

NORTH AMERICAN BUDDHIST STUDIES:
A CURRENT SURVEY OF THE FIELD

CHARLES S. PREBISH

Introduction

In 1959 and 1960, Edward Conze wrote three segmented articles, published in the *Middle Way*, entitled “Recent Progress in Buddhist Studies.” These were collected and eventually published in his volume *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies: Selected Essays by Edward Conze*. By that time two geographic “schools” of Buddhology had been identified: the so-called Anglo-German and Franco-Belgian schools. To these, Conze added a third: the Leningrad school. Each school was essentially defined not only by location, but also by emphasis. Conze was not the only scholar to research the nature of the Buddhist Studies discipline. Jan de Jong published two articles, in the 1974 and 1984 issues of the *Eastern Buddhist*, which were eventually collected into his book *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America*. While offering much interesting data, a consideration of Buddhist Studies in America was virtually absent from the volume, despite its title. More recently North American scholars have begun to investigate the discipline of Buddhist Studies. In 1983, Charles Prebish published “Buddhist Studies American Style: A Shot in the Dark” in that year’s *Religious Studies Review*. More than a decade later, in 1994, he published “The Academic Study of Buddhism in the United States: A Current Analysis” in *Religion*. That same year Malcolm David Eckel published “The Ghost at the Table: On the Study of Buddhism and the Study of Religion” in the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. The following year, the *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* devoted an entire issue to the topic

of Buddhist Studies as an academic discipline, including insightful articles by David Seyfort Ruegg, José Cabezón, and Luis Gómez. Coupled with the success of the Buddhism Section of the American Academy of Religion, the rapid growth of the number of Buddhist Studies scholars on the North American continent, and the large number of venues for Buddhist Studies publication in North America, it was becoming clear that a “North American School of Buddhist Studies” was developing which rivaled, and perhaps even surpassed, the earlier schools noted above. This rapid growth and development has literally begged for analysis and evaluation. This paper, and the three that follow it are the products of a panel entitled “The Academic Discipline of Buddhist Studies in North America presented at the XVth Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies,” held at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia (USA) from June 23–28, 2008.

In the Winter 1991 issue of the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, former editor Ray L. Hart was afforded 112 pages to present the results of a survey entitled “Religious and Theological Studies in American Higher Education: A Pilot Study.”¹ Thirty-five pages of his “report” were devoted to a presentation of the statistical evidence gleaned from a questionnaire distributed to 678 faculty members at 11 types of institutions; the rest of the space was devoted to Hart’s interpretive narrative. Interestingly, he devotes an entire section of that narrative to a consideration of the key questions: “What is the relation between the *study* of religion and theology and the *practice* of religion?” and “What should the relation be?” Perhaps as expected, he could find only one statement on which all faculty everywhere agree: “One who practices religion

¹ See Ray L. Hart, “Religious and Theological Studies in American Higher Education: A Pilot Study,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 59, 4 (Winter 1991), 715–827.

needs to study it.”² This of course begs the larger question, and Hart tries to clarify the three obvious positions he elicited:³

1. The first view is that the study of religion and the practice of religion are two integral “terms;” each has its “site” and the two are not internally related.
2. The second view is that “the relation is completely open.”
3. The third view will by now be obvious: the study of religion presupposes practice, and is undertaken to prepare for and enhance practice.

Hart’s useful findings have already been widely utilized in the discipline, clearly reflecting the perceived importance of self-definition and self-recognition within the broad profession of Religious Studies.

Curiously, Hart’s findings were nearly chronologically coincident with a five-year administrative review of the Buddhism Section of the American Academy of Religion, arguably the largest academic arena for Buddhologists in North America (if not the entire world). AAR’s external evaluator for that review, Professor Malcolm David Eckel of Boston University, noted in his December 1991 report:

The most important achievement of the Buddhism Group and Section at the AAR in the last 10 years has been to create a safe and reliable forum for Buddhist scholars who represent a wide variety of approaches, disciplines, and geographical orientations to exchange views and build bonds of cooperation and understanding that create an active and imaginative scholarly community.⁴

² Hart, “Religious and Theological Studies in American Higher Education,” 779.

³ *Ibid.*, 780–81.

⁴ Malcolm David Eckel, “Review and Evaluation of the Buddhism Section of the American Academy of Religion,” 1991, 2.

In a later article,⁵ Eckel revealed that in the five years between 1986 and 1991, the attendance at the Buddhism Section's annual business meeting grew from 60 to 140, and the mailing list expanded from 106 to 600!

With interest piqued by the data included in Hart's report and the suppositions inherent in Eckel's, in October 1992, I set out to gather materials from the North American community of Buddhologists that would afford this community data similar to Hart's upon which to conduct a second level of self-reflection. It was clear from the outset that the 600-member mailing list mentioned above contained, in addition to so-called Buddhologists, a large number of scholars of other Asian religions, many non-specialist comparativists, and a profusion of "others." After careful sorting and synthesis, a list of 125 scholars whose primary teaching and research work fell within the discipline of Buddhist Studies was compiled, and these individuals were sent requests soliciting both data and narrative statements about the discipline. Following two additional requests, and with a rather surprising response rate of 69.6 percent (compared with Hart's 64 percent), the received material was collated. The preliminary results were presented in a paper at the 1993 AAR annual meeting in Washington, D.C. and published in the fledgling electronic journal *Gassho*, with the full results appearing slightly later in *Religion*,⁶ jointly published in England and the United States.

I should mention that my methodology then, and now, was a bit unusual. Most surveys simply ask a series of forthright questions: How many refereed articles have you published? In which journals

⁵ Malcolm David Eckel, "The Ghost at the Table: On the Study of Buddhism and the Study of Religion," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62, no. 4 (Winter 1994), 1088.

⁶ See *Gassho*, "The Academic Study of Buddhism in America: A Current Analysis," Volume 1, No. 2 (January-February 1994), and *Religion*, "The Academic Study of Buddhism in the United States: A Current Analysis," Volume 24 (1994), 271-78.

have you published? How many books have you authored or edited? How many major honors and/or grants have you been awarded? Tabulating results from questions such as these is a daunting task, complicated by the fact the various scholars have differing notions about what constitutes a refereed publication, what might be considered a “major” grant or fellowship, and so forth. Having served on more search committees than I care to remember, I am also well aware that scholars tend to exaggerate their credentials whenever possible, and I wanted to avoid that dilemma. I wanted to achieve as much consistency with regard to standards as possible. As such, I chose not to offer standard questions on a standard form. Instead, I simply requested a copy of each scholar’s *curriculum vitae* (along with any commentary they wished to provide). In this way, I could standardize the overall tabulation by determining in uniform fashion which journals could be counted as “refereed,” which awards could be considered “major,” and the like.

Later, a second survey was conducted, beginning in Fall 1995. In the intervening years, the survey list was updated, revised, and refined, reflecting the arrival of new scholars into the Buddhological community, the death of others, and shifting interests. Thus, the initial list of requests in the second survey numbered 140, with 106 responses received (or 75.7 percent). On an individual level, the results collected provided an ample view of the demographics of Buddhist Studies in America. With regard to individual training, I was able to document the gender, educational background, language facility, and the like for those polled. Institutionally, I tracked the respective academic rank of the respondents, the type of university in which they teach, and the specific department that employs each. I collected data on memberships in professional organizations, editorships held, geographical area(s) of specialization, grants and fellowships received, professional papers presented, honors awarded, and various categories of publications (including books, refereed articles, and book reviews). From the narratives included with many of the responses, I was able to determine a sense of the sample’s collective perception of those issues deemed critical

to the continuing development and advancement of the discipline. It was also possible to compile information on universities with extensive resources for the study of Buddhism.

In the years following the 1995 survey, no other scholar continued this line of empirical data collection, so in 2006 I decided to once again collect new materials to update and augment my earlier findings. In the intervening decade, one significant factor impacted the methodology for this new study overpoweringly: the Internet. It was no longer necessary to rely on the good wishes and patience of colleagues to collate and print out a copy of their latest *curriculum vitae*, send it along through the postal service, investing valuable time in the process. Now with a couple of mouse-clicks at their computer, they could dash off a Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF file of their materials in less than the time it takes me to read this sentence. Equally, on my end, it was no longer necessary to pour through page after page of cumbersome printed documents. Instead, I could scroll through the submitted materials, tally the results, post them to a computerized spreadsheet, and even have the totals calculated by my unfailing Microsoft Excel program. By 2006, my list of colleagues to be invited for participation in the study had grown to 189. Clearly, I am making no claims that this sample is unwaveringly comprehensive. Nonetheless, after four decades in the discipline of Buddhist Studies, and with numerous editorial duties for a number of professional societies – including the International Association of Buddhist Studies and the American Academy of Religion – I am confident that I have a thoroughly representative sample. Following my initial invitations, several follow-up reminders posted in early 2007, and a final invitation posted on H-Buddhism, I ended the study with 152 submissions (only six of which submitted hard copy versions); that is, an 80.4 percent submission rate. Because I changed professional positions during the 2006–2007 academic year, I delayed tallying the results until May 2007. At that time I was assisted in data processing by Mr. Joshua Pineault, my research assistant at Utah State University. It was his

significant investment of time that allowed me to bring the study to a final conclusion in the summer of 2007.

Individual Results

Regarding basic demographics, in Hart's survey, 85.4 percent of the respondents were male, 14.4 percent female, with .2 percent not answering (p. 796). In my 1995 sample, 83 percent were male, 17 percent female, representing a small increase in percentage of females from my previous investigation (which was 85.1 percent male, 14.9 percent female). The 2006 survey yielded 76.8% males and 23.2% females, clearly indicating a rise toward gender parity in the previous decade. Hart's survey revealed 90 percent of the respondents with one or more doctoral degrees; 9 percent with no doctoral degree; and 1 percent expecting the doctoral degree (p. 800). In my initial sample, 99.1 percent (105 of 106) had a Ph.D./Th.D. This was quite consistent with my 1995 survey, which revealed a 98.8 percent rate for doctoral degrees. My 2006 survey revealed a 98.0% rate for doctoral degrees. Not surprisingly, my 1995 sample seemed to suggest a slightly younger discipline overall than my initial sample: my first sample yielded 1975.9 as the average year for the granting of the terminal degree, whereas my 1995 sample showed 1980.0 as the average year. My latest 2006 sample shows 1989.3 as the average year. As expected, the newest survey yields the youngest rate for the overall discipline. In decades, the breakdown yields:

| Decade Ph.D/Th.D Granted | 1995 Respondents | 2006 Respondents |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2000s | 0 | 27 |
| 1990s | 21 | 49 |
| 1980s | 45 | 42 |
| 1970s | 25 | 24 |
| 1960s | 12 | 5 |
| 1950s | 1 | 0 |
| 1940s | 1 | 0 |
| Unlisted | 0 | 5 |

The majority of the respondents in my studies earned their doctorates at the following universities:

| University | 1993 Survey | 1995 Survey | 2006 Survey |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| University of Chicago | 8 | 14 | 19 |
| University of Wisconsin | 10 | 12 | 10 |
| Harvard University | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Columbia University | 5 | 10 | 14 |
| Yale University | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| University of Virginia | 7 | 7 | 9 |
| Stanford University | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| University of California (Berkeley) | 4 | 5 | 10 |
| Princeton University | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| Temple University | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Northwestern University | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| University of Michigan | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| University of Washington | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Tokyo University | 0 | 2 | 1 |

Leading the way in this category was Harvard University, which produced 20 Ph.D.s, doubling its 1995 total. The University of Chicago was close behind with 19 degrees, representing an increase

of 35.7% from its 1995. Third place honors go to the Columbia University with 14 degrees, a 40% increase from the last survey. New to the 2006 survey were the University of California (Santa Barbara) and McMaster University, with 3 Ph.D.s each, as well as McGill University, the University of California (Los Angeles), and the Australian National University, with 2 Ph.D.s each.

In my 1993 survey, 44.9 percent of those responding taught in various public institutions, while 55.1 percent were employed by private institutions. The 1995 sample closely mirrors that result, with 44.4 percent of those responding teaching in various public institutions, 52.8 percent employed by private institutions, and 2.8 percent employed in other professional settings. In the 2006 sample 50.7% taught in public institutions, 47.4% in private institutions, and 1.9% in other professional settings. Regarding rank, the following results were obtained:

| Rank | 1993 Survey | 1995 Survey | 2006 Survey |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Emeritus | – | 2.8% | 4.6% |
| Full Professor | 36.0% | 33.0% | 38.2% |
| Associate Professor | 31.4% | 33.0% | 27.0% |
| Assistant Professor | 22.1% | 22.7% | 23.0% |
| Lecturer | – | 3.8% | 2.0% |
| Other | 10.5% | 4.7% | 5.2% |

In the 1993 survey, the emeritus rank was combined with Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Dean, and Acting Dean. In the 1995 and 2006 surveys a separate category for Emeritus is listed.

In terms of specialization, any comparison between samples would be incongruous because, for the 1993 sample, only one primary specialization was recorded for each respondent, while in the 1995 sample, it became clear that in many cases, multiple specializations were emphasized. As such, in 1993, 37.0 percent of the

sample reported specializing in Japan/East Asia, while 29.6 percent reported India/South Asia, 23.5 percent Tibet/Inner Asia, 6.2 percent China/East Asia, 2.5 percent Korea/East Asia, and 1.2 percent indicated other choices. Bearing in mind that multiple listings were allowed in the 1995, yielding a total in excess of 100 percent, the survey showed Japan/East Asia and India/South Asia leading the way, with 36.8 percent and 34.9 percent respectively, followed by Tibet/Inner Asia with 20.8 percent, China/East Asia with 15.1 percent, Korea/East Asia with 1.9 percent, and 2.8 percent indicated other choices. For the 2006 sample, one primary specialization only was recorded, yielding 35.5 percent indicating India/South Asia, followed by Japan/East Asia (27.6 percent), China/East Asia (14.5 percent), Tibet/Inner Asia 11.8 percent), Korea/East Asia (2.0 percent), and 8.6 percent indicated other choices.

| Area | 1995 Respondents | Percent | 2006 Respondents | Percent |
|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Japan/East Asia | 39 | 36.8 | 42 | 27.6 |
| India/South Asia | 37 | 34.9 | 54 | 35.5 |
| Tibet/Inner Asia | 22 | 20.8 | 18 | 11.8 |
| China/East Asia | 16 | 15.1 | 22 | 14.5 |
| Korea/East Asia | 2 | 1.9 | 3 | 2.0 |
| Other Areas | 3 | 2.8 | 13 | 8.6 |

Language facility seems to be rather consistent with area specialization, taking into account that many scholars develop a multiplicity of language skills, and that Sanskrit appears to be the consistent foundation language from which other studies in Buddhism proceed:

| Language | 1995 Respondents | 2006 Respondents |
|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| Sanskrit | 59 | 48 |
| Japanese | 49 | 38 |
| Pali/Prakrit | 43 | 38 |
| Chinese | 37 | 34 |
| Tibetan | 33 | 37 |
| Korean | | 2 |

Other languages cited in 1995 include Hindi, Sinhalese, Nepali, Thai, Mongolian, Sogdian, and Vietnamese. In addition to these, the 2006 sample also yielded citations for Gandhari, Khotanese, Khmer, Newari, Lao, Uighur, and Burmese.

With regard to membership in professional and learned societies, Hart's study (p. 809) produced extremely surprising results, considering the nature of his sample. Of the seven most populated professional organizations, *four* had traditionally Asian constituencies: the Association for Asian Studies (2nd; 22 percent), American Oriental Society (4th; 17 percent), International Association of Buddhist Studies (tied for 6th; 8 percent), and the Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy (tied for 6th; 8 percent). Not unexpectedly, the American Academy of Religion topped the list with 67 percent, while the Society of Biblical Literature was third with 19 percent. In the Buddhist Studies sample, a wide variety of professional societies was noted. Presented below is a comparison of the 1993, 1995, and 2006 results:

| Organization | 1993 Percent (No.) | 1995 Percent (No.) | 2006 Percent (No.) |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Amer. Academy of Religion | 75.9% (66) | 87.7% (93) | 67.1% (102) |
| Association for Asian Studies | 57.5% (50) | 57.8% (61) | 42.1% (64) |

| Organization | 1993 Percent (No.) | 1995 Percent (No.) | 2006 Percent (No.) |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| International Assoc. of Buddhist Studies | 43.7% (38) | 47.2% (50) | 32.9% (50) |
| Society for Buddhist- Christian Studies | 19.5% (17) | 20.8% (22) | 12.5% (19) |
| Society for Asian and Comp. Philosophy | 17.2% (15) | 15.1% (16) | 7.9% (12) |
| American Oriental Society | 16.1% (14) | 12.3% (13) | 11.8% (18) |
| Society for the Study of Japanese Religions | 10.3% (9) | 11.3% (12) | 12.5% (19) |
| Society for the Study of Chinese Religions | 8.0% (7) | 11.3% (12) | 5.9% (9) |
| Society for Tantric Studies | – | 9.4% (10) | 2.6% (4) |
| International Assoc. of Shin Buddhist St. | 6.9% (6) | 8.5% (9) | 3.3% (5) |
| Pali Text Society | 6.9% (6) | 4.7% (5) | 9.2% (14) |

Other societies garnering multiple mention by the respondents in the 2006 sample, in decreasing order, include the International Association for the History of Religion, American Philosophical Association, American Society for the Study of Religion, and Buddhist Peace Fellowship. As expected, most respondents reported multiple, and often many, memberships. Many respondents in the most recent Buddhist Studies sample reported significant offices and administrative positions in the above societies. These include:

President (24)

American Academy of Religion: Midwest Region, Southeast Region, Western Region (1 each)

American Society for the Study of Religion (2)

Association of Peer-Reviewed Electronic Journals in Religion (1)

Australian Society of Asian and Comparative Philosophy (1)

Canadian Association for Studies of Asia (1)

Canadian Council for Southeast Asian Studies (2)
 International Association of for Tu-Yung Studies (1)
 International Association for Wonhyo Studies (1)
 International Association of Shin Buddhist Studies (1)
 International Association of Tibetan Studies (1)
 Kuroda Institute for the Study of Buddhism (1)
 Sakyadhita: International Association of Buddhist Women (1)
 Society for Buddhist-Christian Studies (4)
 Society for the Study of Japanese Religions (4)

Vice President (15)

American Academy of Religion: Middle Atlantic Region, Southeast Region,
 Western Region (1 each)
 American Society for the Study of Religion (1)
 Association of Peer-Reviewed Electronic Journals in Religion (1)
 Australian Society of Asian and Comparative Philosophy (1)
 Canadian Association for Studies of Asia (1)
 Canadian Association of South Asian Studies (1)
 Kuroda Institute for the Study of Buddhism (1)
 Society for Buddhist-Christian Studies (3)
 Society for the Study of Japanese Religions (3)

Treasurer (3)

American Academy of Religion: Japanese Religions Group (1)
 American Institute for Sri Lankan Studies (1)
 Society for Tantric Studies (1)

Secretary (5)

American Institute for Sri Lankan Studies (1)
 International Association of Buddhist Studies (1)
 Sakyadhita: International Association of Buddhist Women (1)
 Society for the Study of Japanese Religions (2)

General Secretary (4)

International Association of Buddhist Studies (3)
 Institute of Ethics and Politics (1)

Board Member (28)

American Academy of Religion (1)
 American Association for the Study of Religion (1)
 American Institute for Sri Lankan Studies (4)
 American Institute of Indian Studies (1)

Association for Asian Studies (2)
 Buddhist Peace Fellowship (1)
 International Association of Buddhist Studies (6)
 International Association of Tibetan Studies (1)
 Kuroda Institute for the Study of Buddhism (3)
 Mongolia Society (2)
 Nepal Studies Association (1)
 Society for Asian and Comparative Studies (1)
 Society for Buddhist Christian Studies (4)

Executive Council (9)

American Academy of Religion: Sri Lankan Studies Group (1)
 American Institute for Sri Lankan Studies (1)
 American Society for the Study of Religion (2)
 Association for Asian Studies-Korea (1)
 Institute for the Study of Religion and Culture (1)
 International Association of Buddhist Studies (1)
 International Council of Thai Studies (1)
 Society for Buddhist Christian Studies Advisory Council (1)

Chair/Co-Chair (32)

American Academy of Religion (26)

- Asian Religions (1)
- Buddhism Section (9)
- Buddhist Critical Reflective Group (1)
- Buddhist Philosophy Group (1)
- Chinese Religions Group (1)
- History of Religions Section (1)
- Japanese Religions Group (4)
- Lesbian and Feminist Issues in Religion (1)
- Mid-Atlantic Region-East Asian Chair (1)
- Ritual Studies Group (1)
- Sacred Space in Contemporary Asia (1)
- Steering Committee of the Academic Study and Teaching of Religion Section (1)
- Tibetan and Himalayan Heritage Group (2)
- Women's Caucus of the Mid-Atlantic Region (1)

 Association for Asian Studies (3)

- Committee on Korean Studies (1)
- Southeast Asia Council (1)

Sri Lankan Studies Committee (1)

International Association of Buddhist Studies (1)

Committee on Buddhist Studies and Computers (1)

International Society for Buddhist Studies (1)

Society for Tantric Studies (1)

Steering Committee (1)

In addition, 3 respondents served as regional representatives to international societies, 53 served as members of steering committees, and 9 served on various councils of these societies.

The 1995 and 2006 samples have shown a remarkably high level of activity in presenting scholarly papers at the annual meetings of the above professional societies listed above. Additionally, those sampled have been very active in presenting scholarly papers (not simply “lectures”) in other professional settings such as international conferences, regional professional meetings, and thematic conferences sponsored by various institutions. Adjusting the results to reflect those who did not respond with information on this item, the findings show:

| | 1995 Sample | 2006 Sample |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Papers at Annual Meeting | 4.4 per respondent | 6.4 per respondent |
| Other Scholarly Papers | 12.2 per respondent | 10.5 per respondent |

Thus, the average respondent in the 1995 sample made 16.6 professional presentations during their academic career, while the average respondent in the 2006 sample has made 16.9 professional presentations during their academic career. These figures are slightly lower than the 19.8 figure reported in the 1993. The 1995 sample reflects the earlier supposition that this sample is slightly junior to the previous group of respondents. The same suggestion applies to the 2006 sample.

Buddhist Studies as a discipline presents a high magnitude of success in grant and fellowship acquisition, both during graduate training and after the granting of the Ph.D. degree. For example, and adjusting for those who did not respond with information in this category of inquiry, the 1995 sample reported 2.2 grants per respondent at the graduate school level. This included such items as National Defense Education Act Fellowships, Fulbright awards, and the like, but not assistantships of any kind. With Ph.D. in hand, all samples then reported:

| Grant/Fellowship Agency | 1993 Sample (Number) | 1995 Sample (Number) | 2006 Sample (Number) |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Nat. Endowment for the Humanities | 57 | 73 | 53 |
| Fulbright | 35 | 24 | 51 |
| Amer. Council of Learned Societies | 14 | 24 | 20 |
| Japan Foundation | 13 | 17 | 20 |
| Social Science Research Council | 8 | 8 | 20 |
| American Academy of Religion | - | 5 | 15 |
| Lilly Foundation | - | 4 | 3 |
| Pew Charitable Trusts | - | 4 | 1 |

In the 1995 sample, grants from the Ford Foundation, Mellon Foundation, Danforth Foundation, and Rockefeller Foundation were cited, along with hundreds of grants internally administered by the various faculty members' host institutions. In the 2006 sample, Mellon Foundation grants grew enormously (to 18), followed by grants from the American Institute of Indian Studies (13), the Bukkyô Dendô Kyôkai (Numata Foundation; 9), and Association for Asian Studies (7). In 1995, national and international grants yielded 2.1 awards per respondent, while internal university grants

totaled 2.4 awards per respondent. In 2006, national and international grants yielded 3.9 awards per respondent, while internal university grants totaled 1.1 awards per respondent.

Just as the Buddhist Studies samples yielded highly active involvement in professional societies, and significant success in grant and fellowship acquisition, they also have demonstrated a high degree of accomplishment in securing meaningful editorial positions with leading academic presses and journals. In 1995, no less than 6 individuals were editors for book series with university presses, while another 10 sat on university press editorial boards. Presses represented in this group include Oxford University Press, Indiana University Press, University of California Press, University of Michigan Press, Princeton University Press, University of Virginia Press, and the State University of New York Press. Additionally, 19 respondents edited book series for commercial/trade publishers, while another 7 were editorial board members. Some of the presses cited in this category include Snow Lion, Shambhala, Motilal Banarsidass, Curzon Press, Wadsworth, Buddhica Britannica, the Kuroda Institute Series (published by the University of Hawaii Press), and the AAR Monograph and AAR Texts & Translations Series (both published by Scholars Press). In the 2006 sample, 9 respondents edited or co-edited book series for university presses. Presses represented include Oxford University Press, Stanford University Press, Princeton University Press, University of Chicago Press, and the University of Hawaii Press. Another 13 edited or co-edited book series for commercial/trade publishers. Some of the presses cited in this category include Macmillan, Motilal Banarsidass, Wisdom, Routledge, E.J. Brill, Scholars Press, as well as the Kuroda Institute (associated with the University of Hawaii Press) and the American Institute of Buddhist Studies (associated with Columbia University).

Many respondents in the 1995 survey reported major editorial positions with journals, including:

| Editor-in-Chief/Co-Editor (14) | Associate/Assistant Editor (9) |
|---|--|
| <i>Buddhist-Christian Studies</i> | <i>Critical Review of Books in Religion</i> |
| <i>Buddhist and Tibetan Studies</i> | <i>The Eastern Buddhist</i> |
| <i>Critical Review of Books in Religion</i> | <i>History of Religions</i> |
| <i>History of Religions</i> | <i>Journal of Asian Studies</i> |
| <i>Indo-Judaic Studies</i> | <i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i> |
| <i>Japanese Journal of Religious Studies</i> | <i>Journal of Indian Philosophy</i> |
| <i>Journal of Buddhist Ethics</i> | <i>Journal of the Intl. Assoc. of Buddhist Studies</i> |
| <i>Journal of Buddhist Literature</i> | <i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i> |
| <i>Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies</i> | |
| <i>Korean Culture</i> | |
| <i>Pacific World</i> | |

As well, 9 individuals held Book Review Editorships at *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, *Pacific World*, *Philosophy East and West*, and *Religious Studies Review*. Another 2 held Guest Editor positions at *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie*, and *Journal of Religious Ethics*. Finally, 45 respondents cited positions on the editorial boards of many of the journals listed above, as well as the *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Studies Journal*, *Garuda*, *Gender and World Religion*, *Journal of Asian Philosophy*, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, *Journal of Chinese Religions*, *Journal of Comparative Sociology and Religion*, *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, *Numen*, *Soundings*, *Studies in Central and East Asian Religion*, *T'ang Studies*, and *The Tibet Journal*. In the 2006 sample, we found:

| Editor-in-Chief/Co-Editor (15) | Associate/Assistant Editor (20) |
|---|--|
| <i>Buddhist Literature</i> | <i>Buddhist-Christian Studies</i> (2) |
| <i>Critical Review of Books in Religion</i> | <i>Buddhist Studies Review</i> |
| <i>Japan Studies Review</i> | <i>History of Religions</i> (2) |
| <i>Japanese Religions Bulletin</i> | <i>Journal of Asian and African Studies</i> |
| <i>Journal of Buddhist Ethics</i> | <i>Journal of Asian Culture</i> |
| <i>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</i> | <i>Journal of Asian Studies</i> (2) |
| <i>Journal of Global Buddhism</i> (3) | <i>Journal of Buddhist Ethics</i> |
| <i>Journal of the Barre Center for Buddhist Studies</i> | <i>Journal of Developing Societies</i> |
| <i>Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies</i> (2) | <i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i> |
| <i>Korean Culture</i> | <i>Journal of Indian Philosophy</i> |
| <i>Sakyadhita: International Association of Buddhist Women</i> | <i>Japanese Journal of Religious Studies</i> |
| | <i>Journal of the International Assoc. of Buddhist Studies</i> |
| | <i>Theosophical History</i> |
| | <i>Korea Journal</i> |
| | <i>Religious Studies Review</i> (2) |
| | <i>Review of the Canadian Studies Association</i> |
| | <i>Sophia</i> |

Additionally, 18 held Book Review Editorships at the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, *Journal of Global Buddhism*, *Philosophy East and West*, *Pacific World*, *Religious Studies Review*, *Religion*, *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, *Buddhist and Tibetan Studies*, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, *Sophia*, *Cognitive Science*, and *Nous*. Finally, 65 respondents cited posi-

tions on the editorial boards of many of the journals listed above, as well as the *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies*, *Journal of Religious Ethics*, and numerous others.

Although it has never been clear how to report scholarly publication data with precision, Ray Hart's study utilized three categories: (1) Books, (2) Articles, Essays, Chapters, and (3) Book Reviews. Hart was only concerned with the immediately past five-year period. In other words, Hart presented no career publication data, a statistic which may well be more revealing than his five year information. Thus, in this study, I have confined myself to presenting *only* career data. The categories are at once problematic in that Hart did not distinguish between refereed and non-refereed publications, a distinction now made in virtually all colleges and universities. Equally, Hart made no distinction between books authored and books edited, another distinction that is part of the politically correct protocol of the American system of higher education.

In an attempt to address the exigencies of that system, I have sought to refine Hart's categories somewhat in favor of presenting more meaningful statistics. In so doing, I have separated the book category into two sub-categories: (a) Books Authored/Co-Authored and (b) Books Edited/Co-Edited. I have also pared Hart's Articles, Essays, Chapters category into Refereed Articles and Chapters (taking the stand, not shared in all university evaluations, that most, if not all, chapters are indeed refereed in some fashion, quite often bringing to bear a higher standard than in many refereed journals). In my schema, the following career results can be reported:

⁷ This category was not separated in the first survey, but redesigned in the second.

⁸ Only 72 respondents listed book reviews, and this is reflected in the statistical average.

⁹ Only 116 respondents listed book reviews, and this is reflected in

| Category of Publication | 1993 Sample Average (No.) | 1995 Sample Average (No.) | 2006 Sample Average (No.) |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Books Authored/ Co-Authored | 2.4 (209) | 2.3 (239) | 2.4 (367) |
| Books Edited/Co- Edited | 1.7 (148) | 1.1 (116) | 1.6 (245) |
| Refereed Articles | 16.8 (1462) ⁷ | 7.3 (769) | 6.2 (944) |
| Refereed Chapters | – | 6.5 (689) | 8.2 (1243) |
| Book Reviews | 12.7 (1105) | 12.9 (962) ⁸ | 7.6 (1154) ⁹ |

Allowing adjustment of the sample to reflect career duration, the three sets of results are remarkably similar. Further, by refining the data collection in the 1995 sample it was possible to determine that 126 of the 355 books reported were published with university presses. In the 2006 sample, 239 of the 612 books reported were published with university presses. Allowing for multiple authorship/editorship, it was possible to name and rank those book publishers most often utilized as publication avenues for Buddhist Studies. As such, we can offer the following ranked list:¹⁰

the statistical average. Calculated on the basis of the actual number of respondents who submitted book reviews, the average is 9.95.

¹⁰ To some extent, in the 1995 Sample, with regard to trade/commercial publishers, the personal favorites of a number of prolific authors are reflected. As such, the citations for Prentice-Hall and Tungta reflect the publications of Robert Ellwood and Charles Fu, respectively. Other university presses mentioned include Indiana University Press, University of Virginia Press, Stanford University Press, and the University of Michigan Press. Other trade publishers mentioned frequently include Allen & Unwin, Harper & Row, M.D. Gunasena, Peter Lang, St. Martin's Press, Curzon Press, HarperCollins, Beacon, Wadsworth, Scholars Press, Anima, Eerdmans, Munshiram Manoharlal, Mellen Press, Westminster, and Mouton. In the 2006 Sample, Ellwood's publications again supported Prentice-Hall, while Steven Heine's and Dale Wright's publications supported Oxford University Press.

UNIVERSITY PRESSES**1995 Sample**

1. State University of New York Press
2. University of Hawaii Press
3. Princeton University Press
4. University of California Press
5. Oxford University Press
6. University of Chicago Press
7. Columbia University Press
8. Cambridge University Press
9. Penn State University Press (tie)
- University of S. Carolina Press (tie)

2006 Sample

1. University of Hawaii Press
2. State University of New York Press
3. Oxford University Press
4. Princeton University Press
5. University of California Press
6. Columbia University Press
7. University of Chicago Press
8. Wilfrid Laurier University Press
9. Harvard University Press (tie)
- Penn State University Press (tie)
- Cambridge University Press (tie)

TRADE PRESSES**1995 Sample**

1. Snow Lion
2. Prentice-Hall
3. E.J. Brill (tie)
- Motilal Banarsidass (tie)
5. Tungta (tie)
- Wisdom Publications (tie)
7. Shambhala (tie)
- Greenwood Press (tie)
- Orbis (tie)

2006 Sample

1. Snow Lion
2. Wisdom Publications
3. Routledge/Curzon
4. E.J. Brill
5. Prentice-Hall
6. Harper Collins
7. Shambhala
8. Motilal Banarsidass
9. Peter Lang (tie)

Asian Humanities Press
(tie)

Macmillan (tie)

Asian Humanities Press
(tie)

Continuum (tie)

Orbis (tie)

Allen & Unwin (tie)

It is also possible to determine a ranked list of refereed journals most often utilized as a publication outlet by the overall sample. Comparison of the 1995 and 2006 Samples shows remarkable consistency in the journals most favored by the scholars in the survey. One notable addition to the journals list in the 2006 sample is the online *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, the first such journal to join this exclusive list. This list includes:¹¹

JOURNALS

| 1995 Sample | 2006 Sample |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1. <i>History of Religions</i> | 1. <i>Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies</i> |
| 2. <i>Buddhist-Christian Studies</i> | 2. <i>Buddhist Christian Studies</i> |

¹¹ In the 1995 Sample, at least two cases, journals cited reflect the personal favorites of two prolific scholars: *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* (for Charles Fu) and *Studia Missionalia* (for Alex Wayman). Other journals receiving significant numbers of citations include: *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie*, *Religious Studies Review*, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, *Journal of Feminist Studies of Religion*, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*, *Journal of Religious Ethics*, *Buddhist Studies Review*, and *Korean Culture*. In the 2006 Sample, other journals receiving significant numbers of citations include: *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie*, *Religious Studies Review*, *Journal of Chinese Religions*, *Journal of Contemporary Buddhism*, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, *Religious Studies*, *Japanese Religions*, and *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*.

| 1995 Sample | 2006 Sample |
|--|---|
| 3. <i>Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies</i> | 3. <i>Japanese Journal of Religious Studies</i> |
| 4. <i>Philosophy East and West</i> | 4. <i>History of Religions</i> |
| 5. <i>The Eastern Buddhist</i> | 5. <i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i> |
| 6. <i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i> | 6. <i>Philosophy East and West</i> |
| 7. <i>Japanese Journal of Religious Studies</i> | 7. <i>Pacific World</i> |
| 8. <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> | 8. <i>The Eastern Buddhist</i> |
| 9. <i>Pacific World</i> | 9. <i>Journal of Indian Philosophy</i> |
| 10. <i>Tibet Journal</i> | 10. <i>Journal of Buddhist Ethics</i> |
| 11. <i>Numen</i> | 11. <i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i> |
| 11. <i>Journal of Indian Philosophy</i> | 12. <i>The Tibet Journal</i> |
| 13. <i>The Journal of Asian Studies</i> | 13. <i>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</i> |
| 13. <i>Religion</i> | 14. <i>Journal of Asian Studies</i> |
| 13. <i>Monumenta Nipponica</i> | 14. <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> |
| 13. <i>Journal of Religious Studies</i> | 15. <i>Monumenta Nipponica</i> |
| 13. <i>Studia Missionalia</i> | |
| 13. <i>Journal of Chinese Philosophy</i> | |

Institutional Results

On the surface, it would appear that tracking institutional programs in Buddhist Studies should be quite easy. One might simply turn first to those universities, listed earlier, which produced the largest numbers of doctoral degrees among the respondents to the individual portion of the survey. By cross-referencing with the latest *Directory of Departments and Programs of Religious Studies in North*

America (edited by David G. Truemper), and with the appropriate portion of the World Wide Web pages maintained by these major universities, the results ought to be readily apparent. One could then add to the tracking process by following *where* the recipients of these doctoral degrees are currently employed. To some extent, that was how I compiled my 1993 results, although the World Wide Web was far less useful at that time.

In 1993, I reported that only two North American universities had more than three full-time faculty members whose work falls within the discipline of Buddhology: the University of Virginia and the University of Chicago. Additionally, I reported that Harvard University, Columbia University, the University of Michigan, Princeton University, and McMaster University had three full-time Buddhist Studies faculty members as well; a much larger list of universities with two Buddhist Studies faculty was cited.

However, like all disciplines, Buddhist Studies is continually changing, primarily as a result of faculty relocation, altered interests, retirement, and new hires from the continually increasing number of newly minted scholars entering the field. In the latest (2006) survey, Harvard University now has nine faculty members actively involved in Buddhist Studies. Columbia University has six scholars, while the University of Washington and the University of Wisconsin have five. Many universities, including Princeton, Virginia, Chicago, UCLA, Emory, and the University of California at Berkeley have four. This represents a huge move forward overall. José Cabezón accurately points out: “For about a decade or so, buddhologists in North America have found employment in increasing numbers in departments of religious studies and schools of theology. Often this has meant that we have had to expand our pedagogical repertoire beyond courses in Buddhist Studies to accommodate the curricular need of these institutions.”¹² After surveying a num-

¹² José Cabezón, “Buddhist Studies as a Discipline and the Role of Theory,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 18, no. 2 (Winter 1995), 255.

ber of issues having impact on Buddhist Studies, Cabezón goes on to conclude:

All of these factors have contributed to what we might call the diversification of the buddhologist: a movement away from classical Buddhist Studies based on the philological study of written texts, and toward the investigation of more general, comparative and often theoretical issues that have implications (and audiences) outside of Buddhist Studies. Some colleagues have resigned themselves to this situation: a set of circumstances that must be tolerated for the sake of gainful employment. Others – and I count myself in this camp – have found the pressure to greater diversification intellectually stimulating, affording an opportunity to enter into broader conversations where Buddhist texts are one, but not the only, voice.¹³

Thus it is no longer completely clear what constitutes a full-time Buddhologist, and when one factors in the movement in the opposite direction – scholars from other disciplines incorporating Buddhist materials into their work – the entire issue of listing the number of full-time Buddhologists in any unit becomes quite murky.

One such attempt to at least begin the task of surveying institutions was undertaken by Duncan Williams (while at Harvard University). Williams devised a number of classificatory categories (with his choice of institutions to be appropriately placed):¹⁴

Practitioner-Friendly Institutions

California Institute of Integral Studies
 Graduate Theological Union
 Hsi Lai University
 Institute of Buddhist Studies
 Naropa Institute

Most Comprehensive Programs

Harvard University
 Indiana University

¹³ *Ibid.*, 255–56.

¹⁴ Williams, “Where to Study?” *Tricycle: The Buddhist Review* 6, no. 3 (Spring 1997), 68–69, 115–17.

University of Chicago
 University of Hawaii at Manoa
 University of Michigan
 University of Virginia

Institutions with Strength in East Asian Buddhist Studies

Princeton University
 Stanford University
 University of Arizona
 University of California at Los Angeles
 University of California at Santa Barbara
 University of Pennsylvania
 Yale University

Institutions with Strength in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Studies

Harvard University
 University of Michigan
 University of Virginia
 University of Washington

Institutions with Strength in Southeast Asian Buddhist Studies

Harvard University
 University of Chicago

Other Noteworthy Programs

Columbia University
 University of California at Berkeley
 University of Texas at Austin
 University of Wisconsin

While the attempt was admirable, then and now, the results reflect precisely the kind of dilemma of uncertainty suggested by Cabezón: what to include and what not to include, and who counts where? For example, it might be possible to argue that the Nyingma Institute and Barre Center for Buddhist Studies each have far more developed Buddhist Studies programs than the more academically diversified Graduate Theological Union (whose faculty listing notes “Access to professors at The Institute of Buddhist Studies” ... hardly an endorsement for inclusion in this list) or California Institute of Integral Studies. In some cases, Williams’ choices appear

rather arbitrary as well.¹⁵ To further complicate the circumstance, because of changing employment patterns, by 2006, many of Williams' classificatory judgments are clearly no longer accurate or appropriate.

Conclusion

There is little doubt that the 2006 sample of Buddhist Studies scholars in North America shows some obvious and expected statistical deviance from the earlier samples, each conducted more than a decade ago. The new study shows a significant change in gender status with almost one-fourth of the field now occupied by women. Additionally, the sample is almost one full decade younger with respect to the date at which the terminal degree was earned. On the other hand, the sample seems quite stable with respect to the leading Ph.D. producing universities, with Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, Wisconsin, and the University of California at Berkeley continuing to lead the way. Equally, employment remains almost

¹⁵ When Williams's list was published, the University of Wisconsin, which was one of only two universities in the United States to offer a Ph.D. in Buddhist Studies at that time, was omitted from the "Most Comprehensive Programs" list and cited only as a "Noteworthy Program." Impending or recent retirements notwithstanding, the University of Wisconsin continues to offer a complete and comprehensive curriculum in Buddhist Studies with several primary faculty and several other ancillary faculty. In some cases, an institution was listed on the basis of one very strong scholar, while others were omitted despite several strong scholars. There were omissions, too. Some scholars who merited inclusion in his tally were simply left out. Finally, it is clear that when Williams uses the term "America," he actually means "United States," as no mention at all was made of Canadian universities, a number of which boast strong Buddhist Studies faculties, such as McMaster University. The University of Calgary could easily have been included as well. The above critique should by no means be construed as demeaning. Rather, it merely highlights that the problem of identifying and classifying the Buddhist Studies academic landscape is significantly more difficult than first meets the eye. Quite simply, there is no easy way to synthesize faculty size.

evenly split between public and private universities. India/South Asia continues to lead the way in area specialization, with Japan/East Asia, China/East Asia, and Tibet/Inner Asia following. Curiously, there is a significant drop in Japan/East Asia specialization. Language training follows a similar path with Sanskrit dwarfing the other languages, while Pāli, Chinese, Japanese, and Tibetan remain almost equal. As expected, the American Academy of Religion, Association for Asian Studies, and International Association of Buddhist Studies lead the way in professional affiliations. Buddhist Studies scholars play a markedly leading role in these and other societies with 24 members having held the role of president, 15 vice president, 28 board members, and 32 as Chair/Co-Chair of individual units (with 26 of these in AAR). Those surveyed also played a significant editorial role for book publishers and professional journals. In the latest sample, 9 members edited book series for university presses, while another 13 served in this role for trade/commercial publishers. Another 15 were Editor/Co-Editor of scholarly journals, with 20 serving as Associate/Assistant Editor, representing a significant rise from the 1995 sample.

Scholarly activity has seemed remarkably similar in all three surveys. With respect to book publication, the three surveys tallied 4.1 books, 3.4 books, and 4.0 books chronologically. The leading university presses, in order, were Hawaii, SUNY, Oxford, Princeton, University of California, and Columbia; while the leading trade presses include Snow Lion, Wisdom, and Routledge/Curzon. Similarly, combined articles and chapters yielded 16.8, 13.8, and 14.4 chronologically. The leading journals include (in ranking order) *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, *History of Religion*, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, *Philosophy East and West*, *Pacific World*, *Eastern Buddhist*, and the *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*. In the 1995 sample, scholars presented a total of 16.6 papers, while the 2006 sample yielded 16.9 papers. Grant activity was significant as well, with National Endowment for the Humanities and Fulbright awards leading the way, followed

by the American Council of Learned Society, Social Science Research Council, and the Japan Foundation.

There is little doubt that the latest sample demonstrates that the discipline of Buddhist Studies is growing, thriving, and making a most significant impact on the study of religion in North America. Its impact can be witnessed in the overwhelming success of the Buddhism Section of the American Academy of Religion which, in its twenty-five year history has grown to become perhaps the most influential unit in the AAR. Although not reported in any data collected to date, it is also significant to note that the overall discipline has shown an enormous growth in the number of “scholar practitioners” now teaching in universities and colleges throughout North America. The implications of this development have yet to be fully studied. Clearly, it will be interesting to note how the next decade of Buddhist Studies scholars fares with respect to the above categories studied.