

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.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Professor Robinson has filled the lacuna existing in the ideological bridge between Indian and Chinese Buddhism, though the bridge is narrow in the sense that it focusses only on the Mādhyamika. He centers his discussion on Kumārajīva's translation of the Four Treatises, i.e., *Cbung-lun*, *Sbib-erb-men-lun*, *Pai-lun*, and *Ta-cbib-tu-lun* and the writings of those who were closely associated with Kumārajīva, i.e., Hui-yüan, Seng-jui and Seng-chao. Robinson is eminently qualified since he has the necessary background in the several languages both European and Asian, and he has an eye on the philosophical.

The basic problem for Robinson is to analyze to what extent the Chinese of the early 5th century understood the Mādhyamika thought in terms of Kumārajīva's translations. The adaptation of Indian thought in China, according to him, could be viewed severally. He briefly describes Hu Shih's organic model or holistic view, Walter Liebenthal's stimulus diffusion view, and Arthur Link's cultural amalgam view. He is not completely satisfied with any of the above and thus introduces his own view which consists of three assumptions: (1) that no smallest and no largest unit of culture need be posited, (2) the degree and manner in which different individuals participate in one culture differ greatly, and (3) the persisting biases of a cultural community are transmitted chiefly through its institutions of learning. (pp. 7-8) This then is the cast with which he will activate the ideological flow from India to China.

Since the nature of extant Buddhist literature is a motley of commentaries upon commentaries, the problem of focussing on the original or the near original, the true or not so true interpretations, etc., is real and difficult to say the least. Here Robinson comes up with a novel, albeit complicated, system of viewing the whole of Mādhyamika. He states:

My system is an abstraction from the Mādhyamika systems which in turn describe the views of their Hīnayāna, Tīrthika, and Chinese opponents, which systems in turn refer to the world. Some of the texts to be described refer to the views of other Buddhists or non-Buddhists, which in turn refer to the realm of facts. Thus a description of such a Mādhyamika text is a system about a system about systems about reality. There is a series of ranks in which the present exposition is quaternary and the Mādhyamika texts are tertiary. Each system is an abstraction from its domain of reference rather than a property of it. No matter how

homologous system and meta-system may be, they are not the same system, and the distinct ranks must not be confused. (pp. 18–19)

He is cautious of further meta-systems, of comparative systems, and concludes that his work is only “one account, aiming towards validity only for the structures abstracted and at completeness only for the categories selected from the set of possible ones.” (p. 19)

With this in view, Robinson goes to Nāgārjuna, mainly by way of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, to present the doctrinal structures and the main ideas of dependent co-arising (*pratītyasamutpāda*), personality (*ātman*), and *nirvāṇa*. All of these ideas, according to Robinson, “differ somewhat in reference, but not at all in pattern.” (p. 48) He seeks out this pattern and asserts Nāgārjuna’s own use of logic. There is no violation of the traditional Western “three laws of thought” and, in fact, there is frequent use of *modus ponens* and *modus tollens*, together with quantification of different classes. (p. 54) Nāgārjuna also utilizes the tetralemma (*catuskoti*) not only to elucidate the problems of hypostatization but, according to Robinson, as a pedagogical device. (p. 55)

It seems clear that Robinson’s interpretation of the *Mādhyamika* lies heavily in understanding the logical nature manifested in Nāgārjuna’s works and the subsequent follow up in the Chinese scene. This fits very nicely with respect to the philosophical problematic and the method utilized in solving it. But whether this approach to the *Mādhyamika* is the only approach is also problematic, as Robinson I am sure would readily admit. And further, whether this approach could be transferred from the Indian to the Chinese scene without introducing other Chinese cultural matters is open to question. The logical structure is hardly seen in the Chinese interpreters as Robinson himself concludes:

“The most Indian element in Seng-chao’s writings is the logical. But he apparently learned his logical reasoning by imitating concrete examples. There is no evidence that he possessed any theoretical treatise on the art of reasoning. Under the circumstances, it was natural that even he should not have realized the full value of this new instrument of demonstration.” (pp. 160–61)

However, to be fair to Robinson, it must be said that he has taken a consistent viewpoint on the use of logical patterns and has done a good job of it.

## BOOK REVIEWS

The chapters that follow introduce first Kumārajīva, his biographical sketch, his knowledge of the Mādhyamika and his role as translator and transmitter. Then there is in turn discussions of his three principal associates, Hui-yüan, Seng-jui and Seng-chao. Among the three, Hui-yüan was least informed or knew the Mādhyamika thought since he was exposed very late in years to the system and also because of his prejudices in indigenous systems, especially Neo-Taoism. Seng-jui was young in years and learned well by working on the translations under Kumārajīva. But it was Seng-chao, according to Robinson, who was the most brilliant and original disciple of Kumārajīva who, in turn, is said to have highly commended Seng-chao for his essay on "Prajñā Has No Knowing."

The second part of the book consists of ten documents. They are translations from the *Aṣṭasāhikā* Passages That Parallel the Middle Stanzas, three works of Hui-yüan, two prefaces to Mādhyamika works by Seng-jui, and four works of Seng-chao. Some of these have been made into "Restatements" in the body of the book by Robinson because of the inherent obscurity and difficulty in comprehending the nearly literal translations. All together, they are admirable pieces of labor.

All in all, Robinson has produced a substantial work. It is at once historical, ideological and textual critique, including voluminous notes placed at the end. It should definitely find a lasting place in all graduate libraries.

KENNETH K. INADA