

BOOK REVIEWS

NAGARJUNIANA: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna. By Christian Lindtner. Indiske Studier IV. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982. pp. 327. ISBN 87-500-2385-3

In his introduction Professor Lindtner classifies treatises ascribed to Nāgārjuna into three groups: 1) Works correctly attributed, 2) Works wrongly attributed, and 3) Works which may or may not be genuine. He considers the following as genuine, classing them as Group 1: *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (MK), *Śūnyatāsaptati* (ŚS), *Vigrahavyāvartanī* (VV), *Vaidalyaprakarana* (VP), *Vyavahārasiddhi* (VS), *Yuktisastikā* (YS), *Catuhstava* (CS), *Ratnāvallī* (RĀ), *Pratītyasamutpādaśrdayakārikā* (PK), *Sūtrasamuccaya* (SS), *Bodhicittavivarana* (BV), *Suhrlekha* (SL), and *Bodhisambhāra*[ka] (BS).

The author then deals with these thirteen works one by one, stating in brief his reasons for considering them authentic, describing their contents succinctly, and analyzing their characteristics. For the ŚS, VV, VS, YS, CS and BV, the author provides his own editions of the *kārikās* in Sanskrit, Tibetan, or both. For texts which are not yet translated into Western languages he supplies his own English translations. A photographic reproduction of the Nepalese manuscript of CS with *Akārikā* in an appendix offers scholars useful material for further study of the text. BS, found in neither Sanskrit nor Tibetan, he translates from Chinese. The philological studies of these texts are followed by an excellent essay entitled "The Unity of Nāgārjuna's Thought," in which the author outlines uniform tenets of Nāgārjuna's thought as it appears in the thirteen treatises. This provides a good overview of Nāgārjuna's philosophy.

In editing these six works the author places the Sanskrit text of the *kārikās* when available on even numbered pages; beneath this the Tibetan translations are given; his English translations are juxtaposed on facing pages. Variant readings are given in footnotes. It is extremely helpful that he also adds Sanskrit fragments of the *kārikās* cited in works other than the concerned texts. Although he has taken care in comparing thoroughly the Peking and Nar-

BOOK REVIEWS

thang versions of the Tibetan texts and in choosing the best readings among them, it is regrettable that he seems not to have been able to consult the Derge and Cone versions of the Tibetan canon, which usually offer better readings.

In general the author's English translations of Nāgārjuna's works are precise. Out of the thirteen works that he attributes to Nāgārjuna, YS, ŚS, VV, VP, RĀ, SL and PK, most of which have commentaries by Nāgārjuna himself or by Candrakīrti, have already appeared in Japanese translation (*Daijō Butten*, Vol. 14, Tokyo: Chūōkōron-sha, 1975). Being unable in this brief review to present a detailed examination of all the author's translations I will instead refer to a single example. The author renders (p. 39) ŚS, *kārikā* 10 (*de med na ni phyin ci log/bzi las skyes pa'i ma rig med*): "Without these, ignorance (*avidyā*) based on these perverted views is not possible." The Tibetan words *bzi las skyes pa* can never mean "based on." They mean "produced from the four (perverted views)." He overlooks that in *kārikā* 9 Nāgārjuna talks of the "four perverted views" (permanency, self, purity and pleasure), although Nāgārjuna, denying both permanency and impermanency, etc., actually enlarges them into eight wrong views. Uryūzu Ryūshin, in his Japanese translation of the same text with Nāgārjuna's autocommentary (*Daijō Butten*, Vol. 14, p. 97), rendered the *kārikā* correctly. This points out the increasing need for Western Buddhologists to have a working knowledge of Japanese and for Japanese scholars to write more in English, the modern *lingua franca*.

The author regards the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* as "decidedly spurious." Over the years numerous studies have dealt with the question of the authenticity of this important text, and have arrived at the conclusion that it cannot be attributed *in whole* to Nāgārjuna. Arguments which find later interpolations in Kumārajīva's translation of the text do not preclude altogether the possibility that essentials contained in the text may have been written by Nāgārjuna.

The author puts the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, like the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* extant only in Kumārajīva's Chinese translation, into Group 3, with the remark that it is among "those [texts] that are perhaps authentic." He is aware I am sure that Nāgārjuna professes his faith in Buddha Amitābha in SL as well as RĀ. Readers may regret the absence of detailed arguments concerning the authorship of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* and *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, two important works that actually formed the basis of Chinese Buddhist exegetics and Pure Land Buddhist thought. The same thing could be said about SS, which, contrary to the general opinion, the author regards to be genuine.

The *Upāyahrdaya* is classified under Group 3, among "those most probably not genuine." In doing this the author seems to have depended on the misin-

THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

formation given by Ui Hakuju and Giuseppe Tucci. Not long ago I showed (*Koza Daijō-Bukkyō*, Vol. 9, Shunjū-sha, Tokyo, 1984, pp. 12-42) that in ascribing the text to a Hinayanist scholar, Ui, followed by Tucci, failed to recognize essential similarities between the text and VV, VP and MK, which at least make it possible to attribute it to Nāgārjuna or to a Mahāyānist close to him.

The author's most problematic assertion is his claim that the *Bodhicitta-vivarāṇa* (BV) is a genuine work of Nāgārjuna's. This text criticizes not just idealistic tendencies in general but the entire Yogācāra system of idealism at its most developed stage, including central theories such as *ālaya-vijñāna* (storehouse consciousness), *trisvabhāva* (three natures), and *āśrayaparivṛtti* (transformation of the ground consciousness). The appearance of the Yogācāra school is regarded almost unanimously as post-Nāgārjuna, from the fourth century at the earliest. Elsewhere (p. 180, n. 174) the author asserts that Nāgārjuna was acquainted with the *Lankāvatārasūtra*, a scripture that synthesizes Madhyamaka and Yogācāra philosophies, and which most scholars place in the fourth century. Such statements make one wonder when the author places Nāgārjuna. I was unable to find any reference to Nāgārjuna's dates in the book. If the author thinks that the *Lankāvatārasūtra* and Yogācāra idealism preceded Nāgārjuna, he should have included the arguments to support his contention, for it would seem to contradict the generally accepted opinion.

KAJIYAMA YUICHI

EXISTENTIAL AND ONTOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF TIME IN HEIDEGGER AND DŌGEN. By Steven Heine. Albany, New York: State University Press of New York, 1985, pp. ix + 202. ISBN 0-88706-000-5

Professor Steven Heine has tackled the ambitious task of advancing Western scholarship on Dōgen's philosophy of Zen by introducing Dōgen as a dialogue partner to Heidegger and so evaluating the success of Heidegger's philosophical endeavour in a "universal setting," that is, "from the perspective of comparison with an Eastern thinker" (p. 32). The conventional notion of time—as that which flows and is separate from human existence—is for Dōgen an unenlightened view produced by self-centered deliberation (p. 141); for Heidegger it is a derivative view based on the Aristotelian substance on-