

The Stone Carving in Da-zu, Bao-ding-shan from the Viewpoint of the History of Thought

— Concerning the Carving of the Legends of the *Fu-mu-en-chong Sūtra*
and the *Da-fang-bian-fo-bao-en Sūtra* —

Shigeo Kamata

There are many caves in such mountains as Da-ding-shan, Bei-shan etc. in Da-zu-xian, Si-chuan-sheng, China. This article aims to clarify the historical background of the opinions about the carvings of the legends of the *Fu-mu-en-chong Sūtra* and the *Da-fang-bian-fo-bao-en Sūtra* in the stone carvings of Bao-ding-shan.

The carving of the *Fu-mu-en-chong Sūtra* is a stone carving of the legend based on that Sūtra, and that of the *Da-fang-bian-fo-en Sūtra* is the carving based on the Sūtra of that name.

The former carving is based on the Dun-huang style songs such as Shi-en-de, Shi-zheng-yuan, and Xiao-shun-yue. The background to the opinions is, however, a sūtra-expounding of Fu-mu-en-de, Shi-zheng-yuan, Xiao-shun-yue etc. The background of thoughts is, however, a sūtra-expounding of the *Fu-mu-en-chong Sūtra* (Dun-huang version). The song of Shi-en-de and others based on the sūtra-expounding of the *Fu-mu-en-chong Sūtra* which had been popular during the late Tang Dynasty, the Five Dynasties and Song Dynasty were accepted to be a praising of the idea of filial piety by the people, and were put in solid form as the carving of the *Fu-mu-en-chong Sūtra* of Da-ding-shan stone carving.

At the same time, the carving of the *Da-fang-bian-fo-bao-en Sūtra* seems to have been based on the passages of the sūtra-expounding of the *Da-fang-bian-fo-bao-en Sūtra*. It can be assumed that the sūtra-expounding of the *Da-fang-bian-fo-bao-en Sūtra* existed in the Song Dynasty comparing the carved passages of Da-ding-shan stone carving with those of the *Da-fang-bian-fo-bao-en Sūtra*, since the carved passages

of Da-ding-shan stone carving are made out through the complete extracts from the original passages of the *Da-fang-bian-fo-bao-en Sūtra*.

It is due to the Buddhist idea of filial piety which had become thoroughly familiar to the people during the late Tang Dynasty, the Five Dynasties and the Song Dynasty that two of the legend carvings which praise the Buddhist idea of filial piety were carved. It seems that the main basis for the Buddhist idea of filial piety is the prevalence of the two Sūtras above and the *Ullambana Sūtra*.

On saṃbodhi in Aśoka's Edicts (2)

Junkichi Imanishi

Aśoka declares in his Minor Rock Edict I that he has been devoutly attached to the saṃgha and exerting himself vigorously as an *upāsaka*, and adds the very important statement that as the result of his exertion, the gods, who were unmingled with the people inhabiting Jambūdvīpa, have been made to mingle with them. Though he says nothing about the gods any more, the meaning of "the gods' being mingled with the people" must have been at his time as clear as that of his title "the Beloved of the gods" (*devānaṃpiya*). This assertion should be understood as showing his intimate relation to the Buddhist saṃgha, as he confesses himself in his Edict.

In the Buddhist tradition, the beliefs in tree-gods (*rukkha-devatā*) etc. were very common, e.g. the Sujātā legend in the *Nidānakathā*. Such gods guarded Gotama before and after he became the Buddha. Besides these popular gods, Vedic or Hinduistic gods are also well known. When Gotama attained enlightenment and hesitated about his future duties, Brahmā appeared before him and persuaded him to preach.

But Brahmā, Inda, Cātumahārājikā devā and other gods do not arise above Buddha, but serve Buddha. When Buddha preaches, they come around him to listen to him. Buddha is the teacher of the gods and men (satthā devamanussānaṃ). The *Suttanipāta*, the *Dhammapada*, and almost every sutta at the opening, are full of such descriptions.

Aśoka himself went to the saṃgha and learned really Buddhist texts, of which 7 paryāyas are named in his Bairat Edict. At the first listening to the texts he must have found very vividly that Buddha was sitting in the center of the gods and men, and that the gods were “mingled” with men through the medium of the Buddha or the Buddha’s teaching (dhamma). It must have been the very purpose of his exertion in the saṃgha to find out such teaching for himself as King, and he no doubt thought he had succeeded in attaining “enlightenment” (saṃbodhi).

In the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* there is a very important text on Pāṭaligāma and Pāṭaliputta, the future capital of Magadha and of the Mauryan Dynasty. At first the Buddha gives his teaching to the upāsakas of Pāṭaligāma. Then he says that thousands of gods inhabit Pāṭaligāma and that, according to their own power, kings or ministers intend to build dwelling places in such a place, where reside gods of power corresponding to that of kings and ministers. He adds that Pāṭaliputta will flourish as the central city. These passages mean clearly that the prosperity of the Magadhan and Mauryan capital is endowed with the grace of the gods. Then come the last verses. These verses remind us of Aśoka’s Rock Edict, chapter VII: “King Piyadassī, Beloved of the gods, wishes that all religious sects should live in all parts of his dominions. Because all of them desire to achieve self-control and purity of thought.”

The Origin of Japanese Paradise Painting

Jiro Sugiyama

The Taima-ji temple is situated in the southern part of Nara prefecture. This temple is thought to have been founded in the 7th century. At that time, the Fujiwara capital, the Yakushi-ji temple and the Taigantai-ji temple were built by the government, but unlike these, the Taima-ji temple was built privately. Its main buildings are the Kondo, Mandarado, and two stupas. An image of Maitreya Buddha made of clay is seated in the Kondo, and this is an early example of the use of clay. This technique was imported by Chinese T'ang dynastic technologists.

The Taima clan provided the chief priest for funeral ceremonies and, more importantly, the writer of the funeral orations. Mount Futagami lies to the west of Taima-ji temple. Its summit resembles the Bactrain Camel and with the evening sun setting behind, ancient Japanese no doubt imagined it to be the "faster gate" to the Buddhist paradise. The Mandarado was constructed to the west of the temple and housed the painting of the Amitābha Buddhist paradise, one of the best examples of such a painting in Japan. It was produced in about the latter half of the 8th century.

I consider these monuments from the point of view of Buddhist culture, and not merely as Japanese Buddhist art but also as Chinese, central Asiatic, Indian and western Asiatic art. I focus on the problem of the cave temples painting and the image of Maitreya Bodhisattva, the Maitreya Buddha image and Amitābha Buddha in the 7th-8th century in Japan. The worship of Maitreya and Amitābha is of particular interest to me, and I feel that Taima-ji temple contains the best samples of art connected with Buddhist worship from Maitreya Buddha to Amitābha Buddha.

On Shi (実) as it appears in 'gui yi zhi shi' (歸一之実)
 in the Commentary on the *Miao-fa-lian-hua-jing* (妙法蓮華經)
 written by Zhu Dao-sheng (竺道生)

Tatsuhisa Torii

Zhu Dao-sheng (竺道生) was a prominent Chinese student of Kumārajīva. Among several writings current commentary is one that is only available today in its entirety. Dao-sheng uses the word shi (実) in a quite interesting manner by attempting to convey fo-zhi-jian (仏知見), the buddha's wisdom. As far as I know, shi has never been discussed from this viewpoint. This viewpoint, however, is very significant because it can lead to a new interpretation of shi-xiang (実相) which attracted considerable attention of Buddhists and Buddhist scholars of later ages; and thereby became one of the most important terms of the traditional doctrine of the *Miao-fa-lian-hua-jing* (妙法蓮華經) — a Chinese version of the *Lotus Sūtra*. Traditionally shi-xiang is translated as 'reality' or 'real aspect.' Dao-sheng also discusses this term in his commentary and uses it to express fo-zhi-jian in a very different meaning from the tradition. Dao-sheng's commentary on the *Miao-fa-lian-hua-jing* will certainly reveal a new paradigm for its interpretation.

I came across this viewpoint by noticing two related words in the couplet-like sentences located in the beginning of this commentary. The first sentence gives an accurate botanical description of the lotus flower by using zi (子) in relation with the lotus flower. The second sentence gives a description of the central idea of the *Sūtra* by adding shi at the end of the phrase 'gui yi zhi (歸一之)' therefore meaning 'the fruit of returning as one vehicle (一乘).' By studying the usage of zi before and after Dao-sheng's era, a conclusion is made where zi means 'fruit' when it appears together with the lotus flower. This elucidates the meaning

of the related word shi. Furthermore, this shi is one of many other shis that bear the meaning 'fruit' in Dao-sheng's commentary. I then examined the context where shi appears and came to the conclusion that in cases where shi is used in a buddhological sense — shi is meant to be fo-zhi-jian.

The Characteristics of Interpretation on “Non-enlightenment” in the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun*

Michio Hayakawa

The anonymous book, the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun* (釈摩訶衍論), is a unique commentary on the *Da-sheng-qi-xin-lun* (大乘起信論). I investigate the characteristics of the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun* relative to the commentary on the concept of “non-enlightenment” (無明) which is the most important element of the *Da-sheng-qi-xin-lun*.

As the basis for comparison I use the *Da-sheng-qi-xin-lun-yi-ji* (大乘起信論義記) written by Fa-tung, which is the most standard textbook of all the annotation on the *Da-sheng-qi-xin-lun*.

What are the characteristics of interpretation on non-enlightenment in the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun*?

First of all I mention the following point: Interpreting non-enlightenment, the *Da-sheng-qi-xin-lun* and the *Da-sheng-qi-xin-lun-yi-ji* accept just as a fact that non-enlightenment stands as a link in the chain of the structure of which enlightenment and non-enlightenment are found in “Suchness” (眞如) as the fundamental world and from which the multifaceted phenomenal world is derived. The *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun* seems to follow the interpretation; it is, however, “incorrect.” Dealing with the Identity (同相) and the Nonidentity (異相) of enlightenment and non-

enlightenment, the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun* praises first the actual existence of enlightenment on the Identity, but treating of Non-identity, it gives an example for which Sind (身土), who said he had seen the various surface world, was criticized by Buddha for his lack of wisdom to make him see it. Namely non-enlightenment and the multi-faceted phenomenal world are denied as a result. Only enlightenment is recognized as actual existence, and non-enlightenment loses its validity. That is a remarkable characteristic of the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun* compared with the *Da-sheng-qi-xin-lun-yi-ji*.

The second point is the following: while it is quite incompatible with the above-mentioned point, the strength of non-enlightenment is emphasized at another place in the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun*. "Enlightenment breaks non-enlightenment like sunrise, and non-enlightenment puts out enlightenment like sunset": being so stated, non-enlightenment is on a level with enlightenment. In this connection the following matter is noteworthy. Non-enlightenment is "無明" (mu-myō) in Chinese characters; "無" means "be missing", "there is no ..." (=non), but it is interpreted in one part of the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun* as "unequaled", "there is nothing higher than ..." In consequence "無明" should mean not "non-enlightenment" but "enlightenment being higher than anything" ("there is nothing higher than enlightenment"). Non-enlightenment is "Suchness" itself. This is the underlying idea, non-enlightenment should be "Suchness" in the *Shi-mo-he-yan-lun*. It seems that this identity suggests the departure- and arriving point of religious practice as expression.

A Feature of Vasubandhu's Interpretation of the Three Self-natures Doctrine

Shintaro Kitano

In the course of the development of the Yogācāra school there exist different stages in the manner in which the doctrine of the three self-natures (*trisvabhāva*=*parikalpita-svabhāva*, *paratantra-svabhāva* and *pariniṣpanna-svabhāva*) is explained. The stages are classified into four; (1) the first, corresponding to the *Samādhinirmocana-sūtra* and the *Yogāgācārabhūmi*, (2) the second, including the *Mahāyānasūtrā-laṅkāra* and the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, (3) the third of the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, and (4) the fourth of the *Triṃśikākārikā*. In the first stage, each of the three self-natures is not yet explained in relation to epistemology. In the second stage, the "dependent self-nature" (*paratantra-svabhāva*) is identified with "unreal ideation" (*abhūta-parikalpa*) as the subject of cognition and the "ideated self-nature" (*parikalpita-svabhāva*) as the object (*artha*). In the third stage, the doctrine of the three self-natures and that of "Consciousness-only" (*vijñapti-mātra*) are unified and consequently the object of cognition comes to be immanent in the "consciousness" (*viñāna*) of the "dependent self-nature". In the fourth stage, the understandings in the second and the third stage are unified with each other.

There are several differences between Sthiramati's understanding of the three self-natures doctrine and that of Dharmapāla ; I assert that the point at which those differences start lies between Maitreya and Asaṅga. In Maitreya's understanding of the three self-natures doctrine, the "dependent self-nature" was the subject and the "ideated self-nature" the object of cognition ; whereas for Asaṅga, both the subject and the object of cognition are immanent in the "consciousness" (*viñāna*). These

two different understandings come to be unified in Vasubandhu. With regards to the three self-natures doctrine occurring in the 17th verse of the *Triṃśikākārikā* of Vasubandhu, I argue that Sthiramati's understanding is inherited from Maitreya's and Dharmapāla's from Asaṅga's.

Some Remarks on Tsong kha pa's Conventional World

Kodo Yotsuya

It could be safely said that it is one of the characteristic features of the Mādhyamika school to adopt the "two truths theory" in bridging samsāra and nirvāṇa.

The "two truths" are conventional truth (*saṃvṛti-satya*) and the highest truth (*paramārtha-satya*). Generally speaking, the Svātantrika-Mādhyamika school accepts that there exists an overlapping sphere between the world of conventional truth and that of the highest truth, while the Prāsaṅgika - Māmdhyamika school holds, to the contrary, that those two worlds are distinct from each other. As far as the interpretation of the "two truths theory" is concerned, Tsong kha pa (1357-1419), curiously enough, takes the course of the Svātantrika-Mādhyamika school, although he is an adherent of the Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika thought on other controversial points.

In my last article in this journal I dealt with some aspects of Tsong kha pa's paramarthic world by focusing on some functions of analytical reasoning (*rigs pa* or *risgs shes*) ; in the present paper I depict a fairly intricate structure of Tsong kha pa's conventional world. I will then throw light on the above-mentioned attitude he shows in his interpretation of the "two truths theory" based on the results of these two

articles in the next journal.

On the Sentiency of Plants

Minoru Hara

This is an abridged Japanese version of my paper originally written in English, entitled "A Note on the Concept of Plant and Tree," which is to be published in the Festschrift Professor Padmanabh S. Jaini (Lund). It is evident that the author has been greatly inspired by, and consequently much indebted to the writings of Professor L.Schmithausen, particularly by his monograph *The Problem of the Sentiency of Plants in Earliest Buddhism* (Tokyo 1991).

There are, however, some newly added portions here in this Japanese version. These are as follows.

- (1) The last chapter (the Merit of Planting of Trees=vṛkṣa-ropa).
- (2) Newly added textual materials (Notes 1-10).
- (3) Newly added secondary literatures (marked with asterisk in Bibliography).

For convenience sake, below is given a table of contents of this paper.

Introduction

Chapter I. Sthāvara, tree-worship.

Chapter II. Plants (tr̥ṇa) and Trees (vṛkṣa) in Indian Literature.

Chapter III. Plants and Trees as Living Beings.

Chapter IV. The Sense-organs of Plants and Trees (ekendriya in Buddhist Vinaya and pañcendriya in MBh.)

Chapter V. Tree-dohada (Mallinātha ad Meghadūta 74, Vṛkṣāyurveda,
etc.)

Chapter VI. Aśvattha and Udumbara (MBh.3.115)

Chapter VII. Merit attributed to the Planting of Trees (MBh.13.99)