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(Tokyo University), a new contributor, presents a note on the Mr̥t̥asugatiniyōjana of Śūnyasamādhiyajra, an as yet unpublished Buddhist tantric work dealing with the rites for the departed.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 Dezsó gives us the second half of his parallel edition of the first act of the Kūndamālā in the Nepalese and the South Indian recension. His work demonstrates the importance of Nepalese manuscripts of nāṭaka, 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 Dezsó 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 Kapphīṇābhyudaya, 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 Paṇhavāyaraṇa/Praśnavyakaraṇa 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.\(^2\)

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.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) As far as I know, two other Buddhist Tantric texts surviving in Sanskrit contain prescriptions for funerals. One is Padmaśrīmitra’s Maṇḍalopāyikā, the system of which, according to the author, is (like the Mr̥SuNi) based on the Guhyasamājatantra. (PaŚrMiMa-Up: praṇamya sarvābhāvena vajrācyoṣum mahāgarum | manḍalopāyikāṃ vasye śrīsamājinoṣaṇātah || (f.1v1)). He also quotes several verses from the Catuśṭīṭhataṅkura. The author devotes the last section, Antasthitakarmoḍdeśa, to the prescriptions of the funeral (ff.15v8–15v11). The codex unicus is preserved in the Tokyo University Library, and there is no known Tibetan translation of this text. The other is the Aćāryakriyāsaṅcāya of Darpaṇācārya or Jagaddarpaṇa. Darpaṇācārya devotes the last section, Nirvṛtta-vrācāryanavaśīṣṭakāśaṅvadhi, to the prescriptions of the funeral (MS S ff.240v7–244v4 (= 480.7–488.4)). For the text of the funeral rites of the Aćāryakriyāsaṅcāya 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 Morihuchi (1989: 102, MS No. 431) report this manuscript. I had not been aware of the descriptions of the Kathmandu manuscript in these two sources.

\(^4\) For variations of the author’s name see footnotes\(^7\) and\(^9\) below.
This is more or less supported also by the Tibetan translation9 of the MrSuNi. According to the Deb ther sion po, Śūnyasamādhiḥavajra (or rather Śūnyatāsamādhiḥavajra?) is another name of Devākaraṇḍa (probably a corruption of Divākaraṇḍa) who was one of the four great disciples of Advayavāraṇḍa (Maitrīpa) (Röerich 1988: 392ff., 842). However the guru lineage mentioned in the second from the last verse of the MrSuNi 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 Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatrantra (SaDuPaTa). The same line is also mentioned in the colophon of the Tattvajñānasamāsthīḍhi (TaJiāSaṃ).10

It is unclear who this Bhadrapāda is. Theoretically, the honorific title of a master whose name ends with -bhadrā can be Bhadrapāda. As stated above, according to the Deb ther sion po, Śūnyasamādhiḥavajra was a disciple of Advayavāraṇḍa. The well-known honorific titles of Advayavāraṇḍa are, however, Avadhūtapāda and Maitrīpa. It should be noted that the colophon of the TaJiāSaṃ has several variant readings and in the colophon of one of the Tokyo University manuscripts of the TaJiāSaṃ Śūnyasamādhiḥavajra has the title Avadhūta.11 Kuḍḍalapāda mentions his master Bhadrapāda in several places in his Acintyādvayakramopadeśa (AcAdKraUp). He also mentions the guru lineage from Paramās down to him12. It is, however, unclear who this Bhadrapāda is and whether or not this Bhadrapāda might be another work of Śūnyasamādhiḥavajra, which teaches the practices concerning Vajravārāhi cult.

MrSuNi: śīrbhadrapādāpamdād asādya mahopadeśan13 antyēṣṭaḥ || kṛtasy antyēṣṭividhānān14 śīryāsasamāyatanitye- 

dam || yac chīryāsasamāyān na pūryate karma tasya paryāparyā.15 śīryāmaddārtyāsodhanatrotaktaḥ by āśritām 

tarma || (MS T f. 9r1–3, MS N f. 11r5–11v2) TaJiāSaṃ colophon: kṛtīyām acāryamānyajugosādhitācāryayā- 

bhadrāpādāpānaṇjaparāpāragraṇaṇayaṇaṁ16 paṇid- 

taśīryāsasamādhipādānām (SEd p. 63, ll. 22–23)

9mahopadeśan] N; mahopadesan T
10antyēṣṭaḥ corr.; antyēṣṭḥ T N
11antyēṣṭividhānān] corr.; antyēṣṭvidhānān T N
12chīryāsasamāyān na pūryate] T; chīryāsasamāyān pūryate N
13parīpūrye] T; parīpūryai N
14śodhana] N; parśodhana T
15praṇayiṇaṁ] em. following the variant reading reported in BBK p. 277; “praṇayita” SEd
16See also footnote 11.
identical with the master of Śūnyasamādhi-vajra. The famous Bhadrapāda who has a close relation to the Guhyasamājatantra (GuSaTa), on which the MrSuNi is based, is Dipaṅkarabhadra.\textsuperscript{19} It seems implausible that the master of Śūnyasamādhi-vajra could be the relatively early Dipaṅkarabhadra. But it is interesting to note that the colophon of the TaJñSaṃ quoted above might be interpreted as referring to a master (ācārya) Mañjughoṣa as Bhadrapāda’s teacher. According to tradition, Mañjuśrī revealed the secret teachings of the GuSaTa to Dipaṅkarabhadra’s teacher, Buddhasrījāna (Jñānapāda), after which the latter founded the Jñānapāda 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 ācārya is not correct.\textsuperscript{20}

The MrSuNi is a mixture of verse and prose. In the verse parts the author uses the ārya metre. In the TaJñSaṃ, the author displays greater metrical variety, using indravajrā, upajāti, vasanatālaka, vaṇṇāsthavira, indra-vanmā, sārūlauśvīra, sragdhara, and ārya. Of these ārya is employed most frequently.\textsuperscript{21}

As clearly stated by Śūnyasamādhi-vajra in the two verses of the MrSuNi quoted above, the mantra-visualization system of the GuSaTa is employed in the verses of the Mr.SuNi quoted above, the mantra-visualization method taught in the GuSaTa, provided into two main parts. The former is the Yoga of the Kathmandu valley. Thus the content of the manual is directive scripture for funeral rites as performed in the modern Mr.SuNi. He states also that this was supplemented by the visualisation-system of the GuSaTa is employed in the verses of the Mr.SuNi quoted above, the mantra-visualization method taught elsewhere in this Jñāna, and in the Jñāna part, which is to be interpreted as referring to a master (ācārya) Mañjughoṣa instead of an ācārya. Mañjughoṣa is a name of a deity, and that the reading in which he is called an ācārya is not correct. 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 Ācāryakriyāsāmanucayya (ĀcKrSa). As has been pointed out in several publications, Darpanācārya drew on various texts in writing the ĀcKrSa. The last section also has the source text.\textsuperscript{22} There are a number of manuscripts of the ĀcKrSa 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.

\textbf{References}

\textbf{Primary Sources}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{22}Probably these rites (asthāyāditādāna etc.) are based on the SaDuPaTa. S\textsc{Ed} p. 176, ll. 16–26, T\textsc{Ed} (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 asthāyāditādāna are taught on p. 180, ll. 6–20 of S\textsc{Ed}).

\textsuperscript{23}See also footnote\textsuperscript{1} The opening line of the relevant section of the ĀcKrSa might imply the direction of burning: adhunā pari-nirvāyavājraśārāmavāpyaśārayaṃ nityaṣṭi (em.; “nityaṣṭi MS S) vidhir ucya-te... pranayaṃ tasaṃkhyāyāṃ (em.; tasaṃkhyāyā MS S) ... (MS S l. 240b7 (= 480.7)). It is odd that the maṇḍala, 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.

\textsuperscript{19}E.g. Sakurai points out that probably most of the prescription of abhīṣeka in the ĀcKrSa is a borrowing from Abhayākaragupta’s Vajrāvali (1996: 33). Tanaka points out that the ĀcKrSa drew on Nigabodhi’s Guhyaśāmanjusa-prakāśikavimarsadvatīrtha (2003: 153). I have pointed out that the ĀcKrSa borrows most of the pratīṣṭha section from the Vajrāvali (Tanemura 2004b: 96), and that some verses in the vāstunāga section of the ĀcKrSa are almost identical with those in Tathāgatavajra’s Saṃvaramāndalavigī, which is preserved in the Tibetan canon (Toh. 1511, Ota. 2226) (Tanemura 2002: 571–572, Notes 27, 28).

\textsuperscript{18}E.g. Brough edited (or rather transcribed) a part of a manuscript written by Asaṭānanda 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 (sāṃyutānitya). 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 ĀcKrSa, the MrSuNi might have offered a framework for funeral rites to the Buddhism of the Kathmandu Valley via the ĀcKrSa. I thank Iain Sinclair for drawing my attention to the article of Brough.
 SECONDARY SOURCES


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 Kundamāla. 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 bhāadheo? (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 Lakṣmaṇa’s request Sītā agrees to send a message back to her cruel (nīthhro) husband, but she is still reluctant to reproach him. “Is your majesty not capable of even this much?”, asks Lakṣmaṇa, 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
If we suppose that Sītā 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.

Another telling detail is the name by which Sītā 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 Sītā 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.” When her friend asks her how she knows another man’s heart, Sītā replies: “How could his heart belong to someone else than Sītā?” Vālmīki also assures Sītā in the first act that Rāma did assure Sītā that Rāma’s heart remains with her, but he has not abandoned her in his heart, and the vidiṣāsaka, who knows the feelings of his friend, confirms the same when he says that Rāma holds the earth with his arms and the earth’s daughter in his heart.

Considering all this one would expect Laksman.ā will be more logical. That she resented the way Rāma had treated her is shown e.g. in Act Three when she speaks: “Perhaps [he has expelled you] even from the country?”

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 Laksmana as follows: “The chariot has stopped, sir. Her majesty may alight.” 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 Laksmana’s mouth, since, as he remarks, “Sumantra does not appear to converse directly with Sītā in the drama.” Sumantra, however, does not necessarily address Sītā in the Southern manuscripts. Though the vocative āyuṣman is missing from M2 and T1, he might nevertheless speak to Laksmana, as he does in the Nepalese recension. Therefore one might consider accepting the reading of M2: “SUMANTRAH (rājvākāraṇam abhīniyuḥ): ēṣa sthito rathah. tad avataraṇu devi.”

A few lines below Sumantra says “yad ājnāpayati de-vah” to Laksmana in the Southern recension, which is, as Dutta rightly points out, “undoubtedly inappropriate in this context”. The Nepalese MSS have a better reading again: “yathājñāpayati”.

In his sölloquy Laksmana recalls Rāma’s words with which he entrusted his brother with the thankless task of abandoning Sītā in the forest. In the Nepalese recension Rāma appears to be more aloof than in the Southern one when he says: “Dear Laksmana, it’s rumored that Sītā’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.”

Even from the country? The reading of the Nepalese MSS (grhāt prati grhaṁ nāma kathām janapadaṁ 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 grhaṁ to pati grhaṁ but the sentence would still remain problematic. Further, more drastic emendation could result in the following: kathām pati grhaṁ nāma? “How [could he] possibly [expel you] from the husband’s house?”

---

4 na jatam tava nirvaraham Sīdham hiādo nirvāsīdham kim ya vsaado tī. This reading follows the Tanjore ms with conjectural emendations. The beginning of the sentence (na jatam tava), however, seems to be the same in the Mysore ms.

5 Act Three, 11+., Dutta’s ed. p. 41.


7 Act Two, Dutta’s ed. p. 29: aha sarīreṇa, na paṇa hīreṇa.

8Ibid.: kahaṁ tassa hīreṇa Sīdhe parakeṇaḥ bhavissadi?

927+ vata, janāpavādabhūnā mahārajena tvam tyaktāsi, na tu hṛdayaṇa.

10 Act Five, Dutta’s ed. p. 71: ede āśaṃṣakajayo puredarah-bharavahavanajagaripassaeu, via mahāvarvamizgamamutikālava-cchenā naḥ pṛṇadhāram uvaḥmaṇti, tatha tākam kāvyaṇe sa ṛdāvahām hīreṇa pūdhāvihudharām uvaḥmaṇo adisagarau saṃvuttvo tī. (One might consider emending to saṃvuttvo tī.)

11 saṃdēśavyam āṛyaṇa na kīm cid api saṃdēṣaṁ.

12 saṃdēśavyam āṛyaṇa saṃdēṣaṁ.

13 āṛya nirvāśita nāma hṛdayāt prabhāvīṇuṇa |
When Lakṣmaṇa makes up his mind to convey Rāma’s decision to Śītā he introduces the bad news with the following words in the Nepalese MSS: “Now I, Lakṣmaṇa, 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.”

In verse 7 Lakṣmaṇa is hardly able to tell Śītā it is her exile that Rāma ordered. “Words stuck in my throat”, kanṭhaṁ badhṇāti bhaṁrāti, he says in the Nepalese recension, an idiom comparable with e.g. the definition of astringent flavour in the Śuṣrutasaṁhīta (1.42.9: yo vaktṛna parīsāyaṁ, jīvaṁ stambhaṁyati, kanṭhaṁ badhṇāti, hṛdayam kārsati pādyati ca sa kaśyayeḥ). The Southern MSS read granthiṁ badhṇāti bhaṁrāti, “the words tie a knot”, which we have to fill out by understanding “in my throat”.

In verse 9 Lakṣmaṇa repeats the terrible news to Śītā 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 irrevocability of Rāma’s decision and Lakṣmaṇa’s sympathy for Śītā. In the Southern recension Lakṣmaṇa says: “It seems (kila) 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 Śītā, which suits less well Lakṣmaṇa’s general attitude.

Śītā swoons when she learns that Lakṣmaṇa is about to leave her alone in the forest. In both recensions the breeze revives her (vyanamārutena in the Nepalese MSS, mṛdunānilena in the Southern ones), but while in the Nepalese recension she regains consciousness in one step and the wind becomes the means of her samāśīvasana, in the Southern recension first she breathes again (diśyā śvasiti, reports Lakṣmaṇa) and then the breeze helps in her pratyājayana. The reason for this curious double-

na yuktān kalatramātrasya kṛte śmākaṁ śarañcandiranimālayasya kavāvarṇayāsya kalanīkam utpādayatam.

21Ibid.: devyā kila Śītāyā Śravānabhavanamastamāthaṁ cārītram prati samutpannavarmanīśānāṁ paurāṇāṁ anyādīśāḥ pralāpāḥ pravartante.

22Ibid.: tan na śākno Śītāmātrasya kṛte śarañcandiranimālayasya kalanīkam utpādayatam.

23Ibid.: ayaṁ anavarataśvajanaśravaṇaśadudhghāṣṭhakṣaṁbhāganirlokaṇo Lakṣmaṇo vijāyapati, tathāśrikritajatāṁ hṛdayam.

24Ibid.: ayaṁ anavaratalaśravaṇaśadudhghaḥni nirlokaṇo Lakṣmaṇo vijāyapati, tathāśrikritajatāṁ hṛdayam.

25parystuktā tvam āryena cārītryaγaṇaśālini...

26tyaktā kila tvam āryena cārītryaγaṇaśālini...

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

In verse 13 Lakṣmaṇa conveys Rāma’s final message to Śītā. 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 citranīhitā ghṛheadvatā me, while the Southern MSS have tvam devi citranīhitā ghṛheadvatā me. Cītra and cīta 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: Śītā 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 Śītā. The word citranīhitā 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): citrasthitānām ghṛheadvatānām iti sphuranti sma tadaiva vācā.25

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

When Vālmīki asks Śītā how she got into such a state she is too ashamed to give an answer (27+). The sage resorts to his “eye of visualisation” (dhīyancakṣus) and, in the Nepalese recension, he realises that “this is the consequence of Vālin’s murder” (aye, Vālinadhaśvijrmbhitam etat!). This realisation is missing from the Southern recension, and Vālmīki tells Śītā 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. Dhūranīga, however, might have associated those two incidents in Rāma’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 Śītā.
Sītā: evam viṇṇaṇāvēṣi — juttatam tuha niṉavāraṉaṁ
Sidāṁ niṉvaṉādāmhi āḍā, kiṁ visāaḍo vī?
(evaṁ vijnāpayasi — yuktam tava niraṇaṁdhām Sītāṁ
niṟvāṉavīṭum āḍayaṭ, kiṁ viṣayaḍ a-API?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: sandeṣṭavyamāryā na kiṁ cīd api
samṛdiṣtām.

Sītā: evam mama vaanaṇa viṇṇaṇādavvo tāc mahārāo
— sā tavopavaṇāvīṇi savvaddā matthaṇaṁhīdeṇa,
anjaṁśina viṇṇavedi ājīvam ahaṁ niṅguṇā vi ciraṟapariciteti tī vā,
jādavacca tī vī, aṇāḍha tī vī, Sīda tī vī, tato sumaraṇaṁ
netakeṁpi āvighuṇḍhivavvā mhi.
(evaṁ mama vacanaṇa vijnāpayātyavas tvaẏ maḥārājāḥ —
śa tavopavaṇāvīṇī savvaddā mastaṇaṁhiṭenāṁjaṁśi vī-
vījavapiyati: yady ahaṁ niṅguṇāpi ciraṟapariciteti vā, jāṭa-
pattyeti vā, anāṭhethi vā, Sītēti vā, tataḥ sumaraṇaṁatrenā-
py anuṛgaḥitavāṣyāmī.)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: imaṁ sandeṣaṇaṁ ākāruṇya
kṣate kāraṁ iviḥitaṁ
daśaṁ asaḥyaṁ śokārto
vyaktaṁ āryo gamisyaṭi.

Sītā: vacca, adimahantam viṣaamaṇḍalak ahaṁ tūma
ettikadukkhasaḥāi? sampadaṁ tae ekkēna so cintitaṉavvo
tā gaccha, bhādukuśariṁ śavadhāno lohī.
(vatsa, atimahati viṣayaṁaṇḍale ḍaṁ tavaⁱtāvaḍukkha-
śavaiḥ? sāmṛtpaṁ tvaikena sa cintayitiavyaḥ, taṁ gacca,
braṭṛśaṅgīre śavadhāna bhava.)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: anurūpaṁ maḥāuḥbāvaṭayāḥ.

Sītā: anṛṇaṁ ca, jā*da, paṇaṁdaṇavvai ca tae Rāhava-kulārāṇḍhaṁ śa bhavaḍati viṣa-sūsīdaṇvvo
ppaṭiṁgaṁdo maḥārāo, palaḍavvā ca tae ajjāṇaṁ *aṁṇtī, sāmaśa-

Sītā: evaṁ vi tāṁ jaṇaṁ viṇṇaṇāvēḥi — na juttatam tava
niṟvāṇaṁdhāṁ Sidāṁ hiṅḍo niṉvaṉādāmṇaṁ kiṁ ūṇa visāaḍo
(tīvīvam a-API tāṁ jaṇaṁ viṇṇāpayā — na yuktam tava nira-
ṇaṁdhāṁ Sītāṁ āḍayaṭ niṟvāṉavīṭum, kiṁ punar visā-
yādī itī.)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: sandeṣṭavyamāryā naṁdo saṁdiṣṭām.

Sītā: evam ahaṁ tāṁ vaanaṇa viṇṇaṇādavaṭvoc mahārāo
— sā tavopavaṇāvīṇi savvaddā matthaṇaṁhīdeṇa,
anjaṁśina viṇṇavedi ājīvam ahaṁ niṅguṇā vi ciraṟapariciteti tī vā,
jādavacca tī vī, aṇāḍha tī vī, Sīda tī vī, tato sumaraṇaṁ
netakeṁpi āvighuṇḍhivavvā mhi.
(evaṁ samaṇa vacanaṇa vijnāpayātyavas tvaẏ maḥārājāḥ —
śa tavopavaṇāvīṇī savvaddā mastaṇaṁhiṭenāṁjaṁśi vī-
vījavapiyati: yady ahaṁ niṅguṇāpi ciraṟapariciteti vā, jāṭa-
pattyeti vā, anāṭhethi vā, Sītēti vā, tataḥ sumaraṇaṁatrenā-
py anuṛgaḥitavāṣyāmī.)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: imaṁ sandeṣaṇaṁ ākāruṇya
kṣate kāraṁ iviḥitaṁ
daśaṁ asaḥyaṁ śokārto
vyaktaṁ āryo gamisyaṭi.

Sītā: adimahantam viṣaamaṇḍalak kahiṁ tuṁaṁ
saṁti ettiṁ dukkhasaḥāi? sampadaṁ mae viñṇa tue ekke-
ṇa eso cintitaṉavvo tuṁan bhāduusahaan sarīṁ śavadhāno
loḥī tīi. (atimahaty a-API viṣayaṁaṇḍale bhaktra te saṁty ettauṁ
vashadhānāḥ? sāmṛtpaṁ maṛṁ vinī tvaikenaṣa cintatiyaṇaṁ, tvaṁ bhṛṭṛuḥ 
śaṅgīre śavadhāno bhaveti.)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: anurūpaṁ etam maḥāuḥbāvaṭayāḥ.

Sītā: vacca Lakkhaṇa, paṇaṁdaṇavvo tue mama vaaninga
Rāhava-vāriṁḍhaṁ bhavaḍi Ayojja, sūsīdaṇvvo pa-

28 niṟvāraṇaṁ] N2, niṟvāraṇaṁ?hī] hī N1
29 sandeṣṭavyam] N1, sadeṣṭavyam N2
30 prabhaviṣṇun] N1, prabhaviṣṇunā N2
31 āghāt prati āgāṇaṁ hī N1 N2, kathāṁ paṭiṁghānāṁ hī N2
cconj. N1, taye N2
33 savvada] conj., savaḍa N1 N2
34 matthaṇaṁhīdeṇa] N1, ‘matthaṇaṁhīdeṇa N2
35 a[ai] N1, jaiyā N2
36 adv] N1, yadiyā N2
37 vissa] N1, visaya] N2
38 paṇaṁdaṇavvai] em. ISAACSON, paṇaṭadvavv N1 N2
39 bhavaḍi] N1, bhavaḍi N2
40 sūsīdaṇvvo] conj., sūṣūdaṇvvo N1 N2

28 niṟvāraṇaṁ] Sidāṁ hiṅḍo niṉvaṉādāmṇaṁ, niṟvāraṇadhīm (?) sidī hiṅḍo niṉvaṉādāmṇaṁ T1, niṟvāraṇadhīm sidīm puḍāo
(niṉvaṉādāmṇa?) T2, niṟvāraṇaṁ imaṁ jaṇaṁ saṇādì hiṅḍo niṉvaṉādāmṇaṁ DUTTA(M1, niṉvaṉādāmṇa M2)
29 gṛhaṁ] em. ISAACSON, gṛhaṁ T1, gṛhaṁ DUTTA
30 savvada matthaṇaṁhīdeṇa] conj. savama (?)cāmanāṁhīdeṇa
T1, sava ... avvadeṇa T2, savvāḥ simaṇṭaṇaṁhīdeṇa DUTTA(M2?), avvacamānaṁhīdeṇa M2
31 viṇṇaṇādavv T1, viṇṇaṇādavv ti DUTTA
32 a[ai]t] em., ‘mahaṁde T1 T2, ‘mahide DUTTA (M1 M2)
33 viṇṇaṇaṁhīdeṇa] DUTTA reads it as vi saṁmaṇḍale
34 kahiṁ tuṁaṁ] DUTTA (M1 M2), haṁ tu vi T1 T2
35 tuṁaṁ] DUTTA (M1 T2), tuhu M2, tava T1
36 bhāduusahaan sarī] DUTTA T1 T2 M1, bhāduusahaan M2
37 viṇṇaṇaṁhīdeṇa] ‘pi aavmaṇḍale DUTTA
38 hāṇ] T1, ḍhāṇi DUTTA
39 sūsīdaṇvvo] T1, sūsīdaṇvvo DUTTA
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LAKŠMAṆAṆH: āryaṃ svahastena vane vimoktum śrotum tatḥasyaḥ paridevitaṁ sukhena Laṅkāsanaṁ hataṁ mām ajīvyaṁ Mārūrīt āttavairāḥ.

(dīśa 'valokya)
ete rudanti harinā
haritaṁ vimucya,
haṃśaś ca śokavidhurāḥ
karuṇaṁ rasaṇī.

Sītā: atthamido sūro, dūre adido mānusasaṃpādō, tā Nīr.9:16 juttāṁ avarāṁ vi*lambidum. (astamitaḥ sūryaḥ, dūre 'tīto mānusasaṃpātāḥ, tan na yuktam avarām vilambitum.)

LAKŠMAṆAṆH (aṅjaliṁ baddhvā): ārye, Lakṣmaṇasya-ścimo 'yaṅ prāṇāṁāṅjaliḥ, tat sāvadhānena grhyatām.

Sītā: nićcāvahīdā kkhuvē ahaṁ. (nītyāvahīta khalv aham.)

LAKŚMAṆAṆH:
āryam taṁ vā
bāndhavān vā smarantyā
śokād ātma
mṛtyavā nopaṇeyaḥ.

N2.56e Iśvākūnāṁ
santatiś garbhhasaṃsthā
eyaṁ devyā
yatnataḥ pālaniyā.

dimāgadṛ māhāro, sāhidavā ajāṆaṁ āṇatti, saṃsā-
sidavā Pītiṁvadāṁśīo mama piasaḥo, saṃrāḍavā
sāvavakālaṁ maṇḍabhāṁi. (iti roditi.)
(vatsa Lakṣmaṇa, prāṇātinavā tvāyā mama vaca-
nāt Rāghavakūrājādhanā bhagavaty Ayodhyā, śu-
śrūṣītavāḥ prātimāgadṛ māhārajaḥ, sādhayitavāṁbā-
ṇāṁ āṇaptiḥ, saṃsāvāsavitavāḥ Priyāṁvadāṁśīrā
mama priyasaṅkhāṛ, smartavāya sarvakālaṁ maṇḍabhā-
ṇi.)

LAKŚMAṆAṆH (sodvegam): āryāṃ svahastena vane vimoktum śrotum ca tasyāḥ paridevitaṁ sukhena Laṅkāsanaṁ hataṁ mām ajīvyaṁ Mārūrīt āttavairāḥ.

(vulokya)
ete rudanti harinā
haritaṁ vimucya,
haṃśaś ca śokavidhurāḥ
karuṇaṁ rudaṇī.

Sītā: vacca Lakkhaṇa, āsaṁnāthamayo sūro, dūre a ido mānusasaṃpādō. uḍḍīṇā paksiḥo, saṃcaraṇūti sā-
padā. gaccha, na juttāṁ parilambidum. (vatsa Lakṣmaṇa, āsaṁmāstamayaḥ sūryaḥ, dūre ceto mānusasaṃpātāḥ, uḍḍīṇā paksiḥa, saṃcaraṇī svā-
padā. gaccha, na yuktāṁ parilambitum.)

LAKŚMAṆAṆH (aṅjaliṁ baddhvā): ārye sarvapaścimo 'yaṅ Lakṣmaṇasya prāṇāṁāṅjaliḥ. tat sāvadhānena parig-
ghyatām.

Sītā: nićcāvahīdā khlu ahaṁ. (nītyāvahītā khalv aham.)

LAKŚMAṆAṆH: vijñāpaṁi devīṁ:
āryaṁ mitraṇaḥ
bāndhavān vā smarantyā
śokād ātma
mṛtyave nopaṇeṣāḥ.
Iśvākūṇāṁ
santatiś garbhhasaṃsthā
eyaṁ devyā
yatnataḥ pālaniyā.
Sītā: appadīhadavaṇo kku Saumittī.
(apratihatavacanaḥ khalu Saumitrīḥ.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: idam aparāṃ vijūpayāmi:

jyeṣṭhasya bhrāturu ādesād
āṇīya vijane vane
parityaktāsi yad devi
doṣam ekam kṣamasva me.

Sītā: jyeṣṭhahbhādhuvaṇāṇāṇuvatta tumaṇaḥ tti ko tu-
dosā āṣaṃkiādi?
(jyeṣṭhahbhāṛtyvacanaṇuvartī tvam iti kas tava doṣa
āṣaṃkiyate?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ (pradakṣiṇikṛtya): bho bho lokapālāḥ! śr-
vantu śrīvantu bhavantah:
esā vadhūr
Daśarathasya mahārathasya...

N.1.9e Sītā: *adisaḷāhaṇāṁ akkharāṁ.
(atiśālāhaṇyāṁ akṣaraṇī.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...Rāmaḥvaya-
sya ghiṇi Madhusūdanasya...

Sītā: kudo me ettiāṁ bhāḍadheśāṁ?
(kuto ma iyaṇi bhāḍadheyāṇi?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...nirvāṣītā
patigrhād vijāṇe vane ‘śmin...

Sītā (karnaḥ pīḍhāya): sāntam pāvan.
(śāntam pāpam.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...ekākini
vasati...

(Sītā bhayam nāṭayati.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...rakṣata rakṣatainām.

(Sītā garbhān darśayati.)

Sītā: appadīhadavaṇo kku Saumittī.
(apratihatavacanaḥ khalu Saumitrīḥ.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: iyam aparāṃ vijūpanā.

Sītā: kā anāṇa?
(kāṇyā?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
janeyṣṭhasya bhrāturu ādesād
āṇīya vijane vane
parityaktāsi devi tvam:
doṣam ekam kṣamasva me.

Sītā (sāśram) jeṣṭhahaṇāṇāṇuvatta tumaṇaḥ tti pari-
tosakāle ko doṣa āṣaṃkiādi?
(jyeṣṭhavacananuvartī tvam iti paritosakāle ko doṣa
āṣaṃkiyate?)

(Lakṣmaṇaḥ sapradakṣiṇaṇaḥ parikrāmati. Sītā roditī.)
Lakṣmaṇaḥ (diśo ‘valokyā): bho bho lokapālāḥ! śrīva-
ntu bhavantah:
esā vadhūr
Daśarathasya mahārathasya...

Sītā: adisilāhaṇijjāṁ akkharāṁ sunāṇṭī
ti (atiśālāhaṇyāṁ akṣaraṇī śṛyantē.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...Rāmaḥvaya-
sya ghiṇi Madhusūdanasya...

Sītā: kudo me tāḍiso bhāḍadheō?
(kuto me tāḍṛśo bhāḍadheyāḥ?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...nirvāṣītā
patigrhāt...

(Sītā karnaḥ pīḍhāti.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
...vijāṇe vane ‘śmin
ekākini
vasati rakṣata rakṣatainām.

(Sītā garbhān darśayati.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: enāṁ api bhagavatim āryāyāḥ krte vijū-

8Eight pages of the Mysore Mss (foll. 7–14) are lost beginning
from this place.” (Dutta)
Lakṣmaṇah: etām api Bhāgūra*thūm āryāyāḥ kṛte vijñāpayāmi (jñānubhyāṃ sthitvā kṛtānījah):

jaṭāśramāṃ
kamalagandhaṅkṛtādhiśvāsaḥ
kāle tvam apy
anugṛhaṇa taraṅgavātalāḥ,
devi yadā
ta savāṇāya vigahati tvāṃ,
Bhāgirathī
praśamaya kṣaṇam ambuvegam.

ye ke cid a-
tra muṇaya *nivasantārānye vijñāpayā-
mi śirasā pranipatya tebhyaḥ:
strīte ujjhite-
ty asāraṇeti kulāṅganetī
sevaṃ sadaδ-
va bhavatām anukanpanīyā.

eṣo 'ījalir
viracito vanadevatābhya,
vijñāpanāṃ
dhavanī imām avadhārayantu:
suptā pramā-
davaśāgā viśamasthitā vā
yatnād iyāṃ
bhagavatībhīr avesāṃjīyā.

bho bho hiṁsraya,
bhūmīr eṣā bhavadbhīr
varjyā, dēyo
na praveṣaj pareṣāṃ.
mrgyo mrgyo,
vipratvāse sakhīnāṃ
yuvaṃ sakhīyo,
ma kṣaṇam muṇicatānām.

sakhīyo nadyāḥ,
vāmino lokapālā,
mātār Gaṅge,
bhratāraḥ śailārajaḥ,
bhūyo bhūya
yācate Lakṣmaṇo 'yam:
yatnād rakṣyā.

raja*putṛ. gato 'ham.

(itī niskṛntaḥ.)

Sītā saccāṃ jeva maṃ mandabhāniṁ pari*ccaā

payāmi:
jaṭāśramāṃ
kamalagandhaṅkṛtādhiśvāsaḥ
kāle tvam apy
anugṛhaṇa taraṅgavātalāḥ,
devi yadā
ta savāṇāya vigahate tvāṃ,
Bhāgirathī,
praśamaya kṣaṇam ambuvegam.

ye ke cid a-
tra muṇaya nivasanty aranyeye vijñāpayā-
mi śirasā pranipatya tebhyaḥ:
strīte ujjhite-
ty asāraṇeti kulāṅgateti
devi sadā
bhagavatām anukanpanīyā.

eṣo 'ījalir
viracito vanadevatānāṃ,
vijñāpanāṃ
dhavanī imām avadhārayantu:
suptā pramā-
davaśāgā viśamasthitā vā
yatnād iyāṃ
bhagavatībhīr avesāṃjīyā.

bho bho hiṁsraya,
bhūmīr eṣā bhavadbhīr
varjyā, dēyo
na praveṣaj pareṣāṃ.
mrgyo mrgyo,
vipratvāse sakhīnāṃ
yuvaṃ sakhīyo,
ma kṣaṇam muṇicatānām.

sakhīyo nadyāḥ,
vāmino lokapālā,
mātār Gaṅge,
bhratāraḥ śailārajaḥ,
bhūyo bhūya
yācate Lakṣmaṇo 'yam:
yatnād rakṣyā
raja*putṛ. gato 'ham.

(praṇamya niskṛntaḥ.)

Sītā: kahaṃ! saccāṃ evva maṃ eainīṁ pariccāṃ
gado Lakṣhano. (vīlokyā) haddhi haddhi! athalamido

57 śramāṃ| em., śramo N1 N2
58 savāṇāya N1, vasāṇāya N2
59 bhāgirathī| N1, bhāgirāthī N2
60 nivasanty| N1 N2 nsc, nivasanty N2 nsc
61 praveṣaj| N2 nsc, prasaḥ N2 nsc
62 rakṣyā| N1, rakṣā N2
63 sātā| N1, om. N2
64 saccāṃ| conj, saccakāṃ N1 N2

53 gandha| previous eds., gasyandha T1 T2, garbha DUTTA
54 lokapālā| em., lokapālāh DUTTA
A Parallel Edition of the First Act of the Kundamālā (Pt. II)
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Gado Kumāralakṣaṇo. ā Kumāralakṣaṇa, ā Bharadha, ā Satrughna, na tutaṃ dānī tumbhāṇaṃ Sidāc aṣā-dhamaṇaṃ uvekkhiduṃ. (saṣaṅkatrāṣaṃ) ā tāda, ā Uttarakoṣalādhīva, paraḷagado vi na tumaṇ karesi putvadvāhī pariṭāṇāṃ. (vilokya) haddi haddi, attahamido sūro, rahareṇu, vi Kumāralakṣaṇaṃ na disanti. gado hariṇā, saṣaṃ saṣaṃ āvāṣaṃ, uddīnī, sampadaṃ pakkhiṇo, sāvadā saṃcaṇcariṇī. cchājījaī adīsaṃ amṛdhārēṇaṃ diṭṭhi, niṃmāṇasam mahāraṃaṇaṃ. adisakusala eṇī kiṃ kareṇi mandabhāṇiṇī? (sāsraṃ) haddi haddi, kiṃ nu kku kka na kca paṇvānaṃ jena idaṃ visamaphalaṃ aṣṭābhāvāmi? kaḥiṃ ca *bhaavanti, laoḷāla, kaḥiṃ ca te Lakkhaṇavinniṇādīo vaṇadevaḍāo, kaḥiṃ vā te Rāḥaṃ kulaṃ kulakkaṇagādā Vamāṇa-Vasīṭṭhapamāṇā mahēsino je na māṇ mandabhāṇiṃi pariccāṇī? (iti moḥam upagata.)

(saṃya eva māṇ mandabhāṇinīm parittayaṃ gate kuṃ māralakṣaṇaṃ. ā Kumāralakṣaṇa, ā Bharata, ā Śatrughna, na yuṛtaṃ yuṃmaṇaṃ Sitāya anātha-maṇaṃ upekṣitum. ā tāta, ā Uttarakoṣalādhīva, paraḷakagato 'pi na tvaṇa karoṣi putravadiḥvāḥ pariṭāṇāṃ. ā dhīk, ā dhīk! astamītaḥ śūrīya, rathareṇavo 'pi Kumāralakṣaṇaṃsa na dvṛyante. gate hariṇī svaṃ svaṃ karaṃ āvāṣaṃ. uddīnīḥ sāṃpratam paksināḥ, śvapadaś ca samacaranti. cchaṇyate 'tiśayam andhākārēṇaṃ dhṛṣṭi, niṃmāṇasam mahāraṇyaṃ. atavyakṣalī?? ekākīni kiṃ kareṇi mandabhāṇiṇī? ā dhīk, ā dhīk! kiṃ nu kkalī mayā kṛtaṃ papaṃ yenedaṃ visamaphalaṃ anubhāvai mi? kutra ca bhagavanto lokapāḷāḥ, kutra ca tā Laksmaṇaṇiāṇipītā vaṇadevataḥ, kutra vā te Rāṅgavāṇaṇaṃ kulaṃ kramagatā Vamāṇa-Vasīṭṭhapamāṇaḥ mahāvraṇya yo na māṇ mandabhāṇinīṃ pariṇāyantī?)

(tataḥ praviṣṭi Vālmikī.)

Vālmikī: ākārya Jahnutanaya-samupāgatebhīyaḥ sandhyābhīṣekasamaye munidārakebhīyaḥ ekākīnīm asaraṇāṃ ruddatiṃ aranyē garbhaḥturiṇ śriyam ati. tvaracyagato śmi. tad yāvat tāṃ anveṣayāṃ. (iti pariṇāmaṃ.)
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(tataḥ praviṣṭi Vālmikī.

Vālmikī (sasambhrāmam): ākārya Jahnutanaya. 55

55)rahaṇeu vi lakkhaṇaṃsa (con.), hariṇeu vi lakkhaṇaṃsa (read lakkhaṇaṃsa) T1, hariṇeu vi lakkhaṇaṃsa (read lakkhaṇaṃsa) T2, sarenā vi lakkhaṇa Duta
56)disai, disai T1 T2, disai T2, T2, disai Duta
57)chājja (con.), cājja t1 T2, ṇaṭṭa Duta
58)kṣa aṛaṇeḥiṃi? Duta, kṣaraṇi T1, kṣaraṇi T2
59)adesd asalakākē bhavāmi? Duta, adesd (a?)salakāti gaṃpāmi T1, adesasalakākati bhavāmi T2
60)kadaṇ T1 T2, kidam Duta
61)viraham savvahā? Duta, virahasabba T1
62)kaḥiṃ de bhavaṇanto laoḷālā? kaḥiṃ vā de Lakkhaṇaṇuṭṭāo vaṇadevaḍāo? (con.), kaḥiṃ devaḥantu kāli kāli dāva Lakkhaṇaṇuṭṭāde vaṇadevatāta T1, kāli devaḥantu kāli kāli dāva Lakkhaṇaṇuṭṭāde vaṇadevata T2, kāli devaḥantu kāli kāli dāva Lakkhaṇaṇuṭṭāde de [tāo] vaṇadevaḍāo? Duta
63)kaḥiṃ de Rāṅgavāṇaṇaṃkagadā Vasiṣṭha-Vamāṇaṃpamāṇaḥ mahāppabhaḥbhāva maheśino? Duta, kāli de ṛāṇukkakagadā vvasiṣṭha-vamāṇaṃpamāṇaḥ mahāppabhaḥbhāva (npararabhāva T2 maheśino T2
64)te dāṇīṃ maṇ parittāṃntu abhido bhūteḥ Duta, te dātrimaṇa pariṭtā ahīdehi T1, te dātrimaṇa pariṭtā ahīdehi T2
65)tanayā? em., tanayā T1 (T2), tanayā̄ Duta
Sītā (saṃjñāṃ labdhvā): ko eso mantandi? (vīlokiya) kadhan! na ko vi. nūnaṃ taṃ jaeva Lākṣaṇāvijñānatinī anusaraṇti Bhāradrī[77] tārangavādeṇa maṃ anurgiṇhādi.

(ka eṣa mantrayate? kathami! na ko ’pi. nūnaṃ taṃ eva Lākṣaṇāvijñānapti anusaraṇti Bhāgirathī taraṅgavātena māṃ anurgiṇhāti.)

N1:11v Vālmīkiḥ: kathami! andhaṅkāra*saṃruddhatayā dṛṣṭi- saṅcāryasya[78] na kiṃ cid api dṛṣṭaye. bhavatu, śabdāysiye. ayaṃ ahaṃ bhoh!

Sītā (utthāya parikrami): vacca Lākkaṇa! kiṃ paḍiṇiutto[80] si?

(vatsa Lākṣaṇa! kiṃ pratiniṛṣṭto ’si?)

Vālmīkiḥ: bhavati, nāham Lākṣaṇaḥ.

Sītā (avagunāthanaṃ cṛtva, apasṛtya): hadiḥ hadiḥ! anna N2:58v ko *vi paraparuro. bhodhu, nīvāraśsama. maḥābhāha, idha jyeva cīttha. itthiḥ kkuh ahaṃ eaiṇ. (ha dhiḥ, ha dhiḥ! anyaḥ ko ’pi paraparūṣaḥ. bhavatu, nīvāraśsiye. maḥābhāha, ihiva tīṣṭhā. stī khaḷ vah ahaṃ ekākina.)

Vālmīkiḥ: bhavati, aham parapuruṣaśaṅkaya[81] dināvasānasamaye Bhāgirathīsāmupūgatēbhyaṅ pavasavikumārebhyaṅ[82] svṛtuva tapodhano 'haṃ tvām abhyupagantum āgataḥ. pṛchāmi cātrabhavatām—

samupūgatēbhyaṅ sandhyābhisekavidhaye 
munidārakebhyaṅ 
ekākinaṃ aśaraṇaṃ 
rudatīṃ aranye 
garbhāhuratām striyaṃ atitvaṛayāgato 'smi. 
tad yāvat tām evaṃvēśayāmi. (anvesañāṇā[83] nātayati.)

Sītā (pratyāgama): ko eso maṃ vijjaī[84] (viciṇṭya) na ko vi. āṇātikara-Lākṣaṇāvijñānatinī anusaraṇti Bhārdrī taraṅgena maṃ anurgāmī[85] (ka eṣa maṃ vijya (vīksate)? na ko ’pi. āṇātikara-Lākṣaṇāvijñānapti anusaraṇti Bhāgirathī taraṅgena māṃ anurgiṇhāti.)

Vālmīkiḥ: kathami[86] andhaṅkāra saṃruddhatayā dṛṣṭi- saṅcāryasya na kiṃ cid api dṛṣṭaye. ataḥ śabdāysiye[87] ayaṃ ahaṃ bhoh!

Sītā (saḥarasam): vacca Lākkaṇa! paḍiṇiutto si?

(vatsa Lākṣaṇa! pratiniṛṣṭto ’si?)

Vālmīkiḥ: nāham Lākṣaṇaḥ.

Sītā (avagunāthanaṃ nātayati): accāhāmi! anna eso ko vṛc paraparuro. tā niśvārasma. maḥābhāha, idha evva cīttha[88] itthiḥ aham eaiṇ[89] (autyāhitam! anya eṣa ko ’pi paraparūṣaḥ. tan nīvārayīṣyāmi. maḥābhāha, ihiva tīṣṭhā. stī aham ekākina.)

Vālmīkiḥ: eṣa sthiṭo ’smi. vatse, tavāy api ahaṃ parapuruṣaśaṅkaya. divasāvasānasavasanaṇya[90] Bhāgirathī saṃ- 

upūṣyā pratiṇiṛṣṭtebhyaṃ muniḥkumārebhyaṅ[91] svadvyā 

tāntāṃ upalabhya tapodhano ’haṃ tvām evaṃvēhyupapa-

66["varaya"] DUṬTA, "tvaramā" T1, "paramā" T2 
67anvesaṇāṃ em., anvekaṇaḥ T1, anveṣaṇa DUṬTA 
68maṃ vijya em., maṃ vijja DUṬTA, ma vijja T1, mahajjī T2 
69āṇātikaralakṣaṇāvijñānatinī anusaraṇti Bhārdrī taraṅgena maṃ anurgānādi DUṬTA, āṇātikaro lakkhaṇaṅvāṅṇatī aṇaccharaṇti bhaṅvatarāṅbhāṃraṇrāhīrībhāṃna maṇi anugaṇādi T1, āṇātikaro lakkhaṇaṅvāṅṇatī aṇaccharaṇti bhaṅvatarāṅbhāṃraṇrāhīrībhāṃna maṇi anugaṇādi T2 
70kathama em., athama T1, athava T2, iyaṃ DUṬTA 
71na kiṃ cid api[92] conj., na T2 DUṬTA(T2) 
72śabdāysiye T1, śabdāvaiśye T2, śabdāpāysiye DUṬTA 
73avagunāthanaṃ em., avakunṭhaṇaṃ T1, avakunṭhaṃ DUṬTA (T2) 
74vi[93] em., vā DUṬTA (T1 T2) 
75tā niśvārīṣaṃ T1, niśvāraśsma T2(?) kaham dānim niśvāraśsma DUṬTA 
76maḥābhāha, idha evva cītthā.] conj., maḥābhāha itthāṃ evaṃ T1, maḥābhāha itthāṃ viṣṇyā evvma T2(?) maḥābhāma viṣṇyā evvma DUṬTA 
77itthā ahaṃ eaiṇi em., itthā [ā]haṃ ni(?) eaiṇi T1, idāṇī ahiṇi eaiṇi T2, itthiḥaṃ eaiṇi a DUṬTA 
78divasāvasānasavasanaṇya DUṬTA(T2), divasāvasānasavasanaṇya T1 
79kumārakebhyaṅ T1 T2, "dārakebhyaṅ DUṬTA

---

Newsletter of the NGMCP Number 4
harmena jitaśaṅgrāme
Rāme sāsati[83] medinīm
kāhyaṭaṁ kāhyaṭaṁ[86] vatse
vipad eva[85] kutas tava?

N1:12v Sītā: *tado jīva pūṃśāmānīmānīkādā eso asanīvādo.
(tata eva pūṃśāmānīmānīkādā eso ’saṃipātāḥ.)

Vālmīkiḥ: Rāmād ēva vipattir āgāta bhavatyāḥ?
Sītā[80] adha īm?
(atha kim?)

Vālmīkiḥ: yadi tvā varṇāśrāmavāyavasthāhetubhūtena mahārājena parītyaktaśi tān na yuktam āsmākāṃ tava
parīritam anuṣṭhātum. svastī, yāṣyāmi. (iti parikrāmati.
)

Sītā: bhavaṁ, viṃṇavemī.
(bhagavāni, viṅjaṇāpayāmi.)

Vālmīkiḥ: kathaya, kathaya.

Sītā: jādi āham rājā[87] nivāsida tī kaduva bhaavadā
nānukampi[88] tā ēsa gabbhagadā mama Rauh-Dilīva-
Dasaradhappahudīna[89] samtādi tumhānaṃ pālānī[90]
(yady āham rājā nirvāśīteti kṛtvā bhagavātā nānukampi-
ū, tād ēsa garbhagata mama Raṅgu-Dilīva-Dasāratha-
prabhrīṭiṇāṃ saṃtātṝ yuṣmākāṃ pālāṇīāṃ.)

Vālmīkiḥ (parivrtya): aye katham! Rahgukulam udāha-
rate. bhavatv anuṇyokṣye[91] vatse, kiṃ tvāṁ Daśaratha-
sya vadhiḥ?
Sītā: adha īm?
(atha kim?)

N2:59c Vālmīkiḥ: Videhāḥhipate*r Janakasya duhitā?
Sītā: jaṁ bhaavan ānavedī.
(yad bhagavān ājnāpayati.)

Vālmīkiḥ: Sītā tvam?

Sītā: sā ṣījeva āhaṁ maṇḍabhaṁiniṁ.
(saivāhaṁ maṇḍabhāgīṇīṁ.)

ttum upāgataḥ. pṛcchāmi cātrabhavaṁ—

dharmaṇa jitaśaṅgrāme
Rāme sāsati medinīm
kāhyaṭaṁ kāhyaṭaṁ vatse
vipad eva kutas tava?

Sītā: tado eva punnacandrādī me asanīpādādī.
(tata eva pūṃśa-candrādī me ’saṃipātāḥ.)

Vālmīkiḥ: Rāmād ēva vipattir āgāta bhavatyāḥ?
Sītā: aha īm?
(atha kim?)

Vālmīkiḥ: yadi tvā varṇāśrāmavāyavasthāhetubhūtena ma-
hārājena nirvāśītati sat svastī[92] bhavatvai. gacchamā a-
ham. (parikrāmati.)

Sītā: aha[93] viṃṇavemī.
(ahaṃ viṅjaṇāpayāmi.)

Vālmīkiḥ: kathaya, kathaya[94]

Sītā: ṣā Rauhuṃvēraṇa niṃśāsidetti bhaavadā[95] nānuk-
mpaṇā, ēsa uṇa gabbhagadā Rauh-Saara-Dilīva-Dasara-
happahudīna[96] tāsūṇaṃ saṃtādi tumhānaṃ[97] padipā-
lanīāṃ.
(yady Rauhuṃvēraṇa nirvāśīteti bhagavatā nānukampaṇīyā,
ēsa punar garbhagata Raṅgu-Saara-Dilīva-Dasāratha-
prabhrīṭiṇāṃ saṃtātṝ yuṣmākaṃ pratipālanīāṃ.)

Vālmīkiḥ (pratiniṛtya): katham! Ikṣvākuvaṇḍam[98] u-
dāharati. tad anuṇyokṣye. vatse, kiṃ tvāṁ[99] Daśaratha-
sya vadhiḥ?
Sītā: jaṁ bhaavan[100] ānavedī.
(yad bhagavān ājnāpayati.)

Vālmīkiḥ: kiṁ ca Videhāḥhipater Janakasya duhitā?
Sītā: aha īm?
(atha kim?)

Vālmīkiḥ: kiṁ tvāṁ[101] Sītā?


83[āsati] N₁, sāsati N₂
84[kāhyaṭaṁ] N₁ N₂pc, katām N₂pc
85[āṣa] N₁, ēsa N₂
86[sītā] N₁, om. N₂
87[rāmaṇ] N₁, rāmīṇa N₂
88[puṇu] N₁, pāmaṇu N₂
89[daśaradha] N₂, *daśaradha* N₁
90[pālāṇī] N₁, pālāṇīya N₂
91[anuṇyokṣye] N₁, anuṇyokṣye N₂
89[āmaṇ] T₁, maṇ T₂, mā ṭaṃ T₂, kāmaṇ T₂
dutta
81[vipattitam] em., hipatitim T₁, hipatitum T₂, hi vipattitum DUTTA
82[svastī] DUTTA, sva T₁ T₂
83[āmaṇ] DUTTA, ahi T₁ T₂
84[kathaya kathaya] T₁ T₂, kathaya DUTTA
85[bhaavadā] conj., bhauadā DUTTA (T₁ T₂)
86[rahuśaaraadilīpadasarāhā] DUTTA, rahušaaraadilīpadasarāhā T₂
87[tumhānaṃ] conj., tujāṇi T₁, om. T₂(?), tī dānim DUTTA
88[vaṃsā] DUTTA, *vaṃ T₁, *vaṃ T₂
89[vaṇ] T₁ (?), ca DUTTA (T₂)
90[bhaava] DUTTA, bhaau T₂, haau T₂
91[vaṇ] T₁ (?), ca DUTTA (T₂)
92[nāha] conj., nāhi T₁, nāhi DUTTA (T₁)
VĂLMÎKÎH (savisadam): hă hato 'smi mandabhâgyaḥ.22 atha kiṃ kṛtaṇi bhavatyā yenedrśin daśāṃ anubhâvyase?

(Sītā lâjâṃ nāṭayati.)

VĂLMÎKÎH: ayāḥ katham! lajjate. athavā dhuyanacakṣusō vayaṃ, tad dhuyānenaivâvâsotāyābhīmaḥ. (dhīyānam abhīniyā) aye, Vālivadhaviṣṭūdhītan.23 etat. vate, janāpavâdabhibhūraṇāṃ.24 mahārājena tvaṃ tyaktaśi, na tu īrdayena, tan nirâpârâdhā cātirâbhavatī. tasmāt tvaṃ asmañāṃ.26 aparītāya. tad ehy āśrâmapadāṃ eva gacchāvah.26

N2:59v Sītā: bhavaṃ, ke tumhe?
(bhagavan, ke yuyam?)

VĂLMÎKÎH: vate, śrīryaṭāṃ:

N1:10v so ‘haṃ cīrān-tanasakhe Janakasya rājīna.25 tātasya te
Daśarathasya ca bālamitrām, Vālmikir as-mi. vistṛa svaśaṇapravāsā-duḥkhaṇ, tavā-ham abale śvaśaṭaḥ pitā ca.

Sītā: bhavaṃ, ppaṇāpāmi.
(bhagavan, praṇāpāmi.)

VĂLMÎKÎH: vīrāprasāvā bhava, bhartuś ca punârdaśa-nam avāmpuḥi.

Sītā: amno! varo jve ma caddho29 tumaṇ.100 loassa Vannū, mama uṇa tādo jveva. tā āśrâmapadāṃ gacchaṇa-maḥ.

(parikrāmanātaḥ.)

Sītā: (Gāṇgām vilokyaṇjâlaṃ kṛtvā): bhavaṇicya Bhâ-radhi101 jadi ahaṃ soṭthina gabbhaṃ nīvattemi, tado dīne dīne ssaḥhatthagumhaṇḍaṇ kundamālaṇ uvaḥkaraṇ karâsamaṃ.

(aho! vara eva mahā labdhaha. tvaṃ lokasaya Vâlmâkir, mama punas tāta eva. tad āśrâmapadāṃ gacchāvahā, bhagavati Bhāgīrthi, yady ahaṃ svastya garrhaṇaṃ ni-vaṛtarvāmi, tato dīne dīne svaḥastagûphitaṃ kundamālaṃ upahāraṇaṃ karisyāmi.)

VĂLMÎKÎH: bhavaṇicya, atyantavihitadudhśaṇa-cāro ‘yaṃ mā-N1:13e rgaḥ, vīśeṣataś ca sāṃpratam. yathā yathā ‘haṃ mārgaṃ (nāhaṃ Sītā, bhagavan, mandabhâgini.)

VĂLMÎKÎH: hă hato ‘smi mandabhâgyaḥ. kiṃkṛto ‘yaṃ atrabhâvâtyāḥ pravasāḥ.23

(Sītā lâjâṃ nāṭayati.)

VĂLMÎKÎH: kathāṃ lâjjate. bhavatu, yogacakṣuṣāhaṃ avalokāyāṃ. (dhīyānam abhīniyā) vate, janāpavādabhibhūraṇā Râmeṇa kevalaṃ parītyaṭā, na tu īrdayena. nirâpârâdhā tvaṃ asmañāṃ aparītāyaiva. ehy āśrâmapadaṃ gacchāvah.

Sītā: ko ṣu tuṃaṇ?
(ko nu tvam?)

VĂLMÎKÎH: śrīryaṭāṃ:
so ‘haṃ cīrān-tanasakhe Janakasya rājīnaś, tātasya te
Daśarathasya ca bālamitrām. Vālmikir as-mi. vistṛaṇyajanabhīsaṅkhaṇaṇ, nāṇyas tavā-yam abale śvaśaṭaḥ pitā ca.

Sītā: bhavaṃ, vaṇḍāmi.
(bhagavan, vande.)

VĂLMÎKÎH: vīrāprasāvā bhava, bhartuś ca punârdaśa-nam āpūhi.

Sītā: tuṃaṇa loassa Vannū, mama uṇa tādo eva. tā gacchāmaṇaṃ saṃmaṇ.101 assamaṇāpanām. (Gāṇgām avalokyaṇjâlaṃ baddhiṣa) bhavaṇicya Bhābhaṇicya tel.29jai ahaṃ soṭthina gabbhaṃ ahinnivuttamaṇ.26 tadā tava dīne dīne saḥhattha-guttamaṇ kundamaṇaṇa uvaḥkaraṇ karâsamaṃ. (tvam lokasaya Vâlmikir, mama punas tāta eva. tad gacchâvah samam āśrâmapadāṃ bhagavati Bhāgīrthi, yady ahaṃ svastya garrhaṇaṃ ahinnivartāmaṃ tāda tava dīne dīne svaḥastagûphitaṃ kundamaṇaṃ upahāraṇaṃ karisyāmi.)

VĂLMÎKÎH: atyantâduḥkhaśaṇa-cāro ‘yaṃ mārgaṇa, vīśeṣataś ca tvaṃ prati. tad yathā yathā mārgaṃ ādeśayāmi tathā tathāḥam anugântavah.102

VĂLMÎKÎ: atyantadudhśaṇa-cāro ‘yaṃ mārgaṇa, vīśeṣataś ca tvaṃ prati. tad yathā yathā mārgaṃ ādeśayāmi tathā tathāḥam anugântavah.
ädesâyâmi tathâ tathâ tvâyâhan anvugantavyañâ.

SîTÄ: jaµ bhavaµ añavedi.
(yad bhagavân âjnâpayati.)

VâLMIKÎH:

Nâ2:60r* etasmin kuśakuntake laghutaraµ
nyâso nidheyo ’grataµ.

Sâkheyaµ vinatâ, namasva śanakaih.
śvabhro[99] mahän vîmataµ.
hastenâmśa hastadakṣīṇagataµ[100]
sthānuµ samaµ sâmpratamaµ.
puuy[101] ’smin kamalâkare caraṇaµ
nivrutyataµm kṣâlanam.

(SîTÄ yathoktaµ parikrāmati.)

VâLMIKÎH (puro ’valokya): vate, paṣyaµtad âśramapa-
dam.
Iksvākiânum ca sarvesaµ
kriyā puṣपavanâdikâ
asmâbhir eva kartavyâv.
mâ śuco garbham âtmanâhaµ.

api ca,

Kausalyâpadâsuρiśâ-
saukhyâµ[102] vrddhâsu lapsyase.
pâṣya[103] saukhyo[104] bhâginyaµ ca
tathâtaµ munikanyakâµ.

(itī niskrântau.)[105]

[102]śvabhro] em., svabhro N1 N2
[103]’gataµ] N1, *gata N2
[104]puuy[ ] conj., puþpe N1 N2
[105]saukhyâµ] N1, saukhyâm N2
[106]paṣya] N1 N2[107], pa N2[108]

Kausalyâpadâsuρiśâ-
saukhyâµ vrddhâsu lapsyase.
pâṣya sakhyo bhâginyaµ ca
tavaitaµ munikanyakâµ.

(itī niskrântaµ sarve.)

[99]pâdaµ] DUTTA(T2?), pâda T1
[100]vârtante] DUTTA, vârtante T1, 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 reedited (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
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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 Nevārī-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)
out, and numerous points in the Tibetan translation are discussed.

The book is rounded out—or, one might say, bhūsita—by facsimiles of all three Sanskrit manuscripts. All have been reproduced in full, the first two in color and the third in black-and-white, together with transcriptions (pp. 76–109). This is particularly welcome: it is rare that the primary evidence is made available to the reader in such a fashion. As the author remarks, this section of the book may also be of use to those studying Nepalese palaeography, especially in view of the fact that all three manuscripts are dated ones.

Readers of this book will surely join the editor in the wish expressed in its last sentence (the conclusion of the ‘English Summary’, p. 123; cf. p. vii): ‘May the second volume of the series ‘Editionen von Texten der Cāndrasūra-Schule’ published by the Indica et Tibetica Verlag follow soon’.

(Harunaga Isaacson)

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

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 mahākāvya “King Kapphinā’s Triumph” or Kapphinābhyudaya. 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 Kapphinābhyudaya, its content and its editorial history are given in the postscript to the reprint of the editio princeps (Śivasvāmin’s Kapphinābhyudaya. 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 Kapphinābhyudaya,” (Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ, 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 Kapphinābhyudaya is one of the few extant specimens of the mahākāvya or ‘ornate epic’ genre composed in India during the first millennium of our common era. Leaving aside the linguistically less artistic compositions of Aśvaghoha (Buddhacarita, Saundarananda) and Kālidāsa (Kumārasambhava, Raghuvamśa), there are only five or six such works that we know of from this period: Kumāradāsa’s Jānakīharana, Bhāravi’s Kirātārjuna, Māgha’s Śīsūpālavadha, 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, bālabodhanārtham.

Śivasvāmin’s poem is based on a story in the early Buddhist narrative work Avadānasataka. In section lxxviii of the Avadānasataka it is narrated how king Kapphina from Southern India sends an insolent message to the rulers of the six cities, Śravasti 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 alamkāraśāstras 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 (abhayudaya), 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 Śāiva. 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 Māgha’s Śisupālavadha or Ratnākara’s Haravijaya, 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, as a consequence of which the stock of books was burned in Lahore, 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 Āśvaghosā’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 Uriya script, the other the Devanāgarī transcript of a lost original again written in the Uriya 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 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 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.

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 citrakärya, this does not hold true for the more challenging portions of the poem, in particular cantos vi, xviii, and xix. Canto vi, the Parvatavarāṇa is an exercise in the various types of yamaka; canto xviii, the Citrayuddhavāraṇa, is the usual presentation of all types of śabdālokapāras, including Śivasvāmin’s own innovations; and canto xix, the Ṣambuddhābhīṣṭava, is the famous bilingual praise of the Fully Enlightened Buddha, in which all its 45 stanzas 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 bhāṣāślesa. 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:

ärya-loko 'rka-bhāsaś ca
yatra tulyaṃ mahātapāḥ
bhūmibhāgō 'tha kavyaḥ
samaṇaḥ sandhimatsarāḥ* ||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 Śrāvasti, so yatra refers to it. In its second half something is stated about its environment (bhūmibhāgo) and poets (kavyaḥ). In connection with poets the mentioning of samaṇa- “(poetical) conventions” and sandhi, here to be understood as “juncture” 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:

äry(ā→)aloka , 'rkabhāsaś ca
yatra , tulyaṃ , mahātaṇāḥ , ||
bhūmibhāgō , 'tha , kavyaḥ
samaṇaśam , vimat-sarāḥ , ||[9a]
äry(ā→)aloka , 'rkabhāsaś ca
yatra , tulyaṃ , mahātaṇāḥ , ||
bhūmibhāgō , 'tha , kavyaḥ
samaṇaśam , vimat-sarāḥ , ||[9b]

It has to be admitted that in the conjunct letter nṛi 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 arkbhās-as “the rays (or the splendour) of the sun” in the first case, and bhūmibhāgo “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 mahātapāḥ which can be interpreted as mahā + tapāḥ “great in austerities,” nom. sing. masc. of “tapas as final member of a bahuvrīhi compound, and likewise as mahā + atapāḥ “possessing great heat, splendour,” as nom. pl. fem., referring to “bhāṣ-as. In the second case the attribute is vimatsarāḥ, which is to be interpreted as vi-mat-sarāḥ “endowed with lakes rich in birds” when referring to bhūmibhāgo, and as vi-matsarāḥ “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:

अहोतोसानवरणवेक्षपुतंमिशयोवनीयो
पूर्वविवरणवंसस्तुरादुत्तरभासोह॥

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

a-hato 'sāv ud-dhoraṇa-vahe 'pa-hūtaṃ mitho 'va-
dhīren. a ||
puri sa vareṇa kham amśe dūrād ūdha 'sabhāśa 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. Kapphiṇa]. 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 tosā vuddho raṇa-vahe paḥ tāṃmi thova-
dhīren. a ||
purisa-vareṇa kham-ṃse dūrā dūḍha sa-bhāsāhi ||1b||

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

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

atha buddhah. prabhuh. tasmin ran. a-vadhe stoka-dhīren. a purus.a-varen. a tos.¯ at sva-bh¯ as.¯ abhih. ks.am¯ am. ´ se d¯ ur¯ ad dr. ˙ 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 Śivasvāmin’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:

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.

s¯ ute j¯ atim. s¯ a jarˆ adyam. ca duh. kham ∥

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:

f) sopādāna — “nīdānam

Other beautiful stanzas in this canto are:

abhām arhattvasya manye tavāmūṃ
mārtīṃ martyo ’smītī mā mānya mamsthāh ||
śrīnattāṃ tām vakṣyato mokṣa-gantriṃ
gantri bhaṅgam rājata 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!

In canto viii, which contains the description of the six seasons, Śivasvāmin uses the same device that was used by Maṅgā in canto vi of his Śiṣūpālavādha (in imitation, in turn, of canto ix of the Raghuvam.āsa, 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, Śivasvāmin has this yamaka in all the four lines. Here are a few specimens:

tapati tīvrataram. taran. au tath¯ a vyadhita candraka-cakram asau tatam ||
nahi yathā paritāpa-kari ravel
kara-kal¯ ā’pi kal¯ āpinam āviśat ||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.
32. "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.

nyröm upäisi purā ṛuṣam eṣi ced
idam ivāhīhītā kṛtārjanam ||

stanaṃ stanaḥ stanaṁvṛtunā
padam asādam asāv akarot priye ||35 ||

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 *ṣa-.*

ṣukatatiḥ svatālīvadhīrasal-
lalitātālavadavayasvanā ||
cakitam abhyacarat kaṇūṣārthiṇī
daṣa-diṣaḥ śaḍi-saṣṭa-mahītalāḥ ||44 ||

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 nervous hopping of the parrots, searching for grain while the harvesters are still reaping the fields, is underlined by the frequent palatal sounds, whereas the repeated *la-* reflects the soft ringing of the bracelets of the women in the field.

śrīmat abhiṣṭaṁ śākhamukkaparimārṇam
himarajah prasaraṁ atibhair avam ||
dhavalayan gaṇaṁ dhṛtyakṣitkāṁ
soṣiṣṭaḥ śiṣṭaḥ pramaṇo 'bhavat ||55 ||

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 atibhairavam—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.

bhṛṅgāṅ vīṇā samabhayat sarasāṁ himena
ekam petuṣā'ram arutī svara-sama-bhāsāḥ ||
tīresv cāvahata vāti kṛtaḍbhavānāma-
kam tuṣāra-maruṭi sva-rasan na bhāsāḥ

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 yugmapādayamaka 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 a precise estimate. The numerals occurring in the manuscript bear a certain resemblance to those used in the following dated manuscripts from the University Library, Cambridge: Add. 1643 (1015 AD), Add. 1688 (1065 AD), Add. 1464 (1025 AD), Add. 1688 (1055 AD). However, this is not sufficient to determine the date of the manuscript. • Siglum: N

This portion was microfilmed (in black and white) by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project on September 6, 1970, its reel number being A 24/12.

For the current edition new colour photographs were taken in Kathmandu by Prof. Yūshō Wakahara of Ryūkoku University. They served as the basis for the reproduction of the manuscript, and also for the third revision of the diplomatic transcript.

**Ryūkoku University, Kyōto**

Available folios: 1, 4–14, 17–21, 56; in all 18 folios. Folio 56 is a leaf that was sorted out and later used as the second cover leaf. It contains on its recto side a short portion from canto iv plus some unidentifiable text, and on its verso side only the (faulty) title of the work: Kapphinābhuyudayaḥ.

The manuscript bears the number 617 and was first described by Aiyoshi Sanada in his paper “Ōtani tankentai shōrai: Bonbun butten shiryō [Results of the Ōtani expedition: Materials for the Buddhist Sanskrit literature]” in Chūō ajia kodaigo bunken. Seiki bunkyō. Dai yon [Literatures in the ancient languages of Central Asia. Seiki studies in Culture. Part 4]. Kyoto 1961, pp. 51–118, 3 plates; see pp. 91–92 and 117.

This portion was already published in a facsimile edition in Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Buddhist Sūtras from Nepal, ed. by Taijun Inokuchi, Kyoto 1990 (Facsimile Series of Rare Texts in the Library of the Ryukoku University. 9.), pp. 328–336. The reduced size, however, 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 1/7 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 Kapphinābhuyudaya 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 Kapphinābhuyudaya, 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 corrections 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 Kapphinābhyudaya 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 unclear portions of the work. One would straightaway begin to establish that recension of the Kapphinābhyudaya as commented upon in the commentary. It is not improbable that such a commentary was also consulted 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 mahākāvya genre is not the centre of my scientific and literary interests. Personally I am more attracted by the early phase of classical Sanskrit literature marked by names like Aśvaghoṣa, Mātręta, Kumāralataka, Aryaśūra, Haribhaṭṭa, or Candragomin. However, I am also a great admirer of the incredible skill with which the later authors handle the Sanskrit language and I like to solve puzzles and riddles. This is the reason why I find minor works like Jñānaśrīmitra’s Vṛttamālāstuti or Ratnākaraśānti’s Vidagdhaismāpana also interesting, at least as a kind of pastime. Śivasvāmin’s Kapphinābhyudaya 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 discovered 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.