Editorial

I am delighted to be able to present our fourth Newsletter to appear within twelve months. We have three substantial contributions in this issue, on manuscripts of works of different genres. Ryugen Tanemura (Tokyo University), a new contributor, presents a note on the Mrtasugatiniyojana of Śūnyasamādhivājra, an as yet unpublished Buddhist tantric work dealing with the rites for the departed. I would like here to gratefully acknowledge the kindness of the authorities of Tokyo University Library, who gave us permission to include a photograph of two folio-sides of a Nepalese manuscript of this work in their collection.

Csaba Dezső gives us the second half of his parallel edition of the first act of the Kundaṃalā in the Nepalese and the South Indian recension. His work demonstrates the importance of Nepalese manuscripts of nāṭakas, and provides much material and food for thought for those studying the transmission of such works. The NGMPP has microfilmed many more nāṭaka manuscripts, and it is to be hoped that Dezső and other scholars competent in Sanskrit and Prakrit will study them.

Michael Hahn returns to this issue with the third installment of his ‘Frequent User Highlights’. The work that is emphasized this time, Śivasvāmin’s Kapphinābhyudaya, is one which may be unfamiliar even to lovers of Sanskrit poetry, but certainly deserves to be much better known, and this piece should show that clearly. Hahn’s new edition of this long poem (mahākavya)—with splendid facsimiles of the oldest and most important manuscript—has just been published, and I am sure that the paper in this Newsletter will leave many eager to see it.

The steady stream of indological publications making use of manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP continues: in this issue we have two brief book announcements. I may note here that our announcements do not aim to provide exhaustive information on all book publications using such material. We welcome, I may also add, information on all publications (whether books or articles) that draw on material of the NGMPP, and suggestions regarding important publications that might be announced in our Newsletter.

Diwakar Acharya, who had contributed to the first three Newsletters, is absent from this issue; but I may mention here his recent announcement of a most important discovery among the manuscripts filmed by the NGMPP: ‘The Original Pañcabājāraṇa/Praśnavyākaraṇa Discovered’, in: Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies (SOAS) Issue 2 (March 2007) pp. 22–23.

Our next issue is projected to appear in October; some contributions intended for it have already been received, but I would like to encourage all scholars working on NGMPP manuscripts to send us material—be it announcements, studies, editions, or something different—for consideration for publication here. I thank the contributors to this issue, and thank also our readers, particularly those who provide feedback on the Newsletter and on the work of the NGMCP. I hope that they will find something interesting and useful in the following pages.

Harunaga Isaacson
Mr̥tasugatiniyojana: A Manual of the Indian Buddhist Tantric Funeral

Ryugen Tanemura

The number of philological studies of the Indian Buddhist funeral is small, perhaps mainly because of the very small number of texts which prescribe or record the procedures of it. This small paper reports on the Sanskrit manuscripts of the Mr̥tasugatiniyojana (Mr̥SuNi), a manual of Buddhist Tantric funeral, which is one of the rare and precious materials for studies of the Indian Buddhist funeral.[1]

The Sanskrit text of the Mr̥SuNi has been transmitted, as far as I know, in two manuscripts: one is preserved in the Tokyo University Library (MS No. 307) and the other in the Kaiser Library, Kathmandu. The latter was microfilmed by the NGMPP (Reel No. C47/9). As reported in Matsunami's catalogue, manuscript No. 307 of the Tokyo University Library contains the texts of the Mr̥SuNi and five other Buddhist Tantric works in one bundle. The text of the Mr̥SuNi is contained in ff.1v–9r. First I was editing the Sanskrit text of the Mr̥SuNi based only upon this manuscript. It was Iain Sinclair who kindly drew my attention to the Kathmandu manuscript.

With regard to the Kathmandu manuscript, the material is palm-leaf and the size reported in the index card in the first frame of the Mr̥SuNi film is 19.6 × 4.1cm. The script is bhujimol. The number of folios is eleven. There are five lines per side with the exceptions that there are six lines on f.1v and four lines on f.11v. Although the colophon does not refer to the date of copying, judging from the script and the size of the manuscript, it seems to have been copied not earlier than the thirteenth century.

The colophons of the two manuscripts state that the author is Śūnyasamādhivajra.[4]

[1] As far as I know, two other Buddhist Tantric texts surviving in Sanskrit contain prescriptions for funerals. One is Pādmapāyiṣṭa’s Maṇḍalopāyiṣṭa, the system of which, according to the author, is (like the Mr̥SuNi) based on the Gṛhīvasamājatana. (PaŚrM-Ma-Up: praṇaṇaṇa saraṇabāvena vajrācāryam maṁgaḥ garman | maṇḍalo- pāyiṣṭam vasya śīśamājāvīnānāt [f.1v1]). He also quotes several verses from the Catuspīṭhaṭanta. The author devotes the last section, Antasthitakarmoddhāsa, to the prescriptions of the funeral (ff.15r8–15v11). The codex unicus is preserved in the Tokyo University Library, and there is no known Tibetan translation of this text. The other is the Acāraṇāyāsāmuccaya of Darpaṇācārya or Jagaddarpaṇa. Darpaṇācārya devotes the last section, Nirvārta- jārācāryaparāyaṇaçāria, to the prescriptions of the funeral (MS S f.240v7–244v4 (= 480.7–488.4)). For the text of the funeral rites of the Acārayāsāmuccayacaya see below.

[2] For a description of this manuscript see Matsunami 1965: 112.

[3] This manuscript is not reported in BBK. But Nagao (1963: 13, No. 494) and Moriguchi (1989: 102, MS No. 431) report this manuscript. I had not been aware of the descriptions of the Kathmandu manuscript in these two sources.

This is more or less supported also by the Tibetan translation of the Mr.SuNi. According to the Deb ther sion po, Šūnyasamādhīvajra (or rather Šūnyatāsamādhīvajra?) is another name of Devākaraṇḍa (probably a corruption of Divākaraṇḍa) who was one of the four great disciples of Advaya vajra (Maitrīpa) (ROERICH 1988: 392ff., 842). However the guru lineage mentioned in the second from the last verse of the Mr.SuNi is different from that of the Deb ther sion po. The last two verses say that the author received the great teachings of the funeral from Venerable Bhadra (Bhadrapāda), and that his manual is based on the Guhyasamāja system and supplemented by the teachings of the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatratra (SaDuPaTa). The same line is also mentioned in the colophon of the Tatvaśaṣānandaśīlī (TaJiśaṃ)[5]

It is unclear who this Bhadrapāda is. Theoretically, the honorific title of a master whose name ends with -bhadra can be Bhadrapāda. As stated above, according to the Deb ther sion po, Šūnyasamādhīvajra was a disciple of Advaya vajra. The well-known honorific titles of Advaya vajra are, however, Avadhūtapaḍa and Maitrīpa. It should be noted that the colophon of the TaJiśaṃ has several variant readings and in the colophon of one of the Tokyo University manuscripts of the TaJiśaṃ Šūnyasamādhīvajra has the title Avadhūta. Kuḍālapāda mentions his master Bhadrapāda in several places in his Acintyadvayakramopadesa (AcAdKraUp). He also mentions the guru lineage from Paramāśa down to him. It is, however, unclear who this Bhadrapāda is and whether or not this Bhadrapāda might be

Note that all of these MSS contain various corruptions of what appears in the colophon of the TaJiśaṃ.ѕ

Another work of Šūnyasamādhīvajra, which teaches the practices concerning Vajravārāhi cult.

MrSuNi:

kṛtam antyeṣṭividhān[12]śri guhyasaṃjānyiteṣam||
ycaratryparamjānānānānapūrṇateṣayam karma tasya paripūryam[13]|
śrimaddurgatipariśodhanantarācaktyaḥ hy aśritam karma ||
(MS T f. 9r1–3, MS N f. 11r5–11v2)

TaJiśaṃ colophon:
kṛtam iyam acaryamāni jyohasādhiśthitaścaryāraśri-bhadrapādapānajapajapratyapānyānantaraśri guhyasaṃjānyiteṣam[14]pañḍitaśriyasya samādhipādānām (Sed p. 63, ll. 22–23)

---

5bhidhānān antyeṣṭ[11] bhidhānān mantyeṣṭ T; bhidhāna-m atyeṣṭ N. This sentence is slightly odd. I suspect the possibility that a word (perhaps vidhānam) is missing after antyeṣṭh.

6Two Tibetan translations of the Mr.SuNi are preserved in the Tibetan canon. One was translated by Phyogs dba’ byed byed and Prajñākūṭī (MrSuNiT1). The Tibetan title of this translation is Tha ma’i mchod pa’i cho ga’ go, which is probably a translation of Antyeṣṭivīdhā. The other was translated by Avadhūti vairocanavajra and IDI ri cho kyi grags (MrSuNiT2). The Tibetan title is dpad naṃ soṇ thams cad yon s su shya bā’i rgyud las phyur bā sphyun ma’i nān soṇ sso bhyo bā cho go. The contents expected from this Mr.SuNi title are found only in the latter half of the Mr.SuNi. For the summary of the contents of the Mr.SuNi see below and Tanemura 2004a. Tanemura 2004a reports only the first translation. The colophons of the two Tibetan translations do not clearly state that the title is Mrtasugatiniyojana (see footnote[6] below). The aksaras by hands on the last folio of the Kathmandu manuscript read q’hai/prajāśa’/pranavīdhi and dvan-gyatasa’/durgatimocanā/pā ḥāryā. The colophon of MrSuNiT1: tha ma’i cho ga’i min gri nam gravis gśin po bde bar gsags pa’i gnas la’ ggod pa’ s bā yā ba’ pa nṛti tā dpal tīn ńe ‘dzin rdo rje[15] (Šūnyatāsamādhīvajra) nṛdāṇa pa’ rdzogs so || (D f. 38s5–6, P f. 29v1). The colophon of MrSuNiT2: sī bā bde ’gror sbyar sī bā co’ gsn ści tu ‘dod pa’ mchog tu gya ṃ pa’ s bā yā ba’i min can dpal ston tīn nīd tīn ńe ‘dzin rdo rje[16] (Šūnyatāsamādhīvajra) žabs kyi srd hma’ naḥ pa’ rdzogs so || (D f. 34v7–35v1, P f. 33v4).

7This does not necessarily mean that the GuSaTa itself teaches prescriptions for a funeral, only that the mantra-visualisation system employed in the Mr.SuNi is that of the GuSaTa. This ecclectic syncretism of the teachings of the tantras of different classes may become a target of criticism by theoreticians. This kind of syncretism is, however, found in a number of Buddhist Tantric ritual manuals. As stated above, the PaStMImMaUp quotes verses from the Caturśṅfhaṭāntara although the author states that his manual follows the system of the GuSaTa (see footnote[5]). Kuladatta’s Kriyāsangrahapāparījā, a comprehensive manual of Buddhist Tantric rituals, is a good example of a manual in which this kind of syncretism is found. This character of ritual manuals is found in Šāivism also. See SANDERSON 2005: 556ff.

---

10mahapadesan[17] N; mahapadesan T
12antyeṣṭvidhānam[12] cor.; antyeṣṭvidhānam T N
13śri guhyasaṃjānyānānānapūrṇateṣayam N
14paripūrye T; paripūrayai N
16pranaśayin[17] em. following the variant reading reported in BBK p. 277; “pranajñita” SED
17See also MS No. 190(26) of the Tokyo University Library: kṛto ‘yam śrīmanjūyagoprasādādhiśthitaścaryavajravasarībhadrāpādāpānajapajapratyapānayācaryavānudhātusāri śūnyasamādhipādānānānānapūrṇateṣayam || (sic) (f. 67v3–5). This colophon is somewhat corrupt but Šūnyasamādhīvajra is called Avadhūta. See also MS No. 202(2): kṛto ‘yam manjūyagoprasādādhiśthītācaryavajravasarībhadrāpādāpānajapajapratyapānayācaryavānudhātusāri śūnyasamādhipādānānānānapūrṇateṣayam || (sic) (f. 299v6–300r1). This colophon is more corrupt, but “ṛṛvāvadāḥ” can be emended to “ṛṛvāvadāḥ”. The above is also corrupted, but “ṛṛvāvadāḥ” can be emended to “ṛṛvāvadāḥ”. Note that all of these MSS contain various corruptions of what almost certainly should be “bhadrapādapānajapajapratyapānyānānānapūrṇateṣayam, as in the colophon of the TaJiśaṃ.”

18See AcAdKraUp vv. 88cdl–90abc: paramāśa[o] vināpāda indrabhūthā salaksñēbhūḥ || vālasvajro ganjeṣṭi padmācyōrya mahākāpyāḥ ||

---
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identical with the master of Śūnyasamādhīvajra. The famous Bhadrapāda who has a close relation to the Guhyaśaṃjñatāntra (GuSaTa), on which the MrSuNi is based, is Dipaukarabhadra. It seems implausible that the master of Śūnyasamādhīvajra could be the relatively early Dipaukarabhadra. But it is interesting to note that the colophon of the TaJīSaṃ quoted above might be interpreted as referring to a master (acārya) Mañjughoṣa as Bhadrapāda’s teacher. According to tradition, Mañjuśrī revealed the secret teachings of the GuSaTa to Dipaukarabhadra’s teacher, Buddhaśrījāna (Jīnāpañḍa), after which the latter founded the Jīnāpañḍa school of the GuSaTa. However it would be very odd to say that a person empowers or protects (adhitiṣṭhati) a person. It is, therefore, more probable that this Mañjughoṣa is a name of a deity, and that the reading in which he is called an acārya is not correct.

The MrSuNi is a mixture of verse and prose. In the verse parts the author uses the āryā metre. In the TaJīSaṃ the author displays greater metrical variety, using indravajrā, upajāti, vasanatilakā, vāṃsasthavira, indravamśa, ārddulavikṛṣṭi, sraṣṭhāra, and āryā. Of these āryā is employed most frequently.

As clearly stated by Śūnyasamādhīvajra in the two verses of the MrSuNi quoted above, the mantra-system of the GuSaTa is employed in the verse parts the author uses the āryā metre. In the TaJīSaṃ, the author displays greater metrical variety, using indravajrā, upajāti, vasanatilakā, vāṃsasthavira, indravamśa, ārddulavikṛṣṭi, sraṣṭhāra, and āryā. Of these āryā is employed most frequently.

In this way, the MrSuNi contains two different systems which do not perfectly harmonise with each other.

Finally I should report here the fact that the whole text except the last two verses of the MrSuNi was incorporated into Darpanācārya’s Acāryakriyāsāmanuccaya (AcKrSa). As has been pointed out in several publications, Darpanācārya drew on various texts in writing the AcKrSa. The last section also has the source text. There are a number of manuscripts of the AcKrSa surviving in the Kathmandu valley and elsewhere in the world. This means that we have no small quantity of materials to edit the MrSuNi. I hope to publish a critical edition of the MrSuNi in the near future.
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22Probably these rites (asthyādītādana etc.) are based on the SaDuPaTa SÉD p. 176, ll. 16–26, TÉD (Takahashi 1986) p. 107(12), l. 1–p. 105(14), l. 2. The mantras to be uttered in these rites are taught elsewhere in this tantra (e.g. mantras to be uttered in the asthyādītādana are taught on p. 180, ll. 6–20 of SEQ).

23See also footnote[1]. The opening line of the relevant section of the AcKrSa might imply the direction of borrowing: adhuna pari-nirvāṇavājrācāryaśārīrasya, nityaṣṭhitena (em.) etc. MS vādyu ucita- (prapayata ‘locanabhūtan (em.) etc. MS) . . . (MS S 1.240v7 (= 480.7)). It is odd that the maṅgala, in which the author’s homage and adoration to the deity (in this case, the Goddess Locanā) and the subject-matter to follow are indicated, follows the sentence which indicates the subject-matter.

24E.g. Sakurai points out that probably most of the prescription of abhiṣeka in the AcKrSa is a borrowing from Abhayakāragupta’s Vajrāvalī (1996: 33). Tanaka points out that the AcKrSa drew on Nagabodhi’s Guhyasamājaṃdaṇḍalapopakāvīnsatāvṛti (2003: 153). I have pointed out that the AcKrSa borrows most of the pratiṣṭhā section from the Vajrāvalī (Tanemura 2004b: 96), and that some verses in the vāstuṇāga section of the AcKrSa are almost identical with those in Tathāgatavājra’s Saṃvaramāṇḍalavīḍhi, which is preserved in the Tibetan canon (Tub. 1511, Ota. 2226) (Tanemura 2002: 571–572, Notes 27, 28).

25John Brough edited (or rather transcribed) a part of a manuscript written by Asisṭaṇḍā and presented by Hodgson to the Indian Office Library (Vol. 29, No. 8) (1996: 671). His edition contains a text of a manual of funeral rites (śrītyasamākāraḥ). The description is very short but the outline of the text is similar to that of the MrSuNi. If we consider the number of the manuscripts of the AcKrSa, the MrSuNi might have offered a framework for funeral rites to the Buddhism of the Kathmandu Valley via the AcKrSa. I thank Iain Sinclair for drawing my attention to the article of Brough.
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A Parallel Edition of the Nepalese and South Indian Recensions of the First Act of the Kundamālā (Pt II)

Csaba DEZSŐ

The last newsletter (no. 3, January-February 2007) contained a parallel critical edition of the first half of Act One of Dhīranāga’s drama, the Kundamālā. In this issue I shall present the second half of the act using the same source material: two Nepalese palm-leaf MSS (N₁ = NGMPP B 15/6 and N₂ = NGMPP A 1027/11 and A 24/13, the latter one, dated to N.S. 551, possibly being a copy of the former) for establishing the Nepalese recension, and Dutta’s edition of the Southern recension based on four MSS: two in Grantha (T₁ and M₁), one in Telugu (T₂) and one in Kannada script (M₂), one of which, namely T₁, was available to me in a (not too easily legible) microfilm copy.

The Nepalese MSS, just as in the first half of the act, usually give better readings than the Southern ones. This is especially true about the section following Sītā’s question, kudo me tādiso bhaadhebo? (interrupting verse 20), after which the Mysore MSS are not available for the rest of the act, and the readings of the Tanjore MSS are often hopelessly corrupt, above all in the Prakrit passages. Though Dutta, as well as the editors preceding him, did their best to extract meaningful Prakrit sentences sometimes from utter gibberish, it is perhaps possible to improve upon the text at a few places, also taking into consideration the readings of the Nepalese recension. Nevertheless, the reconstructed Prakrit passages of the Southern recension are far from being perfect, and one can only hope that more and better manuscript material will come to light in South India which will make further improvement possible.

The beginning of the portion edited in this paper is worth a closer look. At Laksmana’s request Sītā agrees to send a message back to her cruel husband, but she is still reluctant to reproach him. “Is your majesty not capable of even this much?”, asks Laksmana, and after which the Mysore MSS are not available for the rest of the act, and the readings of the Tanjore MSS are often hopelessly corrupt, above all in the Prakrit passages. Though Dutta, as well as the editors preceding him, did their best to extract meaningful Prakrit sentences sometimes from utter gibberish, it is perhaps possible to improve upon the text at a few places, also taking into consideration the readings of the Nepalese recension. Nevertheless, the reconstructed Prakrit passages of the Southern recension are far from being perfect, and one can only hope that more and better manuscript material will come to light in South India which will make further improvement possible.

The beginning of the portion edited in this paper is worth a closer look. At Laksmana’s request Sītā agrees to send a message back to her cruel (nīththuḥ) husband, but she is still reluctant to reproach him. “Is your majesty not capable of even this much?”, asks Laksmana, and with Sītā’s reply we reach the text edited in this article. In the Nepalese recension she says: “You have rightly expelled the innocent Sītā from your heart, [but is it right to expel her] also from the country?” while the Southern recension seems to read the opposite: “You were wrong to expel the innocent Sītā from your heart, how much more

1 I thank Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper.
2 E.g., 14+: savvādā matthānīshēdena, 25+: rahareṇu vi Lakkhaṇa, ibid.: kahim de bhaavanī laovālā..., 26+: mahabhaṛ, idha eva cittā, etc.
3 juttam tuha niyantarāhām Sidam niyāsidam hiśādo, kim visado vi?
even from the country? 4

If we suppose that Sitā has braced herself to reproach Rāma then the text of the Southern recension appears to be more logical. That she Resented the way Rāma had treated her is shown e.g. in Act Three when she speaks about the mixed emotions invading her upon seeing Rāma for the first time after many years, and anger, pride and shame are among those feelings beside love and respect 5 Another telling detail is the name by which Sitā calls the father of her two sons: Kuśa replies to Rāma’s question that when they get into some mischief their mother says: “Sons of that merciless man, behave yourselves.”

On the other hand, though Sitā calls Rāma “merciless” to herself, when her friend accuses her husband of cruelty she is ready to defend him and says: “He left me only with his body, not with his heart.” 6 When her friend asks her how she knows another man’s heart, Sitā replies: “How could his heart belong to someone else than Sitā?” Vālmīki also assures Sitā in the first act that Rāma did not abandon her in his heart 7 and the vidīṣaṅka, who knows the feelings of his friend, confirms the same when he says that Rāma holds the earth’s daughter in his heart.

Considering all this one would expect Lakṣmaṇa to assure Sitā that Rāma’s heart remains with her, but he does not appear to do so in our text. The first sentence of his reply is as contradictory in the two recensions as Sitā’s above quoted words are. The Nepalese recension reads: “You have not given any message, my lady, that could / should be sent” 8 while in the Southern one he says: “You have given a message, my lady, that must be sent.” 9 The following verse (14), continuing Lakṣmaṇa’s speech, also differs in the two recensions. The first half of the śloka is the same: “Perhaps you have been expelled, my lady, by the mighty [Rāma] from his heart?” 10 In the Southern recension the verse continues as follows: “But [why] has he expelled you from home? Perhaps [he has expelled you] from home, [but] why [has he expelled you] even from the country?” 11 The reading of the Nepalese mss (ghṛtā prati ṣṛham nāma katham janapatad api) is more difficult to interpret and is possibly corrupt. As it stands it might mean: “Perhaps you have been expelled, my lady, by the mighty [Rāma] from his heart instead of (?) his house. Perhaps [he has expelled you] from home, [but] why [has he expelled you] even from the country?” One might consider emending prati ṣṛham to patiyṛham or patiyṛhan 12 but the sentence would still remain problematic. Further, more drastic emendation could result in the following: katham patiyṛhan nāma? “How [could he] possibly [expel you] from the husband’s house?”

Further Differences Between the Two Recensions: the Sanskrit Passages I shall now return to some Sanskrit passages of the text edited in the last newsletter. In the Nepalese recension, when Sumantra stops the chariot he addresses Lakṣmaṇa as follows “The chariot has stopped, sir. Her majesty may alight.” 13 If we examine the Southern mss, T1 and M2 both have similar readings. Dutta, however, either following T2 or emending the text, puts Sumantra’s above quoted words into Lakṣmaṇa’s mouth, since, as he remarks, “Sumantra does not appear to converse directly with Sitā in the drama” 14 Sumantra, however, does not necessarily address Sitā in the Southern manuscripts. Though the vocative āyusmana is missing from M2 and T1, he might nevertheless speak to Lakṣmaṇa, as he does in the Nepalese recension. Therefore one might consider accepting the reading of M2: “SAMANTRAH (rajuvākaraṇam abhīniva: esa sthito rathaḥ. tad avatartu devi.)”

A few lines below Sumantra says “yad ājnāpayati devaḥ” to Lakṣmaṇa in the Southern recension, which is, as Dutta rightly points out, “undoubtedly inappropriate in this context” 15 The Nepalese mss have a better reading again: “yathājñāpayasi”. In his soliloquy Lakṣmaṇa recalls Rāma’s words with which he entrusted his brother with the thankless task of abandoning Sitā in the forest. In the Nepalese recension Rāma appears to be more aloof than in the Southern one when he says: “Dear Lakṣmaṇa, it’s rumored that Sitā’s chastity has been ruined because she stayed in Rāvaṇa’s house. Therefore one can hear unusual gossips among the citizens. So it would not be appropriate if we tainted the honour of Ikṣvāku’s race, which is spotless like the autumn moon, just for the sake of a wife.” 16 In the Southern

---

4na juttam tava nīnavarāhan Śidām hiādo nivāśitum kīma nā visaādo tī. This reading follows the Tanjore mss with conjunctive emendations. The beginning of the sentence (na juttam tava), however, seems to be the same in the Mysore mss.

5Act Three, 11+, Dutta’s ed. p. 41.

6Act Five, 14+, Dutta’s ed. p. 85f: niranukroṣasya putrā, mā cāpālam tī.

7Act Two, Dutta’s ed. p. 29: aha sitireva, na puṇa hiṣeṣa.

8Ibid.: kaham tassa hiṣesam Śidācār pārakaraṇam bhavissati.

927+ vate, jānavadābhāvabhāṇah mahārajāna tvam tyaktāni, na tu hṛdayeṇa.

10Act Five, Dutta’s ed. p. 71: ede sānakaśeṣino purudara-viśva-vahana-prajapāt-piṣeṣam eto muhāvāravānauṣadasam, kala-vaccheṣo maheṣaḥührāvan uvahantī, tatah takkema bahujaṇeṣaḥ puhvaṇḥ hiṣeṣa puhvavādhihuram uvahantam adisaaγarauvam sanvatturo tī. (One might consider emending to sanvuttuto vī.)

11sandeṣayam āryaya na kim cid api sāndīṣatam.

12sandeṣayam āaryayam viṣayam.

13āryā nirvāstā nāma hṛdayāt prabhāviṣṇunā |
A Parallel Edition of the First Act of the Kundamālā (Pt. II)

recension Rāma is less direct when he brings up Sītā’s alleged adultery and less distant when he mentions her by name instead of referring to her simply as “a wife.”

When Laksmana makes up his mind to convey Rāma’s decision to Sītā he introduces the bad news with the following words in the Nepalese MSS: “Now I, Laksmana, unworthy as I am because of bestowing the misery of eternal separation from one’s kin, will respectfully tell you something, so please brace yourself.”

The text of the Southern recension appears to me somewhat less satisfactory: “Now I, the unworthy Laksmana who shares the misery of eternal separation, will respectfully tell you something, so please brace yourself.”

In verse 7 Laksmana is hardly able to tell Sītā it is her exile that Rāma ordered. “Words stuck in my throat,” kauṭhaṃ baddhaṁ bhairati, he says in the Nepalese recension, an idiom comparable with e.g. the definition of astringent flavour in the Śūrutasamhitā (1.42.9: yo vaṅkṛtaṁ prāṇasaya, jetivaṁ stambhayati, kaṭhaṃ baddhaṁ, hrdayam karaṇi ṣaya ca sa kaṣāyaḥ). The Southern MSS read granthiṁ baddhaṁ bhairati, “the words tie a knot”, which we have to fill out by understanding “in my throat”.

In verse 9 Laksmana repeats the terrible news to Sītā with plain words. In the Nepalese recension he says: “[Though you are] endowed with the merit of chastity, you have been abandoned for good by our master (your husband)” which indicates both the irreversibility of Rāma’s decision and Laksmana’s sympathy for Sītā. In the Southern recension Laksmana says: “It seems (kilo) you have been abandoned by our master (your husband), who is endowed with the merit of morality” thus ex- 
tolling Rāma’s rectitude instead of siding with Sītā, which suits less well Laksmana’s general attitude.

Sītā swoons when she learns that Laksmana is about to leave her alone in the forest. In both recensions the breeze revives her (vanamārūtena in the Nepalese MSS, mrduṇānilena in the Southern ones), but while in the Nepalese recension she regains consciousness in one step and the wind becomes the means of her samāśvāsana in the Southern recension first she breathes again (disṭya śvasitī, reports Laksmana) and then the breeze helps in her pratyāgyāna. The reason for this curious double-

phased recovery (supposing that it is secondary) might have been that the transmitters felt the necessity of a word that is closer to pratyāgyāta in verse 10 than samāśvāsana.

In verse 13 Laksmana conveys Rāma’s final message to Sītā. We find a curious difference between the two recensions at the beginning of the verse: the Nepalese MSS (actually N1, since N2 is corrupt) read tvam devi citrāniḥhitā grhadevatā me, while the Southern MSS have tvam devi citrāniḥhitā grhadevatā me. Citra and citra are very close readings and one could easily have changed into the other, but which one should we regard as primary? The text of the Southern recension is easily interpretable: Sītā is always present in Rāma’s heart as the goddess of the house, which suits the above quoted passages in which Rāma’s heart appears to have remained with Sītā. The word citrāniḥhitā in the Nepalese recension, if it is not just a scribal error, might have been motivated by descriptions of household goddesses appearing on paintings e.g. in the Navasāhasāṅkacarita (9.36): citrāniḥhitām grhadevatānāṁ iti sphuruṇāt, maṣa tadavā vacaḥ.

In verse 17 Laksmana describes how various animals show their compassion for Sītā and, according to the Nepalese recension, he remarks: “These animals are superior, not we humans” (tiryaggatā varam āmi na vayam manusyaḥ). This reading seems to give a better meaning than what we have in the Southern MSS (tiryaggatā varam āmi na paraṁ mantraṣyaḥ), which might be the result of the corruption of vayam to paraṁ (the reading of the Tanjore MSS) to paraṁ.

When Vālmīki asks Sītā how she got into such a state she is too ashamed to give an answer (27+). The sage resorts to his “eye of visualisation” (dhyānacaksu) and, in the Nepalese recension, he realises that “this is the consequence of Vālin’s murder” (aye, Vālinadaveṣṇaṁ bhūyaṁ, ārāma). This realisation is missing from the Southern recension, and Vālmīki tells Sītā only what has already been clear both to her and to the audience, namely that Rāma abandoned her because he was afraid of people’s malicious gossip. It seems conceivable that this reference to Vālin’s death was left out deliberately from the Southern recension, thus avoiding an inauspicious matter. Dhūraṇa, however, might have associated those two incidents in Rā-

ma’s life which do not suit this archetype of righteousness: the murder of the legitimate king of the monkeys and the banishment of the innocent Sītā.
Sītā: evam viññāvēsi — juttān tuha nirvarāhāṁ
Sīdhaṁ niṇvāśidum hīaādo, kiṁ visāādo vi?
(evam vijnāpyayi — yuktāṇ tava nirparādhām Sītāṁ
niṃvāśayitum ārdayāt, kiṁ visāyād api?)

**LAKŚMANĀḤAḥ**: sandeśāyanaṁ ārıyāṁ na kiṁ cēd api
sandīṣṭam.

ārıyā nirvāśitaṁ nāma

Sītā: evam mama vaanaṁ viññāvadavvo tāc mahārāṁ
— sā tavopanaṁvasīṁ savaddaṁ matthaānīhiṇeṇa anja-laṁ viññāvedī jaṁ, aham niṅgunā vi cīrāparicida tī vā, jādāvacca tī vā, āpiṇḍā tī vā, Sīda tī vā, tato sumara-ṃnettakeṇaṁ añguḥiṇḍavaṁ mhi.
(evam mama vacanena vijnāpayitavasāmā mahārājasāṁ
— sā tavopanaṁvasīṁ savaddaṁ mastakanihiṭenānjaṁ vi-jñāpyayati: yady aham niṅgunā cīrāpariciti vā, jātā-patveti vā, anāṭheti vā, Sīteti vā, tataḥ sūmanāmaṭeṇa-ṃ anvargāhitavyāmi.)

**LAKŚMANĀḤAḥ**: imaṁ sandeśaṁ ākārṇya
ksate kṣāram ivihiṁtaṁ
daśāṁ asaḥyaṁ sūkṛto
vyaktam āryo gamiṣyati.

Sītā: vaccha, adimahantevisāmaṇḍalī aham tuma etti kādukkhasāhāṁ? sampadaṁ tae ekkeṇa so cīntitadvvo
tā gaccha, bhādukasāre sāvadhāno lohi.
(vatsa, atimahati viṣayaṃanadeḥ han tavaivādudhka-
hasāhīvaṁ? sūmptaṁ tvaivakena sa cīntayitavyāḥ. tad gac-
cha, bhṛṭṛśaśāre sāvadhāno bhava.)

**LAKŚMANĀḤAḥ**: anūrūpam maḥānubhāvatāyāḥ.

Sītā: anuṣṇaṁ ca ğaṅda, paṇāmidadvvo ca tae Rāhavaku-
larādaḥāṇī sā bhaavādi ca tae susūsīdavvo pādāṁga
-do mahārādo, pālādvā ca tae ājjāṇaṁ āṇātī, saṃsaā-

Sītā: evam vi taman janaṁ viññāvēhi — na juttam tava
nirvarāhāṁ Sīdhaṁ hīaādo niṃvāśiduṁ kiṁ uṇa visāādo

(evam api taman janaṁ vijnāpaya — na yuktāṇ tava nir-
parādhām Sītāṁ ārdayān niṃvāśayitum, kiṁ punar
visāyād iti.)

**LAKŚMANĀḤAḥ**: sandeśāyanaṁ ārıyāṁ sandīṣṭam.

ārıyā nirvāśitaṁ nāma

Sītā: adimahante visāmaṇḍalī kahiṁ tumaṁ sanṭṭi ettiā dukkhasāhāā? sampadaṁ mae vīna tae ekke-
ṇa eso cīntitadvvo. tumaṁ bhāduusā sarīre sāvadhāno
lohi tītī.
(atimahatī api viṣayaṃanadeḥ kutra te santy etāvanto
dukkhasāhāḥ? sūmptaṁ maḥā vīna tāvaiṇāśāsa cīnt-
ayitavyāḥ. tvaṁ bhṛṭṛpute śāre sāvadhāno bhaveti.)

**LAKŚMANĀḤAḥ**: anūrūpam etan maḥāmaṁbubhāvatāyāḥ.

Sītā: vaccha Lakkhaṇa, paṇāmidadvvo tae mama vaanaādo
Rāhavālārāhaḥāṁ bhavaevi Ayojja, susūsīdavvo pa-

---

28 nirvarāhāṁ Sīdhaṁ hīaādo niṃvāśiduṁ con. nirvarārāhāṁ (?) siddhi hiaādo niṃvāśiduṁ T₁, nirparāhāṁ sidum pāuādo (niṃvāśiduṁ?) T₂, nirparāhāṁ imaṁ janaṁ sapadi hiaādo niṃvāśiduṁ DUTTA (M₁, niṃvāśiduṁ M₂)
29 grhāṁ em. ISAACSON, grhāṁ T₁, grhāṁ DUTTA
30 savadda matthaānīhiṇeṇa con. savadda matthaānīhiṇeṇa DUTTA (M₂), avacchanabhānaḥiṇeṇa M₂
31 vinñāvedī T₁, vinñāvedi tti DUTTA
32 mahante em. ‘mahiṁde DUTTA (M₁ M₂)
33 visamaṇḍale DUTTA reads it as vi saamaṇḍale
34 kahiṁ tumaṁ DUTTA (M₁ M₂), han tu vi T₁ T₂
35 tumaṁ DUTTA (M₁ T₂), tuha M₂, tava T₁
36 bhāduusā sarīre DUTTA T₁ T₂ M₁, bhāduussāre M₂
37 visayaṃante ‘pi sakṣaṃante DUTTA
38 hanḍi DUTTA
39 susūsīdavvo T₁, susūsīdavvo DUTTA
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saṅdavvā\textsuperscript{41} ppiasaḥū Ppiaṃvaḍāṁissaṇā\textsuperscript{42} sumaridavvā ca tae mandabhāṁ\textsuperscript{43} (iti rōditī.)

(ayyām svahastena vane vimoktum\textsuperscript{44} śroṭuṁ tatḥāśyaḥ paridevitānā sukhena Laṅkāsāmade hataṁ māṁ ājīvyaṁ Mārūṭī āttatvārāṁ.

(dīśo 'valokya)
ete rudanti harinā
haritaṁ vimucya, haṃsāś ca śokavidhurāḥ
dvayeśa bhagavati, tvayaḥ śūruṣṭavyaḥ pratimāgaḥ mahārājāḥ, pālayitvā ca tvayaṁyānām ājnātipī, samāśvāśayitavāḥ priyasakhyāḥ Priyaṃvaḍāṁśrāḥ, smartavyā ca tvayaḥ mandabhāgni.)

LAKṢMĀṆĀḥ:
āryāṁ svahastena vane vimoktum śroṭuṁ tatḥāșyaḥ paridevitānā sukhena Laṅkāsāmade hataṁ māṁ ājīvyaṁ Mārūṭī āttatvārāṁ.

Sītā: atthamīdo sūro, dūre adido māṇuśasampādo, tā Nī.\textsuperscript{9} 

(ābtathā caryāḥ, dhavām, saṅkarṣānti dhurāḥ.

Sītā: niścāvahidā kkhu\textsuperscript{46} ahaṁ.
(nityāvahitā khalv ahaṁ.)

LAKṢMĀṆĀḥ:
āryāṁ taṁ vā
dvayeśa dvayeśaī ca smarantyā śokād ātmaṁ
mṛtyavā\textsuperscript{47} nopaneyāḥ.

Nī.\textsuperscript{56}vīśvākūnāṁ
santati\textsuperscript{48} garbhāsaṁsthrāṁ
seyaṁ devyā
yatnataḥ pālaṇīyā.

LAKṢMĀṆĀḥ (aṅjaliṁ baddhavā): ārye, Lakṣmāṇasyāpaścino 'yaṁ pranāmaṁjñāḥ, tat sāvadhāhānaṁ grhyatām.

Sītā: niścāvahidā kkhu\textsuperscript{46} ahaṁ.
(nityāvahitā khalv ahaṁ.)

LAKṢMĀṆĀḥ:
āryāṁ taṁ vā
dvayeśa dvayeśaī ca smarantyā śokād ātmaṁ
mṛtyavā\textsuperscript{47} nopaneyāḥ.

LAKṢMĀṆĀḥ (sudvegaṁ):
āryāṁ svahastena vane vimoktum śroṭuṁ ca tasyāḥ paridevitānā sukhena Laṅkāsāmade hataṁ\textsuperscript{49} māṁ ājīvyaṁ Mārūṭī āttatvārāṁ.

Sītā: vacca Lakkhaṇa, āsannāṭhamayō\textsuperscript{50} sūro, dūre a ido māṇuśasampādo. udvāṇa pākkiho, saṁcaranṭi sāpadā, gccha, na juttanā parilambidūm.

(LAKṢMĀṆĀḥ (aṅjaliṁ baddhavā): ārye\textsuperscript{50} sarvaparścino 'yaṁ Lakṣmāṇasya pranāmaṁjñāḥ, tat sāvadhāhānaṁ parigṛhyatām.)

Sītā: niścāvahidā kkhu ahaṁ.
(nityāvahitā khalv ahaṁ.)

LAKṢMĀṆĀḥ: vijnāpaṁyāṁ devīṁ:
āryaṁ mitraṁ
bhaktivān vā smarantyā śokād ātmaṁ
mṛtyavā nopaneyāḥ.

Ikṣvākūnāṁ
santatir garbhāsaṁsthrāṁ
seyaṁ devyā
yatnataḥ pālaṇīyā\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{41}‘ṣaṅkā’ Nī, “siṁhī” Nī.\textsuperscript{2}
\textsuperscript{42}‘mīśeṇaḥ’ conj., “mīmāṃsāḥ Nī Nī Nī
\textsuperscript{43}‘bhāmīṇaḥ’ Nī, “bhāmīṇaḥ” Nī
\textsuperscript{44}vimoktum Nī, vimoḳsṇaṁ Nī
\textsuperscript{45}devīṁ Nī, devī Nī
\textsuperscript{46}pa Nī Nī, om. Nī Nī
\textsuperscript{47}kkhu Nī, kku Nī
\textsuperscript{48}mṛtyaṁ Nī, mṛtyave Nī
\textsuperscript{49}santatir Nī, santatir Nī
\textsuperscript{50}samannāṭhamayō’ DUTTA
\textsuperscript{51}samannāṭhamayō Tī, samassidavvā DUTTA
\textsuperscript{52}‘abhāraṁ’ DUTTA, śvaśṛṣṭiḥ previous eds.\textsuperscript{2}
\textsuperscript{53}‘hataṁ’ DUTTA (Mī Mī), nṛtaṁ Tī Tī
\textsuperscript{54}‘paramaṁ’ DUTTA (Mī Mī), vṛttaṁ Tī Tī
\textsuperscript{55}‘manuṣyāḥ’ DUTTA (Mī Mī), amarṣyāḥ Tī Tī
\textsuperscript{56}‘āsaṅaṅghātayō’ DUTTA (Mī 1), āsaṅgaṁsamō Mī 2, āsatthamati Tī, āśampadati Tī
\textsuperscript{57}‘ārye’ Tī, om. DUTTA
\textsuperscript{58}‘pālaṇīyā’ Tī Tī, raksāṇīyā DUTTA (Mī Mī)
Sītā: appadihadavaṇo kku Somittī.
(appatiḥatavacanaḥ khalu Saumitrīḥ.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: idam aparāṃ vijūpayāmi:

11

N1:9v

(jyeṣṭhasya bhrātur ādesād aniya vijane vane
parityaktāsi yad devi
doṣam ekaṃ kśamasva me.

Sītā: jyeṣṭhabhādbhudavaṇāṇūvattā tūmaṇaṃ tti ko tu-
haṃ doso āṣaṅkiādī?
(jyeṣṭhabhrātṛvacanāṇuvartī tvam iti kas tava doṣa āṣaṅkyate?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ (pradakṣiṇīkṛtya): bho bho lokapālāḥ! śr-
ṇvantu śrṇvantu bhavantāḥ:
esā vadhūr
Daśarathasya mahārathasya...

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...Rāmāhvaya-
sya ghṛṇi Madhusūdanasya...

Sītā: kudo me ettīāṃ bhāadheśāṃ?
(kuto ma iyanti bhāgadheyānī?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...nirvāsītā
patighāḍ vijāne vane ’śmin...

Sītā (kṛṇau piddhāya): sāntaṃ pāvaṇ. (sāntaṃ pāpam.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...ekākiṇī
vasati...

(Sītā bhayam nātayati.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...rakṣata rakṣatainām.

(Sītā garbhaṇaṃ darsayati.)

Sītā: appadihadavaṇo kku Somittī.
(appatiḥatavacanaḥ khalu Saumitrīḥ.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: iyam aparā vijūpanā.

Sītā: kā aṅṇa?
(kāṇyā?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
(jyeṣṭhasya bhrātur ādesād aniya vijane vane
parityaktāsi devi tvāṃ

doṣam ekaṃ kśamasva me.

Sītā: (sāsraṃ) jyeṣṭhabhādbhudavaṇāṇūvattā tūmaṇaṃ tti par
itosakāle ko dosa āṣaṅkiādī?
(jyeṣṭhabhavanāṇuvartī tvam iti paritosakāle ko dosa āṣaṅkyate?)

(Lakṣmaṇaḥ sapradakṣiṇaṃ parikrāmati. Sītā roditī.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ (diśo 'valokya): bho bho lokapālāḥ! śrṇva
ntu bhavantāḥ:
esā vadhūr
Daśarathasya mahārathasya...

Sītā: adisilāhanijjām akkharāṃ sunīanti (atiśāghaniyāṇy akṣaraṇī śṛyante.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...Rāmāhvaya-
sya ghṛṇi Madhusūdanasya...

Sītā: kudo me tādiso bhāadheo?
(kuto me tādṛśo bhāgadheyaḥ?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...nirvāsītā
patighāṭ...

(Sītā kṛṇau piddhāti.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...ekākiṇī
vasati rakṣata rakṣatainām.

(Sītā garbhaṇaṃ darsayati.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: enām api bhagavatīṃ ārīyāḥ krte vijū-

Eight pages of the Mysore Mss (foll. 7–14) are lost beginning from this place.” (Dutta)
N2:57r LAKŚMAṆĀ: etām api Bhāgṛa-thūm āryāvāh kṛte vijñā-payāmi (jārunbhavāṃ sthitvā kṛtañjaliḥ):

jātaśramāṃ?

kamalagandhakṛtādhivāsaiḥ
kāle tvam apy
anugṛhāṇa taraṅgavātaiḥ,
devi yadā
cā savānāya vigāhati tvāṃ,
Bhāgṛathī

praśamaya kṣaṇam ambuvegam.

ye ke cid a-

tra munayo *nivasant, aranye vijñāpayā-

mi śirasā praṇīpatya tebhyaḥ:
strīty ujjhitety asāraṇetī kulāṅganetī
seyaṃ sadai-

va bhavatām anukampanīyā.

eṣo ‘ījalar

viracito vanadevatābhyo,
vijñāpanāṃ
cṣaṇam imāṃ avadhārayantu:
suptā pramā-

davaśāga visamasthitā vā
yatnād iyaṃ

bhagavatibhir avekṣaṇīyā.

bho bho hiṃsṛā,

bhūmīr eṣā bhavadbhir
varjyā, deyo

na praveśaḥ pareśām.
mrgyo mrgyo,
vipravāse sakhīnāṃ
yūyam sakhyo,

mā kṣaṇaṃ muṇicataināṃ.

sakhyo nadyaḥ,

svāmino lokapālā,
mātar Gaṅge,

bhṛtarāha śailarājāḥ,
bhūyo bhūyo

yacakte Lakṣmaṇo ‘yam:
yatnād rakṣyā?

N2:57v rāja*putṛ. gato ‘ham.

(iti niskṛantaḥ.)

N1:10r SĪTĀ saccam jeva maṃ mandabhāiniṁ pari*ccaīa

payāmi:

jātaśramāṃ

kamalagandhakṛtādhivāsaiḥ
kāle tvam apy
anugṛhāṇa taraṅgavātaiḥ,
devi yadā
cā savānāya vigāhate tvāṃ,
Bhāgṛathī,

praśamaya kṣaṇam ambuvegam.

ye ke cid a-

tra munayo nivasanty aranye vijñāpayā-

mi śirasā praṇīpatya tebhyaḥ:
strīty ujjhitety asāraṇetī kulāṅgateti
devi sadā

bhagavatām anukampanīyā.

eṣo ‘ījalar

viracito vanadevatānāṁ,
vijñāpanāṁ

kṣaṇam imāṃ avadhārayantu:
suptā pramā-

davaśāga visamasthitā vā
yatnād iyaṃ

bhagavatibhir avekṣaṇīyā.

bho bho hiṃsṛā,

bhūmīr eṣā bhavadbhir
varjyā, deśō

na praveśaḥ pareśām.
mrgyo mrgyo,
vipravāse sakhīnāṃ
yūyam sakhyo,

mā kṣaṇaṃ muṇicataināṃ.

sakhyo nadyaḥ,

svāmino lokapāla,
mātar Gaṅge,

bhūyo bhūyo

yacakte Laksmaṇo ‘yam:
yatnād rakṣyā

rājaputṛ. gato ‘ham.

(pranampya niskṛantaḥ.)

SĪTĀ: kahaṁ! saccam evva maṃ eāṁṁ pariccaīa
gado Lakṣmaṇo. (vilokya) haddhī haddhī! atthamido
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57jātaśramāṃ [em., *śramaḥ N₁ N₂]
58kamalagandhakṛtādhivāsaiḥ
59kāle tvam apy
60anugṛhāṇa taraṅgavātaiḥ,
61devi yadā
cā savānāya vigāhati tvāṃ,
62Bhāgṛathī

praśamaya kṣaṇam ambuvegam.

ye ke cid a-

tra munayo *nivasant, aranye vijñāpayā-

mi śirasā praṇīpatya tebhyaḥ:
strīty ujjhitety asāraṇetī kulāṅganetī
seyaṃ sadai-

va bhavatām anukampanīyā.

eṣo ‘ījalar

viracito vanadevatābhyo,
vijñāpanāṃ
cṣaṇam imāṃ avadhārayantu:
suptā pramā-

davaśāga visamasthitā vā
yatnād iyaṃ

bhagavatibhir avekṣaṇīyā.

bho bho hiṃsṛā,

bhūmīr eṣā bhavadbhir
varjyā, deśō

na praveśaḥ pareśām.
mrgyo mrgyo,
vipravāse sakhīnāṃ
yūyam sakhyo,

mā kṣaṇaṃ muṇicataināṃ.

sakhyo nadyaḥ,

svāmino lokapālā,
mātar Gaṅge,

bhūyo bhūyo

yacakte Laksmaṇo ‘yam:
yatnād rakṣyā

rājaputṛ. gato ‘ham.

(pranampya niskṛantaḥ.)

SĪTĀ: kahaṁ! saccam evva maṃ eāṁṁ pariccaīa
gado Lakṣmaṇo. (vilokya) haddhī haddhī! atthamido

53gandha” [previous eds., “gasyandha” T₁ T₂, “garbha” DUTTA
54lokapālā [em., lokapālāḥ DUTTA
A Parallel Edition of the First Act of the Kundamālā (Pt. II)  


(tatāḥ praviṣṭā Vālmikīḥ.) [22]

VĀLMIKĪH: ākārya Jahnutanayā- samupāgataṁ bhaṅyāṁ sandhyābhiṣekasamaye munidāraṅkbaṅyaḥ ekāṅkīnāṁ asaṇaṇāṁ
rudaṁ aranyā garbhāturiṇaṁ striyaṁ atmāṁ
ravayaṅgato śmiṁ. 
dad yāvat tāṁ [25] anvesayaṁi. (iti pariprāmaṇā.)

65*[reṇu] N1 N2p c, *teṇ N2ac
66*[haraṇa] N1, harinayā N2
67*[avasaṇa] N1, gehaṇ N2
68*[udidhā] N1, *udaṇ N1 N2
69*[aśraṇa] N1, nā N2
70*[bharaṇa] N1, bhaṇavaṇ N2
71*[gata] N1, *gathā N2
72*[vālmikīḥ] N1, vaṃkī N2
73*[dāraṅkbaṅ] N1, *dākebhyaṁ N2
74*[asaṇaṇaḥ] N1, *asaṇaṇaṁ N1 N2
75*[ati] N1, iti N1 N2
76*[yāvat tāṁ] N1, yāttāṁ N2


(katham! satyaṁ eva maṁ ekāṅkīṁ parītyaya gato Lakṣmaṇaḥ. hā dhīk, hā dhīk! astamitaṁ śūryaḥ, rathareṇupi Lakṣmaṇaṁya na śrāvane. udidhaṁ paśīnāṁ, saṃcaraṇi śvā- padāḥ, cēdyate īndhaṅkāraṇaḥ dṛṣṭiḥ, niṃmāṇaṁ mahāraṇyam. kīm karomi mandabhaṅga, kidṛṣṇa aranṛṇāḥ pravajāṁ ekāṅkī? adesa asalākāe bhavāṁī. kīṁ nū khaḷu maṁ kṛtaṇaṁ pāpaṁ yoneduṁ visamaphalam anubhaśaṁ? kutra ca bhagavanto lokadīlāḥ, kutra vā tā Lakṣmaṇaṅjījī ṣabdo vaṇadevataḥ, kutra vā te Rāhaṇvakuḷaṅkamīgadā Vasiṣṭha-Vaṃśīpamūpamāḥ mahā-paṇhabāḥ mahēsieṁ ta ṣabdo maṁ parītyayantāṁ abhiho bhūteḥ.)

(tatāḥ praviṣṭā Vālmikīḥ.)
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Sītā (sāmñīṇām labdhāvā): ko eso manteti? (vīlokyā) kadham! na ko vi. nūnaṁ tāṁ eva Lakkhaṇaṇīvaṁattīṁ anusāraṇti Bhārīḍhī arthānāe yā maṁ anugrėhādī. (ka eṣa mantrayata? katham! na ko ’pi. nūnaṁ tāṁ eva Laksmaṇāvijā帮助 pratisekhaṇīṁ anusāraṇti Bhāgirathī tārāṅgavātēna māṁ anugrēhātī.)

N1:11v VĀLMĪKIH: katham! andhakāra*saṁruddhatayā dṛṣṭī-saṅcārasyaṁ na kīṁ ciḍ api dṛṣṭaye. bhavatu, śabdāyisyē. ayam ahaṁ bhoḥ!

Sītā (utthāya parikramāt): vacca Lakkhaṇa! kīṁ pāṇiśūttoto 'sti? (vatsa Laksmaṇā! kīṁ pāṇiśūttasta 'sti?)

VĀLMĪKIH: bhavati, nāham Laksmaṇāḥ.

Sītā (avagunāthaṁ kṛtvā, aparṣṭya): haddi haddi! anna ko vi parāparuśo. bhodh, nīvaṝāraṁśu. mahābāhā, idha jyeva cīṭṭha. itthāa kku ahaṁ eāiṅū. (hā dhik, hā dhik! anyāḥ ko ’pi parāparuṣaḥ. bhavatu, nīvaṝāryiyāṁ. mahābāhā, ihaiva tiṣṭha. stī khalv ahaṁ ekāṅkīṁ.)

VĀLMĪKIH: bhavati, aham parāparuṣasaṅkaṇayā dināvasānasāmaye Bhāgṛathhisamupāgatebhyaṁ tapasvikkumārābhyaṁ āsrutvā tapadohano ’ham tvāṁ abhyupagantum āgataḥ. pṛcchāṁ cātraḥbhavatīṁ—

samupāgatebhyaḥ sandhyābhisaṅkhaṁ bhavato nāma mūdīrakṣēbhyaḥ ekāṅkīṁ uṣaṁ raṇyaṁ garbhātūrāṁ striyāṁ ati-tvareṣaṅkhaṁ ’ṣīṁ. (anveṣaṁ nāyaṁ) tad yāvat tāṁ evaṁ abhyupayāṁ. (anveṣaṁ nāyaṁ)


VĀLMĪKIH: katham! andhakārasyaṁruddhatayā dṛṣṭī-saṅcārasyaṁ na kīṁ ciḍ api dṛṣṭaye. atāḥ śabdāyisyē. ayam ahaṁ bhoḥ!

Sītā (sahārṣam): vacca Lakkhaṇa! pāṇiśūttato 'sti? (vatsa Laksmaṇā! pāṇiśūttasto 'sti?)

VĀLMĪKIH: nāham Laksmaṇāḥ.

Sītā (avagunāthaṁ nāyaṁ): accāhdāṁ! anna eso ko vi parāparuṇo. tā nīvaṁraṁśu. mahābāhā, idha evva cīṭṭha. itthāa ahaṁ eāiṅū. (atyāhiṁ! anya eṣa ko ’pi parāparuṇaḥ. tan nīvaṁraṁśu. mahābāhā, ihaiva tiṣṭha. stī aham ekāṅkīṁ.)

VĀLMĪKIH: eṣa sthito 'ṣīṁ. vatse, tavāpy aham parāparuṣasaṅkaṇayā. disivaṁsāvasaṁsaṇayā Bhāgṛathhiṁ samupāṣya pratiniyuktebhyaṁ munikumārakoebhyaṁ (ivadvṛttāntam upalabhyā tapadohano ’ham tvāṁ evabhāypapaṁ)

---

Note: The text contains some Sanskrit phrases and verses that are difficult to translate accurately. The provided translation is an attempt to convey the essence of the original text.
Vālmīkiḥ: yadi tvaṁ varṇāśramavyavasthāhetubhūtena mahārājena paritvaktāsi tāna yuktāna pariṇāṇam anuṣṭaṁvat. svasti, vāyāmi. (iṭi parivrāmaṁ.)

Vālmīkiḥ: kathaṁ, kathaṁ.

Sītā: jādi aham rājāṁ nivāśiḍa tti kaduva bhaavaḍā nāṇukampi† daśā tā ēṣā gābbhagadā mama Rahu-Dilīva-Dasara-happaludituraṁ samāntā tumbhānaṁ pālāṇaṁ. 
(yady aham rājāṁ nīrvasīteti kṛtvā bhagavata nāṇukampi-tā, tād ēṣā garbhagatā mama Rgūl-Dilīpa-Dāsara-prabhūṛṇāṁ samāntā yuṣmānaṁ pālāṇaya.)

Vālmīkiḥ (parivrātya): aye katham! Rg̥huvalum udāhate. bhavatv anuyokṣye, kiṁ tvaṁ Dāsara-thyasa vadhūḥ?

Sītā: adha iṁ? 
(atha kīṁ?)

Vālmīkiḥ: Videhādhībapae r Janakasya duhūtā?

Sītā: jaṁ bhaavaṁ āṇavedi. 
(yad bhagavān ājñāpayati.)

Vālmīkiḥ: Sītā tvaṁ?

Sītā: sā jīvaṁ ahaṁ maṇḍabhāṁī. 
(saivāhaṁ maṇḍabhāgīṁ.)

tuṁ upāgataḥ, pṛcchāṁ cātrabhavaṁ— dharmena jītaṁsagṛāme 
Rāme śāsatāśā mistim 
 kartītāṁ kartītāṁ vatsa 
vipad ēṣā kutas tava?

Sītā: ahaṁ vippattī eva āgataḥ bhavaṭīḥ? 

Vālmīkiḥ: Rāmaṁ eva vipattī eva āgataḥ bhavaṭīḥ?

Sītā: ahaṁ iṁ? 
(atha kīṁ?)

Vālmīkiḥ: yadi tvaṁ varṇāśramavyavasthāhetubhūtena mahārājena nīrvasītati tathā svasti, vācchāmy ahaṁ. (parivrāmāti.)

Sītā: ahaṁ vippattī eva āgataḥ bhavaṭīḥ?

Vālmīkiḥ: Rāmaṁ eva vipattī eva āgataḥ bhavaṭīḥ?

Sītā: ahaṁ vippattī eva āgataḥ bhavaṭīḥ?

Vālmīkiḥ: kathaṁ, kathaṁ.
Vālmīki (saviśādam): ṭha hato 'ṣmi mandabhāgyaḥ.
atha kīṁ kṛtaṁ bhavatā yenedṛśīṁ daśāṁ anubhāvyase?

(Sītā lajjāṁ nātāyati.)

(N2:59) Sīta: bhaavaṁ, ke tumhe?
(bhagavan, ke yēyam?)
Vālmīki: vatse, śrīyātāṁ:

1)13 so 'haṁ ciran-tanasaṅkhe Janakasya rājīna, tātāsya te
Daśarathasya ca bālamitraṁ, Vālimūkṣa as-
mī. viśṛṣṭa sva-jana-pravāsā-duḥkhaṁ, tava-
ham abale śvaśuṛaḥ pitā ca.
Sītā: bhaavaṁ, paṭaṇāmīṁ.
(bhagavan, prānaṇāmīṁ.)
Vālmīki: vīra-praṇaśāvā bhava, bhartuṣ ca punardar-
am a vaśaṁi.
Sītā: ammō! varo jēva ma'e laddho tumaṇ loaśa Vammū, mama uṣa tādō jēva. tā āṣamaṇaṁ gacchhamā.
(parīkṛmātaṁ.)
Sītā (Gaṅgām vi lokēyājīlīṁ kṛtvā): bhaavaṁ Bhā-
radhi jadi ahaṁ soṭṭhiṅa gabbham nivattemī, tado dīne dīne sāṣaḥṭha-γuṃdhīdaṁ kundamaṇaṁ uvaḥraṇaṁ karaiśam.
(aho! vara eva maḥā labdhā. tvān lokasya Vālim-
kī, mama puṇas tāda eva. tad āṣamaṇaṁ gacchāvaḥ.
 bhagavati Bhāgpratāḥ, yady ahaṁ svastya gharbham ni-
vrtaṇvāyāṁ, tato dīne dīne svaḥastaguphitam kundamaṇaṁ upahāraṇaṁ kariśāyāṁ.)
Vālmīki: bhavatī, atyantavitiṣadūṣaṅcāro 'yaṁ mā-
N1:13v gaḥ, viśeṣatāṁ ca sāmpratam. yathā yatḥaṁ 'haṁ mārga
(nāhaṁ Sītā, bhagavan, maṇḍabhaṇginī.)
Vālmīki: hā hato 'ṣmi mandabhāgyaḥ. kiṃkṛto 'yaṁ 
atrebhavyatāṁ pravāsaḥ.

(Sītā lajjāṁ nātāyati.)
Vālmīki: kathāṁ! lajjate, bhavatu, yogacākṣuśāhām 
avalokayaṁi. (dhīyānam abhīniya) vatse, janāpaviva-
ruṇā Rāmeṇa kevalaṁ parītākta, na tu lṛdayena. ni-
aparādha tvam asmāḥ bhīṁ aparityāyaṁ āvīva. eḥy āṣrama-
padaṁ gacchāvaḥ.
Sītā: ko ṇu tumaṇ?
(ko nu tvam?)
Vālmīki: śrīyātāṁ:
so 'haṁ ciran-
tanasaṅkhe Janakasya rājīnas, tātāsya te
Daśarathasya ca bālamitraṁ. Vālimūkṣa as-
-mī. viśṛṣṭyājanābhiśaṅkāṁ, nānyas tava-
-yam abale śvaśuṛaḥ pitā ca.
Sītā: bhaavaṁ, vaṃḍāmī.
(bhagavan, vaṇḍe.)
Vālmīki: vīra-praṇasvā bhava, bhartuṣ ca punardar-
am āṇuḥi.
Sītā: tumaṇ loaśa Vammū, mama uṣa tādo eva. tā 
gacchhamḥa samaṇā� saṁsaṁsaṁpaṇaṁ. (Gaṅgām avalokēyā-
jjaliṁ baddhva) bhavaṁ Bhāraḥ sa navām soṭṭhiṅa gabbham 
aihiniuttām tadā tava dīne dīne saha-ṣṭha-
guṇṭhāṁ kundamaṅgaṁ uvaḥāraṁ karaiśam.
(tvaṁ lokasya Vālimūkṣa, mama puṇas tāda eva. tad 
gacchāvaḥ samam āṣramaṇaṁ. bhagavati Bhāgpratāḥ, ya-
-dy ahaṁ svastya gharbham aiṁhiniartiṁyāṁ tāda tava dīne 
dīne svaḥastaguphitāṁ kundamaṅgaṁ upaḥāraṁ kari-
śāyāṁ.)
Vālmīki: atyantadukkhaṇaṁ aśeṣaṁ 'yaṁ mārgaṁ, viśeṣa-
tas tvām prati. tad yathā yathā mārgam ādeśayāṁ tathā 
tathāḥam āṃguṇaṁvayaṁ. 93

92 bhāgyaṁ [N1, bhaṅga N2]
93 ayi [N1, avi N2]
94 jrenbhitaṁ [N1, jribhatam N2]
95 janāpavīd-[N1 N2c, janāda N2c]
96 āṣamaṇaṁ [N1, om. N2]
97 gacchāvaṁ em, gacchāmaṁ N1 N2
98 rājīnas [N1, rājīna N2
99 laddho [N1, lavo N1 N2
100 tumaṇ [N1, tumma N2
101 bhāradhi [N1, bhāgraddhi N2
102 trahavatāḥ [N1, mandabhāgyaḥ]
103 aṣṭaṁ śadā [N1, śadā N2c]
104 mha samaṇa [N1, sama N1 N2, saṁ DUTTA
105 bhāraḥ [T1, hāraḥ T2, bāra DUTTA
106 mha samam DUTTA
107 gaddhāṁ DUTTA
108 tathāḥam anugantaṁ DUTTA
109 gaddhāṁ DUTTA
110 tathāḥam anugantaṁ DUTTA
111 tathāḥam anugantaṁ DUTTA
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ādeśayāmi tathā tathā tvayāhaṃ anugantavyaḥ.

Śītā: jaṃ bhavaṃ śauvedi.
(yad bhagavān ājñāpayati.)

Vālmīkiḥ:

N2:60r *etasmin kuśakaṇṭa take laghutaraṇaṃ
nyāso nidheyo ‘grataḥ.
śākheyamyu vinatā, namasva śanakaiḥ.
śvabhro mahān vūmataḥ.
hastenāṃśa hastadakṣiṇagataṃ
sthaṇuṃ samaṃ sāṃpratam.
puṣye smin kamalākare caraṇayor
nirvartyatāṃ kṣālanam.

(Sūtā yathoktaṃ parikrāmati.)

Vālmīkiḥ (puro ‘valokyā): vate, paśyaitād āśramapada-
dam.
Iksvākūnāṃ ca sarvesvam
kriyā puṇpavanādikā
asamābhir eva kartavyāv.
mā śuco garbham ātmanāḥ.
apī ca,
Kausalyāpādāśuṛūṣā-
saukhyaṃ vṛddhāśu lapsyase.
paśya sakhyo bhaginyaṃ ca
tathātā munikanyakāḥ.

(itī niskrāntau.)

---

102śvabhro em., svabhro N1 N2
103-gaṭaṃ N1, *gata N2
104-puṣyey conj., puṣpe N1 N2
105-saukhyāṃ N1, saukhyāṃ N2
106-paśya N1 N2, pa N2
107-sakhyo The last available folio of N1 ends here.

108 N2 col.: iti Kundamālāṅko nāma saṃḍ[a]ḥbhāḥ samāptāḥ, kṛty itiṇy kaver Dhiranāgasya.

---

etasmu kuśakaṇṭa take laghutaraṇaṃ
pādaṃ nīdhatvāgrataḥ.
śākheyāṃ vinatā, namasva śanakair.
gartto mahān vūmataḥ.
hastenāṃśa tena dakṣiṇagataṃ
sthāṇuṃ samaṇaṃ sāṃpratam.
puṣye ’smin kamalākare caraṇayor
nirvartyatāṃ kṣālanam.

(Sūtā yathoktaṃ parikrāmati.)

Vālmīkiḥ (nirdīṣya): idam asmākam āśramapadam.
Iksvākūnāṃ ca sarvesvam
kriyā puṇpavanādāyah
asmābhir eva vartyante.
mā śuco garbham ātmanāḥ.

---

Kausalyāpādāśuṛūṣā-
saukhyaṃ vṛddhāśu lapsyase.
paśya sakhyo bhaginyaṃ ca
tavaitā munikanyakāḥ.

(itī niskrāntāḥ sarve.)

109pādaṇ DUTTA(T2?), pāda Τ1
110vartyante DUTTA, vārtyaṇe Τ1, patnyante T2
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Book announcements


Candrakīrti’s famous commentary on the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā of Nāgarjuna, the Prasannapadā, has been enjoying renewed attention in the past ten years or so. This attention has—fortunately—included efforts to improve upon the text of the editio princeps by Louis de La Vallée Poussin. Important manuscript material not used by the Belgian scholar was first reported on by Anne MacDonald in her paper ‘The Prasannapadā: More Manuscripts from Nepal’ (WZKS 44 (2000), pp. 165–181). MacDonald has continued to draw on this material, most notably in her doctoral dissertation of 2003 The Prasannapadā Chapter One: Editions and Translations, announced in WZKS 47 (2003), pp. 217–218, and currently being prepared for publication.

Re-editing the Prasannapadā is, however, too large a task for any one scholar to be able easily to undertake it. It is therefore good to see this volume, a revised version of a doctoral thesis submitted at the University of Copenhagen in 2003, in which a substantial part of Candrakīrti’s commentary on chapter 17 of the Mūlamadhyamakārikā (the karmaphalaparīkṣā: Analysis of Action and Result, as Kragh renders this title) has been re-edited (both the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation) with an English translation and commentary.

Kragh has had access to the Sanskrit manuscripts used by MacDonald, but has chosen not to collate those which she had concluded to be apographs of other accessible manuscripts. This has left five ‘significant’ manuscripts which have been used throughout for his edition of the Sanskrit. Two of the five are ones which have been microfilmed by the NGMPP, with reel-numbers E 1294/3 and C 19/8 respectively. The other three manuscripts used for the constitution of the Sanskrit text are also Nepalese, but are now located in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, in Cambridge University Library, and Tokyo University Library.

The edition of the Sanskrit makes use of color-printing (text portions for which there is a parallel being printed in red), and presents for each section the Sanskrit text, ‘Substantives’ (i.e. apparatus of substantive variants), ‘Accidentals’ (i.e. apparatus of accidental or non-substantive variants), ‘Parallels’ (mainly from other commentaries on the Mūlamadhyamakārikā preserved in Tibetan or Chinese translation), and ‘Notes’ (including both comments on editorial decisions and additional information on the evidence of the MSS, as well as other miscellaneous notes). The edition of the Tibetan translation looks a little more
conventional, with no use of color, but still contains, on each page, edited text, apparatus of substantives, apparatus of accidentals, and notes.

The Sanskrit text is said (p. 34) to aim at reflecting ‘the state of the text shortly before the earliest witness... corresponding to a 13th century edition of the text belonging to the Nevērī-reception’. For this the oldest manuscript, the 13th century palm-leaf manuscript now in the Bodleian Library, serves as ‘copy-text’. Its accidentals, including e.g. the scribe’s orthographical habits, have been preserved with some exceptions (see p. 43), which may give the text an appearance that is a little unfamiliar to those used to reading standardized modern editions. But even for those not much interested in the accidentals of a manuscript (though it be the oldest and best manuscript now available), Kragh’s edition of the Sanskrit of this section should prove of great interest for the substantive changes in the constituted text, as compared with the text of the editio princeps, and for the wealth of documentation of the manuscript readings, of parallels and of other relevant material.

The translation aims at being literal, and contains ‘an interspersed commentary discussing points of interest’ (p. 163). A convention that may be unfamiliar to many is that all the Sanskrit words are given in parenthesis after the corresponding English word or phrase ‘in order to facilitate easy comparison with the original text’.

Twelve pages (401–412) of the Index were omitted by mistake when the book was bound. To correct this oversight, a ‘brochure’ containing the entire Index (not bearing an independent ISBN number) has been issued by the Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, and is supplied together with the book.

An evaluation of Kragh’s work cannot be undertaken here, in what is after all an announcement rather than a review; but it can certainly be said that it will be very useful to those studying Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti, and should prove more widely of interest too. It is to be hoped that others will join Kragh and MacDonald in the task of re-editing the Prasannapadā on an improved manuscript basis.

(Harunaga Isaacson)
Some Highlights of the Work of a ‘Frequent User’ of the NGMPP (III) A new edition of Śivasvāmin’s Kapphinābhuyadaya

Michael HAHN (Marburg)

In the third installment of the report about my work with manuscripts from Nepal I would like to briefly describe a manuscript of unique importance, the oldest known manuscript of Śivasvāmin’s ‘great ornate epic’ or mahākāvyā “King Kapphinā’s Triumph” or Kapphinābhuyadaya. I have chosen this work because a new edition of this most challenging composition, accompanied by a facsimile edition of this precious manuscript (in colour and at its original size) has just been published in Kyoto:


This publication will enable interested colleagues to form their own opinion about the work and its textual basis, and to check whether my statement about the uniqueness of the manuscript is an exaggeration or not.

The basic facts about the Kapphinābhuyadaya, its content and its editorial history are given in the postscript to the reprint of the editio princeps (Śivasvāmin’s Kapphinābhuyadaya. The Exaltation of King Kapphina. Ed. with an introduction by GAURI SHANKAR with an appendix and romanized version of cantos i–viii and xix by MICHAEL HAHN. Delhi 1989) and also in my paper “Doctrinal and Poetry — Śivasvāmin’s Essentials of Buddhism. Text and translation of canto xx of his Kapphinābhuyadaya,” (Buddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ, Swisttal-Odendorf 1997, pp. 207–232. Indica et Tibetica. 30). Since both publications might not be within easy reach of all the readers of these lines, I would like to repeat them here, for the sake of convenience.

The Kapphinābhuyadaya is one of the few extant specimens of the mahākāvyā or ‘ornate epic’ genre composed in India during the first millennium of our common era. Leaving aside the linguistically less artistic compositions of Aśvaghosa (Buddhacarita, Saundarananda) and Kālidāsa (Kumārasaṁbhava, Rāghuvamśa), there are only five or six such works that we know of from this period: Kālidāsa’s Jānakīharana, Bhaavā’s Kīrātārjunīya, Māgha’s Śīsupālavadha, Ratnākara’s Haravijaya and Śivasvāmin’s work. Opinions are divided as to whether the Bhaṭṭikāvya is really a literary composition or just an exercise in grammar and aesthetics, ad usum delphini or, in Sanskrit, bālabodhānārtham.

Śivasvāmin’s poem is based on a story in the early Buddhist narrative work Avadānasataka. In section lxxxviii of the Avadānasataka it is narrated how king Kapphina from Southern India sends an insolent message to the rulers of the six cities, Śrāvasti and others, that they must submit to his rule. The rulers of those cities take refuge to the Buddha, who by a miracle converts king Kapphina.

From these meagre facts Śivasvāmin develops a new
and coherent story that permits him to fulfil the requirements of a sargabandha as defined in the alaṅkāraśāstras on the one hand, and insert many essentials of the Buddhist doctrine at suitable places on the other hand. The immediate target of king Kapphinā’s expansionism now becomes king Prasenajit, the ruler of Kośala and friend and protector of the Buddha, and the main plot is the careful preparation and execution of warfare. This seems to be conventional, were it not for the surprising conclusion of the poem: when king Kapphinā has almost defeated Prasenajit, the Buddha magically interferes and turns the tide, so that king Prasenajit wins. Kapphinā is so impressed by the Buddha’s power that he praises him and decides to become his follower. This is his triumph, success, or exaltation (abhidyutaya), and the moral of the poem is that there are more important things in life than military and political strength. It would not be wrong if one styled the Kapphinābhyudaya as a pacifist mahākāvya.

This is remarkable by itself, but even more remarkable is the fact that Śivasvāmin, the author of the poem, was not a Buddhist but a Śaiva. This is indeed a wonderful illustration of the often-praised Indian attitude of religious tolerance.

The poem consists of 1,130 stanzas which are divided into 20 cantos (sarga) of varying length. The stanzas are composed in 43 different metres, which is an unusually high number. Ten of the cantos (vi–xv) are rather static and descriptive, which is due to the given set of topics to be dealt with in a sargabandha. The main plot is advanced in the remaining ten cantos, two of which (xviii and xix) again have a more decorative function.

As for the literary qualities of the poem it might be too early to give a final assessment since we do not have any in-depth analysis of the complete work that is based on a reliable text. In my opinion, however, it does not fall behind Mañha’s Śiśupālavadha or Ratnakara’s Hara-vijaya, the artistic level being rather even higher. At the end of this communication I will quote a few stanzas that illustrate both aspects of the work, the artistic as well as the literary.

For more details I would like to point to GAURI SHANKAR’s introduction to his editio princeps, and also to A. K. WARDER’s analysis of the poem in vol. 5 of his Indian Kāvya Literature, Delhi 1988, pp. 171–194 (= §§ 3074–3122).

In 1937 the Indian scholar GAURI SHANKAR published the editio princeps of the work. Due to World War II and the subsequent partition of India, the book was not circulated widely, and for a long time I could not get hold of a copy although I was aware of its existence through references in other publications. Since I was primarily interested in unpublished works when in 1976 I began to search systematically for the remnants of the literary creations of Indian Buddhism, I wrongly classified the work as ‘less important’ for my purposes and refrained from making specific efforts to get a copy, e.g. from London, Oxford, or Cambridge. The situation did not change even after, in 1981, I had obtained, in exchange for copies of another important Buddhist work, excellent black and white photographs of the 18 folios of the work from Ryūkoku University.

Six years later coincidence played a decisive role. In March 1987 I was on another brief search tour through India, looking for Indian and Tibetan Buddhist works kept at some rather remote or unlikely places. One of my destinations was the Adyar Library in Madras. After finishing my work half a day earlier than anticipated, I tried to make the best possible use of my time by going through those journals which at that time were not available at my former institute at the University of Bonn. One of them was the Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, and there I found in the latest issue a paper [see plate 1] by GAURI SHANKAR in which he wrote about his edition of the Kapphinābhyudaya, the content of the work, the sad fate of his book and the lack of interest it had met with.

This made me curious, and a little later I could avail myself of a copy of the rare publication. I found that it

Plate 1: GAURI SHANKAR on Kapphinābhyudaya
is a beautifully produced book and that it had appeared in the same series in which also Johnston’s definitive edition of Āsvaghosa’s Buddhacarita was published only one year earlier. From its introduction I learnt that the edition was based on three manuscripts: two from the Government Oriental Manuscript Library in Madras and one from Kathmandu, which was at that time in private possession. While the two manuscripts from Madras—one of them being a palm-leaf manuscript in the Urdu script, the other the Devanāgarī transcript of a lost original again written in the Urdu script—are complete as manuscripts, they are nevertheless lacking large portions of the text. The manuscript from Kathmandu was incomplete with 22 of its originally 56 folios (one of them being a sorted-out leaf) missing. The extant portions, however, contained a text that was obviously complete and of much superior quality. Although Gauri Shankar’s book contains a facsimile reproduction of its last page, the edition is based not on the manuscript itself (or photographs of it) but on a modern transcript.

Back in Germany, I immediately realised that the 18 leaves in Kyōto were part of those 22 folios that are missing in the manuscript from Kathmandu. I compared the text of the first eight cantos, which had suffered most from the absence of the Nepalese manuscript, and found that 1) all the gaps in the editio princeps could be closed; 2) for all the passages marked by an asterisk as corrupt or unintelligible by Gauri Shankar a meaningful text could be restored; 3) in many other places a much better text could be presented.

These observations eventually led to the reprint of the editio princeps, in a postscript to which I presented an improved—not final—text of cantos i through viii and a text of canto xix in which the two languages, Sanskrit and Prakrit, are separated for the first time. I also gave the readings of manuscript N for all those places where the editio princeps has gaps or asterisks. In the introductory portion I tried to illustrate the superiority of N by selected examples. The reprint appeared in Delhi from Aditya Prakashan at the end of 1988 while I was there, on my way to the All India Oriental Conference in Vizianagaram. It was an extremely great pleasure for me that I could hand over the first copies of the book to Gauri Shankar himself. I had been able to trace him in Delhi where he was living with his youngest daughter, a medical doctor. At that time he was 89 years old and of poor eyesight, but nevertheless he had been waiting for our arrival outside for almost half a day, as his daughter told me.

Of particular importance was the discovery of a second palm-leaf manuscript of the Kapphinābhuyudaya among the manuscripts microfilmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, which I designated N2 [see plate 2 on page 28]. According to its colophon, this manuscript is much younger than N, whose script points to the 11th century CE. However it is completely preserved, and of much better quality than M and M3. It is of utmost importance in all those places where N is not available, either because of the complete loss of a folio or physical damage of the extant folios. Because of its close agreement with N, I came to the conclusion that N2 is merely a copy of N, done at a time when N was still complete. With regard to this point I am no longer so sure, because there is also substantial counter-evidence, e.g., correct or complete text where N is faulty or incomplete. These cases are indicated in the critical apparatus of the edited text.

Returning to N, however, its most remarkable feature is the elaborate marking system used by the scribe. It consists of small commas, double commas or dots that are used and placed quite differently. In most cases single commas are used, which are placed at the bottom line, and their function is to separate words. If the end of a word happens to be within a conjunct letter, the single comma is placed at a suitable place below or within the conjunct letter. In the case of vowel sandhi as in nāstīha, the single comma is placed below (or above) the respective vowel sign. Only the end of a stanza is usually marked by a double comma.

In the case of the linguistically more refined stanzas, the parts of a compound may also be separated. As a rule, this is done by tiny dots placed at half height between bottom and the horizontal line on top of the aksaras. The more difficult the stanza is, the more detailed and elaborate the marking system becomes. The tiny dot may then be replaced by a single comma, and the single comma by a double comma. The separation of words can be extremely analytic, marking as a separate entity even the alpha privativum a-, a prefix like sam-, or a suffix like -tā.

The value of these marks cannot be overestimated, since they are a kind of commentary in a nutshell. While it is clear that many of the separations can be found independently by an intelligent reader who is familiar with...
the subject matter and the peculiarities of citrakāywa, this does not hold true for the more challenging portions of the poem, in particular cantos vi, xviii, and xix.

Canto vi, the Parvatavarāna is an exercise in the various types of yamaka; canto xviii, the Citrayuddhavarāna, is the usual presentation of all types of saūdālopkāras, including Śivasvāmin’s own innovations; and canto xix, the Sambuddhābhīṣṭava, is the famous bilingual praise of the Fully Enlightened Buddha, in which all its 45 stantras allow two different separations: the first produces a meaningful Sanskrit text, the second a meaningful Prakrit text.

This is the more difficult variety of the bhāṣaśāleśa. In all these three cantos the difficulties are so extreme that only occasionally one is able to find the solution, which the author seems to have had in his mind. The reader who doubts the truth of this statement is invited to present his interpretation of stanzas vi.43–77, where the readings and separations of N are not available because of the loss of folios 15 and 16.

I would like now to illustrate the value of N by two examples. The first is a simple one. Stanza 16.9 runs as follows in the editio princeps:

ārya-loko ṭeka-ḥāsaṣ ca
yatra tulyaḥ mahātapaḥ || balimbhaḥo ṭha kavyaḥ
samajya sandhimatsaṛāḥ* ||9 ||

By the asterisk GAURI SHANKAR indicates that the last compound (or the whole stanza) is not clear to him. The stanza is part of the description of King Prasenajit’s royal residence Śravasti, so yatra refers to it. In its second half something is stated about its environment (bhāmbhāgao) and poets (kavyaḥ). In connection with poets the mention of samajya “(poetical) conventions” and sandhi, here to be understood as “junction,” as in a drama, does not seem to be out of place. The construction of the stanza, however, remains unclear. Consultation of N revealed the following text and separation:

ārya(ā→)aloka , ṭekaḥāsaṣ ca ,
yatra , tulyaḥ , mahātapaḥ , || bhāmbhāgao , ṭha , kavyaḥ , samajyaḥsan , vimat-saṛāḥ ,, ||9a||

It has to be admitted that in the conjunct letter nṛ it is almost impossible to decide whether the second consonant is va or dha. It was only the intended pun that helped me to identify the second part as va. In a very ingenious manner Śivasvāmin twice attributes common properties to two subjects, the first of which is in the singular, while the second is in the plural: āryaloko “noble people” and arkhabhās-as “the rays (or the splendour) of the sun” in the first case, and bhāmbhāgao “surroundings, environs” and kavyaḥ “poets” in the second. Hence he has to choose the attributes in such a way that they can be interpreted both as singular and plural. In the first case the common attribute is mahātapaḥ which can be interpreted as mahā + tapaḥ “great in austerities,” nom. sing. masc. of “tapas as final member of a bahuvrīhi compound, and likewise as mahā + aṭapaḥ “possessing great heat, splendour,” as nom. pl. fem., referring to “bhās-as. In the second case the attribute is vimatsaṛāḥ, which is to be interpreted as vi-mat-saṛāḥ “endowed with lakes rich in birds” when referring to bhāmbhāgao, and as vi-matsaṛāḥ “free of jealousy” when referring to kavyaḥ “poets.” Once the stanza is correctly interpreted, it seems quite simple. However, without proper marking and given the ambiguity of certain letters, the reader can easily be led astray.

The second illustration is the first stanza of canto xix, the bilingual canto. Written in devanāgarī and without any separation of words it looks as follows:

अहतोसावुद्धेष्यते:ष्टमितथ्योध्विबाकवया।
पुरिसवरेणक्षमतैन्तुरांत्तलोभामवः।

By inserting spaces, hyphens and avagrahas, for the sake of clarification, we can extract the following Sanskrit text:

a-hato ’sāv ud-dhoruṇa-vahe ’pa-hūṭaṃ mitho ’va-dhīreṇa ||
puri sa vareṇa kham amṣe durād udho ’sabhāsa hi ||1a ||

“He [i.e. the Buddha] is unsurpassed in again setting in motion him [who has been] humiliated by invectives [by his adversary, i.e. Kapphinā].

He [i.e. Prasenajit] was carried by the most excellent one in the city [i.e. the Buddha], whose splendour is incomparable, far up into the sky on his shoulders.”

In other words: the Buddha has rescued king Prasenajit when he was already on the verge of losing the battle, thus making him the victor.

A second separation of words is possible which yields the following Prakrit text:

aha toṣa vuddho raṇa-vahe pahū tāṃmi thov-adhīreṇa ||
puris-va[r]eṇa kham-anṃe durā dūdha sa-bhāsaḥi ||1b ||

“The Lord Buddha became strengthened [in his reputation] by the best among men [i.e. king Kapphiṇā] who in the battle-course had shown only little
power,
on account of his contentment, by his own words.”

In other words: king Kapphin, although having lost the battle, became so impressed by the Buddha’s miraculous power that he praised him excessively, thereby further increasing his reputation in the world. A Sanskrit chṛṣṭa of the Prakrit text could run as follows:

atha buddhah. prabhuh. tasmin ran. a-vadhe stoka-dhṛīren. a
purus.a-varen. a tos.¯ at sva-bh¯ as.¯ abhih. ks.am¯ am. ´ se d¯ ur¯ ad
dhr. ˙ nhitah.

In the manuscript the stanza looks as follows:

In order not to create a wrong picture I would like now to quote some “ordinary,” i.e. less artificial, stanzas which show Śīvasvāmin’s skill in effortlessly embellishing the meaning of a stanza, which is his primary concern, by moderate puns. This is how in canto xx he versifies the well-known formula of dependent origination:

sam. sk¯ ar¯ an. ¯ am.
sth¯ ama vidy¯ ad
avidy¯ am.
sam. vittyai
tan¯ am.

One should know that ignorance is the cause of the predispositions; they are sufficient (to produce) perception which (in turn produces) name and form; therefrom arises the form which relates to the six organs of the senses; from the contact with them contact comes into being.

spar´ satah. spar´ sa
¯ avedy¯ a vedan¯ a
sop¯ ad¯ an¯ ad
bhavo

Sensation is to be known (as originating) from contact, and desire (originates) therefrom; this desire is the reason that grasping comes into being; from grasping being is produced, which (in turn produces) old age and the other forms of sorrow.

The attentive reader will notice how skilfully several terms (or syllables) are used twice: in a technical and in a non-technical sense:

a) vidyād — avidyām — saṃvittaya
b) rūpāya — rūpam
c) āyatanyam — tanyeta
d) sparsātah sparsā
e) āvedyā vedanā
f) sopādana — “nidānam

Other beautiful stanzas in this canto are:

arhām arhātvasya manye tavāmūm
mārtiṃ mārtyo ’smīti mā mānya māṃsthaih ||
śrīmattām tām vāksyato mokṣa-gantrīṇī
gantar bhaṅgam rājatā rājate kim ||12 ||

I think that this body of yours deserves the status of an arhat.

Worthy one, do not think that you are an (ordinary) mortal being!

Does sovereignty, which is bound to be destroyed, shine for him who will possess that splendour which leads to liberation?

dhanvin dhinvan punya-paṇyam pusāṇa
dvesyaṃ dvesonmeṣam uṣṇaṃ muṣṭaṇa ||
dhi-kalūṣyaṃ kānti-koṣaṃ kuṣāṇa
śrē yo hy agre dharma-nimna-kriyāṇāṃ ||39 ||

Bowman, delightfully exhibit the merchandise ‘merit’ and passionately remove the despicable arising of hatred, tear out the impurity of mind which is a storehouse of desire, because bliss lies in front of those deeds which are bent towards the dharma.

In canto viii, which contains the description of the six seasons, Śīvasvāmin uses the same device that was used by Māgha in canto vi of his Śīṣupāladhva (in imitation, in turn, of canto ix of the Raghuvamśa, in the first part of which, containing a description of Spring, Kālidāsa had also used it): a yamaka of three syllables in the last line of each verse. Whenever the season changes, Śīvasvāmin has this yamaka in all the four lines. Here are a few specimens:

tapati tīvrataraṇaṃ taraṇau tatha
vyadhita candraka-cakram asau tatam ||
nahi yathā paritāpā-kari raveḥ
kara-kalā’pi kalāpinam āvīṣat ||18 ||

18. When the sun was shining with a scorching heat the peacock expanded the wheel of his tail feathers so that not even a few of the rays of the sun could penetrate to cause him pain.

Here the unvoiced and unaspirated velar and dental stops acoustically underline the scorching heat of the sun. And the minuteness of the particles of the rays of the sun that are warded off by the tail-feathers of the peacock is aptly illustrated by the sequence of short syllables in karakalā.
phala-parigraha-pūrṇa-manonrathā
na gaṇayanti hi kāṁ api dhūṣhataṁ ||
yad avahān sudrśo na śucu klandaṁ
priya-sahāya-sahāva-somāgamāṁ ||21 ||

21. Those whose desires have been fulfilled by the attainment of a desired object
do not pay attention to any form of distress—
this is why the women with the beautiful eyes
did not become exhausted during the hot season
when they wantonly united with their beloved ones.

Here the labials in the first line have a softening effect that
covers well with the content and sound of duḥṣhataṁ,
and the sequence sahā — sahā — samā in line d) produces
a very mellifluous internal rhyme.

25. The cloth of clouds, that was wet with their water
and was very cooling for all the directions,
which were suffering from the exhaustion
of the strong and dreadful heat
that is produced in the scorching hot season,
spread an all-embracing cover against the undesir-
able heat.

Here the heaviness of the summer-heat is illustrated by the
accumulation of velars in line a). The scorching heat
of the summer is again underlined by the accumulation
of voiceless dentals in line d). The image of the clouds
compared to a wet piece of cloth is very ingenious.

31. The dark clouds, resting on the top of the mountain,
were behaving like she-buffaloes
as they emitted tongue-like quivers of lightning
in the pond that is the sky, filled with red water-
lilies, the masses of stars.

The well-known comparison of a dark rain-cloud with a
she-buffalo is expanded to a charming picture with the sky
as a lake, the stars as red water-lilies and the lightning
bolts as the tongues of the she-buffaloes. Despite the
yamaka, the language is remarkably simple.

33. “He always sits around, neglecting (even) the most beautiful women.
Alas, how extremely great is his stupidity!”
Thus man was gently derided by the clouds
whose teeth are formed by rows of lovely herons.

Here the simple and nice image with the white herons as
the teeth of the clouds, deriding a simpleton, has been
enriched in an unobtrusive manner by a second yamaka
in the first line.

35. “You will die straightaway, if you become angry (with your beloved).”
As if addressed in this way,
with a threat from the roaring cloud,
the woman pressed herself firmly against her beloved.

Here the threatening of the roaring thunder-cloud is aptly
underlined by the triple repetition of stana- in line c) and
its harshness by the triple sound ṛa.

44. The parrots, eager to collect grains of rice,
hearing the sound of the rice-women’s bracelets
that glitter and bend to the pleasant beat (of their songs),
cautiously roved around the ground
that was torn up (lit. ‘castigated’) everywhere by the harvesters.

This is a particularly elegant stanza, in which the nerv-
ous hopping of the parrots, searching for grain while the
harvesters are still reaping the fields, is underlined by the
frequent palatals, whereas the repeated ṛa reflects the soft
ringing of the bracelets of the women in the field.

55. The cold season was tormenting,
turning the sky white by masses of very bright
snow-flakes.
The sky, windless and bearing the moon at its head,
was adorned with the constellation of the Pleiades,
(and relying on the desired humidity
that comes from the mouth of Kārttikeya.)
Although the stanza is not fully clear to me (cf. the translation), I quote it here mainly because of the nice linguistic joke of separating *atibhairawam—as everybody would read the text, I am sure—in *atibhair (from *ati-bha-“having excessive splendour”), qualifying *prasarair, and *avam (from *a-va- “without wind, windless), qualifying *gaganam. Without the marking system of N this would certainly have escaped my attention.

bhūrūṇā vinā samabhavat sarasām himena
kam petuṣāram arutis varam-bhāsaḥ ||
tīresu cāvalata vāti kṛtādvānaṁ-
kampe tuṣāra-marutis v rasan na bhāsaḥ \|59 \|

59. The water of the ponds became soundless without the bees, whose splendour lies in their voices, and who left because the snow had fallen down in great quantities.

The splendour (of the ponds) was not as lovely as usual when the cold wind at their banks made the wayfarers shiver.

This very difficult *yogmapādayamaka would also have remained unintelligible for me without the separation marks in N.

The new edition is based on the following three manuscripts all of which originate from Nepal:

National Archives, Kathmandu, Nepal  
Available folios: 2, 3, 22–25, 27–35, 37–55; in all 34 folios  
Inventory number: ca 213, Subject: kāvyam 2  
Size: 30 by 5.5 cm  
Date: undated. The script alone does not permit one to recognize the marking system.

The following four folios are completely lost: 15, 16, 26, 35. The following folios are damaged (with loss of text): 1b, 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b, 9a, 9b, 10a, 10b, 11a, 11b, 12a, 12b, 13a, 13b, 14a, 14b, 17a, 17b, 18a, 18b, 19a, 19b, 20a, 20b, 21a, 21b, 22a, 22b, 23a, 23b, 24a, 24b, 25a, 25b, 42a (water damage), 42b (water damage), 54a, 54b, 55a.

The total loss of texts on the damaged pages amounts to approximately 1\frac{1}{7} pages.

Apart from the page numbers marked by bold face, there is usually only minor loss of text. In comparison with the leaves now kept in Kyōto, the leaves that remained in Nepal have suffered comparatively little.

The total loss of text on the missing and damaged pages amounts to c. 8.65 per cent.

The younger Nepalese manuscript N2  
The second most important manuscript of the *Kapphinābbhudyāya is another palm leaf manuscript from Kathmandu which became accessible through the work of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project.

Number of folios: 113 (complete)  
Inventory number: ca 1668 / Subject: kāvyam 3  
Size: 23 by 4.5 cm  
Date: according to the colophon, the copying was finished Thursday, June 25, 1528 (courtesy of Dr. Karl-Heinz Golzio, Bonn)  
Reel number: B 18/14 Siglum: N2

So far only two cantos of Śivasvāmin poem have been translated into a Western language: canto xx in my paper “Doctrine and Poetry” (see above), and canto viii in the new edition of the *Kapphinābbhudyāya, pp. [29]–[48]. Between 1993 and 1995 I have prepared the still very imperfect draft of a translation of the whole poem except cantos vi, xviii, and xix, for reasons given above. My plan for the future is to finalize the translation of two or three cantos every year, in close comparison with the works of Śivasvāmin’s predecessors, on the basis of the new edition, so that the task should be completed within
the next 5-6 years. I am optimistic that at least the level
of the two aforementioned translations can be maintained.
The translation will inevitably lead to a number of correc-
tions of the text, as in the preceding cases. I also intend
to publish a Devanāgarī edition of the poem so as to make
it more accessible to our Indian colleagues.

There is some trustworthy information that a Sanskrit
commentary on the Kapphinābhudaya has survived in
Tibet. Should this be true, and should access be given
to it within a reasonable span of time, this would cut
short a lot of unnecessary speculations in connection with
many difficult or uncertain portions of the work. One would
straightaway begin to establish that recension of the Ka-
pphinābhudaya as commented upon in the commentary.
It is not improbable that such a commentary was also con-
sulted by the scribe of N who, on its basis, corrected his
copy and inserted the marking system. Even if the scribe
had received the interpretation of the poem only orally,
his teacher (or teacher’s teacher) must have relied on a
work of a related nature. It goes without saying that the
study of the commentary will be greatly facilitated by the
present publication, because the editor of the commentary
will have at his disposal a largely reliable text.

I am not sure whether I am the most suitable editor
of this challenging poem since the mahākāavya genre is
not the centre of my scientific and literary interests. Per-
sonally I am more attracted by the early phase of clas-
cical Sanskrit literature marked by names like Aśvagoṣa,
Mātrēṣṭa, Kumāralāṭa, Aṛyasūra, Haribhaṭṭa, or Candra-
gomin. However, I am also a great admirer of the in-
credible skill with which the later authors handle the
Sanskrit language and I like to solve puzzles and rid-
dles. This is the reason why I find minor works like
Jñānaśīrṣita’s Vīttamālāstuti or Ratnaraśānti’s Vi-
dagdhavismāpana also interesting, at least as a kind of
pastime. Śivasvāmin’s Kapphinābhudaya is certainly a
much more important contribution to the mature phase —
“the bold style” — of classical Sanskrit literature. Since
there seems to be a strange lack of interest on the part of
our Indian colleagues to go beyond the text as established
by GAURI SHANKAR, despite the fact that the newly dis-
covered source material permits us to do this, I felt obliged
to make an improved text accessible in the hope that it
will not meet with the same negligence as did the editio
princeps.
Plate 3: Folios 1b and 2a of N2