Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner.
Aus Anlass seines 70. Geburtstages herausgegeben von G. Oberhammer

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 darśanas 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 Barello 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 Pratityasamutpāda-Formel!” Franz Bernhard examines two different interpretations of the Pratityasamutpāda in Prajñāvarman’s commentary on Udrānavarga XXIX. 24, of which the first enumerates the members 1-7 and the second, ascribed to Kātyāyana-uputra, the members 8 and 10 (pp. 53-63). According to the author the formula of Pratityasamutpāda is a combination of two formulas, one beginning with avidyā and the other with tṛṣṇā. George Chemparathy examines and translates “Two early Buddhist refutations of the existence of Īśvara as the creator of the universe” (pp. 85-100) :1. Yogācarabhūmi (ed. V. Bhatacharya), pp. 144-145; 2. Viṣṇukartrtvāntaṅkarana. The second text was published in Sanskrit and Tibetan by F. W. Thomas (JRAS, 1903, pp. 345-349) and by Stcherbatsky (“Buddhistik filosof o edinobozhdii, Zapiski Vost. Otd. Imp. Russk. Arx. Obšč., XVI, 1906, pp. 058-074). Stcherbatsky has also added a translation. The full title is Viṣṇukartrtvāntaṅkārtr Viṣṇukartrtvāntaṅkārtrkaraṇaṃ. According to Chemparathy the work was probably written by the Tantric master Nāgājuna who, in the view of A. Barello 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 Nāgājuna, the author of the Mādhyaṃkakārikā. It would be more prudent to state that the work is ascribed to Nāgājuna 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 (asaiddha) or that which is both existent and non-existent (siddhaśaiddha). Stcherbatsky wrongly changes the text and reads aṭha siddhaṃ aṣiddhaṃ karoti instead of aṭha siddhaśaiddhaṃ 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 the Bhāvaviveka, Sthiramati and Dharmapāla (pp. 193-203). He arrives at the following dates: Bhaṇaviveka 500-570, Sthiramati 510-570, Dharmapāla 530-561.1 Kajiyama points out that the Kāśyapaparivartaṭṭikā 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 Früh-buddhismus” Kumoi Shozen examines the meaning of amata in canonical texts and the ideas of sa-upādīsesa- and an-upādīsesa-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 Abhisamayālaṃkāra-vṛtti 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 Kṣāṇikatvāññānam bei Dharmakīrti” Ernst Steinkellner studies the relation between the so-called vināśītvāññāna and the satttvāññāna in the work of Dharmakīrti (pp. 361-377). The total structure of the satttvāññāna is to be found for the first time in the Pramāṇaviniścaya.

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, Nāma-rūpa, 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 Pāṇḍita Jala, author of the Yogābhaṣya-vivarana (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 Sarvavarāṇa-balāśaṅgalā and adds notes on the sources of quotations in the text: “Some notes on the Sarvavarāṇa-balāśaṅgalā” (pp. 243-251). To the bibliography one must add E. Abegg, “Die Lehre vom Ṣhūṭa im Sarvavarāṇa-balāśaṅgalā” (Festschrift Windisch, Leipzig, 1914, pp 188-195) and Uno Atsushi’s recently published translation of chapter III (Sekai no meicho, vol. 1, 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 Parāśaraḥasthaṭṭa” Gerhard Oberhammer studies the theories of Ṛṣṭīti and upādhyā in Parāśaraḥasthaṭṭa’s Tattvārāṇa (pp. 253-273). Parāśarabhāṣṭhaṭṭa is one of the most important Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophers before Venkataṭhā and lived in the second half of the eleventh century. His main work, the Tattvārāṇa, is lost but passages of it are quoted by Venkataṭhā. His theory of inference was influenced by the works of Udayana and itself had an influence on Meghaṭhāṭa’s doctrine of Ṛṣṭīti. 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 Śūtrabhāṣya by J. A. B. van Buiten en 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 Buiten, 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-erkennnis” Lambert Schmithausen studies a passage of Prakāṣātman’s Vivarana 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 Prakāṣātman himself. Tilman Vetter examines the problem of the authorship of the bhāṣya on Gauḍapāda’s Māṇḍūkya-Kārikā (GBK), 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 Brahmasūtrabhāṣya. 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 Bhattacharya examines the section of the Tatvacintāmaṇidīhitī on sāmānyalakṣaṇā in “Raghunātha Śiromāṇi 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 (II, 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. Brahmamandya Gupta studies briefly the “Story of the evolution of the concept of negation” (pp. 115-118). Håttori Masaaki examines the “Two types of non-qualificative perception” in the Prakāśapādabhāṣya (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 astitvam jīheyatvam abhidheeyatvam and its implications for the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system: “Astitva jīheyatvam abhidheeyatvam” (pp. 275-280). The author concludes that “astitva, jīheyatva and abhidheeyatva 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 Nyāyavārttika” Anantaalal Thakur shows the help which can be derived from a manuscript of the Nyāyavārttika from the Jaisalmir Jain Bhaṭṭācāra for the establishment of a better text (pp. 379-387). The author announces a new edition of the Bhāṣya, Vārttika, Tātparyatīkā and Parāśuddhi (the Nyāyacaturgranthiḥkā) in the Mithila Institute Ancient Text Series on the basis of manuscripts copied by the same scribe in or around Saṅvat 1501.

Only one article deals exclusively with Yoga: V. M. Bedekar’s “Yoga in the Mokṣadharma-parvan of the Mahābhārata” (pp. 43-52). The author refers to Frawullner’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 Uttarārāmacarita: “Einige Bemerkungen über Śabdabrahman und Vivarta bei Bhavabhūti” (pp. 215-219). For Bhavabhūti śabdabrahman is “das unentfaltete Wortmaterial”, vivarta “die 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 Jambubhaya in his “A comparative study of the Upādādīśiddhiṭkā and the Hettubinḍuṭkā” (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 Mūḍgalopaniṣad which contains a Viśuṣite 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 Chāndogyopaniṣad VI: “Chandogyopaniṣad VI. Ein erneuter Versuch” (pp. 149-159). Hamm refers to recent publications by Frawullner, Edgerton and
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. Sellsheim, “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 Şāhin (The miniatures in a manuscript of the Jewish-Persian Book of Ardashīr by Shāhīn), Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Tübingen 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

The solution of the problem depends on the interpretation of the Kharoṣṭhi inscription of the Berlin intaglio. Janert counts 13 syllables, the 8th aksara 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-raṃ <no>-mi sam-gha-mu-khe which he translates “In the presence of the Head of the Community I laud the Monastery called Thetakula” (“Thetakula, das Kloster, preisst 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 aṣṭāli 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 aksaras, 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 aksaras, which task has been executed by W. Giesen, Berlin, an admirable way (see op. cit., plate opposite to p. 318). The microphoto shows clearly that the 8th aksara 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 sam-gha-mu-dre which Schlingloff translates “Seal of the Community in the Thetakula Monastery” (Gemeindeiegel 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. vhum-ace-majhi-viharami-sagha-mudre, or in Bailey’s translation “The seal of the community in the monastery at Vhum-ace-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 aksaras 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: vh-ri-ace-ma-ma-sta-ya he is perfectly right to do so. The aksaras 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 sam-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. *mudrasatasā* (Plate XX, 10 opposite to p. 100) and *Idrādevaputrena* (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 *aṅsara* of the Berlin intaglio. If completing the last-mentioned character by means of the oblique stroke representing the vocal /e/ one gets an *aṅsara* 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-Mabhūṭ al-kāmilīya ʿalā l-Muqaddima al-Juzūlīya*. 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, *īfāza* (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 *Inbāb ar-ruwāḥ ʿalā anbāḥ an-nuḥāḥ*, immediately after Yāqūt's death in 1229 A.D. (see facsimiles on Plates XII-XXX, of MS Topkapı 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 Kulturbesitz, 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


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 Purânas, 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 Disanayake 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 Scarlia 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


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 Trīṃśikāvījñāpī (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 Bhagavadgîtâ, 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 Köver, 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


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.
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 Gāruḍa represents the flight of the

Eine schlimme Textverschlechterung stellt anyonyatvam (79,20 gegen Ende) für anyādyatvam 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 beschenkt 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.8


77,7: ... iti svabhāvatetuh wird übersetzt mit ”thus the reason is identity”. Das sieht so aus, als wäre stillschweigend die Lesart der Erstausgabe (svabhāvo hetuh) übersetzt worden, obwohl sie nur in der Fußnote — und dort als svabhavo — erscheint.4

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

---


4 Als solcher ist er der logische Spiegel des Verses p. 62, 4f., der die Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhī anvayōmrīkā einleitet.

5 Zur Übersetzung von svabhāva 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 Dharmakirti-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 svabhāva als logischer Grund (hetuh) ist aber keine Beziehung, sondern eine logische Eigenschaft.
mānaḥ")", deutet das Absolutivum nivartya als Attribut im Lokativ zu kṣaṇike ("in the transient momentary being"), liest viśrāmyati statt viśrāmayati und kümmer sich überhaupt nicht um die Syntax. Der die Einleitung abschließende Satz (... iti sattvahetoh kṣaṇabhāṅgasiḍīḍhir āpy anavadyā) bleibt unüberetzt.

79,17: tathā ca saṃkṣaṇaṃ saṃkṣipta' yam abhiprāyaḥ ("The preceding (!) is a con- spectus of the Saṃkṣara."). Mit diesen Worten in Wirklichkeit beginnenden Stellen sollen belegen, was zur Behauptung des Pūrva-paṇḍita, der heuth sei svārūpāsīddhaḥ an Argumenten der verschiedensten 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 idam māta me svātvyādīvat svavacaṇāvirodhād ayuktam. Verf. über- setzt "... 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 Utpallapiṇḍa des Werkes schon hier beginnen und übersetzt die einleitenden Worte (ayam eva codyaprapadho 'smadgurubhiḥ saṃgrihitah = "Eben diesen Pūrva-paṇḍita hat mein Lehrer zusammengefaßt.") folgend: "Now we shall discuss that commentary communicated by our venerable teacher." Es hilft auch nichts, daß Ratnakirti den Vers am Ende seines Werkes nochmals bringt mit der Einleitung: tad ayam pūrva-paṇḍitāsām- kṣepah, denn das soll heißen "Thus we have explained our revered teacher’s dictum."


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 außerindische Kreise auf diesen Text und seine Problematik aufmerksam gemacht zu haben, aber die Gelegenheit eine Deutung vorzulegen, die Ausgangspunkt für weitere Arbeiten sein könnte, wurde nicht genützt. 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’s translation of the Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra 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 'verdwebt', '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, 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 Zauberbad der Göttin Sarasvati" (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 grahamākṣatracandrāsuryāḥ ca samyaika vaṇiyantī 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 vak- has been rendered correctly by the Tibetan translators: gza dan rgya-skar dan zla-ba dan rī-ma yah rī-ma tsa 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 Ćāstī (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 Buddha 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: *ganēvra* — rather ‘army chief’ than ‘chief servant’.

P. 5.4: *uttapta* — ‘ripened’; ‘purified’ as on p. 159.5 (Emmerick, p. 67.7).


P. 38.10: *nītrāṇa* — ‘without salvation’; cf. above p. 24.11.

P. 38.15: *te sarvi sattra vyasanāgatadukhāhitāni* ‘all those beings who are oppressed by the advent of trouble’; read *vyasanāgatadukhāhitā hi* with MSS. ABCDEF and S (= *Śikṣāsamuccaya*): ‘all those beings who are oppressed and suffering’.

P. 44.5: *imāya pariṇāmanavarṇistiya* — ‘by means of this (Confession), which is praised (as a cause of) ripening’; Edgerton, *BHSĐ*, p. 323b ‘with this (sc. desāna) which is praised as a cause of ripening’.


P. 48.7: *sugataśāsāṅkhasuvimālāvaktām* — ‘He has the face of one who has attained bliss, pure as the moon’; read *saumyasyāsāṅka* with MSS. ABCDE as against MS. F and Tib. *bde-gšegs*. Dharmakṣema translates: ‘He has a face pure as the moon which is full’ (*Tūśhō*, no. 663, p. 339b2).


P. 63.3: *uttamāṅsa* — ‘the supreme member’; ‘the head’ (also p. 170.4).


P. 72.17-73.4: *sādhu sādhu mahārājānaḥ ... yad yāyam ... svastayaṇāṃ karisyatāḥ — “Bravo, brave great kings! ... If you ... give welfare”; “Bravo, brave, great kings! ... since you ... will give welfare”, cf. 88.14-89.3: *sādhu sādhu satipuruṣaḥ ... yat tvam ... sanprakāśayītukāmāḥ — Bravo, brave good fellow! ... since you are desirous of making known” (Emmerick, p. 35).

P. 80.18-81.1: *mahārājaguhānusamsāni* — ‘great blessings resulting from royal virtues’; read *mahārājā gunāḥ*, cf. 79.10 (ABDE *mahārājāḥ*), Tib. *rgyal-po chen-po dag yon-tun-gyi* ... Dharmakṣema ‘O, you, four great kings’ (p. 342b12).

P. 84.2-3: *kinyaṃdātraṃ kuśalaṃ pratyāsmaṃ — ‘whatever was his share of merit’; ‘only a small share of merit’.

P. 98.9: *etāḥ ca mahārājānaḥ sūtrendradhārakā — ‘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-idei dbah-poi rgyal-po ’dzin-pa de-dag kyang*.

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: *ātmanas ca sarvaviṣaye ārakṣitukāmo bhavet*.

P. 120.9: *bdhayati* — ‘understands’; ‘explains’.

P. 138.4: *śastaṃ naśa adharmas ca viṣaye tu bhavisyati — Emmerick n. 62: “Instead of *tu* read *yatā* with MSS. ABCDE, supported by Khotanese *kāmihā*”; *yatā* 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 *ächei* ‘disease’”; Dharmakṣema ‘epidemic’ (p. 347c2) and Tib. ‘chi ‘death’ probably render *māri, māri* or *māra.*

P. 164.4: *purastā* – ‘formerly’; Tib. ‘og-*tu = adhastāt,’ cf. 164.5 *urdhvaṃ.*

P. 166.3: *jāmbūnādasuvarṇapya vimānāntarasamasthītaḥ* – ‘residing in his orb of Jambudvīpa gold’; ‘residing in a palace of Jámbūnada gold’.

P. 180.13-14: *tenaivaṇrūpena naimittikena dhātukauṣṭalyena paripṛṣṭena* – ‘as soon as had inquired about such skill in the elements’, n. 91: “Read *mātrakṣaṇa* (cf. MS. G) for *naimittikena* with Nobel, Tib. p. 141 n. 119”; read *samātrakṣaṇa* (Tib. *de tsam-*tig) – ‘having inquired about so little skill in the elements’.

P. 185.6: *tatrādṛkṣīd vyakṣād ardhakāyena devatāṃ niṣkrāmantim* – ‘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: *gajasaka* – ‘treasurer’; ‘astrologer’.


P. 212.1-2: *tayor viśeṣam eka kāra – he reproached those two*; cf. Edgerton, *BHSD,* s.v. *viṣeṣa*; here probably ‘he distracted them’.

P. 216.7: *bhṛatyka* – ‘mother’; ‘brother’.

P. 233.8: *tiṣṭhante utra manopāh* – ‘Your sons are delightful’; ‘Your charming sons are alive’, cf. Tib. *mchis* ‘exist’ and Dharmakṣema ‘your sons still exist’ (p.356a27).

P. 249.9: *trātām* – ‘delivered’; ‘protected’.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong


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 die Verfasserin der buddhistische Vijñānavāda identisch ist mit dem Lankāvatārasūtra!


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 Maṇḍanaṁśīra's Viṃbramavivekaḥ (Wien, 1965), die sie natürlich nicht kennt, bemüht sie sich selbst bei weitem nicht so um eine Beschreibung der historischen Abhängigkeiten und Entwicklungen, bringt aber Material, das über Maṇḍanaṁśīra 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


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. Śabaravāmin's Mīmāṃsābhāṣya I, 1, 1-5; Dignāga's polemic against the Mīmāṃsā in the first and second chapter of his Pratītyasaṃuccaya. 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 Māṃsāka 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 Pārthasārathimireśa and Sucaritamireśa. On pp. 104-106 Frauwallner lists the quotations from the Vṛttikāra in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and the quotations from Bhavadāsa in Sanskrit texts (see also Slokavārtika 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 tīkā mentions a Bhāṣyakāra (bād-’grel byed-pa). Hattori (*op. cit.*, p. 167) thinks this Bhāṣyakāra is identical with Śābarasvāmin 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 svātakṛpāṃśa 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 Upavāraśa is the Vṛttikāra. Finally Frauwallner supposes that Upavāraśa’s commentary is based upon the commentary by Bhavadāsa.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong


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 *Pahcavisāstisāhasrikā* 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.1) comments on both the Abhisamyālākāra (= 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 Áloka took from him much more than is indicated by the few occasions when Vimuktisena is actually quoted, and C. Pensà 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 pratipattiyālambananam (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 Āṣṭa which Haribhadra had in view.

Some of the lesser technical terms are treated at quite inordinate length and it is interesting to see that some of these uncalled-for excursions lead to the Yogācāra tradition. At the end of a description of sāṣṭyutpadapetah śivaro, two pages long (pp. 113-5), Asanga is expressly quoted as the source. Two pages on the five mithyājiva (pp. 23-6) are dragged in because, though absent in both P and AA, the explanation of the eight mahāpuruṣavātarkā (of P 21) contains the words alpeccha (cf. p. 23 1.19) and samuttā (cf. p. 25 1.19) and corresponds to the Bodhisattvabhūmi and so does the explanation of the four dharmoddānā (p. 21), mentioned not in P, but in AA I 1, 20. These observations do, as C. Pensà (p. XIV n. 2) points out, bode ill for A. Wayman's attempt to completely dissociate Asanga 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 vijñānam", when in fact one of two manuscripts, C, has the more probable vijñāpanam. 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. Pensà 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 vr̥tti is only approximately true, based as it was on a few hasty glimpses of the Rome manuscript.

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

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