Classical Studies and Indology

Michael Witzel
Harvard University

§1. A (very) brief historical overview

We all are well aware, I believe, that the study of our subject, the Classics, saw the beginnings of a new approach in the 14th/15th c., the beginnings of the

1.1. Renaissance period, with the rediscovery of the Greek Classics in Italy (Petrarca, Bocaccio, etc.), with the help of Byzantine intermediaries; in a long and gradual process, it was in this period that methods to edit and translate the ancient texts were eventually established.

1.2. It must be noted, however, that such a **rediscovery** of one's own Classical texts is **not isolated**: we can compare the 17th c. Japanese rediscovery and study of their own ancient texts, the Kojiki (and Nihon Shoki), or the 14th c. reinterpretation of the oldest Indian sacred texts, the Vedas by Sāyaṇa. The investigation of such rediscoveries is of interest, but it cannot really be dealt with here. It may be noted, in passing, though, that early Japanese scholars such as Motoori Norinaga and Arai Hakuseki lived in a period of neo-Confucianism, introduced from outside, and that their efforts may be seen as a reaction against "foreign" influence. In the Indian case, the situation is similar: Sāyaṇa lived in the Vijayanagara empire which was founded to ward off Muslim advances into the South of India. He and his philosopher brother Mùdhava actually were important officials of that empire. They helped to strengthen the Hindu basis of the realm by looking back at the roots of Hindu religion in the Vedas and at the spiritual interpretation of some of these texts in the context of Advaita philosophy, and the mythical victory of Hinduism against an earlier adversary, medieval Buddhism. None of these observations, however, detracts from the fundamental and foundational efforts made by such scholars to interpret their early texts.

Since there has been some discussion of what constitutes Classical texts, it is perhaps not insignificant to quote the case of a fairly little known culture, the Dravidian one of Southern India. One of the most prominent scholars in this field, K.Zvelebil, writes:

> "First of all, the so-called Sangam Tamil poetry is regarded by the Tamils themselves, by the professional historiographers and critics, as well as by intellectual readers, as classical in the same sense in which we regard some parts of our national literatures as classical. Second, it has been a finite, "frozen" corpus, a body of texts which had not been expanded since it ceased to be part of a live oral tradition. Since those times, it has become a part of the classical heritage as it were. Third, it is the expression of a linguistic, prosodic and stylistic perfection; it is a finished, consummate and inimitable literary expression of an entire culture, and of the best in that culture; in this sense, it is truly a classical product, a classical literature." [1]

If we substitute "Sangam Tamil poetry" by "poems of the Kojiki and Manyōshū" and "by the Tamils" with "by the Japanese" we obtain a workable and useful definition of what would define the early stages of Classical Japanese texts (see below).

The next step in the development of our subject, the Classics, took place in the late 18th/early 19th century with the

1.3. rediscovery of medieval European traditions (folk literature, fairy tales, medieval epics and poetry, and non-Christian texts, such as the *Edda, Roland, Nibelungen, Igor,* etc.)

It is often forgotten today, especially in America, that the movement which began at the end of the 18th c. with the aim of collecting European folklore, originally was not nationalistic at all (F. Herder). Rather, one wanted to approach the early stages of mankind through these simple productions of the popular spirit. The same collections were, of course, used later in the 19th c., one to underpin the claims of the various European peoples and were used for nationalistic aims, especially in the drive for independence and unification of the peoples of central and eastern Europe. The early 19th century, finally, saw the

1.4. establishment of the current method of historical and textual criticism, of the development of historical linguistics and of a combination of this with philology (and in this sense, as the British call it: "comparative philology").

This is the moment, perhaps, to reflect, albeit briefly,

1 K. Zvelebil, *The Smile of Murugan*, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1973, p.50.

on **philology as such**. My attention was drawn to this through my long stay in the US where it is almost a term of abuse to be a philologist, or worse, an oriental philologist, that is someone who studies non-western languages and literatures.

Philology is not, of course, as one religionist colleague once instructed me, "the study of *a* word". Rather, we should define this approach, with the definition used in the 1988 Harvard Classics conference "*What is philology?*" as "philology is a *Kulturwissenschaft* based on texts", in other words, the study of a civilization based on its texts. As such it is, of course, different from the approaches of archaeology, history, sociology, anthropology or religion, approaches in which texts play a role, though not necessarily the central one. However, as is wrongly assumed by those who attack it, philology does not enclose itself in the texts while ignoring these other approaches.

Rather, philological study comprehends the investigation of the available written and oral texts of a civilization *and* the study of all features necessary for an understanding of these texts. In carrying out this program, a whole range of tools *(Hilfswissenschaften)* that deal with the *realia* met with in the texts come into play. They range from archaeology to writing systems, and from astronomy to zoology.

In the 19th c. this method was put to use also in the *non* -Greek/Roman traditions of Europe (Bible, Germanic, Slavic, Celtic, etc. philology, spearheaded by K. Lachmann).

This development is especially of interest in the context of those times, when literal belief in the Bible was still quite strong in Europe. Yet, even such early scholars as Lachmann underlined that both the Old and the New Testament contain voluminous evidence for multiple authorship and internal contradictions which countermands the claims of the Christian Churches. In the other European disciplines there was, of course, no such sensational aspect to the study of the old texts; however, they provided essential training ground for a host of young philologists (usually turned into High School teachers) and the spread of these ideas among a fairly wide section of the educated public.

Later on, especially from the mid-19th c. onwards, philological study also spread to Sanskrit/Old Iranian (Avesta), Near Eastern, E. Asian Studies, etc. (and with the quickly proceeding decipherment of Egyptian and Mesopotamian texts, also to these new fields). To quote just one example, the so-called Book of the Dead of Egypt is, in reality, a vast collection of texts from graves of the old, middle and new Kingdoms, which lent themselves to historical and critical study of their origin and development.

While Europeans, based on the accounts of the Greek historians, were well aware of Egyptian and Mesopotamian cultures, they now had, as mentioned before, a means to counter-check the Biblical accounts of the Ancient Near East. This coincided, more or less, with the development of the Darwinian school which set back the development of humans by eons beyond the traditional 5-6000 of the re-calculated Biblical account of creation. — The picture widened with the first decipherment of the oldest Indian texts, the Vedas, which were believed, early in the 19th c., to have come directly from the earliest times, from Central Asia, the cradle of humanity. In the case of Chinese Classical texts, these had always been regarded, based on Chinese calculations of their early history, as coming from extremely early times... All of this widened the historical and geographical horizons considerably.

In all these fields, the recently acquired means of textual criticism and historical criticism were consistently applied. In fact, the second part of the 19th century was the heyday of the critical and historical method (which was heavily influenced by the expanding knowledge of comparative Indo-European linguistics).

1.5. It also was the time that saw an increasing **movement away from native interpretation**, from the medieval commentaries. One was confident enough now that with proper indexing of grammatical features, meanings of words etc., one could interpret the archaic texts oneself — and better than the commentators. They were seen as having been too heavily influenced by the changed mind set of their times and as having constantly reinterpreted the old texts on the basis of their medieval background. We know, of course, that this is a common danger: one cannot read the Old Testament part of the Bible, the Torah, through the eyes of medieval Christian interpreters, and we cannot read archaic Indian texts through those of medieval Brahmins. Of course, 19th c. scholars were, somewhat mistakenly, confident that they did not succumb to such influences of their *own* period.

It is, certainly, true that the medieval commentators were almost as distant from, e.g., the ancient Vedic texts as we are nowadays: in time, location, society, religion, climate and natural surroundings. The great commentator Sāyaṇa (d. 1387 A.D.) was a citizen of the last great Hindu empire of Vijayanagara of South India with a full blown caste system, Bhakti/Tantric Hindu religion, a tropical climate dominated by monsoon, and an economy based on rice agriculture, crafts, and trade. This is quite different from being a member of one of the small tribal, pastoral Vedic societies of the Panjab without or with only an incipient caste system, a pre-Hindu religion, a

cold winter, no real monsoon, without cities, and with an economy based on cattle herding. While the medieval commentaries can help us in understanding the ritual and some of the grammar and the general background of the texts, they cannot be relied on for the exact interpretation of individual words, the original meaning of the rituals, and of Vedic religion and myth in general.

1.6. During this period, the (later) 19th c., many of the Classical texts were regarded as having a number of accretions, whose layers and authors were discussed; in short, the principles of higher textual criticism were applied ruthlessly. I just remind of the heated discussion about the development of the great Epic of India, the Mahābhārata, or the Homeric question.

In the spirit of these times, humanity and its Classical texts were regarded as having developed from simple folk poetry (as supposedly found in the Vedas) to higher levels (especially: the Greek classics). Accordingly, the archaic texts, which frequently contain mythological accounts, were frequently explained by a correspondingly simple scheme of 'nature mythology', propounded especially by the Sanskritist Max Müler who saw it as the expression and "explanation" of meteorological and cosmological phenomena; he added the point of the "decay of language" which would have generated many names of deities that were no longer understood as epithets.[2] I cannot go into the details here, and would merely like to point out that we have seen a string of interpretations of mythology and the ancient texts since then.[3]

This was a period of strong "Eurocentrism", (visible also in America which still regarded itself, at the time, as an intellectual extension of Europe). However, it is only in the

1.7. 20th century, that we witness the emergence of various non-philological methods in the interpretation of texts, such as an increased use of the methods of anthropology, with the comparison of ethnographic materials (initiated by Frazer).[4]

All of these approaches may be seen part of the whole picture, as beautifully captured in the Indian 'elephant in a dark room' simile. They explain but aspects of the problem. Increasingly, we notice, that just as in a good poem, in a well-constructed myth, too, many aspects are interwoven into a complex picture with many fore- and backgrounds... Fortunately, we see, from the mid-20th c. onwards, an increasing use of multi-causal explanations and the exit of mono-causal explanations.. This is a welcome trend. The same should be followed in dealing with the Classics as well.

Philology now becomes more and more truly a study of a whole civilization based on its (Classical) texts. What do I mean by that? In order to explain, I will use particular examples, especially from my own field, that is Indian Studies/Indology, and Archaic India in particular.

§2. Recent developments (especially in Indology)

2.1.1. Critical editions and stemma.

It has long been accepted, in fact at least since Lachmann early in the 19th century that in order to study our Classical texts we need a firm basis, a text that is the same or comes as close to the text the author had in mind. This means to employ the methods of historical and textual criticism with a strict adherence to the principle of establishing a family tree of manuscripts (stemma), as summed up in this century, after more than a hundred years of trial and error, by P. Maas and M.L. West.[5]

There has been some criticism, it is true (M.L. West, [6] E. J. Kenney,[7] and already Wilamowitz-Moellendorf [8]) on the stemmatic method used to establish Classical texts, or on the so-called critical edition of the great Indian epic, the Mahābhārata which to a large degree is only an edition of *regional* variations. In fact, Indian texts have hardly seen *any* critical editions in the strict sense. What goes under this name usually are editions with a *selection* of variants. A stemma exists only for a handful of editions. And I wonder how far this principle has been applied, e.g..

---

2 In doing so he condemned Euhemerism, the age-old Greek fashion which makes gods into human beings.

3 (1) Frazer, *The Golden Bough*: the superstitions of mythology are finally to be superseded by science; basis of myth in sympathetic magic.

(2) Aetiologiocal myths: cause or explanation of something in the real world; the historical school: all myths reflect history; remodeling of myths, creation of a cycle of myth (Greece, cf. M.P.Nilsson, *The Mycenean origin of Greek Mythology*, 1932/72, p. 3 sqq.).

4 (3) Functionalism, with stress on charters as validation for customs, institutions, or beliefs (B. Malinowksi);

(4) Re-establishment of a creative era *in illo tempore*, reviving its creative power; e.g. Australian dreamtime (M. Eliade);

(5) Myth and Ritual school: myths are derived from rituals or at least associated with rituals;

(6) Psychology: Freud, Jung; Dumezil, Lévi-Strauss, Kerényi, Dundes. The ultimate reality of myth lies in psyche. For S. Freud, in dreams, myths are public dreams, finally to be supplanted by science; C. G. Jung: myths are revelations of collective unconsciousness never to be replaced by science; Campbell, similarly,: myths are not historical, but a human universal, a feature of psyche. —Structuralists (Lévi-Strauss): experience in binary set of opposites; the structural unity of the social machine is effected by the consistent structure of the mind. In his last book, last paragraph (*Histoire des lynx*) he even traces this binary system back to the two hemispheres of the brain... As such, I regard Lévi－Strauss as one of the last examples of mono-casual explanations.

(7) Historical-geographical method: motifs and tale-types with same motifs in same order; their distribution allows to trace their history (Stith-Thompson);

in Chinese studies. The early introduction of block prints in East Asia has, of course, influenced tradition in other ways than in Europe or India. However, recent archaeological discoveries, especially those of texts on bamboo strips, should have provided the opportunity, similar to the findings of ancient Papyri in Egypt for Greek texts, to check on some of the established traditions and editions of Classical Chinese texts.

2.1.2. Problem of contamination of stemma.

There is, of course, always the possibility of contamination of a stemma (M.L. West 1973). This has been recognized from the beginning. I am that pessimistic. From my experience in Indian texts, I may say that just as in Classical Greek texts, we often have just one late Classical or medieval archetype from which all surviving MSS derive. This is, taking into account the millions of MSS of India, certainly surprising, but is shows that during the middle ages, rare texts were sent for or copied, over long distances, from all over the subcontinent. In such cases, contamination can usually be determined easily. It is the great variety of MSS, in a dozen of greatly varying scripts and influenced by a similar diversity of local pronunciation, from the various nooks and corners of the subcontinent, that allows to trace the various strands of transmission (and their possible intermingling) at a much larger scale than possible in Classical Greek or Roman traditions. It is quite another matter that this has hardly been done in Indian textual studies and that not all means available have been used (especially notable is the general lack of the use of paleography and of a study of the influence of local pronunciation, see below 2.1.9).

2.1.3. New computer-based stemma.

Interestingly, just a few months ago, the biochemist Chr. Howe of Cambridge U., together with the MS scholar Peter Robinson of de Montford U., Leicester,[9] have tested Chaucer's Canterbury tales based on a (tree-like) computer program that has been used for DNA analysis. Howe thought that his program would provide better analysis than the traditional step by step human approach. However useful this approach might be, I find the results as summed up in a popular science magazine somewhat naive: "of 58 mss..., 11 ... have fewest variations but even they contain significant differences... [therefore] Chaucer's original text [of 850 lines of 'Wife of Bath's Prologue', a part of the Canterbury Tales] was probably not a finished product but a working draft... the 11 copies ... incorporate different versions of that rough draft... In the ... Prologue there are some 26 lines ... that occur in some MSS but not in others... Chaucer wrote these originally and then changed his mind and decided that he would delete them."
— Many other scenarios are possible. But all of this is already interpretation. It will be useful to investigate such computer aid further.

There are, it must be admitted, a few other hurdles in establishing a stemma.

2.1.4. Epic texts are one such well-known case to which I will return in some detail. As has been shown by Milman Parry and Albert Lord, Epic texts are in a constant process of recreation by bards and reciters (the Kirgiz Epic Manas is, at currently 200,000 verses, still in progress!) and they therefore are not apt to be reconstructed as an archetype. We may come closer, though, to a number of nuclei, even when not being in a position to establish their exact wording. And we may, as in the Mahābhārata, establish their *redacted* version (cf. above, on the recent Russian approach to texts, 'textology').

2.1.5. Importance of musical tradition in some transmissions

I also think of the medieval composition and transmission of Bhakti-type New Indo-Aryan texts (such as collected, for example, in the Sikh canon, the Ādi Granth). The poems, songs indeed, composed by a variety of medieval authors, have been transmitted, not only orally by bards and reciters but also in musical context. That means, poems were collected and transmitted according to the

---

5 P. Maas, *Textual Criticism*, Oxford 1968 (transl. from *Textkritik*, in: A. Gercke, E. Norden (eds.) *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Leipzig/Berlin: B.G. Treubner, 1922 (Bd. I, 3rd ed., 1927, 1949, 1957, part VII); M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin texts*. Stuttgart: Treubner 1973.

6 M. L. West, *Textual Criticism* esp. p. 35 sqq.

7 E J Kenney, *The Classical Text*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press 1974, p.148, n. 1, notes that only 0.1% of conjectures are actually correct. However, the method by which such emendations have been arrived at needs to be studied: mere guesses are not allowed, see below. — For earlier discomfort with the stemmatic method, in Romance, Germanic and Slavic studies, and for the stress on the "life" of a text during the Middle Ages, see: J.Bédier, La tradition manuscrite du Lai de l'ombre. Réflexions sur l'art d' éditer les anciens textes, *Romania* 54, 1928, 161–196, 321–356; J. Trier, E. Schroeder in: *Jahrbuch der Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Göttingen, 1942/3, p.125; D.S. Licha̱ev, Grundprinzipien textologischer Untersuchungen der altrussischen Literaturdenkmäler, in: G. Marten, H. Zeller (eds.), *Texte und Varianten*, München: C.H. Beck, 1971, 301–315 (cf. Licha̱ev, *Textologija na materiale drevnoj ruskoj literatury*, Moskwa-Leningrad 1962).

8 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Geschichte der Philologie*, Leipzig:Treubner 1927/1959, p.59.

9 *Discover. The world of Science*, Dec.'98, p.34. I must admit that I have seen only this summary.

melody they belong to, and they have undergone changes in that way, i.e. irrespective of their authors and collections made by individuals or by sects.[10]

Actually, this kind of situation is nothing new to a Vedic specialist. The hymns of the oldest musical texts of India, the Sāmaveda, were almost completely extracted from the oldest text, the Ṛgveda, set to music and transmitted in that form. Soon afterwards these 'songs' were assembled in a 'collection' (Saṃhitā), arranged according to the deities and meters used. These musical texts have undergone some modernization at that time as texts transmitted separately (as musical texts) and if we would not have the Ṛgveda in hand, we would not know about their *original* arrangement, and their *exact* wording (though much of it could be reconstructed by emendation).

I think, therefore, once the early New Indo-Aryan texts will have been edited properly in their entirety, indexed and analyzed grammatically, many of the difficulties envisioned by Callewaert will disappear. Probably, similar arguments can be made for part of the Classical Chinese tradition (*Shi Ching*), the poems in the Kiki, etc. Which brings us to other anonymous texts.

2.1.6. Study of anonymous texts: particles, computer use, meter, dialects.

Epic texts such as the Iliad, the Indian Mahābhārata, or sections of the Bible, are by their very nature anonymous, have received a secondary eponymous 'author', or at best, a bard-redactor such as Homer or the eponymous "Vedavyāsa." Especially in this kind of situation, we can take recourse, as has been done from time to time, to the study of independent parameters, such as those of meter, use of particles (by and large an involuntary, very much period-based phenomenon), dialects and other grammatical features. In the Indian context, such investigations have been carried out, e.g. by S. Mayeda, concentrating on particles, for the famous Indian Philosopher Śaṅkara (8th c.) not all of whose works turn out to have been written by him; or by M. Tokunaga, for the Indian epic and, by H. Nakatani for Buddhist texts, both employing, with the help of the computer, the tool of metrical analysis. I myself have tried to do the same for the anonymous Vedic texts, by first establishing place and time of their composition and then studying their dialect features. Which brings us to the role of regional texts or regional traditions.

2.1.7. Role of regional traditions.

They are visible already in the archaic Indian texts, the Vedas, which often have overlapping content and sometimes even largely overlapping wording but are restricted to certain areas of N. India. Again, an "original" text, for example for the *Ur*-Yajurveda, as envisaged by the early proponents of textual criticism, is nowhere in sight. The same is true, with greater clarity, in the case of the Indian epic. Even if we should be able to reconstruct the archetype of its *redaction* in Gupta time (c. 300-500 A.D.), the text has subsequently dispersed all over India and proliferated not just into a Northern and Southern version, but into several local ones as well. The central North-Indian one has become especially influential. We can, with good right, argue with the approach found in Russian 'textology' or of scholars like Madeleine Biardeau, that such regional versions have a right of existence of their own and need to be studied as separate texts which have influenced much of the N. Indian medieval tradition. Scholars who are only interested in the archetype or the oldest version would simply neglect such texts as corrupted. Obviously, both versions have to be studied. Many other cases (such as the recent edition of the Paippalāda Atharvaveda by D. Bhattacharya) could be added.

Closer to home, we may investigate an example such as archaic Japanese mythology as preserved in the Kiki. However, there also are regional variation of these myths in the various local Nara/Heian time gazetteers such as the Harima Fudoki. Obviously, they do not always agree with the official version propagated from the court of Yamato/Nara, even if this version includes much of another region, the Izumo tradition. It is a sad commentary on western scholarship that the Kiki has been translated only once into English during the past 100 years (Aston, Philippi) and that the Fudoki remained untranslated, except into Russian, until a few years ago.[11] Both lines of tradition need study and a possible(?) reconciliation in an older version. (A similar case are the poems of the Manyōshū[12] which shows clear regional features in some poems, those from Azuma.)

Still, it is obvious that all of these more detailed, further studies can be carried out only if we have authoritative

---

10 W. Callewaert, Translating Santa Literature (North India, 1400-1700 A.D.) in: E. Garzilli (ed.) *Translating, Translations, Translators: From India to the West*. Cambridge 1996 (Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora, 1), p. 1-10

11 *Records of wind and earth: a translation of Fudoki, with introduction and commentaries*, by Michiko Y. Aoki. Ann Arbor, 1997; — *The Harima Fudoki*, translated by Donald M. Richardson.Winchester, Virginia 1991.

12 *The Manyōshū; translated and annotated by* J. L. Pierson, Jr. Leyden : E. J. Brill, 1929ー; — *The Manyōshū; the Nippon Gakujutsu Shinkoki translation of One thousand poems, with the texts in Romaji. With a new foreword by Donald Keene*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1965; — *The Manyōshū: a new and complete translation* by H. H. Honda. Tokyo : Hokuseido Press, 1967; — Ian Hideo Levy, *The ten thousand leaves : a translation of the Manyōshū, Japan's premier anthology of classical* **<sic!>** *poetry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press,1981-.

texts in hand, preferably critical ones with stemma. Yet in many fields of the Classics, there is a dearth of such editions. I select the most glaring case, that of Indian texts.

2.1.8. Lack of critical editions.

With millions of Indian MSS in public and private libraries, only a fraction of the texts contained in them — nobody knows how many — have been actually published or used for editions. So far, we have only a handful of critically edited Sanskrit texts which are based on a stemma of the manuscripts used. Without a properly established text, however, it is not possible to tell what an important figure such as the philosopher Śaṅkara (8th c.) actually taught; in our uncritical editions single words and phrases as well as whole sections or even individual texts[13] may be wrong or spurious. Studies based on the present uncritical editions can, at best, only be provisional and is, at worst, plainly wrong since, for example, Śaṅkara may simply not have written the particular expression, sentence or commentary in question.

It is nothing short of a scandal that, after some 200 years of study, instead of preparing reliable texts[14] and translations, a lot of ink keeps being spilled in work with inadequate materials. This is the case with the recent re-translation of Manu,[15] where neither the readily available (semi-)critical edition of J. Jolly nor the oldest available commentary of Bhāravi have been used and where matters of *realia* (for example the system of weights) are treated with cavalier neglect. Even in Herodotos' India, a blade of straw did not weigh four gold pieces.[16] It is surprising to see one re-translation after the other (RV, JB, Manu, Gītā, Kālidāsa,[17] etc.) appear in quick succession, while more difficult first translations and editions of many important texts are rare and far in between.

2.1.9. Studies of MSS and local prints, paleography.

In this context, the increasing loss of MSS, after all the basis of most of our work, must be stressed. Something needs to be done. As far as India is concerned, UNESCO has executed a pioneer project already in the Sixties (films now at Toyo Bunko), and the Indira Gandhi Cultural Center at New Delhi has a project now to film whole libraries (apparently three large S. Indian ones have been completed but are not readily available for research); but all of this is just a drop in the ocean. Many public and private libraries are being eaten up by worms, rats, damaged by fire (in MSS are kept chimneys, in fear of insects), or are just neglected. I heard of a former Maharaja's library which was stored away on a verandah, in the monsoon rain, and I have myself seen the former document collection of the old royal Palace at Kathmandu...

The situation varies from place to place. In W. China (Hsinkiang) for example, increasing irrigation threatens those MSS which have survived in the Takla Makan sands for a thousand years or more... Some pilot project of exploration and preservation should be carried out there. These are some of our oldest Buddhist or Indian MSS, after all.

The same applies, mutatis mutandis to old block prints of China, Tibet, or Mongolia. Many of them may represent the only available copy of the text in question... This is of urgency especially in Tibet.

2.1.10. Written transmission and the influence of local pronunciation.

We should also discuss the nature of written transmission, the influence the changes in the scripts used over time, and the influence that local pronunciation had on the written transmission. Even the written transmission of Vedic texts is not equally good in all its schools; especially the texts with a narrow basis of transmission in just *one* region of India (such as Śaunaka and Paippalāda Atharvaveda, Maitrāyaṇi and Kaṭha Saṃhitā) are vulnerable to corruption. To take a Vedic example, such as the Paippalāda Atharvaveda, one of the texts geographically *limited*, it is necessary

– to ascertain exactly the geographical spread of the Vedic school in question and the MSS involved,

– to state the phonetic and scriptural peculiarities of the school in question, especially so with regard to local paleography (on an all-Indian scale),

– to try to ascertain a stemma of MSS and, as far is discernible, also the *archetype* of the tradition in question,

– furthermore, to evaluate secondary testimony (in grammatical, philosophical commentaries),

– to compare this result with the expected "normal Ve-

---

13 See, e.g., the study of S. Mayeda, On Śaṅkara's Authorship of the Kenopaniṣadbhāṣya. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10, 1967, 33–55, cf. *WZKS* 9, 1965, 155–197.

14 In the Vedic field we have only such works as Y. Ikari's *Vādhūla Śrautasūtra*, or M. Deshpande's *Śaunakīyā Prātiśākhyā* (Harvard Oriental Series, 53). All older editions, including the recent Poona effort (T.N. Dharmadhikari, R.S. Shastri, N.P. Jain, S.S. Bahulkar, *Vedic texts*: A Revision, Delhi 1990), are semi-critical, i.e. without stemma.

15 W. Doniger with B.K. Smith, *The Laws of Manu*. London, New York : Penguin Books 1991.

16 Thus, Doniger/Smith in *Manu* 8. 135, a strange misunderstanding of the St. Petersburg / M. Williams' Dictionary entry of *pala*, and confusion with *palāla*.

17 W. O'Flaherty, *The Rig Veda: An anthology*. Harmondsworth 1981; W. O'Flaherty, *Tales of sex and violence. Folklore, sacrifice, and danger in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*. Chicago 1985; W. Doniger with B.K. Smith, *The Laws of Manu*. London 1991; — for the flood of Gīta translations, see W.M. Callewaert and S. Hemraj, *Bhagavadgītānuvāda. A study in transcultural translation*. New Delhi 1983.

dic", which already in Vedic times has been regionally "colored". Only then, the question can be asked in how far the text transmitted in the MSS / in oral tradition corresponds to the archetype, to the *authentic* form of a *redacted* text, or even to the *original* state that the text had at the time of composition.

This discussion has implications for several areas of Indian philology: First of all, it shows that we could make a much more progress in the tracing the history of a particular text if we only had:
(a) *proper* editions, preferably with *stemma*, or at least all the variants of the MSS available to an editor;
(b) a paleography of the various post-Gupta 'Siddhamātrikā,' early Nāgarī, and the regional S. Indian scripts (preferably until ca.1600 AD). The problem is, of course, that we have — quite differently from the situation in Roman, Greek or Biblical Studies — only a limited amount of manuscript material from the late 1st and the early 2nd millennium A.D., i.e. except for Hsinkiang (usually Buddhist texts), and except for some old MSS from Nepal, Benares and surroundings (all preserved, but hardly used, only in Nepal and in Tibet), and a few from Gujarat (Jaina texts). For additional evidence, one has to take into account the inscriptions-which usually are much more conservative in the form of the letters they use than the MSS.
(c) more knowledge about local habits of pronunciation, preferably collected from Vedic and other recitation as well as from the evidence in medieval inscriptions. Local pronunciation frequently is the cause of writing mistakes. Ultimately, we need a *historical atlas of the 'phonetic' and scriptural mistakes* which will allow to trace the history of transmission of a particular text.

It is my suspicion that most of our well-known "Classical" Indian texts go back to manuscript archetypes of ca. 1000 A.D. only, i.e. to MSS written after the emergence of the various (sub)regional scripts at ca. 1000 AD: the earlier (post-)Gupta MSS must have been rewritten sooner or later after c. 1000 A.D. in the new type(s) of script;[18] cf. for example a Manu-Smrti MS from Benares, written under Jayacandradeva in 1181 A.D. (Kesar Library, Kathmandu), which already follows the Vulgate version (and not Bhāravi's text).

The situation may vary slightly for texts which rest on a purely local tradition only, as for example many of the Kashmirian texts: there, the slow changes in the development of the Śāradā script do not create the same amount of mistakes nor the same degree of corruption as found in the "mainstream" Nāgarī traditions in which a large number of mistakes, if not the majority of the corruptions, occurred during the transcribing process from post-Gupta scripts to Nāgarī at c. 1000-1200 AD. - In such cases, it depends very much on the degree and speed of change the script in question shows when compared to its Gupta time parent (and in the case of ancient texts, the change from Brahmī to Gupta script). Investigations into this process are necessary and would not only provide useful tools for the philologist but, indirectly, also better editions. (I have proposed this already in 1986 but the suggestion has not been taken up. It is only the few Buddhist scholars working on old Central Asian, Gilgit and Nepalese MSS that have a sense of the problems of paleography that are involved in such studies).

A separate investigation should target in how far the influence of (particular recensions of) well-known texts which the scribes had learnt by heart was apt to change the written transmission. This applies, of course, only to a few school books and religious texts.

Returning to the actual texts, provided an archetype or, if not, the best text we can establish among one or more redacted versions (Greek Classics from Alexandria, the Mahābhārata, etc.) is available, we have to determine in which way we want to study them. First of all, we have to determine what kind of text we deal with.

2.2. Types of texts

In the Indian context, for example, we have to pay attention to the fact that many texts became available in codified form only after they had undergone a period of adjustment and redaction — all too frequently — of Brahmanization. The archaic texts, the Vedas, were, by and large, orally composed *by Brahmins for Brahmins.* Thus, the normative role of the Brahmins (and, mutatis mutandis also of Buddhist monks) in the selection, redaction, etc. needs to be highlighted. (More about the political aspects of this process, below).

The same applies, *mutatis mutandis,* to Epic, Buddhist and Jaina texts. The exact process of compilation and redaction and of canonization remains a largely untreated issue in Indian Studies. All early Indian texts were orally composed, in verse or in prose,[19] and bear all the hallmark of oral composition. A few remarks on Vedic oral composition and early oral literature are in place here. (They may be amplified by the oral tradition in other fields such as the Greek epic, old Iranian texts, the Kojiki, the Bible)

---

18 M. Witzel, paper at the 1983 Tübingen Oriental Conference, in: Supplement-Band, *ZDMG* 1985, p. 256 sqq.

19 Unlike the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*, which were created by bard-like craftsmen schooled in traditional Indo-Iranian poetics, the exegetical *Brāhmaṇa* prose texts were composed by priests who were specialists in the complicated Vedic ritual.

2.3. The role of oral tradition.

Vedic texts are, in the first instance, oral texts. It is well known that the Vedas have been both composed[20] and carefully transmitted orally; they were first written down, with one or two exceptions, only in this millennium. The hymns of the *Ṛgveda,* which were created by bard-like craftsmen schooled in traditional Indo-Iranian poetics, the exegetical *Brāhmaṇa* prose texts were composed by priests who were specialists in the complicated Vedic ritual.

This is a well known topic and it therefore may suffice to point out that these texts were handed down from teacher to students as virtual "tape recordings" of the first millennium B.C. without the change of a word, of a syllable, or even an accent. If one did so, one would have faced the horrifying mythical fate of Viśvarùpa whose head was cut off by the god Indra as he had mispronounced a single accent, thereby grammatically turning Indra into his enemy.

It is surprising, even scandalous, that the important oral transmission of the Vedas has so far only been studied in a rather fragmentary way[21] and, worse, that it has been used only for 3 old editions. It is well known that Vedic recitation is usually better than all MSS taken together. Complete tape recordings stored away for decades in S. India have not been accessible to scholars.

The history of the Epics is similar; its redaction must have taken place only in the Gupta period (c. 300-500 AD). As M. Parry and A. Lord have shown, Epic creation and transmission was never as strict as that of the Vedas and has remained fluid, in the case of the Mahābhārata both before and even after its redaction in mid-1st millennium.

I will take the Vedic text as an example here. Many features of the texts still point to their oral composition, for example, the use of deictic pronouns. When the texts say "do it in *that* way...", we simply do not know what *that way* means. The older Indian *Brāhmaṇa* style texts were composed in simple paratactic phrases, and only gradually the language became hypotactic with longer and involved phrases. Typical for them and the oral compositions of this period is the repetitive style, the *Zwangsläufigkeit,* which closely resembles that of the ensuing early Buddhist texts. The subject matter is discussed by adducing several examples that are formulated in virtually the same way, using the same words, phrases, and order of argumentation.[22] Thus, the next sentence or group of sentences are largely predictable. This also serves as a mnemotechnical device that allows for remembering, teaching and learning by heart of long prose passages more easily. — Interestingly, the early Buddhist texts (whether in Pali or other languages) largely agree with this in structure. This is a feature that should be studied in cooperation with scholars of, among others, Tibetan and Chinese Buddhist texts. A good synoptic edition of its many versions (Gāndharī, Tokharian, etc.), of the *older* canon would be highly appreciated. Needless to say, the huge amount of Vedic texts (some 50 MB?) and of the Buddhist texts (80 MB in Pāli) provide perfect material to study oral composition in general. In addition, the 15 MB of the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa provide insight into Bardic verse composition. They have, single-handedly, been entered into the computer by M. Tokunaga. (In the US we only talked about it, actually held a conference in Texas in 1988 — but without tangible results...)

Another mnemo-technical device in the Vedic is the constant use of pratīkas, the short heading-like introductory phrases of a prose section or of a *mantra* which immediately evoke the complete passage.

Surprisingly, even internal references are met with on occasion (for example *ŚB* 4.1.5.15 → *ŚB* 14.1.1), a referral to a text that now is found a few hundred pages apart from the first one in our printed editions.

We can even determine that *Brāhmaṇa* texts were composed on the offering ground itself.[23] The teacher apparently carried out a dry run of the ritual for his students.

The Buddhist texts, after a period of oral transmission similar to the Vedic one, and after undergoing several redactions in the Buddhist Councils from the death of the Buddha until Asoka (c. 250 BC), were apparently first written down in Sri Lanka at c. 50 BC. As mentioned before, the early Buddhist texts (whether in Pāli or other

---

20 This large mass of texts, rather surprisingly, was composed and compiled without recourse to any artificial means of structuring and ordering except for the underlying structure of the rituals well-known to the priests. - One did not follow, as for example in Polynesia, external categories, e.g. the structure of a fish on whose bones various types of knowledge, stories, etc. are mentally arranged; this is similar to the device used in Classical antiquity, for example a palace in whose rooms various types of knowledge were "stored."

21 J.F. Staal, *Nambudiri Veda Recitation*. 's Gravenhage 1961, W. Howard, *Samavedic Chant.* New Haven 1977, W. Howard, *Veda Recitation in Varanasi*, Delhi 1986, M. Witzel, Die mündliche Tradition der Paippalādins von Orissa (Paipp. and Orissa traditions), MSS 44, 1985, 259−287.

22 Nevertheless, the order of the ritual is not always strictly followed in the texts. Rather, various myths (*itihāsa*), deliberations (*arthavāda*), incidental allusions to the actions carried out in the rite (*vidhi*), as the later *Mīmāṃsā* texts classify these items. Note, however, that the *"vidhi"* elements in the *Brāhmaṇa*−s do not *prescribe* ritual action, they merely refer or allude to them to indicate the topic of discussion.

23 Some references mentioning the three sacred fires, which are arranged on the offering ground in a slightly irregular triangular fashion, indicate that the speaker (i. e. the teacher) stood between the the western and southern fires when explaining the ritual to his young Brahmin students.

languages) largely agree with the Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣadic texts in literary structure.

I may point out that the feature of oral tradition is extremely important in the tradition of the Greek Epics, the Psalms or the Christian part of the Bible, early Chinese poetry or Japanese mythology as well; in fact, the preface to the Kojiki refers to the tradition kept by *Katari-be.*

Apart from such considerations, we have to follow a number of prerequisites before we can begin to understand such texts.

2.4. Prerequisites for an understanding of Classical texts.

A text such as the oldest Indian one, the Ṛgveda, cannot be understood if one does not know something about cattle, the historical climate of the Panjab, pre-state tribal societies and their social systems, about the complex system of Indo-European and Indo-Iranian poetics, about oral composition, canon formation and the techniques of critically editing Sanskrit texts; and it cannot be understood at all without a good acquaintance with our old hand-maiden, grammar, — in the present case, that of archaic Sanskrit grammar as clearly distinct from, and preceding Classical Sanskrit grammar (as codified by Pāṇini).

We have to take into account a number of factors: the nature and grammar of the Vedic language in its various stages; the setting of the text: its time, place, as well as the contemporary society, natural surroundings and climate; the style of the text: typical Vedic verse or the *Brāhmaṇa/ Āraṇyaka* prose with its many repetitions, the *Zwangsläufigkeit* ('inevitability') of its way of expression; the parallel texts, and also the medieval exegesis (traditional commentators and their setting); the problems concerning the translation of certain Vedic words (see below); and finally, the difficulties in making the train of Vedic thought understandable and readable to our contemporary audience.

If we follow these rather straightforward rules and use all the tools in hand, we can achieve, in archaic Indian Studies (Vedic) and probably also in Buddhist studies, a certainty, I believe, that approaches that of the natural sciences. In fact, we can proceed in a similar fashion, by trial and error, and by proposing a theory and then actually testing it. Only when the word, concept, or custom under study is attested just once *(hapax)* or if it is attested too **infrequently** to allow a proper investigation of the whole range of meanings, we must remain content with a merely **probable** answer, or a **mere guess**. In all other cases, of course only after painstaking study, we can conclude that, **yes** the theory was right, or **no** it was not.

All of these are prerequisites for study of a text and, indeed, for a good translation — one of the aims of this project.

§3. Translations.

3.1. Original intent.

The most intriguing and difficult part of this undertaking is to translate according to the **original intent** of the composers of the text. One has to enter the **mind** *of the period and the text in question* in order to be able to achieve this aim. There are, however, several stages of work that usually precede this most difficult part of the translation process. Prof. Nakatani has given, in his summary of the project, the example of the original intent of Buddhist terms that have to be understood in Indian context and not in that of later Chinese or Japanese Buddhism. Sometimes such terms and cultural data are quite easy to establish.

For example, in the Buddhist texts we find a story which might seem humorous to us, but which is not so in context. This is in a situation in which the monks have noticed 31 of the 32 marks on the body of the Buddha that a Cakravartin (a world conqueror) should have. They come and ask him about the 32nd, the long tongue. The Buddha just smiled, stuck out his tongue and touched with it his right and his left ear. — We laugh, and so did a Thai abbot to whom I mentioned the story. However, he immediately remarked, like a good philologist, that we have to determine what was meant by this *at the time* of the Buddha.

The same applies to difficult terms such as dharma, and not their translations as accepted and transformed by Chinese terminology; the same applies, of course, to Judaeo-Christian and Muslim thought, etc., for example the Biblical term "son of man" Mt 8.20 (Jesus speaking about himself) etc. (Lk 21.27 etc., etc.), — this certainly was not intended to mean Christ but stems from Daniel 7.13 ("in the clouds of heaven, he came, like a son of man, before the Old one" — which, to me, looks rather Zoroastrian: Ahura Mazdā and the savior, *Saošyant*).

3.2. Meanings.

The same applies to the whole *range of meanings* of a given word, or, in more technical terms, the *aggregates of noemes*[24] that are associated, e.g., in the Indian mind with each Sanskrit word.[25] They have to be *actively* known by

24 See K. Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1967.

25 Or the words of other Sanskrit, foreign, or, for that matter, even older English texts such as those of Shakespeare.

the translator. Only then can we *begin* to understand what certain statements in the text meant to their authors and listeners. Luckily, *Brāhmaṇa or Buddhist* prose is explicit enough to provide us with an inkling of the possible range of mental connections made for each word, although we may be surprised time and again about the enormous range, the seemingly strange links, and the unusual shades of meanings that are employed by the authors.

3.3. "Ambiguous" Words.

A much more difficult problem is that of "ambiguous" words such as *ṛta* or *dharm*a which are very difficult to translate. In fact, *ṛta* is variously translated as 'cosmic law, rule, order, human law, order, customs', etc. There simply is no English, French, German, or Japanese word (maybe *ri* in *giri*) that covers the range of meanings of this word. The case is not isolated; it is a well known problem in translating from other languages. For example French *liberté* or German *Freiheit,* Japanese *jiyū* correspond to both English 'freedom' **and** 'liberty'. Each time we want to translate, for example, the German, or French or Japanese word, we have to choose the proper English equivalent, just as we have to do with *ṛta,* where we could simply choose from among the translations mentioned above. However, in this case a reader will never know what is found in the Sanskrit original, and we would have to explain each time (e.g. in a footnote) that *ṛta* is intended.

Another solution to this problem is to translate words such as *ṛta* by **just one** German or English word, thus *'Wahrheit'* /'truth'. However, neither the German nor the English word covers the *whole* range of meanings of the Vedic word *ṛta.* If we translate *ṛta* by "Wahrheit / truth / Truth" we would have to relearn our own language for the sake of reading ancient Indian texts, — just as Heidegger imposes on us through his idiosyncratic use of German when we read his philosophy. Actually, it seems that no western language has a word more or less corresponding to *ṛta.* As far as I see, it is only the old Egyptian *ma'at,* and perhaps Sumerian *me* and Jpn. *ri* 'law, truth,' (as in *gi-ri* 'justice, sense of duty', gi 'justice, honor', from Chin. *li* 'law, etc.') that convey a similar concept.

What then, does *ṛta* mean? We can approach the problem from its antonym: *druh.* This is easily translatable into English as 'deceiving, cheating' or better into German with the etymologically related words *'Trug, Betrug'* (cf. Engl. 'be-tray'). Deceiving means to say the untruth *(anṛta)* and to actively carry it out *(druh).* The other side of the coin is speaking the truth *(satya)* and acting according to it *(ṛta). Ṛta* thus is a force opposite to ***deception,*** it is the ***force of active truth*** *(Wahrheitsverwirklichung).* Only *because* of *ṛta* does the sun move in the sky and does not fall down, do the rivers flow in their beds, does human society function, do people speak the truth and carry out their obligations and alliances *(mitra),* do sons offer for their departed fathers and ancestors. Without *ṛta* we enter into the state of *Nir-ṛti,*[26] of absolute destruction with no light, no food, no drink, no children, — a sort of Vedic hell to which only those miscreants are sent who have violated the basic order of Vedic society.

But, how to translate *ṛta* then? We cannot put 'active truth' *(Wahrheitsverwiklichung)* into our translation each time; this would at least be cumbersome. And, our readers still would not understand what is intended in the Sanskrit text. Another possibility would be to leave the word untranslated. For the general reader this would mean that important portions of the text remain equally unclear and this cannot be the aim of our work. The best solution to me seems to translate *ṛta* idiomatically but to add the Sanskrit word in parentheses each time, as to allow the reader to gradually understand the concept of *ṛta* with the **whole range** of meanings it implies.

3.4. Style of translation.

Another problem is that of the style of our translation. It still is a fashion among scholars in Indian Studies to resort to Shakespearean English (or, sometimes Classical Japanese) when translating religious texts from India or other areas. But should we really do so? Why should we write, referring to the earth, "so large *thou wert* in the beginning" and not simply "so large *you were* in the beginning"? It is, of course, quite another matter when we deal with two widely distant levels of speech. We may then try to imitate the distinction, though that may be difficult in specific cases.

Yet, we still face quite a host of problems if we want to translate the texts in understandable, contemporary fashion and, for example, not in the (often Victorian) *jargon* Indologists ("*pray,* give me a *boon*!", "the sage, having committed this sin, carried out *penance*", "the king *sported* with his ladies in the pond of his park", etc.).

On the other hand, I do not think that we must, as many American scholars do, always find a "hip" translation, which is also very frequent in what some of us facetiously call "Buddhist Hybrid English" with terms such as *"Thusness"* ; nor do we need, each time, 'hip' translations of, e. g., *saṃjagāma* by "(s)he had sex." We simply can translate "(s)he has come together" — just as the Sanskrit says etymologically — and only where we actually need to be explicit, we could add "(s)he made love to..." as to ex-

26 See L. Renou, Vedic *nirṛti*,. In: *L'Inde fondamentale*, Paris: Hermann 1978, pp. 127-132.

plain the double meaning in the original.

3.5. Commentarial tradition.

As mentioned above, the medieval commentaries can help us in our translation effort and in an understanding of the ritual and some of the grammar, syntax, and the general background of the texts, — their authors, belonged, after all, to the same long-standing tradition — we just have to keep in mid that they were, just as we are today, divided from the time they discuss by a gulf some several hundred or sometimes several thousand years. *The past is an alien country.* To really understand the baroque or the Shakespearean period takes a lot of study; we cannot approach it with our present speech, state of mind or knowledge. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* are, today, *adventurous middle-aged women.*

3.6. The role of translations of Classical texts.

While such items are technical, the issue of translations of the Classics into other languages has played a very important role and needs to be studied at length. In the west, we have long investigated the role of the Greek translation of the OT, and the Latin Vulgate of the NT both of which have played important roles for Judaism and Western Christianity respectively. The King James translation of the Bible into English (generating such popular beliefs as *'if English was good enough for the Good Lord...'*) or Homer's Iliad into German by Voss is other typical cases. This translation has inspired people for more than a century, most important among them, perhaps, H. Schliemann who based his dream of finding the city of Troy on his early reading of Voss's translation.

What we need to do in this project is to study, obviously, the various translations of Buddhist texts which have influenced people in the greater part of Asia, from Uzbekistan to Japan and from Mongolia to Bali. (A large number of languages is involved here: Pāli, local Prākṛts, Gāndhārī, Sogdian, Tocharian, Uighur, Tibetan, Chinese, etc.) Not to forget the adaptation by reading the Chinese version in the local language, as in the Japanese *Kambun* style.

We also have to study these versions in the way the have been adapted to the local mind sets. Thus, as H. Nakatani already has pointed out in his project summary, a Chinese translation term may not cover the original Pāli or Sanskrit term well. To investigate such features in depth, a synoptic edition, as mentioned before, would be useful. It would allow immediate study of parallel versions and (incongruent) translations. This could easily be done now with the help of the largely computerized Buddhist texts.

§4. Inside the texts.

4.1. Inside the Indian (Vedic) Mind

With the discussion of *ṛta, dharma, li (ri)* and similar problematic words we have already entered one of the more important and difficult chapters of translating Classical texts. The real task, however, is how to enter the Vedic or Indian mind, or that of the other texts studied.

In the case of the Veda, this task includes to get a clear idea of ritual, which is the *mesocosm* that links and affects the macrocosm of the universe and the gods with the microcosm of the humans and their immediate surroundings.[27] This link is established through identifications or homologies which can cover a single aspect of the two or three entities involved, or they can cover a larger number of such links. (Even the number of syllables of the Sanskrit word signifying both entities is sufficient). To discover them is the aim of much of the discussion in the ancient Indian *Brāhmaṇa* style texts. The outcome can be such as: "The cow is the earth."

With some effort,[28] thus, we can see that the logic of such texts, even of the often maligned Brāhmaṇa texts, is understandable, and more or less Aristotelian, if we accept that the ultimate premise of the texts is wrong, namely **similarity means complete identity**, and not just 'partial identity', at least in the sphere of the ritual,[29] which, incidentally, is also the one underlying all magical procedures.

Apart from this, we have to study ritual and mythological background, which for want of space, I will not discuss further here. The myths are often interwoven with the text and we need to pay attention to them in interpreting text. Furthermore, it goes without saying that we have to know a large amount of the realia of the period, whether it is items of cattle herding, local climate, tribal society, or ancient customs and beliefs.

4.2. World view (*weltanschauung*)

But how to accumulate an *encyclopedic* knowledge of e.

27 M. Granet uses the same terminology for early Chinese religion and philosophy.

28 Leaving aside the surprise of previous generations of scholars who regarded these texts as the "twaddling of idiots"; for a characterization see Witzel, *On Magical Thought in the Veda*, Leiden: Universitaire Pers, 1979, p. 1.

29 See author, *On Magical Thought*; note that many of the "identifications" are similes or rather metaphors that cover, in the ritual framework *only*, anything from partial to complete 'identity' of two entities. They are based, to use a *Pāṇinean* term, on *ādeśa* 'substitution' of one item by another in the related spheres of macro-, meso-, and microcosm that the *Upaniṣads* refer to by the terms *adhidevata, adhiyajña, adhipuruṣa*.

g. archaic Indian thought and its surrounding *realia*? Certainly by a lot of (slow) reading. Even then, many connections and shades of meanings will escape us. Instead, we have to painstakingly follow the well known rules of philology by studying the meaning, or rather, the whole range of meanings and the usage of the particular word or concept in question. In the Vedic field we have nearly complete indexes and in the Buddhist field by now several electronic versions of the Southern Buddhist Canon (and soon, of the Chinese version). The same has applied, for a long time, to Biblical studies. Whoever does not use these aids can simply no longer claim to have done thorough work, but only to have carried out work of an impressionistic nature. It is always educative to note how little such indices are quoted.

In this fashion, and due to the large number of texts available to us, we have a real possibility to actually "interview" our ancient Vedic, Buddhist or Biblical "informants" of two or three millennia ago and to enter their mind (almost) as well as any contemporary anthropologist can do. In the same fashion, we will have to investigate and then compare the ethos and the "innate logic" of other civilizations (see below, on self-education/*Bildung*).[30]

4.3. Traditional scholarship.

By way of addition, I may underscore the need for the preservation of traditional, local scholarship. Traditionally texts, for example in India, have been studied while mainly relying on memorization of the main treatises in a field (e.g. logic) and of their commentaries and subcommentaries. A Pandit therefore is a walking treasure house, often something like a computer, of his texts and of their traditional interpretation.

This is, after a living oral tradition of scholarship of some 3000 years, under serious threat now in India, where traditional scholarship of Pandits is dying out and is replaced by a watered-down version of 'western' scholarship (as my Indian friends complain).[31]

The case is different, maybe, in other regions of the world (the more or less interrupted traditions of Rome, Greece, Egypt/Mesopotamia), but maybe not so different from those of from Islamic, or Confucian traditions. The orally preserved and the written commentaries of the Classical and premodern periods have their own value, as described above and need to be preserved for the future.

§5. Classical (foundational) texts, their reception and study

Turning now from traditional texts and tradition and recent interpretation to the present, we have to note some contemporary trends in scholarship such as the 'post-modern', 'anti-orientalist' ones. I will not really enter into these discussions here as they represent nothing but contemporary fashions which will be outdated early on in the next century. It should be realized that just as other fashions mentioned in the beginning, they contain a grain of truth, for example the, in part, political nature of many texts, but to view - let us say- a love poem by a David or by a Classical writer, or a piece of mystic literature by a Muslim, Christian or Hindu poet as politically motivated is nothing but sheer nonsense.

5.1.1. Focus.

Instead, what kind of approach should this project focus on? I feel, one of the advances made in our times is, finally, the loss of the mono-causal attitude of explanation and greater cooperation between fields of study.

By the loss of mono-causal attitudes I mean that a given text can no longer be explained by focusing on a single feature of interpretation, be it a strictly biographical, historical, religious, mythological, psychological, economical, materialistic, or as is nowadays fashionable, an exclusively political one. Usually, several of such factors intertwine and have to be used in any understanding of a particular text. Mircea Eliade was one of the first, I believe, who stressed a non-monocausal attitude in the interpretation of myths. A good myth can be read, like a good poem, on *several* different levels, some not even obvious to their authors. (Obviously, this is not yet seen in Lévy-Strauss, G. Dumezil or Paul Ricoeur, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault. But we are on the right path).

By greater cooperation I mean the increasing mutual

30 **Proof:** If it sounds unbelievable that we can actually enter the archaic Indian mind and argue from the inside, following the thought pattern of the Vedic authors, I invite the reader to try the beginning of my *Kaṭha Āraṇyaka*. As the facsimile shows, this is rather fragmentary birch bark MS. In order to restore and to translate the text, I had to study similar phrases or the occurrences of a few key words retained in the fragment. The restoration was supported by the *Zwangsläufigkeit* of *Brāhmaṇa* style: the initial, half peeled off sentence is more or less repeated by a later one. It contained another clue, the frequently met with concepts of "thought-speech-action" (*manas-vāc-karman*), is a collocation that is found not only in the Veda but also in the closely related Old Iranian texts (*manah-vacas-śiiaoϑna*, Yasna 34.1-2). Therefore, I was completely sure that I had restored the text correctly. When I finally checked the original MS again (I had to work from a microfilm), I found that a portion of my initial *lacuna* was covered by a small, dislodged piece of birchbark that had overlapped with my text. Lifting the dislodged fragment, I found the exact text I had restored: If we can write Vedic texts that well, we can *also translate and understand* them.

31 In addition, many are inspired now by an uncritical nationalism which tends to glorify their own past, something understandable after some 200 years of colonialism and another 500 of Islamic rule, but certainly not a scholarly attitude.

cross-fertilization by fields such as DNA analysis & stemma (mentioned above), archaeology, linguistics & the testimony of texts (as we do, e.g., at Harvard for early India), genetics & language super-families, language & pre-history, computer use & meters, pinpointing dialect features & computers, etc.

5.1.2. Exchange of research results.

Such advances are often local in nature and are not noted elsewhere or in other fields of the Classics. For example, I am not well-versed at all in the present state of thinking about the transmission of Classical Chinese texts, the role of oral tradition it (M. Granet, B. Karlgren, G. Pulleyblank) and the role of redaction of texts and early block printing. Possibly Sinology can teach us in Indian Studies much about the political undercurrents that existed at the time of redaction as Chinese history is so much better recorded than the Indian one. But we have to find a *forum* to exchange such results. In the US, such exchange, if existent at all, is limited to the very modern period. In this project, there is a need to set up conferences, or better, small scale meetings to discuss such items in depth.

Next to exchange of results between the Classics, each individual area, be it Rome or India, is in

5.1.3. Further need of a more comprehensive study of texts, involving archaeology, philosophy, anthropology and other *Hilfswissenschaften.* In other words, what we really need in many of the fields of the Classics is a closer cooperation between textual study and the rest of cultural studies and of the (local) natural sciences, everything from archaeology to zoology.

Such cooperation has been lacking especially in the study of early India, with disastrous results anything from the 'vigorous Aryans' subjugating the 'dark local Dravidians', and destroying the Indus civilization in the process, to the present absolute denial of any Aryan immigration and the verdict by an American archaeologist, J. Shaffer echoing Lord Renfrew, about the 'tyranny of linguistics'. Therefore, I have worked and taught together with a local archaeologist who is still digging up Indus civilization sites at Harappa, R. Meadow, to reach a better understanding of earliest India.

I dare say that European classics would also benefit from a still closer collaboration between, e.g., anthropologists and classicists (as constantly done by Greg. Nagy), especially in the fields of customs, beliefs, myths, rituals, a topic to which I will return later.[32]

5.2. Classical texts and their reception.

In the sequel, I propose to look briefly at four important periods of Classical texts and their reception, from their respective archaic periods to modern times. I begin with

5.2.1. "Foundational texts"

By these texts I mean such archaic texts as the Homer's Epics, the Bible, the Zoroastrian texts in Avestan, the Vedas, the Chinese shell inscriptions, the Shi Ching or Confucius's Analects, the Kojiki, the Nihon Shoki and the Manyōshū, etc. As soon as we study such archaic texts, a lot of input from other branches of scholarship is necessary. We need a link between archaeology and texts, for example between the Indus civilization and the Vedas, between the Jōmon/Yayoi periods and the Kiki. I would like to underscore that it is time now, fifty years after the war, to take a closer look, in Japan, at these foundational texts, from a *neutral,* if possible an *outside* point of view (see below). For, as I will try to indicate below, they are of extreme importance even for an understanding of modern Japan. Here, however, I will concentrate on India.

5.2.2. The case of India

Good summaries and insightful overviews of the early texts by competent scholars, are, though rare, not lacking altogether. For India, at the beginning of the century, H. Oldenberg was eminent in this kind of endeavor. Such work is, again, in a class quite different from that of current, fashionable summaries by scholars of the study of religion, for example on the so-called Vedic "identifications",[33] which show little or no progress beyond what H. Oldenberg and Stanislaw Schayer have written in the first two decades of the century. A comprehensive — and philological — study of the concept of the "dentifications" in the Vedic prose texts still is outstanding.[34] In addition, one would like to see a detailed account of post-Ṛgvedic religion as exemplified in the Yajurveda Mantras and the Atharvaveda, and of the Upaniṣadic period, not to speak of a comprehensive restatement and interpretation of (Ṛg -)Vedic mythology.

F.B.J. Kuiper has shown how we should approach this through a clearly synchronic (followed by a diachronic)

32 Summaries of individual cultures are rare. In the case of India, more than a hundred years after H. Zimmer, a new and updated description of Ṛgvedic culture would also be welcome. The Brāhmaṇa period has been treated at length in the comprehensive but fairly little known study of W. Rau of state and society. A correlation of Vedic texts and archaeology, again pioneered by W. Rau, is now well under progress. Such summaries in handbook style will a [ppear in the new *Grundriss, Indian Philology and South Asian Studies* (IPSAS, Berlin-New York 1995-).

33 Such as that of B.K. Smith, *Reflections on resemblance, ritual, and religion*. New York-Oxford 1989.

34 For a summary and discussion, see A. Wezler, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20, 1996, 485-522.

study of the *system* of Vedic mythology. The discussions at the beginning of this century have left the impression of an extreme fragmentation in myth. However, much of what seems to be isolated features is part of a larger, well ordered system, or it can even be understood so if we leave the narrow confines of Vedic and Indian mythology and systematically compare Indo-European[35] and Eurasian parallels,[36] an item to which I will return below.

The detailed study of the myths of such foundational periods is important, I feel, as they often set the *trend* of a particular culture or cultural region. As an example, I will treat some *persistent structures* of South Asian mind and social organization. For, many of the structures of modern South Asian society and religion are already present in the Vedic period of c. 1500-500 BC. Also, many individual features of ritual, customs and beliefs have continued from the Vedic period into modern Hinduism; nevertheless, such correspondences are not recognized very easily.

One such group is clustered around death and its rituals. The ancient death rites are among the most important ones carried out even today. The departed person is believed to go to heaven (or to the pleasant world of the ancestors). Surprisingly, rebirth is frequently not stressed at all in modern S. Asia, and a more or less long sojourn in (Viṣṇu's) Heaven is supposed to occur: the general term for a departed person is *divaṃgata* 'gone to heaven'. The old Vedic idea of a stay in heaven has been integrated into the medieval and modern view of constant reincarnation, and it nowadays forms but one step in this process.

The departed have to be fed by *śrāddha* rituals. This is part of one of the well-known three 'debts' (*ṛṇa,* Taittirīra Saṃhitā 6.3.5.10, Manu 6.35), a very important feature in Hindu society to this very day. It can only be done by having sons who carry out these rites. This wish (by now thoroughly internalized and usually not present rationally) is the reason that so many female babies are aborted today. The last few sentences certainly will sound very much like what we find in Chinese civilization as well.

Even more fundamental is the role of mesocosm between the world of the gods and the humans, and the cycle of exchanges between the gods/humans/other beings that keeps the relations between these realms intact. These exchanges occur between the three levels of the universe: the Microcosm of humans, the Macrocosm of gods/forces of the universe between and the mediating realm (Mesocosm) of ritual *(yajña/pūjā)* and festivals, all supervised and manipulated by priests, the Brahmins, in the interest of their clients (and, not to forget, in their own interest!) This type of universe is visible all over modern South Asia.

The mesocosmic function of ritual is, first of all and most importantly, a cosmic exchange of food: the humans offer food substances to the goods, these partake of it and they gives the remnants *(ucchiṣṭa)* back to the humans in the form of food leftovers, and nowadays also as fruits, flowers called *prasāda* 'grace'. The universal 'currency' is food which has to be constantly recycled in ritual as to keep the universe in motion and functioning well according to the rules of the universal 'law' of *Ṛta* or *Dharma.*

Ritual takes the form of guest worship, governed by a set of rules based on mutual acceptance and trust (*śraddhā,* = Latin *crēdō*). The word for ancestor worship, *śrāddha,* is a derivative of the term. Hospitality was crucial for the self-image of the Vedic Indians and they wanted to treat their gods in the same fashion, just as it is nowadays, in the guest worship of gods and of human guests.

However, gift and counter-gift are difficult to measure and evaluate. Humans give, the gods give back, to a degree, and humans have to give again. The same stone age mentality regulates the relationships between husband and wife, patron *(jajmān)* and client, employer and employee, King and subjects, between the government and the people. There is no concept of 'thankfulness', just *obligation* or *duty (ṛṇa).*

One can see that the cross-temporal study of the underlying features, the ethos of Indian civilization explains much of what is going on today, whether it is in politics or in everyday behavior. It will be very instructive to compare it to the Greek or Chinese pattern — and then to the Japanese one (for example in the Kiki). Gratitude, for example, is certainly a pattern in Eastern and European civilizations but is virtually absent in India and — in America.

5.2.2. Transitional periods: Upaniṣads/Buddhism, pre-Socratics/Plato, Confucius/Lao Tse, etc.

This period, sometimes called the axial period (Jaspers), is of importance as the old pattern, simply based on duties in society *(ṛṇa)* and behavior aligned with the good life in this world and, automatically, the next, breaks down. Instead, for the first time, personal responsibility and morals appear. One has to decide between 'good' and 'evil', however society might have defined what they are. This

35 F.B.J. Kuiper intentionally left out Indo-European parallels in his studies (collected in Kuiper, *Ancient Indian Cosmogony*, Delhi 1983) as he wanted to show first what is available in Indian texts. Note also K. Klaus, *Die altindische Kosmologie, nach den Brāhmaṇas dargestellt*. Bonn 1986.

36 Under preparation by the present writer (Working title: *Origins. The structure and meaning of Laurasian Myth*.) A single case, the Vala myth, will apear in the *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* (www1.shore.net/ ~india/ejvs) shortly.

new development is seen first in Zoroaster's reform, somewhere in E. Iran/Afghanistan towards the middle/end of the 1st millennium BC. (cf. also Akhn Aton's failed religious reform in contemporary Egypt).

It is important to note that in Indian religion, as found in the late Vedic Upaniṣads (early nature philosophy and eschatology), and in the slightly later teachings of the Buddha, the stress now is on the *individual.* Redemption from this 'vale of tears' is to be carried out by *oneself,* with minimal help from one's teacher, be it the Buddha or a Guru. The close relationship between the Upaniṣads and early Buddhism which extend from geographical setting and cultural background to terminology still is in need of much further study (such as by N. Aramaki, H. Nakatani). Buddhist and Vedic studies usually are carried out as if these two developments occurred in a vacuum. — Redemption, in both cases, is achieved for *oneself* only. Even the Buddha, the ultimate symbol of compassion, first contemplated to keep his insights to himself. The Indian had been a *selfish* culture, tempered only by cross-generational contract (as duty: *ṛṇa,* a sort of *'on'*). Again, the various similar developments occurring over a period of a number of hundred years, maybe from 1400 to 400 BC, make for a fascinating topic of exchange between Classicists, even if they do not sustain a single 'axial age'.

5.2.3. Pre-modern period and evolution of the present set of mind.

Things have, however, changed in India subsequently. Why exactly, still remains a mystery. Is it the inherent philosophical trend of Buddhism which produced the Buddhist "saviors", the *Bodhisattva* who act out of compassion, and not in their own interest at all but in the interest of all living beings. (Or is there a trace of Zoroastrian influence? It was after all, Zoroastrianism which first introduced the concept of a savior, *saošyant,* closely followed by Judaism after its 70 years Babylonian exile in mid-first millennium BC).

A similar trend can also be seen, from the middle of the first millennium onwards, in S. Indian Bhakti, that is the worship of a single god who is in a loving relationship with his/her devotee. This religious movement spreads all over North India in the second millennium and still is the driving force of modern Hinduism (Krishna worship etc.) Obviously, this also is the trend found in the mixture of Classical and early Christian world view that lasted throughout the Middle Ages.

Even later Confucianism (Moism) propagated more socially minded humanistic attitudes. I do not propose to review all of this, even in casual fashion, but would just like to point to a few trends we could study at length.

5.2.4. Humanism, enlightenment and 'modern' reactions to Classical texts.

In Europe, the rediscovery of the Classical, non-Christian world that set in with the study of Greek texts in the 14th and 15th century (which was, incidentally, accompanied early capitalism in Italy and beyond) lead, as is well known, to the rediscovery of humans as such and as central in the world we live in, increasingly freed from the fetters of official Christian belief. The period is important for our study of the Classics as it was then that the first steps were taken to a more correct presentation and interpretation of the Greek, Roman and even of the Biblical texts. I need not go into details here. The next step, Enlightenment, is also well known. This period saw the establishment and the expansion of the historical and critical method which we still use. We need to keep these items in mind when we approach our own situation.

For in this century, which is almost behind us now, we have, while continuing the old methods referred to earlier, a number of new aspects that have made headlines in our studies, from psychology to Marxist analysis. Having lived in Europe, Asia and America for at least a decade each and comparing those experiences, I feel that we must also pay attention to what can be called Americanization. Here in Japan, it is visible at every street corner, but it also has left traces in society, economy, polity and general attitude to life. In our case, the study of the humanities, its beneficial effects can be detected and increasingly also its *not* so beneficial ones. While each nation has its own style, also in scholarship, I find a few of the current trends disturbing.

5.2.5 Americanization: 'instant gratification' and 'enthusiastic' study of texts and traditions.

These would include especially the fashionable, short of breath, quickly 'exited' and quickly changing, 'enthusiastic' attitudes that are propagated now. Nothing against some enthusiasm in our studies! Or even some polemics and esprit (Europe for example has become very staid and polite over the past 30 years!) But the attention span in the US is much too short, everything, also in Classical Studies, must lead to *immediate gratification.* A study should be written in one year, one may be lucky if, as one colleague put it, "I can *amuse* them for *two* years."

This procedure is combined, at least in my field, with a lot of rehashing of older, already forgotten positions from the last century, that are now sold as something new. As Kant said, the amount of our knowledge remains the same, just like the circle of light a lamp projects on a table: it is just that the circle moves when you move the lamp.... In addition, foreign languages are virtually unknown beyond some school Spanish and even less French; exchanges

with scholars beyond the oceans therefore do not exist unless they are carried out in English.

I mention such items as anything American is often projected as an advance, as 'progress'. Germany, for example, is now reflecting about a further 'reform' of its decaying universities by imitating American private universities and Graduate Schools and their parent-enslaving financial models. And so does Japan. I wonder whether this can be called progress.[37]

Not that the scholarly scene in the US is without its own merits. There is always the openness of a fresh start in our fields, after centuries of colonialism, and there is stress on a non-Eurocentric attitude (however, unfortunately tempered by an equally naive America-centrism: America is, after all separated from the rest of the world by an ocean on each side....) There also is a willingness to adjust 'completely', as one thinks, to the civilization one studies: one wishes, e.g., to speak very god Japanese and tries to *become* a Japanese (well...?). Also, there is a general openness to ever new approaches, even if the series of new fashions that have blown over from Paris have ceased for the moment. We could definitely use some of all of that openness in our tradition-bound studies of the Classics, and I will allude to some possibilities below. Finally, we should observe present currents and expect

5.2.6. New regional, multi-polar traditions and approaches.

What can we expect in the 21st century? First, like many outside of the US, I think it is obvious that we are heading in the direction of a multi-polar world (American, European, Near Eastern/Islamic, Indian/Hindu, East Asian/Confucian), though not in a necessarily antagonistic contest (S. Huntingdon). While we may applaud this development as it leads us away from the dualism of Cold War and the present (almost) monopolizing Americanism, it will have its disadvantages, also in scholarship. I just hope hat it does not lead to a hardening in scholarly attitudes as can be seen just now in India, with increasing nationalism over the past few years, or in the official Chinese stance of a uniquely "Asian" approach to human values. Such stances filter down, as we have seen too many times during this century, into scholars' attitudes and into writing: they produce new ideological or religious blinkers. We suffer, anyhow, as much as we may try to escape the fetters of our local upbringing, from our own "personal *māyā*" (illusion). Which way are we headed then and in which direction should we head?

§6. The need for a new agreement in Classical Studies

First of all, I suggest that the definition of Classical Studies should be an extension of our definition of philology, that is something like: "the study of a civilization based on its foundational and otherwise culture-specific, typical and important texts": This would include all aspects of Classical texts, of their culture and their local nature as well. Any new over-arching theory would, of course, need to be discussed by the members of the project. In doing so, we need to take into account a number of points.

6.1. "Outside/inside" views of texts belonging to a particular civilization.

In recent years it has frequently been stressed that non-native scholars of a particular civilization should try to achieve an *inside* view of that civilization. This has the obvious advantage that one can better understand all the subtleties of gestures, expression, customs, non-enunciated beliefs, nuances of language, allusions made in literature, etc.

To "enter" a foreign culture in this fashion is, certainly, an ideal. How far this is actually possible is quite another question. Having lived and worked in Nepal for more than five years, I am keenly aware of the ideal but also of the problem. Though I love Nepal and the Nepalis, though I regard my time there as the best period of my life and though I am ready to live there again any time, I do not think I could become a Nepali. Can one, as my religionist colleagues usually assert, study India or Japan by simply immersing oneself, on average for just one year, in a civilization at a particular location? Again, I certainly do not deny the importance of such local study, quite to the contrary, but I deny that sitting on a tatami mat turns you into a Japanese or enables you to understand Japan any better than a close study of its foundational Classical texts would do. One needs to grow up here to be *like* a Japanese.

6.2. Dilemma of the foreign/indigenous scholar: need to combine outside/inside approaches.

On the other hand, the inside view has some disadvantages as well. This may not be obvious to a native scholar. Let me again take up an example from my own experience. Having grown up and having lived in (W.) Germany until I was 29, I was of course heavily influenced by the mind set of the local post-world war culture. Then,

37 As usual, the French have reacted quickly: Viviane Forrester, *L' horreur économique*, Paris: Fayard 1996; Philippe. Labarde, Bernard Maris, *Ah Dieu! que la guerre économique est jolie!* Paris: Albin Michel 1998.

having lived in Nepal, Holland, the US for decades, and here in Kansai for one year, I noticed a certain unease both in Holland and the US, but I had difficulty to pin it down. It had nothing to do with history and politics. Rather with one's own feeling of 'well-being' or *'feeling at home'*. Although both these civilizations should be fairly close to my native one, something was wrong.

I did not investigate this in a scholarly fashion, since this was not my field. But one day I came across a paper written by a French Indologist, L. Dumont, describing German culture. He stressed the importance of *'Bildung'*, that is education and continuing self-education, (something, I believe, that is not so very different from the Chinese concept of continuous self-education and improvement). Only then, I understood; but, typically, I did not find out myself, having grown up *inside* the culture. The ethos of the Dutch and American culture simply is different; other items are much more important: immediate family and a close-knit network of acquaintances in Holland, constant competition and *winning* in the US. Culture is consumption in the US; in Germany, it is an almost religious experience to go to a concert. I am sketching with a very broad pen, of course, but I hope my point is clear.

In other words, the outsider's view is valuable, too. An outsider can detect many items that are, as it were, invisible to a native member of a particular civilization. In short, in our study of the Classics, we have to try to combine both the *inside* and the *outside* view.

6.3. Growing non-Eurocentric respect for other cultures by "outside" researchers.

Luckily, all of this coincides with a growing respect, in the West, for non-western civilizations; we are only too well aware of the past century of Eurocentric and now America-centric attitudes. This kind of attitude is, in itself, not surprising: "We" are always in the center, and "We" are surrounded by "Others". Similar attitudes are found with the Greek (Greeks :: *barbarians*), Indians (*Ārya* of the *madhyadeśa* "the middle country' :: *Mleccha* barbarians), or Chinese ('the middle country', *chūgoku/chū-ka* :: barbarians, *tōi, nanban, seijū, hokuteki*). To study this important aspect of any Classical civilization it may be necessary to look into the interesting accounts about India by Alexander's Greeks, the well-known Chinese and Korean Buddhist pilgrim accounts of India from the 5th−8th c., that of Albīrūnī, an Iranian Muslim, of 11th c. India, the Russian merchant Nikitin's account of 14th c. India, Marco Polo's account of China, the Chinese *(Gishiwajinden)* report on early Japan, etc. Many of them are clearly biased. A comparative study of such texts would be an interesting topic for the present project.

When I think back, my high school texts books still viewed the history of the world in terms of European history: other regions were just *exotic* and their history basically started with the European contact in the 15th and 16 th centuries. This has gradually improved over the past few decades, and in this respect, the US usually is further ahead, at least regarding the foreign cultures are actually represented inside the country, "since we are all immigrants". But this does not mean yet, that e.g. High School text books would point out, as my Indian friends in the US complain, the Indian origin of many of our mathematical concepts, from the so-called Arabic numbers to roots and binary numbers used by our computers now. Here, too, Americans still define themselves as basically Anglo-Saxon or Euro-American; European (especially French/British) hegemonial attitudes have simply been replaced by American ones ("only in America...", "American democracy/education, etc. is the best in the world", "people everywhere envy us for our system"; or, one American general wanted to 'bring culture' to Italy ... all of which are commonly heard sentences).

In the Classical Studies of Rome and Greece, the trumpet was sounded already in 1900: "European Scholars ... find that they have to count with a new factor and have to recognize in our philological work a national stamp" [38] In my own field, Indian Studies, this attitude takes the interesting form of accusing all pre-US scholarship of the Indian Classics as biased, Eurocentric, colonialist etc., and it usually ends with the claim that it is only my contemporary American colleagues who understand classical or modern India (see, for example, the Introduction to the Ingalls *Festschrift*).[39] Can these scholars approach India better just because the USA have not been a colonial power in S. Asia? What about Scandinavians, Germans, Italians? (The rather strange answer is given in S. Pollock's paper *Deep Orientalism*).[40]

6.4. Postmodern stance of texts as inherently political.

Indeed, the post-modern stance of viewing scholarship as inherently political simply is contradicted by history. The 19th c., during which Oriental Studies really took of, was motivated by other goals, in the end, by cultural and spiritual ones: one wanted to find out about the origin and

38 Basil L. Gildersleeve, *Oscillations and Nutations of Philological Studies*, Philadelphia 1900, p. 11.

39 *Sanskrit and Indian studies : essays in honour of Daniel H. H. Ingalls* edited by M. Nagatomi [et al.] Dordrecht/Boston : D. Reidel 1980.

40 Carol A. Breckenridge, Peter van der Veer (eds.), *Orientalism and the postcolonial predicament: perspectives on South Asia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1993.

early stages of humankind. It is quite another story that in some countries such knowledge was subsequently used for political and colonialist aims. At any rate, we should not interpret previous scholarship in monocausal fashion or with teleological hindsight and look at it as motivated simply by political and colonialist aims.

6.5. Role of world view in Classical texts.

It will have appeared, I hope, that we have to take our own conscious and unconscious views of neighboring and distant cultures into account and that we have to achieve a balance of inside and outside views. In this way we can try to come closer to the ultimately important task of our fields, to an understanding of the world view, the *weltanschauung* that drives a particular civilization, what "makes it tick." While we have to work on establishing this for the civilization we work on, the present project should make use of the chance now afforded and start an in-depth *comparison* of these basic world views. I would like to propose to make it a recurrent theme in the investigations and meetings of the project. To name just one example: the role of the trans-generational contract between us and our ancestors in Indian, Chinese as well as in Japanese civilization, and the modern European version of a transgenerational social contract and safety net.

6.6. Role of (local) myth underlying much of an individual civilization.

In this context, I would like to underline again the role that foundational myth(s) have played and still play in each Classical civilization. To take a Christian example, Westerners usually take it for granted, that humans are not only at the top of God's creation but that they also have all the right to exploit the world, its plants and animals. This attitude was not always prevalent in Europe but it certainly became prominent during the Christian era and in its Capitalist/Marxist successor ideologies. The underlying myth is stated clearly in the Bible (I. Moses 9).

Or, to name another foundational myth, the Christian idea about a *primordial* sin (based on I. Moses 2-3, cf. Jeremiah 31.29, but note the little observed revocation in Hesekiel 18.19-20: "the son shall not bear the sin of his father"). This concept is quite different from that of Japan, where primordial *misdeed* (Izanami's speaking first to Izanagi) is atoned by the I. Moses-like abandonment on a float of their misbirth, the 'leech' child Hiru-go. There is no remaining evil or *sin.* In India, there is no primordial *sin* either: the would-be ancestors of humanity, the twins Yama and Yamī, obviously engaged in forbidden incest, and Yama therefore had to become the first mortal and lord of the nether world; instead, his brother Manu (with his Eve-like, pliant wife made from butter, *ghee*) became our ancestor, and humans have to honor and feed him in transgenerational rituals: there is primordial *debt (ṛṇa),* not *sin.* Consequently, in Japan one can get rid of one's (temporary) evil deeds by atonement, *misogi,* or a great atonement ceremony, *oharai,* while there is no need of the sacrifice of someone like Christ to atone for *primordial sin*: this has been sent off, in scape goat like fashion, at the beginning of times. It goes without saying that such concepts set the tone, the ethos for a whole civilization, and it shows, I repeat, how rewarding and timely a study of the classical Japanese texts, in case the Kiki, can be.

In this regard, I believe that it is important to study not only Classics and the foundational myths from Rome to Japan but also those of other peoples. I cannot go into the details here (and refer to my book in progress on comparative mythology, *Origins*), but I believe that most of the mythologies of Eurasia and the Americas are closely related (they form the Laurasian framework of myths, with an underlying *storyline* from creation to destruction of the world). However, those of most of sub-Saharan Africa, of Australia and of Papua form an independent *older* layer of myths that embody some of the stories also found in Laurasian mythology. The comparative study of such myths will tell us much about the human condition as viewed in various parts of the world, — one of the aims of this project.

We may therefore think of adding to this project the "Classics" of non-literate or pre-literate cultures. Or of those that have *not yet* been included into our various "Canons". The oral (or the more or less recently recorded) texts of such cultures play a similar role as the Classics have in ours. To name an obvious example, why should the foundational text of Central America, the *Popol Vuh* of the Mayas not be included, a text that actually has been written down in the 16th cent. in Quiché Maya language? Or the various accounts about Mexico or Peru, in local languages or in Spanish, from the time of the Spanish conquest? The same applies to texts such as the Polynesian myths (*Kumulipo* of Hawaii, written down in the 19 th c.), or the great cycle of Dayak myths from Borneo (still only partially published). Or, closer to home, the Ainu Epic: the texts of this dwindling community of Northern Japan should definitely be included, and not only to shed light on Japan's prehistory and early history. Also, it must not be forgotten that, as so frequently in the Classical World, these myths have a close connection with ritual and need to be studied together.

Obviously, it is not possible, even within the scope of this project, to deal with all of this, and a selection from other civilizations and their texts should be made. Actual selection of such texts can perhaps be made according to their significance and uniqueness as discussed briefly un-

der the heading of 'Laurasian' myths. We would have to select representative texts from Eurasia and the Americas. They could include, from West to East, some of the following: the old Norse *Edda,* the Irish Epic *Tain bo Cuailnge,* the Finnish *Kalevala,* the Kirgiz *Manas* of 200,000 verses!, part of the *Secret History of the Mongols,* the Tibetan *Gesar* Epic, the Dayak cycle, the Ainu epic, the Hawaiian *Kumulipo,* some Amerindian cycle such as that of the Winnebago, the *Popol Vuh* of the Mayas, or a selection of (Lévy-Strauss') Brazilian myths, etc.

From the Afro-Australian group of mythologies would come such texts as W. African oral history of the Kingdom of Segu, Yoruba creation myths, Central African traditions including those of the Pygmies, Bantu myths from Zimbabwe and S. Africa, Bushmen (Khoi-San) lore, traditions of the Andaman Islands, the mythology of the Papuas and Moluccans (*Hainuwele* myth), and that special case, the *Dream Time* myths of the Australian aboriginals.

All such epics and myths represent the world view, the fears and dreams of the people concerned, and they can be set off profitably against what we find in the accepted Classical texts. (As an aside, it may also be pointed out that such comparison will elucidate much in Classical, e.g. Greek or Chinese thought that has archaic, local, maybe even pre-Laurasian roots, (a topic well developed in some modern American studies). To do so will lead to a constant comparison of attitudes of various scholars in the Classics and their general/individual approaches, — which is one of the aims of the project.

§7. Some ideas about desirable prospects and developments in the Japanese context: Classics and education.

In conclusion, I can and I will only speak as an empathetic observer. In what is to follow, I will offer, albeit hesitatingly, some personal suggestions for possible contributions of this project to the future development of Japanese society and thought. These are strictly personal observations, shrouded by my own *māyā.* Of course, I will not attempt to offer a perfect, patent solution, — nor do I have one.

7.1. As is well known, Japan has subsequently accepted and modified Chinese, Buddhist, European and American influences. In doing so, it is stressed, Japanese civilization has often proceeded in a eclectic fashion, selecting only those items of a foreign culture or religion that fit into Japanese culture, even to the extent of "improving" on the original concepts. One can take a simple culinary example such as the popular children's food, *curry,* a business example such as the original American idea of team work (which is now borrowed back into America as factory management), or art, such as the import and Japanization of Chinese Zen painting. The same is true with respect of the take-over of western ideas more than a hundred years ago. The ethos of Japanese culture as such has, basically, *not* changed. It is still based, I think, on a closeness to nature, a collaborative spirit in neighborhoods and workplace. The excesses of western industrialism such as clear cutting of whole forests and strip mining or of unbridled social competition with the concurrent American concept of "losers"[41] is so alien that it is difficult to actually *lose,* for example in the Bōnenkai/NewYear party games. On the other hand, the changes in modern economy and society, along with increasing Americanization, have led to some undesirable developments such as the quasi-abandonment of the Old in separate 'homes', increasing materialism, selfishness, 'downsizing', abandonment of one's employees and the like. Note that Western Europe and Japan have developed, during this century, a social balance now challenged by Americanization, globalization and downsizing. Is unbridled social and economic competition really an ideal to be followed? Clearly, one has to look beyond Westernization or Americanization.

7.2. It is here that Classics as the accumulation of human knowledge and artistic expression become important: We should try to discover new meanings in our study and in our dialogue with other civilizations and patterns of thought. As been mentioned, this does not necessarily mean *just* the Classical texts. For example, the present American fascination with "the Earth" is, at least in part, paralleled and fueled by an understanding of Native American (Amerindian) attitudes towards nature which are *not* Judaeo-Christian. We can suggest such new meanings and attitudes but society will change on its own accord and cannot be "engineered". The history of this century elaborately shows that such macro-engineering has failed. But one can try to *influence* the youth in some beneficial ways, by exposing them to a variety of options and by warning them of the consequences of following certain other paths.

7.3. Even before going into such new concepts, I think it is important to stress the beneficial aspects of the present ethos. Such concepts are dealt with in School through High School, which represent, after all, the important

41 There are weekly columns of "winners' and "loosers", of people who are "up" or "down".

stages in the socialization of children. I think, such items as life-long friendship, respect for the aged, and the nature of social contract are not unimportant to be dealt with, increasingly, also by comparison with other civilizations.

As an example, I mention again from my own experience, the concepts of friendship and *giri,* and the contrast they form with the horrors of no lasting friendship and the lack of a feeling of obligation, both of which are so typical for America (and for Holland), where, as one Japanese friend correctly analyzed during a brief visit, 'people are just *superficially* friendly'. These are no stereotypes; I have often discussed this with foreign friends and colleagues in America. Indeed, whatever their differences may be at home, Europeans of all ethnical backgrounds usually band together in the US. Why is that? American culture does not know the concept of *friendship*; the term just means 'acquaintance', and this kind of 'friends' you can drop, *tripp* up and betray whenever *convenient.* This civilization has deviated so much from that of Europe that it has become alien to Europeans. We still regard it as quasi-European and we then are shocked to find out that people in America operate in totally different ways. Similarly to Europeans living in the US, people from Japan, Korea and China usually will understand each other better than others — maybe due to the underlying Confucianism? A similar observation can be made about educated people from anywhere in the former British Empire: they have gone to the same type of schools, they tend to behave similarly and to understand each other well.

We should learn from such comparisons, proceed with more sophisticated analyses, and draw useful conclusions for a desirable future framework of Japanese culture. In doing so, I would stress the truly humane aspects of East Asian civilization, Confucian or not, e.g., the concept of obligation (not, however, in a feudal sense; there should be certain *limits*).

7.4. As for items that can be studied, learnt and maybe taken over from other civilizations, I may mention such central topics as the Chinese or German one of self-education, self-improvement *(Bildung)* throughout one's lifetime, however, without a religious or local bias.

Another one may be the unlimited and unhindered 'pursuit of happiness', beyond the narrow limits of a money-centered culture. This would actually fit quite well with the Japanese concept of excelling in one's work, whether it is a hobby or one's job.

Items from Indian civilization may include the frequently *practiced* ideal of non-violence *(ahiṃsā)* and of general tolerance in spiritual matters; they have successfully guided several non-Indian social and political movements in past decades, from M.L. King to V. Havel and Mandela. (Both topics, however, still are in need of a closer study even in the Indian context.) Other Indian items worth of deliberation include the recognition of four clear-cut stages in one's life, each one with its individual predilections and requirements. The idea of transgenerational obligation *(ṛṇa),* which resembles Confucian ideals, has already been discussed. One may add the obligation that is formally established between 'blood brothers' *(mith)* and comrades *(sakhi),* an idea now thoroughly missing in many western countries. On an ecumenical and ecological level are the ideas of unity with nature, lost in the West due to the prevailing Judaeo-Christian and Descartian dualism. This idea is found in monistic Hinduism and also in Buddhism where the solidarity with all living beings is stressed, — ideas that need strengthening in present times.

Further items could be selected from a study the Classical texts of other civilizations and also from world mythology. In proposing such items, I think, the stress should be on the 'best' pan-human aspects, showing the range of possibilities, while choice among them should be presented as an individual one, important for one's own (and communal) development, but *not* restricted by traditional society.

7.5. All of this means that we has to think in terms of a larger, indeed of world culture(s). While the various constituent parts and even the earlier variety of one's own culture may look different, (the past is, after all, a foreign country), some of the underlying aspirations remain the same. Equally so, in the various schemes of the ancient Classics or the Laurasian/Afro-Australian myth. The question remains, not surprisingly: *where do I come from? why am I here? where do I go?*

In order to study such questions in High School and beyond, it is necessary to realize that "internationalization", as propagated recently, does not just mean to learn a foreign language, it also means that one has to read foreign or ancient Japanese texts with an open mind. Just to *translate* them (the preferred method, I am told) is not enough; they need *explanation,* an appreciation of their world view, whether it is Plato's *Republic* or a myth of Australian *Dream Time.* Luckily, Japanese High Schools have traditionally taught much more about other cultures than their European or American counterparts, and this teaching has not been limited to just European or American civilizations. One would merely have to expand this scheme and stress that Other's solutions are of value — though they may not always fit in present Japanese society.

7.6. Another important point would be that the Japanese should also actively think, as Ueyama Shunpei and Kato Shuichi do in this symposium, about their own contribution to world culture, beyond that of the present economically driven, money-minded attitude. We know of contributions in music, art, ceramics, literature, films, fashion, religion and the like, items that always highlight some unique point of Japanese mind and civilization. And there is so much more to contribute.

This would also aid in keeping intact the individuality of peoples and cultures around the world against the present onslaught of a universal, one-level pop culture and a money driven civilization. Europeanization (and Christianization in Africa, South-East Asia, Oceania, the Americas) has done already enough damage, we do not need the continuation of another wave leveling all differences.

7.7. Rather, we have to realize that a cosmopolitan point of view is more appropriate for the next century: We will have to live in a multi-polar world, and we better get accustomed to it: it will not be dominated by one civilization alone but, maybe, also those of China, India, Brazil, to mention just a few contenders.

However, apart from such utilitarian, perhaps ultimately political motives, I think that a general opening to the various modes of thought in the world would be welcome and is in fact necessary. The “internationalization” of the Eighties should now be complemented by a *spiritual* opening which can be found in the foundational Classical texts and myths of various peoples.

7.8. A multi-national institute studying such prospects, as proposed by this project, would certainly help in gathering and establishing the required data and it would provide ample opportunity to deliberate on possible solutions.

Witzel教授の対論者としての発言要旨

丸井　浩

０．示唆に富む貴重なご講演に対してまず深く感謝申し上げます。

１．かつてインド学者（Indologista）の間で「古典」(the classic）という概念それ自体について議論がなされたことがあったのでしょうか。

２．今後インド学の分野における本文論評（textual criticism）は，字体の問題（palaeography）や発音上の地方差などのミクロ部分に立ち入った，きめの細かい作業が必要であることを強調されましたが，それとの関連で，インドの写本筆者（a scribe）についてお伺いします。厳密に言えば，最初に筆写する場合と，転写（transcription）の場合を区別しなければならないでしょうが，それはともかく，彼らの身分はどうだったのか，彼らはテキストの内容が理解できたのか否か。

３．０．インド学関連のテキスト・データベースの近況について触れられましたが，ここで大正大蔵経のテキスト・データベース化を推進されている江島教授より，若干補足的な発言を求めたいと思います。

江島　恵教

３．１．漢訳大蔵経の版本として現在使われているのは，言うまでもなく日本で校訂出版された大正脩大蔵経（全100巻）でありますが，目下その全体にわたるテキスト・データベース化を推進致しております。いろいろ技術的にクリアーすべき問題も多く，多難な道のりではありましたが，ようやく軌道に乗りつつあり，その成果の一部が今年(1998年）初めに，東京大学文学部のサーバーを通じてインターネットで公開されるに至りました。ただ何分にも大変費用のかかるプロジェクトであるため，いかに十分な経済的支援をうるかが大きな課題となっています。特に質問というわけではありませんでしたが，Witzel教授のお話に関連して，若干の補足をさせて戴きました。

丸井　浩

４．文化を内側から見る視点と外側から見る視点それぞれのもつ功罪と意義について興味深いご意見を伺いましたが，それとの関連で，いわゆる「教養」（Bildung）を重んずるドイツの伝統に言及されました。古典の研究・教育と「教養」とは密接に結びついてきました。中国の故事成句に「温故知新」という言葉があります。正確な英訳は分かりませんが，“Explore the old and descover the new.”と言ったところでしょうか。あるいは本日のWitzel教授の講演の趣旨に則して言い換えるなら，“Explore the forein and discover one's own.”（但し，Witzel教授が“the foreign”を“the other”と訂正された）という言い方も可能でしょうが，最後にこの点について何かご感想なりお考えがあればお聞かせください。