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Ten years ago, in October and November 1973, I sketched the history of Buddhist studies in Europe and America in a series of lectures delivered at the University of Tokyo.1 It seems appropriate on this occasion to give a brief account of Buddhist studies in the ten years which have elapsed since 1973.

In the first place it is our sad duty to mention the names of the scholars who have passed away during this period. Frank-Richard Hamm (1920–1973)2 died in 1973, Erich Frauwallner (1898–1974)3 the following year. Ludwig Alsdorf (1904–1978)4 passed away in 1978. 1979 witnessed the death of Paul Demiéville (1894–1979),5 Edward Conze (1904–1979),6

---


and Christiaan Hooykaas (1902–1979). In 1980 Valentina Stache-Rosen (1925–1980) and Friedrich Weller (1889–1980) passed away. The following year Isaline Horner (1896–1981) died. In 1982 Jean Filliozat (1906–1982) passed away and in May of this year Étienne Lamotte (1903–1983) departed this life. It is not necessary, I believe, to describe here the accomplishments of these scholars, as their books have been mentioned in previous lectures or will be referred to in the course of this lecture. Apart from Frank-Richard Hamm and Valentina Stache-Rosen, who died at a relatively young age, all the scholars mentioned died in their seventies or eighties or even in their nineties, and their contributions to Buddhist studies are well-known. I would like, however, to say a few words about Étienne Lamotte whose recent death is still so fresh in our memory. In 1973 I expressed the hope that he would be able to complete his translation of the first parivarta (chūan 1–34) of the Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra or Prajñāpāramitopadeśa. The first three volumes of his translation appeared in 1944, 1949 and 1970. In 1976 and 1980 Lamotte published volume four and volume five, thereby completing his translation of the first parivarta. The complete work, which contains more than two thousand five hundred pages, is of a scope without parallel in the history of Buddhist studies in the West. It is difficult to realise that these five large volumes constitute only a part of his achievement. We also owe him excellent translations of five important works: Saṃdhinirmocana (1935), Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa (1936), Mahāyānasamāñgraha (1938–1939), Vimala-
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kīrtinirdeśasūtra (1962) and Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra (1965) and moreover a comprehensive history of Indian Buddhism up to the Śaka era: Histoire du bouddhisme indien: Des origines à l’ère Śaka (1958). His many articles and reviews are listed in the bibliography which Daniel Donnet contributed to a volume of Indian and Buddhist studies published in honour of Étienne Lamotte in 1980.\(^{12}\)

During these last ten years several scholars were honoured with the publication of a felicitation volume: I. Horner\(^{13}\) in 1974, Ernst Waldschmidt\(^{14}\) and Herbert Guenther\(^{15}\) in 1977, Edward Conze\(^{16}\) in 1979 and Étienne Lamotte\(^{17}\) in 1980. Volumes in memory of Richard Robinson\(^{18}\) and Ludwig Alsdorf\(^{19}\) were published in 1978 and 1981. Particularly welcome were the publication of collected articles of Wilhelm Geiger\(^{20}\) in 1973, of Ludwig Alsdorf\(^{21}\) and Jean Filliozat\(^{22}\) in 1974, of R. Otto Franke\(^{23}\) in 1978, of H. von Glasenapp\(^{24}\) in 1980, and of Erich Frauwallner\(^{25}\) in 1982. It is to be hoped that notwithstanding difficult economic conditions the ‘Kleine Schriften’ of eminent scholars will continue to be published, because there is no better way to honour a scholar than by making his work more accessible. In this connection one can have nothing but praise for the von Glasenapp Stiftung which since 1967 has published the Kleine Schriften of many scholars.

Although, on the one hand, Buddhist studies suffered severe losses with


\(^{13}\) See note 10.


\(^{16}\) See note 6.

\(^{17}\) See note 12.


\(^{19}\) Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf. Wiesbaden, 1981.


\(^{22}\) See note 11.


the passing away of several eminent scholars, on the other, it is a matter of rejoicing to see that in recent years young scholars have published excellent work and have in this way contributed to the continued flourishing of Buddhist studies. In most countries of Europe and in America, universities have faced great difficulties in maintaining their existing programmes but Buddhist studies have been continued, and, in some instances, on an even larger scale. There are perhaps at present in Europe and America more scholars engaged in the study of Buddhism than ever before. Let us hope that the younger generation of Buddhist scholars will be able to continue the tradition handed down by their elders.

In the following survey of Buddhist studies we will mainly be concerned with studies relating to Buddhist texts in Indian languages or translated from these languages into Tibetan and Chinese. Without any doubt, the study of Indian Buddhist texts deserves a central place in Buddhist studies because it forms the basis for any serious work in the study of religion, philosophy, history and art.

In the first place we have to draw attention to the fact that in recent years a great number of facsimile editions of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts have been published. In the past editions of Sanskrit fragments of Buddhist texts were often accompanied by facsimiles, but facsimiles of complete manuscripts or of large fragments have been rare, although one must mention that already in 1926 in Japan a facsimile edition of a Sanskrit manuscript brought back by Kawaguchi was published. W. Baruch pointed out that this manuscript was written in 1069/1070. H. Toda has published a romanised transliteration of the entire manuscript. The publication of facsimiles makes it possible to check the readings adopted by editors of texts. However, this is not the only advantage of facsimiles. It is absolutely necessary to study texts as much as possible on the basis of facsimiles of manuscripts because this is the only way to understand the mistakes which have been and can be committed by scribes. Moreover, it is only by taking into account the fact that texts were often successively written in different scripts that one can fully understand the often complicated history of a text in the course of its transmission. For
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this reason we must welcome very much the facsimile editions published in recent years. Of particular importance for the history of Buddhist literature are the manuscripts from Central Asia and Gilgit. Most of the manuscripts from Central Asia contain only fragments. German scholars have published a great number of facsimiles of these manuscripts, either together with text editions or separately since the first publications by Pischel in 1904.\(^{29}\) An almost complete manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka was recently published in facsimile by Lokesh Chandra and in romanisation by H. Toda.\(^{30}\) This so-called “Kashgar” manuscript is described by Heinz Bechert in his foreword to the facsimile edition. Heinz Bechert edited also nine folios of this manuscript in 1972.\(^{31}\) Readings of this manuscript were made known for the first time in 1912 by Hendrik Kern in the edition of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka published in the Bibliotheca Buddhica, but we have had to wait till 1976 for the publication of a facsimile edition of this very important manuscript. The Saddharma-puṇḍarīka is undoubtedly one of the most interesting texts for the study of the history of Buddhist texts because manuscripts of it have been found in Central Asia, Gilgit and Nepal. Many of the Sanskrit manuscripts discovered in Gilgit—those kept in the National Archives in Delhi—were published in facsimile by Lokesh Chandra in ten volumes from 1959 to 1974.\(^{32}\) Two groups of manuscripts of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka (A and B) were published in facsimile and in romanisation by S. Watanabe in 1972.\(^{33}\) Two folios of group B and manuscripts of group C were published in facsimile by Lokesh Chandra. They were not included in the facsimiles published by Watanabe. H. Toda has published a romanised text of these folios, thereby supplementing Watanabe’s edition.\(^{34}\) In 1982 Oskar von


\(^{33}\) Saddharma-puṇḍarīka Manuscripts. Two Parts. Tokyo, 1972.

\(^{34}\) ‘Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra Gilgit Manuscripts (Groups B and C)’, Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu Kiyō (Jimbun Shakai-Kagaku), 14 (1979), pp. 249–304.
Hinüber edited folios 45–74 of another Gilgit manuscript (K) of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. In his introduction he showed that the Gilgit manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka can be divided into two families, one comprising the manuscripts of group A, the other the manuscripts B, C and K. The relations of these two recensions with the Central Asian materials on the one hand and with the Nepalese manuscripts on the other prove to be much more complicated than scholars had thought in the past.

Although, as in my previous lectures, it is my intention to limit this survey to work done by scholars in Europe and America, it was necessary to mention here the facsimiles published by Lokesh Chandra and Watanabe. It is also absolutely indispensable to mention at least the publication by the Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra (Risshō University) of facsimiles of more than thirty manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka from Nepal, Gilgit and Central Asia in fifteen volumes of which twelve have been published since 1977. It has now become possible to make an exhaustive study of the different recensions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka and to analyse in detail the grammatical and lexicographical characteristics of each recension. When writing his Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary and Grammar, Franklin Edgerton had only very unreliable text editions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka at his disposal. It will be one of the main tasks of Buddhist philology to eventually replace Edgerton’s monumental work with one which is based upon reliable editions of texts, but it will be a long time before it will be possible to think of such an undertaking. At present the most important work to be undertaken is the editing of all texts published in facsimiles and the study of different recensions and their grammatical and lexicographical characteristics. What we need are grammars of single texts and not only that but grammars of one single recension of a text on the model of the grammar of the Sanskrit Recension A of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā, published by A. Yuyama in 1973. The same applies to lexicographical studies. Only when a sufficient number of grammars and

lexicons have been published in this way, will it become possible to undertake the compilation of a comprehensive grammar and dictionary of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit.

The publication of facsimiles of Gilgit manuscripts has made it possible to prepare new editions of the texts previously edited in a very unsatisfactory way by Nalinaksha Dutt. Oskar von Hinüber published an excellent survey of the history of the studies on the Gilgit manuscripts.37 It contains a bibliography of editions of manuscripts published in facsimile by Lokesh Chandra. In a recent article on the importance of the Gilgit manuscripts, von Hinüber deals with different problems relating to these manuscripts such as the colophons which contain interesting information on the presence of Sakas in Gilgit and on the pañota-śahi dynasty.38 Von Hinüber also examines the different recensions of the Śaṃghātāsūtra of which eight manuscripts have been found in Gilgit. Of great importance is the almost complete manuscript of the Vinayavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda school. The text of three vastus, Saṃghabhedā-, Śayanāsana- and Adhikaraṇavastu was published by Raniero Gnoli.39 It is very much to be hoped that the manuscript used by Gnoli will also be published in a facsimile edition.

Another important collection of manuscripts and photocopies is the Patna collection of the manuscripts from Tibet which were photographed or copied by Rāhula Saṅkṛtyāyana in the years 1929–1938. Several texts have been published by Indian scholars since 1973.40 However, some of these editions are very unsatisfactory and the publication of facsimiles would be highly desirable.41 Gustav Roth edited the text of the
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Dharmapada which was also edited by N. S. Shukla.\(^{42}\) K. R. Norman and Margaret Cone are at present working on a new edition and critical study of this text which is of great importance for the study of the different recensions of the Dharmapada.\(^{43}\) Chinese versions of the Dharmapada and Udānavarga have been studied by Charles Willemen.\(^{44}\) It is probably not necessary to mention how useful, for Western scholars as well, is the recent publication of the Dharmapada studies of K. Mizuno.\(^{45}\)

The fourth volume of the catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts from Central Asia (Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil IV, Wiesbaden, 1980) lists the editions of texts published in the years 1970–1980. Also very useful is the systematic survey of the manuscripts described in the four volumes of the catalogue. The contents of the manuscripts of Buddhist literature is divided into seven sections: 1. Vinaya; 2. Sūtra; 3. Anthologies of Religious Poems and Narratives; 4. Abhidharma, Buddhist Technical Terms, Commentaries, Yoga; 5. Cult; 6. Mahāyāna-Sūtras; 7. Poetry. In recent years German scholars have been active in photographing Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepal for the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project. A few publications based upon these manuscripts have already appeared.\(^{46}\) Without doubt this project will be of great importance for the study of Sanskrit Buddhist texts but, as long as no list or catalogue is available, it is difficult to know which new materials have been uncovered.

So far we have discussed mainly the publication of facsimile editions and the contents of manuscript collections from Central Asia, Gilgit, Tibet and Nepal. It may perhaps be useful to sketch recent developments in the study of Buddhist texts in a more systematic way, and to begin with the texts of the Hīnayāna schools. We have mentioned already the editions

\(^{42}\) Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung (Göttingen, 1980), pp. 93–155. For Shukla’s edition see note 40.


\(^{45}\) Hokkukyō no kenkyū. Tōkyō, 1981.

of parts of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda school and of the so-called Patna Dharmapada. Fragments of Sūtras from the Turfan collection were edited by Waldschmidt in the fourth volume of the catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts from Central Asia, and in separate publications.\(^{47}\) Fragments of the Abhidharmaparakaraṇabhāṣya were edited by J. Imanishi.\(^{48}\) J. Takasaki identified fragments of the Dharmaskandha among the Gilgit fragments edited by Sudha Sengupta.\(^{49}\) Candrabhāl Tripāṭhi identified fragments of the Ekottarāgama among these same fragments, and is preparing a new edition.\(^{50}\)

In the past, Western scholars have paid relatively little attention to Abhidharma literature. The one great exception is, of course, de La Vallée Poussin. It is therefore not surprising to see that two important Abhidharma texts were recently translated by two pupils of Lamotte. José van den Broeck translated Ghoṣaka’s Amṛtarasa from the Chinese.\(^{51}\) The translation is preceded by a long and interesting introduction which outlines the place of the Amṛtarasa in the development of the Sarvāstivāda school. Marcel van Velthem translated Skandhila’s Abhidharmāvatārāśāstra from the Chinese and edited the text of the Tibetan version.\(^{52}\) Another important Abhidharma text, the Abhidharmahṛdaya or Abhidharmasāra by Dharmārī was translated into English by Charles Willemen and into French by I. Armelin.\(^{53}\) The same text has also been studied in several articles by Leon Hurvitz.\(^{54}\) In my previous lectures I

\(^{47}\) Cf. note 29.


\(^{49}\) ‘Remarks on the Sanskrit Fragments of the Abhidharmadharmaśandhapādaśāstra’ Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies 13 (1965), pp. 403(33)–411(41).

\(^{50}\) Cf. von Hinüber’s article (see note 37), p. (6)332.


\(^{54}\) ‘The Abhidharma on the “Four Aids to Penetration”’, Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization (Emeryville, 1977), pp. 59–104; ‘Fa-sheng’s Observations on the Four
failed to mention the Abhidharma studies published by Frauwallner in 1963, 1964, 1971, 1972 and 1973.\textsuperscript{55} It is the only systematic survey of Abhidharma literature in a Western language and it is a pity that these studies have not been included in his Kleine Schriften. It is to be hoped that they will be published in a separate volume and stimulate further Abhidharma studies.

In the field of Prajñāpāramitā studies Edward Conze, the great pioneer who has done so much in this neglected field, continued his work. In 1978 he published a revised and enlarged edition of his book on \textit{The Prajñāpāramitā Literature}.\textsuperscript{56} Apart from this book Conze has published since 1973 a translation of \textit{The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts} (London, 1973), a translation of \textit{The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & its Verse Summary} (Bolinas, 1973), an edition of chapters 70 to 82 of \textit{The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭadaśasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā} (Roma, 1974), and a further volume of collected articles entitled \textit{Further Buddhist Studies} (Oxford, 1975). In the volume in honour of Conze, \textit{Prajñāpāramitā and related systems},\textsuperscript{57} most contributions deal with one aspect or another of the Prajñāpāramitā literature. This volume shows clearly that Conze’s example has stimulated younger scholars to engage in the study of the Prajñāpāramitā literature. Much remains still to be done and it is to be hoped that a future edition of Conze’s book on the Prajñāpāramitā literature will testify to a continuing interest in this branch of Buddhist studies.

With regard to Mahāyāna sūtras we have mentioned already the many publications of facsimiles and romanised editions of the Saddharma-puṇḍarikasūtra. Paul Harrison published an edition of the Tibetan text of one of the earliest Mahāyāna sūtras, the Pratyutpanna-buddha-


\textsuperscript{57} Tokyo, 1978. For additions see von Hinüber’s review, \textit{IIJ} 23 (1980), pp. 73–74. Yuyama’s edition of the recension A of the \textit{Prajñāpāramitāratnaguṇaṃsaṃcayagāthā} and his grammar of the same text were reviewed by Gregory Schopen, \textit{IIJ} 20 (1978), pp. 110–124.
RECENT BUDDHIST STUDIES

sammukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra.\textsuperscript{58} His translation and study of this text will be published in the near future. In 1965 Friedrich Weller published a German translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta. Another German scholar, Bhikkhu Pāśādika, translated the same text into English.\textsuperscript{59} It will be very useful to compare these two translations carefully when studying the Kāśyapaparivarta. Bhikkhu Pāśādika also ‘restored’ the Sanskrit text of the Vimalakirtinirdesasūtra from the Tibetan version and arrived in several instances at interpretations which differ from those found in Lamotte’s French version which was also translated into English.\textsuperscript{60} A very good and readable translation of the same text was published by Robert Thurman.\textsuperscript{61} Pierre Python O.P. translated the Vinaya-viniścaya-upāli-pariprcchā into French. His book contains also a translation of Mātrceṭa’s Sugatapañcatrīṃśatstotra.\textsuperscript{62} A text which is one of the scriptural authorities for the Tathāgatagarbha school, the Śrīmālāśīṃhanādasaṃțra, was translated from the Tibetan and the Chinese by Alex and Hideko Wayman.\textsuperscript{63}

Much work has been done also in recent years with regard to the Madhyamaka school. To David Seyfort Ruegg we owe the first comprehensive treatment of The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India (Wiesbaden, 1981). Another important work is Chr. Lindtner’s Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgarjuna (Copenhagen, 1982) in which he studies the thirteen texts which, according to the author, can be safely attributed to Nāgarjuna: I. Mūlamadhyamakakārikā; II. Śūnyatāsaptati; III. Vigrahavyāvartanī; IV.

\textsuperscript{58} The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukha-vasthita-samādhi-sūtra. Tokyo, 1970.

\textsuperscript{59} Cf. “Linh-Son”—Publications d’études bouddhiques (Joinville-le-Pont, 1977–1979), Nos. 1–9:


\textsuperscript{63} Alex and Hideko Wayman, The Lion’s Roar of Queen Śrīmālā. New York, 1974.
Vaidalyaprakaraṇa; V. Vyavahārasiddhi; VI. Yuktīsaṅḍikā; VII. Catuḥstava; VIII. Ratnāvali; IX. Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā; X. Sūtrasamuccaya; XI. Bodhicittavivaraṇa; XII. Suḥṛlekhā; XIII. Bodhisambhāra[ka]. Finally, one must mention Jacques May’s article on Chūgan in the fifth fascicule of the Hōbōgirin (Paris-Tōkyō, 1979), pp. 470–493.

One of the most difficult problems in Madhyamaka studies is the great number of works that are attributed to Nāgārjuna. Christian Lindtner adopts internal and external criteria of authenticity. He considers the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās to be his magnum opus. Those works which agree with it in regard to style, scope and doctrine and which are explicitly ascribed to Nāgārjuna by the testimony of ‘trustworthy witnesses’, viz. Bhavya (Bhāvaviveka), Candrakīrti, Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla are considered by him to be genuine. Seyfort Ruegg takes as his point of departure the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās together with any other texts ascribed to the same author that are doctrinally related, namely the Yuktīsaṅḍikā, the Śūnyatāsaptati, the Vaidalyaprakaraṇa, the Vigrahavyāvartanī and the Ratnāvalī. As to the other seven texts attributed to Nāgārjuna by Lindtner, Seyfort Ruegg is much less confident and with regard to most of them he mentions only that they are ascribed to him. With regard to the Bodhicittavivaraṇa, Seyfort Ruegg is inclined to attribute it to a Vajrayānist master, Ārya Nāgārjuna, who was most probably also the author of a commentary on the Guhyasamāja and of the Pañcakrama.

It seems that all scholars agree in considering the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās to be the most important work of Nāgārjuna, and, as such, it has recently been the subject of many studies. New manuscript material has made it possible to publish a new edition which appeared in Madras in 1977.64 Another edition was published by Lindtner who also translated the text into Danish.65 Lindtner is critical of previous English translations of this work by Streng and by Inada, but praises Gnoli’s Italian translation.66 It is to be hoped that a good English translation of this work will be published in the near future.

Of particular importance is the fact that in recent years scholars have concentrated their attention on the Mālamadhyamakakārikās in order to analyse Nāgārjuna’s philosophy. In his book Seyfort Ruegg takes this text as his basis for his sketch of some important points of philosophical interest in Nāgārjuna’s thought. Also based exclusively upon it are two articles by Tilmann Vetter and a very detailed study of the logic and dialectics of Nāgārjuna by Guy Bugault.67

Lindtner published in his Nagarjuniana an edition of the Tibetan text of the Śūnyatāsaptati, of the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan version of the Vigrahavyāvartanī, of the Tibetan version and the Sanskrit fragments of the Yuktiśaṭṭikā and of the Bodhicittavivarāṇa. His book also contains the first edition of the Sanskrit text of the Lokātītastava and the Acintyastava. According to Lindtner, the four hymns of Nāgārjuna are the following: Lokātītastava, Niraupamyastava, Acintyastava and Paramārthastava, because these four are found in four MSS and are often quoted. Moreover, the same four hymns are found in Amṛtākara’s Catuḥstavasamāsārtha.68 In his book Lindtner has translated into English the following texts: Śūnyatāsaptati, Yuktiśaṭṭikā, Lokātītastava, Acintyastava, Bodhicittavivarāṇa and the Bodhisambhāra[ka]. Moreover, he has translated into Danish the four following texts in his book Nagarjuna: Juvelkaeden og andre skrifter (København, 1980): Ratnāvalī, Yuktiśaṭṭikā, Niraupamyastava and Paramārthastava. His Nāgārjuna’s filosofiske værker (København, 1982) contains a Danish translation of the Bodhicittavivarāṇa, the Lokātītastava, the Acintyastava, the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās, the Śūnyatāsaptatiavṛtti, the Vigrahavyāvartanī, and the Bodhisambhāra[ka]. Moreover, this book contains also an edition of the Tibetan text of the Śūnyatāsaptatiavṛtti.

Michael Hahn has published a new edition of Nāgārjuna’s Ratnāvalī.69

---
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His book also contains the text of the canonical Tibetan version and a photocopy of the Chinese translation by Paramārtha. Ajitamitra’s commentary will be critically edited and analysed by Hahn’s pupil, Y. Okada. Nāgārjuna’s Sūtrasamuccaya was translated from the Tibetan version by Bhikkhu Pāśādika.  

Hsueh-li Cheng translated from the Chinese the Twelve Gate Treatise. This work is ascribed to Nāgārjuna in the Chinese tradition, but is probably a later compilation based upon Nāgārjuna’s work.

Āryadeva is generally considered to be a direct disciple of Nāgārjuna. His most important work is without doubt the Catuḥśatakā of which parts have been preserved in Sanskrit. By 1931 Vidhushekara Bhattācharya had already published the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of chapters VIII–XVI. Only recently, however, have Western scholars undertaken the study of this important work. One must mention in the first place Jacques May’s translation of the ninth chapter in which permanent entities are refuted. His work consists of a translation of the text and of Candrakīrti’s commentary and of an edition of the Tibetan version of those portions the Sanskrit text of which has not been transmitted. It is to be hoped that other chapters will be studied in the same way. Lindtner has announced an edition of the Catuḥśatakā. The Akṣaraśatakā and its Vṛtti are attributed to Āryadeva by the Chinese tradition. A new edition by Holten Pind will be published in Indiske Studier V. The Hastavālaprakaraṇa and its Vṛtti are attributed to Āryadeva or to Dignāga. The authors of the most recent translation, Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti, are inclined to attribute the work to Āryadeva.

Regarding the commentaries on the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās: Lindtner has translated the eighteenth chapter of Buddhapatālita’s com-

---

72 Cf. J. W. de Jong’s review to be published in IIJ.
73 The Catuḥśatakā of Āryadeva. Part II. Calcutta, 1931.
76 Cf. Nagarjuniana, p. 15, n. 32.
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mentary and Mervyn Sprung several chapters of Candrakīrti’s Prasannapadā. however, the latter translation has not found favour with reviewers.

More than seventy years ago de La Vallée Poussin published his incomplete translation of Candrakīrti’s Madhyamakāvatāra and his bhāṣya. Recently Helmut Tauscher has continued de La Vallée Poussin’s work by translating the last part of chapter six (verses 166–226) which had not been translated by de La Vallée Poussin. Christian Lindtner has published the Tibetan text of Candrakīrti’s Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa which is to be followed by an English translation.

One of the most popular works of the Madhyamaka literature is Śāntideva’s Bodhicaryāvatāra of which several new translations have recently been published: in English by Stephen Batchelor, in German by Ernst Steinkellner, in Danish by Christian Lindtner and in Dutch by Ria Kloppenborg.

Among the later Madhyamaka scholars one of the most important is Kamalaśīla, the disciple of Śāntarakṣita, on whose Tattvasamgraha he wrote a very extensive commentary. He is also the author of three Bhāvanākramas which have been much studied in recent years. In 1977 J. van den Broeck published a French translation of the first Bhāvanākrama.

---


which was also translated into Spanish by Luis Gómez. The same scholar translated the third Bhāvanākrama into Spanish and an English translation of the same text by Robert Olson and Masao Ichishima appeared in 1979. Kamalaśīla’s Bhāvanāyogāvatāra was rendered into Spanish by Luis Gómez.

The two other philosophical Mahāyāna schools, the Yogācāra and the Tathāgatagarbha, have received less attention from Western scholars in the period under review. Important articles on both schools were published by Lambert Schmithausen. His book on the Viññaptimātratā and the Ālayavijñāna, which is his ‘Habilitationsschrift’, has not yet been published, but many problems have been discussed by him in articles on the Viṃśatikā, the Trīṃśikā, and the Abhidharmasamuccaya. According to Schmithausen “the thesis of universal idealism originated from the generalization of a situation observed in the case of objects visualized in meditative concentration, i.e., in the context of spiritual practice.” Schmithausen has also paid attention to the literary history of the oldest texts of the Yogācāra school. The names of Maitreya, Asaṅga and Vasubandhu are attached to these texts but it is not possible to accept the traditional ascriptions. It is only through detailed textual studies such as the ones undertaken by Schmithausen that it will become possible to trace the history of the early Yogācāra school. A new edition of the Bodhisattvabhūmi was published by N. Dutt in 1966, but Gustav Roth has

shown convincingly that Dutt’s edition is not to be relied upon. Roth has published a new edition of the beginning of the text corresponding to Dutt’s edition p. 1–p. 2, line 3.\footnote{Gustav Roth, ‘Observations on the first chapter of Asaṅga’s Bodhisattvabhūmi’, Indologica Taurinensia III–IV (Torino, 1977), pp. 403–412.} The Tattvārtha chapter of the Bodhisattvabhūmi was translated by Janice Dean Willis but this work is completely unsatisfactory.\footnote{Janice Dean Willis (tr.), On Knowing Reality: The Tattvārtha Chapter of Asaṅga’s Bodhisattvabhūmi. New York, 1979. Cf. J. W. de Jong’s review to be published in OLZ.}

In 1969 David Seyfort Ruegg published his great work on the doctrines of the tathāgatagarbha and the gotra. It was reviewed in a long article by SchmithAUSEN.\footnote{‘Zu D. Seyfort Ruegg’s Buch “La théorie du tathāgatagarbha et du gotra”’, WZKS 17 (1973), pp. 123–160.} In 1973 Seyfort Ruegg published a translation of Bu ston’s treatise on the tathāgatagarbha.\footnote{Le traité du tathāgatagarbha de Bu ston Rin chen grub. Paris, 1973.} His book contains a long introduction on Bu ston’s sources and on the doctrine of the tathāgatagarbha according to Bu ston’s school. Thanks to the studies of Takasaki and Seyfort Ruegg it has now become possible to understand the importance of this school of thought.

the spiritual place of the epistemological tradition in Buddhism in a lecture given at several universities in Japan in 1982. 99 A student of Steinkellner, Gudrun Bühnemann, translated Ratnakīrti's Sarvajñasiddhi. 100 In 1930 Frauwallner translated Dignāga's Ālambanaparīkṣārvṛtti into German. Recently the same text was translated into English by Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti. 101

Alex Wayman has been active in the field of Tantric studies. In 1973 he published a collection of articles and in 1977 a book on the Yoga of the Guhyasamājatantra. 102 Christopher S. George edited and translated the first eight chapters of the Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa tantra of which de La Vallée Poussin had edited the sixteenth chapter in 1897. 103 Many Sanskrit Tantric manuscripts are kept in manuscript collections and still await an editor. It is a pity that in the West few scholars seem to be interested in the philological study of Tantric texts. We owe to a Japanese scholar, Horiuchi Kanjin, the edition of one of the most important tantras, the Sarvatathāgatatatattvasamgraha. 104 Per Kvaerne published in 1977 a very thorough study of the Caryāgīti. 105 His book contains the text of the Caryāgīti and of Munidatta’s commentary and an edition of the Tibetan versions. The concept of sahaja which plays an important role in these Tantric songs was studied by him in a separate article. 106

In the field of Buddhist literature remarkable work has been done by


99 'The spiritual place of the epistemological tradition in Buddhism', Nanto Bukkyō 49 (1982), pp. 1–18.


RECENT BUDDHIST STUDIES

Michael Hahn. In 1974 he published the Tibetan version and a translation of Candragomin’s Lokānandanāṭaka.107 In a paper published in 1977 he studied the Jātakamālās of Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta.108 The Tibetan version of four jātakas from the Haribhaṭṭajātakamālā were edited and translated by Hahn.109 In another article he studied the date of Haribhaṭṭa who according to him was active in the first half of the fifth century.110 Hahn also published a new edition of the Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇdaṇḍakakathā which was previously studied very carefully by Heinz Zimmermann, especially with regard to the very defective Tibetan version.111 Hahn also made a contribution to the study of the first canto of Buddhacarita by studying the Tibetan version of the verses missing in the Sanskrit manuscripts.112 Another text studied in recent years is Kṣemendra’s Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā of which many readings in the Bibliotheca Indica edition were shown to be incorrect.113 Especially useful was a Cambridge manuscript dating from 1302. Buddhist epistolary literature has been studied by Siglinde Dietz in a very voluminous thesis which will be published soon in the Asiatische Forschungen.114 The Suhṛtlekha was

---


translated into Danish by Lindtner and into English by Kawamura and by Jamspal.\footnote{115}

Of great importance for the history of Buddhism in India are inscriptions, and particularly the Aśokan inscriptions. Ulrich Schneider has published a critical edition and translation of the rock edicts.\footnote{116} K. R. Norman has made many contributions in a series of articles.\footnote{117} Since the second world war the Aśokan inscriptions have been studied by many scholars and a systematic bibliography, which would supplement the one published by M. A. Mehendale, would be very welcome.\footnote{118} The so-called epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit has been studied by Th. Damsteeg in a book published in 1978.\footnote{119}

In 1881 the Pali Text Society was founded by T. W. Rhys Davids.\footnote{120} To commemorate the centenary of its foundation, the Pali Text Society published volume 9 of the Journal of the Pali Text Society to which fifteen scholars contributed articles.\footnote{121} Under the guidance of Miss Horner and K. R. Norman, who succeeded her as president, the Pali Text Society continued with the publication of texts, translations, indexes, etc. Miss Horner has made new translations of the Vimāṇavatthu and the Bud-


\footnote{118} M. A. Mehendale, \textit{Aśokan Inscriptions in India}. A linguistic study, together with an exhaustive bibliography. Bombay, 1948.


dhavamsa and Cariyāpiṭaka.122 Her last work was a translation of her edition of the Buddhavaṃsa commentary.123 Bhikkhu Ēnānamoli translated the Paṭisambhidāmagga.124 In 1982 the Pali Text Society published a very useful index of the Kathāvatthu which was compiled by a group of Japanese scholars.125 A new translation of the famous Vessantara-jātaka was published by the Oxford University Press in 1977.126 K. R. Norman published some important notes on the text of this jātaka.127 Ludwig Alsdorf wrote an article on the Bhūridatta-jātaka in which he suggested corrections in the text.128

One of the most important publications is that of the Burmese recension of a collection of fifty jātakas by P. S. Jaini.129 An important cosmological text, the Lokapaññatti, was edited by Eugène Denis who examined in detail the relations of this text to other texts in Pāli, Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan.130 According to Denis the Lokapaññatti was probably translated into Pāli, or compiled in Pāli making use of Sanskrit sources, in Burma in the eleventh or twelfth century. Jacqueline Ver Eecke has edited and translated two later Pāli texts, the Dasavatthupakaraṇa and the Sīhālavatthupakaraṇa.131 Her editions are based mainly upon Sinhalese editions. H. Saddhātissa has written a number of articles on Pāli literature in Thailand, Cambodia and Laos.132 Oskar von Hinüber showed the

importance of the Pāli tradition in Burma for the transmission of the Pāli texts. Both K. R. Norman and O. von Hinüber have made detailed studies of etymological and philological problems in Pāli texts.


A structural grammar of Pāli was published by T. Y. Elizarenkova and V. N. Toporov in 1976.\footnote{136} Of great importance for the study of texts are dictionaries, catalogues and bibliographies. A new dictionary, of which up till now three fascicles have been published, is the Sanskrit Dictionary of the Buddhist manuscripts from the Turfan Discoveries which, with the beginning of the third fascicle, includes also manuscript materials from collections other than the Berlin collection.\footnote{137} It comprises in the first place texts belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school but also Dharmaguptaka and Mūlasarvāstivāda texts. Of the Critical Pāli Dictionary five more fascicles of volume II were published from 1973 to 1982.\footnote{138} After the death of Ludwig Alsdorf the task of editing the dictionary was entrusted to K. R. Norman. The Hōbōgirin, which is correctly called an encyclopaedic dictionary, is a work well known to Japanese scholars. A fifth fascicle containing many important articles appeared in 1979.\footnote{139} A new catalogue of the Taishō edition, this time including all one hundred volumes, was published in 1978.\footnote{140}

We mentioned already the catalogues of the Turfan manuscripts. Important for Pāli studies are the catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts in the Royal Library in Copenhagen by the late Godakumbura, and the catalogue of Burmese manuscripts by Heinz Bechert.\footnote{141} Tibetan blockprints and manuscripts in German collections were described by D. Schuh


and by F. Wilhelm and J. Losang Panglung.\textsuperscript{142} Another important publication is the descriptive catalogue of the Korean Buddhist Canon which was compiled by Lancaster.\textsuperscript{143}

Some attempts have been made to revive the Bibliographie bouddhique, but alas without success. The last fascicle of it comprised the years 1954 to 1958 and in the twenty-five years which have since elapsed no publication has filled this gap in our bibliographical information. However, we must welcome some very useful systematic bibliographies, as, for instance, A. Yuyama's very exhaustive bibliography of the Vinaya literature\textsuperscript{144} and H. Nakamura's comprehensive bibliography of Indian Buddhism.\textsuperscript{145} A bibliography of translations of Pali texts has been published by Russell Webb.\textsuperscript{146} Also very useful are the bibliographies contained in the reprint of the Dbu-ma, Sems-tsam and Tshad-ma sections of the Derge Kanjur.\textsuperscript{147} Another very detailed bibliography comprising both Kanjur and Tanjur will be published as a supplement to the edition of the Nyingma edition of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon which was published by the Dharma Publishing in 1981.

So far we have dealt mainly with Buddhist studies relating to Indian texts. It is not possible to mention even briefly the work which has been done with relation to texts from Tibet, China and the Theravāda countries. Even less will it be possible to do justice to studies in the fields of philosophy, religion, history and art. However, it is perhaps useful to mention a few publications as an indication of the kind of work which is being done in these fields by Western scholars. Since 1959 Tibetan studies have greatly developed, with many publications relating to Tibetan Buddhism and, indirectly, to Indian Buddhism. In 1977 Michel Strickmann


\textsuperscript{146} Russell Webb, \textit{An Analysis of the Pali Canon. With a Bibliography}. Kandy, 1975.

presented an excellent survey of Tibetan Buddhist studies. Of the many publications published since 1977 we mention only one, namely Helmut Eimer’s edition of the Tibetan version of the Pravrajyāvastu of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda school. Eimer has paid much attention to the different Kanjur and Tanjur editions and has shown the importance of consulting as many of these as possible. His edition of the Pravrajyāvastu is based upon no less than six blockprint editions and five manuscripts. With regard to studies on Theravāda countries, one must draw attention to the symposium on Buddhism in Ceylon and on religious syncretism in Buddhist countries. Much information on Buddhism in Cambodia is to be found in the studies published since 1976 by François Bizot. C. Hooykaas, who died in 1979, has made important contributions to the study of Buddhism in Bali.

Very interesting for the study of the texts of the Hīnayāna schools is Schmithausen’s study on the recensions of the Udānavarga. Seyfort Ruegg published an important article on the chronology of the Madhyamaka school. Based upon very careful study of the Pāli texts and the Chinese versions of Hīnayāna texts are the studies of André Bareau, which shed much light on the history of early Buddhism.

---

DE JONG

For the study of Buddhist philosophy one must mention the work of Schmithausen on the smṛtyupasthānas, on the threefold duḥkhatā and on liberating insight,¹⁵⁶ and Seyfort Ruegg’s beautiful study on catuṣkoṭi.¹⁵⁷ A monograph on Self and Non-Self in Early Buddhism is known to me only by a reference in an article by Tilmann Vetter.¹⁵⁸ The two truths in Buddhism and Vedānta have been studied by several scholars in a volume edited by Mervyn Sprung.¹⁵⁹

How important it is to study again identifications made in the past has been shown by Dieter Schlingloff, who in a series of important articles has published the results of his studies of the wall-paintings of Ajanta and of other Buddhist monuments.¹⁶⁰ His work is based upon a careful study of the monuments and upon a profound knowledge of Buddhist narrative literature.


RECENT BUDDHIST STUDIES

Another field of study in which important work has been done in recent years is anthropology. Scholars working in this field have directed their attention to the Tibetans in India and Nepal and to the Theravāda countries. It must be left to a specialist in this field to make a survey of the results obtained by anthropologists.

I hope that I have been able to give some idea of the work which has been done in the last ten years by Western scholars in the field of Buddhist studies and, above all, with regard to the study of Buddhist texts in India. It is of course impossible for one man to give an adequate survey of the work which is being done in so many branches of Buddhist studies, and I can only hope that others will supplement the bibliographical information which it has been my pleasure to present to you in this lecture.

ADDENDUM

Since the writing of this paper several further books and articles have come to my notice. I should also add that Arnold Kunst (1903–1981) and Constantin Regamey (1907–1982) died in 1981 and 1982, respectively. Kunst’s main work was the translation of the anumāṇa chapter of the Tattvasamgraha (Probleme der buddhistischen Logik in der Darstellung des


In October and November 1983 the above paper of mine was read at various Japanese universities. As several publications by Japanese scholars, especially in Western languages, were mentioned, I was asked why other publications by Japanese scholars were not referred to. It was my intention to draw attention to the work done by scholars in Europe and America. Very few publications by Indian and Japanese scholars were mentioned, and these only in so far as they dealt with some specific areas such as facsimile editions of Buddhist Sanskrit texts, editions of Sanskrit Buddhist texts and bibliography. Detailed bibliographies of Japanese publications on Indian Buddhism were prepared on the occasion of the CISHAAN conference by Ejima Yasunori and Katsura Shōryū, and it is to be hoped that these will soon be published. In my paper I mentioned Tripāṭhi’s forthcoming edition of the Ekottarāgama fragments from Gilgit. In this connection mention must be made also of the edition published by Ōkubo Yūsen (‘The Ekottara-āgama fragments of the Gilgit manuscript—Romanized Text’, Bukkyōgaku Seminā 35, 1982, pp. 120–91).