

## REVIEWS

Bernhard Kölver, *Textkritische und philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājatarāṅgiṇī des Kalhaṇa* (= *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Supplementband 12). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1969. XV+67 pp. DM 26.-.

Bernhard Kölver's *Untersuchungen* have been undertaken as Prolegomena for a future edition of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. A short introduction deals with the sources mentioned by Kalhaṇa, and a characterisation of his work. According to Kölver, the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* is a "kāvyā mit historischem Thema" (p. 10). In fact Oldenberg, to whom Kölver makes no reference, had already stressed this aspect of Kalhaṇa's work.<sup>1</sup> However, Kölver points out that, if the literary nature of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* diminishes its reliability as a historical source, the same cannot be said with regard to geographical and cultural data it contains. An appendix contains three studies which illustrate the importance of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* in these respects.

The first part of Kölver's book is devoted to a very careful examination of manuscripts and editions of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. The author shows that most manuscripts derive from MS. A, which formed the basis of Stein's edition. Independent material is to be found in A<sub>3</sub> – corrections noted in A from a manuscript which is independent from A; in MS. L – a manuscript discovered by Stein in 1895 and used by him for his translation; and, finally in MS. M – a manuscript bought in 1885 by Hultzsch. M contains about two-thirds of the seventh book and one-third of the eighth book. The whereabouts of A and L are unknown. As to M, Hultzsch has already published the more important variants (cf. p. 20). It seems, therefore, that the available manuscript materials will not be sufficient to improve much upon Stein's edition apart from incorporating readings from L, which have been noted by Stein in his translation, and from M. Kölver recognizes that a new edition will for the greater part not be very different from Stein's edition with the exception of the last two books. We can only hope that MSS: A and L will be rediscovered and that new manuscript materials will be brought to light.

Kölver's critical examination of the existing text editions is especially important with regard to Vishva Bandhu's recent edition (Hoshiarpur, 1963-65) which is shown not to satisfy the requirements to be expected from a critical edition.

In the first chapter of the second part the author examines a long passage of 161 verses in M which corresponds to 7 verses in Stein's edition (8.1230-36). Hultzsch, who published the text of these verses (they are reproduced on plates 20-24 of K. L.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Aus dem alten Indien* (Berlin, 1910), p. 93: "Der gestaltende Prozess, den dieser Stoff in der Tat durchgemacht hat, ist nicht der des historischen Denkens, sondern der Dichtung – der Dichtung im indischen Sinn, mit ihren glänzenden Eigenschaften und ihren Schwächen".

Janert's *Indische und nepalische Handschriften* 2 [Wiesbaden, 1970]), thought that this passage had been interpolated by Kalhaṇa. Kölver arrives at a different conclusion, according to which these verses are a first draft. Moreover, he emends the readings of two verses (8.1259 and 1397) which seem to contradict this conclusion.

In the following chapter Kölver analyses the metres and particles used in books 1-6 and 7-8 in order to determine whether these two parts of the *Rājataranṅinī* were composed by the same author or by two different authors. The first theory was defended by Bühler against Troyer and Lassen. According to Kölver the differences between the two parts (fewer ornate metres in the second part; greater frequency of *api* in the second part) are not of a nature to make it necessary to postulate more than one author.

Chapter six is devoted to Kalhaṇa's introduction to the *Rājataranṅinī* (1.1-47). Kölver explains Kalhaṇa's motives in mentioning eight *tīrthas* in the second part of this introduction. Six of them are situated near the frontiers of Kaśmīr and the two remaining ones are important *tīrthas* dedicated to Śiva and Viṣṇu. The following chapter, which examines Kalhaṇa's use of sources, shows that the story of King Durlabhaka and Queen Narendraprabhā (4.15-37) has many points in common with the story of Unmādinī which is to be found in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Brhatkathāmañjarī*, and also in Buddhist sources (*Jātakamālā* No. 13, *Jātaka* No. 527). Kölver remarks that, as far as the chronology is concerned, Kalhaṇa could have made use both of the *Brhatkathā* itself and of the two works which are based upon it. However, he believes that Kalhaṇa has borrowed the story from Kṣemendra's *Nṛpāvalī*, a work which is mentioned as one of his sources but which has not been preserved. Kṣemendra would already have observed the parallelism between the story of King Durlabhaka and Queen Narendraprabhā and the story of Unmādinī. Secondly, the author compares *Rājataranṅinī* 1.25-43 and 1.57-82 with the corresponding verses of the *Nilamatapurāṇa* and shows that Kalhaṇa does adhere closely to his source as far as the factual content is concerned.

The three chapters of the appendix deal successively with problems in the identification of names of rivers in Northern Kaśmīr, with the different kinds of suicide mentioned in the *Rājataranṅinī*, and finally with the meaning and background of the drinking of *kośa* during an oath ceremony. In the second chapter Kölver refers to Irish parallels to fasting as a means of extortion. This parallelism had already been noticed by de La Vallée Poussin and Renou.<sup>3</sup> Renou remarks: "Tout paraît indiquer cependant qu'on a affaire à l'une de ces survivances, comme celles qu'on observe sur le plan linguistique (A. Meillet BSL. XXXII 1 p. 5), témoignant de la séparation plus ancienne des langues 'marginales', qui ont emporté avec elles des archaïsmes que les langues centrales ont eu le temps de perdre durant la période ultérieure de communauté où elles ont vécu".

Kölver has studied the *Rājataranṅinī* from many different angles. He has been successful in showing that Kalhaṇa's work is much more than just a historical source. He has shed new light on several problems connected with the *Rājataranṅinī*. Kölver deserves special praise for the fact that he translates all quotations from the *Rājataranṅinī* and other texts. The *Rājataranṅinī* is not always easy to understand and it is important to see how the text is interpreted by somebody who has made a careful study of it. In one place his interpretation has to be corrected, cf. p. 170, n. 2: *Rājataranṅinī* 6.14 *prāyopaveśādhikṛtair bodhitena mahibhṛtā | prāyopaviṣṭo nikaṭaṃ prāpitaḥ kaścid abravīt ||* "Ein bestimmter (Mann), der ins Sterbefasten eingetreten war, sprach zum König\*, den die über das Sterbefasten eingesetzten [Beamten davon] in Kenntnis gesetzt hatten, in (dessen) Nähe gebracht". "\*Zum Gebrauch des Instru-

<sup>3</sup> L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Note sur le Dharmā", *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* 3 (7 mars 1921), 71-80; L. Renou, "Le jeûne du créancier dans l'Inde ancienne", *JA* (1943-45), 117-30.

mentals vgl. L. Renou: Grammaire sanskrite 3. ed. Paris 1968, S. 291". – Renou mentions as an example of an instrumental of accompaniment: *na kenāpi vakti* "il ne parle avec personne". However, in this verse the instrumental *mahibhṛtā* depends on *prāpitaḥ*: 'A certain man, who, [at the order of] the king, had been brought before him...'. On p. 80 Kölver reads in *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 8.1235 *puro 'parodhāvagrāhavyādhi-caurādyupadravāḥ*: "die Leides [manifestationen wie] Vertreibung [aus Besitz], Dürre, Krankheit, Raub usw. [in] der Stadt". One must of course read *puroparodhā*. Stein translates: "the blockade of the City, the drought, the plague, the robberies, and other troubles". The following misprints have to be corrected: p. 129, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 4.36 read *nṛtājñatvān* for *nṛtājñatyān*; p. 150, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 8.2541 read *annais* for *āmnais*; p. 164, n. 5, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 7.1443 read *miṣād* for *miṣad*.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

J. F. Staal (ed.), *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, The MIT Press, 1972. xxiv+557 pp. £15.75.

In 1961 Renou remarked in a review that there was a revival of interest in the Sanskrit grammarians (*JA* [1961], 256-57). Since then there has been great activity in this field as is shown by the large number of publications that have appeared in the last ten years. Staal's *Reader* is not meant in the first place as a contribution to the history of the study of the Sanskrit grammarians. As he writes in his preface, the study of the most important articles that have appeared during the last one and a half centuries is the best way of attaining a better understanding of their work. Moreover, recent developments in Western linguistics make it possible to arrive at a more adequate understanding than in the past.

The *Reader* begins with Hsüan-tsang in the seventh century and ends with four articles by Renou. The editor has divided the history of the study of the Sanskrit grammarians into seven periods: I. Early Accounts (Hsüan-tsang, I-tsing, Fa-tsang, al-Birūnī and Tāranātha); II. The Foundations of Western Scholarship (Pons and Colebrooke); III. The Romantic Period (A. W. von Schlegel and Wilhelm von Humboldt); IV. The Golden Days (Bhandarkar and Kielhorn); V. The Skeptics and their Critics (Whitney, Liebich, Böhtlingk and Bühler); VI. The Transition (Bernhard Geiger); VII. The Modern Period (L. Bloomfield, B. Faddegon, K. C. Chatterji, P. Thieme, P. Boudon, K. A. Subramania Iyer, J. Brough, Y. Ojihara and L. Renou).

Apart from the texts in the first group all selections are given in the original language (English, French and German). Most selections, especially in the last four groups, consist of complete articles. The editor has provided introductory notes. The *Reader* concludes with a bibliography, listing the publications mentioned in the notes and in the selections, an index of names, an index of Sanskrit grammatical terms and an index of sūtras. A separate index of passages of the *Mahābhāṣya* would have been useful.

The editor has made an excellent choice. The introductions and explanatory notes give the necessary information. In some cases they reflect the personal opinions of the editor as could be expected. The selections seem to have been reproduced from typescript. The reproduction is clear but slightly pale. It is regrettable that the original page-numbers have not been added between square brackets. This would have been useful in tracing references to the original publications which are not always easily accessible. The number of misprints is surprisingly small. The following have come to my notice: p. 58 *fongeux – fougeux*; p. 195 *Mimāṣmaka – Mimāṣsaka*.

The first three groups of texts are of a more historical interest but they occupy only 64 of a total of 525 pages. The first selections are taken from Beal's translations of the

*Records of the Western Countries* and of *The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang*. The editor points out discrepancies between the translations of these works by Stanislas Julien and Beal. It is a pity that he has not asked a Sinologist to make a new translation of these selections. Stanislas Julien's translations were excellent for the time in which they were made but Beal's translations have never been adequate. At least the transliteration should have been made uniform. On one page (p. 4) there appear such diverse transliterations as Si-yu-ki, Hwui Li and Hsüan-tsang. It is not entirely correct to say that Hsüan-tsang described his experiences in the *Records of the Western Countries*. This work was written by Pien-chi in 646 (cf. P. Demiéville in *L'Inde classique* II [1953], 406). Beal's use of the term *vājya* (in *tiñantavājya* and *subantavājya*) is not justified by the Chinese text which has *shēng* 'sound, voice'. The editor's speculations about *vājya* and *vākya* are otiose. The same must be said about his suggestions that I-tsing's *pei-na* refers to the name of Puṇyārāja (p. 16, note). No Chinese would ever transliterate *puṇya* by *pei-na*.

The selection from al-Bīrūnī's *India* is taken from Sachau's translation which was published for the first time in 1888 (not in 1910). The editor has not consulted the recent Russian translation by A. B. Khalidov and Ju. N. Zavadovskij (Abu Rejxan Biruni, *Izbrannye proizvedenija* II [Taškent, 1963]). This translation contains an extensive commentary by V. G. Ėrman and A. B. Khalidov which gives valuable additional information not found in Sachau's translation. For instance, al-Bīrūnī mentions a *Śaśidevavṛtti* by Śaśideva. Staal remarks that this work is not known to him. The commentary of the Russian translation remarks that Śaśideva is the author of a grammatical work, entitled *Vyākhyānaprakriyā* (cf. also Aufrecht, *Catalogus Catalogorum*, Part I, p. 618a).

Schiefner wrote in the introduction to his translation of Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism in India* that Tāranātha was born in 1573. However, the wood-hog year is 1575. Pelliot has shown in 1913 that Western scholars had miscalculated Tibetan dates by one or two years ("Le cycle sexagénaire de la chronologie tibétaine", *JA* I [1913], 633-37).

On p. 33 the editor writes that Colebrooke's grammar was never completed, because the printing of Sanskrit characters, manufactured in Calcutta, was so crude that the examples Colebrooke needed to illustrate his statements would have required an excessively large volume. He refers to a statement by A. W. von Schlegel on p. 58 of the Reader but neither here nor anywhere else in the Reader do we find any remarks of this kind by A. W. von Schlegel. I do not know if von Schlegel made this statement somewhere else in a passage not reproduced in the Reader but I am rather puzzled by it because the Sanskrit characters in the first volume of Colebrooke's grammar are far from being crude.

The editor treats Friedrich von Schlegel with excessive severity in saying that it is likely that he never managed to learn Sanskrit well. It would be easier to subscribe to Windisch's opinion that he did not have "eine gründliche Kenntnis des Sanskrit" (*Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie*, p. 58). In a recent study on Schlegel's translations (which the editor does not mention) Ursula Oppenberg arrives at the following conclusion: "Da es Fr. Schlegel gelang, sich trotz der angeführten misslichen Umstände doch immerhin ganz beachtliche Kenntnisse des Sanskrit zu erwerben, die ausreichten, um nicht nur Manuskripte in zwei indischen Schriften zu lesen, Teile davon auszuwählen und zu übersetzen, sondern auch Wesentliches über die Sprache auszusagen, können wir ihm billigerweise gleich seinem Bruder August Wilhelm unsere Anerkennung nicht versagen" (*Quellenstudien zu Friedrich Schlegel's Übersetzungen aus dem Sanskrit* [Marburg, 1965], p. 128).

It seems to me that the editor is also unduly harsh in his opinion of Weber's study on the *Mahābhāṣya* (*Indische Studien* 13 [1873], 293-496), of which he remarks only that in it "many of these topics were treated again and equally unsatisfactory". Weber was

more interested in the realia of the *Mahābhāṣya* than in the grammatical details. Barth was quite justified in expressing his admiration for Weber's courage in studying this difficult text of more than 1000 pages which had been published in India only two years before (*Oeuvres de Auguste Barth* III [Paris, 1917], pp. 82-84; cf. also Winternitz, *Geschichte* III, p. 388, n. 2 and Renou, *Durghaṭavṛtti*, Introd., p. 22, n. 2). As regards the date of Patañjali Weber was certainly not unjustified in remaining unconvinced by Bhandarkar's arguments.<sup>1</sup> Bhandarkar tried to prove that the third chapter of the *Bhāṣya* was written between 144 B.C. and 142 B.C. The editor remarks that recently Frauwallner suggested a later date than the traditional second century B.C. (p. 78). Louis de La Vallée Poussin had already in 1930 given sound arguments for a later date (*L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas* [Paris, 1930], pp. 199-202). The editor seems to favour Bhandarkar as against Goldstücker and Weber. However, one must not overlook the fact that Bhandarkar had the advantage of being brought up in the Indian tradition.

One of the most fascinating chapters of the *Reader* is the fifth which contains two of Whitney's articles and the reactions by Liebich, Böhtlingk and Bühler. It is not surprising that the editor has not much sympathy for Whitney's sceptical views as to the value of the Sanskrit grammarians. Undoubtedly Whitney's views were extreme but one wonders whether all his arguments have been entirely refuted by his opponents. Whitney can only be proved wrong by the compilation of a Sanskrit grammar which reconciles the leading ideas of the Sanskrit grammarians with those of contemporary linguists. Staal seems to be convinced that the two have much in common, if I interpret correctly his statement that "the activities of the Indian grammarians are the closest parallel in history to contemporary linguistics" (p. xii).

The Transition period is represented by one article by Bernhard Geiger. The editor remarks that Whitney's forceful opinions may have acted as a deterrent to many young Sanskritists. In his review of Goldstücker's *Pāṇini* Bhandarkar remarked that a minute knowledge of the complicated and subtle speculations of Indian grammarians can only be acquired after a hard study of at least five years, and from a Paṇḍit-teacher (cf. p. 72). It is not impossible that Bhandarkar's words were a greater deterrent than Whitney's sceptical opinions. In any case, the last chapter of the *Reader* shows that during the years 1925-60 much important work has been done. We may be confident that an editor of a future *Reader* will have only too much to choose from.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

Herbert V. Guenther, *The Tantric View of Life*. Berkeley and London, Shambala, 1972. XI + 168 pp. \$8.50.

Guenther's *Yuganaddha: The Tantric View of Life* was published in 1952 and in a revised edition in 1969 (Varanasi, *Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies* III). The *Tantric View of Life* is an entirely different work. Since 1952 Guenther has published several books and articles on Tantrism and he probably considered it useful to write a new introduction to Tantrism. Guenther's publications in this field are characterised by a vast knowledge of Sanskrit and Tibetan texts and a psychological interpretation of Tantric doctrines. In translating, Guenther uses a terminology of his own making in order to

<sup>1</sup> Staal writes that Weber "apparently did not understand" Bhandarkar's arguments (p. 84). He refers only to Bhandarkar's *Note* (*IA* 2 [1873], 59-61) but does not mention two articles by Bhandarkar which appeared in the same volume of the *Indian Antiquary*: "Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali"; "On the Interpretation of Patañjali" (pp. 69-71 and 94-96). Weber replied to all three in his letter (*IA* 2 [1873], 206-10).

expose the deeper meaning of the vocabulary used in the text. It is not surprising that Guenther's method of translating has met with resistance. Seyfort Ruegg has made some important remarks on this subject in an article in which the problem of translating Tantric texts has been examined in a wider perspective.<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that Guenther is continually trying to discover better equivalents. For instance, in *The Royal Song of Saraha* (Seattle and London, 1969) he translated *chos-sku* (Skt. *dharmakāya*) as 'noetic Being'. In the present work we find three different equivalents: 'value-being', 'Being-as-such' and 'absolute Being'. In former publications Guenther did not hesitate to render *ston-pa* or *ston-pa-ñid* (Skt. *śūnya*, *śūnyatā*) as 'nothing' or 'nothingness'.<sup>2</sup> In this work he uses the term 'openness' and explains in a note that *śūnya(tā)* indicates the 'open dimension of Being' (p. 150, n. 44). I am pointing out these changes in terminology not with the intention of accusing Guenther of inconsistency. His theory of translation implies a constant search for more adequate equivalents. However, the study of Guenther's works is certainly complicated by the fact that it is necessary to try and follow the evolution of the author's terminology.

One of the most conspicuous aspects of Guenther's work is his personal involvement in Tantrism. In the preface he declares: "It is my conviction that Tantrism in its Buddhist form is of the utmost importance for the inner life of man and so for the future of mankind". For him Tantrism is the culmination of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism just as Zen is the culmination of Sino-Japanese Buddhism. Guenther has no sympathy whatsoever for Hinduist Tantrism, which he considers to be a product of a power mentality which is similar to the Western dominance psychology (cf. pp. 2 and 64). He shows even less appreciation for Western civilization (cf. pp. 63-64). Guenther holds both the classical civilization and Christianity in abhorrence: "Plato depreciated not only the body but also the soul" (pp. 6-7); "Christianity advocates the impotence of man, denounces pleasure and condemns its source, woman" (p. 66). Guenther adds in a note that the statements against women found in some Buddhist scriptures are on quite a different level from the venomous outpourings of a St. Jerome, a St. Odo of Cluny and others, as they are not part and parcel of the doctrinal system (p. 154, no. 97). It is difficult not to consider just as venomous the 92 verses which can be found in the ninth chapter of the *Dharmasamuccaya* to which the compiler, Avalokitasimha, has given the charming title "Strijugupsā".<sup>3</sup> Guenther's remark is typical of his a-historical attitude towards Buddhism. There is no doubt that Hinayāna and Mahāyāna Buddhism shared a very negative attitude towards women with contemporary Hinduism. If Guenther is right in his claim that Buddhist Tantrism did not have the same attitude, this must be explained by a historical development which brought about a new and positive appreciation of women. There is no doubt that Buddhism has changed greatly in the course of its history. Tantrism, too, has evolved since its beginnings in India. Guenther quotes both Indian and Tibetan Tantric texts with a preference for indigenous Tibetan texts because the latter "go to the very root of Tantrism". He does not try to trace the history of Tantric doctrines in India and Tibet. Tantrism is seen as a *philosophia perennis* which has remained basically unchanged throughout its long history. However, it is obvious that Guenther has a predilection for Saraha's songs (*dohā*) and the teachings of the Bka'-rgyud-pa school. Saraha and his commentators have made an important contribution to Tantrism but they represent only one tendency in the history of Indo-Tibetan Tantrism. Much work still has to be

<sup>1</sup> "A propos of a Recent Contribution to Tibetan and Buddhist Studies", *JAOS* 82 (1962), 320-31; see also his review of Guenther's *Treasures on the Tibetan Middle Way*, *T'oung Pao* 55 (1969), 220-26.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *The Life and Teaching of Naropa* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 274-75, *The Royal Song*, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Lin Li-kouang (ed.), *Dharmasamuccaya* II (Paris, 1969), pp. 250-94.

done on the interpretation of the teachings of Saraha and his commentators and on their relations with other Tantric schools before it will be possible to know to what extent their opinions are representative of "the Tantric view of life".

Guenther sometimes makes it difficult for his readers to appreciate his work properly. There is no doubt that very few Western scholars have made such a searching study of Tantric texts and have made such persistent efforts to elucidate their inner meaning. It would be wrong to be discouraged by some of his idiosyncracies, for his work deserves to be read with the greatest care.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

G. M. Bongard-Levin, *Studies in Ancient India and Central Asia* (= *Soviet Indology Series* 7). Calcutta, Indian Studies: Past & Present, 1971. vii + iii + 287 pp. Rs. 50.00.

G. M. Bongard-Levin's *Studies* contain seventeen articles divided into three groups: (1) Problems of archaeology and ethnic history; (2) Problems of the ancient history and culture of India; (3) Problems of the history and culture of Central Asia. The articles collected in this volume were originally published in Russian and English between 1957 and 1971. The editor, Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, indicates where the articles were published for the first time. His list omits one article: Indians, Scythians and the Arctic (pp. 52-66). The first three articles deal with prehistory: The Origin of the Mundas (first published in 1957), Symbols of Granary on the Seals of Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa (1957) and Harappan Civilization and the 'Aryan Problem' (1962). Bongard-Levin has added references to recent literature in footnotes to the first article. Other articles in the volume also contain references to recent publications but the text itself has not been revised by the author.

The second group contains seven articles dealing with historical problems of the Mauryan period. Bongard-Levin has studied the history of Mauryan India for many years. In the preface he announces the forthcoming publication of his monograph *India in the Mauryan Epoch*. Bongard-Levin is also the author of the chapters on the Mauryas in the history of ancient India which he published recently together with G. F. Il'in (*Drevnjaja Indija: Istoričeskij očerk* [Moskva, 1969]). The titles of the articles are as follows: "Some Basic Problems of the Mauryan Empire: Agrammes-Ugrasena-Nanda and the Coronation of Candragupta"; "Megasthenes' *Indica* and the Inscriptions of Aśoka"; "The Historicity of the Ancient Indian Avadāna-s"; "An Epigraphic Document of the Mauryas from Bengal"; "On Some Features of the *Varṇa*-System in the *Gaṇa*-s and *Śaṅgha*-s of Ancient India"; "The Kuṇāla Legend" (on Bongard-Levin's and Volkova's edition of the *Kuṇālāvadāna* see *IJJ* VIII [1965], 233-40).

The third group contains a long article on Soviet archaeological studies on Central Asia in the Kushan period (pp. 173-202), an article on historico-cultural contacts between India and Central Asia in ancient times (pp. 203-28), information on the discovery of Buddhist texts in Khotanese and Sanskrit by Soviet scholars (pp. 229-37) and editions of fragments of Sanskrit and Khotanese texts: "Fragment of an Unknown Manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*", "A Fragment of the Sanskrit *Sumukhadhārāni*" and "Fragment of the Śāka Version of the *Dharmaśārirasūtra* from the Petrovsky Collection". A supplement gives a brief sketch of Buddhist studies in Russia (pp. 275-87). The English version does not seem to have been revised by the author as is obvious from the spelling of several names: Scherbatsky, Konze and the Passen (de La Vallée Poussin?).

In recent years Soviet scholars have made important archaeological discoveries in

Central Asia. They have also found many manuscripts. Buddhist scholars will be particularly interested to hear that a Sanskrit Buddhist manuscript, comprising more than 300 folios, has been found near Merv. According to Bongard-Levin it contains several works, including the "Suttavibhaṅga", and the text mentions that the scribe belonged to the Sarvāstivāda school (p. 223). There is no doubt that the discoveries made by Soviet scholars are of great importance for the history of Mahāyāna Buddhism in Central Asia.

The editor, Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, has done excellent work in publishing this collection of articles. We would like to express the hope that the work of other Russian Indologists of the past and the present will be published by him in the *Soviet Indology Series*. Many important studies are almost inaccessible even for the small circle of Indologists able to read Russian.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

H. S. Biligiri (ed.), *CIIL Phonetic Reader Series, 1-4*, Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages, 1972. Pp. 68, 68, 82, 100. Rs. 4/- each.

"Phonetic readers" is an odd term for these volumes. One is reminded of the "phonetic readers" edited by Daniel Jones some decades ago, which contained collections of texts in phonetic transcription (e.g., T. Grahame Bailey's *Panjabi phonetic reader*, London, 1914). But the present publications contain no such running texts. Alternatively, one thinks of a "reader" as a collection of articles, often reprinted from earlier publication, by various authors; but each of these booklets from the CIIL is a new work, by a single author: no. 1 in the series, *Kannada phonetic reader*, is by U. P. Upadhyaya; no. 2, *Malayalam phonetic reader*, by B. Syamala Kumari; no. 3, *Tamil phonetic reader*, by S. Rajaram; and no. 4, *Telugu phonetic reader*, by J. Venkateswara Sastry. Each gives a sketch of phonetics, phonemics, and graphemics for one of the major Dravidian literary languages of South India; further volumes of the series are announced, dealing with Indo-Aryan and Tibeto-Burman languages. A foreword by CIIL Director D. P. Pattanayak, appearing in each volume, states the goal of "presenting the range of phonetic variation obtaining in this sub-continent and demonstrating the closeness of languages on the basis of phonetic patterning", as a contribution to "the emotional integration of the country". A preface by editor Biligiri explains further that the series is "mainly intended to meet the needs of teachers who receive training in an Indian language other than their mother-tongue at the Regional Language Centres of the Central Institute of Indian languages". In vols. 2-4, it is further specified by the individual authors that their works are directed especially to speakers of Indo-Aryan languages, and the Telugu volume in fact gives specific comparisons with the phonetics of Hindi.

It is clear that the present works have a potential usefulness far beyond the CIIL training programs: for foreign students of Indian languages, with either practical or purely scholarly goals, these "readers" provide clear, detailed, comprehensive information, with abundant examples for purposes of drill or verification, on the phonetic systems of the major Dravidian languages. Such information has been difficult or impossible to find elsewhere. This series is, then, to be warmly welcomed; but it is by no means beyond improvement. In the sections which follow, I will offer some criticism — constructive, I hope — first of features which relate the four volumes at hand to one another, and then of features noted in the individual works.

§1. The first chapter of each volume is a brief introduction to articulatory phonetics,



with the customary sagittal-section drawing to show the organs of speech. But there is an odd deformity here: the teeth are depicted with rounded surfaces, looking like a pair of inner lips; and the tongue-tip is not distinguishable at all. The terminology introduced in this section shows some inconsistency between volumes, and even within a volume; e.g., "teeth ridge" and "alveolar ridge" are used in a way likely to confuse the student. The tongue surface is labelled in different ways in the four volumes: 1:5 has "tip, blade, front, and back";<sup>1</sup> 2:2 has "blade" in the diagram but omits it in the discussion; 3:4 says that the blade "includes the tip"; 4:4 omits "tip". Further on, discussing types of articulation, all four books classify [w] (or [v]) and [y] as "(frictionless) continuants", without explaining what other types of continuant there might be; it would be useful to introduce the term "glide" here.

Next come descriptions of individual phones. Each sound is first given a detailed description; e.g., of Kannada [p] it is said: "In the production of this sound the air-current coming from lungs is stopped by making a contact of the lower lip against the upper lip. There is no vibration in the vocal cords. The soft palate is raised to close the nasal passage. When the lips are released the air escapes from the mouth with slight explosion."<sup>2</sup> And finally: "This sound is known as voiceless bilabial stop" (1:15). We then go on to a similar description of [b], etc. — a highly repetitive procedure, which may help teach phonetic terminology, but surely is not necessary to teach [p] and [b]. No comparisons are given with sounds of English or other languages, except for the use of Hindi in the Telugu volume.

In spite of the considerable uniformity of the format of these volumes, and the close historical and typological relationships between the four languages described, the reader may get misleading impressions of phonetic differences between the languages. Thus medial *ɟ* is said to have a flap variant only in Kannada (1:19) and in Telugu (4:27, 70); but the variant occurs in Tamil and Malayalam as well.<sup>3</sup> Again, *c* and *j* are described as stops in Malayalam (2:17-19), but as affricates in the other languages; they are said to be produced with the blade of the tongue in Kannada (1:20) and Tamil (3:22), but with the "mid part of the tongue" in Malayalam (2:23) and Telugu (4:29) — surely these are blade-alveolar affricates in all four cases.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Kannada is described as having [v] before *i*, *e*, *y*, but [w] elsewhere (1:32-3), while only [ṽ] is ascribed to Malayalam (2:28) and Tamil (3:37), and Telugu is said to have [w], with [v] used before *i*, *e* by some speakers (4:47); my own impression here is that both [w] and a lax [v] occur in all four languages.<sup>5</sup> Malayalam is described as having automatic onglides with initial *i* and *u*, as well as *e* and *o* (2:5-10), thus [ʔi \*u ʔe \*o]; Telugu is described the same way (4:70); for Kannada only [ʔe \*o] are mentioned (pp. 10-13), and for Tamil no off-glides are noted at all — but I have certainly heard [ʔi \*u] as well as [ʔe \*o] all over South India.<sup>6</sup> Finally, *h* is said to be voiced in Malayalam (2:26), but voicing is not specified for the other languages; my own ob-

<sup>1</sup> Numerical reference is to volume number in the series, followed by page number.

<sup>2</sup> The English of these works departs somewhat from standard usage, especially as regards the use of articles. Quotes are given verbatim.

<sup>3</sup> For Tamil, cf. M.S. Andronov, *The Tamil language* (Moscow, 1965); for Malayalam, see M. V. Sreedhar, "Phonology of the Cochin dialect of Malayalam", *IJDL* 1 (1972), p. 117.

<sup>4</sup> T. N. Sreekantaia, "Affricates in Kannada speech", *IL* 14 (1954), p. 84, gives this description for Indian languages in general.

<sup>5</sup> For Tamil, cf. M. Fowler, "The segmental phonemes of Sanskritized Tamil", *Lg.* 30 (1954), pp. 362-3; for Malayalam, cf. Sreedhar, p. 124.

<sup>6</sup> For Kannada, cf. Wm. McCormack, *Kannada* (Madison, Wisc., 1966), p. 6; for Tamil, cf. Fowler, p. 361.

servations are that all four languages have voiced *h* when medial, with some devoicing when initial.

All four volumes claim that short and long vowels are (in most cases) of identical quality; thus, for Kannada, we read that for [i] "the front of tongue is raised as high as possible", while for [ii], "the speech organs remain approximately in the same position as in the case of *i*" (1:9). Such a situation is surely rare in languages of the world, and cannot be confirmed for Dravidian: in all these languages long vowels are tenser (non-low vowels becoming higher, while low *a* becomes lower).<sup>7</sup> All four volumes also state (at various points) that, in the production of vowels, "the soft palate is raised so that no air comes through the nasal passage" (to quote Syamala Kumari, 2:5). In fact, however, vowels next to nasal consonants normally show some nasalization — as, again, in most languages of the world.

In each volume, the phonetic descriptions are followed by a chapter of phonetic drills, presenting minimal (and near-minimal) pairs. These are very useful in general, though it is hard to imagine why anyone would need words contrasting *i* with *a*, or *p* with *t*, which are systematically provided. The Malayalam and Telugu volumes also provide long lists of words of different canonical shapes — perhaps of more academic than practical usefulness; the Tamil volume has lists illustrating various consonant clusters. More examples of contrast between single and geminate consonants would be welcome, especially for Malayalam and Tamil.

Following the drills, each volume has a short section on phonemics, but only the Kannada volume gives any explanation as to what a phoneme might be. In all four volumes, this section is poorly integrated, in that some data on allophonic alternation are given here, but other such data, for no obvious reason, are given earlier, as part of the phonetic descriptions. Thus the retroflex flap is described as a variant of *ḍ* for Kannada (1:19); but in Telugu it is described separately, as [ɽ] (4:46), and only linked with *ḍ* in the phonemics section (4:70). Again, in Kannada, a nasalized flap is described only as a variant of *n* (1:27); but the dental nasal [ɳ] and palatal [ɲ] are given separate treatment (1:26) — though they turn out to be simply allophones of *n* (1:48). A more useful procedure might be to list as separate phones just those sounds which will present difficulties to the Indo-Aryan speakers who are seen as the main audience for these books: on that principle, Kannada dental [ɳ] would require little attention since IA speakers need learn no new habits in order to pronounce it in the correct environments.

In each volume, the phonemics section takes note that, although there is clear contrast between short and long vowels in many positions, "all vowels have slightly long allophones when they occur in the word-final position" (to quote Upadhyaya, 1:47). In fact, the generalization can be made about these languages that the contrast between short and long vowels is suspended before pause; LONG vowels occur in monosyllables (e.g. Ka. *huu* 'flower') and under certain intonations (Ka. *maguu* 'child!' used as a vocative); elsewhere, we hear half-long vowels, which are further characterized by some of the same tenseness associated with long vowels. Thus an example like Ka. *tifi* 'know' needs more explanation than Upadhyaya has given: the second *i* is likely to sound more like long *ii* than like the first *i* of the word.

The final sections of these books deal with the four different writing systems of the languages concerned, and with phoneme-grapheme correspondences. None of the volumes provide complete or fully accurate descriptions of these matters, but they do

<sup>7</sup> For Kannada, cf. M. S. Andronov, *The Kannada language* (Moscow, 1969), p. 19; for Malayalam, L. J. Frohnmeyer, *A Progressive Grammar of the Malayalam Language* (Mangalore, 1913), p. 1; for Tamil, A. H. Arden, *A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil*, 5th ed. (Madras, 1942), pp. 35-38; and for Telugu, A. H. Arden, *A Progressive Grammar of the Telugu Language*, 4th ed. (Madras, 1937), pp. 18-19.

contain well-organized lists of examples which should prove useful to students. Only the Tamil volume contains a bibliography, and its references are mainly to works on phonetics rather than Tamil.

§2. Upadhyaya's *Kannada* specifies that it deals with "formal speech by the educated people of the southern part of Mysore state"; he also gives some information on colloquial variants. (The other three volumes, regrettably, never state what style or regional dialect they are describing; but they too seem to concentrate on formal varieties.) Comments on specific passages now follow.

P. 4: something behind the "teeth ridge" is said to be "known as alveolum"; there is, of course, no such word.

P. 14: in *a*, "the back of tongue is slightly lowered from its neutral position": how is the student to know what position is "neutral"?

P. 15: the term "gemination" is introduced here with no explanation to the student.

P. 21: *j* is normally an affricate, as U. says; but the cluster *jñ*, as in his example *jñāana*, is commonly pronounced with a palatal stop.

P. 23: aspirates occur not only in loans from Sanskrit, as stated, but in many words borrowed from Hindi-Urdu, e.g. *khaali* 'empty' (p. 29).

P. 28: *ñ* is said here to occur "only before palatal affricates"; but again note *jñāana* 'knowledge' and some related words.

Pp. 28-9: it should be noted that *f* in loanwords is replaced by *ph* or *p* for many speakers; and that another borrowed fricative, *z*, is used by many speakers (alternating with *j*), e.g. in *qazan* 'dozen'.

P. 30: U. notes that many speakers replace *ṣ* by *ś*; but it might be added that this tends NOT to happen in the cluster *ṣt*, as in *kaṣṭa* 'difficult'.

P. 50: the graphemes *r* and *ṛ* are said to be "rarely used"; in fact, *ṛ* is NEVER used (except when writing the alphabet!) Something should be said about the pronunciation of *r*, which varies between [rɪ] and [ru]. U. mentions visarga, "a glottal fricative", but doesn't say whether it is pronounced the same as *h*.<sup>8</sup>

§3. Syamala Kumari's *Malayalam* deals with a more complex system, one which is of considerable interest to general phonology because of its surface contrast of dental, alveolar, and retroflex stops, and of nasals in six articulatory positions. The following comments apply to her description.

Pp. 7-8: in *a*, the tongue is said to be "as low as possible"; in *aa*, "the tongue position is lower and backer than [a]"!

P. 8: in the production of initial ["o], SK says, "the tongue starts to produce a fronter sound like [w] but soon retracts back and produces the sound [o]". This makes no sense, but perhaps a reduction in lip-rounding is what the author had in mind.

P. 10: the Malayalam vowel transcribed here as [U] is probably not high BACK, but high CENTRAL unrounded, differing in this respect from the corresponding Tamil sound.<sup>9</sup> The statement that it is in "free variation" with [u] when medial, but in contrast when final, is an oversimplification, at least for some dialects.<sup>10</sup> Many examples throughout the book seem to be misprinted with [u] instead of [U].

Pp. 12 ff.: SK lists a set of phones [P T C K], called "weakly voiced fricativised stops", occurring only intervocally, and occasionally after *y* and *l*, in both Dravidian and loan vocabulary. On p. 49 they are described as allophones of *p t c k*. But fully voiced plosives [b d j g] also exist, said to occur medially after nasals in Dravidian vocabulary (*tumbi* 'beetle'), initially and medially in loans (*baabu* 'a name'); SK con-

<sup>8</sup> For details see W. Bright, *An Outline of Colloquial Kannada* (Poona, 1958), pp. 5 and 73-74.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Sreedhar, p. 110.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. W. Bright, "The enunciative vowel", *IJDL* 1 (1972), pp. 37-39; and S. Velayudhan, "Discussions on Bright's enunciative vowel", *IJDL* 2 (1973), pp. 50-53.

siders these as separate phonemes. I suspect that "orthographic dazzle" has affected SK's analysis: her [P T C K] reflect the *p t c k* of written Malayalam, while her [b d j g] reflect written *p t c k* when post-nasal, but *b d j g* when initial or intervocalic in loans. As a matter of phonetic fact, SK's [P T C K] are often identical with her intervocalic [b d j g].<sup>11</sup>

P. 18: *ch* is said to occur only in Sanskrit loans; but *acchan* (~ *accan*) 'father' is of Dravidian origin.<sup>12</sup>

Pp. 20-21: the palatalized sound [kk<] is listed here, but not accounted for in the phonemic description (pp. 48-50). It is apparently a variant of *kk* when preceded by a front vowel plus a morpheme boundary, and followed by [U]: thus *tee-kkU(ka)* 'to rub' (cf. *tēyu(ka)* 'to be rubbed') → *teekk<U*, whereas monomorphemic *teekkU* 'teak' shows no palatalization.

P. 22: it should be noted that, in medial position, dental [n] occurs only geminated, although alveolar [ṇ] and retroflex [ṇ̌] occur both single and doubled.

P. 27: [l̥] is described as a "voiced retroflexed palatal fricativized lateral" in which "the air is let out through the sides as well as over the tongue". It can be more simply described as a retroflex glide; as pronounced by many speakers, it sounds much like an American English *r*.

Pp. 40-41: it would be helpful if more contrasting examples were given for the dental, alveolar, and retroflex nasals, since this contrast is especially difficult for non-Malayalis.

P. 47: SK's phonemic analysis chooses to ignore the fact that the alveolar trill, here transcribed [R], is in complementary distribution with the alveolar stop (intervocalic [t̪], and [d̪] after nasal). Such an analysis would have disadvantages, to be sure: e.g., since Skt. *r* after a voiceless consonant is replaced by Ma. [R], a word like [pRaayam] 'age' (p. 61) would be phonemicized as /p̪aayam/, with an anomalous cluster of initial stops. But SK's analysis leaves /t̪/ with an unaccountably limited distribution.

§4. Rajaram's *Tamil* deals with another complex system, one made even more difficult by social and regional variants, concerning which R says nothing. The type of Tamil chosen for description here turns out to be a highly literary one; but even if a student has no interest in colloquial Tamil, he needs to know more about phonetic variation than he can learn from this booklet. Some details are as follows:

P. 15-16: [u] is described as occurring "initially and medially", but all examples given are in initial syllables; the unrounded [U], on the other hand, is said to occur "finally and medially other than in the initial syllable", and the two sounds are assigned to a single phoneme /u/ (p. 66). As in the corresponding Malayalam case, this is a great oversimplification. In particular, a word like [urU] 'image' (p. 16) will be pronounced [uru] by many speakers.<sup>13</sup>

Pp. 18 ff.: R sets up phones [P T K], defined as lax, slightly voiced stops, and distinguished phonetically from voiced stops [b d g] — much as in SK's analysis of Malayalam. This again is too simple: the sounds in question are realized, in various dialects, as [b ~ β], [d ~ ð], and [g ~ γ ~ x ~ h].<sup>14</sup>

Pp. 19-21: R transcribes the dental stops (and nasal, p. 28) with the underbar, and alveolars with no diacritic — exactly the opposite from the practice followed in SK's Malayalam volume, and in virtually all the literature on Dravidian. To make the

<sup>11</sup> Corresponding to SK's [P T C K], Sreedhar (pp. 117-18) gives [b ~ β], [d], [j], and [γ ~ g].

<sup>12</sup> Cf. T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau, *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* (Oxford, 1961), p. 5 (item 46).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Bright, "The enunciative vowel", pp. 30 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Evidence is to be found throughout the published literature; especially in K. Zvelebil's papers on Tamil dialectology.

confusion even worse, when R comes to the vibrants (pp. 35-36), he follows the usual Dravidianist practice, using the underbar for the alveolar flap, but no diacritic for the more fronted trill.

Pp. 20-21: R here describes alveolar *tt* and *nd* sequences which, in my experience, are rarely heard. In colloquial Tamil, they generally merge with dental [t̪] and alveolar [nn], respectively; in some literary pronunciations, they are rendered as alveolar [t̪t̪r] and [ndr].<sup>15</sup>

P. 26: R lists fricatives *s* and *ʃ* but says nothing about *ʒ*, a common alternant not only of *s* and *ʃ*, but also of *c*.<sup>16</sup>

P. 35: R distinguishes flap [ɾ] from trill [r] — a literary distinction which many Tamil speakers claim to make, but which few actually carry out.<sup>17</sup>

P. 40, middle: in the passage “-C<sub>2</sub> is always [c]”, *c* is an error for *j*.

Pp. 65-6: the phonemic sketch assigns not only [P T K], but also [b d g], to /p t k/, in spite of the existence of contrasting examples like *palam* ‘a measure’, *balam* ‘strength’ and *kili* ‘parrot’, *gili* ‘fear’ (pp. 53-5). R simply notes that the initial voiced stops occur in loanwords; he seems not to realize that his analysis will only work if these loanwords are somehow marked as such. For unexplained reasons, R keeps *c* and *j* as separate phonemes.

P. 77: the heading “/n/ (̲n)” (where the underbar means “dental”) occurs with examples of initial *n*, which seems to contradict R’s statement (pp. 28-29) that initial *n* is alveolar. The confusion probably arises from the Tamil orthography, since the symbol used for initial *n* historically designated a dental.

P. 80, bottom: /n/ [n] is a misprint for /n/ [̲n].

5. Venkateswara Sastry’s *Telugu phonetic reader* struggles with fewer analytic problems; in general, it presents a clear picture of Telugu phonetics, with some valuable comments on regional and social variation. The comparisons with Hindu phonetics will undoubtedly be useful for North Indian students. Since my own experience with Telugu is relatively slight, my comments will be few:

P. 35: VS describes *m* as having a variant [w̃] when intervocalic; other writers have also noted this pronunciation in final position, e.g. in *koopam* ‘anger’.<sup>18</sup>

P. 38, sec. 3.5.6: [̲n] is a misprint for [̲ṇ].

P. 48, middle: [u] is a misprint for [w].

P. 70: VS’s phonemic sketch states that “In case of word-final vowels, the feature of length does not serve as a distinctive characteristic of words. In monosyllabic words the word-final vowel is always long. In case of other words the final vowels are highly variable in length, generally short when the word is not final in phrase, longer when it is in phrase-final position”. This corresponds to the generalization which I stated for Dravidian in §2 above; but in fact, VS gives Telugu examples elsewhere with final *i* vs. *ii*, e.g. *pilli* ‘cat’, *killii* ‘betel leaf’ (p. 13), and with *a* vs. *aa*, e.g. *paṇṇa* ‘song’, *paṇṇaa* ‘turban’ (p. 58). It seems that the distribution of vowel length in Telugu still awaits an accurate statement.

P. 71: VS states “The alveolar affricates [ts] and [dz] are not phonemic. They are grouped with palatal affricates in this phonemic analysis.” But elsewhere (pp. 28-31) he gives examples which show apparent contrast between alveolar and palatal affricates: *khartsu* ‘expenditure’ vs. *carca* ‘discussion’, and *kuudzaa* ‘a pot’ vs. *puuja* ‘worship’. He observes that *ts* and *dz* are replaced by *c* and *j* in some dialects, but does not clarify the background of these sounds: namely, that in coastal Andhra, Dravidian

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Arden, *Tamil*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Fowler, pp. 364-5, where the symbol [ç] is used.

<sup>17</sup> The frequent merger of these sounds is mentioned by Arden, p. 50, and Fowler, pp. 363-4.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Bh. Krishnamurti, *Telugu Verbal Bases* (Berkeley, 1961), p. 5.

vocabulary and some loanwords have *c j* before front vowels, *ts dz* elsewhere — but other loans, especially from Sanskrit, have *c j* in all positions.<sup>19</sup> The result is, of course, that *ts dz* cannot be considered predictable variants of *c j* UNLESS the status of words, as 'unassimilated' Sanskrit loans or not, is somehow marked.

§6. To sum up: we must feel gratitude to the CIIL, to Director Pattanayak, to editor Biligiri, and to the authors of the individual booklets for making these valuable works available. We may expect that later volumes in the *Phonetic reader* series will show continuing improvement, and even that revised editions of vols. 1-4 may be prepared, in order to provide truly definitive sketches of Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil, and Telugu phonetics.

Los Angeles

William Bright

T. Goudriaan, C. Hooykaas, *Stuti and Stava (Bauddha, Saiva and Vaisnava) of Balinese Brahman Priests. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 76. Amsterdam, 1971. 608 pp. Appendices, Plates.*

In the present publication the two authors have presented a corpus of *stuti* and *stava* found in Balinese ritual texts (for a list of the mss. consulted see pp. 21-24). The three hundred odd *stuti* and *stava* found in the book are a heterogeneous assemblage of *kavaca*, *digbandha*, *dhyāna*, *dhāraṇī*, speculative and ritual prescriptive fragments and *phalaśruti*, drawn from a variety of rituals performed by *padanda Saiva*, *padanda Bauddha*, *rēsi* (*kṣatriya*) and *rēsi Vaiṣṇava*. As such it represents a considerable advance on the material published by Sylvain Lévi in 1933.

Only a small number of the hymns were found definitely by the authors to have an Indian origin; these are written in correct Paninian Sanskrit. The great majority of hymns, however, written in a deviant form of Sanskrit, Archipelago Sanskrit (ArSkt), appear to have originated in Java or Bali. The authors have noted a number of characteristics of this form of Sanskrit in their Introduction together with a list of common confusions — orthographic, phonological, morphological and lexicographical — found in the Sanskrit passages in Balinese mss. Because of the considerable reliance placed upon the typed transcriptions of mss. from the Gedong Kirtya in Singaraja, one is inclined to ask how much the picture given of common confusions reflects the confusions and idiosyncrasies of the Kirtya transcribers rather than those of the mss., particularly, for example, in the case of confusions concerning the divisions of words and those deriving from the Balinese script.

Following the Introduction is a critical edition of the text of each hymn together with a translation. In the critical notes to the texts the authors have included only what they have regarded as "real" variae lectiones, excluding cases of inconsistency, ignorance of correct Sanskrit spelling and clerical errors. In the case of hymns written in ArSkt the authors have made no attempt to emend the text in order to produce classically correct Sanskrit. In other cases, however, where it seemed clear that the writer of the hymn intended to write correct Sanskrit, they have made a serious attempt to reproduce a correct text. Translations have been added in nearly all cases. The translations of those hymns written in ArSkt are, however, only tentative because of the difficulty of interpreting this form of language.

The authors have prefaced the edited text of each hymn with short introductory notes containing comment on language and style, Indian parallels and on doctrinal

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Krishnamurti, pp. 2 (with fn. 5, p. 126).

and speculative aspects of the hymn, together with an indication of the ritual context in which the hymn is found. So far as the latter is concerned, only the briefest indication is given. Should the reader wish to learn more about the ritual significance of the hymn, he has to consult the relevant ritual texts, a number of which have appeared in recent publications of Hooykaas. In the case of unpublished texts, of course, the reader has no alternative but to consult the mss. themselves. In this the authors' careful noting of their sources is a considerable help. The six appendices (containing indices of first *pāda*, titles of hymns, lists of Buddhist and Visnuit hymns, an index of names and important words, a list of Skt and Old Javanese texts and collections of texts, and a bibliography of secondary sources) taken together with the list of mss. consulted (pp. 21-24) represent an elaborate system of cross-references valuable to the user of the book.

As a whole the publication fulfills its authors' hope and provides an extremely important source of materials for both the historian of Balinese religion and the student of Indian civilization. One wonders, however, what the writers mean when they say that their intention was also "to provide the Balinese with the correct shape of their religious materials" (p. 7). Are they suggesting that the Balinese are ignorant of the significance of the constituents of their own rituals? Having identified as nearly as possible the original text of each hymn, the authors would appear to go on to infer that that particular version has exclusive legitimacy within the context of Balinese ritual. This is a questionable point of view, for what we are in fact confronted with is a chronological sequence of variant versions of ritual formulae which are etymologically related but which appear to have enjoyed a changing ritual significance. This sequence may very well have begun with the original version which the two authors have identified. This latter version, however, is not the only one which should be regarded as the legitimate interest of scholarship. Rather, the scholar is called upon to understand the whole process of reinterpretation which each hymn has undergone in the course of time.

University of Sydney

P. J. Worsley

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

### CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

**JONG JAN WILLEM DE**, see vol. III, p. 319. Since 1965 Professor of South Asian and Buddhist Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia.

**KAPP, DIETER B.**, geb. 15.2.1941, studierte an der Universität Heidelberg (Altphilologie, Indogermanistik, Indologie, Islamwissenschaft, Ägyptologie und Assyriologie). 1971: Promotion in Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen Indiens (Hindi, Urdu, Tamil) und Islamwissenschaft. Zur Zeit Wissenschaftlicher Assistent am Süd-asien-Institut der Universität Heidelberg. Dissertation: *Das Verbum paraba in seiner Funktion als Simplex und Explikativum in Jāyasis Padumāvati* (Wiesbaden, 1972).