

Two Palm-leaf Fragments of the *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*¹

Péter-Dániel Szántó

1. Introduction

The *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*,² an anthology of exceptional verses by a host of Sanskrit poets, came to the attention of modern scholars in 1901, when an incomplete witness of the work was described by Haraprasād Śāstrī in his report of manuscripts seen and acquired between the years 1895–1900.³ In this short announcement, the text was ‘christened’ as **Kavivacanasamuccaya*. The manuscript was edited about a decade later by F. W. Thomas, who renamed it as **Kavīndravacanasamuccaya* based on the opening verse of the collection. At this time almost nothing was known about who compiled the anthology or even what its original title was. After Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana’s and Giuseppe Tucci’s now legendary trips to Tibet, a complete copy of the text was archived photographically at Ngor and a paper copy from Nepal emerged, too.⁴ Armed with this new evidence,⁵ D. D. Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale produced an admirable edition in 1957.⁶ Their introduction

¹ This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the Horizon 2020 program (Advanced Grant agreement No 741884). I thank Harunaga Isaacson and Jonathan Silk for their suggestions.

² This is the form most scholars refer to the collection and it is also the spelling found in the colophon of the Ngor codex, on which see below. Both *koṣa* and *koṣā* were acceptable forms for the authors of the period, see e.g. Puruṣottamadeva’s *Dvirūpakoṣa* 4a (Tripathi 1982).

³ Thomas 1912: 1. This manuscript is now with the Asiatic Society of Bengal (G 4746 = no. 5436 in Haraprasāda Shāstrī 1934: 350). I do not have access to it.

⁴ I do not have access to this witness; according to Gokhale & Kosambi (1957: xiv-xv), they deposited a copy at the Widener Library at Harvard.

⁵ The efforts to procure and read the manuscripts are detailed on pp. xiii-xv (and xx-xxi). Kosambi bitterly notes: “If it be judged from what follows that the labor of mountains has succeeded in giving birth only to mice, it will not have been for lack of impressive midwifery.”

⁶ I can add but one note to Gokhale’s expert examination of the Ngor codex. On p. xviii of the introduction he deciphers the Tibetan librarian’s mark as [...] *gsang ’dus rgyud phyi dang bcas pa brtsod rigs so* [...], which he interprets as “*Vādanyāya* accompanied by an alien *Guhyasamājatantra*”, adding that “the Sākya monk-librarian who wrote this note apparently regarded the *Guhyasamāja* as a non-Buddhist text.” This is of course incorrect. What the text is actually saying is “a [manuscript] of the *Guhyasamāja*[*tantra*] together with the *uttara*[*tantra*] (viz. the 18th chapter, which was originally an independent text added to the 17-chapter recension in the early 9th c.), [and] a [another manuscript of the] *Vādanyāya*”. Ngor did indeed hold two copies of the *Vādanyāya* in the original as also stated by Dge ’dun chos ’phel (see Jinpa & Lopez 2014: 49). Sāṅkrtyāyana’s photographs deposited in Patna remain

explains that the title was now known to be *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*, that its compiler was one Vidyākara, and that the work is available in two recensions. The compiler was dated on grounds of circumstantial evidence to the end of the 11th and beginning of the 12th c. and the editors advanced the hypothesis that he was a Buddhist scholar active in Jagaddala monastery.⁷ The work, in the words of L. Sternbach, is “[t]he first genuine Sanskrit *subhāṣita-saṁgraha*”⁸ In 1965, Daniel H. H. Ingalls published a richly annotated translation adding a great number of emendations to the 1957 edition. This work, especially Ingalls’ commentary, was justifiably described as ‘a veritable Bible for Sanskritists’.⁹ All these volumes are frequently read and discussed by lovers of Sanskrit poetry to this day.

In his short and damning criticism of F. W. Thomas, Kosambi writes: “In 203cd, he [viz. F. W. T.] accuses Bāṇa of three deliberate solecisms, to arrive at a text which would mean that deer pass glaring hot nights in caves. Indian summer nights are certainly hot, but not glaring, while deer don’t sleep in caves. The verse says that the enemies of the deer pass the glaring heat of the day in caves, which makes sense, as any hunter will confirm.” Not being a hunter myself, I cannot say whether Kosambi is right, but it certainly is the case that *manuscript hunters* will find the study of a particularly rich miscellanea of leaves known by the shelf-mark National Archives Kathmandu 5-7495 very rewarding.¹⁰ This bundle contains no less than 413 leaves in a bewildering variety of scripts, folio sizes, states of preservation, and content. One of the noteworthy treasures in this rich *pātāla* is a pair of hitherto unnoticed palm-leaf fragments of the *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* itself.

If the leaves preserved in this bundle are the remains of a single library, the possessor/s must have had eclectic interests and tastes. We find here fragments of poetry, drama, grammar, lexicography, tantric scripture and exegesis from a variety of traditions (both

notoriously inaccessible, but fortunately the Göttingen copies are available (see Bandurski 1994: 78, under Xc 14/41), whereas Tucci’s plates have become available due to the work of Francesco Sferra (for a list, see Sferra 2008b).

⁷ Sāṅkṛtyāyana’s earlier assertion that the compiler was one Bhīmārjunasoma was rightfully dismissed. He was an erstwhile owner of the manuscript.

⁸ Sternbach 1974: lxxx.

⁹ Browne 2001: 21.

¹⁰ I did not conduct a personal autopsy of the bundle but relied on the high-quality b/w photos of the microfilms of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project reel nos. A 932/8 & 933/1. I use the following abbreviations: [–] only one folio side on frame; [↑] folio side on top of frame; [↓] folio side on bottom of the frame; [r] recto side of folio; [v] verso side of folio; [*] foliation absent; [•] lacuna. [abcd] denote quarter-verses; this is occasionally followed by a number, which refers to the syllable in the *pāda*. Unless stated otherwise, the frames I refer to are from the second reel, i.e. A 933/1.

Buddhist and non-Buddhist), *purāṇa*, ritual manuals, medical texts, and more. To name but a few highlights of the collection, I could identify a hitherto unknown fragment of the *Paramārthasevā* of Puṇḍarīka,¹¹ an ancient (*ca.* 10th-century) fragment of the *Svacchandatantra* in its original Aiśa redaction, an unknown commentary of the *Vāmakeśvarīmata*, two single-folio fragments of Gopadatta's *Saptakumārikāvadāna*,¹² and others.

2. The first fragment

The present study will focus on a relatively long, 12-folio fragment of the *Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa*, while less attention is accorded to a second, 2-folio fragment, which is older but of lesser value. The particular importance of the first fragment lies in the fact that it bears witness to the existence of a third recension of the anthology. Whether this recension too was by Vidyākara, I cannot say. That this is a separate recension is shown not only by some variant readings, but also by a handful of additional verses and even an entirely new, albeit regrettably short, chapter. The three extra verses are added to the end of the section (*vrajjyā*) on Lokeśvara and only the last is attributed to Subhūticandra, whereas the new section boasting three verses is dedicated to the goddess Tārā; the first stanza is attributed to an otherwise unknown Śālarudra and the last, again, to Subhūticandra. Besides

¹¹ 172↓ & 173↑ = fol. 31 containing stanzas 282a–293c = D 1348, 16v6–17r7. For the hitherto available passages of this work, see Sferra & Luo 2016, Sferra 2007a, 2007b, 2008a. These verses fall into the section criticising other religions (Brahmins: 282–284, Vaiṣṇavas 285–287, Śaivas 288–290, Jains 291–293). Among the Śaivas, the Kālāmukhas and Pāśupatas are explicitly named in 290, whereas 289 describes Kāpālika observances. This folio has been forwarded to Francesco Sferra and will be incorporated in his and Luo's eagerly awaited forthcoming edition of this crucial text.

¹² 50↓ & 51↑ = fol. 4 containing stanzas 22–35, plus a part of the prose following; 8↓ & 9↑ = fol. 9 containing stanzas 78b–90b. For an edition, see Hahn 1992. Here are some of the more noteworthy variants compared to the aforementioned edition: **22d** *bhavabandhanakṣayāya*] Ed., *bhavabhogasamkṣayāya* Ms; **24b** *cittakaler*] Ed., *citrakaler* Ms; **24c** *sukhābhilāṣa*] Ed., *sukhābhimāna*° Ms; **25c** *pariṇāmāyata*] Ed. (unmetrical), *pariṇāmāyata*° Ms; **27c** *viṣayair*] Ed., *kaluṣair* Ms; **29b** *upayujyāni bhavāntarā*] Ed., *upayujyāny abhavāntarā*° Ms; **29c** *hīnadīnacittā*] Ed., *dīnadīnacittā* Ms; **33b** *priyabandho*] Ed., *priyabandhoḥ* Ms; **34a** *cāpariniṣṭhita*] Ed., *cāpariniṣṭhitaṃ* Ms; **35d** *āsvādayitum*] Ed., *āsādayitum* Ms; **prose after 35**: *jātasnehākṛāntahṛdayaḥ*] Ed., *jātasnehākṛṣyamāṇahṛdayo 'pi* Ms; **79c** *suṣṭhu*] Ed., *spaṣṭa*° Ms; **79d** *°paripākāṅgāra*] Ed., *°paripākodbhāra*° Ms; **79d** *°svabhāvah*] Ed., *°svabhāvāḥ* Ms; **80b** *°lolāi*] Ed., *°lolā* Ms; **81a** *durnayāviddha*] Ed., *dullayābaddhas* Ms; **81c** *kṛpaṇam abhisamīkṣya*] Ed., *kṛpaṇakam abhivīkṣya* Ms; **81c** *°ānuyātaṃ*] Ed., *°ānuyātaṃ* Ms; **81d** *prāptum*] Ed., *prāptaṃ* Ms; **83a** *°āśrayo*] Ed., *°āśrayān* Ms; **83b** *°śirā*] Ed., *°tanur* Ms; **83d** *°paramparāṃ ca*] Ed., *°paramparāṃś ca* Ms; **84a** *nirmaryādā*] Ed., *nirmaryādaṃ* Ms; **84c** *°dhṛti*] Ed., *°rati*° Ms; **85d** *trātā*] Ed., *trāṇaṃ* Ms; **86b** *°viṣṭabdha*] Ed., *°visrasta*° Ms; **86c** *°snāta*] Ed., *°klinna*° Ms; **86c** *°ādharaṅtān*] Ed., *°āsthalāntān* Ms; **87a** *vyāpnoti*] Ed., *prāpnoti* Ms; **87b** *°vibhāga*] Ed., *°vicārya*° Ms; **87c** *naiti*] Ed., *neti* Ms; **87c** *tamāla*] Ed., *tuṣāra*° Ms; **88a** *°āveśāi*] Ed., *°āvegāt* Ms; **88b** *narakam aśivaṃ*] Ed., *narakaphaladaṃ* Ms; **89a** *°locanaḥ*] Ed., *°locanāḥ* Ms; **89d** *naś chindhī*] Ed., *no bhinddhi* Ms

this feature, which adds to our knowledge of the text's history and transmission, there are also some variant readings worthy of consideration, although it must be said that on the whole the manuscript is not quite as good as that found by Sāṅkṛtyāyana and Tucci (i.e., ms. N).

Here follows a guide to the first fragment. First I list the frames in order and the folios they contain, then the folios and the frames they can be found on, and finally the folios in order with their content. I use the verse numbering of the edition followed by the *pāda* of the verse and the number of the syllable where the folio picks up or breaks off.

In order of frames: 30– = 7v, 31↑ = 7r, 31↓ = *3r, 32↑ = *3v, 32↓ = 42r, 33↑ = 42v, 33↓ = 18r, 34↑ = 18v, 34↓ = 11r, 35↑ = 11v, 35↓ = 12r, 36↑ = 12v, 36↓ = 13r, 37↑ = 13v, 37↓ = 19r, 38↑ = 19v, 38↓ = 16r, 39↑ = 16v, 39↓ = 17r, 40↑ = 17v, 53↓ = 10r, 54↑ = 10v, 55↓ = 4r, 56↑ = 4v

In order of folios: *3 = 31↓ & 32↑, 4 = 55↓ & 56↑ • 7 = 31↑ & 30– • 10 = 53↓ & 54↑, 11 = 34↓ & 35↑, 12 = 35↓ & 36↑, 13 = 36↓ & 37↑ • 16 = 38↓ & 39↑, 17 = 39↓ & 40↑, 18 = 33↓ & 34↑, 19 = 37↓ & 38↑ • 42 = 32↓ & 33↑

Content of the folios: *3 = 2.4(20)a13–3.2(26)b11 (including the 3 extra verses to Lokeśvara), 4 = 3.2(26)b12–4.3(32)b8 (including the 3 extra verses constituting the Tārā section) • 7 = 4.12(41)a13–4.21(50)7 • 10 = 4.38(67)a10–5.6(76)b8, 11 = 5.6(76)b9–5.14(84)d1, 12 = 5.14(84)d2–5.24(94)a4, 13 = 5.24(94)a5–5.32(102)c18 • 16 = 6.16(119)d6–6.25(128)c3, 17 = 6.25(128)c4–6.33(136)b10, 18 = 6.33(136)b11–6.41(144)b10, 19 = 6.41(144)b11–8.1(152)d3 • 42 = 15.32(365)d16–15.42(374)b3

The foliation is in the style seen on a mid-14th c. manuscript,¹³ and this is consistent with the primary scribal hand; it can therefore be surmised that the numbering is original. Curiously, folio no. 3 was not numerated. Occasionally parts of the writing surface were damaged; here, a later scribe tried to restore the readings by tracing anew the letters (I

¹³ Cf. Bendall 1883, plates titled Letter-numerals and Figure-numerals. The number 4 is given with a figure-numeral.

underlined these portions in the edition below¹⁴). There are a number of corrections, both *in situ* and on the margins and we occasionally find glosses in a later hand.

2.1 The new verses

Two of the newly found six verses are directly attributed to Subhūticandra (*ca.* 1060–1140). Our knowledge of this scholar, best known for his *Kavikāmadhenu* commentary (*ca.* 1110–1130) of the *Amarakoṣa*, has been advanced greatly by relatively recent work by van der Kuijp and Deokar.¹⁵ Unfortunately, the opening of this work is still not available in the original, but a glance at the Tibetan translation of the *Kavikāmadhenu* makes it clear that the second Tārā verse too is the work of Subhūticandra. He is otherwise completely absent in both hitherto known recensions of the *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*. It naturally follows that the present fragment is a witness of a third and later recension.

2.1.1 The additional verses in the Lokeśvara section after 2.8(24)

Kandarpo¹⁶ yadi puṣpamārgaṇadharaḥ kiṃ tena śauryātmanā
jītvā tam bata¹⁷ pauruṣam Śaśibhṛtā¹⁸ Gaurīpriyenārjitam |
kṣāntyā yena punar jīto Manaśijāḥ so 'pīśvaras tejasā
pāyād¹⁹ viśvam apāyato²⁰ bhagavatas tat²¹ Padmapāner vapuḥ ||

If Kandarpa (i.e., Kāma) bears a bow made of flowers, what of this courageous being? Heroism indeed did the Bearer of the Moon (i.e., Śiva), the beloved of Gaurī, acquire by having conquered him! But may the body of Lord Padmapāṇi protect the world from unfavourable rebirth, by whom *both* the Love-god and Śiva were overcome—one with forbearance, the other with valour!

¹⁴ In other words, this is what might be termed as palimpsestic correction. Because these readings are secondary, it naturally follows that the editor has a freer hand in emending.

¹⁵ Van der Kuijp 2009, Deokar 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2018. I have adduced the dates from Deokar 2018, presumably her latest take on the issue.

¹⁶ kandarpo] *em.*, kandarppā Ms

¹⁷ jītvā tam bata] *conj.* (Isaacson), tvābhagvatra Ms; hatvā ('having slain') for jītvā is equally possible.

¹⁸ śaśibhṛtā] *em.*, śīśibhṛtā Ms

¹⁹ pāyād] *em.*, yāyād Ms

²⁰ apāyato] *em.*, apāpato Ms

²¹ The *akṣara sta* was not inked again by the second hand but is just about visible.

This *maṅgala* verse contains such strong echoes of *Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa* 1.3(4) of Saṅghaśrī that one might say that it is in imitation of that verse. Kāma is made fun of for bearing a less-than-formidable weapon, whereas Śiva’s victory over him is of course an allusion to the famous ‘burning of the Love-god’ scene immortalised in Kālidāsa’s *Kumārasambhava*. This in our author’s view can hardly be interpreted as a great victory.

vasati patir ayam dharādharāṇām²²
 kuliśakarasya bhayāt payaḥpayodhau |
 iti parikalitaḥ suraiḥ saroja-
dhvajakiranesu jayej jatākalāpah ||

“It must be the lord of mountains who dwells in the milk-ocean fearing him who holds a thunderbolt in his hand (i.e., Indra)!” Thus did the gods fancy when they saw the massed dreadlocks against the backdrop of the radiance of the one marked with a lotus (i.e., Padmapāṇi)—may it be victorious!

The mountains once had wings, but Indra clipped them, and only Maināka escaped by finding refuge in the sea.²³ The gods mistakenly think that Padmapāṇi’s dark dreadlocks against his white aura (*prabhāmaṅḍala*) is the outline of the mountain in the ocean of milk.

haṃho siṃha kim āha pannagapatir bhrātas triśūlottama
 brūhi brūhi kṛpāna kiṃ sa vijitaḥ śastreṇa kena smaraha |²⁴
kenāsmatprabhunā²⁵ vayam²⁶ na caritā²⁷ vighne²⁸ munīnām iti
 śrutvaiṣāṃ vacanaṃ hasaṃs²⁹ trijagataḥ³⁰ stāt Siṃhanādo mude³¹ ||

paṇḍitaSubhūticandrasya ||

²² dharādharāṇām] *em.*, varādharāṇāṃ Ms

²³ Ingalls 1965: 337.

²⁴ The *daṇḍa* is omitted in the Ms.

²⁵ °prabhunā] *em.*, °prabhunī Ms

²⁶ vayam] *em.*, ca yan Ms

²⁷ caritā] *conj.*, caratam Ms

²⁸ vighne] *conj.*, vidyo Ms

²⁹ hasaṃs] *em.*, hasas Ms

³⁰ trijagataḥ] *em.*, trijagata Ms

³¹ mude] *em.*, mudā Ms

“Ho, lion!” “What did the lord of snakes say?” “Brother, supreme trident!”
“Speak! Speak, sword!” “Has the Love-god been overcome and by what weapon?”
“And for what reason were we not yielded (?) by our master against hindrances to
sages?” Having heard their words, may the laughing Simhanāda be for the triple
world’s joy!

(by Paṇḍita Subhūticandra)

The Avalokiteśvara iconographical variant described here is Simhanāda.³² He is in the
guise of an ascetic (*tapasvīn*) and his vehicle is a lion. Rested next to his left arm is a white
lotus topped with an upward-pointing flaming sword, while he is holding a skull-bowl (or a
chopped head³³ or a rosary³⁴) in left hand; his right arm is accompanied by an
upward-pointing trident encircled by a white snake. It is these iconographic elements that
are personified and made to speak in the first three *pādas*. Unfortunately, it is not entirely
clear who says what, and *pāda c* remains obscure; thus my translation is tentative.

2.1.2 The section on Tārā following the Mañjuḥosavrajyā

Tārāvrajyā³⁵ ||

pariṇataśikhikandharābhirāmā
marakataratnamayīva kalpavallī |
śamayatu phaṇibhīṣaṇān apāyān
phalatu samastasamīhitāni Tārā ||

Śālarudrasya ||

³² See e.g. Mañjukīrti’s description in Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen Xc
14/50, fol. 74v–5r; *Sādhanamālā* nos. 22, 25.

³³ As seen here: <http://www.livemuseumofmagadha.com/product/simhanada-lokesvara-mag-m-41-1/>

³⁴ As seen here: <https://www.wisdomlib.org/uploads/files/fig99-Simhanada.jpg>

³⁵ °vrajyā] *em.*, °vajyā Ms

May Tārā, the wish-fulfilling creeper as if made of emerald jewels, beautiful like the bent neck of a peacock, save you from lower rebirths which are terrifying like poisonous snakes and grant you all your wishes!

(by Śālarudra)

The Tārā iconographical variant described here is Khadiravanī/Khadiravaṇī,³⁶ more commonly known by her Tibetan moniker, Green Tārā. It is a common trope that snakes find both the peacock and certain jewels frightening. She is also compared to a creeper on account of her *tribhaṅga* posture, which is presumably why she is compared to the *bent* neck of a peacock and not just the neck. The word *pariṇata* could also be construed with *śikhi*, meaning ‘adult’, ‘mature’, as the plumage of peacocks becomes more spectacular as they advance in age. The poet Śālarudra is otherwise unknown and it is possible that the name is corrupt; among the alternatives that come to mind, *Śīlabhadra is perhaps the most plausible. While this is a perfectly good Buddhist name, such a person is not attested as a poet either.³⁷

kāruṇyakalpatarudārumayī bhavantah
sā Tāriṇī bhavamahārṇavadharmanaukā |
cetaḥprasādabharanirbharakenipāta-
pāteritā nayatu vāñchitapāratnam ||

May the Saviouress, a Dharma-ship on the great sea of transmigration, made of the wood of the wish-fulfilling tree of compassion powered by the incessant splashes of the [steering] oar³⁸ which is bearing the weight of (/counterbalanced by?) the grace of [her] mind, guide you to the desired jewel of the farther shore!

³⁶ See e.g. Mañjukīrti’s description in Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen Xc 14/50, fol. 7r

³⁷ See Sternbach 1980.

³⁸ Compare this image with a rather fine verse on the Vaidyadeva inscription (Venis 1894: 351, 355), which commemorates a naval battle against southern Vaṅga. Also cf. *Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa* 45.18(1559).

This verse too is by Subhūticandra, the third opening stanza in his *Kavikāmadhenu*. The canonical translation is somewhat more faithful to the original, although we have some slight differences between the two transmission lines. D 4300, 244v2–3 reads:

srid pa'i mtsho chen de las sgrol byed chos kyi gru |
snying rje'i dpag bsam ljon pa'i shing las grub gyur pa |
rab tu dang sems dad pa'i skya ba rab bskyod de |
pha rol phyin nas mngon 'dod rin chen thob par shog |

P 5788, 63v4–5 transmits:

srid pa'i rgya mtshor yum gyur sgrol ba'i dge gru ni |
snying rje'i dpag bsam ljon shing dag las grub gyur pa |
rab dang sems kyi dad pas skya ba rab bskyod nas |
pha rol phyin gyur mngon 'dod rin chen thob par shog |

Si tu paṅ chen's translation ('*Chi med mdzod kyi rgya cher 'grel pa 'dod 'jo'i ba mo*, TBRC/DBRC W26630, 1v4–5; Deokar 2014: 301) is as follows:

srid pa'i mtsho chen sgrol bar byed pa chos kyi gru |
snying rje'i dpag bsam ljon pa'i shing las grub khyod k'is |
rab dangs sems kyi tshogs chen skya bas rab bskul nas |
pha rol phyin te mngon 'dod rin chen thob par mdzod |

Curiously, the Tibetan translations (bar perhaps that preserved in P) almost completely mask the fact that the object of worship in this verse is Tārā. It is therefore perfectly understandable that Deokar's translation is as follows (2014: 93):

“May you reach the other shore and acquire the most desired jewel (of enlightenment) by the ship, the Dharma (teachings) carrying one across the great ocean of worldly existence, which has been accomplished from the Wish-Fulfilling Tree of compassion; being propelled by the great multitude of the oarsmen with a perfectly serene mind.”

Indeed, she already intuited the potential problems in the Tibetan in n. 1 on the same page: “What follows is an attempt at translating the Sanskrit behind the not always correct Tibetan rendering of S (1b-3b).”

kāruṇyavāribharitā sarasīva³⁹ nityaṃ
yā Tāriṇī bhavamarau tṛṣam ācchinatti |
śreyas tanotu tava tadvadanābjamadhyam
adhyāsitaś caṭulalocanakhañjarītaḥ ||

Subhūticandrasya ||

May the Saviouress, who, like a pond filled to the brim with the water of compassion, invariably puts an end to thirst in the desert of transmigration, in the midst of whose lotus-face dwell darting wagtail-eyes, bring you welfare!

(by Subhūticandra)

For the dance of the wagtail in autumn, see *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* 11.9(274). Tārā’s darting eyes are an allusion to the fact that, true to her name, she is always eagerly on the lookout to save beings. The verse could also be an allusion to three consecutive seasons: summer (dry desert), the rains (Tārā as a pond), and autumn. I was not able to trace the original source of this verse.

3. The second fragment

The second fragment found in NGMPP A 932/8 is of lesser value, but noteworthy nevertheless. It consists of two large (7 lines, except 117v which has 8) and consecutively numbered folios (117 and 118) to be found on frames 67↓ = 117r, 68↑ = 117v, 70↓ = 118r, 71↑ = 118v. The verses falling within the fragment are 40.30(1362)c6 to 41.14 (1394)15. The hand is Old Newar, the so-called hook-topped script. Judging by the palaeographical features, this fragment is the earlier one of the two. The chief virtue of this fragment is that it confirms several of Ingalls’ emendations, but it also provides a better reading in a few

³⁹ sarasīva] Ms^{pc}, sarīsīva Ms^{ac}

cases. It is hoped that an eventual new edition of Vidyākara's famous anthology will make good use of these two fragments.

Bibliography

Bandurski, Frank. 1994. "Übersicht über die Göttinger Sammlungen der von RĀHULA SĀṆKṚTYĀYANA in Tibet aufgefundenen buddhistischen Sanskrit-Texte (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, III)." Frank Bandurski, Bhikkhu Pāsādika, Michael Schmidt, Bangwei Wang (eds.), *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 9–126.

Bendall, Cecil. 1883. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. Reprint 1992, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Browne, Gerald M. 2001. "Textual Notes on Vidyākara's *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44: 21–24.

Deokar, Lata Mahesh. 2013. "Subhūticandra: A Forgotten Scholar of Magadha." *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 10: 137–154.

——— 2014a. "Subhūticandra's Kavikāmadhenu." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 95: 136–147. [published in 2018?]

——— 2014b. *Subhūticandra's Kavikāmadhenu on the Amarakośa 1.1.1–1.4.8 Together with Si tu Paṅ chen's Tibetan Translation*. Indica et Tibetica 55. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

——— 2017. "Subantaratnākara: An Unknown Text of Subhūticandra." Vincenzo Vergiani, Daniele Cuneo, Camillo Alession Formigatti (eds.), *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages. Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 655–693.

———. 2018. *Subhūticandra's Kavikāmadhenu on the Amarakośa 1.4.8cd–2.2.5ab. Together with Si tu Paṅ chen's Tibetan Translation*. Indica et Tibetica 56. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Hahn, Michael. 1992. *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta. Two Authors in Succession of Āryaśūra. On the Rediscovery of Parts of Their Jātakamālās*. Second edition, thoroughly revised and enlarged. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Haraprasāda Shāstrī, Mahāmahopādhyāya. 1934. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collections of The Asiatic Society of Bengal. Volume VII: Kāvya Manuscripts*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Ingalls, Daniel H[enry] H[olmes]. 1965. *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry. Vidyākara's "Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa"*. Harvard Oriental Series 44. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Jinpa, Thupten & Donald S. Lopez Jr. 2014. *Grains of Gold: Tales of a Cosmopolitan Traveler*. London/Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Kosambi, D[harmananda] D[amodar] & V[asudeva] V[ishwanath] Gokhale. 1957. *The Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa compiled by Vidyākara. Edited with an introduction by D. D. Kosambi*. Harvard Oriental Series 42. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Sferra, Francesco & Luo Hong. 2016. "Materials for the study of the *Paramārthasevā* by Puṇḍarīka." Horst Lasic & Li Xuezhong (eds.), *Sanskrit Manuscripts in China II. Proceedings of a panel at the 2012 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies, August 1 to 5*. Beijing: [add] 231–244.

Sferra, Francesco. 2007a. "Fragments of Puṇḍarīka's *Paramārthasevā*." Konrad Klaus & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Wien: Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66, 459–476.

——— 2007b. “Newly Discovered Stanzas of the *Paramārthasevā* by Puṇḍarīka.” *Newsletter of the NGMCP* 5: 6–9.

——— 2008a. “The Last Stanzas of the *Paramārthasevā*.” *Tantric Studies* 1: 209–214.

——— 2008b. “Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection.” Francesco Sferra (ed.), *Manuscripta Buddhica, Vol. I: Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection, Part I*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 15–78.

Sternbach, Ludwik. 1974. *Mahā-Subhāṣita-Saṅgraha being an extensive collection of wise sayings in Sanskrit critically edited with introduction, English translation, critical notes, etc.* Volume I. Vishveshvaranand Indological Series 64. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute.

——— 1980. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Poets quoted in Sanskrit Anthologies and Inscriptions*. Volume 2: Nakula - Hevidhanesora. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Thomas, F[rederick] W[illiam] 1912. *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya. A Sanskrit Anthology of Verses edited with introduction and notes*. Bibliotheca Indica New Series, No. 1309. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Tripathi, Brahmananda. 1982. *Śrīmadamarasiṃhaviracitaṃ nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam amarakoṣaḥ anekārthadhvanimañjarīdvirūpakōṣaikākṣarakōṣaiśca samupabṛṃhitaḥ ratnaprabhā"khyasaṃskṛtavākhyayā hindītippanyādibhiś ca vibhūṣitaḥ*. Vārāṇasī: Śrījī mudraṅālaya.

van der Kuijp, Leonard. 2009. “On the Vicissitudes of Subhūticandra's Kāmadhenu Commentary on the Amarakoṣa in Tibet.” *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 5: 1–105.

Venis, Arthur. 1894. “Copper-plate grant of Vaidyadeva, King of Kāmarūpa.” *Epigraphia Indica* 2: 347–358.

Abstract

This short paper identifies and discusses two hitherto unnoticed Nepalese fragments of the *Subhāṣitaratnaḷoṣa* of Vidyākara, an early anthology of outstanding verses. I argue that the first fragment is a witness to a third recension of the text. This version transmits some extra verses, among which those of Subhūticandra play a central role. I edit, translate, and briefly discuss these new stanzas.

Keywords

Buddhist literature, Nepalese manuscripts, kāvya, Sanskrit, Subhāṣitaratnaḷoṣa, Subhūticandra.