THE JOURNAL

OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

BUDDHIST STUDIES

Volume 11 *1988* *Number 1*

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. The Four Levels of *Pratītya-Samutpāda* According to the *Fa-hua hsüan i*, *by Carl Bielefeldt* 7
2. On the Possibility of a Nonexistent Object of Consciousness: Sarvāstivādin and Dārṣṭāntika Theories, *by Collett Cox* 31
3. Magical *Upāya* in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*, *by Edward Hamlin* 89
4. Buddhist Sanskrit in the *Kālacakra Tantra*, *by John Newman* 123
5. Two New Fragments of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia, *by Richard Salomon and Collett Cox* 141
6. Some Reflections on R.S.Y. Chi's *Buddhist Formal Logic*, *by Tom J.F. Tillemans* 155

II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism*, by Peter Mansfield (Charles Hallisey) 173
2. *Studies in the Buddhist Art of South Asia*, ed. A.K. Narain (Robert L. Brown) 175
3. *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (Henrik H. Sorensen) 179

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 185

just a decade or so ago, when they were often dated 2nd/3rd c. for the smaller and 4th/5th c. for the larger. That they both were made after 600 C.E. has been shown, for example, by the work of Deborah Klimburg-Salter and Zemaryalai Tarzi. Carter's suggestion, however, that one of the colossi Hsüan-tsang mentions is metal is difficult to judge. Although she points to examples of monumental bronzes from both Western and Asian antiquity, a 100-foot standing Buddha in metal appears to me an interesting but unlikely possibility. As with the other six essays, however, Carter's article is an important contribution that will be of interest to all students of Buddhist art and religion.

Robert L. Brown

Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism. Edited by Peter N. Gregory. Studies in East Asian Buddhism no. 4. The Kuroda Institute for the Study of Buddhism and Human Values. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1987. 266 pp.

Since the publication of *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-yen* in 1983, the first volume in the *Studies in East Asian Buddhism* series edited by Robert M. Gimello and Peter N. Gregory, a number of significant contributions to our understanding of East Asian Buddhism have appeared in this excellent series. The present book, which is a collection of six lengthy articles on different aspects of meditation in Chinese Buddhism, is the most recent. Despite the fact that meditation in one of its many forms has always been at the heart of the Chinese Buddhist tradition, surprisingly little has been written on this topic from a scholarly point of view. For this reason the present collection is a very welcome contribution towards a deepening of our understanding of the contemplative aspects of Chinese Buddhism.

The book opens with a long, very interesting and perceptive introduction by Peter N. Gregory, the editor. Recapitulating the views of previous and current authorities on Zen/Ch'an Buddhism, he points out the need for revising many of our fixed opinions on Chinese Buddhism meditation, which hitherto has tended to be identified solely with Ch'an Buddhism. Gregory presents his views with detailed consideration of the hermeneutics of the various traditions of meditation within Chinese Buddhism, i.e., the methods of meditation seen in relation to their underlying

doctrinal structures, and thus gives us a complex, but at the same time useful methodological framework with which to approach and understand the issue under discussion.

The first paper, "Meditation in Fa-hsiang Buddhism" by Alan Sponberg, is devoted to a hitherto little studied subject (at least among Western scholars), namely meditation as practiced in the Fa-hsiang tradition, which originated with Hsüan-tsang. The author has chosen to present his topic through a discussion of two methods of meditation, both of which were designated by the polyvalent term *kuan*. The first use of this term relates to the practice of visualization, here highlighted by an example of Maitreya visualization found in Hui-li's *Ta T'ang Ta Tzu-en Ssu San-ts'ang Fa-shih chüan*. In its second usage *kuan* appears as a method of "discernment" or "insight," such as is found in the traditional *prajñāpāramitā* literature, but of course based on the *dharmalakṣaṇa* perspective. Sponberg gives considerable space to a general discussion of the importance of defining the meaning of "meditation." In his concern for clarification of terminology the author suggests that the Sanskrit term *bhāvanā* would be a better designation for meditation than the more limited *dhyāna*, since it includes any practice productive of *nirvāṇa*. While much of Sponberg's argument on the issue of *dhyāna* is certainly valid and raises important questions, I think that he might have devoted a separate paper to a discussion of this important topic. By so doing, he would have been able to treat a wider range of Fa-hsiang practices in the present paper, one obvious drawback of which is precisely its narrow focus on only two aspects of Fa-hsiang meditation. This limitation is unfortunate when we consider the copiousness of the existing sources. What is lacking in particular is a discussion of the important Tantric practices in Hsüan-tsang's tradition, practices which the author at least ought to have mentioned when formulating his broad definition of meditation as *bhāvanā*.

Next follows a very interesting and detailed paper by Daniel B. Stevenson, "The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism." Using very wide-ranging source material, the author gives an in-depth presentation and discussion of the structure of early T'ien-t'ai ritual and contemplative practices. Relying mostly on the writings of Chih-i (548–597), Stevenson shows how the meaning of *chih-kuan*, the central type of T'ien-t'ai meditation, covers a wide range of practices, including rituals of repentance as well as *buddhānusmṛti*, Lotus Samādhi and *i-hsing san-mei*, the so-called "one practice *samādhi*." The influence of Tantric Bud-

dhism is also noted. The author treats a large complex corpus of texts expertly and succeeds in showing how structured and multi-faceted the meditation practices of the early T'ien-t'ai tradition were. A minor point of criticism concerns a certain lack of clarity in the way in which Chih-i's master Hui-ssu (515–577) is presented when the author discusses the origin and structure of the early T'ien-t'ai practices. An acknowledgment of Paul Magnin's *La Vie et l'Oeuvre de Huisi (515–577): Les Origines de la Secte Bouddhique Chinoise du Tiantai,* Publications de l'Ecole Française d'Extreme-Orient, vol. 116 (Paris: Ecole Française d'Extreme-Orient, 1979) would have been appropriate in this respect.

Bernard Faure's "The Concept of One-Practice Samādhi in Early Ch'an" sets out to discuss the main methods of meditation on so-called Northern Ch'an Buddhism, i.e. the tradition popularized by Shen-hsiu (605?–706) and his successor P'u-chi (652–739). As Stevenson shows, *I-hsing san-mei* constituted an important part of the higher practices in the T'ien-t'ai regimen and had a fixed meaning as a special type of practice. In the Ch'an tradition one-practice *samādhi* took on a more general meaning, and was redefined as a designation for a number of practices such as *shou-i* (maintaining an unwavering concentration), *kuan-hsin/kan-hsin* (contemplating the mind), and even nien-fo (Buddha invocation). Faure's paper demonstrates a versatile and sure grasp of a large range of sources as well as of the general history of the contemplative traditions in Chinese Buddhism. This allows him to establish a plausible as well as clear presentation of the topic under discussion. However, when he discusses the respective practices of Northern and Southern Ch'an, I am rather reluctant to accept his view that the traditional distinction between gradual and sudden enlightenment is invalid. Clearly the practices of meditation advocated by Shen-hsiu and the earlier patriarchs of the East Mountain/Northern School were gradual, if not in theory, then at least in practice. This can be seen in Tao-hsin's entry in *Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi,* in Hung-jen's *Hsiu-hsin yao lun* and in Shen-hsiu's *Kuan-hsin lun,* all of which speak of preparation and a gradual entry into *samādhi* in their respective sections dealing with the actual practice(s) of meditation.

In his paper "Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse's Tso-ch'an I and the 'Secret' of Zen Meditation" Carl Bielefeldt discusses what he calls "the earliest and in some ways most influential" (pp. 130) manual of Ch'an meditation and presents a very fine translation of the work. The text in question is the *Tso-ch'an I* by the Yün-men monk Tsung-tse (d.u.), a relatively short treatise on meditation

most commonly encountered as a part of the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*, compiled in 1103. I feel, however, that the author in his conscientious effort at contextualizing the *Tso-ch'an I* in relation to earlier T'ien-t'ai manuals of meditation (such as the *Mo-ho chih-kuan* and especially the *T'ien-t'ai hsiao chih-kuan*), may, to some extent, have looked in the wrong place. It is true that Tsung-tse mentions Chih-i and his *Chih-kuan* in the manual, but this indirect reference is solely concerned with how to check demonic disturbances while meditating, and does not refer to the actual practice of *chih-kuan*. In fact, Bielefeldt himself correctly concludes that the *Tso-ch'an I* does not have much in common with the much larger T'ien-t'ai texts on meditation. Furthermore, the doctrinal differences between the Ch'an schools of the late T'ang/Five Dynasties Period—with the exception of the Fa-yen School—and the revived T'ien-t'ai School of early Northern Sung are fairly obvious and would have made a direct link there problematic. For these reasons the author might have looked in other directions for material with which to illuminate the possible origin(s) of the manual as well as other similar Ch'an texts of a later date. Personally I would have tried to relate the *Tso-ch'an I* to references to meditation in material from the Yün-men School (since Tsung-tse belonged to that school), and also to information to be found in the other lineages. A close scrutiny of the Tun-huang Ch'an mss. is most likely to yield significant information in this regard. Slightly later meditation manuals and related texts such as the *Tso-ch'an I* by Fo-hsin Pen-ts'ai (d.u.) and the *Tso-ch'an ming* by Fo-yen Ch'ing-yüan (1067–1120), both of the Lin-chi School, would also serve as useful points of reference.

David W. Chappell follows next with his "From Dispute to Dual Cultivation: Pure Land Response to Ch'an Critics." This paper examines two late T'ang Pure Land masters' response to, and counter-attack on, general Ch'an criticism of the relevance of their practice. The highlights of this paper are Chappell's very interesting examples of the Pure Land master Hui-jih's (680–748) anti-Ch'an polemics which are seen in relation to the criticism directed by the Ch'an master Ling-yü against the excesses of many Ch'an adherents. Likewise Chappell's discussion of the Pure Land dialectics of Fei-hsi (d.u.) serves as a useful point of departure for understanding the later dual cultivation of Ch'an and Pure Land practices. For unknown reasons the author has chosen not to mention the importance of Ch'an and Pure Land practices in the Fa-yen School, a syncretism which is perhaps the

most outstanding example of dual cultivation in Chinese Buddhism. I am also hesitant to accept Chappell's view of the average Pure Land Buddhist's attitude to practice. He asserts that "at a fundamental level they were aware that all was empty and there was nothing to attain" (pp. 189). Although such an argument was put forth by T'an-luan from the point of the two levels of meaning, i.e., as a philosophical view, such an understanding—if employed in practice—would simply prevent the desire for rebirth in Sukhāvatī, the very goal of the Pure Land devotees. In order to go to the Pure Land for rebirth one must believe in it! Another minor point on which I disagree with the author concerns his insistence that "the Southern School of Ch'an emerged partially by defining itself over against various Pure Land practices" (pp. 174). Southern Ch'an emerged—I believe—as a general reaction to intellectualism and relative practices current in T'ang Buddhism as a whole. (This includes the practices employed by various lineages within the Ch'an tradition itself).

The final paper of the volume is Robert E. Buswell's "Chinul's System of Chinese Meditative Techniques in Korean Sŏn Buddhism." In this paper, which may serve as a supplement to the author's momumental work, *The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul,* the focus is on the teachings and methods of meditation propounded by Chinul (1158–1210), the reviver of Korean Sŏn Buddhism during the middle of the Koryŏ Dynasty (936–1392). Buswell presents five aspects of Chinul's thought on practice, including Amit'a invocation. However, Chinul's Sŏn developed in two basic stages. In the early stage it shows strong influence from the *Platform Scripture (Liu-tsu fa-pao t'an ching)* attributed to Hui-neng. The teachings which developed around the combined practice of *samādhi* and *prajñā* especially left a significant impact on Chinul during his formative years. The later and more mature stage is that based on Ta-hui Tsung-kao's *k'an-hua* or *hua-t'ou* practice, i.e., the type of meditation which employs *kung-an.* Buswell's impressive knowledge of the Korean sources is readily apparent in his demonstrations of how these Chinese Ch'an techniques influenced and shaped Chinul's Sŏn in the two basic stages.

Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism is a collection of informative and highly interesting papers written by some of the best American scholars in the field of East Asian Buddhist studies. The volume is significant because most of the information it presents is new or presented in a new light, and one of the book's most marked characteristics is the inner coherence and structure

which connects the individual papers. This places meditation in a central position in the history of Chinese Buddhism and thus gives the reader a firm understanding of its importance. My only real point of criticism of this otherwise excellent collection is the limitation of topics treated. If the book is intended to present the more important traditions of meditation in Chinese Buddhism, then I would have liked to see articles on meditation in the Nan-Pei Chao period (preferably on meditation literature), one on Chen-yen (Tantric) Buddhism in the T'ang, one on the influence of Tibetan practices after the Yüan, and one on Ch'an practice in the Ming. Such papers would have given the present compilation more perspective as well as a deeper historical dimension. However, the book is an important contribution to our understanding of the role of meditation in Chinese Buddhism and can be warmly recommended.

Henrik H. Sorensen