

## BOOK REVIEWS

count is not at present available. I admit also that my delineation of the life histories and achievements of the representative figures of this lineage is sketchy; but then my book is on Chinese Madhyamaka *thought* in particular, not on Chinese Madhyamaka history in general.

Finally, Rhodes suggests that I should take "a closer look at the specific moves through which Chi-tsang sought to establish his system as the normative one for the San-lun sect" (p. 300). Judging from the biographies and writings that I have studied, Chi-tsang did not seem to have any awareness of the existence of two separate systems within the San-lun tradition, not to say to initiate moves to promote the fortunes of one at the expense of the other. I would guess that Rhodes is naively reading into the history of the San-lun tradition features pertaining to the histories of later Chinese Buddhist schools, such as those of the Ch'an School 禪宗. But my guess may be wrong. If this is the case, I would be most grateful if he would enlighten us on the subject.

Rhodes is right when he writes that my book "is far from being the definitive work on 'Madhyamaka Thought in China' " (p. 300), but it does deserve, in spite of its many imperfections, more careful and responsible treatment from reviewers.

A copy of this response has been sent to Professor Rhodes. I look forward to his replying.

### A Response by Robert F. Rhodes

I WOULD LIKE to begin by thanking the editors of *The Eastern Buddhist* for providing me with an opportunity to reply to Professor Lui's comments. Let me begin by stating that I would be the last person to insist on the absolute correctness of my views on Liu's book. It is my belief there are as many readings of a book as there are readers. Ultimately I must ask each reader of this response to decide for herself whether the views expressed in my review (and Liu's response to them) are justified, on the basis of her own reading of the book.

Having said that, let me address some of the points that Liu raises against my review. First, Liu objects to my characterization of his book as a series of self-contained units treating Seng-chao, Chi-tsang, and Chih-i. After looking over the book, I still think my characterization is valid. Liu says that he compares the views of Chi-tsang and Chih-i at crucial points, but a line or paragraph referring to Chi-tsang thrown in the midst of a relentless exposition of Chih-i's system hardly constitutes a systematic comparison of the two thinkers.

Second, concerning my position that Liu has failed to provide an adequate

discussion of Chi-tsang's historical background, once again I have found no reason to change my opinion. Liu states that he devotes a whole section to showing Chi-tsang's background. Unfortunately, these pages only rehearses Chi-tsang's standard San-lun genealogy. Unwittingly or not, Liu is here an apologist for San-lun sectarian history. There is little attempt to situate Chi-tsang's thought in the broad flow of Chinese Buddhism which feeds into his San-lun system. Moreover, Liu states that Chi-tsang was not aware of the existence of different streams of thought in the San-lun tradition. But to be more accurate, Liu should say that Chi-tsang does not mention the existence of different streams of San-lun thought in his writings (and that it is also not found in his biographies). But if Chi-tsang had wanted to present his San-lun system as the orthodox one, it is quite possible that he consciously sought to gloss over any differences between his San-lun system and that of his predecessors. The fact that no such difference is mentioned in the documents does not necessarily mean that such differences did not exist. A more critical attitude toward the text may have been useful here.

Lest it be thought that I am entirely negative about Professor Liu's book, I would like to mention once again that he provides a good outline of Chi-tsang's Madhyamika thought. Since it is the first substantial study on this thinker to be published in English, it is quite valuable. Unfortunately, as far as I can tell, the book also contains many inadequacies, some of which I have tried to point out in my review.