Since 1967 the Glasenapp-Stiftung has published the *Kleine Schriften* of Oldenberg, Kielhorn, Jacoby, Thiene, Geiger and Lüders. On the occasion of his seventieth birthday the Glasenapp-Stiftung has brought a very comprehensive selection of Alsdorf’s articles together. The great variety of his scholarly interests is evident from the bibliography which is divided into thirteen sections: A. Veda-Exegese; B. Jainismus; C. Buddhismus; D. Asoka- und andere Inschriften; E. Sonstige Beiträge zur Mittelindischen Philologie; F. Literatur-, Kultur- und Kunstgeschichte; G. Geschichte; H. Einheimische Wissenschaften; I. Neuindoarischen Sprachen; J. Modernes Indien; K. Geschichte der Indologie; L. Reiseberichte; M. Verschiedenes. All articles, listed in sections A, B, C, D, E, F and H, have been reprinted in this volume. The section on the Asokan inscriptions includes also his contribution on the edicts of Dhauli and Jagada which was published in the Abhandlungen of the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz in 1962. Of the many reviews written by Alsdorf, only three have been reprinted in this volume.

As the editor, Albrecht Wezler, remarks in his preface, Alsdorf’s principal publications deal with Middle-Indian languages and literatures. One of his main interests is the ancient narrative literature of the Jains and the Buddhists. He was the first to point out the importance of the Vasudevahāṇī which he considered to be the oldest non-canonical Jain prose work (p. 111). In several publications Alsdorf examined passages of this work which represents the oldest Jain version of the Brhatkathā. In a paper, contributed to the 19th Congress of Orientalists, Alsdorf announced a study of the Brhatkathā problem on the basis of the Vasudevahāṇī together with a translation of selected passages (p. 106). Let us hope that freedom from official duties will make it possible for him to prepare his manuscript for publication. The Vasudevahāṇī bristles with difficulties and no-one is better qualified to deal with them than Alsdorf.

The Vasudevahāṇī is only one of the many texts which have been subjected to a penetrating analysis by Alsdorf. Due to his great knowledge of Prākrit, Pāli and Apabhraṃśa, combined with an almost uncanny ability to discover and to correct metrical irregularities, many textual problems which eluded previous scholars have been brilliantly solved by him. It is only with the publication of this volume that we are able to see how much work has been done by Alsdorf in the field of textual criticism.

The indices, added to this volume, are not very comprehensive. The Index of words occupies only two pages. The index locorum is more detailed (6 pages), but the index of topics and names is also rather meagre (3 pages). For instance, it does not contain a reference to Homer, although Alsdorf in an interesting excursus to his article on the Vidhuraṇaṭīta-jātaka compares the description of the Manohara jewel with Homer’s famous description of the shield of Achilles and raises in this connection the problem of an Indian translation of Homer (pp. 394–396).

The Glasenapp-Stiftung and the Franz Steiner Verlag deserve the gratitude of Indologists for the publication of this beautiful volume which contains a large part of the œuvre of one of the leading Indologists of our times.

*Canberra*  

J. W. DE JONG

---

1 In *IJJ*, XI, p. 35, due to a regrettable oversight Kielhorn is said to have died in 1912 instead of 1908.
Le Šivaïsme kashmirien a atteint son apogée dans l’œuvre d’Abhinavagupta qui vécut du milieu du Xe siècle jusqu’au début du XIe siècle. Poéticien, philosophe et mystique, Abhinavagupta est l’auteur d’un grand nombre d’ouvrages. K. C. Pandey, auteur d’un ouvrage volumineux sur Abhinavagupta¹ et, à sa suite, d’autres savants ont divisé son activité en trois périodes: une période tantrique ou mystique, une période esthétique et une période philosophique. M. Raniero Gnoli, qui publia, il y a déjà presque vingt ans, un livre sur les théories esthétiques d’Abhinavagupta², s’inscrit en faux contre cette tentative qu’il qualifie d’arbitraire. La longue introduction qui précède sa traduction du Tantrālōka fait ressortir clairement l’unité de la pensée d’Abhinavagupta. C’est certes un préjugé occidental que de vouloir séparer chronologiquement des ouvrages qui traitent de sujets différents. En ce qui concerne Abhinavagupta, comme c’est le cas pour presque tous les penseurs indiens, il n’y a pas d’indications qui permettraient d’utiliser ses travaux pour trazer le développement de sa pensée.

Parmi les ouvrages de caractère tantrique ou religieux le plus important est sans doute le Tantrālōka, ouvrage en trente-sept chapitres, qui, accompagné d’un commentaire de Jayaratha, auteur du XIIe siècle, fut publié en douze volumes de 1918 à 1938 dans The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. Comme le relève M. Gnoli, le Tantrālōka n’est pas un ouvrage philosophique mais un manuel de mystique qui s’inspire de la tradition tantrique telle qu’elle est consignée dans des tantras anonymes. Le Tantrālōka est un ouvrage difficile mais M. Gnoli en facilite l’accès par son excellence dans laquelle il esquisse l’histoire du Šivaïsme kashmirien et présente de manière très lucide les idées maîtresses de la pensée d’Abhinavagupta.


³ P. 833: corriger Capitolo X en Capitolo XI.
savant occidental n’a consacré autant d’efforts à la traduction et à l’étude de l’œuvre d’Abhinavagupta. Abhinavagupta se sert d’un vocabulaire qui lui est propre. Au cours de ses travaux M. Gnoli doit sans doute avoir accumulé beaucoup de matériaux à cet égard et il rendrait de grands services aux études indiennes s’il voulait bien un jour compiler un lexique des termes employés par Abhinavagupta dans le Tantrâloka et autres ouvrages.

Quelques petites remarques pour terminer. Dans l’introduction M. Gnoli parle de kāla comme ‘le mesureur’ (il misuratore). Faute d’index il n’est pas possible de savoir si Abhinavagupta a qualifié le temps de mesureur mais dans le premier chapitre du Mālanivijayatantra nous trouvons la stance suivante:

(1.29)  niyātir yojaya trayaṣva kāraṇa pudgala
kālo’pi kalyāyat enaṃ tasyādibhir avasthitāḥ

M. Gnoli traduit: “L’anima (pudgala) est poi dâlī necessitàt ñissata su di una determinata cerchia di azioni. Il tempo, il quale si presenta in forma di tuti [le huitième d’une seconde], etc., infine la limita e misura.” Le pāda kālo’pi kalyāyat enaṃ rappelle une stance célèbre du Mokṣadharmā (Mbh. éd. de Poona, 12.220.35):

kālena tvāhama ayātam kālenāhām jitast tvayā
gantā gatimatām kālaḥ kālaḥ kalyāyati (v.l. kālayati) praṇāḥ


tvām apya evam sudurduḥṣarām jvalantam parayā sriyā
kāle pariṇate kālaḥ kalyāyati (v.l. kalyāyati) mām iva.

Déjà Garbe, dans sa traduction parue en 1905, proposait la même interprétation: “die Zeit unter den treibenden [Kräften].” Il ne semble faire aucun doute qu’il ne faille traduire ce pāda comme l’ont fait Garbe, Dumont et Edgerton.5

L’interprétation de kālayati comme ‘compter’ peut se prêter à l’autorité de Śāmkara et de Nīlakanṭha qui glose kālayatām par gaṇanam kurvatām. Probablement les commentateurs indiens suivent le Dhātupātha qui a enregistré le sens de ‘compter’ pour kalyāṭi: kala gatau saṃkhyāne ca (Dhātupātha, éd. Bōhtlingk X, 319). Néanmoins, ce sens ne semble pas être attesté dans les textes. En tous cas, il semble difficile d’interpréter kālayati dans Mālanivijayatantra I.29 autrement que dans la stance du Mokṣadharmā citée ci-dessus.

5 Il se peut que d’autres traductions, parues avant et après celle de Garbe, donnent la même interprétation. Nous n’avons consulté plus au moins au hasard que quelques traductions seulement de la Bhagavadgītā. La première traduction européenne, celle de Charles Wilkins (London, 1785), suit l’interprétation traditionnelle: “I am kāl (time) amongst computations.”
Ce n'est que très rarement que l'on soit forcé de rejeter une traduction proposée par M. Gnoli. La stance XI.23 du Mālanīvijayatantra décrit comment le maître pose devant le disciple une oblation:

\[
\text{carukam dāpayet pascāth kharjūra dhiphalodbhavam} \\
\text{śaktyālambanām tanum kṛtvā sthāpayed agrataḥ śiśoḥ.}
\]

M. Gnoli traduit: "Il maestro, dopo di ciò, deve far si che egli [i.e. il discipolo] offra (alle dee) il riso sacrale. Fatto quindi coi frutti del kharjūra, etc., un corpo, sostegno della potenza, deve collocarlo di fronte al discepolo." Il est de toute évidence que kharjūradhiphalodbhavam se rapporte à carukam et śaktyālambanām à tanum: "Ensuite, il doit le faire donner une oblation faite des fruits de kharjūra, etc. Il doit la placer devant le discipolo après avoir soutenu son corps par la puissance (de Rudra)."

La traduction du Tantrāloka par M. Gnoli est un ouvrage qui marquera une étape importante dans le domaine des études du Śivaitisme kashmirien. Nous devons lui être reconnaissants de n’avoir épargné aucun effort pour traduire cet ouvrage difficile.

The Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Ludwik Sternbach, Mahā-subhāṣīta-saṃgraha. Volume I: a0 – anve0. [= Vishveshvaranand Indological Series 64]. Hoshiarpur, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1974. cxii + 424 pp. Rs. 100/-.

The first volume of Sternbach’s Mahāsubhāṣītasamgraha contains 1873 subhāṣītas. The entire work will consist of some twenty volumes plus additional volumes. The only comparable work in a Western language is Böhtlingk’s Indische Sprüche, first published from 1863 to 1865. The second edition (1870–1873; reprint 1966) contains 7613 subhāṣītas and 388 in the section corresponding to Sternbach’s first volume. In his introduction (pp. bxv–cxii) Sternbach gives a survey of the subhāṣīta literature in India and in Greater India and points out its importance. In his work Sternbach has included all subhāṣītas found in the Subhāṣītasamgrahas and a selection of subhāṣītas taken from other Sanskrit texts. He has divided the subhāṣītas into three groups: 1. wise sayings; 2. quotations from literary works; 3. subhāṣītas which do not belong to these two groups but which are found in Subhāṣītasamgrahas. The sources are likewise divided into three categories: primary sources, secondary sources and sources from Greater India. Each subhāṣīta has a serial number. The text is followed by an indication of the sources, variant readings and the name of the metre if it is not a śloka or a anuṣṭubh. Sternbach’s original plan did not include an English translation but at the insistence of the publisher translations have been given for each verse. Sternbach has made use of existing translations. Some verses have been translated by himself and the remaining verses were translated by A. A. Ramanathan of the Adyar Library and Research Centre.

The first volume includes a list of abbreviations, an index of authors and sources of subhāṣītas, an index of metres other than ślokas or anuṣṭubh and a subject index. Each volume will contain these four indices and on completion of the entire work a collective subject-index will be published.

The scope of Sternbach’s enterprise is awe-inspiring. One must admire the untiring energy with which he has collected such a great amount of material. Sternbach’s Mahāsubhāṣīta- samgraha will be of fundamental importance for the study of the subhāṣītas. If one compares
his work with that of Böhtlingk, it is obvious that the purposes of the two collections are entirely different. Böhtlingk’s *Indische Sprüche* was a by-product of the Petersburg dictionary. Böhtlingk spared no efforts to establish a correct text and did not hesitate to make conjectures. With regard to the translations he tried to be as faithful as possible to the original text and at the same time to avoid renderings which would be difficult to understand for a reader who does not know Sanskrit. Böhtlingk’s *Indische Sprüche* has rendered very useful services for the Petersburg dictionary, the last four volumes of which quote quite profusely from it.

Sternbach’s main purpose has been to be as comprehensive as possible. According to his preface his edition of the text is critical. However, he has refrained from correcting wrong readings if there was not sufficient source material. In this respect, Sternbach is of course in a much more favourable position than Böhtlingk who had at his disposal far less material. Without conjectures it would in many cases have been impossible for him to produce an acceptable text. When more sources become available it becomes less necessary to take refuge in conjectures. However, even with the much greater amount of material at present available, conjectures can not be completely avoided. Sternbach has not always established a very satisfactory text even when this would have become obvious to him if he had translated himself all the *subhāṣītas* or if he would at least have critically examined the existing translations which he has utilized. *Subhāṣītas* are not always easy to interpret because without a context a verse is more difficult to understand, especially when it is composed in a very ornate and intricate style. Böhtlingk realized the importance of translations and in the second edition he made many corrections, some of which are based upon critical remarks made by other scholars.

The translations contributed by A. A. Ramanathan, are in general pedestrian but correct. The same cannot be said of the translations taken from existing translations. Quite often these translations are based upon a text different from the one edited by Sternbach. Let us quote only a few examples:

No. 408: *vārī bhogaṁante viṣāpaham*. Translation: ‘[water] is like poison when taken after a meal’. This translation is clearly based upon the reading *viṣapradam*.

No. 534: *parāpiḍā ca yā vṛttir*. Translation: ‘a living with too much trouble in it’. The translation here must be based upon the reading *atipiḍā*.

No. 605: *nābhīmanye kathāmcana*. Translation: ‘one should never in arrogance deem oneself superior to another’, which is based upon the reading *nābhīmanyeta kaṁcana*.

No. 1000 *ma tvā kālo ‘tyagād ayam*. Translation: ‘Let not this Death come to you’, based upon the reading *mā tvā kālo ‘bhyagād ayam* (?)

No. 1292: *akṣrcchṛt sukham āṇopīti*. Translation: ‘he will never come into great misery’, implying the reading *na kṛcchṛt maḥad āṇopīti*.

No. 1611: *antakaḥ śamana mṛtyuh*. Translation: ‘Devastating wind, death’. The translation is based upon the reading *antakaḥ (?) pavano mṛtyuh* (cf. *Indische Sprüche* no. 338).

For the verses of the *Mahābhārata* Sternbach usually quotes Roy’s translations, although they are often far from correct. It is instructive to compare the translations of the two following verses by Böhtlingk and by Roy:

```
anubandham ca sampreksya vipākam [Sternbach: vipākāṁś] caiva karmanām / utthānam ātmanas caiva dhīrāh kurvita va na va // (No. 1475)
```

Böhtlingk: ‘Der Kluge erwäge, bevor er Etwas thut oder unterlässt, die Folgen und Früchte der Handlungen, so wie auch die eigene Anstrengung’ (*Indische Sprüche* no. 318). Roy: ‘He that is wise should either do an act or desist from it fully considering his own ability, the nature of the act, and the consequences also of success’.

```
anubandhān apektē [Sternbach: apektē] sānumbhandheṣu karmasu / sampradhārya ca kurvita na vegena samācaret // (No. 1476)
```

Böhtlingk: ‘Aber der kluge Mann entscheidet, ob er etwas tut oder als etwas unterlassen sollte, die Folgen und Früchte der Handlungen, so wie auch die eigene Anstrengung’ (*Indische Sprüche* no. 317). Roy: ‘He that is wise should either do an act or desist from it fully considering his own ability, the nature of the act, and the consequences also of success’.
Böhtlingk: 'Bei Handlungen, die mit Folgen verknüpft sind, berücksichtige man die Folgen, schreite nach reiflicher Erwägung zur That und gehe nicht mit Uebereilung an's Werk' (no. 319).

Roy: 'Before one engageth in an act, one should consider the competence of the agent, the nature of the act itself, and its purpose, for all acts are dependent on these. Considering these one should begin an act, and not take it on a sudden impulse'.

Sternbach's own translations are often far from adequate. For instance in no. 1286 he translates anavasthatitacittānāṁ prasādo'pi bhayamkaraṁ with 'Even the brightness of men who are of unstable character brings danger'. Prasāda means here of course 'favour', cf. Indische Sprüche no. 259: 'Bei Menschen unbeständigen Sinnes bringt sogar ihre Gunst Gefahr'. In no. 1307 Sternbach translates anāgatavighātāram with 'one whom reversal is due to befall in future' although in the preceding verse he correctly renders the same expression with 'one that provides for the future'. In some cases it seems doubtful that Sternbach translates the text edited by him. For instance:

anāyavyayakartā ca anāthah kalahapriyāḥ
āturāḥ sarvabhakṣi ca naraḥ śighram vinaśyati // (No. 1332).

Translation: 'A lavish spender who is quarrelling undistinctly (!), who runs after all kinds of women will soon perish'. Not less surprising is Sternbach's rendering of no. 1348, a variant of no. 1332:

anālokyā vyayam karttā anāthah kalahapriyāh
āturāḥ sarvakṣetresu naraḥ śighram vinaśyati //

Translation: 'The man who is prodigal, who is quarrelling undistinctly who runs after all kinds of women will soon perish'.

In several instances it would have been easy for the editor to establish a correct text if he had taken more trouble to compare text and translation. For instance no. 1318:

anādaraparo vidvān ihamānāḥ sthirāṁ śriyām
agnēḥ śeṣam ṛṇācheṣam śatroḥ śeṣaṁ na śeṣayet //

Translation: 'A wise man who is solicitous about his property, will not suffer to exist any remnant of fire, of debt, or of an enemy' (J. Taylor's translation). The translation is based upon the reading atyādaraparo which is noted by Sternbach in his apparatus and which has been adopted by Böhtlingk (no. 172). It is obvious that anādaraparo is an impossible reading.

In no. 581 Sternbach translates: 'One should abdohn that wife, even if a mother of ten children, . . . who causes scandals, etc.' but the text has: akrośabījaṁ [probably a misprint for ākrośabījaṁ] . . . tyajeta bhāryāṁ dasāputraśūr api, although the apparatus mentions a variant dasāputrasūr api.

A Mahāsubhāṣitasamgraha can only be a work of lasting value if it is compiled with great care. As the above mentioned examples — selected more or less at random — clearly show, both with regard to the establishment of the text and to the translation, this first volume does not come up to the standard which may reasonably be expected from a work of this kind. We can only hope that future volumes will be prepared with more care.

Canberra

J. W. DE JONG

In 1959 Willibald Kirfel (1885–1964) published as volume four of this series a study on the *Symbolik des Hinduismus und des Jainismus* (cf. *T'oung Pao*, 47, 1959, pp. 160–162). According to the general plan of the series each text volume is followed by a volume of illustrations. In his preface Volker Moeller mentions the problem of how far images of deities can be considered as an expression of the divine. Kirfel had not hesitated to give a large place to the Hindu pantheon. With a reference to Gandhi, Moeller defends the inclusion of images in this volume. Moreover, their presence was required in order to illustrate Kirfel’s descriptions of Indian gods.

The value of Kirfel’s work is to some degree diminished by the fact that he did not refrain from putting forward some rather idiosyncratic theories which are far from being generally accepted. Moeller’s work is free from personal bias and constitutes a reliable guide to the symbolism of Hinduism and Jainism. He has taken many illustrations from objects in the Museum für indische Kunst in Berlin. Moeller has clearly tried to avoid reproducing illustrations which are too well known. Each illustration is accompanied by a brief description which provides the necessary information. Particularly welcome are the sketch of the sacrificial ground according to the Śrauta ritual (pl. 2) and the map of the holy places of the Jains (pl. 121) which is followed by a detailed explanation and by a bibliography.

Moeller’s book contains a good bibliography which is much more comprehensive than the one found in Kirfel’s book. As to Bosch’s *De Gouden Kiem* (Amsterdam—Brussel, 1948), no mention is made of the English translation which has been thoroughly revised by the author: *The Golden Germ, An Introduction to Indian Symbolism* (’s-Gravenhage, 1960). A detailed analysis of Bosch’s book has been given by Odette Viennet in a lengthy review: *IIJ*, 5, 1961, pp. 67–78. Moeller has added a detailed index (pp. 157–172) which greatly enhances the usefulness of this publication. Moeller’s book which has been beautifully produced will undoubtedly be greatly appreciated by all those who are interested in Indian religions.

*Canberra*  
J. W. DE JONG


These two commentaries on the Sāṃkhya-kārikā, edited by Dr. Esther Solomon, were mentioned for the first time by Pulînibhāri Chakravarti in the preface to his *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought* (Calcutta, 1952, pp. II–III). The edition of *V*₁ is based upon a complete palm-leaf manuscript in the Jesalmer Grantha Bhaṇḍāra copied in the first half of the twelfth century. According to the editor Māṭhara’s Vṛtti (M) is only a revised and enlarged version of *V*₁. Three appendices list: 1. Passages found in *V*₁, but not in M; 2. Passages found in M but not in *V*₁; 3. Noteworthy differences in expression in *V*₁ and M in certain passages. The purpose of these appendices is to show the conscious improvement in Māṭhara’s Vṛtti as compared to *V*₁. Moreover, the editor has compared in the notes several passages in *V*₁ and M and also in other commentaries. For a discussion of the authorship and the date of *V*₁, the editor refers to her forthcoming study *The Commentaries of the Sāṃkhya Kārikā – A Study*. 
The edition of V₂ is also based upon a palm-leaf manuscript in the Jesalmere Grantha Bhāndāra. It was copied in saṃvatsar 1176 and comprises 89 leaves of which leaves 57, 58, 60–63, 66–74 and 76–79 are missing. According to the editor this commentary is the earliest of the extant commentaries on the Śāṃkhyakārikā and the authors of V₁, Yuktīdīpīkā and Gauḍapādabhāsya, are indebted to it. Moreover, it has the fairest claim to be regarded as the original on which Paramārtha’s version is based. The editor adds that the kārikā text in V₂ seems to be the original one, and the later variants, if any, are at times based upon the expressions in V₂ in the course of the exposition of the kārikā concerned, or are a result of attempts to improve upon the text as found in V₂. Esther Solomon believes that Īśvaraṅgīṇa himself might have been the author of V₂.

The publication of two unknown commentaries on the SK (= Śāṃkhyakārikā) is to be highly welcomed even if the claims made for them by the editor might prove to be incorrect. The first editor of V₂, Naomichi Nakada, drew attention to the fact that both V₂ and the Yuktīdīpīkā mention seven sources of knowledge which are included in āptavacana, whereas the Suvarṇaśaptāti, translated by Paramārtha, mentions only six sources of knowledge. V₂ and the Yuktīdīpīkā add cestā.¹ According to Nakada this seems to indicate that V₂ is later than the Suvarṇaśaptāti. Moreover, Nakada pointed out that parallel passages to V₂ are to be found in the prakṛtīparīkṣā of the Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā. Recently, Nakada published a Japanese translation of the pūrṇapākṣa of the prakṛtīparīkṣā and in the introduction and the notes he points out the correspondences in wording between V₂ and the prakṛtīparīkṣā.² Nakada arrives here at the conclusion that V₂ was probably written shortly before the time of Kamalāśīla, the author of the Pañjikā and pupil of Śaṅtaraṅgīta (according to Nakanura Śaṅtaraṅgīta lived in the period 680–740). It is a pity that Esther Solomon has not been able to consult Nakada’s edition, for although his edition is not based upon a photocopy of the manuscript but upon a transcript, he has carefully studied the commentaries on the SK in order to establish better readings.

The publication of Esther Solomon’s forthcoming Study and Wezler’s announced critical edition of the Yuktīdīpīkā³ will be eagerly awaited. Without doubt, these two works will shed much new light on the mutual relationship between the different commentaries on the SK and on the history of the Śāṃkhyā school.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG


Ces dix dernières années les publications des opera minora des indianistes se sont multipliées. En Allemagne ont paru ceux de Waldschmidt, Oldenberg, Kielhorn, Jacobi, Thieme, Geiger, Lüders

¹ Śāṃkhyavṛttīḥ. Edited by Naomichi Nakada under the guidance of V. V. Gokhale. 9 + 88 + 88 pp. Cyclostyled edition. The introduction is dated 16th December 1965.


et Alsdorf; en Italie, ceux de Tucci. Il faut mentionner aussi le *Choix d'études bouddhiques* par Paul Demiéville bien qu'il soit en premier lieu sinologue. Cette fois-ci la maison Brill publie un choix des articles de M. Jean Filliozat. Le volume contient une bibliographie de ses ouvrages et articles. Les derniers sont groupés dans les catégories suivantes: histoire — épigraphie; histoire des religions; philosophie, psychologie, Yoga; histoire des sciences; histoire de l'astronomie; histoire de la médecine; archéologie; relations extérieures de l'Inde; langues, littératures; textes tamouls, résumés de cours; paléographie — manuscrits; sociologie et ethnologie; histoire des méthodes des études indiennes. Déjà cette énumération montre l'étonnante diversité de l'œuvre de l'auteur. La bibliographie qui occupe quinze pages n'inclut pas les comptes rendus sauf un, celui des travaux de Franklin Edgerton sur le sanskrit bouddhique hybride paru dans le *T'oung Pao* (vol. 43, 1954, pp. 147–171). Toutefois elle n'est pas complète. Par exemple, y font défaut *'Le Kumāratantra de Rāvanya' (JA*, 1935, I, pp. 1–66) et *La civilisation tamoule dans l'Inde du Sud* (*France-Asie*, no. 99, 1954, pp. 5–19).

Le choix a été déterminé par le désir de réunir, parmi les articles les plus importants et les plus originaux, ceux qui étaient devenus d'accès plus difficile. Le livre s'ouvre sur un article intitulé *'La naissance et l'essor de l'Indianisme*. Les articles suivants, au nombre de trente-cinq, se répartissent en cinq catégories: histoire des religions et de la pensée; histoire des sciences; paléographie — bibliographie; études tamoules; relations extérieures de l'Inde. Le choix fait par les membres du comité de rédaction est représentatif de l'œuvre de M. Filliozat et permet de se rendre compte de sa contribution aux études indiennes. Il n'est pas possible d'énumérer tous les titres des articles réunis dans ce volume. Néanmoins, il faut relever le fait que M. Filliozat a contribué à élargir le champ des études indiennes par ses travaux sur les sciences indiennes — sa formation de scientifique lui permet d'en parler avec autorité — et par l'intérêt qu'il porte aux études tamoules et au rôle que la civilisation tamoule a joué dans l'histoire de l'Inde. Ajoutons qu'en sa qualité de directeur de l'Institut français d'indologie de Pondichéry M. Filliozat s'est efforcé avec succès de développer les études indiennes comme en fait preuve la longue série des publications parues à Pondichéry.

Qu'il nous soit permis d'exprimer le vœu que les indianistes français prendront l'initiative de publier les *opera minora* d'autres savants. Dans ce domaine il reste encore beaucoup à faire, car, à part les œuvres de Barth (5 vols., Paris, 1914–1927) et le *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (Paris, 1937), il n'y a rien à signaler. Le *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* est loin d'être complet car, par exemple, les articles, parus dans le *Journal asiatique* et le *Bulletin de l'École d'Extrême-Orient*, ne s'y trouvent pas. En ce qui concerne Senart, Finot, Bloch et Renou, pour ne mentionner que quelques savants éminents, tout reste encore à faire.

*Australian National University*

J. W. DE JONG


L'étude de M. Meisezahl donne beaucoup plus qu'une critique textuelle du Śmaśānavidhi, car c'est une contribution importante à l'étude de la littérature et de l'iconographie des huit cimetières. En 1934 Finot avait édité et traduit un petit traité, intitulé Śmaśānavidhi, en 29 stances. Grâce à la découverte d'une version tibétaine des stances 4–28 (p. 10, 1.4 corriger 38 en 28) dans un commentaire de l'ouvrage de Lūyīpa par Tathāgatavajra (Tanjour de Pékin,

Dans la stanzë 21 le texte sanskrit et la version tibétaine ne se recouvrent pas:

ghanāc ca jayabhadrākhyāḥ śrīnandao vṛṣṭispriyāḥ
drutaghosopī caṇḍaḥ sāyāḥ varṣaḥ purāṇacāpalau

La traduction tibétaine a:

sprin-rman srgyal-bzan dpal-stugs dān / de-bzin char dān śin-tu mthug /
myur-du-dbyans-ladan gtum-pa dān / char-pa rni-pa tsa bkrol-lo.

M. Meisezahl note que P. a stug pour stugs et mkrol pour bkrol (Co-ne Tanjour: bkrol’?)

D’après le texte sanskrit les noms des nuages sont Jayabhadra, Śrīnanda, Vṛṣṭispriyā, Drutaghosa, Caṇḍa, Varṣa, Purāṇa et Cāpalā. La version tibétaine est rendue par M. Meisezahl de la façon suivante:

Die Wolken rGyal bzaṅ (Jayabhadra), dPal stugs (Śrīghana), dBe bzin char (Vṛṣṭispriyā), Śin tu mthug (Ghana’), Myur du dbyars Isdang (Drutaghosa), gTum pa (Caṇḍa), Char pa (Varṣa) und rNiṅ-pa (Purāṇa) haben sich (vom Wolkenmeer) gelöst.


2 M. Meisezahl transcrit le tibétain d’après le système Pelliot.
3 D’après l’édition de Finot le MS. a -sastamah et non -sasthamah comme dit M. Meisezahl dans note 71.
interprète comme le parfait de *grol-ba* ‘sich lösen, befreien’ il faut corriger *tsa-bkrol* en *tsab-hraII* qui traduit sanskrit *cañcala, cāpalya et capala*. Enfin, dans le texte sanskrit, je propose de lire *jayabhadrākhyāh* pour *jayabhadrākhyāh*.


*The Australian National University*  
J. W. DE JONG

Karuneshā Shukla (ed.), *Śrāvakabhbūmi of Ācārya Aśaṅga [= Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series*  

In 1961 Alex Wayman published an *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhbūmi Manuscript* in which he edited and translated many passages of the text. The first three chapters of Wayman’s work deal

---

(= Ch. XVII, 43).

⁵ Gli otto cimiteri nella letteratura liturgica.
with paleography, literary history and the language of the Śrāvakabhūmi manuscript. Karunesh Shukla’s edition contains the text of the Śrāvakabhūmi and a long introduction. According to the editor a second volume will contain four appendices: 1. The lost portions of the text reconstructed from the Tibetan version; 2. A list of verses occurring in the text; 3. The text of Asanga’s views on Hetuvidyā from the Cintamayībhūmi; 4. The text of the various gāthāvavasthānas.

Shukla’s edition is based on a unique manuscript and it is of course not possible to know how far the editor has correctly reproduced the readings of his manuscript. A request for photocopies of the manuscript (letter 15 May 1974) remained unanswered. However, it is possible to compare some passages, edited by Wayman, with the corresponding passages of Shukla’s edition. Both Wayman and Shukla have pointed out that the photocopies of the manuscript are often difficult to read. Wayman has carefully compared the Tibetan translation which assisted him greatly in deciphering the readings of the manuscript. In his preface Shukla remarks that there are three translations of the Śrāvakabhūmi into Tibetan. Shukla adds that “Prof. V. Bhattacharyya informs us that Jinamitra also translated the work into Tibetan. We had, however, an access only to the portions of the version as preserved in the Tibetan Tripūṭaka (Tanjour, Vol. 110) through secondary sources”. (p. xxii). It is obvious from the above remarks that the editor himself has not been able to use the Tibetan translation (not to mention the four translations invented by him!). In his foreword he expresses his thanks to Shri L. Jampal for his help in reading the Tibetan version. Shri L. Jampal’s help seems to have been of little avail to the editor as will be shown below on the basis of some selected passages.

On the first page of his book Wayman quoted Johnston’s words: “No Buddhist text in Sanskrit can be satisfactorily edited without detailed comparison with such Chinese and Tibetan versions as exist”. Scholars such as Vidiṣṭhikara Bhattacharya have been fully aware of the importance of the Tibetan versions of Buddhist texts and Bhattacharya’s edition of the first five bhūmis of the Bahubhūmikavastu of the Yogācārabhūmi is based upon a careful comparison of the manuscript with the Tibetan version. Bhattacharya had an excellent knowledge of Tibetan and he was not obliged to rely on the help of a Tibetan scholar. It is a great pity that his example seems to have had little impact in India.

In discussing a few passages of the text of the Śrāvakabhūmi the following abbreviations have been used: T. = Tibetan translation (Peking edition, Mdo’-gre, vol. L); C. = Chinese translation (references are given to page, column and line of the Taishō edition, vol. 30, No. 1579, pp. 395–477); W. = Wayman’s Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript; S. = Shukla’s edition.

S. p. 918–19: teṣām samvarāya pratiparyate [\]/ sa śrotreṇa sābdām (bdān); W. p. 61: teṣām samvarāya pratiparyate rakṣati mana-indriyam sa śrotreṇa sābdān. The words rakṣati mana-indriyam, which are found in Wayman’s edition, are absent from Shukla’s edition. From the Tibetan translation it is clear that the text of the manuscript is corrupt. T. 6a5–6: de-dag bsdam-par bya-ba’i phyir sgrub-par byed-cin / mig-gi dbaḥ-po yaḥ sruñ-bar byed-la / mig-gi dbaḥ-pos kyaṅ sdom-pa sgrub-par byed-pa daṅ / de rna-bas sgra-dag = teṣām samvarāya pratiparyate / rakṣati caksurindriyam / caksurindriyena samvaram āpadyate / sa śrotreṇa sābdān. C. (397a23–25) agrees with T. The corruption of the manuscript is probably due to the fact that the scribe read the words rakṣati mana-indriyam in the following line of the manuscript (cf. S. p. 10.2), substituted them for rakṣati caksurindriyam and then omitted the words caksurindriyena samvaram āpadyate. Of course, this conclusion can be substantiated only if the manuscript does, in fact, contain the words rakṣati mana-indriyam as indicated by Wayman. Neither Wayman nor Shukla have indicated here any disagreement of the text of the manuscript with either the Tibetan or the Chinese version.

katamah / [In the following, I have had to correct the partially illegible manuscript and fill it in by means of the later extended treatment of the same subject.] [sa(s) . . . ] dīvā caikrama-nisadāyabhām āvakaraṇīyehyāḥ dharmeṣvāhās cīttaṃ pariśodhayati / rātrāḥ prathame yāme caikrama-nisadāyabhām āvakaraṇīyehyāḥ dharmeṣvāhās cīttaṃ pariśodhayati / pariśodhya tato vihārān nirgamya bahir vihārasya pādāu prakṣaṇyā vihārām praviśya dāśīnena pārśvena sāyāṃ kalpayati / pāde pādām ādāhāyālokaśamāṇī. I have quoted a large part of this passage because it shows clearly the importance of a comparison of the manuscript with the Tibetan translation. Shukla remarks: "MS. leaf blurred with ink, photo indistinct and illegible, construed from the text that follows (sic)". T. 6b3-5: nam-gyi cha-stod daṅ nam-gyi cha-smad-la mi-nal-bar sbyor-ba'i rjes-su brtson-pa 'id gah-ze-na / de-ltar zas-kyi tshod rig-par gyur-pa de 'nn-mo 'chag-pa daṅ 'dug-pa dag-gis sgrīb-par 'gyur-ba'i chos-rnams las sems yoins-su sbyon-bar byed-cin mtshan-mo'i thun daṅ-po la yaṅ 'chag-pa daṅ 'dug-pa dag-gis sgrīb-par 'gyur-ba'i chos-rnams las sems yoins-su sbyon-bar byed-la / yoins-su sbyaṅs-nas de'i-og-tu gtsug-lag-khaṅ gi phyir-byuḥ-ste gtsug-lag-khaṅ-gi phyir-rol-tu rkaṅ-pa bktus-nas gtsug-lag-khaṅ-gi naṅ-du žugs-te / glo g.yas-phab-nas rkaṅ-pa rkaṅ-pa'i stei-du gāg-ste / snan-ba'i 'du-ses. Wayman's edition agrees completely with the Tibetan beginning: pūrvaratrāparātrām jāgarikānyuktātā katamā / sa tathā bhojanē mātraṇīho dīvā caikrama-nisadāyabhām . . . Shukla's edition, however, differs greatly. Shukla points out in his notes that after [cīttaṃ pariśodhayati Wayman reads: rātrāḥ prathame yāme caikrama-nisadāyabhāyām āvakaraṇīyehyāḥ dharmeṣvāhās cīttaṃ pariśodhayati / pariśodhya tato vihārān nirgamya. He also points out that after pādau prakṣaṇyā Wayman adds: vihārāṃ praviśya and that Wayman omits simha in simhasāyāyam. Shukla omits to mention that Wayman adds after sāyāṃ kalpayati the words pāde pādām ādāhāya. Shukla seems to have been guided in his readings by a parallel passage from the Vībhanga quoted by him.1 This passage contains the expression sīhaśeṣayam. However, it contains also several expressions not found in Shukla's edition: rattiyaḥ pathamaṃ yāmaṃ; pādeṇa pādām accādāhāya. C. agrees with T. and W. but omits the words vihārāṃ praviśya (397b12). It would be important to know whether or not these words are found in the Sanskrit manuscript.


S. p. 35.8—10: sa tathādārśi tadbhavulihārī satkāyavairāgyam anuprāṇottati / prathamaṇca dhyāṇam samāpadyate / evam sarvadhyānād ērdhvam. W. pp. 66—67: sa tathā-dārśi tadbhulavihārī samāno [MS.: satkāmah] vairāgyam anuprāṇottati / prathamaṁ ca dhyānam samāpadyate / evam prathamadhyānād ērdhvam. T. 17b7—8: de de-ltar ita-zin de-la lan maṅ-du gna-pa na 'dod-pa la 'dod-chags daṅ bral-ba thob-cin / bsam-gtan daṅ-po la yaṅ sions-par 'jug-par 'gyur-ro / de-brzin-du bsam-gtan daṅ-po'i goṅ-ma dag-nas. Wayman corrects satkāmavairāgyam to samāno vairāgyam. It seems more likely that the original reading is: san kāmavairāgyam. The only difference between C. and T. is that C. has kāmaddhātuvaśvāraṁ for kāmavairāgyam (401c21). However, neither in T. nor in C. is there the slightest reference to satkāyavairāgyam. It is also difficult to imagine that the manuscript read sarvadhyānād for prathamadhyānād.

It is undoubtedly superfluous to examine any other passages. The differences between the readings given by Wayman and Shukla are so considerable that it seems as if they had consulted two different manuscriptsinstead of one and the same. It is, of course, theoretically possible that in each case Shukla's readings are based on the manuscript and those given by Wayman, on the Tibetan translation. Granted this most unlikely supposition, one would be obliged to conclude that Shukla was not aware of the fact that his manuscript contained some very

1 Shukla refers to Vbh. pp. 299—300. The passage, referred to by Shukla, occurs in the edition of the Pāli Text Society on p. 249.22—32. One wonders whether Shukla quotes correctly from the edition used by him. For example, the P.T.S. edition has: uṭṭhānasahaṁ manasikarītvā but Shukla quotes: uṭṭhānasa manasikarītvā.
incorrect readings which ought to have been checked against the Tibetan translation. However, I have not the slightest doubt that wherever Wayman’s readings agree with the Tibetan version the manuscript has been correctly deciphered by him. The conclusion forces itself upon the reader that Shukla’s edition is without any value for the following reasons: 1) It does not adequately reproduce the readings of his manuscript. 2) It is not based on a systematic and careful comparison with the Tibetan version.

For the edition of a Sanskrit Buddhist text the Tibetan version is of the greatest importance. This is a fact well-known to every serious student of Buddhism. However, Chinese versions cannot be entirely overlooked, even if, in general, they are much less literal. Hsüan-tsang, the translator of the Sravakabhiṃ, had an excellent knowledge of Sanskrit and his interpretation, even if it does not adhere literally to the original text, can be quite helpful in understanding a difficult passage. An interesting example is to be found on p. 144.1–5 of Wayman’s book where we read: vṛg-māṃsā-ṣoṇitam asmaṃkam anuprayacchanti / yad utānu-kampās upādāya viśesaphalārthiṇaḥ tasyāṃṣakam tathā pratilabdhyasa pinda-pātasyāya evamṛūpa ta rūpaḥ paribhogah syād yad aham tathā paribhūtām ātmānām / sthāpayitvā paribhūmayya yathā teṣām kāraḥ kṛtā . . . Wayman italicizes the words ayaṃ evamṛūpa . . . paribhūmayya and adds in a note that this phrase is an intrusion. Wayman finds this phrase further on in the Tibetan version: de-ltar dbag-ṅid bzag-ste / yoins-su lois-spyod-par byed-na / de-ltar yoins-su lois-spyod-par byed-pa de ni / dbag-gl tshul dali mthun-pa yin-te. However, Wayman’s hypothesis is proved wrong by the Chinese version which contains a passage corresponding to the phrase italicized by Wayman: (409a25–27) “After having obtained this food I must enjoy it in the following way (by making use of) an expedient (upāya). I must put myself in the proper way, enjoy it not wrongly and recompense the kindness of the giver so that he reaps a very excellent and great fruit . . . .” The Tibetan version agrees both with the Sanskrit text and the Chinese version but the Tibetan translator has put the phrase, mentioned above, at the very end of the entire passage (Wayman’s edition p. 144.5–20 = T. 39a3–39b3). For utānu-kampās read utānu-kampān, for ta rūpaḥ read ‘mūrīpaḥ (cf. Shukla p. 82.14 and 16), for paribhūtāṃ paribhūñjānām, and add a daṇḍa after viśesaphalārthiṇaḥ.

A photocopy of the manuscript is available in Göttingen and we can only hope that a German scholar will prepare a proper edition of this important text.

The Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG


The first two parts of Shafer’s Introduction to Sino-Tibetan were published in 1966 and 1967 (see IJJ, XI, 1969, pp. 310–311). Parts three and four were published in 1968 and 1970. With the publication of part five the work is now completed. It contains a table of contents and reproduces on pp. IX–XVI a preface, a list of abbreviations, a list of symbols and a rough sketch of Sino-Tibetan, all of which had already been published in part one, pp. I–VII. Part five contains moreover a foreword by Helmut Hoffmann who has seen Shafer’s work through the press beginning with the second half of the second part. This must not have been an easy task due to the ‘extraordinarily desolate state of the original manuscript’ mentioned by Hoffmann. A severe accident made it impossible for Hoffmann to see part five through the press. This has been done by Kamil Sedláček. The author, who died in 1969, was not to see the completion of his work, but he would certainly have been highly satisfied with the care bestowed upon his work by Hoffmann and Sedláček.
According to Sedláček, Shafer's Introduction will be for many years to come a reliable guide to all scholars in Sino-Tibetan linguistic studies. I am afraid that it is difficult to concur in this evaluation of Shafer's work. Shafer was a pioneer in a difficult field but, regrettably, he was insufficiently aware of the dangers which beset his path. Roy Andrew Miller has subjected the first two parts of this Introduction to a penetrating analysis (cf. Monmenta Serica, 27, 1968, pp. 398–435). Any user of Shafer's Introduction would be well advised to study carefully Miller's article which clearly exposes the weak points of Shafer's work.

Canberra

J. W. DE JONG


In 1966 Takasaki published a translation of the Ratnagotravibhāga together with a lengthy Introduction: A Study of the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uitaratantra). In a review we expressed the wish that Takasaki would undertake a systematic treatment of the tathāgatagarbha theory and its history (IIJ, XI, p. 39). His voluminous book is not a complete history of the tathāgatagarbha theory in India. According to the English subtitle it is a study on the historical background of the tathāgatagarbha theory based upon the scriptures preceding the Ratnagotravibhāga.

Takasaki's book contains a detailed table of contents, an English translation of which is given on pp. 3–7. Moreover, the author has added a summary in English (pp. 9–14) which will be very helpful for Western readers. The same section of the book contains five indices: I. Sino-Japanese (pp. 16–41); II. Sanskrit-Pāli (pp. 42–58); III. Tibetan (pp. 59–69); IV. Texts quoted (pp. 70–72); V. Names of scholars quoted (pp. 73–74). The bibliography is divided into a Japanese section (pp. 76–97) and a Western section (pp. 98–106). In the preface the author lists his own contributions to the study of the tathāgatagarbha theory: A Study of the Ratnagotravibhāga (Roma, 1966) and twenty-seven articles published during a period of twenty years (1953–1972).

Takasaki's book is based upon a careful study of Sanskrit, Pāli, Chinese and Tibetan sources. As is obvious from the extensive bibliography, the number of scholarly publications in Western languages and in Japanese consulted by the author is very considerable. Within the limited scope of a review it is clearly impossible to examine all the problems discussed by the author. We can only attempt to indicate the way in which the author has undertaken his task.

In his introduction Takasaki points out that in the past Japanese studies of the tathāgatagarbha theory were not based on the Ratnagotravibhāga, although this text was known in Chinese translation, but on such texts as the Fo-hsing lun (T. no. 1610), attributed to Vasubandhu and translated by Paramārtha, and the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun (T. nos. 1666–1667), attributed to Āśvaghoṣa and translated by Paramārtha and Śīkṣānanda. Already sixty years ago Mochizuki Shinkō had tried to show that the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun was not translated from an Indian text but had been compiled in China. Mochizuki's thesis has given rise to a heated controversy among Japanese scholars. In an article, published in 1929, Demiéville defended the authenticity of the text but in a note, added to a reprint of this article, he states without any hesitation that the text has been composed in China.1 Demiéville lists the

Japanese studies on this problem published before 1929. Japanese scholars have continued the
discussion without coming to any agreement.\(^2\) In a note Takasaki raises doubts about the Indian
origin of the text but adds that the apocryphal nature of the text has still to be proved (p. 774,
n. 4). As to the Fo-hsing lun Hattori Masaaki has demonstrated that it was compiled by
Paramārtha on the basis of the Ratnagotraṭībhaṭa and the Yogācārabhūmi.\(^3\) In India and Tibet
the Madhyamika and the Yogācāra are considered the only Mahāyāna schools. Fa-tsang (643–
711), the third patriarch of the Hu-yen school, recognized a third Mahāyāna school:
the ju-lai-tsang yūan-ch'i tsung ‘the school of dependent origination based on the
tathāgatagarbha’ but Fa-tsang’s concept of this school is based upon texts such as the
Lānkāvatārasūtra and the Ta-ch'eng chi'i-hsin lun which combine the garbhā theory with the
Vijñānavāda theory of the ālayavijñāna. It is therefore not surprising that Japanese scholars,
who follow the Sino-Japanese tradition and the traditional exegesis of the Sino-Japanese schools,
were not able to form an adequate picture of the garbha theory as it existed in India.

Obermiller’s translation of the Ratnagotraṭībhaṭa from the Tibetan (Acta Orientalia, IX,
1931, pp. 81–306) stimulated new studies on the garbha theory in Japan. Uí reexamined the
Chinese materials and Tsukinowa Kenryū (1888–1969) compared Chinese and Tibetah texts.\(^4\)
It also became more and more apparent that Paramārtha (500–569) had played an important
role in introducing the garbha theory in China. Paramārtha combined the garbha theory with
Vijñānavāda doctrines and composed texts (Anuttarārayasūtra and the Fo-hsing lun) with
the intention of giving authority to his theories. Moreover, he incorporated the garbha in his
translation of Vasubandhu’s Mahāyānasamgrahabhāṣya. Takasaki explains that Paramārtha by
making use of the name of Vasubandhu, author of the Mahāyānasamgrahabhāṣya and alleged
author of the Fo-hsing lun, has deluded contemporary scholars.

The publication of the Sanskrit text of the Ratnagotraṭībhaṭa in 1950 gave increased impetus
to the study of the garbha theory. In Japan Nakamura Zuiryū published in 1961 a synoptic
edition of the Sanskrit text and the Chinese translation and in 1967 an edition of the Tibetan
text together with a Japanese translation, a Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese index and a Tibetan-
Sanskrit index. Uí’s study and translation of the Ratnagotraṭībhaṭa appeared in 1959 and
Takasaki’s English translation in 1966. Sanskrit and Tibetan materials have been studied in
Recently Lambert Schmithausen has published two important articles on the text of the
Ratnagotraṭībhaṭa and Takasaki’s translation and on Ruegg’s book.\(^5\) Numerous articles have
been written in Japanese by Japanese scholars in recent years (cf. Takasaki’s bibliography).

Takasaki defines the tathāgatagarbha theory as the theory which is propounded by the
Ratnagotraṭībhaṭa. In the first place it is necessary to understand the structure of the

\(^2\) Takasaki points out that Uí Hakujū has defended the authenticity of the text. In an article
in a recently published bibliographical dictionary Tamaki Koshirō says that the authenticity is *
defended by Tokiwa Dajō, Sakaino Kōyō, Hatani Ryōta, Matsumoto Bunzaburō and Hayashiya
Tomojirō. As only supporter of Mochizuki’s thesis, he mentions Murakami Senshō (Shin Butten
kaidai jiten, Tōkyō, 1966, p. 158a). For a recent bibliography of the Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun
(editions and studies) see Kashiiwagi Hiroo’s bibliographical appendix to Hirakawa Akira’s

de Sinologie, 2, 1956, no. 584). Cf. also Takasaki’s article in the volume in honour of Yūki


\(^5\) ‘Philologische Bemerkungen zum Ratnagotraṭībhaṭa’, WZKSA 15 (1971), 123–177; ‘Zu
D. Seyfort Ruegg’s Buch “La Théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra” (Besprechungsaufsatz)
WZKSA 18 (1973), 123–160.
Ratnagotravibhāga and the essence of its doctrine. Takasaki explains that the tathāgatagarbha theory is based upon the doctrines of several sūtras just as the Mādhyamika doctrine is based on the Prajñāpāramitāsūtras, the Yogācāra doctrine on the Samādhinirūpamānasūtra and other texts. The germ of the tathāgatagarbha doctrine can be seen in the concept of the original luminosity of the mind.

In China and Japan the most common synonym of tathāgatagarbha is the ‘Buddha-nature’ (fo-hsing; Jap. bussho). The Sanskrit terms which correspond to fo-hsing are according to the Ratnagotravibhāga buddhadhātu and buddhagotra. The first term is of special importance because it is used in the Mahāparinirvānasūtra. Nevertheless, the author prefers the term tathāgatagarbha because it is found in the colophon of the Mahāparinirvānasūtra (kevala-tathāgatagarbhanirdeśasūtra) and because the Laṅkāvatārasūtra uses the term tathāgatagarbhaurvāda. Moreover, the term buddhadhātu is not found in either the Śrīmālāsūtra or the Laṅkāvatārasūtra. Finally, the Tathāgatagarbhasūtra is one of the most important sources for the tathāgatagarbha doctrine in the Mahāparinirvānasūtra and the Ratnagotravibhāga. The fundamental idea of the Tathāgatagarbhasūtra is expressed in the formula: sarvasattvān tathāgatagarbhāḥ which Takasaki translates “all beings possess the tathāgatagarbha”.

Takasaki formulates as working hypotheses: 1. The tathāgatagarbha theory has been systematized in the Ratnagotravibhāga. 2. The tathāgatagarbha theory teaches that in all beings the tathāgatagarbha, i.e. the cause of potential Buddhahood is present. 3. It is necessary to trace the formation of this theory and of this theory only. 4. In Mahāyāna Buddhism the possibility for the beings to become Buddha is widely recognized but the tathāgatagarbha theory has arisen in opposition to the Śūnyavāda.

The method adopted by the author consists of three parts: 1. Examination of the texts (sūtras and sāstras) which are quoted in the Ratnagotravibhāga and which teach the tathāgatagarbha doctrine. Study of their doctrinal content, the place of the tathāgatagarbha theory in them and their relation to other texts. 2. Examination of texts which are not quoted in the Ratnagotravibhāga but which proclaim the tathāgatagarbha theory. In the case of these texts it is necessary to investigate whether they are earlier or later than the Ratnagotravibhāga. 3. Examination of texts, quoted or not in the Ratnagotravibhāga and which do not make use of the term tathāgatagarbha but which have nevertheless fulfilled an important function with regard to the formation of the tathāgatagarbha theory.

The first part of the book dealing with the formation of the tathāgatagarbha theory examines the texts in groups one and two. The study of the texts in the third group forms the second part dealing with the pre-history of the tathāgatagarbha theory. The first part is divided into four chapters. Chapter one deals with the three scriptures which are of fundamental importance for the formation of the tathāgatagarbha theory: the Tathāgatagarbhasūtra, the Anuñatvāpāurnatvanirdeśa and the Śrīmālāsūtra. The second chapter studies the Mahāparinirvānasūtra and related texts which use both the terms buddhadhātu and tathāgatagarbha. Chapter three is devoted to a study of the gotra theory in the Mahāmeghasūtra and the Mahāyāna-dasaśādharakā. Chapter four deals briefly with the identification of the tathāgatagarbha with the ālayavijñāna. However, Takasaki points out that this topic does not belong to the first period in the history of the tathāgatagarbha theory from the beginning up to and including the Ratnagotravibhāga but to the second period which will be studied by the author in a forthcoming publication. The two appendices to this chapter deal with the chapter on the three kāyas in the Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra, and with the relation between the Śrīmālāsūtra and the Vijñānavāda.

Seyfort Ruegg has pointed out that in the texts the compound tathāgatagarbha is understood mostly as a tatpurusa but sometimes also as a bahuvrīhi (op. cit., pp. 507–513). Takasaki remarks that in the Ratnagotravibhāga it is analysed as (1) a tatpurusa (tathāgatasye me garbhāḥ sarvasattvāḥ), (2) a karmadhāraya (tathāgatas tathataśaṃ garbhaḥ sarvasattvānāṃ) and as (3) a bahuvrīhi (tathāgatadhātur eṣāṃ garbhaḥ sarvasattvānāṃ), cf. p. 21. Seyfort Ruegg considers rightly (2) as a bahuvrīhi.
The second part of the book deals with the pre-history of the tathāgatagarbha theory and investigates a great number of Mahāyānasūtras which contain concepts which are of essential importance for the formation of the tathāgatagarbha theory, such as gotra, dhātu and citta-prakṛti or concepts related to it such as dharmakāya, dharmatā, tathatā, tathāgata, ekayāna, etc. Among the sūtras studied are the Prajñāpāramitāsūtras, the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, the Kāśyapaparivarta, the Vimalakirtinirdesāsūtra, the Śūramgamasaṃadhisūtra, texts belonging to the Buddhāvatamsaka, the Jñānālokālaṃkārasūtra, the Dhāraṇīsvararājasūtra and texts belonging to the Mahāsambhūtasūtra.

A concluding chapter deals with three topics: 1. The history of the Chinese translations of texts relating to the tathāgatagarbha theory. The author distinguishes three periods: 1. The stage of the sūtras translated by Buddhhabhadra, Guṇabhadra and Dharmakṣema. 2. The stage of the sāstras translated by Bodhiruci, Ratnamati, Paramārtha, Hsian-tsang and I-tsing. 3. The stage of the tantric texts beginning immediately after Hsian-tsang. The first stage is the period of the formation of the sūtras which expound the tathāgatagarbha theory. The second is the period of the sāstras which combine the tathāgatagarbha with the ālayaviśṇa. The third is the period in which the tathāgatagarbha theory is combined with tantric ideas. The translations belonging to these three stages were made in 1. the fifth century; 2. the sixth and the first half of the seventh century; 3. from the middle of the seventh century onward. Takasaki adds that the original Indian texts were composed roughly a century earlier but that some texts must have been translated almost immediately after they had been composed. A table clearly illustrates the history of the Chinese translations. A second table illustrates the development of the basic concepts connected with the tathāgatagarbha theory: 1. gotra (vamsa, kula, buddhaputra, etc.); 2. citta (cittaprakṛtiprabhāsvaratā); 3. tathāgatagarbha; 4. dhātu (sattvadhātu, buddha – and dharma); 5. dharmakāya (tathāgata and dharmakāya); 6. other items (guhya, samdhīvacana, uttaratana). The historical development of these concepts with the exception of the tathāgatagarbha itself is briefly outlined by the author (pp. 751–771). The same section contains also a table illustrating the relations between the sūtras and sāstras which propound the tathāgatagarbha theory or which have fulfilled an important function in its formation (p. 769). The final section of this chapter is entitled “Remaining problems”. Takasaki points out that his book deals mainly with the first period in the history of the tathāgatagarbha theory which concludes with the composition of the Ratnagotrabhīṣa in the beginning of the fifth century. The next task which lies ahead is the history of the tathāgatagarbha theory in the second period in which the tathāgatagarbha doctrine is combined with Vījnānavāda doctrines. The author remarks that this second period is important not only in itself, but also because it has exercised its influence in four directions. 1. The tathāgatagarbha theory was completely absorbed by the Vījnānavāda and the existence of the Ratnagotrabhīṣa was almost entirely forgotten. After this period which is dominated by disputes between the Mādhyamika and Yogācāra schools, the tradition of the Ratnagotrabhīṣa was revived and both the AbhisamālāLKāra and the Ratnagotrabhīṣa are numbered among the five texts of Maitreyya. II. The revival of the Ratnagotrabhīṣa and the formation of a group of five texts attributed to Maitreyya must have taken place in recent times because both phenomena are unknown in China. However, they are of the greatest importance for the history of the exegesis of the tathāgatagarbha theory in Tibet. III. In China the idea that “All beings possess the Budhha-nature” has had an enormous influence since the beginning of the fifth century at which time two recensions of the Mahāparinirvānasūtra were translated by Fa-hsien (T. no. 376) and by Dharmakṣema (T. no. 374). A striking feature of the history of the tathāgatagarbha theory in China is the popularity of texts the Indian origin of which is doubtful: the second part of Dharmakṣema’s translation of the Mahāparinirvānasūtra, the Fo-hsing lun, the Ta-ch’eng chi-i-hsin lun and the Vajrasamādhisūtra. IV. The tathāgatagarbha theory is mentioned in tantric texts such as the

Prajñāpāramitānayaśatapāścaśatiśa. Takasaki points out that this theory has also influenced tantric theories in many respects as can be shown by tracing the history of the idea of the bodhicitta.

We hope that we have been able to give at least an idea of the scope of Takasaki’s magnum opus. His main purpose has been to trace the formation of the tathāgatagarbha theory and its prehistory. According to Takasaki the first period in the history of this theory ends with its definite formulation in the Ratnagotravibhāga in the beginning of the fifth century. Takasaki’s book has given the tathāgatagarbhaṇa its proper place as the third Mahāyāna school. However, its importance is not limited to the early history of the tathāgatagarbha theory in India. This theory is so closely interrelated with the philosophical ideas expressed in many Mahāyānasūtras that it is no exaggeration to say that Takasaki’s book is at the same time of fundamental importance for the history of Mahāyāna philosophy in general.

Canberra

J. W. DE JONG

Hoffmann’s book consists of three parts: Symbolik des Lamaismus, Symbolik der Bon-Religion and Symbolik des Schamanismus. The first two are intended by the author as a supplement to his book Religionen Tibets, Freiburg 1956 (cf. CAJ 3 (1957) 79–80), in which the Tibetan religions are studied in their historical development. The chapter on the Symbolik des Lamaismus is subdivided into six parts: Einleitung, Buddhismus und Bodhisattvas, die Götter, Makrokosmos und Mikrokosmos, Die Mysterienspiele, Kultsymbole und Kultzubehör. In discussing the symbolism of Lamaism it is difficult to separate those elements which are specific to Lamaism from those which it shares in common with the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. Hoffmann refers several times to Kiefel’s Symbolik des Buddhismus which appeared in the same series (Band V, 1959). He does not always share his opinions, especially with regard to Iranian influences. According to Hoffmann, the Buddha of the Western Paradise, Amitābha-Amitāyus, has been created on the model of the Zoroastrian god of time, Zurvan. He also sees close relations between the Hellenistic concept of the Soter and the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. The problem of Western influences on the Indian Amitābha literature has recently been examined in great detail by Fujita Kōatsu, who is inclined to deny any external influence. Further studies, especially of the early Mahāyāna literature, are required in order to bring more light into this matter, but it will perhaps always remain impossible to decide one way or the other, in that it is much more difficult to prove influences, than to demonstrate their probability and possibility. The same applies to the problem of Western influences on the systematized Bon religion as it is called by Hoffmann. Here again such a possibility cannot be excluded, but much more research will have to be carried out. The study of the Bon religion, both in its pre-Buddhist form and in its later systematized form, is still in its infancy. In recent years the Tun-huang documents have furnished important information, but the language of these texts is still insufficiently understood and it is not yet possible to translate and explain them with confidence.

Hoffmann has made good use of the original sources and is fully acquainted with the literature on his topic. His chapters on the symbolism of Lamaism and the Bon religion contain

8 For references to the different versions see Takasaki, p. 774, n. 5.
a wealth of information. Three detailed indices (general; Sanskrit; Tibetan) make it possible for the reader to easily find his way in Hoffmann’s book. Very useful also is the bibliography on Tibetan religions which lists publications in Western languages.

The chapter on Shamanism (pp. 100–140) deals not only with symbolism, but with shamanism in general. In the first section Hoffmann examines recent studies on shamanism (Schmidt, Eliade, Schröder, Findeisen, Vajda, Jensen, Lommel) in which the concept of shamanism is defined in different ways. According to Hoffmann, shamanism has developed in archaic hunting communities. The shaman acts for the benefit of the community. He enters into a trance and, assisted by theriomorphic spirits, he journeys to other worlds. The remaining sections of this chapter are devoted to a description of the way in which one becomes a shaman, the initiation ceremony, the trance and the supernatural journeys of the shaman and, finally, to his costume and equipment. With regard to shamanistic elements in Tibet, Hoffmann mentions the gcod ritual, the state oracle in gNas-chuṇi and the drum divination.

Hoffmann’s book is a very welcome survey of the symbolism of Tibetan religions and shamanism. It is to be hoped that the volume of illustrations which is being prepared by Hoffmann and Ulla Johansen will be published before long.

Canberra

J. W. DE JONG


The Subhāṣītaratnakaraṇḍakakathā (henceforth abbreviated SRKK) was mentioned for the first time by Sylvain Lévi in 1899. He stated that the SRKK consists of the verses which conclude the tales in the Dvāvimśatayavadāna. The colophon attributes the SRKK to Āryaśūra. The SRKK was edited for the first time by A. C. Banerjee in 1959 in vol. 21 of the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts (pp. 275–307). This edition is based upon a Newari manuscript from the Durbar Library in Nepal in comparison with the Tibetan translation. Banerjee has not made use of the Dvāvimśatayavadāna (henceforth abbreviated Dvāv.) and the text, established by him, is very unsatisfactory. Zimmermann’s edition is based upon three manuscripts: a manuscript of the SRKK belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society in London (R) and two manuscripts of the Dvāv. (Bibliothèque Nationale: Pa; Cambridge University Library: Ca). The Tibetan version is to be found in two different places in the Tanjur. Zimmermann has made use of the two versions in the Peking and Narthang Tanjurs (P1, P2, N1, N2) and of one version in the Derge and Cone Tanjurs (D1, p).

Zimmermann’s study of the two manuscripts of the Dvāv. proves that Sylvain Lévi’s assumption on the relationship between the SRKK and the Dvāv. is not correct. The Cambridge manuscript contains 97 verses of the SRKK and the Paris manuscript 107. The Paris manuscript does not give all the verses of the SRKK and, moreover, they are not always the concluding verses of the tales. Zimmermann shows that the text of the Paris manuscript is an expanded version as compared to the text of the Cambridge manuscript. He arrives at the conclusion that a critical edition of the Dvāv. on the basis of all the available manuscripts would be required in order to elucidate the composition and history of the Dvāv. and its relation to the SRKK. Zimmermann points out that our knowledge of the Dvāv. is due to three scholars: R. Mitra who described a manuscript of the Dvāv. in Calcutta,1 R. Turner who has studied the language of the

1 The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal (Calcutta, 1882), pp. 85–89.
Dvāvī, and L. Feer who studied the relationship of the Dvāvī with other collections of Avadānas. According to Zimmermann (p. 8, n. 1) reference is always made to one of these three scholars or to Sylvain Lévi in connection with the SRKK or the Dvāvī. This is not quite correct with reference to Speyer who himself inspected the manuscript of the Dvāvī in Paris (cf. his introduction to his edition of the Avadānaśataka).

In his analysis of the SRKK Zimmermann shows that the text consists of two parts: chapters 1–22 which conclude with three samgrahasthāloka-s, and chapters 23–27 which deal with five of the six pāramitā-s: śīla, ksānti, virya, dhyāna and prajñā. The author of this supplement appears to have considered chapters 1–22 to be dealing only with the first of the pāramitā-s: dāna. Zimmermann remarks that although these 22 chapters have as a common theme punya in its manifold forms, many verses have no direct relation to the concept of dāna. According to him, however, even these 22 chapters do not constitute a unified whole. He considers chapters 1–4 to contain the oldest form of the SRKK. Consequently, Zimmermann is of the opinion that there must have been at least three different authors. He does not exclude the possibility that Āryaśūra was the author of the first four chapters even though four verses of the third chapter are to be found in the Bodhicaryāvatāra. Zimmermann points out that of these four verses a half-verse is also found in the Śatapāñcāsatka (Ś: mahārṇavayugachidrakārṇagrīvāryapopamam).

Zimmermann writes: ‘Dann wenn Sāntideva in diesem einen Falle als der Entleiber dasteht, so kann er sich auch den Rest der fraglichen Str. aus dem Schatz seiner bekanntlich ungewöhnlichen Literaturkenntnisse geholt haben.’ This argument has not much weight. D. R. Shackleton Bailey has rightly remarked that the simile of the tortoise and the yoke-hole was common property among Buddhist writers. To the references, given by him, others can be added. Recently this simile has been discussed by W. Bollée and K. R. Norman but without reference to the literature mentioned by Shackleton Bailey and myself. The simile is also found in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. There is no doubt that this half-verse was very popular and its occurrence in Śaṅtideva’s Bodhicaryāvatāra does not prove anything with regard to his authorship of the other verses which are also found in the SRKK. There is therefore no conclusive argument to prove the existence of the SRKK before the time of Śaṅtideva. As to the terminus ad quem, Zimmermann mentions the ninth century since one of the two translators, the Tibetan monk Śākya ‘od, is said to have lived in the ninth century. He refers for this date to W. Zinkgräfl who stated that there have been two translators of the same name, an Indian and a Tibetan, but that both lived in the ninth century. This is not correct. The Indian Śākyā ‘od (Śākyaprabha) is mentioned as one of the translators of the Vinayasamgraha. One of the two other translators is Śīlendrabodhi who is well-known as one of the compilers of the Mahāvyutpatti in the first quarter of the ninth century. The Tibetan monk Śākyā ‘od, however, is a contemporary of Rin-chen bzaṅ-po (985–1055) as has been shown by Tucci. He must have been active in the middle of the eleventh century as can be shown by an examination of the many colophons in

8 Vom Dīvīyāvadānā zur Avadānakalpatātā (Heidelberg, 1940), pp. 61–62.
10 Indo-Tibetica, II (Roma, 1933), p. 50.
the Tanjur in which he is mentioned as translator. The SRKK must therefore have been composed before the beginning of the eleventh century. It is quite possible that both the first part (chapters 1–22) and the second part (chapters 23–27) have come into existence in the period between Śántideva and the eleventh century. Zimmermann refers to Bendall’s introduction to the Śikṣāsamuccaya for Śántideva’s date (seventh century). It has to be pointed out, however, that this date is based entirely upon Tārānātha who wrote his history of Indian Buddhism in the beginning of the seventeenth century. Bendall draws attention to the fact that the Śikṣāsamuccaya was translated by Jñānmitra, Dānasūla and Ye-ses-sde and that, consequently, 800 A.D. has to be admitted as the latest possible terminus ad quem. The dates of Śántideva are as uncertain as those of Āryaśūra who is usually said to have lived in the third or fourth century. The translation into Chinese of a work by Āryaśūra in 434 A.D. seems to be the main reason for putting him in the third or fourth century. However, Lin Li-kouang has shown that this work, the Fen-pieh ye-pao lūeh ching (Taishō no. 723), is another recension of the Fen-pieh shan-o so-ch’i ching (Taishō no. 729) of which the translation is attributed to An Shih-kao (148–170 A.D.). Both the attribution of this recension to An Shih-kao and the attribution of the work itself to Āryaśūra are very doubtful. The only reliable date in connection with Āryaśūra is furnished by the quotations of his Jātakamāla in the inscriptions in Ajañṭā. According to Lüders these inscriptions are from the sixth century.

Zimmermann has found thirteen verses of the SRKK in other texts. The fact that out of 160 verses 13 are found elsewhere seems to indicate that the SRKK is a compilation largely based upon other texts. In an article which has escaped Zimmermann’s notice V. V. Mirashi points out that verse 6 is quoted in two grants of the Maitraka-s of Valabhi, dated Gupta year 248 (A.D. 567–568) and Gupta year 269 (A.D. 588–589). According to Mirashi this proves that the SRKK was composed before A.D. 550. He adds: “We know of no Buddhist writer named Āryaśūra who flourished before this date except the well-known author of the Jātakamāla. It is not therefore unlikely that the SRKK also was the work of Āryaśūra who flourished in the fourth century A.D.” It is much more likely that this verse was well-known in the sixth century and that the SRKK was not the source of the quotations in the Valabhi grants.

Zimmermann’s edition of the SRKK gives for each verse: 1. The text as published by Banerjee; 2. Variant readings from the manuscript used by Zimmermann; 3. Indication of the metre; 4. Translation of the verse; 5. Notes to the translation containing the readings proposed by the editor; 6. The Tibetan translation with indications of the corresponding parts of the Sanskrit verse; 7. Variant readings; 8. Translation of the Tibetan version containing comments on all points which require attention. His main object is to show that the Tibetan translation, though very imperfect and unsatisfactory, is based upon the same text. According to Zimmermann’s English summary the frequent divergences between the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions are due to the following causes: 1. There were considerable deficiencies in the text used by the translators; 2. The Tibetan text is not free of corruptions. One may occasionally wonder whether that could not be the result of subsequent attempts at retouching, undertaken without help from the Sanskrit original; 3. The translators occasionally failed to understand the Sanskrit text. Zimmermann calls the risk which has its origin in the aforementioned discrepancies ‘lexical risk’. The other uncertainty factor is, according to him, the ‘syntactic risk’ due to the fact that the Tibetan translators often stubbornly kept the order of words and/or lines of the Sanskrit version. Zimmermann points out that in several cases there would have been little chance of understanding the text correctly, had the Sanskrit text not been at hand.

Zimmermann's exhaustive study of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the SRKK is excellent from all points of view. The Sanskrit text, as established by him, leaves very few points in doubt. Banerjee's edition is very unsatisfactory. This is certainly partly due to the fact that he has used only one manuscript. It is, however, doubtful whether he has correctly reproduced the readings of his manuscript. His edition of the Prātimokṣa of the Mūlasarvāstivādin abounds in wrong readings of the Gilgit manuscript which forms the basis of his edition. This is obvious if one takes the trouble to compare his edition with the facsimiles of the manuscript published by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. It is a pity that Zimmermann has not been able to consult the Newari manuscript which has been used by Banerjee for his edition. He has also been unable to obtain a copy of the manuscript brought back by Sylvain Lévi. It is therefore not possible to know the relation of this manuscript with the Newari manuscript in the Durbar library. Nevertheless Zimmermann has been able to establish a text which leaves very little scope for uncertainties. It seems unlikely that the use of other manuscripts would result in more than some very minor changes in the text as established by him. The most important part of Zimmermann's work is undoubtedly his thorough examination of the Tibetan version which is probably one of the worst Tibetan translations in the whole of the Kanjur and Tanjur. The comments which Zimmermann has inserted in his translation of the Tibetan version constitute a kind of running commentary in which all peculiarities of the Tibetan translation are elucidated and, as far as possible, explained. The only work which can be compared to Zimmermann's study is Nils Simonsson's Indo-tibetische Studien, Die Methoden der tibetischen Übersetzer, untersucht im Hinblick auf die Bedeutung ihrer Übersetzungen für die Sanskritphilologie (Uppsala, 1957) which, as indicated by the subtitle, examines the methods of the Tibetan translators with regard to the importance of their translations for Sanskrit philology. The Tibetan translations are of essential importance for Buddhist philology. Zimmermann has been successful in showing that even such a deplorable translation as that of the SRKK can be helpful in the study of the Sanskrit original if it is examined carefully pāda by pāda in order to explain all its imperfections.

Zimmermann's edition and translation of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions are of such excellence that only on a few minor points is it possible to suggest other interpretations. Let me conclude this review by giving the notes which I have made while reading Zimmermann's work. All references are to the number of the verses.

47c: rūpārthysamādhisampadakhilam bhuktvā ca sarvam sukhām. Tr.: "Erfolgreich im Zustandebringen der formbehafteten und der formenfreien Versenkungstufen, und nach dem Auskosten restlos aller Glückseligkeit." The translation is too free because rūpārthysamādhi-sampadakhilam refers to sukhām: "a bliss which is complete through the attainment of concentrations endowed with form and without form".

67b: kriyotthāpanam. Tr.: "das Ausführen des Beschusses". In a note Zimmermann remarks that perhaps one must understand "Bewerkstelligung der Ausführung". Kriyā has here undoubtedly the meaning 'rite'. The verse concerns the construction of a maṇḍala.

105: Zimmermann has omitted the translation of line 3 of the Tibetan version: dbyaṅs sñān rol mo dahn mgrin 'debs. Four of the six Tibetan versions have bsdebs 'joined with'. The meaning of this pāda probably is "having joined together sweet sounding music and song" (cf. mgrin geig-tu "with one voice").

116: yadgarbe paripuṣṭin eti śucibhiḥ pronnītyamāno rasaśā bālye yan madhusarpiṣī ca pibati kṣiram ca kāle punah. Tib. tr.: gaṅ zig mnaṅ du rdzogs par ni / gtsaṅ žin yid 'oṅ ro myaṅ la / mar daṅ sbran rtsi stobs daṅ ni / gaṅ zig 'o ma 'thuṅ thes yan. Zimmermann corrects the reading of the Tibetan versions stobs into stob and translates: "Wer, im Mutterleib gedeihend, (sich von) seinem Ghee und Honig von angenehmem Geschmack nähr; wer anderseits zur Zeit Milch

16 Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, part 1 [= Satapiṭaka, vol. 10(1)], New Delhi, 1959.
trinkt." Tib. stob-pa is 'to feed' and not 'to nourish oneself'. I would prefer to read with two Tibetan translations myon instead of myan and to translate as follows: "He who, developing in the womb, enjoys pure and pleasant juices and, in his youth, ghee and honey." The position of these is parallel to that of stobs which represents Skt. balye confounded with bale. It seems difficult to take ro myan as rendering 'taste' and to connect gtsan zin yid 'on ro myan with mar dan zbar rtsi in the following line.

146c: sampuyanam sa labhate bahuratnajato (MS. -jatam). Tr.: "Der gewinnig hienieden, als Besitzer vieler Juwelen, immer hohe Ehrung." Zimmermann translates -jato als 'Besitzer' which seems not possible in this context. It is preferable to read with Banerjee bahuratnajaitar 'with masses of many jewels'. The Tibetan translation has: rin chen mañ dañ bzon pas phug. Probably the Tibetan translators rendered bahuratnayânair.


155c: dūropadrutāsārameyaniyavā tiṣṭhanty api. Tr.: "und (dass sie, wie) ein von ferne angegriffenes Rudel von Hunden, auseinanderstieben und (wieder) stehen bleiben". The Tibetan translation has: khyi dañ 'dra bar riñ na gnas / kun tu rgyug (all versions: 'jug) cim sloṅ bo la phyir idog. Tr.: "wie ein Hund fernab stehenbleibt und, (wenn man) von überall her (auf ihn los-)rennt und (ihn) aufscheucht, wieder zurückkehrt". Tib. sloṅ-ба does not mean 'verscheuchen'. According to Jäschke's dictionary it is used in the meaning 'to excite, cause, inspire (compassion, fear, passion)'. This meaning is derived from the primary meaning 'to cause to rise'. However, the Tibetan translators used here the verb sloṅ-ба 'to ask, to beg': "as dogs they remain at a distance, run in every direction, beg, and turn back". The Tibetan translation has gan-dig but this can be used also for a plural. Undoubtedly the Tibetan translators made no effort to render the rather complicated Sanskrit compound dūropadrutāsārameyaniyavā and gave a very free rendering.

190c: jñātva naraḥ svahitāsāghanatapatrasyām (MS. -parāḥ syām) / kuryān na kah satatam aṣu dṛḍham prayatnam. The first half of the verse mentions the six pāramitā-s. Zimmermann proposed to read tattapasrāyām and supposes that it refers to pāramitā as a unit comprising the six pāramitā-s. It is difficult to see why, in that case, he does not read tattapasrāyām. Probably one must read -tatparās tāḥ / kuryān na kah satatam aṣu dṛḍham prayatnam. The Tibetan translators have read aṣu (myur-du) but the confusion of s and š is a normal phenomenon.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG


The most comprehensive Tantric dictionary is the Mikkyō daijiten published in three volumes in Kyōto in 1932–1933 and reprinted in 1968 in six volumes by Hōzōkan. This dictionary is of great importance, especially for the study of Tantrism in Japan. 1 It is, however, intended primarily for specialists. Moreover, it takes little account of Tantrism outside the Sino-Japanese tradition. Since 1932 much work has been done in Tantric studies by Japanese and foreign scholars. The chief editor, Sawa Ryûken, writes in the preface that the compilers of this dictionary felt the necessity of compiling a dictionary giving explanations written in gendaigo
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(contemporary language) and embracing Tantrism not only in China and Japan but also in India, Tibet, Nepal, etc. Finally, it was considered desirable to add a great number of illustrations. The editorial committee comprises six well-known specialists: Sawa Ryûken, Takai Ryûshû, Tamura Ryûshô, Matsunaga Yuhei, Miyasaki Yûshô and Yamasaki Taikô. The articles have been written with the help of many scholars and temples, the names of which are listed on p. III. The dictionary contains about 3500 articles and 5500 cross-references on 730 pages of two columns. It is comprehensive in scope and includes doctrinal terms, ceremonies, names of gods, persons and temples, religious objects, titles of books, etc. However, the introduction warns the reader that secret doctrines and ceremonies, which are transmitted from teacher to disciple, are excluded. Undoubtedly, the net has been cast wide. For instance, there are articles on Taoism (Dōkyô), the Tibetan language (Chibettogo), Bon-po (Bonkyô), the Mahâbhârata (Mahabharata), the Islam (Isnûmukyo), etc. Very welcome is the fact that all dates are given according to the Western calendar with the addition of characters in brackets. The head-words are printed in kana followed by characters within square brackets. Sanskrit and Tibetan words and equivalents are given wherever required. The appendix contains an index in Roman script of Sanskrit, Pâli, Tibetan and European words and an index of characters according to the number of strokes.

The authors of this dictionary show themselves well informed about Tantric studies in the West. An article on Tantric studies in Europe and America (Ôbei mikkyô) mentions the names of Hodgson, Burnouf, La Vallée Poussin, von Glasenapp, Tucci, Lalou, Snellgrove and Eliade. The articles are well written and informative. They constitute an excellent guide to the bewildering wealth of manâdana-s, ceremonies, mudrâ-s, divinities, etc. to be found in Tantric texts and schools. Only rarely does one look in vain for an important term. For instance, there is no article dealing with chakuji (choosing an appropriate place for the construction of a manâdana). This term is fully studied in the Hôbôgiri (pp. 279–280), a work which seems not to have been consulted by the compilers of the dictionary. Chakuji is found in the Bukkyô jiten, a dictionary of limited size compiled under the supervision of Uê Hakuju. It is to be hoped that it and other important terms which may have been overlooked will be included in a future edition of this dictionary. Another desideratum, which could easily be satisfied without increasing greatly the number of pages is the addition of bibliographical references to recent publications. In the preface Sawa Ryûken rightly remarks that among the many books, published nowadays in Japan on Tantrism, there are both ‘jewels and stones’. It would be useful to draw attention to the ‘jewels’ at appropriate places in the articles.

The dictionary contains a series of appendices which occupy no less than 176 pages:
I. A survey of Tantric schools in Japan; II. The Siddham alphabet and the bija-s; III. The two great manâdanas (ryôbu mandara); IV. Bibliographical details on Tantric texts in the Taishô edition; V. List of Tantric texts in other collections of Buddhist texts published in Japan; VI. Tantric genealogies; VII. List of abridged characters; VIII. Index of words in Roman script; index of characters according to the number of strokes. The usefulness of these appendices is enhanced by several indices and by the fact that the articles in the dictionary make constant references to them.

Sawa Ryûken and his collaborators deserve high praise for their work. The Mikkyô jiten is the first modern Tantric dictionary which takes into account recent scholarship both in Japan and abroad, and which at the same time is accessible to specialists and to readers who have only a general knowledge of Buddhism. Western scholars will find it very useful since it is much easier to consult than the Mikkyô daijiten. The publishers, Hôzôkan in Kyôto, have produced a book which is beautifully printed, bound and illustrated.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

As the author remarks in her introduction the *paccekabuddha* has received little detailed attention. Louis de La Vallée Pousin's article in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (vol. X, 1918, pp. 152–154) is based mainly on Sanskrit texts. According to him the *pratyekabuddha* embodies the old ideal of a solitary and silent life. R. K. remarks in the introduction that the concept of the *paccekabuddha* presented the opportunity to include pre-buddhist recluses and seers in Buddhism. This explains why *paccekabuddhas* are referred to by terms used to denote ascetics, e.g. muni, isi, samana, tapasa, jati. La Vallée Pousin's theory has been accepted by many scholars both in the West and in Japan. However, it must be pointed out that an entirely different theory on the origin of the concept of the *paccekabuddha* was proposed by Uı Hakju (1882–1963) in volume IV of his *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* (Tōkyō, 1927). According to Uı this concept arose in connection with the tradition that the Buddha, after having obtained the bodhi, hesitated to preach the doctrine. The Buddha in obtaining the bodhi realised the truth of the doctrine of *pratītyasamutpāda*. Therefore the *pratyekabuddha* is considered to have obtained the bodhi by meditating on the *pratītyasamutpāda*. In his article on the origin of the *pratyekabuddha* Fujita Kōtatsu remarks that Uı's theory has been followed by other leading Japanese scholars such as Kimura Taiken in his *Shōjō bukkō shisō ron* (Tōkyō, 1937) and Sakaino Kōyō ('Byakushibutsu ron', *Gendai bukkō*, 1933). However, Fujita shows clearly in his article that Uı's theory is not based upon early Buddhist texts and has to be rejected. According to him La Vallée Pousin's theory has been elaborated in Japan by Mochizuki Shinkō ('Engaku', *Bukkyōdaigiten*, vol. I, 1931) and Akanuma Chizen, (*Bukkyō kyōten shiron*, Nagoya, 1939). On the basis of a detailed study of early Buddhist texts in Pāli and Chinese, Fujita arrives at the same conclusion.

Ria Kloppenborg's work is based entirely upon Pāli texts. A study of this kind would certainly have been very useful if an attempt would have been made to trace the development of the concept of the *paccekabuddha* in the canonical texts and the commentaries. However, the author has not tried to differentiate between earlier and later texts. She remarks in the introduction: "The explanations of the commentary have simply been followed. To do otherwise would probably have proved an impossibility."

(p. 12). It is difficult to imagine a more defeatist point of view. It is certainly impossible to maintain. The author herself, in discussing the importance of the verses of the Khaggavisāṇasutta of the Suttanipāta, is forced to remark that the term *paccekabuddha* is not used in these verses because at the time when they were composed, the concept of the *paccekabuddha* was not or had not yet developed within the Buddhist system (p. 11). It would certainly have been necessary to differentiate, not only between canonical texts and commentaries, but also between the earlier and later strata of the canonical writings as has been done, for example, by Sakurabe Hajime in an article on the *pratyekabuddha*. Sakurabe draws attention to the fact that the word *paccekabuddha* is not to be found in texts which are considered to belong to the oldest stratum of Buddhist literature, such as the Suttanipāta, the Dhammapada, the Itivuttaka, the Thera- and Therīgāthā, etc., whereas it is

1 ‘Sanjō no seiritsu ni tsuite. Byakushibutsu kigen kō’, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, V (1957), pp. 419–428. R. K. mentions Fujita's article as one of two Japanese publications about the concept of the *pratyekabuddha* and his position in the Mahāyāna schools which she has been unable to consult (p. 1, n. 1). This article does not deal at all with the concept of the *pratyekabuddha* in the Mahāyāna schools. As is indicated by the title itself Fujita studies the origin of the concept and its development in early Buddhism.

found in the Aṅguttaraniākāya and more frequently in such younger texts as the Khuddakapātha, the Apadāna and the two Nīddesas. The author limits herself to a systematic arrangement of the materials in three chapters: 1. The pacceka-buddha; 2. The Way towards pacceka-bodhi; 3. The pacceka-buddha’s way of life. Chapter four contains a translation of the 41 verses of the Khaṅgāvīṇasutta together with parts of the commentary. An appendix gives a translation of the Pratyekabuddhabhūmi. The author fails to make mention of the fact that this text is a chapter of Asāṅga’s Yogācārabhūmi and that the Sanskrit text has been published by Alex Wayman in the *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* (VIII, 1, 1960, pp. 376–375).

The author translates a number of passages from Pāli texts but their usefulness is greatly impaired by several serious blunders. A few examples may suffice. P. 19: “pacceka-buddhas are unborn when no buddhas are found and in the time of the birth of a buddha”; Sn.A. p. 51: pacceka-buddha āpātavā buddhānam uppajjanakāle yeva uppajjanti “pacceka-buddhas arise without having met buddhas and only at the time of the birth of buddhas”. The author makes no comment on the fact that this passage mentions that pacceka-buddhas exist at the time of the births of buddhas although in the following chapter she quotes a passage from the Sāratthappakāsīni according to which pacceka-buddhas are said to exist only in periods when there are no buddhas (p. 37). Entirely misleading is the translation given of a passage twice quoted by the author (pp. 19 and 77). P. 19: “pacceka-buddhas comprehend not the essence of the dhamma; because not causing (others) to ascend to the supra-mundane (i.e. nibbāna) they are able to teach the vague concept (paññatti)”, cf. p. 77: “for, not causing to ascend to the supra-mundane state they are able to teach the notion (paññatti)”; Sn.A. p. 51: na hi te lokuttarādhammanā paññattiṁ āropetvā desetum sakkonti “for they are unable to put the supra-mundane doctrine into verbal concepts and to teach it”. Pāli paññatti, BHS prajāpati is not ‘a vague concept’ but ‘a verbal designation or concept’. The author seems to have experienced considerable difficulties in translating the word dassana ‘seeing, view’. One of the conditions for the resolve to set out on the way towards pacceka-bodhi is “the seeing of one who has destroyed evil influences” (vigatāsavassana). The commentary explains that this refers to either a buddha or a pacceka-buddha or a disciple (buddhapačceka-buddhasāvakānāṃ yassa kassaci dassanato). R. K. translates vigatāsavassana (Sn.A. p. 51) as “having the destruction of evil influences in view” and the explanation of the commentary as “whose view is (the same as the view) of buddhas, pacceka-buddhas and disciples” (p. 39). On p. 114 R. K. translates nātaka-dassanam āgātaṁ aṭṭhatarāṁ kutumbikabhariṇāṁ (Sn.A. p. 115) “A certain landlord’s wife who had come to see a dancer” as follows: “A certain landlord’s wife, who resembled a dancer.” The author is critical of the existing translations of the Suttaṅgāpātha but she does not hesitate to render anatīṭhapi (n) with ‘not nourished by others’ (p. 116), a translation based upon the explanation given in the commentary: posetabbasaddhivihārikādīvīraḥita (Sn.A. p. 118.10). According to R. K. this means: “without a co-resident etc. who has to (provide) the food”? It is certainly heedless to continue this enumeration of elementary mistakes, but it is necessary to point out that the translation of the Pratyekabuddhahūmi is, if possible, even worse. For instance, kalpaśatām buddhopādam āraṇyati is rendered as “in a hundred kalpas (he) acquires the resolution to become a buddha”. This expression has been explained by Edgerton in his dictionary s.v. āraṇya: “buddhipādāraṇyanā, attainment of the production of Buddhas, i.e. the privilege of being born when a Buddha is born”. 3 R. K. translates asati ca buddhānām utpāde with “without (having made) the resolution of the buddhas”. Translations of this kind of course make nonsense of the text of the Pratyekabuddhahūmi.

It is obvious that the author does not possess the required knowledge of Pāli and Sanskrit to translate the materials studied by her. This combined with the fact that no attempt has been made to arrange the materials in a historical perspective forces us to arrive at the sad conclusion

---

that the author has been badly advised in publishing this book. A comprehensive and satisfactory study of the concept of the \textit{paceka\-buddha} is still outstanding. The best contribution published so far is undoubtedly the short article by Fujita mentioned above. An English translation would be very welcome.

\textit{Australian National University}  \hspace{1cm}  J. W. DE JONG


The Catuspari\-ṣatsūtra (henceforth abbreviated as CPS) is one of the most important Buddhist texts published in recent times. In 1951 Ernst Waldschmidt published a comparative analysis, followed in 1952 by a transcription of the Sanskrit fragments and in 1957 and 1962 by a synoptic edition of the Sanskrit text and parallel versions in Pāli, Tibetan and Chinese. The CPS contains the Sarvāstivāda version of the early history of the Buddhist order, beginning with the obtaining of the bodhi by the Buddha and ending with the conversion of his chief pupils Sāriputra and Maudgalyāyana.

Ria Kloppenburg’s translation is meant to provide text-material for students of Buddhism who do not know Sanskrit and is therefore as literal as possible. On the whole the translation is accurate but in some places other interpretations can be suggested. Several passages present difficulties because the text is not well established. In the following notes references are made to the chapters and sections into which the text has been divided by the editor.

Introduction. Section 3. For a parallel passage see \textit{Gilgit Manuscripts}, vol. III, part IV (Calcutta, 1950), p. 216.3–11. R. K. renders \textit{ji\-nā\-nā\-sā\-nā} with “insight into knowledge” but \textit{ji\-nā\-nā\-sā\-nā} has to be interpreted as a dvandva. For the explanation of the terms \textit{ji\-nā} and \textit{da\-sā\-nā} by the Abhidharmakōśa\-avyākhyā, and for references see L. de la Vallée Poussin, \textit{Abhidharmakōsa de Vasubandhu}, VIII, p. 193, n. 2.

1.7: “O Thou of whom all pride is gone.” In a note R. K. explains that she translates \textit{garvalopa} instead of \textit{p\-\,r\-n\-alopa}. Waldschmidt’s restoration \textit{garvalopa} is based upon Tibetan \textit{ni\-\,r\-\,gy\-\,al bcom} but at p. 434, n. 16 he points out that the reading of the manuscript is more like \textit{rn} than like \textit{rv}. The Gilgit manuscript has \textit{parnalopa} and MS. 42.3 \textit{rnalopa}. It is not possible to read \textit{garvalopa} since it is neither confirmed by the manuscripts nor attested elsewhere as far as I know. The parallel passages have been studied by Alsdorf, \textit{Die Āryā\-Strophen des Pāli\-Kanons} (Wiesbaden, 1968), pp. 54–55. Alsdorf arrives at the following conclusion: “Ein Vergleich dieser Texte zeigt sofort, dass \textit{p\-\,r\-n\-ah\-hā\-ra}, \textit{p\-r\-n\-alopa}, \textit{par\-n\-alopa} and \textit{pra\-j\-n\-ā\-kā\-ra} sämtlich Entstellungen von \textit{p\-n\-a\-n\-hā\-ra} sind, das allein einen wirklich guten Sinn giebt.”1 It is not easy to see how \textit{bhāra} could have been transformed into \textit{lopa}, but perhaps this is due to the influence of Pāli \textit{p\-n\-a\-naloma}. Tib. \textit{bcom} corresponds to \textit{lopa} but Tib. \textit{ni\-\,r\-\,gy\-\,al} ‘pride’ is unexplainable.

3.12: “Furthermore, the gods belonging to the train of Māra, who form a danger are not able to harm the virtuous”; \textit{parato ye upasa\-rga\-devatā mār\-kā\-yā\-kāḥ / na ś\-\,ā\-k\-\,nu\-v\-anta\-ntarāyām kṛ\-\,\,a\-\,\,n\-yā\-ya\-s\-a\-yā\-s\-a\-y kartu vai // Paratas can mean ‘further’ or ‘farther’ but not ‘furthermore’. Here it

1 See also \textit{Bhikṣunī\-vin\-aya}, edited by Gustav Roth (Patna, 1970), p. 122.5–7: bahusr\-uta\-ni citrak\-a\-ma\-n Buddh\-sa\-y\-a paric\-ā\-ra\-ki\-n / par\-n\-a\-b\-hā\-ra\-vi\-sa\-ny\-u\-k\-ta\-ni. Read \textit{p\-n\-a\-b\-hā\-ra\-n} (= \textit{p\-n\-a\-b\-hā\-ra\-n} \textit{vi\-sa\-ny\-u\-k\-ta\-n}, cf. bahussuto cít\-tak\-t\-i buddh\-sa\- paric\-ā\-r\-ako / \textit{p\-n\-a\-b\-hā\-ra\-r} vi\-sa\-n\-n\-u\-t\-to, Therāgā\-thā 1021; \textit{p\-n\-a\-b\-hā\-ra\-r} \textit{vi\-sa\-n\-y\-u\-t\-to}, An\-\,gut\-t\-a\-n\-a\-k\-a, vol. I, p. 162.21.
certainly means ‘from others’: “Those disasters (coming) from others (such as) the gods belonging to the train of Māra.”


4.7: “The ascetic Gautama will (not) enter complete extinction.” In a note the translator remarks that perhaps a negation has been left out of this sentence. A negation is found in the Tibetan translation and must be accepted into the text even if it is absent in the Gilgit manuscript. Cf. CPS p. 438, n. 2, in which Waldschmidt refers to 16.12 where the negation is of course absent.

8.2: “The dharma obtained by me is profound, of deep splendour.” “Of deep splendour” renders *gambhiravabhāso*. Here *avabhāsa* has the meaning ‘appearance’ as the corresponding Pāli *obhāsa* in the passage on the four pools (*udakarahada*) of which the first is said to be *uttāno gambhiravabhāso* (Ang. Nik., II, p. 105). Woodward translates: “The shallow which looks deep” (*Gradual Sayings*, II, p. 112).

8.8: “Conquerors like me who achieved the destruction of evil influences must be recognized”; *jñā hi mādāśa jñeyā ye prāptā āsvākṣayam*: “Those like me who achieved the destruction of evil influences must be acknowledged as Jinas.”

10.10: “For ‘correct’ people who know the ways of the world do not radiate”: *na hi santā prakāśante viditāv lokaparyayam*. In the corresponding verse of Udānavarga 21.7 Bernhard reads *prakāśyante*. The Tibetan translator seems also to have read *prakāśyante*: *skyes-bu dam-pa grags mi-srid* “They cannot be celebrated as excellent people.”

11.7: “men of delusion”; *mohapuruṣāḥ* “stupid fellows”, cf. BHSD s.v.

11.18: “The Tathāgata only ate in the morning at the proper time”; *tathāgata pratīyaty’ eva kālabhojī*. In 16.2 R. K. translates *pratīyaty’ eva* with ‘immediately’: “When his body was tired, he immediately went to sleep”; *srāntakāyah pṛagbhārah pratīyaty’ eva mīḍdham avakrāntah*. The expression *pratīyaty’ eva* has given rise to different explanations and translations, cf. Jean Filliozat, ‘Fragments du Vinaya des Sarvastivadin’, *JA*, 1938, p. 45, n. 3 [= Laghu-prabandhā, Leiden, 1973, p. 103]: “On pourrait interpréter *pratīyaty* comme locatif absolu du participe présent *pratīyant* et traduire ‘tout en répliquant’; Bernard Pauly, ‘Fragments sanskrits de haute Asie’, *JA*, 1957, p. 292: “le sens de ‘tout en répliquant’ ne me semble pas absolument satisfaisant. On pourrait peut-être comprendre ‘tout en faisant cette réflexion’ à moins qu’il ne s’agisse d’un sens temporel: “sur le champ, sans plus tarder”; Louis Renou, compte rendu de Kusum Mittal, *Dогmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus*, I, *JA*, 1959, p. 261: “On relèvera, d’après l’éditeur, la forme *pratīyaty eva*, qu’il rend tantôt par ‘rapidement’, tantôt par “au plus haut degré”: double traduction qui n’est pas sans trahir quelque embarras. La seconde interprétation peut s’appuyer sur la racine yat- “faire effort” avec une évolution de sens analogue à *sahasā “avec force”, d’où “tout-à-coup”.” Renou’s interpretation has been accepted by Luise Schwarzschild, cf. ‘Notes on some words meaning “Immediately” in Middle Indo-Aryan’, *JRAS*, 1961, p. 39, n. 3. Waldschmidt translated *pratīyaty’ eva* in the same context as CPS 16.2 with “schnell”, cf. ‘Zu einigen Bilinguen aus den Turfan-Funden’, *NGAW*, 1955, p. 19 [= Von Ceylon bis Turfan, Göttingen, 1967, p. 256]. Waldschmidt pointed out that Pāli *paṭigacca’ eva* or *paṭikacca’ eva* corresponds to *pratīyaty’ eva* (ibid., n. 138). Edgerton considered *pratīyaty* ‘in advance’ to be a semi-Prakrit form of *pratikṛtya* and Pāli *paṭikacca* (or *gacca*). According to him the meaning ‘quickly’ is a result of specialization or distortion of the meaning ‘in advance’ (Review of Das Catusparisatāsūtra, *Language*, 39, 1963, p. 491). The form *pratīyaty* has been correctly explained by Brough who remarked that Buddhist Sanskrit has the form *pratikṛtya* which corresponds to Pāli *paṭikacca* or *paṭigacca* but that in addition it shows on occasion
pratiyāyata due to a misunderstanding of a Prakrit pdīyacca. As to the meaning Brough said: “For pratiṅkṛtya Edgerton gives the meaning ‘in advance’, and the word may indeed be translated in this way without undue distortion. In many places, however, it continues to carry the connotation of ‘making preparations to meet a contingency’.” (The Gândhārī Dharmapada, London 1962, p. 278). The Tibetans translate pratiyāyā eva with myur-du ‘quickly’ or with expressions meaning ‘previously, before’ (sion-chad, goṅ-ma bzin-du). From the meaning ‘previously’ (i.e. “sooner than usual”), cf. Dines Andersen, A Pāli Reader, glossary s.v. paṭīgacca) the meanings ‘quickly, immediately’ have developed. Apart from the places quoted see further Udānavarga (ed. F. Bernhard) 4.16: pratiyāyeyeva tat kuryād, yaj jāned dhitam ārmanah; 27.8: etat tu śāyam pratiyāyata, hy adhyavastā yatra praśāh prasaktāh; Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part 2 (Srinagar, 1942), p. 86.10: amuko bhiṅgula sa bhavgatal pratiyāyeyā (Ms. pratiyāyeyā; Dutt pratiyāyeyā) vyākṛtaḥ (Dutt vyākṛtaḥ); p. 107.13: pratiyāyeyavāsau (Dutt pratiyāyeyavāsau) vihāraḥ sōbhane viviktāsane ca bhūbhāge pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ.

12.12: “I was not released . . . nor did I leave this or was t separated (from it), free (from it), nor far removed (from it), with undeluded mind.” The translation uses five expressions to render four Sanskrit words: avipātiṣṭhena cittena which Waldschmidt had restored on p. 150 but the Tibetan translation (physin-ci-log daṅ bral-ba’i sems-kyis) shows clearly that vipāryāsāpāgatena cetasā is the correct reading.


27b.10: “The man, hearing (this) from king Śrāṇyā Bīṃباسāra of Magadha, said: “Be it so, Your Majesty’; evaṃ deveti sa puruṣo rājho māgadhasya śrāṇyasya bīṃbasārasya pratiśruti. Pratiśruti—means here of course ‘to consent to, agree, acquiesce’.

27c.20: “They speak of food, drinks and tastes, of sensual desires and women. Seeing that these impurities tend to attachment, therefore I was not delighted with regard to sacrifice and oblation”; annānā pānānī tātā rāsāṁ ca, kāmāṁ ca striś caiva vadanti haike / etām malān upadhau sāmprapāyaṁsa, tasmān na yaste na hute rato ’ham. In the note the translator remarks that ‘they’ refer to the sacrifices. The text has not ‘they’ but ‘some here’. The manuscript reads vadantihaike which Waldschmidt has changed to vadanti haike for metric reasons. It would be preferable to write vadanti ‘haike’ (cf. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar § 4.25). In the second half the translation has to be corrected: “Seeing that in attachment there are these impurities.”

27c.21: “If your mind is not delighted by that, by sensual desires, by food, drinks and tastes, then, in the world of gods and men where does your mind delight in?”; kathān nu te deva-maṇyuṣyalokā rātan manaḥ “How can your mind delight in the world of gods and men?”

27e.22: “The path (of worldly existence) being cut off, it does not proceed. Irreparably it comes to destruction.” The translation of apratisandhi with ‘irreparably’ is based upon Waldschmidt’s note but the meaning of Pāli appatiṣandhiya is ‘not leading (or subject to) rebirth’, cf. Critical Pāli Dictionary s.v.; Edgerton, op. cit., p. 493: apratisandhi (adv.) ‘without rebirth’.

28b.3: “he was closely following the reverend Āśvajit”; āyuṣmantam āśvajitam āgamanayamānaḥ; “he was waiting for the venerable Āśvajit”.

27e.23: “In what is he who is completely released? In the opposite of suffering, the destruction of it . . .”; tatra bhikṣavah kaḥ parinirvṛtyaḥ / anyatra duḥkhah tan niruddham. The text is not very well established, but cf. CPS p. 362, n. 7. In the corresponding passage of the Nidānasavāyukta (ed. Chandrabhāl Triṃṭhī, Berlin, 1962, p. 140) the editor reads anyatra yad duḥkhah. He translates: “Wer hat in einem solchen Fall, ihr Mönche, das volle Nirvāṇa erlangt? Es ist nichts weiter als dass das, was leidvoll ist, vernichtet . . . ” In a note he refers to BHSĐ s.v. anyatra (2). I believe that this translation is correct but that it requires a negation which is found in the Gilgit manuscript: tatra bhikṣavah kaḥ parinirvṛtyo nānyatva yad duḥkhah . . . “In this case, O monks, who is he who is completely released? There is nothing else except that suffering is destroyed . . . (literally: ‘not except that which is suffering is destroyed . . . ’). The

28e.7: The Sanskrit text is missing and R. K. translates in a note the Tibetan translation: “The teacher... saw the friends Upatīsya and Kolita coming to the Vējuvāna. Concerning those two, having come in this way in the middle of the excellent assembly, he taught with certainty: “Those two (will) become the best pair of my disciples in the doctrine.” Tib. ston-pa... 'od-ma'i tshal-du ma phyin-par / de-ltar mchi-ba (cf. p. 391, n. 5) gzigs gur-nas / tshogs mehog dbus-su de gnis ni / 'di gnis ha-yi han-thos-kyi / zu'i-mchog 'gyur žes res bstan-te /, “The teacher... having seen the two friends Upatīsya and Kolita, who had not yet arrived at the Vējuvāna, coming in this way, proclaimed: “In the excellent assembly of these two, both of them, will be the best pair of my disciples”, cf. Alsdorf, op. cit., p. 70 and IIJ, XIII (1971), p. 212.

28g.1–3: “1. In the morning then many monks dressed and taking (their) bowls and robes, entered Rājagṛha to collect alms. 2. Then the people of Rājagṛha, seeing these monks, acted contemptuously towards the (former followers of the) heretical school of Saṅjayin, who were admitted and ordained, and they uttered the verse: “The Buddha arrived in Rājagṛha, the capital of the people of Magadhā. All are guided by Saṅjayin. Whom else will you guide?” “;” atha saṃbhuhā bhikṣavah pūrvāhe nivasaya pātracivaram ādāya rājagṛham pūndāya prāvīśan. 2. atha rājagṛhakā manusyaḥ saṃjayinā tirthyāyatanena pravṛjitenapasampādite tāṃs tāṃ bhikṣuṃ drṣṭvā avaspanavamānaṃ gāthāṃ bhāsante. 3. prāpto rājagṛhe buddho magadhānāṃ purottamaṃ / sarve saṃjayino nītāṃ kīṃ nu bhīyo nāyīsyaṭa // The text in section two seems to be incomplete. According to the Tibetan translation the original text ran something like this: atha ye rājagṛhakā manusyaḥ saṃjayinā tirthyāyatanenācāra-pravṛjitenapasampāditeṇātta-manaso nābhīnandinas te tāṃs tān...: “Then the people of Rājagṛha, furious and discontented because the (followers of the) heretical school of Saṅjayin were recently admitted and ordained seeing all these monks... Cf. Tib. de-na rgyal-po'i khab-kyi mi gan-dag yar-dag rgyal-ba-can-gyi mu-stegs-can-gyi gnas rab-tu phyuṅ žiṅ bṣen-par radsogs-nas rin-po ma lon-pas yi ma raḥs-siṅ mhin-par mi dga-'ba de-dag-gis dge-sloṅ de daḥ de-dag mthon-nas. In 3. saṃjayino designates the followers of Saṅjayin: “All the followers of Saṅjayin are lead (by the Buddha)”, cf. Pāli sabbe saṅjaye netvāna “Leading all Saṅjaya’s (followers)”. (tr. I. B. Horner, The Book of Discipline, IV, p. 56). In 3d nāyīsyaṭa must be a mistake for nāyīsyaṭi which is found in the Pāli and in the Mahāvastu: “What more will he lead?” The parallel texts have kaṃ instead of kīṃ but kīṃ is confirmed by the Tibetan translation (ci-žig) and may have been used to express more forcibly the contempt with which the people of Rājagṛha treated the monks.

The translator does not seem to have consulted Edgerton’s review of Waldschmidt’s edition in which he rejects, for instance, the spellings kummaṣa and Yaṭṭivana. Edgerton’s suggestion to read apratibhānamātram in 28f.12 and 28g.6 is very attractive.
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Though the existence of dialectical differences in the ancient Tamilnad is attested in the classical Tamil texts and the later commentaries, a scientific study of the geographic and caste dialects started only a few decades ago. Grierson’s Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. IV (1906) mentions some of the Tamil dialects. Among the first scholars one cannot miss the names of Robert Caldwell and J. Bloch which have become monumental through the pioneering study of the Tamil dialects though in a very modest way. Native scholars like R. P. Sethu Pillai, T. P. Meenakshisundaram and K. Kanapathi Pillai have spent some time studying the dialectal
differences. The Naṅcilnād dialect of V. I. Subramoniam and the considerable number of
dialectal studies of M. Shanmugam Pillai show the application of modern linguistic principles to
the study of Tamil dialects. Last, but not the least, is the detailed study of K. Zvelebil. At
present a number of young scholars are actively engaged in this endeavour around the centres in
Tamilnadu and Kerala.

The present work is part of the outcome of the project ‘The Linguistic Survey of Tamilnadu’
undertaken by the Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics of the Annamalai University. It
seeks to present a descriptive account of the linguistic structure of the Tirunelvelī Tamil dialect
spoken in the north-western part of Tamilnadu. This work, based on the author’s field work,
gives for the first time a full account of the phonology, morphology and vocabulary of this
dialect. It is not necessary to deal in detail with the obvious positive contributions of this study.
The discussion will be limited to a few conflicting cases where disagreement is unavoidable.

Since the book misses an introduction and a highly desirable map, most of the readers are
left in the dark regarding the exact location where this dialect is spoken, the number of speakers,
the caste or castes to which the informants belong and the relationship of this dialect to the
other dialects of Tamil. What we know at all about the informants is that they “are all people
belonging to the older generation of sedentary areas”. The author has given a detailed description
of the phonemes. No contrast is found between the voiced and the voiceless plosives even
though a number of Sanskrit loan words are listed in the vocabulary. The phonemes /p, t, c, t, k/
have equal number of allophones such as voiced, long voiceless, voiceless and half-long voiceless.
In order to maintain this artificial regularity, such phones as Φ, δ, s and h are treated as separate
phonemes even though the author does not even offer a single minimal pair to justify his analysis.
The artificiality is evident from the absence of the word /φeya/ ‘boy’ in the vocabulary
which gives all the other words in phonemic writing. The description is over simplified when the
author just mentions the well-known descriptions, such as /Φ/ as a bilabial voiceless fricative, /s/
as an interdental voiced fricative and /s/ as a palatal voiceless fricative. One would like to know
rather the distribution of these phones than their description. While -pp-, -tt-, -cc-, -kk- and -ff-
are treated as long consonants, -mm-, -nn-, -ŋŋ-, -ll-, -ll-, -yy- and -vv- are described as geminated
consonants. The suprasegmental features of Modern Tamil have been briefly dealt with in one of
the articles of Rudin. Until now this remains an unfilled gap in any description of Tamil. The
author has also relegated this task to a future publication.

The sandhi rules and the rest of morphology have to be well coordinated in order to avoid
confusion and redundancy. A case in point are the sandhi rules five and ten. According to five,
for example, ali+nt+u would become aliṅc'u ‘having perished’ and according to ten; for example,
kant+t+u would become kantu ‘having seen’. Because of the sandhi rule five, the author does not
mention a separate allomorph -nc- for the past tense. But contradiction arises when he posits an
allomorph -C- in spite of the sandhi rule ten to account for instances like kantu. Lack of
coordination is again visible in the sandhi rule C.2 which deals with the fricativisation of stops
after relative participles. The author has taken /Φ/ and /h/ as separate phonemes, although their
occurrences are perfectly predicted by this rule, e.g., vanta + peya becomes vanta Peya ‘fellow
who came’ and vanta + kāle becomes vanta hāle ‘bull which came’. This sandhi rule does not
justify the author’s decision to interpret Φ and h as separate phonemes.

The most interesting part of the description is morphemics. Under this heading the author
has set up six types of “morphemic words”, namely verbs, nouns, adverbs, adjectives, post-
positions and indeclinables. Word classification is still an unsolved problem in Tamil. The author
defines five types of “words” but the definition for noun is missing. The definition of word
types are based on different criteria. In the case of verbs, nouns(?) and indeclinables it is the
capacity to take a particular suffix versus incapacity; in the case of adverbs, adjectives and post-
positions the syntactic relationship forms the criterion. It goes without saying that these two
yardsticks are not mutually exclusive. For example, the relative participle vanta ‘who came’ is
described under “verbs” because it takes a tense suffix -nt-, whereas on the basis of its syntactic
relationship it comes under adjectives since it is a co-occurrence of a noun. Another extreme case