

Introduction of Buddhism to Korea: New Cultural Patterns. Edited by Lewis R. Lancaster and C. S. Yu. Studies in Korean Religions and Culture, No. 3. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1989. pp. 229.

The present book is a compilation of articles by Korean and Japanese authorities on early Korean Buddhism, and is the first volume in a planned series on the history of Korean Buddhism. A number of noted American scholars have been involved in the translation of the articles in the volume, and considerable editorial effort is evident in the annotation of several of the contributions. In addition to a brief introductory preface by the editor, the book consists of seven chapters as follows.

Chapter 1: “A Short History of Ancient Korean Buddhism” by Ahn Kye-hyŏn. This is a general survey of the main features of Korean Buddhism during the Three Kingdoms Period largely based on fictional and secondary sources. The paper on which the present translation is based dates first appeared in 1970, and a brief look at the references reveals that the bulk of the secondary material is from the 1950s and 1960s. Basing himself on the *Samguk yusa* (T. 2039), a 13th century collection of myths and popular tales, the paper results in a string of fanciful and quite untenable postulates. Included among these is his discussion of “Espionage Activities of Monks and Monk-Soldiers” and “The Decline of Buddhism and the Rise of Taoism” (pp. 7–8), none of which is supported by contemporary historical records. Furthermore his discussion of the great Silla monks is nothing but a paraphrase of the *Samguk yusa*. As such the paper reveals a total lack of text critical methodology, and a poor level of scholarship. The editors mention that some outdated information on Buddhist art that appears in the article has been up-dated; however, in my opinion the entire paper should have been revised in the light of contemporary scholarship. As such there is nothing in the article which is not available elsewhere in English translation, and one wonders why it has been singled out for translation here.

Chapter 2: “Introduction of Buddhism in Korea and Its Impact on Indigeneous Culture” by Inoue Hideo. The author is basically interested in how the advent of Buddhism in Korea brought about a change in attitude towards writing, spirits and religious rites as practised prior to the introduction of the Buddhist religion on the Peninsula. Here the *Samguk sagi*, compiled by Kim Pu-sik in AD 1145, and the *Samguk yusa* constitute the basis of his sources. One of the problems with this essay is that the author makes no distinction between legend and history, but takes the legends as indicators of an underlying historical reality. While it cannot be ruled out that belief in dragons played an important role in pre-Buddhist Korea, we should

be careful not to accept this as a verified fact until proper evidence can be had. Despite of its methodological weaknesses this paper is clearly the best contribution in the book, something which undoubtedly owes much to the translation and annotation of Robert Buswell.

Chapter 3: “The Buddhist Thought of Koguryō” by Kim Tong-hwa. This paper seeks to throw light on Buddhism in the state of Koguryō, for which there is an acute dearth of sources. He notes that since there are no early sources extant, “we must, therefore, rely on information provided in later sources” (p. 79). That contemporary written sources cannot be had is of course the crux of the matter, but it does not follow that one should treat the later records as if they constituted primary material without critical reassessment. However, nowhere in Kim’s presentation does he demonstrate any concern for this problem, but seems happy to accept the information from the *Samguk yusa* and the *Haedong kosōng chōn* (T. 2065) at face value.

Chapter 4: Kodama Daien’s “Serindia and Paekche Culture” seeks to establish a link between Paekche and the culture which flowed east from India and Central Asia via the Silk Road. None of the Korean sources it utilizes is very reliable. However, since the author to some extent focusses on Buddhist scriptures translated in China and their transmission, the paper contains useful information. Unfortunately, the discussion of the Korean pilgrim monks who appear in the paper is highly hypothetical, and essentially it does not yield any new information of real substance.

Chapter 5: “The Transmission of Paekche Buddhism to Japan” by Kamata Shigeo. This paper, by one of Japans leading Buddhologists, is basically a popular survey of the most common views of the past thirty years’ study of early Korean Buddhism, and contains nothing that has not been said before. Unfortunately it also repeats the same mistakes, i.e. lack of a proper historical discussion, reliance on historically problematic sources, etc.

Chapter 6: “Early Silla Buddhism and the Power of the Aristocracy” by Lee Ki-baek, one of Korea’s most noted historians. This presentation attempts at showing the close connection between leading monks and the important families of the Silla synasty. But even here the reader encounters unverified theorizing when Lee is found to base himself on the *Samguk yusa* as a firsthand source in his discussion of the dethronment of the Silla king Chinji (r. 576–9), the account of the monk Chajang (7th century), or when treating the *hwarang* (“flower-knights”) and the worship of Maitreya (pp. 166–7, 169–70).

Chapter 7: Rhi Ki-yong’s “Silla Buddhism: Its Special Features”. This contribution is a brief survey of the major scriptures and doctrines of Silla Buddhism during the 6–7th centuries, including a discussion of the great monks Uisang (625–702) and Wōnhyo (617–86). It is much too short to do the otherwise interesting subject any justice, and in any case contains nothing which is not already available in English.

Korean Buddhism is still a relatively underdeveloped field in modern West-

ern scholarship, and personally I was looking forward to seeing another significant contribution in English, and one which supposedly would feature the best Korean scholarship on the subject. Unfortunately *Introduction of Buddhism to Korea* is more or less a continuation of the ahistorical and non-scientific approach which has plagued much of the native study of Korean Buddhism for the past decades. For the early period it is exemplified through the uncritical use of the *Samguk sagi* (c. AD 1145), the *Haedong kosŏng chŏn* (AD 1215), and the *Samguk yusa* (late 13th century) as primary sources. Both works were compiled/composed several hundred years after the events they purport to describe, and their contents are often of a nature that is unfit to serve as a primary historical source. Nevertheless, both works are uniformly adhered to as if they were “holy writ”, and so far any attempt at casting doubt on their historical value has been met with little less than outrage on the part of the Koreans. The problem with these sources are not only that they are virtually the only records of events that are said to have taken place during the Three Kingdoms Period, but that they have never been properly screened for information that could be authenticated. There are of course isolated cases in which information in the *Samguk yusa* has been shown to correspond to archeological finds, but certainly not to such an extent that the work in general can be accepted as a valid source for the historical reality of the Three Kingdoms Period, not to mention early Korean Buddhism.

The quality of the translations in *Introduction of Buddhism to Korea* is remarkable, and when one appreciates the efforts of the translators, one cannot help wondering why the majority of the selected papers are of such a poor quality. One certainly could have wished for a better editorial work, and for this the two editors are to blame. There is no good reason why the quality of the selection is so poor, when there is such a large quantity of material to choose from. The volume ought to have included at least one or two articles on early Korean Buddhism based on archeology. This would have helped balance the traditional Korean version of Buddhism in the Three Kingdoms Period, and made the volume more worthwhile. Generally speaking, I miss the pioneering work of Kim Yŏn-fae for one, as well as Hwang Su-yŏng, and Mun Myŏng-dae, whose fine archeological studies have contributed much to our understanding of early Korean Buddhism. One could also have included a contribution by Pak Young Sook of SOAS, whose work on early Korean Buddhist archeology contains considerably more substance than any of the papers in the book.

The idea of translating important Korean contributions on Korean Buddhism is certainly a noteworthy and highly welcome enterprise. However, it is essential that the selection of the papers to be translated represents the best material available. Unfortunately this is not the case with the present publication. Basically the volume is redundant and can only serve as a very basic introduction to Korean Buddhism. It may be of some value in introduc-

ing undergraduates to Korean Buddhism, but for the more serious student it is rather unimportant. With the exception of “Introduction of Buddhism in Korea and Its Impact on Indigeneous Culture” by Inoue Hideo, and Kodama Daien’s “Serindia and Paekche Culture”, the material in the book is redundant, and one can only hope that future volumes in the series will be edited with more care and insight.

(HHS)

Dam-chos rgya-mtsho Dharmatāla, *Rosary of White Lotusess, Being the Clear Account of How the Precious Teaching of Buddha Appeared and Spread in the Great Hor Country*. Translated and Annotated by Piotr Klafkowski. *Asiatische Forschungen*, Band 95. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987. XXVII + 537 Seiten.

Das Werk von Dam-chos rGya-mtsho Dharmatāla, ein spätes, aber bedeutendes Mongolisches Geschichtswerk, das 1889 zwar in der Mongolei, jedoch auf tibetisch verfaßt wurde, weist ein rätselhaftes Schicksal vor. Obwohl spät publiziert, scheinen nur noch zwei Exemplare von diesem jetzt 103 Jahre alten Druck zu existieren. Eins davon wurde wegen der unermüdlichen Publikationstätigkeit von Lokesh Chandra in seiner Śāta-Piṭaka Series 1975 und—in romanisierter Ausgabe—1977 neu aufgelegt. Piotr Klafkowski, ein junger polnischer Tibetologe und Mongolist interessiert sich schon seit langem für diese große Chronik. 1979 publizierte er einen Teil von Dharmatālas riesigem Werk—den Abschnitt, der sich mit der Vita des Sechsten Dalai Lama befaßte.

Die vorliegende Übersetzung von Klafkowski ist leider von einer Unmenge von Fehlern und falschen—oder auf jeden Fall unpräzisen—Übersetzungen gekennzeichnet. Nehmen wir einen kleinen Abschnitt als Beispiel. Die Introductory Poems, S. 3—6, zum Beispiel müßten nach Möglichkeit erneut übersetzt werden. Nicht nur, daß beinahe sämtliche sieben- und neunsilbige Strophen ungenau bzw. völlig falsch übertragen wurden: schon die erste Zeile, “rgyal kun bsdus pa’i ngo bo nyid”, die Klafkowski mit “the Essence of all the assemblies of Buddhas” übersetzt, dürfte von uns mit “the essence embodying all Victors [Jinas, d.h. Buddhas]” präziser wiedergegeben werden. Der wohlbekannt Ausdruck *tshogs gnyis*, den Klafkowski als “twin virtues” überträgt, sind natürlich die zwei Anhäufungen (*sambhāra*) von Verdiensten (*puṇya*, *bsod nams*) und Wissen (*jñāna*, *ye shes*), den unentbehrlichen Zurüstungen für den Ziel-orientierten Bodhisattva auf seiner Reise zur Erleuchtung. Auf Seite 3 ist *legs bshad* oder *subhāṣita* nicht übersetzt worden, und das gerade in einer Strophe, wo von Sa-skya Paṇḍita, der Sprüchedichter Tibets *par excellence*, die Rede ist. Wie man auf Seite 4 einen Nebensatz wie “rgyal ba’i mdzad pa bzang nye bar ston mdzad pa” als “who, in his wisdom, nearly equals the Buddha himself” übersetzen kann, und daß er

zugleich in einer Anmerkung hinzufügt, diese Übersetzung basiere sich auf *ston pa*, angeblich vom Klafkowski als weise oder klug [*sic*] verstanden, ist mir völlig unverständlich. Was tatsächlich gemeint ist, ist einfach nur, daß der zweite Buddha, d.h. Tshong-kha-pa, die guten Taten vom Jina, d.h. dem Buddha völlig erklärt hat. Und wie man ferner, auf S. 4, einen Nebensatz wie “thugs bskyed dri bzhon ’gros kysis nyer drangs nas” nur als “drawing our mindes [*sic*] towards the sweet fragrance” konstruieren kann, entzieht sich meiner Kenntnisse. Hier ist—poetisch ausgedrückt—ein Hinweis auf [*bodhi*]cittotpāda. Auf S. 4 übersetzt Klafkowski das Paar *lung* und *rtogs* als “teaching and meditation,” zwei Zeilen später übersetzt er das gleiche Paar, diesmal von Klafkowski als *lung* und *rtog* gelesen, als “writ and way [*sic*]”. Hier ist natürlich von *āgama*, d.h. der skripturellen oder theoretischen Überlieferung versus *adhigama*, Erkenntnisse oder der praktischen, kognitiven Erfahrung die Rede (beides auch *lung gi bstan pa* und *rtogs pa’i bstan pa* genannt). Klafkowski scheint in seinem Werk große Schwierigkeiten mit buddhistischen Begriffen zu haben, obwohl seine Arbeit ständig von seinem buddhistischen Guru, ein gewisser Nyalo Tulku Jampa Kelzang Rinpoche unterstützt und geleitet wurde. Sanskritische Ausdrücke sind nicht selten falsch wiedergegeben oder mißverstanden. Die werden auch fast konsequent ohne diakritische Zeichen dargestellt. Sie bereiten Klafkowski offensichtlich Probleme. Er scheint ferner mit der tibetischen Sprache nicht ganz vertraut zu sein: z.B. wird *brtags* mit “understood” statt das richtige “inspected” or “investigated” wiedergegeben. Ein wohlbekannter Satz wie etwa “[Der Buddha] sammelte [Verdienste und Wissen] wahrend drei inkalkulierbare [Epochen]” (*grangs med gsum du tshogs bsagspa dang*) wird in Klafkowski’s Wiedergabe in “during the three Periods of accumulating ‘incalculable’ merits” umgewandelt. Ferner deutet Klafkowski in der Anmerkung Nr. 23 an, daß der Ausdruck *so skye tshogs lam par ’dod* ihm ein Rätsel ist, wohingegen es lediglich folgendes bedeutet: “Es wird behauptet, daß [Buddha’s Ansammlung von Verdiensten bis zur seiner Pazifizierung von Māra bei der Dämmerung] der Stufe der Ansammlung (*sambhāramārga*) der profanen Individuen (*so so skye bo, pṛthagjana*) angehöre.” Auf S. 16 wird das bekannte Paar *thabs shes* (d.h. *thabs dang shes rab, upāya* und *prajñā*, “Mittel und Wissen”) mit “meaning and means” wiedergegeben. Die ungenauen, verfehlten oder mißlungenen Übersetzungen könnten beinahe *ad infinitum* aufgeführt werden. Es hat keinen Zweck, bei einem Werk von über 500 Seiten hiermit fortzusetzen.

Die Stärke des Werkes liegt unbedingt in dem Mongolischen Teil, und zwar in der mühsamen Bestrebung des Übersetzers, eine lange Reihe von Klöstern und religiösen Persönlichkeiten, die dort tätig waren, zu identifizieren. Diesem Teil sind viele wichtige Auskünfte und Erläuterungen zu entnehmen, und der Leser muß für diese Leistung Klafkowskis dankbar sein, obwohl in Zukunft zweifelsohne zu diesen Themen noch viel zu sagen sein wird.

Ein Teil von Klafkowskis Anmerkungen läßt trotzdem viel wünschen. Sie enthalten nicht selten verjäherte oder gerade für Fachleute irrelevante oder überflüssige bibliographische Angaben. Das ist um so erstaunlicher, da es auch in europäischen Sprachen genügend auf den heutigen Stand des Wissens gebrachtes Quellenmaterial (besonders in den indo-tibetischen oder buddhologischen Bereichen) gibt, aber diese scheinen von Klafkowski unberücksichtigt worden zu sein.

An wissenschaftlicher Ausrüstung und Durcharbeitung fehlen dem Werk von Klafkowski einige grundsätzliche Voraussetzungen. Der Hauptteil dieses Werkes wurde während eines anderthalbjährigen Forschungsaufenthalts am Zentralasiatischen Seminar der Universität Bonn durchgeführt. Es ist erstaunlich, daß Klafkowski die exzellent ausgestattete Bibliothek in Bonn nicht ausreichend benutzte, ganz davon zu schweigen, daß die dort tätigen und zweifelsohne hilfsbereiten Kollegen offenbar auch nicht konsultiert worden sind. Es ist zu bedauern, daß die vorliegende Arbeit ohne diese durchaus nötige Bearbeitung in den Druck gegangen ist.

Klafkowski erweist sich als eine eher unkonventionelle Persönlichkeit. Uns wird zum Beispiel erzählt, daß in den Transkriptionen das Zeichen \emptyset anstatt des üblichen *ü* nur deswegen gebraucht wird, weil seine norwegische Schreibmaschine es nun so wollte. In seinem ganz persönlichen Vorwort hat er uns einige entzückende Reflektionen, die ihm während seiner Arbeit einfielen, weitergegeben, versehen mit Sprüchen georgischer, hawaiischer und moderner kornischer Herkunft (diese letzte Sprache existiert "offiziell" nicht, sondern wird aus *Time Magazine* zitiert!). Selbst Winnie the Pooh fehlt in diesem Zusammenhang nicht.

Zusammenfassend: So wie das Werk vorliegt, ist ein Teil, wie schon erwähnt, zwar gebrauchlich, aber als genauer und völlig zuverlässiger Cicerone durch Dharmatālas umfangreiche Hauptwerk leider von begrenzter wissenschaftlicher Nützlichkeit.

Per K. Sørensen
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität
Bonn

János Szerb, *Bu stones History of Buddhism in Tibet. Critically Edited with a Comprehensive Index*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990. pp. 246. OS 532,-/DM 76, -.

The historical record of Bu-ston Rin-po-grub (AD 1290–1364), the polyhistor or polymath *par excellence* of Tibet, entitled, *bDe bar gshegs pa'i bstan pa'i gsal byed chos kyi 'byung gnas gSung rab rin po che'i mdzad chos 'byung*, was composed in AD 1322. It occupies a cardinal position in Tibetan Buddhist historiography. Its popularity in the West, too, where it has been extensively employed by *Tibetologists*, is due to Obermiller's partial translation in 1932.

This translation is certainly not without its shortcomings, but in view of the relative age of the translation and the fact that Obermiller, a studied and brilliant Buddhologist of the renowned Leningrad School of Buddhology, did not consult other historical sources (in particular in the section of his book where an account of Tibet is given), having had recourse only to Bu-ston Rin-po-che's text, his work must be classified as a fine piece of scholarship.

In Tibet the normative validity of Bu-ston's work as a historical and doctrinal source is virtually unrivalled. A mere perusal of all subsequent writings in Tibet will amply attest to this fact. Szerb provides his readers with a critically edited text of only a part of Bu-ston's *Chos-'byung*, but an important part, namely the section dealing with the history of Tibet. Employing the block print of bKra-shis lhun-po, also used by Obermiller, as his *mūla*, his edition is based upon a meticulous collation of four block prints and two *dbu med* manuscripts. Thus Szerb was amply equipped for the task. And we can certainly be grateful to Szerb for a careful and a profusely annotated edition, where he has evidently given all his effort to the task of tracing Bu-ston's prime sources, whenever identifiable, as well as to his search for relevant or informative parallel sources. Szerb's study will become an important and welcome reference work in this field. Szerb's annotation remains almost flawless, and in spite of the fact that an increasing number of new sources in recent years has been detected and employed, Szerb's findings and comments are still pertinent and relevant.¹

The present publication by the talented Szerb was part of a project initially undertaken by him within the framework of a planned comparative study programme of Tibetan historical sources supported by the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Dr. Szerb's plan was to provide, among other things, standard editions of texts with complete cumulative indexing of proper names and geographical locations, as well as variant readings, etc. Among these objectives he envisaged producing full indexes not only of dGe-ba'i blo-gros' *Deb-ther dmar-po*, bSod-nams grags-pa's *Deb-ther dmar-po gsar-ma* and the Vth Dalai Lama's *rGyal-ba lnga-ba'i deb-ther*, but also of some of the major sectarian histories of the dGe-lugs-pa school.

It is to be lamented that the remaining part of the significant task scheduled by Dr. Szerb will never be completed by him. Hopefully others will take over, since all of his projects are of utmost relevance. The untimely demise of our talented tibetological colleague Janos Szerb has brutally deprived our field of truly fine and meticulous scholar.

Per K. Sørensen
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität
Bonn

¹ Confer the notes to the reviewer's forthcoming translation of *rGyal-rabs gsal-ba'i me-long*, especially Chapter Eight.

John Stevens, *Lust for Enlightenment: Buddhism and Sex*. Shambhala: Boston and London, 1990. pp. 188, £6–99.

John Stevens is well known for his publications on different aspects of Japanese culture: Zen and Tendai, martial arts and poetry, calligraphy and arts. This time his prolific activity has been focussed on a subject only sporadically mentioned by Buddhist scholars.

Stevens starts from the very sources—the sex life of the Buddha—and then moves on to delineate the problem how it existed and was solved in the celibate Buddhist monastic community. As Steven successfully demonstrates, the Buddhist through time and space could not completely reject one of the fundamental human desires, even though he consistently tried to suppress it and replace it with a higher goal—the attainment of enlightenment. The task was not easy, even during the Buddha’s life. This is obvious from the scores of elaborate situations involving sex that persistently occurred in the Buddhist community. The puritanic monastic discipline was not sufficient to persuade the monks to abandon for ever all sexual impulses, and the Buddha was compelled to introduce additional regulations to prevent all manner of bizarre, sex-tinted occurrences in the future. Though strictly condemning any symptoms of sexual appealing and carnal desires, the Vinaya code abounds with rather unusual cases. The reader is supposed to be embarrassed by the information elaborately drawn by Stevens from all available English translations of the early Buddhist works. In spite of the information’s being second-hand, the efforts of Stevens to put together scraps scattered through the huge bulk of the early Buddhist lore is praiseworthy.

One might expect deeper and more novel information when Stevens moves into the field more familiar to him, the Japanese Buddhist experience, which is covered in the largest chapter, Chapter 4, “The Red Thread of Passion: Zen in the Art of Sex”. Not being too important for the Zen school, the sex issue could not escape the attention of Zen masters who stressed the importance of human naturalness in any form. The author provides rather interesting stories, anecdotes, and verses related to sex, of Chinese Chan masters and of such prominent Japanese figures as Ikkyū, Hakuin, Sengai, Ryokan, Mokurai, and others to prove that the suppressed libido found its way out in even the most ascetic persons. He does not propose any satisfactory explanation but a passing remark that for the Japanese “the unbridled love of love was too strong to be suppressed” (p. 94). It is true but insufficient to realize by contrast why the things that appeared disgusting and intolerable for the Chinese Buddhists were accepted and frankly exposed by their Japanese counterparts. Moreover, a considerable part of stories in the chapter can be found in a number of previous publications by Stevens himself.

Unfortunately, the reader receives a slightly biased and incomplete impression about the real state of affairs. Putting aside the sexual symbolism that permeates many concepts and rituals of esoteric Buddhism, Shugendō,

and even some Amidist schools (*kakure nenbutsu*), one can hardly be satisfied by the scarce essay on the Tachikawa-ryū, a Shingon sect that considered copulation to be the only secure means of attaining enlightenment (pp. 80–5). The few extant writings of the sect provide abundant information on the theoretical background and ritual aspects which centre on sexual union. Though Stevens includes in the bibliography all the main monographic Japanese publications on the Tachikawa-ryū, he borrows his information from the most unreliable of the available sources, Utagawa Taiga, *Shingon Tachikawa-ryū no hihō* (Tokyo: Tokuma Shoten, 1981). I suspect that many facts in Utagawa's book were either invented by him on the basis of some sex manuals and later on decorated and intermingled with Shingon and Tachikawa material. References to the sources are only sporadic and dubious, and the terms of esoteric Buddhism used for the purpose of ornamentation help to conceal the real sources, like the *Ishinpō* (a 10th century medical treatise compiled in Japan, Ch. 28 of which contains much otherwise lost information about the Chinese “art of the chamber”), or standard Indian treatises on the art of lovemaking. Anyway, most of the information and colourful descriptions cannot be found in any of the known Tachikawa texts or other secondary works on it. Uncritically following this thread, Stevens suggests information on the Tachikawa that can hardly be reliable. One can compare it with the paper by James H. Sanford, “The Abominable Tachikawa Skull Ritual” (*Monumenta Nipponica*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (1991), pp. 1–20), to become convinced how much really intriguing material, closely connected to the main subject of the book, has been misinterpreted or, rather, left untouched.

All the above critical remarks aim at indicating the inevitable traps to be faced by anyone who would choose Stevens' book as a guide to exotic and neglected byways of Buddhist lore. We may be grateful to Stevens for attracting our attention to an aspect of Buddhist reality that has usually been almost unanimously neglected by most scholars. Put together, even without any attempt at a deep analysis, the information in the book provides a new dimension of Buddhist civilization, unveiling, at least in part, those aspects that for a long time have been concealed or intentionally ignored.

Alexander M. Kabanoff
Institute of Oriental Studies
St. Petersburg