The *bodhipathapradipa* (Tibetan *Byang-chub lam-gyi skrun-ma*) is regarded as one of the most important works of Dipamkararajmani, alias Atisa (982-1054). It was composed during his stay in the nThrö-liding Monastery (Western Tibet) and probably immediately thereafter, it was translated into Tibetan by the Lotsaba dGe-ba'i blo-gros. The original version obviously has not been handed down to our time. The Tibetan rendering is included in the editions of the Tanjur and in separate manuscripts and blockprints. The *Byang-chub lam-gyi skrun-ma* quotes from other texts 36 seven-syllable lines, i.e. 9 quatrains, of which the original Sanskrit is commonly known at present (On the Sanskrit version of a further stanza see below). A first attempt at restoring the original version was made by Mrinalkanti GANGOPADHYAYA and published in 1967 within Alaka CHATTOPADHYAYA's book *Atisa and Tibet* (pp. 545-549); the same restoration was again printed in the *Atish Dipankar Millennium Birth Commemoration Volume* (i.e. Jagannath, Sept. 1982 to Jan. 83 Combined Number and Special Number on Atish Dipanka- prjmaan, Calcutta), pp. 12-14. A brief note entitled "On Atisa's Bodhipathapradipa" by the present author, published by the *Bulletin of Tibetology* (1985: 1, pp. 15-18), gives an evaluation of the mentioned Sanskrit restoration.

In 1984 Losang KÖNBU SHASTRI presented another Sanskrit restoration in his book *Bodhipathapradipa, Akṣara-Dipamkararajmani*-Viśrutab (Sarnath, Varanasi (Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica, VII.)) using the known Sanskrit version of the 36 seven-syllable lines, i.e. of the 9 quatrains, handed down to our time in the original language. This new attempt shows clearly that the interest in
India discusses again on Atisha's main work. An Indian scholar, namely SĀRĀY CHANDRA DAS, was the first one to draw the attention upon the Bodhipathapradīpa by publishing an annotated translation (Journal of the Buddhist Text Society of India, Vol. I (1933)); together with this English rendering (i.e., in the same volume of the mentioned journal) an edition — using the Northang Tanjur and some non-canonical version(s) — of the Drang-chub lam-gyi srog-ma is presented; the name of the editor is not given, but it is evident that it was prepared by SĀRĀY CHANDRA DAS. The second edition we know of was published in Japan: Shōyuki YOSHIKURA uses the versions of the text as found in the Northang, in the Derge, and in the Peking Tanjur — six versions altogether (Tibetan Buddhismology, Kyoto 1953, vol. II, pp. 50-18; the reprint (?) is not accessible to the present writer). S. YOSHIKURA adds valuable references from the Bodhipathapradīpa. i.e., the canonical commentary on the Bodhipathapradīpa, and identifies several parallels in other texts including the Sanskrit version of the lines 105-128. The presentation of the Drang-chub lam-gyi srog-ma prepared by José YAF DEN NROCK is styled as an "édition semi-critique" (a half-critical edition), it relies upon the versions of the text and the commentary as printed in the Peking Tanjur lde blamâu sar le chenpo de 'jegi (Bodhipathapradīpa). Bruxelles 1976 (Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Bouddhiques, Série "Études et textes", 5). Another edition was published by the present writer in the book Bodhipathapradīpa. Ein Lehrgedicht des Atīśa (Rgpa-pa-skra-bzhi), in der tibetischen Überlieferung (Wiesbaden 1978 (Asiatische Forschungen, 59)); it uses the seven editions of the Drang-chub lam-gyi srog-ma in the Cone, in the Derge, in the Northang, and in the Peking Tanjur, one manuscript and eight blockprints (one of them in a modern reprint) from the paracanonical tradition, and some commentaries. Investigations
by means of textual criticism as presented in the last mentioned book (pp. 61-78) have shown that the *Byang-chub lam-po sargon-nma* is handed down to us in three lines:

(a) in the Madhyamaka (dbu-ma) section of the known xylograph editions of the Tanjur,

(b) in the *pho-bo'i chos-chub* ('the brief religious treatises by the master') section of the Srlarga, of the Narthang and of the Peking Tanjurs — this section has been included into the Madhyamaka section by the Narthang and the Peking Tanjurs — and

(c) in numerous paracanonical manuscripts and blockprints.

The aim of the present communication is to show to which extent it is possible to prepare a correct Sanskrit restoration of the *Bodhipathapradīpa* taking the book by Losang Norebu Shastri as an example. Therefore, these lines are not to be regarded as a review in proper sense; so the "Introduction", the translations into Hindi and into English and the other parts of the book are not commented upon. A translation as well as a restoration needs for its basis a version of the text, i.e., an edition, the Tibetan text as presented by Losang Norebu Shastri is to be considered. This is not possible in the case of the restoration prepared by Mrinalkanti Gangopadhyaya; there is the English translation of the *Bodhipathapradīpa* by Alaka Chattopadhyaya and Lama Chima — was used as original by M. Gangopadhyaya?

The 276 lines (padas) of the *Byang-chub lam-po sargon-nma* are arranged by Losang Norebu Shastri in 69 four-lined stanzas; he writes in the "Introduction" (p. 27): "As mentioned, the exact sloka figures are 69 in this text. Besides, variation occur from 11th sloka onwards, till the inset of 33rd sloka; although numbering of sloka comes precisely, but the meaning is not complete in all the slokas." By this
mechanical counting of the stanzas, e.g. the three quatrains quoted from the *Vṛddhapārtha* are cut in that way, that the stanzas in the *Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma* end after the second *pada* of the verses cited (stanza 15-18, lines 59-70) — this cannot have been intended by Atśā. In general an *āṇuṣṭhā* (common *śloka*) is rendered in Tibetan by a stanza consisting of four seven-syllable lines. The seven-syllable-*śloka* may be used for rendering other, more elaborate Sanskrit metres as well, as is evident from the Tibetan version of the *Subhūtiśravastirājasaṃgītakathā* which cannot be split up mechanically into four-lined stanzas, as the longer Sanskrit metres need up to 9 lines in rendering (cf. H. ZIMMERMANN, *Bhairava-sparśa-ratna-kāla-mahā* (den Aryṣaṇā augehrieben) und ihr tibetische Ubersetzung. Wienbaden 1975 (Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie. 8.)). There is the rule that in general the end of a stanza coincides with the end of a sentence. By observing this one can believe complete sense in all the stanzas of the *Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma*. Counting in this way three stanzas of six lines each are formed (stanza 7/8 (lines 25-30), 8/9 (lines 31-36), and 25/26 (lines 99-104)). one sentence of ten lines (stanza 10/12, lines 37-46), and one sentence of twelve lines (stanza 31-33, lines 237-240), which, however, may be regarded as a set of three quatrains. To avoid all the difficulties arising from the counting of stanzas, the present writer prefers in his book *Vṛddhāpartha* quoting by lines (*pada*), a way of quoting adopted for this paper as well.

Losang Namru SHASTHI made use of the Marthang and the Peking *Tantras* — this is said on page 28 of the "Introduction" and to be seen from some of the twenty odd variant readings given with the text, that some paroanalomical version(s) is/are behind the text is evident from some other variant readings. The variant reading in the invocation of Marṣuṇā shows that the *Jñā-ho lama-chub* section
of the Narthang Tanjur (hereafter: x) was considered; other variant readings (e.g. line 39, (syllable) 4 du: j, dang: k; and 46,7 bya 'o: y, bya: x) indicate that the *dhuma* sections of the Peking and the Narthang Tanjurs (hereafter: y) have been used. As it is regarded as a prerequisite for any well-founded translation, to say nothing of a restoration, to have a critical edited text, in the following para a list of some variant readings to be added to or to be corrected in the edition by Losang NORBU SHASTRI is given; it cannot record the variant readings in the inaccessible para-

canonical version(s) used by the mentioned editor, it refers to some of the separate manuscripts and blockprints within the reach of the present writer (hereafter: z).

(Line) 7, (syllables) 7 ba'i: z. 8,4 bas: z. 9,2 gi: y. 15,4 don: x. 26,4 pa: xy. 28,4 yi: y. 28,6 par: xz. 29,2 brangs: y. 34,2 mo: Cone and Derge *dhuma* sections. 35,4 ba: xy. 36,2 po: z. 39,4 don: xz. 45,6 ba'i: z. 51,2 yi: xz. 51,9 las: z. 52,6 kyle: y. 52,8 gnas: x. 57,2 tsha: z. 58,3-4 pa ni 'dir bril: z. 60,7 bas: y. 61,6 gang: xy. 63,4 ma'i xz. ma: y. ba: Cone and Derge *dhuma* sections. 67,2 gi: y. 72,6 tu: xz. du: Cone and Derge *dhuma* sections. 77,5 sdom: z. 77,7 spal: z. 79,5 ria: x. 80,7 la: s. dag: x. 83,5 tigs: xz. 88,3 le'or xy. le'u: z. lega: Cone and Derge *dhuma* sections. 108,6 xgel: x. 111,4 es: z. 111,7 dag: x. 120,7 bya: x. 127,2 drung: y. 128,2 gi: xy. 126,7 bya: xz. 130,4 kyle: z. 130,9 bas: xz. 131,9 ma: z. 140,3 skyed: y. 141,6 skyed: xy. 144,6-7 ma yin: x. 149,4 sa'i: xy. 146,7 de: x. 153,7 sa: z. 154,7 la: x. 156,2 dang: xy. 158,5 ramm: xy. 159,5 dagom: xy. 163,5 cig: xy. 164,5 bugom: x. 176,2 bas: x. 178,6 ha'i: x. 183,3 chos: x. 184,4 kyle: y. 185,2 bugom; x. bugom: x. 187,1 de: z. 188,5 bugom: y. 205,4 bu'i: y. 208,4 du: x. 209,4-7 'gyur bas: xy. 212,3-4 don du: z. 215,3 pa: xz.
In some cases Losang Norbu Shastri bases his Sanskrit restoration upon a text divergent from his edition, i.e. upon variant readings which are not given or recorded, neither in the text nor in the apparatus; as examples follow here: (Line) 53, (syllable) 9 nam seems to be rendered by sansthita, this is an equivalent of the not noted variant reading gnas; 77, 6 amna seems to be rendered by amunaka (1), amunaka is an equivalent of the not noted variant reading adon; 68, 3 lang seems to be rendered by anyah, this is a maybe possible equivalent of the not noted variant reading le'ur, but for this case see below; 145, 1-4 magem ban idam pang (instrumental) seems to be rendered by abhijñāya (genitive), the variant reading to 145, 4 pa'i (genitive) is not noted; 163, 5-7 gic la yang seems to be rendered by saṃsārakā; this is equivalent to the not noted variant reading cig la 'yang; 183, 3 srobs seems to be rendered by diharb, this is equivalent to the not noted variant reading chos.

Within the Sanskrit stanaus quoted from the Sutras at the three following instances the Tibetan words as given by Losang Norbu Shastri do not go with the original: (Line) 64, (syllables) 3-4 bya ba(i) is equated with bṣīli(i)ka'i "sand", which in general is to be rendered by bya ma; bya ba means a very high number, "ten million", 111, 7 srobo has got no equivalent in the Sanskrit, so
the variant reading dag should be taken. 124,5-7 ram par gnan
is regarded as representing vikautan; in this case the syllable
gnan should be emended to gnana (as done by the present writer in
his book Bodhisattvaradja). p. 120).

There are further problems in restoring a Sanskrit original
taking alone upon a Tibetan translation. The Amuṣṭācāra metre which
obviously was used for the majority of stanzas in the Bodhisattvaradja,
allows considerable variation in arranging the single
words within the stanzas; besides, the syntax of the Sanskrit
language and the great number of synonyms offer so many possibilities
of forming sentences with equal sense. To exemplify this,
the two known restorations of lines 229-232 are presented in con-
trast to the version of the stanza concerned as being preserved in
two manuscripts of the Avikalparasahasrabhairava: M. GANDHAPADHYAYA
restores stanza 56 as follows:

saddharmag jinaaputrak kavikalpam cintayan bhavat /

nikvikalpam praptaa tirvī tikvalpam durgamān kramāt //

(The third pada is metrical incorrect, the na-vipulā should not
preceded by the ram-gnaa and show a caesura after the fifth syllab.
le).

Losang RONBU SHAUTRI presents as stanza 58 the following:

ciintite mirvikalpam 'emin saddharmag jinaaputrakalp /

vikalpam durgamān tirvī 'vikvalp prapṣaye kramāt //

Prof. Kasunobu MATSUDA in a letter dated April 12, 1986 informed
the present writer about the original version of lines 229-232 of
the Byong-chub lam-gyi sgon-ma, we are very thankful for this great
kindness. In his paper "Avikalparasahasrabhaira ni tsuite:
sunfunbetsucho no gotoku ni tenkyo to-ahite" (Bukkyō Seminā 34
(1981), pp. 40-49) Kasunobu MATSUDA gives the respective stanza,
here presented in the form of the letter: the stanza reads as
avikalpanayo bhūtva saddharman 'semg ji(st)naṣṭaṣṭaḥ (\)
vikalpanayoga vṛttayā kramāḥ nigalpaiḥā 3. ... (\)
(The last word can be completed by the word 'śāntaḥ'.)

Prof. I. MATSUMA refers in the said letter to another fragmentary version of the stanza given by N. D. KIROKOV, *Catalogus codicum bau̱u̱ ιeriptorum* (Petersburg 1914 (Catalog: Musei asiatici, 1.), p. 331), which in turn presents two variant readings that are more close to the stanza in the Byang-chub lam-avyi sgye-legs ms; this fragmentary version reads as under:
avikalpaṇayā bhaṭavā saddharmane 'aṁśa jñāntaṇāya / vikalpaṇayogā vṛattaye... ...

This last form of the stanza shows very lucidly that the variant reading in line 330, syllable 5, *bham* as equivalent to Sanskrit *bhava* is to be preferred to the reading *bhma* in the sense of the Sanskrit root *cātt* "think". And this second variant reading/meaning was wrongly accepted by the majority of recent editors or translators of the Byang-chub lam-avyi sgye-legs ms including the present writer.

Logan, NOBU SADHU writes in the "Introduction" to his book (p. 28): "Regarding translation and restoration from Sanskrit into Tibetan and vice versa, systematic rules and traditions have been followed faithfully by the ancient Tibetan Lamasāsas translators which are in Sanskrit Tibetan Dictionary Mahāyānapattā [sic]..." So the reader thinks that the rules referred to have been applied in restoring the Sanskrit version. In the following lines a number of conspicuous Sanskrit equivalents to Tibetan words and expressions used in the Byang-chub lam-avyi sgye-legs ms are noted:

Line 1 *thaw gsad* is rendered by *skhilā*, in general it represents...
sarga or kriya: an equivalent of akhila is ma lha pa.
Line 3 bka' 'bo is rendered by utama, which is normally used for
bheda, budha, caryata, abhuda, pu' or pui: the equivalents of
utama are e.g. brjog or dem pa.
Line 3 behi is rendered by hattha, in general it represents the
Sanskrit root jat (jñata), or prakṣaṇa, or upasana.
Lines 4 and 7 rah 'bya is not represented in the restoration.
Line 9 gnyen dug, the plural is not represented in the restoration.
Line 10 dam is paraphrased with the help of kavala. In general
dam represents ndira; the common equivalent of kavala is ma dren
pa or ma 'dren pa.
Line 15 ti is rendered by nirvigha, in general it represents kanta,
kuntika, bhum, or biva.
Line 22 bka' 'bo (thabo) is rendered by nad-Dec), in general it
represents pari-, pru-, sam-, samyak, or by-
Line 28 'boor pa is rendered by prāpta, in general it represents
rddha, vijaya, or Jukt.
Line 31 bmtu 'dum sning po is rendered by bodhigara, it represents
the technical term bodhimarga.
Line 34 pus mo'i las nga is rendered by bstan, in general it re-
 represents 'bras-snying-pa.
Line 37 thams ras is rendered by samanta, in general it represents
sara or visha.
Line 40 'cti 'bo is rendered by dbyor-thang-mapa, in general it re-
 presents the term cinti/cavana.
Line 43 sdog btags sdog btags (rgyi mtha') is rendered by
dubh-btags ... dubh-btags sdog btags sdog btags represents
the technical term dbyung-dbyung-btags.
Line 75 sden pa is not represented in the restoration.
Line 78 'bdag pa is not represented in the restoration.
There are two instances to be noted where a seemingly correct rendering appears as being doubtful. Tibetan le'yu in lines 88 and 161 is rendered by adhyāra. But, the Mahāyutpatti gives parivāra as equivalent to le'yu (Sakakti edition, nos. 1334 and 1467). And that this is the correct word in line 161 is to be seen from the title Sanāttosastakaparivāra/Tīṅg-ngag-'dün-gyi thugs-gyi le'yu which appears in the Tanjur for works of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna, of Bodhibhadra, and of Kṛṣṇapāda — the Bodhipathapradipas refers to the treatise written by Atiśa’s teacher Bodhibhadra as is evident from the Bodhindrayādipādīṣā, the canonical commentary to the Bodhipathapradipa. But, in line 88, adhyāra again appears as rendering the hidden — i.e. the not noted variant reading — le'yu. In this case Atiśa refers to the “Chapter on Morality” in the Bodhisattvabhūmi/Phyang-chub-sems-dpa'is and in the surviving Sanskrit of this text the character IO of the Adhārṣayagārthāna is named äṭipatāla.
The observations sketched in the paper above make it evident that at the present time a correct restoration of the *Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma*/*bodhipathapradipa* is not possible. Therefore, the examples discussed above do not offer correspondences with the help of which a restoration can be achieved. Precise translations of the *Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma* into Indian languages including Sanskrit would be of great benefit for people interested in Buddhist teachings, but not knowing Tibetan.

Prof. Dr. Michael Hahn, Bonn, made some valuable suggestions which are utilized in this paper, for this effective help we would like to thank him very much.