

川崎大師教學研究所紀要・第 10 号抜刷
令和 7 年 3 月 21 日 発行
川 崎 大 師 教 学 研 究 所

New Page From the Tibet Museum birch-bark Manuscript(2):

New Sanskrit Fragments of the
Sattvārāadhanastava Attributed to Nāgārjuna

Daisy Sze Yui Cheung 張思睿

**New Page From the Tibet Museum birch-bark Manuscript
(2):
New Sanskrit Fragments of the *Sattvārādhana*
Attributed to Nāgārjuna**

Daisy Sze Yui Cheung 張思睿

Abstract

In 1929, Sylvain Lévi published the Sanskrit *editio princeps* of the *Sattvārādhana*, a short hymn of eleven verses attributed to Nāgārjuna. However, the first two verses are missing from Lévi's Sanskrit manuscript, and the scholars from the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies in Sarnath, India, had to retranslate the first two verses from Tibetan back into Sanskrit. Now, we are fortunate to have a photograph of part of a complete Sanskrit manuscript of the *Sattvārādhana* preserved in the Tibet Museum. The photograph of the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript provides not only the original Sanskrit of the first two verses but also the missing *pādas* of 6cd and better readings in many places. In addition to this new photograph, there also exists another Nepalese fragment of the *Sattvārādhana* (NAK 5-135 = NGMPP B 24/56), which contains the first six verses. The present article presents a Sanskrit diplomatic edition of the Tibet Museum manuscript fragment, a new Sanskrit critical edition and an English translation of the *Sattvārādhana*, and the critical editions of the two Tibetan translations. The article ends with a reflection on the practice of retranslating Tibetan translations back into Sanskrit.

1. Introduction

In September 2024, when I was visiting the China Tibetology Research Center (hereafter CTIRC) in Beijing, China, I was offered the opportunity to have a look at a publication by the CTIRC. The publication was a big leather-bound book with more than 2,900 pages, including more than 3,000 photographs featuring the geography, history, arts, religions,

ethnography and science of the Chinese Himalaya region.¹ Among some beautiful photographs of Sanskrit manuscripts, one photograph immediately caught my eye. It was a photograph of the so-called Lhasa birch-bark manuscript, a mid-eleventh century Kashmiri birch-bark manuscript on display at the Tibet Museum (Lhasa, Tibet Autonomous Region, People's Republic of China) but still largely inaccessible to scholars. Some of the pages of this Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript have been photographed and published in other official publications before, but the folios on this page of this very big book have not been hitherto photographed. After examination, I confirm that the folios contain the end of the text *Pratisarā* and the first ten verses (out of eleven) of the *Sattvārāadhanastava* attributed to Nāgārjuna. These folios are valuable because they provide the Sanskrit original of the first two verses and *pādas* 6cd of the *Sattvārāadhanastava*, which are missing in the apograph on which Lévi based his 1929 edition. I also confirm Jens-Uwe Hartmann's suspicion that the first two verses of the *Sattvārāadhanastava* in Hartmann's edition were translated from Tibetan back into Sanskrit by the scholars from the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies in Sarnath, India. I further confirm that *pādas* 3cd of Hartmann's edition were added by the Indian scholars based on the Tibetan translations. Based on this new photograph, I will provide a Sanskrit diplomatic edition of the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript fragment.

Péter-Dániel Szántó kindly informed me that there exists another Nepalese fragment of the *Sattvārāadhanastava* (NAK 5-135 = NGMPP B 24/56) which contains verses 1–6d.² Based on the new photograph of the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript, the new Nepalese fragment (NAK 5-135 = NGMPP B 24/56) and the original Sanskrit manuscript on which Lévi's edition is based (NAK 3-715 = NGMPP B 23/8), I will provide a new Sanskrit critical edition and an English translation of the *Sattvārāadhanastava*, followed by the critical editions of the two Tibetan translations.

Before introducing the new materials, a brief overview of the materials we have so far is due.

1.1 Materials We Have So Far

1 Zhang 2022.

2 Email communication, 14 May 2025.

a. Sanskrit Editions

There are several Sanskrit editions of the *Sattvārādhanaśtava*. Sylvain Lévi published the Sanskrit *editio princeps* of the *Sattvārādhanaśtava* in 1929.³ Lévi's edition is based solely on an apograph of a single manuscript (NAK 3-715 = NGMPP B 23/8),⁴ and is incomplete, as the first two verses are missing from the manuscript. In 1992, scholars from the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies in Sarnath, India published another Sanskrit edition in volume 14 of the journal *Dhīh*,⁵ completing the edition by adding a Sanskrit retranslation of the missing verses from the Tibetan translation.⁶ The title is rendered as *Sattvārādhanaśāthā*, which is the Sanskrit title of one of the Tibetan translations (D4516/P5429), and is very likely a retranslation from the Tibetan title. In 1994, the Sarnath scholars published a slightly revised Sanskrit edition in the book *Bauddhastotrasamgraha*.⁷ In 2007, Jens-Uwe Hartmann published a new critical edition of the text and provided a German translation. Although Hartmann had some suspicion that certain verses in Pandey 1994 were retranslated by the Sarnath scholars,⁸ he still adopted most of its readings. The Japanese scholar Akimasa Tsuda published another Sanskrit critical edition in 2011⁹ and translated it into Japanese. Realising that some of the

3 Lévi 1929: 264–265.

4 Lévi 1929: 255, see also Szántó 2013: 444. The readings in the original Sanskrit manuscript differ slightly from those in the apograph used by Lévi, and the readings of the original are superior. For example, in 5a, the apograph reads *mahattvarāṣyam*, while the original manuscript reads *mahac ca rāṣyam*. In 10b, the apograph reads *viḍambanena yamalokaṃ prāpya sātmiṣṭāḥ*, whereas the original manuscript has the superior reading *viḍambaneyam atulā kaṃ prāpya sātmiṣṭā*. In 10c, the apograph gives *saṃsārāt taraṇaṃ ca*, while the original has the preferable reading *saṃsārābharāṇaṃ ca*. In 11 d, the apograph reads *bhavadbhiḥ*, while the original has the superior reading *vahadbhiḥ*. Additionally, *pādas* 6cd, which are missing from the apograph, are in fact present in the original manuscript.

5 Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1992: 1–2.

6 On the English “Abstracts of the articles” page, it is stated explicitly that “Tibetan translations of the verse...was found available by which three preliminary stanzas were restored and could able to present here the complete verse (*sic*)” (Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1992: 161).

7 Pandey 1994: 246–247, no. 100 *Sattvārādhanaśāthā*.

8 See Hartmann 2007, footnotes 4 and 21.

9 Tsuda 2011b.

verses in Pandey 1994 are retranslations, Tsuda omitted those retranslated by the Sarnath scholars in his edition.

b. Tibetan Translations

There are two different canonical Tibetan translations in the bsTan 'gyur: D1125/P2017 (hereafter T₁) translated by Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (982–1054) and Nag tsho lo tsā ba Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba (1011–1064); and D4516/P5429 (hereafter T₂) translated by Buddhākaravarman (11th century) and Chos kyi shes rab (11th century). In 2006, Akimasa Tsuda published the Tibetan edition of D1125/P2017 (with reference to the Sanskrit in the footnote).¹⁰ In 2011, he published the two canonical Tibetan translations together with the Sanskrit, providing Japanese translations for each versions.¹¹ In a 2010 blog post entitled “Dromton’s encouragement”, the Tibetologist Dan Martin informed us that there is a woodblock print of the Tibetan translation of the *Sattvārādhanaśtava* made in Amdo at the Kumbum Monastery.¹² Upon examination, this Amdo woodblock print turns out to be basically the same as T₁.

c. Modern Translations

There are modern translations of this text in at least five languages: French (Lévi 1929), German (Hartmann 2007), English (Brunnhölzl 2007: 313–315; Geshe Tsulga et al. 2015: 25–29; Khenpo Yeshe Gyaltzen et al. 2023), Japanese (Tsuda 2006: 337–340 and 2011b) and Chinese (Geshe Tsulga et al. 2015: 45–47).

d. Tibetan Commentary

There is a Tibetan commentary of the *Sattvārādhanaśtava* composed by the Mongolian monk Ngag dbang dpal ldan (1797–1864).¹³ The commentary is a commentary on the two Tibetan translations T₁ and T₂. The

10 Tsuda 2006: 337–340.

11 Tsuda 2011b.

12 <https://tibeto-logic.blogspot.com/2010/11/dromtons-encouragement.html> (last accessed 9 May 2025).

13 Tsuda 2011b: 75.

Tibetan commentary is edited and translated into Japanese in Tsuda 2011b. The commentary is also the subject of a master's thesis at the University of Munich.¹⁴

1.2 New Folios

a. New Photograph of the Tibet Museum Birch-bark Manuscript

The new photograph of the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript is on page 1185 of the aforementioned very big book (Zhang 2022). The photograph consists of two folios of the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript: on the left is a verso folio marked “sa sto 25” on the left margin, and on the right is a recto folio. The script is Proto-Śāradā.¹⁵ Each folio contains 18 lines. The left folio contains the end of the text *Pratisarā* and verses 1–5 of the *Sattvārāḍhanastava* and the right folio contains verses 5–10 of the *Sattvārāḍhanastava*. The Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript is bound by leather,¹⁶ and the leather flap can be seen in the photograph. The “sa sto” in “sa sto 25” in the margin probably indicates the abbreviation of the title of the text, i.e. *sattvārāḍhanastotra*. However, in the contents sheet of the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript, the text has the name *sattvārāḍhanastavaḥ* (item no. 9).¹⁷ The discrepancies in the name of the text (*sattvārāḍhanastotra* vs. *sattvārāḍhanastava*) might indicate that the scribe of the two folios of the photograph is not the same as the scribe of the contents sheet.¹⁸ The folio number “25” is also puzzling, because we know that in the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript, folio numbers are not marked consecutively but individually (i.e. each text has folio numbers of its own).¹⁹ Since the *Sattvārāḍhanastava/stotra* spans only three folios in the

14 Quarcoo 2007. I have not seen the master's thesis myself.

15 Also called Gilgit/Bamiyan type 2. For a script table of Proto-Śāradā or Gilgit/Bamiyan type 2, see Melzer 2014: 265–267.

16 For detailed description of the leather binding of the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript see Kano and Szántó 2020: 27–28.

17 Kano and Szántó 2020: 29.

18 Kano and Szántó are also of the opinion that the contents sheet is not contemporary with the other parts of the manuscript; see Kano and Szántó 2020: 28. My hypothesis is that the contents sheet was added by another scholar at a later stage.

19 See the folio numbers reported in Kano and Szántó 2020: 34. For an overview of other texts in the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript see Kano and Szántó 2020 and Kano 2021.

Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript, it is curious how the number “25” comes about.

b. New Nepalese Fragment

The new Nepalese fragment is contained in a composite codex (NAK 5-135 = NGMPP B 24/56).²⁰ *Sattvārāḍhanastava* starts from f. 5r3 with the obeisance *namo buddhāya* and breaks off in the middle of verse 6d on f. 5V5.

1.3 About the *Sattvārāḍhanastava*

In the colophons of both Tibetan translations, the *Sattvārāḍhanastava* is said to be extracted from the **Kṣāranadīsūtra*. According to Matsuda and Hartmann, this **Kṣāranadīsūtra* is not the same as the **Kṣāranadīsūtra* in the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* (no. 1177), but is a probably a Mahāyāna sūtra of the same name.²¹ There is also another text called the *Sattvārāḍhana* in the tantra section of the bsTan ’gyur (D2805/P3626), but it is a tantric *sādhana* rather than an exoteric hymn.

As for the authorship of the *Sattvārāḍhanastava*, the redactor of the hymn from the **Kṣāranadīsūtra* is attributed to Nāgārjuna in the colophons of both Tibetan translations. However, other scholars have different opinions about the attribution. Lévi reports that in the manuscript on which he based his edition, the *Sattvārāḍhanastava* is grouped together with other compositions of Aśvaghōṣa.²² Lindtner says the *Sattvārāḍhanastava* reminds him of Mātṛceta.²³ In any case, this text resembles the Buddhist *kāvyas* of the early first millennium.

The *Sattvārāḍhanastava* is usually transmitted together with the *Gurupañcāśikā* in composite codices, such as in NAK 3-715 = NGMPP B 23/8 (on which Lévi’s edition is based) and NAK 5-135 = NGMPP B 24/56 (i.e. the codex containing the new Nepalese fragment). Quoting the *Ādikarmapradīpa* of Anupamavajra, Kano and Szántó inform us that the

20 The composite codex includes a fragment of the *Gurupañcāśikā*, see Szántó 2013.

21 Matsuda and Hartmann 2022: (7)130.

22 Lévi 1929: 256.

23 Lindtner 1982: 17, n. 43.

Daśākuśalaparityāga, the *Ṣaḍgatikārikā*, the *Sattvārādhana*, the *Gurvārādhana* (= *Gurupañcāśikā*) and so on were used prior to tantric initiation.²⁴

The metres used in the eleven verses are: *Vasantatilakā* (verse 1–6), *Śārdūlavikrīḍitam* (verses 7–10) and *Mandākrāntā* (verse 11).

1.4 Synopsis of the Verses

In the *Sattvārādhanastava*, the Buddha declares that true worship of him exists solely through compassion for all sentient beings. He states that harming others—even mentally—contradicts genuine devotion, while service to beings constitutes the highest worship. The Buddha reveals that his entire spiritual journey, including his sacrifices, cultivation of virtues, and ultimate enlightenment, was undertaken solely for the welfare of all beings. He equates himself with sentient beings to such a degree that he considers harm done to them as harm done to himself. The Buddha questions the purpose of spiritual qualities like compassion and patience without sentient beings as their object, and concludes by instructing followers to maintain his teachings through selfless service to others, viewing their commitment to sentient beings as devotion to the Buddha himself.

1.5 New Material and Better Readings

As discussed above, the new Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript photograph provides us with the hitherto lost verses 1–2 and 6cd of the *Sattvārādhanastava*. By comparing the new verses with verses 1–2 in Hartmann’s edition, we can confirm that the verses 1–2 in his edition were retranslated from Tibetan back into Sanskrit by the scholars from the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies in Sarnath, India. *Pādas* 3cd of Hartmann’s edition were added by the Indian scholars based on the Tibetan translations as well.

The new folios also provide many better readings: *sattvahitā kṛṣāpi* for *sattvahitekṣaṇāpi* (4a), *upādadhāti* for *upādadāti* (4b), *sattvāpakāraṇam* for *sattvāpakāraparamaś* (E_I) or *sattvāpakāraparayā* (E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H) (6b), *ātanvatā* for *ātiṣṭhatā* (7b), *sattvārthe ca* for *sattvārthena*

24 See Kano and Szántó 2020: 31, and n. 13 therein.

(7c), *kva vālambyatām* for *ca kvālambyatām* (E_L) or *ca kvālambatām* (E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H)²⁵ (8a), *kvopekṣā muditā ca vastuviṣaye* for *kvopekṣāmuditādivastuviṣayāḥ* (E_H), *kopekṣā[m]uditādivastuviṣayāḥ* (E_L) or *kvopekṣāmuditādivastuviṣayaḥ* (E_{S1} E_{S2}) (8b), *°viḍambaneyam atulā kaṃ prekṣya sātmīkṛtā* for *°viḍambanena yamalokaṃ prāpya sātmīkṛtāḥ* (10b) and *saṃsārābharāṇam* for *saṃsārāt taraṇam* (10c).

2. Diplomatic Edition of the Sanskrit Fragment From the Tibet Museum Birch-bark Manuscript

Editorial signs:

*	<i>virāma</i>
❖	fleuron
@	<i>siddham</i> sign
{ }	cancelled <i>akṣaras</i>
[]	uncertain <i>akṣaras</i>
<u>h</u>	<i>jihvāmūlīya</i>
ḥ	<i>upadhmānīya</i>

Left margin: 25 sa sto

Left side:

Line 1: aṭṭaṭṭahāsasphoṭanāyai | vāyuvamgāyai | la 2 aum aum hrī bhra
Line 2: ma 2 bhrāmaya 2 sarvajvaravighnaviṇāyākām* grasa 2 praveśa
Line 3: ya 2 rakṣa 2 mama sarvatvām* jihvādantamalākulavajraghaṇṭā
Line 4: ya phaṭ* paraśupāsāya phaṭ* jvalitakhaḍgatomaratriśūlā
Line 5: ya phaṭ* || ❖ || namaś śrīvajrasattvāya || ||
Line 6: @ satvārtha eva mama bhaktir abhaktir anyā bhaktis tu tasya mayi
Line 7: yo na kṛpām jahāti | tyaktvā kṛpām vicarati skhalitāni yāni
Line 8: proddhartum arhati kṛpaiva tu tāni nānyaḥ 1 | tenārcito smi sa ca
Line 9: śāsanadhūrdharo me satveṣu yasya karuṇānugamapravṛttiḥ
Line 10: śīlaṃ śrutam ca karuṇā ca matiś ca paṭvī yasyāsti tena suga
Line 11: torcita eva nityam* || 2 || sattvopakāram adhikṛtya gato smi

25 As pointed out by Hartmann in Hartmann 2007: 255, n. 32, both *ca kvālambyatām* and *ca kvālambatām* are not possible in terms of metre. But Hartmann's edition still adopts the reading *ca kvālambatām*, which is probably a typo for a metrically correct emendation.

Line 12: siddhiṃ sattvārtham eva tanum eṣa [sa]mudvahāmi | satvān nihanti
 Line 13: manasāpi hi yas sa kasmān mām eva saṃśrayati yo mayi
 Line 14: nirvyapekṣaḥ 3 | {pūjā tu sā bhavatu} pūjā tu sā bhavati satva
 Line 15: hitā kṛṣāpi pūjyasya yā manasi tuṣṭim upādadhāti |
 Line 16: hiṃsātmikā paraviheṭhanasambhavā vā pūjā na pūjya
 Line 17: m anugacchati saṃskṛtāpi | 4 | dārās sutās ca vibhavaś ca
 Line 18: mahac ca rājyaṃ māṃsāni śonitavasā nayane śarī

Right side:

Line 1: raṃ | yeṣāṃ priyatvam adhikṛtya mayojjhitāni yas tān viheṭhayati
 Line 2: tena viheṭhito ham* 5 || satvopakāraparamā hi mamāgrapū
 Line 3: jā satvāpakārakaraṇaṃ ca parābhavaṃ me | duḥkhaṃ sukhaṃ ca mayi
 Line 4: satvasamānam iṣṭaṃ satveṣu yaḥ praharate sa kathaṃ madīyaḥ 6 ||
 Line 5: satvān prāpya mayā kṛtāni kuśalāny ārādhitās tāyinaḥ prāptāḥ
 Line 6: pāramitās ca satvasamiter evārtham ātanvatā | satvārthe ca sa
 Line 7: mudyatena manasā mārasya bhagnaṃ balaṃ sa[tvai]r eva tathā tathā
 vi
 Line 8: caritaṃ yenāsmi buddhaḥ kṛtaḥ || 7 || kasmin vastuni siddhyatām i
 Line 9: ha kṛpā maitrī kva vālambyatām* kvopekṣā muditā ca vastuvi
 Line 10: ṣaye kasmin vimokṣādayaḥ kasyārthe karuṇāpareṇa mana
 Line 11: sā kṣāntiś ciraṃ bhāvitā | na syur janmani janmani priyavidhau
 Line 12: mitraṃ yadi prāṇinaḥ | 8 | satvā eva gajādibhāvagatayo
 Line 13: dattā mayānekaśaḥ satvā eva ca pātratām upagatā de
 Line 14: yaṃ mayā grāhitāḥ satvair eva vicitrabhāvagamanād a
 Line 15: smatkrpā vardhitā | satvān eva na pālayāmi yadi tat kasyā
 Line 16: rtham arthaḥ kṛtaḥ 9 || saṃsāre vyasanābhighātabahule na syu
 Line 17: r yadi prāṇinaḥ janmāvartaviḍambaneyam atulā kaṃ prekṣa
 Line 18: sātṃkṛtā | saṃsārābharaṇaṃ ca saugatam idaṃ mātmyam a

3. Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text of the *Sattvārādhana*stava

Editorial signs:

deest omitted

E_H Edition by Hartmann

E_L Edition by Lévi (based on an apograph of N₁)

E_{S1} Edition by Sarnath scholars 1 = Rinpoche and Dwivedi 1992

E _{S2}	Edition by Sarnath scholars 2 = Pandey 1994
E _T	Edition by Tsuda
L	Lhasa (Tibet Museum) birch-bark manuscript
N ₁	NAK 3-715 = NGMPP B 23/8
N ₂	NAK 5-135 = NGMPP B 24/56 (contains new fragment of the <i>Sattvārāḍhanastava</i>)

namaḥ śrīvajrasattvāya ||

*sattvārtha eva mama bhaktir abhaktir anyā
bhaktis tu tasya mayi²⁶ yo na kṛpām jahāti |
tyaktvā kṛpām vicarataḥ²⁷ skhalitāni²⁸ yāni
proddhartum arhati kṛpaiva tu tāni nānyaḥ || 1 ||²⁹*

*tenārcito 'smi sa ca śāsanadhūrdharo me
sattveṣu yasya karuṇānugamā³⁰ pravṛttiḥ |
śīlaṃ śrutaṃ ca karuṇā ca matiś ca patvī
yasyāsti tena sugato 'rcita eva nityam || 2 ||³¹*

*sattvopakāram³² adhikṛtya gato 'smi siddhiṃ
sattvārtham eva³³ tanum eṣa samudvahāmi |³⁴*

26 *bhaktis tu tasya mayi*] L; *satveṣu satyam api* N₂

27 *vicarataḥ*] N₂; *vicarati* L

28 *skhalitāni*] L; *khalitāni* N₂

29 For verse 1 E_H p. 253 read instead (following the retranslation by the Sarnath scholars in E_{S1} and E_{S2}): *sattvārtham eva mayi tiṣṭhati sattvaśraddhā nānyatra sā hy aham aho 'dhigṛhītasattvaḥ | caryādhamā karuṇayā rahitā bhaved yā saṃbhāvyate karuṇayaiva prahānam asyāḥ ||*

30 *karuṇānugamā*] L; *karuṇānugatā* N₂

31 For verse 2 E_H p. 253 read instead (following the retranslation by the Sarnath scholars in E_{S1} and E_{S2}): *sattveṣu yasya nītarāṃ karuṇā pravṛttir ārādhakāḥ sa mama śāsanamarmavettā | śīlaṃ śrutiś ca karuṇā ca sudhīś ca yasya nityaṃ sa eva sugatārcanakṛn nigadyate ||*

32 *sattvopakāram*] L N₂; ...*kāram* N₁ E_L; [*sattvōpa-*]*kāram* E_T; *kalyāṇakāram* E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H

33 *sattvārtham eva*] L N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *satvārtha va* N₂

34 E_{S1} E_{S2} and E_H add two additional *pādas* afterwards: *naivaṃ kriyeta yadi sattvahitaṃ mayā ced vyartham karomi tanuṣaṇaṃ annapānaiḥ*. These two additional *pādas* are probably added by the Sarnath scholars, as they are not found in the Sanskrit manuscripts and the two Tibetan translations.

*sattvān nihanti*³⁵ *manasāpi hi yaḥ sa kasmān*
*mām eva saṁśrayati yo mayi nirvyapekṣaḥ*³⁶ || 3 ||

*pūjā tu sā bhavati sattvahitā kṛśāpi*³⁷
*pūjyasya yā manasi tuṣṭim upādadhātī*³⁸ |
hiṁsātmikā paraviheṭhanasambhavā vā
*pūjā na pūjyam anugacchati*³⁹ *saṁskṛtāpi* || 4 ||

*dārāḥ sutās ca vibhavaś*⁴⁰ *ca mahac ca rājyam*⁴¹
*māṁsāni*⁴² *śonitavase*⁴³ *nayane*⁴⁴ *śarīram* |
*yeṣāṁ priyatvam adhikṛtya mayojjhitāni*⁴⁵
yas tān viheṭhayati tena viheṭhito 'ham || 5 ||

sattvopakāraparamā hi mamāgrapūjā
*sattvāpakārakaraṇaṁ*⁴⁶ *ca parābhavo me*⁴⁷ |
*duḥkhaṁ sukhaṁ ca*⁴⁸ *mayi*⁴⁹ *sattvasamānam iṣṭaṁ*
sattveṣu yaḥ praharate sa kathaṁ madīyaḥ || 6 ||⁵⁰

sattvān prāpya mayā kṛtāni kuśalāṇy ārādhitās tāyinaḥ
*prāptāḥ pāramitās ca sattvasamiter evārtham ātanvatā*⁵¹ |

35 *niḥanti*] L; *hinasti* N₁ N₂ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

36 *nirvyapekṣaḥ*] L N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *nirvipekṣaḥ* N₂

37 *sattvahitā kṛśāpi*] L; *satvahitā kṛpāpi* N₂; *sattvahitekṣaṇāpi* N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

38 *upādadhātī*] L N₂; *upādadhātī* N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

39 *anugacchati*] L N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *adhigacchati* N₂

40 *vibhavaś*] L E_H E_T; *vibhavaś* N₁ N₂ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2}

41 *mahac ca rājyam*] L N₁ N₂ E_H; *mahattvarājyam* E_L E_T; *mahattva(ś ca) rājyam* E_{S1} E_{S2}

42 *māṁsāni*] L E_L E_T; *māṁsaṁ ca* E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H; *maṁsāni* N₁; *māṁsāmchi* N₂

43 *śonitavase*] N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_T; *śonitavaśe* E_H; *śonitavasā* L; *śonitavasa* N₂

44 *nayane*] L N₁ N₂ E_L E_{S1} E_H E_T; *nayate* E_{S2}

45 *mayojjhitāni*] L N₁ E_L E_H E_T; *mayojjhitam yad* E_{S1}; *mayojjhitam yat* E_{S2}; *na yo jhitāni* N₂

46 *sattvāpakārakaraṇaṁ*] L; *sattvāpakāraparamaś* N₁ N₂ E_L E_T; *sattvāpakāraparayā* E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H

47 *parābhavo me*] em.; *parābhavaṁ me* L; *parābhavaḥ syāt* N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *parābhavaḥ syād* N₂

48 *duḥkhaṁ sukhaṁ ca*] L; *duḥkhaṁ sukhañ ca* N₁; *duḥkhasukhañ co* N₂; *deest* E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

49 *mayi*] L; *mama* N₁; *sama* N₂; *deest* E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

50 6cd is missing in E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H and E_T.

51 *ātanvatā*] L; *ātiṣṭhatā* N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

*sattvārthe ca*⁵² *samudyatena manasā mārasya bhaganaṃ balaṃ*
*sattvair eva tathā tathā vicaritaṃ*⁵³ *yenāsmi buddhaḥ kṛtaḥ* || 7 ||

*kasmin vastuni sidhyatām iha kṛpā maitrī kva vālambyatām*⁵⁴
*kvopekṣā muditā ca vastuviṣaye*⁵⁵ *kasmin vimokṣādayaḥ*
*kasyārthe karuṇāpareṇa manasā*⁵⁶ *kṣāntiś ciraṃ bhāvitā* |
na syur janmani janmani priyavidhau mitraṃ yadi prāṇinaḥ || 8 ||

sattvā eva gajādibhāvagatayo dattā mayānekaśaḥ
*sattvā eva ca pātratām upagatā*⁵⁷ *deyaṃ mayā grāhitāḥ* |
sattvair eva vicitrabhāvagamanād asmatkṛpā vardhitā
*sattvān eva na*⁵⁸ *pālayāmi yadi tat*⁵⁹ *kasyārtham arthaḥ kṛtaḥ* || 9 ||

*saṃsāre vyasanābhighāta*⁶⁰ *bahule na syur yadi prāṇino*⁶¹
*janmāvartaviḍambaneyam atulā kaṃ prekṣya sātṃkṛtā*⁶² |
*saṃsārābharaṇaṃ*⁶³ *ca saugatam idaṃ mātṃmyam atyadbhutam*
*kasyārthe ca*⁶⁴ *samīhitaṃ yadi na me sattvā bhavyeḥ*⁶⁵ *priyāḥ* || 10 ||

yāvaca cedam jvalati jagataḥ śāsanam śāsanam me
tāvat stheyaṃ parahitaparair ātmavadbhir bhavadbhiḥ |

52 *sattvārthe ca*] L; *sattvārthena* N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

53 *vicaritaṃ*] L N₁; *viracitaṃ* E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

54 *kva vālambyatām*] L N₁; *ca kvālambyatām* E_L E_T; *ca kvālambatām* E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H

55 *kvopekṣā muditā ca vastuviṣaye*] L; *kvopekṣāmuditādivastuviṣayāḥ* E_H E_T;

kvopekṣāmuditādivastuviṣayaḥ E_{S1} E_{S2}; *kopekṣāmuditādivastuviṣayāḥ* N₁;

kopekṣā[m]*uditādivastuviṣayāḥ* E_L

56 *manasā*] L N₁ E_L E_H E_T; *manasaḥ* E_{S1} E_{S2}

57 *upagatā*] L N₁ E_L E_H E_T; *upagataṃ* E_{S1} E_{S2}

58 *na*] L N₁ E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *deest* E_L

59 *tat*] L; *cet* N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

60 *vyasanābhighāta*^o] L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H; *vyasanābhipāta*^o N₁ E_L E_T

61 *prāṇino*] N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *prāṇinaḥ* L

62 *°viḍambaneyam atulā kaṃ prekṣya sātṃkṛtā*] em.; *°viḍambaneyam atulā kaṃ prekṣa sātṃkṛtā* L; *°viḍambaneyam atulā kaṃ prāpya sātṃkṛtā* N₁; *°viḍambanena yamalokaṃ prāpya sātṃkṛtāḥ* E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

63 *saṃsārābharaṇaṃ ca*] L; *saṃsārābharaṇaḥ ca* N₁; *saṃsārāt taraṇaṃ ca* E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

64 *kasyārthe ca*] N₁; *kasyārthena* E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

65 *atyadbhutam ... priyāḥ*] E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *deest* L

*śrutvā śrutvā mama⁶⁶ sucaritaṃ⁶⁷ sattvahetor akhinnaiḥ
khedaḥ kāryo na ca tanum imāṃ muktasārāṃ⁶⁸ vahadbhiḥ⁶⁹ || 11 ||*

*samyaksambuddhabhāṣitaṃ sattvārādhanaṃ nāma mahāyānasūtrāntaṃ
samāptam⁷⁰ ||*

4. New English Translation of the *Sattvārāadhanastava*

Only [devotion to] the goal of sentient beings is my devotion, other is not devotion. But it is he who has devotion in me who does not forsake compassion. For the one who is wandering [in *samsāra*], only compassion and nothing else is able to remove those errors [he makes] after forsaking compassion. 1

I am worshipped by him, and he bears the burden of my teachings — he whose actions towards sentient beings follow compassion. He who has discipline, learning, compassion, and sharp intellect, always in fact worships the Well-gone One (*sugata*). 2

I have attained accomplishment for the sake of assisting sentient beings. Only for the sake of sentient beings, this one i.e. I (*eṣa*), maintain the body. He who harms sentient beings even with his mind, why does he resort to precisely me, being the one who is indifferent to me? 3

It is the worship that benefits sentient beings, even though small, which produces satisfaction in the mind of the one being worshipped [i.e. me, the Buddha]. The worship which has as its nature injury, or arising from harming

66 *mama*] N₁ E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T; *ca mama* E_L; deest L

67 *sucaritaṃ*] em.; *vicaritaṃ* N₁ E_L E_H E_T; *viracitaṃ* E_{S1} E_{S2}; deest L

68 *imāṃ muktasārāṃ*] E_H E_T; *imām uktaśārāṃ* E_L; *imaṃ muktasāraṃ* E_{S1} E_{S2}; *imām bhuktasārāṃ* N₁; deest L

69 *vahadbhiḥ*] N₁; *bhavadbhiḥ* E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T

70 *samyaksambuddhabhāṣitaṃ sattvārādhanaṃ nāma mahāyānasūtrāntaṃ samāptam*] N₁ E_L E_H E_T; *samyaksambuddhabhāṣitā sattvārādhanagāthā samāptā* E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H; deest L. The colophon of E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H and is probably a retranslation of the colophon of the Tibetan translation T₂.

others, even though performed well, does not arrive at the one to be worshipped. 4

Wife, sons, power, great kingdom,⁷¹ flesh, blood, marrow, eyes and body are all abandoned by me for the sake of those who are dear to me. He who harms them, harms me. 5

Indeed, assistance to sentient beings to the highest degree is the best worship for me, and causing harm to sentient beings is an insult [to me]. Suffering and happiness in me are accepted as similar to [those of] sentient beings; how can someone who harms sentient beings be related to me? 6

For the sake of sentient beings, wholesome deeds are done [and] the protectors are pleased by me. And the perfections are reached by me who is doing fully the benefit solely for the assembly of sentient beings. And with a mind exerted for the benefit of sentient beings, I shattered the army of Māra. It is sentient beings alone who have acted in various ways, as a result of which I have become the Buddha. 7

With regard to what thing is compassion accomplished here? And what should loving-kindness be directed at? And what is the scope of object for equanimity and sympathetic joy?⁷² What about liberations (*vimokṣa*) and so on?⁷³ In this undertaking of things which is dear to me (*priyavidhau*), for whose sake is patience cultivated for a long time by the mind intent on compassion, if in every existence sentient beings were not my friends? 8

71 Alternatively, we could take the word *mahat* separately and not together with *rājyam*, i.e. greatness (*mahat*) and kingdom (*rājyam*).

72 Compassion (*kṛpā* or *karuṇā*), loving-kindness (*maitrī*), equanimity (*upekṣā*) and sympathetic joy (*muditā*) are the four *brahmavihāras* or *apramānas*, see *Dharmasaṃgraha* (Kasawara 1885: 4): *catvāro brahmavihārāḥ || maitrī karuṇā muditopekṣā ceti*.

73 There are eight liberations (*vimokṣa*), see *Dharmasaṃgraha* (Kasawara 1885: 12–13): *aṣṭau vimokṣāḥ | tadyathā || rūpī rūpāṇi paśyati śūnyam | s| ādhyātmārūpasamjñī bahirdhārūpāṇi paśyati śūnyam | ākāśānaṃtīyāyatanam paśyati śūnyam | vijñānānaṃtīyāyatanam paśyati śūnyam | ākīṃcanyāyatanam paśyati śūnyam | naivasamjñānānaṃtīyāyatanam paśyati śūnyam | samjñāvedayitanirodham paśyati śūnyam ceti*. See also *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* 8.32.

I gave away precisely sentient beings in the form of elephants and so on repeatedly. Precisely the sentient beings who become the right recipients are made to accept the gift⁷⁴ by me. My compassion is increased by precisely the sentient beings because of [their] going through various existences. If I do not protect precisely the sentient beings, then for whose purpose is all this done? 9

If there were no sentient beings in this cycle of existence full of disasters and afflictions, this unparalleled show of the cycle of births⁷⁵—which I made it my own (*sātmīkṛtā*)—is for whom? And this marvellous greatness of the Buddha⁷⁶ which is the ornament of the cycle of existence—for whose sake would it be desired, if sentient beings were not dear to me? 10

And as long as this teaching of mine—which is the teaching of the world—blazes, you should remain intent on the benefit of others, just as [you are intent on] your own. Reflect again and again on my good deeds, [you] who are tireless should tire yourself for the sake of sentient beings. Do not maintain this body, which is without essence. 11

5. Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translations

Editorial signs:

@	<i>siddham</i> sign
D	Derge edition
E _T	Edition by Tsuda (Tsuda 2006 = Tsuda 2011)
N	Narthing edition
om.	omitted
P	Peking edition
T ₁	Tibetan translation 1
T ₂	Tibetan translation 2

74 The gift here is probably the gift of dharma, or even the gift of awakening.

75 The unparalleled show of the cycle of births probably means that the Buddha imitates saṃsāric activities through his emanation body (*nirmāṇakāya*).

76 The marvellous greatness of the Buddha probably refers to the Buddha's activities of saving sentient beings.

Tibetan translation 1 (T₁, by Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna and Nag tsho lo tsā ba Tshul khrims rgyal ba):

[D74b1, P86a8, E_T 2006 p. 337 (= E_T 2011 p. 83)]

@@@ || rgya gar skad du | satwa ā ra dā na sta paṃ⁷⁷ |
bod skad du | [P86b] sems can mgu bar bya ba'i bstod pa | 'jam dpal dbyangs
la phyag 'tshal lo ||

nga la gus pa sems can don te gus pa gzhan dag min ||
gang gis snying rje ma btang de yis nga la gus pa ste ||
snying rje btang nas gnas par gyur pa lhung ba gang yin pa ||
de ni de las snying rjes bslang bar nus kyi gzhan gyis min || 1 ||

gang gi⁷⁸ snying rje sems can la ni rjes su zhugs gyur pa ||
des ni nga yang mnyes byas des ni bstan pa'i khur yang bzung ||
tshul khrims thos pa snying rje dag dang blo dang gsal ba dag ||
gang la yod pa des ni rtag tu bde bar gshegs pa mchod || 2 ||

nga nyid sems can phan 'dogs gyur pas grub 'di brnyes pa ste ||
sems can kho na'i don du nga yis sku 'di yang dag bzung ||
sems can rnams la yid kyiis gnod par sems de gang gi phyir ||
nga la mi ltos⁷⁹ pas na de'i don ston par mi 'gyur ro⁸⁰ || 3 ||

sems can phan pa chung yang des ni mchod pa 'byung 'gyur te ||
gang gis yid ni mgu bar byed pa mchod pa yin pas so ||
gnod pa'i bdag nyid can nam gzhan la rnam par 'tshes ba'ang⁸¹ rung ||
legs par sbyar⁸² nas mchod par gyur kyang des ni mchod mi 'gyur || 4 ||

chung ma dag dang bu dang 'byor dang rgyal srid chen po dang ||
sha rnams dang ni khrag dang tshil dang mig dang lus rnams kyang ||

77 satwa ā ra dā na sta paṃ] D; satvā ra dā na sta ba P; Sattvārādhanastava E_T

78 gang gi] P E_T; gang gis D

79 ltos] D; bltos P E_T

80 de'i don ston par mi 'gyur ro] D; de yi don ston par mi 'gyur P E_T

81 ba'ang] D; 'ang P E_T

82 sbyar] DP; sbyang E_T

gang la brtse ba'i dbang du byas nas nga yis⁸³ yongs btang ba ||
des na de la gnod pa byas [D75a] na nga la gnod byas 'gyur || 5 ||

des na sems can phan pa byas na nga la mchod pa'i mchog ||
sems can gnod pa byas pa nga la shin tu gnod pa'i mchog ||
bde dang sdug bsngal nga dang sems can mtshungs par myong bas na ||
sems can rnams la 'tshe bar byed de nga yi slob ma ji ltar yin || 6 ||

sems can rnams la brten nas sangs rgyas mnyes dang dge ba byas ||
sems can [P87a] mang po'i don la rab gnas pha rol phyin pa thob ||
sems can don la brtson pa'i yid kyis bdud kyi stobs kyang bcom ||
sems can rnams la de lta de ltar spyad pa des na nga sangs rgyas || 7 ||

skye ba skye bar gces par gyur pa'i gnyen 'dra srog chags med gyur na ||
dngos po gang la 'dir ni snying rje byams las dmigs pa nges par 'grub ||
btang snyoms dga' ba la sogs dngos po'i yul dang rnam par thar la sogs
gang la ||
gang gi don du snying rje de la 'bad pa'i yid kyis bzod pa yun rings⁸⁴ bsgoms
|| 8 ||

glang po la sogs 'gro ba sems can rnams nyid du ma nga yis sbyin pa byas ||
sems can rnams nyid snod nyid du yang nye bar gyur pas nga yis sbyin pas
bsdus ||
sems can rnams nyid sna tshogs dngos por gyur pas nga yi⁸⁵ snying rje 'phel
bar gyur ||
gal te sems can rnams nyid bsrung ma byas na gang gi don du don 'di
bsgrubs || 9 ||

gal te sems can med na 'khor bar nyon mongs mi bzad rab tu mang po las ||
skye ba brgyud par gnod pa mtshungs pa med las gang la brten nas phan 'di
bsgrubs ||
bde bar gshegs kyi bdag nyid chen po ngo mtshar che ba 'khor ba'i rgyan
gyur 'di ||

83 yis] D E_T; yi P

84 rings] DP; ring E_T

85 yi] D E_T; yis P

gal te nga la sems can rnams la brtse med gyur na gang gi don du nye bar bsgrubs || 10 ||

*ji srid nga yi bstan pa 'gro ba rnams la phan pa 'dir ni 'bar gyur pa ||
de srid gzhan la mchog tu phan par 'dod pa khyed kyis gnas par gyis ||
thos pas nga yi⁸⁶ legs par spyad pa sems can don la mi skyo thos bgvid la ||
skyo ba med par lus 'di las ni snying po dag ni blang bar gyis || 11 ||*

*byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod ba tshwa'i chu klung zhes bya ba'i lung las
bcom ldan 'das kyis nyan thos chen po bcu drug la bka' stsal pa | [D75b;
P87b; E_T p. 340] sems can mgu bar bya ba'i bstod pa slob dpon klu sgrub
kyis tshigs su bcad pa'i sgo nas bsdus pa rdzogs so || rgya gar gyi mkhan po
chen po⁸⁷ dī paṃ ka ra shrī dznyā na dang | lo tsā ba dge slong tshul khrims
rgyal bas bsgyur cing zhush te gtan la phab pa'o ||*

Tibetan translation 2 (T₂, by Buddhākaravarman and Chos kyī shes rab):

[P150b5, N140b1, E_T (2011) p. 89]

@@ || rgya gar skad du | satwā ra dha nya gā thā⁸⁸ |

*bod skad du | sems can mgu bar bya ba'i tshigs su bcad pa | sangs rgyas
dang byang chub sems dpa'thams cad la phyag⁸⁹ tshal lo ||*

*sems can don nyid nga la gus yin gzhan dag gus min la ||
gus pa'ang nga yi de la snying rje mi spong ba yin te ||
snying rje spangs pa'i spyod pas dman par gyur pa gang yin la ||
snying rje nyid kyis de la gnod par rigs kyis gzhan gyis min || 1 ||*

*gang zhig sems can rnams la snying rje ldan pas rab 'jug na ||
des ni nga la mchod cing bstan la gces par rab tu gzung ||
gang la tshul khrims thos dang snying rjes blo gros gsal yod pa ||
de ltar des ni bde bar gshegs pa rtag tu mchod par gyur pa yin || 2 ||*

86 yi] P E_T; yis D

87 mkhan po chen po] D; mkhan po paṇḍi ta chen po P E_T

88 satwā ra dha nya gā thā] N; satwā dha dha nya gā thā P; Sattvārāḍhanagāthā E_T

89 phyag] P E_T; om. N

sems can phan pa'i dbang du byas nas ngas 'di bsgrubs pa ste ||
sku 'di sems can don nyid kho nar kun nas bskyed pa la ||
gang zhig yid kyis kyang ni [P151a] sems can dag la gnod byed pa ||
de⁹⁰ ni ji ltar nga la brten te nga la bltos bral yin || 3 ||

gang gis yid la dga'ba bskyed na mchod pa yin pas na ||
[E_T p. 90] sems can dag la phan na de ni chung yang mchod pa yin ||
'tshe ba'i bdag nyid can dang gzhan la gnod pa 'byung ba yi ||
mchod pa legs par sbyar ba yin yang mchod par 'gyur ma yin || 4 ||

chung ma rnams dang bu dang dbang phyug rgyal srid chen po dang ||
sha rnams dang ni khrag dang tshil dang lus rnams dang ni mig ||
gang rnams kho na dga'ba'i dbang byas nga yis btang ba ste ||
gang zhig de la 'tsho na de ni nga la gnod pa yin || 5 ||

sems can rnams la [N141a] mchog tu phan na nga la mchod mchog yin ||
sems can rnams la gnod pa'i mchog ni nga la gnod mchog yin ||
nga dang sems can dag ni bde dang sdug bsngal mtshungs 'dod pas ||
gang zhig sems can gnod byed de ni nga la ji ltar mos || 6 ||

sems can bsten nas nga yis skyob pa mnyes dang dge ba byas ||
sems can dag la brten nas don bsgrubs pha rol phyin pa'ang thob ||
sems can don la yid la brtson pa skyed nas bdud btul te ||
de bzhin sems can nyid spyod gang yin pa yis nga sangs rgyas || 7 ||

gal te skye dang skye bar srog chags dga'ba'i grogs min na ||
gang 'di byams dang snying rjes su la dmigs pa'i gzhi las skyes ||
[E_T p. 91] rnam thar dga'sogs su la bltos shing yul dang gzhi gang yin ||
su yi don du ring nas nga yi yid kyis snying rje bsgoms || 8 ||

ngas ni srog chags nyid ni glang sogs dngos gyur du ma byin ||
sems can nyid ni snod du gyur pas nga yis⁹¹ sbyin pa blangs ||
sems can sna tshogs rgud gyur pa las nga yi snying rjes 'phel ||

90 *de*] P E_T; *nga* N

91 *yi*s] E_T; *yi* PN

gal te sems can mi skyong su yi don du bsgrub par bya || 9 ||

gal te srog chags 'khor bar sdug bsngal du mas bcom min na ||
skye ba len cing sdug bsngal [P151b] *nyams med su phyir bdag gir byed* ||
bdag nyid chen po 'khor ba 'i rgyan gyis bde bar gshegs pa 'di ||
*gal te sems can dga' phyir min na ngal*⁹² *'di su 'i phyir bsgrubs* || 10 ||

nga yi bstan pa ji srid 'gro ba 'di na gsal snang ba ||
de srid gzhan la mchog phan bdag gzhan mnyam par gnas par gyis ||
nga yi sems can don du rab mnyam skyo med sbyor rnam la ||
*skyo bar byed*⁹³ *pa 'i lus 'di zas kyis gsos kyang snying po med* || 11 ||

ba tshwa 'i chu klung zhes bya ba 'i mdo las 'byung [N141b] *ba* || *sems can*
mgu bar bya ba 'i tshigs su bcad pa bcu gcig pa slob dpon 'phags pa klu
sgrub kyis phyung ba rdzogs [ET p. 92] *so* || || *rgya gar gyi mkhan po buddhā*
*ka ra barma*⁹⁴ *dang zhus chen gyi lo tsā ba dge slong chos kyi shes rab kyis*
bsgyur cing zhus te gtang la phab pa 'o ||

6. Sanskrit-Tibetan Philological Remarks

Verse 1: Both T₁ and T₂ are not very satisfactory. The word *vicarataḥ* ‘one who is wandering’ in *pāda* c is rendered by *gnas par gyur pa* ‘remains’ in T₁, but by *spyod pas* ‘by action’ in T₂. The words *proddhartum arhati* ‘able to save’ in *pāda* d are translated by *bslang bar nus* ‘able to lift up’ in T₁, which is good, but by *gnod par rigs* ‘possible to harm’ in T₂, which is either a corruption or a mistranslation.

Verse 2: For T₁, the Peking version’s *gang gi* ‘whose’ in line 1 is better than Derge’s *gang gis* ‘by whom’ because we have *yasya* ‘whose’ in the Sanskrit (*pāda* b).

There seems to be different interpretations of the word *dhūḥ* in the compound *śāsanadhūrvarah*. T₁ translates it as *khur* ‘burden’ and T₂ as *gces pa* ‘beloved’.

92 *ngal*] PN; *nga la* E_T

93 *byed*] N E_T; *phyed* P

94 *buddhā ka ra barma*] PN; *Buddhākaravarman* E_T

Verse 3: T₁ reads in the fourth line *ston pa* ‘teaching’, which is probably an error for *brten pa* ‘relying on’, as in T₂. In Sanskrit we have *saṁśrayati* ‘resorts to’.

Verse 4: Both T₁ and T₂ read *chung yang*, which supports the Sanskrit reading *krśāpi* ‘even though small’ (*pāda* a) in L. In both T₁ and T₂, the two *pūjyas* (*pāda* b: *pūjyasya*; *pāda* d: *pūjyam*) are not translated.

Verse 5: The words *tān viheṭhayati* ‘harms them’ in *pāda* d is rendered *de la ’sho na* ‘nuturing them’⁹⁵ in T₂, but more correctly, by *de la gnod ba byas na* ‘if he harms them’ in T₁. Cf. Also the alternative Tibetan translation (different from both T₁ and T₂) of this verse in the **Ratnakaraṇḍodghāta* by Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (**Adhīśa*) quoted in Tsuda 2011: 76.

Verse 6: The emendation *parābhavo me* ‘an insult to me’ in *pāda* b—proposed in place of L’s reading *parābhavaṃ me*, which is grammatically awkward because *parābhava* is masculine—is supported by both T₁ (*nga la shin tu gnod pa’i mchog*) and T₂ (*nga la gnod mchog yin*). The words *sa kathaṃ madīyaḥ* ‘how can he be related to me’ in *pāda* d is rendered by *nga yi slob ma ji ltar yin* ‘how could [he] be my disciple’ in T₁, but by *nga la ji ltar mos* ‘how [can he be] devoted to me’ in T₂.

Verse 7: The word *ātanvatā* ‘doing fully’ in *pāda* b is rendered by *rab gnas* in T₁, probably translating *ātiṣṭhatā* ‘carrying out’ in the Sanskrit. It seems that the variant *ātiṣṭhatā* existed already in the Sanskrit exemplar of the Tibetan translators. Although the two variants *ātanvatā* and *ātiṣṭhatā* mean more or less the same, the word *ātanvatā* is more frequently attested than *ātiṣṭhatā*.

Verse 8: The word *muditā ca* in *pāda* c is rendered by *dga’ ba la sogs* in T₁ and by *dga’ sogs* in T₂, both reflecting a variant reading like *muditādi* ‘sympathetic joy and so on’, as in N₁ E_L E_H E_T E_{S1} E_{S2}. In T₂, *upekṣā* in *pāda* b is not translated, but there is a word *bltos* which reflects a reading like *apekṣā* ‘with regard to’. And in *pāda* c, T₂ reads *snying rje bsgoms*, as if translating

95 *De la ’sho na* ‘nuturing them’ is probably an error for *de la ’she na* ‘harms them’.

karuṇā bhāvitā instead of *kṣāntir bhāvitā*. In T₂ there is no word reflecting *kṣāntiḥ* in *pāda c*.

Verse 9: The compound *vicitrabhāvagamanād* in *pāda c* is rendered in T₂ not as *sna tshogs dngos por gyur pas* ‘because of going through various existences’ as in T₁, but as *sna tshogs rgud gyur pa las* ‘because of declining in various ways’. The variant readings *cet* (N₁ E_L E_{S1} E_{S2} E_H E_T) and *tat* (L) in *pāda d* are both possible. I have chosen the reading *tat* from L, as L is probably the earlier manuscript.

Verse 10: Both T₁ and T₂ read *'khor ba'i rgyan* in line 3, confirming L's reading *saṃsārābharanam* in *pāda c*. As for the translation of lines 1, 2 and 4, the two translations differ to a considerable extent from the Sanskrit variants, perhaps reflecting difficulties of rendering the Sanskrit into Tibetan.

Verse 11:

- In *pāda c*, both variants *vicaritam* and *viracitam* are not very satisfactory, therefore I emend this to *sucaritam* following the translation of T₁: *legs par spyad pa*.
- In *pāda d*, the variant *vahadbhiḥ* ‘by [you who are] maintaining’ is preferable to *bhavadbhiḥ* ‘by you’, because a verb is needed to govern the object *tanum imāṃ muktasārām* ‘this body which is without essence’. The two Tibetan translations differ considerably: for *tanum imāṃ muktasārām vahadbhiḥ* ‘maintaining this body which is without essence’ T₁ reads *skyo ba med par lus 'di las ni snying po dag ni blang bar gyis* ‘without fatigue, extract the essence from this body’ and T₂ reads *skyo bar byed pa'i lus 'di zas kyis gsos kyang snying po med* ‘this wearisome body, though nourished with food, is without essence’.

7. Conclusion

From the above Sanskrit-Tibetan philological remarks, it is clear that the two Tibetan translations differ to a certain extent from the Sanskrit original and also from each other. The Sanskrit retranslation of the lost verses of the *Sattvārāadhanastava* (verses 1–2 and two extra *pādas* after 3ab) by the

Sarnath scholars, as we can see, in fact also differs from the Sanskrit original newly discovered in the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript fragment and the Nepalese fragment (compare footnotes 29 and 31 with the original Sanskrit in verses 1–2). As Ernst Steinkellner and David Seyfort Ruegg have shown in their pioneering articles,⁹⁶ the retranslation (or retro-translation, as Seyfort Ruegg puts it) from Tibetan translation back into Sanskrit cannot be considered a perfect “reconstruction” of the Sanskrit original which is presumably lost. In my opinion, we could consider this matter from two angles: (1) transmission, and (2) translation.

From the angle of (1) transmission, we can safely assume that during the course of transmission of the Tibetan text—from the first-generation translations by the two groups of translators to the present day—the two Tibetan translations, although no official revision is recorded, have undergone various changes, such as scribal errors and silent editorial modifications by the editors of the Tibetan canon. Even if we were able to eliminate all the transmissional errors in the Tibetan translations through textual criticism and recover a Tibetan text as close as possible to the first-generation translations, we would still only have a Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit text from a specific transmission line at a certain point in time—namely, in the 11th century, when the two Tibetan translations were produced. Although we cannot be certain whether the attribution of the hymn to Nāgārjuna is correct (as I mentioned above in section 1.3), the hymn resembles the Buddhist *kāvya*s of the early first millennium. There is perhaps a gap of several centuries between the composition of the original Sanskrit text and the earliest Tibetan translation. All we can be certain of is that the exemplar(s) used by the translators must have been very close to the earliest dated Sanskrit manuscript of this hymn—i.e. the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript, which dates to the mid-eleventh century.⁹⁷ Furthermore, we still face the problem of transmission in the Sanskrit text itself, including scribal errors and editorial changes.

Let us consider the matter from another angle, i.e. (2) translation. We have two Tibetan translations, and they differ considerably. One reason may be that, due to the restrictions of its grammar, the Tibetan language lacks

96 See Steinkellner 1980, 1988, Seyfort Ruegg 1992 (section VII & VIII) and 2016 (section VII).

97 The manuscript is dated to October 23, 1054 CE, see Kano and Szántó 2020: 30.

the nuance needed to fully capture the complexity of Sanskrit grammatical structures, as noted in Steinkellner 1988.⁹⁸ However, more importantly—as shown in the works of Eli Franco, Pascale Hugon and Karin Preisendanz—the role of Tibetan translators as interpretators should not be overlooked.⁹⁹ The differences between the two Tibetan translations are more likely due to divergent interpretations by the translators. Another reason the two Tibetan translations differ from each other and from the Sanskrit original is that the verses are composed as *kāvya*, a poetic style that is inherently difficult to translate.

It is therefore problematic that the retranslation by the Sarnath scholars presents itself as part of the original. Although we now have the missing verses in the Sanskrit original, the folio which contains verses 10d–11 of the *Sattvārāḍhanastava* in the better Sanskrit manuscript—i.e., the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript—is not yet accessible to scholars. It is my sincere hope that this folio will be made accessible in the near future, so that we may produce a complete, further improved Sanskrit edition of the *Sattvārāḍhanastava*.

Bibliography

- Brunnhölzl, Karl. 2007. *In Praise of Dharmadhātu*. Ithaca, New York; Boulder, Colorado: Snow Lion Publications.
- Franco, Eli. 1997. ‘The Tibetan Translations of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the Development of Translation Methods from Sanskrit to Tibetan’. In *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995. 1: Tibetan Studies*, edited by Helmut Tauscher, Ernst Steinkellner, Michael Torsten Much, and Helmut Krasser, 277–88. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Franco, Eli, and Karin Preisendanz. 2022. ‘On the Unreliability of Tibetan Translations for the Reconstruction of the Original Text of Buddhist

98 Steinkellner gives two examples in his 1988 article: (1) “the fact that one Tibetan term can be found to translate several original Sanskrit terms” and (2) “the fact that “minor” meaningful morphological variations of a Sanskrit term—e.g. basic forms, causative, abstract—that are on principle translatable and normally translated, too, are often...not differentiated” (Steinkellner 1988: 106–107).

99 See Franco 1997, Hugon 2016 and Franco and Preisendanz 2022.

- Sanskrit Works: Observations on rNgog Lo Tsa Ba's Translation of Yamāri's *Pramāṇavārttikālaṅkāraṇibandha*'. In *Śabdānugamaḥ: Indian Linguistic Studies in Honor of George Cardona. Volume II: Historical Linguistics, Vedic, Etc.*, edited by Peter M. Scharf, 421–58. The Sanskrit Library.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2007. 'Der *Sattvārādhana*stava und das *Kṣāraṇadīsūtra*'. In *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ: Papers Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, edited by Birgit Kellner, Helmut Krasser, Horst Lasic, Michael Torsten Much, and Helmut Tauscher, 247–57. Wiener Studien Zur Tibetologie Und Buddhismuskunde, 70.1. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- . 2022. 'The (Re-)Appearance of the "Discourse on the Salt River" (*Kṣāraṇadī-Sūtra*)'. In *Guruparamparā: Studies on Buddhism, India, Tibet and More in Honour of Professor Marek Mejor*, edited by Katarzyna Marciniak, Stanisław Jan Kania, Małgorzata Wieleńska-Soltwedel, and Agata Bareja-Starzyńska, 145–55. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Hugon, Pascale. 2016. 'On the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*: A Look into the Translator's Workshop of rNog Blo Ldan Śes Rab'. In *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China II: Proceedings of a Panel at the 2012 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies, August 1 to 5*, edited by Horst Lasic and Xuezhong Li, 49–113. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House.
- Geshe Tsulga (Tsultrim Chöphel), Thubten Damchoe, and Yeshe Chodron, trans. 2015. 'Praise To Satisfying Sentient Beings'. In *Arya Nagarjuna's Praise to Satisfying Sentient Beings [and] A Commentary on the Awakening Mind*, 25–29. Medford, MA: Kurukulla Center for Tibetan Buddhist Studies.
- Kano, Kazuo 加納和雄. 2021. 'Fugenjōjuhō 1–54 Ge Shiyaku [普賢成就法 1–54 偈試訳; Japanese Translation of the Samantabhadrasādhana: Verses 1–54]'. *Mikkyō Gakkaihō* [密教学会報] 59:210–180.
- Kano, Kazuo, and Péter-Dániel Szántó. 2020. 'New pages from the Tibet museum birch-bark manuscript (1): fragments related to Jñānapāda'. *Journal of Kawasaki Daishi Institute for Buddhist Studies* 5 (March):27–51.

- Kasawara, Kenjiu. 1885. *The Dharma-Saṃgraha. An Ancient Collection of Buddhist Technical Terms. Prepared for Publication by Kenjiu Kasawara and after His Death Edited by F. Max Müller and H. Wenzel*. Edited by F. Max Müller and H. Wenzel. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Khenpo Yeshe Gyaltsen, Tenzin Yeshe Jamchen (Sean Price), and Adam Pearcey, trans. 2023. 'In Praise of Gratifying Sentient Beings'.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1929. 'Autour d'Āśvaghoṣa'. *Journal Asiatique* 215:255–85.
- Lindtner, Christian. 1982. *Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writing and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Indiske Studier 4. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Matsuda, Kazunobu 松田和信, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. 2022. '灰河経（雑阿含 1177 経）の梵文原典と和訳：〔附〕原型カンギュルのチベット語訳テキスト [Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation of Saṃyuktāgama 1077 (Kṣāraṇaḍī) with Appendix: Tibetan Translation Preserved in Proto-Kanjur Manuscripts]' . 仏教学セミナー [*Buddhist Seminar*] 116:1–30(L).
- Melzer, Gudrun. 2014. 'A Palaeographic Study of a Buddhist Manuscript from the Gilgit Region: A Glimpse into a Scribes' Workshop'. In *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*, edited by Jörg Quenzer, Dmitry Bondarev, and Jan-Ulrich Sobisch, 227–72. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Pandey, Janardan Shastri, ed. 1994. 'Sattvārādhana-gāthā'. In *Bauddhastotrasaṃgraha*, 246–47. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Quarcoo, Philip. 2007. 'Nachrichten zum Leben des mongolischen Gelehrten Ngag-dbang dpal-ldan und zu seinem Kommentarwerk Sems can mgu bar bya ba'i tshigs su bcad pa mchan dang bcas pa'. Magisterarbeit, Munich: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
- Rinpoche, Samdhong and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi, eds. 1992. 'Sattvārādhana-gāthā'. *Dhīh: A Review of Rare Buddhist Texts* 14:1–2.
- Seyfort Ruegg, David. 1992. 'Some Reflections on Translating Buddhist Philosophical Texts from Sanskrit and Tibetan'. *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 46:367–91.
- . 2016. 'On Translating Buddhist Texts: A Survey and Some Reflections'. In *Cross-Cultural Transmission of Buddhist Texts: Theories and Practices of Translation*, edited by Dorji Wangchuk, 193–266. Indian and Tibetan Studies 5. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.

- Steinkellner, Ernst. 1980. ‘Some Sanskrit Fragments of Jinendrabuddhi’s Viśālāmalavatī’. In *A Corpus of Indian Studies. Essays in Honour of Professor Gaurinath Sastri*, 96–105. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar.
- . 1988. ‘Methodological Remarks on the Constitution of Sanskrit Texts from the Buddhist *Pramāṇa*-Tradition’. *Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde Südasiens* 32:103–29.
- Szántó, Péter-Dániel. 2013. ‘Minor Vajrayāna Texts II. A New Manuscript of the *Gurupañcāśikā*’. In *Puṣpikā: Tracing Ancient India Through Texts and Traditions*, edited by Nina Mirnig, Péter-Dániel Szántó, and Michael Williams, 1:443–50. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Tsuda, Akimasa 津田明雅. 2006. ‘*Catuḥstava* とナーガールジュナ —諸著作の真偽性’. PhD dissertation, Kyoto University.
- . 2011a. ‘*Kṣāranadī* Toiu Nazo No Kyōten Ni Tsuite [*Kṣāranadī* という謎の経典について]’. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [印度學佛教學研究] 60 (1): 435–429.
- . 2011b. ‘*Sattvārāghanastava* について [On the *Sattvārāghanastava*]’. *Acta Tibetica Buddhica* 4:73–108(L).
- Zhang, Chaoyin 张超音. 2022. *Ximalaya: Shanshui Renwen de Yingxiang Tanxun* [喜马拉雅：山水人文的影像探寻]. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House.

(Acknowledgements: I am grateful to the staffs of the China Tibetology Research Center, Beijing, China for providing me an opportunity to consult the book containing the photograph of the new Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript folios. Many thanks to Kazuo Kano and Shiori Ijuin for reading an earlier draft and for their corrections, comments and suggestions. Many thanks also to Péter-Dániel Szántó for kindly providing the information and images of the Nepalese fragments, and for his suggestions. Thanks are due to all the participants at the ‘Mind and Maṇḍala in Buddhist Tantric Practice International Source Reading Workshop (Vienna, 30-31 May 2025)’ who read the article with me and offered many corrections and suggestions. I would like to especially thank Harunaga Isaacson for his invaluable comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Ben Mitrouev for his corrections. This research was financially supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project ESP654 (Rationalising Tantra in Late Indian Buddhism: Ratnākaraśānti on *maṇḍala* Rituals and Tantric Spiritual Practices).)

New Page From the Tibet Museum birch-bark Manuscript (2) (Cheung)

Keywords: *Sattvārāḍhanastava*, Nāgārjuna, Buddhist hymn, the Tibet Museum birch-bark manuscript