

Sales studies the meaning of the closure of villages in Nepal: “Notes sur la claustration villageoise au Népal” (pp. 547–564). David N. Gellner describes the ritual of the consecration of a Vajra master on the basis of two manuscripts and the verbal commentary from Paṇḍit Asha Kaji Vajracharya: “The Consecration of a Vajra Master in Newar Buddhism” (pp. 659–675).

This beautifully produced volume will be essential reading for all those interested in the peoples of the roof of the world.

4 Jansz Crescent
Manuka ACT 2603
Australia

J.W. DE JONG

Minoru Hara and J. C. Wright, Eds., *John Brough: Collected Papers*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1996. xxii, 533 pp.

John Brough (August 31, 1917–January 9, 1984) was undoubtedly one of the greatest Indologists of the present century. One cannot even casually page through this volume of his collected papers without a feeling of awe at his depth, his care, and his spectacular scholarly range. To call him an Indologist is, in fact, to run the risk of his being misunderstood as a narrow scholar. Nothing could be further from the truth. He published on Vedic, Middle Indic, and Classical Sanskrit philology, Indo-European mythology, Sanskrit grammar and linguistics, Brahmanical society and gotras, the Gāndhārī language and Kharoṣṭhī epigraphy, Central Asian history, Sanskrit poetry and poetics, problems of Chinese and Tibetan translations of Indian Buddhist texts, and more. And in everything he wrote he was sure and steady, while at the same time insightful and innovative, all in a crisp and elegant English style. It is a great pleasure to be able to welcome this volume reprinting most of his non-monographic works.

Despite the astonishingly broad range of his interests and competence, Brough was not a comparativist, at least in the sense that that term is frequently used today. In fact, he rather energetically, and sometimes even rather sarcastically, critiqued a certain type of comparativism, especially in his comments on Dumézil’s ideas on the “Tripartite Ideology of the Indo-Europeans.” Having, for example, offered an elaborate complex of evidence which reduces to ashes Dumézil’s claim that the “Tripartite Ideology” is exclusively Indo-European, and non-Biblical, Brough

wrote (p. 199): “We can, of course, dismiss the whole thing [that is, Brough’s demonstration of the same patterns in Biblical myth] as a mere burlesque, a caricature of Professor Dumézil’s methods: though I protest that I have tried not to caricature, and have done my best to deal with the material in the same manner as he has dealt with the Indo-European material. The reader is free to judge whether or not my treatment is a burlesque.” Despite the putative freedom Brough has given his reader, he ends his study with these words: “The experiment [carried out in the paper] also suggests that the Indo-European ‘tripartite ideology’ could be due very largely to bias in the selection of data combined with ‘la nature des choses’. If it does not prove this with the certainty of a mathematical demonstration, it does at least prove that, up to the present, no very strong reason has been given for thinking otherwise.”

On the other hand, it might be more accurate to say that Brough’s apparent lack of sympathy for comparativism was rather a lack of sympathy for sloppy and unconvincing arguments which select their data with a predetermined conclusion in mind. For Brough’s studies on Central Asia, including his works on Gāndhārī, and his comments on *soma*, if not other studies as well, certainly qualify as inherently comparative, from almost any point of view. If they do not appear to be explicitly comparative, this may be because of the style in which Brough presented his chains of reasoning, his compelling and convincing stringing together of pieces of evidence, which does not give the impression one gets from some other comparativism of forced arguments and selective presentation of evidence. Perhaps the closest Brough came to explicit comparativism is in the Introduction to his little volume of Sanskrit poetry published for a popular audience from Penguin (*Poems from the Sanskrit*, 1968). There he attempts – and I think most would agree that his attempt is remarkably successful – to explain techniques of Sanskrit poetry with English examples, and generally to argue for the position that connoisseurs of literature can take Sanskrit poetry seriously even if they are not fluent readers of Sanskrit. The publication of a volume of Sanskrit poetry from the mass market publisher Penguin itself suggests that we see here an implicit argument for the serious appraisal of Sanskrit poetry outside the narrow confines of academic Indology. On the other hand, it is probably not fair to claim, as one of the editors of these *Collected Papers* has [p. vii], that this volume “must rank as the first successful attempt to achieve transmutation into English . . . poetry.” Setting aside what may be isolated instances of successful earlier translations, and the subjective issue of whose translations are

to be preferred as poetry, surely the priority in this arena must go to the work of Daniel H. H. Ingalls, whose *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry*, his translation of Vidyākara's *Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa*, was published already in 1965.¹

It is no exaggeration to say that in the major areas he touched upon in his research, Brough set the standard. His work on the gotras (his doctoral thesis, later published as *The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara* (1953), and several papers presented here) is classic, his study of *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada* (1962) is justly considered one of the masterworks of Indian Buddhist philology, his studies of Central Asian epigraphy in Kharoṣṭhī are still without published parallel, and so on.

Among his interests, Brough had a special fascination with the problems of the spread of Buddhism from India through Central Asia to China, and his work on Central Asian history, the Gāndhārī language and Gāndhārī manuscript culture are today particularly to be noticed. While there is probably comparatively little that can be done to improve more than incrementally his work on the so-called Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* (unless the missing portions of the manuscript appear), the past several years have seen successive discoveries of voluminous other manuscript materials in Gāndhārī (including some *Dharmapada* fragments), apparently originally from Afghanistan and available now at least in part because of the breakdown of social order in the region. Some of these newly discovered materials are held at present in the British Library, being studied under the direction of Richard Salomon (Seattle), others are in the Schøyen Collection (Norway), the study of which is being coordinated by Jens Braarvig (Oslo). There can be no doubt at all that the successful investigation of these materials will be possible in large part because of the pioneering work done by Brough, and this very work will itself take on a new value in light of these new materials. Indeed, Prof. Salomon has told me that Brough's work on the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* is his constant companion in his study of the new Gāndhārī manuscripts, that he consults it frequently, but finds need to disagree with or correct it but rarely. I suspect it is also the experience of others who have found themselves travelling down the same paths as did Brough, in any field of study, that they find his signposts and remarks invaluable.

The papers collected in the present volume are reprinted very clearly from the original publications, with the exception of two articles which had to be retyped. The articles cover virtually all of Brough's publications, save those published as books (a portion of one of which is

included, his popular work on Sanskrit poetry, mentioned above), or rather insignificant book reviews or notices. Altogether 48 items are included, presented in chronological order. (Book reviews, of which only a very few are reproduced, follow the articles, but again in chronological order.) While this has the advantage of allowing one to follow the evolution of Brough's thinking and inquiry into various issues, some readers might have preferred a topic-wise presentation. On the other hand, the indices – of words in a variety of languages including Old, Middle and New Indo-Aryan, various European languages, Tibetan and Chinese, of text passages, and of names and subjects – should allow readers to find in rather short order whether and where a matter of interest is dealt with in the volume.²

For the sake of convenience, and to present the main contents of the volume, I rearrange the articles (omitting the reviews and two pieces of ephemera) into the following, in some cases somewhat forced, categories; since many of the following studies cover several genres and address several different types of problems, it would no doubt be possible to arrange things somewhat differently. This list, however, might serve as a rough and ready guide to the contents of the volume, thematically arranged:

Indo-European, Vedic and Brahmanical Studies:

- “Sattayā, pp. 1–2.
- “The early history of the gotras,” pp. 3–31.
- “The meaning of ni√hnu in the Brāhmaṇas,” pp. 74–78.
- “Additional notes on the Brahmin clans,” pp. 155–158.
- “Uṣas and Mater Matuta,” pp. 181–185.
- “The tripartite ideology of the Indo-Europeans: An experiment in method,” pp. 186–202.
- “Soma and *Amanita muscaria*,” pp. 366–397.
- “Problems of the «soma-mushroom» theory,” pp. 398–409.
- “Mythological triads,” pp. 423–432.

Buddhist philology and literature:

- “Nepalese Buddhist Rituals,” pp. 54–62.
- “Thus Have I Heard . . . ,” pp. 63–73.
- “The Language of the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts,” pp. 130–154.
- “Some Notes on Maitrakanyaka: Divyāvadāna XXXVIII,” pp. 159–180.
- “The Chinese Pseudo-Translation of Ārya-Śūra's *Jātaka-mālā*,” pp. 217–243.
- “Buddhist Chinese Etymological Notes,” pp. 433–437.

“The Arapacana Syllabary in the Old Lalita-vistara,” pp. 450–460.
 “Sakāya Niruttīyā: Cauld kale het,” pp. 461–468.

Sanskrit Grammar:

“Līlātilaka: a Sanskrit tract on Malayalam grammar and poetics,”
 pp. 32–46.
 “Theories of General Linguistics in the Sanskrit Grammarians,”
 pp. 79–98.
 “Audambarāyaṇa’s Theory of Language,” pp. 99–103.
 “Some Indian Theories of Meaning,” pp. 114–129.
 “I-ching on the Sanskrit Grammarians,” pp. 410–422.

Central Asian Studies:

“Legends of Khotan and Nepal,” pp. 47–53.
 “A Kharoṣṭhī Inscription from China,” pp. 203–216.
 “Il Regno di Shan-shan,” pp. 261–275.
 “Comments on Third-century Shan-shan and the History of Buddhism,”
 pp. 276–307.
 “Supplementary Notes on Third-century Shan-shan,” pp. 351–357.
 “Nugae Indo-sericae,” pp. 358–365.
 “Amitābha and Avalokiteśvara in an Inscribed Gandhāran Sculpture,”
 pp. 469–473.

Sanskrit Literature:

“The Study of the Indian Classics,” pp. 104–113.
 “Introduction” to *Poems from the Sanskrit*, pp. 309–350.
 “Poetry in Classical Sanskrit,” pp. 438–449.

Miscellaneous:

“Obituary: Arnold Adriaan Bake,” pp. 244–259.

Two unpublished works are noted by the editors in the complete bibliography which doubles as a table of contents, both of which should certainly be published. The first is listed as follows: “*Pāpaparimocana*: Sanskrit text and Newārī commentary. Edited with a translation, introduction and notes’ [Buddhist ritual manual for laymen; facsimile reproduction of text, separately bound], University of Edinburgh Thesis [1945].” This text is alluded to in “Nepalese Buddhist Rituals” (p. 54), in which the text there edited is said to form “an interesting supplement to the information of the *Pāpa-parimocana* on the subject of the regular ceremonies and the sacraments” of Nepalese Buddhism, and three verses are quoted in the article on “The Language of the

Buddhist Sanskrit Texts,” p. 150. The text itself (according to the colophon quoted in several catalogues)³ is an extract from a *Sarvatathāgata-dvādaśasāhasra-pārājika-vinayasūtra* (a text concerning which there appear to be no other references), and its chapter titles are listed by Matsunami.⁴ There is no indication in his *Collected Papers* what manuscript materials Brough used for his edition, but a number of manuscripts are listed in catalogues of Nepalese collections,⁵ and more are available now from the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project.⁶ The oldest dated manuscript of the text to which I have seen reference provides the year C. E. 1598/99 (Nepal Saṁvat 719) as the year of writing.⁷ Given the increased interest in recent years in Nepalese Buddhism, it should be possible to find a scholar willing and able to undertake the task of preparing Brough’s manuscript for publication, even if this means taking account of new materials not accessible to Brough.

The second unpublished work is: “Draft supplementary catalogue on Sanskrit manuscripts in the British Museum to 1946. Sanskrit and Prakrit manuscripts: draft catalogue by J. Brough’ [descriptive notes on 215 works contained in 173 manuscripts from the Jain collection of Ratnavijaya Sūri and Hermann Jacobi and from Vedic, classical and Buddhist material acquired 1898–1946; these notes are lodged in the office of the Asst. Keeper for Sanskrit, British Library].” It is well known that most collections are served only by rather inadequate and usually far from up-to-date catalogues of their holdings. Perhaps the materials in Brough’s supplementary list, which to be sure would probably be of great interest to no more than a few philologically minded scholars, could well be prepared and published electronically, and therefore economically, for instance on a web site.

The last item reprinted in *Collected Papers* is the short one page (499) “Some Aspects of Chinese-Sanskrit Buddhist Lexicography,” dating from the mid-1970s. Here is reported Brough’s expression of his awareness of the need for a dictionary of Chinese Buddhist vocabulary which would “indicate how quite common Chinese expressions are used to render non-technical Indian words, often in ways which differ from non-Buddhist Chinese usage.” Moreover, Brough was also very interested in the transcriptions of Indic terms found in Chinese translations, this arising no doubt from his concern with Gāndhārī and with Chinese translations of Buddhist texts of all periods. Recently a dictionary, according to its Preface originally given its impetus by Brough, was published in Japan, under the editorship of Akira Hirakawa: *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1997). The original

plan was to create a work which would have fulfilled the desiderata expressed by Brough, who was to participate in its compilation. But the work as finally completed, although it might prove useful in some cases, unfortunately does not fulfill the desire that Brough expressed. Among other things, the dictionary gives no sources for its equivalents, therefore rendering its information entirely devoid of historical context, not to mention unverifiable. This is a step backwards from even the minimal information provided in Unrai Wogihara's *Kanyaku Taishō Bonwa Daijiten*, in which at least text titles were provided, although in a rather unclear and imprecise way. In addition, Hirakawa's dictionary offers for all Chinese terms only Sanskrit equivalents, ignoring the fact that many of the sources of Chinese translations were obviously Middle Indic. In this regard the excellent works of Seishi Karashima are setting a new standard. Karashima's studies on the earliest Chinese version of the Lotus Sutra, that of Dharmarakṣa (*The Textual Study of the Chinese Version of the Saddharmapundarīka* [Tokyo: Sankibo Press, 1992], and the just released *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra* [Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 1998]), and his examination of the Chinese transcriptions of Indic terms in the *Dīrghāgama* ("Chōagonkyō" no *Gengo no Kenkyū* [Tokyo: Hirakawa shuppan, 1994]) are excellent steps in the direction indicated by Brough. Their contribution toward a more nuanced understanding of the relation between old Chinese translations and the (Middle) Indic sources of these translations is sure to be profound. It will be only on the basis of such careful work that a reliable Chinese-Indic dictionary will someday be compiled.

For the most part, Brough went out of his way to make himself understood, sometimes even to total beginners, as is evident from the easily accessible "Introduction" to his *Poems from the Sanskrit*. He generally made it a practice to translate almost every Sanskrit passage he quoted, and even his discussions of highly technical details of phonology are usually accessible enough for the non-specialist to follow. But sometimes he does make considerable assumptions about his readers' background knowledge. Thus for example in his work on gotras published here, he nowhere clearly explains what gotras are (the terse "organization of ancient Brahmanical society in exogamous clans" [p. 3] would hardly help someone who was not already familiar with the notion), or what the texts governing their logic are ("the *Pravara-adhyāyas* of the Śrauta Sūtras," [p. 3] again meaningful only to the initiated).⁸ In addition, his references are sometimes in the old style, in which a name and a title, often abbreviated, suffice. This will never

stump the specialist, but students may not always find it easy to track down a reference. Thus for example, in his famous study “Thus have I heard . . .” a note offers the reference “*Kacc.* 300, *Mogg.* ii.3, *Sadd.* xxii.581.” It requires some familiarity with Pāli grammatical works to know that Brough is referring to the grammars of *Kaccāyana* and *Moggalāyana*, as well as the *Saddanīti*.⁹ A note from the editors would have smoothed the way here and elsewhere.¹⁰

Although it will be up to the many scholars who continue to investigate the themes touched upon by Brough to correct and expand upon his works (and a few corrections are already offered in the editor’s ‘Introduction’), I notice here just a couple of extremely minor points.

On p. 61, in his study of “Nepalese Buddhist Rituals,” the title *Aparamitā-dhāraṇī* appears without note or reference (and is, by the way, missing from the Index). Probably this is either coincident with, or extracted from, the very popular *Aparimitāyur-jñāna-sūtra*, or its *dhāraṇī*, which circulates independently; the sūtra is extant in Sanskrit and a multitude of languages into which it has been translated. On p. 361 Brough refers to Mironov’s discovery of the form *Avalokitasvara* in a Central Asian Sanskrit manuscript of the Lotus Sutra. A facsimile edition, with transcriptions and corresponding Chinese passages, has recently been published: Jiang Zhongxin, *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection* (Dalian: Lüshun Museum/Tokyo: Soka Gakkai, 1997). The instances of the name appear on plate B-17, recto and verso, and are clearly legible.

The production of this volume of Brough’s papers was clearly a labor of love of the editors, and it is certainly to be hoped that their efforts will help his work reach the audience it deserves.

NOTE

¹ Brough refers to Ingall’s work, in fact, on p. 314 (p. 14 of the introduction to his own volume of translations). I should perhaps confess that I find Ingall’s translations much more satisfying, and perhaps less obvious or heavy-handed, than Brough’s, though certainly this is a matter of taste.

² The indices were prepared by Mark Allon, whose own recent work on *Style and Function* in canonical Pāli prose (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1997) is a notable contribution to Indic philology. I have noticed only a very few points on which these comprehensive indices might be corrected or supplemented. In the list of ṛṣi and gotra names, p. 501, the entry *gautama* omits mention of pages 17 and 25, which are listed however in the general index under ‘Buddha (Śākyamuni)’ (where there is no entry for Śākyamuni or Gotama/Gautama). Under ‘other [Sanskrit] words’ we find *ārtabhāginī* which, however, is being proposed by Brough as the correct gotra name for the corrupt *aṣṭabhaginī*, which itself is nowhere

listed. Both terms should probably have found a place in the gotra name index. In the general index of names and subjects, the headings and sub-headings are sometimes oddly arranged. While there is, for instance, an entry for Tiṣyarakṣitā, there is no sub-heading under Aśoka for 'wife,' although 'son' is listed. Finally, I have noticed only two typing mistakes in the index, an extra 'A.' in the entry for Staël-Holstein, and a missing diacritic in the name *Sucandravadāna*.

³ Seiren Matsunami, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library* (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1965), #237–240; Cecil Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1883), p. 38 (Add. 1276).

⁴ Op. cit, p. 201.

⁵ In addition to those listed in note 3, Hidenobu Takaoka (*A Microfilm Catalogue of the Buddhist Manuscripts in Nepal*, Vol. 1 [Nagoya: Buddhist Library, 1981]) for example lists five, CA 6-3, CA 13-1, CH 141, DH 229, DH 321.

⁶ Dr. Anne MacDonald kindly sent me a list of 10 manuscripts of the text photographed by the NGMPP. (At least three of Takaoka's manuscripts are certainly included here, and the other two may be as well, but I cannot be sure from the short entries.) Dr. MacDonald informs me that according to the project's records, no scholars have yet requested copies of these materials for study.

⁷ Takaoka's DH 229, given the microfilm reel number D 32 20 by the NGMPP.

⁸ These issues are, however, given a clear and detailed discussion in the Introduction to his book, *The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara*, mentioned above.

⁹ These three works are indeed cited in the Index, but only by their full titles. Of course, one could argue that only a specialist would be interested in such references anyway, but see the next note.

¹⁰ Even such obvious abbreviations as ZDMG or JRAS may cause a student much aggravation (while non-specialist librarians may be likewise helpless), and a list of the abbreviations employed in the volume would have cost the editors no more than an hour or two to prepare.

Yale University

JONATHAN A. SILK