

REVIEW ARTICLE

A MISSED OPPORTUNITY

Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism. By EUGÈNE BURNOUF. Translated by KATIA BUFFETRILLE and DONALD S. LOPEZ JR. *Buddhism and Modernity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010. Pp. vii + 608. \$65.00.

Eugène Burnouf can, with full justification, be deemed the father of modern scientific Buddhist studies.¹ It is consequently (or perhaps the logic is the other way around) possible to say, as Donald Lopez does in the first sentence of his twenty-seven-page introduction to this complete English translation of the work, that Burnouf's *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien* of 1844 "was the most influential work on Buddhism to be written during the nineteenth century." Lopez makes, briefly but soundly, a case for this claim immediately thereafter. He goes on to note, however, that "This masterpiece . . . is largely neglected today. One might argue that the book has all but disappeared and remains unread and unexamined, not because it is outdated or has been superseded (although it is and has been on a number of individual points), but because it became so fully integrated into the mainstream representation of Buddhism, which it helped to create, that it is no longer visible." Lopez continues in the following paragraph to offer what comes closest to his case for a translation of the volume:

Burnouf's massive work . . . is of high historical value, providing a clear window onto how Buddhism was understood in the early decades of the nineteenth century, just when the Buddhist traditions of Asia were beginning to be studied by the philologists of Europe. At the same time, it is not simply a monument of antiquarian scholarship; the work offers a vast fount of still accurate in-

¹ Page references for the French original in the following are to the 1844 edition of Burnouf's *Introduction*, on which the translation is based.

formation and insight into Buddhist religion and philosophy, as well as hundreds of pages of translations from important Buddhist texts. And Burnouf's theories on the Buddha's teachings and the development of his doctrine remain both fascinating and instructive. Indeed, Burnouf's *Introduction* was a seminal text in Europe's formation of Buddhism as a textual object. (1–2)

While there is little question that the impact of Burnouf's scholarship on the development of modern Buddhist studies is profound, a substantial question may be raised, namely, whether the best way to begin to appreciate this impact is by means of an unannotated translation of his *Introduction*, accompanied by only a brief and largely nonanalytical introduction. A related question is how representative this work, standing alone, is of Burnouf's thought regarding Indian Buddhism, given that it was understood by its author himself as intimately related to his profusely annotated translation of the Lotus sutra, comprising 283 pages of translation accompanied by more than double that number (582) of pages of notes (*Le Lotus de la bonne loi* [Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1852]).² This translation of the Lotus sutra—in contrast to the *Introduction*, which was reprinted only once, in 1876—has been reprinted a number of times (1925 [with a short preface by Sylvain Lévi], 1973, 1989, 2007), a fact that speaks at least implicitly of its influence and popularity.

Lopez asserts that Burnouf's work provides a window into an understanding of Buddhism in the early decades of the nineteenth century. This assertion needs defending. When Lopez writes that “One might argue that the book has all but disappeared and remains unread and unexamined . . . because it became so fully integrated into the mainstream representation of Buddhism . . . that it is no longer visible,” it is not enough for the abstract “one” to assert this. It is therefore all the more regrettable that Lopez himself does not take up his own challenge, namely, to attempt to clarify Burnouf's impact on the creation of Buddhist studies as a discipline, on the one hand, and on European (or in line with the series title, modern) understandings of Buddhism, on the other. In fact, it is not too much to say that in this regard the introduction to this volume hardly moves us past the treatment given Burnouf almost forty years ago by J. W. de Jong in his *Brief History of Buddhist Studies*.³

Why translate this volume? And if it were to be translated, why do so without attempting to make plain to readers which of Burnouf's insights were revolutionary and formative and, on the other hand, where subsequent scholarship has been able to correct him? Lopez writes: “Burnouf's numerous translations from the Sanskrit have not been checked against the original texts, as important as that task is; the purpose of this translation is to bring his influential understanding of Buddhism to an Anglo-

² Their close relation is also illustrated by their joint index. Lopez writes: “Burnouf's *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi* contains a combined index for both that text and the *Introduction*, so the index to this volume has been extracted from that and provided here” (30). The logic of “so” here remains unclear to me, but in any event, since this index is quite minimal, it is fair to say that the present volume lacks a proper index.

³ J. W. de Jong, *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America* (Tokyo: Kōsei, 1997), 20–26, the portion in question originally published in 1974 in *The Eastern Buddhist*. As de Jong notes, Burnouf's studies were examined in detail already by Ernst Windisch in his *Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und Indischen Altertumskunde*, Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I (Strasbourg: Trübner, 1917), 129–40, a work Lopez does not mention.

phone audience, even when that understanding may not be that of the modern scholar” (30). This appears to be the rationale for this translation: it is meant for English readers who might be interested in the historical understanding of Buddhism through an early window of Buddhist studies. However, setting the expected number of such readers against the number of readers who will see the imprint of the University of Chicago Press, the name Donald Lopez, and the title “Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism”—readers who will not be adequately prepared to separate Burnouf’s insights from his errors—one can see the potential problem. This translation represents, I fear, more than a lost opportunity to consider in situ, as it were, how far we have come from the starting point Burnouf provided and how much (or how little) we have learned from his guidance. The absence of indications in the body of the translation pointing to errors or insufficiencies in Burnouf’s presentation will leave unprepared readers bound to further perpetuate misunderstandings that should have been (and in many cases certainly were heretofore) buried more than a century ago. To take only one example, in this case indeed noticed explicitly by Lopez (25), Burnouf mistook the Yogācāra philosopher Asaṅga’s name to be Saṅgha, referring throughout (even in the index) to “Ārya Saṅgha.” Although Lopez does not attempt to explain the mistake, here Burnouf was evidently influenced by (and apparently miscopied) Csoma de Kőrös.⁴ In this case the error is at least mentioned in Lopez’s introduction, though nowhere else: in almost all other cases of such misunderstandings, there is not a word anywhere.⁵

In some instances, problematic formulations are not only not highlighted, but even uncritically repeated. While Lopez notes that for much of what Burnouf says about “sūtras” he draws instead upon avadānas (16), for example, Lopez does not explain what this means or the difference between the two genres of literature. This issue arises in the context of a contrast between “simple sūtras” and “developed sūtras,” and Lopez freely refers to these as “the two classes of sūtras.” What the relation might be between avadānas and developed Mahāyāna (or Mahāyānist) sūtras remains subject to investigation; it would have been helpful to hint to general readers that current scholarship in this regard does not frame things as did Burnouf.

Lopez makes repeated claims for the influence of Burnouf upon subsequent studies;⁶ yet he also denies it. A case in point is his discussion of Burnouf’s comments on

⁴ “Analysis of the Sher-chin—P’hal ch’hen—Dkon-séks—Do-dé—Nyáng-dás—and Gyut; Being the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th Divisions of the Tibetan Work, Entitled the Kah-gyur,” *Asiatic Researches* 20, no. 2 (1836): 513, repeated in “Notices on the Different Systems of Buddhism, extracted from the Tibetan authorities,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 7 (1838): 144. It is to be noted that, while Csoma, ignoring the negation, writes “A’rya Saṅga” and quotes the Tibetan *’phags pa thogs med*, which rather corresponds to Āryasaṅga [Ārya-Asaṅga], Burnouf makes this [A]saṅga into Saṅgha.

⁵ An odd example is found in the index on page 604, where it is hard to account for Saṅghādīśesa being called “a philosophical treatise,” especially when the reference to page 300 understands it correctly as a class of vinaya offense. The entry is a correct, but automatic, translation of Burnouf’s index entry.

⁶ “Burnouf’s book was studied assiduously not only by his illustrious students, but by the next generations of European scholars of Buddhism, such as Sylvain Lévi, Otto Franke, Hermann Oldenberg, Émile Senart, Theodor Stcherbatsky, F. W. Thomas, E. J. Thomas, Louis de la Val-

caste. Lopez remarks: “After making it clear that the Buddha’s attitude toward caste was a good deal more nuanced than it had been portrayed by previous writers (and would be portrayed by subsequent writers),” which certainly seems to suggest that Lopez believes that the subsequent writers in question ignored Burnouf’s lead. In his “Note on the Translation,” he goes so far as to speak of “the work’s oblivion” (29). Lopez’s introduction contains a number of such own goals. One is therefore entitled to ask whether the effort of producing this translation was energy well spent. It is true that a great many of Burnouf’s insights and discoveries deserve to be considered and reconsidered anew, and if the work stands simply as a historical artifact, or as a resource for rediscovering hints and ideas of a great scholar who dove headfirst into materials, some of which even today remain barely explored, then one cannot but be grateful for this English presentation. If, however, the work comes to be seen as an authoritative recent publication of scholarly merit, this in its turn cannot help but have the effect of, in some regards, actually setting the field back significantly. That the manner in which the translation is presented does not preclude the latter scenario is a cause for regret.

It need not have been this way, even on a purely technical level. The translation has renumbered Burnouf’s footnotes, using running numbers for each section as opposed to the page-based numbers in the original. Since this obviates the need to slavishly follow any original numbering, it would have been simple to add notes indicating spots in which a reader must beware of Burnouf’s formulations, something which, as noted, was not done even in the most egregious cases. Another very simple and user-friendly—even essential—feature would have been the addition in brackets of the original page numbers. As it is, there is no such indication anywhere in the translation. Therefore, a reader who wishes to check a citation or reference to Burnouf in any other work produced in the last 150 years is simply out of luck. Absent the need to maintain the integrity of the original pagination, it is likewise difficult to understand why the additions and corrections Burnouf wished to make to his text—collected by him in his appendix 8 “Additions et corrections”—are reproduced here as such, rather than being integrated into the translation at the spots already explicitly indicated by Burnouf himself.

Lopez states: “Burnouf’s often inconsistent and occasionally cryptic abbreviations of his sources in the footnotes have been provided in full” (30). Unfortunately, this is not true. Many of the sources referred to briefly by Burnouf are cited, for instance, with a family name and single word of the title, or a shortened title. It would not have been difficult to track down the full references.⁷ As a result, a reader inter-

lée Poussin, and Alfred Foucher. A work of similar scope would not be produced for more than a century, when in 1958 the Belgian scholar Monseigneur Étienne Lamotte . . . published *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*” (3). It is surprising here to see no reference to the name of Hendrik Kern, certainly massively more influential than, at the very least, F. W. or E. J. Thomas, and whose own history of Indian Buddhism (*Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indië* [1881–83], almost immediately translated into both French and German) could very well lay claim to being the most immediate and legitimate successor to Burnouf’s work. See further my “Kern and the Study of Indian Buddhism: With a Speculative Note on the Ceylonese Dhammarucikas,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 31 (2012): 125–54.

⁷ As an example, it took me less than a minute to identify what is given on p. 74 n. 51 merely with “Bazin, *Le Pi pa ki*, p. 118” as Antoine-Pierre-Louis Bazin (1799–1863), *Le Pi-Pa-Ki ou l’histoire du luth, Drame chinois de Kao-Tong-Kai, représenté à Péking, en 1404, avec les chan-*

ested in further tracing Burnouf's intellectual debts, for example, cannot make easy use of the translation for this purpose.

While it is one thing not to provide corrections or context to set Burnouf's work in its historically significant frame, this translation (and its introduction), while on the whole quite good, readable, and reliable, also introduces errors here and there that could have been avoided. Particular difficulties were evidently caused by the Sanskrit language. Speaking of Burnouf's contributions to Sanskrit and Hindu studies Lopez mentions his edition and translation of, as Lopez writes it, *Le Bhagavata Purana ou histoire poétique de Kṛichna* (6). In the same sentence he prints the title of the text as *Bhagavata Purāṇa*. The text is rather the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, and the book is titled *Le Bhāgavata Purāṇa ou histoire poétique de Kṛichṇa*.⁸ The contents of the famous Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts sent from Nepal to Burnouf in Paris also appear, at least initially, to have created confusion, since Lopez states that these included "the *Abhidharmakośa*, Vasubandhu's important compendium of doctrine" (11). What Burnouf had, however, was rather the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* of Yaśomitra, a subcommentary.⁹ The first publication of the Sanskrit text of Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the work which could be justly called a "compendium of doctrine," appeared in the edition of Prahlad Pradhan in 1967, based on photographs of a Sanskrit manuscript taken by Rahula Sankrityayana in Tibet in the 1930s, almost a century after Burnouf wrote. It is therefore reassuring to find that Lopez later correctly indicates that what Burnouf studied was indeed Yaśomitra's subcommentary (18).¹⁰ Elsewhere, Lopez spells the name of one of the most famous Buddhist scriptures *Aṣṭasahasrikāprajñāpāramitā* instead of *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* (11). Other examples could be cited,¹¹ but a different problem will be more difficult for general readers than a few careless oversights: in Burnouf's *Introduction*, Sanskrit com-

gements de Mao-Tseu, traduit sur le texte original (Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1841). Similar examples can be found throughout the book.

⁸ The name is written not, pace Lopez, Kṛichna—which would be equivalent to what we would now romanize as the impossible and thus nonexistent Kṛiṣṇa—but Kṛichṇa, that is Kṛiṣṇa. Lopez continues: "He published three large volumes . . . between 1840 and 1847 and planned as many as three more volumes in order to present all twelve cantos of the text." There is no mention that two subsequent volumes did appear in 1884 and 1898, completing the work.

⁹ This is clearly noted in de Jong's *Brief History of Buddhist Studies* (24), a work to which Lopez refers in a different context in a note on 3.

¹⁰ When we read "the *Dharmakośavyākhyā* expresses itself in this way: . . . (*Dharmakośavyākhyā*, fol. 6b of the MS of the Société Asiatique)" (188 n. 169), the text in question is nothing other than Yaśomitra's *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (the passage is found in Wogihara Unrai, *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: The Work of Yaśomitra* [1936; repr., Tokyo: Sanshō Buddhist Book Store, 1989], 7.21–23); one would search in vain for a text called *Dharmakośavyākhyā*, yet this title appears two more times (421, 512), while elsewhere the title is given correctly. Both "titles," *Dharmakośavyākhyā* and *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, are listed—separately—in the index.

¹¹ For instance, Lopez refers to the *Karaṇḍavyūha* (13), rather than *Kāraṇḍavyūha*. In the translation, however, we find *Guṇakaraṇḍavyūha* and *Kāraṇḍavyūha* (234), both forms used by Burnouf (220). In the former title the translation alternates between *Guṇaka*° and *Guṇakā*°. Rather more pedantically, one might note that in his "Note on the Translation," Lopez remarks that "Burnouf's spelling has been corrected in two instances. His *Sāriputra* and *Vātsiputriya* have been changed to *Sāriputra* and *Vātsiputriya*" (30). The latter forms are indeed more common, but Pāṇini 8.4.46–47 indicates that such spellings are to be considered entirely classical.

pounds are written in roman letters with their elements separated.¹² Rosane Roucher suggests to me that this unusual presentation may have been motivated by the fact that the book was intended for a general readership and by Burnouf's corresponding desire to provide his readers a basic Sanskrit vocabulary. The contemporary convention is to write compounds together, however, and the translation obviously has attempted to do this, though often not successfully.¹³ Lopez also does not follow this

¹² They were of course also transcribed in a different system from that in use today, which was standardized only at the International Congress of Orientalists at Geneva in 1894. The romanization has been altered to the modern standard in the translation.

¹³ Errors in need of correction, and other Sanskrit problems in the translation, may be noted as follows: 90: *abuddhoktam abhidharma śāstram* > *abuddhoktam abhidharmasāstram* 90 n. 28: *dhāranātmika iti dharmah* > correct in French (p. 42): *dhāranātmika iti dharmah*; 94: *sūtram mātrkā ca devamanuṣyeṣu pratiṣṭhitam*, that is to say, "The Sūtra and the Mātrkā are established among humans." This is indeed a correct translation of the French (46), but not of the Sanskrit, which refers to gods and humans; 122 n. 23: *kāmā vacarā* > *kāmāvacarā* (correct in the text on which the note comments!); 123 n. 25: *śaraṇa gamana* > *śaraṇagamana*; 125 n. 30: *upasthāna śālā* > *upasthānaśālā*; 131 and n43: *śaṅkhaśīla* > *śaṅkhaśīla*; however, as Edgerton (BHSD s.v. "śaṅkhaśīlā") makes clear, the word must be feminine: *śaṅkhaśīlā*; 184 n. 159, 160: *Nāgara avalambikā* > *Nāgarāvalambikā*; 185: *śramaṇa brāhmaṇa* > *śramaṇabrāhmaṇa*; 223 n. 234: *Vaśiṣṭhides* > *Vaśiṣṭhides* (Burnouf 207 indeed wrote *Vaṣiṣṭhides*, which would be *Vaśiṣṭhides* as the translation has it, but the absence of the retroflex underdot is clearly a misprint. The dental *s* is to be preferred to *ś*.); 239 n. 260 *uposatha* follows Burnouf 227n, but is incorrect: *uposatha*; 250 n. 9: *punya maheśākhyā* > *punyamaheśākhyā*; 252 n. 12 cites *pūrṇakasya ca maryādā bandhanam kartum*, "et Pūrṇam intra limites cohibere." One must read *maryādābandhanam*, the passage in Cowell and Neil's edition (E[ward] B[yles] Cowell and R[obert] A[lexander] Neil, *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* [Cambridge, 1886; repr., Amsterdam: Oriental Press/Philo Press, 1970]) coming at 29.26 reading instead *maryādābandham*. Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡, *Budda ga nazotoku sanze no monogatari: Diviya avadāna zen'yaku* ブッダが謎解く三世の物語: ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナ全訳 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版, 2007): I.100 n. 58 refers to Tibetan *mnar* and Chinese 苦自治罰, both in the sense of being caused to suffer; 263 n. 23: *gośirṣa candana* > *gośirṣacandana*; 266 n. 28: *caitya śalākā* > *caityaśalākā*; 270 n. 34: *viṃśati śikhara samudgataṃ satkāya dṛṣṭi śāilam jñāna vajreṇa bhittvā* > *viṃśatiśikharasamudgataṃ satkāyadrṣṭiśāilam jñānavajreṇa bhittvā*; 273 n. 39: *śraddhā vimukta* > *śraddhāvimukta*; 278 n. 48: *dharma vaijāvṛtyam karoti* > *dharmavaijāvṛtyam karoti*; 291: *śrotāpatti mārga sthāna* and *śrotāpatti phala sthāna* > *śrotāpattimārgasthāna* and *śrotāpattiphala sthāna*; 310 n. 159: *paścāt śramaṇa* > *paścātśramaṇa*; 317 n. 167: *prathama kalpika* > *prathamakalpika*; 348 n. 229: *Rāja taranginī* > *Rājataranginī*; 367 n. 260: *prācīna prāgbhāra* > *prācīnaprāgbhāra*; 395 n. 293: *dhūti bhojanam* and *pūti bhojanam* > *dhūtibhojanam* and *pūtibhojanam*; 418: *Avaraśailāḥ*. Burnouf (446) has this, but the correct spelling is *Aparā* (p/v alternation is common); 419: *Devasarman*, with Burnouf 448, but read *Devaśarman*; 419: *sūtra piṭaka*, *vinaya piṭaka*, and *abhidharma piṭaka* > *sūtrapiṭaka*, *vinayapiṭaka*, and *abhidharmapiṭaka*; 423: *ārya mahāsāṃghikānām lokottara vādinām pāṭhena* > *āryamahāsāṃghikānām lokottaravādinām pāṭhena*; 458 n. 86: *jaimini nyāya māla vistara* > *Jaimini nyāyamālāvistara* (the name of a text); 458 n. 86: *apravṛtta pravartanam* and *puruṣa viśayaḥ śabda vyāpārah* > *apravṛttapravartanam* and *puruṣaviśayaḥ śabdavyāpārah*; 458 n. 86: *upādāna skandha* > *upādānaskandha*; 464 n. 115: *lābha satkāra śloka abhibhūtāḥ* > *lābhasatkāraślokabhibhūtāḥ*; 475 n. 140: *nairātmya dvaya avabodhāt* > *nairātmadvayāvabodhāt*; 512: *Sphuṣārtha* > *Sphuṣārthā* (the error is Burnouf's on 563); 519 n. 58: *trīṭhyam dharma saṅgītim anupraviśya* > *trīṭhyam dharmasaṅgītim anupraviśya*; 536: *samyak saṃbuddhaḥ* > *samyaksaṃbuddhaḥ*; 537: *anupādisesa nibbāna saṃpāpakam* > *anupādisesanibbānasāṃpāpakam*; 537: *sopadhīśeṣam pañcaskandhamātra śūnyam* > *sopadhīśeṣam pañcaskandhamātraśūnyam*; 556: *paranirmita vaśavartin* > *paranirmita-*

principle consistently in his introduction.¹⁴ As another example, we read: “in Pāli this article is written *ābbhokāsikaṅga*” (306). This is not possible because of the Law of Morae (i.e., a long vowel cannot precede a cluster); Burnouf actually wrote *abbhokāsikangga* (309). (The word is misspelled in the English index as well but is spelled correctly in the French.)

This book is the seventh in the University of Chicago Press series “Buddhism and Modernity,” which Lopez edits. Lopez is credited, in the five years since 2005, as author or editor of five out of the series’s seven volumes.¹⁵ The translation, which must have required a massive effort, is roughly 550 pages long, and though it is ascribed to Katia Buffetrille and Lopez, nothing is said about the division of labor, nor is any other name mentioned, even to give credit, for example, for the work of changing the Chinese romanizations into the Pinyin system. Regarding this translation, Lopez speaks (29) of the difficulty of Burnouf’s French, which “requires painstaking precision on the part of a translator to arrive at a clear and exact rendering into English.” Indeed, the translation is on the whole very good.¹⁶ However, there do

vaśavartin; 570: *candana gośūrṣa* > *candanagośūrṣa*; 571: *malaya candana* > *malayacandana*; 574: *Milindapañña*; Burnouf 621 has written this, but spell rather *Milindapañha*; 580: “*chanda samādhi prahāṇa saṃskāra samanvāgata*, a compound”; how is it possible to say directly after this term that it is a compound, but not print it as such? There follow three other compounds with a different first member which also must be printed as such; 581: *kāya smṛtyupasthānam* > *kāyasmṛtyupasthānam*, and so for other compounds of the same formation which follow; 583: *atyayika piṇḍapāta* > *atyayikapīṇḍapāta*, or better *ā°*; 584: *ārya satyāni* > *āryasatyāni*; 584: *śaraṇa gamana* > *śaraṇagamana*; 587–88: *svabhāva śuddhāḥ sarvadharmāḥ svabhāva śuddho ’ham iti* > *svabhāvaśuddhāḥ sarvadharmāḥ svabhāvaśuddho ’ham iti*.

¹⁴ He writes *sopadhīśeṣa nirvāna* and *anupadhīśeṣa nirvāna* (20). If the goal were to make clear the elements of the compound, a hyphen would have served the purpose, here and elsewhere.

¹⁵ For a critical view of another recent volume in this series, Lopez’s *In the Forest of Faded Wisdom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), see Heather Stoddard in *The Newsletter of the International Institute for Asian Studies* 56 (Spring 2011): 30–31.

¹⁶ However, some may not always agree with the translators’ choices. For instance, it is unfortunate that the translation (435–47) follows the example of Conze in using “courses” as a verb, as in “The bodhisattva who courses in the perfection of wisdom.” Here Burnouf has “Le Bōdhisattva qui marche dans la Perfection de la sagesse” (467).

There are also a number of cases of misprints: *Rāmāyana* (7) > *Rāmāyana*; *Pancatantra* (7) > *Pañcatantra*; *Gandavyūha* (100) > *Gaṇḍavyūha*; *adbutha* (108) > *adbhuta*; *piśācas* (163) > *piśācas*; *Vārāṇṣī* (184 n. 157) > *Vārāṇṣī*; *mātangī* (222) > *mātāṅgī*; *Trīśaṅku* (223 and 234n) > *Trīśāṅku*; *angas* and *upāngas* (224) > *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*; *Piṅgalavatsājīva* (346) > *Piṅgalavatsājīva*; *ṛṣi* (366) > *ṛṣi*; *anātmaka* (468 n. 124) > *anāmaka*; *Akaṇiṣṭha* (564) > *Akaṇiṣṭha*; *Trikaṇḍaśeṣa* (587 n. 34) > *Trikaṇḍaśeṣa*. In “A curious fact, although it does not advance our knowledge very much on the question of origin, is that even today, there exists in the district of Gorakhpur, that is to say, in the very country where Śākyamuni was born, a branch of the race of the Rajputs, who takes the name of Gautamides” (182 n. 153), “takes” should be “take.” Sometimes we seem to have to do simply with editing errors. Thus we find “A passage . . . related to the I, which the Buddhists call *pudgala*, or the person who transmigrates, and who they distinguish from” (270 n. 34), in which one must read “and whom.” Possibly confusing is frequent alternation (259 n. 19 and elsewhere) between *Mahāvanso*, *Mahāvamsa*, and *Mahāvāmsa*, without explanation. Furthermore, Burnouf also refers to Edward Upham’s translation of *The Mahāvansi* (which is nowhere further clarified). Other editing errors: “an immense

remain a number of instances in which the result is not properly English.¹⁷

Sometimes trouble is caused by an excessive literalness: “In the way, that the religious law (*brahmacarya*) survives for a long time” (172) renders “De manière que la loi religieuse (*Brahma tcharya*) subsiste longtemps” (142). “The śramaṇa Gautama does not have the supernatural power to perform miracles superior to what man can do that one of his listeners, a householder who wears white robes, possesses” (202) represents “Le Çramaṇa Gâutama n’a pas, pour opérer des miracles supérieurs à ce que l’homme peut faire, la puissance surnaturelle que possède un de ses Auditeurs, un maître de maison, qui porte un vêtement blanc” (180). “This fact indicates another redaction in the most clear manner, and it accords with the development of poetic pieces, where one observes it as testimony that these pieces at least do not derive from the same hand as the simple sūtras” (142) translates “Ce fait indique de la manière la plus claire une autre rédaction, et il s’accorde avec le développement des morceaux poétiques où on le remarque, pour témoigner que ces morceaux au moins ne partent pas de la même main que les simples Sūtras” (105). Curiously reflexive is: “I had nonetheless believed it necessary to translate this passage very literally, which is probably truncated here” (356 n. 240). In these and other cases, more attention to the nature of English would have improved the result.

On occasion, the punctuation calques the French far too closely: “I know him, what needs to be done for him?” (248) copies “Je le connais, que faut-il faire pour lui?” (236). “It naturally separates into two portions: one that draws its authority from the still existing tradition in Nepal, it is that whose elements Mr. Hodgson has furnished us; the other that rests on the testimony of the *Abhidharmakośa*, it is that which I have extracted from this same book” (422) speaks for itself.

On yet other occasions, it is evident that insufficient thought has been given to an automatic translation. Thus: “One understands without difficulty how from the idea of duty or the merit of charity, one passes to the general idea of charity and from there to the particular fact of a special charity; our French word itself has all of this extended acceptance” (90 n. 28). The French word in question (in the note on 42) is *charité*, but the translation contains no hint of this. (Note also the comma between “charity” and “one.”) Another example: “Our monk is the same sage that the Chinese call *Mujianlian*, according to the spelling of Mr. A. Rémusat (*Foe koue ki*, p. 32)” (203 n. 198). Since the French transcription (182, in French “orthographe,” spelling or orthography) *Mou kian lian* has not been preserved, the result is an oddity. (Naturally the romanization of the title of Rémusat’s book has not been changed.) The same note mentions “the great dictionary of *Rādha kant deb*,” which would be meaningless to the type of reader for whom this translation is apparently envisaged; this refers to the work of *Rādhākānta-deva*, namely, the

meditation placed before [all the others], incommensurably certain and which is appropriate for neither to listeners, nor to congregating pratyekabuddhas” (437); “incommensurably certain and which is appropriate for neither to śrāvakas nor to congregating pratyekabuddhas” (439).

¹⁷ Such things occur even in Lopez’s introduction, as when he quotes the expression “that several years of study began to make me familiar” (11), rendering “que plusieurs années d’études ont commencé à me rendre familière” (Akira Yuyuma, *Eugène Burnouf: The Background to His Research into the Lotus Sutra*, Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 3 [Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University, 2000], 60).

renowned Sanskrit-Sanskrit dictionary called *Śabdakalpadruma*. (In the first volume of his *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* edition, for example, on xxxvii, a work intended for a more specialist audience, Burnouf wrote the name as “Rādhākānta Dēva.”)

Finally, and surprisingly, several errors concern Tibetan. In particular, we read: “is followed by *cing*, formative of the gerundive” (578). Burnouf (624) has “est suivi de *tching*, formative du gérondif.” French *gérondif* may indeed refer to what is generally in English called the gerundive, but it also corresponds to what we term the gerund; the latter is correct here.¹⁸ Less importantly, we find *De’i phyag dar khrod pa de dag bkhrus nas* (304 n. 150). While this reproduces what is found in Burnouf’s note (306), since the spelling *bkhrus* is impossible (note that Burnouf writes *Bkah-hgyur* and, as here, *khrod*, corresponding to modern romanization conventions), one must obviously correct to *bkrus*. Burnouf wrote of the Tibetan expression *blag ba med pa* (306), duly given in the English translation. This is, however, an error; the Tibetan letters need to be divided differently, not ལྷག་བཤེད་པ་ but ལྷག་བཤེད་པ་; the word is thus *bla gab med pa*. As with the preceding item regarding *bkhrus*, it would have been trivial to note the necessary correction, or even simply correct it tacitly.

In conclusion, and as an example of what might be done as a first step toward a revised translation, I offer the list which constitutes Appendix 1. Burnouf translated extensive passages from manuscript since, needless to say, no editions existed in his pioneering day. It will be helpful for readers to be able to find these passages in published editions. For practical purposes, I deal here only with the longer citations, although Burnouf quoted numerous smaller passages as well. The passages are given in the order in which they occur in Burnouf’s work.

JONATHAN A. SILK

Leiden University

¹⁸ In fact, Jäschke in his *Tibetan Grammar* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929), discussing forms in *te* and *cing*, explicitly wrote that “Gerund is . . . to be understood . . . as the Gérondif of some French grammarians,” sec. 41.

APPENDIX¹⁹

- Divyāvadāna* [henceforth *Divy.*] 17 Māndhātṛ: 118–29 = French 74–89 = Cowell and Neil, 200.21–210.12. Note that, on 128 = Burnouf 87, Burnouf recognized two stanzas where Cowell and Neil recognized only one (209.1–2). Hiraoka reads a second verse with the parallel in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (I.404 n. 69); Rotman translates it as a verse but without noting any emendation (346).
- Divy.* 20 Kanakavarṇa: 130–37 = Burnouf 90–98 = Cowell and Neil 290.2–298.22.
- Divy.* 26 Pāṃśupradāna: 175–77 = Burnouf 146–48 = Cowell and Neil 352.28–354.25; 177–78 = Burnouf 149 = Cowell and Neil 369.15–370.6.
- Divy.* 12 Prātihāryasūtra: 188–209 = Burnouf 162–89 = Cowell and Neil 143.10–166.27.
- Divy.* 9 Mendhaka: 209–13 = Burnouf 190–94 = Cowell and Neil 126.15–130.11.
- Divy.* 33: Śārdūlakarṇa: 222–25 = Burnouf 205–10 = Cowell and Neil 611ff. As Burnouf's treatment is something in the way of a paraphrase, it is difficult to give an exact correspondence.
- Avadānaśataka* 2 Padma: 217–21 = Burnouf 200–205 = Speyer I.36.2–40.15.
- Divy.* 2 Pūrṇa: 247–78 = Burnouf 235–75 = Cowell and Neil 24.10–55.15.
- Divy.* 23 Saṃgharakṣita: 310–22 = Burnouf 313–29 = Cowell and Neil 330.3–343.24.
- Divy.* 24 Nāgakumāra: 322–25 = Burnouf 329–32 = Cowell and Neil 344.2–346.16.
- Divy.* 25 Saṃgharakṣita-bis: 325–26 = Burnouf 332–35 = Cowell and Neil 346.19–348.3.
- Divy.* 37 Rudrāyaṇa: 331–34 = Burnouf 340–44 = Cowell and Neil 546.23–549.20.
- Divy.* 345–404 = Burnouf 358–432; for the first part see *Divy.* 26 Pāṃśupradāna, partially translated as above: 345–57 = Burnouf 358–74 = Cowell and Neil 369.8–382.2. Then continues:
- Divy.* 27 Kunāla: 357–91 = Burnouf 374–415 = Cowell and Neil 382.5–419.12.
- Divy.* 28 Vītaśoka: 391–99 = Burnouf 415–25 = Cowell and Neil 419.15–429.4.
- Divy.* 29 Aśoka: 399–404 = Burnouf 426–32 = Cowell and Neil 429.7–434.27.

¹⁹ In this appendix, in addition to Burnouf's 1844 work, the following sources are referred to: Edward Byles Cowell and Robert Alexander Neil, *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (1886; repr., Amsterdam: Oriental Press/Philo Press, 1970); Satoshi Hiraoka 平岡聡, *Budda ga nazotoku sanze no monogatari: Diviya avadāna zen'yaku* ブッダが謎解く三世の物語: ディヴィヤ・アヴァダナーナ全訳 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版, 2007); Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *Mūlamadhyamakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4 (1903–13; repr., Osnabrück: Biblio, 1970); Salomon Lefmann, *Lalita Vistara: Leben und Lehre des Čākya-Buddha* (1902–8; repr., Tokyo: Meichō-Fukyū-kai, 1977); Bunyiu Nanjio, *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1 (1923; repr., Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1956); Andy Rotman, *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna*, pt. 1 (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2008); Jacob Samuel Speyer, *Avadānaśataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*, Bibliotheca Buddhica 3, Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (1906–9; repr., The Hague: Mouton, 1958); Unrai Wogihara, *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: The Work of Yaśomitra* (1936; repr., Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1989).

Avadānaśataka 100 Saṅgiti: 405–7 = Burnouf 432–35 = Speyer II.200.7–205.11.

Avadānaśataka 99 Dīrghanakha: 426–31 = Burnouf 456–62 = Speyer II.186.2–195.3.

Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā: 434–47 = Burnouf 465–83 = Mitra 3–27 (Wojihara 21–115).

Lalitavistara chap. 22: 450–54 = Burnouf 486–91 = Lefmann 345.4–350.7.

Avadānaśataka 96 Guptika: 468–69 = Burnouf 509–10 = Speyer II.168.9–170.5.

Laṅkāvatāra: 473–76 = Burnouf 516–19 = Nanjio 182.7–185.16.

Prasannapadā (wrongly called *Vinayasūtra* by Burnouf): 496–97 = Burnouf 543–45 = La Vallée Poussin 50.6–53.5.

Prasannapadā: 510–11 = Burnouf 561–62 = La Vallée Poussin 62.4–63.7.



A Missed Opportunity

Review by: Jonathan A. Silk

History of Religions, Vol. 51, No. 3 (February 2012), pp. 262-272

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/662192>

Accessed: 27/03/2012 04:59

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *History of Religions*.