

From Scholarly Object to Religious Text—  
the Story of the Lotus-sūtra in the West

Max Deeg

“Was hilft’s, daß ich den Augenblick verfluche, Da ich auf das barbarische Gesetz Dem furchtbaren Fohi den Schwur gethan.”

(Friedrich von Schiller, *Turandot, Prinzessin von China*,  
Zweiter Aufzug, Zweiter Auftritt)

“The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra is undoubtedly one of the most interesting texts for the study of the history of Buddhist texts ...”

(J.W. de Jong 1987: 92)

**Abstract**

**T**HIS paper will investigate the history of Western research and reception of the Lotus-sūtra. It will in particular address the question how Western perception of this *sūtra* changed from an object of academic research in the mid-19th century, initiated and instigated by the research on and the French translation of the text by Eugène Burnouf, to a perception of the *sūtra* as a religious text of its own right. I will trace this change of perception by sketching out the history of reception which shows that the “popularity” of the Lotus was restricted to a relatively small circle of Buddhist and Religious Studies scholars and Christian missionaries until a stronger focus on East Asian Buddhism—not least in its Japanese forms—led to the “discovery” of the text as an agent which influenced the religious culture of a large part of Asia. This is reflected in the rich translation history of the text which moves from academic purist “Sanskritism” to a living textual tradition in the form of translations made from Kumārajīva’s Chinese on behalf of Japanese Buddhist denominations. The history of the Lotus and its investigation can be taken as a paradigmatic example of a

shift of Western views of Buddhism from the early period in the 19th century into modern times.

### **Two Lines of Reception of the Lotus-sūtra**

When I was asked to participate in and to contribute to a workshop on the Lotus-sūtra in London—whether the organisers have picked me as one of the translators of the Lotus-sūtra (into German) or not I can only guess but do not know—I posed myself the question of what I could do in a reasonable way. Selfishly I decided to revisit a problem I put to myself quite often when I worked on my own translation of the Lotus (as I will call the text henceforth): why is the text supposed to be so important? And when I say important, I mean, of course, not its importance for Asian religious communities and practitioners—for whom the text has the status of a sacred one—I rather mean the importance that it obviously has in the broader context of Western awareness of Buddhism by, in my opinion, the more or less deliberate coincidence of two factors: the discovery and selection of the text as an object of study for the investigation of the history of Indian Buddhism by the French scholar Eugène Burnouf (1801–1852)<sup>1</sup>, and the importance that the text has had in East Asia since it reached the soteriologically highest “rank” in the system of Tiantai/Tendai 天台 Buddhism. What interests me here is how these two lines of reception of the text finally interconnect and establish the Lotus-sūtra as an important text in the realm of Buddhist and Religious Studies and interreligious discourse.

### **Burnouf’s Encounter with the Lotus-sūtra**

The discovery of Buddhism in the West is a slow and gradual one, which gained momentum only with the growing colonization of, and Western influence upon, Asia in the 19th century. Although some scant knowledge about the Buddha and his religions is already found in Greek and Latin sources, it took some time until it became clear to Westerners that what the different Buddhist cultures and languages denoted with different terms—like Buddha, Gotama, Sagamoni Burcan, or Fo<sup>2</sup> were indeed referring to the same founder figure of what, in a Western conceptualisation, became a world religion, Buddhism<sup>3</sup>.

When Buddhism as a religion was discovered by Orientalist scholars at the beginning of the 19th century, the access to original sources in classical Buddhist languages like Sanskrit, Pāli, Chinese, or Tibetan was

still limited. In the first half of the 19th century, however, Buddhist texts written in Indic languages became accessible to the Orientalists. In the second half of the 19th century Pāli, the language of the Theravāda school of Buddhism, and the canonical texts written in this Middle-Indian dialect very soon became the central subject of Buddhist studies. This was a development guided by the ideological and positivist presupposition that this literature contained the oldest, and therefore most authentic, teaching of the Buddha—an idea which can be linked to scholarly figures such as Thomas William Rhys-Davids (1843–1922), the founder of the Pali Text Society, and Hermann Oldenberg (1854–1920), the author of an influential book on the Buddha and the early history of his religion.

This focus on the Pāli sources, however, has not been the case from the very beginning of Buddhist studies, when texts of what was called the Northern School of Buddhism became objects of study. The person who was standing in the front rank of the study of these texts was a Frenchman, Eugène Burnouf, who became the successor on the Sanskrit chair in Paris of his teacher Antoine-Léonard de Chézy (1773–1832) in 1832. Burnouf who, in the first period of his academic career rather concentrated on the Zend-Avesta and on Hindu-texts like the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, had, as the secretary of the French Asiatic Society (Société Asiatique), already come in contact with the British delegate in the Nepalese capital Kāthmāṇḍu, Brian Houghton Hodgson (1800 or 1801–1894), who was himself interested in Sanskrit manuscripts and texts, collected them and sent them to Calcutta, but also to Paris<sup>4</sup>.

Hodgson had already informed the scholarly public of his findings in a series of articles, the first one of which was published as early as 1828, in which he gives a short description of the Lotus that reflects the knowledge of his local informants rather than a direct familiarity with the work:

“Sad Dharma Pundarika, a Vyākaraṇa, an account of the Maha and other Dīpa Dānas, or of the lights to be maintained in honour of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; with the narrations of the lives of several former Buddhas by Sākya, as well as prophetic indications of the future eminence of some of his disciples. Speakers and hearers, Sākya, Maitreya, Manjusri, &c.”<sup>5</sup>

It is to be noted that for Hodgson the Lotus is just one of the nine Dharmas, i.e. sacred texts, of the Nevari Buddhists, and that he is rather more interested in texts like the Prajñāpāramitā as the most important

one for the Nepalese Buddhists<sup>6</sup> and the Lalitavistara as “the original authority for all those versions of the history of Śākya Sinha, which have crept, through various channels, into the notice of Europeans.”<sup>7</sup>

The first direct contact between Burnouf and Hodgson that is documented—and which became so crucial for the development of Buddhist Studies in France and Europe—is a letter dated to July 7, 1834,<sup>8</sup> in which Burnouf expresses his satisfaction about Hodgson’s offer to acquire Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts for the Société<sup>9</sup>. Burnouf takes the advantage and asks Hodgson to buy and send to him Buddhist texts “which you consider to be the most valuable and suitable ones to get access to the pure Buddhism, that is to say to the part of this system which is not tainted by any modification of Brahmanism[?]”<sup>10</sup>

In his next letter, dated to January 20, 1835, Burnouf asks Hodgson to have copies of the most important Buddhist texts made on his behalf and at the cost of the Société, and—quite smartly—to have other texts made for himself, proposing the Lalitavistara from which he hopes to draw information about the historical and geographical situation at the time of the Buddha<sup>11</sup>. Between February 1836 and June 1837 the Société received 24 copies of Buddhist texts from Hodgson, Burnouf himself a copy of the Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra, and the French scholars divided the texts amongst each other, Burnouf getting the Gaṇḍavyūha, Lalitavistara, Svayambhūpurāṇa (Sambhū purāṇa), Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, Samādhirāja-sūtra and the Kāraṇḍavyūha<sup>12</sup>. Burnouf expresses a kind of frustration about the repetitiveness and the content of the Prajñāpāramitā<sup>13</sup> and mentions that he has chosen to work on the Lotus instead since, as he notes, the Lalitavistara which he was interested in from the beginning was already being translated (from Tibetan) by one of his students and friends, probably Philippe Édouard Foucaux (1811–1894). It seems worthwhile here to quote the first impression of the text’s *magister princeps* in Europe:

“... I turned to a new book, one of the nine *Dharma*, the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, and I can reassure you that I did not have to regret my choice. Since around April 25 I have, without hesitation, dedicated every instant which I could spare from my occupations as professor of Sanskrit and academic to this work of which I have already read quite considerable parts. I have not understood everything, and you will not be surprised by that; the subject is very new for me, as well with respect to the style but also with respect to the deeper meaning. ... Although still a lot of things appear obscure to me I still understand the thread of the book, the way of presentation of the author, and I have even already

translated two whole chapters without omitting anything. These contain two parables which are not without interest but which are especially interesting examples of the way in which the teaching of the Buddhists is communicated and of the discursive and completely Socratic method of exposition. Except for the unfaith (but you are not a ‘clergyman’ [English expression in the French original; M.D.]) I do not know of anything so much Christian in the whole of Asia. Brahmanism appears to me now as a crude and hard Judaism from which you have found Christianity full of morality and compassion with all other creatures. One should not think that everything in this whole book is amusing; to the contrary, the repetitions and tautology in it are tedious. But even this tautology is indeed a remarkable feature and well appropriate for the people which the Buddha addressed. ... Finally I confess to you that I am obsessed with this reading and I would like to have more time and health to preoccupy myself with it at day time and night time. Nevertheless, I will not leave the *Saddharma* before I have extracted and translated quite some fragments<sup>14</sup>, and I am quite convinced that I can do no better to acknowledge your generosity than by communicating to scholarly Europe a part of the wealth which you have so generously put to our disposition.”<sup>15</sup>

Burnouf’s approach is a scholarly and philological one; he asks, in the same letter and a little bit later<sup>16</sup>, to be sent another copy of the Lotus and the Samādhirājasūtra “because one can never be certain of the meaning of some passages if one has only one copy”<sup>17</sup>, and he also asks Hodgson if there is any Vinaya material available in the valley—for which “scholarly Europe” had to wait over a century until the Gilgit manuscript finds fulfilled Burnouf’s wish. But in the correspondence Burnouf’s excitement about the text and his work upon it comes through, but also his frustration at the deficiencies of the copies he has to work with. The value of the Lotus for him lies in the originality of the Buddha’s teaching:

“I have found very interesting details for the judgement of the character of these works [i.e. the Mahāyāna *sūtras*; M.D.] and especially for the genre of preaching of Gāutama of which the *Saddharma* contains if not real fragments but at least a truthful and as far as I can judge perfectly authentic tradition.”<sup>18</sup>

And in his “Introduction”, first published in 1844, in which he did not yet give the Lotus a prominent place at all, Burnouf gives a quite

accurate description of the doctrinal essence of the text:

“The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, or the “White Lotus of the Good Law,” in addition to the parables it contains, deals with a most important point of doctrine, that of the fundamental unity of the three means a Buddha employs to save humanity from the conditions of the present existence.”<sup>19</sup>

Burnouf stresses the fact that, despite Hodgson’s analysis of the doctrine in the Nepalese Sanskrit texts, a detailed study of these sources is necessary, and he gives this also as a reason for delaying the publication of his translation of the Lotus which, in fact, appeared only some months after Burnouf’s premature death despite his reassertions of an earlier publication<sup>20</sup>. This was partly due to Burnouf’s perfectionism<sup>21</sup> and his concentration on other texts from the Nepalese collection after 1839. Burnouf constantly worked on and improved his translation by adding notes, and in February 1852, some three months before his death and the final publication of the book, he notes with some pride:

“I have reviewed the French translation which I had made of the copy of the [French] Asiatic Society which was the only one at that time on the basis of a new copy of the *Saddharma Pundarīka* included in that second box [sent by Hodgson; M.D.]. I have added notes on the language and several appendices on the different philosophical and moral categories which are most often quoted in the *Saddharma*. The volume which is in quart [format] and a dense printing has reached at the moment its 808th page (rather bulky! [English in the original; M. D.], but is not as full as it is voluminous.”<sup>22</sup>

### **The Impact of Indo-Centrism**

Burnouf’s publication clearly had some impact on the study of Buddhism in the West shortly after its publication. In 1854 Philippe Édouard Foucaux published one chapter of the Lotus, “The Lost Son” (“Parabole de l’enfant égaré”: Chapter Four, Skt. Adhimuktiparivarta, Chin. Xinjie-pin 信解品), in Devanāgarī and Tibetan script together with a French translation. Foucaux does not claim any specific reason for his selection of the chapter and emphasizes that his aim was “to facilitate the study of the Tibetan language,”<sup>23</sup> but it is worth noting that in the synoptic Tibetan-Sanskrit version of the fourth chapter of the Lotus at the end of the book (pp.58ff.) we encounter the first ever published part

of a Buddhist Sanskrit text<sup>24</sup>. It took more than half a century until the first complete edition of the Lotus was edited by Kern and Nanjio and finally printed (1908–1912).

However, in this broader context of Buddhist Studies in the second half of the 19th century, i.e. after Burnouf's groundbreaking work which included his introduction to Indian Buddhism, it is interesting to see the direction of research on Mahāyāna texts that was taken on the other side of the Channel, where a thriving Indology and the beginning of Religious Studies were coalescing around the German scholar and Oxford professor Max Müller (1823–1900), a former student of Burnouf's in Paris<sup>25</sup>. Here it was not so much the Lotus<sup>26</sup> but the Prajñāpāramitā and "Pure-Land" literature which was brought to the attention of the German doyen of British Indology through his Japanese students like Kasawara Kenjū (Kenjiu) 笠原研壽 (1852–1883), Nanjō Bunyū 南条文雄 (1849–1927), and later also Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 (1866–1945)<sup>27</sup>, one of the compilers of the standard edition of the Chinese canon, the Taishō-Shinshū-daizōkyō who were all priests of the Jōdo-shinshū denomination founded by Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263), which considers, following Shinran's teacher Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212), as its sacred texts the *three Pure Land sūtras*, the longer Sukhāvativyūha, Wuliang-shou-jing 無量壽經 (T.360), the shorter Sukhavativyūha, Amituo-jing 阿彌陀經 (T.366), and the Guan-wuliang-shou-fo-jing 觀無量壽經 (T.365). Ironically the Lotus, after Burnouf's grandiose translation, was neglected insofar as no *editio princeps* of the text was prepared until Nanjō's and Kern's edition between 1908 and 1912<sup>28</sup>.

The Lotus was, however, too well established as an important Buddhist texts to be excluded in Max Müller's epoch-making translation series, the *Sacred Books of the East*. It was included in form of Johan Hendrik Caspar Kern's (1833–1917) English translation of the Sanskrit version made on the basis of another manuscript than Burnouf's—held in the Cambridge library from the collection of D. Wright<sup>29</sup>, which still was seen as the more authentic one because it was written in an Indian language<sup>30</sup>. The Dutch scholar's approach was, again, a very philological and scholarly one. In his Introduction he discusses, on the basis of Burnouf's established idea that the so-called Mahāvaiṣṭya-sūtras of Mahāyāna Buddhism—of which the Lotus was the specimen chosen by Burnouf decades earlier—were later than the "simple Sūtras"<sup>31</sup> (by which the texts in the Pāli-Tripiṭaka are meant), as well as questions of text chronology and of language (Sanskrit, language of the *gāthās*, "verses", Pāli). He gives—as far as he was able to with the information

given in Nanjō's catalogue—a brief overview of the Chinese translations and compares them with the Sanskrit version<sup>32</sup>. To Kern's translation we also owe, as far as I know, the first example of a translation of a short portion from the Kumārajīva version of the Lotus into a Western language by Burnouf's fellow professor in Paris, Stanislas Julien (1797–1873). This is a verse section from the third chapter of the Lotus contained in a letter sent to Max Müller, which Kern included in his book<sup>33</sup>. The conclusions drawn by Kern from a comparison of this very short passage in translation with his own and Burnouf's translation of the Sanskrit text is typical for the opinion of his days that an Indic version of a text had to be more original than any translation into another language—if there is a difference from the Sanskrit it must have been caused by the translation or the translator, and Kern expresses this in a polite but straight-forward way:

“It is hardly to be supposed that the text used by Kumâragîva can have differed so much from ours, and it seems far more probable that he has taken the liberty, for clearness sake, to modify the construction of the verses, a literal rendering whereof, it must be owned, is impossible in any language.”<sup>34</sup>

Despite his scholarly approach Kern does not seem to have had a very high opinion of the text he was translating:

“[The Lotus] bears the character of a dramatic performance, an undeveloped mystery play, in which the chief interlocutor, not the only one, is Sâkyamuni, the Lord. It consists of a series of dialogues, brightened by the magic effects of a would-be supernatural scenery. The phantasmagorical parts of the whole are as clearly intended to impress us with the idea of the might and glory of the Buddha, as his speeches are to set forth his all-surpassing wisdom.”<sup>35</sup>

The negligence of the Chinese version of the Lotus from the sinological side is understandable in the light of the Indo-centrism of scholarship in the 19th century. Buddhism, already positivist-historicistically hierarchised into an Older Buddhism represented by the Pāli/Theravāda tradition or “Southern School of Buddhism” and the later developmental stage of Sanskrit Buddhism or “Northern School,” was considered to be primarily an ancient Indian religion, and whatever came from another cultural or linguistic sphere was only valuable when it could contribute to the investigation of this ancient form of the religion. Against only a



little resistance<sup>36</sup> it was established, towards the end of the 19th century, by scholars like Thomas Rhys-Davids, Hermann Oldenberg and others<sup>37</sup> that the Pāli texts reflected the most original Buddhist sources—therefore the texts of Northern Buddhism, if they did not mirror these sources, were to be dismissed as secondary.

This is even more clearly reflected in how the British authority on Chinese Buddhist literature of that time approached his subject, by whom I refer to the British naval doctor, Samuel Beal (1825–1889). Besides historical texts like the Chinese Buddhist “travelogues” of Faxian 法顯, Song Yun 宋雲 and Xuanzang 玄奘 he mainly translated texts which were established as Buddhist “classics” such as the Dharma-pada, etc., or texts which were considered to be Indian, but lost in their original language—and in this context the Lotus had no place because it was accessible in its Sanskrit version. In Beal’s *A Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese* (1871), one of the first Western overviews and anthologies of Chinese Buddhist texts, the Lotus is only mentioned in passing-by<sup>38</sup>, and in the list of translators and translations of Buddhist texts in China some years later Kumārajīva’s Lotus-translation is not even mentioned<sup>39</sup>.

## The Christian Missionaries in China

The “canonisation” of the Sanskrit Lotus<sup>40</sup> through the research and translations of Burnouf and Kern, however, eventually led to the “discovery” of the Chinese translation of Kumārajīva through Christian missionaries, mainly in China<sup>41</sup>. The growing attention dedicated to it was partly due to its ‘parallelisation’ with the New Testament. An example springing to mind immediately is that of the Parable of the Lost Son in the Lotus and in the Gospel of St. Luke<sup>42</sup>. The logic of comparison led the missionaries to the conclusion that they had, in the Lotus and other Mahāyāna texts in Chinese like the “Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna” (Chin. Dasheng-qixin-lun 大乘起信論) attributed to Aśvaghōṣa (Chin. Maming 馬鳴), a similar revolutionary religious Truth as in the New Testament, both overcoming the somewhat restricted religious messages in “original” Hīnayāna Buddhism represented by the canonical scriptures in Pāli and in the Old Testament<sup>43</sup>. The Lotus then became the point of comparison and what was needed was, of course, not the Sanskrit version, but the text that was used by East-Asians. In this process, the philological engagement with the text as it was initiated by Burnouf was, for a while at least, dismissed<sup>44</sup>. Already Beal, in one of his few remarks on the Lotus, critically assessed the Indian version of

the text translated by Burnouf and Kern and wrote in favour of Kumārajīva's translation, although it took almost a full century until full-fledged translations of this version in Western languages became available—then, however, in a very short period of time several of them were published<sup>45</sup>.

In the late 19th and early 20th century missionaries in China pointed out that the text was religiously important in the sense that it contained a higher religious truth than others. The emphasis on the Lotus in its East-Asian context by the missionaries was justified by its actual “Sitz im Leben,” its usage, importance and popularity in real life<sup>46</sup>. I would suggest, however, that it would be another matter to explore the real range of this religious importance of the text in the lay and monastic communities in China at that time<sup>47</sup>.

In order to elucidate the points which I just made I would like to concentrate first of all on the work of the Welsh-born Baptist China-missionary Timothy Richard (1845–1919)<sup>48</sup>. In 1910 Richard published a book called “A New Testament for Higher Buddhism” which, for the first time, presented what he thought to be passages from Kumārajīva's Lotus to a Western readership. What he actually presents is an excerpt of the Wuliang-yi-jing 無量義經, “Sūtra of Immeasurable Meaning” (T.276), by Tanmojiatuoyeshe 曇摩伽陀耶舍/Dharmāgatayaśas (?) from the late 5th century<sup>49</sup>, which is then followed by passages in verses allegedly translated from Kumārajīva's translation of the Lotus.

Richard was not only convinced that there was a common source for religious Truth expressed and to be found in the similarities of the texts he studied, but he also held the view that the similarities of Christianity and Mahāyāna Buddhism as found in the “Awakening of Faith” and the Lotus stretched back to a common historical sources, which he located in Mesopotamia<sup>50</sup>. He clearly followed the understanding of the Mahāyāna texts which he studied when he discards the Hinayāna of Pāli Buddhism as a short-lived and inferior forms of Buddhism. Thus he wants to show “that in the *Essence of the Lotus Scripture*, as interpreted by Japanese and Chinese ‘initiated’ Buddhists (but not as in the enlarged version in Kern's translation in the *Sacred Books of the East*), we find the same teaching as in the Gospel of St. John in regard to Life, Light, and Love—a teaching which forms a wonderful bridge crossing the chasm between Eastern and Western religion and civilisation.”<sup>51</sup>

In his “translation” of the Sino-Japanese “Essence” he uses Christian terminology to translate Buddhist words and names, and heavily annotates his translation with comparative footnotes referring the reader back to the bible—a form of presentation which was already used for the

similar purpose of demonstrating the similarities between both religions by Paul Carus in his *Gospel of Buddha*<sup>52</sup>. For the sake of illustration I only can give here two short examples, one part from the third chapter—“Parable”, Piyu-pin 譬喻品, Skt. Aupamyaparivarta, which Richard calls “Allegories, the World on Fire”—containing the famous parable of the burning house, and the complete portion “translated” from the fourth chapter—“Faith and Understanding,” Xinjie-pin 信解品, Skt. Adhimuktiparivarta, which Richard calls “Faith”—which contains the simile of the lost son. In both cases it is interesting that Richard completely omits the stories which attracted later Christian authors so much. I also have to admit that, by comparing Kumārajīva’s text with Richard’s translation, I was not able to identify the passages even on the ground of superficial similarities.

“Fold the palms of your hands together,<sup>i)</sup>  
 Let body and mind repose,  
 Then you quickly will attain rest,  
 And receive a portion of GOD’s law;  
 Your heart will become as peaceful as a lake,  
 Perfectly straightforward, guileless.<sup>ii)</sup>  
 When your mind is made up,  
 Then in a moment, by repentance  
 All is done!  
 For all one’s past and present efforts  
 And study of God’s works  
 All lead back to God.<sup>iii)</sup>...”

<sup>i)</sup> This is one of the Buddhist way of showing reverence. Cf. Tit. ii. 2, R.V. “Reverent in demeanour.”

<sup>ii)</sup> Isa. lvii.15; Luke xix.2–10; John i.47–51.

<sup>iii)</sup> Phil. ii.13. 53

“Greatly congratulate yourself,  
 You are receiving Treasures inestimable,  
 Priceless pearls—without the seeking.  
 Leaving your father’s home,  
 Not knowing where to go,  
 And adding to poverty-distress.  
 Your heart repents and thinks of the  
 Gold, silver, precious stones,  
 Of which your treasury was full,  
 You find the Highest Treasure,

Fatherhood,<sup>iv)</sup> all unsought,<sup>v)</sup>  
 Inheritance, and slaves  
 And many people—all your own,  
 In gratitude for GOD’s mercy  
 Who with kindness  
 Won our hearts,<sup>vi)</sup>  
 We through long nights  
 “Lay hold” of God’s commands,  
 And begin to be rewarded, receiving  
 Great grace from the World-honoured One.<sup>vii)</sup>  
 GOD, with rare wonder, pities, instructs  
 And blesses us.  
 Reverently we worship Him who is on high,  
 Offering Him all things  
 In the one chariot of Salvation,<sup>viii)</sup>  
 Which may be divided into three—  
 The elementary (Hīnayana),  
 The middle (Madhyamayana),  
 And the advanced (Mahāyāna).”

<sup>iv)</sup> Luke iv. 11–24; John xv. 16.

<sup>v)</sup> This expression is remarkable when compared with St. Paul’s words in Rom. x.20, R.V.: “Isaiah is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought Me not; I *became manifest* [italics in the original; M.D.] unto them that asked not of Me.”

<sup>vi)</sup> 1 John iv.10, 19; Eph. iv.32; Tit. iii.3, 4.

<sup>vii)</sup> See p.99, note 2. [there is no note where there should be an explanation of Chin. *shizun* 世尊; M.D.]

<sup>viii)</sup> Rom. xii.1, 2.<sup>54</sup>

## Translations of Kumārajīva’s version in Western languages

Another Christian missionary studying Chinese Buddhism, William Soothill (1861–1935), known to students of Buddhism as one of the compilers of a well-used dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms<sup>55</sup>, published what is normally taken as a translation of Kumārajīva’s Lotus but is, in Soothill’s own words, and although he himself insists calling it a translation<sup>56</sup>, in reality “an abbreviated version”<sup>57</sup> or “a synopsis” of the text<sup>58</sup>. According to his own words Soothill cooperated with a priest of the Nichiren-shū 日蓮宗 Katō Bunnō 加藤文雄 (1888-1934), who was working on a full translation of the Lotus of his own which was, however, published decades after the Katō’s death by the lay organisa-

tion Rishshō-kōsei-kai 立正佼成会<sup>59</sup>.

Soothill's admiration for Richard and his work and the cooperation with the Nichiren-shū priest explains why he could make the following generalizing statement: "The Lotus is the Ultimate Truth preached by every Buddha, once only in every Buddha-world, past, present, and to come. To the Mahayanist it is therefore the Eternal Gospel of Buddhism in all worlds and through all time."<sup>60</sup>

What both Richard and Soothill obviously intended to do is to digest the repetitive text of the Lotus, especially what they saw at work in the translations of Burnouf and Kern made from the Sanskrit, for a Western readership. They do this by shortening and abbreviating the text to a minimum—in their view the religious and spiritual essence—by giving descriptions of the content of its single chapters instead, and by using christo-centric terminology.

In the justification of their omitting and paraphrasing style the result of which can hardly be called "translation" according to today's standards the difference in approach of both authors clearly comes through. Richard is more the substantialist and, in a way, the essentialist, who does not really care about historical correctness when it comes to what he understands as Truth: "The Lotus Scripture in its translation by Kern, was coloured so much by adaptation to Indian environment that the essence of its teaching was obscured<sup>61</sup>. Thus neither of these books [the "Awakening of Faith" included; M.D.] has been fully understood nor appreciated. I do not translate the whole of the Lotus Scripture, but only that part which is considered by Chinese and Japanese "initiated" Buddhists to be its essence. By ... relying on the judgement of the "initiated" as the true teaching of the Lotus Scripture, Western readers will be in a better position to understand the vital connection between Christianity and Buddhism, and to pave the way for the one great worldwide religion of the future."<sup>62</sup>

Soothill, without missing the opportunity to offer 'Western-biased' ridicule of a projected, but somewhat undefined, Asian historical audience of the Lotus emphasizes in a rational way the repetitiveness and redundancy of the text as the reason for his shortening of it: "For the ordinary Western reader [i.e. the Lotus; M.D.] it is much too long, as all that is said is repeated in verse. There is, in consequence, repetition wearisome to the reader of many books. Undoubtedly the method of the author and of his period was useful for driving home truth to the sluggish mind, or to the mind free of other attractive entanglements. It is a method beloved of the unlettered. In order, therefore, that the Western reader may not miss the essential meaning I have omitted the repetitious

and much unnecessary detail, while making it my aim to portray the message of the book as nearly as possible in its own way.”<sup>63</sup>

This kind of christo-centric ‘inclusivization’ of the Lotus became obsolete after the “discovery” of Japanese Buddhism in the aftermath of World War II. This is normally connected with the Zen-“wave,” but what is forgotten is that there was, parallel to the practical and ideological adaptation of Zen in the West, first in America and then in Europe, a stronger preoccupation of Western scholars with Japanese Buddhism and its Chinese roots.

The study of the Tiantai 天台 (Jap. Tendai) school by scholars like Leon Hurvitz (1923–1992)<sup>64</sup>, as well as an earlier emphasis on the importance of this text in East Asia through its visual representation, such as may be found in the murals of Dunhuang<sup>65</sup>, inspired, naturally, the focus on the Lotus in its East Asian context. It is therefore no wonder that one of the first complete translation of the Kumārajīva-version of the Lotus was executed by Hurvitz for the Asian Classics Series, but it is also striking that the history of this translation series was quite similar, although not completely identical, to the underlying change of direction and intentionality between the first translation of the text by Burnouf and the first more or less agenda-manipulated renderings of the Kumārajīva-version through Christian missionaries. Hurvitz undertook his translation as an independent scholarly work while the later translation—in the same series—by Burton Watson, published in the year 1993, was made on request of Soka Gakkai International.

Hurvitz’s translation was made at a time when other translations of Kumārajīva’s version of the Lotus in Western languages were made available in a short period of time, and it is interesting to see that they all coincidentally had a religious background or context of spreading the *dharma* to the West, mainly to the United States. As mentioned earlier, Katō Bunnō’s translation, which was first published in 1975, was originally made for the Nichiren-shū and then published by the Risshō-kōsei-kai. Murano Senchū’s 村野宣忠 (1908–2001) translation was made for the use of the Nichiren-shū and published in 1974<sup>66</sup>. Another translation was produced by a translation team (Buddhist Text Translation Society) in California around the Chinese master Xuanhua 宣化 (Hsuan Hua; 1918–1995)<sup>67</sup>.

Let me, at the end of my paper, briefly mention my own experience as the translator of the German version of the Lotus, which I undertook some years ago on behalf of Soka Gakkai International, Germany. The first idea was that I should translate Watson’s English version into

German, which I declined to do since I did not see any scholarly originality in that kind of work. It was then agreed that I should have complete scholarly freedom of translating the text according to my abilities and methodological approach, which was to render Kumārajīva's text as faithfully, but also as intelligibly, as possible—with recurrence to the older Chinese translation of Zhu Fahu 竺法護/Dharmarak a (3rd century) and the Sanskrit text, if ambiguities in the Chinese had to be clarified, thus following a similar method as Hurvitz. Soka Gakkai International Germany accepted this approach, even though it meant that in some cases my translation differs from Watson's. To accept this even meant that Soka Gakkai International Germany had to reconsider and adjust some of their translations of key-terms in Nichiren Shōnin's 日蓮聖人 (1222–1282) writings.

This translation process I was allowed to undertake seems to reflect a consolidation or harmonization of the Lotus as an object of study and a religious—sacred, if you prefer—text has been achieved in recent years, an aspect which clearly adds a dimension to the work with, and on, the text that was missing in Burnouf's otherwise so adorable *translatio princeps*. It demonstrates that the status of a text as both 'religious' and as 'an object of scholarly study and translation' should not be seen as unreconcilable, but rather the norm in the field of Buddhist Studies.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> For the question of what significance the Lotus may have had for Indian Buddhists see the discussion in Silk 2001.

<sup>2</sup> With all the criticism directed against paganism or "heathendom": see the quotation from Schiller's play *Turandot* at the beginning of this paper—and compare it with the positive assessment of one of the great scholars of Buddhist Studies in the 20th century, J.W. de Jong.

<sup>3</sup> For instance, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) still had doubts about the identity of the different terms for the Buddha in Asian languages. On the "discovery" of the Buddha and Buddhism in the West through scholars and intellectuals see Beinorius 2005, Lopez 2005, Almond 1986 and 1988, and, for the second half of the 19th century in America, Tweed 1992.

<sup>4</sup> On Hodgson and his role as manuscript collector and distributor see Yuyama 2000: 49–54, and 57–62.

<sup>5</sup> Hodgson 1841: 24–25. In his "Sketch of Buddhism" (1827), a part of which is presented in the form of a question-answer-structured kind of catechism, the Lotus is even described in a more confusing way: "... contains an account of the method of building a *chaitya* or *Buddha-mandal*, and the mode and fruits of worshipping it." (Hodgson 1941: 70–71).

<sup>6</sup> Hodgson 1841: 18.

<sup>7</sup> Hodgson 1841: 20.

<sup>8</sup> The letters are edited in Féer 1899, who received them from Hodgson in 1892 (see

p. 147, note 1).

<sup>9</sup> For a full account of Burnouf's activities and the context of his Lotus translation see the excellent monograph of Yuyama 2000.

<sup>10</sup> Féer 1899: 149: "... que vous jugerez les plus précieux et les plus propres à faire pénétrer dans le buddhisme pur, c'est-à-dire dans la partie de ce système qui n'est entachée d'aucune modification de brahmanisme[?]"

<sup>11</sup> Féer 1899: 151, and 153 (letter dated to February 17, 1836).

<sup>12</sup> Féer 1899: 157 (letter dated to June 5, 1837).

<sup>13</sup> Féer 1899: 157–158.

<sup>14</sup> In his letter to Hodgson from July 15, 1837, Burnouf states that he has already translated more than two thirds of the text: Féer 1899:162. And in another letter dated to October 27, 1837, he has already finished the translation of 233 manuscript leaves of a total of 248: Féer 1899: 165.

<sup>15</sup> Féer 1899: 158–159 (June 5, 1837): "... je me tournai vers un livre nouveau, un des neuf Dharma, le *Saddharmapundarîka*, et je puis vous affirmer que je n'ai pas eu à me repentir de mon choix. Depuis le 25 avril environ, tous les moments que j'ai pu enlever à mes occupations comme professeur de sanscrit et academician, je les ai consacrés sans réserve à cet ouvrage, don't j'ai lu déjà des portions assez considérables. Je n'ai pas tout compris, et vous ne vous en étonnez pas; la matière est très nouvelle pour moi, tant sous le rapport du style que sous celui du fond. ... Quoique beaucoup de choses soient encore obscures à mes yeux, je comprends cependant la marche du livre, le mode d'exposition de l'auteur, et j'en ai même déjà traduit deux chapitres en entier, sans rien omettre. Ce sont deux paraboles qui ne manquent pas d'intérêt, mais qui sont surtout de curieux spécimens de la manière dont s'est communiqué l'enseignement des buddhistes et de la méthode discursive et toute socratique de l'exposition. Sauf l'impiété (mais vous n'êtes pas un clergyman), je ne connais rien d'aussi chrétien dans toute l'Asie. Le brahmanisme me paraît maintenant un judaïsme raide et dur, dont vous avez trouvé le christianisme moral et plein de compassion pour toutes les creatures. Il ne faut pas croire que dans ce livre tout est amusant; au contraire les repetitions et la tautologie y sont complètement fastidieuses. Mais cette tautologie meme est un caractère tout à fait remarquable et bien approprié au peuple auxquels s'adressait Buddha. ... Enfin je vous avouerai que je suis passionné pour cette lecture, et que je voudrais avoir plus de temps et de santé pour m'en occuper le jour et la nuit. Je ne quitterai cependant pas le *Saddharma* sans en avoir extrait et traduit de bons fragments, bien convaincu que je ne puis mieux faire pour reconnaître votre libéralité que de communiquer à l'Europe savant une partie des richesses que vous avez si généreusement mises à notre disposition."

<sup>16</sup> Letter dated to July 15, 1837; Féer 1899: 163. It is interesting to note that by then the Lotus has already moved "physically" to the top of Burnouf's wish list of eleven texts of which he wants doublets.

<sup>17</sup> Féer 1899: 160: "... par la raison qu'on n'est jamais sûr du sens de certains passages quand on n'en a qu'un exemplaire." This request of more copies is repeated several times in subsequent letters and shows the rigour of Burnouf's philological approach.

<sup>18</sup> Féer 1899: 165: "J'ai rencontré des details très intéressants pour l'appréciation du caractère de ces ouvrages, et surtout du genre des predications anciennes de Gâutama, dont le *Saddharma* contient, sinon des fragments reels, du moins une tradition fidèle, et, autant que je puis croire, parfaitement authentique."

<sup>19</sup> Burnouf 2001: 112; Burnouf 1876: 61: "Le *Saddharma puṇḍarîka*, ou le Lotus blanc de la bonne loi, outre les paraboles qu'il renferme, traite un point de doctrine fort



important, celui de l'unité fondamentale des trois moyens qu'emploie un Buddha pour sauver l'homme des conditions de l'existence actuelle." This is more or less repeated by Foucaux 1854: 15.

<sup>20</sup> E.g. in his letter to Hodgson dated to July 21, 1839: see Féer 1899: 168. A part of this complete translation (chapter 5, "Herb"), however, was already published in 1845: see Yuyama 2000: 1.

<sup>21</sup> Letter to Hodgson dated from May 10, 1841: Féer 1899: 172–173; in another letter dated to October 28 of the same year Burnouf states that the translation is printed but that he still will have to write an introduction "to this bizarre work" (p. 174). In July 1845 Burnouf still expresses his hope to publish the translation very soon (p.176).

<sup>22</sup> Féer 1899: 177 (letter dated to February 16, 1852): "J'ai revu sur un exemplaire nouveau du *Saddharma Pundarika*, contenu dans cette seconde caisse, la traduction française que j'avais faite sur l'exemplaire, alors unique, de la Société asiatique. J'y ai ajouté des notes sur la langue, et plusieurs appendices sur diverses catégories philosophiques et morales, parmi celles qui sont le plus souvent citées dans le *Saddharma*. Le volume, qui est in-4°, et d'une impression serrée, est actuellement parvenu à sa 808<sup>e</sup> page (rather bulky!), mais malheureusement pas aussi plein que gros."

<sup>23</sup> Foucaux 1854: 21: "... de faciliter l'étude de la langue tibétaine."

<sup>24</sup> See Foucaux 1854: 23.

<sup>25</sup> On Müller and Burnouf see Yuyama 2000: 22–26, and Van den Bosch 2002: 31–34.

<sup>26</sup> In Rājendralāl Mitra's overview of Buddhist Sanskrit literature from Nepal the Lotus only occupies four pages (203–207) compared e.g. with the subsequent Samādhirāja-sūtra with fourteen pages (207–221).

<sup>27</sup> On this collaboration with Japanese scholars and students see Van den Bosch 2002: 133–134.

<sup>28</sup> See Max Müller in his introduction to his and Nanjō's edition of the Smaller Sukhāvativyūha in 1883: Müller 1883: xiv.

<sup>29</sup> Kern 1884: xxxviii.

<sup>30</sup> From the Chinese Buddhist "canon" only Samuel Beal's translations of Aśvaghosa's *Buddhacarita* and the extensive Buddha-biography were included in the *Sacred Books of the East*.

<sup>31</sup> Kern 1884: x.

<sup>32</sup> Kern 1884: xx–xxiv.

<sup>33</sup> Kern 1884: xl–xlii.

<sup>34</sup> Kern 1884: xxiv.

<sup>35</sup> Kern 1884: ix–x.

<sup>36</sup> The Bengali scholar Rājendralāl Mitra, not without Indian nationalist undertones, was one of the few scholars who held an opposite view and even highlighted the Chinese translations as a source for verification of his conclusion that the most original language of the Buddhist tradition (and therefore also texts) was indeed the one of the Gāthā portions of the Buddhist Sanskrit texts: see Mitra 1882: xxviii–xxxix.

<sup>37</sup> On the history of the "discovery" of Pāli Buddhism in the context of colonialism see Harris 2006, esp. 125–138.

<sup>38</sup> Beal 1871: 3.

<sup>39</sup> Beal 1882: 19.

<sup>40</sup> Max Müller, in his essay "Coincidences" (1896; printed in Müller 1901: 252–290), refers to the dispersed Sanskrit Buddhist texts as *Tripiṭaka*, and also speaks of a Mahāyāna canon; on the Lotus as a "canonical book of the Mahāyāna" see Müller 1901:

282. On the problem of canon and canonization in Asian religions in general see the essays in the edited volume Deeg, Freiburger, Kleine 2011.

<sup>41</sup> It is not an easy task to trace the change of conception of Buddhism in the West—already a over-simplification of complex diachronic and diatopic dynamics and discourses in the late 19th and early 20th century—from the focus on Pāli Buddhism to a broader view which included forms of East-Asian Buddhism, promoted through the activities of figures like Paul Carus (1852–1919), events like the World Parliament of Religion on occasion of the World Exhibition in Chicago 1893, Buddhist oekumenism represented by personalities like Anagārika Dharmapāla (1864–1933), Shaku Sōen (Soyen) 釈宗演 (1860–1919) to its single elements of influence. The process definitely was a complex one where interpersonal relationship and networking and publications played a major role. Timothy Richard, for instance, was influenced by and aiming at the Neo-Buddhist movement in China, but also through the Japanese promotion of Buddhism although this is not necessarily recognizable in his work: for instance, in his translation of the “Awakening of Faith” (1907) he does not mention Suzuki’s earlier translation which was published in 1900 although he refers to Suzuki’s work (p. xiv). With a concentration on the Japanese contribution of this process see for instance Snodgrass 2003, esp. 259–277 with an analysis of the role of Daisetsu Teitarō Suzuki 鈴木大拙 貞太郎 (1870–1966).

<sup>42</sup> A more cautious approach was already taken by Foucaux 1854: 20: “Reading the ‘Parable of the child gone astray’ has one think of the one of the lost son, and one has already noticed a similarity between the two stories which is more evident than real.” (“La lecture de la *Parabole de l’enfant égaré* fera songer à celle de l’Enfant prodigue, et l’on a déjà remarqué entre les deux récits une ressemblance qui est plutôt apparente que véritable.”) Some decades later Max Müller’s has also raised remarks and notes of precaution against diffusionist interpretations of such “Coincidences” (see above, note 40): Müller, Nanjio 1901: 282–284.

<sup>43</sup> Cp. Soothill 1830: 26: “The doctrine taught [in the Lotus], whatever its origin, is as revolutionary to Buddhism as was the doctrine of Our Lord to Judaism.”

<sup>44</sup> See Soothill’s 1830: 6, comment on Burnouf’s and Kern’s translations: “Both these translations were made for scholars.” Even sharper in Preface, p. ix: “Too long has this literary masterpiece been buried in translations, unavoidably cumbrous and inspirationally innocuous.”

<sup>45</sup> Soothill 1830: 6, states: “As yet no translation of the Chinese version has been published, yet it is the Chinese version which is most in use in the Far East.”

<sup>46</sup> Soothill 1830, “Preface”, p. v: “As a living book it is no longer read in Sanskrit, but only in the languages of the Far East.” It should be noted that Soothill’s understanding of “Far East” comprises also Mongolia and Tibet (see p. 1).

<sup>47</sup> Soothill, while maintaining the validity of the argument, addresses this contradiction quite clearly: “... it is just to say that, although the Lotus Sutra is undoubtedly a fundamental classic in Mahayanism, as well as the most popular, the number of its readers is small in relation to the population. This is especially the case in China, where it is known to relatively few; at least 95 per cent, of Chinese adults are quite unable to read it, as is probably also the fact among the monks themselves. The same remark would probably apply to Tibet and Mongolia. In Japan both people and monks are better educated, and therefore must be classed in a different category.” (Soothill 1830: 24–25). Soothill is clearly thinking rather in historical terms here, a point which is also supported by the fact that he refers to the popularity of the Lotus reflected in the findings

of Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan (Xinjiang).

<sup>48</sup> On Richard who is still enjoying in China a high reputation see the entry in *Welsh Biography Online* (<http://yba.llgc.org.uk/en/s-RICH-TIM-1845.html>; accessed 28-10-2011) and in the Biographical Dictionary of Chinese Christianity (<http://www.bdconline.net/en/stories/t/richard-timothy.php>; accessed 28-10-2011). On his work see Lai 2009, and Ng 2008.

<sup>49</sup> Richard 1910: 147. It would be worthwhile comparing Richard's translation with the Japanese excerpt, but unfortunately I have not been able to get hold of this text. A quick comparison of Richard's text with T.276 shows that there is almost no connection between the two, and this raises the question what and if at all Richard translated or paraphrased what he had in front of him.

<sup>50</sup> Richard 1907: xiii.

<sup>51</sup> Richard 1910: 2; similarly 127.

<sup>52</sup> Carus 1915.

<sup>53</sup> Richard 1910: 170–171.

<sup>54</sup> Richard 1910: 173–174.

<sup>55</sup> Soothill, Hodous 1937.

<sup>56</sup> Soothill 1830: p. v.

<sup>57</sup> Soothill 1830, "Preface", p. v.

<sup>58</sup> Soothill 1830: 6.

<sup>59</sup> First published in 1975 under Katō's name only, several reprints, e.g. Kato, Tamura, Miyasaka 1975. Katō studied with or under Soothill in Oxford between. On the history of the translation and for a short biographical sketch of Katō see Miyasaka 2008.

<sup>60</sup> Soothill 1830: 17. Soothill also published a biography of Richard: Soothill 1925.

<sup>61</sup> Richard 1910: 129, phrases this even more sharply: "The immense amount of utterly incredible local Indian colouring, as seen in Kern's translation, makes one long for the essence which is the manna which is the manna on which so many millions feed." By translating-paraphrasing a Sino-Japanese synopsis (see p. 129) Richard conceals that the Kumārajīva version is not less abundant than the criticized Sanskrit version.

<sup>62</sup> Richard 1910: 3–4.

<sup>63</sup> Soothill 1830: Preface, p. vii.

<sup>64</sup> Hurvitz 1963.

<sup>65</sup> Already Soothill had noted this; see also Davidson 1954.

<sup>66</sup> Murano 1974. Murano was residential priest for the Nichiren-shū in Seattle before World War II and in Hawai'i after the war.

<sup>67</sup> Hsuan Hua 1977–82. See the homepage of the Society at <http://www.cttbusa.org/cttb/btts.asp>.

### Bibliography

- Philip C. Almond. 1986. "The Buddha in the West. From Myth to History". *Religion* 16: 305–322.
- . 1988. *The British Discovery of Buddhism*. Cambridge, New York, et.al.: Cambridge University Press.
- Beal, Samuel. 1871. *A Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese*. London: Trübner & Co.
- . 1882. *Abstract of Four Lectures on Buddhist Literature in China*. London: Trübner & Co.

- Beinorius, Audrius. 2005. "Buddhism in the Early European Imagination. A Historical Perspective". *Acta Orientalia Vilnensia* 6.2: 7–22.
- Burnouf, Eugène. 1876. *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- . 1925. *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi, traduit du Sanscrit, accompagné d'un commentaire et de vingt et un mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme (Nouvelle édition avec une Préface de Sylvain Lévi)*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- . 2010. *Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism* (translated by Katia Buffetrille and Donald S. Lopez, Jr.). Chicago, London: Chicago University Press.
- Carus, Paul. 1915. *The Gospel of Buddha, Compiled from Ancient Records*. Chicago, London: The Open Court.
- Davidson, J. Leroy. 1954. *The Lotus Sutra in Chinese Art. A Study in Buddhist Art to the Year 1000*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, Oxford University Press (Yale Studies in the History of Art).
- Deeg, Max; Freiburger, Oliver; Kleine, Christoph (ed.). 2011. *Kanon und Kanonisierung*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- De Jong, J.W. 1987. *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Féer, Léon. 1899. *Papiers d'Eugène Burnouf conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris: H. Champion.
- Foucaux, Philippe Édouard. 1854. *L'enfant égaré, formant le chapitre IV du Lotus de la Bonne Loi (publiée pour la première fois en Sanscrite et en Tibétain, lithographiée à la manière des livres du Tibet, et accompagnée d'une traduction française d'après la version tibétaine du Kandjour)*. Paris: Benjamin Duprat.
- Harris, Elizabeth. 2006. *Theravāda Buddhism and the British Encounter. Religious, missionary and colonial experience in nineteenth-century Sri Lanka*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Hodgson, Brian Houghton. 1941. *Illustrations of the Literature and Religion of the Buddhists*. Serampore (without publisher).
- Hsuan Hua. 1977–82. *The Wonderful Dharma Lotus Flower Sutra*, 10 vols. San Francisco: Buddhist Text Translation Society.
- Hurvitz, Leon. 1963. *Chih-i (538–597): An Introduction to the Life and Ideas of a Chinese Buddhist Monk*. Bruges (Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, XII).
- . 1976. *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma. Translated from the Chinese of Kumārajīva*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Katō Bunnō; Tamura Yoshirō; Miyasaka Kōjirō. 1975. *The Threefold Lotus Sutra. The Sutra of Innumerable Meanings, The Sutra of the Lotus Flower of the Wonderful Law, The Sutra of Meditation on the Bodhisattva Universal Virtue*. New York, Tokyo: Kosei.
- Kern, Henrik. 1884. *The Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the True Law*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. xxi).
- Kern, Henrik; Nanjio Bunyiu. 1908–1912. *Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka*. St. Petersburg: Imprimerie de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences (Bibliotheca Buddhica X).
- Lopez, Donald S. 2005. "Buddha". In Donald S. Lopez (ed.). *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press: 13–36.
- . 2010. "Introduction to the translation". In Burnouf 2010: 1–27.
- Lai Pan-chiu. 2009. 'Timothy Richard's Buddhist-Christian Studies'. *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 29: 23–38.

- Mitra, Rājendralāla. 1882. *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Miyasaka Kojirō 2008. “The Divine Mission of the Risshō Kōsei-kai” seen from the publication of the English translation of “The Sutra of the Lotus Flower of the Wonderful Law”, <http://www.buddhistcenter-rkina.org/threefoldlotussutra.html> (accessed 20 October 2011).
- Müller, F. Max. 1901. *Last Essays. First Series: Essays on Language, Folklore, and other Subjects*. London, New York, Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Müller, F. Max; Nanjio Bunyiu [Nanjō Bunyū]. 1883. *Sukhāvātī-vyūha. Description of Sukhāvātī, the Land of Bliss*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (Anecdota Oxoniensia. Texts, Documents, and Extracts, Chiefly from Manuscripts in the Bodleian and Other Oxford Libraries, Aryan Series. Vol. I, Part II).
- Murano Senchu. 1974. *The Sutra of the Lotus Flower of the Wonderful Law (Translated from Kumārajīva’s version of the Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra)*. Tokyo: Nichirenshu Headquarters.
- Ng, Peter Tze Ming. 2008. “Timothy Richard”. *Studies in World Christianity* 14.1: 73–92.
- Reichelt, Karl Ludvig. 1927. *Truth and Tradition in Chinese Buddhism. A Study of Chinese Mahayana Buddhism*. Shanghai: The Commercial Press (several reprints).
- Richard, Timothy. 1907. *The Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana Doctrine—The New Buddhism by the Patriarch Ashvagōsha Who died about A.D. 100, Translated into Chinese by Paramartha (Chen Ti 真諦) Who lived in the Liang dynasty A.D. (502–555)* (Translated into English in 1894 by Rev. Timothy Richard, Litt.D., assisted by Mr. Yang Wēn Hwui). Shanghai: Christian Literature Society.
- . 1910. *The New Testament of Higher Buddhism*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2001. “The Place of the Lotus Sūtra in Indian Buddhism”. In: *The Journal of Oriental Studies* 11: 87–105.
- Snodgrass, Judith. 2003. *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West. Orientalism, Occidentalism, and the Columbian Exposition*. Chapel Hill, London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Soothill, William Edward. 1925. *Timothy Richard of China, seer, statesman, missionary & the most disinterested adviser the Chinese ever had*. London: Seeley, Service & Co.
- Soothill, William Edward. 1930. *The Lotus of the Wonderful Law or The Lotus Gospel. Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra Miao-Fa Lien Hua Ching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Soothill, William Edward; Hodous, Lewis. 1937. *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. (reprinted by Curzon Press 1987).
- Tweed, Thomas A. 1992. *The American Encounter with Buddhism (1844–1912). Victorian Culture and the Limits of Dissent*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Van den Bosch, Lourens P. 2002. *Friedrich Max Müller. A Life Devoted to the Humanities*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill (Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religions xciv).
- Yuyama, Akira. 2000. *Eugène Burnouf, The Background to His Research into the Lotus Sutra*. Hachioji, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, Volume iii).