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The Lokānandaṇāṭaka is a dramatic version of the Manjūśrī legend (Jātaka) found in the Tanjur. In his first chapter, Hahn discusses the question of the alleged author, Candragomin, and gives a list of some 55 works attributed to him in the Peking Tanjur. (To these may be added a lost musical work, according to a commentary on the Rot-mo betan-boos of Sakya Pandita.) Hahn briefly reviews the evidence for Candragomin’s identity and dating, coming down in favour of a fifth-century date, and goes on to investigate in some detail the history of the text, with full discussion of the contributions of Handurakande, La Vallée Poussin, and others, summarizing his conclusions in a chart on p. 23. A study of the many errors and oddities in the text leads Hahn to the conclusion that the version included in the Zhwa-lu Tanjur was taken directly from the translator’s imperfect autograph copy (one might almost say drafting), a conclusion which fits in well enough with the dates of the translator and of the compilation of the Zhwa-lu Tanjur.

Hahn’s problem is thus whether to produce (a) a reconstruction of the translator’s autograph or (b) a reconstruction of what would have been a ‘correct’ translation. His Tibetan text in fact approximates to (a), his German translation to (b) (since the translator, in Hahn’s opinion, has made errors in interpreting the meaning of the Sanskrit, in a number of cases). This seems a common-sense solution in the circumstances.

Hahn rates the Lokānandaṇāṭaka highly as dramatic art, within the limitations of its genre; a judgement with which I heartily agree. Here then is the earliest complete Buddhist drama, a worthy contribution to Sanskrit literature, presented in an edition and translation with full critical apparatus: a notable contribution to Indo-Tibetan studies.

The Vṛttamālāstuti of Jñānasrimitra is a collection of examples of 149 different metrical combinations. Hahn follows the same general procedure as for the Lokānandaṇāṭaka, aiming to place the work and its author in their contexts. He concludes that there are good grounds for identifying Jñānasrimitra with the eleventh-century philosopher of that name.

In the course of his remarks on the language of the Tibetan, Hahn picks out the syllable dag as being not a plural suffix but a device of the translator of the first part of the work (Shongston rDo-rje-rgyal-mtshan) to fill out the metre. The examples given seem somewhat indecisive, in the absence of both the original text and the translator himself. The same goes for the parallel usage of rname. Because rname is slipped in to fill out the line, does this make it any less plural?

In his remarks on ‘Rhythmus’ Hahn again gives the impression of overanalysing his data. He concludes that the ‘structure of Tibetan metres is the triumph of its syllables distinguished by stress rather than length, and backs this up by a quantitative grammatical analysis of the Tibetan metrical foot. The trouble is that his grammatical assumptions are nowhere stated, though presumably they are those given in his own manual of Tibetan grammar. The distinction between ‘word-stem-particle/suffix’, ‘two wordstems’, and ‘two-syllable word’ seem otiose in this context, if indeed they have any grammatical as distinct from etymological significance, which I rather doubt. Now Tibetan metre intuitively falls into two-syllabled feet, especially when heard recited by a native reader. Furthermore, Tibetan poets are very reluctant as a rule to begin a foot with one of the word-final particles such as kyi or tu. I believe that these simple observations are all that Hahn is saying, and I do not see how they point to a ‘trochee’ with initial stress. Hahn nowhere defines the ‘word’, an entity which is by no means obvious, especially in this text which is a tour de force of a very artificial nature, and yet surely stress has to be somehow related to the word.

These minor criticisms apart (along with a general feeling that a sledgehammer is very often being used to crack a nut), I can only express the keenest admiration for Hahn’s thoroughness, perceptive analysis, and sheer scholarly energy. Each metrical example is given in transliteration, and then in German translation, all doubtful or noteworthy expressions are thoroughly annotated, the metre is identified, and references are given to its occurrences in other texts. There follows the entire Mongolian version, then Tibetan–Mongolian and Mongolian–Tibetan lists of equivalents. There is a full bibliography.

Both these works represent significant steps forward in our knowledge of Tibetan literature and its Sanskrit originals.

PHILIP DENWOOD


Studies is a reprint of seven articles published between 1962 and 1973, three of which now have a page or so of addenda and corrigenda, while a fourth has been substantially revised. There are also four indexes, of which three are especially useful: ‘Grammatical and technical terms and items’, ‘Titles of texts and other primary sources (Tibetan, Indic, Chinese, etc.)’, and ‘Names of peoples, places, and miscellaneous terms (Tibetan, Indic, Chinese, etc.)’; a number of obvious misprints, such as ‘Mahāpañhitā’ (p. 19), have, however, been left uncorrected.

All but one of the seven articles are either studies of early grammatical treatises and commentaries, especially the two texts ascribed to the mysterious Thonmi Sambhota, the Sum-cu-pa and the Rtags-kyi-jug-pa, or research into problems in terminology and orthography; they contain perceptive, and even entralling, inquiries into, for example,
the possible Tantric origin of the elusive grammatical terms dīl and kāli, and into the problem of the number of vowel units recognized by the early grammarians, the four units independently symbolized in the orthography as the dbyangs bzhis (-i, -u, -e, -o) versus the five that result from adding to these the vowel -a dependingly symbolized by syllabic symbols such as the 30 gsal-byed (ka, kha, gs, etc.). The seventh article, 'A grammatical sketch of Classical Tibetan', lies outside the scope of the book's title: it is a phonemic and grammatical analysis by Professor Miller himself, which he then applies to two short Classical Tibetan texts. The first six articles, at least, unite to give a good impression of the struggles of the Tibetan grammarians to master differences of language typology and of written medium in their attempt to be faithful to Sanskrit models.

There are, however, a number of small but significant respects in which the author's translations are less than faithful to the grammatical tradition that he is illustrating; they suggest that he is not fully responsive to the character of the Tibetan writing system. I have especially in mind his practice of translating the names of the symbols ka, kha, ga, etc. of the original (pp. 23-4 and elsewhere) as 'k, kh, g', etc. (enticed, it would seem, by a desire to interpret them as 'phonemes of Tibet'). The Tibetan grammarians could easily have devised a means of symbolizing his 'k, kh, g', etc. through some such symbols as □ ..., □ ..., □ ..., □ ..., specifying only the syllable-initial sounds, regardless of vowel; but their alphabet-cum-syllabary accords with their tradition of chanting texts, whereas a more abstract sort of symbolization such as k-, k-, g- does not.

The author's description of the Tibetan writing system, in the last of his studies, as 'an alphabet based on syllabic principles' is too inexact. It is important, for a proper understanding of the resources of the Tibetan script, that the alphabetic and the syllabic components be kept separate and distinct. Measured against a typical syllabic script such as the Japanese kana series the 30 gsal-byed of the Tibetan system (Ţ' - Ū') are clearly to be regarded as a syllabary; indeed all orthographic syllables in -a(-), such as mjal, sgam, and skra, are examples of the syllabic component of the script, though these three syllables also exemplify its other component, the alphabetic, through symbols drawn from the sngon-'jug (m-), rjes-'jug (-l, -m), sa-mgo (s-), and ra-btags (r-) categories. Some of the alphabetic elements are linear; others are non-linear. The linear alphabetic elements comprise the (five) sngon-'jug (pre-radicals), the (ten) rjes-'jug (finals), and the (two) yang-'jug (post-finals); the non-linear elements comprise the superscript symbols l-, r-, and s-(of the la-mgo, ra-mgo, and sa-mgo series), the subscript symbols -y-, -r-, and -w-(of the ya-btags, ra-btags, and wa-zur series); and, especially significant here, the superscript symbols -i, -e, and -o, and the subscript -u, of the dbyangs series, which somewhat resemble such superscript and subscript modifiers as the tilde and the cedilla of European scripts.

Since the syllabic type of symbol symbolizes a syllabic vowel (-a) equally with an initial consonant (or a non-syllabic vowel), e.g. k-, kh-, y-, h-, the author's remark 'gsal byed, which all sources agree has reference to 'consonants', as opposed to the term dīl' which 'has reference to 'vowels', gives a misleading prominence to the initial, and consonant, component at the expense of the final, and vowel, component (though it is only fair to say that he does draw attention to the use of the revealing term gsal-byed tha-ma 'in order to express the vowel a' in a passage cited from Zamatog). I would therefore avoid the term consonant as a translation for gsal-byed in favour of the neutral, and therefore more representative, term radical; for it is impossible to refer to the -a vowel except through the term gsal-byed (or, more specifically, Zamatog's gsal-byed tha-ma). My reason for emphasizing this view of the Tibetan script as a compound of alphabetic and syllabic components is that it seems to me to solve the second of the two problems raised by the author, in the third of his papers, the meaning of gsal-byed in sloka 1 of the Sum-cu-pa.

yi ge 'ab li kah li gais/ 'ah li gsal byed 'i sogs bzi/ kah li sum cu tham paho/.

After considering other interpretations of 'gsal byed' here the author translates it as 'make "clear"', in spite of the peculiar syntax: '[if we] make clear the dīl [they consist of] four, 'i', etc., [and] the kāli are thirty'; but my view of the script suggests to me that the three lines should be translated 'Symbols: vowel, consonant—two.

The vowels: radical, the four in i, etc. The consonants total thirty', in which the dependently symbolized -a of the radicals (gsal byed) is associated with the four independently symbolized vowels -i, etc., as a member of the dīl category.

A further minor but significant infidelity in the author's translations is his anachronistic habit of translating yi-ge 'letter', symbol' by 'phoneme'. This has the effect of giving what is meant as a phonetic interpretation of the script the appearance of a phonemic analysis. It can hardly be that the painstaking and considered labours of Bloomfield, Sapir, Swadesh, Twaddell, and Bloch, to name only a few of the pioneers who strove to make the phoneme concept safe for linguistics, should have been anticipated by an eighteenth-century Tibetan orthoepist.

R. K. SPRIGG


Now that Tibet is closed to Western scholars something of Tibetan culture survives and can