On Translating Literally

Of the making of translations of the Dhammapada there seems to be no end.

Some years ago, in a review of two translations of the Dhammapada,[1] I guessed that there were forty translations into English. My guess was based on someone else's earlier guess plus a few more. Gil Fronsdal, the author of the most recent translation of the Dhammapada I have seen,[2] says there are now well over fifty.[3]

Why do people make new translations of the Dhammapada? Presumably because they don't like the existing ones and think they can do better. Very often it is merely the translations of basic words, e.g. *saṃsāra* or *nibbāna*, to which they object, and they sometimes believe that they have made a better translation because they have thought of a different translation of a particular word, without considering whether they have obtained a better grasp of the meaning of the phrase or the sentence as a whole.

What should the aim of a translation be? Clearly the prime aim is to give the meaning of a text in one language in another language, keeping as far as possible in the second language the peculiarities of the first, with poetry appearing as poetry, or verse as verse. Word play, e.g. puns, should be replicated. It would seem that this aim can only be realised by someone who is fully at home in both languages and is, in fact, bilingual. As far as Pāli is concerned, however, there are very few persons, in the West at least, who can claim to be bilingual in English and Pāli, so we must recognise that this ideal is not likely to be attainable.

For anyone proposing to make a translation of a Pāli text, it is, therefore, a simple matter of deciding whether to make a literal

[1]Norman, 1989B.

[2]Fronsdal, 2005.

[3]Fronsdal, 2005, p. xi.

The Journal of the Pali Text Society, Vol. XXX (2009), pp. 81–97

translation, or a free one, bearing in mind that one danger about the latter is that the elaboration associated with a free translation can be carried to the point where it is not a translation but an interpretation.

An obituary for the Cambridge classicist Guy Lee[4] gave that eminent translator's views on the subject of translation. It reported that, by the time his English version of Ovid's *Amores* was reprinted as *Ovid in Love*, thirty-two years after its first publication, his ideas on translation had turned round, and he had decided to reject his early free translation. Over the years he had worked round to an exactly opposite view of what translation should be. It had become clear to him that Greek and Latin would eventually have to be taught in translation, as the Hebrew Bible had been taught since the sixteenth century. So what was needed, he believed, was close translation, as literal as possible, and Greek and Latin poetry should be treated by the translator as sacred text.

The parallel with Pāli is not hard to see.

Faced with the possibilities of making a free or a literal translation, in my own translations of the Theragāthā, Therīgāthā, Sutta-nipāta, and Dhammapada I have aimed to produce a literal, almost word-for-word, prose translation because this seemed to me to be the best way in which to convey my understanding of the Pāli. I stated[5] that my decision to make prose translations of verse texts arose from my feeling that the verse form in English is properly the province of poets, and no-one should try to write poetry unless he is a poet. A translation made into poor poetry may well persuade the reader that the original text is equally bad poetry.

In some places, however, my decision resulted in a starkness and austerity of words which bordered upon the ungrammatical in English, but my aim was to make clear to readers, if they considered my translation alongside the original, the way in which I understood the authors' words.[6]

---

[4]*The Times*, Wednesday, 10 August 2005, p. 54.

[5]*EV* I, Introduction § 23, *EV* II, Introduction § 45.

[6]Norman, *EV* I § 23, p. xxxvii.

My aim has been in the main overlooked by critics, with the result that they have concentrated their criticism on the literalness of my works. One web site, for example, states of *The Elders' Verses* I and II: "Both this translation and the preceding one are so literal as to lose the poetic flavor of the original, but no reliable alternative translations are available."[7] The reference to poetic flavour suggests that the author of the assessment had not noted my comment.

Of *The Rhinoceros Horn and Other Early Buddhist Poems* (*Sutta-Nipāta*) it states, "Again, extremely literal, but there are no other reliable (and plenty of unreliable) translations available." Of *The Word of the Doctrine* it states, "[This] is not recommended, as it takes the principle of literalness to ludicrous extremes." It is interesting to note that, despite this condemnation, no better translation is suggested. A Google search shows how common this combination of the words "literal" and "ludicrous" is in reviews and assessments — probably helped by the alliteration.

One reviewer, however, has possibly realised what I was trying to do. He wrote of my translation of the Sutta-nipāta (*The Group of Discourses*): "Probably, however, what Norman provides is not so much a translation as a resource for scholars and future translators. For this purpose it is excellent."[8] I welcome this assessment, and I am very happy to think that my efforts are in fact thought capable of serving this purpose. I am reminded of the sub-title which Alfred Edward Housman, the poet and Latin scholar, added to his edition of the work of the Roman author Lucan: *in usum editorum* "For the use of editors", and I am very proud that my work has been judged worthy of being put in a similar category to his, although I would hesitate to print "For the use of translators" on the title page of any of my translations.

---

[7]here-and-now.org/buddrel/netbiblio.html.

[8]Cousins, 1994, pp. 291–92.

We should, however, not lose sight of comments about literal translations which have been made by two scholars whose views are not to be disregarded:

I noted Professor Gombrich's stricture about literal translations in an article on the subject of the translation of Pāli texts into English,[9] which I wrote more than twenty years ago.

He wrote: "The so-called literal translation — an intellectual fallacy and an aesthetic monstrosity — is still widespread; and in our examining we demand good style in Sanskrit prose but rarely in English. Yet in translation there is no clear dividing line between form and content. If our published translations from Sanskrit literature are little read, that may be because few of them deserve to be. Accuracy is a *sine qua non*, but so is taste."[10] Despite this attractive mingling of two clichés (see Google for the prevalence of both), Gombrich did not in fact define "literal", and gave no examples of the type of translation he was condemning.

Elsewhere he was more explicit, and describing Bailey's "translation" from the Khotanese he commented,[11] "[It is] alas so literal and so full of foreign words that it hardly reads as English." He also drew attention to Conze's use of the word "non-attainmentness" and stated, "The work of these great scholars, who would surely castigate any lapse from Tibetan or Sanskrit idiom in others or in themselves, makes me wonder yet again why it is that in our field *English* style is held of no account."

Dr Margaret Cone has written, "Another inheritance [from our predecessors] is the 'literal' translation. A literal translation is not a translation, because the meaning of a Pāli word or passage has not been expressed in English. For particular words, one English equivalent is chosen as the basic meaning, and that English word is used in all contexts." She gave an example of the type of translation she was

[9]Norman, 1984A, p. 83.

[10]Gombrich, 1978, p. 27.

[11]Gombrich, 1977, p. 132.

condemning: "Throughout a whole text, Miss Horner's translations furnish good examples of literalness (not always even accurate) which produces at times incomprehensibility (e.g. 'state of further-men' to translate *uttarimanussadhamma*). Did such translators ever ask, 'What would an Indian hearer have understood from this passage? What indeed is the Buddha's concern here, what problem is he addressing, what is he saying?' "[12]

In view of such comments about literalness, it is interesting to note that a great deal is made of the literalness of Gil Fronsdal's translation of the Dhammapada.[13]

In his Preface (pp. xii–xiii) the author states, "A translator often has to strike a balance between literal but clumsy language and elegant but inaccurate language. I have tried to be as literal as possible while keeping the text both readable and enjoyable. Still, no one can make a completely literal translation, completely free of bias, of a text from a distant culture and a very different language. … In this translation I have tried to put aside my own interpretations and preferences, insofar as possible, in favor of accuracy. In attempting a literal translation, I am trying to understand early Buddhism in its own terms so I can better evaluate our modern versions of Buddhism."

In the Foreword to this new translation Jack Kornfield states, "This new translation is both carefully and honorably literal and beautifully modern."[14] The blurb on the dust jacket claims: "It is the first truly accurate and highly readable translation of this text to be published in English." It would be interesting to know who read all the fifty translations which Fronsdal says have been made of the Dhammapada, and was able to state that this one is the first truly accurate one, while "highly readable" is so subjective as to be unprovable.

We might note, in passing, the way in which such terms as "accurate" and "readable" are used elsewhere of translations of other

[12]Cone, 2007, pp. 101–102.

[13]Fronsdal, 2005.

[14]Fronsdal, 2005, Foreword, p. ix.

texts. For example, we might compare the blurb on the ninth impression (1983) of the paperback edition of The New International Version of the Holy Bible: "So elegantly stated, so faithfully accurate" and "a balanced scholarly, eminently readable bible, providing the most exact, illuminating rendering of the original languages into English". Once again, one can only wonder at the use of the phrases "faithfully accurate" and "most exact". One begins to get the impression that the words "readable" and "accurate" are essential features in any description of a translation.

In view of the rather lavish praise bestowed upon it, it might be useful to discuss a few points in Fronsdal's translation, to see how far it is justified. We should, perhaps, start with two points on which he challenges his own aim of literalness: the use of the masculine and feminine, and the translation of the word *dhamma*.

(a) He does not always observe a distinction between genders. It is obvious that if we have a third person verb, e.g. *gacchati*, with no subject expressed, then it can mean "he/she/it goes". Fronsdal makes much of such potential masculine/feminine mixing. He states (p. xiv) that not only does he use the plural person to make the text a little more gender neutral than the original, but he also uses male and female pronouns more or less randomly. He justifies this by saying (p. 139) that the term *bhikkhu* includes both male and female. He gives no canonical authority for this statement, but says, without references, "The ancient Theravāda commentaries state that anyone engaged in Buddhist meditation practice, whether man or woman, can be called a *bhikkhu.*" Consequently he arbitrarily inserts "her/she" where there is no suggestion of a feminine gender in the text ("she" vv. 3–4, 17–18; "her" v. 63; "herself" vv. 103, 106). It is particularly disconcerting when there is a juxtaposition or dichotomy, and he translates "he" in v. 3 when hatred does not end and "she" in v. 4 when it does, giving the impression that the ending or non-ending of hatred depends upon gender. Scarcely less confusing is the way the sage (*paṇḍito*) will watch over herself in v. 157, but will establish himself in what is proper in v. 158.

My own feeling is that in general statements "he" is gender inclusive, e.g. "he who hesitates is lost" is not restricted to male persons. It is one of the deficiencies of the English language that there is no common all-gender third person pronoun for the singular, as there is "they/them" for the plural, so to emphasise that something refers to male or female we have to say "he or she", but it is possible to overcome this to a large extent by using "one", "anyone", or "someone", e.g. "one" or "anyone" who hesitates is lost, followed (if necessary) by "they": "if someone hesitates, then they are lost", or "Whoever hesitates is lost". On the other hand, I regard "she" as gender exclusive and I would suppose that any general statement including a feminine noun or pronoun was restricted to female persons. To find that, as the reverse of this, Fronsdal actually translates *itthiyā* in v. 242 as "people", with a note on p. 132 justifying this, is disconcerting, since I know of no support for the view that Pāli *itthi* or Skt *strī* ever means anything other than "woman".

(b) In his treatment of the Pāli word *Dhamma*, Fronsdal is inconsistent in a number of ways, which makes for confusion for the reader. He leaves *Dhamma* untranslated in v. 217, but translates it into Skt *Dharma* in vv. 44–45, 79, 82, 86, 102, 168–69, 205, which he justifies (p. xiv) on the grounds that in that form the term has begun to take its place in the lexicon of the English-speaking world and because untranslated it better retains the multivalent meanings of the original — which is unlikely to make the meaning any clearer to readers who do not have access to the dictionary to which he refers and cannot therefore see how it is defined there. On p. 115 (ad vv. 1–2) and on p. 122 (ad vv. 84, 87) he writes *dhamma*. Of the title *Dhammaṭṭha* of section 19 he uses *Dharma* in the note on p. 132, and translates "The Just", while giving "established in the Dharma", "firm in the Dharma", and "righteous" as alternatives.

On p. 122 (ad v. 84) he states, "Because *dhamma* has a broader meaning than just 'truth', perhaps the term should be left untranslated." One might have thought that a multiplicity of meanings would have

more than justified a multiplicity of translations for all the different usages. He touches on the problem in the Preface (p. xiii): "Dhamma can mean, among other things, religious teachings, religious truth, justice and virtue." He comments: "Probably the most debatable choice [of translation] will be my translation of dhamma as 'experience' in the opening two verses", but more often than not he does not give a translation of the word, although there would be no difficulty in doing so. In *EV* I in the note ad Th 2, I explained the various translations I had adopted for what I considered to be the nine different meanings of *dhamma* found in that text.[15] I did the same for my own translation of the Dhammapada in the note ad Dhp 20.[16] Not surprisingly, the most common meaning in the Dhammapada is "doctrine" (teachings, law, rule), because the majority of verses containing the word have been selected as being appropriate to the title Dhammapada.

It is not always clear what exactly Fronsdal has in mind when he writes about "literal" meanings. I assume that he means the etymological meaning. If we look at the word *dharma* from an etymological point of view, then we can say that since the basic meanings of the root *dhṛ* are "bear, hold, carry" the literal meaning of *dharma* is "the thing that bears, holds, carries". This is seen in the older form of the word *dharman* "bearer, supporter, arranger" and the adjective *dhara* "bearing, supporting, carrying", cf. *dharaṇī* "the bearing thing", i.e. "earth". *Dharma* is therefore something like "support, foundation", and we can see the various developments of this, depending on the field in which it is used. Thus when used of religion or government it means "doctrine, law, teachings, rules", and of a philosophical system "characteristics, [mental] phenomena, states, things".

Fronsdal draws attention to the literalness of his translation and yet in more than twenty-five places he gives in the notes an alternative translation which he states is literal or more literal than the one he has given. It is worthwhile looking at some of these and also at some of his

[15]Norman, 2007A, p. 130.

[16]Norman, 1997, pp. 66–67.

other notes on his translations.

p. 115 (title of Chapter 1): he translates *Yamaka* as "dichotomies" rather than the expected "pairs". This seems rather strange. We don't normally talk of husband and wife as a dichotomy. If we want to emphasise the particular nature of the pairs then we could translate as "pairs of opposites".

p. 116 (ad v. 6): he comments on the word *yamāmase*, "Or, if read *yama-amase*, it may … ". If he is suggesting that we are to understand that there is reference to the god Yama here, then the word could be divided up as *Yam*' (or *Yamaṃ*) *āmase*, but *āmase* would be meaningless and we should have to postulate something like *emase* "we go", for which there is no manuscript support. It is perhaps worth pointing out that the parallel verse in the Patna Dharmapada (254) reads *jayāmatha* and that in the Udānavarga (14.8) reads *udyamāmahe*, where a similar word division is, of course, not possible.

p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18): he states that *duggatiṃ/sugatiṃ gato* "literally means gone to a bad/good destination". He translates *duggatiṃ* as "realms of woe" in v. 17, and "states of woe" in v. 240, but "bad rebirth" in vv. 316–18. He translates *sugatiṃ gato* as "reborn in realms of bliss" in v. 18, but as "goes to a good rebirth" in v. 319. These and other variations in translation may well prove confusing to readers. To explain *duggati* and *sugati* it might have been helpful to have given the list of five *gatis* listed at Dhp-a IV 226,5–7: *niraya*, *tiracchānayoni*, *pettivisaya*, *manussaloka* and *devaloka* (hell, birth as an animal, the realm of spirits, the world of men, and the world of gods). Of these the first three are *duggati* and the last two *sugati*. This makes it clear that some of his translations are what might be called "poetic elaborations". We may deduce that *sugata* is someone who has attained a *sugati*, and the translations "well-gone one" in v. 285 and "well-gone" in v. 419 rather obscure this.

p. 117 (ad v. 21): he translates *amata* as "The Deathless". He makes no comment on my translations of the various epithets of *nibbāna,* but translates as follows: p. 117 (ad vv. 21, 114): *amata*

"deathless"; p. 123 (ad vv. 97, 153–54): *akata* "unmade"; p. 137 (ad v. 323): *agata* "not gone to". His translation of *agata* follows the commentary but it is a debatable explanation, since it seems to imply a passive sense of *gata*. I have suggested that it means "without *gati*" (cf. *agati* as an epithet of *nibbāna*), i.e. (a place) where there is no rebirth in one of the *gatis*, just as the other negatives applied to *nibbāna*, e.g. *ajara*, *amata*, *ajāta*, *abhūta*, *akata*, *akālika*, etc., mean "without old age, i.e. where there is no old age", etc.[17]

p. 118 (ad v. 23): he does not mention the fact that *yogakkhema* can also be a *dvandva* compound,[18] and can mean "toil and rest".

p. 122 (ad v. 83): as he says, the editions vary between *cajanti* and *vajanti*. This represents a *c*/*v* variation in the Pāli tradition, which is very ancient. The commentary explains by *vijahanti*,[19] showing that the tradition which Buddhaghosa was following read *cajanti*. In Hinüber and Norman, 1994, we read *vajanti*, being influenced in our choice of reading by Udāna-v 30.52 *vrajanti*, GDhp 226 *vivedi*, and PDhp 80 *bhavanti*, of which the second is some centuries older than Dhp-a, although we recognised that Buddhaghosa made use of commentarial material inherited from his predecessors.

p. 122 (ad v. 89): *āsava* is translated "toxin" with the note that originally it "meant both the intoxicating juice of a plant and the discharge from a sore". Etymologically the word means "inflowing (< *ā-sru*) and can be translated as "influx". The Jains use it in what was probably its original psychological sense of "that by which *karman* flows in and takes an effect on the soul" but this does not suit the changed Buddhist use of the word.[20]

p. 123 (ad vv. 92–93): confusingly, he translates both *gati* in v. 92 and *padaṃ* in v. 93 as "path", which masks the fact that in v. 92 there is a pun upon the word *gati*. When used of birds it means "track", which

[17]Norman, 1994, p. 220 (*CP* VI, pp. 22*f.*).

[18]See Norman, 2007A, p. 142 (ad Th 32).

[19]Dhp-a II 156.

[20]See Norman, 2007A, p. 148 (ad Th 47).

birds do not leave in the sky. Of those who have gained *nibbāna* it means "rebirth", which cannot be known, since they have not gone to any place of rebirth. Consequently the skull-tapper Vaṅgīsa was unable to say in which *gati* someone who was *parinibbuta* was reborn at death in the story at Dhp-a IV 226,5–7 mentioned above in the note on *sugati* and *duggati* (p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18)).

p. 123 (ad v. 95): in the Preface (p. xiii) he states that he has chosen to translate *saṃsāra* as "wandering". In this note he states that literally it means "faring on" but, strangely, in his literal translation of the line he leaves it untranslated.

p. 123 (ad vv. 97, 153–54): he translates *akata* as "unmade". See the note on p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 124 (ad v. 114): he states that *amataṃ padaṃ* literally means "the deathless state" or "the path to the deathless." For the meaning "where there is no death" for *amata* see the note on p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 127 (ad v. 173): *kusala*: he gives the translation "wholesome" for *kusala*, with the comment "[it] is more literally translated as 'skilful' ". The etymology is by no means certain[21] and if MW is a reliable guide it would seem that the earliest attested meaning in Sanskrit is something nearer "good". This in any case makes a better opposite to "evil" in the context.[22]

p. 128 (ad v. 184): he translates *samaṇa* as "contemplative". He does not consider the possibility of a word play on *śamana* and *śramaṇa* (cf. p. 132 (ad v. 254)).

p. 130 (title of Chapter 16): "The Dear". When discussing the meaning of the title (*piya* < Skt *priya*) he states that it is derived from the verbal root *pṛ*, instead of *prī*, which suggests that his ideas about etymology are somewhat suspect.

p. 131 (ad v. 235): he states that "door of death" (*uyyoga-mukha*) is literally "door of departure". Perhaps "undertaking" would be more

[21]See Mayrhofer, 1976, s.v. *kuśala*.

[22]Cf. Cone, 2007, p. 102, n. 7.

literal. See MW, s.v. *udyoga*.

p. 131 (ad v. 240): for *duggati*, translated "states of woe", see remarks about p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

p. 132 (ad v. 246): his note on *paradāraṃ gacchati* seems unnecessarily complicated. He translates "Goes to another's spouse", which seems to be a perfectly satisfactory literal translation, although he says that it means literally "goes with another's wife". I can see no justification for believing that *-dāraṃ* is anything other than the accusative case, and can only assume that "goes with" is an Americanism. He adds, "It is possible that *dāraṃ* here refers to any woman who is under the protection of a man (e.g., a daughter living with her father)." The verse is a straightforward condemnation of an adulterous act, and in fact in Skt *paradāra* has the sense "adultery",[23] and *paradāragamana* means "committing adultery". For the *vṛddhi* formation *pāra-dārika PED* has: "an adulterer, lit. one of another's wife", where a word seems to have been omitted. Strangely enough, in his comment on p. 136 (ad vv. 309–10) Fronsdal states: "I have taken the liberty of translating *para dārā* as "the spouse of another". It is not clear why translating correctly should be regarded as "taking the liberty".

p. 133 (ad vv. 268–69): he translates *muni* as "silent one", and *mona* as "silence". He states, without comment, that *munāti* means "one weighs". This statement is doubtless based on the commentarial gloss *mināti* "measures". I know of no evidence for this equivalence, but as I have pointed out,[24] the cty was probably referring to the idea of *tula* in v. 268. If we want to preserve the word play on *muni* and *mona*, we might think of "a man is not a sage (thinker?)[25] because he is/stays silent as a sage (thinker?)" or "keeps the silence of a sage (thinker?)".

p. 133 (ad vv. 273–75): he explains that his translation "Gods and humans" is a rendering of *dipadānaṃ* (two-footed beings), but does not

[23]See MW s.v.

[24]Norman, 1997, p. 136 ad Dhp 269.

[25]For the derivation of *muni* from *munā-* < *mnā-* < *man-* "to think, know", see Norman, 1961, p. 350 (= *CP* I, pp. 26–28).

say that, rather than his own translation, he is giving the cty's explanation of the word, which is certainly not a literal rendering.

p. 133 (ad vv. 273–75): readers might well wish for some explanation of the nature of the arrows which have been pulled out and it might have been helpful to quote the commentarial explanation "passion (*rāga*), etc."

p. 134 (ad v. 283): there are word plays on *vana* in this verse, but I doubt that there is one on *nibbana* and *nibbāṇa*, which would entail taking and translating *nibbāna* as an adjective. The cty gives no hint of such a word play.

p. 135 (ad v. 285): he translates *Sugata* as "Well-Gone-One" here and as "well-gone" at p. 144 (ad v. 419). See also p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

p. 135 (ad v. 290): he states that *mattā* means " 'lesser'; more literally 'measured' or 'moderate' ", although it is not clear how a noun could have these three adjectival meanings. He says, "K.R. Norman believes that the original meaning of *mattā* was 'material things,' and he translates it so." This might give the impression that I was the first person to give this translation, but anyone consulting MW, to which I refer in my note in *WD*,[26] will find that "materials, property, goods, household, furniture, money, wealth, substance, livelihood" are widely attested meanings for Sanskrit *mātrā*.

p. 137 (ad v. 316): he translates *duggatiṃ* as "bad rebirth", and states that more literally it means "bad destination" or "bad existence". See remarks about p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

p. 137 (ad v. 323): for his translation *agata* "not gone to", see the note about p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 137 (ad v. 326): he states that *aṇukusa*(sic)-*ggaho* literally means "one who handles the goad (of an) elephant driver", although there seems to be no obvious reason for not translating it simply as "goad-holder".

p. 138 (ad v. 334): he translates *hurāhuraṃ* as "ever onward" and

[26]Norman, 1997, p. 142 ad Dhp 290.

states that it could perhaps be more literally translated as "onward and onward again". Since, however, it is used of a monkey seeking fruit in a forest it is more likely to mean something like "to and fro" and be derived from Skt *huras* which is a weak grade formation from the root *hvṛ*- "to go crookedly".

p. 139 (title of Chapter 25): he leaves *bhikkhu* untranslated as the title of this chapter and also when it occurs in the verses of the chapter, except in v. 365 where he translates it as "mendicant", which is, as he says, the literal translation. In vv. 31–32 and elsewhere, however, he translates *bhikkhu* as "monastic", and in vv. 75, 272 as "monk". He states that he sometimes translates it as "monastic" "so it can refer to monastics of any gender". I have already commented on his desire to make the terminology gender neutral but, as far as I understand its usage, "mendicant" is as gender neutral as "monastic", and I can see no reason for changing from one to the other.

p. 141 (ad v. 388): he notes that in this verse there is a word play between *pabbājeti* and *pabbajito* and suggests that it is likely that there is also a play on *samacariyā* and *samaṇa*, but he does not note that there is also a play on *bāhitapāpo* and *brāhmaṇo*, suggesting that in an earlier version of this verse the latter word was in the form *bāhaṇo*.

p. 141 (ad v. 392): he states that *sammāsambuddha* means "fully self-awakened" and explains why the Buddha was self-awakened, but I can see no part of the compound which might mean "self". I wonder if he is confusing *sam*- and *sayaṃ*.

p. 142 (ad v. 405): *tasesu thāvaresu* he translates "timid and strong" but states that the phrase might be more literally translated as "frightened and firm, or moving and unmoving, or perturbed and unperturbed". The concept of three meanings all said to be more literal can only raise doubts about his interpretation of the word "literal".

p. 142 (ad v. 411): he translates *amata* as "deathless". See remarks about p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 144 (ad v. 419): he translates *sugata* as "well-gone" here and as "Well-Gone-One" at p. 135 (ad v. 285). See also p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

It is not always easy to see what principle Fronsdal is following for the inclusion or omission of diacritical marks. In the translation and in the preface and introduction he puts Pāli words into italics, with diacritical marks, but in the notes he usually does neither, e.g. p. 136 ad v. 302: *samsara*, but *saṃsāra* on p. xiii. He also has a slightly cavalier attitude towards the quotation of Pāli compounds. On p. 132 (ad v. 246) he prints *para dārā* instead of *paradārā*, and on p. 143 (ad v. 415) he writes *kāma bhavaparikkhīṇaṃ* for *kāmabhavaparikkhīṇaṃ*.

He refers (p. xviii) to English translations and studies which he has found useful, lists them, including my translation, on pp. 145–46, and encourages anyone interested in further study of the Dhammapada to read them. He mentions me by name in the notes to three verses (ad v. 167 *lokavaddhano*; ad vv. 266-67 *vissaṃ*; ad v. 290 *mattā*), and in a number of cases he gives in his notes my translation (without naming me) with a number of translations by others, only to reject them, e.g. p. 128 (ad *papañca* vv. 195–96 254); p. 129 (ad *ussuka* v. 199); p. 142 (ad *tasa thāvara* v. 405); p. 143 (ad *nibbuta* v. 414).

There is no doubt that Fronsdal's translation reads very easily, and can justifiably be described as "highly readable". To claim, however, that it is "the first truly accurate translation" is much more debatable. Since Fronsdal from time to time justifies himself by reference to *PED*, but never to *CPD* or *DOP*, one suspects that he was rather reliant on out-of-date lexicographical aids. He refers to MW only once (on p. 121 ad v. 70), and yet to try to interpret Pāli terms without reference to up-to-date dictionaries and Sanskrit parallels is not entirely commendable for anyone aiming at accuracy.

There is a small number of misprints:

p. iv: Suttapṭaka *for* -piṭaka
p. xvii: Viggo (*not* Victor) Fausbøll *was* Danish *not* Dutch
p. 119 (ad v. 23): Dhīgha *for* Dīgha

p. 130 (ad v. 209): *insert period after* "task"
p. 136 (ad v. 298): sangha *for* saṅgha
p. 136 (ad v. 308): raṭṭa *for* raṭṭha
p. 137 (ad v. 312): literarlly *for* literally
p. 137 (ad v. 326): aṇukusa *for* aṃkusa
p. 143 (ad v. 416): taṅhā *for* taṇhā
p. 147: Anguttara *for* Aṅguttara
p. 151: Mālunkyāputta *for* Māluṅkyāputta
p. 152: Jñānna- *for* Jñāna-
p. 152: -bhāsiyāim *for* -bhāsiyāiṃ
p. 152: Khuddaka-patha *for* -pāṭha

References

Cone, M., 2001, *A Dictionary of Pāli*, Vol. I (A–Kh), Oxford: PTS

———, 2007, "caveat lector", *JPTS* XXIX, pp. 95–106

Cousins, L.S., et al., (eds) 1974, *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht

———, 1994, rev. of *GD*, *JRAS* 4.2, pp. 291–92

Fronsdal, Gil, tr., 2005, *The Dhammapada*, Boston & London: Shambala

Gombrich, R.F., 1977, rev. of Cousins et al. 1974, *JRAS* 1977, 1, pp. 132–33

———, 1978, *On Being Sanskritic* (An inaugural lecture), Oxford

Hinüber, O. von and Norman, K.R., eds, 1994, Dhammapada, Oxford: PTS

Mayrhofer, M., 1976, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Heidelberg, Vol. III

Monier-Williams, M., 1899, *A Sanskrit–English Dictionary*, Oxford

Norman, H.C., ed., 1906–1914, *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*, London: PTS

Norman, K.R., 1961, "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies II", *JOI*(*B*), X, pp. 348–52 (= *CP* I, pp. 25–29)

———. 1984A, "On Translating from Pāli", *One Vehicle*, Singapore, pp. 77–87 (= *CP* III pp. 60–81)

———, 1989B, "On translating the Dhammapada", *BSR* 6, 2, pp. 153–65 (=

CP VI, pp. 156–70)

———, 1990–2001, *Collected Papers* I–VII, Oxford: PTS

———, 1994, "Mistaken ideas about *nibbāna*", in *Buddhist Forum* III, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, pp. 211–25 (= *CP* VI, pp. 9–30)

———, 1997, *The Word of the Doctrine* (Dhammapada), Oxford: PTS

———, 2001, *The Group of Discourses* (Sutta-nipāta), 2nd edition, Oxford: PTS

———, 2007A, *Elders' Verses* I (Theragāthā), 2nd edition, Lancaster: PTS

———, 2007B, *Elders' Verses* II (Therīgāthā), 2nd edition, Lancaster: PTS

ABBREVIATIONS

The titles of Pāli texts are as in *CPD*.

BSR	= *Buddhist Studies Review*
CP	= *Collected Papers* I–VII (= Norman 1990–2001)
CPD	= *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*
DOP	= Cone 2001
EV I/II	= *Elders' Verses* I and II (= Norman 2007A, 2007B)
GD	= *Group of Discourses* (= Norman 2001)
JOI(*B*)	= *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (*Baroda*)
JPTS	= *Journal of the Pali Text Society*
JRAS	= *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
MW	= Monier-Williams 1899
PED	= Rhys Davids & Stede 1925
PTS	= Pali Text Society
rev.	+ review
Skt	= Sanskrit
WD	= *Word of the Doctrine* (= Norman 1997)