



ISSN 1076-9005
Volume 5 1998: 107–112
Publication date: 1 May 1998

Bauddhavidyāsudhākarāḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday. Ed. P.Kieffer-Puelz & J.U.Hartmann. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1997 (Indica et Tibetica 30), pp.758, ISBN 3-923776-30-6, DM 128,-.

Reviewed by

Peter Fluegel

University of Mainz
e-mail: pf@cix.co.uk

© 1998 Peter Fluegel

Copyright Notice

Digital copies of this work may be made and distributed provided no charge is made and no alteration is made to the content. Reproduction in any other format with the exception of a single copy for private study requires the written permission of the editors. All enquiries to jbe-ed@psu.edu.

This impressive second *Festschrift* for the doyen of Buddhist Studies in Germany comprises contributions from “friends, colleagues and former students all over the world”. In this respect it differs from the earlier *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars fuer Indologie und Buddhismuskunde fuer Professor Heinz Bechert zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Reinhold Gruenendahl, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Petra Kieffer-Puelz, Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag 1993, which aimed at introducing Buddhological studies in Goettingen to the outside world.

The volume offers an update of the Bibliography of Heinz Bechert and 55 scholarly contributions (19 in German), the majority of which are high quality technical editions and translations of inscription and manuscript fragments, many of which are reproduced by way of scanned photographs. Various papers explore the links between Buddhology and Manichaeism, Turkology and other neighbouring disciplines, while others discuss controversial issues in buddhist philosophy. Johannes Bronkhorst (“Nāgārjuna’s Logic” p.29-38) and Wilhelm Halbfass (“*Arthakriyā* und *kṣaṇikatva*: Einige Beobachtungen” p.233-48), for instance, critically comment on aspects of the work of Claus Oetke, while Roland Steiner (“Standard Works on Indian Literature - A Critique. With Special Reference to A.K. Warder’s Treatment of Dharmakīrti’s *Vādanyāya* 19.9-17” p.615-24) and Ernst Steinkellner (“Kumārila, Īśvarasena, and Dharmakīrti in Dialogue. A new interpretation of *Pramāṇavārttika* I 33” p.625-46) elaborate on the philosophy of Dharmakīrti. A wide variety of other subjects are touched upon: Ute Huesken, for example, defends Bechert’s interpretation of *Samghabheda* against his critics (“*Samghabheda* as depicted in the Vinaya of the Mahāvihāra School” p.319-31); Shozen Kumoi scrutinizes “The Concept of *Yoga* in the *Nikāyas*” (p.407-20); Russell Webb introduces “German Scholarship on South-East Asia: A Bio-bibliographical Survey” (p.699-716); and Gananath Obeyesekere (“Taking the Myth Seriously: The Buddha and the Enlightenment” p.473-82) argues that “the Enlightenment rationality has second place in Buddhism [behind intuitive knowledge]” (p.481); to mention but a few. However, in this review I will concentrate only on selected contributions which are not only concerned with texts but with aspects of buddhist ritual and life.

An issue which haunts Buddhology to this day is the perpetual influence of christian presuppositions on comparative research. Oliver Freiberger’s article “Anmerkung zur Begriffsbildung in der Buddhismusforschung” (p.137-52) shows that part of the problem derives from the uncritical import of implicit concepts that emerge in the context of translation work into comparative analysis. For instance the common use of the word monk for *bhikkhu* inadvertently led to its elevation to the status of a metalinguistic category even though no clear definition is agreed. The open question whether mar-

ried Nepalese “*Sākyabhikṣus* are ‘laymonks’ (Lienhard) or not monks at all (Gombrich) illustrates the problem. Freiburger suggests to differentiate more clearly between ‘textual language’ and ‘research language’ in the hope that greater terminological precision may result from the introduction of better defined analytical concepts into comparative research (p.152).

Siegfried Lienhard’s article “Krone und Schirm im Newar-Buddhismus” (p.421-30) offers a detailed analysis of the syncretic symbolism of the ‘royal’ umbrella (*chattra*) of the Nepalese Vajrācārya *sthaviras*, supported by four colour photographs, including one showing the role of such umbrellas in the initiation ceremony of a *sthavira*, which, regrettably, is not explained in the text.

In “The Buddhist Attitude to Thaumaturgy” (p.165-84) Richard Gombrich recalls Malinowski’s demarcation between religion and magic in an attempt to re-assert his own views of *lokuttara dharma*, the centrality of buddhist ethics, and the accretionary nature of popular Buddhism (which—his critics say—are also characteristic for revivalist forms of Buddhism). Accordingly he emphasizes “the non-specificity of the worldly benefits to be derived from acts and institutions that are unambiguously Buddhist” (p.172) and rejects popular syncretic therapeutic buddhist rituals as mere “secular technology” (p.170). Without directly addressing the contravening literature (Tambiah, Kapferer, Bastin etc.) Gombrich argues that only in Śaivaised tantric Buddhism, as opposed to pure Buddhism, “the same practices can be used for secular and religious ends by the same practitioners” (p.182). The lingering problem of explaining Sinhala Buddhist Kālī worship in Munnessaram is then given yet another twist: “What ... makes their behaviour syncretistic is that they seem quite unaware that what they are doing in the Śaivaite arena at Munnessarama contravenes Buddhist norms” (p.166).

Of particular interest is Detlef Kantowsky’s literature review “Buddhisten in Indien heute: Ein Literaturbericht insbesondere ueber die Neo-Buddhisten” (p.361-96), because it contains extensive source materials on the lay dominated Neo-Buddhism in India, which may be useful for interested scholars: e.g. Ambedkar’s 1936 Conversation Speech, the 1955 Buddhist’s Oaths of the Buddhist Society of India, and total figures of Buddhists in India 1951, 1971 and 1991 (6.5 Million). On the basis of recent field studies, Kantowsky tries to determine whether conversions to Ambedkar’s version of Theravāda Buddhism in Maharashtra (which accounts for 92% of all Indian Buddhists) generated new patterns of behaviour in the fields of commerce, commensality and connubium. He concludes with T.Fitzgerald (1994) that due to insufficient data older studies cannot help establishing a detailed picture of the life of the three types of Neo-Buddhists on the ground (village, secular intellectual, and modern soteriological (TBMSG)) beyond

the official rhetoric. As far as one can tell, he writes, the conversion of the untouchable village Mahars was only a limited social success, since no caste-transcending forms of commensality and connubium developed, despite the rejection of traditional polluting occupations, and the success of Buddhism on an individual and communal level. Today, the author sums up, “Neo-Buddhist” is but a name for a new “not occupationally defined caste of the ritually underprivileged” (p.390).

Kantowsky deliberately excluded the activities of the Maha Bodhi Society and of the Tibetan diaspora in India from his review. However, interesting details on both issues are presented in Toni Huber’s article “Colonial Archaeology, International Missionary Buddhism and the First Example of Modern Tibetan Literature” (p.297-318) which describes dGe’-dun Chos’phel’s 1939 *Guide Book for Travel to the Holy Places of India* which took shape under the direct impact of the experience of the Indian exile and Dharmapala’s Maha Bodhi Society in Calcutta as the first document of Tibetan Buddhist Modernism. This printed document was the first book which departed from the then prevailing speculative sacred geography of the Tibetan lamas and adopted the findings of the Archaeological Survey of India and modern maps to identify for the first time in Tibetan language sacred sites like Bodh Gayā, which subsequently became important symbolic resources for the ritual reproduction of the identity of exiled Tibetans.

Several contributors to the volume discuss details of the *uposatha* ceremony, two of which supplement Haiyan Hu-von Hinueber’s recent book *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften fuer die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Reinbeck 1994. Siglinde Dietz (“Anmerkungen zum buddhistischen Fastentag” p.63-70) recalls that according to the Theravādin, Dharmaguptaka and Mahīśāsaka tradition the Buddha followed the example of the Jains and introduced fast-days (*uposatha*) for the buddhist laity as well on king Bimbisāra’s request. At the time of Aśoka four fast-days were declared: the 8th and the 14th or 15th of every half month. Although more detailed information on varied practices is readily available, Dietz assumes that Jains ‘usually’ undertake four *poṣadha* per lunar month as well (p.62n6). However, in her article she discusses an additional fast, called *pāṭihāriya-pakkha* or *pārihāriya-pakkha*, which is now forgotten but mentioned at various places in the canon. Although these passages are mutually contradictory Dietz ventures the guess that *pāṭihāriya-pakkha* signified a special fortnight of restraint, not merely single days of a certain half-month or whole months of fasting (p.69). For confirmation she refers in a footnote to the now extinct Jain *parihāra-viśuddhi* (p.70n34), which however was a collective monastic rite of purification through alternating performances of fasting and offering service, which involved nine ascetics and lasted 18 months.

Claus Vogel's article "On the Date of the Poṣadha Ceremony as Taught by the Mūlasarvāstivādins" (p.673-88) is concerned with the fortnightly monastic *poṣadha* taking place either on the 15th or the 14th. It shows that "the Mūlasarvāstivādins based themselves on the novel lunisolar calendar gradually gaining ground in India from the fourth century A.D. onwards, while the Theravādins rather stuck to the time-honoured lunar calendar introduced in the early days of Buddhism by way of contrast to the Vedic sacrificial calendar" (p.686).

The theme of Buddhist asceticism is also taken up by Minoru Hara in his "A Note on the Buddha's Asceticism: The Liu du ji jing (Six Pāramitā-sūtra) 53" (p.249-60). He states that "The Hindus attached a special importance to asceticism as it promises its practitioners attainment of their desired [secular] objects, but Buddhists did not value it as much" (p.249). Moreover, "the semantic content of *tapas* itself seems to have undergone a considerable change in Buddhist texts (Ethisierung)" (p.250): "the concept of *tapas* is originally incompatible with the concepts of *mokṣa* and *nirvāṇa*" (p.249n6). Without drawing any conclusions, Hara then recalls the role of karmic retribution in several versions of the Buddha's biography, particularly in the Pāli Apadāna and Anavatapta-gāthā and the Chinese Liu du ji jing, where his asceticism prior to enlightenment is interpreted "as the last expiation of evil deeds, which he had committed in his previous births. That is to say, being exempt of the last bit of defilement by his act of undergoing asceticism, he was finally entitled to attain his Buddhahood" (p.250).

In another evocative piece on "Confession in Early Buddhism" (p.55-62) J.Duncan M. Derrett shows himself intrigued by the fact that Buddhist formulas of confession, which are made up by the elements of (1) remorse, (2) communication, and (3) acceptance by a competent monk, do not contribute to the functioning of the group, but merely affect the offender subjectively: "The *saṃgha* does not find itself restored, regularized, by the humiliation of the offender as may well be the Hindu position. ... Buddhist monks did not 'forgive' or 'absolve' anyone (... as in the Judeo-Christian tradition)" (p.57). Derrett argues that in contrast to both Judeo-Christian, Hindu and Jain practices, here "Fellow religionists' acknowledgement of the duty done is instrumental in achieving peace of mind. This derives not from ritual but from popular practice" (p.61): "The analogy is not with rituals but with procedures before village (we should say 'secular') courts ... The offender voluntarily discloses his fault, ... and, unable to remove 'impurities' for himself ..., endures the sentence, whatever it will be" (p.58f.). Buddhist liturgical confessions share the element of remorse with sacramental confessions, the author concludes, but there is no objection to partial and repeated confessions, no promise not to re-offend, no obligatory privacy, no cross-question-

ing, and no conditional absolution, nor any talk of satisfaction or restitution (p.61). Although Derrett does not clearly distinguish between *ālocana* (confession), *pratikramaṇa* (repentance), and *kṣamāpaṇā* (forgiveness), he is convinced that “The Buddhist formulae seem more rational” than the Jain attempt to condone (*khamati*) both general and particular misdeeds by “a mere confessional formula” (p.60). However, he misses the point that for Jains the effect of mutual forgiveness is the reciprocal destruction of individual *karma* cum attachments, not a form of passing on sins or a general ritual absolution of mistakes by the hearer. The view that Buddhist confession is a purely psychological affair without social function seems equally debatable, since *uposatha* ceremonies not only involve mutual forgiveness and formulaic cross-questioning but also collective purity as an indirect consequence of aggregate individual purity. In the light of the massive increase of philological *pāṭimokkha*-studies, it is generally disconcerting that, apart from Dickson 1876, not a single ethnographic description of contemporary buddhist *uposatha*-rituals is available to date to help clarify these issues.

This magnificently produced *Festschrift* contains a wealth of other fascinating materials and arguments that can not be reviewed here. It is essential reading for anyone interested in Indological and Buddhist Studies.