

是書第四個角度是百科全書對中國社會的影響。在「閱讀史」(History of Books)的研究裏，最大的難題不是追蹤書報的出版和流通，而是衡量書報對讀者所產生的影響。一向以來，史學界不大願意研究「讀者的接受程度」(readers' reception)。原因無它，是材料不足。一則無法找出確實數據，證明有多少讀者讀過某一本書或某一刊物；二則無法找到大量的日記、筆記，證實某一本書或某一刊物對某一個讀者的確實影響。雖然如此，書中 Yeh 與 Mittler 試圖對晚清百科全書的社會影響作出初步的探討。兩位作者都集中分析 1919 年出版的《日用百科全書》，時段上是超出了晚清的範圍，但優點是突出百科全書對創造「新女性」的重要性。在分析「新女性」的創造過程，她們首先回溯日本明治時期構造「賢妻良母」的形象，然後根據《日用百科全書》的內容分析各種對「家庭主婦」的要求，諸如「家政」、「保育」、「容儀」、「時間」、「運動」、「體操」等等(見 Yeh 文章，頁 376–94；Mittler 文章，頁 403–18)。

從量化史學的角度來衡量，兩位作者還是沒有提供確實的數據，具體證明讀者的接受程度；但是從研究知識系統的角度來看，她們已經走出重要的一步。就是從百科全書的體例，推想出一百年前對「新女性」的要求。在現實生活裏，百科全書對「新女性」的要求不一定原封不動地照搬照辦，但是我們可以從中看到一個大輪廓、一個大方向。正如 Mittler 在文章結論中說，不論在歐洲還是在中國，百科全書流行，不但證明了民族國家已經建立，也證明了大眾廣泛接受「國民」和「新女性」，成為民族國家裏的男女性別的身份象徵(見 Mittler 文章，頁 418–23)。故此，要認真研究近代中國「民族國家」(nation-state)的特性和演變過程，我們不能不研究百科全書的引入和發展。此說的確是真知灼見，不啻這本論文集送給我們最珍貴的禮物。

韓子奇

美國紐約州立大學 Geneseo 分校歷史系

The Body Incantatory: Spells and the Ritual Imagination in Medieval Chinese Buddhism. By Paul Copp. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014. Pp. xxx + 363. \$55.00.

This is a book about the dhāraṇī, those strings of syllables based on the phonology of Sanskrit that played and still play a major role in all Asian cultures touched by Buddhist influences whilst for the most part attracting little attention from non-Asians interested in Buddhism. A monograph that puts them at the centre of a focused research project has long been overdue, and one that confronts specifically the copious material legacy in the form of epigraphy and printed and manuscript sources that they have bequeathed from the China of the seventh to tenth centuries

C.E. makes an excellent starting point for a reconsideration of their role. For all the Buddhist cultural influences that carried texts and practices similar to the ones studied in this volume across a vast swathe of Asian countries in the first millennium C.E., the Chinese context is the one that can be studied most effectively through a large selection of surviving historical sources, even if our understanding of the broader background is also developing rapidly.¹ The work marks in any case a major advance in our understanding, since throughout the book careful analyses are made of subtle distinctions in the practices implied in our sources, revealing in their fine detail structures of ritual thought and action hitherto obscured. The author is naturally well aware that his studies are in many respects preliminary, and indeed he announces publication on further important related topics in the future, but even so the reader can only be impressed by the degree of erudition that has been required even for a first book length venture into this field.²

Indeed the care exerted in introducing such a wide ranging topic before prudently confining the focus to the period for which the best evidence exists is nothing short of exemplary. An introductory chapter sets the scene by discussing exactly what a *dhāraṇī* is, warning for example (p. 8) that it cannot be reduced to a “spell”—though Sinologists who have not set up their typewriters to cope with Indology may, one trusts, be pardoned for using this handy English word as an equivalent—any more than its many functions may be cut back to the purely mnemonic, even if it is indubitably a site of inspissated meaning. Far from pursuing a reductionist course, the conclusion of this discussion (p. 13) is that such “spells” cannot be brought within the scope of a single term at all. Doubtless more could be said, but enough has been clarified for the opening chapter that follows to set the scene for “Scripture, Relic, Talisman, Spell” within a particular segment of Chinese history. Here, too, the author must be awarded full marks for introducing a strong notion of chronological sequence into his study, where others have often reacted to the rather vague chronology of translated Tantric texts, often insecurely attributed to named translators, by giving vague approximations of date and depicting associated religious phenomena in a somewhat ahistorical way.

Paul Copp is quite clear: whatever antecedents there may have been for the development (cf. p. 33), in the seventh century the spell moved from an oral

¹ Notably through the special issue of the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 77, no. 1 (February 2014), edited by Michael Willis, which contains six articles on “*Mantra* and *dhāraṇī* in the religious traditions of Asia,” though this appeared too recently for its rich findings to be incorporated into the author’s work.

² Though like anyone else the author is occasionally stumped: in n. 58 on p. 264, surely a *shan-jue* 山樾 is not a “mountain stake” but simply a three-pronged stake.

performance that could be recorded in writing to something that had a life also as a written text (p. 30). In doing so it moved from something that might be recorded within a sutra to an entity that stood in its own right as equivalent to a sutra, and indeed its concentrated nature rendered it in many respects superior. For the full implications of this we may perhaps have to wait for the publication of the author's forthcoming study of seals (cf. n. 55 on p. 255), but this was surely not without consequence for a topic to which we return below, namely the history of printing. For now the reliance Copp's study places on material culture rather than on transmitted sources also reveals here something equally valuable, namely (p. 46) that for all the Chinese Buddhist discourse eloquently restating Buddhism in Chinese terms, the practice of the people was to put it crudely on the surviving material evidence much more Indian. Perhaps the self-dramatizing narratives produced by the tiny well-educated portion of the Chinese Buddhist sangha that emphasized their own roles in asserting a place—and especially a political place—within Chinese society should not blind us to the fact that the vast bulk of the population, even if not entirely poor and blank, had far less of a stake in the elite culture that their educated clergy were so keen to impress.

The next chapter moves on to a study of one particular spell amply evidenced by surviving documents, the *Mahāpratisarā dhāraṇī sūtra*, here termed the *Incantation of Wish Fulfillment* (*Foshuo suiqiu jide dazizai tuoluoni shenzhou jing* 佛說隨求即得大自在陀羅尼神咒經, T. no. 1154). This particular text, for which an appendix (pp. 233–37) details twenty-three recovered medieval exemplars, fourteen of them involving printing, and several of them recovered archaeologically within containing vessels (armlets and the like) accompanying buried bodies. One, P. 3679, bears traces of needle holes, suggesting that it had been sewn into clothing (cf. p. 105), and though this example is unique, we should perhaps recall that two other Dunhuang documents, P. 3952 and P. 4072, bear traces of sewing suggesting that they were carried on the person, namely two provisional ordination certificates, apotropaic talismans particularly directed against the attentions of bureaucrats.³ Visible certification of supernatural protection was perhaps one aspect of these “spells,” like the “Registers” (*lu* 籙) issued to Daoist believers.

But in the light of Paul Copp's research the practices drawn upon in the deployment of the new forms of paper spells reach back well into South Asian civilization, too, where for example he notes the talismanic use of sacred cords, for example

³ Jacques Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*, trans. Franciscus Verellen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 56, and note p. 332, end of n. 124, that such certificates are also said to have been inserted in metal tubes like amulets.

(p. 80) in securing and empowering the bricks used to build shrines. This reminds us of the multitude of printed spells, albeit based on another text, that were rolled up and placed inside the bricks of the famous Leifeng ta 雷峰塔, built in Hangzhou in 975.⁴ Perhaps given such a trajectory it would be more useful to think of printing as making possible the extended and amplified use of paper-based objects for all sorts of purposes rather than narrowly for the creation of books, as we tend to do in Europe. Certainly the volume under review makes it plain that printing prompted a small but multifaceted revolution in the design of amulets (well described on p. 103) long before the vigorous and flexible book culture of China shows clear traces of the shifts that were eventually brought about by the new technology. But as is made clear on p. 123, new developments in Buddhism and especially Buddhist thought brought the initial phase of this specific revolution to a close by the start of the eleventh century, as the text of the spell became the focus of new (or newly established) rituals.

Chapter Two thus spans a specific small history, neatly bounded within the materials at our disposal; Chapter Three directs our attention towards a text that was to have a much wider impact in time and space than the boundaries of this study are designed to encompass. In Chinese terms, certainly, the story of the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya dhāraṇī*, here the *Incantation of the Glory of the Buddha's Crown* (*Foding zunsheng jing* 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經, T. nos. 967–974), starts with the first translations in the late seventh century and very swiftly made an impact on the material culture of the age. The fact that the text commends its display on “banners” encouraged the production of stone stelae functioning as objects of display, *jingzhuang* 經幢 (scripture pillars), on which the incantation itself and other related textual materials were inscribed (pp. 145–46). These objects have bequeathed a vast amount of epigraphy that has generated a quantity of rubbings in times past and has now been substantially extended by recent archaeology. One notes that of the collection of rubbings of Tang “scripture pillars” considered important by the Beijing Library, fifteen out of nineteen explicitly derive from the *Incantation of the Glory of the Buddha's Crown*.⁵ This tradition of collecting has already generated a considerable body of scholarship that contemporaries such as Liu Shufen 劉淑芬 and Kuo Liying 郭麗英 have been able to develop in ways that Paul Copp has put to good use, though one excellent study by the latter scholar published too late for consultation by him demonstrates how quite

⁴ Note that “blue brocade strips” were associated with these texts, according to p. 138 of Shih-shan Susan Huang, “Early Buddhist Illustrated Prints in Hangzhou,” in Lucille Chia and Hilde De Weerd, eds., *Knowledge and Text Production in an Age of Print: China, 900–1400* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 135–65.

⁵ Xu Ziqiang 徐自強, ed., *Beijing tushuguan cang shike xulu* 北京圖書館藏石刻敘錄 (Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1988), pp. 176–87.

apart from stone banners the incantation is also depicted written on flimsier structures, such as those looking something like a cross between a solar panel and a satellite dish that adorn the tops of parasols and buildings in some Dunhuang paintings.⁶

These recent publications reveal far more than can be discerned from the rather small number of texts associated with the incantation that in themselves entered the literary tradition. Since there are not so many items of this type, those in recent times with an interest in creating an image of the Tang purified of such conspicuous signs of religious devotion have on occasion tried to minimise their significance. Zhang Shizhao 章士釗 (1881–1973), for example, declared that a piece on the *Incantation of the Glory of the Buddha's Crown* written by Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773–819), who was during the Cultural Revolution period in particular promoted for contemporary political reasons as the very model of an enlightened intellectual, could only have acquired his name on it as the result of some social obligation, if indeed it was not incorrectly attributed to him by an editorial mistake in the first place.⁷ In the light of the research contained in the volume under review such arguments should perhaps best be forgotten.

But the conspicuous role of this incantation in the China of Tang times should not distract us from its more extended importance in the wider history of Asia. The author is of course well aware of this, noting for example the famous pillar of Kunming, erected there during the reign of the Dali kingdom (p. 151, with the author's photograph, p. 153), and also the use of the incantation on a Liao dynasty coffin (p. 154).⁸ But the local culture of Yunnan continued to make frequent use of this incantation long after the end of the independent state there: studies of local religious epigraphy point to its incorporation in funerary monuments, especially monuments combining Chinese with its Sanskrit text, well into the fifteenth century.⁹ The Liao, for that matter, seem to have subscribed to the culture of sutra pillars bearing this incantation right from the early days of their regime before the middle of the tenth century on to the time of their demise in the early twelfth century, using very

⁶ These details are reproduced in Figures 136, 137, and 138 of Liying Kuo, "Dhāra ī Pillars in China: Functions and Symbols," in Dorothy C. Wong and Gustav Heldt, eds., *China and Beyond in the Mediaeval Period: Cultural Crossings and Inter-Regional Connections* (New Delhi: Manohar, 2014), pp. 351–85.

⁷ Zhang Shizhao, *Liuwen zhiyao* 柳文指要 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1971), p. 600.

⁸ In this situation the Liao also seem to have used other, different dhāraṇī too: cf. Hsingyuan Tsao, *Differences Preserved: Reconstructed Tombs from the Liao and Song Dynasties* (Portland, OR: Douglas F. Cooley Memorial Art Gallery, Reed College, 2000), p. 11.

⁹ Zhang Xilu 張錫祿, *Dali Baizu fojiao mizong* 大理白族佛教密宗 (Kunming: Yunnan minzu chubanshe, 1999), pp. 336–37, 378–80.

much the same vocabulary of suffusion of beneficial influence carefully analysed by means of Tang sources on pp. 170–80.¹⁰

But the *Incantation of the Glory of the Buddha's Crown* under the Liao and Dali regimes form but a fraction of the wider history of the text. Kuo Liying mentions its popularity in Vietnam, Korea, and China, and provides a reference and photograph for Vietnam.¹¹ It is worth noting that, as in Yunnan, the Sanskrit text of the incantation remained important in Korea, whilst in Japan the Sanskrit was even preserved in manuscript, which explains why Paul Copp is able to open his study (p. 1) with a quotation from Max Müller (1823–1900) since his Japanese student Nanjio Bunyiu 南條文雄 (1849–1927) had brought the manuscript to his attention and they had co-published it.¹² But polyglot versions of the text outside the borders of Tang China are probably all eclipsed by the magnificent hexaglot (Tibetan Sanskrit, 'Phags-pa, Uighur, Chinese, and Tangut) inscription of c. 1345 at the Juyong guan 居庸關, an epigraphic treasure trove that has occupied the attention of modern scholarship for almost a century and a half.¹³ But to have taken the volume under review off in the direction of Tangut Studies—on which much more could of course be said, too, as the author's listing of the work of Rob Linrothe on the topic indicates—and other such ventures would undoubtedly have created an unwieldy narrative and lessened the value of the book.

¹⁰ Examples may be found in Chen Shu 陳述, ed., *Quan Liao wen* 全遼文 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), pp. 68, 82, and 115, dated to 946, 969, and 1013 respectively, on to pp. 305 and 314, dated to 1108, 1110, and 1111 respectively, all containing the key term *zhan* 霑. A full list from this source—to say nothing on compilations based on more recent discoveries—would be quite long; Liying Kuo states in “Dhāra ī Pillars in China: Functions and Symbols,” p. 353, that she has details of approximately 300 examples from “China proper” up to 1285.

¹¹ Kuo, “Dhāraṇī Pillars in China: Functions and Symbols,” pp. 352, 357 (dated to 973), and Figure 129 on that page.

¹² For the use of Sanskrit in Korean epigraphy, note the examples in Chōsen sōtoku fu 朝鮮總督府, *Chōsen kinseki sōran* 朝鮮金石總覽 (Keijo: Chōsen sōtoku fu, 1919), pp. 540–50. The transmission of the text to Japan is very amply attested—for example Ono Katsutoshi 小野勝年, *Nittō guhō junrei kōki no kenkyū* 入唐求法巡礼行記の研究, III (Tokyo: Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan, 1967), p. 70, shows that in the ninth century Ennin 圓仁 was responsible for importing into Japan versions that were Chinese, Sanskrit, and bilingual (and incidentally that the problems, probably political, surrounding the early history of translations were plainly more complex than Paul Copp's monograph is able to explore), while on p. 155 he points out that even before Ennin's time a manuscript in Sanskrit apparently of seventh-century date had already arrived in Japan, to say nothing of Chinese versions imported earlier.

¹³ The most notable contribution probably remains Murata Jirō 村田治郎, ed., *Kyoyōkan* 居庸關 (*Chū-yung-kuan: The Buddhist Arch Pass of the Fourteenth Century A.D. at the Pass of the Great Wall Northwest of Peking*) (Kyoto: Zayūhō kankōkai, 1957), which contains separate chapters by Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄 and others concerning the various scripts employed to reproduce the text.

For the final chapter turns more immediately productively to a study that examines closely a source not sufficiently studied hitherto, the section on the transmission of incantations, “Chuan mizang” 傳密藏, in the *Da Song sengshi lüe* 大宋僧史略 by Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001), fully translated here on pp. 201–2.¹⁴ In this essay the learned monk and famous Buddhist historian passes over (whilst perhaps as suggested here on p. 212 tacitly drawing on) sources describing the organization in India of an entire section of the canon devoted to incantations, but outlines an invented tradition of expertise throughout the history of Chinese Buddhism from the earliest times into the tenth century in which he himself lived. This attempt at distinguishing a broader tradition of practice involving incantations from the tradition of Tantric Buddhism introduced in the mid-eighth century by masters such as Vajrabodhi (671–741) and Amoghavajra (705–774) is explained (p. 198) by reference to the work of Ronald Davidson, who distinguished the rise of self-consciously theorized Buddhist Tantrism in India from earlier less reflective practice by reference to the rise of a “way of the Bodhisattvas” distinct from yet drawing on and coexisting with earlier notions of the role of the bodhisattva.

Surely in Zanning’s case, however, the analogy most pressing in his mind was that of Chan Buddhism, for Buddhists had practised “Chan” in the sense of meditation long before the period when Bodhidharma was believed to have foregrounded the issue of lineage, and continued to do so after the appearance of a self-conscious Chan tradition. It is precisely such a broader tradition of meditation that Zanning describes in his short essays on the history of the topic immediately before this essay on incantations, for reasons that were clearly political and ideological, tied to his own perception of the situation of Buddhism within the newly reunified political structures of his day in which new notions of a Confucian ideal of correctness played a significant part.¹⁵ Could it be that his attempted broader construction of a tradition of incantatory Buddhism also had political overtones? It is at least worth pointing out that his biography of Vajrabodhi has long been noted for its concluding observation that one of the practices that worthy introduced as part of organised Tantrism was all well and good for sages like the great Indian master, but that it had been corrupted towards less noble ends since his day into something entirely vulgar. This was the practice of *āveśa* (*aweishe* 阿尾奢), the use of a possessed child medium to contact spiritual powers. His reservations about this are surely to be read against the use of

¹⁴ Zanning, *Da Song sengshi lüe*, 1, pp. 240b26–c18, in Taishō Canon 54, no. 2126.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 240a07–b05. For a summary of Zanning’s historiographic tactics with regard to Chan, see Albert Welte, *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 210–11, which volume illuminates considerably the cultural and political situation within which he wrote.

like practices in Daoism and popular religion in China at a time when some sort of rapprochement with the elite values of Confucianism was an urgent necessity for the Buddhist community that he represented.¹⁶

One of the factors that shows that Zanning's construction of a tradition of incantation was a polemical construct rather than a reflection of an existing reality lies in its lack of a bibliographical profile reflecting the classificatory work of other scholar monks. Incantations, once they had in the seventh century achieved an independent status equivalent to sutras, simply sat alongside sutras in the catalogues of the day, whether those transmitted since that time by Buddhists or recovered from Dunhuang. Even very short texts used for practical purposes in order to project power could now be called *jing* 經, and indeed with the arrival of European Christianity in the late Ming new *jing* that were extremely short—and of course had no canonical scriptural status in Europe—were also introduced to the Chinese population as part of the armoury of that religion.¹⁷ With one possible very late exception, no separate bibliographies of Chan texts or Tantric texts survive from before the end of the tenth century.¹⁸ But the self-aware tradition of Tantric Buddhism brought from India by Vajrabodhi, Amoghavajra and others does seem to have had an image of itself as possessing its own distinctive texts and practices, for which it was possible to provide a concise overview.¹⁹ Likewise Chan literature was perhaps already been perceived as forming a loose grouping at the start of the ninth century, and certainly by the middle of that century Zongmi 宗密 (780–841) was organizing it into a distinctive collection, though exactly how is no longer clear.²⁰ There is no evidence that anyone in Zanning's time

¹⁶ This reading of Zanning's remarks is well situated in the research of Edward L. Davis, *Society and the Supernatural in Song China* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001), p. 123.

¹⁷ Note Erik Zürcher, trans., *Kuoduo richao: Li Jiubiao's Diary of Oral Admonitions: A Late Ming Christian Journal* (Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica; Nettetal, Germany: Steyler Verlag, 2007), vol. 1, p. 295, where part of the creed is used as a written text to function "as a kind of written charm" in exorcism.

¹⁸ Fang Guangchang 方廣錫, *Dunhuang fojiao jinglu jijiao* 敦煌佛教經錄輯校 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1997), pp. 541–45, publishes a manuscript from the Beijing Dunhuang collection, 北周 42, that may perhaps date from as late as the early eleventh century, containing a listing of exclusively Tantric materials, many of them plainly incantations, but the manuscript is incomplete, leaving it impossible to judge whether the whole list was exclusively made up of such items or not.

¹⁹ One work that does this was translated by Amoghavajra: see *Dubu tuoluoni mu* 都部陀羅尼目, Taishō Canon 18, no. 903.

²⁰ Peter N. Gregory, *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 322–23, briefly reviews what we know of Zongmi's work, which has not been transmitted.

or earlier—or indeed later—placed incantations in a separate category in this way. But this, of course, does not mean that they were unimportant—quite the reverse—for it shows that incantations were so omnipresent that they defeated the attempts of the Buddhist leadership to tidy them neatly into a tradition that met their own, entirely partial criteria of coherence.

Even so, it is undeniable that incantations remain bibliographically distinctive, in that on the basis of our current knowledge they remain the earliest materials to have been produced by mass printing on paper. In the wake of the publication of an important article on the topic by Peter Kornicki in 2011, the earliest securely datable printed materials surviving today remain the dhāraṇī printed in Japan in 764. As he shows, the most recent Korean scholarship discounts the possibility that a copy of the same printed text found there actually dates to earlier in the eighth century, though it seems to have been replacing an eighth-century copy that may or may not have been printed; a Japanese library holding what could be a yet earlier copy of the same text printed by the Empress Wu has—frustratingly for all of us—not responded to any attempts to enquire about this incantation.²¹

But the twelfth entry in Paul Copp's inventory already mentioned above of copies of the *Incantation of Wish Fulfillment* (p. 235) is deemed by experts to have been produced by printing in the “mid/late eighth century?,” suggesting that it may equally possibly be the oldest printed item we possess. As for the *Incantation of the Glory of the Buddha's Crown*, Fang Guangchang has recently posted a short piece online devoted to a listing of nine early printed Buddhist sutras from the ninth and tenth centuries in which he notes that one manuscript of a version of this text that exhibits typical mid-eighth-century features is actually transcribed according to a colophon from a printed text.²² This implied dating is complicated by the narrative, as given by its eighth-century promoter, of the history of the particular version of the incantation in question here, summarized on pp. 165–66 of Paul Copp's study, but it is even so not impossible.

Now if we look a little further back it is clear that the multiplication of incantations by means of seals impressed on soft materials such as clay was not solely a Chinese practice, but one attested throughout many parts of Asia: the illustration provided on p. 109 of a seventh- or eighth-century stamp of this type carrying a

²¹ Peter Kornicki, “The *Hyakumantō Darani* and the Origins of Printing in Eighth-Century Japan,” *International Journal of Asian Studies* 9, no. 1 (January 2012), pp. 43–70; this study was not available at the time of the writing of the monograph under review.

²² Fang Guangchang, “Jiuzhong zaoqi keben fojing xiaoji” 九種早期刻本佛經小記, http://blog.sina.com.cn/s/blog_53c23f390102vhre.html, accessed 29 April 2015.

substantial quantity of text makes this point eloquently enough.²³ Yet no doubt the Chinese context of the use of seals was also important. We await therefore the author's further researches on this topic, though meanwhile I should in passing point out at least that one of the sources I used myself some years ago to discuss the situation in China at the start of the eighth century has been re-evaluated as not referring to that period at all, in a very detailed study, available online, by Xin Deyong 辛德勇.²⁴ Clearly there is still much work to be done, as the brief coda to the book under review points out.

Here the focus broadens to the wider Asian context once more, but with some very important qualifications. A justifiable emphasis is placed on the history of religious practice within local contexts, as against the allure of the text, and especially of the text as a norm depending for its transmission on a monastic elite of translators and exegetes—the very small elite whose extraordinary intellectual efforts attract most of our scholarly attention. Indeed, another new study of dhāraṇī in Indonesia comes to quite a compatible conclusion, namely that we cannot be certain that incantations there were transmitted within scriptural contexts at all.²⁵ The final plea in this book is for a “humbler history” (p. 232). We must hope it will be heeded, as we must hope that we hear more of this history from Paul Copp soon.

T. H. BARRETT
SOAS, University of London

²³ One situation in which the production of multiple copies was required was in the creation of multiple reliquaries. It is of some interest that the translator responsible for the text distributed in Japan in 764 came from a place where this practice (though not the use of printed paper) is attested by archaeology: see Hasuike Toshitaka 蓮池利隆, “Tokara sō Mitasan to hyakumantō” 觀貨邏僧弥陀山と百万塔, *Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 仏教学研究 64 (2008), pp. 1–20.

²⁴ Xin Deyong, “Lun Zhongguo shuji diaoban yinshua jishu chansheng de shehui yuanyin ji qi shijian” 論中國書籍雕版印刷技術產生的社會原因及其時間, published 2014.11.25 and consulted online at <http://www.zggds.pku.edu.cn/004/> on 27 April 2015; the correction is made on p. 93, though I am not sure the author has grasped the point made (a rather speculative one—as is, I hope, clear) concerning another reference to seals in the *Tang Huiyao* 唐會要, 41: cf. T. H. Barrett, *The Woman Who Discovered Printing* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 85, 120. The overall argument of the 2008 book—that printing could have served ideological as well as religious ends—is not engaged with, nor yet mentioned at all; it is perhaps a little too jejune for a proper scholarly context. The corrections are, of course, gratefully noted.

²⁵ See in particular pp. 186–87 of Arlo Griffiths, “Written Traces of the Buddhist Past: *Mantras* and *Dhāraṇīs* in Indonesian Inscriptions,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 77, no. 1 (2014), pp. 137–94.