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 *Kāvyādarśa*, 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(for which the data made available earlier by the NGMPP in the *Preliminary List of Manuscripts, Blockprints and Historical Documents Microfilmed by the NGMPP, Part 1 (excluding Tibetan Material and Historical Documents)*, available on CD-ROM, served as the starting point) is in the early stages of ongoing revision and correction; but I am confident that this step will make it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 Ḫṛṣṇāpāla’s Commentary on the Prakrit Kāvya Setubandha

Dīwākar Acharya

The Rāvanavahā, also known as Setūbandha and Dasammhavahā, is a well known Prakrit kāvya written by a Pravarasena (possibly Pravarasena II, the fifth century Vākṣṭakā 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 from text of Radhagovinda Basak’s introduction to his edition of the kāvya 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śrīnivāsa</td>
<td>Setudarpana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokanātha</td>
<td>name not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhasāṅka</td>
<td>name not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫṛṣṇāpāla</td>
<td>name not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulanātha</td>
<td>Dasamukhavadhavivarana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Setutattvacandrikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmadāsa</td>
<td>Rāma setupradipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvānārayanādāsa</td>
<td>Setusarāṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krṣṇa</td>
<td>Setuvivarana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallabhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Setucandrikā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Basak reports, Kulanātha, Lokanātha, Śrīnivāsa, Sāhasāṅka and Ḫṛṣṇāpāla 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 Ḫṛṣṇāpāla were hitherto known only from citations found in the later commentaries. I am very happy to announce here that Ḫṛṣṇāpāla’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 Vajracharya 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 micro-filming. The exposure containing 179r and 180r is followed by the one containing wrongly placed 198r and 182r. This suggests that at least two folios are stuck together and as a result 180r and 198r 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 Ḫṛṣṇāpāla 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 Dharmapala. No other works of Ḫṛṣṇāpāla are known from any other sources, but it is probable that he also composed some miscellaneous verses.

As Ḫṛṣṇāpāla states in the Prefatory verses, though an extensive and fine commentary on the kāvya 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 rendering 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 kāvya. King Sāhasāṅka must be Paramāra king Sīḍhurāja whose nom de guerre was nava-Sāhasāṅka. He was ruling over western India in the very end of the 10th century. His son was Ādivarāha Bhajadeva, 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 Ḫṛṣṇāpāla 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

---

1 Basak 1959: xvii. At the time of writing this brief note I did not have access to Handiqui 1976, in which the commentaries on the Setubandha are again discussed, especially on pp. 85–110. Handiqui was aware of some further commentaries unknown to Basak, and also was able to consult manuscripts of several of the unpublished commentaries. I hope to discuss the commentaries on the Setubandha, their chronology, and Ḫṛṣṇāpāla’s place among them in a publication in the near future.

2 Still, Basak puts them after Śrīnivāsa as second, third and fourth in his “approximately chronological” list of commentators. His argument for this is very weak. Basak states that Śrīnivāsa appears to him the earliest commentator, for a copy of his commentary Setudarpana was made by one Ratnasvāra in L. S. 321 (1440 A.D.) during the reign of King Dhīrasimha of Mithilā (Basak 1959: xvii). This piece of evidence makes Śrīnivāsa’s commentary obviously older than 1440 A.D., the date of earliest available manuscript, but certainly not necessarily the earliest of all commentaries Basak listed.

3 A folio used as a cover in the beginning contains the opening part of Molsākaragupta’s Tarkabhāṣā on its verso.

4 For example, kāmarūpa-dvīpātārāḥṣaḥpālaṁ apavrityaṁ setudāyāṁ prathama āśvāsaḥ. The sub-colophons are all basically identical; no particular title is given for any any of the āśvasas.

5 Ganguli 1966: 43.

6 Krishnamachariar (1974:404) mentions a Ḫṛṣṇāpālaeva among royal poets quoted in the anthologies, but without any specific reference. Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa 390, at least, is so attributed.

7 See below, second of the prefatory verses.

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 Harṣapāla’s style.

---

Thus the manuscript ends leaving the text incomplete:

dhaasiharaththialalharaharmuccha-
ntasaapadhiphilasiasarakam | 
samaranntario vaлагga9 rahaṃ 
suasaṣaṣṣhamadhanumirghoso ||
dhuvajikharaḥsthitaijadharamucya-
mānasanaśuṣṭā pratiḥalitasarakaram ||
samaratvarito raham ārohati 
śrutānammarāmaḥdhanumirghosah || 30 ||
ia vāriadahavaṇo dahavaṇṇaṇa-
ttivitàūkkhitattaduro ||
ṇī raḥaṃ ārūḍho rakkasaparī-
vārio dasānānaṇatāṇo ||
iti vāritadasāvadanaḥ dasāvadanaṇaṇaptāya vi-
lasītā utkṣī(ptā) (fol. 197v3–5)

...  

dhaasiharaththialalharaharmuccha-
ntasaapadhiphilasiasarakam | 
samaranntario vaлагga9 rahaṃ 
suasaṣaṣṣhamadhanumirghoso ||
dhuvajikharaḥsthitaijadharamucya-
mānasanaśuṣṭā pratiḥalitasarakaram ||
samaratvarito raham ārohati 
śrutānammarāmaḥdhanumirghosah || 30 ||
ia vāriadahavaṇo dahavaṇṇaṇaṇa-
ttivitàūkkhitattaduro ||
ṇī raḥaṃ ārūḍho rakkasaparī-
vārio dasānānaṇatāṇo ||
iti vāritadasāvadanaḥ dasāvadanaṇaṇaptāya vi-
lasītā utkṣī(ptā) (fol. 197v3–5)

...
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Bilingual Sanskrit-Tibetan Glosses in a Nepalese MS of the Ratnaśrītiṅkā

Dragomir Dimitrov

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 articles 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 Śāstri’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 Brhatstūcāpatra (published in ten volumes in 1960–74 under the editorship of Buddhīśāgara Parājulu) 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.

1 I thank very much my colleague Philip Pierce for checking the English of this paper.

ago. The palm-leaf manuscript, which until that time had only been all too briefly described in the *Bhātisicāyana* under the title Kāvyādārsāṭīkā, turned out to contain the Ratnasūtiṭākā, composed in the first half of the tenth century by Ratnasūrijñāna, a prominent Buddhist monk and scholar from Ceylon. The text represents not only the oldest but arguably also the most valuable commentary on the Kāvyādārsā (“Mirror of Poetic Art”), Dandin’s famous treatise on poetics. Thanks to Dpaṅ Lo tsa ba Blo gros bstan pa (1276–1342), who makes extensive though unacknowledged use of the Ratnasūtiṭākā in his own commentary on the Sīnāṅ me loṅ, the Tibetan translation of the Kāvyādārsā prepared by Šoṅ ston Lo tsa ba Rdo rje rgyal mtshan and Laksmikara, Ratnasūrijñāna’s work has exerted great influence in Tibet, where the codex unicus is nowadays practically inaccessible, if it still exists at all. The new Nepalese manuscript, written in a rather idiosyncratic methods, this edition cannot be considered wholly trustworthy, and is on many occasions in dire need of improvement. 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.

The Nepalese manuscript of the Ratnasūtiṭākā 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 Ratnasūrijñāna’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 Dbus med script, now partly illegible. The text turned out to be transcribed Sanskrit words from the third chapter of the Kāvyādārsā accompanied by their Tibetan equivalents, as found in the Sīnāṅ me loṅ. 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 Kāvyādārsā as commented by Ratnasūrijñāna. The following readings are especially noteworthy:

- *bha ṣṭa* for *vaṣṭun* (KĀ 3.153d), *maṃ da* for *manda* (KĀ 3.160a), *a ṣu* for *ṣu* (KĀ 3.161c), *ṣaṇī ga* for *ṣaṇī gam* (KĀ 3.161d), a *ma ṣa* for *āmarṣa* (KĀ 3.165a), *dura ṣa* for *ṣu ṣa* (KĀ 3.167d), *baṛ hi ni* for *barhini* (KĀ 3.168b), *a ha* for *aḥa* (KĀ 3.174a), a *bi na* for *śu ṣa* (KĀ 3.175a), *ni ti* for *nītir* (KĀ 3.176a), *praḥ na* for *prasthanaṃ* (KĀ 3.176d) and *ut kra mya* for *uttakraya* (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 *gswis pa* with GNQ in place of *gswis pa* (KĀ.T 3.174b). In one case a gloss deviates from a reading adopted only in Snar than Lo tsa ba Dpaṅ dpa’i’s commentary on the *Snāṅ niṅ me loṅ* (J) composed in 1403: *dol bu* in place of *bdag gi* J (KĀ.T 3.160b). In another case a gloss differs from the text adopted by Śī tu Paṅ chen Chos kyi ’byuṅ gnas (1699–1774) in his bilingual Sanskrit-Tibetan edition (Śr) of the Kāvyādārsā: *vīgś in

---

8See Parājuli 1961, pp. 15–16.

9On the history of the Kāvyādārsā in Tibet see Dimitrov 2002, pp. 25–60.

10For the *editio princeps* of the Ratnasūtiṭākā, based on this undated manuscript written in “Maithili 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.

11For a new partial edition based on this Nepalese manuscript see Dimitrov 2004.

---

5In 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 mañ ST (KÄ.T 3.165d). Twice the glosses do not agree with the revised text of the Derge (D) edition of the Tanjur: 'phais in place of 'phoi D (KÄ.T 3.158b) and 'di in place of ni DJ (KÄ.T 3.176b). Lastly, two readings cannot be found in any other text witness of the Sīnaṇ īāg me loṅ: 'di rnamgs la in place of 'di la (KÄ.T 3.161c) and g.yos in place of g.yo (KÄ.T 3.172a). Less important are the few orthographical variants 'od zer i.o. 'od zer (KÄ.T 3.157a), mdab gsar i.o. 'dab gsar (KÄ.T 3.157c) and sgeg pa i.o. sgeg pa (KÄ.T 3.170a). It can be concluded that the Tibetan glosses conform with the version of the Sīnaṇ īāg me loṅ as transmitted in the Ganden, Peking and Narthang editions of the Tanjur which, as we now know, preserve that earliest version of Śoṅ ston Lo tsaṅ bā's and Laksñmikara's translation, which in turn, was at most slightly revised by Dpañ Lo tsaṅ bā. On the other hand, the glosses do not bear any of the traits of the posterior revisions and reeditions of the Sīnaṇ īāg 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 local pandits Indian poetics, grammar and other sciences. From the historical accounts we know of at least two such scholars. One is Dpañ Lo tsaṅ bā, the “Lord of Scholars” (Tib. mkhas pa'i dpañ po), who visited Nepal seven times, as 'Gos Lo tsaṅ bā Gon nu dpal (1392–1481) informs us in his Deb ther sion po. Dpañ Lo tsaṅ bā not only proofread his teacher’s translation, but also studied in detail Ratnaśrijñāna’s commentary on the Kāvyādāraśa himself and completed his own Sīnaṇ īāg 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 Ratnaśrītikā is Śoṅ ston Lo tsaṅ bā, the Tibetan translator of the Kāvyādāraśa himself. From 'Gos Lo tsaṅ bā’s biographical account we know that Śoṅ ston Lo tsaṅ bā 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 Śoṅ ston Lo tsaṅ bā composed a succinct commentary on the Kāvyādāraśa consisting of a series of glosses. A khu rin po che Śes rab rgya mtsho (1803–1875) entered this work in his bibliography A khu tho yig under the title Sīnaṇ īāg me loṅ gi 'grel pa Dbyaṅs can mngul rgyan “Commentary on the ‘Mirror of Poetic Art’ [entitled] ‘Necklace of Sarasvatī’”. It is therefore possible that the Sanskrit-Tibetan glosses on fol. 1a were excerpted from Śoṅ ston Lo tsaṅ bā’s Dbyaṅs can mngul rgyan. One is even tempted to speculate that the “Best among Translators” (Tib. skad gnis smru ba rnamgs 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 Ratnaśrītikā an autograph by Śoṅ ston Lo tsaṅ bā has been preserved. This is, however, mere speculation, and there is no way to prove it. If we had a copy of Śoṅ ston Lo tsaṅ bā’s Dbyaṅs can mngul 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 mngul 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...

Some Highlights of the Work of a ‘Frequent User’ of the NGMPP (II)
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 autocommentary on his
brief but excellent manual of classical Indian metrics,
Chandoratnākara, and Śākyarākṣita’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 varṇaṛṭta section (metres defined by
the number and quantity of syllables per line) is repre-
sented there. As the reader will see, the discovery of
Śākyarākṣita’s Vṛttamālāvivrīti in 1976 enabled me 1) to
assess how well I had coped with a rather difficult Ti-
betan 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 autocommentary
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
explains 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 Chandoratnākara
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 Chandoratnākara can be found in my pa-
per “Ratnākaraśānti’s Autocommentary on His Chando-
ratnākara,” in Vicitrakusumāţjali. Volume Presented to
Richard Othon Meisezahl on the Occasion of his Eighti-
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 9 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 Univer-
sity 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 auto commentary 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. mtsban ṇid, Skt. laksāṇa) and illustration (Tib. dper brjod, Skt. udāharaṇa). The theoretical work is Ratnākaraśānti’s Chandoratnākara, the practical illustration Jñānaśrīmitra’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 || dbayins || dpal || rnam[s][5] |
| rai ṇid || gcig pa’i || sa gan || rnam mdzes[s][6] |
| rtag tu yaṅ || lha daṅ lha || min soṅs su || rab skyes pa || [7] |
| de yi yon tan || dag la smon in || yaṅ dag bsten pas || dri ma dan bral || [8] |
| gcig min srid par ni || gomgs pas rnam, 'phel ba ||
| rtoqs pa'i khyad par dag || legs 'chaṅ rnam kyi bsten || [9] |
| 'dan la gā ya tri bīn || dam pas daṅ por bsgrags pa ||
| gaṅ la sma yshaṅs dag gi || dge legs mchog byuṅ 'byuṅ ba || [10] |
| phyag na utpal sion po || ston pa rol sgeg gnas kyi ||
| sku ni rked pa phra ldan || 'di yis rgyal bar gyur cig || [11] |

Needless to say, I had never before come across such strange verses. Their Sanskrit will be given at the end of this paper. The regular structure of increasing syllables continued, although the number of stanzas within a particular category increased. The structure of the work became clear to me when I reached stanza 19 which runs as follows:

| mi bdad ḋon moṅs gdaṅ ba 'jom sūs ||
| rdogs pa'ai saṅs rgyas rnam kyi rig la ||
| khyod kyi mdzes ldan 'di yis rgyan 'dzin ||
| chu 'dzin dag la glog phren ji bzin || [19] |

I reconstructed glog phren as *vidyunmālā, and when I checked the MONIER WILLIAMS dictionary to see whether this compound has any special meaning I found the entry “a kind of metre.” Thereafter I somehow managed to find its description, and after I had realized that this is a *sama or *vīrya consisting of eight “heavy” or long syllables per line it occurred to me that the expression *vidyunmālā used in a stanza of 4 x 8 lines was hardly coincidental. Then I gradually began to understand the slesā hidden in the Tibetan version of the four introductory stanzas that was used by Jiñānāsīmtrita 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. mīnām, Skt. sama), in his ‘half peaceful’ aspect (Tib. phyed mīnām, Skt. ardhasama), and in his wrathful aspect (Tib. mi mīnām, 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 Vṛttamālāstūti is a comparatively short work; it consists of 154 stanzas. The first four stanzas, composed in the ārya metre, form the introduction, stanzas 5–124 illustrate 120 sama or sama, stanzas 125–140 16 ardhasama, and stanzas 141–154 14 visama, with the last two stanzas also functioning as concluding stanzas.

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. vasantatalaka as “ornament of spring” or sārdulavikrita 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 jaloddhatagatiḥ

Usually one would interpret this name as a bahuvrīhī compound meaning “(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:

| vṛtvam varam imam tvad ekam atula- ||
| prahāva bhavatān na madhyējanāḥ ||
| bhavantam api yah śrayāṇaḥ chamasudhā- ||
| rasesu viratā jaloddhatagatiḥ || [66] |

O you, whose power is incomparable, I have this single request to you: May there be no other being like me Who, although relying on you, Dislikes the taste of the nectar of tranquillity And whose mind is dull and arrogant!

Here jala- is taken as jaḍa- because in poetry la and da are frequently regarded as interchangeable. Uddhata- is used metaphorically, and gati- is to be understood as “(the organ of) insight, mind,” from √gam = aya√gam “to understand.” The stanza also contains information about the caesura (gati) of this metre, for rasesu virat can also be understood as “a break (virat) (takes place) at the ‘tastes’”, i.e., after the sixth syllable; rasa- is frequently used as symbolical numeral for six since the number of tastes is six. It will be explained below how I am able to quote the Sanskrit original of the stanza.

b) The metre meghavisphārjita
This metre belongs to the class of metres with 19 syllables per line, like śārdulaṅkārīdīta. For some external criteria of selection it was clear that this metre should be present in the Vṛttamālāstuti. 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 Vṛttamālāstuti, one of them being the well-known metre śārdulaṅkārīdīta. The second half of the other stanza contains the verbal compound ṛnaṃ par bs-gyis pa “comprehensive yawning, stretching, unfolding”, which is attested as rendering of viṣvimbhitā (a near synonym of viṣphārjita); cf. the Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary by J. S. Negi, vol. 7, Sarnath 2001, pp. 3057b-3058a.

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

| bla ma gaṅ gis bdag pa ṛnaṃ par bs-gyiṅs pa kun nas mun par byed pa ṛnaṃ |  ṛphrog byed dag byed ṛnaṃs kyi dag byed gnas skabs de ni skad cig tsam yaṅ 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-comprising darkness,

Which are the visible consequences of my bad deeds!

So the “unfolding” or “(visible) consequences” (viṣvimbhitā/viṣphārjita) 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’ gaḥ “my sins, bad deeds.” This was the starting point for the discovery of several ingeniously hidden names, up to the name narkutaka for which no meaning is recorded other than “name of a metre.” Jñānārṣimitra created its sound by combining a word ending in -kutaka withṛ- pluskuta-plus the suffix –ka the result of which is “narkkutaka”!

Still there was a remainder of at least 25 per cent of the verses in which I did not succeed to identify the names of the metres. In a few cases the reason was that the text of the Tibetan translation was corrupt in the portion that contained the name of the metre. One case is the metre paṇava of which I was absolutely certain that it was illustrated in the Vṛttamālāstuti. I had even specified three stanzas (29, 31, and 35) as possible candidates. Later I found that it was indeed illustrated in stanza 31. The Tibetan translation has med pa in the place where the equivalent of paṇava—“a small drum” should be found. Since Soṅ-ston, the translator of the first part of the Vṛttamālāstuti could use Śākyaraksita’s excellent commentary while translating the text, there is no reason to assume that he has committed a mistake. Most likely his original text has become corrupt in the course of transmission, as can be shown in several other places.

The well-attested Tibetan equivalent of paṇava is mkhar riṅ or khar riṅ and this is what we have to suspect behind med pa which is unintelligible in the context of the stanza.

The majority of the unidentified names of metres, however, is due to the fact that Jñānārṣimitra 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 bzhos sning thogs me tog gi chen po. After a long and learned introduction Sa skyā Paṇḍita explains in great detail Ratnākaraśanti’s work. After each section he mentions other important metres belonging to that category which are not taught in the Chauḍoratāṅkara. One of his sources that he expressly mentions is Jñānārṣimitra’s Vṛttamālāstuti. 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 Vṛttamālāvivrāti 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.
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Figure 4: Śākyamuni’s Vṛttamālāvivrāti, folios 1b and 2a

vṛttapakṣe tu vāgīṣṭhā | pingalādayo muna-yāḥ | vṛttam̐ padyabhedaḥ | samam̐ vaiśvādi̐ | ardhaسامम अपचित्राय | विषां पदातरित्विधिवादिह | itīthām trividham̐ samāsāta (a) (6)manantī | atrāpi samādīmaṃ pratyekam̐ anantasyād anantaṃ | tad uktam̐ |

anantaḥ padyamārgo ‘yam̐ | viśesāḥ pāthaśobbhaye-ti | parārthavidehyā | iti pūrvavat | athavā parāh prakṛṭṣo y(o) (7) (2a)arthāḥ | tasya vidhaye pratipaṭānārtham̐ | vṛttanibaddho hy arthaḥ su-pratipado bhavati o ||

punaḥ kiṃbhoṭitaṃ tad vṛttam ity āha | pratiṇiyateyādi | [pratiṇiyataकृतकुद्धम | varamunibhir yatra nāma saṃgītaṃ | chandaḥ padaṃ ca paramaṃ | śphurati yathāvividhavinyāśaiḥ || 2 ||

yatra yeṣu vṛttesu pratiṇiyataśv akṛṣṭisu mūrtiṣiḥ rūdhau prasi(ḍ)ham̐ (2) nāma varamunibhir | buddhaḥ saṃgītāṃ saṃbhūya gitaṃ | sthiracakraśaṅgaṃ jñā saṃgranthitā | yatra ca cchandau ‘bhilāṣuḥ | śphurati paśyatām iti śeṣaḥ (||) padaṃ paramam̐ iti pratiṣṭhā ca vyavasthitatā (3) śreṣṭham̐ śphurati | kathau śphurati | vīvidhau ye vinyāśaḥ | saṃprāsiruśaṃ tadanaṭikramaiḥ | astāvayaśa pākṣi-katvād iti bhavah |

vṛttapakṣe tu pratiṇiyataśv (a) (4)kṛṣṭisu niyatagurulaghukramasvarṇesauḥ | rūdhau prasiddhaṃ nāma varamunibhiḥ | pingalā-dhibhiḥ | saṃgītaṃ idam̐ vaśeṣam̐ iyaṃ tanu-madhyeyādi | yatra ca cchando gāyatrīdyā-s(auṃ) (5)e (5)ti | katham̐ vīvidhau ye vinyāśas tatra tatra gāyatrīdāsanunjāniveṣaḥ (||) tada-natikramaiḥ (||) padaṃ ceti | yatih̐ | tace ca cchandau śphurati | atrāpi yathāvividhavi (nāyā) (6)sair̐ iti yojyaṃ |

viśrāma “ṛdhau pade bhaṅgaḥ | pādaṁśe vākṣyate yatir | iti vacanat | athavā ‘śuddhavirādāṃśabhadāv ekā- disthāneṣu bhavat (||) yater yathā yādṛśā (y)e (v)ī(vidhā) (2b)
When in 1976 Dr. Voigt permitted me to see the NGMPP microfilm B 29/31 containing the Vṛttamālāvīrti, 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 aksaras 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:

\[\text{iti duṣkaraprabhedavṛtti (tta)} (5) mālāstutivivrtau samaeśvṛtāni} \]

and

\[\text{iti duṣkaraprabhedavṛttamālāvīrti ardhasaṃeśvṛtāni} \]

We can assume that the full title was Vṛttamālāstutivīrti which was abbreviated by the author himself—or by the scribe—as Vṛttamālāvīrti.

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:

\[\text{‘di yi ge bui gīnī pa’i tshigs bcad bcu geig pa yam na yan chad | Šonī ston lo tsā ba chen po rDo rje rgyal mtshan ggis bsgyar te ’phro la lus pa las Šonī ston de viid kyi bsgyad pa’i slob ma dPa’i lo tsā ba dge sloi dpal ldan Blo gros brtan pas | slob dpon Śākya rakṣi tas mdoz pa’i ’gyel ba la brten nas gois su rdoqos pa’i bsgyar cii su te gtan la phab bo} \]

“This [work] has been translated by the teacher from Šonī (Šonī ston), the great translator (lo tsā ba) rDo rje rgyal mtshan up to the metre yamunā, 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 dPa’i (dPa’i lo tsā ba), the blessed monk Blo gros brtan pa, a disciple belonging to the school of that very Šonī ston, relying on the commentary which was composed by the teacher Śākyarakṣita.”

The few data available on the Buddhist scholar Śākyarakṣita have been collected in the introduction to my book on Jiñānaśrimitra’s Vṛttamālāstuti (Jiñānaśrimittras Vṛttamālāstuti. Wiesbaden 1971. Asiatische Forschungen. 33). The most probable period of activity of Śākyarakṣita lies between 1050 and 1150 AD.

When I compared the explanations in the Vṛttamālāvīrti with the Tibetan translation of the Vṛttamālāstuti I found that in at least ten cases the translation corresponds not to Jiñānaśrimitra’s original wording but to the interpretation of the commentary. Here I would like to give only a few illustrations. In 66d, gatiḥ is translated as blo, following the explanation of gatiḥ as matiḥ. In 79d, dig is translated as lam, following the explanation of dig as māryaḥ. In 101d, the name of the metre mandakrānta translated as dman yan miṅn, following the explanation of commentary mandam apy akrānta sati. In 113c, Blo gros brtan pa adds blo gros brtsaṅ pos to his translation which is not contained in the basic text but only in the Vivrta in the form sudhiḥ.

Since it is not very likely that there was more than one commentary on such an extravagant and specialized work as is the Vṛttamālāstuti, or that such agreements could be found had the translator used another commentary, we can safely assume that the Vṛttamālāvīrti is indeed the commentary by Śākyarakṣita mentioned in the colophon of the Tibetan translation.

Although the Vṛttamālāvīrti helped me to fully understand the meaning of the stanzas 1–149, since it did not give the complete text of the verses of the Vṛttamālāstuti there remained one open question: what was the structure of those 36 metres whose names cannot be found in the extant metrical sāstras which are conveniently indexed in two works by Hari Dūmodar Velankar:


2. Chando’usāsana of Hemachandrāsūri ... Bombay 1961 (Singhi Jain Series. 49.)

During my first visit to Nepal in 1977, I spent most of the daytime going through the index cards of the manuscripts so far microfilmed by the NGMPP. Since I was still suffering from jet-lag, and also because of the terrible noise in the centre of Kathmandu which lasted until midnight (and started in the morning, 6 o’clock, with the radio programme from public loudspeakers at full power), I could not sleep well at night. In order to kill time, I began to reconstruct the stanzas from the Tibetan translation and the Sanskrit commentary. What I had to do, was to form four lines of identical (or half-identical) structure, in which more or less all the equivalents of their Tibetan counterparts occurred and which yielded the meaning as contained in my two sources. I will illustrate this in one case. In its Tibetan version stanza 35 runs as follows:

\[\text{smra ba po bdag de ’niid tshul ’chad sgrub la} \]
\[\text{khrod kyi lag g.yo (g.yon NP) phan tshan} \]
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“You Lord of the speakers (teachers), may the movements of your hands, whose moving bracelets produce sweet sounds when they clash with each other while you are explaining the principles of truth, protect the world!”

As one can see, the stanza is explained in the logical order of the sentence (anvaya), not in the sequence of the words as they actually occur in the stanza. Moreover, it is obvious that compounds are usually resolved so that one does not know in which form they appeared in the stanza.

From my two sources I reconstructed the following stanza:

\[ *p\ddot{a}tu\ tava\ tattvanay\ddot{a}-\ khy\ddot{a}n\\acute{a}rakarav\ddot{a}g\ddot{a}takam\ | \ v\ddot{a}dipate\ vyati\ddot{g}ha\ddot{t}tanato\ | \ valgun\ddot{a}n\ddot{a}d\ddot{a}m\ | \ \text{valayam} \]

Therby I arrived at the following structure for the metre valayam which according to Śākyarāṇḍita was “without precedence, new” (apūrvaṃ) at his time, which can only mean, invented by Jñānaśrīmitra: — U U — U U — U = . In fact, the metre is not unknown to metricians: in Velankar’s second index (Bombay 1961) we find the following entry under the structure bha-bha-bha-ga:

“Citragati H. 2.113; Jk. 2.89; vṛttta Bh 32.217; sāra\ddot{a}\ddot{vati}\ Pp. 2.94.”

H. designates Hemacandra’s Chando’ms\ddot{a}s\ddot{a}na, Jk. Jayakṛti’s Chando’ms\ddot{a}s\ddot{a}na, Bh. 32 the second chapter in Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra (after chapter 15/16) containing later supplements, and Pp. the Pṛkṛtapa\ddot{a}i\ddot{g}ala. Hemacandra is later than Jñānaśrīmitra, Jayakṛti could be a contemporary, while the Pṛkṛtapa\ddot{a}i\ddot{g}ala is definitely later, the supplements in the Nāṭyaśāstra are most likely later than Jñānaśrīmitra. Thus the occurrence in the Vṛttamālāśūtṛ might indeed be the first appearance of this metre.
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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 \textit{Vṛttamālāvīvṛti}. This was so encouraging that I very vaguely conceived the idea of reconstructing the whole \textit{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 Jñānaśrīmitra. 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 \textit{Mahajātakatanmālā} 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 \textit{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 paid by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft to

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{verbatim}
dhīgīh | śrīnām \[5\]
nījaikabhāḥ | vibḥātīs \[6\]
tadyaunāsambhīkāḥ | sevgate caṁsām \[7\]
samāśrayakhalānumālaḥ | sarāsarudāśyudgataḥ \[8\]
naiকbhabhāiyābhyāsavasvrdhām | bodhaviśeṣam sādhu dadhānaḥ \[9\]
gītā gāyatrīvra cchandaśa adyaśa sadbhāḥ | vr̥ttam bhāvi śreya yasyaṁ sād vā viaśe \[10\]
nilopalapaṇer līlānāpaśya | sāstur jagatiyaṁ mārtiś tantrāṅgāya \[11\]
\end{verbatim}

*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 insight, that has been accumulated through practice in countless rebirths, which is to be enjoyed to one’s heart’s content (chandaḥsvādyaḥ) in the same manner as the gāyatrī is praised as the first among the metres (chandaḥsvādyāḥ), in which there was, is, and will be all-encompassing 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 vaiśvam, 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:

\[
tīvra klesāploṣhaṃ直观
praudhaṃ vaṃscam saṃbuddhānām
| dhatte bhūṣām bhātiyaṃ te
| mbhode yadvadd vidyunmālā \| 19 \|
\]


Kṣemendra’s Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā (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 entirely in verse, combining an epic-purāṇic style with ambitious kāvya elements. This literary style served as model both for the later Avadānamālā literature of Nepal and—through its Tibetan translation Byaṅ chub sens dpal ’i rtags pa brjod pa dpag bsam gyi ’khris sglu of the famous Tibetan translator Šoṅ ston rdOb 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 Mohan Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Vol. I) and later together with Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa (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 Sudhanaśīkāyāvadāna (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 Bhadrakālīpāvadāna. 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 Sanskrit 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 Sudhanakumārāvadāna (transmitted in the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya and in the Divyāvadāna), the Kinnarīśudhanājātaka (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 Sudhanakumārāvadāna, 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 Tattvavasimśā, the commentary on Mañḍanamārśa’s Brahmasiddhi by Vācaspatimārśa I. It is a matter for genuine rejoicing that a hitherto unpublished work of so famous an author as Vācaspatimārśa 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 lines 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 Vācaspatimārśa’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 Vācaspatimārśa 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 Vācaspatimārśa 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 Mañḍanamārśa’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 Mañḍanamārśa’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 reconsiders once more the question of the date of Vācaspatimārśa 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 Úśmabheda of Maheśvara (Part 1)

Oliver Hahn

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

There are at least two complete palm-leaf manuscripts of Maheśvara’s Úśmabheda in the National Archives of Kathmandu. One is a 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 Nepalsamvat 319, i.e. 1199 A.D. (A 18/4).

4. This text, together with the commentary of Jñānavimalagani, has been edited by Kümmel (1940). She also discusses the problems as to the relation of this work and another Saṃbhaṇḍaprakāśa ascribed to Puruṣottamadeva (pp. v–vii).

5. E.g. mukha and mukha in the sense of sūrya “sun”.

6. KüMMEL’s edition contains only 59 verses, which are counted from 1 to 59.
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whole Śabdabhедaprakāśa, which has been microfilmed on B 14/21 under the misleading title “Viśavaprakāśa-kosa”. Interestingly, this (undated) manuscript once belonged to a collection of four manuscripts, together with the aforementioned, quite old manuscript of the Viśavapra-kāśa (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 A.D.8

Another manuscript of the Uśnabheda, 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 catalogueing, which was begun by Śāstri with his catalogue of selected manuscripts of the then Durbar Library of Kathmandu,9 some confusion has arisen about the true nature of this text. Originally, the manuscript containing Maheśvara’s Uśnabheda seems to have been kept together with another manuscript, a so-called Upasargavṛtti belonging to the Cāndrayākaraṇa.10 This is corroborated by an inscription on a wooden cover (A 18/6 exposure 6) written by some employee of the then Durbar Library: pra. 1076 — Cāndrayākaraṇasya - upasargavṛttiḥ tathā uṣmabhedaḥ (sic).

Consequently, the Uśnabheda has been (wrongly) associated with the Cāndrayākaraṇa, as is shown by two more misleading inscriptions on the back of fol. 1 and in the margin of fol. 2.11 Thus, there are two consecutive entries in Śāstri, i.e. sub 1076 gha: “Cāndrayākaraṇam” (= Uśnabheda fols. 2–5 microfilmed on B 34/27), and sub 1076 nā: “Uśnabheda” (= Uśnabheda fols. 1 and 6 microfilmed on A 18/6).12 Similarly, there are two entries in the BSP: one as “Cāndrayākaraṇapa-sargavṛttiḥ” in vol. VI, p. 22, no. 66 (cf. B 34/27), and another as “Uśnabheda” in vol. IX, p. 47, no. 129. (cf. A 18/6).13

Fortunately, this mistaken connection established between the Uśnabheda and the Cāndrayākaraṇa 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 Cāndrayākaraṇa on the basis of the manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMCP.14 He put the two fragments of the Uśnabheda together, but could not yet finally resolve the problem as to the assumed connection of the text with the Cāndrayākaraṇa. Oberlies also did not succeed in identifying the text as a section of Maheśvara’s Śabdabheda-prakāśa, and hence was unaware that an edition had already been published. He found, however, that it is different from Purusottamadeva’s Uśnabheda.15 In the New Catalogus Catalogorum, our Uśnabheda is referred to as well.16

This manuscript of the Uśnabheda 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 Kūmmel’s edition. Although the printed text is completely corroborated by Jīnānvimalagani’s commentary, which was written in A.D. 1598 (some 177 years later than our manuscript),17 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 Kūmmel. Apart from a few differences concerning the rules of orthography and sandhi peculiar to the individual manuscripts,18 all variant read-

---

8 It is quite possible that some other manuscripts listed under this title may contain the whole or parts of the Śabdabheda-prakāśa.
9 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 Uśnabheda portion is on fols. 7v–10r.
10 Cf. Śāstri 1905. This text turned up only recently in connection with the investigations about the Uśnabheda carried out in the NAK. The following book containing an edition of the Viṃśātupasaṃgarvṛtti by Dragomir Dimitrov is forthcoming: Lehrschrift über die zwanzig Präverbien im Sankrit (sic). Kritische Ausgabe der Viṃśātupasaṃgarvṛtti von Dragomir Dimitrov is forthcoming: Lehrschrift über die zwanzig Prāverbien im Sakti (sic).
11 Vol. III p. 4. There also, this text is distinguished from Purusottamadeva’s, but the connection with Maheśvara’s Śabdabheda-prakāśa is not yet established.
12 Cf. Śāstri 1905 p. 31. Incidentally, both entries give the date mistakenly as samvat 541, the actual date of the colophon being (nepāla) samvat 541.
13 Both entries give the date correctly as samvat 541.
15 A manuscript containing this text is mentioned in BSP vol. IX p. 47, no. 128: pra. 1475, and equally in Śāstri p. 60 sub 1475 nā. It has re-discovered only recently as microfilmed on B 14/4 together with another text, styled Amarakośaṭṭāpani (sic). Cf. Oberlies 1992 pp. 179–181.
16 Vol. III p. 4. There also, this text is distinguished from Purusottama-deva’s, but the connection with Maheśvara’s Śabdabheda-prakāśa is not yet established.
17 Jīnānvimalagani was a Jaina of the Kharatara sect. He wrote his commentary in the town of Vikrama, today’s Bikaner in the North of Rajasthan (cf. Kūmmel xxvii).
18 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) for a palatal initial s (e.g. ˙nusalaḥ i śgalaḥ). Moreover, the respective class nasal (and not the sign anusvāra) is written before a following consonant (e.g. ˙stala ka for āstam ka etc.).
lings 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 Oṣṭhyadantausthyavakārābhedā.

Finally, a few words as to the structure of the text. As has been mentioned before, the Usabheda 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 old manuscripts from Nepal, and giving those variants prevalence which yield the greatest amount of anuprāsa 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 Usabheda, Part I

On omo manjusmathiya...
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uśīrakāśmīrakakakikṣaṅkǔnakų
kiśorakīṁṣukurakṣurukṣikam
jalāsāyāsokakarsānukṣayapų
yaśaḥ piśāṅgasmapiśācaraṃśmayah

niśāntavesantavisālapecālam
bileṣayāsvattanāsīthaṁvisati
viśāṅkaṭaṁ cānusāyaśāryāyayā
sahopasāyāśāṃavāsitaktivināṁ

tiḥ mahāyatisāṃ

iśāparakāsaśukasavesvīṣakāśāṃ
akāśaśūkaparipāsāpecā
piṅgāsatāḍraśḍraśḍraśdotrāṇaḥ
sadṛś vīnāṃ
kimāśākaraśādiśaḥ
dasaśadalāśaḥ

krośāśulomāsapatralīṅgavāśeśa
kleśaḥpraveśaparīvesavāṁ

bāliśāḥ kuśiḥ rāśi
varāśiḥ vādīḥ bhṛṣāṁ

apabhṛṣāḥ purojaśo
vimiśo śrīṁ anekāśaḥ

dārśaṁ spāraṁ maṇḍalāṁ

sānaḥ E N] aṇaṃ M.

70) [uśīra ] E N] uśīra ] M.
71) [kṛṣaṇu ] E M] kṛṣaṇu ] N.
72) annaṁśaṅgabhaṁyāvaj E N] avyāsaṅgaṁyāvaj M.
73) sahopāsaśājanāvāśātināvaj E] sahopāsaśājanāvāśātināvaj M.
Sājagāṣṭādādāśāhāvajaj

74) prəsnaḥ E N] prəsnaḥ M.
75) pīśumā dāsaṇa E N] pīśunā deṣana M.
76) uṣānā E N] uṣāna M.
77) kasmālaṃ E N] laṇ M.

81) madhyatālāvyāḥ E M] madhyatālāvyāḥ N.
83) pīṃgāda E N] pīṃgāda N.
84) desādāsaḥ M N] veṣadēsaḥ E.
85) leśaḥ E ] veṣa ] M.
86) viśaḥ ca veṣaḥ M N] veṣaḥ ca dāśaḥ E.
87) maṇi E N] maṇi M.
88) vimiśo śrīj E M] vimiśo śrīj N.
89) dāraḥ E N] dāraḥ M.
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NGMCP online database

Kengo Harimoto

The NGMCP would like to invite readers to test the online version of the title list ([http://134.100.72.204:3000/](http://134.100.72.204:3000/)). The goal of this online application is to make accurate information about the manuscripts microfilmed by

111 dantyāḥ E M p.c. N dantyāḥ Mc.e.
112 śambhasambalaśūkaraḥ E śambhasambalaśūkaraḥ M; śambhasambalaśūkaraḥ N. This verse lists a number of words written with the palatal sibilant which can equally by written with the dental
113 raśanāḥ E Mc.e. raśanāḥ Mc.a.
114 sambhasambalaśūkaraḥ E sambhasambalaśūkaraḥ M; sambhasam-balaśūkaraḥ N. This verse lists a number of words written with the dental without any change of meaning, i.e. samba = sama etc.
115 raśanāḥ E Mc.e. raśanāḥ Mc.a.
116 This verse is number [23] of M.
117 This verse is number [24] of M.
118īti tālavyādantyāḥ E tālavyādantyāḥ M; tālavyādantyāḥ N.
119īti E Mc.e. om. M.
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Gründenahl, Reinhold


Kümmer, Auguste


Pant, Mahes Raj


Oberlies, Thomas


Śaṭṭri, Hara Prasad


Vogel, Claus

the NGMPP available to scholars and students worldwide. Currently the data that can be accessed is based on that found on the CD-ROM, *Preliminary List of Manuscripts, Blockprints and Historical Documents Microfilmed by the NGMPP, Part 1 (excluding Tibetan Material and Historical Documents)*, with corrections made by the NGMCP (the process of correction is ongoing, and is in its early stages at present). Our plans in the near future include integration of the data of the Tibetan material, and integration of more detailed information from the current cataloging project.

Some notes about the application:

- The web application is under development, and may not always work as intended. We expect that Internet Explorer, versions 6 and below, will not work as well as other modern browsers. For the present, we recommend users to test the application using Firefox (on all major platforms) or Safari (on Mac OS X).

- 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.