

Anzeigen

CARLOS A. LOPEZ (ED. & TR.)

Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Kāṇḍas Thirteen and Fourteen. Text, Translation, Commentary. [Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora 6]. Cambridge, Mass.: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University, 2010. iii + 246p. US\$ 25.– (ISBN 1-888789-07-7).

Die Bücher 13 und 14 der Paippalādasamhitā (PS) des Atharvaveda umfassen zusammen 155 Strophen/Prosaformulierungen in 18 Sūktas und machen somit etwa 2% der gesamten PS aus. Nicht zuletzt weil – gemäß meiner Zählung – 89 Mantras ganz oder größtenteils neu sind (~ 57%), ist eine auf Dipak Bhattacharyas (Bh.) bekanntlich nicht allzu zuverlässige *editio princeps* (*The Paippalāda-Samhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume One Consisting of the First Fifteen Kāṇḍas*. Calcutta 1997) folgende Neuedition, die sich an den von Th. Zehnder, A. Lubotsky und A. Griffiths in ihren Teileditionen vorgegebenen methodischen Leitlinien orientiert, von vornherein sehr erwünscht. So hat Lopez (L.) seine ursprünglich im Jahre 2000 fertiggestellte Harvard-Dissertation, der neben dem bekannten kaschmirischen Birkenrindenmanuskript (PSK) weitere fünf Handschriften aus Orissa zugrundeliegen, inzwischen an die Art der Darstellung der anderen Teilherausgeber angepasst (s. dazu Th. Zehnder, *IJ* 47 [2004] 56 mit n. 4): Nach einer “Introduction” in den Atharvaveda, die PS, ihre Orissa-Manuskripte und die in der Arbeit befolgten Konventionen (p. 1-50, wobei auf p. 46-50 erstmals statistische Ergebnisse zur Metrik der PS vorgestellt werden [s.u.]), folgt der Hauptteil, in dem einem Sūkta zunächst eine kurze Einleitung in seine Thematik vorangestellt ist und dann die Mantras jeder für sich zusammen mit Übersetzung, Kommentar und allfälligen Parallelstellen angeführt werden (p. 51-206). Abgerundet wird die Arbeit durch die “Bibliography” (p. 207-223) und den “Index Verborum” (p. 224-246). Methodische Unterschiede zu früheren Arbeiten bleiben freilich bestehen: So kennzeichnet L. Konjekturen durch ein vorgesetztes “*” oder “+”. Auch seine Vorgänger haben diese Symbole benutzt, um deutlich zu machen, dass entweder ein Wort in den Text gesetzt ist, das sich in keiner verwendeten Handschrift findet, oder gegen die Orissa-Tradition eine Lesung des kaschmirischen Manuskripts übernommen wurde. L. unterscheidet sie dagegen folgendermaßen (p. 44): Der Asterisk “[i]ndicates restored text that is not found in the available manuscripts”, während das Pluszeichen “[i]ndicates an emendation of the text based on manuscript evidence on grounds of paleographic developments, phonetics, or grammar”. Diese Unterscheidung erscheint mir unnötig kompliziert; doch ist die Kennzeichnung von Konjekturen ohnehin nicht sorgsam durchgeführt: Konjekturensymbole finden sich zum einen fälschlich vor bezeugten Lesungen (z.B. 13.5.5a ⁺*pūrvyah* [Mā_c Ku_c], 13.6.2b ⁺*heḍo* [Ma_{2c}], 13.6.2c ⁺*mṛḍā* [Kā, Ma_{2c}], 13.8.4d ⁺*yuktasyāsya* [Ma_{2c} Gu_c Ku_c], 14.2.5a ⁺*ukṣanti* [Pa_c], 14.3.5a ^{*}*iṣum* [Ku_c] oder 14.4.4b ⁺*śateśudhe* [Ma_{2c} Pa_c Ku_c]) und fehlen zum anderen dort, wo sie hingehören (z.B. 13.2.2b *antarhitauṣasī*, 13.7.3c *kvāhaḥ*, 14.9.1c *akṣyau*).

Dies ist allerdings weder der einzige noch der bedeutendste Mangel der Arbeit: Sie beinhaltet eine solche Vielzahl von orthographischen und grammatischen Fehlern, ungenauen Zitaten, Widersprüchen im kritischen Apparat und Nachlässigkeiten aller Art, dass dem Leser ihre Benutzung wahrlich mühsam wird. Als mehrfach wiederkehrender Fehler des kritischen Apparates mag etwa angeführt werden, dass das Lemma nicht mit dem edierten Text übereinstimmt (13.2.4b *bhāvyaṃ* vs. *bhavyaṃ* und *maiṣaṃ* vs. “m_{a-c}śām” [p. 63 für *m_aiṣāṃ*]; 14.3.10a ⁺*adarśan* vs. ⁺*adrśan*) oder verschiedene Lesarten demselben Manuskript zugeschrieben werden (z.B. *ad* 13.1.10, wo “Pa_c” wohl nur hinter *brāhmaṇāyām* zu lesen ist), und dergleichen mehr (der Apparat zu 13.1.2 ist m. E. ohne L.s Kommentar zu Pāda b [p. 53] kaum nachvollziehbar [die Edition mit ⁺*parītām* in Pāda a statt *parītām* überzeugt auch nicht]).

Schwer wiegt auch, dass abweichende Lesungen von Bh. vielfach entweder überhaupt nicht oder gar falsch angeführt werden, weshalb dessen Text immer verglichen werden muss. Für ersteren Fall sei exemplarisch der Pāda 14.2.1b angeführt, wo sicher mit Bh. *yāḥ samudram abhyarcanti dhenavaḥ* zu lesen ist (von *abhi+arc*), während L. “abhy archanti” (p. 135) liest, was er im Index (p. 229a) auf “√ṛ-₂ ‘reach’” zurückführt, obwohl die Form mit dieser Wurzel *ṛ(c)chanti* lauten müsste. Hier wäre der Hinweis auf Bh.s Text wohl hilfreich gewesen. Falsch zitierte Lesungen von Bh. finde ich, ohne Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit zu erheben, in 13.3.6c (p. 72 “*acchinnaṃ*” st. **acchannaṃ*), 13.8.1ac (p. 113 “*devakośaḥ*” st. *devakośāḥ* und “*giragiraḥ*” st. *garagiraḥ*), 13.9e (p. 121 “*abhipaśyāme*” st. *abhipaśyamāne*), 14.3.8b (p. 154 “*aghorāpakāścāni*” [vgl. L.C. Barrets Transkription von PSK 14.2.8 in *JAOS* 47 (1927) 241] st. *aghorāpakāśāni*), 14.4.5c (p. 161 “*asayeśavaḥ*” st. *asyeśavaḥ*), 14.6.6c (p. 179 “*devayūnarūroho*” st. *devayūn arūroho*), 14.7.9b (p. 190 “*attatha*” statt *attathā*) und 14.9.4a (p. 204 “*śāmyākāḥ*” st. *śāmyākāḥ*).

Auch hätte eine sorgfältigere Durchsicht von Bh.s Text helfen können, Sandhi-Fehler zu vermeiden; denn dort ist dergleichen m. W. nicht zu finden. So ist in 14.5.7a “*dvipāt dvihastaḥ*” (p. 171) zu **dvipād dvihastaḥ* zu korrigieren und in Übereinstimmung mit den Handschriften in 14.5.9cd “*vyathiṣṭhāḥ | mā*” zu *vyathiṣṭhā, mā* und in 14.5.10a “*vikhthāḥ | vṛ*” (p. 174) zu *vikhthā, vṛ* (weiterhin die Anusvāras am Ende von 14.6.8b und 14.6.10b). Neben dem Sandhi ist ferner die Worttrennung gelegentlich falsch: In 14.1.3b ist statt “*ava paśyañ*” (p. 127) richtig *avapaśyañ* und in 14.5.1d statt “*pra tirantṛ*” (p. 164) richtig *pratirantṛ* zu schreiben. Auch *verba composita* im Nebensatz (ebenfalls mit dem in der PS-Tradition nicht überlieferten Udātta auf dem Verb) werden von L. mehrfach fälschlich getrennt geschrieben (13.7.7b *ā ruroha*, 13.7.9c [s. u.] und d bzw. 13.8.1b *pra vettha*, 13.8.4b *saṃ babhūva*, 14.1.6c *abhy aṣiñcan*, 14.1.9c *aty anayan*, 14.1.10a *ut pṛṇanti*, 14.2.6c *pra ṇayanti*), und die beiden Pādas 14.8.10ef lauten statt “*apāyati svapāyati | śuṣke sthāṇāv apāyati ||*”, wozu besonders der von L. zwar in die Bibliographie (p. 213) aufgenommene, für diese Halbstrophe aber offensichtlich nicht herangezogene Bd. 3 der *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik* von Karl Hoffmann (hrsg. von S. Glauch – R. Plath – S. Ziegler. Wiesbaden 1992), p. 830f. zu vergleichen ist (*su* ist nachgestellte, bekräftigende Partikel, nicht wie bei L. “well”).

Schon die genannten “Kleinigkeiten” lassen nicht erwarten, dass der erstellte Text gegenüber dem von Bh. viele Vorzüge aufzuweisen hat. Grundsätzlich ist es so, dass L. kein Symbol für unverständliche Wörter oder Textstellen verwendet (etwa †xyz†), sondern stets konjiziert. Allerdings überzeugen seine Konjekturen oftmals nicht. Die Strophe 13.7.9 liest er folgendermaßen (p. 110): “*yaṃ *śiśāti vṛṣabhaś carṣaṇīṇām | indro vajram ahinā spardhamānaḥ / yena vṛtraṃ maghavā saṃ pipeṣa | taṃ naḥ pra brūhi yadi taṃ pra vettha //*”. Bh. bietet dagegen in Pāda a mit den Manuskripten *siṣeva*. L. hat damit recht, dass dieses hier keinen Sinn macht; doch entfernt sich sein **śiśāti* m. E. zu weit von den Handschriften, zumal neben *saṃpipeṣa* (*sic!*) auch eine weitere Perfektbildung zu erwarten ist. Ich schlage vielmehr die Konjektur **siṣeca* vor. Wenn ich auch sonst keinen Fall der Verschreibung von <c> als <v> in den PS-Manuskripten aus Orissa kenne, stehen Formen von *sic* doch auch sonst gelegentlich neben *vajram* (z.B. *Saunakasamhitā* [SS] 11.10.12cde = 13abc). Sofern ich damit das Richtige treffe, wird hier also auf den Vorgang der Vajra-Herstellung durch Metallgießen angespielt; vgl. W. Rau, *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien*. Wiesbaden 1973, p. 37 mit n. 44.

Verschiedentlich sind L.s Eingriffe in die überlieferte Textgestalt unnötig, oder – genauer – sie verschlechtern den Text (vgl. oben zu 13.1.2). Den zweiten Mantra des von der Śataudana-Kuh handelnden Sūktas 14.7 lässt er folgendermaßen beginnen (p. 184): “*indraḥ ṛpapātha prathamāḥ śataudanām*”. Ohne irgendeine Begründung weicht er somit von Bh. ab, der den Pāda mit *papāta* ediert hat, wie es auch durch die Orissa-Manuskripte gesichert ist. Ich weiß nicht, warum Bh. das *ta* unterstrichen hat (eine solche Unterstreichung gebraucht er normalerweise, um Textstellen als unverständlich zu kennzeichnen); denn *papāta* gibt als 3. Pers. Sg. Perf. Ind. Akt. von *pai* durchaus Sinn. Da Formen dieser Wurzel oft neben Namen von den durch die Luft eilenden Göttern zu

finden sind, sehe ich schlicht keinen Grund für eine Konjekture: “Indra ist als Erster zu der Šataudana[-Kuh] hingestürzt”.

Eine Erklärung wäre schließlich auch im Falle des Verses 14.2.10b angebracht gewesen. L. ediert (p. 143) “mṛdho v.y āsthād *aśisāta bāhū” und “übersetzt” das mit (ibid.) “He has scattered the scorners. Let that one whose two arms [are raised up] has punished [them]” (*sic!* Bh. liest mit den Orissa-Manuskripten *aśasīta*). Weder die Edition mit dem einen Kadenzfehler verursachenden **aśisāta* noch die Übersetzung ist nachvollziehbar. Allerdings hat L. im Index für diese Textstelle auch die Lesung “**aśāsīta*” (p. 243a) angegeben, die er als Aorist von “√śās- ‘to punish’” (*sic!*) versteht, obwohl dieser eigentlich *śīsa-* lautet. Warum hier mit keiner Silbe der sowohl bei Bh. wie auch bei L.C. Barret (*JAOS* 47 [1927] 241) angeführten Parallelstelle KS 39.1 (: 117.11-12), die *aśisīta* (von *śā*) bietet, gedacht wird, ist mir unverständlich.

Es ließen sich noch zahlreiche derartige Ungereimtheiten anführen, und aus der Übersetzung könnten ebenso viele Mängel genannt werden (fehlende Wörter, falscher Modus usw.). Doch findet sich auch Wertvolles. Die erste Hälfte der Strophe 14.9.1 ediert L. folgendermaßen (p. 201): “andhaṃ rātri *ṛṣṭadhūmam | aśīrṣāṇam ahiṃ kṛṇu /”. Dieser Wortlaut ist auch in der ŚS überliefert (in der Ausgabe von Roth – Whitney 19.47.8cd und 19.50.1ab). Ferner kommt der Text auch schon in der PS an früherer Stelle vor. Die Verse 6.20.9ab hat A. Griffiths (*The Paippalādasamhitā, Kāṇḍas 6 & 7*. Groningen 2009, p. 221f.) aber den Manuskripten folgend mit ṛṣṭadhūmamṛ herausgegeben. Da anscheinend ein eine Schlange näher bestimmendes Wort vorliegt, erwägt er zwar auch (unter Hinweis auf den atharvavedisch gut bezeugten *ṛṣṭadamśman-*) die Konjekture **ṛṣṭadhūmam* (als Bahuvrīhi “dessen Rauch scharf/giftig ist”), kann sich aber nicht erklären, wieso “Rauch” in der Bedeutung von “‘breath, odor’ (...) and hence perhaps even ‘poison’” (ibid.) stehen soll. L. denkt nun bei dem “Rauch” an “the ability of some types of snakes to spit or spray venom” (p. 202). Das ist m. E. eine sehr plausible Erklärung. Da das von manchen Schlangen in Gefahrensituationen in Richtung der gegnerischen Augen ausgespene Gift tatsächlich wie ein Sprühnebel aussehen kann, leuchtet es mir durchaus ein, dass es als “Rauch” bezeichnet wurde. Mit seinem Hinweis auf die Königskobra (*Ophiophagus hannah*) trifft L. aber nicht das Richtige: Gerade diese speit kein Gift. Es dürfte eine andere Kobra (Gattung *Naja*) gemeint sein. Vielleicht kann man so übersetzen: “O Nacht, mach die Speikobra blind, die Schlange kopflos!”

Zum Abschluss ein paar Worte zu L.s Behandlung der Metrik: Wie frühere PS-Herausgeber versteht L. die einzelnen Verse nach einer von Zehnder entwickelten (und manchmal missverstandenen) Methode mit einer metrischen “Analyse”, d. h. einer Angabe der Silbenzahl. Wie schon erwähnt, gibt er darüber hinaus auch erstmalig eine Statistik zur Metrik eines PS-Abschnittes, und zwar gemäß der von B.A. van Nooten und G.B. Holland auf den R̥gveda angewandten Methode (*R̥gveda*. Cambridge, Mass. 1994, p. xvii-xviii), nach der angegeben wird, welche prosodische Struktur in Einleitung, gegebenenfalls “break” und Kadenz eines Verses wie oft zu finden ist. So erfreulich ich eine solche Statistik finde, erscheint es mir doch suboptimal, dass sich diese “Harvardstatistik” nicht mit den Versanalysen im Hauptteil zusammenbringen lässt. Kurz, da ein “11” nach Zehnders Methode nichts über die prosodische Struktur von Einleitungsstück, “break” und Kadenz eines Trīṣṭubh-Pādas aussagt, hat L. sich hier selbst doppelte Arbeit gemacht, und seine Ergebnisse sind für den Leser nicht nachprüfbar. Eine Methode, mit der Solches vermieden werden kann, ist von mir vor einigen Jahren aufgezeigt worden (in: A. Griffiths – A. Schmiedchen [ed.], *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalādaśākhā*. Aachen 2007, p. 1-22). Übrigens sind L.s Analysen im Hauptteil oft genug anfechtbar: Z.B. sollte der Pāda 14.5.2a durch die Lesung *s_v vastaye* sicher als regelmäßiger Jagatī-Pāda konstituiert werden, ebenso 14.6.8a durch *sakth_v yau tava*, und 14.6.9a ist in Zehnders Terminologie als “11” zu bestimmen.

Dass dieses Buch gegenüber dem von Bh. den zuverlässigeren Text bietet, lässt sich also klärlich nicht sagen. Freilich bietet es Nützliches und auch einige überzeugende Konjekturen. Doch erwecken die zahllosen Nachlässigkeiten aller Art, besonders die im kritischen Apparat, Zweifel an

der Zuverlässigkeit vieler Angaben. Warum hier kein konzentriertes Korrekturlesen stattgefunden hat, weiß ich nicht zu sagen. Griffiths (*op. cit.*, p. XXI) hat über die dem Werk zugrundeliegende Dissertation geschrieben, sie sei “seriously defective and needs to be done anew”. Bevor die ganze Arbeit nun zum dritten Male angegangen wird, wäre die sorgfältige Anfertigung einer sicher Dutzende von Seiten umfassenden Liste mit Verbesserungen und Korrekturen vielleicht auch ein gangbarer Weg.

Philipp Kubisch

PASCALE HUGON – TORU TOMABECHI (ED.)

Dharmakīrti's Pramānaviścaya, Chapter 3. Critically edited by P.H. and T.T. with a preface by Tom J.F. Tillemans. [*Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region* 8]. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House – Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2011. xlvii + 223p. € 45,- (ISBN 978-3-7001-6893-5).

In his brilliant paper “Die Reihenfolge und Entstehung der Werke Dharmakīrti's” (in: *Asiatica*. Fs. F. Weller. Leipzig 1954, p. 142-154) Frauwallner summarized for the first time Dharmakīrti's entire oeuvre. About the composition of the Pramānaviścaya (PVin) he said on p. 153 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Oberhammer – E. Steinkellner. Wiesbaden 1982, p. 688):

“Nochmal machte er [sc. Dharmakīrti] sich an ein großes Werk, das nun seine eigene Lehre selbstständig darstellen sollte, den Pramānaviścayaḥ. Dabei verwendete er in weitestem Maße den Stoff seiner älteren Werke, aber er formte ihn neu. Er gliederte die ganze Darstellung in 3 Abschnitte, Wahrnehmung, Schluss und Beweis. War das Pramānavārttikam in Versen abgefasst, so schrieb er das neue Werk in Prosa mit eingestreuten Versen. Davon ist nur ein kleiner Teil neu. Die meisten übernahm er aus dem Pramānavārttikam. Ganze Abschnitte des älteren Werkes löste er in Prosa auf. Auch aus der Vṛttiḥ zum Hetuprakaraṇam sind große Stücke übernommen. Aber die Gliederung ist straff und übersichtlich. Wiederholungen sind vermieden, Zerstreutes vereinigt. Wo es notwendig schien, sind Verbesserungen und Ergänzungen angebracht. Ja, manche Abschnitte sind auch ganz neu geschrieben. So entstand denn ein neues wertvolles Werk, das die formlose Fülle des Pramānavārttikam zu einem reichen, aber wohlgeordneten und gegliederten Ganzen vereinigt, in Form und Inhalt ein unerreichtes Meisterwerk.”

Until recently, Dharmakīrti's masterpiece was available only in a Tibetan translation, and its philosophical understanding was often marred by numerous textual problems. After the sensational publication of the first two chapters of the original Sanskrit text by Ernst Steinkellner in 2007 (*Dharmakīrti's Pramānaviścaya, Chapters 1 and 2*. Beijing – Vienna), on the basis of photocopies of manuscripts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region preserved at the China Tibetology Research Center (Beijing), the present excellent edition of the third and final chapter by two of the finest Dharmakīrti scholars, Pascale Hugon (H.) and Toru Tomabechi (T.), makes at long last Dharmakīrti's *magnum opus* available in its entirety in its original language.

The manuscripts used for this edition, two complete and three incomplete ones, have already been described by Steinkellner in his above-mentioned edition. In their learned introduction (p. xiii-xlvii), H. and T. offer additional remarks, especially on the orthographic and palaeographic particulars of the manuscripts, as well as on an incomplete manuscript of Dharmottara's Pramānaviścayaṭīkā; in Appendix 2 (p. 168-172), they also transcribe the marginal notes, written partly in Sanskrit and partly in Tibetan, found on the folios of the third chapter. They also thoroughly investigate the relationship between the manuscripts and arrive, at least for the third chapter, at a different, more comprehensive stemma than the one proposed by Steinkellner (see p. xxivff.). In most cases, as they report, the choice of readings was easily made, for the variations among the manuscripts amount to no more than scribal mistakes; yet in a few cases (see p. xxxiv) the editors also suggest readings that are not found in any of the manuscripts. As a matter of

course, they also used all secondary sources at their disposal, namely, the Tibetan translation, Dharmottara's commentary, and citations of the text *ex alio* and *in alio*. These citations are referred to in a special apparatus, which will greatly facilitate future studies on the composition of the PVin as well as the reception of Dharmakīrti's work by his successors and opponents.

Now that the Sanskrit text is available in a reliable edition, Frauwallner's partly intuitive statement quoted above can finally be examined in detail, and a more thorough and reliable investigation of the relationship between the PVin and other works of Dharmakīrti becomes feasible. Of particular interest to Dharmakīrti scholars would be the extended section on *hetvābhāsa* (p. 91-130), a topic that is not treated as such in any of Dharmakīrti's other works (except in a cursory manner in the Nyāyabindu). Interestingly, even a superficial read through this section reveals the prominent role played by Sāṅkhya opponents and the relatively minor role held by the Naiyāyikas. One wonders whether this is so simply because the Sāṅkhya arguments examined by Dharmakīrti are so clearly faulty and thus conveniently illustrate false reasons, or whether Sāṅkhya was more influential in the seventh century than we (modern scholars) tend to assume. In a personal vein, I may add that I found the section on the *sadvitīyaprayoga* (p. 14.5-18.2) most helpful, for I was not able to understand this type of inference on the basis of the laconic statements found in the Pramāṇavārttika; for a recent debate on the meaning of this obscure and intriguing inference, see the controversy between Claus Oetke and me in the *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40-41 (2012-2013).

Ongoing work is being carried out on this chapter by Takashi Iwata, who has published several excellent studies so far as well as a German translation of its first portion (in *WZKS* 39 [1995], 41 [1997] and 43 [1999]) – more is in preparation. An English translation was also published by Tadashi Tani over the years 1982 to 1994 in the *Bulletin of Kochi National College of Technology*, based on the Tibetan version of the PVin. H. and T. made a working translation of the chapter during the preparation of their edition. It is to be hoped that it will be finalized and made available to the public in the future. For the time being, they provide us with a detailed analysis of the chapter in an appendix to their edition (p. 141-161), which is most helpful.

Everything in the edition itself, and in its introduction and appendices testifies to the meticulous work of H. and T. In fact, I stumbled upon only a single typo. Referring to the discussion of inconclusive reasons (p. 80.9ff.) the editors count the second reason of the *hetucakra* among those examined (p. 151 [III.2.2.2.i]), yet Dharmakīrti refers here to the third reason – the second is actually valid.

To conclude, I would like to offer the following constructive criticism in the spirit of my great appreciation of H. and T.'s marvellous work. While discussing the antinomic reasons (*viruddhāvyaḥhicārin*), H. and T. (p. 160) refer to two hitherto unknown philosophers, Pailuka and Paiṭhara. It is clear, however, that these names are not proper names, but appellations of the Vaiśeṣikas and the Naiyāyikas derived from their two respective theories on the change of colour in earthy substances when they are heated, known as *pīlupākavāda* and *piṭharapākavāda*. These theories form one of the few points on which Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika differ. According to Nyāya, when a pot is put into the kiln and changes its colour, it is the colour of the whole substance, of the *avayavin*, which changes. This assumption, however, goes against the Vaiśeṣika theory that the qualities of the effect are the outcome of the qualities of the cause, in this case, the earth atoms. Probably for this reason, the Vaiśeṣikas, already with Praśastapāda, if not before, assumed that in the process of baking earthen objects, a substance such as a pot disintegrates down to its constituent parts, the atoms, which then change their colour and step by step reconstitute a new whole (see, for instance, S. Bhaduri, *Studies in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Metaphysics*. Poona 1975, p. 90-102). Further, from Dharmakīrti's criticism we learn that the Naiyāyikas considered universals to be ubiquitous, while the Vaiśeṣikas denied this. This is important, for Dharmakīrti provides the earliest reference to this doctrinal difference between the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika because, as is well known, Uddyotakara (just like Praśastapāda) still maintains that universals are

not omnipresent; see e.g., Nyāyavārttika on 2.2.64 (A. Thakur's edition, p. 303.5-10), where Uddyotakara argues that the universal cow-ness is not present in space (*ākāśa*), in absences (*abhāva*) or in any thing other than cows. Previously, the earliest Naiyāyika we knew of who accepted this theory was Jayanta; see Nyāyamañjarī, Mysore ed., p. 36.8: *sarvasarvagatā jātir iti tāvad upeyate* /. Dharmakīrti's criticism thus indicates that this doctrine was well established several centuries earlier.

Eli Franco

HIMAL TRIKHA

Perspektivismus und Kritik. Das pluralistische Erkenntnismodell der Jainas angesichts der Polemik gegen das Vaiśeṣika in Vidyānandin's Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā. [*Publications of the De Nobili Research Library XXXVI*]. Wien: Sammlung de Nobili, 2012. 401p. € 28.– (ISBN 3-900271-42-9).

The work under review is an annotated translation and study of two excerpts from the tenth-century Jaina philosopher Vidyānandin's Satyaśāsanaparīkṣā (SŚP). The SŚP, "The Investigation Whether Teachings are True," of which there is a single edition, edited by Gokulchandra Jain (Calcutta 1964), refutes a series of ten non-Jaina traditions: Brahmādvaita, Śabdādvaita, Vi-jñānavāda, Citrādvaita, Cārvāka, Bauddha, Sāṅkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, and Mīmāṃsā. In the present work the author focuses on the Vaiśeṣika section, specifically, the first part of the *uttarapakṣa* that critiques the notion of inherence (*samavāya*), by translating and commenting on the relevant passage from that section together with a passage from the beginning of the work that provides the framework and motivation for the critical investigation of other theories. Although Jainism is known as the tradition that acknowledges different perspectives, that does not mean that it accepts that competing philosophical views are true. The theories under examination in the SŚP err in taking an exclusive or one-sided position, and they must be refuted in order to vindicate the one true teaching that supersedes them all, namely, the teaching of many-sidedness (*anekāntaśāśana*; see text I 4, p. 170f.). And indeed – also contrary to a common misconception about Jainism – the criterion of truth to be applied in assessing other theories appeals manifestly to the principle of non-contradiction: a teaching is true if it is not contradicted by perception or other assumptions or presuppositions (*dr̥ṣṭeṣṭāvīruddha*). That is the charge to be brought against the Vaiśeṣika, in particular, that his theory of categories as "completely / in every respect different" (*sarvathābhinna*) from each other is contradicted by perception (SŚP 35,27-31).

The passages of the SŚP under examination are treated according to a very rigorous philological-historical methodology. An extensive introduction (Part I) provides a great deal of helpful background: Section IA3 (p. 41-54) situates the SŚP in relation to the common Jaina philosophical project of the *anekāntavāda* – this is one of the clearest accounts of "Jaina perspectivalism" the reviewer has ever read. IA4 (p. 54-60) summarizes the main points of the Jaina debate with the Vaiśeṣika. IA5 (p. 60-67) gives an overview of the argument Vidyānandin (V.) specifically develops in the first part of his *uttarapakṣa* against the Vaiśeṣika concept of inherence, to which the Vaiśeṣika appeals in attempting to explain why a whole may not be perceived as different from its parts. IA6 (p. 67-88) compares the method of treating competing world views followed by V. with other "pluralistic epistemological models," in the process clarifying in what sense the *anekāntavāda* can be said to be a kind of "inclusivism," while IA7 (p. 88-91), at least implicitly, defends it fairly persuasively. Section B of the introduction (p. 93-104) further explains, independently of textual references, the problems entailed by the concept of inherence, using diagrams.

After these illuminating preliminaries the author proceeds to the text of the SŚP itself (Parts II and III). He devotes sections of Part II to: (1 [p. 107-118]) a brief description of the published edition of the SŚP (the author has not undertaken a critical edition) and a discussion of the probable dates of V. and his relation to other Digambara figures, (2 [p. 119-125]) a very clear outline

of the contents of the translated excerpts, (3 [p. 127-140]) an explanation of the criteria used for identifying and categorizing parallel passages, and (4 [p. 141-157]) the application of these criteria in determining the sources of the SŚP and, on that basis, giving a detailed picture of its structure and composition (see below). Finally, in Part III, which comprises p. 159-301 of the work, the translation of the excerpts accompanied by a philological–historical commentary is presented. The excerpts are broken by the author into segments (“Textabschnitte,” which differ from the paragraphs of Jain’s edition) representing steps of V.’s arguments. The text of each segment is given in transcription with parallel passages marked by superscript letters (which are then, below the text, identified as direct or indirect citations, references, etc., along with the corresponding works), variant readings marked by superscribed Roman numerals, and longer passages, marked by superscript Greek letters, that extend across the segments and appear to be indebted to other sources. (This system takes some time to learn, but it is brilliantly conceived and flawlessly executed.) Two appendices include: (1 [p. 305-324]) translations or summaries of passages from four other Jaina works that concern themes relating to the SŚP discussion of Vaiśeṣika, including a passage from V.’s own Yuktyanuśāsanāṅkā that bears some parallels to the SŚP critique of inherence; (2 [p. 325-333]) indices of parallel passages, ordered according to varying degrees of coincidence, as well as unidentified references; (3 [p. 337-350]) schematic presentations of the Jaina *naya*- and *syādvādas*, using the author’s own system of geometric symbols (which the reviewer, unfortunately, did not find very helpful); and (4 [p. 351-375]) the excerpts printed in Devanāgarī, with the segments into which they are divided in Part III clearly marked, together with a running translation without annotations and with minimal use of brackets. This part of Appendix II will be extremely useful to non-specialists who want to access the content of the text without the “distraction” of philological analyses, but who may still refer back to the detailed discussions of the segments in Part III if they wish.

Just this (incomplete) summary of the contents of the work should indicate the exhaustiveness and meticulousness with which these relatively short excerpts (only eleven pages combined in the Devanāgarī version) have been processed. Sometimes the reviewer felt a bit overwhelmed by the intricacy and extent of the philological machinery, yet he must admit that the results are extremely impressive. Every term and concept in the text is thoroughly – and convincingly – explained, so that in the end the literal meaning shines forth brilliantly. Every idea and argument addressed by V. is traced back to its antecedents in earlier philosophical literature. Indeed, the relation of the SŚP to its historical context is illuminated to a degree one would not have thought possible. The author has made every attempt to identify all passages from both Jaina and non-Jaina works that V. cites, alludes to, or may have only been influenced by, as well as citations of / references to the text by later authors (esp. Prabhācandra) and parallel passages in V.’s own works. Certainly, one of the most significant achievements of the study is the analysis of the composition of the Vaiśeṣika portion of the SŚP in IID (p. 141 ff.). Here the author offers plausible hypotheses regarding passages where V. seems to have depended on other sources, and what those may have been, and passages that seem to be his own creations. In many instances, of course, one is able to identify Nyāya–Vaiśeṣika sources, especially the Padārthadharmaśāstra; in others, one can discern a reliance on Samantabhadra. For one significant portion of the text, corresponding to segments II 14-29, the author speculates, on the basis of two references to Dharmakīrti and another to Prajñākaragupta, and from a pattern of parallel passages in the works of Prabhācandra, that V. may have had before him another work “belonging to a Buddhist milieu” (p. 154) that developed some of the same arguments against *samavāya* he employs. The table on p. 157 is a thing of beauty: it assigns the segments representing the first part of the *uttarapakṣa* to different stages of its argument in a very transparent way, while also indexing them according to “Vergleichsstellen.”

One cannot really do justice to a work of this complexity and richness in a short review. The reviewer hopes that he will sufficiently convey his admiration by saying simply that he believes

it is a resource, not only for V.'s thought but for Jaina metaphysics generally – for it is about much more than just these two passages of the SŚP – that scholars will consult with benefit for years to come. There is only one place where the translation did not ring true, and that is the translation of the difficult and possibly corrupt text of segment II 13. But even there the author has the integrity to note an alternative translation (p. 199), suggested by someone else, which seems, intuitively, to be the correct one.

There is only one aspect of the book with which the reviewer found himself strongly disagreeing, and that is the implication that, outside of presenting us with a possible model for mediating disputes between conflicting world-views, the SŚP offers little in the way of philosophical interest (p. 40f.): “Relevanz erhielt das Werk damit nur aus philologisch-historischer und aus philosophie-historischer Sicht: Zum einen gibt das Werk einen Einblick in den jeweiligen historischen Entwicklungsstand der behandelten philosophischen Traditionen und den Stand der Diskussion zu Teilproblemen, zum anderen repräsentiert die Art des Umgangs mit konkurrierenden Weltentwürfen, nämlich diese insgesamt für null und nichtig zu erklären, einen in der Geschichte der Philosophie häufig unternommenen Versuch, abweichender Geltungsansprüche Herr zu werden.”

In fairness, the author suggests immediately prior to this that one might “accommodate” V., whose cosmological views are completely outdated, by having a look at his philosophical arguments. It is, however, the discussion of the “Teilprobleme” in the text that, the reviewer believes, would pique the interest of any contemporary philosopher. Merely the following elegant statement of V.'s core argument against the Vaiśeṣika will make this clear (p. 61): “Die Irrealität der Annahmen des Vaiśeṣika wird dadurch zu beweisen gesucht, dass die aus der Kategorienlehre entwickelten Faktoren des Einzeldinges in der Sinneswahrnehmung nicht zur Erscheinung kämen, da das Prinzip, das ihr gemeinsames Auftreten (*vr̥tti*) beim Einzelding und damit die Sinneswahrnehmung eines konkreten Einzeldinges angeblich ermöglicht, die Inhärenz (*samavāya*), nicht in der Weise gedacht werden kann, dass es mit den Elementen der von ihr zu stiftenden Verbindung selbst in Verbindung treten könnte, und deshalb selbst nicht auftreten (*avr̥ttimat*), außen vor bleiben würde. Wenn aber die Inhärenz nicht schlüssig etabliert werden kann, gibt es keine Verbindung zwischen den die Welt aufbauenden Faktoren. Das Weltgebäude des Vaiśeṣika zerfällt in zueinander nicht in Beziehung stehende Bruchstücke; ohne Verbindung geht der Zusammenhalt der Dinge verloren (*sakalārthahāni*).”

A contemporary metaphysician would find this fascinating. Although the concept of inherence does not get much play in philosophical discussions these days, the more general problem of the nature of properties, and the notions of the instantiation of properties and the “compresence” of tropes, certainly do. Thanks to studies and translations such as the one under review philosophers have reliable guides to the theories and arguments of classical Indian philosophy that could potentially provide them with much food for thought.

John Taber

FRANK VAN DEN BOSSCHE (ED. & TR.)

Elements of Jaina Geography. The *Jambūdvīpasamgrahaṇī* of Haribhadra Sūri critically edited and translated with the commentary of Prabhānanda Sūri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2007. xiv + 327p. Rs. 495.– (ISBN 81-208-2934-4).

Among the differences between the Buddha and the Mahāvīra is the former's pronounced dislike of speculation on the cosmos inasmuch as it is viewed as irrelevant to liberation from *samsāra*. A difference between Buddhist and Jain studies is that the first commentary on the Dīghanikāya started being published already four years before its canonical text. None of the Śvetāmbara texts with cosmographical data, i.e., the Uvaṅgas 4-8, have been critically edited and there are no *cuṃhīs* on them, but we do have medieval Sanskrit *īkāś* and summaries. One of the latter is the

text edition and translation reviewed here, in the introduction to which (p. 1-24) the Belgian author Frank van den Bossche (B.) deals at length with the many Haribhadras mentioned in the Jinaratnakośa and identifies one as the author of the given text, which was written in *saṃvat* 1180 = 1123 CE (p. 15).

Haribhadra's Jambūdvīpasamgrahaṇī consists of thirty Prakrit *āryā gāthās*, in the text called *sūtras*, for the critical edition of which B. used three Indian editions and the 23 MSS listed on p. 21-23. These stanzas and Prabhānanda's commentary (Vṛtti) written in the thirteenth-fourteenth (?) centuries are printed in Devanāgarī and Latin script and translated with short notes. It would have been practical to print the English rendering opposite the Latin text of the Vṛtti, thus saving the reader much leafing, especially in longer commentarial sections such as p. 88ff.

Contrary to older scholiasts, Prabhānanda sometimes mentions the names of sources quoted which, however, is apparently no guarantee that the source or the citation is correct. Thus, e.g., on p. 32, n. 3 and p. 34, n. 1, B. refers to an assumed quote from the Bhagavaī (Viyāhapannatti [VP]) as "untraced", yet with a little effort something can be done for the identification.

Starting with the rare and curious words "*jambūrukā* [!] *jambū-vannā* [!] *jāva uvasohemāṇā*" (p. 32 and 34) one sees from the glossary in B.J. Doshi's and A.M. Bhojak's *Viyāhapannattisuttam* edition (*Jaina-Agama-Series* 4, Part 1-3. Bombay 1974-1982) that the first two words in their proper form do not occur there. This excludes the VP, as we have it now, as the source. The Abhidhānarājendrakōśa does not list these words.

With the help of Muni Ratnachandra's *Ardha-Magadhi Dictionary* (II/772b) we find *jambūrukka* and *vaṇa* in Jambuddīvapannatti (JP) 7,177, a passage which resembles our quote (JP, ed. Bombay 1920, p. 540a1-3): *se keṇ' aṭṭheṇaṃ bhante, evaṃ vuccai jambuddīve 2, goyamā. jambuddīve ṇaṃ dīve tattha 2 dese taḥiṃ 2 bahave jambūrukkhā jambūvaṇā jambūvaṇasaṇḍā ṇiccaṃ kusumiyā jāva piṇḍimamañjarivaḍeṃsagadharā sirīe aīva uvasobhemāṇā ciṭṭhanti. jambūe sudaṃsaṇḍe aṇḍhīe nāmaṃ deve mahiddhīe jāva paliovamaṭṭhiie parivasai. se teṇ' aṭṭheṇaṃ goyamā, evaṃ vuccai jambuddīve.*

The words *dīve mandarassa pavvayassa uttareṇaṃ* occur at VP 4,4 (Part 1 [Bombay 1974], p. 179,13f.), the same with *dāhiṇeṇaṃ* instead of *uttareṇaṃ* at 3,7,4 (op. cit., p. 169,15f.); but an equivalent to Prabhānanda's *lavaṇassa dāhiṇeṇaṃ* was actually not found. Yet this shows that Prabhānanda's memory can be sharpened.

The description of Jambūdvīpa in stanza 3 continues with the statement about it having 190 units (p. 46ff.). This causes B. to make two notes on *navya-sayaṃ* (p. 49, n. 1) and *kalā* (p. 50, n. 1) instead of just referring to W. Schubring's *Doctrine of the Jains*, § 113. Moreover, the mention of Ayodhyā is of course not missing (p. 108,22), but one would then have expected a reference to D. Schlingloff's interesting study *Die altindische Stadt* (Wiesbaden 1969) for comparison, unless B. intended this book particularly for the Indian market (which would explain the addition of the text in Devanāgarī, and the reference to a text edition with Hindi and Gujarati paraphrase on p. 106, n. 1).

Numbering the lines of the text, as is being done in modern Pali Text Society editions, would have been useful. The same can be said of printing proper names with a capital so they can be spotted more quickly on a page.

The translation of a Sanskrit commentary is useful for students, yet it ought not be necessary to tell the Indological reader in a note that *te* is a "nominative masculine plural, while '*khaṇḍāni*' is a nominative neuter plural" (p. 62, n. 2); further, *khaṇḍa* is masculine and neuter. B. also declares (p. 24) that he did not make a critical edition of Prabhānanda's commentary. Thus the opportunity to correct faulty metre in citations, where possible, was wasted, e.g., on p. 123, where the first half of a regular Āryā is given as "*vijayaṃ paḍi veyadḍho, gaṃgā-siṃdhu-samā du dunnī naī*" (cf. p. 102) without noting that as °*samā du* constitutes the sixth Gaṇa, °*siṃdhu*° must as the fifth be emended to °*siṃdhū*°.

One is sometimes in doubt whether a native speaker gave his *placet* to the English rendering: e.g., a word is not “connected with” a gender (p. 126); the “tutelary godhead” (p. 127) or “In there, there are ...” (p. 133) makes one wonder; the Indian monarch does not “reign” his country (p. 127), but rules, as he is the owner of his realm and its inhabitants.

Two useful appendices, one on the circumference of Jambūdvīpa (p. 255f.) and the other containing “Materials for the study of the Jain Haribhadras” (p. 257-271), as well as twelve colour figures illustrating in a very instructive manner the Jain universe and the details of Jambūdvīpa (p. 275-286), a bibliography (p. 287-301) and a list of Indian names and words (p. 303-327) conclude the book.

The bibliography, which apparently was not proof-read (e.g., P.S. Jaini’s *The Jaina Path of Purification* [Berkeley 1979] is also found under Padmanabh, S. Jaini), has many omissions to be partly supplied from p. 4ff. (e.g., the monographs of S. Mookerjee and B.K. Matilal from the note on p. 29). R.C. Majumdar’s *The History and Culture of the Indian People* is listed under “The” instead of under the name of its editor. The same pertains to *The Cambridge History of India*. Royce Wiles’ *The Śvetāmbara Canon* (A Descriptive Listing of Text Editions, Commentaries, Studies and Indices. Canberra 1999) seems to have escaped B.’s attention in addition to newer editions of, e.g., W. Schubring’s *The Doctrine of the Jainas* (Delhi 2000) and particularly P. Dundas’ *The Jainas* (London – New York 2002).

Users, especially non-Indologists, of this – despite the above-mentioned shortcomings – generally valuable and stimulating contribution to the knowledge of traditional Jain thinking about the universe would also appreciate the addition of an English subject index in a revised future edition.

Willem B. Bollée

S. SAMBANDHAŚIVĀCĀRYA – T. GANESAN (ED.)

Sūkṣmāgama. Vol. I: *Chapters 1 to 13*. Critical Edition. [Collection *Indologie* 114]. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry – École française d’Extrême-Orient, 2010. 1 + 203p. Rs. 650.– / € 28.– (ISBN 978-81-8470-181-4 / 978-285539-105-2).

With the first volume of the *editio princeps* of the *Sūkṣmāgama* (SūĀ) by S. Sambandhaśivācārya and T. Ganesan, the French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP) has published a further important portion of the 28 *Mūlāgamas* of the Śaivasiddhānta.

The present volume contains a critical edition of the first thirteen chapters of the SūĀ, which in total comprises nearly one hundred chapters with approximately three thousand verses (p. xi). The book is introduced with a preface by Bruno Dagens in French and English (pp. iii-ix). This is followed by an introduction and a “Summary of the Book” by the editors. The introduction, in English (p. xi-xx), consists of very brief general remarks about the SūĀ as well as a very short description of the contents of the first thirteen chapters of the text. The “Summary of the Book”, provided in English (p. xxi-1) and in Sanskrit (p. 1-25), then depicts these contents passage for passage and in careful detail. The eight manuscripts used for the critical edition are then listed (p. 26). Of these, all but one are transcripts from the collection held by the IFP. Those transcripts are published in full on the internet (http://www.muktalib5.org/digital_library.htm), and thus an attentive reader can check any doubtful passage directly.

The critical edition (p. 27-203) itself has been produced with great care. In addition to recording all text variants that appear, it also reports other sources dealing with the same topic as the chapter in question (in the first n. of each chapter) and gives parallel texts (e.g., p. 28, n. 12) or passages from other works that describe particular topics in more detail than found in the SūĀ (e.g., p. 39, n. 15). Furthermore, it identifies the Vedic mantras mentioned in the text (e.g., p. 30, n. 16 or p. 32, n. 1).

The contents of the first thirteen chapters of the SūĀ are prescriptions for rites for temple worship of Śiva. According to the editors, some of these are quite uncommon, as for example the “rule relating to the auspicious day” (*puṇyāhavidhi*, chapter 1). Others are found in many other Ā-gamas, such as the *pañcagavyavidhi* (“rule relating to the five products of the cow”, chapter 2; cf. p. xii). The length of the chapters varies greatly. The shortest is the ninth, dealing with the rite of evening protection (*sāyarakṣā*), with ten *ślokas*; the longest is the thirteenth chapter on the festival (*utsava*), with three hundred and ninety and a half *ślokas*.

The book will be of great value for Sanskrit scholars dealing with this particular tradition or with texts and rituals of the Śaivasiddhānta or Hindu religions in general, and will provide a safe basis for their studies. However, the very detailed summary of the original text will also be a useful source for scholars, for example, of social anthropology or religious studies, who do not read Sanskrit but are interested in the subject of temple worship.

In his preface Bruno Dagens announced that “this first volume ... is to be followed in the near future by a second one” (p. viii). Already two years later the *Critical Edition* of Chapters 14 to 53 was published as no. 3 of the series “Steles: Jean Filliozat Series in South Asian Culture and History” (Pondicherry 2012), comprising clxxiii + 403 pages. We are congratulating its editors, who were joined by B. Dagens himself and by M.-L. Barazer-Billoret with the ongoing collaboration of J.-M. Creisméas, to their resolve to continue this extensive edition project as well as their tenaciousness to maintain its high quality.

Marion Rastelli

BARBARA SCHULER

Of Death and Birth. Icakkiamman, a Tamil Goddess in Ritual and Story. With a Film on DVD by the Author. [Ethno-Indology 8]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009. xvi + 501p., 1 DVD. € 98.– (ISBN 978-3-447-05844-5).

The book, a revised version of the author’s PhD dissertation from 2004, contains an edition and translation of the Icakkiamman Katai (IK) and a study of the role of this text in the so-called *koṭai* festival taking place in the southern part of Tamilnadu. The book is accompanied by a film on DVD of the ritual in question.

The IK is performed in the bow song tradition. The edition is, however, not based on live performances, as is the case with the street theater play “Karṇa Mōkṣam” edited by Hanne M. de Bruin (Pondichéry 1998), but on manuscripts and printed editions. As noted by the author, the representatives of the bow song tradition have become very keen on having written or printed versions of their text made available (see p. 10, n. 23). In appendix C (p. 361-475) the readings of four versions are compared. From the material presented there one can get a good picture of the flexibility of a story in a living tradition.

The text edition and annotated translation are found on p. 67-144 and 145-217 respectively. The edition is presented in a clear way, though the information provided in the notes on peculiar features of the language is sometimes formulated rather amateurishly. A case in point concerns the word *ciranta* in line 20 about which Schuler (Sch.) says, probably following the suggestion of a native speaker, “I read this as *kaṇatta(I)* (unbearably heavy)” (p. 68, n. 25). Another instance is found in n. 13 on p. 67 where we are advised to read *vaḷamayatu* as *vaḷamai*. We are, however, dealing with the phrase *vaḷama(i) (y)atu* here, in which *atu* “that” refers back to the noun *vaḷamai*. Compare phrases like *yukam atilum* “the *yuga*, in that one”, in line 17. The use of this *atu* may be compared with that of *taṇ* in the phrase *ceṭṭi taṇai* in line 91. The author characterizes both this *atu* and *taṇ* as colloquial features (see n. 132 and 97 respectively). This matter, however, seems to require further study. In this connection I would like to draw attention to the instances of *taṇ* (and *tam*) in similar constructions in the above-mentioned “Karṇa Mōkṣam”, which seem to be

completely absent from the prose conversations and restricted to the songs in that play (see *WZKS* 46 [2002] 271). The same construction is also common in classical texts and medieval commentaries. Sch.'s translation of this difficult and often tantalizingly elliptic text is excellent and a real achievement.

The second part of the book is devoted to the festival at which the text is sung and the relationship between text and ritual. It includes a detailed presentation focused on which part of the *IK* is sung at precisely which moment of the festival. It should be noted that during the festival the *IK*, the story of which is situated, if anywhere, in the northern part of Tamilnadu, is followed by a local *Icacki* story, summarized on p. 304, which relates how the particular goddess has arrived in the local temple, in this case one in Paḷavūr in the south of Tamilnadu. An interesting conclusion is that there is hardly any interaction between the text of the *IK* and the ritual and that "the climactic moments of the *IK* performance and the nodal points of the ritual do not coincide" (p. 341). According to the author this might be explained by assuming that the text has been superimposed on the ritual. In the case of the particular festival investigated by Sch. the group behind this may, as she suggests, indeed have been the local *Vēḷāḷas*, who are the main sponsors of the festival (p. 278) and who also play an heroic role in the story.

In the *IK* itself the female protagonist has been called *Nīli*. In order to trace the history of the story, Sch. has collected all references in earlier literature to *Nīli* (p. 27-55). Her treatment of the matter is, however, confusing. It also includes, for instance, several passages in which *Nīli* is not mentioned, at least not by name (*Maṇimēkalai* 26.5-34 [p. 30f.]; *Tēvāram* 1.45.1 and 7 [p. 32-34]). It would have been more to the point if she had concentrated instead on passages which also contain incidents known from the *IK*, treating them with greater care. For instance, in her translation of *Tēvāram* 1.45.1 (p. 33), which contains probably one of the earliest references to one such incident, Sch. misconstrued the phrase *muṇai natpāy*. The latter is to be taken with the immediately following *vaṅcappaṭuttu*. The stanza refers to a woman who takes a man's life after she has pretended (*vaṅcappaṭuttu*) that she was his former lover (*muṇai natpāy*). Another fairly early reference to the story is found in *Cēkkiḷār's* *Periyapurānam* 1080 (no. 7 on p. 37), which Sch., again, misunderstood, in this case because she failed to resolve the *sandhi* correctly. The construction of the stanza is the following: *cirutoṅṭar ... uyiraiyum ... coṟ ram meymmaiṅ tūkki(y) accollai kākka ... ikaḷntatu*, "The humble devotees (this refers to the *Vēḷāḷas* in the *IK*), having to choose (*tūkki*) between their lives and the promise (they had given to the merchant, the *ceṭṭi* of the *IK*), chose that promise (*accollai*) and with that lost their lives".

These details apart, the present book stands out head and shoulders above the editions and translations of similar texts from the various living traditions in Tamilnadu brought out by the Institute of Asian Studies in Chennai. It deserves to be taken as an example for future studies in this field.

Herman Tiekens