

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

***A Buddhist Terminological Dictionary. The Mongolian Mahāvvyutpatti.* Edited by Alice Sárkozi. In collaboration with János Szerb. — Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 130. Harrassowitz Verlag: Wiesbaden, 1995, XXIV, 836 pp.**

The Sanskrit-Tibetan terminological dictionary Mahāvvyutpatti, compiled in Tibet at the beginning of the ninth century to translate the sacred Buddhist texts, was afterwards translated into Chinese, Mongolian, and Manchu. It is not surprising that it drew the attention of many Orientalists who worked in various fields of scholarship. The beginning of the investigation and publication of the Mahāvvyutpatti dictionary can be traced to the first half of the nineteenth century, and about two dozen works dealing with Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese versions of the dictionary have appeared since then.

As Alice Sárkozi points out, the Mongolian version of the Mahāvvyutpatti dictionary “was ... neglected for a long time” (p. VII), that is the reason why until recently the dictionary material in Mongolian could be discovered only in a few facsimile publications which constituted, as a rule, abridged versions of the dictionary. The “Mongolian Mahāvvyutpatti”, published by the Hungarian scholar Alice Sárkozi, thus presents the first work dealing with the Mongolian version of the Sanskrit-Tibetan dictionary in particular.

Dr Sárkozi based her publication on the Mongolian part of the Mahāvvyutpatti manuscript which was purchased by V. P. Vasilyev in Peking in the late 1840s. At present, this manuscript (No. 25147) is preserved among the Tibetan materials in the library of the Oriental department of the St. Petersburg State University. The reason this particular manuscript, which is well known to specialists thanks to its facsimile publication (see *Quadrilingual Mahāvvyutpatti, Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese-Mongolian Lexicon of Buddhist Terms*, New Delhi, 1981), has been preferred to any other is not only because it is unique, but first of all because it comprises the earliest known Mongolian version.

In the course of time essential corrections were made in the text of the original Mongolian translation of the dictionary represented in the St. Petersburg manuscript so that in many instances the original terms have been crossed out and the new ones inserted. All of these interpolations are shown by Dr Sárkozi in the footnotes.

In 1749, the Mahāvvyutpatti was incorporated into the Peking block-print of the Tanjur in Mongolian where a later, reformed stage of the Mongolian language is seen. This new version of the dictionary is included by Alice Sárkozi in the main body of the publication under the letter “T”.

Preparing the text of the Mongolian Mahāvvyutpatti for publication, Dr Sárkozi took into account one more manuscript version of the dictionary which was found in one of the Ulan Bator collections. The Mongolian text is close to the version which was included in the Tanjur. Therefore, orthographic features, as well as text variations, of the Ulan Bator manuscript are fixed in the footnotes as commentaries on the block-print version of the dictionary.

Judging from the numeration used in the publication, the volume under review must include 277 topic sections covering 9,565 dictionary entries. These numbers, however, need some correction, since it becomes obvious in particular that the number of chapters should be shown as 279, because two additional chapters turned out to be duplicates (see Nos. 127a and 238a). As for the number of entries, they, on the contrary, must be less than 9,565. The reason for these discrepancies is that when preparing the Mongolian part of the dictionary for publication Dr Sárkozi made use of the numeration employed in the two-volume publication made by R. Sakaki in 1925 (*Mahāvvyutpatti, Bon-Zō-Kan-Wa Shi Yaku Myō-gi Tai-Shū*, Kyoto) which contained Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese versions of the Mahāvvyutpatti. Taking Sakaki's numeration as a model, Dr Sárkozi aimed at making it easy to find Sanskrit and Tibetan parallels. As she points out in the introduction to her publication, the numeration chosen strictly follows the model, “even taking over its faults” (p. IX).

However, the “faults” in Sakaki's publication are quite numerous. The less harmful among them are thirteen instances of confusion in the sequence of the dictionary entries. More frequent and rather disappointing are omissions in the numeration. According to our calculation, not less than 133 omissions were made by R. Sakaki. Moreover, in twenty-three cases one entry is shown under two, three (Nos. 4873—5, 5978—80), or even four (Nos. 3930—3, 6740—3) numbers. By contrast, under one number (No. 230) ten entries are shown. Besides, duplicate numbers can be discovered (Nos. 1055 and 2347), as well as numbers that contain no information at all (Nos. 3823,