

## SHORT NOTICES

R. MESQUITA: *Madhva: Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya. Annotierte Übersetzung mit Studie.* (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, XXVIII.) 562 pp. Vienna: Sammlung De Nobili, 2000.

Madhva, who probably lived at the beginning of the thirteenth century C.E., was the founder of the Dvaita system of Vedānta. He claimed to be an *avatāra* of Vāyu and a partial *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. A special feature of Madhva's works that has been puzzling scholars for a long time is that he quotes a number of unidentifiable sources. In his earlier study, *Madhva und seine unbekanntes literarischen Quellen: einige Beobachtungen* (Vienna: Publications of the De Nobili Research Library XXIV, 1997), Mesquita deals with the problem of Madhva's sources. An English version of this book was recently published as *Madhva's unknown literary sources: some observations* (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2000).

The Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya, also known as Viṣṇutattvavirṇaya (=VTN) counts among the ten compendiums or independent works (*daśaprakaraṇa*) authored by Madhva. Among these works, it is the longest, most important and possibly one of Madhva's latest. The text establishes Viṣṇu as the supreme deity and contains Madhva's reading of the well-known statement from Chāndogya-Upaniṣad 6.8.7–6.16.3, as *atat tvam asi* ('You are not that').

The book under review consists of two parts. Part 1 (=pp. 49–236) presents an annotated translation of the VTN, and is followed by a detailed study of the text in Part 2 (=pp. 237–531). Two English translations of the VTN already exist: S. S. Raghavachar translated the text for the first time (*Śrīmad-Viṣṇu-Tattva-Virṇaya of Śrī Madhvācārya*, Mangalore: Sri Ramakrishna Ashrama, 1959; second edition, 1971). Another, rather free, translation by K. T. Pandurangi appeared in 1991 (*Viṣṇutattvavirṇaya. Translated into English with detailed notes.* Bangalore: Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation). Both translations are accompanied by the Sanskrit text and draw heavily on interpretations of the text in Jayatīrtha's commentary Viṣṇutattvavirṇayaṭīkā. In contrast to these two earlier translators of the VTN, Mesquita presents a literal translation, which endeavours to interpret the VTN by drawing on parallel passages from Madhva's own works and by identifying and documenting the teachings of opponents who are referred to by Madhva. In addition, only Mesquita's translation is based on the authentic edition of the text of the VTN included in *Saryamūlagranthāḥ (Saṅkīrṇagranthāḥ)*, volume 5. Edited by B. Govindacharya. Udipi: Akhila Bharata Madhva Maha Mandala, 1974, pp. 12–44). In his study in Part 2 of the book, Mesquita continues to examine the problem of Madhva's unidentifiable citations which is the focus of his earlier monograph. In that monograph

Mesquita arrived at the conclusion that these citations are not taken from lost works but are composed by Madhva himself in support of his doctrines. Madhva believed himself to have been authorized by Viṣṇu to compose these passages. Mesquita's study provides a detailed and thorough discussion of topics dealt with in the VTN and is a welcome addition to his earlier monograph. The book contains a valuable textual analysis (pp. 35–47) and useful indices. In his preface (p. 11) the author announces that a third study on Madhva is in preparation. It is hoped that it will be published soon.

GUDRUN BÜHNEMANN

C. BOUY: *Gaudapāda: L'Āgamaśāstra. Un traité vedāntique en quatre chapitres. Texte, traduction et notes.* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, série in-8°, fascicule 69.) 432 pp. Paris: Edition-Diffusion de Boccard, 2000.

Gaudapāda's Āgamaśāstra (=ĀŚ) is an important work marking the origins of non-dualist Vedānta. It was probably composed between c. 550 and 700 C.E. (Bouy, p. 21). The work is comprised of four chapters (*prakaraṇa*). Chapter i consists of 12 prose passages and 29 verses. The prose passages are commonly held to form the Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad (=MaU), attributed to the Atharva-Veda. Dualist Vedāntins, however, also include the 29 verses. The ĀŚ, whose title is not known with certainty, is also referred to as the Kārikā by Gaudapāda on the Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad. In his article, *Die Gaudapādīya-Kārikās: zur Entstehung und zur Bedeutung von (A)dvaita* (Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 22, 1978, pp. 95–13), T. Vetter argued that these four chapters did not originally constitute one work but separate treatises and that they were written by one author in a different sequence, namely *prakaraṇas* 4, 3, 2 and 1, thus reflecting the author's development. Gaudapāda is traditionally identified as the teacher of the teacher of Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara wrote a commentary on the ĀŚ, which is probably authentic and was completed before 1000 C.E. (cf. Bouy, p. 340), and his commentary was again commented upon by others.

The book under review presents mainly an edition (pp. 63–79) and translation of the ĀŚ with Bouy's extensive commentary (pp. 81–322) and elaborate introduction (pp. 11–52). Bouy's text of the ĀŚ is based on the edition published by the Anandāśrama, Pune, that of Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya (published in: *The Āgamaśāstra of Gaudapāda*. Edited, translated and annotated by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1943, reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989 with a foreword by Ch. Lindtner) and on several other editions

and standard commentaries. The book contains several useful appendices with concordances and textual variants, an extensive bibliography (pp. 351–86), and several indices. Some parts of the book present in modified and revised manner the material treated in Bouy's article, *La Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad et l'Āgamaśāstra: Concordances externes et citations*, published in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 41, 1997, pp. 119–58.

The detailed introduction discusses problems regarding the author, his time, works attributed to him, different scholarly positions and arguments regarding the composition of the AS and sources of that text. Bouy's work attempts to include all available materials on the AS and Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad by surveying the extensive published research by predecessors and evaluating it carefully in light of his own research on the text. The result is a detailed study of the work.

GUDRUN BÜHNEMANN

CHRISTOPHER BO BRAMSEN (Chinese Translation by Lin Hua): *Peace and friendship: Denmark's official relations with China 1674–2000*. 160 pp. Copenhagen: Nordic Institute for Asian Studies, 2000.

Christopher Bo Bramsen's book celebrates the fifty years of diplomatic relations between Denmark and the People's Republic of China by giving a condensed overview of the official links between the two countries over more than 300 years. It is written by Denmark's Ambassador to Beijing, a man with considerable experience in China.

The book is a valuable, detailed overview of official relations, highlighting all major events and recording which persons were involved. It contains numerous illustrations (in high-quality reproduction), many of which are rare.

The book is easily read and destined to be available in libraries, in embassies and occasionally to offer sources of inspiration for those writing speeches for banquets. For historians, it may serve as a first introduction and a very helpful and well-structured account, and as a short-cut to cracking the problem of Chinese words in obscure transcriptions as well as names of Western individuals and companies in Chinese characters. The book is well researched; one can feel the care for detail and sense the trouble the author and the Chinese translator have gone through to verify the identity of people and many historical details.

I found pleasure in reading this book, perhaps because I am Danish and work on China issues. Among other things, I enjoyed comparing the pictures of ambassadors and Chinese leaders. From Mørch and Mao Zedong (p. 111) in an almost feudal posture, via Oldenburg and Chen Yi (p. 119) in a polite gesture of formal respect, to Stenbæk Hansen (p. 120) chatting up Li Xiannian in the style of an overly keen salesman, and Belling in a firm handshake with Yang Shangkun (p. 139). Bramsen lets the pictures tell their own story,

and they exonerate him from commenting on the issues on which a diplomat may not find it convenient to formulate an opinion. It is, for example, left to the reader to decide whether the Danish Prime Minister Poul Hartling fell into a propaganda trap set by the Chinese during his visit to China in 1974 (picture pp. 124–5) or whether he had a clear vision of the huge potential an early Danish overture to China could have for Danish trade.

The title of the book, *Peace and friendship*, is bland; it reminds me of toasts at banquets where people are short of something meaningful to say. A title like *Driven by trade and pragmatism: Denmark's official relations with China 1674–2000* would probably have been more apt, albeit not very diplomatic. Denmark has always had significant business interests in China. Telegraph connections to China were an extension to the network which the Danish Great Northern Telegraph Company had built across Russia, for example the telegraph link to Shanghai was established in 1872 as a sea cable laid by Great Northern. Danish companies traded and invested in China from the seventeenth century. For many years the East Asiatic Company of Copenhagen had a considerable presence in China, and today Danish shipping companies such as MAERSK have a sizeable share of China's international transport. The diplomats representing Denmark in China have for more than 300 years done a fine job, profiting very much from the fact that the two countries have been at peace all the time and thus may have some claim to celebrate 'friendship'.

FLEMMING CHRISTIANSEN

THE SOCIETY OF CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES: *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages*, XV. 190 pp., 17 plates, one fold-out chart. Osaka: The Society for Central Eurasian Studies, 2000.

The Japanese tradition of interest in Inner Asia stretches back more than a century, well beyond the expeditions mounted by Count Otani in the region during the days of Stein and Pelliot. As a result, Japan is a major producer of research and publication on the area, even though, since most European and North American scholars in the field do not read Japanese, the resulting literature is not cited as often as it should be. The fifteenth volume of the main language-oriented journal on the area published in Japan shows that there is no reason for this situation to continue. Of course the bulk of the journal remains in Japanese, for example the first ninety-nine pages of a meticulous study of ninth- and tenth-century official seals on documents from Dunhuang by Moriyasu Takao. A fourteen-page summary in French, however, makes the results of this study more widely available, while the tabulated materials on the last eight pages (pp. 114–21), and the magnificent fold-out chronological chart that follows, should be readily accessible to most sinologists, thus furnishing a comprehensive sigillographic

guide to officialdom at Dunhuang following the Tibetan occupation that deserves to become familiar to all scholars working in this area.

Somewhat briefer is a piece by P. Zieme on two fragments he has examined in the Otani Collection in Kyoto that turn out to derive from the famous Uighur Buddhist work *Maitrisimit nom bitig*, specifically from a passage enumerating the thirty-two marks of a Buddha. This study, entirely in English, is followed by the only contribution solely in Japanese, from Moriyasu and the Sogdian expert Yoshida Yutaka, introducing and translating from Uighur and Sogdian respectively eight letters discovered at Bezeklik in 1980–81; full transcriptions of the letters (three in Sogdian, five in Uighur) are nevertheless provided. Finally, a twelve-page bibliography is appended, including eight monographs and over one hundred articles, several of them in French or English, by the Chinese scholar Rong Xinjiang. When one considers that Professor Rong has only had the opportunity to publish his researches during the last twenty years, their quality (covering such important topics as the forgery of Dunhuang manuscripts, Khotanese history and early Zen texts) and their quantity suggest that for all the presumed marginality of this field as seen from the perspective of the English-speaking academic world, it is one that is developing with formidable energy, thanks largely to the efforts of East Asian scholars. Surely we can no longer afford to ignore journals such as this, whatever language the editors choose to publish contributions in.

T. H. BARRETT

LÉON VANDERMEERSCH (ed.): *Extrême-Orient, Extrême-Occident 22: L'art des jardins dans les pays sinisés: Chine, Japon, Corée, Vietnam*. 190 pp. Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2000. FF100.

The series of thematic volumes published under the title *Extrême-Orient, Extrême-Occident* continues to go from strength to strength, never failing to hit upon a topic of worthwhile comparative interest, and this issue on gardens certainly maintains the standard achieved so far. To be sure, the historian of religion, expecting some further elaboration of R. A. Stein's pioneering work on the religious

significance of miniature gardens in East Asia will find his work cited only occasionally, with the main focus of interest in the three essays apiece on China and Japan and the single contributions on the two other cultures named lying elsewhere. But there is plenty of useful information here even so, with pride of place going to a lengthy essay by Che-bing Chiu on the Yuanming yuan, the great imperial gardens of the Qing destroyed by nineteenth-century Western invaders, a sad later history touched upon but lightly here which may be more profitably explored in the admirable study of Geremie R. Barmé published in *East Asian History* 11, June 1996.

Chiu also touches lightly on the considerable importance of the Yuanming yuan as a place of work, a theme contrasting strongly with a contribution to the Japanese section by Michel Viellard-Baron on the Heian garden as a place of entertainment. In fact the history of work, for example the compilation of literary compendia, in the surroundings of imperial parks, goes back in China even to before the equivalent of the Heian period—the Hualin yuan of the Liang dynasty was certainly such a workplace—raising questions of comparison that might profitably be taken further at some point. Elsewhere, however, comparisons are made with some deftness, as between the role of water in the Korean and the Japanese garden, by Park Jungwook. One major surprise is to find as the last substantial item an essay in English by Craig Clunas, reprinted to provide the only reflection on Western discourse concerning the Chinese garden. Following its clear demonstration of the persistent ideological value to be assigned to any discussion of nature in Western writing on the Chinese garden, this essay finds a strongly sympathetic response in some remarks by Baldine Saint-Girons, one of two additional pieces of commentary on the contents of the volume appended at the end—the other is an all too brief comparison of East Asian with South and South-East Asian garden plans by Jacques Dumarçay. Readers who choose to start with the 'wrong end' of this collection and then consider the earlier contributions in the light of the observations made by Clunas and Saint-Girons will probably find this issue of *Extrême-Orient, Extrême-Occident* particularly rewarding. But even those who start more conventionally with the preface by Léon Vandermeersch will find plenty of opportunities for reflection. One cannot wait to discover what comparative theme this most thought-provoking of serials on East Asia will turn to next.

T. H. BARRETT