* 9 (1947), p. 123 = *Kleine Schriften* (Wiesbaden, 1974), p. 154.

³ In section 91 (p. 100) the word *maṇḍavaṃsi* is left out in the translation.

⁴ The meaning of *bodhistha*- is unclear.

⁵ The edition of Mhesana has *ghāda*, cf. variants p. 147. The abbreviations E and B in the appendix containing the variant readings are nowhere explained.

⁶ Cf. R. L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-aryan Languages* (London, 1966), p. 241, no. 4450: *ghātā*- ‘nape of the neck’; Pa. *ghātā*- ‘nape of the neck’; Pk. *ghāda* ‘lower part of the skull’, etc.

Otto Strauss, *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhelm (Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 24). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1983. XIX, 566 pp. DM 88,-.

The *Kleine Schriften* of Otto Strauss (1881–1940) include almost all his articles. The only major one not reprinted is his article on Indian religion in Clemen’s *Religionen der Erde* (München, 1927, pp. 95–144). Particularly welcome is the inclusion of his “Habilitationsschrift” on ethical problems in the Mahābhārata which was first published in 1911 in the *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* (Vol. 24, pp. 193–335). In it, Strauss clearly explains the principles of *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* which dominate the ethical horizon of the epic. In the period 1922–1932 Strauss published two books, a translation of Viśvanātha Pañcānana’s *Kārikāvalī* and *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* (Leipzig, 1922) and his *Indische Philosophie* (München, 1925), which both have been reprinted. He also published a series of important philosophical studies of which the following must be mentioned: ‘Altindische Spekulationen über die Sprache und ihre Probleme’ (*ZDMG* 81, 1927, pp. 99–151); ‘Udgīthavidyā’ (*SPAW*, philos.-hist. Kl., 1931, pp. 243–310); ‘Die älteste Philosophie der Karma-Mīmāṃsā, (*ibid.*, 1932, pp. 469–532). The

last two were written as contributions for a comprehensive study of Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā, but the political situation in Germany after 1933 prevented Strauss from continuing his research. In 1935 Strauss was dismissed from his post as professor, and in 1939 he came to Holland where he received a friendly welcome in the house of friends in Bloemendaal. Five months after the occupation of Holland he died — on the twentieth of October 1940.

Strauss became interested in Indian philosophy under the influence of Paul Deussen together with whom he translated philosophical texts from the Mahābhārata (*Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhārata*, Leipzig, 1906). He was himself well aware of the imperfections of this work as is obvious from remarks made in his review of Modi's *Akṣara* (cf. p. 543). Strauss's own translations are excellent examples of how difficult texts can be translated both faithfully and lucidly, cf. his translations of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, Kielhorn I, 242, 10 — 247, 16 (pp. 258—271), of *Brahma-Sūtra* 3,3,1—9 with Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* and Vācaspatimiśra's *Bhāmātī* (pp. 344—378) and of *Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya* I,1,1—5 and I,3,30—35 (pp. 404—442).

Friedrich Wilhelm has included a representative selection of Strauss's many reviews (pp. 508—556)¹ which are listed in the bibliography. He has also added a list of texts studied by Strauss, an index of Sanskrit words and a subject index.

A few additions can be made to the bibliography. On the tenth anniversary of the death of Strauss, G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga (1874—1957) wrote "In memoriam prof. Otto Strauss" in the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant* (20.10.1950). In it he recalls how he met Strauss for the first time when the latter had just begun his studies at the university of Munich. Van den Bergh van Eysinga, who is well known to Indologists on account of his *Indische Einflüsse auf evangelische Erzählungen* (Göttingen, 1904; 2nd. ed., 1909) remained a close friend of Strauss until his death. No mention is made by him of the fact that Strauss was his guest during his stay in Holland. F. B. J. Kuiper tells me that in the summer of 1940 David Friedmann and he visited Strauss and sat beside his sick-bed during this time. Van den Bergh van Eysinga also mentions that Strauss published several articles and reviews in the *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift*, which he edited for thirty years. His "In memoriam" gives the titles of two articles: "Die guten Werke als indisches Problem" (1934, pp. 201—205) and "Zur Interpretation der Bhagavadgītā" (1936, pp. 247—262). It will not be difficult to compile a more complete list of his contributions to the *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* which, alas, is not to be found in any Australian library.

NOTES

¹ On p. 556 the footnote is not reproduced.

Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert. 4. Lieferung: *ātma-dvīpa / idam* unter Beratung durch Georg von Simson bearbeitet von Michael Schmidt. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [1984], pp. I–III, 241–320. DM 50,-.

L'avertissement de ce quatrième fascicule porte la date de janvier 1981 mais nous ne l'avons reçu qu'en 1984. C'est seulement dans le premier fascicule que l'on trouve une date de publication (1973). Puisque la publication de ce dictionnaire ne sera terminée que dans un avenir assez lointain, on aimerait bien savoir la date exacte de publication de chaque fascicule. Le quatrième inclut plusieurs textes de l'école Sarvāstivādin qui n'appartiennent pas à la collection de Berlin ainsi que plusieurs textes de cette collection qui ne furent pas inclus dans les fascicules précédents. Il est évidemment pas toujours possible d'exclure des textes d'autres écoles, comme, par exemple, le Prātimokṣasūtra des Mūlasarvāstivādin, cf. p. 286 s.v. (*ā-ropa*)- *yitavya* et p. 295 s.v. *āloka*- (*saṃdhi*). Bien que les redacteurs aient souvent recours aux manuscrits pour vérifier des leçons, en ce qui concerne le Prātimokṣasūtra des Mūlasarvāstivādin ils semblent n'avoir consulté que l'édition de A. Ch. Banerjee (cf. premier fascicule, p. XVI). Malheureusement, cette édition fourmille de fautes.¹ On trouvera aussi des différences entre l'édition parue dans l'*Indian Historical Quarterly* (vol. 29, 1953, pp. 162–174, 266–275, 363–377) et celle publiée en 1977 (*Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit*, Calcutta, 1977). Aussi, Banerjee a reconstruit en sanskrit une grande partie du texte qui manque aux manuscrits. Par exemple, la citation *kaukrtyam āropiyatavyam* (p. 286) provient d'une section reconstruite par l'éditeur. Très probablement, dans son édition du Prātimokṣa des Sarvāstivādin, Georg von Simson vérifiera sur les facsimilés les leçons adoptées par Banerjee.² Nous espérons que son travail comprendra également une édition des fragments du Prātimokṣa des Mūlasarvāstivādin car on ne peut guère étudier séparément les Prātimokṣa des Sarvāstivādin et des Mūlasarvāstivādin.

Le redacteur de ce fascicule est Michael Schmidt qui s'est admirablement acquitté de sa tâche difficile. Indépendamment l'un de l'autre nous avons fait la même correction, cf. s.v. *ātmaparitāpanāyoga*.³ Page 304, s.v. *ā-sad* il faut lire "Don instantané à ceux qui sont proches, s'approchant soi-même" pour "Don instantané . . . s'approchent . . ." Page 306 on trouve *āsanna-dūra-janma-viprakṛṣṭa* dans une citation du Yogavidhi. Il se peut bien qu'il faudra séparer *āsannadūrajanma* et *viprakṛṣṭam* et lire *tadvac chru(tam ā) [sa] nnadūrajanma viprakṛṣṭam bhāvanā[ma] (yā)t tu sannikṛṣṭam bhavati* mais le sens reste obscure.

NOTES

¹ Cf. notre compte rendu de Ch. D. Prebish, *Buddhist Monastic Discipline*, IJ 19 (1977), pp. 127–130.

² Cette édition est annoncée dans Heinz Bechert et Georg von Simson, *Einführung in die Indologie* (Darmstadt, 1979), p. 74.

³ Cf. notre compte rendu de *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil IV (Wiesbaden, 1980), OLZ, 79 (1984), Sp. 392–393.

Jean Dantinne, *La splendeur de l'inébranlable (Akṣobhyavyūha)*. Tome I. Chapitres I–III: les auditeurs (Śrāvaka) (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 29). Louvain-la-Neuve, Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1983. XXVI, 325 pp.

L'Akṣobhyavyūha est un des textes qui font partie du Mahāratnakūṭa. Il fut traduit par Lokakṣema vers 179–180 p.C. et par Bodhiruci entre 706 et 713. Une traduction faite par Chih Tao-ken sous le règne de l'empereur Cheng des Chin Orientaux (326–342) n'a pas été préservée. La version tibétaine fut établie au début du neuvième siècle par Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi et Ye-sés-sde. Le travail de M. Dantinne contient une traduction complète de la première partie de la traduction de Bodhiruci (AV 1). En plus, M. Dantinne traduit tous les passages de la traduction de Lokakṣema (AV 2) qui diffèrent de la version de Bodhiruci ou qui n'y figurent pas. En ce qui concerne la version tibétaine, M. Dantinne a également traduit tous les passages qui ne se trouvent que dans celle-ci, en ajoutant en bas de page le texte tibétain correspondant. On regrette que M. Dantinne n'ait pas édité la version tibétaine en entier, en marquant les passages traduits. Les traductions chinoises sont beaucoup plus aisément accessibles que les traductions tibétaines. M. Dantinne explique bien l'importance de la version tibétaine pour l'étude de l'Akṣobhyavyūha (voir p. 4). L'édition de la version tibétaine aurait été d'autant plus bienvenue que M. Dantinne a consulté trois éditions xylographiques (Pékin, Narthang et Derge).

Selon M. Dantinne AV 1 pourrait représenter un premier original indien, tandis que l'AV 2 et l'AV Tib. dériveraient d'un second archétype, distinct du premier, tant par la structure du texte que par le contenu doctrinal (cf. pp. 37–39). M. Dantinne suggère que l'original de l'AV 1 date de vers 200 p.C., puisqu'il est question du culte du livre, préoccupation étrangère au Sukhāvatyūha.¹ L'AV Tib. contient une allusion au culte des reliquaires et des images du Tathāgata Akṣobhya. M. Dantinne écrit: "Un archétype indien de l'AV 2 et de l'AV Tib. devait jouir d'une certaine notoriété vers le milieu du premier siècle p.C., dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Inde, parmi les dévots d'Akṣobhya. Ceux d'entre eux qui, un peu plus tard, adoptèrent le culte des images du Buddha, composèrent vers 100–125 p.C. la version utilisée par les traducteurs de l'AV Tib. Quant à l'AV 2, il aurait été traduit d'après une variante plus ancienne, datant vraisemblablement des environs de 50 p.C." (pp. 45–46).

L'introduction étudie en détail les renseignements fournis par les sources chinoises et tibétaines sur les versions chinoises et tibétaines, et les traducteurs de ces versions. M. Dantinne fait remarquer que l'AV par sa description du paradis d'Akṣobhya répondait bien aux préoccupations eschatologiques des Chinois à la fin de la dynastie des Han. En ce qui concerne la traduction de Bodhiruci elle fait partie du plan ambitieux de compilation et traduction du Mahāratnakūṭa. M. Dantinne n'étudie pas la compilation de cet ouvrage mais, dans une note, il rejette la possibilité d'un original indien qui aurait existé en Inde, entre le 4e et le 7e siècles, comme l'avait affirmé Étienne Lamotte.²

La traduction s'accompagne de notes philologiques en bas de page. Des notes détaillées relatives à des concepts philosophiques ou religieux sont réunies dans le commentaire qui

suit la traduction de chaque chapitre. L'ampleur de ce commentaire se montre bien par le fait que, par exemple, la traduction du premier chapitre occupe 48 pages et le commentaire 59 pages. Ces notes de caractère encyclopédique contiennent de nombreuses références à des textes sanskrits, pâlis, tibétains et chinois. M. Dantinne traduit soigneusement tous les textes qu'il cite. Pour donner une idée de la richesse de ce commentaire on ne peut faire mieux que reproduire la note suivante (p. 7, note 22): "Parmi les sujets traités, mentionnons entre autres: au chapitre I, Rājagṛha, Ānanda, *guṇavyūha*, conduite difficile des Bodhisattva (*bodhisattvadūṣkaracaryā*), application de mérite (*pariṇāmana*), commémoration des Buddha (*buddhānusmṛti*), les attitudes (*īryāpatha*), prêche de la Loi aux femmes; au chapitre II, les cinq corruptions, arbre de l'Éveil (*bodhivṛkṣa*), les sept joyaux (*saptaratna*), destinées (*gati*), les dix bonnes façons d'agir (*daśakuśalakarmapatha*); au chapitre III, fruit de saint (*arhatphala*), les libérations (*vimokṣa*), l'entrée dans le courant (*srota-āpanna*), celui qui ne revient plus qu'une fois (*sakṛdāgāmin*), celui qui ne revient plus (*anāgāmin*), symbolisme de l'échelle ou de l'escalier."

Pour les transcriptions phonétiques chinoises et pour les noms propres sanskrits transcrits phonétiquement en chinois M. Dantinne donne la restitution de la prononciation chinoise ancienne d'après Grammata Serica de B. Karlgren, mais il s'abstient de reconstruire la forme indienne qui y correspond et ne donne que le terme sanskrit.³ M. Dantinne s'est efforcé non seulement de signaler les formules et les clichés sanskrits mais aussi de restituer de larges parties de l'original sanskrit, en se servant notamment de passages parallèles dans le *Karuṇāpūṇḍarīka*. De telles restitutions sont toujours difficiles à faire car même dans les formules stéréotypées il y a souvent des petites variations, mais, dans l'ensemble, elles aident certainement à se former une idée de l'original sanskrit.

L'ouvrage de M. Dantinne est une contribution de premier plan à l'étude de la littérature de Mahāyāna. La traduction est excellente et le commentaire est une source pleine d'information. La table analytique énumère toutes les notes contenues dans le commentaire, en donnant à chaque note un intitulé. Malheureusement, ces intitulés ne se trouvent pas dans le corps de l'ouvrage même. L'index détaillé contient les termes techniques, accompagnés d'une traduction française, et les noms propres.

Pour terminer quelques observations sur des points de détail. P. 78, l. 12: corriger *cetaḥparivartakam* en *cetaḥparivartakam*. P. 88, n. 70: *spobs pa chags pa med pa* rend skt. *asaṅgapratibhāṇa* et non *nirupalepapratibhāṇa*, cf. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* s.v. *asaṅgapratibhāṇa*. P. 142: M. Dantinne cite un passage de la Śrāvakabhūmi (éd. K. Shukla, pp. 343–345) qui avait été édité déjà en partie par M. Alex Wayman (*III* 3, 1959, pp. 112–113).⁴ Dans quelques instances le texte de M. Wayman est à préférer. Lire *yo 'sya kuśalapakṣaprayuktasya* pour *yo 'pyakuśala-*. Dans note 3 M. Dantinne propose de lire *yo 'pi kuśala-* mais on ne trouve pas d'équivalent pour *api: dge-ba'i phyogs-la rab-tu brtsön-pa de-la = asya kuśalapakṣaprayuktasya*. Lire *aiśvaryaprāptaḥ* (Tib. *phyug thob-pa*) pour *niścayaprāptaḥ*. Lire *yena ca mṛtyum na samatikrāmaty* pour *yena ca mṛtyum namayati krāmayaty* (Tib. *gañ-gis 'chi-ba las yañ-dag-par mi 'da'-bar byed-pa*). P. 161, ll. 12–13: M. Dantinne traduit *sā ceyam arthākṣiptā* par "Ce revêtement de la cuirasse vise au bien d'autrui" mais *arthākṣipta* signifie "impliqué", c'est-à-dire le fait que le Bodhisattva pratique la Perfection du don implique qu'il est revêtu de la cuirasse de la Perfection du don. P. 162, ll. 34–35: *na ca prayuktavīryam saṃsrayeyam, prāg eva nyūnatāreṇa kālena tanutāreṇa ca duḥkheṇa*. M. Dantinne traduit: "et qu'une fois attelé à cette tâche, je ne relâche pas mon énergie, avant qu'au fil du temps, la douleur ne s'atténue." M. Dantinne n'a pas compris *prāg eva*: "et qu'une fois attelé à cette tâche, je ne relâche pas mon énergie, et encore moins (que je m'efforce) pendant un temps plus court ou au prix d'une moindre douleur." P. 179: dans la citation de l'Abhisamayālamkāra M. Dantinne lit *vāsanāyāḥ samuddhato*. L'édition de Wogihara que M. Dantinne ne mentionne pas dans sa bibliographie a *samudghāto* pour *samuddhato*. P. 191, § 14: M. Dantinne traduit: "ils n'ont pas non plus de corps à l'aspect maladif, ils n'ont pas d'excréments." Le texte chinois a: "aussi ils ne sont pas laids, et leurs corps est libre de

puanteur et de saleté.” La version tibétaine a: “ils ne sont pas laids (*durvarṇa*) et n’ont pas de mauvaise odeur” (*de’i mi-rnams-la kha-dog nañ-ba dañ / dri mi-ñim-pa dag.*). P. 197, § 20: M. Dantinne traduit: “C’est comme les habitants de l’Uttarakuru qui n’ont qu’un roi”. Le texte chinois a: “C’est comme chez les habitants d’Uttarakuru qui n’ont pas d’autre roi.” De même la version tibétaine: *’di-lta-ste / dper-na / byañ-gi sgra-mi-sñan-gyi mi-rnams-la rgyal-po źes bya-ba gźan-med-pa de-bźin-du*. M. Dantinne n’a pas traduit le texte de l’AV 2 qui est assez différent: “Dans ce champ la nourriture des habitants surpasse la nourriture des dieux et des hommes. La couleur, le parfum et la saveur de leur nourriture surpasse aussi ce que mangent les dieux et les hommes. Dans ce champ il n’y a pas de roi. Il y a seulement le roi de la Loi, le Buddha, le dieu supérieur aux dieux. Le Buddha dit à Śāriputra: “C’est comme chez les habitants du continent Uttarakuru où il n’y a pas de roi qui règne. De même, Śāriputra, il n’y a pas de roi dans le champ d’Akṣobhya, le Tathāgata, l’Arhat, le Samyaksaṃbuddha. Il y a seulement Akṣobhya, le Tathāgata, le dieu supérieur aux dieux, le roi de la Loi”. AV 1 et AV Tib. ne disent pas qui est le roi de l’Uttarakuru tandis que l’AV 2 dit qu’il n’y a pas de roi. Comme le mentionne M. Dantinne dans une note, selon l’Ātānāṭiyasutta, le roi de l’Uttarakuru s’appelle Kuvera ou encore Vessavana (P. 197, n. 68). Il semble que l’auteur de l’original indien de l’AV 2 connaît la tradition selon laquelle il n’y a pas de roi chez les Uttarakuru. Cette tradition paraît remonter à l’Aitareya Brāhmaṇa où il est dit que les Uttarakuru n’ont pas de roi.⁵ Il y a des descriptions détaillées de l’Uttarakuru dans les différentes versions chinoises de la Lokaprajñapti (Taishō nos. 1, 30; 23, 24, 25 et 1644) et dans la version tibétaine de la Lokaprajñapti.⁶ En parcourant rapidement les versions chinoises nous n’y avons pas trouvé la mention d’un roi. P. 205, n. 102: à propos de l’expression *mchod rten du ’gyur* (*caityabhūta*) M. Dantinne aurait dû se rapporter à l’article suivant de Gregory Schopen: ‘The Phrase ‘sa prthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet’ in the Vajracchedikā; Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna’ (*IJJ* 17, 1975, pp. 147–181). P. 129, 1. 24: *anyatra mātṛpitṛbhrātṛsvajanamitradravyasya svalpasyānuparodhino grahaṇam*. M. Dantinne traduit: “sauf, au cas où l’on prend le bien de sa mère, de son père, d’un frère, d’un parent ou d’un ami qui manifeste peu d’opposition.” Evidemment *svalpa* et *anuparodhin* dont le sens dans ce contexte n’est pas clair se rapportent au *dravya*: “sauf, au cas où l’on prend de sa mère, etc. un objet de peu de valeur et dont la perte ne cause pas dommage (?)”. P. 240, n. 50: M. Dantinne dit que le moine ou la nonne qui désirent coudre une robe, doivent le faire en étant assis sur un siège de bambou, appelé *kaṭhina*, mais le texte du Bhikṣuṇīvinaya dit qu’il ne faut pas s’asseoir sur un *kaṭhina*: *tena hi na kṣamati kaṭhine niṣīditum*.⁷ P. 252, 1. 8 d’en bas: *asilokabhaya* n’est pas “la crainte du monde des épées”, mais “la crainte de la mauvaise réputation (*a-siloka*)”. Signalons encore qu’à la liste des sigles il faut ajouter MVAŚ (cf. p. 74, note 5) = R. C. Pandeya (ed.), *Madhyānta-Vibhāga-śāstra*, Delhi 1971, et DKWJT (passim) = Morohashi Tetsuji, *Dai Kan-Wa jiten*, Tokyo 1955–1960.

NOTES

¹ P. 45, 1. 3 lire AV 1 pour AV.

² *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*. Tome IV (Louvain, 1976), p. 1846, note. Cf. aussi nos remarques dans *T’oung Pao* 64 (1978), p. 171.

³ M. Dantinne n’explique pas pourquoi il n’a pas eu recours au *Grammata Serica Recensa* publié en 1957 (*Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities*, vol. 29, pp. 1–332).

⁴ Pour l’édition de K. Shukla voir *IJJ* 18 (1976), pp. 307–310.

⁵ Aitareya Brāhmaṇa viii. 14. Cf. H. Jacobi, ‘Blest, abode of the (Hindu)’, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. II (1909), p. 699a. On trouvera une bibliographie de l’Uttarakuru dans G. Tucci, ‘A propos Avalokiteśvara’, *MCB* 9 (1951), p. 197, n. 1.

⁶ Au sujet de ces textes, voir L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme. Études et Matériaux. Cosmologie: Le monde des Êtres et le Monde-réceptacle* (London, 1914–1918), pp. 295sq.;

Paul Mus, *La Lumière sur les Six Voies* (Paris, 1939); G. Tucci, 'À propos Avalokiteśvara', *MCB* 9 (1951), pp. 173–219; Eugène Denis, *La Lokapaññatti et les idées cosmologiques du bouddhisme ancien*, 2 tomes (Paris, 1977); Erik Zürcher, 'Buddhist Influence on Early Taoism', *T'oung Pao* 66 (1980), p. 139, n. 101.

⁷ Cf. aussi Akira Hirakawa (tr.), *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns* (Patna, 1982), p. 386.

Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien, Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981 herausgegeben von Klaus Röhrborn und Wolfgang Veenker (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Band 16). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1983. VII, 142 pp. DM 84,-.

From 2 to 5 July 1981 a symposium was held in Hamburg in honour of the eightieth birthday of Professor Annemarie von Gabain. A report on this symposium entitled "Neue Ergebnisse der Zentralasienforschung" is published in the *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* (Neue Folge, Band 2, 1982, pp. 275–290). Fourteen papers read on that occasion have now been published in this volume, which is of great interest both for Buddhist and Indian studies. It is not possible for one reviewer to discuss here in detail contributions by scholars working in many different fields but it may be useful to give some indication as to the content of those papers which are relevant to Buddhist and Indian studies. Heinz Bechert discusses the problems which have arisen during the compilation of the Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der Turfan-Funde (SWTF) as to determining to which schools the Buddhist Sanskrit texts found in Central Asia belong. The SWTF aims at including the following texts: 1. All Dharmagupta texts; 2. All Sarvāstivāda texts with the exclusion of later philosophical texts; 3. The Mūlasarvāstivāda texts discovered by the "Turfan" expeditions ('Das "Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der Turfan-Funde" als Hilfsmittel für die Zentralasienforschung', pp. 4–10). In 'Some remarks on translation techniques of the Khotanese' (pp. 17–26), Ronald E. Emmerick remarks that the translators were in the process of developing terminology to translate the Buddhist Sanskrit technical terms but had not reached the point of having a rigid system of equivalences such as was developed by the Tibetans. Emmerick's paper contains a new edition and translation of the preface to the Khotanese translation of the Siddhasāra, a medical work written by Ravigupta about A.D. 650. Oskar von Hinüber examines the traces of Gāndhārī in the Sanskrit text of the Upāligāthās ('Sanskrit und Gāndhārī in Zentralasien', pp. 27–34). He discusses in detail the word *parṇajaha*, which corresponds to Pāli *pannadhaja*. According to von Hinüber, Pāli *pannadhaja* derives from *prajñādhvaja*, and *-jaha* from *jhaya* 'flag' which in Gāndhārī becomes *jaa*, which was written as *jaha* with an *-h-* as a syllable-divider. Problems relating to the phonology of vowels in Indian loan-words in Tokharian are discussed by Lambert Isebaert: 'Der Beitrag der indischen Lehnwörter zu Problemen der tocharischen Phonologie', pp. 35–43. Several words in Uigur Buddhist texts translated from the Chinese are explained by György Kara as borrowed from the Chinese ('Sino-ugurische Worterklärungen', pp. 44–52). Dieter Maue studies the light which the Uigur Brāhmī manuscripts shed on the phonology of the Uigur dentals ('Zu den Dentalen im Brāhmī-Uigurischen', pp. 53–64). Juten Oda studies the Indian names of eight bodhisattvas and of several of eight supernatural beings in the Sākiz yūkmāk yaruq sūtra, the Uigur version of a Chinese apocryphal text probably compiled in China during the first half of the eighth century: Fo-shuo T'ien-ti pa-yang shen-chou ching (Taishō no. 2897): 'Remarks on the Indic "Lehngut" of the Sākiz yūkmāk yaruq sūtra', pp. 65–72.¹ Edwin G. Pulleyblank points out the importance of Chinese transcriptions of Indian Words for the study of the reconstruction of the phonology of Old Chinese, Early Middle Chinese (the language of the Ch'ieh-yün dictionary of A.D. 601) and Late Middle Chinese (the T'ang

dynasty dialect of Ch'ang-an) ('Stages in the transcription of Indian words in Chinese from Han to Tang', pp. 73–102). His article is divided into the following sections: 1. Introduction; 2. Early and Late Middle Chinese (EMC and LMC); 3. Secular transcriptions of Indian words in the Han period; 4. Buddhist translations of the later Han period; 5. The Chinese dialect of the Han Buddhist transcriptions; 6. The Indian source language of the early Buddhist translations; 7. Later translations in Early Middle Chinese; 8. Buddhist transcriptions of the Tang period in Late Middle Chinese; 9. APPENDIX I: A Comparison of Karlgren's "Ancient Chinese" with EMC and LMC; 10. APPENDIX II: Summary of the changes between EMC and LMC. Pulleyblank's article is of great importance not only for Sinologists but also for all those who are interested in Chinese transliterations of Indian words and in borrowings from the Chinese into other languages. Pulleyblank would render a great service to non-Sinologists by bringing together the results of his researches in the form of a dictionary, as has been done by Karlgren in his *Grammata Serica* (1940) and *Grammata Serica Recensa* (1957). Klaus Röhrborn studies the combinations of Indian words with Turkish words in Old Turkish ('Syntaktisches Verhalten der indischen Fremdwörter im Alttürkischen', pp. 103–112). Lore Sander sketches the development of the Brāhmī script in manuscripts from Gilgit and Bamiyan ('Einige neue Aspekte zur Entwicklung der Brāhmī in Gilgit und Bamiyan [ca. 2.–7. Jh. n. Chr.]', pp. 113–124). She arrives at the following conclusion: 'Zwei Entwicklungslinien der Brāhmī sind aus den Funden von Bamiyan und Gilgit herzuleiten, von denen die zum "Rundtyp" führende Schriftentwicklung sich stärker vom indischen Vorbild löst als die mit der "Protośāradā" endende. Die Vorstufen zum "Rundtyp" sind es, die die Brāhmī im Tarimbecken am nachhaltigsten beeinflusst haben, auch wenn die "Protośāradā" mit ihren geraden Linien nicht ohne Einwirkung insbesondere auf die "südtürkistanische Brāhmī" gewesen sein mag' (p. 122). Klaus T. Schmidt studies the relation between the Sanskrit text of Mātṛceta's Varnārhavarṇa (II, 17b–43b, 56d–64d and 68c–73b) and the Tokharian translation. Schmidt points out that the nominal constructions of the original have been changed into verbal ones by the translator ('Zum Verhältnis von Sanskritvorlage und tocharischer Übersetzung. Untersucht am Beispiel osttocharischer Stotratexte', pp. 125–131). Nicholas Sims-Williams examines Indian loanwords in Parthian and Sogdian ('Indian elements in Parthian and Sogdian', pp. 132–141). He proposes a new etymology of the title Ἀδβαγ, which he derives from Buddhist Sanskrit (and Pali) *adhideva*- or *atideva*- 'supreme deity', the prefix being borrowed and the nominal compound replaced by its Iranian equivalent (Sog, βγ-, Pth. bg). Three appendices list Indian words in Manichean Parthian, Christian Sogdian and Manichean Sogdian.

NOTE

- ¹ On this text see also R. A. Stein, 'Tibetica Antica I', *BEFEO* 72 (1983), pp. 214–215.

Reinhold Grünendahl, *Viṣṇudharmāḥ. Precepts for the Worship of Viṣṇu*. Part 1, Adhyāyas 1–43. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1983. XI, 250 pp. DM 42,-.

The Viṣṇudharma is a text of approximately 4,200 verses divided into 105 chapters. It is an important source for the study of the liturgy of early Viṣṇuism. R. C. Hazra was the first scholar to study this text, which, however, has remained unedited. Grünendahl has been able to utilize fifteen manuscripts, of which no less than ten were filmed for the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP). Grünendahl points out that the three dated Viṣṇudharma-mss. of the 11th century, two of which could be utilized for this edition, are

the oldest dated testimony of non-Buddhist literature in Nepal (p. IX). In his introduction to the text, Grünendahl studies the influence of the Bhārgavas on the Viṣṇudharma. Śaunaka is the chief narrator of the text and several members of the Bhārgava clan are mentioned in the text. Furthermore, the Viṣṇudharma has several passages in common with the didactic portions of the Mahābhārata (p. 63, n. 3). According to Grünendahl, the Viṣṇudharma is a compilation of the Bhāgavatas, but the compilers were more interested in *kriyāyoga* than in theoretical discussions. The text describes itself as a *śāstra*. Grünendahl writes: "Not so much the subject matter itself, as the exclusiveness it is treated with distinguishes the Viṣṇudharma from current categories. Seen in context with other sectarian 'Śāstras' of a similar style, it is not altogether improbable that they represent a particular 'Śāstra' -literature that can still be traced in very few extant texts and a number of titles of extinct works, resp. quotations from them" (pp. 66–67). Grünendahl suggests that the disappearance of this 'Śāstra' -literature is probably due to the fact that substantial parts of it were incorporated into the epics and especially the Purāṇas. With regard to the Viṣṇudharmottara, Grünendahl remarks that an examination of the numerous parallels between this text and the Viṣṇudharma proves that many passages of the Viṣṇudharma were taken over by the Viṣṇudharmottara, but often after having undergone considerable changes. The Viṣṇudharma became a very popular text in the period of the compilation of encyclopaedic commentaries on older works, and of Nibandhas, and many quotations from it are to be found in them. It is also often quoted by the followers of the Caitanya-school of Viṣṇuism, especially the Six Gosvāmins. As to the time of compilation, Grünendahl points out the difficulties in fixing the date of a text which is the product of a process of development, and critically examines and rejects Hazra's views.

Grünendahl divides the manuscripts into three groups. The critical apparatus of adhyāyas 1–28 contains the variants of all manuscripts. Thereafter only the relevant variants of the principal representatives of the three groups are noted. Grünendahl's detailed summary of the 43 adhyāyas, and his careful edition, are extremely welcome. To the errata given on a separate sheet, one must add the following: p. 84 (2.23b) for *tyakṣate* read *tyakṣyate*; p. 139 (23.2b) for *pātanānām* read *yātanānām*; p. 144 (24.21f) for *vṛddim* read *vṛddhim*; p. 171 (32.13c) for *mat-sariṇī* read *matsariṇī*. On p. 117 (13.19d) and p. 129 (19.16b) Grünendahl reads *vitta-śāṭhyam vivarjayet*. Probably *vitta* should be emended to *citta*. P. 197.37c: the text has *nṛṇām* but in other places one finds *nṛṇām*, cf. p. 192 (45d), 197 (38d and 39d).

Ch. Willemen, *The Chinese Hevajratāntra*. The Scriptural Text of the Ritual of Great King of the Teaching. The Adamantine One with Great Compassion and Knowledge of the Void (Orientalia Gandensia VIII). Leuven, Uitgeverij Peeters, 1983. 208 pp. 1380 FB.

In 1959, D. L. Snellgrove translated the Hevajratāntra and edited the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts (cf. *IJJ* 4, 1960, pp. 198–203). In his note on the texts he wrote: "The Chinese version of the tantra (Taishō edition no. 892) appears to be based on the same Sanskrit original as the Tibetan, but the translator clearly found difficulty in rendering the more obscure parts as intelligible Chinese. Thus this version, rather than assisting towards a better understanding of the Sanskrit, would seem to provide new material for a study of its own" (Part II, p. viii).

In his work dedicated to the memory of W. R. B. Acker (1907–1974),¹ Ch. Willemen presents a complete translation of the Chinese version of the Hevajratāntra preceded by a long introduction which deals with the division of the tantras, the tantras in China, the Indian and Tibetan texts of the Hevajratāntra, Dharmapāla, the translator of the Hevajratāntra, and the four consecrations in the Hevajratāntra.

Willemen's translation of this difficult text is an important contribution to the study of the Chinese translations of tantric texts. His notes contain explanations of technical terms

and many references to the Sanskrit text. Willemen has not contented himself with consulting Snellgrove's edition, but has also made use of three manuscripts in the Tōkyō University Library (Nos. 510, 511 and 512). It is always possible to interpret such an often complicated text in some places in a different way, but on the whole the translation is not to be faulted.

The translator, Dharmapāla, was born in Kaśmīr in 963 A.D. and arrived in China in 1004 A.D. He translated the Hevajratāntra in 1054–1055 A.D. and died in 1058 A.D. Together with Wei-ching he compiled a Compendium of Indian Writing of the Ching-yu Era. According to Willemen, the compilation of this book, the last long treatise on Siddham in China, clearly shows that Dharmapāla was a well-trained philologist, a fact which must be taken into account when judging his translations (cf. p. 28). Willemen remarks that the Indian text of the Hevajratāntra is much more explicit than the Chinese translation. He continues: "I am convinced that Dharmapāla rendered the Indian original in a very tactful, deliberately abstruse way, but remaining true to the actual proceedings of the Indian original. The coherence of the Chinese 'mistranslations' only proves Dharmapāla's sound philological abilities and his remarkable talent for tactfulness. It would be a mistake merely to discard the Chinese Hevajratāntra as a faulty translation. Dharmapāla delivered a translation which was morally acceptable and in line with the existing Chinese esoteric texts, yet ambiguous enough to leave room for the right interpretation" (p. 29). In his preface Willemen declares himself unable to share the apparent surprise at the considerable differences noted between the Chinese texts and the Indian original of the anuttarayogatantras. He remarks: "Only an uncertain grasp of Chinese, when combined with a more thorough knowledge of both Sanskrit and Tibetan, would lead one to assume the answer to many of the problems raised, was to be found in the Chinese versions. A specific study of the relation between the Indian originals and the Chinese versions seemed urgently required to resolve some of the difficulties in this respect." I have quoted at length Willemen's remarks which seem to be directed against Snellgrove and others who accused Dharmapāla of "mistranslations". In my review of Snellgrove's work I pointed out that the Chinese version is very bad and that all the passages relating to sexual rites have been omitted, but that it can be useful for the textual study of the Sanskrit text of the Hevajratāntra.² Let me quote an interesting example in which the reading of the Chinese version is confirmed by one of the manuscripts consulted by Willemen. In II.5,46e the Sanskrit text has *adhyāntakrūrācittāya*. The Chinese transliteration is based upon a reading *ādhmātakrūrācittāya*.³ This reading is also found in manuscript no. 511 (cf. p. 109, n. 56). This makes it possible to correct a difficult passage in I.2,20: *paścād ācārya 'dhyātmakrūrācetasā mantram japed vijane deṣe*. Snellgrove translates: "Then the master, his mind resolved in inmost wrath, should utter this *mantra* in that lonely spot." The manuscripts have *adhyātara-* (A, B), *adhyātra-* (C) and *adhyāta-* (K). The Tibetan translation (*nan-gi*) renders *adhyātma-* or *abhyantara-*. The corresponding Chinese text is rendered by Willemen as follows: "After that the ācārya with a harsh ritual voice should immediately utter this spell calling for rain" (p. 43). This translation represents a rather desperate attempt to make sense of the Chinese character *fa* (*dharma*). Without any doubt, the original Sanskrit text has *ādhmātakrūrācetasā*. The same reading has to be adopted in II.9,2: *herukapratirūpenādhyātmakakrūrācetasā*, MS A *-ādhyātakrūra-*; MS B *-ādhyātamakrūra-*; MS C *-ādhyātākrūra-*. The Yogaratnamālā commentary has *adhyātam* (Tib. *'khrugs-śiñ*) = *atyantaduṣṭam*. The Chinese version did not translate II.9,1–2 (cf. Willemen, p. 116, n. 13).

Willemen's remarks suggest that Dharmapāla perfectly understood the Sanskrit text and that the divergences from the Sanskrit text are only caused by his desire to avoid both hurting the sensitivities of the Chinese and making too explicit the tantric rituals to those who are not initiated. However, there are many places in which it would have been possible to render the Sanskrit text exactly as it is. In his notes Willemen himself mentions instances in which Dharmapāla clearly mistranslated the Sanskrit text (cf. p. 45, n. 52; p. 78, n. 15; p. 88, n. 21; p. 94, n. 65; p. 104, n. 17). Other translations are completely nonsensical. For instance, in II.3,34cd the Sanskrit text has: *pañcaskandhāś ca rūpādya vijñānāntā mahākṛpa* MS A has

samskārantā which is confirmed by the Chinese version and by the Yogaratnamālā.⁴ The Chinese version has: “The five aggregates are form, etc. . . ., and also the formations of great compassion” (Willemen, p. 89). It goes without saying that “formations of great compassion” makes no sense at all. One must add that the Chinese version also seems to have confused *samskārantā* with *samskāratā*. In II.9,8 the Sanskrit text has: *paśya devī mahāratnam jvālāmālākulaṃ vapuḥ / ayogyāḥ syād aviddhena viddhaḥ san rudidāyakaḥ* //. Snellgrove translates: “Behold, O Goddess, this great gem, this body in a darting ring of flames. Useless is a gem uncut, but once cut, it gives forth its brilliance.” The Chinese version has: “Take for instance a great gem or a multitude of radiant garlands. He who has perceived it or he who has not yet perceived it and he who is unfit are all happy with it” (p. 117). This strange rendering is due to the fact that Dharmapāla clearly confounded *viddha* “pierced” and *vidita* “known”. On p. 33, n. 1 Willemen remarks that the title of the Sanskrit text is Śrīhevajradākinījālasamvaramahātāntrarājā. This title is found in MS. No. 512 and at the end of the first part of the Sanskrit text in Snellgrove’s edition: *Śrīhevajradākinījālasamvara-Vajragarb-hābhisambodhi-nāma prathamāḥ kalparājā samāptaḥ*. Dharmapāla confuses *jāla* and *jvālā*, cf. p. 40, n.1, and p. 81, n. 1 (here one must correct °*jālā* to °*jvālā*, i.e. wrong rendering of °*jāla*). Similar examples could be quoted *ad libitum*.

In some instances Dharmapāla is closer to the Sanskrit text than would appear from Willemen’s translation. I.3, 16: *śmaśāne krīḍate nātho ’ṣṭayoginībhiḥ parivṛtaḥ / śvasatīty anayā yuktyā śmaśānety abhidhīyate* //. Snellgrove translates: “This Lord plays in the cemetery surrounded by his eight yoginīs. ‘In the cemetery’, we say, because here we have a play on words, for *śvasati* means ‘he breathes’ and *śvavasati* means ‘resting-place of corpses’.” Willemen renders the Chinese version as follows: “While intoning the syllable *hūṃ* one should mentally produce the Lord in a cemetery surrounded by eight yoginīs. As one is called the means, one’s body represents the cemetery” (p. 49). A more literal translation is: “One must go to the cemetery, mentally produce the Lord and intone the syllable *hūṃ*. Eight yoginīs surround him. In this way (*fang-pien*, Skt. *yukti*) it is said that one’s body is the cemetery.” The Yogaratnamālā explains that *śvasati* stands for *śavānām vasatiḥ*. Dharmapāla seems to explain it as meaning *śvaśarīra*. I.6,9: *bodhibījanikṣepeṇa saṃskṛtām <imām> grh<ñiyāt>*. Snellgrove translates: “Take her then who is now consecrated with the depositing of the seed of enlightenment.” Willemen has: “(If you produce him in another family), the knowledge of the seed of bodhi will cause you to still remain in the conditioned” (p. 56). In a note Willemen remarks that if you produce Hevajra in the wrong family, you will not reach the unformed (*asaṃskṛta*), even though you have knowledge of the seed of bodhi (*bodhibīja*). However, the Sanskrit text makes it clear that *saṃskṛta* means here “consecrated”, cf. also Yogaratnamālā: *bodhibījanikṣepo ’bhiṣekādis tena saṃskṛtām*. The Chinese text must be translated accordingly: “(If you produce him in another family), the knowledge of the seed will cause you to be established in the consecration.” On p. 58 Willemen translates: “He must not recklessly perform any act which by nature is associated with great compassion, i.e. homa, etc. . . .”. Willemen has combined two sentences which have to be separated. The first sentence corresponds to Sanskrit I.6,23cd: *sarvabhāvasvabhāvena [vi]cared yogī mahākṛpaḥ*. Snellgrove translates: “The yogin wanders, filled with great compassion in his possession of a nature that is common to all beings.” A literal translation of the Chinese would be: “All the natures (*svabhāva*), are all acts associated with great compassion.” Perhaps this can be translated rather freely as: “All his acts are by nature associated with great compassion”. The second sentence corresponds to Skt. I.6,24a: *homatyāgatapo ’tīto*. Snellgrove translates: “He has passed beyond oblations, renunciation, and austerities.” The Chinese version has: “One should not prepare acts such as homa, etc.”. Chapter VIII explains the Five Wisdoms and concludes this section by declaring: *ākārān bhāvayet pañca vidhānair kathitair budhaḥ*. “The sage should conceive of these five aspects (*ākāra*, i.e. *ādarśajñāna*, etc., cf. Yogaratnamālā) in the modes here explained.”⁵ The Chinese version has: “One should visualize these five Wisdoms in due succession in the way explained.” Willemen translates: “Visualization is said

to be like a succession of these five wisdoms" (p. 64). II.9,7: *rahasyam paramam vakṣye; śṛṇu devī varāṇane / bhavasya śodhanam ramyam avikalpasiddhidāyakam* //. Snellgrove translates: "Now listen, fair-faced Goddess, and I will tell you the profoundest secret of the beauteous purifier of existence, who bestows that perfection that is free from all relative thought." Willemen translates: "Further, in our explanation purity is supreme – the most excellent secret" (p. 116), but the meaning is as follows: "Further, that which is to be explained is the pure, supreme and most excellent secret".

It is not surprising that in the interpretation of the Chinese version of the Hevajratāntra there may be different opinions as to the exact rendering of some passages. However, only in very few cases does Willemen's translation seem to be incorrect. His work is an important and very welcome contribution to the study of Chinese versions of *anuttarayoga* texts. Particularly welcome are the Chinese-Sanskrit Glossary (pp. 135–184) and the list of Chinese transliterations of Sanskrit syllables in mantras (pp. 185–193) which will be very helpful in the study of other Chinese versions of tantric texts. It is difficult to share Willemen's admiration for Dharmapāla's philological abilities, but he has convincingly shown that it will be necessary to pay more attention to the Chinese versions of *anuttarayoga* texts.

NOTES

¹ For more information on the work of Acker and other scholars in the University of Gent see Redy Smet and K. Watanabe, "Indology and Buddhist Studies in Gent University, Belgium" (in Japanese), *Annual for the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism Taisho University* 4 (1982), pp. 258–249.

² *IJJ* 4 (1960), p. 200.

³ *IJJ* 4 (1960), p. 202.

⁴ *IJJ* 4 (1960), p. 202.

⁵ Snellgrove's translation is wrong, cf. *IJJ* 4 (1960), p. 201.

Inklusivismus. Eine indische Denkform. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer (Publications of the de Nobili Research Library, Occasional Papers 2). Wien, 1983. 113 pp.

The term "inclusivism" was used by Paul Hacker to indicate a way of thinking which claims for, and thus includes in, one's own religion what really belongs to an alien sect (cf. pp. 35). Gerhard Oberhammer publishes the text of a lecture delivered in 1977 by Paul Hacker in Hamburg and Vienna ("Inklusivismus", pp. 11–28). Hacker writes: "Inklusivismus ist ein Begriff, den ich zur Beschreibung von Daten aus demjenigen Bereich benutze, den wir indische Religionen und speziell indische Religionsphilosophie nennen. Inklusivismus bedeutet, dass man erklärt, eine zentrale Vorstellung einer fremden religiösen oder weltanschaulichen Gruppe sei identisch mit dieser oder jener zentralen Vorstellung der Gruppe, zu der man selber gehört. Meistens gehört zum Inklusivismus ausgesprochen oder unausgesprochen die Behauptung, dass das Fremde, das mit dem Eigenen als identisch erklärt wird, in irgendeiner Weise ihm untergeordnet oder unterlegen sei. Ferner wird ein Beweis dafür, dass das Fremde mit dem Eigenen identisch sei, meist nicht unternommen" (p. 12).

In his lecture, Hacker quotes examples of inclusivism from the Upaniṣads, the Bhagavadgītā, the Purāṇas, and Neo-Hindu thinkers. According to Hacker, in all these cases inclusivism implied that one group feels itself weaker than another group. He points to feelings of inferiority in Radhakrishnan, and remarks: "... was wir für die Vergangenheit nur wahrscheinlich machen können, ist in der Gegenwart dokumentarisch gesichert, Der Inklusivismus wächst auf dem

Boden einer Frustration, eines Unterlegenheitsbewusstseins" (p. 21). In the case of Tulsīdās, a Rāmait who lived in Sivaītic Benares, Hacker sees an example of the opposite of frustration. Hacker discerns a similar kind of inclusivism in early Buddhism, into which brahmanic concepts are transformed and incorporated: "Der Buddhismus hat mit ungeheurer geistiger Kraft das Wesentliche, das er in den wichtigsten arischen Begriffen vorfand, in sich hineingeholt und dann das ihm Unwesentliche abgestreift" (p. 27).

Wilhelm Halbfass's paper bears the title " 'Inklusivismus' und 'Toleranz' im Kontext der indisch-europäischen Begegnung" (pp. 29–60). He begins by giving a survey of Hacker's statements on inclusivism, and points out that since Hacker's first publication on this topic in 1957 his views have become more peremptory. Halbfass makes some important remarks concerning tolerance, and rejects Hacker's later opinion that in India instead of tolerance only inclusivism existed. According to Halbfass one must distinguish between the concept of tolerance and the practice of tolerance. Halbfass writes: "... es kann doch gewiss tolerantes Verhalten und 'gelebte Toleranz' im Rahmen oder auf der Grundlage 'inklusionistischer' Denkens geben" (p. 46).

Two other topics discussed by Halbfass are the necessity to differentiate within the concept inclusivity, and the problem of whether or not it is limited to India as affirmed by Hacker. The first is briefly dealt with by Hacker in the concluding passage of his lecture: "Beim Inklusivismus bleibt meistens das Fremde unverändert bestehen, abgesehen von dem Inklusivismus der Stärke, den man, wenn man will, Umdeutung nennen kann. . . ." (p. 28). In this context Halbfass pays particular attention to classical Indian philosophy. He disagrees with Hacker's opinion that inclusivism is to be found only in India. Halbfass quotes examples from classical antiquity, early Christianity and Islam, and discusses in some detail Hegel's scheme of "Aufhebung", in which the historical dimension contrasts with the ahistorical nature of Indian cyclical conceptions.

Critical discussion of Hacker's concept of inclusivism is continued in Albrecht Wezler's paper ("Bemerkungen zum Inklusivismus-Begriff Paul Hackers", pp. 61–91). Wezler begins by showing that inclusivism also occurs in other religions. He quotes examples from Japanese Buddhism and from a book by Father H. M. Enomiya-Lassalle S. J. (*Zen-Buddhismus*, Köln, 1966). According to the teachings of the eighth patriarch of the Shinshū school, Rennyo Shōnin (1415–1499), the Shintō deities were appearances of the Buddha, and when we call on the name of the Buddha all the Shintō gods are included therein (p. 65). Wezler remarks that "erst der 8. Patriarch – und nur dieser Schule des japanischen Buddhismus – auf die Idee verfallen ist, in dieser Weise zu werben, und nicht auch schon seine Vorgänger und die Vertreter anderer Sekten" (p. 67). The idea of the Shintō gods being appearances of the Buddha occurs in Japanese Buddhism long before Rennyo Shōnin. This scheme of *honji-suijaku* is well-known in Japanese Buddhism. According to M. W. de Visser it was already propagated in the beginning of the ninth century by Dengyō Daishi and Kōbō Daishi.¹

Wezler sees the historical roots of inclusivism in the Vedic practice of identification and substitution (*ādeśa*). He explains the attraction of inclusivism to the Indians by the importance attached to tradition, and remarks that "die Häufung 'inklusionistischer' Argumente gerade im indischen religiösen Denken sehr viel, wenn auch wohl nicht ausschliesslich, mit dem ausgeprägt traditionalistisch-konservativen Charakter der indischen Kultur zu tun hat" (p. 87). Finally, Wezler points out that the tension between old and new is not an exclusively spiritual phenomenon and that one must also take into account psychological, social and similar factors.

Gerhard Oberhammer's epilogue contains a reflection not only on Hacker's concept of inclusivism but also on the contributions by Halbfass and Wezler. He begins by distinguishing between affirming the identity of foreign ideas with one's own and the actual adopting of foreign ideas. Furthermore, Oberhammer points out that inclusivism does not include the attempt to understand a foreign religious tradition or central idea from the point of view of one's own tradition. According to him, Hacker has not made this distinction, and Bhagavadgītā 7,20–23 and 9,23 must be seen not as an example of inclusivism but as a theological

explanation of the efficacy of foreign rites according to the religious tradition of the believers in Kṛṣṇa/Bhagavān. Oberhammer explains Hacker's interpretation of these two passages of the Bhagavadgītā on the basis of his theological view that inclusivism is characteristic for Indian religious traditions, but is totally and fundamentally excluded and impossible in the Christian tradition. According to Hacker, the Fathers adopted the practice of utilization (*chrēsis, usus iustus*), in which elements of foreign traditions are adopted only after having been transformed and reoriented.

Oberhammer points out that inclusivism is typical for the growth of the "Offenbarungskorpora" of Hinduistic traditions. Characteristic in this context is the relativist attitude which manifests itself in the process of incorporating foreign elements in one's own tradition. According to Oberhammer the possibility of inclusivistic forms of thought depends on the specific nature of the experience of transcendence. He writes: "Die religiösen Traditionen des Hinduismus bleiben grundsätzlich offen für die Aufnahme neuer, heilsvermittelnder Mythisierungen der Transzendenz, wobei dieser grundsätzlichen Offenheit als charakteristische 'Denkform' das Phänomen des Inklusivismus entspricht" (p. 113).

This little booklet is a beautiful tribute to the inspiring force of Hacker's ideas. It would be tempting to continue the discussion of his ideas on inclusivism and *usus iustus*. For instance, much attention has been paid by the contributors to the problem of whether or not inclusivism is exclusive to the Indian tradition. One could also put the question as to whether or not *usus iustus* is exclusive to the Christian tradition. What Hacker writes about early Buddhism (see above p. 000) corresponds exactly to his definition of *usus iustus*. Oberhammer refers to the fact that Hacker's inclusivism allows for the transformation of foreign elements in the case of "Inklusivismus der Stärke" (p. 105). It then becomes very difficult to draw a line between inclusivism and *usus iustus*.

NOTES

¹ *Ancient Buddhism in Japan*, vol. I (Leiden, 1935), pp. 224–225. See also Masaharu Anesaki, *History of Japanese Religion* (London, 1930), p. 137; Sir Charles Eliot, *Japanese Buddhism* (London, 1935), p. 242; William R. LaFleur, *The Karma of Words* (Berkeley, 1983), p. 12. The *honji-suijaku* doctrine is studied in the following monographs: Alicia Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation; The Historical Development of the Honji-suijaku Theory* (Tokyo, 1969); Maruyama Shūichi, *Honji-suijaku* (in Japanese) (Tōkyō, 1974). According to Alicia Matsunaga, "by the early part of the twelfth century or near the end of the Fujiwara period, the systematized relationships of *honji-suijaku* were set forth" (*op. cit.*, p. 231).

John S. Strong, *The Legend of King Aśoka. A Study and Translation of the Aśokāvadāna*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1983. xii, 336 pp. \$37.50.

In the first part of his book John S. Strong presents an exegesis of the Aśoka legend in five chapters: 1. The Legend and Its Background; 2. Dirt and Dharma: Kingship in the *Aśokāvadāna*; 3. King and Layman: Aśoka's Relationship to the Buddhist Community; 4. Aśoka and the Buddha; 5. Aśoka: Master of Good Means and Merit Maker. In his study of the Aśoka legend, Jean Przyluski examined the growth of the legend and its relation to local Buddhist communities. Przyluski made a great use of Chinese sources and translated in its entirety the *A-yü-wang chuan* (Taishō no. 2042).¹ In 1979 Gen'ichi Yamazaki published a very detailed study of the Aśoka legend, making use of Chinese, Indian and Tibetan sources, and the studies of Japanese and Western scholars.² Yamazaki's work seems to have remained completely

unknown to Strong and it is therefore perhaps not superfluous to quote the following passage from the English summary: "My first object of this study is to make clear the political and religious realities of the Aśokan Age through a critical study of the legends, with my second object being to show one aspect of the spread of Indian culture by clarifying the acceptance and modification of Aśoka legends in the countries surrounding India" (p. I). Strong's study is mainly based upon the Sanskrit text of the *Aśokāvadāna* and does not quote any of the important Chinese sources at first hand. He quotes a great number of books and articles (cf. Bibliography, pp. 313–327) but important publications have escaped his notice, and those which are mentioned in the bibliography he does not seem to have always studied carefully. Moreover, his use of the existing literature is not very critical. To mention only a few examples: Strong writes that in India the concept of the *cakravartin* goes back to the tenth century B.C. (p. 48), referring in a note to a book by Charles Drekmeier;³ it is of course completely impossible to adduce any proof in support of this statement. On the interpretation of the epithet "Beloved of the Gods" (*devānāmpriya*), Strong refers to publications by Louis de La Vallée Poussin, Sylvain Lévi and F. Kielhorn (p. 11, n. 29), but completely ignores a recent article by Minoru Hara.⁴ On p. 13 Strong quotes from Rock Edict VIII the phrase: "[he] left for Sambodhi [complete enlightenment]" without pointing out that this interpretation is not accepted by the majority of scholars.⁵ Strong attributes the *Sūtrālamkāra* to Aśvaghoṣa and states that Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* is in both style and contents closely akin to it (pp. 31–32). Although Strong quotes in a note Lüders' *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, he does not seem aware of the fact that Lüders showed both works to be one and the same.

Strong, who is more interested in the interpretation of the legend than in a critical study of the legend and its background, likes to make sweeping statements. For instance, he writes that, according to Max Weber, early Buddhism was a classic example of other-worldly mysticism divorced from any real involvement in political rule or in worldly economic activities (p. 38). Strong adds that, today, this Weberian viewpoint has been fundamentally undermined, and in a note he refers for one aspect of this discrediting of Weber to a book by Heinz Bechert. However, Strong does not mention an important article by Bechert, in which he discussed Weber's interpretation in much greater depth.⁶ In his English summary Bechert writes: "Weber's opinions about the character of early Buddhism can be considered correct even today to a great degree, in spite of some misconceptions in Weber's book. Original Buddhism has been conceived as a way to final salvation, not as a social movement. The followers of the Buddha's teachings tried to evade implications of their religious movement in political and social matters as far as possible" (p. 294). Strong clearly prefers the "pulsating galactic or maṇḍala model" of Buddhist kingship as described by Stanley Tambiah!

Strong criticises de La Vallée Poussin for translating *pratyudyāna* in the *Abhidharmakośa* by "spontaneous surrender" (reddition spontanée) which, according to him, hardly does justice to the sense of "meeting" or "encounter" implicit in the term (p. 52, n. 37). Strong refers to de La Vallée Poussin's translation of *kārikā* III, 96 of the *Abhidharmakośa*.⁷ If Strong had taken the trouble to find out how de La Vallée Poussin arrived at his interpretation, he would have found the answer on p. 202, where de La Vallée Poussin translates a passage of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: "Le souverain à la roue d'or triomphe par *pratyudyāna*. Les petits rois viennent vers lui, disant: 'Les districts riches, florissants, abondants en vivres, pleins d'hommes et d'hommes sages, daigne Sa Majesté (*devādhideva*) les gouverner! Nous-mêmes nous sommes à ses ordres'." De La Vallée Poussin's translation is fully confirmed by the Sanskrit text published in 1967: *yasya sauvarṇaṃ cakraṃ bhavati taṃ koṭarājānaḥ svayam pratyudgacchanti*. . .⁸ It is rather surprising to see Strong in the same note characterise the *Mahāvīyūtpatti* as a great encyclopaedia of Buddhism.

In his chapter on Aśoka and the Buddha, Strong studies several versions of Aśoka's attempts to obtain Buddha's relics from the nāgas (pp. 111–116). However, no mention is made at all of Przyluski's article on the division of the relics of the Buddha, although it is listed in the bibliography.⁹ Strong refers to a very late work, the *Thūpavaṃsa*, but does not pay any

attention to the very interesting account found in the *Lokapaññatti*, which was studied by Eugène Denis,¹⁰ although the bibliography lists both this article by Denis and his edition and translation of the *Lokapaññatti*.¹¹

As an example of Strong's exegetical methods, we refer to the pages he devotes to "The Doctrine of Essence" (pp. 148–155). Strong translates a passage from the *Divyāvadāna*, from which we quote the following verse: "Once one has enjoyed curds, ghee, fresh butter, and buttermilk, the best part of the milk – its essence – is gone. If the jar is then accidentally broken, it is hardly something to get upset about. So too there should be no sorrow at death if one has already extracted from one's body, its essence – good conduct" (pp. 149–150). Strong's translation is based upon Mukhopādhyāya's edition: *dadhighṛtanavanītakṣīratacropayogād varam apahr̥tasāro maṇḍakumbhovahagnaḥ / na bhavati bahūśocyam yadvad evaṃ śarīraṃ sucaritahr̥tasāraṃ naiti śoko 'ntakāle //* (p. 74.5–8). Needless to say, Strong's translation has only a remote relation to the Sanskrit text which, as edited by Mukhopādhyāya, is not comprehensible. If Strong had not only quoted Lüders' *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* but also read it, he would have found on p. 147 Lüders' emendations which establish an acceptable sense for this verse: *dadhighṛtanavanītakṣīratacropayogāt param apahr̥tasāre maṇḍakumbhe 'vabhagne / na bhavati bahu śocyam yadvad evaṃ śarīre sucaritahr̥tasāre nāsti śoko 'ntakāle //*. According to Strong the similes used in the passage translated by him intriguingly recall those used by the Sarvāstivādin teacher, Dharmatrāta, to explain how an element, although it changes as it moves through the three times, nonetheless remains the same.¹² The similes used by Dharmatrāta relate to the unchangeableness of colour (*varṇa*) in a golden pot which is broken, or in milk which is transformed into curd, Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, p. 296.10–12: *yathā suvarṇabhājanasya bhittvā 'nyathā kriyamānasya samsthānānyathātvaṃ bhavati na varṇanyathātvaṃ / yathā ca kṣīraṃ dadhitvena parinaṃad rasavīryavipākān parityajati na varṇam*. In the *Divyāvadāna* the simile relates to the fact that once the essence has been taken out of the pot, it does not matter when the pot is broken. It is difficult to see how this simile intriguingly recalls those used by Dharmatrāta.

Strong's translation of the *Aśokāvadāna* is based upon Mukhopādhyāya's edition, which is not a very good choice. As already shown above, Mukhopādhyāya does not know the work done by scholars such as Lüders who have suggested many excellent emendations. Moreover, Mukhopādhyāya freely changes the readings of his text to make them agree with Przyluski's translation of the *A-yü-wang-chuan*.¹³ It would have been much better to translate the *editio princeps* by Cowell and Neil, also referring to the emendations proposed since its publication. Strong mentions Burnouf's translation and remarks that there are a number of mistakes in his work (p. 171). It seems therefore appropriate to compare Strong's renderings of several passages with those found in Burnouf's *Introduction à l'histoire du buddhisme indien* (Paris, 1844). The meaning of *īryāpatha* seems to be unknown to Strong, who translates it by "various ascetic performances" (p. 175) and by "the practices of a religious mendicant" (p. 181). *Īryāpatha* signifies "the deportment" or "the four bodily attitudes", and there is no ground for attributing to it the meaning of "heretical practices" as done by Edgerton with reference to *Divyāvadāna* 350.7 (Mukhopādhyāya 4.3). Burnouf correctly translates *praśānteneryāpathena* (*Divyāvadāna* 354.4; Mukhopādhyāya 10.13) by "avec une démarche recueillie" (p. 147). Strong translates *lokālokavara* (*Divyāvadāna* 423.28; Mukhopādhyāya 62.11) by "the best in this world and beyond" (p. 227). Burnouf has "la première des lumières du monde" (p. 420). Aśoka advises his brother Viśāoka to exercise himself in begging: *bhaikṣe tāvad abhyāsaḥ kriyatām* (*Divyāvadāna* 424.16; Mukhopādhyāya 63.9). Strong translates: "why don't you do your begging near at hand?" (p. 228). Burnouf has: "commence ici ton apprentissage de mendiant" (p. 420). Sthavira Upagupta thinks that when Aśoka goes to see him, Upagupta, there will be injury to a great number of people and to the country: *yadi rājagamīṣyati mahājanakāyasya pīḍā bhaviṣyati gocarasya ca* (*Divyāvadāna* 386.6–7; Mukhopādhyāya 77.4–5). Strong translates: "If the king did come, it would be difficult to find provisions for the large number of men in his escort" (p. 240). Burnouf has: "Si le roi vient ici, il en

résultera du tort pour une grande foule de peuple et pour le pays” (p. 379). For the relics of the Buddha, Aśoka gives eighty-four thousand urns and eighty-four thousand pieces of cloth or silk (*paṭṭa*) to the yakṣas (Divyāvadāna 381.3; Mukhopādhyāya 54.1). Strong interprets *paṭṭa* as an ‘inscription plate’ (p. 219). Burnouf has ‘bandelette’ (p. 373). Strong’s translation is absurd as he could easily have discovered by reading Przyluski’s translation of the *A-yü-wang-chuan*: “84.000 bandelettes de soie de diverses couleurs” (*op. cit.*, p. 243).

In all these cases mentioned above Burnouf’s translation (published in 1844!) is to be preferred to Strong’s interpretation. Of course, Burnouf has also made some mistakes and it would have been helpful if Strong had corrected them. However, when Burnouf makes a mistake Strong does the same. Aśoka offered only one *kākaṇī* to the stūpa of Vātula because “he had so few desires that he did not act as others did for the benefit of all mankind” (Strong, p. 255). The Sanskrit text continues as follows: *sā pratyāhatā tasyaiva rājñah pādāmūle nipatitā / yāvad amātyā vismitā ūcuḥ / aho tasya mahātmano ’lpecchatā / babhūvānāyāpy anarthī* / (Divyāvadāna 396.13–15; Mukhopādhyāya 91.8–9): “It [the *kākaṇī*], being rejected, fell at Aśoka’s feet. Amazed the ministers said: ‘Ah! How few desires has this magnanimous being. He does not want even this [*kākaṇī*].’ Strong translates: ‘The ministers were amazed. They fell at Aśoka’s feet and said in awe: “Aho! Although this magnanimous being lacked desires, he unfortunately also lacked purpose”’ (p. 255). Burnouf has: “A ces mots les ministres furent frappés d’étonnement, et tombant aux pieds du roi, ils s’écrièrent: Ah! la modération des désirs de ce sage magnanime a été inutile, puisqu’il n’a pas rencontré de difficultés” (p. 392).

In the index of Strong’s book one finds *gaṭis* instead of *gatis* (p. 331). Alas, this is not a simple printing error because it occurs persistently throughout the book (pp. 137, 144, 145, 146, 160 and 331). Strong remarks patronizingly that Burnouf’s translation was a remarkable achievement notwithstanding the mistakes which are to be found in his work. It is an even more remarkable achievement to produce so many mistakes in 1983, 139 years after the publication of the *Introduction à l’étude du buddhisme indien*.

NOTES

- ¹ *La légende de l’empereur Aśoka dans les textes indiens et chinois*. Paris, 1923.
- ² Yamazaki Gen’ichi, *Ashoka-ō densetsu no kenkyū* [The legend of Aśoka. A Critical Study]. Tōkyō, Shunjusha, 1979.
- ³ *Kingship and Community in Early India*, Stanford, 1962, p. 203.
- ⁴ ‘A Note on the Sanskrit Phrase devānām priya’, *Indian Linguistics* 30, 1969, pp. 13–26.
- ⁵ Cf. *The Eastern Buddhist*, N.S., Vol. XV No. 1 (1982), pp. 149–150; Gustav Roth, ‘Notes on Inscriptions of Aśoka’, *Prajñā-Bhārati* 2 (Patna, 1982), pp. 37–38; Yamazaki, *op. cit.*, pp. 93–94 and 99–100.
- ⁶ ‘Einige Fragen der Religionssoziologie und Struktur des südasiatischen Buddhismus’, *Beiträge zur religionssoziologischen Forschung* 4, 1968, pp. 251–295.
- ⁷ *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, troisième chapitre, Paris-Louvain, 1926, p. 197.
- ⁸ *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, ed. by P. Pradhan, Patna, 1967, pp. 185.24–186.2.
- ⁹ ‘Le partage des reliques du Buddha’, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 4, 1936, pp. 341–367.
- ¹⁰ ‘La Lokapaññatti et la légende birmane d’Aśoka’, *JA* 1976, pp. 97–116.
- ¹¹ See also Yamazaki, *op. cit.*, pp. 75–77 and 87–88.
- ¹² Cf. p. 150, n. 1, in which Strong refers to Surendranath Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 1, p. 115.
- ¹³ See our review, *IJJ* 12 (1969–1970), pp. 269–274. On p. 270, line 21, read Memyō for Mamyō. On p. 271, line 20, read 382.4–384.23 for 382.4–383.23.

The Writings of Professor Bruno Petzold (1873–1949). Buddhist Research Information Numbers 4–8. October 1980–October 1982. 237 pp. \$12.00.

In 1908 Bruno Petzold went to Tientsin and from there he moved to Tokyo in 1910. He spent the rest of his life in Japan teaching German language and literature and studying Buddhism and especially Tendai. The bibliography compiled by his son Arnulf Petzold in 1982 is now published as numbers 4–8 of the *Buddhist Research Information*. During his life Petzold published a number of articles, several of which have been reprinted in *Tendai Buddhism: Collection of the Writings by Bruno Petzold* (Yokohama, 1979). Bruno Petzold left some very extensive manuscripts, one of which was recently published: *Die Quintessenz der T'ien-t'ai- (Tendai-) Lehre. Eine komparative Untersuchung*. Herausgegeben von Horst Hammitzsch (Wiesbaden, 1982). The other manuscripts deal with the following topics: *Die Tendai Lehre* (1165 pp. typescript); Shō Shikwan (*Die kleine Meditation*) by Chisha Daishi (402 pp. typescript); *Die Biographie über Dengyō Daishi* (607 pp. typescript); *Shittan* (204 pp. typescript); *The Classification of Buddhism* (1047 pp. typescript).

Both his published and unpublished writings are catalogued in great detail. One wonders why some items are listed three times. For instance, in the *Buddhist Yearbook 1933* Petzold published an article entitled 'Japan at the Time of her Greatest Distress and MAHĀYĀNA BUDDHISM'. The same article is moreover mentioned twice as a monograph (!), with the same pagination (pp. 16–23) as the article in the *Buddhist Yearbook* (cf. p. 83). The section 'Book reviews' mentions two book reviews and several notices in the *Bibliographie bouddhique*. The information given is incorrect in several instances: p. 114, sub 147 pw: read page 49 a for 49b; sub 148 pw: read *Ta tche tou louen* for *Ta che tou lun*; sub 150 pw: read 683 for 684.

Part II of the bibliography (pp. 128–170) contains reprints of various articles, introductions, etc. by Bruno Petzold, and of 'In Memory of Prof. Bruno Petzold' by Arnulf H. Petzold reproduced from Petzold's book on the *Buddhist Prophet Nichiren – A Lotus in the Sun* (Tokyo, 1978). Part III (pp. 169–237) is a composite index.

The publication of Petzold's posthumous manuscripts will make it possible to form an opinion about his contribution to Buddhist studies. Petzold studied under the guidance of Japanese scholars who must have greatly assisted him in his studies.¹ It seems that Petzold could not read Chinese or Japanese himself, although he lived in China and Japan for more than forty years.² Whether Petzold's work is important enough to warrant the publication of such a detailed bibliography, is a question which can only be answered after the publication of his major works. In any case, the editor has edited this work with great care, although errors such as

the ones pointed out above show that the information given by Arnulf Petzold does not seem to have been checked. We must also point out that the Sanskrit equivalent of *kesa* is not *kaśāya* or *kāśaya* (see pp. 3, 139, 140) but *kāṣāya*. Probably the editor found *kaśāya* in Ui Hakuju's *Bukkyō jiten* (p. 225b). To the two reviews listed on p. 112, one must add a review by R. Schmidt of Petzold's 'Goethe und der Mahāyāna-Buddhismus', cf. *OLZ* 40, 1937, Sp. 703–704.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

NOTES

¹ The most important are Shimaji Daitō (up to 1927) and Hanayama Shinsō (after 1927).

² See Hanayama's reminiscences about Mr. Bruno Petzold, *Tendai Buddhism* (Yokohama, 1979), p. 425.