

alternative sources or levels of coherence, appealing to an “unseen subtlety” that contains all opposites (p. 155) or playing the “wild card” that puts every perspective on par with every other (pp. 180–95). Ziporyn thus rehearses the entire history of early Chinese philosophy in terms of disputes about coherence.

Ziporyn’s survey is always interesting, often illuminating, and sometimes brilliant. His response to the charge that Zhuangzi is a “relativist” belongs in the latter category (pp. 190–95). The challenge, however, is to provide readers with a clear account of what occurs when early Chinese philosophers engage the world coherently. While Hall, Ames, and Hansen regard the Chinese tradition as “profoundly and overwhelmingly nominalist in orientation,” Ziporyn wishes to establish that “the actual approach taken by Chinese thinkers . . . is neither strictly nominalist nor strictly realist in the Western sense” (p. 56). Finding a language that is adequate to describe this middle ground proves difficult, and readers can sense the struggle. Ziporyn’s descriptions of non-ironic coherence as “almost voluntaristic” and “one might even say performative” feel halting and tentative (pp. 126, 122). Readers sympathetic with this book will find themselves searching alongside Ziporyn for terms adequate for his insights, which are often pioneering and difficult to relate in conventional terms.

Being a sympathizer, I found myself on numerous occasions recalling the language of pragmatic naturalism. To identify “human desire as the irreducible starting point of all inquiry” (p. 232) and to connect coherence to “equilibrium” and “growth” (p. 84) immediately calls John Dewey to mind. Ziporyn makes only one mention of Dewey, and unfortunately what he says is inaccurate: he mislabels Dewey as a “nominalist” (p. 44), even though it is well established that Dewey is neither a realist nor a nominalist.¹⁰ While this mistake has no bearing on this book’s arguments about Chinese philosophy, the point is relevant for comparative philosophers who, in broad sympathy with Ziporyn, are searching for ways to think past realist/nominalist dichotomies and better understand what for Chinese thinkers might have been common sense.

JAMES BEHUNIAK JR
Colby College
jbehunia@colby.edu

INNER ASIA

Handbook of Tibetan Iconometry: A Guide to the Arts of the 17th Century.

Edited by CHRISTOPH CÜPPERS, LEONARD VAN DER KUIJP, and ULRICH PAGEL, with a Chinese introduction by DOBIS TSERING GYAL. Leiden: Brill, 2012. x, 386 pp. \$138.00 (cloth).

doi:10.1017/S0021911813002039

Handbook of Tibetan Iconometry: A Guide to the Arts of the 17th Century is an impressive act of preservation of a stunning testament to the refinement of Tibetan

¹⁰See, e.g., Larry Hickman and Thomas Alexander, “The Development of American Pragmatism,” in *The Essential Dewey: Pragmatism, Education, Democracy*, eds. Larry Hickman and Thomas Alexander (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 1:xi.

culture. Aside from its obvious coffee-table appeal, it is a book primarily for specialists in the study of Tibetan intellectual history, seventeenth-century Tibet, and Buddhist art history, particularly the Indo-Tibetan science of iconometry. The heart of the book is a full-color facsimile reproduction of a seventeenth-century Tibetan iconometric handbook, the *Cha tshad kyi dpe ris Dpyod ldan yid gsos* (*Illustrations of measurements: A refresher for the cognoscenti*). The handbook was produced by a trio of experts in drawing and penmanship under the auspices and in accordance with the scholarly oeuvre of Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho (1653–1705), the *sde srid* (civil administrator) of the Fifth Dalai Lama's Dga' ldan pho brang government of Tibet from 1679 to 1705. *Handbook of Tibetan Iconometry* also includes a brief but cutting-edge introduction to the scholarly output of Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho and the study of Tibetan iconometry, as well as useful appendices. The breathtaking line drawings and examples of Tibetan scripts of the *Dpyod ldan yid gsos* are more than worth the cost of the book.

The preface and the English-language introduction explain the origin of the *Dpyod ldan yid gsos* and the manner in which it came to be reproduced here. One can only hope that this collaboration between the Tibetan Autonomous Regional Archives in Lhasa and the International Archives Preservation Trust will produce further invaluable manuscripts. Though not stated explicitly by the authors of the introduction, the *Dpyod ldan yid gsos* is a treatise that states in word, but more powerfully in imagery, Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho's position on debates within the science of iconometry, presumably in order to apply these principles to the adornment of the Potala Palace, which was under construction at the time of the handbook's production. The editors point us in this direction, for they state that the text takes into account Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho's *Vaiḍūra g.ya' sel*, his previously known work, which contains, among other things, his views on iconometry. Conveniently, one of the appendices of *Handbook of Tibetan Iconometry* contains the corresponding passages in the *Vaiḍūrya g.ya' sel* that provide information about the illustrations in the *Dpyod ldan yid gsos*.

The introduction also attempts to contextualize the *Dpyod ldan yid gsos* through examining the greater oeuvre of Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho. Though fascinating, this part of the introduction suffers from two problems: at times it is lacking in detail, and at other times it provides too much. For example, there is a lack of completeness in the discussion of Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho's literary output, such as listing newly discovered works attributed to him by only their poetic titles in Tibetan, some of which provide no clue as to the actual contents of these works. On the other hand, the introduction gets lost in minutiae at best only tangentially related to Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho and of almost no relevance to the *Dpyod ldan yid gsos*. For example, we are treated to a lengthy examination of Tibetan attempts to translate one *pada* from the *Sarasvatavijākaraṇa* grammar of Anubhūtiśvarūpa (thirteenth century). The most useful part of the introduction is the partial annotated bibliography of studies of Tibetan iconometry. The authors mention a number of lesser-known works in Tibetan and other languages. This list does not aim for completeness, but rather points the reader in the appropriate direction. To their list, I would add two important publications: the two volumes of collected Tibetan iconometric texts republished in 2001 by Spen pa rdo rje at the Norbulingka Institute in Sidhpur, India, under the title *Bod kyi mehog gi lus bzo 'bur sku'i mdo rgyud thig yig gis brgyad cing rtse gdong rig pa'i 'byung gnas kyi bzo rtsal gi byung brjod mthong brgyud lag len man ngag gcig tu bkod pa'i deb ther rin chen sna bdun gyi khra tshom*, and the essay by A mdo Byams pa, "Ri mo'i skor gyi dpyad pa sngon med bzo ba rigs pa'i dgongs rgyan," published in *Krung go'i Bod ljongs* in 2001, of which I have recently completed an English translation. A mdo Byams pa was recognized as the greatest Tibetan painter of the twentieth century. In his essay on Tibetan iconometry, he

engages directly with many of the same topics as Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho, including the legacy of the father of Tibetan iconometry, Sman bla don grub.

The majority of the plates are photographed beautifully, revealing the exquisite details of the drawings. Some of the images are slightly blurry in places, which makes reading some of the captions challenging, but not impossible. Nevertheless, the editors were kind enough to provide a table of legends following the plates.

The end matter includes the aforementioned table of legends and corresponding passages of the *Vaidūrya g.ya' sel*, as well as lists of divinities, scripts, and stūpas. The editors have also transcribed the brief Tibetan text preceding the illustrations of the *Dpyod ldan yid gsos*, but an English translation of the text would have been a nice addition. The Chinese introduction by Dobis Tsering Gyal is mainly a translation of the Tibetan text accompanying each plate. The editors promise to add a Tibetan introduction in a subsequent edition.

Overall, *Handbook of Tibetan Iconometry: A Guide to the Arts of the 17th Century* is a stunning work of beauty, a testament to diligence, and an insightful analysis of our present knowledge of Tibetan iconometry and Sde srid Sangs rgyas rgya mtsho.

CAMERON DAVID WARNER
Aarhus Universitet
etncw@hum.au.dk

The Taming of Demons: Violence and Liberation in Tibetan Buddhism. By JACOB P. DALTON. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2011. x, 311 pp. \$50.00 (cloth); \$27.50 (paper).
doi:10.1017/S0021911813002040

The Taming of Demons: Violence and Liberation in Tibetan Buddhism takes up the provocative issue of violence in Tibetan Buddhist ritual and mythology. Grounding his study in Dunhuang manuscripts, Jacob Dalton illuminates tantric developments during the little-understood “age of fragmentation,” following the dissolution of the Tibetan empire in the mid-ninth century, and their enduring legacy in the Tibetan Buddhist *imaginaire*. The many shades of ritual violence discussed in this book include demon subjugation in temple building and stūpa construction, “tantric war magic” used against invading Mongol armies (p. 132), and the notorious “liberation rite” (*sgrol ba*) that claims to deliver an “object of compassion” to a Buddhist pure realm, taking its life in the process (p. 77, 84). The liberation rite becomes a focal point for Dalton to explore the limits of ritual violence in Buddhist tantra and chart out the pervasive but ambivalent role it plays in Tibetan religious history.

The first chapters set the stage for his study by tracing the emergence of ritual violence in Buddhist tantra in India with the rise of the Yoga and Mahāyoga tantras in the seventh to eighth centuries and by asking how this informed the emergence of tantric practice in Tibet. Chapter 1 uses the foundational tantric myth of the subjugation of Rudra (a version of which Dalton translates in an appendix) as a launching-off point to discuss the taming of demons, pivotal to the mythology that consolidated around the Tibetan assimilation of Buddhism during the imperial period (seventh to ninth centuries). Building on the work of Samten Karmay, chapter 2 argues for the reassessment of the age of fragmentation that followed as a period when tantric practice flourished, unfettered by