

A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America

J. W. DEJONG

Foreword

THERE seems to be little necessity to justify an attempt to sketch briefly the history of Buddhist studies. There is an abundance of material available in the writings of scholars, but no single work has yet been devoted to a systematic study of the history of Buddhist studies. Windisch's unfinished work contains much information on Buddhist studies in Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century,¹ but very little on the following decennia. Henri de Lubac, a Jesuit father, has written a book on the meeting of Buddhism and the West.² He is more interested in the reaction of the Western world to Buddhist ideas than in the history of Buddhist studies. The most important chapter of his book for Buddhist scholars is the one which deals with the information on Buddhism which can be found in the writings of missionaries in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. A recent work on *Buddhist Nirvāna and Its Western Interpreters* by G. R. Welbon³ attempts to show how Western scholars have ex-

* The following chapters formed the basis for a series of lectures given at the University of Tokyo in October and November 1973. The second part will appear in the following issue of the *Eastern Buddhist*. —Eds.

¹ Ernst Windisch, *Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und indischen Altertumskunde*, I, Strassburg, 1917; II, Berlin u. Leipzig, 1920; *Philologie und Altertumskunde in Indien*. Drei nachgelassene Kapitel des III. Teils der Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und indischen Altertumskunde, Leipzig, 1921.

² Henri de Lubac, *La rencontre du bouddhisme et de l'occident*, Paris, 1952.

³ G.R. Welbon, *The Buddhist Nirvāna and Its Western Interpreters*, Chicago, 1968.

plained the meaning of Nirvāna. The usefulness of his book is diminished by the fact that the author was not sufficiently equipped for this difficult task.⁴ Apart from these three books there are of course many other publications which contain useful information. The most important will be mentioned in due course.

The first chapter deals very briefly with the period up to about 1825. Although important work had been done before that date, it mostly remained unpublished and became known much later. More will be said in this chapter about the period 1826–1877, in which Eugène Burnouf is the dominating figure. The second chapter begins in 1877 and ends about 1942. This period witnesses the work of such great scholars as Sylvain Lévi, Louis de La Vallée Poussin, Hermann Oldenberg, Th. Stcherbatsky and the Rhys Davidses. The third chapter deals with the most recent period, whereas the final chapter sketches some of the tasks which will require the attention of scholars in coming years.

In this brief sketch it is of course impossible to deal adequately with all aspects of Buddhist studies. The main emphasis has been put on philological studies. From a geographic point of view India is the principal country dealt with but developments in the Theravāda countries and in China and Tibet have not been entirely neglected. No attempt has been made to include studies on Japanese Buddhism and the history of Japanese Buddhist studies. This is a topic which can only be adequately treated by Japanese scholars.

⁴ For a review of his work see *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, I, 1972, pp. 396–403.

ABBREVIATIONS

AMG, B.V.	Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de Vulgarisation	JOR	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras
AO	Archiv Orientalní	JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
BCL	Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l'Académie royale de Belgique	MCB	Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient	NGGW	Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
Bibl. B.	Bibliotheca Buddhica	OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
Bibl. Ind.	Bibliotheca Indica	RHR	Revue de l'histoire des religions
BMFJ	Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise	RO	Rocznik Orientalistyczny
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies	SBE	Sacred Books of the East
CPD	Critical Pāli Dictionary	SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
GOS	Gaekwad Oriental Series	WZKS	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens
HJAS	Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies	WZKSO	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens
IA	Indian Antiquary	ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft
IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly	ZII	Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik
IJ	Indo-Iranian Journal	ZVORAO	Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdelenija Russkogo Arxeologičeskogo Obščestva
Ind. St.	Indische Studien		
JA	Journal Asiatique		
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society		
JASB	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal		
J. Bombay Br. RAS	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society		
JIP	Journal of Indian Philosophy		

CHAPTER I

The early period (300 B.C.—1877)

Knowledge of Buddhism in Antiquity (p. 58)—The legend of Barlaam and Josaphat (p. 59)—Papal envoys to the Mongol Khans and the travels of Marco Polo (p. 61)—Xaverius and other missionaries (p. 63)—Catholic missionaries in Tibet in the 17th and 18th centuries (p. 64)—First Pāli studies. Translations of the Kammavācā (p. 66)—Pāli studies by Burnouf and others (p. 69)—Burnouf's study of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts (p. 72)—Translations of Buddhist texts in Kalmyk, Mongolian and Tibetan (p. 74)—French translations of Fa-hsien's *Fo-kuo-chi* and Hsüan-Tsang's *Hsi-yü-chi* (p. 75)—Study of Theravāda Buddhism by Spence Hardy, Bigandet and Alabaster (p. 75)

Already long before Alexander the Great information about India reached Greece.⁵ Since Alexander's conquests (326–323 B.C.) much more became known about India. The most important source is the work of Megasthenes who about 300 B.C. visited Pātaliputra as an envoy. Megasthenes's work has not been preserved but many Greek and Latin authors have made use of it.⁶ Megasthenes mentions brahmans and śramaṇas. Some scholars have considered the śramaṇas to be Buddhists but this is not warranted by the use of the word in the inscriptions of Aśoka and in the Pāli texts. The first time Buddhism is mentioned in a Greek source is five hundred years after Megasthenes. Clement of Alexandria who wrote his *Stromateis* about 200 A.D. mentions Indians who follow the precept of Boudda and venerate him as a god.⁷ It is not surprising to find this information in an author living in Alexandria. In a discourse to the citizens of Alexandria, Dion Chrysostomos mentioned that among his audience

⁵ W. Reese, *Die griechischen Nachrichten über Indien bis zum Feldzuge Alexander des Grossen*, Leipzig, 1914.

⁶ The most careful study of Megasthenes's work is B.C.J. Timmer, *Megasthenes en de indische Maatschappij*, Amsterdam, 1930. Recent literature on Megasthenes is given by J. Duncan M. Derrett, *Megasthenes, Der kleine Pauly*, 3 (Stuttgart, 1969), col. 1150–1154.

⁷ *Strom.* I.15.71; cf. Timmer, *op. cit.*, p. 84–6; A. Dihle, *Indische Philosophen bei Clemens Alexandrinus, Mullus (Festschrift Klausner)*, München, 1964, pp. 60–70.

there were Bactrians, Scythians and some Indians.⁸ Dion Chrysostomos died in 117 A.D. During the early centuries of our era there was no lack of contact between South India and Ceylon on the one hand and Alexandria and Rome on the other.⁹ Clement could have been particularly well informed about India, if it is true that his teacher Pantainos travelled to India, as is told by Eusebius ($\pm 263-339$).¹⁰ Several scholars believe that Alexandria is mentioned in Pali texts. The name Alasanda is found four times in the Milindapañha (ed. V. Trenckner 82.23-24, 327.27, 331.18 and 359.29), twice in the Mahāniddeśa (P.T.S. ed. 155.5 and 415.11) and once in the Mahāvamsa (XXIX.39).¹¹ Agreement on this point, however, has not been reached by scholars.

About two centuries after Clement Buddha is mentioned by Hieronymus ($\pm 347-419$) who tells us that Buddha was born from the side of a virgin.¹²

In the following centuries no knowledge of Buddhism seems to have reached the West. In mediaeval times Christendom venerated two Saints, Barlaam and Josaphat. The legend of these two saints was very popular and versions in many languages (Greek, Latin, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Provençal, Romaic, Dutch and Scandinavian) circulated in mediaeval Europe. When the legend of Buddha became known in Europe, the resemblance with the legend of Saint Josaphat was soon noticed. The first to point it out was an unknown editor of Marco Polo's work who added the following remark to Marco Polo's account of the legend of Buddha: "This is like the life of Saint Iosaphat who was son of the king Avenir of those parts of Indie, and was converted to the Christian faith by the means of Barlam, according as is read in the life and legend of the

⁸ Ad Alexandrinos 32, 40.

⁹ J. Filliozat, *Les échanges de l'Inde et de l'Empire romain aux premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne*, *Revue historique*, 201, 1949, pp. 1-29; Ét. Lamotte, *Les premières relations entre l'Inde et l'occident*, *La Nouvelle Clio*, 1953, pp. 83-118; R. Delbrueck, *Südasiatische Seefahrt im Altertum*, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 155/156, 1955-6, pp. 8-58, 229-308; Franz F. Schwarz, *Neue Perspektiven in den griechisch-indischen Beziehungen*, *OLZ*, 67, 1972, col. 18-21.

¹⁰ Eusebius h. eccl. 5, 10.

¹¹ Cf. H. de Lubac, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-16; *Critical Pali Dictionary*, I Copenhagen, 1924-1948, pp. 441-442.

¹² Hier. adv. Iov. 1,42; cf. A. Dihle, *Buddha und Hieronymus*, *Mittelalterliches Jahrbuch*, 2, 1965, pp. 38-41. Foucher, *La vie du Bouddha*, Paris, 1949, p. 357: *Traditur quod Buddam, principem dogmatis eorum, e latere suo virgo generavit.*

holy fathers."¹³ The Portuguese writer Diogo do Couto, who described about 1612 the exploits of his countrymen in India, remarked that Josaphat "is represented in his legend as the son of a great king in India, who had just the same upbringing, with all the same particulars that we have recounted in the life of Buddha . . . and as it informs us that he was the son of a great king in India, it may well be, as we have said, that *he* was the Buddha of whom they relate such marvels."¹⁴ However, not until the nineteenth century was the Buddhist origin of the legend of Josaphat discovered by scholars.¹⁵ Since 1859, much has been written on this topic. In a study published in 1894, Ernest Kuhn gave a full survey of the work done by scholars since 1859.¹⁶ Recent discoveries of Georgian manuscripts have led to new discussions on the history of the legend. D.M. Lang and Georgian scholars have pointed out that there are two Georgian versions, an older and more complete version which was probably written in the ninth or tenth century, and a shorter one, based upon the more complete version. Both versions have been translated into English by D.M. Lang.¹⁷ There seems to be no doubt that the older Georgian version is a Christian adaptation of an Arabic text. Probably towards the end of the eighth century 'A Book of the Buddha,' a 'Book of Balauhar and Budhasaf' and a 'Book of Budhasaf by himself' were translated from Pehlevi into Arabic. The most complete extant text of the Arabic story was published in Bombay in 1888. This version has been translated into Russian by V.R. Rosen. It was published in 1947 by Krachkovsky.¹⁸ Nothing is known of the Pehlevi versions mentioned above. Lang supposes that the Barlaam and Iosaph legend first developed in Central Asia among the Manichæans. An Old Turkish fragment relates the encounter of prince Siddhārtha with a sick man. As to the Indian sources of the legend, it has been pointed out that many of the parables are not of Buddhist origin but can be found in the Pañcatantra

¹³ Cf. L. F. Benedetto (ed.), *Marco Polo. Il Millione*, Firenze, 1928, p. cxxxvii, n. 1; A. C. Moule & P. Pelliot, *Marco Polo. The Description of the World*, I, London, 1938, p. 410.

¹⁴ Cf. D. M. Lang, *The Wisdom of Balavar*, London, 1957, p. 12.

¹⁵ Laboulaye, *Journal des Débats*, 26 Juillet 1859; Felix Liebrecht, *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, II, 1860, pp. 314-334.

¹⁶ *Barlaam und Josaph. Eine bibliografisch-literaturgeschichtliche Studie*. München, 1894.

¹⁷ *The Wisdom of Balavar*. London, 1957; *The Balavarians*, London, 1966.

¹⁸ *Povesti o Barlaame i Iosafe*. Moskva-Leningrad, 1947.

and the Mahābhārata. It is quite possible that the Chinese translations of Buddhist texts contain episodes which have found their way into the legend. I hope that Japanese scholars will study the oldest accessible versions of the legend (the old Georgian version and the Arabic version) and compare them with the Buddhist texts in Chinese which have not been consulted by scholars in the past. The Georgian version, in its turn, has been translated into Greek about A.D. 1000. From Greek it was translated into Latin (A.D. 1048) and from Latin into many Western languages.

The first contacts of the Western world with Buddhism in Asia took place in the thirteenth century when Pope Innocent IV sent Franciscan and Dominican friars as envoys to the Mongol khan. The Italian Franciscan friar John of Pian di Carpio (†1252) left Lyons in 1245. The following year he reached the Mongolian camp in Central Mongolia. In 1247 he returned to France and wrote the *Ystoria Mongalorum*. He speaks of the religion of the Kitai in Christian terms: "Kytai autem, de quibus superius diximus, homines sunt pagani, qui habent litteram specialem; et habent Novum et Vetus Testamentum, ut dicitur, et habent Vitas Patrum, et heremitas, et domos quasi ecclesias factas, in quibus ipsi orant temporibus suis; et dicunt se quosdam sanctos habere. Unum Deum colunt, dominum Jesum Christum honorant, et credunt vitam aeternam, sed minime baptizantur; Scripturam nostram honorant et reverentur, christianos diligunt, et eleemosynas faciunt plures; homines benigni et humani satis esse videntur" (*Sinica Franciscana* I, pp. 57-58). This passage clearly refers to the Confucianists and not to the Buddhists, as asserted by H. de Lubac. Information about Buddhists is given by Willem van Ruysbroeck, a Flemish Franciscan friar, who spent six months in 1254 in Karakorum. In his *Itinerarium* he describes rather accurately Tibetan lamas and mentions even the formula *Om mani padme būm* (*Ou man baetavi* or *On man baccam*, *Sinica Franciscana*, I, p. 230). However, the most comprehensive account of Buddhism is to be found in Marco Polo's *Description of the World* (*Divisament dou Monde*). Marco was in China from 1275 to 1291. Arriving in Sa-chau (Tun-huang) he meets Chinese Buddhists: "It (Sa-chau) lies in a province called Tangut, whose inhabitants are all idolaters, except that there are some Turks who are Nestorian Christians and also some Saracens. The idolaters speak a language of their own. They do not live by trade, but on the profit of the grain which they harvest from the soil. They have many abbeys and monasteries, all full of idols of various forms

to which they make sacrifices and do great honour and reverence" (tr. Ronald Latham, London, 1958, pp. 54-55). In his book Marco Polo mentions Tibetan Buddhists. However, it is in a chapter dealing with Ceylon that Marco Polo has given a fairly accurate summary of the life of the Buddha. He mentions Adam's Peak: "The Saracens say that it is Adam's grave, but the idolaters call it the monument of Sakyamuni Burkhan (Sagamoni Borcan)." Marco Polo tells that he was the son of a king; he mentions two of his encounters, one with a dead man and one with a very old man, how he left the palace and 'spent the rest of his days most virtuously and chastely and in great austerity'. Marco Polo knows about the reincarnations of the Buddha: "And they said that he had died eighty-four times. For they say that when he died the first time he became an ox; then he died a second time and became a horse" (tr. Latham, pp. 255-257).

While Marco Polo returned from China, Pope Nicholas IV sent Friar John of Monte Corvino (1247-1328) to the Mongols. He arrived in Khanbaliq (Peking) in 1294. He lived for many years in China from where he sent two letters, the first dated 8 January 1305, the second 13 February 1306, in which he mentions the idolaters. John of Monte Corvino was appointed Archbishop of Khanbaliq in 1307 and died in 1328. In the same year the Franciscan friar Odoric de Pordenone (†1331) arrived in Peking. In 1330 he returned to Padua where he dictated the story of his travels (*Relatio*). The last papal envoy is John Marignolli who was sent to China in 1339 by Pope Benedict XII. He arrived in Khanbaliq in 1342 where he remained for three years. He returned in 1352 by way of Ceylon.¹⁹

The travels of the friars aroused much interest in Europe. The most popular work, which contains many legends apart from information obtained from the writings of the friars, is John Mandeville's *Voyages*, written in 1365. There are about 300 manuscripts of this work which was translated into most European

¹⁹ The texts of the writings of the papal envoys have been published by A. van den Wyngaert O. F. M., *Sinica Franciscana*, vol. 1: *Itinera et relationes Fratrum Minorum saec. XIII et XIV*, Quaracchi-Firenze, 1929. Translations of the most important are to be found in C. Dawson (ed.), *The Mongol Mission, Narratives and Letters of the Franciscan Missionaries in Mongolia and China in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, trans. by a Nun of Stanbrook Abbey, London and New York, 1955. For further bibliographical references see I. de Rachewiltz, *Papal Envoys to the Great Khans*, London, 1971.

languages and printed 22 times between ca. 1470 and the end of the eighteenth century.²⁰

Henri de Lubac summarizes the knowledge which the Western world had acquired during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, in the following words: "Quelques récits curieux, quelques détails extérieurs, quelques descriptions de la vie des bonzes et des lamas, c'était donc à peu près tout. La grande religion d'Orient n'apparaissait pas dans son individualité; elle n'était même pas nommée. De ses doctrines, autant dire qu'on ne savait rien" (*op. cit.*, p. 47).

Vasco da Gama's voyage to India in 1497-8 inaugurated a new chapter in the history of the relations between the West and Asia. In the sixteenth century missionaries went out to China, Japan, Ceylon, Siam and Indochina. In 1542 Franciscus Xaverius (1506-1552), a Spanish Jesuit, left for India. In the following year he arrived in Goa which had been occupied by the Portuguese in 1510. In 1547 Xaverius met a Japanese merchant, named Yagiro, and brought him back to Goa. Yagiro explained to Xaverius and other missionaries the history of Xaca (i.e. Śākya), his cult and the life of the bonzes. Information obtained from Yagiro was sent to Europe in letters written by Xaverius himself (22.6.1549), by Cosme de Torrès (25.1.1549), by the Fathers of Goa and by Father Nicolas Lancilotto (26.12.1548).²¹

Xaverius left Goa for Japan in 1549. He died three years later. It is not possible to study here in detail the work of missionaries in Japan and other Asian countries in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Henri de Lubac has given some information on the knowledge of Buddhism which they obtained in these countries. No detailed study has been made by Buddhist scholars of the many reports sent by missionaries and of the publications which are based upon these reports. Only a detailed investigation could show how reliable is the information contained in these publications. A study of this kind is hampered by the fact that many of them are found only in very few libraries. Many reports and letters have not yet been published and are kept

²⁰ Cf. M. Letts (ed.), *Mandeville's Travels. Texts and Translations*, 2 vols., London, Hakluyt Society, 1953; M. Letts, *Sir John Mandeville. The Man and his Book*, London, 1949.

²¹ Cf. *Epistolae S. Francisci Xaverii*, nova editio (G. Schurhammer et I. Wicki), t. II, Roma, 1945, pp. 151-153; R. P. Schurhammer, *Die zeitgenössischen Quellen zur Geschichte Portugiesisch-Asiens zur Zeit des hl. Franz Xaver*, 1538-1552, Leipzig, 1932; Guillaume Postel, *Des Merveilles du Monde*, Paris, 1552.

in manuscript form in libraries and collections. Very few have been critically edited. Even those that have been so edited have for the greater part not been annotated by Orientalists. In these circumstances it is difficult to form a clear opinion on the extent and the correctness of the knowledge of Buddhism which reached Europe in the sixteenth–eighteenth centuries. Missionaries came into contact with Theravāda Buddhism in Ceylon, Burma, Siam and Indochina and with different forms of Mahāyāna Buddhism in China and Japan. Their knowledge was based upon what they observed, and on discussions with Buddhist priests, but very rarely on the study of the Buddhist literature itself. For these reasons it must have been very difficult to gain a clear notion of the main Buddhist ideas. A religion like Buddhism which is based upon principles which are very different from the guiding principles of Christianity cannot be understood without a thorough study of its scriptures.

There is perhaps only one important exception to the fact that the missionaries were not well versed in Buddhist literature. Curiously enough, the best knowledge, obtained in this period on Buddhism, comes from a country which was more inaccessible than other Buddhist countries, namely Tibet. At the end of the sixteenth century Jesuit missionaries believed that Christians lived in Tibet.²² The first missionary to enter into Tibet was the Portuguese Jesuit Antonio d'Andrade (1580–1634) who arrived in August 1624 in Tsaparang (rTsa-bran) the capital of the kingdom of Guge. After his return to Agra he wrote a report of his voyage on the 8th November 1624. It was published in 1626 in Lisbon, entitled: *Novo Descobrimento do gram Cathayo ou Reinos de Tibet pello Padre Antonio de Andrade da Campanhia de Jesu, Portuguez, no anno de 1626.*²³ Translated into French in the following year, this aroused great interest in Europe. However, the success of the mission in Tsaparang did not last for a long time. In 1635 the last two missionaries were expelled. A new attempt in 1640 led to the imprisonment of Manoel Marques. The last news from him reached India in 1641. Most probably he died in captivity. The efforts of the Jesuits to found missions in other parts of Tibet had even less success. Estevão

²² Giuseppe M. Toscano, *La prima missione cattolica nel Tibet*, Parma, 1951, p. 19; Luciano Petech, *I missionari Italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal*, I, Roma, 1952, p. xviii.

²³ Annotated translation in Toscano, *op. cit.*, pp. 47–76; Portuguese text in F. M. Esteves Pereira, *O Descobrimento do Tibet pelo P. Antonio de Andrade*, Coimbra, 1921.

Cacella and João Cabral travelled in 1627–8 via Bhutan to Shigatse (gZis-ka-rtse). Cacella arrived on the 20th January 1628 and left again at the end of January. On the 28th February 1630 Cacella returned to Shigatse where he died on the 6th March. After a first stay in Shigatse in 1627–8 Cabral returned there in March 1631, but the same year or the next year he left Shigatse. In 1661 the Austrian Johann Grüber and the Belgian Albert d'Orville arrived in Lhasa from Peking. Their stay was of short duration (8th October to the end of November) but noteworthy because it was due to these two Jesuits that the first information on Lhasa reached Europe.²⁴

Of greater importance are the missions established in Lhasa by Italian Capuchins and Jesuits in the 18th century. The Capuchins remained in Lhasa during the greater part of the first half of the eighteenth century (1707–1711; 1716–1733; 1741–1745). Only one of them acquired a good knowledge of the Tibetan language: Francesco Orazio della Penna (1680–1745) who from 1717 to 1721 applied himself with great energy to the study of Tibetan. Della Penna, who lived in Lhasa from 1716 to 1732, compiled a great Tibetan dictionary (of about 35,000 words) which was later translated into English by F.C.G. Schroeter and published in Serampore in 1826: *A dictionary of Bhotanta or Boutan language*. Della Penna also translated several Tibetan works among which must be mentioned Tson-kha-pa's *Lam-rim chen-mo* and the *Prātimokṣasūtra*. These translations have not been preserved but Della Penna's chronological summary of Tibetan history was published by Antonio Giorgi in his *Alphabetum Tibetanum Missionum Apostolicarum commodo editum* (Roma, 1762; XCIV + 820 pp.). In Giorgi's work there are also other parts based upon writings of Della Penna.²⁵

On September 24, 1714, two Jesuit fathers, Ippolito Desideri (20.12.1684–14.4.1733) and Manuel Freyre, left Delhi for Lhasa. On the 26th June 1715 they

²⁴ Cf. Athanasius Kircher, S. J., *China monumentis qua sacris, qua profanis, necnon variis naturae et artis spectaculis, aliarumque rerum memorabilium argumentis illustratis*. Amstelodami, 1667; C. Wessels S. J., New Documents relating to the Journey of Fr. John Grueber, *Archivum historicum S. J.*, IX, 1940, pp. 281–302. On the Jesuit missionaries in Tibet and Central Asia see C. Wessels, S. J., *Early Jesuit Travellers in Central Asia*, The Hague, 1924.

²⁵ A definitive edition of all documents relating to the Capuchin mission in Tibet has been published by Luciano Petech, *I missionari Italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal*, I–IV, Roma, 1952–1953.

arrived in Leh, the capital of Ladakh, and the following year, on the 18th March, they finally arrived in Lhasa. Manuel Freyre returned to India, but Desideri remained in Lhasa until the 28th March 1721. During the five years of his stay in Lhasa, Desideri studied in Tibetan monasteries and acquired an excellent knowledge of the Tibetan language and the Tibetan religion. He made excerpts of many Tibetan works, first of all of the Lam-rim chen-mo. He left India in 1729 and during his return journey he began writing a *Relazione* on his travels and on Tibetan customs and religion. The manuscript of his work remained unpublished until 1904 when extracts of it were published by C. Puini who had discovered the manuscript in 1875. An incomplete English version was published in 1931 by Filippo De Filippi: *An Account of Tibet; the travels of Ippolito Desideri of Pistoia, S. J. 1712-1727*, London, 1931; second ed., 1937. A complete and beautifully annotated edition of the original Italian version has been published recently by Luciano Petech.²⁶ In this edition, the *Relazione* consists of four books. The third book (Petech, vol. VI, pp. 115-309) is entirely devoted to a description of Tibetan religion. Petech characterizes it with the following words: "A stupendous description of the lamaist religion, penetratingly and profoundly understood in its essential nature as few European scholars have been able to do in the two following centuries." And Giuseppe Tucci remarked: "The work of Desideri was in advance of his time: the secrets of the speculations of Mahāyāna Buddhism which began to be revealed by Orientalist erudition in the last years of the last century are already clear in the logical scholastic architecture of his *Relazione*" (cf. Petech, *op. cit.*, V, pp. xxvi-xxvii). An English version of the complete Italian text of the *Relazione* and of the precious notes by Luciano Petech is an urgent desideratum.

It is only in the nineteenth century that the Indian sources of Buddhism in Pāli and Sanskrit began to be studied. The first Pāli grammar to be published in Europe was written by Burnouf (1801-1852) and Lassen (1800-1876): E. Burnouf et Chr. Lassen: *Essai sur le Pāli ou langue sacrée de la presqu'île au-delà du Gange*, Paris, 1826 (vii+224pp., 6pl.). In the first chapter Burnouf sketches the history of Pāli studies up to 1826. According to Burnouf the first to mention Pāli was Simon de La Loubère who visited Siam in 1687-1688 as envoy of King

²⁶ *I missionari Italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal*, V-VII, Roma, 1954-1956.

Louis XIV. In 1691 he published a *Description du royaume de Siam*.²⁷ La Loubère's book contains a translation of the life of Devadatta (La vie de Thevetat, le frère de Sommona-Codom, traduite du Bali, t. II, pp. 1-6) and an abstract of the Pātimokkha (t. II, pp. 35-57). He also drew attention to the similarity of the names of the days of the week in Pāli and Sanskrit (t. II, p. 75). Burnouf adds: "Dans l'état d'imperfection où se trouvaient ces études, il y avait quelque mérite à faire ces rapprochements que Chambers a reproduits depuis." Nevertheless, Burnouf gives the honour of having discovered the connection between Sanskrit and Pāli not to William Chambers but to Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo, an Austrian, whose civil name was J. Ph. Wesdin (1748-1806).²⁸ In 1793 he published a catalogue of the manuscripts of the Museum of Velletri: *Musei Borgiani Velitris Codices Manuscripti Aveses Peguana Siamici Malabarici Indostani*, in which he remarked that Pāli is "a dialect or a daughter of Sanskrit, the most ancient language of India."²⁹ According to Burnouf, Chambers repeated this in his article "Some account of the sculptures and ruins at Mavalipuram" (*Asiatick Researches*, I, 1788, pp. 145-170: His article is dated 17 June 1784). It is of course impossible that Chambers repeated a remark published five years after the publication of his article. The real state of affairs is just the opposite. In his *Systema brahmanicum* (published in 1791 and not in 1792 as said by Windisch, p. 21) Paulinus refers expressly to Chambers: "D. Chambers in libro *Asiatick Researches* tom. 1, pag. 160 & seq., ubi defendit linguam Balicam seu Pali vel Bali, qua liber Kammuva scriptus est, a Samscrdamica descendere, aut saltem unam cum altera intimam affinitatem habere, allatis etiam multis exemplis, quae ibi vide" (p. 117). Chambers discovered Sanskrit elements in Tamil and concluded that: "*Shanscrit* [was] common to both that [i.e. Tamil, Tamulic in his spelling] and the *Balic*." Chambers observed that the "*Shanscrit* word *Māba*, which signifies *great*, is constantly used in the *Balic* language in the same sense. And the names of the days are most of them the same in *Shanscrit* and in *Balic*."

Apart from the texts translated by La Loubère, the first Pāli text to become

²⁷ Cf. Windisch, *op. cit.*, p. 125; de Lubac, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

²⁸ Cf. Windisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-22 and p. 203; de Lubac, *op. cit.*, pp. 109 and 11.

²⁹ Quoted after Bechert, Some side-lights on the early history of Pāli lexicography, *Añjali. O. H. de A. Wijesekera Volume* (Peradeniya, 1970), p. 1.

known in Europe was the *Kammavācā*. In his *Systema brahmanicum* Paulinus quoted an Italian translation in the Library of the Propagation of the Faith made from the Pāli original in 1776.³⁰ Another translation was described by Paulinus two years later in the catalogue already mentioned.³¹ According to him this text is accompanied by a commentary. It is not clear whether the commentary accompanying the text was based upon a Pāli text or on oral explanations.³² Paulinus quotes several passages from the Peguanus codex (Burmese manuscript) of the *Kammuvā* and adds explanations which were given by an erudite interpreter (*eruditus interpres*). The explanations, quoted by Paulinus, are obviously added to the translation by the Italian translator. Only an examination of the manuscript, which has been in the Library of the Vatican since 1902, will be able to show whether or not the explanations are due to the translator.³³ Perhaps it will also be possible to discover whether the Italian translator has used a Pāli text or whether his translation is based upon a Burmese version of the original. Another translation was made in Burma by Father Vincente Sangermano (1758–1819, cf. Windisch, p. 17). His translation was published in English by Francis Buchanan-Hamilton (1762–1829) in an article published in 1799 in the *Asiatick Researches: On the Religion and Literature of the Burmas* (*As. Res.*, VI, 1799, pp. 136–308). Buchanan received from Captain Symes three Latin translations made by Sangermano: 1. A cosmography, extracted from various Burmese writings (pp. 167–256); 2. A short view of the religion of Godama written by a late Tarado or king's confessor (pp. 265–273);

³⁰ According to Burnouf the manuscript contains also the Pāli text. Cf. *Papiers d'Éugène Burnouf*, Paris, 1899, p. 115.

³¹ *Kammuvā*, o sia Trattato dell'ordinazione dei Talapoini del secondo ordine, detti *Pirzen*, 30 pp. (*Musei Borgiani Velletris Codices etc.*, No. 6, p. 84).

³² *Kammuvā*, o sia trattato della ordinazione dei Talapoini in carattere Pali o Bali sopra ole dorate. Traduzione fatta per commissione di Monsignor Stefano Borgia segret. di Propag. nel 1776 (*Systema*, p. 114, n. 2). According to Burnouf the explanations quoted by Paulinus (*Systema*, p. 115: Innanzi a tutto, etc.) are to be found in the manuscript in the library of Velletri, but in his *Systema* Paulinus seems to refer only to the manuscript in the library of the Propagation of the Faith.

³³ Cf. The remarks on the commentary by Buchanan (*Asiatick Researches*, VI, 1799, p. 280) and by Spiegel (*Kammavākyam*, Bonn, 1841, p. xi). I have been unable to consult Paulinus's Catalogue, p. 84, to which Buchanan refers.

3. The book of ordinations (pp. 280–289). Burnouf says that these three treatises were based upon Pāli books but from Buchanan's description it seems obvious that, most probably, the second and also the first were written in Burmese. It is not clear whether Sangermano translated the Kammavācā from the Pāli or from a Burmese version. Buchanan himself did not know Pāli or Burmese but his long article is not only useful for the information which he presented for the first time, but also for some perspicacious comments which he made. For instance, he states categorically that Nirvāṇa is not annihilation: "Annihilation . . . is a very inaccurate term. Nieban implies the being exempted from all the miseries incident to humanity, but by no means annihilation" (p. 180). Amusing is a remark by a Siamese painter on Devadatta: "Devadat, or as he pronounced it, Tevedat, was the god of the *Pye-gye*, or of *Britain*; and . . . it is he who, by opposing the good intentions of Godama, produces all the evil in the world" (p. 268). The translation by Sangermano and Buchanan of the Kammavācā has been of use to Burnouf and Lassen who were able to compare it with a Pāli manuscript in the Royal Library in Paris. The first reliable translation of the Pāli Kammavācā is due to a Wesleyan missionary in Ceylon, Benjamin Clough, who published an English translation in 1834.³⁴ The Paris manuscript was used by Friedrich Spiegel (1820–1905) who in 1841 published the *Upasampadā-Kammavācā* in Devanāgarī together with a Latin translation and notes: *Kammavākyaṃ. Liber de officiis sacerdotum buddhicolorum* (Bonn, 1841). Three years later Otto von Boehtlingk published the *Kaṭhina-Kammavācā* (*Bull. hist.-phil. de l'Académie de St. Pétersbourg*, I, p. 342ff.) and in 1845 Spiegel published three other Kammavācās in his *Anecdota Pālica* (Leipzig, 1845, pp. 68–71).

In the year following the publication of the *Essai sur le Pali*, Burnouf published a small brochure of 30 pages, entitled *Observations grammaticales sur quelques passages de l'Essai sur le pali de MM. E. Burnouf et Ch. Lassen*, in which he quotes the *Mahāvamsa* and the Pāli dictionary *Abhidhānappadīpikā*. Burnouf continued his Pāli studies until his death. He collected much material for a grammar and a dictionary which have not been published. He planned to study in detail the canonical Pāli texts in the second volume of his *Introduction à l'étude du Bouddhisme*

³⁴ *The Ritual of the Buddhist Priesthood*. Tr. from the original Pāli work, entitled *Karmavākya*. London, 1834.

indien, but his untimely death prevented him from carrying out his plan. The 21st appendix of his translation of the Lotus sūtra which was published in October 1852 is entitled: "Comparaison de quelques textes sanscrits et pâlis" (pp. 859–867). Burnouf was only able to complete the first pages of this essay when in the first days of March illness forced him to abandon his work. He died only a few weeks later on the 28th May 1852. Burnouf had made a careful study of a manuscript of the Dīghanikāya. The appendices of his translation of the Lotus sūtra contain a complete translation of the Samaññaphala and Mahānidāna suttas (pp. 449–482; 534–544) and a translation of the beginning of the Tevijja sutta (pp. 490–4).

When Burnouf and Lassen wrote their *Essai sur le Pali*, they did not know that a Pāli grammar had already been published. In 1824 Benjamin Clough, a Wesleyan missionary, published in Colombo *A compendious Pali grammar with a copious vocabulary in the same language* (iv+147+20+157 pp.). This work was first undertaken by W. Tolfrey. Clough's book consists of three parts: a grammar based on the Pāli grammar Bālāvatāra, a collection of roots based on the Dhātumañjūsā and a vocabulary based on the Abhidhānappadīpikā. Clough's Pāli grammar seems to have reached Europe only after a long delay. On 11 January 1832 A. W. von Schlegel wrote to Lassen that according to Brockhaus only two copies had arrived in Europe.³⁵ Important work on Pāli was done in Ceylon also by George Turnour (1799–1843) who entered the Civil Service of Ceylon in 1818. In 1837 he published text and translation of the first 38 chapters of the Mahāvamsa. At the same time he contributed a series of important articles to the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*.³⁶ In the same period another Wesleyan missionary, D. J. Gogerly (1792–1862), began to publish articles on Pāli literature. His collected writings have been published in two volumes in Colombo in 1908.³⁷ They contain many translations of Pāli texts, for instance, a translation of the Pātimokkha which was first published in 1839 in the *Ceylon Friend* (reprinted in 1862 in *JRAS*, XIX).

³⁵ *Briefwechsel A. W. von Schlegel—Christian Lassen*, Herausgegeben von Dr. W. Kirfel, Bonn, 1914, p. 217.

³⁶ Examination of Some Points of Buddhist Chronology, *JASB*, V, 1836, pp. 521–536; An Examination of the Pāli Buddhistic Annals, *JASB*, VI, 1837, pp. 501–528, 717–737; VIII, 1838, pp. 686–701, 789–817, 919–933, 991–1014.

³⁷ *Ceylon Buddhism, being the collected writings of Daniel John Gogerly*.

In 1821 the Danish linguist Rasmus Kristian Rask (1787–1832) visited Ceylon and collected many Pāli and Sinhalese manuscripts. Rask studied there Pāli and Sinhalese with the assistance of B. Clough. He also wrote a Pāli grammar which was largely based upon the *Bālāvatāra* but this was never published. His manuscript collection made Copenhagen one of the most important centres of Pāli studies in Europe. The Pāli manuscripts were described by N. L. Westergaard (1815–1878) in collaboration with Friedrich von Spiegel in the catalogue of the Indian manuscripts of the Royal Library: *Codices indici Bibliothecae Regiae Havniensis*, Havniae, 1846. From 1859 till 1865 the French consul in Ceylon, P. Grimblot, collected a large number of Pāli manuscripts which have been described by J. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire.³⁸ Grimblot planned the publication of many texts in a *Bibliotheca Palica* but death prevented him from carrying out his plans. Léon Feer published his *Extraits du Paritta* in 1871 (*J.A.*, 1871, II, pp. 225–335). The first scholar to make good use of the manuscripts collected by Grimblot was I. P. Minaev (1840–1890) who published in 1869 the text of the Pātimokkha with a translation and many extracts from Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā*, the *Kāṅkhā-vitarāṇi*, etc.³⁹ In 1872 Minaev published a Pāli grammar which was translated into French and English.⁴⁰ Spiegel was the first to publish Pāli texts from the Copenhagen collection in his *Anecdota Palica* (Leipzig, 1845) which contains the first four stories of the first vagga of the *Rasavāhīnī* and the *Uragasutta* from the *Suttanipāta*. In 1855 Viggo Fausbøll (1821–1908) published the *Dhammapada* with a Latin translation and extracts from the *Dhammapadatthakathā*. Albrecht Weber (1825–1901) translated the *Dhammapada* in German (*ZDMG*, 14, 1860, pp. 29–86; *Indische Streifen*, I, 1868, pp. 112–185). Both Fausbøll and Weber also published some *Jātakas* from the *Jātaka* collection.⁴¹ Of other texts published before 1877

³⁸ Du bouddhisme et de sa littérature à Ceylan. Collection de M. Grimblot, consul de France à Ceylan, *Journal des Savants*, 1866, pp. 43–59, 100–116, 151–166.

³⁹ *Pratimoksa-sutra. Buddijskij služebnik*, Spb., 1869. lii+122pp.

⁴⁰ *Očerki fonetiki i morfologii jazyka pali*. Spb., 1872; *Grammaire Pālie*, Paris, 1974; *Pāli Grammar*, British Burmah, 1883. On Minaev see Alexandra Schneider, Professor J. P. Minayeff, *IHR* X, 1934, pp. 811–826; *Ivan Pavlovič Minaev. Sbornik statej*, Moskva, 1967.

⁴¹ A. Weber, *Über das Makasajātakam*, *Ind. St.*, 4, 1858, pp. 387–392; V. Fausbøll und A. Weber, *Die Pāli-Legende von der Entstehung des Sākya (Çākya)-und Koliya-Geschlechtes*, *Ind. St.*, 5, 1862, pp. 412–437; Fausbøll, *Five Jātakas*, Copenhagen, 1861; *The Data-*

mention must be made of Childers's editions of the Khuddaka-pāṭha (*JRAS*, 1870, pp. 309–389) and the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta (*JRAS*, 1875, pp. 49–80; 1876, pp. 219–261), and Senart's edition and translation of Kaccāyana's grammar (*JA*, 1871, pp. 193–540; also published separately, Paris, 1871). Book 6 of this grammar had already been translated by the Sinhalese scholar James d'Alwis (1823–1878) in 1863.⁴²

As mentioned before, Burnouf's Pāli dictionary was never published. In 1845 Spiegel announced a compilation of a Pāli dictionary on which he continued working for many years up to 1865. Bechert has given some information on the manuscript of Spiegel's dictionary which he received from a great-grandson.⁴³ Pāli scholars had to wait till 1875 to see the first Pāli dictionary published in Europe: *A Dictionary of the Pāli language* by Robert Caesar Childers (1838–1876). With the publication of Childers's dictionary and Minaev's grammar and due to the presence of good collections of Pāli manuscripts in European libraries, the conditions were created for fruitful work in Pāli philology. From 1877 onwards Pāli texts began to be published and translated in great number as we will see in the next chapter.

In 1837 the Société Asiatique received from Brian Houghton Hodgson (1800–1894) in Kathmandu 88 manuscripts of Sanskrit Buddhist texts. Immediately Burnouf began reading the manuscripts. On 5 June 1837 Burnouf wrote to Hodgson that from the 25th April he devoted all his spare moments to reading the Saddharmapundarīka.⁴⁴ His translation of this text was completed in 1839.⁴⁵ It was printed in 1841 but did not appear until after his death in 1852. Burnouf translated many Buddhist Sanskrit texts. His translations from the Divyāvadāna, the Avadānaśataka and other texts were published in his *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien* (Paris, 1844), but many others were never pub-

**rasba-Jātaka*, Copenhagen, 1871; Two Jātakas, *JRAS*, V. 1871, pp. 1–13; *Ten Jātakas*, Copenhagen, 1872.

⁴² *An introduction to Kaccāyana's grammar of the Pāli language*, Colombo-London, 1863. On d'Alwis see: *Memoirs and Desultory Writings of the Late James D'Alwis*. Edited by A.C. Seneviratne, Colombo, 1939.

⁴³ Heinz Bechert, Some side-lights on the early history of Pāli lexicography, *Añjali* (Peradeniya, 1970), pp. 1–3.

⁴⁴ *Papiers d'Eugène Burnouf conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1899, p. 158.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

lished. Among his posthumous papers are an almost complete translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāparamitā* and translations of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* (which took him only ten days to complete) and the *Sumāghāvadāna*.⁴⁶ Burnouf carefully read many other texts, even such difficult and voluminous texts as the *Mahāvastu* and the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*. The amount of work done by Burnouf in the last fifteen years of his life is staggering. Not only did he study many Sanskrit Buddhist manuscripts, but he also continued his studies of Avestan and Pehlevi texts, and his translation of the *Bhāgavata Purāna*. In connection with his Pāli studies he undertook the study of Sinhalese, Burmese and Siamese translations and commentaries. Moreover, he did not neglect modern Indo-Aryan languages such as Bengali, Marathi and Gujarati. For most of these languages he had to compile his own dictionary. All this was done without neglecting his duties as Professor at the Collège de France and often in poor health.

Burnouf stressed the fact that Indian Buddhism had to be studied on the basis of the Sanskrit texts from Nepal and the Pāli texts from Ceylon.⁴⁷ According to him it would be possible to find the fundamental and ancient elements of Buddhism in that which was common to both the Sanskrit and the Pāli texts.⁴⁸ Burnouf was well aware of the fundamental importance of the study of the texts for the history of Buddhism.⁴⁹ His idea with regard to India at the time of the Buddha, the doctrine of the Buddha and its later development, the relation of Buddhism to castes, etc. which he develops in the *Introduction* are all based on a careful study of the texts. It is only due to the progress in the study of Buddhist literature that some conclusions he arrived at have had to be modified. However, even after almost 130 years his *Introduction* and also his translation of the *Saddharmapundarika* are works which one can never read without learning something. A detailed survey of the contents of these two works can be found in Windisch's work.⁵⁰

Burnouf appreciated the importance of Tibetan translations for the study

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 63 and 65.

⁴⁷ *Introduction*, p. 12.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

⁵⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 131-139.

of Sanskrit Buddhist texts. When he began to study these texts in 1837, Buddhism had been studied already by scholars among the Kalmyks who lived between the Volga and the Don. Benjamin Bergmann (1772–1856) translated several Kalmyk texts and noted his observations of Kalmyk customs. His *Nomadische Streifereien unter den Kalmüken in den Jahren 1802 und 1803* (Riga 1804–5; reprint, Oosterhout, 1969)⁵¹ is still an important source for the study of the Kalmyks and Lamaism in general. Bergmann realized that, in order to understand Lamaism, it would be necessary to study the Mongolian literary language and Tibetan. This program was executed by Isaak Jakob Schmidt (1779–1847) who lived among the Kalmyks during the years 1804–1806. Schmidt became the founder of Mongolian and Tibetan studies in Russia.⁵² In four long articles, published from 1832 to 1837 in the *Mémoires de l'Académie*, he studied Tibetan sources of Mahāyāna Buddhism.⁵³ In the last of these four articles he translated the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā from the Tibetan version. In the same years Alexander Csoma de Kőrös (1784–1842) published an analysis of the Kanjur and an abstract of the contents of the Tanjur.⁵⁴ The Tibetan version of the Lalitavistara was studied by Philippe Édouard Foucaux (1811–1894) who published the Tibetan text and a French translation in 1847–1848.⁵⁵ In 1843 Schmidt published the Tibetan text and a German translation of the “Sage and the Fool,” a collection of tales told in the *bu* language in Khotan shortly before 445.⁵⁶ Franz Anton von Schiefner (1817–1879) trans-

⁵¹ Cf. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, XIV, 1972, pp. 265–7.

⁵² Cf. Franz Babinger, Isaak Jakob Schmidt, 1779–1847, *Festschrift für Friedrich Hirth*, Berlin, 1920, pp. 7–21.

⁵³ Über einige Grundlehren des Buddhaismus, *Mémoires de l'Acad. Imp. d. Sc. de St. Pétersbourg*, I, 1832, pp. 90–120, 222–262; Über die sogenannte dritte Welt der Buddhaisten, *ibid.*, II, 1834, pp. 1–39; Über die Tausend Buddhas einer Weltperiode der Einwohnung oder gleichmässigen Dauer, *ibid.*, II, 1834, pp. 41–86; Über das Mahājāna und Pradschnā Paramita der Bauddhen, *ibid.*, IV, 1837, pp. 123–228.

⁵⁴ *Asiatick Researches*, XX, 1836–9, pp. 41–93, 393–552. French translation by Léon Feer, *Analyse du Kandjour, recueil des Livres sacrés du Tibet*, *Annales du Musée Guimet*, II, 1881, pp. 131–555.

⁵⁵ *Rgya Tsh'er rol pa, ou Développement des Jeux*, Paris, 1847–1848.

⁵⁶ *Dsanglun oder der Weise und der Tor*. St. Petersburg, 1843. For some bibliographical notes see J.W. de Jong, *Buddha's Word in China*, Canberra, 1968, p. 23, n. 39. Add Takahashi Moritaka, *Zō-Kan tsaiyaku: Kengukyo*, Ōsaka, 1970.

lated many stories from the Tibetan version of the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya and published the Tibetan text and a German translation of Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism in India*.⁵⁷ Also based on Tibetan sources is V. P. Vasil'ev's *Buddhism* which was published in Russian in 1857 and in German and French translations in 1860 and 1865.⁵⁸

Of great importance for the study of Indian Buddhism is the work done by Sinologists. Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832) who in 1815 became the first professor of Chinese at the Collège de France translated Fa-hsien's *Fo-kuo-chi*. It was published after his death by Klaproth and Landresse.⁵⁹ His successor, Stanislas Julien (1797–1873) translated the life of Hsüan-tsang and his *Hsi-yü-chi*.⁶⁰

We mentioned the study of Buddhism among the Kalmyks by Bergmann and Schmidt. Buddhism in the Theravāda countries also became better known by the work of the Wesleyan missionary R. Spence Hardy (1803–1868) who published several works based on Sinhalese sources.⁶¹ In Burma the Roman Catholic bishop P. Bigandet (1813–1894) studied Burmese sources on the life of the Buddha⁶² and in Siam Henry Alabaster (died 1884) translated several Siamese texts.⁶³

In the period 1800 to 1877 the knowledge of Buddhism in the West greatly increased. Still very few Pāli texts were published during this period, but the publication of a grammar and a dictionary and the presence of collections of

⁵⁷ *Tibetan Tales*, London, 1882; *Tāranātha de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India propagatione narratio*, Petropoli, 1868; *Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien*, St. Petersburg, 1869.

⁵⁸ *Buddhizm, ego dogmaty, istorija i literatura*, č. I., Spb., 1857; *Der Buddhismus, Seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur*, St.-Petersbourg-Riga-Leipzig, 1860; *Le Bouddhisme, ses dogmes, son histoire et sa littérature*, Paris, 1865. On Vasil'ev see Z. I. Gorbačeva, N. A. Petrov, G. F. Smykalov, B. I. Pankratov, *Russkij Kitaeved Akademik Vasilij Pavlovič Vasil'ev (1818–1900)*, *Očerki po istorii russkogo vostokovedenija*, II, Moskva, 1956, pp. 232–340.

⁵⁹ *Foe Koue Ki ou Relation des royaumes bouddhiques de Fa bian*, Paris, 1836.

⁶⁰ *Histoire de la vie de Hiouen-tsang et de ses voyages dans l'Inde*, Paris, 1853; *Mémoires sur les Contrées occidentales de Hiouen-tsang*, Paris, 1857–1858.

⁶¹ *Eastern Monachism*, London, 1850; *Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development*, London, 1853; *The Legends and Theories of the Buddhists*, London, 1866.

⁶² *The Life of Gaudama*, Rangoon, 1858; Second enlarged edition, *The Life or Legend of Gaudama*, Rangoon, 1866; third edition, London, 1880; fourth edition, London, 1911.

⁶³ *The Wheel of the Law. Buddhism illustrated from Siamese sources*, London, 1871.

manuscripts in several centres of Oriental studies would make intensive work possible in the following period. Burnouf laid solid foundations for the study of Sanskrit Buddhist texts. Important work had been done on the Tibetan sources in this period but this field would be relatively neglected in the coming decennia. Abel-Rémusat and Stanislas Julien had made known important texts for the history of Buddhism in India, but in this field, too, progress was less conspicuous in the following years.

CHAPTER II

The middle period (1877–1942)

Editions of Pāli and Sanskrit texts in the last quarter of the 19th century (p. 77)—Senart's *Essai sur la légende du Buddha* (p. 78)—Kern's *History of Buddhism in India* (p. 79)—Oldenberg's *Buddha* (p. 81)—The first two Buddhist Councils (p. 83)—The relations between Buddhism and Brahmanism (p. 84)—The relations between Buddhism and Sāṃkhya (p. 85)—The relations between Buddhism and Yoga (p. 86)—The inscriptions of Aśoka. Senart's conception of Buddhism at the time of Aśoka (p. 87)—Buddhist monuments and inscriptions (p. 89)—Discoveries of Buddhist manuscripts in Central Asia (p. 91)—Later work by Kern, Senart and Oldenberg. Barth (p. 93)—Sylvain Lévi (p. 93)—Louis de La Vallée Poussin (p. 96)—Jean Przyluski (p. 98)—Lamotte (p. 99)—Stcherbatsky (p. 99)—d'Oldenburg and Obermiller (p. 101)—Lüders and Waldschmidt (p. 102)—Schayer, Tuxen, Tucci and Frauwallner (p. 102)—Johnston's editions of Aśvaghosa's works. Weller and Nobel (p. 103)—The Critical Pāli dictionary. Wilhelm Geiger (p. 104)—Tibetan sources on Buddhism (p. 104)—Chinese sources on Buddhism. Watters, Peri, Chavannes, Pelliot and Demiéville (p. 105)

It is of course not possible to make a sharp distinction between the early period of Buddhist studies up to 1877 and the following one, but 1877 can be taken as point of departure for a new era in Buddhist studies for several reasons.

From 1877 many Pāli texts were edited. Moreover, Buddhist Sanskrit texts began to be published in increasing number from 1881 onwards. Perhaps even more important is the fact that significant works on Indian Buddhism began to appear in the next few years, most of them written by scholars who were to contribute much to Buddhist studies in the succeeding decennia.

In 1877 Fausbøll published the first volume of the Jātaka book. The seventh volume, containing Andersen's index, appeared in 1897. Oldenberg's edition of the Vinayapīṭaka appeared from 1879 to 1883. In 1881 T. W. Rhys Davids (1843-1922) founded the Pali Text Society. With the exception of the texts mentioned above, almost all Pāli texts published in Europe since that date have been published by the Pali Text Society. Already in the eighteen-eighties a beginning was made with the publication of all five Nikāya. In 1882 the first volume of the *Journal of the Pali Text Society* was published. By 1930 all five Nikāya were published and a beginning had been made with the publication of the Aṭṭhakathā-s. As far as the non-canonical Pāli texts are concerned, mention must be made of Oldenberg's edition of the Dīpavaṃsa in 1879, and of Trenckner's edition of the Milindapañha in 1880. At the same time many Pāli texts were translated, to begin with the Pātimokkha, the Mahāvagga and the Culavagga, which were translated jointly by Oldenberg and Rhys Davids (*SBE*, 13, 17, 20, Oxford 1881-1885). In 1899 Rhys Davids published the first volume of his translation of the Dīghanikāya. In 1894 he had already completed his translation of the Milindapañha (*SBE*, 35, 36, Oxford 1890-1894).

Since Burnouf's death in 1852 little work had been done in the field of Sanskrit Buddhist literature. The only important text published between 1852 and 1880 was the Lalitavistara of which Rajendralal Mitra (1824-1891) published a very unsatisfactory edition (*Bibl. Ind. work no. 15*, Calcutta, 1853-1877). The last fascicle of this edition appeared in 1877. In 1882 Émile Senart (1847-1928) published the first volume of his edition of the Mahāvastu. Senart's edition of the Mahāvastu, of which the third and final volume appeared in 1897, is still one of the most important works in the field of Buddhist studies. In 1881 Max Müller published the Sanskrit text of one of the most famous texts of Mahāyāna Buddhism, the Vajracchedikā. Two years later he published the texts of the Smaller and Larger Sukhāvativyūha, the sacred texts of the Pure Land School in China and Japan. The Divyāvadāna, already well-known through Burnouf's translations in his *Introduction*, was carefully edited by E. B.

Cowell (1826–1903) and R. A. Neil in 1886. Five years later, in 1891, Hendrik Kern (1833–1917) published the *Jātakamālā* as the first volume of the *Harvard Oriental Series*. Sarat Chandra Das (1849–1917) and Hari Mohan Vidyabhusan began the publication of Ksemendra's *Avadānakalpalatā* in 1888. The last fascicle appeared only in 1918. In 1889 Minaev published Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (*Zap. Vost. Otd. Imp. R. Arx. Obšč.*, IV, pp. 153–228). Louis de La Vallée Poussin (1869–1938) in 1898 published the ninth chapter of Prajñākaramati's commentary and from 1901 to 1914 the complete text.¹ In 1893 Cowell published the *Buddhacarita*. Lefmann (1831–1912)'s new edition of the *Lalitavistara* was printed in 1882 but did not appear until 1902.²

The enumeration of the Pāli and Sanskrit texts published in those years shows how active scholars were at that time in editing Buddhist texts. During the same period great efforts were made in the interpretation of the Buddhist texts. The problems, discussed in the works of the leading scholars, are of basic importance and it is therefore necessary to dwell upon their work in some detail. Senart's *Essai sur la légende du Buddha* appeared from 1873 to 1875 in the *Journal Asiatique* but the second edition, which dates from 1882, deserves our special attention because it contains a revised version of the introduction and the conclusions in which the author carefully explains his method and the results obtained by it. Senart explains that the stories relating to the Buddha contain both legendary and realistic elements. In the past scholars have considered the legendary elements as an addition to a basis of historical facts. Once freed from these legendary elements, the historical truth about the Buddha would become clear. It was usual to apply this method—called the subtraction method by de La Vallée Poussin—before Senart's time and also after him. It was the same method of historical criticism which was developed by New Testament scholars in studying the life of Jesus. However, Senart believed that the legendary or rather the mythological elements form a coherent system which existed already before the time of the Buddha. It is not surprising to see that Senart made great use of the *Lalitavistara*. As to the Pāli texts, he was unable to go back to the canonical texts, which were not yet published

¹ *Bouddhisme, Études et Mémoires*. London, 1898, pp. 233–388; *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*, Calcutta, 1901–1914.

² Cf. *Lalitavistara* (ed. S. Lefmann), vol. II, Halle, 1908, p. v.

at that time. He relied upon such texts as the *Nidānakathā* and the *Budhavamsa* and its commentary. Senart studied in detail the conception of the cakravartin and his seven ratna and that of the Mahāpuruṣa and his marks. In this way the Buddha was considered by him as the solar hero, the Mahāpuruṣa, the Cakravartin. Before his birth he is the supreme god. He descends from heaven as a luminous god. His mother, Māyā, represents the sovereign creative power and is at the same time the goddess of the atmospheric mist. She dies but survives as Prajāpatī, creating and nourishing the universe and its god. In this way Senart explains all twelve episodes of his life. He characterizes his method as historical mythology as distinct from comparative mythology. The latter method was very popular in the nineteenth century and tended to assimilate gods and mythological figures to naturalistic phenomena as the sun, the clouds, lightning, etc. It will be sufficient to mention in this connection the names of Adalbert Kuhn, author of *Die Herabkunft des Feuers und der Göttertranke*, Berlin (1859) and of Max Müller, *Essay on Comparative Mythology*, London (1856); *Lectures on the Science of Language*, London (1861–1864). Senart's merit consists in the fact that he—although influenced by the naturalistic mythology of his time—in the first place tried to explain the myth of the Buddha as a product of India and its religious concepts. In this regard his attitude is in marked contrast to that of Kern in his book on the history of Buddhism in India, which was first published in two volumes in Dutch in 1882 and 1884. A German edition appeared in the same years, translated from Dutch by Hermann Jacobi: *Der Buddhismus und seine Geschichte in Indien* (Leipzig, 1882–1884). Almost twenty years later a French translation was published (*Histoire du Bouddhisme dans l'Inde*, Paris, 1901–1903). In the first volume Kern related first the life of the Buddha according to Pali and Sanskrit sources—or according to Southern and Northern sources, as one used to say at that time. His main sources are the same as those used by Senart: the *Nidānakathā* and the *Lalitavistara* (cf. Vol. I, p. 18, n. 2). After having retold the legend of the Buddha in great detail, Kern arrives at his interpretation. Like Senart he considers the Buddha to be a solar god. However, Kern is much more astronomical in his exegesis than Senart. The twelve *nidāna* are the twelve months of the year. The six heretical teachers are the planets. His first predication takes place in midsummer. For this reason the Middle Way is its theme. Kern never hesitates in his identifications with stars, planets and constellations. Senart's system of

interpretation is based upon a careful examination of the Vedic and Brahmanical literature but one finds nothing similar in Kern's book. One observes with some astonishment that his categorical statements have been able to carry away even such a sober-minded and cautious scholar as Barth, who was willing to consider the courtezans as mother-goddesses, the six heretical teachers as the six planets and the rebellion of Devadatta as the struggle of the moon with the sun (*Oeuvres de Auguste Barth*, I, Paris, 1914, p. 335). However, Barth believed that the legend of the Buddha contains historical elements which had been handed down since the time of the Buddha. Even Senart was willing to admit that historical elements had been connected secondarily with the mythical biography of the Buddha (*op. cit.*, pp. 442-444), but for him the mythical and historical elements belonged to two entirely different traditions. Senart conceded the fact that the Pāli sources were less miraculous than the Lalitavistara but, according to him, this does not guarantee their greater authenticity. On the contrary, this is due to the fact that they have been re-written and simplified. Nevertheless, the mythical elements which have been preserved in the Pāli tradition show that there is no fundamental difference between the Pāli tradition and the Sanskrit sources.

Kern entirely dissolved the historical Buddha in the solar god. Senart and Barth did admit the possibility that reliable information had been handed down concerning the life of the Buddha, but neither of them attempted to collect these data. T. W. Rhys Davids, who in 1877 published his *Buddhism, being a sketch of the life and teachings of Gautama the Buddha* (I quote from the 14th edition published in 1890), believed that the Pāli texts are much more reliable and complete than the Sanskrit works. He put great reliance on those statements in which they agree. According to him it is possible to discover the historical basis of the legend of the Buddha. On the basis of the Pāli sources, Rhys Davids sketches the life of Gautama. In a chapter on the legend of the Buddha he refers to Senart's theory which he accepts "to a certain modified extent" (p. 190). Rhys Davids believes that "the later forms of each episode (of Buddha's life) differ chiefly from the former in the way in which they further exaggerate the details of the stories so as to make them more consistent with the imperial wealth and power ascribed to Gautama or his father by the Chakrawarti parallel; or with the belief in Gautama's omniscience and omnipotence" (p. 194).

Senart's theory was rejected by Hermann Oldenberg (1854–1920) in his *Buddha. Sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde*, which appeared in 1881. I quote from the second edition (Berlin, 1890) which refers to the second edition of Senart's *Légende* (Paris, 1882). In a chapter entitled "The character of the tradition. Legend and myth" (Die Beschaffenheit der Tradition. Legende und Mythos), Oldenberg defends the reliability of the canonical Pāli texts. According to him the great majority of the sacred texts were compiled before the council at Vesālī about 380 B. C. These texts were transmitted in Ceylon without undergoing such profound changes as those to which the texts of other schools were subjected. Oldenberg points out that the Pāli texts used by Senart such as the Nidānakathā and the Buddhavaṃsa are much younger than the canonical texts. He is firmly convinced of the fact that the canonical texts contain a series of positive facts which inform us about the life of the Buddha. Oldenberg is without doubt justified in pointing out that Senart has based his theory on younger texts. However, it is difficult to accept that the Pāli Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas are a reliable source for Buddhism during the first century after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa. Already in 1879 in the introduction to his edition of the Mahāvagga, Oldenberg defended the historicity of the Council at Vesālī and the antiquity of the Vinaya. On this point he never changed his opinion, as one can see from a note, published in 1912, in which he declares that the essential parts of the Vinaya and Sutta Pitakas were compiled before the Council at Vesālī.³

Oldenberg does not deny that the traditions concerning the Buddha contain legendary elements which go back to Vedic times or even further back and which are connected with popular ideas relating to the solar hero, the luminous example of all earthly heroes (p. 89). However, when Oldenberg relates the life of the Buddha, he does not elaborate on this aspect of the legend of the Buddha. No scholar has accepted in their entirety Senart's theories, but it is interesting to see that even such eminent representatives of what came to be called the Pāli school as Rhys Davids and Oldenberg did not deny that Senart was not completely wrong. Kern's extreme view which even denied the existence of the historical Buddha altogether has not found any followers, but Senart's

³ Cf. Studien zur Geschichte des buddhistischen Kanons, *NGGW*, 1912, p. 203, no. 5 = *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1967, p. 1021, n. 5.

theory has continued to exercise a fascination on later scholars even though most of them followed Oldenberg's example. It has become customary to oppose Senart's mythological method to Oldenberg's rationalistic and euhemeristic method. Foucher, the author of the most recent work on the Buddha, declares that in Senart's Buddha the human being is absent but in the one described by Oldenberg the god.⁴ This formula which had first been used by Barth, who did not refer to Senart's work but to Kern's *History of Buddhism*, has often been repeated. Without doubt it underlines a very important aspect of the methods applied by Senart and Oldenberg and it would be possible, by placing Senart or Kern at one end of the spectrum and Oldenberg at the other, to determine the exact place which later scholars occupy in relation to Senart or Oldenberg. Some are closer to Senart, some to Oldenberg or go even beyond him. However, one aspect of the work by Senart and Oldenberg is not covered by the above-mentioned formula. Senart did not hesitate to make use of texts of much later date because he thought it possible to reconstruct the legend of the Buddha as a system of which the separate parts are indissolubly connected. To use a modern terminology, Senart's approach was structuralistic as against Oldenberg's atomistic method which consisted in collecting bits of historical information in the oldest accessible sources. By denying Senart the right to make use of some texts of later date, by accepting only part of his conclusions, one does not take into account an essential aspect of Senart's method. The important point in Senart's work is the fact that he based himself upon the conceptions which the Indians had of the Buddha. Their reality is not the historical reality as conceived by nineteenth century scholars.

Oldenberg's merit consists less in his rejection of Senart's methodological views but in his attempt to distinguish earlier and later sources. Oldenberg has done important work in studying Buddhist texts from the point of their style. Already in his *Buddha* he draws attention to some stylistic features which prove the younger date of the Buddhavamsa (second ed., 1890, p. 77, n. 1). In 1882 he distinguished earlier and later strata in the Lalitavistara.⁶ He con-

⁴ *La vie du Bouddha*, 1949, p. 13.

⁵ RHR, 1882, p. 242 = *Œuvres*, I, Paris, 1914, p. 344.

⁶ Über den Lalitavistara, *Verhandlungen des 5. Internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses*, Berlin, 1882, Bd. 2, 2, Berlin, 1882, pp. 107-122 = *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 873-888.

tinued this line of research in his *Buddhistische Studien* which were published in 1898.⁷ Famous is his distinction between a nominal style A and a hieratic, canonical style B in Buddhist Sanskrit texts such as the Mahāvastu, the Divyāvadāna, the Avadānaśataka, etc.⁸ Style B closely resembles the style of canonical Pāli texts and is older than style A. Oldenberg is the first scholar to have undertaken the task which Burnouf was unable to accomplish: the comparison of Pāli and Sanskrit texts for the sake of establishing the older and common elements in both. Notable work has been done also in this respect by Ernst Windisch (1844–1918) in his studies on Māra and Buddha, the birth of the Buddha and the composition of the Mahāvastu.⁹ Oldenberg already took into account the Sanskrit fragments discovered in Central Asia in the beginning of the twentieth century. As we will see later on, the publication of Sanskrit fragments and their comparison with parallel texts in Pāli, Chinese and Tibetan has made great progress in the last forty years.

Oldenberg's reliance on the Pāli texts was connected with his belief in the historicity of the Council at Vesālī and in the compilation of Buddhist texts before this Council. His examination of the traditions concerning the two first councils at Rājagṛha and Vaiśālī in the introduction to his edition of the Mahāvagga in 1879 has stimulated in the following years an animated discussion on the Councils. A good summary of the different points of view and of the literature up to 1911 is found in L. de La Vallée Poussin's article in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (vol. IV, 1911, pp. 179–185). The inconclusiveness of the debate shows the difficulties in obtaining reliable information from the conflicting Buddhist traditions. La Vallée Poussin, who also published a long article on the Councils in 1905,¹⁰ declared that without a study of the Chinese sources no definite conclusions could be reached. However, even the transla-

⁷ *Buddhistische Studien*, *ZDMG*, 52, 1898, pp. 613–694 = *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 889–970.

⁸ *Studien zum Mahāvastu*, *NGGW*, 1912, pp. 123–154 = *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 1037–1068; *Studien zur Geschichte des buddhistischen Kanons*, *ibid.*, pp. 155–218 = *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 973–1036.

⁹ *Māra und Buddha*, Leipzig, 1895; *Buddha's Geburt und die Lehre von der Seelenwanderung*, Leipzig, 1908; *Die Komposition des Mahāvastu*, *Abh. d. K. Sächsischen Ges. d. Wiss.*, Philol.-hist. Kl., XXVII, 1909, pp. 467–511.

¹⁰ *Les deux premiers conciles*, *Muséon*, VI, 1905, pp. 213–323; English tr.: *The Buddhist Councils*, *JA*, 37, 1908, pp. 1–18, 81–106.

tion and study of the Chinese sources by Jean Przyluski in 1926–1928¹¹ and by Marcel Hofinger in 1946¹² has not put an end to the debate as can be seen from recent studies.¹³

The introduction of Oldenberg's *Buddha* contains a chapter entitled "Indian pantheism and pessimism before Buddha," in which he studies the relations between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Oldenberg discovered in the older Upaniṣads ideas which are closely related to Buddhist ideas. Quoting BAU IV. 4.12 ātmānam ced vijāniyāt ayam asmiti puruṣaḥ, kim icchan kasya kāmāya śariram anusamjvaret (If a man should well understand the Self, saying 'I am It'—seeking after what, for desire of what, should he crave after the body?—tr. Edgerton, *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy*, 1965, p. 163), Oldenberg pointed to the similarity with Buddhist ideas about desire, nescience and the abolition of suffering through knowledge (*Buddha*, 2. Auflage, 1890, p. 53). Special attention was paid by Oldenberg to the Kāthaka-Upaniṣad, in which text, pre-buddhist according to him, the Buddhist Satan Māra figures in the form of *mṛtyu* 'Death'. Oldenberg believed that the Buddhists had probably not known the brahmanical texts but, nevertheless, he did not hesitate to state that Buddhism had not only inherited from Brahmanism many of its important dogmas but also the mood of religious thought and sentiments (*op. cit.*, p. 54). Since 1881 much has been written on the relations between the Upaniṣads and Buddhism, but without clear results. In 1925 in a preface to a new edition of his *Bouddhisme*, which was first published in 1909, La Vallée Poussin remarked that on the relations between the Upaniṣads and ancient Buddhism arbitrary judgments were given (p. vii: "Sur les rapports des Upanishads et du vieux Bouddhisme, on s'en tient à des opinions arbitraires"). La Vallée Poussin does not pronounce himself on this problem and in his *Le dogme et la philosophie du bouddhisme* which

¹¹ *Le concile de Rājagṛha. Introduction à l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques*, Paris, 1926–1928.

¹² *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī*, Louvain, 1946.

¹³ For instance: Paul Demiéville, A propos du concile de Vaiśālī, *T'oung Pao*, XL, 1951, pp. 239–296; Erich Frauwallner, Die buddhistischen Konzile, *ZDMG*, 102, 1952, pp. 240–261; A. Bareau, *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques*, Paris, 1955; Étienne Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, I, Louvain, 1958, pp. 136–154, 297–300; L. Alsdorf, Aśokas Schismen-Edikt und das Dritte Konzil, *IIJ*, III, 1959, pp. 161–174; H. Bechert, Aśokas "Schismen-Edikt" und der Begriff Sanghabheda, *WZKS*, V, 1961, pp. 18–52.

appeared in 1930, he contents himself with some bibliographical notes (pp. 165-167). Opinions have varied greatly. As La Vallée Poussin remarked, scholars who take their point of departure in the Veda and Brahmanism, consider Buddhism as an annex of Brahmanism. The doctrines of transmigration and of the act had been invented by the brahmins. The life of a religious mendicant had been inaugurated by the brahmins and Nirvāna is nothing else than an atheist deformation of Nirvāna in Brahman. With these words La Vallée Poussin describes an extreme point of view. Between this point of view and the other extreme which denies any relation at all between brahmanical and Buddhist ideas intermediate positions have been taken by most scholars. The bibliography on this topic is immense and a critical analysis of even some of the most important publications would take up too much space.¹⁴

In the first and second edition of his *Buddha*, Oldenberg denied any relation between Sāṃkhya philosophy and Buddhism (*op. cit.*, p. 100, note 1). Already Burnouf in his *Introduction* discussed the relation between Buddhism and Sāṃkhya philosophy, and observed a great analogy between the primitive ontology of Buddhism as reflected in the theory of the twelve nidāna and Sāṃkhya philosophy (p. 511). Albrecht Weber tried to identify the tattvas of the Sāṃkhya with the nidānas.¹⁵ Max Müller firmly rejected any similarity between Sāṃkhya and Buddhism.¹⁶ However, the controversy on this problem became acute with the publication in 1896 of an article by Hermann Jacobi (1850-1937).¹⁷ Jacobi believed that the nidānas were based upon a pre-classical Sāṃkhya system which did not know the three guṇa and which was taught by Buddha's teacher Arāḍa Kālāma whose tenets are exposed by Aśvaghōṣa in the twelfth canto of the *Buddhacarita*. Oldenberg replied to Jacobi's theory in the third edition of his *Buddha* (1897, pp. 443-455). The problem of the relations between Sāṃkhya and Buddhism was studied again by him in his

¹⁴ The most recent discussion is to be found in an article by Paul Horsch, *Buddhismus und Upaniṣaden, Pratidānam (Kaiser Volume, 1968)*, pp. 462-477.

¹⁵ Die neuesten Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Buddhismus, *Indische Studien*, III, 1853, pp. 131-133.

¹⁶ Cf. *Chips from a German workshop*, I, London, 1867, p. 226. This passage is quoted by Oldenberg, *Buddha*, 2. A., p. 100, note 1.

¹⁷ Der Ursprung des Buddhismus aus dem Sāṃkhya-yoga (*NGGW*, 1896, pp. 43-58 = *Kleine Schriften*, II, Wiesbaden, 1970, pp. 646-661).

Buddhistische Studien, ZDMG, 52, 1898, pp. 681–694 (= *Kleine Schriften*, II, pp. 957–970), in his book on the Upanisads which was published in 1915 (*Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus*, 1915, 2. Aufl. 1923, pp. 254–275) and in an article on the Sāṃkhya-system, published in 1917, in which he stated unambiguously that Buddhism was influenced by pre-classical Sāṃkhya.¹⁸ Jacobi defended his views against Oldenberg's objections in his *Buddha* and against Senart¹⁹ in a second article in which he did not fundamentally change his position.²⁰ Richard Garbe (1857–1927) also believed that Buddhism was influenced by Sāṃkhya, not by a pre-classical Sāṃkhya, however, but by Kapila's system which he considered to be older than Buddhism.²¹ Dependence of Buddhism on Sāṃkhya ideas had also been defended by other scholars such as Joseph Dahlmann (1860–1930)²² and Richard Fischel (1849–1908).²³ More careful in his judgment is A. B. Keith (1879–1944).²⁴ La Vallée Poussin rejected Sāṃkhya influence but did not elaborate his point of view.²⁵ Recently Horsch stated categorically that all attempts to derive Buddhist philosophy from a primitive Sāṃkhya (*Ursāṃkhya*) must be considered as unsuccessful, but the last word on this problem has certainly not yet been said.²⁶

Kern was the first scholar to advocate Yoga influence on Buddhism.²⁷ On

¹⁸ Zur Geschichte der Sāṃkhya-Philosophie, *NGGW*, 1917, pp. 218–253 = *Kleine Schriften*, II, pp. 1423–1458. On Buddhism and Sāṃkhya see pp. 1445–1452.

¹⁹ A propos de la théorie bouddhique des douze Nidānas, *Mélanges Charles de Harlez*, 1896, pp. 281–297.

²⁰ Über das Verhältnis der buddhistischen Philosophie zu Sāṃkhya-Yoga und die Bedeutung der Nidānas, ZDMG, 52, 1898 = *Kleine Schriften*, II, pp. 662–676.

²¹ Einleitung zur Übersetzung des Sāṃkhyattvakaumudī, München, 1892, pp. 517ff.; *Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, 1894, pp. 3–5, 14–23; *Sāṃkhya und Yoga*, 1896; *Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, 2. Auflage, 1917, pp. 6–18.

²² *Nirvāna*, Berlin, 1897; *Buddha*, Berlin, 1898; *Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, Berlin, 1902.

²³ *Leben und Lehre des Buddha*, Leipzig, 1906.

²⁴ *The Sāṃkhya System*, London, 1918, 2nd ed., 1924, pp. 24–33; *Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon*, Oxford, 1923, pp. 138–143.

²⁵ Cf. *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux* (1898), p. 82; *Indo-européens et Indo-iraniens*, Paris, 1924; Nouvelle édition, Paris, 1936, p. 310; *Le dogme et la philosophie du bouddhisme*, Paris, 1930, p. 182.

²⁶ Buddhismus und Upanisaden, *Pratidānam*, 1968, p. 475.

²⁷ *Geschiedenis etc.*, I (1882), pp. 366–405.

this point also the relations between Buddhism and classical Yoga or pre-classical Yoga have often been discussed. In 1898 La Vallée Poussin reacted against the definition of Buddhism as an atheist religion and consecrated a chapter of his book on Buddhism to Buddhist Yoga.²⁸ Senart studied in detail Yoga influence on Buddhism, but he has been unable to convince other scholars that the Yoga which influenced Buddhism was already Yoga in its classical form.²⁹ In his *Origines bouddhiques* he arrived at a different conclusion, according to which Buddhism was influenced by a form of Viṣṇuīte Yoga older than the Yoga of the epic and not yet associated with Sāṃkhya.³⁰

La Vallée Poussin and Beckh have stressed the importance of Yoga in Buddhism. La Vallée Poussin declared that Buddhism is essentially pure Yoga, Nirvāna mysticism.³¹ Similarly Hermann Beckh (1875–1937) stated that “Der ganze Buddhismus ist durch und durch nichts als Yoga.”³² Oldenberg recognized the importance of Yoga in Buddhism but was not willing to consider Buddhism as a branch of Yoga.³³ For a bibliography on Yoga and Buddhism one must refer to La Vallée Poussin’s publications.³⁴ La Vallée Poussin does not mention Beckh’s *Buddhismus* (I-II, 1916)³⁵ or Keith’s chapter on Buddhism and Yoga in his *Buddhist Philosophy* (1923, pp. 143–145).

While texts were edited and translated and the problems connected with their interpretation were studied by scholars in Europe, in India inscriptions were discovered and edited and Buddhist monuments described and interpreted. Among the inscriptions, those of Aśoka are the most important for the historian. It is not necessary to relate the first attempts at deciphering by James Prinsep (1799–1840) in 1834 and the following years. Burnouf is the first scholar of Buddhism to have studied the Aśokan inscriptions. He remarked that these epigraphical monuments contain a considerable number

²⁸ *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux*, pp. 82–93.

²⁹ *Bouddhisme et Yoga*, *RHR*, 42, 1900, pp. 345–365; *Nirvāna*, *Album Kern* (Leiden, 1903), pp. 101–104.

³⁰ *Origines bouddhiques*, *AMG*, B. V., tome 25, 1907, pp. 115–158.

³¹ *Le bouddhisme et le yoga de Patañjali*, *MCB*, V, 1937, p. 227.

³² *Buddhismus*, II, Berlin und Leipzig, 1916, p. 11.

³³ *Die Lehre der Upanishaden* (1923), pp. 275–288.

³⁴ *Le dogme et la philosophie du bouddhisme* (1930), pp. 182–184; *Le bouddhisme et le yoga de Patañjali*, *MCB*, V, p. 223, n. 1.

³⁵ Latest edition in one volume, Stuttgart, 1958.

of words and expressions which belong to the language and the authentic doctrine of Buddhism (*Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi*, p. 653). Burnouf's careful examination of the inscriptions in the tenth appendix of his book (pp. 652-781) resulted in a more adequate interpretation of many passages. His work was continued by Kern who in 1873 published a monograph on the "Chronology of the Southern Buddhists and the monuments of Aśoka the Buddhist" (*Over de Jaartelling der Zuidelijke Buddhisten en de Gedenkstukken van Aśoka den Buddhist*, Amsterdam, 1873). In 1874 Barth published a long review of Kern's work.³⁶ In 1877 General Alexander Cunningham (1814-1893), who in 1870 became director-general of the "Archaeological Survey of India," published as volume I of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* a comprehensive edition of the inscriptions of Aśoka. New inscriptions continued to be discovered. Senart, who in 1879 wrote a long article on Cunningham's edition, prepared a new edition of the inscriptions in a long series of articles in the *Journal Asiatique* which were published later in two volumes: *Les inscriptions de Piyadasi*, Paris, 1881-1886. Senart's great knowledge of Middle-Indian languages enabled him to make an important contribution to the study of the language and the grammar of the inscriptions. Senart also studied the inscriptions in a larger perspective in an article published in 1889.³⁷ On the basis of the inscriptions, Senart described a popular Buddhism which attached more importance to happiness in this world and to rebirth in heaven than to Nirvāṇa and to abstruse speculations on the causal chain. According to him, Buddhism was at that time a large popular movement inspired by an elevated ethical code and reacting against ritual Brahmanism in the same way as contemporary Hinduism. Barth did not accept Senart's conclusions and pointed out that dogmatical speculations must have originated very soon in Buddhism.³⁸ La Vallée Poussin remarked that from the beginning Buddhism was at the same time not only a religion of the masses but also of a clergy which propagated a doctrine of salvation and ascetism.³⁹ In the preface of the second edition of his *Buddha*, Oldenberg entirely rejected Senart's ideas

³⁶ *Œuvres*, III, 1917, pp. 131-139.

³⁷ Un roi de l'Inde au IIIe siècle avant notre ère. Aśoka et le bouddhisme, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1^{er} mars 1889 (tome 92), pp. 67-108.

³⁸ *Œuvres*, II, 1914, pp. 55-57.

³⁹ *Bouddhisme, Études et matériaux*, London, 1898, pp. 31-33.

and remarked that the true nature of Buddhism was realised not by the lay-followers, but by the monks whose goal was Nirvāna. Oldenberg also protested against Senart's reduction of Buddhism to a branch of Hinduism and pointed out that fundamental Buddhist concepts such as the dualism between the sufferings of human existence and deliverance, the doctrine of karman and also the ascetic way of life were inherited from Vedism (*Buddha*, 2. Auflage, 1890, pp. iii-viii). Though Senart's views were not accepted by these prominent scholars, his concept of Aśokan Buddhism has continued to exercise a kind of subterranean influence on Buddhist studies and not without justification. The inscriptions of Aśoka cannot give a complete picture of Buddhism in the third century B. C., but they are of great value for the study of popular Buddhism at that time and of the influence Buddhism had among lay-followers. Buddhism is not only a doctrine of monks and ascetics but also a religion which for many centuries counted its followers in India by many millions. It is one of the merits of La Vallée Poussin's *Bouddhisme* (London, 1898) to have stressed the importance of taking into account both popular Buddhism and monastic Buddhism for a better understanding of the place of Buddhism in the history of Indian religions.

Senart's *Inscriptions de Piyadasi* was followed by other publications of new inscriptions and by contributions to their interpretation. Senart himself wrote several articles. Important work was also done by Georg Bühler (1837-1898) and Heinrich Lüders (1869-1943). Eugen Hultzsch (1857-1927) published a new edition of *The Inscriptions of Asoka* in 1925. His work has remained the standard edition up to our days but many new discoveries and new interpretations which have been published in recent years make the publication of an entirely new edition an urgent desideratum. K. R. Norman of Cambridge University has for a number of years been engaged in this task and we may hope to see the publication of his edition in the course of this decennium.⁴⁰

The Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey which were published from 1871 onwards by Cunningham and by James Burgess, who succeeded him in 1885 as director-general, contain much material for Buddhist archaeology. Of special importance for Buddhist studies was Cunningham's book

⁴⁰ For a bibliography see M.A. Mehendale, *Aśokan Inscriptions in India* (A Linguistic Study together with an exhaustive Bibliography), Bombay, 1948.

on *The Stupa of Bharhut* (London, 1879). The monuments of Sāñchī had already been studied by James Fergusson in his *Tree and Serpent Worship* (London, 1868). However, neither his work nor F. C. Maisey's *Sanchi and its Remains* (London, 1892) were very satisfactory. Sir John Marshall (1870–1958), who in 1902 succeeded to Burgess, continued the work first undertaken by Cunningham (*The Bilsa Topes*, London, 1854). His guide to Sāñchī (*A Guide to Sanchi*, Delhi, 1918; 2nd ed., 1936) was the result of the work done by him on the site between 1912 and 1919. With A. Foucher and N. G. Majumdar he published finally in 1940 *The Monuments of Sanchi*, a splendid publication in which Marshall studied the monuments and the art of Sāñchī, Foucher (1865–1952) the meaning of the sculptures and N. G. Majumdar the inscriptions.⁴¹

It is not feasible to enumerate the important epigraphical and archaeological discoveries which relate to Buddhism but mention must be made of the Aśokan inscriptions discovered in 1895 and 1896 in Nepal. The first, found near the village Nigliwa, mentions the stūpa of the Buddha Konākamana, the second, found at a distance of 13 miles from it near the village Paḍeria, was erected by Aśoka in the 21st year after his consecration to commemorate the birth of the Buddha in the park of Lummini. The discovery of these two pillars and consequently of the nearby site of Kapilavastu and of the stūpa of Krakucchanda established, as Barth remarked, that the legend of the Buddha is more ancient than was supposed before.⁴² The discoveries could not prove the historical truth contained in the legend of Buddha, but they made it impossible to consider Kapilavastu a mythological locality without a real foundation as had been done by Senart and Kern. Already about 1870 Cunningham believed that he had rediscovered the place of Buddha's Nirvāṇa near the village of Kasia, 34 miles East of Gorakhpur, but doubt continued. Vincent A. Smith wrote a monograph on *The Remains near Kasia* (Allahabad, 1896) in which he rejected Cunningham's claim. It is only in 1911 that an inscription discovered by Hiranda Shastri proved without any doubt that Cunningham had been correct in his identification.⁴³

⁴¹ For a survey of the archaeological work done in India up to 1938 see *Revealing India's Past. A Cooperative Record of Archaeological Conservation and Exploration in India and Beyond*. London, 1939.

⁴² Découvertes récentes de M. le Dr Führer au Népal, *Œuvres*, IV, pp. 323–335.

⁴³ Cf. J. Ph. Vogel, *Op het voetspoor van Boeddha*, Haarlem, 1934, p. 72.

The last decennium of the nineteenth century inaugurated a long series of important discoveries of Buddhist manuscripts in Central Asia. The Russian consul in Kashgar, Nikolaj Fedorovitch Petrovskij (1837–1908)⁴⁴ sent manuscripts in several languages to Serge Oldenburg (1863–1934) in St. Petersburg. A photocopy of one leaf of a Kuchean text was published by Oldenburg in 1892 and in 1900 Ernst Leumann (1859–1931) published a transcription of it and of another leaf.⁴⁵ In the following years Oldenburg published Sanskrit fragments from Kashgar.⁴⁶ In the same years manuscripts from Khotan and Kashgar were sent to A. F. R. Hoernle (1841–1918) who reported on them in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*.⁴⁷ Of great importance was the discovery of a manuscript of a version of the Dharmapada in Prakrit. Part of the manuscript had been acquired by Dutreuil de Rhins and Grenard in Khotan in 1892. Another part had been sent to Oldenburg by Petrovskij in 1897. Oldenburg published a facsimile and transcription of one leaf in 1897 and in the following year Senart published a transliteration of the fragments in Paris.⁴⁸ A definitive edition of all fragments was not published before 1962: John Brough, *The Gandhārī Dharmapada*, London, 1962. It contains a full bibliography of all publications relating to the text.

These and other discoveries in Central Asia led to the organisation of several expeditions to Central Asia: three expeditions led by Sir Aurel Stein

⁴⁴ Cf. S. F. Oldenburg, Pamjati Nikolaja Fedoroviča Petrovskogo 1837–1908, *Zap. Vest. Otd. R. Arcb. Obšč.*, XX, 1910, pp. 01–08.

⁴⁵ S. F. Oldenburg, Kašgarskaja rukopis N. F. Petrovskogo, *ZVORAO*, VII, 1892, pp. 81–82; E. Leumann, Über eine von den unbekanntem Literatursprachen Mittelasiens, *Mémoires de l'Acad. imp. des sc. de St.-P.*, VIIIe série, Tome IV, No. 8, 28 pp., 2 pl.

⁴⁶ Otryvki kašgarskix sanskritskix rukopisej iz sobranija N. F. Petrovskogo, *ZVORAO*, VIII, 1894, pp. 47–67; XI, 1899, pp. 207–267; XV, 1902–3, pp. 0113–0122; K kašgarskim buddijskim tekstam, *ibid.*, VIII, 1894, pp. 151–153; Ešče po povodu kašgarskix tekstov, *ibid.*, pp. 349–351.

⁴⁷ The Weber Manuscripts, *JASB*, 62, part 1, 1893, pp. 1–40; Three further collections of Ancient manuscripts from Central Asia, *ibid.*, 66, part 1, 1897, pp. 213–260; A report on the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia, *JASB*, 68, part 1, Extra-number Nr. 1, 1899 and *JASB*, 70, part 1, Extra-number 1, 1901.

⁴⁸ S. F. Oldenburg, Predvaritel'naja zametka o buddijskoj rukopisi, napisannoju pis'menami kharoṣṭhī, Sanktpetersburg, 1897; E. Senart, Le manuscrit kharoṣṭhī du Dharmapada: les fragments Dutreuil de Rhins, *JA*, 1898, II, pp. 193–308, 545–548.

(1862–1943) in 1900–1901, 1906–1908 and 1913–1916, four German expeditions, the first led by Albert Grünwedel (1856–1935) and Georg Huth (1867–1906) in 1902–1903, the second by Von Le Coq (1860–1930) in 1904–1905, the third by Von Le Coq and Grünwedel in 1905–1907 and the fourth led by Von Le Coq in 1913–1914, a French expedition led by P. Pelliot (1878–1945) in 1906–1908, three Japanese expeditions in 1902–1904, 1908–1909 and 1910–1913, and three Russian expeditions, the first by D. Klementz in 1898, the second and third led by Serge Oldenburg in 1909–1910 and 1914–1915. Other expeditions are mentioned by Jack A. Dabbs⁴⁹ but the above-mentioned are the most important for Buddhist studies. Buddhist manuscripts in Sanskrit, Kuchean, Agnean, Khotanese, Sogdian, Uigur, Tibetan and Chinese arrived in great number in Paris, London, Berlin, St. Petersburg and Japan as a result of these expeditions. A bibliography of Central Asiatic Studies has been published in volume I of the *Monumenta Serindica* (Kyoto, 1958, pp. 53–87). Waldschmidt's *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfansfunden* (I, Wiesbaden, 1965, pp. xxvi–xxxii) lists all Sanskrit fragments published by German scholars from 1904 to 1964 (for the years 1964–1970 see volume III, 1971, pp. 275–276). Bernard Pauly has listed the publications of Sanskrit fragments brought back by Pelliot: *Fragments sanskrits de Haute Asie (Mission Pelliot)*, *JA*, 1965, pp. 83–121. As far as I know, there are no bibliographies for the publication of Sanskrit fragments from the collections in London, Leningrad and Japan, but most of those, published before 1959, are to be found in Yamada's *Bongobuten no sbobunken* (Kyoto, 1959). For Kuchean and Agnean one must refer to Ernst Schwentner, *Tocharische Bibliographie 1890–1958* (Berlin, 1959), for Sogdian to M. J. Dresden, *Bibliographia Sogdica concisa (Jaarbericht No. 8 van het vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap Ex Oriente Lux, 1942, pp. 729–734)*, for Khotanese to M. J. Dresden, *Introductio ad linguam hvatanicam (ibid., No. 9, 1944, pp. 200–206)* and L. G. Gercenberg, *Xotano-Sakskij jazyk*, Moskva 1965, pp. 16–29; for Uigur to Rudolf Loewenthal, *The Turkic Languages and Literatures of Central Asia* ('s-Gravenhage, 1957), and the supplementary indications given by me in *IJ*, II, 1958, p. 81. The Tibetan manuscripts in Paris and London

⁴⁹ Jack A. Dabbs, *History of the discovery and exploration of Chinese Turkestan*. The Hague, 1963; Chap. V. The Archaeological Period: 1888 to Stein's First Expedition; Chap. VI. The Archaeological Period: 1901–1914.

have been catalogued by Marcelle Lalou⁵⁰ and La Vallée Poussin⁵¹ but a bibliography of text editions does not exist.

We have mentioned the principal publications of Kern, Senart, and Oldenberg. For other studies by them it suffices to refer to the bibliographies of these three scholars.⁵² The reviews of Auguste Barth (1834–1916), who especially during the period 1880 to 1900 carefully analysed many important publications on Buddhism, have been published in five volumes.⁵³ The bibliography of his works and the general index in volume 5 are very useful for the study of the history of Buddhist studies.

In the eighteen-sixties a new generation of scholars was born: R. Otto Franke (1862–1928), Serge d'Oldenburg (1863–1934), Sylvain Lévi (1863–1935), Th. Stcherbatsky (1866–1942), F. W. Thomas (1867–1956), E. J. Thomas (1869–1958), Louis de La Vallée Poussin (1869–1938) and Heinrich Lüders (1869–1943).

Sylvain Lévi's importance is not limited to Buddhism but the work which he has done in this field has had a lasting influence not only in Europe, but also in India and Japan. In 1927 Sylvain Lévi recalled how in 1887 Fujishima Ryōon and Fujieda Takutsū, two priests of the Nishi Honganji, became his first two pupils.⁵⁴ They have probably contributed in directing his attention towards Buddhism. Sylvain Lévi has not written any comprehensive work on Buddhism but his genius led him from discovery to discovery and his work has not ceased to stimulate research in many directions. Very soon he realised the importance of Chinese not only for the study of Buddhism, but also for that of Indian history. Sylvain Lévi has shown by his example that Indian,

⁵⁰ *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains de Touen-bouang*, I, Paris, 1939, II, 1950; III, 1961.

⁵¹ *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-buang in the India Office Library*, London, 1962.

⁵² H. Kern, *Verbreide Geschriften, Register en Bibliografie*, 's-Gravenhage, 1929; L. Finot, Nécrologie d'Émile Senart, *BEFEO*, XXVIII, 1929, pp. 335–347; A. Guérinot, Bibliographie des travaux d'Émile Senart, *JA*, 1933, II, fasc. annexe, pp. 1–75; Hermann Oldenberg, *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1967, pp. vii–xxxv.

⁵³ *Ceuvres de Auguste Barth*, I–V, Paris, 1914–1927. For an obituary of Barth see A. Foucher, Auguste Barth, *Bulletin de la commission archéologique de l'Indo-chine*. Années 1914–1916, Paris, 1916, pp. 207–221.

⁵⁴ Matériaux japonais pour l'étude du bouddhisme, *BMFJ*, I, 1927, p. 1.

Tibetan and Chinese sources are indispensable for the study of Buddhism. Sylvain Lévi was fascinated by Aśvaghōṣa. In 1892 he published text and translation of the first canto of his *Buddhacarita*,⁵⁵ but he abandoned his plan to edit the text in favour of Cowell. Already in his first publications Sylvain Lévi studied the historical problems related to Aśvaghōṣa, Kaniska and the Indo-Scythians.⁵⁶ During his first journey to Nepal in 1898 he looked for the Sanskrit original of Aśvaghōṣa's *Sūtrālamkāra*. Sylvain Lévi obtained a copy of Asaṅga's *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* which he edited and translated in 1907 and 1911, the first publication of a text of the Yogācāra school. His researches on Aśvaghōṣa resulted in tracing 26 stories of the *Divyāvadāna* in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin.⁵⁷ Sylvain Lévi's article complemented the research undertaken by Édouard Huber (1879–1914).⁵⁸ Huber's translation of the *Sūtrālamkāra* (Paris, 1908) was a point of departure for a long article on Aśvaghōṣa and his *Sūtrālamkāra* by Sylvain Lévi.⁵⁹ In 1922 Sylvain Lévi discovered in Nepal a manuscript of the *Dharmasamuccaya* which contains the verses of the *Saddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra*. In a famous article Sylvain Lévi had already in 1918 compared the description of Jambudvīpa in this work with the *digvarṇana* in the *Rāmāyana*.⁶⁰ On rather tenuous grounds Sylvain Lévi connected the name of Aśvaghōṣa with the *Saddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra*.⁶¹ The publication by Lüders in 1926 of Sanskrit fragments of the *Sūtrālamkāra* put into doubt both title and authorship of the work.⁶² Many scholars participated in the debate which took place in the following years.⁶³ Even though Sylvain Lévi has

⁵⁵ *Le Buddhacarita d'Aśvaghōṣa*, *J.A.*, 1892, I, pp. 201–236.

⁵⁶ *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes*, *J.A.*, 1896, II, pp. 444–484, 1897, I, pp. 5–42, 1897, II, pp. 526–531.

⁵⁷ *Les éléments de formation du Divyāvadāna*, *T'oung Pao*, 8, 1907, pp. 105–122.

⁵⁸ *Trois contes du Sūtrālamkāra d'Aśvaghōṣa conservés dans le Divyāvadāna*, *BEFEO*, IV, pp. 709–726; *Les sources du Divyāvadāna*, *BEFEO*, VI, 1906, pp. 1–43.

⁵⁹ *Aśvaghōṣa. Le Sūtrālamkāra et ses sources*, *J.A.*, 1908, II, pp. 57–184.

⁶⁰ *Pour l'histoire du Rāmāyana*, *J.A.*, 1918, I, pp. 5–161.

⁶¹ *J.A.*, 1925, I, pp. 36–40.

⁶² *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmanditika des Kumāralāta*, Leipzig, 1926.

⁶³ Sylvain Lévi, *La Dṛṣṭānta-pankti et son auteur*, *J.A.*, 1927, II, pp. 95–127; *Encore Aśvaghōṣa*, *J.A.*, 1928, II, pp. 193–216; *Autour d'Aśvaghōṣa*, *J.A.*, 1929, II, pp. 255–285; *Kaniska et Sātavāhana*, *J.A.*, 1936, I, p. 80; Johannes Nobel, *Kumāralāta und sein Werk*,*

claimed too much for Aśvaghosa, his devotion to him has brought to light much important material.

Sylvain Lévi's discovery in Nepal in 1922 of Vasubandhu's *Vimsatikā* and *Trimsikā* was of great importance for the knowledge of the Yogācāra school.⁶⁴ Some of the most important texts discovered by Sylvain Lévi were published by his pupils. Félix Lacôte (1873–1925) edited and translated Budhasvāmin's *Brhatkathāślokaśamgraha* (Paris, 1908–1929) which added a new dimension to the study of the famous *Brhatkathā*. Yamaguchi Susumu edited in 1934 Sthiramati's *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā* (Nagoya, 1934; reprint, Tokyo, 1966). Sylvain Lévi took also great interest in the discoveries of Sanskrit and Kuchean manuscripts in Central Asia. Pischel's publication of a Sanskrit fragment of the *Samyuktāgama* (*SPAW*, 1904, pp. 807–827) inaugurated the publication of Sanskrit manuscripts discovered by the German Turfan expeditions. Sylvain Lévi showed that the corresponding text was to be found in the Chinese version of the *Samyuktāgama*.⁶⁵ This discovery was of great importance for the history of the Buddhist canon. In a study of the sacred scriptures of the Buddhists, Sylvain Lévi underlined the importance of the discoveries of Buddhist texts of different schools for the history and comparative study of the Buddhist canon.⁶⁶ For Sylvain Lévi's editions of Sanskrit and Kuchean fragments we must refer to the bibliography of his writings in volume VII–VIII of the *Bibli-*

* *NGGW*, 1928, pp. 295–304; Um Aśvaghosa, *NGGW*, 1931, pp. 330–336; L. de La Vallée Poussin, *La Siddhi de Hinan-tsang*, I, Paris, 1928, pp. 221–224; Jean Przyluski, Aśvaghosa et la *Kalpanāmanditika*, *BCL*, 5e série, XVI, 1930, pp. 425–434 (see Pelliot's review *T'oung Pao*, 28, 1931, pp. 196–197); *Sautrāntika et Dārśāntika*, *RO*, VIII, 1932, pp. 14–24; *Dārśāntika, Sautrāntika and Sarvāstivādin*, *IHQ*, XVI, 1940, pp. 246–254; Entai Tomomatsu, *Sūtrālamkāra et Kalpanāmanditika*, *JA*, 1931, II, pp. 135–174, 245–337; E. H. Johnston, *Buddhacarita*, II (1936), pp. xxii–xxiii; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Mecaka et le Sūtrālamkāra*, *JA*, 1952, pp. 71–73.

⁶⁴ *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, Paris, 1925; *Matériaux pour l'étude du système Vijñaptimātra*, Paris, 1932.

⁶⁵ *Le Samyuktāgama sanscrit et les feuillets Grünwedel*, *T'oung Pao* 5, 1904, pp. 297–309.

⁶⁶ *Les Saintes Écritures du Bouddhisme. Comment s'est constitué le canon sacré*, *AMG*, B. V., t. XXXI, 1909, pp. 105–129 = *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*, Paris, 1937, pp. 75–84. For Oldenberg's reaction see *Studien zur Geschichte des buddhistischen Kanons*, *NGGW*, 1912, pp. 197–208 = *Kleine Schriften*, II, pp. 1015–1026.

ographie bouddhique (Paris, 1937, pp. 1-64). Of his other articles we mention only two which have a great bearing on the history of the Buddhist canon: his article on a precanonical language and his study on the texts recited by Kotikarna.⁶⁷ In 1928 Sylvain Lévi visited Bali and Java. In Bali he gained the confidence of the priests and was able to collect several stotra which were published in *Sanskrit Texts from Bali* (Baroda, 1933, GOS, LXVII). When he visited the Borobudur and inspected the lower galleries he recognized that the sculptors had made use of a text dealing with acts. A manuscript of this text had been discovered by him in Nepal during his last visit.⁶⁸

Louis de La Vallée Poussin (1869-1938) was one of the first pupils of Sylvain Lévi, but the nature of his work is entirely different. He devoted most of his research to the study of Buddhist dogmatism as he called it and of the philosophical schools of Mahāyāna. His first works concern Tantrism: an edition of the Pañcakrama, edition and translation of the Ādikarmapradīpa and a chapter on Tantrism in his *Bouddhisme* of 1898.⁶⁹ Already in 1897 he analysed a chapter of the Prasannapadā,⁷⁰ and in the following years he published a masterfully annotated edition of the Prasannapadā, an edition of the Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā, an edition of the Tibetan text of the Madhyamakāvatāra and an incomplete translation of the same text.⁷¹ His translation of the Bodhicaryāvatāra is still by far the most learned of all the existing translations.⁷² In 1933 La Vallée Poussin wrote a long comprehensive article on the Madhyamaka but

⁶⁷ Observations sur une langue précanonique du Bouddhisme, *J.A.*, 1912, II, pp. 495-514; Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques, *J.A.*, 1915, I, pp. 401-447.

⁶⁸ Sylvain Lévi, *Mahākarmavibhaṅga et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa*, Paris, 1932. See also N. J. Krom, Het Karmawibhaṅga op Barabudur, *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde*, deel 76, serie B, no. 8, Amsterdam, 1933, pp. 215-283.

⁶⁹ *Études et textes tantriques*. I. Pañcakrama. Gand, 1896; *Bouddhisme, Études et matériaux*, London, 1898, pp. 162-232 et 118-161.

⁷⁰ Caturāryasatyaparikṣā, *Mélanges Charles de Harlez*, 1897, pp. 313-320.

⁷¹ *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna* avec la Prasannapadā, commentaire de Candrakīrti, *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, IV, St.-Petersbourg, 1903-1913; *Prajñākaramati's Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva*, *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta, 1901-1914; *Madhyamakāvatāra* de Candrakīrti, traduction tibétaine, *Bibl. B.*, IX, St.-Petersbourg, 1907-1912; *Madhyamakāvatāra*, traduit d'après la version tibétaine, *Muséon*, 8, 1907, pp. 249-317; II, 1910, pp. 271-358; 12, 1911, pp. 235-327.

⁷² *Introduction à la pratique des futurs Bouddhas*, Paris, 1907.

his final opinion on the Madhyamaka absolute did not appear until after his death.⁷³ In 1905 in an article on the 75 and 100 dharma, La Vallée Poussin studied the Abhidharmakośa and the Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi.⁷⁴ In this field his work culminated in his translation of the Abhidharmakośa, one of the greatest achievements in Buddhist studies.⁷⁵ La Vallée Poussin translated also many passages of the Abhidharma works of the Sarvāstivādin and of the Mahāvibhāṣā to which he referred also in his Abhidharma studies. In the field of Yogācāra studies his greatest achievement is his translation of the Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi.⁷⁶ Even the later Buddhist school of logic was not neglected by him as is shown by his edition of the Tibetan text of the Nyāyabindu together with Vinītadeva's commentary.⁷⁷

Philosophical problems were studied by him in many publications. Let us mention only his articles on the doctrine of *karman*,⁷⁸ the *trikāya*,⁷⁹ the *pratītyasamutpāda*⁸⁰ and the councils.⁸¹ His numerous contributions to Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (12 volumes, 1908–1921; Index volume 1926) deal with many aspects of Buddhism. If one adds to all this his publications of Sanskrit fragments (cf. *JRAS*, 1907, 1908, 1911, 1912, 1913) and many other articles and reviews, it is difficult to imagine that so much has been achieved by one scholar.⁸² La Vallée Poussin published the results of his researches also in books which were meant for a larger (but highly intelligent) public: *Bouddhisme. Opinions sur l'Histoire de la Dogmatique*, Paris, 1909; *The Way to Nirvāna*,

⁷³ Réflexions sur le Madhyamaka, *MCB*, II, 1933, pp. 1–59; *Buddhica*, *HJAS*, 3, 1938, pp. 137–160.

⁷⁴ Dogmatique bouddhique. Les soixante-quinze et les cent dharmas (avec la collaboration de T. Suzuki et de P. Cordier), *Muséon*, 6, 1905, pp. 178–194.

⁷⁵ *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, 6 volumes, Paris-Louvain, 1923–1931.

⁷⁶ Paris, 1928–1929.

⁷⁷ *Tibetan Translation of the Nyāyabindu* of Dharmakīrti, with the commentary of Vinītadeva, *Bibliotheca Indica*. Calcutta, 1907–1913.

⁷⁸ Dogmatique bouddhique, *J.A.*, 1902, II, pp. 237–306, 1903, II, pp. 357–450.

⁷⁹ *JRAS*, 1906, pp. 943–977; *Muséon*, 14, 1913, pp. 257–290; *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, Vol. II, Paris, 1929, pp. 762–813.

⁸⁰ *Bouddhisme. Études et matériaux. Théorie des douze causes*. Gand, 1913.

⁸¹ Les deux premiers conciles, *Muséon*, 6, 1905, pp. 214–323; The “Five Points” of Mahādeva and the Kathāvatthu, *JRAS*, 1910, pp. 413–423.

⁸² For a bibliography of his writings see *Bibliographie bouddhique*, XXIII bis, Paris, 1955, pp. 1–37.

Cambridge, 1917; *Nirvāna*, Paris, 1925; *La Morale bouddhique*, Paris, 1927; *Le dogme et la philosophie du bouddhisme*, Paris, 1930. Moreover, much information on Buddhism is to be found in the three volumes of his history of Ancient India: *Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens. L'Inde jusque vers 300 av. J.-C.*, Paris, 1924, nouvelle édition, 1936; *L'Inde au temps des Mauryas*, Paris, 1930; *Dynasties et Histoire de l'Inde depuis Kanishka jusqu'aux invasions musulmanes*, Paris, 1935. We have already mentioned several times La Vallée Poussin's *Bouddhisme* which appeared in 1898. In this work he discussed for the first time many problems such as the value of the Pāli sources, the nature of popular Buddhism, Buddhist Yoga, etc. La Vallée Poussin was never satisfied with the results he obtained and many of the problems were studied by him again and again over a period of forty years. It is for this reason difficult to give a general characterisation of his principal views. However, on some points his opinions did not vary greatly. La Vallée Poussin has always stressed the fact that Buddhism owed most of its ideas to brahmanical speculation and ascetism, although he pointed out that one can recognize in Buddhism a characteristic way of envisaging the problem of salvation, a coherent doctrine which can be called an orthodoxy (*Bouddhisme, Opinions*, etc. p. 51). From the beginning La Vallée Poussin has also underlined the importance of Yoga and in one of his last articles he did not hesitate to consider Buddhism as a branch of Yoga, an opinion which was utterly unacceptable for Oldenberg, as we have seen.⁸³ The problem which was always the centre of his research was the interpretation of Nirvāna. In his *The Buddhist Nirvāna and its Western Interpreters* (Chicago, 1968, pp. 256–283) G. R. Welbon has attempted to sketch the evolution of La Vallée Poussin on this point, but only a fuller treatment could do justice to this difficult problem. La Vallée Poussin always had a disinclination to study the life of the Buddha and other problems which can hardly be solved with the help of the existing materials. He preferred to analyse the views of the different schools. No scholar has contributed more to our knowledge of Buddhist Abhidharma than La Vallée Poussin.⁸⁴

Jean Przyluski (1885–1944), another pupil of Sylvain Lévi, did excellent

⁸³ See note 33.

⁸⁴ For an excellent characterization of La Vallée Poussin's personality and work see Étienne Lamotte, *Notice sur Louis de La Vallée Poussin*, *Académie royale de Belgique—Annuaire pour 1965*, Bruxelles, 1965, pp. 145–168.

work in translating from the Chinese texts concerning northwestern India, Buddha's parinirvāna, the legend of Aśoka and the Council of Rājagrha.⁸⁵ Przyłuski attached much importance to geographical factors for the development of Buddhist schools. His work on the Council of Rājagrha is inspired by some rather wild sociological ideas. Although many of Przyłuski's theories cannot stand the test of a serious examination, his translations will always be useful for the historian of Buddhism. In later publications Przyłuski succumbed to a mania of comparatism which led him to discover everywhere non-Indian influences. Probably not much of it will be of any lasting value. To Przyłuski belongs the great merit to have created with Marcelle Lalou (1890–1967) the *Bibliographie bouddhique* which analyses exhaustively all publications relating to Buddhism during the years 1928 to 1958 (*Bibliographie bouddhique*, I–XXXII, Paris, 1930–1967). A complete analytical bibliography of Przyłuski's writings has been published recently: A. W. Macdonald et Marcelle Lalou, *L'œuvre de Jean Przyłuski*, Paris, 1970.

La Vallée Poussin's most famous pupil is Étienne Lamotte (1903–) who before 1942 published translations of the *Saṃdhibinirmocana* (Louvain, 1935), of Vasubandhu's *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* (MCB, IV, 1936, pp. 151–263) and of Asaṅga's *Mahāyānasamgraha* (2 tomes, Louvain, 1938–1939). A discussion of his recent work has to be postponed to the next chapter.

Theodor Stcherbatsky was a pupil of Minaev, Bühler and Jacobi. His most important work is devoted to the logic and epistemology of the later Buddhist authors Dharmakīrti and Dharmottara. In 1903 he published a Russian translation of Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* and Dharmottara's *śikā*. This was followed by a study of the main concepts of the Buddhist epistemological school, published in Russian in 1909 and in French and German translation in 1924 and 1926.⁸⁶ Both works appeared in an entirely new and enlarged version in English in the two volumes of *Buddhist Logic* (Bibl. B., XXVI, Leningrad, 1930–1932).

⁸⁵ Le Nord-ouest de l'Inde dans le Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivādin et les textes apparentés, *JA*, 1914, II, pp. 493–568; Le parinirvāna et les funérailles du Buddha, *JA*, 1918–1920, separate edition, Paris, 1920; Le partage des reliques du Buddha, *MCB*, IV, 1936, pp. 341–367; *La légende de l'empereur Aśoka*, Paris, 1923; *Le Concile de Rājagrha*, Paris, 1926–1928.

⁸⁶ *Erkenntnistheorie und Logik nach der Lehre der späteren Buddhisten*, München-Neubiberg, 1924; *La théorie de la connaissance et la logique chez les bouddhistes tardifs*, Paris, 1926.

In 1918 Otto Rosenberg (1888–1919) published a study on the problems of Buddhist philosophy, largely based on Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*, in which he advocated the view that Buddhist philosophy was based on the idea of the plurality of dharmas.⁸⁷ Stcherbatsky accepted Rosenberg's view and described Buddhism as a system of Radical Pluralism in his *The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the Word "Dharma"* (London, 1923) which contains an analysis of the main doctrines of the *Abhidharmakośa*. La Vallée Poussin's *Nirvāna* and, to a lesser degree, Keith's *Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon* (Oxford, 1923) provoked a spirited attack by Stcherbatsky in his *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāna* (Leningrad, 1927). The second part of this book contains a translation of chapter I and chapter XXV of Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā*. The first part sketches the development of Buddhist philosophy in the schools of Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. Stcherbatsky believed that Buddhism arose as a philosophical system which analysed matter and mind as composed of evanescent elements (*dharmas*). It is not possible to follow in detail Stcherbatsky's opinions on the later development of Buddhist philosophy. His conclusion (pp. 60–62) summarizes briefly the results at which he arrived. Stcherbatsky had a profound knowledge both of Western and Indian philosophy. In his translations he strove to render the philosophical meaning and not the literal sense. In his interpretation of the epistemological school of Buddhism he tried to show up parallels with Kant's transcendental philosophy. Stcherbatsky's philosophical views regarding the radical pluralism of early Buddhism and the transcendental character of later Buddhist philosophy do not do justice to the essentially religious nature of the Buddhist quest for salvation. Stcherbatsky also carried on a vivid controversy with La Vallée Poussin on the nature of the Absolute of the Madhyamaka. For further details we refer the reader to two articles, recently published in the *Journal of Indian Philosophy*.⁸⁸ Even if Stcherbatsky's ideas cannot always carry convic-

⁸⁷ *Problemy buddijskoj filosofii*, Petrograd, 1918; German translation: *Die Probleme der buddhistischen Philosophie*, Heidelberg, 1924. See also A. M. Pjatigorskij, O. O. Rozenberg i problema jazyka opisanija v buddologii [O. O. Rosenberg and the problem of the language of description in Buddhology], *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*, 5 (Tartu, 1971), pp. 423–436.

⁸⁸ J. W. de Jong, The Problem of the Absolute in the Madhyamaka School, *JIP*, 2, 1972, pp. 1–6; Emptiness, *ibid.*, pp. 7–15.

tion, one must recognize that by translating and explaining for the first time some very difficult Buddhist philosophical texts, he has made an important contribution to Buddhist studies.⁸⁹

A contemporary of Stcherbatsky was Serge d'Oldenburg whom we mentioned already in connection with the publication of Sanskrit fragments from Kashgar. Oldenburg published many writings on Buddhist tales and Buddhist iconography. Several of his articles were translated during the eighteen-nineties.⁹⁰ Oldenburg founded the Bibliotheca Buddhica of which the first volume was Bendall's edition of the Śikṣāsamuccaya (1897-1902). The thirtieth volume, Stcherbatsky's translation of the first chapter of the Madhyāntavibhāṅga, appeared in 1936. Many well-known scholars published editions of texts in this series. To mention only a few: the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā by Louis Finot (1865-1935) in 1898, the Avadānaśataka by J. S. Speyer in 1902-1909, the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra by H. Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio in 1908-1912. Another Russian scholar who has to be mentioned here is von Staël-Holstein (1877-1937) who edited the Kāśyapaparivarta (Shanghai, 1926) and Sthiramati's commentary (Peking, 1933).⁹¹

A pupil of Stcherbatsky, Eugène Obermiller (1901-1935), translated from

⁸⁹ For a bibliography of his writings see *Materialy po istorii i filologii central'noj Azii*, vyp. 3, Ulan-Ude, 1968, pp. 5-7 (add *Über den Begriff vijñāna im Buddhismus*, *ZII*, 7, 1929, 136-139). Several of Stcherbatsky's Russian articles have recently been published in English translation: *Papers of Th. Stcherbatsky*, Calcutta, 1969; *Further Papers of Stcherbatsky*, Calcutta, 1971.

⁹⁰ On the Buddhist Jātakas, *JRAS*, 1893, pp. 301-356; The Buddhist Source of the (Old Slavonic) Legend of the Twelve Dreams of Shahaish, *JRAS*, 1893, pp. 509-516; Notes on Buddhist Art, *JAOs*, 18, 1897, pp. 183-201; H. Kern, Een Russisch Geleerde over de beeldhouwwerken van de Boro Boedoer, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederl. Indië*, 47, 1897, pp. 49-56; *Verspreide geschriften*, 4, 1916, pp. 209-231; A propos du Mahābhārata dans la littérature bouddhique, *RHR*, 37, 1898, pp. 342-343. For a complete bibliography see P. Skačkov, *Materialy dlja bibliografija trudov S. F. Oldenburga, Sergeju Fedoroviču Ol'denburgu k pjatidesjatiletiju naučno-obščestvennoj dejatel'nosti 1882-1932*, Leningrad 1934, pp. 625-637.

⁹¹ Cf. S. Elisséef, Staël-Holstein's Contribution to Asiatic Studies, *HJAS*, 3, 1938, pp. 1-8; E. Schierlitz, In Memory of Alexander Wilhelm Baron von Staël-Holstein, *Monumenta Serica*, 3, 1938, pp. 286-291.

the Tibetan the Uttaratantra or Ratnagoṭravibhāga.⁹² His main work was devoted to the Abhisamayālamkāra.⁹³

Heinrich Lüders's importance for Buddhist studies consists in his extremely careful editions of Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia. His edition of fragments of Buddhist dramas revealed for the first time the fact that Aśvaghosa had written for the theater, a fact of great importance for the history of Indian theater.⁹⁴ We mentioned earlier his edition of fragments of the Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā. Other publications of fragments have been reprinted in his *Philologica Indica*. Of great importance for the problem of the pre-canonical language is his posthumously published *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Kanons* (Berlin, 1954) in which he defended the view that the Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist texts show traces of the existence of a primitive canon (Urkanon) written in an Eastern dialect, called Ardhamāgadhī or Old-Ardhamāgadhī. Lüders's work on the Sanskrit fragments was continued by his pupil Ernst Waldschmidt (1897–), who edited fragments of the Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa of the Sarvāstivādin and fragments of canonical sūtras.⁹⁵

In the field of Buddhist philosophy important work has been done by Stanislas Schayer (1899–1941), Poul Tuxen (1880–1955), Giuseppe Tucci (1894–), and Erich Frauwallner (1898–). Schayer and Tuxen have contributed to a better understanding of the Madhyamaka philosophy by their studies on Candrakīrti's Prasannapadā.⁹⁶ Schayer provoked a lively discussion

⁹² The Sublime Science of Great Vehicle to Salvation (Uttaratantra), *Acta Orientalia*, 9, 1931, pp. 81–306.

⁹³ The Doctrine of Prajñāpāramitā as exposed in the Abhisamayālamkāra, *Acta Or.*, 11, 1932, pp. 1–133, 334–354; Analysis of the Abhisamayālamkāra, 3 fasc., Calcutta, 1933, 1936, 1943. See further La Vallée Poussin, *MCB*, 5, 1937, p. 244; Th. Stecherbatsky, Dr. E. Obermiller, Obituary Notice, *J. of the Greater India Society*, 3, 1936, pp. 211–213.

⁹⁴ *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*. Berlin, 1911; Das Śāriputraprakaraṇa, ein Drama des Aśvaghosa, *SPAW*, 1911, pp. 388–411 = *Philologica Indica*, Berlin, 1940, pp. 190–213. For a bibliography of Lüders's writings see H. Lüders, *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1973, pp. vii–xiii.

⁹⁵ *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins*, Leipzig, 1926; *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon*, I, Leipzig, 1932.

⁹⁶ St. Schayer, *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannapadā*, Cracow, 1931. For an (incomplete) bibliography see *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, XXI, 1957, 24–27; Poul Tuxen, *Indledende Bemaerkninger til buddhistisk Relativism*, København, 1936; In what sense can we call*

on the problem of pre-canonical Buddhism.⁹⁷ Tuxen also is the author of one of the best books on Theravāda, based upon first-hand knowledge of Buddhism in Thailand.⁹⁸ Of Tucci's work on Buddhist philosophy one must mention above all his *Pre-Dinnāga Buddhist texts on logic from Chinese sources* (Baroda, 1929), his translation of Dinnāga's *Nyāyamukha* and his articles on the *Vāda-vidhi*, *Dinnāga*, *Buddhist logic before Dinnāga*, etc.⁹⁹ Many other articles and books on Indian Buddhism were published by Tucci before 1942.¹⁰⁰ In the same period Erich Frauwallner published a series of important articles on *Dignāga*, *Dharmakīrti* and *Dharmottara* which greatly increased the understanding of the role played by these thinkers in the development of Indian philosophy.¹⁰¹

We mentioned before the fascination which *Aśvaghosa* had exercised on *Sylvain Lévi*. *E. H. Johnston* (1885–1942) studied his work for many years and published exemplary editions and translations of his *Saundarananda* (Calcutta, 1928–1932) and his *Buddhacarita* (Calcutta, 1936; *Acta Orientalia*, 15, 1937, pp. 26–62, 85–111, 231–292). The edition and translation of the Tibetan version of the *Buddhacarita* by *Friedrich Weller* (Leipzig, 1926–1928) rendered great service to Johnston. *Weller* (1889–) extensively studied Buddhist scriptures in Sanskrit, Pāli, Chinese, Tibetan, Mongolian and Sogdian.¹⁰² An important *Mahāyānasūtra*, the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*, was edited with

*the teachings of *Nagarjuna* negativism? *JOR Madras*, XI, 1937, pp. 231–242. On Tuxen see *Kaj Barr*, *Poul Tuxen, Oversigt over Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Virksomhed 1955–1956*, pp. 1–32.

⁹⁷ *Precanonical Buddhism*, *AO*, 7, 1935, pp. 121–132; *New Contributions to the Problem of Pre-hinayanistic Buddhism*, *Polish Bulletin of Oriental Studies*, 1, 1937, pp. 8–17. See also *Constantin Regamey*, *Le problème du bouddhisme primitif et les derniers travaux de Stanislaw Schayer*, *RO*, XXI, 1957, pp. 37–58.

⁹⁸ *Buddha. Hans Lære, dens Overlevering og dens Liv i Nutiden*. København, 1928.

⁹⁹ *The Vāda-vidhi*, *IHQ*, 4, 1928, pp. 630–636; *Buddhist logic before Dinnāga*, *JRAS*, 1929, pp. 451–488, 870–871; *Is the Nyāyapraveśa by Dinnāga*, *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 7–13; *Bhāmaha and Dinnāga*, *IA*, 59, 1930, pp. 142–147; *Notes on the Nyāyapraveśa by Śāṅkaravāmin*, *JRAS*, 1931, pp. 381–413.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *Giuseppe Tucci, Opera minora*, I, Roma, 1971, pp. xi–xviii.

¹⁰¹ Cf. *Verzeichnis der Schriften Erich Frauwallners*, *WZKSÖ*, XII–XIII, 1968, pp. 9–10.

¹⁰² Cf. *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. xi–xiii.

great care by Johannes Nobel (1887–1960) in 1937 (for critical remarks see Edgerton, *JAS*, 77, pp. 185–187).

We mentioned the work done by Fausbøll and the Pali Text Society for Pali studies. Denmark has continued to be an important centre for Pali studies. The most important undertaking in the field is the Critical Pali Dictionary by Dines Andersen (1861–1940)¹⁰³ and Helmer Smith (1882–1956),¹⁰⁴ who made use of the lexicographical materials collected by Trenckner. The first volume of the dictionary, comprising the letter a, was published from 1924 to 1948. In this connection one must mention the lexicographical materials collected by Wilhelm Geiger (1856–1943), which remained unpublished as were the materials collected before him by Burnouf and Spiegel. However, Geiger's materials have been put at the disposal of the editors of the CPD and have been included in fasc. 2 and following of volume 2. Geiger's name will also always be connected with the two Pali chronicles *Dīpavaṃsa* and *Mahāvāṃsa* to which he devoted many years of careful study. To Geiger is also due the best Pali grammar (*Pāli, Literatur und Sprache*), which appeared in 1916. Finally, one must mention his very fine translation of the first two volumes of the *Samyuttanikāya* (München-Neubiberg, 1930–1925). Together with Magdalene Geiger he wrote a detailed study of the meaning of the word *dhamma* in Pali literature (*Pāli Dhamma vornehmlich in der kanonischen Literatur*, München, 1921; W. Geiger, *Dhamma und Brahman*, *Z. f. Buddhismus*, III, 1921, pp. 73–83).¹⁰⁵

Tibetan studies relating to Buddhism can only be mentioned briefly. W. W. Rockhill (1854–1914) made important material accessible to the scholarly world by his translations from the Tibetan of the *Udānavarga* (London, 1883), *The Life of the Buddha*, based on the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (London, 1884) and the *Bhikkunī-prātimokṣa-sūtra* from the same *Vinaya* (Paris, 1886).¹⁰⁶ Georg Huth (1867–1906) edited and translated the *Hor-cbos-*

¹⁰³ On Andersen see *CPD* pp. xxxv–xxxviii.

¹⁰⁴ On Helmer Smith see *CPD*, II, 1, 1960, pp. v–viii.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Bechert's article on Geiger, *CPD*, II, 2, 1962, pp. ix–xiv; for a complete bibliography of Geiger's writings see Wilhelm Geiger, *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1973, pp. xi–xxxiii.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. A. Cordier, *Nécrologie William Woodville Rockhill*, *T'oung Pao*, 16, 1915, pp. 160–164; B. Laufer, *Nécrologie William Woodville Rockhill*, *ibid.*, pp. 289–290.

byun (Strassburg, 1892–1896).¹⁰⁷ Palmyr Cordier (1871–1914) published a very accurate catalogue of the Tibetan Tanjur (*Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1909–1915).¹⁰⁸ Berthold Laufer (1874–1935) published many articles, based on Tibetan materials.¹⁰⁹ Giuseppe Tucci undertook several expeditions to Tibet and brought back many precious materials on Tibetan Buddhist literature and art.¹¹⁰ The important work of Andrej Vostrikov (1904–1937) on Tibetan historical literature was published twenty-five years after his death: *Tibetskaja istoričeskaja literatura*, Moskva, 1962 (Bibliotheca Buddhica, vol. XXXII).

Sinologists continued to study the travels of Chinese pilgrims to India. Thomas Watters (1840–1901) prepared extensive notes on Hsüan-tsang's Hsi-yü-chi which were published posthumously: *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, London, 1904–1905 (cf. Pelliot's review *BEFEO*, V, 1905, pp. 423–457). Noël Peri (1865–1922) wrote some important articles of which we mention only two: one on the date of Vasubandhu and one on the wives of Śākyamuni.¹¹¹ Two of the greatest Sinologists, Édouard Chavannes (1865–1918) and Paul Pelliot (1878–1945), have made notable contributions to Buddhist studies. Chavannes translated I-tsing's work on the pilgrims to the Western countries (*Mémoire composé à l'époque de la grande dynastie T'ang sur les religieux éminents qui allèrent chercher la loi dans les pays d'Occident par I-tsing*, Paris, 1894) and many Buddhist stories (*Cinq cents contes et apologues*, I–III, Paris, 1910–1911; IV, 1935). Together with Sylvain Lévi he wrote articles on some enigmatic titles in the Buddhist ecclesiastic hierarchy and on the sixteen Arhats.¹¹² Pelliot's contribu-

¹⁰⁷ Cf. B. Laufer, Nécrologie Dr. Georg Huth, *T'oung Pao*, 7, 1906, pp. 702–706.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Éd. Chavannes, Le Dr. Palmyr Cordier, *T'oung Pao*, 15, 1914, pp. 551–553.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. H. G. Creel, Obituary Berthold Laufer: 1874–1934, *Monumenta Serica* I, 1935, pp. 487–496; Johannes Schubert, Berthold Laufer, *Artibus Asiae*, IV, 1935, pp. 265–270; V, 1935, p. 83; VI, 1936, p. 169.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Note 100.

¹¹¹ A propos de la date de Vasubandhu, *BEFEO*, XI, 1911, pp. 339–390; Les femmes du Śākyamuni, *ibid.*, XVIII, ii, pp. 1–37. See further Ed. Maitre's obituary, *BEFEO*, XXII, 1922, pp. 404–417.

¹¹² Quelques titres énigmatiques dans la hiérarchie ecclésiastique du Bouddhisme indien, *JA*, 1915, I, pp. 193–223; II, pp. 307–310; Les seize Arhats protecteurs de la Loi, *JA*, 1916, II, pp. 5–50, 189–305. See further Henri Cordier, Édouard Chavannes, *JA*, 1918, I, pp. 226, 227, 228, 246.

tion to Buddhist studies up to 1928 has been analysed in the *Bibliographie bouddhique* IV-V (Paris, 1934), pp. 3-19. His most important publications since 1928 have been mentioned by Paul Demiéville in "La carrière scientifique de Paul Pelliot, son œuvre relative à l'Extrême-Orient" in *Paul Pelliot* (Paris, 1946), pp. 29-54. Paul Demiéville (1894-) has continued the tradition. His article on the Chinese versions of the Milindapañha (*BEFEO*, XXIV, 1924, pp. 1-258) is the definitive work on the subject. As editor-in-chief of the *Hōbōgirin* (fasc. 1, 1929; fasc. 2, 1930; fasc. 3, 1937), Demiéville has contributed some very long and important articles (see for instance the article on *Byō* 'Illness', pp. 224-270). The recently published *Choix d'études bouddhiques* (Leiden, 1973) contains some of his contributions to Buddhist studies.