V. Notices of Books.

We have read with great interest the translation of the first fifty Suttas of the Majjhima Nikāya which Dr. Neumann offers us as a first instalment of this most important book. The Majjhima Nikāya has never been translated before (excepting three Suttas contained in the eleventh volume of the Sacred Books), and thus Dr. Neumann's work may be considered as quite original. He begins by a short preface, giving his opinion about the value of the Pāli commentaries, especially those written by Buddhaghosa. Since nobody has translated the Majjhima Nikāya before him, he has had no occasion to controvert the renderings of his predecessors, as was done, for instance, in his translation of the Dhammapada (Der Wahrheitspfad), published some years ago.

Although Dr. Neumann states in his preface that he does not rely too much on these Pāli commentaries, and although he gives us a number of instances where they are certainly wrong, still his translation shows that he has studied them thoroughly. Whenever he gives a rendering different from that of Buddhaghosa, we may believe that he has done so after full consideration; the only thing we regret is that his notes are not more numerous, and that in very few cases only we are informed why he has adopted this rendering in preference to any other one.

On the whole the translation reads very well. The language is clear, and the rendering of the religious technical terms is satisfactory throughout. In perusing the book I only found a few errors, and these are of no great consequence. Page 409: the Pāli words, ‘yañ īnad eva bhikkhave paccayam paticca uppajjati viññānam tena ten eva saṅkham gacchati,’ are translated ‘Aus war für einem
Grunde Bewusstsein entsteht, gerade durch diesen und nur durch diesen kommt es zu Stande.' Now the term 'saṅkhāṃ gacchati' is rendered correctly in Childers' dictionary 'to be reckoned as, to be called or termed,' and therefore the meaning of our passage is this: 'Aus was für einem Grunde Bewusstsein entsteht, gerade danach und danach allein wird es benannt.' Page 363: 'seyyathā pi nāma kuñjaro saṭṭhihāyano gambhīraṃ pokkharaṇīṃ ogūhitvā saṅadhovikaṃ nāma kīlītajātam kīlītī' is translated 'Gleichwie ein sechzigjähriger Elephant in einen tiefen Lotusweiher steigt und ein Spritzbad zur Erholung nimmt.' The translation is correct, but not literal, and here Dr. Neumann should have given in a note the reasons why he translated this way. 'Saṅadhovika' is a mistake for 'sāṅadhovika,' and this means literally 'cloth-washing.' The commentary tells us that the cloth-washing was considered as a great festival in India, and that it was accompanied by all sorts of aquatic sports, in which even the elephants used to take part. So there is no question of a simple shower-bath, as Dr. Neumann's translation would suggest. In the same Sutta, three pages further on, we have the words 'jāpetāyām vā jāpetum;' rendered by 'einen in die Acht zu erklärenden achten zu lassen.' The verb 'jāpeti' occurs also Milindapañha, pp. 171, 227, 402 (Rhys Davids' translation, i, p. 240; ii, pp. 29, 342). I now believe that Rhys Davids' derivation from 'jyā' is correct, and that we must not read 'jhāpeti' instead, as I suggested in my Pāli Grammar, p. 37. The meaning would be 'to fine one who ought to be fined,' not 'to proscribe' as Neumann has it. The commentary reads 'jhāpetum,' and would have supported me in the mistake I made twelve years ago.

Page 370: the words 'visūkayitāni, visevitāni, vipphan-ditāni' are translated 'Stacheln, Dornen, Zacken.' Most probably Dr. Neumann has chosen these expressions because in the foregoing allegory a crab is mentioned whose limbs are broken by stones and pebbles thrown at him by naughty boys and girls. The identical passage without
the allegory occurs again, Saṃyutta Nikāya, xii, 35, 14; and Warren, in his ‘Buddhism in Translations,’ p. 168, renders it ‘puppet-shows, resorts, writhings.’ The first of the three, ‘visūkayitāni,’ is evidently derived from ‘visūka,’ and is used in the same sense as ‘diṭṭhivisūka,’ Suttanipāta 55, where Fausboll translates it ‘the harshness of the philosophical views.’ ‘Vipphandita’ is given by Childers with the meaning ‘sceptical agitation’; and ‘visevita,’ which does not occur anywhere else, evidently means ‘deceit, hypocrisy.’ Saccaka Niganṭhaputta’s heretical opinions are refuted by the Buddha, and he is unable to continue his discourse with him, just as the crab is unable to move with his broken limbs.

Page 280: Dr. Neumann translates ‘sottiya’ by ‘Fertiger.’ I would prefer ‘Befreiter’ if he wanted to render it according to the etymology given in the text (from sru ‘to flow down’).

Page 124: ‘ubbhatṭhaka’ is rendered by ‘Stetigsteher.’ I think ‘Aufrechtsteher’ would be better, as ‘ubbha’ represents Saṃskrit ‘ūrdha.’ The whole passage occurs again, Aṅguttara Nikāya, iv, 198, 2; Puggala Paññatti, iv, 24.

In the note on p. 22, Dr. Neumann gives a derivation of ‘sallekha’ which seems to me quite impossible. ‘Lagh’ can never become ‘lekh,’ and the composition ‘sallagh’ would also be monstrous. I do not see why he objects to the derivation given by Childers from saṃlikh ‘to scratch out.’ His rendering ‘Ledigung,’ which he uses here and in the translation of the Sallekhasutta on p. 61, is very good, and agrees perfectly with our etymology of the word.

Page 6: the words ‘bhikkhu sekho apattamānaso’ are rendered ‘als kämpfender Mönch mit streitendem Busen.’ I do not object to this translation, but Dr. Neumann should have added a note at the bottom of the page in which he informs his readers that ‘apattamānasa sekha’ means a monk who is under training and has not yet attained Arahatship.

Rather a slip of the pen than a real error is what
occurs on p. 12. Here the words 'Jānato aham bhikkhave passato āsavānāṁ khayaṁ vadāmi no ajānato' are translated 'Dem Kenner, ihr Mönche, dem Kundigen verheisse ich Wahnversiegung, keinem Unbekannten.' It ought to be 'keinem Nichtkenner.' 'Unbekannt' is the equivalent of the Pāli 'aṇṇāta.'

In a note on p. 513, Dr. Neumann corrects Trenckner's reading 'sabbatopabham' into 'sabbatopaham,' and compares the concluding stanza of the Kevaṭṭasutta in the Dīghanikāya. I believe that his correction is right, and the second part of this 'sabbatopaham' is the word given by Childers s.v. 'paho' (from 'pajabāti'). So far I quite agree with Dr. Neumann. But when he goes on in his note saying that the various reading 'pabham' is to be derived from 'bhaṇj,' I must contradict him. If there be such a reading as 'sabbatopabham,' which I do not know, then this can certainly not be derived from 'bhaṇj.' The only possible derivation would be from 'bhā,' but as this would not give a good sense I think that we must stick to the above-mentioned correction.

E. MÜLLER.

GESCHICHTE DES BUDDHISMUS IN DER MONGOLEI. AUS dem Tibetischen des Jigs-med nam-mk'a, herausgegeben, übersetzt, und erläutert von Dr. GEORG HUTH. 1ter Teil, x, pp. 296; 2ter Teil, xxxii, pp. 456. (Strassburg, 1893–6.)

In 1893 Dr. Georg Huth, of the University of Berlin, already well known by his scholarly translations of several difficult Tibetan texts, published the text of Jigs-med nam-mk'a's "History of Buddhism in Mongolia" (H'or ch'ös chyong), and in the early part of the present year he brought out a careful and accurate translation of this important Tibetan work.

Since the publication, nearly thirty years ago, of the text and translation of Tāranātha's history of Buddhism in India, by Professor Anton Schiefner, no such valuable