

Grey, Leslie, *A Concordance of Buddhist Birth Stories*, Third Edition. Oxford: The Pali Text Society 2000, pp. XIV, 622. ISBN 0-86013-380-X. £ 25,—.

Anyone who has worked with Grey's second edition of his *Concordance of Buddhist Birth Stories* will of course welcome enthusiastically a third improved edition of this collection of dense and valuable material regarding the Buddhist *jātaka's* and *avadāna's*. And indeed, by reading the introduction, the volume is presented to the reader as the final version of the work.

However, slight uneasiness arises already by the very statement of this completion of task: "This being the last edition of the Cocordance [*sic!*], it is proper to explain the reason and justification of this publication" (p. vii). Is that just an insignificant orthographic slip or a bad portent? Whoever wondered what the plural "Introductions" in the list of content (p. vi) meant, will get nervous at this point. Unfortunately, this uneasiness is not merely the fantasy of an ill-meaning and pedantic reviewer . . .

Let's start with the make-up. In its third edition, the structure of Grey's concordance is left unchanged. The concordance *stricto sensu* (pp. 1–496) is followed by tables of comparison to V. Fausbøll's edition of the *jātaka's*¹ (pp. 497–508), the translation by Cowell² (pp. 509–520) and the numbers of the types of folktales in the well-known system by "AT" = A. Aarne/Stith Thompson: *Types of Folktale*, Helsinki 1964 (pp. 533–540, 546–554). Moreover, also a concordance to L. Bødker, *Indian Animal Tales*, Helsinki 1957 (pp. 541–545) and Stith Thompson, *Motif Index of Folk Literature*, Bloomington 1958 (pp. 555–573) is provided. The bibliography (pp. 574–606) followed by a general index (pp. 607–622) completes the concordance.

The references to Aarne/Thompson are somewhat awkwardly split into three tables: "Folktale by AT Number", "Folktale by Description" and after the concordance with Bødker's *Indian Animal Tales* the proper table of comparison to AT. Surely, the second table has a use by its own if one wants to look up a special type of folktale according to the formulaic description provided in AT. However, the first and third table could have been easily joined: the first just identifies the type of a folktale as referred to in the main concordance while the third refers AT-citations to the actual Buddhist stories.

¹ London, 1877–1896.

² E.B. Cowell. *Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Birth*. Cambridge, 1895–1907.



New and very useful is the table of comparison to Malalasekera, *DPPN*³ (pp. 521–532). Moreover, the third edition presents to the user a considerable enhancement of bibliographical references compared with the second edition (Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1994). So, the editor provides a most welcome 20% of new references (almost 200), mostly from Jewish folktales. Thus a very important field of comparative material is now broadly incorporated. Most of the new material was already pointed to in 1998, when Grey presented a supplementary article in *JPTS* 34 (1998): 103–147.

However, Grey didn't change some crucial shortcomings of the make-up of his concordance, some of which had been noticed before.⁴ Grey cites almost exclusively material in translations into European languages, which leaves out lots of the Sanskrit *avadāna*'s, not to speak about the Chinese sources, which are broadly confined to the edition and translation by É. Chavannes (*Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues*, Paris 1910–1934). Also, the majority of the countless Tibetan stories are disregarded. Moreover, the cases in which versions in Buddhist literatures are quoted, they are cited almost exclusively by reference to the translation; so the scholar, who doesn't have the mostly old and rare translations at hand, is stuck there, although he might have access to the original source. Even worse, Grey does not differentiate between translations, versions and parallels of a motif. The references are given alphabetically, normally by the name of the translator (!) followed by the year of publishing. Consequently, the user has to check the bibliography constantly just to get an impression about the specific folk tradition to which a reference refers. Thus, the immense amount of information contained in this book is arranged in such an awkward way, that it is hardly useful for anyone but an expert or someone willing to invest lots of hours to decipher the information step by step.

The bibliography itself is presented incomplete. For instance, the frequent reference “Cchattopadhyay (1994)” remains an insolvable riddle; after communication with the publisher, the riddle proves insolvable even for the author himself! Also abbreviations employed in the bibliography are insufficiently explained on pp. x–xiii. Fortunately, the expert doesn't need an explanation for an abbreviation like “WZKS”. But what about the very frequent “TEM” and “IFA”? After reading the entire bibliography, one finds the clue to this riddle in a lemma listed *s.v.* “Various authors” [*sic!*]:

³ J.P. Malalasekera. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. London, 1937.

⁴ For the first edition see e.g., the reviews by R. Gombrich. *JRAS* ser. 3 nr. 3, 1993; 78: 143–144 and J.W. de Jong. *IJJ* 1994; 37: 64–66; for the second e.g., J.W. de Jong. *IJJ* 1998: 72–73.

The abbreviations refer to the series “A tale for each month” of the Israel Folktale Archive (IFA). On top of that, the abbreviations are totally inconsistently employed. You will find “Artibus Asiae” next to “AAA” etc. Other journals, which occur frequently, aren’t abbreviated at all, e.g., *Indologica Taurinensia*. Obviously, no effort to harmonize the bibliography was made. Unfortunately, in the result a lot of references appears twice, with and without abbreviation. Moreover, a most user-unfriendly situation is created by the arrangement of the references in the bibliography. Although quoted with year of publishing in the concordance, the references seem to be intended to be listed alphabetically with some changing criteria (the first word, the first noun), an order, which was obviously abandoned during the attempted harmonizing. The result is bibliographical chaos. Someone who wants to look up the reference “Schlingloff (1977)” has indeed to read all 25 references to Schlingloff’s publications in order to solve the question.

As for the references, crucial recent publications are still lacking. That concerns not only important works by e.g., O. von Hinüber, A. Mette, K. Norman, Th. Oberlies and J. Sakamoto-Goto, but also e.g., the editions and translations of the *Sāmaĵātaka* by R. Čičak-Chand (thesis Bonn 1974) and the anonymous *Kapīsāvadāna* by Leo Both (Berlin 1995).

Ignoring Marek Meĵor’s edition and translation (Tokyo 1992), Kṣemendra’s *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* is quoted in the old edition (without indicating the editors; it was made by Sarat Chandra Das and Hari Mohan Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Calcutta 1888–1918). Regrettable but less essential is the omission of the nice French translation of selected *ĵātaka*’s by G. Terral-Martini (*Choix de Ĵātaka*, Paris 1958) and the Japanese *ĵātaka*-translation by Naoshirō Tsuji (*Ĵātaka monogatari*, Tokyo 1957).

As indicated above, the formal state of the book is regrettable. While checking the entire book, one encounters an unbelievably huge amount of orthographically and computatorically deformed presentation of material. Thus, one wonders why no one of the general Pali Text Society editorial board ever bothered in advance of the publication to check for these easily avoidable deficiencies. In this regard, the third edition means definitely a regress compared with the second edition, where many faults of the first edition (Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 1990) were corrected. This observation concerns not only occasional corrections to the worse, like making *musāvāda/mṛṣāvāda* a feminine (-vādā, p. ix) or funny heads like “TMI Motif-Index of Fold [*sic!*] Literature” (above pp. 555–573). Obviously due to converting problems, the computer induced deformations have such a broad impact that it won’t be superfluous to present a selective list of corrections in order to enable the future reader to make smoother use of the book:

- In the capital heads of the actual concordance (pp. 1–496) and the Index (pp. 607–622), occasionally ‘ā’ stands for ‘Ū’, ‘ī’ for ‘L’, ‘ī’ stands for ‘Ñ’, ‘i’ for ‘D’, ‘ó’ for ‘M’, ‘ù’ for ‘S’. Further, in the AT, *Types of Folktale*-concordance (pp. 546–554) ‘T’ sometimes misrepresents ‘É’.
- Throughout the work, especially in the Bibliography (pp. 574–606) and the Index, the user has to be aware, that ‘i’ may stand for ‘d’, ‘ñ’ for ‘H’, ‘s’ for ‘ô’, ‘ú’ for ‘s’, ‘ü’ for ‘t’ etc.

Generally, the third edition of Leslie Grey’s Concordance of Buddhist Birth proves mostly generated by the incorporation of his supplementary article in *JPTS* 34 (1998) into the second edition. Given the poor formal state of the new book, the reader would almost be better off with the second edition and a copy of that article at hand.

Leslie Grey, a doctor in Medicine, dedicated himself most beneficially to the collection of Buddhist Birth Stories and their parallels in Folk Literature from all over the world. For that he earned incontestable merits and the sincere gratitude of all scholars of Buddhist studies. However, as for the question how to present the huge amount of material he collected, he should have called in the help of professionals in Buddhist studies. It’s hard to see how the Pali Text Society editorial board could not have offered such help and why it didn’t try to avoid this awkward state of a still important book.

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Oude Boteringestraat 38
NL-9712 GC Groningen

BURKHARD SCHERER

Schneider, Ulrich, *Opera Minora herausgegeben von Marion Meisig* [Beiträge zur Indologie Band 39]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2002, pp. XII, 273. ISBN 3-447-04700-3. € 68,—.

Eigentlich sollte dieses Werk nicht besprochen werden. Denn, wie man aus dem Vorwort erfährt: “Rezensionen wurden nicht aufgenommen, da Ulrich Schneider von Rezensionen nichts hielt” (S. XII): Die vier kurzen Besprechungen aus der Feder von U. S. fehlen daher. Trotz dieser erklärten Abneigung des Verfassers der hier gesammelten Beiträge ist vielleicht sinnvoll, auf diesen Band wenigstens hinzuweisen, der neben einer kurzen, meist biographischen Einleitung, eine Bibliographie und den grössten Teil von U. S.s Aufsätzen enthält. Nur wenige Arbeiten wurden beiseite gelassen. Der Aufsatz “Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Aggaññasutta”



Indo-Iranian Journal 46: 289–290, 2003.

© 2003 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.