

## Thoughts on Originality, Reuse, and Intertextuality in Buddhist Literature Derived from the Contributions to the Volume

VESNA A. WALLACE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

vwallace@religion.ucsb.edu

### ABSTRACT

Studies in originality, authorship, and intertextuality in the contexts of the South Asian and Tibetan Buddhist literature are indispensable for uncovering the direct and indirect referential connections and the diverse modes of their production in an extensive mosaic of Buddhist texts. They also highlight the multifarious functions of textual reuses and re-workings in cultural productions and religious and literary reinvigorations. Moreover, a reintegration of explicit and silent citations and creative paraphrases and a recirculation of narrative adaptations, which have been often sidelined in the study of Buddhist literature, have been shown to be integral to the formation of a textual authority and to the restructuring of cultural and doctrinal meanings.

### KEYWORDS

intertextuality, textual reuses, reworked sources, source text, derivative text, silent borrowings, deliberate citations, second-hand citations

This collection of well-researched articles, which covers the topics of authorship, originality, and literary reuses of Buddhist sources within the Buddhist and Vedānta traditions, brings to light the diverse methods of textual reuses and their specific aims. It also highlights certain aspects of intertextuality found in different genres of Buddhist literature. As every scholar of Buddhist studies knows, intertextuality has been an important feature of Buddhist literature, which has been for centuries spatially and interlinguistically transmitted and perpetually reused. The reuse, evocation, quotation, recycling, and appropriation of texts and Buddhist ideas have been a common strategy in all Buddhist literary traditions. The Buddhist oral and written literature, which is founded on remembering and

relying on older texts, is by nature intertextual. Diverse genres, themes, formulas, images, widely disseminated arguments, and their polemics are reflected in virtually every Buddhist literary tradition.

The articles in this volume either directly or indirectly highlight several important features of intertextuality in Buddhist literature, and they substantiate that textual reuses and reworking of texts have occupied a center stage in the Buddhist literary traditions of South Asia and Tibet. The contributors to the volume further demonstrate that such literary practices have been socially acceptable in their cultural contexts, and that they have been often intentional and in conformity with the specific goals set by the authors that they study. It is also shown here that the authors of the works examined in this volume have been fully cognizant of the interconnections and interdependence of their texts with other works, which suggests that they have been also aware of the usefulness of intertextuality in pursuing their authorial agenda. Likewise, we find that in addition to citations and silent borrowings, the intertextual connections among Buddhist texts were also formed through paraphrases, echoes, and allusions. The contributors' investigations into the issues of reuses, originality, and intertextual relations inform us that their endeavor is inevitably a comparative enterprise, through which one recognizes repetitions and variants of identical or similar phrases, passages, themes, and structures. We further see that for intertextual connection to be evident, the vocabulary and theme among the interrelated texts must be common, devoid of contradiction in meaning, and their chronology must be convincing. The presence of literary memories, such as linguistic formulas, themes, and so on, which appear as a purposeful assembly of fragments of other texts in the form of explicit and silent citations and paraphrases within a new text, is demonstrated in all of the works examined by the contributors to the volume.

Examining the contributors' modes of delving into the issues of textual reuses, we encounter the diversity of procedures and reasons for which the authors of the texts under the contributors' investigation reused and reworked their sources. Cantwell's analysis — which focuses on the ways in which Dudjom Rinpoche reworked Pema Lingpa's 'Ultra Secret Razor Lifeforce Vajrakīlaya' and Tsultrim Dorje's 'Main Ritual Manual', and his reasons for that — instantiates the necessity of examining a full spectrum of causes and conditions that motivate the author to rework his source texts. Analyzing the mentioned works of Dudjom Rinpoche as examples of literary reuses and re-workings in the revelatory genre of Tibetan Buddhist literature, Cantwell discovers these literary processes in the author's rephrasing, restructuring, and versifying of the disordered, inconsistent, and unclear, prose source texts. Her analysis also brings to light a wide range of the underlying factors of these literary procedures. They include the formal ties to the specific lineage affiliation, conservatism within the given revelation tradition that encourages reproduction of the source texts, the social context of relationship between the author and his communities of followers, the expectations of his followers, and the author's other practical and aesthetic considerations. A reworking of the source texts is understood as effective in reinvigorating and universalizing the revelatory tradition of the Nyingma lineage. The tradition's acceptance of the reworked source text as original points to the revelatory tradition's receptivity to the idea of multiple, original versions of the same text, unrestricted to a single author. One wonders to what degree the tradition's

acceptance of the reworked sources as new, reconsecrated and useful versions is based on the tradition's assumption that the ultimate source of every revelation is the same *rig pa* ('primordial awareness'), which displays the same or similar contents of a revealed knowledge.

Cantwell's study also informs us of the multiple functions of textual reuses and re-workings of the source texts. It leads us to the conclusion that while the act of reworking the source text may preserve the particular genre and the areas of knowledge — in this case, the revelatory genre and its subject matter — it also inhibits the ossification of both the source texts and of the revelatory tradition itself. Although the degree of Dudjom Rinpoche's reworking of his sources is not extensive, we must admit that his reworked text is still subject to them; and although the meaning of his reworked text is produced interactively with its source texts, there are visible demarcations between his text and his source texts and between his phrasing and that of the previous authors. Cantwell's emphasis on authorial intent and on textual relation of Dudjom Rinpoche's revision to Pema Lingpa's source text proves that, as a treasure revealer, whether 'inspired by *rig pa*' or prompted by external social factors, he cannot be seen as a single author who is entirely responsible for his work. It is in the difference of Dudjom Rinpoche's revision of Pema Lingpa's source material that the authority of Dudjom Rinpoche and the authenticity of his contribution are further established. Furthermore, the fact that about eighty percent of Dudjom Rinpoche's 'Ultra Secret Razor Lifeforce' Framework text for the Major Practice session reproduces virtually unchanged an earlier Framework text for the 'Meteoritic Iron Razor' illustrates a broader pattern found also elsewhere: that self-plagiarism, the ethics of which is nowadays seriously questioned, has been an accepted practice in the traditional world of Tibetan, Buddhist religious texts. This raises the question whether self-plagiarism in some way alters or extends our definition of intertextuality.

The example of Dudjom Rinpoche's reuses of his source texts is representative of explicit intertextuality, where the author of the source text is acknowledged. In contrast, bDe chen 'od gsal rdo rje's 'History of the Introduction of Buddhism in Tibet', discussed in Terrone's article, stands as an example of intertextual connections formed through silent, but not secret borrowings, as the text that he was reusing was well known to Tibetan scholars. Terrone's analysis reveals that silent reuses of the source texts in historical writings can be utilized for the purpose of advancing new ideas and reshaping history. Thus, while silently laying claim to the authority on the basis of antecedent works, the 'History of the Introduction of Buddhism in Tibet' also stands as a separate, self-authorizing text. In the example of bDe chen 'od gsal rdo rje's historical work, we find that silent borrowings transmit historical narratives, promote certain historical claims and values, and can serve as the means of assuring the consistency and survival of the Buddhist tradition at the time when Tibetans were seeking to recover from the trauma of the last seventy years. bDe chen 'od gsal rdo rje's manner of textual reuses is illustrative of an intertextual method in which the placing of silent borrowings into the novel organization of the narrative and into selected themes is given priority over the historicity of their claims for the sake of legitimizing and rejuvenating the Tibetan Buddhist tradition. Terrone's and Cantwell's case studies equally bring to light a potent revivifying role of literary reuses in bringing about both literary freshness and the survival of the given Buddhist tradition, which

was well understood by the authors that they study. Their analyses also hint to the importance of knowing the genealogy and socio-historical situatedness of the derivative text in order to adequately understand the ways in which the source text and derivative text are brought into relation and for what purposes.

Other instances of reuses in commentarial and legal sources, discussed in several articles of this volume, further testify to the fact that borrowings from other sources, be they explicit or silent, have been invariably chosen with a specific agenda in the author's mind. In these genres of literature, a construction of the text and what the text does has been as important as its content. The author's intentionality behind his selection of textual borrowings and his organization, contextualization, and rewriting render his work original, regardless of the plurality of sources that it contains and of the impossibility for any author of commentarial and legal works to express his individuality without relying on other texts that contextualize his thought and work. This then leads us to consider that different types of literary authorship are possible.

While the contributions by Cantwell and Terrone focus on the regenerative function of textual reuses, Freschi's and Kieffer-Pülz's analyses demonstrate that intertextuality can also be subversive. For instance, Freschi's study of Veṅkaṭanātha's reuse of Dharmakīrti's work and other Buddhist texts illustrates intertextuality in service of the subversive interpretative strategy of Veṅkaṭanātha's theological agenda. Freschi's article also hints at the problems one may encounter in trying to distinguish between the citations that are directly taken from another source and the second-hand citations, and in differentiating deliberate citation from the more unconscious types of reference. Veṅkaṭanātha's choice of doctrinal contexts in which to use the broad or specific references is shown to correspond to his specific doctrinal interests, adding to the previously indicated evidence, seen in Cantwell's and Terrone's articles, that citations are never accidental. One assumes that Veṅkaṭanātha's citations from Buddhist sources are inter-religiously familiar to be meaningful and semantically relevant to his Vedāntin readership. It is worth noting that in contrast to other case studies of intertextuality discussed in this volume, in which textual reuses are utilized in non-oppositional ways, in Veṅkaṭanātha's text and in Sāriputta's *Vinayasāṅgaha*, analyzed by Kieffer-Pülz, we see the examples of oppositional uses of citations.

On the example of intertextuality observed in Sāriputta's *Vinayasāṅgaha*, we find that intertextual connections and reuses in this compendium of legal monastic texts can indirectly subvert the canonical hierarchy and uniformity of the thematic structure and legal monastic maxims. Kieffer-Pülz's scrutiny of the aforementioned compendium reveals the presence of different restructuring procedures in the commentarial Pāli legal literature, which came about during different periods in the development of this genre of Buddhist literature and in different geographic areas. As she endeavors to make sense of the rearrangements of silent borrowings, the restructuring of largely unaltered portions from the source texts, and the insertions of loose excerpts of unaltered passages into the derivative text, she discovers a set of problems that every scholar might face when examining the intertextual relations that took place transregionally and over different time periods. Difficulties that arise are in the tasks of determining the nature of the interdependence among the given texts, in identifying which text among the source texts is authoritative, and in discovering the self-under-

standing of the author of the derivative text, and his place and role within the tradition.

The preference for silent borrowings over explicit citations, which is witnessed in the works studied by Terrone, Kieffer-Pülz, and Kramer, has multiple reasons. Perhaps, the most prevalent reason for this type of preference lies in what has not yet been stated by the contributors, and that is the author's cognizance that unlike explicit citations, *silent borrowings* are modifiable; they can be easily adapted to the author's specific aims. Inconsistency in whether citations are made explicitly or silently in Buddhist literature is indicative of the absence of the notion of unauthorized appropriations of other sources in Buddhist literary traditions. It also suggests that intertextuality requires not only the erudite author but also the erudite reader who is familiar with passages silently borrowed from other sources. The reader who is able to differentiate the derivative text from its source texts in silent borrowings, allusions, and the like is able to clearly grasp historical arguments through dense intertextuality. Furthermore, Kramer's investigation of the relationship among three commentaries attributed to Sthiramati — the *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*, the *Sūtrālaṃkāravṛttibhāṣyā*, and the *Trīṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣyā* — underscores the idea that those statements that were widely circulated and familiar to specific readership did not necessitate a mention of the title or of the author. The texts studied by Kramer and Freschi also show that even when the author provides the reader with an explicit citation from another source, he does not necessarily do it in the exact, same words. This fact elicits the question whether or not a paraphrase, or any other form of a non-replicative citation, can be considered as authorial. It is well known that explicit citations are often used in commentarial treaties in order to transfer the authority of a message of the source text into the derivative text, but what about silent citations or paraphrases? Who is the bearer of the authorial view in them, the referring author, the cited author, or both?

The investigation of different compositional structures, styles, contents, recycled passages, and explicit and silent citations in the interrelated texts can enable us to determine whether such texts are products of the same or different authors. In her forensic study of the interdependence between 'Sthiramati's' three commentarial works that is evidenced by a considerable number of common passages, Kramer indirectly points out that intertextual connections between interrelated texts can lead to the false conclusion of their common authorship if one ignores other important features of the individual texts. Her study leads us to the conclusion that neither the commentaries nor the so-called 'root' texts should be considered as self-contained, independent texts, but as summaries of the various textual sources that circulated either orally or in a written form.

The case studies discussed by the aforementioned contributors to the volume are some of many instances that inform us that in the context of the Buddhist literary traditions, texts have been received and reused in a variety of ways, even within a single commentarial work, language, genre, and tradition. Similarly, DiSimone's investigation of three related canonical texts — the Sanskrit *Prasādanīyasūtra*, Pāli *Sampasādanīyasutta*, and Chinese *Dīrghāgama* of the Dharmaguptaka tradition — uncovers multifarious divergences among these three texts in terms of their arrangements of the content, amendments and interpolations of the authors' and redactors' doctrinal views, which at times give rise

to contradictory readings. In DiSimone's view, the deviations among the three mentioned texts are most likely the result of the doctrinal confusions and theme-related inconsistencies on the part of their redactors. But there is also another factor that needs to be taken into consideration. The difficulty one faces in tracing the origins of divergences in interconnected texts comes from the varied nature of textual contacts themselves, which can be parallel, intersecting, or overlapping, and that can take place on multiple occasions. The same applies to determining the source of divergences among the variants of the *Avadānaśataka* examined by Formigatti. Formigatti's study of the *Avadānas* sheds light on two types of textual reuses that occurred in the transmission of this anonymous collection of Buddhist narratives — one is the reuse of narrative motifs and stylistic devices, and the other is the reuse of an entire text for the sake of creating a new one. The narratives contained in the *Avadānas*, in which the source texts are not acknowledged, illustrate the fluidity of the boundaries between the source texts, compilation, and what Formigatti calls 'semi-authorial, adapted text,' which is characteristic of this literary genre. One can say that in the genre of the popular narratives in general, which were transmitted in oral and written forms, the whole idea of the 'original text' and the notion of a single author are deeply problematic. Since the examined versions of the *Avadānaśataka* are manuscripts, there is an additional way of approaching the issue of authorship of these texts. Being written down by hand, the different manuscript variants of *Avadānas* can be seen as productions in their own right. The author's or the scribe's purposeful writing of a manuscript, in addition to his work of identifying and integrating passages into the appropriate places within the narrative, qualify as authorial engagements. Moreover, similarly to the compilation of the Buddhist legal texts discussed by Kieffer-Pülz, here too, the compilers' or editors' major reworking of the texts asserts the authority of both — of the derivative text and its source texts that are known to the educated reader.

Hackett's examination of the hermeneutical strategies in Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of Candrakīrti's *Pradīpodyotana* commentary on the *Guhyasamājantra* sheds light on the ways in which a commentarial text becomes a hybrid by integrating the words of the root text with the insertions of the commentator's explanatory remarks. Here one sees a different kind of textual hybridization from the one observed in texts discussed by several other contributors to the volume. In their case studies, hybridization is brought about by diminishing or erasing the boundaries between the authorial statements and those of others expressed in silent borrowings and unconscious types of reference. In contrast, in the *Pradīpodyotana* the root text is clearly demarcated from the commentator's words. As Hackett directs his attention to commentaries on the *Pradīpodyotana*, we observe different types of a textual reuse: one in which the commentator (Bhavyakīrti) mostly glosses the words of the root text, the other in which the commentator (Tsong kha pa) remakes the *Guhyasamājantra* in conformity with a Tibetan idealized image of this Indic tantric system, and yet the other in which the commentator (Dol po pa) mixes cited passage from the *Guhyasamājantra* with citations from other canonical texts and Indic commentaries while neglecting their original contexts. One wonders whether or not a comprehensive philological study would make it possible for the scholar to identify the diversity of voices in the type of commentary written by Bhavyakīrti, as it is possible to do so

in a *śāstric* type of commentary, in which the words of the author and cited passages are relatively easy to distinguish. In relation to Hackett's brief reference to an annotated text, one also may ask whether or not interlinear annotations that function as tissues of the text's connective structure, as well as marginal annotations that provide links to other relevant texts, which are often found in Tibetan literature, reflect a specific intertextual method? Does the annotator, who provides the reader with an epistemological assistance, become a collaborator to the author of the annotated text?

One can say in conclusion that the contributors to the volume have succeeded in demonstrating that conscious or subconscious reproductions of source texts are intimately related to a construction of the author's identity with regard to his established tradition and to the authors of the source texts who embody the authority of that tradition. They indirectly remind us that the idea of authorship and originality is culturally and historically specific, and that it is important to differentiate originality from novelty. We have seen that standards of originality in the traditional Buddhist literary world are not universally accepted and celebrated. Although the figure of the author may be important in certain instances, the idea of authorship in Buddhist literary traditions tends to be fluid. Whether known or anonymous, the authors of the texts discussed in this volume are not to be viewed as isolated figures, for they are consumers as well as creative restorers and transmitters of ideas given in their sources. Their creative dimension seen in the chain of intertextual relations is inseparable from their conscious input of references from other sources and from their broader social and historical contexts. Thus, their derivative works are not unitary, but impregnated with other texts and discourses; and just like their source texts, their derivative texts themselves are to be understood as malleable and subjected to different appropriations and absorptions into later texts. Thus, we are left with the qualm whether any text, insofar as each text is interconnected to other texts, can be ultimately regarded as a 'source text' and its author as a sole author.