

# A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America

J. W. DE JONG

## Chapter III

### The recent period (1943–1973)

Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. The objections raised by critics and especially by Helmer Smith (p. 50)—Brough's edition of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada (p. 57)—Editions of Sanskrit texts from Central Asia (p. 58)—Bareau's work on early Buddhism (p. 62)—Pāli studies (p. 63)—Lin Li-kouang's work on the Saddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra and the Dharmasamuccaya. Abhidharma (p. 64)—Mahāyāna studies. Conze, Lamotte, Nobel and Weller (p. 64)—Mātrceta (p. 66)—Mahāyāna philosophy (p. 66)—Buddhist epistemology (p. 68)—Tantrism (p. 69)—Lamotte's *Histoire du bouddhisme indien* (p. 69)—Tibetan Buddhism (p. 69)—Chinese Buddhism (p. 70)

By 1943 some of the greatest scholars of the preceding period had passed away: to mention only a few: Sylvain Lévi, Louis de La Vallée Poussin and Stcherbatsky. Lüders died in 1943 but his *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons* appeared posthumously and in an incomplete form only in 1954. Several scholars who had already published important work before 1943 continued their activity after that date, for instance Friedrich Weller and Ernst Waldschmidt in Germany, Étienne Lamotte in Belgium, Erich Frauwallner in Austria and Giuseppe Tucci in Italy. With the death of Stcherbatsky Buddhist studies declined in Russia and only in recent years does one observe an increasing interest in Buddhism, especially in the field of Central

# A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America

J. W. DE JONG

## Chapter III

### The recent period (1943–1973)

Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. The objections raised by critics and especially by Helmer Smith (p. 50)—Brough's edition of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada (p. 57)—Editions of Sanskrit texts from Central Asia (p. 58)—Bareau's work on early Buddhism (p. 62)—Pāli studies (p. 63)—Lin Li-kouang's work on the Saddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra and the Dharmasamuccaya. Abhidharma (p. 64)—Mahāyāna studies. Conze, Lamotte, Nobel and Weller (p. 64)—Mātrceta (p. 66)—Mahāyāna philosophy (p. 66)—Buddhist epistemology (p. 68)—Tantrism (p. 69)—Lamotte's *Histoire du bouddhisme indien* (p. 69)—Tibetan Buddhism (p. 69)—Chinese Buddhism (p. 70)

By 1943 some of the greatest scholars of the preceding period had passed away: to mention only a few: Sylvain Lévi, Louis de La Vallée Poussin and Stcherbatsky. Lüders died in 1943 but his *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons* appeared posthumously and in an incomplete form only in 1954. Several scholars who had already published important work before 1943 continued their activity after that date, for instance Friedrich Weller and Ernst Waldschmidt in Germany, Étienne Lamotte in Belgium, Erich Frauwallner in Austria and Giuseppe Tucci in Italy. With the death of Stcherbatsky Buddhist studies declined in Russia and only in recent years does one observe an increasing interest in Buddhism, especially in the field of Central

Asian archaeology.<sup>1</sup> In other countries, however, many scholars either specialized in Buddhism or devoted much of their research to Buddhism. Although the total number of specialists in this field in the West is considerably smaller than in Japan, the future of Buddhist studies looks much brighter now than it did in the first post-war years.

One of the most important contributions to Buddhist studies in recent years is undoubtedly Franklin Edgerton's monumental *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary* (New Haven 1953). Franklin Edgerton (1885–1963) embarked upon this immense task in the nineteen-thirties and a number of articles preceded the publication of his grammar and dictionary.<sup>2</sup> However, only after the publication of his work did Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit become the subject of a lively discussion. Yuyama lists nineteen reviews of Edgerton's work and several articles (by Bailey, Brough, Iwamoto, Nobel, Raghavan, Regamey and Smith) which are inspired by it.<sup>3</sup> Edgerton defended his views in several articles and reviews and also continued his work on BHS (= Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit) in several publications.<sup>4</sup> In his *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Reader* (New Haven, 1953) he applied his principles in the editing of several BHS

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Heinz Bechert, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft in den Ländern des Theravāda-Buddhismus*, I, Frankfurt am Main-Berlin, 1966, p. 138; A. N. Kotschetow, Die buddhistische Forschung in der UdSSR, *Buddhist Yearly 1967* (Halle, 1967), pp. 86–118; N.L. Zukovskaja, Sovetskaja buddologija (bibliografičeskij obzor za 1959–1969 gody), *Narody Azii i Afriki*, 1970 (6), pp. 148–156.

<sup>2</sup> The Prakrit underlying Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *BSOS*, 8, 1936, pp. 501–516; Nouns of the a-declension in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *HJAS*, 1, 1936, pp. 65–83; The meter of the Saddharmapundarikā, *Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume*, Madras, 1936, pp. 39–45; Gerunds in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *Language*, 13, 1937, pp. 107–122; The aorist in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *JAS*, 57, 1937, pp. 16–34; Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit *sambhā*, *sambhī*-(*nirmocana*), *JAS*, 57, 1937, pp. 185–188; Meter, phonology, and orthography in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *JAS*, 66, 1946, pp. 197–206; Indic Causatives in -āpayati (-āpeti, -āvai), *Language*, 22, 1946, pp. 94–102.

<sup>3</sup> Akira Yuyama, *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapundarikāsūtra*, Canberra, 1970, pp. 80–81.

<sup>4</sup> Reviews of Waldschmidt's Mahāparinirvānasūtra, Mahāvadānasūtra and Catuspariśatsūtra, *JAS*, 72, 1952, pp. 114–117; 77, 1957, pp. 227–232; *Language*, 39, 1963, pp. 489–493; of Ensink's *The questions of Rāstrapāla*, *JAS*, 73, 1953, pp. 169–170; *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit language and literature*, Banaras, 1954; Semantic notes on Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung (Festschrift Albert Debrunner)*, Bern, 1954, pp.\*

texts.<sup>5</sup> For the editing of BHS verse Edgerton's views on the metre and phonology of the gāthās are of fundamental importance. They were first attacked by Helmer Smith in *Les deux prosodies du vers bouddhique* (Lund, 1950), in which he severely criticised Edgerton's article in *J.AOS*, 66 (pp. 197–206). After the publication of Edgerton's *Grammar and Dictionary*, Smith discussed Edgerton's views in his *Analecta rhytmica* (Helsinki, 1954) and in his "En marge du vocabulaire sanskrit des bouddhistes" (*Orientalia suecana*, 2, 1953, pp. 119–128; 3, 1954, pp. 31–35; 4, 1955, pp. 109–113).<sup>6</sup> Edgerton's metrical theories were also discussed briefly by Waldschmidt (*Das Mahāvadānasūtra*, II, Berlin, 1960, pp. 59–62), by Heinz Bechert (*Bruchstücke buddhistischer Versammlungen*, I, Berlin, 1961, p. 26; *Über die "Marburger Fragmente" des Saddharmapundarīka*, Göttingen, 1972, p. 70), and by Franz Bernhard (*Udānavarga*, Göttingen, 1965, pp. 16–20). Finally, in this connection, mention must be made of Lamotte's pages on BHS in which he draws attention to the history of epigraphic mixed Sanskrit (*Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, I, Louvain, 1958, pp. 634–645).

Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit was first known as Gāthā dialect because it was characteristic for the language of the verses of Mahāyāna sūtras. Wackernagel (*Altindische Grammatik*, I, Göttingen, 1896) enumerates the publications which appeared up to 1896 (pp. xxxix–xl). Bibliographical information on the publications which appeared since 1896 is given in Renou's translation of Wackernagel's text (*Altindische Grammatik, Introduction générale*, Göttingen, 1957, pp. 81–85). Senart's edition of the Mahāvastu made it clear that the Gāthā dialect was not limited to verses. Moreover, it was found to have been used in inscriptions and in non-religious works such as the Bakshālī manuscript, a mathematical text (edited by G. R. Kaye: *The Bakshālī Manuscript*, Calcutta, 1927) and in the Bower manuscript, a medical text discovered in 1890 near Kucha (edited by A. F. R. Hoernle, *The Bower Manuscript*, Calcutta, 1893–1912). In 1886 Senart proposed therefore the name "mixed Sanskrit" (*Les*

\*129–134; The nature of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *J. Ganganatha Jha Research Institute*, 11/12.2, 1955, pp. 1–10; On editing Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *J.AOS*, 77, 1957, pp. 184–192; The Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā, *IIJ*, 5, 1961, pp. 1–18.

<sup>5</sup> For a complete bibliography of Edgerton's publications see *Language*, 40, 1964, pp. 116–123.

<sup>6</sup> For Smith's other publications on Pāli and Middle Indic metrics see *Critical Pāli Dictionary*, vol. II, fasc. I, Copenhagen, 1960, p. viii.

*inscriptions de Piyadasi*, II, Paris, 1886, p. 470). Edgerton's Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit refers only to Buddhist texts and does not include secular texts and inscriptions. The publication of Edgerton's work makes it possible to study the linguistic history of India on a much more comprehensive basis than in 1886 when Senart tried to unravel the relations between Sanskrit, mixed Sanskrit and Prakrit (*op. cit.*, pp. 447-538). Edgerton's work is in the first place descriptive. He divides the BHS in three classes according to the degree of hybridization of the language. The first class contains texts of which both the prose parts and the verses are entirely in BHS. This class consists mainly of the Mahāvastu. One must add now the parts of the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika edited by Gustav Roth and Jinananda.<sup>7</sup> The second class comprises texts of which the verses are in BHS but the prose parts contain few signs of Middle Indic phonology and morphology. However, the vocabulary is largely BHS. The third class consists of texts of which both prose and verse are Sanskritized. Only the vocabulary shows that they belong to the BHS tradition. According to Edgerton BHS tradition goes back to an early Buddhist canon, or quasi-canon, which was composed in a Middle Indic vernacular that very probably already contained dialect mixture. In his view the Prakrit underlying BHS was not an eastern dialect as had been assumed by Heinrich Lüders, who maintained that at least parts of the works of the Pāli and Sanskrit canon were translated from Old-Ardhamāgadhī. Edgerton did not have at his disposal Lüders's *Beobachtungen* and referred to Lüders's view that the original dialect of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīka was Māgadhī, solely on the ground of voc. pl. forms in *-ābo*. The *Beobachtungen* contain more evidence in support of Lüders's theory but it is certainly true that the characteristics of BHS cannot be explained exhaustively by an Old-Ardhamāgadhī canon. It is of course possible that some texts were transmitted in Old-Ardhamāgadhī but that later additions to the canon were composed in a mixture of dialects with the consequence that the older parts of the canon also were transposed into the same language. This mixture of dialects was subjected to a process of Sanskritization when BHS texts were written. Brough,<sup>8</sup> Renou<sup>9</sup> and Regamey<sup>10</sup> agree on this point

<sup>7</sup> G. Roth, *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya*. Patna, 1970; B. Jinananda, *Abhisamācārikā*. Patna, 1969.

<sup>8</sup> The Language of the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, *BSOAS*, 16, 1954, pp. 351-375.

<sup>9</sup> *Histoire de la langue sanskrite*, Paris, 1956, p. 209.

<sup>10</sup> Randbemerkungen zur Sprache und Textüberlieferung des Kāraṇḍavyūha, *Asiatica*.\*

with Edgerton, but they are not willing to accept that the prose of the works of the second class and the works belonging to the third class belong to the BHS tradition. According to them these texts were written in a Buddhist Sanskrit which contains some elements of BHS. Edgerton has rejected this opinion: "It seems to me that hybrid forms in the prose of the second class are just what hybrid forms in the verses of the same texts are: relics of genuine BHS forms which must have been much more numerous. Similarly texts of the third class. And I hold that all the works I have classified as BHS (excepting perhaps the *Jātakamāla*), and some others, do constitute, on the whole, a unified tradition" (*JAOS*, 77, 1957, pp. 189-190). In his grammar (1.40-44) Edgerton pointed out that in the case of texts such as the *Saddharmapundarika*, *Vajracchedikā* and the *Udānavarga* the Central Asian manuscripts show a more Middle Indic appearance than the Nepalese manuscripts. According to Regamey (*Asiatica*, p. 523) these texts have not been submitted to a conscious Sanskritization but copyists have corrected the texts. However, if one compares for instance Chakravarti's edition of the *Udānavarga* with the later recensions, one observes not a mechanic Sanskritization but the transposition of words, the substitution of *pādas* by newly created *pādas*, etc. This is certainly due to a deliberate attempt to re-write these verses in Sanskrit. It seems to me that it is not possible to make a unilateral decision. Some texts, written in Buddhist Sanskrit with a few BHS elements, may have directly been composed in this language but others may well be the end product of a long process of Sanskritization. It will probably be possible to arrive at a greater degree of certainty only when the available Central Asian and Gilgit manuscripts have been properly edited and accompanied by photographic facsimiles.

Another objection which has been raised against Edgerton is his use of Nepalese manuscripts. Edgerton has not himself studied any manuscripts of Buddhist texts. Scholars such as Brough, Regamey, Nobel and Waldschmidt have a long experience of studying manuscripts and are more keenly aware of the possibility of scribal errors than Edgerton. It is of course often difficult to distinguish between a genuine BHS form and a scribal error. It is perhaps methodically advisable to consider in the first place the possibility that an aberrant (from classical Sanskrit) form is a BHS form and not a scribal error.

\* *Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 514-527.

However, in his reaction to the practice of editors who have Sanskritized their texts Edgerton has sinned in the opposite direction. Edgerton admits the genuineness of 3rd plural, optative and aorist forms in *-itsu(b)* and *-etsu(b)* because they occur very often in the manuscripts of the Mahāvastu. Brough and Regamey are undoubtedly right in rejecting the evidence of the recent Nepalese manuscripts in this case. There is no doubt that Edgerton's Grammar contains many forms for which the manuscript evidence is slight and doubtful. It will be necessary to verify in each case whether the manuscript readings can be accepted as such or whether a different reading must be assumed. Let me quote one example which has been discussed by Brough. In the Lalitavistara one finds *anyatra karma sukrtāt* (37.7). In 8.9 Edgerton explains *karma* as an abl. of an *a*-stem resulting from a shortening of *-ā(r)* metri causa. In 17.13 he proposed an alternative explanation as a stem-form. Brough prefers this explanation. However, if one takes into account the context: *na ca saṃskṛte saḥāyā na mitrajñātijano ca parivārāḥ / anyatra karma sukrtād anubandhati prṣṭhato yāti*, it is obvious that *anyatra* is here not a preposition but an adverb meaning "on the contrary, only" (cf. Edgerton's Dictionary s.v. *anyatra*). The original reading must have been *anyatra karma sukrtam*. A misunderstanding of the meaning of *anyatra* has led to the transformation of *sukrtam* into *sukrtād*. Edgerton has pointed out that a syllable ending on an anusvāra before a vowel is used metri causa in order to obtain a long syllable. In his critical examination of Edgerton's view Helmer Smith prefers to speak of metrical doublets: for instance *-am*, *-ām* or *-amm* before a vowel instead of *-am*. Edgerton's assumption of lengthening and shortening of vowels because it is required by the metre has been rejected by Nobel with reference to Smith's article. Edgerton has replied (*JAO*, 77, p. 187) by stating that "Smith thought that such changes should be recognized only when there was some historic, phonological or morphological "justification" for them." I believe this does not reproduce Smith's opinion quite adequately. In *Les deux prosodies du vers bouddhique* Smith admits lengthening of a short vowel at the end of a pāda, of an initial vowel preceded by a prefix (an-ābhibhūto) and shortening of *-e* to *-i*, *-ā* to *-a*, *-am* to *-u*, *-o* to *-u*. The principal point of difference between Edgerton and Smith is that, according to Smith, Middle Indic orthography admits a short vowel before a caesura where metrically a long vowel was pronounced, for instance the fifth syllable of a triṣṭubh-jagatī, and also in other places where the metre

requires a long vowel, for instance the second syllable of a triṣṭubh-jagatī, the third syllable of the first and third pāda of a śloka. In these places manuscripts often write -o for -a. Smith maintains that one pronounced a long a and not an o. The writing of an -o is a pedantic orthography. Smith, who has a profound knowledge of Pali metres, also tried to show that there is a greater variety of metrical schemes in Middle Indic metres than in the metres of classical Sanskrit. Therefore Smith does not limit himself to stating that lengthening or shortening of vowels must be justified on historic, phonological or morphological grounds but he maintains that also metrical and rhythmical considerations have to be taken into account. Smith has made an important contribution to the study of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit metrics in his articles. It is a pity that he has not written in a more accessible form, but one has to seriously take into account his objections against Edgerton. However, one should not magnify the differences between the views of Edgerton and Smith. Much of what has been said by Edgerton is correct but his short article contains statements which are too comprehensive and which must be qualified by a series of restrictions. Edgerton's metrical theories have a great bearing on the editing of BHS texts. As Smith points out, it would be a falsification to try and reconstruct artificially a metrically correct text by transforming Sanskrit forms into hybrid forms. However, Smith does not indicate how an editor has to proceed when his manuscripts are partly written in a Middle Indic orthography and partly in a metrically correct but pedantic orthography. This does not happen only in Nepalese manuscripts but already in older manuscripts from Central Asia and Gilgit. In these circumstances, and considering the fact that in most cases there is only one Central Asian or Gilgit manuscript, it will certainly be more advisable to be conservative, i.e. to keep the manuscript readings and to correct only those which are scribal errors. In the second place it will be necessary to separate manuscripts which belong to different streams of tradition. An edition such as Kern's edition of the Saddharmapundarika which combines readings from Nepalese manuscripts with readings from the Central Asian Petrovsky fragments is neither flesh nor fish. The Saddharmapundarika is a typical example of the problems connected with the editing of manuscripts of different origin: Nepalese manuscripts and fragments from Gilgit and Central Asia. One ought to edit the fragments separately before trying to reconstruct the history of the text. Once all the fragments from



Gilgit and Central Asia have been properly edited, it will be possible to see how they relate to the text as transmitted in Nepal. Until now only some fragments from Gilgit and Central Asia have been edited. The Nepalese manuscripts were not properly edited by Nanjio and Kern, as Baruch pointed out in his *Beiträge zum Saddharmapundarikasūtra* (Leiden, 1938). Only when a substantial part of the Central Asian and Gilgit fragments of Buddhist texts has been edited will it be possible to study in far greater detail both the metrics and the grammar of BHS. For Edgerton's work the Mahāvastu is of fundamental importance. The presence of an old manuscript in Nepal and the publication of parts of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya will make it possible to re-edit the Mahāvastu and to re-examine the characteristic features of its language and metrics. Roth's edition of the Bhikṣunī-vinaya will be of great help but Jinananda's edition of the Abhisamācārikā cannot be used because the editor has failed to reproduce the manuscript readings correctly (see my review of Jinananda's edition in *IIJ*, XVI, 1974, pp. 150–152). It will also be one of the tasks of the future to study again the problem of the Prakrit underlying BHS. Dschi Hsien-lin has defended the view that the original Buddhist canon was written in Old-Ardhamāgadhī and that texts, which show the substitution of *-u* for *-am*, have been submitted to the influence of the dialect of north-western India (Bailey's Gāndhāri).<sup>11</sup> Both Edgerton and Bechert (Über die "Marburger Fragmente" des Saddharmapundarika, pp. 78–79) have shown clearly the unacceptability of Dschi's theory. Edgerton believes that BHS is based upon a Middle Indic vernacular which very probably already contained a dialect mixture. He finds no reason to question the essential dialectic unity of the BHS Prakrit. Bechert (*op. cit.* p. 76) has pointed out that the Mahāvastu and the Bhikṣunī-vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika belong to a different linguistic and stylistic tradition than other BHS texts such as the Saddharmapundarika. Undoubtedly, future research will be able to make finer linguistic and stylistic distinctions between the texts which have been named BHS by Edgerton. Brough has already made a division in nine groups which takes into account linguistic and stylistic features. However, for two reasons it will probably

<sup>11</sup> Die Verwendung des Aorists als Kriterium für Alter und Ursprung buddhistischer Texte, *NGGW*, 1949, pp. 245–301; Die Umwandlung der Endung *-am* in *-a* und *-u* im Mittelindischen, *NGGW*, 1944, pp. 121–144.

never be possible to fully explain the Middle Indic background of the different classes of BHS and Buddhist Sanskrit texts. In the first place the Middle Indic material at our disposal such as the Aśokan inscriptions and later inscriptions are not sufficient. Texts in Middle Indic languages were written down several centuries after Aśoka and do not allow conclusions as to their characteristic features in earlier periods. In the second place, BHS texts were submitted to a great deal of Sanskritization before they were written down; it is not possible to prove that they were originally composed orally in Middle Indic without any admixture of Sanskrit influence. Even in the case of Pāli, where the problems of text editing are far less than in BHS texts, it has not been possible to determine exactly which Middle Indic dialect or dialects contributed to its formation. Both for historical and linguistic reasons western India was probably the home of Pāli, but the well-known Māgadhisms in Pāli show that Pāli is not based exclusively on western dialect(s). Pāli probably found its final form in western India only after having undergone the influence of Middle Indic dialects in other parts of India.

If much more work still has to be done on BHS, the same cannot be said with regard to the only extant Buddhist text in Prakrit, the *Gāndhārī Dharma-pada* as it has been called by John Brough (London, 1962). His edition contains all fragments. Previous scholars: Senart, Lüders, Franke, Bloch, Konow and Bailey had been able to study only the parts published in 1897 and 1898. The language of the text had been called Northwestern Prakrit. Gāndhārī, the name Bailey proposed, was adopted by Brough. In 1946 Bailey showed that this language has been of great importance for the history of Buddhism in Central Asia.<sup>12</sup> Many Indian words in Khotanese, Agnean, Kuchean and other languages of Central Asia are based on Gāndhārī forms. The same language is used in the Kharoṣṭhī versions of the Aśoka inscriptions in Shahbazgari and Mansehra, later Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions,<sup>13</sup> and in the Niya documents which were edited by A. M. Boyer, E. Senart and P. S. Noble (Oxford, 1920, 1927, 1929). This language has as typical features the preservation of all three Indian sibilants, and the preservation of certain consonant groups (tr, br)

<sup>12</sup> Gāndhārī, *BSOAS*, II, 1946, pp. 764–797.

<sup>13</sup> *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, volume II, part 1: Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, with the exception of those of Aśoka. Ed. Sten Konow, Calcutta, 1929.

which have been assimilated in other Prakrits. Chinese transcriptions of Indian words in the translation of the Dirghāgama of the Dharmaguptakas are based upon a Prakrit dialect which, according to Bailey and Brough, must have been the Gāndhārī language. Undoubtedly, other Chinese translations must have been made from texts written in Gāndhārī. Only a careful study of Chinese translations will make it possible to discover which translations are based upon a Gāndhārī original. It is not possible to determine to which school the Gāndhārī Dharmapada belonged. The Sarvāstivāda school is the one most frequently mentioned in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions of northwestern India. From the publications of Central Asian manuscripts by Waldschmidt and other German scholars it is obvious that the same school was once prevalent in Central Asia. However, Brough shows that the Gāndhārī Dharmapada is different from the Sarvāstivāda tradition as preserved in the Udānavarga. Brough mentions as possibilities the Dharmaguptakas and the Kāśyapīyas which are both mentioned also in northwestern inscriptions. He carefully compares the Gāndhārī versions of the Dharmapada stanzas with those of other versions in the extensive commentary (pp. 177-282) which follows his edition of the text. This commentary is of fundamental importance for the study of many linguistic and grammatical problems in the Sanskrit, Pāli and Gāndhārī versions of the Dharmapada. Brough's work can be called without hesitation the definitive work on the subject. Further research and the discovery of new materials are not likely to cause any substantial changes in the main body of this work. K. R. Norman, an excellent specialist in Middle Indic, who has made a thorough study of Brough's work, has recently shown that only very few revisions can be suggested.<sup>14</sup>

In the last thirty years great progress has been made with the publication of the Sanskrit manuscripts that were brought back by the German Turfan expeditions. Most of the Hīnayāna fragments belong to the Sarvāstivāda school. This has been proved by comparison with Chinese translations for fragments of the Vinaya and also for an Abhidharma text, the Saṅgītiparyāya, fragments of which were published by Stache-Rosen.<sup>15</sup> Fragments of the same

<sup>14</sup> Notes on the Gāndhārī Dharmapada, *Indian Linguistics*, 32, 1971, pp. 213-220.

<sup>15</sup> Valentina Stache-Rosen, *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im ältern Buddhismus*, II. Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgītiparyāya. Berlin, 1968.

text were found by Hackin in Bamiyan in 1930.<sup>16</sup> A manuscript, brought back from Kucha by Pelliot, has been identified by Demiéville as a fragment of the *Abhidharmajñānaprasthānaśāstra*.<sup>17</sup> It is more difficult to identify sutra texts as belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school because there is no complete Chinese translation of the *Sūtrapiṭaka* of the different schools. It is moreover not always easy to determine to which school one should assign the texts which are extant in Chinese translation.<sup>18</sup> Popular in Central Asia was a group of six texts: *Daśottarasūtra*, *Śaṅgītisūtra*, *Catuspariṣatsūtra*, *Mahāvadānasūtra*, *Mahāparinirvānasūtra*. The sixth text was probably the *Ekottarasūtra*. Ernst Waldschmidt has analysed the *Mahāparinirvānasūtra* and parallel texts in *Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha* (Göttingen, 1944–1948) and has edited the Sanskrit text together with parallel passages in Pāli, Tibetan and Chinese (*Das Mahāparinirvānasūtra*, Berlin, 1950–1951). Waldschmidt has in the same way analysed and edited the *Mahāvadānasūtra* which deals with the seven Buddhas who preceded Gautama and, in particular, with Vipāśyin (*Das Mahāvadānasūtra*, Berlin, 1953–1956). The third great text analysed and edited by Waldschmidt is the *Catuspariṣatsūtra* which relates an important episode in the life of the Buddha, beginning with the invitation of the Brahmakāyikā gods to preach the doctrine and ending with the conversion of King Bimbisāra and Upatīśya and Kolita.<sup>19</sup> Waldschmidt was able also to use a manuscript from Gilgit which had been identified by Giuseppe Tucci as part of the *Samghabhedavastu* of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin. The comparison of the manuscripts from Central Asia with the Gilgit manuscript is important for the linguistic history of the text but also for the study of the relations between the Sarvāstivādin and the Mūlasarvāstivādin. If the *Catuspariṣatsūtra* is a Sarvāstivāda text, the Mūlasarvāstivādin must have incorporated great parts of it in their Vinaya, of which a considerable part has

<sup>16</sup> Sylvain Lévi, *Sur des manuscrits sanscrits provenant de Bamiyan (Afghanistan), et de Gilgit (Cachemire)*, *J.A.*, 1932, I, pp. 2 et 9–13.

<sup>17</sup> Un fragment sanskrit de l'Abhidharma des Sarvāstivādin, *J.A.*, 1961, pp. 461–475.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. J.W. de Jong, *Les Sūtrapiṭaka des Sarvāstivādin et des Mūlasarvāstivādin, Mélanges d'indianisme à la Mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris, 1968, pp. 395–402.

<sup>19</sup> Vergleichende Analyse des *Catuspariṣatsūtra*, *Festschrift Schubring*, Hamburg 1951, pp. 84–122; *Das Catuspariṣatsūtra*, Berlin, 1952, 1957, 1962.

been found in Gilgit.<sup>20</sup> Waldschmidt's editions are exemplary. His careful editions of the fragments leave no doubt about the manuscript readings, which, moreover, can be checked with the help of photomechanic reproductions of the manuscripts.<sup>21</sup>

By analysing parallel texts and publishing the Sanskrit fragments together with parallel passages, Waldschmidt has made available all the relevant material. It is a pity that, as has been observed by Nobel,<sup>22</sup> Dutt's edition of the Gilgit manuscripts is very unsatisfactory. Waldschmidt's editions have been criticised in one respect only. According to Edgerton Waldschmidt has Sanskritized many readings.<sup>23</sup> There is no doubt that the texts edited by Waldschmidt contain BHS elements. However, it is by no means sure that this has to be explained by the fact that these texts were originally composed in BHS. From a historical point of view one would expect texts such as the Mahāparinirvānasūtra to belong to the older stratum of the Buddhist canon. However, it is possible that the Sarvāstivādin began writing down their canonical texts at a much later period when the use of Sanskrit had already greatly replaced the use of Prakrit and BHS. Some Sarvāstivāda texts were originally written in BHS. This is shown by the existence of an old manuscript of the Udānavarga, found near Kucha by Pelliot, which was partly edited by Chakravarti.<sup>24</sup> It seems possible that a small number of texts of the Sarvāstivāda school were written in BHS but that later texts were written in Buddhist Sanskrit with an admixture of BHS elements. An edition of the Udānavarga which Lüders had prepared was destroyed in the war. Franz Bernhard (1931–1971) whose untimely death is a great loss for Buddhist studies, has edited the text of the Udānavarga with the help of a great number of manuscripts and

<sup>20</sup> *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. III, part 1, Srinagar, 1947; part 2, 1942; part 3, 1943; part 4, Calcutta, 1950. All edited by Nalinaksha Dutt.

<sup>21</sup> *Faksimile-Wiedergaben von Sanskrit-Handschriften aus den Berliner Turfansunden*. I, The Hague, 1963; *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfansunden*. I, Wiesbaden, 1965; II, 1968; III, 1971.

<sup>22</sup> *Udrāyana, König von Roruka*. II, Wiesbaden, 1955, p. v, note 1.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. note 4; see also Brough, *The Language of the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, *BSOAS*, 16, 1954, pp. 364–365.

<sup>24</sup> N.P. Chakravarti, *L'Udānavarga sanskrit*. Tome premier. Paris, 1930.

fragments.<sup>25</sup> The text edited by him represents the vulgata, which is much more Sanskritized than the text preserved in the manuscript mentioned above.

Many other Sanskrit fragments of the Turfan collection have been published in recent years. I mention only the edition of the Daśottarasūtra by Mittal and Schlingloff, Tripāthi's edition of the Nidānasamyukta, Härtel's edition of the Karmavācanā, Valentina Rosen's edition of fragments of the Vinayavibhaṅga of the Sarvāstivādin and of the Saṅgītisūtra, Schlingloff's edition of stotras, metrical texts and a Yoga textbook, and Weller's edition of fragments of the Buddhacarita, the Saundarananda and the Jātakamālā.<sup>26</sup> Waldschmidt has also edited a large number of fragments in a series of articles, many of which have been reprinted in a collection of his publications,<sup>27</sup> and in the *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfansunden* of which three volumes have been published with three or four still to follow.

Sanskrit fragments from the Pelliot collection in Paris have been edited by Bernard Pauly in a series of articles published in the *Journal Asiatique*.<sup>28</sup> Pauly has also given a general description of the collection of Sanskrit fragments brought back by Pelliot.<sup>29</sup> His article contains a list of the fragments that have been published prior to 1965 (pp. 116–119). These fragments also show the prevalence of the Sarvāstivādin in the region of Kucha.

We already mentioned the publication of parts of the Vinaya of the Mahā-sāṃghika. Roth's careful edition of the Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya is not only important for putting at our disposal the Indian original but also for opening up new perspectives for a renewed study of the Mahāvastu, a sixteenth century manuscript of which exists in Nepal. J. J. Jones's translation of the Mahāvastu is based upon Senart's edition and upon a comparison with parallel texts in the Pāli Tripitaka.<sup>30</sup> Some parts of the Mahāvastu have been critically studied

<sup>25</sup> *Udānavarga*, I–II, Göttingen, 1965–1968. See also L. Schmithausen, Zu den Rezensionen des Udānavargaḥ, *WZKS*, 14, 1970, pp. 47–127.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. E. Waldschmidt, *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfansunden*, I, Wiesbaden, 1965, pp. xxviii–xxxii; III, 1968, pp. 275–276.

<sup>27</sup> *Von Ceylon bis Turfan*, Göttingen, 1967.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *JA*, 1965, pp. 116–119, pp. 183–187; 1966, pp. 245–304; 1967, pp. 231–241.

<sup>29</sup> Fragments Sanskrits de Haute Asie (Mission Pelliot), *JA*, 1965, pp. 83–121.

<sup>30</sup> *The Mahāvastu* (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, XVI, XVIII, XIX), London, 1949, 1952, 1956.

by Alsdorf and T. R. Chopra.<sup>31</sup> Ernst Leumann's translation of Mahāvastu, I, pp. 1-193.12 has been published in Japan.<sup>32</sup> This was not available to Jones but he could have made use of Otto Franke's translation of Mahāvastu, I, pp. 4.15-45.16, which was published posthumously.<sup>33</sup> In *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature* (Rome, 1956) Erich Frauwallner tried to establish that the Vinayas of the different schools derive from a work called *Skandbaka*, composed in the first half of the 4th century B.C. This theory has been accepted by several scholars but was rejected by Lamotte (*Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, I, pp. 194-197).

Important work on the history of early Buddhism has been published by André Bareau (1921- ), who made a comprehensive study of the materials which have been transmitted on the Buddhist sects and on the councils.<sup>34</sup> Bareau has written a large work on the biography of the Buddha which is based upon a critical examination of the information on the life of the Buddha contained in the Sūtrapitakas, the Vinayas of the Theravādin, the Mahiśāsaka and the Dharmaguptaka, and the Sanskrit Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra and parallel texts.<sup>35</sup> Bareau's work is an important contribution to the study of the "successive states of the legend of the Buddha," to use the title of a chapter of Lamotte's book in which he distinguishes five successive states in the development of the Buddha legend.<sup>36</sup> A. Foucher's *La vie du bouddha* (Paris, 1949) is important not for a critical examination of the literary sources of the Buddha

<sup>31</sup> L. Alsdorf, Verkannte Mahāvastu-Strophen, *WZKSÖ*, XII-XIII, 1968, pp. 13-22; T.R. Chopra, *The Kula-jātaka*, Hamburg, 1966.

<sup>32</sup> *Proceedings of the Faculty of Liberal Arts & Education*, Yamanashi University, I-III, 1952, 1957, 1962. The translation of Mahāvastu II. 83.13-121.14 by Ernst Leumann and Watanabe Shōkō was published in *Indo koten kenkyū (Acta Indologica)*, I, 1970, pp. 63-108.

<sup>33</sup> Maudgalyāyanas Wanderung durch die leidvollen Welten, *Z.f.Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, 45, 1930, pp. 1-22; *Zur Erinnerung an R. Otto Franke, Königsberger Beiträge. Festschrift zum 400-jähr. Jubelfest d. Staats- und Univ. -Bibliothek zu Königsberg/Pr.* (Königsberg, 1929), pp. 115-124.

<sup>34</sup> *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule*, Saïgon, 1955; *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques*, Paris, 1955.

<sup>35</sup> *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapitaka et les Vinayapitaka anciens*, Paris, 1963, 1970, 1971.

<sup>36</sup> *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, I, Louvain, 1958, pp. 718-733.

legend but for the use of archaeological materials he had studied for many decennia.

In recent years the study of the Pāli canon has continued. In 1960 the first fascicle of the second volume of the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* was published. The cooperation of scholars from several countries promises to assure a steady progress in the publication of this monumental dictionary. The seventh fascicle, published in 1971, brings the dictionary up to the word *ugghātima* and we may expect the completion of volume two, containing the vowels *ā—o*, in the near future. In 1952 the Pali Text Society published the first fascicle of a *Pāli Tipitakam Concordance* which, on completion, will render great services to Pāli and Buddhist studies. In the field of Pāli grammar special attention has been paid to syntax by Hans Hendriksen (1913— ), who wrote a *Syntax of the infinitive verb-forms of Pāli* (Copenhagen, 1944), and by Oskar von Hinüber (1939— ), who analysed the syntax of the cases in the Vinayapiṭaka.<sup>37</sup> A grammar of Pāli according to structural principles was published in Russian by T. Ja. Elizarenkova and V. N. Toporov (*Jazyk Pali*, Moskva, 1965). The Pali Text Society continues to publish editions of texts and translations. Among the latter one must mention Miss I. B. Horner's translations of the entire Vinayapitaka and the Majjhima-nikāya which are distinguished by their precise terminology and judicious use of the commentaries.<sup>38</sup> K. R. Norman made new translations of the Thera- and Therīgāthā which, through a penetrating analysis of metrical, grammatical and philological problems, mark a great advance on Mrs. Rhys-Davids's translation.<sup>39</sup> The necessity to revise older editions of Pāli texts by taking into account Oriental editions of Pāli texts and analysing metrical problems has been clearly brought out in several studies published by Alsdorf and W. B. Bollée.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *Studien zur Kasusyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-pitaka*, München, 1968 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *IIJ*, XV, 1973, pp. 64-66).

<sup>38</sup> *The Book of Discipline*, London, 1938, 1940, 1942, 1951, 1952, 1966; *The Middle Length Sayings*, London, 1954, 1957, 1959.

<sup>39</sup> *The Elders' Verses I*, London, 1969 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *IIJ*, XIII, 1972, pp. 297-301); *The Elders' Verses II*, London, 1971.

<sup>40</sup> L. Alsdorf, *Bemerkungen zum Vessantara-Jātaka*, *WZKS*, I, 1957, pp. 1-70; *Die Āryā-Strophen des Pāli-Kanons*, Wiesbaden, 1968; *Das Jātaka vom weisen Vidura*, *WZKS*, XV, 1971, pp. 23-56; W.B. Bollée, *Kuṇāla-jātaka*, London, 1970.



One of the most important texts of later Hīnayāna is the Saddharmasmṛty-upasthānasūtra. It was studied by Lin Li-kouang (1902–1945) in his: *L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi* (Paris, 1949). Lin also prepared an edition of the Sanskrit text of the verses which had been re-arranged in 36 chapters by Avalokitasimha as a compendium of the Buddhist doctrine: the *Dharmasamuccaya*. Lin prepared the first volume for publication which appeared after his death in 1946. Volume 2 (containing chapters VI–XII) was published in 1969 and the final volume in 1973. According to Lin's calculation the incomplete Sanskrit manuscript of the Dharmasamuccaya contains 2372 verses whereas the Chinese and Tibetan versions of the Saddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra contain about 2900 verses. The verses are not very interesting in themselves, being nothing but dull variations on well-known themes, but they form a welcome addition to Buddhist literature in Sanskrit. The edition is based upon very bad copies, made by Nepalese scribes, and much effort will still be needed to solve textual problems. In the field of Abhidharma we must welcome the publication of the Sanskrit text of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* by P. Pradhan (Patna, 1967), although the critical apparatus is practically non-existent. Much more care has been given by P. S. Jaini to his edition of the work of an unknown Vaibhāṣika critic of Vasubandhu's Sautrāntika leanings: the *Abhidharmadīpa* (Patna, 1959).

In the field of Mahāyāna studies much work has been done in recent years. Our knowledge of a rather neglected group of texts, the Prajñāpāramitā texts, has been greatly enlarged by the efforts of one scholar, Edward Conze (1904– ). Since the publication of his article on the Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra in 1948 (*JRAS*, 1948, pp. 33–51) he has published a great number of books and articles, most of them dealing with Prajñāpāramitā or the Abhisamayālamkāra. He published a comprehensive survey of the Prajñāpāramitā literature, editions and translations of the Abhisamayālamkāra, the Vajracchedikā, the Aṣṭasāhasrikā, the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā, the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā, and a dictionary of Prajñāpāramitā literature.<sup>41</sup> Conze also published extensively

<sup>41</sup> *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, The Hague, 1960; *Abhisamayālamkāra*. Translation, Roma, 1954; *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Ed. & Tr., Roma, 1957; *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Tr., Calcutta, 1958 (New edition together with tr. of the Ratnagunasamcaya-gāthā: *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & its Verse Summary*, Bolinas, 1973); *Buddhist Wisdom Books. The Diamond Sutra. The Heart Sutra*, London 1958; *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, London and Madison, 1961–4; *The Gilgit Manuscript of the\**

on many other aspects of Buddhist studies, for instance: *Buddhism. Its Essence & Developments*, Oxford, 1951; *Buddhist Thought in India*, London, 1962; *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies*, Oxford, 1967. It is to be hoped that soon a complete bibliography of his writings will be published.

The greatest work ever undertaken by a Buddhist scholar in the West is undoubtedly Lamotte's translation of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra* or *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*.<sup>42</sup> The author of this work treats so many topics that it requires a scholar of great learning to do full justice to its richness. Nobody could have been more qualified than Lamotte. The notes, which take up much more space than the translation itself, constitute a treasure-house of learning in all things Buddhist unequalled in Western Buddhist studies. An extensive index becomes an ever more urgent desideratum with the publication of each new volume. The three volumes published so far bring the translation to the end of the 27th *chüan*. A further volume is required to complete the translation of the first *parivarta* (*chüan* 1-34), the most important part of the work. Let us hope that Lamotte will be able to publish a fourth volume and an index to the four volumes without being daunted by the immensity of his task.

Johannes Nobel continued his work on the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, the Sanskrit text of which he had edited in 1937. In 1944 he published the Tibetan translation, in 1950 a Tibetan-German-Sanskrit dictionary, and in 1958 a translation of I-tsing's version and the Tibetan translation of that same version.<sup>43</sup> Lamotte translated the *Vimalakīrtisūtra* from the Tibetan and Hsüan-tsang's Chinese version,<sup>44</sup> and another important text, the *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra*.<sup>45</sup>

\* *Aṣṭādaśasāhārikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Ed. & Tr., Roma, 1962; *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature*. Tokyo, 1967.

<sup>42</sup> *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, I, Louvain, 1944; II, 1949 (reviewed by P. Demiéville, *J.A.*, 1950, pp. 375-395 = *Choix d'études bouddhiques*, Leiden, 1973, pp. 470-490); III, 1970 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *Asia Major*, XVII, 1971, pp. 105-112).

<sup>43</sup> *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Die tibetischen Übersetzungen*. I. Die tibetischen Übersetzungen, Leiden, 1944; II. Wörterbuch Tibetisch-Deutsch-Sanskrit, Leiden, 1950; *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. I-tsing's chinesische Version und ihre tibetische Übersetzung*, 2 Bände, Leiden, 1958 (cf. E. Conze, *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies*, Oxford, 1967, p. 18).

<sup>44</sup> *L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti*, Louvain, 1962 (reviewed by R.H. Robinson, *IIJ*, IX, 1966, pp. 150-159).

<sup>45</sup> *La concentration de la marche héroïque*, Bruxelles, 1965 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *OLZ*, 65, 1970, cols. 72-83).

Friedrich Weller, who in 1933 and 1935 published indices of the Tibetan translation and Indian text of the Kāśyapaparivarta, continued his work on this text with translations of the four Chinese versions and the Indian text and an edition of the Mongolian version.<sup>46</sup> The Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā has been translated by J. Ensink.<sup>47</sup>

A manuscript brought back by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana and manuscript fragments from the Turfan collection in Berlin were used by D. R. Shackleton Bailey for his editions and translations of Mātṛceṭa's stotras.<sup>48</sup> Fragments of the Varnārhavarna were edited by Pauly and Schlingloff published photo-mechanic facsimiles of the fragments of Mātṛceṭa's stotras in Berlin.<sup>49</sup>

In the last thirty years much work has been done in the field of Mahāyāna philosophy. Jacques May's excellent translation of chapters II–IV, VI–IX, XI, XXIII–XXIV, XXVI–XXVII of the Prasannapadā supplements the translation of the other chapters by Stcherbatsky, Schayer, Lamotte and de Jong.<sup>50</sup> Nāgārjuna's Vighrahavyāvartanī with the author's commentary has

<sup>46</sup> *Index to the Tibetan Translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta*, Cambridge, Mass., 1933; *Index to the Indian Text of the Kāśyapaparivarta*, Cambridge, Mass., 1935; Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Tjin-Übersetzung verdeutscht, *Wis. Z. der Karl-Marx Universität Leipzig*, 13. Jg. 1964, Gesellschafts- und Sprachw. Reihe, Heft 4, pp. 771–804; Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Djin-Fassung verdeutscht *MIO*, XII, 1966, pp. 379–462; Die Sung-Fassung des Kāśyapaparivarta, *MS*, XXXV, 1966, pp. 207–361; Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Han-Fassung verdeutscht, *Buddhist Yearly 1968/69*, Halle 1970, pp. 57–221; *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta*, Heft 1. Mongolischer Text, Berlin, 1962; Heft 2. Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Textes, Berlin, 1965.

<sup>47</sup> *The Question of Rāṣṭrapāla*, Zwolle, 1952 (reviewed by D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *JRAS*, 1954, pp. 79–82; J.W. de Jong, *J.A.*, 1953, pp. 545–549).

<sup>48</sup> A Note on the Titles of Three Buddhist Stotras, *JRAS*, 1948, pp. 55–60; The Varnārhavarna Stotra of Mātṛceṭa, *BSOAS*, XIII, 1950, pp. 671–701, 810, 947–1003; *The Śatapāṭhāṅga of Mātṛceṭa*, Cambridge, 1951 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *T'oung Pao*, XLII, 1954, pp. 397–405).

<sup>49</sup> Matériaux pour une édition définitive du Varnārhavarnastotra de Mātṛceṭa, *J.A.*, 1964, pp. 197–271 (cf. J.W. de Jong, A propos du Varnārhavarnastotra de Mātṛceṭa, *IIJ*, X, 1967, pp. 181–183); Dieter Schlingloff, *Die Buddhistotras des Mātṛceṭa*. Faksimilewiedergabe der Handschriften, Berlin, 1968.

<sup>50</sup> *Candrakīrti. Prasannapadā madhyamakavṛtti*. Douze chapitres traduits du sanscrit et du tibétain, accompagnés d'une introduction, de notes et d'une édition critique de la version tibétaine, Paris, 1959 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *IIJ*, V, 1961, pp. 161–165).

been edited by E. H. Johnston and Arnold Kunst (*MCB*, 9, 1951, pp. 99–152) and translated into English by Kamaleswar Bhattacharya (*Journal of Indian Philosophy*, I, 1972, pp. 217–261). T. R. V. Murti's *Central Philosophy of Buddhism* (London, 1955) is based upon the available Sanskrit texts of the Mādhyamika school. An important review by Jacques May criticizes the Kantian bias of Murti's approach.<sup>51</sup> Friedrich Weller published a Tibetan-Sanskrit index of the Bodhicaryāvatāra in 1952–1955.<sup>52</sup>

The Chinese Buddhist canon has preserved important materials for the early history of the Yogācāra school. They were studied by P. Demiéville in a long article on the Yogācārabhūmi of Saṅgharakṣa (*BEFEO*, XLV, 1954, pp. 339–436). The publication by V. V. Gokhale (1901– ) of fragments of the Sanskrit text of Asaṅga's Abhidharmasamuccaya (*J. Bombay Br. R.A.S.*, NS 23, 1947, pp. 13–38) has led to further studies of this basic Abhidharma work of the Yogācāra school. Prahlad Pradhan reconstructed the Sanskrit text with the help of Hsüan-tsang's Chinese version and Walpola Rahula translated the entire work into French.<sup>53</sup> Paul Demiéville translated a chapter of the Bodhisattvabhūmi from the Chinese and Nalinaksha Dutt published a new edition of the text.<sup>54</sup> Alex Wayman (1921– ) published an *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961) and L. Schmithausen made a very thorough study of a small section on Nirvāṇa.<sup>55</sup> G. Tucci published Asaṅga's summary of the Vajracchedikā: the Trisatikāyāḥ prajñāpāramitāyāḥ kārikāsaptatiḥ (*Minor Buddhist Texts*, I, 1956, pp. 1–128). An excellent survey of the history and doctrines of the Yogācāra school has been given by Jacques May (*La philosophie bouddhique idéaliste, Études asiatiques*, 25, 1971, pp. 265–323).

<sup>51</sup> Kant et le Mādhyamika, *II*, 1959, pp. 102–111.

<sup>52</sup> *Tibetisch-sanskritischer Index zum Bodhicaryāvatāra*, Berlin, 1952–1955.

<sup>53</sup> Prahlad Pradhan, *Abhidharmasamuccaya of Asaṅga*, Santiniketan, 1950; Walpola Rahula, *La compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharmasamuccaya) d'Asaṅga*, Paris, 1971 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *T'oung Pao*, 59, 1973, pp. 339–346). See also L. Schmithausen, The definition of pratyakṣam in the Abhidharmasamuccayaḥ, *WZKS*, 16, 1972, pp. 153–163.

<sup>54</sup> P. Demiéville, Le chapitre de la Bodhisattvabhūmi sur la Perfection du Dhyāna, *RO*, 21, 1957, pp. 109–128 = *Choix d'études bouddhiques*, Leiden, 1973, pp. 300–319; *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, edited by Nalinaksha Dutt, Patna, 1966.

<sup>55</sup> *Der Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt in der Vimścayasamgrahāni der Yogācārabhūmi*, Wien, 1969.

The main work of the Tathāgatagarbha school, the Ratnagoṭravibhāga, has been edited by E. H. Johnston (Patna, 1950) and translated by J. Takasaki.<sup>56</sup> The doctrine of the *tathāgatagarbha* has been studied on the basis of Indian and Tibetan materials by David Seyfort Rugg.<sup>57</sup> Rugg is not the first scholar to have studied Indian Buddhist philosophy in the light of the Tibetan philosophical tradition. Obermiller, for instance, made use of works written in Tibet. However, nobody before him has studied Tibetan works on such a large scale.

Much work has been done also on the epistemological school of Buddhism, first by Frauwallner and other scholars of the Vienna school.<sup>58</sup> Hattori Masaaki translated the first chapter of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*.<sup>59</sup> As to Dharmakīrti, one must mention the texts published by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana (see Yamada Ryūjō's *Bongo butten no shobunken*, Kyōto, 1959, pp. 142-143). An excellent edition of the first chapter of the *Pramāṇavārttika* was published by Raniero Gnoli.<sup>60</sup> Tilman Vetter translated the first chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and wrote on epistemological problems in Dharmakīrti.<sup>61</sup> Frauwallner studied the order in which the works of Dharmakīrti were composed.<sup>62</sup> Ernst Steinkellner published the Tibetan text, a reconstruction of the Sanskrit text and a richly annotated translation of the *Hetubindu*. He also wrote two articles on Dharmakīrti's philosophy.<sup>63</sup> We shall refrain from mentioning publications

<sup>56</sup> *A Study on the Ratnagoṭravibhāga (Uttaratantra)*, Roma, 1966 (reviewed by J.W. de Jong, *IIJ*, XI, 1968, pp. 36-54). See also L. Schmithausen, *Philologische Bemerkungen zum Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, *WZKS*, 15, 1971, pp. 123-177.

<sup>57</sup> *La Théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra*, Paris, 1969 (reviewed by M. Hattori, *J. of Indian Philosophy*, 2, 1972, pp. 53-64).

<sup>58</sup> E. Frauwallner, *Dignāga, sein Werk und seine Entwicklung*, *WZKSO*, 3, 1959, pp. 83-164; *Materialien zur ältesten Erkenntnislehre der Karmamīmāṃsā*, Wien, 1968, pp. 62-106.

<sup>59</sup> *Dignāga. On Perception*, Cambridge, Mass., 1968.

<sup>60</sup> *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti*. The first chapter with an autocommentary, Roma, 1960.

<sup>61</sup> Tilman Vetter, *Erkenntnisprobleme bei Dharmakīrti*, Wien, 1964; *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya*. 1. Kapitel: Pratyakṣam, Wien, 1966.

<sup>62</sup> Die Reihenfolge und Entstehung der Werke Dharmakīrti's, *Asiatica*, 1954, pp. 142-154.

<sup>63</sup> *Dharmakīrti's Hetubindu*. 2 Teile, Wien, 1967; Die Entwicklung des kṣāṇikatvānumānam bei Dharmakīrti, *WZKSO*, 12-13, 1968, pp. 361-377; Wirklichkeit und Begriff bei Dharmakīrti, *WZKS*, 15, 1971, pp. 179-211.

relating to later philosophers such as Devendrabuddhi, Dharmottara, Arcata, Jitāri, Durvekamiśra, Ratnākīrti, Jñānaśrī, Ratnākaraśānti and Mokṣakara-gupta. The publications which appeared up to 1965 are listed in Karl H. Potter's *Bibliography of Indian Philosophies* (Delhi, 1970). More recent publications are enumerated in a supplement (*J. of Indian Philosophy*, 2, 1972, pp. 65–112).

Tantrism is still the most neglected branch of Buddhist studies. Tucci's *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* (Roma, 1949) contains much information on Indian and Tibetan Tantrism. David Snellgrove (1920– ) published an excellent edition and translation of the Hevajratantra (London, 1959) and Ariane Macdonald has made good use of Tibetan sources in her study of the second chapter of the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa: *Le Maṇḍala du Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Paris, 1962).

In the last thirty years only one comprehensive work on Indian Buddhism was published: Lamotte's *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, I (Louvain, 1958) to which we have already referred several times. This work gives evidence of Lamotte's great knowledge of the Buddhist scriptures and their historical background. Lamotte has been successful in analysing the historical and geographical factors which determined the history of Buddhism from its beginning to the end of the first century A.D. His work will for many years be the basic work on the history of Buddhism during this period.

To end this rapid survey of the research accomplished during the last thirty years, a few words must be said on Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism, because Indian Buddhism cannot be studied without knowledge of its developments in Tibet and China. It is not necessary to dwell in detail upon the great contributions made by Tucci in this field. A complete bibliography of his writings from 1911 to 1970 (*Opera minora*, I, Roma, 1971, pp. xi–xxiv) shows how much he has done. Herbert V. Guenther (1917– ) has made notable contributions to the study of Tibetan philosophy, although his interpretations are not always acceptable. His main works are: *sGam-po-pa. Jewel Ornament of Liberation* (London, 1959); *The Life and Teaching of Naropa* (Oxford, 1963); *Treasures on the Tibetan Middle Way* (Leiden, 1966); *The Royal Song of Saraha* (Seattle, 1969); *Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice* (London, 1972); *The Tantric View of Life* (Berkeley / London, 1972). Lessing and Wayman published a translation of *Mkhas-grub rje's Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras* (The

## THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

Hague, 1968), which is a systematic survey of Tantrism by one of Tsonkha-pa's main pupils (1385–1438).

In the field of Chinese Buddhist studies the leading scholar is Demiéville. His work on the Council of Lhasa is of great importance for the history of Buddhism in India, Tibet and China.<sup>64</sup> Many of Demiéville's articles on Buddhism were published recently in *Choix d'études bouddhiques* (Leiden, 1973), which also contains a bibliography of his publications. To this must be added his translation and study of the ninth century Ch'an master Lin-chi: *Entretiens de Lin-tsi* (Paris, 1972). Other contributions by Demiéville to Buddhist studies are found in *Choix d'études sinologiques* (Leiden, 1973). Erik Zürcher (1928– ) wrote a comprehensive study of the early period of Chinese Buddhism from its beginnings in the first century to the early fifth century: *The Buddhist Conquest of China* (Leiden, 1959). A reprint with additions and corrections was published recently (Leiden, 1972). Kenneth Ch'en wrote the first history of Buddhism in China in a Western language: *Buddhism in China. A Historical Survey* (Princeton, 1963). In a compact article Demiéville sketched the main lines of development of Chinese Buddhism.<sup>65</sup> His article gives a select bibliography of the most important publications in Western languages on Chinese Buddhism.

## CHAPTER IV

### Future perspectives

Buddhist studies in Japan. Lack of bibliographical and critical information (p. 72)  
—Critical editions of Chinese Buddhist texts (p. 74)—Study of the terminology, vocabulary and style of Chinese Buddhist texts and its importance

<sup>64</sup> *Le concile de Lhasa. Une controverse sur le quietisme entre bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle de l'ère chrétienne*, Paris, 1952. See also G. Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, II, Roma, 1958; III, Roma, 1971.

<sup>65</sup> Le bouddhisme chinois, *Encyclopédie de la Pléiade, Histoire des Religions*, t. I, Paris, 1970, pp. 1249–1319 = *Choix d'études bouddhiques* (Leiden, 1973), pp. 365–435.

## BUDDHIST STUDIES IN THE WEST

for the history of Buddhism in India and China (p. 76)—Chinese-Sanskrit indices (p. 78)—Translations of Pāli and Sanskrit texts (p. 79)—Lamotte's translation of the Daichidoron (p. 80)—Critical translations of Chinese Buddhist texts (p. 80)—How to translate original Chinese Buddhist texts (p. 80)—The study of Buddhism seen in a larger context (p. 81)

It is not my intention to speculate about the future of Buddhist studies. Nobody can foresee at present in which direction Buddhist studies will develop in the years to come. Much will depend on the conditions which will prevail in the universities in which most of the research is undertaken. Even more important, perhaps, is the human factor. Will Buddhist studies be able to continue to attract capable young scholars to engage in a field of study which promises little material gain and which to many seems of no relevance in the world of today?

There seems little point in trying to answer these questions. However, it is not impossible to offer some reflections on the tasks which lie ahead of us. In the preceding pages we have tried to sketch briefly some aspects of Buddhist studies in the West. In order to arrive at a more complete picture of the state of Buddhist studies at present, it would be necessary to study the results obtained by Japanese scholars since the beginning of the Meiji period when the first Japanese scholars went to Europe to study Buddhist Sanskrit texts. It would be presumptuous on my part to try to do this. Much more work has been done in Japan by Japanese scholars in the last hundred years than by Western scholars. Moreover, even the best libraries in the West contain only a small fraction of the Japanese publications on Buddhism. It is very difficult for a scholar in the West to know what is being published in Japan. This brings me to the first point I would like to discuss. In the past Western scholars have made little use of Japanese publications, whereas many Japanese scholars are very well informed about the research which is being undertaken in the West. In the first place, this is due to the fact that few Western scholars know Japanese. Most Western scholars begin by studying Sanskrit and Pāli and acquire later sufficient knowledge of Tibetan and Chinese to read Tibetan and Chinese texts translated from Sanskrit or other Indian originals. Their knowledge of Chinese enables them to make use of Japanese dictionaries such as Mochizuki's *Bukkyō daijiten* and Akanuma's *Dictionary of Proper Names*, etc.,



but this knowledge is not sufficient for reading Japanese books and articles. In the second place, in the West Buddhist studies are more orientated towards philological and grammatical problems. The West has been nurtured in a long tradition of editing, translating and analysing Latin and Greek texts. The methods developed by classical scholars have been applied to the study of Sanskrit and Pāli texts. In Japan the Chinese Buddhist canon has for many centuries been the basic source for the study of Buddhism. This canon has been printed many times in China and Japan since the 10th century and for this reason Japanese Buddhist scholars in the past were not obliged to study and edit manuscripts in the same way as Western scholars had to edit manuscripts in Latin and Greek, to study the grammar of these languages, etc. When Western scholars began a serious study of Buddhist texts, their first task was the editing and translation of Sanskrit and Pāli texts and the study of Sanskrit and Pāli grammar.

It is not surprising, in view of the different traditions in which Western and Japanese scholars have been educated, that Buddhist studies have developed in different directions in the West and in Japan. However, it will certainly be to the detriment of Buddhist studies in the West, if Western scholars remain largely ignorant of the work done by their Japanese colleagues. It will always be a difficult task for Western scholars to learn enough Japanese to read Japanese publications, but this is an obstacle which must be overcome. Western Sinologists are very well aware of the importance of the work of Japanese scholars and nowadays most Western Sinologists make good use of Japanese studies. It is undoubtedly necessary for Western Buddhist scholars to follow the example of the Sinologists. Even though a Western scholar has to spend many years to acquire a good knowledge of Sanskrit, Pāli, Tibetan and Chinese, it will not be impossible for him to learn enough Japanese to enable him to read Japanese publications. However, once a scholar has learned enough Japanese, he is faced with a great practical problem. Each year Japanese scholars publish not only many books, some of which run to 600 or more pages, but also numerous articles in hundreds of periodicals. A Japanese scholar can go to his university library and find out which articles are important for his research. In the West this is out of the question. Even in the richest universities the Western specialist in Buddhist studies can make only a modest claim on the financial resources of the library for the purchase of publications in

his field of research. He has to be very selective in advising the library with regard to the purchase of books and the subscription to periodicals. In the second place, a Western scholar whose knowledge of Japanese will always be limited will not be able to make a rapid selection of the books and articles which are most useful for his research. Scholarly advice from his Japanese colleagues will be of great help to him. He would be greatly assisted by bibliographies which are both analytical, critical and systematic. The only Western bibliography which took into account Japanese publications, the *Bibliographie bouddhique*, has ceased to appear and there seems at present no prospect for its revival. Japanese scholars have done excellent work in publishing systematic bibliographies of articles on Buddhism such as the bibliographies published by the Ryūkyō University, but no information is given on the contents or on the scholarly value of the articles. Annual bibliographies like those published by the Jimbun Kagaku Kenkyūsho in Kyōto and Tōhō Gakkai in Tōkyō are useful, but they are not an answer to the requirements of Western specialists. In the first place there is a need for systematic and critical surveys of the work done in the different branches of Buddhist studies in the last fifty years or so. One would like to suggest that a group of leading Japanese scholars plan a series of bibliographical surveys relating to such topics as Early Buddhism, the schools of Hīnayāna Buddhism, Early Mahāyāna, Madhyama, Yogācāra, etc. These surveys should not limit themselves to an enumeration of titles of books and articles, but critically analyse the contents of the most important of them, so that it will be possible to learn not only what has been done and achieved but also what still has to be done. Once a series of such bibliographical surveys has been published, it would be possible to publish regularly surveys of the current research, adding, insofar as possible, also information on the research projects which are being undertaken by individual scholars or by institutes and universities. It will be necessary to indicate exactly the page numbers of books and articles and the date and place of publication, indications which are not always given in Japanese bibliographies. It would certainly be difficult to expect that such surveys would be published in English, but this is not necessary, although it would be helpful for librarians in Western universities. However, if published in Japanese, it would both be easier for Japanese scholars and also cheaper to produce.

At the same time such bibliographical surveys would be useful for young Japanese scholars.

It may seem that this proposal is only meant to assist Western scholars in finding their way in the overwhelming mass of Japanese publications and therefore of less interest to Japanese scholars. However, such systematic bibliographical information will not only also be useful to Japanese scholars, but it will help in bringing about a greater exchange of ideas and methods between Western and Japanese scholars to the benefit of both of them. If Western scholars will make greater use of Japanese publications and will react to them, it will be of use to Japanese scholars. It is exactly because Japanese and Western scholars have been brought up in different worlds, that an exchange of opinions will be fruitful. For instance, Japanese scholars will be able to learn from the philological methods developed in the West, whereas Western scholars have much to learn from Japanese scholarship in the study of Chinese Buddhist texts which have been closely scrutinized by Japanese scholars for many centuries. The number of Buddhist scholars in the West is limited and will probably always be limited. Most of them are working more or less in isolation, because there are very few universities in which one will find more than one or two specialists in this field. Moreover, Western scholars are scattered over many countries and write in several languages. It is difficult for them to cooperate in research projects. Nevertheless, some important publications have been realised by international co-operation: The Pali Text Society, the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, and the *Bibliographie bouddhique*. At present the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* is one of the most important undertakings in this respect. Japanese scholars have produced lasting achievements through co-operation. One must be extremely grateful to the great energy of Takakusu for having organized the publication of such epoch-making works as the *Taishō Daizōkyō*, the *Nanden Daizōkyō* and the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō*. Thanks to the tireless energy of Miyamoto Shōson, the *Index of the Taishō Daizōkyō* is at present being published at regular intervals.

The fact that Japanese scholars in the past have been able to produce such collective works of lasting value to Buddhist studies and continue to do so at present, justifies the hope that it will be possible to organise other projects of similar scope. The *Taishō Daizōkyō* was published fifty years ago and is still the basis for serious study of the Chinese Buddhist canon. However, the

editors have not been able to make full use of all the existing materials. Moreover, although many variant readings are given in the foot-notes, the *Taisbō Daizōkyō* cannot be said to be a truly critical edition of the Chinese texts. It is one of the traditions of Western scholarship that the study of philosophical, religious and historical problems in ancient Rome and Greece must be based in the first place on a sound philological basis. The same applies to the study of Buddhism which has produced such an enormous literature in many languages. One may expect that the publication of Sanskrit manuscripts will continue both in the West and in Japan. A critical study of the Chinese Buddhist texts can only be undertaken in Japan by Japanese scholars. It will be necessary to collect systematically the printed editions of the Chinese canon. Some of them, for instance the very important Chi-sha (積砂) edition, had not even been discovered when the *Taisbō Daizōkyō* was being published. Furthermore many old manuscripts are still preserved in Japanese temples and libraries. Last but not least the Tun-huang manuscripts have now become more accessible since many collections have been catalogued. The fact that at present many more manuscripts are available is of great importance for the study of the transmission of the Chinese texts. In ancient manuscripts many characters were written in a way different from the present and this accounts for confusion between characters and for scribal errors which have been perpetuated in the printed editions. Just as editors of Sanskrit manuscripts have to pay careful attention to the script in which a manuscript is written and to the errors the scribe may have committed in copying a manuscript written in a different script in order to establish a correct text, in the same way the editor of Chinese Buddhist texts will have to take into account historical and personal peculiarities in the writing of Chinese characters.

It is obvious that such an undertaking will demand many years and requires the co-operation of many scholars. It will probably be advisable to begin with texts which are rather short and of which the textual history is not too complicated. This depends of course also on the number of manuscripts available. The publication of a small number of critical text editions will make it possible to gradually work out a system of editorial methods before undertaking the editing of more difficult texts on a larger scale. In this way one will obtain a slowly increasing corpus of critical text editions which will form the essential basis for further comparative study of the Chinese texts with Indian originals

and Tibetan translations. The publication by the Suzuki Foundation of the Peking edition of Kanjur and Tanjur has greatly stimulated the study of the Tibetan canon. In this case, too, it will now be necessary to compare other editions and Tun-huang manuscripts and to publish critical editions. Some of the Tun-huang manuscripts contain archaic translations which have been revised by the editors of the Kanjur and Tanjur. In some cases, these archaic translations are closer to the Indian original than the revised texts in the Kanjur and the Tanjur. Critical editions of Chinese and Tibetan translations are an essential prerequisite for the publication of synoptic editions of the various translations of the same text. Von Staël-Holstein's edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* is a good example of the way a synoptic edition has to be planned. The ideal goal of Buddhist philology must be the publication of synoptic editions of Buddhist texts in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese or Tibetan and Chinese. Of course, in the absence of an Indian original and a Tibetan translation, only a critical edition of the Chinese text will be possible.

The Chinese Buddhist texts are of fundamental importance for Buddhist studies for two reasons. In the first place the Chinese canon has preserved many Indian texts and especially ancient Indian texts which have not been translated into Tibetan. In the second place the Chinese texts have been translated from the second century A.D. onwards and enable us to study older recensions of Indian texts. The fact that many texts have been translated more than once in different periods in China makes it possible to study the development of these texts. This is not possible with the help of Tibetan translations which, generally, represent the Indian text in its final form. However, the study of Chinese translations is often complicated by the fact that the attribution of a translation to a translator is wrong or doubtful. The Chinese canon contains many catalogues of translations, Tao-an's catalogue dating from 374 A.D. being the first. However, they often contain conflicting information. Japanese scholars—I mention only Tokiwa Daijō and Hayashiya Tomojirō—have done much work in studying these catalogues critically. In the second place, a study has been made of the terminology used by the translators. This internal criterion is certainly the most important. Generally speaking, however, scholars have studied the terminology of a text in the course of their research and limited themselves to a number of technical terms. In this field of research much more work still has to be done. It will be neces-

sary not to study a single text but to study the work of one translator systematically. Hayashiya Tomojirō had realised the importance of a systematic study of the terminology used by translators, but he has not been able to carry out his plans. It will be necessary not to limit oneself to the terminology but also to take into account the vocabulary used by the translator and the characteristic features of his style. The terminology is not always a reliable guide because translations of Buddhist terms are often taken from translations already in existence. Moreover, one must be aware that the printed editions of the Chinese canon do not always transmit a text in exactly the same form as it has been written by a translator and his collaborators. Translations had been copied for many centuries before they were printed for the first time. It is quite possible that later copyists changed the renderings of Buddhist terms to bring them in line with the equivalents current in their time. It is much more difficult to change the vocabulary and the style. As mentioned before, Tun-huang fragments of Tibetan translations of Buddhist texts contain archaic translations which, in some cases, have been subject to extensive revision by the editors of the Kanjur and Tanjur. There is no evidence to prove that the organisers of the first printed editions of Chinese translations have revised existing translations to a large extent, but it is quite possible that copyists made some changes in the texts. A systematic examination of the Chinese Buddhist texts, translated by An-shih-kao (安世高) and his successors, will make it possible to determine the peculiarities of each translator. Traditionally a distinction is made between archaic, old and new translations. However, this distinction is not sufficient for a critical examination of the existing translations. We need to know in the first place the terminology, the vocabulary and the style of the principal translators in much more detail. Once this is better known, it will become possible to decide with greater certitude whether a certain text is rightly or wrongly attributed to one of these translators. After having studied the work of the principal translators, it will be easier to study carefully the translations which have been made by translators who have translated only a few texts.

A careful study of the language in which the Chinese Buddhist texts are written is necessary in order to determine the date of each translation and the name of the translator. In this way it will become possible to solve many problems relating to the history of the Chinese Buddhist canon, problems

which are of great importance both for the history of Indian Buddhism and that of Chinese Buddhism. A better and more precise knowledge of the language of the Chinese translations will also lead to a greater knowledge of the Indian originals. Many Indian texts are only known through a Chinese translation. Even if an Indian original exists, it is often not the text translated in China but a later text which differs from it, because in the course of its transmission in India it has been subjected to alterations and accretions. Of great importance for the knowledge of the language of the Indian original are the transcriptions of Indian names and terms. In recent years John Brough has shown that the language of northwestern India, the so-called Gāndhārī, has to be taken into account in explaining Chinese transcriptions of Indian names. Thanks to the work of Karlgren, Pulleyblank and other scholars, it is possible to reconstruct with a fair degree of certainty the pronunciation of Chinese characters in T'ang and pre-T'ang times. On the Indian side more is now known about Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and Gāndhārī through the work of Edgerton and Brough. Continued study of Chinese transcriptions and of Indian texts which are not written in pure Sanskrit will be required in order to obtain a better picture of the linguistic aspects of the texts which have been translated into Chinese.

In recent decennia many scholars have done excellent work in publishing detailed Tibetan-Sanskrit indices of Buddhist texts. However, there still are very few Chinese-Sanskrit indices. It is of course more difficult to compile indices of Chinese translations than it is of Tibetan translations, because the Tibetan translators generally adhered to a well-determined terminology, although sometimes one Sanskrit word is rendered by many different Tibetan words as can easily be seen by consulting Lokesh Chandra's Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary. However, it is certainly possible to compare Indian texts with Chinese translations and to compile Chinese-Sanskrit dictionaries. These dictionaries would be of great help in the study of Buddhist texts. Once a number of these dictionaries or indices has been published, it will be possible to compile a comprehensive Sanskrit-Chinese dictionary which will allow us to see how a certain Sanskrit term has been translated by An-shih-kao, Dharmarakṣa, Kumārajīva, etc. Probably there will be less uniformity in the renderings of terms by the translators of Indian texts in China than is the case in Tibet. In China especially the translators in older periods have not

always used the same equivalents. This is perhaps also partly due to the fact that they did not always have the same Chinese collaborators who polished the Chinese style. However, the range of variation in the use of terminology by one translator is one of the important facts which can only be determined by the compilation of Chinese-Sanskrit and Sanskrit-Chinese dictionaries.

In the past much work has been done in translating Buddhist texts in Sanskrit, Pāli and Chinese. Much more still has to be done. Many translations of Sanskrit texts by Western scholars were done in the nineteenth century. Moreover, they were not based on critical editions. Very few contain sufficient notes. However, there are at present some excellent translations, for example, Johnston's translations of the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda*. Johnston's translations are based upon critical editions and an extensive study of Buddhist literature in Sanskrit and Pāli. Johnston paid great attention to the stylistic and lexical characteristics of these two Sanskrit texts. A scholar who is well acquainted with the Chinese Buddhist literature could probably add much to the commentary and it is always possible to improve upon Johnston's translation in some points as has been shown by Claus Vogel in his study of the first chapter of the *Buddhacarita*.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, Johnston's translations are a splendid achievement and they show how Buddhist texts should be translated. Many Pāli texts have been translated into English, but new critical translations are an urgent desideratum. As an example of such a critical translation, accompanied by lengthy notes, I would like to mention K. R. Norman's translation of the *Theragāthā*. In this translation the commentary takes up much more space than the translation itself. Norman's work shows clearly how Pāli texts have to be translated and studied.

The translations by Johnston and Norman are translations of literary texts. Therefore it is not surprising that they have concentrated their efforts in the first place on the language and the style of the texts, as is obvious from the notes to these translations. In the case of texts of philosophical and historical importance, a translation ought to be accompanied by a commentary dealing with these aspects. It is not difficult to mention a translation which contains a commentary discussing in great detail all important items in the text itself:

<sup>1</sup> Claus Vogel, On the first canto of Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddhacarita*, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, IX No. 4 (1966), pp 266-290.



Lamotte's translation of the Ta-chih-tu-lun (大智度論). Lamotte's work is a fine example of Buddhist scholarship. Without any doubt Japanese scholars would be able to provide us with translations of Chinese Buddhist texts accompanied with commentaries of similar scope. Most translations in the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō* are only sparingly provided with notes. However, it is not sufficient to translate a text and to explain briefly some technical terms. Both the introduction and the commentary of a translation ought to give full information on all matters relating to the text.

With regard to translations of Chinese Buddhist texts, Western translators are forced to translate each character into English or another Western language. Japanese translators often do not really translate a Chinese text but rather indicate how a sentence has to be analysed and constructed. All important words and terms are left untranslated, because the Japanese language allows them to maintain the same Chinese characters as those found in the Chinese text. However, such translations fail to do justice to the original texts. It will often be necessary to translate Chinese characters by other Chinese characters. Sometimes, however, it will be difficult to find good equivalents and it will be necessary to maintain the same characters but, in such cases, one needs a note to explain the exact meaning and value of these terms in the Chinese text. Critical translations of Chinese Buddhist texts into Japanese must be based on a searching analysis of the style, vocabulary and terminology of the Chinese text. In the case of Chinese Buddhist texts, translated from original Indian texts, it will be necessary to try and determine, as far as possible, the Indian terms which occur in the original text.

Problems of a different nature arise when one has to translate original Chinese Buddhist texts. In many instances, the authors of these texts have used Buddhist terms but not in the same meaning which they have in Indian texts. In the early period of Chinese Buddhism Taoist ideas clearly exercised a great influence. Often it is difficult to know whether a certain term reflects a Taoist idea or has to be interpreted as a Buddhist idea rendered by a Taoist term. A Japanese translator will be tempted to maintain the same Chinese characters without trying to solve this difficulty. In the case of such texts an English translation would be greatly preferable. Let me quote one example. Seng-chao's work has been studied and translated by a group of scholars from Kyōto in the *Jōron no kenkyū*, a splendid publication which shows the excellent

results which can be obtained by the combined efforts of a group of scholars in the study of one text. In a review of this work in the *Young Pao* Paul Demiéville has expressed his great appreciation of the work done by these scholars.<sup>2</sup> However, he has not omitted to point out that the Japanese translation of the text does not solve all problems related to the interpretation of the text, mainly because difficult terms have not been translated. Demiéville remarks that, in translating the same text into English, Liebenthal had to decide in each single instance how to render a Chinese term into English. Undoubtedly, the ideal solution would be that Japanese and Western scholars would work together in order to translate such texts into English to the benefit of both Japanese and Western scholarship.

In what has been said up to now, the main emphasis has been put on philological problems, such as critical editions of texts, analysis of style and language, critical translations, etc. Buddhist studies, of course, embrace much more than philology but philology is of basic importance. Once texts have been properly edited, interpreted and translated it will become possible to study the development of religious and philosophical ideas. Indian Buddhism has produced a very rich literature, of which much is preserved in Sanskrit and Pāli but even much more in Tibetan and Chinese translations. Moreover, Buddhist monuments show another important aspect of Buddhism. The great wealth of literary and archaeological sources for the study of Buddhism in India will occupy many scholars for centuries to come. However, this mass of material must not make us forget that Indian Buddhism cannot be studied in isolation from its context. It is necessary to study Vedic and Brahmanical literature, Jainism and other Indian religions, Dharmasāstras, etc. The study of Indian Buddhism has in the first place to be seen as a branch of Indology. In Japan the study of Buddhism has for many centuries been based exclusively on Chinese Buddhist texts. In the last one hundred years Japanese scholars have added to the study of Chinese texts that of Sanskrit, Pāli and Tibetan texts and much has been done by them for the study of Indian Buddhism. However, other branches of Indological studies have not developed to the same extent. Recent years have seen an increasing interest among Japanese scholars for the study of the six darśanas. It is to be hoped that many scholars

<sup>2</sup> Vol. 45 (1957), pp. 221-235.

## THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

will become interested in other aspects of Indian culture as well. Scholars such as Tsukamoto Zenryū have brilliantly demonstrated that Chinese Buddhism can only be understood when seen against the background of Chinese history and culture. In the same way, Indian Buddhism has to be studied in relation to Indian culture, as one of the manifestations of Indian spirituality. This can only be achieved when scholars are actively engaged in the study of all aspects of Indian culture. The cultures of India, China and Japan cannot be understood without knowledge of Buddhism. In the same way Buddhism cannot be understood without knowledge of the cultures of India, China and Japan. Allow me to terminate by expressing the wish that future generations of scholars, both in Japan and in the West, will closely work together in the study of Buddhism.