

THE STUDY OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY IN GERMANY AND
AUSTRIA : A SURVEY OF RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS
(1965 – 1972)

By

WILHELM HALBFASS, Philadelphia (U.S.A.)

I. *Historical Introduction*

The study of Indian thought in Germany owes much of its initial momentum to Romantic nostalgia : “ For the German Romanticists, . . . India . . . was a symbol of their own spiritual origin and homeland, their own forgotten depth ”¹. Novalis, Görres, occasionally Schelling, to some extent already J. G. Herder, and above all Friedrich Schlegel were the heralds of this Romantic myth of India as the “ cradle of mankind ”². It remains symptomatic that Friedrich Schlegel’s brother August Wilhelm became the first professor of Sanskrit in Germany (Bonn 1818); and still in his later British years, Max Müller was well aware of the Romantic roots of his own Indological interest.³—G.W.F. Hegel, the most powerful critic of Romantic nostalgia, represents a different and highly critical approach to Indian thought; yet, he is a keen and watchful observer and tries to deal philosophically with Indian philosophy.⁴ Other, and lesser, figures also demonstrate how Indian philosophy, however insufficiently known, enters the horizon of philosophers and historians of philosophy and contributes to articulating the idea of a world history of philosophy. K.J.H. Windischmann, e.g., includes Indian philosophy, with the aid of his son, the Sanskritist F.H.H. Windischmann, in his unfinished “ Philosophy in the Progress of World History ” (*Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte. I: Die Grundlage der Philosophie im Morgenlande*, 4 vols., Bonn 1827-1834). The philosopher-Sanskritist O. Frank presents an edition and German translation of Sadānanda’s *Vedāntasāra* (München-Leipzig 1835), one of the favorite texts in the early days of the study of *Vedānta* (also dealt with by F.H.H. Windischmann in the fourth volume of his father’s work; E. Röer, 1845; L. Poley, 1869⁵).—

1 Halbfass, W. *Hegel on the Philosophy of the Hindus*. In : German Scholars on India (Varanasi 1973), p. 107-122.

2 *Loc. cit.*

3 Cf. *India—What Can It Teach Us?* (London 1883) 29-33.

4 E.g. in his Berlin “ Lectures on the History of Philosophy ” (*Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*); cf. Halbfass, W. *loc.cit.*

5 Cf. Windisch, E. *Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und indischen Altertumskunde* (I : Strassburg 1917; II : Berlin und Leipzig 1920; Grundriß der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I, 1, B) 63 ff.; 207; 210 f. Potter, K. H. BIP; to Potter’s list of translations, the German translation in O. Böhtlingk’s *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie* (Leipzig 1909) has to be added.

The general and philosophical interest in Indian thought was, however, most successfully promoted by A. Schopenhauer—with the somewhat questionable effect, that it became almost automatically associated with “idealism” on the one hand, “pessimism” on the other hand. Inspired by Schopenhauer, P. Deussen became one of the most devoted Western students of Sanskrit and of Indian philosophy. His translations of sixty Upaniṣads and of Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ⁶, as well as the six volumes of his “*Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*” (General History of Philosophy, Leipzig 1894-1913; vols. 1-3 on Indian philosophy), bear witness to a unique combination of a somewhat one-sided enthusiasm with thorough scholarship. Deussen's younger contemporary, the philosopher-theologian R. Otto, contributes especially to the knowledge of *Viśiṣṭādvaita* ⁷; and in general, Indian thought has become a really tangible factor of German thought and culture in the first decades of the 20th century. However, the attitude of the more conservative academic historians of philosophy remains hesitant, if not explicitly negative. Statements reach from basic doubts as to the accessibility and intelligibility of Indian philosophy ⁸ to categorically denying the title of philosophy to Indian thought. ⁹ In spite of the repeatedly manifested interest of such leading 20th century thinkers as M. Scheler, M. Heidegger and K. Jaspers ¹⁰, we may say that the contributions of German philosophers resp. academic teachers of philosophy to the interpretation of Indian philosophy remain somewhat scattered and casual; and there has been a certain tendency to leave this field to less academic thinkers, such as L. Ziegler, the count H. Keyserling, and H. Kassner.

Most of the pioneering and fundamental work has been done by Indologists, such as O. Strauss (for some time co-worker of P. Deussen), G. Thibaut, R. Garbe, also H. von Glasenapp, H. Jacobi, P. Hacker and, with a very different approach, W. Ruben. Others, like E. Hultzsck, E. Windisch, F.O.

6 *Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda* (Leipzig 1897); *Die Sūtra's des Vedānta...nebst dem vollständigen Commentare des Ṣaṅkara* (Leipzig 1887).

7 Cf. *Dīpikā des Nivāsa* (Tübingen 1916); *Rāmānuja, Siddhānta* (Jena 1917); among his other contributions, cf., e.g., *Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa* (Jena 1917); *West-Östliche Mystik* (Gotha 1916).

8 Cf. H.-G. Gadamer, Preface to : Dilthey, W.: *Grundriß der allgemeinen Geschichte der Philosophie* (Frankfurt 1949) 18.

9 E.g. Windelband, W.: *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Tübingen ¹⁵ 1957), 22, although granting the possibility of certain steps towards philosophy in Oriental cultures, presents the history of philosophy as a strictly European phenomenon and explicitly excludes Chinese and Indian thought.—A brief discussion of the problem of the applicability of the term “philosophy” to Indian thought is given by W. Ruben (cf. the book referred to in n. 33).

10 Cf. the sections on the Buddha and Nāgārjuna in Jaspers' *Die großen Philosophen* (München 1957), also H. von Glasenapp, *Das Indienbild deutscher Denker* (Stuttgart 1960).
OJ22

Schrader, H. Oldenberg, whose main interest is in other areas of Indian studies, at least occasionally turn towards Indian philosophy.¹¹

The most distinguished living representative of the study of Indian philosophy in Europe is, no doubt, E. Frauwallner of Vienna. Starting around 1930, with pioneering contributions to the study of early *Sāṃkhya* and, above all, of the school of Dīṇāga and Dharmakīrti, his research covers all major fields of Indian philosophy, with the exception of *Vedānta*. Two volumes of his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (Salzburg 1953 and 1956) have been published so far.¹²—Frauwallner's work is continued by a group of former disciples of his, such as G. Oberhammer and E. Steinkellner (now his successors in Vienna), L. Schmithausen, T. Vetter, G. Chemparathy, who pursue the study of Indian philosophy in the sense of working towards a sober and literal understanding of important sources, and of trying to integrate them into their proper historical context. As a rule, systematic philosophical evaluation and comparative studies are put aside by this group.—Apart from Vienna, the universities of Münster (P. Hacker) and Hamburg (L. Schmithausen; A. Wezler) can now be regarded as centres for the study of Indian philosophy in the German-speaking area of Europe.¹³

Except for a few casual hints, the following brief survey of books and articles, which contribute to the study of Indian philosophy (*not* Indian thought in general) on an academic level of research, will be confined to the period from 1965 to 1972. Primary attention will be paid to contributions in German.—I am neither claiming completeness nor complete neutrality.

II. Buddhist Philosophy

Although E. Frauwallner's interest and scholarly competence cover many different areas of Indian thought, his name will above all remain connected with the exploration of that school of Buddhist philosophy which is known as the school of 'Buddhist Logic' and is most notably represented by Dīṇāga and Dharmakīrti; since the 1930ies. Frauwallner's efforts laid the foundations of a much more comprehensive and historically adequate understanding than it had been accessible to Th. Stcherbatsky.¹⁴ It is true that his most recent contribu-

11 Cf. the indices in E. Windisch's *Geschichte* (see above, n. 5) and in BIP.

12 These two volumes have been translated into English by V. M. Bedekar (*History of Indian Philosophy*, 2 vols., Delhi 1972).

13 Marburg may be mentioned in this connection as a place where special attention is paid to Bhartṛhari (cf. W. Rau's philological work on the *Vākyapadiya* and its manuscript tradition; P. S. Sharma's translation of the *Kālasamuddeśa* of the *Vākyapadiya* (together with Helārāja's *Vṛtti*; Delhi 1972) was written as a doctoral dissertation under the guidance of W. Rau).—Two of Frauwallner's disciples, T. Vetter and G. Chemparathy, are now teaching at Utrecht (Holland).

14 Cf. the Frauwallner bibliography in BGI,

tions focus on other themes; but his work is being continued by some of his disciples, mainly by E. Steinkellner and T. Vetter. After his *Erkenntnisprobleme bei Dharmakīrti* (Wien 1964; VKSKSO. 1), which attempts a systematic philosophical interpretation of epistemological issues in Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*, Vetter published *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ, 1. Kapitel : Pratyakṣam* (Wien 1966; VKSKSO. 3), containing the Tibetan version which is the basis of our knowledge of this text, together with an introduction, a German translation and the Sanskrit fragments which were known at that time. Although the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* reproduces a good deal of the textual material, especially of the verses, of the earlier and more famous *Pramāṇavārttika*, its mode of presentation is in a sense purified, i.e. more strictly epistemological.¹⁵—In 1968, a text was published in India which turned out to be an extremely rich mine of textual information on important thinkers of the 1st millennium A.D., among them Dharmakīrti—sc. Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*.¹⁶ Its numerous quotations from the first chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, which had not been identified as such by the editor, have recently been collected by E. Steinkellner (*New Sanskrit-Fragments of Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ, First Chapter*. WZKS 16, 1972, 199-206), and they add considerably to restoring the original wording of the text.—An edition of the second chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (on *svārthānumāna*), which incorporates the relevant passages from the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, has been prepared by Steinkellner and is in the press; a translation will follow.¹⁷ Already in 1967, Steinkellner made accessible another Dharmakīrti text, apparently a product of his later years—the *Hetubindu* (*Dharmakīrti's Hetubinduḥ*. 2 vols., Wien 1967; VKSKSO 4.5; Tibetan text, reconstruction of the Sanskrit text, German translation and extensive notes). That an actual and proper restoration of the Sanskrit text became possible in this case is mainly due to the fact that, in addition to the Tibetan translation, a paraphrasing commentary (by Arcaṭa) and a sub-commentary (by Durvekamiśra) in Sanskrit were systematically consulted. As its title indicates, the *Hetubindu* deals with the types of logical reasons, basically the *svabhāvahetu* and the *kāryahetu*, but it also contains an interesting discussion of the 'proof of momentariness' (*kṣaṇikatvānumāna*); its presentation by Steinkellner is a model case of a rigorously philological approach, which tries to understand Dharmakīrti's words in their own context and horizon, and deliberately abstains from any further-reaching "philosophical" evaluation.

Several other contributions by Steinkellner have to be mentioned in this connection: *Bemerkungen zu Iśvarasena's Lehre vom Grund* (WZKS 10,

15 Cf. also Vetter, T.: *Das Problem des metaphysischen Beweises in der logisch-erkenntnistheoretischen Periode der indischen Philosophie*. (ZDMG 118, 1968, 351-356; on Dharmakīrti's criticism of what Vetter calls the "metaphysical proof").

16 Ed. Yoṣindrananda, Vārāṇasī 1968 (*Ṣaḍdarśanaprakāśaṇa granthamālā* 1).

17 In VKSKS.

1966, 73-85) examines some statements in Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti* (with special reference to the *vaidharmyavacanārtha*) which are attributed to Dharmakīrti's teacher Iśvarasena; this throws some light on the hitherto rather obscure development between Diñnāga and Dharmakīrti—*Die Entwicklung des kṣaṇikatvānumānam bei Dharmakīrti* (BGI 361-377) shows that the 'proof of momentariness' undergoes a development in Dharmakīrti's thought, from more traditional forms to its most advanced stage, the *sattvānumāna* in the *Pramāṇavinīścaya*¹⁸.—*Wirklichkeit und Begriff bei Dharmakīrti* (WZKS 15, 1971, 179-211) systematically examines the usage of one of Dharmakīrti's most important terms, *svabhāva*, in the first chapter of the *Pramāṇavārttika* (347 occurrences). It classifies the meanings of this term according to its ontological, epistemological and logical functions and shows how its basic ontological meaning ('Eigenwesen', 'own-being') remains decisive for its specifically logical functions, notably in the compound *svabhāvahetu*; this is a result which is definitely incompatible with Stcherbatsky's widely accepted interpretation of the *svabhāvahetu* inference as "analytical proposition" in the Kantian sense.¹⁹—Regarding the theme of "inference", A. Wezler's *Diñnāga's Kritik an der Schlusslehre des Nyāya und die Deutung von Nyāyasūtra I. 1. 5* (ZDMG, Supplement I/3, 1968, 834-840) may be mentioned, which discusses Diñnāga's criticism of the *Nyāya* theory of inference and the meaning and implications of *Nyāya-sūtra* I. 1. 5.

As noted above, E. Frauwallner has recently been less concerned with the school of Diñnāga and Dharmakīrti.²⁰ In the field of Buddhist studies, he has mainly been engaged in the study of Abhidharma. In a series of four articles *Abhidharma-Studien*, published between 1963 and 1972²¹, he discusses problems which may not be philosophical in any strict and proper sense of this word, but are nevertheless historically very important for the beginnings and early developments of Buddhist philosophy and have to be taken into consideration for an adequate understanding of that stage of development which was reached in Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*. Starting with the early systematizations of

18 Cf. in this connection Steinkellner's review of A.C.S. McDermott, *An Eleventh-Century Buddhist Logic of 'Exists'* (Dordrecht 1969). IIIJ 14 (1972) 115-118.

19 This theme was developed in a paper read by Steinkellner at the 183rd meeting of the American Oriental Society, March 1973 (Washington, D.C.).—Cf. in this connection G. Oberhammer, *Der Svābhāvika-Sambandha, eingeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Nyāya-Logik* (WZKSO 8, 1964, 131-181); on Diñnāga and Dharmakīrti: 135-139.

20 But see his translation of a passage from Diñnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* in *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṃsā* (Wien 1968; VKSKSO 6).

21 I. *Pañcaskandhakam und Pañcavastukam* (WZKSO 7, 1963, 20-36); II. *Die kanonischen Abhidharma-Werke* (WZKSO 8, 1964, 59-99); III. *Der Abhisamayavādaḥ* (WZKS 15, 1971, 69-102); IV. *Der Abhidharma der anderen Schulen* (WZKS 15, 1971 103-121; 16, 1972, 95-152).

the *Pañcaskandhaka* and the *Pañcavastuka*²², he follows the development of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma literature, discusses its agreements with Pāli Abhidhamma works and the possibility of a common source, emphasizes the role of Dharmaśrī (*Abhidharmasāra*) as precursor of Vasubandhu, and finally reconsiders the Pāli *Abhidhammapiṭaka* and the *Śāriputrābhidharma* which has been attributed to the Dharmaguptaka school.—At this point, we may express our hope that the third volume of Frauwallner's *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (History of Indian Philosophy) will be published soon and thus add to our understanding of the hitherto rather opaque philosophical developments in the *Hinayāna* schools.

A new and thorough analysis of one of the most basic and central teachings of Buddhism, the *pratīyasamutpāda* formula, is given by F. Bernhard, the editor of a monumental critical edition of the *Udānavarga*²³, in his article *Zur Interpretation der Pratīyasamutpāda-Formel* (BGI 53-63); his conclusion is "that originally the second part of the *pratīyasamutpāda* formula was not a continuation but a parallel of the first part"²⁴.—Referring to Bernhard's edition, L. Schmithausen presents a long series of penetrating philological observations concerning the different recensions of this text: *Zu den Rezensionen des Udānavargaḥ* (WZKS 14, 1970, 47-124); *Philologische Bemerkungen zum Ratnagotravibhāga* (Philological Remarks on the Ratnagotravibhāga) follow one year later (WZKS 15, 1971, 123-177). Other documents of the scholarship and linguistic sovereignty of this master philologist among contemporary students of Indian thought are: *Der Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt in der Vinīścayasaṃgrahaṇī der Yogācārabhūmiḥ* (Wien 1969, VKSKSO 9), making accessible, with the help of Tibetan, Chinese and Mongolian versions, an important section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, which introduces a new concept of *nirvāṇa* and has not been preserved in the Sanskrit original; *Zur Literaturgeschichte der älteren Yogācāra-Schule* (ZDMG, Supplement I/3, 1968, 809-821), which discusses problems of the literary history of the older *Yogācāra* school; *Sautrāntika-Voraussetzungen in Viṃśatikā und Trīṃśikā* (WZKSO 11, 1967, 109-136), which points out certain doctrinal divergences between these two short treatises by Vasubandhu, especially the fact that the term *ālayavijñāna* does not occur in the *Viṃśatikā* and that it does not advocate the Yogācārin's "eightfold complex of mental series", which we have in the *Trīṃśikā*. However, Schmithausen finds certain

22. Cf. in this connection J. Imanishi, *Das Pañcavastukam und die Pañcavastukavibhāsā* (Göttingen 1969; Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Jg. 1969, Nr. 1). Imanishi presents and analyses Sanskrit *Abhidharma* fragments from the famous Turfan manuscripts.

23. *Udānavarga*, herausgegeben von F. Bernhard, 2 vols. (Göttingen 1965-1968; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse III/54. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10).

24. BGI 63.

Sautrāntika traces also in the Yogācāric *Triṃśikā*. He concludes (—referring, of course, to Frauwallner's "two-Vasubandhu hypothesis"): "On account of these Sautrāntika-elements *Viṃśatikā* and *Triṃśikā* may be attributed to the author of *Abhidharmakośa*"²⁵.

III. *Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika*

The classical period of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* in the 1st millennium A.D. is a period of constant conflict with Buddhist philosophy, but at the same time of a remarkable interplay and mediation of ideas. This specific relationship between *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* and 'Buddhist Logic' has, in several exemplary cases, been accentuated by Frauwallner and his disciples.²⁶ However, in their most recent contributions only a somewhat casual attention is paid to the classical and ancient periods of *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika*. L. Schmithausen's *Zur Lehre von der vorstellungsfreien Wahrnehmung bei Praśastapāda* (WZKS 14, 1970, 125-130) critically discusses and rejects M. Hattori's interpretation of the role of 'non-qualificative perception' in *Praśastapāda*²⁷ and emphasizes the ambiguity which results from the applicability of *ālocanamātra* to both the *dravya* as qualificand (*viśeṣya*) and its qualifiers (*viśeṣaṇa*).—G. Oberhammer, *Zur Deutung von Nyāyasūtram I. 1.5* (WZKS 10, 1966, 66-72) relates *Nyāyasūtra* I.1.5 to a passage in the *Carakasamhitā* and interprets the controversial 'trividham' as implying 'trikālam'. The legitimacy of such an interpretation is denied by A. Wezler, *Die 'dreifache' Schlußfolgerung im Nyāyasūtra I. 1.5* (IJ 11, 1968/69, 190-211); Wezler tries to re-interpret the 'pūrvavat', 'śeṣavat' and 'sāmānyavat' in the light of two Buddhist works, sc. the *Upāyahrdaya* and 'Piṅgala's' commentary on Nāgārjuna's *Madhyamakāśāstra*.

Some remarkable contributions to the study of *Navyanyāya* have recently been presented by Frauwallner. His *Die Lehre von der zusätzlichen Bestimmung (upādhiḥ) in Gaṅgeśa's Tattvacintāmaṇiḥ* (Wien 1970, VKSKS 9) gives the text, a German translation and an interpretation of *Tattvacintāmaṇi* II/14 (with references to the relevant passages in *Maṇikaṇṭha* and *Vardhamāna*); this chapter is an important source for our understanding of the concept of *upādhi*,

25 WZKS 11, 1967, 136.—Cf. also L. Schmithausen, *The Definition of Pratyakṣam in the Abhidharmasamuccayaḥ*. (WZKS 16, 1972, 153-164); this is a rejoinder to A. Kunst's review of Schmithausen's *Maṇḍanamīśra's Vibhramavivekaḥ* (BSOAS 30, 1967), mainly concerning the definition of *pratyakṣa* in Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya* as "svasatprakāśābhrānto 'rthah'".

26 Cf., e.g. E. Frauwallner, *Zu den Fragmenten buddhistischer Logiker im Nyāyavārtikam*. (Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 40, 1933, 281-304).

27 *Two Types of Non-Qualificative Perception* (BGI 161-169).—Classical *Vaiśeṣika* is a major field of research for the writer of the present survey; cf. Halbfass, W.: *Remarks on the Vaiśeṣika Concept of Sāmānya*, Añjali, Papers on Indology and Buddhism. A Felicitation Vol. pres. to O. H. de A. Wijesekera on his 60th birthday, ed. by J. Tilakasiri (Peradeniya 1970) 137-150; this is followed by several forthcoming publications on related topics.

as it had been developed in the school of Udayana.²⁸ The article *Prabhākara Upādhyāya* (WZKS 9, 1965, 198-226) discusses the role of the Naiyāyika (not the Mīmāṃsaka) Prabhākara as a forerunner of Gaṅgeśa, with special reference to his theory of *vyāpti* and *upādhi*. Frauwallner's most remarkable contribution in this field, however, is a series of articles on *Raghunātha Śīromaṇi* in WZKS (0): 10 (1966) 86-207; 11 (1967) 140-208; 14 (1970) 161-208. Raghunātha's explication of some passages of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* (the *sāmānyābhāvaprakaraṇa*, the *vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāvaprakaraṇa* and the *siddhāntalakṣaṇaprakaraṇa*) is confronted and compared with that given by his most important predecessors, such as Yājñapati, Jayadeva, Rucidatta, and Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma. Thus, Raghunātha's role and position in the development of *Navyanyāya* is critically examined, and his achievements and his philosophical stature are subjected to some serious questions. What distinguishes him from the older group of Gaṅgeśa commentators (Yājñapati to Vāsudeva), is, in Frauwallner's view, a rather one-sided interest in formal subtleties and in the applicability of concepts and definitions to a variety of often very remote and artificial cases.

IV. *Sāṃkhya and Yoga*

After a long and remarkable tradition of *Sāṃkhya* scholarship in Germany and Austria²⁹, relatively little philosophical attention has been paid to *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga* in the last decade. G. Oberhammer's article *Meditation und Mystik im Yoga des Patañjali* (WZKS 9, 1965, 98-118) discusses the meaning and function of *samādhi* and *samāpatti* in Pātañjala Yoga. His *Gott, Urbild der emanzipierten Existenz im Yoga des Patañjali* (Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 86, 1964, 197-207) relates Patañjali's idea of God to that of the 'Great Seer' and points out its prototypical role for the conception of liberated existence. This discussion is to a certain extent continued by A. Wezler, *Der Gott des Sāṃkhya: Zu Nyāyakusumāñjali I. 3* (IJ 12, 1969/70, 255-262); starting with a passage in Udayana's *Nyāyakusumāñjali*, which is supplemented by a number of thematically related passages, Wezler shows that, already in the days of Pāṇcaśikha, and in spite of the theoretical atheism of *Sāṃkhya*, Kapila played a quasi-divine role as *ādividvāms*, as prototype of the perfect knower and seer.—A very remarkable philological contribution to the study of *Sāṃkhya*, which has to be mentioned in this connection, is S. A. Srinivasan, *Vācaspatimiśra's Tattvakaumudī. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung* (Hamburg 1967; Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien 12); it also gives (54 ff.) a careful discussion of the date of Vācaspati and his *Tattvakaumudī*.³⁰

28 The text of the anonymous *Upādhidarpaṇa*, which is also very relevant in this context, will be edited by G. Oberhammer in VKSKS.

29 Cf. Larson, G.: *Classical Sāṃkhya* (Delhi 1969) 16 ff.

30 Chronological problems concerning Vācaspati (with special reference to his relationship with Maṇḍana, Trilocana, Jayanta) are also discussed by L. Schmithausen, *Some Remarks*

V. *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta*

One of the central figures for contemporary research in the field of Indian philosophy is, no doubt, Maṇḍanamiśra. His *Vibhramaviveka*, according to our present state of knowledge the earliest work of Indian philosophy dealing exclusively with the theme of error, was made fully accessible by L. Schmithausen, *Maṇḍanamiśra's Vibhramavivekaḥ. Mit einer Studie zur Entwicklung der indischen Irrtumslehre* (Wien 1965; VKSKSO 2). The text of the only known manuscript, an attempted reconstruction, a verse index, German translation and commentary are followed by a comprehensive historical survey of Indian theories of error which leads from the older developments in *Mahāyāna* Buddhism, early *Vedānta*, *Vaiśeṣika* and *Mīmāṃsā* to Diñnāga, Kumārila, Prabhākara, Dharmakīrti, their *Naiyāyika* contemporaries, and to Maṇḍana himself. What is thus presented to us, may be called a specimen of a philologically based philosophical "Problemggeschichte".—Another contribution to the study of Maṇḍana's thought is T. Vetter, *Maṇḍanamiśra's Brahmasiddhiḥ—Brahmakāṇḍaḥ. Übersetzung, Einleitung und Anmerkungen* (Wien 1969; VKSKSO 7), containing a German translation, together with introduction and notes, of the *Brahma*-section of Maṇḍana's *Brahmasiddhi*³¹.—E. Frauwallner, *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṃsā* (Wien 1968; VKSKSO 6) deals with problems of earlier *Mīmāṃsā*. Specifically, it presents and discusses two of the most important documents of ancient *Mīmāṃsā* epistemology :

1. *Śabarabhāṣya* I.1. 1-5 (Sanskrit and German) ;
2. Diñnāga's polemics against *Mīmāṃsā* in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*³² (Tibetan and German). A third section of the book tries to clarify the role of the "*ṛttikāra*" mentioned by Śabarasyāmin; according to Frauwallner, he is not identical with the *Mīmāṃsā* "*ṛttikāra*" (identified as Bhavadāsa) who is mentioned in Diñnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*.

In the field of *Vedānta* studies, P. Hacker continued his long series of remarkable contributions to an historical and philological exploration of *Advaita* literature. In *Śaṅkara der Yogin und Śaṅkara der Advaitin* (BGI 119-148),

on the Problem of the Date of Vācaspatiśra (Journal of the Bihar Research Society 54, 1968, 158-164).

31 It is an interesting coincidence and symptomatic of the growing interest in Maṇḍana that in the same year M. Biardeau published her French translation and analysis of the complete text of the *Brahmasiddhi* : *La philosophie de Maṇḍana Miśra, vue à partir de la Brahmasiddhi* (Paris 1969; Publications de l'Ecole Française de l'Extrême-Orient. 76).

32 Cf. Frauwallner's rejoinder to the review by H. Scharfe (JAOS 91, 1971, 316-318), mainly concerning problems of translation and the identity of the "*ṛttikāra*" : *Zum Ṛttikāragranthaḥ* (WZKS 16, 1972, 165-167).—A major part of the passages translated from the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* has been made accessible in the same year by M. Hattori, *Diñnāga, On Perception* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968; HOS 47).

Hacker tries to establish the identity of Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda, author of a *Yogabhāṣyavivaraṇa* (published in 1952), with the famous author of the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. This amounts to the thesis that Śaṅkara was first an adherent of Pātañjala Yoga and then turned an Advaitin; in support of his thesis, Hacker finds numerous conceptual affinities to the Pātañjala system still in Śaṅkara's authentic *Advaita* works^{32a}. In *Relations of Early Advaitins to Vaiṣṇavism* (WZKSO 9, 1965, 147-154) he argues for the equally unorthodox thesis that Śaṅkara did not come from a Śaiva, but from a Vaiṣṇava milieu. Another Śaṅkara study is T. Vetter, *Zur Bedeutung des Illusionismus bei Śaṅkara* (BGI 407-423); it distinguishes two kinds of *avidyā* in Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, one related to the individual and its liberation, the other one to cosmic illusion, and both different from the *avidyā* concept of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikābhāṣya*, which is regarded as an earlier work by Śaṅkara.—An interesting chapter of *Advaita* philosophy of language is made available in German translation in T. Vetter *Sarvajñātman's Saṃkṣepaśārīrakam, 1. Kapitel: Einführung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen* (Wien 1972; VKSKSO 11.)

A useful survey and analysis of the *Pañcapādikāvivarāṇa* of the 10th century Advaita commentator Prakāśātman is given by K. Cammann, *Das System des Advaita nach der Lehre Prakāśātmans* (Wiesbaden 1965; Münchener Indologische Studien 4). Some passages in the same text are discussed by L. Schmithausen, *Zur advaitischen Theorie der Objekterkenntnis* (BGI 329-360); Schmithausen distinguishes and analyses three different theories of object-knowledge in Prakāśātman's *Vivaraṇa*. Continuing earlier articles on *jīvanmukti* in the Upaniṣads etc. J. F. Sprockhoff examines the concept of *jīvanmukti* according to Vidyāranya's *Jīvanmuktiviveka* in *Der Weg zur Erlösung bei Lebzeiten, ihr Wesen und ihr Wert, nach dem Jīvanmuktiviveka des Vidyāranya* (WZKS 14, 1970, 131-159).

Two contributions to the study of *Viśiṣṭādvaita* have recently been brought out by G. Oberhammer: *Die Theorie der Schlußfolgerung bei Parāśarabhaṭṭa* (BGI 253-273) illustrates a chapter of *Viśiṣṭādvaita* logic and epistemology between Rāmānuja and Veṅkaṭanātha, trying to reconstruct the theory of inference, as expounded by Parāśarabhaṭṭa in his *Tattvaratnākara*. Problems of early *Viśiṣṭādvaita*, particularly its connexions with Pāñcarātra, are examined (with special reference to Yāmuna's *Āgamaprāmānya* and the relevant passages of Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*) in Yāmunamuni's *Interpretation von Brahmasūtram* 2. 2. 42-45. *Untersuchung zur Pāñcarātra-Tradition der Rāmānuja-Schule* (Wien 1971; VKSKS 10).

32a Cf. also Hacker, P.; *Notes on the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad and Śaṅkara's Āgamaśāstravivaraṇa*. India Major: Congrat. Vol. pres. to J. Gonder, (Leiden 1972) 115-132.
023

VI. *Some General and Miscellaneous Contributions :*

A representative of the Marxist approach to Indian thought and culture is W. Ruben of East Berlin; accordingly, he emphasizes naturalistic and materialistic trends and tries to understand the development of Indian philosophy in the context of social and economic developments. Among his more recent contributions are *Seit wann gibt es Philosophie in Indien?* (BGI 295-302), which discusses the question of the historical origins of Indian philosophy, and *Die gesellschaftliche Entwicklung im alten Indien. Bd. 4 : Die Entwicklung der Philosophie* (Berlin 1971, VIO 67), a volume on Indian Philosophy which is part of a comprehensive social history of ancient India.³³ One of Ruben's disciples, H. Rüstau, discusses two ways of linking *Advaita Vedānta* philosophy with the ideology of the national liberation movement in India in *Swami Vivekananda and Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak. Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten ihrer philosophischen Auffassungen* (Neue Indienkunde—New Indology. Festschrift W. Ruben zum 70. Geburtstag. Berlin 1970, VIO 72, 539-549).—Another contribution published in East Berlin is R. Hauschild, *Die Aṣṭāvakra-Gītā* (Berlin 1967; Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 58/2).—Indian approaches to the problem of “proving” the existence of God are discussed by G. Oberhammer, *Zum Problem des Gottesbeweises in der indischen Philosophie*³⁴ (Numen. International Review for the History of Religions. 12, 1965, 1-34); mechanistic and theistic types of Hindu cosmogony are contrasted by P. Hacker, *Mechanistische und theistische Kosmogonie im Hinduismus* (Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft 49, 1965, 17-28).—D. Schlinghoff, *Fragmente einer Palmblatthandschrift philosophischen Inhalts aus Ostturkistan (Ms. Spitzer)* (BGI 323-328), presents the oldest known evidence—from a palm-leaf manuscript discovered in Central Asia—for the Parvan arrangement of the *Mahābhārata* and for the existence of the doctrinal and philosophical parts of the Śāntiparvan.³⁵

33 Ruben's book is divided into six main chapters, which discuss six “periods” of ancient Indian thought from “Rgvedic mythology (1200-900 B.C.)” to what Ruben calls “completion of epistemology (300-500 A.D.)”.—One of the special features of the book is that at the end of each chapter it inserts a brief comparison with the respective developments in Greek thought; the main purpose of these synoptic sections is to illustrate how in both cultures different stages of philosophical development are conditioned by corresponding stages of socio-economic development.

34 Oberhammer's article follows the development and its attempted solutions in *Nyāya* thought from Pakṣilasvāmin and Uddyotakara to Trilocana and Jayanta, including a detailed discussion of Dharmakīrti's critical observations concerning the logical legitimacy of proving the existence of God (*Īśvara*).—In this context, the unpublished doctoral dissertation by G. Chemparathy, *Aufkommen und Entwicklung der Lehre von einem höchsten Wesen in Nyāya und Vaiśeṣika* (Wien 1963), has to be mentioned; in the meantime, the author has presented numerous other contributions in this field of research.

35 Cf. D. Schlinghoff, *The Oldest Extant Parvan-List of the Mahābhārata* (JAOS 89, 1969, 334-338).

Abbreviations

- BGI = Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festschrift für E. Frauwallner (WZKSO 12-13, 1968-69)
- BIP = K. H. Potter, Bibliography of Indian Philosophies (Delhi 1970; Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, 1)
- HOS = Harvard Oriental Series (Cambridge, Mass)
- IJJ = Indo-Iranian Journal ('s-Gravenhage)
- JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven, Conn.)
- VIO = Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin)
- VKSKS[O] = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens [since 1970, vol. 9: Südasiens], published by Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien), Philosophisch-historische Klasse, in the series of its *Sitzungsberichte*.
- WZKS[O] = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens [since 1970, vol. 14: Südasiens]
- ZDMG = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Wiesbaden)