The following three chapters (pp. 117–81) deal separately with the first three satipaṭṭhānas. Here and elsewhere, there is a tendency to refer to variations given in Chinese sources but ignore evidence from extant Sanskrit materials. So, for example, one list of the last four stages of mindfulness of breathing (differing from that usual in Pali sources) is given from the Chinese Saṃyukta Āgama (p. 185 n. 12), but the situation is in fact a little more complex. See Schlingloff, Dieter, Ein buddhistisches Yogalehrbuch. Textband (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), p.67f. A separate chapter is devoted to each of the various lists given in the usual treatment of the fourth satipaṭṭhāna. There is much of interest here, but criticisms can be made on some points of detail. So for example, discussing the difference between middha and thīna, Ven Anālayo rejects the explanation of middha as referring to mental factors (Vibh-a 369), arguing that in the light of A IV 85, it is ‘probable that to speak of ‘torpor’ does refer to physical torpor’ (p. 188 n. 21). I suspect, however, that the Abhidhamma commentary simply means that middha brings about a weakness of the cetasikas which activate and operate the body.

A short section in the chapter on the aggregates discusses the historical context of the teaching on anattā (p. 207ff.). Here and elsewhere the descriptions of non-Buddhist viewpoints are perhaps a little simplistic, even tendentious. In the chapter on the sense spheres, there is an excellent treatment of the frequently misunderstood fetter of ‘clinging to rules and observances’ (p. 220 n. 12). Later in the same chapter there is some discussion of the ‘perceptual process’ and a discussion of the famous instructions to Bāhiya (Ud 8). In the following chapter on the awakening factors, Ven Anālayo repeats the common claim that, ‘At S V 115 the Buddha emphatically stated that sati is always useful’ (p. 235 n. 6). In fact, it seems that what was said is more specific to the Sutta context: mindfulness is helpful in every case (sabbatthika/sabbatthaka), i.e. it is useful whether the mind is dull or over-energized and it is useful as a support for any of the other six awakening factors. (See mulaṭīkā to Vibh-a 219).

The fourteenth chapter concerns ‘Realization’ and looks briefly at whether realization is gradual or sudden as well as discussing the nature of Nibbāna. A concluding chapter tries to summarize the key aspects of satipaṭṭhāna and contextualize it in the Buddha’s teaching as a whole. It ends quite enthusiastically: ‘it is the practice of satipaṭṭhāna … that constitutes the direct path to the realization of Nibbāna, to the perfection of wisdom, to the highest possible happiness, and to unsurpassable freedom’ (p. 277). Ven. Anālayo has collected and applied a great many relevant passages from the Pali canonical and commentarial literature. This is a valuable contribution to the study of satipaṭṭhāna practice within the Theravāda tradition. It also sheds much light on how an intelligent and scholarly practitioner in present times perceives what he is doing.

L.S. Cousins, Oxford


The volume under review is the revised edition of Chang-Qing Shih’s PhD dissertation (Bristol, 1998). Despite its more general title, this work is basically a ‘textual study of Chitsang’s Erh-ti-i (The Meaning of the Two Truths)’ (p. 1).1

1. Chang-Qing Shih consistently uses the dated Wade-Giles transcription of Chinese; this review employs the standard Pinyin transcription.
Jizang (Wade-Giles: Chi-tsang, 549–623 CE), seventh patriarch of the Chinese Madhyamaka school (Sanlun), is without doubt the most important proponent of Chinese Madhyamaka after Sengzhao.

Sanlun takes its name from the *Three Treatises* it employs as its fundament: Nāgārjuna’s *Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā/Madhyamaka-śāstra* (*Zhonglun*), the pseudo- Nāgārjunian *Dvādaśā-vāra-śāstra* (*Shiermenlun*), and Āryadeva’s *Saṭa(ka)-śāstra* (*Bailun*); although Jizang sometimes counts as the founder of the *Sanlun zong* proper (as Shih also holds, p. 32 *et passim*), the school ultimately derived from Kumārajīva (Jiumoluoshi) utilising his translations of the *Three Treatises*. Sanlun uses the well-known method of the eight negations, with which Nāgārjuna begins his *Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā* in order to reject all points of view; by refuting all concepts, the philosophical-experiential objective is the ineffable realisation of emptiness. Jiumoluoshu’s student Sengzhao (348–414) was then the first important proponent of Chinese Madhyamaka. His monumental *Zhaolun* contains the first substantial indigenous Chinese contributions to Madhyamaka, including his rejection of time and the idea of the unchangingness of all phenomena or their immobility, and the non-dual quality of *prajñā* (*banruo*) as supreme gnosis without concepts and objects, but with ‘emptiness’ as point of reference.

The school flourished for the last time 200 years after Sengzhao, under the prolific Jizang. Among his works features the *Sanlun xuanyi* (*The Profound Meaning of the Three Treatises* T. 42 no. 1852, ca. 599), which is a global interpretation of the three founding scriptures of the Sanlun school; furthermore, he wrote an extensive commentary to each of the *Three Treatises* (*Sanlunshu* T. 42 nos. 1824 (ca. 608), 1825, and 1827); a general explanation of Mahāyāna from the Mādhyamaka point of view (*Dasheng xuanlun* T. 45 no. 1852, after 608).

The main focus of the Chang-Qing Shih’s study is Jizang’s earliest treatise *Erdiyi* ‘The Meaning of the two Truths’ (T. 45 no. 1854, before 599). The Chinese text is easily accessible online through the Chinese Buddhist Electronical Text Association (CBETA, www.cbeta.org/result/normal/T45/1854_001.htm).

In this treatise, Jizang expands the Nāgārjunian theory of the Two Truth (*satya-dvaya, erdi*), by introducing steps in between *samvrti-satya* (*sudi*) and *paramārtha-satya* (*diyiyi*). In the first step, one recognises reality of the phenomena on the conventional level, but assumes their non-reality on the ultimate level. In the second step, one becomes aware of Being or Non-Being on the conventional level and negates both at the ultimate level. In the third step, one either asserts or negates Being and Non-Being on the conventional level, neither confirming nor rejecting them on the ultimate level. Hence, there is ultimately no assertion or negation anymore; therefore, on the conventional level, one becomes free to accept or reject anything.

The study contains, after the Preface (pp. v–vi), a short foreword by Alex Wayman (p. xi) and one by Chang-Qing Shih’s Bristolian supervisor Paul Williams, containing a sketch on the development of Madhyamaka generally and also some personal notes (pp. xiii–xviii). It then contains: an Introduction (pp. 1–12) seven chapters dealing with sources (I, pp. 13–70) and doctrinal framework (II, pp. 71–105), the definitions of the two truths (as Shih later concludes, the term ‘two principles’ is more appropriate, III, pp. 106–49), the relationship of *sudi* and *diyiyi* (IV, pp. 150–94), the outline of Jizang’s theory in the *Erdiyi* (V, pp. 195–248), the two methods of acquisition (*jiaodi* and *yudi*, VI, pp. 249–309) and the

---

2. Read *chiao-ti* instead of *chno-ti* on p. ix.
problem of loss (VII, pp. 310–50). Then there are: a lucid conclusion providing summaries of the discussion for each chapter (pp. 351–9), an Appendix on structure of the erdi sections of the Erdiyi and Dasheng xuanlun (pp. 360–63), a useful Chinese Glossary (pp. 364–85) and a somewhat superfluous two page list (‘glossary’) of Chinese-Sanskrit equivalents (pp. 386–7).³ A very limited bibliography (pp. 388–96) and a much too short index (pp. 397–401) conclude the volume.

The book contains much valuable material, especially translated text passages (unfortunately all without the accompanying Chinese original), many of which are translated here for the first time into a Western language. Apart from Jizang’s Erdiyi and Dasheng xuanlun, there is a good number of extracts from the Sanlun in Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation, Sengzhao, and other works by Jizang himself and a few of his near contemporaries Zhiyi and Daoxuan. However, Indian or Tibetan sources are never compared⁴ and unfortunately, due to the lack of an Index locorum, all the valuable passages are not systematically accessible.

Furthermore, the study could have greatly benefited from the consultation of some essential publications including those readily available in English, such as those by Gadjin Nagao (1989), Hsueh-Li Cheng (1982, 1986), Hurvitz (1975), Yu-lan Fung (1952–53), just to name a few. Although his inclusion of Japanese scholarship is praiseworthy, important French⁵ and German contributions are most regrettably not consulted, especially Walleser’s highly relevant annotated German translation of Nāgārjuna’s Madhyamakaśāstra (Chinese version).⁶

Chang-Qing Shi’s study investigates some important questions around the position and contribution of Jizang’s work; the result is a useful collection of evidence with not many surprises, mainly regarding the extent of Jizang’s reception of Nāgārjuna and of his direct teacher Falang (507–581), who has been known mainly for his comparison of Harivarman’s hybrid Śrāvakayāna/Mahāyāna Satyasiddhi-śāstra (Chengshilun T. 32 no. 1646) with the Mādhyamika concept of śūnyatā (kong). Apart from the quite distracting all-pervading shortcomings in English grammar and stylistics,⁷ the study is not helped by the abundance of lengthy paraphrases of passages already quoted, more so as these redundancies are then presented under the pretence of critical analysis. For example, having quoted Daoxuan’s biography of Jizang, the author paraphrases the whole story again and draws ‘conclusions’ such as the following (comments in square brackets by reviewer):

‘Based on my observation, Sanlun (Three Treatises) was the main idea of Chi-tsang since he was regarded the founder of the Sanlun school [sic]. Hence, Tao-hsüan placed Sanlun before the rest of sūtras and śāstras. This indicates that Tao-hsüan probably thought that Sanlun was more important to Chi-tsang than others [sic]. But according to my study, the frequently quoted scriptural texts [sic] is the Lotus-sūtra’ (p. 30). Leaving aside other infelicities in the symptomatic passage quoted, Shi’s observation on the Lotus Sūtra is self-

³. Read san-hsing trisvabhāva on p. 386.
⁴. References to Nāgārjuna’s Mālamadhyamakakārikā are to Inada’s translation.
⁵. Especially J. May’s entry ‘Chūgan’ in Hōbōgirin (pp. 470–93), and his article ‘La philosophie bouddhique de la vacuité’ Studia Philosophica. Annuaire de la société suisse de philosophie 18 (1958).
⁶. Walleser, M. (1912). This also applies to the French edition and study of the Sanskrit original with Candrakīrti’s Prasannapadā by Louis de la Vallée Poussin (St.-Petersbourg, 1903–13).
⁷. Just to give one specimen: ‘We shall now examine Chi’tsang’s life in relation to Fa-lang’s to establish the extent of the latter’s influence on Chi’tsang’s thoughts by Fa-lang’ (p. 23).
evident from Daoxuan’s own account, in which he clearly states that Jizang preached the Lotus Sūtra more than three hundred times (quoted, p. 28).

As indicated, the presentation of the research questions and results in Shih’s study takes sometimes a surprisingly naïve form. For example, there can’t have been any serious doubt before this study that Jizang was influenced by Nāgārjuna (sic! p. 3), but how was he influenced by Nāgārjuna? Further, one of Shih’s major conclusions, namely that Jizang was greatly influenced by the work of his teacher Falang, is not quite as surprising as the author wants to make us believe. Again, the interesting question is: how was Jizang influenced by his teacher? Similarly problematic is the abundance of trivial statements presented as critical analysis like ‘Chi-tsang was the founder of the Three Treatises school (Sanlun Tsung), and his main ideas were influenced by the Three Treatises’ (p. 32).

This notwithstanding, there are some original analytical observations in Shih’s study, especially in chapters 6 and 7. Given the generally unfortunate presentation of the author’s investigation, I still can’t help wondering, whether a better form of making the material accessible would have been an annotated continuous translation of the Erdiyi and the parallel sections of the Dasheng xuanlun.

It is, however, Chang-Qing Shih’s merit to have provided scholars of Madhyamaka and especially of Sanlun with a collection of passages demonstrating among other things Nāgārjuna’s and Falang’s influence. Furthermore, his collection of textual sources provides a good base for the further study of this still often neglected Chinese Mādhyamika thinker.
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8. E.g. the most recent Encyclopedia of Buddhism, Robert Buswell (ed.) (New York: Macmillan Reference, 2004) doesn’t merit Jizang with his own lemma and refers to him insufficiently s.v. Madhyamaka school.