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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, 1869 5 ).

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 (1: Strassburg 1917; II: Berlin und Leipzig 1920; Grundriß der indo-ärischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I, I, B) 63 ff.; 207; 210 f. Potter, K. H. BLP; 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 Brahma-sūtrabhāṣya 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 Indo-logists, 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. Hultzsch, E. Windisch, F.O.

---

6 Sechzig Upanishad’s des Veda (Leipzig 1897); Die Sūtra’s des Vedānta....nebst dem vollständigen Commentare des Čāndakā (Leipzig 1887).
7 Cf. Dipikā des Nivāsa (Tübingen 1916); Rāmānuja, Siddhānta (Jena 1917); among his other contributions, cf., e.g., Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa (Jena 1917); West-Östliche Mystik (Gotha 1916).
9 E.g. Windelband, W.: Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie (Tübingen 18 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). 0122
Schrader, H. Oldenberg, whose main interest is in other areas of Indian studies, at least occasionally turn towards Indian philosophy.\textsuperscript{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 Śāmkhya and, above all, of the school of Diṇnāga and Dharmakīrti, his research covers all major fields of Indian philosophy, with the exception of Vedānta. Two volumes of his \textit{Geschichte der indischen Philosophie} (Salzburg 1953 and 1956) have been published so far.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{13}

Except for a few casual hints, the following brief survey of books and articles, which contribute to the study of Indian philosophy (\textit{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.

\section*{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 Diṇnāga 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.\textsuperscript{14} It is true that his most recent contribu-

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. the indices in E. Windisch’s \textit{Geschichte} (see above, n. 5) and in BIP.

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

\textsuperscript{13} Marburg may be mentioned in this connection as a place where special attention is paid to Bhartrhari (cf. W. Rau’s philological work on the \textit{Vākyapadīya} and its manuscript tradition; P. S. Sharma’s translation of the \textit{Kālasanuddeśa} of the \textit{Vākyapadīya} (together with Helārāja’s \textit{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).

\textsuperscript{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; VSKS. 1), which attempts a systematic philosophical interpretation of epistemological issues in Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇavārttika, Vetter published Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ, 1. Kapitel: Pratyakṣam (Wien 1965; VSKS. 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. 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. 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. 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; VSKS. 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 Arcaṇa) and a sub-commentary (by Durvekmārā) 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 Iṣvārasena’s Lehre vom Grund (WZKS. 10,


16 Ed. Yoṣindranāda, Vāraṇasi 1968 (Ṣaḍḍarśanaprakāśana granthamālā 1).

17 In VSKS.
1966, 73-85) examines some statements in Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttikasvāryttī* (with special reference to the *vaidharmayavacanārtha*) which are attributed to Dharmakīrti's teacher Iśvarasena; this throws some light on the hitherto rather obscure development between Diṅnāga 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 *Pramāṇaviniścaya*\(^{18}\).* 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 *Diṅnāga's Kritik an der Schlusslehre des Nyāya und die Deutung von Nyāyasūtra I. 1. 5* (ZDMG, Supplement 1/3, 1968, 834-840) may be mentioned, which discusses Diṅnāga'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 Diṅnāga 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 1972\(^{21}\), 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

---


\(^{19}\) 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 Diṅnāga and Dharmakīrti: 135-139.

\(^{20}\) But see his translation of a passage from Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* in *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamimāṃsā* (Wien 1968; VKSKSO 6).

the Pañcaskandhaka and the Pañcavastuka\textsuperscript{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 reconsider 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 pratiṣayasamutpāda formula, is given by F. Bernhard, the editor of a monumental critical edition of the Udānavarga\textsuperscript{23}, in his article Zur Interpretation der Pratiṣayasamutpāda-Formel (BGI 53-63); his conclusion is “that, originally the second part of the pratiṣayasamutpāda formula was not a continuation but a parallel of the first part”\textsuperscript{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 Udānavargā (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 Viniścayasaṃgrahani der Yogācārabhūmi (Wien 1969, VKS KO S 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 Viniśatikā und Triṃśikā (WZKSO 11, 1967, 109-136), which points out certain doctrinal divergences between these two short treatises by Vasubandhu, especially the fact that the term d layāvijñāna does not occur in the Viniśatikā and that it does not advocate the Yogācārin’s “eightfold complex of mental series”, which we have in the Triṃśikā. However, Schmithausen finds certain

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. in this connection J. Imanishi, Das Pañcavastukam und die Pañcavastukā:ībhāva (Göttingen 1969; Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse I. 1969, Nr. 1). Imanishi presents and analyses Sanskrit Abhidharma fragments from the famous Turfan manuscripts.


\textsuperscript{24} BGI 63.
Sautrāntika traces also in the Yogācārīc Triṃśikā. He concludes (—referring, of course, to Frauwallner’s “two-Vasubandhu hypothesis”): “On account of these Sautrāntika-elements Vīṃśatikā and Triṃśikā may be attributed to the author of Abhidharmakosā” 25.

III. Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika

The classical period of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika in the 1st millenium 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 Praśāstapaḍā (WZKS 14, 1970, 125-130) critically discusses and rejects M. Hattori’s interpretation of the role of ‘non-qualificative perception’ in Praśāstapaḍā 27 and emphasizes the ambiguity which results from the applicability of ālocaṇamātra to both the dravya as qualificand (viṣeṣya) and its qualifiers (viṣeṣaṇa).—G. Oberhammer, Zur Deutung von Nyāyasūtra I. 1.5 (WZKSO 10, 1966, 66-72) relates Nyāyasūtra I.1.5 to a passage in the Carakasaṃhitā 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 (IIJ 11, 1968/69, 190-211); Wezler tries to re-interpret the ‘purvavat’, ‘śeṣavat’ and ‘sāmānyavat’ in the light of two Buddhist works, sc. the Upāyahrdaya and ‘Piṅgala’s’ commentary on Nāgārjuna’s Madhyamakasāstra.

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 Tatvavacintāmaṇiḥ (Wien 1970, VKSKS 9) gives the text, a German translation and an interpretation of Tatvavacintāmaṇi II/14 (with references to the relevant passages in Maṇiśaṅgha and Vardhamāna); this chapter is an important input for our understanding of the concept of upādhi,

25 WZKSO 11, 1967, 136.—Cf. also L. Schmithausen, The Definition of Pratyakṣa in the Abhidharmasamuccayaḥ. (WZKS 16, 1972, 153-164); this is a rejoinder to A. Kunst’s review of Schmithausen’s Maṇḍanaṇīśa’s Vibhramavivekaḥ (BSOAS 30, 1967), mainly concerning the definition of pratyakṣa in Asaṅga’s Abhidharmasamuccaya as “svasatprakāsābhārānto ‘rihah’”.

26 Cf., e.g. E. Frauwallner, Zu den Fragmenten buddhistischer Logiker im Nyāya-vārtikam. (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, Ahjāli, 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. The article Prabhākara Uपाध्याय (WZKSO 9, 1965, 198-226) discusses the role of the Naiyāyika (not the Mīmāṃsaka) Prabhākara as a forerunner of Gāṅgēśa, 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 sāmānyabhāvaprakaraṇa, the vyadhikaraṇaḥāhmāvacchinnābhāvaprakaraṇa and the siddhāntalakṣaṇaprakaraṇa) is confronted and compared with that given by his most important predecessors, such as Yajñapati, Jayadeva, Rucidatta, and Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma. Thus, Raghunātha's role and position in the development of Navyāyā is critically examined, and his achievements and his philosophical stature are subjected to some serious questions. What distinguishes him from the older group of Gāṅgēśa commentators (Yajñapati 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 Austria, 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 (WZKSO 9, 1965, 98-118) discusses the meaning and function of samādhi and samāpatti in Patañjala 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 Nyāyakusumānjali 1. 3 (III 12, 1969/70, 255-262); starting with a passage in Udayana's Nyāyakusumānjali, which is supplemented by a number of thematically related passages, Wezler shows that, already in the days of Paṇcaśīkha, 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, Vācaspatiimiśra's Tattvakaumudi. 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 Tattvakaumudi.

28 The text of the anonymous Upādhiyāpapā, which is also very relevant in this context, will be edited by G. Oberhammer in VSKR.
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, Maṇḍanamīśra. 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, Maṇḍanamīśra’s Vibhramavivekaḥ. Mit einer Studie zur Entwicklung der indischen Irrtumsllehre (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 Indien theories of error which leads from the older developments in Mahāyāna Buddhism, early Vedānta, Vaiśeṣika and Mīmāṃsā to Diṅnāga, Kumārila, Prabhākara, Dharmakīrti, their Naiyāyika contemporaries, and to Maṇḍana himself. What is thus presented to us, may be called a specimen of a philosophically based philosophical “Problemsgeschichte”. Another contribution to the study of Maṇḍana’s thought is T. Vetter, Maṇḍanamīśra’s Brahmasiddhi—Brahmakāṇḍaḥ. Übersetzung, Einleitung und Anmerkungen (Wien 1969; VKSKSO 7), containing a German translation, together with introduction and notes, of the Brahmas-section of Maṇḍana’s Brahmasiddhi. — 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. Diṅnāga’s polemics against Mīmāṃsā in the Pramāṇasamuccaya (Tibetan and German). A third section of the book tries to clarify the role of the “vṛtti kāra” mentioned by Śabaravāmin; according to Frauwallner, he is not identical with the Mīmāṃsā “vṛtti kāra” (identified as Bhavadāsa) who is mentioned in Diṅnāga’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),


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 1959; Publications de l’Ecole Française de l’Extrême-Orient. 76).

Hacker tries to establish the identity of Śaṅkarabhadgavatpāda, author of a Yogabhāṣyavivarana (published in 1952), with the famous author of the Brahma-
sūrabhāṣya. 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. 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 Brahmāsūrabhāṣya, 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 Saṅgha-gaśārīrakom, 1. Kapitel: Einführung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen (Wien 1972; VKS KSO 11).

A useful survey and analysis of the Pañcapādikāvivarana of the 10th century Advaita commentator Prakāśātman is given by K. Cammann, Das System des Advaita nach der Lehre Prakāśātmanas (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 jivanmukti in the Upaniṣads etc. J. F. Sprockhoff examines the concept of jivanmukti according to Vidyārāṇya’s Jivanmuktiviveka in Der Weg zur Erlösung bei Lebzieten, ihr Wesen und ihr Wert, nach dem Jivanmuktiviveka des Vidyārāṇya (WZKSO 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 Pāṇcarātra, are examined (with special reference to Yāmuna’s Āgamaprāmāṇya and the relevant passages of Śaṅkara’s Brahmāsūrabhāṣya) in Yāmunamuni’s Interpretation von Brahma-

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 Indenkunde—New Indology. Festschrift W. Ruben zum 70. Geburtstag. Berlin 1970, VIO 72, 539-549).—Another contribution published in East Berlin is R. Hauschild, *Die Aśṭāvakra-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 Kosmogenie im Hinduismus* (Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft 49, 1965, 17-28).—D. Schlingloff, *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 *Pāñcāsūtra* 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 (*Īsvara*).—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.
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