THE JOURNAL

OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

BUDDHIST STUDIES

Volume 3 1980 *Number 2*

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

II. SHORT PAPERS

III. BOOK REVIEWS

IV. NOTES AND NEWS

practitioners who were not even capable of seeking their own welfare, let alone that of others" (p. 92). First of all, the cases of egocentric exhortations are *not* "isolated instances": at least no more isolated than the instance (*Dīgha* ii, 119) on which the author bases the claim for altruism. What is more, there are here some problems of hermeneutics. Why consider altruism as the "actual" ethical stance of the Theravāda, while considering as *upāya* statements such as "one's own goal should not be forsaken for another's no matter how great" (*Dhammapāda*, v.166—*attadatthaṁ paratthena bahuna pi na hāpaye*). No convincing reason is given for believing this (and not the converse) to be the case.

Now the points raised thus far are for the most part controversial in their own right, and my raising them is in no way meant to depreciate Dr. Aronson's extremely valuable work. It should be stressed that the strong point of the book is its general excellence as an expositive and philological work, not concerning itself with issues in the philosophy of love and compassion in any great detail. For those of us who (for better or for worse) have been bitten by the bug of *dialectica philosophica*, we can only hope that Dr. Aronson will one day honor us with a volume on the Buddhist *philosophy* of love, comparable in quality to the present, more descriptive work.

José Ignacio Cabezón

Chūkan to Yuishiki (Mādhyamika and Vijñaptimātratā) by Gadjin Nagao. Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1978, pp. x + 606 + 45.

This volume is a collection of twenty-five articles that Professor Nagao has written over the last forty years. They are divided into two sections. The first contains essays of a more general nature, while the second contains those directed to more specific topics. Also included is a general index in Japanese, Sanskrit, and Tibetan, an index of titles of *sūtras* and *śāstras*, and a listing of modern works, both in Japanese and Western languages, which have been referred to in the articles.

Although these articles were written at different times and on different themes, they evince Professor Nagao's overarching thesis of the organic relationship between Mādhyamika and Vijñaptimātratā. There has been the tendency to see Mādhyamika as the doctrine of emptiness over against Vijñaptimātratā as the teaching of being, and

thus to regard these schools as being diametrically opposed. Such an understanding of the dichotomous relationship of Mādhyamika and Vijñaptimātratā is apparent in the history of the dispute between later Mādhyamikas (such as Bhāvaviveka) and later Vijñānavādins (such as Dharmapāla), in the argumentation between the Chinese schools of *San-lun hsüeh* and *Fa-hsiang*, and in subsequent developments in both China and Japan.

Furthermore, the Tibetan tradition, which bases itself firmly upon Mādhyamika thought, tends to de-emphasize any intimate relationship of that thought with Vijñaptimātratā.

However, Professor Nagao strongly and consistently argues that Mādhyamika and Vijñaptimātratā are organically related and not in any way opposed to one another. The splitting of them into disparate, contradictory positions, he argues, is a later development, and does not represent the original lines of Mahāyāna thinking in India. Mādhyamika is understood as the immediacy of direct, religious insight, while Vijñaptimātratā is taken as an attempt to systematize doctrinally the content of that insight. The basic Mādhyamika themes are identified as the fusion of the two notions of *pratītyasamuptāda* and *śūnyatā*, and the consequent understanding of the synergistic relationship between the two truths of *paramārtha* and *saṃvṛti*. These themes are taken over by the Vijñānavādins and grounded in the dependently co-arisen nature (*paratantra-svabhāva*) of consciousness (*ālaya-pravṛtti-vijñāna*). It is within this paratantric consciousness that one's awareness can be radically re-orientated (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*) from the imagined nature (*parikalpita-svabhāva*) that would see the self and things as given external units of meaning to the awareness that all things are empty of any such imagined reality (i.e. *pariniṣpanna-svabhāva*). Thus the Mādhyamika themes of *pratītyasamutpāda* and *śūnyatā* are reworked within the context of conscious interiority, and become grounded within consciousness itself. The Vijñaptimātratā synthesis then treats the same Mādhyamika themes, but from a different point of departure.

Of special note in this regard is the first essay, "Chūkan tetsugaku no konponteki tachiba" (The Basic Standpoint of Mādhyamika Philosophy), which is more of book-length size than an essay. Professor Nagao's treatment of Mādhyamika is not from a pure Mādhyamika doctrinal position, but rather he frequently interprets Mādhyamika from Yogācāra doctrinal themes. Although he himself notes (p. VII) that some may criticize such a procedure, it is entirely consistent with his overall understanding of the relationship between these two schools. He thus follows the development of the basic Mādhyamika themes not only through Candrakīrti and Bhāvaviveka, but also through the Vijñānavādins Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Sthiramati, and Dharmapāla.

Such an understanding of the organic relationship between Mādhyamika and Vijñaptimātratā is the hallmark of Professor Nagao's thinking, and it forms an always-needed antidote for the tendency to read later sectarian diffrences back into the formative stages of Mahāyāna doctrinal development.

John Keenan

Introduction à la connaissance des hlvṅ ba[1] (μζθϑωο) *de Thailande*, by Anatole-Roger Peltier. Paris: Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. CXV, 1977. 214 pages, 3 plates.

The work published by A.-R. Peltier is an important contribution to our knowledge of Thai Buddhism.

After the stack of works written on Thailand, one might have thought that the essential had been said about this country and its inhabitants. However, A.-R. Peltier has us discover a category of monks who are at the center of a phenomenon that has profoundly affected the religious attitudes of Thais, and of whom no one until now has spoken, nor even mentioned the existence: the *hlvṅ ba*[1].

The *hlvṅ ba*[1] are Buddhist monks, living or dead, who are considered to be endowed with supernatural powers that they put to the service of living beings, and who are objects of great veneration by faithful lay-people of all social classes. This category of thaumaturge monks, which appeared shortly after World War II, and was popularized by the press, counts around 400 representatives distributed throughout the territory of Thailand, and its audience varies from the boundaries of a village to the whole country, sometimes even overflowing Thailand's borders.

The epithet *hlvṅ ba*[1] is neither a title recognized by the religious authorities nor a grade of the Buddhist hierarchy, but solely a qualifier attributed by lay-people, and by them alone. The giving of this qualifier, which neither the hierarchy nor the Minister of Cults condemn or even criticize, is not bound to any formal rule. Its attribution is only made to monks to whom lay-people attribute an exceptional degree of sanctity—acquired through the experience of the mental disciplines of *vipassanā kammaṭṭhāna* and the practice of *dhutaṅga*—and in whom they recognize the powers of a healer, aptitude in preparing a lustral water with magical virtues, the knowledge of "magical" formulae (*gāthā āgm* and *mantra*), as well as other accessory qualities that vary infinitely, and of which the most common are the possession of a "divine sight," of a "speech with marvelous power," the capacity to displace oneself from one point to another in an instant, to stop rain, etc.