

## BOOK REVIEWS

*THE BODHISATTVA DOCTRINE IN BUDDHISM.* Edited and introduced by Leslie S. Kawamura. Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1981; xxi, 272 pp.

*The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhism* contains eleven papers presented at the Calgary Buddhism conference, Sept. 18–21, 1978, sponsored by the Religious Studies Department, Faculty of Humanities, The University of Calgary. According to the preface to the volume, the purpose of the conference was to investigate the evolution of the Bodhisattva doctrine in the country of its origin and in the countries to which Mahāyāna Buddhism has spread.

With the exception of the opening address by Peter Slater on the relevance of the Bodhisattva concept for today (pp. 1–15), the papers have been arranged according to the major languages in which the research was done. India and China are each represented by two papers and Tibet and Japan by three papers each. In his introduction Leslie S. Kawamura summarizes the main points raised in the papers (pp. xi–xxi).

In reading the papers one is struck by the great plasticity of the concept of the Bodhisattva. It has been developed and adapted to different circumstances in each country. Very instructive in this respect are developments which took place in Tibet and Japan, and which are outlined in papers contributed to this volume. Turrell V. Wylie stresses the political aspects of the Bodhisattva doctrine in his paper, "Influence of the Bodhisattva doctrine on Tibetan Political History." In his paper, "The Bodhisattva Doctrine as Conceived and Developed by the Founders of the New Sects in the Heian and Kamakura Periods," Hisao Inagaki examines the influence of the *mappō* idea, the *ekayāna* doctrine and the *hongaku* theory on the development of the Bodhisattva doctrine in the new sects which arose in Japan. In the post-war period Japan witnessed the rise of new religions which attempted to fill the spiritual vacuum created by Japan's military defeat. In his paper, "Japan's New Religions (1945–65): Secularization or Spiritualiza-

tion?", Minoru Kiyota explains the success of the new religions deriving from the Nichiren sect, of which the Sōka Gakkai is the most successful.

In their contributions on developments in China, both Yün-hua Jan and Lewis R. Lancaster distinguish different types of Bodhisattvas. Jan outlines three types in his paper, "The Bodhisattva Idea in Chinese Literature: Typology and Significance." The first is the Bodhisattva of the Birth-Stories (*jātakas*) in which he is represented as "the most compassionate, wise, powerful and virtuous being who could not and should not be denied and slandered." The second type of Bodhisattva is found in the scriptures on the ten stages (*bhūmi*) of the path of the Bodhisattva. Much more popular was the third type, which greatly appealed to the masses of the believers, namely the Bodhisattva as saviour. Jan sketches the development of the worship of Kuan-yin, the most honoured among all the Bodhisattvas in China. In his paper, "The Bodhisattva Concept: A Study of the Chinese Buddhist Canon," Lewis Lancaster distinguishes four types of Bodhisattvas. 1. Jātaka Bodhisattvas. 2. "Phantasma Bodhisattvas," who are capable of appearing suddenly and without (p. 154, line 19 correct with to without) previous birth and maturation. 3. "Meditation Bodhisattvas," who comprise two types; the first being those whose names are derived from names of *samādhis* and who are enumerated as members of audiences gathered to hear Buddhas preach; the second including Bodhisattvas, such as Vajrapāṇi, who are only present in the visualizations of the meditator. 4. "Living Bodhisattvas," great Buddhist teachers who were given the title of Bodhisattva by later generations, as well as those who received the title of Bodhisattva in a ceremony of investiture.

Lancaster draws attention to controversies which arose in China concerning the Bodhisattva concept, and remarks that Fo T'u Cheng taught that only the historical Buddha Śākyamuni should receive attention.<sup>1</sup> This is not mentioned in his biography in the *Kao-seng chuan*, cf. A. F. Wright, "Fo-t'u-têng. A Biography," *HJAS* 11 (1948), pp. 321-371. According to Lancaster, Saṃghadeva and Dharmayaśas represented a group that was in opposition to Mahāyāna and other schools which held to docetic notions. He refers to their biographies in the catalogue section, but they make no mention of their opposition to Mahāyāna. The *Kao-seng chuan*, to which Lancaster does not refer, makes it clear that both monks were very well versed in the Abhidharma literature, but this does not imply a rejection of Mahāyāna. In the case of Fa-tu, Dharmayaśas's disciple, the *Kao-seng chuan* points out that he rejected *Vaipulyasūtras* and declared that one ought to venerate only Śākyamuni. However, the author of this work stresses the fact that Fa-tu arrived at these heretical views after the return of Dharmayaśas to foreign countries (cf. Taishō no. 2059, p. 329c). It is to be hoped that in a future publication Lancaster will indicate the sources for his

<sup>1</sup> Lancaster does not explain his spelling Fo T'u Cheng for Fo-t'u-têng.

statements on Fo-t'u-t'eng, Saṃghadeva and Dharmayaśas.

Other papers in this volume deal with less general themes. In his paper, "The Bodhisattva Returns to This World," Gadjin M. Nagao examines with his usual thoroughness and learning the meaning of the terms *apraṭiṣṭhita-nirvāna* and *saṃcintyabhavopapatti* in Mahāyāna philosophical texts. Nagao explains that these two terms represent the "descending" direction, which constitutes one aspect of the way of the Bodhisattva, the other being the "ascending" direction which aspires to final liberation. Lobsang Dargyay in his paper, "The View of Bodhicitta in Tibetan Buddhism," studies the attempts of Tibetan scholars to harmonize divergent opinions expressed by Indian masters with regard to the nature of *bodhicitta*. In note 16 Dargyay refers to a quotation from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* by Tsong-kha-pa. According to Dargyay Tsong-kha-pa's quote is "seemingly based on the Sanskrit sentence *samyakpranidhāna . . .* that cannot be detected in the TTP edition" [i.e., the Peking edition of the Tibetan version of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*]. The sentence referred to is the following: *yāni ca kāṇicit tadanyāni laukikalokottareṣv artheṣu kuśalāni samyakpranidhānāni teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ agryam etat samyakpranidhānaṃ niruttaraṃ yaduta bodhisattvasya prathamāṣ cittotpādaḥ* (ed. Nalinaksha Dutt, p. 8.11-13). The Tibetan version corresponds exactly to the Sanskrit text: *byañ-chub sems-dpa'i dan-po sems bskyed-pa de ni de-las gzan-pa 'jig-rten-pa dan' jig-rten-las 'das-pa'i don-dag la yan-dag-pa'i smon-lam dge-ba de-dag thams-cad-kyi nan-na yan-dag-pa'i smon-lam-gyi mchog bla-na med-pa yin-no*||. In note 23 Dargyay refers to Ārya-Vimuktisena's *Abhisamayālaṃkāravṛtti* but does not indicate where the passage occurs in Pensa's edition. Vimuktisena explains the words *citta* and *utpāda*. With regard to the latter he remarks: *utpādagrahanam anutpādajñāpanāc cittasyādhiḡgamadharmam prati prathamāvadhībhāvajñāpanārtham cittotpādaḥ* (Pensa, p. 31.5-6). Dargyay points out that in Tsong-kha-pa's *gSer-phreng*, *dn̄gos-po* corresponds to *bhāva*, but that the Tibetan version of Vimuktisena's work has *dbang-po*. He proposes to change *dn̄gos-po* to *ngo-bo* and to translate it as 'essence'. Probably he has confused *bhāva* with *svabhāva*. Tibetan translators render both *bhāva* and *vastu* with *dn̄gos-po*. In his article, "Bodhisattva—The Ethical Phase in Evolution," H. V. Guenther translates many passages from Tibetan authors from Vairocana in the eighth century to Mi-pham (1846-1912) which explain the word Bodhisattva. It would have been very useful if Guenther had added the Tibetan texts translated by him because most of them are not easily available. The editor of the volume, Leslie S. Kawamura, in his paper, "The Myōkōnin, Japan's Representation of the Bodhisattva," studies the lives of the *myōkōnin*, outstanding faithful *nembutsu* practitioners. The term *myōkōnin* (*miao hao jen*) was probably first used by Shan-tao (613-681). In Japan, biographies of *myōkōnin* were composed by Gōsei (1721-1794). His work was later expanded by Sōjun (1791-1872).

Many problems are dealt with in A. L. Basham's paper, "The Evolution of the Concept of the Bodhisattva." He begins by stating that "we are more likely to find traces of 'primitive' Buddhism in the Pāli scriptures than in any other Buddhist texts." Later on Basham refers to texts in Buddhist Sanskrit. That there are to be found more traces of 'primitive' Buddhism in the Pāli scriptures than in the Mahāyāna sūtras in Buddhist Sanskrit is a truism which probably nobody would dispute. However, Basham seems to overlook completely the scriptures of other Hīnayāna schools of which many Sanskrit fragments have been published in recent years and of which complete Chinese versions have been handed down. Much material is to be found in Ét. Lamotte's *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse* (Vols. 1-5, Louvain, 1944-1980), the notes to which quote profusely from the scriptures of the Hīnayāna schools other than the Theravāda. These texts are at least as important for our knowledge of 'primitive' Buddhism as the Pāli texts.

In studying the evolution of the Bodhisattva ideal Basham relies mainly upon Har Dayal's *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (London, 1932) and Marie-Thérèse de Mallmann's *Introduction à l'étude d'Avalokiteśvara* (Paris, 1948).<sup>2</sup> Since 1948 much important work has been done in this field, especially by Japanese scholars. Although most of the work done by Japanese scholars is written in Japanese, many books contain English summaries. For bibliographical details it suffices to refer to Hajime Nakamura's *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes* (Osaka, 1981). For instance, several problems dealt with by Marie-Thérèse de Mallmann have been discussed at great length in Kōtatsu Fujita's *A Study of Early Pure Land Buddhism* (Tokyo, 1970). This book contains a very useful English summary and has been reviewed at some length in the *T'oung Pao* (Vol. 58, 1972, pp. 352-366).

Basham pays particular attention to inscriptions and presents some new conclusions and interpretations which deserve to be discussed in more detail. Asoka's Eighth Rock Edict tells us that when he had been anointed ten years he set out for *sambodhi*. In 1913 (not in 1925 as stated by Basham) D. R. Bhandarkar first suggested that *sambodhi* here refers to the Bodhi Tree (*Indian Antiquary* 42, 1913, pp. 159sq.). Most scholars have accepted this explanation, but according to Basham Asoka resolved to achieve full enlightenment. He argues that references to the sacred tree as *sambodhi* in later Pāli texts do not prove that it was known by this name in the 3rd century B. C. However, also in the Mahāvastu *sambodhi* occurs as name for the bodhi tree, as has been shown by Akira

<sup>2</sup> Basham refers to the 1967 edition which is completely identical with the original edition. According to the introduction, de Mallmann's book was completed in March 1946. Apart from a few French publications, no books and articles published after 1939 are used by the author.

Yuyama (cf. *Pratidānam. Studies presented to F. B. J. Kuiper*, The Hague-Paris, 1968, p. 489). More important is the fact that Asoka's visit to the Bodhi Tree is described in the *Aśokāvadāna* and is illustrated on the great Stūpa of Sāñchi (cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Inde au temps des Mauryas*, Paris, 1930, p. 107). According to Basham, "those who support the now conventional interpretation overlook the fact that the verb *niškram-* . . . implies setting out on a journey." However, this is exactly one of the main arguments of de La Vallée Poussin for assuming that Asoka travelled to the Bodhi Tree: "L'édit emploie le même terme (*nishkram*) pour indiquer le départ pour les parties de chasses, le départ pour la Sambodhi. N'est-il pas question dans les deux cas d'un réel déplacement?" (*op. cit.*, p. 106).

In quoting the texts of inscriptions Basham relies almost exclusively on D. C. Sircar's *Select Inscriptions* (Vol. I, 2nd ed., Calcutta, 1965), a work compiled for the benefit of university students and not meant to replace the original publications which Basham seems not to have consulted. Moreover, Basham is very careless in quoting from Sircar's work. For instance, according to Basham the inscription of the Meridarch Theodoros on the Swat relic casket contains the words *bahu-jana-hitāya* (p. 34). These words are not to be found in the inscription but only in Sircar's Sanskritization (p. 111). According to Sircar the text has *bahu-jana-[hiti]ye*, but he points out in a note that F. W. Thomas read *bahujatiṣṭiye* and S. Konow *bahujanastitiye*. On the same page 34 Basham says that Sircar reads in the thirteenth line of the inscription on the Mathura lion capital the words *mukti-hitāya*. However, Sircar read *ma(?)kihi(?)ra(ta?)ya* and his Sanskritization *mukti-hitāya* is no more than a wild guess. In a note Basham says that "after examining the facsimile in CII [Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Part 1, Calcutta, 1929] (p. 48) we are more than doubtful about this interpretation." No facsimile is to be found on p. 48 but only Konow's transcription of the text. The facsimile (cf. plate VII between pages 36 and 37) is too unclear to check Konow's readings.

Basham discovers a completely theistic Mahāyāna in an inscription on a Buddha image from Mathura, dated in the year 14 of Kaniṣka's reign (p. 36). Here the Buddha is designated as *pitāmaha, saṃmyasaṃbuddha* (not *samya-saṃbuddha*) and *deva*. According to Basham the term Pitāmaha "seems to presuppose something like the *trikāya* doctrine, imperfectly understood by the lady donor (*Pitāmaha* suggests the *Dharmakāya*, *deva* the *Samhoga-kāya*, and *samyak-saṃbuddha* the *Nirmānakāya*)." Of course, no Buddhist scholar has ever suggested such an interpretation. Basham seems also to be unaware of the fact that the designation of the Buddha as *pitāmaha* is also found in three other inscriptions (cf. H. Lüders, *Mathurā Inscriptions*, Göttingen, 1961, p. 118 and p. 119, note 2; Th. Damsteegt, *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit*, Leiden, 1978, p. 182). It would be necessary to study these inscriptions together in explaining the de-

signation *pitāmaha*. The fact that this designation also occurs elsewhere makes it in any case highly unlikely that its use is due to a misunderstanding by the lady donor. Moreover, it is very doubtful that this inscription dates from the year 14 of the great Kaniṣka, cf. J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw's detailed discussion of this inscription (*The "Scythian" Period*, Leiden, 1949, pp. 302–318). Even more surprising is Basham's interpretation of an inscription from Nagarjunikonda which was first edited by J. Ph. Vogel (*Epigraphia Indica* XX, 1929–30, pp. 16–17). This inscription records the erection of a pillar "for the attainment of welfare and happiness in both the worlds and in order to attain herself the bliss of Nirvāṇa and for the attainment of welfare and happiness by all the world" (translation Vogel). Basham proposes to translate *ubhaya-loka-hita-sukhāvaha* by "the bringing of welfare and joy to both families." According to him "if we take the phrase as meaning 'both worlds' the phrase *sarva-loka-hita-sukhāvaha* seems pleonastic." One is at a complete loss to see how there can be a pleonasm because in the first case the word *loka* refers to this world and the hereafter and in the second case to mankind. Basham tries to justify his translation of *loka* as 'family' by referring to the meaning of *log* in several modern Indo-Aryan languages! The fact that in the very same inscription both families (*ubhaya-kula*) are mentioned is explained away by him as follows: "by *ubhaya-loka* Śāntiśrī perhaps refers to the individual members of the two families, as distinct from the families taken collectively in *ubhaya-kula*." The meaning of the expression *ubhaya-loka* is obvious for anybody who has even the slightest acquaintance with Buddhist texts, in which so often mention is made of this world and the next.

We must be grateful to Leslie S. Kawamura for having so carefully edited this volume which contains much interesting material on the Bodhisattva. It is a pity that no Buddhist scholar of repute has contributed a paper on the development of the Bodhisattva doctrine in India, but we must welcome the fact that this book contains three papers on Japan, because Japanese Buddhism has not yet received due attention from scholars outside Japan. Leslie S. Kawamura also deserves our gratitude for the excellent and detailed index which occupies more than thirty pages divided into two columns.

J. W. DE JONG