



**Th. Sicherbatsky**

b. 1st October [19th September, o.s.], 1866

d. 18th March, 1942

Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences (from 1910), Academician (from 1918); Corresponding Member of Gottingen Academy of Sciences (from 1931).

Honorary Member of Royal Asiatic Society, London (from 1932), German Oriental Society, Berlin (from 1934) and French Asiatic Society, Paris (from 1935).

Director, Institute of Buddhist Culture, Academy of Sciences, USSR (1928-1930); Head, Indo-Tibetan Section, Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences, USSR (1930-1942).

*Privat Dozent*, Leningrad [then St. Petersburg] State University (from 1900); Professor (1909-1941).

Photograph by courtesy of  
Professor V. I. Kal'yanov of Leningrad

SOVIET INDOLOGY SERIES. No. 2

PAPERS  
OF  
Th. STCHERBATSKY

*Translated for the first time into English by*

HARISH C. GUPTA

*Edited with an Introduction by*

DEBIPRASAD CHATTOPADHYAYA

INDIAN  
STUDIES  
PAST & PRESENT

---

Printed by R. K. Maitra from R. D. Press,  
11/B, Chowringhee Terrace, Calcutta 20,  
and published by him on behalf of  
*Indian Studies : Past and Present*,  
3 Sambhunath Pandit Street, Calcutta 20

Price Rs. 25.00

*Date of Publication*  
November 30, 1969

in this volume



*Translator's Preface*  
*Acknowledgement*  
*Introduction*

## PAPERS OF STCHERBATSKY

### A BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHER ON MONOTHEISM

—Text, Translation with Critical Introduction of Nāgārjuna's  
*Īśvara-kartṛtva-nirākṛtiḥ-viṣṇoḥ-ekakartṛtva-nirākaraṇa*

HISTORY OF MATERIALISM IN INDIA 17

THEORY OF POETRY IN INDIA 25

SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF ANCIENT INDIA 53

### 'ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER MINDS'

—Free Translation of Dharmakīrti's  
*Santānāntara-siddhi*  
with Vinītadeva's  
*Santānāntara-siddhi-ṭīkā* 71

## APPENDICES

- A. Select Bibliography 123
- B. Archive Materials 129

Index

## TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

Thanks to Dr. I. D. Serebryakov, we now possess a fine selection of the outstanding contributions of the Russian Indologists of the 19th and early 20th centuries, which, as edited and annotated by him, is published under the title *Izbrannye trudy russkikh Indologov-filologov* (Moscow, 1962). Stcherbatsky's paper on *Scientific Achievements of Ancient India* has been translated by me from this volume. } As regards the other papers included here, thanks are due to Prof. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya who, on his last visit to Russia, had the vision and the initiative to procure the microfilms of their Russian originals with a view to study and publish them.

In translating these papers, I have been fully aware of the pre-emptuousness of the task. And I might not have taken it up, if it were not for the boundless encouragement and learned guidance of Professor Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya himself—who, with his first-hand knowledge of the work of Soviet Indologists, was the most appropriate person to guide such a project. In the midst of his manifold activities, he very kindly scrutinised the manuscript, rectified my errors and suggested suitable revisions. And for this, I cannot adequately express my profound gratitude to him. The errors, which still survive, are obviously due to my own inadequacies.

Professor Chattopadhyaya was also kind enough to accede to my request for a comprehensive Introduction to this volume.

I am also indebted to Professor Mrinalkanti Gangopadhyaya of Vidyasagar College, Calcutta, for kindly going through the entire manuscript and making very useful suggestions.

Calcutta  
November 30, 1969

Harish C. Gupta

### A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T

*Among the innumerable Soviet friends and scholars from whom I have received help and active support in this venture, I am particularly anxious to express my deep gratitude to Professor V. V. Balabushevich, Professor V. I. Kal'yanov, Dr. I. D. Serebryakov, Dr. E. E. Tyomkin, Dr. A. D. Litman, Dr. G. M. Bongard-Levin and Dr. N. P. Anikeev. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Institute of Philosophy, Academy of Sciences USSR, on whose kind invitation I had the opportunity of visiting the Soviet Union in 1968 and of meeting the Soviet philosophers and Indologists.*



*Apart from Sri Harish C. Gupta—who insists on putting some high sounding words about me in his Translator's Preface and thereby makes it most embarrassing for me even to acknowledge the elementary fact that without his help it would have been simply absurd for me to work on this project—I am most grateful to Professor Mrinalkanti Gangopadhyaya, Dr. Mahadevprasad Saha and Dr. Alaka Chattopadhyaya for help in various forms.*

*—Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya*

## INTRODUCTION

Theodore Stcherbatsky<sup>1</sup> was born on October 1 [September 19, o. s.], 1866, at Kielce, Poland, where his father was then working. He died on March 18, 1942, at Borovoi in North Kazakhstan. His epitaph, translated into English, reads: “He explained to his country the wisdom of the ancient Indian thinkers.”

An epitaph is, of course, only an epitaph and it is not intended to be an exhaustive description of the total contribution of the person whose memory it cherishes. So are the words inscribed on Stcherbatsky’s tomb, which are moreover chosen specially from the point of view of his countrymen. To the Indians, however,—and particularly to those of our countrymen who want to make a serious study of our own philosophical tradition—the urge to say a great deal more about Stcherbatsky is almost irresistible. Their gratitude to him is immense. In an important sense, Stcherbatsky did help us—the Indians—to discover our own past and to restore the right perspective of our own philosophical heritage. Yet this was only one aspect of his grand contribution to Indology, though at the same time one cannot also help wondering how immensely the importance of this particular aspect of his contribution would have increased but for his personal fascination for the philosophy of Immanuel Kant and his consequent eagerness to read Kantian philosophy—or the potentials thereof—in medieval Indian texts where these could not have historically belonged.

Thus for example, the greatest tribute Stcherbatsky could think of paying to Dharmakīrti [c. 7th century A. D.],—his favourite Indian philosopher,—was to describe him as “the Indian Kant.” Though eloquent as his personal admiration for both Dharmakīrti and Kant, such a description has not even a figurative value for those for whom Kant is not the measure of philosophical greatness. Taken in its literal sense, on the other hand, it is likely to interfere with an objective understanding of Dharmakīrti’s actual philosophical position in its concrete historical context. But more of this later.

Notwithstanding this, however, it is impossible to underestimate in any way the significance of Stcherbatsky’s recognition—and even a passionate defence—of the stupendous importance of Dharmakīrti or, more strictly, of the epistemological and logical tradition associated with the names of Dharmakīrti and his

- 
1. According to Russian orthography—Fedor Ippolitovich Shcherbatskoi. The Russian name *Fedor* (Feodor) is derived from the Greek *Theodor*. Stcherbatsky himself used the form Theodore, which is retained here.

grand preceptor Dignāga [c. A. D. 500] in the development of Indian philosophical activity in its maturest phase. Perhaps in default of a more satisfactory description of it and also for the purpose of a convenient form of reference, Stcherbatsky called this the tradition of “Buddhist logic”, though, rightly enough, without attaching any lop-sided religious significance to the word “Buddhist” in this particular context.<sup>2</sup>

Our knowledge of “Buddhist logic” is inextricably connected with the work of Stcherbatsky and we could have called him its only discoverer but for the fact that when he was working on the subject, the Indian historian of Indian logic, S. C. Vidyabhusana,—quite independently of Stcherbatsky but following the same line as followed by Stcherbatsky himself—worked as another pioneer worker on the subject.<sup>3</sup> While speaking of the discovery of “Buddhist logic”,

- 
2. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic* i.2: “The Buddhists themselves call this their science a doctrine of logical reasons (*hetu-vidyā*) or a doctrine of the sources of right knowledge (*pramāṇa-vidyā*), or simply, an investigation of right knowledge (*samyag-jñāna-vyutpādana*). It is a doctrine of truth and error. In the intention of its promoters the system had apparently no special connection with Buddhism as a religion, i.e. as a teaching of a path towards salvation”.
  3. It may be useful to have here a brief account of the works on the same subject by Satischandra Vidyabhusana.

“In 1901”, wrote Sir Ashutosh Mukherjee, “I had come across a monograph on *Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan* by Sadajiro Sugiura who had offered it as a dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania. This work seemed to me of fascinating interest as opening up a new field of investigation full of untold possibilities. I suggested to Satischandra, who at that time was engaged in the study of Tibetan, that he should undertake to explore the materials available from Tibetan sources.” (Foreword to *A History of Indian Logic* by S. C. Vidyabhusana, Calcutta, 1921, pp. xix-xx). Evidently, Sir Ashutosh did not know at that time that this possibility was already being extensively explored by Stcherbatsky—1902 being the date of the publication of his first paper on the subject. However, Vidyabhusana, trained in Tibetan by no less a Tibetologist than Sarat Chandra Das himself, took up the suggestion of Sir Ashutosh in right earnest and, though showing no awareness of Stcherbatsky’s works (perhaps because the earlier of these were in the Russian language), started reconstructing the “Buddhist Logic” from the Tibetan sources. His first monograph on the subject, *History of the Medieval School of Indian Logic* appeared



therefore, we have to add the name of Vidyabhusana to that of Stcherbatsky, though there had been some basic differences in the approach as well as in the outcome of the works of these two scholars. While Vidyabhusana's approach had on the whole been that of a dry historian, Stcherbatsky wanted to rationalise "Buddhist logic" in modern terminology and to offer a vigorous philosophical defence of it. He severely criticised those European scholars who claimed "that the ancient Indians were incapable of exact thinking and lucid presentation and attributed these qualities exclusively to ancient Greek and modern science".<sup>4</sup> "There is a widely spread prejudice", he argued "that positive philosophy is to be found only in Europe. It is also a prejudice that Aristotle's treatment of logic was final ; that having had in this field no predecessor, he also had no need of a continuator. This last prejudice seems to be on the wane. There is as yet no agreed opinion on what the future logic will be, but there is a general dissatisfaction with what it at present is. We are on the eve of a reform. The consideration at this juncture of the independent and altogether different way in which the problems of logic, formal as well as epistemological, have been tackled by Dignāga and Dharmakīrti will possibly be found of some importance."<sup>5</sup> In thus trying to discover and defend "Buddhist logic", Stcherbatsky perhaps went to the extent of reading too much of later philosophical significance in the writings of Dignāga

---

in 1909, and his *magnum opus*, *A History of Indian Logic*, in 1921—nine years earlier than Stcherbatsky's maturest work on the subject, viz. the *Buddhist Logic*, in which therefore, Stcherbatsky freely used Vidyabhusana's results. Vidyabhusana also wrote a considerable number of articles on "Buddhist Logic" before the publication of his monographs. Thus : in the "Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal"—*Dignāga and his Pramāṇa-samuccaya* (1905), *Indian Logic as preserved in Tibet* (1907), *Nyāya-praveśa or the earliest work extant on Buddhist Logic by Dignāga* (1907), *Hetu-cakra-hamaru...of Dignāga* (1907) ; in the "Journal of the Buddhist Text Society"—*The Philosopher Dignāga, a contemporary of poet Kālidāsa* ( iv. 3, 1896 ), *The influence of Buddhism on the development of Nyāya Philosophy* ( vi. 3, 1898 ), *The Buddhist version of the Nyāya Philosophy* ( vii. 1, 1900 ) ; in the "Journal of the Mahabodhi Society"—*Life of Dignāga* (1899), *Influence of Buddhism on the development of the Hindu Nyāya philosophy* (1902), etc.

4. Stcherbatsky's, *Theory of Knowledge and Logic According to the Later Buddhists* (in Russian), quoted by N. P. Anikeev, *Modern Ideological Struggle...* 34.
5. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, i. preface xii.

and his followers, but the fact remains that this produced an impact on the academic world which it would have been otherwise difficult to produce. Secondly, as we shall presently see, Stcherbatsky trained a generation of brilliant scholars to follow up his line of research, while in India there had practically been no outstanding scholar to continue Vidyabhusana's work, at least not in any big way.

The word *discovery* is being deliberately used, for the grand tradition of "Buddhist logic" was lost and forgotten in India. Excepting for a solitary text along with a commentary on it—about which we shall presently speak—nothing of the enormous literature produced by these logicians is so far known to have survived in India. Even this text remained as some kind of a sealed work at the time of its discovery and, after being discovered, it drew a desultory attention of the scholars then specialising in Indian philosophy. In the Indian philosophical tradition itself, the names of these Buddhist philosophers were remembered vaguely and often not without a stigma attached to them prompted by an intense sectarian animosity against the Buddhists. Only a few scraps of their statements remained quoted in the writings of their opponents; but since these were quoted invariably for the purpose of being refuted and ridiculed, the statements, torn out of their actual contexts, were presented in the most adverse settings and necessarily not without the tendency of attaching some perverse significance to these.

Such a deplorable condition of the survival of "Buddhist logic" had the most serious repercussion on the understanding of the Indian philosophical situation as such, inasmuch as even the writings of the rival philosophers that survived in the country could not be fully understood in default of the knowledge of the writings of the "Buddhist logicians". In other words, the loss of "Buddhist logic" meant much more than a mere insufficiency of the knowledge of the Buddhist tradition itself. It meant also a serious insufficiency of the understanding of the other philosophers belonging particularly to the more developed phase of the history of Indian philosophy.

The reason for this is not difficult to see. In the more sophisticated period of the history of Indian philosophy, the significant texts of the rival philosophers were largely inspired by the zeal to refute the views of these "Buddhist logicians". Or, in Indian terminology, they represented the main *pūrvapakṣa* ("the position of the opponent") of the other philosophers. Evidently, it is impossible to understand fully any philosophical text without also having an adequate idea of the views which it is above all intended to refute.

Here is just an example. Uddyotakara [c. 6th-7th century A.D.] wrote his *Nyāya-vārtika* with the ostensible purpose of expounding the significance of Vātsyāyana's [c. 4th century A.D.] commentary on the *Nyāya-sūtra*. But the book was polemical throughout and the polemics directed mainly against Dignāga,

who had made a bold effort to set up a new system of logic and epistemology by demolishing the position of Vātsyāyana. In such a circumstance, one cannot hope to understand the full significance of Uddyotakara's work by depending on it alone. One has also to study Dignāga in order to understand why Uddyotakara was taking so much pain to refute certain views, often digressing long and even apparently going out of his way for this purpose. Incidentally, from this text itself it is even difficult to form an adequate idea of the actual views he wanted to refute, for Uddyotakara himself did not maintain an exemplary objectivity in his writings, or, as Stecherbatsky put it, he "does not mind at all to distort the opinion of his adversary and to answer him with some bluffing sophistry".<sup>6</sup>

It follows, therefore, that not even the acutest analysis of Uddyotakara's work is by itself enough to understand it, not to speak of arriving at an actual idea of the philosophical situation of his time. As Rahula Sankrityayana puts the point, "The old masters are to be re-edited, giving the full quotations or references from their predecessors, where the hints are not clear enough. For example, if an edition of the *Nyāya-vārtika* is published with copious quotations from the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* and the *Nyāyamukha*, or if the student has already studied these two masterpieces of Dignāga before going to Uddyotakara, the study of the *Nyāya-vārtika* will become a joy and not a cause of headache to the teacher and to the student".<sup>7</sup>

What is said of Uddyotakara's text is on the whole true of the stupendous works of Kumārila [c. 8th century A.D.], Akalaṅka [c. 750 A.D.], Vācaspati Miśra [c. 9th century A.D.], Udayana [c. 10th century A.D.] and others, which owe one of their main impetus to the vital clash of ideas with the later Buddhist philosophers. Of these philosophers, Kumārila represented the Mīmāṃsā view, Akalaṅka the Jaina view, Udayana the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika view, while Vācaspati Miśra was supposed to be a master of all the (Brahmanical) philosophies though perhaps with a pronounced bias for the Vedānta. Their names are specially mentioned, because during the maturest period of Indian philosophical activity mainly these views retained full vigour. It was the interaction and interconnection of these views with the philosophy of the later Buddhists that imparted real life and vigour to the philosophical situation as a whole. There was, therefore, no chance of understanding this philosophical situation in spite of remaining almost completely ignorant of the later Buddhist philosophers. But the fact is that "only a few decades ago Vasubandhu, Dignāga and Dharmakīrti were mere legendary names, which were only heard, when the long forgotten tomes of the old masters were dusted on ceremonial occasions."<sup>8</sup>

6. *Ib.* i. 49.

7. Rahula Sankrityayana, preface of the *Pramāṇa-vārtika* (Allahabad 1943) p. 10.

8. *Ib.* p. 8-9

We can now see the stupendous significance of the discovery of "Buddhist logic". Of the five living components of the comparatively later phase of the Indian philosophical thought as a whole, only four—viz. the Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta, Jaina and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika—actually survived in the country. But the fifth—i.e. the one represented by the later Buddhist philosophers—did not. As a result, even the surviving trends could at best be incompletely understood and there was no question of arriving at a picture of the total philosophical situation. Stcherbatsky, along with Vidyabhusana, lifted the veil of oblivion on "Buddhist logic". It was by itself the discovery of a long-forgotten but by far the most vigorous aspect of the Indian philosophical activity. But it was something more than that. It created the first real possibility of restoring the correct perspective of the Indian philosophical situation.

Since I have been using the word *discovery* rather freely, I may as well try to be clearer about it.

Neither Stcherbatsky nor Vidyabhusana discovered any original text of Dignāga or Dharmakīrti. As for Dignāga, the modern scholars have practically given up the hope of ever finding the Sanskrit original of his *magnum opus*, the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* beyond some fragments of it.<sup>9</sup> A few decades after the major works of Stcherbatsky and Vidyabhusana surveying "Buddhist logic", efforts were made to reconstruct some other logical treatises of Dignāga.<sup>10</sup> We are a little more fortunate with regard to the original works of Dharmakīrti. The honour of first finding a copy of his *Nyāya-bindu* belongs to Bhagvandas Kevaldas<sup>11</sup>, though it was first edited and published by P. Peterson in 1889 as an appendix to Dharmottara's commentary on the text itself.<sup>12</sup> And the much greater honour of finding the Sanskrit original of Dharmakīrti's *magnum opus*, the *Pramāṇa-vārtika*, belongs to Rahula Sankrityayana, who discovered it during his expeditions<sup>13</sup> to Tibet (1934 and 1936) and published it in 1943. Besides these,

9. H. N. Randle, *Fragments from Dignāga (Pramāṇa-samuccaya)*, London, 1926.

10. G. Tucci, *Nyāya-mukha, the oldest Buddhist text on Logic after Chinese and Tibetan Materials*, Heidelberg 1930; *Nyāya-praveśa* (ed. Part I—Ananda-shankar B. Dhruva; Part II—V. Bhattacharyya). GOS No. 38-39, Baroda 1927-30.

11. P. Peterson, *Nyāya-bindu-ṭīkā...*, Calcutta 1889, preface p. xiv.

12. P. Peterson, *Nyāya-bindu-ṭīkā...*, to which is added the *Nyāya-bindu*, Calcutta 1889.

13. For the account of Rahula's Tibetan expeditions and of the discovery by him of the Buddhist manuscripts, see *Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, 1935 & 1937.

some other writings of Dharmakīrti are published by the modern scholars,<sup>14</sup> though compared to the literally staggering bulk<sup>15</sup> of the actual output of the “Buddhist logicians”, their original writings so far recovered are really insignificant.

What is most remarkable about Stecherbatsky is that long before Rahula’s discovery of the *Pramāṇa-vārtika*, practically the entire tradition of “Buddhist logic” was reconstructed by him and this based not only on the thorough study of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti but also of a large number of commentators and sub-commentators on them.

How could this be at all possible? For an answer to this, we have to remember an old controversy among the European Indologists and this is perhaps best retold in the words of Stecherbatsky himself. “At the dawn of European Indology”, he observed, “there has been a controversy between the great French scholar E. Bournouff and the great Russian scholar V. Vasil’ev on the question whether Buddhism could be better understood from the Indian or also from the Chinese and Tibetan sources. According to the first, only Indian sources provided evidence on genuine Buddhism; according to the second, Buddhism in the totality of its development can be best understood only from the Chinese and Tibetan sources in addition to the Indian ones”.<sup>16</sup> And he added that working on the tradition of Vasil’ev and Minaev excellent results had already been reached by himself as well as his talented pupil O. Rozenberg [1888-1919], whose early death meant a great loss to the world of Indology.

This controversy is now dated, of course, and it is generally admitted that no study of Buddhism—particularly of the later phase of its history—can be satisfactory without depending on the Chinese and Tibetan materials. Several thousands of works produced by the later Buddhists are lost in their Indian originals but remain preserved mainly in Chinese and Tibetan translations. Of these translations, again, the Tibetan ones have a special importance. While the Chinese translations are comparatively free, the Tibetan ones are not so. As a result, it is comparatively easier and even safer to return back to the lost Indian texts from their surviving Tibetan translations.

14. L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Nyāya-bindu with commentary of Vinītadeva* (Tibetan), Calcutta 1907; Sukhalala Saṅghavi and Jinavijaya Muni, *Hetu-bindu-prakarāṇa with commentary of Arcaṭa Bhaṭṭa*, Baroda 1949; Dalasukha Bhai Malavaniya *Svārthānumāna-pariccheda with author’s own commentary*, Benares 1959.

15. See Vidyabhusana, *A History of Indian Logic*, 270-346.

16. Stecherbatsky, Preface to the *Madhyānta-vibhaṅga* p. iv-v.

It is important to emphasise this point, particularly because in India to-day the study of classical Tibetan is on the decline and its bearing on the knowledge of Buddhism somewhat ignored. It will, therefore, be relevant here to have a few words on this.

Since the time of the first important Tibetan king Sroñ-btsan-sgam-po<sup>17</sup>, the entire Tibetan culture was sought to be consciously modelled on Indian culture : the Tibetan script was fashioned after the Indian script<sup>18</sup>, the Tibetan grammar was modelled on Indian grammar<sup>19</sup>, the academic ambition of the advanced Tibetan scholars was to be trained in some Indian centre of learning, the Tibetan centres of learning were simply the imitations of the Indian centres<sup>20</sup> and even Tibetan history was sought to be explained as a continuation of Indian history<sup>21</sup>. When, a few centuries later, translation work on a grand scale of the Indian texts—specially Buddhist texts—was taken up by the Tibetans under the patronage of the monk-ruler Ral-pa-can<sup>22</sup>, absolutely rigid and mechanical principles for choosing Tibetan equivalents for Indian words were legally enforced by the state, so that the supreme sanctity<sup>23</sup> of the Indian texts was not to be affected in any way. As a result, the Tibetan translations are some kind of mechanical replica of the Indian originals. As Stcherbatsky himself explained, “The importance of Tibetan

---

17. A. Chattopadhyaya, *Atiśa and Tibet*, Calcutta 1967, 180ff.

18. *Ib.* 198ff

19. *Ib.*

20. Even the names of some of the Tibetan monasteries like Potala and 'Bras-spuñs (=Dhānyakaṭaka) are simple imitations of Indian names.

21. A. Chattopadhyaya, *op.cit.* 152ff.

22. *Ib.* 250ff.

23. But the negative result of such a reverential attitude to the Buddhist texts must not be overlooked. See Rahula Sankrityayana in *Journal of Bihar & Orissa Research Society*, 1935, 22-3 : “The devout people consider it a great meritorious deed to enshrine the palm-leaf MSS inside a *stūpa* or image. In this way, hundreds of books are now beyond our reach. I heard at Sa-skya that a palm-leaf MS copy of Dharmakīrti's great work *Pramāṇa-vārtika* is enshrined in an image of him, kept in one of the chapels of the Lha-khañ-chen-mo of Sa-skya. A few years back, an old stucco image in bSam-yas had fallen down and inside it many such MSS were found. The image was reconstructed and the MSS were put back into it again. The other practice is more atrocious. In some of these monasteries, Lamas cut the MSS in pieces and offer them to those pilgrims who bring rich presents. These small pieces are said to possess the miraculous power of healing all kinds of diseases when a drop of water in which the piece has been dipped is administered to the patient.”

translation for the right interpretation of the ancient Buddhist texts is generally admitted. These translations were always prepared by a committee composed of Indian *paṇḍita*-s and a learned Tibetan translator (*lo-tsa-ba*). The greatest care was bestowed on the right understanding of the original. Special expeditions were sent out to India for search of old and trustworthy manuscripts, translations were then corrected by the committee according to the new finds. Needless to say that both the Indian *paṇḍita*-s and Tibetan *lo-tsa-ba*-s were profoundly versed in the technical difficulties of Sanskrit grammar, poetics, philosophy and other medieval Indian sciences. For the sake of uniformity, bilingual dictionaries were prepared at an early date. The terminology established by them had been authorised by the Tibetan government and severe punishments were proclaimed against trespassers to the renderings enforced by the state law. Under these circumstances, the Tibetan translations afford invaluable assistance for establishing the text of every ancient Buddhist work of which insufficient or corrupt manuscripts are available".<sup>24</sup>

We can now easily see how Stcherbatsky could reconstruct "Buddhist logic" in spite of the deplorable condition of the availability of the original texts on it. His first article on the subject, *Logic in Ancient India*, appeared in 1902 and it was soon followed by the two volumes of *The Theory of Knowledge and Logic According to the Later Buddhists*, published during 1903-9. During these years, excepting for Dharmakīrti's *Nyāya-bindu* and Dharmottara's commentary on it, no original work on "Buddhist logic" was known to the academic world, and, though Peterson's edition of these appeared in 1889, in the words of Stcherbatsky himself, it "did not prove sufficiently reliable to allow a clear comprehension in many important passages. The task of an English translation attempted by the learned editor himself and after him by the late Professor C. Bendall, had to be given up for want of a sufficiently reliable text. Additional great help was then derived from the Tibetan translations. Accordingly, an edition of the Tibetan text and a new edition of the Sanskrit original were begun by me in this series [i.e. the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* Series] and at the same time a translation (in Russian) and an *analysis of the system* were published".<sup>25</sup>

The expression *analysis of the system* was of course a modest one. What it actually meant was much more than a mere exposition of Dharmakīrti's *Nyāya-*

---

24. Preface to Obermiller's *Index Verborum* (*Bibliotheca Buddhica* 1927) p. i. Ital. added.

25. *Ib.* p. ii.

*bindu*. It meant the exposition of the entire tradition of epistemology and logic associated with the names of the later Buddhists based on the writings of Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and a host of their commentators—a reconstruction which received its final form in the first volume of the *Buddhist Logic*.

Thanks to the magnificent tradition of Sanskrit, Tibetan and Mongolian studies already set up in St. Petersburg and largely inspired by I. P. Minaev [1840-1890], Stcherbatsky acquired a grand proficiency in Tibetan, Mongolian and other languages and thus became much more than a first-rate Sanskritist. He moreover extensively toured Mongolia where, under the guidance of the learned Lamas, he vastly improved the knowledge of the Tibetan language and read the Buddhist texts preserved in the monasteries. It was a pity that the political considerations of the time led the then Dalai Lama to refuse him the permit to visit Tibet,<sup>26</sup> though this could not prevent Stcherbatsky from acquiring the mastery of Tibetan language and thus to have a free access to the enormous literature on logic and epistemology produced by the later Buddhists.

Not that Stcherbatsky was the first Indologist who worked for the reconstruction of later Buddhism on the basis of the Tibetan materials. Already before him, Alexander Csoma de Koros, H. A. Jaschke, Sarat Chandra Das, I. J. Schmidt, W. V. Vasil'ev, A. Schiefner and others magnificently contributed to this reconstruction. What was nevertheless distinctive of Stcherbatsky was that while others before him used the Tibetan sources mainly for the purpose of understanding later Buddhism in its religious, metaphysical and mystical aspects, Stcherbatsky was the first to be seriously drawn to the essentially rational and logical contributions of the later Buddhists. In this he differed not only from the Tibetologists preceding him but also from the general run of the European thinkers taking notice of Indian philosophy, or, more broadly, of the Indian cultural heritage—from Schopenhauer, Hegel, Deussen, Max Müller and others—who were all building up a somewhat perverted picture of Indian wisdom by way of emphasising only the religious, “spiritual” and the most extravagantly idealistic tendency of the *Upaniṣads* and Śaṅkara Vedānta.<sup>27</sup> For them, the growth of these tendencies in Indian culture was so overpowering that the Indian mind could pay at best a desultory attention to the problems of logic and rational analysis, i.e. philosophy as fully emancipated from magic, mythology and religion. Of course, Stcherbatsky did not go to the other extreme of denying these trends in the Indian philosophical heritage. Acknowledging the fact that all these were there, he came out with a bold protest against the essentially unscientific and non-objective

26. See *infra* note 43.

27. I need not go here into much details of this, because N. P. Anikeev in his *Modern Ideological Struggle for the Ancient Philosophical Heritage of India*, Calcutta 1969, has discussed it.



tendency then prevailing in Europe of seeing only these in Indian wisdom. Thus he insisted that “there is a struggle between the purely religious and philosophical trends”<sup>28</sup> in Indian thought and he was happy that the Russian Indologists “were able to distinguish Buddhism proper from various alien, mystic and even fanatic theories which in the course of time fused into Buddhism and enwrapped it.”<sup>29</sup>

But the importance of Stcherbatsky’s work on “Buddhist logic” does by no means mean that he was disinterested in Buddhism in its totality. His admiration of the contributions of the later Buddhists to logic and epistemology was of course very great. But he did not at all ignore the theological, metaphysical and even mystical views developed by the followers of this creed. Two of his works, *The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the word ‘Dharma’* and *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa* still remain for us among the illuminating expositions of the theology and metaphysics of the so-called Hinayāna and Mahāyāna Buddhism. His translation and exposition of the *Madhyānta-vibhaṅga* attributed to Maitreya [c. 400 AD] is for us an indispensable work for the study of the philosophy of the Yogācāra school of Buddhism. So also are his edition of Maitreya’s *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-prajñā-pāramitā-śāstra* and his exposition and translation of Dharmakīrti’s *Santānāntara-siddhi*. And how vague indeed would have been our knowledge of Buddhist mysticism but for his work on Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharma-kośa* along with Yaśomitra’s commentary on it. Incidentally, when the greatest historian of Indian philosophy—S. N. Dasgupta—was working on the first volume of his *History*, he had to rely on the materials supplied by Stcherbatsky for the discussion of Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharma-kośa*. As Dasgupta acknowledged, “I am indebted for the above account to the unpublished translation from Tibetan of a small portion of the *Abhidharma-kośa* by my esteemed friend Professor Theodore Stcherbatsky of Petrograd. I am grateful to him that he allowed me to utilise it.”<sup>30</sup>

All these give us some idea of the breadth of Stcherbatsky’s interest in Buddhism. Surprisingly, however, his first published paper had nothing to do

---

28. Stcherbatsky, *Theory of Knowledge and Logic of the Later Buddhists* (in Russian) ii. p. ix.

29. Stcherbatsky, *S. F. Ol’denburg as an Indologist* (in Russian), Leningrad 1934, p. 80. Quoted by Anikeev, *op.cit.*, 35.

30. S. N. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy*, Cambridge 1922-55 i. p. 117n.

with the Buddhist religion and philosophy. It was instead a technical study of an Indian inscription, published in the *Epigraphia Indica*, as a joint work with V. G. Ojha, who is now known as one of the foremost authorities on Indian paleography. And here are a few more examples to show what a broad range of the Indian cultural heritage he wanted to cover. He wrote on *The Theory of Poetry in India*, on *The Categorical Imperative in the Brāhmaṇas*, on *The Scientific Achievements of Ancient India*, and he was one of the first among the modern scholars to discuss *The History of Materialism in India*—a subject to which he later engaged his pupil M. Tubyansky [1893-1943] to work more intensively and by utilising the hitherto unutilised Tibetan materials.<sup>31</sup> Besides these, he translated Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāra-carita*, led a team of translators of Kauṭilya's *Arthasāstra* and edited with a German translation the poetical work of Hari Kavi, *alias* Bhānudatta. And, notwithstanding the scope to differ on matters of evaluation and interpretation—which inevitably exists among the leading scholars—nowhere in this wide range of Indian studies covered by Stcherbatsky is there any scope of grading his contribution as second-rate or to view it as being based on secondary sources. That is why, no tribute paid to him as an Indologist runs the risk of exaggeration. And great tributes had indeed been paid to him by some of the leading scholars of our time. Thus, for example, Rahula Sankrityayana wrote, "In 1929, when I asked Professor Luders of Berlin, whom I met in Ceylon, 'Who is the greatest scholar in Europe of Indian—particularly Buddhist—philosophy?', he, without a moment's hesitation said, 'Dr. Stcherbatsky'. In 1932, Sylvain Lévi also told me the same thing".<sup>32</sup> Rahula himself, while dedicating his edition of the *Prāmaṇa-vārtika* to the memory of Stcherbatsky, described him as "the greatest Orientalist of his time", adding in Sanskrit verse :

*ākaraṇītaṃ tava yaśo vahuśaḥ suhr̥dbhyo  
'dhītāśca vismitatayā kṛtayastvdiyāḥ  
vaiduṣyamikṣitamaho nitarāṃ gabhīraṃ  
lokottareva viditā tvayi kā vibhūtiḥ...<sup>33</sup>*

- 
31. Stcherbatsky refers to this in his *Buddhist Logic* i. 15n, though I have not been able to ascertain whether the work is published so far. If it still remains unpublished, the Soviet colleagues would do an excellent service to Indian studies by making it available in print.
32. Rahula Sankrityayana, *Jin-kā main kṛtajñā* (in Hindi), Allahabad 1957, p. 195.
33. In English translation : "I have heard of your fame again and again from the friends. I have studied your works with great amazement and am struck by your extremely profound scholarship. I wonder if you acquired some supper-normal faculty..."

But perhaps the greatest tribute to Stcherbatsky is the accomplished fact that after him it has become impossible to discuss Indian philosophy adequately and at the same time to remain innocent of his contributions to our understanding of it.

But the tribute paid to Stcherbatsky is also a tribute to his teachers, for he could acquire such an all-round proficiency in Indian studies largely because he had the fortune of being trained by some of the foremost scholars of his time. Among his teachers three must be mentioned in particular. They were I. P. Minaev, G. Bühler and H. Jacobi.

Minaev was one of the pioneers of Indian studies in Russia and it will be specially relevant to quote what Stcherbatsky himself said about him in 1934. "The study of Sanskrit began in Russia in the early forties of the last century. The first teacher was Kossovich.<sup>34</sup> He was succeeded by I. P. Minaev. He (Minaev) was not only a first-class Pali and Sanskrit scholar, to whom science is indebted for many valuable editions of texts and works on the history and geography of India, but he also was a great traveller and an authority on historical geography of the countries lying between India and the Russian empire. He visited India three times and only a premature death stopped his preparations for a fourth long journey to India through Afghanistan—a journey which if realised would have lasted four years. Under the cover of a rigid scholarship, with a rather sceptical, sarcastic turn of mind, I. P. Minaev concealed a warm heart, which was deeply concerned with the past, present and future destinies of India as well as with the destiny of his own country".<sup>35</sup>

At about the age of eighteen (in 1884), Stcherbatsky joined the University of St. Petersburg and became a pupil of Minaev. This was a turning point of his life. Before joining the university, he studied Gothic, Anglo-Saxon and Germanic languages under Professor F. A. Braun and the Church Slavonic and Serbo-Croatian languages under Professor I. V. Yagich. Under Professor Minaev he had his first lessons in Pali and Sanskrit and this in a sense determined the major interest for the rest of his life. Professor V. I. Kal'yanov, the seniormost of Stcherbatsky's personal disciples now living, observes: "It is not known if the scientific interests of Stcherbatsky would still have been directed to the study of

---

34. Sri H. C. Gupta tells me that, evidently enough, Stcherbatsky here has in mind only his *alma-mater*, the University of St. Petersburg, where, in the Faculty of Oriental Languages, Kaetan Kossovich [1815-1883] was the first Professor of Sanskrit.

35. Stcherbatsky in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vo. x, pp. 81 ff

Indian philology and philosophy had he not come in contact with Professor Minaev in the faculty of comparative linguistics in the very early years of his student life.”<sup>36</sup>

In 1889, Stcherbatsky completed his course at St. Petersburg University and went to Vienna to study under G. Bühler [1837-1898], another veritable giant in the field of Indology. I am tempted to quote here what Max Müller said about Bühler, particularly because the same words apply perhaps with an additional emphasis to Bühler’s pupil Stcherbatsky : “It was the fashion for a time”, said Max Müller, “to imagine that if one had learnt Sanskrit grammar and was able to construe a few texts that had been published and translated before, one was a Sanskrit scholar. Bühler looked upon this kind of scholarship as good enough for the *vulgus profanum*, but no one was a real scholar in his eyes who could not stand on his own feet, and fight his own way through new texts and commentaries, who could not publish what had not been published before, who could not translate what had not been translated before.”<sup>37</sup>

Indeed, Stcherbatsky too could stand on his own feet and fight his own way through not only new texts and commentaries but even through those, the originals of which were long lost to the Indians themselves. Of course, he could do this primarily because of his mastery of the Tibetan, with the knowledge of which his studies under Bühler had little to do. But this study was vitally important for the shaping of Stcherbatsky into an all-round Indologist. Under Bühler he studied Indian poetics, Pāṇini’s grammar, the *Dharmaśāstras* and Indian palaeography—in short, those branches of Indian studies in which Bühler was then considered the most outstanding scholar in Europe.

Professor Kal’yanov<sup>38</sup> says that the study of Indian poetics under Bühler helped Stcherbatsky to have a stable foundation for his subsequent research in Indian philosophy and that the intense interest he developed in Indian grammar added to his interest in Indian logic, the two being organically related. However, for the technical apparatus which enabled him to move freely through the maze of the abstruse arguments and counter-arguments of the Indian philosophical texts—which moreover were written in a peculiarly laconic form—Stcherbatsky must have been most indebted to H. Jacobi, the maker of a generation of specialists in Indian philosophy. “In Professor Jacobi”, says Professor Kal’yanov, “Stcherbatsky found a scholar who was closer to him in spirit. To Professor Bühler, Indian

36. V. I. Kal’yanov in *Izvestiya AN SSR* (in Russian) 1946, Vol. 5, No. 3, p. 245.

37. Max Müller in *JRAS* 1898. Reprinted in *Indian Studies : Past & Present*, Vol. i, p. 2.

38. Kal’yanov, *op.cit.*, 245-6.

philosophy was a supplement to the historical and literary studies, whereas to Jacobi it was an object of study in itself...By his studies under Professor Jacobi, he had a solid foundation for the study and interpretation of the Indian philosophical *śāstra-s*”<sup>39</sup>

Minaev, Bühler, Jacobi—howevermuch imposing such a list of teachers may appear to us, Stcherbatsky’s hunger for the knowledge of India was apparently insatiable and so in 1910 he made his long desired trip to India. We know something about it from his paper, *A Short Report on the Trip to India*. “The object of my tour of India”, said he, “is, besides a general acquaintance with the country, primarily the quest of the relics of the Buddhist philosophical literature in the writings of the Buddhists themselves and also in those of the Brahmanas and Jains, inasmuch as these throw light on the period of the flourish of Buddhism in the history of the Buddhist civilization (5th to 10th centuries A.D.). At the same time, I intended to familiarise myself with the present position in India of the study of Sanskrit language and literature, specially of those branches of literature which till now have not been taken up by European scholars and are for them more or less a riddle.”<sup>40</sup>

The best way to accomplish this second purpose, Stcherbatsky evidently knew, was to study some Indian philosophical text in the traditional Indian style and under a traditional Indian *paṇḍita*. The language of these texts is often extremely cryptic while the points and counter-points raised particularly in their polemical parts are often most difficult to follow. It is only through the tradition of direct oral transmission from teacher to student prevalent in the country for centuries that the subtle significance of these texts has somehow or other survived. Hence, among the many other things Stcherbatsky wanted to do in India, one was to study Indian philosophy under an Indian *paṇḍita*. However, when Stcherbatsky came to India, this traditional mode of study had already much disintegrated and it was not easy to find a really competent *paṇḍita* who fully retained the age-old tradition. Fortunately for Stcherbatsky, he could find one in Bombay, whom he mentioned as the Maithila *paṇḍita*. “He hailed from Durbhanga”, said Stcherbatsky, “and was in Bombay only by chance, because of the famine in his own province. This famine had made almost half the population to leave his province. The authority of this *paṇḍita* among the local Indian castes was so high that without prejudicing his own position in any way he could freely live with me. We lived in a completely Indian atmosphere in a locality where there was not a single

---

39. *Ib.* 246.

40. Quoted by Kal’yanov, *op.cit.*, 248.

European and where the only language of communication was Sanskrit. Everyday, from morning till evening, we spent our time in philosophical discussions with only two breaks in a month—the days of the new moon and full moon”.<sup>41</sup>

This shows how keen Stcherbatsky was to establish a real rapport with the Indian mind for the purpose of understanding traditional Indian thought. But his mission was also that of a scientific investigator. Hence, he toured India extensively—visited Benaras, Calcutta, Mahabaleshwar and other places—and collected materials for his own studies. In Calcutta, for example, he found a new manuscript of his most favourite subject. As he said in the *Preface* to his Tibetan edition of the *Nyāya-bindu*, “At the time of my stay in Calcutta in 1910, I also discovered another manuscript of the *Nyāya-bindu-ṭīkā*—not used by Peterson—in the library of the Asiatic Society. Due to the kindness of the Secretary of the Society, Dr. Denison Ross, this manuscript was sent to us for my use in the Asiatic Museum, Academy of Sciences”.<sup>42</sup>

He also went to Darjeeling in search of the Buddhist manuscripts and to collect information about the Buddhist monasteries there. Because of some political developments in Tibet, the Dalai Lama was at that time staying at Darjeeling. From the writings of Sir Charles Bell<sup>43</sup>—who referred to Stcherbatsky simply as “the Russian professor”—we learn how Stcherbatsky took the opportunity of meeting the Dalai Lama and entreated his best for a permit to visit Tibet. But the Dalai Lama could not grant him the permission, because of the then political considerations concerning the relation between China and Tibet.

What is unfortunately lacking in our knowledge of Stcherbatsky’s relations with India is an adequate information of his personal Indian friends and colleagues. We have only some stray hints of this. Thus, from the description of Stcherbatsky’s collection preserved in the Archives of the Academy of Sciences, USSR, we know of more than thirty eminent Indians whose personal letters to Stcherbatsky are preserved in the archives. These correspondents included Rabindranath Tagore, S. N. Dasgupta, D. R. Bhandarkar, V. Bhattacharyya, D. Kosambi, B. C. Law, N. N. Law, G. Jha, Raghu Vira, P. L. Vaidya, N. Dutt, S. K. Chatterji, Rahula Sankrityayana and others. Stcherbatsky was certainly keeping himself in close touch with the eminent Indians of his time and with their progress in the rediscovery of India. He must also have been writing back to his Indian friends, though we know of such letters only in scraps. S. N. Dasgupta quotes<sup>44</sup> one at length in his *History of Indian Philosophy*, in which Stcherbatsky wanted to explain

41. Quoted by Kal’yanov, *op.cit.*, 248.

42. Stcherbatsky, *Preface* (in Russian) to *Nyāya-bindu* p. ii.

43. C. Bell, *Portrait of the Dalai Lama*, London 1946, p. 106.

44. S. N. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy*, i. 409n.

how he proposed to understand Dharmakīrti's conception of the *svalakṣaṇa*. But there is no reason to think that his letters to the Indian friends were necessarily impersonal. The last letter received by Rahula Sankrityayana<sup>45</sup> from him shows how deeply Stcherbatsky was moved by the purely personal concern for his Indian friend. It was written in 1941, when Rahula was in the British jail and Stcherbatsky would not simply believe the senselessness of indefinitely detaining such a fine scholar : "Are you still in jail ? Have you been informed how long you will be kept in detention ? How is your health ? You have written nothing about your health in your letter. You must know what is going to happen hereafter. Is it really possible that nothing has been intimated to you about the future ? Did you enquire ?..."

The Archives also contains letters to Stcherbatsky from the leading European scholars like L de la Vallée Poussin, M. Winternitz, W. Ruben, R. Garbe, S. Lévi, P. Pelliot, E. Sénart and many others. It thus appears that he worked in his own way to build up some sort of international coordination in Indology, and though we do not fully know what he wrote back to his correspondents, there is enough indication to think that one of his points was to help his colleagues abroad with the materials of his own researches. Thus, when Winternitz was working on the second volume of his *History of Indian Literature*, very little was really known about the actual writings of Dignāga. But the author wanted to assure his readers that more knowledge was forthcoming. "Translations of Dignāga's works", he said, "are to appear shortly by Professor Stcherbatsky, who wrote to me on 26th April 1929 : 'You will be astonished to find among the Indians, specially Dignāga, a comprehensive system of critical philosophy. It has long been my conviction that we here have before us a most excellent achievement of the Indian mind ; this conviction has now grown stronger than even before, and I hope to be in a position to present it clearly'".<sup>46</sup>

Correspondences apart, Stcherbatsky worked in direct collaboration with some of the leading Indologists of his time. After returning from India, he undertook a systematic study in Vasubandhu's *Abhidharma-kośa* (as preserved in Tibetan

---

45. Quoted by Rahula Sankrityayana in *Jin-kā Mem Kṛtajñā*, Allahabad 1957, 195.

46. M. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. ii, (Eng. Tr. Calcutta 1933) 363n.

translation) along with Yaśomitra's commentary on it. This study was facilitated by an Uigur translation of the work discovered by A. Stein in Central Asia. S. Lévi, L. de la Vallée Poussin, U. Wogihara, O. Rozenberg and D. Ross joined him in this great project. The result was the magnificent edition of the text published in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* series.

This series—the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*—had indeed been a landmark in modern Indology and it cannot but remind us of another important colleague of Stcherbatsky—though a little senior one and, in a sense, one of his early teachers.<sup>47</sup> He was S. F. Ol'denburg [1863-1934], the original architect of the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, which was started by the Academy of Sciences of Russia in 1897 to coordinate the work of the scholars all over the world devoted to the history, culture, literature of India, China, Tibet and Mongolia. A large number of significant works came out in this series during the lifetime of Ol'denburg and it is well known that shortly after the series was started, Stcherbatsky took an intense interest in it and worked jointly with Ol'denburg to make it a grand international success.

Ol'denburg's own work was primarily on the folk-lore, ethnology and art of the peoples of Russia, Western Europe and a number of eastern countries like Indonesia, China and Afghanistan and the subject of his doctorate dissertation was Buddhist legends. For twentyfive years [1904-1929], he remained the perpetual secretary of the Russian Academy of Sciences and in 1917 he became the Minister of Education of the Provisional Government.

However, from the point of view of the contemporary Soviet Indologists, one of the most important things to remember about Ol'denburg is that it was largely through him that Lenin himself maintained his connection with the Indologists of his time. "Lenin repeatedly took interest in the development of Russian Oriental studies and extended active help to the workers on this field. It is well known that Lenin received the senior Russian Orientalist S. F. Ol'denburg and discussed with him the significance of Oriental studies".<sup>48</sup> What Lenin is reported to have said to Ol'denburg still remains the main source of inspiration of the Indologists in the Soviet Union to-day. "Well", said Lenin, "here is your subject. It seems far away. Yet it is close. Go to the masses, to the workers, and tell them about the history of India...and see how they will respond

47. Kal'yanov, *op.cit.*, 245.

48. N. P. Anikeev, *op.cit.*, 57.



to it. And you yourself draw inspiration from it for fresh research, work and study of great scientific importance."<sup>49</sup>

In the Soviet period, when Indological studies in USSR took a new turn under the guidance and inspiration of Lenin, Stcherbatsky, along with a number of other old guards—V. V. Bartol'd, I. Yu. Krachkovsky, N. I. Konrad and others—enthusiastically responded to the call of the new tasks envisaged by Lenin and took active part in organising the new Institutes.

Maxim Gorky initiated the idea of setting up a new Institute for an allround study of the Orient and Lenin immediately decreed that the Peoples' Commissariat of Nationalities should take urgent steps to set up such an Institute. Accordingly were set up the Moscow Institute of Oriental Languages and the Petrograd Institute of Modern Oriental Languages. In the maturest period of his life, Stcherbatsky himself used to lecture in this new Leningrad Institute and thus worked to build up the new generation of Soviet Indologists.

From what is discussed it is already obvious that the image of Stcherbatsky we have is much more than that of an individual scholar. Stcherbatsky became an institution, as it were. This becomes all the more obvious when we consider the number of brilliant scholars trained up by him. In this, his contribution differed significantly from that of S. C. Vidyabhusana, who, like Stcherbatsky, was one of the earliest scholars to have worked on "Buddhist logic" based on Tibetan materials but who, unlike Stcherbatsky, left practically no important scholar in India to continue the work in the same line. For the understanding of Stcherbatsky's full stature, therefore, it is essential to have a few words on the outstanding students he produced, who, moreover, quite early in life, worked their way up to become his able colleagues and collaborators.

The more significant names from this point of view are those of Professor O. Rozenberg, whose *Problems of Buddhist Philosophy* Stcherbatsky so much admired; Academician B. Ya. Vladimirtsov, who worked mainly in the field of Mongolian studies and wrote extremely significant works on the language, history and culture of the Mongols; P. V. Ernshtedt, who specialised in the Coptic and Classical languages; A. A. Frieman, who worked in the field of Indo-Iranian languages; V. I. Kal'yanov, who is now the Professor of Sanskrit in the Leningrad University and is continuing to produce first-rate studies on the different aspects of ancient Indian history and culture.

---

49. V. V. Bonch-Bruевич, *V. I. Lenin in Petrograd and Moscow* (in Russian), Moscow 1956, p. 32. Quoted by Anikeev, *op.cit.*, 60-1.

Stcherbatsky reared up indeed a whole generation of Russian Indologists. But I am specially anxious to speak here about the activities of two of them, because, though both of them died in their early thirties, both became so much proficient in Indian studies that Stcherbatsky himself substantially depended on them even in the maturer phase of his own activities. They were E. Obermiller [1901-1935] and A. Vostrikov [1904-1937].

Inspired and guided by Stcherbatsky, Obermiller took up the study of Buddhism at an early age and acquired for this purpose an excellent proficiency in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Mongolian languages. His health was extremely poor and his personal resources at best meagre. Still he extensively toured Transbaikal and Buryatia for studying the Buddhist texts preserved in the monasteries there. These were not merely the Indian texts preserved in Tibetan language but included texts written originally by the Tibetan scholars, who, after the practical extinction of Buddhism in India, preserved and continued the Buddhist tradition in a very important sense. Already in his early twenties, Obermiller prepared the *Sanskrit-Tibetan and Tibetan-Sanskrit 'Index Verborum' to Dharmakīrti's Nyāya-bindu and Dharmottara's Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā* (published in 1927-28), which was more exhaustive than Vidyabhusana's Bilingual Index of the *Nyāya-bindu* published in 1917. He was accepted by Stcherbatsky as a collaborator for editing, translating and explaining Maitreya's *Abhisamaya-alaṅkāra-prajñā-pāramitā-upadeśa-śāstra*, published in 1929 and it was on this young student that Stcherbatsky entrusted the responsibility of seeing through the press the second *Kośasthāna* of Yaśomitra's *Sphutārthā*. In 1935, the year of his death, was published his magnificent study of Tsoñ-kha-pa, the great Tibetan scholar and religious reformer who founded the dGe-lugs-pa sect and who was also a voluminous writer on Buddhism. The year after this was posthumously published his work *How to Study the Tibetan Medical Literature*. But Obermiller's greatest contribution to our knowledge of Buddhism was his magnificent English translation of Bu-ston's *chos-byuñ* [History of Buddhism], a work undertaken directly under the advice of Stcherbatsky. "In the years 1927 and 1928", wrote Stcherbatsky in the Preface to this, "I have interpreted the work to my pupil E. E. Obermiller making it the subject of our seminary study. He then has made an English translation which was revised by me and is now published".<sup>50</sup> This translation work was much more than a mere matter of changing the language. Bu-ston was one of the redactors of the *bKa'-gyur* and *bsTan'-gyur* great collections and his knowledge of the Buddhist texts was most profound. The work is full of quotations from the lost Indian texts. But, as was the practice of the Tibetan historians, Bu-ston referred to these texts by their abbreviated forms, from which it is most difficult

---

50. Stcherbatsky, Preface to Obermiller's *History of Buddhism*, Vol. i, p. 4.

to reconstruct their full titles. Obermiller not only reconstructed these titles but moreover traced to their sources practically all the passages quoted by Bu-ston—a feat which appears to us all the more incredible when we remember that he became an invalid at the age of twenty-seven : his right hand was paralysed and he had to remain completely bed-ridden up to the time of his death.

More imposing perhaps was Vostrikov's stature particularly as a Tibetologist, though his proficiency in Sanskrit and the mastery of the technicalities of Indian philosophical discussions were nothing short of being amazing.

It is well known that Stcherbatsky usually consulted him for the elucidation of the more difficult Tibetan texts, or, as Stcherbatsky himself acknowledged<sup>51</sup>, for the translation of "several hard passages" of the *Madhyānta-vibhaṅga*, he was indebted to Vostrikov. In the *Buddhist Logic*, again, Stcherbatsky said that, thanks to the researches of Vostrikov, the apparently baffling problem of the textual order of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇa-vārtika* was no more baffling after all.<sup>52</sup> Vostrikov edited the Tibetan version of the *Pramāṇa-vārtika* along with Debendrabuddhi's commentary on it, both of which he also translated. In 1935 appeared his study, *The Nyāya-vārtika of Uddyotakara and the Vādanyāya of Dharmakīrti*. It was Vostrikov's work on the *Logic of Vasubandhu*, again, that Stcherbatsky found most helpful for understanding the historical background of the thoughts of Dignāga. *The Grammar of Tibetan Language*, which Vostrikov left unfinished because of his early death, was later completed by Stcherbatsky.

In the field of Tibetan studies, however, the most significant contribution of Vostrikov was his *Tibetan Historical Literature*, published in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* series in 1962, i.e. about twenty-five years after his death. This monumental study—a classic on the subject—could have easily been the life-work of any front-rank scholar, particularly of one who died so early. But Vostrikov was more versatile. He edited the text of the *Kālacakra* (in Sanskrit) based on two manuscripts (one of which was recovered by Minaev in India) and a Tibetan translation. Jointly with Ol'denburg, Stcherbatsky, Obermiller and Semichov, he worked on the translation of the *Arthaśāstra*. From the announcement of 1930 concerning the publications under progress in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* series it appears that he also translated the enormous *Nyāya-vārtika-tātparyā-ṭīkā* of Vācaspati Mīśra, though the translation is not yet published.

We have thus some idea of Stcherbatsky as well as of his teachers, colleagues and pupils. What led him to take such an all-absorbing interest in the Indian cultural heritage is not fully known. This much is certain, however, that it was

51. Stcherbatsky, Preface to the *Madhyānta-vibhaṅga* p. iv.

52. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, i.38.

not any romantic fascination for the half unknown mystic East in which some of his European contemporaries were seeking an escape from the sickness and degradation of their own capitalist society. Certainly, again, it had nothing to do with the peculiarly perverted moral sanction for colonial exploitation which another section of his European contemporaries was trying to derive by depicting Indian culture as being inherently stunted in matters of science and rationalism: it helped them to feel superior by imagining that the Indians had never been any better than idle dreamers of the path leading to an escape from the world or *samsāra* and were therefore naturally doomed to servitude and slavery. Stcherbatsky had positively and absolutely nothing to do with any such tendency.

On the contrary he showed definite distaste for any romantic fascination for the mystic East and he was the first among the European scholars to have insisted on the importance of recognising India's contribution to science and rationalism. Along with Ol'denburg, one of the remedies he suggested for the perverted but popular notion of the Indian cultural heritage was to work for making available more adequate and objective data about Indian thought, specially in its logical and scientific aspects. "At the suggestion of S. F. Ol'denburg", wrote he, "the Academy of Sciences decided to undertake the publication of translations of monumental works on Indian philosophy from Sanskrit and other Oriental languages... Our knowledge in this field still could not be deemed to be more than a mere conjecture on the nature of Indian philosophy. The main Indian philosophical system, the one that diligently worked out Indian logic and epistemology—the Nyāya system—still remained to be studied and its main treatises were yet to be translated into any European language. Buddhism and Jainism still remained primarily religious teachings, and their philosophical principles vague and inconsistent. The Indian thought on the whole still remained enveloped in the mist of Oriental fantasy and the orderly forms of its consistent logical theories were hidden from the keen sight of the historians of philosophy owing first to the inadequacy of the materials available to them and second to the lack of any systematic methods of its scientific study. Besides this stage of scientific knowledge, there could be discerned, in the wider circles of reading public, a *morbid interest in Indian philosophy* caused by the hazy state of our knowledge of the subject and the various fables of supernatural powers rampant therein. Of course, the latter circumstance also springs from the fact that compared to European philosophy, the Indian thought is pervaded by mystic moods, states of philosophical immersion into pure thought, ecstasy and similar states to a much greater extent. Ecstatic states almost invariably play some role in most of the Indian philosophical systems. But mysticism in the object of our study does not at all give us the right to convert our knowledge of it into some new mysticism."<sup>53</sup> Elsewhere he warned

---

53. See p. 73 of the present collection of papers.

against an over-simplified view of Indian philosophy, pervaded throughout by mysticism as it were : "Just as the European mind is not altogether and always free from mysticism, so is the Indian mind not at all necessarily subjected to it. Not to speak about the numerous materialistic doctrines, the orthodox Mimāṃsakas themselves held about *yoga* an opinion which probably represents just what all of us, so far as we are not mystics, think about it, viz. that *yoga* is sheer imagination, just as any other ordinary fanaticism."<sup>54</sup>

We have in these statements some idea of Stcherbatsky's approach to Indian philosophy in general. He did not overlook or ignore the influence of mysticism and religion in Indian philosophy, but he had absolutely nothing to do with those who saw only these in Indian philosophy. On the contrary, what made the Indian philosophical tradition really important for him was the solid logical core of it and the discussion of vital philosophical problems in terms of philosophy proper. To ignore this was to show only a "morbid interest in Indian philosophy"—the kind of interest which was most popular among his European contemporaries.

But what it was that helped Stcherbatsky himself to avoid such a morbid interest? N. P. Anikeev suggests that at least an important factor that contributed to the mental make-up of Stcherbatsky was the growing strength of the democratic movement in Russia which heralded the October Revolution. The Russian intellectuals connected with this democratic movement—themselves struggling against exploitations and imperialist designs of the Czarist regime of their time—felt no need to evolve any rationale for colonial exploitation of the Indian people or to deny them the human dignity, to portray them as inherently stunted in science and rationalism. On the contrary, these intellectuals created in their country an atmosphere of broad sympathy for the oppressed people of India and thus helped the Russian Indologists to develop a different methodological approach to the Indian cultural heritage : "What is the reason for this advantage of Russian Indologists over most of their Western counterparts? This question is in need of a detailed consideration. Yet we can mention here one obvious reason for this difference. Undoubtedly, it is because of the general atmosphere of sympathy and friendly feelings towards the oppressed peoples of the East nurtured in Russia in the 19th century under the influence of Russian revolutionary democracy in which the progressive intelligentsia was brought up. It is sufficient to mention that the organs of revolutionary democrats like *Otechestvennye Zapisky* and *Soyremennik* regularly published in their pages materials and reviews on the life of the Eastern peoples, including that of India...N. G. Chernyshevsky and N. A. Dobrolyubov were highly interested in the East, particularly in India, and devoted many moving articles to India, in which, by exposing the groundlessness of Europeo-centrism, they highly

estimated the achievements of the people of East in the field of culture, warmly supported them in their struggle for national independence and condemned the colonial rampage of the capitalist 'civilizers'...Chernyshevsky was one of the first Russian thinkers who, even in the middle of the 19th century opposed the then widely prevalent view-point that Greece was the homeland of philosophy. He emphatically argued that 'all this is only due to the lack of knowledge about the East in those times'. Like most of the Russian scholars, Chernyshevsky highly estimated the level of scientific and philosophical thoughts of the Indian nation. In his opinion, the ancient Indians were not only in no way inferior to the ancient Greeks but in many respects were undoubtedly superior to them".<sup>55</sup>

Sharing as he did the intellectual atmosphere created by the Russian revolutionary democrats, Stcherbatsky could easily avoid "the morbid interest in Indian philosophy" and work for the grand reconstruction of the Indian logical tradition which was largely forgotten to the Indians themselves.

Yet we cannot help wondering to-day how immensely the importance of this reconstruction would have increased but for Stcherbatsky's personal bias for the philosophy of Kant. In the *Buddhist Logic* we freely come across "the thing-in-itself", "the schematism of the categories", "the synthesis of Apperception", the division of judgments into *a priori* and *a posteriori* as well as into analytic and synthetic—and so on. And not merely Kant. In the writings of the same medieval Indian philosophers, he reads Bergson's *duration*, Russell's *sense-data* and a whole host of ideas of the decadent European philosophy. All these create serious difficulty for an objective understanding of "Buddhist logic" in its concrete historical context, and, what is perhaps worse particularly from the point of view of the contemporary Soviet historians of world-philosophy, this tendency of Stcherbatsky tended to obscure the basic struggle in Indian philosophy, which was inevitably the struggle between idealism and materialism. But I need not go here into the details of all these particularly because the contemporary Soviet philosophers, with all their respect for Stcherbatsky as the builder of the generation of modern Indologists, have themselves discussed this limitation of Stcherbatsky and have given us sufficient critical caution against it.<sup>56</sup>

Calcutta  
November 30, 1969

Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya  
Editor  
*Indian Studies : Past & Present*

55. N. P. Anikeev, *op.cit.*, 38-40.

56. See, for example, I. M. Kutasova, *Buddhist Philosophy and Logic in the works of Academician Stcherbatsky* (in Russian),—"Sovetskoe vostokovedenie", 1958, 3, pp. 136-143.

## Appendix A

## A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TH. STCHERBATSKY'S WRITINGS

## PART I

## MONOGRAPHS, ARTICLES, TRANSLATIONS, ETC

*Only the first editions are listed. Entries under each heading are in chronological order*

## A. MONOGRAPHS

- 1 *Teoriya poznaniya i logika po ucheniyu pozdneishikh buddistov* [Theory of Knowledge and Logic According to Later Buddhists]. St. Petersburg, 1903-1909 (Izd. fak. vost. yazykov Imp. Sankt-peterburgskogo universiteta. No. 14).  
*Contents.*—Pt. I. *Uchebnik logiki Darmakirti, s tolkovaniem na nego Darmottary* [Russian translation of Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* and Dharmottara's *Nyāyabindu-ṭikā*]. Pt. II. *Uchenie o vospriyatii i umozaklyuchenii* [Study of Perception and Inference].
- 2 *The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the Word "Dharma"*. London, Royal Asiatic Society, 1923. 112 p. (*Prize Publication Fund*. Vol. VII).
- 3 *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*. Leningrad, AN, SSSR, 1927. vi, 246 p. This work, brought out in criticism of Poussin's *Nirvāṇa*, gives a comprehensive and constructive survey of the later Buddhist philosophy.
- 4 *Buddhist Logic*. 2 vols. Leningrad, AN, SSSR, 1930-1932. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*. xxvi).  
Vol. 2 contains an English translation of Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* and Dharmottara's *Nyāyabindu-ṭikā*.

## B. ARTICLES

- 1 *Lunsaḍi Plates of Śilāditya II*; [Gupta-] *Samvat 350*. "Epigraphia Indica", Calcutta, 1896-97, v. IV, pp. 74-81. (Jointly with Vajeshankar G. Ojha).
- 2 *Logika v drevnei Indii* [Logic in Ancient India]. "Zapiski Vost. Otd. Imp. Russ. Arkheol. Obshchestva", St. Petersburg, 1902, v. 14, No. 3, pp. 155-173.

- 3 *Teoriya poezii v Indii* [Theory of Poetry in India]. "Zhurn. Minist. Narod. Prosveshcheniya", St. Petersburg, 1902, Ch. 341, No. 6, Sec. 2, pp. 299-329.
- 4 *Rapports entre la theorie bouddhique de la connaissance et l'enseignement des autres ecoles philosophiques de l'Inde*. "Museon", Brussels, 1904, nouv. ser., vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 129-171.
- 5 *Buddiiskii filosof o edinobozhii* [A Buddhist Philosopher on Monotheism]. "Zapiski Vost. Otd. Imp. Rus. Arkheol. Obshestva", St. Petersburg, 1904, v. 16, No. 1, pp. 058-074.
- 6 *Notes de litterature bouddhique. La litterature Yogācāra d'apres Bouston*. "Museon", Brussels, 1905, vol. 6, pp. 144-155.  
A translation, in French, of an extract from Bu-ston's *chos-'byuñ*—devoted to the literature of the Yogācāra school.
- 7 *Kratkii otchet o komandirovke v Indiyu* (v 1910 g.) [A Short Report on the Trip to India (in 1910)]. "Izvestiya russkogo komiteta dlya izucheniya Srednei i Vostochnoi Azii v istor., arkheol., lingvist. i etnogr. otnosheni-yakh", St. Petersburg, 1912, Ser. 2, No. 1, pp. 70-75.
- 8 *Uchenie o kategoricheskom imperativе u brakhmanov* [Study of Categorical Imperative in Brāhmaṇa-s]. "Sbornik Muzeya antropol. i etnogr. pri Ros. Akad. nauk", Petrograd, 1918, v. 5, No. 1, p. 359-370.
- 9 *The Soul Theory of the Buddhists*. "Izvestiya Ros. Akad. nauk", Petrograd, 1920, Ser. 6, v. 13, No. 15, p. 823-854; No. 18, p. 937-958.
- 10 *Nauchnye dostizheniya drevnei Indii* [Scientific Achievements of Ancient India]. In *Otchet o deyatel'nosti Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk za 1923 god* [Report on the Work of the Russian Academy of Sciences for the Year 1923], compiled by S. F. Ol'denburg and read at the meeting of the Academy held on 2nd February, 1924. Leningrad, 1924, pp. 1-25.
- 11 *K istorii materializma v Indii* [On History of Materialism in India]. "Vostochnye zapiski Leningr. instituta zhivyykh vostochnykh yazykov", Leningrad 1927, v. 1, pp. 1-10.
- 12 *Ueber den Begriff vijñāna im Buddhismus*. "Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik", Leipzig, 1929, Bd. 7, Hf. 1, s. 136-139.
- 13 *Dignāga's Theory of Perception*. "Journal of Taisho University", Tokyo, 1930, vol. 6-7.
- 14 *The Doctrine of the Buddha*. "Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies", London, 1932, vol. 6, pt. 4, pp. 867-896.
- 15 *Die drei Richtungen in der Philosophie des Buddhismus*. "Rocznik orientalistyczny", Lwow, 1934, v. 10, pp. 1-37.
- 16 *Selbstanzeige*. "Rocznik orientalistyczny", Lwow, 1934, pp. 179-185.
- 17 *The "Dharmas" of the Buddhists and the "Guṇas" of the Sāṃkhya*s. "Indian Historical Quarterly", Calcutta, 1934, v. 10, pp. 737-60.



## C. ADDRESSES, LECTURES, ETC

- 1 *Filosofskoe uchenie buddizma* [Philosophical Study of Buddhism]. Petrograd, 1919, 48 p.  
A Speech made at the inauguration of the first Buddhist exhibition in St. Petersburg on 24th August, 1919.

## D. TRANSLATIONS

- 1 Dharmakīrti. *Obosnovanie chuzoi odushevlenosti. S tolkovaniem Vinītadeva* [Establishment of the Existence of Other Minds. With Vinītadeva's Commentary]. Translated from Tibetan. Petrograd, 1922, xv, 79 p. (*Pamyatniki indiiskoi filosofii*. No. 1).  
A double translation into Russian—one free and the other literal—of Dharmakīrti's *Santānāntara-siddhi* and Vinītadeva's *Santānāntara-siddhi-tika*.
- 2 Daṇḍin. *Priklyucheniya desyati printsev*. [Adventures of Ten Princes]. Translated from Sanskrit. "Vostok", Moscow-Petrograd, 1923, No. 3, pp. 50-82; Moscow-Leningrad, 1924, No. 4, pp. 65-96; 1925, No. 5, pp. 16-46.  
A Russian translation of *D.śakumāracarita*.
- 3 Maitreya, Bodhisattva. *Madhyānta-Vibhāṅga. Discourse on Discrimination between Middle and Extremes, ascribed to Bodhisattva Maitreya and commented by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati*. Translated from Sanskrit. Moscow-Leningrad, AN, SSSR, 1936, viii, 106 p., 58 p. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xxx).

## E. PREFACES

- 1 *Indices Verborum Sanskrit-Tibetan and Tibetan-Sanskrit to the Nyāyabindu of Dharmakīrti and the Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā of Dharmottara*. Comp. by E. Obermiller with a pref. by Th. Stcherbatsky. From the edition of the Sanscrit and Tibetan texts by Th. Stcherbatsky. 2 vols.—Leningrad, AN, SSSR, 1927-1928. (*Bibl. Buddhica*, xxiv, xxv).
- 2 Bu-ston. *History of Buddhism (chos-'byuñ)*. Pt. 1-2.—Leipzig-Heidelberg, 1931-1932. *Materialen zur Kunde des Buddhismus*. Hrsg. von M. Walleser. Hft. 18-19).  
Pt. I.—*The Jewellery of Scripture*. Transl. from Tibetan by E. Obermiller. With an introd. by Th. Stcherbatsky. 187 p.

## PART II

## SANSKRIT/TIBETAN TEXTS EDITED &amp; PUBLISHED

*Entries arranged under the names of the authors of the texts*

## Dharmakīrti

*Nyāyabindu* : *Buddiiskii uchebnik logiki, sochinenie Dharmakīrti i tolkovanie na nego Nyayabindutika, sochinenie Dharmottary* [Nyāyabindu : A Buddhist Treatise on Logic by Dharmakīrti, along with Dharmottara's Commentary Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā].

Fasc. I [Sanskrit text, published with introduction and notes by Th. Stcherbatsky]. Petrograd, 1918. ii, 95 p. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, vii).

Fasc. I & II [Tibetan translation, published with introduction and notes by Th. Stcherbatsky]. St. Petersburg, 1904. iv, 222 p. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, viii).

*Santānāntara-siddhi. Tibetskii perevod sochinenii Santānāntara-siddhi Dharmakīrti i Santānāntara-siddhi-ṭīkā Vinītadeva vmeste s tibetskim tolkovaniem, sostavlenym Agvanom Dandar-lkharamboi.* [Santānāntara-siddhi. Tibetan translations of Dharmakīrti's Santānāntara-siddhi and Vinītadeva's Santānāntara-siddhi-ṭīkā, together with another commentary in Tibetan by Agvan Dandar Lha-rampa].

Fasc. I & II [Published with introduction by Th. Stcherbatsky]. Petrograd, 1916. xviii, 129 p. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*. xix).

- ? *Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā-ṭippaṇī. Tolkovanie na sochinenie Dharmottary Nyāyabinduṭīkā.* [Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā-ṭippaṇī : A Commentary on Dharmottara's Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā]. Sanskrit text, published with notes by Th. Stcherbatsky, St. Petersburg, 1909. iv, 43, 5 p. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xi).

This work is anonymous.

## Maitreya, Bodhisattva

*Abhisamayālaṅkāra-parajñāpāramitā-upadeśa-śāstra. The Work of Bodhisattva Maitreya.* Ed., expl. and translated by Th. Stcherbatsky and E. Obermiller.

Fasc. I [Contains Introduction, Sanskrit text and Tibetan translation]. Lenin-grad, AN, SSSR, 1929. xii, 112 p. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xxiii, fasc. 1).

## Vasubandhu

*Tibetskii perevod Abhidharmakoṣakārikāḥ i Abhidharmakoṣabhāṣyam sochinenii Vasubandhu.* Izd. F. I. Shcherbatskoi [Tibetan Translation of Abhidharmakoṣa-kārikā and Abhidharmakoṣa-bhāṣyam, the works of Vasubandhu. Published by Th. Stcherbatsky].

Part I [Tibetan text. Edited by Stcherbatsky]. Petrograd, 1917. pp. 1-96. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xx, pt. i).

Part II. Leningrad, AN, SSSR, 1930, pp. 97-192 (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xx).

## Yaśomitra

*Sphutārthā Abhidharmakoṣa-vyākhyā, the work of Yaśomitra.*

First Koṣasthāna [Sanskrit text. Edited by Sylvain Levi and Th. Stcherbatsky]. Petrograd, 1918. vii, 96 p., (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xxi).

Second Koṣasthāna [Sanskrit text. Edited by U. Wogihara and Th. Stcherbatsky and carried through the press by E. E. Obermiller]. Leningrad, AN, SSSR, 1931, 96 p. (*Bibliotheca Buddhica*, xxi).

## Hari Kavi, son of Nārāyaṇa Sūri, also styled Bhānubhaṭṭa

*Ueber das Haihayendracarita des Harikavi.* "Zapiski Imp. AN Po ist.-fil. otdeleniyu", St. Petersburg, 1900, v. 4, No. 9, pp. i-xii, 1-112.

Publication of Sanskrit text, its translation into German, and study of the epic poem of Hari, the Indian poet who lived in the second half of 7th century.

## Appendix B

### EXTRACT FROM THE CATALOGUE OF MATERIALS FROM STCHERBATSKY'S COLLECTION

#### PRESERVED IN THE ARCHIVES OF THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, USSR

Reproduced from

*Arkhiv Akademii nauk SSSR. Obozrenie arkhivnykh materialov.*  
Moscow-Leningrad, 1959

(Translated from Russian)

[These materials from the personal collection of Th. Stcherbatsky were received by the Archives of the Academy of Sciences, USSR from Stcherbatsky's widow in 1942 and from the Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences USSR in 1954. A brief catalogue of this collection, compiled by Profesor V. I. Kal'yanov, appeared in *Arkhiv Akademii nauk SSSR. Obozrenie arkhivnykh materialov* (v. 4, Moscow-Leningrad, 1959). The scope of this catalogue can be seen from the following note of the Editors :

"It is not possible at present to give complete and accurate bibliographical particulars of the materials included here, for without a careful investigation it is not possible to know whether these materials have been published—in the form in which they are preserved in the archives. This would have held up the publication of this preliminary survey for a considerably long time. Therefore, the remarks 'not published' are made only for those items for which there is absolute certainty that they have not yet been published".]

#### I

##### ON INDIAN EPIGRAPHY

(Jointly with V. G. Ojha)—*Lunsaḍī Plates of Śīlāditya II*

#### II

##### ON INDIAN THEORY OF POETRY

Sanskrit poem *Haihayendracarita* (text in Sanskrit language with variant readings) ; German translation of Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* and an extract from the

Russian translation of this work ; Russian translation (in part) of Jagannātha's *Rasagaṅgādhara*.

### III

#### ON SANSKRIT GRAMMAR AND LANGUAGE

Russian translation of *Grammar of Sanskrit Language* by Varadarāja (incomplete); *Sanskrit-Russian Glossary to Bühler's Text Book* (in part); Lexicographical materials on Sanskrit language (for various masterpieces of Sanskrit literature—in separate note books).

### IV

#### ON TIBETAN GRAMMAR AND LANGUAGE

*Opredeliteli kornei v tibetskom yazyke* [Root Determinants in Tibetan Language]; Materials on Tibetan grammar and language.

### V

#### ON INDIAN (BUDDHIST) PHILOSOPHY

*Buddiiskii filosof o edinobozhii* [A Buddhist Philosopher on Monotheism]; *Notes de littérature bouddhique. La littérature Yogācāra d'après Bouston*; *Kratkii uchebnik logiki Darmakīrti s tolkovaniem Darmottary* [Dharmakīrti's treatise on logic, with Dharmottara's commentary]; *O vospriyatii posredstvom vnutrennego organa chuvstv* [On Perception by Internal Sense Organ]; *Buddhist Logic* (Loose sheets of the manuscript in English along with author's own review of the work in German language); *The Doctrine of the Buddha*; *Dignāga's Theory of Perception*; *There is no soul* (Buddhism. II); *Das Hinayāna* (a preliminary draft of the article *Die drei Richtungen in der Philosophie des Buddhismus*); *Madhyānta Vibhaṅga* (Loose sheets of the manuscript in English); *The Problem of the Reality of Relations in Indian Philosophy* (a rough copy with notes); *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (in Russian); *Nyāya-Bhāṣya* (in German and English); *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* (English translation); *Nyāya-kārikā* (in English); Translations, notes and studies on Buddhist logic (in English and partly in Russian); *Vyatireka* (Russian translation of a passage, in śloka, on "contraposition"); *Kṣaṇikatva I. II (Causality)* (A Study in English); *Pramāṇa-viniścaya* (in English); *Apoha. Jinendrabuddhi. I-III* (English translation of the philosophical treatise); Notes to *Kaṇikā-bhāṣya* and passages from English translation of *Nyāya-kaṇikā*; *Preface* to the English translation of *koṣasthāna*; *Prajñākaramati's commentary on Bodhicaryāvatāra* (Tibetan text with Russian translation); English translation of an article by A. I. Vostrikov on *Vādaividhi*; Introduction to E. E. Obermiller's *Prajñāpāramitā-ratnagaṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (or *Samcaya*); Russian translation (in part) of *Nyāya Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya*; Russian

translation of (*Śabda-vyāpāra-vidhi*) ; *On the school of Mimāṃsakas* (in German) ; Passages from German translation of *Nyāya-kaṇikā* ; *Study of the Theory of Knowledge and Logic* (in Russian) ; Russian translation of the Tibetan work of Vasubandhu—*Abhidharmakoṣa* ; English translation of *Madhyānta-vibhaṅga-śāstra-bhāṣya-ṭīkā* and the relevant materials ; *Ācārya-Bhavyasya Mādhyamika-hṛdayam (Tarkajvālāparābhidhānam)* ; *Ācārya-Śervāski-Vostrikophābhyām sampāditaṃ sam-pūritaṅca* (Sanskrit manuscript of *Mādhyamika-hṛdayam*, prepared by F. I. Stcherbatskoi and A. I. Vostrikov) ; *Śākyabuddhi* (Tibetan text), and also *Kārikā* and *Vṛtti* ; Polemic with Īśvarasena (Tibetan text and English translation) ; Russian translations of individual portions from *Abhidharmakoṣa* ; English translations of individual portions from *Abhidharmakoṣa-bhāṣya* ; Excerpts and English translations of individual sections and chapters of Buddhist philosophical works (*Nyāyabindu*, *Madhyānta-vibhaṅga* etc.) ; German translation of philosophical works *Pātāñjala-darśanam* ; Russian translation of the third chapter from *Mādhyamikavṛtti* (entitled *Caḡsurādīndriyaparīkṣā*) ; *The Conception of Buddhistic Nirvāṇa* (an article in English language) ; *Vācaspatimiśra on the Reality of Relation* (An extract from Russian translation of *Nyāya-kaṇikā*) ; Sanskrit and Tibetan indexes to various texts.

## VI

## ON HISTORY OF INDOLOGY

*S. F. Ol'denburg as an Indologist* (An article and obituary).

## VII

## TRANSLATIONS OF LITERARY MASTERPIECES

Daṇḍin's *Dāśakumāracarita* (Daṇḍin's *Adventures of Ten Princes*)—content of second chapter, Russian and German translations of its extracts and a vocabulary to the text, Russian translations from Chapters I, V and VI, translation of Chapter VIII and the conclusion ; Russian translation of *Pāñcatantra* (beginning) ; a translation in verse of the first 7 verses from Kālidāsa's lyrical poem *Meghaçūtam* (The Cloud-Messenger) ; translation of 22 verses from Kālidāsa's epic poem *Raghuvamśa*.

## VIII

## TEXTS OF MANUSCRIPTS (SANSKRIT AND TIBETAN)

*Amarakoṣa* (Tibetan text, re-written by F. I. Shcherbatskoi) ; *Abhisamaya I. Pramāṇa-samuccaya* (Tibetan text and loose sheets of the manuscript in English) ;

*Koṣa-Kārikā II* (Tibetan text); *Prajñā-pāramitā* (Tibetan and Sanskrit text); *Amṛta-kaṇikā* (Sanskrit text); *Pramāṇa-viniścaya* and *Hetubindu-prakarṇam* (Tibetan text); Tibetan text of Russian-British agreement of 18/31 August, 1907 on Tibet; *Kṣaṇabhaṅga-siddhi* (Sanskrit text in Latin transcription); photocopies from Sanskrit, Tibetan and Pali manuscripts and also from the manuscripts in Kharoṣṭhī script and articles in Hindi and Urdu; photocopies of wall paintings from Buddhist temples.

## IX

### ON EXPEDITIONARY ACTIVITY

Notes made at the time of travels in Urgu (note-book); *A Short Report on the Trip to India* (a rough manuscript); photocopies throwing light on the life and customs of the Mongols (made at the time of travels in Mongolia).

## X

### COMMENTS ON THE WORK OF OTHER SCHOLARS

On S. Agrell's work on *Accents in Russian Language* (in German); On A. I. Vostrikov's *Tibetan Historical Literature*; On V. I. Kal'yanov's *Slozhnye slova v Sanskrite* [Complex words in Sanskrit]; On W. Ruben's *Die Nyāyasūtras* (in German); Stanislaw Schayer's *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannapadā*; On A. A. Stael Holstein's work on the restoration of text of three Sanskrit hymns—submitted by him to the Faculty of Oriental Languages for obtaining an academic degree; A review of the research work done by E. E. Obermiller (A review made jointly with I. Yu. Krachkovsky when Obermiller's name was being considered for Associate Membership of the Academy of Sciences.)

## LETTERS

### From Th. Stcherbatsky

The addressees include: A. M. Deborin, A. E. Fersman, V. L. Komarov, Emile Senart, H. G. Wells, James Woods, etc.

### To Th. Stcherbatsky

The correspondents include: V. M. Alekseev, S. A. Arrhenius, B. B. Baradiin, A. Barth, V. V. Bartol'd, D. R. Bhandarkar, Swami Durga Chaitanya Bharati, V. Bhattacharyya, F. A. Braun, Bernhard Breloer, Jarl Charpentier, Suniti Kumar Chatterji, S. N. Dasgupta, M. F. Dostoevsky, Nalinaksha Dutt, M. R.

Fasmer, Richard von Garbe, Helmuth von Glasenapp, Vasudeva Gokhale, A. Grünwedel, Johannes Hertel, Alfred Hillebrandt, Hermann Jacobi, Swami Jagadiswarananda, S. Jain, Ganganatha Jha, D. B. Kalelkar, P. L. Kapitsa, A. B. Keith, V. L. Komarov, Sten Konow, Dharmanand Kosambi, V. L. Kotvich, D. N. Kudryavsky, Bimala Churn Law, Narendra Nath Law, Ernst Leumann, Sylvain Levi, Heinrich Luders, E. D. Maclagan, N. Ya. Marr, Yu. N. Marr, Paul Masson-Oursel, J. Masuda, E. Meyer, V. F. Minorsky, M. G. Mittag-Leffler, M. A. Mookerji, Kalidas Nag, Narendra Deva, J. Nobel, E. E. Obermiller, S. F. Ol'denburg, Paul Pelliot, Henri Pirenne, N. A. Podkopaev, Jean Przyluski, Raghu Vira, T. N. Ramachandran, S. A. Rhys Davids, E. D. Ross, F. A. Rozenberg, O. O. Rozenberg, Walter Ruben, Rahula Sankrityayana, Lakshman Sarup, K. Sastri, S. Sastri, Stanislaw Schayer, F. O. Schrader, Emile Senart, R. Sh masastri, Mahendranath Sircar, Otto Strauss, Luigi Sualì, V. I. Suri, Rabindranath Tagore, F. W. Thomas, M. I. Tubyansky, G. Tucci, P. L. Vaidya, Louis de la Vallee Poussin, Siddheshwar Varma, V. I. Vernadsky, B. Ya. Vladimirtsov, V. Vondrak, A. I. Vostrikov, M. Walleser, Friedrich Weller, M. Winternitz, James Woods, R. Yamada, F. F. Zelinsky, etc.



## ERRATA

<i>page</i>	<i>line</i>	<i>as printed</i>	<i>should be</i>
3	19	T. W. Thomas	F. W. Thomas
	31	1930	1903
9	2	Consciousness	Knowledge
	from below		
10	17	[known]	[certain]
	from below		
11	1	He makes the non-existent	He makes the non-existent existent
24	6	Ego-khe	<i>Idem.</i>
	from below		
27	9	Just as	As
84	15	its	their