

tion by Zhaohua Yang provides a wealth of data and analysis on the Tang-period Chinese Buddhist cult of Ucchuṣma (“Devouring Impurities: Myth, Ritual and Talisman in the Cult of Ucchuṣma in Tang China,” Ph.D diss., Stanford University, 2013). In discussing the origins of that cult, Yang notes that a chapter of the 653–654 CE Buddhist *Dhāraṇīsaṃgraha* was devoted to Ucchuṣma, who also appeared in the **Mahābalocchuṣmavidyārājasūtra*, a work translated into Chinese in Kucha before 730 CE. Given the fact that Sanderson (“The Śaiva Age,” in *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, ed. Shingo Einoo [Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo, 2009], 51) establishes the date of the BraYā to the sixth to seventh century on the basis of a mention of the title in a 810 CE manuscript of the *Skandapurāna-Ambikākhaṇḍa*, there is no hard evidence for its predating these two Buddhist sources. However, as Yang notes, the highly transgressive content of the **Mahābalocchuṣmavidyārājasūtra* reflects an intense engagement with the Śaivas in its place of origin, which he situates in Kashmir. Sanderson has forcefully argued that the Buddhist Yoginī Tantras were, in the main, derivative of the Śaiva Tantras. However, this position likely does not apply for the Kashmir of the seventh to eighth centuries, where a distinctive and eclectic “culture of the charnel ground” was emerging in certain esoteric circles. If, as was the case, the iconographies, mantras, and maṇḍalas of the Śaiva and Buddhist Tantric deities and their entourages resembled each other so closely, this was because the actors in this new culture were often the same people. Buddhist tantric practitioners were not “derivative” of Śaiva tantric practitioners. They did not live inside their texts, and texts have never had agency. The *Brahmayāmala-Picumata[-Ucchuṣma Tantra]* is a window onto a revolution, from a time before the “Leninists” began fighting the “Trotskyists.”

DAVID GORDON WHITE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

“. . . für die Wissenschaft, der ich von ganzer Seele lebe.” *Otto Böhtlingk (1815–1904): Ein Gelehrtenleben rekonstruiert und beschrieben anhand seiner Briefe*. By AGNES STACHE-WEISKE. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ. 2017. Pp. xv + 583. €118.

Otto Böhtlingk an Rudolf Roth: Briefe zum Petersburger Wörterbuch 1852–1885. Index. By AGNES STACHE-WEISKE, GABRIELE ZELLER, and FRANK KÖHLER. Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung, vol. 45.2. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ. 2015. Pp. 188. €59.

The two titles under review are further installments of a large-scale project funded by the German Research Foundation, of which a first gem, a model edition of the letters of Otto Böhtlingk to Rudolf Roth, detailing their collaboration in making the monumental Petersburg Dictionary of Sanskrit, appeared in 2007 (reviewed in *JAOS* 129.3 [2009]: 507–11). Published as volume 45 in the series of the Helmuth von Glasenapp Foundation for Indological research, the letters had only an index of persons. Volume 45.2 in the same series incorporates the index of persons into a general index (pp. 5–84). It also offers an index of Sanskrit and related words discussed in the correspondence (pp. 85–147), an important feature when producing a dictionary is the object of discussion. As a repertory of entries that required deliberations, this tool will serve as a valuable index not only for the correspondence, but also for the dictionary itself. An index of references in Böhtlingk’s letters to entries in the two editions of his *Indische Sprüche* (pp. 149–58) plays a similar dual role for correspondence and work discussed. This additional volume further offers a list of sources (pp. 159–88) and a user’s guide (pp. 1–4).

Böhtlingk’s biography is a masterpiece, even more remarkable since it could not draw on its subject’s private papers, which his widow destroyed according to his instructions. It makes up for this regrettable loss by making use of an amazingly large and varied collection of official documents, institutional records, and colleagues’ correspondence, in addition to his works and scholarly letters. At every step, the context of Böhtlingk’s scholarly, academic, intellectual, and social life is explored, throwing light not only on his own experiences, but also on the circumstances of contemporary institutions and social circles. The result is a thick volume in nine chapters and ten appendices, in which, within broad stages of Böhtlingk’s life, the topical prevails over the chronological. It is a scholar’s contextual biography, in which Böhtlingk’s four marriages and four children and their descendants,

however necessarily referred to in the sequence of his life, are specifically addressed in a separate chapter (7), after his death (at 6.4), friends (6.5), and other considerations at Leipzig, his final location. A five-page long table of contents gives a clear overview of the rigorously numbered architecture of the work, down to individuals. Thus, Böhlingk's antagonism to Max Müller is described at 4.4.4.4, accusations of plagiarism against Monier-Williams at 4.4.4.5, the collaboration of Roth at 4.4.7.1, of Whitney at 4.4.7.5. The whole is written in clear, crisp, accessible prose, devoid of detours and redundancies. The reader is consistently advised of what may be the biographer's speculations, however well-founded, and of what remains unknown, when available evidence has resisted extreme sleuthing.

After a foreword, a list of abbreviations, a list of ten well-chosen and handsomely reproduced illustrations, and a first chapter of introduction, chapter 2 is devoted to Böhlingk's early years (1815–1835). Born into a family of international merchants of Dutch origin who moved from Lübeck to St Petersburg in the days of his great-grandfather, Otto Böhlingk was raised as a member of the German community in Baltic Russia. This and the following chapter, on his studies briefly in Berlin and longer in Bonn, are troubling in that some claims he made defy proof. The records of the University of St Petersburg do not document the studies he claimed to have made there in 1833–1834. The title of "Privat-Docent" he assumed in Bonn to join a club does not represent employment as a lecturer at the University, but embellishes on a status as independent scholar or possibly private tutor. The doctorate he obtained from the University of Gießen in 1838 was of the *in absentia* kind available to foreigners without coursework or dissertation. Böhlingk apparently sought a shortcut to travel to England with a Ph.D. in hand, to consult the manuscript collections of the East India Library and the Royal Asiatic Society.

On such questionable underpinning an eminent career was built, beginning, on Böhlingk's return to Bonn, with the publication of his epoch-making *Pāṇini's acht Bücher grammatischer Regeln* (1839–1840). The biographer somewhat short-changes her subject by suggesting that he expanded a prior edition by Colebrooke. *Pace* Adelung and his source, Roebuck's *Annals of the College of Fort William*, Colebrooke did not edit the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The 1809 printing of the text in traditional oblong format was one of the productions of the Sanskrit Press that Colebrooke founded in Calcutta and that his personal librarian Bābūrāma directed, with a commentary by two named pandits in Colebrooke's employ, all of it *at Colebrooke's behest*. Böhlingk's effusive acknowledgment of Colebrooke is not to that edition, which Colebrooke never claimed was his, but to his 1805 *Grammar of the Sanscrit Language*, based on traditional Indian grammar, without which Böhlingk could not, he wrote, have understood Pāṇini's work. Böhlingk's presentation of the text and his selection from the commentary were his own, and they ushered in an era in which Western scholars—though clearly not beginning students—could access Pāṇinian grammar without the direct instruction of pandits.

After a somewhat reluctant edition and Latin and German translations of the *Abhijñānaśakuntala*, another fruit of his stay in London, Böhlingk answered a call of the Petersburg Academy to which he had been looking forward. For the next quarter of a century he resided and worked in the country of his birth, immersed in issues of linguistics while rising in the ranks of the Academy. No teaching was associated with his several positions, but work in a host of committees and commissions, and a decade-long assignment as director of the Academy's press, amid the strife of an institution in a phase of russification. Prior to the great dictionary, which rightly occupies center stage, with due notice of collaborators and rivals, Böhlingk produced works on non-Pāṇinian systems of Indian linguistics, on aspects of the Sanskrit language preparatory to a grammar that did not coalesce, and a well-known chrestomathy. Indologists may be surprised at the number and prominence of studies of other languages such as Russian and the language of Gypsies in Russia. There were two magisterial volumes on the language of the Yakuts, for which Böhlingk remains more famous in Russia than for the great Petersburg dictionary of Sanskrit. Work on the first five volumes of the dictionary proceeded alongside with four volumes of *Indische Sprüche*. It was a very full scholarly life.

For twenty-four years after his induction in the Petersburg Academy, Böhlingk did not journey abroad, until he made a visit to Germany and Switzerland, when he traveled by steamboat up the Rhine, but pointedly avoided alighting in Bonn, thereby adding to the fog of his early residence there. Two years later, in 1868, he took a leave of absence from the Academy and left forever the land of his birth for the land of his soul. He cited a wish for a more temperate climate as the reason for his move, but he may also have sought relief from the contentious atmosphere at the Academy. Perhaps surprisingly,

he did not join Rudolf Roth in Tübingen, but chose Jena, where his youngest sister lived, thereby prolonging a correspondence with his principal collaborator. It was in Jena that the large dictionary was completed and the shorter dictionary was begun and almost finished. He enjoyed friends among the university's faculty. The numbered subdivision of section 5.6 "Jenaer Freunde" risks flattening major differences: 1. August Schleicher died a few months after Böhntlingk's arrival; 2. August Leskien came and went within a year; 3. Berthold Delbrück came and stayed, as did 4. the silent Carl Cappeller, his student; 5. Peter von Bradke and 6. Leopold von Schröder might be more aptly characterized as short-term mentees, the latter better appreciated than the former; and 7. the librarian Anton Klette.

In 1885, just short of his seventieth birthday, Böhntlingk surprised all his friends, except Leskien, by suddenly moving for a last time, to Leipzig. His wife's unwed companion had gone there a year earlier to give birth to, and leave, a son, for whom Leskien and his wife acted as godparents. Böhntlingk legitimized the child only after his wife's death and his prompt remarriage to the boy's mother, who had continued to live in the Böhntlingk household in Leipzig as she had done in Jena. Life continued as before—Böhntlingk's retirement from, and election as honorary member of, the Petersburg Academy making little difference from his repeatedly renewed leave of absence. He continued to be productive, with a new edition and translation of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and books and a stream of articles on a wider range of subjects, including Upaniṣads, poetics, and Vedic texts. Here as well he met with young scholars and with friends among the Leipzig faculty, Leskien, Karl Brugmann, and Ernst Windisch.

After two final chapters devoted to portraits of Böhntlingk and brief conclusions, the volume features an array of appendices. The first two convey additional information: on Böhntlingk's ancestors and siblings; and family trees. The others provide useful lists and tables. Appendix III offers a visually explicit chronology in four columns for locations, events, years, and publications. Appendix IV lists Böhntlingk's correspondents, in separate sections for mail to and mail from. Appendix V gives a chronological list of learned societies which Böhntlingk joined or of which he was made an honorary member. Appendix VI presents chronological lists of Böhntlingk's books and of his other publications, a painstaking reconstruction, since Böhntlingk did not leave a list of his own. The bibliographical appendices VII and VIII present, in a total of sixty-five pages with several subdivisions, sources, published and not, institutional and not, for Böhntlingk's biography. Appendix IX supplies nutshell biographies of persons named in the book. One might occasionally quibble over what constitute the most important traits to be mentioned in this context, but the ensemble is of undeniable convenience to readers. The last appendix is a general index.

A rare slip may be unavoidable in a book this rich and this complex. I might mention that the quintessentially Philadelphian American Philosophical Society is consistently misidentified as a Boston institution. In the chronological list of events in Appendix III, a mechanical disruption to the columns' alignment places Böhntlingk's seventieth birthday in 1886 instead of 1885. I might also point to the regrettable omission, in the index, of the learned organizations to which Böhntlingk belonged, which could have usefully been listed individually or grouped as social clubs are under the entry "Gesellige Vereinigungen." The rationale for this omission is likely to have been that a list of learned organizations can be found in Appendix V. Yet, notwithstanding the merits of that chronological list, it does not include references to pages in the volume, and therefore cannot be used as a searching tool. Such minor flaws in no way detract from the value of a book of thorough scholarship and a paragon of comprehensiveness and organization.

ROSANE ROCHER
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

On Cold Mountain: A Buddhist Reading of the Hanshan Poems. By PAUL ROUZER. Seattle: UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS, 2016. Pp. xiv + 266. \$40.

Buddhist literature occupies a paradoxical position in modern understandings of classical Chinese literature. At a popular level in the West, there remains the quasi-orientalist idea of traditional