Pāṇini a inséré dans la large portion de son Aṣṭādhyaśi 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, paribhāṣās, définitions de noms techniques, etc., destinées à régler le maniement des injonctions des chapitres subséquents, attribue les noms techniques ātmanepada et parasmaipada à ces deux séries de désinences ainsi qu’aux 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 (āhāka 14) à répartition de ces deux séries de désinences, selon le sens d’exprimer et dans l’ensemble des racines, faisant ainsi le lien avec l’enseignement connexe du Dhiṭupāṭha. L’ouvrage de Mme Rocher consacré à ce quatorzième āhāka 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 yaḥ 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 parasmaipada, 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’imparfait) et l’agent quand il y a échange d’action (cas du réciproque) ou quand l’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 du sens défini. Le Dhiṭupāṭha, 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 Dhiṭupāṭha en indice un accent atone ou ā reçoit les désinences ātmanepada; une racine qui porte en indice un accent modulé ou ṝ 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 parasmaipada.

Tel est le cadre de la description de Pāṇini. Elle est poursuivie par un relevé de particularités, complété par le vṛttiṇk. Ainsi avons-nous un précieux répertoire de formes particulières avec définition précise des circonstances de leur emploi, présence de certains préverbes, acceptations 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 commentateurs 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 Kāśika et ses deux commentaires, Nyāsa et Padamañjari, dans la Durghaṭaṇḍī, dans les ouvrages spécialisés consacrés aux racines, Mādhyāvyadhāntī, 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 Durghatavrti se signale par son effort en ce sens. Elle résume un désaccord en réinterprétant un énoncé de la règle, un ca par exemple. Ou bien elle reconnaît à certains textes (purāṇa, épopee, 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 ṣājaghe n 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 kāvyā. Dans le vers 2.35 du Kirātārjuniya, cité §754, on trouve une forme nayanti qui est mise en question, parce qu'une désinence atmanepada 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 "déployer" 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 śīvam aupayikam “un moyen favorable”, au lieu de faire de ce second terme un objet de vīgānayya. 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 atmanepada n’a pas été employée. Ce faisant, il donne à la stance 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 stance etanamanda ... attribuée à Vallana par le Saduktikarṇāṁrta (donnée aussi dans le subhāṣitaratnakosā, no. 1664, éd. Kosambi-Gokhale, citée Vakroktīvīta, Kāvyapra-kāśa, 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 couvres pas ta poitrine d’un vêtement de feuilles (de plumes de paon, selon Śrīdhara)”. Ḫalakikar place cette stance dans la bouche d’un amoureux (voir son commentaire sur Kāvyaprakāśa, 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’enfuient devant les chasseurs. Il figure cette fuite comme signifiant une pièce 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 Kāvyaprakāśa donne ce vers comme exemple du défaut cūtāsamskṛti, faute de grammaire. Anunāthane selon la règle reçoit la désinence atmanepada, quand le sens est celui de souhait, aśīh. Or ici le sens est yācanam “demande”. Nāgēśa précise quelle peut être la différence entre ces deux sens. Il y a aśīh, “souhait”, quand il y a 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. Ḫalakikar marque la distinction plus simplement : il y a aśīh 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 Bhattacharya, 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 Ḫāṇakasamuccaya de Puruṣottamadeva.
Après la confrontation avec l’usage, une autre tâche des commentateurs de Pâñini est d’assurer la logique interne, le mécanisme d’application des règles. On connaît le caractère quasi algébrique des formules pâniniennes dont on s’attende à ce qu’une application mécanique fournisse toutes les formes désirables. Le Mahâbhâṣya, et déjà le vârttika avant lui, ont montré des incohérences, des irrégularités. Le Mahâbhâṣya s’est attaché à corriger les sutra déficients, à rattraper leur efficacité, plus d’ailleurs, en les réinterprétant qu’en en changeant la teneur. Les sutra de l’âhnikâ 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 bhâva-karti “réfléchi”, identification des racines, etc. On connaît l’intelligence que Patañjali a mis dans les solutions et les débats qu’il a construit à partir de quelques postulats tels que la non-inutilité d’aucun énoncé de Pâñini, 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 Mahâbhâṣya, le Pradîpa et les commentaires de la Kâśîkâ. 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 Nâgâsa pour mieux comprendre la validité logique des discussions du bhâsa. 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 fluëe. Le sutra 1.2.4 autorise le transfert de l’application d’une opération déterminée par un énoncé nît à un élément qui n’est pas nît. Ce terme nît peut se comprendre soit comme un bahuvrihi “qui a pour indice nît”, soit comme un karmadâraya “indice nît”. Pour montrer que le sutra 1.3.12 ne s’applique pas dans le cas où un thème verbal est nît par ledit transfert, Patañjali dit que l’éconce nît dans 1.3.12 est un karmadâraya, non un bahuvrihi. Comment la forme en karmadâraya empêche-t-elle l’application vicieuse? Patañjali ne le dit pas. Nâgâsa laisse entendre le raisonnement suivant. Il est d’autres opérations déterminées par un énoncé nît, par exemple celle qui est prescrite par kniti ca 1.1.5. Or dans ce sutra l’on a, comme nous le verrons ci-dessous, un énoncé en bahuvrihi, de même que dans l’injonction du transfert sârvadâtukam apit (nît). On conclura de la conformité de kniti ca, etc., avec la règle de transfert, que l’opération transférable ne l’est que si elle est déterminée par un énoncé en bahuvrihi. Enfin il faut montrer pourquoi il faut lire dans 1.3.12 un énoncé en karmadâraya. Pour cela Kâśîya recourt à l’argument de l’antarâraţâva du karmadâraya. Dans le cas de 1.2.4 seule l’analyse en bahuvrihi est possible. Dans celui de kniti ca, on établit que le sens du locatif est celui de cause, le sens du sutra étant : le guṇa et la vrddhi causés par nît 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 nît comme un bahuvrihi “(affixe) qui a pour indice nît”. La démonstration peut être poursuivie pour d’autres énoncés que celui de kniti ca.

Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat


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 "Shaṅkara 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, Shaṅkara and Bradley have certainly been two of the most outstanding philosophers..." (p. 13). 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 Shaṅkara, 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 Shaṅkara 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 Shaṅkara, 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 Brahmāsatrābhyāsa, e.g., the Bhāmaśītra and the Iṣṭasiddhi. He unquestioningly accepts the authenticity of such works as the Gītābhāṣya, the Madhayakārikābhāṣya and the Vivekacūḍāmaṇī. As far as interpretation is concerned, mention may here be made only of his efforts to establish that Shaṅkara 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 Shaṅkara's axiom that only Brahmā is real, that the world is real in so far as it is identical with Brahmā 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 dvīroopam, p. 127).

Berkeley

J. F. Staal


Volume 24 of the Sacred Books of the Buddhists contains an edition and translation of a prose text of the Maniḍūḍavādaṇa, an edition of a metrical version of the same text, and a transliteration and synopsis of the drama Lokāṇanda 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 Jātakaṃḍāṇī 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 *Maniśūdāvadāna* is to be found both as a separate text and as a chapter of the *Divyāvadānāmālā*. Dr. Handurukande has used five manuscripts of the *Maniśūdāvadāna* and two manuscripts of the *Divyāvadānāmālā*. In his recent book on the avadāna literature Iwamoto enumerates twelve manuscripts of the *Maniśūdāvadāna* (*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 Nos. 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 *Divyāvadānāmālā*, belonging to the Kyoto University, the *Maniśūdāvadāna* is also the 31st chapter (see Iwamoto, *op.cit.*, pp. 141 and 147). However, in two other manuscripts of the *Divyāvadānāmālā* (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-xvi). Handurukande shows clearly that all manuscripts go back to a common archetype which is not free from errors. According to the introduction, the *Maniśūdāvadāna* 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 *Maniśūdāvadāna*. 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: *prāṇoti tuṣṭiṁ paramāṁ yaśas ca*. It is of course not necessary to relate *paramāṁ* to *yaśas* instead of to *tuṣṭiṁ*. 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 āṃ) occur in a single sentence p. 4.15-16: *Tatas sā Bodhisatvvasyānubhāvenāraṁpurvāṁ imāṁ gāthāṁ pratibhāṣitā. As is obvious from the variant readings, one has to read: Tayā ... *pūrvā imā gāthāḥ pratibhāṣitāḥ (tatas sā; A tata tasyā corrected to tatas sā, B C tasyā, D tatasyā, E tatasmā, F tataḥ sā – imāṁ gāthāṁ; A B imāṁ gāthā, C D E imā gāthā – pratibhāṣitā, C F bhāṣitāḥ, D bhāvīti, G pratibhākhito). Perhaps one must read *pūrvā-m-imā* with -m- as 'hiatus-bridge' (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 ā (see p. 14.4-5: *Tvayaśām agramahīṣi 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 *kimvīkāro 'yam*
udāra 'rabhāṣo bhavīṣyaṭi kimānusāṃsa (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. III, 1, 1957, p. 312); p. 16.7 iṣṭopačāryakāḥ? – read iṣṭopačārakāḥ? p. 18.3 and p. 25.2 read dhanajātaṁ instead of dhanaṁ jātaṁ; p. 36.8 karuṇāyamānam uvāca – read karuṇāyamāna (sic MSS. CDEG) or karuṇāyamāna-m- uvāca; p. 39.9 dhairyam samuttaman – read dhairyam anuttaman?; p. 48.4 abhiśiktā – read abhiśiktā (ahaṁ in 48.3 is probably a scribal error for mayā); p. 53.13-14 parisamaṇḍalam ānayanāṃ taṁ – read parisamaṇḍaladārāyapattam? p. 75.3 maitriṁ paribhāvitasya – read maitriṁparibhāvitasya; p. 75.8 "upasargotsṛṣe – read "upasargoparasṇa (cf. 76.15); p. 85.11 "balena vivārya – read "balenaṁtivāsya? (cf. 82.11); p. 98.1 kāyeṣu kāmacchandaṁ prahāya tad bahu-

yānavihāri – read kāmeṣu kāmacchandaṁ prahāya tad bahu

yānavihāri (cf. Divy. p. 225.28: kāmeṣu kāmacchandaṁ vyapahāya tad bahu

yānavihāriṇo). I have noted the following printing errors: p. 13.7 read atikrānta for atikratā; p. 15.13 read paripācanārthaṁ for paripācanārtham; p. 74.5 read vākyasākhilyena for vāika; p. 102.2 read tatāticatagun-

nāna anusmyta for tatāticataganunānusmyta. I do not understand p. 34.13 ākārayām āśa (translated as 'he took') and p. 42.13 samākārayām āśa ('he appeared').

The translation which follows the text is excellent apart from a few minor points. P. 14.7: na hi puṇyam apunyam vā parasamāṃṇanāṃ samkrāmatai, “neither merit nor de-

merit finds continuance in others” – rather: “neither merit nor merit passes over to an other series (i.e. individual; see Edgerton’s Dictionary s.v. samātati and saṃtāna)”, p. 39.8: kṛṣṇam jagat pariśārāṁ udyatasyāya de kṣaṃanā, “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 vṛkkam vā hṛdayamā纳斯medamostikṣam 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 vṛkkam as is done in p. 42, n. 32); p. 59.11: smṛtyapramose, “mindfulness, abstinence from theft: “non-loss of memory” (see BHS Dictionary s.v. asampramoṣaṇa); p. 59.15: saṁsān, “on occasions” – “concisely”; p. 63.6: sukhasaṁjñāṁ tu ma kārṣṭi kadā cid grhačārake, “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 Jatakasūla is translated in the same way by all translators: Speyer “one who lives in the house”; Baranikov (1962) “o žizni v dome” [‘life in the house’]; Gnoli (1964) “uno che vive la vita di casa”.

In classical Sanskrit (Kaut, Arth. and Daśak.) and in Buddhist Sanskrit cāraka often occurs in the meaning ‘prison’ (see BHS Dictionary s.v. cāra; Lalitavistara, ed. S. Lefmann, p. 204.9; Divyavnadāna, pp. 365.4; 377.16, 23: Dharmasamuccaya IV, 4a); p. 66.7: hartum, “to kill” – “to take away”; p. 82.10: karmavāyisyā parihiṇaḥ, “disregarded (the pain), through (the power of) his detachment from sensuality” – “deprived of his detachment from pleasures”; p. 89.4-5: 'pīdaṇīṃ satvāḥ svakam api bāhaṁ grātāṁ 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. xxxii-xliv) the editor studies a metrical version of the Mañjūciḍa story which is contained in the fourth chapter of the Śīvam-
bhuvanamāhāpurāṇa, of which the only known manuscript is in the Bibliothèque Nationale. This version has been analysed and studied by de La Vallée Poussin (“Mañjū-

ciḍāvadāna, as related in the fourth chapter of the Śīvamāhuṇāpurāṇa [Paris, dev. 78], J.R.A.S, 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.2 This

metrical version of the Maniçūḍāvadāna 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: dātāvadātāśayah – dānāvadātā"; 25b: "dānagamyāḥhisangame – dānāgamyāḥhis-
sangamaṁ; 63d: vicerur – virecur (cf. 149d); p. 154.17: sarvam ārāyāmi – sarvadarp
śini (MS. sarvadarśini); p. 155.10: mahimāṁ – mahimāṁ (sic MS.); p. 155.24: aprabādhito – aprabodhito; p. 155.26: bhavad ārāyā (MS. ārāyā) – bhavadāśrame?; p. 156.22: jvara-uddhārana kāmukāṁ – jagaduddhārana-kāmuka (MS. jagaduddhārana-

The third text published in this book is the Tibetan text of the drama Lokānanda which is based on the Maniçūḍa 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 transcribed from the Peking and Nathang editions, with one or more editions of the Tanjūr. 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 – bacas; p. 213.21: mt’oi bdul-ba’i – mt’oi-ba dula-ba’i; p. 225.13, 17: bgra-ses – bgra-sis; p. 227.7: bruñ – btrad; p. 229.9: spon – gtoñ (PN ston), etc.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong


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 and undoubtedly his contribution to the study of the Prajhāpāramitā 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, pravāyvaratayitukā – pravāyavatayitukā; p. 103.9, pravrajīno – pravrajita; 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 Saddharmapundarika: "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


Mallavādīn'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 Nyāyāgamānāsūrīni, a commentary on the Nayacakra by Simhasūri, 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. Another edition has been published in the Shri Labdhisurishwar Jain Granthamala. E. Frawallner has pointed out the shortcomings of both editions. In the same article Frawallner announced a new edition by Muni Jambūvijayaji. The first volume, comprising the first four ara-s, has now appeared as volume 92 of the Śrī Ātmānand Jain Granthamala. The first part contains an English introduction by E. Frawallner (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 2001 Muni Jambūvijayaji planned to edit Jinabhadra’s Viśeṣāṇavakamahābhāṣya, but at the request of his Guru Śrī Bhuvanavijayaji Mahārāja, he abandoned this plan and undertook to edit the Nyāyāgamānūsūrīni 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 Simhasūri. 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 Jambūvijayaji undertook the study of Tibetan. The discovery of an older manuscript of Simhasūri’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. 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 Mallaśvādin. 1. Bhadrśīvarśūri’s Kahāvali (Vikrama second half of the twelfth century); 2. Prabhā-

---

1 Dvādasāranyakaphra of Śrīmallavādīsūri, with the commentary Nyāyāgamānūsūrīni of Śrī Simhasūri, ed. by the late Muni Caturvijayaji and Lalcandra B. Gandhi (= GOS, No. CXVI) (Baroda, 1952).
2 The Dvādasāranyakakram of Śrī Mallavādi Kshamasramana with the Nyāyāgamānūsūrini Commentary by Śrī Simhasurīgani Vadi Kshamasramana, ed. by Acharya Vijayaladabhisuri (= 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.
4 Muni Jambūvijayaji quotes all dates according to the Vikrama era.
5 This date is given by Anantatal Thakur in his Introduction to Muni Jambūvijayaji’s edition of the Vaśeṣīkastriṭa of Kaṇḍāda with the Commentary of Candraśīnanda (= GOS, No. 136) (1961). The date, indicated by Muni Jambūvijayaji (prākkathana p. 7 n.1), is Vikrama 2015, the eighth day of the white half of the month Māgha.
vacandrasūri's Prabhāvakacarita (Vikr. 1334); 3. Merutūṅga's Prabandhacintāmaṇi (Vikr. 1361); 4. Rājāsekharaśrī's Prabandhakośa (Vikr. 1405); 5. Saṅghatilakācārya's Samvatsvasaptati (Vikr. 1422). In the same note the editor reproduces the text of the life of Mallavādin in the Kahāvalī and in Āmrađavesūrī's commentary on Nemicandraśūri's Ākhyānāmanikarśa (Vikr. 1190). The text of the Kahāvalī 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 Prabhāvakacarita, Mallavādin defeated the Baudhas (i.e. Buddhānanda) in Vira 884 (= Vikr. 414). The Nayacakra discusses the doctrines of many philosophers such as Vārṣaganyya, Vasurāta, Bhartṛhari, Vusubandhu (the author of the Kośa) 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 Prabhāvakacarita 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 Simhasūri’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 Simhasūri. 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 Simhasūri’s indications. Muni Jambūvijayajī has already published several articles on the dates of Mallavādin, Bhartṛhari and Dignāga. According to the passages of Simhasūri’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 Punyarāja’s commentary on Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapadiya II, 486, 489 and 490. Several scholars agree also that, according to Punyarāja’s commentary on Vākyapadiya II, 489, Candrācārya = Candragomin was the master of Vasurāta. The dates of Candragomin and Bhartṛhari have been discussed by many scholars. 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. Frauwallner has recently shown that Dignāga’s Traikālyaparikṣā is


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.

H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar, “Bhartṛhari and Diṅnāga”, 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 (prākkathana p. 16 n. 3) refer to Vākyapadiya II, 156 and 157, Rangas-
based upon the Vākyapādiya. If one combines Śimhasūri’s indications and the fact that Bhartṛhari is quoted by Dignāga, the following chronological sequence can be established: Vasūrāta — 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. Moreover, if Puṇyarāja’s commentary is understood to mean that Candragomin was the teacher of Vasūrāta, he must have lived in a period much earlier than any one of those proposed previously. However, the text of Puṇyarāja’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?

According to Śimhasūri’s commentary Dignāga attacked his guru Vasubandhu (the author of the Vādavidhi). 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. Tāranātha’s work was written in 1608 and is not always a reliable source. However, it is clear from Śimhasūri’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 Āptamāṁśā.

The Prabhāvakacarita attributes to Mallavādin the authorship of a Rāmāyana, called Padmācari. 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 Śimhasūri’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). Śimhasūri’s commentary is of special interest for the information which it gives on the older Sāmkhya and Vaiśeṣika literature and on Buddhist logic.

One of the most important texts of the older Sāmkhya literature is the Saṣṭiṣṭantra by Vṛṣagana or Vārṣagana. Quotations from it are to be found in the third chapter of Śimhasūri’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 Vākyapādiya 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 Jambūvijaya jai points out that Dignāga has also quoted another verse of Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapādiya (III, 14,8) in his vr̥tti on the second verse of the fifth chapter of the Pramāṇasamuccaya (prākkathana p. 16 n. 3). Quotations from Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapādiya in other works have been studied by Nakamura (op.cit., pp. 122-136).


10 See e.g. Louis Renou, La Durgācaturīti de Śarada, 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-tsin comme étant mort en 651."


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


14 Cf. E. Frauwallner, "Zur Erkenntnisdhre des klassischen Sāmkhya-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 Sūtrapaṭha quoted by Simhasūri is different from the one in Śāntakamaṇī’s Upākṣāra but agrees with the Sūtrapaṭha which has been transmitted together with a commentary by Candrānanda. When the text of the first five ara-s of the Nayaṇakraṇa had already been printed, the editor obtained a manuscript containing both a separate text of the Vaiśeṣikasūtras and the Sūtras together with Candrānanda’s vr̥tti (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: “Vaiśeṣikasūtrasaṁbandha pariśiṣṭam” for a list of the relevant notes). Subsequently, the editor obtained a copy of another manuscript, written in Śāradā script (MS. O). On the basis of these two manuscripts (PS/P and O) he has edited the Vaiśeṣikasūtras of Kanāda with the Commentary of Candrānanda (GOS, No. 136, Baroda, 1961). This edition contains appendices comparing the Sūtrapaṭha with those found in the Upākṣāra and in an anonymous commentary, edited by Anantātal Thakur. Another appendix examines in detail the readings of the Sūtrapaṭha according to the two manuscripts and quotations from the Sūtras in other texts (pp. 227-234: Vṛddhipratakam).

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 prastāvānā (pp. 6-8) to the same edition.

Simhasūri gives several references to Āryadeva’s Cauṭhyaśataka and to Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakosa 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 vr̥tti and Jñānendrabuddhi’s tīkā (cf. Bhotapariśiṣṭam, pp. 95-140). Other sections of these works have been translated in notes to the eighth ara (cf. prākkathana, 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).

The editor points out that in the eighth ara Mallavādin discusses the apohaṇa, 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 Sāmānyaparikṣā 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 Sāmānyalakṣaṇaparikṣā by Frawallner (WZKSO, III, 1959, p. 139). In a letter to Muni Jambūvīyajī, Frawallner 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


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


Vaiśeṣikakāraṇa of Kanāda with an anonymous commentary, ed. by Anantātal Thakur (Darbhanga, 1957).

GOS, No. 136 reproduces the Tibetan text in Tibetan characters (cf. pp. I-LI). In the Bhotapariśiṣṭa Tibetan texts are transliterated in devanāgarī. Would it not have been possible to use romanization?
eleven verses. Probably he had studied the *apo'haśāda* in this commentary. It seems difficult to imagine that Dignāga would have written both a *Sāmānyalaksana-parikṣā* 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. Iśvarasena is known to have written a commentary on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, but his work is lost. According to Frawuwallner, he was probably the teacher of Dharmakīrti. 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 Vīra 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 *bāṣya*, which were later amalgamated into one work.

Little is known about Simhasūri. A verse from another work by him is quoted by Kojārya in his commentary upon the *Viśeśāvaśāyakabhāṣya*. Kojārya quotes Dignāga, the *Avāsya-kacāra* and Simhasūri's commentary, but not Kumārila and Dharmakīrti. Simhasūri quotes three verses which also occur in the *Viśeśāvaśāyakabhāṣya*, 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 Baudhā" (adyata-nabaudhā) 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 Yāso-vidayāya (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 Puñija 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.

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 *Nayacakravytī* in his notes

---


11 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 Jambūvijayaji's edition). These two manuscripts seem to have been used only by the second editor Lalacandra B. Gandhi (cf. prastāvānā, 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 (prâkkathana) by the editor: pp. 7-43; Gujarati introduction (prastâvanâ) 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 *ara*-s: pp. 1-375.


The editor announces that the second volume, containing the remaining eight *ara*-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: *aneka vâsâni bhûsâm parisñâm yasmâbîhih sanskalitam idam bhojasparisñâsam* (p. 40). The reconstruction of the *Nayacakra* was perhaps even more difficult. In the first place the *pratika*-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 *spañâm or sugamam*. 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 Jambûvijayâjî.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong


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 Himalaya 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 Himalayas 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 Kulu 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, Kulu, 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.

Leiden

P. H. Pott