

## REVIEWS

Anne S. Goodrich, *Peking Paper Gods. A Look at Home Worship*. Monumenta Serica Monograph Series, No. 23. Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 1991.

Looking at foreign material culture is always fascinating. If one then can combine the material culture with elements of folklore, one can be captured by an even more interesting subject. I think this has happened to Anne S. Goodrich and it has resulted in a book on Peking paper gods. In this respect the book is absorbing. The author presents the printed pictures of various Chinese gods and guardians that she bought in Beijing in 1931. These woodblock printed pictures are generally known in the West as New Year prints. But, as the author indicates, some of the pictures were also used at other occasions and festivals throughout the Chinese lunar year.

The main part of the prints which the author presents belongs to the tradition of woodblock prints derived from the book illustrations. These illustrations again were originally based on the old style of figure painting, which was probably already developed in the late Zhou Dynasty, 500–220 BC. The Beijing prints described in the book have also been inspired by the folklorist tradition of squeezing many elements into a small space. The prints are generally designed like advertisements showing the figure's potent powers. Colours are for the most sparse, they are used to highlight spots and are pale washes of pink, violet, red and blue-green. Few of the prints are real colour woodblock prints, and again some details may have been given an additional coat of paint. One pantheon print belongs to the fully developed folklore style, where the lines are minimized to a few essential cuts to make the figures stand out in clear shapes. The colouring is bright in sharply defined areas and forms the pictures into a kind of multicoloured collage. Most of the prints were made in Beijing, but a few of the more colourful ones were produced in Yangliuqing (Yang-liu ch'ing) near Tianjin.

In the book the gods are grouped in more or less coherent spheres of life, *e.g.* happiness, wealth, rearing children, medicine, exorcism, nature, the sky, professions, the household, time, and death. The placing of some of the gods under specific areas of function has been problematic. As a solution the

author has placed some of them together as miscellaneous gods, some under Daoist and some under Buddhist gods. Then she has singled out Kuandi to form a group of his own. The short final chapter is reserved for four pantheons, of which one is a collection of single prints stored in an envelope. Finally, eight appendixes, a bibliography, a list of illustrations (a rather important list for the curious reader), and an index are included.

First of all Anne S. Goodrich gives the reader background information about her collection and tries to give an introduction to popular religion in China. This introduction is too short to give the necessary knowledge of the very complex and diverse world of popular religious ideas in old China. The author herself stresses that her intention is to give a picture of the Beijing world of gods as it was told to her by her Chinese informants and this might be the reason why she fails to give a more detailed explanation of popular religion.

Her way of presenting the various groups is sometimes irksome, because she describes the related gods and gives their functions both in the introductory remarks to the chapter and under the entry for each god. For example, the general abilities and virtues of the gods of wealth are repeatedly given under each of them. But if the reader uses the book as a handbook these repeated statements are of course essential for defining the god or guardian in question. The grouping itself is reasonably well accomplished but can be questioned. Firstly, not all the family and domestic gods are placed together, but separately in two chapters, "Patron Deities" and "Household Deities". Both groups are placed after the Nature Deities and Sky Powers, whereas one would expect them to be placed in close proximity to the various groups connected with family life. Secondly, Kuandi, whom the author stresses as the most important and powerful god for ordinary people, is placed just before the miscellaneous gods and the pantheons at the end of the book, instead of giving him a more prominent place at the beginning of the book. The disposition of the groups is of course a question of taste.

The detailed information assembled in the book makes it a good handbook, but the reader would find it more valuable if the index had been prepared more carefully. Some names of gods and persons are not in the index. Other entries lack cross-references, e.g. between Door Gods and Menshen. There is even a wrong reference under the Menshen to the God of Water and Hail. As a further inconvenience the spelling of the names is not always correct in the text of the book, e.g. Kou Tung for Kou Ch'en. All these inaccuracies indicate editorial carelessness.

The notes are sometimes incomplete: on p. 240 (n. 316) and p. 369 (n. 491) the author fails to refer to the archeological reports or monographs in which she has found the information she presents. Occasionally the notes refer to articles or books which are not listed in the bibliography. In one case the reference is to a German translation of *Chinese Mythology* by A. Christie, while the bibliography refers to the original book in English. If the book is

used as a handbook all these minor details become important. In contrast, the appendices are highly valuable. Here useful references are assembled together, saving the reader from the trouble of consulting other reference books.

The definitions and descriptions of the gods and deities are mostly correct but sometimes the author seems to lack a deeper knowledge of certain gods and guardians. The author explains that her knowledge is mainly based on the information she obtained from her Chinese informants, but in fact she has also used some general Western sources. Therefore she should have included all the most important facts concerning a deity, instead of only hinting at their functions or iconography. For example, she only refers to Roto Lirien wang as the fifth Heavenly King, but does not mention his relevant role as protector of the Buddhist monasteries. The author's inadequate knowledge of source material is also apparent in the case of Weito as she does not seem to know his three variant positions: (1) standing, his hands resting on a sword or a club firmly supported on the ground, (2) standing or sitting with the sword leaning against his shoulder, (3) standing or sitting with the sword resting horizontal on his arms, which are bent in front of the breast in a position of prayer (the only position given by the author). Further, the importance of Tabeifo is underestimated and the author does not know his Sanskrit name, Mahākaruṇā, the Bodhisattva of Compassion. I find her statement about the splitting of the soul into three at death rather dubious. The author does not clearly indicate the source of this view, but it might be based on the statements of her informants. It is in any case an idea that I find difficult to accept. At best one can talk about two souls, a *hun* and a *po* soul, but that is an academic and scholastic view, whereas the common people only refer to one soul, this being a logical and easily grasped idea.

The force of the book is the Beijing explanations of the duties of the various gods and deities and their connections to former living persons. These tales and explanations are rewarding and add liveliness to the text. Now and then the explanations are so vivid and arresting that one nearly hears the informants' own voices speaking. This is especially apparent under the entries on deities connected to childbirth.

The usefulness of the book is decreased by the rather poor illustrations, which are sometimes too dark and sometimes out of focus. The details often disappear into the greyness of the photos. Many of the described deities are not illustrated at all. On one occasion the author is too modest in claiming that she does not possess a separate print of Puxian Pusa, when this Bodhisattva is in fact illustrated on the following page and the list of illustrations credits her as the owner of the print. Now and then the same god or guardian is illustrated twice, either from the author's own collection or from A. Nachbauer's and Wang Ngen Joung's album of Beijing gods. What the reader is most interested to see is the author's collection, or at least all

the deities mentioned in the text. If duplicate illustrations of some gods had been avoided, it would have been possible to show more prints from the collection of the author, even with the same amount of illustrations published in the present book.

Many of the above mentioned frustrations could have been avoided if the editor had been more thorough and if the author had used Chinese sources and some additional Western sources and studies on popular Chinese gods, such as the two inspiring studies by Mary H. Fong, *The Iconography of the Popular Gods of Happiness, Emolument, and Longevity (Fu Lu Shou)*, and Wu Daozi's, *Legacy in the Popular Door Gods (Menshen) Qin Shubao and Yuchi Gong*, published respectively in *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 44 (1983), and *Archives of Asian Art*, Vol. 42 (1989). What is lacking in the bibliography is references to publications of collections of prints of popular gods not included in the works by B. Day and H. Dore. Such information would be useful for the inquisitive general reader.

It is a pity that the book just misses the chance to be the fundamental book on Beijing paper gods because of the above mentioned faults, even though it contains all the necessary ingredients. However, the present book can be used as a handbook on Chinese paper gods by the members of the general, interested public. A sinologist may find it useful as a source to prints of popular Chinese deities from the Beijing area and Northern China.

Bent Lerbæk Petersen  
*Royal Library, Copenhagen*

*Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Ed. by Robert E. Buswell, Jr. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, 1990. US\$37.50, cloth.

The study of apocryphal literature in the Buddhist tradition has been a largely neglected topic in Western scholarship, and only recently has it started to invoke a more focussed interest among concerned scholars. However, apocrypha must now be considered one of the most important factors in understanding the cultural transformations Buddhism underwent in the cultures in which it took root. The articles making up this volume were originally part of a large study project covering Buddhist apocrypha in general, but various factors caused the editor to focus on the Chinese cultural sphere. While this has resulted in a considerable limitation in the scope of the topic under discussion, it has also given the book a more specialized direction, which affords the reader a greater insight into a significant aspect of Chinese Buddhism.

The book opens with a general introduction by the editor, in which he argues for the value and contribution that the study of Buddhist apocrypha may contribute to the field. He goes on to discuss the definition of apocrypha

in the Buddhist context and traditional standards of scriptural authenticity. Here Buswell compares the Buddhist developments with those of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. The second half of the introduction is devoted to a presentation of the individual contributions in the volume, and their value to the study of Buddhist apocryphal literature.

In “The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues”, by Kyoko Tokuno, the reader is introduced to the tradition of codifying the *Tripitāka* in China and its importance for the formulation of the Chinese Buddhist canon. The author discusses the criteria for apocryphal scriptures, and shows how the concept of orthodoxy fluctuated according to religious and historical realities. This contribution is highly valuable, not only for its abundance of factual information, but also for its general presentation of traditional Chinese Buddhist bibliographical practice through the examples of the major sūtra catalogues. It will surely be a standard reference for future study of the codification of the Buddhist canon in China.

Michel Strickmann’s “The Consecration Sūtra: A Buddhist Book of Spells” is yet another significant contribution to our understanding of Chinese medieval religion by the same scholar who brought us the now classical study of the Daoist Mao Shan tradition. Again Strickmann treats his topic in a superior and convincing manner, and his description of the mutual concerns of Buddhism and Daoism in relation to popular “Demonic” cults in 5th century China is a delight to read. One could only wish that he had paid more attention to the actual contents of the *Consecration Sūtra* from the point of view of Daoist practices. For example, it would have been very interesting to see a discussion of the spells and talismans (*fu*) that appear in the *sūtra*’s seventh chapter, in relation to 5th century Daoist practices and ceremonial literature. While it may be true that the concept of “registers of gods” (*shenlu*), with which the person who holds it controls the various spirits, is a typical borrowing from Daoism in the form we have it here, one should not forget that many canonical and early esoteric *sūtras* such as the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*, the *Anantamukhasādhaka-dhāra* (T. 1015, etc.), the *Mahāmayūrī sūtra* (T. 984, etc.), the *Foshuo guanding qiwan erqian shenwang hu piqiu zhou jing* (T. 1331), etc., contain lengthy lists of gods, spirits, and other beings of the *ba tianlong pu* type, which serve exactly the same purpose as the Daoist registers, namely the empowerment and protection of the person “who recites it, holds it, and teaches it to others”. In other words, precisely because such practices and beliefs were readily understood by the Buddhists, it was that much easier to take them over from the Daoists.

“Stages of Transcendence: The *Bhūmi* Concept in Taoist Scripture”, by Stephen R. Bokenkamp, centres on the inter-relationship between Buddhist scriptures, both genuine translations and apocryphal works, and the Daoist Lingbao tradition of South China. The discussion focusses mainly on the Buddhist concept of *bhūmis* or various numbers of stages, which the bodhi-

sattvas are said to traverse on their way towards enlightenment. At the outset of his presentation Bokenkamp argues that both Buddhists and “their Taoist counterparts were embarked upon the same enterprise—the remolding of Buddhism to Chinese specifications” (p. 119). He is no doubt right in this observation, but he should also have made it clear that the Daoist transformations and adaptations of Buddhist material, at least in the early phase in the interplay between the two religions, were made with the explicit purpose of augmenting their own weak doctrinal position *vis à vis* the more structured teachings of the Indian religion.

Bokenkamp points out that the Daoist manuscripts from Dunhuang are mentioned in relation to the anti-Buddhist change evident in the Lingbao and other Daoist canonical scriptures which took place during the Tang (pp. 122–3). The Daoist Dunhuang manuscripts pose considerably more problems than outlined by Ōfuji Ninji, at least in the work referred to by Bokenkamp, and as long as no full picture of what Dunhuang Daoism was actually like, we should be careful of generalizing on the basis of this material alone. While it is true that some of the later Daoist manuscripts show some evidence of having “weeded” out their former Buddhist contents, or at least modified them considerably, there are also several later manuscripts, such as the *Benji jing* (P. 2467.4, etc.), the *Taishang lingbao laozi huahu miao jing* (S. 2081), and the *Taishang yuanyang jing* (S. 3016), an 8th century manuscript, which show a very high degree of influence from Buddhism. It appears that on the grass-roots level (at least in the Dunhuang context) that Daoism and Buddhism co-existed without any great problems. Hence polemics issuing from doctrinal issues are not likely to have played a great role in the diffusion of the Daoist scriptures in the oasis. I agree with Bokenkamp that Daoistic notions of “sudden and gradual” may have played a role in the formulation of the Chan Buddhist concept of “sudden enlightenment” (*dunjiao*; pp. 135–6). However, this influence is certainly more likely to have come from the study of the *Daode jing* and the *Zhuangzi*, which we know the early Chan monks read, than from the Lingbao scriptures, which they most certainly did not study. However, the idea of leaping over the *bhūmis* to “sudden enlightenment” need not be attributed to Daoistic influence. By the mid-6th century the Chinese Buddhists had already developed their *prajñā*, and *tathāgathagarbha*/Buddha Nature (*foxing*) hermeneutics to a point where the logic of absolutism overrode the idea of gradual cultivation through stages. Hence there is no good reason why they should not have formulated the doctrine of “sudden enlightenment” themselves.

Towards the end of his presentation the author argues that “we have learned that scriptures in the Ling-pao tradition cannot be studied without reference to Buddhist apocrypha” (p. 137). Indeed! The “sūtras” of the Lingbao tradition cannot and should not be studied without reference to the canonical Buddhist scriptures! It is understandable that scholars such as Bokenkamp, working in the field of Daoism, are eager to reclaim “lost terri-

tory” in their (noteworthy and sympathetic) attempt at reinstating Daoism at the core of the Chinese religious tradition, a place where it rightly belongs. However, we should be careful not to overdo this, especially in cases where the sources are historically flimsy.

“The Textual Origin of the *Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching*: A Canonical Scripture of Pure Land Buddhism”, by Kōtatsu Fujita, attempts to pick up on the previous discussion of the problematic origin of the *Guan wuliang shou jing*, the translation of which is traditionally attributed to the North Indian monk Kalayasas. A Central Asian or Chinese origin of this major Pure Land scripture has long been suspected and set forth by several scholars previously. Here the author provides a thorough text-critical discussion of the background of the “translation” based on catalogues and biographies, and attempts (not very convincingly) to establish a direct link with the sculptural art of Gandhara (pp. 158–9). I find it hard to see any connection between the giant standing Buddha at Bamiyan in Afghanistan and the *Guan wuliang shou jing*. Fujita provides us with a good overview of the respective arguments for the alternative compilation theories, without, however, committing himself to either of them. Instead he ends up somewhere in the middle by stating that “for now I will thus take a compromise position, by partially accepting both theories” (p. 163). Thus, what begins as a very promising paper abruptly ends, leaving the reader nowhere. In fact, by leaving off when the facts are starting to get interesting Fujita does not provide us with anything new as regards the history and composition of this seminal Pure Land scripture. Although there may be substantial differences in their respective views on the origin and composition of the *Guan wuliang shou jing*, it is felt that this paper could have benefitted by referring to the more than ten-year-old study by Julian Pas.<sup>1</sup>

Whalen Lai’s article, “The *Chan-ch’a ching*: Religion and Magic in Medieval China”, provides an interesting discussion of the development of a popular Buddhist cult in Canton during the late 6th century on the basis of an apocryphal sūtra which advocates the use of a type of Ksitigarbha divination, followed by a doctrinal part based on the *Dasheng qixin lun* (The Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna). The origin and development of the *Chan-ch’a ching* is accounted for in detail. Its link with the Ti lun tradition of North China and the *Dasheng qixin lun*, which obviously provided the basis for the second chapter of the text, is given lengthy treatment. Written in his usual discursive style, the author argues that the apocryphal sūtra under discussion was seminal in the development of main doctrinal issues such as the One Mind, “meditation on suchness as real”, and “mind and mind only”, all of which are central to the later development of Chinese Buddhism.

---

<sup>1</sup> Julian F. Pas, “The *Kuan-mu-liang-sho Fo-ching*: Its Origin and Literary Criticism”, in: *Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization*, ed. Leslie Kawamura and Keith Scott, Emeryville: Dharma Publishing, 1977, pp. 199–218.

One of the questions that arise from this paper pertains to the general importance of the *Chan-ch'a ching*. From Lai's presentation it appears that it was important not only in China, but also in Korea and Japan (p. 196). I am not fully convinced of this. Its use and popularity during the Tang is basically not documented beyond the catalogue entries, the Korean account is based on a 13th century compilation of folk tales, and the Japanese reference, in which only the divinatory part is employed, is dated to the Edo period. When the text resurfaces in late Ming China, it appears to be an isolated instance. In my opinion none of this points to a scripture of importance, but rather to an example of how apocryphal literature arose in response to the needs of the time, only to be integrated in the "orthodox tradition" and eventually forgotten.

Mark Edward Lewis, in "The Suppression of the Three Stages Sect: Apocrypha as a Political Issue", takes the discussion of the relationship between the State and religious orthodoxy as his point of departure. He argues that the formulation and organization of the Chinese Buddhist canon took place through incessant involvement from the central government. In other words, canonical orthodoxy in the Chinese experience is here seen as a political issue, and not one pertaining to doctrinal truths. While this observation obviously holds true for the development of the Chinese *Tripitaka*, we may extend it even further to encompass virtually all ideology in China down through the centuries. Even today, it is a central aspect of the state hermeneutics in the country, and one may well argue that it constitutes the very paradigm for our understanding of the continuous interaction between state and ideologies, whether religious, philosophical or political, in Chinese history. The followers of the Three Stages Sect emphasised the doctrine of "the end of the Law" (*mofa*), indirectly denigrating the present rule, and Lewis shows how this concept brought the Three Stages Buddhists into a head-on collision with the central government. This eventually caused the sect to be forbidden and its literature proscribed. Other factors, such as the rejection of support from wealthy lay people, including tokens of imperial benevolence, further alienated the sect from the centre of political power. Through its heterodox views and practices the Three Stages Sect set itself apart from the other schools of Chinese Buddhism, and thereby paved the way to its own perdition. Lewis' presentation, which is essentially a survey of the history of the Three Stages Sect, offers many insights and useful observations.

Lewis' presentation is followed by "The Relativity of the Concept of Orthodoxy in Chinese Buddhism: Chih-sheng's Indictment of Shih-li and the Proscription of the *Dharma Mirror Sūtra*", by Antonino Forte, who has long since established himself as a leading authority on the history of early Tang Buddhism. Forte's short paper provides a continuation of the arguments offered by Lewis in the preceding contribution with special emphasis on the *Dharma Mirror Sūtra*, a fragment of which has been found among the Dunhuang manuscripts. Taking his presentation along strict historical lines the



author discusses the laborious attempts of Zhisheng (d.u.), the compiler of the Kaiyuan Catalogue, to “weed out” an apocryphal Three Stages Sect *sūtra*, i.e. the *Foshuo shi suofan zhe yuqie fajing jing* [Dharma Mirror Sūtra], which had been accorded canonical status in AD 712. This paper clearly demonstrates how political issues and connections influenced the criteria for including scriptures in the *Tripitāka*.

Next follows Paul Groner’s article, “The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline in Japanese Tendai: A Study of Annen’s *Futsu jūbosatsukai kōshaku*”. This, written along historical lines, is a well composed and very fine contribution to our knowledge of Japanese Tendai Buddhism and its monastic regulations. The issue of the *Vinaya*, and its related hermeneutics, provides an insight into the major causes for the relatively weak implementation of the precepts by Japanese Buddhists. Despite the fact that the *Fanwang jing* is a Chinese fabrication, and the obvious merits of the paper from the point of view of Japanese Buddhism, one wonders what it is doing in a compilation of studies on Chinese Buddhist apocrypha.

Finally there is an appendix consisting of “An Introduction to the Standards of Scriptural Authenticity in Indian Buddhism”, by Ronald M. Davidson. Although an interesting and informative study in its own right, this paper is of little significance to the Buddhist apocryphal tradition in China, since the issues it raises are strictly concerned with the Indian tradition. One could argue that the article is of relevance for making a comparative study, but in the light of the focus of the present monograph, it seems somewhat irrelevant.

*Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* is an interesting compilation of high-quality scholarly papers which throw light on an important aspect of the Chinese Buddhist tradition that has hitherto been somewhat neglected, at least in Western studies. With a few exceptions as noted above, I believe that the editor has done a very thorough job in illuminating the topos of his monograph. For the sake of completion the book should have provided more focus on the esoteric Buddhist tradition, which I believe, is where a very large amount of apocryphal *sūtras* and greatly embellished scriptures were made. Strickman’s contribution is virtually the only example of this material, which exerted an enormous influence on the shaping of Chinese Buddhism. In addition I would have preferred the book to have included at least one contribution on “modern” Chinese Buddhist apocryphal literature, or some attempt at linking the past with the present. Such a contribution could for example have dealt with the role of apocryphal Buddhist *sūtras* in a contemporary context. A paper of this kind would have made the book more complete, and perhaps enhanced its value for a wider range of scholars.

The importance of this collection of articles is even more relevant when seen in relation to the recent discovery of the apocryphal *sūtras* kept in Nanatsu-dera in Nagoya. Its high standard, as well as its interesting, general topic, makes *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* one of the most significant

contributions among the recent studies of traditional Chinese religion, and it can be warmly recommended.

(HHS)