Editorial

This is the fifth issue of the Newsletter of the NGMCP; a small jubilee, and I am glad to be able to announce news that is further cause for celebration. On August 15, 2007, the agreement of cooperation between the Nepalese Government and the Asien-Afrika-Institut, University of Hamburg, under which the NGMCP operates, was renewed for a further five years. A month later, on September 24, 2007, the agreement between the Tribhuvan University and the German Oriental Society regarding the work of the NRC was also renewed. With these two renewals, the NGMCP and the NRC at which its Nepalese branch is located can look forward confidently to a bright and very productive future. Our readers can find more on this, and other news from the NGMCP in Nepal, in the contribution to this issue by Dr. Albrecht Hanisch, since February 2007 the local director of the NRC and resident representative of the NGMCP in Nepal.

I have also the pleasure of welcoming several new contributors. Francesco Sferra, a noted specialist in, among other areas, the Vajrayāna, edits fragments of Puṇḍarīka’s Paramārthasevā, an important early work of the Kālacakra system, which have recently been discovered among the materials microfilmed by the NGMPP. This contribution supplements the paper already dedicated to the Paramārthasevā by Sferra in the recently published Festschrift for Michael Hahn (Indica et Tibetica).

Michael Slouber (Berkeley), another first time contributor, has studied the unpublished Śaiva tantra Kriyākalaguṇottara, and presents some of his findings, in particular concerning the relationship of the manuscripts of this text. Kengo Harimoto, of the NGMCP in Hamburg, presents a single leaf, of unusual antiquity and interest, of a manuscript of the Agamaśāstravivaraṇa, or Gaṇḍapādākārikābhāṣya, sometimes attributed to Śaṅkara. Harimoto contributes also an announcement of a recent critical edition of the first chapter of the Pātañjalayogasāstra, i.e. the Yogasūtra and Yogabhāṣya; yet another important publication which has made use of manuscripts microfilmed by the NGMPP.

Peter Bisschop, another new contributor, presents notes on a Vārānasimāhātmya compendium, again a recent discovery, which, as he demonstrates, provides important new evidence on the development of the sacred geography of Vārānasī. And last but not least, this issue concludes with the fourth installment of Michael Hahn’s ‘Frequent User Highlights’. The work taken up for discussion this time is Haribhaṭṭa’s Jātakamālā, of which Hahn has just published an editio minor. Readers of that edition—which deserves many, for as Hahn rightly stresses, Haribhaṭṭa’s work is of great elegance, and played an important part in the history of Sanskrit literature, being for centuries much read both within India and beyond—will certainly also want to note the list of corrections to it which Hahn appends to his paper.

It is, then, with great pleasure, for many reasons, that I present this very rich issue. My thanks are due to all the contributors, and most particularly to Kengo Harimoto, who is at the same time our skilled typesetter. This will be the last issue of 2007; we expect to release the next (for which contributions are warmly welcomed) at the beginning of April 2008. In the meanwhile I wish our readers happy and instructive reading with this issue of the Newsletter of the NGMCP.

Harunaga Isaacson
Recent Developments at the Nepal Research Centre Including the Work of the NGMCP from October 2006 to September 2007

Albrecht Hanisch

The activities of the Nepal Research Centre (NRC) are based on a five-year agreement of cooperation between Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, and the German Oriental Society signed on August 30, 2002, thereby continuing an original agreement entered into on August 31, 1977. In the Newsletter of the NGMCP, number 3 (January-February 2007), pp. 1-4, a report appears on the work at the NRC during April 2005 and September 2006. It was written by Dragomir Dimitrov, who left the posts of local director of the NRC and resident representative of the NGMCP at the end of September 2006.

The NRC office at Baluwatar

The present report will describe the activities carried out at the NRC during this past year, including the work of the NGMCP, which since 2002 has been housed in the NRC and indeed for the time being ensures the survival of the NRC. The basis for the work of the NGMCP, which was launched in 2002 and is funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), is a five-year agreement between the Government of Nepal, represented by the National Archives under the Department of Archaeology, and the Department of the Culture and History of India and Tibet of the Asia-Africa Institute at the University of Hamburg.

After the above-mentioned positions became vacant, the management of the NRC and the Kathmandu branch of the NGMCP were provisionally taken care of by Mr. Nam Raj Gurung, the general manager of the Kathmandu office. The staff of the NGMCP continued the cataloguing work on their own. Since most of them, both experienced Nepalese scholars and their younger colleagues, largely students from Tribhuvan University and Mahendra Sanskrit University, by then were already well acquainted with the goals and working methods of the NGMCP, the process of manuscript cataloguing could be pursued uninterruptedly. Only managerial decisions had to be postponed, pending the appointment of a new local director by the Asia-Africa Institute, University of Hamburg.

For administrative reasons it took until the end of January 2007 for the vacancy to be filled. Since February 1, 2007 the position of local director of both institutions, the NRC and the NGMCP, has been held by Albrecht Hanisch, who before worked as a researcher and lecturer in Indology and Tibetology at the University of Marburg.

Since the agreement between the Government of Nepal and the Asia-Africa Institute, University of Hamburg, concerning the NGMCP and also the agreement between Tribhuvan University and the German Oriental Society regarding the work of the NRC were terminated on August 15, 2007 and August 30, 2007 respectively, two of Hanisch’s most important preliminary duties were to carry out negotiations with the representatives of the Nepalese Government and of Tribhuvan University in order to obtain an extension of both projects for another five years from the Nepalese side.

Signing the agreement between the NRC and the Tribhuvan University

The negotiations on the extension of the NGMCP, including a presentation outlining the project’s work to the National Planning Commission, lasted several months but were successfully concluded. On August 15, 2007 the extension of the NGMCP until August 15, 2012 was confirmed officially from the Nepalese side. Subsequently, the renewed agreement of cooperation between Tribhuvan University and the German Oriental Society, granting an extension of the work of the NRC until August 30, 2012, was signed.

The NRC actually receives no funding at all but makes its very limited income solely by the sale of books published by the centre.
The negotiations took place under not entirely easy circumstances. The political situation in Nepal is still unstable. The constitutional assembly election, originally scheduled to take place in June 2007, had been postponed to November. But then, because of conflicts between rival parties and the unfulfilled demands of various ethnic groups, on October 5, 2007 the elections again had to be postponed, and now definitely will not be held before 2008.

More tangible obstacles to the work of the NRC and NGMCP in Kathmandu are the numerous strikes and blockades (making it sometimes impossible for the project’s staff members to reach the office), and also the frequent shortage of electric power supply and of other forms of energy. Last winter the project had to cope with power cuts (“load-shedding”) of up to seven or eight hours per day, by resorting to the use of storage batteries and flexible working hours. For the winter 2007/08 the government has announced power cuts lasting up to 12 hours per day. Meeting this challenge will require additional measures.

Nevertheless, not least because of the dedicated work of the staff members, the Kathmandu branch of the NGMCP has been able to keep up with its manuscript cataloguing work, and the NRC has remained a centre frequently contacted and visited by both local and foreign scholars who are doing research work in and on Nepal.

On the work of the NGMCP

During a period of more than 30 years, some 180,000 manuscripts and other historical documents from all over Nepal were microfilmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP). Within the time limit of 12 years, regularly set by the DFG for long-term research projects, the NGMCP for the time being aims at descriptively cataloguing the Indic manuscripts which are kept in Kathmandu either in the National Archives or Kaiser Library, and additionally the palm-leaf manuscripts belonging to various private collections. This is a conscious choice so that it includes all the palm-leaf manuscripts that are of the greatest importance to the history of transmission, while staying within the bounds of what can be done within a period of 12 years. But even this limitation leaves the NGMCP with a total of over 40,000 titles to be catalogued – making the project an ambitious undertaking. Since numerous manuscripts originally referred to under one single title have turned out to contain in fact more than one title (so-called “multiple-text manuscripts”), the total number of titles has been slowly increasing.

At present, a new database is under development in which the list of catalogue entries will be organized automatically. Unlike the previous method of documenting the work on the basis of several lists entered into the computer and compiled in tabular form, the new database will considerably accelerate the documentation of progress, allow a quick overview of the available catalogue entries and protect the catalogue from having entries that are listed twice. A detailed report on the progress of the work of the cataloguing project will be given in a subsequent number of the newsletter of the NGMCP, after the completion of the new database.

Examining an old palm-leaf manuscript

At the end of March 2007, Mr. Madhusudan Rimal, who had worked as an assistant cataloguer for the NGMCP left the project on a three-year DAAD scholarship to pursue doctoral studies at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich. His departure deprived the NGMCP of an experienced and diligent colleague. The NRC and the NGMCP warmly wish him much success in his further career.

Sadly, the project has also lost another colleague. On October 1, 2007 Mr. Ramji Khadka, who was working as an assistant photographer for the NGMCP, died after a short and unexpected illness. A very reliable and highly esteemed colleague, he was only 32 years old, and leaves behind a wife and two children. All members of the NRC and the NGMCP were deeply shocked by his death and will hold his memory dear.

Support for individual scholars

As has been the custom, the NRC in Kathmandu provides scholars from all over the world with help and advice in accessing research materials, working facilities, information, accommodations, and the like. Within the first three quarters of 2007 a number of scholars and Ph.D. candidates availed themselves of this support. Ms. Astrid Krause (Universität Leipzig), visiting the NRC in spring and again in autumn 2007, continued her studies on the Nepalese manuscripts of the Puspadintāmaṇi. Mr. Christof Zotter (Universität Heidelberg), continued his search for Nepalese manuscripts on the vrutabandha and
other rituals. Mr. Arthur P. McKeown (Harvard University), explored manuscripts dealing with the early history of the Svayambhūnātha Stūpa. Prof. Gudrun Bühnemann (University of Wisconsin, Madison), who is used to visiting the NRC regularly, continued her studies on Nepalese iconography. Dr. Katia Buffetrille (Université de Paris) was assisted in her search for documents that shed light on the history of the sacred sites of Halesi-Maratika in East Nepal. Ms. Aldine Aaten (Universiteit Leiden), was able to find and access manuscripts on Indian mathematics (ganita). Mr. Kenta Suzuki (University of Tokyo), was supported in his efforts to acquire copies of old Nepalese manuscripts of the Abhisamayālaṃkārā.

In September 2007 Prof. Taiken Kyuma (Mie University), Prof. Kei Kataoka (Kyushu University, Fukuoka), and Dr. Ryugen Tanemura (University of Tokyo) met with Harunaga Isaacson, the director general of the NRC and the NGMCP, at the NRC and worked together on an edition of the rDo rje theg pa'i mtha' gūns sel ba.

Further academic visitors, welcomed and assisted at the NRC in 2007, include: Prof. Yusho Wakahara (Ryukoku University, Kyoto), Prof. S. S. Bahulkar (Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath), Dr. Klaus-Dieter Mathes (Universität Hamburg), Prof. Willibald Haffner (Universität Gießen), Prof. Alexander von Rospatt (University of California, Berkeley), Dr. Ulrike Roesler (Universität Freiburg), Mr. Iain Sinclair (Universität Hamburg), Mr. Wieslaw Mical (Universität Hamburg, currently working in Kathmandu), Prof. Franz-Karl Ehrhard (Ludwig-Maximilians Universität), Tulku Pema Tharchhin Lama (Serlo Gonpa, Solukumbhī), Prof. Adalbert Gail (Freie Universität Berlin), Dr. Liu Yinghua (China Tibetology Research Centre Beijing), and Dr. Michael Mühlich.

The library of the NRC

At the same time, the NGMCP continues to publish its newsletter (the fifth number of which you are holding in your hands or reading on your screen) at regular intervals.

Collaboration with other institutions and planned events

The NRC and the NGMCP have kept up their traditionally good contacts with the National Archives, Kathmandu, thereby ensuring that the manuscript cataloguing work continues smoothly. There are contacts with further academic institutions in Kathmandu, such as the Department of Buddhist Studies at Tribhuvan University, the Sanskrit University, the Valmiki Campus, and the Panamanian-Swiss novelist who focuses particularly on Indian culture, turned to the NRC for advice while searching for source material for her next novel.

The NRC also provides support in acquiring copies of microfilms kept in the National Archives, Kathmandu. Scholars from all over the world utilize this service. During the reporting period, the NRC processed more than 30 orders for microfilm copies.

Publishing

Since 1981 the NRC has been assisting the Tribhuvan University Central Library in editing the annual Nepalese National Bibliography (NNB), which comes out at regular intervals and lists all available new publications that have appeared in Nepal with the exception of only a few categories such as newspapers, periodicals, maps, and schoolbooks. At present, the NNB for the years 2000–2002 is being prepared for print. For the first time it will include ISBN numbers. As for the Journal of the Nepal Research Centre, some final contributions have been collected for volume XIII, so that it should be ready for publication soon.
Nepalese branch of the South-Asia Institute of Heidelberg University. Contacts with Kaiser Library (directed by Mr. Bhola Nath Shrestha) and Ryukoku University Kyoto (Prof. Yusho Wakahara) have been intensified.

Manuscripts in the Kaiser Library

New contacts were established with the Institute for Higher Tibetan Studies at Sarnath (Prof. S. S. Bahulkar), the Tibetan Academy of Social Sciences (TASS) and the China Tibetology Research Centre (CTRC). A conference on Tantric studies at the NRC is also being planned, to which quite a few international scholars will be invited.

At the beginning of September 2007 the NRC was integrated into the European Consortium for Asian Field Study (ECAF), which is still in its initial stages (for information see http://www.efeo.fr/ECAF/index_eng.html). Thereby the NRC has become part of a far-reaching academic network, consisting of many international academies, universities, research institutes, and museums.

Finally, it may be mentioned that in 2008 several events and festivities will be held in Kathmandu and other places in Nepal in order to celebrate the 50th anniversary of diplomatic relations between Nepal and Germany. Given the long tradition of Nepalese-German cooperation in the cultural field that started with the Nepal Research Centre (NRC) and the NGMPP, and due to the fine reputation of the NGMCP in Nepal and abroad, the NRC and the NGMCP have been invited jointly by the German Embassy in Kathmandu and a number of Nepalese-German academic friendship organizations to participate in this series of events. This will offer a very good opportunity to make the work of the NRC and the NGMCP better known both in Nepal and among the numerous official guests from Germany who will visit Nepal next year. At the planning stage are, among other things, a one-day open house at the NRC and an on-site inspection of the National Archives in order to give an impression of Nepal's very rich cultural heritage on the basis of the huge collection of manuscripts kept there.
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Newly Discovered Stanzas of the Paramārthasevā by Puṇḍarīka

Francesco Sferra

Introductory Remarks

Recently, during a scientific mission in Nepal, my friend Prof. Dr. Harunaga Isaacson discovered some folios containing stanzas of the Paramārthasevā by Puṇḍarīka (10th–11th cent.) in two palm-leaf manuscripts held by the Kaiser Library of Kathmandu. He knew that I was publishing a paper on the Sanskrit fragments of this text ("Fragments of Puṇḍarīka’s Paramārthasevā", in Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern übereicht, herausgegeben von Konrad Klaus und Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 66, Wien 2007, pp. 459–476), in which I announced that I intended to write a monograph on the Paramārthasevā (p. 465), a text that merits an important place in early Kālacakra literature. Thus, he very kindly sent me an e-message informing me of his new discovery (August 19th 2006) and soon provided me with a brief description and pictures of the folios of the two manuscripts, which allow us to read in the Sanskrit original 12 new stanzas of the text (1–4, 47–54).

Stanzas 1–4 actually appear in a single leaf (folio 1 verso), partly damaged in the bottom, that contains approximately the first eight and a half stanzas (pāda c) of the work. This leaf has been included with another 20 leaves in a codex listed as MS 117 and microfilmed in NGMPP Reel C 13/5, which is labelled ‘Pañcaraksā (Prakīrṇa)’, even though none of the leaves seems to contain the Pañcaraksā. The leaf containing the beginning of the Paramārthasevā has seven lines and is written in gomola script.

Stanzas 47–54 appear in folio 5 recto–5 verso. This is part of a small group of four folios (folios 3 recto–6 verso) containing stanzas 21c–69c of the text. These leaves have been grouped with 57 folios from a different manuscript (of the Kriyāsaṅgrahapaññikā), catalogued as MS 163 and microfilmed in NGMPP Reel C 17/7, which consists of 61 leaves, each containing 5/6 lines and measuring 31.5 × 9.5 cm; it is written in gomola script and is labelled generically ‘Buddha Tantra’.

These two manuscripts partly overlap with the sources used in the above-mentioned paper and confirm most of the conjectures and emendations proposed in that work, such as *gītā for *gīta (st. 6a), nimittam for nimītvam

1In particular, fol. 3r, which is partly broken, contains stt. 21c–27c; fol. 3 verso (partly broken) contains stt. 27c–33c; fol. 4r, stt. 33c–39d; fol. 4v, stt. 39d–46b; fol. 5r, stt. 46b–52c; fol. 5v, stt. 52c–59a; fol. 6r, stt. 59a–64d; fol. 6v, stt. 64d–69c.
(st. 61a) and some retranslations from Tibetan in the lacuna, such as mārgavānasacittato na śrīgurūḥ (st. 32cd), na śrīgurur bhīṣṇukakālabhojī (st. 34b), kastārīkādhyair bahu-māraṇatruḥ (st. 46d). In a few cases, however, we have different readings, such as "ghṛāśraya" for the restored "ghṛāṣrama" (st. 28c) and guṇaratnasārīṣ for guṇadhiṣpata-nāṣṭaḥ (st. 35a). Diaphoretic variant readings are present occasionally, such as "pātradhāraḥ" instead of "pātradhārā" (st. 33b).

Here I limit myself to editing the newly discovered stanzas and refer the reader to the above-mentioned paper and its bibliography for a brief introduction to the text. Sandhi and orthography (e.g. śilā for silā [st. 50a]) have been silently standardized.

A complete list of all the variants will be published in the above-mentioned monograph together with some changes to the text as given in my earlier paper made necessary by new discoveries. For instance, in pāda d of verse 60 I read siddhatvabuddhatvam, following MS NAK No. 5-7235 (NGMPP Mf. No. B 30/31), fol. 8v; however, the most plausible reading is siddhatvabuddhatvam traidhātuke jñānadīvākaraṃ ca| maitreyanātham ca sāmānjughoṣaṃ cintāmaṇiḥ vajradharaṃ yaṣaṃ ca (1) I1 v2.

NOTE: the epithets śrīśākyasīṃha and jīānadvākara can also be found in the last introductory stanza of the Vimalaprabhā (ed. by Jagannatha Upadhya, CHTS, Sarnath 1986, vol. 1, p. 11).

The Tibetan translation of these stanzas by Zla ba mgon po (Somanātha), which sometimes diverges from the original text that has come down to us (cf. e.g. stanzas 47, 51), has been reproduced below on the basis of the Peking and sDe dge editions.

Sigla and Abbreviations

I1 Kaiser Library, MS 117; NGMPP Mf. C 13/5
I2 Kaiser Library, MS 163; NGMPP Mf. C 17/7
r recto
v verso
D Tibetan translation: dPal don dam pa'i bsūn pa by Zla ba mgon po: sDe dge edition, bS’stan ’gyur rgyud, rgyud, vol. NA, # 1348, fols. 1v1-20r3
T Tibetan translation
ac ante correctionem
conj. conjecture
em. emendation
pc post correctionem
⟨⟨...⟩⟩ enclose akṣaras and avagrahas not present in the manuscript
 ⟨⟨...⟩⟩ enclose the numbers of the stanzas, which are not present in the manuscript
[... ] enclose the pagination (the subscript numbers indicate the line change)

Text

[1 1v1] oṃ namo mañjunāthaiḥ ||

śrīśākyasīṃhaṃ prāṇipatya mūrdhṇā
traidhātuke jñānadīvākaraṃ ca|
maitreyanātham ca sāmānjugoṣaṃ
cintāmaṇiḥ vajradharaṃ yaṣaṃ ca (1) I1 v2.

NOTE: the epithets śrīśākyasīṃha and jīānadvākara can also be found in the last introductory stanza of the Vimalaprabhā (ed. by Jagannatha Upadhya, CHTS, Sarnath 1986, vol. 1, p. 11).

saḍdarśanānekamatair aganyā
tarkādirbhir mandadhīyam nrūnām yā|
vakṣyāmya ahaṃ tāṃ paramārthasevaṃ
saṅkīṣepato lokamātānaḥ hatvā || (2)

2a "matair em. supported by T (gśuṅ) | "satair I1.

ācāryavakrāṃgut[æg[1 1v3]ṣṭasiddhiḥ
sarvāṇijagāṭahkilahavrajāyānē |
tasmād gurau āhavand ķṣṭaṣiṣyāiḥ
parīkṣayāmāne āṃ ("ṣṭi na pāpaleṣaḥ || (3)

3b "ākhila | "ākhila I1. 3c gurau em. | gurauṃ I1 | āhavand conj. based on T (gyer bzin du) | āhavand (contra metrum) I1 | ķṣṭaṣiṣyāiḥ I1 | "varāṣiṣyāiḥ, "sačchisāyāiḥ etc. T (slob ma dam pa nāms kyis). 3d parīkṣayāmāne em. | parīkṣayāmāne I1.

[47] yasmin bahūlūv haribra[m[1 1v2]lharudra(ś)
candrārāhugrahatalārakādyaḥ |
tāṃ vajrasattvam paścāmācaḥ ya
gṛñantā mūrkha jaḍalokānāmāṃ || (4)

4a haribrahmarudrasāṃ em. | haribrahmarudrā I1; *hariśaṃbhu-
rudrā T (khyab 'jug blec 'byun drag po). 4c pitaraṃ vīhāya
conj. based on T (yah [...] nāms spaṅs te) | pitara (blank space of circa 3 aṅkaras) ya I1.

pramāṇahām (etc. [see the above-mentioned pa-
per]) || (5)

* * *

[I2 5r1] [...] pralambahāraṃ mañjunāḍalaiś ca
samekhalanupuraṅkaraṃṣaṃ ca | [I2 5r2]
samaṅulikeyaśarasakhiṭhikābhīr
vīcitravasstraiv bhavadulṅkhaḥttarā || (47)
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50 This stanza is also quoted without attribution in the Subhāṣītasaṃgraha (ed. Cecil Bendall, Le Muséeon, N.S., 4–5 [1903–1904], part 1, p. 383, lines 16–20) with the only variant iḥāpi instead of iḥaiva in śaiva in pāda c. It is introduced there with the words anyatṛapy ukmat.

52c "cittair em. (cf. T) "citte I2. 52d "praṇyādhes em. (cf. T) "prabuddhes I2.

53b "cittair em. based on T "citte I2 o "duḥkha added in the upper margin o "do em. "de I2. 53c tyāgo varo "stīr conj. "tyāgotevāsya I2. 53d "ta added in the upper margin.

54a maha" I2 sc ] ma" I2 ac. 54d "āvinyād em. "ōviniṣayāni I2.

Tibetan Translation
dpal dus kyi 'khor lo la phyag 'tshal lo ||

khams gsum la ni ye šes ūn mor byed pa yi ||
dpal ldan šākyā'i seṇ ge byams pa'i mgon po dañ ||
'jam dbyan bs ca pa yid bzin nor dañ grags pa dañ ||
rd'o rje 'dzin pa rnañs la spyi bo phyag 'tshal te || (1)

Lta ba drug gi gūnī mañ [P 2r] rtog ge la sogs kyis ||
blo dman rnañs kyis gañ žig brtag par dka' bas te ||
mor dus pas ni 'jig rten lugs ni spaiš nas su ||
don dam bsñen pa de ni bdag gis bsdad par bya || (2)

4a mañ D ] mar P. 2b dman rnañs kyis D ] dman mi rnañs kyis ni P.

"dod pa'i dūnos grub slob dpon žal gyi rjes 'bra'ni bar ||
ma lus rdo rje theg par thams cad mkyhen pas gsinis ||
de phyir slob ma dam pa rnañs kyis bla ma gser bzin du ||
yois su btags na sdiq pa cuñ zad yod ma yin || (3)

gañ las khyab 'jug bde 'byuñ drag po zla ba dañ ||
ni ma rgyu skar sgra gcana gza' sogs gyur pa yi ||
rd'o rje sems dpa' yab de dag ni rnañs spañis te || [D 2r]
rmøis pas 'jig rten mes po'i lam la len par byed || (4)

4b yi D ] yis P.

* * *

[D 4v] [...] rab tu 'chau ba'i do šal nor bu rna cha dañ ||
ske rags dañ bcas kru gدب yan lag sruñ dañ ni ||
cod pan dañ bcas dpun rgyan rke nor bzañ spo gdañ ||
sna tshogs na bza' yis ni sdbg bsañ mañ 'joms la'o || (47)
byug pa dañ ni gur gum tsandan la sogs pa ||
a ga ru nag si lla la sogs spo dañ ni ||

tsam pa ka mchog la sogs dri žim me tog dañ ||
rin chen mar mes lam ni mi ūams la'o || (48)

48d: hypometrical.

rtsod ldan dбаñ gis bla ma skyon dañ yon tan Ôdres ||
rmøan pa kun du sdbg pa med pa yod ma yin ||
gañ žig yon tan lha pa yai ni legs dpay nas ||
bu rnañs kyis ni de la brten par 'gyur ba'o || (49)
rd'o dañ šiñ gi rañ bzin sañs rgyas rnañs kyis ni ||
skye ba 'bum phrag gis ni thar pa mi ster ro ||
skye ba 'di ūid du yai gañ žig rtag pa ni ||
bla ma bsten pa yis ni bde ba ster par mzdad || (50)

50c rtag em. || brtag D P.

spun dañ chuñ ma śiñu sdbg grogs po mgon po dañ ||
bla ma dag dañ mtsbišus pa'i pha ma yod ma yin || [P 5v]
skye ba 'di ūid du yai sdbg bsañ 'joms pa yi ||
rd'o rje 'dzin pa'i dpal bzañs dag gis ster ba'o || (51)
siñ tu rnañ par dag pa'i blo yis bsten bya yi ||
ji ltar phyi dus sdbg bsañ ster bar min pa'o ||
ma dag sems kyis bsten pas sdbg bsañ 'gyur ba ste ||
Aside from its penchant for mantras, the text contains a great deal of rare material of a folk-medical nature, as well as mythological explanations of treatments. For example, it appears to be the only extant text that treats the origin and full system of invocation of the mantra-deity Khadgarāvāna, whose cult spread across much of India and as far east as Bali between the tenth and twelfth centuries.

Alexis Sanderson has pointed to Kṣemarāja’s numerous citations to the Kriyākālaṅgaṇottara in the latter’s eleventh-century commentary to the Netratantra, and recognized that the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript preserves the same text. Up until now, no editions of the text have been published, aside from a few isolated verses cited in the works of Sanderson and Törzsök and the brief transcriptions in two manuscript catalogues.

The Gāruda- and Bhūtatantra genres have hardly caught the notice of scholars despite their importance for understanding the religious beliefs and practices as well as the medical knowledge of early South Asian peoples. Perhaps the earliest reference to these branches of knowledge is Chandogya Upaniṣad 7,1.2. The context is the sage Nārada describing his scholarly qualifications. He lists the genres he has studied including the four books of the Veda, histories, mathematics, and notably for us, the “science of spirits” (bhūtavidyā) and “science of serpent beings” (sarpadevajanavidyā). Thus here we have evidence that these types of texts date back at least 2,500 years. Clearly they were important enough at that time to be included in Nārada’s brief list, and I suggest that they have continually played a fundamental role in folk and, to some extent, popular Hindu religion. A cursory search of the NGMPP and other large manuscript catalogues reveals literally hundreds of texts concerned with spirit possession, snakes, and poisons. We currently have only a handful of non-critical editions of texts which may come under the genre Bhūtatantra and none, to my knowledge, is an early Īśāvāsya that com-

The Manuscripts of the Kriyākālaṅgaṇottara
Michael Slouber

A Few Comments on the Text
Possession is a condition that continues to be a fact of life in most South Asian contexts. The realities of physical and mental illnesses were fertile ground for texts with practical remedies in mind. There is a class of such texts, known as Bhūtatantras, that is solely concerned with curing possession and related illnesses. An allied genre, whose texts are known as Gāruda, is concerned with the classification of snakes, treatment of snakebite, and illnesses caused by other venomous creatures. The Kriyākālaṅgaṇottara is an early Īśāvāsya scripture that combines the two genres. It survives in a half-dozen Nepalese manuscripts and two partial manuscripts held in Jammu and Paris. Its thirty-five chapters deal with everything from the warding off of snakes, spiders, and scorpions, to various techniques for combatting childhood and adult possession. It may be considered a cross between a religious and folk-medical text.

The meaning of the title Kriyākālaṅgaṇottara is not yet entirely clear to me. Kriyākāla may be taken in its Ayurvedic sense of the time to begin treatment (Singh 1969: 451–453), or it may have an esoteric meaning such as that suggested by Kṣemarāja commenting on Svācchandaṃśa 6.97–7.1.

In the Kujbhsāmataṇtra, both Goudhaan and Schoterman’s edition and the more recent (partial) edition by Heiligers-Seelean read sā kriyākālaṅgaṇottara...davā at verse 16.42. Heiligers-Seelean translates: “the kriyā-śakti, superior to the qualities of time...” (1994: 265), but this is a suspect rendering because it takes the first member as the main subject modified by the rest of the compound (note that the word-division sā kriyā kālaṅgaṇottara would be highly improbable in the light of, among other things, the occurrence of kriyākālaṅgaṇottara as an unmistakable compound at Kujbhsāmataṇtra 11.87d). The editors list as a variant kriyākālaṅgaṇottare, attested in three manuscripts including D, the oldest of the group. Neither edition offers philological notes explaining the editors’ rationale in choosing between readings.

3 Cf. Sanderson 2001: 14, fn. 13. Sanderson notes quotations in the commentary to Netratantra verses 19.62–64b, 69, 172–178b, 179a, 179c–180b, 180cdd, and 182. There is also a lengthy quote in the commentary to 19.81ab (Shāstri 1939: 157–8). Having collated these testimonia with the Nepalese readings, I can say that the verses (as edited by Shāstri) seem to be in their agreement, sometimes reflecting the readings of β, and sometimes those of γ. See the textual stemma below.
4 Sanderson 2007: 288, fn. 181
5 Törzsök in Padoux 2000 vol. II.
7 Olivelle, 1998: 258–9, 563. Śaṅkara glosses bhūtavidyā as bhūtatantra and sarpaśudvajanavidyā as sarpaśudvajān gārdaṃ as
8 In reference to this scholarly neglect, Frederick Smith has recently argued that the place of possession within Hinduism has been continually downplayed by orthodox transmitters of the literature, including non-Indian scholars in modern times, in order to construct a more sophisticated and orderly Hinduism. His book (The Self Pos-
knowledge, for the Gārūḍa-tantras.

The Kriyākāla-guṇottara is quite possibly the earliest surviving text which is solely devoted to Bhautika and Gārūḍa interests. The Nettatānta, recently dated to the eighth century by Alexis Sanderson has as its nineteenth chapter a self-contained Bhūtatantra directed at a royal readership. It is in its eleventh century commentary to the text that Ksemarija cites passages from the Kriyākāla-guṇottara. We have several canonical lists of Bhūtatantras, such as those found in the Śrīkaṇṭhiya and Jiñānapacāśikā. Although these lists do not directly cite the Kriyākāla-guṇottara, they do contain titles, such as Khadgaraṇaṇa and Caṇḍāśīdharā which are taught in it. We also have a text variously spelled Trotala, Trotāla, Totala, Trolatottara, etc., that falls under the Gārūḍa class. Depite recent claims that this last text has been lost, pieces of it are available in several Nepalese manuscripts filmed by the NGMPP.

The Manuscripts

Among the six Nepalese manuscript[s] of the Kriyākāla-guṇottara, I have determined that three are not directly dependent upon each other while three are direct copies. This will be demonstrated below following the stemma diagram, and for the sake of brevity I will describe only the "firsthand witnesses" to the text (P alm, Dω, and Prb).

A common convention among manuscript hunters is to ignore the later paper manuscripts in the presence of a palm-leaf "original." I object, however, to the assumption that Kriyākāla-guṇottara, they do contain titles, such as Khadgaraṇaṇa and Caṇḍāśīdharā which are taught in it. We also have a text variously spelled Trotala, Trotāla, Totala, Trolatottara, etc., that falls under the Gārūḍa class. Depite recent claims that this last text has been lost, pieces of it are available in several Nepalese manuscripts filmed by the NGMPP.

P alm “Palm-Leaf”

Title: Kriyākāla-guṇottara

Script: Nandināgari/Palī

Medium: Palm-leaf


Size: 31.5cm X 5.5cm

Number of folios: 144

Lines per Side: 4–5

Aksaras per line: circa 50

Location Held: National Archives Kathmandu (NAK) 3/392.

Microfilmed: NGMPP B 25/32; filmed September 27th, 1970

Photographed by Author: July 28th, 2006.

Colophon Date: Nepāladeśīyasanvat 304 jyeṣṭha-sud 13 gurau.

Many scholars have taken note of P alm’s final colophon and the important historical information it offers. Of particular interest is identifying the location in which it was written, Dhavalasrotapura, and the status of the ruler “Mahāśāmanta” Ratnadeva (Ratnadıva [sic])

Cataloguers have generally fared poorly with the script of P alm. A few notable features to look for include deletion of an aksara with a thin vertical mark above it, alternating pṛṣṭhamatra and “modern” Devānāgari e and o vowel marks, and the non-initial vowel i written as an “afterthought.” A few notable ligatures include ṣrṣ, ḍha, and ḍhyā.

Transcription Example: See figure 1.

PRb “Pracalita B”

Title: Kriyākāla-guṇottara

Script: Pracalita (Newari Script)

PRb “Pracalita B”

Title: Kriyākāla-guṇottara

Script: Pracalita (Newari Script)
Transcription Example: See figure 2.

Dc. “Devanāgari C”

Title: Kriyākālagaṇottara

Script: Devanāgari

Medium: Paper

Condition: Very good, slight mold and water damage around margins.

Size: 20.5cm x 6.5cm

Number of folios: 248 (Part 1: 164, Part 2: 84)

Lines per side: 6

Aksaras per line: circa 36

Location Held: Part 1: Private Collection; provided to NGMPP by one Minaraj Regmi. Part 2: National Archives Kathmandu (NAK) 5/4949.

Microfilmed: NGMPP E 2189/6 (Part 1); NGMPP B 120/11 (Part 2)

Photographed by Author: July 28th, 2006

References: None.

Colophon Date:
naip¯ alike gaterabde dahan¯ a´ svayug¯ a ˙ nkite /
paks.e ph¯ alung. a´ sukle tu tr.t¯ ıy¯ ay¯ am. tithau ravau //
śivarāmasya paatra yasvanāthasya sānana /
likhitaṃ vaidyadevena kriyākālagaṇottaram. //

The text has been split into two parts. Part 1, which includes chapters one through nineteen, is privately held, but was lent to the NGMPP for microfilming. The second half of the text is held at the National Archives in Kathmandu. It seems—and this can only be speculation without further evidence—that the manuscript was split immediately after its copying to manuscript D. It may be at this point that the two halves went their separate ways. D, for some reason, only copied through chapter nineteen. We know that the text was whole at the time of copying because of the short note on the final page of D, and another at the starting page of Pr’s latter half. D reads: atu uttaragranthah (pustakāntare ****), which I take to essentially mean that there is more to the text than what is given here. In Pr (in the same hand and writing size) we have the following note on the starting page of chapter twenty: itah pāvegranthah (pustakāntare), meaning there was more to the text preceding that page. D could not have copied solely from Part 1, because the last line of chapter nineteen, which is present in D, is on the first line of Part 2.
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**Condition:** Very good, slight damage from water, mold, and rodents.

**Size:** 30cm x 8.5cm

**Number of folios:** 88

**Lines per side:** 6–10, usually 8–9

**Aksaras per line:** circa 54

**Location Held:** National Archives Kathmandu (NAK) 5/4947.

**Microfilmed:** NGMPP A 149/2 October 8th, 1971

**Photographed by Author:** July 28th, 2006

**References:** none

**Colophon Date:** None given. Text ends with blessing and granthasamkhya.

Notable scribal features include:

- Prśthamaṭra vowels used occasionally, suggesting that they were present in the script of an exemplar: 
  \[ \text{cum. d. e} \] (32v4) = camde.

- Gemination after consonants in all of the manuscripts consulted, however only in D is there gemination before certain consonants. It is common especially in the case of t preceding ya or sa: 
  \[ \text{vattsa} \] (25v1) = nṛtya; \[ \text{vattsa} \] (25v8) = vattsa.

- Metathesis self-corrected by scribe: 
  \[ \text{vam. ´ sa} \] (22v8) = vam. ´ sa.

- The following is the manuscript’s space-filler/hyphenation symbol used sporadically at the end of lines: \[ \text{vam. } \] (27r6).

**Transcription Example:** See figure 3.

---

### Transcription

| Line 1: | brbamuvam tu prabhabhyet \[ \text{vam. } \] ye to bhaktadhvam | mantram | vyavaharaksadabhi | \[ \text{vam. } \] isvara vyavaharaksadabhi |
| Line 2: | krti | karmanasāyam | | karmanasāyam | 
| Line 3: | yathā | karmakriyam | | arcanam ca | prathamam |
| Line 4: | dvā ña | rojya | | prathamam | utpattitrividham |
| Line 5: | satah. | uttama ´ siva ´ saktibhyam | | unmattam | mam. travidyam |
| Line 6: | satah. | uttama | | mam. kā | 

---

### Colophon

The chart on page 14 graphically represents the interrelationships of the actual and conjectured manuscripts of the Kriyākālagūṇottara which have survived. The manuscript listed as “Jammu,” is a seven folio section held at the Raghunātha Temple Library in Jammu. A reported sixteen folio manuscript held at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris is under investigation.

The three lighter color rounded fields delineated with broken lines represent conjectured hyparchetypes (namely Σ, γ, and β) rather than extant manuscripts. The transmission between these hyparchetypes and the extant Nepalese manuscripts may include a number of intermediaries, therefore the lines connecting them are broken. Cases of direct descendants (such as D from Pₘₐₙ), are marked by a bold black arrow. This means the “child” manuscript copied directly from the “parent.”

---

27Special thanks to Dr. Rāmkṛṣṇa Sūkla for traveling to Jammu and photographing this manuscript on my behalf.
Transcription

Line 1: laks.an. air yuktah. sa bhavet ks.atriyo grahah.∥ samanātud yo nairiketa jyottbhe kampate punah∥ gāyate nṛttaye caiva kampate krośate punah∥ gāvho dhuram dhāmas caiva

Line 2: karmānto karṇāni ca∥ vanīgaśttiharaṇyaṃ ca kathāsu pratimiyate∥ pīlamāśtraprīṣaś caiva pīlamaḥānukpoṇah∥ vaisyaṃ etene rūpena graham viniyā.-

Line 3: d evaśrayah∥ yas tu māraparśaṃ ca kurvate vikṛtāṅg api∥ hastāhyāṃ sprīyate medhrāṃ aścincī caapi mardate∥ vacanam ca na guṇāhāti nāttmāhām nābhajā.

Line 4: nati śrīś cākṣaye nātṛyaṃ sādṛghanauṣpitaḥ∥ yas tu sāvāna rūpāni vajāmiśrāni tu kāryāta∥ caṛṇiṣāhām iti jñeyāvācāryabodhātṛtāvāhāḥ

Line 5: pariśkeśa ca śhāṇayaṃ go madrām na pragyacchaḥ∥ sa yonavānam āpanna visṛṣṭram caiva teṣhāti∥ bhā guṇakāti brāhmaṇāḥ sahāsāte kṣatriyāḥ∥ bhogasa-

Line 6: tveti te vaisaṇa he sādhī śūdra ucyate∥ itareṣāṃ tu varṇāṇāṃ yatheṣāṃ tu bh(ā)² prāyajet∥ || its kriyākālaugnantare aṣṭamah pātalas∥ || kārtīkeya uṣā-

Line 7: ca∥ ye te bhātādhiṣṭa mantrāṃ viniyāśa ca uṣabhāryaḥ∥ teṣāṃ laks.-parāpāṃ ca nāṅgottamām prthahprthah∥ kānumāṇaḥ gāḍāsthāṇam kathāvasa va prosādātah∥

Line 8: iśvara vraśa∥ mantrāś ca viviśdiḥa vatiṣa utmaṇḍhamaṇḍhāmāṃ∥ teṣāṃ karma kriyāśpāṃ arcanam ca prthahprth∥ utpattiśritvān teṣāṃ tām ruddha so-
The timeline is for the reader’s convenience, however it is not vertically precise. That is to say, I have no formula such as “1/2 inch = 100 years” as one might expect in a timeline. For this reason, the dates are linked to their respective texts by a broken grey line. The other manuscripts cannot be precisely dated at this time.

### Rationale for the Stemma Chart

**γ and β are Separate Branches of Σ**

From the most cursory survey of variants it is evident that the extant Nepalese manuscripts fall into two groups: one descended from γ, and the other descended from β. We can infer that the two are related by way of their hyparchetype Σ, because of a number of conjunctive errors.

Consider the corrupt 9.17b with its various non-sensical readings. It seems that by the time of Σ, this *pada* was conflated with that of 9.18b. Consider 9.30, where we have all manuscripts reading the hypermetrical and difficult to construe “*bhityavargasya*.” Additionally we have a contextually necessary verse in chapter 10 (which would have been numbered 10.07) missing, though not marked as such, in all the manuscripts. Verse 10.05 instructs the positioning of the seat and implements of a Brahman in the Northeast; verse 10.06 that of a Kṣatriya in the Southeast; and verse 10.08 that of a Śūdra in the Northwest. The seat and implements of a Vaiśya in the Southwest should have been present between 10.06 and 10.08 based on the counter-clockwise enumeration of the text. All the manuscripts have errors in common and therefore have Σ as a common ancestor.

**P alm descends from the hyparchetype γ**

Proving the existence of the γ hyparchetype is not as simple. Somadeva Vasudeva has often reminded me of BÉDIER’s epiphany that there is an aesthetically pleasing yet erroneous desire for the stemma to always branch into two. We must ask ourselves: “Why could P alm not...
be copying directly from β? Do we need γ as a hyparchetype?” One piece of evidence for γ although admittedly not firm proof, is a series of illegible characters in the hyparchetype of P alm which P alm marks as horizontal lines (P alm 142’1). Neither Prv, (160’3) nor Dv (86’1) are missing the syllables, therefore β must have the complete verse, and Σ would also be complete. A possible criticism of this hypothesis is that Σ was missing the text, but β improvised a reading to fill the lacuna. However one thing we can be sure about is that P alm is not copying from a lacunose β, because Prv and Dv, independently read a complete verse. Therefore it is likely that these illegible syllables reflect a manuscript that is intermediary between Σ and P alm, and we can call that manuscript γ.

**Dv and Prv descend from P alm**

Manuscripts Dv and Prv clearly descend from P alm. This is evident in P alm’s countless minor and major mistakes carried through to Prv and Dv, that do not occur in the β manuscripts. Take the opening words of chapter 9 for example (as in P alm’s transliteration example). In P alm there is a mistake: “[bhi”ay]ε tu.” The scribe of P alm caught himself and deleted the extra syllable with a tiny vertical dash mark, but Dv and Prv did not understand, reading bh”ay ε tu (Dv, 27’7) and bh”ay e tu (Prv, 27’6) respectively.

The final word of chapter nine offers further confirmation. P alm reads the corrupt and hypometrical “k”ayet against β’s “k”aryat.” Figure 4 shows why Dv and Prv read the even more corrupt “k”ayete.”

Note that Dv and Prv read the vi”rama of the previous line as an extra ek”ara of “k”ayet.”

To demonstrate that Dv is copying directly from P alm and not through an intermediary, we have the case of an eye-skip lacuna precisely equal to one line of P alm (Beginning of chapter ten, Dv, 30’, line four, skips line three of P alm 47’5).

**Dv and Prv descend from hyparchetype β**

Demonstrating the existence of the β hyparchetype is relatively simple. We need only show that Dv and Prv, share errors, and that neither is copying directly from the other. Take for example 9.14a, which corruptly reads kalakalasena nama in the β-derived manuscripts. Also, in the Raks”ap”atāla (Chapter 24), the β group shares a very lacunose section which is not missing in the γ group: Dv 65”–66” and Prv 116”–117”.

We can be certain that Prv is not copying from Dv, nor vice-versa because often Dv is missing more text in the lacunose sections of the β group. This clearly demonstrates that Dv is not the exemplar of Prv. It also suggests that Dv was copying from a later, more damaged form of the β exemplar. Take as an example the opening of the third pa”tala (Prv, 7”–8”; Dv, 4”–5”).

**Dv descends from Prv**

The final relationship to be demonstrated is that of Dv and Prv. We have a comment written in the same hand on both Dv and Prv. In the case of the former it is on the final page of the (incomplete) manuscript and in the case of the latter it is on the first page of the latter half of the text not copied by Dv. For a full explanation, see the colophon section in the description of manuscript Prv. For numerous shared lacunae, see Dv 22” and Prv 34”.

**Abbreviations**

Σ = Common ancestor of all extant manuscripts.
γ = The archetype of P alm, and Dv/Prv via P alm.
β = The archetype of Prv and Dv, and Dv via Prv.
P alm = NGMPP B 25/32
Dv = NGMPP B 120/3
Prv = NGMPP B 119/5
Dv = NGMPP C 30/16
Prv = NGMPP A 149/2
Prv = NGMPP E 2189/6
(xyz) = xyz are uncertain syllables.
[ε] = ε is omitted propia manu
* = illegible syllable
[xyz]narn = reading xyz supplied in margin
va”de = deva (metathesis self-corrected by scribe).

**References**


A Fragment of the Āgamaśāstra vivaraṇa
Kengo Harimoto

Introduction
The manuscript microfilmed as NGMPP A 39/3 is a fascinating case. It consists of eight folios, each of which belongs to different texts, viz. (in the order of filming):

1. Viniṣṭa-consaṅgkrāhāṇī section of the Yogācārābhūmi (See Matsuda 1995.)
2. First chapter of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (See Matsuda and Toda 1991.)
3. Third chapter of the Pramāṇaviniścaya by Dharma-kirti (See Matsuda and Steinkellner 1991.)
4. Unknown commentary on the Abhidharmaśobhāṣya (See Matsuda 2000.)
5. Āgamaśāstra vivaraṇa (a.k.a. Gaṇḍapāḍakārikābhūṣya, etc.)
6. Bhūkṣuṇi-karvācāraṇā (See Bendall 1903.)
7. Śatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramāṇī
8. Paryāṣaṇagṛahaṇī section of the Yogācārabhūmi (See Matsuda 1994.)

Seven of these are Buddhist works; some of them were hitherto entirely unknown (4) or unknown in Sanskrit (1, 3, 8). In addition, this bundle is significant because it is a collection of very old, perhaps some of the oldest manuscripts found in Nepal. This bundle was once photographed by Cecil Bendall, who produced a report on 6 above, the Bhūkṣuṇi-karvācāraṇā. Later on, Kazunobu Matsuda was to produce reports on five (1, 2 with Toda, 3, with Steinkellner, 4, and 8) of them (relevant references are in parentheses).

One of the two unreported folios, 5, is a fragment of the commentary ascribed to Śaṅkara on the Mādhyāntiya-upaniṣad and its commentary Gaṇḍapāḍakārikās. The root text is often called the Āgamaśāstra and the commentary is also variably called a bhāṣya or a vivaraṇa. The extent of the fragment is the commentary on the Gaṇḍapāḍakārikās 2 (Vaitathya-prakaraṇa), 7–13.

It is a palm-leaf with two binding holes and a very wide shape, typical of older manuscripts found in Nepal. The size of the folio is unknown. It was filmed verso first

1Much of the information in this first paragraph is owed to publications by Kazunobu Matsuda. See Bibliography.
2Matsuda 1990 was the first to report the identities of all the manuscripts found in Nepal. This bundle was once photographed by Cecil Bendall, who produced a report on 6 above, the Bhūkṣuṇi-karvācāraṇā. Later on, Kazunobu Matsuda was to produce reports on five (1, 2 with Toda, 3, with Steinkellner, 4, and 8) of them (relevant references are in parentheses).
3As for the Pramāṇaviniścaya, since then complete manuscripts came to light. An edition is currently being published. See Steinkellner 2007.
4The NGMCP title list has 51 × 4 cm as the measurement of the manuscript A 39/3. However, we would not know which folio this measurement applies to since the manuscript is a bundle of folios
Fragment of the Āgamaśāstravivarāṇa

by the NGMPP. There are five lines on each side. The left and right edges have broken off. About 30 aksaras are lost on the left-hand side; and about 10 aksaras on the right hand side. The script could be classified as transitional Gupta, the script variously called as Licchavi, early Nepali, or Gilgit/Bamiyan type II in its earlier form—literally all kinds of scripts that are in between the Gupta script and various later scripts, such as Devanagari, Newari, Maithili (proto-Bengali, and hence Bengali), Saradā, etc. The shape of the manuscript and script resemble the old Nepalese manuscripts of the original Śkandapurāṇa, one of which is dated 810 C.E. The script of our folio, however, has some peculiarities: it seems to anticipate the Maithili (proto-Bengali) script. One such feature is that in many cases the marker to signal that a consonant has the vowel e is longer than the typical hook-like marker, which is often easy to miss. In this folio the marker often extends almost to the height of the consonant symbol. Another feature is that the scribe uses quite distinct shapes for sibilants s and ṣ, resembling the symbols for the same sibilants in Maithili script. This is in contrast to some of the very old manuscripts, such as the dated Śkandapurāṇa manuscript, where the difference is whether the top is open or closed, as well as to somewhat later manuscripts in which the distinction almost disappears.8 We might not exclude the possibility that this manuscript was imported from somewhere else. Nonetheless, I doubt that this manuscript is written later than 1,100 C.E.; more probable is perhaps 1,000 C.E. plus or minus 50 years.

Facsimile and Transcript

Facsimiles and transcripts are given in the following pages. The following notations are employed:

- • signifies the space created to clear the binding holes. In this folio, the lines above and below that are not directly affected by binding holes, too, have spaces, corresponding to the position of the binding holes. These spaces, too, are signified by the ○ symbol.
- • . . . signifies lost text whose length is unknown.
- • + signifies lost aksaras whose numbers are relatively certain (being part of verse text).
- • {x−y} means certain element of the text is changed from x to y.
- • ] enclose cancelled elements.
- • — represents a similar sign found at the end of some lines.
- • , represents a short daṇḍa-like sign found on verso line 3 in GK (Gaṇḍapādakārīkā) 2.11 at the end of first two pādas.
- • .. represent an aksara I cannot decipher.
- * represents virāma.

Comparison to the vulgate

I have compared the readings found in our fragment with the Ānandaśāraṇa edition of the text (Apte 1921). The following variants can be observed. A reading from our manuscript is followed by a | sign and the reading in the edition. The location in the edition, page and line, is recorded inside parentheses.

- Recto, line 1: asattvam uktan| asattvam yad uktam (70,23); gamanādikāryam| gamanāgamanādikārye (71,1).
- Recto, line 2: jāgarite ’pi hi| jāgarite hi (71,4); vinivartitaṭṭ putamātra caiva (?)| vinivartitaṭṭ putamātra eva (71,5); pītā ca tryptotthitas| pītā cātryptotthitas (71,6); vipratipattiḥ dhṛṣṭā tena manyāmaha| vipratipattir dhṛṣṭā (a variant dhṛṣate is recorded) ato manyāmaha (71,7).
- Recto, line 3: bhedānam| jāgradbhedānām (71,23); iti tad asat| iti yad uktam tad asat (71,23); ete evaite (72,1).
- Recto, line 4: dhṛṣṭam apūrvam adṛṣṭapūrvam| dhṛṣṭam apūrvam (72,5); apūrvam sthāniḥdharma| apūrvam sthāniḥdharma (72,5); draṣṭur eva| draṣṭur eva hi (72,6); apūrvadharma| apūrvam ‘yam dharmah (72,7); sthāniṣṇaḥ svapna| sthāniṣṇaḥ svapna (a variant sthāniṣṇava is noted) (72,8).

Notes:

8This contradicts the observation by Matsuda. Cf. Matsuda 1991, n. 12. Perhaps what is meant by “ordinary Nepali script” is not what we consider to be the Newari script. In the NGMCP title list, the term Newari is applied to the script that starts to appear roughly in the 12th century. The script in the folio in discussion is clearly distinct from that script.

9See Adriaensen, et al. 1998, 32–33.

10See Adriaensen et al. 1998, 33.
Figure 1: Āgamaśīstravivarana fragment recto

Transcript

1. . . ///(dya)nta(vatve) || na mithyaiva khalu te (smr.)tāḥ || 2.7 svapna(dṛṣṭyavaj jāgaritadṛṣṭyānām āsatvam uktaṃ tad ayuktam yasmāj jāgradrśyā anna-pāṇavāhañādayaḥ ○ kṣutpipāśadīnivṛttiṃ kurvanto gamaṇādikārayaṃ ca saprayojanaḥ dṛṣṭā na tu svapna(dṛṣṭyānā)//./.
2. . . ///(svapne) vipratipadyate jāgarite ○ pī hi (bhuktv)ā pītvā ca (tṛ)po vinivartita<m>ṛ</m>t(ṛ) svapnānātra(ś cē)va kṣutpipāśadīyārttam alorātṛśītam abhuktavantuṃ ātmānāṃ manyate yathā svapne ○ bhuktvā pītvā ca tṛptottihitas tathā tasmāj jāgradrśyānāṃ svapne vipratipatti(m) dṛṣṭa vā tena manyāmaḥ teḥśām āpy a(satva)m (svapnaḍṛṣṭyā)//./.
3. . . ///(tā) apūrrvam sthānidharmmo hi yathā svarggaṃ(विस्तारम्) tān āyaṃ prekṣate gatvā yathaiheva sūṣkitaḥ|| 2.8 svapnajāgradbhedaḥyāḥ samatvād bhedānāṃ āsatvam iti tad āsat kasmād dṛṣṭā ○ntasyāsīddhatvā kathaṃ na hi jāgradrśtaḥ ete bhedāḥ | svapne dṛṣṭyante kintary apūrrvam svapne (pa)ṣyati (caturda). (ga)jām a(rūdham a)ṣṭāblu(ja)//./.
4. . . ///to (dṛṣṭ)ānto siddhaḥ | tasmāt svapnāvaj jāgaritāyaśatvam ity ayuktam tan na svapne dṛṣṭam apūrrvam adṛṣṭpūrvam yat manyase na tat svataḥ siddhaḥ kintary apūrrvam sthānidharmmo hi sthānino dṛṣṭum ○r eva (sval)anasthānāvato dharmmo yathā svarggantaṃśaṃ āhināṃ śaḥasrākṣatvādī(ś tā)thā svapnaḍṛṣṭya pūrvvadharmo)//./.
5. . . ///(māṃ) svacittavikalpān āyaṃ sthānyāḥ sva○puṇḍraksapnasthānaṃ gatvā prekṣate yathaiheva loke (su)ṣikhoto desāntaramārggas tena mārggeṇa taddeśāntaraṃ gatvā padāṛthān paśyati (ta)dvat ta(sma)○d yathā sthānidharmānāṃ rajjuṇapunṛgatṛṣṇikādīnām āsatvam tathā svapnaḍṛṣṭyānā—
Transcript
1 ...///svapnadrśantasyāsiddhatvam | sva○puṇavaśāvāv apy antācetasā kalpitam asat* vahiṭhām hi sat sadasator vaitathyaṇuṃ drṣṭam* ||2.9?
apūrvvatvāsākān nirā○kṛtya svapnadrśantaṃya punaḥ | svapnātyatāṃ jagradbhedānāṃ prapañcayam āha —
2 ...///(āka)ṭa(ān) nānāntarasamakālam eviḍārṣa(ō)nāta* | tatraṇa svapnātyaṃ vahiṭhāṃ caksurādiśvarenaḥ abhilaṃ ghaṭaḍi sād ity evam asaty api niścite
sadasadvi○bhāgō drṣṭā ubhayor api tv antaraḥśicetāḥ kalpitayor vaitathyaṇuṃ eva drṣṭaṃ | jagradvṛttāv apy anta —
3 ...2.10? ...///ktān | antarvahiścetāḥ kalpitatvā○viśeṣāti {i—i} ti vyākhyātām anступ(ena) || ubhayor api vaitathyaṇuṃ bhedānāṃ sthānayor yaya, ka etān buddhyate
bhedaṃ kā vai teṣāṃ vikalpa○kaḥ ||2.11 codaka āha | svapnājagradsthanābhedaṃ yadi vaitathyaṇaḥ ka etān antarbbahiścetaḥ | kalpitān bhedaṃ budhya(te)///... 
4 ...///(rā)tmavāda īṣṭāḥ || kalpayat ā ○(ma)ṇātmaṇān ātmaṃ devāḥ svamānayaḥ | sa eva buddhyate bhedaṃ iti vedāntanāścayāḥ ||2.12 svayaṃ svamānayaḥ svam ātmanān ātma ○ deva ātmany eva vaksyamānābheda-kāraṇaḥ kalpayati rajjvādāviva sarpāṇiṃ svayam evaṃ tān budhya,te bheda(sas) tadvāde(ve)ty eva (ve)///... 
5 ...///yaḥ || vik(ā—a)○roty aparān bhāvānum antaściterate (a)vaśthītān* | niyatāṃc ca vahiścitta evaṃ kalpayate prabhūḥ ||2.13 sa kalpaya'n’ kena prakārēṇa kalpayatōtīty ucyate | vikaroti nānākaroty aparā(ṇaśāstrīyāṇa lau)kṣīlā(ṇ bhā)vā(ṇ padārthān śabdādin anyā). ... ... ...///
--- Evaluations

If this manuscript had survived in its entirety, it would have offered a significant help in critically editing the Āgamaśāstravāraṇa, or even the Gaudapādakārikās. Among the variants, the variants of the Gaudapādakārikās 2.9 and 2.10 are particularly intriguing. The text equivalent to GK 2.9 found in our fragment is prose. The critical apparatus to the edition shows a wide variety of readings, including unmetrical ones similar to the reading found in our fragment. On the other hand, the following text, as far as judging from the part that has survived, is in essence identical to the one that appears in the edition. And this text does appear to be a commentary on the verse/prose GK 2.9. At this moment, I cannot offer a satisfactory explanation. Similarly, even though only the beginning is extant, the text that corresponds to GK 2.10 cannot be a *sloka*. Further investigations might yield something interesting. Other variants, such as where compounds in our manuscript are resolved in the edition, or our manuscript has fewer elements in *dvandva* compounds testify to the folio’s antiquity.

However regrettable the loss of most of the manuscript may be, the significance of this one folio lies in the first place in the fact that it exists. Written in a very old script, having been found among other rare Buddhist texts, this folio suggests the importance of the text (among the Budhists?) in quite early time.

This fragment is probably the oldest surviving manuscript fragment of a work ascribed to Śāṅkara. It would not surprise me if this manuscript was written even before Vācaspati Miśra was active.

This might have several implications. One area of interest is its authorship. Scholars do not agree whether the Āgamaśāstravāraṇa was written by the same person who wrote the Brahmāsūtrasūkaṅkarabhāṣya. Either position one wishes to take, the existence of such an early manuscript must now be taken into account. If one does not think this work to be by the author of the Brahmāsūtrasūkaṅkarabhāṣya, then (s)he might want to consider the possibility that at least it was written by a relatively early author. This work cannot be by a late, e.g. 12th or 13th century, author.

--- Bibliography


Note that the fourth prakaraṇa of the Gaudapādikārikās is well-known for its wide use of Buddhist terminology.
Notes on a Vārāṇasimāhātmya Compendium

Peter Bisschop

The Kaiser Library in Kathmandu, whose rich collection has been described by Dimitrov and Tamot in the 3rd issue of this Newsletter, contains a manuscript of great interest to Purāṇa scholars, and to all those interested in the history of Vārāṇasi. The work is listed under the title Vārāṇasimāhātmya; but it is not an original work, being rather a compendium of various Vārāṇasimāhātmyas quoted with attribution from different Purāṇas. In this respect it somewhat resembles a Dharmanibandha work on pilgrimage to the holy city.

On the last folio of the manuscript two dates, (Nepāla) Sanvat 650 = 1530 AD and (Nepāla) Sanvat 789 = 1669 AD, have been added by later scribes, but the original date of the manuscript is no doubt considerably older. It is a palm-leaf manuscript written in old Nagārī script and may probably be dated on palaeographical grounds to the 13th century. The manuscript is incomplete although in its current state it already amounts to a good 147 folios. The Kaiser Library accession number is 66, and the manuscript has been microfilmed by the NGMPP on reel C 6/3.

The manuscript is important for a number of reasons. First of all, it yields a considerable amount of new evidence on the development of the holy city of Vārāṇasi in the early medieval period. The text stands, one can say, at a transitional moment in time: it records Vārāṇasimāhātmyas from several Purāṇas, but is evidently unaware of the Kāśikhaṇḍa which becomes central to the religious identity of Vārāṇasi in the subsequent period. It is indeed most likely that the latter text did not yet exist at the time of composition of the compendium. Related to this is the issue of the rise to prominence of Viśvanātha, from a relatively minor shrine at the start of the 12th century to the major holy centre of Vārāṇasi by the 13th century, a position which it holds unto the present day. Viśvanātha is central to the vision of Vārāṇasi in the Kāśikhaṇḍa, but the present compendium contains only a few scattered references to it under the name of Viśveśvara. Nevertheless, its phenomenal rise can be glimpsed in these passages, as may be illustrated for instance by this verse found in a long passage attributed to the Matsyapurāṇa on folio 44:\[1\] avinaktaṣya madhye tu ge ge līṅgā[\(\|\)] sthitā[\(\|\)] mune | viśveśvarasya te sarve saṃsān bhaktā eva vajanti te |[]]. It is in particular in this ‘Matsya-purāṇa’, probably one of the latest Purāṇas quoted in the compendium, that Viśveśvara becomes prominent.

In its attributions of the Māhātmyas to individual Purāṇas the compendium is rather problematic. In fact, the names of different Purāṇas seem to be used almost interchangeably, and as a result it is a difficult task to identify the Purāṇas in question. This may indicate the fluid identity of the Purāṇas in general, and serve as a warning to the modern scholar concerning the attributions of material quoted from Purāṇas in works like these.

A few examples may illustrate this point. The beginning of the manuscript contains a long passage of thirteen chapters on ‘the appearance of Bhaiara’ (bhairavaprāduṛbdhava) from a ‘description of Vārāṇasi’ (vārāṇasīvārṇaṇa) attributed to the already mentioned Matsyapurāṇa (up to folio 59\(\|\)). None of this can be identified in the present Matsyapurāṇa. Later on, how-

---

1 I am indebted to Harunaga Isaacsnon for first drawing my attention to the manuscript and providing me with photographs, and to Dhwakar Acharya for sharing with me his ideas about the date of the manuscript.

2 On the cover folio an earlier scribe has written Vārāṇasīsārā-pratisangraha but this has been changed by a second scribe to Vārāṇasimāhātmya.

3 A related manuscript, privately owned, has been microfilmed by the NGMPP twice, on reel E 766/7 and on reel E 1418/2. This is likewise called Vārāṇasimāhātmya and is 144 folios long. Harunaga Isaacson has informed me that he has determined that this manuscript transmits the same collection, but I have not yet examined it myself.

4 Speakers in this ‘Matsyapurāṇa’ of our collection are Nārada and Pulastya. The topography of Vārāṇasi at the time of composition of this text seems to correspond to a great extent to that of the so-called ‘Līṅgapurāṇa’ quoted by Laks-mādhara in his Kṛtyakalpataru (Tirthahivecanaśrāddha 2). At the same time stories are found in this text — examples are the curse of Durvāsas and...
ever, the well-known Vāraṇasimāhātmya of the Matsya-
purāṇa (MtP 181–185) is quoted in separate sections, yet
these are not attributed to the Matsya-purāṇa but to the
Skandapurāṇa. The Vāraṇasimāhātmya of the original
Skandapurāṇa (SP II A) on the other hand, is quoted
under the name of Puṣkaraipurāṇa (folios 123v–127v =
SP 26) as well as under its original name (folios 127v–
138v = SP 29.1–95). Other Puruṣas quoted are the lost
Nandipurāṇa, the Brahmāpuraṇa, the Vāyupuraṇa, the
Vāmanapurāṇa and the Śivapurāṇa. I have not been able
to identify any of these passages in the available editions
of these texts.

The Vāyupuraṇa presents an interesting case. The
compendium contains one passage attributed to the
Vāyupuraṇa. This is not found in the current editions of
the Vāyupuraṇa and is concerned with the Kapālamocana
myth. The apparent reason for its attribution to the
Vāyupuraṇa is that the myth is narrated by Vāyu.
Kapālamocana had become one of the main religious sites
of Vārānasi by the early medieval period, so it comes as
no surprise to find this myth included here. However,
in fact the passage in question is not about the site of
Kapālamocana in Vārānasi at all. It is largely overlapping
with chapter 7 of the original Skandapurāṇa and this con-
tains no reference whatsoever to Vārānasi.

It seems that the compiler has included this material here
for the simple reason that it is concerned with Śiva’s ‘release of the skull’
(kapālamocana) even though this does not take place at
the Vārānasi site of Kapālamocana.

Skandapurāṇa 7 has been studied in detail by Yokochi
(2004), because it is one of the few passages of the original
Skandapurāṇa which has a parallel in the Avantyakhaṇḍa
(MtP Avantyakhaṇḍa I.9). In that text the myth is asso-
ciated with Mahiśikālavana in Ujjain, but this is not the
case here nor in the Skandapurāṇa. As a whole the pas-
sage is closer to SP 7 than to MtP Avantyakhaṇḍa I.9, but
it shares phrases and sometimes entire verses with the
Avantyakhaṇḍa which are absent in the Skandapurāṇa.

The compiler of the Avantyakhaṇḍa thus seems to have
had access to a version of the myth akin to the one in-
cluded here. It should be noted that SP 7 is one of the
chapters of the Skandapurāṇa for which the Nepalese (S)
recension is largely absent, due to loss of folios of the
Nepalese manuscripts, and that consequently the text of
SP 7 has been constituted on the basis of the Ambikā-
khāṇḍa and Revikhaṇḍa recensions of the Skandapurāṇa.
It is by no means unlikely that the text transmitted here
is closer to what the original text of this chapter had. More
research is needed before any more definite observations

can be made.

This may serve to illustrate the kind of material in-
cluded here and its relevance for the study of Puruṣic
literature and of the history of Vārānasi. All in all,
the manuscript presents us with a rich overview of the
Māhātmya literature around at the time of composition of
the compendium, which makes it a highly valuable piece
of historical evidence on the development of the sacred
spots of Vārānasi. It also stands as testimony to the
longlasting connection between Nepal and Vārānasi.

I intend to make parts of it available in future studies.
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the framestory of Śiva’s plotting the move of all the deities from Mt.
Mandara — that resemble some of the later Kāṭīkhaṇḍa’s mythol-
ogy. Also noteworthy is the fact that it records other stories which
in wording and phrasing seem clearly to presuppose the original
Skandapurāṇa, such as the aetiological myths of Hiranyakarha,
Gopreksa and Bhadradoha, as well as the story of king Divodāsa
being tricked out of Vārānasi by Nikumbha (here Kvemaka). In
other words, it appears to stand somewhere midway between these
texts and may therefore prove to be crucial to further studies of
the development of the mythology of Vārānasi.

5 The manuscript breaks off in the middle of a section quoting SP
29.97 ff. (folios 144r–145v) and so the colophon recording the name of
the Purāṇa is missing. It should be observed that the compendium
only quotes passages from SP 26 and 29, thus omitting SP 27 and
28 which indeed are not concerned with Vārānasi but with religious
duties of Śiva devotees and as such do not form part of the Vāraṇasi-
mahātmya proper.

6 Note also that Kapālamocana is not included in the Skanda-
purāṇa’s Vāraṇasimāhātmya (SP IIA).


**Book announcement**


The Pātañjalayogasāstra, which consists of the Yugasūtra and its commentary Yogabhāṣya, might be one of the most frequently printed Sanskrit texts. Yet, or perhaps accordingly, till now no edition can really be called reliable. Maas’ new critical edition of its first pāda is the first serious attempt to get back to the text originally intended. The monograph consists of 1) discussions on the title, author and the date of the text, 2) a description of the textual witnesses (both editions and manuscripts), 3) the critical text with apparatus, and 4) appendices.

In the first chapter Maas argues that Patañjali (different from the author of the Mahābhāṣya) is the author of the Pātañjalayogasāstra, and places its composition between 325 and 425 c.e. The second chapter is dedicated to describing 21(!) printed editions and 25 manuscripts of the text. Of those manuscripts, five are from the NGMPP collection, microfilmed as A 61/11, A 62/32, A 62/37, B 40/2, M 97/4, and T 6/5. In discussing the transmission of the Pātañjalayogasāstra in manuscripts, Maas argues that there are northern and southern groups; that not only among the groups but also beyond the groups there is evidence of heavy contamination; and that the southern group exhibits less deviation from the original. His discussions are supplemented by charts that intended to help the reader to understand the relationship among the editions or manuscript transmissions.

The critically edited text is presented in Roman characters, accompanied by six registers of critical apparatus. The apparatuses are: one for variants in manuscripts; the second for variants in published editions; the third to record how the sūtras and the bhāṣya text are divided in witnesses; the fourth for testimony; the fifth to record the meter when the text is metrical; the sixth to record folio changes in manuscripts. The editor does not pretend to be absolutely confident about his reconstruction of the text; indeed, in many places the reader finds the text has a wavy underline, indicating uncertainty. All the wavy-underlined portions are discussed in the ‘Kritische Noten’ (Critical Notes). One might see the wavy underline rather as a signal for readers that the portion has a critical note. All in all, the thoroughness of the critical apparatus and textual presentation is of a kind rarely found in indological publications.

In addition to the critical text, the monograph includes a reconstruction of the Pātañjalayogasāstra text from probably the oldest commentary on it, the Pātañjalayogasāstravivaraṇa. Such a reconstruction is very time consuming work, involving much uncertainty, especially when the editions of the Vivaraṇa on which the reconstruction is based are less than optimal. The implications of this are intriguing; the difficulty but also the need for detailed investigations in the textual history of the Pātañjalayogasāstravivaraṇa is not the least of them. For someone who aspires to such an endeavor, and for anyone studying the history of the Yoga-school, already a vast quantity of material is presented in this monograph. One may wish for similarly thorough editions of subsequent chapters of the Pātañjalayogasāstra to appear in the near future.

(Kengo Harimoto)
Some Highlights of the Work of a ‘Frequent User’ of the NGMPP (IV)

Michael Hahn (Marburg)

With considerable delay the ten genuine legends from Haribhāṭa’s Jātakamāla which are preserved in Nepal have now been made accessible to interested colleagues through the following publication:


The work has an extremely long and complicated editorial history that cannot be related in full detail. A short summary is given in the preface. Here I would like to mention only the beginning of my acquaintance with the work and then point to its importance as a specimen of the early campū genre. Cf. also my contribution to Newsletter of the NGMCP No. 1.

In a certain manner one could say that one of the pratyayas of my encounter with Haribhāṭa is World War II. When the intensive air raids on the German capital Berlin began in 1942, the precious collections of the Preußische Staatsbibliothek were brought to safe havens in the countryside. Marburg happened to be the place where the oriental collections were temporarily kept—actually more than 20 years. This was the reason why during my time as a student in Marburg (1962-1967) I had easy access to the copy of the Derge Tanjur.

When in the beginning of 1965 I decided to write my Ph. D. thesis in the field of Indian philology I looked for a topic in which I could use my newly acquired knowledge of classical Tibetan. This led to an intensive study of Hakujū Ui’s catalogue of the Derge Tanjur. Even after I had chosen Jñānaśrimitra’s Vṛttamālāstuti as starting point for my thesis I continued perusing works that seemed to be important from the literary point of view. One of these works was Haribhāṭa’s Jātakamāla which immediately attracted me by its flowery style. Despite my very limited knowledge of classical Tibetan and the extraordinary difficulties caused by the rather clumsy and partially corrupt translation of the text I felt that this work deserved closer inspection.

For about 5 years my studies of the work were entirely based on the Tibetan translation. They resulted in the inclusion of two very short legends in my Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache (first published Hamburg 1971) and four papers in Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens, published between 1973 and 1980. In Newsletter No. 1 (p. 5) I have described how in 1973 I very accidentally discovered the first manuscript containing the original text of nine of Haribhāṭa’s legends, the Avadānāsārasanamuccaya manuscript from Cambridge; cf. the specimen on p. 21 of Newsletter No. 1. In 1975 and 1976 I got access to two better manuscripts containing the nine legends of the Avadānāsārasanamuccaya plus a tenth genuine legend plus the spurious Śākyasimhajātaka that at an early stage (before the middle of the 12th century AD) was added to Haribhāṭa’s work: the Jātakamālaavadānsūtra and the Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamāla. The latter work is the source from which the other two manuscripts took their stories. A specimen can be found on p. 22 of Newsletter No. 1.

In the spring and summer of 1979, during my term of office as local director of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, I began to prepare an edition of the eleven legends of Haribhāṭa’s Jātakamāla as preserved in the Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamāla. While doing this, I was assisted by Mahes Raj Pant, Chief Research Scholar of the Nepal Research Centre. We finished the text rather quickly, however the introduction could not be printed due to insufficient diacritics. Thus the edition remained unpublished and later fed rats and mice in the Nepal Research Centre.

Much later, in 1992, I had eventually prepared a computerized version of the introduction, but then I had become dissatisfied with the 1979 edition because of the many printing mistakes (mostly minor ones) that had escaped our attention during the process of proofreading. Therefore I ultimately abandoned the plan of publishing the Kathmandu edition. The same year saw the revised
version of my booklet Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta in which I gave the texts of the first four legends.

At the end of the nineties I had finally prepared my own devanāgarī edition of Haribhaṭṭa’s Jātakamālā. Unfortunately many mistakes had again crept in during the repeated process of converting my original transcripts from handwriting to typewriting and later into computer files. So the proofreading had to start again from scratch. Although assisted by research assistants, disciples and colleagues, this was a slow process, often interrupted by other more urgent commitments.

In 2004 the situation changed again when copies of another manuscript of Haribhaṭṭa’s Jātakamālā, containing almost 70 per cent of the work, were made accessible to me. This manuscript is older and of better textual quality than the Bodhisattvājaṭākavādānāmalā. However, the gaps are very irregular so that many of the legends are not only missing but also incomplete. Then I decided to publish as a starting point the editio minor of the ten genuine legends as preserved in Nepal, along with the anonymous Śākyasinhajātaka in order not to protract the project for another decade. Fortunately in 2005 my esteemed friend and colleague Prof. Minoru Hara could convince the editorial board of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies, Tokyo, to include the editio minor in its monograph series. It is a nice coincidence that the same institute published my first announcement of my rediscovery of the Jātakamālās of Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta exactly 30 years ago.

Why editio minor? The text is given in transliteration, not in devanāgarī, a facsimile of the manuscript and its diplomatic transcript are not included, as originally planned, and the critical apparatus has been limited to real variant readings, omitting the recording of countless insignificant scribal errors. I have to admit that until 2004 the manuscript of the Bodhisattvājaṭākavādānāmalā as the sole survivor of Haribhaṭṭa’s original words had assumed for me an almost sacred position. Therefore the idea of adding its facsimile and diplomatic transcript had been conceived. Taken by itself, it is a fairly good, but neither very old (most likely 17th century; at least earlier than 1690 AD) nor otherwise remarkable manuscript.

With the second manuscript, written on palm-leaf and of superior quality, the first manuscript has now lost its initial spell for me—at least in that sense that I don’t deem it necessary to report all its peculiarities. Nevertheless it is of utmost importance in all those cases where it preserves text that cannot be found in the new manuscript.

A few words should be said about the literary importance of the work itself. Until recently it has not been common knowledge that the campā genre or prosimetric form did not begin with the Nalaḍamayanti-kathā in the 10th century but almost a millennium earlier. From what we can conclude of the extant specimens, this genre seems to have developed in the Buddhist milieu, particularly in its narrative literature. The oldest known author is Kumāralātā, author of the Kalpanāmaṅgadītikā Dṛṣṭāntapāṇikāthi, who lived in the 1st or 2nd century AD. His complete work has survived only in Chinese translation, aptly rendered into French by Édouard Huber. At that time it was wrongly attributed to Asvaghosa and its title was given as Sūtraḷāṁkāra, a wrong reconstruction from the Chinese. However, substantial portions of its original were found in Central Asia and later edited by Heinrich Lüders. The next author is Samghasena who wrote a brief Jātakamālā consisting of only eight legends. As in the case of Kumāralātā, the complete work exists only in Chinese translation, aptly rendered into German by Holger Hōke. Dieter Schlingloff, who has generously given his material to the present writer, identified some fragments of the work among the Turfan collections. The first fully fledged and fully preserved work of the campa genre is the famous Jātakamālā or Bodhisattvāvaṭādānāmalā composed by Āryaśūra (3rd or 4th century AD), on which cf. again Newsletter of the NGMCP No. 1. Āryaśūra’s immediate successor is Haribhaṭṭa (not later than 400 AD) who was followed by Gopadatta (6th or 7th century AD) a substantial part of whose work has been preserved in Nepal. In addition to these five known authors numerous early specimens of the genre have survived in anonymous works or manuscripts. Famous specimens are the legends of Viśvantara or Dhammaruci in the Vinayavastu of the Mulasārvasvātivādins.

The history of the genre and its development is yet to be written. Āryaśūra and Haribhaṭṭa represent its most mature form. Already earlier I have expressed my opinion that Āryaśūra introduced the elements of kāvyā into the Buddhist narrative literature while Haribhaṭṭa added to it the dramatic element. His legends are full of dramaturgical terms and in his plot construction he obviously follows the rules of the nātyasāstra. In this respect he goes far beyond his predecessor. The works of both authors deserve also being studied with a view to the development of prose writing of which we have only the later examples of Daṇḍin, Baṇa and Subandhu. As for the content of its 34 legends, they are a mixture of well known and lesser known stories. The only overlap with Āryaśūra is the Śāsajātaka, and in this particular case Haribhaṭṭa retells a different version. Haribhaṭṭa is experimenting not only with the form (plot-construction) but also with the length of the stories which is at much greater variance in comparison with Āryaśūra. The most striking case is his version of the Sudhana-Kīnari legend which is actually a love and adventure story with just a minor Buddhist varnish. Consisting of 243 stanzas plus prose passages, it is almost a novel. Haribhaṭṭa’s version has recently been compared with Kṣemendra’s version in Martin Stranbe’s book Prinz Sudhana und die Kinnari that was announced in Newslet-
Haribhaṭṭa’s work must have been extremely popular inside and outside India. This is witnessed by the fact that in the 11th century his work was still known to Kösmendra in Kashimir, which was, most likely, the home of Haribhaṭṭa. Fragments of his work were recently discovered in Afghanistan. They were written not later than in the 7th or 8th century. Already in the first half of the 5th century Chinese pilgrims heard Haribhaṭṭa’s version of the Prabhāśa legend in Central Asia and incorporated it in the *Sūtra of the Wise Man and the Fool*. Haribhaṭṭa’s *Kinnarīsudhanājātaka* (No. 25) is reflected in the Khotanese version of the legend, his *Rūpyāvatījātaka* (No. 6) in a fragmentary Tokharian version, and an abbreviated version of his *Simhājātaka* (No. 32) occurs in a bilingual manuscript in Sanskrit and Uigur.

Haribhaṭṭa’s Sanskrit is the clearest and most elegant that I have happened to read and it is my hope that many colleagues through the present publication will share my experience.

I would like to inform the readers of this communication that in the near future we will hopefully see an *editio maior* of Haribhaṭṭa’s *Jātakamālā* that has a different shape than originally envisaged. It will not be the one of Haribhaṭṭa’s home of Haribhaṭṭa. Fragments of his work were re-

at the end of this communication I would like to give a list of corrigenda to the *editio minor*. The majority of them was communicated to me by Peter Khorroche.

**Corrections for editio minor**


- p. 3, v. 4b nirvṛīḍatām → nirvṛīḍatām
- p. 3, v. 4d yuktāṃ → yuktān
- p. 4, v. 7c vipulāṃ → vipaṃ
- p. 4, v. 2d (trsl.) in unable → is unable
- p. 6, l. 18 ‘brī → ’brī
d and b) from the new manuscript:

1. Prabhāśa; 3. Dharmakāma; 7. Śreṣṭhin; 8. Padma-
ka; 23. Kanakavarman; 24. Mūlka; 26. Jāyvalin; 34. Śyenaka

This will give access to far more than 50 per cent of Haribhaṭṭa’s work. The fragmentary legends will be studied in separate papers along with their Tibetan translations.

At the end of this communication I would like to give a list of corrigenda to the *editio minor*. The majority of them was communicated to me by Peter Khorroche.
Some Highlights of the Work of a ‘Frequent User’ of the NGMPP (IV)

p. 113, v. 19.41b parisphuraddalḥ (prima manu) → parisphurattvacalḥ (secunda manu, in margine), against HJM: tib kun nas ’phros pa’i ’dab ma can

p. 115, v. 20.1+ rāja babhūva → rājā babhūva

p. 115, v. 20.2d salilāniva → salilāniva

p. 117, v. 20.11b ks.aranta → ks.arant

p. 117, v. 20.14b yāto → yāte

p. 117, v. 20.14c saṃbhṛṭakṣīraṇu → saṃbhṛṭakṣīrau

p. 118, v. 20.20+ atha ca candro → Delete ca?

p. 119, v. 20.26a tal lohitasya → tallohitasya

p. 120, v. 20.28c tadā’ subhadhvam. si, against HJM: mi dge ‘joms pa’i

p. 120, v. 20.29b viśvasaniyaṃ → viśvasaniyaṃ

p. 121, v. 20.35a vyālokayan → vyālokayan

p. 121, v. 20.51c payodharau → payodharā

p. 122, v. 20.51+ agnisatkāraṇu → agnisakāraṇa

p. 123, v. 20.52a māṃ putravṛkṣanu vrddhyai (thus Ms A, but unmetrical) → māṃ *putravṛkṣanu *saṃ- vrddhiyi [ma-vipulā, but saṃ-√vṛdh not attested in HJM]

p. 128, v. 22.15+ saratsalīn → saritsalīn

p. 131, v. 22.34+ rājovācā → rājovāca

p. 131, v. 22.36c cśān → teśān

p. 132, v. 22.38+ mahārājaḥ → mahārājaḥ

p. 135, v. 22.62+ neṣyāmuti → neṣyāmuti

p. 135, v. 22.62+ ahāṃ → ahāṃ

p. 136, v. 22.71a bhikṣunāsādītāṇu → bhikṣunā- sādītāṇu

p. 138, v. 32.19 dākulatām → akulatāṃ

p. 140, v. 32.24a sātā vyālambya (A) → saṭāṃ vyālambya (e.c.)

p. 143, v. 32.45+ śrūyatāṃ → śrūyatāṃ

p. 143, v. 32.46a dvīsādi → dvīsāti

p. 143, v. 32.46+ vīmucyatāṃ → vīmucyetām

p. 143, v. 32.46+ ātmanam → ātmanāṃ

p. 145, v. 32.60b jahāti | → jahāti |

p. 146, v. 32.69 arumudāḥ → arumudāḥ

p. 149, v. 32.94a kṣubhnāte → kṣubhnāte
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Two specimen pages from the editio maior, illustrating Haribhaṭṭa’s mature style of prose and verse