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although published in 1930, is still the most important publication on Paramārtha and is indispensable for any further study of his life and ideas.

J.W. de Jong.

NOTES


Diana Paul Replies:

I always enjoy taking the time to reply to reviews of my books that have grappled with the content and basis of the analysis. A well-thought-out review always leaves the reader with a clearer idea of the author’s purport and intent for writing the book. It gives a clear exposition of the substance and thesis of the book. I am sorry to say that the reader who looks at de Jong’s review will not be able to grasp the nature of my project at all. The burden on any conscientious reviewer is to pay attention to what the author does write about rather than being preoccupied with issues that the reviewer wants to raise because he or she thinks those issues are more important. It is one thing to meet on the issues and substance and to disagree or to criticize. It is quite another to read a protracted discourse that, in fact, does not acknowledge what does appear in the work. This discourse by de Jong is such a protracted one. First, the reader should note that de Jong makes note of only Chapter One (two references) and Chapter Five (three references), without discussing Chapter Two, “The Dissemination of Paramārtha’s Ideas,” Chapter Three, “Theory of Language in Yogācāra,” and Chapter Four, “Philosophy of Mind.”

My major intent was to show in simpler, readable language
and in a philosophically systematic way how Paramārtha, in his representation of Yogācāra Buddhism, thought that it was in the very nature of the structure of the mind to undergo self-analysis and eventually to be able to analyze and dissect the structures of the mind itself, assuming proper discipline and meditative training. Chapters Three and Four represent the major thrust of this intent and are entirely ignored by de Jong.

I do not plan to take each of the five examples, three of which discuss footnotes, and refute de Jong, belaboring the points on which the contents of his review are based. I think one or two examples should be sufficient to indicate that de Jong did not read my work carefully, nor did he pay close attention to detail, although on first appearance it may seem so to the reader who has not read my book.

My first example: He remarks that I claim “that all biographical data presented on the figure of Paramārtha are based upon his biography in the Hsu kao seng chuan.” The indisputable fact is that I wrote: “All biographical data presented on the figure of Paramārtha are based upon this account (HKSC), unless otherwise noted (emphasis added). At one time there were three biographies of Paramārtha . . . .” (p. 187, #31). De Jong goes on to describe what an important source Ui Hakuju’s study is, apparently implying that I do not give credit to his contribution. In the same citation given above (p. 187, #31) I clearly assert: “Ui Hakuju has analyzed Paramārtha’s biography in great detail . . . and his work is the single most important secondary source in my analysis of the HKSC.”

My second example, on a question of historical dating with regard to the translation made by Paramārtha of the Kośa: The Kośa was translated in 564 and Hui-k’ai wrote an introduction even though the translation by Paramārtha had not yet been completed (p. 194, #25). The biography of Paramārtha clearly states that Paramārtha continued to translate that same text after Hui-k’ai’s death, although he dearly missed his favorite student. Ui claims that the biography means to say that Paramārtha revised and polished an already completed text, even though the HKSC does not say that. I consider this an unsolved puzzle—that is, an alleged introduction to an incomplete translation. Ui insists that the translation was completed before Hui-k’ai’s death, choosing to disagree with the only biography available to us. Ui and de Jong have the same position. I strictly adhere on this point to the biography itself. One may, of course, be unpersuaded by my arguments and side with Ui on this point.
On translation differences, I again will be brief and discuss only one example. De Jong does not like my rendering of verse VII (p. 155) and prefers Hsüan-tsang’s Chinese translation. The text, according to Paramārtha’s rendition of this verse, does state quite clearly that the *adana-vijñāna* is eliminated absolutely in cessation-meditation, implying that the Arhat has indeed not completely attained a non-grasping, non-appropriating egolessness. This is a severe criticism made against the Arhat’s spiritual attainment and quite unusual. But Paramārtha does make that claim, although Hsüan-tsang does not.

One final comment on de Jong’s review: Unfortunately, for both the readers of the review and of my rejoinder, the framework for discussing my book was reduced to five very narrow points or footnotes that do not get to the substance and heart of my analysis of Paramārtha’s unique contributions to an extraordinary school of thought in Chinese Buddhism. The latter would be the only proper subject for an informative review of this book and would focus on the central issues I discussed. De Jong’s lengthy review apparently professes to be about the central issues but, in fact, does not show recognition of what the central issues are.

J.W. de Jong Replies:

In order not to take up too much space I will deal as briefly as possible with the remarks made by Diana Paul in her reply. Diana Paul insists that “all biographical data presented on the figure of Paramārtha are based upon this account (HSKC), unless otherwise noted” (i.e. on HKSC 2060.50.429c6–431a6). On p. 35 Diana Paul writes: “Two months later on the twelfth day, eighth month, of the second year of Kuan-t’ai (September 18, 1568), Paramārtha’s favorite disciple, Hui-k’ai, died.” This is not found in Paramārtha’s biography but in that of Hui-k’ai. However, the date mentioned here is not the twelfth day of the eighth month, but the twentieth day of the eighth month (HSKC 2060.50.431bl5). Diana Paul continues: “Paramārtha grieved deeply for him, and, with the rest of his disciples, burned candles and incense in Fa-chun’s room.” This also is not found in Paramārtha’s biography but in that of Chih-Chi (HSKC 2060.50.431cl 1–12). Then follows the sentence to which I referred in my review: “He (i.e. Paramārtha) continued to translate the *Abhidharma-kosa*.”

In her reply Diana Paul writes that “the biography of Paramārtha clearly states that Paramārtha continued to translate