

Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner.
 Aus Anlass seines 70. Geburtstages herausgegeben von G. Oberhammer
 (= *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens*, Band XII-XIII,
 1968/1969). Wien, 1968. 426 pp.

The *Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens* published on the occasion of the seventieth birthday of Erich Frauwallner contain thirty-three articles. Most of them deal with Indian philosophy. This gives a unity to this volume which distinguishes it from the usual type of Festschrift. A bibliography of the writings of Erich Frauwallner lists his publications but not his reviews except for three. Professor Frauwallner has made important contributions to the history of Indian philosophy. Most of his early articles, published between 1930 and 1937, deal with the works of Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara. The study of Buddhist philosophical works, preserved in Tibetan translation, has proved to be of the greatest importance not only for the history of Buddhist philosophy but also for that of other Indian philosophical schools. During the last twenty years Professor Frauwallner has extended his interest also to earlier periods of the history of Buddhist thought, and his publications testify to the fact that he has extensively studied Chinese translations of Indian Buddhist texts. At the same time he has not neglected the study of the six darsanas and of later philosophical schools such as the Navyanyāya. His treatment of difficult technical philosophical problems is always lucid and his translations of very complicated texts are so clear and understandable that one tends to underestimate the problems which the translator had to solve. With regard to the history of the Indian philosophical systems, Professor Frauwallner has advanced from time to time more speculative theories which will have to be carefully examined by other scholars. Sometimes his critical sense seems to have been sadly lacking. The bibliography lists under the year 1941 an article, entitled "Die Bedeutung der indischen Philosophie". It contains the text of a paper, read in the autumn of 1942 in Berlin on the occasion of an "Orientalistentagung". The volume, containing the text of the papers, was published in 1944 by H. H. Schaeder. In his paper Professor Frauwallner repeated to a great extent the arguments which he had already advanced in a paper read in Bonn on the 30th August 1938 ("Der arische Anteil an der indischen Philosophie", *WZKM*, 46, 1939, pp. 267-291). Professor Frauwallner refers to the

same paper in the first volume of his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (p. 455) but without mentioning the fact that the introduction to this book omits entirely his former ideas on "wissenschaftliche Philosophie" and its creation by the Aryans. One would have welcomed a clear and unambiguous disavowal of these unscientific racist theories.

Eight articles of the *Beiträge* deal with Buddhism. In "Verkannte Mahāvastu-Strophen" (pp. 13-22), Ludwig Alsdorf reconstructs the text of 21 Āryās in *Mahāvastu* I 2,15-4,10 and refers to Leumann's reconstruction which was published in 1952 in Japan by Shiraishi Shindō. Shiraishi Shindō has published in three "Hefte" Leumann's translation of *Mahāvastu* I 1-193,12 (1952, 1957, 1962). The third "Heft" is not mentioned by Alsdorf (p. 13, n. 2). In the second part of his article Alsdorf corrects the text of III 58,18-59,1 and reconstructs a Mālinī stanza in III 61,16-18 (on p. 21,9 of Alsdorf's article 64, 12 must be corrected to 61, 12). In "Les idées sous-jacentes aux pratiques cultuelles bouddhiques dans le Cambodge actuel" André Bareau studies liturgical formulae used in present-day Cambodia (pp. 23-32). The ideas expressed in these formulas concerning the goods desired by the faithful, the beneficiaries of these advantages and the direct and indirect methods used to acquire these goods reflect magical and paganistic beliefs and Buddhist concepts which do not entirely agree with the doctrine of the Pāli canon. In "Zur Interpretation der Pratītyasamutpāda-Formel" Franz Bernhard examines two different interpretations of the Pratītyasamutpāda in Prajñāvarman's commentary on *Udānavarga* XXIX. 24, of which the first enumerates the members 1-7 and the second, ascribed to Kātyāyanaputra, the members 8 and 10 (pp. 53-63). According to the author the formula of Pratītyasamutpāda is a combination of two formulas, one beginning with *avidyā* and the other with *trṣṇā*. George Chemparathy examines and translates "Two early Buddhist refutations of the existence of Īśvara as the creator of the universe" (pp. 85-100) : 1. *Yogācārābhūmi* (ed. V. Bhat-tacharya), pp. 144-145; 2. *Viṣṇorekakartṛtvanirākaraṇa*. The second text was published in Sanskrit and Tibetan by F. W. Thomas (*JRAS*, 1903, pp. 345-349) and by Stcherbatsky ("Buddijskij filosof o edinobožii, *Zapiski Vost. Otd. Imp. Russk. Arx. Obšč.*, XVI, 1906, pp. 058-074). Stcherbatsky has also added a translation. The full title is *Īśvarakartṛtvanirākṛtiḥ Viṣṇorekakartṛtvanirākaraṇam*. According to Chemparathy the work was probably written by the Tantric master Nāgārjuna who, in the view of A. Bareau and E. Conze, lived in the seventh century A.D. (cf. p. 91). The only reason for this ascription seems to be the fact that no scholar ascribes this work to Nāgārjuna, the author of the *Mādhyamikakārikā*. It would be more prudent to state that the work is ascribed to Nāgārjuna by the Tibetan tradition but that nothing is known about the author and the date of the work. Chemparathy's translation compares favourably with that of Stcherbatsky which he has not been able to consult. According to the text the Īśvara produces that which exists (*siddha*), or that which does not exist (*asiddha*) or that which is both existent and non-existent (*siddhāsiddha*). Stcherbatsky wrongly changes the text and reads *atha siddham asiddham karoti* instead of *atha siddhāsiddham karoti*. He translates: "God makes that which is not existent to that which exists". Stcherbatsky's interpretation is untenable. Kajiyama Yuichi studies the dates of "Bhāvaviveka, Sthiramati and Dharmapāla" (pp. 193-203). He arrives at the following dates: Bhāvaviveka 500-570, Sthiramati 510-570, Dharmapāla 530-561.¹ Kajiyama points out that the *Kāśyapaparivartaṭīkā* was translated by Bodhiruci around 510 A.D. Therefore this text cannot have been written by the Sthiramati who lived in the sixth century as has been assumed by Ruegg (*La théorie du tathāgatagarbha et du gotra*, Paris, 1969, p. 42). In "Der Nirvāṇa-Begriff in den kanonischen Texten des Frühbuddhismus" Kumoi Shōzen examines the meaning of *amata* in canonical texts and the ideas of *sa-upādisesa-* and *an-upādisesa-nibbāna* (pp. 205-213). David Seyfort

¹ This date is not given by Kajiyama but see M. Hattori, *Dignāga, On Perception* (= *H.O.S.*, vol. 47) (1968), p. 5, n. 25.

Ruegg studies the theories of "Ārya and Bhadanta Vimuktisena on the Gotra-theory of the Prajñāpāramitā" (pp. 303-317). According to the author Ārya-Vimuktisena's *Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti* is the oldest available commentary on the *AA*. It was followed in time — and to a certain extent in wording also — by Bhadanta-Vimuktisena's *Vārttika*. The Sanskrit text of the first *abhisamaya* of Ārya-Vimuktisena's vṛtti has been published by Corrado Penso (*S.O.R.*, vol. XXXVII, Roma, 1967). The section on *gotra* is to be found on pp. 73-78,7. Bhadanta-Vimuktisena's *Vārttika* has been preserved in Tibetan translation. In "Die Entwicklung des Kṣāṇikatvānumānam bei Dharmakīrti" Ernst Steinkellner studies the relation between the so-called *vināśitvānumāna* and the *sattvānumāna* in the work of Dharmakīrti (pp. 361-377). The total structure of the *sattvānumāna* is to be found for the first time in the *Pramāṇavinīścaya*.

Several articles deal with different aspects of the Vedānta philosophy. Paul Hacker published in 1950 an article which has had a great influence on the study of Śaṅkara and his philosophy: "Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Śaṅkaras: Avidyā, Nāmarūpa, Māyā, Īśvara", *ZDMG*, 100 (1950), pp. 246-286. The same is likely to happen with his article "Śaṅkara der Yogin und Śaṅkara der Advaitin" in which he advocates the theory that Śaṅkara was first an adherent of Pātañjala Yoga, author of the *Yogabhāṣyavivaraṇa* (Madras, 1952), and later became an Advaitin (pp. 119-147). Hacker points out the important consequences of this theory for the study of the chronology and the authenticity of Śaṅkara's works. Also Mayeda Sengaku in his study of "The Advaita theory of perception" draws attention to similarities in Śaṅkara's view and that of the Yoga system (pp. 221-239). According to the author Śaṅkara's view of perception depends considerably upon Sāṃkhya and Yoga views but possesses already the essential characteristics of the later Advaita theory of perception. Nakamura Hajime gives a bibliography of the translations of the different chapters of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* and adds notes on the sources of quotations in the text: "Some notes on the Sarvadarśanasamgraha" (pp. 241-251). To the bibliography one must add E. Abegg, "Die Lehre vom Sphoṭa im Sarvadarśanasamgraha" (*Festschrift Windisch*, Leipzig, 1914, pp. 188-195) and Uno Atsushi's recently published translation of chapter III (*Sekai no meicho*, vol. I, Tokyo, 1969, pp. 399-427). Nakamura studies in detail the last chapter of the *SDS* which has not been translated. In "Die Theorie der Schlussfolgerung bei Parāśarabhaṭṭa" Gerhard Oberhammer studies the theories of *vyāpti* and *upādhi* in Parāśarabhaṭṭa's *Tattvaratnākara* (pp. 253-273). Parāśarabhaṭṭa is one of the most important Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophers before Veṅkatanātha and lived in the second half of the twelfth century. His main work, the *Tattvaratnākara*, is lost but passages of it are quoted by Veṅkatanātha. His theory of inference was influenced by the works of Udayana and itself had an influence on Meghanādāri's doctrine of *vyāpti*. V. Raghavan compares several passages of "Bhāskara's *Gitābhāṣya*" with corresponding passages of Śaṅkara's *Gitābhāṣya* and shows that Bhāskara quotes Śaṅkara several times verbatim (pp. 281-294). He points out that Bhāskara also criticizes one or more other early commentators. Raghavan's article shows once again the importance of Bhāskara. An edition and translation of his *Sūtrabhāṣya* by J. A. B. van Buitenen and an edition and translation of his *Gitābhāṣya* by Daniel H. H. Ingalls and Subhadra Jha are due to appear in the *Harvard Oriental Series* (cf. J. A. B. van Buitenen, *The Adyar Library Bulletin*, XXV, 1961, p. 268, n. 1). Let us hope that they will soon be published. In "Zur advaitischen Theorie der Objekt-erkenntnis" Lambert Schmithausen studies a passage of Prakāśātman's *Vivaraṇa* which contains three different theories (pp. 329-360). According to the author the first is perhaps due to Śaṅkara, the second to Padmapāda and the third to Prakāśātman himself. Tilman Vetter examines the problem of the authorship of the bhāṣya on Gauḍapādas *Māṇḍūkya-Kārikā* (*GKBh*), Śaṅkara's polemic against Buddhist idealism (*Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* II, 2,28-32) and finally the two kinds of *avidyā* in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*: "Zur Bedeutung des Illusionismus bei Śaṅkara" (pp. 407-423). He be-

lieves that the *GKBh* has been written by Śaṅkara. According to him Śaṅkara has proposed different concepts of the irreality of the world in the *GKBh* and the *Brahma-sūtrabhāṣya*. Finally, Śaṅkara admits apart from an individual *avidyā* also an *avidyā* based on Brahman: "so ist doch die Theorie der engeren Śaṅkaraschule, dass das Brahman Āśraya der Avidyā sei, in ihrer Grundlage bei ihm vorhanden" (p. 422). Vetter refers to Hacker's publications but does not mention Ingalls' articles on Śaṅkara's polemic against the Buddhists and on the locus of *avidyā*: "Śaṅkara's Arguments Against the Buddhists" (*Philosophy East and West*, III, 1954, pp. 291-306); "Śaṅkara on the Question: Whose is Avidyā?" (*id.*, III, 1953, pp. 69-72).

The following articles concern Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika doctrines. Gopikamohan Bhat-tacharya examines the section of the *Tattvacintāmanidīdhiti* on *sāmānyalakṣaṇā* in "Raghunātha Śiromaṇi on sāmānyalakṣaṇā" (pp. 65-74). In "Jāti et lakṣaṇa" Madeleine Biardeau draws attention to the controversy between J. F. Staal (*JAOS*, 81, 1961, pp. 122-126) and B. K. Motilal (*IJ*, VIII, 1964, pp. 85-95) concerning the extensional or intensional nature of the doctrines of *lakṣaṇa* and *saṃkara*, and discusses the fact that *jāti* "class" and *lakṣaṇa* "definition" exclude each other (pp. 75-83). She concludes by pointing out that logical relations have to be studied in their own philosophical context. Brahmananda Gupta studies briefly the "Story of the evolution of the concept of negation" (pp. 115-118). Hattori Masaaki examines the "Two types of non-qualificative perception" in the *Prasastapādabhāṣya* (pp. 161-169). The introduction of the idea of distinct and undifferentiated perception of the object itself is due to the influence of Dignāga. Karl Potter examines the meaning of the phrase *astitvaṃ jñeyatvaṃ abhidheyatvaṃ* and its implications for the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system: "Astitva jñeyatva abhidheyatva" (pp. 275-280). The author concludes that "*astitva*, *jñeyatva* and *abhidheyatva* all designate the same universal, since they apply to exactly the same individuals. Nyāya is clearly property-extensional." (p. 279). In "Textual Studies in the Nyayavārtika" Anantalal Thakur shows the help which can be derived from a manuscript of the *Nyāyavārtika* from the Jaisalmir Jaina Bhāṇḍāra for the establishment of a better text (pp. 379-387). The author announces a new edition of the *Bhāṣya*, *Vārtika*, *Tātparyaṭīkā* and *Parīśuddhi* (the *Nyāyacaturgranthikā*) in the *Mithila Institute Ancient Text Series* on the basis of manuscripts copied by the same scribe in or around Śaṃvat 1501.

Only one article deals exclusively with Yoga: V. M. Bedekar's "Yoga in the Mokṣa-dharmaparvan of the Mahābhārata" (pp. 43-52). The author refers to Frauwallner's treatment of Yoga in the Epic in his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*, vol. I but does not make any mention of E. Washburn Hopkins' "Yoga Technique in the Great Epic" (*JAOS*, 22, 1901, pp. 333-379).

Two articles relate to Bhartṛhari's linguistic philosophy. Siegfried Lienhard studies the meaning of the terms *śabdabrahman* and *vivarta* in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*: "Einige Bemerkungen über Śabdabrahman und Vivarta bei Bhavabhūti" (pp. 215-219). For Bhavabhūti *śabdabrahman* is "das unentfaltete Wortmaterial", *vivarta* the "Dichtungen" as "dessen Entfaltungen". Gaurinath Sastri compares the monism of Bhartṛhari and Śaṅkara: "Monism of Bhartṛhari" (pp. 319-322).

The importance of Jaina works for the study of Buddhist works is shown by Jaina Muni Jambuvijaya in his "A comparative study of the Utpādādisiddhīṭīkā and the Hetubinduṭīkā" (pp. 187-191). "The Jaina conception of deity" is studied by A. N. Upadhye (pp. 389-393).

Three articles concern the upaniṣads. Jan Gonda explains one of the later upaniṣads, the *Mudgalopaniṣad* which contains a Viṣṇu interpretation of the *Puruṣasūkta* (pp. 101-113). The introduction and annotations which follow the translation contain a wealth of information. Frank-Richard Hamm gives a carefully annotated new translation of *Chāndogyaopaniṣad* VI: "Chandogyopaniṣad VI. Ein erneuter Versuch" (pp. 149-159). Hamm refers to recent publications by Frauwallner, Edgerton and

Thieme. A carefully annotated Russian translation by A. Ja. Syrkin was published in 1965. Syrkin has been able to use W. Morgenroth's thesis: *Chandogya-upaniṣad. Versuch einer kritischen Ausgabe mit einer Übersetzung und einer Übersicht über ihre Lehren*, Dissertation, Jena, 1958. According to Syrkin it contains on pp. 539-561 a "Literaturverzeichnis". In "Seit wann gibt es Philosophie in Indien?" Walter Ruben studies the materialism of Uddālaka and the idealism of Yājñavalkya (pp. 295-302).

Different topics are studied in the following articles. Heinz Bechert studies "Eine alte Gottheit in Ceylon und Südindien" (pp. 33-41). The Ceylonese God of Kataragama is identical with the South Indian God Subrahmaṇya or Murugan. His cult was already popular in South India in a prehistoric period. J. C. Heesterman's "On the origin of the *nāstika*" studies the role of the *nāstika* in the verbal contest (pp. 171-185). Dieter Schlingloff studies the enumeration of the parvans of the *Mahābhārata* in a manuscript from Qyzil: "Fragmente einer Palmblatthandschrift philosophischen Inhalts aus Ostturkistan (MS. Spitzer)" (pp. 323-328). Additional information is to be found in Schlingloff's "The oldest extant Parvan-list of the *Mahābhārata*" (*JAOS*, 89, 1969, pp. 334-338). In "The cult of the divine name in the Haripāṭh of Dhīyāṇdev" Charlotte Vaudeville studies a sequence of 27 stanzas in old Marāṭhī, dedicated to the praise and exaltation of the sacred name of Hari (pp. 395-406). The *Haripāṭh* is usually included in collections of Vaiṣṇava "abhangas", short poetical utterances of one single stanza on the theme of Vaiṣṇava bhakti.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

K. L. Janert, R. Sellheim, H. Striedl, *Schriften und Bilder: Drei Orientalische Untersuchungen* (= W. Voigt, *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband, 7*). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1967. VIII + 87 pp., 32 plates.

The German Society for Research (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) having decided to publish a catalogue comprising all the data about the Oriental manuscripts in Germany, the members of the executive committee met at two conferences held at Marburg in 1961 and 1965 in order to report on their studies and discoveries.

The next year the various papers were published under the title *Fortschritte und Forschungen bei der Katalogisierung der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Marburger Kolloquium 1965* (= *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Forschungsbericht, 10*) (Wiesbaden, 1966). Moreover, the editor W. Voigt selected from these reports three extensive studies which lent themselves very well to their being published in the separate series of Supplements to the List of Oriental Manuscripts in Germany (see "Vorwort", pp. VII-VIII). This collection called *Schriften und Bilder* (Manuscripts and Illuminations) consists of the next contributions: K. L. Janert, "Studien zur indischen Schriftkunde und Religionsgeschichte: zwei frühe indische Amulette" (Studies on Indian palaeography and history of religions: two early Indian charms), pp. 1-40, 6 plates; R. Sellheim, "Neue Materialien zur Biographie des Yāqūt" (New sources concerning Yāqūt's biography), pp. 41-72, 24 plates, 1 map; H. Striedl, "Die Miniaturen in einer Handschrift des jüdisch-persischen Ardašīrbuches von Šāhīn (The miniatures in a manuscript of the Jewish-Persian Book of Ardashīr by Šāhīn), Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Tübinger Depot, Ms.or.qu. 1680", pp. 73-87, 2 plates.

K. L. Janert discusses the purport of a small-sized and oval-shaped rock-crystal intaglio showing an image and a Kharoṣṭhī inscription (Museum for Indian Art, Berlin-Dahlem, catalogue-number I.C. 43.640), see pp. 1-35. He compares it with a

similar rock-crystal intaglio bought by the late Dr. B. B. Whitehead at Rawalpindi fifty years ago, see pp. 36-40, cf. B. B. Whitehead, "Notes on the Indo-Greeks, part III", *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 6th series, vol. X (London, 1950), esp. pp. 230-231, and J. Ph. Vogel, "Seals of Buddhist Monasteries in Ancient India", *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (Centenary Volume 1845-1945)*, N.S., vol. I (Colombo, 1950), pp. 27-32, esp. pp. 31-32.

The solution of the problem depends on the interpretation of the Kharoṣṭhī inscription of the Berlin intaglio. Janert counts 13 syllables, the 8th *akṣara* being slightly damaged whereas the remaining 12 characters are perfectly legible. Therefore in his opinion the inscription reads as follows: *the-ta-ku-laṃ-vi-ha-ram* <no>-*mi saṃ-gha-mu-khe* which he translates "In the presence of the Head of the Community I laud the Monastery called Thetakula" ("Thetakula, das Kloster, preiße ich laut singend bei dem Haupt der Mönchsgemeinde"), see pp. 5-10. Indeed the image shows a man wearing Indo-Scythian dress, his arms raised in *añjali* in front of a person sitting cross-legged, who raises his right arm "in a greeting way", see pp. 2-4. Janert supposes that the scene as well as the inscription engraved in the rock-crystal stone have an esoteric meaning which he has tried to grasp. I do not intend to lay any stress on the pages that deal with ancient Indian charms and Atharva-Vedic texts (they contain, though, a great many bibliographical details which will be useful in another context), because the inscription itself has been shown by D. Schlingloff to consist of only 12 *akṣaras*, which ruins Janert's interpretation, see D. Schlingloff, review on *Forschungen und Fortschritte der Katalogisierung der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Marburger Kolloquium 1965*, in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 72. Band (1967), pp. 315-320. Schlingloff has had a microphotograph taken of the 7th, 8th and 9th *akṣaras*, which task has been executed by W. Giesenhagen, Berlin, in an admirable way (see *op. cit.*, plate opposite to p. 318). The microphoto shows clearly that the 8th *akṣara* in question does not exist. It is a scar on the surface of the intaglio. In consequence the inscription runs as follows: *the-ta-ku-la-vi-ha-ram-mi saṃ-gha-mu-dre* which Schlingloff translates "Seal of the Community in the Thetakula Monastery" (Gemeindesiegel im T.-Kloster).

Therefore the rock-crystal object of Berlin should be regarded as a seal-die and *not* as a charm which also tallies with the discovery of numerous monastic seal impressions and a few seal-dies of baked clay during the Kasia excavations in India, see J. Ph. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 29. The inscription itself, says Schlingloff, should be compared with the one on Whitehead's rock-crystal intaglio, viz. *vhumi-age-majhi-viharami-sagha-mudre*, or in Bailey's translation "The seal of the community in the monastery at Vhumi-aga-majhi (the middle of the earth's lap)", see D. Schlingloff, *op. cit.*, p. 320, and B. B. Whitehead, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

In this connection I should like to make a few remarks. When studying the enlarged photograph of Whitehead's seal-die (Plate VI of Janert's article) I could not distinguish the last four *akṣaras* at all. For the rest, Whitehead's transcription (if it was his transcription; it has not been stated *expressis verbis* in the text of his article!) contains an error. When Janert transcribes the legible portion of the inscription as follows: *vhumi-a-ga-ma-sta-ya* he is perfectly right to do so. The *akṣaras* *sta* and *ya* are sufficiently visible, see concerning *sta* G. Bühler, *Siebzehn Tafeln zur Indischen Palaeographie* (= *Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*), (Strassburg, 1896). Tafel I, number 39/III in fine.

If, therefore, the legible part of Whitehead's transcription is showing an error, one should beware of relying on it when comparing its illegible portion with the text of the Berlin intaglio. In this respect the Whitehead intaglio does not give any support concerning the question if the last word of the Berlin intaglio should be read either as *saṃ-gha-mu-khe*, i.e. "in the presence of the Head of the Community", or as *sa-gha-mu-dre*, i.e. "Seal of the Community". As the shape of the final character seemed to represent the only key to the solution of this problem, I consulted Sten Konow's

Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (Calcutta, 1929). Examples of the compound syllable *dre* are lacking. On the other hand Sten Konow's collection shows two examples of *dra*, viz. *mudrasatasa* (Plate XX, 10 opposite to p. 100) and *Idradevaputrena* (Plate XXX, 1 opposite to p. 157, 3d line). The second example shows the slightly curved type of *dra*, but the first one seems to represent the rather edgy shape that is peculiar to the final *akṣara* of the Berlin intaglio. If completing the last-mentioned character by means of the oblique stroke representing the vocal *e* one gets an *akṣara* which may be supposed to look similar to the one at the end of the Berlin intaglio's inscription. It would confirm Schlingloff's reading anyway.

In the second contribution to *Schrifte und Bilder* R. Sellheim reports on his identification of the Berlin manuscript, Staatsbibliothek, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Ms.or. oct. 3377, at present at Marburg. The manuscript appears to represent a copy of the second volume of Ibn al-Muwaffaq's grammar, the *Kitāb al-Mabāḥiṭ al-kāmiliya 'alā l-Muqaddima al-Juzūliya*. The copyist himself was no less a person than the famous traveller and geographer Yāqūt (1179-1229), which enhances the value of this manuscript a great deal. From the colophons it appears that Yāqūt finished the copy only a few months after the original text had been completed by Ibn al-Muwaffaq. On the 10th of October 1223 A. D. he collated his copy with the original text in the presence of the author, who in his own person added to it a certificate, *ijāza* (see facsimiles on Plates VII-XI). Sellheim discusses the purport of the biography of Yāqūt which al-Qifṭī, vizir at Aleppo, inserted in his biographical lexicon, the *Inbāḥ ar-ruwāḥ 'alā anbāḥ an-nuḥāḥ*, immediately after Yāqūt's death in 1229 A.D. (see facsimiles on Plates XII-XXX, of MS Topkapu Saray, Ahmat III 3064). Ibn Ḥallikān (†1282 A.D.), author of the *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, is shown to have borrowed his Yāqūt biography from al-Qifṭī (see pp. 66-72). A useful map is added giving a survey of the chronology and caravan-routes of Yāqūt's numerous travels.

In the third contribution H. Striedl makes it probable that the twenty-four illuminations of the seventeenth-century MS or.qu. 1680, Stiftung Preussischer Kultur Besitz, Tübinger Depot, are to be regarded as part of the manuscript itself as style and details point to the period of the Isfahan School's Successors. In illustration two plates are added, viz. Beshōtan convenes the daughters from all the empire's provinces on behalf of Shāh Bahman (Plate XXXI) and Shērō's fight with the Wolf (Plate XXXII).

Summarizing my impression I conclude that *Schrifte und Bilder* places at the reader's disposal a valuable collection of source material illustrated by no less than thirty-two plates showing facsimiles and objects of art. It will, undoubtedly, stimulate further studies in various fields of Orientalism.

Rijswijk (ZH)

P. H. L. Eggermont

Oscar Botto (ed.), *Storia delle letterature d'Oriente*. Milano, Casa Editrice Dr. Francesco Vallardi, Società Editrice Libreria, 1969. Vol. I, xxxix + 937 pp.; Vol. II, xxvi + 705 pp.; Vol. III, xxxi + 905 pp.; Vol. IV, xxx + 871 pp.

The publication of this comprehensive history of Oriental literatures in four big volumes has been achieved through the tireless efforts of Professor Botto who has been able to bring together an excellent team of scholars, both Italian and foreign. There is probably a work of similar scope in no other language. Interest in Oriental literature seems to be very great in Italy. The second volume of *Le Civiltà dell'Oriente* (Roma, 1957) deals entirely with Oriental literatures and contains some excellent articles. The *Storia delle*

Letterature d'Oriente is much more comprehensive. The articles dealing with the more important literatures are more detailed, but literatures of less importance have not been overlooked (for a detailed table of contents see *III*, vol XIII, p. 67).

For the readers of the *Indo-Iranian Journal* the most important volume is the third which deals with the literatures of India, Ceylon and South-East Asia. Almost half of this volume is taken up by Oscar Botto's history of the ancient literatures of India. It is an excellent and lucid survey in which no branch of Indian literature is omitted. Part I deals with Vedic literature, Part II with the epics and the Purāṇas, Part III with the Buddhist and Jain literatures, Part IV with classical literature and Part V with the technical literatures (philosophy, philology [grammar, lexicography, metrics, poetics], *trivarga* [law, politics, erotics] and sciences). An extensive bibliography (pp. 339-350) is added by the author. The second part of this volume comprises the medieval and modern Indian literatures (Indo-Aryan and Dravidian). The Indo-Aryan literatures (Bengalese and Oriya by John V. Boulton, Hindi by Ganesh Dutt Gaur, Assamese by Tarapada Mukherji, Marathi and Gujarati by Ian Matthew Paton Raeside) occupy pp. 351-555, the Dravidian literatures by John R. Marr pp. 557-626. The penetration of Indian culture into Central Asia is studied in Mario Bussagli's article on Indo-European literatures of Central Asia (pp. 627-645). The literatures of Laos, Cambodia and Thailand are described by Solange Thierry (pp. 647-735). D. E. Hettiaratchi writes on Singhalese literature (pp. 737-761) and Wimal Dissanayake on modern Sinhalese literature (pp. 737-761). The volume concludes with the history of Malaysian and Indonesian literatures by Andries Teeuw (pp. 771-860).

As to the other articles, mention must be made here of the article on Persian literature by Gianroberto Scarcia in volume II (pp. 243-452). This article contains a few pages on the ancient literatures of Iran (pp. 259-265). This is one of the few topics dealt with in greater detail in the second volume of the *Le Civiltà dell'Oriente* in which Antonino Pagliaro wrote on "Letterature dell'Iran Preislamico" (pp. 301-344). Volume II contains also articles on the literatures of Pakistan and Afghanistan (Pashto) by Alessandro Bausani (pp. 581-657, 659-676). Volume IV contains articles on Burmese literature by Hla Pe (pp. 243-301), Tibetan literature by the late Marcelle Lalou (pp. 303-338) and Mongolian literature by Charles R. Bawden (pp. 339-379).

In a collective volume of this nature no absolute uniformity can be expected. Most authors intersperse the text with excerpts and add a bibliography. Each volume contains an index of names of persons and literary works. The articles are illustrated by plates of which many are in colours.

These four splendid volumes will be of great interest to all those who read Italian. They will be very much indebted to Professor Botto for having undertaken this exacting and arduous task and to the publisher for the care given to the material aspects of these volumes.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Hermann Jacobi, *Kleine Schriften*, Herausgegeben von Bernhard Kölver, 2 Teile. (Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 4, 1 + 2). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1971. XII + 1156 pp. Ln. DM 98.—.

The *Kleine Schriften* of Hermann Jacobi (1850-1937) is the fourth volume of the publications of the Glasenapp-Stiftung. The systematic bibliography, compiled by the editor, shows the wide range of Jacobi's interests which extended to many branches of Indology (pp. VII-XXII). His first publication, an edition of chapters III-XII of the *Laghu-Jātaka*, was published in 1872. The last to appear during his life was his translation of Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikāvijñapti* (Stuttgart, 1932). During the span of sixty

years his activity resulted in a continuous flow of articles, monographs and editions and translations. It was of course not possible to reproduce all his articles, contributions to encyclopedias and reviews. The editor decided to omit the articles on poetics and aesthetics, which have recently been published by Hans Losch, and also editions and translations of Jain texts which appeared in periodicals. With one exception, Jacobi's review of Garbe's *Bhagavadgītā*, reviews have been omitted entirely. Also omitted are the many articles, contributed by Jacobi to Hasting's *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. However, almost all of Jacobi's articles, with the exception of the two fields mentioned above, have been included. They are systematically grouped together into the following sections: Sprachwissenschaft; Wortstudien; Metrik; Literaturgeschichte; Wissenschaftliche Literatur; Philosophie; Religion; Astronomie, Chronologie und Verwandtes; Inschriften; Verschiedenes; Nachrufe, Biographisches; Über Hermann Jacobi. Jacobi's important articles on Prakrit, metrics, the epic, philosophy, Jainism, astronomy and chronology are all to be found in these two volumes. It is certainly superfluous to enumerate their titles because they are well-known to the Indologist.

For the publications, published before 1920, the editor has based himself upon Kirfel's *Verzeichnis der bis zum 11. Februar 1920 erschienenen Schriften Hermann Jacobis*. Kirfel's *Verzeichnis*, which we have not been able to consult, seems to have omitted the second of Jacobi's two articles on the Mitanni gods in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*: "The Antiquity of Vedic culture" (*JRAS*, 1910, pp. 456-464).¹ One regrets that both articles are not reproduced here, not only on account of the importance of the problems discussed, but also because Oldenberg's reactions to Jacobi's theory of the Vedic character of the Mitanni gods ("On the Antiquity of Vedic culture", *JRAS*, 1909, pp. 1095-1100; "The Antiquity of Vedic culture", *JRAS*, 1910, pp. 846-850) have been included in Oldenberg's *Kleine Schriften* (pp. 802-812).

The editor, Bernhard Kölver, deserves high praise for his excellent choice. One must also be grateful to him for the systematic bibliography of Jacobi's publications² and the detailed indices (pp. 1133-1156).

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

E. A. S. Butterworth, *The Tree at the Navel of the Earth*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1970. xii + 239 pp with 31 plates. DM. 68,—.

1. In the concluding paragraph of this book the author writes: "This book has done no more than allude to the kingly, priestly and communal aspects of the Tree of Life and World Tree. Others have written on these matters with learning and insight. We have tried to say something about that inner nature of the Tree and its symbols of the centre of the earth and the light in the zenith which made it a figure of the source of life and the heart of the universe. It is a symbol with many aspects, and a number of forms, which could be used, like the Christian Cross, even by enemies as proper to the cause of either side ..." (p. 226f.).

In 1966 Butterworth published a book on *Some Traces of the Pre-Olympian World in Greek Literature and Myth*. In the book here under review he still follows more or less the same track, his aim being to demonstrate that we must turn to Sumer and Akkad to discover the "inner meaning" of the Tree of Life. In that culture area the

¹ Cf. L. Renou, *Bibliographie védique* (Paris, 1931), No. 128-10.

² "Some Ancient Jaina Works", *The Modern Review*, Dec. 1914, pp. 574-577; "Some aspects of Jainism", *Mahabodhi* 22, 1914, pp. 83-90; "The metaphysics and ethics of the Jainas", *Jaina Antiquary* 10, 1944, pp. 32-40 (see Karl H. Potter's *Bibliography of Indian Philosophies*, 1970, Nos. 4850 and 4931). On p. XI line 3 read: S. 67-78.

tree had, according to him, two circles of meaning, an outer circle of ritual and public myth, and an inner circle of esoteric meaning with a background of shamanist ecstasy and the practice of yoga (p. 200f.). The author's main concern is, accordingly, to reveal this "deeper meaning" (p. 80), the "true nature" (p. 172), the "ultimate significance" (p. 176), the "inner nature" (p. 226) of this cosmic symbol and of many myths connected with it. The book focusses on Ancient Greece and the world of the Eastern Semites, where an explanation for the spiritual background of Greek religious concepts is sought. Much use, however, is made of the doctrine of the Indian Kuṇḍalinī-Yoga, which in the author's opinion has its origin, more likely than not, in Western Asia (p. 197). The method of this book can be defined as "comparison" and "interpretation" (*Deutung*), and its character is, accordingly, entirely different from, e.g., *The Tree of Life* by E. O. James (Leiden, 1966), whose sub-title, *An Archaeological Study*, clearly indicates its divergent approach.

An analysis of myths and archaeological finds (particularly seals) from Mesopotamia, which the author interprets in the light of what is known about shamanist religions in Siberia and Indian Yoga, leads him to explain the mountain and the Tree of Life as having originally been symbols of forms of supernatural or ecstatic discipline and experience. In the course of time, however, they became symbols of kingship and, as a result of this, the ecstatic discipline dwindled away (p. 148). The epic of Gilgamesh is held to be a story of paradise lost: Gilgamesh, by taking upon himself the Sumerian kingship, abandons the ecstatic experience of immortality for the secular duties of the ruler. Quite apart from the question whether this interpretation is correct or not, the reader cannot help wondering if the general approach of this book does not reflect, in this rather negative appreciation of worldly power, something of the mental atmosphere of the Western world in 1970. Every period is necessarily sharp-sighted (and accordingly blinded) in its own way. Anyway, this book contains a wealth of interesting material and even more interesting conclusions. Since, however, the major part of the material discussed by Butterworth is taken from fields which are not covered by this journal and which lie outside the competence of this reviewer, the latter can only confine himself to some marginal notes on the author's method, which cannot fail sometimes to provoke serious objections.

2. In the last half century or so, after an age of unsystematic comparison of religions, scholars have come to realise that every religion should first and foremost be studied in the context of the particular culture of which it forms part. On the basis of such analyses there is, of course, ample scope for comparative studies. A return, however, to the wild guess-work which once brought "comparative religion" into disrepute would obviously threaten the scholarly character of these studies. It may be true that interpretation (*Deutung*) belongs to the very nature of the *Geisteswissenschaften* but this fact, far from being an excuse for subjective handling of the material, should rather be an earnest warning against the drawing of any ill-founded conclusion. The search for a deeper meaning, if not pursued with the utmost circumspection and a flawless method, runs the risk of being little more than a mere projection of the author's mental make-up on the ancient symbols. It is, indeed, the basic methodological weakness of the so-called *humaniora* that in this field the truth of a statement cannot be verified by an experiment and that many interpretations are inevitably arbitrary since they can be neither proved nor disproved.

No reader of this book, whatever his admiration for the vistas it opens up, can be blind to the fact that many interpretations are mere suggestions, which are insufficiently based on facts. It is readily admitted that without some intuitive insight and empathy no results of material importance can be attained. Far too often, however, the reader meets with phrases like the following (italics mine): "*It is clear* in the light of the symbolism of tree and serpent, that in these stories Garuḍa represents the flight of the

ist in Wirklichkeit eine Verbesserung der Verf. gegen beide Ausgaben. Nach der Anmerkung scheint es Thakurs Text gegen *paras tu* der Erstausgabe zu sein. Glatte Textverbesserungen werden aber im Text sonst nicht eingearbeitet wie *vacanena* (p. 19, Anm. 18) mit der Erstausgabe gegen *vacaneva* bei Thakur, obwohl in der Übersetzung die richtige Lesart zugrundegelegt wird. Oder *aśeṣāṇi* (p. 16, Anm. 10) gegen Thakurs *aśoṣāṇi*, wie die Verf. als Verbesserung vorschlägt, obwohl die Erstausgabe ohnedies die richtige Lesart hat.

Eine schlimme Textverschlechterung stellt *anyonyatvam* (79,20 gegen Ende) für *anyānyatvam* dar. Die Übersetzung erweist sich dann auch als sinnlos, was aber nicht bemerkt worden sein dürfte.

Die wenigen Beispiele auf Grund von Stichproben zeigen, daß diese Textbearbeitung uns gegenüber der Ausgabe von Thakur keinen Fortschritt beschert hat, im Gegenteil. Man fragt sich, warum sich Verf. in keiner Weise um die anderen textlichen Zeugen bemüht hat, die geholfen hätten, über einen bloßen Nachdruck hinaus einen wesentlich besseren Text herzustellen.³

Leider ist auch von der Übersetzung nicht viel Gutes zu sagen. Das kleine Werk ist ein typisches Beispiel für den stark formal geprägten und logische Klarheit intendierenden Stil Ratnakīrtis und ist ohne genauesten Nachvollzug des Gedankenganges und schärfste Beachtung des vorhandenen Textes vielfach nur schwer interpretierbar. Betrachtet man den Text nur als Anhaltspunkt um "comparative logic" treiben zu können, dann kann es, wie im vorliegenden Fall, geschehen, daß oft eine aus text-äußeren Quellen gespeiste Interpretation mit der möglichen sprachlichen nicht mehr harmoniert, sondern diese vielmehr so stark beeinflußt, daß man manchmal über die Sanskritkenntnisse staunen muß, die so etwas erlauben. Die Übersetzung bietet ein Kaleidoskop von Fehlern, die von problematischen Interpretationen des z.T. recht spröden Textes bis zu reinen Schlampigkeiten reichen. Besonders auffallend sind einige Fälle von glatten Vergewaltigungen des Textes, für die ich ein paar Beispiele gebe.

77,4f.: Der einleitende Vers ist ganz mißverstanden. Vor allem ist nicht *-rupiṇi*, sondern *iha ucyate* Prädikat — es liegt also nur ein Satz vor, nicht zwei —, und *vaidharmya-vati dṛṣṭānte* ist kein absoluter Lokativ. Ratnakīrti gibt hier keine Definition, sondern einen Śāstraśārīra-Vers.⁴ Ich würde als Übersetzung vorschlagen: "In der folgenden [Abhandlung] (*iha*) tragen wir die im [mit der Folge] gemeinsamen Fehlen bestehende, [auch] das gemeinsame Vorkommen implizierende Vyāpti des Grundes 'Seiendsein' in einem ungleichartigen Beispiel vor,"

77,7: ... *iti svabhāvahetuḥ* wird übersetzt mit "thus the reason is identity". Das sieht so aus, als wäre stillschweigend die Lesart der Erstausgabe (*svabhāvo hetuḥ*) übersetzt worden, obwohl sie nur in der Fußnote — und dort als *svabhavo* — erscheint.⁵

78,8f.: Wenn ich die Übersetzung des *iti*-Satzes richtig deute, verbindet sie ein Maskulinum mit einem Neutrum ("the reality [*sattvam*!] proved[?] lacking [*vinivarta-*

³ Hier sind vor allem die Werke Jñānaśrīmitras zu nennen. Ein beträchtlicher Anteil des Ratnakīrti-Textes ist durch entsprechenden Text bei Jñānaśrī gedeckt. Dazu kommt nun auch noch der 1968 endlich veröffentlichte Text des Nyāyabhāṣaṇam, das Verf. aber offenbar noch nicht zur Hand hatte.

⁴ Als solcher ist er der logische Spiegel des Verses p. 62, 4f., der die *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhir anvayātmikā* einleitet.

⁵ Zur Übersetzung von *svabhāvaḥ* durch "identity" möchte ich, auch wenn sie in der Fachliteratur seit langem geläufig ist, hier nur bemerken, daß das Wort "Identität, identity" im Zusammenhang der Logik der Dharmakīrti-Schule nur als Bezeichnung für eine Beziehung (relation) verwendet werden sollte und in diesem Sinn auch zu recht für die Übersetzung des Terminus *tādātmyam* gebraucht wird (p. 52: "existential identity"). Der *svabhāvaḥ* als logischer Grund (*hetuḥ*) ist aber keine Beziehung, sondern eine logische Eigenschaft.

māṇaḥ]), deutet das Absolutivum *nivartya* als Attribut im Lokativ zu *kṣaṇike* ("in the transient momentary being"), liest *viśrāmyati* statt *viśrāmayati* und kümmert sich überhaupt nicht um die Syntax. Der die Einleitung abschließende Satz (... *iti sattvahoḥ kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhir apy anavadyā*) bleibt unübersetzt.

79,17: *tathā ca śaṅkarasya saṃkṣipto 'yam abhiprāyaḥ* ("The preceding [!] is a conspectus of the opinion of Śaṅkara."). Die mit diesen Worten in Wirklichkeit beginnenden Stellen sollen belegen, was zur Behauptung des Pūrvaṇaḥ, der *hetuḥ* sei *svarūpāsiddhaḥ* an Argumenten der verschiedenen Naiyāyikas beigebracht werden kann. Dabei bezieht sich *saṃkṣipta-* auf das Verhältnis zum Zitat bei Jñānaśrī (p. 18, 20-24), was ein Vergleich der beiden Zitate klar macht.

79,26: *tad idaṃ mātā me vāndhyetyādivat svavacanavirodhād ayuktam*. Verf. übersetzt "... that such (an objection) is meaningless [Anm. 55: 'literally: 'I shall prove that to be useless', because it is a self-contradictory assertion." und ich kann für diese seltsame Interpretation des Beispiels keinen Grund finden.

81,17ff.: Ausgehend von der vorgefaßten Meinung der hier zitierte Vers müsse die These des Siddhāntin vertreten, weil er von Jñānaśrī stammt, läßt die Verfasserin den Uttarapaṇḍita des Werkes schon hier beginnen und übersetzt die einleitenden Worte (*ayam eva codyaprabandho 'smadgurubhiḥ saṃgrhītaḥ* = "Eben diesen Pūrvaṇaḥ hat mein Lehrer zusammengefaßt.") folgend: "Now we shall discuss that commentary communicated by our venerable teacher." Es hilft auch nichts, daß Ratnakīrti den Vers am Ende seines Werkes nochmals bringt mit der Einleitung: *tad ayaṃ pūrvaṇaḥ saṃkṣepaḥ*, denn das soll heißen "Thus we have explicated our revered teacher's dictum."

Die Folge ist, daß der Vers inhaltlich in der Übersetzung auf den Kopf gestellt wird. Das geht ganz einfach. Verf. findet in der ersten Verszeile dreimal *na*, obwohl das dritte *na* ein *tena* ist, und läßt ein *te* verschwinden. Auch der Rest des Verses bleibt unverständlich, weil er wohl nur in Kenntnis der logischen Struktur von Jñānaśrī Pūrvaṇaḥ interpretiert werden kann.

81,28f.: Auch der den Siddhānta zusammenfassende Vers Jñānaśrīs ist nicht verstanden, wobei der größte Fehler die Auflösung *bādhā-avidhi-* sein dürfte, wo eindeutig *bādhā-vidhi-* zu trennen ist (vgl. J 90,1: *vidhiniśedhavyavahāraḥ*).

Diese Proben mögen genügen. Hier ist viel Arbeit verschwendet worden, weil sie nicht weit genug in das Material hineingeführt hat, weder sprachlich noch sachlich. Es war sehr verdienstvoll, auch außerindologische Kreise auf diesen Text und seine Problemstellung aufmerksam gemacht zu haben, aber die Gelegenheit eine Deutung vorzulegen, die Ausgangspunkt für weitere Arbeiten sein könnte, wurde nicht genutzt. Es bleibt zu hoffen, daß die Verf. sich nicht entmutigen läßt, ihre Kenntnisse zu vertiefen, um die Erforschung dieser Literatur und philosophischen Problematik in Zukunft besser fördern zu können als es ihr mit der vorliegenden Arbeit gelungen sein dürfte.

Wien

Ernst Steinkellner

R. E. Emmerick, *The Sūtra of Golden Light. Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (= *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, vol. XXVII). London, Luzac & Company Ltd., 1970. xiii + 108 pp. £ 3.—

R. E. Emmerick's translation of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* is based upon Nobel's edition (Leipzig, 1937). Nobel used seven manuscripts, six of which are written on paper and one (G) on palmleaf. According to Nobel all six paper manuscripts derive from a common archetype. The text is much better preserved in the palmleaf MS. However, Nobel points out that of the 76 folios of this MS. 28 (1-7, 12-13, 16, 22,

27-34, 37, 41-43, 46-47, 49-50, 52) are missing. The writing has been obliterated in five of these folios (15, 18, 19, 23, 60) and subsequent retracing has resulted in wrong readings. The existing folios correspond to the following pages of Nobel's edition: 8-11 = 25.1-42.17; 14 = 52.1-56.12; 15+ (+ = writing obliterated and retraced) = 56.12-62.5; 17 = 65.10-67.13; 18+-19+ = 67.13-72.12; 20-21 = 72.12-77.9; 23+ = 79.11-81.10; 24-26 = 81.10-89.3; 35-36 = 106.14-113.3; 38-40 = 116.6-124.7; 44-45 = 130.16-138.10; 48 = 146.7-151.7; 51 = 158.10-162.6; 53-59 = 165.6-188.9; 60+ = 188.9-192.4; 61-72 = 192.4-251. Even MS. G is not free from corruptions: especially in the verses, it is often almost impossible to arrive at a satisfactory text. Edgerton has severely criticized Nobel for inconsistencies in his treatment of Buddhist Hybrid forms (cf. *JAOS*, 77, 1957, pp. 184-188). However, Edgerton's criticisms hardly ever affect the meaning of the text as established by Nobel. Wherever the Sanskrit text is hopelessly corrupt, the Tibetan and Chinese versions are of great assistance. Therefore Emmerick is right in maintaining that it is quite possible to render the text adequately into a modern European language even though the words 'verderbt', 'dunkel' and 'unsicher' and the like are alarmingly frequent in the apparatus of Nobel's edition.

In the critical apparatus of his edition of the Tibetan version (Leiden, 1944) Nobel has made a number of corrections in the Sanskrit text. They have been listed by Emmerick in his notes. Moreover, Emmerick himself suggests some emendations based upon the manuscripts, and also on the Tibetan and Khotanese versions. Although the text as established by Nobel and corrected by himself and Emmerick is infinitely superior to that of the two preceding editions,¹ there is still room for improvement quite apart from the inconsistencies pointed out by Edgerton. Emmerick has compared the Khotanese versions and an appendix lists the fragments previously identified and those which he himself has been able to identify. One would have expected the study of these Khotanese fragments to be helpful in suggesting emendations in the Sanskrit text, but in his preface Emmerick remarks that they require further study. Apparently it was his intention to translate the Sanskrit text first, before undertaking an exhaustive study of the Khotanese fragments.

Two chapters of the text have been separately studied by Nobel: chapter 7, cf. "Das Zaubervad der Göttin Sarasvatī" (*Festschrift Schubring*, Hamburg, 1951, pp. 123-239) and chapter 16, cf. *Ein alter medizinischer Sanskrit-Text und seine Deutung* (Supplement to *JAOS*, no. 11, 1951). Passages from chapters 6 and 12 have been translated by A. L. Basham, cf. Th. de Bary, ed., *Sources of Indian Tradition* (New York, 1958), pp. 181-185. This translation is not free from errors. To quote a single example: Nobel p. 74.10-75.1: *ahorātram grahanakṣatracandrasūryāś ca samyak vahiṣyanti* has been rendered as follows: "Planets and stars, moon and sun, will duly bring on the days and nights" (*op. cit.*, p. 182). Emmerick translates: "Day and night, planets, asterisms, moon and sun, will move properly" (p. 28). The intransitive meaning of *vah-* has been rendered correctly by the Tibetan translators: *gza dan rgya-skar dan zla-ba dan ñi-mia yan ñin-mts'an-du legs-par rgyu-bar 'gyur* (p. 56.11-12). Emmerick has carefully compared the Tibetan translation which is of great help even in places more obscure than the one just mentioned. His translation is excellent and only very few improvements can be suggested. The following notes point out a number of passages or words which can be rendered in a different way. In a few passages the

¹ The partial edition by Çarat Chandra Dās and Çarat Chandra Çāstri (Fasc. 1, Calcutta, 1898) and the edition by Bunyiu Nanjio and Hokei Idzumi (Kyoto, 1931) have been reviewed by Nobel (*OLZ*, 1933, Sp. 572-575). The recent edition of the text by S. Bagchi in the *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts* (no. 8, Darbhanga, 1967) is based upon the edition by Nanjio and Idzumi but a 15 page appendix, entitled *Errata and Variae Lectiones*, lists different readings from Nobel's edition!

text has to be corrected before a satisfactory sense can be obtained. All references are to page and line of Nobel's edition.

P. 3.9: *gaṇeśvara* – rather 'army chief' than 'chief servant'.

P. 5.4: *uttapta* – 'ripened'; 'purified' as on p. 159.5 (Emmerick, p. 67.7).

P. 24.11: *nistrāṇa* – 'without deliverance'; 'without protection', cf. p. 53.1, 4 (Emmerick, p. 19) and Nobel, *Wörterbuch Tibetisch-Deutsch-Sanskrit* (Leiden, 1950), s.v. *skyob-pa*.

P. 29.2: *karmāvaraṇa* – 'acts (and) hindrances'; 'obstruction due to past actions', cf. Edgerton, *BHSD* (= *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*), s.v.

P. 38.10: *nistrāṇa* – 'without salvation'; cf. above p. 24.11.

P. 38.15: *te sarvi sattva vyasanāgataduḥkhitāni* 'all those beings who are oppressed by the advent of trouble'; read *vyasanāgataduḥkhitā hi* with MSS. ABCDEF and Ś (= *Śikṣāsamuccaya*): 'all those beings who are oppressed and suffering'.

P. 44.5: *imāya pariṇāmanavarṇitāya* – 'by means of this (Confession), which is praised (as a cause of) ripening'; Edgerton, *BHSD*, p. 323b 'with this (sc. *deśanā*) which is praised as a cause of ripening'. In his article on *pariṇāmāna* Edgerton does not give the meaning 'transfer of merit', for which see L. de La Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux* (London, 1898), p. 108 n. 1; id., *JA*, 1903, II, p. 439sq.; Pelliot, *JA*, 1914, II, p. 135; Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (London, 1932), pp. 188-193; Nobel, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. *śno-ba*.

P. 48.7: *sugataśaśāṅkasuvimalavaktraṃ* – 'He has the face of one who has attained bliss, pure as the moon'; read *saumyaśaśāṅka* with MSS. ABCDE as against MS. F and Tib. *bde-gsegs*. Dharmakṣema translates: "He has a face pure as the moon which is full" (*Taishō*, no. 663, p. 339b2).

P. 48.9: *taruṇaruḥāṅga* – 'the members of a newly-born'; *taruṇaruḥa* can hardly mean 'newly-born', although Tib. has *gzon-nu btsas*, cf. Nobel's note, p. 48 n. 9.

P. 63.3: *uttamāṅga* – 'the supreme member'; 'the head' (also p. 170.4).

P. 65.2: *sarvabhayaprabandhacchedakāḥ* – 'destroys the continuity of all fears'; Nobel remarks: "unsicher, die Korrektur würde dem Tib. 'jigs-pa thams-cad-kyi rgyun gcog-pa entsprechen. ABDE *sarvabhayapratīṣamanāḥ*; C ° *bhayapratīṣrambhena*; F ° *bhayaprasastena*." Read *sarvabhayapratīprasrambhāṇāḥ* 'allays all fears', cf. Edgerton, *BHSD*, s.v. *pratīprasrambhāṇa* and Mahāvīyutpatti nos. 845 and 1383: *rgyun bcaḍ-pa* = *pratīprasrabdha*.

P. 72.17-73.4: *sādhu sādhu mahārājāṇaḥ ... yad yūyam ... svastyayanaṃ kariṣyatha* – "Bravo, bravo great kings! ... If you ... give welfare"; "Bravo, bravo, great kings! ... since you ... will give welfare", cf. 88.14-89.3: *sādhu sādhu satpuruṣa ... yat tvam ... samprakāśayitukāmaḥ* – 'Bravo, bravo good fellow! ... since you are desirous of making known' (Emmerick, p. 35).

P. 80.18-81.1: *mahārājagunānuśaṃsāni* – 'great blessings resulting from royal virtues'; read *mahārājā guṇā*, cf. 79.10 (ABDE *mahārājāḥ*), Tib. *rgyal-po chen-po dag yon-tan-gyi* ... Dharmakṣema 'O, you, four great kings' (p. 342b12).

P. 84.2-3: *kiyaṃmātraṃ kuśalaṃ pratyamśaṃ* – 'whatever was his share of merit'; 'only a small share of merit'.

P. 98.9: *etāḥ ca mahārājāṇaḥ sūtreṇradhārakā* – 'And these great kings will sustain those monks'; 'And, O great kings, they will sustain those monks', cf. Tib. *rgyal-po chen-po-dag ... mdo-sdei dbari-poi rgyal-po 'dzin-pa de-dag kyaṇ*.

P. 100.15: *yasya cāsti narapater viṣaye priyatā* – 'by that king of men in whose region there is affection (for it)'; 'by that king of men who has affection for his domain', cf. 77.12-13: *ātmanaś ca sarvaviṣayaṃ āraṇṣitukāmo bhavet*.

P. 120.9: *bodhayati* – 'understands'; 'explains'.

P. 138.4: *śastreṇa nāśa adharmas ca viṣaye tu bhaviṣyati* – Emmerick n. 62: "Instead of *tu* read *yatra* with MSS. ABCDE, supported by Khotanese *kāmiṇa*"; *yatra* is not supported by MS. G, Tib. and Dharmakṣema and does not give a good sense.

P. 140.2: *maram* – 'defilement', n. 63: "Read *malam* with MSS. BDE(F), supported by Khotanese *āchei* 'disease'"; Dharmakṣema 'epidemic' (p. 347c2) and Tib. 'chi' 'death' probably render *māri*, *māri* or *māra*.

P. 164.4: *purastāt* – 'formerly'; Tib. 'og-tu = *adhastāt*, cf. 164.5 *ūrdhvaṃ*.

P. 166.3: *jāmbūnadasuvarṇasya vimānāntārasaṃsthitāḥ* – 'residing in his orb of Jambudvīpa gold'; 'residing in a palace of Jāmbūnada gold'.

P. 180.13-14: *tenaivaṃrūpena naimittikena dhātukaśālyena pariprṣṭena* – 'as soon as ... had inquired about such skill in the elements', n. 91: "Read *mātrakeṇa* (cf. MS. G) for *naimittikena* with Nobel, Tib. p. 141 n. 119"; read *tanmātrakeṇa* (Tib. *de tsam-ñig*) – 'having inquired about so little skill in the elements'.

P. 185.6: *tatrādrākṣid vṛkṣād ardhakāyena devatāṃ niṣkramantīm* – 'He saw there a goddess, with half a body, coming out of a tree'; 'He saw there a goddess coming out of a tree with half her body only', cf. Tib. *lus-phyed tsam* 'only half the body'.

P. 196.11: *gaṇaka* – 'treasurer'; 'astrologer'.

P. 206.3: *āvarjitamanasas* – 'with humble heart'; 'with converted minds', cf. Edgerton, *BHSD*, s.v. *āvarjayati*.

P. 212.1-2: *tayor vikṣepaṃ cakāra* – 'he reproached those two'; cf. Edgerton, *BHSD*, s.v. *vikṣepa*; here probably 'he distracted them'.

P. 216.7: *bhrātṛka* – 'mother'; 'brother'.

P. 233.8: *tiṣṭhanti te putra manāpāḥ* – 'Your sons are delightful'; 'Your charming sons are alive', cf. Tib. *mchis* 'exist' and Dharmakṣema 'your sons still exist' (p. 356a27).

P. 249.9: *trātāṃ* – 'delivered'; 'protected'.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Esther A. Solomon, *Avidyā - A Problem of Truth and Reality* (= *Theses Publication Series*, 8). Ahmedabad, Gujarat University, 1969. XXVII + 572 pp.

Die Leistung des vorliegenden Buchs besteht vor allem darin, daß fast jedes indische System unter dem zentralen Begriff des Nichtwissens beleuchtet wird und so eine Art Geschichte der indischen Philosophie entstand. An Kritik hingegen könnte vorgebracht werden: Die 1949-1953 erarbeitete (und erst 1969 publizierte) Dissertation hatte schon damals manche wichtige europäische Abhandlung vernachlässigt; inzwischen sind jedoch wichtige Arbeiten über Teilprobleme, denen E. Solomon wie etwas Neuem gegenübertritt, erschienen. Außerdem ist das Buch, wenn wir nicht von obiger Kennzeichnung als einer Art Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, sondern vom Titel selbst ausgehen, unnötig breit (typische Dissertation, wie sie in manchen Ländern gefordert wird). Freilich muß dieser letzte Punkt im Falle E. Solomons nicht zur Kritik reichen. Entgegen dem normalen Brauch verarbeitet sie nämlich hauptsächlich keine Sekundärliteratur, sondern die Quellen selbst, und zwar der verschiedensten Richtungen, so daß man vor dieser Vielseitigkeit nur Respekt zeigen kann. Wiederholungen gleicher Gedanken in verschiedenen Schulen und damit etwas ermüdende Breite, besonders gegen Schluß des Buches, sind damit nicht ausgeschlossen. Auch die Nichtbeachtung mancher Sekundärliteratur ist bei dem gekonnten Umgang mit den Quellen im allgemeinen kein Nachteil, sondern eigentlich nur störend für den Leser, der manche Ergebnisse schon anderweitig (insbesondere durch die Arbeiten von E. Frauwallner) kennt. Bei Zeitmangel und Materialfülle ist aber wohl die Entscheidung Solomons für die Primärquellen immer vorzuziehen.

Was den Inhalt betrifft, gliedert sich das Buch in *Zwei Teile*: I: "Avidyā as a philosophical concept", II: "Avidyā - logical and epistemological".

Im ersten Teil werden in 23 Kapiteln (vom Veda bis Madhusūdana Sarasvatī) die Begriffe *avidyā* und *māyā* untersucht: für die ältere Zeit bemüht sich die Verfasserin um eine Bestimmung des Wortgebrauchs, bei den philosophischen Systemen notiert sie die Definitionen dieser Begriffe und beschreibt ihre Position in den verschiedenen Erlösungswegen und Kosmologien. Etwas schwach sind die historischen Einleitungen zu den verschiedenen buddhistischen Schulen (pp. 59, 125, 135, 139): unsere Kenntnisse sind heute doch wohl besser. Dies betrifft aber nicht die Ausführungen über Avidyā selbst. Beachtenswert ist ferner, daß für die Verfasserin der buddhistische *Vijñānavāda* identisch ist mit dem *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*!

Zu den Ausführungen über Śāṅkara wäre folgendes zu sagen: Śāṅkara kennt (zumindest im *Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya*) keine zwei Kräfte der Avidyā, eine *āvaraṇa*- und *vikṣepaśakti*. E. Solomon weiß dann auch prompt – im Gegensatz zu den meisten andern Behauptungen – dafür keine Stellen beizubringen (pp. 147 und 235). Was sie dafür an indirekten Belegen bringt, ist ein Beweis für zwei Arten von Avidyā, die von Śāṅkara systematisch noch nicht richtig verarbeitet sind (s. Vetter, "Zur Bedeutung des Illusionismus bei Śāṅkara", *WZKSÖ*, XII-XIII, 1968, p. 407ff.). Vor allem nach den seit 1950 erschienenen Aufsätzen von P. Hacker ist gegen die im übrigen sachkundige Darstellung bei E. Solomon doch einzubringen: Śāṅkara (hauptsächlich Kommentarverfasser und auf frühere Kommentare sich stützend!) muß an vielen Stellen mehr philologisch-historisch als systematisch untersucht werden.

Im zweiten Teil des Buches behandelt die Verfasserin das erkenntnistheoretische Nichtwissen, den Irrtum. Im Vergleich etwa zu L. Schmithausens Studie zur Entwicklung der indischen Irrtumslehre in *Maṇḍanamiśra's Vibhramavivekaḥ* (Wien, 1965), die sie natürlich nicht kennt, bemüht sie sich zwar bei weitem nicht so um eine Beschreibung der historischen Abhängigkeiten und Entwicklungen, bringt aber Material, das über Maṇḍanamiśra hinausgeht (vor allem die mittelalterlichen Vedāntaschulen), und gibt damit eine wertvolle Ergänzung zu Schmithausens Buch.

Zusammenfassend: Wenn auch Kritik im Detail – wie bei den meisten Büchern, die eine ganze Tradition behandeln – möglich ist, so verdient die Gesamtleistung doch alle Anerkennung. Und die klare Art der Darstellung macht das Buch auch zu einer empfehlenswerten Einleitung in die indische Philosophie.

Utrecht

T. Vetter

Erich Frauwallner, *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karma-mīmāṃsā* (= *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsber.*, 259. Band 2. Abh. = *Veröff. der Komm. f. Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens*, Heft 6). Wien, Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1968. 114 pp. ÖS 148,—.

Professor Frauwallner's latest publication contains text and translation of two important texts for the study of the theory of cognition in early Mīmāṃsā: 1. Śābarasvāmin's *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* I, 1, 1-5; Dignāga's polemic against the Mīmāṃsā in the first and second chapter of his *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. For his edition of the text of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* Frauwallner has made use of three editions, four South Indian manuscripts and commentaries on the bhāṣya. His edition corrects many wrong readings in the existing editions and shows clearly the desirability of a new edition of the entire bhāṣya.

Frauwallner mentions Jacobi's translation of a small portion of the text and the complete translations by Otto Strauss and Ganganatha Jha. No mention is made of Madeleine Biardeau's *Théorie de la connaissance et philosophie de la parole dans le brahmanisme classique* (Paris-La Haye, 1964) in which many parts of this section of the bhāṣya are translated and discussed. Needless to say Frauwallner's translation is excellent. It is very convenient to have text and translation on opposite pages. It would be useful to have other important Indian philosophical texts edited and translated in the same way. Would it not be possible to publish a series of *Fontes philosophiae indicae*?

The second part of this publication contains Dignāga's polemic against the Mīmāṃsā in *Pramāṇasamuccaya* I, 36-47 and II, 47-52. The text of both Tibetan translations is edited with the help of the editions of Derge, Narthang and Peking. As is well known, both translations are very unsatisfactory. Without an excellent knowledge of Indian philosophy it would be impossible to translate adequately the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. It is very instructive to compare Frauwallner's translation of *Pramāṇasamuccaya* I, 36-47 with Hattori's translation which was published at the same time: *Dignāga, On Perception* (= *H.O.S.*, vol. 47) (Cambridge, Mass.). There are only minor differences between the two translations. Hattori adds many words, in square brackets, whereas very few words have been added by Frauwallner. Hattori provides a detailed commentary (*op. cit.*, pp. 161-172) which is extremely valuable. It is a good thing to have two such excellent translations of this text. Frauwallner's translation of Dignāga's polemic is followed by a study of his sources (pp. 94-103), in which he examines the theories of the Vṛttikāra quoted by Dignāga. According to Frauwallner this Vṛttikāra was Bhavadāsa whose name is mentioned by Pārthasārathimīśra and Sucaritamīśra. On pp. 104-106 Frauwallner lists the quotations from the Vṛttikāra in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and the quotations from Bhavadāsa in Sanskrit texts (see also Ślokaṅkārtika I, 63 quoted by Hattori, *op. cit.*, p. 166). According to him Bhavadāsa probably lived in the first half of the fifth century. Jinendrabuddhi's ṭīkā mentions a Bhāṣyakāra (bśad-'grel byed-pa). Hattori (*op. cit.*, p. 167) thinks this Bhāṣyakāra is identical with Śabarasyāmin but from Frauwallner's remarks it is obvious that he must be a different person.

In the last part of his work Frauwallner studies the doctrine of the Vṛttikāra mentioned by Śābara (pp. 107-113). According to him the doctrine of *svataḥprāmāṇya* was first proposed by the Vṛttikāra. He is also responsible for the long passage on the existence of the soul in the commentary on sūtra 5. With other scholars (cf. Hattori, *op. cit.*, p. 166) Frauwallner believes that Upaśarṣa is the Vṛttikāra. Finally Frauwallner supposes that Upaśarṣa's commentary is based upon the commentary by Bhavadāsa.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Corrado Pensa, *L'Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛtti di Ārya-Vimuktisena, primo abhisamaya. Testo e note critiche* (= *Serie Orientale Roma*, XXXVII). Rome, Istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo Oriente, 1967. xv + 135 pp. 4.500 lire.

This is a welcome and careful edition of approximately one half of a unique Nepalese manuscript of ca 1,000 A.D. The manuscript is rather corrupt, and the editor has regularly compared it with the Tibetan translation of the *vṛtti* and the Sanskrit text of the first *abhisamaya* of the revised version of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* as edited by N. Dutt in 1934. The result of his critical labours is a satisfactory text throughout.

Vimuktisena (the *Ārya* serves to distinguish him from the more shadowy *Bhadanta*

V.) comments on both the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (= *AA*) and the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* (= *P*) side by side. As for the first, it now becomes clear that Vimuktisena was Haribhadra's principal source and that the *Āloka* took from him much more than is indicated by the few occasions when Vimuktisena is actually quoted, and C. Pensa has everywhere noted numerous passages which have been absorbed by Haribhadra. Nevertheless the doctrine is, as one would have expected, here in a more undeveloped state, and, to give just one example, the elaborations of Haribhadra on the divisions of *pratipattiyāmbanam* (H 78-9) are here absent (pp. 78-9), as they are also in the *Ta chih tu lun*, and therefore constitute a late scholastic elaboration.

As regards *P*, Vimuktisena has set himself three tasks: (1) He has coordinated the text of *P* not only with the divisions given in the *AA* itself, but with the hundreds of later subdivisions which must have developed at some time, in the oral tradition and which agree in all details, except for a few trifling exceptions (e.g. at I, 2, 5), with the headings and sub-headings of the Nepalese manuscript of *P*. (2) He indicates the passage of *P* which corresponds to some item in *AA* by usually quoting its beginning and then summing up the remainder of its contents. (3) He picks out a number of individual terms and explains them. The commentary must have been addressed to an audience fairly familiar with brahminical Sanskrit and all the terms commented upon have some Buddhist flavour. In the present state of our knowledge these comments are the most valuable part of the work and teach us most about the thinking of the *Prajñāpāramitā*. Vimuktisena goes here often beyond Haribhadra, because he deals with words which occur in *P*, but not in the shorter *Aṣṭa* which Haribhadra had in view.

Some of the lesser technical terms are treated at quite inordinate length and it is interesting that some of these uncalled-for excursions lead to the Yogācāra tradition. At the end of a description of *śaṣṭyaṅgopetaḥ svāro*, two pages long (pp. 113-5), Asaṅga is expressly quoted as the source. Two pages on the five *mithyājīva* (pp. 23-6)² are dragged in because, though absent in both *P* and *AA*, the explanation of the eight *mahāpuruṣavīṭarkā* (of *P* 21) contains the words *alpeccha* (cf. p. 23 1.19) and *saṃtuṣṭa* (cf. p. 25 1.19)³ and corresponds to the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and so does the explanation of the four *dharmoddānāni* (p. 21), mentioned not in *P*, but in *AA* I 1, e 20. These observations do, as C. Pensa (p. XIV n. 2) points out, bode ill for A. Wayman's attempt to completely dissociate Asaṅga from the *AA*.

There are a few very minor blemishes. Misprints have slipped through at 26,6; 40,21; 52,14; 60,25; 74,9; 77,8; 80,1 and 10; 90,11; 93,2; 106,14; 108,16; 112,7; 126,16 and 18. 126,15-18 should have been printed as verse. It is not quite correct to say at p. 70 n. 2 that "H ha *viññānam*", when in fact one of two manuscripts, C, has the more probable *viññāpanam*. And in this age of microfilms, the quotations from later parts of *P* should have been made from one of the many Nepalese manuscripts of that text, and not from the Tibetan translation in the *Tanjur*. The long quotation on pp. 12-13, for instance, is from folio 476a-b of the Cambridge Ms Add 1628 and fits as V 6e, 1-3 into the scheme of the *AA*.

We must hope that Dr. Pensa will soon bring out the second volume of Vimuktisena's work, which is such an important link in the unfolding of the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature in India.

Edward Conze

¹ See my *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (1960), p. 111. What I say there about Vimuktisena's *vṛtti* is only approximately true, based as it was on a few hasty glimpses of the Rome manuscript.

² These are not just *falsità*, as C. Pensa says, but a monk's wrong ways of getting a living.

³ In the lay-out of Pensa's text this far-fetched connection is not made very clear.