Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 20 • Number 1 • Summer 1997

ELI FRANCO

A Short Response to Roger Jackson's Reply

I am honored that Roger Jackson considered my review worthy of response. Unfortunately, I find his response as flawed as his book. The passages I discussed were not chosen arbitrarily; they simply form the beginning of the first two sections of his translation (on *pramāṇabhūtatva* and *jagaddhitaiṣitā*). Naturally they constitute only a sample, but I wonder why Jackson is so confident that they are unrepresentative for the whole work ("a few errors in a huge, translated work"). Let him rest assured: almost every single verse of his translation is faulty. The crux of the matter, however, is whether Jackson's mistaken translation represents rGyal tshab's understanding. I will argue against it not by adducing further "arbitrary" examples, but by explaining what is wrong with his methodology. Jackson assumes that if a word, which appears in the verse, appears in the commentary in certain manner, then rGyal tshab interprets the word in the verse in that manner. However, this assumption is unjustified. Furthermore, what happens if a word appears in two or more statements? Let's look again at GT252 / IEP222 quoted by Jackson in the response. Apart from obvious mistakes (*ston par 'gyur dgos pa* . . . is not "he became the teacher" but "the purpose / motivation of becoming a teacher," *ma mthun pa* is not "inappropriate" but "dissimilar," etc.), we see that *thugs rje* appears twice: the first time it is mistranslated ("compassionate"), but even the second time it is not capitalized (i. e., not taken as "incorporation"). On the other hand, the translation of *sñiṅ rje*, which also appears twice, is capitalized once. Yet Jackson argues that *thugs rje* (not *sñiṅ rje*) is not an instrumental. Even if this were of any relevance to his mistranslation "ACCUSTOMATION WITH," Jackson is inconsistent in the application of his own method because he should have capitalized "ACCUSTOMATION WITH previous HOMOGENES" and claimed that rGyal tshab construes "accustomation" with "homogenes" (*svajāti*) in the following verse. Even Jackson shrinks from such an interpretation, although philosophically it represents Dharmakīrti's opinion correctly. The fact that it crosses the boundaries of a verse is not unusual

for Dharmakīrti's statements. In the final analysis Jackson will have to admit that he did not capitalize "homogenes," because it is *grammatically* impossible to read the verse in this way. In numerous cases, however, he attributes grammatically impossible or highly improbable readings to rGyal tshab. Furthermore, when rGyal tshab "has altered the sequence of the verse" Jackson translates accordingly; however, it is obviously absurd to assume that rGyal tshab understood verses in reversed order.

Consequently, Jackson's translation of the verses does *not* represent rGyal tshab's understanding. Jackson erroneously maintains that "the capitalized words . . . indicate direct quotations from the root-verse." He simply confuses quotations and more or less close references to what is expressed in a verse. When rGyal tshab quotes, he adds *ces*, etc. Let me repeat myself: often it is impossible to "distill" rGyal tshab's interpretation of the verses word for word, certainly not by Jackson's method, which is mechanical, arbitrary, and furthermore disregards rGyal tshab's hermeneutical situation. Would rGyal tshab really suggest repeatedly and nonchalantly readings of the verses which blatantly go against Dharmakīrti, Devendrabuddhi, Prajñākaragupta, Ravigupta and Sa skya Paṇḍita taken together? For Jackson this is not even problematic. However, the "incorporation" of words from the verses in the commentary does not imply that rGyal tshab was the ignorant, misunderstanding, misinterpreting, distorting, "innovative" fool that Jackson would have us believe. Obviously, commentaries may distort, but the kind of literal, ungrammatical distortion assumed and presented by Jackson is, to my knowledge, unprecedented in any Indian or Tibetan commentary. To render *sā . . . asiddho 'bhyāsaḥ* "*compassioñ is not accomplished by accustomation*" is absurd, and to attribute this interpretation to rGyal tshab is an insult to traditional Tibetan scholarship.

Naturally Jackson attempts some damage-control, but his approach is, again, not quite scholarly. He takes some of my statements out of context, distorts others. (I did not "insist" that Jackson "should be reading rGyal tshab rje via Dharmakīrti"; I simply claimed that Jackson mistranslated and misinterpreted both Dharmakīrti and rGyal tshab, and I substantiated this claim with a considerable number of examples.) He minimizes and obscures the differences between us as well as the relevance of the general problems and mistakes pointed out by me (our differences are not even "significant"). His main strategy, however, is to limit the scope of my criticism: I focus "on passages and issues that are of secondary consequence." I address only "selected items" in the glossary and "two samplings" of the translation. Even concerning these insignificant parts, what

I have to say is hardly relevant, because Jackson conveniently compartmentalizes the whole issue: he is the soaring philosopher-Tibetologist, I the lowly, "fundamentalist" philologist-Indologist who is not interested in philosophical discussions, or worse, cannot understand them. Jackson's approach is unacceptable: it condones ignorance, promotes shallowness, and, in this case, led to distortion that is not rGyal tshab's but Jackson's own. Jackson certainly deserves a more response than was possible here within the limited space granted to me.