The *bodhipatradipā* (Tibetan *Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma*) is regarded as one of the most important works of Dipamkararṣiṇī, alias Attiśa (982-1054). It was composed during his stay in the nter-o-ding Monastery (Western Tibet) and probably immediately thereafter, it was translated into Tibetan by the Lobsang 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 sgron-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 *Atiśa and Tibet* (pp. 545-549); the same restoration was again printed in the *Atiśa Dipamkara Millennium Birth Commemoration Volume* (i.e. Jogakirti. Sept. 1982 to Jan. 83 Combined Number and Special Number on Atiśa Dipamka- priyam, Calcutta), pp. 12-14. A brief note entitled "On Atiśa's Bodhipatradipā" by the present author, published by the *Bulletin of Tibetology* (1985: 1, pp. 13-18), gives an evaluation of the mentioned Sanskrit restoration.

In 1984 Losang KOBNU SHASTRI presented another Sanskrit restoration in his book *Bodhipatradipābha, Ākṣara-Dipamkararṣiṇīḥ*

_Virācitaḥ* (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 SARAT CHANDRA DAS, was the first one to draw the attention upon the Bodhipatthapradipa 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 sgrom-ma is presented; the name of the editor is not given, but it is evident that it was prepared by SARAT CHANDRA DAS. The second edition we know of was published in Japan: Shōyuki YOSHIMURA uses the versions of the text as found in the Northang, in the Derge, and in the Peking Tanjurs — six versions altogether (Tibetan Buddhismology, Kyoto 1953, vol. II, pp. 50-18; the reprint (?) is not accessible to the present writer). S. YOSHIMURA adds valuable references from the Bodhisthayapadamāla, i.e., the canonical commentary on the Bodhipatthapradipa, and identifies several parallels in other texts including the Sanskrit version of the lines 105-128. The presentation of the Drang-chub lam-gyi sgrom-ma prepared by Josè VALDENBERG 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 (Le flaneau sur le chemin de l'Eveil (Bodhipatthapradipa). Bruxelles 1976 (Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Bouddhiques, Série "Etudes et textes", 5.)). Another edition was published by the present writer in the book Bodhipatthapradipa. Ein Lehrgedicht des Atīśa (Dīnapāraprītha) in der tibetischen Uberlieferung (Wiesbaden 1978 (asiatische Forschungen, 59.)), it uses the seven editions of the Drang-chub lam-gyi sgrom-ma in the Cone, in the Derge, in the Northang, and in the Peking Tanjurs, 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 Byeng-chub lam-gri lugs-ma is handed down to us in three lines:
(a) in the Madhyamaka (de-ba-ma) section of the known xylograph editions of the Tanjur,
(b) in the De-bo'i chos-chub ('the brief religious treatises by the masters') section of the Serje, 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 paramonastic 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 Bodhipatrapradipika taking the book by Losang NORBU 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. As 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 NORBU SHASTRI is to be considered. This is not possible in the case of the restoration prepared by Nirmalkanti GANGOPADHYAYA; there is the English translation of the Bodhipatrapradipika by Aloka CHATTOPADHYAYA and Lama CHINMA — was it used as original by M. GANGOPADHYAYA?

The 276 lines (padas) of the Byeng-chub lam-gri lugs-ma are arranged by Losang NORBU 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 32nd 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 *Vindhapi**p**udg**ap**at**s**am**adr**o**d**ha**stra* are cut in that way, that the stanzas in the *Bryang-cho* lám-gyi sgra-ma end after the second *pada* of the verses cited (stanza 15-18, lines 59-70) — this cannot have been intended by Asanga. In general an Amogh (common *bloka*) is rendered in Tibetan by a stanza consisting of four seven-syllable lines. The seven-syllable lines may be used for rendering other, more elaborate Sanskrit metres as well, as is evident from the Tibetan version of the *Subhāgīsūtrasamārājamālā* 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, *die Subhāgīsūtrasamārājamālā* [den Aryabhata zugeschrieben] und ihre tibetische Übersetzung, Wienbaden 1975 (Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie. 8.), page 111). 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 *Bryang-cho* lám-gyi sgra-ma. Counting in this way three stanzas of six lines each are formed (stanza 7/5 (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 61-63, lines 237-248), 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 *Vindapi**p**udg**ap**at**s**am**adr**o**d**ha**stra* quoting by lines (*padas*), a way of quoting adopted for this paper as well.

Losang Norbu Shantik made use of the Nalawang and the Peking Tangsurs — 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; these some paranomalous version(s) is/are behind the text is evident from some other variant readings. The variant reading in the invocation of Marju unit shows that the *Yo-bol* chos-cho 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: j, bya: xz) 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 ha'i: s. 8,4 bns: s. 9,2 gi: y. 10,4 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: n. 39,4 don: xz. 45,6 bns: x. 51,2 yis: xz. 51,9 las: z. 52,6 kyi: y. 52,8 gns: x. 57,2 taba: z. 58,3-4 pa ni 'dir bri: z. 60,7 las: 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: xzs. du: Cone and Derge dhuma sections. 77,5 sdom: x. 77,7 spol: z. 79,5 rin: x. 80,7 la: x. dag: x. 85,5 riga: xz. 88,3 le'or xy. le'u: x. lega: Cone and Derge dhuma sections. 108,6 sgrl: x. 111,4 sde: x. 111,7 dag: x. 120,7 bya: x. 127,7 'dung: y. 128,2 gi: xy. 126,7 bya: xz. 130,4 kyi: x. 130,9 pas: xz. 131,9 ma: z. 140,3 skyed: y. 141,6 skyed: xy. 144,6-7 ma yin: x. 143,4 ma'i: xy. 146,7 don: z. 153,7 par: x. 154,7 la: x. 156,2 dang: xy. 159,5 rnam: xy. lha'i bsgom: xy. 163,5 cigs: xy. 164,5 bsdg: x. 176,2 bns: z. 178,6 ha'i: z. 183,3 chos: xz. 185,4 byi: y. 185,2 rgya: xz. bsgom: z. 187,1 de: x. 188,5 bsgom: y. 205,4 bu'i: y. 208,4 du: z. 209,4-9 'gyur bns: xy. 212,3-4 don du: x. 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) 8 ma seems to be rendered by amathik, this is an equivalent of the not noted variant reading ghas; 77, 8 amna seems to be rendered by anuvaha (1), anuvaha is an equivalent of the not noted variant reading adom; 88, 3 letg seems to be rendered by anyavya, this is a maybe possible equivalent of the not noted variant reading le'nir, but for this case see below; 145, 1-4 yugam has yan gan (instrumental) seems to be rendered by abhiMasya (genitive); the variant reading to 145, 4 pa'i (genitive) is not noted; 163, 5-7 goci la yang seems to be rendered by karavandhi, this is equivalent to the not noted variant reading cig la 'jang; 183, 2 tshogs seems to be rendered by dihyup, this is equivalent to the not noted variant reading chos.

Within the Sanskrit stanzas 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 ma'(i) is equated with bskil(i)kar(i) "sand", which in general is to be rendered by bya ma; bya ma means a very high number, "ten million", 111, 7 mo'g has got no equivalent in the Sanskrit, so
the variant reading dag should be taken. 124,5-7 rnam par gnas
is regarded as representing vibrato; in this case the syllable
gnas should be emended to gnas (as done by the present writer in
his book Bodhisattvapradīpa, p. 120).

There are further problems in restoring a Sanskrit original
based alone upon a Tibetan translation. The Anuṣṭhāna meter which
obviously was used for the majority of stanzas in the Bodhisattvapra-
dīpa, allows considerable variation in arranging the single
words within the stamāṇa; besides, the syntax of the Sanskrit
language and the great number of synonyms offer so many possibili-
ties 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 Avikālapraveśadhrānta: M. GANAPATHAYA
restores stanza 56 as follows:

saddharmam jinaputakāh cāvikalpam cintayan bhavat /
nirvikālapaḥ prāptās tirvāṃ vikalpaḥ durgāmān kramāt //
(The third pada is metrical incorrect, the ma-vipulā should be
preceded by the ra-gnas and show a caesura after the fifth syllab-
le).

Losang RÖMBU SHAÑSTRI presents as stanza 58 the following:

cintite nirvikalpe 'smin saddharmam jinaputakāp /
vikalpaḥ durgāmānaḥ tirvāṃ 'vikalpaḥ prāptasyā 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 Byeng-chen lam-gyi agyon-ma, we are very thankful for this great
kindness. In his paper *Nirvikālapraveśadhrānta ni tsui*: mufunbetsu-no to gotoku no tenkyo to-ahite* (Bukkyō senmō 34
(1981), pp. 40-49) Kasunobu MatsuDA gives the respective stanza,
here presented in the form of the letter: the stanza reads as
avikalpanaḥ bhūtiḥ saddhāvame 'ṣaṁj jñāntasmajab !(/
ā avikalpanaṁ vyātiṣṭha krāmbha niṣayalpaṁ 3. ... (/)
(The last word can be completed by the word Samajab.
Prof. G. N. BATUTIJA refers in the said letter to another fragmentary version of the stanza given by N. D. KRAJEVIĆ, Catalogus medii evum āryaśritorum i.e. (Fasc. I. Petropolit 1914 (Catalog 1. Musei Aiatoci. 1.), p. 331), which in turn presents two variant readings that are more close to the stanza in the Byang-chub lam-avyi gser-o-pha; this fragmentary version reads as under:
ā avikalpaḥav bhūtiḥ saddhāveme 'ṣaṁj jñāntasmajab /
ā avikalpaḥav vyātiṣṭha ... ...
This last form of the stanza shows very lucidly that the variant reading in line 330, syllable 5, bhave as equivalent to Sanskrit have is to be preferred to the reading bhave in the sense of the Sanskrit root cītt "think". And this second variant reading/meaning was wrongly accepted by the majority of recent editors or translators of the Byang-chub lam-avyi gser-o-pha including the present writer.
Losang NORBU SHASTRI writes in the "Introduction" to his book (p. 28): "Regarding translation and restoration from Sanskrit into Tibetan and vice versa, systematic rules and tridents have been followed faithfully by the ancient Tibetan Lotaivasa translators which are in Sanskrit Tibetan Dictionary Māhāvīraṭtī [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 gser-o-pha are noted:
Line 1 theṃ and is rendered by akhilam, in general it represents...
sarva or kīvā: an equivalent of akṣiṇa is na luga pa.
Line 3 bran-pa is rendered by uttana, which is normally used for bhāra, loka, gṛipti, akṣiṇa, su- or su-, the equivalents of uttana are e.g. bhāra or dama pa.
Line 3 bha-ba is rendered by kāṭika, in general it represents the Sanskrit root gṛip (gṛipti), or gṛipamukta, or gṛipta.
Lines 4 and 7 bha-ba is not represented in the restoration.
Line 9 gong dag, the plural is not represented in the restoration.
Line 10 tan-pa is paraphrased with the help of karva. In general tan represents uttana; the common equivalent of karva is ma dreg pa or na 'dres pa.
Line 15 sī is rendered by nirūpa, in general it represents kāra, kāla, kām, or kīva.
Line 22 yon-dag (thaba) is rendered by padapō, in general it represents pūr-, pr-, sam-; samapti, or by-
Line 28 'boor-pa is rendered by pūrpa, in general it represents rdo-rab, rdo-rab, or yuta.
Line 31 byang chub sning po is rendered by bodhisattva, it represents the technical term bodhisattva.
Line 34 pum mo-lha-rig is rendered by laṃkañ, in general it represents gumaspāla.
Line 37 thams red is rendered by samants, in general it represents sarva or vikāra.
Line 40 'chi 'po is rendered by buddhakīrtimappu, in general it represents the term yathā/gūḍavarna.
Line 43 du-dug bka-gsal du-dug bka-gsal (rgya stobs) is rendered by dus-hats, du-dug bka-gsal du-dug bka-gsal represents the technical term dus-hus-dus-hats.
Line 75 adon pa is not represented in the restoration.
Line 78 'bad pa is not represented in the restoration.
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Line 78 ḍrāṃg is rendered by ḍrāṅg, in general it represents derivatives of the Sanskrit root dhā, dhār, or ḍhār.
Line 141 ṛgās pa is rendered by vṛgdha, the intended meaning is something like vistara or vistipa.
Line 164 ḍewa is rendered by ḍeu, in general it represents ḍhulā, ḍhūpa, ḍhulāma, ḍhurwa, or svastika.
Line 178 ḍam bya'i is rendered by niṣṭūṭi, in general aoph ba represents śahāti or pratisthāt.
Line 179 ḍuṅs is not rendered in the restoration.
Line 203 mi dgyis paś is rendered by maṇḍapaṃḥastāt, in line 214 appears as equivalent aṇibbhataḥ.
Line 242 ḍi dang ṛgās is rendered by śānti-vistara: the group of technical concepts meant in this context starts with śānti and ṛgās.

There are two instances to be noted where a seemingly correct rendering appears as being doubtful. Tibetan le'u in lines 88 and 161 is rendered by adhyāya. But, the Mahāvaṃśaṭānta gives parivarta as equivalent to le'u (Sakakti edition, nos. 1354 and 1467). And that this is the correct word in line 161 is to be seen from the title Saṃśīśaṃbhṛṣṭaparivarta/Tīṇg-ne. 'dun-gyi tshogs-kyi le'u which appears in the Taṅjūr for works of Dīpaṃkararāja, of Bodhidhāra, and of Kṣapaṇā — the Bodhipathapradīpa refers to the treatise written by Aṭṭā's teacher Bodhidhāra as is evident from the Bodhipathapradīpa, the canonical commentary to the Bodhipathapradīpa. But, in line 88, adhyāya again appears as rendering the hidden — i.e. the not noted variant reading — le'u. In this case Aṭṭā refers to the "Chapter on Morality" in the Bodhisattvabhūmi/Paṇḍ−cuppam-gaṭa'd paś, and in the surviving Sanskrit of this text the cue-verb IO of the Aḍḍhārayogasthāna is named ṛgās-paṭala.
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*/*bodhipathapradyoga* is not possible. Therefore, the examples discussed above do not offer corrections 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 Mahr, Bonn, made some valuable suggestions which are utilised in this paper, for which effective help we would like to thank him very much.