

The Elders' Verses, I: *Theragāthā*. Translated with an introduction and notes by K. R. Norman (= *Pali Text Society Translation Series*, No. 38), London, published for the Pali Text Society, Luzac and Company, Ltd., 1969. lxiv + 319 pp. £ 5.5.—.

In 1933 the editors of the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* expressed their unreserved admiration for the *PTS Translation Series* (CPD, p. XXIX). Undoubtedly, they would have welcomed with great joy the most recent addition to this series, Mr. K. R. Norman's translation of the *Theragāthā* which supersedes the excellent translation published by Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids in 1913. Mr. Norman's work consists of three parts: introduction (pp. xix-lxiv) preceded by a preface, a bibliography and list of abbreviations; translation (pp. 1-116) and notes (pp. 117-300). Three indexes conclude the work: one of parallel passages in Sanskrit, Prakrit and non-canonical prose (pp. 301-304), one of names (pp. 305-309) and one of words discussed or quoted in the notes (pp. 310-316). In this last index words or meanings, not given in *PED* (= *Pāli-English Dictionary*, PTS, 1925) are marked with an asterisk.

Mrs. Rhys Davids greatly relied on the commentary for the explanation of difficult words and expressions. Mr. Norman does not neglect the commentary which is copiously cited, but he adopts a more critical attitude towards it. No explanation, given by the commentary, is accepted without having been carefully examined. Mr. Norman proposes many emendations for the text of the *Theragāthā* (cf. the list of emendations in the second edition of the *Thera- and Theri-gāthā*, PTS, 1966, pp. 223-232). Not all of the emendations, listed in this edition, have been maintained by him because some of the readings found in other editions are due to later normalization. Mrs. Rhys Davids made only a few remarks on the metres of the *Theragāthā* (*Psalms of the Brethren*, p. LII). Her hope expressed there that a competent discussion of this subject would be undertaken in the future has been realized by Mr. Norman. In his introduction the metres of the text are listed and the metre of each pāda, except the śloka, is analyzed. In a paragraph on metrical licence Mr. Norman lists the changes which would be required for regularizing unmetrical verses under the following headings: the unhistoric doubling of consonants, the simplification of consonant groups, the restoration of doubled consonants, the shortening of nasalized vowels, removal of syllables, lengthening of vowels and shortening of vowels. The last paragraph of the introduction discusses consonant groups not making position and svarabhakti vowels. Mr. Norman states that the metre is a great guide in deciding between alternative readings, but he is careful to remind us that it would be wrong to try to correct every metrical irregularity. He points out that the fact that the metre of a verse can be improved, is no evidence that it should be improved. In many instances irregular pādas seem incapable of improvement. Mr. Norman remarks: "Unless we assume that the text is hopelessly corrupt, we are forced to admit that the authors wrote unmetrical verses." Perhaps the authors of the verses are not always to blame but those who 'transposed' the original Eastern text into Pāli and who were unable to keep the metre of the original text.

In discussing the date of the *Theragāthā*, Mr. Norman expresses his disagreement with Winternitz's opinion that the two poems on the decline of the Dharma (920-48, 949-980) were later than the time of Aśoka.¹ It is difficult to adduce any convincing proof in support of either of these conflicting views.² Undoubtedly, evil monks must have existed already in the early period of Buddhism, but these vivid descriptions of the decline of the Dharma remind us of the numerous passages of a similar nature which

¹ Winternitz's view is shared by Nakamura Hajime, cf. "Genshi bukkyō seiten

are to be found in later Sanskrit and Chinese texts (cf. Et. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, I, Louvain, 1958, pp. 210-222). A careful study of Buddhist eschatological literature will perhaps lead to a better understanding of its historical background and development. Nakamura has pointed out that *Theragāthā* 234-236 and *Therīgāthā* 400 must have been composed at a time when Pāṭaliputta was flourishing. According to him these verses have been composed after Aśoka and before the time of king Khāravela and king Menander, i.e. between 223 and 160 B.C. (*op.cit.*, pp. 36-37). He also believes that 892-919 were composed during the Maurya period, because 914 mentions 'The lord of Jambusaṇḍa' (*op.cit.*, p. 32). However this may be, it is obvious that the *Theragāthā* cannot have been compiled before the time of Aśoka.

The *Theragāthā* belongs to the *Khuddakamikāya*, a *nikāya* which seems to have been compiled at a later date than the other four *nikāyas* (cf. Lamotte, *op.cit.*, pp. 167-181). Oldenberg was the first to point out that the *Sthaviragāthā*, mentioned in the *Divyāvadāna*, must be the Sanskrit equivalent of the *Theragāthā* (*ZDMG*, 52, 1898, p. 656). The recent publication of fragments of the *Sthaviragāthā* by Heinz Bechert (*Bruchstücke buddhistischer Verssammlungen aus zentralasiatischen Sanskrithandschriften*, I: *Die Anavataptagāthā und die Sthaviragāthā*, Berlin, 1961) proves the correctness of this hypothesis. At the same time the text of the *Anavataptagāthā* shows that the contents of the *Sthaviragāthā* are not identical with those of the *Theragāthā*. Several verses spoken by Anuruddha (910-919) are to be found in the *Anavataptagāthā*. Bechert's publication of these two texts, to which Mr. Norman does not refer, gives us some idea of the way in which authors, belonging to different Buddhist schools, compiled collections of verses attributed to famous monks. In view of the fact that many verses of the *Theragāthā* are to be found also in the *nikāyas* and in the parallel texts of the *āgamas*,³ it is possible to assume that these authors combined verses, not collected in the *nikāyas*, with verses taken from them. Perhaps this process of compilation took place during a long period in which verses were continually added to an existing collection.

It is impossible to summarize the wealth of information on metrical, grammatical and lexicographical problems contained in the notes to the translation. The word index makes it easy to locate the discussion of individual words. There is however no index to the important grammatical remarks made by Mr. Norman. Mention must certainly be made of the following notes: 9. *sv* for *so*, a "mistranslation" of an Eastern *se* = *taṃ*; 22. *ṇamul*-gerunds; 36. passive past participles as action nouns; 42. split compounds; 49. confusion of *p* and *s*; 57. alternation between *-k-* and *-y-*, or *-k-* and *-t-*; 78. aorists ending on *-issam*; 225. derivatives of *sma*; 405. *a(n)* before finite verbs (see also R. Otto Franke, *ZDMG*, 48, 1894, pp. 84-85); 527. future active participles in *-esin*.

Mr. Norman's excellent work shows clearly that the many problems in Pāli texts and especially in verses can only be solved by an exhaustive and thorough study of the metrical, grammatical and lexicographical particularities. It is with great pleasure that we look forward to Mr. Norman's translation of the *Therīgāthā* which has been announced in the last report of the Pāli Text Society.

seiritsu kenkyū no kijun ni tsuite [On guiding principles in the study of the formation of the early Buddhist scriptures]", *Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō*, 21 (1955), pp. 52-53.

² The evidence quoted from the *Mahāvamsa*, composed in Ceylon near the end of the fifth century A. D. (cf. Wilhelm Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*, 1960, p. 71), does not carry too much weight.

³ The Japanese translation of the *Theragāthā* by Masunaga Reiō (*Nanden daizōkyō*, vol. 25, Tokyo, 1936) gives references to the parallel verses in the Pāli *nikāyas* and the Chinese translations of the *āgamas*. They greatly facilitate the comparison of the Pāli and Chinese versions of these verses.

To conclude this review I venture to submit the following remarks which are meant at the same time as a tribute to Mr. Norman's fine scholarship and as a small contribution to the study of this important text.

The first pāda of 9 (=885a) has only seven syllables: *svāgataṃ nāpagataṃ*. CPD proposes to add a svarabhakti vowel (see s.v. *apagata*). Mr. Norman admits svarabhakti vowels in *dvāra* and *tvam* (p. lxiv), but does not state his reasons for rejecting the same solution in this case.

Verse 16 speaks of a *bhaddo ājañño naṅgalāvattani sikhī*. The commentary explains that *ājañña* can refer to a bull, a horse or an elephant. In this verse the commentary takes *ājañña* to be a bull. However, Mr. Norman remarks that *sikhin* does not apply to a bull. He proposes to solve this difficulty by assuming that the thoroughbred is a horse and that *naṅgala* means here 'tail' or is a mistake for *naṅgula*. However, according to the *Medinikośa* *sikhin* can also refer to a *balivārda*. Perhaps, in this case, *sikhā* means the tuft on the belly of a bull. Mr. Norman always translates *ājañña* by 'thoroughbred'. I suppose that in 173 and 659 he takes it as referring to a bull. In both verses Mr. Norman translates *dhura* by 'load'; 173 *vahate dhuraṃ* 'draws its burden'; 659 *dhure yutto dhurassaho* 'yoked to a load, enduring a load'. According to PED *dhura* is used figuratively in the meaning of 'burden, load, charge, office, responsibility'. This may be true or not but, in any case, it seems preferable to translate *dhura* in these two verses by 'yoke' (cf. also 359 *viriyadhuraniggahito* where *dhura* is used figuratively: 'restrained by the yoke of energy').

In note 22 Mr. Norman suggests taking *jhāyaṃ* as a *ṇamul*-gerund. He quotes other examples of *ṇamul*-gerunds in Pāli. One of these: *jīva-gāhaṃ ca naṃ aggahe* can better be taken as an example of a cognate accusative (cf. J. S. Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 44; L. Renou, *Grammaire sanscrite*, p. 289). To these gerunds can be added *ālumpakāraṃ* which has to be read in *Dhp-a* II.55,22: *ubho hi hatthehi ālumpakāraṃ guthaṃ khādī*. Norman's edition has *ālumpākāragūthaṃ*, but one of his manuscripts (C) has the reading *ālumpakāragūthaṃ*. CPD quotes this passage under *ālumpakāraṃ* but states wrongly that manuscript C reads *ālumpakāraṃ gūthaṃ* and that Norman's edition has *ālumpakāragūthaṃ*.⁴ CPD does not refer to BHS *alopakāraṃ* and *ālopakāraṃ* both taken as gerunds by Edgerton (*BHS Grammar* 22.5, 35.3, 35.5; *Dictionary* ss.vv. *ālopa* and *-kāraṃ*). Cf. also Pāli *sannidhikāraṃ*, BHS *saṃnidhikāraṃ* (*Mahāvastu* I.343.18).

In verse 55 a new interpretation for *āsandiṃ* is proposed by Mr. Norman who takes it as the 1st sg. aorist of a form *ā-sad-* showing a nasal infix. A Sanskrit version of this verse is to be found in the fragments of the *Sthaviragāthā* published by Heinz Bechert (*op.cit.*, p. 263). Instead of *āsandiṃ* this version has *āsannāṃ* which probably resulted from a misunderstanding of *āsandiṃ*. Mr. Norman remarks that in the first line of 55 a finite verb is missing. However, the second line is a cliché which occurs often in the *Theragāthā* (24, 66, 107, 108, 220, 224, 286, 562, 639, 886, 903). In two verses (117, 349) the first pāda has *tisso vijjā ajjhagamim* for *tisso vijjā anuppattā*. If one replaces in 55c *anuppattā* by *ajjhagamim*, a finite verb would not be required in the first line. The Sanskrit version of the second line is slightly different: *tisro vidyā mayā (prāptāḥ kṛtām buddhasya sāsanam)*. This shows that alternative readings exist in the second line.

In 104 *lahuko vata me kāyo phuṭṭho ca pītisukhena vipulena*, Alsdorf suggests reading *pīti* m.c. and deleting *ca*, in order to restore the Āryā metre. However, instead of *phuṭṭho* the original reading must have been *phuṭo* 'suffused', cf. 383 *pītiyā phuṭasariro*. Therefore *ca* has to be maintained.

In 305 *sugatavara* is rendered by 'the best of the well-farers'. The commentary gives

⁴ CPD quotes variant readings from Norman's edition, using the same signs. This is likely to create confusion. For instance, according to the system of CPD S indicates a Siamese text whereas Norman's S refers to a Sinhalese print.

two explanations: *sugatassa varassa sugatesu ca varassa*. The first seems preferable. For this use of *vara* see *PED*. It seems unlikely that the Buddha would have been considered the best of the Buddhas. The expression *buddha-seṭṭha* occurs several times (175, 368, 1168-69). In the commentary on 175 two explanations are given: *Buddhassa sambuddhassa tato eva sabba-satt'uttamatāya seṭṭhassa Buddhānaṃ vā sāvaka-buddhādinaṃ seṭṭhassa*. Here again the first explanation is the more acceptable one. According to the second explanation *buddha* refers to the disciples. The same interpretation is proposed twice by the commentary for *tathāgata* (see Norman's note ad 1205). Miss Horner and Mr. Norman rightly reject this interpretation. I believe that *sugatavara* and *buddhaseṭṭha* have to be interpreted as equivalents of *varasugata* and *seṭṭhabuddha*. The position of *vara* and *seṭṭha* in compounds is discussed by the *Saddanīti* (ed. Helmer Smith, p. 924) according to which *vara* has to be used as second member of a compound; *seṭṭha* can be both first or second member: *pavara-varasaddesu pavarasaddo pubbanipātī, varasaddo pacchānipātī: pavararājā, rājavaro. Uttamādayo pubb'-uttasesu: uttararājā — rājuttamo, seṭṭharāja — rājaseṭṭho icc ādi*. Another example of *vara* used in this way is *sabbākāravarūpa* in 929 and 1046. For BHS *sarvākāravaropeta* see *BHS Dictionary*. The expression *pañcasetṭha* in 1275 is not clear, but I do not believe that it is possible to interpret it as meaning the best of the five Buddhas of the Buddha-kappa.

In 386 Mr. Norman rejects Smith's suggestion to read *phassissam* for *phusissam*, because *phusissam* seems essential to pick up *phusit'aggalaṃ* in 385. However, other texts have *phassita* (BHS *sparsita*, see *BHSD*) in this expression. Mr. Norman's rendering of *phusissam catasso appamaññāyo* with 'I shall fasten on to the four illimitables' is probably caused by his translation of *phusit'aggalaṃ* by 'with its door fastened'. The idiomatic use of *phusita* in this expression makes it rather awkward to use the same English equivalent with regard to the four illimitables. In 725 *phusimsu* is rendered more appropriately by 'they attained' (see also 212, 980 and 1114).

In 419 *aññānamūlabhedāya* is explained by the commentary as *tassa* (i.e. *aññānamūlassa*) *bhedāya vajirūpama-ñāṇena bhindan'atthāya*. Mr. Norman translates: 'by breaking the root of ignorance', assuming a feminine *bhedā* which does not seem to be attested elsewhere.

Verse 511 is well interpreted by the commentary which explains that only an unlucky man would turn away with hands and feet the goddess of Fortune who had arrived at his couch. To such a man is compared somebody who after having pleased the Teacher, would displease him. Mr. Norman refers to Mrs. Rhys David's note according to which the commentary takes *siri* not as the goddess of luck but as the *sirisayana* or cathedra of a teacher. Mrs. Rhys Davids has certainly misread the commentary (*saviggahaṃ sirim, sayane upagataṃ*) which makes no mention whatsoever of a *sirisayana*. Mr. Norman remarks that *pāṇāmeyya* would seem to require an object and suggests reading *siraṃ* instead of *sirim*. His translation of *virādh-* by 'transgress, sin' does not render its meaning adequately. The word-play between *ārādh-* and *virādh-* is not on 'honour, worship' and 'transgress, sin', but on 'propitiate, please' and 'offend, displease', cf. *BHSD* ss.vv. *ārāgayati* and *virāgayati*. I see no difficulty in translating the text as it is: 'He who would turn away with his hands and feet the goddess of Fortune who has arrived, would after having pleased such a master displease him.'

In a note on 528 Mr. Norman remarks that *dumāni* could be an Eastern masculine accusative plural in *-āni*. However, *dumāni* in this verse is a nominative.

In 677-678 Mr. Norman translates *nibbindati* by 'becomes indifferent to' but gives no other examples for interpreting *nibbindati* in this way. I believe that this verb has here its usual meaning 'have enough of, turn away from, be disgusted with'. In 1207 Mr. Norman translates *Māra nibbinda buddhamhā* by 'Keep away from the Buddha, Māra', but *nibbinda* here means 'turn away (in disgust on account of the hopelessness of your attack on the Buddha)'.

In 695 the text reads *dharmakucchi samāvāso*. Mr. Norman suggests reading *kucchi dhamma-samāvāpo* 'his belly is the fireplace of the doctrine'. The parallel passage in Chinese (*Taishō*, No. 26, Vol. I, p. 608c11) has 'his belly is the retainer of the dharmas' which would correspond to *kucchi dhammasamāvāso*.

In 947 occurs the expression *pacchimo kālo* which Mr. Norman translates by 'the last hour'. The same expression is to be found in 977 where it is rendered by him as 'the last time'. Both 920-48 and 949-80 deal with prophecies of the decline of the dharma. I believe that the commentary on 947 is right in explaining *pacchimo kālo* as the *atita-satthuko carimo kālo*, cf. *paścime kāle* in the texts quoted by Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, p. 215.

Mr. Norman has a long note on *pātālakhattaṃ* and *baḷavāmukhaṃ* in 1104. He points out that at *JA* iv. 141 *vaḷabhāmukha* occurs as the name of a sea and that Pātāla exists in BHS as the name of a locality (*BHS Dictionary* gives only one reference to the badly transmitted *Mahāmāyūri*). However, in *JA* iv. 141 as in the corresponding story in the *Jātakamālā* (ed. H. Kern, p. 92.25) *vaḷabhāmukha* is both an imaginary geographical location and the gateway to hell. Both *pātāla* and *vaḷavāmukha* are to be found together in the following verse of the *Mahābhārata* in which there can be no question of geographical names: *antakaḥ śamano mṛtyuḥ pātālaṃ vaḷavāmukhaṃ | kṣuradhārā viṣaṃ sarpo vahnir ity ekataḥ striyaḥ* (Poona ed., XIII. 38.29).

In 1141 the mind is said to be *anissitaṃ sabbabhavesu hehisi*. Mr. Norman translates: 'you will be free from all existences'. In Pāli texts *anissita* is used in the meaning 'free from craving and view', cf. E. Conze, *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, Part I (London, 1961), p. xli. The commentary explains: *sabbesu pi bhavesu taṇhādi-nissayehi anissitaṃ bhavissasi*. It seems to me that Mr. Norman is right in not following the commentary but one would have welcomed a note explaining his reasons.

In 1165 the interpretation given by the commentary seems more acceptable. It explains *sithilaṃ ārabha* by *sithilaṃ katvā, viriyaṃ akatvā*, cf. also *CPD* s.v. *ārabha*. Mr. Norman translates the first *pāda* by 'This is not referring to a slack thing'. I suggest the following translation: 'It is not by slackness, it is not by a little effort that Nirvāṇa which releases all ties can be obtained.'

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Karuṇāpūṇḍarika. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Isshi Yamada. Two volumes. London, School of Oriental and African Studies, 1968. 287 pp.; 420 + 22 pp. £ 6.6.—. [Sole distributing agents: Luzac & Company, London.]

The Sanskrit text of the *Karuṇāpūṇḍarika* was first published in 1898 by the Buddhist Text Society of India (cf. Emeneau, *Union List*, No. 3718). This edition which I have not been able to consult seems to be very unsatisfactory. Sylvain Lévi has remarked that it contains many mistakes.¹ Apart from Sylvain Lévi, few scholars appear to have made use of it. Edgerton does not even mention it in his *Grammar and Dictionary of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*. According to Dr. Yamada the edition of the Buddhist Text Society of India is based upon a single manuscript belonging to the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Ms. D of Yamada's edition).

¹ "Une légende du Karuṇā-Puṇḍarika en langue tokharienne", *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (Paris, 1937), p. 276 (first published in the *Festschrift V. Thomsen*, Leipzig, 1912, pp. 155-165).

The present edition is based upon six Sanskrit manuscripts, two versions of the Tibetan translation (Peking and Narthang) and two Chinese translations. Moreover, the editor has added a long introduction which occupies the greater part of volume one (pp. 7-250). Undoubtedly, this edition marks a great progress upon the editio princeps, but I am afraid that it is not free from imperfections. As long as no other manuscript materials become available, it will probably be impossible to establish an entirely satisfactory Sanskrit text. Nevertheless, with the help of the materials at present available, a better text could have been established. The main reason for the defects of this edition must be sought in the fact that the editor has not sufficiently taken into account the grammatical particularities of the text. He devotes a section of his introduction to the "Method of presentation of the text" (pp. 33-58) and discusses in it peculiarities of the spelling of words in manuscripts and differences between the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan and Chinese versions, especially as regards proper names, but little is said about the grammatical features of the text. The editor merely observes that on account of the flexibility of Buddhist Sanskrit grammar, he has refrained from correcting any grammatical peculiarities in the Sanskrit manuscripts. As examples he quotes *abhisamkārṣit* instead of *abhisamaskārṣit* (!), *samanupaśyāmaḥ* instead of *samanupaśyāvaḥ*, *pradakṣiṇīkṛtvā*, *sajjikṛtvā* and irregularities of sandhi before initial *r*. This statement and the editorial practice of the editor make it clear that, in his opinion, a text, written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, may show almost any grammatical or lexicographical irregularity. Especially since the publication of Edgerton's Grammar and Dictionary of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, there is often a tendency to select the most aberrant readings of the manuscripts and to justify them with references to Edgerton's work.² Dr. Yamada does not refer to Edgerton, but his edition shows clearly his conviction that any anomaly, described in Edgerton's Grammar, is admissible in the *Karuṇāpūṇḍarika*. Insufficient attention is being paid to Edgerton's classification of BHS (= Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar) into three classes. Each editor of a BHS text has to determine to which of the three classes his text belongs. In an important article on "The language of the Buddhist Sanskrit texts" (*BSOAS*, xvi, 1954, pp. 351-371) John Brough has declared that the immediate task for the future is the closer delineation of the various forms and styles of Buddhist writings in Sanskrit, and a detailed grammatical analysis of each type. In his article he presents specimens of nine distinct styles. For the time being, it will perhaps be better to adhere to the three classes set up by Edgerton. The *Karuṇāpūṇḍarika* clearly falls within the second class in which the verses are hybridized, but the prose has relatively few signs of Middle Indian phonology and morphology. The prose of the *KP* (= *Karuṇāpūṇḍarika*) is very rich in BHS words. Although most of them have been recorded in Edgerton's dictionary, it would have been the task of the editor to give an index of BHS words. Below I list a number of BHS words with references to the text without trying to be complete with regard to the words selected and to the references given. A second list contains words, which are absent from Edgerton's Dictionary and a few others worthy of note.

The Sanskrit text of the *KP* has been badly transmitted. This is especially true of the first part. All six manuscripts used by the editor are recent Nepalese manuscripts, written by scribes who had only a vague knowledge of Sanskrit. They are certainly responsible for such anomalies as confusions of number, gender and case. The prose of the *KP* is written in a fairly correct Sanskrit as is obvious from the passages which have suffered less in the course of transmission. Undoubtedly, in many places it is impossible to establish a correct text, because the manuscripts are too corrupt. However, in other cases it is quite well possible to correct the readings of the manuscripts with the help of the Tibetan and Chinese translations. The editor shows an exaggerated confidence in the correctness of the manuscripts. Even when the manuscripts omit an

² Cf. my review of Ratna Handurukande's edition of the *Mañicūḍāvādāna*, *IJJ*, XII, p. 140-143.

anusvāra, he does not correct them. It is clear that all six manuscripts go back to a fairly recent archetype which is full of scribal errors. In these circumstances, it is the task of the editor to correct the text wherever possible with the help of the Tibetan and Chinese translations. In places where the manuscripts are too corrupt, it is necessary to indicate in the notes the text on which the translations are based. Dr. Yamada could have made much more use of the translations. Often he does not indicate differences between the Sanskrit text and the translations, although he is aware that these differences exist. In his introduction Dr. Yamada even states that they indicate the fact that there were many versions of the *KP* in the past (p. 43). The examples which he gives only concern the omission or addition of words. However, in some passages there are more considerable differences between the Sanskrit text and the translations (cf. introduction pp. 24-26; cf. also Vol. I, notes pp. 251-287). In view of the fact that the Sanskrit text has been so badly transmitted, more importance must be attached to the places where differences exist between the Tibetan translation, on the one hand, and the Chinese translation on the other.³ These differences are not such that they point to the existence of many versions in the past. In a few places, the Tibetan translation is based upon a text which is slightly expanded or altered. Most of the differences between the Tibetan translation and the Chinese translations are of a very minor nature, as can be expected in the course of several centuries of transmission. In some cases it is evident that the Tibetan translation is based upon a manuscript which contained corrupt readings. Other differences are caused by wrong interpretations due to the translators of the Sanskrit text into Tibetan. In his notes the editor often merely reproduces the text of the Tibetan and Chinese translations and leaves it to the reader to draw his own conclusions.

The introduction is divided into two parts. The first deals with the materials and the text (pp. 8-62). It is a pity that the English text has not been corrected as carefully as one might expect in a publication of the School of Oriental and African Studies. According to the editor his edition is based upon six manuscripts, but I have failed to discover in the notes any reference to the manuscript of the Kyoto University Library (MS. F). For the Tibetan translation the editor has used the Peking and Narthang editions.⁴ A long passage is repeated twice in the Narthang edition as is pointed out by the editor. For the history of the Kanjur editions, it would be interesting to know whether this repetition also occurs in other editions.

The beginning of the Sanskrit text (1.4-7.15) is quite different from the Chinese and Tibetan versions. The editor remarks that it is very similar to the beginning of the *Saddharmapundarika*, but that it is not a simple quotation from it, for there are passages which are not found in it (*KP* 6.7-7.15). In this connection the editor raises a series of questions: "Was this alteration made on purpose, or by accident? If it were the former, what was the reformer's intention to change the introductory part following the fashion of that in the *SP*? What was the relationship between our text and the *SP*? Was it the reformer of the Sanskrit version of the *KP* who added the new sentences, after quoting the *SP*, in order to expound the idea? Did a certain recension of the *SP* exist, which

³ According to the editor the two manuscripts used by the two Chinese translators are fundamentally similar and belong to the same transmission (cf. p.16).

⁴ Winternitz (*A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, Calcutta, 1933, p. 313, n. 2) states that Feer translated the introduction to the Tibetan version. However, Feer translated the first chapter of the *Mahākaruṇāpundarika* which is an entirely different text (cf. *Bibliographie bouddhique*, II, Paris, 1931, p. 6 no. 27 and p. 7 no. 33). Feer translated also a passage of the same text relating to the compilation of the Canon (*Annales du Musée Guimet*, Vol. V, 1883, pp. 78-80). The Tibetan text was edited by him in 1865 (cf. *Bibliographie bouddhique*, II, p. 3 no. 6). The same text was translated from the Chinese version by Jean Przyluski (*Le concile de Rājagṛha*, Paris, 1926-1928, pp. 122-124).

was different from the recensions we have today and possessing all passages quoted by the KP, and which was also lost in the course of transmission? Was there a certain sūtra from which both the writer of the SP and the reformer of the KP quoted the opening passages?" He concludes with saying: "Although these are such questions that cannot be answered from the existing materials in our hands, new discoveries of materials in future and investigations on this matter may give us certain clues one day to advance the morphological studies on these Mahāyāna texts." I have not quoted these two passages in order to give a specimen of the style of the editor. It would have been the task of the Publications Committee to make the necessary corrections. However, they show with how little care the editor has studied his text. It is obvious that pp. 1.4-6.7 have been copied from the beginning of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*.⁵ The following passage (6.9-7.3) is clearly based upon *Lalitavistara* pp. 51.19-52.15 (ed. S. Lefmann). The remaining passage (7.4-7.15) is a fragment of the original text (cf. the Tibetan translation, Vol. I, 255.6-10; 256.22-24; 257.7-13). Only one small passage (7.8-10), a well-known cliché, is not found in the Tibetan translation. The only reason for quoting the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* and the *Lalitavistara* as a substitute for the original text of the beginning is to be sought in the fact that often the first leaves of a manuscript are lost. It is not surprising to see that the Nepalese scribe of the archetype of the six manuscripts has used two texts of which many manuscripts existed in Nepal in order to fill the gap. This, incidentally, furnishes another argument for assuming that the archetype has been written at a fairly recent date.

The second part of the introduction contains a summary of the text (pp. 63-120) and a study of its contents (pp. 121-250). Especially this last section is a very valuable contribution to the study of Buddhist literature. Dr. Yamada examines the development of the concept of many Buddhas, the texts relating to *vyākaraṇa* and *prañidhāna*, the formation of the *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka* and its relations with the Amithābha literature. He quotes a wide range of Chinese Buddhist texts as perhaps only a Japanese scholar is able to do.

As far as I know no other scholar has made such an exhaustive study of the KP. Dr. Yamada does not refer to any Japanese studies. Therefore it is perhaps useful to list the publications dealing with the KP, which have come to my notice (an asterisk indicates publications which I have not been able to consult).

- * Ono Gemmyō, "Hikeyō no ni-honshōdan", *Shūkyō Kai*, III, 5 (1907).
- * Katō Chigaku, "Muryōjūkyō to Hikeyō no taishō", *Mujintō*, XXIV, 11 (cf. *IBK*, III, 1, p. 187).
- * Mochizuki Shinkō, "Hikeyō no Mida honjō setsuwa ni tsuite", *Bukkyōgaku zasshi*, III, 7 (1922).
- Mochizuki Shinkō, *Jōdokyō no kigen oyobi sono hattatsu* (Tokyo, 1930), pp. 336-345.
- * Nishio Kyōo, "Hikeyō no seiritsu oyobi sono busshinkan", *Ōtani Gakuhō*, XII, 2 (1931), pp. 44-62 (cf. *Bibliographie bouddhique*, III, No. 250).
- Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. V (Tokyo, 1933), pp. 4294c-4296b.
- Mochizuki Shinkō, *Bukkyō kyōten seiritsu shiron* (Kyoto, 1946), pp. 236-246.
- Ujitani Yūken, "Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka no Amidabutsu inganmon ni tsuite", *IBK*, III, 1 (1954), pp. 186-190.
- Sanada Ariyoshi, "Hikeyō ni tsuite", *Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō*, 21 (1955), pp. 1-14.
- * Sanada Ariyoshi, "Hikeyō no betsushutsukyō ni tsuite", *Ryūkoku daigaku ronshū*, 354 (1957), pp. 1-23 (cf. *Bibliographie bouddhique*, XXVIII-XXXI, No. 568).
- * Ujitani Yūken, "Hikeyō" no Amidabutsu hongan kō", *Dōhō gakuho*, IV (1957), pp. 41-95 (cf. *Bibliographie bouddhique*, XXVIII-XXXI, No. 570).
- Ujitani Yūken, "Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka ni okeru ichini no mondai", *IBK*, X, 1 (1962), pp. 108-113.

⁵ With the exception of 5.7-13 for which passage see *LV*, p. 51.10-16.

Ujitani Yūken, "Bonzō taishō ni yoru Hikekyō shosetsu no Muryōjubutsu honganmon ni tsuite", *IBK*, XIII,1 (1965), pp. 221-226.

* Ujitani Yūken, "Hikekyō ni okeru shobutsu honnen to Muryōjubutsu honganmon", *Shinshū Kenkyū*, vol. X (cf. *IBK*, XV,2, p. 510).

Ujitani Yūken, "Hikekyō no Bayuhichū 'Vāyuvicṇu' to Daihi biku", *IBK*, XV,2 (1967), pp. 506-511.

While reading the text of the *KP* I have made a number of notes. In several places I have consulted the Tibetan translation but I have only rarely made use of the Chinese translation. The *Karuṇāpuṇḍarika* is a very long text. To compare it from the beginning to the end with the Tibetan translation and the two Chinese translations is a task which can only be undertaken by the future editor of a new edition of the Sanskrit text. It is difficult to know whether the manuscripts contain readings worthy of note which have not been recorded by Dr. Yamada. According to his introduction he has only noted the variant readings which effect (sic!) the meaning of the passage or have some grammatical significance (Vol. I, p. 33). A future editor would have to take much more account of parallel passages to be found in the text itself or in other texts. As remarked above, not sufficient use has been made of the Tibetan and Chinese translations. On account of its literalness, the Tibetan translation will generally be more useful. However, where both Chinese translations are clearly based upon a text different from the one used by the Tibetan translation, an attempt must be made to establish a text which corresponds with the text underlying the Chinese translations, provided that the context shows the latter to be more acceptable. The following notes contain a number of emendations. Others have been mentioned in the indices. These notes are only meant to provide an indication of the work which will have to be done for the establishment of a better text.

It is easier in a review to point out the defects of a book rather than its merits. I am afraid that the above remarks have created the mistaken impression that Dr. Yamada's work is without any merit. This is undoubtedly not the case. It is obvious from the notes to the text that Dr. Yamada has an excellent knowledge of Tibetan and Chinese. Often his suggestions are extremely useful. My main objection concerns the principles which have guided him in the establishment of the text.

In the following notes and indices Y. indicates Dr. Yamada's readings. For the Tibetan translation I refer to the Peking edition. *BHSD* = Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*; *CPD* = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*. Texts are referred to by the abbreviations used in these two dictionaries.

1.10 °vaśī° – *SP* 1.8 °vaśitā°.

2.3 *Mahāsthāmnā* – *SP* 1.10 *mahanāmnā*.

5.3 *samādhānamukhaṇirdeśaṃ caryāvaiśāradyaṃ* Cf. 287.11-12, etc. (see below Index I *samādhāna*).

5.10 *nābhipatato* – *nābhitapato*.

5.11 *bāhuprasāritaṃ* – *bāhuṃ pra*°.

7.8 *avacot* – *avocat*.

8.20 *padmaṃ* – *padma*. Both *padma* n. and *padma* m. are used, cf. 9.19, 66.10, 68.3, etc.

12.6 *mukhān nir*°. Dr. Yamada adds in a note: "Read *mukhāt* (abl)!"

15, n.11 Ch ins *arajocittāḥ*. More probably *amalacittāḥ*.

16.4-5 'sārabhinmāccālanabalino – °bhinnoccālana°, cf. T. *goṇ-du skyod-par byed-pa* = *uccālana*.

17.9 *tārakārūpā*; note 5: New comp. for constellation. – See *PTSD tārakā*.

20.11 *daśābhyantarakalpān* – *daśāntarakalpān* (same correction in 21.4). Cf. 31.10

29.19 T. adds *dharmabhāṇakasya* (160b7).

30. n.5 *snobs pa* – *spobs pa*.

- 32.6 *tasyām eva rātryām atyayena* – *tasyā eva rātryā atyayena*. The frequent use of the *m* as saṃdhi-consonant in the *Karuṇāpuṇḍarikā* is due to the tendency of the scribes to avoid hiatuses. In 70.2 all MSS. read *tasyā eva rātryā*. Elsewhere the *m* is to be found, cf. 34.1, 119.4, 20, 120.1 etc.
- 38.3-4 *vacasā ... supratividhāḥ* – °*viddhāḥ*, cf. Mvy 2411, 2415, 2416; BHSD *paricita*.
- 39.3 *utsārayitavyāḥ* – *uccārayitavyāḥ*. Cf. 73.4 *uccārayiṣyanti*.
- 41.15 *Santāraṇa* – The Chinese versions read *Santiraṇa* (cf. p. 52, n. 7) but the Tibetan version *Santāraṇa* (*yañ-dag-par sgrol-ba*) or *Santiraṇa* (*yañ-dag rtog*), cf. 116.11, 220.13, 285.18, 288.5, 290.12, 291.8, 295.4, 297.14, 300.9 and *Utpalasaṃtiraṇa* 181.3, 183.13. See also Yamada, Vol. I, p. 79. The original reading must have been *Samtiraṇa*.
- 43.2 *Maitreyāśāparipūrṇāśaktas* – *Maitreyāśā paripurnā, śaktas*. This is one of the cases in which the editor had failed to separate the words correctly.
- 47.14 *tataḥ parśadam* – according to T. one must read *tasyām parśadi tādṛśam*, cf. 80.7.
- 49.7 *buddhadarśanāt sukhā prīṇitagātrā* – T. *sañs-rgyas mthoñ-ba'i bde-bas lus tshim-par gyur-nas* = *buddhadarśanasukhena prīṇitagātrā*.
- 51, n. 2 *bsñus pa* – *bsdus pa*.
- 62.17 °*bhr̥ṅgārāma°* – °*bhr̥ṅgārārāma°*, cf. 60.12
- 67.5 *bhakṣayante* – *bhakṣayantaṃ*. cf. T. 177a7.
- 68.9 *saṃvicintayamāna* – *svapnaṃ vicintayamāna*, cf. p. 68, n. 2 for T.
- 68.15 *adhatrīyāṃ varṣaśatām* – *ardhatrīyāṃ ...* Also 71.4
- 69.2-3 *stri°* ... *yācayitvā* not in T. (178a3-4).
- 75.16, 17 *duḥkhotpattibhūtaṃ* – T. *duḥkhotpattihetubhūtaṃ* (*sdug-bsñal 'byuri-ba'i rgyu*).
- 79.11 *katame sattva bhagavatā vinitāḥ sad ekasattvasyāpi* – ... *vinitāḥ yad ...*
- 80.8 *tadādarśavyūhaṃ* – *yathādarśavyūhaṃ* (MSS. *yadā-*).
- 90.4-6 *gacchata rājānaḥ svakasvakāṃ devaparśadāṃ sannipātayata Jambūdvīpe, bhagavantaṃ darśanāyopasaṃkrāmata* – *gacchata rājānaḥ, svakasvakāṃ devaparśadāṃ sannipātayata, Jambūdvīpe bhagavantaṃ darśanāyopasaṃkrāmata*.
- 98.2 *āsanasthā*, n. 1: T. *adūrasthāyino* – T. *āsannasthā*.
- 102.7 *saṃāptā* – *saṃāpto*.
- 117.3 *vellitavasumatisañailā* – *calitavasumati sañailā*. Cf. 120.12, 123.15, 134.16. MSS. BE *calita°*.
- 124.20 *sattvānāṃ āśayapariśodhayamānaḥ* – ... *āśayaṃ pari°*.
- 125.19 *nāsmākaṃ pratirūpaṃ*, n. 7: read *pratibhāgam* – T. *cha* renders Sanskrit *pratirūpa*, cf. Jäschke, *Tibetan-English Dictionary*, p. 151a: *cha ma yin-pa* “unfit, improper, unbecoming”, Divy 127.11 *na mama pratirūpaṃ* = T. *bdag-gi cha ma yin-te*.
- 130, n. 7 *dril* – *dri la*.
- 132, n. 2 *dur smrig* – *ñur smrig*.
- 133.7 *nāmaṃ* – *nāma*.
- 145.13 *śarīraṃ sādhaeyeyuḥ* – *śarīraṃ dhyāyeyuḥ* (T. *sregs-par gyur-nas*), cf. BHSD **dhyāyati*.
- 153.9 *anuttarais tavaṃs taveyaṃ* – *anuttaraiḥ stavaiḥ staveyaṃ* (T. *bla-na ma mchis-pa dag-gis bstod-pa gyur-cig* 218b8).
- 159.15 *Māravīnārditaḥ* – T. *Māvinārditaḥ* (*ñā-rgyal sgrogs*), Ch. 1 “destroying king Māra” (193b4): *Māravīnārditaḥ?*
- 163.7 *upasthiteyaṃ* – *upasthiheyaṃ* (MSS. ACDE: *upasthiheyaṃ*), cf. *adhiṣṭhiheyaṃ* 245.3, *upasthiheyaṃ* 314.5.
- 168.18-19 *na dvijihve nerṣyāmātsaryaparicite* – *na dvijihvo nerṣyāmātsaryaparito* (T. *dkris-pa* = *parita*, cf. Mvy 2443; 149.6 *paritās*, T. *dkris-pa*). Same correction 419.2 *mithyādharmaparicitanāṃ*, read °*paritānāṃ* (T. *yonis-du dkris-pa*).
- 170.2, 6 *karmakṛtaṃ* – *karma kṛtaṃ*.
- 170.7-8 *nityagarbhavāśena pratyājāyeyur duḥkhaṃ pratyānubhavitavyaṃ bhavet* T. – *mñal-na gnas-pa'i sdug-bsñal ḥams-su myoñ-bar gyur-pa* (227a2) = *garbhavāsaduḥ-*

- khaṃ pratyanubhavitavyaṃ bhavet.*
- 170.11 *garbhavāsena ca pratyāḍīyeyus – garbhavāse na ca ...* (T. *mñal-na gnas-par skye-bar ma gyur-cig* 227a4). Yamada, Vol. I, p. 270: *na garbha-vāsena – garbha-vāse na.*
- 170.12 *karmaparikṣayaṃ – karma parikṣayaṃ.*
- 181.4 *Baliṣṭhā – Variṣṭhā* (MSS. *cariṣṭhā*; T. *mchog*).
- 188.7 *sarvaparigrahaḥvasaraṇatāyai – °vasarjanatāyai?* (T. *spoñ-par byed-par 'gyur-ro*).
- 197.7 *abhiśaya – atīśaya* (T. *khyad-'phags*).
- 197.10 *naramanu – naravaru* (T. *mī-yi dam-pa*), cf. 199.13.
- 204.16 *manāthā – manāpā?* (T. *yid-du mchi*).
- 206.1 *bhavadāraṇa pratibhayaṃ – ... °bhaye.*
- 214.7 *ratnavr̥ṣṭiḥ pravaraṣān ni° – ... pravaraṣen ...* (MS. C °varṣon; MS. D. °varṣen).
- 215.9 *śrotrapatheṣu – śrotrapuṭeṣu* (MS. A °puṭeṣu, MSS BCDE °puṭeṣu), cf. 419.9 *kāṇaputeṣu* (T. *rna lam-du* 336b5). The Tibetan translator has wrongly translated *patha* instead of *puṭa*.
- 219.10-11 *mahākaraṇaṃ sarjayeyuḥ – mahākaraṇaṃ saṃjanayeyuḥ.*
- 219.14 *sattvān pratyuhyamānān – sattvān uhyamānān* (MSS. ABE *satvāny ujjamānāny*).
- 219.17 *prañidhānaṃ sarjayitvā – prañidhānaṃ saṃjanayitvā.*
- 224.6 *tad api – tathāpi* (T. 'on-kyāñ 251a4).
- 224.13 *sampratipannāḥ dāśasu kuśaleṣu karmapatheṣu – ... dāśasv akuśaleṣu karmapatheṣu.* However, the Chinese and Tibetan versions of this passage (224.11-18) are different from the Sanskrit text. The Tibetan translator has failed to see that *anarthikās* (224.11) relates not only to *triṣu sucariteṣu* but also to *devamānuṣī-kābhīḥ śrisaṃpattibhir* (cf. 230.6, 234.10).
- 230.4-5 *riktamuṣṭisadr̥śasantānāṃ – riktamuṣṭisadr̥śadagdhasantānān.* T. *chan-pa* (not *chad-pa* as in 230, n. 2, cf. Mvy 2813, Jäschke, 'chais-pa) *ston-pa lta-bu dan sems-ṣan rgyud tshig* (Peking *cig* must be corrected into *tshig* as is obvious from the Chinese versions) -gi.
- 235.3-4 *pañcakāmaguṇāgr̥ddhacittā – °guṇāgr̥ddha°* (T. 'dod-pa'i yon-tan lha-la 'chums-pa'i sems 256b2).
- 235, n. 7: Ch T ins. *mātsaryacittāḥ – kadaryacittāḥ*, cf. Mvy 2485; 238.3 *kadaryāḥ*, T. 'juñs-pa.
- 237.14 *paraṣadam̐śamaśakāśiṣa° – paraṣa* not in T.
- 246.12 *pūrvaṃ vairaṇa – pūrvavaireṇa* (T. *sñon-gyi 'khon-gyis* 262a4), cf. BR *pūrvavairin*.
- 246.18 *āpatyāṃ – āpatyāṃ* (T. *slan-chad* 262a7).
- 248.12 *mā cāhaṃ śakyaṃ – mā cāhaṃ śaknuyāṃ* (MSS. ABE *satkuryā*; MSS. CD *satkuryāṃ*).
- 250.10 *°śrutadhāraṇīviprañāśa° – °śrutadharāviprañāśa°.*
- 255.3 *pūrvabuddhāsukṛtādhikāraṇāṃ* T. has translated *pūrvabuddheṣu kṛtādhikāraṇāṃ* but the Chinese versions have rendered *pūrvabuddheṣv akṛtādhikāraṇāṃ*.
- 263.11 *°rocamahārocamānapūrnācandravimalā° – Ch. 2 seems to have read rocamahā-roca (māna is a mistake for mahā)–sthālamahāsthālacakravimala.* Cf. Mvy 6183-6192.
- 265.16 *akalahābandhanavigrahāḥ – T. has read akalikalahābandhanavigrahāḥ (thab-mo dan | 'thab-pa dan | rtsod-pa dan | 'chiñ-ba dag ma mchis-pa* 271a1), cf. Mvy 5229.
- 266.15 *śarirās tṛkāryaṃ – śarirāḥ śāstrkāryaṃ* (T. *ston-pa'i mdzad-pa*), cf. 313.17
- 268.5 *nirvarte tu gaticakre – nivartite gaticakre* (T. 'gro-ba'i 'khor-lo zlog-ciñ 272a5). Cf. 313.2 *vivartitagaticakraḥ*, read *nivartita°*.
- 270.3 *tivrakleṣa raṇakaṣāye kaliyuge – tivrakleṣaraṇakaṣāye kaliyuge* T. *ñon-moñs-pa dan | thab-mo dan | sñigs-ma bdo-ziñ rtsod-pa'i dus-la* 273a5), cf. 287.18, 297.8-9.
- 270.7 *na ca viśarāmi bodhau prañidhānaṃ – na ca viśr̥jāmi* (T. *spañ-bar mi bgyi-ziñ* 273a8)
- 291.2 *bhagavataḥ sakāśāt parivartitvā – ... parāvṛtya* (T. *phyir-phyogs-te*), cf. 301.4.

- 296.10-11 *tena bhagavatā tathārūpaṃ smitaṃ prāviṣkṛtaṃ yadā* – ... *prāviṣkṛtaṃ yathā* (T. 'di-lta-ste 282a7).
- 305.3 *te puṣpā visarītā* – ... *vikasitā* (T. *kha-bye-ziñ* 286b6).
- 306.9 *śrāvākapratyekabuddhavarjitā* – °*varjita*.
- 315.4 *Saurabhyākīṃśukā* – *Sauratyākīṃśukā* (T. *des-pa* ...), cf. 345.3, 347.7.
- 336.11-12 *nirodhaviḍhapaśamena samādhinā* – The Chinese versions translate *anurodhavirodha*°, but T. *nirodhavirodha*°, cf. Mvy 606 *sarvanirodhavirodhasaṃpraśamano nāma samādhiḥ*.
- 337.8 *araṇena samādhinā* – T. *āraṇasaraṇasarvasamavasaraṇena samādhinā*, cf. Mvy 618.
- 337.9 *anilaniketena samādhinā* – Ch. 2 *aniketaniratena samādhinā*? Cf. Mvy 619 *anilambhaniketanirato nāma samādhiḥ*; *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (ed. N. Dutt), p. 203.14: *anilāniketo nāma samādhiḥ*; *BHSD a-nilambha*.
- 339.9 *vivaraṇaprahāṇāya* – *nivaraṇa*° (T. *sgrib-pa* 301b7).
- 340.4 *sarvakleśān avamardanatāyā* – *sarvakleśāvamardanatāyāi* (T. *ñon-moñs-pa thams-cad 'joms-par byed-par 'gyur-ro* 302a5), cf. 189.4-5.
- 340.8 *akuśaladharmāpasaraṇa*° – *akuśaladharmāvasarjana*°? See above 188.7
- 351.14 *netrāv utpādyā* – ... *utpāṭya*, id. 380.2
- 360, n. 14 *spōs* (311a5) is to be corrected into *spyos*.
- 362.11 °*saṃkṣobhavidam* – ... *vivādam* (T. *rtsod-pa* 312a1).
- 367.10 *mārabalaparāśayaśabdaṃ* – °*parājayaśabdaṃ*. See Yamada, vol I, p. 39 for a strange attempt to justify the reading *parāśaya*.
- 376.9 *saṃśrayase mahākāle* – *saśreyase* (T. *legs-bcas*) *mahākāle*.
- 397.9 *adhiṣṭhāvān* – *adhiṣṭavān*.
- 406.4 *Dharmaveśapradīpaḥ* – *Dharmavegapradīpaḥ*, cf. T. (*chos-kyi ūgs-kyi sgron-ma*) and Ch. 1.
- 407.2 *Vigatasamṭāpodbhava*° – *Vigatasamṭāpobhyudgata*°, cf. the Chinese and Tibetan translations and 407, n. 15.
- 415.3 *avikṣiptam* – T. *anutkṣiptam aprakṣiptam*, cf. Mvy 6357.

Index I.

- a-kṣūṇa* – *akṣūṇavyākaraṇā* 258.15-259.1
- adhitiṣṭhati* – *vajramayam ātmabhāvam adhitiṣṭhati* 33.6-7; *sāvaśeṣakarmaphalam cādhiṣṭhiheyam* 245.3-4; *evamrūpam karmaphalān aparikṣiṇān adhiṣṭhihitvā* 246.10; *sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhitatvāt* 78.11; *sarvasaṃyojanādhiṣṭhitacittāḥ* 235.11-12.
- adhyavasita* – *asakto 'grādhō 'grathito 'mūrcchito 'nadyavasito* (Y. 'navadhyavasito) 'nadyavasānam āpannaḥ 35.13-14 (cf. *Divy* 534.18-20; *Mvy* 2191-2197); *anadhya-vasitacittāḥ* (Y. *anavasthitacittāḥ*) 235.6-7.
- Anaṇaṇa* – *rājaputram Anaṇaṇaṃ nāmāmantrayati* 135.2.
- anarthika* – see *arthika*.
- an-upacchedana-tā* – *triratnavamṣṣūnupacchedanatāyāi* (Y. °*tayā*) *saṃvartate* 341.2
- anubudhyana-tā* – *arthagatyanubudhyanatāyāi* 188.13-14.
- anuśāsani* – *anuśāsaniṣṭhāyāṇāṅkṛtā yathāvadānuśāsaniṣṭhāyāḥ* 259.1-2.
- anusamḍhi* – *tathāgatasyānusamḍhau* 196.11-12, 196.16-17; *tasyānusamḍhau* (Y. °*dheḥ*) 209.15, 210.1.
- antara-kalpa* – 201.4, 211.16, 266.4 *śastrāntarakalpa*; 212.3, 266.11-12 *durbhikṣāntara-kalpa*; 212.8, 266.14 *rogāntarakalpa*.
- a-paryādinna* – *a-paryādinnavyāhāreṇa* (Y. *a-paryādinnavyāhāreṇa*) 256.2.
- abhinirmāti* – *ātmānam abhinirmāya* 11.6; *yakṣarūpaṃ ātmānam abhinirmāya* 384.11-12.
- abhiṣyanda* – *puṇyābhiṣyandaḥ* (Y. °*syandaḥ*) *kuśalābhiṣyando* (T. *rgyun rgyas*) 85.9; *puṇyābhiṣyandena* (Y. °*syandena*) (T. *rgyu mthun-pa*) 140.20 Cf. *Pāli kammābhisanda*, *kusalā*°, *puññā*°; *Mv* ii.276.10 *puṇyābhiṣyandaḥ kuśalābhiṣyandaḥ*; *Sanskritthand-*

schriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil II (Wiesbaden, 1968), p. 19 (*BHSD* has only *abhiṣyanda* "flux, ulceration of the teeth" but see *abhiṣyaṇṇa* and *abhiṣyandati*).
abhiṣaṃskāra – 11.5, 12.12, 13.4, 47.14, 51.2, 80.7, 396.6 *ṛddhyabhiṣaṃskāra*.

a-manyana – *sarvadharmāmanyane samādhau* 330.2-3.

a-manyana-tā – *tyāgasyāmanyana-tām* (Y. °tā) *careyaṃ ... kṣāntya-manyana-tām* (Y. *kṣāntya-manyana-tā*) ... *careyaṃ* 229.8-10; *sarvasamādhaya udayavyayāmanyana-tām* *gacchanti* 330.3.

artha-vaśa – *kim-arthavaśaṃ samanupaśyamāno* 193.9-10; *kam arthavaśaṃ sampāśya-mānaḥ* 268.9.

arthika – in comp.: 163.9, 268.7, 11.14, 269.2, 6 *bodhyarthika*; *puṇyārthi* 85.16; *annārthikā yāvad ratnārthikā* 350.11; with loc.: *saṃbodhāv arthikā* 84.15, 'narthikās (Y. °nāthakās) *triṣu sucariṭeṣu* 224.11; with instr.: *kuśalamūlenārthikāḥ* 85.15 *svakāyajivitenāpy anarthikāḥ* 144.18, *anarthikās* (Y. °kāḥ) *tribhir yānair anarthikā devamānuṣikābhīḥ saṃpattibhir anarthikāḥ kuśalaparyeṣṭyā* 149.3-5, *anarthikās tribhiḥ puṇyakriyāvastubhir* 200.9, *anarthikās tribhir yānair* 200.11-12, *anarthiko* (Y. *anārthako*) *divyasukhopapattibhiḥ* 230.6, *anarthikās tribhir yānair* 234.3, *anarthikā devamānuṣyaśrisaṃpattibhir* 234.10.

avabhāsa – *teṣāṃ na Sumerur avabhāsam āgacchati* 11.10-11, *na ca Sumeruḥ cakṣuṣo 'vabhāsam āgacchati* 99.11, *na ca teṣāṃ Sumeruḥ ...* 100.11-12; *buddhakṣetrāna-vabhāsatātānāṃ sattvānāṃ* 252.1, *sarvabuddhakṣetrāvabhāsatātā* 258.14-15.

avarupta – 31.17-18, 79.9, 115.12, 133.5, 151.14, 170.14, 224.2, 225.6, 305.19, 310.12, 14 *avaruptakuśalamūla*; 79.13, 170.15, 208.10, 240.2, 260.9 *anavaruptakuśalamūla*; *śrāvakayāne bijam avaruptaṃ syāt* 242.17; *lakṣaṇānuvyañjanānavaruptabījānāṃ* 253.7-8.

avaropayati – *kuśalamūlāny avaropayitvā* 32.10-11; *kuśalamūlāny avaropya* 42.8-9; *kuśalamūlāny avaropitavān* 34.9; *bhagavataḥ śāsane 'varopitakuśalamūlas* 76.16-17, *avaropitanīrvāṇabījasantatīnāṃ sattvānāṃ* 240.3-4, *śrāvakayāne bijāny avaropitāni* 244.8; *agramārgabījāṃ avaropayeyaṃ* 239.4.

avahoṭimaka – *durvarṇā avahoṭimakā ahrīkā* 234.17; *durvarṇā avahoṭimakā* (? MSS. *drohoṭimakā, prohoṭimakā*; T. *mī sdug-pa as in* 234.17) 307.6.

avinipāta-dharman – *avinipādatadharmāno yāvad bodhiparyantāt* 15.9-10.

asaṅga-pratibhāna-tā – *bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ asaṅgapratibhānatām pratilabhate* 30.11 *āgrhīta* – *svaśarīre 'py anāgrhītamānasāḥ* 107.7; *āgrhītasantānāḥ* 260.1, *āgrhītasantānānāṃ sattvānāṃ* 261.11.

āgraha – *āgrahaparigrahaśabdo* 236.11.

ājanya – *dhyānasambhāro bodhisattvānāṃ ājāneyacittatāyai saṃvartate* 187.8-9, id. 338.11-12 (Y. °tayā).

ātmabhāva – body of a *tathāgata*: *tathāgatasyātmabhāvaṃ* 11.16-17, *vajramayaṃ ātmabhāvaṃ adhitiṣṭhati* (Candrottamas *tathāgataḥ*) 33.6-7; great body seen by Samudrarenu (= Śākyamuni): *sahasrayojanapramāṇam ātmabhāvaṃ samanupaśyati* 66.15-16, *mahān ātmabhāvo dṛṣṭaḥ* 69.13, *yat tvaṃ brāhmaṇādrākṣīt mahāntam ātmabhāvaṃ* 72.7-8; body magically created by Samudrarenu: *nairayikam ātmabhāvaṃ abhinirmīṇitvā* 153.15-16, *tathārūpaṃ ātmabhāvaṃ nirmīṇitvā* 154.11; enormous body obtained by Durdhana (= Śākyamuni): *parvatapramāṇam ātmabhāvaḥ samvṛttaḥ* 364.4, *evaṃrūpo mamātmabhāvaḥ prādura bhavati* 366.9-10, *evaṃrūpeṇātmabhāvena ... sattvāṃ saṃtarpayeyaṃ* 367.2-4 (cf. 367.16, 19); enormous body of Śākyamuni: *yojanapramāṇamātram ātmabhāvaḥ saṃsthitāḥ* 411.9-10; attainment of a body by ordinary beings: *yathārūpeṣu ca bhagavan sattvāḥ kuleṣūpapaḍyante, yathārūpaś ca teṣāṃ ātmabhāvapratilābhāḥ* 154.6-8.

ādinava – *ādinavadarśi* 35.14.

ādeya-vākya – *dharmaśākaḥ ādeyavākyaḥ* 162.16-17.

ābhāsa – *naiva tasmin samaye Sumeru Cakravāḍa Mahācakravāḍāḥ* (Y. °ḍaḥ) *cakṣuṣa ābhāsam āgacchanti* 26.9-10 (cf. 411.16); *pṛthivī cakṣuṣo nābhāsam āgacchati*

- (Y. °nti) 412.2; *yeṣāṃ ca sattvānāṃ mama kāyo lakṣaṇāṅkaṅkṛtāś cakṣurindriyasyābhāsaṃ āgacchet* 131.10-11; *teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ śrotrendriyeṣv ayaṃ dharmaparyāya* (Y. °yam) *ābhāsaṃ āgacchatu* 164.8-9 (cf. 164.19-165.1).
- āya-dvāra* – *kalyāṇamītrasaṃbhāro bodhisattvānāṃ sarvaḡuṇyādvārātāyai* (Y. *sarvaḡuṇyā dvārātāyā*) *saṃvartate* 340.11-12; *yathānye kuṭumbino dadanty āyadvāraṃ* (T. 'du-ba'i sgo) *ye devasya nagaragrāmajanapadakarvaṇeṣu prativasanti* 368.17-369.1.
- ārāgayati* – *dharmavinayam ārāgayeyuḥ* 271.10; *sarve ca te sattvā buddhān* (Y. *buddhā*) *bhagavanta ārāgayeyuḥ* 272.12-13 (*ārādhayati*: 215.7, 361.12).
- āryavaṃśa* – *iha bodhisattvo mahāsattvaś caturṣv āryavaṃṣeṣu vyavasthito bhavati* 35.7-8.
- āspḥānaka* – *tathārūpam aham āspḥānakaṃ dhyānam dhyāyeyam* 242.9-10.
- utkūla* – *parvatotkūlā ca dharaṇī bhaviṣyati* 237.13.
- uttārana-tā* – *prayogāṅkaṅkṛtāḥ pratijñottārāṇātāyai* (Y. °rāyā) 257.8-9, *prayogasaṃbhāro bodhisattvānāṃ sarvasaṃbhārōttārāṇātāyai* (Y. °tārāṇātāyā) *saṃvartate* 340.14-15 (confusion between *saṃsārōttaraṇa* and *saṃbhārōttārāṇa*: 187.3, 189.8, 189.11).
- utsada* – *notsadaśarkarakāṭhallakaṇṭakagahanā* (T. *utsada* = *mtho-dman*) 142.6-7; *puṇyotsadavyāhāreṇa* (T. *utsada* = *che-ba*) 254.9.
- upadhāna* – *paramēṇa ca sukhopadhānena samarpitāḥ* 169.16-17.
- ekajātīpratibaddha* – 107.16, 129.14, 20, 230.6-7, 244.9.
- kālānūsāri* – *kālānūsārigandham* 167.15; *goṣīrṣoragasārakālānūsārigandhavrṣṭiḥ* (Y. °sāri *gandhavrṣṭiḥ*) 214.9-10.
- kuhaka* – *akuhakaś ca bhavaty alapako* 38.14.
- khaṭṭuṅka* – *krūrakhaṭṭukasaṃtānā* (MSS. *khadvāṅka*, *khadvamka*, *khadvaka*; T. *dmurgod* = *khaṭṭuṅka* Mvy 2450) 260.1.
- citrikāra* – *tivrapremaprasādagurugauravacitrikārajātāḥ* 398.1-2.
- jātiya* – *aviheṭṭhanajātiyo* 38.12, *rjukajātiyāś* 256.9, *yādr̥gjātiyāṃ buddhakṣetraguṇavyūhān ākāṅkṣeyuḥ tādr̥gjātiyān buddhakṣetraguṇavyūhāṃś* (Y. °hāḥ) *teṣu ratnavṛkṣeṣu paśyeyuḥ* 108.19-109.1, *yathādhimuktā bodhisattvāś tādr̥gjātiyāṃ śabdāṃ śṛṇuyuḥ* 128.18.
- tāttaka* – *yāttakaṃ* (Y. *yāntakaṃ*) *teṣāṃ ekonāśitīnāṃ buddhānāṃ āyuhpramāṇam tāttakaṃ* (Y. *tāntakaṃ*) 184.2-3, *tāttakaṃ* (Y. *tāntakaṃ*) *mama bodhiprāptasya dīrgham āyur bhavet* 212.18-19, *na kevalaṃ tāttakā nirdeṣayanti yāttakā devasya yācanakāḥ* 377.5-6.
- dakṣiṇīya* – *adakṣiṇīyacittāḥ* 235.10.
- dhāraka* – *saddharmadhārako babhūva* 347.1.
- nidhyapti* – *nidhyaptibalinaḥ* 16.5, *nidhyapticittatā* 342.6.
- nirhāra* – *Nirhārapatim nāma samādhiṃ* 102.1.
- netri* – 219.8, 295.13 *prañidhānanetri*; 288.19, 298.8 *prañidhānanetridhvaja*; 227.16 *parityāganetriguṇa*; 229.4 *netriguṇa*; 211.14-15, 212.15, 321.15, 321.18, *saddharmanettri*.
- naiṣadyika* – *traicivarikah vṛkṣamūlikah naiṣadyikah āraṇyakah* 162.14-15.
- paricita* – *dharmā bahavaḥ śrutā bhavanti dhṛtā vacasā paricitā* 38.2-3.
- paripūri* – 94.18-19, 118.11, 133.10-11, 138.11-12 *āśāparipūri*; 343.5 *lakṣaṇaparipūri*; *śīlasaṃbhāro bodhisattvānāṃ prañidhānaparipūryai* (Y. °dhānapūryai) *saṃvartate* 187.5-6; *kṣāntisaṃbhāro bodhisattvānāṃ lakṣaṇānuvyañjanaparipūryai saṃvartate* 187.6-7; *indriyasam̐bhāro bodhisattvānāṃ saṃvaraparipūryai saṃvartate* 189.3-4; *indriyasam̐bhāro bodhisattvānāṃ sarvasattvendriyaparipūryai* (Y. °yā) *saṃvartate* 340.2-3; *upāyakaūśalyasaṃbhāro bodhisattvānāṃ sarvajñajñānaparipūryai* (Y. °yā) *saṃvartate* 341.4-5; *kathaṃ ca punaḥ kṣāntiparipūrīr* (Y. *kṣāntiyā paripūrīr*; T. *bzod-pa yonṣ-su 'rdzogs-par 'gyur*; cf. 341.12) *bhavati* 341.18; *naivaṃrūpā* (Y. °pam) *ca me prañidhānaparipūrīḥ* (Y. °nam *paripūri*) *syād* 367.14; *daśatathāgatabala-pariṇipādānasannāhah sarvapāramitāparipūryai* (Y. °yā) 414.13-14.
- paribhāvita* – °*darśanaparibhāvītā amī mantrapadāḥ* 46.16; *mahākaruṇāparibhāvītā vāḡ*

- bhāṣitā* (Y. *vāgbhāṣitā*) 286.6-7; *mahākaruṇāparibhāvitā vācā bhāṣitā* 295.11.
pariṣkāra – 36.1, 54.14-15, 64.3, 65.5, 9, 322.4-5 *glānapratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkāra*; *dharma-gurukā na pariṣkāragurukā* 173.1; *vividhapaniṣkāraparihiṇāś ca te sattvā* 249.2.
paryāpanna – *aviciparyāpanno* 215.10, *caturyoniparyāpannām* 240.9, *sarve devā ye Sahe buddhakṣetre paryāpannās* 242.14-15.
paryeṣṭi – *sarvakuśaladharmaparyeṣṭicittā* 15.16, *kuśalaparyeṣṭyā* 149.5, *dharma-paryeṣṭiparā* 167.1-2, *kuśalaparyeṣṭicittānām* 190.20, *adharmabhogaparyeṣṭino* 233.18-19, *śāntanirvāṇāparyeṣṭicittā* 235.9, *akuśalaparyeṣṭicaryām* 384.10.
pīthati – *apāyapathāḥ pīthitāḥ* 374.11.
paudgalika – *paudgalikam* (Y. °*kaṁ*) *upabhogaparibhogopasthānaparicaryāntaḥpuram* 55.8-9; *paudgalikaparigrahe* 322.5-6 (MSS. *yophalika*, *yoddhalika*, *pīdbhalika*; T. *gañ-zag-gir*). Read °*pariṣkāraṁ vācchindyā paudgalikam parigṛhya*? Cf. *Bbh* 166.26.
pratikruṣṭa – *pratikruṣṭe* (Y. *pratikaṣṭe*) *pañcakaṣāye buddhakṣetra upapannaḥ* 52.5; *pratikruṣṭe pañcakaṣāye buddhakṣetre* 310.1-2.
pratiṅgrati – *āhāraṁ pratiṅgrati* 58.14.
pratiprasambhaya – *vimuktiprītisukhaṁ pratiprasrabhya* 9.8, *ṛddhyabhisamskāraṁ pratiprasrabhya* 13.4; *jihvendriyārddhyabhisamskāraṁ* (Y. °*driyam ṛddhyabhisams-kāreṇa*) *pratiprasambhayitvā* 12.12, *tām ṛddhiṁ pratiprasambhayitvā* 413.4-5; *svarddhyabhisamskāre pratiprasambhite* 51.2.
pratisaṁlayana – *ekākināḥ pratisaṁlayananiṣaṇṇā* (Y. °*ṣaṇṇam*) 101.8; *pratisaṁlayanād vyutthāya* 101.15; *pratisaṁlayanāśabdaḥ* 264.7.
pratisaṁlāna – *pratisaṁlānasambhāro bodhisattvānām yathāśrutadharmapratipatyai* (Y. °*tyā*) *saṁvartate* 340.16-17.
pratyāṅyate – °*yeyuḥ* (-us, -ur) 109.5, 130.4, 143.3, 169.17, 170.8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 259.17; *pratyāṅyātāḥ pratyāṅyīṣyanti* 15.7-8, 16.12, 15, 18.5-6, 19.10-11; °*jātā* 147.16, 238.17, 239.15; °*yīṣyanti* 237.9-10.
prabhedana-tā – *maṭisambhāro bodhisattvānām buddhiprabhedanatāyai saṁvartate* 188.12-13, id. (Y. °*tayā*) 339.13-14.
praśrabdha – *praśrabdhakāyaśamskāraḥ praśrabdhavākśamskāraḥ* 243.9-10.
praśrabdhī – *Ākāśasphuraṇadharmāvacchedapraśrabdhīm samādhīm* (Y. °*raṇam dhar*° ... *śrabdhisamādhīm*) 412.4-5.
bhūyasyā – *bhūyasyā mātrayā* 238.2-3, 328.2, 361.5-6.
yathā-paurāṇa – *Sālaguḥā yathāpaurāṇā* (Y. °*paurvānām*) *saṁsthitā* 396.18-19.
yadbhūyasā – *saṁchādītā yadbhūyasānantaryakārakā* (Y. *saṁcchādītāya bhūyas ān*°) 274.13 (T. *phal-cher*).
yāttaka – see *tāttaka*.
raṇamjaha – *raṇamjahena samādhinā* 330.8.
riñcati – *akuśalaṁ riñcitvā* 201.5; *riñcitāḥ sarvapaṇḍitaiḥ* 224.14; *antaśa ekasattvam api riñceyam* (Y. *riñceyur*) 323.16.
luḍita – *askhalitāluḍitacittānām* 190.17.
lūha – *vividhalūhatapovratābhiyuktā* (Y. °*tapavrata*) 238.8, *lūhatapovrataduṣkaracārikām* (Y. *lūhatapo vrata*°) 243.6.
vitihāraka – *padavītihārakam api* 162.10.
vaimātra – *na ca tatra sattvā vaimātrā bhaveyuh* (T. *rim-pa ma mchis-pa*) 166.16-17.
vaiyāvṛtya – *vaiyāvṛtyakarmāṇi* 262.1; *vaiyāvṛtyaśabdo* (Y. °*vṛttiśabdo*) 264.6-7.
vairamaṇa – *prāṇātipātavairamaṇe* (Y. °*viramaṇe*) 350.4.
vairamaṇi – *prāṇātipātavairamaṇyām pratiṣṭhāpayeyam* 211.17, *prāṇātipātavairamaṇyām* (Y. *prāṇā*°) *vyavasthāpayeyam* 260.12; with *adattādāna* etc. 260.13, 14, 15, 261.1-2, 3.
vairamaṇya – *mīthyādrṣṭivairamaṇye samādāpitāḥ* 350.5-6, *prāṇātipātavairamaṇye samādāpitā* 354.12-13.
vyanti-karoti – *mama cātra parikṣiṇam karmaphalam kṣiṇam vyantikṛtam bhavet* (Y. ... *cātrāparikṣiṇakarmaphalakṣiṇavyantikṛtam* ...) 247.2-3.
vyavasthāna – *triyānavyavasthānena* (Y. *triyānena vya*°) *dharmam deśayeyam* 245.13-14.

- śraddhā-deya* – *tad api dānapratigrahakasya śraddhādeyavinipātanaṃ* 318.2, *na ca yuṣmākaṃ śraddhādeyaṃ bhaviṣyati* 364.18-19.
- śrutādhāra* – *bahuśruto bhavati śrutādhāraḥ śrutasannicayaḥ* 37.18.
- samaṅgi-bhūta* – *pañcabhiḥ kāmagaṇaiḥ samarpitāḥ samaṅgibhūtaḥ vihareyus* 304.17-18.
- samanvāharati* – *bhagavāṃś caināṃ samanvāharatu* 101.14; “*agrato Ratnagarbhas tathāgato niṣaṇṇo 'ham'*” *sarvacetasā samanvāharanti* 302.16-17; *tad yuṣmābhiḥ sarvacetasā samanvāhartavyam* (Y. °yāḥ) 413.16; *saṃprajānantaḥ* (Y. *saṃprajānaṃ tataḥ*) *sattvāḥ samanvāharata* 413.7.
- samavasaraṇa* – *Vaiśāradyasamavasaraṇaṃ nāma bodhisattvam* 46.12-13, *Sarva-puṇyasamavasaraṇaṃ nāma samādhiṃ* 47.16; *samavasaraṇaḥ sa mārgaḥ cintanāya* 77.13-14; *vajrāsanaṃ syāt*, *Prasamakṣamasuvicitrajñānāgandhasamavasaraṇaṃ nāma bhavac* 130.15-16; *sarvadharmasamavasaraṇasāgaramudre samādhau* 329.18-330.1.
- samādāpanā* – *cittam utpādayata Samudrareṇor brāhmaṇasya samādāpanāyai* (Y. °nayā) 90.16-17.
- samādhāna* – *samādhānabalinaḥ* 16.5-6; *nirodhasamādhānena* 34.5; *samādhānabalena* 20.19, 226.6, 262.6; *vividhasamādhānabalena* 300.17; *Darśanavyūhasamādhānabalena* 155.15; *samādhānāṅkuram ropayeyam* 240.11; *dr̥ḍhaviṛyasamādhāno* 356.11-12; *dr̥ḍhaviṛyasamādhāna* 276.6 (vs); *jñānaśilasamādhānaḥ* 279.8 (vs); 5.3, 287.11-12, 288.8, 290.5, 296.19, 299.19, 327.5-6, 8, 10, 14, 344.3-4, 13-14 *samādhānamukhanir-deśa*.
- samudānana* – *sarvasaṃyojanabandhanasamudānana-cittā* 235.10.
- samudānana-tā* – *atir̥ṇasattvottaraṇatāyai* (Y. °tayā) *mahānāvasamudānana-tā* 414.6-7.
- samudānaya-tā* – *pariśeṣā dharmāḥ prajñājñānopāyasambhārasamudānayatāyai paryeṣṭavyāḥ* 189.17-190.2.
- samudānayatī* – *catvāra ime mānavaka* (Y. °kā) *bodhimārgapratipannena bodhisattve-nākṣayakośāḥ samudānayatavyāḥ* 186.13-15; *tribhiḥ puṇyakriyāvastubhiḥ samudānītakusalamūlānāṃ* 191.1-2, *aviciparāyaṇāni karmāṇi samudānītāni syur* 272.6-7.
- samudānayana* – *sarvadharmasamudānayanasaṃbhāraḥ* 187.1.
- sarvāvanta* – 12.13, 43.8, 81.7 etc.
- sārāyaṇīya* – *śaṭsārāyaṇīyasaṃbhāro* (Y. *ṣaṭpārā°*; T. *sñiṇ-por byed-pa drug-gi tshogs*) 189.6, *sattvāṃ śaṭsārāyaṇīyeṣu* (Y. *ṣaṭpārā°*) *samādāpayeyam* 212.8-9, *śaṭsārāyaṇīyadharmaparivarjitānāṃ* (Y. *ṣaṭpārā°*) 255.6-7, *tvam api sattvāṃ śaṭsārāyaṇīyadharmaiḥ* (Y. *ṣaṭpārā°*) *saṃtarpayiṣyasi* 319.8-9.
- sukhasaṃsparśa* – *śītalā vāyavaḥ sugandhikā mṛdukāḥ sukhasaṃsparśacalitāḥ* (?) *pravāyante* 9.5-6, *sukhasaṃsparśā vāyavaḥ pravāyanti* 14.13.
- heṣṭima* – *ūrdhvaṃ yāvad akaniṣṭhabhavanaparyantaṃ heṣṭimena ca yāvat kāñcanacakra-paryantaṃ* 239.12-14; *dakṣiṇapaścimottaraheṣṭimopariṣu dikṣu* 388.11-12.
- heṣṭhā* – *heṣṭhā* (Y. *heṣṭham*) *yāvat kāñcanacakra-paryantaṃ* 238.15.

Index II.

- a-kṣaṇyana-tā* – *yā viṣayeṣv akṣaṇyanatā āmapratyavekṣaṇā iyaṃ kṣāntipāramitā* 228.2-4 (T. *mī bzod-pa ma mchis-pa* “absence of impatience”! The Chinese versions are quite different).
- an-āyūhana-tā* – *virye 'nāyūhanatām* (Y. °tā) 229.9. Cf. BHSD *an-āyūha*.
- apratisaṃdhi-nirodha* – “destruction without rebirth” 347.12 (T. *mtshams-med-pa* ‘i’ *gog-pa*; *mtshams sbyor-ba* = *pratisaṃdhi*). Cf. CPD *a-ppaṭisaṃdhiya* : *appaṭisaṃdhanirodha* Ud-a 434.1.
- abhisambudhyana* – °*bodhyabhisambudhyana*° 249.7; *bodhipakṣābhisambudhyanakaro* 418.12.
- avabudhyana-tā* – *kugatyavabudhyanatayā* 257.7; *sarvadharmāvabudhyanatayā* 414.11.
- a-sajjana* – “unimpeded”, *tasya ca samādheḥ pratilābhād asajjanā daśasu dikṣu*

- aprameyeṣv anyeṣu buddhakṣetreṣu gaccheyuḥ* 126.7-8. Cf. CPD *asajja*(t), *asajja-māna*. T. *thogs-pa ma mchis-par* “without impediment”.
- ārambha* – *parasparasārambhacittāḥ* (T. *phan-tshun noḥs-pa rtsom-pa'i sems*) 235.7; *dharmeṣu sārambhacittā* (T. *chos-rnams la noḥs-par brtson-pa'i sems*) 235.8-9. Cf. CPD *ārambha* (d) “evil act, offence, injury”.
- utsodha* – *utsodhaḥ sa mārgaḥ* 78.11 Cf. BHSD *utsodhi*.
- ullaṅghana* – *ullaṅghanavacanena* 317.10. T. *brñas-pa'i tshig* “despising words”.
- ullaṅghya* – *ullaṅghyavacanena* 318.9. T. *brñas-tshig* “despising words”.
- kāṣāyakaṇṭha* – *sahadarśanena sattvāḥ kāṣāyakaṇṭhās tribhir yānair avavartikā bhavyeyur* 324.2-3. T. *nur-smrig 'gul-na thogs-par 'gyur-ba* “wearing the yellow robe on the neck”. Cf. RP 29.2: *kāṣāyakaṇṭha vicarantā grāmakuleṣu madyamadamat-tāḥ*.
- gāḍhakarma* – *sarvāni gāḍhakarmāṇi niravaśeṣaṃ kṣapayati* 29.2-3. T. *las dan-po rnams* “the first acts” (?). Read *las nan-pa rnams* “bad acts”? See *pragāḍha*.
- cāraka* – “prison”, *saṃsārācārake* 202.4,15; *bhavadācārake* 206.1 (vs); *bhavadācārake* 224.14-15; *haḍiṇiḡaḍabandhanacārakasaḍdo* 236.6: *saṃsārabhavadācārakeṣu* 207.5 (vs). Cf. IJJ, XIII, p. 142.
- dakaprasāda* – 377.16, 382.16. Cf. BHSD *udakaprasāda*.
- dagdhasantāna* – *dagdhasantānānām kuśalamūlaparihinānām* 231.8-9, *dagdhasantānā akuśalamūlasamādhānāḥ* 231.19-232.1, *mūlāpattim āpannāḥ dagdhasantānāḥ śubhamārgapraṇaṣṭāḥ* 247.14-15, *mūlāpattisāparādhikā dagdhasantānāḥ* 259.14-15, *grhītā dagdhasantānā(h)* 278.9 (vs), 278.14 (vs), 279.5,10 (vs), 280.4,9 (vs), *dagdhasantānāḥ sattvā akuśalamūlasamavadhānagatā* 233.6-7, *dagdhasantānā akuśalasamavadhānagatā* 268.1-2, *akuśalamūlasamavadhānagatā dagdhasantānā(h)* 286.14-15, 288.1-2, 296.1-2, 297.10, 308.15-16. T. *sems-kyi rgyud tshig* “of burnt continuity of mind”. Cf. BHSD *saṃtāna*. See also above 230.4-5.
- pragāḍhakarma* – *pragāḍhakarmapratyayena* (T. *las-kyi rkyen rab-tu dam-pos*) *te sattvās tasmin samaye Bhadrakalpe viṃśottaravarṣaśatāyuskeṣu pratyāḡāyīṣyanti* 237.8-10. The Chinese versions translate *pragāḍha* and *gāḍha* as “weighty, heavy” (Ch. 1-207a6; Ch. 2-266c26). T. *rab-tu dam-po* “very strong”. Cf. BHSD *āgāḍhatara*.
- prajñāpana* – *divyāsanāni divyāni prajñāpanāni* 88.10-11, *pīṭham sthāpayitvā śatasahasramūlyena prajñāpanena prajñāpya* 198.2-3, *kṛtsnam Saham buddhakṣetram prajñāpanapramāṇam* (Y. *prajñāpana*) *me tatra svacarma parityaktam* 365.17-18. Probably meaning “carpet”. In 365.7-18 the text seems to be in disorder.
- praśrambhayati* – *teṣāṃ ca tṛṣṇāsaṃyojanaratikriḍāsaumanasyābhīratāṃś cittacaitasikāṃ sarvān praśrambhayeyuḥ* 265.5-7. Cf. BHSD *praśrabhyate*.
- vinipātana* – *tad api dānapratigrāhakasya śraddhādeyavinipātanaṃ* 318.2. Cf. BHSD *śraddhā-deya*.
- vimārgita* – *brahmāyihāravimārgitānām* 254.3. Cf. 254, notes 2 and 3.
- saṃkhyāta* – *yathā na pūrvaṃ kenacit sattvasaṃkhyātena anyatīrthikena vā śrāvakayānikena vā* 244.16-18. T. *semś-can du bgrañ-ba* “counted as living being”.
- samavadhāna* – 108.13-14, 145.8-9 (Y. *samavadhānakūśalamūla*), 269.13 *kūśalamūla-samavadhāna*; 224.17-18 (Y. *sakuśala*°; T. *mi-dge-ba'i...*), 233.7, 268.1-2, 306.9-10, 307.6-7 *akuśalamūlasamavadhānagata*; 306.16 *kūśalamūlasamavadhānagata*; 231.19-232.1 (Y. °*mūlasamādhānāḥ*; T. ... *dan 'grogs-pa*), 259.17, 348.10-11 *akuśalamūlasamavadhāna*; *ānantaryakārakā yāvad akuśalamūlasamavadhānagatā* 274.13-14, 286.14-15, 288.1-2, 297.9-10, 308.15, 310.8-9, 312.4; *ānantaryakārakānām yāvad akuśalamūlasamavadhānagatānām* 310.3.

Saigusa Mitsuyoshi, *Studien zum Mahāprajñāpāramitā (upadeśa) śāstra*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München. Tōkyō, Hokuseidō Verlag, 1969. 241 pp. \$ 20.—.

L'ouvrage de M. Saigusa est divisé en deux parties. La première partie contient des remarques sur l'auteur et le traducteur du *Mppś* (= *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-upadeśa-śāstra*), un chapitre sur la structure du texte et une énumération des textes cités dans le *Mppś* et le *Shih-chu p'i-p'o-sha lun* (T. 1521). M. Saigusa se contente de citer l'opinion des savants sur l'attribution du *Mppś* à Nāgārjuna et il accepte comme hypothèse de travail que Nāgārjuna a écrit une grande partie de cet ouvrage. Dans le chapitre sur la structure du *Mppś* M. Saigusa étudie plusieurs textes déjà traduits et expliqués par M. Demiéville (*JA*, 1950, pp. 375-397; cf. surtout p. 375 n. 1 [corriger ici dix mille en cent mille], p. 381 n. 1; 383 n. 4 [corriger T. 1509, 75 b-c en T. 1509, 756 c]; pp. 387-388). Si M. Saigusa avait lu attentivement ce compte rendu, il aurait trouvé réponse à deux des trois questions qu'il se pose (p. 12). P. 14 n. 9 il faut corriger 150.000 – 500.000 = 100.000 en 1.500.000 – 500.000 = 1.000.000. M. Saigusa énumère les titres des textes cités dans le *Mppś* mais, à une ou deux exceptions près, il n'a pas essayé d'identifier les passages cités. A propos de la citation du Dhammapada (*Mppś* 59c = Lamotte p. 29) M. Saigusa renvoie au Dhammapada 60 et 380, mais la deuxième demi-stance ne s'y trouve pas. M. Lamotte traduit: "Un esprit peut sauver un esprit, un autre homme peut sauver un esprit; la pratique du bien et le savoir, voilà le meilleur sauveur." Il vaudrait mieux rendre la première demi-stance ainsi: "L'*ātman* peut sauver l'*ātman*, un autre homme comment peut-il sauver l'*ātman*?" M. Saigusa corrige plusieurs fois le titre donné par M. Lamotte, p. ex. *Shē-li-fu pēn-mo ching* – *Śāriputrāpūrvāparāntakasūtra*. Cela est une reconstruction impossible que l'on ne peut pas justifier en renvoyant à l'équivalence *Pēn-mo ching-Pūrvāparāntakasūtra*.

M. Saigusa a tort de supposer que Kumārajīva procède de manière systématique dans ses traductions de termes sanskrits. D'ailleurs, il le reconnaît lui-même (cf. p. 183: "Da Kumārajīva manchmal die Namen der Bodhisattvas mit den verschiedensten chinesischen Ausdrücken übersetzt"). Reconstruire les mots sanskrits, traduits par Kumārajīva, est une entreprise aléatoire à moins qu'il ne s'agisse de termes bien déterminés. Ceci ne pourra se faire qu'à l'aide d'un glossaire chinois-sanskrit des textes sanskrits traduits par Kumārajīva dont l'original a été conservé. Peut-être un tel glossaire montrera que Kumārajīva n'a nullement suivi un système qui permette de reconstruire les mots sanskrits avec assez de certitude. Plusieurs reconstructions, proposées par M. Saigusa, sont inacceptables. P. 94, l. 6 d'en bas: "tiefsinnig (*gambhīra*) und vorzüglich (*virāj*)" — "profond (*gambhīra*) et subtil (*sūkṣma*)" (cf. p. 161 n. 10 où *wei-miao* correspond à *sūkṣma*); p. 99 l. 3: *bhāva* – *bhava*; p. 108, l. 21: *apagacchati* ne signifie pas "lebt abseits"; p. 116, l. 3: *prasarpati* – plutôt *vivardhate*; p. 116, l. 24: *sārdha* – lapsus pour *sādhāraṇa*?; p. 139, l. 19: *bhāva* – *bhava*; p. 139, l. 22: "beide Extremen" (*dvānta*)!; p. 157, l. 5: *paritrāṭavya* – plutôt *uttarayitavya*; p. 163, l. 20: *abhibhāvana* – la traduction de Lamotte est correcte; p. 165, l. 7: *parikṣāṇa*!; p. 202, l. 2: *uddiśati sma* – *vyākaraṇi*. Pour revenir à la liste des titres des ouvrages cités M. Saigusa mentionne sous no. 45 un *Therīśūtra*. Il s'agit de la *Śrīmāti-brāhmaṇi-paripṛcchā* (cf. Demiéville, *op.cit.*, p. 379 n. 2). M. Lamotte n'a pas reconnu que *To-ch'ih ching* est le titre d'un *sūtra* (cf. Lamotte, p. 541; Saigusa, p. 21, no. 49) et il traduit: "C'est en ce sens qu'il est dit, dans beaucoup de *sūtra*, que deux Buddha n'existent pas simultanément dans un même monde." Ce passage se trouve dans le *Bahudhātukasutta* (*Majjhima-nikāya*, vol. III, p. 65): *aṭṭhānam etaṃ anavakāso yaṃ ekissā lokadhātuyā dve arahanto Sammāsambuddhā apubbam acarimaṃ uppajjeyyūṃ, n'etaṃ thānaṃ vijjatīti pajānāti* (cf. *Madhyamāgama* T. 26, p. 723c29-724a1).

Dans la deuxième partie M. Saigusa étudie quelques thèmes principaux du *Mppś*. Un

chapitre est consacré à l'étude des *pāramitā* (pp. 60-132). Le suivant s'appelle "Wahrheit" (pp. 133-166). Le dernier chapitre traite du bodhisattva (pp. 167-209). Nous ne pouvons que relever quelques points traités par M. Saigusa. Il fait remarquer que, à part des six *pāramitā*, le *Mpps* mentionne souvent l'*upāya* mais que l'*upāya* est rarement considéré comme une septième *pāramitā* comme dans le *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* et le *Lalitavistara*. En ce qui concerne le *pratītyasamutpāda* M. Saigusa distingue deux sens différents; 1. la chaîne des douze membres; 2. la relation mutuelle des dharma (*paras-parāpekṣā*) qui est identique à la vacuité. Le raisonnement de M. Saigusa dans ce chapitre n'est pas toujours facile à suivre. M. Saigusa renvoie le lecteur à deux articles qu'il a publiés ailleurs ("Engin to Yuishin – Jūji-kyō to Nāgārjuna to o chūshin toshite", *Kegon shisō*, Kyōto, 1960, pp. 201-273; "Engi no kōsatsu – idappaccayatā kara pratītyasamutpāda ye", *IBK*, VI, Tōkyō, 1958, pp. 344-355). Un bref résumé de ces articles aurait probablement facilité la lecture de ce chapitre. Le chapitre sur le bodhisattva contient des données intéressantes mais le sujet est loin d'être épuisé. Probablement un traitement détaillé aiderait beaucoup à déterminer la position du *Mpps* dans la littérature du Mahāyāna.

Un appendice signale les stances, citées dans le *Mpps*, et compare les citations des *Madhyamakārikās* avec le texte correspondant des *Madhyamakārikās* (pp. 211-223).

Le livre de M. Saigusa apporte beaucoup de neuf grâce aux nombreuses citations du *Mpps*. Un texte d'une telle étendue et d'une telle richesse de contenu mérite d'être étudié sous beaucoup d'angles différents. En lisant ce livre, toutefois, on ne peut pas entièrement échapper à l'impression que l'auteur n'a pas toujours poussé assez loin son enquête. Espérons qu'il poursuivra ses recherches sur ce texte qui est d'une importance capitale pour les études bouddhiques.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Lives of Eminent Korean Monks. The Haedong Kosūng Chōn. Translated with an introduction by Peter H. Lee (= *Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies*, XXV). Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1969. xv + 116 pp. \$7.00.

Following the example of the *Kao-seng chuan*'s written in China, the Korean monk Kakhun compiled by royal command in 1215 the "Lives of Eminent Korean Monks". The first two extant chapters have been published several times since their discovery in the beginning of this century. The most accessible edition is the one published in 1927 in volume 50 of the *Taishō Daizōkyō* (no. 2065, pp. 1015-1023). Dr. Peter H. Lee's carefully annotated translation is extremely welcome, because the number of sources on the history of early Korean Buddhism is very limited. The translation is competently done, although sometimes a little too free, e.g. p. 19: "it functions with the display of coming and going", the text mentions 'birth' (*sheng*) and 'extinction' (*mieh*); p. 20: "his teaching" instead of "his fame and teaching" (*sheng chiao*, cf. *Shang shu*, Legge, III, p. 150). The annotation traces the sources of the many literary allusions. Much information is given on the persons mentioned in the text. The orthography of Sanskrit words has apparently not been checked by a Sanskrit scholar. There are also a few other mistakes which have to be corrected. In note 160 two translations of the *Fa-kuo chi* are mentioned: one by Jean Rémusat in 1836 and one by Klaproth and Landresse in 1848. Abel Rémusat's translation was published posthumously by Klaproth and Landresse in 1836. It is of course correct to translate *chao-t'i* by 'monastery', but the addition of the word *cāturdiśa* requires a note (cf. p. 61). Its meaning is 'pertaining to the four directions, universal'. In Buddhist Sanskrit texts *cāturdiśa* often qualifies the *bhikṣusamgha* 'the universal monk-brotherhood' (cf. Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist*

Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, 1953 s.v. *cāturdiśa*). In China *chao-t'i* seems to have been used as a general term for monastery. Probably its original meaning was 'monastery belonging to the universal monk-brotherhood'. In note 290 *adhyātma-tyāga* is given as the Sanskrit original of the *she-shen* 'sacrificing oneself'. I do not know from where this Sanskrit term is taken. Mochizuki's *Dictionary* (p. 2162b) gives *ātma-parityāga* which is found in the *Vyāghripārvata* of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*. In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* the term *ātmabhāva-parityāga* is used (cf. Kern and Nanjio's edition, p. 406.13). The expression *chu-lei* is explained as a rendering of *pariṇāmanā* (cf. p. 81). However, it is used to translate *anuparindanā* 'the handing over [of the doctrine]'. cf. the title of chapter 27 in the translations of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* by Dharmarakṣa and Jñānagupta and Dharmagupta (*Taishō*, nos. 263 and 264); Mochizuki's *Dictionary* s.v. *fuḥō* (p. 4493b). On *Shih-li fo-shih kuo* (*Śrīvijaya* not *Śrībhoja*) much has been written by Cœdès, Ferrand and others since the publication of Pelliot's article in 1904 (cf. p. 94 n. 478), cf. e.g. the article on *Sumatora* in volume VIII of Mochizuki's *Dictionary* (pp. 147b-151a).

According to the introduction the first chapter is the more important of the two and throws new and often brilliant light on the development of Korean Buddhism from the time of its introduction to the seventh century. It is a pity that the author does not elaborate on this statement. It would have been useful to have some indication of the knowledge which can be obtained from other sources, and of the additional information to be found in the first chapter of the *HKC* (= 'Lives of Eminent Korean Monks'). Of the second chapter it is said that it consists chiefly of excerpts from the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* and from the *Ta-t'ang hsi-yü ch'iu-fa kao-seng chuan* of I-ching, except for the life of the monk Anham.¹ Neither here nor in the notes to the translation of the second chapter is there any precise indication as to the extent of the borrowings from these texts by Kakhun. We have to content ourselves with rather vague statements such as the one found in note 96 of the introduction: "Even if he [= Kakhun] drew on existing materials, he always supplemented them, as in the case of Wŏn'gwang, with new materials written in a balanced, allusion-packed prose."² Even the information given on the history and discovery of the *HKC* is unsatisfactory. According to the introduction it was discovered in or about 1914 by Yi Hoe-gwang (1840-1911), cf. p. 2 and p. 2 n. 6. The preface mentions the earliest available edition in block prints, but does not give any information about the dates and number of block-print editions of the work. According to the introduction it was unknown until its discovery except by its title and by a few quotations. It would have been useful to enumerate these quotations. The author states that the *HKC* is one of the primary sources of the *Samguk yusa*, but he seems to contradict himself in note 5: "Unless Iryŏn is referring to the biography of monks compiled by Kim Tae-mun, which existed at the time of the copilation of *SGSG*, he must be referring to *KSC* (= *Kao-seng chuan*)." The author fails to tell us whether or not Kakhun has made use of the biography of the monks by Kim Tae-mun and of the *Samguk sagi*. The *HKC* mentions a *ku-chi* which is translated by 'ancient record' (p. 31) and by 'old records' (p. 45). The only information provided on these records (p. 31 n. 98) is a reference to *Changwoe chamnok*, I, 69 and *SGYS*, Introduction, pp. 15, 22-23.³ In the preface Lee promises a critical edition of the *HKC*. Let us hope that in

¹ The division of the text in two chapters is not indicated in the translation. Chapter two begins with the life of Kaktok (p. 70). Also the title of these two chapters (*Liu-t'ung* I, 1 and I, 2) is not mentioned.

² On p. 4 mention is made of the fact that Kakhun copied almost verbatim the account of Tamsi in the *Kao-seng chuan*. This account is a part of chapter one which, accordingly, also contains long excerpts from other texts.

³ For *Changwoe chamnok*, which is not listed in the abbreviations, see p. 2 n. 8 and p. 3 n. 12.

this edition full information will be given by him on the history of the text of the *HKC*, its sources and the use made of it by later authors.⁴

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung* (= *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, hrsg. von W. Voigt, Supplementband 8). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH., 1968, XI, 203 pp., 46 pl. DM 84,—.

La collection des manuscrits sanskrits de l'Asie centrale à Berlin contient des matériaux importants pour l'étude de la paléographie indienne. Le travail de Mme Sander est consacré surtout à l'étude des manuscrits anciens dont la plupart ont été probablement apportés en Asie centrale par des Indiens. Jusqu'à maintenant seuls quelques rares manuscrits de cette collection avaient été étudiés du point de vue paléographique par Lüders. Lüders avait déjà apporté des changements à la terminologie employée par Hoernle. Mme Sander établit la classification suivante:

- A. Indische Schrifttypen
 - I. Kuṣāṇa-Brāhmī (Alphabet a-d)
 - II. Indische Gupta-Alphabete (Alphabet e-l)
- B. Turkistanische Schrifttypen
 - III. Turkistanischer Gupta-Typ (Alphabet q)
 - VII. Südturkistanische Brāhmī (Alphabet v)
 - IV. Frühe turkistanische Brāhmī (Alphabet r, s)
 - V. Nordturkistanische Brāhmī, Typ a (Alphabet t)
 - VI. Nordturkistanische Brāhmī, Typ b (Alphabet u)
- Sonderschriften.
 - S I. Gilgit/Bamiyan-Typ II (Alphabet m)
 - S II. Śāradā-Schrift (Alphabet n)
 - S III. Pāla-Schrift (Alphabet o)
 - S IV. Sondertyp der Gupta-Schrift (Alphabet k)
 - S V. Südindischer Schrifttyp.

III correspond au "North Western Gupta variety" dans la terminologie de Hoernle et au "archaischer Typ der nördlichen turkestanischer Brāhmī" dans celle de Lüders. IV représente un stade transitoire entre III et V, VI, VII. VII correspond au "Upright Gupta" de Hoernle et V-VI au "Slanting Gupta" de Hoernle. Les "Sonderschriften" sont des écritures qui n'ont exercé aucune influence sur le développement de l'écriture au Nord du bassin du Tarim.

Le livre de Mme Sander est divisé en huit parties (A-H). A (Die Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung) donne un aperçu de la collection des manuscrits sanskrits de Berlin (pp. 1-50). B est consacrée à l'étude des manuscrits de l'époque des Kuṣāṇa (pp. 51-84), C à l'étude des écritures Gupta du Nord de l'Inde (pp. 85-136), D à l'étude des "Sonderschriften" (pp. 137-180). E contient des remarques sur les tableaux 29-40 qui reproduisent les alphabets q-v (pp. 181-183), F résume les résultats obtenus (pp. 184-188), G contient une liste d'abréviations, une bibliographie, une liste

⁴ To the literature mentioned in note 13 of the introduction, one must add the notices of the *Kaitō kōsōden* in Mochizuki's *Dictionary* (Vol. VIII, pp. 51c-52a) and in Ono Gemmyō's *Bushō kaisetsu daijiten*, vol. II (1933), p. 34.

des manuscrits qui ont servi à établir les alphabets, une liste des tableaux dans le texte et dans l'appendice et une liste des numéros du catalogue qui ont été étudiés ou mentionnés (pp. 189-203). H est un appendice de 41 tableaux qui reproduisent les alphabets étudiés. Ces tableaux donnent les combinaisons des consonnes avec les voyelles, les semi-voyelles et les diphtongues. Ils copient exactement les formes données par les manuscrits. Heureusement Mme Sander n'a pas suivi l'exemple de Dani qui a préféré donner "the forms of the various styles as I have reconstructed them after examining the different inscriptions" (A. H. Dani, *Indian Palaeography*, Oxford, 1963, p. 11). Les tableaux 1-8 contiennent les alphabets a-d (env. II^e-III^e siècles), 9-20 les alphabets e-g (env. III^e-IV^e siècles) et les alphabets h-k (env. IV^e-V^e siècles), 21-26 l'alphabet l (env. VI^e siècle), m (à partir du VI^e siècle) et n (env. XII^e siècle), 27-28 l'alphabet o (env. XII^e siècle), 29-40 les alphabets q-v et 41 les signes utilisés dans des manuscrits de textes koutchéens, ouïgours et khotanais.

Dans A Mme Sander étudie les lieux d'origine des manuscrits et les matériaux utilisés par les scribes. Deux tableaux montrent les lieux d'origine, les différents types d'écriture et les matériaux employés. Ces tableaux sont basés sur une liste de 729 manuscrits. De ces manuscrits 2,06% proviennent de Tumšūq, 45,96% de la région de Kučā, 23,46% de Šorčuq et 28,52% de la région de Tourfan.¹ Le type d'écriture le plus répandu est V (334 manuscrits). Presque tous les manuscrits (681) sont écrits sur papier. Les autres matériaux employés sont les feuilles de palmier (32), le cuir (6) et l'écorce de bouleau (10). Dans le dernier chapitre de cette partie Mme Sander étudie les tâches et les méthodes de la paléographie indienne et explique le but et l'arrangement de son travail. Elle relève les mérites et les faiblesses du livre de Dani, le premier livre qui marque un progrès sur l'*Indische Palaeographie* de Bühler. Mme Sander fait ressortir l'importance qu'il faut attacher à l'étude du processus de changement des formes des lettres.

La partie principale de ce livre est consacrée à l'étude des manuscrits de l'époque des Kušāṇa, des manuscrits écrits dans les écritures Gupta du Nord de l'Inde et des "Sonderschriften". Chaque chapitre comporte une partie descriptive et une partie comparative. La première étudie un groupe d'alphabets et essaie de déterminer les tendances du développement de l'écriture. La deuxième partie compare les écritures des manuscrits de Berlin avec celles employées dans des inscriptions et d'autres manuscrits. Cette comparaison sert à établir une chronologie relative des manuscrits.

Le travail de Mme Sander est une contribution de la première importance à l'étude de la paléographie indienne. Les conclusions sont basées sur l'examen critique d'une grande masse de matériaux soigneusement arrangés. Mme Sander n'hésite pas à rectifier les opinions émises par des savants illustres tels que Lüders et Thomas. Son travail montre nettement qu'une étude paléographique d'une inscription ou d'un manuscrit doit être basée sur l'étude du système d'écriture employée et qu'il ne faut pas se contenter d'en isoler une seule lettre ou même quelques lettres. D'autre part, il faut pouvoir disposer de matériaux suffisants dont on connaît date et origine. Les études paléographiques ne peuvent avancer que par l'emploi de nouvelles méthodes et par leur application rigoureuse. Dans le domaine de la paléographie indienne on ne pourra trouver de meilleur guide que le livre de Mme Sander.²

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

¹ Une carte aurait été la bienvenue. Les *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden* (Teil I, p. XI) reproduisent une petite carte de Le Coq qui ne donne pas tous les lieux mentionnés par Mme Sander. Une bonne carte de l'Asie centrale se trouve dans le septième volume du *Bukkyō daijiten* de Mochizuki Shinkō (Tōkyō, 1933; 2e ed., 1954; 3e ed., 1960).

² La bibliographie contient plusieurs fautes d'impression. No. 30 Orientales, lire

Stuart Buck, *Tibetan-English Dictionary with Supplement*. Washington, Catholic University of America Press. 1969. xviii + 833 pp. \$25.00.

This is the third dictionary of modern Tibetan to be published during the last seven years. I think that it would be generally agreed that a dictionary such as this should take into consideration all the material published before. Unfortunately Buck's dictionary does not. Besides the vocabulary of *Nationalities Pictorial* and, in the Supplement, that of the *Glossary of New Terms*, Buck has used the dictionaries of A. Csoma de Kőrös, Jäschke, S. Ch. Das and some other dictionaries, but he does not seem to have made use of two dictionaries which record the language used in modern Tibetan literature (B. Semičov and others, Moscow, 1963; E. Richter, Leipzig, 1966). And what is more, he does not mention the existence of these materials and we gain the impression that the work of Tibetologists of the USSR and the People's Democracies in the fields of Tibetan lexicography, grammar and phonetics has been completely overlooked (K. Sedláček - ČSSR; E. Richter and J. Schubert - GDR; Géza Uray and A. Róna-Tas - Hungary; B. Semičov - USSR). While referring to the works of the first Hungarian Tibetologist, Csoma de Kőrös (a grammar and a dictionary), S. Buck does not mention the works of the first Russian Tibetologist, I. J. Schmidt (also a grammar and a dictionary, 1839 and 1843), although they still provide many useful materials and I. J. Schmidt was the first to arrange his dictionary in the order of the Tibetan alphabet. Schmidt's method has been accepted by subsequent compilers of Tibetan dictionaries: Jäschke, S. Ch. Das and all others, including S. Buck himself. We cannot imagine that S. Buck, as a Tibetologist, does not know these works.

What is more, S. Buck has apparently not made use of the recently published dictionaries of modern Tibetan. For example, of the new terms formed in modern Tibetan with the help of *rin-lugs* only thirty-three are listed by S. Buck: under ka: 2, kha: 3, ga: 4, ña: 1, ta 1, pa: 5, pha: 1, ma: 8, tsa: 1, za: 1, ra: 3, la: 2, sa: 1. However the dictionaries by Semičov and others and by Richter list ninety-five terms formed with the aid of *rin-lugs*. This example may suffice to show that S. Buck has not used all the opportunities he had, although numerous others could be mentioned. All Tibetologists will suffer as the result of Buck's failure to use the works of Tibetologists from the USSR and the GDR.

We hope that S. Buck will take these remarks into consideration when bringing out a second edition of his dictionary and that at the same time he will omit the religious and philosophical terminology. The terms cited by him occasionally and without any apparent system are not sufficient to translate classical Buddhist literature. Many of his translations are not in accordance with our present-day interpretation of Buddhist philosophical terms (*chos*, *chos thams-cad*, 'du-byed, 'du-śes, *ston-pa-ñid*, 'dus-byas, etc.). In the USSR a "Tibetan-Russian-English Dictionary with Sanskrit equivalents" by the late Professor G. de Roerich in three volumes with a supplement by B. Semičov forming a fourth volume, will soon be published. We hope that this dictionary will enable us to translate almost all Tibetan philosophical treatises. It would render unnecessary the unsystematic introduction of these terms into a dictionary of modern Tibetan.

Ulan-Ude

B. Semičov

Orientalis; No. 150, inscriptions, lire inscription; d'ancienne, lire l'ancienne; No. 157 document, lire documents; No. 201 Jātakamāla, lire Jātakamālā; No. 204 Gaudensia, lire Gandensia. Le travail de J. Filliozat ("Paléographie", *L'Inde classique*, Tome II, 1953, pp. 665-712) n'est pas mentionné.