

ANMERKUNGEN

¹ Iambus – Choriambus – Iambus / Baccheus (vgl. dazu Gregory Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1974).

² Im Falle der Prosastelle 92+ (*anyaiś ca*) und der Strophe 100 (Bahuvrīhi auf °*gaṇḍān*), wo jeweils mask. Formen auftreten, obwohl von den Apsarasen die Rede zu sein scheint, dürfte eher eine Unachtsamkeit in Bezug auf die Erzählungssituation, als ein grammatischer Lapsus des Dichters anzunehmen sein.

³ S. 68 Zeile 19 lies: *'psarasaś* für *'psaraś*; Zeile 21 lies *vāsāṃsi* für *vasāṃsi*.

Catalogue of the United States Library of Congress Collection of Tibetan Literature in Microfiche. Musashi Tachikawa in collaboration with Tshulkrim Kelsang and Shunzo Onoda. [Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica Series Maior III], Tokyo, The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1983. 353 pp.

This catalogue is an indispensable guide for users of the microfiche edition of the Library of Congress PL 480 acquisitions produced by The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions (IASWR). The 2678 bibliographic entries (which include some cross references) are arranged mainly by author. Each compactly presented entry gives where necessary: author and editor (both with dates), title and abbreviated title, imprint details, microfiche and Library of Congress card number and lastly a one or two word "subject classification". As E. Gene Smith remarks in his Foreword

"Dr Tachikawa has attempted to provide an indication of the broad subject area or, in the case of doctrinal works, the sectarian order to which the author belongs. This is, of course, a useful beginning."

While these indications are a general guide and cannot be compared to such detailed notes as those given, for example, in the University of Washington Tibetan Catalogue of 1969, the aim here has been "to prepare a simply usable catalogue-index". That aim has been fulfilled.

There is no formal bibliography and it is to be assumed that the United States Library of Congress Accessions Lists have been the major source for details such

as dates. Unfortunately there is no title index either; while we can be grateful that the information scattered through the bulky LC Accessions Lists is here more succinctly presented, the title indices of the later Lists will be missed.

Australian National University

ROYCE WILES

Rainer von Franz, *Die unbearbeiteten Peking-Inschriften der Franke-Lauferschen Sammlung* (Asiatische Forschungen, Band 86). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1984. XII, 259 pp., 18 pl. DM 98,-.

In 1914 Otto Franke and Berthold Laufer published in facsimile a large collection of inscriptions from lamaist temples.¹ Several inscriptions have since been edited and translated by Erich Haenisch, Ferdinand Lessing, Wolfgang Bauer and Herbert Franke. All inscriptions are listed in chronological order by von Franz in his introduction, but without indicating which ones were studied by the above-mentioned scholars.² Von Franz's book contains an edition and annotated translation of thirteen inscriptions on lamaist temples in or near Peking. One inscription is in Chinese only, the others are in two (Chinese – Manchu), three (Chinese – Manchu – Mongolian) or four languages (Chinese – Manchu – Mongolian – Tibetan). The inscriptions studied by von Franz date from the reigns of the K'ang-hsi emperor (1662–1722) and the Ch'ien-lung emperor (1736–1795) and are important documents for the study of the religious politics of these two emperors with regard to their lamaist subjects. Von Franz translates the Chinese text and compares it with the different versions in Manchu, Mongolian and Tibetan. Moreover, von Franz has consulted many Chinese sources on the history of the temples. The Chinese texts are written in a flowery language full of allusions to the Chinese classics which are carefully traced by von Franz. It is therefore not surprising to see that the texts of the other versions are often quite different. It is interesting to note that where these versions mention the Yellow Doctrine, the Chinese text has a much more neutral expression. For instance, in one inscription the Chinese text has *fu tian* "field of bliss". Von Franz writes: "Chin. *fu tian* 'Feld des Segens', ist ein buddh. Bild für die aus guten Taten erwachsenden Rekompensation. Politische Gründe mögen nun dafür massgeblich gewesen sein, dass in den anderen Versionen diesem weitgehend untendenziösen Ausdruck [sofern man seinen buddh. Ursprung nicht schon als tendenziös bezeichnen mag] die Bezeichnung für die reformierte Richtung des Lamaismus 'Gelbe Lehre', oder 'Lehre der Gelbmützen' (nach der Kleidung ihrer Vertreter) gegenübersteht: dem der anderen Sprachen unkundigen Chinese bleibt der Glaube an das über allen Parteiungen stehende

Kaisertum erhalten, bei Mandschuren, Mongolen und Tibetern entsteht der Eindruck einer besonderen Würdigung des Lamaismus" (p. 67).

Only in very few cases is it possible to suggest a different interpretation. On p. 67 von Franz writes that "Tib. *stug po bkod pa* [*'i žaṅ kham*s] ist eine Bezeichnung für den 'Og min-Himmel, über dem der Dhyāni-Buddha ('Weisheitsbuddha') Akṣobhya auf einem weissen Lotus thronend residiert." Tib. *stug po bkod pa* renders Sanskrit Ghanavyūha, the name of the paradise ('Pure Land') of the Buddha Mahāvairocana. Manchu *g'anabuhe* is not derived from Skt. *ghana* "dicht", "hart", an epithet of the Buddha, but is the Manchu transcription of Sanskrit *Ghanavyūha*. On p. 120, *'od kyi dra ba* is not a "Glanzhalskette" but a "net of light", cf. p. 211 where Ch. *wang* "net" corresponds to Tib. *dra-ba*, Manchu *zala* and Mongolian *cala* (both transcriptions of skt. *jāla*). On p. 153, von Franz is puzzled by the Tibetan term *re-mig* which, of course, is equivalent to *re'u-mig* "trellis, chess board".³ In the same inscription the Tibetan text connects E and F: *dus bzaṅ por rgyal yum haṅ tha'i hu skyo saṅs la gdan draṅs te gus pas mčhod pa'i che / skye bo su žig gis dad ba daṅ gus pa čhen pos bsod nams daṅ che dpag tu med pa rjes su yi raṅ bas spel bar mi 'gyur*, "When at an auspicious time the mother of the Emperor will be invited for a pleasure ride and be respectfully honoured, who will not then with faith and great respect increase through a benediction his merit and infinite life?" This construction explains the perfect *draṅs* which is queried by von Franz (pp. 154–155). Tib. *skyo saṅs* is not an abbreviated expression for *skyo saṅs gnas* "Lustgarten" but "a pleasure ride or walk" and it corresponds to Chin. *guo zhi* "an ihm (= dem Tempel) vorüberziehen" (p. 154).⁴ On p. 112 von Franz translates: "wie könnte es hierzu genügen unter Befolgung einer [bestimmten] Lehre das eigene Verhalten zu kultivieren". The Chinese text does not warrant this interpretation and says only: "How would it be enough to practise according to the doctrine?" The Tibetan version has *spyod lam dag ba* "a pure way of conduct".

One must welcome the fact that these thirteen inscriptions have been so carefully studied by von Franz, but it is a pity that he has refrained from including the inscriptions studied by other scholars. For instance, F. D. Lessing gives nothing more than an unannotated translation of the Chinese text of two inscriptions of the Yung-ho-kung in four languages.⁵ According to von Franz, E. Ludwig has studied an inscription in four languages which dates from 1782 but has omitted a part of the inscription. Ludwig's book is extremely rare and von Franz does not say whether it contains the text of the inscription in all four languages.

NOTES

¹ *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus China*. Erster Teil: Lamaistische Klosterinschriften aus Peking, Jehol und Si-Ŋan. Berlin-Hamburg, 1914.

² For bibliographical information see Wolfgang Bauer, 'Zwei mehrsprachige Gedichtinschriften Kaiser Ch'ien-lungs aus dem "Gelben Tempel" zu Peking', *Studia Sino-Altaica* (Wiesbaden, 1961), p. 21, n. 3. Add H. Franke, 'Die dreisprachige Gründungsinschrift des 'Gelben Tempels' zu Peking aus den Jahre 1651', *ZDMG* 114 (1964), pp. 391–412.

³ For *re'u mig* see Chos-kyi Grags-pa's *Tibetan Dictionary* (Peking, 1957), p. 838a.

⁴ For *skyo sañs* see H. A. Jäschke, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London, 1881), p. 31: *skyo-sañs* "recreation"; *skyo-sañs la 'gro-ba* "to take a walk or a ride, to promenade".

⁵ F. D. Lessing, *Yung-ho-kung*. Volume one (Stockholm, 1942), pp. 9–12 and 58–61.

⁶ Cf. von Franz, p. 18, and Bauer *op. cit.*, p. 22, n. 7. We have been unable to consult Ludwig's book.

J. Terjék (ed.), *Collected Works of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös*, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984. *Tibetan-English Dictionary*, LX, 351 pp. \$34.00; *Sanskrit-Tibetan-English Vocabulary*, being an edition and translation of the Mahāvyutpatti. XXXII, XXXVII, 390 pp. \$38.00; *Grammar of the Tibetan Language*. XXXII, XVI, 204, 40 pp. \$24.00; *Tibetan Studies*, being a reprint of the articles contributed to the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and Asiatic Researches. XXXII, IX, 459 pp. \$44.00. The four volumes together \$120.00.

On the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös (1784–1842), the Hungarian Academy of Sciences has published his collected works in four volumes. Each volume contains a foreword by János Szentágothai and a short biography of Csoma de Kőrös by József Terjék. Csoma began his Tibetan studies in 1823. In 1831 he arrived in Calcutta in order to prepare his grammar and dictionary for publication. Both works were published in 1834 in 500 copies. His edition and translation of the Mahāvyutpatti, which work he mentioned already in a letter of 25 May 1825 addressed to Captain Kennedy, appeared in three fascicles in 1910, 1916 and 1944. From 1832 on Csoma published many articles in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. They were collected and edited by E. Denison Ross in a special issue of the Journal published in 1912. In his foreword János Szentágothai gives the date 1909. József Terjék writes in his preface that this issue was published in 1911. In order to prevent confusion in future bibliographies it is perhaps useful to reproduce the information given on the cover of this issue: Journal & Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. VII, Extra No. 1911. Alexander Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Volume, Calcutta: Printed at the Baptist Mission Press, and Published by the Asiatic Society, 1, Park Street, Calcutta. 1912. Issued 23rd April, 1912. *Tibetan Studies* reproduces both the text of this issue and the articles published in 1836 and 1839 in volume XX of Asiatic Researches. In

these articles Csoma analysed the contents of both Kanjur and Tanjur and described the life of the Buddha according to the Lalitavistara and the Mñon-par 'byuñ-ba.

Csoma is not the first European to have made a thorough study of the Tibetan language and literature. He was preceded in the eighteenth century by Italian missionaries, among whom the most outstanding scholar was Ippolito Desideri (20.12.1684 – 14.4.1733). The work of the Italian missionaries has been made known by Luciano Petech in the seven volumes of *I missionari Italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal* (Roma, 1952–1956). However, Csoma can rightly be called the founder of Tibetan studies because it was only due to the publication of his works that it became possible for scholars in Europe to undertake the study of Tibetan texts.

Csoma's works have been reprinted many times, especially in recent years. However, this uniform edition in beautifully bound volumes will be welcomed by all Tibetologists. One must be very grateful to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for having taken the initiative in honouring the memory of Csoma in this very befitting way.

Lal Mani Joshi, *Discerning the Buddha*. A Study of Buddhism and of the Brahmanical Hindu Attitude to It. New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1983. XXIII, 275 pp. Rs. 140.

Lal Mani Joshi (1935–1984) died shortly after the publication of this book. In 1967 he published a study on Indian Buddhism during the 7th and 8th centuries A.D.: *Studies in the Buddhistic Culture of India*, which appeared in a second revised edition in 1977. Of his other books, one must mention his *Brahmanism, Buddhism and Hinduism* (Kandy, 1970), in which he discussed several topics which are studied in more detail in *Discerning the Buddha*; and his *Facets of Jaina Religiousness in Comparative Light* (Ahmedabad, 1981). Together with Harbans Singh he published *An Introduction to Indian Religions* (Patiala, 1973). He wrote many articles and contributed to several books. His untimely death is a great loss for Buddhist studies in India.

Joshi's book studies the Hindu attitude to Buddhism. His point of departure is the writings of Swami Vivekananda (1863–1902) who often referred to Buddhism and the Buddha with great sympathy. However, as pointed out by Joshi, Vivekananda's attitude towards Buddhism was ambivalent. Joshi writes: "In his speeches in Europe and the United States of America he freely praised the Buddha and stressed His ethical, rational and humanistic teachings. But he

always repeated his own important and unavoidable opinion that 'the Buddha was a Hindu' and 'Buddhism a rebel child of Hinduism . . .'. But when the Swami had to address his co-religionist Hindus in India, he often became harsh on Buddhism, even on the Buddha, and openly opposed the Buddhists. Here in the home of Brahmanism he would refer to Buddhism as atheism and nihilism, and denounce the ancient Buddhists for their alleged introduction of Tantric rites and degradation of Indian civilization" (p. xxi). This tendency in Vivekananda's writings on Buddhism was also noticed by Wilhelm Halbfass, who remarked: "Daneben ist es jedoch sehr auffällig und symptomatisch, dass die freundlichen und rühmenden Stellungnahmen in der Regel vor westlichem, namentlich amerikanischem Publikum abgegeben werden, während Kritik und Warnungen vor allem in Indien geäußert werden" (*Indien und Europa*, Basel/Stuttgart 1981, p. 265). Joshi suggests different explanations for Vivekananda's attitude towards Buddhism: "Was it a Bodhisattva's skill in means? Or, was it a cross-cultural diplomacy? Perhaps it was a demand of dynamics of national reform" (p. xxi). However, it is not surprising that Vivekananda praised Buddha and Buddhism in his speeches in Europe and America, because Buddhism belonged to India's glorious past which had been revealed to the Indians in the nineteenth century by the efforts of Western scholars. However, it was impossible for an Indian nourished in the Indian tradition to forget that the Buddhists were *nāstika*-s. Joshi writes that "the ancient Brahmanical thinkers understood the Buddhist system of thought as 'nihilistic' (*vaināsika*) and 'materialistic' (*nāstika*) and put it on a par with the Cārvāka system. Modern Brahmanical scholars interpret the word *nāstika* in the sense of being 'non-Vedic', 'atheistic' and 'heterodox'" (p. 9). However, already in Manu the word *nāstika* refers to somebody who does not recognize the Veda, cf. II.11: *yo 'vamanyeta te tūbhe hetuśāstrāśrayāḍ dvijaḥ / sa sādhubhir bahiṣkāryo nāstiko vedanindakaḥ* //. Vivekananda rightly remarked that "if you deny the authority of the Vedas, you are a *nāstika*" (p. 92). Joshi's many quotations from Vivekananda's writings show clearly that Vivekananda, although he heaped both praise and blame on Buddhism, was consistent in his interpretation of Buddhism as a branch of Hinduism. For him all that what was good in Buddhism had been absorbed by Hinduism, and what was not good had to be rejected. Joshi quotes profusely from the eight volumes of Vivekananda's writings and his book is a useful guide to the latter's opinions on Buddhism. Joshi takes great pains in refuting the wrong ideas and misconceptions which inspire many of Vivekananda's remarks. This aspect of Joshi's book is perhaps more useful for Indian readers than for Western readers who are less likely to have been influenced by this form of Neo-Vedānta Hinduism. Joshi has an excellent knowledge of the Buddhist sources and of the works by scholars in the field, and generally speaking one will find oneself in agreement with him. However,

Joshi touches on many problems and he sometimes has a tendency to express an opinion without considering carefully what has been written by other scholars on the same topic. For instance, he writes that "The controversy whether Buddhism was originally a simple religion, a mass movement, and later on became a scholastic philosophy of intellectual ascetics, or that the philosophical doctrine of ascetics became in course of time a popular cult, a religion of the masses, is, in our opinion, futile and based on inappropriate conceptualizations" (p. 18). According to Joshi, "the earliest form of Buddhism, as far as this can be ascertained, was both a religion and a philosophy, accessible to both the intellectual world-renouncers and the devout and pious householders" (p. 19). However, the important point is whether the Buddha addressed himself in the same terms to these two groups. This problem has been studied in detail by Lamotte in his chapter on the lay followers (cf. *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, Louvain, 1958, pp. 71–92), to which Joshi does not refer at all. Joshi quotes a list of twenty householders who became *arhat*-s and concludes that "the basic structure of Buddhist soteriology and its practice do not imply that the career of a homeless recluse is *sine qua non*" (p. 22).

Even though it is impossible to agree with Joshi in every point, there is no doubt that his book is well-informed and instructive. It is a great pity that this gifted and active scholar has passed away at such an early age. It is to be hoped that an enterprising editor will bring out a selection of his many published and unpublished articles as a well-deserved tribute to his memory.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Yoshiro Imaeda, *Catalogue du Kanjur tibétain de l'édition de 'Jang sa-tham*. Première partie: Edition en fac-similé avec introduction. Seconde partie: Texte en translittération. (Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica. Series Maior. IIa. IIb.). Tokyo, The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1982, 1984. 104, 112 pp.

Die Erforschung des tibetischen Kanjur und seiner Überlieferungsgeschichte wird bislang dadurch erschwert, dass keiner der frühen Textzeugen – seien es Handschriften oder Blockdrucke – zugänglich ist. So ist z.B. vom ersten Kanjurdruck überhaupt, der Peking-Ausgabe aus dem Jahre 1410, nur eine einzige Seite in stark verkleinertem Faksimile veröffentlicht worden (Shinten Sakai, *Ramakyō no teniseki*, Kōyasan 1944, Tafel 1). Dies gilt auch für den Nachdruck dieser Ausgabe aus dem Jahre 1606 (*op. cit.*, Tafel 2), von dem in der einstigen Königlich Preussischen Bibliothek, Berlin, 37 Bände vorlagen, die aber in den Wirren zu Ende des 2. Weltkrieges verlorengegangen sind. Von der drittältesten Blockdruckausgabe, die 1608–1621 in 'Jan Sa tham entstanden ist (*op. recens.*, I, pp. 12 und 14) und von der ein Exemplar in Mungod/Orissa erhalten sein soll (I, p. 9, Anm. 2), hat nun Yoshiro Imaeda den einheimischen *dkar chag*-Band, den ihm Ellis Gene Smith zugänglich

gemacht hatte, im Faksimile veröffentlicht und das Verzeichnis der Tibetischen Titel in Transliteration mitgeteilt. Damit sind wertvolle Materialien, die für die weiteren Kanjur-Forschungen höchst willkommen sind, allgemein verfügbar.

Leider hat Y. Imaeda im Titel seines Buches nicht angegeben, dass die Druckausgabe aus 'Jañ Sa tham üblicherweise, und zwar auch in der tibetischen und mongolischen Tradition, als Lithang-Kanjur bezeichnet wird – wie leicht wäre eine entsprechende Ergänzung des Haupttitels gewesen! Auch ein anderer weit verbreiteter Kanjurdruck ist ja nur unter dem Namen des Klosters bekannt, in dem seine Druckstöcke gelagert wurden, und nicht unter dem des Ortes, an dem die Ausgabe kalligraphiert und geschnitzt worden war: Die Platten des Narthang-Druckes wurden in Šel dkar rdzön angefertigt und nach Abschluss dieser Arbeiten nach Narthang gebracht (Luciano Petech, *China and Tibet in the Early 18th Century*. (T'oung Pao. Monographie. I.). Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1950, pp. 144–145; ebenso: Second, Revised Edition. 1972, pp. 160–161). Der Zeitpunkt, vor dem nach Y. Imaeda der Transport der Drucktafeln von 'Jañ Sa tham nach Lithang erfolgt sein muss, nämlich das Jahr 1698 (*op. recens.*, I, p. 15), kann auf das Jahr 1691 gesetzt werden: Die Biographie des 1. Lcañ skya-Khutukhtu spricht von einem Lithang-Kanjur, der bereits im Jahre 1691 in das Kloster Dgon luñ kam (Klaus Sagaster, *Subud Erike. Ein Rosenkranz aus Perlen*. (Asiatische Forschungen. 20.). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1967, p. 225).

Der erste Band des zur Besprechung vorliegenden Buches beginnt mit einem "Préface" von zwei Seiten Umfang. "En guise d'introduction" (*op. recens.*, I, p. 5) wird Seite 7–23 der wichtige Artikel von Y. Imaeda, "L'édition du Kanjur tibétain de 'Jang sa-tham", der im *Journal Asiatique*, tome CCLXX, numéro 1–2, 1982 (pp. 173–189), erschienen ist, in unveränderter Fassung photomechanisch nachgedruckt; einer der Schreibfehler wird in einem eigenen "Corrigendum" auf Seite 24 berichtet. Dem nichtpaginierten Tafelteil ("Planches") ist ein Verzeichnis der vier Teile des *dkar chag*-Bandes – zwei tibetische und zwei chinesische – vorangestellt; ihre Titel werden in Transliteration bzw. Transkription – bei den chinesischen zusätzlich in Originalschrift – und mit verkürzten französischen Inhaltstiteln ("l'index tibétain", "le colophon tibétain", "le voeu chinois", "la préface chinoise") unter Nennung der Anzahl der Folien (22, 36, 3, 7) angeführt. Vor jedem der vier genannten Teile findet sich zusätzlich ein Blatt, das die gleichen Angaben für die jeweils folgende Faksimilewiedergabe bietet. Die Tafeln, aus denen die Originalgrösse des Blockdruckes nicht zu ersehen ist, sind bis auf einzelne Stellen im tibetischen Text gut lesbar. Gemessen an den Schwierigkeiten der Reproduktion, nämlich dem geringen Kontrast des Originals – roter Druck auf bräunlichem Papier – und dem Umweg über einen Mikrofilm, ist die Wiedergabe gut gelungen.

Der zweite Band ist dem Gedenken an den 200. Geburtstag von Alexander Csoma de Körös gewidmet. Er beginnt mit einem Inhaltsverzeichnis (p. 7) – ein solches fehlt im ersten Bande – und einem "Préface" (pp. 9–16). Den Hauptteil (pp. 17–108) nimmt die nach den Abteilungen des Kanjur gegliederte Transliteration ("Translittération de l'index tibétain (*dkar chag*) collationnée avec l'édition de Pékin") ein, sie verwendet für 620 von insgesamt 1006 Texttiteln eine von E. G. Smith maschinenschriftlich ausgefertigte Transliteration, der Verweise auf den Derge-Druck (p. 16: "collationnée avec l'édition de Derge") beigegeben waren, die aber dann zugunsten der Peking-Katalogzahlen getilgt und nur dort belassen wurden, wo der entsprechende Text im Peking-Kanjur nicht nachgewiesen werden konnte (so nach pp. 9/10). Die Anmerkungen dazu sind am Schluss des Bandes (pp. 109–112) zusammengefasst.

In der Transliteration werden die tantrischen Texte durch Zwischenüberschriften in "Rgyud-'bum", "Rnying-rgyud", "Gzungs-'dus" und "Dri-med-'od" untergliedert. Der tibetische *dkar chag* weist aber nur eine Abteilung *gsaṅ shags rgyud 'bum* (foll. 9b5 bis 21a8) aus, anschließend ist ohne Zwischentitel der Band mit dem Kālacakra-Kommentar *Vimalaprabhā* (*Dri med 'od*) genannt. Zu den beiden Abschnittüberschriften "Rnying-rgyud" (*op. recens.*, II, p. 87) und "Gzungs-'dus" (p. 90) wird ein Verweis auf folgende Anmerkung gegeben: "Dans le texte même du *dkar-chag*, la partie Rgyud n'est pas divisée en sections. Néanmoins pour la clarté de l'exposé et compte tenu de la division en sections dans les autres