

THE JOURNAL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

A. K. Narain
University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

EDITORS

ERNST STEINKELLNER
WIEN

Heinz Bechert
Universität Göttingen, FRG

Leon Hurvitz
UBC, Vancouver, Canada

Lewis Lancaster
University of California, Berkeley, USA

Alexander W. MacDonald
Université de Paris X, Nanterre, France

B. J. Stavisky
WNIIR, Moscow, USSR

Alex Wayman
Columbia University, New York, USA

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Stephan Beyer
University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

Volume 4

1981

Number 1

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. The Concepts of Truth and Meaning in the Buddhist Scriptures, *by Jose I. Cabezon* 7
2. Changing the Female Body: Wise Women and the Bodhi-sattva Career in Some *Mahāratnakūṭasūtras*, *by Nancy Schuster* 24
3. *Bodhi* and *Arahattaphala*. From early Buddhism to early Mahāyāna, *by Karel Werner* 70

II. SHORT PAPERS

1. A Study on the Mādhyamika Method of Refutation and Its Influence on Buddhist Logic, *by Shohei Ichimura* 87
2. An Exceptional Group of Painted Buddha Figures at Ajanṭā, *by Anand Krishna* 96
3. Rune E. A. Johansson's Analysis of *Citta*: A Criticism, *by Arvind Sharma* 101

III. BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

1. Cross Currents in Early Buddhism, *by S. N. Dube* 108
2. Buddha's Lions—The Lives of the Eighty-Four Siddhas, *by James B. Robinson* 111

3. Tangles and Webs, <i>by Padmasiri de Silva</i>	113
4. Buddhist and Freudian Psychology, <i>by Padmasiri de Silva</i>	114
5. Buddhist-Christian Empathy, <i>by Joseph J. Spae</i>	115
6. The Religions of Tibet, <i>by Guisepppe Tucci</i>	119

IV. NOTES AND NEWS

1. A Report on the 3rd Conference of the IABS	123
2. Buddhism and Music	127
3. Presidential Address at the 2nd IABS Conference at Nalanda <i>by P. Pradhan</i>	128

Contributors	143
--------------	-----

underlying theme: the image of man as a patient, society as sick and the Buddha and Freud as physicians." (p. 3). This then is what de Silva is going on to discuss in this fascinating and original book: a comparison between the therapeutic methods of Buddhism and Freud's psychoanalysis. The Buddhist axiom: "*sabbe sattā ummattakā*" (all worldlings are deranged) shows that both systems looked upon the neurosis of mankind as a problem with which to deal, but Freud saw the solution as a rational insight into one's own condition; whereas Buddha was concerned with a man's emotions and whole being. Both systems had a dynamic quality and not a static one; however, in de Silva's view Buddhism goes further than does Freud. Freud claims that man must live with the best adaptation to the human condition that one can have and Buddhism's *arahat* professes to transcend this condition entirely.

De Silva's new book discusses and compares the following notions in the two systems: mind, unconscious, motivation, the libido versus *kamā-taṇhā*, the ego, ego instincts versus *bhava-taṇhā*, and finally the death instinct versus *vibhava-taṇhā*. The approach to these concepts is novel, detailed, and convincing. And, I would suggest that almost any reader could learn something about both Freud and early Buddhism from reading this book. De Silva is knowledgeable and a good writer as a bonus. I commend this book to your attention.

Gary W. Houston

Buddhist-Christian Empathy, by Joseph J. Spae, C.I.C.M. Chicago: The Chicago Institute of Theology and Culture, and Tokyo: Oriens Institute for Religious Research, 1980. 269 pp. (bibliography, index). U.S. \$16.00. ¥3500 (Japan).

This is an important book and a vexing book. It says so much yet it says so little. I am tempted to declaim that it was impossible to review, for I wished to haggle with the author over every other sentence, but short of writing my own book, that I cannot do. That I should wish to haggle is a mark of praise: worthless books need not be dignified by criticism. Fr. Spae is incapable of writing a worthless book.

Those who do not know Fr. Spae certainly should. He is a Belgian (hence he pronounces his name 'spah') Catholic priest of immense learning and global awareness, who has lived in Japan for over thirty years, thoroughly penetrating and lucidly expounding Japanese culture in a limpid, rhythmic English which only rarely stumbles, reminding us that it is not his mother tongue. A pupil of Lamotte, he displays many of

the features of that bionic Belgian Buddhologist. Herein he turns to what is evidently close to his heart, the dialogue between Christianity and Buddhism, a phenomenon which Arnold Toynbee felt would be recorded as the greatest event of the twentieth century (pp. 66, 223).

The book is in three parts which, having been written for different audiences at different times, do not quite gel, as Fr. Spae warns us (p. 7). Thus the elementary 2:5 follows the advanced 1:3 and 2:1; 2:7 is a superficial re-run of the insightful 1:4; and the hope that "some day the twain shall meet" (p. 70) has been realised by p. 131, "already the twain have met." Disregarding these slight flaws, the book can still be mined for much information not otherwise readily obtainable. Perhaps the most useful sections are 1:4, on the phenomenon of the young, unmarried, white American intelligensia who seek to understand Buddhism; 2:4 on Japanese Buddhist liturgies; 2:6 on D. T. Suzuki's flirtations with Christianity (which, however, fails to discuss his possible predilection for Swedenborg, whom he translated into Japanese, and who might be a source for the curious ideas quoted on p. 182); 3:1:2, "Encounter Centers throughout the World"; and 3:4, a select bibliography of a few hundred items in many languages.

The author's approach is unrepentently theological, but it is eirenically so. Christianity continued the Jewish controversy over exclusivity (e.g., *Leviticus*) versus openness (e.g., *Ruth*) by maintaining Christ as either the unique saviour (e.g., *Mark*) or the unique *focus* of a universal movement towards salvation (e.g., *John*). Exclusivity was championed above all by Calvin (and, in our own day, by Hendrik Kraemer) who decreed that even noble works done out of Christ merit God's wrath, whereas Orthodoxy, and now Catholicism's Second Vatican Council, has preferred the openness of "Logos Christology," according to which Christ is the enfleshment of the eternal ordering principle in the Godhead (the Logos), so that wherever there is order (logic) there is Christ (Logos) in some obscure form. Fr. Spae consistently adopts the stance of a Catholic Logos Christologist (Protestantism is mentioned minimally and Orthodoxy only as a comment on my own remark concerning *ekphrasis* in T'an-luan—p. 102), looking for an early-Panikkar-esque "hidden Christ of Buddhism." He claims to find an incipient God in Buddhism, since both Christians and Buddhists believe in "a common Supreme Reality" (p. 199) but regrets that "unfortunately" this belief "did not doctrinally ripen into the acceptance of an objectively absolute being" (p. 90) even though the "true self" is, for him, both God and Nirvana (p. 39). He states that Buddhism is a "monism" (p. 105 et passim), that Buddha preached a "Causeless Cause" (p. 107), and that this is so obvious it must be "taken for granted" (p. 108).

A Buddhist is taken up short by such remarks. First, they could be

turned around to give an equal and opposite polemic effect: whatever is well said (*suvacana*), we could reply, is a Buddha Word (*buddhavacana*), and Christ was a Bodhisattva-Mahāsattva. We could insist that the book be re-titled *Christian-Buddhist Empathy*, for nowhere do we find firm evidence from Fr. Spae that Buddhists see incipient Buddhas in Christianity, although this would evidently be a very Buddhist opinion.

Secondly, and far more seriously, a Buddhist must object that he does not believe in a Supreme Reality or a Causeless Cause, that he is neither a monist nor a dualist nor both nor neither, that *śūnyatā* is neither Nothingness (pp. 39, 113) nor an impersonal Absolute (p. 114 et passim), and that everyday reality is a delusion but in no sense an "illusion" (p. 114 et passim). Simply put, Christians preach an incomprehensible Ultimate Reality while Buddhists teach that Reality is ultimately incomprehensible. Between these two positions there is not even the feasibility of a bridge. They live in mutually irrelevant universes. The Buddhists in Fr. Spae's book point this non-duality out to him (e.g., p. 119), and he himself states it (p. 162) in an immediate contradiction to his own monistic remark. One has the uncomfortable feeling that the author is listening but not hearing. "Non-duality" (as Fr. Spae's friend Abe Masao has often said) is not Monism. It is a Mādhyamikan non-affirming negative.

How could such a learned man say such things? I believe that there are two interconnected reasons: linguistic and cultural. Fr. Spae's main concern is with Japanese Buddhism, which he knows best. But the Japanese language is (as Fr. Spae is at pains to demonstrate) heavy on aesthetics and light on noetics. Specifically, I would say, *aru* means both "exist" and "be at a place," and *ichi* is both "one" and "unique." This leads to a lack of interest in distinguishing sharply between a Being and something one which happens to be here, and between "one" and "only." I see this confusion (as I would call it) or non-distinction (as a Japanese would call it) going on in the English language works of D. T. Suzuki, many of which, of course, were made presentable by his American wife. *Isshin de aru*, for instance, is not (Buddhistically) "The One Mind exists" but "Only mentation is observable." This linguistic situation needs to be approached, by a Westerner, through a methodology of de-enculturalisation or historico-linguistic unpacking.

Fr. Spae's emphasis is not only on Japanese Buddhism, but chiefly on Shin and, to a lesser extent, Sōtō. It is germane to point out that these are Kamakura forms of Buddhism. A discussion of Tibetan Buddhism (except for its controversially Boulderised form of Vajradhatu) is conspicuously absent. Had there been such, we should have had a markedly different book. One need not accept *tout court* the dGe lugs pa line that Tibetans have the pure Mahāyāna to recognise that, whatever

late Indian Mahāyāna was, its nearest surviving relative is probably a Tibetan. Therein we find an elegant balance between Hinayāna, Yogācāra, Mādhyamika and Vajrayāna, arranged in an ordered series which preserves their several individualities. Chinese Buddhism took this, or something very much like it, and Sinified it into a *yin-yang/t'i-yung* cosmology in which (as witness T'ien-t'ai and Hua-yen) the edges of the Indian lineages began to blur. In Kamakura times, the Japanese compressed the galumphing Tendai Shū into the One Thing necessary. This One Thing, be it *shinjin*, *shikandaza* or *daimoku*, became the focus of the exercitant's energies, with evident practical effect, but with the attendant impossibility of *explicating* such a compressed *mārga*. The *Kyōgyōshinshō*, for instance, is not an argument, it is a testament.

Now, in order to understand what *shinjin*, etc. is all about, the Buddhologist must *culturally unwrap it* by tracing it back to its Chinese and Indo-Tibetan roots (without, of course, *identifying* it with such roots). Shinran *means* to speak of the balance of Teaching, Practice and Attainment, as the original title of his work, *Ken Jōdo Shinjitsu Kyōgyōshō Monrui* ("Proof Texts Demonstrating the True Teaching, Practice and Attainment according to Sukhāvati"), shows, but he simply *exults*, he gives us a Shin version of the Zen Shout (see esp. chapter 3—p. 323, lines 2-3 in the Nihon Shisō Daikai edition). Much as I admire Shinran (witness my own work) he does not have the precision of Tsong kha pa and his *Lam rim chen mo*. Any discussion of Buddhism *as such* must move away from the polite vagueness of Japanese aesthetics to the sharp logic of Tibetan noetics. And then, no incipient God would be found in Buddhism. Only *karuṇā* and *sūnyatā*.

Further, I am bound to say that though I was flattered to be accorded five pages of appreciative comment (pp. 99–103), I was surprised to find that I had spoken of "a rumor of God" in T'an-luan (p. 99). *Religionswissenschaftliche*, I had pointed to *structural* but not to *content* similarities between Pure Land and Theism. Fr. Spae makes me, and others like me, say more than I would wish.

My criticism has been extensive and harsh because of the importance of the book. It is the best book of its kind I have seen, it will be widely read, and it should become a classic. It tells us where we are in Christian-Buddhist dialogue. But, the topic is close to my own heart also, and I think we should know how far we still have to travel before any kind of "symbiosis, a kind of synergistic merger" (p. 233) between these two great spiritual traditions can occur.

Roger Tashi Corless.