

A SANSKRIT FRAGMENT OF CANDRAGOMIN'S
PRANĪDHĀNA

PÉTER-DÁNIEL SZÁNTÓ

Introduction

It is difficult to announce happily the survival of the Sanskrit text of the *Candragomipraṇīdhāna* in a Kaiser Library manuscript bundle after having faced the devastating loss of Prof. Michael Hahn, the chief authority on things related to the author (and much else!), and the building of the archive itself in the tragic earthquake that shook Kathmandu recently. My discovery of the fragment dates back to 2013 and I was honoured to receive some comments from Prof. Hahn in the form of a very gracious but critical e-mail, including confirmation of the very fact that this was indeed a previously unreported find.

To Hahn's unparalleled scholarship on the identity of Candragomin I can add nothing. In the aforementioned missive he wrote "[f]rom its style, the *Candragomipraṇīdhāna* might also be authentic," meaning that he found it probable that the text I shall present here is the work of the poet-grammarian. Again, I am in no position to dispute this claim. My contribution will therefore be a very simple one: to present the bundle where the fragment survives, to edit the text, to comment on it verse by verse, and to offer a tentative translation.

The text was hitherto known only in Tibetan translation (Tōh. 4386, Ōta. 5931), which consists of eleven stanzas. A rendering into English may be found in Tatz's thesis (1978: 454–455), which was published almost verbatim in Tatz 1985: 25–26 (see Hahn 1993 for a thorough review).

The manuscript bundle Kaiser Library 127 was first archived on microfilm by the NGMPP (reel no. C 14/5), but since then colour images have also become available. The present status of the manuscript is unknown and I have not performed a personal autopsy; my work is based on the colour images.

The bundle contains only palm leaves; their sizes and state of preservation vary considerably. Most of the leaves are remnants of at least two old manuscripts of Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. To my knowledge, none of the editions have made use of these fragments and the most up-to-date survey of *Bodhicaryāvatāra* manuscripts (Stender 2014) does not mention them either. One of the two witnesses contains a colophon stating that the copy was a pious gift of the monk Abhaya[...]bhadrā¹ in the year 237 of the Nepal Era, that is to say 1117 CE. The first leaf contains the beginning of the *Tantrākhyāna* (marked on the cover as "*Taṃtrāṣyāna*" in a later hand). Another leaf contains the beginning of the *Jātiśmarā nāma dhāraṇī* (Tōh. 4457)². There are also fragments of the works called *Triskandhadeśanā* and the *Aṣṭāṅgaṇḍhānuśaṃsā*, as well as a variety of praises, the titles which can still be read being *Arapacanadaṇḍakastava*, *Avalokiteśvarastotra*, *Sarvajīnaratnakaraṇḍaka Avalokiteśvarastotra*, and *Mañjughoṣastuti*. The last of these is an important hymn to Mañjughoṣa attributed to Dignāga (Tōh. 2712) a verse from which is fairly often quoted in exegesis as early as the late eighth century; I intend to discuss this work elsewhere. Further fragments include an almost complete *Navaślokī* by Kambalācārya, the end of a work attributed to Nāgārjuna listing chapter names of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* in *anuṣṭubh* verse, the beginning of an unidentified *sūtra*, and a single-folio fragment of a tantric work discussing the preliminaries of a *sādhana* related to the Śaṃvara/Saṃvara cycle. Several fragments remain unidentified.

The fragment concerning us here is contained on the recto and verso sides of a single folio. The text was copied after the *Navaślokī* and before an unidentified series of invocations beginning with a refuge formula. It is therefore clear that originally the present witness was transmitted in a composite manuscript.

¹ The reading *abhaya-* is the result of a correction by rubbing out the previous three syllables. After *abhaya-* and before *-bhadrā* there is a *kākapada* mark, but since the margin is lost due to damage, it is not certain what the donor's full name was. *Abhaya-* could attract something like **-datta*, whereas the second half, *-bhadrā*, may have been part of the ordination onomastic element **śrībhadrā*.

² It is perhaps worthwhile to note for codicologists that according to the Tibetan colophon, the Sanskrit original was written in gold (*rgya dpe gser gyis bris pa*).

The size of the folios cannot be determined, especially since they are damaged at the margins. There is a string hole towards the left; the scribe left a small rectangular space around it in lines 3 to 5. The handwriting is quite clear, but not always correct. The script employs the *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā* and it does not display hook-tops. Normally this would mean that the script precedes the 13th century, but since East Indian and Nepalese palaeography is still a largely unstudied field, I hesitate to propose a date. There are several corrections to the text; these are discussed individually in the edition.

There is a very strong possibility that the present fragment is not a *codex unicus*, since the KCDS catalogue (p. 107) has an entry “*zla ba grags pas mdzad pa'i smon lam lo ma gcig b'zugs*/月称所著祈祷文一篇.” It is not impossible that here *Candrakīrti is a slip of the pen for Candragomin.

Edition, Commentary, Translation

The following abbreviations and symbols are used: r. = recto, v. = verso, l. = line number,³ Ms = manuscript, st. = standardization, corr. = correction, em. = emendation, conj. = conjecture. + denotes a damaged/illegible *akṣara*, . and – denote the metrical quantities of missing syllables, short and long respectively.

// *namo buddhāyaḥ* //

This is the scribal obeisance, an element sometimes incorrectly edited as part of the main text. The hypercorrection *buddhāyaḥ* is a rather clear sign that the scribe is not very learned, in spite of the fact that he managed to copy a more or less correct text.

bhagavan

This vocative, a kind of *Auftakt*, is missing in the Tibetan translation, but it may be original.

³ It should be understood that these denote not true line numbers (which is nearly impossible to determine in the present state of the manuscript); the beginning of the line number is placed wherever we start to have legible text in the given line.

*yatra yatropapadye 'haṃ karmabhir bhavaśaṅkaṭe /
tatra tatra pumān bhūyāṃ [r. l. 3] śrāddhaś cāvikalendriyaḥ // [1]*

Notes: 'haṃ] st., haṃ Ms • °śaṅkaṭe] st., °śaṅkaṭe Ms • śrāddhaś cāvikalendriyaḥ] conj. Hahn, + + + kalendriyaḥ Ms (only the right half of -ka- is legible in -kalendriyaḥ)

Commentary: The Tibetan translation of *pādas ab* is / *srid pa'i las ni nām pa yis // gañ dañ gañ du ñer skye ba* / which is either a misunderstanding or the result of a series of corruptions in transmission. Perhaps a more correct rendering would have been **srid par las kyi nām pa yis* / if we posit that the Tibetans chose to simplify the metaphor *bhavaśaṅkaṭe*. Tatz's translation (1978: 454 = 1985: 26) is therefore also incorrect: "With anxiety for the karma of existence, / However and wherever I am born." The second half is correctly translated as / *de dañ der ni skyes pa dañ // dad dañ dbañ po tshañ ba dañ* /, but here it is Tatz who commits an error by ignoring *skyes pa* ("male"): "In that [form] and in that [place], / Pure in faith and in faculties." Seeing only the Tibetan, it is of course perfectly possible to understand *dad dañ* in such a way, but there does not seem to be any space for an adjective in the Sanskrit, where we expect **avikalendriyaḥ* preceded by a word meaning "possessing faith" (*śraddhā*). Prof. Hahn's initial solution was *śrāddho 'vikalendriyaḥ*, which tallies with the Tibetan, but it is hypometrical. His second attempt was *śrāddhaś cāvikalendriyaḥ*, which I accepted gratefully.

Translation: "Wherever I may be born in the dire straits of existence by the power of former deeds, may I in each and every [rebirth] become male, faithful, with faculties intact,"

*sarvaśilpakalābhijñāḥ sarvaśāstraviśāradaḥ /
sarvavastuparityāgī sarvakāmaparāñmukhaḥ // [2]*

Commentary: The Tibetan renders the last word of *pāda b* slightly unusually, / *bstan bcos kun la 'jigs med dañ* /, hence Tatz's "Fearless in all treatises." *Pāda c* is translated quite precisely (in the position of *pāda d*), / *dños kun yoñs su gtoñ ba dañ* /, but it is translated somewhat loosely as "Magnanimous in all matters," by Tatz. The word *vastu/dños po* here has a more restricted sense of "material goods," "property." The word *kāma/dod pa* does not mean merely "desire," but also the "objects of desire," hence I slightly modify Tatz's "Turning my back to all desires,"

below. The first line is echoed in Jagaddarpaṇa's description of a tantric *ācārya*, slightly modifying the phrasing to fit the context (*Kriyāsamuccaya*, Ms 5r): *sarvaśilpakalābhijño mantrasāstraviśāradaḥ /*

Translation: “an expert in all crafts and arts, versed in all treatises, one who is [able] to give up all material goods, one who is averse to all objects of desire,”

smṛtimān avisaṃvādī sattvānāṃ priyadarśa[r. l. 4]naḥ /
kalyāṇamitrasaṃsevī bodhicittavibhūṣitaḥ // [3]

Notes: *avisaṃvādī*] st., *avisaṃvādī* Ms • *sattvānāṃ*] st., *satvānāṃ* Ms • °*darśanaḥ* /] conj., °*darśa* + + Ms • *kalyāṇa*°] conj., + + + Ms • °*saṃsevī*] st., °*saṃśevī* Ms

Commentary: The Tibetan translation of the second line seems to contain a contamination: / *byaṅ chub sems kyis rnam brgyan pa'i // dge ba'i bśes gñen bsten pa daṅ /*, hence Tatz's “Serving a spiritual adviser / Who is adorned with the thought of awakening.” It is unnecessary (and perhaps even offensive, given the cultural norms) to suppose that the *kalyāṇamitra* does not possess *bodhicitta*; this seems to be here a requirement that the author wishes for himself. This is quite clear from the Sanskrit, and also from the Tibetan if we emend *brgyan pa'i* to *brgyan pa*. The second line is repeated verbatim in the benefits section of the *Tārāṣṭottaraśatanāmastotra* (55ab), which otherwise contains several further echoes of this work.

Translation: “one who is mindful, one who does not lie, one who is joyful to behold for people, one who correctly serves a spiritual advisor, one who is adorned with the resolve to become enlightened,”

vinayācārasaṃpannaḥ śucir jātismaraḥ sudhīḥ /
pāpakarmakriyābhūruḥ kalyāṇācāragocaraḥ // [4]

Notes: °*saṃpannaḥ*] em., °*saṃpanna* Ms • *sudhīḥ*] em., *sudhī* Ms post corr., *su+i* Ms ante corr. • /] st., // Ms

Commentary: The Tibetan translation of *pāda b* is confused and confusing: / *blo bzaṅ skye ba gtsaṅ ma dran /*, hence Tatz's “Mindful of good intellect and clean rebirth.” It is fairly obvious that the translators read **śucijātismaraḥ*, which does not yield good sense. The second line is rendered accurately, adding a causal relationship between the two verse

quarters: / *sdig pa'i las la 'jigs byed pas // spyod pa dge ba'i spyod yul can /*, but it is translated into English by Tatz somewhat strangely as “My course will have a wholesome object, / Out of fear for sinful karma.”

Translation: “one who is fully endowed with disciplined deportment, clean, one who is able to recollect former births, one who is intelligent, one who fears committing sinful acts, one whose goal is to act beneficially;”

ante cānu[r. 1. 5]*ttarajñānadaśapāramitāśrayām /*
prāpnuyām acalāṃ nātha jagadekāntasaukhyadām // [5]

Notes: *cānuttarajñāna*^o] conj. (^o*jñānāṃ* or ^o*jñānād* conj. Hahn), *cānu* + + + + Ms • ^o*daśapāramitā*^o] conj., + + + + *mitā*^o Ms • ^o*āśrayām*] st., ^o*āśrayām* Ms • *acalāṃ nātha*] em., *acalān nātha* Ms • *jagadekānta*^o] Ms post corr., *jagadekakānta*^o Ms ante corr. • ^o*dām*] st., ^o*dāṃ* Ms

Commentary: The Tibetan translation seems to be fairly accurate, if somewhat opaque and therefore open to interpretation: / *mthar yañ bla med rtogs pa yis // pha rol phyin pa bcu bsten pas // 'gro la gcig tu bde ba yi // g.yo med mgon po thob par gyur /* (one exception is that one should read *brten* rather than *bsten*). It should not come as a surprise then that Tatz’s translation is inaccurate (the slight modifications in 1985: 26 are here noted in brackets): “Adhering to the ten perfections, / The supreme and ultimate comprehension (achievement), / May I become the unwavering savior (protector), / Who brings only happiness to the world.” How to reconstruct the end of the first *pāda* is questionable. Prof. Hahn in his personal communication suggested either a feminine accusative construed with *acalāṃ* or a neuter ablative, possibly following the Tibetan. Here I have opted for a third solution, but this needs to be re-examined in light of Candragomin’s doctrinal convictions gathered from his other works. It is also possible that *rtogs pa* does not mirror *jñāna*, but another synonym.

Translation: “and finally, may I obtain, o protector, [the level (*bhūmi*) called] the Unshakeable, grounded in unsurpassed gnosis and the ten perfections, which bestows absolute bliss on the world.”

mā me strītvam mā ca me dāsabhāvo
mā mūrkhvatvam mā kudeśeṣu janma /
mīthyādṛ[r. 1. 6] -- . -- . --
buddhotpādo mā ca me bhūt paro'kṣaḥ // [6]

Notes: *dāsabhāvo*] after this, a comma-like *daṇḍa* points out the end of the *pāda* • *buddhotpādo*] conj., + *ddhotpādo* Ms • *paro'kṣaḥ*] st., *parokṣaḥ* Ms

Commentary: The metre is *Śālinī*. The Tibetan translation of the second line is / *saṅs rgyas 'byuñ la lkog ma gyur // nam du'añ lta ba log ma gyur /*, which Tatz (1978: 454–455) interprets as “Let my future Buddhahood be visible, / And may there never be any wrong views.” This is quite untenable even from the Tibetan, which can now be corrected to *'byuñ ba* instead of *'byuñ la*, unless we assume that a *locativus respectivus* was intended. The list reflects the so-called *akṣaṇas*.

Translation: “May I never be [reborn as] a female, nor as a slave; may I never be [born] as an idiot, or born in a barbaric country; [may I never cling to ...] wrong views, may the coming of the buddha[s] [into this world] never be blocked from my sight.”

mā tac chīlaṃ yan na buddhatvahetor
mā tad dravyaṃ yat pareṣām abhogyam /
kāmaṃ bhikṣāṃ dehi dehity adeyaṃ
mā +e [r. 1. 7] --- . --- . -- ḥ // [7]

Notes: from *abhogyam* up to *adeyaṃ mā* the lower half of the line is broken, therefore these readings are not entirely certain • *abhogyam*] st., *abhogyam* Ms

Commentary: The metre is *Śālinī*. The Tibetan is rather puzzling for the entire verse: / *'dod med tshul ldan saṅs rgyas rgyur // pha rol 'dod pa'i rdzas loṅs spyod // sems can ṅam thag byed 'gyur ba'i // 'dod pa'i sloṅ mo bdag mi spyod /*, cf. Tatz's translation: “Let me become Buddha with a desireless manner, / Enjoying things that are not desired by others; / Let me not lives (live) on alms I may desire, / When they are the cause of distress.” Prof. Taiken Kyuma kindly offered the following reconstruction for the last *pāda*: **mā deyaṃ tad yaj janārtivahetuḥ/°hetoḥ*. He also suggested that we may interpret the second line as follows: “You should not give what is not to be given, which is the cause of the suffering of beings, saying that you should give any alms at will.” To this interpretation, he added the note: “[t]his part might then be interpreted as a kind of restriction on the deed of *dāna*. In any case, the first line is expressing his wish to keep away from any good (but worldly) characters

or dispositions throughout his *samsāra*, which would rather prevent us from acquiring the buddhahood smoothly. In the second line, he only wants what is available for the deed of *dāna*, without any attachment to worldly things.” I can only hope that this excellent suggestion – for which I am very grateful – might find confirmation soon in another witness.

Tentative and partial translation: “Let there be no conduct, which is not the cause of buddhahood, nor any goods that cannot be enjoyed by others. Bestow alms willingly! Give away [even that which] is not to be given away! [...?]”

jātasya jāyamānasya garbhasthasyāpi dehinah |
mā me tatra kule jan+ + + + + + + + [8]
 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + [v. l. 1] *pañca + // [9?]*

Notes: At least one verse is lost here, possibly more.

Commentary: From this point onward the divergence from the Tibetan starts. The six verse-quarters placed here in the translation correspond to the *Mandākrāntā* verse x+2 below. I will not attempt a translation. Based on the Tibetan, which is in my view garbled at this point, the sense of the verse may have been that the author does not wish to be born in a family, where the Buddha is not venerated: / *gañ du sañs rgyas lhar byed pa'i // rigs der bdag ni skye ba dañ /*, pace Tatz, who interprets this as “I will be born in those families / That produce divine Buddhas.”

The almost entirely missing verse here is most likely reflected by the tenth Tibetan verse, which lists five things (cf. last word surviving, probably a remnant of *pañcakam*) desirable to possess: merit (*bsod nams*, *punya*), knowledge (*ye śes*, *jñāna*), strength (*stobs*, *bala*), vigour (*brtson 'grus*, *vīrya*), and the resolve of awakening (*bodhicitta*, *byañ chub sems*). It is quite impossible to reconstruct *pāda c* as **punyajñānabalavīrya-*, since that would be unmetrical. It follows that a synonym for *bala* was used, probably one that had the metrical pattern short-long (e.g. ?) or long-short (e.g. *śakti*, *sattva*, etc.). In the latter case we have a good *ra-vipulā*, as there is a caesura after the fourth syllable. However, I am baffled by *pāda d*, as I cannot guess what the fifth syllable may have contained.

yenopāyena sārvajāṇaṃ prāptaṃ nātha padaṃ tvayā /
tenāha + + + + + + + + + + + [x]

Notes: For the entire surviving verse the upper part is missing. • *sārvajāṇaṃ*] conj., *sārvajāṇa* Ms • *prāptaṃ*] st. *prāpta* Ms • *padaṃ*] conj., *pada* Ms

Commentary: This fragmentary verse corresponds to the last verse in the Tibetan translation: / *ji ltar thams cad mkhyen pa yi // źabs thob pa yi thabs de bźin // de ltar bdag gis thabs kysis ni // thub pa'i dbaṅ po'i źabs thob śog*. Tatz interprets this as follows: “Just as the all-knowing one, / Had his means to attain the stage, / So may I, by my own means, / Obtain the stage of the sage’s faculties.” The translation *źabs* is perhaps a little unseemly, one would have expected *go 'phañ*, and Tatz did not fall into the trap. However, he did with *thub pa'i dbaṅ po'i*, which is not **munendriya*, but **munīndra*. I will here translate only what can be gleaned from the Sanskrit. The translation “by my own means” is also questionable; the author here expresses the wish to use the *same* means as the Buddha did.

Translation: “O protector! [May] I [...] by that [...] by which means you have obtained the stage of omniscience!”

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
 + + + + + [v. 1. 2] *bhūyo bhūyo bhūyo 'pi bhūyasi // [x+1]*

Commentary: Nothing in the Tibetan corresponds to this verse. I will not attempt a translation.

budde bhaktiḥ prakṛtir aśaṭhā sarvasattveṣu mairī
tyāge 'bhyāsaḥ <phalavimukhatā saṃgamo bodhisattvaiḥ /
prajñā tīkṣṇā sumahati kule janma kāntaṃ va>[v. 1. 3]pur me
jātau jātau sugatakavitā cāstv alaṃ vistareṇa // [x+2]

Notes: °*sattveṣu*] st., °*satveṣu* Ms • after *me* the scribe points out the end of the *pāda* with comma-like *daṇḍa* • *'bhyāsaḥ*] st., *bhyāsaḥ* Ms (only the lower part of these two *akṣaras* is visible) • For the text placed between chevrons, see the Commentary below. • *cāstv alaṃ vi°*] in a bolder ductus, possibly the result of tracing out the letters after they had faded slightly

Commentary: The metre is *Mandākrāntā*. The Tibetan corresponding to this verse seems to be a very unsatisfactory rendering: / *sems can*

*rnams la byams goms śiṅ // rgyu med rañ bzin saṅs rgyas daṅ // byaṅ
sems 'gro ba'i 'bras mi lta // rigs chen blo nor skye ba daṅ // skye ba skye
bar lus mdzes śiṅ // bde gśegs maṅ po'i sñān ṅag byed /*. Tatz's translation
is as follows: "Developing love for sentient beings; / Not seeking the
effects of the causeless essential nature, / Of Buddha, bodhisattva-hood
and the world, / Born in a high family with intelligence and wealth, / With
a handsome form in birth after birth, / Composing poems for many Suga-
tas, [...]" The second Tibetan verse-quarter was very likely corrupted in
transmission; I suspect that the original was something like */ *sgyu* [not
rgyu] *med rañ bzin saṅs rgyas dad* [not *daṅ*] /.

This verse, along with the two following, fortunately survive in another
source, which allows us to reconstruct the missing parts plausibly. This
is the unedited *Ādikarmāvatāra* of Mañjukīrti, which I have read from
images (Niedersächsische Universitäts- und Staatsbibliothek, Göttingen
Xc 14/50) of the only known witness, a composite manuscript. Although
Rāhul Sāṅkrtyāyana found the manuscript in Tibet, it was never trans-
lated. Mañjukīrti incorporates the verses (folio 10r–10v) without men-
tioning the source and with the instruction *iti praṇidhiṃ vidhāya* at the
end. This may suggest that some of Candragomin's verses may have had
a liturgical function by Mañjukīrti's time.

Translation: "May I possess in each and every rebirth devotion to the
Buddha, an honest [lit. not false] nature, love for all sentient beings, the
habit to relinquish, disinterest in the fruit [of pious acts], [may I] meet
bodhisattvas, [may I possess] a sharp intellect, [may I be] born in a noble
family, [and possess] a beautiful body, as well as poetic skill [to praise]
the Sugatas. But enough of prolixity!"

*dīrghāyuh kulajaḥ pumān paṭumatir vidvān ahīnendriyas
tvadbhaktipravaṇaḥ sukh<ī sakaruṇaḥ prāsādika>*[v. 1. 4]ḥ *satkaviḥ /
mātrjñāḥ piṭṛbhaktir eva satataṃ jātismaraḥ śīlavān
dharmātmā dhanavān pradānanirataḥ kalyāṇamitrānvitah* // [x+3]

Notes: *vidvān ahīne*°] corr., *vidvān na hīne*° or *vidvānn ahīne*° Ms •
tvadbhakti°] Ms post corr., *tvatta*... Ms ante corr. • *mātrjñāḥ*] Ms post
corr., *mātr* + + +e Ms ante corr.

Commentary: The metre is *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*. In the 'Göttingen ms.' we
have an unmetrical reading, *prasādikaḥ* for *prāsādikaḥ*. Perhaps

pitybhakta would have been more apposite, but this is what is transmitted by both our witnesses. It may be argued that the two are from the same family, however, cf. variant reading in next verse, end of *pāda b*.

The question whether this and the next verse were original parts of the work cannot be resolved at present. Such stanzas may have circulated independently and worked into texts freely. A strong argument against their authenticity and thus the hypothesis that the Tibetan translation mirrors an earlier stage of the text is the fact that these latter verses more or less repeat what has already been stated in the *Anuṣṭubh/Śālinī* section. However, it is noteworthy that the *Mandākrāntā* verse x+2 also has some repetitions and the Tibetan translators already saw it. At any rate, what seems to be quite clear is that were several recensions of this short text.

Translation: “May I have a long life, may I be born in a [distinguished] family, may I be male, may I have a sharp mind, be learned, with all faculties intact. May I be devoted to your worship, may I be happy, compassionate, amiable, and a good poet. May I honour my mother, may there be devotion to my father, may I always remember my previous births, may I possess a good moral conduct, may I be pious, rich, happy to give, and may I have a spiritual advisor.”

*utsāhī balavā<n priyo bahumataḥ sa>[v. 1. 5]rvāmayair varjitaḥ
sattvānām anukampakaḥ śrutidharaḥ śuddhāśayaḥ kṣāntimān |
yāval lokahitodayāya bhagavann āpnomi bauddhaṃ padaṃ
tāvat syām aham ebhir eva <satataṃ sarvair gu>[v. 1. 6]ṇair bhūṣitaḥ || o ||
[x+4]*

Notes: *sattvānām*] st., *satvānām* Ms • °*dharaḥ*] Ms post corr., °*dhāraḥ* Ms ante corr. • °*āśayaḥ*] st., °*āsayaḥ* Ms • *bauddhaṃ*] corr. & st., *bod-dham* Ms • *guṇair*] conj., *guṇai* Ms • The double *daṇḍas* are smeared with a reddish substance.

Commentary: The metre is *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*. Mañjukīrti has the variant reading *śaucavān* for *kṣāntimān*.

Translation: “May I be energetic, strong, kind, honoured by many, without any affliction, compassionate towards sentient beings, with a powerful memory, a pure heart, patient. Until, o Lord, I reach the state of buddhahood for the benefit of the world, may I constantly be adorned with all these virtues!”

candragomipraṇidhānaṃ samāptam // o //

Notes: *samāptam*] st., *samāptam* Ms • The double *daṇḍas* are smeared with a reddish substance.

Primary Sources and Abbreviations

- KCDS = 中国藏学研究中心收藏的梵文贝叶经（缩微胶卷）目录 [Zhongguo zang xue yanjiu zhongxin shoucang de fanwen bei ye jing (suowei jiaojuan) mulu] *Kruṅ go'i bod kyi śes rig źib 'jug lte gnas su ṅar ba'i ta la'i lo ma'i bstan bcos* (spyin śog 'dril ma'i par) *kyi dkar chag mdor gsal*, n.a.
- Kriyāsamuccaya* (or *Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya*) by Jagaddarpaṇa (ca. 12–13th c., Nepal). Ms used here: Kaiser Library 110 = NGMPP C 11/6 & 12/1.
- NGMPP = Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project.
- Ōta. = Daisetz T. Suzuki, ed. 1962. *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition – kept at the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto – Reprinted under the Supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto. Catalogue & Index*. Tokyo.
- Tārāṣṭottaraśatanāmastotra*. In Janardan Shastri Pandeya, comp., *Bauddha-stotra-saṅgraha. A Collection of One Hundred Eight Old Buddhist Hymns – First Series*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994: 81–85.
- Tōh. = Hakuju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, and Tōkan Tada, eds. 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.

Secondary Sources

- Hahn, Michael. 1993. “A Difficult Beginning. Comments on an English translation of Candragomin’s *Deśanāstava*.” In Ram Karan Sharma, ed., *Researches in Indian and Buddhist Philosophy, Essays in Honour of Professor Alex Wayman*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers: 31–60.
- Stender, Daniel. 2014. “Preliminary Survey of Sanskrit Manuscripts of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*.” In Giovanni Ciotti, Alastair Gornall and Paolo Visigali, eds., *Puṣpikā: Tracing Ancient India Through Texts and Traditions*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxbow Publications: 147–169.
- Tatz, Mark. 1978. “Candragomin and the Bodhisattva Vow.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- Tatz, Mark. 1985. *Difficult Beginnings: Three Works on the Bodhisattva Path*. Boston & London: Shambhala.

ABSTRACT

This short paper presents for the first time the original Sanskrit of an important Mahāyāna text, the *Candragomipraᅇidhāna*. The fragment used here survives in a bundle of scattered leaves in the Kaiser Library, Kathmandu. Unfortunately, the margins are damaged, hence only a portion of the work can be recovered. Nevertheless, even the extant portion can serve to rectify some misunderstandings of the Tibetan translators. In addition, it would seem that this version is a recension different from the one that served as the basis for the Tibetan translation.