

Vincenzo Vergiani

A Tentative History of the Sanskrit Grammatical Traditions in Nepal through the Manuscript Collections

Abstract: Despite the recognised centrality of grammar in South Asian intellectual history, much of the existing scholarship on the history of the various grammatical traditions consists of lists of names, works and relative, approximate chronologies. Little is known of how their fortunes related to the socio-political changes that affected a given region in the course of time, and even less about the social history of grammar. This article is an attempt at reconstructing the history of the three main schools of Sanskrit grammar – Pāṇiniya, Cāndra and Kātantra – in medieval Nepal through the survey of the grammatical works listed in the catalogues of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (NGMCP) and the small but important Cambridge collections. The study of the colophons (where available), as well as the assessment of other indicators of age and provenance such as the material (palm leaf/paper) and the script, can throw light on the social and cultural conditions that made the various systems flourish or decline at different times.

1 Introduction

In this article I will present a preliminary attempt to flesh out the history of grammatical traditions in medieval (and to a lesser extent early modern) Nepal on the basis of the data one can glean from the catalogues of the manuscript collections.¹

I wish to thank my former project collaborator Camillo A. Formigatti, who first gave me the idea of developing the type of methodological approach implemented here, and Daniele Cuneo and Victor D'Avella, who read and commented on an earlier draft of this article. I am also grateful to Dominic Goodall for his invaluable help with the interpretation and translation of the scribal colophons, and Alessandra Petrocchi for the information about the astronomical details of the dates. I alone am responsible for all remaining faults.

1 Here I will mostly rely on the Descriptive Catalogue (wiki) of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (http://134.100.29.17/wiki/Main_Page) and the Sanskrit Manuscripts catalogue in the Cambridge Digital Library (<http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/sanskrit>).

It is generally taken for granted, and for reasons that are self-evident to any Indologist, that grammar played a central role in the literary cultures of pre-modern South Asia, and it is well-known that this holds true for the dominant pan-Indian Sanskrit culture as much as for many of the regional vernacular traditions, and for Pāli, the language medium of Theravāda Buddhism. The Pāṇinian system was the first to achieve a mature textual form already a few centuries before the Common Era and to spawn a rich speculative and commentarial tradition, and to this day it has remained the most influential school in the intellectual history of South Asia. However, from the first centuries of the Common Era other systems of Sanskrit grammar were born, which mostly modelled themselves to varying extents after the Pāṇinian system. Some of these (just to mention the most ancient), such as the Kātantra, were apparently stimulated by the need for a more pragmatic, teaching-oriented approach, others, such as the Cāndravyākaraṇa and the Jainendravākaraṇa, originated within particular religious groups (the Buddhists and the Jains, respectively), even though, as far as we can tell, Pāṇinian grammar had from the start been non-sectarian and counts some Buddhists among its exponents. The historical development of each of these systems has on the whole been sketched out, even though the modern Indological scholarship, especially in recent decades, has mostly focused on the Pāṇinian tradition. We know the names and the relative chronology of the main authors, and the titles and contents of dozens of works produced in medieval times. However, despite the consensus on the centrality of the linguistic speculation in the Indic intellectual universe, so far there has been little research and reflection on how the fortunes of the various grammatical traditions relate to the bigger historical picture, the socio-political changes that affected this or that region of South Asia in the course of more than two millennia. Similarly, very little is known about the social history of grammar in South Asia: how it was produced, practised, taught and transmitted; who were the scholars who engaged in this discipline, who were their patrons, and what were the institutional contexts – formal and/or informal – in which they operated; and, most relevant to the topic of this volume, how their works were composed, circulated, preserved and handed down in book format, namely, in what ways the specific features of the South Asian manuscript culture at different times and in various places across the subcontinent and beyond affected and reflected the history of the various grammatical traditions.

The notorious almost complete lack of an indigenous historiographical tradition, as well as the scarcity of diaries, letters, autobiographies, and other first-hand

For a similar approach, in which catalogues of Sanskrit manuscripts are used as sources for the intellectual history of South Asia, cf. Zysk 2012.

accounts of daily life in pre-modern South Asia undoubtedly make this a daunting task, especially for the earliest period roughly up to the end of the first millennium CE. And it would be futile, I believe, to attempt to engage in this kind of historiographical enterprise on a large scale, namely embracing the whole temporal arc of the Sanskrit civilisation across the entire region, as this would inevitably lead at best to sweeping generalisations and platitudes. One should rather direct the attention to particular places and times, and collect the relevant data to build up a credible picture of the vicissitudes of grammatical studies in a given historical and geographical context. This entails the careful perusal of literary and epigraphic sources, which can shed light on the practices and movements of the people who engaged in grammar, the foundation and endowment of educational institutions, the circulation of books, and so forth. Gradually, through the accumulation of such case studies, we will eventually get a clearer historical picture of grammar in pre-modern South Asia.

2 Nepal as a case study

The idea to investigate this aspect of ancient Nepalese literary culture was born during the Sanskrit Manuscripts Project at the Cambridge University Library. The Nepalese holdings there contain a fair number of grammatical works, as can be expected in any generalist South Asian manuscript collection, and some of them are remarkably old and rare. Moreover, the requirements of cataloguing drew my attention to the colophons, which often provide a fascinating and rare insight into the circumstances that led to the copy of a work. As Eva Wilden writes in her contribution to this volume, this kind of paratext is a threshold that allows us to enter the text and at the same time to go out ‘into the community and culture that produced the manuscript... our only way back into that world’ (see Wilden, below, p. 164). In other words, colophons (and other similar paratexts: introductory verses, marginal annotations, etc.) give us access – especially rare for pre-modern South Asia – to a first-hand account of the social dynamics surrounding the production and transmission of knowledge.

In many ways Nepal offers a unique opportunity for such a case study. It has often been remarked that its temperate climate has allowed the preservation of manuscripts for much longer than in any other region of South Asia, with the earliest exemplars going back to the second half of the first millennium CE, so that one can form a relatively accurate idea of the works that were read and copied in

the country at a certain time starting from a quite early age.² Moreover, the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (henceforth, NGMCP) has produced a large and easily accessible database of the manuscripts microfilmed by its predecessor, the Nepalese-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP), which between 1970 and 2001 reproduced virtually all the manuscripts (around 190,000) held in Nepalese collections.

Therefore, it should be possible to retrace the history of grammatical traditions in Nepal by looking at the texts that are preserved in the collections, the number of extant witnesses for a given tradition in general and for specific texts, and their distribution over the span of several centuries – from the central middle ages to the early modern period. And possibly, through the study of colophons, it should also be possible to relate it to political and social events or specific centres of learning (monasteries, temple schools, *pāṭhaśālās*, courtly circles), or even to the role played by particular individuals (authors, sponsors, scribes) in the cultural dynamics of a certain period. Even if we allow for the losses that must have certainly occurred over time, as is inevitable, the abundance of materials in the existing manuscript collections should make the survey sufficiently reliable from a statistical point of view and allow a coherent historical picture to emerge from their analysis, as I hope I will be able to show here.

In this article I apply the method briefly outlined above to provide what is a still provisional, bird's-eye view of the history of grammatical traditions in Nepal. To get an accurate picture, a more in-depth study will be required, based on the direct inspection of the relevant manuscripts, as well as of other potentially available sources.³ Given the centrality of grammar in pre-modern South Asia, such a survey will certainly prove relevant to the intellectual and social history not only of Nepal, but of the whole subcontinent and beyond.⁴

² Regmi (1960, 1965) and Petech (1984) have put manuscript colophons to good use (along with more common sources such as inscriptions and chronicles) in their historiographical works on early to late medieval Nepal.

³ I have not managed to have access to the colophons of all the manuscripts that should have been included into my survey. All extant Nepalese manuscripts are listed in the NGMCP online catalogue, but some only have minimal entries with no excerpts.

Note that here, when I mention a manuscript kept in a Nepalese collection, I refer to it with its library classmark (whenever available), followed by the number of the reel in which it has been reproduced by the NGMPP between brackets, because in the NGMCP catalogue the manuscripts are listed under the reel number. Cambridge manuscripts are named by their shelf-marks, starting with either Add. or Or.

⁴ See e.g. some recent works by Mahesh Deokar (2008) and Dragomir Dimitrov (2016), which throw light on some important but until now virtually unknown works in the Cāndra tradition, and their influence on the Pāli grammatical tradition of Sri Lanka. For a recent, brilliant example

3 General features of Nepalese grammatical manuscripts

Some of the considerations in this paragraph may apply not just to grammatical manuscripts, but to all Nepalese manuscripts. First of all, I should clarify that here by ‘Nepalese manuscripts’ I intend not only the manuscripts that were copied in Nepal, but also those written elsewhere but kept there in pre-modern times⁵ after being imported into the country at some point in its history, presumably because there was a demand for that particular work or class of works.

Regarding the manuscripts copied locally, the place of production of the copy is sometimes explicitly stated in the colophon and/or, more frequently, the year is given in the Nepāla Era. But even when the colophon is not available, the particular variety of north-Indian script⁶ used in the country has distinctive features that are a reliable indicator of the provenance. The other most common script found in the manuscripts taken into consideration here is Maithili, which was used in the region of Mithilā (present-day Tirhut in north Bihar) that lies immediately to the south of the Kathmandu Valley and in ancient times provided the only relatively easy access to the latter. The large number of manuscripts in this script found in Nepalese collections testifies to the historic links between these two regions throughout the Middle Ages, with phases of intensified exchange due to the social and political circumstances of either region.

When the colophon is not available or does not contain a date, the manuscript can be tentatively dated not only on palaeographic grounds, but also on the basis of the material. While in the earliest period palm leaf alone was used, starting from the 15th century paper gradually became more and more common,⁷ therefore its use can be taken as a quite reliable pointer to the relative lateness of the copy. On the other hand, one should keep in mind that palm leaf remained in use for a rather long time after the use of paper became widespread. For example, among the manuscripts I have taken into consideration there are palm-leaf copies

of the kind of historiography of grammar I have in mind, see also Alastair Gornall’s unpublished PhD thesis (2013), which also deals with the Pāli grammatical tradition of Sri Lanka; and outside South Asia, for the influence of Sanskrit grammar in Tibet, see Verhagen (1994, 2001).

⁵ Starting with the colonial period, many Nepalese manuscripts have been acquired by Western libraries, including the University Library in Cambridge.

⁶ This script has been variously called in the secondary literature: Newari is the term used in the NGMCP catalogue. In the online catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts Project we have opted for the descriptive term Nepālākṣara, which I use also in this article.

⁷ On the production and availability of paper in late medieval Nepal see Formigatti 2016, 64.

of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Siddhāntakaumudī* dating to the second half of the 17th century.⁸ Therefore, one cannot assume that a given manuscript is old, namely pre-15th century, simply because it is made of palm leaf. Nevertheless, for the bulk of the collections the palm leaf/paper divide does indeed roughly distinguish the older manuscripts from younger ones. Thus, under the subject heading *vyākaraṇa* the NGMCP website lists over 2300 manuscripts,⁹ but only 143 of them are made of palm leaf and therefore can be assumed, in principle, to go back to earlier times. It is mostly on this latter older set that I direct my attention in this article.

Keeping these considerations in mind, I will now proceed to present the data I have collected about Nepalese grammatical manuscripts, devoting one section each to the three main traditions found in the region – the Cāndra, the Kātantra and the Pāṇiniya¹⁰ – and one more paragraph to miscellaneous works.

4 The Cāndra school

The Cāndra school of grammar,¹¹ established by the Buddhist Candragomin (c. 4th century CE) with his *Cāndravvyākaraṇa*,¹² a sūtra work in six chapters, is represented by a fairly large number of manuscripts in the earliest period, more than any other grammatical system.

Under the title *Cāndravvyākaraṇa* the NGMCP catalogue title list¹³ enumerates 36 items, 33 of which are palm-leaf manuscripts (26 of them in Nepālākṣara

8 The former is National Archives of Kathmandu (henceforth NAK) 1/468 (A 1162/12), dated Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat (LS) 541, corresponding to 1661 CE; the latter is NAK 4/40 (B 35/6), dated LS 532 = 1652 CE. Both are mentioned below, § 5.

9 All the figures given in this article need to be taken with a pinch of salt because the lists on the NGMCP web pages are not entirely consistent as they are based on the microfilm reels prepared by the NGMPP. However, occasionally the same manuscript has been microfilmed twice (or more) under different reel numbers, and therefore it is listed twice. Moreover, the pioneering work carried out by the two projects on tens of thousands of manuscripts has inevitably been uneven in terms of accuracy, so some works have been wrongly identified and many texts contained in multi-part bundles have been missed altogether.

10 The data concerning these traditions are summarised in three tables appended to the article.

11 On the Cāndra system, see Scharfe 1977, 162 ff.; Saini 1999, 45–50. Oberlies (2012) contains a survey of the unpublished works of this school.

12 First published in Liebich 1902, 1–139, without Dharmadāsa's *Vṛtti*; again in Chatterji 1953, with the *Vṛtti*.

13 <http://mycms-vs04.rz.uni-hamburg.de/sfb950/>, last accessed 18/12/2016.

script). However, the search for *Cāndravyākaraṇa* in the NGMCP descriptive catalogue¹⁴ returns 65 results (many of them duplicates), among which one finds more than a dozen palm-leaf manuscripts that are not included in the previous list. Moreover, the name *Cāndravyākaraṇa* seems to have been used in the NGMCP catalogue as a blanket term to refer generically to works belonging to the Cāndra tradition because the corresponding records often show that in fact the manuscripts contain other works than the Cāndra *sūtrapāṭha*¹⁵ (including the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* of Ratnamati, the *Śabdalaṅkāraṇavivaraṇapañjikā* of Pūrṇacandra, the *Sumatipañjikā* of Sumati, etc., for all of which see below).

Among the manuscripts not included in the title list, two – NAK 4/26 (A 53/1) and NAK 1/1692 (A 53/3), containing the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* (*sūtrapāṭha*) and Dharmadāsa's *Vṛtti*, respectively – are said to be in 'Transitional Gupta' script, and thus they are presumably very old, possibly from the first millennium CE.¹⁶ Another set of three – NAK 4/311 (A 38/4 1, 2, 3), the first containing the *Śabdalaṅkāraṇavivaraṇapañjikā*, the other two the complex *sūtrapāṭha* plus *Vṛtti* – are part of the same bundle, in which one colophon, now apparently lost, bore the date *samvat* 2005, probably to be understood as Nepāla Samvat (henceforth, NS) 205 (= 1085 CE).¹⁷ Clearly, these fragments need to be carefully inspected and dated as precisely as possible on palaeographic grounds.

Of the remaining palm-leaf manuscripts, 15 are said to contain the *sūtrapāṭha* with the *Vṛtti*, while five contain the *sūtras* alone, and in the remaining four the exact content is unspecified. Similarly, in the collections of the Cambridge University Library there are 14 palm-leaf manuscripts of Cāndra works: six are copies of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, three of them with the *sūtrapāṭha* alone, the other three including the *Vṛtti*. Throughout the medieval period one finds manuscripts in which the *sūtrapāṭha* is transmitted either with or without Dharmadāsa's *Vṛtti*, which suggests that the two works were not regarded as a single inseparable complex. It is worth recalling that the name of Dharmadāsa, an author of whom nothing else is known, has been handed down in the colophons or internal rubrics of

¹⁴ http://134.100.29.17/wiki/Main_Page, last accessed 18/12/2016.

¹⁵ Not all of these are even affiliated to the Cāndra system. For instance, one manuscript, NAK 1/1697 (A 51/15), contains an unpublished Pāṇinian work, possibly called *Sambandhaprakaraṇa* (see below).

¹⁶ Unfortunately, I did not have access to the images of the microfilms of these ancient manuscripts.

¹⁷ The catalogue entry for A 38/4 (1) remarks that 'it is not uncommon that scribes write "1001" instead of "101" (or likewise "2005" instead of "205")', and '(t)hese figures, then, must be interpreted as "100 + 1" and "200 + 5" respectively'. It also notes that the year 1085 CE looks like a 'reasonable time for the copying of this MS'.

(at least) four Nepalese manuscripts¹⁸ of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* – an important piece of evidence in the debate on the authorship of the *Vṛtti*, which for a long time has been considered the work of Candragomin himself by some scholars.¹⁹

Besides the (probably older) manuscripts mentioned above, the earliest dated manuscripts are from the 12th century. One is a *Cāndravyākaraṇavṛtti* manuscript from NS 254 (= 1134 CE), written during the reign of Indradeva.²⁰ The other is NAK 3/379 (A 53/2; also A 1279/8), a copy of *Cāndravyākaraṇa* dated NS 276 (= 1155 CE²¹), during the reign of Ānandadeva (1147–1167 CE), whose colophon reads²²:

samvat 276 prathamapauṣakṛṣṇadivā caturthyaṃ śrīānandadevasya vijayarāje likhitam idam pustakaṃ || || yaṃṭākudumbajakulaputraśrīmanahaṛṣavarmasya pustako 'yaṃ ||

This book has been copied in the year 276, on the fourth [lunar day] of the dark fortnight of the first [intercalary] month of Pauṣa, during the victorious reign of Ānandadeva.²³ This book belongs to Manahaṛṣavarma, the scion of the northern²⁴ family.

Both these kings, whose mutual relationship is uncertain, belong to the so-called Transitional Period.²⁵ Judging from the way his name is mentioned, the owner of the latter manuscript, Manahaṛṣavarman, may have been a layman, possibly an aristocrat from an illustrious family. Further below one finds some lines by a later

18 NAK 1/1558 (A 52/14), NAK 5/736 (A 54/7, B 173/21), NAK 1/1608 (B 35/13), and NAK 1/1697 (B 35/20).

19 On Dharmadāsa's authorship of the *Vṛtti*, see Dash (1986, 8–21) and Oberlies (1989, 2 ff.; 1992, 162 ff.); for a survey of the controversy, and further proof of Dharmadāsa's authorship, see Vergiani 2011.

20 Sāṅkṛtyāyana (1937, 43) records it among the holdings of a Tibetan monastery. Petech (1984, 57) quotes it among the documents of king Indradeva (c. 1126–1136) and reports the colophon as follows: *samvat 200-50-4 caitra-śukla-saptamyāṃ śrīmat rājādhirāja-parameśvara-paramahatṭāraka-paramaśaiva indradevasya śrī-indradevasya vijayarāje likhitam idam*.

21 Petech (1984, 62) writes that the date is verified for 14 December 1155.

22 For manuscripts other than those held in Cambridge, I rely on the transcripts found in the NGMCP catalogue entries (with minor adjustments), unless otherwise stated.

23 Throughout this article, when a proper name in a colophon is preceded by the single honorific *śrī* I will leave it untranslated.

24 *yaṃṭā* is a Newari word meaning 'northern' (see Malla 2000, s.v.). The confusion between dental and retroflex consonants is not unusual in the transcription of Newari names.

25 The history of the Kathmandu Valley until the early modern period is usually divided for convenience into five political ages (see Slusser 1982, 18): the Licchavis (c. 300 to 879 CE); the Transitional Period (c. 879–1200); the Early Malla (1200 to 1382); the Late Malla (1382 to 1769); and the Shah (from 1769). For the purposes of this article, the earliest available documents go back to the Transitional Period.

hand, among which the following passage that mentions the purchase of the manuscript in NS 473 (= 1353 CE) by a certain Buddharakṣita:

samvat 473 pauṣasūklapūrṇamāyā [!] *cālisadammena kṛitaṃ śrībuddharakṣitena* ○
*atyamtabhaktiyuktena vyākaraṇaṃ sākhiḍṛṣṭa*²⁶ *saṃcamaṃveje bhāsa*²⁷ *śubhaḥ* ||

Bought in the year 473 on the day of full moon of the bright fortnight of [the month of] Pauṣa, for [the price of] 40 *dammās*²⁸ by Buddharakṣita who has extraordinary devotion, [this] grammar is a bright light appearing like a friend ... [*saṃcamaṃveje*²⁹?].

It is impossible to determine what prompted Buddharakṣita's purchase of this manuscript for what appears to be a considerable sum two centuries after its production – whether it was for study reasons or as a gesture of devotion³⁰ (the wording of the passage does not clearly point to a scholarly interest, as might be expressed through a common phrase such as *svapāṭhārtham*). But the existence of several copies of Cāndra works produced in the three centuries after this manuscript was copied shows that at the time of the purchase there was a lively interest in the Cāndra grammatical tradition.

Confining ourselves to copies of the *sūtrapāṭha* (with or without *Vṛtti*), the next dated manuscript is NAK 5/729 (B 35/24), dated NS 345 (= 1225 CE), which contains the *sūtrapāṭha* with the *Vṛtti*. Its short colophon is followed by a partially corrupt quotation of verse 60 from the *Saptakumārikāvadāna* of Gopadatta's *Jātakamālā*³¹:

samvatsa[re] 345 *kārttikaśuddhi 5 ādityavāsare* *likhitim* [!] *idaṃ pustako yaṃ śubhaḥ* || * *yaḥ satvānām avi*|| * || *ratasaṅkleśanāśārthaśāntaḥ santaptānām adhi-*
*gatayathābhūta[dha]rmādhirājaḥ | hlāda*³² [!] *cakre prakṛtīśīśirai*³³ [!] *dharmavāgambukumbhaiḥ śāstre tasmai paramabhiṣaje sarvakālaṃ namo stu* ||³⁴ (fol. 62v6–8)

26 Possibly emend to *sākhiḍṛṣṭaḥ*.

27 Possibly emend to read *bhāsaḥ*.

28 The term *damma* – from the Greek *drachmē* – is the name of a coin used in medieval Nepal, also called *karṣa*. Four *karṣas* were equivalent to one *pala* (see Kölver and Shakya 1985, 85).

29 Possibly a toponym.

30 Or perhaps as a collectible? We do not know if there were collectors of 'rare' books in the pre-modern Indic world, but there is no reason to assume there were not.

31 I am grateful to Dominic Goodall for pointing this out to me.

32 Emend to *hlādaṃ*.

33 Emend to *prakṛtīśīśirair*.

34 The verse in the edition by Michael Hahn (1992, 58–72) reads: *yaḥ sattvānām aviratarasakleśanāḍivraṇāntaḥ saṃtaptānām adhi-gatayathābhūtadharmādhirājaḥ | hlādaṃ cakre prakṛtīśīśirair dharmavāgambukumbhaiḥ śāstre tasmai paramabhiṣaje sarvakāle namo 'stu*. I am grateful to Mahesh Deokar for his comments on the interpretation of this verse.

This brilliant book has been copied in the year 345 on Sunday the fifth day of the bright fortnight of [the month of] Kārttika [= October/November]. May there be reverence in all times for that teacher (*śāstre*), the supreme physician, who is the destroyer of ulcers and sores in the form of the defilements [caused] by the incessant enjoyment [of the sense objects], the great king of the acquired real *dharma*, who pleased the scorched beings with naturally cool jugfuls of the water [that is] the words of *dharma*.

This colophon provides no information besides the date of completion of the copy, but the following verse unmistakably shows that the scribe was active in a Buddhist milieu.

The colophons of the next two dated manuscripts of *Cāndravyākaraṇa* (both without the *Vṛtti*), namely NAK 1/1583 (A 52/1), dated NS 377 (= 1257 CE),³⁵ and NAK 5/724 (B 34/15), dated NS 379 (= 1259 CE),³⁶ just give the year of copy without making any mention of the ruling king or the scribe. It may not be a coincidence that they were produced during or soon after the short and troubled reign of Jayadeva, the last of the so-called Early Mallas (see Petech 1984, 89 ff.).

Approximately one century younger is a copy of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* kept in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, no. 3823, dated NS 476 (= 1356 CE),³⁷ prepared by (or possibly for) the *vajrācārya*³⁸ Kṣemendra in a *vihāra* in Patan. To the end of the same century should tentatively³⁹ be assigned NAK 5/727 (A 53/8), a palm-leaf

35 The colophon (fol. 33r5) reads: *śreyo 'stu samvat 377 kārttikakṣṇacaturthasyām* [!] || *maṅgal-avāśare* || 'May there be bliss. Tuesday, the fourth [day] of the dark fortnight of [the month of] Kārttika, in the year 377'.

36 The partially legible colophon (fol. 40r7) reads: *samvat 379 poṣaśu*{di.. ..} *bda* 'The bright fortnight of [the month of] Pauṣa, in the year 379'. As noted in the NGMCP catalogue entry, the exact date of this manuscript is uncertain because the colophon is written in a different hand from the rest.

37 The colophon reads: *samvat 476 phālgunaśukladaśamyām śukravāsare ādrānakṣatre | rājādhirājaparameśvaraparamabhāṭṭārakaśrīśrījayarājadevavijayarājye | ... śrīyokhācchavihāravajrācāryaśrīkṣemendrasya likhitam* (quoted in Petech 1984, 123, among the four documents of the reign of king Jayarājadeva).

38 The term *vajrācārya* designates a Buddhist tantric priest, but as Slusser (1982, 287–288) points out, from the 12th century onward, as the *vihāras* became increasingly secularised, it gradually evolved into a caste and family name, conferred by heredity: 'Even *vajrācāryas* who no longer chose to function as priests automatically belonged to a religious aristocracy if they confirmed their status by the observance of proper initiation rites. Literally, they became "Buddhist Brahmins".'

39 The NGMCP catalogue entry reports that the colophon with the date is probably a later addition, which 'seems to be not very reliable'. Indeed the colophon, which includes some Newari words (here in bold), seems to confuse the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* with the *Kālāpavyākaraṇa*, i.e. the *Kātantra*: *samvat 517 kārtikṣṇadasamyāyā titho vṛsapavāre śrīrathahemavyākraṇa seṇā juroḥ kalāpavyākṛnasūtraḥ* [!] || (fol. 25r).

manuscript of the *Cāndravyākaraṇavṛtti*, dated NS 517 (= 1397). In the early 15th century we find two more dated palm-leaf manuscripts of the Cāndra *sūtrapāṭha* without commentary, both in Nepālākṣara. The first is NAK 5/730 (B 34/25),⁴⁰ dated NS 531 (= 1411 CE), bearing the following colophon that gives the scribe's name, Manikarāja⁴¹:

*samvat 531 phālguaśuklacaturddaśyām bṛspa○tivāsare*⁴² [!] || *śrīśrijayajotimalladevasya* [sic!] *vijayarāje* [!] || *likhitim* [!] *iti manikarājena śubham astu* || (fol. 112v2–4)

[This book] has been written by Manikarāja in the year 531, on Thursday the fourteenth [lunar day] of the bright fortnight of [the month] Phālgua [February–March] during the victorious reign of the glorious king Jayajotirmalla. May there be bliss.

The second manuscript, Add.1691.4,⁴³ held in the Cambridge University Library, was copied just one year later, in 1412. The colophon on fol. 44r gives the date with some unusual astronomical details:

samvat 532 āśāḍhakṛṣṇa | *ekadaśyām tithau* | *kṛttika(!) ghaṭi 20 rohiṇinakṣatre* || *gaṇḍaghaṭi 9 vṛddhiyoge* | *somavāsare* | *likhitam idaṃ* ||

This [book] has been written in the year 532, on Monday the eleventh lunar day of the dark fortnight of [the month of] Āśāḍha [June–July], when there are 20 *ghaṭis*⁴⁴ [left] in the lunar mansion Kṛttikā before the asterism Rohiṇi, [and] there are nine *ghaṭis* [left] in [the *yoga*] Gaṇḍa before [the *yoga*] Vṛddhi.⁴⁵

Next comes NAK 5/731 (A 52/3), a manuscript of *Cāndravyākaraṇa* dated NS 561 (= 1441 CE), which is part of a bundle that also contains a copy of the Cāndra *Uṇādisūtra*⁴⁶ by the same hand. The colophon gives the name of the scribe and owner of the manuscript, a certain Abhayarāja, who declares to have copied the work in order to teach his son Akṣayarāja and other pupils:

⁴⁰ This manuscript is not listed in Petech 1984.

⁴¹ The same name appears in a colophon of an almost contemporary copy of the *Subantarānākara* (see below, p. 97).

⁴² Emend to *bṛhaspativāsare*.

⁴³ <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01691-00004/1>.

⁴⁴ A measure of time, consisting of 24 minutes.

⁴⁵ I am not entirely sure about the translation of the final part of the colophon that mentions *ghaṭis*. One would expect the scribe to refer to the 'hours' that have lapsed rather than those that are left, but then there would be no need to mention Rohiṇi, which is the lunar mansion following Kṛttikā, or Vṛddhi, which is the next *yoga* after Gaṇḍa.

⁴⁶ Published in Liebich 1902, 140–171.

kṛtir iyan tribhūmiśvarabodhisatvaśricandragomipādānām [...] || naipālābdagate mṛgāṅkarasayucchrīpañcabāṇayudhe⁴⁷ māse kṣṇaśucāu divākaratithau ṛṣyeva⁴⁸ puṣṇābhidhe⁴⁹ | śaṣṭhā'dhyāyasasūtrakam [!] likhitikam⁵⁰ [!] śubhrāṁśuvāre śubhe tasmād dharṣasutena niṣṭhīmanasā⁵¹ [!] putrārthahetos tv alam || nāmnā abhayarājena cāndrasūtram akhaṇḍitam | putrāyākṣayarājāya śiṣyārthena [[ca]] liOkhyate || (fol. 45r4–45v2)

This is the composition of the feet of the Bodhisattva Candragomin, the lord of the three worlds [...]. The sūtra in six chapters has been copied in the year 561⁵² of the Nepāla Era, on Monday⁵³ the lunar day [presided] by the Sun⁵⁴ in the dark fortnight of the month of Śuci⁵⁵ and in the lunar mansion called Puṣyā, thus the son of Harṣa, called Abhayarāja, has thoroughly (*alam*) copied the entire Cāndrasūtra with a firm mind for the sake of [his] son (*putrārthahetoḥ*), with the purpose of [teaching his] son Akṣayarāja as well as [other] pupils [*śiṣyārthena*].

The Cambridge University Library has five more undated manuscripts – the first three of *Cāndravāyākaraṇavṛtti*, the last two of the Cāndra *sūtrapāṭha* alone – that can be tentatively assigned to the 14th–15th centuries on palaeographic grounds: Add.2192,⁵⁶ Add.1657.3,⁵⁷ Add.1691.5,⁵⁸ Add.1660.2,⁵⁹ and Add.1691.7.⁶⁰ Several undated manuscripts of the *Cāndravāyākaraṇa*, with or without Dharmadāsa's *Vṛtti*, on

47 Emend to °bāṇāyudhe.

48 Emend to ṛkṣe ca, where ṛkṣa means 'lunar mansion' (cf. the colophon of NAK 3/685 below). I am grateful to Nirajan Kafle for suggesting this emendation.

49 Emend to puṣyābhidhe.

50 Clearly a mistake for likhitam.

51 Possibly emend to niṣṭhīmanasā.

52 The year is written in *bhūtasamkhyās* (i.e. common nouns having a conventional numerical value), starting with the unit, followed by tens and hundreds: one = *mṛgāṅka*, 'moon'; six = *rasa*, 'flavour', because there were six basic flavours; added to = *yut*; five = *śrīpañcabāṇāyudha*, lit. 'the weapon of the venerable one with the five arrows', namely the five arrows of Kāma. Cf. Petocchi 2016.

53 *śubhrāṁśuvāre*. The compound *śubhrāṁśu* 'having white rays' is an epithet of the moon.

54 Namely, the seventh lunar day (cf. Einoo 2005, 106).

55 *śuci* is another name for the hot summer month of Āṣāḍha. Cf. the following versified list of alternative names for some months found in *Jayasīṃhakaḷpadruma* (kindly brought to my attention by Dominic Goodall): *caitro māso madhuḥ prokto vaiśākho mādhabo bhavet | jyeṣṭhamāso tu śukraḥ syād āṣāḍhaḥ śucir ucyate | nabhomāsaḥ śrāvaṇaḥ syān nabhasyo bhādra ucyate |*

56 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-02192>.

57 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01657-00003>.

58 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01691-00005>.

59 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01660-00002>.

60 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01691-00007>.

palm leaf and in Nepālākṣara, which may be from the same period, are also recorded in the NGMCP catalogue.⁶¹

But, even more interesting, the manuscript collections in Nepal and, on a smaller but significant scale, in Cambridge also preserve the evidence of a rich commentarial tradition on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* comprised of several works that in their Sanskrit version have been preserved only in Nepal.⁶² Among these there are three unpublished commentaries on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* with Dharmadāsa's *Vṛtti*, namely the *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā* of Ratnamati,⁶³ with some sub-commentaries, the *Ratnamatipaddhati* of Ānandadatta, the *Nibandha* of Ratnadatta, and Sāriputta's *Candrālaṃkāra*; the *Śabdalaṅkāraṇavaraṇapañjikā* of Pūrṇacandra; and the *Sumatipañjikā*.⁶⁴ Moreover, one finds works on the verbal system, such as the *Dhātupārāyaṇa*, possibly composed by the same Pūrṇacandra who authored one of the three *Pañjikās*, and the *Ākhyātaratnaśoṣa*, and others on the nominal declension, in particular the *Subantaratnākara* of Subhūticandra⁶⁵ (with some later works based on it), and the *Uṇādisūtra* with the anonymous *Uṇādisūtravṛtti*. All of these are preserved in Nepalese manuscripts that are dated or datable between the 10th and the 15th century CE.

61 The NGMCP catalogue also records a single palm-leaf manuscript of *Cāndravyākaraṇa* in Maithili script (NAK 5/6209, reel A 54/2). Unfortunately, the entry for this item is very limited; the only additional piece of information given is the number of folios, 23, with the measures.

62 Many of these works were translated into Tibetan in medieval times (see Verhagen 1994, 2001, *passim*). In the 1930's Sāṅkṛtyāyana recorded several Sanskrit manuscripts of works belonging to the Cāndra system as well as to other grammatical schools held in the libraries of Tibetan monasteries (see Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1935, 1937).

63 On this work, see now Dimitrov 2016, 599 ff. According to Dimitrov (2016, 557), the grammarian Ratnamati is the same as Ratnaśrījñāna, a Sinhalese Buddhist monk who composed a commentary on Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa* in the first half of the 10th c. CE and also wrote works in Sinhalese and Pāli under the name of Upatissa.

64 On these works, their dates, and their mutual relationships, see Oberlies 2012; Dimitrov 2016, 599–706; and Mahesh Deokar's contribution to this volume.

65 On this work and its author, better known for the *Kavikāmadhenu*, a commentary on the *Amarakośa*, see Lata Deokar (2014) and her contribution to this volume.

For Ratnamati's *Cāndravyākaraṇapañjikā*, probably composed in Sri Lanka around 930 CE (Dimitrov 2016, 599), one can rely on a handful of witnesses, including three fragments kept in Nepal, and one in Cambridge.⁶⁶ In the Kathmandu set one finds Kaiser 17 (C 2/9),⁶⁷ dated NS 363 (= 1243 CE), the colophon of which reads:

iti [...]karaṇe ratna[ma]tikṛtāyām pañjikāyām pañcamasādhyāyasya prathamah pādaḥ samāpta [!] || gra[ntha]pramāṇam asya dvādaśottaranavaśatam || saṃ 363 pauṣa budha 10 śubham ○

Thus the first quarter of the fifth chapter of the *Pañjikā* composed by Ratna[ma]ti on [the *Cāndravyā*]karaṇa has been completed. It measures 912 gra[nthas]⁶⁸. In the year 363, on Wednesday the tenth of the month of Pauṣa. Fortune!

The Cambridge manuscript, Add.1657.1,⁶⁹ is incomplete and has no colophon, but it can be dated to the 12th–13th century.

To the same author Dimitrov (2016, 565 ff.) attributes a treatise on semantics called *Śabdārthacintā* and the auto-commentary *Vivṛti* thereon (Dimitrov 2011, 43, n. 86). The former is preserved in a single palm-leaf manuscript that was brought from Nepal to Calcutta, where it is now kept in the Asiatic Society, by Haraprasāda Śāstrī. The latter is preserved in NAK 1/1697,⁷⁰ a palm-leaf copy in Nepālākṣara that Dimitrov tentatively dates to the 12th–13th centuries.

As mentioned above, three sub-commentaries on Ratnamati's *Pañjikā* are extant. The *Ratnamatipaddhati* of Ānandadatta⁷¹ survives in three fragments preserved in Cambridge, namely Add.1657.2, Add.1691.6, and Add.1705, and in five more fragments identified by Dimitrov, namely NAK 5 /456 A, B, C, D, and E (A 57/31).⁷² According to Dimitrov, all the Kathmandu fragments can be dated to the

⁶⁶ See Oberlies 2012, 145–148, which does not mention the Cambridge copy. One palm-leaf copy of this work ‘in Proto-Bengali script of the eleventh century’ (Dimitrov 2010, 50), photographed by Sāṅkrtyāyana in 1937, is known to exist in Tibet; and another is found in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.

⁶⁷ The NGMCP entry is very pithy. The NGMCP catalogue also lists NAK 4/247, a modern paper copy in Devanāgarī of this manuscript, made in Vikrama Samvat 1989 (= 1933 CE).

⁶⁸ A unit of measure of the length of a manuscripts consisting of 32 *aḥṣaras* (syllables).

⁶⁹ <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01657-00001>.

⁷⁰ NGMCP catalogue http://134.100.29.17/wiki/A_54-1_%C5%9Aabd%C4%81rthacint%C4%81viv%E1%B9%9Bti. Retrieved 18 December 2016. Dragomir Dimitrov and Mahesh Deokar are preparing a critical edition and translation of the *Śabdārthacintā* with the commentary (personal communication, September 2016).

⁷¹ Already mentioned with the title *Sūtrapaddhati* in Liebich 1896.

⁷² On the *Ratnamatipaddhati* and, in particular, its Kathmandu copies, see Dimitrov 2016, 624 ff.

12th–13th centuries. Three of them (A, B, and E) look very similar, and the handwriting is possibly the same, therefore ‘it may be assumed that they were prepared ... possibly by one and the same scribe or at least in the same scriptorium’. Nothing is known with certainty about Ānandadatta, who according to Dimitrov (2016, 676) may have been affiliated to one of the Buddhist universities in eastern India. If Ratnamati’s *Pañjikā* was composed in the first half of the 10th century CE, as argued by Dimitrov, Ānandadatta must have flourished some time between the second half of the 10th c. and 1199 CE, corresponding to NS 319, which is the date recorded in the colophon of Add.1657.2:

[...] *raṇe mahopādhyāyaśrīānandadattavirācitāyāṃ rannamatipaddhatau dvitīyādhyāyasya prathamah pādaḥ samāptaḥ || O || samvat 319 jaiṣṭhakṛṣṇa amāvāsyāṃ tithau subha |* (fol. 31r1–2).

The first quarter section (*pāda*) of the second chapter of the *Ratnamatipaddhati* composed by the great teacher Ānandadatta on the [*Cāndravyākā*] *raṇa* has been completed, in the year 319, on the lunar day of the New Moon in the dark fortnight of [the month of] Jyaiṣṭha.⁷³

The *Nibandha*⁷⁴ of Ratnadatta is preserved in fragmentary form in two manuscripts identified by Dimitrov (2014; 2016, 691 ff.), one kept in Kathmandu (NAK 5 /456 F, A 57/31) and comprised of just three palm leaves, which preserves the author’s name and the title;⁷⁵ the other, slightly bigger (11 folios), kept in Cambridge (Or.714⁷⁶). The two fragments are so similar that, according to Dimitrov (2016, 691) ‘originally [they] might have even belonged together’. If the *Pañjikā* was composed in the first half of the 10th century CE, as argued by Dimitrov (2014), Ratnadatta would have flourished some time between the mid-10th century and the 13th century, the likely date of the Cambridge manuscript.

The University Library in Cambridge also holds Or.1278,⁷⁷ the only known copy of the *Candrālaṃkāra*⁷⁸ composed by the 12th-century Sinhalese Buddhist monk and scholar Śāriputta (in Sanskrit, Śāriputra).⁷⁹ This manuscript is written in the rare Bhaikṣukī script, mostly used by Buddhists in eastern India. On the basis of the

⁷³ The year is written in letter-numerals, namely āu = 3, a = 1, o = 9.

⁷⁴ This is certainly an abridged form of a longer title that probably contained a clear reference to the commented text.

⁷⁵ *mahopādhyāyarannadattakṛte* [!] *nibandhe prathamasyādhyāyasya tṛtīyaḥ pādaḥ* (quoted in Dimitrov 2016, 691).

⁷⁶ <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-00714>.

⁷⁷ <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-01278>.

⁷⁸ Already mentioned as of unknown author in Liebich 1896.

⁷⁹ On this work and its *codex unicus*, see Dimitrov 2010.

colophon found in the Kathmandu portion Dimitrov (2010, 42–46) surmises that the manuscript may have been copied in the 12th century CE at the great Buddhist monastery (*mahāvihāra*) of Somapura (modern Paharpur, in Bangladesh).

Pūrṇacandra's *Śabdalaṅkāraṇavivaraṇapañjikā*, another independent commentary on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, has been transmitted in three palm-leaf manuscripts, all of them in Nepālākṣara. The oldest copy is possibly NAK 4/311, mentioned above, which may date to the late 11th century. Both the name of the author and the title of the work are attested there in a rubric.⁸⁰ Roughly one century younger is Kaiser 9/27 (C 82/7), dated NS 314 (= 1194 CE), the colophon of which reads:

[...]gomipraṇīta *śabdalaṅkāraṇavivaraṇapañjikāyām ācāryapūrṇacandraviracitāyāḥ śaṣṭhyo 'dhyāyāḥ samāptaḥ* || * || *samvat 314*⁸¹ [...] || [so]madine | *punarvasunakṣatre* || *rājādhirājaparamēśvariparamabhaṭṭārakaḥ* [sic!] | *śrīlakṣmīkāmādevasya vijayarājyeh* | *śrīkothavulaṅkhu* || *somacandrena likhita*[m] | *da*[m] *pustakam* || *lekhikena likhitan iti* || (fol. 59v1–3)

The sixth chapter of the *Śabdalaṅkāraṇavivaraṇapañjikā* composed by the teacher Pūrṇacandra on the [*Cāndravyākaraṇa*] composed by [Candra]gomin has been concluded. This book has been copied by Somacandra in the year 314, on Monday [...],⁸² under the asterism of Punarvasu, during the victorious reign of the king of kings, the highest sovereign, the supreme lord Lakṣmīkāmādeva, ... [*kothavulaṅkhu*⁸³?]. Written by the scribe.

The third extant copy of Pūrṇacandra's commentary is NAK 5/735 (A 53/15), undated, where a sub-colophon gives the name of the scribe, a Buddhist layman (*upāsaka*) called Mādhava.⁸⁴ Pūrṇacandra is also mentioned as the author of a commentary on the Cāndra *dhātupāṭha* called *Dhātupārāyaṇa* in the rubrics of the *codex unicus* Add.2121,⁸⁵ kept in Cambridge.⁸⁶ Liebich (1902, IX) used this manuscript

80 *candragomipraṇītaśabdalaṅkāraṇavivaraṇapañjikā*Oyām ācāryapūrṇacandrakṛtāyām prathamasyādhyāyasya prathamah pādah samāptaḥ.

81 The year is written in letter numerals: āu= 3, ḍo = 10, pka = 4.

82 Month and lunar day are not legible. But on the basis of the coincidence of the *nakṣatra* with the day of the week, Petech (1984, 77) conjectures that the month may be Caitra, and the full date likely correspond to Monday, March 20, 1194.

83 Possibly a toponym: in classical Newari *kotha/kvāṭha* means 'fort', *laṅkhu* 'river' or 'road'; for *vu* cf. the sociative suffixes *u*, *vo* (Malla 2000, all s.v.).

84 *paramopāsakacandragomipraṇītaśabdalaṅkāraṇavivaraṇapañjikāyām ācāryapūrṇacandrakṛtāyām prathamō dhyāye dvitīyāḥ pādah samāptaḥ* ||*|| *śubham astu* || * || *sarvvaḥ jagatām iti* || O || *paramopāsakamādhavena likhitam idam iti* || (fol. 241/82v6–7). Note that Candragomin himself is called *upāsaka* here.

85 The work and the Cambridge manuscript were already listed in Liebich 1896; see also Liebich 1902, IX–X.

86 See for example the rubric of the section on roots of the second class (*adādi*): *ācāryapūrṇacandrarakite dhātupārāyaṇe adādilaḥ parisamāptaḥ* || (fol. 48r3–4).

for his edition of the Cāndra *Dhātupāṭha*. According to Verhagen (1994, 110), Pūrṇacandra's work was known to the Tibetan grammatical tradition and was used by native translators of the Cāndra *dhātupāṭha*. The manuscript does not have a colophon, but it can be dated to the 13th–14th centuries CE on palaeographic grounds.

The third commentary on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, the *Sumatipañjikā*,⁸⁷ is partially preserved in two undated palm-leaf manuscripts in Nepālākṣara both kept in Kathmandu, namely NAK 5/734 (B 34/29), consisting of 107 folios, and NAK 5/732 (B 35/31), 101 folios, both containing portions of the commentary on the first chapter. The two copies have a very similar colophon in verse.⁸⁸ The following is from NAK 5/734 as quoted by Dimitrov (2016, 690, n. 247):

rājñā śrīguṇakāmadevavibhunā svasyaikaṛāṅjye kṛte |
varṣe 'smin diśamuttare śatatame – – – (māse) – (te) |
(gaṅgāmārga)[tithau bṛhaspati]dine tārādhanīṣṭhānvite |
nāmneyaṃ sumatir yathābhilīkhitā (se) – – (syai śāśvate) || (fol. 91v1–2)⁸⁹

This [commentary] named the 'Correct Doctrine' (*sumati*) ... as it was written in the year 110 on Thursday the third lunar day associated with the asterism Dhaniṣṭha of the month,⁹⁰ in which the powerful king Guṇakāmadeva has established his own sole reign.⁹¹

87 On the *Sumatipañjikā* see Oberlies (2012, 152) and Dimitrov (2016, 688–690), who has identified another fragment of this work in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta (*ibidem*: 629).

88 Here is the colophon of NAK 5/732 as given in the NGMCP catalogue:

rājñā śrīguṇakāmadevavibhunā svasyaikaṛāṅjye kṛte
varṣe smin diśam uttare śatatame – – – – – |
– – – – – (6) dine tārādhanīṣṭhānvite
nāmneyaṃ sumatir yathābhilīkhitā (!) – – – – – ||.

89 This is followed by a verse that, as Dimitrov (2016, 690, n. 248) notes, is badly corrupt: *ra-vikaviśāśisomyā vyomni sambhānti yāvat | sumatir api maneṣāvad atra prātisasya | subhadīnakarājīvo jīvako nandako 'pi | bhavatu vabhubhṛtām śrīmañjughoṣānubhāvāt.*

90 The year is expressed partly with a word numeral (*śatatama* 'hundredth'), partly with a *bhūtasamkhyā* (*diś*, *diśā* = 10, like the ten directions of space). Unusually, the lunar day (*tithi*) is also expressed with a *bhūtasamkhyā*, i.e. *gaṅgāmārga* = 3. Regmi (1965, 110) quotes this colophon reading the year as 104. However, although the basic cardinal points are four, the usual value of *diś* as a *bhūtasamkhyā* is 10 since the four intermediate directions (south-east, north-west, etc.) are also counted, plus above and below.

91 For the import of the expression *svasyaikaṛāṅjye kṛte*, and the Nepalese political institution known as *dvairājya* (roughly 'shared kingdom'), see Petech 1984, 33.

The year is NS 110, corresponding to 990 CE, which makes this copy of the *Sumatipañjikā* one of the oldest dated grammatical manuscripts of Nepal. Its author, possibly named Sumati,⁹² should therefore be assigned to the mid 10th century at the latest.⁹³ The colophon of the other copy, NAK 5/732, is one of three documents listed in Petech (1984, 32–33) on the basis of which the historian tentatively dates Guṇakāmadeva's reign to c. 980–998 CE.

Two more works should be mentioned here, both of which are preserved in a few palm-leaf manuscripts in Nepālākṣara. The first is the *Ākhyātaratnakoṣa*, of an unknown author,⁹⁴ which survives in three copies. According to the NGMCP catalogue entry, the work 'enumerates and exemplifies a great deal of roots, but not all, from the Dhātupāṭha, giving the individual forms arising after the substitution of the *lakāras* such as *laṭ*, *luṭ*, *liṭ*, etc. has taken place'. The following introductory verse found in one of its witnesses, NAK 1/1152 (A 52/5), seems to allude to the *Dhātupārāyaṇa*, Pūrṇacandra's commentary on the *Dhātupāṭha* mentioned above:

dhātupārāyaṇaṃ samyak nirūpya vyavahāriṇāṃ | koṣa ākhyātaratnānāṃ svābhogāya kariṣyate ||

Having given careful consideration to the complete list of verbal roots (*dhātupārāyaṇa*), a treasury of the verb-gems [used] by ordinary speakers will be compiled for my own use.

One copy of this work, NAK 3/685 (B 23/36), is dated NS 537 (= 1417 CE), and bears this quite long and elaborate colophon:

*ākhyātaratnakoṣaḥ samāptaḥ || * ||
śrīraghuvamśasāravindaṭjuṇḍaṭ prakāśanekamārttaṇḍasya⁹⁵*

⁹² The name appears in the verse following the colophon (see n. 87), but, as Dimitrov (2016, 690) remarks, 'it is difficult to decide whether this is again the name of the work or perhaps a personal name'.

⁹³ Dimitrov (2016, 690) remarks that these stanzas are 'placed, strangely enough, before the subcolophon of the commentary on Cān. 1.1' and 'were written possibly by the commentator himself or by the scribe who prepared the master copy'. On their basis, he conjectures that 'this commentary was composed by a scholar from the Kathmandu Valley'. It seems to me that this conclusion is only warranted if these verses can be attributed with certainty to the author rather than the scribe.

⁹⁴ The NGMCP catalogue entry of one of its copies, NAK 1/1152 (A 52/5), tentatively attributes it to Pūrṇacandra, but as far as I can tell this is not supported by any colophon or textual tradition. The issue of the authorship of this work can only be settled by the edition and study of the work, which is unpublished.

⁹⁵ Emend to *prakāśanaikamārttaṇḍasya*.

*rājādhirājaparamēśvarasya paramamāheśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakasya
 sakalaguṇakālānidhāna[sakhi]vatpratipālanekanipunasya⁹⁶
 sakalahimabho⁹⁷bhāgadhavalabahalakīrttiparipūritasya
 sakalajāṭjācakajana⁹⁸cintāmaṇikalpavṛkṣasya
 śrīśrījayajyoti[r]malladevasya vijayarājye ||
 cāturbrahmavihāracāraṇapaṭuḥ sannītiratnāmṇavaḥ
 śrīmatpuṇyakadambakeśarinibhaḥ pratyakṣaviśvambharaḥ |
 sarvveśam pratipālanekanipunaḥ⁹⁹ sarvveṇa māheśvaro
 jīyāj jaṅgamakalpavṛkṣasukṛti śrījyoti[r]mallaprabhuḥ || ○ ||
 śrīmadyaśo[†]ccha[†]lalitaṃ haritāsthītānām
 saṅkhāvātām¹⁰⁰ śravaṇayor api maṅḍano vai |
 brāhmīn dadhāti suratām varakaṅthalagne¹⁰¹
 śrīmān guṇajñajayabhairavamalladevaḥ || ○ ||
 sārottamam idaṃ ratnam ākhyādhātusambhavam |
 likhyate tejarāmeṇa kramācāryeṇa dhīmatā ||
 abde śailakṣānubānasahite māsāsīte māghake
 cāturthītithisa[ṃjñā]ke bhṛgudīne ṛṣe¹⁰² ca barhiṣṭhite |
 yoge maṅḍavare ghaṭe ravigate candre ca kanya(!)sthite
 hy etasmin samaye samāptasakalaṃ ā[khyā]taratnottamaṃ ||
 udakānalacaurebhyo mūṣikebhyas tathaiva ca |
 rakṣitavyam prayatnena mayā kaṣṭhena likhyate || || (fol. 172r5–v6)*

The *Ākhyātaratnakośa* has been completed during the victorious reign of the glorious Jayajyotirmalla, who is the one sun serving to illuminate ... [*juṅḍa?*], the lotus of Raghu's race, the king of kings, the highest sovereign entirely devoted to the great Lord [Śiva] (*paramamāheśvara*), the supreme lord who is alone adroit in protecting like a [true] friend the treasure of all virtues and arts, full of copious fame that is as resplendent as all the parts of the moon, a wish-fulfilling tree bearing wish-fulfilling gems for all suppliant folk (*sakalajācākajana?*).

May the glorious king Jayajyotirmalla, who is generous like a moving wish-fulfilling tree, triumph, he who has sharpened [his intellect] by attending the Cāturbrahma Vihāra,¹⁰³ [and is] an ocean of gems of statecraft (*saṃmiti*), similar to a lion with a multitude of fortunate

⁹⁶ Emend to *°pratipālanakanipunasya*.

⁹⁷ Possibly emend to *°himabhānu*^o, literally 'having cool lustre', namely the moon.

⁹⁸ Possibly emend to *°yācakajana* 'suppliant people'.

⁹⁹ Emend to *°pratipālanakanipunaḥ*.

¹⁰⁰ Possibly emend to *saṅkhyāvātām*.

¹⁰¹ Possibly emend to *varakaṅthalagne*.

¹⁰² Emend to *ṛkṣe*.

¹⁰³ As the four *brahmavihāras* are the four noble Buddhist virtues (sympathy, compassion, joy and equanimity), Dominic Goodall (personal communication) suggests that some pun may be intended here, implying that the king was 'skilled in practising the whole group of Buddhist virtues'.

merits, a directly visible all-sustainer,¹⁰⁴ the follower of Maheśvara (*māheśvara*) who is alone adroit in protecting all [beings] with all [means].

[...],¹⁰⁵ he [because of what he says] is verily an ornament (*maṇḍanaḥ*) to the ears of people of intellect (*śaṅkhyavatām?*), the honourable Jayabhairavamalla, a connoisseur of virtues, [who] wears the goddess (*suratām*) Brāhmī fixed to his excellent throat (*vara-kaṅṭhalagnām?*).

The learned Tejarāma Kramācārya has copied this jewel of the finest nature that collects the roots of verb forms in the year 537,¹⁰⁶ on Friday the fourth lunar day of the month of Māgha and in the lunar mansion of Kṛttikā,¹⁰⁷ since the best of the jewels of verbs (*ākhyātaratnot-tamam*) has been entirely completed at the time when the *yoga* is Maṇḍavara,¹⁰⁸ Aquarius is in the sun, and the moon is in Virgo.

This has been copied for Jayabhairavamalla. One should make an effort to protect it from water, fire, and thieves, as well as from mice – I toiled to copy it.

This is one of the thirty-five documents listed by Petech (1984, 163–164) for the reign of Jayajyotirmalla, who ruled between 1408 and 1428. The colophon is similar to a royal eulogy (*praśāsti*), ornately extolling the king's manifold virtues – his Śaiva faith, his statesmanship, his commitment to the protection of the arts, and his intellectual achievements¹⁰⁹ – and linking his name to the Cāturbrahma Vihāra (located in Bhatgaon according to Petech), possibly the institution where the sovereign had received his education or a centre of scholarly activity that he sponsored. It also mentions the names of the scribe, Tejarāma Kramācārya, and the person who commissioned the copy, the aristocrat Jayabhairavamalla, the husband of Jayajyotirmalla's daughter Jīvarakṣā, who is described as wearing Brāhmī, that is Sarasvatī, as an ornament around his neck.

The other independent treatise is the *Subantarātākāra*,¹¹⁰ which survives in six palm-leaf manuscripts, all in Nepālākṣara, five of them kept in Nepal and one

104 Unlike gods, who are invisible to ordinary mortals.

105 At present I am not able to offer a plausible interpretation of the first *pāda* of this verse (*śrīmadayaśo'rcca+lalītaṃ haritāsthītānām*).

106 The year is given in *bhūtasamkhyās*, starting from the units: 5 like the arrows (*bāṇa*) of Kāma; 3 like the fires (*kṛśānu* = *agni*); 7 like the mountain (*śaila*) ranges (*aśva*) of the earth. Petech says that 'the date is verified in all elements for Friday, February 5th, 1417'.

107 *barhithita*, literally 'the one placed on the peacock (*barhin*)', namely Kārttikeya.

108 The name *maṇḍavara* does not appear in the usual list of 27 *yogas*.

109 There may be more in this than the usual hyperbolic adulation found in this kind of text, since Jayajyotirmalla is allegedly the author of the *Siddhisāra*, a treatise on *jyotiṣa* preserved in a Cambridge manuscript, Add.1649 (see incipit: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01649/4>; also Regmi 1965, 638).

110 On this and other works by the same author see Lata Deokar's contribution to this volume, in which she also gives the full text of the manuscript colophons mentioned below (below, pp. 663–664).

in Cambridge.¹¹¹ Two of these, Kesar 582 and Cambridge Or.148, have colophons showing that they were also produced during Jayajyotirmalla's reign. The former was copied in NS 533¹¹² (= 1413 CE) by Māṅikarāja (almost certainly the same as the scribe of NAK 5-730, a *Cāndravyākaraṇa* manuscript mentioned above, p. 87), probably active at court, who praises the sovereign's learning and statesmanship at length.¹¹³ The latter was copied just a few years later in NS 540 (= 1420 CE) by a Buddhist monk called Dharmarasika, in the Śrīṣaḍakṣarīmahāvihāra in the town of Gaṅgūlapatana, for his personal use.¹¹⁴ Another work also attributed to Subhūticandra and called *Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparikrama*, dealing with nominal declensions, is preserved in NAK 5/416 (B 34/16), a palm-leaf manuscript in Nepālākṣara from NS 560 (= 1440 CE).

The manuscript collections in Nepal and in Cambridge also preserve a few palm-leaf copies of other works that can be assigned to the Cāndra tradition – mostly smaller tracts on specific topics, perhaps composed for didactic purposes. Among them one finds the *Uṇādisūtra* with its *Vṛtti*, the *Prādivṛtti*, the *Kṛdbhāṣya*, the *Tiṅbheda*, the *Viṃśatyupasargavṛtti*, and the (*Bālavallabhā*) *Prakriyā*.

Four of these manuscripts have colophons with dates. The earliest is NAK 5/410 (A 53/16), a copy of the *Uṇādi(sūtra)vṛtti*¹¹⁵ in Nepālākṣara dated NS 489 (= 1369 CE).¹¹⁶ Next is a NAK 3/361 (B 35/33), a copy of the *Tiṅbheda* (also bearing the alternative title *Ākhyātavicāra*), with a colophon that just gives the date *saṃvat*

111 This is Or.148 (<http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-00148>).

112 The year is written with *bhūtasamkhyās*. The relevant part of the colophon reads: *vahnau vahnau ... vānābde* 'in the year (*abda*) *vāna* = arrow = 5, *vahni* (= *agni*) = 3, *vahni* = 3'.

113 One should of course compare the handwriting in the two manuscripts to be absolutely sure. It would be interesting to investigate if the name of Māṅikarāja (or Manikarāja, as it is spelled in the other manuscript) appears also in manuscripts of works on other subjects than grammar.

114 Gaṅgūla(patana) is another name of Kathmandu, according to Petech (1984, 164), who quotes this document but misreads the name of the *vihāra* as Śrī-Yatradevī.

115 The NGMCP records two more palm-leaf copies of this work: NAK 5/409 (B 34/18), in Nepālākṣara, and NAK 5/733 (B 35/16), in a hybrid form of Nepālākṣara with some features of Maithili. This work is already mentioned in Liebich 1896 and 1902: VIII–IX, and it was known to the Tibetan tradition (see Verhagen 1994, 113–114, 121–122).

116 Or possibly 479 = 1359 CE. The uncertainty stems from the fact the year is expressed in *bhūtasamkhyās*, unusually starting with the hundreds: *veda* = 4 like the 4 Vedas, *nāga* 'snake', which can stand for either 7 or 8, and *graha* 'planet' = 9 because Indian astronomy counted nine planets. The colophon reads: *saṃvatasarā* [sic!] «(..) *vedanāgagraha* || *āṣāḍhaśuklapratipadāḥ* [sic!] *mṛgaśiri-ṅakṣatra* [sic!] | *vṛddhiyoga* | *magalavāra* [sic!] | *leṣijaśu* [sic!] ||. The catalogue entry notes that the manuscript contains many scribal mistakes, possibly because it was copied from a manuscript in a different script.

540 (= 1420 CE). Another is NAK 5/407 (B 34/24), a copy of the *Prādivṛtti*, a short work on preverbs (*upasarga*) from NS 574 (= 1454 CE), whose colophon reads:

brahmānanāśvabāṇe 'bde mārggakṛṣṇe tiOthau yame | ṛkṣahastārkkavāre ca prādiḥ saṃli||
* ||*khitam mayā* || (fol. 7r2–3)

I have copied this work [called] *Prādi* in the year 574,¹¹⁷ on Sunday the second (*yame*) lunar day of the dark fortnight in the month of Mārga(śirṣa), under [the lunar mansion] Hasta and the Great Bear [constellation].¹¹⁸

The fourth is NAK 5/6210 (B 460/15), a paper manuscript of the *Upasargavṛtti* (or *Viṃśatyupasargavṛtti*, as the Tibetan translation suggests¹¹⁹) traditionally attributed to Candragomin himself, dated NS 774 (= 1654 CE).¹²⁰ This is among the very few Cāndra works copied after 1600.¹²¹ The search for paper manuscripts of the *Cāndravāyākaraṇa* in the NGMCP online catalogue returns not more than a dozen hits, and only two of these are said to be in Nepālākṣara (NAK 5/2591 and 4/247). Three more manuscripts (reels B 460/16, 17 and 18) are 20th-century copies of old manuscripts, as is stated in the colophon of one of them.¹²² This clearly suggests that after the 16th century the Cāndra tradition in Nepal underwent a dramatic decline. (For a synopsis of Cāndra manuscripts, see Tab. 1)

117 The year is given in *bhūtasamkhyās*, starting from the units: 4 like Brahma's faces (*brahmānana*); 7 like the horses (*aśva*) of the Sun; 5 like the arrows (*bāṇa*) of Kāma.

118 Another possible interpretation of the compound *ṛkṣahastārkkavāra* is 'Sunday (*arka-vāra*) under the lunar mansion (= *rkṣa*) *Hasta*', although in this case one would rather expect the expression *hastarkṣa*.

119 Verhagen 1994, 55; cf. also Dimitrov 2011, 14.

120 The colophon simply reads *iti cāndravāyākaraṇasya upasarggavṛtṭiḥ samāptiḥ* [!] || || *saṃ* 774 || (fol. 5r5).

121 The manuscript of another work, partly based on the *Subantarātnākara* and partly on the *Rūpāvatāra*, a Pāṇinian work, is dated NS 737 (= 1617 CE). The scribe, a certain Kāśirāma, copied it for his son (see below L. Deokar, p. 683).

122 1989 *mite vikramasamvatsare śrāvāṇamāsasya viṃśatitmadivase guruvāsare divyaratnavajrācāryyeṇa prācīnapustakataḥ pratilipi samāptikṛtvā śubham rāmacandraśarmaṇā śodhitā* (fol. 40r1–5). The date given in the colophon is 1989 of the Vikrama Era, corresponding to 1933 CE.

5 The Kātantra school

The NGMCP catalogue lists more than 40 manuscripts of works belonging to the Kātantra school,¹²³ a dozen of which are on palm leaf, most of them in Nepālākṣara. The earliest of these is NAK 3/397 (A 52/12), an incomplete copy of Trilocanadāsa's *Kātantravṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*, the most widespread sub-commentary on Durgasimha's commentary on the Kātantra *sūtrapāṭha*, covering *pādas* 1–4 of chapter 4, the section on primary suffixes (*kṛt*). According to the catalogue entry, this quite ancient witness is in Devanāgarī (presumably an early form of the script) and bears the date of LS 156 (= 1286 CE), two elements indicating that it was probably produced in northern India¹²⁴ and then brought to Nepal, or perhaps produced there by a scribe who had moved to the Kathmandu Valley. The colophon, which is followed by an apotropaic verse praising the scribe's painstaking labour,¹²⁵ reads:

*la saṃ 156 phālgunavadi 2 ravau || ṭhakkuraśrīprajñāpatināleki yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā ti (!)
likhitam [e]khako nāsti doṣaḥ || bhagnapṛṣṭi¹²⁶-kaṭi-gr[ī]va- s{t}a{b}(a)dha[dṛṣṭir
a]dhomukha[m] [l] duḥkhe[na lī](2)khitam sāstram [putravat prati]pālayet || (fols 79r4–79v2)*

[This] has been written in the year 156 of the Lakṣmaṇa Era, on Sunday the second [day] of the dark half of the month of Phālguna [February–March], by Ṭhakkura¹²⁷ Prajñāpati. As it was seen so it was written, the scribe has no fault. Painfully written, with aching¹²⁸ back, loins [and] neck, the gaze fixed, the head downcast, this book should be protected like a son.

The next dated manuscript is Kesar 14 (C 2/6), a palm-leaf copy in Nepālākṣara script of a work called *Padarohaṇa*, according to the NGMCP catalogue a treatise

123 On the history of Kātantra see Belvalkar 1915, 68 ff., Saini 1999, 15–44, and Shen forthcoming.

124 The use of the Lakṣmaṇa Era was confined to a region that corresponds to today's northern Bihar.

125 The same verse, with minimal variation, is also found in other colophons, including that of Or.148, a later manuscript of the *Subantarātnākara* mentioned above and discussed in L. Deokar's contribution: *bhagnapṛṣṭ(h)akatigrīvaṃ (!) taptadṛṣṭir adhomukham | kastena (!) likhitam sāstram jīvatat pratipālayet |*

126 Emend to *bhagnapṛṣṭha*^o.

127 This title suggests that the copyist was a man of some social standing.

128 Sanskrit *bhagna*, lit. 'broken'.

(*prakriyā*) dealing with the derivation of nouns and verbs,¹²⁹ composed by a certain Utsavakīrti. According to the colophon, the manuscript was copied in NS 513 (= 1393 CE):

ity upādhyāyotsava[k]irrtikṛto[!] padarohana[!] samāptaḥ || --- || śreyo 'stu nepālo 'bdo tridaśapañcagate | māghakṛṣṇa daśāyāṃ tithau[vāre] || [rā]jādhirājaparamabhaṭṭāarakaparameśvaraśrīśrījaya[sthiti]ma[l]ladevasya vijayarāje [!] | śrīśrīsuvarṇanapanārīḥ na[garyāṃ] samavasthitapātraśrī [...] (fols 98v5–99r1)¹³⁰

Thus the *Padarohaṇa* composed by the teacher Utsavakīrti is completed. May there be bliss. In the year 513 of the Nepali Era, on the tenth lunar day of the dark fortnight of the month of Māgha [January–February], during the victorious reign of the king of kings, the supreme lord, the highest sovereign, the glorious Jayasthitimalla,¹³¹ [for the dignitary ... established¹³²] in the city of Suvarṇapanārī¹³³...

Only a few years younger than the manuscript of the *Padarohaṇa*, NAK 5/418 (A 54/3) contains another minor work in the Kātantra tradition, the *Syādyantakoṣa*, the title of which clearly identifies it as a treatise on nominal declension.¹³⁴ The manuscript, on palm leaf, is dated NS 516 (= 1396 CE) and is written in Nepālākṣara. Its quite detailed colophon¹³⁵ reads:

129 The NGMCP catalogue quotes at least two more copies of this work, undated but most probably later since they are on paper. This work was probably known to the Tibetan tradition (see Verhagen 1994, 59–61).

130 The NGMCP catalogue entry does not give any excerpt for this manuscript. I have transcribed this colophon from a copy of the microfilm.

131 The two *akṣaras* giving the name of the king are barely legible, but the vowels are almost certainly i's, and the year falls within Jayasthitimalla's reign. Petech 1984 does not list this colophon among the documents of this king.

132 This is a tentative translation, based on the meaning 'court dignitary, official' for the term (*mahā-*)*pātra* in medieval Nepal (see Regmi 1965, 498 ff.), an interpretation that seems to be corroborated by the following word, *śrī*, commonly prefixed to proper names in such documents. My conjecture is that this line of the scribal colophon may have mentioned the name of the person who commissioned the copy (or – less likely – who prepared it). Unfortunately the rest of the line is almost completely effaced.

133 Another name of Kathmandu.

134 In the Kātantra system *sI* is the technical term for the first ending – nominative, singular, masculine –, corresponding to Pāṇinian *sU*. There is a Tibetan translation of a text called *Syādyantaprakriyā*, attributed to Mañju(śrī)kīrti and affiliated to Kātantra (Verhagen 1994, 70–72). Cf. also L. Deokar in this volume (below, p. 671).

135 Partially quoted in Petech (1984, 147). He specifies that the date is verified for Wednesday 7 June 1396. Note that Petech's readings occasionally differ from those found in the NGMCP catalogue entry. Here I am relying on the latter.

*samvat 516 ākhā[ḍha]*¹³⁶ *śuklapratipadyāyā* [!] *tithau buddhavāsare*¹³⁷ *purnavasunakṣatre*¹³⁸ || *juva*¹³⁹ *rājaśrīśrīdharmamalladevasya vijayarājyasamaye* || ○ *śrīvyanāpyānā*[[ma]] *deśanag-napatanavare* || *brahmakulendravidiprasrijivasarmaṇasya* [!] *yathābhilikhitaṃ manoratham pustakam idaṃ sapūrṇam* [!] *astu* || ○ *viprendraśrījivasarṇeṇa satvārthapratihetanā*¹⁴⁰ | *anena puṇyamārggena nīpatan*¹⁴¹ [!] *sarvvasukhāspadaṃ* || *likhitaḥ śrī amarendracandrena* | (fol. 74r2–5)

May this book, a desire of the mind, be entirely completed as it was written [in the original document?] for the brahmin Jivaśarmaṇa, the chief of the Brahma lineage, in the year 516, on Wednesday the first lunar day of the bright fortnight of [the month of] Āṣāḍha under the asterism Punarvasu, during the victorious reign of the crown prince (*yuvarāja*) the glorious Dharmamalla, in the city of Nagna-Patanavara in the country called Vyanāpyā.¹⁴² [This work,] the seat of all happiness, proceeding by this meritorious road the cause of which is the pursuit of truth by the chief of brahmins (*vipendra*) Jivaśarma, has been copied by Amarendracandra.

If my understanding of the colophon is correct, a high-ranking brahmin called Jivaśarma(ṇa), possibly living in a town of the Banepa region, commissioned the manuscript to the copyist Amarendracandra during the reign of Jayadharmamalla, the eldest son of Jayasthitimalla and Rājalladevī, born in 1367.¹⁴³ Here Jayadharmamalla is given the title *yuvarāja* because, after his father's death in September 1395, he shared the kingdom with his brothers Jayajyotirmalla and Jayakirtimalla for a number of years (Petech 1984, 143, 151), in keeping with the established practice of *dvairājya* mentioned above.

In the early 15th century we find a copy of the Kātantra *sūtrapāṭha*, NAK 5/417 (B 35/19), copied in NS 531 (= 1411 CE) during the reign of king Jayajyotirmalla (who was by then ruling alone since both his brothers had died). The book belonged to a minister (*amātya*) called Jayabrahma, as specified in the colophon:¹⁴⁴

136 Emend to *āṣāḍha* = June/July.

137 Emend to *budha*^o.

138 Emend to *punarvasu*^o, which is the name of a lunar mansion.

139 Emend to *yuva*^o.

140 Possibly emend to *hetunā*.

141 Possibly emend to *nīpatat*.

142 According to Petech, who reads *Byanappāna*, this may be identified with present-day Banepa, to the east of Kathmandu.

143 See Petech 1984, Appendix Genealogy C, p. 231.

144 The NGMCP entry gives the final rubric but not the scribal colophon, which I quote from Petech 1984, 162. According to him, the date is verified for 9 April 1411.

śreyo 'stu samvat 531 caitrakṣṇapratipadyāṃ tithau svātinakṣatre siddhiyoge yathākaraṇa[m] muhūrte bṛhaspativāsare meṣarāśigate savitari tulārāśigate candramasi rājādhirājaparameśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakaśrīśrījayajyotirmalladevasyavijayarāje amātyajayabrahmakasya pustako 'yam...

May there be bliss! This book belongs to the minister Jayabrahma, [having been copied] in the year 531, on Thursday the first lunar day of the dark fortnight of [the month of] Caitra [April] under the asterism Svāti [and] the yoga Siddhi at the time [established] in accordance with the astrological calculation (*yathākaraṇam*) when the Sun is in the sign of the Aries and the Moon is in the sign of the Libra during the victorious reign of the king of kings, the highest sovereign, the supreme lord, the glorious Jayajyotirmalla...

A few years later, in NS 536 (1415 CE) another manuscript, NAK 1/1078 (B 34/17), also on palm leaf and in Nepālākṣara, containing the entire Kātantra *Dhātupāṭha*, may have been copied for an unnamed young royal prince (*rājakumāraka*), possibly a son or nephew¹⁴⁵ of Jayajyotirmalla:¹⁴⁶

*ṛtu[rā]maśare yāte māse mārggaśire 'śite¹⁴⁷ |
susampūrṇaṃ kṛtaṃ lekhaṃ suOpañcamyāṃ tithau vare || rājādhirāja[|h|]parameśvara-
paramabhaṭṭārakaśrīśrījayajyotirmalla-devasya vijayarāje || ○ vidyāvilāsaraghurāja-
kumārakasya cintāmaṇīdrumasamārthijanasya tasya | śrīśrīsubhairavamal[|]asya
parājayasya kālāpadhātuvarapuṣṭakam eva yasya || (fol. 33v1–4)*

The copy [of this book] has been entirely completed in the year 536,¹⁴⁸ in the dark [fortnight of the] month of Mārggaśira [November], in the auspicious (*vare*¹⁴⁹) fifth lunar day, during the victorious reign of the king of kings, the highest sovereign, the supreme lord, the glorious Jayajyotirmalla. This excellent book [containing] the verbal roots of Kālāpa¹⁵⁰ belongs to the prince of the solar dynasty (*°raghu°*) who has playful ease with learning

145 Possibly Jayayakṣamalla, Jayadharmamalla's son, who succeeded his uncle to the throne.

146 The final portion of the colophon is not entirely clear and lends itself to multiple interpretations. The colophon is partially quoted in Petech (1984, 163), which on the last line reads *śrīśrīśrīsubhairavamal(l)asya ya rājā yasya* for *śrīśrīsubhairavamal[|]asya parājayasya*. According to him, the date corresponds to 21 November 1415.

147 Probably a misspelling for *asita* 'dark'.

148 The year is expressed in *bhūtasamṅkhyas*: starting from the units, *ṛtu* 'season' stands for 6, *rāma* stands for 3, and *śara* 'arrow' for 5.

149 Alternatively, one may conjecture that this is to be emended to *vāre*. We have seen the expression *tithau vāre*, in which the two words – essentially synonyms meaning 'lunar day' – apparently reinforce each other, in other colophons quoted above.

150 Kālāpavyākaraṇa was another name for the Kātantra.

(*vidyāvilāsa*°), [and is] like (°*sama*-) a wish-fulfilling tree for the suppliants (-*arthijā-nasya*),¹⁵¹ who is victory (*parājaya*) [incarnated] [and bears the *biruda*] Subhairavamalla.

The next dated manuscript, NAK 3/383 (A 53/9), dated Nepāla Samvat 545 (1425 CE) is a copy of Durgasiṃha's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, a work on the metarules (*paribhāṣā*) of Kātantra, also on palm leaf and in Nepālākṣara, suggesting that the interest in this grammatical tradition was not purely practical but embraced its theoretical aspects. Besides the date, the colophon gives the name of the scribe, once again a brahmin named Gayāpati:

samvat 545 āṣāḍhasuklapūrṇṇamāsyām tithau | pūrva[phālguni]nakṣatre | [vai]dhṛtiyoge | śanidīne | vipraśrīgayāpatinā likhito (2) yam | yathā dṛṣṭe sati tathā likhitā na doṣaṃ lekhakasya ||

This has been copied by the brahmin Gayāpati in the year 545, on Saturday the day of full moon of the bright fortnight of [the month of] Āṣāḍha, under the asterism of Phālguni,¹⁵² under the *yoga* Vaidhṛti. As it was seen so it was written: the scribe has no fault.

Around the mid-15th century, another palm-leaf manuscript in Nepālākṣara script, NAK 9/589 (C 55/7), contains the Kātantra *sūtrapāṭha* with Durgasiṃha's *Vṛtti* and Trilocanadāsa's *Vivaraṇapañjikā*. The colophon gives the year as NS 567 (= 1447 CE), when the ruling monarch was Jayayakṣamalla.¹⁵³ It also mentions the name of the scribe, the brahmin Śivaharideva:

*samvat 567 śrāvaṇakṛṣṇadaśamyām tithau ādityavāsare saṃpūrṇṇam kṛtam idaṃ puṣṭa[!]*kaṃ* | rājādhirājayameśvara¹⁵⁴paramabhaṭṭārakaśrīśrījayayakṣamalla devavijayarāje [!] || śubham astu sarvajagatām iti || likhitam idaṃ dvijavaraśrīśivaharidevena idaṃ puṣṭa[!]*kaṃ* || (fol. 27r1–3)*

151 This is a tentative translation based on the conjecture that the members of the compound are clumsily inverted: one would rather expect *arthijana-cintāmaṇidrumasamasya*.

152 According to the NGMCP the date corresponds to 30 June 1425 CE, but the correct asterism for that date should have been *pūrvāṣāḍha* instead of *pūrvaphālguni*. It is possible that the scribe confused the names of the two *nakṣatras*.

153 Jayayakṣamalla (1408–1482) ruled from 1428 to the year of his death, an exceptionally long reign attested by numerous manuscript colophons (including this one) and inscriptions (Petech 1984, 176).

154 The epithet *yameśvara* is unusual. Considering the similarity between the *akṣaras* ya and pa in Nepālākṣara, I suspect the correct reading is °*pameśvara*°, in turn probably a simple scribal mistake that should be emended to *parameśvara*, one of the titles commonly adopted by the Malla kings.

This book has been completed in the year 567, on Sunday the tenth lunar day of the dark fortnight of [the month of] Śrāvaṇa,¹⁵⁵ during the victorious reign of the king of kings, the highest sovereign, the supreme lord, the glorious Jayayakṣamalla. May there be fortune for all the worlds. This book has been copied by the best of the twice-born Śivaharideva.

Among the remaining undated palm-leaf manuscripts of Kātantra works one finds copies of the *sūtrapāṭha*, alone or with Durgasiṃha's *Vṛtti*, the *Dhātupāṭha*, the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* ascribed to Durgasiṃha and a commentary on this called *Paribhāṣāvṛttiṭīkā*, a *Kātantravṛttipañjikā* by Udayaśramaṇa (apparently different from Trilocanadāsa's commentary), and some minor works such as the *Prajñāvistārikā* (NAK 1/1152, B 35–15) of Billeśvara (also known to have composed a *Ṭīkā* on the *Kātantravyākaraṇa*) and a *Dhātusaṃgraha*, these last two in Maithili script.

The Kātantra tradition continues to be well attested in several paper manuscripts from the late medieval and early modern period.¹⁵⁶ Quite a few of them are in Devanāgarī or Maithili script. Among the dated ones, the earliest appear to be a copy of *Triliṅgaprakaraṇa*, a section of *Syādyantakoṣa* (NAK 5/5496 = A 1212/23), written in NS 600 (= 1480 CE) or 620 (= 1500 CE) by the scribe Śubharāja in Devanāgarī;¹⁵⁷ and NAK 1/1406 (A 1309/4), simply listed as *Kātantra*, in Devanāgarī, from the year 1554 of the Vikrama Era, i.e. 1497 CE.¹⁵⁸ This is followed by NAK 5/4274 (A 552/7), a copy of Trilocanadāsa's *Kātantravṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*, in Devanāgarī, dated 1632 of an unspecified era (probably Vikrama, corresponding to 1575–76).¹⁵⁹

NAK 1/1528 (A 552/11; also A 1302/8) is a copy of the section on *sandhi* of the Kātantra *sūtrapāṭha* in Nepālākṣara, dated NS 705 (= 1585 CE). The pithy colophon

155 The date is verified for 10 August 1447 (Petech 1984, 171).

156 Unfortunately, many of these have not been properly catalogued yet, and their entries contain only a very basic physical description. In most cases the title is simply given as *Kātantra*, without any further specification.

157 Another entry in the NGMCP catalogue, for Kesar 234 (C 26/7-1), the copy of a clearly related work called *Syādyantakoṣasāra*, said to be on palm leaf and in Nepālākṣara, records a very similar colophon and was written by the same scribe in NS 620 (= 1500 CE). It is possible either that the script of these two manuscripts is Devanāgarī with some features of Nepālākṣara (or vice versa), or that one of the two records is not correct. In any case, the relation between these two manuscripts needs to be investigated further.

158 The very pithy entry in the NGMCP catalogue just gives the title as *Kātantra*.

159 The colophon, in ungrammatical and badly spelled Sanskrit, reads: *saṃvat 1632 samaye vaiśāṣa śudi 6 sanivāsare || || pāṭhārthaṃ liṣāpitaṃ pāṭhakam itā[!]nandasutap-admanābhaliṣyāpitaṃ pāṭhārthaṃ liṣitaṃ pustaka śrīvāstavyaṃ pāṃḍe madanaputra gosāi dāsena || viśvanāṭhasaraṇaṃ ||* (fol. 115v5–8).

also contains an invocation to the goddess Durgā.¹⁶⁰ Another manuscript, NAK 1/1388 (B 458/19), also simply listed as *Kātantra*, is in Nepālākṣara and dated NS 707 (= 1587). Among the dated manuscripts from the 17th century one finds Kesar 191 (C 20/8; also C 21/1), also in Nepālākṣara, a copy of the *Kātantravṛtti* from NS 755 (= 1635 CE) written by a certain Sūryarāma for his personal use (*svārthe*);¹⁶¹ E 1707/10 (no accession number) is a copy of *Dhātuvṛttimanoramā*, most probably a commentary on the Kātantra *dhātupāṭha*, in Nepālākṣara, dated Nepāla Samvat 802 (= 1682); and NAK 1/1351 (B 462–17) is a copy of *Durgasiṃhavṛtti*, also in Nepālākṣara, from Nepāla Samvat 812 (= 1692), with a colophon in heavily Sanskritised Newari apparently stating that the copy was prepared for king Bhūpatīndramalla.¹⁶² The production of manuscripts of Kātantra works continued well into the 19th century. (For a synopsis of Kātantra manuscripts, see Tab. 2).

6 The Pāṇinian school

When we turn to the Pāṇinian school, we get a very different picture from the fervour of activity that is testified by the surviving manuscripts of the Cāndra grammar since the early medieval period. On the basis of the data available in the NGMCP online catalogue,¹⁶³ it appears that among the major works of this school composed in the first millennium CE – the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Vākyapadīya*, and the *Kāśīkavṛtti* with its subcommentary *Vivaraṇapañjikā* (also known as *Nyāsa*) –, only the *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi has been preserved in a manuscript that is earlier than the late 15th century. The manuscript in question, NAK 4/216 (A 52/13), in Nepālākṣara, is comprised of more than 400 folios and covers the first four *adhyāyas*. The copy is likely to be incomplete, since it ends

160 *iti sandhau pañcamah pādaḥ samāpta || me mahyaṃ durggāpṛitir astu || 7 || sambat 705 śrāvaṇaśuklapañcamyā.*

161 *samvat 755 āṣāḍhakṣṇatrayodaśi sampūrṇam iti likhitaṃ śrīsūryarāmeṇa svārthe || (fol. 77v9).*

162 Colophon: *samvat 812 vaiśāṣavadi thva kuhnu śrībhūpatīndramalladeva na dayakā dina || śubham astu || (fol. 18r5)* (Newari words in bold: *thva kuhnu* ‘on this day’; *na* ‘genitive case marker’; *dayakā* ‘which was made’ [Malla 2000: all s.v.]). However, note that Bhūpatīndramalla reigned in Bhaktapur from 1696, when he succeeded his father Jitāmitramalla (see Slusser 1982, 205–206), therefore the date in the colophon may be wrong.

163 The University Library in Cambridge holds no manuscripts of Pāṇinian works from Nepal.

on fol. 423r with the rubric to the fourth chapter rather than a proper colophon.¹⁶⁴ Despite the absence of a date, according to the catalogue entry it can be ascribed to the beginning of the 11th century on palaeographic grounds.

The first – but seemingly isolated – dated specimen of a Pāṇiniya manuscript is NAK 4/755 (B 35/34), a palm-leaf copy in Nepālākṣara of the *Sambandhasiddhi*, written in Nepāla Samvat 329 (= 1209 CE).¹⁶⁵ This work is an obscure (and as far as I know unpublished) commentary on the *Kāraḥakakra* or *Vāraucasaṅgraha* traditionally attributed to the mythical Vararuci, of uncertain date (probably second half of the first millennium CE), itself somewhat on the periphery of the Pāṇinian tradition despite its popularity (on Nepalese copies of the *Kāraḥakakra*, see below).

Particularly striking is the absence of early manuscripts of the *Mahābhāṣya*. A search on the NGMCP catalogue returns about 120 hits, but all the copies are on paper, and thus presumably later than 1500, and most of them are in Devanāgarī. Some also contain the subcommentary *Pradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa, and a few Nāgeśa's *Uddyota*. Only a few copies happen to be dated, the oldest in Devanāgarī apparently from c. 1790.¹⁶⁶ As for Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, another major work in the early Pāṇinian tradition, not a single manuscript is recorded in the NGMCP catalogue.

The search for copies of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* itself returns around 90 hits, but only one of these is in Nepālākṣara script, undated and (probably) on paper, so presumably late (see below). Significantly, the earliest surviving copy of Pāṇini's *sūtra* in Nepal, NAK 4/326,¹⁶⁷ is a palm-leaf manuscript in Maithili script, dated LS 374, corresponding to 1494 CE. The colophon (fol. 82v4–5) suggests that it was produced in eastern India (and later brought to Nepal):

164 *bodhisatvadeśīyācāryajinendrabuddhiviracitāyām kāsikāvivaraṇapañjikāyām caturtho dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ* || 'The fourth book of the *Kāsikāvivaraṇapañjikā* composed by the teacher Jinendrabuddhi, who is like a bodhisattva, has been completed.'

165 The colophon (not transcribed in the NGMCP catalogue entry) is hardly legible from the image of the microfilm, but fortunately the year (written in numerals) is very clear.

166 NAK 5/3832 (B 472/1) is dated Samvat 1847 of an unspecified era. If it were the Vikrama Era, the year would be 1790–1791 CE.

167 The same manuscript has been microfilmed twice (reels A 1311/19 and A 1162/13), which is not unusual, but in this case there is also some uncertainty in the catalogue about the library classmark, which is given as NAK 5/4481 in one place. There is one more record, of reel A 52/4, by a different author, describing an *Aṣṭādhyāyī* manuscript that is suspiciously similar to the former in terms of number of folios, with an almost identical colophon and yet another classmark. Only the direct inspection of the manuscript(s) in Kathmandu will clarify this confusion.

la saṃ 374 śrāvaṇabadi 13 ravau cāuṇṭitapāsamlagnadalakauligrāme pāṇḍavagrāmīyapaṭhatā śrīvarddhamānena svapāṭhārthaṃ ṭhakukesārddhaṃ likhitaiśā pustiti || pustakalikhanaṇaparīśramavettā vidyujjano¹⁶⁸ nānyaḥ | sāgaralaṃghanakhedam hanūmān ekaḥ paraṃ veda |

This book has been copied in the year 374 of the Lakṣmaṇa Era, on Sunday 13, in the dark half (*badi*) of the month of Śrāvaṇa [= July–August], by Vardhamāna, the reciter/preceptor (*paṭhatā*) from [the village known as] Pāṇḍavagrāma, in the village of Dalakauli attached to Cāuṇṭitapā, for his personal study, together with [i.e. with the help of?] Ṭhakuke.¹⁶⁹ Only someone who is learned (*vidvājano?*) knows the fatigue of copying a book, no one else; only Hanūmān knows the formidable effort of jumping across the ocean.

This late 15th-century Maithili copy of a Pāṇiniya work is far from being exceptional. In fact, the NGMCP lists at least half a dozen manuscripts in the same script and from approximately the same period, containing the *Kāśīkāvṛtti*, the *Nyāsa*, and other works. The oldest appears to be NAK 1/464 (A 52/8 = A 1171/4), from LS 358 (= 1478 CE), containing *Kāśīkāvṛtti* on *adhyāya 7, pāda 2*, of *Aṣṭādhyāyi*. Its colophon reads:

la saṃ 358 āśvīnavadi dvādaśyāṃ bhaume jamugāma-braṃhāpure sadupādhyāśrīvāsudevacarāṇāravindebhyāḥ paṭhatā śrīguṇapatinā svapāṭhārthaṃ likhitam idaṃ pustakam iti || (fol. 32r4–5)

This book has been copied for his personal study by Guṇapati, reading at the lotus-feet of the virtuous teacher Vāsudeva, in the year 358 of the Lakṣmaṇa Era, on Tuesday (*bhauma*) the twelfth [lunar day] in the dark fortnight of the month of Āśvina in [the town of] Jamugāma-Brahmapura (?).

By a curious coincidence, the next two manuscripts (both on palm leaf) are dated to the same year, LS 376 (= 1496 CE). They are NAK 1/1537 (A 53/7) and NAK 1/468 (A 1171/2). The former is a copy of the *Nyāsa*, covering just the second *pāda* of *adhyāya 1*, and its colophon specifies the name of the scribe, Jagāditya, who copied the manuscripts for his personal use:

*la saṃ 376 māghaśudi [pū]ṛṇṇimāyāṃ kuje udyānagrāme śrījagādityena svapāṭhārthaṃ likhitam idaṃ pustakam iti | ○ ti || || * || * || makarāhisaṃ śrīraghuśarmmaṇā śrīramānandeṣu dattā | (fol. 63r1–2)*

168 Possibly emend to *vidvājano*.

169 Possibly emend to *ṭhakure*.

This book has been copied in the year 376 of the Lakṣmaṇa Era, on Tuesday (*kuje*, i.e. the day of Mars) the day of full moon of the bright fortnight of the month of Māgha [January–February], in the village of Udyāna, by Jagāditya for his personal study.

Donated ... [*makarāhisam?*] by Raghūśarman to Rāmānanda.¹⁷⁰

The latter is a copy of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* alone containing *pāda* 2, *adhyāya* 1, commissioned by a certain Rāmānātha, bearing the title of *ṭhakkura*, and copied by the scribe Buddhīnātha:

śubham astu lasaṃ 376 āśvinaśudi 5 śukre śrīcaraṇadharaṇagare | ṭhakkuraśrīrāmānātha-mahāśayānā[m ā]jñayā śrībuddhīnāthena likhitam idaṃ pustakam iti || (fol. 17v4–5)

May there be fortune. This book has been copied by Buddhīnātha by order of Sir (*mahāśaya*) Ṭhakkura Rāmānātha in the year 376 of the Lakṣmaṇa Era, on Friday (*śukre*, i.e. the day of Venus) the 5th [day] of the bright fortnight (*śudi*) of the month of Āśvina, in the town of Śrīcaraṇadhara.

The colophon of another palm-leaf manuscript of *Kāśikāvṛtti* in Maithili script, NAK 1/468 (A 1171/3), is even more concise, with no date:

iti kāśikāyāṃ vṛttau tṛtīyasyādhyāyasya prathamah pādaḥ samāptaḥ || || śubham astu || oṃ namo gopālāya || sarasvatyai namaḥ || śrīnaraharer līpīr iyaṃ (†mariyah†) || (fol. 35v4)

The second quarter of the first book of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* has been completed. May there be fortune. Oṃ, homage to Gopāla. Homage to Sarasvatī. This is the copy [made] by Narahari ... [*mariyah?*]

It is difficult to draw any historical information from these colophons, or even identify the places they mention, but it is clear that these copies were originally made for the personal use of individual scholars, possibly in eastern India, and then later presumably sold and brought to Nepal.

Another early Pāṇiniya work that – like several texts of the Cāndra tradition – made its way into Nepal from eastern India, having been originally composed by a Southern author, is the little-studied *Rūpavatāra*¹⁷¹ of the Srilankan Buddhist monk Dharmakīrti (probably 10th century), the first known attempt at rearranging Pāṇini's *sūtras* according to topic, a few centuries before Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita's *Siddhānta Kaumudī*. It is plausible that, like Ratnamati's *Cāndravivaraṇapañjikā* and, possibly, its sub-commentaries, Dharmakīrti's work was studied in the Buddhist

170 The catalogue entry points out that the final sentence is probably a later addition.

171 The only study devoted to this work that I am aware of is Lalithambal's 1995 monograph.

universities of eastern India, but unlike those, it was preserved even after their decline, certainly because it was kept alive in brahmanical circles thanks to its affiliation to the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition. The Nepalese collections hold three palm-leaf copies of *Rūpāvatāra*, all of them in Maithili script, two of which are dated (for the third manuscript, NAK 1/1559 = A 1162/5, see Śāstrī 1905, 70). The oldest is from LS 367 (= 1487 CE),¹⁷² the other, NAK 4/764 (A 52/11) is a few years younger, from LS 383 (= 1503 CE), and was prepared by a certain Śaṅkara:

ity ācāryyadharmma ○ *kīrttiviracite rūpāvatāre tiṅantākhyah samāptaḥ* || || *la saṃ* 383
āśvinaḥṣṇadvādaśyāṃ śukre ajinauliśrāmavāstavyena śrīśaṅkareṇa likhitaiśā ○ *pustiketi* ||

Thus, the Section on Finite Verbs in the *Rūpāvatāra* composed by the Teacher Dharmakīrti has been completed. This book has been copied by Śaṅkara, a resident of Ajinauliśrāma, in the year 383 of the Lakṣmaṇa Era, on Friday the 12th [lunar day] in the dark fortnight of the month of Āśvina.

The *Rūpāvatāra* seems to have enjoyed a continued popularity in later centuries, because there are several paper copies of it, some of them in Nepālākṣara – one from NS 697 (= 1577)¹⁷³ – while others are in Maithili or Devanāgarī. The most recent is a Devanāgarī copy dated Nepāla Samvat 1001 (= 1881).¹⁷⁴

Among the *kaumudī*-type works, a search for the *Prakriyākaumudī* of Rāmacandra returns no less than 32 hits.¹⁷⁵ At least six of these are dated. NAK 1/446 (A 556/6), in Nepālākṣara, bears the year 601 of an unspecified era. If this belonged to the Nepāli Era, it would correspond to 1481 CE,¹⁷⁶ which means it would have been copied only a few decades after the work was composed in the

172 This is reel A 1162/4, for which no proper record exists in the NGMCP catalogue. However, the manuscript is described in Śāstrī 1905, 60-61, among those then held in the Durbar Library of Kathmandu.

173 This is NAK 5-5497 (A 567/8), for which only a minimal record exists in the NGMCP catalogue.

174 This is NAK 5-5498 (A 555/2), whose colophon reads: *ity ācāryyaśrīdharmmakīrttiviracite rūpāvatāre subaṃtāvatāraḥ samāptaḥ śubham śrisamvat 1938 śrīnepālasaṃvat 1001 sāla miti śrāvaṇava vadi 6 ro 1 etad dīne idaṃ pustaka likhitam samāptam likhitam idaṃ pustaka śrīlalitāpūranagarasya śrīmahābuddhopāśakācāryyaśrījitānandena śubham* (fol. 89v3–5). The year is given both in the Vikrama and the Nepāli Eras. The scribe was a lay (*upāsaka*) Buddhist scholar called Jitānanda from the town of Lalitāpūra, i.e. Patan.

175 Interestingly, this work was also known to the Tibetan tradition (see Verhagen 1994, 135–137, 317–320).

176 Unfortunately the colophon is very short and does not indicate the day of the week, so the date cannot be verified: *saṃvat 601 phālgūṇa śukla dvitīyā likhitam idaṃ pustakaṃ* (fol. 110v8–9). Only the direct inspection of the manuscript will be able to tell.

first half of the 15th century. Furthermore, if the catalogue entry is correct, the copy is on paper, which would make this a relatively early specimen of paper manuscript in Nepal. If, on the other hand, the date is given in the Lakṣmaṇa Era, which – as mentioned above – had some currency in Nepal, it would correspond to 1721 CE. The other dated copies are all from the 17th century onwards, some in Nepālākṣara, some in Maithili, and some in Devanāgarī. Among those in Maithili, NAK 1/309 (A 555/1) and NAK 5/3559 (A 555/12) give the year 792 according to the Nepāla Era (= 1672 CE). The colophon of the former explicitly indicates Kāṣṭhamāṇḍapanagara, that is Kathmandu, as the place of copying.¹⁷⁷ In the latter, the scribe, a certain Gaṅgādhara, calls himself a *mahāmantrin*, which suggests he may have been a high-ranking official at court.¹⁷⁸ Another, NAK 1/1076 (A 53/13), on palm leaf, is dated LS 558 (= 1678 CE), and the scribe's name is given as Dāmodara Śarmā. The colophon of yet another copy, NAK 1/313 (A 555/9), in Nepālākṣara and on paper, from the same year expresses the date as NS 798 (= 1678 CE), again in Sanskritised Newari.¹⁷⁹

Another Pāṇiniya work composed by a Buddhist author, the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva (12th century), is also preserved in both palm-leaf and paper manuscripts, either in Maithili or Nepālākṣara scripts, but none of them is dated.¹⁸⁰ Another work found in the Nepalese manuscript collections is the *Kārakacakra* or *Vārarucasamgraha*,¹⁸¹ already mentioned above. It is a short treatise in verse on Sanskrit syntax and word formation, comprised of five sections (*paṭalas*), dealing with *kārakas*, *samāsas*, *taddhitas*, *tiñantas* and *kṛdantas*, usually accompanied by a commentary that was possibly called *Prayogamukha* and is sometimes attributed to Dharmakīrti, who might be the same as the author of the *Rūpāvatāra*.¹⁸² The Nepalese collections hold several copies of the

177 It reads: *om || om || om || 792 || pauṣe māsi śukle pakṣe navamyāṃ tithau kāṣṭhamāṇḍapanagare yo ...*

178 *nepālasammat [!] 792 || * || * || [-9-] daśamyāṃ bṛhaspatau keva mahāmantri gaṅgādhareṇa likhitaiṣā prakriyā || nama kṣṇāya ||* (fol. 97v4–6). There is some uncertainty in the interpretation because the sentence is clearly ungrammatical, as frequently happens with scribal colophons.

179 *sambat 798 pauṣa kṣṇa pañcami kuhnu sampūrṇa yāñā ||* (fol. 129r2–3) (*kuhnu* 'on the day'; *yāñā*: past form of *yāca* 'to do').

180 NAK 1/425 (A 52–7) is a palm-leaf copy in Maithili script of the *Bhāṣāvṛttipañjikā* of Viśvarūpa, a sub-commentary on Puruṣottamadeva's *Vṛtti*.

181 There is some uncertainty about the title: alternative names are *Kārakasaṅgraha*, *Prayogamukha* (*maṇḍana*) and *Prayoga* (*viveka*) *saṅgraha* (cf. the remarks in the catalogue entry of NAK 4/798 [A 51/14]).

182 The catalogue entry of NAK 4/798 (see previous note), an undated palm-leaf copy in Maithili, remarks that in the work the 'ślokas of Vararuci's *Prayogamukha* or *Kārakacakra* are given and commented upon. [...] In two sub-colophons (as in other MS) the *Prayogamukha* itself is

Vārarucasamgraha, mostly on paper, often with the commentary. An undated palm-leaf specimen, NAK 4/798 (A 51/14), is in Maithili script, suggesting perhaps that this work too may have been brought into Nepal from eastern India. The earliest dated copy is NAK 1/1490 (A 557/8), on paper, in Nepālākṣara, from NS 750 (= 1630 CE), copied by a scholar/teacher (*upādhyāya*) called Mahādeva.¹⁸³ Roughly half a century later, in NS 805 (= 1685 CE), another copy, NAK 6/495 (A 1108/06), also on paper and in Nepālākṣara, was prepared by a brahmin called Cakrarāja, who proudly claims to be ‘the excellent pandit, the sovereign among the twice-born’ (*dvijātīnām cakravarttisupaṇḍitaḥ*). In NS 883 (= 1763 CE), the colophon of another Nepālākṣara copy, NAK 4/151 (A 557/7), informs us in a mixture of Sanskrit and Newari that the scribe Bhāju Dhana had written it for the ‘sole purpose of study’ (*adhyayanārtham eva*), surely implying that this was not a copy made for sale by a professional scribe.¹⁸⁴ Another paper manuscript of the *Prayogamukha*, NAK 1/1590 (A 557/3), undated, is remarkable in that, according to the catalogue entry, it is written in Maithili script on folios 1v–34v, and in Nepālākṣara script from fol. 35r to fol. 56v, even though the text is continuous – further evidence of the close and persisting links between Nepal and Mithilā.

The importation of manuscripts of Pāṇinian works from the Mithilā region of eastern India appears in fact to have continued in the late medieval-early modern period. NAK 4/257 (A 53/14), a palm-leaf copy of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* prepared by a scribe called Hariśvara for a certain Kṛṣṇānanda, dates from LS 437 (= 1567 CE).¹⁸⁵ Slightly younger is NAK 1/1114 (B 35/22), *Ṣaṭkārakabālabodhinī*, a didactic work on *kāraḥ* ascribed in the NGMCP catalogue entry to Prabhudāsa, from LS 475 (= 1595).¹⁸⁶ The 17th century saw the production of a manuscript such as NAK 4/40 (B 35/6), a copy of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, on palm leaf, dated LS 532 (= 1652 CE),

attributed to Dharmakīrti. However, there seems to be a tradition to refer both to Vararuci’s verses and Dharmakīrti’s commentary thereon as *Prayogamukha*’.

183 Colophon: *saṃvat 750 āśvīnakṛṣṇapratipadyāditye śrīmahādevopādhyāyena likhitam idaṃ pustakaṃ* || (fol. 73r5).

184 Colophon (with Newari words in bold): *saṃ 883 jyeṣṭhaśuklayā ekāśī [!] somavāra **thva kuhnu** saṃpūrṇa **yañā julo** || lekhakāya śubhaṃ bhavatu sarvvaḍā || śrī 3 madekajaṭāyai pītir astuḥ [!] || guṇāhimātaṃgagate ca varṣe, jeṣṭhe śucau candradine hares tithau | bhāju dhana vyākaraṇaṃ prayogamukhaṃ lilekhādhyayanārtham eva* || (fol. 50v2–5).

185 See the colophon: *la. saṃ. 437 phālgunaśuklasaptamyāṃ candravāsare śrīkṛṣṇānandasya pāṭhārthaṃ śrīhariśvareṇa ○ li[khi]...* (fol. 65r2).

186 Colophon: *iti ṣaṭkārakapustakaṃ samāptam iti || * || la saṃ 475 pauṣaśudi 12 budhe bhau ā(dra)grāme śrīmurāriśarmmaṇā likhiteṣā pustakīti* ||. This manuscript is mentioned in Śāstrī 1905, vii–viii, where the work is said to belong to the Kātantra school.

copied by a certain Cūḍāmaṇi for his son in a place called Taraunī,¹⁸⁷ and NAK 1/468 (A 1162/12), yet another copy of *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, dated LS 541 (= 1660 CE), which the scribe, boasting of his ‘clear and graceful handwriting’ (*prakaṭacārulekhā*), dedicates to Bhārati (i.e. Sarasvatī).¹⁸⁸ Like the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, most works of later Pāṇinīyas – such as Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa, and Nāgeśa, just to name some of its major representatives – are well attested in the Nepalese collections with several modern copies listed in the NGMCP catalogue. (For a synopsis of Pāṇinīya manuscripts, see Tab. 3)

7 Miscellaneous grammatical manuscripts

While in the previous paragraphs I have focused on the three grammatical systems that are arguably the oldest and most influential in the intellectual history of South Asia, here I will look at some of the other grammatical works that are found in the Nepalese collections. The sheer number and variety of manuscripts of grammatical works (even outside the main traditions) confirms that *vyākaraṇa* played a key role in the literary culture of medieval and early modern Nepal like in the rest of the subcontinent. Other schools are also represented – in particular, a search for *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa* returns more than 200 hits, mostly paper manuscripts, with one possibly quite old palm-leaf manuscript¹⁸⁹ –, as well as several works of a didactic nature, or of uncertain affiliation (sometimes mixing elements of different schools), or smaller tracts on specific topics, or even works dealing with languages other than Sanskrit. Without any ambition to be in any way exhaustive, I will present some of these manuscripts, once again focusing on the most ancient items.

187 Colophon: *dviraṅṅniśavaktrāṅkīte lakṣmaṇābde śucau kāmāthiyāṃ śucau jivavāre | vyalekhīd idaṃ pustakaṃ putrapāṭhe prayatnena cūḍāmaṇiḥ saṃs [sic!] taraunyām ||* (fol. 158r6). The name Taraunī recurs several times among the localities of the Mithilā region mentioned in the table found in Zysk 2012, p. 276 ff.

188 Colophon: *la saṃ 541 kārttikaśu pañca[mī] yadartham iha me śramaḥ prakāṭacārulekhānvite [for °ānvitah?] sa eṣa laṣitānvito bhavatu bhāratītatparaḥ ||* (fol. 12r3–4).

189 This is NAK 3/686 (B 35/8), in Nepālākṣara, dated Samvat 457 of an unspecified era (no proper catalogue entry is available): if it were in the Nepāli Era, the year would correspond to 1337 CE, quite an early date for a copy of *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa*, which was composed around the mid 13th century; if it were in the Lakṣmaṇa Era, it would be 1577. The latter date seems much more likely.

The NGMCP catalogue lists a 14th-century manuscript of a work that it calls (*Bhū*-)*Padagahana*. I would tentatively emend the title to *Padagrahaṇa* on the basis of the colophon as I could read it in the microfilm (which also reproduces the initial card with a partial transcription of the same). This work of uncertain affiliation and subject is contained in NAK 1-468 (A 1161/12), a palm-leaf manuscript in Nepālākṣara copied in NS 484 (= 1364 CE), consisting of 13 leaves. The catalogue entry provides only very basic physical information and no excerpt. The colophon (fol. 13v, l. 3) reads:

*ity upadhyāyotsavakīrttikṛtaṃ pada[gra]hanam [sic!] samāptam || * || śreya 'stu || samvat 484
kārttikaśuklaḥ paurṇamā[syāṃ ti]tho bharinī[!na]
[13v4][kṣa]tre | somavāsare || rājādhirājaprameśvara[!]-śrīśrijayārjjuOnadevasya vijayarāje
[!] || śrīkāstamaṇḍapa[-2-]na [-1-] likhitā śrī [-13-][13v5][-7-] idam | [-22-]va ca | rakṣatavyam [!]
prayatnena mayā [kaṣṭeṇa] likhitam | śubham astu sarvvajagatām ||*

Thus the *Padagrahaṇa* composed by the Teacher Utsavakīrti has been completed. May there be bliss. This has been copied in the year 484, on Monday, the lunar day of full moon in the bright fortnight of [the month of] Kārttika, under the asterism Bharāṇi, during the victorious reign of the king of kings, the highest sovereign, the glorious Jayārjunadeva, in Kāṣṭhamaṇḍapa¹⁹⁰ ... One should make the effort to protect it as I have toiled to write it. May there be fortune for all worlds.

According to Petech (1984, 130 ff.;¹⁹¹ see also Genealogical Table B) king Jayārjunadeva of the Bhonta family, born in 1338, ascended to the throne in 1360 in association with his father Jayarājadeva and reigned alone after the latter's death in 1361. Thus the present manuscript belongs to the early years of his rule, which was later challenged and effectively overturned by Jayasthitimalla in the 1370's, although Jayārjunadeva remained nominally in power until his death in 1382. On the basis of the author's name, Utsavakīrti, and the similarity of the titles, one may suspect this to be the same as the *Padarohaṇa* (see above, § 2), a work belonging to the Kātantra school. Only the inspection and comparison of the two manuscripts will make it possible to establish whether they contain the same work or two different works by the same author.

¹⁹⁰ The Kāṣṭhamaṇḍapa was a well-known public rest-house that gave its name to the city of Kathmandu (see Petech 1984, 187). It is difficult to decide whether here the name refers to the building or already to the city.

¹⁹¹ However, note that Petech 1984 does not list this colophon among the 16 documents of Jayārjunadeva's reign.

A few decades younger is NAK 1/1076 (A 18/6), a fragmentary palm-leaf manuscript in Nepālākṣara script of a tract called *Ūṣmabheda* attributed to Maheśvara, which according to the catalogue deals with the spelling and pronunciation of words containing the sibilants (*ūṣman*) *śa*, *ṣa* and *sa* (for an edition of this work, see Hahn 2006 and 2007). The short colophon bears the year NS 541 (= 1421 CE):

*samvat 541 dvirāṣāḍhaśuddhi*¹⁹² *15 tad eva tithau sampūrṇṇaṃ yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā likhitaṃ lekhaḥo [!] nāsti doṣaḥ ||* (fol. 6v5)

This has been completed in the year 541, the 15th lunar day of the bright fortnight of the intercalary Āṣāḍha month. As it was seen so it was written, the scribe has no fault.

A few surviving manuscripts indicate that the interest in grammatical works was not confined to those dealing with Sanskrit, but also embraced grammars of Prakrit, which – as is known – was an integral part of the classical Sanskritic literary culture. Among these the following, kept in the Cambridge University Library, is especially noteworthy. The manuscript, Or.84,¹⁹³ is in fact the oldest known surviving copy of the *Prākṛtasañjivanī* of Vasantarāja, a commentary on the *Prākṛtprakāśa* traditionally ascribed to Vararuci, by far the most popular grammar of Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit. Even though incomplete (it ends on fol. 48v with the final lines of the commentary on the first *sūtra* of chapter 4, *sandhāv acām aḍlopaviśeṣā bahulam*, on fol. 45r, l. 1), it is a generally correct and reliable witness for the surviving portion. The colophon is missing, but the manuscript can be dated on palaeographic grounds to the 15th century at the very latest. Moreover, the verses found at the beginning of the manuscript,¹⁹⁴ which are not found in the printed edition of the *Prākṛtasañjivanī*, provide some information on its author:

*hṛtpadmasadmodaravartti rūpaṃ
dhyātaṃ sudhāsyandi sadaiva yasyāḥ |
prakaḷpate vānmayatatvasiddhyai
devīn namasyāmi sarasvatīṃ tām ||*¹⁹⁵
*manthakṣobhitaduḥkhasindhu*¹⁹⁶ *vilasaḍḍiṇḍirapiṇḍopamaḥ*

192 Probably to be emended to *śudi*.

193 <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-00084/1>.

194 The verses are preceded by a short invocation – *ṛ omṇ namaḥ sarvvajñāya ||* – suggesting that the unknown scribe was a Buddhist. I wish to thank Emmanuel Francis, Andrew Ollet and, especially, Dominic Goodall for their comments on the readings and the interpretation of these verses.

195 The first verse is in *upajāti* metre, the second in *śārdūlavikrīḍita*, and the last three in *āryā*.

196 Probably to be emended to *°dugdhasindhu*^o ‘ocean of milk’.

saṃmūrcchatghanaghoraghoṣaghaṭanāvvyāghūrṇitāśāgajah |
stikṣat¹⁹⁷kajjalapūñjasecakarucou kṛṣṇasya pāṇau sthite¹⁹⁸ |
yuṣmākaṃ śaradabhrakhaṇḍakacakhes¹⁹⁹ tatpāñcajano²⁰⁰ mude ||
bhaṭṭaśrīśivarājāṅgatadoṣaḥ²⁰¹ prasamitā²⁰²nyatejasvī
sūrya iva satyavatya samajani O sūnur vjijayarājaḥ²⁰³ ||
pūrṇakalo [']py akalaṃko jāttā²⁰⁴ vasudhātale sūdhakiraṇaḥ²⁰⁵ |
tatpādasamupajīvi²⁰⁶ vasantarājānujas tasya |
suvyaktarūpasiddhiṃ so [']natisaṃkṣepavistarāOm akarot ||
vararucisūtreṣv etāṃ prākṛtasamjivanivṛttim || (fol. 1v1–4)

I pay respects to the goddess Sarasvatī, [having] constantly meditated upon her form, oozing with nectar (*sudhāsyandi*) inside her abode [that is] the lotus of my heart, so that I may attain [mastery over] the truths expressed through language/literature.

May the Pāñcajanya conch, whose complexion is like the whisks of [white] autumn clouds, lying in Kṛṣṇa's hand that looks [as black] as a cloud [that is] like a heap of wet collyrium – [the conch] which is like a fragment of cuttle-fish-bone that has flashed [into view] from the ocean of milk when it was stirred up by the churning, and which makes the elephants of the directions roll about because it produces a terrible roar so dense that it congeals – be for your joy.

Bhaṭṭaśrī Śivarāja, flawless and possessed with an energy that eclipsed that of others like the sun [by which the night is dispelled and which has a radiance that puts all else in the shade], was born of Satyavatī as the son of Vijayarāja. Even though he has become full [like the moon/mastered all the arts] (*pūrṇakalo*), his limbs have no marks (*akalaṃko*) [unlike the moon's face], [and] his rays are like nectar on the surface of the earth. His younger brother and devoted servant is Vasantarāja. He [Vasantarāja] has composed this commentary, the *Prākṛtasamjivani*, on the sūtras of Vararuci, neither too short nor too long, in which the derivation of [speech] forms is perfectly clear.

Vasantarāja is certainly the same as the author of the *Vasantarājaśākuna*, a work on divination based on the observation of the flights of birds, which has the following very similar, if less elaborate, set of initial verses that among other things

197 Probably to be emended to *stimyat*^o.

198 Emend to *sthito*.

199 Probably to be emended to *śaradabhrakhaṇḍakachavis*.

200 Emend to *tatpāñcajanya*.

201 Emend to ^o*rājo gata*^o. *gatadoṣaḥ* is likely meant to be a pun meaning both 'flawless' and 'by which the night (*doṣa* = *pradoṣa*) is dispelled'.

202 Emend to *praśamitā*^o.

203 Emend to ^o*rājñah*.

204 Emend to *jāto*.

205 Emend to *sudhā*^o.

206 Emend to ^o*jīvi*.

detail his genealogy and mention the name of Candradeva who commissioned the work:

*bhaṭṭaḥ śrīśivarājo 'doṣorjitamūrtir atitejasvī |
sūrya iva satyavatyāṃ samajani sūnur²⁰⁷ vijayarājāt ||
pūrṇakalo 'py akalamko jāto vasudhātāle sudhākiraṇaḥ |
tatpādasamupajivī vasantarājo 'nujas tasya ||
abhyarthito 'bhiyatnāt kṛtabahumānena candradevena |
vyaracayad asau tadarthaṃ śākunam anyopakṛtaye ca ||²⁰⁸*

This Candradeva is identified as a king of Mithilā by the commentator Bhānucandraṇi (a Jaina pandit at Akbar's court).²⁰⁹ The Cambridge manuscript confirms that Vasantarāja was the son of Vijayarāja and Satyavati, and Śivarāja's younger brother, and it gives credibility to Bhānucandraṇi's assertion that Vasantarāja hailed from Mithilā, given the historical ties between this city and Nepal. The *Vasantarājaśākuna* is frequently quoted in king Ballālasena's *Adbhutasāgara*, which was begun in 1169 CE (he ruled until 1179 CE), as Kane notes, while the *Prākṛtasāñjivani* is quoted in the *Kavikāmadhenu* of Subhūticandra (c. 1060–1140 CE; see L. Deokar in this volume, p. 673), therefore Vasantarāja cannot be dated later than the early 12th century.

In Nepal the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* itself only survives in (presumably younger) paper copies. But another Prakrit grammar, the *Prākṛtānuśāsana* ascribed to the Buddhist Pāṇinian grammarian Puruṣottamadeva (early 12th c.), is preserved in NAK 4–150 (A 53/17[1]), a palm-leaf manuscript in Nepālākṣara, together with the *Apabhraṃśānuśāsana* of the same author. Its colophon reads:

*iti puruṣottamadevasya paiśācikaṃ sūtraṃ samāptaṃ || saṃ 385 jeṣṭhe likhitam ut-
tamaśrijñānena saptativarṣavayasā ||* (fol. 16v)

As the era is not specified, we cannot be sure about the exact year in which the manuscript was copied. The NGMCP catalogue entry gives LS (i.e. Lakṣmaṇa Samvat) in square brackets, which would correspond to 1515 CE, but it does not explain on what basis; if it were Nepāla Samvat, the manuscript would be much older, as the year would correspond to 1265 CE. Once again, only the direct inspection of the manuscript (or at least the microfilm) will make it possible to establish the date more securely on palaeographic grounds.

²⁰⁷ The edition reads *sanur*, certainly a misprint.

²⁰⁸ *Vasantarājaśākuna* vv. 3–5 (Jaṭāśaṅkara 1997, 4–5).

²⁰⁹ Bhānucandraṇi's *Ṭīkā*: ... *kena candradeveneti mithilādhiśenety arthaṃ* (Jaṭāśaṅkara 1997, 5). Cf. Kane (1977, 805–806 and n. 1309); and Śāstrī (1905, 7).

8 Conclusions

The data presented in the previous pages – albeit limited and incomplete – allow us, I believe, to draw a sufficiently clear and intriguing picture of the history of *vyākaraṇa* in medieval and early modern Nepal.

The Cāndra system appears to have been predominant in the early medieval period since virtually all the (admittedly few) grammatical manuscripts from the first millennium CE contain works of this school. While the presence of both Hinduism and Buddhism is attested in the Kathmandu Valley since the early centuries of the Common Era in inscriptions, sculptures, and architecture (temples, *stūpas*, *caityas*), it appears that, as far as grammar is concerned, the latter prevailed in the process of acculturation of the local population, predominantly of Newar stock and language. There is of course nothing intrinsically ‘Buddhist’ in the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*, but there is little doubt that due to its origin the system thrived mainly in Buddhist circles and educational institutions. The Buddhist *vihāras* of the Kathmandu Valley must have been responsible for the importation and flourishing of the Cāndra grammar. They were part of an international network of religious and educational organisations that extended from Sri Lanka and southeast Asia to central and east Asia, with a hub in the great ‘universities’ located in eastern India (modern Bengal and Bihar), a region that was relatively close and accessible through the Nepalese Tarai. Moreover, the valley was a major stopover on the most direct route connecting Tibet to India. Nepalese monks must have travelled to the centres of learning of eastern India to pursue their education and returned to their homeland with manuscripts of the works they had studied, which were later copied again in the local script. All of the most ancient copies of Cāndra works appear to be in the ‘Transitional Gupta’ or old Nepālākṣara scripts, and thus they already represent an advanced stage in the process of circulation of these works.

Some of the Nepalese *mahāvihāras* certainly provided not only instruction to the local novices but also higher education, thus functioning as centres of intellectual and scholarly debate and production.²¹⁰ This is confirmed by the presence in the collections not only of copies of the basic texts (the Cāndra *sūtrapāṭha* with the *Vṛtti*) or the didactic manuals, but also of the sophisticated later commentaries and treatises, such as Ratnamati’s *Cāndravvyākaraṇapañjikā* and *Śabdārthacintāvivṛti*. The accounts of Tibetan monks sojourning in the Valley, and the collaboration of Nepalese pandits to the translation of Sanskrit works into Tibetan that is attested

²¹⁰ See Dimitrov’s conjecture that the author of the *Sumatipañjikā* may have been active in the Kathmandu Valley.

in Tibetan sources, are further proof of the scholarly fervour in medieval Nepal.²¹¹ For example, according to Verhagen (1994, 89, 98) Dpañ Blo-gros-brtan-pa (1276–1342), ‘indubitably one of the main exponents of Sanskrit linguistics in Tibet’, is known to have ‘made several visits to Nepal’, and two of his translations of grammatical treatises, namely the *Adhikārasaṃgraha* and the *Vibhaktikārikā*, both associated with the Cāndra school, were produced in Patan; and Yar-kluṅs-lo-tṣā-ba (‘the translator from Yar-kluṅs’) Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan (c. 1285/1295–died after 1378), who produced translations of the Kātantra *sūtrapāṭha* and Durgasiṃha’s *Vṛtti*, was active both in Nepal and his homeland. Around the same time (13th–14th centuries) we learn from Tibetan colophons that a Nepalese Brahmin grammarian named Jetakaṛṇa ‘served as an informant’ for the translator Ņi-ma-rgyal-mtshan, who studied with him near Kathmandu and produced Tibetan renderings of Cāndra works (including the *sūtrapāṭha*); and another, called Śrīmaṇika or Maṇika,²¹² is mentioned as the supervisor/tutor of the Tibetan translator of two Kātantra works, the *Tyādyantasya Prakriyā-vicārita* and the *Uṇādivṛtti* (Verhagen 1994, 85–86).

Despite the association of Cāndra grammar with Buddhism, the Nepalese and Tibetan sources do not seem to indicate that in the Kathmandu Valley its study was exclusively confined to Buddhist circles.²¹³ The number of extant copies of the various works is small, as may be expected after so many centuries, but they are numerous enough to suggest that these books were not meant just for a few erudite clerics, and that just like elsewhere in the subcontinent, grammar – in one or the other of its scholastic branches – was a key component of the education and culture of the local elites, as confirmed for example in the 15th century by the *Ākhyataratnaśoṣa* commissioned by Jayabhairavamalla, the king’s son-in-law, or the copy of the *Kātantravyākaraṇa* belonging to the minister Jayabrahma.

The decline of the Buddhist centres of learning of eastern India brought about by the Muslim invasions in the late 12th century may have initially given an even stronger impulse to the cultivation of the Cāndra system in the Kathmandu Valley, as a number of monks/scholars sought refuge there. Approximately one century later, in the late 13th/early 14th centuries, the core texts (*sūtra* and *vṛtti*) of both

211 On the regular contacts of Tibetans with Nepal, see e.g. Regmi (1965, 629–631).

212 His provenance is unspecified but the name (or some variant of it) was clearly popular in medieval Nepal: above we have met an early-15th-century scribe called Maṇika (or Māṇika)-raja (see above pp. 89 and 98); and the 14th-century court intellectual and polymath who composed the *Abhinavarāghavānandanātaka* (Cambridge Add. 1658.1), as well as works in Newari on lexicography and *dharmasāstra*, was called Maṇika (Māṇikya) (see Formigatti 2016, 56 ff.).

213 See for example the abovementioned role of the brahmin Jetakaṛṇa in the Tibetan translation of Cāndra works.

Kātantra and Cāndra were translated into Tibetan (Verhagen 2001, 210), often relying, as was mentioned above, on the collaboration of Nepalese scholars.²¹⁴ And the continued copying of many Cāndra works well into the 15th century shows that the scholarly community of the Kathmandu Valley, probably strengthened by the contribution of the north-Indian refugees, certainly sustained the tradition for a few more centuries. However, the drying-up of its original fountainhead, the Buddhist universities where it had flourished in the first millennium CE, combined with the changes Newar Buddhism underwent approximately at the same time, with the increasing secularisation of the *vihāras* and the virtual end of monasticism,²¹⁵ gradually caused the system to wither and eventually die out, as evidenced by the sharp decline in the production of new copies of Cāndra works after 1500.²¹⁶

Moreover, another factor may have concurred to the decline of the Cāndra school, namely the Brahmanical bias of the religious and cultural policy initiated in the late 14th century by king Jayasthitimalla, the founder of the late Malla dynasty, who was possibly of Maithili origins. Mithilā, the immediate southern neighbour to the Kathmandu Valley and a celebrated centre of Brahmanical learning, had always played a role in shaping the culture of the region, but after its conquest by the Muslims in 1324–1325 CE a new wave of Maithili refugees, including members of the aristocracy and the ‘Brahman intelligentsia’, as Slusser puts it, settled in the valley. Among them was the former queen Devaladevi, the wife of Harisimpha of Tirhut (who died in early 1326 during the northbound journey), with her son

214 In this respect E. Gene Smith (1968, 5) notes that ‘[t]he second and greatest transmission of Indic civilization to Tibet (11th–14th centuries) resulted from a coincidence. Hindu civilization was faced with a monumental crisis at a time when Tibet was at the beginning of a period of maximum cultural receptivity. It was this fortunate accident that produced modern Tibetan civilization.’

215 On this phenomenon Slusser (1975, 286–287) writes: ‘By the end of the 12th century, a change had come about in Nepalese Buddhist practice that would at length mean the end of monasticism and entrain the decline and virtual dissolution of Buddhism in the Kathmandu Valley. [...] Apparently, the principal catalyst that propelled the monks and nuns out of their *saṃghas* and back into the familiar and nearby secular milieu was the doctrine and practice of Vajrayāna. The conventual, celibate community ceased to have the same value it had as one of the Three Jewels, Dharma-Saṃgha-Buddha. Celibacy was nullified by the ritualistic practices associated with the female principles, *prajñā* [...]. The physical conditions and the doctrinal and social climate prevailing by the end of the Transitional Period provided almost irresistible conditions for channeling the monks and nuns back into the secular community.’

216 Something similar seems to have happened at the southern end of the subcontinent, in Sri Lanka. Like in Nepal, Buddhism kept thriving there, albeit in its Theravāda Pāli-medium form, but in modern times manuscripts of Cāndra works, which had originally nourished the local Pāli grammatical tradition, could no longer be found on the island, a clear sign that any active interest in the speculations of the ancient Buddhist Sanskrit grammarians had ceased.

Jagatsiṃha. After they settled in Nepal, Jagatsiṃha married Nāyakadevī, the last issue of the royal family of Bhatgaon. In 1347 a baby girl, named Rājalladevī, was born to them, but soon after her mother died, while her father was taken to prison and nothing more is heard of him.²¹⁷ Devaladevī assumed regency and somehow managed to assert herself as the protagonist of Nepalese politics in the following decades until her death in 1366, through troubled times marked by foreign invasions and unrest among the local nobility. She was instrumental in arranging the marriage in 1355 of her granddaughter Rājalladevī with the newcomer Jayasthitimalla, who acted as the de facto ruler during the reign of the ineffectual Jayārjunadeva, until after the latter's death in 1382 he was officially enthroned. Petech (1984, 127–128) notes that Jayasthitimalla's 'lineage was surprisingly obscure' and conjectures that he may have come from an aristocratic family of Tirhut, on the basis of an old chronicle that claims he hailed from the south. He further remarks that 'the political career of Jayasthitimalla was accompanied by a certain measure of immigration from Tirhut; in the years after 1380 we find repeated mention in the chronicle of Ḍoya (Maithilī) residents in Nepal. And the rule of Jayasthitimalla certainly marked a strong revival of that kind of rigid brahmanical orthodoxy, which was always typical of Mithilā'.

If we turn now at the history of the other two main grammatical systems considered in the previous pages, the Kātantra and the Pāṇinīya, the data gleaned from the survey of the manuscript collections and the study of the colophons largely appear to confirm the broader historical picture, but at the same time raise further questions that for now cannot be easily answered. In the earliest period the two systems do not seem to have made significant inroads into Nepal, a fact which is in itself surprising. It is of course possible that the absence of early documents, and particularly of dated colophons, is the result of random loss. And there are undated palm-leaf manuscripts that should be inspected and dated as accurately as possible on palaeographic grounds, although overall their number is quite small. However, especially in comparison with the manuscripts of Cāndra works, it is indeed striking that there is only one single copy of a Pāṇinīya text that can be dated to the early second millennium (NAK 4/216, see above p. 105). And it may not be by chance that this happens to be a copy of the *Nyāsa*, Jinendrabuddhi's sub-commentary on the *Kāśīkāvṛtti*, namely a work that was composed by a Buddhist author who was pos-

217 On this complex and somewhat obscure chain of events see Regmi 1965, 288–293; Slusser 1982, 55–56; and Petech 1984, 115–121.

sibly active in the 8th century CE in one of the Buddhist universities of eastern India.²¹⁸ The odd copy of this or that Pāṇiniya work may well have made its way into Nepal in the earlier period, as there was no doctrinal bias against the system itself, but as far as we can tell this does not seem to have led to a sustained and widespread interest in Pāṇini's grammar.

The earliest dated manuscript of a Kātantra work is even younger than the *Nyāsa* manuscript, as it dates from the end of the 13th century. It is said to be in Nāgarī script, which suggests a foreign origin. But then, starting with two late-14th century manuscripts, a continuous and substantial number of manuscripts, mostly in Nepālākṣara, testify to the successful establishment of the Kātantra tradition in the region. It is noteworthy that from the colophons its followers appear to have been mostly high-ranking brahmins. Some of these may have been related to the court as the recurring references to the ruling kings (less frequent in Cāndra manuscripts) seem to suggest, and we saw above that in one case (NAK 1/1078) the copy is explicitly said to have belonged to a prince (*rājakumāra*). These few data cast an interesting light on the history of this tradition, which has received little scholarly attention after the early 20th century, despite its antiquity and the ubiquitous references to it in Sanskrit literature.²¹⁹ The Kātantra system was supposedly established as an alternative to Pāṇini and is believed to have been less interested in rigorous linguistic theory and more in the actual teaching of Sanskrit,²²⁰ and purportedly addressed to a socially broader readership.²²¹ Initially this grammar, ascribed to Śarvavarman (of whom nothing is known, but who is generally assumed to have been

218 On the likely identity of Jinendrabuddhi the author of the *Nyāsa* with Jinendrabuddhi the commentator of Diñnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, see Steinkellner's Introduction in Steinkellner, Krasser and Lasic 2005, xl ff. Note that one of the pieces of evidence that are used to support this identification is that in the internal rubrics of both works the author is referred to as *bodhisatvadeśīyācāryajinendrabuddhi* (cf. the rubric in NAK 4/216, quoted above, n. 164). Steinkellner thinks that Jinendrabuddhi may have been active at Nālandā (or a similar centre) c. 710–770 CE.

219 The oldest known fragments of the Kātantra *sūtrapāṭha*, from central Asia, date from around the 5th century CE (Scharfe 1977, 162). On the significance of Kātantra in the history of medieval India, see Pollock 2006, 169 ff.

220 Nevertheless, I suspect the *Kātantravyākaraṇa* was conceived not so much as a language primer but rather as a grammar handbook, meant to give a smattering of this all-important subject to anyone who – for a variety of reasons – did not wish to or could not embark in a full-blown brahmanical education, which implied studying Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

221 Cf. the following verses, said to be from Śaśideva's *Vyākhyānaprakriyā*: *chāndasāḥ svalpamatayaḥ śāstrāntararatās ca ye | īśvarā vācyāniratās tathālasyaayutās ca ye | vaṅk-sasyādisaṃsaktā lokayātrādiṣu sthitāḥ | teṣāṃ kṣipraṃ prabodhārtham anekārthaṃ kalāpakam* || 'The Kalāpa has various purposes: it is aimed at teaching Sanskrit quickly to those who study the Vedic texts, those who are slow-witted, those who take delight in other śāstras, as well as to

a brahmin), must have been popular with the Buddhists, and through them propagated to central Asia, but later they seem to have preferred the *Cāndravvyākaraṇa* composed by their coreligionist Candragomin. As far as I know, no study exists of the later history of the Kātantra tradition, but we know that over the centuries the system spread across the subcontinent and further beyond, and its literature kept expanding. The evidence drawn from the Nepalese manuscript collections suggest that, in the wake of the historical events briefly outlined above – in short, the decline of the Cāndra school and the rise to power of the culturally ‘brahmanising’ Mallas –, the local scholarly circles first turned to the Kātantra, most probably with the contribution of newcomers from Mithilā. This in turn implies that in this renowned citadel of brahmanical learning (and perhaps in other areas of North India²²²) the Kātantra system enjoyed a position of prestige and could count on influential followers. To what extent these differed from the Pāṇinīyas, and what the factors and circumstances were that determined the affiliation to one or the other system, we simply do not know, but it would be definitely worth investigating.

If we turn now to the Pāṇinian school, its true beginnings in the region appear to go back to the late 15th century, at least one century later than Kātantra.²²³ This impression is corroborated by the fact that virtually all the early copies of Pāṇinian works are in Maithili script, and therefore they were probably imported to Nepal from Mithilā, as if there had been a dearth of local copies. It is of course well known that manuscripts in Maithili script were also produced by foreign scribes who had settled in the Kathmandu Valley, but the geographical references found in the colophons seem to be to Indian towns and villages, and none of them makes any mention of a Nepalese king. However, from the late 15th century onward the data show an increasing production of local copies of all the Pāṇinian works (with the remarkable exception of the *Vākyapadīya*), including those of the so-called *Navyavyākaraṇa*, the movement that effectively kicked off a revival of Pāṇinian grammar across the subcontinent. At the same time, the substantial number of late manuscripts of Kātantra works that were either copied locally or imported shows a continued interest also in this system.

rulers, to those who love talking (?), those who are slothful, those who are engaged in trade, farming, etc., and those who are busy with worldly affairs and the like’ (Dwivedi 1977, p. 3 *prāstāvika*; also quoted in Belvalkar 1976, 82, from which I take the reading *vaṇik-sasyādīsamsaktā*; here Dwivedi read *vaṇijas tṛṣṇādīsamsaktā*). For an overview of the state of the art in Kātantra studies, see Shen forthcoming.

222 On the rise of Kātantra in Bengal in the 15th–16th centuries see Belvalkar (1976, 75).

223 With the usual caveat: if the picture we get from the manuscript collections is not distorted by the fortuitous loss of all early Pāṇinian manuscripts.

Interestingly, Ruegg (1996, 221) and Verhagen (2001, 207) point out that the introduction of the Pāṇinian system into Tibet took place quite late in comparison to Cāndra and Kātantra, namely in the 17th century, and suggest various possible explanations, the main one, in Verhagen's words, attributing 'the impetus ... to the activities of a particular individual or a small group of associated individuals, which could be one or more Indian master(s) proficient in a certain system who was (or were) active in Tibet, or a Tibetan scholar-translator actively seeking tutelage in a particular tradition'.²²⁴ In light of the data presented above it seems reasonable to suggest that the historical events in Nepal – and their reflections on the local intellectual community – may have played a significant role in the transmission of the Sanskrit grammatical traditions to Tibet. It cannot be a coincidence that, broadly speaking, the chronological sequence of this transmission appears to reflect the state of the art in Nepal, with a delay of one or two centuries.

To conclude, it is tempting to relate the rise of both the Kātantra and the Pāṇinian grammatical traditions as testified in the manuscripts to the dynastic change that took place in the Kathmandu Valley in the second half of the 14th century, with the rise to power of the Malla dynasty founded by Jayarajasthitimalla, and the subsequent burgeoning of a more 'mainstream' Sanskrit culture that Formigatti and Cuneo have aptly dubbed 'the Malla Renaissance' (see Formigatti 2016), in a context that saw the once dominant Cāndra tradition decline as a consequence of the far-reaching changes Newar Buddhism, and Newar society at large, underwent at the same time.

²²⁴ Gene Smith (1968, 6) suggests that one factor of the 'revival of interest in Sanskrit' in Tibet in the 18th century 'might have been the Newar artisan-merchant community resident in Tibet', with its century-long Sanskrit heritage. He also remarks that 'when Si-tu and his contemporaries went outside Tibet for studies, they almost invariably went to the Kathmandu Valley where they found a considerable number of learned pandits'. This may already have been the case in earlier centuries.

Tab. 1: Cāndra manuscripts in Nepalese collections.(CV = Cāndravāyākaraṇa *sūtrapāṭha*; CVV = *sūtrapāṭha* with *Vṛtti*; Nep = Nepālākṣara; pl = palm leaf)

DATE (in CE)	SHELF MARK	TITLE	SCRIPT	MATERIAL
990	NAK 5/732, NAK 5/734	Sumatipañjikā	Nep	pl
before 1000 ?	NAK 4/26, NAK 1/1692	CV, CVV	Transitional Gupta	pl
1085	NAK 4/311	CVV, Śabdalaḥṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā of Ratnamati	Nep	pl
1134	(kept in Tibet)	CVV	Nep	pl
1155	NAK 3/379	CVV	Nep	pl
1194	Kaiser 9/27	Śabdalaḥṣaṇavivaraṇapañjikā	Nep	pl
1199	Add.1657.2	Ratnamatipaddhati of Ānandadatta	Nep	pl
12 th – 13 th c.	NAK 5 /456 A, B, C, D, E	Kathmandu fragments of Ratnamatipaddhati	Nep	pl
12 th c.	Or.1278	Candrālaṃkāra of Sāriputta	Bhaikṣukī	pl
12 th – 13 th c.	NAK 1/1697	Sabdārthacintāvivṛti	Nep	pl
12 th – 13 th c.	Add.1657.1	CV-Pañjikā	Nep	pl
1225	NAK 5/729	CVV	Nep	pl
1243	Kaiser 17	CV-Pañjikā	Nep	pl
1257	NAK 1/1583	CV	Nep	pl
1259 (?)	NAK 5/724	CV	Nep	pl
13 th c.	Or.714	Nibandha of Ratnadatta	Nep	pl
13 th c.	Add.1705	Ratnamatipaddhati	Nep	pl
13 th – 14 th c.	Add.2121	Dhātupārāyaṇa of Pūrṇacāndra	Nep	pl

DATE (in CE)	SHELF MARK	TITLE	SCRIPT	MATERIAL
13 th – 14 th c.		Ratnamatipaddhati	Nep	pl
1356	Asiatic Society Calcutta 3823	CV	Nep	pl
1369	NAK 5/410	Uṇādisūtravṛtti	Nep	pl
1397 (?)	NAK 5/727	CVV	Nep	pl
14 th – 15 th c.	Cambridge UL	Various CV and CVV Mss	Nep	pl
1411	NAK 5/730	CV	Nep	pl
1412	Add.1691.4	CV	Nep	pl
1413	Kesar 582	Subantarātnākara of Subhūticandra	Nep	pl
1417	NAK 3/685	Ākhyātarātnakośa	Nep	pl
1420	Or.148	Subantarātnākara	Nep	pl
1420	NAK 3/361	Tiṅbheda	Nep	pl
1440	NAK 5/416	Subvidhānaśabdāmālāparīkrama of Subhūticandra	Nep	pl
1441	NAK 5/731	CV + Uṇādisūtra	Nep	pl
1454	NAK 5/407	Prādivṛtti	Nep	pl
1654	NAK 5/6210	Upasargavṛtti	Nep	pl

Tab. 2: Kātantra manuscripts in Nepalese collections

(K: Kātantra *sūtrapāṭha*; KV: *sūtrapāṭha* with Durgasiṃha's *Vṛtti*; KVP: Trilocanadāsa's *Pañjikā*; DN: Devanāgarī; Nep: Nepālākṣara; pl = palm leaf)

DATE (in CE)	SHELF MARK	TITLE	SCRIPT	MATERIAL
1286	NAK 3/397	KVP	DN	pl
1393	Kesar 14	Padarohaṇa of Utsavakīrti	Nep	pl
1396	NAK 5/418	Syādyantakośa	Nep	pl
1411	NAK 5/417	K	Nep	pl
1416	NAK 1/1078	Dhātupāṭha	Nep	pl
1425	NAK 3/383	Paribhāṣāvṛtti of Durgasiṃha	Nep	pl
1447	NAK 9/589	KVP	Nep	pl
14 th –15 th c. ?		Several Mss of K, KV, KVP, Paribhāṣāvṛtti, etc.	Nep, Maithili	pl
1497	NAK 1/1406	K (?)	DN	paper
1480 or 1500	NAK 5/5496	Triliṅgaprakaraṇa (section of Syādyantakośa)	DN (?)	paper
1500	Kesar 234	Syādyantakośasāra	Nep (?)	pl
1575–76	NAK 5/4274	KVP	DN	paper
1585	NAK 1/1528	K	Nep	paper
1587	NAK 1/1388	K (?)	Nep	paper
1635	Kesar 191	KV	Nep	paper
1682	not available	Dhātuvṛtti-manoramā	Nep	paper
1692	NAK 1/1351	KV	Nep	paper

Tab. 3: Pāṇinian manuscripts in Nepalese collections

(DN: Devanāgarī; Nep: Nepālākṣara; pl = palm leaf)

DATE (in CE)	SHELF MARK	TITLE	SCRIPT	MATERIAL
early 11 th c.	NAK 4/216	Kāśīkāvṛtti	Nep	pl
1209	NAK 4/755	Sambandhasiddhi	Nep	pl
1478	NAK 1/464	Kāśīkāvṛtti	Maithili	pl
1487	unknown	Rūpāvatāra	Maithili	pl
1494	NAK 4/326	Aṣṭādhyāyī	Maithili	pl
1496	NAK 1/1537	Nyāsa	Maithili	pl
1496	NAK 1/468	Kāśīkāvṛtti	Maithili	pl
after 15 th c.		Several Mss of Kāśīkāvṛtti, Nyāsa, Dhātupāṭha, Rūpāvatāra, Bhāṣāvṛtti, Vārarucasamgraha, etc.	Maithili, Nep, DN	paper
1503	NAK 4/764	Rūpāvatāra	Maithili	pl
1567	NAK 4/257	Aṣṭādhyāyī	Maithili	pl
1577	NAK 5/5497	Rūpāvatāra	Nep	paper
1595	NAK 1/1114	Ṣaṭkārakabālabodhinī	Maithili	pl
1630	NAK 1/1490	Vārarucasamgraha	Nep	pl
1652	NAK 4/40	Siddhāntakaumudī	Maithili	pl
1660	NAK 1/468	Aṣṭādhyāyī	Maithili	pl
1672	NAK 1/309	Prakriyākaumudī	Maithili	paper
1672	NAK 5/3559	Prakriyākaumudī	Maithili	paper
1678	NAK 1/1076	Prakriyākaumudī	Maithili	pl
1678	NAK 1/313	Prakriyākaumudī	Nep	paper
1685	NAK 6/495	Vārarucasamgraha	Nep	paper

DATE (in CE)	SHELF MARK	TITLE	SCRIPT	MATERIAL
1763	NAK 4/151	Prayogamukha	Nep	paper
1790/1791	NAK 5/3832	Mahābhāṣya	DN	paper

References

- Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna (1976), *An account of the different existing systems of Sanskrit grammar*. (2nd ed., rev. ed.), Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan. [First edition 1915]
- Bendall, Cecil (1883), *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge. With introductory notices and illustrations of the palæography and chronology of Nepal and Bengal*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Chatterji, Kshitish Chandra (1953), *Cāndravākaraṇa of Candragomin*. Part 1 (Chapters 1–3); Part 2 (Chapters 4–6), Poona: Deccan College.
- Dash, Prafulla Chandra (1986). *A Comparative Study of the Pāṇinian and Cāndra Systems of Grammar (Kṛdanta portion)*. New Delhi: Ramanand Vidya Bhavan.
- Deokar, Lata M. (2014), *Subhūticandra's Kavikāmadhenu on Amarakośa 1.1.1–1.4.8: Together with Si tu Paṅ chen's Tibetan Translation*, Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Deokar, Mahesh A. (2008), *Technical Terms and Techniques of the Pali and Sanskrit Grammars*, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir (2010), *The Bhaikṣukī manuscript of the Candrālaṃkāra: Study, script tables, and facsimile edition* (Harvard Oriental Series 72), Cambridge, Mass.: Published by The Harvard Oriental Series, The Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir (2011), *Śabdālaṃkaraḥṣavibhāga. Die Unterscheidung der Lautfiguren und der Fehler*. Kritische Ausgabe des dritten Kapitels von Daṇḍins Poetik 'Kāvya darśa' und der tibetischen Übertragung 'Sñan ṅag me loṅ; samt dem Sanskrit-Kommentar des Ratnaśrījñāna, dem tibetischen Kommentar des Dpañ Blo gros brtan pa und einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrit-Grundtextes, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir (2016), *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati: A Philological Chronicle (Phullalocanavaṃsa)*. Napoli: Series minor, Università degli studi di Napoli L'Orientale.
- Dwivedi, Jānakī Prasāda (ed.) (1997), *Kātantravyākaraṇa of Ācārya Śarvavarmā with four commentaries: Ṛṭti and Ṭikā by Śrī Durgasīmha, Kātantravṛttipañjikā by Śrī Trilocanadāsa, Kālāpacandra by Kavirāja Suṣeṣaśarmā, Samikṣā by editor*. Sarasvatībhavana-granthamālā 135, Part 1. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University.
- Einoo, Shingo (2005), 'Ritual calendar. Change in the conceptions of time and space', in *Journal Asiatique*, 293.1: 99–124.
- Formigatti, Camillo Alessio (2016), 'Towards a Cultural History of Nepal, 14th–17th Century. A Nepalese Renaissance?', in *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 89: 51–66.
- Gornall, Alastair (2013), *Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pāli in Medieval Lañkā*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, submitted to the University of Cambridge.

- Hahn, Michael (1992), *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta. Two authors in the succession of Āryaśūra on the rediscovery of parts of their Jātakamālās*. (2nd ed., revised and enlarged, Studia philologica Buddhica Occasional paper series, 1), Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Hahn, Oliver (2006), 'The *Ūṣmabheda* of Maheśvara', in *Newsletter of the NGMCP*, 2: 19-23.
- Hahn, Oliver (2007), 'The *Ūṣmabheda* of Maheśvara', in *Newsletter of the NGMCP*, 3: 6-9.
- Jaṭāśaṅkara, Śrīdhara (1997), *Vasantarājaśākunam. Bhaṭṭa-Vasantarājaviracitaṃ Bhānu-candraṅiviracitayā ṭikayā samalaṅkṛtam*, Mumbai: Khemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsaśreṣṭhi.
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman (1977^{2nd}), *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. 5, part II, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kölver, Bernhard, and Hemrāj Śākya (1985), *Documents from the Rudravarṇa-Mahāvihāra, Pāṭan. 1, Sales and mortgages*, Nepalic, 1. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
- Lalithambal, K.S. (1995), *Dharmakīrti's Rūpavatāra: A critical study*, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica, 153. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Liebich, Bruno (1902), *Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa. Die Grammatik des Candragomin. Sūtra, Uṇādi, Dhātupāṭha* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes. Band 11), Leipzig.
- Malla, Kamal P. (2000), *A Dictionary of Classical Newari. Compiled from Manuscript Sources*. [chief editor, K.P. Malla], Kathmandu: Nepal Bhasha Dictionary Committee.
- Oberlies, Thomas (1989), *Studie zum Cāndravākaraṇa: Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2*. (Alt- und neu-indische Studien 38), Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.
- Oberlies, Thomas (2012), 'Cāndriana Inedita (Studien zum Cāndravākaraṇa V)', in François Voegeli et al. (eds), *Devadattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst felicitation volume*. Worlds of south and inner Asia 5, Bern: Peter Lang.
- Petech, Luciano (1984), *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1482)*. 2nd Edition (Serie orientale Roma v. 54), Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Petrocchi, Alessandra (2016), 'The Bhūtasamkhyā Notation: Numbers, Culture, and Language in Sanskrit Mathematical Literatur', in G. Thompson and Richard K. Payne (eds), *On Meaning and Mantras: Essays in Honor of Frits Staal*, Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies and BDK America.
- Pollock, Sheldon (2006), *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Regmi, D.R. (1960), *Ancient Nepal*. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay.
- Regmi, D.R. (1965), *Medieval Nepal*. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay.
- Ruegg, D. Seyfort (1996), 'Notes sur la transmission et la réception des traités de grammaire et de lexicographie sanskrites dans les traditions indo-tibétaines', in N. Balbir, G. Pinault and J. Fezas (eds), *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien. Centenaire de Louis Renou. Actes du Colloque international (Paris, 25–27 janvier 1996)*, Paris: H. Champion, 213–232.
- Saini, R.S. (1999), *Post-Pāṇinian Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*, Delhi: Parimal Publications.
- Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Rāhula (1935), 'Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet', in *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, 21, Part 1: 21–43.
- Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Rāhula (1937), 'Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet', in *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, 23, Part 1: 1–57.
- Śāstrī, Haraprasāda (1905), *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts (1901–1902 to 1905–1906)*, Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.

- Scharfe, Hartmut (1977), *Grammatical Literature*. History of Indian literature, vol. 5, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Shen, Yiming (forthcoming), 'Fundamentals for the study of Kātantravyākaraṇa'. *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhāṣā*.
- Slusser, Mary Shepherd (1982), *Nepal Mandala. A Cultural Study of the Kathmandu Valley*. Vol. 1. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, E. Gene (1968), in Lokesh Chandra (ed.), *The autobiography and diaries of Si-tu paṅ-chen*, with a foreword by E. Gene Smith. Śata-piṭaka Series v. 77, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Vergiani, Vincenzo (2011), 'A Quotation from the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* of Bhartṛhari in the Pratyāhāra Section of the *Kāśīkāvṛtti*', in P. Haag and V. Vergiani (eds), *Studies in the Kāśīkāvṛtti. The Section on Pratyāhāras. Critical Edition, Translation and Other Contributions*, London: Anthem Press.
- Verhagen, Pieter C. (1994), *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Transmission of the Canonical Literature*. Volume One, Leiden: Brill.
- Verhagen, Pieter C. (2001), *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Assimilation into Indigenous Scholarship*. Volume Two, Leiden: Brill.
- Zysk, Kenneth G. (2012), 'The Use of Manuscript Catalogues as Sources of Regional Intellectual History in India's Early Modern Period', in S. Rath (ed.), *Aspects of Manuscript Culture in South India*, Leiden: Brill.