

THE JOURNAL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BUDDHIST STUDIES

CO-EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Gregory Schopen
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana, USA

Roger Jackson
Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut, USA

EDITORS

Peter N. Gregory
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA

Ernst Steinkellner
University of Vienna
Wien, Austria

Alexander W. Macdonald
Université de Paris X
Nanterre, France

Jikidō Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Steven Collins
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana, USA

Robert Thurman
Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA

Volume 11

1988

Number 1

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. The Four Levels of *Pratītya-Samutpāda* According to the *Fa-hua hsüan i*, by Carl Bielefeldt 7
2. On the Possibility of a Nonexistent Object of Consciousness: Sarvāstivādin and Dārṣāntika Theories, by Collett Cox 31
3. Magical *Upāya* in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*, by Edward Hamlin 89
4. Buddhist Sanskrit in the *Kālacakra Tantra*, by John Newman 123
5. Two New Fragments of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia, by Richard Saloman and Collett Cox 141
6. Some Reflections on R.S.Y. Chi's *Buddhist Formal Logic*, by Tom J.F. Tillemans 155

II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism*, by Peter Mansfield (Charles Hallisey) 173
2. *Studies in the Buddhist Art of South Asia*, ed. A.K. Narain (Robert L. Brown) 175
3. *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (Henrik H. Sorensen) 179

- LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 185

II. REVIEWS

Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism, by Peter Masefield. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1986. xx, 187 pages.

Peter Masefield applies his broad knowledge of the Theravāda canon and commentaries to two distinct purposes in this book: first, to clarify a number of difficult or neglected concepts in Pali, and second, to present a theory about the development of Buddhism. Unfortunately, the combination of purposes detracts from the overall contribution of Masefield's labors, mainly because a weak historical thesis seems to restrict the scope of the word studies which in themselves are serious and valuable.

Masefield begins by saying that, "the sad fact is that much of the basic terminology and symbolism of the Nikāyas is still in need of detailed investigation" (p. xv). There is no denying this, and it is to Masefield's credit that he attempts to rectify what many of us deplore. He is most successful in the first chapter, "The Spiritual Division of the Buddhist World," in which he considers the distinctions between the *ariyasāvaka* and the *puṭhujjana*. Masefield has collected a number of passages which suggest that the *puṭhujjana* was indeed considered as apart from the Buddhist path (*prthak*; see the PTS dictionary, s.v. *puṭhujjana*, which says this meaning of separateness "is not felt at all in the Pali word"), and, according to his conclusions, eternally so. Masefield's discussion is quite thought-provoking, but it is regrettable that he does not consider those passages which speak of the *kalyāṇa puṭhujjana* (e.g., in *Paṭisambhidāmagga* and the *Dīgha* commentary) which seem to suggest the opposite.

Chapters Two and Three also make contributions to our understanding of Theravādin systematic thought, but they are more grab-bags of suggestion than sustained arguments. Chapter Two, "The Path," begins with the question of how "right view" can be the beginning of the eightfold path, and continues with considerations of the organization of the path according to the threefold division of *sīla*, *samādhi*, *pañña*, the idea of *Dhamma* as sound, and the concept *parato ghosa*. Chapter Three, "The Goal," takes up different schemata of the fruits of the path. Masefield, arguing that these fruits are actually discontinuous goals, questions whether they could be attained after the *parinibbāna* of the Buddha and his great disciples.

Masefield's answer is negative, and his sweeping conclusions are presented in a short (18 pages) fourth chapter in which his "historical" thesis finally becomes explicit. For Masefield, Buddhism *was* a short-lived esoteric movement. The "true *Dhamma*" lasted only "a mere seventy years," and thus the subsequent Buddhist tradition is merely the misguided product of *puthujjana* monks who, by definition, were unaware of this cataclysmic fact (pp. 162, 163).

This might work as "theological" argument, even if a very nihilistic one. As history, however, this is very poor stuff. Indeed, the requirements of good historiography are not Masefield's strong suit. He is inconsistent in his appeals to textual history, justifying his selection of texts on the grounds that they "may, for reasons of style, be said to form a literary unit" (p. xvii), while also invoking the idea that these same texts have suffered a later redaction which distorted their original message (p. 46). Masefield organizes his investigation with elastic categories like "the Nikāya period" and "the Abhidhamma period" which he never specifies temporally. He has a disconcerting tendency to make debatable links, such as his identification of Mi-la-ras-pa as "the Tibetan counterpart of *Aṅgulimāla*" (p. 92). There are problems of historical fact, such as his blunt statement that the *Vimuttimaggā* is a non-Theravādin text. And it is quite surprising that the translator of commentaries attributed to Dhammapāla could simply state that this author wrote in the late fifth century, ignoring the discussions about his date and works which have appeared in the scholarly literature.

Masefield seems to have a low opinion of his co-workers in the field of Buddhist studies (e.g., p. 54). This in itself is innocuous, but I can't help wondering whether this opinion has led Masefield to ignore generally the contributions of other scholars. While there are profuse references to Pali literature, there are remarkably few to secondary literature. In a book that seeks to overturn much of scholarly opinion (especially the conventional idea that the early Buddhist movement had a strong exoteric orientation), more detailed reaction to individual arguments would seem to be required. Moreover, Masefield is misleading about his use of his colleagues' labors. He quotes verbatim existing translations without acknowledgement (e.g., pp. 71, 73, 130, 153). This may not be uncommon these days, but it becomes a disservice because Masefield is often critical of individual translators by name.

In his preface, Masefield seems to step back from his histor-

ical thesis: "My next reading of the Nikāyas will probably cause me to rethink some of the claims made in the present work but if . . . enough has been said to stir others into realization of the need for a re-examination of the Buddhism portrayed in the Nikāyas, my efforts will have been rewarded" (p. xx.). I expect that few students of Buddhism will want to adopt the general claims of Masfield's book, but if my own experience is at all representative, it will indeed send many back to the texts for a fresh reading.

Charles Hallisey

Studies in Buddhist Art of South Asia, edited by A.K. Narain (New Delhi: Kanak Publications, 1985), 139 pp., 54 figs., US \$50.00

Studies in Buddhist Art of South Asia publishes seven papers presented at an international conference on Buddhism held at the University of Wisconsin in 1976. The essays are arranged chronologically by topic, with the first three dealing with the origin of the Buddha image and the remaining four with diverse subjects. The three essays on the early Buddha image are, I think, particularly suggestive and deserve careful reading by scholars interested in early Buddhist doctrine and art.

The first of the early Buddha-image essays, by the volume's editor A.K. Narain, proposes that the earliest anthropomorphic Buddha images occur on a coin-type of the Śaka king Maues who reigned ca. 95–75 B.C.E. in the area of the Swat Valley and Kashmir. Narain argues that the cross-legged figure on Maues' coins, although long considered but mostly rejected by scholars as a Buddha image, should be reconsidered as indeed the Buddha. He suggests that the ideological underpinnings for the creation of the anthropomorphic image came from the Sarvāstivāda school of "Hīnayāna" Buddhism and its philosophy of "realism." Narain feels the Sarvāstivādins associated themselves with the Śakas as patrons in a mutually advantageous political and economic alliance that allowed for the creation of the Buddha image. The period from the appearance of the Maues coin-type to the numerous examples of anthropomorphic images during the reign of the Kuṣāṇa king Kaniṣka some 200 years later is, according to Narain, one of experimentation. Extant Buddha images of the period are few, however, and mostly on coins,