

Book Reviews

Charles Genoud and Takao Inoue, *Buddhist Wall-Paintings of Ladakh*. (French edition, Geneva, Edition Olizane, 1981. English edition, translated by Tom Tillemans, Geneva, Edition Olizane, 1982) 248 pp. 345 color and 35 black and white illustrations.

Pratapaditya Pal and Lionel Fournier, *A Buddhist Paradise: The Murals of Alchi* Western Himalayas*. (Hong Kong, Visual Dharma Publications Ltd., 1982) 288 pp. 160 color illustrations.

Pratapaditya Pal. *Art of Tibet. A Catalogue of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art Collection*. (Los Angeles, co-published by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art and University of California Press, 1983) 288 pp. 48 color plates, 143 black and white illustrations. With an appendix on inscriptions by H. E. Richardson.

Concomitant with the arrival of tourists along portions of the Silk Route, in the Himalayas, in Ladakh and in Tibet, a plethora of books has recently appeared on the subject of Buddhist art in these regions. The new generation of writers can build upon the steady foundations established in Buddhist iconography by Tucci, Bhattacharyya, Gordon, de Mallmann et al., combined with the now available treatises of Taranatha, the Fourth Panchen Lama, the Sgrub thabs kun btus or the Rin chen gter mdzod and others in the considerable array of Tibetan historical and literary sources which have become accessible in the last fifteen years. If the field has long been hampered by what E. Gene Smith termed, in 1970, "the pontifications of eminent museologists and art historians regarding the characteristics and dates of the various styles and schools (which) represent nothing but uninformed guesses,"¹ hopefully the situation is starting to change.

For this reader, Charles Genoud's *The Buddhist Wall Paintings of Ladakh* is indicative of considerable progress in the domain. Having studied *thang-ka* painting with a Tibetan artist (whose line-drawings illustrate the text), and having consulted eminent lamas, Genoud is certainly in a unique position to provide a thorough introduction to the religious background and the iconography found in Ladakhi wall paintings in particular, and in Vajrayana art in general. In the brief introductory essays (33 pp. set in large type) Genoud discusses the pantheon, Ladakh, styles of Buddhist art, and the symbolism of the iconography. For the latter he has translated a particular sadhana for Vajrabhairava which is explained in great detail. The essays are clear enough for a general reader and accurate to the point of providing much information useful to a specialist as well. Thanks to Takao Inoue's careful photography of several wall paintings from each monastery selected, this work conveys the diversity of both painting styles and religious cycles practised in Ladakh from

the mid-eleventh century to the present. It is recommended without reservation for the general public.

For the specialist, a few minor points must be raised. There is neither index nor detailed table of contents, although allowance has been made for copious notes, appendices, glossary and bibliography. Prior to each section of identified photos appear a few unidentified photos, ostensibly from the same monastery, but never mentioned in the text or the explanation of plates (pp. 49–87), which otherwise do provide very detailed iconographical information. Finally, in the bibliography, the words consulted in Tibetan receive very cursory bibliographic data—no author, pagination, or date of publication is given to two publications from India. More precise references would have been appreciated. But the plates are precious for anyone interested in Ladakh or Buddhist art, and Genoud's careful explanation of Vajrayana philosophy and meditation according to the Dge-lugs-pa tradition (pp. 87–110) is a very reliable summary.

Dr. Pratapaditya Pal, Curator of Indian and Southeast Asian Art at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, is already well-known for his numerous books and articles on iconography and stylistic evolution in India (particularly Kashmir) and Nepal, as well as for the magnificent exhibits he has organized.² In these two recent publications, Pal has undertaken the difficult task of introducing the complexities of the monastery of Alchi and that of documenting the treasures of Tibet in the L. A. County collection, certainly one of the richest public collections in the world. In the latter effort, he has had the valuable assistance of H. E. Richardson, who read and translated all pertinent inscriptions in Tibetan.

A Buddhist Paradise: The Murals of Alchi is visibly intended to be a luxurious book. The glacé black paper used as a background to the highly colored photographs (many of which occupy a full 8½" x 11" page) is very stark indeed. This reader has understood that all of Alchi is to be imagined as if one were examining one by one the contents of a *mgon-khang* with a very bright hand-torch. The photographs are beautiful—but, alas, occasionally blurred. The colors here are quite different from all previous publications where portions of Alchi are illustrated.³ Repainting is both common and on-going in Ladakh, but not at Alchi as well.⁴ Given these circumstances, it would have been helpful for Lionel Fournier, the photographer, to provide the technical photographic data which would allow the reader, far from the site, to better assess what is seen. Fournier's close-up photos are all the more spectacular when one is aware of the difficulties inherent by virtue of the lay-out of the temples and the lighting conditions.

Pal's essays are directed towards a public already familiar with Vajrayana art. The entire text is 56 pages including notes, bibliography, and index, set in large type, covering artistic milieu, religious background, and styles and aesthetic. Concentrating on defining several distinct painting styles found in Alchi's different temples, Pal links them with Indian, Central Asian, and Iranian (Sassanid) prototypes and distinguishes three basic styles: I. Dukhang and Sumtsek, II. Lhakhang Soma, III. Lotsawa Lhakhang (the transcription is

Pal's). He seeks to establish in addition a chronological framework for each style, determined largely on the basis of stylistic parallels, in combination with historical data and liturgical cycles correlated with a particular monastic order.

Pal generally follows the history of Alchi according to Snellgrove and Skorupski, concurring with their preliminary iconographical analyses. In this respect, Pal's description of plates is often succinct, but he has compensated by pinpointing aesthetic features relevant to the plates in his essays. More genuinely problematic, however, is Pal's methodology of historic analysis, starting from his premise that "We are so used to interpreting art with history that we seldom consider the artistic evidence to corroborate a [sic] historical hypothesis" (p. 17). While this methodology may in some cases be justified, it leads Pal to the analysis of the Lha-khang So-ma as a 'Bri-gung-pa sanctuary.

It is generally admitted that Alchi preserves several phases of Bka'-gdams-pa art, which exhibit two widely divergent stylistic traditions, that of Kashmir imported via Rin chen bzang po and, after the arrival of Atisha in 1042, that of Eastern Bihar imported via Atisha. In the Gsum-brtsegs and 'Dus-khang temples, the style of representation is Kashmiri, while in the Lha-khang so-ma, the style is not Kashmiri. Pal finds stylistic affinities for this temple in the group of *thang-ka* recovered from Kharkhoto (Hsi-hsia), dated prior to its destruction in 1226–27 by Chinggis Khan.⁵ Karmay, in the meticulously documented *Early Sino-Tibetan Art*, had tentatively suggested the possibility of a 'Bri-gung-pa affiliation for one of the Kharakhoto pieces. On the basis of a monk portrayed wearing a hat which Karmay describes as identical to that of the Zhva-nag Karma-pa lineage, she stated that although it is not known what kind of a hat the 'Bri-gung-pa wore, their presence in Hsi-hsia prior to 1226 is attested by the Mkhas-pa'i dga'-ston.⁶ Karmay was no doubt unaware that the same source attests that Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa, the first Zhva-nag Karma-pa (1110–1193), had founded temples in Hsi-hsia, and thus the monk portrayed could possibly be a Karma-pa monk.⁷ However, Pal takes Karmay's 'Bri-gung-pa hypothesis for one *thang-ka* and seems to build it into absolute certainty for the entire group of Kharakhoto paintings, using the stylistic parallel to establish a sectarian and chronological affiliation for the Lha-khang So-ba. To further this argument, he notes the absence of portraits of Rin chen bzang po and Atisha in the temple, and the presence of a portrait of Padmasambhava.⁸ Following Snellgrove (as does Genoud), Pal identifies the portrait of the young, bearded monk next to Padmasambhava as a portrait of Śāntirakṣita. In the absence of an inscription, it seems highly improbable to identify the subject as Śāntirakṣita, usually depicted as an aged monk without beard.⁹ Yet, were this portrait to be Śāntirakṣita, it is not entirely incompatible with a Bka'-gdams-pa affiliation. The last element contributing to Pal's hypothesis is derived from Petech's analysis of the *La-dvags rgyal rabs*, which, it would seem, Pal has misunderstood. Petech states that Lha-chen-dngos-grub, besides *restoring* (italics mine) the temples built by his ancestors, also acted as patron to 'Bri-'gung-chos-rje (1143–1217).¹⁰ Pal states, p. 23, "Thus the probability that King Ngotrúp *built*

(italics mine) the Lhakhang Soma around 1215 to commemorate his association with the Drigung-pas becomes more than conjecture, especially when we are told that Ngotrup was responsible for restoring the temples built by his ancestors.” We do not know which temples Lha-chen-dngos-grub restored, nor do we know if he built any. Elsewhere, Petech has stated, “After this episode (Lha-chen-dngos-grub’s patronage in 1215 of the ‘Bri-gung-pa expedition in Kailasa) no more mention is made of further exchanges (between the Ladakhi rulers and the ‘Bri-gung-pa) and we may infer that there was none for more than three centuries.”¹¹ This reader finds it premature to consider, as does Pal, that the Lha-khang So-ma is an isolated ‘Bri-gung-pa sanctuary in the midst of the Bka’-gdams-pa monastery at Alchi. Only further studies, placing the Alchi murals in the wider context of the other early monuments of Western Tibet, Ladakh, and the Himalayas, will determine the chronological sequence of the temples at Alchi.

The tenor of *Art of Tibet* is very different. It is designed as a descriptive catalogue of the collection to introduce the general public to the Tibetan painting and sculptural traditions and artifacts. The organization of the book is exemplary—several brief chapters describe Tibetan geography, society, religion and religious history, painting and sculptural techniques. These serve to prepare the reader for the beautiful photographs covering close to fifty pages of color. At last we get to see almost all the b/w plates of *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* in full color! Next appear discussion of styles of representation and the description of the plates, each description illustrated by a smaller format black and white photo. The appendix is largely the result of H. E. Richardson’s readings of selected inscriptions—these provide an invaluable complement to the photos. The phonetic rendering of Tibetan spelling used in the text is explained in a table which gives the correct Tibetan transcriptions, followed by copious glossaries, bibliographies and index. All this for only \$22.50!!!

The introductory essays are on the whole clearly written and accurate. As minor points, we must question Pal’s use of the term “Dard” (here as in *The Murals of Alchi*) without qualification, as this term is a misnomer for several distinct ethnic groups in Ladakh, and the description of pre-Buddhist religion in Tibet as “animistic and shamanistic” is simplistic and outdated.¹² The brief definitions of painting styles are easy to follow and to relate to the works of art illustrated. Pal has culled available literature in Western languages to document how the Tibetans themselves assessed their art—E. Gene Smith’s vivid translation of a casting episode described in the *Autobiography of the First Panchen Lama* is quoted here, and reveals much about the techniques of casting in early 17th-century Tibet, while at the same time conveying the excitement which surrounded a major art commission.

With the individual plate descriptions, wherever possible, Pal has integrated much of the content of the inscriptions. When inscriptions are lacking, however, occasionally strange conjectures occur. For example, M7 is a wooden manuscript cover, the reverse of which has been painted. According to the

description, the attribution of this piece to “Zanskar (?), 16th century . . . Sakya pa sect” is made because Francke noted yellow robes in Zanskar, and the monks depicted here wear purple inner robes and yellow outer robes. Noting that the monks have no headdresses, Pal assigns them to the Sa-skyapa order whose members are indeed often depicted without hats. But were there any Sa-skyapa monasteries in Zangs-skar in the 16th century? In the absence of a reference other than Francke’s discussion of robe color, this attribution seems problematic—as does the attribution of regional provenance and date to *rdorje* and other ritual objects (pp. 240–56). Nonetheless, it is admirable that Pal does not hesitate to alter his own prior assessments of region, date and iconography in the light of subsequent research. Much prior literature on each piece is noted at the beginning of the individual description, which is a very helpful practice, indeed, but there are notable omissions in the lists. Conspicuously absent is any reference whatsoever to the thesis of J. Huntington, “The Styles and Stylistic Sources of Tibetan Paintings,”¹³ which studied many of the L. A. County Museum *thang-ka*.

Two errors must be mentioned here. Although paintings on linen or cotton cloth are more common, it is preposterous to state (p. 114) that “Tibetans rarely, if ever, painted on silk” and (p. 187) “Turquoise is not local (to Tibet).”¹⁴

Notwithstanding the circumspect attitude which this reader finds warranted in regard to Pal’s historical analyses in *The Murals of Alchi*, and the very minor reservations observed for *Art of Tibet*, Pal’s erudition and finely honed aesthetic observations, Richardson’s rigorous readings, and the major importance of the material illustrated make these books indispensable acquisitions for those interested in Tibetan art history and valuable references for an academic library.

NOTES

1. E. Gene Smith, Introduction to Kongtrul’s *Encyclopedia of Indo-Tibetan Culture*, Delhi, 1970. p. 52.

2. Cf. *The Arts of India and Nepal: The Nasli and Alice Heeramaneck Collection*, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1966 (much of the Heeramaneck collection was acquired by the L. A. County Museum, including many pieces collected and published by G. Tucci in *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, Rome, 1949). “The Art of Tibet,” with an essay by E. Olson, Asia House, New York, 1969. “Indo-Asian Art from the John Gilmore Ford Collection” Baltimore, 1971. *The Arts of Nepal*, Brill, Leiden, Vol. 1., 1974, Vol. II., 1978. *The Bronzes of Kashmir*, Akademische Druk, Graz, 1975.

3. In addition to the plates illustrated in *Buddhist Wall-Paintings of Ladakh*, discussed above, cf. R. Goepfer, *Alchi Buddha, Göttinen, Mandalas*, Köln, 1982. R. Khosla, *Buddhist Monasteries of the Western Himalayas*, Kathmandu, 1979). T. Kobayashi, “The Mandala of Tibet” (in Japanese)

Mizue 1980: 3-79. M. Singh, *Himalayan Art*, Unesco Books, 1968. D. L. Snellgrove and T. Skorupski, *The Cultural Heritage of Ladakh*, Warminster, Vol.I.1977, vol.II.1980.

4. See Henss, M. *Society for the Preservation of Cultural Monuments in Ladakh*, Annual Report, 1983 (Zurich).

5. On the Kharakhoto group, cf. also Béguin, G. et al. "Dieux et Démons de l'Himalaya" *Réunion des Musées nationaux*, Paris, 1977, pp. 76-85. It is often difficult to obtain the original publication, Oldenburg, S.F. *Materialy po bouddiskoy iconografii Khara-khoto*. St. Petersburg, 1914. In *The Murals of Alchi*, Pal discusses these in relation to Lha-khang So-ma, pp. 22-23, 56-59.

6. Karmay, H. *Early Sino-Tibetan Art*, Aris and Philips, Warminster, 1975, pp. 35-42, and plate 7 (page 18).

7. Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag-'phreng-ba, *Mkhas-pa'i dGa'-ston*, Pa. folio 17-18. Attention has been drawn to this passage by Stein, R. A., "Mi-nag et Si-hia: géographique historique et légendes ancestrales," BEFEO, 1951, p. 247, note 2.

8. Cf. p. 42 of *The Murals of Alchi* for the identification of the portrait of Padmasambhava. Pal has failed to indicate here something perhaps quite significant in this context: Padmasambhava is represented at Alchi surrounded by his eight manifestations known as the Gu-ru mtshan brgyad. On the right border of pl. LS 20, Nyi-ma'i 'od-zer, Shakyamuni instead of Shakyaseng-ge, Gu-ru seng-ge sgra-grogs, and Rdo-rje 'gro-lod. On the left, Gu-ru O-rgyan rdo-rje 'chang, Padmasambhava, Blo-ldan mchog-sred, and Gu-ru Padma rgyal-po. Only five of these eight forms are attested (but without iconographical description) in the habitual version of the earliest biography of Padmasambhava, the *Zangs-gling-ma*, attributed to Nyang-ral (1124-1192). The eight forms at Alchi do correspond to the *bka'-thang* of the 14th century, but this alone cannot determine the date of the wall-paintings. Cf. A. M. Blondeau, *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Ve Section*, Tome 85 (1976-77) and "Analysis of the biographies of Padmasambhava according to Tibetan Tradition: classification of sources" in (eds. M. Aris and A. S. S. Kyi) *Tibetan Studies in Honor of Hugh Richardson*, Warminster, 1980, pp. 45-52.

9. For the Dge-lugs-pa tradition of representing Śāntirakṣita, cf. Olschak, B. C., *Mystic Art of Ancient Tibet*, London, 1973, p. 119 (no. 25). She also gives the Rnying-ma-pa iconographic tradition for his representation, pp. 24-25 op.cit.

10. Petech, L. *The History of Ladakh*, ISMEO, Rome, 1977, p. 19.

11. Petech, L. "The 'Bri-gung-pa sect in Western Tibet and Ladakh" in *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium*, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, Vol. XXIII, Budapest, 1978, p. 323.

12. Cf. Clarke, G. "Who were the Dards?" in *Kailash*, Vol. V, no.4, Kathmandu, 1977, pp. 323-56. An excellent summary of pre-Buddhist religion in Tibet is that of Blondeau, A. M. "Les religions du Tibet" in *Histoire des Religions*, t. III, *Encyclopédie de la Pléiade*, Paris, 1976, pp. 234-47.

13. University of California, Los Angeles, Ph.D., 1968. Fine Arts.

14. For paintings on silk, cf. Dagyab, L. S., *Tibetan Religious Art*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1977, p. 40. On turquoise in Tibet, Laufer has no less than five

areas where it is to be found as a local product—the Gangs chen mountains in Mnga'-ris, Lhasa district, Chamdo district, Draya and Derge. Cf. Laufer, B., *Turquoise in the East*, Field Museum, Chicago, 1913, pp. 16-18.

Amy Heller
Ecole pratique des hautes études
Paris

W. Hellrigl and K. Gabrisch, *Tibet: A Philatelic and Numismatic Bibliography* (George Alevizos, Santa Monica, California, 1983)

This thin volume lists 535 titles concerning not only the philatelic or numismatic literature of Tibet but also the postal and currency system of that country.

The bibliography mentions seals in ink and wax, British medals (distributed after the Younghusband expedition of 1903-1904 to the participants) and "primitive money" such as tea bricks and silver bars. Included are articles about fakes and imitations of coins, papermoney and stamps, as well as auction catalogues and special exhibition catalogues.

Not only publications in well-known Western languages, but also in Russian, Japanese, Chinese and even Nepali are mentioned in the bibliography.

The commentaries following each title give proof of the thorough knowledge of both the authors. They analyse in the shortest possible form the content and illustrations of each publication, besides mentioning lots of details of interest for the specialist and the layman. These commentaries give many hints concerning the trade, history and anthropology of Tibet. Therefore the bibliography provides valuable information not only for the philatelist or numismatic collector, but also for the Tibetologist.

As introductions to the various sections, the reader finds illustrations of fine examples of stamps, coins, medals and seals. The booklet closes with an index and short biographies of the authors, who have presented us here, in a very condensed form, with one result (out of many) of their experience of many years as collectors, which will be gratefully acknowledged by all friends of Tibet.

Veronika Ronge
Universität Bonn

Luc Kwanten, *The Timely Pearl, A 12th-Century Tangut Chinese Glossary, Volume 1., The Chinese Glosses.* (Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Indiana University Uralic And Altaic Series, Bloomington, v. 142, 1982) 265 pp.

This poorly printed, badly written, and all-but-unedited book is virtually beyond criticism: it promises a great many things, but it turns out to deliver so few of them that in plain fact there is precious little here upon which to focus a review, whether positive or negative. Not the least of the author's frequent lapses from accepted academic norms—but among his most unedifying specimens of the same—is his penchant for universally denigrating the work of everyone who has dealt with this difficult and perplexing field before him. This he does however generally without taking the risk of exposing his own findings to the light of scrutiny or criticism, by the simple expedient of almost never revealing, in satisfactory or indeed even in comprehensible detail, just what his own presumably different and better findings may actually be. Everyone else, we are told, has always been wrong: that is of course quite possible, though not very probable. But what we are never shown, in this new addition to Indiana University's once-prestigious series of monographs in the Uralic and Altaic field, is how Kwanten's findings are any better or any more correct than those of his here so heavily excoriated predecessors—much less by what right he now considers himself entitled to bad-mouth their efforts.

Alludedly, this book is a "study" of the only surviving Hsi-hsia-Chinese bilingual text, the well-known *Fan-Han ho-shih chang-chung chu* of A.D. 1190. This printed text (not, as we shall find Kwanten alleging, a manuscript!) is especially precious because of its Chinese phonetic and semantic glosses for Tangut script forms. Nowhere in this publication does Kwanten attempt to translate the Chinese title of this text, except once on the cover of his volume, where he renders it *The Timely Pearl*. He does not explain that this rendition is borrowed in truncated form from the English summary that accompanied Nishida Tatsuo's two-volume study of Hsi-hsia language and script (of which publication, more later). There *Fan-Han ho-shih chang-chung chu* was rendered (not by Nishida, but by his penny-a-line English-language amanuensis) as *The Timely Pearl in the Palm*. This was an over-literal rendering of the original; *ho-shih* does not mean 'timely' but rather 'essential' (as in "an essential conversation manual for travelers"), and *chang-chung chu* is simply a fancy way of saying 'handbook' or *vade mecum*. *Fan-Han* in the text's title means, of course, *Fan-Chinese*, with *fan*, generally 'Tibetan,' here for Tangut or Hsi-hsia. We shall adopt, for the rest of this review, Kwanten's abbreviation CCC for this text; it is the only item from his study that may be taken over intact without prejudice to further scholarly discourse.

As one of the earliest surviving written records for any of the Tibeto-Burman languages, and also as one of the earliest bilingual monuments from the Tibetan linguistic area in the broad sense, the CCC is of obvious importance to Tibetan studies in general, and to Tibetan linguistics in particular; its study is also a matter of obvious concern for the readers of the *Journal of the Tibet Society*.

Of the CCC, Kwanten alleges (p. 8) that although obviously this text "as a native, bilingual document is of the utmost importance for both the phonology and the lexicography of the [Hsi-hsia] language," until his study

“it has been treated as merely an interesting but external source of data on the language.” This is not true. In documentation of this allegation, Kwanten cites pp. 525–27 of the basic two-volume study of the Hsi-hsia language and script by the Japanese scholar Nishida Tatsuo, his *Seikago no kenkyū* (1964–66). But this citation directs us only to the English-language “summary” of his work appended to the second of Nishida’s two volumes, a “summary” that, like most such attempts by Japanese scholars to epitomize their Japanese-language publications in a foreign language, is more misleading than informative.

Actually, in this instance even the passage in this English-language summary that Kwanten cites demonstrates that his allegation is untrue; but if he had gone the necessary step further and consulted Nishida’s study, as he purports to have done, he would have found on pp. 14–21 that Nishida made the phonetic and semantic data that he was able to extract from the CCC into an integral part of his reconstruction of Hsi-hsia phonology. A glance at Nishida’s Japanese text would have shown that the Japanese scholar, for better or worse, two decades ago did precisely what Kwanten now proposes to do himself—but does not even come close to carrying off. In a word, not only does Kwanten’s book tell us nothing, it need never have been written.

Thus dismissing Kwanten’s claims to be the first to treat the materials of the CCC properly—claims that are as presumptuous as they are preposterous—the reader soon discovers that Kwanten’s self-styled “study” of this admittedly important source for Hsi-hsia consists, in its entirety, of the following: (a) introductory matter, with sub-divisions “Introduction,” “The Document,” and “The Phonological Hypothesis,” covering pp. 1–38 (a carelessly written, and even more carelessly printed, account of Tangut history and of the CCC, together with a turgid account of the author’s “phonological hypothesis” in terms of which he proposes to reconstruct the phonetic details of the Hsi-hsia language; (b) “Part II, Phonological Tables,” which turns out to be the bulk of the book, from p. 39 to p. 186 (this consists of copying out Karlgren’s Middle Chinese reconstructions, and Lo Ch’ang-pei’s T’ang Five Dynasties Northwest dialect reconstructions, for each Chinese character used as a phonetic gloss in the CCC, then under each copying out the reconstructions of Nishida and Sofronov for each Hsi-hsia character(s) using this phonetic gloss, but all without a single reconstruction of a single Hsi-hsia form, or the decipherment of a single Hsi-hsia graph, or the translation of a single entry from the Hsi-hsia-Chinese bilingual that is ostensibly here being “studied.” In a word, this entire section is nothing but busy-work, copying out verbatim the work of others, who are in the introductory matter roundly trounced for their many alleged mistakes); (c) “Part III, Facsimile,” pp. 187 to the end of the book (offering badly reproduced and largely illegible plates of two different wood-block prints of the CCC). Even though it is obvious to a glance that these are printed texts (indeed, given the wretched quality of the reproduction, that is about all one can be sure of), Kwanten mysteriously labels these “Manuscript A” (p. 188) and “Manuscript B” (p. 226). There is not a hint here as to how

these printed pages reproduced in his plates relate to his introductory account of "The Document," nor any clue as to where or indeed just what his pseudo-MS really is. One can only conclude that he himself really does not know, otherwise surely he would have told us.

And that, for all its presumptions and allegations, is actually all there is to this book: not a single Hsi-hsia linguistic form recovered or reconstructed, not a single graph deciphered, nothing really ever explained, nothing really ever stated or presented clearly and unequivocally—nothing, that is, except the author's contempt for all his academic predecessors. "By and large," he tells us, "the translations [of Nishida's edition of the CCC] can be accepted although an important number of emendations have to be made" (p. 5). If that is so, what are those emendations, and why doesn't Kwanten make them? "Laufer's work . . . compounded the errors made by Ivanov. He accepted the Russian scholar's translation at face value and failed to realize that in many instances Ivanov read the material wrongly" (p. 7). If that is so, what were Ivanov's errors, and how did Laufer compound them, and why doesn't Kwanten now clear all this up? Previously published studies are scored as "nothing but guesswork an [sic!] contain an exceedingly large number of unattested meanings" (p. 35). Perhaps so, but in that case how is Kwanten any better, in view of his careful avoidance of providing the reader with a single meaning for a single Hsi-hsia form?

What at first might appear to be an exception to this book's uniform absence of content is provided by pp. 29-31, where the author argues that the Hsi-hsia language "present[s] a number of syntactic features, such as verbal declensions, pronominal conjugations [sic!], that are more closely related to Altaic languages than to Sino-Tibetan languages" (p. 29). At first blush this would appear to be something along the lines of a thesis, or at least a hypothesis, but closer inspection shows that the exception suggested by these pages is only apparent, not real: the circumstances under which the exception proves the rule surely applies here.

Ever since B. Laufer's pioneer 1916 study of these same CCC materials (*TP*, 17, 1-126), the linguistic affiliation of Hsi-hsia within the Tibeto-Burman group has been generally accepted. Of course, long-accepted positions on any issue may often usefully be subjected to reinvestigation; and sometimes such reinvestigation shows that it is necessary to revise long-held views. But reversal of established positions cannot be accomplished either by *fiat* or allegation, much less by simply impugning the reputation and scholarship of the earlier scholars whose work provided the basis for the views in question: data, documentation, and facts are all necessary.

In support of his more-than-slightly startling allegation that Laufer was completely wrong, and that Hsi-hsia is not Tibeto-Burman but Altaic, Kwanten first presents the truly cryptic information that "we indicated this in a public lecture at Columbia University in 1977" (p. 38, note 30). That lecture remains unpublished, and so the citation is really not much help. Apparently Kwanten regards Hsi-hsia linguistic studies rather like opera fans do the late

Maria Callas in *Norma*: no good just reading about it, you had to be there—in this case, you had to be at Columbia in 1977. We weren't.

Following close upon the heels of this cryptic citation, Kwanten then offers two specific bodies of evidence for Hsi-hsia as an Altaic language. Neither deals with "verbal declensions," whatever those may be (the term is hardly a common linguistic collation). One apparently has to do with the putative morphological location of the Hsi-hsia morph for verbal negation following the verbal root or stem. If this is true, it is of course rather unlike Chinese and Tibetan: but Kwanten tells us next to nothing about this feature, nor does he venture to discuss its importance in linguistic-comparative terms, so that really nothing can be made of any of this.

The other feature discussed in this brief section of the book is somewhat clearer, actually involving a modicum of linguistic evidence, and as a consequence quite simple to dismiss. Apparently this comes under what Kwanten calls "pronominal conjugations." At any rate, he alleges that "in the case of the personal pronouns, we find a number of nominal and oblique forms, as well as a usage which strongly resembles that of these pronouns in Altaic languages" (p. 29). End of the description. Fortunately, he then breaks his usual rule and does give some linguistic forms in evidence, so we are able to puzzle out the sense of this otherwise rather opaque statement.

The forms that are here alleged to have been reconstructed by Nishida and Sofronov (not by Kwanten!) for first, second, and third person nominative, and for first and third person oblique are arranged into a paradigm (with "N" for Nishida's reconstructions, and "S" for Sofronov's) as follows:

	1st per.	2nd per.	3rd per.
nom.	<i>ŋhah</i> (N), <i>nga</i> (S)	<i>niĥ</i> (N), <i>ni</i> (S)	<i>thah</i> (N), <i>tha</i> (S)
obl.	<i>muh</i> (N), <i>mI</i> (S)	-----, -----	<i>miĥ</i> (N), <i>mi</i> (S)

What Kwanten apparently is trying to argue here is that the language is Altaic, not Sino-Tibetan, because it has oblique forms in *m-* for the first and third person pronouns, as against nominatives in *nga-*, *ni-*, and *tha-*.

It is almost needless to add that this conclusion does not at all follow. First, no forms could possibly be more redolent of Chinese, and of Tibetan—and hence also of "Sino-Tibetan," if such a thing ever existed—than the reconstructed nominatives that he cites from Nishida and Sofronov. Second, ever since Bernard Karlgren's famous paper on "Le Proto-Chinois, Langue flexionelle" (*JA* 1920, 205–32), we have all known that the earliest form of Chinese had a distinctive paradigm for the pronoun, with a striking formal differentiation between nominatives and obliques. If this sort of paradigm makes Hsi-hsia Altaic, it also makes Chinese Altaic. Third—and most important—the only thing that can be said with confidence about any putative similarity between this Hsi-hsia paradigm and the original Altaic paradigm for the declension (*not* the "conjugation," not even the conjugation) of the pronoun is that the two do not resemble one another at all. If these Hsi-hsia forms are correct, Hsi-hsia had pronouns with obliques in *mi-* and *mu-* stems,

as against nominatives in *nga-*, *ni*, and *tha-* stems. In Altaic, the pronoun originally had a 1st person sg. nom. in **bi*, with which went an oblique **män*, similarly for 2nd person sg. nom. **si* but oblique **sän*, and for 3rd person sg., nom. **i* but oblique **än*. If anything here is held to look even remotely like the Hsi-hsia paradigm—and it really does not—it can only be the fact that the 1st person sg. has two allomorphs: but the Altaic nominative is the one that looks vaguely like the Hsi-hsia oblique—while *vice versa*, i.e., Hsi-hsia oblique vis-à-vis Altaic nominative, there is absolutely no resemblance. In a word, Altaic clearly has nothing to do with Kwanten's "pronominal conjugations." The paradigm of English *I* nominative versus *me* oblique looks more like Kwanten's Hsi-hsia paradigm than Altaic does. Are we then to regard English as an Altaic language?

But the above refutation itself might well be accused of having made an initial methodological error, since it takes the data for the Hsi-hsia personal pronoun presented in Kwanten, pp. 29–30 at face value. A moment spent checking with Nishida's *Seikago no kenkyū* shows that even this is wrong. There is absolutely nothing to Kwanten's thesis about the putative Altaic nature of the Hsi-hsia pronoun because the two oblique forms that Kwanten cites are not pronouns at all, but verbal negatives (the Hsi-hsia graphs, and their correct definitions, are to be found on pp. 476, graph 238–062, and p. 355, graph 041–181, in Nishida's study).

Along with not consulting these pages in Nishida's study, Kwanten has also not consulted Nishida's grammatical sketch of Hsi-hsia, *loc. cit.*, pp. 269–271, where he presents a complete account of the Hsi-hsia pronoun. It shows none of the features alleged by Kwanten—but it does display interesting—and significant—signs of a morphological phenomenon common to many Tibeto-Burman languages and generally called 'verbal pronominalization'. This Kwanten never mentions. But the oblique forms he does mention are all demonstrably false, and so his Altaic thesis for the pronoun at least is also demonstrably false; there simply is nothing to any of this.

The reader of this review will by this time have noticed how many of Kwanten's errors, misstatements, and misunderstandings could have been avoided—indeed, how this entire book could well have been avoided—if Kwanten had ever actually consulted Nishida's *Seikago no kenkyū*, a book that he alleges to cite many times. The two hefty volumes of Nishida's study were published in Kyoto where Nishida lives and works. When we find Kwanten at least twice (p. 33, p. 40) erroneously listing their place of publication as Tokyo, we begin to suspect that he has never seen the books in question. But even citing Nishida on Hsi-hsia without actually ever looking at his book as a technique for scholarly obfuscation is not anything for which Kwanten can claim priority: it was initiated a decade ago by Paul Benedict and James Matisoff (cf. *JAOS* 94, 1974, 201–202). There are many problems in Nishida's long and elaborate study of Hsi-hsia. It deserves—and has yet to receive—a searching, critical inspection. But for all its problems, it also deserves to stop being 'cited' inaccurately, irresponsibly, and sight-unseen, by foreign scholars

who by the plain internal evidence of their own writing may be demonstrated never once to have looked inside it.

Reconstructing the Hsi-hsia language, and deciphering the Hsi-hsia script—the two basic issues that this book never approaches, much less solves—are both, after all, essentially linguistic problems; and it soon becomes clear that at least one of the reasons why Kwanten has been so astonishingly unsuccessful even in coming to grips with his self-imposed subject, not to mention his abject failure to deal with it either responsibly or convincingly, is to be identified in his truly astonishing naiveté concerning the science of linguistics. Frequently it is this naiveté that also propels more than a few of his sullen and ill-advised polemics against his predecessors: he reads out his betters for no more reason than merely because he cannot understand what it was that they were doing when they were doing linguistics.

Kwanten's p. 7 bristles with examples of this sort of thing. "The major difficulty," he writes, "with Laufer's study is not its weak phonetic reconstruction, but the fact that he assumed that the words in Ivanov's list were basic semantic units. . . . Laufer, like Ivanov, assumed that the Hsi Hsia characters were similar to Chinese characters; hence, they assumed that the character for *man*, to give but one example, was always the same, regardless of its functions." None of this is remotely true. Laufer was an extraordinarily sound philologist, and a remarkably competent linguist. He took Hsi-hsia words for and as words, for better or worse (and *pace* any problems that Ivanov may have introduced); such nebulous modern nonsense as 'basic semantic units' is mercifully anachronistic for Laufer's time, and wickedly libelous for the work of Laufer himself.

As for such vapid vagueness as Kwanten's insouciant reference (repeated twice this same page) to "the [Hsi-hsia] character for *man*," the less said the better: *man* is surely (or the last one heard it still was) an English word, not Hsi-hsia; and to write of "the [Hsi-hsia] character for *man*" demonstrates that Kwanten is not only linguistically liable, he also does not understand the essential difference between language and writing—not very good philological equipment for one not only determined to plunge into the study of a virtually unknown language written in a still largely undeciphered script, but along the way to sweep into oblivion generations of painstaking previous scholarship on these same problems.

One also reads with genuine astonishment references to "the poor transliteration qualities of Chinese" (p. 37), as if somehow that particular language suffered from some inherent disability or affliction. In evidence for this linguistically meaningless calumny, we are told that "Chinese *lo* [after which there is a long lacuna, where apparently a Chinese character was supposed to be hand-written in, but never got done] renders both the Tibetan *blo* and the Turkic *ra*" (*loc. cit.*). Again, language and script are so confused in Kwanten's text that it is all but impossible to unravel what he is saying; but as everyone else working in the field knows perfectly well, the Chinese transcriptions of foreign words (he is really talking about transcription, of course, not

'transliteration') were historically just as precise or just as loose as the circumstances behind their employment warranted. There are T'ang period transcriptions of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit texts into Chinese that are (and, by the nature of the texts, had to be) models of accuracy and precision; the Mongol and Ming transcriptions of Middle Mongolian distinguish *r* and *l*, *q* and *k*, and all the other critical phonological contrasts of Mongolian phonological structure; if Chinese *lo* appears to render 'Turkic *ra*', that is because modern Chinese *lo* goes back to earlier **la*; if the T'ang transcriptions of Tibetan render Tib. *blo* as *lo*, that is because whoever did the transcriptions heard *blo* pronounced as *lo*, not because of any "poor transliteration qualities of Chinese," etc., etc. Examples of this sort of thing in this book could be multiplied virtually without limit; to discuss them further would only be to pay them more credit than they deserve.

In view of Kwanten's demonstrated inability to distinguish language from writing, his genial indifference to the identity of specific languages, not to mention their involved historical relationships within the tangled web of Central Asian history, is hardly surprising, though none the less reprehensible. In an attempt to prove the superiority of *his* reconstruction of Hsi-hsia—one of the few passages in the book where any evidence for any of his "findings" is actually cited—he writes as follows: "In the examples below, a number of Sanskrit names have been extracted from the Hsi Hsia translation of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*. The Hsi Hsia translation differs sufficiently from the Chinese model to be considered an original text, not a slavish translation" (p. 22). He proceeds, *inter alia*, to offer "*da/dai r(a)/la ni*" (p. 24) as his reconstruction (which he mysteriously categorizes as "a phonetic scheme that can accommodate both Chinese and Sanskrit data," p. 25) for the Hsi Hsia borrowing of Buddhist Sanskrit *dhāraṇī*, which he incidentally simplifies (p. 24) to *dharani*.

Again, one must resist the temptation to dignify this sort of thing with elaborate correction and refutation, and so we will limit ourselves instead to a few salient points: (1) in an article published almost thirty years ago in *Biblia, Bulletin of Tenri Central Library*, No. 11, July 1958, pp. 13-20, Nishida Tatsuo demonstrated that all the existing Hsi-hsia translations of the Mahāyāna canon are secondary retranlations from earlier Chinese translations, but sometimes and in some parts showing that the translators also frequently had reference to Tibetan translations; (2) in the same article, he demonstrated that there are at least two different Hsi-hsia versions of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*, but also that both are retranlations from the Chinese; (3) further, in this same article, he specifically discussed the Hsi-hsia versions of Buddhist Sanskrit *dhāraṇī*, showing that his reconstruction (which Kwanten miscopies, and misquotes) of this form as **doloni* substantiates the borrowing of the form into Hsi-hsia via a Chinese intermediate, while in the *incipit* of a Hsi-hsia translation of the *Ārya Mārīcī-nāma dhāraṇī* in the Tenri University Library Collection (= Tōhoku Cat. 988, *Hphags-mo ḥod-zer-can zes-bya baḥi gzuṅs*; Taisho 1257), the same term appears in another Hsi-hsia

writing that he reconstructs as **thanrañži*, still hardly “Sanskrit,” but indeed showing signs of the translator(s) having paid more attention to some original Indic form than to its Chinese borrowing.

At best Kwanten’s account of what he is attempting to do in this passage is internally self-contradictory. He argues that the Hsi-hsia *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* is an “original text,” yet he would go directly to “Sanskrit” to establish the forms for Indic loans in the same. At worst, it suggests that the Hsi-hsia translators were either able or willing to go to Indic originals in rendering the canon, furthermore that those originals were in “Sanskrit”—both of which are quite absurd propositions. The language of the Indic originals of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* are no more in “Sanskrit” than the *Sursum Corda* is in Latin—rather less, actually—even begging the question of whether the Hsi-hsia translators had at hand *any* Indic originals in the first place, which too is unlikely in the extreme.

But at this point, we find ourselves back where we were with Kwanten’s allegations about the Hsi-hsia pronouns: the refutation, plain and simple though it is, of his views hardly matters, since his forms and the claims that “The Sanskrit examples were chosen so that the Hsi Hsia character functions not only as a phonetic gloss for the Sanskrit but is also an attested morpheme in the language itself” (pp. 22-23). Once again, a moment spent checking in Nishida’s book shows that this too, like his pronominal paradigms, is simply false.

Of the three Hsi-hsia graphs employed in his putative reconstruction of the word *dhāraṇī*, for example, the first two (Nishida, p. 351, number 039-098, and Nishida, p. 320, graph 088-111) are both registered in the Hsi-hsia corpus as graphs employed solely (and as in this word) as transcription characters to render the sound of foreign words, not as “attested morpheme[s] in the language itself.” (The third, Nishida, p. 313, graph 007-065, is a grammatical participle in Hsi-hsia, but the carelessly scrawled form with which it is written on p. 24 [compare the quite different scrawl seventh from the top on this same page, which is supposed to be the same Hsi-hsia graph!] leaves in question the identity of this graph anyway.)

The low esteem in which Kwanten holds his scholarly forerunners is more than matched by the contempt that his publishers obviously entertain for anyone foolish enough to purchase, or to attempt to read, this book. We have already noticed the chaotic arrangement and virtually illegible condition of the only portion of the volume remotely likely to be of use to anyone, i.e., the facsimiles of the CCC blockprint that occupy p. 187 ff. But over and above this, there is—for what little it is worth—the text proper of Kwanten’s study to reckon with; and even for these days of generally hand-made, kitchen-sink *samizdat*’ academic publication, this book marks a new nadir.

The book reproduces typed masters with hand-written inserts for Chinese, Hsi-hsia, and diacritics. The typing appears never to have been proof-read (so that one finds such mysteries as references to the “üOth century,” p. 10); sometimes the typist left blank space for the insertion of the handwritten

materials, sometimes he or she did not. Sometimes someone wrote something into the blank spaces left by the typist, sometimes someone did not and the reader now has the blanks left open to fill in at will. When something had to be written in and the typist had not left space for it, it was then scribbled between or over or under the lines as luck would have it; etc., etc.—in a word, simple chaos, and plain contempt for the reader.

Moreover, what has been written in on the typewritten masters is almost always so badly and carelessly scrawled that one is more often than not hard put to tell the Chinese from the Hsi-hsia: the one script is quite as lamentably deformed, mishapen, and disfigured as the other. Whoever is responsible for the sorry scrawls that here masquerade as Chinese characters is, like too many beginning students of Chinese and Japanese, laboring under the sorry misunderstanding that cursive calligraphy consists in wildly scrawling the script in an idiosyncratic and self-indulgent fashion. The results, as now preserved in these pages for distribution to libraries throughout the world, can only baffle and bemuse scholars everywhere—in the unlikely case, that is, that our Chinese and Japanese colleagues even recognize these sorry scribbles as attempts to write Chinese. And with perfectly ordinary Chinese characters miswritten in this almost unbelievable fashion, what has happened to the Hsi-hsia graphs may be left to the reader's imagination. When their index-numbers are given (and when these numbers prove, as they do on occasion, to be correct), it is possible to identify the genuine Hsi-hsia graphs in the lists of Nishida or Sofronov; verifying a few in this fashion soon reveals that they have suffered the same graphic fate as the Chinese, but in spades.

So also for the diacritics in which almost every one of the forms copied from Nishida and Sofronov bristle. These too have been carelessly scrawled into the typed masters—or on occasion, carelessly omitted—with a fine abandon, suggesting whoever did the writing understood nothing of what these marks were originally intended to represent. Most shocking of all, there is not anywhere in these pages a single word of explanation for even one of the many different arbitrary phonetic symbols and signs employed by the different authors whose reconstructions, both of Chinese and Hsi-hsia, are here copied out by Kwanten. Each of the scholars concerned has used his own transcription and reconstruction conventions. To bring these together, as here, without a word of explanation for the symbols employed, is to reduce the whole body of these materials to nonsense—even if the many different symbols involved had been copied neatly and accurately, which is anything but the case.

There has also been a great garble of the typed masters for the first portion of the volume somewhere between the typewriter and the camera: p. 4 promises a note 3, but the note 3 printed on p. 33 is not the right one for this passage, it goes instead with note 5 on p. 5; note 6 on p. 34 corresponds to nothing at all in the text; etc. In a word, visually and graphically, and as an example of how a book is to be put together, this volume's physical preparation is in every way on precisely the same sorry level as its scholarly content.

In a word, then, it is obvious that this new contribution to the Sino-Tibetan

linguistic literature is totally without merit or excuse. It is beneath scholarly notice. This in turn leaves us to answer the question, why notice it at all, particularly to the length of the present review? The answer lies in the fact that the book deals with a topic of great potential importance for future work in the field of Inner Asian linguistics. There is the great danger that its publication will lead in either one of two different directions, both of them unfortunate in the extreme. On the one hand, readers may be led to believe that anything in Kwanten's work can be taken at face value, which is not true. On the other hand, readers may conclude that nothing at all of scientific value can possibly be made of Hsi-hsia linguistic studies, which is also far from the case. When any scholarly problem has been approached in the uninformed, arrogant, self-seeking manner that disfigures the pages of this book, there is always the imminent danger that more responsible scholarship will, if only from considerations of fastidious self-protection, shy away from the entire area for generations to come.

This last, the most likely fall-out effect of this publication, would be doubly unfortunate because, in actual fact, there is much in the work of Nishida, Sofronov, and the others who have concerned themselves with this field that would benefit from serious, informed, and responsible critical review. Nishida's work in particular deals on a grand scale with putative phonetic reconstructions of an almost unbelievable degree of elaboration. The many diacritic marks and special letters with which his reconstruction of Hsi-hsia bristles (most of them carelessly reproduced in this book, and none of them ever explained) point up one of the many areas of his work that urgently calls for painstaking, competent review and critique. The great danger—and the great pity—of this *fatras* by Kwanten is that there will almost surely be a natural reluctance on the part of responsible scholars in the field to get involved in any of this in the near future, lest they too end up being tarred with the same brush. There is also the unpleasant question of squandering scarce financial resources on this sort of thing, resources that others are now unlikely to come by again. One reads with disbelief, in the book's front-matter, that "The Research was supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities." Senator Proxmire, where are you—and your Golden Fleece Award—when we really need you?

But in all truth, a book like this is no laughing matter, no matter how risible one may in fact find it. Even before its appearance, Hsi-hsia studies were at an impasse, with so many mutually conflicting claims for mutually contradictory reconstructions and decipherments from various academic circles that everyone seriously concerned about the field was virtually at a loss to know what to make of all this. We have seen that Kwanten's *Timely Pearl* is far from being a pearl; but in one sense at least, it may actually prove to be timely, if only it serves to focus attention on the sorry state of Hsi-hsia researches, and if it encourages other, more competent and more responsible investigators to do something about it.

One is reminded, in many ways, of the situation that obtained in the decipherment of cuneiform in the mid-nineteenth century, and also of the striking demonstration, proposed by Fox Talbot in 1855, that, as one account has put it, “officially declared the gates of cuneiform open” (Maurice Pope, *The Story of Archaeological Decipherment*, New York, 1975, p. 117, where the whole story is competently and entertainingly related). On that occasion, various scholars submitted, in sealed envelopes, their independent translations of a newly discovered cuneiform inscription, the clay cylinder with the inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I, King of Assyria, to an outside committee that judged, not directly on the merits of the decipherment, but simply on the amount of agreement between the translations submitted.

One of the factors that has made all existing claims from Hsi-hsia reconstruction and decipherment less than convincing is that they have dealt almost exclusively with Hsi-hsia translations of Chinese originals. We can of course read the Chinese originals, so claims also to be able to read the Hsi-hsia translations of those originals necessarily lack the power of conviction. Now it is probably time to run a Fox Talbot-style demonstration with an original Hsi-hsia text, minus a Chinese version. Let Nishida, Sofronov, and, if he wishes to participate, Kwanten, all do independent translations of a Hsi-hsia original, and submit them to an outside, impartial committee for comparison. Short of something along those lines, there seems to be as little point, for the present at least, in the generation of still more contending schools of Hsi-hsia studies as there is in the allegations, undemonstrated claims and undocumented speculations, not to mention the many downright distortions and mistakes, of Luc Kwanten’s *Timely Pearl*.

Roy Andrew Miller
University of Washington

Hopkins, J., *The Yoga of Tibet. The Great Exposition of Secret Mantra — 2 and 3*, by *Tsong-ka-pa*. Introduced by His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. Translated and edited by Jeffrey Hopkins (The Wisdom of Tibet Series, London, George Allen & Unwin. 1981) viii + 272 pp.

This work consists of three parts. The first (pp. 1-42) is an introductory section by His Holiness the present Dalai Lama, and translated by Jeffrey Hopkins. The second (pp. 43-203) is a translation by Jeffrey Hopkins of a portion of the *Sñags rim chen mo* which he labels “2,” calling it “Action Tantra,” and “3,” calling it “Performance Tantra.” The third part (pp. 205-259) is the translator’s supplement about the ideas and literature of “2” and “3,” glossary and bibliography.

One can only describe the Dalai Lama’s introduction to the main ideas as brilliant. However, the general reader is forced to read this through the translator’s eyes. As to his rendition of *Bya ba’i rgyud* as “Action Tantra” and

Spyod pa'i rgyud as "Performance Tantra" I wonder why the original Sanskrit (Kriyā-tantra and Caryā-tantra) would not be better, since 'action' and 'performance' are rather inane renditions. Is there not also 'action' and 'performance' in both of them? The translator does not even admit to demurring over the words, as though there might have been some difficulty.

The main part is of course the translation of "2" and "3." Hopkins hopes to demonstrate the correctness of the translation by a remarkable statement in "Translator's Note": "Part II was orally retranslated into Tibetan for Lāti Rinbochay for the sake of correction and verification, and a complete commentary on the same was received from Denma Lochö Rinbochay." This is a direct challenge to any reviewer that a criticism of the translation is a disrespect to the learned Tibetan lamas whose precious advice he utilized at every step. Of course, such an attitude goes with regarding the text being translated as something holy. I also regard the *Sñags rim chen mo* as a great work of literature. It deserves great care in translating. So I shall go ahead with the job of reviewing, because if perchance the translation is found faulty in some respect this is not disrespect to those lamas: it is respect for the text.

I shall concern myself with certain important citations, namely of the *Vairocanābhīṣambodhi-tantra* (with my signal *V-A-T*) and the *Concentration Continuation* (as Hopkins renders the *Bsam gtan phyi ma rim par phyé ba*), but have space only to treat a few of them.

Take Hopkins, p. 184, two verses that I happen to know are from *V-A-T*, Chap. II, 238-39; and his translation: "The Buddha explains these pledges to you—a good system of conduct. Protect these just as you would protect your own life." The Tibetan, *brtul zugs bzañ po khyod la bśad*, means "explains to you, O goodly avowed one"—the vocative.

Hopkins, p. 192, citation from *V-A-T*, in fact, its Chap. V, "augmented with the word of withdrawal" for Tib. *slar sdud pa yi tshig gis non*. But *slar sdud pa*, occurring various times, similarly misunderstood, is a grammatical term meaning 'reiteration'; and *non* is a weak imperative of a verb meaning to 'restrain'; hence, "One should restrain by way of the repeated words." *Ibid.*, Hopkins: "Join the letters to the letter [a moon disk]," for Tib. *yi ge dañ ni ye ge sbyar*. As to how the Tibetans, such as Tsoñ-kha-pa, understood this, since Buddhaguhya's commentary for Chap. V of the scripture was lost: they resorted to the work Hopkins calls *Concentration Continuation* with Buddhaguhya's commentary thereon. Hence, the passage cited earlier (Hopkins, p. 144), which shows that one of the terms *yi ge* is not a *yi ge*, rather is a *mi 'gyur ba* ('an unchanging'). The reason is that *yi ge* translates the Sanskrit *akṣara*, and *mi 'gyur ba* translates *a-kṣara*. The translators of the *V-A-T* mistakenly translated both by *yi ge*, while those of the *Concentration Continuation* got it right. Tsoñ-kha-pa does not explain this because he does not write a grammatical commentary. In the *Sñags rim chen mo* he expects the reader to understand the cited verses; he sometimes cites them without comment, or adds further information, or explains some of the procedure involved. But Hopkins, as is obvious from p. 144, and elsewhere, was trying to use Tsoñ-kha-

pa's words to understand the cited verse. This is why Hopkins' troubles in translating the text center on the citations. There are other drawbacks about his rendition of this citation on p. 192, but I shall pass to a different one.

Hopkins, pp. 186-7, the heading "Mundane and Supramundane Yoga" with a citation of the *V-A-T*, in fact, its Chap. IX, and a brief comment by Tsoñ-kha-pa. Here Hopkins puts in various expressions in brackets. My thesis: Hopkins did not understand anything in the citation of the *V-A-T*, did not understand the author's comment, and the many bracketed expressions are pointless. Hopkins' first brackets: [The yoga for prior approximation] shows the crude expression 'approximation' for this text's emphasis on "preliminary service," which in fact takes six months. Then he gives Tsoñ-kha-pa's division into mundane and supramundane and adds in brackets, "which are other names for the yogas with and without signs." This directly contradicts the cited scripture, which I give here (2½verses): / *phyi dañ nañ gi sbyor ba yis / yan lag bži pa ñas bśad pa / de yañ 'jig rten pa yi ste / dmigs pa can ni bla med pa / slar sdud pa yi tshig gis non / lha yi rjes su soñ ba'i yid / śub ste bzlas brjod byed pa'i mchog / dmigs pa can la bstan pa yin / yid kyi 'jig rten 'das źes bya / slar sdud la sogs nmam par spañs / lha dañ gcig tu byed pa dañ / tha dad ma yin 'dsin pa yi / yid kyis rañ bžin dbyer med bya / gźan du bya ba ma yin no /*

This is Hopkins' translation of this passage:

I have explained [the yoga] having four branches with external and internal application. This is the unsurpassed worldly imagination. Augmented with the word of withdrawal, the mind which has accorded with the deity is taught as the supreme of whispered repetitions, having apprehension.

For the mentally supramundane, withdrawal [from external branches of repetition to the internal] and so forth are completely abandoned. [Oneself and the deity] are made undifferentiable in [terms of empty] nature through a mind creating oneness with the deity's form] and not conceiving of [physical] difference.

In no other way is [supramundane repetition] to be done. First of all, we notice the same line in this passage that he previously got wrong, to wit, his "augmented with the word of withdrawal." Notice also that the Tib. *dmigs pa can* is repeated; and the first time he translates it "imagination," the second time "having apprehension." He did not recognize that this term *dmigs pa can* means 'apprehension (of outward object)' and that it was repeated because it is given first for the mundane case and next for the supramundane case, both of which are 'yoga with signs.' Therefore, also, he mistook the terms *phyi* and *ñañ* as "external and internal," whereas the scripture uses them as 'outward' and 'inward,' and uses the 'inward' only for the case of 'yoga with signs.' Above all, even with Hopkins' mistranslations, he has not succeeded in a cogent statement of translation; that is to say, a discerning reader would have cause to wonder if the scripture is badly written, and if so, why bother to cite such nonsense? It is therefore with respect for the scripture and for Tsoñ-kha-pa's good judgement in citing it, that I here give my suggestion for translation:

I have explained the four members [i.e., in Tibetan, *yi ge, mi 'gyur ba, g'zi*, and second *g'zi*] by outward and inward praxis. Besides, one should restrain by way of repeated words the incomparable mundane one possessed of apprehension (of outward object). I teach that the mind which is consistent with the deity has the best whispered recitation, and is possessed of apprehension (of the deity object), (so) called the "supramundane mind." (The inward praxis) avoids the repetition, and so on; acts as one with the deity and does not conceive a difference. The indissoluble nature is to be made by the mind. There is no other way to make it.

On this passage, Tsoñ-kha-pa makes this remark: 'di'i 'jig rten las 'das pa yañ 'phags pa'i rgyud kyi zag med la mi byed kyi bdag med pa'i rnam pa can dañ des zin pa'i rnal 'byor yin no/. I render this: "The supramundane of this passage does not mean the non-flux (*anāsrava*) of a noble person's stream of consciousness, but is his selflessness character and the *yoga* comprised by it." The implication is that both the mundane and the supramundane *yoga* is subject to 'flux' (*āsrava*), and that only the inward praxis of acting as one with the deity is free from it; and this is Tsoñ-kha-pa's explanation of the scripture's 'impure yoga' (with signs) and 'pure yoga' (without signs). Tsoñ-kha-pa's passage is translated above without a single bracketed expression: see Hopkins' version:

The supramundane in this passage does not refer to a non-contaminated [wisdom consciousness in the continuum of a Superior *directly* realizing emptiness] but is [a consciousness] having the aspect of selflessness [that is, realizing emptiness conceptually *or* directly] or a *yoga* conjoined with that [in which the wisdom consciousness itself manifests in form].

I need not comment further on this style of adding a multitude of bracketed expressions as a substitute for understanding and communicating the author's passage. In fact, practically every citation I looked at while reviewing this work had some minor or major fault. Since the present part of the *Sñags rim chen mo* is about the easiest of the long work, I dread what we shall be treated to if Hopkins continues with later parts of this great native work of Tibet.

It remains to mention that a fine feature of the present work is the illustrations of the 'seals' (*mudrā*), thirty-eight in number.

Alex Wayman
Columbia University

Richard Sherburne, ed. and tr., *A Lamp for the Path and Commentary of Atiśa* (London, George & Unwin, 1983 = The Wisdom of Tibet Series, 5) xiv + 226 pp.

Das vorliegende Buch, das sich dem Ziel der Reihe "The Wisdom of Tibet Series" entsprechend an ein allgemeines Leserpublikum wendet, geht zurück

auf die 1976 vorgelegte von Turrell V. Wylie betreute Dissertation "A Study of Atiśa's Commentary on His *Lamp of the Enlightenment Path* (Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma'i dka' 'grel)". . . University of Washington, die aus einer annotierten Übersetzung des *Byaṅ chub lam gyi sgron ma* (*Bodhipathapradīpa*) und des *Byaṅ chub lam gyi sgron ma'i dka' 'grel* (*Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā*) sowie dem Abdruck der beiden Texte nach dem Peking- und dem Derge-Tanjur besteht.

Die besondere Bedeutung des vorliegenden Bandes ist darin zu sehen, daß jetzt eine erste vollständige Übersetzung der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā*—nach dem Peking-Tanjur—allgemein zugänglich ist (Seite 15–187). Diesen Kommentar zum *Bodhipathapradīpa* charakterisiert Christian Lindtner in der Vorbemerkung zur Übertragung eines kurzen Stückes daraus ("Atiśa's Introduction to the Two Truths, and Its Sources. Appendix: Atiśa's Commentary to *Bodhipathapradīpa* 189–208". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 9 [1981], 205): ". . . the *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* does not seem to have received the attention to which its importance entitles it. Though a late source it is none the less noteworthy for its rich historical information and as a testimony of one of the last attempts to provide a comprehensive survey of Buddhism in India."

Die "Introduction" (Seite x–xiii) spricht kurz von der Entstehung der beiden übersetzten Werke und weist auf deren Bedeutung für das religiöse Leben Tibets hin. Zu dem kurzen Lebensbild des Atiśa (Seite xi–xii) erscheinen keine Quellenangaben; die Formulierung "all his biographers" deutet aber an, daß es mehrere Lebensbeschreibungen gibt. Von den bisher erschienenen Übersetzungen des *Bodhipathapradīpa* in europäische Sprachen—derzeit sechs—nennt R. Sherburne nur zwei, und zwar in der "Bibliography" (Seite 204–220) (Sarat Chandra Das, "Bodhi Patha Pradīpa". *Journal of the Buddhist Text Society of India*, Vol. I, Pt I, 39–48, Pt III, 21–26, und Alaka Chattopadhyaya/Lama Chimpa in A. Chattopadhyaya, *Atiśa and Tibet. Life and Works of Dīpamkara Śrījñāna in relation to the History and Religion of Tibet*. Calcutta [1967], 525–535. Unerwähnt bleiben: José Van den Broeck, *Le flambeau sur le chemin de l'Eveil* (*Bodhipathapradīpa*). Texte tibétain édité, traduit et annoté. Bruxelles 1976. (Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Bouddhiques. Série "Études et Textes". 5.), 1–12, Helmut Eimer, *Bodhipathapradīpa. Ein Leergedicht des Atiśa* (*Dīpamkaraśrījñāna*) *in der tibetischen Überlieferung*. Wiesbaden 1978. (Asiatische Forschungen. 59.), 105–141, Alex Wayman, *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real. Buddhist Meditation and the Middle View*. From the *Lam rim chen mo* of Tsoṅ-kha-pa. New York 1978, 9–14, (Gonsar Tulku/Brian C. Beresford,) "Atiśa's 'Lamp for the Path' ". *Mahayana Texts on the Graded Path. Published in Memory of the Bodhisattva Tenzin Gyaltzen, the Khunnu Lama Rinpoche*. Dharamsala, H. P. 1978, 1–25 (Pothe), und die Fassung der Übersetzung in R. Sherburnes Dissertation. Jetzt liegt noch vor Christian Lindtner, "Lampen på vejen til den højeste oplysning". *Gads religionshistoriske tekster*. København 1984, 159–163 (Abschnitt 7.3.16.).

Die Übersetzung des *Bodhipathapradīpa* bildet den Anfang des eigentlichen Buches (Seite 1–13), zu ihr zählt eine aus dem Kommentar abgeleitete Gliederungsübersicht (Seite 1). R. Sherburne unterteilt—wie auch andere Autoren (z.B. Alex Wayman)—den Text in 68 Strophen; die Behandlung der Verse im Kommentar zeigt jedoch, daß diese weitgehend mechanische Aufteilung nicht immer angemessen ist. So ist nach den beiden ersten Zeilen des Verses 8 (Zeile 29–30) ein Einschnitt anzusetzen, wie sich aus der Behandlung der beiden Teile dieser Strophe in der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* (Peking-Tanjr, *dbu ma, ki*, Folio 280a6–7 und 284a7) zeigt. Dies läßt auch die Übersetzung durch R. Sherburne erkennen: Zeile 29–30 erscheinen im Abschnitt “II Sevenfold Worship: The Good Practice” (Seite 25–28); Zeile 31–32 hingegen im Abschnitt “IV The Heart of Enlightenment” (Seite 34). Daß nach der Verszeile 30, also mitten in der Strophe 8, ein neuer Abschnitt beginnt, kann man auch aus zwei späteren Kommentaren zum *Bodhipathapradīpa* ersehen (*Byañ chub lam gyi sgron ma'i nam bšad phul byuñ bšad pa'i dga'ston* des Blo bzañ chos kyi rgyal mtshan (Panchen Lama I.) (1567–1662) und *Byañ chub lam gyi sgron ma'i 'grel pa gžuñ don gsal ba'i ñi ma* des Brag dkar sprul sku Blo bzañ dpal ldan bstan 'dzin sñan grags (19. Jhdt), siehe H. Eimer, *Bodhipathapradīpa*, 203, 210, 217 und 223).

Für die Übersetzung des Grundtextes verwendet R. Sherburne eine gehobenerere Form der Sprache, dies zeigt sich deutlich beim Vergleich mit der nicht allgemein zugänglichen Dissertation; der Grund für dieses Vorgehen mag in der Überlegung gegeben sein, daß der *Bodhipathapradīpa* in Tibet memoriert wurde, wenn die *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* studiert werden sollte. Die Übersetzung des Kommentars hingegen bemüht sich, dem Leser entgegenzukommen; daher werden umständlichere Konstruktionen, wenn z.B. verkürzte Zitate aus kanonischen Quellen eingeführt werden, aufgelöst: So gibt R. Sherburne die ersten dreizehn Strophen der *Bhadracarī* in Übertragung (Seite 25–27), um bei der Wiedergabe der Interpretation durch den Kommentar sich auf die Verszahlen beziehen zu können und nicht die angeführten Anfänge der jeweiligen Strophen zu deren Kennzeichnung übertragen—und entsprechend ergänzen—zu müssen.

Leider sind auch Stellen zu finden, an denen die Konstruktion des tibetischen Originals mißverstanden wurde. Das auffälligste Beispiel erscheint auf Seite 18:

“In this area of Tibet there are persons who misinterpret the Mahāyāna Path of the Buddha's teaching. Gurus and Spiritual Friends are arguing back and forth about things they themselves do not comprehend.”

Diese Übertragung enthält die für den Buddhismus Tibet unvorstellbare Behauptung, daß *gurus* und *kalyāṇamitras* die rechte Lehre nicht verstanden hätten. Im tibetischen Text lautet dieses Stück (Folio 278b5–6):

bod kyi yul 'di na sañs rgyas kyi bstan pa theg pa chen po'i lam 'di la log par rtog pa'i gañ zag bla ma dge ba'i bšes gñen gyis yoñs su ma zin pa dag phan tshun rtsod ciñ. . .

Man muß diese beiden Teilsätze, die auch in der biographischen Überlieferung über Atiśa erscheinen, wohl folgendermaßen verstehen:

“[Weil] hier im Lande Tibet Menschen mit falscher Denkweise, die von keinem Lehrer, [der ja] ein Freund [auf dem Wege] zum Heil [ist,] richtig geleitet werden, über die Lehre des Buddha, diesen Weg des Mahāyāna, hin und her disputieren . . .”

Von besonderem Wert dürfte es für fachkundigen Benutzer sein, daß R. Sherburne in den Anmerkungen, die an den Kapitelenden zusammengefaßt werden, zu sehr vielen Zitaten buddhistischer Schriften in Grundtext und Kommentar die Stellenangaben im Kanon anführt, und zwar in dem Nachdruck des tibetischen Tripiṭaka aus Peking (Abkürzung “Ot.”). Wenn Zitate aus Texten erscheinen, von denen Übersetzungen ins Englische oder Französische allgemein verbreitet sind, wird so gut wie nur auf diese Bezug genommen. Damit sind fast alle zitierten Stücke identifiziert. Den Sanskrit-Parallelen geht R. Sherburne nicht weiter nach, sonst hätte er zu neun Strophen des *Bodhipathapradīpa* eine dem heute verlorenen Original nahestehende Fassung finden können: Strophe 15–17 (Verszeile 59–70) sind als Zitat aus der *Vīradattapariṣcchā* in der *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* und im ersten *Bhāvanākrama* des Kamalaśīla erhalten, Strophe 26–31 (Verszeile 105–128) als Zitat aus dem *Mañjuśrībuddhakṣetraguṇavyūhālaṅkārasūtra* im *Śikṣāsamuccaya* des Śāntideva.

Die im *Bodhipathapradīpa* und in der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* erscheinenden Titel von buddhistischen Schriften führt R. Sherburne nur in englischer Übersetzung an, und zwar—wie eine Vorbemerkung zum ersten Teil der “Bibliography” (Seite 204) sagt—übertragen nach den tibetischen oder Sanskrit-Formen, die sich in Atiśas Werken finden. Dies mag ein Vorgehen sein, das für ein allgemeines Publikum zunächst sinnvoll erscheint; bei dem Bemühen jedoch, tiefer in den Buddhismus einzudringen, muß der Benutzer z.B. *Stalks in Array Sūtra* oder *Hearer’s Level* unter den “Primary Sources, *A Buddhist Scriptures*” (Seite 204–215) in der “Bibliography” aufsuchen, wenn er die ursprünglichen Titel *Gaṇḍa-vyūhasūtra*/ *Sdoñ po bkod pa’i mdo* oder *Śrāvakabhūmi*/*Ñan thos kyi sa* nicht aus der Wiedergabe erschließen kann. Der “Index” (Seite 221–226) bietet keine Hilfe, wenn man von den tibetischen oder Sanskrit-Titeln ausgehend deren Übersetzung durch R. Sherburne auffinden will, er enthält die englischen Formen. Auch das “Glossary” (Seite 192–203) hilft bei den Titeln nicht weiter; es erklärt neben allgemein üblichen Sanskritbegriffen und einigen Sanskrit-Namen die in die Übersetzung aufgenommenen Wiedergaben buddhistischer Termini.

Die Übersetzung der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* wird in zwei Hauptstücke “Vehicle of the Perfections” (Seite 23–161) und “Vehicle of Mysticism” (Seite 165–187) und das erstere noch in Teile (“Parts”) und Kapitel untergliedert; jedem Kapitel ist eine schematische Übersicht über dessen Aufbau vorangestellt. Diese Unterteilung ist weitgehend aus Zwischenkolophonen im

tibetischen Text abgeleitet. Jedoch *ñan thos kyi theg pa'i skabs rdzogs so* (Folio 304b2), "This completes the section on the Hearer's Vehicle" (Seite 80), wird nicht genutzt, um ein Hauptstück "Śrāvakayāna" abzusetzen; der Grund hierzu ist nicht ersichtlich, in der Dissertation hingegen erscheint zu der betreffenden Stelle (Seite 250, Anm. 132) der lapidare Hinweis: "This section conclusion has been inserted by a later editor and is not one of the original main topic headings Atiśa gives; see Dedication and Theme . . ." Folgt man nun diesem Verweis und sucht die Übersetzung von Folio 279b3-5 auf, also die Bestimmung des Themas der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā*, findet man in dem Buch auf Seite 20 eine Gliederung in fünf mit Großbuchstaben bezeichnete Punkte, auf die aber später nicht Bezug genommen wird. Die Übersetzung des Themas ist ungenau, vom tibetischen Text werden nämlich nicht fünf Hauptpunkte genannt, sondern deren drei, wobei der erste wiederum untergliedert ist. Aufgrund dieses Mißverständnisses konnte R. Sherburne die Probleme, die sich aus den divergierenden Gliederungshinweisen in der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* ergeben, nicht erfassen.

Schon beim ersten Durchblättern fallen kleinere redaktionelle Mängel des Buches auf, hier sind zuerst die Unterschiede zwischen dem Haupttitel und dem Umschlagtitel der Paperback-Ausgabe oder auch der Kolummentitel auf Seite 17 und 19 "Commentary on the Difficult Points" statt "Dedication and Theme" zu nennen. Ein sehr unschöner Fehler, der sich nur aus nachlässiger Redaktion ergeben haben kann, ist auf Seite 11 geschehen: In der Übersetzung des *Bodhipathapradīpa* erscheinen als Strophe 57 vier Zeilen, und zwar nach der Prosaerleitung für das Zitat (Zeile 228a) nur drei Verszeilen (Zeile 229-230 und 232); es müßten aber insgesamt fünf Zeilen sein, da eine volle vierzeilige Strophe zitiert wird. Auf Seite 147 werden nun in der Übersetzung von Folio 327b3 der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā*, wo nur die Prosaerleitung von Strophe 56 (Zeile 224a) mit dem Vermerk *zes pa la sogs pa*, "und so weiter", steht, die Strophen 56, 57 und 58 aus dem *Bodhipathapradīpa* angeführt. Und zu Strophe 57 findet sich am Fuß der Seite die durch ein Sternchen bezeichnete Anmerkung: "Atiśa has apparently abbreviated the root text. See p. 11." Die auf Seite 11 in der Übersetzung fehlende Verszeile 231, *rnam rtog bgrod dka' rnam 'das te*, die R. Sherburne auf Seite 147 mit "And transcends the arduous trails of such thought," wiedergibt, wird von ihm in der Dissertation in der Übersetzung des Grundtextes (Seite 45) wiedergegeben und im Abdruck des *Bodhipathapradīpa* (Seite 487) im Wortlaut mitgeteilt.

Die Veröffentlichung einer ersten Übersetzung der *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* hat diesen umfassenden und für die Buddhismuskunde so bedeutsamen Text einem weiten Publikum verfügbar gemacht. Besonderen Nutzen werden aus diesem Buch aber nur diejenigen ziehen können, die über Kenntnis des Tibetischen verfügen und sich in die Fragen der buddhistischen Religion eingearbeitet haben; denn nur sie können merken, ob die Wiedergabe des Textes der tibetischen Fassung entspricht, und den wertvollen Nachweisen der Quellen von kanonischen Zitaten nachgehen.

Helmut Eimer
Bonn

Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher (eds.), *Contributions on Tibetan Language, History and Culture. Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Symposium Held at Velm-Vienna, Austria, 13-19 September 1981* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 10-11, Wien, 1983) 2 vols., xvii + 455 pp. + 18 plates; x + 332 pp.

The two volumes containing the papers presented at the Velm Symposium reflect the impressive present-day range and quality of Tibetan studies. The first volume consists of papers which might be classified as "general Tibetology," while the second volume mainly consists of papers which deal with various aspects of religion and philosophy and which fully justify the assertion of the editors that "the originality of the Tibetan masters goes well beyond their fascinating achievements in Buddhist exegesis only" (I, xvii).

In a short review it is impossible to deal with each article, and unfair to single out a few contributions for special mention while passing the remainder by in silence. I will therefore limit myself to presenting the major themes and subjects dealt with, giving only brief references to the relevant contributions.

The basic discipline of linguistics is well represented: R. A. Miller writes on "Thon mi Sambhoṭa and his grammatical treatises reconsidered," and not less than three papers deal with the modern Amdo dialect (G. Kara, Thubten J. Norbu, and A. Róna Tas). B. Shefts Chang and Kun Chang write on "Tense and aspect in spoken Tibetan," Ngawangthondup Narkyid on "The origin of the Tibetan script," and Wang Yao on the development of tones in Tibetan. Useful lexical articles are provided by R. E. Emmerick and J. Karsten. P. Klafkowski's study of the history of Tibetan Bible translations must also be mentioned here.

Another field in which considerable progress has been made in recent years is the study of early Tibetan history. Notable contributions are included by C. I. Beckwith, Fang Kuei Li, and J. Szerb. Later Tibetan history is dealt with by E. Sperling.

Literary history and analysis of written sources are the subject of articles by H. Eimer, D. Schuh, and H. Uebach. The history of Tibetan studies in the West is dealt with by E. Csetri (Csoma de Kőrös) and A. Pinsker (Johann Grueber). Tibetan medicine is discussed by E. Finckh, and Tibetan musicology by M. Helffer.

F. A. Bischoff ("Die Wu T'ai Shan Darstellung von 1846") and J. L. Panglung ("Die Überreste des Klosters Ńar ma in Ladakh") write on art and architecture. Social anthropology is represented by G. E. Clarke ("The Great and Little Traditions in the study of Yolmo, Nepal"). P. Klafkowski's article on the literature of the Lepchas and J. Karsten's article on the Lhasa New Year celebrations may also be included here.

A few articles focus on other Central Asian peoples (H. Stang on the naming of Činggis and Wang Yao on the emperor Kung-ti of the Sung dynasty). Finally, G. Uray's study of Tibet's connections with Nestorianism and Manicheism in the eighth to the tenth centuries provides a thorough

presentation and evaluation of a question of great importance for the early cultural and religious history of Tibet.

The second volume has been edited with the conviction that "Alongside of the traditionally established divisions of tibetological research it is the new presence of the study of the theoretical efforts and traditions within Tibetan religions and philosophy which we are tempted to note as a distinguishing feature of the Symposium at Velm-Vienna." Thus, the volume contains several articles dealing with the philosophy and literature of the Mādhyamika school (S. Diets, M. Kalf, Ch. Lindtner, K. Mimaki, O. H. Pindt, D. Seyfort Ruegg, M. Sato, H. Tauscher) as well as other aspects of Tibetan Buddhist philosophy (L. S. Kawamura, L. Schmithausen, E. Steinkellner, J. Takasaki, T. Tillemans, and P. M. Williams). Discussions of central problems in the native Tibetan hermeneutical tradition are provided by M. Broido and N. Katz. Religious history in the strict sense of the term is dealt with by E. De Rossi-Filibeck and S. G. Karmay. Finally, Achok Rimpoche presents a Buddhist message of universal relevance: "The importance of love and compassion in Buddhism."

While not entirely absent, reminders that Tibetan culture and religion are also a part of the contemporary world are relatively few and far between in these volumes. Obviously, a scholarly gathering is not an appropriate context for what might easily become a political and ideological confrontation. Still, perhaps all of us who are engaged in Tibetan studies might consider whether our scholarly efforts might not in one way or another more specifically involve the realities which form the premises today of Tibetan civilization—both outside and inside Tibet.

This having been said, I hasten to add that the two volumes of the Velm Symposium augur well for the future of Tibetan studies, and should be acquired by anyone interested in the trends and interests of present-day Tibetology.

Per Kvaerne
Universitet i Oslo
