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0. Introduction

The Yavanajñataka (YJ, “Genethliacal astrology of the Greeks”) is one of the most important historical documents extant in Sanskrit which attests to the intellectual exchange between the Greeks and the Indians in the early centuries of the common era. In 2012, on the basis of a newly discovered Nepalese manuscript (Q), I have shown that Pingree’s generally accepted claim that the Yavanajñataka of Sphujidhvaja was “a versified work composed in 269/270 CE based on a prose original in Greek composed by Yavaneśvara in Alexandria in 149/150 CE” is no longer tenable in view of the new evidence.1 In this paper, I will attempt to consolidate my findings as well as filling in some of the lacunae in Pingree’s edition on the basis of the newly discovered manuscript (Q) as well as the old one (N) reexamined.

1. Spurious Claims of Dates and Bhūtasamkhya in Pingree’s Edition

As shown in my previous study of the YJ, the important dates Pingree claimed to have identified in the colophon of the last chapter of the text (Ch.79, vv.60–62), based on the characteristic way of representing numbers by figurative words known as bhūtasamkhya, turned out to be his own emendations.2 Thus all Pingree’s claims which hinge on these bhūtasamkhya readings will need to be reexamined.3

The date of composition was in fact not given in this text as typical of all early jyotiṣa, or Indic texts in general. The adoption of the “beginning of Aries” (meṣādā) as the equinoctial point,4 together with the use of astronomical cycle (yuga) of 165 years starting from Śaka -56 points only to the terminus post quem of 22 CE, while the actual date of composition could be much later.5 Furthermore, it is not even certain that the text was composed by Sphujidhvaja, who was one of the Greek kings (yavaneśvara) himself, let
alone that there were two earlier texts beside the present one, one in prose Sanskrit and another one in Greek as Pingree suggested. At any rate, hints of the actual date of the work may be gleaned from the general content of the work (§3), as well as its technical content and relation to other jyotiṣa texts (§4).

2. Lacunae/Corrupted Passages

In view of the availability of the new manuscript Q, some major lacunae/corrupted passages may now be amended (2,23–26; 3,7; 4,20–23; 4,35; 16,20; 17,6; 17,16; 18,34–36; 26,26; 28,1; 30,27, 66–67; 31,33–34; 34,21–22; 40,22; 57,32; 60,6; 28–30,78/88/94; 62,8–10; 67,8; 68,1–5; 73,1; 74,1; 79 et passim). 7

3. General Content

3.1. Mathematical Expressions and Units

The lack of bhūtasamkhya in all the mathematical algorithms as well as some characteristic use of traditional Indian units (3/5 patas = 1 kudaw, 1 nāḍikā = 10 kalīs, etc.) point to a certain affinity between the Veddāngajyotiṣa (VJ) and the YJ. However, since the YJ utilizes indigenous Indian materials in tandem with the Greek ones (e.g., horā < ω, δρέκκανας < δρέκκανας, ὅραρις < ὅραρις, etc.), while there has been no explicit description of the planets or the Zodiac in the entire Vedic corpus, including the VJ, such disparity suggests that the VJ or the knowledge therein served as the substratum of the YJ. By and large, the mathematical thinking of the YJ is comparable to that of the VJ and not to any known Greek work, 8 though more of the non-Greek nature of the work is evident through particularly its technical content as we shall see (§4).

3.2. Reference to Indian Culture

Although the YJ was considered by its author to be a work based on the Greek teachings, the abundant Indian elements such as the utilization of the Sanskrit alphabets, 10 and references to various aspects of Indian society, such as the ayurveda, castes and Indian deities must be properly accounted for. The well-wrought amalgamation as shown in various verses suggests a process of synthesis which might have lasted for decades or even centuries.

4. Technical Content and Relation with Other Jyotiṣa Texts

There are a number of technical features which the YJ shared with the VJ but not any known Greek astral texts. These include most notably the concept of tiṣṭhi, an artificial unit based on the synodic month which was described as the “soul” (jiva) of astronomical calculation in our text, 13 and the use of the twenty-eight Indian lunar mansions (nakṣatras). 14 Furthermore, there are also some features of the horoscopy in the YJ which are not attested in any Greek or Roman sources extant, for example, the division of a sign (30°) by seven (310, etc.) and nine (330). While it is possible that the YJ inherited a Greek tradition lost to us, the Indian content of the horoscopes suggests that the YJ represents a new attempt to amalgamate the two.

Because of the early date Pingree gave to the YJ, this text was considered a progenitor of all later jyotiṣa texts, including the Vṛddhabāvanājātaka (VYJ) of Minarāja of which some parallel passages may be found. Pingree dated the VYJ to the early fourth century, interpreting vṛddha as “expanded.” However, more generally, vṛddha may simply be understood as “old,” suggesting the work to have preceded rather than succeeded the YJ. As far as the parallels are concerned, the VYJ may represent a smaller, and possibly earlier core. 15

Besides the VYJ, the hitherto unexamined Gargasamhita and Parāśaratantra, both quoted...
in the VYJ, may too be antecedents of the YJ. It is noteworthy that in Varāhamihira’s BJ (sixth century), some of the Greek contents therein cannot be identified in the YJ, and by and large, there is no evidence that the very learned Varāhamihira knew this work at all. One may thus speculate that the circulation of the YJ must have been fairly limited or that it became widespread only after the time of Varāhamihira.

5. Conclusion

From the above discussion, we can see that there is little evidence, if at all, to suggest that the YJ was a versification of a prose translation of a lost Alexandrian text in Greek dated mid-second century as Pingree claimed. The mathematical idioms, the general contents as well as the technical concepts utilized in the texts suggest that it was most likely an original attempt by the Indianized Greeks to amalgamate Greek astral science with the Indian one based on a preexistent tradition in India. The work was most likely conceived in Sanskrit by an author who was conversant in both Greek and Indian astral science, and was certainly greatly familiar with the Indian culture and the Sanskritic tradition. From a philological point of view, the YJ could be dated between 22 CE to early seventh century, with the likelihood of somewhere between the fourth and sixth century as suggested by various evidences. While it may not be the oldest jyotiśa texts extant in Sanskrit, its content remains to be of great interests to scholars of different fields. A closer examination with other jyotiśa texts such as the Gargasamhīti, the BJ and perhaps more importantly, the VYJ may help to establish its true historical position.

1) Mak 2013a: 1–2; 2013b: 81–82. 2) Mak 2013a: 11–14; 2013b: 68–71. The findings confirmed the suspicions of Shastri, who was in fact the first to propose the bhūtasamkhya readings (and the šaka era interpretation), which were described by himself as “doubtful” (Shastri 1901: 8).
3) For example, the earliest use of zero in an Indian text, the earliest use of bhūtasamkhya, the dating of the Pāśaṭhāsiddhānta, the interrelation amongst the jyotiśa texts extant, the impact of Greek astral science on its Indian counterpart and so on. 4) The beginning of Aries (meṣālī) is referred to as the starting point of the lunar-solar yuga (Mak 2013b: 88–89). 5) On the possible backward calculation, see Mak 2013a: 10 fn.16. The terminus ante quem for this work remains to be 629 ce, the date of Bhāskara’s commentary to the Āryabhaṭīya where passages of the YJ were quoted. 6) On the problem of identity of Yavaneśvara and Sphujidhvaja, see Mak 2013b: 71–73. 7) A new critical edition of the YJ is currently under preparation. 8) Mak 2013a: 9. 9) There is no evidence of the concepts of geometry or trigonometry in the Yavaneśvara Jātaka.
きる日付を持つ。本稿では、これらの写本に関して意見を数点紹介する。まず、ネパールでは仏教徒がこれらの写本の制作に関わっていた。さらに、仏教徒がテキストの著作に関わっていた可能性を示す跡がこれらの写本には見いだされる。ネパール出の写本に見られるテキストは一部の伝承系统を形成し、つまりは、3本の写本はどれも共通の祖先から派生したと考えることができ、他の地域でのテキストの変遷からの影響は大きく受けていない。しかし、このネパールバージョンがもと伝承過程の痕跡を示す。すでに9世紀にはさまざまな形でのテキストの意識的、無意識的な変化のあとが見いだされる。一つはこれら痕跡を通じて、さらには純粋に古い読みを保存することによって、ネパール出の写本は「スシュルタサンヒター」の古いテキストの復元を可能にし、テキストがどのように変化して来たかを知る手がかりを提供する。

185.『スシュルタサンヒター』の構成における臨床的視点
森口 真衣

インド医学の理論について、Cakrasamhita（以下CS）系統の医学書では「病気の原因」を扱うNidana（以下Ns）を中心とするnidana論が展開されるが、Susrutasaṃhitā（以下SS）にそのような議論は見られない。本稿では医学書としての構成と標題（分類項目）に注目し、SSの臨床への関心を考察した。

Cikitsāsthāna（以下Cs）はNsとの対応項目に増補して成立したと考えられ、SSのCsは内に比べて増補が多い。病気の原因を基準により重視あるいは診断の異なる病態を区別して配置した階層的構築もつSSは解剖学的部位と疾患機序に基づいた分類を重視しており、その背景に豊富な臨床例の観察が想定される。

Uttaratantra（以下Ut）はAsāṅgaのうち4部門に対応し、CSのCsで増補された項目の一部がSSではUtのkāya-cikitsā（以下kcy）に収録される。基本的には医学（Ns）と治療法（Cs）は別々に記載されるが、Utは医学と治療法を同一項目内に収録し、循環器系、消化器系など身体機能に応じた配置で構成されている。

ここで既出冊本ではUtにおいて6.38（女性生殖器疾患が小児科を扱うkau-mārbbhiya以下kmbh）最終部に含まれているが、上記の特徴を踏まえると構成上6.38はkmbhではなくkcyの泌尿器／生殖器関連箇所に配置されるべきである。そこでThe Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project（NGMPP）のSSネパール写本を検証したところ、果たして6.38はkmbhではなくkcyの男性生殖器疾患（6.59）に続けて収録されていた。従ってこれがUt本来の配置であったと想定される。

186. 最古のインド・ギリシャ系のサンスクリット文献の再考
—新発見の「ヤヴァニジャータカ」の写本に基づいて—
妻 文彪

「ヤヴァニジャータカ」（ギリシャ人の出生占星術）は紀元後のギリシャとインドの二つの文明の交流の証拠となる重要な文献である。このテキストは19世紀末から文献学者に知られていたが、校訂本は1978年にビンギリーによってはじめて出版された。その後、シュクラ（1989）とファルク（2001）がビンギリーの校訂及びその解釈の様々な誤りを指摘したが、全体的にテキストについての研究は進んでいなかった。2012年に新しいネパール写本が発見されたのできっかけとして筆者は「ヤヴァニジャータカ」が紀元後149/150年にアレクサンドリアでヤヴァニシェヴァラという人物がギリシャ語で制作した作品を、紀元後269/270年にギリシャ人のスブジヴァージャが翻訳したという「ビンギリー説」を批判した。本稿はこのような見解をまとめ、ビンギリー版の誤解を訂正し、独文を埋め、「ヤヴァニジャータカ」の歴史的な位置を再考する試みである。

187. ジャイナ教におけるプラフマチャリヤ
小林 久泰

ジャイナ教の基本文献「タットヴァ・アルタ・スートラ」における五大誓戒についての註解については大きく二つの系統がある。すなわち、『注意を怠った人の行為によって』という「殺生」の定義に見られる限定句をそれ以外の四つの誓戒すべてに縁起させる系統、そして、その限定句を不浄戒を除いた三つの誓戒のみ縁起させる系統の二つである。後者の系統は、白衣派の伝統にのみ特徴的に見られ、証言者たちが白衣派独自に展開した戒律文献に求めている。白衣派証言者たちが不浄戒を特別視するのは、このような戒律文献の影響を強く受けていたためであり、またその戒律文献に説かれる通り、悪行を行う人は、不注意であるか否かに関係なく、必ず欲望と嫌悪を伴っているため、他の誓戒とは異
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