



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Review of Zin, M.; Schlingloff, D. Samsāracakra: the wheel of rebirth in the Indian tradition

Silk, J.A.

Citation

Silk, J. A. (2022). Review of Zin, M.; Schlingloff, D. Samsāracakra: the wheel of rebirth in the Indian tradition. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 65(2), 171-180. doi:10.1163/15728536-06502001

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3455028>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Book Reviews



Monika Zin and Dieter Schlingloff, *Śaṃsāracakra: The Wheel of Rebirth in the Indian Tradition*. New Delhi: Dev Publishers & Distributors, 2022. ISBN 978-93-87496-77-4. 230pp. 9 color plates. ₹1595.

In 2007, Monika Zin and Dieter Schlingloff published a small book in German, being a four-chapter study on the so-called Wheel of Rebirth, the *śaṃsāracakra*.¹ This has now been translated into English, and published in India in a well-produced volume. There are only slight differences between the two (aside from the language): while the German volume had only a single (not very good) color plate, the present translation can boast nine very nice and nicely reproduced color images.² While there is no indication of the division of labor between the authors, one may suppose that the lion's share of the Sanskrit philology is due to Schlingloff, and that most of the visual analysis is the work of Zin.

The four chapters of the book deal with: 1. “The Water Wheel and a Symbol of Śaṃsāra,” 2. “Buddhist Instructions for Painting the Wheel,” 3. “The Painting of the Wheel in Ajanta,” and 4. “Text and Painting in Comparison.” In sum, the book is largely an exercise in making sense of the partially preserved painting on the veranda of cave 17 in Ajanta. The first chapter is in some ways an exception to this focus, in that it is dedicated to the proposition that the imagination of the wheel of śaṃsāra is based not, as is commonly assumed, on a

1 *Śaṃsāracakra: Das Rad der Wiedergeburten in der indischen Überlieferung*. Düsseldorf: EKÖ-Haus = *Buddhismus-Studien / Buddhist Studies* 6. ISBN 978-3-89129-695-0. I know of only one review, that of Petra Kieffer-Pülz, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 161.1 (2011): 223–224.

2 These are indicated as copyrighted by the Ajanta Archives of the Saxon Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Research Centre “Buddhist Murals of Kucha on the Northern Silk Road,” and apparently photographed by Andreas Stellmacher. It is not quite clear what Kucha and the Northern Silk Road have to do with Ajanta but one might guess that the connection is that this is Monika Zin's academic home.

cart wheel (evidently without much thought, and no doubt by transference from the image of the *dharmacakra*, which is indeed from early times so imagined), but rather on what is called in English the Persian Wheel or Noria, an apparatus consisting of buckets attached to a water wheel for the purpose, in the first place, of irrigating fields. The operative point here is that the buckets pick up water from one place and deposit it in another, an image linked then to the transmigration of the individual from one life and physical manifestation to the next. The device in question is called the *ghaṭīyantra*.³ A number of hand-drawn images are reproduced, but none of their sources are particularly old (the oldest seems to be figure 4, p. 12, from the 12th c.). Nevertheless there are numerous textual sources attesting to the existence of this water wheel, and describing it in enough detail that its construction is well understood. The authors discuss the logic of the image of the wheel, and what might drive it forward (they do not, however, mention, *karman*, which I should think would be the most common or logical engine, or rather fuel), but they do suggest (p. 16):

Whatever is described in the various ideological systems as the driving force that causes the endless succession of birth, old age, and death, and constant rebirth into the various forms of existence, the image of the externally driven wheel has shaped the ideas surrounding the cycle of rebirth. It is not only the turning of the water wheel in the same fixed place, unconnected with any locomotion and therefore seen as futile, that makes this wheel better suited to the image of *saṃsāra* than the wagon wheel; it is also the number of spokes, which are much fewer than compared [*sic*] to those of the wagon wheel. While the spokes of the wagon wheel must be closely spaced to withstand the pressure of the wagon, the distance between the spokes of the water wheel, which must only support the row of pots, can be much greater. In this way, the space between the spokes can be used to visualize the realms of the world inherent in *saṃsāracakra*.

I find the suggestion of a physical constraint intriguing, but also not necessarily entirely convincing. While the rationale for the rotation of a water wheel and the fact that its buckets actually transfer water from one place to another is extremely suggestive, the question of the physical construction of the number of spokes is far from self-evident. Should we also think that the motivation

3 Or one had better say: among other names. The authors cite also (p. 6) *vāriyantra*, *kūpayantra*, *jalayantracakra* and *araghaṭṭaghaṭīyantra*, and there appear to be other forms as well.

for the inclusion of a sixth realm—in addition to the gods, humans, animals, pretas, hell beings, also the asuras—was motivated by the physical fact that building a wheel with six spokes is easier and more stable than one with five? Such a suggestion would seem to emerge from the logic of the authors, though they do not offer it. In any event, the status of the asura as one of the destinies of rebirth remains to be adequately treated.⁴

The second chapter presents two textual sources, the first a short passage found in Sanskrit in the *Divyāvadāna*, the scriptural source of which is the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. It comes from the beginning of the 21st chapter, the *Sahasodgata-avadāna*.⁵ The second is a manuscript, found in Duldur-Akur in Central Asia, now kept in Paris; although not mentioned by the authors, it is catalogued as Pelliot Sanskrit rouge 5.1–3. The fragment was edited earlier by Bernard Pauly as item VII in “Fragments sanskrits de Haute Asie (Mission Pelliot).”⁶ I will return to these sources below.

The third chapter, constituting roughly half the book, briefly discusses the history of research on the painting found in the veranda of cave 17 at Ajanta, and then at much greater length offers an “Interpretation of the Painting.” Here each extant portion of the painting is analyzed, and details reproduced in hand sketches, without which many or even most details would be impossible to recognize. The value of this analysis for art historians in particular is obvious. The final chapter explicitly confronts the cited texts with the painting. Although a

4 One is tempted as a first step to wonder whether it is an inheritance (like the pratyekabuddha) which the Buddhists found themselves obliged to take into account, although it played in fact no real role in their system. However, I refrain from further comment on this issue here since my student, Meng Xiaoqiang (Alex), will address the topic in his doctoral dissertation, now in preparation.

5 The text is taken selectively from Cowell and Neil 1886: 298.24–300.24, skipping to 302.9–12. See below note 12.

6 *Journal Asiatique* 247 (1959): 203–249, in which the relevant pages are 228–240. In the volume under review the reference is given (36n92) as 1960 (and Sanskrit as Sanscrit, as it was in the German book). Schlingloff must have made use of an offprint; the copy of the offprint I have seen is indeed dated 1960, and moreover, since “with facsimile” is indicated, this must be the off-print, since the original journal publication was without plates. The full range of articles by Pauly published under the same title includes: *Journal Asiatique* 245 (1957): 281–307; 247 (1959): 203–249; 248 (1960): 213–258 and 509–538; 249 (1961): 333–410; 250 (1962): 593–612; 252 (1964): 197–271; 253 (1965): 83–121 and 183–187; 254 (1966): 245–304; 255 (1967): 231–241. Good color photographs of the *rouge* manuscripts may be seen at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b6000206v>. However, note that this file offers no numbering! The manuscripts were given a preliminary catalogue in Taijun Inokuchi, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts Brought from Central Asia by Paul Pelliot Preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (preliminary)*. Kyoto: Ryukoku University, Institute of Buddhist Cultural Studies, 1989, in which see page 7 for the relevant fragments.

tremendous amount of detail is offered and many facts and speculations cited, it is not reassuring to read the confession of the authors (p. 173) that “It is hardly possible to determine what the relationship between the Ajanta painting and either of the literary versions might be, as the decisive images were not preserved.” The authors in fact seem themselves rather unhappy with this humble but honest conclusion, and in the continuation of the same paragraph (p. 174) write “Today, there is a gap ... which might indicate ... there could once have been This could verify the dogmatic statement” This kind of speculation is almost the very definition of special pleading, and casts some doubt not on the tremendous data presented here but on the attempt, mostly implicit but sometimes explicit, to directly link the cited textual sources to what is seen on the wall in Ajanta.

Now, there are many virtues of this book, but also some serious problems and it is only fair that these be given due attention. While it is surely praiseworthy that the book was published in English, making it available in the first place to a much broader audience (and in fact the rather unconventional way the German edition was published probably made it difficult to obtain even in Europe and North America, not to mention elsewhere), the book is now 15 years old, and scholarship has not stood still, a fact which both authors know very well: some of the most relevant scholarship published in the last decade and a half has either been written by or dedicated to them.⁷ It is clearly stated

7 Marek Mejer, for instance, published “Painting the ‘Wheel of Transmigration’ (*samsāra-cakra*): A Note on the Textual Transmission,” in a volume edited by Eli Franco and Monika Zin and dedicated to Schlingloff, *From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eighteenth Birthday*. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute: 11.671–690. One must further note that while the authors refer (57n124) to the important work of Stephen F. Teiser only on the basis of a personal communication, in fact his book is now well known: *Reinventing the Wheel: Paintings of Rebirth in Medieval Buddhist Temples*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006. Anyone interested in the topic of the book under review would certainly profit from Teiser’s book, and it is hard to understand that even such a simple update as to mention that the book in fact appeared in print is omitted. In this regard, moreover, quite surprising is the lack of attention given to the scholarship of Walter Spink (not as in German and English, Walther), whose work, though often controversial, should be considered whenever thinking about Ajanta. Several volumes, moreover, of his Meisterwerk, *Ajanta, History and Development*, had appeared even before the publication of the German edition, yet they find no mention. The series is as follows: *Ajanta, History and Development*, Vol. 1: The End of the Golden Age (2005); Vol. 2: Arguments about Ajanta (2006); Vol. 3: The Arrival of the Uninvited (2005); Vol. 4: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture—Year by Year (2008); Vol. 5: Cave by Cave (2006); Vol. 6: Defining Features (2014); Vol. 7: Bagh, Dandin, Cells and Cell Doorways (2017). All volumes are Leiden: Brill Publishers. In regard particularly to the issue discussed by the authors on p. 55

on the reverse title page “The text has not been revised or updated and therefore research published after 2007 has not been incorporated.” While the lack of updating is regrettable, what is hard to understand is that even errors in the book have not been repaired.⁸ Furthermore, unfortunately the translation into English, credited to Amanda Wichert, was evidently not even proof-read, much less corrected.

concerning the relationship between the door cut-out and the painting, see Spink’s Vol. 5. 216–217.

Even works by the authors themselves are not exempt from this disregard: 65n142 cites Schlingloff’s *Die altindische Stadt*, without noting that this was published in English: *Fortified Cities of Ancient India*, London: Anthem Press, 2013 (reviewed by O. v. Hinüber in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 60.2 [2017]: 187–199).

It is not only more recent scholarship that suffers; some items referred to in the book are given incomplete or entirely absent references. For instance, the reference p. 51 and 52n109 mentions N.W. Thomas but credits Thomas N. Waters with an article in *Man* 1 (1901—not 1902 as cited): 1–4, the author of which is in fact N.W. Thomas, who is also the author of the unmentioned illustrated article “A Buddhist Wheel of Life from Japan,” *Folklore* 12.1 (1901): 67–69.

- 8 As an example, in the paper of Mejer mentioned in the previous note, he points out on 68n43 that the *Vinaya-sūtra* is wrongly quoted as reading *citram ārāmasya* (§17.2.10), when in fact it reads *citraṇam ārāmasya*. This remains uncorrected in the English version (22n85). As another example of lack of care, on p. 60 we read of “the fold-out drawing at the end of the book,” but there is no fold-out drawing in this book; the relevant drawings now appear on (unnumbered) pp. 218–219.

Regarding further updating and the state of the field, 64n141 refers to the *Lokaprajñapti*; although reference is made to a 2004 article by Sieglind Dietz, there is no mention of the 2002 book by Kalpaka Sankarnarayan, Kazunobu Matsuda, and Motohiro Yoritomi, *Lokaprajñapti: A Critical Exposition of Buddhist Cosmology*. Mumbai: Somaiya Publications, nor of the even earlier Akira Yuyama, “Remarks on the Kōkiji fragment of the *Lokaprajñapti*,” in: Gilbert Pollet, ed., *India and the Ancient World: History, Trade and Culture before A.D. 650: Professor P.H.L. Eggermont Jubilee Volume Presented on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 25. Leuven: Peeters, 1987: 215–227. Moreover, a complete Japanese translation of the text has appeared: Fukuda Takumi 福田琢, “Katō Sei ikō Zōbun wayaku *Sekensesetsu*” 加藤清遺稿 蔵文和訳 『世間施設』 1 *Dōbō Bukkyō* 同朋佛教 34 (1999): 19–60 (140–199); 2 *Dōbō Bukkyō* 35 (1999): 27–43; 3 *Dōbō Bukkyō* 36 (2000): 19–56 (128–191); 4 *Dōbō daigaku ronsō* 同朋大学論叢 84 (2001): 45–68 (86–63); 5 *Dōbō daigaku ronsō* 85/86 (2002): 194–226 (305–273); 6 *Dōbō daigaku ronsō* 89 (2004): 93–109 (146–130); 7 *Dōbō Bukkyō* 40 (2004): 25–52 (162–135). Finally, we must note that Matsuda Kazunobu has more recently published Sanskrit materials: 松田和信, “Torin-ji buttō yori shutsudo shita Sekensesetsuron no bonbun shahon” トリン寺仏塔より出土した世間施設論の梵文写本 [Sanskrit manuscript of the *Lokaprajñapti* from mTho lding dGon pa in West Tibet]. *Bukkyō daigaku Bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 佛教大学仏教学部論集 103 (2019): 29–39.

At 91n221, reference is made to *surā*, in which “recent” work is cited—from 1979! Now one should in the first place see James McHugh, *An Unholy Brew: Alcohol in Indian History and Religions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Although the English is on the whole quite clear, there are places where things have not gone smoothly, and unfortunately one is found in the very first paragraph, in a sentence which reads: “Schwierigkeit bereitet dagegen einmal das Verständnis der *māyā* (‘Illusion’, ‘Blendwerk’), durch welche der Herr die Wesen herumwirbeln läßt (oder durch welche sich die Wesen auf der Maschinerie befinden?), dann aber vor allem die Frage, um was für eine Maschinerie es sich hier handelt.” This becomes in English, “*Māyā* (‘illusion,’ ‘mirage’), through which God causes these beings to whirl (or through which these beings find themselves on the machine?), however, is more difficult to comprehend, beyond this, what is the machine of which the text speaks?” There are other examples like this, which can somehow be understood, but which could easily have been repaired by someone with a sense of the flow of an English sentence.

More serious is a choice perhaps made intentionally by the authors for their German version, namely that they evidently translated almost all passages from Sanskrit themselves. Doubtless this allowed them a precision and uniformity which otherwise might have been lacking. However, for an English version it would often have been possible to locate reliable translations and thus not place on the shoulders of their translator the too heavy burden of transforming their German renderings into English, in the course of which sometimes connections with the Sanskrit have been lost. Moreover, in some cases even significant contributions have therefore been overlooked, even those which appeared long ago.⁹ For instance, when the *Kuvalayamālā* is cited (p. 17), it is surprising to find no reference to the work of Christine Chojnacki, whose monumental complete translation is now available in English, thoroughly overseen by the translator herself.¹⁰

The important passage from the *Dīvyāvadāna* mentioned above has recently been translated by Andy Rotman.¹¹ As a specimen of the difference a good

9 As a trivial example, 10n47 refers to Jacobi’s *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Mahārāshṭrī* (misprinted as *ṛāshṭrī*) (Kiel, 1886: 18, citing *āraghaṭṭika*), but without mention of the extremely useful translation by John Jacob Meyer, *Hindu Tales* (London, 1909), who 57n5 notes the word, though he does not offer any extended discussion.

10 *Uddyotanasūri’s Kuvalayamālā: A Jain Novel from 779 AD*. Bangalore: Sapna Book House. The book states that it was translated from French by Alexander Reynolds and “largely revised by the author.” The passage cited on p. 10 of the book under review and quoted in Prakrit in note 74 is translated in Chojnacki’s volume 2, p. 842. The relevant portion of the text continues for some pages thereafter. The French version was published as *Kuvalayamālā: Roman Jaina de 779, composé par Uddyotanasūri*. Indica et Tibetica 50.1–2. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2008.

11 *Divine Stories*. *Dīvyāvadāna* Part 2. Somerville MA: Wisdom Publications, 2017.

English translation can make, let us compare one short passage from the beginning of the cited portion:¹²

sa yāni tāni nārakāṇām sattvānām utpātānupātānacchedanabhedanādīni duḥkhāni tiraścām anyonya-bhakṣaṇādīni pretāṇām kṣuttrṣādīni devānām cyavanapatanavikiraṇavidhvaṃsanādīni manuṣyāṇām paryeṣṭīya-sanādīni duḥkhāni tāni dṛṣṭvā jambudvīpam āgatya catasraṇām parṣadām ārocayati.

The translation offered by Zin and Schlingloff reads (p. 23):

After he had seen those [*the*] hellish [*region dwelling*] beings the suffering of the tearing, ripping, cutting, breaking apart etc., for the animals the devouring-one-another etc., for the *pretas* the starving, thirsting, etc., for the gods the falling, crashing, being scattered, disintegrating etc. and for humans the sufferings of the evil of aspiration etc., and after he had gone back to India, he told [*this*] to the fourfold congregation.

Rotman has instead (p. 95):

There he saw many kinds of suffering, such as hell beings being pulled, plucked, cut, and pierced; animals being devoured by each other; hungry ghosts being tormented by hunger and thirst; gods passing away and falling, undergoing ruin and destruction; and humans pained by longing and misfortune. And having seen all this, he would come to Jambudvīpa (Black Plum Island) and address the four assemblies.

This is unfortunately not the end of the problems with the English translation of the short section from the *Dīvyāvadāna*. In the very next division of the text, the translation has one having a student “who leads an unsatisfied ascetic life” (rather, who is unsatisfied leading the ascetic life) go to Mahāmaudgalyāyana and think (this not clear in the translation) that the latter will “admonish and instruct him in the right way,” but then immediately thereafter we read that “–this one admonishes and instructs the venerable mahā-Maudgalyāyana in the right way.” Needless to say, the poor student is not

12 E[dward] B[yles] Cowell and R[obert] A[lexander] Neil, *The Dīvyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge, 1886; Reprint: Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970): 299.1–6.

admonishing the great Arhat, no matter what the English translator may have thought.¹³

I have no intention of going through the whole passage here, which is full of oversights (*jānakāḥ prcchakā buddhā bhagavantaḥ* becomes “As knowledgeable ones, the exalted Buddhas are askers,” while it means of course that the buddhas ask even though they already know the answer), but there is one point which comes back repeatedly and requires notice, namely the term *aupapāduka*. In German *aupapādukāḥ sattvā* was rendered “vor-neuer-Existenz-stehenden Wesen,” and in English this has become “the beings on the cusp of a new existence.” As the authors themselves cite the Vinaya commentaries as explaining (p. 28),¹⁴ the reference is to beings in the intermediate state, the *antarābhava*, but the term is a well-known one which refers to spontaneous birth, the manner of being born other than from a womb, from an egg or from moisture. The entire point here of the status of the beings is lost by this paraphrase. The treatment is puzzling since Monika Zin knows all of this, and has published about it.¹⁵

When we come to the quite fragmentary document preserved in Paris, I find it slightly difficult to follow what Schlingloff has done with it. Working directly from the fragments, Pauly already offered a reading and French translation, making much sense of the sometimes extremely poorly preserved text. Schlingloff tells us that in his edition he did the following: “The text reproduction consists of a diplomatic exact transcription of the handwritten findings [*sic*; Befundes is rather ‘finds’] in **bold type**. In round brackets () the *akṣaras* can be

13 One is not surprised to see that the German is entirely correct: “–diesen ermahnt und unterweist der Ehrwürdige mahā-Maudgalyāyana auf die rechte Weise.” The translator has simply not understood the German correctly, and no one took the time to read the translation to correct even such an obvious error, to recognize which no knowledge of Sanskrit is required. Another example on p. 39: Sanskrit *„yaṁ śrutvā* is rendered “(After people have taken this report)”; this is a mistranslation of German “(Nachdem die Menschen diesen Bericht) vernommen haben,” (note the place of the parentheses!), in which vernommen haben does not mean “have taken” but “have heard.” On p. 42 in 12a, *jarā* (Ger. das Alter) appears only as “age.” In the next item (p. 43, 12b) *marāṇaṁ sa puruṣo mṛto*, “das Sterben, (der Mann) gestorben” has become “dying, (the man) having died.” I do not, incidentally, understand why “der Mann” is placed in parenthesis if Schlingloff’s reconstruction is accepted—he reads: [p](u)[ru](ṣo) which in context seems surely correct. At 66n147 the translator has completely forgotten to translate the note.

14 The relevant passages in the commentaries are edited and translated by Mejer (above note 7).

15 “Crossing the Ocean of *saṃsāra*: Berlin, Museum für Asiatische Kunst, no. III 9023,” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 72.2: 183–217, in which see p. 198, where Zin correctly identifies the *aupapāduka* with the *gandharva*, referring to the status of beings in the intermediate state, *antarābhava*. This need not have remained unclear in the English book.

found which were not preserved, in square brackets [] partly damaged *akṣaras*. If the readings of partially destroyed *akṣaras* are secure, their transcription is also shown in **bold type**.” What then do we do with the second section into which Schlingloff divides the text? He prints:

(ācaritam āyusmato mahā-Mau)[V₃](**dgalyāyanasya** kālena kālaṁ nara-
ka-cārikāṁ tiryak-cārikāṁ preta-cārikāṁ manu)[**ṣ**]ya-cārikāṁ | [**d**]e[v]-
(a-cārikāṁ |).

According to the scheme as cited above, a portion of the name Mahāmaudgalyāyana is sure, but its first part is not. Similarly dev- is secure, but not the -a of deva, nor the ṣ of manuṣya. None of this makes sense.

In the immediately following passage we have within parentheses (here called round brackets, indicating non-preserved and thus entirely hypothetical readings) naraka-cārikāṁ **tiryak**-cārikāṁ, but the *tiryak* is printed in bold, and only this. There are many such examples.

It is opined that the scribes made mistakes (p. 36, with the example n. 93 of -kartām or kartam as a possible hybrid form), but no mention is made of the interesting form (p. 43, §11) in the sentence fragment ..[sya] bahiḥ saṁsāra-cakrasya [maṇḍal](a) [ū]rdhvaṁ buddhasya cchāyo likhi[ta](vyaḥ), translated “outside the wheel of rebirth, (in a) circle, above the image of the Buddha should (be) painted” There seems no choice but to accept *chāyo* here as masculine (the reading on the photographs is quite clear).¹⁶ On the same page only slightly above we come across the expression (upāyāsaḥ) puruṣoḥ [*sic*, MS reads so] upāyusko likhit(avyaḥ), translated “(exertion), a strained man (shall be) painted.” Setting aside the English here, what is *upāyusko*? On p. 170n575 the authors write “*upāyuska* is a απ. λεγ.” What they neglect to mention is that Pauly (234n4) devoted some attention to the form: “«À l’esprit troublé» me semble la traduction probable de la forme bizzare *upāyuska* donnée par notre manuscrit. *Upāyuska*, avec ṣ cérébral, signifierait «soumis à la durée de la vie», mais ce sens ne conviendrait pas. *Alpāyuska*, «dont la vie est courte», serait plus correct comme forme mais comment représenter un personnage ainsi qualifié et quel rapport y aurait-t-il entre le trouble de l’esprit et la brièveté de la vie? Et s’il est permis de corriger s en ṣ, rien n’autorise la lecture *alpa*- au lieu de *upa*-.” I do not have a solution to offer here, and only note that the authors need not

16 Masc. *chāya* does exist, but in the meaning of a kind of demon or, according to dictionaries, as an adjective cited in the sense of “shadowing,” examples being found in *Mahābhārata* 12,136.20 (in the compound *śitacchāyo*), or 150.4 (in *ghanacchāyo*). Does it exist in this sense outside of compound?

have been content to merely note the form as a hapax, given that Pauly had already offered at least preliminary thoughts.

In sum, while the book certainly has much to offer, and will be especially welcomed by those who command no German—and its publication in India at a reasonable price is a great plus—its appearance unchanged after 15 years, and with no effort made to correct even known errors in the German edition, should signal a need for caution. Readers should have a reasonable expectation, I believe, that scholarly publications present them up-to-date information about a field, but this book does not. This is a pity, since to a great extent at least a partial updating could have been accomplished with relatively little effort. Be that as it may, the work is worth reading, even in its imperfect form.

Jonathan A. Silk | ORCID: 0000-0002-9796-1021

Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

j.a.silk@hum.leidenuniv.nl