a Babylonian Julius Obsequens." This refers to such things as a cut-off head covered with sweat (?), a mare which had a horn on the left side of her head, a sheep with four horns, a bearded woman, etc., etc. Such things as these were recorded in Babylonia until a very late date, like the goat which brought forth fifteen young at one time.¹ The tablet translated by M. Boissier is exceedingly mutilated, and no trustworthy rendering of it can be given until the text is completed. It seems to have contained nothing but the bare statements that the things referred to had been seen—may it not be a list of titles of works?

The book of Dr. Boissier is a noteworthy production, and Assyriologists will look forward to the "Sketch of Assyro-Babylonian Divination" and "Glossary of Assyrian words in language of Augury," which he is now preparing for publication.

The plates give the model of an ox's hoof inscribed with auguries found by Mr. Rassam at Kouyunjik, and the large fragment with diagrams numbered K. 2086, etc. Both are reproduced by means of the unsatisfactory half-tone process, and the photographs of the hoof are accompanied by drawings.

T. G. PINCHES.

ON YUAN-CHWANG'S TRAVELS IN INDIA (629-645 A.D.). Vol. I. By the late THOMAS WATTERS, M.R.A.S. Edited by Professor T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, F.B.A., and Dr. S. W. BUSHELL, M.D., C.M.G. (London: Oriental Translation Fund, n.s., vol. xiv, Royal Asiatic Society.)

The Oriental Translation Fund has done us once again a great service by issuing a work of the greatest importance for the study of the history and geography of India. It was very fortunate that a scholar like Mr. Watters, who

¹ See "The Old Testament in the Light of Records of Assyria and Babylonia" (S.P.C.K., 1904), p. 484.

was admirably qualified for the subject, should have taken up the study, and that the publication should have been carried out under the able editorship of Professor Rhys Davids and Dr. Bushell.

Mr. Watters modestly called his work "Notes on Yuan-Chwang's Travels in India." It is, however, practically a new translation of the whole text, so far as we can judge from the volume just published, the portions omitted being of little or no value for practical purposes. The first volume includes a note on the life of Thomas Watters (1840-1901) by Dr. Bushell, and another on the name "Yuan-Chwang" by Professor Rhys Davids; also a special chapter by the author on the Title and Text of the Hsi-yü-chi, and a note on the much discussed Introduction of the original text itself. As regards the actual text of the Travels, it brings us across the Chinese frontier down to the sacred Jetavana of Śrāvastī.

The work in almost every page is marked by wonderful clearness and convincing accuracy, especially as to the identification of Indian names and places. The author corrects several improbable and often impossible theories advanced by his predecessors, Julien, St. Martin, Cunningham, Beal, etc., and clears up once for all many obscure passages which had been previously unintelligible owing to the limited knowledge of the subject then available. His work practically embodies all the results of the researches made by previous scholars and explorers, as well as those of the minute investigations conducted by himself. When we examine the names of the books to which he refers in his notes, we are surprised to discover how well versed he was in all the important Buddhist texts, not only those contained in the Chinese *piṭaka* collection, but also several works never included in it; and we are still more surprised to see how well he knew where to look for information on diverse subjects among the vast number of Chinese books, both sacred and secular, many of them existing only in some isolated libraries in Japan. He probably spent some time in preparatory study with a view to understanding Yuan-Chwang more completely.

In view of his great success in the execution of the work a few slips of the pen in regard to minor points are scarcely worth mentioning here. But I shall refer to one or two which, if left unnoticed, might mislead some interested readers.

When he corrects Julien, in translation especially, he is generally right, and is supported by proofs from other sources. But when he is speaking of the Sanskrit names of the 'Five Sciences' given by Julien he represents (p. 157) the French savant as restoring the names entirely from his own conjecture, and in one case even goes so far as to say that Julien discovered his error afterwards. But the 'Five Sciences' (pañcavidyāsthāna), unknown as they are to brahmin literature, were preserved and studied as useful knowledge among the Buddhists. The nomenclature may be entirely Buddhistic, yet it is not Julien's at all, because the names are found in the Mahāvvyutpatti, § 76, 1-5, as (1) Śabdavidyā (Grammar); (2) Hetuvidyā (Logic); (3) Adhyātmavidyā (Subjective Science); (4) Cikitsāvidyā (Medicine); (5) Śilpakarmasthānavidyā (Arts and Crafts)—thus perfectly justifying Julien's restorations. If Julien recognized his mistake in 'Hetuvidyā' and thought it ought to have been 'Nyāya,' the explanation may be that he had forgotten the source from which he originally drew his information.

In his notes on the Buddhist Council said to have been held under King Kaṇiṣka (pp. 270-278) Mr. Watters clears up several doubtful points important for the history of Buddhism. That the supposed Council of Kaṇiṣka was not to settle the canonical texts, but to draw up commentaries, is no longer open to question. Whether, however, such a Council drew up the existing commentaries is still disputed, and Mr. Watters maintains the negative, for the simple reason that one of the official commentaries (Mahāvibhāṣā) relates a miracle which it says occurred *formerly* in the reign of that king.

Vasumitra, moreover, who is reputed to have been the Head of the Council of Compilation, is mentioned and quoted

in the book just referred to. These seem to be strong grounds of argument, but, as Watters himself points out, there appear to have been several Vibhāṣās and several Vasumitras (seven or eight); and this makes any conclusion hazardous which is based upon any one of them singly. Besides, the Mahāvibhāṣā is not a commentary, properly speaking. The work seems to me to be a record or collection of notes taken orally from the learned referees present at the Council, as well as of quotations from ancient authors of various schools. In this case the frequent occurrence, in the text, of Vasumitra, Pārśva, etc., who are said to have been the elders at the Council, will be quite natural, and consequently quotations from their opinions are not from their books but from their utterances. At any rate, the opinions recorded of the Kashmir and Gāndhāra schools of the Ābhidharmika teachers, which are referred to as contemporaneously existing, are certainly not quotations from books.

The Council, whether held under Kaniṣka or soon after him, drew up very likely only the Vibhāṣā on the Abhidharma as represented by Kātyāyanīputra's Jñānaprasthāna belonging to the Sarvāstivādins. But the compilation of the Upadeśa on the Sūtras and of the Vibhāṣā on the Vinaya may be a fiction altogether. Again, there is no evidence that any other schools than the Sarvāstivādins took part at all in this Council of Compilation.

The whole affair was therefore Hīnayānist, and had nothing to do with the Mahāyāna system. All arguments about the Council and its works will be valueless until the Mahāvibhāṣā—an encyclopædia of Buddhist philosophy¹—is translated into one of the European languages.

Mr. Watters represents (p. 278) Aśvaghōṣa, the vice-president of the Council according to one account, as writing his composition of the Vibhāṣā on stone. But unfortunately he is never represented so in the Life of Vasubandhu, which is Mr. Watters's authority, as can be seen from my translation (*Tong-pao*, July, 1904). Perhaps the mistake arose

¹ Compare Watters, p. 278.

in confusing the edict forbidding the Vibhāṣā being taken out of the country (which was published on stone) with the Vibhāṣā itself.

The name of one of the Indian alphabets, Kharoṣṭha (Kharoṣṭhī), he says (p. 153), is translated in Chinese by 'Ass-ear.' This is evidently a slip of the pen, for the Chinese translation is 'Ass-lip' correctly.

A Chinese annotator, he says (p. 328), has suggested that 'stūpa' here is a mistake for 'place.' This is quite a misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Watters. The annotator simply says that the particle 也 (which follows the word) 'stūpa,' ought to be corrected to 地, 'place.'

As to the 'Three ways of transmigration' (p. 371), he introduces a curious explanation, i.e. the "ways of pain, of perplexity, and of moral action." This, however, refers to the three gatis, the worst half of the six gatis, namely, the hells (naraka), brute creation (tiryagyoni), and departed (hungry) spirits (preta).

The name of Vasubandhu's mother, 'Bilindi,' and that of his younger brother, 'Bilindi-bhava,' given by Mr. Watters (p. 210), ought to be respectively 'Viriñci' and 'Viriñci-vatsa,' as I have represented them in my translation of the Life of Vasubandhu (*Tong-pao*, l.c.).

The 'Vidyāmātrasiddhi' (唯識論), a well-known work of Vasubandhu, and a textbook of the Yogācārya system (p. 370), ought to be restored to the 'Vijñāna-mātra-siddhi.' The origin of this mistake, which is not Mr. Watters's at all, arose from the Tibeto-Chinese Catalogue compiled in the Council of Kubilai Khan (1280-1294) in China, which transcribes the first part of the name with Ch. 尾底牙, 'wei-ti-ya' (vidyā), which M. Julien and Dr. Nanjio followed.

Kuei-chi (died 682), however, a disciple of Yuan-Chwang, says in his commentary on the text that the name is 毗若底摩咀刺多悉提, 'Pi-zo-ti-ma-ta-la-ta hsi-ti,' which will be something like 'Vijñāti-mātra-tā-siddhi.' A Tibetan work, too, by Ratnasambhava seems to have something like 'Vijñāvati-mātra-tā-siddhi.'

These clearly show that this original had some word derived from 'vijñā,' but not 'vidyā,' and this is fully borne out by the evidence that can be adduced from other sources, such as 'Vijñānāsti-tva-mātra-vādinah' (Śaṅkarācārya's bhāṣya on the Vedānta sūtras); 'Vijñānamātrām atroktaṁ yogācāryena dhimatā' (Sarvasiddhānta saṁgraha); 'Vijñānamātrika' (Lankāvatāra); and 'Vijñānavādinah' of other texts. Thus we are perfectly justified in using 'Vijñānamātra' for the hitherto accepted 'Vidyāmātra.'

The use of Sanskrit and Pāli forms side by side was intentional, as the author himself would have us understand (p. vi); but a want of uniformity in spelling is unfortunately noticeable throughout the book, such as Fang-chih, Fang-chieh; t'u-shih, t'eu-shih; sammatiya, sammitiya; Trayastrimśa, Tayastimśa; utpalavarṇī, utpalavarṇā; Śrāvasti, Sravasti; Asaṅga, Asanga; saṁhitā, sanhitā; etc. We meet some of these frequently.

The regrettable point of the work is that it contains a comparatively great number of mistakes in Chinese characters. To those who read Chinese, and intend to study Mr. Watters's arguments, these mistakes are rather misleading.

This is, let it be remarked in conclusion, an important and indispensable work by one of the ablest of scholars, and attractive to students of Indian history and geography, as well as to those of Chinese Buddhism. It will form a valuable and permanent memorial of its much lamented author.

J. TAKAKUSU.

RECENT ARABIC PUBLICATIONS IN THE EAST.

THE ILIAD OF HOMER, translated into Arabic verse, with Introduction, Notes, Glossary, and Indices. By SULAIMAN AL-BISTANI. (Cairo: Hilal Press, 1904.)

This work was received with enthusiasm by the Cairene Press, and for the first time probably in the literary history of the East a banquet was given in honour of the talented