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EDITORIAL

It is a great pleasure to report that the second volume of the *Journal of the Tibet Society* has been received even more positively than the first. The present issue embodies, we hope, further improvements.

Our new Assistant Editor, Dr. Michael Walter, has provided a set of standard abbreviations of commonly-used references for use in *Journal* publications. It is expected that all future manuscripts submitted for publication in the *Journal of the Tibet Society* will use these abbreviations. Additions to this list may be published in a future revised list; all suggestions in this regard are welcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Abbreviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKBAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AÖAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArOr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSOAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWCBRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWCRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRDTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBHAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SÖAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAJB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAJW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.I.B.
Articles

A NOTE ON DGOS-'BREL

Michael M. Broido

INTRODUCTION

This note is about the group of terms used in India and Tibet for specifying the conditions that a piece of writing should be a work of science, a šāstra (bstan-bcos). These terms describe the connection between the whole work and the general purposes for which it was written and is to be studied. The Indians do not seem to have had a single word for these terms and the topic covered by them, but in Tibet the word dgos-'brel was used. In this note we deal mainly with the application of the dgos-'brel terms to the tantras. Tibetan texts keep this topic separate from the topic called bshad-thabs, i.e., "methods of explaining (the tantras)." While dgos-'brel is applied to the tantras themselves, bshad-thabs is about the methods used in commenting upon them; still, there are some areas of overlap.

Though the dgos-'brel texts do not say explicitly that the tantras are šāstras, they do make use of the traditional criteria for a piece of writing to be a šāstra, and they show how the texts satisfy these criteria. Only one such passage (as far as I know) has come to us in Sanskrit. This is found in the Vimalaprabhā, the celebrated commentary on the Kālacakratantra which is held in such high esteem in both India and Tibet. That passage is given in both Sanskrit and Tibetan in Appendix A.

The dgos-'brel of a work is often discussed under five headings, viz. the *text (rjod-byed, abhidhāna), its *topic (brjod-bya, abhidheya), the immediate *purpose (dgos-pa, prayaohana) for which it was written, the more *distant purpose (dgos-pa'i dgos-pa or nying-dgos, prayaohanaprayojava), and the *connection ('brel-ba, sambandha) between them. All these words are commonplace, but they take on a specific shade of meaning in this context. Our authors tell us mainly what are their referents, without specifying their senses (perhaps supposing these to be well-known). I will try to fill this gap. Some of the difficulties of translating intensional terms such as the two prayaohanas are discussed in Appendix B. The most interesting Tibetan account of dgos-'brel known to me is that of Bkra-shis Rnam-rgyal (1512-87), discussed in sec. 2.7 and partly given in Tibetan in Appendix C.

1. THE GENERAL USAGE OF THE DGOS-'BREL TERMS

1.1 dgos-'brel. This word is used in Tibetan texts only, not in translations of Indian texts. It may be no more than a contraction of dgos-pa and 'brel-ba, a kind of dvandva. Since it is a specialised technical term, I will not translate it at all. Its main concern is with the interpretation of a work as a whole, and not with that of its parts; here too it differs from *methods of explanation (bshad-thabs, see note 2).
The Indian Vajrayāna works known to me which discuss dgos-'brel all belong to the mother division of the anuttarayogatantras (Hevajra, Cakrasamvara, Kālecakra). dgos-'brel is concerned mainly with the literal or expressed sense of the texts, and its appearance in connection with the mother-tantras no doubt has much to do with the fact that they are meant to be taken (comparatively) literally. In contrast, the father-tantras rely much more on various kinds of indirect or implied sense; this is dealt with more fully in bshad-thabs, and so it is not surprising that the father-tantras have an elaborate bshad-thabs. But Tibetan authors tend to apply both dgos-'brel and bshad-thabs to both the father and mother tantras.

To see how the dgos-'brel terms fit together, we may consider Vajragarbha’s account of them in relation to the Hevajra-tantra, an account which he seems to be quoting from the Hevajra-tantra in 500,000 verses:

In the laghu-tantra [in 700 verses], the *topic is the Jina Hevajra together with Nairātmyā. The *text is the collection of chapters of the tantra which bring about understanding (rtogs-pa). The *connection is the mark of this *text and its *topic of being mutually related as text and topic. The *purpose is to grant power to enter the mandala, etc. The *distant purpose is to bring about clarity on the nature of things after empowerment.

These five remarks by Vajragarbha spell out the referents of the five terms in the case of the Hevajra-tantra. Let us now, under the remaining headings, explain their senses as they seem to have been used in various texts.

1.2 rjod-byed (the *text; abhidhāna). This term is not intensional. In general it stands for words, sentences, discourse, as a system of signs, that is, considered as associated with the conventions or rules which govern their use for communication between people familiar with the language of which they form a part. In the present dgos-'brel context, the word is used to refer just to the tantra or other work under consideration. (Bu-ston and Tsong-kha-pa are taking certain bshad-thabs materials as the *text; all our other authors are mainly concerned with the tantra as *text, but Skra-shis Rnam-rgyal supplies in addition a parallel analysis where the *text is the primary dgos-'brel he has supplied for the Hevajra-tantra). The Vimalaprabhā distinguishes between the general notion of discourse (vācaka) and the particular *text (abhidhāna) under consideration; this distinction is special to the dgos-'brel context and was ignored by the translators of the VP, who rendered both words by rjod-byed (cf. Appendix A and note 8).

1.3 brjod-bya (the *topic, abhidheya). This term is intensional, since whether U is the topic of V depends on the name used for U; see Appendix B. Abhidheya in general means that which is to be expressed (literally, just as abhidhā is the literal sense of a word). However, here in dgos-'brel the referent of the terms abhidheya, brjod-bya seems to be simply what the *text is about; Hevajra and Nairātmyā in the above quotation from Vajragarbha. But the term is more intensional than this suggests. The word “topic” has an intensional ambiguity: it can mean either the topic indicated by the words, or
the topic intended by the author (of course these are normally identical). This ambiguity is found also in the present use of abhidheya, brjod-byas, and motivates my choice of "*topic." However, the word does not denote an intention in the dgos-*brel context (though it may do elsewhere), this being the province of the two *purposes. The Sanskrit again distinguishes between the general case (vācya) and the present case (abhidheya) in a way not reflected in Tibetan (brjod-byas).

1.4 *brel-ba (the *connection, sambandha). Obviously the general idea here is that of the connection between a work and its topic. The use of discourse (vācaka, rjod-byed) is governed by conventions, and these limit the range of things which a piece of discourse can be held to be about. In a long piece of discourse, such as a whole tantra or sāstra, we might expect that the *text would determine the *topic uniquely. Perhaps this is the point of the word phan-tshun (parasparam, App. A) which means "mutually"; however, this is not to be taken too seriously, since the *topic will never determine the *text uniquely. *Text and *topic must be appropriately connected; so the sambandha has often been called "aptness" or "fitness"; "connection" is literal.

1.5 dgos-pa (the *purpose, prayojana). In all cases it is supposed that the *text is uttered with some intention beyond a strictly perlocutionary one (for instance if a maṇḍala-rite is described the perlocutionary intention may be to get people to do it). The *purpose is a more general purpose, yet related to the immediate form of the *text.

1.6 dgos-pa'i dgos-pa (or nying-dgos: the *distant purpose, prayojanaprapyojana). The *purpose of the text is not necessarily the ultimate goal which its utterance is intended to achieve. The *purpose may be achieved for the sake of a further purpose; the latter is the *distant purpose. The Sanskrit and Tibetan phrases might be more literally rendered by "secondary purpose," indicating the dependence of the dgos-pa'i dgos-pa on the dgos-pa; yet the *distant purpose is often more important than the *purpose, and so I avoid the word "secondary."

1.7 The necessary and sufficient conditions for a text to be a śāstra are that it should have a *topic and a *purpose, and that *text and *topic should be suitably *connected. Our texts do not always mention the *text, presumably since it is taken for granted. On the other hand there is a real controversy over whether the *distant purpose is necessary or even useful. The point at issue can be seen by taking the *text to be the Nyāyabindu of Dharmaśāstra. Śūtra I.1 says that right knowledge will be expounded (vyutpāda) since it precedes the achievement of all human aims (artha). Vīnātadeva10 says that the *purpose of the work is to expound right knowledge, and the *distant purpose (the purpose of the purpose) is to achieve all human aims. Dharmottara11 ignores this distinction and explains how the *purpose of the work is expressed by the entire śūtra.
2. THE DGOS-'BREL TERMS AS USED IN INDIVIDUAL VAJRAYĀNA TEXTS

2.1 Vimalaprabhā: the *text is the Kālacakratantra, the *topic is Kālacakra, the *purpose is to accumulate merit through entering the maṇḍala and giving worldly empowerment, and the *distant purpose is to accumulate both merit and awareness once the “disconnected” (niranvaya) siddhis of mahāmudra have been obtained, following the transworldly fourth empowerment of great prajñā. This passage is given in Appendix A, and following it the VP speaks of the arising of the goal of buddhahood in the aspirant once the five parts (of dgos-'brel) have been experienced.

2.2 Vajragarbhaṭikā: see section 1.1 above.

2.3 Bde-mchog Stod-'grel: the *topic is Heruka (i.e., Cakrasaṃvara), the *text is the Cakrasaṃvaratantra, the *connection is as in 1.1 above. The *purpose is to achieve worldly siddhi and act for the benefit of beings (after) entering the maṇḍala; the *distant purpose is to achieve the siddhis of mahāmudra (through) accumulations of merit and awareness, and (to attain) Buddhahood.

2.4 Bsod-nams-rtse-mo: the *text is the tantra under discussion, the *topic is the “three tantras” of ground, path and goal, the *purpose is to get oneself and others to internalize (nyams-su len-pa) the “three tantras.” The *distant purpose is to go to the ultimate in these three tantras (rgyud gsum-par mthar-phying-pa). The *connection is the connection as of cause and effect between means and that which arises from means [e.g., the connection of the two satyas, Madhyamakāvatāra VI.80].

2.5 Bu-ston: here the context is the “seven ornaments” of the Pratītpoddyotana, upon which Bu-ston is commenting. The *text is the “thirteen ornaments not different from the tantra,” viz., the six alternatives (mtha-drug), the four methods of explanation (shul-bzhi) and the two styles of explanation (bshad- shul gnyis). The *topic is the remaining ornaments, viz., the introduction (gleng bslang-ba), the four arguments on rising into buddhahood (sangs-rgya-ba'i rigs-pa bzhi), and the “certainty about the two satyas” (bden-gnyis nges-pa). The *purpose is that the person entering the tantra become certain about this *topic, [specifically] the two satyas. The *distant purpose is the two levels of siddhi.

2.6 Tsong-kha-pa's treatment can easily cause confusion because he is commenting not on the Guhyasamāja itself but on its ākhyā-tantra (bshad-rgyud) the Jñānavajrasamuccaya. This does not contain the usual maṇḍalas, rituals, etc., but consists of *methods of explanation (bshad-thabs) for the GST. He says that when studying any tantra one should always be asking: What is the *topic? What is the *purpose? (etc.). Then he says of the JVS: the *topic is the seven ornaments of bshad-thabs. The *purpose is that on the basis of this tantra (viz., the JVS) one should well understand the don (artha) of the tantra under consideration (viz., the GST). The *distant purpose is that when
one is convinced of this artha and has taken it to heart, the most able will attain the siddhi of a buddha, the medium the eight types of siddhi, and the least able the siddhis šānti, etc. The *connection is understanding how the artha of *topic, *purpose, and *distant purpose depend on the tantra under study. [On this use of don (artha), cf. the end of Appendix B.]

This reads like a simple attempt to combine the dgos-'brel of the explanatory tantra JVS with that of the mūlatantra GST. It might be better to acknowledge that each needs separate explanation, and perhaps also to separate dgos-'brel in the style of Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal (sec. 2.7).

It is interesting that Tsong-kha-pa’s *distant purpose (nying-dgos) is practically the same as the *purpose (dgos-pa) given in verse 16 of the Pradīpoddyotana:21

/dgos-pa yang ni bshad-bya ste/ /zhi-sogs bya-ba’i cho-ga dang/
de-bzhin grub-pa brgyad dang ni/ /sangs-rgyas kyang ni mchog yin-no/

which might perhaps be rendered:

To explain the *purpose: it is the procedure for calming and so forth, and the eight siddhis, and the highest buddhahood.

Thus according to Tsong-kha-pa, the *purpose of the seven ornaments is similar to the *distant purpose of dgos-'brel, at least for the GST. This example warns us against the careless transfer of such technical terms from one context to another.22

2.7 Sgam-po-pa Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal.23 The introduction to his commentary [E] on the Hevajra-tantra contains an account of dgos-'brel more elaborate than any so far considered. He starts by setting it in the context of Vasubandhu’s rnam-bshad rig-pa, identifying it with dgos-pa (purpose), the first of five conditions24 without which explanations of the sūtras are said to fail. He then gives two applications of each of the four main dgos-'brel terms; these applications will be distinguished by suffices. The first set takes the tantra under discussion as the *text, while the second set takes for its *text the explanation of the dgos-'brel for the first *text. He says:25

In order to arouse the interest of the listener,26 before the tantra is explained it is necessary to speak of the dgos-'brel. [The rnam-bshad rig-pa] says: “In order to arouse the interest of a listener who has heard about the greatness of the sūtras, one should first speak of the purpose.” Now, in dgos-'brel there are four well-known items (chos): *topic, *purpose, *connection and *distant purpose; or, if the *text itself is added, five. Consider the set of four. Then the artha27 indicated by the words of the text (gshung) is the *topic. The artha to be understood (go-ba) on the basis of these words is the *purpose. The artha to be realised by the person [receiving instruction] is the *distant purpose. The connection between the *topics and these two *purposes is called the *connection.

Next, we have the four [items of the dgos-'brel2 based] on the words of the dgos-'brel. The four items *purpose, etc. [of the dgos-'brel] based on
the words of the gzhung are the *topic2. The *purpose2 is that on the basis of the words of the dgos-*brel4, the person should understand (rtogs-pa) these four items as being in the gzhung. The *distant purpose is that when they have been understood, the person should enter29 into the gzhung. The *connection2 is analogous to the *connection1.

Bkra-shis-nam-rgyal also spells out the five referents of "*topic1," etc., as in sec. 2.3. Unfortunately he does not do this for the dgos-*brel2. For the Tibetan, see Appendix C.

2.8. Padma-dkar-po30 and Kong-sprul 31 both give brief accounts of dgos-*brel in their works on the Hevajra-tantra. But they add little to Vajragarbha (sec. 2.2) and Bkra-shis-nam-rgyal (sec. 2.7) respectively.

* * * * * * * *

APPENDIX A: THE VIMALAPRABHĀ ON DGOS-*BREL

Extracts from the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts

Sanskrit This is transcribed from a microfilm of text E 13746 as filmed by the Nepalese-German Ms. preservation project. The section transcribed occurs at 10b7-lla2 and is part of the introduction to the work (i.e., not really commenting on any verse of the Kālacakratantra). This part of the ms. is very clear and I have transcribed it without alteration apart from a single slip of the pen in the second sentence (ms.: abhidhiyā).

ata utkād anena kramaṇa pañcapiṭalasvabhāva tayāvasthitaḥ // kālacakro bhagavānagrābhidheyaḥ // asya pratipādakam pañtalasamūham tantrarājam abhidhānapam // anayān abhidheya-abhidhānapayāḥ parasparam vācyavācakalokaśanāḥ sambandhah // vācyo bhagavān kālacakraḥ pañcapiṭalasvabhāva tayāvasthitaḥ // vācakam kālacakram abhidhānapaścapiṭalātmakaṃ // anāṭidibuddho bhagavān vācyāḥ // vācakam ādibuddham abhidhānaṃ iti, vācyavācakalokaśanāḥ // abhidheyaabhidhānasambandhāḥ // ato maṇḍala-praveśałauikkābhīśeka dānena punyāsambhārārthakāraṇaṃ prayojanam, mahāprajñācaturthhalokottarābhīśeka dāna nirvanyaya mahāmudrāsiddhi lābhāya, punyājñānasambhārārthakāraṇaṃ prayojana-prayojanam iti //

Tibetan This is transcribed from the reprint of the Sde-dge edition, 12a1-a5. (As is well-known, this reprint is excellent and very clear.)

```

```
ིན་ཐེག་པར་ཞིག་བྱུང་ནི། འཛིན་བཏོན་དུང་དེ་དེ་བྱ་བཅོས་ཐེག་པར་ཞིག་བྱུང་ནི།
ིན་ཐེག་པར་ཞིག་བྱུང་ནི་དེ་དེ་བྱ་བཅོས་ཐེག་པར་ཞིག་བྱུང་ནི།
བཅོམ་རྣམ་རབ་དགེ་གཞི་ཅིག་ཁྱབ་མ་ཨུ་མུང་ཐེག་པར་ཞིག་བྱུང་ནི།
བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན།
བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན།
བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན།
བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན།
བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན།
བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན།
བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན། བདེ་ཡི་ན།

••••••
APPENDIX B: TRANSLATING INTENSIONAL TERMS

As in the body of the paper we must distinguish carefully between intention (with a t) and intension (with an s). I shall treat intention colloquially, as similar to purpose. Intension is a term of art and needs definition. Consider any substantive (noun or adjective). The set of things to which it applies is called its extension. If its meaning is fully specified by giving its extension, it is said to be extensional; if not, it is intensional.

Roughly speaking, intensionality arises from the possibility of one thing having more than one name, as follows. Let $a, b \ldots$ be things (so "a", "b" \ldots denote things). We do not demand that $a, b \ldots$ all be distinct. Let $a^*, b^* \ldots$ be names of $a, b \ldots$; of course we do not demand that each thing have a unique name, so that $a \rightarrow a^*$ is not a function. Thus, $^*$ acts as a kind of quotation mark. However, it is important to acknowledge explicitly that quotation does not have to be done with inverted commas "\ldots"; in Tibetan it is done with \ldots zhes-pa. I shall regard $a^*, b^* \ldots$ as used for the purpose of identifying reference in the sense of Strawson. So "a = b" means that a and b are the same thing; "$a^* = b^*$" means that $a^*$ and $b^*$ are the same name (under some unspecified individuation-condition). Normally neither of $a = b$ and $a^* = b^*$ follows from the other. Now let $F$ be a predicate (standing for a property, say a Begriff in the sense of Frege). A typical subject-predicate sentence will have the form $F(a^*)$, say. If $F$ is extensional as just defined, then the truth-value of $F(a^*)$ is determined by $F$ and $a$, but not by $a^*$; if $a = b$, then $F(a^*)$ and $F(b^*)$ are true or false together. (Though it is not my purpose to give a rigorous argument, the assertion follows rigorously whenever meaning is determined by truth-conditions, in particular if meaning is taken to be Fregean sense.) However, if $F$ is intensional, then even though $a = b$, $F(a^*)$ and $F(b^*)$ may not be true or false together. This phenomenon is called referential opacity and its presence is the most useful (sufficient) criterion for intensionality.

Extensional terms are relatively easy to translate. We find out what the extension is (the set of things to which the foreign term applies) and we then try to find an English term with the same extension. The difficulty with intensional terms is that there seems to be no simple guideline of this type.

Consider the problem of translating brjod-byas (abhidheya). Anything whatever can be spoken of (brjod-pa, vac-), so anything can be a brjod-bya. This alone does not tell us what brjod-byas means. (What are we saying about something when we say it is the brjod-byas of something else? This is exactly the question which is begged if we claim that we know the meaning of brjod-bya once we know, for each X, what [if anything] is the brjod-bya of X. Yet this is just the kind of information given by most of the texts quoted in the body of the paper.) Thus the term is intensional. What more is there to the meaning? My "topic" is just a guess based on the examples mentioned in the texts (it has the right referents and seems to have the right kind of intensional ambiguity, as mentioned in sec. 1.3). Otherwise it just "seems to fit." This is unsatisfactorily vague; we want a better criterion, but I don’t know any.
Is brjod-byā (abhidheya) also referentially opaque? This depends on delicate questions of individuation. For instance, Hevajra and Cakrasaṃvara are both Heruka, but Hevajra is not Cakrasaṃvara (contrast Frege’s famous example: the morning star and the evening star are both Venus; but is the morning star the evening star?) Even so, it seems fairly clear that Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal is treating “brjod-byā” as referentially transparent. Consider [E, 15b2]: spyir rgud-kyi bstan-byā’i gtso-bor gyur-pa’i bcom-ladan-’das de-nyid brjod-byā/; it seems clear that he would be prepared to treat this remark as a schema, into which the name of a tantra and any name of its chief deity can be substituted to yield a true sentence, as long as coferentiality is preserved. He actually gives an example in which (because of the context) the substitution of “Heruka” for “Cakrasaṃvara” preserves the reference, while the substitution of “Hevajra” for “Cakrasaṃvara” plainly would not.

The situation is even more difficult for the translation of artha (don) when it means roughly “meaning” or “intention,” or for prayojana (dgos-pa) when it means roughly “purpose.” These English expressions do not refer at all, there seem to be no things called meanings, purposes, etc. That being so, what could constitute evidence for the correctness of “meaning,” “purpose,” even in particular cases, except a kind of vague goodness of fit? And if nothing counts as evidence in any particular case, nothing can count as evidence in general (e.g., for the linguistic meanings). Similar difficulties occur with such terms as brjod-don, dgos-don, dgongs-gzhi, etc. (also other compounds of dgongs-pa). In this area there does seem to be a good case for adopting the Tibetan expedient of simply ruling that a certain English expression (perhaps picked out by some typographical device, such as the prefixed asterisk) shall stand for some specified Sanskrit or Tibetan expression. Needless to say, a device of this kind creates a new word. This is very far from the claim that the English word (without the asterisk) means the same as that Sanskrit or Tibetan word; and it seems hard indeed to know what this claim might mean.

These themes are well illustrated by the passage of Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal given in section 2.7. There we see the intensionality of don, artha in some of the many ambiguous ways in which it is used. These include the concept conveyed by a word or a phrase; the general purpose for which sentences or texts may be uttered; the content which may be conveyed by means of their utterance; and the intention or purpose towards which the audience may be directed as a result of hearing (and perhaps acting upon) the utterance. All these ways of using don, artha might perhaps be broadly covered by “sense.” (Clearly many other uses will not be covered; consider e.g., paramārtha-satya or artha-śāstra.) So let us invent the pseudo-English *sense; the middle of Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal’s remarks becomes (dropping the suffices):

Then the *sense indicated by the words of the text (gzhung) is the *topic. The *sense to be understood (go-ba) on the basis of these words is the *purpose. The *sense which is to be realized by the person [receiving instruction] is the *distant purpose.
Is this English? Does it make better sense, as we naively say? We need a short word ambiguous for the object or the content of an intentional state. Colloquial English does not seem to possess such a word. Could *sense function in this way?

* * * * * * * *

APPENDIX C:
BKRA-SHS- RNAM-RGYAL ON DGOS-'BREL: TIBETAN TEXT
[Source: E, 15a b]
[For the subsequent quotation see sec. 2.3; the Tibetan is similar to that in appendix A.]
GST: Guhyasamājatantra  
JVS: Jñānavrajasamuccaya  
PPD: Pradīpoddyotana (Peking)  
PPDT: PPD-abhisandhi-prakāśikā-nāma vyākhyā-ṭīkā by Bhavyakīrti (Snar-thang)  
VG: Vajragarbhaṭīkā (Snar-thang)  
VP: Vimalaprabhā  
VPS, VPT: Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of VP (cf. Appendix A)

A. Sa-skya-pa Bsod-nams Rtse-mo (1141–82): Rgyud-sde spyi’i rnam-bzhag  
B. Bu-ston (1290–1364): Dpal gsang ba ’dus-pa’i ṭikka sgron-ma rab-tu gsal-ba  
E. Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal (1512–87): Kye’i rdo-rje’i ’grel-pa legs-bshad nima’i od-zer  
H. Padma-dkar-po (1527–92): Dpal kye’i rdo-rje’i spyi-don grub-pa’i yid’phrog  
J. Kong-sprul (1813–99): Brtag-gnyis spyi-don gsang-ba bla-med rdo-rje drwa-ba’i rgyan  
K. Kong-sprul: Rgyud bla-ma’i snying-don-gyi rnam’-grel phyir mi-ldog-pa’i sengge’i nga-ro

NOTES

1. *dgos’-brel* is the term used by Bsod-nams-rtse-mo, Tsong-kha-pa and Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal and seems fairly standard. Padma-dkar-po and Kong-sprul use the variant *dgos-don*. Odder is Bu-ston’s *dgongs’-grel*.


3. The asterisk * before an English word indicates a cipher for the corresponding Tibetan or Sanskrit expression in the relevant context. This device is intended to help the reader who does not know oriental languages, without committing me to unsupportable claims about “translation.” See Appendix B.

4. The distinction between expressed and implied senses, e.g., that of vācyā/vyaṅgya (brjod-byas/gsal-byas) is fundamental in such Indian works on poetics (alaṅkāraśāstra) as the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, and clearly influenced the treatment of bshad-thabs in the introduction of Bhavyakīrti’s important commentary PPDT on the PPD. Bh. also uses the distinction of sabdālaṅkāra and arthālaṅkāra in the same way as all alaṅkāraśāstra works since Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. See my “Killing, Lying, Stealing and Adultery: a Problem of Interpretation in the Tantras,” to appear in the Proceedings of the 1984 Conference on Buddhist Hermeneutics, held at
the Kuroda Institute, Los Angeles (ed. Lopez). However this influence of poetics on tantric commentary seems to have been much weaker in Tibet, and so will not be mentioned further in this note. Again, even when the vocabulary of poetics is not available for whatever reason, the problem of expressed and implied sense remains. Many Tibetans dealt with it by using a vocabulary of their own (not derived entirely from Sanskrit). See, e.g., my “Abhiprāya and Implication in Tibetan Linguistics”, *J. Ind. Phil.* vol. 12, pp. 1–33, 1984. Yet again, the implied sense enters into dgos-'brel only indirectly, in connection with the two *purposes*, and so will not be further considered here. (See also note 17.)

5. VG 7a3
6. kye'i rdo-rje 'bum-lnga-pa las, ibid.
7. This reference is to the Hevajra-tantra as we now have it, here called nyung-ngu'i rgyud-gzung.
8. brjod-par-bya-ba dang rjod-par-byed-pa (also in the VP; Skt. is vācyavācaka, not abhidheya-abhidhāna).
9. It is desirable to maintain a feeling for the distinction between the general rules for using a word and the rules which apply in the special context under consideration, even though this distinction is difficult to draw clearly. I shall attempt to deal with both.

10. Vinītadeva’s *Nyāyabinduṭikā* (ed. Poussin) on NB I.1, e.g.,

![Image]

Both Vinītadeva and Dharmottara refer to the N.B. as *prakaraṇa* (work, treatise) but Vinītadeva explicitly identifies this word with *śāstra* at 31.6.

11. Dharmottara’s *Nyāyabinduṭikā* (ed. Malvania) on NB I.1: samyagjñāna-pūrviketyādīnā’sya prakaraṇasya abhidheyaprayojanam... prakaraṇa-abhideyasya samyagjñānasya sarvapuruṣārthasiddhiḥetutvam prayojanamuktaṃ/

12. VPS 10b7, VPT 12a1; see Appendix A.

13. Quoted by Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal, E 15b3. The *bde-mchog stod-'grel* is a commentary, no doubt of Indian origin, on some work of the Cakrasamvara cycle, and is often quoted in bKa-brgyud works. However, I have been unable to locate it in the bstan-bsgyur.

14. A 62a4
15. The three tantras of ground, path and goal go back to GST ch. XVIII. For
Bsod-nams-rtse-mo they are the most important of all devices for explaining the tantras (rgyud-kyi bshad-thabs). For a detailed account of the three tantras, see my "Ground, Path and Goal in the Vajrayāna: Padma Dkar-po on Tantra," to appear in this journal.

16. B 21a3.

17. rgyan bdun, saptalaṅkārāḥ. These are found in the introductory section of the PPD, and form the basis of its *methods of explanation (bshad-thabs). See B, 20b2 ff., and my survey mentioned in note 2. Each ornament is itself a group of *methods, often individually called ornaments too, making 27 in all. Here Bu-ston divides them into two classes, actually of 12 and 15 (see note 18).

18. tham-gyi-ba'i rgyan bcu-gsum, B 21a3. This remark is clarified at 20b7: mtha-drug tshul-bzhig bshad-pa'gyis-te bcu-gsum-po rgyud-las tham-gyi-ba'i rgyan yin-la/. ("Thirteen" reflects the Tibetan custom of adding one to the total of a list.) Similarly for the remaining ornaments.

19. Most of these technical terms are explained in the article mentioned in note 2.

20. D 173b8

21. In the PPD, the first of the seven ornaments, the "introduction" (upodghāta, gleng-bslang-ba) contains five items: the name of the tantra, its author, the kind of person for whom it was written, its length and its *purpose. Steinkellner rightly remarks in note 12 of his "Tantristic Hermeneutics" (Proceedings of the 1976 Csoma de Kőrösi Symposium held at Mátrafűred, Hungary, ed. L. Ligeti) that this ornament is connected with the general conditions for the composition of śāstras; we see that this connection is rather indirect (he did not suggest otherwise). This indirectness was certainly appreciated in Tibet, since otherwise works containing an exposition of the "introductory ornament" would not have needed to deal additionally with dgos-'brel.

22. This again confirms the indirectness of the connection mentioned in note 21.

23. E 15a2 (see Appendix C)

24. The verse of the rnam-bshad rig-pa [E 15a3] lists them as: dgos-pa, bsdu-don, tshig-don, mthams-sbyar and brgal-lan. Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal glosses these [ibid.] as: rgyud-kyi dgos-'brel (the dgos-'brel of the tantra), brjod-byai bsdu-don (the summarized artha of the *topic), gzhung-gi tshig-don (the literal meaning of the source-text), bshad-pa'i mthams-sbyor (the connection between the parts of the explanation), and lung-rigs-kyi brgal-lan (replies to queries [based on] scripture or reasoning).

25. E 15a4; a few words have been dropped, and material in square brackets [ ] is my interpolation.

26. This is a common motivation for dgos-'brel; compare Dharmottara on NB I.1.

27. The use of don, artha here as a kind of blanket intension is noteworthy. This word is so vague that it is almost impossible to translate it consistently by one English word. [Both these points are developed in Appendix B.]

28. 'jug-pa (praveśa), E 15b2: de-ltar rtogs-nas gzhung-la 'jug-par-'gyur-ba nying-dgos/
29. Of all our authors, Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal is the most sensitive to the idea that once a text has been interpreted, it can be re-interpreted; or, once the meanings of words have been changed, they can be changed again, etc. For another example, related to the well-known vajra-song in HT II.iv, see E 208b; his discussion of this is taken up in note 85 of my “Does Tibetan Hermeneutics throw any light on Sandhābhāṣa?”: Journal of the Tibet Society vol. 2, pp. 5-39, 1982.

30. H 5b3 ff.

31. J 16a1 ff. A slightly different account is given at K 25b ff.
THE SPIRITUAL HERITAGE OF MA GCIG LAB SGRON

Massimo Facchini

In 1055¹ Ma gcig lab sgron was born in Tibet. She was one of the very few women who had a primary role in the country’s religious history; this woman gave birth to a teaching called *Bdud kyi gcod yul* (Cutting off Spiritual Death) which permeated the four great schools of Tibetan Buddhism.

The *gcod* tradition is still alive in some Tibetan monasteries,² and in recent years it has started to spread among the western Buddhists in the U.S.A. and in Europe.

The traditional Tibetan sources usually say that Ma gcig received the *gcod* teaching from the Indian master Pha dam pa sangs rgyas,³ and in the *Grub mtha’* (p. 107) the author says that the Gcod yul is a branch (*yan lag*) of the Zhi byed.

While the meeting between Ma gcig and Dam pa (or one of his disciples) is credible, I have doubts about the strict interdependence between the Zhi byed and the *gcod* traditions.

These doubts are based first of all on the difference existing between the two teachings which only have their relationship (that for the Zhi byed is really close) with the *Prajñāparamitā* in common.⁴ Moreover there are two characteristics in the figure of Magcig that, according to the tradition, make it impossible for her to be the source of a teaching that was so important in Tibetan religious history.

Ma gcig is a Tibetan and, moreover, a woman; all the Buddhist teachings come from India, and, according to the traditional sources, everything (writing, medicine, astrology, etc.) was imported into Tibet from India and China.

Ma gcig is a woman, and you can’t find another woman in the religious history of Tibet who founded a religious tradition. From a sociological point of view, Ma gcig is a diversity in a context of equals.

The two characteristics that give her this uncomfortable position are inverted in a biography of her,⁵ in which her previous life as an Indian prince is recounted.

In her previous life her name was Smon lam grub (pp. 2-3), the child of an Indian king. During his short life Smon lam grub obtained the ordinary and extraordinary siddhis, converted 100,000 non-Buddhists (p. 6), and worked for the benefit of all sentient beings.

When Smon lam grub was twenty years old a dark-blue dākini⁶ said to him (pp. 9-10): “I shall kill you and your consciousness will enter me.” So saying, she raised her knife to kill Smon lam grub and his consciousness entered her; in this way he was guided to Tibet.
In the land called Lab phyi E'i gang ba (p. 10), in the town called Mtsho me, she saw a man and woman in union and entered the womb of the woman. The name of Ma gcig’s mother was ‘Bum lcam (p. 11), and she came from the family called Phyug ishang. Her father’s name was Chos kyi dzal ba, and he was a local mayor. As soon as the baby was born, standing in a rainbow light, she assumed the dancing position of Vajra Yogini (p. 19), and on her tongue there was a red hrī, while on her forehead was an eye. Her father recognized in her all the signs of a dākinī.

When she was eight years old, the lama who taught her the Dharma told her parents that she was a dākinī and that he had given her the name Shes rab sgron me (Fiery Torch of Prajñā). The girl became very famous in her country and the king ordered Ma gcig’s family to bring her to him. When the king asked her name she said: “Call me Rin chen sgron me, Sgron tse, or A sgron” (p. 26). Hearing these words the king said: “If you join the name Sgron me to the place of your birth, Lab, it will be auspicious.” So after that she was called Lab sgron.7

Following these biographical notes, let us now consider the spiritual heritage of Ma gcig lab sgron.

The Tibetan verb gcod pa means “to cut,” and it is very common in Tibetan. It has assumed many derived meanings such as “to cure (a disease),” “to suppress (a passion),” “to kill,” etc.8

The CCK (p. 415) says: “This doctrine is called Gcod yul because it thoroughly cuts (gcod) all the ropes of the mind’s (sems) pride and goes beyond the four limits8 and the eight bounds.”10

Again in the CCK (p. 415) it is explained that to define the system of Ma gcig the verb gcod pa can be substituted by its homophone sphyod pa (to practice).

The Grub mtha’ (p. 114) says that the Gcod yul is so called because its precepts “… cut the egoistical mind’s activity through the bodhisattva’s compassion. The roots of transmigration are cut by means of the explanation of śūnyatā (stong nyid). Moreover it is also called sphyod because one must practice the way of the union between thabs (skillful means, Skt. upāya) and shes rab (profound wisdom, Skt. prajñā ), which is the way of the bodhisattvas.”

The CCK (p. 414) lists the four devils (bdud, Skt. māra) which are the object of the gcod practice. These four are defined as the four “internal devils (nang gyi bdud)”:

- Thogs bcas (bdud) (Devil) of the senses, concrete.
- Thogs med (bdud) (Devil) of the mind, not concrete.
- Dga’ brod (bdud) (Devil) of lust, desire.
- Snyems byed (bdud) (Devil) of pride.

These four are joined together with the four “external devils (phyi bdud)” in the same work (CCK, p. 414):

- Phung po (bdud) (Devil) of the body.
- Nyon mongs (bdud) (Devil) of passions.
- Lha bu (bdud) (Devil) of lust.
- Chi bdag (bdud) (Devil) of death.
In the Mahāyāna system these four correspond to the four māra:

Skandhamāra, the devil who generates the five psychophysical constituents.
Kleśamāra, the devil who generates suffering and illness.
Devaputramāra, the devil who generates lust.
Mṛtyumāra, the devil who leads one to death.

Thus, the objects of the “cutting through” (gcod) are the four māra (Tib. bdud) who lead one to spiritual death (the root of the Sanskrit word māra is mr, “to die”).

The field in which the māra operate is the discursive mind (sams, the intellection process that is the cause of dualism, assuming a thinking subject different from the object that is thought. The discursive mind is the cause of suffering, of fear; it is the world of our ego, which is anxious about living and dying.

In fact it will be this individual world that will conclude its own existential process; that part of us that we identify with our thoughts and with our rational world.

The enlightened mind (byang chub kyi sams), which is innate but latent in all the sentient beings and that has to be “recognized” by the practitioner in order to achieve liberation, is not involved in living and dying; it lives in a relationship of continuous transformation with the whole, being indissolubly joined to it.

The gcod practice is therefore addressed to the destruction of the discursive process and leads to the understanding that “. . . all things which appear, even the Gods, are a creation and a phantom of our unconquered thought.”

It is this vision of the world that shows the links of the gcod system with the Prajñāpāramitā which emphasize the non-dual nature of reality. Gcod-yul is therefore a complete and direct meditative practice because the understanding of reality’s emptiness leads to the sudden release from saṁsāra.

But how does the gcod practice lead to the goal? The way is through sacrifice and offering; the offering of one’s own body and life, and the destruction of the five components of the human being.

From the seed-syllable at the center of his body the practitioner visualizes a dākinī (Tib. mkha’ ’gro ma), usually Vajra Yogini (Tib. Rdo rje rnal ’byor ma) or Ma gcig lab sgron, at the top of his head and identifies his consciousness with her. Then he starts dancing with the dāmaru in one hand, while blowing the rkgang gling.

The sound of these instruments and the concentration involved give life to many demonic beings in front of the practitioner, who offers them his own body as food. At the end of the rite everything is reabsorbed into the seed-syllable from which everything started. To perform a gcod rite, “. . . a cemetery, or any wild site whose physical aspect awakens feelings of terror, is considered to be an appropriate spot. . . .”

To endorse this point, in the Grub mtha’ (pp. 115–16) the author quotes three passages based upon the Hevajra Tantra (Tib. Brtag gnysis). He states that, for meditation, suburbs and lonely places, the night and the Ma mo
house,\textsuperscript{17} and cemeteries and woods are considered good. Further on in the *Hevajra Tantra* it is stated that, having given the gift of your body, the practice becomes still purer. It is also stated that were a *lha min* (*asura*) to walk before you, even if it came in the form of Indra, you would not be afraid because of your lion’s form.\textsuperscript{18}

I think it is important to note that the means to overcome the mind’s conditioning is the mind itself, its own projections. This meditative process possesses a great psychological significance. There are two distinct elements in its actualization: a preparatory element, in which the deceptive assumption of the existence of gods and demons is made, and a second element which brings about the certitude that gods and demons are nothing other than emanations of our thought.\textsuperscript{19}

Two paths are open to man. One leads to a state of submission to joy and pain. Its contents or duration may vary and it is still always the path of *samsāra*. The other path is the way of enlightenment. In order to traverse it, *gcod* must cut off the root of the cycle of *samsāra*. This process begins with two erroneous views: one general, abstention from evil and so on; one particular, the performance of good actions; transcending both there will be the certainty that there is neither subject nor object.\textsuperscript{20}

As I said above, one of the derived meanings of the verb *gcod pa* is “to cure, to heal;” in Tibet many illnesses are considered to be caused by devils and the *gcod* practitioners are called to give remedy.

In cases of pestilence or leprosy they are the only ones who dare to have contact with the infected corpses, because they never become contaminated. This is the reason why people in the West often refer to the *gcod* practice as exorcism.

There is a big difference between the two: exorcism, in fact, assumes the existence of an alien entity which must be “cast out” from somewhere or someone. In the *gcod* context, however, the devil that the practitioner finds in front of him is his own dualistic mind with its own passions and projections because, “... from the material world up to omniscience everything will be recognized as the devil’s action.”\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{NOTES}

1. On this point the following works agree: *B.A.* II, p. 981; Tucci, p. 39; Ferrari, p. 121, n. 198; and Vostrikov, p. 134, n. 391.

2. Rgyu ne and Skyabs che in eastern Tibet.
3. On his life and teachings (Zhi byed) see B.A. II, pp. 867–981. See also CCK, p. 421; Grub mtha’, p. 107; Aziz 1978; and Aziz 1979. On the meeting between Dam pa and Ma gcig see Lalou, pp. 39–47.

CCK (p. 490) gives a brief account of their meeting and says that Ma gcig (whose nun’s name, Tshul khrims rgyan, is given) stayed with him for seven years. The Grub mtha’ (p. 114) says that Ma gcig received the gcod teaching from Skyo ston Bsod nams bla ma, who received it from Dam pa, and it does not mention the meeting between Ma gcig and the Indian master. According to this text, the tradition that began with Skyo ston and Ma gcig is called mo gcod, which is different from the pho gcod that was transmitted by Dam pa to Sma ra ser po. On the pho gcod see Lauf, pp. 85–95, and De Rossi. The meeting between Dam pa and Sma ra ser po is recounted in CCK, pp 433–35.

4. On the relationship between Zhi byed and the Prajñāpāramitā see TPS, p. 92; and Grub mtha’, pp. 107 and 113.


6. dākinī (Tib. mkha’ ‘gro ma), a goddess or realized yoginī.

7. The biography of Ma gcig is in B.A. II, p. 983; and CCK, pp. 451–60. See also Lalou, p. 49.


9. The “four limits” are birth and death, immortality and annihilation, existence and non-existence, and phenomenon and voidness. See Das, p. 968.

10. Sems kyi snyems thag thams cad yul de nyid kyi steng du thad kar gcod de mu bzhis’am mtha’ brgyad spros bral du gnas pa na bdud kyi gcod yul du grags pa yin la.


13. The dāmaru is an hourglass-shaped pellet drum with two faces which has a very complicated symbolism. The rkang gling is a sort of trumpet made of a human thighbone. On these instruments and their symbolism, see Ringjin Dorje and Ter Ellingson.


17. Here Snellgrove (pt. I, ch. VI [6]) translates: “Meditation is good if performed at night beneath a lonely tree or in a cemetery, or in the mother’s house, or in some unfrequented spot.” But the Ma mo are a class of female demons assuming various manifestations. According to me, the right translation is, “the house of the Ma mo.” On the Ma mo see Neumaier as well as Nebesky-Wojkowitz, pp. 269–73.

18. Probably Simhamukha (Tib. Seng ge’i gdon pa can), the Lion-faced dākinī.


20. Ibid., p. 89.

21. CCK, p. 414.
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Tibetan Texts:


INHALTSVERZEICHNISSE DER GESAMMELTEN WERKE
TIBETISCH SCHREIBENDER AUTOREN

Günter Grönbold

Die tibetische Literatur läßt sich ganz grob in drei Gruppen einteilen: 1. die kanonische buddhistische Literatur, wie sie in den Sammlungen von Kanjur und Tanjur vorliegt (hierbei handelt es sich um reine Übersetzungs-
literatur aus dem Sanskrit), 2. die "theologisch"-scholastische Literatur, die seit Verbreitung des Buddhismus bis heute in Tibet und den tibetisch
beeinflußten Gebieten entstand, 3. alle Literatur, die außerhalb der beiden
vorigen Gruppen steht, besonders die profane, weltliche.

Gruppe Nr. 1 ist bekannt und gut zugänglich in verschiedenen Editionen
der beiden Sammlungen.¹ Nr. 3 ist am unbekanntesten, da hier sehr wenig
erhalten ist, ja vielleicht kaum je schriftlich fixiert wurde. Aber auch Nr. 2 ist
noch viel zu wenig bekannt. Es handelt sich hierbei um Literatur, die in den
Klöster verfasst wurde, von Lehrern, Äbten und bedeutenden Vertretern
bestimmter Schulrichtungen. Ihr Charakter ist exegetisch, interpretatorisch
oder apologetisch. Sie bezieht sich oft auf kanonische Texte. Aus diesen
Werken kann die Entwicklung des religiösen und philosophischen Denkens
in Tibet (vor allem in der Herausbildung der verschiedenen Schulen)
erschlossen werden. Doch enthalten sie oft auch historisches oder bibli-
ographisches Material, was sie dann besonders wertvoll macht. Diese Literatur
liegt meist vor in den "Gesammelten Werken" (Gsün'-bum, auch Bka'-bum)
der Bla-mas. Erst allmählich wird der wahrhaft riesige Umfang dieser
Literaturgruppe sichtbar. Durch sie wird die tibetische Literatur zu einer der
umfangreichsten der Welt überhaupt.

Durch die wachsende Zahl von Handschriften- und Blockdruck-
katalogen² wird bekannt, welche Gsün'-bums es gibt und wo sie liegen. So gibt
Gombojab³ eine Liste von 208 tibetisch schreibenden Autoren (hauptsächlich
Mongolen), von denen "Gesammelte Werke" existieren. 98 Gsün'-bums, die
im Buryatskiy kompleksniy nauchno-issledovatel'skii Institut in Ulán Udè
liegen, sowie 9 in der Orientalischen Fakultät der Universität Leningrad nennt
K. Lange.⁴ Die im Kloster Dga'-ldan-theg-chen-glin in Ulánbator vor-
handenen "Ges. Werke" führt Taube an.⁵ Sie sind mit erfaßt in der Übersicht,
die Lokesh Chandra gab und in der noch die Gsün'-bums im Orientalischen
Institut der Akademia Nauk Leningrad, der Staatsbibliothek Ulánbator, der
International Academy of Indian Culture New Delhi, sowie der Tohoku
University Sendai genannt werden⁶. Siebzehn Autoren, deren Werke in der
Nationalbibliothek in Peking liegen nennt Lokesh Chandra an anderer
Stelle,⁷ ferner die Namen von 69 Khalkha-Mongolen, von denen es Gsün-
'bums gibt.⁸ Zwanzig Gsün'-bums in der Sammlung des Dalai Lama
schließlich zählt Schuh auf.⁹

Der Wert der Inhaltsverzeichnisse liegt zum einen darin, daß die Identifizierung von kleinen Texten möglich wird. Andererseits läßt sich unschwer feststellen, wer sich mit welchen Themen, Lehren oder Texten befaßt hat. So wird man einmal eine Geschichte der religiösen Ideen oder Systeme schreiben können.


Zu zweien der ausgewerteten Werke ist noch soviel zu sagen: Der Prager Katalog ist lediglich eine fotomechanische Wiedergabe der Titelblätter der in zwei Hauptdruckereien in Derge (Sde-dge) hergestellten Blockdrucke. Es findet sich zu Anfang des Werkes eine Übersicht der enthaltenen Sammlungen. Der Bihar-Katalog ist an sich fast unbrauchbar und wird nur durch die Rezension von J. W. de Jong13 etwas erschlossen.

ANMERKUNGEN


10. s. Taube, S.1045 f. Das Werk ist enthalten in *MHTL*. Ähnlich Ye-šes-thabs-mkhas in seinem Bla-ma dam-pa-rnams-kyi gsun-'bum-gyi dkar-chag gñen 'brel dran gso'i me-lon für mongolische Autoren (abgedruckt in *ETPM*).
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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 btsus 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,” 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. 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"x11" 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. Repainting is both common and on-going in Ladakh, but not at Alchi as well. 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 (Sasanid) 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. Karmay, in the meticulously documented Early Sino-Tibetan Art, had tentatively suggested the possibility of a ‘Bri-gung-pa affiliation for one of the Kharkhoto 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. 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. 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 Kharkhoto 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. Following Snellgrove (as does Genoud), Pal identifies the portrait of the young, bearded monk next to Padmasambhava as a portrait of Šantarākṣita. In the absence of an inscription, it seems highly improbable to identify the subject as Šantarākṣita, usually depicted as an aged monk without beard. Yet, were this portrait to be Šantarākṣita, 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-duags 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). Pal states, p. 23, “Thus the probability that King Ngotrup built
(italics mine) the Lhakhang Soma around 1215 to commemorate his association with the Drgung-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-chhen-dngos-grub restored, nor do we know if he built any. Elsewhere, Petech has stated, "After this episode (Lha-chhen-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-skya-pa order whose members are indeed often depicted without hats. But were there any Sa-skya-pa 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 rdo-rje 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


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

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.

Alledgedly, 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
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"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 Karlgen’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 woodblock 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 it, 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
BOOK REVIEWS

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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st per.</th>
<th>2nd per.</th>
<th>3rd per.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td><em>n̄a</em> (N), <em>nga</em> (S)</td>
<td><em>ni</em> (N), <em>ni</em> (S)</td>
<td><em>tha</em> (N), <em>th</em> (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td><em>mu</em> (N), <em>mi</em> (S)</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mu</em> (N), <em>mi</em> (S)</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td><em>ni</em> (N), <em>mi</em> (S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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*- and *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 *mān, similarly for 2nd person sg. nom. *si but oblique *sān, and for 3rd person sg., nom. *i but oblique *ān. 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 Tokyo 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 obsfucation 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 Suwarnaprabhasa. 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 retranslations from earlier Chinese translations, but sometimes and in some parts showing that the translators also frequently had reference to Tibet an translations; (2) in the same article, he demonstrated that there are at least two different Hsi-hsia versions of the Suwarnaprabhāśasūtra, but also that both are retranslations 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, Ḫphags-mo Ḫod-zer-can zhes-byā baḥi gzunś; Taisho 1257), the same term appears in another Hsi-hsia
writing that he reconstructs as *thanrañji, 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 Swarṣaprabhāsāsūtra 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 Swarṣaprabhāsāsūtra 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 dhāraṃi, 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. 318, 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 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 undocu-
mented speculations, not to mention the many downright distortions and
mistakes, of Luc Kwanten's *Timely Pearl*.

Roy Andrew Miller
University of Washington

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,

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 *Shāks 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 Denna Lochō 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 Siṅgs 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 Vairocanābhisaṃbodhi-tantra (with my signal V-A-T) and the Concentration Continuation (as Hopkins renders the Bsam gtan phyi ma rim par phye 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 žugs bzaṅ po khyod la bṣad, 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 sdu pa yi tshig gis non. But slar sdu pa, occurring various times, similarly misunderstood, is a grammatical term meaning 'reiteration'; and non is a weak imperative of a verb meaning '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 Tson-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. Tson-kha-pa does not explain this because he does not write a grammatical commentary. In the Siṅgs 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 Tson-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 \textit{V-A-T}, in fact, its Chap. IX, and a brief comment by Tsoṅ-kha-pa. Here Hopkins puts in various expressions in brackets. My thesis: Hopkins did not understand anything in the citation of the \textit{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 Tsoṅ-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 (2\textsuperscript{nd} verses): / phyi daṅ naṅ gi sbyor ba yis / yan lag bŜi pa ŏnas bšad pa / de yaṅ ‘jig rten pa yi ste / dmigs pa can ni bla med pa / slar sdu s pa yi tshig gis non / lha yi rjes su soṅ ba’i yid / ‘sub ste b扎las brjod byed pa’i mchog / dmigs pa can la bstan pa yin / yid kyi ‘jig rten ‘das ŏes bya / slar sdu la sogs rnam par spāṅs / lha daṅ gcig tu byed pa daṅ / tha dad ma yin ‘dsin pa yi / yid kyis raṅ bŜin dbyer med bya / gzan 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. \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{phyi} and \textit{naṅ} 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 Tsoṅ-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, gṣi, and second gṣi] 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, Tson-kha-pa makes this remark: 'di'i 'jig rten las 'das pa yan '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 (anāśrava) 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' (āśrava), and that only the inward praxis of acting as one with the deity is free from it; and this is Tson-kha-pa's explanation of the scripture's 'impure yoga' (with signs) and 'pure yoga' (without signs). Tson-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 Snags 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


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

Die besondere Bedeutung des vorliegenden Bandes ist darin zu sehen, daß jetzt eine erste vollständige Übersetzung der Bodhimârgradîpapañjikâ—nach dem Peking-Tanjur—allgemein zugänglich ist (Seite 15-187). Diesen Kommentar zum Bodhipathapradîpa 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 Bodhipathapradîpa 189-208”. Journal of Indian Philosophy 9 [1981], 205): “. . . the Bodhimârgradîpapañjikâ 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.”


Für die Übersetzung des Grundtextes verwendete R. Sherburne eine gehobenere 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 *Bodhimārgadīpapāṇijīka* 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 Übersetzung (Seite 25-27), um bei der Wiedergabe der Interpretation durch den Kommentar sich auf die Verszahlen beziehen zu können und nicht die angeführten Anzahlen 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 Übersetzung enthält die für den Buddhismus Tibet unvorstellbare Behauptung, daß gurus und kalyāṇamitrās die rechte Lehre nicht verstanden hätten. Im tibetischen Text lautet dieses Stück (Folio 278b5-6):

*bod kyi yul 'di na saṅs rgyas kyi bstān pa theg pa chen po'i lam 'di la log par rtog pa'i gaṅ zag bla ma dge ba'i bšes gñen gyis yoṅs su ma zin pa dag phan tshun rtsod ciṅ. . ."
Man muß diese beiden Teilsätze, die auch in der biographischen Überlieferung über Atiśa erscheinen, wohl folgendermaßen verstehen:


Die im Bodhipathapradīpa und in der Bodhimārgadīpapaḍāṇjīkā 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 Bemühren 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/ Sdoṅ po bkod pa'i mdo oder Śrāvakabhūmi/ Nyon 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 der Übersetzung aufgenommenen Wiedergaben buddhistischer Termini.

Die Übersetzung der Bodhimārgadīpapaḍāṇjīkā 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 ṇan thos kyi theg pa’i skabs rdzogs so (Folio 504b2), “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. 182) 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 Bodhimārgadīpapaṇṭikā, 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 Bodhimārgadīpapaṇṭikā ergeben, nicht erfassen.


Die Veröffentlichung einer ersten Übersetzung der Bodhimārgadīpapaṇṭikā 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

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 Körös) 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 Nār 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 Maḥyamika school
(S. Diets, M. Kalff, 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. Tille
mans, 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, Acho 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
The Tibet Society

MINUTES

The Tibet Society's  
Annual Membership Meeting  
May 19, 1983

The 1983 Annual Membership Meeting of the Tibet Society was held in the Dogwood Room of the Indiana Memorial Union, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, on May 19, 1983 at 5:00 p.m.

Professor Thubten Jigme Norbu opened the meeting, greeting the members in attendance. He thanked Mrs. Janet Olsen for her assistance in running the day-to-day affairs of the Society.

Professor John Krueger, Treasurer, then made the financial report, explaining item by item the expenses and income of the preceding year.

It was explained that the counting of the ballots had already been done by the Secretary, under supervision, in order to avoid spending too much time during the meeting. Newly received ballots were given to Mr. Elliot Sperling, of the Nominating Committee, to count.

Mr. Sperling then read the Minutes of the 1982 meeting. A motion was made and moved to accept them.

Mr. Sperling, Assistant Editor of the Journal of the Tibet Society, also made a report on the forthcoming issue of the Journal. He mentioned that the feedback on the first issue had been overwhelmingly positive.

Professor Norbu then asked whether there was any further business. There was a brief discussion about the recent addition of several life members to the Society's membership.

Mr. Sperling then read the report on the Board of Directors election. He announced that Professor Norbu, Mrs. Elinor Roos, and Professor Eva Dargyay were elected to three-year terms beginning in 1983.

Professor Norbu then asked if there was any further business. Mr. Kurt Keutzer inquired about the Society's procedure for collecting dues, and asked whether or not the system could be clarified and simplified. Professor Krueger then explained that the dues go to support the work of the Society, which is largely the producing of publications, and the annual dues collections may not necessarily always coincide with the dates of publication.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Christopher I. Beckwith  
Secretary Pro Tempore
The Tibet Society, Inc.

FINANCIAL REPORT
January - December, 1983

Savings:
Beginning Balance Savings, Account One (Jan. 1, 1983) $ 159.30
Interest Earned 1983 ...................................... 25.79
Deposits .................................................................. 500.00
Balance (Dec. 31, 1983) ...................................... + 685.09

Beginning Balance Savings, Account Two (Jan. 1, 1983) 767.49
Interest Earned 1983 ............................................. 169.05
Transferred from Checking .................................... 3,000.00
Balance (Dec. 31, 1983) ...................................... + 3,936.54

Checking:
Beginning Balance (Dec. 31, 1982) .................... 2,259.56
Deposits, // 866–892 ........................................... 3,633.28
Total Income ..................................................... 5,892.84

Expenditures:
Checks 726, 733–48 .............................................. 25.00
Advertising Refund ............................................ 150.00
Banking Error ...................................................... 39.00
Book Refunds ..................................................... 107.55
Donations to Specific Organizations .................... 10.00
Filing Fee .......................................................... 20.00
Miscellaneous .................................................... 82.50
Office Expenses ................................................ 390.00
Postage ............................................................. 45.00
Postal Box Rent .................................................. 1,310.86
Printing ............................................................ 3,240.00
Transferred to Savings ....................................... 472.95
Total Expenditures ............................................. 5,419.91
Balance in Checking (Dec. 31, 1983) .................... 5892.84

John R. Krueger
Treasurer
The Journal of the Tibet Society is a scholarly periodical devoted to all areas of research on Tibet and regions influenced by Tibetan culture, including the arts, astronomy, geography, history, linguistics, medicine, philosophy, religion, the social sciences, and other subjects. Publication in the Journal is open to scholars of all countries. The languages of the Journal are English, French, German, and Tibetan. The editor welcomes the submission of articles, brief communications, and books for review, which deal with Tibet or the Tibetan cultural realm.

Tibetan may be transliterated by contributors in accordance with any of the standard scientific transliteration systems generally accepted. The following rules must be observed, however:

1) Absolute consistency must be maintained, except when quoting previous writers' works, in which case the system found in the quoted original must be retained in the quotation.

2) If any capitalization is necessary, only the first letter of any word may be capitalized, e.g. Dpal-ldan, and not dpal-ldan, the exception being that in words beginning (in transliteration) with a non-alphabetic diacritical mark—such as the apostrophe—the following letter is to be capitalized, e.g. 'jam-dpal.

3) The type font currently available to us includes the following diacritical marks and special letters: ' " _ ^ ~ a n ç. (A complete Greek font is also available.) It is therefore desirable for all transliteration, whatever the system, to restrict itself accordingly.

Transcription of other commonly used languages with non-Latin scripts is to be done according to the following systems:

Arabic: 'b t th j (or g) ḥ kh d dh r z s sh ʾ d t z g h f q k l m n h w y. The article should always be transcribed al- (or Al-), and diphthongs should employ w and y (instead of u and i) as second elements.

Chinese: The Wade-Giles system.


Mongol: The system found in N. Poppe, Grammar of Written Mongolian, Wiesbaden, 1954.

Russian: a b v g d e zh z i y k l m n o p r s t u f kh ts ch sh sch 'i ' e y u ya.

Sanskrit: The system adopted by the 10th International Congress of Orientalists (Geneva, 1894).

Manuscripts should be typed on white bond paper, double-spaced, with wide margins on all sides. Notes must also be typed double-spaced, consecutively numbered, on a separate page or pages at the end of the manuscripts (not at the bottom of the page). Please submit a neat, finished, manuscript. The original copy should be submitted. Authors must retain at least one copy of their manuscript. It is necessary that all errors be corrected on the galleys, which should be returned immediately.

All quoted passages of Tibetan more than a few words in length must be noted in the article text with a number (such as a line-reference to the original source) in square brackets—e.g.: [8,1]—and then written or typed out in Tibetan print-style script (dbucan) on a separate page or pages. These passages will be printed in Tibetan at the end of the article. In other words, the original Tibetan of long quoted passages will not appear in transliteration in the body or notes of an article, but will appear in Tibetan script alone, at the end of the article. (For examples, please see the articles by H. Uebach and A. Wayman in Volume I. The same method is to be followed for citations of Chinese words or of Japanese words containing ideograms, which unless very well known should generally be provided. For an example, please see the article by J. Kolmas in Volume I. For certain kinds of studies, this procedure may not be feasible, in which case exceptions might be made.