

Candradāsa's *Tārāstuti**

Jürgen HANNEDER (Marburg)

vyutpannam iti gauḍīyair nātirūḍham apīsyate |
(*Kāvyaḍarśa* 1.46ab)¹

Some years ago Prof. Michael Hahn encouraged me to edit and translate the *Tārāstuti* and kindly placed at my disposal his transcript of SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA's text² with a few hints as how to reconstruct the text. This was a tough test of a novice doctoral student; but it resulted in a preliminary edition and translation of the text, which I subsequently was able to discuss with Prof. Kameshwar Nath Mishra (Sarnath), when he was appointed visiting professor in Marburg. As a result further emendations and improvements were made, but I did not, at that time, consider the edition nor the understanding of the text adequate. Some time later Prof. Uwe Hartmann very kindly provided me with a copy of the relevant pages of SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA's catalogue.

I was therefore surprised to find that the text of the *Tārāstuti* has been included by Janardan Shastri PANDEY in his *Bauddhastotrasaṃgraha*.³ From the Hindi introduction (see p. 10), and from the fact that the editor is an expert in codicology and well-known for his collaboration in the *Rare Buddhist Text Project* at the *Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies* one might gain the impression and hope that the editor uncovered new manuscripts of the *Tārāstuti* published therein, even though no sources are actually recorded. To my surprise I discovered that his text of the *Tārāstuti* closely resembles a preliminary version of my edition of it; it reproduces some of my emendations as well as my blunders. One might give the editor the benefit of the doubt and argue that even the mistakes could have been arrived at independently, and, furthermore, that the variations indicate his own effort, but there are arguments that speak against this possibility. Firstly, if PANDEY had had access to SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA's transcript, the odd *-candrake* in verse 1a would be a rather improbable coincidence. This mistake was in my preliminary edition and has its source in a misprint in HAHN's rapidly produced transcript that was never intended for

* I am very grateful to Prof. Michael Hahn for drawing my attention to this text and for providing me with a draft edition of the *Śrīmahātārāstotra*, furthermore to Prof. Aśok Aklujkar, Prof. Dominic Goodall, Prof. Harunaga Isaacson, Dr. Roland Steiner and Dr. Dragomir Dimitrov for their comments on the present article.

¹ "Den Gauḍas [aber] gefällt auch [ein Kunstgedicht] mit nicht besonders geläufigen [Wort]bedeutungen, weil sie meinen: „[Dies] ist gelehrt.“" (Translation: DIMITROV 2002, p. 220).

² See SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA 1937.

³ PANDEY 1994, pp. 86–87.

publication. Neither of us had, at the time, access to the original source, and only later was I able to ascertain that SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA has *-candrike!*⁴

Secondly, PANDEY, in other parts of his book, marks his conjectures by brackets; in the *Tārāstuti* there is only one such instance.⁵ He thereby tacitly acknowledges that he printed the text as he found it and that his own contribution is the one correction in vs. 3d. PANDEY's edition, apart from adding further misprints,⁶ differs from my preliminary version in that it restores the readings of SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA that were documented in my apparatus in place of my emendations.⁷ This is done even when the restored text is metrically wrong. Furthermore he has sometimes rearranged the text without paying attention to the metre: in 7ab, for instance, he transposed *graha-* – against my transcript – to the second line, which must have seemed too short to him; in fact, there is a lacuna in the second line.⁸ It is therefore also unnecessary to speculate on how one could possibly understand the text as printed by him. I need not go into forensic details here; PANDEY's text is embarrassing, since the ultimate source for this unfortunate edition is one of my earlier printouts that has served as an “*ādarśapustaka*”. Had his “edition” solved the problems of this text, there would have been no reason for me to publish my own attempt, nor to tax the reader's patience by exposing its history.

The Text and its Author

In 1937 Rāhula SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA published a transcript of a hymn to Tārā that is attributed in the commentary to one Candradāsa.⁹ Unfortunately only the beginning of the commentary is given in the catalogue (see below). The *Tārāstuti* is a brief devotional text that consists of one opening verse which expresses adoration of the goddess Tārā and announces the work, and nine verses that describe the “dangers” (*bhaya*) from which the devotee is saved when he calls the deity's name; these are lions, wild elephants, fire, snakes, thieves, imprisonment, water, Vetālas and poverty.¹⁰ The introduction to the commentary recounts an anecdote according to which Candradāsa composed this poem in great danger, when

⁴ Another such double-blind test is *-karavāla-* (6b), which is HAHN's misprint for *-karāla-*. The unmetrical *-dhūli-* (4c) is my own earlier misprint.

⁵ This is indeed not one of my emendations.

⁶ *-pālītā* for *-pāṭalitā* (2b); *-ullalat-* for *-ullala-* (8a); *-visrīkṛta-* for *-viśrīkṛta-* (9b).

⁷ One exception is 8bc, where it is obvious that *-pallavān* and *-sāgarān* are wrong.

⁸ See also *sukhada-* in 1a, which is already marked as wrong by SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA; also the wrong division of Pādas in 2cd and 9ab, superfluous *-āvaliḥ* in 7c, and *yat-* in 9c.

⁹ SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA 1937, pp. 51–52.

¹⁰ Other configurations of these “dangers” may, for instance, include Rākṣasas, lepers, curses of Dākinīs or Ṛṣis; see WILLSON 1986, pp. 217 (vs. 20) and 234 (vs. 6).

his ship was being battered by a storm. Through the excellence of his Stotra the sea retreated from the spot that he came to land on, which was then called *candradvīpa*. This legend, as well as the name Candradāsa, connect the text to the Buddhist poet and grammarian Candragomin,¹¹ of whom a few Stotras to Tārā are preserved in the Tibetan canon.¹² Of these, the ten-verse *'Phags ma sgrol ma 'jigs pa chen po brgyad las sgrol ba'i bstod pa*¹³ resembles our text to a certain extent in content and construction,¹⁴ and also the twelve-verse *'Phags ma sgrol ma la bstod pa tshigs su bcad pa bcu gñis pa*¹⁵ shares some of its ideas.¹⁶ The possibility that the twelve-verse Stotra could go back to our Sanskrit text is, because of the incongruence in metre, remote.¹⁷ With the ten-verse Stotra the matter is more complicated. Its metre is longer, and it tallies in the sequence of *bhaya*s with the Sanskrit *Tārāstuti*.¹⁸ A closer look reveals that, even if we take into account all the supposed processes of distortion involved in translating a piece of Kāvya from Sanskrit to Tibetan, and even if we assume that the translators took an unusual liberty in condensing and rephrasing the material, the evidence for assuming that the Tibetan Stotra was intended as a translation of the Sanskrit *Tārāstuti* is weak.¹⁹ Not much value need be

¹¹ On the date and works of this author see HAHN 1974, pp. 1–6. Candradāsa occurs as the name of the author in the Tibetan *Lokānanda* (see HAHN 1974, p. 1). An exhaustive discussion of the date and some problems of authorship can be found in STEINER 1997, pp. 32–41.

¹² See HAHN 1974, p. 10f., for a list.

¹³ Peking Tanjur (Japanese facsimile reprint) no. 4873, no parallel in the Derge Tanjur. An English translation is to be found in WILLSON 1986, pp. 236–237. As STEINER has pointed out to me, the Sanskrit title that is transmitted in transliteration with the text, namely **Āryatārāmahāṣṭabhayottārastava*, is presumably no more than a clumsy re-translation of the Tibetan title.

¹⁴ Both texts have ten verses: the first is an opening adoration of Tārā, vss. 2–8 describe the same “dangers”, but vss. 9 and 10 differ. Examples for the correspondences and differences are given below. An assessment of the similarity in contents is not easy, since the Sanskrit text is not always beyond doubt. We could imagine that a Tibetan translator faced with the complex and difficult style of the *Tārāstuti* may have chosen to present only the main ideas and to translate more the required sense in accordance with the conventions than the exact words.

¹⁵ **Āryatārāstotradvādaśagāthā*, Peking no. 4490 with duplicates 4493, 4870. 4490 corresponds to Derge Tanjur, *rgyud*, vol. *mu* (76), fol. 281a5–281b5 (= The Tibetan Tripitaka, Taipei Edition. Taipei 1991. Vol. 32, p. 81, fol. 561.5–562.5). The three versions in the Peking Tanjur have differing titles both in Tibetan and Sanskrit, which do not matter here. For a translation of the text see WILLSON 1986, pp. 232–233.

¹⁶ The **Āryatārāstotradvādaśagāthā* contains two descriptions that remind us of the Sanskrit *Tārāstuti*, namely that robbers cut travellers with swords (6) and that the servants of the kings drag a person by the hair (7). But these may be conventional descriptions, whose double occurrence do not, in the absence of other evidence, count for much.

¹⁷ The translation has 7 syllables per quarter.

¹⁸ The Tibetan text ends with a concluding verse.

¹⁹ STEINER has advanced the hypothesis that, since no real Sanskrit title seems to exist for the Tibetan Stotra, and no translator is given in the Tanjur, the Tibetan Stotra could indeed be a production of a Tibetan

attached to the episode related in the commentary to the *Tārāstuti* and those to be found in the works of the Tibetan historians Bu-ston and Tārānātha²⁰ that centre on Candragomin suffering shipwreck, unless one wants to conclude that he was particularly unlucky, or careless, in his nautical enterprises. However, what seems plausible is that Candragomin, since he is in hagiography portrayed as a devotee of Tārā, could attract the authorship of anonymous Stotras, and this is what seems to have happened in our case.

The most important piece of evidence – especially in the absence of more objective arguments – is the style of the *Tārāstuti*: it is indeed difficult to imagine the author of the elegant *Śiṣyalekha* composing a Stotra in such a heavily burdened *gauḍīyarīti*.²¹ For that reason I regard the *Tārāstuti* as a later text by an unknown author, the authorship of which has been ascribed to a famous author perceived to be a devotee of Tārā.²² In my opinion only precise data on the history of the cult of Tārā could furnish criteria for determining the authorship: If it could, for instance, be proved that the Tārāmantra, which occurs in the *'Phags ma lha mo sgrol ma la bstod pa mu tig 'phreñ ba*,²³ or details in the iconography, are unlikely to appear as early as the 5th century, then Candragomin's authorship could be excluded.

There are considerable problems with this small text, partly because the only known manuscript, as is indicated by the frequent violation of metre, is faulty, but also because of its complicated diction. This has necessitated an inordinate number of emendations. The first guiding line for restoring a plausible text was of course the metre, which is in our case, as already indicated by SĀNKRṬYĀYANA, the so-called *dvipadī*. The metre is described by Jayakīrti thus:

translator who had before him several Sanskrit sources, among which the *Tārāstuti* edited here was one. This working hypothesis may be difficult to prove in detail, but is in my opinion the most plausible explanation of the relationship of the texts discussed here.

²⁰ See HAHN 1974, p. 6, and WILLSON 1986, pp. 222–223.

²¹ One should emphasize that this is no solid evidence. If we did not know better, we would not ascribe the *Deviśataka* to the author of the *Dhvanyāloka* (see INGALLS 1989, p. 565f.).

²² This, by the way, does not mean that the other *Tārāstotras* that are preserved in the Tanjur and are ascribed to Candragomin are necessarily genuine. HAHN has gained the impression that of the *Tārāstotras* only the *Śrīmahātārāstotra* (Peking 4489) appears to match the literary capacities of Candragomin (see HAHN 1974, p. 12). Whether he actually was a devotee of Tārā, remains to be seen; the ascription of any number of *Tārāstotras* to him is no sufficient proof (*pace* HAHN 1974, p. 2, note 2), and may be no more than a reflex of hagiographical accounts or the stories that are recounted by commentators in order to show the effect of recitation (compare Jinarakṣita's introduction to the *Sragdharāstotra*, ed. in: DE BLONAY 1895, p. 30f.). Neither is HAHN's emendation of *hla mo rgyal ma* to *hla mo sgrol ma* in *Lokānanda*, vs. 5, compelling, because a rejection of the *lectio difficilior* only in order to be in line with Bu-ston and Tārānātha is, I think, difficult to sustain.

²³ Sanskrit version of the title: *Āryatārādevīstotramuktikāmālā*. Peking 4869, translated in WILLSON 1986, pp. 226–231.

“One *gaṇa* consisting of six morae is followed by five *gaṇas* with four morae and one long syllable. [Of these] the second and the sixth is a *jagaṇa* (*jo*) or consists of four short syllables (*nlagano*: *nagaṇa* plus one *laghu*). A *jagaṇa* may not stand elsewhere. Should there be four short syllables in the second (*kara*) or sixth (*rasa*) position, a caesura has to follow after the first short syllable. [...]”²⁴

This is in accord with Hemacandra's *Chando 'nuśāsana* 4.64, who, however, lists *dvipadī* as a Prakrit metre and does not mention the rule of the excluded *jagaṇa*.²⁵ In our text this rule is violated in 7c, but the quantity and quality of the text does not allow any definite answer of the question whether our author did actually observe it. For that reason I have not attempted to introduce more complicated emendations only in order to meet that rule, when the minimal emendation, as in 2d and 9b resulted in this error. In 9c the second *gaṇa* is metrically wrong and seems beyond repair.

Unfortunately the textual problems are compounded by the fact that the *Tārāstuti* is an example of the *gauḍīyarīti*, a poetic style that is not only characterized by long compounds, but also by unusual words as well as words in uncommon senses. Possibly this was thought appropriate for a devotional Stotra to Tārā, since it reflected her ability to transform even an untalented devotee into the “Lord of Speech”.²⁶

For that reason I can only repeat the remarks given above: most of the present edition is so insecure that the only justification for publishing it is the one given in the introduction.

The Commentary

For reference I shall give the beginning of the commentary as printed in SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA's catalogue:

*ādīmadhyāvasānaśrīr aprameyagaṇākaraḥ*²⁷ |
yo hi tasmai namo buddhadharmasaṅghāgravartine || 1 ||

²⁴ *ṣaṭkalatāś catuṣkalagaṇāḥ pañcaiva gurūttarās tathā | jo nlagano 'thavā dvitīye ṣaṣṭhe ca na cetaratra jaḥ || nle sati tatra kararasasthāne prathamalaghau tu yatir asau | syād Dvipadīti ṣaṭkalagaṇe lna samo 'tra pareṇa yujyate ||*, Jayakīrti, *Chando 'nuśāsana* 6.28, in: VELANKAR 1949, pp. 64–65. The last line of the definition gives the name of the metre and a further specification, which remains uninterpretable.

²⁵ *ṣaś cugau dvitīyaṣaṣṭhau jo līr vā dvipadī || 64 ||*, Hemacandra, *Chando 'nuśāsana* 4.64, in: VELANKAR 1949, p. 108; cf. p. 159.

²⁶ See Sarvajñamitra's *Sragdharāstotra* 20bcd (ed. VIDYABHUSANA 1908): ... *vidvadgoṣṭhīṣu yaś ca śrutadhanavirahān mūkatām abhyupaiti || sarvālaṃkārahūṣāvibhavasamudītam prāpya vāgīśvaratvam | so 'pi tvadbhaktīśaktyā harati nṛpasabhe vādisiṃhāsānāni ||*.

²⁷ -*gaṇākaraḥ* HAHN's emendation: *gaṇākaraṃ* MS.

bhagavatyāryatārāyā yābhiṣṭutir udāhṛtā |
ācāryacandradāsa²⁸ taṭṭikākhyāyate mayā || 2 ||

ayam ācāryacandradāsaḥ samudre potārūḍhaḥ samīraṇādibhiḥ poteṣu viśīryamāṇeṣu mahatyā bhaktyāryatārāyāḥ stotrārthābhidhānārtham ādau saṃbandhābhidheyaprayojanādy avadyotayan sakalajagattrayātiśāyināṃ guṇānām abhidhānapratijñām uccacāra | tadvacanātiśayena taddeśājalam apasasāra | candramaṇḍalād vāyunā nīlābhraṇḍam iva jalāpasaraṇāc candrapūrvākhyo dvīpaḥ saṃvṛtaḥ |

[Translation:] “Obeisance to him, who is splendour in the beginning, middle and end, who is a mine of immeasurable virtues, and who is the foremost of the [three jewels] Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha.

[Herewith] I shall comment on the praise of the venerable noble Tārā, which has been uttered²⁹ by the master Candradāsa.

This master Candradāsa, when he was on board of a ship at sea while the ships were shattered through winds etc., uttered with great devotion, in order to name the subject of the Stotra (*stotrārtha*), [devoted] to the noble Tārā, in the beginning [i. e. as the first verse] the promise to express [Tārā’s] virtues that surpass all the three worlds; [this he did by] indicating the connection [the reason for composing the work?], the subject, the purpose etc. Through the excellence of his words³⁰ the water retreated from that place. Since the water retreated [from there] like a group of dark clouds through the wind from the orb of the moon, the island that emerged is called ‘moon-island’.”

²⁸ *ācārya*- SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA’s emendation: *ācarya*- MS.

²⁹ Even if these modest verses do not suggest a deeper meaning, it should be noted that the word *udāharaṇa* is also the name of a panegyric that starts with words like *jayati*, is written in complex metres like Mālinī and contains *anuprāsas*! See APTE 1924, s. v. *udāharaṇa*-.

³⁰ *-vacanātiśaya* adds an interesting point: The tension between liturgical Stotras like *nāmastotras*, which do not appeal through their form, and literary Stotras, where religious function is overshadowed by emphasis on literary qualities, is here resolved by explaining the religious efficacy of the Stotra through its literary qualities.



Tārā

तारास्तुतिः

सुरेशचक्रचारुचूडामणिरुचिरमरीचिसंचय-
 प्रचुरशिखाप्रचारपरिचुम्बितचर्चितचरणचन्द्रके ।
 जगति चराचरे ऽपि साचीकृतचकितकृपालुलोचने
 स्तुतिवचनोपचारमुचिताचरितं रचयामि देवि ते ॥ १ ॥

नखरकठोरकोटिकुट्टितकरिकटतटपाटनोत्कटाः
 प्रविकटरुधिरपटलपटपाटलिता अटवीविलुण्ठकाः ।
 विकटसटाट्टहासघटितावटतटभटनोद्भटास् - -
 त्वञ्जुषि झटिति यान्ति सटिनो ऽपि कुण्ठितकुण्ठितशक्तिताम् ॥ २ ॥

मलिनमहाकपोलतलविगलितमदजलमलनविह्वलाः
 स्वलदलिजालबहलकोलाहलललितविलासलासिनः ।
 विचलितकर्णतालपवनाहतललितविलेपधूलयः
 पथि न गजाश्चलन्ति कुलशैलतुलास्तव नामलालिताः ॥ ३ ॥

मारुतघातजातरभसोज्ज्वलदनलशिखाकदम्बक-
 प्रतिहतपुरपुरंध्रिहाहारवभरितदिगन्तभैरवः ।
 उद्धतधूम्रधूमधूलीधुतबद्धघनान्धकारकं
 त्वन्नतिनीतिरुद्धगतिरेति शमं बहुशो हुताशनः ॥ ४ ॥

चलितलतावितानकुटिलोद्गमदुर्गमगहनवर्तिनः
 सपदि पुरो नरस्य तारेति मनागपि नामधारिणः ।
 स्फीतफणौघघोरफूत्कारपरिस्फुरितानलस्फुट-
 स्फुरदुरुविस्फुलिङ्गविस्फारिणि फणिनि विषं विनश्यति ॥ ५ ॥

Mss: RS = Palm-leaf ms. acc. to SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA's transcript (see introd.). 1a सुरेश conj.] सुखद् RS
 1d आचरितं conj.] आचरति RS 2a कोटि conj.] कोटिकट्टु RS 2a तटपाटन conj. K. N. Mishra] तटाटन RS
 2a ओत्कटाः conj.] ओत्कटा RS 2c ओद्भटास् conj.] ओद्भटास् RS 2d ऽपि कुण्ठितकुण्ठितशक्तिताम् conj.]
 कुण्ठादपि कुण्ठितकुण्ठशक्तिताम् RS 3d नाम conj. PANDEYA] लाम RS 4a उज्ज्वलद् conj.] उख्वलद् RS
 4d रुद्ध conj.] om. RS 5c परिस्फुरिता conj.] परिस्फुरता RS

Praise of Tārā

1. O Goddess! The moonlight from your anointed feet is kissed by the expansion (*pracāra-*) of the many edges of the mass of brilliant rays from the elegant crest-jewels of the group of highest gods. Your tremulous, compassionate eyes glance even on the moving and unmoving world. For you I compose this worship that consists of words of praise, which is the proper conduct [towards you].

2. Even lions, which have the power (*-utkaṭāḥ*) of cleaving an elephant's temples that have been cut (*-kuṭṭita-*) by the sharp edges of their nails, [lions,] which are reddened through a frightful garment (*-paṭa-*) of masses of blood, and who plunder (*-viluṅṭhakāḥ*) the wilderness, who are [...] emboldened (*-udbhaṭāḥ*) by roaring (? *-bhaṭana-*) at the caved [mountain] sides (*-avaṭa-taṭa-*) that were brought about by their boisterous laughter [with?] their frightful mane, become at once utterly bereft of power, when one [...] is devoted to you.

3. Elephants, agitated (*-vihvalāḥ*) through the bearing (*malana*) of the ichor that is oozing down from the surface of their stained, broad temples, are naturally (*-lalita-*) and gracefully (*-vilāsa-*) moving [their heads] around (*-lāsinaḥ*) [to avoid]³¹ the strong noise of a swarm of wavering bees, [and] who have struck the dust that is [for them] a beautiful ointment by the wind from their flapping ears. [Those elephants,] like [one of the seven] principal mountains do not get in the way once they are pleased by your name.

4. Fire that terrifies because it fills [even] the end of the horizon (*-diganta-*) with the cries³² from the women in towns blocked up with plentiful flames (*-analaśikhākadambaka-*) that are flaring up through the vehemence produced through the onslaught of the wind, [this fire] is in many ways (*bahuśaḥ*) extinguished [so that] a dense darkness that is formed of excessive (*uddhata-*) grey smoke and dust, when its course (*-gatiḥ*) is impeded by practising prostration to you.

5. When a snake suddenly [appears] before a man inside a thicket, in which he can hardly move because of the curved shoots (*-udgama-*) of the canopy of shaking creepers, [a snake] that shines with many bright (*-sphuṭa-*), scintillating (*-sphurad-*) broad sparks from the fire that springs forward from the terrifying hissing in the mass of its large expanded hood, its poison is annihilated if he recites, even just a little, the name "Tārā".

³¹ Lit.: "through".

³² Lit.: "the sound *hā hā*".

क्षणकृतकोपकम्पकरकर्षितखरकरवालनिर्मल-
 व्यतिकरकरकरालविकरालमहाबल^० - - ^०भुजार्गलः ।
 प्रस्थितपथिकविकटकटविघटनपटुरतिनिष्ठुराशयो
 भगवति भक्तिवन्तमुपसर्पति तव न वने ऽपि तस्करः ॥ ६ ॥

यो ऽपि नरेन्द्रवीरकिंकारकचग्रहनिग्रहो ग्रह-
 ग्रस्त इव - - रज्जुहिञ्जीरविजर्जरिताङ्गपञ्जरः ।
 प्रतिपदखनखनायमानमुखरीकृतखरखरशृङ्खलः
 त्वच्चरणारविन्दमभिवन्द्य स नन्दति मुक्तबन्धनः ॥ ७ ॥

कलकलकलिललोलकल्लोलजलोल्ललकालिकानिला-
 स्फालितविपुलबहलवेलकुलकूलतमालपल्लवात् ।
 सरभसमकरनिकरखरनखरसुदुस्तरतो ऽपि सागरात्
 तारिणि तरलतारतरतारकमातुरमेत्य रक्षसि ॥ ८ ॥

सूक्ष्मविरावसारसरघोत्करनिर्भरघोरघर्घर-
 घ्राणघृणाङ्घ्रिपाणिविनाकृतक्वथितशरीरपञ्जराः ।
 क्षणमहाप्रसादावेशत्वत्प्रणताः कामरूपिणः
 तत्क्षणलब्धकिरणमणिकुण्डलमण्डितगण्डमण्डलाः ॥ ९ ॥

यूकविकीर्णशीर्णपटकर्पटकटितटवेष्ठनोद्भटः
 संकटपेट्टपूरमात्रार्जनपरपुरपिण्डतर्कणः ।
 यदि तव नामकं हृदि करोति हि राजसेककः
 प्रौढवधूविधूतचामीकरखचितविचित्रचामरः ॥ १० ॥

6c विकट conj.] निकट RS 7a किंकार conj.] हुंकार RS 7b हिञ्जीरविजर्जरिता conj.] हिञ्जीरवजर्जरिता RS
 7c शृङ्खलः conj.] शृङ्खलावलिस् RS 7d चरणार] चरणा (र) RS 8b पल्लवात् conj.] पल्लवान् RS 8c सागरात्
 conj.] सागरान् RS 9b घ्राणघृणाङ्घ्रि^० conj.] घ्राणा घृणांघ्रि^० RS 9b पाणिविनाकृत conj.] पाण्यस्त्रविश्रीकृत RS
 9b पञ्जराः conj.] पञ्जरा RS 9c क्षण conj.] यत्क्षण RS 9c प्रणताः conj.] प्रणता तारिणि RS 9c रूपिणः
 conj.] रूपिणा RS 9d तत्क्षणलब्ध conj.] तत्क्षणलब्धलोल RS 9d मण्डलाः conj.] मण्डला RS 10c राजसेककः
 conj. ISAACSON] राक्षसेककः RS 10d चामरः conj.] चामरम् RS

6. A thief, whose frightful (*-vikarāla-*), strong [...] arm bolts, which are terryfing (*-karāla-*) because they deliver clean strikes (*-vyatikara-*) with a sharp-edged sword (*-karavāla-*) that is drawn out by the hand through suddenly shaking in rage; [this thief,] whose intentions are very cruel and who is skilful at cutting up the dreadful corpses (*-kaṭa-*) of dead travellers, does not, even in a forest, attack someone who has devotion to you, O Deity.

7. Even he who is restrained by the strong servants of the king through being seized by the hair, as if seized by a planet[ary influence], whose bodily frame (*-aṅgapañjara-*) is torn to pieces by a rope [strong enough] for tying elephants, whose extremely rough (*-kharakhara-*) fetters are resounding by clanking at every step, [he] rejoices, freed of fetters, after adoring your lotus feet.

8. You, o Saviouress, approach one who is afflicted (*āturam*) and the pupils of whose eyes (*-tāarakam*) are trembling (*tarala-*) and intensely shining (*-tāratara-*) and save him even from the ocean, at the shore of which³³ the buds of the Tamāla plants were in disarray (*-ākula-*) because of the great, wide tide, that was churned up (*-āsphālita-*) by the wind from dark clouds, and that is shaking (*-ullala-*) because of the water of the changing waves (*-lolakallola-*) that are full of roaring noise; [the ocean] which is very difficult to cross because of the sharp claws of the many violent crocodiles.

9. The [Vetālas], whose noses make a low sound and are frightful on account of being filled with a swarm (*-utkara-*) of bees whose essence (? *-sāra-*) is a subtle sound, whose bodily frames suffer³⁴ being deprived of their disgusting (? *-ghṛṇa-*) hands and feet, when they are devoted to you through immersion (*-āveśa-*) in your supreme grace for a moment, they take bodily forms at will and at once their round cheeks are decorated with earrings whose gems are [like?] rays.

10. One, who is good at wrapping the loins with a garment (*-karpaṭa-*) made of torn cloth and scattered with lice, who ponders (*-tarkaṇa-*) on alms in a town and is engrossed in acquiring only [the quantity for] filling his shrunken stomach, if he bears your name in mind, he is consecrated as the king (*rājasekaka-*) and his manifold chowries (*-cāmarah*) inlaid (*-khacita-*) with gold are waved by bold women.

³³ Lit.: “the shore-Tamāla buds are in disarray”.

³⁴ Lit. “boil” (*-kvathita-*; or perhaps read **-krathita-*?).

Notes

What follows are brief notes on the translation with some examples from the *'Phags ma sgrol ma 'jigs pa chen po brgyad las sgrol ba'i bstod pa*³⁵ to substantiate the conclusions put forth in the introduction.

(1) *-candrike* and *-locane* are vocatives. • The emendation to *sureśa* rests on the assumption that the author is here trying to allude to Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā*,³⁶ and perhaps more specifically to *Sragdharāstotra* 1a (*-śiraścārucūḍāmaṇi-*). • *ācarita* (1d) has to be understood as equivalent to *ācāra*.

For the interpretation we may add that Tārā sits “on a moon seat, cooling with compassion migrating beings”,³⁷ an idea which fits in with the image presented in our verse. Her feet are like the moonlight in that they “cool down” the suffering, but the moonlight from her moon seat is also hyperbolically imagined to exude from her feet.

In the Tibetan Stotra the first verse runs as follows:

| *khyod źabs lha dan lha min ma lus phyag byas śin* |
 | *thugs rjes nan 'gror 'gro ba'i sems can rnam la gzigs* |
 | *mi mthun spaṅs pa'i sgrol ma khyod la ni* |
 | *zla ba sbas pa źes bya bdag gis bstod par bgyi* |

Here the feet of Tārā are venerated by all gods and *asuras*.

Tib. 1b corresponds roughly to Skt. 1c. The rest of the Tibetan text cannot be brought into accord with the Sanskrit. In 1d Tib. reads *zla ba sbas pa*, i. e. *candragupta*, as the name of the author.

(2) The missing two syllables must have completed the locative absolute.

| *glaṅ po bsad pa'i khrag gis rkaṅ lag dmar gyur ciṅ* |
 | *lam du źugs pa mthoṅ nas rnam par gnon byed pa'i* |
 | *seṅ ge lam du khyod dran pas ni bgrod dka' ba'i* |
 | *nags tshal śin tu rab tu stug por 'jug par 'gyur* |

Only one idea in Tib. is comparable, namely that the “paws of the lion are reddened through the blood of the elephant it has slain”, but this is a common poetical convention and thus the parallelism is insignificant. In Tib. the idea that the “lion enters the forest that is difficult to cross (*bgrod dka' ba*) and very dense (*śin tu rab tu stug[s] po*)” is unhelpful in the context.

³⁵ See above, note 13.

³⁶ *-sarvorvīpaticakracārucūḍāmaṇi-*, see GRAY 1962, p. 146 (first prose sentence).

³⁷ WILLSON 1986, p. 212 (= *Āryatārāstotra* ascribed to Māṛṇceṭa, vs. 2).

(3) PANDEY's conjecture „*nāma*“ in Pāda d is convincing.

| *bar med myos chus dri ma can gyi khur tshos la* |
 | *buñ ba ldiñ ba zar zir tshogs kyi sgras g.yos pa* |
 | *yud tsam mi sdod gsod pa'i *glañ chen* lam du ni* |
 | *sgrol *ma khyod la *rab (?) btud bcom par byas par 'gyur* |

In Tib. *myos chus dri ma* would correspond to *-madajalamala-*.

(4) In Pāda d there are again two syllables missing. I have provisionally inserted *ruddha* as a diagnostic conjecture in order to be able to translate the verse.

| *'jig dus rluñ stobs che bas sbar ba yi* |
 | *gnam ltar rgya che rab tu 'bar ba'i me* |
 | *groñ khyer 'ga' žig la ste³⁸ khyod kyi miñ* |
 | *brjod byed de mod ñe bar ži bar 'gyur* |

The third line as read in the transmitted text is odd. WILLSON thinks that *groñ khyer 'ga' žig* might be an abbreviation for 'citizen', or a "figure of speech for people in the city",³⁹ and translates: "Should some citizen call upon Your name ..." STEINER's conjecture solves the problem: "The fire *in a (any) town* is extinguished ..."

(7) *-kiṃkāra-* is an admittedly insecure conjecture, which rests on the assumption of an unattested variant form *kiṃkāra* for *kiṃkara*. It would certainly be a *lectio difficilior*, add an *anuprāsa* and restore the obvious sense. • Unfortunately the two missing syllables leave *rajjuhiñjīra* as a tautology.

(8) There are again similarities in construction between Skt. and Tib., i. e. robbers attacking a traveller (6), a person being thrown into prison by a king (7), and shipwreck (8) as well as in minor motives, but no indication that there was agreement in words. That most of these descriptions are conventional is suggested by another parallel in the Tibetan *Āryatārāstotradvādaśagāthā*, where in vs. 7 it is said that the person in captivity is "seized by the hair" (*skra nas bzuñ nas / kaca-graha*).

(9) The constitution of this verse with its eight conjectures can only be called tentative, but five of them were necessitated by metrical defects, whereas the other three concern simple confusions of endings. Among these the emendation *-vinākṛta-* is the least secure.

³⁸ *la ste* emendation STEINER for the transmitted *gal te*.

³⁹ WILLSON 1986, pp. 236 and 409.

(10) This verse is obviously about a beggar, i. e. the danger of poverty, and elegantly uses the *vr̥ddhakumārīnyāya*. • If we take *Āryatārāstotradvādaśagāthā* 11 as our inspiration, according to which beggars are transformed into emperors, the emendation suggested by ISAACSON, *rājasekakah*, is the most efficient way to arrive at the meaning “king”; another possibility would be *rājasevakah*.

This is the ninth danger described. It is noteworthy that Skt. ends rather abruptly, whereas many other *Tārāstotras* ascribed to Candragomin have as their last verse a dedication of the merit.⁴⁰ But without the primary source, i. e. the manuscript described by SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA, before us, we cannot even be sure whether the text or manuscript was complete.⁴¹

Bibliography

APTE, Vaman Shivram

1924 *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Containing Appendices on Sanskrit Prosody and Important Literary & Geographical Names in the Ancient History of India. (For the Use of Schools and Colleges). By Vaman Shivram Apte. Third Edition, Revised & Enlarged. Bombay 1924 [1890].

DE BLONAY, Godefroy

1895 *Matériaux pour servir a l'histoire de la déesse buddhique Tārā*. Par Godefroy de Blonay. Paris 1895.

DIMITROV, Dragomir

2002 *Mārgavibhāga – Die Unterscheidung der Stilarten*. Kritische Ausgabe des ersten Kapitels von Daṇḍins Poetik *Kāvyaḍarśa* und der tibetischen Übertragung *Sñan nag me lon* nebst einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrittextes. Von Dragomir Dimitrov. Marburg 2002. (Indica et Tibetica. Band 40).

GRAY, Louis H.

1962 *Vāsavadattā. A Sanskrit Romance by Subandhu*. Translated, with an Introduction and Notes by Louis H. Gray. Delhi 1962 [1912].

HAHN, Michael

1974 *Candragomins Lokānandanātaka*. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben und übersetzt. Ein Beitrag zur indischen Schauspieldichtung. Von Michael Hahn. Wiesbaden 1974.

INGALLS, Daniel H. H.

1989 “Ānandavardhana’s Devīśataka”, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 109. New Haven 1989, pp. 565–575.

PANDEY, Janardan Shastri

1994 *Bauddhastotrasamgraha*. Editor Janardan Shastri Pandey. Foreword by H. H. The Dalai Lama. Introduction by S. Rinpoche. Delhi 1994.

⁴⁰ In addition to the two works mentioned earlier these are: *Āryatārāstotrapraṇidhāna* 11 (4871) and *Śrīmahātārāstotra* 26 (4489).

⁴¹ Perhaps the wrong numbering of the last two verses in SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA’s transcript points to a problem in the transmission of the text.

SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA, Rāhula

1937 "Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-Leaf Mss. in Tibet", in: *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*. Vol. XXIII, Part I. Bankipore 1937, pp. 51–52.

STEINER, Roland

1997 *Untersuchungen zu Harṣadevas Nāgānanda und zum indischen Schauspiel*. Von Roland Steiner. Swisttal-Odendorf 1997. (Indica et Tibetica. Band 31).

Tibetan Tripitaka

1991 *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Taipei Edition*. Editor-in-Chief A. W. Barber. 72 vols. Taipei 1991.

VELANKAR, Hari Damodar

1949 *Jayadāman (A collection of ancient texts on Sanskrit Prosody and A Classified List of Sanskrit Metres with an Alphabetical Index)*. Edited by H. D. Velankar. Bombay 1949. (Haritoṣamālā, No. I).

VIDYABHUSANA, Satis Chandra

1908 *Bauddha-Stotra-Saṅgrahaḥ or a Collection of Buddhist Hymns*. Volume I: *Sragdharā-Stotram or a Hymn to Tārā in Sragdharā Metre by Bhikṣu Sarvajña Mitra of Kaśmīra*. With the Sanskrit Commentary of Jina Rakṣita, together with two Tibetan Versions. Edited by Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana. Calcutta 1908.

WILLSON, Martin

1986 *In Praise of Tārā. Songs to the Saviouress*. Source texts from India and Tibet on Buddhism's great Goddess. Selected, translated and introduced by Martin Willson. London 1986.