

AGAIN: ON ATISA'S BODHIPATHAPRADĪPA

Helmut Eimer

The BodhipathapradĪpa (Tibetan Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma) is regarded as one of the most important works of DĪpaṅkaraśrījñāna, alias Atiśa (982-1054). It was composed during his stay in the mTho-lding 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 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 Atish Dipankar Millennium Birth Commemoration Volume (i.e. Jagajjyoti, Sept. 1982 to Jan. 83 Combined Number and Special Number on Atish Dipankar Srijanan, Calcutta), pp. 12-14. A brief note entitled "On Atiśa's BodhipathapradĪpa" 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 NORBU SHASTRI presented another Sanskrit restoration in his book BodhipathapradĪpaḥ, Ācārya-DĪpaṅkaraśrījñāna-viracitaḥ (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 focusses again on Atiśa's main work. An Indian scholar, namely SARAT 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 (1893)); together with this English rendering (i.e., in the same volume of the mentioned journal) an edition — using the Narthang Tanjur and some non-canonical version(s) — of the Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-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: Shyuki YOSHIMURA uses the versions of the text as found in the Narthang, in the Derge, and in the Peking Tanjurs — six versions altogether (Tibetan Buddhistology, Kyoto 1953, vol. II, pp. 50-78; the reprint (?) is not accessible to the present writer). S. YOSHIMURA adds valuable references from the Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā, 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 Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma prepared by José VAN DEN BROECK 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 flambeau sur le chemin de l'Eveil (Bodhipathapradīpa). 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 Bodhipathapradīpa. Ein Lehrgedicht des Atiśa (Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna) in der tibetischen Ueberlieferung (Wiesbaden 1978 (Asiatische Forschungen. 59.)), it uses the seven editions of the Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma in the Cone, in the Derge, in the Narthang, 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 Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma 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 Jo-bo'i chos-chuñ ("the brief religious treatises by the master") section of the Derge, 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 Bodhipathapradipa 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 Mrinalkanti GANGOPADHYAYA; there is the English translation of the Bodhipathapradipa by Alaka CHATTOPADHYAYA and Lama CHIMPA — was it used as original by M. GANGOPADHYAYA ?

The 276 lines (padas) of the Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-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 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 Vīradattagrhapatipariprcchāsūtra 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 Atiśa. In general an Anuṣṭubh (common śloka) 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 Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā 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 Subhāṣita-ratna-karaṇḍaka-kathā (dem Āryaśūra zugeschrieben) und ihre tibetische Uebersetzung. Wiesbaden 1975 (Freiburger Beitræge 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 achieve 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 (stanzas 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 (stanzas 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 Bodhipathapradīpa quoting by lines (padas), a way of quoting adopted for this paper as well.

Losang NORBU SHASTRI made use of the Narthang and the Peking Tanjurs — 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 paracanonical version(s) is/are behind the text is evident from some other variant readings. The variant reading in the invocation of Mañjuśrī shows that the Jo-bo'i chos-chun section

of the Narthang Tanjur (hereafter: x) was considered; other variant readings (e.g. line 39, (syllable) 4 du: y, dang: x; and 46,7 bya 'o: y, bya: xz) indicate that the dBu-ma 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, (syllable) 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 bzangs: y. 34,2 mo: Cone and Derge dBu-ma sections. 35,4 ba: xy. 36,2 po: z. 39,4 dang: xz. 45,6 bca': z. 51,2 yis: xz. 51,9 las: z. 52,6 kyis: y. 53,8 gnas: x. 57,2 tshe: z. 58,3-6 pa ni 'dir bri: z. 60,7 nas: y. 61,6 gang: xy. 63,4 ma'i xz, ma: y, ba: Cone and Derge dBu-ma sections. 67,2 gi: y. 72,6 tu: xyz, du: Cone and Derge dBu-ma sections. 77,5 sdom: z. 77,7 spel: z. 79,5 ris: x. 80,7 la: z, dag: x. 83,5 rigs: yz. 88,3 le'ur xy, le'u: z, legs: Cone and Derge dBu-ma sections. 108,6 sgröl: z. 111,4 (s)te: z. 111,7 dag: z. 120,7 bya: z. 123,3 gzung: y. 125,2 gi: yz. 126,7 bya: xz. 130,4 kyis: z. 130,9 pas: xz. 131,9 na: z. 140,3 skyed: y. 141,6 skyes: xy. 144,6-7 ma yin: x. 145,4 pa'i: xy. 146,7 de: z. 153,7 par: z. 154,7 la: z. 156,2 dang: xy. 157,5 rnam: xy. 158,5 bsgom: xy. 163,5 cig: xy. 164,5 bžag: x. 176,2 bas: z. 178,6 ba'i: z. 183,3 chos: z. 184,4 kyi: y. 185,2 bsgoms: x, bsgom: y. 187,1 de: z. 188,5 bsgom: y. 205,4 bcu'i: y. 208,4 du: z. 209,6-7 'gyur bas: xy. 212,3-4 don du: z. 215,3 pa: xz.

215,7 fid: z. 216,1-2 'di ni: z. 216,5 bsgom: xy. 218,7 žing: xy.
 219,5 rig: xy. 219,6 dpyad: z. 223,5 rtogs: y. 227,3-6 ting 'dzin!
 la gnas: xz, ting nge 'dzin la: y. 227,7 pas: x, gnas: y. 230,5
 bsam: y. 235,4 par: z. 237,7 bsgoms: z. 237,7 na: z. 243,7
 pa'i: z. 245,1-2 bden pa: x. 245,3 yi: x. 257,2 po'i: z. 263,5-6
 gyur pa'i: xz. 267,5 lhung: y. 268,3-4 nam yang: z(x). 271,5
 brñes: z. 271,6 gyur: x. 271,7 cing: x. 272,4 las: x. 273,7
 gyi: y.

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 nas seems to be rendered by saṃstṛiṭi, this is an equivalent of the not noted variant reading gnas; 77,5 smon seems to be rendered by saṃvāra (!), saṃvara is an equivalent of the not noted variant reading sdom; 88,3 legs seems to be rendered by adhyāya, this is a maybe possible equivalent of the not noted variant reading le'u(r), but for this case see below; 145,1-4 mngon šes ldan pas (instrumental) seems to be rendered by abhiḡāsya (genitive), the variant reading to 145,4 pa'i (genitive) is not noted; 163,5-7 gcig la yang seems to be rendered by kaśmīṣcid, this is equivalent to the not noted variant reading cig la 'ang; 183,3 tshogs seems to be rendered by dharmāḥ, 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 bye ba('i) is equated with bāli(u)ka(ā) "sand", which in general is to be rendered by bye ma; bye ba means a very high number, "ten million". 111,7 mchog 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 viśrutam; in this case the syllable gnas should be emended to grags (as done by the present writer in his book Bodhipathapradīpa, p. 120).

There are further problems in restoring a Sanskrit original basing alone upon a Tibetan translation. The Anuṣṭubh metre which obviously was used for the majority of stanzas in the Bodhipāthapradīpa, allows considerable variation in arranging the single words within the stanza; 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 contrast to the version of the stanza concerned as being preserved in two manuscripts of the Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī; M. GANGOPADHYAYA restores stanza 56 as follows:

saddharmaṃ jinaputraś cāvikalpaṃ cintayan bhavet /
nirvikalpaṃ prāptās tīrtvā vikalpān durgamān kramāt //

(The third pada is metrical incorrect, the ma-vipulā should be preceded by the ra-gaṇa and show a caesura after the fifth syllable).

Losang NORBU SHASTRI presents as stanza 58 the following:

cintite nirvikalpe 'smin saddharme jinaputrakaiḥ /
vikalpaṃ durgamaṃ tīrtvā 'vikalpo prāpsyate kramāt //

Prof. Kazunobu MATSUDA in a letter dated April 12, 1986 informed the present writer about the original version of lines 229-232 of the Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma, we are very thankful for this great kindness. In his paper "Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇī ni tsuite: mufunbetsuchi to gotokuchi no tenkyo to-shite" (Bukkyō seminā 34 (1981), pp. 40-49) Kazunobu MATSUDA gives the respective stanza, here presented in the form of the letter: the stanza reads as

follows:

avikalpanayo bhūtvā saddharme 'smiṃ ji(nāṭma)jaḥ (/)

vikalpamārgam vyatītya kramān niṣkalpam ā. . . (//)

(The last pada can be completed by the word āpnuyāt).

Prof. K. MATSUDA refers in the said letter to another fragmentary version of the stanza given by N. D. MIRONOV, Catalogus codicorum manu scriptorum Indicorum. (Fasc. I. Petropoli 1914 (Catalogi Musei Asiatici. I.), p. 331), which in turn presents two variant readings that are more close to the stanza in the Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma; this fragmentary version reads as under:

avikalpāśayo bhūtvā saddharme 'smin jinātmajaḥ /

vikalpadurgam vyatītya

This last form of the stanza shows very lucidly that the variant reading in line 230, syllable 5, bsam as equivalent to Sanskrit āśaya is to be preferred to the reading bsams in the sense of the Sanskrit root cint "think". And this second variant reading/meaning was wrongly accepted by the majority of recent editors or translators of the Byang-chub lam-gyi sgron-ma including the present writer.

Losang NORBU SHASTRI writes in the "Introduction" to his book (p. 26): "Regarding translation and restoration from Sanskrit into Tibetan and vice versa, systematic rules and traditions have been followed faithfully by the ancient Tibetan Lotsawas translators which are in Sanskrit Tibetan Dictionary Mahāvvyutpatti [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-gyi sgron-ma are noted:

Line 1 thams cad is rendered by akhila, in general it represents

sarva or viśva; an equivalent of akhila is ma lus pa.

Line 3 bzang po is rendered by uttama, which is normally used for bhadra, śubha, praṇīta, sādhū, su- or sat-; the equivalents of uttama are e.g. mchog or dam pa.

Line 3 bskul is rendered by kathita, in general it represents the Sanskrit root cud (codayati), or prakampya, or preṣana.

Lines 4 and 7 rab tu is not represented in the restoration.

Line 9 gang dag, the plural is not represented in the restoration.

Line 10 tsam is paraphrased with the help of kevala, in general tsam represents mātra; the common equivalent of kevala is ma dres pa or ma 'dres pa.

Line 15 ḥi is rendered by nirvāṇa, in general it represents śānta, śāntika, śama, or śiva.

Line 22 yang dag (thabs) is rendered by sad(upāya), in general it represents pari-, pra-, sam-, samyak, or su-.

Line 28 'byor pa is rendered by prāpta, in general it represents rddha, vibhava, or yukta.

Line 31 byang chub sffing po is rendered by bodhisāra, it represents the technical term bodhimāṇḍa.

Line 34 pus mo'i lha nga is rendered by jānuni, in general it represents jānumaṇḍala.

Line 37 thams cad is rendered by samanta, in general it represents sarva or viśva.

Line 40 'chi 'pho is rendered by saṃkrāntimarāṇa, in general it represents the term cyuti/cyavana.

Line 43 sdug bsngal sdug bsngal (rgyu mtshan) is rendered by duḥkha(hetos) ... duḥkhāt, sdug bsngal gyi sdug bsngal represents the technical term duḥkhaduḥkhatā.

Line 75 sdom pa is not represented in the restoration.

Line 78 'bad pas is not represented in the restoration.

Line 78 blang is rendered by āpnuyāt, in general it represents derivatives of the Sanskrit roots dā, har, or grah.

Line 141 rgyas pa is rendered by vrddhi, the intended meaning is something like vistara or vistīrṇa.

Line 164 dge is rendered by punya, in general it represents kuśala, śubha, kalyāṇa, śreyas, or svasti.

Line 178 spang bya'i is rendered by nirāsitum, in general spoṅ ba represents jahāti or prativirati.

Line 179 rnams is not rendered in the restoration.

Line 203 mi dmgis pas is rendered by aprāpyamānatvāt, in line 214 appears as equivalent anālābhataḥ.

Line 242 ži dang rgyas is rendered by śānti-vistara; the group of technical concepts meant in this context starts with śānti and puṣṭi.

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 Mahāvvyutpatti gives parivarta as equivalent to le'u (Sakaki edition, nos. 1334 and 1467). And that this is the correct word in line 161 is to be seen from the title Samādhisambhāraparivarta/Ting-nge-'dzin-gyi tshogs-kyi le'u which appears in the Tanjur for works of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna, of Bodhibhadra, and of Kṛṣṇapāda — the Bodhipathapradīpa refers to the treatise written by Atiśa's teacher Bodhibhadra as is evident from the Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā, 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 Atiśa refers to the "Chapter on Morality" in the Bodhisattvabhūmi/Byang-chub-sems-dpa'i sa, and in the surviving Sanskrit of this text the chapter 10 of the Ādhārayogasthāna is named śīlapaṭala.

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