

Rosane Rocher, *La théorie des voix du verbe dans l'école pāṇinienne (le 14e āhnika)* (= *Université libre de Bruxelles, Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres*, tome XXXV). Bruxelles, 1968. 350 pp.

Pāṇini a inséré dans la large portion de son *Aṣṭādhyāyī* consacrée à la dérivation (*adhyāya* 3 à 5) son enseignement des désinences personnelles du verbe. Il en distingue nettement deux séries. Le premier *adhyāya* qui contient tant de propositions, *paribhāṣā*, définitions de noms techniques, etc., destinées à régler le maniement des injonctions des chapitres subséquents, attribue les noms techniques *ātmanepada* et *paraśmaipada* à ces deux séries de désinences ainsi qu'à quelques suffixes verbaux (participes). Ces noms mêmes "mot pour soi", "mot pour autrui" nous indiquent que nous avons là la distinction entre voix moyenne et active. Dans ce même *adhyāya*, Pāṇini consacre 82 *sūtra* (*āhnika* 14) à répartition de ces deux séries de désinences, selon le sens à exprimer et dans l'ensemble des racines, faisant ainsi le lien avec l'enseignement connexe du *Dhātupāṭha*. L'ouvrage de Mme Rocher consacré à ce quatorzième *āhnika* vise principalement à montrer comment les grammairiens les plus anciens de l'école de Pāṇini ont traité la question des voix du verbe sanskrit. C'est une présentation détaillée, claire des faits que ces grammairiens ont mis en évidence, ainsi que de leurs procédés d'exposition.

Mme Rocher reconnaît chez eux deux démarches fondamentales, l'une d'analyse de la forme en éléments, racine, affixe, etc. l'autre d'analyse des faits de la réalité exprimés par chacun de ces éléments. Pāṇini ne traite pas dans l'abstrait des voix du verbe. Il part des désinences et montre quel sens elles apportent à l'action signifiée par la racine. Elles suffisent à définir les voix active et moyenne. Elles ne suffisent pas à faire apparaître le passif, un affixe *yak* étant requis. De plus elles sont identiques au moyen et au passif. Aussi ne trouve-t-on pas ici une présentation de plusieurs voix, ni une classification des formes sous plusieurs rubriques, actif, moyen, passif, réciproque, réfléchi. Pāṇini part de l'existence de deux séries de désinences et c'est quand il en précise le sens qu'il fait entendre en même temps à laquelle de nos voix leur emploi correspond. Les désinences *paraśmaipada*, dit-il, servent à exprimer l'agent (ce qui correspond à notre voix active), les désinences *ātmanepada* à exprimer l'objet (cas de notre passif), l'action ou l'état (cas de l'impersonnel) et l'agent quand il y a échange d'action (cas du réciproque) ou quand ledit agent est bénéficiaire du fruit de l'action (sens du moyen). Le sens n'est pas la seule cause de l'emploi de l'une ou l'autre série de désinences. Il est nombre de cas où l'on doit constater un emploi qui n'est pas fonction des sens définis. Le *Dhātupāṭha*, en connexion avec une information du *sūtra*, note l'existence de ces emplois. Ainsi, comme l'enseigne le *sūtra* 1.3.12, toute racine qui porte dans le *Dhātupāṭha* en indice un accent atone ou *ñ* reçoit les désinences *ātmanepada*; une racine qui porte en indice un accent modulé ou *ñ* prend les mêmes désinences avec la nuance de sens que l'agent est bénéficiaire du fruit de l'action; toute autre racine prend les désinences *paraśmaipada*.

Tel est le cadre de la description de Pāṇini. Elle est poursuivie par un relevé de particularités, complété par le *vārtikā*. Ainsi avons-nous un précieux répertoire de formes particulières avec définition précise des circonstances de leur emploi, présence de certains préverbes, acceptions particulières, emploi transitif ou intransitif, temps ou formes spéciales. Mme Rocher passe en revue avec beaucoup de soin toutes ces règles particulières et ceci constitue la part la plus importante de son ouvrage. L'étude de Pāṇini étant évidemment inséparable de celle des commentaires et développements qu'il a suscités, elle présente aussi toute la somme d'explications, justifications, exemples, contre-exemples, excursus contenus dans le *Mahābhāṣya* et son commentaire, le *Pradīpa*, dans la *Kāśikā* et ses deux commentaires, *Nyāsa* et *Padamañjarī*, dans la *Durghaṭavṛtti*, dans les ouvrages spécialisés consacrés aux racines, *Mādhaviyadhātuvṛtti*, etc. A la fin de son chapitre de conclusions elle tente de caractériser chacun de ces commentateurs. Particulièrement intéressante et vivante est, chez ces auteurs, la confrontation qu'ils font entre

l'usage et la lettre de la règle. Y-a-t-il divergence, ils s'empressent en réinterprétant l'énoncé de la règle de montrer que ce n'est qu'apparence. La *Durghaṭavṛtti* se signale par son effort en ce sens. Elle résout un désaccord en réinterprétant un énoncé de la règle, un *ca* par exemple. Ou bien elle reconnaît à certains textes (*purāṇa*, épopée, etc.) une indépendance légitime par rapport à Pāṇini. Parfois elle rend un verdict d'incorrection. Ou, souvent, au lieu de réinterpréter la règle, elle réinterprète le vers cité, tel ce vers du *Kirātārjuniya* (17.63) où pour justifier un *ājaghne* on propose quatre constructions différentes et fort inattendues (§505). On voit dans ces débats comment la grammaire est un instrument d'explication pour le commentateur de *kāvya*. Dans le vers 2.35 du *Kirātārjuniya*, cité §754, on trouve une forme *nayanti* qui est mise en question, parce qu'une désinence *ātmanepada* est requise en vertu du *sūtra* 1.3.37 qui la prescrit quand l'objet se situe dans l'agent, sans pour autant être partie de son corps. Or, ici, l'objet est la force qui appartient aux ambitieux, agents de l'action signifiée par *nayanti*, verbe que Mme Rocher traduit par "déploient" et traite comme ayant un seul objet. Mallinātha entend la phrase autrement et propose une solution grammaticale originale. Le verbe *nayanti* a le sens de *prāpaṇam* "faire atteindre" et se construit avec un double objet. Mallinātha construit *nayanti* avec *pauruṣam* "le courage" et *śivam aupayikam* "un moyen favorable", au lieu de faire de ce second terme un objet de *vigaṇayya*. Or le moyen favorable est un objet qui n'appartient pas à l'agent et Mallinātha peut dire que c'est en raison de la présence de cet objet que la désinence *ātmanepada* n'a pas été employée. Ce faisant, il donne à la strophe le sens: "après s'être assuré de l'heureuse obtention d'un fruit considérable, ils joignent leur courage au moyen favorable, maîtres de la précipitation de la colère, ceux qui désirent vaincre".

Au §817, dans sa traduction obscure de sens, Mme Rocher ne rend pas justice à la strophe *etanmanda* ... attribuée à Vallana par le *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (donnée aussi dans le *subhāṣitaratnaśa*, no. 1664, éd. Kosambi-Gokhale, citée *Vakroktijivita*, *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, etc.). Une traduction littérale nous semble pouvoir être (voir aussi la traduction de M. Ingalls dans *An anthology of sanskrit court poetry*, HOS, 44, Harvard, 1965): "ce couple de tes seins au teint légèrement clair, au centre sombre, comme le fruit tinduka lent à mûrir, apparaît bon pour la caresse de la main des beaux jeunes chasseurs; ainsi, ô fille du chef du hameau, le troupeau d'éléphants priant désespérément pour la protection de sa vie, te demande-t-il: ne couvre pas ta poitrine d'un vêtement de feuilles (de plumes de paon, selon Śrīdhara)". Jhalakikar place cette strophe dans la bouche d'un amoureux (voir son commentaire sur *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, Poona, BORI, 1950). La scène se passe dans une tribu de chasseurs ou habitants de la forêt, d'où un effet de couleur locale particulier. L'amoureux prend comme prétexte un troupeau d'éléphants qui s'enfuit devant les chasseurs. Il figure cette fuite comme signifiant une prière des éléphants adressée à la jeune fille: si la beauté de tes seins attire et retient les jeunes chasseurs, ils nous oublieront et nous laisseront vivre tranquillement; dévoile-donc ta poitrine. Et ainsi l'amoureux a indirectement manifesté son désir. Le *Kāvyaaprakāśa* donne ce vers comme exemple du défaut *cyutasamṣkṛti*, faute de grammaire. *Anunāthate* selon la règle reçoit la désinence *ātmanepada*, quand le sens est celui de souhait, *āśih*. Or ici le sens est *yācanam* "demande". Nāgeśa précise quelle peut être la différence entre ces deux sens. Il y a *āśih*, "souhait", quand il y a un simple désir; il y a *yācanam*, "demande", quand il y a une démarche provoquée par un désir, mais qui vise à produire chez quelqu'un d'autre un désir de donner l'objet désiré. Jhalakikar marque la distinction plus simplement: il y a *āśih* quand l'objet du verbe *anunāth* est seulement la chose désirée, le sens de souhait n'étant pas possible si la personne à qui le désir s'adresse est donnée comme objet. Dans le cas présent, l'accusatif *tvām* interdit le sens de souhait. Le commentaire de Śrīdhara (éd. Sivaprasad Bhattacharyya, Calcutta, Sanskrit College, 1961, p. 188) rejette qu'il y ait incorrection et invoque la thèse du caractère facultatif de l'emploi dans les sens autres que celui de souhait, thèse qu'il attribue à Maitreya et au *Jñāpakasamuccaya* de Puruṣottamadeva.

Après la confrontation avec l'usage, une autre tâche des commentateurs de Pāṇini est d'assurer la logique interne, le mécanisme d'application des règles. On connaît le caractère quasi algébrique des formules pāṇinéennes dont on s'attend à ce qu'une application mécanique fournisse toutes les formes désirables. Le *Mahābhāṣya*, et déjà le *vārttika* avant lui, ont montré des incohérences, des irrégularités. Le *Mahābhāṣya* s'est attaché à corriger les *sūtra* déficients, à rattraper leur efficacité, plus d'ailleurs, en les réinterprétant qu'en en changeant la teneur. Les *sūtra* de l'*āhnika* 14 posent nombre de problèmes de cette sorte: caractère limitatif des injonctions, objet sur lequel porte la restriction, interposition d'affixes entre racine et désinence, ordre d'application des règles, traitement du *bhāva-karṭṛ* "réfléchi", identification des racines, etc. On connaît l'intelligence que Patañjali a mis dans les solutions et les débats qu'il construit à partir de quelques postulats tels que la non-inutilité d'aucun énoncé de Pāṇini, etc., inaugurant par là une discipline rigoureuse encore cultivée de nos jours. Dans la première partie de son livre, Mme Rocher analyse ces problèmes tels qu'ils sont présentés dans le *Mahābhāṣya*, le *Pradīpa* et les commentaires de la *Kāśikā*. Elle se déclare quelquefois déconcertée devant les procédés de raisonnement. Peut-être faut-il recourir aux explications des commentateurs plus tardifs, en particulier s'aider de l'intelligence de Nāgeśa pour mieux comprendre la validité logique des discussions du *bhāṣya*. Ce dernier est souvent elliptique et ce sont les commentateurs qui se mettent en devoir de fournir une démonstration rigoureuse manquante.

A titre d'exemple nous citerons le raisonnement que Mme Rocher a évoqué § 153-154 de façon un peu floue. Le *sūtra* 1.2.4 autorise le transfert de l'application d'une opération déterminée par un énoncé *ñit* à un élément qui n'est pas *ñit*. Ce terme *ñit* peut se comprendre soit comme un *bahuvrīhi* "qui a pour indice *n*", soit comme un *karmadhāraya* "indice *n*". Pour montrer que le *sūtra* 1.3.12 ne s'applique pas dans le cas où un thème verbal est *ñit* par ledit transfert, Patañjali dit que l'énoncé *ñit* dans 1.3.12 est un *karmadhāraya*, non un *bahuvrīhi*. Comment la forme en *karmadhāraya* empêche-t-elle l'application vicieuse? Patañjali ne le dit pas. Nāgeśa laisse entendre le raisonnement suivant. Il est d'autres opérations déterminées par un énoncé *ñit*, par exemple celle qui est prescrite par *ñiiti ca* 1.1.5. Or dans ce *sūtra* l'on a, comme nous le verrons ci-dessous, un énoncé en *bahuvrīhi*, de même que dans l'injonction du transfert *sārvadhātukam apit (ñit)*. On conclura de la conformité de *ñiiti ca*, etc., avec la règle de transfert, que l'opération transférable ne l'est que si elle est déterminée par un énoncé en *bahuvrīhi*. Enfin il faut montrer pourquoi il faut lire dans 1.3.12 un énoncé en *karmadhāraya*. Pour cela Kaiyaṣa recourt à l'argument de l'*antaraṅgatva* du *karmadhāraya*. Dans le cas de 1.2.4 seule l'analyse en *bahuvrīhi* est possible. Dans celui de *ñiiti ca*, on établit que le sens du locatif est celui de cause, le sens du *sūtra* étant: le *guṇa* et la *vr̥ddhi* causés par *ñit* n'ont pas lieu. Or ce sont des affixes qui selon 7.3.84 sont cause de *guṇa*, non des indices; l'on doit donc entendre ce *ñit* comme un *bahuvrīhi* "(affixe) qui a pour indice *n*". La démonstration peut être poursuivie pour d'autres énoncés que celui de *ñiiti ca*.

Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat

S. N. L. Shrivastava, *Śaṅkara and Bradley. A Comparative and Critical Study.* Delhi-Varanasi-Patna, 1968. 272 pp.

The topic of colonialism and its evils, though not normally within the scope of this Journal, sometimes encroaches upon even such lofty subjects as the study of Indian and comparative philosophy. Here we are facing such an intrusion, ultimately due to the fact that colonial rulers tend to set up a system of education partly in order to implant

their own values and cultural prejudices. But by the time this system takes root (perhaps after foreign rule has ended), it may fail to do anything but evoke the fashions of a bygone generation in a distant country. Thus Indian students of English are made to study Wordsworth, and Indian students of philosophy Bradley. This leads in turn to comparative studies, often written in the spirit of apologetics. Only a sizeable bookcase would be large enough to accommodate all the Indian theses and dissertations on such topics as "Kālidāsa and Wordsworth" or "Śaṅkara and Bradley". Since this state of affairs conforms to a general pattern, merely drawing attention to it does not constitute valid criticism of an individual author, except in so far as it may serve as a mild reproach for conformity.

Though Professor Shrivastava observes that the dominant note today is "Scientific (sic) Empiricism", he adheres throughout to the view that "it can be said without fear of contradiction that in the history of philosophical-thought, Śaṅkara and Bradley have certainly been two of the most outstanding philosophers..." (p. 3). It is true that this is not a contradiction; but it is a falsehood. It just isn't true that Bradley was an outstanding, or even a moderately original philosopher, though he was regarded as such by some people in England during the first decade of the twentieth century. He therefore is no match for Śaṅkara, who not only was a great philosopher by any standards (not excluding contemporary and presently fashionable ones) but who has also had the advantage of some twelve centuries in which his worth has been established beyond any doubt. Thus, comparing Bradley with Śaṅkara is like comparing a Victorian imitation of French Regency with a Greek temple. As to Bradley, Dr. Shrivastava engages in a rather Quixotic fight: having set him up first as a great philosopher, he then draws attention to his errors and confusions. As to Śaṅkara, he does not teach us anything new, but he is at any rate on firmer ground.

Dr. Shrivastava makes use of several sources other than the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, e.g., the *Bhāmatī* and the *Iṣṭasiddhi*. He unquestioningly accepts the authenticity of such works as the *Gītābhāṣya*, the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikābhāṣya* and the *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*. As far as interpretation is concerned, mention may here be made only of his efforts to establish that Śaṅkara did not mean to say that the world is unreal. I think that on our *vyāvahārika* level this is largely a matter of words, although it appears to be a simple matter of logic (given that the meaning of "real" is fixed) to infer from Śaṅkara's axiom that only Brahman is real, that the world is real in so far as it is identical with Brahman and unreal in so far as it is different from it. — Misprints are comparatively few and the transliteration used (in addition to the *devanāgarī* footnotes) is generally consistent (exceptions are *bhootadarśana*, p. 117 and *dviroopam*, p. 127).

Berkeley

J. F. Staal

Ratna Handurukande, *Maṇicūḍāvadāna being a Translation and Edition and Lokānanda, a Transliteration and Synopsis* (= *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, vol. XXIV). London, Luzac & Company Ltd. 1967. IV, 300 pp. £ 4.15 s.

Volume 24 of the *Sacred Books of the Buddhists* contains an edition and translation of a prose text of the *Maṇicūḍāvadāna*, an edition of a metrical version of the same text, and a transliteration and synopsis of the drama *Lokānanda* which has been preserved in a Tibetan translation. We must be grateful to the Pali Text Society for including in this series, in which translations of the *Jātakamālā* and the *Mahāvastu* had already appeared, Sanskrit and even Tibetan texts. Let us hope that by pursuing this course the Pali Text Society will increasingly become a Buddhist Text Society!

In collections of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts there is a great number of metrical and prose avadānas of which, to date, only very few have been published. The prose text of the *Mañicūḍāvadāna* is to be found both as a separate text and as a chapter of the *Divyāvadānamālā*. Dr. Handurukande has used five manuscripts of the *Mañicūḍāvadāna* and two manuscripts of the *Divyāvadānamālā*. In his recent book on the avadāna literature Iwamoto enumerates twelve manuscripts of the *Mañicūḍāvadāna* (*Bukkyō setsuwa kenkyū josetsu*, Kyoto, 1967, pp. 142 and 162). Among these twelve manuscripts are three belonging to the Tokyo University Library: Nos. 277, 278 and 279 (see Seiren Matsunami, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*, Tokyo, 1965, pp. 103 and 235). Matsunami notes that in the colophons of No. 277 and No. 278 it is stated that this avadāna is the 31st chapter and that consequently this avadāna may be part of some avadāna collection. In a manuscript of the *Divyāvadānamālā*, belonging to the Kyoto University, the *Mañicūḍāvadāna* is also the 31st chapter (see Iwamoto, *op. cit.*, pp. 141 and 147). However, in two other manuscripts of the *Divyāvadānamālā* (in Paris and Calcutta) it is respectively the 7th and 16th chapter (Iwamoto, *op. cit.*, p. 147).

The introduction deals in detail with the manuscripts, their mutual relation, and the linguistic characteristics of the text (pp. ix-xxvi). Handurukande shows clearly that all manuscripts go back to a common archetype which is not free from errors. According to the introduction, the *Mañicūḍāvadāna* falls into the third group in Edgerton's classification of Buddhist Sanskrit texts, in which non-sanskritic forms are not common while the vocabulary is the clearest evidence that they belong to the BHS (= Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit) tradition. In establishing the text Handurukande has tried to retain grammatical forms proper to BHS as far as the manuscripts show evidence of them. Although she has been aware of the danger of applying too mechanically Edgerton's principles, one cannot escape the impression that too many BHS forms have been introduced into the text. On pages xv-xvi the editor lists some of the grammatical features of BHS which are to be found in the *Mañicūḍāvadāna*. Many of these features hardly occur in texts of Edgerton's third group. However, manuscript evidence does not always support the readings selected by the editor. For the use of an adjective in the accusative plural qualifying a noun in the accusative singular the reader is referred to p. 5.2: *prāpnoti tuṣṭim paramāṃ yaśas ca*.¹ It is of course not necessary to relate *paramāṃ* to *yaśas* instead of to *tuṣṭim*. Four features (use of a past passive participle with active meaning; transfer of a masculine ending to a feminine noun; use of a masculine modifier with a feminine noun; accusative plural endings in *ām*) occur in a single sentence p. 4.15-16: *Tatas sā Bodhisatvasyānubhāvenāśrutapūrvām imām gāthām pratibhāṣitā*. As is obvious from the variant readings, one has to read: *Tayā ... °pūrvā imā gāthāḥ pratibhāṣitāḥ* (*tatas śā*; A *tata tasyā* corrected to *tatas sā*, B C *tasyā*, D *tatasyā*, E *tatasmā*, F *tataḥ sā - imām gāthām*; A B *imām gāthā*, C D E *imā gāthā - pratibhāṣitā*, C F *°bhāṣitāḥ*, D *°bhāvitā*, G *pratibhākhito*). Perhaps one must read *pūrvā-m-imā* with *-m-* as 'hiatus-bridger' (F *°pūrvām*; A B C D E G *°pūrvam*); *pūrvām* can easily have been corrupted to *pūrvam*. The reference given to Edgerton's *Grammar* 10.51 for the use of an accusative singular ending in *i* (see p. 14.4-5: *Tvayaṣāṃ agramahiṣī sthāpayitvā ...*) is clearly wrong for here Edgerton is discussing occurrences of an accusative singular in *-i*. Moreover, he only deals with occurrences of this form in verses belonging to the first and second groups in his classification. As to the use of a neuter modifier with a masculine noun (Edgerton 6.14) the editor has failed to see that in *kiṃvikāro 'yam*

¹ The author refers to the sections into which she has divided the text. Some sections comprise more than two pages. For this reason I think it more convenient to refer to page and line. It is a pity that in the editions of the Pāli Text Society the lines are not numbered in the margin by adding the figures 5, 10, 15 etc. as has been done in the edition of the Pāli Jātakas from volume 2 onwards.

udāro 'vabhāṣo bhaviṣyati kimanuśaṃsa (p. 22.5-6) *kim* is part of a compound (see Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, §408, Rem.), though her translation is correct.

Apart from the examples mentioned above, the text is very well edited. In a few places another reading could be suggested: p. 2.12 – read °*damaram taskara*° (cf. *IJJ*, I, 1957, p. 312); p. 16.7 *iṣṭopacāyakāḥ?* – read *iṣṭopacārakāḥ?* p. 18.3 and p. 25.2 read *dhanajātaṃ* instead of *dhanam jātaṃ*; p. 36.8 *karuṇāyamānam uvāca* – read *karuṇāyamāna* (sic MSS. CDEG) or *karuṇāyamāna-m- uvāca*; p. 39.9 *dhairyaṃ samuttamaṃ* – read *dhairyam anuttamaṃ?*; p. 48.4 *abhiṣiktvā* – read *abhiṣiktā* (*aham* in 48.3 is probably a scribal error for *mayā*); p. 53.13-14 *parśatmaṇḍalam ānayaṃti taṃ* – read *parśanmaṇḍalamadhyapatitaṃ?* p. 75.3 *maitrīm paribhāvitasya* – read *maitripāribhāvitasya*; p. 75.8 °*upasargotsrṣṭe* – read °*upasargopasrṣṭe* (cf. p. 76.15); p. 85.11 °*balena vivārya* – read °*balenādhivārya?* (cf. 82.11); p. 98.1 *kāyeṣu kāmaccchandaṃ prahāya tad bahu-yatnavihāri* – read *kāmeṣu kāmaccchandaṃ prahāya tadbahulavihāri* (cf. Divy. p. 225,28: *kāmeṣu kāmaccchandaṃ vyapahāya tadbahulavihāriṇo*). I have noted the following printing errors: p. 13.7 read *atīkrāntā* for *atīkrānta*; p. 15.13 read *paripācānārthaṃ* for *paripāraṇārthaṃ*; p. 74.5 read *vākyasākhyena* for *vāka*°; p. 102.2 read *tathāgataguṇān anusmṛtya* for *tathāgataguṇānusmṛtya*. I do not understand p. 34.13 *ākārayām āsa* (translated as 'he took') and p. 42.13 *samākārayām āsa* ('he appeared').

The translation which follows the text is excellent apart from a few minor points. P. 14.7: *na hi puṇyam apuṇyaṃ vā paraśaṃtānaṃ saṃkrāmāti*, "neither merit nor demerit finds continuance in others" – rather: "neither merit nor demerit passes over to an other series (i.e. individual; see Edgerton's Dictionary s.v. *saṃtati* and *saṃtāna*)"; p. 39.8: *kṛtsnaṃ jagat paritrātum udyatasāyāda te kṣamaṃ*, "It is possible for you to save the whole world now, for which you are ready..." – "It is now proper for you, who are ready to save the whole world..."; p. 42.15 *vṛkkaṃ vā hrdayamāmsamedomastiṣkam vā*, "the heart or the flesh and fat of the heart" – "the kidneys or the heart, the flesh and the fat" (there is no justification for giving the meaning 'heart' to *vṛkkaṃ* as is done in p. 42, n. 32); p. 59.11: *smṛtyapramoṣe*, "mindfulness, abstinence from theft" – "non-loss of memory" (see *BHS Dictionary* s.v. *asaṃpramoṣaṇa*); p. 59.15: *samāsān*, "on occasions" – "concisely"; p. 63.6: *sukhasaṃjñāṃ tu mā kāṛṣiḥ kadā cid gṛhacārake*, "Do not ever designate the word 'happiness' in relation to one who leads a household life" – "...in relation to the prison of the house". This verse of the *Jatakamālā* is translated in the same way by all translators: Speyer "one who lives in the house"; Barannikov (1962) "o žizni v dome" ['life in the house']; Gnoli (1964) "uno che vive la vitā di casa". In classical Sanskrit (*Kaṭṭh. Arth. and Daśak.*) and in Buddhist Sanskrit *cāraka* often occurs in the meaning 'prison'² (see *BHS Dictionary* s.v. *cāra*; *Lalitavistara*, ed. S. Lefmann, p. 204.9; *Divyāvadāna*, pp. 365.4; 377.16, 23; *Dharmasamuccaya* IV, 4a); p. 66.7: *hartum*, "to kill" – "to take away"; p. 82.10: *kamavairāgyāt parihiṇaḥ*, "disregarded (the pain), through (the power of) his detachment from sensuality" – "deprived of his detachment from pleasures"; p. 89.4-5: *pidāniṃ satvāḥ svakam api bāhuṃ gṛhitaṃ na paśyanti*, "people could not see others, even those who held their own arms" "People could not even see their own arms which they grasped".

In the second part of the introduction (pp. xxxiii-xlv) the editor studies a metrical version of the Mañicūḍa story which is contained in the fourth chapter of the *Svāyam-bhuvamahāpurāṇa*, of which the only known manuscript is in the Bibliothèque Nationale. This version has been analysed and studied by de La Vallée Poussin ("Mañicūḍāvadāna, as related in the fourth chapter of the Svayambhūpurāṇa [Paris, dev. 78]", *JRAS*, 1894, pp. 297-319). It is surprising that this article is not mentioned in the introduction although references in notes show that it was known to the editor.³ This

² The Tibetan translator renders *cāraka* by *bison-ra* 'prison', cf. *Tanjur* (Peking edition), Mdo-'grel, XCI, p. 68a5: *bison-ra 'dra-ba'i khyim-la | nams-yañ bde-bar ma sems-ṣig*.

metrical version of the *Maṇicūḍāvadāna* comprises 473 verses, and, inserted between verses 78 and 79, a very corrupt prose section of which a translation is given in the introduction (pp. xxxv-xxxix). This version contains a few sections which have no parallels in the prose avadāna. For establishing the text the editor has been able to use only one manuscript. In several places the text is incomprehensible, which is probably due not only to the corruption of the manuscript but also to the fact that some parts were written by an author who did not know Sanskrit very well. Nevertheless, in quite a few places the text can be emended without too many difficulties. In the following remarks I refer to the verses by their number and to the prose section by page and line. 2d: *dātāvadātāśayaḥ* – *dānāvadātā*³; 25b: *°dānagamyābhisaṃgame* – *°dānāgamyābhisaṃgamaṃ*; 63d: *vicerur* – *virecur* (cf. 149d); p. 154.17: *sarvaṃ darśayāmi* – *sarvadarśinī* (MS. *sarvadarśinī*); p. 155.10: *mahimā* – *mahimānam* (sic MS.); p. 155.24: *aprabādhito* – *aprabodhito*; p. 155.26: *bhavad āśrayāt* (MS. *ātrayāt*) – *bhavadāśrame*?; p. 156.22: *jvara-uddhareṇa kāmukām* – *jagaduddharaṇakāmuka* (MS. *jagaduddhareṇa-kāmukā*); 80a: *svām śiṣyām* – *svāśiṣā* (MS. *svāśiṣyā*); 149a: *purodhasā* – *purodhaso*; 152c: *mukhair* – *makhe* (MS. *makhai*); 188a: *āśayām* – *āśayā* (sic MS. cf. 193b: *nairāśam*); 221a: *ghorām* – *ghoro* (MS. *ghorā*); 224cd: *avijñāya jijñāsitaṃ* – *abhijñāya jijñāsitaṃ*?; 228c: *kṣudhārtāyāpyalaṃ* – *kṣudhārtāyāparaṃ* (MS. *°tāyāpalaṃ*); 260d: *vā salilaṃ vidadhim tathā* – *vā salilam vā darim* (sic MS.) *tathā*; 312d: *bhūmikaṃ panah* – *bhūmikampanam*; 335d: *gamanam* – *gaganam*; 345c: *°samāsinā* – *°samāsino*; 380c: *peritaṃ* – *parito* (MS. *peritoṃ*).

The third text published in this book is the Tibetan text of the drama *Lokānanda* which is based on the *Maṇicūḍa* legend. One must be grateful to the editor for having published the text of this drama together with a detailed introduction and a synopsis. She stresses the desirability of a reconstruction of the Sanskrit original (p. 203). An English translation would probably be more useful, and one must hope that the editor, who has taken such pains in studying this text, will herself undertake its translation. I have not been able to compare the text, which was transliterated from the Peking and Narthang editions, with one or more editions of the *Tanjur*. However, a quick look at the text shows that quite a few misprints and erroneous readings have to be corrected, for instance, p. 210.12: *mk'a* – *mk'as*; p. 210.23: *becas* – *bcas*; p. 213.21: *mi'on bdul-ba'i* – *mi'on-ba dul-ba'i*; p. 225.13, 17: *bkra-śes* – *bkra-śis*; p. 227.7: *btuñ* – *biud*; p. 229.9: *spoñ* – *gtoñ* (PN *stoñ*), etc.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Edward Conze, *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies*. Publishers: Bruno Cassirer, Oxford. Distributors: Faber and Faber, London. 1967. xii + 274 pp. 42/—.

Professor Edward Conze is certainly one of the most productive scholars in the field of Buddhist Studies. The number of books, articles and reviews he has published since World War II is considerable. His greatest achievement is undoubtedly his contribution to the study of the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature, of which little was known until Edward Conze undertook to explore it. However, other branches of Buddhist studies have not been neglected by him as is testified by his numerous publications relating to

³ In several places de La Vallée Poussin quotes readings which are preferable to those adopted by the editor: p. 70.10, *pravyāvartayitukāmo* – *pracyāvayitukāmo*; p. 103.9, *pravrajino* – *pravrajito*; p. 156.2, *tvam* – *tvām*; p. 182 (387a), *dharmaprabhāvāt* – *dharmaprabhāvān* (JRAS, 1894, p. 311: “vois les sept makāras, issus du dharma”).

Mahāyāna philosophy, meditation in the Theravāda school, etc. His translations of Buddhist texts are taken from a great variety of Pāli and Sanskrit scriptures. Being inspired by an awareness of the relevance of Buddhist thought to modern man, Conze has brought a new tone of personal engagement to Buddhist studies, which have greatly benefited from his approach.

It is to be welcomed that a selection of his articles, hitherto scattered in many places, has been published. The contents of this volume reflect the richness and variety of Conze's scholarly work. The first article, "Recent Progress in Buddhist Studies" (pp. 1-32), is a survey of Buddhist studies between 1940 and 1960 (first published in *The Middle Way*, 34, 1959, pp. 6-14; 1960, pp. 144-150; 35, 1960, pp. 93-98, 110). It is, as far as I know, the only recent and detailed survey of Buddhist studies. The concept of saviours in Buddhism is treated in "Buddhist Saviours" (pp. 33-47; first published in *The Saviour God*, Manchester, 1963, pp. 67-82). His comprehensive survey of "Mahāyāna Buddhism" is certainly the best introduction available at present (pp. 48-86; first published in *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Living Faiths*, 1959, pp. 296-320). The next two articles are translations. The first translates a passage of the *Visuddhimagga* (ed. H. C. Warren, chapter VIII, sections 3-17 and 25-41) in which Buddhaghosa treats of the meditation on death: "The Meditation on Death" (pp. 87-104; first published in *The Middle Way*, 29, 1955, pp. 159-163; 30, 1955, pp. 15-18, 54-57). The second is a translation of chapter 5 of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*: "The Lotus of the Good Law, ch. 5: On Plants" (pp. 105-122; first published in *The Middle Way*, 37, 1962, pp. 95-96; 1963, pp. 157-160; 38, 1963, pp. 15-17, 49-51). The following six articles all relate to Prajñāpāramitā literature: "The Development of Prajñāpāramitā Thought" (pp. 123-147; first published in *Buddhism and Culture*, Kyoto, 1960, pp. 24-45); "The Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya Sūtra" (pp. 148-167; first published in *JRAS*, 1948, pp. 33-51); "The Composition of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā" (pp. 168-184; first published in *BSOAS*, 14, 1952, pp. 251-262); "Hate, Love and Perfect Wisdom" (pp. 185-190; first published in *The Mahabodhi*, 62, 1954, pp. 3-8); "The Perfection of Wisdom in Seven Hundred Lines" (pp. 191-206; first published in *Kalpa*, I, 2, 1963, pp. 4-10; I, 3, 1963, pp. 11-12); "Prajñā and Sophia" (pp. 207-209; first published in *Oriental Art*, I, 4, 1948, pp. 196-197); parallels, true and spurious, between Buddhist and European philosophy are treated in the two articles that follow. "Buddhist Philosophy and its European Parallels" (pp. 210-228; first published in *Philosophy East and West*, 13, 1963, pp. 9-23); "Spurious Parallels to Buddhist Philosophy" (pp. 229-242; first published in *Philosophy East and West*, 13, 1963, pp. 105-115). The final article deals with "The Iconography of the Prajñāpāramitā" (pp. 243-268; first published in *Oriental Art*, II, 4, 1949, pp. 47-52; III, 3, pp. 104-109).

Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies is a book which is of great interest both to the general public and to the specialist. May it soon be followed by a second volume, to be called *Further Buddhist Studies*, mentioned by Professor Conze in his foreword!

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Dvādaśāraṇaṃ Nayacakraṃ of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādi Kṣamāsramaṇa With the Commentary Nyāyāgamānusarīṇī of Śrī Siṃhasūri Gaṇi Vādi Kṣamāsramaṇa, Part I (1-4 Aras). Edited with critical notes by Muni Jambūvijayaṇī (= *Śrī Ātmānand Jain Granthamālā*, Serial, No. 92). Bhavnagar, Sri Jain Atmanand Sabha, 1966. 8 + 4 + 6 + 98 + 375 + 166 pp. Rs. 25.00.

Mallavādin's *Nayacakra* is one of the most important of the older Jaina philosophical works. It is of very great interest not only for the light it throws on Jaina philosophy,

but also for the information on other philosophical schools which can be obtained from it. It is regrettable that the *Nayacakra* itself has not been preserved. However, the *Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī*, a commentary on the *Nayacakra* by Siṃhasūri, has been handed down. Editors of this text have tried to reconstruct the text of the *Nayacakra*. An edition of the first four *ara*-s (the *Nayacakra* consists of three *mārga*-s; each *mārga* comprises four *ara*-s) appeared in the *Gaekwad Oriental Series* in 1952.¹ Another edition has been published in the *Shri Labdhisurishwar Jain Granthamala*.² E. Frauwallner has pointed out the shortcomings of both editions.³ In the same article Frauwallner announced a new edition by Muni Jambūvijayajī. The first volume, comprising the first four *ara*-s, has now appeared as volume 92 of the *Śrī Ātmānand Jain Granthamālā*. The first part contains an English introduction by E. Frauwallner (pp. 1-6), a Sanskrit introduction (prākkathana) by the editor (pp. 7-43) and a Gujarati introduction (prastāvanā) by the same (pp. 44-89). The Sanskrit and Gujarati introductions are not identical, which is clear from the fact that the first refers to the second. However, my ignorance of Gujarati prevents me from indicating which additional information can be found in the prastāvanā. The prākkathana discusses not only many important problems, but it also relates in detail the rather complicated history of this edition and the methods employed by the editor in overcoming the difficulties which confronted him.

In Vikrama 2001⁴ Muni Jambūvijayajī planned to edit Jinabhadra's *Viśeṣāvaśyaka-mahābhāṣya*, but at the request of his Guru Śrī Bhuvanavijayajī Mahārāja, he abandoned this plan and undertook to edit the *Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī* and to reconstruct the original text of the *Nayacakra*. Although six manuscripts were at his disposal, he soon recognized that a correct text could not be established without studying the many works quoted by Siṃhasūri. Of special importance for this purpose were Buddhist works which had been preserved in Tibetan translation. In order to be able to read these works Muni Jambūvijayajī undertook the study of Tibetan. The discovery of an older manuscript of Siṃhasūri's commentary also greatly facilitated the establishment of a correct text.

After having finished preliminary studies the editor prepared his edition of the text and commentary for the press. First the text of *ara*-s 1-7 (pp. 1-552) was printed after delays due to several causes. The printing of this part of the text was completed before the death of his guru and father on 16th February 1959.⁵ Subsequently the eighth *ara* (pp. 553-737) was printed. In the introduction and appendices references are given to the pages of the printed text of the first eight *ara*-s, although the present volume only comprises the first four.

On p. 11, n. 1, the editor lists the sources which inform us on the life of Mallavādin.

1. Bhadrēśvarasūri's *Kahāvalī* (Vikrama second half of the twelfth century); 2. Prabhā-

¹ *Dvādaśāranayacakra of Śrīmallavādisūri, with the commentary Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī of Śrī Siṃhasūri*, ed. by the late Muni Caturvijayajī and Lalendra B. Gandhi (= *GOS*, No. CXVI) (Baroda, 1952).

² *The Dvadasaranayacakram of Sri Mallavadi Kshamasramana with the Nyayagamānusarini Commentary by Sri Sinhasurigani Vadi Kshamasramana*, ed. by Acharya Vijayalabdhisuri (= *Shri Labdhisurishwar Jain Granthamala*, No. 20 & 26) (Chhani, 1948 & 1951) (see *WZKSO*, I, 1957, p. 147 n. 1). Part III was published in 1957 (see *WZKSO*, III, 1959, p. 100 n. 33). I have not been able to consult this edition.

³ "The Editions of Mallavādi's Dvādaśāranayacakram", *WZKSO*, I (1957), pp. 147-151.

⁴ Muni Jambūvijayajī quotes all dates according to the Vikrama era.

⁵ This date is given by Anantlal Thakur in his Introduction to Muni Jambūvijayajī's edition of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda* (= *GOS*, No. 136) (1961). The date, indicated by Muni Jambūvijayajī (prākkathana p. 7 n.1), is Vikrama 2015, the eighth day of the white half of the month Māgha.

vacandrasūri's *Prabhāvākacārīta* (Vikr. 1334); 3. Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* (Vikr. 1361); 4. Rājasekharasūri's *Prabandhakōśa* (Vikr. 1405); 5. Saṅghatīlakācārya's *Samyaktvasaptati* (Vikr. 1422). In the same note the editor reproduces the text of the life of Mallavādin in the *Kahāvālī* and in Āmradevasūri's commentary on Nemican-drāsūri's *Ākhyānamāṇikōśa* (Vikr. 1190). The text of the *Kahāvālī* is also reproduced in the introduction of *GOS* vol. 116. This introduction quotes passages from many texts relating to Mallavādin (pp. 9-29). It also refers to a manuscript, written in Vikr. 1291, and containing a life of Mallavādin in Prakrit (cf. *GOS*, vol. 76, pp. 194-195). However, the manuscript itself was not available to the editor.

According to the *Prabhāvākacārīta*, Mallavādin defeated the Bauddhas (i.e. Buddhānanda) in Vira 884 (= Vikr. 414). The *Nayacakra* discusses the doctrines of many philosophers such as Vārṣaganya, Vasurāta, Bhartṛhari, Vasubandhu (the author of the *Kōśa*) and Dignāga. According to the editor, the date mentioned by Prabhāvacandra does not conflict with the dates of these philosophers who accordingly must have lived before Mallavādin or in the same period (ca. 350 A.D.). If this is the case, the traditionally assumed dates of many Indian philosophers would have to be revised. However, such a late text as the *Prabhāvākacārīta* is not an authoritative source for the date of Mallavādin. More evidence is certainly needed before this date can be allowed.

In the second place, the names of the above-mentioned philosophers seem to occur only in Siṃhasūri's commentary. In the case of each of them it must be proved beyond all doubt that Mallavādin really refers to the philosophers mentioned by Siṃhasūri. One must not be misled by the fact that the editor has printed in bold type in the text of the commentary not only the quotations from the *Nayacakra*, but also proper names which are absent from it. Only after the publication of the second volume of this edition will it be possible to consider the available evidence and to examine the reliability of Siṃhasūri's indications. Muni Jambūvijayajī has already published several articles on the dates of Mallavādin, Bhartṛhari and Dignāga.⁶ According to the passages of Siṃhasūri's commentary quoted by him (pages 15 and 16, notes 2 and 3) Vasurāta was the teacher of Bhartṛhari. As is pointed out by the editor, the same tradition is found in Puṇyarāja's commentary on Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadiya* II, 486, 489 and 490. Several scholars agree also that, according to Puṇyarāja's commentary on *Vākyapadiya* II, 489, Candracārya = Candragomin was the master of Vasurāta. The dates of Candragomin and Bhartṛhari have been discussed by many scholars.⁷ Of great importance for determining the date of Bhartṛhari is the recent discovery of two verses from the *Vākyapadiya* (II, 160 and 157) in the fifth chapter of Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. This discovery seems to have been made simultaneously by H.R. Rangaswamy Iyengar and Muni Jambūvijayajī.⁸ Frauwallner has recently shown that Dignāga's *Traikālyaparikṣā* is

* "Mallavādi ane Bhartṛharino samay", *Jaina Satyapraśāsa*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Nov. 1951), pp. 26-30; *Buddhiprakāśa*, vol. 98, No. 11 (Nov. 1951), pp. 332-335; "Bhartṛhari aur Diṇnāga kā samay", *Nāgarīpracārīṇi Patrikā*, Vol. 60, Nos. 3-4 (Samvat 2012), pp. 227-233; "Bhartṛhari ane Diṇnāga", *Jaina Ātmānanda Prakāśa*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (15 Sept. 1952), pp. 22-27 (see prākāthana pp. 15 and 16 notes 2 and 3). I have been unable to consult these articles.

⁷ See the references given by Sadhu Ram, "Bhartṛhari's Date", *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute*, Vol. IX (1952), pp. 135-151. See also David Seyfort Ruegg, *Contributions à l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne* (Paris, 1959), pp. 57-64 and the literature quoted by him.

⁸ H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar, "Bhartṛhari and Diṇnāga", *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, Vol. 26 (1951), pp. 147-149. According to Sadhu Ram (*op.cit.*, p. 142 n. 25) the same verses have been traced by Muni Jambūvijayajī in the first two articles mentioned in note 6. Sadhu Ram and Muni Jambūvijayajī (prākāthana p. 16 n. 3) refer to *Vākyapadiya* II, 156 and 157, Rangas-

based upon the *Vākyapadīya*.⁹ If one combines Sīṃhasūri's indications and the fact that Bhartṛhari is quoted by Dignāga, the following chronological sequence can be established: Vasurāta — Bhartṛhari — Dignāga — Mallavādin. Even if Mallavādin cannot be dated in the fourth century A.D., there is no doubt that Bhartṛhari must have lived long before the first half of the seventh century as had been generally agreed in the past on the strength of I-ching's testimony.¹⁰ Moreover, if Puṇyārāja's commentary is understood to mean that Candragomin was the teacher of Vasurāta, he must have lived in a period much earlier than any one of those proposed previously.¹¹ However, the text of Puṇyārāja's commentary is not unambiguously clear. Even if the above-mentioned interpretation is correct, how much credit has to be given to the testimony of an author who probably lived many centuries after Candragomin?¹²

According to Sīṃhasūri's commentary Dignāga attacked his guru Vasubandhu (the author of the *Vādaividhi*). This tradition was already known from Tāranātha's History. Frauwallner has pointed out that this alleged pupilship hails from the late and unsatisfactory Tibetan tradition.¹³ Tāranātha's work was written in 1608 and is not always a reliable source. However, it is clear from Sīṃhasūri's commentary that the tradition of Dignāga's pupilship goes back to a much earlier period. Finally, the editor draws our attention to the fact that Dignāga's doctrines have been refuted by the Jain author Samantabhadra in his *Āptamīmāṃsā*.

The *Prabhāvākacarita* attributes to Mallavādin the authorship of a *Rāmāyaṇa*, called *Padmacarita*. According to the same text, the *Nayacakra* comprises ten thousand ślokas (i.e. 320.000 syllables). Both indications do not seem very reliable. The second is inadmissible, because Sīṃhasūri's commentary comprises eighteen thousand ślokas and is several times longer than the text commented upon. More credible is the tradition which attributes to Mallavādin the authorship of a commentary upon Siddhasena Divākara's *Sammatī*.

The *Nayacakra* and its commentary are of great importance for the study of Indian philosophical systems, as is pointed out by the editor in his introduction (prākkathana, pp. 19-23). Sīṃhasūri's commentary is of special interest for the information which it gives on the older Sāṃkhya and Vaiśeṣika literature and on Buddhist logic.

One of the most important texts of the older Sāṃkhya literature is the *Śaṣṭitantra* by Vṛṣagaṇa or Vārṣaganya.¹⁴ Quotations from it are to be found in the third chapter of Sīṃhasūri's commentary.

wamy Iyengar (*op.cit.*, p. 149 n. 12), Nakamura Hajime ("Tibetan Citations of Bhartṛhari's Verses and the Problem of his Date", *Studies in Indology and Buddhism. Presented in Honour of Professor Susumu Yamaguchi*, Kyoto, 1955, p. 134) and Frauwallner (*WZKSO*, V, 1961, p. 13) to *Vākyapadīya* II, 160 and 157. I have not been able to verify in the edition of the *Benares Sanskrit Series* which of the two indications is correct. Muni Jambūvijayaṇī points out that Dignāga has also quoted another verse of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* (III. 14,8) in his *vytti* on the second verse of the fifth chapter of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (prākkathana p. 16 n. 3). Quotations from Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* in other works have been studied by Nakamura (*op.cit.*, pp. 122-136).

⁹ *WZKSO*, III (1959), pp. 107-116, 145-152.

¹⁰ See e.g. Louis Renou, *La Durghaṭavytti de Śaraṇadeva*, Vol. I, Fasc. 1 (Paris, 1940), p. 37: "Bhartṛhari est l'un des rares noms de la littérature grammaticale exactement datable, depuis que Max Müller a eu reconnu en lui le grammairien mentionné par I-tsing comme étant mort en 651."

¹¹ See L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Dynasties et Histoire de l'Inde depuis Kanishka* (Paris, 1935), p. 64 n. 2; D. Seyfort Ruegg, *op.cit.*, pp. 58-59.

¹² For the date of Puṇyārāja see D. Seyfort Ruegg, *op.cit.*, p. 63 n.1.

¹³ Cf. *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu* (Roma, 1951), p. 63.

¹⁴ Cf. E. Frauwallner, "Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhya-Systems",

Simhasūri's commentary on the sixth and seventh *ara*-s is of very great interest for the study of the older Vaiśeṣika literature and of the text of the Vaiśeṣika sūtras. The text of the *Sūtrapāṭha* quoted by Simhasūri is different from the one in Śaṅkaramiśra's *Upaskāra* but agrees with the *Sūtrapāṭha* which has been transmitted together with a commentary by Candrānanda. When the text of the first five *ara*-s of the *Nayacakra* had already been printed, the editor obtained a manuscript containing both a separate text of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* and the *Sūtras* together with Candrānanda's *vṛtti* (MS. PS/P, cf. GOS, No. 136, Baroda, 1961, Introduction, p. 1). This manuscript has been used by him for reproducing the complete text of the *Sūtras* and the commentary in the notes of this edition (see p. 141: "Vaiśeṣikasūtrasambandhi pariśiṣṭam" for a list of the relevant notes). Subsequently, the editor obtained a copy of another manuscript, written in Śāradā script (MS. O).¹⁵ On the basis of these two manuscripts (PS/P and O) he has edited the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda* (GOS, No. 136, Baroda, 1961).¹⁶ This edition contains appendices comparing the *Sūtrapāṭha* with those found in the *Upaskāra* and in an anonymous commentary, edited by Anantalal Thakur.¹⁷ Another appendix examines in detail the readings of the *Sūtrapāṭha* according to the two manuscripts and quotations from the *Sūtras* in other texts (pp. 227-234: *Vṛddhipatram*).

Simhasūri quotes several Vaiśeṣika works which have not been handed down to us. These quotations have been brought together by the editor in an appendix to his edition of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* (pp. 146-152). The problems relating to these works have been dealt with by him in his *prastāvanā* (pp. 6-8) to the same edition.

Simhasūri gives several references to Āryadeva's *Catuhśataka* and to Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* but his main contribution to the study of Buddhist philosophy is to be found in his discussion of Dignāga's philosophy in the first and eighth *ara*-s. In order to enable the reader to understand better Dignāga's doctrines, the editor has translated into Sanskrit large sections from the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, Dignāga's *vṛtti* and Jinendrabuddhi's *ṭīkā* (cf. *Bhoṭapariśiṣṭam*, pp. 95-140). Other sections of these works have been translated in notes to the eighth *ara* (cf. *prākāśana*, p. 39 n. 8 for a list of references). The editor had already used the same works for the study of Vaiśeṣika and Nyaya doctrines (cf. GOS, nr. 136, pp. 153-219).¹⁸

The editor points out that in the eighth *ara* Mallavādin discusses the *apohavāda*, but does not seem to refer to the fifth chapter of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. He advances the hypothesis that Mallavādin has taken the *pūrvapakṣa* from Dignāga's *Sāmānyaparīkṣā* mentioned on pages 627-628 of the text. I-ching has translated a short work by Dignāga (T, nr. 1623), of which the Sanskrit title has been reconstructed as *Sāmānyalakṣaṇaparīkṣā* by Frauwallner (*WZKSO*, III, 1959, p. 139). In a letter to Muni Jambūviyajāi, Frauwallner gives some information about this text (cf. GOS, No. 136, p. 153, n. 2). It is possible that Dignāga had written a commentary upon this text which consists of

WZKSO, II (1958), pp. 84-139; G. Oberhammer, "The Authorship of the Śaṣṭitantram", *WZKSO*, IV (1960), pp. 71-91. Important for the date of Vārṣaganya is the discovery of a reference to him in Asaṅga's *Yogācārabhūmi*, cf. D. Seyfort Ruegg, "Note on Vārṣaganya and the Yogācārabhūmi", *III*, VI (1962), pp. 137-140.

¹⁵ As this manuscript was not at the disposal of the editor for the establishment of the text of the *Sūtras* and the *vṛtti* in the notes of his edition of the *Nayacakra*, a list of better readings to be found in MS. O is given in a special appendix (pp. 158-161).

¹⁶ Cf. E. Frauwallner's review, *WZKSO*, VI (1962), pp. 184-185.

¹⁷ *Vaiśeṣikadarśana of Kaṇāda with an anonymous commentary*, ed. by Anantalal Thakur (Darbhanga, 1957).

¹⁸ GOS, No. 136 reproduces the Tibetan text in Tibetan characters (cf. pp. I-LI). In the *Bhoṭapariśiṣṭa* Tibetan texts are transliterated in devanāgarī. Would it not have been possible to use romanization?

eleven verses. Probably he had studied the *apohavāda* in this commentary. It seems difficult to imagine that Dignāga would have written both a *Sāmānyalakṣaṇaparikṣā* and a *Sāmānyaparikṣā*.

Simhasūri refers also to a commentator of a work by Dignāga. According to the editor, the commentator is not Dignāga himself nor Dharmakīrti nor Jinendrabuddhi who both belong to a later period. Īśvarasena is known to have written a commentary on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, but his work is lost.¹⁹ According to Frauwallner, he was probably the teacher of Dharmakīrti.²⁰ The identity of the commentator to whom Simhasūri refers, is a problem the solution of which must be left to future research.

Obviously, Simhasūri's work quotes many Jain texts. The editor points out that the quotations from the Āgamas often give a text different from the one established in Vira 980 (= Vikr. 510). He admits that both Mallavādin and Simhasūri must have lived before that date. Further he remarks that the quotations from the *Nandisūtra* in the eighth *ara* prove that originally this work consisted of two parts, *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*, which were later amalgamated into one work.

Little is known about Simhasūri. A verse from another work by him is quoted by Koṭṭārya in his commentary upon the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*. Koṭṭārya quotes Dignāga, the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and Simhasūri's commentary, but not Kumārila and Dharmakīrti. Simhasūri quotes three verses which also occur in the *Viśeṣāvaśyakabhāṣya*, but according to the editor the source of this quotation is a different work. He supposes that Simhasūri lived shortly after Mallavādin, because he refers to Dignāga as a "contemporary Bauddha" (*adyatanabauddha*) and quotes the Āgamas according to a tradition different from the one established in Vikrama 510.

As mentioned above, the editor first used six manuscripts. All these manuscripts go back directly or indirectly to a manuscript written by Yaśovijayaya (MS. YA) in Vikrama 1710. Only when the first seven *ara*-s had been printed, did this manuscript come to the notice of the editor. In establishing the text of these *ara*-s, the editor gives the variant readings of these six manuscripts. In an appendix he lists the readings of MS. YA for those places where the six manuscripts have not the same readings (pp. 142-146). In editing the text of the last five *ara*-s, the editor does not give the variant readings of the six manuscripts, but only refers to MS. YA. As mentioned earlier, the discovery of an older manuscript was of great help to the editor. This manuscript, referred to by the editor as MS. BHĀ, was written by Puñja at the order of Dharmamūrti who lived from Vikrama 1585 to 1670. It gives many correct readings not to be found in the six manuscripts derived from MS. YA. The editor assumes that it has been written about Vikrama 1650 and consequently is sixty years older than MS. YA. MS. YA seems to be more correct than MS. BHĀ, but both share several incorrect readings. For this reason the editor believes that both manuscripts descend from a common archetype.²¹

The editor does not provide us with a palaeographic description of the manuscripts, but gives a useful list of *akṣara*-s which have been misread by the scribes (*prākkathana*, p. 37). The numbers in the margin of the text refer to MS. BHĀ (e.g. recto and verso of f. 4 are indicated by 4-1 and 4-2). In quoting the text of the *Nayacakravṛtti* in his notes

¹⁹ Cf. Ernst Steinkellner, "Bemerkungen zu Īśvarasenas Lehre vom Grund", *WZKSO*, X (1966), pp. 73-85.

²⁰ Cf. *WZKSO*, V (1961), p. 141.

²¹ The edition of the *Nayacakra* published in *GOS*, No. CXVI is based upon two manuscripts, MS. PA (one of the six manuscripts based upon YA) and MS. BHA (MS. BHĀ of Muni Jambūvijayajī's edition). These two manuscripts seem to have been used only by the second editor Lalacandra B. Gandhi (cf. *prastāvanā*, pp. 37-38). In the first part of the text references are given to MSS. KA, KHA, GA and GHA, but no information is given about these manuscripts. A few readings from PA and BHA are quoted on pages 1-10. Probably they were added later by the second editor.

at the bottom of the pages, the editor always refers to the folios of this manuscript.

The reconstructed text of the *Nayacakra* is printed at the top of each page in bold type. The commentary is printed below and is separated from the reconstructed text by a line. Quotations from the *Nayacakra* in the commentary are also printed in bold type. The notes at the bottom of the page record variant readings and quotations which are helpful for the establishment of the text. Extensive notes and quotations from many texts are to be found in a separate appendix (pp. 1-94).

It will probably be useful for the reader to indicate briefly the contents of the three parts which constitute this volume.

Part I. Introduction by E. Frauwallner: pp. 1-6; Sanskrit introduction (prākkathana) by the editor: pp. 7-43; Gujarati introduction (prastāvanā) by the editor: pp. 44-89; detailed table of contents of parts II and III: pp. 90-98.

Part II. Text of the first four *āra*-s: pp. 1-375.

Part III. A. Tīpṇāni: pp. 1-94; B. Bhoṭapariśiṣṭam: pp. 95-140; C. Vaiśeṣika-sūtrasambandhi pariśiṣṭam: p. 141; D. YA pratipāṭhapariśiṣṭam: pp. 142-146; E. Nayacakre vṛttau vā caturśv areṣūllikhitānām vāda-vādi-grantha-granthakṛnnāmnām sūciḥ: pp. 147-148; F. Sampādānopayuktāgranthasūciḥ saṅketādivivaraṇam ca: pp. 149-157; G. Candrānandaracitavṛttiṣṭutasya Vaiśeṣikasūtrasya adhyāyakrameṇa O. pustake śuddhapāṭhāḥ: pp. 158-161; H. Nayacakraprathamavibhāṅgasya śuddhipatṛakam: pp. 162-166.

The editor announces that the second volume, containing the remaining eight *āra*-s, will be published in the near future. This edition will be of the greatest importance for the study of the older period of Indian philosophy which is relatively unknown because many works have not been preserved. It would be difficult to mention another edition of an Indian philosophical text which has been edited with so much care. Already from the long list of books, consulted by the editor (cf. Part III F), it is obvious that he has spared no pains in preparing this edition. How many works, some only existing in manuscript form, have been consulted by him in order to trace the quotations in the text! The translation of complicated logical texts from Tibetan into Sanskrit must have demanded great efforts as the editor states in his introduction: *anekavarṣāṇi bhṛṣam pariśramyāsmābhiḥ saṅkalitam idam bhoṭapariśiṣṭam* (p. 40). The reconstruction of the *Nayacakra* was perhaps even more difficult. In the first place the *pratīka*-s have to be traced in the commentary. In many places the commentator quotes only the first and last words of a passage. Sometimes no explanation is given by the commentator who, in such cases, contents himself with stating that the text is *spāṣṭam* or *sugāmam*. An entirely correct reconstruction of the original is perhaps impossible, as long as no other materials are available. As Frauwallner remarks in his preface, the reconstruction has been carefully considered and deserves our full attention. We are looking forward to the second volume of this *magnum opus* which does great honour to the scholarship of Muni Jambūvijayajī.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Hermann Goetz, *Studies in the History and Art of Kashmir and the Indian Himalaya* (= *Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg*, Band 4). Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1969. 8vo, viii & 197 pp., xlix pls.

It was a congenial idea of the staff of the South Asia Institute of the University of Heidelberg to honour the seventieth birthday of Professor Hermann Goetz by a re-edition of a number of scholarly articles he wrote on the history and art of those parts of the Indian Himālaya he knows so well from personal visits as well as from

profound scholarly research. Many of those articles had been published in Indian journals and are hardly accessible to-day outside the specialized institutes in the main centres of Orientalistic research.

It is not without reason that the editors of this volume could only achieve their object by inviting Professor Goetz' cooperation, and even more than that. Nobody could have obtained a satisfactory result without his active assistance.

Only a small number of Indian archaeologists of to-day, I believe, have met Dr. Goetz at Baroda in the years the articles were composed. I remember how he took me from the train one morning in May 1952 before sunrise, and brought me to his bungalow when the day came to life, and with it the almost unbearable heat of the period in that part of India. It was his wife who came to my rescue when I had listened for hours to his long monologues about his research and his theories. I felt hopelessly incompetent to keep up even an appearance of interest in a climate which neither suited him nor me. But I realised that here was a man who had worked well and worthily for many years, but almost without contact with competent scholars. He had spent every hour to the research that was dear to him; he had collected an enormous amount of information, and he had reason to believe in theories he had formed for himself and by himself.

Afterwards I read many of his articles, and more and more I became convinced of his qualities, but also of the fact that he had worked without the benefit of a close cooperation with other scholars, never having a proper chance of an exchange of opinions, nor receiving the useful criticism every scholar needs. His style of writing remains difficult and sometimes even cumbersome. It takes time to adjust oneself to this style, and to learn to justify the work he did. He habitually packs his articles with information, using long sentences which compel the reader to a perusal of the text when he really wants to understand all the details given.

The studies of Dr. Goetz are based on an extensive knowledge of the history and art of those parts of the Himâlayas which offered a refuge likewise to the remnants of defeated former conquerors and of their cultural traditions. His researches are mainly founded upon observations made on the spot during many travels by all means of transport, on horseback and on foot in the course of many summers between 1937 and 1960, when the oppressive heat of the Indian plains forced a retreat into the cooler climate of the hills. Accompanied by his tireless and most sympathetic wife Goetz travelled across the hills, searching for antiquities and monuments, spending long days in noting down all kinds of details, and at the same time always about to arrange his material into new schemes and patterns of culture. So I met him and his wife in Kuļu valley in 1952. I do not remember of ever having seen him relaxing; always busy noting, measuring, making photographs with an inexpensive camera — which he never managed to use to the best of its possibilities —, and wherever possible expounding his theories when meeting people willing to listen.

Now, at the age of retiring, Goetz has offered us his collected studies in the form of this book, the papers having been recast in part where recent research had made them obsolete. The book is of a major interest to those specializing in the history and culture of Northern India in its widest sense and with special emphasis on Kashmir, Chamba, Kuļu, Kumaon, and some parts of Nepal. No scholar working in this line can afford to discard the book when studying this highly interesting, but also rather complicate subject. The index to the volume will prove to be of great help to them, and this is a major asset of the book, its style of writing remaining heavy. It will be used as a book of reference mainly, and many scholars in the line of Indian archaeology will make use of it with much profit, and will probably forget how this mine of information was formed by hard days' work of a man swotting for many years in the loneliness of a Baroda bungalow.