Editorial

I am pleased indeed to present the second number of the Newsletter of the NGMCP. This Fall sees the return of several contributors to our first, July, issue. Diwakar Acharya announces the discovery of a manuscript of what is probably the oldest surviving commentary on the great Prakrit poem *Setubandha/Rāvaṇavaha* and gives us some samples from this work, which will prove interesting both to lovers of poetry and students of Prakrit (p. 2). Dragomir Dimitrov reports (p. 4) on his discovery in a palm-leaf manuscript of glosses in Tibetan on Daṇḍin’s great work on poetics, the *Kāvyādārśa*, and points to the possibility that their author might have been no ordinary student of the text. Michael Hahn continues his survey of some of the high points of his more than thirty years of work with Nepalese manuscripts; we think that also non-Sanskritists, reading the second part of his ‘Some Highlights of the Work of a ‘Frequent User’ of the NGMPP’ (p. 7), may experience something of the excitement that is felt by the ‘professional manuscript-hunter’ when a long awaited, or a completely unexpected, discovery is made. Oliver Hahn, a NGMCP staff-member specializing in grammatical and lexicographical literature, presents the first part of a new edition, using old Nepalese manuscripts, of an unusual work by the twelfth-century lexicographer Maheśvara (p. 19). We also have announcements of two recent book-publications making use of manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP (p. 17).

Last, but definitely not least, it gives me special pleasure that the NGMCP can here publicly announce that for the first time, information about the manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP is available online, accessible to anyone in the world who can use the Internet. The online database is in an early beta version, and the information it contains (for which the data made available earlier by the NGMPP in the *Preliminary List of Manuscripts, Blockprints and Historical Documents Microfilmed by the NGMPP, Part 1 (excluding Tibetan Material and Historical Documents)*, available on CD-ROM, served as the starting point) is in the early stages of ongoing revision and correction; but I am confident that this step will make it significantly easier for scholars to locate material relevant to their work, and thus will facilitate studies of the manuscript treasures of Nepal. The web-application through which the database can be accessed was written by Kengo Harimoto, whose announcement and request for feedback will be found at the back of this issue (p. 23).

I would like here to offer warm thanks to our contributors, and also to everyone who provided us with feedback on our first Newsletter. It has been encouraging to know that we have found enthusiastic readers all over the world. A number of them have also promised us contributions in the future, and thanks in part to them, I anticipate that our third number, to be published online in January 2007, will be a bumper one, with well over the 24 pages that the first two numbers each cover, and with even more contributions introducing rare and important discoveries among the manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP. It will also present reports on recent activities of the NGMCP and NRC, in Hamburg and in Nepal. I trust that our readers will be looking forward to it, and hope that in the meantime they will find something to enjoy and to whet their appetite in this second Newsletter of the NGMCP.

Harunaga Isaacson
A Brief Note on Ḥarṣāpāla’s Commentary on the Prakrit Kāvyā Setubandha

Diwakar Acharya

The Rāvaṇavālha, also known as Setubandha and Dasanukhavālha, is a well known Prakrit kāvyā written by a Pravarasena (possibly Pravarasena II, the fifth century Vākṣṭaka king, though this identification is not undisputed). More than a dozen commentaries were written on this work, but so often, the earliest commentaries are known only from references. I reproduce here a list of commentaries on the text from Radhagovinda Basak’s introduction to his edition of the kāvyā with the commentary Setutattvacandrikā. Here is his “approximately chronological” list of commentaries and their authors flourishing before 1646 A.D.:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śrīnivāsa</td>
<td>Setudarpana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokanātha</td>
<td>name not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhasāṅka</td>
<td>name not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarṣāpāla</td>
<td>name not known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulanātha</td>
<td>Dasanukkhavadvivarana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Setutattvacandrikā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmādāsa</td>
<td>Rāmasetupradipa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivanārayāndāsa</td>
<td>Setusaraṇi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td>Setuvivarana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallabhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Setucandrikā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Basak reports, Kulanātha, Lokanātha, Śrīnivāsa, Sāhasāṅka and Ḥarṣāpāla are the earlier commentators who have been most extensively and repeatedly quoted in the Setutattvacandrikā, the commentary he edited. The commentaries of Lokanātha, Sāhasāṅka and Ḥarṣāpāla were hitherto known only from citations found in the later commentaries. I am very happy to announce here that Ḥarṣāpāla’s commentary has now been discovered in Nepal. It is preserved in a single palm-leaf manuscript written in a variety of Newari script. The manuscript comes from a private collection of Mr. Dharma Vajraharya of Kathmandu, and has been microfilmed by the NGMPP under reel no. E 1407/6. The manuscript consists of a total of 197 folios, containing five to six lines. Folio 181 is either missing or has been skipped in microfilming. The exposure containing 179r and 180r is followed by the one containing wrongly placed 198v and 182r. This suggests that at least two folios are stuck together and as a result 180v and 198v are not present in the microfilm. The manuscript covers up to the 37th stanza of the last canto, with two lacunae covering 13.2–14. and 15.31–34. Some folios are slightly damaged by breaking and moths. The size of the leaves as recorded in the NGMPP index card is 31.8 x 5.1 cm. The consecutive numbers of the folios are given on the verso side in middle of the left-hand margin.

The sub-colophons state that our author Ḥarṣāpāla was a king of Kāmarūpa (Assam) and with this information it is possible to identify him and determine his time. This king was the second-last in the lineage founded by Brahmāpala, and ruled Kāmarūpa from Durjayā before the end of the eleventh century. He was the son of Gopāla, married with Ratnā, and was succeeded by his son Dharmapāla. No other works of Ḥarṣāpāla are known from any other sources, but it is probable that he also composed some miscellaneous verses.

As Ḥarṣāpāla states in the Prefatory verses, though an extensive and fine commentary on the kāvyā by King Sāhasāṅka was already available, still he wrote a new commentary after consulting many specialists of Prakrit, thinking that a shorter commentary with Sanskrit renderings of the Prakrit verses and brief notes would be more useful for the general populace. He is not aware of any other commentary on the kāvyā. King Sāhasāṅka must be Paramāra king Siddhurāja whose nom de guerre was nava-Sāhasāṅka. He was ruling over western India in the very end of the 10th century. His son was Āḍivāraṇa Bhōjadeva, the most glorious among Paramāras.

I have no access at present to the manuscript of Śrīnivāsa’s commentary Basak has mentioned. However, since the dates of King Sāhasāṅka and Ḥarṣāpāla are known, I can say that the commentaries of these two kings are, in all probability, the first and second commentaries written respectively in the end of the 10th and
around the middle of the 11th century.

I shall now present a small portion of the commentary from the beginning and end to allow readers to have an idea of Harsapāla’s style.

Thus the manuscript ends leaving the text incomplete:

dhaasiharathṭhijalaharamuccha-
ntāsānipidphalāsaśarakaṃ

samarañṭario vallaggaṃ
dhvaśāharasthitajaladharamucya-
manasāniso pratyphalasārakaṃ

samaraṭvārito rahamaḥ
drātārāṇaṃ 

ia vairadahavaṇo
dhavaṇanaṇa-

vīttivalukkhitadhuḥ

nī rahamaḥ ṛująḥ
dhakaṭasari-

vāri dosanaṇataṇo

iti vairadahavaṇo
dhasaṇadāṇiṇīṇaṭyādyā
vilasitā utkṣīṇatā (fol. 197v–3–5)

...
abbhuhita22 ḍivānāṁ nihavaḥ oppa
pr23 haṇḍakhaṁ sahuśaṁ

śrutvā indrajidevadhaṁ muṣṭatī sarasāṁ daśānaṁ bāṣpajalam | abhuhitā | abhyutjeti tānāṁ nipaṭati tappaṁ va | gḥṛtam iva tatkṣa

muddho a mehaṇāṁ pariattātanā
takkhaṇa cia vihipā | soavisāṁ samāṁ hathāḥiṁ va
dohiṁ āhao dasavaṇo ||

nipaṭite ca meghanāda papavartamāṁ,24 tatkṣa

ṇyaṁ eva vihipāṁ śokaviśādhyāṁ samāṁ hastābhyāṁ iva dvābhyaṁ āhato (fol. 1981–5)

Harṣapāla’s commentary, though brief, is important for the reading of the mula it preserves. In almost every stanza, I have found some major or minor variant reading. I have also noted that a few stanzas found in the later commentaries are missing in Harṣapāla. An edition and a detailed study of this commentary, which in any case is among the earliest surviving commentaries on any Mahākāvya, is very much a desideratum.
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Bilingual Sanskrit-Tibetan Gloses in a Nepalese MS of the Ratnaśrītikā

Dragomir Dimitrov11

Among the numerous Nepalese manuscripts kept at the National Archives in Kathmandu there are many extremely valuable and rare copies which until now have either completely escaped the attention of researchers or have not been studied in detail. This remarkable collection consists currently of approximately 40,000 manuscripts, most of them easily accessible on microfilms prepared by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project. Although in the last hundred years a large number of Nepalese manuscripts have been used by scholars for critical editions and have been dealt with in various articles2 still these constitute only a fraction of the whole seemingly limitless collection. Many manuscripts have practically been neglected, not least because they have been poorly described, if catalogued at all. Neither Haraprasāda Śaṅkara’s pioneer work A Catalogue of Palm-leaf & Selected Paper MSS. Belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal (published in two volumes in 1905 and 1915) nor the National Archive’s own Brhatācārīpatra (published in ten volumes in 1960–74 under the editorship of Buddhīśāgara Parājula) nor even the most comprehensive Preliminary List of Manuscripts, Blockprints and Historical Documents Microfilmed by the NGMPP (published in June 2003) suffice to make us fully aware of the real titles and content of all the documents lying on the shelves at the National Archives. It is the aim of the ongoing Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project to prepare the ultimate descriptive catalogue of this huge and invaluable collection. Until this ambitious task has been fully accomplished, researchers will have to rely on incomplete, sometimes even inadequate documentation, and be prepared for many surprises, some positive and others negative.

I was treated to a positive surprise during my very first encounter with a Nepalese manuscript some eleven years ago.12

11 Thank very much my colleague Philip Pierce for checking the English of this paper.

12 Cf. http://www.uni-hamburg.de/ngmcp/publications.html
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ago. The palm-leaf manuscript, which until that time had only been all too briefly described in the Bhātisīcāpati, under the title Kāvyādarṣaṭīkā, turned out to contain the Ratnasūṣṭhīkā, composed in the first half of the tenth century by Ratnasūṣṭhīnā, a prominent Buddhist monk and scholar from Ceylon. The text represents not only the oldest but arguably also the most valuable commentary on the Kāvyādarṣa (“Mirror of Poetic Art”), Dandīn’s famous treatise on poetics. Thanks to Dpaṅ Lo tṣa baBlo gros bstan pa (1276–1342), who makes extensive though unacknowledged use of the Ratnasūṣṭhīkā in his own commentary on the Śīnā iṇāg me lōi, the Tibetan translation of the Kāvyādarṣa prepared by Śoṅston Lo tṣa ba Rdo rje rgyal mtshan and Lakiṃkara, Ratnasūṣṭhīnā’s work has exerted great influence in Tibet, where the Kāvyādarṣa has been studied with great zeal since the thirteenth century. There are indications that the document, written in “Maithil script”, see Parajuli 1961, pp. 15–16. 4

The Nepalese manuscript we have now one more codex of Ratnasūṣṭhīnā’s commentary, and one can only hope that sooner rather than later at least one more manuscript may surface, perhaps from some hitherto inaccessible collection. The newly discovered Nepalese manuscript allows us to improve on the editio princeps considerably, as well as to re-edit the root text of the Kāvyādarṣa and study the Tibetan textual tradition on a more solid basis. 5 Thus, the importance of this manuscript cannot be overstated. It is one of those invaluable gems in the National Archives which have been waiting for many years undisturbed to be brought to light.

Since the last folio of the manuscript, on which the date of the copy may have been indicated, is lost, we can only hypothesize on palaeographical grounds that this manuscript, written in an old variety of the Newārī script (Bhujimola), was copied probably sometime in the twelfth or thirteenth century. There are indications that the present manuscript was copied was itself incomplete and dilapidated, the part of the commentary on the first and second chapters of the Kāvyādarṣa until KĀ 2 172 being missing completely. In addition, during the subsequent long time of transmission eleven leaves of our manuscript were also lost. Luckily fol. 1 has survived, though in poor condition. It seems that the scribe started copying the commentary on KĀ 2 173 on fol. 1b, exactly from the point marking the beginning of the text available to him in the older manuscript. Thus, the scribe has left fol. 1a blank, as is the usual practice when starting a new manuscript. 6

The Nepalese manuscript of the Ratnasūṣṭhīkā is particularly intriguing because it bears the traces of a Tibetan scholar who examined it. From the few Tibetan glosses added in the margins on folios 7b, 14a, 51a and 52b, it is clear that this unknown Tibetan scholar studied Ratnasūṣṭhīnā’s commentary on the basis of this manuscript. It is most interesting that probably the same Tibetan scholar used the originally blank fol. 1a as a kind of scrap paper and filled it in with some notes in Tibetan Dbu med script, now partly illegible. The text turned out to be transcribed Sanskrit words from the third chapter of the Kāvyādarṣa accompanied by their Tibetan equivalents, as found in the Śīnā iṇāg me lōi. The first pair of bilingual Sanskrit and Tibetan glosses that can be deciphered after probably two obliterated pairs concerns a passage from KĀ 3 153c. The last legible gloss on the mostly illegible last line of the folio relates to KĀ 3 179c. Although the available text is too short and its decipherment not always certain, it is possible to draw some conclusions concerning the textual tradition the cited passage belongs to.

With regard to the Sanskrit text, the glosses confirm in all cases the wording of the Kāvyādarṣa as commented by Ratnasūṣṭhīnā. The following readings are especially noteworthy: ba śya for vaśyām (KĀ 3 153d), maṃ da for manda (KĀ 3 160a), a su for āsu (KĀ 3 161c), nyāṃ [ga] m[i] for nyāṃgam vi (KĀ 3 161d), a mar ṣa for ṣāmarṣa (KĀ 3 165a), dur di na for ṣūrdinah (KĀ 3 167), [ba]r hi ni for ṣabhiṣṭa (KĀ 3 168b), a ha for ṣāha (KĀ 3 174a), a bi na [śuṣā rāṇa] for avināśvāran (KĀ 3 174b), a sad for asad (KĀ 3 175a), n[ī ti ni] for nītī (KĀ 3 176a), pra ṣāha na for prasthānaṃ (KĀ 3 176d) and ut kra mya for utkrānya (KĀ 3 179c).

As for the Tibetan text, it is important to note that in two cases the glosses agree with readings to be found only in the Ganden (G), Peking (Q) and Narthang (N) editions of the Tanjur: so ka with GNQ in place of sos ka (KĀ.T 3 167d) and gsvis pa with GNV in place of gsvis pa (KĀ.T 3 174b). In one case a gloss deviates from a reading adopted only in Snār than Lo tṣa ba Dge ’dun dpal’s commentary on the Śīnā iṇāg me lōi (J) composed in 1403: dal bu in place of bdag gi J (KĀ.T 3 160b). In another case a gloss differs from the text adopted by Śi tu Paṅ chen Chos kyi ’byuṅ gnas (1699–1774) in his bilingual Sanskrit–Tibetan edition (Sr) of the Kāvyādarṣa: vīrg in

---

3See Parajuli 1961, pp. 15–16.
4 On the history of the Kāvyādarṣa in Tibet see Dimitrov 2002, pp. 25–60.
5 For the editio princeps of the Ratnasūṣṭhīkā, based on this undisputed manuscript written in “Maithil script”, see Thakur/Jha 1957. Due to the poor state of the manuscript and the editors’ idiosyncratic methods, this edition cannot be considered wholly trustworthy, and is on many occasions in dire need of improvement. The manuscript was in the private possession of Prof. Upendra Jha and is nowadays practically inaccessible, if it still exists at all.
6 For a new partial edition based on this Nepalese manuscript see Dimitrov 2004.
7 In other words, there is no evidence that any folios before fol. 1 of the present manuscript have been lost. For a detailed description of the manuscript see Dimitrov 2004, pp. 93–96.
place of māṇi ST (KĀ.T 3.165d). Twice the glosses do not agree with the revised text of the Derge (D) edition of the Tanjur: 'phrais in place of 'pho Di (KĀ.T 3.158b) and 'di in place of ni Di (KĀ.T 3.176b). Lastly, two readings cannot be found in any other text witness of the Śūnya ūlag me loṅ: 'di rnams la in place of 'di la (KĀ.T 3.161c) and g.yos in place of g.yo (KĀ.T 3.172a). Less important are the few orthographical variants 'od gzer i.o. 'od zer (KĀ.T 3.157a), mdub gsar i.o. 'dub gsar (KĀ.T 3.157c) and sgreg pa i.o. sgreg pa (KĀ.T 3.170a). It can be concluded that the Tibetan glosses conform with the version of the Śūnya ūlag me loṅ as transmitted in the Ganden, Peking and Narthang editions of the Tanjur which, as we now know, preserve that earliest version of Šon ston Lo tsā ba’s and Laks.ṣākara’s translation, which in turn, was at most slightly revised by Dpaṅ Lo tsā ba. On the other hand, the glosses do not bear any of the traits of the posterior revisions and reeditions of the Śūnya ūlag me loṅ.

The early character of the glosses is consistent with the old physical appearance of the manuscript. Thus, it seems quite likely that the Tibetan text was written at least a few centuries, and possibly even some seven hundred years ago, not much later than the time the Sanskrit manuscript itself was copied. Obviously, it is not possible to establish with certainty who that Tibetan scholar was who added the glosses. We can only guess that he may have been one of those prominent Tibetans who had visited the Kathmandu Valley in their quest to study with the famous pandit Mahendrabhadra. From the historical accounts we know of at least two such scholars. One is Dpaṅ Lo tsā ba, the “Lord of Scholars” (Tib. mkhas pa’i dpaṅ po), who visited Nepal seven times, as ’Gos Lo tsā ba Gon nu dpal (1392–1481) informs us in his Deb ther sron po. Dpaṅ Lo tsā ba not only proofread his teacher’s translation, but also studied in detail Ratnasrijānā’s commentary on the Kāvyādāraśa himself and completed his own Śūnya ūlag me loṅ gi rgya cher ’grel pa Guṇ don gsal ba “Extensive commentary on the ‘Mirror of Poetic Art’ [entitled] ‘Clarification of the treatise’s meaning’”, probably in the thirties of the fourteenth century. Another scholar who may have contributed the glosses to the manuscript of the Ratnāśrītikā is Šon ston Lo tsā ba, the Tibetan translator of the Kāvyādāraśa himself. From ’Gos Lo tsā ba’s biographical account we know that Šon ston Lo tsā ba spent five years in Nepal, probably before 1270, studying poetics and other minor sciences under the guidance of the pandit Mahendrabhadra. Moreover, it is mentioned in various sources that Šon ston Lo tsā ba composed a succinct commentary on the Kāvyādāraśa consisting of a series of glosses. A khu rin po che Ses rab rgya mtsho (1803–1875) entered this work in his bibliography A khu tho yig under the title Śūnya ūlag me loṅ gi ’grel pa Dbyaṅs can mgul rgyan “Commentary on the ‘Mirror of Poetic Art’ [entitled] ‘Necklace of Sarasvati’”. It is therefore possible that the Sanskrit-Tibetan glosses on fol. 1a were excerpted from Šon ston Lo tsā ba’s Dbyaṅs can mgul rgyan. One is even tempted to speculate that the “Best among Translators” (Tib. skad gnis smrū ba rnams kyi mchog) added the glosses himself to the Sanskrit manuscript. If it were possible to prove this positively, it would follow that in the Nepalese manuscript of the Ratnāśrītikā an autograph by Šon ston Lo tsā ba has been preserved. This is, however, mere speculation, and there is no way to prove it. If we had a copy of Šon ston Lo tsā ba’s Dbyaṅs can mgul rgyan, it would at least be very easy to check whether the glosses indeed derive from this commentary or are rather some incidental notes by some other, anonymous, Tibetan student of Indian poetics. Since the Dbyaṅs can mgul rgyan appears to be lost, the question remains open.
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Some Highlights of the Work of a ‘Frequent User’ of the NGMPP (II)

Michael HAHN (Marburg)

In the second installment of my report about my work with manuscripts from Nepal, I would like to present the manuscripts of two works relating to chandahśāstra, or

Figure 1: Fol. 1a from a Nepalese palm-leaf MS of the Rataṃśātīyā (NAK Acc. No.: 1/468)
the science of metrics. This leads me back to the begin-
nings of my studies, and I cannot resist inserting some
autobiographical details whose sole purpose it is to illus-
trate the coincidental manner in which the course of my
studies was determined and in which I got access to im-
portant manuscripts and texts.

First let me describe the two manuscripts. They
are those of Ratnākaraśānti’s auto commentary on his
brief but excellent manual of classical Indian metrics,
Chandoratnaśānta, and Śākyaraksita’s commentary on
Jñānaśrīmitra’s Vṛttamālāstuti. The work of Jñānaśrī-
mitra was the topic of my Ph. D. thesis, which I wrote
in Marburg between 1965 and 1967. The former work
formed the most important basis for the latter work be-
cause its complete vṛtta section ( metres defined by
the number and quantity of syllables per line) is rep-
resented there. As the reader will see, the discovery of
Śākyaraksita’s Vṛttamālāvivṛti in 1976 enabled me 1) to
assess how well I had coped with a rather difficult Ti-
etan text and 2) to solve all the open questions that
had remained after the completion of the thesis, its re-
vision and subsequent publication in 1971. Access to the
Sanskrit manuscript of Ratnākaraśānti’s auto commentary
that previously could be used only in its Tibetan transla-
tion made it possible to understand much better its im-
portant introductory portion in which Ratnākaraśānti ex-
plains what motivated him to compile his manual and it
also led to a number of corrections of the main text.

Here are two samples of the Chandoratnaśānta
manuscript, which was filmed by the NGMPP on reel No.
A 20/9. The title given there is Chandograntha.

This is probably folio 2a. It is mutilated and diffi-
cult to read. However, by comparing the text with its
canonical Tibetan translation most of the text could be
deciphered. A bilingual edition of the first introductory
section of the Chandoratnaśānta can be found in my pa-
per “Ratnākaraśānti’s Auto commentary on His Chando-
ratnaśānta,” in Victrakusumājī. Volume Presented to
Richard Othon Meisezahl on the Occasion of his Eight-
eighth Birthday. Ed. By Helmut Eimer, Bonn 1986 (Indica
et Tibetica. 11.), pp. 77–100. There one can also find all
details about the manuscript.

The reproduction on page showing folio 6a (or 6b),
is much more legible.

I have prepared, but not yet published, an edition of the
whole manuscript. Its first folio is lost, some other por-
tions are mutilated. There is at least one more manuscript
of the commentary. It was microfilmed in Tibet by Rahula
Sankrityayana. In order to save film, a great number of
pages was filmed simultaneously. The microfilm is kept
in the K. P. Jayaswal Institute in Patna. Another copy
of the film as well as prints are available in the Semi-
nar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde of the University
of Göttingen. The original manuscript seems to be
in excellent shape, but unfortunately the verso pages are out of focus in the photograph and almost impossible to read, at least for me. Pandit Jagadishwar PANDEY, the present director of the institute, nevertheless managed to read great portions of these pages, and many years ago he kindly put at my disposal his transcript of the first pages which enabled me, together with the Tibetan translation, to fill the gap in the beginning. To my greatest surprise I found that the text of the autocommentary is not transmitted uniformly. There are several variant readings in the manuscript from Tibet, and the Tibetan translation seems to be based on a third manuscript with its own variant readings. This state of affairs, although surprising at first, can easily be accounted for if one recalls that the Chandoratnākara must have been used as a textbook for students and hence a great number of copies must have existed, with several variants caused by the individual way of teaching of the respective professors.

When in the spring of 1965 I decided to write my Ph. D. thesis, my original plan had been to find a topic that included Sanskrit, Tibetan and also mathematics. Mathematics had been not only my favourite subject at school, but had also played an important role in my study of psychology and the B.A. thesis which I had completed in 1964 and in which I had tried to develop a new mathematical model of scaling psychic phenomena. Moreover, I had studied very intensively Bhāskaracārya’s excellent mathematical treatise Lilāvati together with two Sanskrit commentaries. This had been inspired by a seminar on Indian mathematics, held by Wilhelm Rau, in the course of which about one quarter of the Lilāvati was read.

Unfortunately the Tibetan Buddhist canon does not contain a single work that met the above-mentioned conditions, and the extra-canonical literature was not accessible to me at that time. However, I knew that the science of metrics, through the so-called prastāra technique, contains a certain mathematical element, the theory of combination. Thus metrics became an alternative possibility as topic of my planned thesis. When I studied the dkar chag of the Tibetan Tanjur, I found that there is a section on metrics, divided into theory (Tib. mtshan ṅid, Skt. laksana) and illustration (Tib. dper brjod, Skt. udāharaṇa). The theoretical work is Ratnakaraśānti’s Chandoratnākara, the practical illustration Jñānaśrūmitra’s Vṛttamālāstuti. I found that the Chandoratnākara had already been competently edited by Georg Huth in 1890, so the Vṛttamālāstuti remained as the only possible topic in this field.

When I first transcribed the Tibetan text I became rather puzzled after the first four (introductory) stanzas which show a rather regular structure of 4 x 9 syllables per line. Thereafter the text looks as follows:

| blo || dbyaṅs || dpal || rnam [5] |
| rai ṅid || gcig pa’i || sa gani || rnam mdzes [6] |
little later. The Vṛttamālā astuti the caesuras they might contain. This will be illustrated a formation about the category to which they belong and their original Sanskrit the stanzas also contain some in- having a different metrical pattern in all four lines. In

Now there was a twofold challenge: a) to understand the meaning of the highly artificial stanzas; b) to identify the names of the metres. As for the first task, it was partially easier to work with the Tibetan translation, because at least the long compounds of the original are usually resolved and rare Sanskrit words are represented by more common Tibetan equivalents, but partially much more difficult, because many syntactical hints like the case endings are lost in a metrical text. As for the second task, it was quite simple in all those cases where the stanza illustrates a well-known metre, and its name is used and translated in its primary meaning, e.g. vasantatilaka as “ornament of spring” or sārdulavikrīdita as “playfulness of a tiger.” Unfortunately this was the case only in little more than 50 per cent of the stanzas. In about 25 per cent of the cases the names were intentionally obscured, either by using a rather unusual meaning of the names or by hiding them in an artificial manner. I would like to illustrate both of these techniques.

a) The metre jāloddhatagatiḥ

Usually one would interpret this name as a bahuvrīhi compound mean “(the animal) having a gait (that is characterized as) jumping out of the water,” e.g., a dolphin. In stanza 66 it is used in a completely different meaning:

b) The metre meghavisphūrjita

Here jala- is taken as a kind of metre. Thereafter I somehow managed to find its description, and after I had realized that this is a samarītā consisting of eight “heavy” or long syllables per line it occurred to me that the expression vīdyanmālā used in a stanza of 4 x 8 lines was hardly coincidental. Then I gradually began to understand the ślesa hidden in the Tibetan version of the four introductory stanzas that was used by Jñānasirimitra to explain the twofold purpose of his work: on the one hand it is a hymn of praise of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī who is described in his friendly of peaceful aspect (Tib. mñān, Skt. sama), in his ‘half peaceful’ aspect (Tib. phyed mñān, Skt. ardhasama), and in his wrathful aspect (Tib. mi mñān, Skt. visama); on the other hand it is an illustration of the three categories of metres defined by their number of syllables per line—a number that can be sama, that means, having an identical metrical pattern in all the four lines; ardhasama, that means, only ‘half identical’ in that lines 1 and 3 and lines 2 and 4 have identical structures; or visama, that means, having a different metrical pattern in all four lines. In their original Sanskrit the stanzas also contain some information about the category to which they belong and the caesuras they might contain. This will be illustrated a little later. The Vṛttamālāstuti is a comparatively short work; it consists of 154 stanzas. The first four stanzas, composed in the āryā metre, form the introduction, stanzas 5–12 illustrate 120 sāmarītās, stanzas 125–140 16 ardhasamaśrītās, and stanzas 141–154 14 visamaśrītās, with the last two stanzas also functioning as concluding stanzas.
This metre belongs to the class of metres with 19 syllables per line, like śārdulaśvickṛita. For some external criteria of selection it was clear that this metre should be present in the Vṛttamālastruti. Since the name is quite characteristic—"roaring of the clouds"—one expects that it would not be difficult to identify it in its Tibetan translation, all the more as there are only two metres of this category in the Vṛttamālastruti, one of them being the well-known metre śārdulaśvickṛita. The second half of the other stanza contains the verbal compound rnam par bs-gyi’s pa “comprehensive yawning, stretching, unfolding”, which is attested as rendering of vijhmbhita (a near synonym of visphūrajita); cf. the Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary by J. S. Negi, vol. 7, Sarnath 2001, pp. 3057b–3058a.

The second half of stanza 103 of the Vṛttamālastruti runs as follows in the Tibetan translation:

| bla ma ga’i gis bdag pa rnam par bs-gyi’s pa kun nas mun par byed pa rnas | | phrog byed dag byed rnam s ky i dag byed gnas skabs de ni skad cig tsam ya’i sgrub par md-zod | 105 |
| O teacher, only for a short while grant that condition—
The most purifying among all the purifying (conditions)—
That takes away the all-compassing darkness, Which are the visible consequences of my bad deeds!

So the "unfolding" or "(visible) consequencs" (vijhmbhita/visphūrajita) are there, while there is no trace of "clouds" (megha)—this was my first thought. But then I realized that while the "clouds" are missing megha is nevertheless there: all we have to do is to read me ‘gha “my sins, bad deeds.” This was the starting point for the discovery of several ingeniously hidden names, up to the "my sins, bad deeds." This was the starting point for the translation, all the more as there are only two metres of this category in the Vṛttamālastruti, one of them being the well-known metre śārdulaśvickṛita. The second half of stanza 103 of the Vṛttamālastruti runs as follows in the Tibetan translation:

The majority of the unidentified names of metres, however, is due to the fact that Jñānasrimitra has used so far unknown names of metres. In 1968, the first reprint of the collected works of the most prominent abbots and scholars of the monastery Sa skyā appeared in Japan. When we received the volumes of the Sa skyā pa’i bka’ bum in Hamburg in 1969, I noticed that vol. V contains a fascinating treatise on metrics composed by Sa skyā Paṇḍita, Sde bsho sny a tshogs me tog gi chun po. After a long and learned introduction Sa skyā Paṇḍita explains in great detail Ratnakarasānti’s work. After each section he mentions other important metres belonging to that category which are not taught in the Chaudoratanukara. One of his sources that he expressly mentions is Jñānasrimitra’s Vṛttamālastruti. These additions enabled me to identify a great number of previously unidentified metres, but only the names, not their metrical structure. In the case of the remaining unidentified metres the Vṛttamālavivrtti helped of which I would now like to present the first two pages on page 12.

This is an analytical transcript with the insertion of the basic text in square brackets and tentative restorations of the missing portions in angular brackets.

### Unknown metre

| namo maṇjuśriye | jñānaśriprahlāvān vṛttamālām iva dihyām nidhehi | jñānaśriprahlāvān vṛttamālām vayam upśimateh | hiḥyam prakṛṣaṇaparṇuṇapagana jñānaśri-mitra vṛttamālā /// /// /// (2)ntam ārya-maṇjuśriyam abhituṣṭaḥ yatिरśaRSAjaṁjaṁaḥ svacchandaso vṛttabhadraḥ api pratipipāyatiṣaḥ ādau tāvat pratipādyavṛttanām sāmānyam prabheda prastavānam āha || vṛ(ṭtam 1)3 tyādi |

| vṛttam samam ardhastamaṃ viṣamaṃ cety āmananti vāgṣṭhaḥ | trividhāṃ parārthavidhāye samāsato vyāsāto ’nantam [ 1 ] |

vāgṣṭha maṇjuśriyam tava vṛttam caritram āmananti manyanta upadhiṣanti vo munindrā iti śesāḥ | kṁbhiṭhām taud ity āha | samāṇaṃ tulyam śantāram ity arthaḥ | ardhastamaṃ

1Before namo we find a sign representing om (or siddham).
24-5 aksaras are missing. Read „vṛttamāla(dvārena bhagava)(2)ntam? 3vāgṣṭha Ms.
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Figure 4: Sākyamunī’s Vṛttamālāvīrti, folios 1b and 2a

\[4\] takrodharupam | vișamaṇ ā vikāṭa-
krodharupam | itīṭtham saṃkṣepeṇa tripra-
kāraṇa caritaṃ tava kathayanti | vistaratas tv ekaikasyānanyād anantaṃ | kimartham ity āha | parārthavi(dhaye) (5) parārthakarana-
ṛtham |

vṛttapakṣe tu vāgīṣāh | piṅgalādayo muna-
yāḥ | vṛttam padyabhedaṃ | saṃaṃ vaiśvāḍī | arḍhasaṃaṇ ā upacitrādi | viṣamaṇ ā pada-
caturdhūvādi | itīṭtham trividham samāṣata (ā) (6)mananti |atrāpi samādām pratyekam ananyād anantaṃ | tad uktam |

anantaḥ padyamargo 'yam 
viṣēṣaḥ pāthasobhayeye-
ti | parārthavidhaya iti pūrvavat athavā para-
rāḥ prakṛṣṭo y(o) (‘2a)arthāḥ | tasya vidhaye 
pratipadānāartham | vṛttaniṁbaddho hy arthaḥ su-
pratipado bhavati | o || 
pūnaḥ kiṃbhiṣitaṃ tad vṛttam ity āha | prati-
tiniyatetvādī |

[pratiniyatākṛtṛūḍham 
varumāṇībhīr yatra nāma saṃgītam | 
chaṇḍaḥ padaṃ ca paṇamaṇ 
spurati yathāvividhavinyāśaḥ || 2 || 
yatra yēṣu vṛttesu pratiniyatāsvā kṛtiṣu 
mūrtiṣu rūḍham prasi(dhaṃ) (2) nāma 
varumāṇībhīr buddhāh saṃgītam saṃbhūya 
gitam | sthirakārakārdasunjūna saṃgranthitā | ya-
tra ca cchando bhilāṣaḥ | spurati paśyatām 
iti śeṣaḥ (|) padaṃ paṇamaṇ iti pratiśthī 
cāvyavasthitā(ṭa) (3) śreṣṭham spurati kathaṃ 
spurati | vīdhiḥ ve vīnyāśah | sattvānum ru-
cisamaṇāropas radaṇatikramaḥ | astāvasya pākṣi-
katvād iti bhāvah |

vṛttapakṣe tu pratiniyatāsva (ā) (4)kṛtiṣu 
niyatagurulaghukramasvarūpesu | 
rūḍham prasiddham nāma varumāṇībhīḥ 
piṅgalā-dibhiḥ | saṃgītāṃ idaṃ vaisēm iyana ta-
madhyetvādī | yatra ca cchando gāyatrīādi-
s(aṃ)(jīne) (5)ti | kathām vīdhiḥ ye vīnyāsāś 
tatra tatra gāyatrīādīsaṃjñānīvēṣaḥ (|) tada-
naṭikramaḥ (|) padaṃ ceti | yathā | tacje 
cokṛṣṭaṃ spurati | atrāpi yathāvividha-
vī(ṇyā) (6)sair iti yojyaṃ |

visrāma ṛdhē pade bhāṅgah 
pādāṃśe vākṣyate yatir 
iti vacanat athavā śuddhabhāṣābhādāv ekā-
disthaṃesa bhavat (|) yater yathā yādṛśā (y)e 
( v)i(vidhā) (2b)

\[4\] 2–3 aksaras are missing. 
\[5\] mūrtiṣu margine. 
\[6\] samāropas corrected to "samāropās. 
\[7\] niyatāsv corrected to "niyatāsv."
When in 1976 Dr. Voigt permitted me to see the NGMPP microfilm B 29/31 containing the Vṛttamālavīrītī, this was a revelation because this commentary proved to be something like a magic key for most of the unsolved portions and problems of the Vṛttamālāstuti and its Tibetan translation. It took some time before I could read the Bengali type of script, and moreover several leaves are damaged on the right side which results in the loss of several akṣaras at the end of the lines. However, most of the text is very correctly written so that only a few emendations are necessary. The only flaw other than the mutilated pages is the missing last folio that contained the commentary on stanzas 150–154 and the colophon with the name of the author, and perhaps also the date of copying. The title of the work, however, is known from the intermediate colophons after stanzas 124 and 140 which run as follows:

\[
\text{iti duṣkaraṇaprabhedakṛṣṇa-}\text{vṛttamālavivarṭī (ta) (5)māláṣṭutivivarṭītau}
\]

\[
\text{samaṃvṛtti}
\]

and

\[
\text{iti duṣkaraṇaprabhedavṛttamālavivarṭītau ardhasaṃvṛtti}
\]

We can assume that the full title was Vṛttamālavīrītī which was abbreviated by the author himself—or by the scribe—as Vṛttamālavīrītī. Fortunately the name of the author of the commentary could easily be determined. The colophon of the Tibetan translation of the Vṛttamālāstuti runs as follows:

\["di yī ge bcu gnis pa'i tshiṅ ba bcad bcu gge g pa ya mu na yan chad \mid Šoṅi ston lo tṣa ba chen po rDo rje rgyal mtshan gyis bskyar te 'phro la lus pa las Šoṅi ston de viṅ kiḥ bṛgyad pa'i slob ma dPaṅ lo tṣa ba dge sgo dpa'l ldan Blo gros brtan pas \mid slob dpon Śākya rākṣi tsa māṇḍa pa'i 'grel la btren nas gois su rdo'gogs par bskyar cīṅ us te gtaṅ la phab bo \mid"

"This [work] has been translated by the teacher from Šoṅi (Šoṅi ston), the great translator (lo tṣa ba) rDo rje rgyal mtshan up to the metre gmanu, which is the eleventh among the metres of twelve syllables [per line]; what is left over has been translated until the end, corrected and edited by the translator from dPaṅ (dPaṅ lo tṣa ba), the blessed monk Blo gros brtan pa, a disciple belonging to the school of that very Šoṅi ston, relying on the commentary which was composed by the teacher Śākyarākṣita."
During the sleepless nights of the next two weeks, I reconstructed, in a similar manner, all the 36 stanzas whose structure was unknown. These reconstructions were scribbled down in the margins of a proof copy of my thesis which I had taken with me to Nepal and which I still keep as a kind of precious souvenir. I would like to show two of these pages, 104 and 105, which contain the reconstructions of stanzas 35 and 36 (page 15).
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Figure 5: Page 104 and 105 of a proof copy of the edition of the Vṛttamālāstuti
Although there remained several unclear portions, I basically succeeded in creating stanzas of a uniform metrical structure whose meaning was identical with the Tibetan translation and the explanation of the Vṛttamālāvivṛti. This was so encouraging that I very vaguely conceived the idea of reconstructing the whole Vṛttamālāstuti, although I was fully aware that this would take a long time and that the result would be no more than an approximation to the original wording of Jñānasrimitra. Then again coincidence helped me not to embark on a futile project.

Already during the first days of my stay in Kathmandu I had become acquainted with a young and dedicated Nepalese Sanskrit scholar who worked for the NGMPP, Mahes Raj Pant. We had many discussions about various projects and publications plans. At that time I had finished the first draft of my edition of the Mahajātakaśanālā and began to think about a suitable place and way to publish the text. Dr. Michael Witzel, then the local director of the project, who facilitated my work in Kathmandu in every possible respect, had mentioned the possibility of printing such a text in Nepal, in devanāgarī and at much lower cost than would be possible in Germany. I had then begun to discuss this plan with Mahes Raj Pant and in order to illustrate to him the size of a subsidy that was required for indological publications in Germany I showed him my thesis, mentioning the huge subsidy paid by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft to Germany I showed him my thesis, mentioning the huge subsidy that was required for indological publications in

When I compared my reconstructions with the actual wording of the Vṛttamālāstuti I found 35 of them to be correct, at least with regard to their metrical structures. Occasionally lines or parts of lines were misplaced, but that affected neither the meaning nor the structures of the stanzas. In stanza 35 there is only one deviation from the correct wording. In lines ab I had reconstructed tatveṇavaśākhyāmakaṁ whereas the original text has ‘vidhau’ instead of ‘kare’. Here Śākyarākṣita had not quoted the word to be explained, ‘vidhau, in its original shape, but only given its paraphrase ‘karaṇakāle. The only case where I had not been able to establish a regular structure was the following stanza 36. I had written down a sentence, not a stanza, consisting of 4 x 11 syllables that more or less correctly represented the meaning of the stanza. The structure, however, remained irregular:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rūpaṁ akkilam atha guṇaṇaṁ} & \quad \text{kṛitīṃ tavedaṁ saṃvikṣyātiśāyi} \\
\text{naivaśayē bhiḥrad (dhi) virāmāṁ} & \quad \text{triṣṭubhi jāgan mandān upajātām} \quad || \quad 36 ||
\end{align*}
\]

This is Jñānasrimitra’s text with the structure ——— ——— ——— ——— ———:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rūpaṁ te guṇaṇaṁ atha kṛitīṁ} & \quad \text{saṃvikṣyākāhin idam atiśāyī} \\
\text{bhiḥrānāṁ naivaśayāvirāmāṁ} & \quad \text{mandān triṣṭubhi jāgad upajātām} \quad || \quad 36 ||
\end{align*}
\]

The expression bhiḥrānāṁ “visayāvirāmāṁ” marks the caesura, with visaya symbolizing “live.”

In fact, my attempts at reconstructing stanzas of the Vṛttamālāstuti from its Tibetan translation and the Vṛttamālāvivṛti were not entirely futile. Apart from running a test with subsequent feedback to what extent such a venture could be successful, there remained one case in which the ability to reconstruct stanzas of the Vṛttamālāstuti was indeed required. In the old manuscript that was the basis of Yogi Naraharināth’s edition, and that he in a farsighted manner reproduced in his booklet, the text of stanza 62, illustrating the metre bhujajagrapayātām, is omitted by inadvertency. In my edition which is to appear in the near future I will present it in a reconstructed form.

At the end I would like to present the text of stanzas 5-11 illustrating 7 different metres in the form of one coherent sentence:

\[
\begin{align*}
dhiḥgh- | śrīnām || 5 || \\
nijākabhiḥ | vibhāts ya | 6 || \\
tadgaṇāśamsibhiḥ | sevgale cāniśām || 7 || \\
samāśraṇakhalanmalāḥ | saraśurāśīṣdūdgataḥ || 8 || \\
naiḥkabhāyiḥbhāyānaiḥvyrdham | \\
bodhaviśeṣaṁ sādhu dadhānaiḥ || 9 || \\
gita gāyatrvirna cchandhavaś adyā sadbhāḥ | \\
vṛttam bhāvi śreyo yasyaṁ sad vā visvāṁ || 10 || \\
nilotpalapāṇer nilānilapaṣyā | \\
śāstur jagatiyaṁ mārtis tanumadhyā || 11 ||
\end{align*}
\]

“The which shines as the sole genuine place of wisdom, eloquence and bliss, and is continuously adhered to by those who praise its virtues, who stand out among gods, asuras and other (beings),
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and whose defects become obstructed through
the contact with it,
who preserve well that distinguished form of in-
sight,
that has been accumulated through practice in
countless rebirths,
which is to be enjoyed to one’s heart’s content
(chandahsvadhyā)
in the same manner as the gāyatrī is praised
as the first among the metres (chandahsvadhyā),
in which there was, is, and will be all-
compassing good fortune—
this (beautiful) slender shape of the teacher (i.e.
Mañjuśrī),
who holds a blue lotus in his hand
and is an abode of beauty, be victorious!”

The name of the metre in stanza 10 is vaisvām, in stanza
11 the well-known tanumadhyā. Gāyatrī is the name of
the category of metres consisting of six syllables per line.
This name is usually given in the first metre of a certain
category, but occasionally also in the last metre.
And the original Sanskrit of stanza 19 quoted above
runs:

tīvraēśāploṣadhvaṃsā-
praudhe vamśe sambuddhānām |
dhate bhūṣāṁ bhātīgaṁ te |
‘mḥode yadvad vidyunmālā ||19||

Prinz Sudhana und die Kinnarī. Eine buddhistische
Liebesgeschichte von Kṣemendra. Texte, Übersetzung, Studie
Von
MARTIN STRAUBE

MARBURG 2006

Kṣemendra’s Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalata (Av-klp) is
the latest and, at the same time, the most voluminous
literary collection of accounts of the former births of
the Buddha which was created in India, more exactly,
in Kashmir. It is peculiar in narrating these events en-
tirely in verse, combining an epic-purānic style with ambi-
tuous kāvyā elements. This literary style served as model
both for the later Avadānamālā literature of Nepal and—
through its Tibetan translation Byaṅ chub sens dpa’i
rtogs pa brjod pa dpag lsdam gyi ’khrī shis of the famous
Tibetan translator Šoṅ ston rDo rje rgyal mtshan—for
the ornate style of medieval Tibetan literature.

The complete text was edited for the first time in two
volumes by Sarat Chandra Dās together with Hari Mohn
Vidyābhuṣaṇa (Vol. I) and later together with Satis
Chandra Vidyābhuṣaṇa (Vol. II) between 1888 and 1918.
The editors based their text on two fragmentary Nepalese
manuscripts (now in the Cambridge University Library),
and a Tibetan block print containing the Sanskrit text in
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Kṣemendra’s Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalata (Av-klp) is
the latest and, at the same time, the most voluminous
literary collection of accounts of the former births of
the Buddha which was created in India, more exactly,
in Kashmir. It is peculiar in narrating these events en-
tirely in verse, combining an epic-purānic style with ambi-
tious kāvyā elements. This literary style served as model
both for the later Avadānamālā literature of Nepal and—
through its Tibetan translation Byaṅ chub sens dpa’i
rtogs pa brjod pa dpag lsdam gyi ’khrī shis of the famous
Tibetan translator Šoṅ ston rDo rje rgyal mtshan—for
the ornate style of medieval Tibetan literature.

The complete text was edited for the first time in two
volumes by Sarat Chandra Dās together with Hari Mohn
Vidyābhuṣaṇa (Vol. I) and later together with Satis
Chandra Vidyābhuṣaṇa (Vol. II) between 1888 and 1918.
The editors based their text on two fragmentary Nepalese
manuscripts (now in the Cambridge University Library),
and a Tibetan block print containing the Sanskrit text in
Tibetan script and the Tibetan translation (crafted under the aegis of the Fifth Dalai Lama). Although this edition must be regarded as an impressive pioneering work it is obvious to every careful reader that it cannot be regarded as the last word on Kṣemendra’s text. The first serious attempt to improve the text of the *editio princeps* was made by Jan Willem de Jong, who published philological remarks on almost every chapter in a series of articles written between 1977 and 1996. De Jong’s articles encouraged subsequent studies by various authors who strove to improve and translate the text, and investigated the sources and the context of individual stories of the text. This procedure proved to be useful in solving many problems, because Kṣemendra’s complex and often concise style demands a knowledge of the various versions of the individual stories in order to fully understand and appreciate them.

The present book deals with the longest and perhaps one of the most charming chapters of the Av-klp, the *Sudhanakumārīvadāna* (no. 64). For the first time in any study on the Av-klp, all textual sources which transmit the Sanskrit text of a single section have been collected, described in detail and arranged according to their textual relationship. This involved four Nepalese Sanskrit MSS (including one which was microfilmed by the NGMPP, on reel B 95/5), three bilingual Tibetan block prints, as well as an adaptation of Kṣemendra’s original in the Nepalese *Bhadrakalpāvadāna*. The thorough examination of these textual witnesses combined with a detailed study of the possible sources of Kṣemendra’s narration yielded more than 80 improvements of the text of the *editio princeps*, roughly a third of which were already suggested by de Jong. All editorial decisions which were not based on trivial arguments have been discussed and justified in a philological commentary. Special attention has been given to a critical edition of the Tibetan translation on facing pages since the Tibetan text in the *editio princeps* is based on a single block print. A German translation, the first ever made in a western language, is added to the text editions. It aims to display the editor’s interpretation of the text and, beyond this, strives to render the original Sanskrit not only in terms of correctness of meaning but also, as far as possible, of style and flair. Annotations discuss difficult passages of the Sanskrit and explain allusions and metaphors. The language, metre, and style of both the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation are studied in separate sections with special attention given to Śōn ston’s techniques used in rendering Kṣemendra’s kavya into Tibetan.

A further aim of the book was to establish which of the extant Indian versions could have served as a model for Kṣemendra. By a detailed comparison of the *Sudhanakumārīvadāna* (transmitted in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* and in the *Divyāvadāna*), the *Kinnarīsudhanajātaka* (25th chapter of Haribhaṭṭa’s *Jātakamālā*), and a short and laconic Khotanese version, it could be made quite probable that Kṣemendra knew and actually made use of Haribhaṭṭa’s version. It also seems quite certain that he used a version which must have been very close to but cannot be identical with the Sudhanakumārīvadāna, since there are some events in Kṣemendra’s text described in detail which are but briefly, one may even say cryptically, alluded to in that version.

This book aims to provide materials for a future complete new edition of Kṣemendra’s *magnum opus* as a reliable basis for literary and cultural as well as linguistic studies of this important work of the Buddhist narrative literature.

(Martin Straube)
time the text of a substantial part of the Tattvasamīkṣā, the commentary on Maṇḍanamārśa’s Brahmasiddhi by Vācaspatimīrśa I. It is a matter for genuine rejoicing that a hitherto unpublished work of so famous an author as Vācaspatimīrśa I has been discovered in Nepal, albeit in incomplete form, and all students and lovers of Indian philosophy will no doubt be grateful to Diwakar Acharya, both for the countless hours that he has spent examining Nepalese manuscripts, which have led to discoveries such as this one, and for the no less time-consuming and difficult work of attempting a first edition of this commentary. The manuscript has suffered serious damage; apart from rubbing which has nearly effaced the writing on some folios, the right sides of each leaf are damaged, with eight to fourteen aśkaras having been lost in each line except the last one. For even an extremely tentative hypothetical reconstruction, such as that given here, wide reading in Vācaspatimīrśa’s other works and a vast range of philosophical literature in Sanskrit was required. Improvement on this edition will, it is hoped, be possible in the future (above all, there is always a chance that another manuscript may come to light), but Diwakar Acharya’s work should be duly recognized as a major contribution; and anyone who attempts to read Vācaspatimīrśa I’s work from the manuscript—as is made possible by the reproductions, in black and white, but of sufficiently good quality, in this book—will be impressed by the courage with which the editor undertook the task of restoration and the learning and ingenuity which allowed him to complete it.

The Brahmasiddhi is, no doubt, one of the major milestones of philosophical literature in Sanskrit, and Vācaspatimīrśa I’s commentary, apart from its intrinsic interest and importance for a better understanding of the thought of the famous commentator, also is an important witness for the text of Maṇḍanamārśa’s work (which is given here, for the portions for which the commentary is available), allowing the earlier editions to be improved on at a number of places, and furthermore deserves to be taken very seriously in future attempts to come to grips with Maṇḍanamārśa’s thought. No translation of root text or commentary is presented here; but the edition is preceded by an extensive introduction, which, among other things, also considers once more the question of the date of Vācaspatimīrśa I and gives a summary of the edited text, and it is followed by ‘Critical Notes’ which discuss briefly most of the hypothetical reconstructions, and mention a few alternative possibilities.

At the request of Diwakar Acharya, I print here a list of corrections to the edition that he has sent me.


The Īṣṭabhedha of Maheśvara (Part 1)

Oliver Hahn

Two distinct texts of the name Īṣṭabhedha are known to us up to now: one by Puruṣottamadeva (first half of the 12th c.) and another by Maheśvara, the author of the Viṣvaprakāśa. The latter text was composed in Śākasaṅvat 1033, i.e. 1111 A.D. To his kośa, Maheśvara has appended a supplement, known as Sabdabhedapārakāśa. This text consists of the following four parts: a Dvīrpākoṣa of 133 verses (the Śabdabhedha proper), which lists (pairs of) nouns and adjectives showing certain differences in form (i.e. spelling), their meaning being the same. Secondly, an Oṣṭhyadantaḍīya-vakārahṛtha of 34 verses, which is concerned with the correct spelling and pronunciation of words containing vā and va respectively. Thirdly, an Īṣṭabhedha of 60 verses, which teaches the correct spelling and pronunciation of words containing the sibilants (iṣṭam) s, s and s. Lastly, a Śāntabhedha of 44 verses, concerned with the grammatical gender of nouns.

There are at least two complete palm-leaf manuscripts of Maheśvara’s Īṣṭabhedha in the National Archives of Kathmandu. One is part of a manuscript containing the

1. Cf. Vogel 1979 p. 331 and Pant 2000 pp. 288–291. In the New CatCat (vol. XII p. 146) however, Puruṣottamadeva is associated with the 11th c. A.D. To my knowledge, this text has not yet been published.

2. A homonymic dictionary of 2200-odd stanzas.

3. The NAK possesses, among others, a complete manuscript of this text dating Nepalasamvat 319, i.e. 1199 A.D. (A 18/4). This text, together with the commentary of Jñānavimalaṇa, has been edited by Kümmel (1940). She also discusses the problems as to the relation of this work and another Sabdabhedapārakāśa ascribed to Puruṣottamadeva (pp. v–viii).

4. E.g. mukra and mukrā in the sense of sūrya “sun”.

5. KüMMEL’S edition contains only 59 verses, which are counted from 1 to 59.
whole Śabdabhedaprakāśa, which has been microfilmed on B 14/21 under the misleading title “Vīśvaprakāśakośa.” Interestingly, this (undated) manuscript once belonged to a collection of four manuscripts, together with the aforementioned, quite old manuscript of the Vīśvaprapaśa (A 18/4, cf. note 3). Although it cannot be said with absolute certainty that these two manuscripts were written by the same scribe, they at least seem to be from approximately the same period, i.e. the end of the 12th century.1

Another manuscript of the Uṣnābhedā, however, deserves a few more detailed remarks. For some reason or other, it got divided in two parts, which consequently were microfilmed on two different reels, i.e. A 18/6 (fols. 1 and 6) and B 34/27 (fols. 2–5). In the course of cataloguing, which was begun by Śastri with his catalogue of selected manuscripts of the then Durbar Library of Kathmandu,2 some confusion has arisen about the true nature of this text. Originally, the manuscript containing Mahēśvara’s Uṣnābhedā seems to have been kept together with another manuscript, a so-called Upasargavrtecī belonging to the Čandravyākaraṇa.3 This is corroborated by an inscription on a wooden cover (A 18/6 exposure 6) written by some employee of the then Durbar Library: prā. 1076 — Čandravyākaraṇasaṃgaṇa — upasargavrtecī tathā uṣnābhedah (sic). Consequently, the Uṣnābbedha has been (wrongly) associated with the Čandravyākaraṇa, as is shown by two more misleading inscriptions on the back of fol. 1 and in the margin of fol. 24. Thus, there are two consecutive entries in Śastri, i.e. sub 1076 gha: “Čandravyākaraṇaṃ” (= Uṣnābbedha fols. 2–5 microfilmed on B 34/27), and sub 1076 nā: “Uṣnābbedha” (= Uṣnābbedha fols. 1 and 6 microfilmed on A 18/6).5 Similarly, there are two entries in the BSP: one as “Čandravyākaraṇopasargavrtecī” in vol. VI, p. 22, no. 66 (cf. B 34/27), and another as “Uṣnābbedha” in vol. IX, p. 47, no. 129.6

Fortunately, this mistaken connection established between the Uṣnābbedha and the Čandravyākaraṇa has eventually led to the reuniting of both parts of the manuscript, as Oberlies became aware of the text while doing research on manuscripts pertaining to the Čandravyākaraṇa on the basis of the manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP.7 He put the two fragments of the Uṣnābbedha together, but could not yet finally resolve the problem as to the assumed connection of the text with the Čandravyākaraṇa. Oberlies also did not succeed in identifying the text as a section of Mahēśvara’s Śabdabhedaprakāśa, and hence was unaware that an edition had already been published. He found, however, that it is different from Purusottamadeva’s Uṣnābbedha.8 In the New Catalogus Catalogorum, our Uṣnābbedha is referred to as well.9

This manuscript of the Uṣnābbedha is written neatly in old style Newari characters, and is dated (nepāla)samvat 541, i.e. A.D. 1421. Apart from a few scribal errors and some corrupt passages, the text contains quite a number of interesting variant readings with respect to the text of KÜMMEL’s edition. Although the printed text is completely corroborated by Jīnānāṁalagani’s commentary, which was written in A.D. 1598 (some 177 years later than our manuscript)10, there is a fair chance that this manuscript has preserved some older (and maybe “more authentic”) readings. Furthermore, the other manuscript (B 14/21), even if it should turn out not to have been copied in the late 12th century, is almost certainly an even older witness of the text.

That is why I have thought it worthwhile to prepare another critical edition of the text here, which is based on the two manuscripts from the NAK mentioned above, together with the text edited by KÜMMEL. Apart from a few differences concerning the rules of orthography and sandhi peculiar to the individual manuscripts,12 all variant read-

---

1 It is quite possible that some other manuscripts listed under this title may contain the whole or parts of the Śabdabhedaprakāśa.
2 The overall impression of both hands is quite similar. However, the scribe(s) has/have used different writing devices, which makes it almost impossible to decide whether or not we are dealing with a single scribe. Another interesting feature of this manuscript is that the first two folios are written in Newari, whereas the remaining 10 folios are written in Maithili characters. The Uṣnābbedha portion is on fols. 7v–10r.
3 Cf. Śastri 1905.
4 This text turned up only recently in connection with the investigations about the Uṣnābbedha carried out in the NAK. The following book containing an edition of the Vīmaṇaprakāśasarvasargavrtecī by Dragomir Dimitrov is forthcoming: Lehrschrift über die zweizig Präverbsätze im Sanskrit. Kritische Ausgabe der Vīmaṇaprakāśasarvasargavrtecī und der tibetischen Übersetzung. (Indica et Tibetica [in print].)
5 The inscriptions read prā. 1076 — cāndravyākaraṇasaṃgaṇa (ūṣnābbedha) (sic) and prā. 1076 — cāndravyākaraṇasaṃgaṇa (ūṣnābbedha) (sic, . . .) . . . (sic, Uṣnābbedha crossed out) respectively.
6 Cf. Śastri 1905 p. 31. Incidentally, both entries give the date mistakenly as samvat 441, the actual date of the colophon being (nepāla)samvat 541.
8 A manuscript containing this text is mentioned in BSP vol. IX p. 47, no. 128: prā. 1475, and equally in Śastri p. 60 sub 1475 nā. It has been re-discovered only recently as microfilmed on B 14/4 together with another text, styled Amarakoṣaṭīpauṇi (sic). This is corroborated by Jīnānāṁalagani’s commentary, which was written in A.D. 1598 (some 177 years later than our manuscript) there is a fair chance that this manuscript has preserved some older (and maybe “more authentic”) readings. Furthermore, the other manuscript (B 14/21), even if it should turn out not to have been copied in the late 12th century, is almost certainly an even older witness of the text.
9 Cf. Śastri 1905.
10 A special feature of the orthography of the manuscript preserved on A 18/6 and B 34/27 (= N) is the use of a final guttural n (instead of anusvāra) before a palatal initial ś (e.g. śanalah śṛgālah). Moreover, the respective class nasal (and not the sign anusvāra) is written before a following consonant (e.g. Śītāi ca for Śiṭam ca etc.).
ings from the two manuscripts as well as the printed edition are recorded in the apparatus. As scribes using both the Newari and Maithili type of script usually do not graphically differentiate between labio-dental va and bilabial ba, the edition follows the spelling taught in the Oṣṭhyadantaṃśhayavakārabheda.

Finally, a few words as to the structure of the text. As has been mentioned before, the Ṣuṣmabheda is a metrical text, containing 60 verses of various metres. The verses normally consist of lists of words, which are ordered according to phonetic principles. Only in a few instances, a meaning is added in the locative case. The text is divided into three main sections, each section having its own verse numbering in the two manuscripts. Thus, the following scheme is observed:

i) sa as part of an initial, middle and final aksara of a word (verses 1–18); words containing sa only in connection with a certain meaning (19–20); twice sa in a word (21–22); sa and sa occurring in a word (23); words where both writings sa and sa are admitted without any change of meaning (24)

ii) sa as part of an initial, middle and final aksara of a word (1–13); sa and sa occurring in a word (14); sa and sa occurring in a word (15–16)

iii) sa as part of an initial, middle and final aksara of a word (1–15); sa in combination with consonants (16–17); twice sa in a word (18–19).

Besides this general scheme, the words are ordered with a view to grouping such as contain similar consonants or syllables. In this way, words most similar in form tend to occur side by side, or at least within the same verse. Editing the text, however, I tried to steer a middle course between preferring the readings of the two manuscripts from Nepal, and giving those variants prevalence which yield the greatest amount of anuprāśa within a given verse. However, I did not want to overestimate this last-mentioned principle, as in the course of the redaction of the text similar words may sometimes have been substituted for less similar words by some scribe or other to make the text “more perfect”.

Edition of the Ṣuṣmabheda, Part I

Omo nama maṇjūmāthaya

atha tālavyamūrdhanyadantyanāṃ api leśatāḥ

Before the portion of the text (talavyaksarākāraṇa), the portions containing sa and sa will appear in our next newsletter. The following abbreviations and symbols are used in the critical apparatus: N = Newari (A 18/6 and B 34/26); M = Maithili (B 14/21); E = Edition Kümmler; a.c. = ante correction; p.c. = post correction. A single dot (.) represents an illegible or otherwise indeterminable part of an aksara.

Thus begins N, which contains the Usmabheda only. E and M have no such invocation in this part, since there the Usmabheda is preceded by the above-mentioned parts of the Saṅghabhadraprakāśa.

This introductory verse is counted as the portion of the text (talavyasamāna), and sa and sa are not counted in M; and altogether omitted in N.

>This introductory verse is counted as the portion of the text (talavyasamāna), and sa and sa are not counted in M; and altogether omitted in N.

The following metres are used: Vasantatilaka, Upajāti, In-
Newsletter of the NGMCP Number 2

This verse is missing in the edition. In M it occurs as number dantyāḥ. 
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The NGMCP would like to invite readers to test the online version of the title list (http://134.100.72.204:3000/). The goal of this online application is to make accurate information about the manuscripts microfilmed by
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- We cannot guarantee 24/7 availability of the application at this moment. Please expect some occasional downtime or strange behaviour during the daytime on weekdays in western Europe (GMT +1), as we may modify, test or restart the application.
- We ask users to register to use the application. We only ask for a user name and password. This is because we are planning to introduce functionalities that depend on users’ needs or privileges (such as being able to correct the data in the database). We have no intention of obtaining personal information about users. Anyone with concerns about privacy can choose a completely random user name; i.e., the user name does not have to be a real name or to bear any relationship to an email address one uses.
- The use of the database should be straightforward after logging in. Some help texts are available in the form of links.
- If the application seems not to be working, please make sure that cookies and Javascript/ECMAScript are enabled in your browser.
- Contact kengo.harimoto@uni-hamburg.de with questions and feedback with regard to the application.