

Conference

Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons

Universität Hamburg & University of Tsukuba
Convenors: Orna Almogi & Chizuko Yoshimizu
September 24–25

Tokyo Campus of the University of Tsukuba at Myogadani, Room 120

The evolution of Buddhist scriptures and the formation of the various Buddhist canons are complex processes that often stretch over a long period of time and involve numerous aspects of the societies in which they take place. Understanding these two related processes is not only crucial to our study of the history of Buddhism in general and of Buddhist ideas in particular, but is also instrumental in appreciating the impact of social and cultural aspects on intellectual and religio-philosophical developments and vice versa. The conference “Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons” aims at discussing various issues related to these two processes, both on the meta-level and by way of specific examples, including various stages (or versions) in the evolution of a specific scripture, fluidity between treatises and scriptures resulting in the transformation of the one into another or vice versa, influence of śāstric literature on the evolution of scriptures, intertextuality between various scriptures, the issue of revelation versus authorship and its influence on the evolution of scriptures and formation of canons, processes leading to the formation of canons (of varying scope and content), and the impact of various social and political aspects of society on these two processes.

Abstracts

The Formation and Evolution of Canonical Versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*

Ingo Strauch (Lausanne)

The *Prātimokṣasūtra* is generally regarded as one of the oldest texts of the Buddhist canonical literature. Its core certainly goes back to the days of the historical Buddha. Due to its importance for the functioning and the identity of the Buddhist order, a rather great number of versions of this text were preserved in different Buddhist traditions. Generally, each of these versions is considered as characteristic and typical for a specific Buddhist *nikāya*. Even the notion of a “canonical language” is frequently associated with the *Prātimokṣasūtra*.

More recent research, however, has shown that even within a school tradition different versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* were transmitted and acknowledged. Thus the question arises whether regional, linguistic and historical contexts were equally important for the genesis of these so-called canonical versions. At the same time, it has to be defined what exactly conditioned the status of a version as canonical: its language, its exact wording, or simply the fact that it was perceived as canonical by a specific Buddhist community in a specific historical and local context?

The variety of versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* also allows for a view on the textual evolution of this text in a synchronic and diachronic perspective. How exactly did the supposed ancient core of this text develop into these versions?

It is the aim of my paper to discuss these two problems on the basis of the most ancient manuscript of a *Prātimokṣasūtra* known so far: the birch-bark fragment BC 13 from the Bajaur

Collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts. This manuscript contains two different versions of the initial part of the *Naiḥsārgika Pātayantika* rules of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*. By comparing these two versions with each other and with their parallels in different traditions, I will try to demonstrate the mechanisms that seem to have been at work in the evolution of this text towards a form that became accepted as canonical.

Further Evidence of the Early Mahāyāna Scriptures' Origin from Mahāsāṃghikas

Seishi Karashima (Soka)

In my article “Who Composed the Mahāyāna Scriptures?—The Mahāsāṃghikas and Vaitulya Scriptures” (ARIRIAB 18 [2015]), I have assumed that members of the Mahāsāṃghikas composed new scriptures, often consisting of questions and answers, thus condemning the conservative thoughts on Buddhist doctrines and called these newly-composed texts *vedulla / vaitulya*, meaning that they were “irregular” as Buddha’s scriptures but “incomparable, peerless.” Later, they came to be called, in a more positive way, *vaipulya* “full development, abundance, plenty, fullness”. Much later still, they came to be called *mahāyāna-sūtra* as well.

According to various sources, the coexistence of multiple *buddhas* at the same time, the Buddha’s preaching in one sound, and preaching by magically-produced *buddhas* were denounced by both the Sthaviravādins and Sarvāstivādins, while the Mahāsāṃghikas affirmed them. In fact, the commentary on the *Kathāvatthu* says that those who affirmed preaching by the magically-produced Buddha are called the *Vetulyaka / Vetullaka*. However, coexistence of multiple *buddhas*, preaching in one sound, and preaching by magically-produced *buddhas* are common features of Mahāyāna scriptures.

I shall introduce some more evidence from Mahāyāna scriptures which show the close relationship between the Mahāsāṃghikas and them.

Revisiting the Tenth Chapter of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*: A Scripture on Rational Reflection

Chizuko Yoshimizu (Tsukuba)

The tenth chapter of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* has attracted modern scholars of Buddhist logic including myself by its teaching of logical reason called *upapattisādhanayukti* (“the reason [consisting in] the establishment by argument [of three *pramāṇas* or valid means of cognitions]”). As I discussed the issue in my previous papers published in 1996 and 2010, however, I never considered the significance of the fact that a *sūtra* (i.e. the “Buddha”) teaches rational reflection of Buddhist (i.e. *his own*) teachings. In this decade, several scholars have intensively discussed scriptural authority or authenticity in Buddhist tradition. The *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* is well-known for its claim that it represents the real intention of the Buddha’s Word as articulated in the “third turning of the Dharma-wheel,” which is superior to the first and second Dharma-wheels turned for the sake of the Śrāvakayāna and other Mahāyāna

traditions, as well as for its claim of teaching definitive meaning (*nītārtha*) that is higher than indirect meaning requiring further interpretation (*neyārtha*). Hermeneutical evaluation of scriptures is one of the characteristics of this *sūtra*.

The tenth chapter, however, does not speak of these topics. Having exposed the characteristic of *dharmakāya* without birth, the *sūtra* adduces the skillfulness of the *nirmāṇakāya* (“manifested body”) or Śākyamuni in teaching *Sūtra*, *Vinaya*, and *Māṭrkā*. The four kinds of *yukti* are subsumed into the *Māṭrkā* (i.e., Abhidharma), which the *sūtra* declares to be the Buddha’s teaching (by saying, “I teach” this). This *Māṭrkā* portion is, moreover, remarkably long because the explanation of *upapattisādhanayukti* is long. It is apparent that the chapter’s emphasis lies on the *upapattisādhanayukti* or the reflection by three kinds of valid means of cognitions, i.e., direct perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), and authority (*āgama*). The same *yukti* is also used in the *Śrāvakahūmi* mainly for spiritual practice.

This paper aims to clarify the significance of the “Buddha’s” teaching on rational reflection by reexamining the context of the tenth chapter. I would also like to discuss the fluidity between the *sūtra* and such Yogācāra treatises as the *Śrāvakahūmi*.

Scriptural and Quasi-scriptural Authority in Early Yogācāra Buddhism

Martin Delhey (Hamburg)

In its systematized form, Yogācāra or Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda Buddhism represented, as is well-known, one of the two great rival schools of Indian Mahāyāna philosophy; the other being the Madhyamaka school of thought. Both claimed to offer an authoritative interpretation of the Mahāyāna scriptures. Compared with their classical counterparts, the earliest Yogācāra works are much more heterogenous and unsystematic in character. Moreover, they lack some of the central dogmatic-philosophical tenets that later became characteristic for this school of thought, or contain them only in their incipient stages. In this formative period, conservative and Mahāyāna Buddhist texts are found side by side, and we also recognize an intensive preoccupation with both spiritual practice *and* dogmatic-exegetical concerns. Another notable feature of this early period was a great amount of innovation. The most famous examples are the development of a complex psychology, with the newly established subliminal consciousness called *ālayavijñāna* at its center, and several original variants of a Mahāyānistic middle way between existence and non-existence, recognizable in works like the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* or the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*, with the latter text marking the starting-point of the “Mind-only” doctrine. In the present paper, it will be argued that the early Yogācāras were very well aware of their innovativeness and that they adopted several different strategies to lend authority to their new teachings. At least two such approaches will be distinguished, namely, on the one hand, the production of new scriptures, especially the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*, and, on the other hand, the attempt to attach quasi-canonical status to their basic work, the *Yogācārabhūmi*, in general and to some of its parts in particular.

A Tantra's Dependent Origination: The Sources and Transformations of the *Hevajratantra*

Harunaga Isaacson (Hamburg)

One of the most famous of Buddhist Tantras, one of the first to receive attention from modern scholars, and one of the most frequently edited, translated and studied, it might be expected that by now most of what can be known about the *Hevajratantra* and its history should have been well-established. This is however not the case. I will very briefly summarize the state of the art so far, and will then attempt to contribute towards a better understanding of the origin, the transmission, and the influence of this celebrated Yoginītantra.

Weaving Dharma into Words: Composition Strategies in Buddhist Tantras

Francesco Sferra (Naples)

On close examination, Tantric Buddhist scriptures often appear to be dense works, the result of a sophisticated and complex intellectual elaboration. During the presentation, we will try to examine some of the composition techniques of these scriptures and the strategies employed by their redactors to combine novelty and tradition and ensure success to their works.

On Transforming Non-scriptural Texts into *Buddhavacana*: The *Ratnagotravibhāga* and 無上依經

Kazuo Kano (Komazawa)

In this presentation, I shall focus on the 無上依經 (**Anuttarāśrayasūtra*, or rather, **Uttaratantrasūtra*), which is a transformation of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* into a *mahāyānasūtra*, i.e., a *buddhavacana*.

My talk consists of four questions:

- (1) What are the special features of the 無上依經?
- (2) What was the motivation of transforming the *Ratnagotravibhāga* into a *buddhavacana*?
- (3) What enabled the person behind this transformation to modify the *Ratnagotravibhāga* into a *buddhavacana*?
- (4) Who was responsible for this transformation?

As for point (1), I shall introduce studies by Takasaki and Shimoda, who identified this *sūtra* as a patch-work text which takes the *Ratnagotravibhāga* as its main source and in addition extracts passages from the *Adbhutadharmaparyāya* (i.e., *Kūṭāgārasūtra*) in its opening part.

With regard to point (2), as Shimoda states, the *sūtra*'s purpose has been to revive the forgotten link between Buddha-nature and the worship of the Buddha's relics deposited in *stūpas*, which was originally taught in the *Mahāpariṇirvāṇamahāsūtra* at the very beginning of the Buddha-nature tradition.

Point (3) attempts to shed light on the “boarder” between *sūtra* and *śāstra*. (3a) The anonymity of the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* (in its original state) is, as Suguro suggests, a crucial factor that opened the way to the transformation of this work into several derivives, i.e., not only the 無上依經, but also the 佛性論 and 法界無差別論 among others. Thanks to this anonymity, the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* was probably considered an “open resource” for producing new scriptures, just like the case of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, which, being ascribed to Maitreya (弥勒說), was almost anonymous and thus could function as an “open resource” for the emergence of various new scriptures including the 菩薩善戒經.

(3b) There are still other factors which probably enabled one to transform the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* into a *sūtra*. These include its unique sub-title *Uttaratantra* (which succeeds one of alternative titles of the *Mahāparinirvāṇamahāsūtra*); the propagation-part (chapter 5) which encourages to copy and spread this text (just like a Propagation Chapter (流通分) of a *sūtra*); and its anthology-style consisting of a number of *mahāyānasūtra* quotations. All of these could have facilitated the establishment of the scriptural authenticity of the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* in suggesting that it is not an ordinary treatise ascribed to a certain individual, but a quasi-*buddhavacana* ascribable to nobody, although it was later ascribed to individuals such as Sāramati or Maitreya.

Needles to say, the extension of the *buddhavacana* idea (standardized by *dharmatā* or *subhāṣita*) in Abhidharma and Mahāyāna literature contributed to the fluidity of the borderline between *sūtras* and *śāstras*, as Honjo pointed out. Sakurabe, Aohara, and Fukuda clarified the relation between the patch-work *Samgītisūtra* and its Abhidharma version 集異門足論. This is just the opposite case of our example.

As for point (4), we can neither specify the composer of this *sūtra*, nor establish this act as either Indic or Chinese phenomena; Paramārtha and his circle are most likely to be the persons involved.

Jñānapāda’s *Mukhāgama: A Visionary Text between Scripture and Human Authorship

Péter-Daniél Szántó (Oxford)

Jñānapāda (ca. 770–820 CE) was a person of paramount importance for the evolution of early mature tantric Buddhism, and his *Mukhāgama, which unfortunately survives only in Tibetan translation, was his chief work. The text is an extremely curious one, straddling the world of revelation and human authorship; it includes a spiritual autobiography, the chronicle of a vision he had received from Mañjuśrī, and a number of teachings revealed in that experience. In my talk I would like to explore what Jñānapāda actually sought to achieve with this text. I will argue that it was instrumental in setting up a new school and that this process was very likely a template for organising the following of new teachings. I will also show that while the text itself is almost never quoted in exegetical literature, it was nevertheless very influential via a number of passages that were incorporated by subsequent scriptures and ritual manuals.

Three Two-Fold Criteria of Scriptural Authenticity in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism

Dorji Wangchuk (Hamburg)

Tibetan scholars who were in charge of codifying or compiling what came to be known as the “Tibetan Canon,” namely, the “Word [of the Buddha] in [Tibetan] Translation” (*bka' 'gyur*) and “Treatises in [Tibetan] Translation” (*bstan' 'gyur*), were inevitably faced with the responsibility of making judgments and decisions based on certain criteria about the authenticity of scriptures and treatises, and accordingly, to include those that fulfilled the criteria and exclude those that did not. They were particularly suspicious of Chinese composing Sūtric scriptures and Tibetans Tantric ones. The ensuing situation was that the authenticity of a certain scripture would be rejected by one scholar but accepted by another. What were then the criteria of scriptural authenticity? In this paper, I wish to revisit the topic that I have been trying to explore in the past few years and discuss three two-fold criteria of authenticity of Buddhist scriptures, namely, what I am wont to call (1) a “genetic–diachronic” and “generic–synchronic” criteria, (2) “objective criterion of authenticity” and “subjective criterion based on mystical experience” recognized by David Seyfort Ruegg, and (3) “scriptural-textual” and “doctrinal-contentual” criteria.

Lists of Texts in the Sarvāstivāda Tradition as Witnesses for Scripturalization-cum-Canonization Processes

Norihisa BABA (Tokyo)

This presentation focuses on canonization of texts in the Sarvāstivāda School. Despite several studies by scholars on *buddhavacana* in connection with Sarvāstivāda scriptures, a more thorough-going understanding of the canonization process related to these scriptures requires detailed study of extant Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan texts associated with this tradition. First, based on a consideration of the lists of texts of Sarvāstivāda scriptures, I shall point out a lack of a fixed definition of a canon within the Sarvāstivāda School. I will then focus on the gradual authorization of versified texts as *buddhavacana*. Finally, based on these two points, I will discuss the Sarvāstivāda’s view of *buddhavacana*.

Nine Recitations and the Inclusive Tripiṭaka: Canon Formation in Pre-modern Thailand

Peter Skilling (Bangkok)

In 1893, King Rāma V (Chulalongkorn) of Siam published the first typeset, printed Pali Tripiṭaka. In terms of canon formation and Tripiṭaka production, I count this as the start of the modern era. In this paper, I deal with aspects of canon production that preceded this event.

The formation of the Tripiṭaka in pre-modern Thailand is the result of a distinctive trajectory, which may be said to have reached a high point during the reign of King Rama I (1782–

1809). After the old city of Ayutthaya had been devastated by a Burmese invasion, Rama I reestablished the capital at Bangkok in 1782 and undertook many measures to restore Thai society and culture. One of these was a recitation-convocation (*saṅgāyanā*) that produced an ‘inclusive Tripiṭaka’ that incorporated everything that was available in the Pali language at the time: from the ‘core’ Sutta, Vinaya, and Abhidhamma to the commentaries and sub-commentaries along with apocryphal sūtras and jātakas, chronicles, poetry, linguistics, and a range of ancillary works. The inclusive Tripiṭaka had been the norm since the Ayutthaya period (1351–1767), and most probably before, not only in Thailand but also in Burma. This extensive and inclusive collection included numerous works composed in Thailand, the ‘Pali literature of Siam’. In the century to follow many inclusive Tripiṭakas were inscribed by hand on palm leaves and offered to temples. King Rama V (Chulalongkorn: October 1868–October 1910) had inclusive Tripiṭakas copied well into his reign, but by the last decade of the nineteenth century new notions of canonicity and canon production had come to the fore. In 1893 Chulalongkorn produced the ‘first printed Pali Tripiṭaka’ for world-wide distribution. This signalled the end of the palm-leaf tradition and of inclusive Tripiṭakas.

Pali texts that relate the history of the recitation-convocation include *Saddhamma-saṅgaha* and the *Samgītiyavamsa*. The latter, by Somdet Phra Vanaratana master scholar from Wat Phra Chetuphon (Jetubana, popularly known as Wat Pho) in the capital, was composed in 1789 to complement King Rama I’s convocation. It describes nine recitation-convocations in India, Sri Lanka, and Siam. Another source is the ‘Announcement to the Deities’, an official court document ritually read out in Thai before the convocation to inform the divine beings of the royal merit about to take place. Also in Thai are sermons, sometimes for three or more reciters, that accompanied ritual enactments of the five *saṅgāyanā* from the Ayutthaya to the Bangkok periods.

What is the Place of the “Works Composed by Worthy of this Land”? The Shifting Status of Indigenous Texts in the History of the Chinese Buddhist Canon

Stefano Zacchetti (Oxford)

While translations of Indic scriptures can be said to constitute the most characteristic and quantitatively significant typology of Buddhist canonical collections produced in China during the medieval period (especially from the 2nd to the 8th centuries CE), modern editions of the canon contain also a substantial number of texts of various kinds (commentaries, prefaces, treatises, historiographical works etc.) that were composed directly in Chinese by monks and laymen. The first known examples are coeval with the earliest translations (second half of the 2nd century), and Chinese works became increasingly numerous and important during the following centuries. The status of this rich indigenous literature and its position vis-à-vis the “main canon” (*zhengzang* 正藏) – which for the most part consisted of translated texts – became an important issue confronting the bibliographers who, from the 4th century on, were engaged in collecting and organizing Buddhist scriptures. This paper will analyze the different attitudes to this question reflected by catalogues composed from the 6th to the 8th centuries CE, and discuss their broader cultural implications.

The Detection and the Elimination of ‘Chinese-made Sūtras’ Mixed in Monastic Libraries and Catalogues during Medieval China

Funayama Toru (Kyoto)

In the history of Chinese Buddhism, especially during the fifth to eighth centuries, some Chinese monks and laity endeavored to compose quite a number of what is called “Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha” or Chinese-made sutras so that they could possess “translated” texts to support their indigenous, sinicized form of belief. On the other hand, many, if not all, Chinese scholar-monks took extreme care to detect and exclude such apocryphal sutras from the Buddhist canon. In his groundbreaking work entitled *Records of the Kaiyuan Era Catalogue of the Buddhist Teachings (Kaiyuan shijiao lu)*, Zhisheng testifies that the exact number of authentic Chinese Buddhist translations extant in 730 CE in his monastery at Chang’an (present-day Xi’an) was 1,076, whereas the number of the Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha and other possibly dubious texts was 406: namely, over 27 percent of the whole “Buddhist translation-style scriptures” was forgery. In this presentation I shall attempt to explore Zhisheng’s intentions to identify apocryphal texts to be eliminated from the monastic library and his criteria or scholastic methodology to detect forged sutras. In order to strengthen my argument, I shall also pay attention to Sengyou’s (445-518) views on the same points expressed in his *Collection of Records of Issuing the Three Storehouses (Chu sanzang ji ji)*, the earliest extant Chinese Buddhist Catalogues in China.

The Compilation of the *Wukuzhangju-jing* 五苦章句經 (T. 741): A Comparative Study of the Newly Found Old Japanese Manuscript Version and the Woodblock Printed Version

Shoshun Hayashidera (Hokkaido)

An increasing number of Chinese Buddhist canonical texts discovered in old manuscript collections extant in Japanese monasteries—such as the Kongō-ji monastery—bear titles identical to the woodblock printed canonical versions produced in China but differ from them in content. The discovery in recent years of such texts is helping to shed light on different aspects of the formation and transmission of Buddhist texts, aspects that we would not have learned from the study of the woodblock printed versions alone.

In this presentation, I would like to take up one such text, namely the text of the *Wukuzhangju-jing* 五苦章句經 (T. 741). This is a small scripture classified into the Hīnayana Sūtra division in the Chinese Buddhist Canon. It mainly deals with the sufferings of five transmigratory existences: divinities (*deva*), humans (*manuṣya*), animals (*tiryāṅc*), ghosts (*preta*), and inhabitants of hell (*nāraka*), although it contains explanations of other doctrines as well.

We find two remarkable differences between the manuscript and the printed versions. First, the manuscript version lacks one paragraph found in the printed one. This paragraph contains an alternative title of this scripture and proclaims the merits to those who keep it. Second, the manuscript version has two additional verses at the end of the text, which are not found in the printed version, but were apparently imported from other existing Buddhist texts in translations.

These two differences might be an indication that this text presents a compilation and that each version reflects the different stages in the process of compilation. Moreover, we also find some anomalies regarding the content in the common portions of the versions. Specifically, the text contains explanations of some other doctrines based on some existing scriptures seemingly in random order.

Through a comparison of both versions as well as content analysis of the text, I will show that the text is plausibly a sort of apocryphal work compiled by using some existing scriptures, although it is contained as a genuine one in the Chinese Buddhist Canon. I would also like to consider the significance of such texts found in the Japanese Manuscript Canon that differs from the hitherto known woodblock printed Chinese canonical collections.

The Editorial Guidelines of Copying the Buddhist Canon as Reflected in the Extant Old Japanese Manuscript Corpuses

Toshinori Ochiai 落合俊典 (ICPB, Tokyo)

The old Japanese manuscripts of Buddhist texts surviving to our day can be classified into two groups: (a) the Nara manuscript corpus and (b) the Heian-Kamakura manuscript corpus. The former is based on Zhisheng's 智昇 *Kaiyuan Catalogue* 開元錄 (730) while the latter follows Yuanzhao's 円照 *Zhenyuan Catalogue* 貞元錄 (830).

Many projects of copying Buddhist scriptures were undertaken from the late Heian period, the so-called the Insei 院政 or cloister government age, to the Kamakura period. Compared to the Nara manuscripts, the impressive number of extant manuscripts of the Heian-Kamakura period (approximately 40,000 scrolls) makes it possible to examine the corpus using precise, empirical methods, which constitutes a great advantage.

Yuanzhao's *Zhenyuan Catalogue* fell into disuse in China. One of the main reasons for this was its inclusion of scriptures associated with the Three Stages Movement 三階教. In contrast to this, the original text of the *Zhenyuan Catalogue* continued to be used in Japan. This offers precious information on the Three Stages Movement texts, which at one time were included in the Buddhist Canon. Furthermore, it also led to the preservation of such Three Stages Movement texts as the representative scripture *Sanjie Fofa* 三階佛法. The manuscript collections of the Shōsō-in 正倉院聖語藏本, Hōryū-ji 法隆寺一切經本, Kōshō-ji 興聖寺一切經本, Nanatsu-dera 七寺一切經本, etc. are representative in this sense.

The Nanatsu-dera collection contains manuscripts of texts that are usually listed in the catalogues of scriptures not included in the Canon. Based on historical documents and catalogues, we can infer that this situation had already began at the time of the Nara manuscript corpus. The same situation is reflected in the *Zhenyuan lu* brought from China to Japan by Kūkai 空海. Such editorial guidelines contributed to the preservation of no less than 43 texts, amounting to 105 scrolls, which we find now in the Nanatsu-dera collection.

Here I must add that there are three extant versions of the *Zhenyuan lu*:

(1) The version included in the Second Edition of the Korean Canon 高麗再雕版: this has deleted all Three Stages Movement texts as well as any records concerning them.

(2) Version (A) of the *Zhenyuan lu* brought by Kūkai (found in the collections of Nanatsudera, Hōryū-ji, Hōshō-ji 法勝寺金字經, Bonshaku-ji 梵釈寺藏經, and Ishiyama-dera 石山寺一切經): at the end of the list of Mahāyāna scriptures, we find the *Ciren wen bashi zhonghao jing* 慈仁問八十種好經.

(3) Version (B) of the *Zhenyuan lu* brought by Kūkai (found in the collections of Hō'on 報恩藏一切經, Shimizu-dera 清水寺藏經, Kōshō-ji 興聖寺一切經, Kongō-ji 金剛寺一切經, Matsuo-sha 松尾社一切經, Saihō-ji 西方寺一切經, and Chūson-ji 中尊寺一切經): at the end of the list of Mahāyāna scriptures, we find the *Fa chang zhu jing* 法常住經.

The catalogue records concerning Three Stages Movement texts as well as the *Sanjie Fofa* have survived due to the basic editorial policy which guided the copying of old Japanese manuscript corpuses along lines similar or close to the original *Zhenyuan lu*. Furthermore, such apocryphal texts as *Piluo sanmei jing* 毘羅三昧經 and the *Qingjing fa xing jing* 清淨法行經 are extant today thanks to the fact that texts usually listed in catalogues of scriptures not included in the Canon were copied and preserved in the monastic collections of several Japanese temples.

Editors as Canon-Makers: The Formation of Tibetan Buddhist Canonical and Para-canonical Collections in View of Their Editors' Agendas

Orna Almogi (Hamburg)

It is generally accepted that what is referred to as the Tibetan Buddhist canon was to a greater extent shaped in the 14th century, with initial efforts made in sNar thang which in turn were followed by similar activities in other religious centres. Moreover, the formation of the Tibetan Buddhist canon inevitably also led to the formation of para-canonical collections, and in the following centuries, numerous editions of canonical and para-canonical collections have been produced. Despite the fact that virtually in all cases copies of previous editions were used as models, it is undisputable that the new editions received their final shape with regard to both content and organization very much thanks to the efforts of their respective editors, each of whom left his marks on the edition produced under his supervision. Moreover, occasion of producing mere copies of new sets, too, gave editors the opportunity to exercise their influence to some extent. (And indeed the difference between a new edition and a copy is not always clear-cut). The choices and decisions editors made were often influenced by their personal agendas, which in turn were motivated by various factors such as school affiliation, philosophical view, and political ties. This is true not only for what is referred to as “local editions” but also for what could be regarded as “mainstream editions.” In my talk, I shall attempt to explore the role of editors as “cannon-makers” at the backdrop of religio-philosophical and possibly also socio-political factors.

Digital Devices for Studying the Evolution of Scriptures and Formation of Canons

O. Almogi & D. Wangchuk (Hamburg), K. Nagasaki (DHII, Tokyo), S. Nehrdich (Hamburg)

The progress in computer technologies in recent years, particularly in the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP), is increasingly having impact on the Humanities, in general, and Buddhist studies, in particular. In our presentation, we would like to focus on some ongoing projects, which could facilitate, and in fact revolutionize, the study of the two main topics of our conference, namely “evolution of scriptures” and “formation of canons.”

In 2015, “Scholars and Scribes,” a collaborative project of the Universität Hamburg (Almogi & Wangchuk) and Tel Aviv University (Dershowitz & Wolf) funded by the German-Israeli Foundation, was launched in order to develop computerized tools to advance and facilitate Tibetan Buddhist textual scholarship. One of the three main objectives of the project has been the development of an “approximate text alignment” tool for easily locating shared passages, be they acknowledged citations or “borrowed” texts with no attribution, in order to better our understanding of the history of composition of individual texts, on the one hand, and the emergence of entire corpora of Buddhist works, on the other. We have by now succeeded in locating all “approximate text alignments” in the Tibetan Buddhist canon (using the ACIP files of the IHa sa bKa’ ’gyur and sDe dge bsTan ’gyur). It has soon become clear that the overwhelming amount of matches made a thorough assessment of the findings without the help of further computerized tools impossible. In 2018, the project thus started a further collaboration with the International Institute for Digital Humanities (DHII), Tokyo (Nagasaki), in order to develop a website for this purpose.

Likewise in 2018, another collaborative project was launched between Universität Hamburg (Nehrdich) and Düsseldorf (Hellwig). This project focuses on the development of a word segmentation tool for Sanskrit and on “translingual text alignment” of Sanskrit Buddhist texts and their Tibetan translations. The hitherto results clearly show that this approach could be applied to other pairs of “Buddhist languages,” such as Sanskrit and Chinese or Chinese and Tibetan, with similar success expectations. Following the successful development of the segmenter and the translingual alignment tool, further ways for augmenting the “approximate text alignment” results achieved by of the “Scholars and Scribes” project in order to further facilitate the study of “evolution of scriptures” and “formation of canons” are currently being explored.
