

REVIEWS

Das Varṇārhavarṇastotra des Mātṛceṭa. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Göttingen, 1987. Pp. 372.

Among the fairly numerous hymns (*stotra*, *stava*; *bṣtod pa*) transmitted, mainly in later Tibetan translations, under the name of Mātṛceṭa, the Buddhist *stotrakāra* par excellence, *Śatapañcāśatka* and *Varṇārhavarṇastotra* stand out as the most important. Based on Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia and R. Sāktyāyana's handwritten copy of a complete Sanskrit ms. in Tibet (still extant in Lhasa!), D. R. Shackleton Bailey (Professor of Greek and Latin at Harvard University since 1975) published an excellent critical edition, almost definitive, of the *Śatapañcāśatka*, Cambridge, 1951.

Several scholars, first F. W. Thomas, then A. F. R. Hoernle, W. Siegling, D. R. Shackleton Bailey, B. Pauly, W. Couvreur, D. Schlingloff and K. T. Schmidt, have in various ways dealt with the *Varṇārhavarṇastotra* (also entitled *Catuḥśataka*), thus creating a natural desire to have everything collected within the compass of one single volume.

With the help of all these contributions and of his own identification of further Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia (there is no complete Sanskrit manuscript), Jens-Uwe Hartmann has now published a superb critical edition of the extant Tibetan version (CDNP) of VAV along with the available Sanskrit fragments, comprising ca. 82% of the complete text, thus filling a considerable lacuna in the study of early Mahāyāna.

In his introduction Hartmann discusses the sources available for a biography of Mātṛceṭa, provides a list of the works traditionally ascribed to him, identifies quotations from later sources, accounts for the textual basis of his edition, notes the linguistic and orthographic peculiarities of the mss. and analyses the metric and poetic features of the VAV. The bulk of his work comprises a meticulously accurate (though certainly not very poetical) German rendering of VAV. Finally the book contains various concordances, a *pāda-index* to VAV and *Śatapañcāśatka*, an index of select words, and a good bibliography.

As said, this is a fine piece of work, in the best German tradition, and no decisive improvement can be made until (if ever) new Sanskrit fragments, or a complete manuscript (perhaps from Tibet) are discovered. I shall therefore confine myself to offering a few observations and suggestions, and call attention to some important points made by Jens-Uwe Hartmann.

A significant result of Hartmann's careful collation of the four Tibetan editions of the VAV is that the Cone Tanjur in this case is unlikely to have been based on the Derge edition. This means that Vogel's well-known account of the relationship between the various Tibetan editions has to be modified

accordingly. All editions are, as known, assumed to go back to the “Old Narthang” edition, a direct knowledge of which would solve many of our problems today. As far as I am informed, the handwritten Narthang *bKa’ ’gyur* was still to be seen surviving in Gyantse in 1981.

Another good thing to recall when working with a Tibetan translation without the Sanskrit original is that, dealing with such a fairly brief text as VAV, in 29 cases the Sanskrit allows one to emend against the consensus of CDNP. In the majority of cases even an experienced philologist would not expect anything to be wrong in Tib.

To Hartmann’s list of quotations found in later sources a few more may now be added. Eight verses from chapter II may be found in Guṇaprabha’s *Bodhisattvabhūmivṛtti*. I shall quote them from the Derge edition (No. 4044, fol. 170a7–171a4): *ji ltar slob dpon ma khol gyis bstod pa b[z]i brgya pa las....*

khyod kyi bstan la ma brten par ||
de ñid mthoñ ba ’ga’ yañ med ||
loñ ba lta bu’i ’jig rten gyi ||
mig tu gyur pa khyod la ’dud || 2.56

me dañ mar me’i ’od yod ciñ ||
zla skar nor bu yod gyur kyañ ||
ñi ma med na sa steñ ’di ||
gsal bas rgyas par mi ’gyur la || 2.57

de las g’zan pa’i snañ ba ’am ||
de las khyad ’phags g’zan dag ni ||
yod kyañ khyod med ’gro ba ’di ||
snañ ba med par gyur pa yin || 2.58

ji ltar ma rig mun pa yi ||
sgrib pas sems ni yoñs bkag (!) pas ||
mun par gyur pa’i ’jig rten gyi ||
snañ bar gyur pa khyod la ’dud || 2.59

don ni don du ma rig ciñ ||
don ma yin yañ don min du ||
blo yis chos ni ma rtogs pa ||
khyod la brten nas rtogs pa yin || 2.60

phal cher don min spoñ ’dod kyañ ||
rmoñs pas don ni spoñ ’gyur te ||
mi šes pa ni don ’dod kyañ ||
don ma yin pa grub par ’gyur || 2.61

khyod la brten nas ci rigs par ||
 gñi ga dag ni rtogs 'gyur te ||
 de dag gñi ga ñer bstan pa'i ||
 don du gyur pa khyod la 'dud || 2.62

rnam pa thams cad yoñs mkhyen pas ||
 mkhyen bya thams cad kun snañ ba ||
 ye śes snañ ba mdzad pa yi ||
 ye śes gyur la phyag 'tshal lo || 2.63

In the *Bodhisattvaśīlaparivartaṭīkā* by Jinaputra (D. No. 4046, fol. 191b4), there is another verse by “*bstod pa byed pa*”, the *stotrakāra*, which certainly conveys the *rasa* characteristic of Mātṛceṭa:

ji ltar tshig ni btsun pa dañ ||
 lus can mams kyi bsod nams žiñ ||
 gžan la gnod byed mi 'gyur žes ||
 sñiñ brtse'i bdag ñid khyod la brten ||

Some observations on the individual verses:

1.1: Mātṛceṭa speaks of himself as *mañḍa*, dull-headed, which recalls Nāgārjuna's usage, cf. MK XXXIV, 11 & 12. It is used in the context of one who does not grasp the Buddha's *deśanā*.

1.2: This is an allusion to the celebrated *pañkaprakṣālananyāya*, the maxim of washing off the mud, suggesting that Mātṛceṭa had been wasting his life before finally being converted to Buddhism. See Eckel in *Indiske Studier V* (Copenhagen 1985), p. 70, n. 1; *ida mayā... tvām ārabhyārabhyate* simply means: “I write/compose this (work) about you,” cf. CPD, s.v. *ārabhha*.

1.3: Read *tasyedaṃ* (misprint).

1.5: I prefer *kathā sāram* for *kathāsāram*. In *b va na* means “if not”, as Tib.

1.9: Read *sakenopanayāmi* to avoid the difficult *sa kenopanayāmi?*

1.10: I take *vimuktisāmānyagatais* to mean “who share liberation (with you)”.

1.11: For *sausīrya* cf. *Niraupanyastava* 18—Mātṛceṭa's devotion to Mahāyāna is quite outspoken in these verses.

1.21: Here *pracaya*, quantity, has not been translated. Does *saṃpradhāraṇā* suggest the image of a calculus?

2.14: For *bhāvato*, “sincerely” (hardly “vom Existentiellen her”), cf. Rāhulabhadra's *Prajñāpāramitāstotra* 2 (*bhāvena*) and 14 (*bhāvataḥ*). In MK XV, 7 Nāgārjuna refers to Bhagavat as *bhāvābhāvavibhāvin*, “understanding being and non-being”.

2.35: *bženis* (*bis*), obvious misprints for *bžeñs*.

2.55: There are several cases of *anupādāya* being used as an “indecl. adj.” in MK XXV.

6.3: Note the interesting adv. *itītikayā*, from *itītikā* (not from *itītika!*). Compare *ahamahamikā*, etc., Wackernagel II, 2 201. Quite often such formations only occur as adv. in the instrumental.

6.9: On *vivāda*, *dṛṣṭi* etc., cf. also *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* 46–47 (my *Nagarjuniana*, p. 114).

6.10: For *dhīra*, opp. to *manda*, cf. 1.1, see PED, s.v. Favourite term in the *Suttanipāta* to which these verses often allude. For *śava* cf. 10.5 (not 10.7), and BHSD, s.v.

6.12: *na sameti te* + instr., “You have nothing in common with”.

6.36: On *pravṛtti* / *nivṛtti* cf. *Catuḥśataka* VIII, 8.

7.20: There is an echo of this verse in Bhavya’s *Madhyamakahr̥daya* VIII, 79.

9.1: It may well be better to read *śeṣaḥ pāllaviko janaḥ*, with Tib. The exact meaning of *pāllavika*, Tib. *tshogs śiñ mchis* (read thus), remains uncertain. MW suggests “diffusive, digressive”, but this does not fit the context very well.

9.11: This verse is almost an echo of Āryadeva’s *Catuḥśataka* V,1, q.v. VAV is occasionally referred to as the *Catuḥśatakastotra*. Would Mātṛceṭa thereby want to intimate that his work is to be regarded as a “companion” to that of his guru, Āryadeva? One could easily argue, on a philological basis, that Āryadeva’s work lacks all the “religious” elements of VAV, i.e. all the elements that are required to give a “complete” picture of early Mahāyāna as found, above all, in Nāgārjuna’s *Ratnāvalī*. Once all the minor works of Mātṛceṭa have been critically edited, it will certainly prove fruitful to compare the numerous parallel passages in Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva and assess the literary output of Mātṛceṭa in this perspective.

11.28: For *go* in the sense of *vāc* see the verse quoted in my *Nagarjuniana*, p. 91, n. 124, which also explains why Tib. renders it as *sa rnam*s. *Proktā* / *proktam* does not mean “angesprochen”. In early Madhyamaka literature it invariably means: “That has been declared/described/explained in the scriptures (by the Buddha)” (see e.g. *Lokāūtastava* 9, 20; *Acintyastava* 32, 36, 44, 48; *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* 33, 34, etc.).

13.25: Again there is an echo of this verse in *Madhyamakahr̥daya*, this time in III, 3, q.v.

Jens-Uwe Hartmann has provided me with the following “Korrigenda zu Das Varnārhavarṇastotra des Mātṛceṭa”:

Zwischen dem Fahnen und den Umbruchkorrekturen sind zwei Druckfehler eingedrungen, die sich kaum als solche erkennen lassen:

S. 133, Vers 2.72c: lies *bhāvitānirmalasya*

S. 193, Vers 6.6b: lies *vyapāśrayāt*.

Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert. 5. Lieferung: *idam/upasaṃ-pādita*. Göttingen, 1987. Pp. iii + 80. DM52,-.

With a few exceptions and additions this is a dictionary and concordance (abbreviated: SWTF) to all the more or less fragmentary published Buddhist texts brought to Berlin by the four Prussian expeditions to Xinjiang, or East Turkestan (i.e. Turfan, Kučā, Qarašāhr and Tumšūq), between 1902 and 1914.

Sanskrit texts on grammar, medicine, astronomy and metre, Mahāyāna-sūtras and hymns (above all the *stotras* of Mātṛceṭa) have, as a rule, been excluded as sources for the SWTF. The complete list of texts included is given in the first fascicle, 1973, pp. xi–xiv. Lists of additional sources are given in fasc. II, 1976, p. ii; fasc. III, 1981, pp. iii–iv; fasc. IV, 1984, pp. ii–iii and, finally, fasc. V, 1987, p. ii.

The fascinating and intricate story of the findings and their subsequent publication has been related briefly by Ernst Waldschmidt in the first volume of the *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Wiesbaden 1965, pp. xi–xxxii.

For the first three fascicles, Georg von Simson (now Oslo) had the main editorial responsibility; beginning with the fourth fascicule it was entrusted to Dr. Michael Schmidt. In connection with the elaboration of the the fifth fascicule Dr. Schmidt has received competent help from Jens-Uwe Hartmann, also in Göttingen. Hovering in the air above it all is, as it were, right from the start, the imposing and enterprising personality of Professor Heinz Bechert, who stands as “Leiter” or “Herausgeber” of the SWTF.

And the readership of the SWTF? Clearly all those students and scholars who in their daily work benefit by using *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Edgerton’s *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* and, perhaps, *Hōbōgirin*.

The eighty pages of the fifth fascicule cover about the same ground, viz. *idam* to *upasaṃpādita* in “Turfan-Sanskrit” as do fasc. VI–XI of *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*. Almost every entry in the SWTF contains a reference to the CPD and BHSD.

As one of the most valuable features of the fifth fascicule I would mention the copious entries under *idam* and *idānīm* and also those under *iva* and *iha*. The references and quotations have been arranged in an intelligible manner, permitting us to see clearly their usage and precise meaning (often a question of context, etc.).

Let me add a few notes and observations on some of the entries:

Page 327: *idapratyayatā-pratītyasamutpāda*-. A better translation than the ones suggested would be: “*pratītyasamutpāda* in the sense of this being *pratyaya* [of that], i.e. in the sense of empirical causality.” (There may also be

other ways of understanding p.; cf. the compound *pratīyasamutpādaśūnyatā* (in *Mūlamadhyamakakārika* XXIV, 36: “*sūnyatā* in the sense of p.”)

Page 331: *indriyaparāparajñānabala-*. This reading is supported by *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (ed. P. Pradhan), p. 411. Tib. has ... *mchog dañ mchog ma yin pa*....

Page 339: *īśvara-kartṛ*. For “Gott und Schöpfer” I prefer “Creator in the form of God”, and for *īśvarakartṛka* I prefer “believing that the Creator is God”. Cf. the small treatise entitled *Īśvarakartṛtvanirākṛti* (or *Viṣṇor ekakartṛtvanirākaraṇa*, my *Nagarjuniana*, p. 16): “Refutation of Īśvara as the Creator (God)”, where a *dvandva* is quite impossible. Cf. also CPD, s.v. *issara-karṇna-vādi(n)*, “one who believes/maintains that this world was created by a supreme deity”.

Page 341: *uc-cagghikā* (and *uc-chagghikā*, *uccaṃghikā*). Add: used in the instr. only. Check here ref. to Pauly, p. 239. SWTF refers to CPD, s.v. *ujjagghikā*, and BHSD, s.v. *uccaghati*. But see rather BHSD, s.v. *ujjāṅkikā* (the form given in *Mahāvīyutpatti*). It has been suggested, cf. BHSD, s.v., that the “correct” reading would be *ujjākṣikā*. None of the meanings suggested, viz. “lautes oder böses Lachen; Auslachen”, or “Schimpfen” (thus Chinese, cf. *Upālipariṭṭhā* (ed. Stache-Rosen), p. 96, n. 107)¹ fits the context very well. The reference is to the way a monk walks or sits. In Skt. we have e.g. *kapi-jaṅghikā*, and could thus most easily suppose the original to have been *ujjāṅghikayā*, “with (the robe) up his shanks”, or, less probably, “with his legs up (when sitting)”. Pāli knows *jaṅghā*, the lower leg, from knee to ankle, in compounds *jaṅgha-*^o. The original meaning of the term was already obscure at an early date. Note that the Chinese, *loc. cit.*, has nothing corresponding to Pāli *hasanīyasmim vatthusmim mihitamattam karoti*. It would only fit with the Theravāda interpretation of our entry, not with the one represented in the Chinese version.

Page 346: *ut-kṛṣṭikā* and *utkṛṣṭikā-kṛta*. These do not mean “Aufrichten oder Zurückwerfen (des Kopfes)”, or “Unzufriedenheit”, nor has it anything to do here with “eine falsche Rückbildung aus *ukkaṅṭhikā*” etc., as suggested by von Hinüber. Our word corresponds to Pāli *ukkhittakā* (*sic!*), again instr. only: “with the robe tossed up, or, as the Chinese quite correctly has it, “mit bloßem Oberkörper” (*Upālipariṭṭhā*, p. 98, etc.). Cf. also J. Filliozat, *Laghu-prabandhāḥ*, p. 85. One would have expected the Pāli to be *ukkhittikā*, from Skt. *utkṛṣṭikā*, with exactly the same meaning as BHS *utkṛṣṭikā* (Edgerton misunderstands Tib. *mgo mi brdze!*). In any case: “with (his robe) tossed up”.

Page 352: *uttareṇa*. When a verb of movement, as here, *anvāvṛtta* (not quite precisely defined in fasc. II) is given, it is better to take the instr. as indicating the way or road, to quote old Speijer, “über oder durch welchen eine Bewegung stattfindet.” So: “he went along the northern (road), to (*vena*)...”

¹ (*Ed. note:*) See the following review.

-*uttarottareṇa* is, perhaps, “by (a road) further north”.

Page 361: *utplutya*. Good remark in von Hinüber, 1986, §157. Though our entry “corresponds” to Pāli *uppacca*, there is a different shade of meaning in *utplutya*. Like *samplava*, *viplava*, *upaplava* etc., there seems to be a connotation of (an action) that happens in a sudden and confused manner, beyond control. As such it hardly belongs to the most ancient strata of Sanskrit.

Page 373: *ud-dhata*. “Erregt; in einem euphorischen, vermutlich über-triebenes Selbstvertrauen implizierenden Zustand befindlich”. A rather cumbersome definition for a dictionary, though correct.

Page 376: *udyūthaka*. If we trust the Pāli commentaries the word does not mean “kampfbereit”, but “combatant”. The Chinese speaks of “ein kämpfen-des Heer” (*Upālipariprechā*, p. 77). It is necessary to reconsider the history, usage and form of the word more carefully, also in Pāli. It may well be that in the earliest phase only *udyuthikā* / *uyyodhikā* / *udyūthikā* was known as a fem. subst., in the sense of “troops in combat”.

Page 394: *upa-laṣaṇa*. Better than “Untersuchung” would be “Aufmerk-samkeit” or “Beobachtung”. Cf. my remarks on Pāli *upa-lakkhaṇa* in *IJJ* 28 (1985), pp. 299–302.

Page 394: *upaśamādhiṣṭhāna*. Does not mean “Entschluß zur (inneren) Ruhe” (misled by the definition in CPD, “resolve to establish inner peace”), but “power/control by means of in the form of inner peace”. This explanation fits much better with the explanation given, e.g., in *Saṅgītiparyāya* IV, 16, q.v.

There can be no doubt that Drs. Schmidt and Hartmann are doing a fine job in the office of the SWTF in Göttingen. We shall keep our fingers crossed that they will be able to continue to do so!

Upālipariprechāsūtra. Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin. Aus dem Chinesischen übersetzt und den Pāli-Parallelen gegenübergestellt von Valentina Stache-Rosen, herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert. Göttingen, 1984. Pp. 120, DM62, –.

No other name in the history of Buddhism is so intimately connected with the transmission and early history of the corpus of monastic discipline, the *Vinaya*, as that of Upāli. No wonder, for Upāli was, we are told, the person appointed to recite the *Vinaya* at the first council immediately after the passing away of the Buddha. And no wonder that most Buddhist “schools” have their own text entitled: “The Questions of Upāli”.

What we have here is a translation of the *Yu-po-li wen fo ching* found in Taishō XXIV, No. 1466, 903–10. The Chinese text is also reproduced. It is said to have been made from a “*fan*” original, and that, in this case, most

probably means that it belongs to the small group of texts in the Chinese Tripiṭaka that have been made not from the Sanskrit, but from the Pāli or Prakrit. It seems quite plausible, as the translator and the editor argue, that the *Upāli*, like the *Vimuttimaggā*, belongs to the Abhayagirivihārin section of the Theravādins.

Almost all the paragraphs in the *Upāli* find their literal parallels in the Pāli *Vinaya* available to us in the PTS edition of Oldenberg (*Parivāra* and *Suttavibhaga*). These Pāli parallels have here been juxtaposed to the translation from the Chinese. Variants etc. are indicated by italics, and in the notes (few but good) the precise differences between the Chinese and the Pāli are indicated—all of it very convenient.

V. Stache-Rosen describes the relationship between the two versions as follows: “With the exception of the Sekhiya section, each and every rule of the Chinese *Upālipariṭicchāsūtra* is found in the *Parivāra* and the *anāpatti* clauses are found in the *Vibhaṅga*, although the order is different.” And: “Pārājika 1–4, Saṅghādisesa 1–10 and Nissaggiya 1–23 and Pāṭidesaniya 1–4 correspond to each other. Among the 92 Pācittiya rules, the order is different and among the 73 Sekhiya rules, eight have no correspondence in the Pāli text. One may therefore say that the *Upālipariṭicchāsūtra* corresponds to the whole of the *Vibhanga*, not only to the *Pātimokkha*.”

First our text, by way of introduction, mentions the 26 circumstances under which a monk can be considered either dependent (*nissita*) or independent (*anissita*). Then we have all the rules and offences: 4 Pārājika-violations involving permanent expulsion; 13 Saṅghādisesa, which involve a time of penance before reinstatement by the Congregation; 30 Nissaggiya-Pācittiya-offences that require expiation and involve forfeiture; 92 Pācittiya-rules, violations of which require expiation; 4 Pāṭidesaniya-rule violations, requiring that faults are confessed; finally 72 (!) Sekhiya-rules.

Valentina Stache-Rosen’s work is useful in several respects. The late authoress’ translation from the Chinese is a welcome and very reliable help for those who want to read the original on their own. Those who are mainly interested in Pāli will find that in a dozen cases or so the Chinese translator’s understanding of a term differs from that given in Pāli dictionaries or commentaries. The main value of this work, however, is obviously to be seen in its being a further contribution to the comparative study of Buddhist monastic discipline. Here, small differences in parallel texts often end up making a large difference.

To a modern mind, reading Buddhist *Vinaya* can, to be quite frank, often be a dreadfully boring pastime. I suppose that some of the ancient Buddhist monks must have felt the same way about it, for how are we otherwise to explain the fact that a *Mahāyānasūtra* with the same title was composed on the same topic, *Vinaya*, but in an entirely different, much more “free-and-easy” spirit? I am, of course, thinking of the text edited and translated by Pierre Python, Paris, 1973.

Indeed, now that some of the basic philological spade-work has been done, a comparative study of these two *Upāliparipṛcchāsūtras* would shed light on some fundamental ethical differences in early Buddhism that eventually led to the formation of two independent “vehicles”.

Christian Lindtner

Institute of Oriental Philology

University of Copenhagen

Buddhism and the State in the Far East (Buddizm i gosudarstvo na Dal'nem Vostokye). Edited by A. S. Martynov. Moscow: Idatel'stvo “Nauka”, 1987. Pp. 226.

All the essays included in this volume are concerned in some way with a peculiar religious situation in the countries of the Far East through the Middle Ages. One may wonder why—having dominated many aspects of the social and cultural fields—Buddhism could not finally dominate in this region and ultimately conquer the native ideological traditions. It seems reasonable to look for an explanation of the fact in the specific relations between the foreign creed and the state orders in these countries, based on a sacralized complex of native beliefs. The pragmatic attitude of the secular authorities to the interaction of the native and Buddhist traditions resulted in handling both of them merely as suitable devices for the achievement of political purposes. Meanwhile, with a few exceptions, the Buddhist clergy was kept apart from involvement in any political matters. The essays in the book are intended to elucidate the problem and deal with it from different positions and in different countries and ages.

A. S. Martynov in the Introduction (entitled “The State and Religions in the Far East”) has tried to illustrate the pragmatic attitude of the Chinese officials to Buddhism and the ways in which it was treated through all the stages of Chinese history. In this way he has provided theoretical grounds for more general conclusions about the character of the relationship of the state and religion in the Far East as a whole.

T.G. Komissarova deals in her paper with disputes on the problem of the Buddhist monks' non-commitment to any secular ruler. The idea was expounded for the first time by Hui Yuan (334–416) in his treatise *Shamen bu jing wang zhe lun* (A Monk Does Not Pay Homage To The Emperor) and was developed about sixty years later by Huan Xuan. In the IV–Vth centuries the Chinese, discussing the problem of non-commitment, usually treated it

together with a Buddhist concept of the immortality of Soul, and that idea, being incompatible with traditional Chinese beliefs, put an obstacle to fast and successful expansion of Buddhism on Chinese soil. As an appendix, the article includes translations of the texts on the problem, borrowed from a huge collection, *Hung ming ji* by Seng-yu (445–518).

Two articles by A. S. Martynov and by Ye. I. Kychanov centre upon the development of Buddhism in China at the beginning of the Tang dynasty. Martynov's essay, "Buddhism and the Court in the Early Tang Period (VII–VIIIth Centuries)", contains a critical analysis of the changes in attitude towards Buddhism that took place under the first Tang emperors. As a result, some components of the Buddhist religion, e.g. accumulation of virtues (*gung de*) by the rulers or involvement in charity activities, were incorporated into the official state cult. Kychanov treats the legal status of the Buddhist clergy and the monastic regulations, borrowing material for his considerations mainly from the official codes, such as *Tang lu shu yi* (653) and *Qingyuan tiaofa* (1202). A Russian translation of the paragraphs from these works, connected with the discussed problems, is added.

By comparing the biographies of the same monks in the dynasty history *Jin shu* (it includes five Buddhist biographies) and a hagiographical work *Gao seng zhuan* (Lives of Eminent Monks) by Hui-jiao (497–554), M. Ye. Yermakov comes to the conclusion that the official historiography tended to show Buddhist monks as miracle-doers rather than spiritual leaders and thinkers. To support his suggestion he illustrates it with a translation of Kumārajīva's biography from *Gao sen zhuan*, putting the parts included in the dynastic history into italics.

Another paper by Ye. I. Kychanov, "The State and Buddhism in Xi Xia (982–1227)", provides a short survey of the history of Buddhism in the Tangut state, where it co-existed with Confucianism. The author tries to explain the reasons for Buddhism's unstable position in the Xi Xia state, until it totally yielded to the Confucian pressure.

In his article, "The Concepts of a Theocratic State in Japanese Buddhism", I. N. Ignatovich discusses the theoretical background in the teaching of Saicho (767–822) and Nichiren (1222–82), who propounded the establishment of ideal state order with the bodhisattva-monks as the most true advisers, instructors and supporters of peace and order in the state. He considers the ideas of these Japanese priests to be somewhat similar to Plato's ideal state.

A. M. Kabanov traces in his paper the evolution of the Rinzaï Zen school in Muromachi Japan through the development of an officially sponsored system, *gozan jissatsu* (Five Mountains and Ten Temples). This system resulted in the bureaucratization and secularization of Rinzaï Zen by the middle of the XVth century. The Chan monastery system imported into Japan from China with the Chan teaching in the XIIIth century had already contained all the seeds of evil that sprouted and flourished on Japanese soil at a later stage.

B. N. Melnichenko in his article, “Buddhist Church and Secular State in Medieval Thailand”, has tried to show the changing character of relations between Buddhism and secular authorities in Thailand from the XVth to the XIXth century. Once influential with—and in the XVIIIth century even in opposition to—the king, the Buddhist clergy lost its power in the course of time, until it was totally subjugated to the state.

A. N. IGNATOVICH: *Buddhism in Japan: Essays on the Early History* (Buddizm v Iaponii: Ocherk rannei istorii), Moscow: Izdatel'stvo “Nauka”, 1987. Pp. 315.

This book is the first Soviet publication where a total survey of a certain period in the history of Japanese Buddhism has been made. The period from the first appearance of Buddhism on the Japanese islands through the whole of the Nara period is covered. As far as I know, this is the third monograph work on the theme in European languages. It is a new step after the pioneering two-volume work by M. V. de Visser, *Ancient Buddhism in Japan*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1935, and the very detailed work by J. H. Kamstra, *Encounter or Syncretism. The Initial Growth of Japanese Buddhism*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967. The latter author, however, stops in the middle of the VIIth century. Ignatovich attempts to exhaust all the available materials in Japanese and Western languages (his Bibliography includes about 180 items in Japanese and about 120 in Western languages) and, while paying his homage to their studies, surpasses both of his predecessors with a more extensive treatment of the problem (though in a quite concise form). He uses Japanese and secondary sources extensively, but disagrees with certain conclusions of some eminent specialists. The evaluation of all former studies in the field is done by Ignatovich in his Introduction, where he also delineates the main problems to be discussed and formulates his approach in dealing with them.

In the first chapter he tries to point out the main political and social factors in VIth century Japan, to explain the rapid accommodation of Buddhism to Japanese society. He considers it to be a suitable device for those forces which tried to establish a well-organized and united state. After a short description of the native pre-Buddhist religious complex, the author scrutinizes all the existing sources where the arrival of Buddhism in Japan is mentioned. He pays attention to the persistence of Shinto beliefs that influenced Buddhism from its earliest stages in Japan, for instance the consistent conception of Buddha as a kind of *kami*. A prominent trait of early Japanese Buddhism, suggests Ignatovich, was its consistent tendency to gain official recognition. The prolonged struggle of rivalling clans preceded the final adoption of Buddhism. It resulted in the establishment of the state-sponsored

temple network and the hierarchical system of monkish ranks.

The author disagrees with those Japanese scholars (e.g. Tamura Eiichi) who date the beginning of state controlled Buddhism in Japan at the end of the VIIth century, and stresses A.D. 623 as the exact point when this process began. In his opinion, in the early stage of Buddhism in Japan the scholastic level of the Japanese monks, as well as that of Korean missionaries, was very low. It caused the predominance of cult and worship in the first stage, while from the VIIth century dogmatic, philosophical and sociological aspects became dominant.

In the second chapter Ignatovich analyses the political situation in the VII–VIIIth centuries, the problem of relations between Buddhism and the secular authorities and concludes that after the Taika reforms favourable conditions for the dissemination of Buddhism in Japan were created. He traces all the main historical events that were in some way connected with the propagation of Buddhism and pays special attention to the Dōkyō incident, which he evaluates as evidence of the weakness of Buddhism in Japan at that period.

The third chapter includes a detailed account of the six Nara Buddhist schools, the main sūtras and treatises used and produced by them. He finally gives a quite satisfactory exposition of their teachings according to the Japanese and Chinese sources. Though in principle of Chinese origin, the doctrines of the six Nara sects have been too neglected by scholars. Ignatovich declares that an adequate understanding of early Japanese Buddhism is incomplete without a knowledge of these doctrines. Moreover, he has discovered some Japanese innovations introduced into the original Chinese teachings.

The book can serve as a useful introduction for anyone interested in the history of Japanese Buddhism.

Alexander Kabanov
Oriental Institute
Leningrad
USSR

Présence du Bouddhisme. Sous la direction de René de Berval. Bibliothèque illustrée des Histoires. Paris: Gallimard, 1987 (reprint). 816 pages, 151 illustrations.

This large compilation of articles and essays on Buddhism first appeared as a special publication of the journal *France-Asie* which was published in Saigon in 1959 on the occasion of the Buddha Jayanti, the 2500th anniversary of

the passing of Lord Buddha. The new edition has not been re-edited or had any substantial alterations made-with the exception of the glossary, which has been improved and corrected. The bibliography has been updated and vastly expanded to include material published prior to 1987.

The book contains thirty-three articles and essays written by leading Buddhologists, Buddhists, cultural historians and art historians, and it covers roughly all the known aspects of the Buddhist religion anno 1959, including its history, doctrines, geographical settings, culture and art. This material has been divided into two parts with a total of eight main chapters. The first part, entitled “Le Bouddhisme”, treats main doctrines and historical development, with an emphasis on the Pāli tradition. Translations from the Indian canonical Buddhist literature are also included. Part Two, under the title, “Expansion du Bouddhisme en Asie”, is again sub-divided into two sections, the first of which presents Hīnayāna Buddhism and its development in India and the South East Asian countries, i.e. Burma, Thailand, Laos and Campuchia. Sub-section Two deals with Mahāyāna Buddhism and its presence in the countries of China, Korea, Japan, Tibet, Indonesia and Vietnam.

For some reason the second half of the book appears more useful and homogeneous than the first. This may be because this latter part deals with history and cultural developments in a slightly more concrete manner than the part on Śākyamuni Buddha and general doctrine, which when seen with contemporary eyes appears slightly old-fashioned and outdated. There are, however, several fine contributions in the first half of the book too, of which mention can be made of Denise Delannoy’s “La vie monastique au Tibet”, Jean Filliozat’s “Aśoka et l’expansion bouddhique”, and the fine article by Paul Levy on “Les Pèlerins chinois en Indes”. Linking together the two halves of the book is the editor’s contribution, “Chronologie de l’expansion bouddhique”, which gives a highly useful series of data on the introduction of Buddhism in the respective countries where it took root.

The second part of *Présence du Bouddhisme* contains, as said above, by far the best and most useful material in the book. Here the best chapters are André Migot’s “Le Bouddhisme en Chine”, a chapter which offers a fine historical introduction to Chinese Buddhist doctrines and practices. It is further enhanced with an integrated glossary in Chinese. Next follows Rhi Ki-yong’s (Yi Ki-yong) excellent presentation “Le Bouddhisme en Corée”, which still remains one of the best introductions to Korean Buddhism so far to appear in any Western language. Lastly mention should be made of Mai-Tho-Thruyên’s chapter on Vietnamese Buddhism, which allows one an insight into the historical development of Buddhism in the country, while at the same time presenting the major doctrines and the various Buddhist schools. This chapter also features an integrated set of Chinese characters for the key words and names, and is among the best contributions to the book.

One of the problems with *Présence du Bouddhisme* is its age. Since the book saw the light of day in 1959, the study of Buddhism has escalated

greatly to become a major field of study in the academic world. Consequently, a fair number of articles included in the volume are either out-dated, or too simplistic when seen from the perspective of contemporary research. Especially problematic are the contributions by I. B. Horner, “Le concept de Liberté dans le Canon pali”, reminiscent of British Buddhism under Queen Victoria, and by Nalinaksha Dutt, “Les principes fondamentaux du Mahāyāna”, which today appear overly superficial, ignoring as they do several important aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism such as Tantrism and the logical tradition. Also, Alexandra David-Neel, in her “Le Bouddhisme au Tibet”, displays a general ignorance of Tibetan religion, Vajrayāna doctrine and the history of Tibet.

Despite the fact that the bibliography has been updated and upgraded, it has, however, been rather arbitrarily compiled, ignoring many important contributions to the field of Buddhology, especially recent American publications of studies on Tibetan and East Asian Buddhism. In a few cases the commentaries which accompany the illustrations are faulty, with the worst blunders appearing in the chapter on Korea (pl. 117, 118, 121).

Présence du Bouddhisme can best be seen as an introduction to Buddhism and Buddhist culture. Simply because its scope is as vast as it is, the book is for natural reasons only able to present a general view of the highly diversified doctrinal and regional developments to be found in Buddhism. On the other hand, the book gives the reader a concise and useful overall picture of the Buddhist religion as such, and is at times quite successful in establishing meaningful links between the various cultures which came under Buddhist influence. As a handbook and guide to the Buddhist religion and its culture the book can be warmly recommended, and it is especially useful for teaching Buddhist culture to undergraduates (assuming, of course, that they read French). Lastly, due credit should be given for the large number of photographs which adorn the book. They are well chosen from a pedagogical point of view and are highly useful. They are for the most part of exceptionally fine quality and include several rare pieces of art as well as buildings and locations of the past.

Henrik H. Sørensen
East Asian Institute
University of Copenhagen