

duction which describes the whole ceremony of the Aśvamedha, and a list (with the text printed) of those passages of the Taittirīya which are to be found also in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa.

Of particular value are the parentheses which, as the preface states, contain 'not only the words that must be understood in the text, but also short explanations, . . . introductory notes . . . and remarks that may help the reader to grasp the significance of the rites and to follow the phases of the sacrifice.' These parenthetical explanations are so important—there are hardly two consecutive lines in the translation without inserted comment—that an example must be given in sufficient length to show both the value of and the necessity for these explanations. In the following passage (3.8.10), Dumont's notes are italicized: 'He offers ( $6 \times 4 + 6$ ) thirty Audgrahaṇa oblations (*that is to say that, on each of the six first days of the Dīkṣā, he offers the four Audgrahaṇa oblations of the ordinary Soma-sacrifice, and, on the seventh day, the six special Audgrahaṇa oblations of the Agnicayana: cf. Āp. 16.8.13*). The Virāj (-stanza) consists of thirty syllables, and the Virāj is food. (*Thus, inasmuch as he offers thirty Audgrahaṇa oblations*) he obtains food.'

It is too much, of course, to expect that any translation should please everyone in all its parts. On such a text as this, complete unanimity is impossible. For myself, for example, I should stand by the idea that Prajāpati, in the ancient legend, having assumed the form of a horse, remained for a year *in an aśvattha tree*, since I think that the god in the sacred wood and Prajāpati are completely identical; and I should therefore so translate the locative in *sò 'śvatthé samvatsarām atīṣṭhat* (3.8.12). Dumont prefers '. . . he stood for a year under an aśvattha tree.' With the same idea in mind I should also, therefore, choose some other, rather slightly stronger, expression than 'resting-place' to render *yoni* in the same passage, since, although it is said that Prajāpati's stay in the tree is temporary (i. e. for a year), I believe that it is so only because the year is the ultimate temporal limit (cf. the *ἐνιαυτός δαίμων*—not the 'corn-spirit') and that Prajāpati's avatar is an annual one for obvious and natural reasons.

Similarly, in another difficult passage (3.8.20), *ātmanā 'bhījuhōti sātmanam evāi 'nam sātanaṃ karoti. sātma 'mūṣmīl loké bhavati, yá evaṃ véda,*

which Dumont translates, 'Upon (*the horse*), he (*the Adhvaryu*) (*symbolically*) makes oblation of the (*horse's*) Self (*probably, by pouring clarified butter into the fire*). He (*thus*) endows him (*the horse*) with the (*horse's*) Self, with his own living body. He (*the Sacrificer*), who thus knows, becomes endowed with his own Self (*with his own living body*), in yonder world.' I should prefer, because of the expressly stated doctrine of knowledge (*ya evaṃ véda*), to omit any addition to the simple statement of the text that he who understands becomes *sātma* in yonder world: I do not think that the meaning is 'with his own living body.'

But these are differences of opinion only. There are many matters of greater interest: the complete description of the fertility rites accompanying the slaying of the horse (3.9.6 and 7); the mention of man as a victim (3.9.8)—and this, apparently, not merely symbolically; the dog as a symbol of evil (3.8.4); the statement that it is the moon (rather than the sun) which is born again (3.9.5). It is important that this text is now easily available with what amounts to interlinear translation and comment, for this part of the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, despite its strange obliquity and lack of logical connection and—to be sure—despite a certain amount of nonsense, too, is a useful work and not the mere twaddle it is sometimes thought to be. It is a commentary on the most solemn sacrifice in ancient India, and it tells us many things worth knowing about it: it tells us, for instance, that the sacrificer is the horse (3.9.17), and that Prajāpati is the horse (3.9.23), and that the sun, also, is the horse (3.9.21); and these statements, common though they are in their theory of universal identity, should at least remind us that a very long tradition of Vedic interpretation has all along been saying these same things about the fundamental meaning of the Vedic sacrifice and, indeed, of the Vedas themselves. It may be that Śāyana is quite right, after all, in many of his comments on the Rig-Veda—as, for example, in what he has to say about the first word in Vāmadeva's poem (RV. 4.26) which begins, 'I was Manu; I was the sun': his gloss reads, *aham vāmadeva indro vā*.

The sections of the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa here published are part of a projected complete translation. There is probably no one in the West better suited to do this particular work than Dr. Dumont.



There may be someone else outside of India who knows the *Aśvamedha* so well that he is able to suspect a lacuna in the explanation of the liturgy; but there is certainly no one else who could both be aware of an error and be able to supply a plausible correction: this nice feat Dr. Dumont has performed in a brief footnote (no. 11, p. 475).

Now that he has made his way into the text by the route that he knows best, it is to be hoped that the many difficulties of the remaining parts will not too long delay his final translation of the entire *Brāhmaṇa*.

MURRAY FOWLER

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

*Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*. By ETIENNE LAMOTTE. Tome I, chapitres I-XV, première partie (traduction annotée). Pp. xxxii + 620. Tome II, chapitres XVI-XXX. Pp. xxii + 498 (numbered 621-1118). Louvain: BUREAUX DU MUSÉON, 1944, 1949. (Bibliothèque du Muséon, volume 18).<sup>1</sup>

Students of Buddhism owe a great debt of gratitude to L. for having translated the first fifth part of this monumental work, which ranks with the much larger *Mahāvibhāṣā* as the principal source for a study of the *Hīnayāna-Mahāyāna* schism. It fully deserved the honor of having been accorded by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres the *Prix Stanislas Julien* (1949). It brings out the fact that knowledge of early Chinese Buddhist literature is much more essential for the understanding of Indian Buddhism of the *Kuṣāna* period than acquaintance with the Tibetan versions in *Kanjur* and *Tanjur*, where almost all early texts, such as *āgama-sūtras*, are missing. The Sanskrit originals of *Mpps* and *Mahāvibhāṣā* are lost, and they have not been translated into Tibetan, or any language other than Chinese. L. is as well qualified in Indic languages as in Buddhist Chinese, and is to be congratulated on the successful completion of this first instalment of the copiously annotated translation and restoration of the Sanskrit original text. Restored are only proper names, booktitles, technical terms, and other easily recognizable items. He could have done a better job, if he had consulted the three annotated Japanese translations of T1509, published in the three Japanese *Tripitāka*

collections *Kokuyaku-daizōkyō*, *Shōwa-shinsan-kokuyaku-daizōkyō*, and *Kokuyaku-issaikyō*. His sparse and inadequate references to related passages in the as yet untranslated four-fifths of the *Mpps* might have been improved upon by using the classified index *Daichidoron-ruishūhyōmoku*, written by the Japanese monk *Nissō* in A. D. 1668, and printed in the collection of Japanese Buddhist works *Nihondaizōkyō* (1917), vol. 29, pp. 457-539. The complete French translation will require at least ten oversize volumes. In view of the very large number of proper names, booktitles, and rare words, an index volume is urgently needed.

Although *Mpps* is primarily a commentary on the philosophical *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-pp.*, so many stories, parables, and anecdotes are told to illustrate precepts, virtues, and doctrines, that a large part consists of tales occurring in parallel versions in Buddha's biography, *sūtra*-, *jātaka*-, *avadāna*-, *nidāna*-, *vinaya*-, *vyākaraṇa*-, *vibhāṣā*-literature, and in non-Buddhist folklore. The Sanskrit text of two stories, that of *Śākyamuni*'s disciple *Mṛgaśiras* 'Deer-head,' and that of King *Bimbasāra* and the courtesan *Āmrāpālī*, has been quoted from the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* (*Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, ed. N. Dutt) and reprinted with translation on pp. 991, 1085. Passages from several *Upaniṣads* are quoted pp. 744, 1073. L. collates carefully *Mpps* references to Buddha's sermons with both Pali *nikāyas* and Chinese *āgamas*. A large majority of the scriptures quoted by *Mpps* was identified by L. with passages in the *Sarvāstivāda Canon*, and, to a lesser extent, *Theravāda Canon*, sometimes interpreted in a Mahayanist way. Examples of such Mahayanist Pali suttas are: *Avijjāpaccaya* (*ubho ante anupagamma*), *Nalakāpiya*, *Pheṇa*, *Kullūpama* (*Samyutta*, *Majjhima*; L. 64, 1079). The following Mahāyāna texts are quoted in the translated part (the first 18 scrolls) of *Mpps*: *Mahāpp. sūtra*, *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra*, *Nāgārjuna's Madhyamakakārikās*

<sup>1</sup> See my review of Tome I *HJAS* 10.216-23. Abbreviations are as follows. *Mpps*: *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*. L.: Lamotte, or his book under review. pp.: *prajñāpāramitā*. T followed by a figure refers to text number in *Taishōdaizōkyō* edition of Chinese *Tripitāka*. Titles of periodicals abbreviated as listed on *HJAS* covers.



and the Madhyamakāśāstra. I add a list of sūtras (abbreviated s.), specified as Mahāyāna-sūtras, enumerated in the untranslated chapter on Mahāyāna T1509, p. 394b, and identify them tentatively with texts in the Chinese Canon: (1) Buddhāpadānas. T199; (2) Suvikrāntacintādevaputra-paripreṣhā T588; (3) Kuśalamūlasamparigraha T657; (4) Saddharmapūṇḍarika T262-5 (L. 752 refers to a legend told in this sūtra); (5) Ratnameghas. (L. p. 44, n. 3) T658-660; (6) Mahameghas. T387; (7) Dharmameghas. (separate translation of the tenth bhūmi of the Daśabhūmika); (8) Maitreyaparipreṣhās. T349; (9) Śaṭpāramitās. T261. Moreover, the following Mahāyāna-sūtras are mentioned in the untranslated part, p. 756b: (10) Gaṇḍavyūhas. T293, 300; (11) Mahākaruṇās. T380; (12) Upāyas. T345; (13) Anavataptanāgarājaparipreṣhās. T 635; (14) Asurarājaparipreṣhās. The following Mahāyāna-sūtras, in addition to the above, are quoted in Nāgārjuna's other works (Daśabhūmivibhāṣā, etc.): (15) Tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeśa T 312; (16) Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśa T650; (17) Sarvadevavyūhas. (Devatās.? T592); (18) Daśabhūmis. T283-4; (19) Akṣayamatīnirdeśas. T403; (20) Ugradattaparipreṣhās. T323; (21) Ratnacandraparipreṣhās. T437; (22) Pratyutpannabuddhasamukhāvasthitasamādhis. T416-8; (23) Tathāgatajñānamudrāsamādhis. T632-4; (24) Sūtraṅgama (samādhi) s. T642; (25) Sukhāvativyūha T360-367. This list may be helpful for L. and others, who try to determine the chronological sequence of the Mahāyāna texts and the titles of Nāgārjuna's authentic works.

Mistakes are unavoidable in such a colossal compilation and listing a few does not detract from L.'s merits. Ranking next to Prajñā and Pāramitā (100 enumerated in the 44th parivarta) in importance is the term *shih-hsiang*, heading the title of pps. T240, identified with pp. L. p. 1105-6, occurring in the title and constituting the subject-matter of the untranslated 43rd parivarta, and mentioned in the first gāthā on a par with pp. This term renders (*sarvadharmā*) *tattvalakṣaṇa* and *dharmatā* in Madhyamakakārikā XVIII. 9 (J. W. De Jong, Prasannapadā, p. 29-33), T1564, p. 24, n. 1, 3, and *tattvalakṣaṇa* (relating to *parikalpita*, *paratantra*, *pariniṣpannasvabhāva*) in Vasubandhu's Madhyāntavibhāgabhāṣya, ed. S. Yamaguchi, Skt. text p. 114, l. 8, p. 115, l. 3, 12, Tib. Chin. text p. 45. Different Chinese characters (not *shih-*

*hsiang*) represent the synonyms *paramārthalakṣaṇa* (L. p. 78, Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra, Skt. p. 22, T. vol. 31, p. 598 b, c) and *tathatālakṣaṇa* (L. 749; Pañcaviṃśatipp. T220, vol. 7, p. 604 c 5, T223, p. 325). L.'s reconstruction *satyalakṣaṇa* (pp. 45, 49, 710, 925, 950, 969) is wrong. Only the first member of the compound *bhūta-lakṣaṇa* (L. pp. 68, 677, 700, 709, 1060; Lanka 288) is correct. His latest reconstruction (letter of 9/16/49) *bhūtanaya* is firmly based on the correspondence of T1509, p. 416 b 23, 417 c 4, and Pañcaviṃśatipp., ed. N. Dutt, p. 216, l. 18, p. 223, l. 5. L. renders the key-terms *anupalabdha*, *anupalabhya* sometimes correctly by 'insaisissable' (1104), 'non-établi,' 'introuvable' (75), 'non-acquis' (1112), 'non-perçu' (1106), 'not being a predicate' (1091 n.), but very often incorrectly by 'non-existent' (724, 733-5, 750, 919, 981, 1092, 1100). This leaves the erroneous impression that the Mpps views are negativistic (*asatpakṣa*, *abhāvadrṣṭi*, *ucchedavāda*), whereas this sort of one-sided śūnyavāda is rejected throughout the work, e. g. p. 1078-1095. The Buddha is said to be *anupalabbhiyamāna* in the Pali Saṃyuttanikāya, Pt. 3, p. 112, l. 6, and corresponding Chinese āgama, T vol. 2, p. 31 b, where *apaññāyamāna* (restored from the Chinese) 'unperceivable' is added. Buddha enumerates the characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of pp. (51, 1100, 1106). L. correctly restored the first one, *śūnya*, but did not recognize the 2nd, being *animitta* (L. reads *bhavābhava*)-*anabhisamskāra* (L. reads *akriyā*). He mistook the 2nd character of the emphatic copula *tsê-shih* (Jap. *sokuze*: Oda, Bukkyōdaijiten, p. 1083) for *bhava* (correct: *bhāva*) 'existence.' Mvy. X. 19, 22: *anabhisamskārāḥ sarvadharmāḥ, animittāḥ*. See Wogihara's Bonwadaijiten (1940-4), p. 4, 44, Pañcaviṃśatipp., ed. N. Dutt, p. 223, l. 7. On the ground of position (problems 9-12) in the stereotyped series of 14 *avyākṛtavastūni* L. (p. 155, 529) translated *shên* (ātman, jīva) 'Tathāgata, ou le saint affranchi du désir.' That the meaning of *shên* in these passages is 'soul (ātman), vital principle (jīva)' seems to be proven by the terminology of a list of Śrāvaka theses in the Chinese Nirvāṇasūtra, T vol. 12, p. 473 b 24, 563 b 15, 716 b, 809 c, 819 a, where *wo* (ātman) is a textual variant of *shên*. This interpretation is supported by W. Liebenenthal's discussion of *shên* in the terminology of Sêng-chao, who assisted Kumārajīva in translating the Mpps and many other works (The book of Chao, MS Monogr. 13, p.