

THE JOURNAL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BUDDHIST STUDIES

CO-EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Gregory Schopen
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana, USA

Roger Jackson
Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut, USA

EDITORS

Peter N. Gregory
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA

Ernst Steinkellner
University of Vienna
Wien, Austria

Alexander W. Macdonald
Université de Paris X
Nanterre, France

Jikidō Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Bardwell Smith
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota, USA

Robert Thurman
Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Bruce Cameron Hall
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia, USA

Volume 9

1986

Number 2

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. Signs, Memory and History: A Tantric Buddhist
Theory of Scriptural Transmission, *by Janet Gyatso* 7
2. Symbolism of the Buddhist *Stūpa*, *by Gérard Fussman* 37
3. The Identification of dGa' rab rdo rje,
by A. W. Hanson-Barber 55
4. An Approach to Dōgen's Dialectical Thinking
and Method of Instantiation, *by Shohei Ichimura* 65
5. A Report on Religious Activity in Central Tibet,
October, 1985, *by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. and
Cyrus Stearns* 101
6. A Study of the Earliest *Garbha Vidhi* of the
Shingon Sect, *by Dale Allen Todaro* 109
7. On the Sources for Sa skya Paṇḍita's Notes on the
"bSam yas Debate," *by Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp* 147

II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *The Bodymind Experience in Japanese Buddhism:
A Phenomenological Study of Kūkai and Dōgen*,
by D. Shaner
(William Waldron) 155
2. *A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur*,
by Tadeusz Skorupski
(Bruce Cameron Hall) 156

3.	<i>Early Buddhism and Christianity: A Comparative Study of the Founders' Authority, the Community, and the Discipline</i> , by Chai-Shin Yu (Vijitha Rajapakse)	162
4.	<i>The Heart of Buddhist Philosophy: Dinnāga and Dharmakīrti</i> , by Amar Singh (Richard Hayes)	166
5.	<i>Shōbōgenzō: Zen Essays by Dōgen</i> , translated by Thomas Cleary (Steven Heine)	173
6.	<i>Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen</i> , edited by Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory (John Jorgensen)	177
7.	<i>The Tantric Distinction</i> , by Jeffrey Hopkins (Bruce Burrill) Jeffrey Hopkins Replies Bruce Burrill Replies	181
	NOTES AND NEWS [2 items]	189
	LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	191

taught that to attain understanding one must “cast off (the concepts of) body and mind” and centered his teaching on the incessant practice of “just sitting,” which he considered the very activity of enlightenment itself, free even from the concept of “attaining enlightenment.” In Shaner’s interpretation, it is the experience of “bodymind” free fromthetic positing based on the noesis / noematic split that characterizes both Kūkai’s and Dōgen’s description of the enlightened mode of awareness. This strongly parallels the phenomenological analysis.

Thus phenomenology provides a powerful hermeneutical tool for us to gain an appreciation of these Japanese Buddhist thinkers. It also transposes their philosophies directly into the framework of current discussions of the “mind-body problem.” This is of particular relevance now, the author suggests, because the “mind-body antimony . . . [is] irresolvable unless the Platonic or Cartesian assumptions about ‘what is mind’ and ‘what is body’ are reconsidered.”

The main shortcoming of this work lies with phenomenology itself. Shaner takes great pains to qualify Husserl’s exaggerated truth-claims for phenomenology and to explicate his own presuppositions, but it often seems that we are then left with little more than an “appropriate” hermeneutical strategy, since the whole of the study lies “within the limits of the phenomenological *epoché*” outside of any attempt at evaluating its ultimate validity. But then, this is a problem that the phenomenologists and their critics have thrashed out in greater detail elsewhere.

By applying phenomenology hermeneutically the author is able to skillfully explicate often tradition-bound concepts and doctrines and extract vital and (contemporaneously) relevant meaning from them. If it is any measure of success, his work prompts one to return to the original texts themselves (à la Husserl’s cry “to the things themselves”) to reread them in a new, and perhaps brighter, light.

William Waldron

A Catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur, by Tadeusz Skorupski. Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Maior, IV. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1985. xxvi + 367 pp.

Tadeusz Skorupski teaches in the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. His previous publications

include *The Sarvadurgatiparisodhana Tantra* (Sanskrit and Tibetan texts with English translation, 1983) and *The Cultural Heritage of Ladakh* (with D.L. Snellgrove, 2 volumes, 1977, 1980). The present work describes a manuscript set of the Tibetan Kanjur preserved in the Tog (or sTog) Palace near Leh, Ladakh (cited in this review as the Tog MS). More precisely, it catalogues a photo-offset reproduction: *The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*, published by C. Namgyal Tarusergar (Leh, Ladakh: Sherig Dpemzod, 1975-1980) in 109 unbound Tibetan-style volumes (not including the *dkar chag*, or Tibetan table of contents, published separately). These 109 volumes contain 811 separate texts. This reproduction can be found, for example, in the libraries of the University of Wisconsin (Madison) and Indiana University (Bloomington), and is available in microfiche from the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions (Stony Brook, New York).

Skorupski's introduction discusses the Tog MS, its contents and possible origin, the Leh reproduction, and the organization of the catalogue. The catalogue itself describes the 811 texts, which are arranged in twelve sections and by volume numbers. Each main entry gives a text number, the Tibetan title, the Sanskrit title (given for all but 113 texts) or Chinese title (given for 4 texts), *le'u* or *bam po* subdivisions if known, the text's colophon if it has one, and the folio, side, and line on which the text begins and ends. Five indexes (Tibetan and Sanskrit titles, and Tibetan, Sanskrit, and Chinese names of translators) refer back to the text numbers. The title indexes also give cross-references (by text number) to the Derge, Peking, and Ulan Bator Kanjurs. Skorupski used three main sources for this catalogue: the *dkar chag* mentioned above, the Leh reproduction itself (in which each volume begins with a table of contents), and an independent *dkar chag*, contained in the collected works of Jaya Paṇḍita, describing the older *Them spangs ma* Manuscript Kanjur from which the Tog MS may ultimately derive. The historical importance of the Tog MS merits a lengthy comment.

The Kanjur (*Bka' 'gyur*) and Tanjur (*Bstan 'gyur*), the collected Tibetan translations of Indian Buddhist *sūtras* and *sāstras*, are, along with the Pāli and Chinese Tripiṭakas, our most important sources for the Buddhist Canon. Beginning with the Yung-lo Kanjur (1410), numerous blockprint or xylographic editions of the Tibetan Canon have been printed in China and at various places in Tibet and Mongolia. Many of these are represented in Western collections, in modern printed or microform reproductions, and in catalogues. The (Ch'ing Dynasty) Peking editions

are well known through the Japanese reprint and the Ōtani Catalogue; the Derge Kanjur and Tanjur through the Tōhoku catalogue and the Nyingma and Rumtek reprints. The Narthang and Cone editions also include both Kanjur and Tanjur; the Narthang Kanjur and Cone Tanjur are available in microfiche. Lithang, Urga, and Lhasa editions of the Kanjur alone are now attested by exemplars and *dkar chags*. Other xylographs are now known only from references. Ideally anyone editing a Tibetan canonical text should use all available testimonia. The number of research tools to assist such work is steadily increasing.

Beside these xylographic printed editions, the Tibetan Kanjur also survives in complete manuscript sets. The Kanjur must have existed as a manuscript collection before being printed, but the importance of surviving MSS as evidence for this Ur-Kanjur is only now becoming clear. Early 20th century Western scholars knew only two MS Kanjurs: the Berlin MS (formerly in the Royal Library, now in the Staatsbibliothek Preussische Kulturbesitz) and the London MS (in the British Museum). As it happens, the Berlin MS closely resembles the printed Peking editions, and the true position of the London MS was not understood until recently (see especially Helmut Eimer in *Zentralasiatische Studien* 15, 1981). Other MS Kanjurs are now known. The manuscript preserved at the Tōyō Bunko in Tokyo was described by Kōjun Saitō (in Japanese) in *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 63 (1977). Géza Bethlenfalvy has published *A Hand-list of the Ulan Bator Manuscript of the Kanjur Rgyal-rtse Them Sparis-ma* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982). Finally, there is the Tog MS, its published reproduction, and the present catalogue. It now seems that the London, Tokyo, Ulan Bator, and Tog MSS form a separate recension of the Kanjur and a separate body of textual evidence. The history and inter-relationships of the various Kanjurs is being clarified, partly in the introductions to catalogues and handlists, partly in articles (especially recent works by Helmut Eimer and Yoshiro Imaeda). Skorupski's introduction contributes to this discussion.

Skorupski presents evidence for the history and contents of the Tog MS, and speculates about its position among the various Kanjurs, particularly the manuscript versions. The Tog MS was copied from a Bhutanese MS, being completed before or shortly after the death of King Nyi ma Rnam rgyal of Ladakh (reigned 1691-1729). No direct evidence is known for the nature and antecedents of this Bhutanese original. Skorupski cites Eimer's suggestion that the Tog MS belongs to the recension stemming from the *Them spangs ma* MS Kanjur, preserved in the *Dpal 'khor chos sde* at Gyantse (*Rgyal rtse*) in Central Tibet. Although the

chronological evidence for this Gyantse MS is contradictory, indicating either the 14th or the early 15th century, it may preserve a version of the Kanjur predating the oldest known printed edition (1410). The *Them spangs ma* redaction survives in presumed copies (the Tokyo, Ulan Bator, and, possibly, London MSS), and in Jaya Paṇḍita's description of its contents. It is not clear whether the original MS survives in Tibet. According to Skorupski the Tog MS differs, in structure and contents, from all other Kanjur editions, but is closest in both regards to this *Them spangs ma* recension. After considering the few differences between the Tog MS and the *Them spangs ma* tradition, Skorupski endorses the suggestion that the Bhutanese source of the Tog MS was based on the *Them spangs ma* Kanjur.

Merely comparing the number of volumes in different Kanjurs signifies little; a different number of volumes may contain the same texts, while the same number of volumes contains different texts. Kanjurs can be compared by their arrangement into sections, the arrangement of texts within sections, and the variation in their readings. The last criterion is beyond the scope of a catalogue; the first two, though not conclusive, can be persuasive in combination. The Tog MS differs from other *Them spangs ma* representatives in the overall order of its sections. Skorupski explains this by the attempt in the Tog MS *dkar chag* to relate the sections of the canon to a theory of different proclamations of the Buddha's teaching. However, the order of sections in the Ur-Kanjur has not been established. Kanjur editions differ widely in this regard, as may be seen from the examples listed in the following table. Kanjurs contain some or all of the following sections: Vinaya (A), Prajñāpāramitā in 100,000 (B), 25,000 (C), 18,000 (D), 10,000 (E), and 8,000 (F) Stanzas, Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts (G), Avamtamsaka (H), Ratnakūṭa (I), Miscellaneous Sūtras (J), Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra (K), Tantra (L), Old Tantras (M), Kālacakra Commentary (N), and Dhāraṇī Collection (O). Sections lacking in particular editions may or may not be included in other sections.

Tog Palace MS:	A, B, H, I, C, D, E, F, G, J, K, L.
Ulan Bator MS:	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, M, L.
London (Eimer):	L, J, K, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, A
Narthang Kanjur:	A, B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J, K, L.
Lhasa Kanjur:	A, B, C, F, D, E, G, I, H, J, K, L.
Derge (Tōhoku):	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O.
Cone Kanjur:	L, J, B, C, F, G, D, E, I, H, A.
Peking (Ōtani):	L, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, H, J, A.

The Tog MS also differs in its arrangement of texts within the Vinaya and Tantra sections. For the Vinaya the Tog MS follows the order of the printed Kanjurs against that of the *Them spangs ma*. It seems as if the first five Tantra texts of the *Them spangs ma* have been moved in the Tog MS, so that its Tantra section begins with the *Laghusaṃvara Tantra*. Skorupski relates this to the preference for that Tantra by the 'Brug pa Dkar brgyud pa sect of Bhutan and Ladakh. Otherwise, the Tog MS closely agrees with the Tokyo and Ulan Bator MSS. According to Bethlenfalvy (1982) the Ulan Bator MS contains 834 texts to the 811 of the Tog MS. This discrepancy largely disappears when we note that the Tog MS lacks the "Old Tantra" section, which contains 19 texts in the Ulan Bator Kanjur.

These MSS together differ from the printed Kanjurs, not only in sectional arrangement, but also in containing texts lacking elsewhere. Skorupski lists 15 texts absent in the Peking and Derge canons, and 12 texts which are found in the Tanjur in the Derge and Peking editions. The Tog MS places these 12 among the Miscellaneous Sūtras. They are of various types, including a *stotra* (Tog MS no. 44), several *avadānas* (nos. 310, 311, 319), and three *abhidharma* texts: the *Karma-*, *Loka-*, and *Kāraṇa-prajñāpti* (nos. 286, 313, 316). All four editions of the Tanjur place these last three texts at the beginning of the Abhidharma section of the Sūtra Commentaries, before Vasubandhu's *Abhidharma-kośa-kārikā*. They seem to be the only pre-Vasubandhu Abhidharma texts known in Tibetan, and the only Abhidharma texts ever found in Kanjurs. If the MSS preserve a tradition predating the printed Kanjurs, this shows an earlier stage in the process of classifying texts into the "Buddha's Word" and the *śāstras* of his Indian successors. Further study is needed of other points of agreement in arrangement and readings between the Tog MS and the *Them spangs ma* tradition, against the other Kanjurs. This will help to clarify the history of the Kanjur and its recensions.

These and other fascinating peculiarities of the Tog MS now lie open to our scrutiny, thanks to Dr. Skorupski's excellent catalogue. I have only two criticisms. Skorupski has "normalized" the spelling of Tibetan and Sanskrit text titles, giving what he considers important variants in footnotes. This normalization is necessary to allow cross-reference to other editions; Sanskrit titles especially are often quite garbled in Tibetan transcription. However, it would have been useful to give as well all the actual readings of the Tog MS, since even simple misspellings can be textual evidence for relationships between editions.

A more serious problem is the lack of a comparative table of Kanjurs by text number. Such a table is included, for example, in Bethlenfalvy (1982) giving text numbers of the Ulan Bator MS, in order, in the first column, with corresponding text numbers for six other editions in successive columns. Such a table reveals a great deal of information at a glance. Skorupski does give cross-references, by text number, to the Derge and Peking editions, but these are given (twice) in the two title indexes. This format is very cumbersome if, for example, one wants to see whether a string of texts occurs together and in the same order in various editions. If not summarized in a table, these cross-references should have been given under the main entry for each text. Space saved in the indexes could be better employed to include variant titles.

These criticisms are minor, detracting little from the value of this catalogue, which is otherwise easy to use, well organized, and clearly printed. Specialists in the history of the Kanjur will appreciate the historical information in the introduction. Any scholar interested in using the printed or microfiche reproductions of the Tog Palace Kanjur should welcome this catalogue, which makes the 109 volumes and 811 texts of the Tog MS really accessible for the first time. We can all join Dr. Skorupski in the hope, expressed in his introduction, that he will do further work on this Kanjur. The catalogue itself should encourage textual and comparative studies of specific texts.

Reliable and usable catalogues and bibliographies are indispensable research tools for Buddhist Studies. Dr. Akira Yuyama, Director of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies (formerly the Reiyukai Library), merits the gratitude of Buddhologists for giving us many such tools through his own publications and by publishing works of other scholars in the Institute's *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica*. The Tibetan Canon is particularly well represented in this series. Most of these publications are available for the cost of the postage. A list of titles can be obtained from the International Institute of Buddhist Studies, 5-3-23 Toranomom, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105, Japan.

Bruce Cameron Hall