

THE JOURNAL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Roger Jackson
Dept. of Religion
Carleton College
Northfield, MN 55057
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

Jikido Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Steven Collins
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Robert Thurman
Columbia University
New York, New York, USA

Volume 16

1993

Number 1

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. Religion, Kinship and Buddhism: Ambedkar's Vision of a Moral Community
by Anne M. Blackburn 1
2. Vasubandhu on *saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānam*
by Robert Kritzer 24
3. Is It a Crow (P. *dhama*) or a Nurse (Skt. *dhātṛī*), or Milk (Skt. *kṣīra*)
or a Toy-Plough (P. *vaṃka*)?
by Stephan H. Levitt 56

II. REVIEW ARTICLE

- Issues on the Field of East Asian Buddhist Studies: An Extended Review
of *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (T. Griffith Foulk) 93

III. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Collected Papers, vol. 2*, by K. R. Norman (Nirmala Salgado) 183
2. *The Dating of the Historical Buddha. Die Datierung des Historischen Buddha*, part I, ed. Heinz Bechert (A. K. Narain) 187
3. *Gender and Salvation: Jaina Debates on the Spiritual Liberation of Women*, by Padmanabh S. Jaini (Serinity Young) 202

IV. RESEARCH TOOLS

- A Bibliography of Buddhist Materials in the Recorded Sound Collection
of the Library of Congress
by Floyd B. Hooker 209

V. NOTES AND NEWS

- IABS Financial Statement, 1991 245

Collected Papers. Vol. 2. by K. R. Norman. London: The Pāli Text Society. 1991. 276 pages

This volume, as its title indicates, is the second volume (of three) of a collection of papers written by K.R. Norman. It includes twenty-two articles first published between 1977 and 1983 in selected journals. The articles include Pāli etymological studies that are based in both Jain and Buddhist texts, and treatments of a wide range of topics, from a translation and critical analysis of the eighth chapter of the *Uttarādhyaṇa Sūtra* to an essay on the early history of the Pali Text Society. The articles are arranged in the order in which they were first published.

In "The Buddha's View of the Devas," Norman indicates that the so called "problem" of describing Buddhism, with its polytheistic elements, as "non-theistic" only emerges in the endeavors of Western scholars to classify Buddhism. The problem disappears if one interprets non-theistic to mean "accepting the existence of devas, but denying them any causal role in the universe" (1). He shows that "The real problem of Buddhism vis-à-vis the devas was not in accommodating them into the Buddhist cosmology, but in fitting the eternal gods of the R̥gveda into the system of *samsāra*" (1). He proceeds to examine critically several Pali Text Society translations of the *Sangārava Sutta* one of the two canonical passages on the subject—and he also discusses the relevant Sinhalese and Burmese manuscripts. Norman shows that the early translations are unsatisfactory because they do not give the full context of the brahman Sangārava's question to the Buddha: "*kin nu kho, bho Gotama, atthi devā? ti...*", nor do they clarify that the Buddha's claim that there certainly are devas, ("*thānaso me taṃ Bhāradvāja, viditaṃ yadidaṃ atthi devā u*") is actually the Buddha's attempt to verify the eternal reality of the devas; and that this interpretation takes care of the confusion rendered in the old translations when the questioner first refutes the Buddha's answer and then accepts it. Norman demonstrates that the words *atthi devā* should be corrected to *atthi adhidevā* in order to render the passage meaningful. The passage would then show that the Buddha, rather than acknowledging the brahmanical gods to the brahman Sangārava, was asserting that there were indeed earthly princes (*devas*) in addition to beings who were superior to them (*adhidevās*)—like himself. The second essay on this topic, "Devas and Adhidevas in Buddhism," examines the

Kaṇṇakatthala Sutta—the second of the canonical *suttas* which illustrate the Buddha's view of *devas*. Norman shows that once again *adhi* has been mistaken for *atthi* and that the text becomes more meaningful when this rendering is presented. He concludes that in these two *suttas*, the Buddha asserted the existence of both earthly princes (*devas*) and superior beings (*adhi devas*), who are both subject to rebirth. The two articles are significant not just in clarifying the misperceptions that arise in previous translations—but also in illustrating the importance of recognizing the nature of *devās* and *adhidevās* for Buddhism as a whole.

In “Attā in the Alagaddūpama-sutta,” Norman examines the six wrong views on *attā* in this text. He shows that, contrary to the views of some scholars such as E.J. Thomas and R. Gombrich, Buddhism was acquainted with the Upanishadic notion of the world soul. This is clearly evident in the *Alagaddūpama Sutta* since in proving that what is *anicca* and *dukkha* cannot be *attā* the Buddha must refer to an assumed knowledge of the Upanishadic *ātman* which is both *nitya* and *sukkhā*. He substantiates this view by showing that both a Jain text and the *Anattalakkhaṇasutta* provide very similar arguments denying the existence of the Upanishadic *ātman*, knowledge of which these texts must presuppose. He shows that while the Buddha might not specifically deny the existence of *attā* in the Pāli canon, the Buddha did deny the existence of a permanent individual self. This article is a useful one not only because it questions and corrects previously held notions concerning the Buddha's views on *attā*, but also because it renders the significance of *attā* relevant to the broader context of the meaning of *paṭicca-samuppāda*.

The essay “Dhammapada 97: a Misunderstood Paradox” is significant because it explains the double meaning of *saddho* in this little understood verse in the *Dhammapada*. While Erghart's translation of the verse indicates that one who is without faith (*assaddho*) is an *uttamaporiso*, later translators have refrained from this usual translation of *assaddho* because of the confusion it brings to the context of the verse. Norman shows that there is an important difference between “to have faith in” and—for lack of direct experience—“to take some one's word for something.” While both may be considered accurate renderings of *saddahati*, it is the verse itself that indicates that faith is not necessary, but there is a question as to whether the reference is to faith in the necessity of faith, as opposed to direct knowledge. Norman shows that, like *assaddho*, the other adjectives in the verse have double meanings, a “good” one and a “bad” one. He suggests that the bad meanings were lost by the time this pre-Buddhist verse was included in the Buddhist collection. Norman's insights into a single riddle-like verse of the *Dhammapada* points to the likelihood that other similarly paradoxical verses should be examined for possible double-entendres.

The essay “The Pratyeka-Buddha in Buddhism and Jainism” is a philological examination of the term *pratyeka*. Norman shows that the concept of the *pratyekabuddha* is pre-Buddhist and pre-Jain. He demonstrates that both the terms *patteya/pacceka* may be derived from *pratyaya buddha*. Since *pratyaya* has the

sense of *nimitta*, this could refer to a *buddha* who was awakened by an external cause as opposed to those *buddhas* who were self-awakened. Norman discusses the assimilation of the *pratyeka-buddha* conception into Buddhism and Jainism and suggests that it was originally borrowed from another sect and then used to fill in the gap between *buddha* and *sāvaka*. His examination sheds light on a new meaning of the concept of the *pratyeka-buddha*, who is not just an individual *buddha*, but originally was considered as a *buddha* who was enlightened in a certain way.

In "Four Etymologies of the *Sabhiya Sutta*," Norman considers the etymologies of the four words *viriyavā*, *ariya*, *kusala* and *ājāniya* to determine the history of the *sutta*. He maintains that it was originally composed in a Prakrit and by means of a comparison with Tibetan texts indicates that the *Sutta* tradition was quite different from the commentarial tradition. He suggests that a study of the *Sabhiya Sutta* and its commentary across traditions shows evidence of a commentarial tradition that may have crossed sectarian boundaries. He urges caution in using metrical analysis alone to determine the dating of a text, since in the case of the *Sabhiya Sutta* this is obviously misleading.

In "Māgadhisms in the *Kathāvatthu*" Norman examines the nominative and vocative singular masculine "e" forms in the *aṭṭhakathās* and in the *Kathāvatthu*. He indicates that these forms were known and recognized by Buddhaghosa. He demonstrates that the language of the *Kathāvatthu* and the Eastern Ashokan inscriptions share affinities and indicates that the *Kathāvatthu* was first uttered in Magadha. He suggests that the close relationship between the language of the *Kathāvatthu* and Sinhalese arose from the colonisation of Ceylon by people from Eastern India and that is likely that the "e" forms of the *Kathāvatthu* are due to the influence of Māgadhi, rather than Sanskrit or Prakrit.

The volume includes four essays on the Ashokan pillars. In "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XII" Norman examines recensions of the Ashokan edicts in order to ascertain the procedure for the transmission of exemplars. He shows that the majority of Ashokan inscriptions are based on just two "master" exemplars. In the "Notes on the so-called the Queen's Edict of Ashoka," he provides a new and corrected version of the inscriptions and shows that the main purpose of this edict was to give instruction about the accounting procedure involved concerning gifts made by the second queen. In "Ashokan *Silā-thaṃbas* and *dhamma-thaṃbas*," he emphasizes the importance of discerning the difference between the two types of pillars. He shows that Ashokan inscriptions give no indication that stone pillars did not exist before his time and that—in the light of the paucity of evidence available to the linguist—the art historian and the archeologist may be helpful. In "Notes on The Ahaurā Version of Ashoka's First Minor Rock Edict," Norman discusses the unusual words *buddhase salile*, "the body of the Buddha," found in this version only, and also discusses the numerals 256 which are missing from this version, but appear in most others. He shows that a particular sentence in the edict including these discrepancies was misread by the scribe, who made conjectures and added his own meanings when he inscribed the edict. Thus Norman's philological critique clarifies the significance of miswritten *akṣaras* and presents a clarification of this

otherwise misunderstood edict.

"The Dialects in Which the Buddha Preached" is a slightly revised version of "The Language in Which the Buddha Taught." These essays discuss the well-known Vinaya passage concerning the proposed translation of the Buddha's words. Norman sets out to explain two problems: 1) Why, though they knew the difference between the two languages, Pāli was referred to as Māgadhi by the missionaries to Ceylon, and 2) Whether Buddhaghosa's sources, which say that the Buddha spoke Māgadhi, are correct. He shows that since Pāli, the language of the canon, was akin to Māgadhi, Buddhaghosa probably called the language of the canon Māgadhi—and hence also the language of the Buddha.

The Pāli text society has added a useful index of references to Old and Middle Indo-Aryan words used in the volume and inserted the pagination of the original versions in addition to cross references to other articles by Norman on similar subjects. However, apart from these alterations in the presentation of the papers since their first appearance, there has been no effort made to reorganize the papers in any useful way. For example, several of these articles may be grouped according to subject matter, such as the four articles on the Ashokan edicts, the three articles on Pali etymologies and the two articles on the Buddha's view of the *devas*. While the cross-references do serve as a useful guide to the reader who wishes to pursue a study of Norman's views on a particular topic, it might have been even more helpful if in doing so s/he were not obliged to search within and across the volumes of Norman's collected essays. Nevertheless, credit must be given to the Pali Text society for the work it has done in collecting and re-presenting these essays which originally appeared in a large number of journals.

The publication of this volume and its two companion volumes will be useful not just in providing easy accessibility to Norman's numerous philological studies on Pāli and Middle Indo-Aryan Studies, but also in reminding scholars that retranslations of the Pāli texts are long overdue.

Nirmala S. Salgado