

BUCHBESPRECHUNGEN

Henning Schunk

Arrians Indiké. Eine Untersuchung der Darstellungstechnik. [Philippika. Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen 135]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2019. 316p. € 78,- (ISBN 978-3-447-11282-6).

This book is a slightly revised version of the doctoral dissertation presented by the author in the winter term of 2017/2018 at Philipps-Universität Marburg. It belongs to Classical Philology and mainly concentrates on the second part of the *Indica*, the account of the coastal venture of Nearchus, which the author calls the *Paraplous*. Following the ideas of Albert Bosworth and Philip Stadter, he shows by way of a close comparison to the *Anabasis* that even here Arrian was never the mere compiler as many scholars have wanted to see him. Beside philology also statistical methods are used.

The first chapter (pp. 11ff.) begins with the methodological statements given by Arrian in the two prooemia of the *Anabasis*. With the help of a detailed analysis of the cross-references between the *Anabasis* and the *Indica* the author tries to show how closely the two works belong together. An important link between them is the central role of Alexander, which also can be traced in the *Indica*.

The second chapter (pp. 51ff.) delves into Arrian's way of using his sources, which seems to be the same in both works. He selects those he deems to be the most reliable, preferably accounts by eye-witnesses. In the *Anabasis* the main sources are Ptolemy and Aristobulus, in the first part of the *Indica* Megasthenes, Eratosthenes and Nearchus, in its second part only Nearchus. Arrian's relation to his sources and views on their reliability is discussed with many examples. From the Indological viewpoint the long discussion about his critical attitude towards Megasthenes (pp. 75ff.) is important. In the second part of this chapter, a comparison of similar passages in Arrian and Strabo (pp. 94ff.) shows that Arrian is dramatizing the story and emphasizing the good qualities of Nearchus.

In chapter three (pp. 111ff.) the author discusses Arrian's way of dealing with Alexander and Nearchus in more detail. In the *Anabasis* Alexander is naturally the central figure. The author has made a count that he is named approximately three times on every page of the Teubner edition. However, also in the *Indica* Alexander plays a more important role than one may expect. The coastal voyage of Nearchus is understood by Arrian as an extension of Alexander's deeds. Only in the account of a part of the journey, namely from the mouth of the Indus to Carmania, Nearchus is more or less the central figure; in other parts of the account he appears merely as an assistant to Alexander who occupies the prominent position.

Chapter four (pp. 149ff.) offers a comparison between the presentations of the figures of Alexander and Nearchus. In a way Nearchus here becomes a lesser version of Alexander, the hero of the *Anabasis*, constantly reflecting Alexander's good qualities. Especially the piety and military skill of both are noted with many examples. All this also clearly shows that the idea we get of Nearchus is not his own creation, but a product of Arrian's interpretation.

The last chapter (pp. 189ff.) is dealing with the role of Homer in Arrian. In the *Anabasis* Alexander and other characters are often compared to Homeric heroes and this is as much true for the *Indica*. A great number of Homeric reminiscences both in the *Anabasis* and the *Indica* are traced and analysed by the author. While Alexander is like Achilles (with Arrian as Homer to praise him), the parallel to Nearchus is naturally Odysseus. These reminiscences seem to be a stylistic device of Arrian himself, and whenever they appear in quotations from earlier authors we can conclude that Arrian is not providing the exact wording of his source.

Finally, in his presentation of conclusions and results (pp. 241ff.) the author gives a summary of the main points discussed in the preceding chapters. As a future task he briefly points out that a comparison between the first part of the *Indica* and the long account of Egypt in Herodotus would certainly yield interesting results and further our understanding of Arrian's work.

There are two appendices (pp. 247ff.) devoted to Arrian's language. In the first, the author compares the occurrences of different prepositions in the *Anabasis* and the *Indica*. The second appendix lists all Homeric words found in the *Indica* alphabetically arranged in a table that shows their occurrences in the *Indica*, in the *Anabasis*, in both Homeric epics and in Herodotus (who may in some cases have been Arrian's real source for them).

The bibliography is divided in several parts: editions, translations, commentaries, other texts, general works, monographs and, finally, articles. The distinction between the last three categories is unnecessary and somewhat disturbing. Furthermore, there is an index locorum, but no general index.

In a review published in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* it must be mentioned that the discussion is mostly concentrating on Greek philological questions. The main passages that are analysed in the book are given both in the original and in translation, but in the following discussions one frequently meets with Greek terms and words that are familiar only to classical philologists. Moreover, while the interest of Indologists in the *Indica* tends to focus on its descriptive first part, which is mainly based on Megasthenes, the author mostly concentrates on the second part, the coastal voyage of Nearchus. However, for a reader familiar with Greek philology the book offers many fine and pertinent

points which will certainly also benefit Graeco-Indian studies. Sometimes the author may have been carried too far in his analysis, seeing motives and intentions where perhaps there were none, but as a whole the book is an important contribution to an important field of study.

Klaus Karttunen

Rosane Rocher, with Agnes Stache-Weiske

For the Sake of the Vedas. The Anglo-German Life of Friedrich Rosen 1805–1837. [Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 118]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020. XX + 396p. € 68,- (ISBN 978-3-447-11448-6).

Nowadays the name of Friedrich August Rosen (1805–1837) is almost forgotten among Indologists. Nevertheless, in his short life he did important pioneer work in making at least part of the Ṛgvedasamhitā, namely the first Aṣṭaka, available to Western scholars. As the early Indian publications of the Scottish missionary John Stevenson (1798–1858) on the Ṛgveda were not available in Europe,¹ the famous article of Henry Thomas Colebrooke² with its meagre indications was all that existed at the time, and it was Rosen's book that turned the interest of Eugène Burnouf and others to the Ṛgveda.

Rosane Rocher is a veteran scholar of the history of Indology, with publications on the lives of Alexander Hamilton (1968) and Nathaniel Brassey Halhed (1983), and much else. Agnes Stache-Weiske (1962–2021), who assisted her with German-language materials, has authored or co-authored several important books on German Indology, for example on Franz Anton Schiefner (2015) and Otto von Böhtlingk (2017). In the book under review, their collaboration has produced a thorough and well-balanced scholarly biography.

Friedrich Rosen was born in Hannover, but grew up in Göttingen and Detmold. He began his studies at Leipzig University in 1822. Like many talented young men, he had some difficulty in selecting his own field of study and thus attended lectures on law, theology, history, philosophy and classics. In addition, he enjoyed private lectures on Arabic by Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer. At that time Fleischer was still a senior student, although he was soon to become a world-famous Arabist, and a life-long friend of Rosen. During the 1824 summer recess

¹ On him, see Cezary Galewicz, *The Missionaries in the Race for Putting the Veda to Print. Cracow Indological Studies* 21.1 (2019) 137–164.

² On the Vedas or Sacred Writings of the Hindus. *Asiatick Researches* 8 (1805) 377–497, reprinted in London in 1808. See H.T. Colebrooke, *Miscellaneous Essays. With Life of the Author by His Son Sir T. E. Colebrooke*. 3 vols. London: Trübner, 1873, pp. 8–102.

of the University, Rosen began to read Sanskrit together with his father, with the meagre books then available in Germany, especially O. Frank's grammar.³ After this vacation Rosen headed towards Berlin and became Franz Bopp's student. Sanskrit was now his main field of study, in addition to some classes on Persian and Arabic, and he proceeded rapidly. In the winter of 1825, he was already inofficially conducting Bopp's classes during the professor's stay in London, and in the new year 1826 he presented his doctoral dissertation, entitled *Corporis radicum sanscriticarum prolusio. A Specimen of the Collection of Sanskrit Roots*.⁴ When the doctoral degree was conferred on March 15, 1826, he became the first doctor among Bopp's students.

With his new degree, Rosen continued his intensive work on Sanskrit roots and the complete *Radices sanscritae illustratas* amounting to 378 pages appeared in 1827. He had gone through all the Sanskrit texts then available which unfortunately was very little. However, this work served students of Sanskrit well for some fifteen years until N.L. Westergaard published a similar book in 1841, now on a much larger textual basis.

Rosen had long planned to continue his studies in Paris and arrived there in the spring of 1828. However, very soon afterwards he was offered a chair at the newly established University of London, later known as University College. He wanted to delve into the Vedas, and the possibility of having easy access to British manuscript collections was inviting although, beside Sanskrit, he also had to teach Hindūstānī there, which he now had to learn quickly, in addition to Persian and Arabic. He began teaching in 1828, from 1829 onwards including Hindūstānī, but the University experienced many initial difficulties and in August 1831 Rosen, like several other frustrated professors, turned in his resignation. However, the work with the Ṛgveda kept him in London, and in addition he prepared a catalogue of Robert Chambers' manuscripts, published anonymously after his death. Eventually, the university was reformed and in the winter of 1834 Rosen was invited to become Professor of Sanskrit there. He could now concentrate on teaching Sanskrit alone, although there were not always students interested in taking Sanskrit classes. He had no important disciples, but nevertheless brought the first seeds of comparative linguistics to England.

³ *Vyākaraṇaṁ śāstracaḥṣuṣ. Grammatica Sanscrita, nunc primum in Germania*, edidit Othmarus Frank. Wirceburgi: typographice et lithographice sumtibus propriis, 1823.

⁴ In the list of the sixteen common verbal roots discussed in this specimen and reproduced on p. 63, there appears an error that the development of computer fonts with sophisticated diacritics have nowadays made rare. The reader will certainly wonder what could be behind the root "t[Y+1E5D)". A check in the original *Prolusio* showed that it is the root *tī*.

Rosen seems to have had a pleasant and social nature, and in London he quickly made many friends both among the English and resident Germans. Not all of them belonged to academic circles; for example, Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy was his close friend. Among colleagues his best friends were Adolf Friedrich Stenzler and Bernhard Dorn. He was always ready to help visiting scholars and those who turned to him by way of letters. He kept apart from scholarly quarrels and had good relations both with Franz Bopp and August Wilhelm von Schlegel. He was active in the Royal Asiatic Society, the Oriental Translation Fund and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

Rosen's unfinished publication on the Ṛgveda which contains the first Aṣṭaka, i.e., the first 121 hymns, is of course wholly antiquitated nowadays. To give just one example, it does not include accents. However, in many respects he understood the difficult text remarkably well. As we are told on p. 326 of the book under review, the translations of Horace Hayman Wilson and Simon-Alexandre Langlois were a step backwards, while Rosen's work has been received favourably even by much later scholars such as Louis Renou and Georges-Jean Pinault. The work appeared posthumously, edited by Ludwig Poley who is not mentioned in it by name.⁵ The hymns are provided both in Devanāgarī and transliteration, with Latin translation; the commentary covers only the first 31 hymns. The book was subsequently used by Burnouf in his classes, and Böhlingk incorporated the first 19 hymns, with accents added, in the first edition of his *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie* (1845).

During his short life, Rosen could not publish much. Beside the *Roots* and the Ṛgveda his most important book was the edition-with-translation of *The Algebra of Mohammed ben Musa* (London: Oriental Translation Fund, 1831). It was the *editio princeps* of this significant text, and in his notes Rosen could clearly show the dependence of its author, an important mathematician, on Indian mathematics. Following Rosen, he is called Ibn Mūsā in the book under review; for non-Arabists it would have been helpful to mention that he is better known as al-Khwārizmī.

In addition to this, Rosen wrote two rather long reviews for the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, and anonymously further ones for the *Asiatick Journal* and *Quarterly Journal of Education*, as well as many anonymous contributions to the *Penny Cyclopaedia*. He also examined the manuscript of Graves Champney Haughton's Bengali dictionary before its publication in 1833.

Until now, Rosen's features are mainly known from the bust made by Robert Westmacott the Younger (Plate 6 in the book under review). Now we also get to

⁵ *Rigveda-Sanhita. Liber Primus. Sanskritè et Latinè*, edidit Fridericus Rosen. London: Allen & Co – Paris: Duprat, 1838.

see two sketches of him, one of 1827 by an unnamed friend (Plate 8), another, rather idealized one of 1829 by Wilhelm Hensel (Plate 1).

Klaus Karttunen

Agnes Stache-Weiske

„... für die Wissenschaft, der ich von ganzer Seele lebe“. *Otto Böhtlingk (1815–1904). Ein Gelehrtenleben rekonstruiert und beschrieben anhand seiner Briefe*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2017. xv + 583p. € 118,- (ISBN 978-3-447-10758-7).

There is no need to emphasize the importance of Otto Böhtlingk among nineteenth-century Western Indologists. Works such as the two St. Petersburg dictionaries, the edition of Pāṇini's grammar, the *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie* and the *Indische Sprüche* are familiar to everyone interested in classical Indology. What was missing so far was a full biography. Now this need has been amply satisfied.

Agnes Stache-Weiske (1962–2021) has been long active in research on the history of Indian Studies, beginning with the revised edition of her mother's work in this area.¹ In 2007 she participated in the publication of the correspondence between Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth.² Together with Hartmut Walravens she has edited Anton Schiefner's letters to his Indological colleagues,³ and until a few months before her too early and much regretted demise she was working on other parts of Schiefner's correspondence. Letters were also the main source of the present volume. In the case of Böhtlingk, there are only few letters sent to him that have been preserved, but a great number of letters written by him are found in European and American collections. Some additional information was culled from the correspondence between his friends. The most important names here are Roth, Schiefner, Albrecht Weber and William Dwight Whitney.

¹ Valentina Stache-Rosen, *German Indologists. Biographies of Scholars in Indian Studies Writing in German*. 2nd revised edition by Agnes Stache-Weiske. New Delhi: Max Mueller Bhavan, 1990.

² *Otto Böhtlingk an Rudolf Roth. Briefe zum Petersburger Wörterbuch 1852–1885*. Hrsg. von Heidrun Brückner und Gabriele Zeller, bearbeitet von Agnes Stache-Weiske. [Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung 45.1]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.

³ Hartmut Walravens – Agnes Stache-Weiske, *Anton Schiefner (1817–1879) und seine indologischen Freunde. Seine Briefe an die Indologen Albrecht Weber (1825–1901), Rudolf Roth (1821–1895) und William D. Whitney (1827–1894) sowie den Indogermanisten Adalbert Kuhn (1812–1881)*. [Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 868. Band = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 89]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2015.

The life of Böhlingk consists of five periods: early years in St. Petersburg and Dorpat (Tartu) (1815–1835), studies in Berlin and Bonn (1835–1842), the time of intensive work in St. Petersburg, soon conducted as Academician (1842–1866), the years in Jena (1866–1885) and finally those in Leipzig (1885–1904). In the book under review, it is presented in much detail, beginning with the family background. From the introduction we learn that Böhlingk’s family was originally from Lübeck and that its name is an obscure German word meaning “a castrated ram”. On Böhlingk’s childhood and school years there is hardly any material available, but what little there is, is carefully collected here. At St. Petersburg University he initially studied Arabic and Classics, but Böhlingk’s encounter with Friedrich Bollensen turned his interest to Sanskrit. He seems to have shared the opinion also expressed by others about Franz Bopp not being very inspiring as a teacher and soon moved from Berlin to Bonn, where Christian Lassen became his main teacher.

Böhlingk received his doctoral degree from the University of Gießen. We learn that at that time Gießen was still among those lesser German universities where one could obtain the degree without being present and even presenting a dissertation. The reason for this choice seems to have been that Böhlingk was rather shy and averse to public appearance. This perhaps also explains why he never had a teaching position and avoided giving public speeches and lectures. Very rarely he attended conferences; he was no traveller. After his study years in Germany and a visit to France and the U.K., he left St. Petersburg not even once between 1842 and 1860, and after he had settled in Germany in 1868 he never left the country again. In spite of his reclusiveness, he had many friends and in his later years often helped and advised young aspiring scholars. In the present volume, full light is also thrown on the scholarly controversies Böhlingk had especially with Max Müller and Theodor Goldstücker.

Böhlingk’s scholarly career can be roughly divided into three phases. The first-ever edition of Pāṇini’s grammar (1839), which marks the first phase, was also his first published work soon to be followed by a number of grammatical studies. After a Turkological interlude, the years 1852–1875 (devoted to the *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*) and 1877–1889 (devoted to the *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*) were mainly devoted to dictionary work, even though towards their end he also concentrated on other, smaller tasks, mainly in the area of textual criticism and interpretation of Vedic literature. As Böhlingk’s major publications have already been fully analysed by Ernst Windisch,⁴ the author decided to focus on their background and tendencies (p. 149).

⁴ Ernst Windisch, *Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und indischen Altertumskunde*. [Grundriss der indoarischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I/1.2]. Berlin – Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1920, pp. 238–246.

The above-mentioned Turkological interlude was assigned to Böhntlingk as an official duty by the Russian Academy of Sciences. This duty concerned the Siberian linguistic material collected by the physician and naturalist Alexander von Middendorf. The main result of Böhntlingk's work on this material was *Über die Sprache der Jakuten* (1851), a grammar and dictionary of the Turkic Yakut language which until then was hardly known. In this work, Böhntlingk showed such a linguistic acumen that his name is still remembered in the history of Turkology.

The author has taken the trouble to trace all available photographs and portraits of Böhntlingk, which are reproduced in 13 figures (pp. 372–379).⁵ Information on his four marriages and five children is presented in separate chapters. To ascertain details on Böhntlingk's first marriage obviously required some detective work.

At the end of the book we find no less than ten useful appendices (“Anhang”). The first (pp. 385–404) traces the family background beginning with Peter Böhntlingk (1689–1746), the merchant who moved from Lübeck to St. Petersburg in 1713. The second (pp. 405–407) illustrates this background in three genealogical tables. The third appendix (pp. 408–414) presents Böhntlingk's life in a chronological table, also noting his main publications. This is followed by two appendices with lists of the receivers and senders of letters written by and sent to Böhntlingk (appendix 4, pp. 415–417) and of various honours conferred to him (appendix 5, pp. 418–420). Appendix 6 is a full bibliography of Böhntlingk (pp. 421–434), containing also information on the reviews of his books. The next appendix (pp. 435–447) is a very rich list of secondary sources on Böhntlingk's life, career and publications, followed by an appendix that lists the sources of the present work (archives: pp. 448–455, printed sources: pp. 456–496, internet sources: pp. 496–499). Also Russian sources have been fully noted. We must be especially grateful to the author for having compiled appendix 9 (pp. 500–571) which provides brief biographical accounts, one to twelve lines each, of all persons mentioned in the book; this could not have been an easy task to complete. The tenth and last appendix (pp. 573–583) is an alphabetical index. As many names are repeatedly mentioned in the book, it was a very good idea to highlight the numbers of the most relevant pages through the use of bold print.

⁵ On p. 380 we learn that the photograph presented as showing the young Böhntlingk in W. Rau, *Bilder 135 deutscher Indologen* [Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung 23], Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982, p. 24, is not a picture of Böhntlingk, but most probably of the Russian Indologist Ivan Pavlovič Minaev (1840–1890). In the book under review, we find a picture of young Böhntlingk from around 1838 on p. 372.

An Arabic proverb states that no human book is perfect. Even in the fine book under review, one could point out some minor mistakes, especially in appendix 9. To give just two examples, Friedrich Adelung hardly knew enough Sanskrit to teach Bollensen (p. 508), and Jakob Johan Wilhelm Lagus never went to Italy and did not write a Persian grammar (p. 538). However, these are minor mistakes and on the whole there is very little to criticize about the book, not even typographical errors. There was a true need of a full account of Böhlingk's life and this book fulfills it in an excellent way. It was a pleasure to read it.

Klaus Karttunen

Nalini Balbir – Georges-Jean Pinault

Richard Pischel: *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von N.B. und G.-J.P. 2 vols. [Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung 48.1–2]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020. XCII + 1270p. € 198,- (ISBN 978-3-447-11445-5).

It is telling for the wide range of Pischel's interests that two editors from different disciplines, Nalini Balbir (Middle Indic languages and literature) and Georges-Jean Pinault (Indo-European linguistics, Tocharian), have been invited to prepare an edition of his scholarly papers. The articles and reviews in the two volumes cover a variety of disciplines and have been divided into no fewer than eleven categories, ranging from Vedic and Sanskrit Kāvya literature to Buddhism and European gypsy languages.

While some of Pischel's (1849–1908) publications may no longer stand the test of time, thanks to his thoroughness and the details he presented to support his arguments they have lost nothing of their usefulness. Good examples of Pischel's attention for detail are – and I mention only those publications I have worked with, and still work with myself – the publications that deal with the literary Prākṛits. Take for instance his “Materialien zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṃśa” (1902), reproduced in Vol. I, pp. 149–232. In the edition of the Apabhraṃśa stanzas, Pischel carefully noted all the variant readings found in the sources available to him, something which, unfortunately, has not become common practice among subsequent editors. The variants collected by Pischel include even the most minimal differences. In fact, most variants are of this type and concern endings, like *bhaṇa* “speak!” beside *bhaṇu*, and *pucchaha* “you ask” beside *pucchahu*.

This type of variation actually lies at the heart of Apabhraṃśa, which, as a linguistic category, also includes the so-called pre-modern languages like Old

Hindī and Old Gujarati. It presents a stage of language in which in pronunciation word-final syllables had lost much of their weight, and word-final vowels their distinctive colours. The question is what made the scribe, who in this case had no standard grammar to fall back on (except probably that of Sanskrit), write *pucchaha* when the mother copy read *pucchahu*. Even if in pronunciation the two forms may have been almost indistinguishable, visually – and we are dealing with manuscripts here – they still differ. The same we see in the variations of the instrumental *hatthem* and *hatthim*, “with the hand”. In *hatthem*, the *e* of the Sanskrit ending *-ena* is still visible, in the variant *hatthim* even this last trace is lost.

Pischel, moreover, was also the first to offer a (or better: the) solution for the term *aṭhabhāgiye* in Aśoka’s Lumbinī inscription. In the article “Die Inschrift von Paḍeriyā” (II/852–864) he showed, by adducing many examples from later inscriptions, that we are dealing with an administrative term here. Together with a village the king grants the donee the revenues, or the free use, of “the eight *bhāgas*”. The *bhāgas* may differ, and range from the surrounding pasture lands and mango groves to iron mines. Pischel’s finding was given a new life by Harry Falk in his article “Zur Geschichte von Lumbinī”, published in *Acta Orientalia* 52 (1991) 70–90, at p. 87. However, the implications of Pischel’s discovery have so far been insufficiently recognized in studies of taxation in India in the third century B.C. Likewise, the last word has not yet been said about his very thorough study of the poets at the court of King Lakṣmaṇasena (I/766–802). For instance, it cannot be a coincidence that two of this king’s poets produced Sanskrit renditions of works of literary genres that according to the language code of Kāvya should not be written in Sanskrit but in a Prakrit, namely, Govardhanācārya, who composed the *Āryāsaptaśatī* based on Hāla’s *Sattasāī*, and Jayadeva, who composed the *Gītagovinda* which represents in Sanskrit an *Apabhraṃśa* genre (*catuspadī*).

The publications reproduced in the two volumes include a large number of reviews, which through their sheer number testify to Pischel’s wide interests. Furthermore, many of them go far beyond providing general characterizations of the books reviewed. The review of Paul Regnaud’s *La rhétorique sanskrite* (1884) consists of thirteen tightly printed pages (II/829–841); Pischel’s review of Sylvain Lévi’s *Le théâtre indien* (1890) amounts to as many as sixteen pages (II/725–740).

The articles and reviews reproduced here are preceded by a highly informative introduction by the editors (pp. IX–LXVII), in which they provide information about Pischel’s life and career, his teachers, his favourite colleagues and those he had rather strained relationships with, and his students. It also offers a high-

ly useful evaluation of his work, distinguishing between publications that are dated and such that are still topical and relevant today. In effect, the editors present Pischel with the Festschrift he deserved but missed out on due to his unfortunately premature and unexpected death when he was travelling in India, actually his very first visit to that country.

The impression one gets of Pischel from reading this editorial introduction and from going through the complete list of his publications (pp. LXXVIII–XC) is that of a scholar carefully and relentlessly collecting and classifying whatever material came into his hands. This material was so voluminous that he simply did not have the time to bring it into shape all by himself and therefore graciously put it at the disposal of a colleague: he entrusted his collation of the manuscripts of Rājaśekhara's Karpūramañjarī to the care of Sten Konow whose edition of the text appeared in 1901, with an English translation by Charles Rockwell Lanman. But when a group of gypsies happened to encamp in what was, so to say, his backyard in Halle, he rushed out to investigate their language and record their songs.

Herman Tieken

Heidrun Brückner – Ingo Strauch

Julius Jolly: *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von H.B. und I.S. Nach Vorarbeiten von Albrecht Wezler. 2 Bände. [Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung 38.1–2]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012. xlviii, xi + 1378p. € 198,- (ISBN 978-3-447-06817-8).

In the course of his extraordinarily long and fruitful academic career at the University of Würzburg, Julius Jolly (1849–1932) authored twenty-three monographs in the fields of Linguistics, Indology and South Asian Studies. Some of Jolly's monographs were ground-breaking at their time. Others, like his handbook on Indian medicine (*Medicin*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1901), remain valuable sources of information even today. The breadth and depth of Jolly's work provides thus a model of scholarship to which few scholars of the present time may even aspire. Besides having produced an impressive monographic oeuvre, Jolly industriously authored research papers, brief communications, encyclopaedia entries, and newspaper articles that testify to Jolly's broad range of interest and his devotion to sharing knowledge not only with his peers in Europe, India and the United States but also with the general public. Jolly's collected papers, which are reprinted in two volumes together with some short monographic writings reproduced from digitised microfilms and newly pre-

pared scans, comprise the majority of Jolly's articles devoted to Indological topics, broadly conceived. Those of Jolly's linguistic publications that are not of Indological relevance have been excluded from the collection.

The two volumes start with a "Preface by the Editors" ("Vorwort der Herausgeber", pp. IX–XII), consisting of Jolly's concise academic *curriculum vitae* and a description of the process of publication of the volume that Albrecht Wezler had first initiated. Following a list of abbreviations, the first volume continues with a complete list of Jolly's publications ("Vollständiges Schriftenverzeichnis", pp. XV–XLIV) that provides full bibliographical data for each entry. This record, in which works that are reprinted in the collection are printed in bold typeface supplemented with the page numbers in the present volumes, is divided into the two main sections of (I) independent works and (II) collected papers. The second main section is subdivided into papers devoted to (A) Linguistics, (B) Religion, (C) Law and Custom, (D) Medicine, (E) Arthaśāstra, (F) Miscellanea Including Modern India, (G) Obituaries and Appraisals, and (H) Reviews. A supplemental main section, consisting of articles dealing with Jolly and his work, comprises the two subsections of (I) biographical and bibliographical articles, and (II) obituaries. The sequence of papers within each subsection follows the chronology of their publication.

This user-friendly arrangement of Jolly's oeuvre is unfortunately not maintained in the actual sequence of papers in the volume, the rationale of which escapes the present reviewer, except that reviews appear jointly in a separate section towards the end of the second volume (pp. 1196–1357). Two separate tables of contents at the beginning of each volume consisting of bare titles and page numbers make the individual papers accessible. The sparse information provided in these tables of contents is somewhat impractical because it requires the reader to search the previous systematic list of publications for bibliographical information concerning the original publication. In the case of the article "Die Adoption in Indien" (pp. 205–237), the list of reprinted writings also needs to be consulted because the article does not contain its title on the initial page.

The second volume concludes with five indices: (1) an index of words (pp. 1358f.), featuring seventy-five Sanskrit words, three words in Greek, six words in modern Indian languages and two anglicised Indian terms, (2) an index of text passages (pp. 1360–1363), (3) an index of subjects (pp. 1364–1372), (4) an index of names and authors (pp. 1373–1375), and (5) an index of texts (pp. 1376–1378). The limited extent of these indices naturally affects their utility. To provide just a few examples: Jolly's article "Zur Quellenkunde der indischen Medizin: 1. Vāgbhaṭa" (pp. 696–710) – an important contribution to the history

of Āyurveda that establishes the relative chronology of the Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha and Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā – appears to have been overlooked in the preparation of several of the indices. The index of texts lacks a reference to the respective pages of this article, at least in its entries on Aṣṭāṅgahrdayam, Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha, Rājatarāṅginī and Suśruta[samhitā]. The Carakasamhitā does not have an entry at all in this index. “Caraka” and “Suśruta” are entries in the index of names and authors, however without any reference to the previously mentioned article. The name of the Indian scholar Mahesachandra Nyayaratna, to whom Jolly refers in his communication “Eine Sanskrit-Ode auf Königin Victoria” (p. 1066) – mainly the translation of a Sanskrit poem that the pandits of the province of Bengal composed in honour of the fiftieth crown jubilee of Queen Victoria – is not listed in the index of names and authors. These examples, which could be multiplied, may suffice to demonstrate that the indices do not match the model that Lambert Schmithausen has provided with his index to the volume of Paul Hacker’s collected papers published in the same series as the volume under review.¹

Since many of Jolly’s writings have become difficult to access, Albrecht Wezler, Heidrun Brückner and Ingo Strauch deserve the gratitude of the scholarly community for initiating the edition of Jolly’s collected papers and for having taken up the task of editing the two stately volumes, respectively. Its publication even eighty years after Jolly’s demise is relevant for the fields of Indology and South Asian Studies as well as for the history of the humanities in general. Jolly’s collected papers are still important tools for research in Indology. Moreover, his writings are eminent source materials for the historiography of this very academic field. Without wanting to anticipate the results of more comprehensive research, the present reviewer found that Jolly emerges from his writings as a dedicated scholar driven by a genuine interest in knowledge and sympathy for the subject of his research. For example, Jolly was interested in the living conditions of the people in pre-modern and modern South Asia, as can be concluded from his work “Über die rechtliche Stellung der Frauen bei den alten Indern nach dem Dharmasāstra” (pp. 1–57), and a series of further papers on family life, ritual and legal aspects of marriage, and contemporary family-related matters (see, e.g., “Indische Verhältnisse der Gegenwart: I. Indische Familienverhältnisse”, pp. 1132–1135). Jolly also expressed unreservedly criticism of the British colonial policy and the lack of justice concerning the employment and salary of Indians in administrative positions (see, e.g., “Indische Stimmungen vor dem Kriege”, pp. 1128–1131). Moreover, he criticised the substitution of

¹ Lambert Schmithausen (ed.), Paul Hacker: *Kleine Schriften*. [Veröffentlichungen der Helmut von Glasenapp-Stiftung 15]. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978, pp. 825–914.

the traditional Indian legal system with British jurisdiction at least mildly (see “Die Adoption in Indien”, p. 209). On the whole, however, Jolly kept his personal views modestly in the background of his writing. His main concern was to communicate multifarious aspects of the culture and history of pre-modern South Asia in a manner accessible to his audiences.

The fruits of Jolly’s work can now be used, reused and reassessed on the basis of a high-quality reprint with hardcover binding. Readers who are content with using books in electronic form will also appreciate the republication of Jolly’s collected papers by the German specialised information service (*Fachinformationsdienst*) “CrossAsia” as openly accessible, fully searchable high-resolution files in PDF format at <http://crossasia-repository.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/view/schriftenreihen/=23c-31.html> (last accessed on November 16, 2020).

Philipp A. Maas

Harry Falk – Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber – Walter Slaje

Oskar von Hinüber: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil III. Herausgegeben von H.F., H.H.-v.H. und W.S. [Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung 49]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2019. LII + 706p. + 38 Abb. € 140,- (ISBN 978-3-447-11156-0).

Üblicherweise erscheinen Kleine Schriften in der Reihe der Glasenapp-Stiftung erst dann, wenn das wissenschaftliche Œuvre eines Gelehrten unwiderruflich abgeschlossen ist. Ein solches Vorgehen garantiert Vollständigkeit. Vernünftigerweise gilt diese Regel aber nicht als unumstößlich, obschon nur ganz selten, wie etwa im Fall von Paul Thieme, davon abgewichen wird. Sie kann modifiziert werden, wenn die wissenschaftliche Bedeutung eines Gelehrten es erforderlich erscheinen lässt, seine unselbständigen Schriften möglichst rasch in der praktischen Form von Sammelbänden verfügbar zu machen. Im vorliegenden Fall steht die Bedeutung außer Frage. Der Sachverhalt lässt sich in einem Satz zusammenfassen: Oskar von Hinübers Aufsätze sind enorm zahlreich, sie sind von einer enormen inhaltlichen Breite, und sie sind enorm wichtig. Die entsprechenden Worte der Herausgeber in der Einleitung zum ersten Band kann man nur unterstreichen.¹ Daher muss man der Stiftung und den Herausgebern äußerst dankbar sein, die meisten der über eine Vielzahl von nicht immer leicht erreichbaren Publikationsorganen verstreuten Aufsätze bereits jetzt in insgesamt

¹ S. dazu auch die Bemerkungen von Stanley Insler in seiner Rezension der ersten beiden Bände (*Indo-Iranian Journal* 55 [2012] 79–81). Insler bietet zugleich einen Überblick über die Anordnung der Aufsätze nach inhaltlichen Kriterien.

drei Bänden bequem zugänglich gemacht und durch ausführliche Indizes erschlossen zu haben.

Die ersten beiden Bände sind 2009, mithin genau zehn Jahre vor dem dritten, erschienen. Sie umfassen bereits 69 Aufsätze und 44 Rezensionen. Eine Bemerkung in der Einleitung zum ersten Band lässt sich dahingehend verstehen, dass jedoch kein Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit erhoben wird. Ausgewählt wurden Beiträge, „die die indologische Forschung auf zentralen Gebieten des Faches in besonderer Weise vorangetrieben haben und als grundlegend für die Kultur- und Sprachgeschichte sowie für die Realienkunde im Sinne handbuchreifen Wissens gelten müssen“ (pp. viif.). Ebenso wurde darauf verzichtet, die bereits in den Band *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1994 (2. Auflage 2005), aufgenommenen 18 Beiträge noch einmal nachzudrucken. Der dritte und derzeit letzte Band ist im Jahr 2019 erschienen, passend zum 80. Geburtstag des Verfassers. Obschon er weitere rund 700 Seiten mit Aufsätzen umfasst, erwies es sich auch hier als unmöglich, tatsächlich alle unselbständigen Schriften der Jahre 2006 bis 2017 aufzunehmen. Daher haben sich die Herausgeber entschieden, eine sowohl inhaltliche wie formale Trennung vorzunehmen: Alle epigraphischen Studien, die in der Serie *Annual Report of The International Research Institute of Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* erschienen sind, haben sie ausgegliedert und kündigen an, dass diese in einem eigenen Band an der Mainzer Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur veröffentlicht werden sollen. Offenbar sind Epigraphie und Wichtigkeit aber nicht die einzigen Kriterien für Aufnahme und Ausschluss gewesen. So mag mancher Benutzer bedauern, dass von Hinübers grundlegende Revision seiner früheren Studien zu den Gilgit-Handschriften aus dem Jahr 2014 nicht mitaufgenommen worden ist;² gäbe es in unseren Fächern einen *citation index*, dann würde dieser Beitrag wohl schon jetzt zu seinen meistzitierten Arbeiten zählen. Wahrscheinlich hat hier aber bereits der schiere Umfang von knapp sechzig Seiten dazu geführt, dass die Herausgeber sich gegen eine Aufnahme entschieden haben.

Der nunmehr vorliegende dritte Band umfasst weitere 27 Aufsätze, 34 Rezensionen, einen Wörterbuchbeitrag und zwei Nachrufe. Anders als in den ersten beiden Bänden sind die Aufsätze hier nicht mehr nach Sachgebieten angeordnet, sondern ausschließlich nach ihrem Erscheinungsdatum. Darauf folgen auf

² The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research. In: 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*. [Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 80]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014, pp. 79–135.

knapp hundert Seiten insgesamt sechs Indizes, nämlich jeweils ein Verzeichnis der Wörter, der Stellen, der Sachen, der Autoren, der Texte sowie ein Verzeichnis der Personennamen und ihrer Titel. Das Wortverzeichnis ist nochmals unterteilt in die Gruppen Sanskrit, Pali, Epigraphische Varianten des Pali in Inschriften (hier dürfte es sich um einen unbeabsichtigten Pleonasmus handeln), Mittelindisch, Neuindisch und Diverse Sprachen; das Stellenverzeichnis ist untergliedert in Pali-Literatur, Prakrit-Literatur, Sanskrit-Literatur, Handschriften und Inschriften. Mithin bieten die Indizes eine breite Palette von Zugriffsmöglichkeiten auf die Aufsätze, und man muss nur einmal das Sachverzeichnis durchblättern, um die Vielfältigkeit der behandelten Gegenstände zu sehen, die man hier erschlossen findet. Dabei ist mit größter Dankbarkeit hervorzuheben, dass die Herausgeber sich entschieden haben, einen Gesamtindex für alle drei Bände zu erstellen; dies erleichtert den Zugriff ganz erheblich.

Der Verlag Harrassowitz macht darauf aufmerksam, dass aufgrund eines bedauerlichen Versehens eine veraltete Version des Schriftenverzeichnisses in den Band aufgenommen ist. Dieses Versehen nimmt man geradezu mit Freude zur Kenntnis, hat der Verlag doch als willkommenen Ausgleich die aktualisierte Fassung in Form eines PDF zum unentgeltlichen Download bereitgestellt.³ Diese PDF-Datei ist durchsuchbar, und damit lässt sich die Bibliographie natürlich viel besser benutzen. Im Nachhinein würde man sich beinahe wünschen, dass beim Index ein ähnliches Malheur passiert wäre, denn dann hätte man auch diesen mindestens ebenso wichtigen Teil des Bandes in einer suchfähigen Fassung zur Hand.

In den drei Bänden liegen unselbständige Schriften aus den Jahren 1978 bis 2017 vor. Wenn man allerdings Herrn von Hinüber kennt und weiß, mit welcher Disziplin und mit welchem Planungsgeschick er seine wissenschaftliche Arbeit organisiert, dann weiß man auch, dass er seither alles andere als untätig geblieben ist, und zudem wünscht man sich, dass dieser Zustand so bald auch keine Veränderung erfahren möge. Mit dem dritten Band ist also noch keineswegs das letzte Wort gesprochen, und über kurz oder lang werden wir uns gewiss auf einen weiteren Band freuen dürfen.

Jens-Uwe Hartmann

³ Unter https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/titel_5866.ahtml (zuletzt aufgerufen am 13.7.2021).

Asko Parpola – B.M. Pande – Petteri Koskikallio (ed.)

Corpus of Indus Seals and Inscriptions 3. New Material, Untraced Objects, and Collections Outside India and Pakistan. Part 2: Shahr-i-Sokhta; Mundigak; Mehrgarh, Nausharo, Sibri, Dauda-damb; Chanhu-daro; Ahar, Balathal, Gilund; Kalibangan; Rojdi. [Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Humanoria 383 = Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India 116]. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 2019. xxxvii + 394p. € 160,- (ISBN 978-951-41-1134-1).

Volume 3.2 of the *Corpus of Indus Seals and Inscriptions (CISI)*, edited by Asko Parpola, B.M. Pande and Petteri Koskikallio, is a valuable and welcome addition to the study of inscribed and glyptic materials from the Indus Civilization (2600–1900 BCE) and some of its contemporary bronze age neighbors. It builds upon the earlier *CISI* volumes (Joshi – Parpola 1987;¹ Shah – Parpola 1991;² Parpola et al. 2010³) and is an excellent catalog of illustrated seals, sealings, and related materials from twelve sites, many of which have not been published before or only partially published in a variety of esoteric and not easily accessible sources.⁴ The preface to the volume and short essays that follow provide important background on the Indus Civilization and objects included. The reference data at the end are valuable to anyone interested in further research on the corpus. This work contributes positively to ongoing academic interest in the Indus, its writing, relationships with its neighbors, and the study of seals and glyptic materials more broadly.

The organization and presentation of illustrated objects in this volume is comparable to the earlier ones. Parpola and his colleagues have developed an effective and standardized method for presenting the data that includes quality images, a site-based organizational framework, consistent numeration, and attempts to classify inscribed materials morphologically and, when applicable,

¹ J.P. Joshi – A. Parpola (ed.), *Corpus of Indus Seals and Inscriptions I. Collections in India.* [Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Series B 239 = Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India 86]. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1987.

² S.G.M. Shah – A. Parpola (ed.), *Corpus of Indus Seals and Inscriptions 2. Collections in Pakistan.* [Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Series B 240 = Memoirs of the Department of Archaeology and Museums, Government of Pakistan 5]. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1991.

³ A. Parpola – B.M. Pande – P. Koskikallio (ed.), *Corpus of Indus Seals and Inscriptions 3.1. Supplement to Mohenjo-daro and Harappa.* [Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Humanoria 359 = Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India 96]. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 2010.

⁴ Many of these sources are referenced in the introductory essays, which include bibliographies, and consist of published excavation reports, edited volumes, and specialized journals.

chronologically. This volume also includes innovations compared to the previous ones that improve its content and research potential. The most significant of these is the inclusion of seals and other inscribed objects from sites beyond the Indus culture area, which facilitates comparative analyses and presents these materials in a single, well-organized volume. New illustrations of objects from Indus or Indus-related sites including Chanhu-daro, Kalibangan, Mehrgarh, Nausharo, Rojdi, Sibri, and Dauda-damb are also major contributions to this volume. Finally, I find the reference data at the end of the volume to be quite valuable. Though this is present in all previous *CISI* volumes and includes bibliographic references, image numbers for the *CISI* project and the institutions that house the objects, and summaries of the archaeological contexts for most of the objects that are illustrated, notable additions to this one include descriptions of raw materials, dimensions, and a larger table-based format that is easier to read and navigate. This information is useful to scholars interested in comparative studies and investigations of variability among different sites and regions.

Many of the images of seals, sealings, and related materials included in this volume are of high quality and most of the inscribed or painted surfaces of illustrated objects are shown at 200% of their actual size unless clearly specified. This practice, followed in the earlier *CISI* volumes, is beneficial to researchers interested in studying multiple elements of inscriptions, iconography, and technologies. Objects that are not illustrated with high quality images are supplemented with line drawings that clarify these features, another positive contribution to the volume. Line drawings of materials from Shahr-i-Sokhta in particular are valuable because they include technical details that help identify aspects of production not always visible in photographs. The sizes of the images are sufficient for analysis and some also capture other technical features that may provide insights into aspects of production and use that are difficult to identify in original source materials. Color images of seals and related materials from multiple sites included at the end of the volume, most of which are shown at 200% of their original size (or higher), are especially useful for more detailed studies. Many of these have not been published in color before and represent another important contribution of this volume.

Parpola's preface is well-written and provides an introduction to the *CISI* project, Indus Civilization, and its relationship to some contemporary cultures represented by illustrated objects in the volume. It also summarizes the sites that the materials are from and credits the scholars who have contributed to their compilation and analyses, including the authors of the short essays that follow. This information is useful in providing background and context to the materials, sites, and people featured; and the more detailed discussion about

Rojdi concisely summarizes information that is otherwise only available in an excavation report and several publications that are not easily accessible. Both maps included are also useful for reference to the sites included and discussed in the volume.

The essay on seals and seal impressions from Shahr-i-Sokhta is a short introduction to the subject written by two experts with considerable experience studying the material. Massimo Vidale and Alessandra Lazzari succinctly discuss the history and chronology of the site and how this reflects on the use of seals and sealings at the site over time, recognizing the complexities associated with both. They note several important trends associated with seal use, principal changes in raw materials that they correlate with societal changes, and in closing provide a brief summary of chronology at the site and its connection to the contemporary cultural horizon in the Indus Civilization.

In discussing the objects included in the volume from the sites of Mehrgarh, Nausharo, Sibri, Dauda-damb, and Mundigak, H el ene Tromparent begins with a summary of the French Mission excavations from which they were recovered, noting that most of them have yet to be fully published. The remainder of the essay is concerned primarily with discussing the chronology of three of the sites (Mehrgarh, Sibri, Nausharo) and the numbering system of some of the objects included in the volume. This provides readers with important background information on the history of research at the sites and clearly explains the recording system used to document the materials included in the volume.

The essay by Gonzague Quivron is a reprint of an earlier publication (Quivron 1997)⁵ written by one of the world's leading experts on ceramics from the sites of Mehrgarh and Nausharo. It is a detailed analysis of incised marks and signs present on pottery from both sites, including descriptions of types, their frequencies (and how these change over time), representations on different vessel forms, and a brief discussion of how they were made. In conclusion, several interpretations of the function and use of the pot marks are provided. These include the observation that the signs were likely used during the manufacturing sequence and did not serve major purposes after firing, that Indus writing was not derived directly from the pot marks, and that their decline before the emergence of the Indus Civilization may be best understood in the context of changes in pottery production technologies and organization.

⁵ G. Quivron, *Incised and Painted Marks on the Pottery of Mehrgarh and Nausharo-Baluchistan*. In: *South Asian Archaeology 1995. I: Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the European Association of South Asian Archaeologists, Cambridge, 5–9 July, 1995*, ed. by R. Allchin and B. Allchin. Cambridge: The Ancient India and Iran Trust, 1997, pp. 45–62.

Marta Ameri's essay on the seals and sealings from the Ahar–Banas Culture provides an introduction to the Ahar–Banas Culture, contemporary to but distinct from the Indus Civilization. This is followed by a discussion of seals and sealings from the sites of Gilund, Balathal, and Ahar, all of which were made from and used on terracotta. Ameri then summarizes the chronology of seals and sealings at the Ahar–Banas sites, noting that they may not have been contemporary. Ameri also outlines differences in the archaeological contexts of the seals and sealings from Gilund. These patterns, discussed thoroughly in other publications (Ameri 2010⁶ and 2014⁷) regarding seal use in the Ahar–Banas Culture, are indicative of activities and behaviors that are distinct from the Indus Civilization.

Overall, I find little to critique in this volume. The organization and presentation of illustrated objects is good, as are most images of seals, sealings, and related materials from the different sites that are included. The broad scope of materials, especially those from outside of the Indus Civilization, are welcome additions to the *CISI* project. The preface and essays are well written, but with the exception of the one by Quivron, all could have been improved had they been longer. In particular, more discussion on manufacturing methods, chronologies, archaeological contexts, and the function and uses of the seals, sealings, and related materials, including pottery, would have been useful for scholars (including myself) interested in further studies on the material. However, much of this information is either available in other sources or will be published in the future, and is not necessary in a series of short, introductory essays like those included here. Volume 3.2 of the *Corpus of Indus Seals and Inscriptions (CISI 3.2)* is a positive and important contribution to the study of the Indus Civilization and a testament to the legacy of the outstanding research of Asko Parpola and his colleagues. It is a welcome and valuable addition to the study of the Indus Civilization seals and writing, and has broad appeal to a variety of scholars working in and beyond the field of South Asian archaeology.

Gregg Jamison

⁶ M. Ameri, *Sealing at the Edge of Third Millennium Middle Asian Interaction Spheres. The View from Gilund, Rajasthan, India*. PhD dissertation. New York University, 2010.

⁷ M. Ameri, Report on Seal Impressions and Related Small Finds. In: *Excavations at Gilund. The Artifacts and Other Studies*, edited by T. Raczek, V. Shinde and G. Possehl. [Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 45]. Pune: Deccan College, 2014, pp. 176–229.

Joel P. Brereton – Theodore N. Proferes (ed.)

Creating the Veda, Living the Veda. Selected Papers from the 13th World Sanskrit Conference. [Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Humaniora 379]. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, 2018. 185p. € 35,– (ISBN 978-951-41-1120-4).

The book under review, following an Introduction by the editors, contains nine contributions which grew out of papers that were originally presented in the Veda section of the 13th World Sanskrit Conference held in Edinburgh, Scotland, 10–14 July 2006. Most of them deal primarily with various aspects and problems of the Ṛgveda, but also seek to embed their topic into Indian religious and cultural history in general.

Stephanie W. Jamison’s paper (“‘Sacrificer’s Wife’ in the *Ṛgveda*: Ritual Innovation?”, pp. 19–30) may be regarded as an addition to her 1996 book, *Sacrificed Wife / Sacrificer’s Wife. Women, Ritual, and Hospitality in Ancient India*, in which she did not systematically investigate the Early (Ṛgveda) and Old Vedic (Atharvaveda) texts. In this paper, she convincingly argues that “there is little or no evidence for the ritual *patnī* [i.e., the ritual role of the sacrificer’s wife] in the earlier *Ṛgveda*, and [...] this ritual role was being introduced in the late Ṛgvedic period” (p. 19). According to Jamison, there were two main motivations for the *patnī*’s introduction into Vedic solemn sacrificial rituals: the first one was the fact that the wives of the gods, the divine homologues of the sacrificer’s wife, already had a prominent part in Ṛgvedic rituals (and probably already in Indo-Iranian times), the second one was the *patnī*’s presence and participation in domestic (*grhya*) rites (cf. p. 26). On p. 24, Jamison claims that the hapax *mithūkṛt-* in the enigmatic Mudgala/Mudgalānī hymn (RV 10.102.1a),¹ which is generally translated as “wrongly/incorrectly made; inverted; auf falsche Weise gefertigt; unbrauchbar (vel sim.)”, is actually the first signal of the new, untried model of the ritual relationship between husband and wife, since its primary (!) reading should rather be “making a pair / made a pair” or, as translated later on, “made of a (sexual) pair” (note that the two translations are not equivalent). I think that Jamison’s hypothesis can be maintained only if we consider the alleged semantics of the compound as secondary and being due to some folk etymology (on the basis of *mithuná-* and related derivatives), given that the primary meaning of the adjective **mithú-* (whence *mithū* with adverbial accent shift) was rather “entgegengesetzt, gegenseitig”, whence “verkehrt, falsch”.² On

¹ For all primary sources I am using the electronic texts contained in the Text Database of TITUS (Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien; <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de>).

² Cf. Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*. Bd. II. Heidelberg: Winter, 1996, pp. 375–376 (s.v. *METH*) (henceforth: *EWAia*); Irene Balles, *Die altindische*

p. 26, n. 17, the *dvandva* compound in Atharvavedasamhitā (Śaunaka) 9.6.15 should rather be cited in the plural (*ulūkhalamuśalāni*), and not in its stem form.

The paper of Joel P. Brereton (“The Early Evolution of the *puróhita*”, pp. 31–43) follows a similar path and lucidly demonstrates that, in the Ṛgveda, the term *puróhita-* (cf. also related expressions such as, e.g., *purás dhā*) does not refer to the royal functionary of later times (which, in order to make the distinction clear, Brereton spells as “purohit”), but has a more general meaning and “describes someone or something that is ‘set to the fore’ or ‘set in front’” (p. 31), sometimes in spatial relation, but normally in terms of rank or authority. In the context of ritual, the one set in front, the leader of the officiants, is the *hótar-*. It is only in some late Ṛgvedic passages in the seventh *maṇḍala* that the term *puróhita-*, applied by Vasiṣṭha to himself, is used in a manner similar to later purohites. Some minor details: There are inconsistencies in the spelling of the word *hótar-* (sometimes with the accent, sometimes without). Given that the adverb *át* has an ablatival origin (*EWAia* I/163), it seems to me better to translate *ád it* as “right after that” than “then surely” / “surely then” as done by Brereton on two occasions (ṚV 8.12.25c on p. 33 and ṚV 7.33.6d on p. 41). The imperfect *abhavat* in ṚV 10.150.4a on p. 39 should be rendered in English by the simple past instead of the present perfect (“has become”). On p. 38, the vocative *mitramahaḥ* (“o you of Mitra’s might”) is missing from the translation of ṚV 1.44.12ab. On p. 41, Brereton mentions two possible interpretations of ṚV 7.33.6 (i.e., the text can imply that the Tṛtsus, with Vasiṣṭha as their leader [*puraetár-*], fought against the Bharatas, but also that they rescued them), but in his translation he uses the contrastive coordinating conjunction “but” in *pāda* c, which is compatible only with the latter interpretation. However, the original text contains no contrastive element (only *ca*); therefore the addition of “but” should be avoided in the translation in order to retain the ambiguity of the Sanskrit text.³

Theodore N. Proferes’ contribution (“Fire in the Waters and the Alchemical King”, pp. 45–53) focuses on the unction ceremony at the coronation of a king. He claims that “the unction waters were understood to contain both the power to rule, as well as a solar substance associated elsewhere with the leader’s

Cvi-Konstruktion. Form – Funktion – Ursprung. Bremen: Hempen, 2006, p. 254. Remember that the syntagm *mithū kṛ* does occur elsewhere in the Ṛgveda (1.162.20cd), but does not mean “to make a pair / of a pair”, nor does *mithū* have a predicative function in this construction (see Karl Hoffmann, Zum prädikativen Adverb. In: Id., *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik.* Bd. II. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1976, p. 346).

³ As done, among others, in the new (2014) translation of Jamison and Brereton himself (*The Rigveda. The Earliest Religious Poetry of India.* Translated by Stephanie W. Jamison and Joel P. Brereton. Vol. II. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 2014, p. 924).

charismatic glow” (p. 46). This connection also sheds light on the figure of Apām Napāt, a “fiery god within the waters” who is “the custodian of sovereign power” (p. 52). On p. 46, in connection with the unction liturgies, the author refers to some Yajurvedic mantras and a passage of the Aitareyabrāhmaṇa, but unfortunately fails to give the exact loci.

Jarrold Whitaker (“Masculinity and Violence in the *Ṛgveda*: Defining the Roles of *nár*, *vīrá*, and *śūra*”, pp. 55–69) deals with words for “man” (*nár*-, *vīrá*-) and “manhood” / “masculinity” (*nṛmṇá*-, *vīryà*-, *páum̐sya*-) in the *Ṛgveda*. He investigates how *Ṛgvedic* rhetoric and *Ṛgvedic* ritual employed these value-laden concepts in order to define man and masculinity, and to socialize males in accordance with these ideals which were essential for male members of the Vedic Aryan tribes to fight for land and resources. Whitaker points out (pp. 62–67) that *vīrá*-, which is often, but incorrectly, translated as “hero”, in fact designates a brave man of an overwhelmingly martial nature, while the genuine word for “hero” is rather the noun *śūra*-. As far as the specific words are concerned, I fail to see the reason why *púmāms*-/*pum̐s*- “Mann, männliches Wesen” (*EWAia* II/144–145) has been excluded by Whitaker from the discussion. Although this noun is attested only 14 times in the *Ṛgveda*,⁴ which is a decidedly small number in comparison to the 452 attestations of *nár*- and 135 attestations of *vīrá*- (p. 56, n. 3), the fact that its derivative *páum̐sya*- has an important role in the paper indicates that it would have been worthwhile to include *púmāms*- as well. On p. 64, the verbal form *dāti* (*ṚV* 6.24.2d) is not a present indicative, but rather a root aorist subjunctive⁵ and should be translated as such (“let him give” or “will give” instead of simply “gives”).

Ferenc Ruzsa’s essay (“Is the Cosmic Giant an Indo-European Myth?”, pp. 71–80) deals with the famous *Ṛgvedic* hymn, the *Puruṣasūkta* (*ṚV* 10.90), and its alleged Indo-European background. As is well known, the myth of *púruṣa* whose body parts become parts of the world has long been considered as the reflex of a common Indo-European myth of the cosmic giant, which has striking parallels in various other Indo-European mythological traditions (summarized by Ruzsa in Table 1 on p. 73). Ruzsa argues that the parallels do not prove a common inheritance, but are “rather due to the natural tendencies of human thinking” (p. 74) and based on more or less obvious man–cosmos homologies. In order to show this, Ruzsa presents, beside references to non-Indo-European traditions, the results of an experimental verification of his hypothesis (pp. 76–78, Tables

⁴ Cf. Hermann Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. 6., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Maria Kozianka. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996, col. 821.

⁵ See, among others, Ulrike Joachim, *Mehrfachpräsentien im Rgveda*. Frankfurt am Main – Bern – Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1978, p. 91.

2 and 3), which is based on the answers that selected university, primary and secondary school students gave to his question “The gods created the world from the body of a giant cut into pieces. Which of his parts became what?”. Ruzsa’s well-grounded caution is not only relevant to this particular mythological problem, but can, and in fact should, be applied *mutatis mutandis* to any other field of research, including comparative linguistics or poetics, in which reconstruction methodology plays a prominent role.⁶

The paper by Tamara Ditrich (“Stylistic Analysis of Coordinative Nominal Constructions for Dual Deities in the *R̥gveda*”, pp. 81–109) investigates various means of naming pairs of divinities in the *R̥gvedic* hymns (i.e., *dvandva* compounds, elliptic dual forms, *asyndeta*, and syntagms constructed with a coordinative conjunction such as *ca*). Her observations and conclusions are based on a detailed statistical analysis of five such pairs (1. Indra–Vāyu; 2. Mitra–Varuṇa; 3. Indra–Varuṇa; 4. Indra–Agni; 5. Dyaus–Pṛthivī), the results of which are summarized in twelve tables throughout the paper. Ditrich demonstrates that the poets’ choice among the above mentioned constructions depends on various factors. To mention just one of them, in hymns dedicated to the pair in question or to several or all deities, *dvandva* compounds are clearly the most frequent choice, while in hymns dedicated to another deity, the ratio of alternative constructions raises significantly, and the pair is more often named through *asyndeta* or with coordinative conjunctions. Ditrich also points out that the rich variety of coordinative constructions for dual theonyms may also reflect “the idea of magical power attributed to the name of a deity in the *R̥gveda*” (p. 108). Some minor details: At the bottom of p. 86, *vāruṇa* in RV 8.25.2 should be replaced by *vāruṇo* (nominative). Further, I would perhaps be more cautious (cf. p. 90 with n. 52) in regarding the two divinities, when their names do not form a *dvandva* compound within a list of more deities, as necessarily being conceived by the poet as a pair even if they appear in immediate succession. On pp. 94–95, Ditrich claims that in the compound *indrāgni-* the first constituent is probably in stem form. However, on account of the vowel sandhi, it can equally be considered as an instance of type 3 of Ditrich’s classification (i.e.,

⁶ For instance, as I have tried to show in a recent article (Funkcióigés szerkezetek és nyelvészeti rekonstrukció [Light verb constructions and linguistic reconstruction], *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 113 [2017] 111–146), the nowadays rather popular undertaking of reconstructing specific light verb constructions for the Proto-Indo-European parent language on the basis of more or less similar multi-verb constructions of the daughter languages is most often mistaken, since the latter are probably, or at least possibly, the results of independent developments of the individual languages, which follow common tendencies of human languages in general and thus do not at all prove genetic inheritance. To generalize this observation, we have to bear in mind that not all common features of genetically related languages are necessarily genetically related themselves, since they can also be the results of independent innovations.

first member in dual; cf. p. 81, n. 1). On p. 97 (with n. 85), in connection with the pair Indra–Agni, it seems to me odd to regard a hymn as being “dedicated to another deity” if the addressee of the hymn is Agni himself. I also do not agree with Ditrich’s treatment (cf. pp. 97–102) of *á* (e.g., *á* [...] *divá á pṛthivyá[h]* RV 7.39.5a) and *ná* (e.g., *divó ná pṛthivyá[h]* RV 1.38.2b) as coordinative particles. In my understanding, in such cases, *á* is an adverb with a following ablative meaning “from” (thus, the two names are rather in asyndeton), and *ná* a comparative particle meaning “like, as” (cf. the translation of RV 1.38.2b by Jamison and Brereton: “Where now [...] have you gone on earth, as if in heaven?”).

Frank Köhler’s paper (“Mapping the Poet in the *Ṛgveda*”, pp. 111–125) focuses on various terms which refer to the concept “poet” and on their distributional peculiarities in the *Ṛgvedic* hymns. The terms which Köhler investigates are *kaví-*, *jaritṛ-*, *ṛṣi-*, *stotṛ-*, *vedhás-*, *brahmán-*, *kārú-*, *vāghát-*, *vená-*, *rebhá-* and *brāhmaṇá-* (p. 115). The statistical results of the analysis are summarized in four detailed tables (pp. 116, 118 and 120). It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to make clear distinctions between various words belonging to the same semantic domain of “making poems” (p. 114). As Köhler points out, the application of many, seemingly synonymous, words for the same concept may indicate “the intention of the speakers to capture the structure of all details of a state of affairs that is central to their world-view” (p. 113). On p. 115, Köhler observes that “the differences in the number of occurrences point against similar meanings of the terms, since one would expect that terms with similar meanings are used with similar frequency”. However, I think that such generalizations are not necessarily valid, especially in cases where, as in the *Ṛgveda*, we do not have enough information about the more subtle (e.g., stylistic or connotational) differences of the seemingly synonymous words. On the basis of the contexts, Köhler claims that “the central semantic domain of *stotṛ-* is *begging*” (p. 119). Although I do not dispute the validity of this statement in itself, I miss the author’s exposition as to how this usage of *stotṛ-* can be reconciled with its etymology, i.e., its derivation from the root *stu* “to praise”, which describes an action that is obviously different from begging (cf. also other derivatives of the root, such as *stóma-* or *stotrá-*, both meaning “praise, eulogium”). Two small remarks on the translation of RV 8.97.1 on p. 119: the equivalent of *id* “only” is missing from the translation; the absence of a comma after “who strew ritual grasses” makes the English text somewhat misleading at first reading, i.e., *asya* actually belongs to *vardhaya*: “increase [...] with (lit. from)⁷ [...]” and not “strew [...] with [...]”.

⁷ On the interpretation of *asya* cf. Hermann Oldenberg, *Textkritische und exegetische Noten. Siebentes bis zehntes Buch*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1912, p. 147.

The longest and most technical article of the volume is Mislav Ježić's paper ("Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad: The Development of the Text and its Final Redaction", pp. 127–153). The author analyzes the text of the Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad, which is obviously a compilation of different materials and various layers, with meticulous philological care, and lucidly shows how it was formed during successive redactional phases and processes. With the help of a close study of various terms (in particular, *tanmātra*- and *indriya*-), he is also able to refine Hans Bakker's thesis on the Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad as a "proto-Sāṃkhya" text (p. 132).

Madhav M. Deshpande's contribution ("Predicament of the Maitrāyaṇīya Community in Maharashtra: Migration, Acculturation, and Identity-crisis", pp. 155–168) is an exception among the articles in the sense that, in contrast to all others, it does not focus on a particular ancient Vedic text. The author deals with a recent dispute (the so-called *Maitrāyaṇī prakaraṇa*, p. 159) among the Vedic *śākhās* related to the Maitrāyaṇīya brahmins living around Nasik, Maharashtra. Deshpande convincingly argues that, while the affair concerns the exclusion of Maitrāyaṇīya brahmins from various ritual occasions (on which Deshpande cites particularly interesting documentary evidence from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, pp. 160–167), the real heart of the issue is the question whether the Maitrāyaṇīyas belong to the northern Gauḍa or the southern Drāviḍa brahmin sect, a problem which has emerged as a result of their historical migration from the north and east of India into Gujarat and Maharashtra (pp. 155–158). Thus, the affair is a nice illustration of the conflict between history and brahminical ideology.

The book is completed by three very detailed and helpful indices (pp. 169–185): 1. Index of passages cited, 2. General index, 3. Index of Sanskrit words (including names).

It has to be emphasized that the editors and typesetter did an excellent job. There are only few typos in the book and most of them bear no relevance to the understanding of the text. In what follows, I present only a very short collection of some problematic cases. On p. 21, in the citation of Taittirīyasaṃhitā 3.2.8.4k, the 3rd dual indicative *aśnutaḥ* should be corrected to imperative *aśnutām* (in accordance with the translation); on p. 27, the Avestan transcription should follow Hoffmann's principles and *ā* should be printed instead of *â* in *nâ*, *yâscâ* and *gânâ* (Yasna Haptaṅhāiti 38.1); on p. 51, the phrase *ékaḥ id rájā jágataḥ* is not from 1.121.3b, but 10.121.3b; on p. 62, in the citation, *nīn* should be replaced by *nīñ*; on pp. 84, 85, 87, 88, 92, 94, 95, 98, and 99, the character *á* (in the conjunctions *utá* and *ná*) is consistently misprinted in the tables as "ř"; on p. 109, in the bibliography, the entry Oldenberg 1923 is confused; it seems that two entries have somehow been conflated.

As the editors put it in their Introduction (p. 7), “these essays illustrate the directions that European and American scholars have taken contemporary Vedic studies”. Thus, the publication of the book may be a most welcome event for all those who would like to make themselves familiar with the present-day state-of-the-art of Vedic research, were it not for the period of twelve years that had passed since the 2006 conference until the book took its final shape in 2018. Of course, it all depends on one’s understanding of the adjective “contemporary”; nevertheless I think that, even in terms of conference proceedings, this period is far too long and, I should add, difficult both to accept and to account for. Even so, Vedic studies are not a field of research that changes at a particularly rapid pace, which means that the book, and the articles therein, will surely retain their high value for a long time to come.

Máté Ittzés

Thomas Oberlies

Pāli Grammar. The Language of the Canonical Texts of Theravāda Buddhism. Volume 1: *Phonology and Morphology.* Volume 2: *Conspectus of Verbs and Verb Forms, Indexes and Bibliography.* Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2019. viii + 714p. & 576p. £ 72,- (ISBN 978-0-86013-522-7 & ISBN 978-0-86013-523-4 [hbk]).

The present work in two volumes is an expanded and improved version of an earlier volume published in 2001 by the same author.¹ Interestingly, this very fact is not mentioned by the author and the previous version is not referred to in the bibliography. The new version has incorporated observations made by reviewers and includes a useful “Conspectus verborum” in Volume 2 to be consulted along with the grammar. Volume 1 contains a rich description of the phonology and morphology of canonical Pāli, systematically analysed in comparison with Vedic, Sanskrit and Middle Indic languages. This is so far the most detailed treatment of the grammar of canonical Pāli as a Middle Indic language since Wilhelm Geiger’s Pāli grammar² and Oskar von Hinüber’s *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*.³ The bibliographical apparatus of Thomas

¹ *Pāli. A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka.* [Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3]. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

² Wilhelm Geiger, *Pāli. Literatur und Sprache.* Strassburg: K.J. Trübner, 1916; Wilhelm Geiger, *A Pāli Grammar.* Translated into English by Batakrishna Ghosh. Revised and Edited by K.R. Norman. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2000 (reprint with corrections of 1994).

³ Oskar von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick.* [Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 467 = Veröffentlichungen

Oberlies' new version, compiled in Volume 2, is breathtaking in its comprehensiveness, certainly the most useful bibliography of Pāli linguistic scholarship to date. The author states that a third volume on Pāli Syntax is under preparation. Once this third volume will have come to light, Oberlies' *Pāli Grammar (PG)* will be difficult to supersede in the next decades.

A number of interesting theories are put forward in *PG*, many of them also found in Oberlies' 2001 Pāli grammar. They are no doubt the product of profound scholarship and, in general, rather convincing. Sometimes, of course, the reader may miss a more balanced assessment of the existing research and the problems involved in certain word formations. For example, on p. 376, n. 1, it is stated that *bāheti* cannot be a denominative, as postulated by Dines Andersen⁴ and Franklin Edgerton,⁵ because *bahi* is an indeclinable. Helmer Smith⁶ quotes the gloss in the Paramatthadīpanī on the Udāna-Aṭṭhakathā, *bahi katvā*,⁷ which indicates that some traditions in Pāli interpreted the word in this way. According to Oberlies, it also cannot be derived from Skt. *barhayati*, as John Brough has proposed.⁸ However, one may note that H.W. Bailey, in his article on "Buddhist Sanskrit" (cited by Oberlies), gives a quite plausible explanation:

Under *bāhayati* "expel", Pali *bāheti* it is desirable to note that the Kharoṣṭhī Dharmapada has *brah-* corresponding to this *bāh-*, which would attach the word to *brah-*, *barh-*, *vrah-*, *varh-* "remove by force".⁹

This could perhaps explain Pāli *vāhayati/vāheti* which was eventually confused with the causative of *vahati*, from *√vah* "to carry", as used in the Suttanipāta.¹⁰ Oberlies, however, proposes another explanation (p. 376, n. 1), namely that *bāheti* derives from *bādhatē* and belongs to a group of *e*-verbs in Pāli that are

der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasien 20]. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985. 2., erweiterte Auflage 2001.

⁴ Dines Andersen, *A Pāli Reader with Notes and Glossary*. Part II: *Glossary*. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag, 1907, p. 188.

⁵ Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. II: *Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953, p. 399, s.v. *bāhayati*.

⁶ Helmer Smith, *Saddanūti. La Grammaire Palie d'Aggavaṃsa*. Vol. V.2: *Tables 2me partie. Vocabulaire, additions, corrections (2me Fascicule Dhakketi - Holati)*. [Skripter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 12]. Lund: Berlingska Bocktryckeriet, 1966, p. 1639.

⁷ Ed. by Kittisobhaṇa Thera. Bangkok: Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya, 1922, p. 58, l. 21.

⁸ John Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962, p. 178.

⁹ H.W. Bailey, *Buddhist Sanskrit. The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1955.1–2 (1955), pp. 13–24.

¹⁰ Dines Andersen – Helmer Smith (ed.), *Sutta-Nipāta*. London: Pali Text Society, 1913, p. 50, v. 282: *vāhetha*; for the commentary on this term, see Helmer Smith (ed.), *Sutta-Nipāta Commentary, Being Paramatthajotikā II*. Vol. I: *Uragavagga, Cūlavagga*. London: Pali Text Society, 1916, p. 312: *te palāpe vāhetha, opunātha, vidhamatha* ("drive away those idle talks, throw them away, destroy them"). See also below.

not causatives or denominatives, but analogical to other forms with the affix *-aya-* > *-e-*. If we look up the verb *bāheti* in the *Dictionary of Pāli*, for instance, we find that an open explanation is maintained: “[*poss. denom. from bahi, but cf. S. bādhatē; BHS bāhayati, bāheti*] *drives away, repels*”, and if we look at the information provided on the past participle *bāhita* in the same article, things become further complicated: “*see also pabālha², pabāhita, vāheti (sv vahati)*”.¹¹ As Oberlies indicates in the footnote referred to above, Smith, in the *index verborum* to his edition of the *Saddanīti*, “crosses” *bāheti* with *vāhayati*.¹² All in all, the situation seems quite confusing and highlights the need for a reference grammar of Pāli that problematises such mysteries. To a high degree, *PG* accomplishes that in the footnotes, but Oberlies’ assertiveness when dismissing other people’s conjectures may give the false impression that such matters have been settled once and for all.

Following Geiger’s trail, Oberlies strives to explain linguistic phenomena, and does not simply record or describe attested forms. This approach is quite useful to advanced students who are often puzzled by certain forms of Pāli words whose etymology defies the sharpest intellects in the discipline. Particularly illuminating is the systematic distinction between eastern and western forms, e.g., in §45 on the inflexion of *n*-stems: “eastern ones with epenthetic *-i-*, western ones with assimilated consonants”. Similarly, on p. 159 (§19.2.) it is stated that the consonant conjunct *kṣ* in the west develops into *cch*, in the east into *kkh*. One example for this development is the word *chamā* “earth”, which comes from Skt. *kṣamā*.¹³ However, we also find *khamā*, meaning “patience”. As the author has already pointed out elsewhere in the book under review (p. 153, §17.8), words for which there exist such couplets may be used to differentiate between two meanings or shades of meaning, respectively. Here we can see the influence of the work of scholars such as Hermann Berger, Paul Tedesco and Colette Caillat, who are perhaps not as well-known as K.R. Norman and Oskar von Hinüber, but the importance of whose contributions to the study of Pāli historical grammar and philology cannot be overstated.

It has to be noted that in *PG* Oberlies examines a much greater number of editions than Geiger does in his Pāli grammar, which results in greater precision when it comes to pinpointing the right reading of a word in a given passage. In terms of Pāli textual criticism, however, not much has changed since Geiger’s time. In this connection, Oberlies does not mention the new edition of the

¹¹ Margaret Cone, *A Dictionary of Pāli*. Part III: *p – bh*. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2020, p. 584, s.v. *bāheti*.

¹² Loc. cit. (see n. 6 above).

¹³ Cf. von Hinüber, *Überblick* (see n. 3 above), §234.

Pāli Nikāyas by the Dhammachai Tipiṭaka Project. He also does not refer to Chris Clark's PhD dissertation which includes a partial, but definitely improved edition of the Apadāna.¹⁴ As Clark points out in the introduction to his thesis, echoing what K.R. Norman, Richard Gombrich and other eminent scholars of Pāli have repeated numerous times, Pāli canonical texts still await proper critical editions. Thus, Oberlies' conclusions are likely to undergo revision once the canonical and ancillary texts will have been critically edited on the basis of all available manuscripts.

In the Introduction to *PG*, as well as at other places in this book, certain assertions concerning the role of traditional Pāli grammar in the transmission of Pāli literature would have benefitted from some more substantiation. For instance, on p. 7 it is stated: "And though the earliest date to which the manuscript tradition goes back is the twelfth century, when the grammarians gave a systematic description of the standard language (see Smith, Sadd p. vi), what from earlier times has been preserved of a textual tradition can be counted on the fingers of one hand." To my knowledge, this point, which is key to the theory of the progressive Sanskritisation of Pāli, still needs to be proved with hard evidence of Pāli manuscripts prior to the twelfth century, which we do not possess.¹⁵

Sometimes one has the impression that *PG* is not based on a scrutiny of primary sources, but rather on the compilation of other reference works. On p. 136, for instance, Oberlies follows Geiger's §43.2: "Milinda (proper name) = μὲνάνδροϛ (in the last two cases *l* is perhaps due to dissimilation)". Oberlies here reads μὲνάδροϛ (*sic*), replicating Geiger's error concerning the accent, instead of the correct μὲνάνδροϛ. Since the laws of phonetic adaptation from Greek to Middle Indic, if they exist at all, are not known, the position of the Greek accent should be properly recorded whenever possible, because it could play a key role in the Indic adaptation.¹⁶ In any case, this is a minor, formal point, in a section that

¹⁴ See Chris Clark, *A Study of the Apadāna, Including an Edition and Annotated Translation of the Second, Third and Fourth Chapters*. PhD dissertation. University of Sydney, 2015.

¹⁵ See Ole Pind's review of Oberlies 2001 (see n. 1 above) in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 154.2 (2004) 508–513, at p. 509: "Smith's remark may not have been intended in the sense in which it usually has been taken because it is contradicted by the evidence and every other page of his edition of the *Saddanīti*." See also Alexander Wynne, *A Preliminary Report on the Critical Edition of the Pāli Canon Being Prepared at Wat Phra Dhammakāya*. *Thai International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 4 (2013) 135–170, at p. 137.

¹⁶ For the redaction of a vowel *a* > *i* after the accented syllable, see Geiger, *Pāli Grammar* (see n. 2), p. 13, §19.1. Some examples of Greek and Indic words, including Greek Ménandros / Pāli Milinda can be found in Jules Bloch, *Indo-Aryan, from the Vedas to Modern Times. English Edition. Largely Revised by the Author and Translated by Alfred Master*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve, 1965, p. 34.

focuses on dissimilation of consonants. In passing we may note that some of the examples would benefit from comparison with other editions, e.g., p. 135 *nāsmiye* Ja V 397,²⁹*, a dissimilation from a supposedly lost **nāśniye*, reads *nāśniye* in the Burmese edition of the same stanza.¹⁷

In Volume 2, *PG* is no doubt exhaustive, but inevitably there are missing forms. The user of this grammar should therefore not expect to find each and every Pāli verbal form in the *Conspectus*. For instance, the entry for root §532 *√sic* does not record the athematic absolute *sivā* (cf. Skt. *siktivā*) in verse 777 of the *Suttanipāta*, with v.l. *siñcivā*.¹⁸ Further, in the *Mahāniddeśa*, in the PTS edition we read *sivā* glossed as *osiñcivā* itself another canonical form that is not recorded in Volume 2, §532, of *PG*.¹⁹ The Sinhalese²⁰ and Thai²¹ editions read *siñcivā osiñcivā*. Oberlies redirects us to p. 42, n. 5, where we are given further bibliographic references to understand the meaning of *sivā* in *Suttanipāta* v. 771. No mention is made here of the abovementioned variant readings and the Burmese reading of the word in the *Suttanipāta* and *Mahāniddeśa*. The form *sivā* is the *lectio difficilior* here, and probably constitutes the oldest form, *siñcivā* being a later analogue based on *osiñcivā* in the *Mahāniddeśa*.

Another example of an absolute missing in the *Conspectus* is *paccivā*, the middle/passive absolute of *pacati*, seen in *vassasatasahassāni niraye paccivā* “after consuming himself in hell for hundreds of thousands of years...”.²² The form is explained in the *Dictionary of Pāli*.²³

Given the calibre and complexity of the work under review, a full analysis would take a lifetime of study. What follows are therefore simply some notes that hopefully can be of interest to the author as well as to the readers of the present review:

¹⁷ The Burmese Sixth Council Edition has been accessed through the website www.tipitaka.org (last accessed September 23, 2021). All references to B^c texts in the present review are to this electronic edition.

¹⁸ See Andersen – Smith (ed.), *Sutta-Nipāta* (see n. 10), p. 151, v. 771.

¹⁹ See Louis de La Vallée Poussin – E.J. Thomas (ed.), *Niddeśa I. Mahāniddeśa*. Vol. I. London: Pali Text Society, 1916, p. 20, l. 2.

²⁰ For the Sinhalese edition see Labugama Lankānanda Thera, *Mahāniddeśapāli*. [Buddha Jayanti Tripiṭaka Series XXXIII]. Colombo: Government of the Republic of Śrī Lankā, 1961, p. 28, l. 1.

²¹ For the Thai edition, I have used the electronic version published on a CD Rom by the University of Mahidol, Bangkok, Thailand, conventionally known as BUDSIR (https://www.mahidol.ac.th/budsir/BUDSIR_Eng.htm, last accessed September 23, 2021). See volume 29, *Mahāniddeśo*, p. 22, l. 20, with the v.l. *sivā*.

²² Hermann Oldenberg (ed.), *The Vinaya Piṭakam*. Vol. III: *The Suttavibhaṅga, First Part (Pārājika, Saṃghādisesa, Aniyata, Nissaggiya)*. London: Pali Text Society, 1881, p. 108, ll. 9–10.

²³ Op. cit., p. 23, s.v. *pacati*¹ (see n. 11 above).

On pp. 70 and 400, Oberlies postulates a rare, indeed unique second person singular imperative ending in *-am*, supposedly from an imperative ending in *-āt*. It is attested in the form *nikhaṇaṃ* in Jātaka VI,²⁴ p. 12, l. 25*. The form is anticipated as *khaṇanto* in the commentary introduction to the stanza (Jātaka VI, p. 12, l. 22), and it is glossed as *nikhaṇanto* in the commentary proper. It is difficult to understand why Oberlies calls the *-āt* ending an imperative, when it seems to be a potential or subjunctive.²⁵ Despite Norman's observation in his review of Oberlies' 2001 Pāli grammar²⁶ that this is probably an optative,²⁷ Oberlies has maintained his opinion. Oberlies' conjecture is thought-provoking, but it fails to explain how the same form *nikhaṇaṃ*, being a second person imperative, can be employed as a conditional in a subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction *ce* in the following stanzas. Oberlies himself acknowledges the close relationship between imperative and optative on pp. 399, 421 and 426, n. 2. Furthermore, in §99 he considers the form *nikhaṇaṃ* in Jātaka VI, p. 12, l. 31* a present participle employed as conditional or irrealis, which matches what the commentary says about the supposedly imperative form *nikhaṇaṃ* in Jātaka VI, p. 12, l. 25*.

On p. 60 Oberlies states: "The shortening due to the law of *mora* even occurs (c.) when the geminate consonant is split by a vowel (*apilapati* 'floats before [one's mind])' < *āplavate* [A II 185,12]." The passage from the *Āṅguttaranikāya* in the Sinhalese edition reads: *tassa tattha sukhino dhammapadāpilapanti*,²⁸ which Bhikkhu Bodhi analyses as *dhammapadā apilapanti* and translates as follows:²⁹ "There, the happy ones recite passages of the Dhamma to him." In the edition of the Pali Text Society the text reads *pi lapanti* separately, without any indication of the elision of an initial *a*-,³⁰ which Bhikkhu Bodhi finds "unacceptable". The Burmese Sixth Council Edition – perhaps based on the *Critical Pāli Diction-*

²⁴ Viggo Fausbøll, *The Jātaka Together with its Commentary, Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha. For the First Time Edited in the Original Pāli*. Vol. VI. London: Pali Text Society, 1896.

²⁵ See also Thomas Oberlies, Die Verwendung des part. praes. als Konditional im Pāli. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 34.2 (1991) 121–122.

²⁶ See n. 1 above.

²⁷ See K.R. Norman, Middle Indo-Aryan Grammar. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 97.4–5 (2002) 623–628, at p. 624 [= *Collected Papers*. Vol. VIII. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2007, pp. 327–366, at p. 329].

²⁸ *Āṅguttaranikāya* Editorial Board of The Tripitaka Translation Committee, *Āṅguttaranikāya*. Part II. [Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series XIX]. Colombo: The Government of Ceylon, 1962, p. 358, l. 12.

²⁹ Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha. A Translation of the Āṅguttara Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2012, p. 1715.

³⁰ Richard Morris (ed.), *The Āṅguttara-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka*. Part II: *Catukkanipāta*. London: Pali Text Society, 1888, p. 185, l. 13.

ary³¹ – reads: *tassa tattha sukhino dhammapadā plavanti*, with v.l. *pilapanti*.³² The Manorathapūraṇī, following the same reading, explains:³³

dhammapadā plavanti ti antarābhavē nibbattamuṭṭhassatino, ye pi pubbe sajjhāyamūlikā vācāparicītabuddhavacānadhammā, te sabbe pasanne ādāse chāyā vīya plavanti, pākaṭā hutvā paññāyanti.

To the one reborn who is muddled in mind in an intermediate state between two existences, the teachings of the Buddha’s words that he had recited, being rooted in his past recitation of them, all float up clearly discerned like images in a pure mirror.³⁴

In the commentary it seems clear that the meaning “floating”, which supports the understanding of *pilapanti* as a form derived from \sqrt{plu} “to float”, is already operating. Oberlies’ example agrees with that provided in the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*,³⁵ where it is cited, with the plural form *apilapanti*, with reference to Aṅguttara II,³⁶ p. 185, but the origin of the *a-* remains highly problematic. In the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* the derivation from *āplavate* is merely conjectural: “*prob. meant as an equivalent to sa. ā-plavate* (\sqrt{plu}), *cf. perhaps āgilāyati for āgilāyati and, as to p-v: p-p, abhasampilāpa, pipati, pilapati (s. v. apilāpana).*” If we look up *apilāpana* in the same dictionary we enter a loop: “*a-pilāpana, n. (cf. a-pilāpeti below), ‘the not allowing any floating’; Nett-a ad Nett 28,13.*”³⁷ A more sensible derivation of *apilapeti* from *abhilapeti* is given in the *Dictionary of Pāli* s.v. *apilapati*:³⁸ “*api²+lapati; cf. S. abhilapati; see K.R. Norman, 1988, pp. 49–52*”, which is the one followed by Bhikkhu Bodhi (see above). Oberlies lists Norman 1988 in the bibliography, but the reason why he dismisses his solution is not explained.

On p. 176 (§25) Oberlies states: “Other than in Sanskrit, all vowels (incl. ‘nasal’ vowels which represent long vowels) of both (a) the final of the previous word and (b) the initial of the following one may be elided.” Indeed, it is

³¹ *A Critical Pāli Dictionary Begun by V. Trenckner. Revised, Continued, and Edited by Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith.* Vol. I. Copenhagen: Andr. Fred. Høst & Son, Kgl. Hof-Boghandel, 1924, pp. 291–292, s.v. *apilapati*.

³² *Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti Piṭakaṃ. Suttantapiṭake Aṅguttaranikāye Ekaka- Duka- Tika- Catukka-Nipāta-Pāḷi.* 2nd ed. Yangon: Buddhasāsana Samīti, 1959, p. 505, l. 5.

³³ *Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti Piṭakaṃ. Manorathapūraṇī nāma Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathā.* Vol. II. Yangon: Buddhasāsana Samīti, 1958, pp. 364, l. 27 – 365, l. 1.

³⁴ Adapted from Bhikkhu Bodhi, loc. cit. (see n. 29 above). Bhikkhu Bodhi translates *antarābhavē* as “in his next existence.”

³⁵ Loc. cit. (see n. 31 above).

³⁶ *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya. Edited by the Rev. Richard Morris, M.A., LL.D. President of the Philological Society.* Part II: *Catukka Nipāta.* London: Pali Text Society, 1888.

³⁷ Op. cit. (see n. 31), p. 292.

³⁸ Margaret Cone, *A Dictionary of Pāli.* Part I: *a–kh.* Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2001, p. 174.

true that in some contexts any of the vowels may be elided in either position. Classical Pāli grammarians, however, show that in certain contexts, generally in formulaic collocations, only one of the two vowels may be elided, either the last vowel of a preceding word or the first vowel of a subsequent word. Oberlies gives the example *ten' upasaṅkami*, but he does not clarify that the sandhi form *tena' upasaṅkami* is unattested, i.e., not possible, despite the sequence -V V-. To my knowledge, these types of sandhi forms which we could tentatively call “frozen sandhi forms” have not received much attention from Pāli scholars. They are known in the tradition as “permanent” or “mandatory” (*nicca*) sandhi forms.³⁹

Occasionally the anecdotal is placed on the same level as the general rule. This may puzzle a good number of students. For instance, the first-person pronoun *amhi* (§49.1) is practically negligible in terms of occurrences. To report this form on the same level as *ahaṃ* adds unnecessary complexity to a pronominal paradigm that is otherwise well established. In contrast, other forms are constitutive of recurrent formulae in Pāli, and the reader should be made aware of this fact because he will encounter them repeatedly. For instance, the forms *āhuneyyo pāhuneyyo dakkhiṇeyyo* (p. 586) are given with the reference “D III 5,23”, but this sole reference is misleading because these forms belong to a recurring formula which seems to follow a certain metrical pattern in prose called *vedha*, of which Oberlies is obviously aware.⁴⁰

Some explanations are not entirely convincing, for instance when Oberlies argues that the pronoun *tāya* is borrowed from the nominal type *kañṇāya* to avoid homonymity with the second person pronoun *tayā* (Skt. *tvayā*) (pp. 272–273). Although this is not indicated in a footnote, the idea is presumably taken from Stanley Insler’s “Rhythmic Effects in Pali Morphology”:⁴¹ “[...] the demon. instr. *tāya* (and analogic *imāya*) must have been borrowed from the nominal type *kañṇāya* (cf. Pkt *tāe* after *mahilāe*), surely to avoid homonymity with the 2nd person pronoun *tayā* = Skt *tvayā* [...]”. But if homonymity is, on principle, avoided in Pāli, how can we explain the wide-spread use of homonyms such as *taṃ* (= *tvam*, nominative/accusative singular of the second person pronoun), *taṃ* (accusative singular masculine of the pronoun *sa*), *taṃ* (nominative/accusative singular neuter of the same pronoun), and *taṃ* (accusative singular feminine of this pronoun)? Similarly, explanations of the type *tissāya* as a blending of *tissa* and *tāya* (p. 273) operate on a rather speculative basis.

³⁹ Cf. *Padarūpasiddhi*. Yangon: Saccamandain Press, 2006 (3rd reprint), pp. 8–10, §15.

⁴⁰ Cf. p. 111, n. 3.

⁴¹ Stanley Insler, Rhythmic Effects in Pali Morphology. *Die Sprache* 36 (1994) 70–93, at p. 72.

Apart from specific points that could be raised, Oberlies' *Pāli Grammar* is to be welcomed as a landmark in Pāli and Middle Indic Studies. Without doubt, it is the best reference grammar for Pāli on the market, for which we also have to thank the efforts of the Pali Text Society.

ERRATA AND CORRIGENDA

- p. 10, n. 1: sessings > settings? sessions?
- p. 11, last line: *vkhādatha* > *khādatha*
- p. 66: *chave* “corpse” (*chavaḥ*): It should be noted that *chave* here is an adjective, not a noun, and seems to follow the inflection of an *a*-stem base.
- p. 90: *diṭṭhī+gata-* “come into the field of vision” > *diṭṭhī+gata-* “[theory] referring to [one or more] false view(s)”
- p. 159: “*chuddha*” is found in the Index (Vol. 2), but not in the main body of the text. Cf. Oberlies, op. cit. (see n. 1), p. 106.
- p. 200, n. 1: ands > and
- p. 254: *bhattā* “husbands” > *bhattā* “devotees”; cf. *Dictionary of Pāli* (see n. 11), p. 620, s.v. *bhatta(r)*¹.
- p. 271: fossalised > fossilised
- p. 363: actes > acts
- p. 394: *sadhu paṭibhaṇāsi* > *sādhu paṭibhaṇāsi*
- p. 420: your reference > your reverence
- p. 437, n. 2: Suhrdayamaṅgalam > Sauhrdyamaṅgalam
- p. 441: *akaram* > *akaraṃ*
- p. 536: *vaṇṇaṃ* > *vaṇṇam*
- p. 547: *rājā kale* > *rājā kāle*
- p. 555: [not by the endings ...] albeit by the stems > but by the stems
- p. 589: inuguration > inauguration
- p. 594: [*āsati* > *āsati*

Aleix Ruiz-Falqués

Bhikkhu Bodhi (tr.)

The Suttanipāta. An Ancient Collection of the Buddha's Discourses Together with Its Commentaries, 'Paramatthajotikā II' and Excerpts from the 'Niddesa'. [The Teachings of the Buddha Series]. Somerville: Wisdom Publications – Pali Text Society, 2017. 1612p. US\$ 75,- (ISBN 978-086013-516-6 [hbk]; 978-161429-454-2 [e-book]).

Venerable Bhikkhu Bodhi's translation of the Suttanipāta is a welcome addition to his other translations of complete canonical Pāli texts: *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha. A Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*; *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha. A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*; and *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha. A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya*.

As Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi points out in his introduction, the Suttanipāta has been translated into English several times: by Viggo Fausbøll (*Sacred Books of the East* X, 1881), Robert Chalmers (*Buddha's Teachings*, 1932), E.M. Hare (*Woven Cadences of Early Buddhists*, 1947), Ven. H. Saddhātissa (*The Sutta-Nipāta*, 1985), K.R. Norman (*The Group of Discourses*, 1984; 2nd ed. 2001), and N.A. Jayawickrama (*Suttanipāta. Text and Translation*, 2001).¹ Partial translations have been made by Ven. Bhikkhu Paññobhāsa (*The Aṭṭhakavagga*, 2012), Ven. Bhikkhu Ṭhānissaro (“The Atthaka Vagga”, 1997; and “The Parayana Vagga”, 1997), and Gil Fronsdal (“The Aṭṭhakavagga”, 2016). Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi also mentions the German translation by Nyanaponika Thera.²

The introductory material includes a preface, a key to pronouncing Pāli, a list of abbreviations, a long introduction, and a guide to the suttas. The translation of the text comes next (pp. 157–348), followed by the commentary on the entire text (pp. 349–1330), “Elucidator of the Supreme Meaning” (Paramatthajotikā II), and selected passages from the Niddesa. Appendix 1 gives parallels to suttas of the Suttanipāta (pp. 1331–1334). Appendix 2 provides verse parallels from the Yogācārabhūmi's Śarīrārthagāthā (pp. 1335–1337). Appendix 3 lists numerical sets mentioned in the commentaries (pp. 1339–1344). There are 2173 notes on pp. 1345–1558. The last sections are a Pāli–English glossary (pp. 1559–1580), a bibliography (pp. 1581–1586), an index of subjects discussed in the commentaries (pp. 1587–1598), an index of proper names (pp. 1599–1605), and an index of Pāli words discussed in the notes. While there is no general index

¹ Other translations into English are by Mutu Coomāra Swāmy (1874) and Sister Uppalawana (1992).

² Other translations into German are by Arthur Pfungst (1889) and Arthur Seidl (1924).

of subjects, the reader is referred to the thematic guide to the verses which is found in the introduction (pp. 93f.).

In the preface, Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi gives details of the editions he used. He says that the style he uses is a middle course between the approaches of the two translations that were most useful to him: Norman's attempt to give the meaning most probably intended by the original speakers or understood by their listeners, and Jayawickrama's reliance on the explanations in the commentaries. Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi uses free verse for the poetry rather than prose. In some passages he differs from the explanations found in the commentaries; these passages are enumerated on pp. 78–81.³

In the introduction, Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi discusses the Suttanipāta as an anthology and speculates about how the prose came to be added to the verses.⁴ A table gives the forms of the suttas. The sections of the introduction include one on people the Buddha spoke with and people he taught, and discussions of lay ethics, Brahmanism and social order, renunciation, monastic training, the spiritual ideal, and the concept of the *arahant* (three terms are used in the text to refer to the *arahant*: *bhikkhu*, *brāhmaṇa*, and *muni*). There is also a section on the repudiation of views. The section on the ultimate goal of *nibbāna* includes a long discussion of why the Aṭṭhakavagga does not include references to *nibbāna* as a state of transcendent liberation. Another section goes into the Buddha as the spiritual hero. This is followed by seven sections about special Pāli terms found in the text.

The introduction also contains a very useful discussion of the commentary, Paramatthajotikā II, explaining the explanations of terms and meanings, and doctrinal interpretations of the canonical text. All of this commentary is included in the book under review, with only some listings of synonyms and some technical grammatical sentences being left out (see p. 17). The subsequent section is about passages where the translation differs from the explanation in the commentary, as already mentioned above. Next comes an examination of the Niddesa, the commentary on part of the Suttanipāta that is included in the Pāli canon. The two sections of the Niddesa comment on the Aṭṭhakavagga (“The Chapter of Octads”), the Pārāyanavagga (“The Chapter on the Way to the Beyond”) (except for the introductory verses), and the Khaggavisāṇa-sutta (“The Sutta on the Rhinoceros Horn”). As the Niddesa is very repetitive, it is

³ The reader is referred to footnotes for the discussion of the differences. The page numbers for all but the last five footnotes are incorrect, but finding the correct note is not difficult.

⁴ In future editions it would be helpful to have the subsections of the introduction and the guide to the suttas listed with page numbers in the table of contents. It would also help to include the Pāli titles of the suttas alongside the titles in English in the table of contents.

not translated in its entirety. Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi also goes into the sorts of definitions and compendia used in the Niddesa, and the explanations given in it of the defilements, the spiritual practice, and the spiritual ideal.

In the guide to the suttas, Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi gives a detailed analysis of the content of each text. He points out the passages that are also found in other Pāli canonical texts, and he discusses passages that are found in the texts of other Buddhist traditions. This often leads to an examination of the question of the chronology of texts or sections of texts. Important contributions to dating the texts by other scholars are discussed, and Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi often gives his own point of view.

The translation will be of great value to practising Buddhists and to scholars. It is especially good to have consistency in the way Pāli is translated across the many translations made by Ven. Bhikkhu Bodhi. The style of English is very fluent, and the canonical text can be read on its own. For anyone who wants to understand the text in greater depth, the discussion in the guide to the suttas functions as a modern-day commentary. The translations of the Pāli commentaries give insight into many aspects of Buddhism, and the background stories for the poems are similar to the stories found in the Jātaka stories and the Dhammapada commentary.

It is not easy using such a large book with so many sections to refer to: the translation of the text, the commentaries on the text, and the footnotes to every section of the book. Putting the material starting with the appendices in a separate volume would make the use of the book under review much easier, but it would result in two volumes of very different size.

William Pruitt

Peter Jackson – Yumi Ousaka

Paramatthadīpanī III. Dhammapāla's Commentary on the Vimānavatthu.
The Burmese Edition, with Other Editions Collated by P.J. Index Prepared by
Professor Y.O. Revised Edition. Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2016. 585p.
£ 60,- (ISBN 978-0-86013-504-4 [hbk]).

The first edition in Latin script of *Paramatthadīpanī III. The Vimānavatthu-Aṭṭhakathā of Dhammapāla*, prepared by E. Hardy, was published by the Pali Text Society (PTS) in 1901. Since it was out of print for quite some time, the publication of a new edition of the commentary in 2016 by Peter Jackson with an index by Yumi Ousaka, under the auspices of the PTS, Bristol is indeed welcome news.

In 1886, Edmund Rowland Gooneratne edited the text of the *Vimānavatthu* for the first time.¹ Almost hundred years later, in 1977, N.A. Jayawickrama brought out a new edition of the *Vimānavatthu*.² The text has been translated into English twice, first by J. Kennedy in the year 1942 (London: Luzac) as *Stories of the Mansions*, and later by I.B. Horner in 1974 (London: PTS) under the title *The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon. Part IV: Vimānavatthu. Stories of the Mansions. New Translation of the Verses and Commentarial Excerpts*. In 1989, P. Masefield published the translation of the *Vimānavatthu-Atthakathā* entitled *Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning so Named the Commentary on the Vimāna-Stories* (Oxford: PTS).

A new revised edition of the *Vimānavatthu* commentary was indeed a desideratum for a number of reasons. Hardy, for his edition, could only make use of one Sinhalese palm-leaf manuscript from the India Office Library and two paper manuscripts, one in the Sinhalese and another in the Burmese script which were copied for him by Ven. Subhūti of Ceylon and James Gray of Burma, respectively. He, however, could not make use of the Cambodian fragments kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris and a complete manuscript housed in the St. Petersburg library, although he was aware of these sources. In the preface to his edition, Hardy has pointed out lacunae and some other problems in the Sinhalese palm-leaf manuscript at his disposal. Although he could fill up some of the lacunae by supplying in footnotes the missing text on the basis of the two paper manuscripts, the manuscript material used for this first edition was far from being satisfactory. At the end of his preface, Hardy has acknowledged a substantial number of errors in his edition. This certainly warranted a fresh attempt at revising this old edition.

Jackson's new edition, which he prepared at the behest of W. Pruitt, is, in the editor's own words, "a diplomatic edition" based on the Burmese edition of the *Vimānavatthu* with collation of other printed editions. The collated editions include: Hardy's first edition in Latin script of 1901, the edition of 1958 (= 2502 BE) in Burmese script,³ the electronic *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* version prepared by the Vipassana Research Institute, Igatpuri,⁴ the printed edition in Sinhalese script of 1925 in the Simon Hewavitane Bequest Series,⁵ and the Buddhist Scriptures Information Retrieval (BUDSIR) electronic text

¹ *The Vimāna-Vatthu of the Khuddaka Nikāya Sutta Pitaka*. London: Froude.

² *Vimānavatthu and Petavatthu*. New Edition. London: PTS.

³ *Chaṭṭhasaṅgītipīṭakam*. Rangoon 1956.

⁴ See <https://tipitaka.org/romn/> (last accessed September 10, 2021).

⁵ Vol. XVII: *Paramattha Dīpanī or The Commentary to the Vimāna-watthu of the Khuddaka Nikāya Sutta Pitaka*. Colombo: S and S Printers, 1925.

transcribed from an edition published by Mahidol University, Bangkok.⁶ In the foreword to his edition, after listing the source material of his new edition, Jackson has noted down some of his editorial practices. Although he has generally retained the original punctuation and some other orthographical practices of the Burmese edition, they have been modified whenever necessary to suit the presentation of the current edition. For the sake of convenience of users, Jackson has tried his best to maintain the page and line division of Hardy's edition even at the cost of a somewhat clumsy layout. The new edition includes all such portions of the text that are missing in either the Burmese or the Latin script edition. The portions that are only available in Hardy's edition are given in footnotes.

Since the present edition is a diplomatic one, Jackson has recorded all the variants in the critical apparatus, including even those which are clear instances of scribal errors or orthographic peculiarities and sometimes even variants that are merely the result of specific editorial conventions of earlier editors.⁷ Although these are useful in terms of getting an overall picture of the material at hand, often such minor details may not be of great interest to readers seeking for genuine variants. In the later part of the edition, however, the editor has restricted himself to providing only the genuine variants. He has justified this lack of consistency in recording variants in the earlier and later parts of the edition, stating that “[s]pelling variations and similar minor differences are collated fairly fully at first, but this is often phased out once the pattern or lack of one becomes clear.” Jackson has also identified sources of some citations that remained unidentified in Hardy's earlier edition, for instance, *Jātaka* IV 52,⁸ *Dīgha Nikāya* II 17 (p. 9, nn. 17 and 28),⁹ III 102¹⁰ and II 93 (p. 85, n. 12), III 102 (p. 284, n. 28), *Majjhima Nikāya* III 237,¹¹ and *Dīgha Nikāya* I 235 (p. 349, n. 3).¹² This will definitely improve our understanding of the relation of this commentary to its canonical and non-canonical sources.

On a number of occasions Jackson has pointed out instances where the printed editions have not recorded the variants clearly and accurately.¹³ It would have been nice if such ambiguities could have been removed in the new edition by

⁶ See <https://www.mahidol.ac.th/budsir/budsir-main.html> (last accessed September 10, 2021).

⁷ Cf., for instance, p. 2, nn. 14 and 26.

⁸ Ed. V. Fausbøll. London: Trübner & Co., 1887.

⁹ Ed. T.W. Rhys Davids – J. Estlin Carpenter. London: Frowde, 1903.

¹⁰ Ed. J. Estlin Carpenter. London: Frowde, 1911.

¹¹ Ed. R. Chalmers. London: Frowde, 1899.

¹² Ed. T.W. Rhys Davids – J. Estlin Carpenter. London: Frowde, 1890.

¹³ Cf., for instance, his notes on pp. 3 (n. 7), 5 (n. 18), 24 (n. 20), etc.

consulting the manuscript material used by the earlier editors of the Latin, Burmese and Sinhalese script editions. Further, the value of this new edition would have considerably increased if the editor would have been able to consult the Cambodian fragments in Paris and the complete manuscript at the St. Petersburg library, which Hardy had referred to in his introduction.

In the new edition, Jackson has retained Hardy's original preface to the 1901 edition. In this preface, Hardy has provided important information about the nature of manuscripts material used for the first edition along with his comments on some characteristic features of Dhammapāla's commentary. At the end of the preface, Hardy briefly discusses the relation of the stories in the *Vimānavatthu* to their counterparts in other Pāli and Sanskrit texts. Hardy's old edition contained three separate indexes of (1) proper names, (2) words, and (3) quotations, works named, and references. In the present edition, these have been merged into a single extensive word index covering more than one third of the book's pages (pp. 365–585). Although the number of entries in the index has considerably swollen due to the inclusion of all possible word-forms resulting from the treatment of sandhi, having such an index is indeed a luxury, especially for those readers who are not keen on using electronic tools to search through the text. In 2018, P. Kieffer-Pülz has published a list of corrections to this new edition in *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 33, pp. 123–129. Scholars can now use the present edition in the light of these corrigenda.

I am sure that this new publication will receive a warm welcome by scholars working in the field of Pāli studies. It will certainly prove helpful as it makes all relevant textual material on the *Vimānavatthu-Atthakathā* easily accessible. Scholars will find it convenient to be able to consult the different printed and electronic editions of the text together in one place. The editor Peter Jackson deserves our appreciation for meticulously collating such a large amount of available material. The Pali Text Society should also be thanked for bringing out this much needed publication.

Mahesh A. Deokar

Peter Jackson – Yumi Ousaka

Paramatthadīpanī IV. Dhammapāla's Commentary on the Petavatthu. The Burmese Edition, with Other Editions Collated by P.J. Index Prepared by Professor Y.O. Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2019. 485p. £ 55,50 (ISBN 978-0-86013-521-0 [hbk]).

The present volume offers a fresh version of Dhammapāla's *Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā* ("Commentary on the *Stories of Hungry Ghosts*") (Pv-a).¹ According to the colophon, Dhammapāla wrote this commentary at the Badaratitthavihāra in South India, following the style, or method, of the old commentaries (*porāṇaṭṭhakathānayaṃ*).² The verses of the *Petavatthu* (Pv) are incorporated into the main text of the commentary, and each story is presented in three parts: an introductory story giving the circumstances in which the verses were delivered by the Buddha, then the verses themselves, and finally a commentary upon the verses. Dhammapāla attributes the first two parts to the Buddha himself,³ thus providing his commentary with an aura of canonicity. The Theravāda tradition seems to have taken the Pv and Pv-a as a narrative unit, and when Pv stories are cited, they are mostly the ones that we find in the commentary.⁴

The Pv and its commentary occupy a marginal position in standard manuals of Theravāda doctrine. The historical significance of these texts, however, cannot be overstated, as both Pv and Pv-a are models for the ghost or spirit literature in Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia. They are also textual authorities for the many traditions of ancestor worship in these regions, and they have played a major role in the systematisation of the idea of merit transfer in Theravāda Buddhism.⁵

The book under review is titled *Paramatthadīpanī IV*, with a number, because this particular text belongs to a long series of commentaries on minor works pertaining to the Khuddaka Nikāya, namely, Udāna, Itivuttaka, Vimānavatthu, *Petavatthu*, Theragāthā, Therīgāthā and Cariyāpiṭaka. These texts had not been commented upon by Buddhaghosa or other scholars before.⁶ The title *Paramatthadīpanī* ("Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning" [U Ba Kyaw / Peter

¹ For *peta* (Skt. *preta*) "hungry ghost", see Rita Langer, *Buddhist Rituals of Death and Rebirth. Contemporary Sri Lankan Practice and its Origins*. London: Routledge, 2007, pp. 16ff.

² K.R. Norman. *Pāli Literature, Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*. [A History of Indian Literature VII.2]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983, p. 134.

³ Norman, op. cit. (cf. n. 2), p. 135.

⁴ Jeffrey C. Shirkey, *The Moral Economy of the Petavatthu. Hungry Ghosts and Theravāda Buddhist Cosmology*. PhD dissertation. University of Chicago, 2008, p. 10.

⁵ For a conceptual framework to understand stories on hungry ghosts in Theravāda on the basis of Pv and Pv-a, see Shirkey, op. cit. (cf. n. 4).

⁶ Norman, op. cit. (cf. n. 2), p. 133.

Masefield]) applies to the extended commentary on all these minor works. The reader should be aware that Edmund Hardy's first edition of the Pv-a bears the title *Paramatthadīpanī III*,⁷ whereas the *Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā* is titled *Paramatthadīpanī IV*. The changed sequence matches the classification of the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*, followed by Oskar von Hinüber in his reference work *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*.⁸

Peter Jackson's edition of the Pv-a is, at the same time, a revised version of the old 1894 edition, and an altogether new text. It is a revised edition because it maintains the old Foreword by Hardy and incorporates the old critical apparatus. The text is moreover presented by the publisher as a reprint ("First printed 1894, Reprinted 2019"), and it has preserved the old line numbering for the sake of consistency in referencing. The advantage of this decision is obvious, even if the layout of the text looks a bit awkward at times. However, the present volume can also be described as a new edition because its editor intends to represent the Burmese edition and has incorporated the variants collated from other editions. Therefore, the text does not read as the 1894 edition.

The volume opens with a synthetic Note on the Edition, which seems to be wrongly titled Foreword. The Contents page needs to be corrected, as there is no Foreword to the volume. The Preliminary Note lists the witnesses that have been consulted and describes the editorial policy of the present edition, a policy that is complex and aims at recording even minor details such as scribal mistakes (see below).

After Hardy's Preface to the first edition of 1894, a List of Errors in this edition is included. In this list, the editor of the volume states that "the emended readings agree with VRI's B". If VRI B^c (i.e., the Vipassana Research Institute's Burmese edition) refers to the online version of the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana Tipiṭaka,⁹ it is unfortunate that the editor did not consult and collate the original printed text in Burmese script, in any of its revised reprints. Instead, Jackson follows a "Latin-transcript edition" from 2008 (see p. vii). This transcript is of lower quality and does not always agree with the online Romanised version.¹⁰ As a result of this, we find numerous cases in which the editor wrongly reads one

⁷ Edmund Hardy, *Dhammapāla's Paramattha-dīpanī, Part III, Being the Commentary on the Peta-vatthu*. London: Pali Text Society, 1894 (rather 1896, cf. the introduction to Pv-a, p. viii, n. 1). For an English translation see *Dhammapāla, Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning. So Named the Commentary on the Peta-Stories (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā)*, translated by U Ba Kyaw, edited and annotated by Peter Masefield. London: Pali Text Society, 1980.

⁸ Cf. Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. [Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2]. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996, §273.

⁹ This edition can be openly accessed at www.tipitaka.org.

¹⁰ Cf. the previous note.

word when two words should be read, and makes a note indicating that other editions read two words instead of one. Actually, these editions are correct, and the Burmese edition also reads two words:

- p. 22, l. 21: *santite* > *santi te*
 p. 33, l. 28: *kissakammavipākena* > *kissa kammavipākena*
 p. 33, l. 30: idem
 p. 41, l. 22: *sabbaṃnibbāpaye* > *sabbaṃ nibbāpaye*
 p. 41, l. 28: *tavavacanāṃ* > *tava vacanāṃ*
 p. 42, l. 29: *maccharinībhikkhū* > *maccharinī bhikkhū*
 p. 43, l. 2: *vassaṃvutthānaṃ* > *vassaṃ vutthānaṃ*

Jackson's edition is accompanied by a very useful Index by Yumi Ousaka. Professor Ousaka has already earlier on contributed to enhancing the quality of the Pali Text Society's editions by producing such computer-generated word indices. Unfortunately, the present Index reproduces the wrong readings of the main text (e.g., *mayhaṃakāmāyā*, following Pv-a p. 144, l. 4 which wrongly reads one word here instead of *mayhaṃ akāmāyā*, glossed as *mama anicchantiyā*).

The critical apparatus of the present edition is much richer and informative than the old one. As the volume progresses, this apparatus becomes lighter. At the beginning of the volume, it can be confusing because it includes a large quantity of notes that are not worth recording. For instance, according to n. 29 on p. 24 E° (i.e., Hardy's first edition of 1894) mistakenly reads *gatham* for *gātham*, which is simply a typographical error, not a variant. Similarly, the apparatus records case endings whose spellings traditionally oscillate, e.g., in n. 4 on p. 25 °*isu* in the Sinhalese edition consulted by Jackson,¹¹ instead of the normative °*īsu* for the locative plural. This oscillation is ubiquitous in most manuscripts and one may simply ignore it; to discuss this phenomenon in the Introduction would have sufficed. I agree that spelling variations, if they truly represent the style of a particular scribe, are potentially interesting for a certain type of reader. However, I wonder whether the decision to record them as a principle (p. viii) can justify the heaviness of a critical apparatus. As Professor Nalini Balbir has pointed out, “[o]verloaded and hardly legible critical apparatus are not necessarily a positive sign. To draw a line between trivial and non-trivial variants is, in my opinion, the work of the editor.”¹²

¹¹ The Sinhalese edition corresponds, according to the Foreword (p. vii), to the “Simon Hewavitane Bequest edition [no I], 2461/1917”.

¹² Nalini Balbir, Thoughts about “European Editions” of Pāli Texts. *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies* 1 (2009) 7.

There are some cases where the oscillation between two readings is well recorded in the canonical literature and all mss. tend to vary due to the similarity of the *akṣaras*. A good example is *upapanna* (“attained”) vs. *uppanna* (“arisen”). In this case, we expect that the editor will proceed consistently with his own decision. However, such a consistency is not always maintained in this new edition of the Pv-a in places where the old one was consistent. For example, on p. 26, l. 14 one finds *pettivisaye uppannānam*, with v.ll. *upap*^o in manuscript B of the 1894 edition and manuscript B of the Sinhalese edition, and two lines later *pettivisayūpapannā*, with v.ll. *pettivisayuppannā* in the 1894 edition and *pittiv[isayuppannā]* in manuscript B referred to in this edition.¹³ This inconsistency, of course, is not the fault of the new editor. The “error” is inherited from the Burmese edition.

As previously stated, the main problem with the present edition is its reliance on a faulty Romanised transcript of the Burmese edition. This has caused a number of errors that could have easily been avoided. Let me briefly illustrate what I mean by that. In Pv-a p. 22, l. 3, the editor reads *aṅgamagavosīhi* which makes no sense, but we have the v.l. *aṅgamagadhavāsīhi* “inhabitant of Aṅga and Magadha” (cf. the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* s.v. *aṅga-magadha-vāsī*) in all the printed editions consulted by the editor. Here the new Pv-a reading is the result of a confusion with the original Burmese script: it reads ၈၀ (vo) instead of ၈၀ (dhavā). The reading should thus be restored to *aṅgamagadhavāsīhi*, with no variant. Similar errors can be found elsewhere, for example on p. 24, l. 18: °*tittisandhi*^o > °*bhittisandhi*^o and on p. 35, l. 19: *kuṭambiko* > *kuṭumbiko*.

On the same page some verses are quoted (Pv-a p. 22, ll. 6–7), but this does not become sufficiently clear from the layout. After the second *pāda* we find a period that should not be there because the sentence continues. The use of this punctuation mark follows the Burmese Romanised edition, which has mechanically replaced the double *daṅḍa* (|| ||) of the Burmese script with a period. An improvement in the new edition is that the reference to the source of this quotation has been corrected. In his edition, Hardy mistakenly refers to the Mahāvamsa, but Jackson rightly refers to “Vin I 38”,¹⁴ a reference that is already given, using a different system, in the Burmese edition. One would perhaps expect that the new editor would have also recorded Oldenberg’s reading in his edition of the Vinaya.¹⁵ The newly edited Pv-a reads as the Burmese

¹³ All sigla are explained on p. vii of Jackson’s edition.

¹⁴ That is to say, Hermann Oldenberg, *The Vinaya Piṭakaṃ*. Vol. I: *Mahāvagga*. London: Pali Text Society, 1879, p. 38, ll. 15–16.

¹⁵ See the previous note.

edition¹⁶: *siṅgīnikkhasavaṇṇo*, with n. 6 referring to *siṅganikkhasuvaṇṇo* of the 1894 edition. However, Oldenberg's edition of the Vinaya (I/38, ll. 15–16) has *siṅgīnikkhasuvaṇṇo*, with the following note: “*siṅgīnikkhasuvaṇṇo* ABC constantly; DE: *siṅgīnikkhasuvaṇṇo ti siṅgīsuvavaṇṇanikkhena samānavaṇṇo*. The [parallel in the; ARF] Jātaka Aṭṭhakathā (cf. Ja I 84,₁₈*) reads: °*savaṇṇo*.”¹⁷

In Pv-a p. 22, l. 16 we see another undesired consequence of using a Romanised version instead of consulting the original Burmese text. The editor reads *abhiviyabhimsanakam*, which does not make sense. Instead, we would expect *ativiyabhimsanakam* “extremely dreadful”. This reading is recorded in Pv-a p. 22, n. 16 for the 1894 edition, the Sinhalese edition and the Siamese edition,¹⁸ and is also found in the online version in Roman script of the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana Tipiṭaka.¹⁹ This demonstrates once again that the printed Romanised version used by the editor is a corrupt version of the original edition.

I hope the above comments will prove useful to the editor and publisher. After a thorough revision based on the original Burmese printed edition in Burmese characters, Jackson's edition will definitely replace Hardy's good, but outdated edition of the Pv-a.

Alex Ruiz-Falqués

¹⁶ See *Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti piṭakam. Mahāvaggapāli*. Yangon: Buddhasāsana Samīti Press, 1957 (2nd ed.), p. 48, ll. 24–25.

¹⁷ Oldenberg, op. cit. (cf. n. 14), p. 367, §22.

¹⁸ That is, the so-called Thai edition known as the Syāmaratṭha Tepiṭaka, published by Mahachulalongkorn University on CD-ROM, on which the Buddhist Scriptures Information Retrieval (BUDSIR) electronic text published by Mahidol University is based; see <https://www.mahidol.ac.th/budsir/budsir-main.html> (last accessed September 24, 2021). Its date cannot be ascertained, and a list of sigla is missing.

¹⁹ Cf. n. 9 above.

C.M.M. Shaw – L.S. Cousins

The Book of Pairs and Its Commentary. A Translation of the Yamaka and Yamakappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā. Vol. 1 & 2. [Pali Text Translation Series]. Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2018 & 2020. xvi + 411p. & vi + 456p. £ 35,50 & £ 35,50 (ISBN 978-0-86013-513-5 [Vol. 1] & 978-0-86013-528-9 [Vol. 2]).

The Yamaka is the sixth text of the Theravādin Abhidhammapiṭaka. Its name, which means “Book of Pairs”, refers to the text's methodology of posing a question followed by its converse formulation, e.g., “(a) Is suffering, the truth of suffering? (b) Is the truth of suffering, suffering?” (Vol. 1, p. 275). It has been speculated that this lengthy work of applied logic was used as a manual

for advanced students of the Abhidhamma to help them become experts in the system and skilled in debate.¹ The Pāli text of the Yamaka was edited by Caroline Rhys Davids and published in two volumes in 1911² and 1913.³ Its commentary, the Yamakappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā, was also edited by Caroline Rhys Davids and published in the *Journal of the Pali Text Society* in 1912.⁴ In her forewords to these editions, Rhys Davids does not portray the Yamaka in a particularly positive light, describing it as “a baffling and forbidding composition”,⁵ referring to its ten chapters as “valleys of dry bones”⁶ and commenting (on its repetitive nature) that “like Sisyphus, we slide down from it gasping in despair”.⁷ It is perhaps no wonder that a century passed before there were scholars brave enough to prepare a complete English translation of this text. Thus far two volumes have been published of a projected three-volume set, in which Charles Shaw has translated the Yamaka while Lance Cousins has translated its commentary.

The Yamaka is divided into ten chapters, called *yamakas*, each dealing with a separate topic, namely, roots (*mūla*), aggregates (*khandha*), spheres of perception (*āyatana*), elements (*dhātu*), truths (*sacca*), formations (*saṅkhāra*), tendencies (*anusaya*), consciousness (*citta*), phenomena (*dhamma*) and faculties (*indriya*). Volume one covers chapters one to five, while volume two covers chapters six to eight. Most of these chapters follow a threefold structure, namely, (1) the delimitation of terms and concepts (*paṇṇattivāra*), in which questions are firstly posed by themselves and then repeated with answers, (2) a discussion on the process of rebirth with reference to person and place (*pavattivāra*), and (3) a description of an individual’s understanding of the category being considered (*pariññāvāra*). Within these sections there are further subdivisions. The complicated structure of the Yamaka, together with its terse wording, make it an especially challenging text. It would therefore have been desirable to include in volume one introductory material to help orientate and prepare the reader for what lies ahead, including information on the text’s structure, system of logic, language, style, etc. As it stands, unless one firstly reads the secondary literature on the Yamaka (helpfully listed in a footnote in Vol. 1/xi) and/or has prior experience reading Abhidhamma texts, the first chapter or two

¹ A.K. Warder, *Indian Buddhism*. 3rd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000, p. 290.

² *The Yamaka. Being the Sixth Book of the Abhidhamma-piṭaka*, ed. by Caroline Rhys Davids. Vol. 1. London: Henry Frowde for the Pali Text Society, 1911.

³ *The Yamaka. Being the Sixth Book of the Abhidhamma-piṭaka*, ed. by Caroline Rhys Davids. Vol. 2. London: Humphrey Milford for the Pali Text Society, 1913.

⁴ Yamakappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā from the Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā, ed. by Caroline Rhys Davids. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 6 (1912) 51–107.

⁵ Rhys Davids, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 4), p. 51.

⁶ Rhys Davids, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 2), p. xi.

⁷ Rhys Davids, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 2), p. xvi.

of this translation is unlikely to make a great deal of sense. It should be noted, however, that the commentary provides some explanation of the structure and approach of the root text, and the inclusion of a translation of the commentary is a very valuable addition to this publication.

Due to the terse and formulaic wording of the Yamaka, it would be impossible to produce a translation that is both very faithful to the Pāli and written in natural English. It seems that the translators have prioritised the former over the latter, which seems wise given the highly technical nature of the text. Indeed, the Yamaka implies a great deal of assumed knowledge and therefore the translation might have benefited from the addition of footnotes which briefly explain key terms and concepts with which less experienced readers may be unfamiliar. The translation follows the Pali Text Society edition of the Yamaka; however, because the text of this edition is heavily abbreviated, the Vipassana Research Institute's digitisation of the Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti edition has also been utilised to fill out the abbreviated passages. This has resulted in an eclectic translation that draws from both editions. Helpfully, a system of brackets has been used to indicate what text is found in one edition but not the other.

Despite the Yamaka's difficult style, its content offers a wealth of interesting details. For instance, the chapter of formations (Saṅkhārayamaka; Vol. 2, pp. 3–82) frequently uses the terms “moment of arising” (*uppādakkhaṇa*) and “moment of dissolution” (*bhaṅgakkhaṇa*). This could be regarded as an early expression of the concept of momentariness, which becomes more fully developed in the commentaries with the additional term “moment of presence” (*thitikkhaṇa*). This is just one aspect of the Yamaka that deserves further investigation, and the two books under review will undoubtedly be invaluable for such future research. With the eventual publication of the remainder of this multivolume set, this first complete translation of the Yamaka will be a significant contribution to Pāli studies.

Chris Clark

K.R. Norman – Petra Kieffer-Pülz – William Pruitt (tr.)

Overcoming Doubts (Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī). Vol. I: *The Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha Commentary*. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2018. L + 628p. £ 45,50 (ISBN 978-0-86013-517-3).

This work represents the first translation of the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī into a Western language and marks a significant achievement in the study of the Theravāda Vinaya. The translation of “Overcoming (*vitaraṇī*) Doubts (*kaṅkhā*)” concerns a

complete commentary on two lists of monastic rules (Pātimokkha) for Buddhist monks (*bhikkhu*) and nuns (*bhikkhunī*) written in the Pāli language.

According to the Theravāda tradition, the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī belongs to the tradition of the Mahāvihāra monastery in Ceylon and is ascribed, along with the four times longer codex Samantapāsādikā, to the well-known commentator Buddhaghosa (approximately fifth century). The Samantapāsādikā, however, comments upon the whole Vinaya text, including the Khadhakas and Parivāras.¹ It seems that the intention of the compiler of the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī was twofold: on the one hand, to convey all essential and practical knowledge on the Vinaya to the monks and nuns and, on the other hand, to help them to overcome any doubts that they might have concerning the Pātimokkha.

The present English translation – being heavily annotated – is an extensively revised version of the first complete translation by K.R. Norman (1925–2020), which was completed in connection to the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī edition published by Norman together with W. Pruitt in 2003² in order to replace D. Maskell’s edition from 1956. Thus, this English translation relies on the second edition of the Pāli text.

Because of its broad scope, the complete translation of the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī is divided into two volumes. The first volume, which is discussed in this review, covers the commentary on the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha in full. The forthcoming second volume will contain the entire commentary on the Bhikkhunī Pātimokkha and will include various indices to both volumes (see p. xiii–xiv: “Preface”).

In the 38 pages long “Translator’s Introduction” (pp. xiii–l), relevant issues, such as the (anonymous) author and the text’s possible sources, as well as the structure of the commentary are discussed. The question of exactly how ancient the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī is and from when it dates is by no means easy to answer. Nevertheless, the far too long time span from the fourth to the tenth century³ is a cause of confusion. What can be ascertained is only the assumption that the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī presupposes the Samantapāsādikā.

The translation itself comprises 557 pages, which correspond to pages 1–277 in the above-mentioned edition of the Pāli text. Some spot checks show that the English translation is mostly reliable and understandable. In the well-annotated apparatus, parallel passages from the Samantapāsādikā as well as statements in other Pāli texts and commentarial literature are taken into account. The

¹ Cf. O. von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin – New York 1969, §§221–225.

² Reviewed by Th. Oberlies in *Buddhist Studies Review* 21.1 (2004) 85–87, and P. Kieffer-Pütz in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 155 (2005) 665–670.

³ See p. xxiii for the late fourth or fifth century as *terminus post quem*, and p. xxviii for the tenth century as *terminus ante quem*.

respective page numbers of the text edition are indicated – in bold type and angle brackets – in the header as well as in the running translation of the text, which makes the re-examination of the original Pāli text easier. Furthermore, the practice of adding corresponding Pāli terms to the English translation is convenient for further studies.

Concerning the phrase *pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukkhittaka* (“suspended for not giving up an evil view”, p. 29), it should be noted that this rule does not deal with any kind of evil views, but explicitly refers to the rejection of the Buddha’s fundamental teaching about *antarāyikā dhammā* (matters obstructive to salvation). It is precisely this wrong view that leads to the suspension; with regard to *ukkhapanīyakamma* as part of an earlier Vinaya terminology the reader is referred to the paper “On the Relationship between *asambhoga* and *ukkhapanīyakamma*” by the present reviewer.⁴ Furthermore, the translation “a joint enjoyment of food” for *āmisa-sambhoga* (p. 434) would limit the meaning of the term *āmisa* too much because it also comprises clothes and other objects that a monk is allowed to own including his right of inheritance. The alternative translation, “the enjoyment of material goods” (for *āmisa-paribhoga*, p. 435), is, therefore, more comprehensive. In addition, the replacement of the old term *āmisa-sambhoga* by *āmisa-paribhoga* in the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī as well as in the Samantapāsādikā and Samantapāsādikā-ṭīkā (p. 435, n. 1) could possibly indicate an intended exchange of the archaic terminology taken over from the Jainas.

The book under review also contains 49 appendices (pp. 559–589) explaining many difficult terms and passages “because they [these explanations; H.H.] were too long to be included in footnotes” (p. xiv). Indeed, a mere word for word translation of such a technically difficult text on Buddhist law without detailed explanations would inevitably lead to incomprehensibility or even misunderstanding. For example, Appendix 2 (pp. 559f.) discusses among other things the phrase *uddiṭṭhaṃ kho āyasmanto nidānan ti* (“Recited, venerable sirs, is the introduction [to the Pātimokkha]”); the parallel concerning the Prātimokṣasūtra recitation as found in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, namely under which circumstances – including an emergency – this Sūtra is allowed to be recited in five different (shortened) versions, is discussed by the present reviewer in “Some Remarks on the Skt. Manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra found in Tibet”.⁵

⁴ *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2011 12* (2012) 77–85.

⁵ In: *Jaina-itihāsa-ratna. Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, ed. by U. Hüsken, P. Kieffer-Pülz and A. Peters. [Indica et Tibetica 47]. Marburg 2006, pp. 283–337, at pp. 290f.: *nidānam uddiṣya, catvāraḥ pārājikān dharmān uddiṣya*, etc.

In addition, a glossary of essential terms is provided for this translation work (pp. 590–603); however, it would seem that the choice of these terms was more or less coincidental. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the list of terms primarily serves to “avoid the many repetitions of constantly reappearing terms” (p. xiv), and not to explain the most relevant Vinaya terms that appear in the *Pātimokkha*. The readers of the English translation of the *Kaṅkhāvīṭaraṇī* are, therefore, advised not to forego the use of the much more detailed word index of its 2003 edition, which comprises 190 pages with two columns per page. Furthermore, concerning the term *pārājika* as discussed in the glossary (p. 599), the interesting article “Pārājika Does Not Necessarily Entail Expulsion” by Bhikkhu Anālayo should be referred to.⁶

As long as the *pātimokkha* is relevant, one should not completely lose sight of the original meaning of this crucial term. In 1985, Oskar von Hinüber thoroughly examined the early Pāli texts and the various possible derivations of the word *pātimokkha*.⁷ According to the earliest explanation preserved in the *Mahāvagga*, i.e., *pātimokkhan ti ādiṃ etaṃ mukhaṃ etaṃ pamukhaṃ etaṃ kusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ tena vuccati pātimokkhan ti*,⁸ the word *pātimokkha* was understood as referring to “something which is at the beginning” or “something which is essential”. For more details the reader is referred to Hu-von Hinüber’s and Yamanaka’s paper “Did Buddha Vipāśyin Teach the *Prātimokṣasūtra*?”⁹

The Vinaya scholarship community is looking forward to the second volume of the translation and is especially interested in the fascinating list of parallels between the *Kaṅkhāvīṭaraṇī* and the *Samantapāsādikā*, that will be included.

Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber

⁶ *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2018 22* (2019) 3–8.

⁷ Cf. his article “Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien”, in: *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, ed. by H. Bechert. Vol. I. Göttingen 1985, pp. 57–75.

⁸ Cf. H. Oldenberg (ed.), *The Vinaya Piṭakam. One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. 5 vols. London 1879–1883, I/103.

⁹ *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2016 20* (2017) 58–66.

Giulio Agostini

The Ornament of Lay Followers. A Translation of Ānanda's Upāsakajanālaṅkāra. Bristol: The Pali Text Society, 2015. xiv + 346p. £ 20,- (ISBN 978-0-86013-506-7).

Giulio Agostini is to be congratulated on an accessible translation of the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*, making an important contribution to the scholarly arena of second-millennium A.D. Pāli-language textuality and intellectual history. This long-neglected research area fortunately now enjoys more substantial attention. Manuscript evidence has long attested to the importance – in Lāṅkā and elsewhere in the Pāli world – of compositions developed around the thematic interest of the author by excerpting and recombining units from earlier texts, often including portions of *tipiṭaka* and *aṭṭhakathā* material though by no means limited to that *oeuvre*. It is clear from the manuscript record that such compositions, which I here refer to for convenience as “compendia,” – distinct from explicitly condensed digests – were a significant form of authorial practice within the Pāli world. Witnessed already in the early and subsequently strongly influential fifth-century Pāli-language *Visuddhimagga*, preparation of compendia was a powerful mode of scholarly expression, in Pāli as well as in local literary languages that participated in Pāli-language intellectual culture. Compendia could provide guidance to readers, teachers, and preachers, and were sites for intellectual innovation (often expressed as deferential inheritance).¹ We should not underestimate other motivations for the composition of compendia, such as to demonstrate authorial erudition in competitively performative scholarly environments, to respond to a lay patron’s request, and/or to make merit for the author and patron(s).

The *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra* comprises nine explanatory sections (*niddesas*): (1) on the moral practice related to going for refuge in *buddha*, *dhamma*, and *saṅgha*; (2) on precepts; (3) on austerities; (4) on livelihood; (5) on the ten bases of pure actions; (6) on faults that produce an impediment; (7) on mundane achievements; (8) on supramundane achievements; and (9) proof of merits and their fruits. According to the author, Ānanda, this didactic compilation is composed to delight (*pāmojattthāya*) a particular audience, the *abhinavasādhujana*; his reference to this intent helps to close each explanatory section. Agostini translates *abhinavasādhujana* as “people who recently became pious.”² Given the

¹ See, for instance, Alastair Gornall, *Rewriting Buddhism. Pali Literature and Monastic Reform in Sri Lanka, 1157–1270*. London: UCL Press, 2020.

² Agostini, op. cit., p. xi.

Lankan connections of the author, self-described as a *sīhaḷācariya*,³ one might linger with this translation, alert to Lankan usage of the second millennium. This invites us to recognize a certain semantic overdetermination characteristic of *sādhujana* (Pāli) and *sat puruṣa* (Sinhala), according to which such persons are at once virtuous and captivating.⁴ Thus, Ānanda's audience might be designated as “people newly marked by beautiful virtue.” This coheres well with Ānanda's description of his own composition: “[...] this book should be known as *Upāsakajanālaṅkāraṇa* [...] because it illustrates [*upāsakas*'] virtues (*guṇānaṃ*), the adornments of these persons (*janabhūsanānaṃ*).”⁵ References to jewels and adornments recur throughout the work.

The *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra* is the first compendium available in translation through the Pali Text Society, and a welcome addition to its valuable series. Agostini's translation of the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra* is a contribution with implications well beyond our understanding of this particular text. It is a readable translation, handling well for the most part the commentarial style characteristic of many compendia. Agostini's translation of the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra* will thus help to familiarize readers – including emergent scholars of Pāli – with the textual strategies of compendia, texts that evince complex patterns of explicit and implicit citation, and which adapt commentarial and extra-commentarial Pāli texts to a wide array of purposes. However, caveats rightly noted by Petra Kieffer-Pülz⁶ with respect to the translation of some transition points within the work's flow of argument should receive careful attention.

While appreciative of Agostini's translation, one would wish for a more substantial introduction to the likely context of the work's composition and use. When was the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra* written? Agostini attributes the work to the twelfth century, following H. Saddhatissa, whose critical edition of the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra* is the basis for Agostini's translation.⁷ However, Ānanda uses works by Sāriputta and Sumaṅgala which must date from the last two to

³ H. Saddhatissa, *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra. A Critical Edition and Study*. London: Pali Text Society, 1965, p. 358.

⁴ See also Charles Hallisey's comment that *sādhujana* is an “under-theorized technical term,” cited in Jonathan A. Young, *Adornments of Virtue. The Production of Lay Buddhist Virtuosity in the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*. PhD dissertation. Cornell University, 2011, p. 85. Young offers an analysis of “adornment” rooted in premodern subcontinental materials (pp. 156–160).

⁵ Saddhatissa, op. cit. (cf. n. 3), p. 123. Here I slightly modify Agostini's translation (Agostini, op. cit., p. 1).

⁶ Review of Giulio Agostini (tr.), *The Ornament of Lay Followers. Ānanda's Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 78.3 (2015) 632–633.

⁷ Agostini, op. cit., p. xi with n. 1, and p. xiii; Saddhatissa, op. cit. (cf. n. 3), especially pp. 33–36 and 43–45.

three decades of the 1100s at the earliest.⁸ Further, Ānanda's students included Vedeha who flourished in the latter half of the thirteenth century, suggesting that Ānanda's active dates fall somewhat earlier in the thirteenth century.⁹ Another factor to be considered in dating the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra is the author's colophonic reference to composing the work from a monastery complex in what is almost certainly peninsular India.¹⁰ Agostini translates the relevant passage – describing the monastery to which Ānanda refers – as a place where Lankan *theras* had come to reside “when the whole island of Laṅkā was destabilized by the fire of the Tamils.”¹¹ This line has long been used in attempts to date the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra.¹² In an important study, Amaradasa Liyanagamage argues strongly for the view that the *theras* referred to by Ānanda had relocated during the time of Kāliṅga Māgha's military campaigns on Laṅkā between 1214 and 1255, and that Ānanda was among them.¹³ This would cohere with Junko Matsumara's persuasive dating of Ānanda and Vedeha noted above (n. 9). Jonathan Young rightly notes, however, that the colophon to the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra is very general, simply associating Ānanda with a monastery that had an historical association to Lankan monks who had at some point left the island in response to Tamil threats.¹⁴

The Upāsakajanālaṅkāra is framed as a compendium of conduct (virtue-as-ornament) for *upāsakas*, a particular category of lay Buddhists. Lankan authors during this period had a strong interest in lay practice, witnessed for instance through didactic story collections such as the Saddhammaratnāvaliya and Pūjāvaliya. This focus may relate to the increasing decentralization of monastic institutional life in the island, as well as the growing importance of Buddhist institutions, including many that were new, located outside the Anurādhapura and Poḷonnaruva domains.¹⁵ Presumably Ānanda composed the

⁸ Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1997, p. 172. See also Amaradasa Liyanagamage, A Forgotten Aspect of the Relations Between the Sinhalese and the Tamils. *Ceylon Historical Journal* 25.1–4 (1978) 102–103.

⁹ Junko Matsumara, *The Rasavāhinī of Vedeha Thera. Vaggas V and VI*. Osaka: Toho Shuppan, 1992, p. xxx; id., Remarks on the Rasavāhinī. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 25 (1999) 155–172. See also D.P.R. Samaranāyake (ed.), *Nikāya Saṃgrahaya*. Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1966, p. 81, and Liyanagamage, op. cit. (cf. n. 8), pp. 123–124.

¹⁰ Liyanagamage, op. cit. (cf. n. 8). See also Young, op. cit. (cf. n. 4), pp. 28–29.

¹¹ Agostini, op. cit., p. 337.

¹² Wilhelm Geiger (ed.), *Cūlavamsa*. London: Pali Text Society, 1980, pp. 58–80; C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts*. Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1980, p. xxix.

¹³ Liyanagamage, op. cit. (cf. n. 8), pp. 103–106.

¹⁴ Young, op. cit. (cf. n. 4), p. 25.

¹⁵ This relates to an important observation made long ago in Frank Reynolds – Charles Hallisey, Buddhist Religion, Culture and Civilization. In: Joseph Kitagawa – Mark D. Cummings (ed.), *Buddhism and Asian History*. New York: Macmillan 1989, pp. 3–28.

Upāsakajanālaṅkāra in Pāli to serve trans-regional goals, since Pāli enabled a textual community encompassing both Lankan and peninsular arenas. However, the inspiration to write for the benefit of “people newly marked by beautiful virtue” may also owe something to the mood of the times, an awareness that even in Laṅkā the *sāsana* was operating in “frontier”¹⁶ conditions.

Young’s dissertation and a subsequent related article¹⁷ explore possible functions of the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra within a ritually plural environment, such as that of peninsular India characterized by theists and Jains, as well as Buddhists. Young’s analysis valuably indicates areas for further investigation of the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, reading Ānanda’s composition in relation to Maria Heim’s comparative study of *ācāra* texts of the early second millennium A.D.¹⁸ The ninth and closing section of the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, closely studied by Steven Collins (whose work Agostini consults),¹⁹ is likewise well suited to a subcontinental audience. Collins notes that what he calls the “Debate section” (i.e., the first nine paragraphs of this *niddesa*) “is written with the extreme concision (and precision) of language characteristic of South Asian philosophical texts.”²⁰ Against anticipated opponents, it argues that Buddhadatta’s arguments for *anattā* do not undercut the merit-making and cultivation of virtue envisioned by the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra.

The Upāsakajanālaṅkāra’s framing devices deserve somewhat more attention in relation to questions about Ānanda’s context and intended audience. It has long been noted that the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra distinguishes itself from the Paṭipattisaṅgha, and explicitly seeks to supersede that work.²¹ In the opening lines Ānanda writes:

The old *Compendium of Conduct*, devoid as it is of the narrative of the beginning and other [materials], is exegetically confused, and therefore it does not appeal at all to newcomers to the dispensation of the Conqueror.²²

¹⁶ Philip Carroll Friedrich, *Merchants, Ministers, and Monks. Making Buddhist Power and Place in Medieval Sri Lanka*. PhD dissertation. University of Pennsylvania, 2020.

¹⁷ Young, op. cit. (cf. n. 4); Jonathan Young, Practical Canons from Buddhist Pasts: What Pāli Anthologies Can Tell us About Buddhist History. *History of Religions* 60.1 (2020) 37–64.

¹⁸ Maria Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia. Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain Reflection on Dāna*. London: Routledge, 2004. Note also K.R. Norman’s comment about *ācāra* texts in *Pāli Literature Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983, p. 170, cited in von Hinüber, op. cit. (cf. n. 8), p. 178.

¹⁹ Agostini, op. cit., p. 321.

²⁰ Steven Collins, A Buddhist Debate about the Self; and Remarks on Buddhism in the Work of Derek Parfit and Galen Strawson. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25.5 (1997) 467–493, at p. 475.

²¹ Saddhatissa, op. cit. (cf. n. 3), pp. 49–51; von Hinüber, op. cit. (cf. n. 8), p. 178; Young, op. cit. (cf. n. 4), pp. 33–38; Agostini, op. cit., p. xi.

²² Agostini, op. cit., p. 2; cf. Saddhatissa, op. cit. (cf. n. 3), p. 123.

Ānanda goes on to provide a *nidāna* within the first *niddesa* and, as Agostini rightly notes,²³ refers back to this *nidāna* in the final passages of the work before the expression of the aspiration for others' well-being and the colophon. Here, near the end of the composition, Ānanda says:

Since its [the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*'s] meaning is not mixed up with the views of other *nikāya*-s, it is not confused, it is based on the existing meritorious achievements²⁴ of monks belonging to the Mahāvihāra order,

[and] it has been made evident – furnished with discourses such as the *nidāna*; therefore, respect is due here by whomever desires benefit.²⁵

“Going for refuge” is the foundation of the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*,²⁶ yet without Ānanda's addition of the *nidāna* it lacks an authorizing context. In Ānanda's words,

recent male and female *upāsaka*-s entertain a doubt in their mind as to “Who is a Buddha? Who is a worthy one?”, etc. And once uncertainty has arisen, they might find neither joy nor happiness, and without joy and happiness, they might not enter the *sāsana* by going for refuge. Therefore, in order to cut off uncertainty and produce clarity, one must thus understand in detail what follows.²⁷

Drawing on the commentarial scaffolding of the *Paramatthajotikā*,²⁸ but introducing narrative materials from elsewhere, Ānanda elucidates who uttered the *Saraṅgāmanasutta*, where it was said, when it was expressed, and why it was uttered.²⁹ Ānanda's additions would have served an especially important function within a ritually and doctrinally plural and competitive environment, establishing more securely the credentials of Gotama Buddha and the *sutta* itself.

As noted, the *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra* explicitly claims the authority of the Mahāvihāra intellectual tradition. This move would have been recognized as such by many readers and listeners – whether on the island or mainland – already familiar with Pāli materials from Laṅkā owing to the long premodern history

²³ Agostini, op. cit., p. 336, n. 1.

²⁴ Here I translate *pavattiphalanissito*. Ānanda likely uses the term *phala* here in part to echo the conclusion to the immediately previous *niddesa* on merits and their fruits. See Agostini, op. cit., p. 335, n. 5.

²⁵ Agostini, op. cit., pp. 335f. I have slightly modified the translation of these lines based on Saddhatissa, op. cit. (cf. n. 3), p. 357.

²⁶ Agostini, op. cit., p. 3; Saddhatissa, op. cit. (cf. n. 3), p. 124.

²⁷ Agostini, op. cit., pp. 5–6.

²⁸ Helmer Smith (ed.), *The Khuddaka-Pāṭha Together with Its Commentary Paramatthajotikā I*. London: The Pali Text Society, 1959, pp. 13–14.

²⁹ Saddhatissa, op. cit. (cf. n. 3), p. 125. For a discussion of these narrative choices, see Young, op. cit. (cf. n. 4), pp. 56–63.

of intellectual interchange across the straits. Given the period of the work's composition, Ānanda's choice to identify the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra with previous scholarly works of the Mahāvihāra suggests that his primary audience was subcontinental. By the time he composed the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, the three *nikāyas* (Jetavana, Abhayagiri, and Mahāvihāra) had become less important institutionally and discursively in Laṅkā, superseded by *mūla* and *āyatana* affiliations, as well as the *gāma*vāsi/*arañña*vāsi distinction.³⁰ In this regard, see for instance Buddhaputra's interest in the Mahā Nethra Pāsada Mūla as expressed in his Pūjāvaliya, also composed in the thirteenth century.³¹ Associating the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra with the Mahāvihāra (and making substantial use of the Pāli commentaries and the Visuddhimagga) situated the composition and Ānanda as heirs to the first-millennium intellectual world of the *aṭṭhakathās* and Buddhaghosa, yet without locating Ānanda within any second-millennium Lankan lineages or specific institutional arenas. Predecessor Lankan *theras* receive only general and formulaic reference in the colophon,³² while Ānanda devotes several lines to the origin of the monastery complex from which he writes. This contrasts with the more detailed teacher–student information provided in two Pāli works composed on Laṅkā in the post-Poḷonnaruva period, the Rasavāhīnī, composed by Vedeha, as well as the slightly later Sārasaṅgaha.³³ Given the strong scholarly traffic between the subcontinent and the island characteristic of this time,³⁴ is entirely possible that Ānanda envisioned readers and listeners in Laṅkā. Yet the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra's framing devices suggest they were not his primary audience.

Anne M. Blackburn

³⁰ See, for instance, the Dambadeṇi Katikāvāṭa from the thirteenth century. See Nandasena Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas. Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon from the 12th Century to the 18th Century*. Munich: R. Kitzinger, 1971, pp. 44–92 and 136–161. These changes were already underway before the *saṅgha* “purification” of Parakramabāhu I in the twelfth century. See R.A.L.H. Gunawardana, *Robe and Plough. Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*. Tucson: The Association for Asian Studies, 1979, pp. 282–312.

³¹ *Ñānavimala Kiriāllē, Pūjāvaliya*. Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1965, p. 805.

³² Agostini, *op. cit.*, pp. 337–338; Saddhatissa, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 3), p. 358.

³³ The colophons to these works are reproduced in Godakumbura, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 12), pp. 56–61.

³⁴ For instance, Geiger, *op. cit.* (cf. n. 12), chapters 8 and 84.

Sean Gaffney

sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gži. Jātakanidāna. A Critical Edition Based on Six Editions of the Tibetan bKa' 'gyur. Jātakanidāna vol. 1. Oxford, New Zealand: Indica et Buddhica, 2018. liv + 269p. € 159,- (ISBN 978-0-473-44461-7 [Hardcover] / 978-0-473-44462-4 [PDF]).

The *sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gži* (Jātakanidāna) is an unusual *bKa' 'gyur* text: first, because it is one of only a few works that were translated into Tibetan from the Pāli; and second, because it is a commentarial text rather than the word of the Buddha and thus one would not expect to find it in the *Bka' 'gyur* at all. The latter anomaly was already briefly discussed by Jampa L. Panglung,¹ and, as Gaffney suggests (pp. xxxivf.), it may well have something to do with the *sūtra*-style introduction found in the Tibetan translation (but not in the extant Pāli version). Yet, ultimately the reasons for the text's inclusion in the *bKa' 'gyur* remain unclear.

The translation was prepared by the Sinhalese *paṇḍita* Ānandaśrī and the Tibetan *lo tsā ba* Ņi ma rgyal mtshan (ca. 1260 – ca. 1330) and thus is a relatively late addition to the body of texts that were rendered into Tibetan during the *bstan pa phyi dar* (“later spread of [Buddhist] teachings [in Tibet]”). While Ņi ma rgyal mtshan, a prolific translator and one of the main teachers of Bu ston rin chen grub, is a well-known figure, Ānandaśrī remains somewhat obscure. There seem to be no Pāli sources on his life or work, and in his introduction Gaffney recapitulates the scant information that is available from Tibetan sources (pp. xxxviff.). This largely tallies with the work of Panglung² and with that of Peter Skilling.³ However, Gaffney's interpretation (pp. xxxviif. and n. 41) of a passage in Bu ston's Chos byuñ to the effect that the *sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gži*, together with a dozen other texts, was translated during Ņi ma rgyal mtshan's extended stay in Nepal is in contradiction to the colophon of the *sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gži* according to which the translation was done in Thar pa gliñ, a place situated to the south of Ža lu in Central Tibet. The relevant passages in the colophon and in the Chos byuñ read as follows:⁴

¹ Zur tibetischen Übersetzung des *Jātakanidāna*. In: *Festschrift Dieter Schlingloff*, ed. by Friedrich Wilhelm. Reinbek 1996, pp. 207–214, at pp. 212f.

² Op. cit. (see n. 1), pp. 208–210.

³ Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 19 (1993) 69–201, at pp. 86–90.

⁴ Cited according to Gaffney's edition, p. 181 and p. xxxvi, n. 34. Instead of *tsatsha* (in *lo tsatsha ba*) I would prefer to read *tstsha* (for 𑖦).

*paṇḍi ta ā nanda śrī'i źal śna nas dañ | mañ du thos pa'i lo tsatsha ba śākya'i dge
sloñ ñi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzañ pos | skad gñis smra ba rnams kyi gdan sa
gsug lag khañ chen po dpal thar pa gliñ du bsgyur ciñ źus te gtan la phab pa'o ||*

And:

*bdag gi bla ma ñi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzañ pos bal por lo bcu bźir sbyaṅs
pa mdzad | ri'i kun dga'i mdo la sogs mdo bcu gsum tsam paṇḍi ta ā nanta śri
spyan drañs te bsgyur ro ||*

Panglung's German translation of the two passages reads as follows:⁵

Dieses [sKyes-pa rabs-kyi gleñ-gźi] wurde von dem Paṇḍita Ānandaśrī und dem gelehrten buddhistischen Mönch Ñi-ma rgyal-mchan dpal-bzañ-po in Śrī Thar-pa-gliñ, dem Sitz der zwei Sprachen Sprechenden [= Locāba] übersetzt, korrigiert und festgelegt.

And:

Mein Lehrer Ñi-ma rgyal-mchan dpal-bzañ-po hat 14 Jahre lang in Nepal studiert. Nachdem er den Paṇḍita Ānandaśrī eingeladen hatte, übersetzte er rund 13 Sūtras, das Gīryanandasūtra usw.

Gaffney's translation of the passage in the Chos byuñ basically agrees with that of Panglung, but obviously the colophon of the sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gźi strongly militates against Gaffney's interpretation that Ñi ma rgyal mtshan and Ānandaśrī translated the text in Nepal.⁶

The Tibetan and the Pāli title (sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gźi / Jātakanidāna) given at the beginning of the Tibetan translation are rendered as "Prologue to the Birth Stories" by Gaffney (p. xxxiii). While both *gleñ gźi* and *nidāna* have an extended range of different meanings, this translation adequately reflects the character of the text, which provides a doctrinal framework matching the various stages in the long spiritual evolution of Gotama, starting with his resolve to become a Buddha, and thus constitutes an introduction to the entire (Pāli) Jātaka collection. In the title of the text, the meaning of *gleñ gźi* / *nidāna* therefore appears to be different from the one in the titles of the text's three chapters, that is, Riñ ba'i gleñ gźi / Dūrenidāna, Bar ba'i gleñ gźi / Avidūrenidāna and Ñe ba'i gleñ gźi / Sāntikenidāna. With Oskar von Hinüber,⁷ *gleñ gźi* / *nidāna* are better rendered as "cause" or "origin" in these chapter titles, in the sense that they treat the causes or origins in the remote, middle and near past that ultimately led to Gotama's enlightenment.

⁵ Op. cit. (see n. 1), p. 209.

⁶ It should be noted that Gaffney does not provide a translation of the colophon.

⁷ *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin – New York 1996, pp. 55f.

Gaffney's introduction also contains a brief but useful discussion on the history and intricate composition of the *Jātakanidāna* as well as on the reputed but highly questionable authorship of Buddhaghosa (pp. xxviii–xxxiii). As Gaffney rightly points out, the composite character of the *Jātakanidāna* does not allow one to “even suggest that the text had an author in the contemporary sense of the term” (p. xxx). A rather surprising factual error is found on pp. xxxviii f., where Gaffney states that the *Mahāvvyutpatti* / *Bye brag tu rtoḡs byed chen mo* was compiled during the *bstan pa phyi dar* and that this was done in “an attempt to standardize the terminology used in the new translations [i.e., those done during the *bstan pa phyi dar*; K.T.]”. He does not provide any evidence for this statement, but most likely it is simply the result of some slip or misreading. Doubtlessly, the dictionary was already compiled during the *bstan pa sna dar*.

The edition of the text is based on the four xylograph *bKa' 'gyurs* from Peking, *sDe dge*, *sNar thañ* and *lHa sa*, and the two manuscript *bKa' 'gyurs* from *sTog* and *Šel dkar* (London), respectively identified by the *sigla* Q, D, N, H, S, L. Gaffney states that in his choice of these six Tibetan witnesses he was “guided by the work of those engaged in the fields of *bKa' 'gyur* and text-critical research” and that this selection “provides a sample view of both *Tshal pa* and *Them spañs ma* textual lineages of the *bKa' 'gyur*” (p. xli). For this purpose, the collation of Q, N, S and L is certainly apposite, but the inclusion of D and especially the twentieth-century witness H seems somewhat questionable. In fact, according to Paul Harrison “one can forget about the later conflated and derivative editions, such as [...] *Derge*, *Lhasa*”.⁸ Because in the transmission of the *sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gži* the *sNar thañ bKa' 'gyur* – some of whose texts follow the tradition of the *Tshal pa* and others that of the *Them spañs ma* group – falls on the *Them spañs ma* side, Q is the only true representative of the *Tshal pa* group in Gaffney's edition and thus the collation of the *Lithang* (*'Jañ sa tham*) *bKa' 'gyur* instead of D and H would have been preferable.⁹

It would have been nice if the edition could have incorporated some of the witnesses of the *sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gži* in those *bKa' 'gyur* collections which have become accessible in more recent times and whose stemmatic position and text-critical value are partly still unclear, such as the ones from *Basgo* (*Ladakh*) and from various sites in *Bhutan*.¹⁰ However, apart from the fact that at least some of these sources may not even have been available when Gaffney

⁸ *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra. A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) Based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment*. Tokyo 1992, p. xlix.

⁹ See also Harrison's deliberations on this, loc. cit. (see n. 8).

¹⁰ See <https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/verif/verif2.php?id=32> (last accessed August 23, 2021).

prepared his edition, limiting the collation to a reasonable number of witnesses, and particularly to those found in some of the more widely used bKa' 'gyurs descending from the Tshal pa and the *Them spañs ma*, certainly makes sense from a practical point of view. The all-encompassing edition of basically any pre-modern text will hardly ever be possible, and considering that nowadays new bKa' 'gyur collections are becoming available at an almost exponential rate this is especially true for bKa' 'gyur texts.

It is to the great benefit of Gaffney's edition that he compared the Tibetan witnesses in detail with the Pāli text as extant in the editions of Viggo Fausbøll¹¹ and Lakshmi Narayan Tiwari.¹² This was not only instrumental in the evaluation of the numerous variant readings in the Tibetan witnesses but it also led Gaffney to conclude that "the Tibetan is a literal rendering of the Pāli text of the *Jātakanidāna*, in much the same way as the Tibetan translations of Sanskrit *sūtras* were literal" (p. xliii). It thus seems that the doubts voiced by some previous scholars as to whether the sKyes pa rabs kyi gñeṅ gzi is really a translation of the Pāli text can be laid to rest.

Gaffney explains the procedure in establishing his edition as follows (p. xli):

The base text used in the preparation of the critical edition is the sTog Palace manuscript edition, making use of its folio numbering and *śad* 'punctuation' throughout. All five other Tibetan editions have then been compared against the sTog Palace edition, and their variants included either in the critical apparatus as variant readings, or depending on their agreeing with, or rather corroborating the Pāli, as the adopted reading in the edition itself.

Given the somewhat erratic use of the *śad* in Tibetan sources in general, Gaffney's approach of following one particular witness in this respect throughout his edition can certainly be justified. However, a short explanation as to why exactly the sTog manuscript was chosen here would have been welcome. Gaffney does not provide any explanation as to how he decided for or against particular Tibetan readings in those cases where the Pāli text does not provide any, or not enough, supporting evidence for a decision. Here the decisions seem to have been made on more general grounds (attestations of particular spellings or morphological forms, grammatical criteria, etc.) and the readings of the sTog manuscript were also not taken over mechanically, as seen, e.g., in nn. 7, 9 (and 12), and 69 in the edition.

The edition itself has been prepared with great care and in my selective reading I noticed only one major lapse: At the very end (p. 181), it is not mentioned that

¹¹ *The Jātaka Together with its Commentary, being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*. Vol. 1. London 1990 (originally published in 1877).

¹² *Paramatthajotikā nāma Jātakaṭṭhakathā*. Varanasi 1992.

the colophon is missing in Q, and perhaps also in L, as unlike for D, H, N and S no colophon is mentioned for L on the text's "Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies" webpage.¹³ Rather curiously, Gaffney even quotes a variant reading for Q (and L) in n. 982 in his edition of the colophon.

The general value of the study is greatly enhanced by three indices (terms, proper names, place names) and eight extensive appendices: I) Tibetan, Sanskrit and Prākṛit parallels to Dhammapada verses, II) Pāli verses from the Theragāthā and Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, III) Miscellaneous Pāli verses from the Vinaya and the Commentaries, IV) Verses in the Jātakanidāna with no identifiable Pāli canonical source, V) Pāli canonical or commentarial sources for verses associated with Jātakas, VI) Tibetan translation of the Buddhavaṃsa verses cited in the Jātakanidāna, VII) Sequential list of Tibetan and Pāli textual variations, VIII) Works of Ņi ma rgyal mtshan listed in the Peking Edition Catalogue and Index.

Kurt Tropper

¹³ See the URL provided in n. 10.

Yasutomo Nishi

Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. Central Asian (Kashgar Manuscript) and Gilgit–Nepalese (Kern–Nanjio's Edition) Recensions of Transcription in Roman Script. Vol. I: Word Index – Vol. II: Reverse Word Index. [Philosophica Mahāyāna Buddhica Monograph Series 1–2]. Tōkyō: Chūō Academic Research Institute, 2019. vi + 262 & iv + 313p. (ISSN 2434-8465).

The work under review consists of a computer-generated word index and a reverse word index to the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka (SP), a Mahāyāna *sūtra* which is one of the most influential Buddhist texts in East Asia, probably also in Central Asia (Khotan),¹ although its influence on Indian Buddhism, judging from the number of citations and commentaries, does not seem to be on a par with its appeal and success elsewhere in the Buddhist world.² The Sanskrit manuscripts of the SP mainly stem from the periphery of the Indian subcontinent, transmitted in Nepal or excavated from various sites in Gilgit and Khotan. The maker of the index, Yasumoto Nishi (henceforth YN), is well informed about the individual Sanskrit manuscripts, which are genealogically categorized into

¹ Oskar von Hinüber, A Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra Manuscript from Khotan. The Gift of a Pious Khotanese Family. *Journal of Oriental Studies* 24 (2014) 134–156, at pp. 147f.

² Jonathan Silk, The Place of the Lotus Sūtra in Indian Buddhism. *Journal of Oriental Studies* 11 (2001) 87–105.

two groups: the Gilgit–Nepalese line on the one hand and the Central Asian (Khotanese) line on the other.³ Apart from his role as maker of the index, YN is the associate director of the Chūō Academic Research Institute (CARI), which is also the publisher of the book series. CARI, in its turn, is affiliated with Risshō Kōseikai (立正佼成会), a lay Buddhist movement and New Religion founded in 1938. Genealogically speaking, Risshō Kōseikai grew out of the Nichiren sect of Japanese Buddhism for which the SP is of greatest significance.

The religious motivation of the present work is made explicit in the preface to the first volume, authored by the director of CARI, who has declared its objective “to clarify Mahayana Buddhist texts, especially the Lotus Sutra, through linguistic study and to seek out the contents of thought that brings us even one step closer to world peace projected by Buddhism [...]” (Vol. I/ii). To a Western audience it is not *prima facie* clear why the SP is accorded such a decisive role in the quest for world peace. The use of the SP to invigorate social actions directed towards world peace is a characteristic shared by Risshō Kōseikai and other SP-based religious bodies in modern Japan.⁴ To that end, YN has stressed, in his laconic introduction (Vol. I/iii),⁵ the importance of reading the SP in its original language, which forms his main research topic.

As to the original language of the SP, YN basically follows Tsuji Naoshirō in adopting what he believes to be a hypothesis developed by Hendrik Kern and Franklin Edgerton, that the SP was originally composed in Middle Indic and was gradually Sanskritized to different extents over the course of its transmission, which led to the various degrees of hybridity as evinced in the extant manuscripts. This hypothesis, however, was not first formulated by Kern,⁶ but by Heinrich Lüders who concluded his 1916 study of the SP fragments in the Hoernle collection with an educated guess “that the text of the Saddharmapundarīka to which both the Central-Asian and the Nepalese MSS. go back,

³ A useful synoptic listing of all extant Sanskrit manuscripts of the SP following their genealogical classification is found on YN’s homepage (<https://www.cari-saddharmapundarika.com/sp-1>, last accessed July 8, 2021).

⁴ The goal of world peace, as Jacqueline Stone demonstrates, has been shaped not so much by the SP as by more recent historical circumstances (e.g., WWII); see Jacqueline Stone, Nichiren’s Activist Heirs. In: C. Queen et al. (ed.), *Action Dharma. New Studies in Engaged Buddhism*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003, pp. 81–88.

⁵ For an expanded version of the introduction, see Yasutomo Nishi, Examining the Sanskritization of the Saddharmapundarīka. A Study of Synonyms in the Text. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 67.3 (2019) 1106–1111.

⁶ As a matter of fact, Kern merely touched upon some linguistic features of the Middle Indic language underlying the verses of the SP, without going so far as to make any strong case for “the original language”; see Hendrik Kern, Additional Note. In: H. Kern – Bunyiu Nanjio, *Saddharmapundarīka*. [Bibliotheca Buddhica 10]. St. Petersburg 1908–1912, pp. x–xi.

was written in a language that had far more prākritisms than either of the two versions,” and he was “even inclined to believe that the original was written in a pure Prākrit dialect which was afterwards gradually put into Sanskrit.”⁷ In order to verify and substantiate this theory, YN has proposed to thoroughly identify “synonyms” and to scrupulously document their distribution across the Sanskrit versions. A comprehensive word index of the Sanskrit manuscripts of the SP, to his mind, will facilitate the identification of “synonyms” so as to uncover the patterns of their distribution (Vol. I/iv).

The term “synonym” does not seem to be clearly defined anywhere in this work. In most cases, it is used to refer to various forms of a given lexeme in Sanskrit, Middle Indic, and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (e.g., *acintya*, *acintiya*, and *acintika*), which have nearly the same meaning. According to the aforesaid theory, the more archaic a manuscript is, the greater the number of Middle Indic elements it contains, while standard Sanskrit forms, which are results of a secondary Sanskritization, mostly occur in younger manuscripts. However, the process of Sanskritization does not merely affect a lexeme on the (morpho-) phonological level, but also takes a heavy toll on its semantics. There are cases of hyper-Sanskritization in which semantically distinct words arise out of one and the same underlying Middle Indic form (for example, *ārya* “noble” and *adya* “now” < **ajja*; *pra-sthā-* “to advance, proceed” and *pra-arth-* “to wish for” < **[p]paṭṭh-*),⁸ and puns based on polysemy in Middle Indic almost always cannot come through in the course of this process.⁹ In other words, there are sets of variant readings that do not consist of synonyms, at least not in the usual sense of this term. YN’s choice of the term “synonym” is thus unfortunate. However, whatever they may be called, the main objective of YN’s index is to facilitate their identification. It will be examined in the following to what extent this objective is achieved, and this will be done on the basis of two factors: (1) the edition or romanized transcripts selected as textual sources; (2) the degree of parsing or the aids compensating for its lack (e.g., cross-references, lemmatization, etc.).

⁷ Heinrich Lüders, Miscellaneous Fragments. In: A.F.R. Hoernle (ed.), *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1916, pp. 1–175, at p. 161. He even ventured to identify the underlying Middle Indic language as Māgadhī on the basis of the vocative plural ending *-āho* (p. 162); see also Oskar von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Wien 2001, p. 234, §322 (< **-ā bho*).

⁸ See Seishi Karashima, Some Features of the Language of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44.3 (2001) §§2.2–3.

⁹ See Ruixuan Chen, An Opaque Pun. Tentative Notes on Kāśyapaparivarta §68. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 61.4 (2018) 369–395.

As the title indicates, the text sources on which the indices are based are the *editio princeps* by Kern and Nanjio (KN)¹⁰ and the romanized transcript of the so-called Kashgar manuscript by Hirofumi Toda (O[Th]),¹¹ which are supposed to represent the Gilgit–Nepalese recension and the Central Asian recension, respectively. The use of KN as representative of the Gilgit–Nepalese recension may raise a few eyebrows, since neither Kern nor Nanjio was in a position to collate any SP manuscripts from Gilgit, which did not come to light until the 1930s. Although the affinity between the Gilgit and Nepalese manuscripts is arguably close relative to the Central Asian line, it is not justifiable to treat the Gilgit manuscripts as if they were *codices descripti* to be eliminated. One may explain away this problem by assuming that the present work is a stepping stone to a larger project which will eventually take the Gilgit manuscripts into account. In that case, still it would have been less confusing had “Gilgit–” been left out of the title. On the other hand, KN is not a hyparchetype of the extant Nepalese manuscripts, but, as J.W. de Jong put it, “neither flesh nor fish”,¹² insofar as it incorporates a number of readings from Central Asian fragments at Kern’s disposal, mainly from O(Th). Kern and his apologists contended that he did not mix up recensions because a Central Asian reading is adopted only in case it seems to be the original or only correct one among variant readings that are close alternatives.¹³ However, according to Seishi Karashima, this principle is not consistently followed and, what is more problematic, Kern’s substitution of Nepalese readings with Central Asian ones is not always indicated.¹⁴ In any case, it is an undeniable fact that KN contains readings which are not attested in any Nepalese manuscripts. A joint concordance of KN and O(Th) thus exaggerates the extent of convergence between the two recensions, since it contains more common readings than those actually shared between the manuscripts from Nepal and those from Khotan.

¹⁰ Kern – Nanjio, op. cit. (cf. n. 6).

¹¹ Hirofumi Toda, *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts. Romanized Text*. Tokushima 1981.

¹² See J.W. de Jong, A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America. *The Eastern Buddhist* 7.2 (1974) 49–82, at p. 55.

¹³ See Kern, op. cit. (cf. n. 6), p. ix. For the voices of Kern’s apologists, the reader is referred *inter alia* to Tilmann Vetter, Hendrik Kern and the Lotussūtra. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism* 2 (1999) 129–141, at pp. 139f. See also Jonathan Silk, Kern and the Study of Indian Buddhism. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 31 (2012) 125–154, at pp. 133f.

¹⁴ See Seishi Karashima, The Triṣṭubh-Jagatī Verses in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism* 19 (2016) 193–210, at p. 193.

Given that O(Th) is a diplomatic edition, it would have made more sense to compare it with the diplomatic edition of a manuscript that occupies an important position in the Nepalese line, for instance, Haruaki Kotsuki's romanized transcript of manuscript R,¹⁵ on which the collation of KN is based. If an older witness of the Nepalese recension is preferable, manuscript K dated in 1069/1070 CE,¹⁶ which was brought from Tibet and is kept at Tōyō Bunko, could have been utilized instead of KN. The base of O(Th), usually dubbed "the Kashgar manuscript", was possibly unearthed at the site of Khādalik in Khotan, while Kashgar is the place where it was purchased by a Russian diplomat. This manuscript used to be considered a seventh-century product, but, as von Hinüber demonstrates, is in fact a copy no earlier than the eighth/ninth century CE,¹⁷ and thus chronologically posterior to the Gilgit manuscripts. Despite some secondary additions and interpolations, this manuscript contains a fair number of Middle Indic archaisms,¹⁸ the analysis of which will undoubtedly be aided by a well-edited word index. And yet, if one were to do justice to the diversity of the Central Asian recension, the oldest SP witness from Khotan, i.e., the Ōtani fragments preserved in the Lüshun Museum (late 5th century CE),¹⁹ should also have been indexed, for they exhibit Middle Indic archaisms missing from both KN and O(Th).²⁰

It remains to be examined whether or not the word indices, as they stand, smooth the way for the identification of variant readings ("synonyms" in YN's terminology). The indices in question are computer-generated using the index-making program developed by Yumi Ousaka et al., which has also been used to index several Pāli texts based on the Pali Text Society's editions. One of the shortcomings of this program, as Eli Franco has pointed out, is its lack of parsing and cross-references so that sandhi clusters and compounds are treated as single words.²¹ This has led to rather severe problems when different conventions of word division are being followed in KN and O(Th), e.g., KN *tadyathā* (1/94)²²

¹⁵ Haruaki Kotsuki, *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (No. 6). *Romanized Text*. Tōkyō 2007.

¹⁶ Hirofumi Toda, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Nepalese Manuscript (K')*. *Tokushima daigaku kyōyō-bu rinrigakku kiyō* [Bulletin of the Department of Ethics, the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Tokushima University] 8 (1980) 1–39, 9 (1982) 1–33, 10 (1982) 1–44, and 11 (1985) 1–44.

¹⁷ Von Hinüber, op. cit. (cf. n. 1), pp. 137f.

¹⁸ See Karashima, op. cit. (cf. n. 14), p. 205.

¹⁹ Zhongxin Jiang, *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection. Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text*. Tōkyō 1997.

²⁰ Karashima, op. cit. (cf. n. 8), pp. 222f.

²¹ See Eli Franco, Review of Y. Ousaka – M. Yamazaki, *Index to the Visuddhimagga* (Oxford 2004). *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 157.1 (2007) 251.

²² The page numbering follows the pagination of the printed edition. Note that the pagination of the digitally available edition (<https://www.cari.ne.jp/Saddhmapundarika/PMB/PMB%20>

= O(Th) *tad* (I/94)* *yathā* (I/193), and when syntagms in O(Th) are substituted in KN with compounds, e.g., KN *śayanāsanopastabdhāḥ* (I/221) ← O(Th) *śayyāsanai* (I/221) *upastabdhā* (I/43). YN has made no attempt at lemmatization, so various forms resulting from nominal inflection and verb conjugation are arranged according to their endings in the reverse word index. The method of reverse indexing, which is otherwise useful for the study of fusional languages, is not always instrumental in identifying Middle Indic elements. This is the case, for instance, with words having plural endings in *-ebhi(s)* (instrumental), *-ebhyas* (ablative), and *-eṣu* (locative), which are used interchangeably across the recensions.²³ The fluidity of inflectional morphemes in Middle Indic more often than not renders the reverse word index futile.

On the other hand, the profundity of the changes triggered by the process of Sanskritization seems to have been underestimated by YN, whose methodology for index-making presupposes a minimal degree of variation on the phonological and lexical levels. Even if the initial and final syllables remain unaltered, a pair of variant readings such as O(Th) *pāracitrakasya* (I/141) and KN *pārijātakasya* (I/142)*²⁴ takes quite some etymological gymnastics to identify, despite the fact that they are printed on two sides of the same piece of paper. What is more, there are cases in which lexical substitution *metri causa* takes place between genuine synonyms that have completely different forms: e.g., KN *putraḥ/-ān* (I/143) ← O(Th) *ātmajaḥ* (I/31) or *aurasā* (I/51), and KN *sattvān* (I/234)* ← O(Th) *prāṇino* (I/157)*.²⁵ In such cases, identification is impossible by dint of the word indices.

All in all, it is my duty as reviewer to acknowledge the extraordinary commitment of YN to the study of the SP, which, because of its multifarious significance, deserves the most thoroughgoing treatment. Be that as it may, it seems that there is still a long way to go before a useful device can be created to comprehensively identify and analyze variant readings in the various recensions of the SP. In the age of digital humanities in which academia now lives, it strikes many scholars as a throwback to produce word indices such as the present volumes, and it becomes increasingly difficult to justify them in the face of text-mining software with advanced search features. For the study of the SP,

Series%201.pdf, last accessed July 15, 2021) is slightly different; in most cases, what is printed at p. *n* is found at p. *n*+1 of the digitally available edition. There are exceptional cases in which the page numbers of both editions coincide; these cases are indicated below by asterisks.

²³ See Karashima, op. cit. (cf. n. 8), §2.8.

²⁴ See Karashima, Hanyi fodian de yuyan yanjiu [Linguistic Studies of the Chinese Translations of Buddhist Canonical Texts]. *Suyuyan yanjiu* [Studies of Vernacular Chinese] 4 (1997) 29–49, at p. 33.

²⁵ See Karashima, op. cit. (cf. n. 14), p. 201.

the future is perhaps rather to be sought, for instance, in the development of semi-automated, interactive visual alignment of its multiple Sanskrit versions, a technology that has been applied to medieval French literature.²⁶ In this regard, it might be time for the field of Indology and Buddhist Studies, just like other fields of the humanities, to bid farewell to word indices or, by way of a classic Buddhist metaphor, to leave the raft after having reached the other shore.

Ruixuan Chen

²⁶ Stefan Jänicke – David Joseph Wrisley, Interactive Visual Alignment of Medieval Text Versions. In: Brian Fisher, Shixia Liu and Tobias Schreck (ed.), *2017 IEEE Conference on Visual Analytics Science and Technology. Phoenix, Arizona, USA, 1–6 October 2017. Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society 2017, pp. 127–138.

Ivan Andrijić – Sven Sellmer (ed.)

On the Growth and Composition of the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas. Relationship to Kāvya. Social and Economic Context. Proceedings of the Fifth Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, August 2008. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2016. XXXVI + 536p. US\$ 60,- (ISBN 978-953-7997-28-1).

Under the aegis of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ivan Andrijić and Sven Sellmer edited in 2016 this impressive volume of the proceedings of the Fifth Dubrovnik Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas (DICSEP 5), held in August 2008.

After an accurate and informative Preface by the General Editor, Mislav Ježić, and the partially overlapping but insightfully critical introductory essay by Greg Bailey, the book boasts nineteen articles, all written in English by a spectacular plethora of leading scholars in the field as well as a few younger researchers, resulting in a total sum of more than 500 pages of clearly penned, state-of-the-art scholarship. The editors cleverly organized the inevitably multifarious contributions within five well thought-out sections: (1) Growth of the Sanskrit Epic and Purāṇic Texts (4 essays); (2) Social and Economic Context (6 essays); (3) Composition and Narrative Strategies in the Purāṇas (3 essays); (4) The Sanskrit Epics and Kāvya (4 essays); and (5) Word Studies (2 essays). Among the variety of theories and approaches (be they historical and compositional or literary and structural), what is maybe the crucial recurring theme of the majority of essays is aptly pinpointed by Bailey: “[T]he hypothesis that the *Mahābhārata* is somewhat of a clearing house for the presentation of a more expansive view of the world than what is found in the Vedic literature, whilst simultaneously

preserving the Vedic brahmin as an essential cultural marker in society” (p. 3). The volume is smoothly rounded off by the list of Contributors, two carefully redacted indices (Index of Passages Cited and General Index) and a section with summaries of the papers and a table of contents in Croatian, in order to at least implicitly contextualize, if not defy, the hegemonic nature of the English language in contemporary South Asian Studies. The very professional editorial care and the aesthetically pleasing and reader-friendly results also deserve a special mention in the current worldwide decline of these undervalued qualities of what actually makes a book.

No single essay is below the high standards required by such a prestigious publication. The first section of the volume opens with “The Archetypal Design of the Two Sanskrit Epics”, a masterful paper signed by Alf Hiltebeitel. As in some of his previous research, the celebrated American scholar, one of the major world experts of the Sanskrit epics, focuses on the heroines of the two story-worlds, Draupadī and Sītā, by tracing parallels and similarities amongst crucial moments of their life stories (birth, marriage and encounters with monsters). Most importantly, his contention is that the common, underlying archetypal design is first taken up by the Mahābhārata and then redeployed and updated in the Rāmāyaṇa.

The volume continues with a paper by Oliver Hellwig, “A Computational Approach to the Text History of the *Rāmāyaṇa*”, which offers a very sophisticated machine-based analysis of semantic and lexical units of Vālmīki’s epic with the aim of reconstructing compositional layers in the text. The computational method is thoroughly described in the paper and its results confirm Brockington’s famous assessment of the Rāmāyaṇa’s layering, with the first and the seventh books representing a later stage of composition. Book 2 is also singled out by Hellwig’s analysis as standing out with respect to the core of the epic, also in accordance with Brockington’s conceptions and possibly corroborating the more daring hypothesis of the following essay in the volume.

Mislav Ježić’s “*Rāmāyaṇa* and *Dasarathajātaka*” first reiterates the conclusions of previous scholarship by the same author: the core books of the Rāmāyaṇa, from books 3 through 6, present the underlying structure of a fairy tale, as they match closely the scheme created by Vladimir Propp. Second, it argues that “book 2, completed with a finale similar to that found at the end of book 6, existed as an independent and complete story which directly inspired the version of the Rāma story in the *Dasarathajātaka*” (p. IX) and, basically *contra* Brockington, that this second book was the earliest kernel of the epic, to which the so-called core books were added only after the redaction of the Jātakas.

The next article, “Cosmogony in the Transition from Epic to Purāṇic Literature” by Horst Brinkhaus, is an accurate philological analysis of two cosmogonic myths (one more in the spirit of Sāṃkhya, the other closer to the ancient Vedic model) and their combination across multiple sources, namely, the Mahābhārata, the Harivaṃśa, the Mānavadharmasāstra and four Purāṇas (Viṣṇu, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Mārkaṇḍeya). The final, historical aim that the essay successfully achieves is to show how the Harivaṃśa plays a transitional role between the material found in the Mahābhārata and how the later texts draw on this source.

The social and economic context of the epics is the focus of the second section of the volume. Its first essay is tersely titled “Āśramas, Agrahāras, and Monasteries”. In this textually rich account of several religious institutions across numerous sources, both textual and epigraphical, Johannes Bronkhorst offers the well-documented hypothesis that the two institutions of *āśramas* and *agrahāras* must have mostly overlapped in practice as places of Vedic study and performance of rites. Furthermore, according to the author the idyllic depiction of *āśramas* in the epics and later Brahminical texts is one of many clear signs of the historical need for Brahmin communities to advertise in front of potential royal donors their then-burgeoning institutional bodies as a valid alternative to the successful monasteries of Buddhists, Jains and Ājīvikas.

In the following article, “A Probe for Economic Data in the *Mārkaṇḍeyasamāsyaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (3,179–221)”, Greg Bailey offers a very original, economic and partially historical interpretation of a passage on the progressively declining epochs of mankind (*yuga*), which is normally understood in mythological and religious terms. The dire portrayal of social and economic disarray is implicitly ascribed, according to the terminological analysis carried out by the author, to the malicious agency of ascetic groups, Buddhists in particular. Obviously, this can once again be interpreted as part of the marketing strategy of Brahmins in search of royal patronage. More interestingly from a historical perspective, the same passage could be seen as expressing “the brahmins’ corporate anxiety about the transformation from small to large-scale societies where different modes of wealth acquisition are practised and kings are becoming more involved in raising taxes and wealth redistribution” (p. 8).

The crucial figure of the Vṛātyas takes center stage in the two following articles. Yaroslav Vassilkov’s “The *Mahābhārata* and the Non-Vedic Aryan Traditions” combines textual studies, archeology and anthropology in order to identify a pre-Vedic type of “pastoral heroic” society and to isolate some of its characteristics (for instance, the cow as a paradigmatic form of wealth). This culture, akin to brotherhoods of unmarried warriors attested in other Indo-European sources,

would represent the ancient background against which Vedic culture was an underrepresented newcomer and a dangerously rival societal form.

Tiziana Pontillo's paper "Droṇa and Bhīṣma as Borderline Cases in Brāhmaṇical Systematization: a Vrātya Pattern in the *Mahābhārata*" is a detailed survey of an impressive number of *vrātya* elements in the epic. Its daring and powerfully argued conclusion is that the orthodox class division between warrior/sacrificer and priest/officiant is a new pattern that substituted the *vrātya* model in which the same social agents would play both roles in different circumstances, the two heroic characters of the title being the paradigmatic figures of the ancient system that was bound to die for the new to take hold.

The self-immolation of widows on their husbands' funeral pyres (*sahagamana*) is the focus of "How Did Mādrī Die and Why Was She Burnt Twice?" by Przemysław Szczurek. On the basis of a perusal of juridical, poetical and epic sources composed over almost two millennia, the author shows how the practice of *sahagamana*, originated among the military aristocracy, became progressively more and more accepted in brahmanical circles, which explains its marginality in the oldest epic strata as well as the narrative discrepancies in the account of Mādrī's demise.

"The Strange Story of Princess Mādhavī" by Danielle Feller is a multi-faceted analysis of the extremely complex life of king Yayāti's daughter and the boon granted to her to regain virginity after the birth of each of her sons from her four husbands. Two main lines of interpretation are offered: Mādhavī as paradigmatic of the position of women as sexual objects and mere instruments of reproduction; and, more interestingly, Mādhavī as a capsized symbol of the sacrificial horse in the *aśvamedha* and therefore an emblem of the interconnected natures of kingly power and human fertility.

The articles of the third section move to the Purāṇas and their composition. Renate Söhnen-Thieme's "Mapping the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*: Framework, Dialogue Structures, Time Concepts, and Other Narrative Strategies" fully delivers what it promises: a carefully researched analysis of the complex structural and compositional layers of the arguably most important specimen of purāṇic literature. Indebtedness, appropriation and replacement in authority are the key aspects of the relation of the Bhāgavata with its three most important textual sources: the Mahābhārata, the Viṣṇupurāṇa and the Jain tradition.

In his "Textual Strategies, Empowerment and 'True' Discourse in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*", McComas Taylor focuses on the complex relation between text and audience. He analyses the formidable claims to power and authority that the Bhāgavata makes through its textual strategies of empowerment, such as the use of authoritative fictional meta-authors (Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Nārada, etc.), the sacred

landscapes chosen as places for its recitation, the references to its superiority to the Vedic tradition coupled with the paradoxical self-representation as the culmination of the Veda, etc. The exceptional reception history of this most influential purāṇic text, epitomized by the week-long recitations of the text that still take place today in Vṛndāvana and Mathurā, testifies to the success of its legitimizing techniques.

Strategies of interfaith persuasion and dissuasion are the focus of Kenneth Valpey's "Precept, Practice and Persuasion: Truth and Heresy in the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*". The studied portions of the text stage a heated polemic against the heretic naked ascetics belonging to the renunciatory traditions by recounting how their heterodox views had been proclaimed by Viṣṇu himself, in the form of Māyāmohinī, the "Magic Deluder", in order to deceive the Asuras and thus win by ruse the battle against evil. Whether this narrative stratagem betrays a feeling of upcoming danger or a sense of brahmanical confidence remains an interesting open question.

The following section, dealing with the relationship between the epics and *kāvya* tradition, opens with a masterful article by Patrick Olivelle, "Aśvaghōṣa and the Brahmanical Theology of the Epics and the Dharmasāstras". Reiterating and expanding decades-long research into the historical dynamics among early Indian traditions, the author shows how Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddhacarita* can be interpreted as a concerted response and reaction to the whole brahmanical culture of his time, from the epics to the Dharma literature. This deeply intertextual nature of the *Buddhacarita* is shown in its reinterpretations and disruptions of brahmanical doctrines such as the concept of *trivarga*, shunned in favor of the up-front pursuit of liberation, or the old-fashioned notion of *dharma*, updated as the *saddharma*, the "true *dharma*" of Buddhism.

The second article of this section, Klara Gönc Moaçanin's "The *Nalopākhyāna* Seen through the Lens of *Kāvya*", highlights the *kāvya* elements of both style and content within the famous tale and argues that the love story of Nala and Damayantī was most probably an independent literary composition later on interpolated in the original epic and originally based on a fairy tale.

"The Repudiation of Sītā in Canto XX of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* with Special Reference to the Use of Imperatives" by Lidia Sudyka compares the episode in the *Rāmāyaṇa* with its treatment by the seventh-century poet-grammarian who set out to treat Pāṇini's grammar in his work by illustrating it through the *Rāma* story. The results of the analysis of canto XX and its use of imperatives highlight how the figure of Sītā in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* is imbued with honor and strength, which bestow upon her a more elevated moral status than in Vālmīki's epic.

The paper by Anna Bonisoli Alquati, “Rāma’s Story in Kālidāsa’s *Raghuvamśa*”, is a literary study of the famous *kāvya* and its intertextual relation with its obvious source for the Rāma story, the Rāmāyaṇa. A particular focus of the article is the authorial agency of the poet, expressed in the numerous changes to the epic material and its rearrangements that Kālidāsa successfully weaves into the plot in order to fulfill his two purposes: the evocation of poetic emotions and keeping the focus on the dynastic history.

The last two papers of the volume zoom in all the way to the level of individual words and the worlds of meanings that they encompass. Of extreme interest for psychologically oriented researchers like the present reviewer is the article by Sven Sellmer, “Aspects of *manas* in the *Mahābhārata*”, in which an extensive survey of the grammatical uses and semantic nuances of the term within the narrative portions of the epic (i.e., leaving out the theory-laden didactic portions) offers a very important step towards the formulation of an implicit “epic psychology” and the clarification of the exact semantic field covered by the term *manas*.

“Sanskrit Reciprocal Pronouns: Their Semantics and Use in the Epics and *Arthaśāstra*” by Leonid Kulikov is the last article of the volume. This essay is a linguistic study of three terms usually considered as synonyms in Sanskrit: *anyonyam*, *parasparam* and *itaretaram*. Although it proved impossible to find a uniform rationale of their use across all consulted sources (possibly also because in the case of the epic the choice of words heavily depends on metrical exigency), Kulikov argues that at least in the *Arthaśāstra* “*Paraspara-* is used in contexts of inimical activities, or, at any rate, referring to the activities that have some negative consequences [...]. By contrast, *anyonya-* is employed in other cases – that is, in the contexts of friendly or neutral activities” (p. 474).

To conclude, the volume *On the Growth and Composition of the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas* is a very important contribution to contemporary scholarship in the field, and it was a pleasure to read and shortly review its contents as a “teaser” for prospective readers in search of extraordinarily deep insights into the interconnected realms of narration, religion and society in Sanskrit culture.

Daniele Cuneo

Gavin Flood – Charles Martin

The Bhagavad Gita. A New Translation. [Norton Critical Editions]. London – New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2015. xviii + 206p. US\$ 13,95 (ISBN 978-0-393-34513-1).

In diesem dreiteiligen schmalen Band legen Gavin Flood (Direktor des Centre for Hindu Studies at Oxford University) und Charles Martin (Dichter und Autor, New York) erstens eine Neuübersetzung der Bhagavadgītā vor, flankiert zweitens von der Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad und Auszügen (zu Kapitel 13) aus einigen klassischen indischen Kommentaren (an erster Stelle von Śāṅkara und Rāmānuja) sowie Hinweisen auf die unvermeidlichen modernen Kommentatoren Tilak und Aurobindo, sowie drittens einige als kritische Auseinandersetzung bezeichnete Essays von John L. Brockington, Arvind Sharma, Rudolf Otto, Eric Sharpe und Christopher A. Bayly, die dekontextualisiert nacheinander abgedruckt sind.

Die Übersetzung ist sauber erarbeitet und gut lesbar, bietet aber kaum neue Einsichten. Sie beansprucht, analog statt imitativ zu sein, und nicht Zeile für Zeile, sondern Vers für Vers vorzugehen; die “heroischen Epitheta” für Kṛṣṇa und Arjuna werden beibehalten, um einen Eindruck zu vermitteln von der Gesellschaft, die in der Gītā beschrieben wird, die also “archaic, heroic, and on the edge of its catastrophic doom” gewesen sei (p. xviii).

Der zweite Teil, mit “Contexts” betitelt, präsentiert die verlässliche Übersetzung der Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad von Patrick Olivelle (erschienen 2008 bei Oxford University Press), weil diese Upaniṣad und die Gītā vor allem durch ihre theistische Ausrichtung eng verwandt seien. Das ist *common sense*, und die weniger als eine Seite umfassende Einleitung zum Text kann selbstverständlich keine historisch-kritische Kontextualisierung bieten, geschweige denn eine zumindest grobe Begründung der Datierungs- und Stilfragen diskutieren. Die wenigen Sätze bieten nicht mehr, als was in jedem Lexikon zu lesen ist. Auch die Textauszüge aus Śāṅkaras und Rāmānujas Kommentaren sind nur ein Neuabdruck der weit bekannten Übersetzungen, wie von Śāṅkaras Kommentar durch A. Mahadeva Sastri (1891 und weitere Ausgaben und Nachdrucke, ab 1918 auch mit dem Sanskrit-Text), unter Bezug auf Shastri Gajānana Śambhu Sādhales Ausgabe des Textes zusammen mit elf Kommentaren von 1935 (Nachdruck Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1992). Eine Einordnung in die indische Religionsgeschichte fehlt.

Der dritte Teil zu den moderneren Auseinandersetzungen mit der Gītā erscheint als eher zufällig: Warum gerade diese Auswahl getroffen wurde, wird nicht begründet. Es fällt auf, dass ausschließlich englischsprachige Autoren aufge-

führt werden (mit der Ausnahme von Rudolf Otto in englischer Übersetzung); Kommentare und kritische Studien in anderen europäischen Sprachen werden nicht zur Kenntnis genommen, ganz zu schweigen von den Studien, die die japanische oder chinesische Religionswissenschaft hervorgebracht hat. Man hätte ferner gern gewusst, ob es eine religiöse, wissenschaftliche oder künstlerische Auseinandersetzung mit der Gītā in Afrika, in Mittel- und Südamerika und im islamischen Nahen Osten gibt; es gibt sie, aber die Autoren nehmen davon keinerlei Notiz. Am interessantesten ist der Beitrag des im Jahre 2015 verstorbenen Indien-Historikers und Direktors des Cambridge Centre of South Asian Studies Christopher A. Bayly, der deutlich macht, dass die Gītā zu ihrer Prominenz aufgestiegen ist, als Indien im Zuge der Entkolonialisierung eine neue politische und staatsphilosophische Identität suchte. Das ist zwar keine neue These, aber sie wird kundig und pointiert vorgestellt. Baylys Fazit ist: Die Gītā brauchte für ihre Relevanz das neue Indien mehr als umgekehrt. Die nationalistisch-ausgrenzende Rhetorik von RSS und neuer Rechten in der BJP, die die Gītā für ihre Zwecke (um)interpretieren, beängstigt den weitsichtigen Historiker: er ist jeder Normativität von Schriftreligionen wegen der “tendency to moral exclusionism and the possibility of political manipulation for murderous ends” (p. 203) abhold. Eine Debatte dieser These angesichts der widersprüchlichen und nur kontextualisiert verständlichen Texte der Gītā im historisch-kritischen Diskurs bleibt aus.

Michael von Brück

Kerstin Schier

The Goddess's Embrace. Multifaceted Relations at the Ekāmrānātha Temple Festival in Kanchipuram. [Ethno-Indology, Heidelberg Studies in South Asian Rituals 15]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2018. xiv + 212p. € 54,- (ISBN 978-3-447-11134-8).

This monograph, as its title shows, deals with the major annual festival of the Ekāmrānātha temple in Kanchipuram, which celebrates and re-enacts the divine marriage between Ekāmrānātha (a form of Śiva) and Kāmākṣī, or, more precisely, her local ectype, Ēlavārkuḷali, in contemporary ritual. The book is the published version of the author's PhD thesis, defended five years earlier at the University of Oslo. Although it is written in a fairly fluid style, it still bears the mark of a thesis at some points, with a few repetitive conclusions and slightly too personal remarks such as (p. 5) “I tried to absorb as much as possible of the festival.”

Methodologically, the author follows Axel Michaels¹ and other scholars who propose to combine Indian philology or textual–historical studies and anthropology under the heading of “Ethno-Indology.” Accordingly, she also presents a historical overview of the festival, although the focus remains on contemporary performance.

Since the anthropological aspect dominates her research, one would expect that the author has full command of the language of the festival and ritual participants, namely modern spoken Tamil. However, while Kerstin Schier is not unfamiliar with this language, she admittedly (p. ix) does not have a proficient command of it and thus relied on the help of interpreters throughout her research, whether for spoken or written Tamil. Her honesty in this respect is laudable, especially because many other researchers equally depend on interpreters without admitting their lack of full linguistic competence. Anthropological research and participant observation (if one may still use this controversial term) would nevertheless be more authentic with a full command of the languages of the communities studied. Schier has nonetheless been able to turn this drawback to her advantage, by letting her field assistant (Subramanian) establish the first contact and thus act as a mediator. Moreover, as Schier remarks on p. 8: “In India it is proper conduct to let the man speak first and questions are often directed to the man, even when they actually address the woman.” Thus, the assistant did not only act as an interpreter but also as a mediator across gender barriers.

The monograph follows a coherent order of presentation. Chapter one describes the temple with its surroundings and their physical aspects as found today, with an attempt to reconstruct the architectural formation of the temple as much as possible. Chapter two examines the festival from a historical perspective and how it figures in the normative literature (such as in Aghoraśivācārya’s *Mahotsavavidhi*), which is then contrasted with its contemporary version according to the author’s observations. Chapter three presents and analyses nine textual versions of the major myth, namely of the divine marriage. Each presentation takes into account the context of the version under discussion and compares its details to those of the others, in order to determine both a common shared core and the historical and contextual variations. In Chapter four, a detailed description of the most important ritual day follows, including the description of all particular events and their oral interpretations by the participants. Chapter five portrays the three goddesses that appear in the procession and ritual, and tries to retrace the origin of the goddess Ēlavārkuḷali, who perhaps replaced a

¹ Axel Michaels, General Preface to the “Heidelberg Studies in South Asian Rituals”. In: *Words and Deeds. Hindu and Buddhist Rituals in South Asia*. [Ethno-Indology 1], ed. by Jörg Gengnagel, Ute Hüsken and Srilata Raman. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005, pp. 7–13.

goddess called Baṅgāru Kāmākṣī when the image of the latter was moved to Thanjavur at the end of the seventeenth century. Chapter six focuses on the ways participants perceive the ritual. They include priests, various family groups and residents of the city, donors and couples who go to the temple to get married along with the divine couple. Finally, Chapter seven proposes an interpretation of the divine marriage as a commemorative ceremony that forms and transmits a collective cultural memory. The conclusion discusses further implications and potential themes for future research.

Although anthropological research dominates the monograph, it also contains significant findings on the basis of textual–historical research. For example, following Ayyar 1965² it confirms that originally the temple was probably that of a pillar deity (Kampan̄ or Ēkampan̄) and that the association with a mango tree may date from some time after the twelfth century. On the basis of inscriptional evidence, the author also shows that “it seems possible that the deities’ marriage has not always been associated with Paṅkuṇi Uttiram, or at least not as prominently as it is today.” It is also demonstrated, through a detailed analysis of nine text passages on the divine marriage, that three major currents influenced their narratives: the *bhakti* movement, the pan-Indian mythological tradition and Āgamic Śaivism of the Siddhānta. Here, perhaps a slightly more nuanced and more historical analysis would have been welcome.

Concerning the goddesses involved, namely, Kāmākṣī, Āti Kāmākṣī Kālīkāmpāl, Baṅgāru Kāmākṣī and Ēlavārkuḷali, the author shows how through the interplay of their histories their identities mingle, get separated and renewed in the course of centuries, in a constant interaction between local and pan-Indian traditions.

The most important contribution of the author remains nonetheless the anthropological study, which presents original findings, analyses them in their context and relates them, whenever possible, to the written tradition, such as on p. 105: “[...] the pan-Indian motif of Pārvatī’s jealousy is made manifest locally in Kanchipuram in the form of a jealousy between Ēlavārkuḷali and Kāmākṣī.” Several peculiarities of the living oral tradition are also highlighted, for instance the popular legend according to which a cat’s crossing the marriage rituals is a bad omen and therefore requires a renewed celebration of the marriage each year. Most significantly, the author shows in detail how local traditions are formed: the change of the goddess’s procession which ends up moving through every street of Okkapiranthan Kulam, her visits to the houses along the road, the adoption of the *kāvaṭi* and of divine possession from the cult of Murukan̄, the acquisition and the splitting of the right to perform the divine marriage, etc.

² V. Ramnatha Ayyar, Development of the Name and Composition of a Divine Symbol at Kāñcī. *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 29 (1965) 144–176.

The study is enriched with numerous photographs, plans and maps to illustrate the divine and human participants in the ritual, and the localities where the festival takes place. The only chapter that seems to add relatively little to what has previously been said is Chapter seven on the formation of cultural memory. After a definition of what is meant by this title, this chapter is basically a summary of the rites as commemorative ceremonies and re-enactments.

There are only a few typos and problems concerning English style or the transcription of words in Indian languages. See, for instance,³

p. 34: *deteiled* for *detailed*;

p. 87: *ākṣamālā* for *aṣṣamālā*, *sukarūpaka* for *śukarūpaka*, *dhenus* for *dhenu*, *gaṅgā/hīrtha* for *gaṅgātīrtha*;

p. 48, n. 32: [...] references to the marriage are rare in medieval inscriptions *and if*, they come from Viṣṇu temples. *In contrary to Śaiva texts* the marriage ritual is treated at some length in Vaiṣṇava texts, *thus, she suggests, that* the marriage was ritually more important for Vaiṣṇavas than for Śaivas.

There is only one major scholarly error I have identified, but it is not a negligible one. It concerns the Skandapurāṇa: “[...] there are scholars such as Bakker, who do believe that an ‘original’ *Skanda Purāṇa* existed as a single and coherent text” (p. 81, n. 29). Schier seems to be completely unaware of the Skandapurāṇa project⁴ launched in 1990, and of the discovery of the earliest recension of the Skandapurāṇa datable to the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century CE. The project, which involves the critical edition of this major Śaiva Purāṇa, published the fifth volume of the Sanskrit text together with a synopsis in 2021 and has produced several important monographs, volumes of collected articles, and papers by Hans Bakker, Peter Bisschop, Elizabeth Cecil, Yuko Yokochi and others.⁵ Thus, it is certainly not the whim of a single scholar who maintains an erroneous belief in a non-existing *Urtext*.

Notwithstanding these few shortcomings, Kerstin Schier’s monograph is a richly documented original piece of research which will probably remain a point of reference for anyone interested in the Ekāmrānātha temple festival in Kanchipuram.

Judit Törzsök

³ Typographical errors or other problems are set in italics.

⁴ For the most recent phase of this project, see <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/research/research-projects/humanities/the-skandapurāṇa-project#tab-1> (last accessed August 23, 2021).

⁵ For these publications, see <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/research/research-projects/humanities/the-skandapurāṇa-project#tab-3> (last accessed August 23, 2021).

James Mallinson – Mark Singleton

Roots of Yoga. Translated and Edited with an Introduction. [Penguin Classics]. [London:] Penguin Books, 2017. xl + 540p. £ 10,99 (ISBN 978-0-241-25304-5).

The book under discussion is divided into eleven chapters, each focusing on a central term or practice of yoga, such as “Posture”, “Mantra” or “*Samādhi*”. Preceding these chapters is a very concise introduction to the entire book, which sketches the history of yoga, discusses scholarship on yoga and explains the structure of the work.

Each of the eleven chapters begins with a short introduction, which gives a historical overview of the practice under discussion and contextualizes it. One to two pages of “Chapter Contents” follow, which list the names of the texts from which passages have been extracted and translated. In most chapters, the passages are grouped according to specific themes and are presented in chronological order within these subsections. The major part of each chapter is taken up by the translations of the selected passages.

Passages from an impressive number and range of texts have been extracted. The authors note that the number of texts used exceeds one hundred. The material dates from the time of the Atharvaveda to the middle of the nineteenth century CE. Genres range from philosophical treatises to works of poetry, such as Kālidāsa’s *Kumārasambhava*. The original material presented in translation is written in various languages, including Sanskrit, Middle-Indic dialects, Old Marathi, Bengali, Kashmiri and Tibetan.

Some of the material was previously published elsewhere but has been retranslated here; in other cases text from published translations has been extracted and included in the book. It is noteworthy that the authors have made an effort to include material from vernacular languages to balance out the numerous passages from Sanskrit texts, and that they also included Buddhist and Jain texts.

The extracted passages not only describe various aspects of yogic practice but also include portions of text that are critical of yoga (pp. 39ff.). I found these passages particularly interesting, since they offer new perspectives other groups have had on yoga, and material that previously was hardly known to scholars.

The translations of the extracted passages are faithful to the originals and yet readable, as far as I could check. However, given the lack of context provided, they are often hard to understand. Thus, the important definition of yoga in the *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad* requires an interpretation, which the introduction to the chapter does not offer. The well-known passage states that “yoga is the arising and the passing away” and has been interpreted in different ways. Similarly, the beau-

tiful passage from the verses of the fourteenth-century poetess Lallā remains obscure. The same is true of the passage from the Gorakṣa Bijay and a long passage from the Atharvaveda (p. 137). The reader who is trying to understand these passages will have to look for other translations and published studies on these works. The obscurity of some of the material is a concern, since the introductions to the individual chapters do not supply more information and interpretations of such passages. One could try to address this issue in the next edition of the book. Additional notes on the translated passages could provide much needed information. One could also present fewer text extracts but add more detailed explanations. Although scholars will be grateful for the large number of text portions included in the book, the general reader will derive more benefit from the latter approach. Currently there is the danger that the general reader will get lost in the details of the material presented.

Roots of Yoga is similar in format to other “roots” books published by Penguin. Dominik Wujastyk’s *Roots of Ayurveda*¹ in particular has provided one model (see p. 488). It contains fewer but longer extracts from texts, each explained in more detail, an approach which facilitates a better understanding of the material. *The Roots of Vedānta*² has an even narrower focus on the works of or attributed to a single author. It offers longer portions of text, which are explained to a broader readership with few annotations. Of these three books, the volume on Vedānta is the most accessible (and least scholarly), and *Roots of Yoga*, due to its scope and conciseness, the least accessible. Unlike in *Roots of Ayurveda*, where footnotes are used, the notes for each chapter of *Roots of Yoga* (except for the introduction) are placed at the end of the book, in the order of the chapters. This arrangement is not uncommon, but is nevertheless inconvenient for the reader and often leads to time-consuming searching and turning over of pages, making the book less user-friendly.

Although also intended for a general readership and not merely for the scholarly community (p. xxvi), *Roots of Yoga* will be most useful to scholars, who will value it as a rich collection of material and an important reference work. On the university level, the book will be helpful for graduate students but is not suitable as a textbook for the instruction of undergraduate students.

Roots of Yoga is an impressive sourcebook for the scholar, offering a wealth of new and important information on yoga, much of which awaits further detailed

¹ *The Roots of Ayurveda. Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings*. Translated with an introduction and notes by Dominik Wujastyk. London: Penguin Books, 2003 (third and revised edition).

² *The Roots of Vedānta. Selections from Śaṅkara’s Writings*. Selected, edited and introduced by Sudhakshina Rangaswami. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2012.

analysis. The book is the result of a bold undertaking, in which two scholars have made accessible to us a huge body of material.

Gudrun Bühnemann

Christian Coseru

Perceiving Reality. Consciousness, Intentionality, and Cognition in Buddhist Philosophy. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. xvii + 356p. US\$ 78,- (ISBN 978-0-19-984338-1).

Over the past decades some scholars primarily trained in philosophy departments in European and North American universities have devoted book-length studies to investigate Indian and Buddhist philosophical thought from the standpoint of contemporary Western philosophical concerns. In *Perceiving Reality* (hereafter *PR*) Christian Coseru aims to make the Buddhist epistemological program continuous with and relevant to contemporary philosophical concerns, and “to propose novel solutions to enduring and genuinely universal philosophical problems” (p. 6). The author discusses and argues for a naturalized approach to Indian Buddhist epistemology, with phenomenology and analytical philosophy of mind forming the conceptual framework for an exploration of perceptual awareness. Phenomenology, in particular, is said to be “inescapable” as it offers an account of experience that is “capable of capturing the specific ways of our *being-in-the-world*, a world that is inseparable from its mode of apprehension” (p. 271; see also p. 291). While giving due recognition to the views of his predecessors, from Bimal K. Matilal to Tom Tillemans and George Dreyfus,¹ Coseru offers a philosophical discussion of self-awareness as constitutive of perception primarily based on the *Tattvasaṃgraha* and the commentary on it, the *Pañjikā*, composed by the eighth-century Indian Buddhist epistemologists Śāntarākṣita and Kamalaśīla, respectively. Several sections, especially in chapters 7 and 8, rely on the views of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti, the philosophers who laid the foundations of the Buddhist tradition of epistemic enquiry between the fifth and seventh century.

Methodological issues are dealt with at length in chapter 2, which presents a nuanced overview of methods applied in the study of Indian philosophy and more specifically Buddhist epistemology in the past decades. Larger questions about perception in relation to knowledge and conception are discussed in the final chapter 9. Here, based on Roger Jackson’s claim concerning the optimism about the possibility of knowledge reflected by the Buddhist epistemological

¹ Dreyfus’ *Recognizing Reality* is echoed in the title of the book; see p. 26, n. 28.

model, the author argues that the phenomenological reflection shows how such a possibility is found beyond the distinction of “seeing” and “seeing as” because “seeing reveals an intentional relation that does not detach it from seeing as” (p. 281).

Within the framework provided by these two chapters, the author presents a detailed description of Indian Buddhist epistemology “as a system of pragmatic or context-dependent reasoning” (p. 34). Chapter 3 offers a useful overview of the descriptions of consciousness and cognition that appear in the Nikāyas and in Abhidharmic literature, which are the backdrop against which Buddhist epistemology developed. The author observes that the model of cognitive dynamics of the Abhidharmic tradition shows how perception follows the sense and not the object, which becomes a percept only when it enters “the horizon of awareness” (p. 84). This model is linked with Edmund Husserl’s concept of a world of lived experience (*Lebenswelt*) as well as Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s view of the world as a meaningful realm of experience (pp. 66f.). Chapter 4 provides a highly informative account of the Indian philosophical debate on the tension between direct perception and conceptualization, which also includes language. The interplay between the author’s methodological background and his philosophical considerations is especially evident here. For example, Coseru refers to the importance of a “historically anchored and philosophically edifying” approach in the reconstruction of the thought of past philosophers (pp. 109f.); the adopted strategy of naturalization, which consists in “bridging the gap between phenomenology and natural science” and including the mental in the natural (p. 115); or the role of anti-psychologist tendencies in assessing the value of Buddhist and more in general Indian thought (p. 118).

Chapters 5 and 6 illustrate the purpose of Śāntarakṣita’s and Kamalaśīla’s epistemological project and their discourse concerning perception as an epistemic modality which is devoid of concepts and non-deceptive, and is therefore the basis for effective action. With regard to the purpose of their project, *PR* connects the insights deriving from listening, thinking, and meditating – an Abhidharmic model related to the Buddhist path to liberation – to the understanding of the interdependent arising of phenomena (pp. 133f.). However, it fails to clarify the nature of such an understanding and the reason for its importance, which lies in its connection with liberation from suffering. In chapter 6, the lengthy exploration of perception according to Buddhist epistemology emphasizes the separation between perception and conceptualization, and provides an introduction to how the Buddhist epistemologists’ position can be seen from a phenomenological point of view, also hinting at Kamalaśīla’s commitment to a sort of sensory-motor account of phenomenal experience. Throughout the discussion, it is clear that the author subsumes under the term perception dif-

ferent modes of direct perception described by Buddhist epistemologists, but he does not specify whether his considerations on the phenomenal character of the referent of perception apply to a distinct mode or all of them. This lack of specification might not be irrelevant in the process of naturalizing Buddhist epistemology.

One of Coseru's main concerns in *PR* is to show the connection between the Buddhist epistemological view of self-awareness and the idea of perception as perception of the intended object, with intentionality revealing "the co-constitutive nature of perception and that which is perceived" (p. 9). In chapter 7, in particular, the author looks into the adequacy of a foundationalist approach to the Buddhist epistemological program, eventually arguing for an "anti-foundationalist reading" of it insofar as perceptual awareness is not bound to justifying basic empirical beliefs (p. 227). In the author's understanding of Buddhist epistemologists, perception "is epistemically warranted because of, and only when, its content (that is, the object as perceived) is reflective of the causal cognitive web experience", with "our cognitive faculties embodied and embedded within the environment of which we are part" (pp. 199 and 194). Coseru suggests an alternative foundationalist view that includes consideration of developments in cognitive science. Drawing from the embodied mind thesis famously propounded by F. Varela, E. Thompson and E. Rosch,² he endorses a return to naturalism in epistemology and a view of the latter as "contained in sciences of cognition" (p. 228). Nevertheless, he acknowledges Matilal's remark that the question of what we perceive directly is not a scientific question and can only be answered through conceptual analysis and philosophical argument (p. 227). Furthermore, in considering Buddhist epistemology from within the framework of "a modern cognitive scientific setting", Coseru also claims a contribution of Buddhist epistemology to "expanding our knowledge of the phenomenology of first-person experience" (pp. 229–230). In chapter 8, following Jonardon Ganeri, Coseru argues for the accountability of self-awareness in Buddhist epistemology based on the intentionality of perception, with the intentional character of self-awareness being apparent in the sense of embodied agency typical of epistemic feelings. Furthermore, he explains that, if we adopt a phenomenological understanding of intentionality, it is possible to "make sense of our perceptual experiences" without resorting to a transcendental subject or self (p. 272). Dignāga's theory of cognition is illustrated as having a dual aspect, with the subjective aspect being self-awareness as cognizing agent and the objective aspect the intentional aspect of cognition. In this view, awareness of something as well as awareness

² *The Embodied Mind. Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.

of the perception that is occurring are constitutive of perception, and “the subject of experience can also become an intentional object of experience when it is reflectively apprehended” (p. 269).

As we have seen, *PR* offers a detailed discussion of a vast range of views – from previous philosophical readings of Buddhist epistemology to phenomenology and cognitive science – and shows possible continuities between them. In doing so, *PR* contributes to a non-compartmentalised study of the sources of Buddhist epistemology and to the integration of the latter in a non-regionally based philosophical perspective. These are long-term processes that require sustained exchange and cooperation between philosophers and philologists who work on South Asian philosophical literature. Each group can learn from the other specific contents as well as consideration of and sensitivity to larger issues that might be deemed common sense in one domain and yet fall outside the scope of customary attention in the other. *PR*, in particular, illuminates philosophical matters that would remain undetected in a philological approach to Buddhist epistemology. On the other hand, a few issues related to cultural and intellectual history appear less sharply outlined to the eye of a philologist.

From a philologist’s point of view, a first set of observations is about *PR*’s representation of Buddhist and, more in general, Indian philosophical and cultural history. Although the book purposely does not fall in such a historical frame, it inevitably describes features related to the latter. In these cases, its narrative at times generates a picture that is only partially supported by the present state of historical and philological research on Buddhist epistemology. For instance, the author explains the causal model of perception as resting on two sets of premises, the second of which is that unique particulars are able to produce real effects even in the case of perceptual illusions (p. 233). Since the subsequent lines do not offer specifications on this statement, it is not possible to situate the latter within the complex Buddhist account of perception, which might only partially accommodate such a view. Another case in point is the author’s claim of an absence of distinction between the causal question and the question of justification. This is deemed to be a reflection of “the pragmatic concern of Indian philosophers, rather than a failure to address the normative question – of why might we be justified in believing something – on its own” (p. 213). Now, consideration of the philosophical debate around, for example, the authority of the Vedas or other scriptures would possibly challenge the idea of such an absence and provide materials to clarify the impact of the normative question as well as the contours of the pragmatic concerns in Indian philosophy. Here I use the conditional mood not to avoid judgment speech, but because I am not aware of comprehensive interpretative studies on relevant South Asian philosophical literature that can shed light on these issues.

The narrative of *PR* also seems to cast a distorted light on Śāntarakṣita's and Kamalaśīla's thought when it describes their ultimate aim as providing "a basis for effective action" (p. 191). Contextually, "effective action" seems to suggest the primacy of a pragmatic concern and thus to obliterate the soteriological nature of the ultimate aim of the Buddhist epistemological program. Indeed, the author ascribes a primacy of pragmatic concerns to this program (e.g., p. 250), especially when he discusses a model of phenomenology that takes the Buddhist epistemological account of perception as intentionally constituted and supporting the dual-aspect nature of intentional acts (see especially section 8.3–4). However, it remains sometimes unclear how and to what extent the proposed model would be supported by the Buddhist authors from whom the entire discussion derives. This is especially evident in the case of Dignāga's presentation of self-awareness. While Birgit Kellner argues that, due to its brevity, it cannot present unequivocal evidence for intentional self-awareness, Coseru finds confirmation in the mere coherence of the model that he prioritizes (p. 264).

A second set of observations is concerned with the "longevity of Eurocentrism", on which Sonja Brentjes has recently written.³ *PR* adopts the terminological and conceptual apparatus of specific trends of Western philosophy for describing the Buddhist epistemological program. It is thus in a way unavoidable that the book's narrative translates that program into a Western cultural and philosophical discourse. This has its own merits in hermeneutical terms, but it also entails the danger of a Eurocentric approach to philosophy, which includes conferring a preference to specific topics mainly because they figure high on the agenda of philosophers who work in Western universities. A longevous aspect of a Eurocentric attitude is observable in the claim that the results of modern neuroscientific research (which is used as being synonymous with Western science) can settle "beyond speculative arguments" whether there is empirical support for an insight which "the Buddhist tradition had sought to defend mainly on phenomenological grounds", namely that the central role of perception for knowledge is in jeopardy due to imagery and natural cases of misperception (pp. 230f.). Such a claim reflects the mostly unquestioned view of the objectivity of modern research and its capacity to settle things in a way that is more valuable than others. However, if things are settled, we can at the most seek confirmation for what we already know, instead of acknowledging what is different and exploring other ways of thinking based on a holistic approach rather than on cherry-picking. Moreover, to use as a yardstick the results of neuroscientific

³ Relationships between Early Modern Christian and Islamic Societies in Eurasia and North Africa as Reflected in the History of Science and Medicine. *Confluence. Online Journal of World Philosophies* 3 (2015) 85–121.

research poses the question of why we, in the so-called West, should engage in thinking philosophically and, additionally, from the point of view of far distant philosophies such as Indian Buddhist epistemology. Despite a narrative that might give a different impression, *PR* in fact well displays that at least some of the questions asked in the field of cognitive science are informed by coherent philosophical models for understanding the complex human cognitive world and by the philosophers' capacity and experience in developing such models. Furthermore, *PR* shows that Buddhist epistemologists provide one such model, by means of which they explain cognitive processes and make sense of human experience within a coherent frame of reference. The latter does not find correspondence in any of the schemes developed in cognitive science. So, it may all the more help to ask new questions as well as interpret the data coming from the latter field of research. Eventually, Coseru has recourse to a philosopher, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, to explain "what it might be like to be fully immersed in the perceptual experience" (pp. 231–233).

Another longevous aspect of a Eurocentric attitude can be seen in the little consideration given to subjects that are not traditionally included in the Western philosophical discussions concerning knowledge. Meditative practices and their attainments as well as yogic perception are this type of subject. *PR* mentions them on different occasions, but usually without further discussion, which makes the author's statements somehow axiomatic. For example, it is claimed that Buddhist accounts of meditative attainments are phenomenologically opaque (p. 265); or that Buddhist meditative traditions can supply "methods for a phenomenological exploration of the constituent elements of experience", but cannot be separated from the "epistemological inquiry that has evolved to bear on the results of such experience" (p. 229). In the latter case, the explanation that follows is about "essential qualities of things", for example a specific tree, which is cognized as such (e.g., a redwood) because it is not "a causal basis for the apprehension of that which is other than this specific instance of redwood". The latter point is a reference to the theory of *apoha* ("exclusion"), which Dignāga and later authors developed to explain how the application of a word to an object and the formation of concepts function, namely by referring to an individual x by way of excluding every individual that is a non- x . The connection made by the author between cognitive methods developed in meditative traditions and the notion of *apoha* is interesting, but it can hardly be supported by the provided example because the essential qualities of things explored by Buddhist meditative practices are ultimately – to mention the qualities that are especially relevant in the epistemological discussion – being momentary and selfless. On the other hand, although not overtly related to meditative practices, some remarks in *PR* are potentially useful for a discussion

of knowledge that includes meditative practices and their results. A case in point is the author's elaboration on the opposition between "ordinary, untutored perception" and "trained perception", as related to a pragmatic–phenomenological model in which "perceiving is learning the 'rules' of sensorimotor contingency, that is, the non-propositional form of *knowing how*" (pp. 219–221; see also p. 142). The phrase "trained perception" might well describe the kind of perception attained by the yogis.

Coseru's philosophical reading of Buddhist epistemology is an important contribution to the understanding of Indian philosophy outside South Asian studies and its inclusion in the realm of philosophy tout court. While exemplifying the specificity of philosophical skills in crafting concepts and models for making sense of the process and results of cognizing, Coseru's *PR* shows that Indian philosophy is a complex way of thinking that can trigger other ways of thinking. It is to be hoped that *PR* will not only generate a debate on the philosophical side, but also an exchange between philosophers and philologists because things are not settled on either side, quite the contrary.

Cristina Pecchia

Jens W. Borgland

Examination into the True Teaching. Vidyānandin's Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā.
Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020. xii + 290p. € 72,- (ISBN 978-3-447-06703-4).

Vidyānandin was a Jaina Digambara scholar of the tenth century CE. His *Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā* covers 47 pages in its single edition by Gokul Chandra Jain.¹ Jens W. Borgland's book offers the first complete translation of the extant text into a European language. The book gives a good overview over the examination of the philosophical traditions that are mainly addressed in the available parts of the work, namely, Advaitavedānta, Yogācāra, Cārvāka, Sautrāntika, Sāṅkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā. Vidyānandin's examination (*parīkṣā*) as to whether these doctrines (*śāśana*) are true (*satya*) or not, ends disastrously for their proponents; they are not at all true. They are to be understood as one-sided (*ekānta*) because their central tenets are contradicted by the results of two means of valid cognition, i.e., perception and inference (*dr̥ṣṭeṣṭaviruddha*).

Borgland's (B.) book is divided into two parts, an "Introduction" (pp. 1–97) followed by "Text and translation" (pp. 99–263). For the text, B. provides a

¹ *Vidyānandi-kṛta-Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā*, ed. by Gokul Chandra Jain. [Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā: Saṃskṛta Grantha 30]. Calcutta 1964.

transliteration of Jain's edition of the *Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā* (SŚP), standardized in terms of punctuation and implementation of sandhi rules, and enriched by numerous suggestions for correction of the text. The editorial choices are consecutively addressed in footnotes to the text and summarized in a "List of emendations" (pp. 103–107). B.'s corrections are based on parallel texts in altogether twenty-nine other works (see the "Overview" on pp. 117f.) and on his understanding of Vidyānandin's (V.) argumentation. In structuring this argumentation, B. relies to a large extent on Jain's earlier division of the text into paragraphs.

The translation offers the English-reading audience a first-time investigation into the SŚP that aims at a philologically justified rendering of the entire extant text. The conceptual scope of the work is huge: in his presentation of the philosophical doctrines of his opponents, i.e., the *pūrvapakṣas*, V. summarizes discourses that span centuries, and uses terms and arguments whose precise meaning can ultimately only be ascertained in the context of the original works of the respective traditions. V. also drew from the text of other works in his refutations, i.e., the *uttarapakṣas*, and often applied strategies of argumentation that had already been used by his predecessors. Even so, V. was a very productive author: the editions of all works ascribed to him amount to some 1,000 printed pages. Moreover, much of the textual material of the SŚP is also attested in the very same words in other works of V. Faced with such a situation where every single sentence of the work focused upon is potentially attested also in other works which may provide critical information for the constitution of the text and its understanding, a translator has to take choices. B. decided to mainly contribute to our knowledge of the SŚP with a translation that aims at offering a coherent intra-textual interpretation of this relatively extensive work. He presents a word-by-word translation that mirrors the concise style of scholastic Sanskrit and is still well readable. In general, his semantic and conceptual analysis of individual words and arguments makes good sense in the context of the individual paragraphs and sections of the text, and the translation is well conceived with regard to the matrix of argumentation by which V. structured the work as whole. This is a considerable achievement, and every reader who is interested in how an acclaimed premodern Jaina philosopher dealt in detail with alternative world views will be grateful that B. thought through the whole available work from beginning to end.

Historians of Indian philosophy will be additionally grateful for the instances of annotation where B. critically reflects on specific terms and arguments in the context of secondary and sometimes also primary literature. Such occasional notes enrich particularly the sections on Cārvāka doctrine (pp. 161–164), Sautrāntika Abhidharma (pp. 177–184), Sāṅkhya (pp. 207–209), Vaiśeṣika (pp.

219–237) and Mīmāṃsā (pp. 251–254). Together with the references to parallel passages, notes of this type comprise roughly a third of all notes on both text and translation; other notes are devoted to the explication of editorial choices and recording of variant readings to the text as well as to cross-references within the translation. Notes on the choice and sources of the English equivalents for technical terminology in Sanskrit are very rare; translation equivalents were evidently chosen from those “that are well established in secondary literature” (“About the translation”, p. 119).

The introduction consists of chapters on the work and author (pp. 1–14), on “Pramāṇa and Anekānta” (pp. 15–45) and on the “Subject matter of the Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā” (pp. 46–97). In these chapters, the author contextualizes his own train of thought within the relevant secondary literature. The first and last chapters of the introduction contribute significantly to our knowledge of the SŚP and V.’s edifice of thought. Chapter 1.3, “The Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā” (pp. 3–12), provides a very clear exposition of the doxographical aspects of the work. This allows the reader to acquire an overview of the twelve doctrines that are treated in the extant text of the SŚP, of their different designations and the designations of their proponents throughout the work, e.g., “Puruśādvaīta [...] Brahmādvaīta [...] Vedāntavādins” (p. 3, n. 12), and of the organizing principles of V.’s discussion, including the presumably lost portions on the Tattvopaplavaśāsana and V.’s own Anekāntaśāsana (pp. 5f.). V.’s motivation for the systematic discussion of doctrines of his philosophical opponents is discussed (pp. 9f.) in the context of O. Qvarnström’s observation that doxographical accounts of opposing doctrines “were part of an attempt to define one’s own ideological position.”² Here B. explicates his hypothesis that “the Buddhists were felt as a particular pressing threat” (p. 10) with a line of argumentation provided by Ph. Granoff (pp. 10–12), who presents examples from the narrative literature where “we see Jains acknowledging that unlike Hinduism Buddhism could be a powerful adversary, successful through many means in attracting Jain devotees.”³ With its frequent references to the translation, this chapter clearly benefits from B.’s intra-textual approach and sets a firm basis for further studies into the doxographical aspects of the SŚP.

The second chapter of the introduction is intended for the general, non-specialist reader (see p. 15). In it, B. sketches two theories that are fundamental for V.’s

² O. Qvarnström, Haribhadra and the Beginnings of Doxography in India. In: *Approaches to Jaina Studies*, ed. by O. Qvarnström and N.K. Wagle. [South Asian Studies, Papers 11]. Toronto 1999, pp. 167–210, at p. 173.

³ Ph. Granoff, Being in the Minority: Jain Attitudes towards other Religious Groups. In: *Jainism and Prakrit in Ancient and Medieval India. Essays for Prof. J.C. Jain*, ed. by N.N. Bhat-tacharya. Delhi 1994, pp. 241–267, at p. 260.

thought: “Pramāṇa – the valid means of knowledge” (pp. 16–35) and “The anekāntavāda” (pp. 35–45). In the context of his description of perception, he shortly refers to the notion of perception of the Jaina philosopher Akalaṅka (pp. 24f.); his treatment of inference closes with some examples for the usage of the formal demonstration of an inference in the SŚP (pp. 31–34). B.’s exposition of the ontological, epistemological and logical theories that are collectively addressed with the term *anekāntavāda* is based on secondary literature by, notably, K. Dixit, B.K. Matilal, N. Shah and P. Balcerowicz.

The third chapter of the introduction is dedicated to an overview of V.’s argumentation in the SŚP. Through the order of his discussion, B. highlights arguments that revolve around “the relationship between the universal and the particular” (p. 50):

The view that the universal is merely an unreal construct is refuted in the Bauddha chapter; the view that the individual is merely an unreal modification (*vivarta*) caused by ignorance (*avidyā*) is refuted in the Puruṣādvaita chapter; and the one-sided view of complete difference between the universal and particular is refuted in the Vaiśeṣika chapter. In the Mīmāṃsaka chapter, Vidyānandin refutes the one-sided view of the universal as being completely identical to the individuals, as well as the view that is completely permanent ... (p. 87).

This hypothesis on a basic structure of argumentation in the SŚP continues a line of research in the historiography of Digambara philosophy that was advocated in particular by N.J. Shah in his interpretation of Samantabhadra’s *Āptamīmāṃsā*.⁴ B.’s contribution to this line of research is the contextualization of the hypothesis within the SŚP and the explication of the opponents’ doctrines in the context of more recent secondary literature. In this, the depth of B.’s analysis differs: the discussions of arguments pertaining to the presentation and refutation of Advaitavedānta (pp. 71–77), Nyāya–Vaiśeṣika (pp. 77–81) and Sāṅkhya (pp. 87–90) are kept to a minimum, but the treatment of arguments pertaining to Sautrāntika Abhidharma (pp. 51–64) and to the Yogācāra school of Buddhism (pp. 64–71), to Mīmāṃsā (pp. 81–87) and to the Cārvāka view (pp. 90–94) contains nuanced expositions, some of which are also explicated in the light of text passages taken from original sources.

With the studies carried out in the third chapter of the “Introduction”, the references to parallel passages in Samantabhadra’s and Akalaṅka’s works (see “Concluding remarks”, pp. 94–97), a list of “Quotations in the SŚP” (pp. 109–116) and three different indexes (pp. 279–290), the book provides valuable material for the further exploration of the history of the arguments reflected in the SŚP.

⁴ See N.J. Shah, *Samantabhadra’s Āptamīmāṃsā. Critique of an Authority. Along with English Translation*. [Sanskrit-Sanskriti Granthamālā 7]. Ahmedabad 1999, pp. 19–22.

Thus, the author is to be congratulated on a book that will be an indispensable companion for future study of the Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā and the history of Vidyānandin's thought.

Himal Trikha

Almut-Barbara Renger – Alexandra Stellmacher (Hrsg.)

Übungswissen in Religion und Philosophie. Produktion, Weitergabe, Wandel. [Religionswissenschaft: Forschung und Wissenschaft 15]. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2018. xiv + 294p. € 34,90 (ISBN 978-3-643-13222-2).

Die vierzehn in dem vorliegenden Band gesammelten Aufsätze gehen im Wesentlichen auf die 2014 an der Freien Universität Berlin veranstaltete Tagung "Übungswissen in Religion und Philosophie: Produktion, Weitergabe, Wandel" des Sonderforschungsbereichs 980 ("Episteme in Bewegung: Wissenstransfer von der Alten Welt bis in die Frühe Neuzeit") zurück. Sie beschäftigen sich mit Übung als einer Form des Lernens und der Praxis in verschiedenen Kulturen der Vormoderne und umspannen den geographischen Raum von Griechenland bis nach Süd- und Ostasien. Ein einleitendes Essay von Anne Koch mit dem Titel "Übungswissen. Subjekttheoretische Bemerkungen zu somatischer Konditionierung, Widerständigkeit und Externalisierung" untersucht den vielschichtigen Begriff Übungswissen und nimmt dabei häufig Bezug auf das körperliche Wissen "bei Yogastellungen des modernen transnationalen Positions-Yoga" (p. 3). Die Beiträge sind in drei Sektionen gegliedert, von denen sich die erste mit griechischer Philosophie und die zweite mit den abrahamitischen Religionen befasst.

In der ersten Sektion analysiert Michael Erler den Übungsbegriff bei Platon. Christoph Horn widmet sich dem philosophischen Übungswissen in der Stoa. Im letzten Beitrag in dieser Sektion beschäftigt sich Rainer Thiel mit Einsicht und Einübung. Er untersucht die Aufnahme der ethischen Schriften von Epiktet, Aristoteles und Platon im spätantiken Neuplatonismus.

In der zweiten Sektion beschäftigt sich Lennart Lehmann mit dem Zusammenhang zwischen dem Studium der Tora und der Askese im rabbinischen Judentum. Der folgende Beitrag von Markus Vinzent untersucht die "Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten in liturgischem Übungswissen des frühen Christentums" mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Textversionen des Vaterunser. Jörn Müller beschäftigt sich mit dem Übungswissen in der christlichen Philosophie der Spätantike, insbesondere den Lehren von Origenes und Augustinus. Niklaus Largiers Beitrag ist der Übung des Gebets gewidmet. Peter J. Bräunlein unter-

sucht die unterschiedliche Bedeutung des Begriffs der *disciplina* im lateinischen Christentum und auf den katholischen Philippinen. Dabei geht er im Detail auf die Praxis der Selbstgeißelung bei den philippinischen Passionsritualen ein. Der letzte Beitrag in dieser Sektion von Nora K. Schmid beschäftigt sich mit dem “Übungswissen in der frühislamischen Mahnpredigt” am Beispiel des Asketen al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.

Die dritte Sektion ist den asiatischen Religionen gewidmet. In seinem Aufsatz “Die Illusion von Kontinuität. Buddhistische Regeln (Vinaya) als Übungswissen zwischen Normativität und Wandel” befasst sich Max Deeg mit dem Problem, dass buddhistische Autoritäten einerseits den Anspruch auf Kontinuität bei der Befolgung der buddhistischen Ordensregeln wahrten, aber oft durch Interpretation der Regeln einen Wandel in der Tradition herbeiführten. Der Autor stützt sich hauptsächlich auf Material der Mūlasarvāstivāda-Tradition, das uns teilweise in Sanskrit, aber zum größten Teil auf Chinesisch und Tibetisch überliefert ist. Er widmet sich dabei eingehend der körperlichen Praxis des meditativen Auf- und Abgehens (*caṅkrama[na]*).

Christof Zotter behandelt in seinem Beitrag “Vedisches Übungswissen. Schülerschaft und Ritual in der brahmanischen Tradition” die Überlieferung des Veda von Lehrer zu Schüler in Indien und die Praktiken der Einübung des vedischen Wissens. Er analysiert die Bedeutung des Initiationsrituals (*upanayana*) und der Rituale und Observanzen, in die das Vedastudium eingebettet war. Dabei geht er auch auf moderne Entwicklungen der Rituale in Nepal ein. Während die korrekte Rezitation des Veda durch Nachsprechen, besondere Rezitationsweisen (*pāṭha*) und begleitende Hand- oder Kopfbewegungen eingeübt und von Generation zu Generation weitergegeben wurde, konnte, wie er zeigt, das in knapp gefassten Leitfäden zum Ritual kodierte Wissen um die Anwendung des Veda relativ leicht den Bedürfnissen der jeweiligen Epoche angepasst werden und Neuerungen und lokales Brauchtum integrieren.

Der Aufsatz “Übungswissen in Yoga, Tantra und Asketismus des frühen indischen Mittelalters” von Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen und Silje Lyngar Einarsen beschäftigt sich mit dem Problem, wie yogisches Übungswissen (definiert als “traditionsgebundene Erinnerung” [p. 252]) überliefert und transformiert wurde. Besondere Aufmerksamkeit widmen die Autoren der Lehre von der *kuṇḍalinī*-Energie und den *cakras* in der esoterischen Anatomie. Die Texte *Netratantra* (700–850 n. Chr.), *Kubjikāmatatantra* (11. Jh.) und *Hāthapradīpikā* (15. Jh.) stehen dabei im Zentrum der Untersuchung.

In dem abschließenden Beitrag “Übung und ‚gewonhaitt‘. Transformierbarkeit von Körper und Geist in der Brahmanenepisode von Johann Hartliebs ‚Alexander‘ (1450)” untersucht Falk Quenstedt den Zusammenhang zwischen Übung

und Gewohnheit und die Art und Weise, wie Übungswissen vermittelt wird, anhand einer Episode in einem Alexanderroman. Es handelt sich dabei um die Brahmanenepisode im "Alexander" von J. Hartlieb, einem Autor des 15. Jahrhunderts. In diesem Teil des Werkes wird die Lebensweise der Brahmanen beschrieben und die Vorstellung von der Transformierbarkeit von Körper und Geist durch Übung ausgedrückt.

Den beiden Herausgeberinnen ist es mit diesem Sammelband gelungen, einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Erforschung von Übungswissen in verschiedenen Kulturen zu leisten. Es ist sehr zu begrüßen, dass dabei die asiatischen Religionen stark berücksichtigt wurden. Der vorliegende Band ist für Religionswissenschaftler und interdisziplinär arbeitende Philologen von besonderem Interesse.

Gudrun Bühnemann

Siegfried Tornow

Einführung in die Sprachenwelt Südasiens. Die Sprachen, Texte und Religionen Indiens und seiner Nachbarn. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2019. 198p. € 38,- (ISBN 978-3-447-11242-0).

Nicht nur die Anzahl der Sprachen Südasiens ist immens, auch die Vielfalt der Sprachformen und textlichen Traditionen ist einzigartig und für jeden, der sich mit dem Subkontinent näher befasst, eine Herausforderung. Umso erstaunlicher ist es, dass es bislang kaum brauchbare Einführungen gibt, die diese linguistische Diversität in auch für Laien verständlicher Form behandeln. Das Buch von Siegfried Tornow ist der gewagte und durchaus ambitionierte Versuch, einen umfassenden Überblick über diese hoch komplexe Sprachenvielfalt zu vermitteln und dabei nicht nur die linguistischen Aspekte abzudecken, sondern auch die literarischen und religiösen. Dies in einem Buch von weniger als 200 Seiten zu bewerkstelligen, ist freilich nur mit großen Abstrichen möglich, und so muss das Unterfangen lückenhaft bleiben.

Zunächst aber zu den Verdiensten des Buches. Die Struktur des Werkes ist sehr übersichtlich: die ersten vier der acht Kapitel sind primär deskriptiv; sie geben einen mit Zahlentabellen belegten Überblick über die Sprachen und Sprachfamilien, mit kurzen, kenntnisreichen Portraits einiger wichtiger Einzelsprachen. Hierbei wird teils auch auf einzelne grammatische Aspekte (Phonologie, Morphologie, Lexik etc.) eingegangen, was allerdings nur sehr fragmentarisch möglich ist. Ein Kapitel befasst sich mit den Funktionen der wichtigsten Sprachen als Amtssprachen in den verschiedenen Staaten und Bundesländern. Des Weiteren wird deren Bedeutung als Schul- und Bildungssprache oder als Mediensprache

(Buchdruck, Zeitungen, Film) angesprochen. In diesem Zusammenhang werden auch die kolonial geprägte Geschichte des Subkontinents und die folgenreiche Sprachpolitik der Briten näher thematisiert. Ein Kapitel widmet sich eigens dem Thema "Sprache und Ideologie" und zeigt, wie eng Sprache mit religiösen und politischen Identitäten zusammenhängen kann. Dieser Sachverhalt liegt bis in die Gegenwart hinein zahlreichen Konflikten zugrunde; Beispiele sind hier Kaschmir und Goa.

Die zweite Gruppe von Kapiteln (5–7) befasst sich vor allem mit der Beziehung der Sprachen zu den religiösen Traditionen, insbesondere den Schriftreligionen. Kapitel 5 ist primär ein religionsgeschichtlicher Überblick, angefangen bei den Adivasis (die allerdings nur auf einer halben Seite abgehandelt werden) über die verschiedenen Hindu-Traditionen bis hin zu Muslimen, Christen und Juden. Nach einem kurzen Kapitel über die Schriften folgt ein Abriss der "Sprach- und Textgeschichte", der die verschiedenen literarischen Genres präsentiert. Auch hier wird der Schwerpunkt eindeutig auf die klassische, vormoderne Literatur gelegt (Sanskrit, Prakrit). Die moderne Literaturgeschichte endet mit Premchand und Aurobindo, die postkoloniale Literatur kommt nicht vor. Das achte und letzte Kapitel, das nochmals ausgewählte Sprachen porträtiert, wirkt teilweise etwas redundant, da vieles schon vorher zur Sprache kam.

Insgesamt hat das Buch eher den Charakter eines Nachschlagewerkes: sucht man etwa Informationen zur Sprachsituation in Pakistan oder zu den sprachlichen Besonderheiten des Dravidischen, so wird man über das Inhaltsverzeichnis fündig. Leider besitzt das Buch nur ein relativ knappes Register von zweieinhalb Seiten, so dass nicht alle Themen leicht zu lokalisieren sind. Doch da die Kapitel klar strukturiert und die Unterkapitel und deren Abschnitte ausführlich gekennzeichnet sind, behält man gut den Überblick und kann sich in die kurzessayhaften Themenblöcke einlesen; es liegt in der Natur einer solchen Einführung, dass die Themen nur skizziert werden können. Man bekommt zwar einen durchaus lebendigen Eindruck der reichen Sprachkultur Südasiens, doch da der Autor sich vorwiegend auf die Schrifttraditionen konzentriert, die auch am besten untersucht sind, zeigen sich in einigen Bereichen große Lücken. So bleiben die reichen mündlichen Traditionen, etwa die diversen epischen Gesänge lokaler Barden, Hochzeitslieder von Frauen und schamanische Rezitationen, unerwähnt. Zu diesen Themen gibt es inzwischen fundierte Forschungsliteratur aus ganz Südasiens.

Der näher interessierten Leserschaft wird leider wenig Hilfe geboten. Von einer Einführung wie auch von einem Nachschlagewerk erwartet man kundige Angaben zu weiterführender, auch neuerer Literatur. Hier zeigt sich jedoch, dass die von Tornow verwendete Literatur keineswegs die Bandbreite und den

Stand der gegenwärtigen Forschung repräsentiert. Der Autor bezieht sich oft ausführlich auf andere, teils ältere Überblickswerke (z.B. von Helmuth von Glasenapp, Christoph von Fürer-Haimendorf und Georgij A. Zograph) und beschränkt sich meist auf deutsche Publikationen. Auf diese Weise fehlen in der Literaturliste wichtige Beiträge aus der internationalen Forschung, etwa Sheldon Pollocks Arbeiten zur Entwicklung der “Vernakularisierung”, George van Driems monumentales Werk zu den Himalaya-Sprachen oder jüngere Arbeiten zu Phänomenen wie Code-Switching, Multilingualismus, Multiskriptalität oder Filmsprache. Gerade in den Bereichen von sprachlicher Praxis und Performanz wurden seitens der amerikanischen Tradition der Ethnographie des Sprechens wichtige Impulse gegeben (z.B. von M. Apte, B. und Y. Kachru, A.K. Ramanujan und S. Blackburn). Das Feld der Diskurspraktiken ist hochgradig wandelhaft und somit ein spannendes Gebiet der Sprachforschung. Das Buch von Tornow gibt eine Einführung und einen guten Überblick für den Laien, doch die wissenschaftlich Interessierten müssen die vertiefende und aktuelle Literatur in den meisten Bereichen selbst ausfindig machen.

Martin Gaenszle

Ophira Gamliel

A Linguistic Survey of the Malayalam Language in Its Own Terms. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2020. xvi + 324p. € 39,80 (ISBN 978-3-447-11267-3).

The very title of Ophira Gamliel’s book *A Linguistic Survey of the Malayalam Language in Its Own Terms* indicates what sets it apart from other present-day grammars and textbooks of Malayalam. On the one hand, terms used by native linguists and grammarians are included; on the other hand, only formulations that are heard in everyday life or found in literature appear as sample sentences. The author’s primary concern is to provide students and scholars of various disciplines with a reference work for Malayalam as a research language.

Gamliel refers to earlier analytical approaches to the grammar and linguistics of Malayalam. They serve as role models on which she builds. Hermann Gundert analysed Malayalam from the viewpoint of the European philological tradition of the nineteenth century, taking various dialects and sociolects into consideration and therefore working closely with people from different parts of society.¹

¹ *A Catechism of Malayalam Grammar*. Rev. and enlarged by L. Garthwaite. Mangalore: Plebst & Stolz, Basel Mission Press, 1867; *Malayālam bhāṣāvyaākaraṇam. A Grammar of the Malayalam Language*. Mangalore: Plebst & Stolz, Basel Mission Press, 1868; *A Malayalam and English Dictionary*. Mangalore: C. Stolz – London: Trübner & Co., 1872.

In his *Kēraḷapāṇinīyam*,² A.R. Rājarājavarmma described the language in the tradition of Sanskrit grammarians like Pāṇini, making likewise use of the ancient Tamil grammatical tradition based on Tolkāppiyam (Tolkāppiyar)³ and the work of his contemporary Robert Caldwell.⁴ As a living language with a vast range of literature encompassing different dialects, sociolects and influences from Arabic, Tamil, Sanskrit and European languages, open to innovation yet retaining archaic stages at the same time, Malayalam is not easy to encapsulate. According to Gamliel the so-called standard Malayalam and the non-standard varieties “may be described as polyglossia rather than diglossia” (p. 3).

Divided into sixteen chapters and ten appendices, the book aims to provide basic knowledge of the Malayalam language broad enough to enable Malayalam learners to advance their studies according to their interests and inclinations, be it the study of varieties of spoken Malayalam, or literary or historical studies. Gamliel’s *Survey* clearly goes beyond conventional introductions to contemporary standard Malayalam and is geared towards a holistic approach to the language. Although the author states that the book is oriented towards a theoretical rather than a practical study of Malayalam, each chapter concludes with an exercise section, the respective keys to which can be found in one of the appendices. The so-called “old script” including all ligatures is used throughout the book. It may appear confusing that the transliteration of Malayalam does not follow the standard of ISO 15919 “Transliteration of Devanagari and related Indic scripts into Latin characters”. To distinguish between long and short “e” and “o” in Dravidian languages, according to ISO 15919 “e” and “o” represent the short vowels, “ē” and “ō” the long ones. Gamliel leaves these long vowels unmarked as “e” and “o”, while the short ones get marked as “ě” and “ō̄”. Further, the retro-alveolar liquid is represented by *z* rather than the more common “[a]”. Students of non-European languages and contrastive linguistics are used to dealing with such “juxtaposed possibilities”. Especially in the field of Malayalam, one has to engage anew with each author in terms of the transliteration and technical terms he or she chooses to describe the language. In Gamliel’s approach, I see the advantage that she uses Malayalam script and, additionally, local terms consistently – that is exactly what one needs to communicate with linguists of different schools, especially in Kerala.

² Tiruvantapuram: Sāyāhna Phaṇṭṭṣan, 2017 (1896).

³ See V. Murugan, *Tolkāppiyam in English. Translation, with the Tamil Text, Transliteration in the Roman Script, Introduction, Glossary, and Illustrations*. Chennai: Institute of Asian Studies, 2000.

⁴ *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*. London: Trübner, 1856, revised edition 1875.

The book is structured as follows: Chapters 1 and 2 provide a general introduction to the language, script and pronunciation. Chapter 3 follows with *sandhi* rules and discusses the locative. Chapter 4 introduces the verb, discusses weak and strong verbs, the different verbal stems, citation forms and auxiliary verbs, and provides the overview “Tense and Aspect at a Glance”. The next chapters discuss, among others, negation and interrogatives (Chapter 5); nouns and case (Chapter 6); modifiers and time clauses (Chapter 7); pronouns, abilitative and conditional (Chapter 8); participial nouns, quotative and infinitive (Chapter 9); desiderative, imperative, modal auxiliary verbs and irrealis conditionals (Chapter 10); prohibition, permissive and periphrastic ability (Chapter 11); simultaneous aspect, restriction and emphasis, negative question tags, postpositions, comparative and superlative (Chapter 12); verbal nouns, valency and causation, time adverbs and kinship terms (Chapter 13); a review of old and classical Malayalam, phonology, nominal morphology and lexical honorification (Chapter 14); pronominal endings, auxiliary verbs, archaic verbal forms and adverbial clauses (Chapter 15); and genres and registers in premodern Malayalam literature and regional literatures (Chapter 16). The appendices provide charts, tables and lists of nouns (Appendix A), pronouns (B), finite verbs and their negation (C), dependent verbs and their negation (D), mood (E) and kinship terms (F), a glossary (G), and finally the key to the exercises (H), suggestions for further reading (I) and a list of Malayalam sources (J).

Concerning Appendix I, I would like to point out that in times of the COVID-19 pandemic, when we are often cut off from libraries for weeks at a time, we realize the growing importance of internet resources. It would therefore be helpful to include links to important online facilities in a future edition of the book. The University of Chicago, for example, has added Hermann Gundert’s *A Malayalam and English Dictionary* with a well-working search tool to its “Digital Dictionaries of South Asia” at <https://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/gundert/>. Through the “Gundert Portal” (<https://www.gundert-portal.de/>), hosted by the library of the University of Tübingen, Hermann Gundert’s above-mentioned grammar books are available, as is his dictionary or L.J. Frohnmeyer’s *A Progressive Grammar of the Malayalam Language for Europeans*.⁵ *Kēraḷapāṇinīyam* can be downloaded legally at <http://books.sayahna.org/ml/pdf/keralapanineeeyam.pdf>. Currently, the University of Texas is building a Malayalam language programme. On its homepage one finds references to useful internet sites: <https://malayalam.la.utexas.edu/resources/>.

After having worked with earlier versions of Gamliel’s *Survey* in my international Malayalam classes at the University of Tübingen, I was eagerly awaiting

⁵ Mangalore: Basel Mission Press, 1889.

this publication as other books are either too theoretical, such as R.E. Asher and T.C. Kumari's *Malayalam*,⁶ Michail S. Andronow's *A Grammar of the Malayalam Language in Historical Treatment*,⁷ or Swenson's *Malayalam Verbs. Functional Structure and Morphosemantics*;⁸ outdated, such as grammar books from the nineteenth century like the ones by Gundert and Frohnmeyer; or not suitable for academic purposes, like the "Learn in 30 days ..." series, small books and CD or DVD courses designed for tourists, or online-resources for children of Malayalee parents living outside Kerala. Rodney F. Moag's *Malayalam. A University Course and Reference Grammar*⁹ faces the problem that quite a number of his constructed examples read oddly. Books like *Malayalam Self Instructor for English Speaking People* by James C. Karapally¹⁰ or *Conversational Malayalam. A Microwave Approach* by N.D. Krishnamurthy, H. Parameswaran and U.P. Upadhyaya¹¹ lack a systematic explanation of the grammatical structure.

Thus Ophira Gamliel fills an important gap by having written a modern textbook with exercises, overviews, and discussions of language development and the literature of Malayalam. Minor errors are forgivable and hardly avoidable in the first edition of such a comprehensive work. For my part, I am collecting whatever comes to my attention in our Malayalam courses at the University of Tübingen and will communicate my findings to the author before a second edition of this highly appreciated book – which will certainly come sooner rather than later – will go to press.

Heike Oberlin

⁶ London: Routledge, 1997.

⁷ Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.

⁸ Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2019.

⁹ Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, 1980, with numerous revisions in the following years.

¹⁰ Aluva: Pen Books, 2003.

¹¹ Bangalore: N.D.K. Institute of Languages, 2005.