analyze in more depth the great number of musical traditions that exist in this area of the globe.

Gerald GROEMER
Edo Tokyo Museum
Tokyo

NEPAL

MUMFORD, STAN ROYAL. *Himalayan Dialogue: Tibetan Lamas and Gurung Shamans in Nepal.* Madison, Wisconsin, and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989. xii+286 pp. Cloth US$40.00; ISBN 0-299-11980-7.

This remarkable book is the result of two and a half years of anthropological research in the northern Nepalese village of Tshap between 1981 and 1983. Tshap is one of the villages in the Gyasumdo region established more than a hundred years ago by Tibetan immigrants from southern Tibet and from ethnically Tibetan areas of Nepal. Their neighbors are the Gurungs of Tapje village on the other side of the river; the Gurungs also claim to have Tibetan origins dating back centuries ago.

Tshap is a stronghold of Tibetan Nyingmapa Buddhism, while Tapje is a stronghold of the Gurung shamanism that probably represents a continuation of the pre-Buddhist tradition of Tibet. The meeting of the immigrant Tibetans with the indigenous Gurungs instigated a contemporary clash between Buddhist lamas and Gurung shamans, which testifies to the centuries-old dramatic dialogue between Tibetan Buddhism and the pre-Buddhist Tibetan religion. The existence of this dialogue was a well-known fact, but its process remained rather obscure because of the fact that our only evidence was literary. We must therefore thank Stan Royal Mumford for his field study, his careful description, and his sagacious analysis.

The two conflicting but closely related religious systems that met in Gyasumdo both attempt to serve the same purpose: ensure the well-being and happiness of the people. The ideological and ritual realization of this purpose is dialogical, but becomes controversial as soon as the unbound shamanic tradition and the loosely bound village-Buddhist traditions are challenged by bound Buddhist orthodoxy.

For example, until the early 1960s the Buddhists took part in the shamanic spring sacrifice of a deer. The rite is meant to ensure fertility and security by pleasing the ancestral deity of the Gurung nobility and the serpentine *klu* spirits of the underworld. The Tibetans of Tshap village were subservient to the lords of Tapje village, and thus could not avoid participation in the rite despite Tibetan Buddhism's condemnation of ritual killing (*dniarmchnd*, "red offering") as the most serious form of transgression. This attitude of compromise became impossible after the arrival of Lama Chog Lingpa from Tibet soon after 1959. He strongly repudiated the "red offering," replacing it with an annual fertility rite in the Tibetan Buddhist manner according to a ritual text composed by himself (facsimile and English translation: Appendix A). In this text, Lama Chog Lingpa explicitly identifies himself with the famous Lama Padmasambhava, who acted similarly in eighth-century Tibet. In both cases the purpose of the original ritual—material gain, such as a good harvest—was supplemented by a religious goal, i.e., the propagation of Buddhism.

There were other life rituals that had a common ground but became exposed to

orthodox Buddhist interpretation: additional rites of exchange with the *klu* spirits, rites of defense involving the middle-world guardian deities (*btsan*), and rites exorcising the upper-world demons (*bdud*). The Gyasumdo death rituals—the calling of the lost soul and the funeral ceremonies—had the same character of dialogical formation and orthodox Buddhist interpretation. The rituals of life and death address the problems of the present era, the "bad time" (*dus ngan-pa*) that followed the prime era of original harmony and the subsequent era of harmony-restoring kingship (the "good time," *dus bzang-po*). The book describes the Buddhist and shamanic dialogical responses to this historical sequence. The approaches are differently accentuated: Shamanism aims at socially oriented intramundane problem solution; Buddhism includes intramundane problem solution, but is oriented toward extramundane salvation.

Both shaman and village lama confront the same practical needs of their people. Mumford gives the following example (196–222): The daughter of the leader of Tshap village fell seriously ill with a malady obviously caused by evil spirits. The village lama was called to perform the required exorcism, but he failed. In this desperate situation, the old system of interreligious ritual succor was reenacted: the shaman from the other side of the river was called for help. He tried to expel the demons by beating the patient with a broom, while the lama reluctantly cooperated by whispering in the young woman's ear a section of the Buddhist *Tibetan Book of the Dead.* The broom treatment also failed, so only the "red offering" could help. The lama was ready to look the other way. But suddenly the young woman died. The shaman said that because the animal sacrifice had not been performed the killer demons had triumphed. The lama said that the demonic attack must have been a secondary cause (*rkyen*) of the root cause (*rgyu*) of the dead person's karmic fruition. If this were so, the young woman had had a "timely death" (*dus-la shi-ba*). The lama-shaman cooperation showed the old practical compromise, though the explanation of the cause of death was significantly different.

One of the major merits of Mumford's book is its documentation and analysis of the mechanism of shamanic-Buddhist interaction through dialog and contest on the practical as well as on the theoretical plane. Equally valuable are Mumford's records of local interpretations of orthodox Buddhist concepts. For example, the village lama certainly knows that the concept of the "five deteriorations" (*snigs-ma lnga*) officially pertains to the deterioration of religious and ethical capacities, but he explains it, in accordance with village folk tradition, as the debasement of material values: the lowering of food quality due to marketed tastes, the shift in cooking vessels from gold to silver to copper and finally to today's aluminum, etc. (227, 229). These material deteriorations are also presented as signs of the "bad time" we live in, the time of natural, social, and religious decay that contrasts with the earlier "ideal" and "good" eras.

Mumford's elaboration of the historical model of the three eras is basically convincing (see chapter 5). However, the concept of the "good age" cannot be opposed to the present "evil era of deterioration" (better: "bad era or time") without first discussing the significance of the former term. According to orthodox teaching, the present era too is a good age (Skr. *bhadrakalpa*), since it is an age when Buddhas appear to show the path to salvation.

Although, in my opinion, Mumford is right in considering the second era to be the era of the wheel-turning kingship (universal kingship; 227), it is not possible to link this era with the ritual *maṇḍala*. Mumford's interpretation of the ritual *maṇḍala* as the "Mandala of the Wheel-turning King" (232–35) is not correct: the *maṇḍala* is offered to the Buddhas and lamas as a symbol of the entire world, but, contrary to what he believes, it is not offered by the world king. Rather, an officiant offers it in the

name of the community. Its symbolism includes the wheel-turning king, to be sure, but his "seven jewels of royalty" (wheel-turning kingship, *rgyal-sridrin-chen sna-bdun*) form only one part of the whole offering complex. This complex also includes the famous "eight lucky signs" (*bkra-śis rtags-brgyad*), which are no less important than the seven jewels of royalty. Nor is Mumford's description of the *maṇḍala* (233) correct. The constituent symbolic subcomplex of the *maṇḍala* is formed not by the "eight sacrificial goddesses," but by the "eight lucky symbols" that the goddesses carry in their hands and that Mumford does not even mention.

Mumford also errs in certain statements regarding Buddhist cosmology, in which there are four continents surrounding Mt. Sumeru, the "World Mountain." Mumford says that "the Wish-granting Tree goes with the southern continent, Dzambuling (*'dzam-bu gling*), designated as the human world and generally referring to the Indian subcontinent." In fact, the Wish-granting Tree goes with the northern continent. And although Dzambuling is said to resemble the Indian subcontinent, it includes also the other lands of the human world, i.e., China, Tibet, Mongolia, etc.

The translations of the two local texts at the end of the book (Appendices A and B) also contain errors. *ngen 'gro* (correctly *ngan 'gro*) on page 257 does not mean "hell" but "bad fate." There are three bad fates: birth in one of the many hells, birth as a hungry ghost, and birth as an animal. *stong-gsum* (262) does not mean "the three worlds of emptiness," but "consisting of three thousand (worlds)," i.e., the universe. Here *stong* is not an abbreviation of *stong-pa-nyid*, "emptiness," but means "thousand."

Careless errors also catch the eye. Mumford refers to Mañjuśrī (Manjushri), a bodhisattva, as the "Buddha Manjusri" (91, 151). The Tibetan equivalent of Mañjuśrī is not 'Jam-dpal-dbyangs (Skr. Mañjuśrīghoṣa), but 'Jam-dpal. *rigs-gsurn rngon-po* (98) does not mean "the three protector Buddha-lineages," but "the protectors of the three (Buddha-)Lineages." The name of the third of these three protector bodhisattvas, Phyag-na rdo-rje, is not Vajradhara in Sanskrit (Vajradhara is a buddha, Tib. rDo-rje-'chang), but Vajrapāṇi. Such inaccuracies are annoying; I hope similar problems were avoided in the presentation of the field material, which cannot always be verified by the reader.

Mumford undoubtedly has a good command not only of the local Tibetan dialect but also of written Tibetan. It is therefore irritating to note errors in his transcriptions of written Tibetan and Sanskrit names and expressions. A basic term like "bad time" (178: "evil age"), *dus ngan-pa*, is always misspelled as *dus ngen-pa*, with *ngen-pa* reflecting the modern Tibetan pronunciation of the written Tibetan *ngan-pa*. Most of the names of the "seven jewels of royalty" are transcribed wrongly (234): *gser k'yi khor-lo* should be *gser-gyi 'khor-lo* (*rin-po-che*); *tsu-mo rin-po-che* should be *btsun-mo rin-po-che*; *rta-chog rin-po-che* should be *rta-mchog rin-po-che*; *lon-po rin-po-che* should be *blon-po rin-po-che*; and *dmak-pon rin-po-che* should be *dmag-dpon rin-po-che*. Sanskrit *chakravārtin* should either be *chakravartin* (transcription) or *cakravartin* (transliteration). There are very many other mistakes of this kind. What is the use of giving names and terms in transliteration if the transliterations cannot be trusted?

The anthropologist should also try to avoid philological and linguistic mistakes, which reflect poorly on the professional quality of his work. It is regrettable that such shortcomings should be present in the book under review, since they lead to unnecessary doubts about a study deserving of great attention.

Klaus SAGASTER
University of Bonn
Bonn, Germany