

## Anzeigen

HARTMUT WALRAVENS (ed.)

Albert Grünwedel. Briefwechsel und Dokumente. [Asien- und Afrika-Studien der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 9]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2001. xxxvi + 206p. € 69.- (ISBN 3-447-04454-3).

This exemplarily edited volume collects Albert Grünwedel's (1856-1935) correspondence with various scholars, publishers and collectors for the years 1889-1922. A supplementary section, entitled "Grünwedeliana" (p. 181-199), contains material from the notebooks of Otto Ilzhöfer. Grünwedel's letters cover much of his time at the Museum of Ethnology in Berlin and provide insight into some of the circumstances under which Grünwedel's major works came into being, as well as into the organization of the Turfan expeditions that contributed so enormously to the collection in the present "Museum für Indische Kunst".

Most revealing are certainly the letters to Ernst Kuhn (1846-1920), Indologist and Iranianist at the University of Munich, who had not only been Grünwedel's teacher but in his final three decades was one of the major supporters of Grünwedel's scientific work. Other major sets of correspondence concern primarily work within the museum (Felix von Luschan, 1852-1929, ethnologist at the Museum) and publishing matters (Ernst Boerschmann, 1873-1949, architect and researcher on China, and Richard Andree, 1835-1912, geographer and editor of *Globus*). The remaining letters to a number of scientists in an array of fields (Carl Bezold, Wilhelm Meyer, Richard Pietschmann, Emil Schlagintweit, Gottfried Merzbacher and Heinrich Brunn) do not contribute much more in regard to Grünwedel's interests and personality. Finally, the "Grünwedeliana" mainly collect appraisals and letters concerning his last major work on the Kālacakratāntra, a work that never reached publication (an incomplete manuscript is kept in the "Bayrische Staatsbibliothek").

While the collected correspondence allows only glimpses of Grünwedel's scientific work, it is extremely informative in regard to his personality, his interests and the publication process of his works. A devoted philologist with wide-ranging competence and a great interest in Tibetan and Buddhism, Grünwedel was quite sceptical of ethnology and its methods.

In editing the letters, W. has preserved the stylistic and orthographic peculiarities of Grünwedel's writing as well as his drawings (in particular p. 76-79) and the original Devanāgarī and Tibetan characters. W. has further added a complete list of Grünwedel's writings that includes short summaries of their content and references to their reviews, and a list of literature about Grünwedel. A separate index of names pertaining to both lists concludes this section (xiii-xxxiv). A register of the names occurring in the letters has been added at the end of the book, and references to biographies of the persons named are included in notes at their first mention. The book, well produced, is robust but light, making it a pleasure to use, both at first reading and for later reference checking.

Christian Luczanits

MARGARET CONE

A Dictionary of Pāli. Part I: a-kh. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2001. xxiv + 778p. £ 25.- (ISBN 0-86013-394-X).

The lexicon of Ms Cone (C.) presented here, for which the reviewer (rev.) suggests the abbreviation *DP*, is not a mere revision of Rhys Davids and Stede's *Pali-English Dictionary* (*PED*), but a completely new one for which its predecessor is only one of several sources besides, e.g., the oriental and the new PTS editions, the *Critical Pali Dictionary* (*CPD*) and a small selection of secondary literature, particularly the works of Professor K.R. Norman to whom, together with Professor R.F. Gombrich, the volume is dedicated. Here it is somewhat surprising not to find mentioned, *inter alia*, Mayrhofer's Sanskrit and Old Indo-Aryan Dictionaries and Werba's *Verba IndoArīca* (1997) though Westergaard's *Radices Linguae Sanscritae* are.

The compilers of *PED* were well aware of its shortcomings (Foreword, p. vii; Afterword, p. 736ff.) among which, however, they may not have reckoned the sometimes long etymological considerations as of *ajjhopanna* and *ukkhā* (missing in *CPD*, but see there s.v. *ukkā-sata*) and the description of developments of technical terms such as *atta(n)*, *arahatta*, *kamma*, etc. These *negativa* have been avoided in *DP* which, compared with *PED*, has important *positiva*, prominent among which is that quotations replace mere references thus enabling the user to see the context immediately.

The Indian scripts do not have hyphens, but the rev. thinks this should not be adopted in the transcription as done in *PED* and *DP*. What is positive again is the adoption of the abbreviations of texts as in *CPD* thus creating a uniform system though the introduction of "fpp" instead of the usual "gerv." (thus *PED* and *CPD*) or "grd." for *gerundivum* seems unnecessary.

The translations in this dictionary are generally clear, balanced and well-founded though in most cases secondary literature, if any, is not referred to. Yet this would be sometimes helpful, particularly in the case of *realia* such as birds for which the late judge, man of letters and amateur ornithologist K.N. Dave's *Birds in Sanskrit Literature* (Delhi 1985; <sup>2</sup>2000 with the index composed by Couture and Linke) can be profitably consulted, e.g., for *kāla-kokila* "the black cuckoo" (Ja V 419,13), though caution is advised as to his etymological speculations. Dave (p. 129) defines this bird as "Koel" as against *phussa-kokila* "the Asiatic Cuckoo". In *DP* I/706a *kuṇāla* is "the Indian cuckoo", but this is an umbrella term and the *kuṇālo nāma sakuṇo ... ativiya citto citta-patta-cchadano* in Ja V 416,29f.\*\* (ref. not in *DP*) needs a detailed examination because of the epithets *citto*, etc. To this end Dave (p. 128) refers to "the *āvāśyaka sūtra*, a Jain work by *malayaḡirya*", i.e., Mūlabhāṡya 113 on ĀvN 464, where Bhagavān is said to have had ten dreams one of which shows two *kokilas* (*do koilā*). *Malayaḡiri* 271b,10ff. explains this as follows: *dvau kokilau tad yathā – ekaḡ śveto 'paro vicitraḡ ... śveta-kokilaḡ śukla-dhyānam, yas tu vicitraḡ kokilas, tat kila dvādaśāṅgam pravacanam* "two *kokilas*, one white, the other variegated. The white one represents pure meditation, the variegated one, the Doctrine as recorded in the twelve Āṅgas".

*Malayaḡiri*'s predecessors, Jinadāsa and Haribhadra, do not comment on this place, whereas Dave (ib.) equates *śveta-kokila* with Pāli *phussa-kokila* and thinks

that “*vicitra kokila* is either a mistake for *kṛṣṇa kokila* or is to be rendered as *vi* not *citra*, variegated i.e. of a uniform colour viz. black, or again it may refer to one of the Malkohas which have a variegated plumage” (p. 128f.). It may be the latter, then, for the Doctrine cannot of course have but positive qualities for Jains. Cuckoos and koels are different birds (see Dave, p. 127 and 140) and the latter apparently are birds of the eastern plains (see Dave, p. 127f., not very clear to rev.), which then may contradict *vana-saṅde* in Ja V 416,29\*\*, where the *kuṇāla* lives. Thus *kuṇāla* is certainly “a kind of bird” (DP I/706a), but the exact species apparently remains to be established. The definition of *kuṇāla*, etc., may show a limit of C.’s principle, sound in itself, that “the definition should be as short and all-embracing as possible” (JPTS 22 [1996] 30): the result should possibly not be “a kind of ...”. On the *kokila* also K. Karttunen’s paper: Sparrows in Love. The Display and Pairing of Birds in Sanskrit Literature. *Studia Indologica* 7 (2000) 197-205, esp. 198f., could have been mentioned.

Here two more cases in point may be mentioned, viz. *kaṅka* and *koṅca*<sup>2</sup>. The former designates not just “a heron” (DP I/606b), but “grey heron” and possibly also “Pallas’s Fishing Eagle” (Dave, op. cit., p. 195; cf. PW s.v.), for the compound *kaṅka-patta*, according to C., is “an arrow with a flight of heron feathers; (or a heron’s feather)”. Now Dave (p. 189) informs us that the ancients often killed vultures, eagles and other large birds “for their quills with which to feather their arrows”, as is shown, e.g., in *gārdhra-pakṣa* and *-pattra* “arrow decorated with vulture’s feathers” (MW 354b < “ein mit Geierfedern geschmückter Pfeil” [PW II/739], though the feathers are no decoration, of course). Besides, as the grey heron and the Egretta (thus P. Thieme, *Kleine Schriften* II, Wiesbaden 1995, p. 877 renders *kaṅka*) are relatively slow water-birds compared with the Fishing Eagle, the latter’s feathers may be meant in *kaṅka-patta*.

As to *koṅca*<sup>2</sup> “a kind of bird, probably a heron or crane; (possibly a curlew)” (DP I/731a), Dave (p. 312f.) distinguishes in Vedic between *krauñc(a)* “Flamingo” and *krauñca* “Common Crane” and denies the meaning “osprey” given in MW for the latter, and the meanings “curlew or snipe” for both as stated in Macdonell and Keith’s *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects* (I/198) as “pure guesswork and wholly incorrect” (p. 312, n. \*\*). “In later literature”, he continues on p. 313, *krauñca* “has been utilized as a base for coining the names of some Storks, Herons and also the Flamingo, all sharing the common feature of a long and flexible neck”. The species thus depends on possible epithets.

For *kukkuha*, Skt. *kukkubha*, too, Dave (p. 137f.) gives a meaning different from “an osprey” (DP I/700b), viz. “Coucal (Crow-Pheasant)”. In such cases a source or foundation for the translation would be desirable.

Within the alphabetical scope of the present volume, there are also many architectural terms for which A.K. Coomaraswamy’s *Early Indian Architecture studies* (*Eastern Art* [EA] 2-3 [1930-1931]) are a valuable source. C. knows these articles, but used them, as far as I could see, only for *kaṅṅikā* and not for, e.g., *indakhāla* or *kūṭāgāra* discussed in detail in EA 2 (1930) 215 resp. 3 (1931) 191ff. Some words treated by Coomaraswamy are missing in PD at all, as are *antarattāla* in Ja VI 400,14 (thus read in EA 2 [1930] 211 for “Ja II”), also missing in CPD (which only quotes its derivative *antarattāla* [I/241b] as does PD), *antar-āpaṇa* in Mil 2,1 (s.

*EA* ib. and *CPD* I/244f.) and *antepura-pālaka* in *Ja* VI 455,26 (s. *EA* 3 [1931] 181 and *CPD* I/249a).

Occasionally, C. also refers to AMg. which stresses the fact that in the absence of a scientific Ardhamāgadhī-English lexicon one can often profitably use the Pāli dictionaries, too, as important aids besides *PW* and *MW* (thus, e.g., Pāli *ereti* may correspond to AMg. *edei*). No doubt the *magnum opus* of C. reviewed here promises to become one of these important aids and one at a price which is affordable, compared with *CPD* or Mylius' *Wörterbuch Pali-Deutsch*. We eagerly await the other volumes.

Willem B. Bollée

MICHAEL S. ANDRONOV

A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages. [Beiträge zur Kenntnis südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen 7]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2003. 334p. € 78.- (ISBN 3-477-04455-1).

Andronov's book is, after Caldwell's 1913 study and Bloch's of 1946, the first that again covers the entire field of comparative Dravidian linguistics. It is the English version of a monograph that was originally written in Russian and published in 1978. Its translation and publication were clearly meant as a tribute to A.'s life-long dedication to the study of the Dravidian languages. However, the timing of the publication could not have been more awkward. Almost simultaneously a similar book authored by Bhadriraju Krishnamurti appeared: *The Dravidian languages* (Cambridge University Press 2003). When compared to it, A.'s book turns out to be in many respects outdated. Admittedly, the book is said to have been updated in the course of the translation but, as can be gathered from a quick look at the bibliography, this has been done in a highly economic way. Another case in point is the treatment by A. of the so-called serial verb forms pellmell with the "regular" verbal conjugations. The serial forms, which are reflexes of original periphrastic constructions, have been rightly treated separately by Krishnamurti; this is indeed to be expected given Steever's 1988 study of the phenomenon. Furthermore, A. does not treat the complex predicates containing auxiliary verbs separately, which is a missed opportunity if only because we are dealing with a topic of interest to students of Indo-Aryan languages as well.

All this, however, does not mean that A.'s book is redundant. It has, in fact, important merits of its own, mainly due to its approach. Thus, where Krishnamurti presents the material mostly in relation to a reconstructed suffix, A. works the other way around. That is to say, in the section on morphology, for instance, he in most cases first presents the forms of the various languages that exhibit a particular function, and only then tries to reconstruct the suffix or suffixes. As a result, certain forms or developments that are shared by only one or two languages and as such do not fit into Krishnamurti's account remain fully above board in A.'s book. For the same reason information on, for instance, the rare continuative tense in the Dravidian languages (§ 244-251) is difficult to find in Krishnamurti's book.

Another important contribution of A.'s is the attention he pays to dialects, those of the literary as well as the non-literary languages. Especially his material on the Tamil dialects is rich. A case in point is the recognition of the non-past suffix *-t-*, which the dialects in the extreme south of Tamilnadu have in common with languages outside the southern group. Unfortunately, however, the consequences of the distribution of this suffix for the interpretation of the origin of the typical southern present with *°k(k)inr* are not elaborated upon.

On the whole, therefore, we should be grateful for the publication of the English version of A.'s book, which could indeed be read profitably in tandem with that of Krishnamurti's.

Herman Tiekens

KLAUS G. WITZ

The Supreme Wisdom of the Upaniṣads. An Introduction. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998. xxv + 558 pages. Rs. 700.- (ISBN 81-208-1573-4).

This is a difficult book to review. On the one hand, it has a good bibliography and the author, a mathematician by training, has read and absorbed much of the modern scholarship on the Vedas, Upaniṣads, and ancient India. The aim of the book, on the other hand, is not to advance scholarship but to further spiritual insight and growth: "The book represents an attempt to present the spiritual aspects of the Upaniṣadic teaching on the basis of the texts themselves, and in a way that respects tradition and is defensible in the modern world today. The emphasis is not so much on ideas and issues, as on the meaning which individual texts have in terms of spiritual life. The Infinite Truths of the Upaniṣads can emerge only when one takes them seriously and makes efforts to live them in one's daily life" (p. vii).

The closest western parallel to W.'s work is what has been called "Biblical Theology". Both take the work of historians, philologists, and text scholars seriously, but their ultimate aim is to enhance the spiritual life of their readers. In this W. has no doubt succeeded. Seekers after spiritual upliftment can read this book with profit and, as an added bonus, acquire some knowledge of recent scholarship on the Upaniṣads and the Vedas.

The book contains six chapters. The first deals with the historical and literary background of the Upaniṣads, and the second with the Great Teachings. The third chapter searches for the transcendental teachings about the infinite behind the mythological discourse. The fourth is on meditation (*upāsanā*); the fifth deals with the five sheaths of the self; and the sixth is on *daharavidyā*, an examination of the teachings on the heart.

Just as others before him, including well-known scholars, W. attempts to uncover, understand, and unfold a unitary religious philosophy behind all the Upaniṣads. For the spiritual seeker in the Indian tradition, just as for the Christian theologian examining the Bible, this is a legitimate quest. For the historical scholar, however, it is a highly dubious premise. "The Upaniṣads speak in many voices," says W., "but in an extraordinary harmony!" (p. 156). The search for such harmony was at the root of the Vedāntic commentaries and the Brahmasūtras and, with respect to the ritual portions of the Vedas, the enormous labors of the Mīmāṃsakas.

W. is not just a theologian but also a devotee of Sai Baba. One trend in his book, therefore, is to highlight the correspondences between the Upaniṣads and the teachings of Sai Baba. Throughout the book we see W. using Sai Baba's thoughts and interpretations in his examination and exposition of the Upaniṣadic doctrines.

As a work of theology this book may appeal to a cross-section of individuals both in India and in other parts of the world interested in Indian spirituality. I am unable to judge the value of the book for that audience. For readers of this journal, who are primarily scholars, this book adds little of value to the current scholarship on the Upaniṣads.

Patrick Olivelle

MICHAEL COMANS

The Method of Early Advaita Vedānta. A Study of Gauḍapāda, Śaṅkara, Sureśvara and Padmapāda. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000. xxiv + 492p. Rs. 495.- (ISBN 81-208-1722-2).

Die vorliegende Studie ist das Ergebnis von Comans' (C.) jahrelanger Beschäftigung mit den vier Autoren des Advaita-Vedānta, die er nach eigenen Angaben vor über zwanzig Jahren "at the feet of Swami Dayānanda Sarasvatī" (p. xi) begonnen hatte. Die längste Darstellung (Kap. 4-6) ist Śaṅkara gewidmet (182p.), jene über Gauḍapāda (Kap. 1-3) umfaßt 162p., während die Abschnitte über Sureśvara (Kap. 7) mit 64p. und Padmapāda (Kap. 8) mit 56p. eher kurz gehalten sind. Die Studie endet mit einem "Postscript on Method", einer "Select Bibliography" und einem Index.

Die Arbeit basiert auf englischen Übersetzungen der Quellenwerke (p. xii). C. verzichtet auf Sanskrit-Zitate und damit auch auf ihre genaue, historisch-philologische Auslegung. Was die Benützung der Sekundärliteratur betrifft, geht er sehr selektiv vor: "I have tried to keep somewhat abreast of the secondary literature and from time to time I discuss views found in academic publications" (p. xiv). Es handelt sich dabei ausschließlich um Arbeiten in englischer Sprache. Wichtige diesbezügliche Veröffentlichungen in deutscher oder in französischer Sprache bleiben dabei unbenützt. Somit verabsäumt C. die Forschungsergebnisse führender Wissenschaftler auf dem Gebiet des frühen Advaita wie P. Hacker oder T. Vetter zu verwerten oder sich mit ihnen auseinanderzusetzen. So geht er etwa in seiner Darstellung von Gauḍapādas Lehre auf Veters grundlegende Untersuchung in *WZKS* 22 (1978) 95-131 nicht näher ein, auch nicht auf die Arbeit von Ch. Bouy in *WZKS* 41 (1997) 119-158. Ebensowenig setzt sich C. bei seinen Ausführungen über Śaṅkara und seine Schüler mit wichtigen Monographien wie Hackers *Untersuchungen über Texte des frühen Advaita I: Die Schüler Śaṅkaras* (Wiesbaden 1951) und seinen "Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und Erkenntnistheorie der Inder" (*Vivarta*, Wiesbaden 1953) bzw. Veters *Studien zur Lehre und Entwicklung Śaṅkaras* (Wien 1979) auseinander. Vor allem aus diesem Grund muss man C.' Arbeit bei aller Mühe, die er sich gemacht hat, als wenig geglückt bezeichnen. Dies gilt auch für zwei Themen, auf die C. besonderes Gewicht legt: "I have specially highlighted two issues that have not received sufficient attention

in many of the publications dealing with Śaṅkara's thought. There are, firstly the question about the nature of Īśvara in Śaṅkara's Advaita .... Then there is the discussion of method, i.e., exactly how, and to what extent does Śaṅkara understand Upaniṣads to be a revelation about Brahman" (p. xiv).

Sonderbar ist, dass C. seine Ausführungen über das Wesen des Īśvara (p. 215f.) als Eigenleistung hinstellt. In Wirklichkeit übernimmt er, wenn auch sehr vereinfachend, das Bild Īśvaras, das Hacker erstmals in seiner epochalen Śaṅkara-Studie (*ZDMG* 100 [1950] 276ff.) auf Grund zahlreicher Belegstellen herausgearbeitet hatte, eine Arbeit, die C. in englischer Übersetzung zur Verfügung stand (p. 246, n. 94). Auch die Erörterung der Methode Śaṅkaras erscheint sehr problematisch. C. geht dabei (p. 285f.) vom Standpunkt von R. De Smet (*The Theological Method of Śaṅkara*. Diss. Rom 1953) aus, dass Śaṅkara beim Vortrag seiner Lehre nach einer allgemein gültigen Methode vorgeht. Dagegen hatte schon Vetter in seinen *Studien* (p. 12f.; vgl. auch ds. in *ZDMG-Suppl.* III,2 [1977] 1015ff.) argumentiert, wobei er mit Hilfe einer Reihe von Beispielen und Gegenbeispielen überzeugend die Unhaltbarkeit dieser These zeigen konnte. Leider sind die soliden Erkenntnisse dieser Arbeiten von Vetter in C.' diesbezügliche Ausführungen nicht eingeflossen. Somit steht nicht nur die Beurteilung der Methode Śaṅkaras, sondern die gesamte Studie C.' auf sehr schwachen Beinen, insofern wichtige wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse zum jeweiligen Thema nicht zu Rate gezogen worden sind.

Die hier angezeigte Studie ist durchwegs flüssig und gut lesbar. Trotz der genannten Mängel hat sie einen nicht geringen Informationswert und könnte zu einer ersten Orientierung dienen.

Roque Mesquita

JONARDON GANERI

*Philosophy in Classical India. The Proper Work of Reason.* London – New York: Routledge, 2001. vi + 207p. US \$ 14.99 (ISBN 0-415-24035-2).

Within the broader framework of countering the idea of a non-rational India (cf. p. 4), and envisaging the goal of unravelling new philosophical paradigms (cf. p. 5), Ganeri (G.), in the six chapters of this book, presents specimens of rationality and applications of the concept of reason that he has discovered in the philosophical writings of Classical India.

Starting with the epic literature's rebuff of the subversive usage of reason made by critics of the predominant tradition and with the goal-oriented and instrumental rationality found in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, he subsequently introduces the reader to the early Nyāya and to how rationality in this school is connected with the theory of proper means of acquiring true beliefs, the art of debate, rational inquiry and soteriology. In the second chapter, the reader is presented with Nāgārjuna's use of reason for demonstrating the limits of reason itself and his – in G.'s opinion unsuccessful – endeavour to show that all concepts are empty. Whereas in the first two chapters reason is described as being used to codify common sense or to undermine it, Chapter three examines Vaiśeṣika metaphysics in order to illustrate how reason is used to construct a non-commonsensual theory.

Bhāsarvajña, Udayana and Raghunātha are shown to have reacted to inconsistencies in the Vaiśeṣika teachings by recasting parts of them, rationality appearing here in the form of principled revision. In Chapter four, Dignāga is described as a rational reconstructionist who tries to show that the ontological commitments made by common sense are reducible to a much smaller set, offering a minimal ontology of tropes and two similarity relations. In this context Dignāga's theory of meaning and his views concerning logic are discussed. In sharp contrast to the confrontational rationality met with in the art of debate, Chapter five presents the Jaina rationality of reconciliation, in which the aim of reason is harmony. The harmonisation of conflicting beliefs is achieved by the Jainas through a technique that makes explicit the hidden parameters in belief and assertion, which more dogmatic philosophers fail to realise. The last chapter deals with the later Nyāya theory of suppositional reasoning – a theory about the burden of proof and the role of presumption, about the conditions under which even inconclusive evidence is sufficient for warranted belief.

References to primary sources and modern studies in more than 200 footnotes attest to the author's erudition. Each of the chapters is followed by a section entitled "Further Readings", intended "to help those who are coming to the subject anew" (p. 5). A list of the philosophical texts discussed in the book, which includes references to editions and available translations, a bibliography, and an index complete the volume.

The value of G.'s book is greatly increased by the fact that in addition to a judicious selection of materials and their interpretations that are already known to the specialist, the author offers some new solutions to difficult points. Especially noteworthy is his interpretation of the terms *sapakṣa* and *vipakṣa* used by Dignāga (cf. p. 116), his solution to the problem of whether the *pakṣa* is included in the *sapakṣa* or not (cf. p. 116f.), and his proposal for how to understand Dignāga's second and third conditions of a proper reason so that their equivalence is avoided (cf. p. 116).

Not content with increasing our knowledge of Indian philosophy, G. goes further. The final aim for him is neither to describe the genesis and development of ideas in their specific socio-historical conditions, nor to look at these ideas in a comparative way, but "to discover new forms of rationality and applications of the concept of reason, and so to enrich a common philosophical vocabulary" (p. 3). Deliberately distinguishing his methodological approach from comparative philosophy and the history of ideas, G. describes it as "a critical and analytical evaluation of conceptual paradigms in Indian theory" (p. 5). His interest is that of an analytical philosopher. Accordingly, his preferred manner of dealing with the ideas found in the Indian writings consists in their decontextualisation, so as "not to mistake contingent properties in the contextual formulation of an argument or idea for essential properties of the argument or idea itself" (p. 4). It is again this philosophical perspective that encourages G. to render the discussions found in the texts of ancient India in a modern philosophical idiom and to describe them with the help of concepts associated with contemporary philosophical currents. Just to give two examples, he displays the Vaiśeṣika ontology by means of graph theory and translates Dignāga's views on perception and inference and their

respective objects into the language of trope theory. Samples may illustrate this: “The inherence relation connects things in the ontology in inheror-inhersee pairings. So the substances, qualities, motions, universals and individuators are represented as the nodes of a graph whose set of edges represent the inherence relation.” (p. 73), or: “Perception is a non-constructive, purely causal, process of grouping tropes via concurrence into objects. Inference is a conceptual process of grouping tropes via exact similarity into properties.” (p. 103). Sometimes G. apparently becomes so fascinated by his topic that he seems to involve himself in the discussion (cf. “Dharmakīrti’s point is well taken, but it does not constitute a refutation of the theory. We may simply give up the strange claim that absence can be perceived.” [p. 21]). This attitude together with witty remarks such as “how to practice poverty in metaphysics” (p. 97) with respect to the Buddhist Dignāga and “the end of reason is the *end* of reason” (p. 97) with respect to Nāgārjuna contributes to the vividness of the presentation and gives an entertaining quality to this book which indeed deals with rather difficult matters.

Since G. has a highly developed knack for discovering issues of relevance to contemporary philosophical discussions as well as a profound knowledge of the Indian philosophical traditions and the modern scholarly studies on them, this monograph should be of great interest to the Indologist and to the reader conversant in contemporary trends of Western philosophy who also is interested in Classical Indian thought.

Horst Lasic

JONARDON GANERI (ed.)

Indian Logic. A Reader. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 2001. ix + 221p. US \$ 14.99 (ISBN 0-7007-1329-8).

Wohl in der Absicht, die indische Logik sowie ihre wissenschaftliche Aufarbeitung einem breiteren Publikum zu öffnen, wurden hier die zehn folgenden, bereits andernorts publizierten Texte zur indischen Logik neu aufgelegt (in Klammern jeweils das Erscheinungsjahr des Originals):

(1) Henry T. Colebrooke, “The Philosophy of the Hindus: On the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika Systems” (1824); (2) Max Müller, “On Indian Logic” (1853); (3) H.N. Randle, “A Note on the Indian Syllogism” (1924); (4-5) Stanislaw Schayer, “Studies in Indian Logic” (1932) und “On the Method of Research into Nyāya” (1933); (6) Daniel H.H. Ingalls, “Logic in India” (1955); (7) I.M. Bochénski, “The Indian Variety of Logic” (1956); (8) J.F. Staal, “The Concept of *pakṣa* in Indian Logic” (1973); (9) Sibajiban Bhattacharyya, “Some Aspects of the Navya-Nyāya Theory of Inference” (1987); (10) Bimal Krishna Matilal, “Introducing Indian Logic” (1998).

Stanislaw Schayers Beiträge (Nr. 4 und 5) wurden von Joerg Tuske eigens aus dem deutschsprachigen Original übersetzt und liegen nun erstmals auf Englisch vor. Die anderen Beiträge wurden mit geringfügigen, hauptsächlich gestalterischen Veränderungen nachgedruckt.

Eingeleitet wird die Zusammenstellung von einem kurzen Vorwort (p.vii-ix) sowie einem Essay von Ganeri (G.) mit dem Titel “Indian Logic and the Colonization of

Reason" (p.1-25), bei dem es sich – was allerdings unerwähnt bleibt – um eine überarbeitete und erweiterte Fassung eines bereits 1996 erschienenen Aufsatzes handelt (The Hindu Syllogism: 19th Century Perceptions of Indian Logical Thought. *Philosophy East and West* 46 [1996] 1-16). Eine Bibliographie ausgewählter und weiterführender Primär- und Sekundärliteratur (p. 216-221) schließt den Band ab.

Soweit nachprüfbar – nicht alle Beiträge waren für die Rezensentin im Original verfügbar – entstanden beim Nachdruck nur zwei sinnentstellende Fehler. Im Text Nr. 8 (Staal) fehlt, wohl aufgrund von Zeilensprung, p. 159 der im Folgenden in eckige Klammern gesetzte Text: "In fact, what *sapakṣa* and *vipakṣa* [have in common excludes what is ordinarily called the *pakṣa*. For *sapakṣa*] is defined as any locus, different from the *pakṣa*, where the *sādhya* occurs". Im "Summary" von Nr. 7 (Bochénski) wird zweimal der "intentionale" Charakter der indischen Logik als ihr besonderes Merkmal hervorgehoben, während im Original von ihrem "intentionalen" Charakter die Rede ist. Überdies ist die ausführliche Bibliographie von Arbeiten zur indischen Logik aus den Jahren 1926-1932 in n. 1 zu Text Nr. 5 (Schayer) in der Übersetzung leider entfallen.

Joerg Tuskes Übersetzungen der beiden Aufsätze von Stanislaw Schayer transportieren den Gehalt der Texte zwar weitgehend korrekt, verändern aber an mehreren Stellen durch stilistische Glättungen und Verknappungen die prägnante rhetorische Eigenart des Originals. So wird, um nur ein Beispiel zu nennen, aus Schayers "traditionell verballhorntem ... Aristoteles" des 19. Jahrhunderts in der englischen Übersetzung ganz nüchtern eine "traditional interpretation that rests on misunderstandings".

Aus dem Vorwort lässt sich erschließen, dass die Auswahl der Beiträge auf zwei Kriterien beruht: dass sie bzw. ihre Autoren für die Erforschung indischer Logik in einer bestimmten Periode repräsentativ waren oder dass sie bei der Bekanntmachung indischer Logik im Westen eine große Rolle spielten. Das Heranziehen dieser verschiedenartigen Kriterien verdeutlicht die letztlich zweifache Absicht des Bandes, nämlich einerseits historisch maßgebliche Texte der Forschungsgeschichte versammelt zu präsentieren, andererseits leicht fassliche Einführungsliteratur zur indischen Logik selbst anzubieten. Als Resultat stehen thematisch ausgreifende Forschungsaufsätze (Nr. 1-5, mit gewissen Abstrichen auch Nr. 8-9) Seite an Seite mit Überblicksdarstellungen, die zur Publikation in Nachschlagewerken verfasst wurden (Nr. 6, 7 und vom Ansatz her auch Nr. 10). Diese Heterogenität der Textauswahl wird in den relevanten Ausführungen der Einleitung allerdings nicht ausreichend berücksichtigt. So wirkt die dort vorgenommene, rein auf inhaltlich-methodologischen Kriterien beruhende Klassifikation der Beiträge in jeweils eine "syllogistische", "formalistische" und "Eigenschafts-Lokus-bezogene" Interpretation indischer Logik propagierend gezwungen und ist an mehreren Beiträgen nicht nachvollziehbar. An der Auswahl bemerkenswert ist ferner die Konzentration auf die "Eigenschafts-Lokus-bezogene Interpretation" (Texte Nr. 6-10) als repräsentativ – auch im qualitativen Sinn – für die Befassung mit indischer Logik in etwa seit den 1950er Jahren. Mag man der Textauswahl diese Einseitigkeit verzeihen, so hätte sie zumindest durch Hinweise auf alternative Ansätze und Interpretationen, die ja in der Bibliographie durchaus präsent sind, in der Einleitung ausgeglichen werden können.

Zu den Beiträgen selbst finden sich in der Einleitung sonst kaum Angaben, weder zu ihrer Entstehung und Rezeption noch zur wissenschaftlichen Biographie ihrer Autoren. Weiterführende Arbeiten werden zwar in der Bibliographie angegeben; der darin erreichte, die einzelnen Beiträge z.T. wesentlich korrigierende Forschungsstand ist in der Einleitung allerdings nicht reflektiert.

Die aus dem 1996 publizierten Aufsatz übernommenen Teile der Einleitung befassen sich mit der Rezeption insbesondere des *pañcāvayava* im Europa des 19. Jahrhunderts. G. bietet eine Reihe historisch interessanter Informationen aus philosophiegeschichtlichen Nachschlagewerken sowie aus Werken und biografischen Berichten britischer Mathematiker (Boole, DeMorgan). Diese werden allerdings nicht als Grundlage für historische oder kritische Reflexion herangezogen, sondern als Details in grob entworfene atmosphärische Bilder gestellt, die auf unbestimmte Weise mit romantisierenden Mythen und kulturellen Stereotypen zu tun haben. Letztlich bleibt nicht viel mehr als die Erkenntnis, dass eine gewisse Kenntnis indischer Logik in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts in der Luft gelegen hätte (p. 7). Diese Schlussfolgerungen enttäuschen mit ihrer Unbestimmtheit umso mehr, als mit Wilhelm Halbfass' Studie zur europäischen Rezeption indischen Denkens eine differenzierter präsentierende wie auch tiefgründiger analysierende Arbeit vorliegt, die als Ausgangspunkt für weitere Reflexionen im Zusammenhang mit indischer Logik hätte dienen können (vgl. Wilhelm Halbfass, *India and Europe*. Albany 1988; darin v.a. Kapitel 9 "On the Exclusion of India from the History of Philosophy").

Vor allem durch die Wiederveröffentlichung älterer Texte zur indischen Logik kommt dem Band das Verdienst zu, selbst in Bibliotheken und Archiven nur schwer zugängliche Materialien einer breiteren Leserschaft zu öffnen, wenn auch die Kriterien für die Textauswahl nicht unmittelbar einleuchten. Die Gelegenheit, die Zusammenstellung durch zusätzliche Dokumentation und Reflexion sachlich, historisch und auch von theoretischem Standpunkt aus verständlich zu machen, wurde überdies nicht in dem Maße genützt, wie es wünschenswert und in Anbetracht des heutigen Kenntnisstandes auch durchaus möglich gewesen wäre.

Birgit Kellner

ERNST STEINKELLNER – MICHAEL TORSTEN MUCH

Texte der erkenntnistheoretischen Schule des Buddhismus. Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur / Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature II. Mit einem Vorwort von Heinz Bechert. [Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 214]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995. XX + 137p. € 22.90 (ISBN 3-525-82304-5).

This is the second volume of a planned series of reference works which will present a systematic survey of Buddhist Sanskrit literature. Its first volume, *Vinaya-Texte*, compiled by Akira Yuyama and published in 1979 (see the list of reviews in: *Sūryacandrāya*. Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday, ed. P. Harrison – G. Schopen. Swisttal-Odendorf 1998, p. xi), was at the

same time intended to announce a huge project designed by the Committee for Buddhist Studies of the Academy of Sciences in Göttingen. The plan of this project has been sketched by Professor Heinz Bechert in his Preface to the present volume (p. V), the whole range of Sanskrit Buddhist literature being arranged into nine sections: 1. Vinaya; 2. Sūtra (Śrāvakayāna); 3. Abhidharma; 4. Kṣudraka and related texts; 5. Mahāyāna-Sūtras; 6. Tantra, Mantra, Dhāraṇī, etc.; 7. non-canonical doctrinal texts, philosophy, Stotras, ritual, Kāvya; 8. inscriptions, legal texts, etc.; 9. auxiliary sciences (with subdivisions). Within this scheme the subcategory of epistemological Buddhist literature was assigned the number 74. However, at present this subcategory has been provisionally postponed for the sake of convenience, to be duly introduced when the other parts of the project are ready.

Owing to a quickly growing mass of materials and limited means for dealing with it, it was decided that the range of collaborators should be widened and that the cooperation of scholars from other academic centres who specialize in the given subjects should be requested. Accordingly, the present volume was prepared by two specialists working in the Department of Tibetan and Buddhist Studies at the University of Vienna, namely, Professor Ernst Steinkellner and Dr. Michael Torsten Much. The volume consists of a Preface by Heinz Bechert (p. V-VI), a List of Abbreviations (p. IX-XIV), an Introduction with bibliographical notes (p. XV-XX), a Systematic Survey (p. 1-111), Appendices A-C (p. 113-125), and Indices (p. 126-137).

From the Introduction we learn (p. XV) that the compilers followed the project's general principles regarding the formal arrangement and description of the material. However, in some cases they found it necessary to depart from a rule, viz., when the subject matter or the system of abbreviations required it. Although the compilers generally followed Bechert's *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien* (Göttingen 1990), they also introduced other abbreviations, particularly with regard to Buddhist epistemological texts, which have long been the focus of study in Vienna, and which have received internationally approved sigla that more or less deviate from the Göttingen system. Concerning the actual use of abbreviations, one would have liked to see some abbreviated titles of reference works included into the respective list on p. IXff., e.g., Frauwallner's "Landmarks" (= Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic. *WZKSO* 5 [1961] 125-148) and his "buddh. Texte" (= Zu den buddhistischen Texten in der Zeit Khri-Sron-Lde-Btsan's. *WZKSO* 1 [1957] 95-103), while others could have been unified and simplified in a more accessible manner, e.g., "Frauwallner, Dignāga" instead of "Frauwallner, Dua" or "Seyfort Ruegg" instead of "SeyR."

A characteristic feature of the epistemological school of Buddhism is that it embraces the works of thinkers who show a keen interest in the various problems of theories of cognition, regardless of their dogmatical orientation within the Buddhist tradition. The main focus of the Survey is on the later works of Dignāga and on texts by Dharmakīrti and his followers. The mainstream of the Buddhist epistemological school is connected with the Sautrāntika and Yogācāra traditions; however, the compilers emphasize that there are important thinkers also to be

found among the representatives of the Madhyamaka tradition, such as Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, or of the Vaibhāṣika, such as Śubhagupta. On the other hand, the compilers give no account of authors like Dānaśīla, Ratnavajra or Ānandavardhana, even though their works are included in the Tshad ma section of the Tibetan Tanjur. Those thinkers who are known only by name and whose works have been lost also remain unmentioned (cf. p. XVI).

The Survey contains 42 descriptions of authors and their works, beginning with Dignāga (ca. A.D. 480-540) and ending with Vibhūticandra (ca. A.D. 1200); the last entry (42) contains “varia” (p. 111). Each entry is provided with a brief note on the author, his approximate date, and a list of works with bibliographical references (often provided with some comments), all based on the contemporary state of research. The compilers took great pains to provide the most recent and most reliable data; they also acknowledge the use of standard reference works on the subject, as well as of buddhological bibliographies. Special mention is made of C. Regamey’s *Buddhistische Bibliographie* (Bern 1950), which served as a stimulus and model for the authors of the present Survey. Thanks to close cooperation with Japanese scholars, it was possible to include many references to Japanese contributions. The authors of the Survey attempted to include all contributions published until the end of 1993, and also a few Viennese publications from 1994. Given the steady flow of new editions, translations and important studies, a new enlarged and revised edition will soon be a desideratum.

Worthy of special notice is the final part of the Introduction (p. XIX-XX), in which the compilers of the Survey share with their readers the information they have collected about the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts still preserved in Tibet in Lhasa, at the Potala and Norbulingka. These are for the most part texts which have been preserved only in Tibetan and/or Chinese translations, e.g., Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā (Jinendrabuddhi), Nyāyamukha, Pramāṇasamuccaya (Dignāga), etc.

There are three Appendices: “Appendix A: Werke vor Dignāga” (p. 115-118), containing 1. pre-Dignāga anonymous handbooks of debate (*vāda*) and 2. Vasubandhu’s (“the younger”, according to Frauwallner’s hypothesis, ca. A.D. 400-480) works on logic; “Appendix B: Jaina-Werke” (p. 119-120) on Jaina commentaries bearing on the works of the Buddhist epistemological school (Haribhadra Sūri, Mallavādin, Kalyāṇacandra, etc.); “Appendix C: Die Verfasser und Bearbeiter der tibetischen Übersetzungen” (p. 121-125), being a list of 54 works with the names of their Tibetan translators. The volume concludes with Indices of authors, titles of the works (Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan), Tibetan translators, and place names.

The Survey is carefully edited, and we can only be most grateful for the compilers’ efforts. Their work is an indispensable reference tool and a mine of information for students of Buddhist and Indian philosophy and literature.

Marek Mejor

SANJUKTA GUPTA

Lakṣmī Tantra. A Pāñcarātra Text. Translation and Notes with Introduction. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000 (First Indian Edition). xxxix + 398p. + 3 charts Rs. 495.- (cloth [ISBN 81-208-1734-6]) / 295.- (paper [ISBN 81-208-1735-4]).

The book is a new edition of the work of nearly the same title published in Leiden in 1972. It comprises an English translation of the full text of the Lakṣmītantra (LT) and an introduction discussing the content, the date, and the place of origin of the work. To date, apart from the rather unreliable translation of the Paramasaṃhitā by S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar (Baroda 1940), it is the only translation of the entire text of a Pāñcarātra Saṃhitā. As it provides insight into a quite unusual work of the tradition, it is a very useful and valuable instrument for every student of Pāñcarātra.

The new edition is a reprint of the first one with the exception of an additional "Introduction to Indian Edition" on p. xxxvii-xxxix. This introduction considers new research results published by Mark Dyczkowski in his edition of Vāmanadatta's Saṃvitprakāśa (Varanasi 1990) that throw new light on the date of the LT. As pointed out by Dyczkowski (*op. cit.*, p. 31-35) as well as by R. Torella (On Vāmanadatta. In: *Pandit N.R. Bhatt Felicitation Volume*. Delhi 1994, p. 486ff.), the LT incorporates or paraphrases several verses from the Saṃvitprakāśa. Further, as Gupta (G.) adds and as has been previously indicated by A. Malinar (Zur Einordnung der Göttin Lakṣmī in die Pāñcarātra-Lehren des Lakṣmītantra. In: *An-näherung an das Fremde*. Stuttgart 1998, p. 531, n. 3), the LT is influenced by Kṣemarāja's Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya. In addition G. writes that the LT reflects some of Rāmānuja's ideas. One would have been grateful to have been told which of his ideas these are and where they can be found in the LT. This is one of the major points of criticism of G.'s book, namely, that her remarks, which are very interesting in general, are often not verifiable. Another example of this problem is the wording of the *pañcopaniṣanmantras* that is given on p. 90 and 396 with no indication of a textual source (as, e.g., Nityagrantha [ed. P.B. Annangaracharya, *Sri Bhagavad Ramanuja Granthamala*. Kancheepuram 1956], p. 182,18-20).

On account of the new results of research that have provided insight into the great influence of the Kashmirian Pāñcarātra and Pratyabhijñā tradition on the LT, G. has now revised her original attempt to date the LT and has established the date of the text's final redaction from between the ninth and twelfth centuries (p. xxi) to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century (p. xxxvii). However, as R. Torella has indicated (*op. cit.*, p. 486, n. 16), the first author to quote the LT was not Vedāntadeśika as G. believes (p. xx), but Maheśvarānanda in his Mahārthamañjarīparimala, who is dated to the twelfth century (see L. Silburn, *La Mahārthamañjarī de Maheśvarānanda*. Paris 1995, p. 9). The first author to quote the LT in the Viśiṣṭādvaitavedānta tradition was probably Vātsya Varadaguru (see e.g. Prapannapārijāta 6.13cff. [publ. by Visisthadvaita Pracharini Sabha, Madras 1971]).

These remarks are not meant to diminish the value of the book. At present, it is one of the most important works in Pāñcarātra research, and thus its reappearance

is highly welcome. It is an asset that this Indian edition now makes the book available to a larger number of scholars.

Marion Rastelli

JOHN E. CORT

Jains in the World. *Religious Values and Ideology in India*. New York – New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001. xviii + 267p. £ 39.50 / Rs. 500.- (ISBN 019-565-3602).

In the last two decades Anglo-American cultural anthropology has done much field work on Jainism, especially in Gujarat, which found expression in important studies by Babb, Banks, Carrithers, Cort, Folkert, Humphrey, Laidlaw, Reynell and others. The book reviewed here is a reconceptualised version of the author's unpublished Ph.D. thesis entitled "Liberation and Wellbeing" (Harvard 1989).

The material for this truly rich and well-informed volume, the manuscript of which many scholars read and commented upon, was collected during field work mainly in Patan and Ahmedabad between 1985 and 1998. It shows in seven chapters with many details that Jainism has come a long way from the religion of its Ardha-Māgadhī scriptures. It thus is a welcome pendant to J. Laidlaw's *Riches and Renunciation* (Oxford 1995), for it treats many other aspects.

The fifteen page "Introduction" portrays the book as an exploration of the practices and beliefs of the Śvetāmbar Mūrtipūjak Jains in North Gujarat and an investigation of the Jain debates about the proper attitude toward the world, its central theme being "the interaction between the realm of wellbeing and the ideology of the path to liberation (*mokṣa-mārg*)" (p. 6), between the extreme wealth of the Jain merchants and the ascetic poverty of the Jain renouncers. This may be unintentionally shown by the pictures on the dust jackets of the American edition of the book (young girls in fancy silk dresses carrying auspicious pots of water, etc., to mark a mendicant's entrance into the city for his *comāsum* retreat) and the Indian edition (a metal tray depicting the *siddhacakra*, i.e., the *maṇḍala* with the Jina and the other four Supreme Beings, viz. liberated souls, mendicant leaders and preceptors, and all common renouncers).

After a discussion of the term ideology, important in the theoretical framework of his book – Cort (C.) uses it in the sense of "a mode of interpreting reality based upon a systematic, idealist quest for order" (p. 10) – the author expounds on his methodology which approximates an ethnography (p. 12ff.). He aims to study "the practices, ideologies, and beliefs of the Jains as people, both today and throughout their long history" (p. 14) and states that "There is rarely a direct influence on contemporary practice and belief that can be traced from any given Prakrit or Sanskrit text, although one will certainly encounter constant references to these texts in the sermons and writings of the tradition's ideologues" (ib.). This is of course no new discovery and explains that in the frame of this study C.'s "guides in the selection of texts were contemporary Jains, not scholarship on the Jains" (ib.). It does not explain the academic disinterest in present day India to edit and work on Prakrit texts, as Jain practice and beliefs will hardly have changed of late

and should not keep students from studying tradition, just as Homer and Hesiod still occupy us.

The first chapter (“The Ideology of the Path to Liberation” [p. 16-30]) contrasts the prescriptive picture of Jainism based on the canonical scriptures found in earlier scholarship, e.g., *tantis verbis* in the subtitle of W. Schubring’s *Doctrine of the Jainas* against C.’s modern descriptive portrait of it as a lived religious tradition, or, in his own words, Schubring’s “model for Jainism” against his “model of Jainism” (p. 16). As to these “little traditions” for the remote past, however, the sources are poor and the informants are monks. Though the first rules for the laity appear as early as Aupapātika 57, actual popular practices like Hindu rites as mentioned in Kalpasūtra 104 and Rāyapasenaīya 803 (ritual at the birth of a son) are condemned only later, e.g., by Somadeva.

The second chapter (“Jains and Jainism in Patan” [p. 31-60]) is a detailed survey of the history, esp., of the *yatis*, *saṃvegī sādhus* and the various mendicant lineages, the difference between the Sāgar and Vijay *samudāys* in the Tapā Gacch, *pujārīs* (who are no Jains because they eat the rice offered in the temple) and Jain castes. As the Portuguese etymon *casto* “pure” indicates, intercaste relations are generally based on purity, but sometimes wealth plays a role, too, as with the Śrīmālī castes (p. 57).

Chapter three presents a most welcome detailed account of “Going to the Temple. How to worship God” (p. 61-99). The Jain *deva* is no creator, but the total of the emancipated souls at the top of the universe or, in C.’s words (p. 92): “God, according to the Jains, is any soul who has attained liberation”. Various rituals as executed by different devotees are described with details not found elsewhere, e.g., flower *pūjā* with green *āsoṣalav*, Asoka leaves (p. 84; cf. p. 154 and 168) being auspicious for the Jains probably because the Arhat Mallā attained *nirvāṇa* under an Asoka tree, and *āratī*, the waving of lamps before the Jina. Their performance in front of the image implies also reciting praises and singing hymns (p. 66f.). These are given in translation. The addition of their original at the bottom would have been desirable, for they will be difficult to obtain, but the book regrettably has no footnotes, and the endnotes do not give the texts either.

Chapter four deals with “Gifting and Grace. Patterns of Lay-Mendicant Interaction” (p. 100-117) and describes the daily routine of the mendicants, to which belongs, *inter alia*, the visit to a temple. If there is none in the village where (s)he is staying worship is done in an *upāśray* building, in which mendicants usually sojourn, in the presence of a *sthāpanācārya*. This consists of four small sticks supporting five conch shells in a folded cloth representing the five Supreme Lords which physically signal that a mendicant is always in the presence of the entire Jain spiritual hierarchy (p. 102). Neither the term nor the object occurs in the Canon, and the word seems to appear first in Mānavijaya, Dharmasaṃgraha I, p. 210a according to H. von Glasenapp (*Jainism*, p. 484), who explains the kauri shells (or pieces of sandal) the mendicants carry with them (and not “on them”, as “mit sich” in the German original [p. 386] was wrongly translated) as symbolizing five virtues: knowledge, faith, etc. (op. cit., p. 429). Mānavijaya composed his work in *saṃvat* 1738 / 1681 C.E. (see H.D. Velankar, *Jinaratnakośa*. Poona 1944, p. 193f.). Besides three pictures C. gives no information on the possible origin of

this cult symbol. Further interesting and rarely treated themes in this chapter are the auctioning off (*bolī*) of the funeral of a monk (p. 115f.) and blessings with “*vāskep*” which C. gives as his equivalent of the Skt. compound *vāsakṣepa*, interpreting it as “thrown scented powder” (p. 115; cf. p. 210 and 267b), a technical term known only from Jain sources (the earliest evidence of which seems to be contained in Hemacandra’s *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacaritra* I [Śrī Jain Ātmānand Sabhā ed. Bhāvnagar 1936] 3,663c, commented upon by H.M. Johnson in her translation of the *Ādīśvaracaritra* [Baroda 1931], p. 210, n. 274; for later uses of the term see B.J. Sandesara – J.P. Thaker, *Lexicographical Studies in ‘Jaina Sanskrit’*. Baroda 1962, p. 91 and 202) – blessings which according to C. are also given by a layperson and that on the right big toe (why here?) of a renouncer.

The fifth chapter is entitled “Holy Ascetism” (p. 118-141), of particular interest for its data about lay ascetism. Chapter six “Remembrance and Celebration” (p. 142-185) deals with the Jain religious year, with a list of the annual festivals on p. 143. Some of them, like Oḷī, Dīvālī and Paryuṣaṇ, are described in great detail which is all the more important because C. was an eyewitness and a true “student of religion whose aim is to understand lived experience” (p. 186). Where Hindu and Jain festivals overlap, like Dīvālī, C. may be right that the latter do not seem to be borrowed from the former.

The last chapter (p. 186-202) discusses “Ideologies and Realms of Value”, i.e., of wellbeing. Wellbeing, which C. uses instead of auspiciousness, covers many concepts like happiness, profit, merit, etc., which Jains he asked could not distinguish clearly. C. analyzes each of them and then states that the *mokṣa-mārg* ideology and the values of wellbeing are held in an unresolved “tension” (p. 200). Without a thriving Jain laity renouncers cannot walk the *mokṣa-mārg*, but also without the latter there would be no wellbeing.

As throughout the book, also in the “Glossary” (p. 205-210) the Indian terms are given in their Gujarātī (/Hindī) form (cf. p. xif.), transcribed as heard (e.g. “*aṭṭham*” [p. 205; also p. 134f., 140, 149f. and 258a] instead of *aṭṭham*) and impractically arranged in the order of the Latin alphabet. A Sanskrit word would be indicated by “S.”, but only if it is cited as an (etymological) explication of a *tadbhava* form, not if as *tatsama* it constitutes a main entry (e.g., right the first term, *abhakṣya*, or *aṣṭaprakārī pūjā*). *āśopalav* is not included in C.’s list. “*cāturmāsa*” from which on p. 206 Gujarātī *comāsum* (s.v.) is derived, should be corrected to *caturmāsa*, “*kṣamāpanā*” (p. 207) to *°pana*, and “*māryadā*” (ib.) to *maryādā*. “*micchāmi dukkaḍaṃ*” (sic ib. and p. viii instead of the correct Ardha-Māgadhī nominal phrase *micchā me dukkaḍaṃ*, or *micchā dukkaḍaṃ*, as it occurs in Malayagiri’s commentary 24b7 *ad Vyavahārabhāṣya* 63), was discussed by Laidlaw, op. cit., p. 214. “Pās” is not “vernacular for Pārśva” (p. 220, n. 10), but the Ardha-Māgadhī form of the name of the twenty-third Jina, and the reviewer is not convinced that the sanskritisation Pārśva is correct (s. *BEI* 16 [1998] 366f., according to which *pāsa* might be a shortened form of \**upāsa*[*seṇa*]). Finally, the etymon of *vejāvacca* cannot be “*vaiyāvṛtta*” (p. 223, n. 10), but is *vaiyāpṛtya*. Apart from these linguistic details we must be grateful to the author for a valuable instrument in the field of Jain studies.

Muni Shri NYAYAVIJAYAJI

JAINA Philosophy and Religion [English translation of *Jaina Darśana*]. Translated by Nagin J. Shah. [Bhogilal Lehar Chand Institute of Indology Series 12]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass – Bhogilal Lehar Chand Institute of Indology – Mahattara Sadhvi Shree Mrigavatiji Foundation, 1998. xxv + 469p. Rs. 450.- (ISBN 81-208-1490-8).

Avec cette traduction anglaise, Nagin J. Shah rend accessible à un public plus large l'ouvrage en gujarati du moine Shri Nyayavijayaji, dont les multiples éditions successives ont prouvé le succès. En effet, dans ce livre, à partir des œuvres canoniques et de leurs commentaires, dont il a une connaissance approfondie, le moine Shri Nyayavijayaji présente de manière claire et vivante les principes de la religion et de la philosophie jaina: ainsi l'âme, principe de vie, et les substances inanimées (matière, espace, temps, *dharma* et *adharmā* [p. 3-16]); les sept vérités fondamentales (*puṇya*, *pāpa*, *āsrava*, *saṃvara*, *bandha*, *nirjarā*, *mokṣa* [p. 16-30]); les cinq vœux principaux et les sept vœux secondaires (p. 43-60); les règles de conduite (*āvaśyaka*, etc. [p. 107ff.]); l'austérité externe et interne (p. 128-134); les types de méditation (p. 134-138) et de sentiments (p. 161-166); les âmes, leur classification et leur couleur (p. 193-216); la théorie du *karman* spécifique au jainisme (p. 267-316), etc. Souvent précédée de questions prêtées à l'auditoire, l'explication des diverses notions est illustrée d'exemples concrets, tirés ou non des commentaires, qui montrent le bien-fondé des principes jaina dans la vie courante (par exemple: toute vérité n'est pas bonne à dire; il vaut mieux se taire plutôt que livrer un homme à des personnes qui veulent le tuer).

L'entreprise de Nagin J. Shah qui rend hommage à ce maître jaina ne peut donc qu'être accueillie avec reconnaissance.

Christine Chojnacki

CHOONG MUN-KEAT (WEI-KEAT)

The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism. A comparative Study based on the *Sūtrāṅga* portion of the Pāli Saṃyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama. [Beiträge zur Indologie 32]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000. XV + 269p. € 74.- (ISBN 3-447-04232-X).

Schon der Titel dieser 1998 der Universität Queensland vorgelegten Dissertation lässt erkennen, dass eine Vertrautheit mit dem neueren Stande der Buddhismusforschung nicht zu erwarten ist: Einen "*sūtrāṅga*-Abschnitt" gibt es weder sprachlich (Pāli ist *suttāṅga*) noch inhaltlich im Saṃyuttanikāya (SN [vgl. WZKS 38 (1994) 121-135]), dessen erster Band zwei Jahre vor der Drucklegung (1998) neu herausgegeben, aber nicht benutzt worden ist. Die verfehlte Einteilung, der lange Tabellen gewidmet sind (p. 243-253), wird zwei Werken des chinesischen Buddhisten Yin Shun, "Die Herausbildung früher buddhistischer Texte" (1971) und "Gemeinsame Ausgabe von Sūtra und Śāstra des Saṃyuktāgama" (1983) entnommen (p. 7 [beides in Chinesisch]), aus denen der Verf. manche Anregung geschöpft hat. Von westlicher, aber auch weitgehend von östlicher Forschung zum Buddhismus ist die Dissertation trotz einer längeren Bibliographie offensichtlich wenig

genutzter Bücher unberührt geblieben, wie etwa ein Blick in die Einleitung zu den Konzilien der Buddhisten (p. 2ff.) oder in Kapitel 6 zum *paṭiccasamuppāda/pratīyasamutpāda* (p. 150ff.) oder zu *saṅkhāra/saṃskāra* (p. 162) unmittelbar vor Augen führt.

All dies wären nur ärgerliche Versäumnisse, wenn denn der Nidānavagga des SN und sein Gegenstück im chinesischen Saṃyuktāgama sorgfältig verglichen wären. In der Tat werden jedoch nur teils verkürzte Übersetzungen, teils Paraphrasen neben einander gestellt, aus denen sich weder die Textgestalt erkennen noch etwas ableiten lässt. Entsprechend lauten die Ergebnisse, beispielsweise am Ende des 2. Kapitels: “Beide Fassungen stimmen in Teilen überein, weisen aber auch bedeutende Unterschiede auf. Dies muss klärlich bei der Identifikation und Diskussion der frühen Lehren des Buddhismus berücksichtigt werden” (p. 72 [leicht gekürzt]). Das ist so neu nicht. Entsprechend inhaltsleer fallen dann notwendigerweise die Schlussfolgerungen aus (p. 241f.). Von den Lehren des frühen Buddhismus weiss man nach der Lektüre des Buches nicht mehr als vorher. Warum dieser fehlgeleitete Fleiss des Verf. im Druck vorgelegt worden ist, lässt sich kaum erraten.

Oskar von Hintüber

W. PACHOW

A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa. On the Basis of its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pāli Versions. Revised and Enlarged Edition. [Buddhist Tradition Series 31]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000. xvi + 240p. Rs. 395.- (ISBN 81-208-1572-6).

Das vorliegende Werk ist die revidierte und erweiterte (so laut Angabe auf der Rückseite des Titelblattes) Ausgabe einer in Santiniketan 1955 in Buchform veröffentlichten (davor in *Sino-Indian Studies* 4 [1951] und 5 [1955] erschienenen) und dort in den vierziger Jahren des vorigen Jhs. unter der Anleitung von V.V. Gokhale ausgearbeiteten und in Bombay eingereichten Doktorabhandlung (s. die Besprechungen von J.W. de Jong, *T'oung Pao* 47 [1959] 155-157 und K. Chang, *JAOS* 80 [1960] 71-77). Ihr Kern besteht aus der vergleichenden Zusammenstellung der Regeln des Prātimokṣasūtra (PrMoSū) der verschiedenen buddhistischen Schulen. Ausgangspunkt ist jeweils Kumārajīvas chinesische Übersetzung des PrMoSū der Sarvāstivādin (Nanjio 1160 = Taishō 1436, XXIII 470b5 v.1 - 479a6), die der Verf. in englischer Übersetzung wiedergibt. Daran anschließend werden die entscheidenden Passagen des Sanskrit-Textes derselben Schule nach der Ausgabe Finots (in *JA* 1913) zitiert. Es folgen die Versionen der übrigen Vinaya-Schulen: die der Theravādin auf Pāli, dann die der Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya, Mahāsāṃghika und Mūlasarvāstivādin, wiederum in englischer Wiedergabe der wichtigsten Passagen der chinesischen Versionen, und schließlich noch einmal die Version der Mūlasarvāstivādin nach S.C. Vidyabhusanas englischer Übersetzung der tibetischen Version dieser Schule (in *JASB* 1915) sowie die Sanskrit-Stichwörter der Mahāvyyutpatti. Das war hier so detailliert zu beschreiben, weil das vom Verf. verwendete Abkürzungssystem einigermaßen undurchsichtig ist und den meisten heutigen Benutzern Schwierigkeiten bereiten dürfte. Auch die im knappen “Foreword” vom Herausgeber der Serie, A. Wayman, gemachten Bemerkungen

(“The meaning of ‘comparative’ in his title is that Pachow does not restrict himself to Pāli, but usually presents in addition many other traditions, such as the Sarvāstivādin. ... Pachow gives his translation of the text, with both Pāli and Sanskrit equivalents, and alternate renderings for the terms, including references to the Tibetan version ...”) geben den Sachverhalt nur unzulänglich wieder.

Angesichts der Tatsache, dass die Version der Sarvāstivādin Ausgangspunkt des Vergleichs ist, muss bedauert werden, dass auch für die Neuauflage lediglich Finots Sanskrit-Text von 1913 zitiert wird. Wenn auch die kritische Ausgabe des Rez. (*Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, Teil II. Göttingen 2000) noch nicht vorlag, so hätten doch die meisten Lücken mit Hilfe von V. Rosen, *Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins* (Berlin 1959) sowie Teil I der eben genannten Ausgabe (Göttingen 1986) gefüllt werden können. Auch der in einer vorläufigen Edition (A.C. Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit*, Calcutta 1977) vorliegende Sanskrit-Text der Mūlasarvāstivādin (nach den Gilgit-Handschriften) wurde nicht berücksichtigt, ebensowenig wie der in hybridem Sanskrit verfasste Text der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin (ed. N. Tatia, Patna 1975), nicht einmal in der im Klappentext erwähnten älteren Ausgabe von W. Pachow und R. Mishra (Allahabad 1956). Der indische Originaltext hätte, wo vorhanden, schon deshalb den Vorzug verdient, weil die chinesischen Interpretationen ein- und desselben Sanskritausdrucks nicht selten auseinandergehen (vgl. Changs oben zitierte Besprechung).

Dem Hauptteil vorangestellt ist eine ausführliche “Introduction” (p. 3-63), in der der Verf. auf die Bedeutung des Ausdrucks *prātimokṣa*, die Funktion des PrMoSū und seine Entstehungsgeschichte und Entwicklung in den verschiedenen Schulen eingeht. Dieser Abschnitt enthält gewiss eine Reihe richtiger Beobachtungen, stand jedoch schon bei seinem ersten Erscheinen kaum auf dem neuesten Stand der Forschung (s. die oben genannten Besprechungen). Für die Entstehung der Pāli-Version sei auf die kürzlich erschienene Studie O. von Hinübers verwiesen (*Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin*, Mainz 1999 [dazu vgl. WZKS 45 (2001[2002]) 23-58]). Diese Arbeit stand dem Verf. für seine Neuauflage zwar noch nicht zur Verfügung; da aber auch die übrige Forschungsliteratur der letzten Jahrzehnte nicht berücksichtigt worden ist, soll hier auf eine Diskussion der einzelnen in der Einleitung behandelten Punkte verzichtet werden.

Der dritte Teil des Buches enthält Appendices mit verschiedenen Übersichten und Konkordanzen. Neu hinzugekommen ist hier ein kleines Kapitel “The Prātimokṣa and the Vinaya” (p. 227-232), das sich aber an den wissenschaftlichen Laien wendet und der Forschung keine neuen Erkenntnisse bringt. Ohne die von H. Bechert in Gang gesetzte Diskussion zu berücksichtigen, wird hier der Buddha nach wie vor auf 563-483 v.Chr. datiert (p. 227). Neu ist auch die “Bibliography”. Sie enthält nur sieben Titel, darunter nur zwei nach der Erstauflage 1955 erschienene. Das Gros der verwendeten Literatur ist nach wie vor in dem dem Buch vorangestellten Abkürzungsverzeichnis zu finden (p. xiii-xvi). Hier sind die meisten Druckfehler der ersten Auflage übernommen worden, z.B. F. Max “Mulier” statt “Müller” (p. xv unter “SBE”) und viermal “Oldenburg” statt “Oldenberg”. Die Abkürzungen sind oft unglücklich gewählt und entsprechen nicht dem heutigen Usus (s. H. Bechert, *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien*. Göttingen 1990). Das Buch, das ohnehin neu gesetzt worden ist (Zwischen-

titelblätter und -überschriften erhöhen jetzt die Übersichtlichkeit, und auch der Index ist überarbeitet worden), hätte in diesem Punkt – bei allerdings nicht unerheblichem Arbeitsaufwand – wesentlich gewinnen können.

Aller Kritik zum Trotz wird man doch dem bejahrten Verf., dem Herausgeber der Serie und dem Verlag dankbar sein, dass sie sich dieses immer noch nützlichen Nachschlagewerkes angenommen und es wieder allgemein zugänglich gemacht haben.

Georg von Simson

RUTH SONAM (tr. & ed.)

The 37 Practices of Bodhisattvas. An Oral Teaching by Geshe Sonam Rinchen. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1997. 112p. US \$ 12.95 (ISBN 1-55939-068-9).

Vorab sei festgestellt, daß die vorliegende Publikation keine wissenschaftliche Arbeit darstellt, sondern ein zeitgenössisches Stück lebender Tradition des tibetischen Buddhismus – im speziellen Fall der dGe lugs pa Schule –, und damit nicht im eigentlichen Sinn Gegenstand einer wissenschaftlichen Kritik sein kann und hier nur vorgestellt werden soll.

Anhand des Verstextes rGyal ba'i sras kyi lag len sum cu so bdun ma ("Die 37 Praktiken der Söhne des Siegers") von Thogs med bzañ po (1295-1369) gibt Sonam Rinchen, ein Geshe des Klosters Sera Je und damals am Library of Tibetan Works and Archives in Dharamsala tätig, eine religiöse Belehrung, die formal im wesentlichen der tibetischen Tradition verpflichtet ist, sich aber in erster Linie an europäische und amerikanische Zuhörer richtet. Das führt mitunter zu Interpretationen, die in einer wissenschaftlichen Behandlung des Textes als anachronistisch abzulehnen wären, im gegebenen Rahmen aber durchaus ihre Berechtigung und didaktische Funktion haben. So interpretiert Sonam Rinchen etwa das Verbum *sgrogs pa* "verlautbaren, bekannt machen" in Vers 14 als "to broadcast" – so auch die Übersetzung – und kommentiert entsprechend: "... how would we feel if someone said unpleasant things about us on the BBC World Service or on Voice of America?" (p. 47).

Den Bedürfnissen der speziellen Zielgruppe wird auch insofern Rechnung getragen, als in 44 Anmerkungen die nötigsten Erläuterungen zu Termini, Texten und historischen Personen gegeben werden. Sie sind überwiegend klar und verlässlich, wenn man davon absieht, dass bei biographischen Details – der tibetischen Tradition entsprechend – zwischen Legenden und historischen Fakten nicht unterschieden wird. Nur in wenigen Fällen sind die Erklärungen zweifelhaft. Als Beispiel mag n. 13 genügen, wo die Bezeichnung *rygal [ba'i] sras* "Sohn/Söhne des Siegers" für Bodhisattvas damit erklärt wird, dass diese "are their children in that they are born from the speech or teaching of Buddhas", was nach Candrakīrti (Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya ad VI 225) auf die Śrāvakas zutrifft.

Die englische Übersetzung von Ruth Sonam, der langjährigen Dolmetscherin von Sonam Rinchen, ist leicht lesbar und – soweit das für den Verstext in Stichproben überprüft wurde – textgetreu; es lassen sich kaum Verbesserungen vorschlagen.

Neben Sonam Rinchens mündlicher Lehrdarlegung enthält das vorliegende Buch eine kurze Einleitung zur Person von Thogs med bzañ po (p. 7-11), wobei dasselbe gilt, was mit Bezug auf die biographischen Anmerkungen festgestellt wurde, und eine Edition des tibetischen Verstoffes (p. 101-112). Hier ist allerdings in irreführender Weise und in Widerspruch zur Übersetzung und der Erklärung in n. 13 der Titel als “rGyal sras thogs med kyis mdzad pa'i lag len so bdun ma” (“Die 37 Praktiken, verfasst vom Bodhisattva Thogs med”) angegeben, wobei *rgyal sras* zwar als “Ehrentitel” dem Namen des Autors beigefügt ist, aber als Bestimmung davon, wessen Praktiken beschrieben sind, ausgefallen ist.

Abgesehen von solchen kleinen und kaum ins Gewicht fallenden Unzulänglichkeiten ist diese Publikation ein begrüßenswerter Beitrag zur lebenden Tradition des tibetischen Buddhismus und nicht nur interessierten Laien zu empfehlen, sondern auch als ein Beispiel für die rezente Entwicklung innerhalb der Tradition selbst von Interesse.

Helmut Tauscher

GUDRUN BÜHNEMANN

The Iconography of Hindu Tantric Deities. Vol. I: The Pantheon of the Mantramahodadhi — Vol. II: The Pantheons of the Prapañcasāra and the Śāradātilaka. [Gonda Indological Studies IX]. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2000-2001. xxix + 280p. & xviii + 389p. € 80.- & 82.- (ISBN 90-6980-119-1).

As a continuation of several other pertinent studies (Gudrun Bühnemann, *Forms of Gaṇeśa*. Wichtrach 1989; G.B. – M. Tachikawa, *The Hindu Deities Illustrated According to the Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya*. Tokyo 1990), Bühnemann (B.) presents further material relevant to the iconography of Hindu tantric deities. The two volumes contain the Sanskrit text of the *dhyānaśloka*s describing the Hindu pantheon from Mahīdhara's Mantramahodadhi (MM), the Prapañcasāra (PS, attributed to Śaṅkara), and Lakṣmaṇadeśika's Śāradātilaka (ŚT), its translation into English and explanatory notes on the respective deities (I/71-209 and II/30-122 & 176-292). This is complemented by comprehensive introductions that deal with the authors and the dates of the works, their editions, translations, and commentaries, their text's structure, their relationship to other earlier and later works, the context of the *dhyānaśloka*s, each respective work's pantheon, and the deities' attributes and colours (I/1-62 and II/1-21 & 143-163). An important part of the publication are colour and black-and-white reproductions of paintings and line-drawings that depict the visualized deities (I/215-224 [reproductions on 64 unpaginated pages] and II/123-126 & 293-294 [reproductions on 22 unpaginated pages]). Further, the books include useful tables and indices on the iconographic features of the deities, an index of Sanskrit verses and a general index.

The books also include critical editions and translations of MM 25 (I/237-263) and ŚT 1 and 25 (II/309-366). MM 25 contains a description of the six magic rites (*ṣaṭkarman*), the MM's content, its author's genealogy and the date and place of its composition. ŚT 1 describes the creation and ŚT 25 the practice of yoga. There is no doubt that these topics are of great interest, but one asks oneself how they

are related to the iconography of deities. B. provides an explanation only in connection with ŚT 1. This chapter, she writes, explains “how the *kuṇḍalinī* creates the various mantras and their presiding deities” (II/309). This is true, but the chapter does not contain additional information on the deities’ iconography. Perhaps it would have been better to publish the edition and the translation of the chapters mentioned, together with a complementary study, separately.

As B. herself writes (I/5), *dhyānaślokas* do not have the purpose of describing how to make images, but prescribe how the worshipper should visualize the deity that he is worshipping. However, *dhyānaślokas* from, e.g., the PS are also found in Śilpaśāstra texts such as the Śilparatna (see the concordance, II/127-129; for the Śilparatna itself, cf. I/58). Thus, the *dhyānaślokas* also have a certain importance for painting and sculpture. This, however, is limited insofar as art objects do not always correspond to śilpaśāstric prescriptions and thus also not to the original *dhyānaślokas* included in them (cf. A.J. Gail, Iconography or icononomy? Sanskrit texts on Indian art. In: *Shastric Traditions in Indian Arts*, ed. A.L. Dallapiccola. Stuttgart 1989, p. 109-114). One must keep in mind that a large number of the drawings presented by B. were made in order to illustrate the textual descriptions (they are, e.g., taken from an edition of the MM; see I/60ff.), and that another group of illustrations was selected because of their correspondence to the texts. Thus the illustrations do not supply “representative” pictures (if these exist at all), but – at least in the case of those pictorial representations that were not drawn specifically to illustrate these texts – only show that representations corresponding to the texts also exist in the art traditions. Therefore, the illustrations are to be considered only as a visual aid complementing the texts. They themselves do not say anything about a close relation between *dhyānaślokas* (or Śilpaśāstra) and iconography in general. As illustrative material, however, they are valuable, and thus the combination of textual descriptions and illustrations as presented by B. will be a useful source for future studies in Indian art history.

Marion Rastelli

