

Anzeigen

PAUL HARRISON – JENS-UWE HARTMANN (ED.)

From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field, Stanford, June 15-19 2009. [Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 460 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 80]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014. xxii + 403p. € 119,80 (ISBN 978-3-7001-7581-0).

From Birch Bark to Digital Data is the outcome of a 2009 conference that aimed to “bring together the principals of all the major manuscript projects currently underway”, as the volume’s editors, Professor Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, state in their Introduction (p. xxi). The manuscripts that underpin these projects originate in Central Asia (including Gāndhārī and Kharoṣṭhī documents from the Hindukush area), in the Indo-Himalaya, i.e., East India or Nepal, and in Thailand and Sri Lanka. The volume usefully gathers in one place data on manuscript collections that would otherwise stay confined in narrow subfields delineated by language, geographical origin and genre. Staying up to date with the publications of these subfields is “extremely difficult” even for specialists, as Hartmann and Wille observe (p. 247). Much of the volume is therefore devoted to updated bibliographies of primary and secondary sources.

The section on Gāndhārī manuscripts begins with a survey of the major collections and recent work on their contents by Richard Salomon (p. 1-17). There follow three separate chapters on manuscripts in Kharoṣṭhī script. Mark Allon (p. 19-33) summarises research on the Robert Senior collection, many texts of which correspond to *sūtras* in *catuṛāgama* compendia. Collett Cox (p. 35-49) describes exegetical works in Gāndhārī, which include commentaries on root texts such as the Saṅgītisūtra as well as “independent scholastic treatises” (p. 40) on doctrine. Harry Falk and Ingo Strauch (p. 51-78) introduce two collections: the Bajaur collection, comprising nineteen birch-bark scrolls found in a ruined monastery near Pakistan’s northern border with Afghanistan, and the Split collection, an artificial designation for various Gāndhārī manuscripts without an identified findspot. These collections are extraordinarily significant for the study of Buddhism’s early history, containing, for instance, the earliest manuscript of a Prātimokṣasūtra, a Prajñāpāramitā in Gāndhārī, Vinaya texts with no apparent *nikāya* affiliation, and at least one Mahāyānasūtra unknown in any other tradition (p. 59 & 69-71). A list of the manuscripts in these collections is also provided (p. 73-75).

Several contributions deal with Sanskrit manuscripts. Oskar von Hinüber’s report on “The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research” (p. 79-135) is especially informative. The documents found in Gilgit represent a rare snapshot of the transmission of the *dharma* at one time and place; in some cases they comprise “more than a single copy of one and the same text, ... showing different recensions” (p. 79). Professor von Hinüber uses this “closed corpus” to cast much-needed light on the operation, funding, and learning of the classical South Asian monastery. The appended “Bibliographical Guide to Identifications and Editions of the Gilgit Manuscripts” (p. 91-118) is almost exhaustive, though note that further identifications (e.g., Noriyuki Kudo, Newly Identified Folios in the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 17 [2013(14)] 517-518) and at least one edition (Toshiya Unebe, *Sarvagatipariśodhana-Uṣṇīṣavijayā nāma Dhāraṇī: Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations, along with Japanese Translation. Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Nagoya University, Philosophy* 61 [2015] 97-145) drawing on the same corpus have since been published.

Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille discuss “The Manuscript of the *Dirghāgama* and the Private Collection in Virginia” (p. 137-155). The birch-bark manuscript in question, dating from the last quarter of the first millennium, is a vital discovery in that it preserves much more of the early Buddhist *āgama* in Sanskrit than has come to light from other sources. In the present chapter Hartmann updates previous descriptions of the manuscript with findings from newly found folios, while Wille identifies Sanskrit manuscript material – mostly of Vinaya texts – that may have come from the same findspot (p. 148-152). Some important studies on the *Dirghāgama* manuscript are referred to only as uncredited, untitled “dissertation project” or “Masters thesis” submissions at the University of Munich (p. 142-143). For more usefully detailed references, at present one has to go to Zhen Liu’s “Fànběn *Zhāng Āhán* gàishù” (*The Western Region Studies* 1 [2011] 93-114), which is also not mentioned in the chapter.

Jens Braarvig summarises the origins and contents of the Sanskrit manuscripts in “The Schøyen Collection” (p. 157-164), appending a list of titles from the collection published in four volumes of the *Buddhist Manuscripts* series. There are no footnotes in Braarvig’s chapter, which seems to retain the form of a prepared talk. Kazunobu Matsuda briefly describes six private “Japanese Collections of Buddhist Manuscript Fragments from the Same Region as the Schøyen Collection” (p. 165-170). Lore Sander addresses the problem of “Dating and Localizing Undated Manuscripts” (p. 171-186) written in “standard” South Asian scripts. In this chapter it becomes clear that little progress has been made towards a useful taxonomy of scripts categorised by time, place, palaeographic form, sectarian affiliation and so on. It is odd, for instance, that Sander uses the designation “Gilgit/Bāmiyān Type II” (p. 173) for a script that is much better known elsewhere as Siddhamātrkā, and which is now formally called Siddham in the Unicode Standard (U+11580-115FF). The main advance discussed by Sander, carbon dating, is disappointingly said to provide only a “time scale ... as broad as the dates gained by palaeographic methods” (p. 174). While the volume’s editors are keen to stress the “hi-tech investigations ... the digital revolution” taking place in the field (p. xxii), there is little apparent interest in the difficult, cutting-edge work of encoding scripts and establishing standard nomenclature. Some contributors still rely on microfilm, as is stated by Shin’ichiro Hori (p. 260) in “From the Kathmandu Valley to the Tarim Basin” (p. 257-267), which lists fragments kept in St. Petersburg, in the Ryukoku University and again at the British Library.

A “Survey of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Turfan Collection (Berlin)”, covering some 7100 items collected by German expeditions to Xinjiang from 1902-1914, is presented by Klaus Wille (p. 187-211). This is accompanied by a text-title index to the eleven published volumes of the *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden* series. Similar information is given in “The Central Asian Sanskrit Fragments in the Pelliot Collection (Paris)” by Hartmann and Wille (p. 213-222), a “Survey of the Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Hoernle, Stein, and Skrine Collections of the British Library (London)” by Wille (p. 223-246), and “Further Collections of Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia”, again by Hartmann and Wille (p. 247-255), which refers to a number of smaller collections in St. Petersburg and elsewhere. The indexes accompanying these contributions can also be used to locate items in online image repositories (<http://idp.bl.uk> and <http://gallica.bnf.fr> are mentioned on p. 192 and 214 respectively).

A good portion of the new information in the volume comes out of the People’s Republic of China. In “Indic and Khotanese Manuscripts: Some New Finds and Findings from Xinjiang” (p. 269-278), Qing Duan briefly introduces “over five hundred documents” (p. 270) in several languages that up to 2009 flowed into Chinese archives, many of which mention the former capital of the Khotanese kingdom, Birgamdara, conjectured to be in present-day Cèlè county 策勒县 (p. 269-270). This corpus promises to yield fresh insights into the history of the region, and has since been explored further by Duan elsewhere (e.g., in *Xinjiang Manuscripts Preserved in the National Library of China: Khotanese Remains*. Shanghai 2015). By contrast, there is

nothing new in Paul Harrison's "Earlier Inventories of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibet: A Synoptic List of Titles", which aggregates the three published catalogues of Frank Bandurski, Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana and Sen Wang (p. 279-290). Since the information from Zhao Luo's unpublished catalogue, "[c]irculating unofficially", could not be aggregated because "[p]ermission was ... declined" (p. 279, n. 3), there is little value in this chapter, which also misses an opportunity to notice other publications on Sanskrit manuscripts originally kept in China's Tibet Autonomous Region (TAR), such as Kazuo Kano's study of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna's manuscript collection, "Atisha ni yurai suru Retin-ji kyū zō no bonbun shahon: 1934 nen no Chibetto ni okeru Bompon chōsa o kiten to shite" (*Indo Ronrigaku Kenkyū* 4 [2012]). There is, however, more substantial news on research projects in or with Chinese institutions in the chapters by Saerji ("Indic Buddhist Manuscripts in the People's Republic of China. The Peking University Project" [p. 291-300]), the late Helmut Krasser ("Indic Buddhist Manuscripts in Vienna: A Sino-Austrian Co-operative Project, with Methodological Remarks on Śāstric 'Urtexts'" [p. 301-313]), Hong Luo ("Sanskrit Manuscript Projects in the China Tibetology Research Center" [p. 315-321]), and Yoshiyasu Yonezawa and Jundō Nagashima ("The Sanskrit Manuscript Research Project at Taisho University" [p. 323-332]), also concerning the above-mentioned manuscripts. Even though the projects referred to in these articles have already, in many cases, been communicated informally or in online ephemera, they have now been positively confirmed in print. We can therefore soon expect to see complete Sanskrit editions of such gems as the Bodhisattvapiṭaka, Candrakīrti's Madhyamakāvātāra, Abhayākaragupta's and Samayavajra's commentaries on the Pañcakrama, Sthiramati's Abhidharmakośavyākhyā Tattvārthā and several works by Śāṅkaranandana (p. 302-303), as well as Puṇḍarīka's Paramārthasevā (p. 318), among others. These announcements ought to help to coordinate work on the TAR Sanskrit corpus, though at least one manuscript kept there, of Guṇaprabha's Vinayasūtra with its *vṛtti* autocommentary, has for several years been studied in two separate undertakings, namely, by Hong Luo (p. 319) and at Taisho University (p. 331).

The coverage of Pali manuscripts is necessarily limited, as "a tremendous amount ... urgently need[s] to be listed and documented" (p. xviii-xix). Here the editors could have mentioned recent attempts to digitise manuscripts in previously inaccessible libraries in Myanmar, in particular, "most of which have not been published", according to a 2013 notice on the Pali Text Society's website (<http://www.palitext.com/subpages/thaton.htm>). Included in the volume are Peter Skilling's "Reflections on the Pali Literature of Siam" (p. 347-366), which concludes with a note on the *tannan* digitisation project of the École française d'Extrême-Orient in Bangkok, and Bhikkhu Ñānatusita's lists of "Pali Manuscripts of Sri Lanka" (p. 367-403), which focuses on manuscripts in Southeast Asian scripts in Lankan libraries. Finally, another contribution focusing on codicology is the late Michael Hahn's article on "Various Aspects of Dealing with Buddhist *codices unici*" (p. 333-346), which gives corrections to his published editions of the Śiṣyalekha and Kapphiṇābhyudaya.

A strength of the book is that many contributors are familiar with their respective collections, the research published on them to date, and the work remaining to be done. As Georges-Jean Pinault anticipates in his review: "ce livre servira d'instrument de référence pour les années à venir" (*Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 31 [2013(15)] 355-364, p. 363). Pinault also remarks on the lack of any index, which indeed limits the book's usefulness for those who cannot search it in PDF format. Perhaps the more serious limitation, though, is the lack of a unifying vision of *buddhavacana* that coordinates texts, manuscripts and translations, as was done so well in the Japanese *Bongo Butten no Kenkyū* series. The editors of *From Birch Bark to Digital Data* instead express their aversion to such "bland uniformity" (p. x), even while seeking to "provide a comprehensive overview" (p. ix) of Buddhist manuscripts. They concede that "it proved impossible to achieve ... completeness" (ib.) – quite an understatement. The omission of the findings of the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project, which has overseen some "110,000 manuscripts" – far more than all

the material discussed in the volume put together – is unexplained (“the present director of the NGMCP” participated in the conference, but “was regrettably unable to contribute a paper” [p. xviii]). The general level of understanding of Nepal’s vitally important manuscript culture leaves a lot to be desired. Hori (p. 257) proposes to set up a database of Nepalese colophons, yet does not acknowledge by name the work already done on this in other projects such as the NGMCP and privately by Kazumi Yoshizaki and others. Hori refers to the “Newar era” (a translation of the term *nepālasamvat* should use the toponym “Nepal”, not “Newar”, which is a demonym). The editors somehow claim that the “colourful” (p. vi) Buddhism of Nepal lacks “Mainstream” (p. xvii) works. It is unsurprising, then, that other major efforts to digitise Nepalese manuscripts are overlooked: the Cambridge Digital Library (<http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk>), the Institute of Oriental Culture at the University of Tokyo (<http://utlsktms.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp>), Giuseppe Tucci’s collection, Sylvain Lévi’s newly unearthed collection at the Collège de France, and others. In spite of these shortcomings, the volume as it stands has practical value for researchers and can be commended in particular for its treatment of Central Asian manuscripts.

Iain Sinclair

ANNE MACDONALD (ED. & TR.)

In Clear Words. The Prasannapadā, Chapter One. Vol. I: Introduction, Manuscript Tradition, Sanskrit Text – Vol. II: Annotated Translation, Tibetan Text. [Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 863 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 86]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2015. xi + 367 + 584p. € 83,- (ISBN 978-3-7001-7673-2).

Candrakīrti’s commentary on Nāgārjuna’s Mūlamadhyamakakārikās, known by the title *Prasannapadā* or “In Clear Words”, plays a central role in the study of Indian Buddhist thought. As Anne MacDonald points out in the introduction to her massive and authoritative study of this text, Nāgārjuna’s own *kārikās* have presented scholars with many puzzling problems, not only of textual interpretation, but also in the interpretation of its philosophical ideas. For anyone who is curious about what it means to know Emptiness, how Emptiness is related to other fundamental concepts in Indian Buddhist thought, and how Indian Buddhist scholars struggled to articulate their views of reality with the precision and conceptual clarity demanded by the rigorous process of public debate, Candrakīrti’s commentary is a uniquely insightful source. This has been true not just for contemporary scholars, but also for the long line of Tibetan scholars for whom Candrakīrti’s text was the touchstone for interpretation of Madhyamaka tradition.

Candrakīrti’s text has been significant enough in its own right to command attention from generations of scholars, but its significance was assured in the early years of the twentieth century by Louis de La Vallée Poussin’s masterful edition of the Sanskrit text. Other commentators on Nāgārjuna, such as Buddhapālita, Bhāviveka, and Avalokitavrata, had to be studied largely in Tibetan translation. Candrakīrti’s text could be studied with attention to the nuance, the texture, and the subtle rhetoric of his Sanskrit philosophical prose. La Vallée Poussin based his edition on three Nepali paper manuscripts, two of which had been discovered by Brian Houghton Hodgson (1801-1894), a British Resident in Kathmandu and one of the great pioneers in the study of Buddhist manuscripts. La Vallée Poussin acknowledged that these three manuscripts were “mediocre copies of an original that seems not to have been irreproachable,” but his use of the Tibetan translation and his extraordinary knowledge of Buddhist texts made possible an edition that Anne MacDonald rightly describes as “truly commendable”. The La Vallée Poussin edition has been the foundation for the study of Candrakīrti and Nāgārjuna’s verses for over a hundred years.

Scholars of this tradition have become aware, however, that new manuscript discoveries have begun to render La Vallée Poussin's achievement obsolete. It is into this gap that Anne MacDonald has stepped with this remarkable new edition, translation, and analysis of the first chapter of Candrakīrti's text. With the help of two newly identified palm-leaf manuscripts (one in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and another in the Potala Palace, Lhasa), and with a thorough analysis of the broad tradition of Nepali paper manuscripts, this impressive work has put the study of Candrakīrti's text on a much more solid critical foundation.

This work is divided into two volumes. The first volume contains an introduction, a description and analysis of the manuscripts, a critical edition of the Sanskrit text, and a diplomatic edition of the Bodleian palm-leaf manuscript. The second volume contains an annotated translation, several illuminating appendices, a critical edition of the Tibetan translation, a bibliography, and indices to key words, authors, and texts. The total package constitutes a work of truly impressive scholarship and will give new critical impetus to the study of Nāgārjuna and his heirs.

One might ask how an edition and study of just one chapter of a twenty-seven chapter work could be so valuable. There is more work to be done, to be sure, but the first chapter alone constitutes a large proportion of the text. Its discussion of critical issues in epistemology and logical procedure is the crux of Candrakīrti's argument, and it has attracted the vast majority of critical attention, not only in contemporary scholarship but also in Tibet. To master this chapter is to master the fundamental issues in Madhyamaka thought.

For a scholar of this tradition, the value of Anne MacDonald's mastery of the text emerges most clearly, not only in her analysis of the manuscripts and in the precision of her critical edition, but also in the translation and especially in the notes. Prasannapādā chapter 1 has been the focus of intense study by scholars as different as Stcherbatsky, Hopkins, Kajiyama, Siderits, Huntington, Katsura, Vetter, Oetke, Yotsuya, Ruegg, Garfield, and Arnold. This list is hardly exhausting, but it gives an impression of the challenges that lie ahead for anyone who wants to navigate the complexities of scholarship on this work. Add to this the complexity of the dissonant voices of previous commentators, including Bhāviveka's critique of logical methodology in the commentary by Buddhapālita, and the layers of appropriation in subsequent texts, and the challenge can seem extremely daunting. Anne MacDonald navigates this complexity with a sense of calm respect that gives each position its due. Reading her notes is like sitting in a relaxed seminar, where time slows down, and the nuances of each word and phrase can be weighed to extract their meaning. It is easy to see these notes as a reflection of the reading practices of Anne MacDonald's many respected teachers and colleagues, but she has appropriated these practices in her own distinctive way and applied them gracefully to the text.

Different readers will find different points to note in her commentary on Candrakīrti's commentary on Nāgārjuna. There is a very precise discussion, for example, of Candrakīrti's nuanced account of the term "dependent arising" (*pratītyasamutpāda*) at the start of the text. One of the most difficult words for translators of this opening passage has been the term *śiva* as a modifier of *pratītyasamutpāda*. Anne MacDonald solves the problem of this term correctly, in my view, by tying it directly to Candrakīrti's own explanation of *pratītyasamutpāda* as "free from the misfortunes of birth, old age, death, etc." Her translation of *śiva* as "welfare" should remove any lingering confusion about its meaning.

Anne MacDonald notes (vol. II, p. 36, n. 85) that Candrakīrti's account of *pratītyasamutpāda* is intended to prove that all things lack real existence, while also allowing for their "establishment" on the level of surface truth. This is a delicate and ambiguous challenge, but it is the key to this chapter and also the text as a whole. One might say that it is the key to Madhyamaka thought.

Nāgārjuna's statement that it is impossible to teach the ultimate without depending on conventional usage (MMK 24.10ab: *vyavahāram anāśrītya paramārtho na deśyate* /) does not appear

until chapter 24, but the relationship, rhetorical and otherwise, between the ultimate and the conventional runs throughout the argument of chapter 1. There is now no better guide, in my view, to the deep textual complexity of this question than Anne MacDonald's patient elucidation of the arguments in this text. We can be grateful for her accomplishment and look forward with great anticipation to the chapters that lie ahead.

Malcolm David Eckel

CHRISTOPHER G. FRAMARIN

Desire and Motivation in Indian Philosophy. [Routledge Hindu Studies Series 12]. London – New York: Routledge, 2009. xvi + 196p. £ 85,- (ISBN 978-0-415-46194-8 [hbk]).

Emotions have recently resurfaced as a subject of enquiry in both philosophy and the history of ideas; G.F. Schueler's *Desire: Its Role in Practical Reason and the Explanation of Action* (Cambridge, MA 1995) and Simo Knuuttila's *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* (Oxford etc. 2004) are two prominent examples in these fields, to which recent titles in the field of South Asian studies can be added. In the book here under review, in particular, Christopher G. Framarin (hereafter F.) discusses how some orthodox Indian traditions interpret the role and nature of desire with reference to action.

As F. says at the outset (p. 1), one of his main aims is to develop a "plausible interpretation" of the Bhagavadgītā's idea of desireless action (which he calls a "doctrine") expressed by Kṛṣṇa's advice to Arjuna to act without desire. This famous episode in the Gītā throws into sharp relief the dilemma posed by the possibility of non-intentional action, or "desireless action", the phrase that renders the commentarial expression *niṣkāmakarma* and F. sees as encapsulating the idea corresponding to Kṛṣṇa's advice to act without desire. Assuming that action entails desire, the idea of desireless action is a paradox and so would seem to require a non-literal interpretation. Indeed, "being without desires" has been explained as being without desires that are not permissible. However, in Western philosophy the idea that desire is a necessary condition of action became the "default position" only after Hume's influential formulation, and in Indian philosophy, too, it does not exhaust the possible ways of looking at the relation between action and desire. Thus, according to F., since some Indian traditions do admit desireless action, there is no need to take recourse to a non-literal interpretation of Kṛṣṇa's advice. F.'s closer analysis reveals this type of interpretation as based on various "some desires interpretations" and ultimately failing. Among the various texts that present a discussion of the relationship between action and desire, F. chooses, with no apparent design, the Yogasūtra, Manusmṛti, Nyāyasūtra, and Maṇḍanamīśra's Brahmasiddhi. His implicit (and problematic) methodological assumption is that the conclusions drawn from some set of texts can be applied to other texts that are not equally explicit on the same matter, in this case, the Gītā.

In Chapter 1 F. presents four ways to interpret desireless action based on the distinction between permissible and impermissible desires. From Chapter 2 to 6 he explores the arguments for such a distinction that are based on (1) the *mokṣa*-only interpretation, (2) the no selfish desires interpretation, and (3) the non-phenomenologically salient desires interpretation. The entire discussion adopts the modality of Western philosophical discourse, with arguments arranged in syllogistic form. From the Yogasūtra F. extracts a traditional account of permissible desires being described as occurring in a fully knowledgeable agent (Chap. 2). In Chapter 3 F. discusses the desire for *mokṣa* as expounded in the Gītā, in Chapter 4 the no selfish desires interpretation of Kṛṣṇa's advice, in Chapter 5 the theory of motivation in the Manusmṛti, and in Chapter 6 the spectrum of impermissible desires presented in the Nyāyasūtra and Maṇḍanamīśra's Brahmasiddhi. Chapter 7

then offers a “defense of desireless action” (p. 110), being followed by a short “Conclusion” (p. 123).

Three appendices present F.’s translations of relevant excerpts from the Manusmṛti, the Nyāyasūtra, and the Brahmasiddhi, together with some traditional commentaries and F.’s remarks on them. Although there is no reference to these appendices in the previous chapters, they offer to readers a means of judging how the topic under examination is discussed in the original sources.

The citation of Sanskrit texts is rather unconventional, conforming as it does to the usage of Devanagari script of having two or more words written without intervening blank spaces. Sanskrit texts contain typos here and there. I shall only mention a most unfortunate one, namely “*sarvān karmān*”, instead of *sarvān kāmān*, in the first citations from the Gītā on p. xii and p. 1.

With regard to the theory of motivation in the Manusmṛti, F. shows its divergences from the Humean position by discussing, in particular, the initial verses of the second chapter of the Manusmṛti. He points out the erroneous translation of II 3ab (*saṃkalpamūlaḥ kāmo vai yajñāḥ saṃkalpasambhavāḥ*) provided in W. Doniger and B.K. Smith’s *The Laws of Manu* (Penguin 1991, p. 17). Although F. does not mention any other translator or interpreter of the Manusmṛti, his grammatical remark on the text results in an interpretation equivalent to the one provided in 1886 by G. Bühler, who translates: “The desire (for rewards), indeed, has its root in the conception that an act can yield them, and in consequence of (that) conception sacrifices are performed” (*The Laws of Manu*. Oxford 1886, p. 29). F.’s translation differs from the semantic point of view; it reads: “Even desire has belief as its basis. Sacrifices arise from beliefs” (p. 80). In all fairness to Doniger and Smith, however, their translation of the crucial term *saṃkalpa* is not simply “intention”, but also “conception of a definite intention” (quoted on p. 77). This makes F.’s discussion of the pair desire and intention on p. 77-80 slightly out of focus. Furthermore, drawing on Medhātithi’s commentary on the Manusmṛti, F. elaborates on desire for an end or result. He observes that the Gītā extends the scope of this type of desire to all types of actions. According to the Manusmṛti, on the other hand, such a scope does not take in the performance of obligatory rites (*nityakarmans*). Here, as on other occasions, F.’s conclusions are seen to be problematic in virtue of his too hastily ascribing to a text what a commentator says about it.

In his discussion of impermissible desires in the Nyāyasūtra and Brahmasiddhi, F. puts forward observations relating to the distinction between liberation as absence of pain and liberation as bliss and compares Maṇḍanamīśra’s distinction between *rāga* and *icchā* with Vācaspatimiśra’s between *dveṣa* and *vairāgya*. In F.’s opinion, neither *icchā* nor *vairāgya* precludes the attainment of liberation; for *icchā* indicates a mental state that does not belong to the category of *rāga* (or does so only partially), and *vairāgya* “is a phenomenologically non-salient aversion” (p. 97). This explanation also occurs on p. 108; see also p. 103, where F. states that “neither mere *icchā* nor *vairāgya* can be translated as desires or aversions of a particular sort”, and p. 105, where F. considers *vairāgya* and *dveṣa* as mutually exclusive. However, this way of interpreting *vairāgya* may need to be revised, because *vairāgya* more generally indicates detachment, in the sense of a mental state that is not “coloured” by any emotion, be it *rāga* or *dveṣa*. Applying F.’s terminology, *vairāgya* might thus be explained as an emotional state that lacks phenomenological saliency, since it does not correspond to any type of excited emotion. To use A. Chakrabarti’s words, quoted by F. himself, *vairāgya* is a “state of ‘colourlessness’” (p. 98), or, referring to the Gītā, the state in which one is “unmoved (*acala*) by desire” (p. 99). The identification of non-phenomenologically salient desires as permissible desires constitutes the “standard” interpretation that F. next criticizes, arguing that “the class of desires that are impermissible is much broader than the standard interpretation allows” and should be seen as comprising “[a]ny desire that either (1) is phenomenologically salient or (2) disposes the agent towards sensations that are inconsistent with equanimity” (p. 101). Unfortunately F. does not explain in which sense the standard account is

not broad enough and why the distinction he makes is necessary (i.e., why the second type of desires cannot be included in the first type), why equanimity is so important or what qualifies an agent as equanimous. In his “revised account” (p. 103), F. focuses again on the interpretation of *icchā* and *vairāgya*, which, after a highly debatable explanation concerning the meaning of “purpose”, are rendered respectively as “positive purpose” and “negative purpose”. This twisting of the words’ meaning did not help the present reviewer to gain a clearer understanding of the views expressed in the sources. Furthermore, one may notice the more general absence of considerations on topics such as *jñāna* (which is suddenly mentioned but not explained on p. 106) and the nature of the agent of desire, which are crucial subjects of the Indian philosophical debate.

In the end, F.’s account of desireless action and his distinction between purposes and permissible desires (which is again alluded to in the “final objection”, on p. 126) are rather unconvincing, mainly because of the inappropriate hermeneutical strategy applied to the original sources. From a more general point of view, the adduced range of sources does not adequately reflect the discussion in Indian philosophy, since Buddhist and Jaina texts are not included, and the variety of the Brahmanical philosophical tradition is scarcely represented. In any case, it is F.’s merit to have begun an articulate discourse on the relation of desire and action in Indian philosophy, and to have presented a new way of reflecting on the topic of desire, one that can draw the attention of specialists from other fields as well as be fruitfully used by specialists of South Asian studies, who can go on to broaden and deepen F.’s discourse.

Cristina Pecchia

DRAGOMIR DIMITROV

Śabdālaṃkāradoṣavibhāga – Die Unterscheidung der Lauffiguren und der Fehler. Kritische Ausgabe des dritten Kapitels von Daṇḍins Poetik *Kāvyaḍarśa* und der tibetischen Übertragung *Sñān ṅag me loṅ* samt dem Sanskrit-Kommentar des Ratnaśrījñāna, dem tibetischen Kommentar des Dpañ Blo gro grtan pa und einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrit-Grundtextes. Teil 1: *Einleitung, Überlieferung, Textausgabe, Übersetzung* – Teil 2: *Kommentare, philologische Bemerkungen, Faksimiles, Anhänge, Konkordanzen und Indizes.* [Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung, Monographien 2]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011. xii + 278p. & vi + 645p. (= p. 279-923). € 178,- (ISBN 978-3-447-06495-8).

Nine years after the edition of the first chapter of Daṇḍin’s seminal treatise on poetics *Kāvyaḍarśa* (“Mirror of Poetic Art”, henceforth KĀ), titled *mārgavibhāga* (“Distinction of Styles”), together with its thirteenth-century Tibetan translation *Sñān ṅag me loṅ*, Dragomir Dimitrov (D.) has presented an even more diligent edition of the third chapter of the work titled *śabdālaṃkāradoṣavibhāga* (“Differentiation of Figures of Sound and Faults”), which also includes an edition of the Sanskrit commentary *Ratnaṭikā* (10th c.) and of the Tibetan *Dpañ Ṭikā* (14th c.). While the edition of the *mārgavibhāga*, which is already out of print, was distributed in the series *Indica et Tibetica* in Marburg, founded by the late Michael Hahn, the monograph on the *śabdālaṃkāradoṣavibhāga* is now published by Harrassowitz Verlag. Nevertheless, the volumes appear fairly uniform.

A new edition of the third chapter of the KĀ together with the *Ratnaṭikā* was indeed a desideratum. The KĀ (*editio princeps* by Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa, Calcutta 1803) had never been critically edited, and the only edition of the *Ratnaṭikā* (by Anantalal Thakur and Upendra Jha, Darbhanga 1957) was based on a single defective manuscript. Through the discovery of a palm-leaf manuscript which can be dated back to the twelfth or thirteenth century and which is now kept in the National Archives in Kathmandu, D. was able to improve on several doubtful readings and edit for the first time those passages that were not covered by the *Ratnaṭikā* manuscript used by Thakur

and Jha, above all the commentaries on stanzas 3.46 and 3.50-56. Unfortunately, the Nepalese manuscript does not transmit the commentary on the first chapter of the KĀ and only about half of it on the second.

Apart from the variant readings recorded in modern editions, no South Indian manuscript readings were collated for this new edition of the KĀ, since these manuscripts were inaccessible to the author (as was also the case in his 2002 edition of the *mārgavibhāga*). Numerous manuscripts in repositories in Chennai and Trivandrum, also one kept in Colombo, are listed in the New Catalogus Catalogorum (vol. 4, p. 108), and their collation would certainly add valuable information to our knowledge of the history of the textual transmission of the “Mirror”. In fact, D. presents only a northern text of the KĀ that is reflected in the Sanskrit and Tibetan *īkās*.

The edition of the Tibetan texts is meritorious in more than one respect. The Śān ṅag me loṅ is preserved in all five known editions of the Tanjur and in a considerable number of non-canonical witnesses such as half a dozen Tibetan commentaries, including the Dpañ Ṭīkā. However, the latter have not yet been printed, let alone critically edited. Dimitrov’s analysis of the Ratnaṭīkā and the Dpañ Ṭīkā reveals a close relationship between the two works, which becomes even more evident by their being printed on facing pages. In general, the impact of Daṇḍin’s KĀ on classical Tibetan literature is striking and certainly deserves the attention of scholars.

The title *śabdālamkāradoṣavibhāga* was not chosen on the basis of manuscript evidence, but following modern editions, since their titles, as Dimitrov argues (Pt. 1, p. 12), appear more precise and suitable than those found in the subcolophons. The name of the chapter also differs from the edited subcolophons, that is, *duṣkaranāmā trītyaḥ paricchedaḥ* in the root text (Pt. 1, p. 242) and *duṣkaraparicchedas trītyaḥ* in the Ratnaṭīkā (Pt. 2, p. 457).

The constituted texts and variant readings of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan root text in Part 1 were printed in Devanāgarī and Tibetan Dbu can script respectively. The commentaries including the respective root texts edited in Part 2 and all other instances of Sanskrit and Tibetan texts were transliterated. To facilitate the understanding of Daṇḍin’s skillfully crafted stanzas, which are fairly sophisticated in some passages of his work, an analytical transliteration was used. For this purpose, the transliteration that was first employed by Michael Coulson in his critical edition of Bhavabhūti’s play *Mālatīmādhava* (Delhi 1989) was modified and simplified. It is not used throughout the two volumes, but only in the edition of the KĀ. Different colours are used to print text that contains various kinds of paronomasia (*yamaka*). In addition, these and other figures of sound are graphically visualised in one of the numerous appendices (Pt. 2, p. 733-737). Bold typeface helps identify text quoted from the root text in both the commentaries.

The edition is furnished with a complete German translation of this chapter of Daṇḍin’s treatise (Pt. 1, p. 254-278), which is based on Ratnaśrījñāna’s interpretation wherever the Sanskrit wording is ambiguous. Like the text editions it is furnished with a detailed table of contents (here in German, there in Sanskrit and Tibetan), which amounts to a structural analysis of this part of the treatise.

The facsimiles of the above-mentioned manuscript from Nepal (Pt. 2, p. 581-655) and an undated Tibetan manuscript (Pt. 2, p. 656-728), which come with diplomatic transcripts on facing pages, are printed in high resolution and basically readable. However, due to the unavoidable photomechanical reduction in size, the Nevārī-script and Dbu med graphemes appear rather small and are hard to read in some places. Reference to high-resolution images in some accessible digital repository would perhaps have better served the purpose and would have reduced the volume and price of the book.

In the comprehensive introductory section of Part 1, Dimitrov demonstrates that the arrangement of the KĀ in general and of its third chapter in particular is remarkably systematic and succeeds

in solving some hitherto unsolved problems that have been brought forward in secondary literature. Moreover, his analysis reveals previously unnoticed principles that Danḍin applied in the organisation of his treatment of various kinds of *yamaka*.

Although the layout of both Part 1 and 2 includes useful and precise page headers, the reader needs to juggle with a considerable number of bookmarks in order to navigate between the large number of related sections.

For those who do not read German, there is a fine summary in English at the very end of Part 2 (p. 917-923). It provides an overview of Part 1 as well as Part 2 and an accurate outline of the important analyses, findings and conclusions. The greater part of the apparatus (twelve appendices, six concordances and five indices) is perfectly intelligible even with only a rudimentary knowledge of German. This is especially true, of course, for the constituted texts, the facsimiles and their diplomatic transcripts.

Christian Ferstl

KARL DEBRECZENY (ED.)

The Black Hat Eccentric. Artistic Visions of the Tenth Karmapa. New York: Rubin Museum of Art – Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012. 320p. US\$ 75,- (ISBN 978-0-9772131-0-8).

Karl Debreczeny (D.) stellt mit diesem Buch, das Beiträge von Ian A. Alsop (A.), David P. Jackson (J.) und Irmgard Mengele (M.) enthält, den 10. Karmapa Chos dbyings rdo rje (1604-1674) als eine äußerst kreative Künstlerpersönlichkeit vor, die unter den ansonsten meist anonym geliebten tibetischen Künstlern hervorsticht.

Im 1. Kapitel ("The Artist's Life" [p. 33-63]) bearbeitet M., gestützt auf ihre eigene, bei Vajra in Kathmandu publizierte Studie "*Riding a Huge Wave of Karma. The Turbulent Life of the Tenth Karmapa*", die Biographien dieses Karmapa und zeichnet sein Leben nach: seine frühen Jahre in Tibet, seine Flucht 1645-47, seinen Aufenthalt in Lijiang (Yunnan) und schließlich seine Rückkehr nach Zentraltibet 1672. M.s detaillierte Dokumentation dieser Künstler-Vita ermöglicht es D., im 2. Kapitel ("Early Artistic Career & Exile in Lijiang" [p. 65-95]) eigenhändige bzw. signierte Malereien des 10. Karmapa aufzuspüren und sie anhand stilistischer und ikonographischer Vergleiche Arbeiten von Schülern bzw. solchen anderer Werkstätten gegenüberzustellen. Damit können ältere Zuschreibungen zu anderen Perioden und Regionen widerlegt bzw. endgültig falsifiziert werden.

Im 3. Kapitel ("Set 1: Arhats – By the Hand of the Master" [p. 97-127]) wird eine Gruppe von sieben Bildern (Buddha Śākyamuni und die 16 Arhats) besprochen, die inschriftlich für den 10. Karmapa gesichert und ins Jahr 1660 datiert ist. Das chinesische Exil hat die Kunst dieses Karmapa sehr stark beeinflusst. Seine Kompositionen sind sehr frei; oft fehlen klare Umrisslinien und er verwendet häufig Tusche sowie fahle und gebrochene Farben, die nass aufgetragen sind. Damit unterscheidet sich seine Malerei ganz deutlich von dem unter dem 9. Karmapa in Tibet entwickelten Gardri-Stil, der zwar in Landschaftsdarstellungen deutlich chinesische Einflüsse zeigt, aber in der Linienführung und Farbgebung der tibetischen Tradition verpflichtet bleibt.

In den Kapiteln 4-6 werden Malereien von Schülern bzw. möglicher Werkstätten des 10. Karmapa beschrieben. Bei einer Gruppe von Arhat-Bildern (Kapitel 4: "Set 2: Arhats – Workshop Production" [p. 129-147]) können die Unterschiede zu den Werken des Meisters besonders deutlich gezeigt werden, insofern die Charakteristika der Malerei des 10. Karmapa zwar vorhanden sind (er hat also wohl den Entwurf geliefert), aber in der Ausführung die Farben intensiver und die Modellierung härter ausfallen.

Keine Vergleiche sind bei einer Gruppe von Bildern zum Leben des Buddha möglich (Kapitel 5: "Set 3: Deeds of the Buddha – Workshop Production" [p. 149-169]), da es zu diesem Thema keine eigenhändige Bildserie des 10. Karmapa gibt. Äußere Einflüsse haben auf diese Gruppe besonders stark eingewirkt. Die Farben sind bunt und intensiv wie in der traditionellen tibetischen Malerei; die Kleidung hingegen folgt eher indischen und chinesischen Vorbildern.

A. setzt sich im 8. Kapitel ("The Sculpture of Chöying Dorjé, Tenth Karmapa" [p. 215-245]) ausführlich mit Plastiken aus dem Umfeld des 10. Karmapa auseinander. Einige Skulpturen tragen Signaturen, deren Echtheit A. außer Zweifel stellt. Vergleiche der Körpermerkmale der dargestellten Figuren lassen deutliche Parallelen zur Malerei des 10. Karmapa erkennen. Seine Biographien belegen, dass er eine Werkstatt unterhielt; doch ist die Trennung eigener Arbeiten von denen seiner Werkstatt immer noch sehr schwierig. Auch muss davon ausgegangen werden, dass der Karmapa eigene Plastiken später selbst kopiert hat. In den Biographien ist auch von seiner Vorliebe für frühe Kaschmir-Plastiken die Rede, deren typischen weichen Faltenwurf er immer wieder nachahmt.

J. zeigt in Kapitel 10 ("The Language of Art: The Challenge of Translating Art Historical Terms from the Biography of the Tenth Karmapa" [p. 279-289]) die mit der kunstgeschichtlichen Terminologie in den biographischen Quellen verbundenen Schwierigkeiten auf. Dabei versucht er mit Erfolg, einige Begriffe zu deuten; bei anderen verweist er auf die Notwendigkeit weiterer Forschungen.

D. legt mit diesem Band nicht nur eine hervorragend recherchierte und mit sehr gutem Bildmaterial versehene Darstellung des künstlerischen Schaffens des 10. Karmapa, sondern auch eine für die tibetische Kunst im Allgemeinen bahnbrechende Arbeit vor. Es wäre zu hoffen, dass diese bald mit Bezug auf das Œuvre anderer tibetischer Künstler ihre Fortsetzung findet.

Eva Allinger

L. KULIKOV – M. RUSANOV (ED.)

Indologica. T. Ja. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume / Sbornik statej pamjati T. Ja. Elizarenkovej.
Book 1. Compiled and ed. by L.K. and M.R. [*Orientalia et Classica XX*]. Moskva: Rossijski Gosudarstvennyj Gumanitarnyj Universitet – Institut Vostočnyx Kul'tur i Antičnosti, 2008. 530p. (ISBN 978-5-7281-1028-6).

Als Tatyana Yakovlevna Elizarenkova am 5.9.2007 nach langer Krankheit starb, hat sich die von ihrem Schüler Leonid I. Kulikov und M.A. Rusanov ursprünglich als Festschrift zu ihren Ehren geplante Aufsatzsammlung in eine Gedenkschrift verwandelt (s. "Preface", p. 8).

Das Buch beinhaltet nach einer von Vyacheslav V. Ivanov in russischer Sprache verfassten Biographie Professor Elizarenkovas (p. 9-20) und ihrer 52 Jahre akademischen Schaffens umfassenden Bibliographie (p. 21-38) insgesamt 30 Aufsätze in alphabetischer Reihung der Autoren, welche nur insofern nicht ganz konsequent eingehalten ist, als der Beitrag Vladimir N. Toporovs, des schon im Jahre 2005 verstorbenen Ehemannes der Geehrten, vorangestellt ist.

Das wissenschaftliche Wirken Tatyana Elizarenkovas spiegelt sich in den hier versammelten Beiträgen gleichsam wider. In ihrer Laufbahn stand nämlich die Forschung zum Veda an erster Stelle und gipfelte bekanntlich in ihren monumentalen Übersetzungen der R̥gvedasamhitā (RV) und der Śaunaka-Atharvavedasamhitā (nicht ganz vollständig). Daneben nahmen aber auch – wie die Bibliographie imposant veranschaulicht – u.a. Studien zum epischen Sanskrit, zum Mittel- und Neuindischen und sogar zum Drawidischen ihre Aufmerksamkeit in Anspruch. Ebenso verhält es sich mit der ihr gewidmeten Gedenkschrift.

Zu der inhaltlichen Vielfalt tritt die sprachliche: Neben 16 Studien in englischer (12), deutscher (3) oder italienischer (1) Sprache ist knapp die Hälfte der Aufsätze in Russisch geschrieben. Im konkreten Fall ist dieser Umstand zwar durchaus begreiflich; doch da Russisch sich als internationale Wissenschaftssprache schlicht nicht durchgesetzt hat, wäre es sehr wünschenswert gewesen, wenn diesen gelehrten Beiträgen zumindest ein Abstract in englischer Sprache mitgegeben worden wäre (ein solches findet sich einzig vor dem deutschsprachigen Aufsatz E. Tichys [p. 479]). Nur aus dem übersetzten Inhaltsverzeichnis (p. 529f.) kann der des Russischen Unkundige auf die Inhalte der russischen Beiträge schließen.

Es fällt auf, dass die Aufsätze zum Veda bzw. zum Indoiranischen fast ausschließlich von westlichen Forschern geschrieben sind (mit Ausnahme der Arbeiten von V.N. Toporov [p. 39-62] zu Sarasvatī und V.N. Romanov [p. 419-434] zu *upa-ās*), während die russisch schreibenden Gelehrten die anderen Forschungsgebiete Elizarenkovas behandeln: Studien zum klassischen bzw. epischen Sanskrit stammen von N.R. Lidova (p. 273-292), S.L. Neveleva (p. 329-351) und S.D. Serebryany (p. 449-458), zum Mitteloindoiranischen von M.A. Rusanov (p. 435-448) und A.A. Vigasin (p. 493-499), zum Neuindoiranischen von A.I. Kogan (p. 197-226), V.P. Liperovsky (p. 293-304) und G.V. Strelkova (p. 459-477), zur Schrift der Induskultur von V.V. Ivanov (p. 141-152), zur Tamil-Phonologie von M.S. Andronov (p. 71-77) und zum Persischen von N.I. Prigarina (p. 389-418). Dazu kommt noch ein wissenschaftsgeschichtlicher Beitrag von V.M. Alpatov (p. 63-69).

Von den westlichen Forschern behandelt einzig J.C. Heesterman ein nicht-vedisches Thema (p. 127-139 zum *dharmā-* des Yūdhiṣṭhira).

Unter den vornehmlich den Veda betreffenden Studien finden sich sprachhistorische Arbeiten von F. Kortlandt (p. 227-230) zur Genese des Desiderativums und von R. Lazzeroni (p. 263-272), der seine Erklärung des "Kuiperschen Rätsels" (bezüglich des einstigen Bedeutungsverhältnisses zwischen Nasalpräsentien und ihren Nebenformen ohne Nasal) vorträgt. Untersuchungen zur vedischen Dichtersprache stammen aus der Feder von S.W. Jamison (p. 153-165), die in der Verwendung von diminutivem *-ka-* und Optativformen des Perfektstammes Merkmale von Frauensprache in der RV sieht, J.S. Klein (p. 167-182), der eine Materialsammlung zu verschiedenen Arten stilistischer Wiederholung von Adverbien in der RV vorlegt, und W. Knobl (p. 183-195), der mit seiner genialen Erklärung des katalektischen RV-Verses 10.129.7b die poetische Technik des Verschweigens illustriert.

Am häufigsten sind Studien zur Semantik einzelner Wörter bzw. Phrasen vertreten: H.W. Bodewitz (p. 79-98) beleuchtet unter sämtlichen denkbaren Aspekten den Refrain *kāsmā devāya haviṣā vidhema* (RV 10.121) und T. Gotō (p. 115-125) beschäftigt sich mit der Formulierung *śālām as*, die inhaltlich wohl im Gegensatz zu *cakrām car'* steht, mithin das "In-der-Hütte-Sein" bezeichnet, also das sesshafte Leben im Gegensatz zum nomadischen, wobei er zu dem Schluss kommt, dass in *śālām* nicht ein prädikativer Nominativ, sondern ein Inhaltsakkusativ vorliegt. L.I. Kulikov (p. 245-261) untersucht die Bedeutung des Kausativs von *sam-khyā/kṣā*, verwirft den alten Ansatz "cause to look at" und kommt, zumindest für das ältere Vedisch, zu der Bedeutung "cause to appear, cause to be considered, make associated with" (p. 257). A. Lubotsky (p. 305-313) korrigiert den vom Dhātupāṭha in die Wörterbücher übernommenen Wurzelansatz *stigh* aufgrund der Handschriftenlesarten von Maitrāyaṇīya- und Paippalāda-Samhitā zu "*stīg-* ... 'to penetrate'" (p. 310), während G.-J. Pinault (p. 353-388) eine Hypothese zur Etymologie des vedischen Wortes *māmścatū-* aufstellt (**māmś-catū-* [mit der Nūristānī-Affrikata /č/ statt indoarisch /ś/] "cutting up the flesh" [p. 383]) und in den ṛgvedischen Belegstellen desselben und seiner Ableitungen Belege für die Vertrautheit der Dichter mit dem sonst erst yajurvedisch bezeugten Mythos von der Tötung des Soma durch Mitra und Varuṇa findet. E. Tichy (p. 479-491) erklärt die sprachhistorischen Wurzeln von ved. *jyók* und vergleicht dessen Semantik mit denen von lat. *diū* und *iūgis*. J.C. Wright (p. 501-526) skizziert die Bedeutungsentwicklung von *grāvan-* ("from pressing-stone to

terrestrial deity” [p. 502]) und Th. Krisch (p. 231-243) stellt sein RIVELEX-Wörterbuch vor, indem er die in diesem angewandte Methode mit der Präsentation des Eintrags *á* illustriert.

Des Weiteren legt H. Falk (p. 99-114) seine auf den vorhandenen Editionen aufbauende Textrekonstruktion eines Abschnittes aus dem Nidānasūtra vor und übersetzt diesen auch. Schließlich gibt Ch. Minkowski (p. 315-328) einen Einblick in die jüngere indische Veda-Rezeption, indem er Nilakanṭha Caturdharas Methode erläutert, in seinem Śivatāṇḍavatantra aus bestimmten ṚV-Strophen Anleitungen zur Erstellung von magischen Quadraten herauszulesen. Nur nebenbei merke ich an, dass der Ausdruck *uṣtrapada-* nicht nur “[p]erhaps ... a reference to board game” (p. 323) darstellt, sondern sicher vom Schachspiel herrührt; vgl. A. Weber, Fortsetzung seiner Untersuchungen über das indische Schachspiel in *Monatsbericht der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1874) 713ff.

Die Herausgeber haben mittlerweile einen zweiten Band *Indologica* publiziert (Moscow 2012). Dieser beinhaltet 22 weitere Aufsätze und weist in sprachlicher wie inhaltlicher Hinsicht eine ähnliche Vielfalt auf. Beachtlich mag sein, dass er auch mehrere Arbeiten zu indischen Wissenschaften beinhaltet; ferner, dass an seinem Ende eine bisher unpublizierte (russischsprachige) Arbeit Tatyana Elizarenkovas zu den Flussnamen in der ṚV steht; endlich, dass im Gegensatz zum hier besprochenen Vorgänger, bei dem sich schon beim ersten Durchblättern einige Seiten aus der Bindung gelöst haben, ein längere Haltbarkeit versprechender Hardcover-Einband verwendet wurde.

Bei beiden so inhaltsreichen Bänden kann ich nur einen Umstand bedauerlich finden: dass Professor Elizarenkova, die in Russland zu Lebzeiten nicht nur keine öffentliche Wertschätzung erfuhr, sondern in den 1970ern wegen ihrer Unterschrift unter einem Protestbrief sogar ihres Moskauer Lehrstuhles enthoben wurde, diese schöne Würdigung nicht mehr zu Gesicht bekam.

Philipp Kubisch

