

Patrick Olivelle, *Vāsudevāśrama Yatidharmaparakāśa*. A treatise on world renunciation. Critically edited with introduction, annotated translation and appendices. Part one. Text. (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, III). Vienna, Gerold and Co., 1976. 139 pp. AS 270,-; Leiden, E. J. Brill. DGld. 38,-

In his preface Patrick Olivelle remarks that only a few of the texts dealing with the rules governing the life of orthodox renouncers have been published and none has been translated so far. His careful edition of Vāsudevāśrama's *Yatidharmaparakāśa* is a very welcome addition to the literature on this topic. Little seems to be known about the author apart from the fact that he belonged to the *āśrama* subdivision of the 'renouncers of the ten names' (daśanāminah) of the Advaita Vedānta tradition. In the introductory verses, Vāsudeva says that he is the pupil of Govindāśrama who was the pupil of Rāmakṛṣṇāśrama. Of the works used by him, he mentions

in the same verses the works of Mādhava, etc., the Viśveśvapaddhati (= Viśveśvarapaddhati or Yatidharmasamgraha, Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, vol. 60), the Praṇavamīmāṃsā and the Praṇavavārttika. He quotes also several times from the Yatidharmasamuccaya. Several works of the same title are mentioned in manuscript catalogues and, probably, Olivelle will be able to give more information on this text in his translation of the *Yatidharmaparakāśa*. The work must have been composed between 1675 and 1800. The upper limit can be fixed on the basis of the most recent author quoted by Vāsudeva, i.e. Viśveśvara Bhaṭṭa (1620–1685) who completed his father's work, the *Dinakaroddyota*. The lower limit depends on the date of the oldest manuscript, i.e. 1832 A.D.

Olivelle points out that the (constituted) text of his edition is not based upon 'selected readings' but is made strictly according to well defined rules of textual criticism. Olivelle's edition is based upon six manuscripts. A stemma is given on p. 21. A more detailed examination of the edition can better be postponed until the publication of the announced translation. However, attention has to be drawn to two points. Olivelle has divided the text into 74 sections in accordance with the divisions found in the text itself. In each section he has numbered all sentences. The variants are listed at the bottom of the page with references to the number of the sentence. The text itself does not contain any references to the variants and the reader is forced to read at the same time the text and the variants at the bottom of the page. It would have been useful if references would have been given in the text itself with the help of letters (a, b, c, etc.). This would have made it much less laborious for the reader to discover the variants. In the second place, Olivelle shows perhaps too much confidence in the text-critical rules which he has drawn up. For instance, in section 19.4, he reads: *tato dakṣiṇaṃ jānuṃ bhūmiṃ nītvā*, although two manuscripts (Bh and P) have the reading *jānu*. However, Olivelle reads *jānuṃ* in accordance with his rule c: "A reading found in recension Y* and in at least one of the sub-recensions of X* is considered to be the original" (p. 24). He is therefore forced to state on p. 28 that in 19.4 *jānu* is taken as masculine, as in the epic. However, in the same section 19 *jānu* n. is found a few lines later: 19.10 *dakṣiṇaṃ jānv avācya*. It would not have been impossible for Olivelle to admit the reading *jānu* in 19.4 because he allows exceptions. For instance, in 10.25, Olivelle reads *nityaśuddhabuddhamuktasvabhāvaparamānandādvayabrahmapratipādakaṃ*, although manuscripts B, Bh, D, H and W read *-svabhāvaṃ*. According to Olivelle, these exceptions are due to the fact that certain wrong readings occurred already in the archetype Z* and were later corrected in some manuscripts by the scribe. However, it seems much simpler to take into account the fact that scribes are notoriously unreliable in the notation of the anusvāra. The presence or the absence of an anusvāra cannot be considered a genuine variant. It is not surprising that, in writing *dakṣiṇaṃ jānuṃ* instead of *dakṣiṇaṃ jānu*, several scribes added a superfluous anusvāra, being probably influenced by the presence of the anusvāra in *dakṣiṇaṃ*.

The *Yatidharmaparakāśa* contains a great number of quotations of which most have been carefully identified by the editor. Appendix I contains an alphabetical index of ritual formulae; appendix II, an alphabetical index of quotations; appendix III a systematic index of quotations, and appendix IV a general index, i.e. an index of Sanskrit words.

Australian National University

J. W. DE JONG