Editorial and News from the NGMCP

The third number of our Newsletter has been delayed a little, for which I offer apologies to readers and contributors alike. In compensation, I am glad to be presenting an issue that is particularly rich in content, half as large again as either of its predecessors. Even at that, some contributions have had to be held over for the following issue, which should be available online by early May.

We begin this Newsletter with two reports. Dragomir Dimitrov presents an illustrated survey of the work and activities at the Nepal Research Centre in the period April 2005 to September 2006, while Dominic Goodall and Harunaga Isaacson report briefly on a workshop held in January 2007 which brought together scholars from all over the world to study one of the unique manuscripts in the National Archives, Kathmandu. There follow two contributions with critical editions. Oliver Hahn gives us the concluding part of his edition of Maheśvara’s Usmabheda; and it is a pleasure to welcome Csaba Dezs˝ o, of ELTE University, Budapest, to these pages for the first time with Part 1 of an edition of the hitherto unknown Nepalese recension of the first act of the play Kundamāla, in parallel with the South Indian recension of the same. We have an announcement of a recent book-publication, and a brief contribution by Diwakar Acharya drawing attention to a manuscript, not hitherto used, of Cundragomin’s Śiyalekha. This issue then concludes with another contribution by Dragomir Dimitrov, this time together with Kashinath Tamot: a fine piece on Kaiser Shamsher and the ‘Kaiser Library’.

This is an opportunity to thank Dr. Dragomir Dimitrov not only for his contributions to this Newsletter, but for his years of dedicated service to the NGMCP and NRC. As of February the 1st, 2007, he has been succeeded as Local Director of both institutions in Kathmandu by Dr. Albrecht Hanisch. I am happy to welcome Dr. Hanisch, already in station in Kathmandu, most warmly; and equally warmly wish Dr. Dimitrov all success. We anticipate that he will continue to stay in close contact with the NGMCP, and it is our hope that our readers will soon encounter him again in the Newsletter of the NGMCP.

Harunaga Isaacson

The Work at the Nepal Research Centre from April 2005 to September 2006

Dragomir Dimitrov

The activities of the Nepal Research Centre (NRC) carried out in the period from April 2005 to September 2006 were based on an agreement of cooperation between the Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, and the German Oriental Society, which was signed on August 30, 2002. In the recent period of turbulent and troublesome political developments, which repeatedly brought life in Nepal to a standstill, the NRC established itself as a safe haven where researchers involved in Nepalese studies were able to pursue their work undisturbed by the ongoing political imbroglio in the country.

Infrastructure At present the NRC is accommodated in a beautiful building situated in peaceful surroundings in Bahuwatar, in the northern part of Kathmandu (P.O.
The Work at the Nepal Research Centre from April 2005 to September 2006

Box 180, Icchunadi Marga 127, Baluwatar-4). The building houses the offices of the NRC, working rooms equipped with computers and microfilm readers, the library of the NRC, as well as a comfortable lounge. In the courtyard a nice garden was arranged in August 2005, which provides further space for studies and discussions in the open.

Staff

Until March 2006 Deputy Director General of the NRC was Prof. Michael Friedrich (University of Hamburg). In April 2006 Prof. Harunaga Isaacsion (University of Hamburg) took the position of Director General on a long-term basis. Acting Director of the NRC during the whole period was Dr. Dragomir Dimitrov. General Manager of the NRC was Navraj Gurung. Throughout this period many Nepalese and foreign scholars were affiliated with the NRC.

Support for the NGMCP

Since April 2002 the NRC hosts the office of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (NGMCP) in Kathmandu. Serving as a base of support for this long-term academic project funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) is not only prestigious, but also vitally important for the NRC, since the NGMCP’s staff members contribute actively to maintaining and developing the services provided by the NRC. The NRC, on its part, ensures the best possible conditions for the realization of the NGMCP in Nepal. During the period under review a large number of catalogue entries were prepared by NGMCP’s personnel at the NRC.

Progress Report of the NGMCP

(October 2006) By the beginning of October 2006 over 16,250 catalogue entries have been processed by the NGMCP. They are in various stages of completion, depending on the particular procedures involved. Over 8,070 entries may be termed completed. Approximately 400 entries are in process at any one time. Over 3,580 entries done by hand are now digitized and await further processing. Over 4,200 entries are still in a handwritten form. As a whole, the work is running smoothly and the project is doing good progress.

Activities

Support for individual scholars

Apart from hosting the NGMCP, the NRC endeavoured to provide as much assistance as possible to all visiting researchers by supplying working facilities, information and other help. Many Nepalese and foreign scholars, graduate and post-graduate students were welcomed and assisted at the NRC. Gergely Hidas, MA (University of Oxford) consulted Nepalese manuscripts of the Pañcaraksā. Astrid Krause, MA (Universität Leipzig) examined all the available Nepalese manuscripts of the Puspacintāmani, while preparing a new critical edition of the text. Christof Zotter, MA (Universität Heidelberg) studied Nepalese manuscripts containing various texts about the Vratābandha ritual. Kathleen Gögge, MA (Universität Heidelberg) researched on ritual texts such as the Laksāmipūjāvidhi, the Satyanārayanapūjāvidhi and others. Dr. Johanna Buss (Universität Heidelberg) focused her work on the Nepalese mortuary rites. The NRC assisted Isabell Johnne, MA (Freie Universität Berlin) during her research stay dedicated to the Buddhist deity Vasundharā. Shaman Hatley, MA (University of Pennsylvania) was helped while studying texts of the Tantric Śaivism. Michael Slouber, MA (University of California, Berkeley) spent six weeks studying Classical Newari at the NRC and read texts such as the Agastyaavratakathā, the Haragana-kathā, the Nagaśādhanavidyā, the Pratāpa-mallāśāntipurapraveśā, the Kusopadesāṇitīśāra and the Bāla-cikitsā. Dr. Alexandra Leduc-Pagel (School of Ori-
ental and African Studies, London) explored a Nepalese manuscript of the *Tathāgataguhyāka*. Prof. Gudrun Bühnemann (University of Wisconsin-Madison), a regular visitor of the NRC, continued her studies on Nepalese iconography. Yogesh Mishra, MSc. (Bhaktapur, Nepal) carried on his research on texts in Classical Newari.

Tibetans and a Fullbright student at Bodhnath

During the period under review the NRC was visited by quite a large number of American PhD candidates and holders of Fullbright fellowships. Jessica Birkenholtz, MA (University of Chicago) studied Sanskrit and Newari manuscripts of the *Svasthānivratakathā* and was assisted by Dr. Kashinath Tamot, an affiliated Newari specialist at the NRC. Nancy Lin, MA (University of California, Berkeley) conducted research towards her dissertation and examined Tibetan manuscripts and xylographs of texts in literary genres. Cameron David Warner, MA (Harvard University) studied Tibetan historiographical texts concerning the Jo-bo-Sākyamuni statue and explored the huge collection of Tibetan material microfilmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP). In the course of his study on the Indrajatra festival, Michael Baltuis, MA (University of Iowa) consulted the vast collection of historical documents also microfilmed by the NGMPP.

Many other scholars, among them Prof. Paul Harrison (University of Canterbury), Dr. Anne Macdonald (Universität Wien), Prof. Patrick Olivelle (University of Texas), Prof. Sheldon Pollock (University of Columbia), Prof. Akira Saito (University of Tokyo) and Prof. Francesco Sferra (Università degli Studi di Napoli L’Orientale), were assisted in their search for copies of particular Nepalese manuscripts.

Besides this, the NRC further supplied its services in handling of orders for microfilm copies from the National Archives in Kathmandu. This service was particularly appreciated by scholars during the difficult times when the state institutions in Nepal could hardly function, crippled by political conflict and the unpredictable strikes. The NRC was successful in securing a speedy and reliable processing of the orders at the National Archives. More than fifty orders for microfilm copies were processed in this period.

Digital photo from a microfilm copy of a manuscript of the Chandoratna

**Maintenance of the NRC Library** The reference library of the NRC was well visited in the period under review. In order to ensure efficient and secure handling of the material kept in the library, specific rules for the use of the NRC Library were introduced. Due to the very limited funds available to the NRC, there were unfortunately only few new acquisitions. Nonetheless, some valuable publications were acquired, not least thanks to the donations by generous publishers and authors as well as owing to the book exchange programmes which the NRC is maintaining with other institutions.

**Organization of lectures** In August 2006 a new series of lectures was initiated at the NRC. Prof. Harunaga Isaacson delivered the first lecture entitled “Reflections on the *Caṇḍamahāroṣanatātra* and its place in the history of Vajrayāna Buddhism”. In September 2006 Dr. Dragomir Dimitrov presented the second lecture entitled “Philological Archaeology (Notes on some recently discovered manuscripts of the *Ratnaśrītiṭā* and the *Vinsātupasargavṛttī*). The third lecture in this series is due to be continued in 2007.
Publishing  With the assistance of the NRC the next volume of the Nepalese National Bibliography (NBB) for the years 1997–1999 was published by the Tribhuvan University Central Library in 2005. In February 2006 a reprint of Klaus-Dieter Mathes’ book ‘Gos Lo tsā ba gZhon nu dpal’s Commentary on the Ratnagotravibhāgavyākhyā (Nepal Research Centre Publications, No. 24) was prepared at the NRC. In July 2006 Diwakar Acharya’s VācaspAtiṁśra’s Tattvasaṅkṣā, The Earliest Commentary on Maṇḍanaṁśra’s Brahmāsiddhi (Nepal Research Centre Publications, Nr. 25) was published. Apart from this, the long-awaited new volume of the Journal of the Nepal Research Centre (vol. XIII) is well advanced in preparation and will appear in 2007.

Collaboration  The NRC maintained its traditionally good connections with the Department of Archaeology and the National Archives in Kathmandu. It also had contacts with the Valmiki Campus, the Sanskrit University, the Social Science Baha, the branch office of the South Asian Institute at the University of Heidelberg, the Guthi Samsthan, the National Library and some other institutions in Kathmandu. New contacts were established with Dr. Yoshiko Abe (Cultural Affairs Depart-

Workshop on the Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā: The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra?

Dominic GOODALL and Harunaga ISAACSON

From 2nd to 12th January of this year, a Workshop on Early Śaivism: the Testimony of the Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā was held in the Pondicherry Centre of the Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient (‘French School of Asian Studies’). The Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā, a fundamental tantra of the Śaiva Siddhānta, is a lengthy, unpublished, text of great antiquity that is full of unparalleled material of great importance for the early history of the Śaiva religion. The work is in many respects very different from the other ancient Siddhāntatantras, and is often difficult to interpret. It is now transmitted to us in a single beautiful Nepalese manuscript of perhaps the 9th century\(^1\) one of the unique treasures of the National Archives, Kathmandu, microfilmed by the NGMPP (NGMPP A 41/14). But it was once widely known across the Indian subcontinent; and even beyond it, for it is mentioned in tenth-century inscriptions in Cambodia.\(^2\) We now have grounds for supposing the Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā to be the earliest Siddhānta tantra in the Śaiva Siddhāntaśāstra repertoire to survive complete, and perhaps even the earliest surviving scriptural text of Tantric Śaivism. It is thus a source of major importance for the early history of Śaivism.

---

\(^{1}\) There are also two Nepalese apograph copies of the 20th century: NAK 5-2406, NGMPP A 159/18, and Wellcome Library MS Indic δ 41. These both reproduce the foliation of the original and often have a few more aksaras at the edges than now survive on the foils of the old manuscript.

\(^{2}\) Cf. e.g. Sanderson 2001, pp. 23–24, n. 28.
of tantrism; but it also contains unparalleled information about more archaic forms of Śaivism followed by Pāśupata groups.

The two-week meeting in Pondicherry brought together scholars of Śaivism from around the world to study this important document. The workshop took the form of daily all-morning reading sessions, led by Alexis Sander-son, in which we discussed the constitution and interpretation of the text, followed by an afternoon lecture by one of the participants.

A complete electronic text of the Niśvāsa-corpus was circulated among the participants before the workshop, and we now plan a printed volume, to be ready in 2008, that will contain a first critical edition of the three oldest of the five major sections of the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā, namely the Mūlasūtra, the Uttarāsūtra and the Nayasūtra. Introductory material, notes, and a few contextualising essays—drawn from or drawing upon the lectures and discussions that took place at the workshop—will accompany the Sanskrit text.

The peculiarities of the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā adverted to in the course of the workshop are too numerous to discuss, but a few notable ones may be mentioned here.

- The Niśvāsa devotes more attention than any other known tantra to the Atimarga (i.e. Pāśupata) context from which tantric Śaivism emerged, and reveals how close it is to this Pāśupata milieu.
- Many of the lists of theologemes or other entities fall short of expectations formed by reading other Śaiva literature: thus, in the Niśvāsa, we encounter only 4 kalās where we expect 5, thirty-two tattvas where we expect thirty-six, 2 nādis where we expect minimally 3, and so forth.
- Several doctrinal positions that are now thought of as defining characteristics of the Śaiva Siddhānta are entirely absent from the text: there is no discussion about duality or non-duality, nor is there a single mention of the innate impurity (mala) that is held to cling to every soul, removable only by initiation.
- The Niśvāsa recognises itself as belonging to the Mantramarga (the ‘path’ of tantric Śaivism), but it does not declare itself to be a Siddhāntatantra or distinguish its own brand of tantric Śaivism from any other: it seems possible that the label ‘(Śaiva) Siddhānta’ was not known at the time of the redaction of the text.
- An unusual, and seemingly primitive, classification of three levels of siddhi, the attainment of which can be known by whether some object becomes warm, emits smoke, or bursts into flame, is shared by the Niśvāsa and, apparently alone among other Śaiva tantras, the Brahmayāmala (which like the Niśvāsa is as yet unpublished, but survives in an early Nepalese manuscript, microfilmed by the NGMPP on reel A 42/6); the same levels, and sometimes identical siddhis associated with them, are found in some Buddhist tantras, such as the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa.
• Unlike most other Siddhāntatantras, and in a manner uncharacteristic of the Śaiva Siddhānta as idealised by its theologians, the Nīśāvaśa gives a great deal of space to magic recipes for attaining supernatural powers.

• The Eastern face of the five-faced Sādāśiva is, throughout the Śaiva traditions, almost invariably that of Tātpuruṣa, but in the Nīśāvaśa’s archaic iconography it is that of Ardhanārīśvara.

• The first chapter of the Nīśāvaśa’s Nayasūtra explains how the sādhaka can shape his body to form the graphs for each of the letters of the Sanskrit syllabary: we agreed that the script presupposed appeared to be North Indian of between the 5th and 7th centuries AD.

On the basis of our reading so far, we are inclined to place the earlier parts of the text between 450–550 AD. Stratification was discussed intensively; a final conclusion has not been reached on this complex topic, but there was general agreement that the Mulasūtra must be the most ancient core of the text.

The following papers were delivered:

Alexis SANDERSON (All Souls College, Oxford) ‘The Nīśāvatattvasaṃhitā and its Śaiva Context’ (Wednesday 3rd January)

Dominic GOODALL (EFEO, Pondicherry), using summaries supplied by Kei KATAOKA (Kyushu University, Fukuoka) ‘The Structure of the Nīśāva-corpus’ (Thursday 4th January)

Jun TAKASHIMA (Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) ‘Early History of Śaiva mathas—8th to 13th Century’ (Friday 5th January)

Harunaga ISAACSON (Asien-Afrika Institut, University of Hamburg) ‘Language and Formulæ in the Nīśāvacorpus’ (Monday 8th January)

Shaman HATLEY (University of Pennsylvania) ‘The Brāhmavāyāma and Early Śaiva Literature with Special Reference to the Nīśāva’ (Tuesday 9th January)

Peter BISSCHOP (University of Edinburgh) ‘ “Purāṇic” Topography in the Nīśāva’ (Wednesday 10th January)

Andrea ACRI (University of Leiden) ‘Inclusivism in the Nīśāva as illustrated by Chapter 12 of the Guhyasūtra’ (Thursday 11th January)

Diwakar ACHARYA (University of Kyoto) ‘Pratisṭhā in the Nīśāvasaṅghya and in the Śvāyambhūva, an early unpublished source of the Pañcarātra’ (Friday 12th January)

### Bibliography
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### The Īśanabheda of Maheśvara (Part 2) Oliver HAHN

In our last Newsletter (no. 2, October 2006) I presented the first part of a new edition of Maheśvara’s Īśanabheda, based on two unpublished manuscripts from the NAK and KÜMMEL’s edition. This text – which teaches the correct spelling and pronunciation of words containing the sibilants (ṣa, sa, and sa) is the third of four sections constituting the Śabdabhedaprakāśa, a supplement to Maheśvara’s lexicographical work Viśvaprakāśa. Now the second part of the Īśanabheda is presented, which covers the remaining sections of the text, listing words containing the sibilants ṣa and sa. These two portions can be analysed as follows:

i) sa as part of an initial, middle and final aksara of a word (13); sā and sa occurring in a word (14); sa and ṣa occurring in a word (15–16)

ii) sa as part of an initial, middle and final aksara of a word (15–16); sa in combination with consonants (16–17); twice sa in a word (18–19).

Thus, the words listed in the Īśanabheda are ordered according to phonetic principles. Regarding the subject matter of this little kośa, it can be noticed that there is quite a number of rare or even “unknown” words. Moreover, many an unknown meaning we learn from Jñānavimalagāni’s commentary. To mention a few examples: according to the commentator, the word koša

5This text was composed in sākasamvat 1033, i.e. 1111 A.D. I should like to add a few facts about Maheśvara’s life and background, as given in Vogel 1979 p. 329 ff.: “Maheśvara Kavi, son of Śrī Brāhma and grandson of Keśava alias Keśa, traces his family back to one Haricandra, who was the court physician of King Śahasāṅka and author of a lost commentary on the Carakasamita; another forefather, Śrī Keśa by name, served as doctor to the royal household at Gahāpur. Besides the present work, he wrote a Sāhasāṅkacarita, which has not been handed down to us. His sources were Bhogīndra, Kātyāyana, Śahasāṅka, Vācaspati, Vyāđi, Viśvarūpa, the Amara- or Amalāmāgala, Śubbāṅga, Vopāli, and Bhāguri.”

6Similarly, the other three parts of the Śabdabhedaprakāśa, namely the Dvīpupadeśa (the Śabdabheda proper), the Oṣṭhyanadantaṭṭa śayavakārabhedha, and the Liṅgaḥbhedha, as well as the Viśvaprakāśa itself, are all arranged according to phonetic principles in the first place.

7Cf. Vogel p. 331: “As the Śabdabhedaprakāśa seldom goes into details of meaning and the Viśvaprakāśa often does not help
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m. (verse 11 sub sa) refers, besides its common meaning “touch-stone”, to the “world” or “cycle of rebirth” (samsāra). Two words not occurring in our dictionaries are gispāśa n. and dhūpāśa n. (16 sub sa), meaning “bad language” and “a bad yoke” respectively. The word sārasvata n. (18 sub sa) has the additional meaning “splendour, beauty” (tejas). Moreover, a distinction is drawn between the spelling sārpa n. (part 1, 7 sub sa) “winnowing basket” and sūrpa m. (4 sub sa), to the latter of the meanings “snake” and “a kind of fish” are added. Finally, the following example (4 sub sa) shows a striking divergence of our dictionary entries from the meanings as given by Jñānavimala; whereas Monier-Williams (following Böhtlingk) has for sṛṇi m. “elephant-goat” (also f.), “moon” and “enemy”, and for sṛṇi f. “sickle”, the commentator assigns to this word the meanings “thunderbolt”, “sun”, “wind”, “elephant-goat”, and “fire”.

Edition of the Üsmahbeda, Part 2

sañḍalikësādavabhūsanosanā|8| pāśānarosāvivāsaḥbhūsanām | pāśaṇḍakūṭikāṇḍanāśitāmīśikaṃ|9| gavesitān|10| niḥsamadūṣyaṃśikaṃ|11| 1 1| puspaḥiṣeṣhakṣadhayoṣhidīṣa|12|

cut of the problems posed thereby, numerous passages would quite be unintelligible but for the excellent scholia of Jñānavimala Gani, a Śvetāmbara Jaina of the Kharataragachcha and disciple of Bhānumani Gani, who lived at Vikramanagara or Bikaner under the reign of King Rājasima (1573–1611). Moreover, Kümml (pp. 387–397) adds to her edition a useful index of words and meanings not occurring in the Petersburg Dictionary (and consequently not in Monier-Williams dictionary).

9 Cf. Kümml p. 161: kutsitā dhūṛpāśam, kutsitā gīr gīrṣam. For this use of the word pāśa (technically called pāṣap) cf. also Pāṇ 5.3.47.
10 Cf. Kümml p. 182f.: sarvaṃvyaḥ śaṃ sāryataṃ, ... te jo vyākaraṇam ca.
12 Cf. Kümml p. 166: sārati sṛṇy, vajram adityo ’nilo ’skaus ’gūṣ ca. Besides the examples mentioned here, the substantial body of words in the Üsmahbeda representing botanical names and other materia medica, diseases and parts of the body, might indeed point to the medical background of Viśveśvara’s family.

The following abbreviations and symbols are used in the critical apparatus: N = Newari (A 18/6 and B 34/26); M = Mathili (B 14/21); E = Edition Kümml; a.c. = ante correctionem; p.c. = post correctionem. A single dot (.) represents an illegible or otherwise indeterminable part of an aksara. For details regarding these manuscripts see part 1 of this edition (Newsletter no. 2, October 2006).

16 |sādava| |sādava| E |sādava| M.
17 |gavesitān E M |nivesitān N.
18 |niḥsamadūṣyaṃśikaṃ E M |niḥsamadūṣyaṃśikaṃ N.
19 |ausadha| E N |ausadha| M.
The Manuscripts of the two Recensions  

The Kun-damālā, a play in six acts based on the Uttarakūṭa of the Rāmāyaṇa, was first published by M. Ramakrishna Kavi and S. K. Ramanath Sastri in 1923. The editors used two manuscripts from Tanjore and two from Mysore, and they also consulted two more fragmentary manuscripts in private collections (these however, cannot be traced today). Four more editions appeared until 1955, all based on the edictus princeps, and an English translation by A. C. Woolner was also published in 1935.

Kali Kumar Dutta’s critical edition was printed as No. XXVIII of the Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series in 1964 (reviewed by J. R. A. Loman in JAOS 86.2, 1966). For his edition Dutta could use the same manuscripts that had been available to the first editors (except for the two fragments that could not be located):

115ca E N\[\] va M.  
116
117sākasasāsanaṁ E N\[\] “sākasasāsanaṁ” M.  
118am i dantyadava-yopeta ṣāmbheda ‘tra dārśitaḥ E M\[\] am i dantyadava-yo ṣāṃbheda dacaradārśitaḥ N.  
119samāptaḥ N\[\] om. M. The colophon of N reads thus: śreya ṣāṃvat 541 dvārakāśvaraṁdukkhaḥ 15 tadd eva tuhaṁ samśārṇaṁ pāthā ṣṛṣṭiṁ tathaḥ likhitaṁ lekhakā nāsti dōṣaṁ ॐ ॐ ॐ. This date corresponds to the full moon day, July the 15th, 1421 A.D. (for the calculation of this date I am grateful to Dragomir Dimitrov, Marburg).

*I thank Prof. Harunaga Isaacson for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper.

The parallel edition of the Nepalese and South Indian Recensions of the First Act of the Kun-damālā (Part I)  

Csaba DEZSŐ

A Parallel Edition of the Nepalese and South Indian Recensions of the First Act of the Kun-damālā (Pt. I)
Both of the Tanjore MSS lack the prastāvāna and a portion of the first act. Dutta thinks the Telugu MS may be a copy of the Grantha one. The Mysore MSS are also incomplete: the last part of the first act, the whole of the second and portions of the third and sixth acts are missing. The Kannada MS might be a copy of the Grantha one, or both might be copies of a third manuscript, at least according to Dutta.

In September 2000 I ordered microfilm copies of manuscripts of various dramas from the National Archives in Kathmandu. Among these was one entitled kundamālā-nāma naṭakā-sāta. Among the Telugu MSS written in Newari script, which contains a bundle of various works written down by a scribe called Rāmagūra, there are two more relevant entries in the title-list of the NGMPP which escaped my attention in 2000: one kundamālā (sic), reel A 1027/11, classified as stotra, and another one kundamālā, reel A 24/13. When I was able to consult them a few months ago, it turned out that they are actually independent microfilms of the same palm-leaf manuscript in Newari script, which contains a bundle of various works written down by a scribe called Rāmagūra. A 24/13 has 63 folios (ff. 1–63), while A 1027/11 only contains the last fourteen leaves (ff. 50–63). The following works make up the manuscript: Bhartṛhari’s Vaiṅgaṇyaatāka (ff. 1–15r), Mohamudgara (ff. 15r–31r), Vyaśasa-sūkṣama-viṣāda (ff. 31r–50r), kundamālā Act One (ff. 50r–60v), Hariharastava (ff. 60v–63r), and Paśuravaṭrastutti (ff. 63r–63v). My siglum for this manuscript is N2.

Two separate colophons give us as the date in which Rāmagūra copied the MS N.S. 551 during the reign of Jayayakṣamaṇalla in the town of Śikharā (Pharping), where Nāthasīṃha was the lord. He seems to have copied the first act of the kundamālā upon the request of Nāthasīṃha.

Collation of the two manuscripts reveals them to be very closely related. In fact N2 may well be an apograph of N1; or both may have been copied from the same exemplar. Since N2 contains the closing words of Act One (which are missing from N1), but nothing after that, N1 (or their common hyparchetype, if they had one) might have only contained the first act of the play, which would mean that only the first and last folios of N1 are missing. Rāmagūra is not the most careful of scribes; he often omits one or two aksaras, but he also often corrects his mistakes. We should be grateful to him, however, for copying the text, since in this way the Prologue has been preserved, and as one expects in the case of a classical Indian drama, the prastāvāna provides important details about both the play and the playwright.

The Author of the Play: Dhiranāga from Anurādhapura

The name of the author of the kundamālā has been the subject of debate since the publication of the editio pinceps. According to the text of the Mysore MSS the sātṛadhāra announces the play as follows: adīṣṭo ’smi pariṣāda — tatrādhavaṇa ’rālapuravāstavasasya kaver Diṇāgasya kṛtiḥ kundamālā nāma, sā tvaḥ pravakṣyati. This means the author was called Diṇāga, and he was from Anurādhapura. On the strength of this reading, and on the basis of a manuscript of the Subhāṣītavali in which the vaiṇavabhaṣavasī-verse of the kundamālā is quoted and attributed to Diṇāga, Kavi and Sastri, the first editors of the play, concluded that the author’s name was Diṇāga. Dutta also brings up exhaustive (though not necessarily convincing) arguments in favour of the name “Diṇāga”.

Though the Prologue has not been preserved in the Tanjore MSS, their colophons supply information about the author. The colophon of T1 reads: anḍhrapūravāsī. The kāvech Dhiṇāgasya kṛti kundamālā nāma nāṭakam saṃāptam; T2 has the following colophon: anuṇāṇāsya kavedhiṇāgasya kṛti kundamālā nāma nāṭakam saṃāptam. Following this evidence several scholars (P. P. S. Sastri, M. Krishnamacharier, A.C. Woolner, etc.) were inclined to ascribe the play to Diṇāga.

As for Anurādhapura, the first editors could not identify it with any known place, and, taking also into consideration the colophons of the Tanjore MSS, they suggested that it might be an erroneous reading for Anurādhapura in Ceylon.

(Read: Nāthasīṃhāḥ nāreśvarat?) līkhitam Rāmagūptena Śītānvari-vāsasāstrakam ||

1Dutta’s ed., p. 1.
2Kavi-Sastri p. iii.
3Dutta pp. 19ff.
4This is what Dutta reports. I can read (with difficulty) the following on the microfilm: annā! (or) pravastha!?
5One can perhaps see a h after kṛti on the microfilm.
6Dutta’s ed., p. 110.
7Kavi-Sastri p. vi.
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The matter is further complicated by the testimony of works which refer to or quote from the Kundamālā. The Subhāṣītāratanakosa cites verse 20 of Act Four and ascribes it to Dhīranāgā.16 The Nāyādarpāṇa mentions a Kundamālā “composed by Vīranāgā.”17 The Saduktiśarāṇaṭa quotes the asamādhaśvaśarunjī-verse and attributes it to Ravināgā.18 If we compare all these names, there is a possibility that through progressive corruption Dhīranāgā was changed to Vīranāgā and that to Ravināgā.

Rāmagupta’s manuscript throws new light upon this matter. The above quoted sentence of the Prologue reads in N 2 as follows: ajñānīto ‘sma pariśadā — *tatrabhava-ta (conj.: bhave v N 2) ‘nrvānapravāstavasya kaver Dhīranāgasya kṛityḥ Kundamālā nāma, sā tvayā prajyotaka-vygeti. The beginning of N 2’s colophon after the first act of the Kundamālā confirms the information given by the Prologue: iti Kundamālānīko nāma *samdarbhah (em.: sandabhah N 2) samāptah, kṛity īyaṁ kaver Dhīranāgasya.

Thus we have the evidence of a Nepalese MS, the Tanjore MS, and the Subhāṣītāratanakosa, possibly corrobated (though in an indirect way) by the Nāyādarpāṇa and the Saduktiśarāṇaṭa, against that of the Mysore MS and a certain, unidentifiable MS of the Subhāṣītāvali. On the whole it seems more probable that the author of the Kundamālā was called Dhīranāgā rather than Diṅnāgā, and, accepting the evidence of N 2, he might indeed have been a Čeylonese from Anurādhapura, as the first editors suggested.

The date of the Kundamālā has also been a subject of controversy. Since Bhoja quotes verse 20 of Act Four in his Śrīgāraprakāśa,19 the first half of the eleventh century might be regarded as a terminus ante quum.20 Woolner and others (e.g. S. K. De, V. V. Mirashi) consider the Kundamālā later than Bhavabhūti’s Uṭtararāmacarita21 Dutta, on the other hand, argues for a much earlier date and places Diṅnāgā in the fifth century.

Differences Between the Two Recensions; the Prologue

In the title of this paper I refer to two recensions of the Kundamālā, which requires some comment. As the parallel edition will show, the text of the Kundamālā as transmitted by the Nepalese MS differs in many places from the text as edited by Dutta on the basis of South Indian MSs. The majority of these differences cannot be explained away as mere corruptions resulting from scribal errors, and the parallel passages that diverge both in the choice and the arrangement of words stand as independently interpretable alternatives.

As Dutta’s edition is based on Grantha MSS and on other manuscripts written in Southern scripts probably based on them, we may regard his text as representing the Southern recension of the Kundamālā. The recension transmitted by N 1 and N 2 is termed “Nepalese” in this paper. N 1 is altogether a more reliable witness, and N 2’s readings are of real use only for reconstructing the passages missing from N 1, i.e. most of the Prologue and the last few words of the first act. In some cases I could not extract a satisfactory meaning from the text transmitted by the Nepalese MS and had to suppose that N 1 and N 2 share an error or an omission: in such instances I resorted to emendation, taking into consideration the reading of the other recension.

In two cases Dutta also rejected the readings offered by the manuscripts and adopted the readings of the testimony as better ones: verse 1 (v. 2 in his numbering): saha instead of sada, and verse 5 (v. 6 in his numbering): vānīra instead of nīvāra. Since he aimed to reconstruct the text of the Kundamālā as its author had composed it, his decisions were probably justified. Nevertheless, since I am reproducing the text of the Kundamālā as it was transmitted in the South, in both cases I have restored the readings of the manuscripts, because they have an interpretable meaning. This policy is certainly debatable, especially since in each case it is not difficult to trace how the reading changed through mistakes made in the course of transmission, and thus it is possible that the reading of the manuscripts does not reflect the intention of the transmitters. On the other hand, even though these readings may well have resulted originally from scribal error, they are meaningful, and they might have been part of the text of the play as it was known in the South.

Since we are dealing with a literary work composed by a single author there is a question that necessarily arises: is it possible to determine which recension is closer to the

---

16Nāyādarpāṇa p. 43: Vīranāgānībaddhāyaṇa Kundamālāyaṇa.
17Saduktiśarāṇaṭa (ed. Banerji) verse 56 (p. 18); this edition of the SKA reads taranāyuṣa, which is probably a typo.
18F. W. Thomas, and, following him, K. K. Dutta also pointed out stylistic similarities between Kumārādāsa’s Jñānakīharana and the Kundamālā which might also suggest a Čeylonese authorship of the latter (cf. Dutta, p. 44f).
19Raghavan’s ed. p. 480.
20An earlier testimony might be that of the Mahānātaka which quotes the same verse in both of its recensions. The date of the Mahānātaka, however, is also controversial, it might have been redacted in the court of king Bhoja.

---
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text of the drama as it was composed by Dhiranāga? If we compare the texts of the two recensions with quotations from the play found in subhāṣīta-collections and in works on dramaturgy and poetry we will find that the readings of these testimonia either agree with or are at least closer to the text of the Nepalese recension.24 This means that the text of the Nepalese recension is probably closer to the text of the Kundamālā as it was known to Viḍyākara, the compiler of the Subhāṣītaratnakosa (c. 1100 A.D.), to Śrīdhāradāsa, the compiler of the Sāduttikaranya (1205/6 A.D.), to Śāradātītāya, the author of the Bhā-vapraṅkāsana (13th century), to Sāgaranandind, the author of the Nāṭakalaksānaratnakosa (13th century), and to Viśvanātha, the author of the Sāhityadarpāna (14th century) than that of the Southern recension. Considering the places of composition of the above mentioned works their authors were possibly acquainted with a Northern / North-Eastern recension of the play, which was probably not far removed from the text of the Kundamālā as it was transmitted in Nepal. But this does not answer the question whether the Nepalese recension is closer to the original composition of a Ceylonese playwright than the Southern one.

I am not certain that this question can be answered in a general way, but by comparing the texts of the two recensions we might make a few observations concerning certain passages. To begin with the Prologue, we find that the Nepalese recension conforms to the convention of its own provenance: the Director, whose first words are

\[\text{vajevordhvavisarpinī.} \]

... which is followed by the stage direction \text{nāndyante tataḥ praviṣati śūtradhāraḥ}, recites the benedictory verse (\text{jvalevordhvavisarpini.}...) and then continues without saying \text{alam ativistareṇa} (he would actually cut short himself with this expression).25 What makes the Prologue of the Southern recension unusual is the presence of a verse before the stage direction \text{nāndyante tataḥ praviṣati śūtradhāraḥ}. This verse, an invocation to Ganesa, does not appear in the Nepalese recension and its introduction in the Mysore MSS (the Tanjore MSS are not available for this part) upsets the expected structure of the Prologue. It seems conceivable that it was not part of Dhiranāga’s original work but was added later in the course of transmission; it might have been inserted by a scribe as a manīgala-verse appropriate at the commencement of his task.

To decide whether the Nepalese or the Southern version of the Prologue is Dhiranāga’s would involve a long digression into the vexed question of the origin and structure of the \text{prastāvānā}, which I would prefer to avoid in this paper. There is one additional point, however, which may be worth considering. The kind of Prologue we find in the Southern recension is usually called \text{sthāpāna} in other texts.26 Yet the Mysore MSS of the Kundamālā call it \text{prastāvānā}. This might suggest that an originally “prastāvānā-style” Prologue (like that of the Nepalese recension) was recast in the course of transmission according to the Southern conventions.

There are several Sanskrit passages after the Prologue which differ and are worth comparing in the two recensions, and I am going to return to some of them in the second part of this paper.

The Prakrit of the Two Recensions Satā, in accordance with the rules of \text{nātyasastra}, speaks Śauraseni in the Kundamālā, but her Prakrit passages differ in several respects in the two recensions:

— The Nepalese MSS show certain features of Śauraseni to a greater extent than the Southern recension. In Old Śauraseni intervocalic \text{-t-} and \text{-th-} were not dropped27 similarly to Pali in which intervocalic mutes are retained.28 Unvoiced consonants in free positions are found in such forms as \text{katham}, \text{ssakam} and \text{mettakeya} in the Nepalese MSS, while the Southern recension reads \text{khaṁ} and \text{mettaceña}. The Prakrit grammarians prescribe

24Cf. verse 1 (\text{jvalevordhvavisarpini.}...) and 1+ (ko na khāle āryāvāneina...)... verse 5 (vānena vānirvan), verse 11 (gunānvite).... Cf. however verse 1, where the Subhāṣītaratnakosa reads “tūngā” instead of “tōga” read by both recensions and by the Sāduttikaranya, and verse 2, where the reading of the Nāṭakalaksānaratnakosa (vijane vane ‘śmin) differs from both recensions. It is interesting to note that the Nāṭakalaksānaratnakosa refers to the first act of the Kundamālā with the title \text{Śitānirvāsa} (§§ 1644, 3089), just as the colophon of N2 (f. 60v: \text{Śitānīrvasāśastrakam}).

25Cf. for example the Prologues of the so-called Bhāṣa-plays, the Caturbhā, the Viṇāvīsavadatt, the Mattavilāsaprabhasa, as well as the Southern MSS of Kālidāsa’s plays, the Nāgānanda (cf. Steiner p. 77), etc. There are exceptions, e.g. in certain MSS of the \text{Kārṇabhāra} we find the term \text{prastāvānā} at the end of its Prologue (the other so-called Bhāṣa-plays use \text{sthāpāna}). On the other hand, in other MSS of the same play the entire Prologue is omitted, and the \text{Abhijñānāśatantracarī} also confirms there was no introductory scene in the original Karnabhāra (cf. UNNI, pp. 54f).

26Cf. for example the Prologues of the so-called Bhāṣa-plays, the Caturbhā, the Viṇāvīsavadatt, the Mattavilāsaprabhasa, as well as the Southern MSS of Kālidāsa’s plays, the Nāgānanda (cf. Steiner p. 77), etc.

27Cf. the northern recensions of Kālidāsa’s, Viśākhadatta’s, Hara’s, and Bhavabhūti’s plays. As for the phrase \text{alam ativistareṇa, Steiner} (p. 80) concludes that it was not part of the original text of the Nāgānanda (though it occurs in the Northern recension and can be traced in the Tibetan translation; the Nepalese MSS lacks this part); it is also missing from the oldest MSS of the Māñ̄añ̄ātmādhava, and COULSON remarks (p. 234) that it is “a phrase which copyists might introduce even if it were not there”.

28Cf. von Hünöer §86.

29Cf. Geiger §35.
the change of Sanskrit intervocalic -t- and -th- into -d- and -dh- in Śārasenī (cf. Pischel §203, (Pseudo-)Vararuci 12.3, Hemacandra 4.260, 267). Accordingly we find forms like bhavati, Bhāiravati, āsiddalassa, jādo, tadāhā, jadāhā, kadhehi, anātāda, ākosalādhiṣṭa in the Nepalese MSS, while in the Southern recension we read bhauvati, Bhāiravi, āsīdalassa, jāo, taha, jaha, kadehi, anātāda, ākosalāhīva. Hemacandra, however, also permits such forms as kahede, niño and kaham (beside kadhehi, yādīho and kadīham), and in the Śārasenī passages of the so-called Bhāsa-plays we also find e.g. kahede.

— Intervocalic consonants are often retained at the boundaries of words in compounds in the Nepalese MSS, e.g. jalakanī, ssajana, uttarakosalāhīva, pādajupariṇāsamāsā.

— Another peculiarity of the Śārasenī passages of the Nepalese MSS is the reappearance of an initial consonant group in an assimilated form at the beginning of a word e.g. ssajana, ppavāsā, ssadhamme, ppādīmāgalo (in these cases the double consonants are preceded by short vowels or -o): the corresponding words begin with a single consonant in the Southern recension (sañja, sadhamme, ppādīmāgalo). The same kind of double initial consonants can be observed in the Prakrit passages of the fourteenth-century palm-leaf MS in Newari script of the Rāmaññakāṭikā (reel no. C 6/9, NAK accession no. 9/73), a play written by Dharmagupta, a fourteenth-century Nepalese court-poet, 9/73), a play written by Dharmagupta, a fourteenth-century Nepalese court-poet, Sundarasena, a fourteenth-century palm-leaf MS in Nepalese script of the twelfth-century Nepalese court-poet and in the fourteenth-century Nepalese MS of the Sundarasena, a play probably written in Nepal in the same century.

While it is dropped in the Nepalese recension, the intervocalic consonant is retained in a compound: tatappadesado in the Nepalese recension and tatappadādā in the Southern. This can be compared with Hemacandra’s optional rule (2.97), according to which both naṅgāmo, kusumapaya, devathā and naṅgāmo, kusumapaya, devathā are acceptable forms. Interestingly in one case it is the Southern recension which reads “pparisa” while in the Nepalese MSS we find “parisa”, though in the latter case it follows a word ending in a long vowel (“kaṃā”) which might explain the lack of reduplication.

— Sanskrit eva becomes jeva after -o and -a, and jeva after -n in the Nepalese MSS of the Kundamālā, similarly to the Nepalese MS of the Cauḍaṇaśīka (written in Newari script in 1250 A.D.), the Nepalese MS of the Muddrārākṣasā (dating from 1376 A.D.), and the above mentioned fourteenth-century MS of the Rāmaññakāṭikā, which read jeva in the majority of cases besides jeva in a few instances. As for the Prakrit grammarians, Pseudo-Vararuci teaches in 12.23 evasa ya eva (v.l. jeve), and Mārkandeya prescribes the form jeva (9.153), or jeva / jeva when it follows and anusvāra (9.154).

Hemacandra, Puruṣottama and Namisādhū, however, teach gyeva and the same form predominates in the twelfth-century Nepalese MS of the Nyāgānanda as well as in the Jaina nāgari MSS of the Agamadambā. Steiner considers gyeva as the older form, which, however, was gradually replaced by jjeva, as the plays preserved in inscriptions dating from the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, which only know the forms beginning with (j)je, also indicate.

In the Southern recension of the Kundamālā we find eva and eva in the Prakrit passages, which accords with Trivikrama’s (a Southern grammarian’s) rule evārthe eva (3.2.18). In the so-called Bhāsa-plays eva prevails beside eva.

As Dutta reports (Part One, pp. 144ff., Appendix I, p. 5) the Southern manuscripts actually write a small circle between two a-s. “‘aautasa’ stands evidently for the Skt. ‘āyapastraṇa’, says Dutta, and continues: ‘Evidently this word represents either ‘aayautta’ or ‘ajajutta’ available in Skt. dramas. But it is not clear which one was actually used by the playwright. Instead of running the risk of taking liberty with the text, we retained the word as it has been found in the mss. though apparently it seems to be meaningless.’ (Dutta, Appendix I, p. 5.) Actually Dutta prints amautā with an anusvāra in the text which is surely misleading. Esposito encountered the same orthographical peculiarity in the MSS of the so-called Bhāsa-plays, and pointed out the following: “Pischel §284 nimmt an, daß die Schreibweise a’ einen Laut zwischen ajja und ayja bezeichnen soll […] Die Lesart ayja fur a’ kann aber durch die Schreibweise der ersten Art von Ms. als gesichert gelten.” (Esposito p. 95, note 17.) Accordingly I changed Dutta’s amautās to ayyauttas in the text of the Southern recension.

31 Interestingly in one case the Souther MSS show a reading where the intervocalic consonant is retained in a compound: sthīyanaṃsasa, while it is dropped in the Nepalese MSS: sthīyaṃsasa.
33 E.g. fol.5v: pppavāsā (first word of the sentence!), fol. 6r: tatttha ppādīhā, āgāmane ppādīvalihe, abhhantare ppādīvalienhe, etc.
35 Actually T1 reads “parisvaha”. Cf. Pischel §195: JM. namō-
the play. On the other hand, the early thirteenth-century inscription of the Parijātamañjari-nātīkā has only ajañītta, just as the Nepalese MSS of the Caudalakāṣṭikā from the same century and the above mentioned fourteenth-century Nepalese MSS of the Sundaraseṇa and Rāmāūkanātīkā. As Steiner points out, “Spätestens im 13. Jh. scheint sich jedoch — zumindest im Norden — -jj- im Schauspiel-Prakrit bzw. in dessen Überlieferung durchgesetzt zu haben.”

— For Sanskrit hā dhik we find the standard Śauraseṇī form haddhi in the Southern recension of the Kundamālā. The Nepalese MSS, however, consistently write haddi, which might be another Nepalese peculiarity, since we find the same haddi in the above mentioned fourteenth-century MS of the Rāmāūkanātīkā (e.g. fol. 34r).

To sum up, both recensions seem to follow the characteristic features of the MSS of their provenance in the transmission of the Prakrit passages. I did not mention the practice of yaśruti in the above comparison since its occurrence or omission in a particular MS does not seem to depend on the age of the play or that of the MS or on the recension. There is a very close relation between the two Nepalese MSS of the Kundamālā, N2 is possibly a direct copy of N1, nevertheless N2 shows a distinct preference for yaśruti, while N1 avoids it. Since N1 (when available) practically always gives better readings, I have also adopted its “no yaśruti” policy.

Though it is difficult to say whether Dhīrāmāgā himself preferred gyeva to jyeva, kadhehi to kukehi, or ayya to aja, in some of the Prakrit passages we can determine which recension gives a better reading. In 3+ Dutta rejects kedure, the reading of the Tanjore MSS and the Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakosa, as “definitely a corrupt reading” The Nepalese MSS, however, also support kedure, which is in fact a possible form on the analogy of kēcciraṃ, in which ke stands for Sanskrit kiya!

In 4+ Sītā says she has been refreshed by the wind blowing from the Ganges. The Nepalese recension reports her words as follows: sutthu vattam, edassa jalakaññapuisahasidalasssa Gaṅgāmarudasssa āvādametaeyya jyeva pādjuaparisassasssa parikkhao jādo. This reading is simple and easily interpretable. In the Southern recension the corresponding passage runs as follows: simpadān janāṇikaraparipisahasadalasssa Bhaīravarāṇgamārudaṃ parīsença parissamasssa via pāvassasa parikkhao jāo. This reading contains two comparisons: the wind from the Ganges is “as gentle and cool as the touch of a mother’s hand”, and due to the touch of the wind “misfortune, like fatigue, has dissolved”. The Southern MSS seem to offer a more poetic reading which might be regarded as more suitable for a good kavi. The readings jalakaññi and jaṇanīkara seem to be close enough to suppose that textual corruption (e.g. the transposition of the aksaras ka and vi/i) might have also taken part in the change of one reading to the other. The wind spraying around cool droplets has just been mentioned in the preceding verse (sītās tarungakanikā vikirn), and later in verse 6 we again read about breezes cooled by droplets of water (satikanikāṣṭamarutas / sajalakanikāṣṭamarutas). Sītā’s words according to the Nepalese MSS would fit perfectly in this context. On the other hand, the simile of the Southern recension might also seem appropriate if we recall that Sītā is going to become a mother soon (it was her dohada to visit the Ganges).

The other comparison in the Southern recension (parissamasssa via pāvassasa) is not as easy to interpret. The cool wind has relieved Sītā’s weariness, but what pāpa has it removed? Sītā is still unaware of her banishment. It is perhaps conceivable that pāvassa resulted from the change of a reading similar to the pāda of the Nepalese recension, the meaning of which suits the context well (“the weariness of my feet has been relieved”).

Thus refreshed, Sītā would like to descend to the river and asks Lakṣmaṇa for help. Again the reading of the Nepalese MSS appears to be more logical: tā imādo taṭpadaśesādo jadhā aparissantā vāvadārāmi tadā adesēhī me maggaṃ, vs. tā imādo tadāpadaśādo jahā parissantā odrārāmi taho adesēhī me maggaṃ in the Southern recension.

When Lakṣmaṇa finally comes forward with the message that Rāma has ordered someone to be banished (6+), Sītā most logically asks in the Nepalese recension whose banishment he is talking about (kassā?). Dutta follows the Mysore MSS in reading kahāṃ samādītho, but the Tanjore MSS have kampa which supports the reading of the Nepalese recension, especially if the circle read as nī by Dutta actually doubles the following s.

In 10+ vinā vi nānughīdaṃ mhi, the reading of the Nepalese MSS, is again supported by the Tanjore MSS (vi-nānughīdaṃ hmi T1, vinānughīdaksi T2). Dutta probably adopted the reading of the Mysore MSS, but it is perhaps conceivable that vinā ni possibilità was a correction of vinā-
nugahida, which in turn had arisen through haplography from viṇā viṇānugahida.\textsuperscript{54}

In verse 12 Laksmana assures Sītā that she has been completely exonerated in front of the sages, guardian deities, her husband and Laksmana himself, but there is still something which results in Sītā’s banishment and which, according to the Nepalese recension, he is ashamed to speak about (lajjām nāṭayati). Sītā presses him to tell her what this “but” is (kadhēki kīṁ kīṁ tu?), and finally Laksmana blurs it out: “People are uncontrollable (loki nirvikusah)”. In the Southern recension it is Sītā who appears to be ashamed when she urges Laksmana, but her bashfulness does not really match her behaviour. On the other hand Laksmana has every reason to be embarrassed and fall silent in mid-sentence.

In Sītā’s following lamentation the Nepalese recension reads vaccha, jai evam uvaṃbhia ajjāvitthena pariccattā ahām tā sūṭṭha pariccattā mhi, while the text of the Southern recension seems to be evam pariccattā supariccattā mmi. Dutta actually prints evam pariccattā! νu pariccattā mmi, but if we examine his apparatus we find some readings which, on the one hand, make more sense, and, on the other hand, are relatively closer to the Nepalese recension: the Tanjore mss also read vaccha as the first word of the sentence, and the Mysore mss have supariccattā, comparable with sūṭṭha pariccattā above.\textsuperscript{55} It is perhaps conceivable that Dharanāga originally wrote something like vaccha, evam pariccattā su(ṭṭha) pariccattā mhi, which was later supplemented with what we have in the Nepalese recension, but this is just hypothesizing.\textsuperscript{56}

According to the Southern recension Sītā considers it appropriate to give up her life once her husband has abandoned her, but then she thinks she should protect the child of that merciless man, and consequently spare her defamed self as well. In the Southern recension Sītā first seems hesitate whether it is appropriate to put an end to herself, and then she raises the question if she should spare herself in order to see Rāma’s child.\textsuperscript{57} Since Laksmana’s reaction in both recensions is “I am obliged”, it is more probable that Sītā finally decided to spare herself.

Then Laksmana conveys Rāma’s message to Sītā, in which Rāma assures his wife of his fidelity (verse 13). She replies that even the pain caused by her abandonment has been removed by this message. The reason she gives for this has been interpreted in several ways.\textsuperscript{58} Dutta reads na hi taha ayā sattā paṅgo itthiājaṃassa dukkham appāṃ jaha ayyāsatto, and interprets as follows: “It is quite in the fitness of things according to the Indian genius that any other woman devoted to or enamoured to the husband does not cause so much affliction to a woman as it causes an unbearable heartburn to the wife when the husband becomes himself attracted to another woman.”\textsuperscript{59}

I am not that confident about what suits more the “Indian genius”, but perhaps the reading of the Nepalese MSS offers another possible interpretation: na tadhā ayyāsatto paṅgo itthiājaṃassa dukkham uppādaanti jadā ayyāsatto, that is “husbands dependent on others do not cause so much pain to women as those attached to other [women]”. With this Sītā seems to say (perhaps with a hint of irony) that although Rāma can be influenced in his decisions by what other people think and say, at least he is not attached to another woman.

Laksmana asks Sītā what kind of message she will send back to Rāma. She first asks him to request the ladies in the court to give her their blessing: āsissappadaññeta ayyāhīṃ anuyghidawva mhi, as we read in the Nepalese mss. The Southern recension, at least as it is printed, has at this point a savabhā hiṃna ayyāhīṃ anuyghidawvetti. T\textsubscript{1}, however, seems to read āsissappadaññeta ayyāhīṃ anuyghidawvetti, which is not very far from the Nepalese recension.

Sītā is not too willing to send any message to her husband, but Laksmana’s request should not be denied, at least she does not have the courage to refuse it, as the Nepalese recension reads: na hi Sidāe dhīthattanam. This reading perhaps suits the context better than that of the Southern recension: na Sidāe dhanattanam, “Sītā is unfortunate”. In the Nepalese recension Sītā sends Rāma the following words: maṃ maṃḍabhaṁīṁ aṇuṣayanto va-nyāssamaparivālapaṇaḥ appāṇaṁ mā bādheki (conj.: bādheki N\textsubscript{1} N\textsubscript{2}), “You are a very important person because you protect the [order of] castes and life-stages, do not torment yourself when mourning me, an unfortunate woman.” In the Southern recension we read: maṃ maṃḍabhāṁīṁ aṇuṣayanto vaṇṇaṇasamarpījapaṇaḥ ahiṣhanto atītanam na bādheki, “Do not torment yourself with mourning an unfortunate woman, thus frustrating the protection of the [order of] castes and life-stages”. The reading maṃ maṃḍabhaṁīṁ is perhaps better, the Southern version can be explained with haplography. As for the difference between a mahaggham appāṇaṁ and app ātītanam, the readings of the Southern mss are worthwhile to have a closer look: T\textsubscript{1} is hardly legible at this point, but perhaps it reads mahaggham(?) a(?)ttānanam. Dutta reports T\textsubscript{2} as maḥbhassan atānī, and M\textsubscript{2} as maḥanāṭhta, which all point in the direction of the Nepalese reading.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Pischel, S. 564.
\textsuperscript{55} Dutta actually reports that the sentence νu pariccattā mmi is omitted in the Tanjore mss, which means that the reading he adopted might be his own emendation.
\textsuperscript{56} In the same passage uggabhodi, the reading of the Nepalese recension, is supported by the Tanjore mss ubhodi / upodi (Dutta reads uvvodi, probably with the Mysore mss).
\textsuperscript{57} This is the reading the Tanjore mss seem to suggest, but one could select differently from the νus and νas of the mss.
\textsuperscript{58} Cf. Dutta Appendix I, pp. 5f.
\textsuperscript{59} Dutta Appendix I, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{60} In the same sentence T\textsubscript{1} reads sarīre with the Nepalese recension. Dutta prints sasarīre and reports no variants.
In the following parallel edition of the first half of Act One of the Kundamālā (the second half will appear in the second part of this paper), the left column contains the text of the Nepalese recension and the right column the text of the Southern recension. From Dutta’s critical apparatus I have only reproduced the testimonia and those variant manuscript readings which might be important for the reconstruction of Dhīranāga’s work.

I have also pored over a microfilm copy of T1, one of the Tanjore mss. Unfortunately this manuscript has turned out to be full of errors and lacunae, and the copy I have is also not an easily legible one. Nevertheless I have noticed some readings which differ from what Dutta reports in his apparatus and which are comparable with the readings of the Nepalese recension: these are recorded in the apparatus below the text of the Southern recension. As for the readings of the other Southern mss I have relied upon Dutta’s apparatus.

\[\text{Nepalese recension}\]

\[\text{Southern recension}\]

---

1. Jambhārimaulīmāndāra-
mālīkāmadhvucumhunāh
pibeyurantarāyābdhinī
Herambapadapāṃsavah. 0

(nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhāraḥ.)

SūTRADHĀRAH:

jvālevordhvasipini pariñata-
syāntapastatasejasa
Gaṅgātyataragasarpavasatīr
valmikalakalasmita iva
sandhyevārdrāṃjālakolalatanor
indoḥ sahasthayāni
pāyād vas turānurānāṃsuṃkapiśā
Śambhor jātaṣaṃhatiḥ.

(nāndyante) SūTRADHĀRAH:

ālam ativistareṇa. ajjāpito ’smi pariṣadā — tatrabhava-
vaṭa nūradhāpuravāstavyasya kaver Dhīranāgaṣya kṛtīḥ
Kundamālā nāma, *sā tvaya prayoktaveteyī. tad asya san-
darbhasya sācyavavidhāyinīṁ āryāṁ āhūya raṅgabhūṁīṁ
avatārānī. (īti parikrūmati.)

(nepathyē:) ita īto ’vataraṭvāryā, īta itaḥ.

SūTRADHĀRAH (ākaraṇya):

aye! ko mēkhāl āryāyāvānena sāhāyakam iva me sampā-
daśyati (vi lokṣya sakaraṇam) kaṣṭham atikarunah va-
rtate.

Laṅkēśvarasya bhavane
suciraṃ śhīteti
Rāmena lokapariva-

\[\text{N2 incipit: om namo nāteṣvāraya. jvālevordhṛdha... (Nepalese manuscripts from all periods usually write ārdhṛdha rather than ārdhvā.)}\]

\[\text{ārdhṛdha}^2\] em., *ārdhṛ N2

\[\text{nāndyante}^3\] em., nādyante N2

\[\text{tatrabhavato}^4\] conj., bhavato N2

\[\text{katokatharav}^5\] em., bhavataraṇa N2

\[\text{ko nu}^6\] conj., tat ko ‘nu N2

\[\text{The first folio of N1 is missing, fol. 2 begins with yati. vi lokṣya...}\]

\[\text{atikarunam}^8\] conj., ati ‘N1 N2

1. mss. SKA Dutta, *tuṅga* SRK

2. nāteṣvāraya

3. *nāteṣvāra* N2

4. sācyavavidhāyinīṁ āryāṁ āhūya raṅgabhūṁīṁ

5. atikarunam vartate N2

\[\text{Laṅkēśvarasya bhavane}

suciraṃ shīteti
Rāmena lokapariva-

\[\text{ādiśto ’smi pariṣadā—tatrabhavato ’rāralapuravāstavya-
sya kaver Dūnāgasya kṛtī Kundamālā nāma, sā tvaya
prayoktaveteyī. tad yāvad asya sandarbhasya prayogā-
sācyavavidhāyinīṁ āryāṁ āhūya raṅgabhūṁīṁ avatārā-
mi.}\]

(nepathyē:) ita īto ’vataraṭvāryā.

SūTRADHĀRAH:

aye! ko mēkhāl āryāyāvānena sāhāyakam iva me sampā-
daśyati? (vi lokṣya) kaṣṭham bhoh! kaṣṭham bhoh!
atikarunam vartate

Laṅkēśvarasya bhavane
suciraṃ śhīteti
Rāmena lokapariva-

\[\text{N1 incipit: om namo nāteṣvāraya. jvālevordhṛdha... (Nepalese manuscripts from all periods usually write ārdhṛdha rather than ārdhvā.)}\]

\[\text{ārdhṛdha}^2\] em., *ārdhṛ N2

\[\text{nāndyante}^3\] em., nādyante N2

\[\text{tatrabhavato}^4\] conj., bhavato N2

\[\text{katokatharav}^5\] em., bhavataraṇa N2

\[\text{ko nu}^6\] conj., tat ko ‘nu N2

\[\text{The first folio of N1 is missing, fol. 2 begins with yati. vi lokṣya...}\]

\[\text{atikarunam}^8\] conj., ati ‘N1 N2

1. *toṣi* mss. SKA Dutta, *tuṅga* SRK

2. nāteṣvāra

3. *nāteṣvāra* N2

4. sācyavavidhāyinīṁ āryāṁ āhūya raṅgabhūṁīṁ

5. atikarunam vartate N2

\[\text{Laṅkēśvarasya bhavane}

suciraṃ shīteti
Rāmena lokapariva-

\[\text{ādiśto ’smi pariṣadā—tatrabhavato ’rāralapuravāstavya-
sya kaver Dūnāgasya kṛtī Kundamālā nāma, sā tvaya
prayoktaveteyī. tad yāvad asya sandarbhasya prayogā-
sācyavavidhāyinīṁ āryāṁ āhūya raṅgabhūṁīṁ avatārā-
mi.}\]

(nepathyē:) ita īto ’vataraṭvāryā.

SūTRADHĀRAH:

aye! ko mēkhāl āryāyāvānena sāhāyakam iva me sampā-
daśyati? (vi lokṣya) kaṣṭham bhoh! kaṣṭham bhoh!
atikarunam vartate

Laṅkēśvarasya bhavane
suciraṃ śhīteti
Rāmena lokapariva-
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"vikaśya yamāśa (vatsa Laksmana, atipravṛttāturanāgamavekam-piadhē ēttaḥ na pāremi saṃsthādum, kiṃ puṇa oda-ridum. (vatsa Laksmana, atipravṛttāturanāgamavekam-piadhē ēttaḥ na pāremi saṃsthādum, kiṃ puṇa avatāratu mātrāṃ.

Laksmanaḥ: ita ito 'vatāratvā ērāyā, ita itaḥ. ētaṇi nītā-ntagahanantarurutātpratānasamrddhatayā nā rathapravē-śayogāyāni Bhāgirathikānaṇānī.

Sītā: vaccha Lakkhaṇa, adisasapaiuttāturanāgamavekama-dhura etasmin rathavrā l Jáṇanā a pi saṃarthāsmy āsanaṇa dhārayitaṃ, kiṃ puṇa avaratitum."

Laksmanaḥ: ārya Sunantra, atirabhasaparvṛttadhavages-tāya alakṣitaśamavasīmāṃ tuʿraṅgamaṃ Gaṅga-prāpate kā dangersam api pātyantī. tat turaṅgamanīyam yatnāḥ kriyātīm.

Sumantrāḥ: ete kriyāmāṇāṃ, api yatnam avitartate haṃ gāndhāvparviyā vājīnā. pāsā—

amī patadbhī śravāṇeṣu manḍaṃ viṣṇyamāṇāḥ kalahaṃsaśagitaḥ anāśravāḥ pragrahasanyamasyāṃ turaṅgāmāṃ tūrṇataraṃ prayānti.

Laksmanaḥ: tathāpi sarvatmanā kriyātīṃ yatnāḥ.

Sumantrāḥ: yathājñāpayati kumāraḥ. "iti rāthāka-rṣaṇam abhinīga" āyuṣman, eṣa sthito rathaḥ. avatāratu devī.

(Sitā-Laksmana avatārya parikramati.)

Laksmanaḥ: ārya Sunantra, dirghādvaparipāśrāntās tu-raṅgāmāḥ, tad eto viśrāmaya. "iti samjñāṇam dadāti."

Sumantrāḥ: yadhājñāpayati kumāraḥ. "iti rathāka-rṣaṇam abhinīga."

Laksmanaḥ: eṣa sthito rathaḥ. tad avatāratu devī.

(Sitā abhāvita parikramati.)

Laksmanaḥ: Sunantra, dirghādvaparipāśrāntāt e tu-raṅgāmāḥ. tad viśrāmayaṅtām.

Sumantrāḥ: yad ājñāpayati devaḥ. "iti rathāṃ adhitārūga niṣkraṇtaḥ."

9 ṛi garbhaguruṇa] conj., adīgarvaguruṇa[N, N2
10) laksmanaḥ] N1, laksmaṇa N2
11) saṃuddha[em.], saṃuddha N2
12) saṃathah] N1, saṃatha N2
13) kiṃ] N1 ki N2
14) avaratidum] N1, avaratidum N2
15) kriyāmāṇam] em., kriyāmāṇam N1, N2
16) avitartante] N1, avitartate N2
17) kalahaṃsa] N1, kalaha N2
18) samyamaṃ] N2 N2ac, -samyasa N2ac
19) yadhājñāpayati] N1, yadhājñāpayati N2
20) ṛi] em., ṛi payasīti N1 N2
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"nīrvasītāṃ janapadād api garbhaguruṇa
Sītānā vaināya parīkṛṣaṇa Laksmaṇo 'yam.

(pitā niṣkraṇtaḥ, prastāvānaḥ.)

(tatāḥ pravīṣati sūtādhīṣṭhitaraṇaḥ Sītām āropya Laksmaṇaḥ.)

Laksmanaḥ: ita ito 'vatāratvā ērāyā, ita itaḥ. ētaṇi nītā-ntagahanantarurutātpratānasamrddhatayā nā rathapraveśāyogāyāni Bhāgirathikānaṇānī.

Sītā: vaccha Lakkhaṇa, adisasapaiuttāturanāgamavekama-dhura etasmin rathavrā l Jáṇanā a pi saṃarthāsmy āsanaṇa dhārayitaṃ, kiṃ puṇa avaratitum."

Laksmanaḥ: ārya Sunantra, atirabhasaparvṛttadhavages-tāya alakṣitaśamavasīmāṃ tuʿraṅgamaṃ Gaṅga-prāpate kā dangersam api pātyantī. tat turaṅgamanīyam yatnāḥ kriyātīm.

Sumantrāḥ: ete kriyāmāṇāṃ, api yatnam avitartate haṃ gāndhāvparviyā vājīnā. pāsā—

amī patadbhī śravāṇeṣu manḍaṃ viṣṇyamāṇāḥ kalahaṃsaśagitaḥ anāśravāḥ pragrahasanyamasyāṃ turaṅgāmāṃ tūrṇataraṃ prayānti.

Laksmanaḥ: tathāpi sarvatmanā kriyātīṃ yatnāḥ.

Sumantrāḥ: yathājñāpayati kumāraḥ. "iti rāthāka-rṣaṇam abhinīga" āyuṣman, eṣa sthito rathaḥ. avatāratu devī.

(Sitā-Laksmana avatārya parikramati.)

Laksmanaḥ: ārya Sunantra, dirghādvaparipāśrāntās tu-raṅgāmāḥ, tad eto viśrāmaya. "iti samjñāṇam dadāti."

Sumantrāḥ: yadhājñāpayati kumāraḥ. "iti rathāka-rṣaṇam abhinīga."

Laksmanaḥ: eṣa sthito rathaḥ. tad avatāratu devī.

(Sitā abhāvita parikramati.)

Laksmanaḥ: Sunantra, dirghādvaparipāśrāntāt e tu-raṅgāmāḥ. tad viśrāmayaṅtām.

Sumantrāḥ: yad ājñāpayati devaḥ. "iti rathāṃ adhitārūga niṣkraṇtaḥ."

7 nīrvasītāṃ... "guruṇa] mss. SD (p. 338), nīrvasītāṃ patīghṛd vijane vane 'śmin NLRK (quoted by DUTTA)
8 prastāvānaḥ] M1 M2 DUTTA, sthāpanā previous editions
9 kriyāmāṇam api "Tanjore mss. begin herefrom." (DUTTA) [T1 begins with yam api.]
10 amandram] DUTTA (M2), amandam M1, mantrama T1, mantrama T2, "The text here is mutilated in Tanjore scripts." (DUTTA)
11) Sumantraḥ... devī DUTTA (T2), Sumantraḥ (rajyākṣa-ṛṣanām abhinīga): eṣa sthito rathaḥ. tad u T1, Sumantraḥ (ra- jyākṣarṣaṇam abhinīga): eṣa sthito rathaḥ. tad avatāratu devī. M2, Sumantraḥ rajyākṣaṇam abhinīyāti M1, “the port[il] on following it is mutilated” (DUTTA)
N1:3r LAKŠMANAH: i'ta ita āryā. ita itaḥ, (iti parikrāmataḥ.) LAKŠMANAH (svagatam): ādiṣṭo 'ham āryeṇa, athavā svāminā: “vatsa Laksmana, devyāḥ kila Sitāyā Rāvaṇabhavanāvasthānād acāryitvam utpamnam. tataḥ pariṇām anyādṛṣa eva pralāpāḥ śrīyante. taṁ na yuktam kalatamātrasya kṛte śmākaṁ śaracandraṁnirnālyasya śvācvāuckyāvanasya kalāyam utpādayatīm. Sitāyā cāhaṁ gurvībhāvavasūlabhēm dohadena Bhāgṛathidasānāṁ pratv abhyarthītāḥ tāṁś tāṁ vām anenaiva vyājena Samuḍrādhiḥśitaratham āropya kutra çid vanoddeśāḥ tāṁ parītyāgyāvaṁ upapattāvaṁ. so ‘ham idāniṁ mandabhāyah svajanabhandhunirviśaṅkāṁ devīm ādāya gṛhahariniṁ iva vadhyaḥbhūmiṁ parītyāgyāvaṁ upanam utpagataḥ.

SĪṬA: vacca Lakkhaṇa, adisaḍāgabbaḥbhāvavanaṁ pariparissatāṁ na vahanti me ca/laṇāṁ tā tāgagdo bhavivaṁ nirūvehi dāva kedured bhavadeva Bhāraddhi ti. (vatsa Laksmana, atisyayagurukgarbhabharadvahanaparīśrāntau na vahato me caṇāṇu. tad agrato bhūtvā nirūpaya tātavā yāvad bhagavatī Bhāgarthītī.)

LAKŠMANAH: ārye, naṁ āṣamatarvartiṁ Gaṅgeti ratad avatārāśi. tad ālaṁ viśādena. saṃprāpta eva vayaṁ. paśyā,

ādāya paṁkajavanān
makarandagandhaṁ
kārṣaṁ, nītāntamadhirunā
kalahamaṁ
śītās taraṅgakāṅkaṁ
vikiram upeto Gaṅgānilas tava saṁbhājanakāṅkaṁṣeayaeva.

SĪṬA (sparśaṁ nātyaṁ): suśṭhu vuttam, edasā jalakaṁīja-pariśasusahasīdālaśa Gaṅgāmarudassa avidaṃmetatēna ķeṣeā pādājau)pariśasam adhipād kādo. tadāh vi dohadakūduhaḷeṇa Gaṅgāvagāhe adhiṣṭ maṃcuchhe ṣeti sarīrām. tā mātā todappadaśo jādā aparīsantā vāvadārāmi tadāh aśeṣe me magamas. (suṣṭhatēkām, etasya jalakāṅkāsūralaṁ śrīkuṭhaśalasaya Gaṅgāmarutusāyapātmātṛeṇa pādājau)pariśasamāraṇī tā kāṣṭo jātāḥ, tadāpi dohadakūṭhaḷena Gaṅgāvagāhe adhiṣṭ samutsukayati (?) me sarīrama. tad asmaṭ tattapraśedād yādā aparīśrāntā vyāvataraṇi (?) tathādeṣeya me maṅgam.)

N2:5r LAKŠMANAH (parikramya atmagatam): samādiṣto ‘ham āryeṇa, athavā śvāmiṁ “vatsa Laksmana, devyāḥ kila Sitāyā Rāvaṇabhavanāsamsthānāṁ caśītām prati samutpannavamarśānaṁ paurāṇāṁ anyādṛṣaḥ pralāpāḥ pravartante, tān na śāknomitītāmātrasya kṛte śaracandraṁnirnālyasya śvācvāckyāvanasya kalāyam utpādayatīm. Sitāyā cāhaṁ gurvībhāvavasūlabhēm dohadena Bhāgṛathidasānāṁ pratv arthītāḥ tāṁś tāṁ vām anenaiva Gaṅgāmanavavyājena Samuḍrādhiḥśitaratham āropya kasmin ca cid vanoddeśe purṇaṣṭaya nivartavesvi.” tātah āham aśiṣṭaṁ bhagavatī Bhāgarthītī tartaṁ āropya kasmin ca vaidyabhūmiṁ vanaṁ upanayāmāṁ.

SĪṬA: vaccha Lakkhaṇa, adisaḍāgabbaḥbhāvavanaṁ pariparissantau na pāhuvaṁti me caṇāṇu. tā tāgagdo bhavivaṁ nirūvehi kṣitiṁ Bhavadeva Bhāraddhi ti. (vatsa Laksmana, atisyayagurukgarbhabharadvahanaparīśrāntau na prabhuvato me caṇāṇu. tad agrato bhūtvā nirūpaya tātavā yāvad bhagavatī Bhāgarthītī vartaṁ ātrip.

LAKŠMANAH: naṁ āṣamanaiva bhagavatī Bhāgarthī, tātah ālaṁ viśādena. saṃprāpta eva vayaṁ. paśyā, ādāya paṁkajavanān
makarandagandhān
kārṣaṁ, nītāntamadhirunā
kalahamaṁ
śītās taraṅgakāṅkaṁ
vikiram upeto Gaṅgānilas tava saṁbhājanakāṅkaṁṣeayaeva.

SĪṬA (sparśaṁ nātyaṁ): sampradaṁ janāṅkaraparipārsusahasīdālaśa Gaṅgāmarudassa pārīśrasuṣeṣe māṇe pāvavam śaśītām adhipād kādo. tadāh vi dohadakūduhaḷeṇa Gaṅgāvagāhe naṁ maṃcuchhe ṣeti sarīrām. tā mātā todappadaśo jādā aparīsantā vāvadārāmi tadāh aśeṣe me magamas. (sāṃpradaṁ janāṅkaraparipārsusahasītalsaya Bhāgarthanāarpānārūṣetāmārāraṇāramuṣeṣeṣe māṇe pāvavam pāṇya tadāh vi dohadakūduhaḷeṇa Gaṅgāvagāhe naṁ maṃcuchhe ṣeti sarīrām. tām sadā nītāntamadhirunā apariśrāntaṁ vyāvataraṇi (?) tathādeṣeya me maṅgam.)

12 pratv arthītāḥ M₂, pratvāsthītahi (?) T₁, prārthītāḥ DUTTA (M₁ T₂) 12

13vacca. . .) cf. NLRK (quoted by DUTTA): vacca Lakkhaṇa, adisaḍāgabbaḥbhāvavanaṁ vahanacchānaṁ ṣa (v.e. vahanacchānaṁ maṭeha / mantapa(?) na) vahanahitāme caṇāṇu. tā tāgagdo bhavivaṁ nirūvehi dāva kedure bhavadeva Bhāraddhi ti.

14adisa получи) DUTTA (M₁ M₂ T₂?), adisa “) T₁

15 kṣita(?) DUTTA (M₁?), kedure T₁ T₂, kedure M₂ 16

16sampadanā) DUTTA (M₁ M₂ T₂?), ettha T₁ 17

17pariparissāha) DUTTA (M₁ M₂ T₂?), “parisuha” T₁ 18

18 “śiṣā” . . pāvavam DUTTA (M₁ M₂ T₂?), “śiṣā” tāvaḥ sa vi pāvavam (p cancelled?) vi T₁ 19

19jha parīṣṣaṇtāḥ DUTTA (M₁ M₂ T₂?), jahāparaḥ T₁
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18 A PARALLEL EDITION OF THE FIRST ACT OF THE KUNDAMĀLĀ (Pt. I)
LAKŚMAṆĀ (puro nirdśīya): ārye, atyantavīśamānuṣyaṃviiṣeṣāt 

SīTĀ (yathoktām avātīrya): vaccha, suṣṭhū prīśaṁtaṇām. etad kim pāsuvacchāyayāū mūhūttaṃ upaviṣā viśsamisān.

LAKŚMAṆĀ: āho! asañhārayaparicchadhā suṅktināḥ. tathā hi,

SīTĀ: jadha bhanidaṃ kumārea, sañjanaṃjñagadāde (via ettha ahirāmārde mē hiaam).
(yathā bhapitaṃ kumārea, svajānamadhyagatāyā ivātrābhīramate me hṛdayaṃ.)

LAKŚMAṆĀ (sevgatam): esā viśrānta sukhopaviṣṭā devī. tad ayam evāvasaraḥ. bhavantu, yathāsthitaṃ āvedyāmī.

LAKŚMAṆĀ (ātmagatam): ālaḥ sukhopaviṣṭā ca devī. tad ayam evāvasaro yathāsthitaṃ vyavasitum. (prakāśam, sahasā pādasya nipatya) ayam anavartaṣṭāvajayaṇapraśadadvahṣaṃvībhagānirnākṣo Lakṣmaṇo vijyāpayati, tathātāriyātā devī...

SīTĀ: jaha bhanidaṃ kumārea, saañañamajñagadā ciṣārata duravatāro 'yam ādānā ekṣaṃ. mē etassim. pāavacchāyē mē hṛdayaṃ.
(yathā bhapitaṃ kumārea, svajānamadhyagatāyā ivātrābhīramate me hṛdayaṃ.)

LAKŚMAṆĀ (vamaṃ nirdśīya): evam gate kīḍaṃ kusalaṃ āryasya?

31√dhuṣascāratayā N1, √dhuṣascāratayā N2
32√deśas N1, √deśa N2
33√prapadām conj. pramādaṃ N1 N2
34√jañānaya¯vatartav N1, jañānaya¯vatartav N2
35√parisamantā em., parissatta N1 N2
36√uvasiśa N1, uvasiśa N2
37√asamhārya° conj., asahāya° N1 N2
38√sañilañikā° N1, sañilañikā° N2
39√mañjaya conj., viramati N1 N2
40√jadhā N1, yathā N2
41√gadā N1, √gadē N2
42√kriyātāṃ N1, √kṛtā N2
43√kusalā em., kusalaṃ N1 N2
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LAKŚMAṆĀH (vanaṁ nirdśya): evaṁ gate kīḍrṣaṁ kuśalam āryasya?

Sītā: kim puṇo vi saṁādiṭṭho vaṇāvāso ambāye Kekaie?
(kim punāpi saṁādiṣṭo vaṇāvāso 'mbaya Kaikeyayā?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: samādiṣṭo vaṇāvāso, na punar ambayā.

Sītā: keṇa unā?
(kena punaḥ?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: āryeṇa.

Sītā: kassa?
(kasya?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH (bāspastambhaṁ nātayitvā):
āryasyādeśa ity eva,
vaktum iĉchāmi yatnataḥ
taveti hṛdayam gatvā
kāthāṁ bhāṁ bhārati.

Sītā: vaccha, kim mama saṁādiṭṭho vaṇāvāso?
(vatśa, kim kīṁ maṁ saṁādiṣṭo vaṇāvasah?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: na kevalaṁ tavātmāno ‘pi.

Sītā: kathāṁ via?
(kathāṁ iva?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH:
prakāmabhuṅktaśīśītvattapīṁ,
suhrjanenāhitayaṅgayavahanaṁ,
āryasya ramye bhavane ’pi vāSAT āyasa
 tapi pravāsena vaṇāvāsena eva.

Sītā: paripphuṇaṁ kadhēhi, *kadhāṁ mama vaṇāvāso
ajajītattasa ppaṅva ti.
(paripṛṣṭaṁ kathyaya, kathāṁ mama vaṇāвāsa āryaputrasa pravāsa iti.)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: ārye, kim aparāṇaṁ kathayāmi mandaṁbhāgyaṁ

parityaktā tvam āryena,
cāritragunāsāllīnī,
mayā ca kīla gantavyaṁ

N2:53v
N1:5e

Sītā: ajjū Kekaie puṇo vi saṁādiṭṭho vaṇāvāso?
(āryaṁ Kaikeyaṁ punaṁ api saṁādiṣṭo vaṇāvāṣaṁ?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: samādiṣṭo vaṇāvāso, na punar ambayā.

Sītā: keṇa unā samādiṭṭho?
(kena punaḥ saṁādiṣṭaḥ?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: āryeṇa.

Sītā: khaṁ samādiṭṭho?
(kathed samādiṣṭaḥ?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH (bāspastambhaṁ abhināya):
āryasyādeśa ity eva,
vaktum iĉchāmi yatnataḥ
taveti hṛdayam gatvā
granthim bhāṁ bhārati.

Sītā: kim mama saṁādiṭṭho vaṇāvāso?
(kim mama saṁādiṣṭo vaṇāvasaḥ?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: na kevalaṁ tava, ātmamo ’pi.

Sītā: khaṁ via?
(kathāṁ iva?)

LAKŚMAṆĀH:
prakāmabhuṅkta svagṛḥābhīmānat
suhrjanenāhitayaṅgayavahanaṁ
āryasya ramye bhavane ’pi vāSAT
tavi pravāsena vaṇāvāsena eva.

Sītā: vaccha, paripphuṅaṁ kaṁhehi, ajjū khaṁ mama vaṇāvāso ayyautattasa vaṇāvaṁ
(tatī, paripṛṣṭaṁ kathyaya, adya kathāṁ mama vaṇāvaṁ āryaputrasa vaṇāvāsa iti.)

LAKŚMAṆĀH: kim aparāṇaṁ kathayāmi mandaṁbhāgyaṁ?

tyaktā kīla tvam āryena
cāiritragunāsāllīnī,
mayāpi kīla gantavyaṁ

tyaktvā tvam iha kānane.

44kīḍrṣaṁ| N1, kīḍrṣa N2
45āryasya| N1, rāmasya N2
46Lakṣmaṇaḥ| N1, om. N2
47ambaṁ| N1, ambāya N2
48evaṁ| N1, eva N2
49kathaṁ| N1, katha N2
50bhāṁ| N1 N2p, badhnā N2ac
51bhākta| conj., “bhākti”| N1 N2
52vahanaṁ| N1 N2p, “hau”| N2ac
53pi| N1 N2p, om. N2p
54vāSAT| N1, vāsa N2
55aparaṁ| N1 N2p, aram N2ac
56bhāgyaṁ| N1, “bhāgya N2

23ajjū Dutta (M1 M2), ki (kim?) aṣe T1, aamae [? read: ayyae?] T2
24āryaṁ previous eds., ambayā Dutta
25kahaṁ Dutta (M1 M2), kassa T1, kansa [read: kassa?] T2
26evaṁ Dutta (M1 M2 T2), eṣa T3
27ajjū Dutta (M1 T1 T2), om. M2
28vaṇāvāso Dutta (M1 M2 T2), bh(h?)aṇāvāso T1
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Sītā: hā tāda, ārya Kośalāhīva, ajja uvarado si. (hā tāta, ārya Kośalādhipa, adyaparato ‘sī.) (iti moham upagatā.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ (sasambhramam): hā hā dhīk kaṣṭham. nirghātāpatādārūṇenaṃ nāṃ naṃ u-paratā devī. tat ko nu khālu samāśvānaṃ ‘bhuyāyāḥ? (viśāḍam nātāgya?)

Sītā samāśvasītā.

Lakṣmaṇaḥ (Sītāṃ dhṛtvā saharṣaṃ):

Bhāgurathīśīkaraśītalena
samvijyamānā vanamārūtena
madbhāgyaśeṣeṇa ca bodhyamānā
dvyagata rājastu kathāṃ cit.

Sītā: *vaccha Lakkhaṇa! kim gado si? (vatsa Laksmaṇa! kim gato ‘sī?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: ārye, eṣa tiṣṭhāmi mandabhāgyaḥ.

Sītā (āṭhāgopavāśa): vaccha Lakkhaṇa, kitti uvālam-bhia ajaiśteṇa ahaṃ parīcattātā?

(vatsa Laksmaṇa, kim ity upālabhyārṇapuruṣaṇaṃ pari-
yaktātā?)

N1:5:4r *Lakṣmaṇaḥ: kidṛṣo devyā upālaṃbhāḥ?

Sītā: aho me adhaṇṇatatanam janena keṇa ci uvā-lamhamattakeṇa viṇā viṃ nāṇugghilida mhi. vaccha, aththi mama kim pi tena saṃdhiṣṭaṃ?

(aho me ‘dhanayatvaṃ yat keṇa cid upālabhamatātreṇa viṇāpi nāṇugṛhitām. vatsa, asti mama kim api tena saṃdhiṣṭaṃ?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: asti.

Sītā: kadhehi. (kathaya.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
tulvyānvaṇety anuguneti guṇāviveti
duṣkhe sukhe ca suciṛaṃ sahatvāsīnītānañāmi, kevalam ahaṃ janavādabhiṣyā
Sīte tyajāmi bhavaṃṇa na caritraḍoṣāt.

Sītā: janāvāvādabhaṃaṇa? kim vaṇṇaṃ pi me aththi? (janāpāvādabhaṇaṇa? kim vacanīyaṃ api me ‘ṣṭī?)

Sītā: hā tāda, ayya Kosalāhīva, ajja uvarado si. (hā tāta, ārya Kośalādhipa, adyaparato ‘sī.) (moham gaccha-
tā.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ (sasambhramam): kaṣṭaṃ bhoh! kaṣṭaṃ bhoh nirghāṭapatādārūṇenaṃ parītyagavāṛtāsraṇena parītyagatā rājastu kathāṃ cit.

Sītā: vaccha Lakkhaṇa! kim gado si?

(vatsa Laksmaṇa! kim gato ‘sī?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: ājñāpaya, tiṣṭhānī eṣa mandabhāgyaḥ.

Sītā: kim uvālaṃbhīṃ amṛṇi parīcattātā?

(kim upālabhyāṃśi parītyaktātā?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: kidṛṣo devyā upālaṃbhāḥ?

Sītā: aho me adhaṇṇatatanam! kim uvālabhametatta-
eṇa viṇā nīgalida hmi kim aththi kim viṃ deṇa saṃdhi-
ṭhaṃ?

(aho me ‘dhanayatvaṃ! kim upālabhamatātreṇa viṇā nī-
ghṛhitām? kim asti kim api tena saṃdhiṣṭaṃ?)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: asti.

Sītā: kahehi kahehi.

(kathaya kathaya.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ:
tulvyānvaṇety anuguneti guṇāviveti
duṣkhe sukhe ca suciṛaṃ sahatvāsīnītānañāmi, kevalam ahaṃ janavādabhiṣyā
Sīte tyajāmi bhavaṃṇa na tu bhavaḥdoṣāt.

ayam āryasya saṃdeśāḥ.

Sītā: kaḥaṃ janavādabhayaṇetteṇi? kim vi vaṇṇaṃ me aththi?

(kathama janavādabhayaṇeti? kim api vacaniyaṃ me ‘ṣṭī?)
LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: kidṛṣṭṇa devyā vacanīyaṁ?

SĪTĀ: kadhehi kīṁ kīṁ tu?

LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: — loko nirānkuṣāḥ.

SĪTĀ: haddī haddī. aggisuddhīsamkītaṇeṇa sumarāvidī. vaṭcha, āvva evam u>vālabhiṣṭaḥ ajaśiṭṭaḥ pa- riceṣṭṭaḥ ahaṁ tā suṣṭhau pariccattā,mī. tā juttam ajaśiṭṭapariccattam attānaṁ pariccaudī. kīṁ tu tassa ījye nirānukkuṣoṣaṁ samāpiṣkiṣi sa gabbhau pari- rakkhidavvo. tena vaṇ琏kalaiṅkohadhau attānaṁ pari- rakkhiṃ.66


LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: amrūṛiḥo 'smī. idam aparṇam āryeṇādi- śṭāṃ adārāt.

SĪTĀ: kīṁ ṭu kkhu bhavissadi?

LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: tvāṃ devi citraṇihītā, grhadevate ā, svapne tathā śayanaṃ- dhyagatā sakhi tvam, dārāntarāharaṇani- śṛṇhamānasasya, yāge 'pi te praktikṛtī mama dharmapatiṃ.68

LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: kidṛṣṭṇa śrīyā vacanīyaṁ?

SĪTĀ (lajajāṃ nāyatayi): kahehi kīṁ?

LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: — loko nirānkuṣāḥ.


LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: amrūṛiḥo 'smī. uttāḥya paṇrāmati. idam aparṇam śrīyeṇādi- śṭāṃ adārāt.

SĪTĀ: kīṁ ṭu khec bhavissadi?

LAKŚMANAṆAṆ: tvāṃ devi cītanīhitā, grhadevate ā, svapnagatā śayanama- dhyasakhi tvam eva dārāntarāharaṇani- śṛṇhamānasasya, yāge tava pratiḥkṛtī

---

66[muninān] N1, muniṇāna na N2
67[lajajāṃ nāyatayi] N1, om. N2
68[sumarāvida] N1 N2ac, sumavida N2ac
69[uggho] N1, ugggo N2
70[saṃbhiṅhadv] N1, bhāvadv N2
71[aelaṇ] N1, ala N2
72[pariccaudī] N1, pariccaudī N2
73[parti] N1, piri N2
74[ciṭra] N1, ci N2
75[dārāntarāḥa] N2ac N1, dārāntāha N2ac
76[amrūṛiḥo] N1, amrūṛiḥo om. T1
77[uttāḥya paṇrāmati] om. T1
78[mahālānaṅa] Dutta (M1 M2), ubbosi T1, uposadi T2
79[pariccaudī] Dutta (M1 M2), mahakkāṇe. vaṭcha T1, mahālīvne. vaṭcha T2
80[supariccaudī] mī. M1 M2, ṭu pariccattā mī. Dutta, om. T1 T2
81[pariccaudī] mī. M1 M2, ṭu pariccattā mī. Dutta, om. T1 T2
82[kīṁ ṭu khec juttam mama] conj., kīṁ ṭu khec juttam mama T1, sī-ḥu khec juttam mama T2, kīṁ ṭu khec juttam mama Ṇāma (M1), ṭu khec juttam mama M2
83[mahādyasakhi] Dutta (M1 T2 T2), na M2 previous eds.
84[jīvidan] Dutta (M1 M2 T2 T2), om. T1
85[mahādyasakhi] tvam eva] Dutta (M1 M2 T2 T2), “māhādyagatā sakhi tvam T1ac, “māhādyagataḥ sakhi tvam T1ac
Sītā: evam sandīṣṭaṁ pariccādunkhavat[44] pi me avanītāṁ. na tadā maṁ itthiṣṭāṁ pāṇīḥ itthiṣṭāṇaṁ dukkhvam uppaḍanto jadha aṣṭaṁ tāṁ. (evam sandīṣṭaṁ paryāyaṁ dukkhvam aṁ neti paryāyaṁ. na na tathā aṁ ṣaṁ tattā pāṇīḥ itthiṣṭāṇaṁ dukkhvam uppaḍeto jahā aṁṣasato.)

Lakṣmaṇaḥ: caḥ pratīsandeśaḥ[45]


Nī:7v LAKSAMANAHK: *pratīsīyeyām ājīva[46] āsya na koṁ ciḏ aṁi sāndeṣṭvavāyam?


LAKSMANAHK: kiṁ etāvāt aṁi prabhavaṁ na devi?

Sītā: evam sandīṣṭaṁ ayaṁiṭṭheṣa pariccādun-kkhavam mayī niṟravaseṁaṁ avanītāṁ. na maṁ itthiṣṭāṁ pāṇīḥ itthiṣṭāṇaṁ dukkhvam uppaḍeto jahā aṁṣasato. (evam sandīṣṭaṁ ayaṁiṭṭheṣa māṇyaṁ niṟravaseṁaṁ aṁpaṇitāṁ. na na tathāṅyā saktā patauyāḥ strījaṁaṁsa dukkhvam upapadaṁyati aṁṣyāsaktāṁ.)

LAKSMANAHK: caḥ pratīsandeśaḥ?

Sītā: kassa? (kasya?)

LAKSMANAHK: āsyaṣa.


LAKSMANAHK: pratīsīyeyām ājīva. āsyaṣa na kiṁ cet sanḍīṣṭaṁ?

Sītā: tathaṁ nīṭhuru nāma sanḍīṣiādi tti appadīha-da vaṅṭadē esā Lakkhaṇaṁ. na Śīḍāh dhūṭtattaṁ. tathaṁ mama vaanaṁ tāṁ janaṁ viṁśaṅe — maṁ maṇḍabhaṅgīṁ ānusoṣanto vāṃsaṁparipālaṁ ahaṅkhamoḥttaṁ na[53] bādhehi, sadaṃhame sārāre sāvadhāṇo bhavīsati. vatsa Laksmaṇa, kiṁ upālaḥbe ṣaṁrājāma?)

LAKSMANAHK: kiṁ etāvāt aṁi prabhavaṁ na devi?
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UNNI, N. P.
For quite some time now, a group of scholars at the University of Groningen and elsewhere has been working on the earliest known work that identified itself as the Skandapurāṇa. In its oldest surviving manuscripts, all Nepalese, this work calls itself simply that; manuscripts of what appear to be two later (closely related) recensions call themselves respectively the Revākhaṇḍa (R) of the Skandapurāṇa and the Ambikākhaṇḍa (A) of the Skandapurāṇa. Two volumes of a new critical edition of this text (first published by Kṛṣṇa Prasāda Bhaṭṭārāṇi in 1988) have been published so far, in 1998 (eds. R. Adriænsen, H.T. Bakker, and H. Isaacson) and 2004 (eds. H.T. Bakker and H. Isaacson), as supplement volumes to the Groningen Oriental Series; numerous articles have also been dedicated to the work (some are collected in Origin and growth of the purāṇic text corpus: with special reference to the Skandapurāṇa, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2004. Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference, Vol. 3,2, while others have appeared in various journals and felicitation or other collective volumes). Peter Bisschop (currently Lecturer in Sanskrit Studies at the University of Edinburgh) has now published a monograph (revised from his doctoral dissertation at the University of Groningen, 2004) containing a detailed study of the evidence of the Skandapurāṇa for the sacred topography of early Śaivism. The core of the book is again a critical edition, this time of chapter 167 of the text, which contains a list of Śiva’s sanctuaries (āyatana). New is that in fact not one but two editions of the same chapter are presented: one gives the recension represented by the early Nepalese manuscripts (two are available for this chapter, S1 = NAK 2–229 = NGMPP B 11/4; S2 = NAK 1–831 = NGMPP B 12/3), while the other is based on the manuscripts of the R and A recensions, attempting to reconstruct a common ancestor thereof. Each edition receives its own synopsis, and its own detailed annotation.

The choice to present two editions is discussed in detail (see especially pp. 47–49); it is chiefly justified by the fact that in this chapter the R and A recensions contain much additional matter, including an additional frame story and more elaborate accounts of most of the sacred places. Since the manuscripts of these recensions are in the main rather bad, reconstructing an intelligible text was no easy task. The tentative nature of this second edition is clear from the numerous crux marks and wavy lines. Further progress should be possible in the future; but Bisschop’s edition makes available for the first time some material of considerable interest (not included in the edition of the Skandapurāṇa published by Bhaṭṭārāṇi), and his extensive annotation, discussing both the (numerous) textual difficulties and the significance of the revisions and additions that we find in the R and A recensions, will doubtless be appreciated.

It is clear that much more remains to be done on the old Skandapurāṇa, a work which might have languished unpublished and unknown to scholars had it not been for the fortunate circumstance that it survived in old Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts first noticed more than a century ago by Haraprasad Shastri. This handsomely produced and well-indexed book gives a good example, particularly in its rich annotation of the edited text, of the fruits that can be won from the careful study of this text. The importance of this ancient Purāṇa, not merely for our understanding of the processes by which Purāṇic literature was composed and transmitted, but also as a remarkable source for the study of the history of Indian religions, in particular Śaivism, is becoming steadily clearer.

(Harunaga Isaacson)

One more Manuscript of the Śiṣyalekha

Diwakar Acharya

One more paper manuscript of the Śiṣyalekha of Candragomin not known to the editor and translator of the text, Prof. Michael Hahn, has been found in the National Archives, Kathmandu. It is a copy of the origi-
nal Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript now preserved at Cambridge. This manuscript appears older than the other two paper manuscripts known to the editor, as the scribe has apparently read one or two extra aksaras at the damaged edges of the original palm-leaves. It bears manuscript no. 5-7848, and has been microfilmed on NGMPP reel no. B 315/11.

I checked the edition against this new manuscript in places where the editor uses brackets in order to suggest that the text is lost, dropped or partially damaged in the manuscript, or an asterisk to mark his emendation to the text. I present here the cases where the new reading might necessitate a reconsideration of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>New Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>tāpā(µa)(hāri pa-ra)nī(r)(v)(ṛ)t-ś-kāranaṃ ca</td>
<td>tāpāpanodanan eva ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>( ... hradāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>sīksā[pa-deṣa]</td>
<td>sīksābalaṃa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b</td>
<td>nīrāyaḥ ca ghorāḥ</td>
<td>nīrāyaḥ(!) sughorāḥ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>ba{(ba)logra}</td>
<td>ba{bahlogra}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22b</td>
<td>*bhī[āvaḥ]</td>
<td>*bhāvaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23d</td>
<td>ba{(bi)laṃ}</td>
<td>lalitaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>balā(ḍ a)nicchataḥ</td>
<td>balād anicchataḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26c</td>
<td>(karo)ti</td>
<td>karoti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28a</td>
<td>(tato) 'ṣya</td>
<td>tato 'ṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29c</td>
<td>upa(µa)ucchati</td>
<td>upagacchati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a</td>
<td>iti (ce)(t ca)</td>
<td>iti cet ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32c</td>
<td>vijaḥāti (niṣaṃ)</td>
<td>vijaḥāti niṣaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39a</td>
<td>*tuhaṃnilo 'pi</td>
<td>tuhaṃnilo pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41a</td>
<td>caṇica(ṣa)taṇikara*</td>
<td><em>caṇcacaṭṭā(ṭ)niṇara</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42d</td>
<td>&quot;hāsa&quot;nicitāntaka*</td>
<td>&quot;hāsanicitāntaka*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51c</td>
<td>*kartum kartum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54c</td>
<td><em>(sakalāvali)</em></td>
<td>&quot;sakalāvali&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57c</td>
<td>*ghaṭītaṃ</td>
<td>ghaṭītaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63b</td>
<td>*āropayanti *śivam</td>
<td>āropayanti subham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97c</td>
<td><em>ṭa vasaṭalā</em></td>
<td>tannispala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100a</td>
<td>(na yanāḥ) (kṣema-)na va ca</td>
<td>na mārasvyāya na ca(!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109a</td>
<td>*nityākīrṇān</td>
<td>nityākīrṇān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110d</td>
<td>(bhava)-bhava</td>
<td>bhavaḥbhava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114b</td>
<td>(kamalī(ṇi))</td>
<td>&quot;kamalīn&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the above cases confirm the editor’s restorations and emendations, but the instances of 7c, 8c, 11a, 57c, 63b, 97c and 100a are different. In verse 7c, it seems that the author used apanodana not apahārīa. In verse 11a, sīksābalaṃa might possibly be considered, though this reading may ultimately be unsatisfactory. In verse 57c, ghaṭītaṃ fits well and gives a little more alliteration. In 63b, it is possible to accept subham as found in the new manuscript. In 97c, the palm-leaf manuscript reads tannispalaḥ, and the new manuscript further drops the visarga. Both of these readings are corrupt, but perhaps the original might have been tannir-bharāḥ. In 100a, the reading of the new manuscript does not fit in the context but might help to guess at the original reading, for which na yanāḥ nōdyānair na ca may be a possibility. The two aksaras at the broken edge of the palm-leaf are closer to dyānair in the new manuscript, and cannot be read kṣema- as in the edition.
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Kaiser Shamsher, his Library and his Manuscript Collection

Dragomir Dimitrov and Kashinath Tamot (Kathmandu)

Kaiser Shamsher was born as the third son of the Rana prime minister Chandra Shamsher Jang Bahadur Rana (1863–1929) and Loka Bhakta Lakshmi Devi (1867–1905) on 8 January 1892 at Thapathali in Kathmandu. He received his education at the Durbar High School. In 1908 Kaiser Shamsher went to Britain together with his father and remained there for a year — an experience which made a deep impression on his young mind.

During his lifetime Kaiser Shamsher occupied various posts and had many responsibilities both in the civil and the military administration. In 1901 he was appointed major general. In 1920 Kaiser Shamsher became a lieutenant general. In 1922–30 he served as the chairman of the Kathmandu municipality. Later he was the southern commanding general (1934–45) and eastern commanding general (1945–47). Kaiser Shamsher worked as director general of various institutions, such as the Royal Museum (1928–39), the Archaeology Department (1931–39), and the National Museum.

We would like to thank Philip Pierce for checking the English of this article, and Bijay Gurung, Navraj Gurung and Yugesh Budhathoki for their assistance in providing us with relevant materials used here.

1There is a minor typo in the edition; brackets are wrongly placed. It should be tāpā(µa)(hāri pa-ra)nī(r)(v)(ṛ)t-ś-kāranaṃ ca)
the Foreign Affairs Department (1932–37). As a foreign minister of Nepal, he attended the coronation ceremony of George VI on 12 May 1937 at Westminster Abbey in London. In 1947–48 Kaiser Shamsher was appointed as Nepal’s ambassador to Britain. In 1951–53 he was commander-in-chief. He also served as minister of defence (1951–55) and minister of finance and administration (1952–53). In 1956 Kaiser Shamsher was promoted to field marshal.

For his good services Kaiser Shamsher received various orders and awards. He was decorated with the Star of Nepal First Class (Supradīpta Mānyavara), the Order of Om Ram Patta, the Order of Tri Shakti Patta First Class, and the Order of Ojaswi Rajanya, to name only a few of his Nepalese decorations. On 23 May 1934, in Kathmandu the French Government bestowed upon Kaiser Shamsher the distinction of Grand Officer of the Order of the Legion of Honour of France.

As for his family life, Kaiser Shamsher married twice and had five sons and five daughters. On 20 April 1904 he married his first wife Lakshmi Rajya Lakshmi Devi (1895–1954), the eldest daughter of King Prithvi Bir Bikram Shah Dev (1875–1911). Hemraj Sharma (1878–1953) collected certifications and other [necessary items] from the sacred scriptures and arranged the marriage. In 1943 Kaiser Shamsher married Krishna Chandra Devi, daughter of Mukunda Bahadur Singh of Bajura. Kaiser Shamsher was undoubtedly a remarkable intellectual who was deeply respected by his contemporaries. Perceval Landon, the author of a two-volume work on the history of Nepal published in 1928 during the rule of Chandra Shamsher (1901–29), was highly impressed by Kaiser Shamsher:

The third son is General Kaiser, who combines an astonishing width of reading, knowledge of the world, and general culture with a reputation as a first-class shot and an expert knowledge of the fauna of Nepal. He has been commissioned to make the arrangements for the great big game shoots which take place from time to time in honour of distinguished visitors, and if the organization of the camps and general sporting strategy of that which was attended by the Prince of Wales in 1922 is an indication of General Kaiser’s capacity, his future career will be watched with no little interest not only by India, but by Western Asia.

Kaiser Shamsher had a keen interest in zoology. His contributions on the study of rhinoceroses were published in the Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society. He also collected animals for research purposes. In this connection Landon remarks:

General Kaiser had been chiefly concerned with making this collection, and king George expressed to him his great pleasure and satisfaction in becoming thus the owner of so many of the animals that were destined to fill needed gaps in the collection in the Zoological Gardens in London.

Kaiser Shamsher was also interested in astronomy. His correspondence with the pundit Hemraj Sharma in the 1920s includes queries about the subject. Further, Kaiser Shamsher had notable literary contributions to his credit. He translated Kālidāsa’s play Vikramorvaśī in 1925 and published it himself. This is one of the earliest translations of Sanskrit literature in modern Nepali. The language was corrected by Hemraj Sharma, the prescriptive grammarian of Nepali whose grammar Candrikā (Gorakhbābāśī-vaśyakarana) was published in 1912. Kaiser Shamsher is also known for his contributions in the field of Nepalese historical literature. In 1951–64 he was patron and treasurer of the Nepāla-Sāṁskṛtika

\[^{13}\text{See Bhaṭṭaṛāi 1999, pp. 717–718.}\]
The Kaiser Library  The most significant legacy left by Kaiser Shamsher is undoubtedly his private library, which embodies its owner's passionate and lifelong efforts in collecting books from both Europe and Asia. From his trips to Britain Kaiser Shamsher, a bibliophile par excellence, inevitably brought back many new books for his own collection. He also used his good connections and high positions to gain access to rare printed and handwritten material from Nepal and India. The history of the library can be traced back to 1909, when Kaiser Shamsher started putting his own stamp on the books in his possession. Within about half a century the number of his books grew to such an extent that it may now safely be considered one of the largest private libraries in South Asia, and certainly the largest one in Nepal. The collections kept in this library, though neglected for a long time, are of great importance and deserve much more attention and closer study. Since its beginnings the library has been accommodated in a building which was constructed in 1895 by order of Bir Shamsher and which Chandra Shamsher purchased in 1908 for his son. After Kaiser Shamsher's demise in 1964, in accordance with his wife's will his second wife Krishna Chandra Devi donated 190 ropanis (9.67 hectares) of land to His Majesty's Government of Nepal, at a special ceremony on 11 September 1968. The donation consisted of the Kaiser Mahal (the Kaiser Palace), the Kaiser Pustakalaya (the Kaiser Library) and the Kaiser Baga (the Kaiser Garden, recently reopened under the name of "Garden of Dreams"). Each of these assets has its own glorious history. Here we are concerned, however, only with the Kaiser Library. When it was donated, Kaiser Shamsher's private library contained approximately twenty-eight thousand printed books in various languages and covering a large number of subjects, such as history, religion, philosophy, astronomy, medicine, hunting, gardening, and travelling. The Kaiser Library is very important for its early "Nepal Collection". In 1974 Thakurlal Manandhar published a detailed bibliography of the works on Nepal in the Kaiser Library. One highlight of this library is its collection of rare English books, especially publications from the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Among scholars, the Kaiser Library is particularly famous for its collection of Nepalese manuscripts. Besides this, many noteworthy paintings, photographs, sculptures, maps and press cuttings are also part of the library and attract public interest. The portraits of various Nepalese and foreign personalities are especially worth seeing. As Amatya points out, the Kaiser Library is "not a mere library but also a rich art gallery" and "a small Museum by itself".

Parisad (Nepal Cultural Council), which brought out a number of publications with his support.

Kaiser Shamsher was, then, a man of varied interests. As Saphalya Amatya remarks, “[t]he Late Kaiser was essentially a man of artistic taste. He was very much interested in paintings, photographs and gardening. He himself was a good photographer and a competent gardener.” Mahes Raj Pant rightfully describes him as “the great connoisseur of books” Salil Subedi and Anagha Neelakantan sum him up in the following words: “By all records, Keshar Sumsher loved the good life, books, botany, good food and wine, and beautiful women." Kaiser Shamsher passed away on 7 June 1964 at the age of 72.

The Kaiser Library The most significant legacy left by Kaiser Shamsher is undoubtedly his private library, which embodies its owner’s passionate and lifelong efforts in collecting books from both Europe and Asia. From his trips to Britain Kaiser Shamsher, a bibliophile par excellence, inevitably brought back many new books for his own collection. He also used his good connections and high positions to gain access to rare printed and handwritten material from Nepal and India. The history of the library can be traced back to 1909, when Kaiser Shamsher started putting his own stamp on the books in his possession. Within about half a century the number of his books grew to such an extent that it may now safely be considered one of the largest private libraries in South Asia, and certainly the largest one in Nepal. The collections kept in this library, though neglected for a long time, are of great importance and deserve much more attention and closer study.

Since its beginnings the library has been accommodated in a building which was constructed in 1895 by order of Bir Shamsher and which Chandra Shamsher purchased in 1908 for his son. After Kaiser Shamsher’s demise in 1964, in accordance with his wife’s will his second wife Krishna Chandra Devi donated 190 ropanis (9.67 hectares) of land to His Majesty’s Government of Nepal, at a special ceremony on 11 September 1968. The donation consisted of the Kaiser Mahal (the Kaiser Palace), the Kaiser Pustakalaya (the Kaiser Library) and the Kaiser Baga (the Kaiser Garden, recently reopened under the name of “Garden of Dreams”). Each of these assets has its own glorious history. Here we are concerned, however, only with the Kaiser Library. When it was donated, Kaiser Shamsher’s private library contained approximately twenty-eight thousand printed books in various languages and covering a large number of subjects, such as history, religion, philosophy, astronomy, medicine, hunting, gardening, and travelling. The Kaiser Library is very important for its early “Nepal Collection”. In 1974 Thakurlal Manandhar published a detailed bibliography of the works on Nepal in the Kaiser Library. One highlight of this library is its collection of rare English books, especially publications from the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Among scholars, the Kaiser Library is particularly famous for its collection of Nepalese manuscripts. Besides this, many noteworthy paintings, photographs, sculptures, maps and press cuttings are also part of the library and attract public interest. The portraits of various Nepalese and foreign personalities are especially worth seeing. As Amatya points out, the Kaiser Library is “not a mere library but also a rich art gallery” and “a small Museum by itself”.

---

14 These are the first five volumes of the Nepāla-Sāṃskṛtika Pārisad Patrikā (Journal of the Nepal Cultural Council), vol. 1 (1952), vol. 2 (1953), vol. 3 (1957; Aitihāsika Patrasaṅgraha, part 1), vols. 4–5 (1964; Aitihāsika Patrasaṅgraha, part 2), the Jayarathākaraṇāṭaka (1957) and the Tiratnamsaunduryagāthā (1962).
16 M. Pant 1993, p. 18.
Indeed, no visitor of Kathmandu interested in Nepal’s history and culture should miss the chance to visit this extraordinary library-cum-museum, “the perfect souvenir of a rather bizarre chapter in the history of Nepal Mandala, a chapter not without residual values nor altogether without charm, as Kaisher Mahal attests”.

Azhar Abidi, an Australian writer of Pakistani origin, who did not miss his chance to admire the riches of the Kaiser Library, gives the following report of his recent visit to this treasure house:

I WRITE my address in the clerk’s register and enter, with trepidation. The library of Kaiser Shamsher Jung Bahadur Rana is the oldest library in Kathmandu—and it is pickled in time. The reading room has a Railway and Canal Map of India drawn by George Philip and Son Ltd, 32 Fleet Street, London. Railways have been updated to October 1906, canals to August 1905. There is a rolled-up map of Africa, a map of Asia, and a ‘heliozincographed’ map of Nepal, printed by the Survey of India Offices, Calcutta, and based on a 1924–25 survey. Mt Everest is shown here as 29,002 feet high.

Eyes agape, I walk down the hall. Timber floor, high ceiling, musty smell. On the walls, black and white photographs of dead nobles. Two portraits of glaring British Army officers. A stuffed Bengal tiger with a spider web between its jaws. Further down, there is a bust of Napoleon and a painting of an Englishwoman. The newer titles include hardbacks by Alistair Maclean, Irwin Shaw, Jean Renoir and Anthony Burgess. They are over forty years old. […] The Funk and Wagnall’s New Standard Dictionary, supervised by Mr Isaac K. Funk, is lying on an oak table. […]

The hunting books are more flamboyant, and after sitting for more than half a century on these shelves they are still ripe with bravura that is rare these days—the sort where the author lights his pipe and sets out to follow the paw marks of a tiger into the bush.


I return to my oak table. I have a leather-bound volume of Dante’s Inferno, illustrated in ink by Gustave Doré, printed by Cassell and Company, 1912, and a notepad. There are no other visitors. So I spend the rest of the afternoon planning the great Kaiser Library Robbery.

Initially Kaiser Shamsher’s collection was accessible only to members of his family and some other notable Nepalese and foreign visitors. Eventually, though, Kaiser Shamsher actually allowed the interested public access to his private library even during his lifetime. It all began on 12 May 1951, when the Nepal Cultural Council was established under his patronage.

At the first meeting held in the house of the Poet Laureate Lekhnath Paudyal, the historian Balchandra Sharma proposed Kaiser Shamsher as
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I return to my oak table. I have a leather-bound volume of Dante’s Inferno, illustrated in ink by Gustave Doré, printed by Cassell and Company, 1912, and a notepad. There are no other visitors. So I spend the rest of the afternoon planning the great Kaiser Library Robbery.

Initially Kaiser Shamsher’s collection was accessible only to members of his family and some other notable Nepalese and foreign visitors. Eventually, though, Kaiser Shamsher actually allowed the interested public access to his private library even during his lifetime. It all began on 12 May 1951, when the Nepal Cultural Council was established under his patronage. At the first meeting held in the house of the Poet Laureate Lekhnath Paudyal, the historian Balchandra Sharma proposed Kaiser Shamsher as
Chairperson and introduced him with the following words:

हामी उपि्थत भएका माझ कलाेवषयक शास्त्र छरै भए 
तामानी भी केहीहो भएलो प्रेयो वजन-सट्टको समानरुपण 
पाँकी अर अहिले पाइनु मुक्तिल हुँ ।

At the end of the meeting, Kaiser Shamsher graciously remarked:

‘मैं आफूो जीवनभरी साहित्य र कला जति साम्राज्य एकज 
पर्ने सकेकी विपए ल्याभना तपाईहुँ यस महान् प्रवर्तको 
बढी गौतमीको र सावो राज्य उपयोगिता पर्ने ध्येनी 
आएकोले वनाईगाँहु न्यहुन्ता हुँ।’

In this way Kaiser Shamsher opened his library to the scholars affiliated to the Nepal Cultural Council. The general public was given access to the valuable collections only later, at the end of 1968. Since then the Kaiser Library has continued to be used as a reference library, and is open to all readers and visitors. Nowadays, the library operates under the Ministry of Education and Sports of the Government of Nepal, which occupies a few wings of the same building.

The Kaiser Manuscript Collection

The most valuable treasure stored in the Kaiser Library is its collection of old and rare Nepalese manuscripts. In his pursuit of collecting manuscripts, Kaiser Shamsher was inspired by Brian Houghton Hodgson (1800–1896), who in 1820–43, during his stay at the British Residency in Kathmandu, did pioneer scholarly research and collected over five thousand Nepalese manuscripts, now kept in the British Library. Kaiser Shamsher was also influenced by the efforts of other early researchers, in particular by Cecil BENDALL (1856–1906) and Haraprasādā ŚASTRĪ (1853–1931). Kaiser Shamsher saw scholars coming to Nepal in search of the lost ‘Indian’ civilization, and he came into personal contact with many of them. He had friendly relationship with Sylvain LÉVI (1863–1935) and was well acquainted with Giuseppe Tucci (1894–1984). Portraits of both scholars are still hanging on the walls in the Kaiser Library. Kaiser Shamsher enabled LÉVI, Tucci and other scholars to gain access to many valuable Nepalese manuscripts and significantly facilitated their scholarly work.

Thus, for example, Luciano PETECH, who in the late 1950s came to Nepal to do research on the history of medieval Nepal, discovered in Kaiser Shamsher’s collection a very important Sanskrit chronicle, which he appended in his Medieval History of Nepal (1958), naming it “the Kaisher fragment of “Vamśavali” (Kaisher Library, n. 171)” PETECH considered the discovery of this manuscript very fortunate. The text trans-
Kaiser Shamsher, his Library and his Manuscript Collection

Portrait of Sylvan Lévi

The NRC edition of the Gopālavamsāvalī

committed in the manuscript is now famous as “the Kaiser Vaṃsāvalī”. Interestingly, it was Kaiser Shamsher who originally intended to publish the Gopālavamsāvalī for the first time and commissioned the work on it in 1959. Five researchers from the Nepal Cultural Council studied the text on each Saturday for six months. However, the text could not be published during Kaiser Shamsher’s lifetime. About twenty years later, the seed of the plan for a publication of the Gopālavamsāvalī sown by Kaiser Shamsher was helped along by Dhanavajra Vajrācārya, who in 1980–81 initiated a project on the Gopālavamsāvalī at the Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies of the Tribhuvan University in Kathmandu. The fruit was eventually reaped in 1985 when Vajrācārya and Kamal P. Malla published the edition of the Gopālavamsāvalī in the series of the Nepal Research Centre.

The high value of Kaiser Shamsher’s manuscripts was obvious to scholars, so it was quite natural that the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP) decided to include the collection within the scope of its activities. The NGMPP microfilmed the whole collection of manuscripts housed in the Kaiser Library under the reel letter C. The microfilming activities at the Kaiser Library took place in two phases. The first phase was initiated on 28 October 1975 beginning with reel no. C 1/1, and it lasted until 31 August 1976. Seven years later, on 30 October 1983 the second phase started, and the work was completed on 31 January 1984, finishing at reel no. C 124/6. On altogether 124 microfilm reels 1,168 manuscripts with more than 100,000 folios containing approximately 1,350 separate texts were microfilmed.

The original negative films are kept at the National Archives in Kathmandu, together with a set of positive copies. Another complete set of positive copies is stored at the State Library in Berlin. At the time of microfilming, the NGMPP prepared index cards for each processed manuscript. The information from these index cards was incorporated into the “Preliminary List of Manuscripts, Blockprints and Historical Documents Microfilmed by the NGMPP, Part 1 (excluding Tibetan Material and Historical Documents)” published on a CD in June 2003. The NGMPP database, which includes the relevant information concerning the manuscripts at the Kaiser Library, has meanwhile become easily available over the Internet. A preliminary descriptive catalogue of Kaiser Shamsher’s manuscripts has been prepared by Dinesh Raj Pant and Yogesh Mishra; however, this catalogue has not been published yet. Within the ongoing Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (NGMCP) funded by the German Research Foundation a comprehensive descriptive catalogue of these manuscripts is being prepared. By the beginning of October 2006 more than one hundred manuscripts had been described in full detail.

About forty percent of the material collected by Kaiser Shamsher are old palm-leaf manuscripts (486 MSS). Two thirds of the manuscripts in the collection are written in various forms of the Newari script (868 MSS). There are also manuscripts written in Devanagari script, and a few more in Bengali, Maithili, Tibetan and Kutila (Transitional Gupta) scripts. The bulk of the manuscripts con-

---

35See Tewarī 1964.
37See http://134.100.72.204:3000
38See http://www.uni-hamburg.de/ngmcp
Microfilm copy of a palm-leaf manuscript of Ratanmati's Chandravyakarana paujika

A damaged palm-leaf manuscript in the Kaiser Library

tain texts in Sanskrit. Apart from them, the collection includes texts in Newari and Nepali, and some few in Hindi, Maithili and Prakrit. The texts are devoted to various subjects. Most widely represented is the hymnal literature (268 MSS); there are many Buddhist texts on various subjects (218 MSS), ritual texts (176 MSS), tantric texts (130 MSS), and astronomical texts (98 MSS).

The manuscript collection housed in the Kaiser Library is extremely valuable, not least because the codices kept there have been selected specifically on the basis of their importance. There are hardly any accidental acquisitions, and generally there are not many copies of the same title. The core of the material was formed probably around a traditional Rana collection, to which Kaiser Shamsher zealously added many more manuscripts. The older generation of Newar scholars used to talk about rare pieces of art and manuscripts which Kaiser Shamsher collected from local intellectuals. By acquiring the manuscripts for his own library, Kaiser Shamsher has prevented invaluable cultural items of Nepal from being irreversibly lost or illegally taken out of the country. The majority of the manuscripts acquired by Kaiser Shamsher for his collection are still available in the Kaiser Library, although some precious documents have unfortunately been lost. Apart from this, from a note written by Ramesh Prasad Dhungana on 28 April 1971 it is known that before Kaiser Shamsher’s collection was handed over to His Majesty’s Government of Nepal, 42 manuscripts from the Kaiser collection were taken on loan by the Bir Library. It is difficult to establish how many manuscripts exactly were available in 1968 when ownership of the Kaiser Library was transferred.

Garzilli’s note that “Kaiser Shamsher gave 600 palm-leaf manuscripts to the Royal Library, which in 1976 were filmed by Michael Witzel for the NGMPP on films numbered C1 et seqq.” (Garzilli 2001, p. 120, fn. 18) is not very accurate. All manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP on C reels, with the exception of those lost or stolen, are still kept at the Kaiser Library.
Kaiser Shamsher’s collection includes many remarkable and truly unique manuscripts. It may suffice here to mention only a few rarities to give an impression of the great importance of this exquisite depository. A very old incomplete palm-leaf manuscript of the Jatarāpiṭākā, the earliest commentary on the Amarakoṣa, dated NS 239 [AD 1119] is preserved in Kaiser Shamsher’s collection (NGMPP, C 121/1). A palm-leaf manuscript dated NS 494 [AD 1374] was found in it which contains the earliest known Newari translation of the Sanskrit version of the Haramekhalī, a medical work in Prakrit (NGMPP, C 80/11 = C 106/5). Historians have repeatedly been denying the story told in the vernacular chronicles about an attack on the Kathmandu Valley by Mukunda Sena, the king of Palpa in Western Nepal. In Kaiser Shamsher’s collection a manuscript of the Nāradasmrta (NGMPP, C 40/2a) dated NS 631 [AD 1511] was found, which contains undeniable evidence that Mukunda Sena did indeed attack the Kathmandu Valley in NS 645 and 646 [AD 1525 and 1526]. We know about the Licchavi King Mānadeva IV from a very old palm-leaf manuscript of the Suṣrutasamhitā, a medical treatise, which was copied in Deopatan (Gvala) in MS 301 [AD 877] and is now kept in the Kaiser Library (NGMPP, C 80/7). Only recently an old palm-leaf manuscript of the Nyāyavikāśaṇī, a Newari commentary on the Nāradasmrta written by Manjika in NS 500 [AD 1380], was identified in the Kaiser manuscript collection (NGMPP, C 5/2). This codex was copied in NS 672 [AD 1552] at the time of the Patan king Visnuśinha (1536–58). Until now only a modern copy of this old manuscript was known to exist (NGMPP, B 415/20) and a better retake in A 1313/14.

In the first half of the twentieth century a number of erudite private collectors and institutions in Kathmandu were competing with each other in collecting Nepalese manuscripts. Among those particularly active, besides Kaiser Shamsher, was Hemraj Sharma, who established an even bigger collection, which he kept in his private house, the Bharatī Bhavan, at Dhoka Tole in the centre of Kathmandu. There the second biggest manuscript collection in Nepal of the time was accommodated. The largest collection of Nepalese manuscripts was stored in the Bir Library. The Bir Library was first called Nepāla Pustakālaya (Royal Nepalese Library and was established at the time of King Girvan Yuddha Bikram Shah Dev (1797–1816) in 1812. It became popular un-

43See M. Pant 2000, pp. 57–68.  
45In 1955, soon after Hemraj Sharma’s death, 8,043 manuscripts from his library were sold by his family to His Majesty’s the Government of Nepal, and the material was transferred to the National Library of Nepal. After the foundation of the National Archives in Kathmandu, this precious collection of manuscripts was moved there.

The collection contains now more than 35,000 manuscripts and documents.

Hemraj Sharma and the custodians of the Bir Library were aware that Kaiser Shamsher was in possession of extremely rare and important manuscripts embellishing his superb library, and made efforts to arrange modern copies for their own collections. Hemraj Sharma, in particular, had many occasions to explore Kaiser Shamsher’s collection and commission new copies. Both intellectuals were well-acquainted, moreover Kaiser Shamsher esteemed Hemraj Sharma and even called him respectfully his guru. Kaiser Shamsher’s old manuscript of the Tribhūnākaviḍāpiṭāha dated NS 406 [AD 1286] was copied in VS 1980 [AD 1923], and the Devanagari copy was included in Hemraj Sharma’s collection under the title Tribhūnākaviḍāya. Later this modern copy came into the possession of the National Library of Nepal and eventually was brought to the National Archives (Acc. No. 5/2231). The NGMPP

44A letter from Kaiser Shamsher is preserved in which it becomes clear that he was involved in the nomination of his learned contemporary for the prestigious title Vidvacchiraman “Crest-jewel of the Learned Persons”. The decoration was offered to Hemraj Sharma at the suggestion of Kaiser Shamsher or at least with his active support. The letter dated VS 1992, 10 Baishakh [22 April 1935] reads:

Dear Sir, ([the title] Vidvacchiraman “Crest-jewel of the Learned Persons” seems to be better, though Panditārāja ‘King of Scholars’ is indeed in vogue in Nepal. Instead of Panditaśri “Respectable Scholar” it seems better [to say] Panditārāja ‘King of Scholars’. It is a good idea to offer [the title] Panditārāja to the foremost learned person in the Kingdom, as is the case with [the title] Poet Laureate. I hope you will reach Jawalakhel Durbar at 12 o’clock today. Let us discuss then which [title] will be better, Panditārāja or Vidvacchiraman. I have returned the directory. Your student forever, Kaiser.” (See RAJ 1978, p. 98, Appendix 9 where a facsimile of this letter in Kaiser Shamsher’s own handwriting can be seen.) The nomination took place on the occasion of the sixty-first birthday of the then prime minister Juddha Shamsher Jang Bahadur Rana (1874–1952); the Lalmohan of the title, however, was provided only four years later in VS 1996, 16 Bhaḍra [1 September 1939] (see RAJ 1978, Appendix 1).
microfilmed both manuscripts, Kaiser Shamsher’s old one under the title *Vidyāpīṭhapratīṣṭhāvīḍhī* (NGMPP, C 106/3) and the modern copy under the title *Triḥūṃiṇikāvidyāpīṭhapratīṣṭhāhā* (NGMPP, A 865/2, A 1231/8, B 520/4).

Another noteworthy example is Kaiser Shamsher’s manuscript of Ratnamati’s sub-commentary on Dharmanātha’s *Candravṛtti* on the *Candravyākaraṇa*, Candragomin’s famous Sanskrit grammar. The importance of this old manuscript dated NS 363 [AD 1243], of which only 79 folios are preserved, was clearly recognized by Kaiser Shamsher. The National Archives owns two modern copies of two different parts of the old manuscript. Both modern copies were prepared by order of Kaiser Shamsher’s nephew Mrigendra Shamsher (1906–?), who was at the time Chief of the Department of Education. The first copy was written by Divyaratna Vajračārya in VS 1989 [AD 1932], while the second copy was prepared by Yajñānanda Vajračārya (1917–1997), most probably years after Divyaratna Vajračārya copied his part. The NGMPP microfilmed all three manuscripts, the old one in the Kaiser Library (NGMPP, C 2/9) and the two modern copies in the National Archives (NGMPP, A 1286/14 and B 406/16).

In this way, even when there were no microfilms, photocopying machines, scanners or digital cameras, enthusiastic and praiseworthy efforts were being made to preserve the invaluable knowledge contained in the Nepalese manuscripts by safely storing them and preparing modern copies on their basis. Thanks to the huge technological advancements at the turn of the twenty-first century, it has become now significantly easier to preserve manuscript material in a very efficient and economical way. At the same time, even when the manuscripts are locked in a storage room under proper conditions, images of them can easily be made available in digital form, so that researchers and the interested public all over the world can have immediate online access to the contents of the manuscripts. The responsibility of today’s generation of scholars and conservators is all the more greater to make every possible effort to ensure proper preservation and study of the material which has survived the whims of past centuries.

Despite the efforts of some few individuals, it is no secret that since Kaiser Shamsher’s private collection was handed over to the public in 1968, no significant improvements have been made in the preservation of the precious manuscript collection. On the contrary, since 1968 the manuscripts, which are kept bound in cloth and piled on shelves in ordinary metal cupboards placed in an environmentally unmonitored room, have been exposed to ever more risk of damage and loss. Not only creatures such as insects, mice and irresponsible humans may get access of the text (see Petech 1984, p. 98).
to the material, but also fungus and the increasing atmospheric pollution in Kathmandu are irreparably affecting the material. Not even the fact that the collection has been microfilmed by the NGMPP and the contents of the manuscripts are thus preserved can serve as a consolation, for some of the microfilms prepared at the Kaiser Library are unfortunately of poor quality and either hardly or not legible at all. Further, the microfilms which are more than thirty years old are already showing the ravages of time, and it is not certain for how much longer they will last.

Until very recently another of Kaiser Shamsher’s legacies, the Kaiser Bāga, an exquisite English-style Edwardian garden built in the 1920s was lying in ruins, neglected for decades. It is only thanks to a project funded by the Austrian Development Aid and directed by the Austrian architect Götz Hagmüller that the Kaiser Garden was rescued from imminent demolition. After six years of restoration and renovation the garden was triumphally reopened on 8 October 2006.

The unsuitable “manuscript room” where Kaiser Shamsher’s unique collection of Nepalese manuscripts is currently kept, is only a one-minute walk from the “Garden of Dreams”. It will be unpardonable not to follow the example set by the restorers of the Kaiser Garden. The establishment of an environmentally controlled storage room for the safe preservation of the invaluable manuscripts in the Kaiser Library is an urgent need and should not be postponed any further. The first necessary step has already been taken by the Nepal Research Centre, which is working on a proposal for a new project at the Kaiser Library. The Kaiser Library Manuscript Collection Project will try to establish a modern storage room, a professional conservation studio and a fully equipped reading room. Within this project the manuscript collection of the Kaiser Library will be digitized by means of the newest technology and reorganized in accordance with the comprehensive descriptive catalogue being prepared by the NGMCP. It remains to be seen whether the Nepal Research Centre will be able to overcome all the obstacles lying ahead so as to allow the Kaiser Library Manuscript Collection Project to be started in the near future. Its successful completion will not only save one of Nepal’s most remarkable manuscript collections from damage and loss, but should also serve as a model for the preservation of many other invaluable textual witnesses and bearers of Nepal’s great immaterial wealth.
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