



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The proof is in the pudding: what is involved in editing and translating a Mahayana sutra?

Silk, J.A.

Citation

Silk, J. A. (2013). The proof is in the pudding: what is involved in editing and translating a Mahayana sutra? *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 56(2), 157-178. doi:10.1163/15728536-00000007

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3448244>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



Review Article

The Proof Is in the Pudding: What Is Involved in Editing and Translating a Mahāyāna sūtra?

Jonathan A. Silk

Leiden University

j.a.silk@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract

While different readers will have different expectations from something called a ‘critical edition,’ at a minimum one might expect reliable treatment of the sources employed, and from a translation consistent and reliable renderings, with or without meaningful commentary or annotation. The present review examines how far a recent contribution fulfills these minimal criteria.

Keywords

Critical editions; Buddhist sūtras; Mahāyāna literature; *Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvāṇanirdeśa*; *Satyaka-parivarta*

Jamspal, Lozang, *The Range of the Bodhisattva, A Mahāyāna Sūtra* (Ārya-Bodhisattva-gocara): *The Teachings of the Nirgrantha Satyaka*. Introduction and Translation [Treasury of the Buddhist Sciences series] (New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies / Columbia University Center for Buddhist Studies / Tibet House US, 2010), US\$ 49.00 / £ 34.00, ISBN 978 1 935011 07 1.

Jamspal, Lozang, *The Range of the Bodhisattva, A Mahāyāna Sūtra* (Byang chub sems dpa'i spyod yul): *The Teachings of the Nirgrantha Satyaka*. Critical Tibetan Edition [Treasury of the Buddhist Sciences series] (New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies / Columbia University Center for Buddhist Studies / Tibet House US, 2010), ISBN 978 1 935 01113 2.

In light of the current inaccessibility (if not nonexistence) of Indic language versions, the canonical collections of Mahāyāna scriptures in Tibetan and Chinese preserve in translation a large number of texts which remain, at least for the time being, among our best sources for the scriptural side of Mahāyāna Buddhism in

India. Despite this wealth of material, all too much scholarship returns again and again to the same few texts, with comparatively little attention given to the galaxy of other sources likely to shed light on many sorts of questions (and to raise new ones). It is thus with a sense of gratitude that one would expect to greet any publication which takes up a scripture otherwise more or less ignored by modern scholarship. As a general rule this is certainly a valid expectation. As I will endeavor to justify below, however, there are occasions on which one's welcome must be subdued, or even cold, and the appearance of the two volumes under review is, sadly, just such an occasion.

The *Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvānanirdeśa* may be termed a mid-length Mahāyāna sūtra, occupying (varying by the edition) something like 60~80 pages of Tibetan and,¹ in its longer Chinese version, almost 50 pages in the Taishō edition (a mere 16 in the shorter and older version, for reasons discussed below). Much of the already modest modern scholarly attention directed at this text has focused on its sixth chapter,² that on, as Zimmermann (2000: 178) translates, “Royal Ethics” (*rgyal po'i tshul*, Wanglun 王論, *Rājanīti),³ although its presentation of the doctrine of the *tathāgatagarbha* and *ekayāna* has also attracted some notice (Takasaki 1974: 254–273, Kuboi 1999). However, the text deals with much more than this, ranging over the perfections, an array of Mahāyāna doctrinal topics, and so on. The very title of the text, moreover, does not suggest that its authors thought that it concentrated on ethics, royal or otherwise. Zimmermann (2000: 177) translates this title “Sūtra which Expounds Supernatural Manifestations [that are Part of] the Realm of Stratagems in the Bodhisattva's Field of Action,” a title that suggests that from this perspective the text deals with the more or less familiar topic of the bodhisattva's salvific practice. In addition, the scripture's own list of alternative titles gives some idea of how its authors con-

¹ To list only those available to me now, Derge 146 [*mdo sde, pa* 82a3–141b7]; Peking 813 [*mdo sna tshogs, nu* 37b1–101b8]; sTog 246 [*mdo sde, la* 1b1–83b2]. Note that there are at least two Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts which contain portions of the text: La Vallée Poussin 1962: § 133, 135. A quick glance suggests that the text does not differ from that transmitted in the Kanjur(s).

² See Jenkins 2012, Zimmermann 2000, 2006. From another perspective see the detailed study of a portion of the *nidāna* in Grohmann 1994 (with only a very brief English summary, unfortunately, and as far as I know this author did not publish further on the text).

³ One might even consider this emphasis ironic if one of Zimmermann's hypotheses for the absence of the chapter in the older Chinese translation of Guṇabhadra is accepted, namely that the chapter is an interpolation in an older core scripture which did not address this topic. This is not the place to repeat all of the rich observations on the sūtra offered by Zimmermann who, it is to be hoped, might return to his careful studies of this text. Note that without explanation the author of the volumes under review (introduction p. xxvii) offers Rājavṛta instead of Zimmermann's more plausible Rājanīti for the title of the sixth chapter.

ceived of its scope. (The reconstructions of Sanskrit titles below are, with the exception of the final two, those of Jamspal, based on Tibetan, but the Chinese largely agrees. The final title is not reconstructed, for reasons discussed below.)⁴

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------|-------------|
| * <i>Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvāṇanirdeśa</i> | <i>byang chub sems dpa'i spyod yul gyi thabs kyi yul la rnam par 'phrul ba bstan pa</i> | 說菩薩行方便境界神通變化經 | 菩薩行方便境界奮迅法門 |
| * <i>Tathāgataguhyasthāna</i> | <i>de bzhin gshogs pa'i gsang ba'i gnas</i> | 如來密處 | 如來深祕密藏 |
| * <i>Tathāgatānantaryādharmanirdeśa</i> | <i>de bzhin gshogs pa'i bar med pa'i chos bstan pa</i> | 如來說純無雜法 | 如來具足功德 |
| * <i>Tathāgataviśaya</i> | <i>de bzhin gshogs pa'i yul</i> | | 如來甚深境界 |
| * <i>Ekayānanirdeśa</i> | <i>theg pa gcig tu bstan pa</i> | 如來說出一乘 | 一乘 |
| * <i>Mañjuśrīparipṛcchā</i> | <i>'jam dpal gyis yongs su dris pa</i> | 文殊師利所問 | 文殊師利所說經 |
| * <i>Satyaka-vyākaraṇa</i> (Jamspal: <i>Satyavādin-</i>) | <i>bden smra lung bstan pa</i> | 薩遮受記 | 薩遮尼乾子授記經 |
| <i>Satyaka-parivarta</i> (Jamspal: <i>Satyavādin-</i>) | <i>bden smra'i le'u</i> | 薩遮品 | 薩遮尼乾子所說經 |

As these alternative titles indicate, at least as far as the scripture's self-presentation is concerned, the theme of ethics, royal or otherwise, is not prominent. Rather, the list here emphasizes a secret teaching of the Tathāgata, namely the teaching of the single vehicle (*ekayāna*), and the range of the Tathāgata's capacities. And what of this Satyaka (or **Satyavādin*), whose name appears in the final two items?

The Sanskrit title of the sūtra given above is that found transliterated in the Tibetan translation, and corresponds to the Tibetan title *'Phags pa byang chub sems dpa'i spyod yul gyi thabs kyi yul la rnam par 'phrul ba bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. In addition, we have two Chinese translations, *Foshuo pusaxing fangbian jingjie shentong bianhua jing* 佛說菩薩行方便境界神通變化經, translated by Guṇabhadra 求那跋陀羅 (T. 271), and *Da sazheniganzi*

⁴ Tibetan in Jamspal ed. pp. 196–197; Chinese (see below): T. 271 [IX] 316b5–8; T. 272 [IX] 365c8–12.

suoshuo jing 大薩遮尼乾子所說經 (T. 272), translated by Bodhiruci 菩提流支, this translation having the alternate title *Pusa jingjie duoxun famen jing* 菩薩境界奪迅法門經. The title of the second Chinese translation was translated by Zimmermann “Great Sūtra Expounded by Satyaka Nigranthaputra.” In fact, the title *Satyaka-parivarta* is attested in a reference in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*;⁵ this reference is cited by Jamspal, although not prominently, being buried in a note (207n26), and the importance of the attested title is not noted. From the term Nigranthaputra we would expect this Satyaka to be a Jaina but, in the end, what becomes clear is that whatever his ‘real identity,’ for instance whether he is to be connected with the Saccaka of the *Cūḷa-* and *Mahā-Saccaka* suttas in the *Majjhima-Nikāya* (Zimmermann 2000: 177n3), within the world of the scripture he is an advanced bodhisattva who has taken on the form of some sort of non-Buddhist for the sake of teaching the dharma. (It is interesting and perhaps important to note the suggestion of Hartmann 2011: 86n2 that the dialogue in the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya between King Pradyota and his minister Bharata “possibly served as a model for a talk between the same king and the Jaina follower Satyaka” in the text under discussion here. Further investigation in this regard would be welcome.)

In the 1991 PhD thesis which formed the original basis of the books under review (or at least the translation volume), Lozang Jamspal told a moving story of his discovery that the *Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvāṇanirdeśa* which he was studying was the same text as the Satyaka sūtra (*bden pa po'i leu*) quoted by Tsong kha pa,⁶ and the identification of which had long been sought by Jamspal's doctoral advisor, Prof. Alex Wayman. (Sadly, this story and some of the warm appreciations the author expressed to Prof. and Mrs. Wayman in the thesis are absent from the published version.) In fact, it is under this title that the sūtra is usually cited in Tibet, although it would be prudent to point out that the most likely reason for this is that most Tibetan authors did not read the sūtra (or any sūtras), but borrowed their citations from others, this practice leading to the type of homogeneity we indeed encounter.⁷

⁵ Bendall 1897–1902: 165.17, reading *āryasatyake parivartte ...*, on p. 407 tentatively but mistakenly identified this with the thirteenth chapter of the *Avatamsaka*, *'Phags pa'i bden pa*. See also the *Munimatālamkāra* (Derge Tanjur 3903, *dbu ma, a*, 104b–105b).

⁶ As one learns from the website of the Vienna Kanjur project (<http://www.istb.univie.ac.at>), manuscript collections record the scripture under alternate titles, including *'Phags pa bden pa po'i le'u zhes bya ba'i chos kyi rnam grangs*. See immediately above for the attestation of the Sanskrit title to which this corresponds.

⁷ The author notes a number of occasions on which Tsong kha pa quotes the sūtra. As the research of my student Reinier Langelaar (2011) has demonstrated, Tsong kha pa borrowed

Any appreciation of the structure of the *Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvāṇanirdeśa* is complicated by the fact that the Tibetan text is not divided as is the later Chinese translation, the older Chinese translation having no internal divisions at all.⁸ To make things more complicated still, Jamspal, feeling unhappy with the length of the final chapter, divided it himself in a fashion not agreeing with the Chinese translation. As he writes correctly (translation p. xvii), “In the Tibetan version there are only ten chapters, and there is no indication of where the ninth chapter ends and the tenth chapter begins. Thus, there is some confusion about the chapters’ divisions after the ninth chapter.” He goes on, however, to say, “I was informed that there are twelve chapters in the [*sic!*] Chinese version of this sūtra. Adopting this system, I have chosen to redivide the last two chapters of the Tibetan version into four, according to subject matter.”⁹ In the process the author has invented new chapter titles (which neither parallel the Chinese titles nor come at the same spots) and chapter colophons, even going so far as to alter the actual final chapter colophon in his edition (from ‘ten’ to ‘twelve’), without note. The result can be seen in the following table:¹⁰

heavily from the *Bstan rim chen mo* of Gro lung pa and other sources, and at least those quotations of the *Satyaka* that occur in the first third of the *Lam rim chen mo* rely on Gro lung pa. The sūtra is also cited in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (Pāsādika 1989: 77–78 [Jamspal ed. 98–99, trans. 62] and 127–128 [Jamspal ed. 47–50, trans. 31–33], of which Jamspal 208n45 notes only the former; he does however note that parts of this same chapter 4 are cited in a commentary to the *Laṅkāvatāra*, but does not give full details—see Derge Tanjur 4019, *mdo ’grel, pi* 122a6~).

⁸ I would like to avoid adopting Zimmermann’s unwieldy acronym BGUVVNS, as logical as it may be, though I do not have a better suggestion. Given the attestation in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, it may be best to refer to the text as ‘the *Satyaka*’, as does Jamspal (although he does not offer this as his reason).

⁹ The information he received is moreover not entirely correct, and may have been provided by someone unfamiliar with Buddhist language. In note 8 on p. 184 Jamspal quotes the English translation of the eleventh chapter of T. 272 as “What the Nirgrantha, Mahāsātya Received and Recorded,” citing Chinese *shòuji* 授記. This term is a standard equivalent of *vyākaraṇa*, prediction to ultimate buddhahood.

¹⁰ In his thesis the author offered translations of both the Tibetan and T. 272 chapter titles, and very roughly illustrated their coordination in a table (p. 6), absent from the book. This is not the only spot where more information was provided in the thesis than found a place in the book version. The Sanskrit reconstructions I offer here are based on the sūtra’s Tibetan or Chinese, not on Jamspal’s modified Tibetan. They are intended to give a very broad impression and nothing more.

| Tib. chpt. | Tib. | LJ's chpt. | LJ's Table of Contents | T. 272 | Reconstruction |
|------------|---|------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <i>gleng gzhi</i> | 1 | <i>gleng gzhi</i> | Xu pin 序品 | *Nidāna |
| | | | | Wenyi pin 問疑品 | *Prašna? |
| | | | | Yicheng pin 一乘品 | *Ekayāna |
| 2 | <i>pha rol tu phyin pa bstan pa</i> | 2 | <i>pha rol tu phyin pa</i> | | *Pāramitānirdeśa |
| 3 | <i>thabs la mkhas pa</i> | 3 | <i>thabs la mkhas pa</i> | | *Upāyakauśalya |
| 4 | <i>theg pa gcig tu bstan pa</i> | 4 | <i>theg pa gcig tu bstan pa</i> | | *Ekayānanirdeśa |
| 5 | <i>rgyal po'i drung du phyin pa</i> | 5 | <i>rgyal po dang 'phrad pa</i> | Yiyan chiwang pin 詣嚴熾王品 | *Rājopasaṃkrama? |
| 6 | <i>rgyal po'i tshul</i> | 6 | <i>rgyal po'i tshul</i> | Wanglun pin 王論品 | *Rājanīti |
| 7 | <i>bden smra mgron du bos pa</i> | 7 | <i>mgron la bos pa</i> | Qingshi pin 請食品 | *(Satyaka)-Nimantraṇa? |
| 8 | <i>yon tan dang skyon bstan pa</i> | 8 | <i>skyon dang yon tan bstan pa</i> | Wenzuiguo pin 問罪過品 | *Guṇadoṣanirdeśa? |
| (9) | — | 9 | <i>de bzbin gshegs pa'i yon tan</i> | Rulai wuguo gongde pin 如來無過功德品 | *Tathāgata(nirdoṣa)guṇa? |
| 10 | <i>lung bstan pa</i> | | | | *Vyākaraṇa |
| | | 10 | <i>de bzbin gshegs pa mjal ba</i> | Yirulai pin 詣如來品 | *Tathāgatōpasamkrama? |
| | | 11 | <i>don dam byang chub bstan pa</i> | Shuofa pin 說法品 | *Dharmadeśanā? |
| | | | | Shouji pin 授記品 | *Vyākaraṇa |

| Tib. chpt. | Tib. | LJ's chpt. | LJ's Table of Contents | T. 272 | Reconstruction |
|------------|------|------------|---|-----------------------|----------------|
| | | 12 | <i>bkas bsngags shing lung bstan pa</i> | Xingongde pin 信功德品 | *Śraddhāguṇa |

The fashion in which these chapters are distributed may be illustrated in another table. This table also serves the purpose of indicating the locations of text in the Peking and sTog Kanjurs since, although the author in his edition claims to have collated them, no hint is given to the location even of chapter divisions in these editions, Jamspal limiting himself to giving marginal notation of folio sides in the Derge Kanjur text (I do not have access to the Narthang Kanjur at present, and as is explained below, it is pointless to waste any space on Lhasa, the two other editions used by the editor).

| Trans. chpt. | Trans. page | Ed. page | Peking 813 | Derge 146 | sTog 246 | T. 271 | T. 272 |
|--------------|-------------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|--------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | 3 | 4 | 37b1 | 82a3 | 1b1 | 300b14 | 317a8 Xu pin 序品 I |
| | 6 | 11.10 | 40b2 | 85a4 | 7a2 | 301b16 | 318c6 Wenyi pin 問疑品 II |
| | 10 | 18.3 | 42b2 | 87a3 | 9b6 | 302a21 | 319c20 Yicheng pin 一乘品 III |
| 2 | 15 | 23 | 43b8 | 88a7 | 11b3 | 302c6 | 320c13 |
| 3 | 27 | 41 | 48b3 | 92b7 | 17b2 | 304b8 | 324b14 |
| 4 | 33 | 49 | 50b2 | 94b5 | 20a2 | 305a13 | 325c13 |
| 5 | 41 | 63 | 55a1 | 98b6 | 25b2 | 306c10 | 327c22 Yiyan chiwang pin 詣嚴熾王品 IV |
| 6 | 47 | 73 | 58a2 | 101b4 | 29a7 | – | 329b16 Wanglun pin 王論品 V |
| 7 | 65 | 103 | 69a5 | 112a1 | 43a5 | 307a21 | 338c27 Qingshi pin 請食品 VI |
| 8 | 69 | 109 | 70b8 | 113b2 | 45a6 | 307b1 | 339c15 Wenzuiguo pin 問罪過品 VII |

| Trans. chpt. | Trans. page | Ed. page | Peking 813 | Derge 146 | sTog 246 | T. 271 | T. 272 |
|--------------|-------------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|---------|--|
| 9 | 79 | 125 | 75b8 | 118a4 | 51b1 | 308b26 | 342a26 Rulai wuguo gongde pin 如來無過功德品 VIII |
| | | | - | - | - | - | 344a10–345a5; 347a26–354c16; 358c1–359b8 |
| 10 | 101 | 163 | 86b4 | 128b1 | 65a1 | 311c14 | 359c17 Yirulai pin 詣如來品 IX |
| 11 | 105 | 167 | 88a8 | 130a2 | 67a4 | 312a27 | 360a16 Shuofa pin 說法品 X |
| | 109 | 175.1 | 92b1 | 133b1 | 72a4 | 313b18 | 361c28 Shouji pin 授記品 XI |
| 12 | 111 | 177 | 93a7 | 134a5 | 73a5 | 313c11 | 362b10 |
| | 119 | 191.11 | 98b8 | 139a6 | 80a1 | 315b28 | 364b28 Xingongde pin 信功德品 XII |
| (end) | -123 | -198 | -101b8 | -141b7 | -83b3 | -316b15 | -365c20 |

The two volumes under review profess to present a “Critical Tibetan Edition” of the sūtra and a translation (with some annotation). I am sure that a variety of readers expect a variety of different things from both editions and translations, but one of the most basic things which any reader would be justified to expect is fidelity, whether that be to the word or to the spirit of the source text. When it comes to an edition, one should be able to expect that the sources are accurately reported, within the scope of the editor’s editorial policy (e.g., in the case of a Tibetan text the editor may have found it pointless to report differences in punctuation, or differences between *nga* and *da*, or *pa* and *ba*, but such a policy should of course be articulated). When an editor does not bother to state his principles, it is difficult to know where to begin. Here is what Jamspal has to say about his editorial principles (edition p. xv):

The basis for this critical edition ... was the version of the text found in the Stog Palace Kangyur. Textual annotations and text critical notes were added based on comparisons with four other recensions of the same text from the Derge, Peking, Narthang and Lhasa Kangyurs. Although no Sanskrit manuscript ... has yet been found, annotations based on parallel Sanskrit passages and reconstructions have been added to this edition as well.

At certain points in the text ... the narrative takes the form of a dialogue between two or more individuals. Where the original text(s) only read *smras pa*, explicit speaker identifications have been added reflecting the persons in question

Although several recensions were used in the compilation of this critical edition, rather than provide page references for all of them, given the widespread availability of the Derge recension of the Kangyur, page references for this recension have been inserted in both the Tibetan text and in the English translation as an aid for any reader wishing to compare the two. In addition, the text has been formatted with paragraph breaks reflecting the same divisions as the English translation also for this purpose.

In Jampal's 1991 dissertation, he translated, he stated, the sTog-Derge text (without further discussion), with sTog provided in facsimile, though no coordination between text and translation was offered. There is no explanation in the present publication as to why the page numbers of his own edition were not inserted in the translation, which would certainly have made the reader's job somewhat easier. In the absence of more helpful keys to link the edition and the translation, at least the idea of coordinating the paragraphing was a good one; unfortunately it is irregularly applied. The same is true for speaker identifications, which are often marked in the edition (within brackets), but not always (one might also note that the author has added Tibetan numbering to lists and verses, but without employing brackets to identify these as editorial insertions). As a simple example, in the translation on page 61, line 6, a change of speaker is noted in a new paragraph, and then again another 3 lines below. In the edition, 97.1 and 3, there are no paragraph breaks and no new speakers. The confusion apparently stems from the author's misunderstanding of the Tibetan text. What he translates as the words of the king Caṅḍapadyota are rather the continuing words of the interlocutor (*Satyavādin), and instead of the king's "What are these three? As a righteous ruler, do I not ..." we should read: "What are these three? [He, the king, thinks:] 'As a righteous ruler ...,'" this being clear from the final *zhes* marking quotation of the thought. (In the translation on p. 61, l. 2, a new paragraph should start with the words "If a righteous ruler" according to the Tibetan text 96.18, but there is no paragraph change in the translation. This sort of thing is extremely common.)

There is no explanation for the choice of the editions to be compared (and what does the author mean by 'recension?'); in particular, it is to be noted that the Lhasa edition is highly conflated and from a text critical point of view utterly worthless. Time and energy spent collating it is wasted. In two places (18n64, 33n19) the editor suggests that "Only Lhasa is grammatically correct," and it is natural that it might seem so to him since the Tibetan grammar he learnt in school may have had more in common with the grammar of the twentieth century Lhasa editors than with that of, for instance, scholars of the past such as Si tu paṅ chen Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1699?-1774), who is credited with the editing of the Derge Kanjur.¹¹ The editor gives no further reasons for choices

¹¹) See Verhagen 2010.

of variants which, as I will document below, he exceedingly frequently does not even report, or reports wrongly.

I have looked in vain for more than a small handful of “annotations based on parallel Sanskrit passages and reconstructions.” In only a single instance is an annotation offered based on Sanskrit, when the editor suggests (194n60): “The translators possibly read *ākāra* (rnam pa) instead of *ācāra* (spyod pa).” This is indeed a likely suggestion, supported by the older Chinese translation. For the Tibetan *de nga'i rnam pa las rjes su dran par byed par 'gyur ro || nga'i bstan pa la yang dad pa thob par 'gyur ro ||*, T. 271 (316a3–4) has 彼王爾時，修念我行，於佛法中得清淨心。(T. 272 [365a16–18] seems rather different.) Ironically, despite the suggested correction offered in the edition, the translation abbreviates the whole (p. 121), providing only: “He will commemorate and have faith in my doctrine.”

Had the author wished to provide “annotations based on parallels,” he might have done so for instance for the passage which reads (p. 49): “[The ruler] makes the entire great universe peaceful by means of righteous activities and, without recourse to harmful ventures, injury, punishment, or use of weapons, he protects his domain with impartiality.” The Tibetan here has (ed. 76; D 102b6–7; P 59a6–7; S 31a2–3): *des^a sa chen po ma lus ba gnod par sdo ba ma mchis shing^b 'tshe ba ma mchis la | chad^c pa ma^d mchis shing mtshon gyis bda' ba ma mchis pa 'di nyid chos dang 'thun par snyoms pas^e legs par phab ste | gnas lags so* (a: P: *de* for *des*; b: S *te |* for *shing*; c: P: *'ching* for *chad*; d: LJ's ed. omits *ma*; e: S *par* for *pas*). This is a stock phrase, for which see the *Mahāvvyūtpatti* (§3636): *sa imām eva samudraparyantām mahāpṛthivīm akhilām akaṅṭakām anutpātām adaṇḍenāśas-treṇa dharmeṇa samenābhinirjityābhyāvasati = de rgya mtsho la thug pa'i sa chen po ma lus par gnod par sdo ba med cing 'tshe ba med pa 'di nyid chad pa med cing mtshon gyis bda' ba med la chos dang mthun zhing snyoms pas legs par phab cing gnas pa'o*. Such examples could be multiplied.

Another (rare) instance of suggested emendation comes on p. 58 of the edition on which a verse is printed as follows:

dper na rin chen dam pa indra nīla^a ||
 gang dang gang gi gnas su gzhag gyur pa ||
 phyogs de thams cad mdog gcig sgyur byed de ||
 kha dog sngon por gyur yang^b rtog pa med ||

The two roman lower case letters are the editor's notes: a) “Although all recensions read *sna tshogs*, we have amended the text to read *indra nīla* in keeping with other instances of the metaphor.” b) “Narthang, Lhasa: *gyur kyang*.” However, collating the sources available to me (Derge 98a4; Peking 54a5–6; sTog 24b3–4), we find instead the following:

dper na rin chen dam pa an da rnyil¹ ||
 gang dang gang gi gnas su gzhag² gyur pa ||
 phyogs de thams cad mdog gcig sgyur byed de ||
 kha dog sngon por³ gyur yang rtog pa med ||

1) It is a bit difficult to know how to romanize what we find, *an da* འན་ད་ in Derge (tsegs are not visible to me in Peking), and *a-nda* འ་ན་ཏ་ in sTog, but the sense is quite clear. Peking, moreover, reads *snyil*. In any event, there is no trace of any *sna tshogs* anywhere. 2) S: *bzhag*, 3) S: *po*. The expression *anda rnyil* is far from unknown, and therefore the justification for emending it eludes me. The editor also fails to note that as emended the verse line is unmetrical. (Note the Chinese translations: T. 271 [306b11–12]: 紺琉璃寶衆寶上 隨其所在住止處 一切皆同作一色 而是紺色無差別; T. 272 [327b13–14]: 上因陀羅寶 隨處青光色 普照物皆同 而寶無分別). The translation has (p. 38): “For example, the excellent, precious sapphire jewel, wherever it is placed, transforms [all colors in] all directions into only the color blue, although it has no discursive thought.” The grammar appears to suggest rather that although the sapphire colors other things, it nevertheless is free of discrimination.

In at least two places the author has dropped text: p. 168 between ll. 16–17 he has omitted *’dus ma byas su mi blta’o* || from a list (it is however in his translation), and two pages later at 170 l. 4 what he prints as *de gshogs pa* is *de bzhin gshogs pa*.

One might well conclude that, faced with sheer drudgery of collating a large number of xylographs and block prints, not to mention the trouble of obtaining copies of them in the first place, little would be gained by moving beyond the widely available xylographs of Derge and Peking and the manuscript from sTog. This is not in itself a silly thing to think, and from the point of view of establishing a readable and for the most part ‘reliable’ text, I would consider it acceptable. But to call the result of such a collation—even if done correctly—a “critical edition” is another thing again. The editor of our text has shown himself to be, to borrow the expression of a compassionate friend of mine, utterly “innocent” of the nature and definition of a critical edition, concerning which a considerable amount has been written. Even if the author had only examined what was widely available before 1991 on the topic of Kanjur textual criticism, he would have been drawn to treat his project somewhat differently, I imagine. In fact, however, there is more wrong with the edition of this text than that it is not critical. It is easy to demonstrate that even for the few editions the editor claims to have consulted, he has failed to record their significant readings in numerous cases.¹²

¹²⁾ My *impression* is actually that he has failed to do this in the majority of cases, but my sample size is too small to make this claim.

While the Introduction to the edition (quoted virtually in full above) is brief, that to the translation is not only insubstantial, but often weak, by which I mean also that the relation of much of what the author has to say to the sūtra putatively under study is far from clear (this is also an extremely frequent problem with the notes to the translation). A few examples may illustrate his method. The author dates the text (p. xv) to between the third century BCE and the first century CE, his reasoning being (pp. xlvi–xlviiii) that the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* and the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka* have been dated to the first century CE. A number of doctrines found in these texts and in some works of Nāgārjuna are not found in the *Satyaka*. Ideas such as “the five paths and ten stages of the bodhisattva, reference to the form body and the body of truth of the Buddha,” or mention of images of the Buddha or image worship are absent. “All of [these] are pivotal elements in the Mahāyāna works developed later, such as the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīka*.” On the other hand, “The *Satyaka*’s presentation of the thirty-two auspicious marks and the eighty distinctive marks of the Buddha, and of his virtues, are identical to those of the Sarvāstivādins and Theravādins. The *Satyaka*’s viewpoint, therefore, lies somewhere between the perspective of the Sarvāstivādins and the conceptions and theories of the fully developed Mahāyāna. It therefore plausibly could be considered an early-stage Mahāyāna text.” One hardly knows what to say. This compelled silence is only compounded by the immediately following consideration of the sūtra and the Aśokan edicts, which the author begins by asserting that “There is considerable evidence to indicate that the compilation of the *Satyaka* was influenced by the Edicts of King Aśoka or vice versa.” After citing several edicts, each time suggesting that they influenced the sūtra “or vice versa,” (an addition from the thesis version, in which only the first possibility was envisaged), the author suggests (p. li) that “it thus seems plausible that the *Satyaka* could have been compiled during Aśoka’s reign or before the diminishing of the influence of the Aśokan Edicts and the great sovereignty of the Mauryan dynasty.” At least it is now clear upon what grounds the author has suggested the range between the third century BCE and the first century CE for his text.

Returning to the question of source materials, the author states that “The Sanskrit version of this unique teaching of the Buddha was lost several centuries ago” The implication seems to be that some Sanskrit text survived until, say, the 16th century, but no further explanation is offered. As an apologia for not considering the Chinese translations, the author states that (xvii): “Lacking knowledge of Chinese and wishing to pursue the Tibetan text in its own context, I have not thoroughly investigated the differences between the Chinese and Tibetan versions.” While it would be better to be able to take into account all relevant sources, one can only do what one is able to do. Why, however, the author sees fit to offer no further information as to what “its own context” might mean to him is less clear.

Much of the Introduction addresses the theme of the sixth chapter, and we learn that (p. xxvi) “In the Buddhist tradition, many scriptures dealing with law and polity, *dharmasāstras*, had been written, but the original Sanskrit versions of almost all of them have been lost.” Most probably what the author has in mind are *nīti* texts, but it is hard to know since he cites no examples; as far as I know, there is no such thing as a “Buddhist *dharmasāstra*.”

When passages of the *sūtra* are cited in the Introduction, there is no indication of their location in the text, so finding the passages in question is very difficult. Moreover, the analysis offered is often less than spare. Of the three pages devoted to “Karmic retribution for killing others during war,” for example, about two thirds consists of quotations from the *sūtra* and the *Manusmṛti*, the latter of which is characterized in its entirety with a single sentence: “Such advice is contrary to the peacemaking tenor of the *Satyaka*.” Many other references to and comparisons with other literature do not benefit even from such a brief analysis as this.

When it comes to more strictly doctrinal aspects of the scripture, the author turns primarily to Madhyamaka authors, although he does not connect their positions with quotations from the *sūtra*. It is probably not too much of a leap to see evidence of the author’s traditional scholastic training, in which categories and listing can (although in the right hands they certainly need not) take the place of analytic or synthetic thought. The final section of the Introduction offers no summation but instead is titled “The Ten Powers of the Tathāgata.” It begins “The powers of the Tathāgata are mentioned only briefly in the *sūtra* ...,” but the author then goes on to quote at length from Candrakīrti’s autocommentary to the *Madhyamakāvātāra*. Nothing follows this quotation; the Introduction ends abruptly, with a notation of two “Abbreviations and Sigla,” of which neither is an abbreviation; we have only the indication that brackets are used for material added by the translator, and that † marks a page break in the Derge “recension.” The author’s use of brackets is inconsistent.

When it comes to the translation, it is, unfortunately, not an exaggeration to say that it is rife with substantial errors. These range from missing or added text (for the latter, questions where none stand in the Tibetan, for instance), to inconsistencies in technical terms (the appended glossaries appear not to have helped much in this regard), very often within the course of a single paragraph, making coherent understanding impossible, misconstruals of syntax, and almost everything in between. In the following I have tried to notice not necessarily the worst cases, but typical (even random) instances.

On page 11 we find *yi dam* rendered twice in a list as ‘commitment,’ while in the immediately following list it has become ‘pledge.’ On page 30 within one and the same sentence *snying po* is rendered both ‘quintessence’ and ‘essence.’ On page 44 in a single verse (1) “nonvigilant” and “remiss in their duties” represent

the same term, as do “hell” and “hell realms.” Later in the same series of verses (verse 11) *log par lta*, perhaps *kudṛṣṭi*, is rendered “unrealistic views,” which is a rather politically correct (mis)translation. Such things might be considered relatively trivial, and indeed they may be.

What is important or substantial depends, of course, on the question of who is making that judgement. But if we imagine, for instance, that art historians might read this translation, their attention might be drawn to the 4th verse of Chapter III, which is translated (p. 28): “Although [the bodhisattva] may appear playing amidst women, clanging together bracelets [on his arms], he never ceases contemplating the sufferings of sentient being [which are] due to the miseries of hells and so forth.” The Tibetan text (ed. 43; Derge 93b2, Peking 49a6–7, sTog 18a7–b1) reads:

gdu bu 'khrol ba'i sgra chen 'byung ba yi |
 btsun mo'i^a 'khor na de dag sgeg par^b snang ||
 sems can dmyal la^c sogs pa'i gnod pa yis ||
 sems can sdug bsngal sems shing rtag mi gyo ||

a: P: *mo* for *mo'i*; b: D: *sgreg bar* (LJ indicates the reading *sgreg*, but not *bar*); c: P: *pa* for *la*

The bangles or bracelets here belong to the women, not to the bodhisattva. Moreover, the women mentioned here, *btsun mo'i 'khor*, are the harem (*antahpura*), something missed also at the beginning of the same chapter in the third item of the first list, when the bodhisattva is said to appear “to dwell amidst a circle of women,” *btsun mo'i 'khor gyi nang na*, rather: within the harem. It is interesting to note that at least the second Chinese translation T. 272 does seem closer to Jamspal's understanding in having the bodhisattva adorn himself (324c27–325a1): 菩薩方便行一切諸境界 或現種種相 殊妙莊嚴身 遍諸宮女中行於放逸行 或現在地獄 救諸苦衆生. What this says, however, is that the bodhisattva practices his upāya everywhere, sometimes appearing with various marks, his body adorned wonderfully, sporting amidst the palace women, sometimes in hell saving suffering beings. Therefore, the bodhisattva's appearance in the two realms is presented as parallel, not as in Jamspal's reading of the Tibetan as logically connected. (The older Chinese translation T. 271 [304b28–29] does not mention the bangles).

At the end of the text we find a discussion of relics. King Aśoka, we are told, will come to Rājagṛha. “He will prepare,” the translation tells us (p. 121), “a great celebration of offerings and remove the reliquary along with the relics.” This translation suggests that there is some focus on the relics here, but the Tibetan text has rather (ed. 194; D 140b3–4; P 100b1; S 81b6) *mchod pa'i cho ga^a mngon par 'du bya ba chen po byas te sa'i phyogs de nas ring bsrel gyi za ma*

tog de phyung nas (a: P: *go cha* for *cho ga*), indicating that, after celebrating the ritual, what the king did is take the relic casket (**dhātukaraṇḍa?*) from that spot (**pṛthivīpradeśa*). That there is no relic as such here (that is, what is in the reliquary is the text itself) is obvious from the following. The translation goes on: “the teacher Indrasukha will reveal this Dharma scripture from the reliquary and bring it to the northern region of this great country. There, not many people will receive it or read it. There shall be only a few people who will read and retain this Dharma teaching.” The text reads (ed. 195; D 140b5–7; P 100b3–5; S 82a2–3): *de'i tshē^a chos smra ba dbang po bde bas chos kyi rnam grangs 'di ring bsrel^b gyi za ma tog nas phyung nas | byang phyogs kyi rgyud kyi yul chen por 'jog par 'gyur te | skye bo mang pos shes par mi 'gyur | skye bo mang pos rig par mi 'gyur | skye bo mang pos yongs su bzung^c bar mi 'gyur la chos kyi rnam grangs^d 'dzin pa nyung ba dang | klog pa nyung bar 'gyur te |* (a: P: omits *tshē*; b: P: *srel* for *bsrel*; c: S *gzung* for *bzung*; d: LJ correctly notes that S adds *'di ni*, which he adopts into his text), “At that time the preacher (**dharmabhāṇaka*) Indra-?, having removed this scripture (**dharmaṃparyāya*) from the relic casket, will place it in a great country in the north; many persons will not know it, many persons will not understand it, many persons will not comprehend (**pari√grah*) it; on the contrary, few will uphold this scripture, few will read it.” The Chinese versions are instructive: T. 271 (316a14–17): 爾時，因陀舍摩法師，從於寶箱出此經已，安置北方多人住處。此經又無多人識知，無多人解，無多人受，少人受持讀誦此經。T. 272 (365b4–8): 爾時，淨自在比丘，於彼舍利函中取此法門，在於北廂大國土中廣宣流布。文殊師利，彼淨自在比丘，雖加流布，而此法門受持者少，多人不知，多人不覺，多人不攝，多人不受，希有人能受持讀誦此法門者。 The first Chinese version has the name of the preacher phonetically as 因陀舍摩, the second translates it as 淨自在. The name element Indra is clear from the Tibetan *dbang po* alongside 因陀 and 自在. If we assume that *bde ba*, 舍摩 (**śa-ma*) and 淨 represent the same thing, no very good possibility occurs to me without invoking all sorts of possible but not necessarily applicable hypotheses. (Jamspal himself in a note, 218n18, suggests that his *indrasukha* “is probably a misreading of Indragupta ... who superintended the construction of the eighty-four thousand *vihāras* ordered by Aśoka. Therefore, Skt. *indrasukha* should be read as *indragupta* and Tib. *dbang po bde ba* as *dbang po sbas pa*.” This hardly needs to be seriously considered, and the author’s eagerness to willy-nilly rewrite his text is noteworthy.)

Coming to central elements in the discussion in the sixth chapter, it is illustrative to compare the treatment of a passage by Jamspal and the earlier translation of Michael Zimmermann. The passage reads (ed. 80; Derge 104a5–b3; P 60b5–61a3; S 32b7–33a6):

smras pa | log pa'i chos kyis^a 'khor zhes^b bya ba gang yin |
 smras pa | don gyi bstan bcos su ming btags pa | gnod par 'gyur ba dang ldan pa | dam
 pa'i chos ltar bcos pa | rtsod pa'i dus na skyes bu dam pa ma lags pas bgyis pa la mos
 pas yongs su bgos^c pa'i lta bas yon tan du lta ba lags so ||
 smras pa | bram ze bstan bcos gang la chos dang ldan pa'i rgyal pos brten^d cing skye dgu
 skyong bar byed pa'i bstan bcos gang yin |
 smras pa | rgyal po chen po de ni bstan bcos gang las mi rigs pa'i chags pa dang | mi rigs
 pa'i zhe sdang dang | mi rigs pa'i gti mug gi gnyen po rang bzhin nam | rab tu dbye
 ba'am | phan yon gyi sgo nas bstan pa ste | de la gnyen po'i rang bzhin ni 'di lags te |
 'di lta ste | de'i gnyen por 'gyur ba ma chags pa dge ba'i rtsa ba dang | zhe sdang ma
 mchis pa^e dge ba'i rtsa ba dang | gti mug ma mchis pa^f dge ba'i rtsa ba lags so || de la
 gnyen po kun nas slong ba ni 'di lags te | 'di lta ste | bag mchis pa dang | snying rje lags
 so ||
 rgyal po chen po de la chos dang ldan pa'i rgyal po'i longgs spyod rnam^g dang | bdag nyid
 kyang mi rtag par rtags shing | dran pa nye bar bzhag^h ste | nyes dmigs su lta zhing nges
 par 'byung ba 'tshal bas | longgs spyod rnam^h la spyod^h cing | rgyal po'i dbang phyug gi
 dbang bgyid pa 'di ni | de'i bag mchis pa lags so ||

a: D, S: *kyi* for *kyis*; LJ notes S but not D; b: P, S: *ces* for *zhes*; c: D, P: *bsgos* for *bgos*;
 d: P: *rten* for *brten*; LJ's note wrongly gives: S, D, N, P: *rten* for *brten*; e: D, S: *pa'i*
 for *pa*; f: D, S: *pa'i* for *pa*; g: D, P: *gzbag* for *bzhag*; LJ is here correct; h: P: omits
rnam la spyod.

Jamspal p. 51

Caṇḍapradhyota: What is the meaning of
 going astray by means of perverse law?

Satyavādin: In the aeon of strife and discord,
 people believe in harmful law texts, said
 to be the texts of law and promoted as
 holy teachings by inferior people. Full of
 [deluded] convictions, they view such texts
 of law as virtuous.

Caṇḍapradhyota: O brahmin, what [kind of]
 law text can a virtuous ruler rely upon to
 protect the people?

Zimmermann 2000: 187

[The king] asked: “What does ‘to be
 confused by a wrong law (*mithyādharmā*)’
 mean?”

Answer: “It is to [wrongly] conceive of the
 so-called *arthaśāstra*(s) as virtuous (*guṇa*)
 [caused] by [a wrong] view (*dṛṣṭi*) habituated
 through belief [into these writings. But those
arthaśāstra(s)] are connected with what leads
 to harm, [they are] counterfeits of the good
 law (**saddharma-pratirūpaka*) and are made
 by bad people in [this last and] vicious [of
 the four] age(s) (*kaliyuga*).”

[The king] asked: “Brahmin, which are the
śāstras on that [] which, [JAS] a king loyal to
 the dharma bases himself and protects [his]
 subjects (*prajā*)?”

Jamspal p. 51

Satyavādin: Your Majesty, it is a law text that by means of its nature, divisions, and meritorious results describes the antidotes to inappropriate attachment, hatred, and ignorance. The nature of these antidotes are as follows: the nonattachment root of virtue is the antidote to attachment; the loving root of virtue is the antidote to hatred; and the insight root of virtue is the antidote to ignorance. These antidotes are the result of heedfulness and compassion.

Your Majesty, a righteous ruler, after attaining a realization regarding the impermanence of himself and his possessions, then mindfully would consider the disadvantages of worldly things. Then while ruling over his domain, he would use those possessions without being attached to them. This is called the heedfulness of a ruler.

My own suggestion for a reformulation of Jamspal's last paragraph would be something like:

Your Majesty, a righteous ruler, after realizing and being mindful of the impermanence of himself and his possessions, then mindful of the disadvantages desires certain liberation; this enjoying of his possessions and exercising power [in this manner] is heedfulness.

The immediately following passage reads (ed. 81; D 104b3–6; P 61a3–8; S 33a6–b4)

gang la gnas te ma thob pa'i longs spyod kyi 'bras bu la nye bar mi 'tsho ba dang | thob pa la'ang^a dus ma yin par nye bar mi 'tsho ba dang | dus la bab kyang dbul po rnams la gnod pa bgyis shing^b mi 'tsho ba dang | mu ge'i gnod pa zhig byung na skye dgu rnams kyi skyabs bgyid pa dang | chom rkun gyi gnod pa dang | pha rol gyi dmag tshogs kyi gnod pa dang | gcig la gcig gnod par gyur pa zhig byung na | yang dag par phan 'dags par bgyid pa dang | dbul po rnams la nor sbyin pa dang | mi srun pa rnams la yang dag par chad pas bcad^c pa 'di ni | de'i snying rje zhes bgyi ste | rgyal po chen po | chos gnyis po de dag dang ldan na chos dang ldan pa'i rgyal po skye dgu yang dag par skyong bar bgyid ces bgyi ba lags te | bag mchis pa dang snying rje gnyis lags so ||

Zimmermann 2000: 187

Answer: “Great King, they are [those] *śāstras* in which the antidotes (*pratipakṣa*) against the evil (*viśama*) greed (*rāga*), the evil anger (*dveṣa*), and the evil misguidedness (*moha*) have been expounded according to [their] nature, [their] subdivisions (*prabbedā*), and [their] benefits (*anusāinsā*). Thereby the nature of the antidotes is [the following]: the wholesome root (*kuśalamūla*) of the [evil's] antidote “without greed”, the wholesome root of the [evil's] antidote “without anger”, and the wholesome root of the [evil's] antidote “without misguidedness”. What thereby gives rise (*samutthāna*) to the antidotes is conscientiousness (*apramāda*) and compassion (*karuṇā*).

“Great King, a king loyal to the [right] dharma understands and brings to [his] awareness (*smṛtyupasthāna*) that material wealth and he himself too are not lasting; [he thus] perceives the misery [of these things] (*ādīnava*) and desires deliverance (*niryāna*). [If he] handles material wealth and practices [his] sovereign power with [the aforementioned attitudes], then this is his conscientiousness (*apramāda*).”

smras pa | bram ze nram pa gang gis na ji ltar chos dang ldan pa'i rgyal po snying rje can
 mi srun pa chad pas gcod pa yin |
 smras pa | rgyal po chen po chos kyi rgyal po chos dang ldan pa snying rje can ni | gnas
 lnga la dran pa nye bar gzhas cing mi srun pa chad pas gcod pa lags so ||

a: P, S *thob pa'ang* for *thob pa la'ang*; LJ only notes S; b: D, P, S all add *nye bar*, missing in LJ's edition; c: S: *gcad* for *bcad*.

Jamspal translates (p. 52):

As a ruler, he must not use inappropriate possessions [and he must not] even use appropriate possessions at an improper [time] or even at a proper time if that would be harmful to the poor. Were crop failure or famine to occur to [afflict] the people, he should provide them with protection. He also should protect people from the harm and ill caused by robbers and thieves, armies from other states, and one another. He should benefit all. He should give property to the poor and lawfully chastise the wicked. This is called the compassion of the ruler. O Your Majesty, by possessing these two virtues of heedfulness and compassion, a righteous ruler perfectly can protect the people. Therefore, heedfulness and compassion are very important for the ruler.

Caṇḍapradīyāta: O brahmin, how does a compassionate and righteous ruler chastise wicked people?

Satyavādīn: O Your Majesty, remaining mindful of the five states, a compassionate and righteous ruler should consider these necessities while punishing wicked people.

I would offer instead:

As a ruler, he must not use inappropriate possessions or use appropriate possessions at an improper [time] or even at a proper time if that would be harmful to the poor. Were there to occur the affliction of famine, he will provide the people with protection. Were there to occur affliction from thieves, armies from other states, or that [inflicted on] one by another, he will defend them (? **sam\grah*; T. 272 [333a29] 護). He will give property to the poor and punish the ill-behaved (**durjana*?). This is called compassion. Your Majesty, by possessing those two qualities (*chos*), a righteous (*chos*) ruler will protect the people, [namely], heedfulness and compassion.

Caṇḍapradīyāta: O brahmin, by means of what good qualities (**ākāra*) does a compassionate and righteous ruler punish the ill-behaved?

Satyavādīn: Your Majesty, mindful (**smytyupasthā*) of five states, a compassionate and righteous dharma king punishes the ill-behaved.

Since it is not possible or desirable to catalogue all instances in which I find the translation lacking, I will restrict myself here to several more cases in which I find erroneous translations that might cause confusion for those not able to read the text on their own. I should emphasize that these are very far from isolated examples.

Concerning the question of royal involvement in the internal affairs of the monastic community, we find a passage which contains some technical terminology of monastic discipline (see Clarke 2008: 125 ff.; ed. 86–87; D 106b3–5; P 63a7–b2; S 36a4–7; trans. 55):

smras pa | log bar zhugs pa^a nmas la ji ltar nan tan du bya |
 smras pa | rgyal po chen po yang dag pa'i ngyen po'i phyogs la gzud^b pas bzlog par bgyi'o
 || rgyal po chen po gal te gang zag tshul khriims nyams pa'am | lta ba nyams pa'am |
 cho ga nyams pa'am | 'tsho ba nyams pa zhig dge 'dun 'thun pas sbyangs^c te | brtags
 nas bskrad par bgyis pa'am | rang gis khas^d blangs pa las dge 'dun gyis bskrad par mi
 nus na | de la chos dang ldan pa'i rgyal pos yang dag pa la yang dag par rtogs par bgyis
 te | btsun pa'i phyogs kyi grogs bgyi'o ||

a: P *zhugs par zhugs pa* for *zhugs pa*; b: LJ prints *bzud* with a note that D, P, S have *bzud*, but in fact all read *gzud*; c: LJ correctly notes *S dbyangs* for *sbyangs*; d: LJ correctly notes P *khas zas* for *khas*.

Caṇḍapradyota: How does one take care of those who go astray?

Satyavādin: Your Majesty, by means of applying the perfect antidote, one should be able to stop them. If a person in a spiritual community loses his morality, right views, right practice, or right livelihood, then the spiritual community ought to purge, examine, and expel him; if with their words, however, they are not able to do so, the ruler perfectly should realize the truth and support the venerable ones' position [the side of the saṅgha].

For the answer, we must translate rather:

[*Satyavādin*] said: Your Majesty, one will turn them back [from their misbehavior] by applying the perfect antidote (**pratipakṣa*). Your Majesty, if a person loses his morality, right views, right practice, or right livelihood, then a meeting of the spiritual community (**saṅghasāmagrī*) will purify him and, having examined him, expel him; if the spiritual community cannot expel him by his own admission [**pratijñā*; of a fault, which in the case of expulsion should be a *pārājika* offense], in that case a righteous ruler perfectly realizes the truth [of the situation] and supports the position of the elders.

One might imagine that while there are errors in narrative passages, given the translator's evident interest in the Madhyamaka the philosophical passages might be rendered with great precision. That is however not the case. What Jamspal calls chapter 11 ("The Ultimate Truth") begins with a list of those who "do not see the Tathāgata." Included in this list are (ed. 167; D 130a7–b1; P 88b7–8; S 67b4–5): *ngar 'dzin pa mthong ba ni de bzhin gshegs pa mthong ba ma yin | nga yir 'dzin pa mthong ba ni de bzhin gshegs pa mthong ba ma yin | mtshan ma mthong ba ni de bzhin gshegs pa mthong ba ma yin pa'i phyir te* |, "One who perceives self-grasping [an egoist] does not see the Tathāgata. One who perceives self-accomplishment [an egoist] does not see the Tathāgata. And one who perceives any identity whatsoever does not see the Tathāgata." We notice that two of the items are glossed identically. In fact, these two are a constant pair, and with the third are members of a common list, *ahaṃkāra* and *mamakāra*, with the third item being *nimitta*, thus the reference is to one who imagines a sense of 'I', one who imagines a sense of 'mine' and one who imagines some sort of 'mark' or characteristic, perhaps

of existent things (although one should be careful not to impose doctrinal categories which are not evident in the text itself).

A final example may be drawn from the fourth chapter, that on the Unique Vehicle (ed. 54; D 97a3–6; P 53a4–7; S 23a4–b1; trans. 36)

'jam dpal yang sangs rgyas kyi zhing 'di na gzhan mu stegs can spyod pa pa dang | kun tu rgyu^a dag snang ba 'di yang de bzhin gshegs pa'i byin gyi rlabs dang thabs la mkhas pa'i yul bsam gyis mi khyab ba yin par rig par bya'o || de ci'i phyir zhe na^b | 'di ltar mu stegs can gzhan gyi sgo 'di dag thams cad ni rnam par thar pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i sgo la gnas pa dag ste | shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa las nges par byung ba dag go | thabs la mkhas pas rnam par rtse ba dag go | sangs rgyas dang chos dang dge 'dun yid la bya ba ma trang ba dag go | sems can yongs su smin par bya ba rnam la dam pa'i pha rol tu son pa dag go | sems can yongs su smin par bya ba'i phyir de bzhin gshegs pa'i byin gyi rlabs kysis byin gyis brlabs pa dag go |

a: D, P, S all + *gang*; b: P *i' phyir zhe na* for *de ci'i phyir zhe na*

Mañjuśrī, again, one should realize that in this buddha-field, all heterodox ascetics and wandering mendicants appear only by means of the blessing and inconceivable domain of skillful means of the Tathāgata. Why? All these various gateways of the heterodox [ascetics] are at the gateway of inconceivable liberation. They advance toward the perfection of insight. They sport with skillful means. They do not abandon the contemplation of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha. Because they have been blessed by the consecrations of the Tathāgata, they are perfectly suited to the maturation of sentient beings.

For the sake of a sort of touchstone, we might notice the Chinese translations:

T. 271 (306a5–9): 文殊師利, 汝今當知如來受持不可思議方便境界。以是緣故, 此佛刹土現諸一切外道出家。所以者何。一切外道上首, 皆是住於不可思議解脫, 從般若波羅蜜出, 遊戲方便。亦不捨離念佛、法、僧。教化衆生到於彼岸, 如來受持化衆生故。

T. 272 (326c24–327a2): 文殊師利, 我佛國土有諸外道尼乾子等, 皆是如來住持力故。爲欲示現不可思議方便境界。何以故。此諸一切諸外道等, 皆是住於不可思議解脫門故。皆是大智究竟般若波羅蜜門故。一切皆得大方便力奮迅自在故。一切皆得不捨佛、法、僧等念故。一切皆到第一彼岸。以大神力教化衆生故。一切皆得如來加力教化衆生故。

The translation of this passage contains a number of misunderstandings in addition to a skipped sentence. After stating that where the Buddha appears heterodox practitioners cannot, the text continues (in a rough translation):

Mañjuśrī, once again, you should know that the appearance of heterodox practitioners and wandering ascetics (**anyatīrthikacarakaparivṛājaka*) in this buddha-field is the inconceivable [working] of the Tathāgata's salvific power (**adhiṣṭhāna*) and the domain of his skillful means. Why? In this fashion, all these approaches of heterodox practitioners dwell in the approach to inconceivable liberation. They emerge from the perfection of wisdom, they sport in skillful means. They do not abandon mental cultivation

of the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṅgha. They urge toward the highest perfection (**paramapāramitā*) those beings who are to be fully matured. They are empowered by the Tathāgata's salvific power for the sake of beings who are to be fully matured.

While more could certainly be said about the translation (and some things are perhaps best left to speak for themselves, such as King Śuddhodana's name glossed (p. 112) as "Pure Pudding" or Mahāprajāpati Gautamī's as "Great People Master Gautamī"), I believe the examples provided above suffice.

The notes to the Introduction and translation contain the same sorts of irrelevancies, flat out errors and the like as does the rest. "Buddhists," we are told (184n13), "do not accept ultimate outer objects." The references here are, it need hardly be said, to Yogācāra works, not to the sūtra (or any sūtra). When the author tells us (199n31) that Tibetan *cang shes* renders *ājāneya*, this is correct, but it is not obvious what he means when he explains the Tibetan term as meaning 'empathy.' Edgerton, to whom he refers in this context, quite rightly pointed out that the Tibetans misunderstood the term as related to *√jñā* and took it as 'omniscient,' a meaning recorded already by Csoma de Kőrös in his dictionary of 1834. One gains further insight into the author's starting point from expressions such as that in which he states (200n1, my emphasis) that "In addition to the six perfections, there are four more perfections. These are *really* included in the perfection of insight." For the protagonist Satyavādin to obtain awakening as the Buddha predicts, he (204n3) "must be at least an eighth-stage bodhisattva or higher," with reference to the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*; there is no space here for imagining that the doctrine of the sūtra might not track classical Yogācāra thought (or the synthetic doctrinal schemes taught by modern Tibetan scholastics).

It is, in conclusion, a pity that the American Institute of Buddhist Studies and Columbia University Press should have permitted this work to appear. It does not reflect well on the author, does not contribute in a significant way to scholarship, and does not provide a foundation for future study. Both the edition and the translation need to be redone afresh. It is my hope that the modest information offered in this review might stimulate a capable scholar to undertake a proper study of this interesting scripture.

References

- Bendall, Cecil. 1897–1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva, Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 1 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Clarke, Shayne. 2008. “The case of the nun Mettiyā reexamined: on the expulsion of a pregnant bhikṣuṇī in the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṅghikas and other Indian Buddhist monastic law codes.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 51: 115–135.
- Grohmann, Friedrich F. (Gāo Míngdào 高明道). 1994. “*Púsà suǒxíng fāngbiān jìngjiè yóuxì shéntōngshuō* Fóshēnguāngyù suǒyǐn” 《菩薩所行方便境界遊戲神通說》佛身光喻索隱 [The Buddha’s Physical Splendour—Probing into Some Aspects of the Relevant Similies in the Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviśaya-vikurvāna-nirdeśa]. *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal / Zhōnghuá Fóxué xuébào* 中華佛學學報 7: 373–447.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2011. “Lost in the Daśottarasūtra, Found in the Kṣudrakavastu.” *Dunhuang Tulufan Yanjiu* 敦煌吐魯番研究 [Journal of the Dunhuang and Turfan Studies] 12: 85–98.
- Jamspal, Lozang. 1991. The Range of the Bodhisattva: A Study of an Early Mahāyānasūtra, “Āryasatyakaparivarta”, Discourse of Truth Teller. Doctoral thesis, Columbia University.
- Jenkins, Stephen. 2010. “Making Merit through Warfare and Torture According to the *Ārya-Bodhisattva-gocara-upāyaviśaya-vikurvāna-nirdeśa Sūtra*.” In Mark Juergensmeyer and Michael Jerryson, eds., *Buddhist Warfare* (New York: Oxford University Press): 59–75.
- Kuboi Takayuki 久保井隆之. 1999. “Daisasshakenjikyō no kōsei” 『大薩遮尼乾子經』の構成 [The Formation of the *Mahāsatyakanirgranthaputra-sūtra*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 47/2: 879–877 (146–148).
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1962. *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Langelaar, Reinier. 2011. Citing Sūtra Second-hand: Sūtra, Śāstra & Other Sources in Tsongkhapa’s *Lamrim Chenmo*. BA Thesis, World Religions, Leiden University.
- Pāsādika, Bhikkhu. 1989. *Nāgārjuna’s Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the Mdo kun las btus pa*. Fontes Tibetici Havnienses 2 (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).
- Takasaki, Jikido 高崎直道. 1974. *Nyorai-zō Shisō no Keisei: Indo Daijō Bukkyō Shisō Kenkyū* 如來藏思想の形成・インド大乘仏教思想研究 [Formation of the Tathāgatagarbha Theory]. (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Verhagen, Peter C. 2010. “Notes apropos to the Oeuvre of Si-tu Paṅ-chen Chos-kyi-‘byung-gnas (1699?-1774) (3): The ‘Editor’ Si-tu Paṅ-chen.” In Anne Chayet, Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, Françoise Robin, and Jean-Luc Achard (eds), *Edition, éditions: l’écrit au Tibet, évolution et devenir*. Collectanea Himalayica 3 (Munich: Indus Verlag): 465–482.
- Zimmermann, Michael. 2000. “A Mahayanist Criticism of *Arthaśāstra*: The Chapter on Royal Ethics in the *Bodhisattva-gocaropāya-ṣiśaya-vikurvāna-nirdeśa-sūtra*.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 1999*: 177–211.
- . 2006. “Only a Fool Becomes a King: Buddhist Stances on Punishment.” In Michael Zimmermann, ed., *Buddhism and Violence* (Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute): 213–242.