

Ludwig Alsdorf, *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Albrecht Wezler [= *Glaserapp-Stiftung*, Band 10]. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1974. XXII + 762 pp. Ln. DM 88,-.

Since 1967 the Glaserapp-Stiftung has published the *Kleine Schriften* of Oldenberg, Kielhorn<sup>1</sup>, Jacobi, Thieme, Geiger and Lüders. On the occasion of his seventieth birthday the Glaserapp-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. Aśoka- 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 Aśokan inscriptions includes also his contribution on the edicts of Dhauli and Jaugaḍa 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 *Vasudevahiṇḍī* 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 *Bṛhatkathā*. In a paper, contributed to the 19th Congress of Orientalists, Alsdorf announced a study of the *Bṛhatkathā* problem on the basis of the *Vasudevahiṇḍī* 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 *Vasudevahiṇḍī* bristles with difficulties and no-one is better qualified to deal with them than Alsdorf.

The *Vasudevahiṇḍī* is only one of the many texts which have been subjected to a penetrating analysis by Alsdorf. Due to his great knowledge of Prakrit, 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 *Vidhurapaṇḍita-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 Glaserapp-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

<sup>1</sup> In *IJJ*, XI, p. 35, due to a regrettable oversight Kielhorn is said to have died in 1912 instead of 1908.

Raniero Gnoli (tr.), *Luce delle Sacre Scritture* (Tantrāloka) di Abhinavagupta [= *Classici delle religioni* N. 25]. Torino, Edizione U.T.E.T., 1972, 900 pp. L. 15.000.

Le Śivaïsme 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 Abhinavagupta<sup>1</sup> 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'Abhinavagupta<sup>2</sup>, s'inscrit en faux contre cette tentative qu'il qualifie d'arbitraire. La longue introduction qui précède sa traduction du Tantrāloka 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 tracer le développement de sa pensée.

Parmi les ouvrages de caractère tantrique ou religieux le plus important est sans doute le Tantrāloka, ouvrage en trente-sept chapitres, qui, accompagné d'un commentaire de Jayaratha, auteur du XIIIe siècle, fut publié en douze volumes de 1918 à 1938 dans *The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies*. Comme le relève M. Gnoli, le Tantrāloka 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 Tantrāloka est un ouvrage difficile mais M. Gnoli en facilite l'accès par son excellente introduction dans laquelle il esquisse l'histoire du Śivaïsme kashmirien et présente de manière très lucide les idées maîtresses de la pensée d'Abhinavagupta.

Ce sont ces mêmes qualités de clarté et de précision que l'on retrouve dans la traduction. Le Tantrāloka traite d'un grand nombre de sujets, mais les notes qui accompagnent la traduction fournissent les renseignements dont le lecteur a besoin. M. Gnoli y cite aussi le commentaire de Jayaratha dont il ne partage pas toujours les opinions. Parmi les textes, cités par Abhinavagupta, l'ouvrage principal est le Mālinīvijayatantra dont M. Gnoli a traduit les chapitres I–IX et XI (cf. premier appendice, pp. 783–837).<sup>3</sup> Les autres appendices contiennent des passages de plusieurs textes et surtout de longs extraits du Parātrīśikāvivaraṇa (pp. 165.3–192.7; pp. 45.10–51.13; pp. 133.14–143.15 (appendices III–V, pp. 839–867). Le dernier appendice énumère les textes et les auteurs cités dans le Tantrāloka. Il n'y a pas d'index mais Abhinavagupta lui-même a résumé les arguments, traités dans les trente-deux premiers chapitres, dans les stances 287–328 du premier chapitre. M. Gnoli a utilisé ce sommaire pour indiquer le contenu des sections dans lesquelles les chapitres se divisent.

Dans une note bibliographique M. Gnoli énumère les ouvrages d'Abhinavagupta, les traductions en langues occidentales, les travaux sur Abhinavagupta et le Śivaïsme kashmirien et, finalement, les traductions et commentaires d'autres textes du Śivaïsme kashmirien.<sup>4</sup> Nous y apprenons que M. Gnoli a déjà publié en italien des traductions de deux autres ouvrages d'Abhinavagupta: le Tantrasāra qui se présente comme un résumé du Tantrāloka et la Parātrīśikālaghuvṛtti (Torino, 1960 et 1965). M. Gnoli a également traduit d'autres textes du Śivaïsme kashmirien dans un volume intitulé *Testi dello Sivaismo* (Torino, 1962). Aucun autre

<sup>1</sup> K. C. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta, an Historical and Philosophical Study*. Benares, 1935. Second revised edition, 1963 (cf. le compte rendu de Renou, *JA*, 1963, pp. 400–402).

<sup>2</sup> *The Aesthetic Experience according to Abhinavagupta*, Rome, 1956. Second revised edition, Benares, 1968.

<sup>3</sup> P. 833: corriger Capitolo X en Capitolo XI.

<sup>4</sup> P. 61 lire L. D. Barnett pour L. D. Burnett. P. 62 la Somaśambhupaddati a été traduite par Mme Hélène Brunner-Lachaux en français et non en anglais. Le deuxième volume a paru en 1968.

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 Tantrāloka 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 Mālanīvijayatantra nous trouvons la stance suivante:

(I.29) *niyatir yojayaty enam svake karmaṇi pudgalam  
kālo'pi kalayaty enam tuṭyādibhir avasthitah*

M. Gnoli traduit: "L'anima (*pudgala*) è poi dalla necessità fissata su di una determinata cerchia di azioni. Il tempo, il quale si presenta in forma di *tuṭi* [le huitième d'une seconde], etc., infine la limita e misura." Le pāda *kālo'pi kalayaty enam* rappelle une stance célèbre du Mokṣadharmā (Mhbh. éd. de Poona, 12.220.35):

*kālena tvāhaṃ ajayaṃ kālenāhaṃ jitas tvayā  
'gantā gatimatām kālaḥ kālaḥ kalayati (v.l. kalayati) prajāḥ*

Ici *kalayati* a sans aucun doute le sens de 'pousser' (cf. BR *kal* 1: treiben, antreiben). Le dictionnaire de Pétersbourg cite Bhagavadgītā 10.30b: *kālaḥ kalayatām aham* que Schlegel rendait ainsi: "tempus ego numeros modulantium". La traduction de Schlegel est suivie par d'autres savants. Ne citons que Senart: "Je suis Kāla (le Temps) entre tout ce qui se compte", et Zaehner: "among those who reckon I am Time". Toutefois, d'autres traducteurs préfèrent interpréter *kalayati* comme signifiant ici 'pousser'. Edgerton traduit: "I am Time of impellent forces". Dans une note il renvoie à la traduction de l'*Īśvaragītā* par P.-E. Dumont (Baltimore-Paris, 1933) où se retrouve ce même pāda (cf. chap. VII.16b). Dumont traduit: "Parmi les forces qui poussent (qui pressent, qui contraignent), je suis le Temps (qui inexorablement pousse les êtres vivants vers la mort)." Il justifie sa traduction par une note dans laquelle il cite la stance du Mokṣadharmā, mentionnée ci-dessus, et la stance suivante (éd. de Poona, 12.220.40):

*tvām apy evaṃ sudurdharṣaṃ jvalantaṃ parayā śrīyā  
kāle parinate kālaḥ kālayiṣyati (v.l. kalayīṣyati) 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.<sup>5</sup>

L'interprétation de *kalayati* comme 'compter' peut se prévaloir de l'autorité de Śaṅkara et de Nīlakaṇṭha qui glose *kalayatām* par *gaṇanam kurvatām*. Probablement les commentateurs indiens suivent le Dhātupāṭha qui a enregistré le sens de 'compter' pour *kalayati*: *kala gatau samkhyāne ca* (Dhātupāṭha, éd. Böhtlingk X, 319). Néanmoins, ce sens ne semble pas être attesté dans les textes. En tous cas, il semble difficile d'interpréter *kalayati* dans Mālanīvijayatantra I.29 autrement que dans la stance du Mokṣadharmā citée ci-dessus.

<sup>5</sup> 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:

*carukaṃ dāpayet paścāt kharjūrādīphalodbhavam  
śaktyāmbanām tanuṃ kṛtvā sthāpayed agrataḥ śiśoḥ.*

M. Gnoli traduit: "Il maestro, dopo di ciò, deve far sì che egli [i.e. le disciple] 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 *kharjūrādīphalodbhavam* se rapporte à *carukaṃ* et *śaktyāmbanām* à *tanuṃ*: "Ensuite, il doit le faire donner une oblation faite des fruits de *kharjūra*, etc. Il doit la placer devant le disciple 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 Śivaïsme 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-subhāṣita-saṃgraha*. Volume I: *a° – anve°*. [= *Vishveshvaranand Indological Series* 64]. Hoshiarpur, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1974. clxii + 424 pp. Rs. 100/-.

The first volume of Sternbach's *Mahāsubhāṣitasamgraha* contains 1873 *subhāṣitas*. 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 *subhāṣitas* and 388 in the section corresponding to Sternbach's first volume. In his introduction (pp. lxx–clxii) Sternbach gives a survey of the *subhāṣita* literature in India and in Greater India and points out its importance. In his work Sternbach has included all *subhāṣitas* found in the *Subhāṣitasamgrahas* and a selection of *subhāṣitas* taken from other Sanskrit texts. He has divided the *subhāṣitas* into three groups: 1. wise sayings; 2. quotations from literary works; 3. *subhāṣitas* which do not belong to these two groups but which are found in *Subhāṣitasamgrahas*. The sources are likewise divided into three categories: primary sources, secondary sources and sources from Greater India. Each *subhāṣita* 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 *subhāṣitas*, an index of metres other than *ślokas* or *anuṣṭubhs* 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 *Mahāsubhāṣita-samgraha* will be of fundamental importance for the study of the *subhāṣitas*. 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 been quite possible. This would probably have become obvious to him if he would have translated himself all the *subhāṣitas* or if he would at least have critically examined the existing translations which he has utilized. *Subhāṣitas* 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: *vāri bhojanānte viṣāpaham*. Translation: '[water] is like poison when taken after a meal'. This translation is clearly based upon the reading *viṣapradam*.

No. 534: *parapīḍā ca yā vṛttir*. Translation: 'a living with too much trouble in it'. The translation here must be based upon the reading *atipīḍā*.

No. 605: *nābhimanyet kathamcana*. Translation: 'one should never in arrogance deem oneself superior to another', which is based upon the reading *nābhimanyeta kamcana*.

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

No. 1292: *akrcchrāt sukham āpnoti*. Translation: 'he will never come into great misery', implying the reading *na krcchraṃ mahad āpnoti*.

No. 1611: *antakaḥ śamano mṛtyuḥ*. Translation: 'Devastating wind, death'. The translation is based upon the reading *antakaḥ* (?) *pavano mṛtyuḥ* (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 samprekṣya vipākam* [Sternbach: *vipākāṃś*] *caiva karmaṇām / utthānam ātmanas caiva dhīraḥ kurvīta vā na vā* // (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 apekṣeta* [Sternbach: *avekṣeta*] *sānubandheṣu karmasu / sampṛadhārya ca kurvīta na vegena samācāret* // (No. 1476)

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 *anavasthitacittānām prasādo'pi bhayaṃkaraḥ* 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 anāthaḥ kalahapriyaḥ /*  
*āturaḥ sarvabhakṣī ca naraḥ śighraṃ 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:

*anālokya vyayaṃ karttā anāthaḥ kalahapriyaḥ /*  
*āturaḥ sarvakṣetṣu naraḥ śighraṃ 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:

*anādarāparō vidvān ihamānaḥ sthīrām śriyam /*  
*agneḥ śeṣaṃ ṛnāccheṣaṃ śatroḥ śeṣaṃ 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 abandon that wife, even if a mother of ten children, . . . who causes scandals, etc.' but the text has: *akrośabījām* [probably a misprint for *ākrośabījām*] . . . *tyajeta bhāryāṃ daśaputrasūr api*, although the apparatus mentions a variant *daśaputrasūm 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.

Volker Moeller, *Symbolik des Hinduismus und des Jainismus*. Tafelband [= *Symbolik der Religionen*, herausgegeben von Ferdinand Herrmann, Band XIX]. Stuttgart, Anton Hiersemann, 1974. 172 pp., 121 pl. DM 74,-.

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 Viennot in a lengthy review: *IJJ*, 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

Esther A. Solomon (ed.), *Sāṃkhya-Saptati-Vṛtti* (*V*<sub>1</sub>). Ahmedabad, Gujarat University, 1973. 11 + 173 pp. Rs. 6.00.

Esther A. Solomon (ed.), *Sāṃkhya-Vṛtti* (*V*<sub>2</sub>). Ahmedabad, Gujarat University, 1973, 9 + 111 pp. Rs. 5.00.

These two commentaries on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, edited by Dr. Esther Solomon, were mentioned for the first time by Pulinbihari Chakravarti in the preface to his *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought* (Calcutta, 1952, pp. II–III). The edition of *V*<sub>1</sub> is based upon a complete palm-leaf manuscript in the Jesalmere 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*<sub>1</sub>. Three appendices list: 1. Passages found in *V*<sub>1</sub>, but not in *M*; 2. Passages found in *M* but not in *V*<sub>1</sub>; 3. Noteworthy differences in expression in *V*<sub>1</sub> and *M* in certain passages. The purpose of these appendices is to show the conscious improvement in Māṭhara's *Vṛtti* as compared to *V*<sub>1</sub>. Moreover, the editor has compared in the notes several passages in *V*<sub>1</sub> and *M* and also in other commentaries. For a discussion of the authorship and the date of *V*<sub>1</sub> the editor refers to her forthcoming study *The Commentaries of the Sāṃkhya Kārikā – A Study*.

The edition of  $V_2$  is also based upon a palm-leaf manuscript in the Jesalmere Grantha Bhaṇḍāra. It was copied in saṃvat 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 *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and the authors of  $V_1$ , *Yuktidīpikā* and *Gauḍapāḍabhāṣya*, 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  $V_2$  seems to be the original one, and the later variants, if any, are at times based upon the expressions in  $V_2$  in the course of the exposition of the *kārikā* concerned, or are a result of attempts to improve upon the text as found in  $V_2$ . Esther Solomon believes that Īśvarakṛṣṇa himself might have been the author of  $V_2$ .

The publication of two unknown commentaries on the SK (= *Sāṃkhyakārikā*) is to be highly welcomed even if the claims made for them by the editor might prove to be incorrect. The first editor of  $V_2$ , Naomichi Nakada, drew attention to the fact that both  $V_2$  and the *Yuktidīpikā* mention seven sources of knowledge which are included in *āptavacana*, whereas the *Suvarṇasaptati*, translated by Paramārtha, mentions only six sources of knowledge.  $V_2$  and the *Yuktidīpikā* add *ceṣṭā*.<sup>1</sup> According to Nakada this seems to indicate that  $V_2$  is later than the *Suvarṇasaptati*. Moreover, Nakada pointed out that parallel passages to  $V_2$  are to be found in the *prakṛtiparīkṣā* of the *Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā*. Recently, Nakada published a Japanese translation of the *pūrvapakṣa* of the *prakṛtiparīkṣā* and in the introduction and the notes he points out the correspondences in wording between  $V_2$  and the *prakṛtiparīkṣā*.<sup>2</sup> Nakada arrives here at the conclusion that  $V_2$  was probably written shortly before the time of Kamalaśīla, the author of the *Pañjikā* and pupil of Śāntarakṣita (according to Nakamura Śāntarakṣita 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 *Yuktidīpikā*<sup>3</sup> 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 *Sāṃkhya* school.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

Jean Filliozat, *Laghu-prabandhāḥ*. Choix d'articles d'Indologie. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1974. XXV + 508 pp. DGlD. 75,-.

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

<sup>1</sup> *Sāṃkhyavṛttiḥ*. Edited by Naomichi Nakada under the guidance of V. V. Gokhale. 9 + 88 + 88 pp. Cyclostyled edition. The introduction is dated 16th December 1965.

<sup>2</sup> 'Shinrikōyō oyobi sono chūshakusho ni arawareta Sāṃkiya gakuha no konponshitsuryōin ni tsuite (wayaku narabini Sāṃkiya-buritti tono hikaku)' [English title: 'On a Primary Material Cause of Sāṃkhya Philosophy as Expounded in the *Tattvasaṃgraha* and the *Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* (*Prakṛtiparīkṣā*) – Japanese Translation and Notes, Introduction Discussing the Relationship between Sāṃkhyavṛtti and the *Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* –], *Tsurumi daigaku kiyō*, Dai 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 gō – *Hoiku-hoken shika hen* (1974), pp. 161–188.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Wezler, 'Some observations on the *Yuktidīpikā*', *Suppl. II. XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag* (Wiesbaden, 1974), pp. 434–455.



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 Rāvaṇa' (*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 minima* 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

R. O. Meisezahl, 'Śmaśānavidhi des Lūyī. Textkritik nach der tibetischen Version des Kommentars Lūyīpādābhisamayavṛtti Sambarodaya nāma von Tathāgatavajra', *Zentralasiatische Studien* 8 (1974), 9–127.

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,

Rgyud-'grel, vol. Pa, ff. 295–297)<sup>1</sup> M. Meisezahl a pu apporter plusieurs corrections au texte et à la traduction. En outre, il a consulté plusieurs autres traités relatifs aux cimetières que l'on trouve dans le Tanjour tibétain. Tous les problèmes ne sont pas encore résolus, car le manuscrit fourmille de leçons corrompues. La première stance est écrite dans le mètre Sragdharā. Dans la quatrième ligne M. Meisezahl lit: *savyaiḥ kartitrīśūlaparaśuḍamarukaṃ bibhrataṃ sambarākhyam*. Une note indique que le MS porte *kartrī*<sup>o</sup>, leçon qui paraît préférable à *karti*<sup>o</sup>. En lisant *kartrītrīśūlaṃ paraśuḍamarukaṃ* l'irrégularité métrique disparaît. Dans 2d *māya* est sans doute une faute d'impression pour *mayā*. Dans 7d au lieu de *kṛtāñjaliśīrā nataḥ* il faut lire *kṛtāñjaliḥ śironataḥ*. La confusion de *o* et *ā* est fréquente dans les manuscrits. Dans 14b il vaut mieux lire *lakṣmyāṃ vane* 'dans la forêt Lakṣmī' que *lakṣmyā vane*. Dans c le MS. a *rakto* 'grinḡuṇḡakapālī et la version tibétaine: *sku-mdog dmar-po thod-pa* 'dzin.<sup>2</sup> M. Meisezahl cite d'autres textes qui mentionnent une cuiller ou une cruche (*kunḡa*; en tibétain *gunḡa*) et il propose de lire: *rakto* 'srgḡuṇḡakapālī. Peut-être faut-il lire *raktāṅgaḥ kuṇḡakapālī*, plus proche de la version tibétaine. Si l'on accepte la suggestion de M. Meisezahl, il faut lire 'sṛkkunḡa<sup>o</sup> au lieu de 'srgḡuṇḡa<sup>o</sup> car *gunḡa* n'est pas attesté en sanskrit. Dans 15c M. Meisezahl lit *mūrdhāñjalipuṭībhūya* (tib.: *spyi-bor thal-mo sbyar gyur-nas*). Note 50 dit: P. *mūrdhā*<sup>o</sup>. Probablement P. est une erreur pour F. (= Finot). Il nous paraît préférable de lire: *mūrdhny añjalipuṭībhūya*. Dans 17b M. Meisezahl corrige la leçon du MS. *dhūmrāṅkāṅguliko* en *dhūmrāṅgakuliko* (tib.: *dud-mdog rigs-ldan*). Il vaut mieux lire: *dhūmrāṅgaḥ kuliko*. Dans 19b le MS. a *puṭāñjalimasasṭhamah*.<sup>3</sup> M. Meisezahl lit: *puṭāñjalīsamādaraḥ* d'après tib.: *thal-sbyar gus-daṅ-bcas-pa* 'o. La leçon, proposée par lui, n'est pas possible car *samādara* ne peut pas signifier 'plein de respect' (*sa + ādara = sādara*). Je propose de lire: *puṭāñjaliḥ sagauravaḥ*.

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

*ghanās ca jayabhadrākhyāḥ śrīnando vṛṣṭisupriyaḥ  
drutaghoṣo'pi caṇḍaḥ syād varṣaḥ purāṇacāpalau*

La traduction tibétaine a:

*sprin-rnams rgyal-bzañ dpal-stugs dañ / de-bzin char dañ śin-tu mthug /  
myur-du-dbyaṅs-ldan gtum-pa dañ / char-pa rñiñ-pa tsa bkrol-lo.*

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

D'après le texte sanskrit les noms des nuages sont Jayabhadra, Śrīnanda, Vṛṣṭisupriya, Drutaghoṣa, Caṇḍa, Varṣa, Purāṇa et Cāpala. La version tibétaine est rendue par M. Meisezahl de la façon suivante:

Die Wolken rGyal bzañ (Jayabhadra), dPal stugs (Śrīghana), De bzin char (Vṛṣṭipriya), Śin tu mthug (Ghana?), Myur du dbyaṅs ldan (Drutaghoṣa), gTum pa (Caṇḍa), Char pa (Varṣa) und rñiñ-pa (Purāṇa) haben sich (vom Wolkenmeer) gelöst.

Il me semble que, en apportant quelques corrections au texte tibétain, on pourrait le mettre davantage en accord avec le texte sanskrit. *Dpal-sdug* au lieu de *Dpal-stug* correspondrait assez bien à Śrīnanda. Je ne comprends pas comment *De bzin char* représente Skt. *Vṛṣṭipriya*. Il faut certainement lire: *char dañ śin-tu mthun = Vṛṣṭisupriya*. *De-bzin* (Skt. *tathā*) ne fait pas partie du nom. Dans la stance 43c du 17e chapitre du Sambarodayatantra M. Meisezahl lit *purāṇas ca tathāvarṣas* (Tib. *gañ-ba dañ ni de-bzin 'bebs*) qu'il traduit par 'Purāṇa, Tathāvarṣa'. Il faut évidemment comprendre 'Purāṇa et aussi Varṣa'. En ce qui concerne *bkrol* que M. Meisezahl

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 10, ligne 6: 295<sup>7</sup>–197a<sup>3</sup>. Il faut certainement corriger 197 en 297. Faut-il lire 295a ou 295b?

<sup>2</sup> M. Meisezahl transcrit le tibétain d'après le système Pelliot.

<sup>3</sup> D'après l'édition de Finot le MS. a -*saṣṭamah* et non -*saṣṭhamah* comme dit M. Meisezahl dans note 71.

interprète comme le parfait de 'grol-ba 'sich lösen, befrieren' il faut corriger *tsa-bkrol* en *tsab-hral* qui traduit sanskrit *cañcala*, *cāpalya* et *capala*. Enfin, dans le texte sanskrit, je propose de lire *jayabhadrākhyāḥ* pour *jayabhadrākhyāḥ*.

Dans 24d le texte sanskrit a *vaṅgapuṣpaphalānvitāḥ* (Tib.: *me-tog 'bras-bu phun-sum-tshogs*). *Vaṅga* est probablement une corruption pour *bahu*. Dans 26a le MS. a *olambā śūlabhinnaiś* (Tib.: *gsal-śiñ bskyon dan mduñ-gis phug*). Finot avait proposé de lire *olambaiḥ* ou *ullambaiḥ*. M. Meisezahl préfère *ullambaiḥ* parce que cette leçon est plus proche du Tib. *gsal-śiñ bskyon* qui, d'après lui, rend Skt. *śūlollambanaiḥ*. M. Meisezahl fait remarquer: "Vermutlich liegt hier die aus metrischen Gründen gebotene Kürzung *ullambaiḥ* vor". Il traduit *ullambaiḥ* avec 'Mit (Menschen), die auf einem Pfahl aufgespiesst sind'. On ne peut pas séparer *olamba* ou *ullamba* du mot *ālamba* (*ālambha* dans l'édition de M. Meisezahl) que l'on trouve dans Sambarodayatantra XVII, 45: *kañkāśūlabhinnāmbhārādhadaghaśirāḥ*. M. S. Tsuda lit *kañkāśūlabhinnāmba*<sup>4</sup>. Selon son apparatus trois manuscrits ont <sup>o</sup>*bhinno* et quatre <sup>o</sup>*bhinnā* et il aurait dû lire <sup>o</sup>*bhinnāmba*. La version tibétaine du Sambarodayatantra rend *ālamba* avec '*phyañ* 'pendant'. Le traducteur tibétain du Śmaśānavidhi, en rendant *olambaiḥ* ou *ullambaiḥ* avec *gsal-śiñ skyon* 'empalé', s'est écarté du texte sanskrit. Il a probablement choisi une expression de trois syllabes pour pouvoir remplir le pāda. En tout cas, *ullamba* ou *olamba* ne peut pas signifier 'auf einem Pfahl aufgespiesst'. En pāli *olamba* signifie 'hanging down'. Que l'on lise *olambaiḥ* ou *ullambaiḥ* le sens est le même qu'en pāli. Dans 29c il faut corriger *mayādayiva* en *mayādayiva*.

Si je me suis arrêté assez longtemps sur les problèmes que le texte du Śmaśānavidhi pose au lecteur, c'est que les matériaux, présentés par M. Meisezahl, facilitent beaucoup l'étude de ce petit traité. Le travail de M. Meisezahl contient une introduction, une étude des textes tantriques sur les cimetières dans le Kanjour tibétain (texte sanskrit et version tibétaine de Sambarodayatantra XVII, 38–47; analyse de l'Adbhutaśmaśānālankāra et du Śmaśānālankāratāntra), une nouvelle édition et traduction du Śmaśānavidhi et une étude iconographique de sept thaṅka (pp. 56–89; planches pp. 91–127). Dans la deuxième partie du troisième volume des *Indo-Tibetica* M. G. Tucci avait étudié la littérature liturgique sur les huit cimetières (pp. 173–181).<sup>5</sup> M. Meisezahl signale que le texte sanskrit, édité par M. Tucci, est un passage d'un ouvrage intitulé *Hevajrasādhanaṭṭippanī Vajrapradīpā*. M. Tucci avait attribué ce texte à Suratavajra mais, d'après le colophon que cite M. Meisezahl, l'auteur en est Sūrata que la version tibétaine appelle dPal Jā-lan-dha-ri-pa. L'ouvrage de M. Tucci contient également une traduction d'un petit traité, intitulé *Aṣṭaśmaśāna* (Tib.: *Dur-khrod brgyad-kyi bśad-pa*, cf. P. Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain*, II, p. 74), et une analyse de deux autres opuscules (Cordier, *op. cit.*, p. 74, nos 13 et 14). M. Meisezahl montre que la littérature sur les huit cimetières est beaucoup plus riche. Nous devons lui être reconnaissants de l'avoir si bien explorée et d'avoir contribué ainsi à élargir nos connaissances de la littérature et de l'iconographie du tantrisme bouddhique.

*The Australian National University*

J. W. DE JONG

Karunesha Shukla (ed.), *Śrāvākabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga* [= *Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series* vol. XIV]. Patna, K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1973. CV + 511 pp. Rs. 45.00.

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

<sup>4</sup> Shin'ichi Tsuda, *The Saṃvarodaya-tantra. Selected Chapters* (Tokyo, 1974), p. 124 (= Ch. XVII, 43).

<sup>5</sup> Gli otto cimiteri nella letteratura liturgica.

with paleography, literary history and the language of the Śrāvakabhūmi manuscript. Karunesha 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 Asaṅga's views on Hetuvidyā from the Cintamayībhūmi; 4. The text of the various *gāthāvyavasthānas*.

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. Bhattacharya 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 Tripiṭaka (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. Jamspal for his help in reading the Tibetan version. Shri L. Jamspal'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 Vidhusekhara 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 *Yogācārābhūmi* 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-'grel, 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. 9.18–19: *teṣāṃ samvarāya pratipadyate* [/] *sa śrotreṇa śabdām (bdān)*; W. p. 61: *teṣāṃ samvarāya pratipadyate rakṣati mana-indriyaṃ sa śrotreṇa śabdān*. The words *rakṣati mana-indriyaṃ*, 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-ciñ / mig-gi dbaṅ-po yañ sruñ-bar byed-la / mig-gi dbaṅ-pos kyañ sdom-pa sgrub-par byed-pa dañ / de rna-bas sgra-dag = teṣāṃ samvarāya pratipadyate / rakṣati cakṣurindriyaṃ / cakṣurindriyeṇa samvaram āpadyate / sa śrotreṇa śabdān*. C. (397a24–25) agrees with T. The corruption of the manuscript is probably due to the fact that the scribe read the words *rakṣati mana-indriyaṃ* in the following line of the manuscript (cf. S. p. 10.2), substituted them for *rakṣati cakṣurindriyaṃ* and then omitted the words *cakṣurindriyeṇa samvaram āpadyate*. Of course, this conclusion can be substantiated only if the manuscript does, in fact, contain the words *rakṣati mana-indriyaṃ* 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.

S. pp. 10.11–11.5: *jāgarikānuyogah katamaḥ* / [*sa divā caṃkramaniśadyābhyām āvaraṇīyebhyo dharmebhyaś cittam pari*] *śodhayati* / *sa divā caṃkramaniśadyābhyām āvaraṇīyebhyo dharmebhyaś cittam pariśodhya, tato viharān nirgamya, bahir viharasya pādaū prakṣālyā, dakṣiṇena pārśvena śiṃhaśayyām kalpayaty ālokaśamjñī*. W. p. 62: *jāgarikānuyogah*

*katamaḥ* / [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). . . ] *divā caṅkrama-niṣadyābhyām āvaraṇīyebhyo dharmebhyaś cittam pariśodhayati / rātryāḥ prathame yāme caṅkrama-niṣadyābhyām āvaraṇīyebhyo dharmebhyaś cittam pariśodhayati / pariśodhya tato viḥārān nirgamyā bahir viḥāraṣya pādaḥ prakṣālyā viḥāraṃ praviśya dakṣiṇena pārśvena śāyāṃ kalpayati / pāde pādām ādhāyālokaśamjñī*. 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 dan nam-gyi cha-smad-la mi-ñal-bar sbyor-ba'i rjes-su brtson-pa ñid gañ-ze-na / de-ltar zas-kyi tshod rig-par gyur-pa de ñin-mo 'chag-pa dan 'dug-pa dag-gis sgrib-par 'gyur-ba'i chos-rnams las sems yoñs-su sbyon-bar byed-ciñ mtshan-mo'i thun dan-po la yañ 'chag-pa dan 'dug-pa dag-gis sgrib-par 'gyur-ba'i chos-rnams las sems yoñs-su sbyon-bar byed-la / yoñs-su sbyaṅs-nas de'i 'og-tu gtsug-lag-khañ nas phyir-byuñ-ste gtsug-lag-khañ-gi phyi-rol-tu rkañ-pa bkruś-nas gtsug-lag-khañ-gi nañ-du žugs-te / glo g.yas-pas phab-nas rkañ-pa rkañ-pa'i steñ-du gžag-ste / snañ-ba'i 'du-śes*. Wayman's edition agrees completely with T. apart from the beginning: *pūrvarātrāpararātraṃ jāgarikānuyuktatā katamā / sa tathā bhojane mātṛajño divā caṅkrama-niṣadyābhām . . .* Shukla's edition, however, differs greatly. Shukla points out in his notes that after [cittam pari] śodhayati Wayman reads: *rātryāḥ prathame yāme caṅkrama-niṣadyābhyām āvaraṇīyebhyo dharmebhyaś cittam pariśodhayati / pariśodhya tato viḥārān nirgamyā*. He also points out that after *pādaḥ prakṣālyā* Wayman adds: *viḥāraṃ praviśya* and that Wayman omits *siṃha* in *siṃhaśāyāṃ*. Shukla omits to mention that Wayman adds after *śāyāṃ kalpayati* the words *pāde pādām ādhāya*. Shukla seems to have been guided in his readings by a parallel passage from the Vibhaṅga quoted by him.<sup>1</sup> This passage contains the expression *siḥaseyyam*. However, it contains also several expressions not found in Shukla's edition: *rattiyā pathamaṃ yāmaṃ; pādena pādām accādhāya*. C. agrees with T. and W. but omits the words *viḥāraṃ praviśya* (397b12). It would be important to know whether or not these two words are found in the Sanskrit manuscript.

S. p. 19.11–12: *akṣaṇopannaḥ / apramattaḥ*. W. p. 64: *akṣaṇopapannaḥ kṣaṇopannaḥ / pramattaḥ apramattaḥ*. T. (9b7–8) agrees with W.: *mi-khom-par skyes-pa dan / khom-par skyes-pa dan / bag med-pa dan ldan-pa*. C. (398c1–2) also agrees with W.

S. p. 35.8–10: *sa tathādarśi tadbahulavihārī satkāyavairāgyam anuprāpnoti / prathamāṅca dhyānaṃ samāpadyate / evaṃ sarvādhyanād ūrdhvaṃ*. W. pp. 66–67: *sa tathā-darśi tadbahulavihārī samāno [MS.: satkāma] vairāgyam anuprāpnoti / prathamam ca dhyānaṃ samāpadyate / evaṃ prathamādhyanād ūrdhvaṃ*. T. 17b7–8: *de de-ltar lta-ñin de-la lan mañ-du gnas-pa na 'dod-pa la 'dod-chags dan bral-ba thob-ciñ / bsam-gtan dan-po la yañ sñoms-par 'jug-par 'gyur-ro // de-bžin-du bsam-gtan dan-po'i goñ-ma dag-nas*. Wayman corrects *satkāmavairāgyam* to *samāno vairāgyam*. It seems more likely that the original reading is: *saṃ kāmavairāgyam*. The only difference between C. and T. is that C. has *kāmadhātuvairāgyam* 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 *sarvādhyanād* for *prathamādhyanād*.

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 manuscripts instead 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

<sup>1</sup> Shukla refers to Vbh. pp. 299–300. The abbreviation Vbh. is not found in his bibliography. 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: *uṭṭhānasaññaṃ manasikaritvā* but Shukla quotes: *uṭṭhānasa manasikaritvā*.

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 *Śrāvakabhūmi*, 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: *tvag-māṃsa-śoṇitam asmākam anuprayacchanti / yad utānukampās upādāya viśeṣaphalārthinaḥ tasyāsmākam tathā pratilabdhasya pīṇapātasyāyam evaṃrūpa ta rūpaḥ paribhogah syād yad ahaṃ tathā paribhūtam ātmānam / sthāpayitvā paribhūṃjīya yathā teṣāṃ kārāḥ kṛtā . . .* Wayman italicizes the words *ayam evaṃrūpa . . . paribhūṃjīya* and adds in a note that this phrase is an intrusion. Wayman finds this phrase further on in the Tibetan version: *de-ltar bdag-ñid bzag-ste / yoṅs-su loṅs-spyod-par byed-na / de-ltar yoṅs-su loṅs-spyod-par byed-pa de ni / bdag-gi tshul dan 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 *utānukampās* read *utānukampām*, for *ta rūpaḥ* read *'nurūpaḥ* (cf. Shukla p. 82.14 and 16), for *paribhūtam paribhūṃjānam*, and add a *danḍa* after *viśeṣaphalārthinaḥ*.

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

Robert Shafer, *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*, Part 3. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1968. pp. 217–312; Part 4, 1970, pp. 313–408; Part 5, 1974, pp. XVI + 409–525. DM 48.-, 64.-, 112.-.

The first two parts of Shafer's *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan* were published in 1966 and 1967 (see *III*, 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. *Monumenta 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

Takasaki Jikidō, *Nyoraizō shisō no keisei* [The formation of the tathāgatagarbha theory]. Tōkyō, Shunjūsha, 1974. xxii + 779 + 106 pp. Yen 9.000.

In 1966 Takasaki published a translation of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* together with a lengthy Introduction: *A Study of the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra)*. In a review we expressed the wish that Takasaki would undertake a systematic treatment of the *tathāgatagarbha* theory and its history (*IJJ*, 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 Aśvaghoṣa and translated by Paramārtha and Śikṣānanda. 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.<sup>1</sup> Demiéville lists the

<sup>1</sup> "Sur l'authenticité du *Ta tch'eng k'i sin louen*", *BMFJ*, II, 2 (Tokyo, 1929), pp. 1–78; *Choix d'études bouddhiques* (Leiden, 1973), p. XXXIII. Walter Liebenthal has arrived at the same conclusion, cf. 'New light on the Mahāyāna-śraddhotpāda Śāstra', *T'oung Pao* 46 (1958), 155–216.

Japanese studies on this problem published before 1929. Japanese scholars have continued the discussion without coming to any agreement.<sup>2</sup> 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 *Ratnagotravibhāga* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*.<sup>3</sup> In India and Tibet the Mādhyamika and the Yogācāra are considered the only Mahāyāna schools. Fa-tsang (643–711), the third patriarch of the Hua-yen school, recognized a third Mahāyāna school: the *ju-lai-tsang yüan-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 *Lankāvatārasūtra* and the *Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun* which combine the *garbha* 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 *Ratnagotravibhāga* from the Tibetan (*Acta Orientalia*, IX, 1931, pp. 81–306) stimulated new studies on the *garbha* theory in Japan. Ui reexamined the Chinese materials and Tsukinowa Kenryū (1888–1969) compared Chinese and Tibetan texts.<sup>4</sup> 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 (*Anuttarāśrayasūtra* 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 *Ratnagotravibhāga* 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. Ui's study and translation of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* appeared in 1959 and Takasaki's English translation in 1966. Sanskrit and Tibetan materials have been studied in Seyfort Ruegg's magnum opus: *La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra* (Paris, 1969). Recently Lambert Schmithausen has published two important articles on the text of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* and Takasaki's translation and on Ruegg's book.<sup>5</sup> 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 *Ratnagotravibhāga*. In the first place it is necessary to understand the structure of the

<sup>2</sup> Takasaki points out that Ui Hakuju 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 Daijō, Sakaino Kōyō, Hatani Ryōtai, 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 Kashiwagi Hiroo's bibliographical appendix to Hirakawa Akira's *Daijōkishiron* (*Butten Kōza*, Vol. 22, Tokyo, 1973), pp. 390–413.

<sup>3</sup> 'Busshōron no ichi kōsatsu', *Bukkyō shigaku* 4 (1955), 160–174 (cf. *Revue Bibliographique de Sinologie*, 2, 1956, no. 584). Cf. also Takasaki's article in the volume in honour of Yūki Reimon: *Bukkyō shisōshi ronshū* (Tōkyō, 1964), pp. 241–264.

<sup>4</sup> Ui Hakuju, *Indo tetsugakushi* (Tōkyō, 1932), pp. 317–322, 407–416 and 418–433. Tsukinowa Kenryū, 'Kukyōichijōhōshōron ni tsuite', *Nihon bukkyō kyōkai nenpō* 7 (1935), 121–139 = *Butten no hihan-teki kenkyū* (Tōkyō, 1972), pp. 364–381.

<sup>5</sup> 'Philologische Bemerkungen zum Ratnagotravibhāga', *WZKS* 15 (1971), 123–177; 'Zu D. Seyfort Rueggs Buch "La Théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra" (Besprechungsaufsatz)', *WZKS* 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 *Samādhinirmocanasūtra* 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. *bussō*). 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 *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. Nevertheless, the author prefers the term *tathāgatagarbha* because it is found in the colophon of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (*kevala-tathāgatagarbhanirdeśasūtra*) and because the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* uses the term *tathāgatagarbhavāda*. 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 *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the *Ratnagotravibhāga*. The fundamental idea of the *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra* is expressed in the formula: *sarvasattvās tathāgatagarbhāḥ* which Takasaki translates "all beings possess the *tathāgatagarbha*".<sup>6</sup>

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 *Anūnatvāpūrnatvanirdeśa* and the *Śrīmālāsūtra*. The second chapter studies the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* 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 *Mahāvāyana-daśadharmaka*. 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 *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamasūtra*, and with the relation between the *Śrīmālāsūtra* and the *Vijñānavāda*.

<sup>6</sup> Seyfort Ruegg has pointed out that in the texts the compound *tathāgatagarbha* is understood mostly as a *tatpuruṣa* but sometimes also as a *bahuvrīhi* (op. cit., pp. 507–513). Takasaki remarks that in the *Ratnagotravibhāga* it is analysed as (1) a *tatpuruṣa* (*tathāgatasye me garbhāḥ sarvasattvāḥ*), (2) a *karmadhāraya* (*tathāgatas tathataiṣaṃ garbhāḥ sarvasattvānām*) and as (3) a *bahuvrīhi* (*tathāgatadhātur eṣaṃ garbhāḥ sarvasattvānām*), 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 *Mahāvānasūtras* which contain concepts which are of essential importance for the formation of the *tathāgatagarbha* theory, such as *gotra*, *dhātu* and *cittaprakṛti* or concepts related to it such as *dharmakāya*, *dharmatā*, *tathatā*, *tathāgata*, *ekayāna*, etc. Among the sūtras studied are the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtras*, the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*, the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra*, the *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra*, texts belonging to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*, the *Jñānālokālaṃkārasūtra*, the *Dhāraṇīśvararājasūtra* and texts belonging to the *Mahāsannipātasūtra*.

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 Buddhahadra, Guṇabhadra and Dharmakṣema. 2. The stage of the śāstras translated by Bodhiruci, Ratnamati, Paramārtha, Hsüan-tsang and I-tsing. 3. The stage of the tantric texts beginning immediately after Hsüan-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 śāstras which combine the *tathāgatagarbha* with the *ālayavijñāna*. 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* (*vaṃśa*, *kula*, *buddhaputra*, etc.); 2. *citta* (*cittaprakṛtiprabhāśvaratā*); 3. *tathāgatagarbha*; 4. *dhātu* (*sattvadhātu*, *buddha* – and *dharmā*); 5. *dharmakāya* (*tathāgata* and *dharmakāya*); 6. other items (*guhya*, *saṃdhāvacana*, *uttaratantra*). 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 śāstras 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 *Ratnagotravibhāga* 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 *Vijñānavāda* 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. I. The *tathāgatagarbha* theory was completely absorbed by the *Vijñānavāda* and the existence of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* was almost entirely forgotten. After this period which is dominated by disputes between the Mādhyamika and Yogācāra schools, the tradition of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* was revived and both the *Abhisamālālaṃkāra* and the *Ratnagotravibhāga* are numbered among the five texts of Maitreya. II. The revival of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* and the formation of a group of five texts attributed to Maitreya 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 Buddha-nature” has had an enormous influence since the beginning of the fifth century at which time two recensions of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* 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 *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, the *Fo-hsing lun*, the *Ta-ch’eng ch’i-hsin lun* and the *Vajrasamādhisūtra*.<sup>7</sup> IV. The *tathāgatagarbha* theory is mentioned in tantric texts such as the

<sup>7</sup> For this text see P. Demiéville, *Le concile de Lhasa* (Paris, 1952), pp. 54–58; Walter Liebenthal, ‘Notes on the “Vajrasamādhi”’, *T’oung Pao* 44 (1956), 347–386.

*Prajñāpāramitānayaśatapañcaśatikā*.<sup>8</sup> 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 *tathāgatagarbhavāda* 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

\*Helmut Hoffmann, *Symbolik der tibetischen Religionen und des Schamanismus* [= *Symbolik der Religionen*, herausgegeben von Ferdinand Herrmann, Band XII]. Stuttgart, Anton Hiersemann, 1967. DM 60,-.

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*, *Buddhas 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 Kirfel'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 Kōtatsu, who is inclined to deny any external influence.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>8</sup> For references to the different versions see Takasaki, p. 774, n. 5.

<sup>1</sup> *Genshi jōdo shisō no kenkyū*, Tokyo, 1970. See our review, *T'oung Pao* 58 (1972) 352–366.

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-chun 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

Heinz Zimmermann, *Die Subhāṣita-ratna-karaṇḍaka-kathā* (dem Āryaśūra zugeschrieben) und ihre tibetische Übersetzung. Ein Vergleich zur Darlegung der Irrtumsrisiken bei der Auswertung tibetischer Übersetzungen. [= *Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie*, Band 8]. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1975. VI + 273 pp.

The Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā (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 Dvāviṃśatyavadāna. 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 Dvāviṃśatyavadāna (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 (D, c).

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,<sup>1</sup> R. Turner who has studied the language of the

<sup>1</sup> *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal* (Calcutta, 1882), pp. 85–89.

Dvāv.<sup>2</sup> and L. Feer who studied the relationship of the Dvāv. with other collections of Avadānas.<sup>3</sup> 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 Dvāv. This is not quite correct with reference to Speyer who himself inspected the manuscript of the Dvāv. 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 *saṃgrahaśloka*-s, and chapters 23–27 which deal with five of the six *pāramitā*-s: *śīla*, *kṣānti*, *vīrya*, *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 Śatapañcāsatka (5b: *mahārnavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvārpaṇopamam*). Zimmermann writes: "Dann wenn Śāntideva in diesem einen Falle als der Entleiher 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.<sup>4</sup> To the references, given by him, others can be added.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> The simile is also found in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra.<sup>7</sup> There is no doubt that this half-verse was very popular and its occurrence in Śāntideva'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 Śāntideva. 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. Zinkgräf 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.<sup>8</sup> This is not correct. The Indian Śākya 'od (Śākya-prabha) is mentioned as one of the translators of the *Vinayasamgraha*.<sup>9</sup> One of the two other translators is Śīlendrabadhi who is well-known as one of the compilers of the Mahāvīyūtpatti in the first quarter of the ninth century. The Tibetan monk Śākya 'od, however, is a contemporary of Rin-chen bzang-po (985–1055) as has been shown by Tucci.<sup>10</sup> He must have been active in the middle of the eleventh century as can be shown by an examination of the many colophons in

<sup>2</sup> 'Notes on the language of the Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā', *JRAS* (1913), pp. 289–304.

<sup>3</sup> 'Le livre des cent légendes', *JA* (1879), II, pp. 293–297, 305–306; *Avadānaśataka* (Paris, 1891), Introduction; *Fragments extraits du Kandjour* (Paris, 1883), pp. 544–552.

<sup>4</sup> *The Śatapañcāsatka of Mātṛceṭa* (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 12–13.

<sup>5</sup> Compte rendu de *The Śatapañcāsatka of Mātṛceṭa*, *T'oung Pao*, 42 (1954), p. 404.

<sup>6</sup> Review of K. R. Norman, *The Elders' Verses II. Therīgāthā* (London, 1971), *JAOS*, 93 (1973), p. 603; K. R. Norman, 'Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IX. The blind turtle and the hole in the yoke', *JOIBaroda*, XXI (1972), pp. 331–335.

<sup>7</sup> *The Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇaśāstra*. Transl. by Kosho Yamamoto. Vol. I (The Karibunko, 1973), p. 34.

<sup>8</sup> *Vom Divyāvadāna zur Avadānakalpalatā* (Heidelberg, 1940), pp. 61–62.

<sup>9</sup> P. Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. IIIe partie (Paris, 1915), p. 401.

<sup>10</sup> *Indo-Tibetica*, II (Roma, 1933), p. 50.

the Tanjur in which he is mentioned as translator.<sup>11</sup> 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 Śāntideva and the eleventh century. Zimmermann refers to Bendall's introduction to the Śikṣāsamuccaya for Śāntideva's date (seventh century). It has to be pointed out, however, that this date is based entirely upon Tāranātha 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 Jīnamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye-ses-sde and that, consequently, 800 A.D. has to be admitted as the latest possible *terminus ad quem*. The dates of Śāntideva 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 lüeh ching* (Taishō no. 723), is another recension of the *Fen-pieh shan-ō so-ch'i ching* (Taishō no. 729) of which the translation is attributed to An Shih-kao (148–170 A.D.).<sup>12</sup> 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 Jātakamālā in the inscriptions in Ajanṭā. According to Lüders these inscriptions are from the sixth century.<sup>13</sup>

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 Valabhī, 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.<sup>14</sup> He adds: "We know of no Buddhist writer named Āryaśūra who flourished before this date except the well-known author of the Jātakamālā. 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 Valabhī 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.

<sup>11</sup> Marcelle Lalou, *Répertoire du Tanjur d'après le catalogue de P. Cordier* (Paris, 1933), p. 213.

<sup>12</sup> *L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi* (Paris, 1949), pp. 102 and 313.

<sup>13</sup> 'Ārya-Śūras Jātakamālā und die Fresken von Ajanṭā', *Gött. Nachr. Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (1902), pp. 758–762 [= *Philologica Indica* (Göttingen, 1940), pp. 73–77].

<sup>14</sup> 'A note on the Subhāṣitaratna-karaṇḍakakathā of Āryaśūra', *Adyar Library Bulletin*, 25 (1961), pp. 304–307.

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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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: *rūpārūpyasamādhisampadakhilam bhuktvā ca sarvaṃ sukhaṃ*. Tr.: "Erfolgreich im Zustandebringen der formbehafteten und der formfreien Versenkungsstufen, und nach dem Auskosten restlos aller Glückseligkeit." The translation is too free because *rūpārūpyasamādhisampadakhilam* refers to *sukhaṃ*: "a bliss which is complete through the attainment of concentrations endowed with form and without form".

67b: *kriyotthāpanam*. Tr.: "das Ausführen des Beschlusses". 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: *dbyañs sñan rol mo dan 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 gcig-tu* "with one voice").

116: *yadgarbhe paripuṣṭim eti śucibhiḥ pronnīyamāno rasaiḥ / bālye yan madhusarpiṣī ca pibati kṣīraṃ ca kāle punaḥ*. Tib. tr.: *gañ žig mñal du rdsogs par ni / gtsaṅ žiñ yid 'oñ ro myaṅ la / mar dan sbrañ rtsi stobs dan ni / gañ žig 'o ma 'thuñ thse yañ*. Zimmermann corrects the reading of the Tibetan versions *stobs* into *stob* and translates: "Wer, im Mutterleib gedeihend, (sich von) reinem Ghee und Honig von angenehmem Geschmack nährt; wer andererseits zur Zeit Milch

<sup>15</sup> 'The Prātimokṣa-Sūtra', *IHQ*, 29 (1953), pp. 162–174, 266–275, 363–377.

<sup>16</sup> Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, part 1 [= *Śatapīṭaka*, 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 *myoñ* instead of *myaṅ* 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 *thse* is parallel to that of *stobs* which represents Skt. *bālye* confounded with *bale*. It seems difficult to take *ro myaṅ* as rendering ‘taste’ and to connect *gtsaṅ zhiñ yid ‘oñ ro myaṅ* with *mar dañ sbran rtsi* in the following line.

146c: *saṃpūjanāṃ sa labhate bahuratnajāto* (MS. *-jātaṃ*). Tr.: “Der gewinnt hienieden, als Besitzer vieler Juwelen, immer hohe Ehrung.” Zimmermann translates *-jāto* als ‘Besitzer’ which seems not possible in this context. It is preferable to read with Banerjee *bahuratnajātair* ‘with masses of many jewels’. The Tibetan translation has: *rin chen mañ dañ bžon pas phyug*. Probably the Tibetan translators rendered *bahuratnayānair*.

155a: *dagdhassthūṇāsamucchrayāḥ*. Tr. “mit Körpern wie flammende Säulen”. *Dagdhassthūṇā* is ‘a burnt wooden post’. It is used in Buddhist texts to describe a *pretī*, cf. Avadāśataka (ed. Speyer, vol. I, p. 253.13): *pretīm adrākṣaṃ dagdhassthūṇāsadrśīm*; Ratnamālavādāna (ed. K. Takahata, p. 53.19): *pretīm . . . dagdhassthūṇāmahākṛtīm*.

155c: *dūropadrutaśārameyanivahā vyāvṛtya 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) *ciñ sloṅ ba la phyir ldog*. Tr.: “wie ein Hund fernab stehenbleibt und, (wenn man) von überall her (auf ihn los-)rennt und (ihn) aufscheucht, wieder zurückkehrt”. Tib. *sloṅ-ba* 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-ba* ‘to ask, to beg’: “as dogs they remain at a distance, run in every direction, beg, and turn back”. The Tibetan translation has *gañ-žig* but this can be used also for a plural. Undoubtedly the Tibetan translators made no effort to render the rather complicated Sanskrit compound *dūropadrutaśārameyanivahā* and gave a very free rendering.

190cd: *jñātvā naraḥ syahitasādhanatpatparasyām* (MS. *-paraḥ syām*) / *kuryān na kaḥ satatam āśu drdhaṃ prayatnam*. The first half of the verse mentions the six *pāramitā*-s. Zimmermann proposed to read *tatparasyām* 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 *tatparāyām*. Probably one must read *-tatparās tāḥ / kuryān na kaḥ satatam āśu drdhaṃ prayatnam*. The Tibetan translators have read *āśu* (*myur-du*) but the confusion of *s* and *ś* is a normal phenomenon.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

*Mikkyō jiten*. Sawa Ryūken hen. Kyōto. Hōzōkan, 1975. VI + 730 + 176 pp. Yen 9.500

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.<sup>1</sup> 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 Ryūken, writes in the preface that the compilers of this dictionary felt the necessity of compiling a dictionary giving explanations written in *gendaigo*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. Demiéville, *JA*, 1933, fasc. ann., pp. 97–98; *Bibliographie bouddhique*, VI (Paris, 1936), p. 16.



(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 Ryūken, Takai Ryūshū, Tamura Ryūshō, Matsunaga Yūkei, Miyasaki Yūshō and Yamasaki Taikō. 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 (*Dōkyō*), the Tibetan language (*Chibettogo*), Bon-po (*Bonkyō*), the Mahābhārata (*Mahābhārata*), the Islam (*Isurāmukyō*), 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, Pāli, 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 (*Ōbei mikkyō*) 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 maṇḍala-s, ceremonies, mudrā-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 maṇḍala). This term is fully studied in the *Hōbōgirin* (pp. 279–280), a work which seems not to have been consulted by the compilers of the dictionary. *Chakuji* is found in the *Bukkyō jiten*, a dictionary of limited size compiled under the supervision of Ui 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 Ryūken 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 *bīja*-s; III. The two great maṇḍalas (*ryōbu mandara*); IV. Bibliographical details on Tantric texts in the Taishō 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 Ryūken and his collaborators deserve high praise for their work. The *Mikkyō 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 *Mikkyō daijiten*. The publishers, Hōzōkan in Kyōto, have produced a book which is beautifully printed, bound and illustrated.

Ria Kloppenborg, *The Paccekabuddha. A Buddhist Ascetic. A study of the concept of the paccekabuddha in Pāli canonical and commentarial literature* [= *Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina*, vol. 20]. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1974. XIV + 135 pp. DGlD. 40.-.

As the author remarks in her introduction the *paccekabuddha* has received little detailed attention. Louis de La Vallée Poussin'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*, *samaṇa*, *tāpasa*, *jaṭila*. La Vallée Poussin'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 Ui Hakuju (1882–1963) in volume IV of his *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* (Tōkyō, 1927). According to Ui 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 Ui's theory has been followed by other leading Japanese scholars such as Kimura Taiken in his *Shōjō bukkyō shisō ron* (Tōkyō, 1937) and Sakaino Kōyō ('Byakushibutsu ron', *Gendai bukkyō*, 1933).<sup>1</sup> However, Fujita shows clearly in his article that Ui's theory is not based upon early Buddhist texts and has to be rejected. According to him La Vallée Poussin's theory has been elaborated in Japan by Mochizuki Shinkō ('Engaku', *Bukkyōdaijiten*, 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*.<sup>2</sup> 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 Ittivuttaka, the Thera- and Therīgāthā, etc., whereas it is

<sup>1</sup> '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.

<sup>2</sup> 'Engaku kō', *Ōtani Gakuhō*, XXXVI, 3 (1956), pp. 40–51.

found in the *Āṅguttaranikāya* and more frequently in such younger texts as the *Khuddakapāṭha*, the *Apadāna* and the two *Niddesas*. The author limits herself to a systematic arrangement of the materials in three chapters: 1. The *paccekabuddha*; 2. The Way towards *paccekabodhi*; 3. The *paccekabuddha*'s way of life. Chapter four contains a translation of the 41 verses of the *Khaggavisāṇasutta* 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 *Asaṅga'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: "*paccekabuddhas* are born when no *buddhas* are found and in the time of the birth of a *buddha*"; Sn.A. p. 51: *paccekabuddhā buddhe appatvā buddhānaṃ uppajjanakāle yeva uppajjanti* "*paccekabuddhas* 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 *paccekabuddhas* exist at the time of the births of *buddhas* although in the following chapter she quotes a passage from the *Sāratthappakāsinī* according to which *paccekabuddhas* 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: "*paccekabuddhas* 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 lokuttarādhamaṃ paññattim āropevū desetum sakkonti* "for they are unable to put the supra-mundane doctrine into verbal concepts and to teach it". Pāli *paññatti*, BHS *paññapti* 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 *paccekabodhi* is "the seeing of one who has destroyed evil influences" (*vigatāsavadassana*). The commentary explains that this refers to either a *buddha* or a *paccekabuddha* or a disciple (*buddhapaccekabuddhasāvakaṇaṃ yassa kassaci dassanan to*). R. K. translates *vigatāsavadassana* (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*, *paccekabuddhas* and disciples" (p. 39). On p. 114 R. K. translates *nāṭakadassanaṃ āgataṃ aññataraṃ kuṭumbikabhariyaṃ* (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 *Suttanipāṭa* but she does not hesitate to render *anaññaposi(n)* with 'not nourished by others' (p. 116), a translation based upon the explanation given in the commentary: *posetabbakasaddhivihārikādivirahita* (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 needless to continue this enumeration of elementary mistakes, but it is necessary to point out that the translation of the *Pratyekabuddhabhūmi* is, if possible, even worse. For instance, *kalpaśataṃ buddhotpādam āragayati* 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. *āraṇa*: "*buddhotpādārāṇatā*, attainment of the production of *Buddhas*, i.e. the privilege of being born when a *Buddha* is born".<sup>3</sup> R. K. translates *asati ca buddhānaṃ utpāde* with "without (having made) the resolution of the *buddhas*". Translations of this kind of course make nonsense of the text of the *Pratyekabuddhabhūmi*.

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

<sup>3</sup> Weller proposes two different interpretations: "Entzücken über das Erscheinen eines *Buddha*" or "Einen erscheinenden *Buddha* erfreuen", cf. *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta* (Berlin, 1965), p. 77, note 5.

that the author has been badly advised in publishing this book. A comprehensive and satisfactory study of the concept of the *paccekabuddha* 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.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

*The Sūtra on the Foundation of the Buddhist Order (Catuspariṣatsūtra)* translated by Ria Kloppenborg [= *Religious Texts Translation Series Nisaba*, volume one]. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1973. XVI + 123 pp. DGlD. 16.-.

The Catuspariṣatsūtra (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 Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana.

Ria Kloppenborg'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 *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part IV (Calcutta, 1950), p. 216.3–11. R. K. renders *jñānadarśana* with "insight into knowledge" but *jñānadarśana* has to be interpreted as a dvandva. For the explanation of the terms *jñāna* and *darśana* by the Abhidharmakośavyākhyā, and for references see L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, VIII, p. 193, n. 2.

I.7: "O Thou of whom all pride is gone." In a note R. K. explains that she translates *garvalopa* instead of *pūrṇalopa*. Waldschmidt's restoration *garvalopa* is based upon Tibetan *ña-rgyal bcom* but at p. 434, n. 16 he points out that the reading of the manuscript is more like *ṛṇ* than like *rva*. The Gilgit manuscript has *parṇalopa* and MS. 42.3 *rṇalopa*. It is not possible to read *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, *Die Āryā-Strophen des Pāli-Kanons* (Wiesbaden, 1968), pp. 54–55. Alsdorf arrives at the following conclusion: "Ein Vergleich dieser Texte zeigt sofort, dass *pūrṇabhāra*, *pūrṇalopa*, *parṇalopa* und *prajñākāra* sämtlich Entstellungen von *paññabhāra* sind, das allein einen wirklich guten Sinn gibt."<sup>1</sup> It is not easy to see how *bhāra* could have been transformed into *lopa*, but perhaps this is due to the influence of Pāli *paññaloma*. Tib. *bcom* corresponds to *lopa* but Tib. *ña-rgyal* '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"; *parato ye upasargā devatā mārakāyikāḥ / na śaknuvanty antarāyaṃ kṛtapuṇyasya kartu vai* //. *Paratas* can mean 'further' or 'farther' but not 'furthermore'. Here it

<sup>1</sup> See also *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya*, edited by Gustav Roth (Patna, 1970), p. 122.5–7: bahusrutam citrakatham Buddhasya paricārakam / paṇabhāravisaṃyuktam. Read *paṇabhārah* (= *paññabhārah*) *visaṃyuktam*, cf. bahussuto cittakathā buddhassa paricārako / paññabhāro visaññutto, Theragāthā 1021; paññabhāro visaṃyutto, Aṅguttaranikāya, vol. I, p. 162.21.

certainly means 'from others': "Those disasters (coming) from others (such as) the gods belonging to the train of Māra."

4.6: "capable of speaking for themselves (on the dharma) and well-acquainted (with the dharma)"; *alam svasya vādasya paryavadātāro*: "capable of elucidating their own doctrine", cf. Tib. *rañ-gi smra-ba gsal-bar byed-nus-pa'i*. See also Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (henceforth abbreviated as BHSD) s.v. *paryavadāpayitar*: "one who purifies completely: *svasya vādasya paryavadāpayitāro* Divy. 202.13". Burnouf translates: "ils peuvent faire adopter aux autres tous leurs raisonnements" (*Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, Paris, 1844, p. 78).

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 *gambhīrābhāso*. 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 gambhīrobhāso* (Aṅg. Nik., II, p. 105). Woodward translates: "The shallow which looks deep" (*Gradual Sayings*, II, p. 112).

10.8: "Conquerors like me who achieved the destruction of evil influences must be recognized"; *jinā hi mādṛṣā jñeyā ye prāptā āsravakṣayam*: "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 santaḥ prakāśante viditvā lokaparyayaṃ*. 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 pratiyaty' eva kālabbhojī*. In 16.2 R. K. translates *pratiyaty' eva* with 'immediately': "When his body was tired, he immediately went to sleep"; *śrāntakāyaḥ prāgbhārah pratiyaty' eva middham avakrāntah*. The expression *pratiyaty' eva* has given rise to different explanations and translations, cf. Jean Filliozat, 'Fragments du Vinaya des Sarvāstivādin', *JA*, 1938, p. 45, n. 3 [= *Laghu-prabandhāḥ*, Leiden, 1973, p. 103]: "On pourrait interpréter *pratiyaty* comme locatif absolu du participe présent *pratiyant-* 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, *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus*, I, *JA*, 1959, p. 261: "On relèvera, d'après l'éditeur, la forme *pratiyaty 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 *pratiyat' 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 *paṭigacc' eva* or *paṭikacc' eva* corresponds to *pratiyaty' eva* (*ibid.*, n. 138). Edgerton considered *pratyatyā* 'in advance' to be a semi-Prakritic 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 Catuṣpariśatsūtra*, *Language*, 39, 1963, p. 491). The form *pratiyatyā* 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

*pratiyatya* due to a misunderstanding of a Prakrit *paḍiyacca*. As to the meaning Brough said: "For *pratikṛtya* 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 Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London 1962, p. 278). The Tibetans translate *pratyaty'eva* with *myur-du* 'quickly' or with expressions meaning 'previously, before' (*šnon-chad, goñ-ma bzin-du*). From the meaning 'previously' (i.e. "sooner than usual", cf. Dines Andersen, *A Pāli Reader*, glossary s.v. *paṭigacca*) the meanings 'quickly, immediately' have developed. Apart from the places quoted see further Udānavarga (ed. F. Bernhard) 4.16: *pratiyatyeva tat kuryād, yaj jāned dhitam ātmanah*; 27.8: *etat tu śalyaṃ pratiyatya paśyato, hy adhyavasitā yatra prajāḥ prasaktāḥ*; *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part 2 (Srinagar, 1942), p. 86.10: *amuko bhikṣuḥ sa bhagavatā pratiyatyeva* (Ms. *pratiṭipadyeva!*) *vyākṛtaḥ* (Dutt *vyākṛtāḥ*); p. 107.13: *pratiyatyevasau* (Dutt *pratiṭipatyevāsau*) *viḥaraḥ śobhane viviktāsane ca bhūbhāge pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ*.

12.12: "I was not released . . . nor did I leave this or was I separated (from it), free (from it), nor far removed (from it), with undeluded mind." The translation uses five expressions to render four Sanskrit words: *mukto, nisṛto, viśamyukto, vipramukto*. As to "undeluded mind" the translator refers to *aviparītena cittena* which Waldschmidt had restored on p. 150 but the Tibetan translation (*phyin-ci-log dan bral-ba'i sems-kyis*) shows clearly that *viparyāśāpagatena cetasā* is the correct reading.

25a.11: "method of the dharma"; *dharmavinaya!* Same mistake in 25b.9.

27b.10: "The man, hearing (this) from king Śraiṇya Bimbasāra of Magadha, said: "Be it so, Your Majesty"; *evaṃ deveti sa puruṣo rājño māgadhasya śraiṇyasya bimbasārasya pratiśrutya. Pratiśru-* 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"; *annāni pānāni tathā rasāṃs ca, kāmāṃs ca strīś caiva vadanti haikē / etāṃ malān upadhau saṃprapaśyaṃs, tasmān na yaṣṭe na hute rato 'ham*. In a note the translator remarks that 'they' refer to the sacrifices. The text has not 'they' but 'some here'. The manuscript reads *vadantīhaikē* which Waldschmidt has changed to *vadanti haikē* metri causa. It would be preferable to write *vadant' ihaikē* (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?"; *kathan nu te deva-manuṣyaloke ratam manah* "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 *apratīsandhi* with 'irreparably' is based upon Waldschmidt's note but the meaning of Pāli *appaṭīsandhiya* is 'not leading (or subject to) rebirth', cf. *Critical Pāli Dictionary* s.v.; Edgerton, *op. cit.*, p. 493: *apratīsaṃdhi* (adv.) 'without rebirth'.

28b.3: "he was closely following the reverend Āsvajit"; *āyuṣmantam āsvajitam āgamayamānaḥ*; "he was waiting for the venerable Āsvajit".

27e.23: "In what is he who is completely released? In the opposite of suffering, the destruction of it . . ."; *tatra bhikṣavaḥ kaḥ parinirvṛtaḥ / anyatra duḥkham tan niruddham*. The text is not very well established, cf. CPS p. 362, n. 7. In the corresponding passage of the Nidānasamyukta (ed. Chandrabhāl Tripāthī, Berlin, 1962, p. 140) the editor reads *anyatra yad duḥkham*. 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 BHSD 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 bhikṣavaḥ kaḥ parinirvṛto nānyatra yad duḥkham . . .* "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

Tibetan translation confirms this interpretation: *dge-sloñ-dag de-la yoñs-su mya-nan-las 'das-pa gañ ze-na / gzan med-kyi sdug-bśhal 'gags-pa gañ yin-pa / de ni ñe-bar ži-ba /*.

28e.7: The Sanskrit text is missing and R. K. translates in a note the Tibetan translation: "The teacher . . . saw the friends Upaṭiṣya and Kolita coming to the Veṇuvana. 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 gyur-nas / tshogs mchog dbus-su de gñis ni / 'di gñis ña-yi ñan-thos-kyi / zuñ-mchog 'gyur žes ñes bstan-te /*, "The teacher . . . having seen the two friends Upaṭiṣya and Kolita, who had not yet arrived at the Veṇuvana, coming in this way, proclaimed: "In the excellent assembly these two, both of them, will be the best pair of my disciples", cf. Alsdorf, *op. cit.*, p. 70 and *III*, 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 Sañjayin, who were admitted and ordained, and they uttered the verse: ". "The Buddha arrived in Rājagṛha, the capital of the people of Magadha. All are guided by Sāñjayin. Whom else will you guide?" "; *atha saṃbahulā bhikṣavaḥ pūrvāhṇe nivasya pātracivaram ādāya rājagṛhaṃ piṇḍāya prāviśan*. 2. *atha rājagṛhakā manuṣyāḥ sañjayinā tīrthyāyatanena pravṛjitenopasaṃpāditena tāms tān bhikṣūn dṛṣtvā avaspaṇdayamānā gāthāṃ bhāṣante*. 3. *prāpto rājagṛhe buddho magadhānāṃ purottamē / sarve sañjayino nītāḥ kiṃ nu bhūyo nayaṣyatha //*. The text in section two seems to be incomplete. According to the Tibetan translation the original text ran something like this: *atha ye rājagṛhakā manuṣyāḥ sañjayinā tīrthyāyatanenācirapavāḥitenopasaṃpāditenānāṭa-manaso 'nabhinandinas te tāms tān . . .* : "Then the people of Rājagṛha, furious and discontented because the (followers of the) heretical school of Sañjayin were recently admitted and ordained seeing all these monks . . . Cf. Tib. *de-na rgyal-po'i khab-kyi mi gañ-dag yañ-dag rgyal-ba-can-gyi mu-stegs-can-gyi gnas rab-tu phyuñ žiñ bśñen-par rdsogs-nas riñ-po ma lon-pas yi ma rañs-śiñ mñon-par mi dga'-ba de-dag-gis dge-sloñ de dañ de-dag mthoñ-nas*. In 3. *sañjayino* designates the followers of Sañjayin: "All the followers of Sañjayin are lead (by the Buddha)", cf. Pāli *sabbe sañjaye netvāna* "Leading all Sañjaya's (followers)". (tr. I. B. Horner, *The Book of Discipline*, IV, p. 56). In 3d *nayaṣyatha* must be a mistake for *nayaṣyati* which is found in the Pāli and in the Mahāvastu: "What more will he lead?" The parallel texts have *kaṃ* instead of *kiṃ* but *kiṃ* 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 *kunmāsa* and *Yaṣṭivana*. Edgerton's suggestion to read *apratibhānamātram* in 28f.12 and 28g.6 is very attractive.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG

A. Kamatchinathan, *The Tirunelvēli Tamil Dialect*. Annamalainagar, 1969. xvi + 188 pp. Rs. 5.00.

Though the existence of dialectal differences in the ancient Tamilnad is attested in the classical Tamil texts and the later commentaries, a scientific study of the geographical 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 *Nāñcīlnād 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 Tirunelvēli 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 phonemics. 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, ʈ, 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  $\Phi$ ,  $\delta$ , 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 also evident from the absence of the word / $\Phi$ eya/ '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 / $\Phi$ / as a bilabial voiceless fricative, / $\delta$ / 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- and -kk- are treated as long consonants, -mm-, -nn-, -ṇṇ-, -ll-, -ḷḷ-, -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 *aliñcu* 'having perished' and according to ten, for example, *kaṇ+nt+u* would become *kaṇṭu* 'having seen'. Because of the sandhi rule five, the author does not mention a separate allomorph -ñc- for the past tense. But contradiction arises when he posits an allomorph -ṭ- in spite of the sandhi rule ten to account for instances like *kaṇṭu*. 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 / $\Phi$ / and /h/ as separate phonemes, although their occurrences are perfectly predicted by this rule, e.g., *vanta + peya* becomes *vanta  $\Phi$ eya* 'fellow who came' and *vanta + kāle* becomes *vanta hāle* 'bull which came'. This sandhi rule does not justify the author's decision to interpret  $\Phi$  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, postpositions 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 postpositions the syntactic relationship forms the criterion. It goes without saying that these two yard-sticks 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-occurent of a noun. Another extreme case