

followed by a few remarks on the method of bearing this teaching in mind and on the spiritual advantages of following it.

This analysis permits us to see the *Hṛdaya* in its historical perspective. It is the *dbarṃa-cakra-pravartana-sūtra* of the new dispensation.

This is a very penetrating insight.

In this section, in connection with the texts concerned, Dr. Conze discusses the divergence between *cittāvaraṇa* and *cittālabhaṇa*, both of which are used to denote the "impeded mind." According to him, we may suppose that originally there was *cittārambaṇa*. Truly, in Nepalese Mss *āvaraṇa* is often changed into *ārambaṇa*, as Dr. Conze holds. Nevertheless, we cannot surmise its original form to be *ārambaṇa* merely on the basis of the Chinese translation and Nepalese Mss, for the Tibetan translation *sgrib-pa* is not *ārambaṇa* but *āvaraṇa*.

As is usual with Dr. Conze's work, the English translations are very good. This is especially the case with his translation of the *Saddharmapundarika*, Chapter 5, which, by referring to the Tibetan translation, is very much an improvement on the hitherto published versions.

NAGASAKI HŌJUN

*STUDIEN ZUM MAHĀPRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ (UPADEŚA) ŚĀSTRA*,  
Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München vorgelegt von Mitsuyoshi Saigusa in München 1962, Hokuseido Verlag Tokyo, 1969 239 pp.

ALTHOUGH many studies have been made on the Mādhyamika philosophy, most of them are based on the *Madhyamakakārikā* of Nāgārjuna with its commentaries by his followers, especially by Candrakīrti. Studies of another important Mādhyamika text, *Ta chib tu lun* 大智度論, are comparatively few, and insofar as those written in Western languages are concerned, there have been only two major works:

1. Lamotte, Étienne. *Le Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*. Vol. I, 1944; Vol. II, 1949, Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon [A French translation of the first 18 Chüan of the *Ta chib tu lun*].

2. Ramanan, K. Venkata. Nāgārjuna's Philosophy as Presented in the *Mabā-*

## BOOK REVIEWS

*prajñāpāramitāśāstra*. Rutland, Vermont—Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1966.

The difficulties one encounters when he tries to make a systematic study of the *Ta chib tu lun* consist not only of its bulk (100 Chüan or 700 pages in the *Taisbo Tripitaka*), but also of its being an encyclopedic commentary on the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitāsūtra*, in other words, the fact that the text itself is not written with a consistent principle but is a gathering of incoordinate pieces of information. With great pleasure, therefore, we can add to the above list Professor Saigusa's newly published work, *Studien zum Mahāprajñāpāramitā-(upadeśa) śāstra*.

The present work was originally his dissertation presented to the Ludwig-Maximilians University in Munich in 1962 for doctorate, and was published in the form of a book in 1969. For reasons, unknown to the writer, the author has not consulted several important works, e.g., the above-named book of Raman's and Richard H. Robinson's *Early Mādhyamika in India and China*, both of which were published between these two dates and which have much bearing upon the content of this book.

Neither the Sanskrit original nor the Tibetan translation of the *Ta chib tu lun* is extant. Thus, besides problems concerning its contents, there are two questions about the text itself: 1) The Sanskrit name is usually reconstructed as *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, but we have no way to confirm it. Although the word *lun* (equivalent to *śāstra*) is almost always added to Buddhist treatises in Chinese translations, it is very rare for a Sanskrit work to have the word *śāstra* at the end of its title. Professor Saigusa reconstructed the title as *Mahāprajñāpāramitā (upadeśa) śāstra* (Abbr. Mppś), but without any argument for it. If we are not able to argue for a reconstruction of the title, it is perhaps better for us to use the Chinese name itself.

2) Although Kumārajīva, the Chinese translator, ascribes the text to Nāgārjuna, we are not sure if this tradition should be accepted. Professor Saigusa omitted his argumentation about the authenticity of the Mppś, though he gives a brief account of opinions of several scholars regarding the question of its attribution (pp. 3–5). A more detailed account is given in Robinson's work pp. 35–39. Among these opinions, the arguments of Higata Ryūshō, Miyaji Kakue, and Robinson seem to be most important, and they deny, partially or wholly, the authenticity of the Mppś.

Most of the scholars who study the Mādhyamika philosophy on the basis of

the *Madhyamakakārikā* of Nāgārjuna restrict the citations of materials to works which he believes to be attributable to Nāgārjuna. For example, Robinson, after enumerating all the works which Tibetan and Chinese traditions ascribe to Nāgārjuna, says (Robinson p. 27):

The question of which of these works are not authentic attributions has not yet been wholly resolved. However, if we define Nāgārjuna as the author of the Middle Stanzas [*Madhyamakakārikā*], then there are no grounds for impeaching the authenticity of the other four works listed by Tāranātha [*Tuktisastikā*, *Sūnyatāsaptati*, *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, *Vaidalya*], as their content agrees with that of the Middle Stanzas. In addition, the *Ratnāvalī*, *Catuhstava*, *Pratītyasamutpādadbrdaya*, and *Bhava-samkrāntiśāstra* (Murti, *Buddhism*, p. 90, n. 2; p. 91, n. 4) are attested by quotations in Candrakīrti, and the *Subhillekha* was translated into Chinese twice shortly after A.D. 430, once by Guṇavarman and once by Saṅghavarman. The *Mahāyānavimśaka* may or may not be by the author of the Middle Stanzas (Murti, *Buddhism*, p. 91, n. 3; Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, pp. 199–200).

On the other hand, scholars who study the Mppś usually work with the hypothesis that Nāgārjuna is the author of the major portion of the Mppś (Saigusa p. 5) and 'postpone such arguments [as those about the problem of the attribution] to a later date' (Ramanan p. 13).

Those who have read Ramanan's work must have had the impression that the Mppś contains many important philosophical ideas which are not found in the *Madhyamakakārikā*, the *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, etc. There are some who feel with Ramanan that the basic conceptions of the *Śāstra* (=Mppś) constitute a natural continuation and development of those found in the well known works of Nāgārjuna like the *Mādhyamikakārikā* and the *Vigrahavyāvartanī* (Ramanan p. 13–14). But there are also others who do not feel so. Besides, it is possible that someone other than Nāgārjuna continued and developed the latter's thought. It would seem better that until the problem of the attribution is solved, we treat the Mppś as a different field of the Mādhyamika philosophy from that of Nāgārjuna himself. We can compare the Mppś with the *Madhyamakakārikā* and discuss the relation between them; but that is one thing and to attribute the Mppś to Nāgārjuna is another.

## BOOK REVIEWS

If a scholar postpones argumentation about the problem of the attribution and studies with a mere hypothesis that the Mppś is Nāgārjuna's work, or if he remains noncommittal to the problem, he will be inevitably confronted by self-contradiction. In his review on Lamotte's translation of the Mppś John Brough writes:

Professor Lamotte is somewhat noncommittal in his introduction on the question of the attribution. . . In a note, however, on p. 140, the identification would seem to be accepted without question, in spite of the fact that the note concerns a difference in view (admittedly minor one) between *Madhyamakakāśtra* and the Mppś. On pp. 614 and 734 further differences are noted and in the latter place Professor Lamotte appears to leave the question open. . . [Cited in Saigusa p. 4].

Professor Saigusa writes on p. 141:

Der Verfasser des Mppś hat in diesem Werk [Mppś] in weit höherem Maße als in den *Madhyamakakārikā*s die verschiedenen Lehren vom Āgama an bis zum Mahāyāna-Buddhismus seiner Zeit, vom Buddhismus bis zur damaligen allgemeinen indischen Philosophie hin berücksichtigt. . . .

And again on p. 147:

Bei Nāgārjuna und auch in den *Prajñāpāramitāsūtras* und selbstverständlich im Mppś, kommen die Begriffe Nirvāna, *mokṣa* oder *Vimukti* nicht häufig vor und wenn sie einmal auch gefunden werden, werden sie kaum im eigentlichen Sinne, nämlich in Bezug auf das höchste Ziel benützt. . . .

However, if it is a mere hypothesis that the Mppś is a work of Nāgārjuna, it seems incorrect to treat the *Madhyamakakārikā* and the Mppś as belonging to the same person, and it is not *selbstverständlich* that in the Mppś Nāgārjuna does not use the terms, *nirvāna*, *mokṣa* or *vimukti* very often.

The present book is divided into two parts. In the first part which is concerned with the structure of the Mppś, Professor Saigusa briefly introduces the author of the Mppś and the Chinese translator, Kumārajīva (§1); deals with some problems regarding the relation between the extant Mppś and its original which is said to have been much larger in bulk (§2); and presents detailed and

precise lists of the sūtras and treatises cited in the Mppś. The list proves to be very useful for scholars. A list of the works cited in the *Daśabbūmikavibhāṣā* is also appended, because the situation of the work is similar to that of the Mppś—i.e. both are commentaries on sūtras; their authenticity is doubted; Kumārajīva is their translator, etc. However, the author does not seem to draw any conclusion from this comparison.

In the introduction (§1) of the second part, the author juxtaposes the verses of salutations that appear in the beginning of each of the Mppś, *Madhyamakakārikā*, *Daśabbūmikavibhāṣā*, *Tukṭiśāstikā*, and *Vigrahavyāvartanī*. He is of the opinion that the most important topics of a treatise are summarized in the verse of salutation of the treatise. Thus, from the salutation verse of the Mppś, he derives three themes which he regards to be the central subjects of the Mppś and which at the same time form the subjects of the chapters of the second part of his book, viz., 1) the six *pāramitās*, 2) truth, 3) *Bodhisattva*.

While explaining *pratityasamutpāda* as it appears in the Mppś in p. 140, Professor Saigusa calls the causal chain of 12 members, in which one member appears or disappears after another, *idampratya-yatā*, and the interdependent relation *para-sparāpekṣā*. The latter is easy to understand. As to the former, however, since most scholars call interdependent relation *idampratya-yatā*, and not the causal chain of 12 members, the reader doubts this passage. He does not understand the meaning until he reads a previous article written by the author in Japanese and published in a Japanese journal in which the professor maintains that *idampratya-yatā* does not mean interdependence but origination from a cause. Reference to this article is made in the present work, but Professor Saigusa gives no account of its content. Since his Japanese is very difficult even to the eyes of scholars educated in Japan, the writer feels it is unlikely that many German readers will read this article, and hence, wishes the author had presented a brief account of the content in German in order to avoid misunderstanding of his interpretation referred herein. Later, on p. 159, Professor Saigusa refers to another Japanese article without giving explanation of the content.

The author devotes the first 28 pages to etymological interpretation of the Sanskrit word *pāramitā*. According to the author, the word has two different meanings: 1) having reached the other shore (*pāram + ita*); 2) perfection (*pārami + tā*). As is well known, *pāramitā* was translated into Tib. *pha rol tu pbyin pa* (p. 67 *phal rol. . .* is a misprint) and into Chi. *tao pi an* 到彼岸 or *tu pi an* 度彼岸. These

translations both mean 'having reached the other shore,' the other shore standing for emancipation.

Citing many passages from sūtras, Hinayāna as well as Mahāyāna, the author tries to defend the meaning of 'having reached the other shore' the etymology of which is condemned by modern Sanskritists. He says that Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism, has developed from the idea '*pāramitā* = having reached the other shore,' and that therefore the idea is the foundation of Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism (pp. 68-69)—the author appears to have forgotten that he is not dealing with Tibetan, and Chinese Buddhism, but Indian Buddhism. At the same time, however, the author seems to be well conscious that such an etymology is wrong, and in the next section he cites proofs for the second etymology. It is at this point that the reader becomes perplexed because it is difficult for one to know which specific etymology the author favors.

In Buddhist philosophical texts we find a number of dogmatic etymologies which, though philologically incorrect, present important philosophical ideas. For example, Candrakīrti derives the meaning 'universally covering = convention' from the word *samvṛti* (*Prasannapadā* p. 492, *samantād varanam samvṛtib*). He is wrong in etymology, but no one will try to defend him, nor to condemn him for his lack of grammatical knowledge. It simply shows that Candrakīrti was a philosopher and that he preferred philosophical significance to philological accuracy. The same thing can be said with regard to the first etymology of *pāramitā*. Ancient Buddhist philosophers loved the idea of 'having reached the other shore' and did not care for philology. Professor Saigusa need not suffer from such a dilemma!

Then, he explains the usage of the word *pāramitā* in the Mppś, in which Kumārajīva interprets the word according to the first meaning; the author suggests in §2,4 the meaning of 'having reached perfection' as the third interpretation and cites some passages supporting it.

In the rest of §2, different numbers of *pāramitās* and each of the six *pāramitās* are explained with profuse citations from various texts. In §3, the idea of truth is treated under three headings: *pratītyasam-utpāda* (dependent origination), *śūnyatā* (emptiness), and *madhyamā pratipad* (the middle way). The section on emptiness in which the author stresses that emptiness in the Mādhyamika philosophy is none other than emancipation is perhaps most fascinating in this book. In §4 which deals with the *bodhisattva*, he, after having described the development

of the idea of *bodhisattva*, explains the characteristic features of the *bodhisattva* and *mahāsattva*, the relation between the *bodhisattva* and the *buddha*, etc. in the Mppś. A large and exact list of *bodhisattvas* with proper names who appear in the Mppś is conspicuous in this chapter. As an appendix to the book, the author has prepared another list of the verses in Mppś which are identical or comparable to those in the *Madhyamakakārikā*. Higata, Lamotte, and Robinson once tried to identify citations from the *Madhyamakakārikā* in the Mppś (cf. the list in Robinson pp. 37-38). There is no doubt, however, that Professor Saigusa's list is most complete and exact.

To sum, the greatest merit of the present work is a number of lists in which materials are collected, coordinated, and arranged under important categories. No reader will fail to notice how much work has been involved in the compilation of these lists, most of which are unique and of great help for scholars of various fields of Buddhist study. The author begins each section with a brief account of the subject concerned and subsequently presents a list to support his argument and conclusion. On the other hand, however, the author sometimes neglects discussions necessary to make those lists more functional; and when the author derives no conclusion from a list the reader is left wondering as to its purpose. In spite of this writer's criticism, there is no doubt that Professor Saigusa's book is one of the most useful works yet to appear on this subject.

KAJIYAMA YUICHI

*EARLY MĀDHTAMIKA IN INDIA AND CHINA*. By Richard H. Robinson.  
The University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, Milwaukee, and London,  
1967, 347 pp.

Very few scholars have concentrated their studies on the impact and adaptation of Indian Buddhism in China. The work under review falls in this category. Other works which have enlightened our knowledge in this area are Arthur F. Wright's *Buddhism in Chinese History* and E. Zürcher's *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, but these are mainly historical in nature which carry the whole area of Buddhism and therefore fall short of any doctrinal interpretation. It is without saying that Japanese scholars on the whole, such as, Tsukamoto Zenryū, Ōchō Enichi, Nagao Gadjin, etc., have been doing extensive work in Chinese Buddhism but their works generally have not been read outside their native land.