

MARTIN G. WILTSHIRE: *Ascetic figures before and in early Buddhism: the emergence of Gautama as the Buddha*. (Religion and Reason 30.) pp. xxxvi, 338 pp. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990. DM 168.

This book is about *pratyekabuddhas*, those mysterious beings who appear in both Buddhism and Jainism. In his review of Ria Kloppenborg's *The Pacceka-buddha: a Buddhist ascetic* (Leiden 1974), Richard Gombrich suggested that the *pratyekabuddha* was invented to fill the gap in Buddhism between the *samyaksambuddha* and the *śrāvaka*. In 'The *pratyeka-buddha* in Buddhism and Jainism' (P. Denwood and A. Piatigorsky: *Buddhist Studies, ancient and modern*, London, 1983, 92-106), I agreed with Fujita Kotatsu's suggestions that the *pratyekabuddhas* were non-Buddhist in origin, and that the word *pratyekabuddha* was already in general use by the time Buddhism and Jainism made their appearance, being borrowed into those religions from some earlier source. Nevertheless, Wiltshire states that Gombrich's 'fiction' explanation is perhaps the closest anyone has come to providing a successful explanation of their identity.

In his investigation, Wiltshire examines all the information available about the *pratyekabuddha*, as *isi*, *samaṇa*, and *muni*, in a wide range of texts in Pali, Prakrit and Sanskrit. Unfortunately, many of his quotations, for which some references are incorrect and others missing, are flawed by misprints and other errors, especially in the use of diacritical marks. The repetition of incorrect forms, e.g. *thūpa*, *pūja*, *śūnya*, and their inclusion in the index, suggests that Wiltshire actually believes them to be correct.

He quotes Pali and Sanskrit unconventionally, to say the least, frequently mixing declined and stem forms, e.g. 'he is . . . a *munipavaram* and a *sammāsambuddha*', separating the elements of compounds, e.g. *aneka vihitam*, and occasionally hyphenating separate words, e.g. *pubbakā-isayo*. He mixes languages, e.g. *dharmacakkhu*. He produces phrases such as 'living as a *brahmacariya*', 'the absence of *ūparodhati*' and 'the inhabitants do not "obstruct" or "oppose" (*avirujjhati*) him'. The persistent writing of *rājarsi* for *rājarsi* shows a disregard of Sanskrit sandhi, as does *samrāt* for *saṃrāt* (from *saṃrāj*), and *śrāmita* for *śrānta* (from *śram*).

Wiltshire frequently mistranslates, while the equivalents inserted after other people's translations suggest some difficulty in relating the translation to the original. He equates 'to bring into subjection' with *nānamanti* (*Uttarā-dhyāyanasūtra* IX.32), although *nānamanti* means 'they do not bow down'. He quotes *indram iccarataḥ sakhā* (Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII.15), and translates 'Indra is the comrade of the wanderer', without explaining how *indram* can be the subject. He seems to assume that *iccarataḥ* is a nominative singular form, which he quotes in the 'stem' form *iccarata*. The quotation should be *indra ic carataḥ sakhā*,

where *indra* is nominative, *carataḥ* the genitive singular of the present participle of *car-*, and *ic* the particle *id* in sandhi form. His mistranslation of *paccekabuddhā buddhe appatvā buddhānam uppajjanakāle yeva uppajjanti* renders unnecessary any explanation of the contradiction between the statement that *paccekabuddhas* arise only at the time when *buddhas* arise and the doctrine that *paccekabuddhas* cannot exist with a *sammāsambuddha*.

He concludes that Buddhism and Jainism have a common ancestry, of which the *pratyekabuddhas*, the first renouncers (*śramaṇas*), were part. He conjectures that the notion of the Buddha is based upon the format of the myth about the *paccekabuddha* Nimi. We should note that if this was so, then there was a reversal at some stage: originally one became a *buddha* and then a *śramaṇa*, while Gotama and those enlightened after him (*anubuddha*) were *śramaṇas* first and then *buddhas*. In his discussion, Wiltshire emphasizes the idea of the *brahma-vihāras*. He rightly sees that the concept is older than Buddhism, without realizing how important this fact is for his investigation. In origin *brahma-vihāra* was a brahmanical term, literally meaning 'dwelling in or with *brahman*', but when the Buddha was speaking to young brahmins who were disputing the correct way to obtain *brahma-sahavyatā*, he interpreted it, perhaps jokingly, as meaning a state of union with the god Brahmā, by rebirth in the Brahmaloaka. In short, the Buddha took over an Upaniṣadic idea and adapted it to Buddhist purposes.

Other words too were given a specific Buddhist sense, including *buddha*, which basically means 'awakened' or 'wise' in Sanskrit. Although Buddhism is said to teach that *pratyekabuddhas* achieve the summum bonum of Buddhist experience, enlightenment (*bodhi*), this cannot be true of the pre-Buddhist *pratyekabuddhas*. The nature of the first *pratyekabuddhas* cannot be determined until the meaning of *-buddha* has been decided. Jainism uses the word *bohi* (= *bodhi*) of the things which caused the first four *patteyabuddhas*' experience, rather than the experience itself, which suggests that they were 'awakened' (to *saṃvega*) rather than 'enlightened', while in the statement *evam karenti sambuddhā paṇḍiyā paviyakkhaṇā* at the end of the Namipavvajjā (*Uttarā-dhyāyanasūtra* IX 62) the collocation with *paṇḍiyā* and *paviyakkhaṇā* shows that *sambuddhā* means 'wise', despite Jacobi's translation 'enlightened'.

Wiltshire's discussion of the *pratyekabuddha* is not helped by his misleading translation of both *samaṇa* (*śramaṇa*) and *pabbajita* as 'renouncer', while he does not even mention the word *sannyāsin*, which can more appropriately be so translated. Jacobi long ago pointed out that the Buddhist and Jain vows closely resemble those of the brahmanical *sannyāsin*, and it is arguable that Buddhism was a development of, or reaction to, certain aspects of brahmanical and Upaniṣadic thought, rather than the *pratyekabuddha* myth.

The nature of the errors in this book suggests that Dr. Wiltshire possibly lacked the linguistic expertise necessary to write it. The number of errors, of which those mentioned above are only

a small fraction, makes it very clear that it should not have been published in its present form.

K. R. NORMAN

FRANZ-KARL EHRRARD: '*Flügel-schläge des Garuḍa*': *Literar- und ideengeschichtliche Bemerkungen zu einer Liedersammlung des rDzogs-chen*. (Tibetan and Indo-Tibetan Studies, 3.) xli, 333 pp. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1990. DM 76.

The *Flügel-schläge des Garuḍa* (*mKha'-ldin gñog-rlabs*) is a collection of poems written by Tshogs-drug rañ-grol (1781–1851) in 1806 or 1807. His poems are inspired by the works of Kloñ-chen rab-'byams who lived from 1308 to 1364 according to Ehrhard. Other scholars mention 1363 as the year of his death, cf., for instance, S. G. Karmay, *The Great Perfection* (Leiden, 1988), 14 and 213. In a long introduction Ehrhard first gives an overview of the history of the school of the 'Ancients' (*rNin-ma-pa*) and studies in some detail three works, written between the end of the eighth and the beginning of the tenth century, in which one finds the first systematic treatment of one of the main schools of the Ancients, the school of 'Great Perfection' (*rDzogs-chen*): Padmasambhava's *Man-nag lta-ba'i phren-ba*, gNubs Sañs-rgyas ye-śes's *bSam-gtan mig-sgron* and Ka-ba dPal-brtsegs's *lTa-ba'i rim-pa bñad-pa*. In these three works the rDzogs-chen is described as the last of six or three classes of tantras in which one finds the final and definite doctrine. Kloñ-chen rab-'byams elaborated the final concept of nine vehicles of which the last is the Atiyoga divided into three subdivisions: the class of the mind (*sems-sde*), the class of dimension (*kloñ-sde*) and the class of instructions (*man-nag sde*). Ehrhard pays special attention to the third subdivision which is also called the 'Heart-drop' (*sñin-thig*). According to the tradition this doctrine was brought to Tibet in the eighth century by Vimalamitra. The works attributed to him were discovered over a period of 250 years by text-discoverers (*gter-ston*). Ehrhard examines the different lists of these texts as mentioned by Kloñ-chen rab-'byams who created a coherent philosophical system from the different traditions associated with Vimalamitra: 'The Vehicle of the Vajra-essence, of the Clear Light' (*'od-gsal rdo-rje sñin-po theg-pa*). Another trend of the 'Heart-drop' school is represented by the 'Heart-drop of the Ḍākinis' (*mKha'-gro sñin-thig*) which is associated with the name of Padmasambhava and which is said to have been discovered by Padma las-'brel-rtsal (1291–1319) in 1313. Kloñ-chen rab-'byams codified the Ḍākinī doctrines in his *mKha'-gro yan-thig*.

In the second part of the introduction Ehrhard examines the life and studies of Tshogs-drug rañ-grol, mainly on the basis of his detailed autobiography: *bSam-'phel dbaṅ-gi rgyal-po*. Ehrhard describes three editions of his songs which were brought together in three

collections, containing respectively 23, 18 and 3 songs. Ehrhard has translated the first fourteen songs of the first collection. As to the sources of the songs Ehrhard distinguishes between secondary and primary sources. He calls secondary those texts quoted in the songs which do not belong to the sñin-thig literature whereas primary sources are texts of the sñin-thig school.

The songs of Tshogs-drug rañ-grol describe his mystical visions. In the third and last part of his introduction Ehrhard studies the mystical exercises *khregs-chod* and *thod-rgal* and explains their difference. He also examines how *khregs-chod* has been described in the sñin-thig tradition of Vimalamitra. Ehrhard discusses in detail the meaning of the word and suggests rendering it as 'Festes Entschiedensein' or 'Festes Bestimmtein' (pp. 80–81). In his very useful glossary Ehrhard renders *thod-rgal* as 'All-mähliches Aufsteigen' (the page references from 127 to 143 seem to be wrong and have each to be augmented by one). Another term studied by Ehrhard is *no-sprod-pa* which he renders as 'Konfrontation'. He suggests that concrete examples such as crystal and the sky were used to confront the mystic with ultimate reality.

Text and translation are given on opposite pages and are followed by a commentary of more than sixty pages in which Ehrhard carefully explains the meaning of the terms and concepts found in the verses (the commentary begins on p. 232 and not on p. 243 as indicated in the table of contents). Both the introduction and the commentary bear witness to Ehrhard's wide reading in the voluminous literature of the school of the Great Perfection of which many texts have been published only in recent years. His work is an important contribution to the study of rDzogs-chen and together with the above mentioned book by Karmay assists us greatly in better understanding this school which has played such an influential role in Tibet for more than a thousand years.

J. W. DE JONG

GUDRUN BÜHNEMANN and MUSASHI TACHIKAWA: *The Hindu deities illustrated according to the Pratiṣṭhā-akṣaṇasārasamuccaya*. (Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum, 3.) 172 pp. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1990. US\$38.40.

This excellently produced work provides an important bridge between the textual evidence for the ancient iconographic tradition of Hindu Tantra, especially its Śaiva/Śākta and Vaiṣṇava forms, and the actual practice of the traditional artists who produce images for worshippers. By presenting this seventeenth-century artist's handbook illustrated with line drawings to guide the image-maker, Bühnemann and Tachikawa have made a really valuable contribution to the study of Hindu iconography.

Study of iconography is integral to the study of a religion. Iconography is based on certain motifs, and religious convention supplies the symbolism of those motifs. A Hindu will