Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung. Volume 63 (4), 455–471 (2010)
DOI: 10.1556/AOrient.63.2010.4.4

THE BUDDHIST CONTRIBUTION TO THE INDIAN BELLES LETTRES*

MICHAEL HAHN

Ritterstr. 14, D-35287 Amoeneburg, Germany
e-mail: hahn.m@t-online.de

The paper aims at summarising the progress that has been made after World War II in collecting, editing, translating, and analysing the Buddhist contributions to classical Sanskrit literature. It demonstrates that the systematic search for manuscripts has brought to light many unknown works, among them veritable highlights of their respective genres, such as the play *Lokānanda* by Candragomin, the *Jātakamālās* by Saṅghasena, Haribhaṭṭa, and Gopadatta, a great number of outstanding hymns by Mātṛceṭa and his successors, and verse epics such as the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* by Śivasvāmin, and the two late poems by Sarvarakṣita, namely the *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā* and the *Maṇicūḍajātaka*. It is noteworthy that in many cases the oldest or even only specimens of various genres were composed by Buddhist authors.

Key words: Sanskrit literature, Buddhist literature, Haribhaṭṭa, *Jātakamālā*, *campū*.

Since one of the aims of this conference is to underline the value of textual studies, I thought it appropriate to illustrate the enormous progress that has been achieved in various fields of Indian studies after World Ward II by a single case that has been my special field of research for the last 45 years: the Buddhist contribution to classical Sanskrit literature. I am fully aware that statements of a similar nature and weight can be made with regard to many other fields of Indian studies: Buddhist philosophy, Tantric studies, Jain studies, Middle-Indian linguistics, history, art history, epigraphy, etc. However, Buddhist studies are peculiar insofar as the original works are no longer available in the very country in which they were once composed or compiled. The majority of them are entirely lost, and we know of them only if their titles are mentioned in other extant works. In other cases, passages of lost works, occasionally

* This paper was read at the conference "Letting the Texts Speak: The Importance of Textual Studies in Contemporary Indology" (Budapest, 3–5 February 2010).

0001-6446 / $ 20.00

of considerable length, are quoted in anthologies like Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. The main place where a substantial number of Buddhist texts have survived the holocaust – a suitable term if one reflects about the original meaning of the term that is "burning of everything" – of the Buddhist culture of India is, as everybody knows, Nepal. Therefore, the study of the so-called Northern Buddhism began with the analysis of manuscripts from Nepal that were sent to India, England and France.[1]

Gradually, more remnants of Buddhist literature were found at other places: in Central Asia, Tibet, and the north-western parts of what can be called "Greater India", i.e., the realm where Indian culture flourished; these are the places that now belong to new political entities like Pakistan, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, or whose status is disputed, like the northern part of Kashmir. I am very glad to see that at least three contributions to this conference deal with related topics, namely the papers by Dr. Jowita Kramer, Prof. R. K. Mishra, and Dr. Gergely Hidas.

And last but not least the two huge collections of translations of Indian Buddhist texts have to be mentioned here: The so-called Chinese and Tibetan Tripiṭakas. The former collection contains some 1700 works of Indian origin that were translated between the 2nd and 11th centuries CE. Translated into English, they would fill approximately 300,000 pages in the octavo format. The latter collection contains some 5000 works that were translated between the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 14th centuries CE. Only a few of them were translated later, e.g., Pāṇini's grammar. Translated into English, they would cover more than 400,000 pages. My free guess is that not more than 25% of these texts have survived in their original language.[2] But even in these cases the translations, in particular those into Tibetan, are invaluable ancillary sources because they are quite often based on better manuscripts than those that have survived in the places mentioned above.

It was a rare coincidence that in 1965 the seed was laid for what later became a systematic search for the remnants of *belles lettres* composed by Buddhist authors. At that time I was a student at the University of Marburg and looking for a suitable topic for my Ph.D. thesis for which I wished to make use of my newly acquired knowledge of Classical Tibetan. By good luck, the Oriental Section of the former Prussian State Library of Berlin (now Staatsbibliothek Berlin) was still temporarily located at Marburg. This enabled me to consult the Derge edition of the Tibetan Tanjur in my search for hitherto unexplored works that seemed to be of some literary importance. For my thesis I chose the Tibetan version of Jñānaśrīmitra's *Vṛttamālāstuti*, a highly sophisticated illustration of 150 different Sanskrit metres in the form of a hymn of praise of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī. While going through the catalogues of the Tibetan canon, several other works caught my eye. Among well-known works like

[1] Because of the great number of works mentioned in this paper, it is impossible to give a complete bibliography even of recent studies pertaining to them. The select references given here will therefore be restricted to some exemplary publications, preferably to those that contain detailed bibliographies. Lack of mention of a book or paper is not meant as a judgement of lesser value or importance.

[2] This figure might increase substantially once the full size of Indian manuscripts preserved in Tibet and their actual state of preservation become known.

Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita*, Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā*, Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*, Harṣadeva's *Nāgānandanāṭaka*, Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, or Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, I discovered works that were not mentioned or described in the histories of Indian literature. Two prominent examples were Haribhaṭṭa's *Jātakamālā* (HJM) and Candragomin's *Lokānandanāṭaka*. They immediately aroused my curiosity and I began to transcribe and translate them while I was still working on my Ph.D. thesis. Even with my limited knowledge of Tibetan I could feel that both works were outstanding exemplars of their respective genres that deserved more attention than they had been given before.

In 1973, while I was preparing the Tibetan version of legend No. 6 of HJM for publication, I discovered that its Sanskrit original was still extant, hidden in a quite recent paper manuscript of Nepalese origin, which now belongs to the collections of the University Library, Cambridge. The manuscript is undated, and neither the author, nor the compiler, nor the scribe are mentioned. The rather arbitrary title of the compilation is *Avadānasārasamuccaya* and it contains, as we now know, five legends from a *Jātakamāla*, most likely composed by a certain Gopadatta, nine legends from Haribhaṭṭa's *Jātakamālā*, and two anonymous legends, the *Śambūkāvadāna* and the *Sumāgadhāvadāna*.

This discovery, which bewared me of many unnecessary speculations about the correct interpretation of the Tibetan translation of that legend, finally convinced me of the necessity of first making a systematic survey of what is still available of the Buddhist literature in its original form before studying new works. Thanks to several travel and research grants from the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) I could visit the most important places and libraries where Buddhist manuscripts are kept and in many cases I was permitted to take or obtain microfilms or photostat copies. From the beginning, I confined myself to what I later termed the "poetic and didactic literature of Indian Buddhism". In this manner I collected more than 1000 manuscripts for the library of the Indological Institute of the University of Bonn. Of particular importance and help was the *Nepal–German Manuscript Preservation Project*, which had been launched under the auspices of the German Oriental Society (Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft) in 1970. A brief report of my various travels as well as a list of titles of the manuscripts is contained in a volume celebrating the 30th anniversary of the institute in Bonn as an independent entity (see Hahn 1988; Eimer 1988).

This collection became the starting point for many theses (M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.) and several other studies, books as well as papers, of the genres they represent. These studies comprise re-editions of well-known works, whenever better manuscripts became available, and many first editions. I now would like to describe in which way and to what extent these studies – as well as those done at other places – have broadened our knowledge of classical Sanskrit literature. The most important projects in this domain are the analysis of the Buddhist Sanskrit literature of Nepal, the analysis of the manuscript remains found in Central Asia, and the analysis of the famous Gilgit manuscript. The Indian manuscripts that were kept and preserved in Tibetan monasteries have so far contributed only very little to the history of Indian *belles lettres*.

However, that might change dramatically in the near future. The manuscript remains that were recently discovered in Pakistan and Afghanistan contain some interesting texts. However, most of them are very fragmentary, especially those that belong to poetical and didactic works.

The most important conclusion that can be drawn from the new material that became accessible in the 20th century is that many or almost all genres of *belles lettres* have its oldest specimens in Buddhist literature. A second conclusion is that Buddhist literature contains many genres that have not been described by the *ālaṃkārika*s, the theoreticians. Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṃkāra* or the first chapter of Daṇḍin's *Kāvyadarśa* describe literary genres only very summarily, as a short glance at these works suffices to show. Apparently, finer distinctions were not regarded as very important by these authors. When we look at the actual practice, we observe that a much greater variety of forms existed. The classifications and categories used in the Tibetan Tanjur show that its editors were well aware of this fact. Taking this as a basis, we can establish the following forms and categories, starting with the major forms:

A. Works in prose

Prose narrations (rare); e.g. some tales in the Avadāna literature (*Avadānaśataka*, *Karmaśataka*, *Divyāvadāna*) or in the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins

B. Verse compositions

1. Ornate epic (*sargabandha*)
   1a. Primarily poetic compositions like *Buddhacarita*, etc.
   1b. Philosophical poems like *Pāramitāsamāsa* or *Bodhicaryāvatāra*
   1c. Shastric kāvyas like *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā*
   1d. Verse epics like the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* or the *Maṇicūḍajātaka*
2. Hymns (*stotra*); many sub-types
3. Sermons (*kathā*, *parikathā*); a great variety of forms
4. Epistles (*lekha*); a great variety of forms
5. Moral maxims (*nīti*)
6. Riddles (*prahelikā*)
7. Metrical exercises (*chandaḥśāstrodāharaṇa*)

C. Mixed style

1. Drama (*nāṭaka*)
2. The elaborate form of Buddhist legends (*Jātakamālā*)
3. Sermons (*kathā*, *parikathā*)
4. Epistles (*lekha*)

The traditional Indian system has the following six-fold classification:

A. Drama (*nāṭaka*)
B. Ornate epic (*sargabandha* "poetry [divided into] chapters or cantos", also called *mahākāvya* "great ornate epic")
C. Compositions in verse (*anibaddha* or *muktaka* "isolated stanzas", and *khaṇḍakāvya* "short poems (without chapter-division)
D. Mixed forms (*campū*)
E. Biography (*ākhyāyikā* "report" usually dealing with living or recently deceased persons)
F. Novel (*kathā* "fictitious story" – admitted as subsection of *ākhyāyikā*)

Usually, only drama and ornate epic are regarded as the two fully fledged literary forms of which the other above-mentioned forms are just abbreviations or subsections.[3]

The systematic analysis of the newly found primary sources and also of the two huge collections has brought to light many new works that can be regarded as a substantial enrichment of classical Sanskrit literature.

A. Works in prose

Literary works composed exclusively in prose are rare in Sanskrit literature. The well-known prose romances such as *Vāsavadattā*, *Daśakumāracarita*, or *Kādambarī* have no counterpart in Buddhist literature. Works like *Mahāvastu* or *Lalitavistara*, the Tibetan and Chinese *Abhiniṣkramaṇasūtras*, or other biographies of the Buddha in the Chinese Tripiṭaka, whose core is composed in prose, always contain certain metrical passages. A huge early work of Buddhist narrative literature is the hitherto little explored *Karmaśataka*. It consists of 127 stories illustrating the effects of karma, and is preserved only in a Tibetan translation. Its style is simple prose, similar to that of the *Avadānaśataka*, with little poetic merits. The situation is different with regard to the narrative portions in the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. They seem to preserve the oldest stratum of a narrative prose that is also the characteristic of the later *Tantrākhyāyika*/*Pañcatantra* recensions. Several of these stories are known through their inclusion in the *Divyāvadāna*. However, they often represent distorted and incomplete versions. The analysis of the narrative portions of the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins should be based on a revised edition of its extant parts in the Gilgit manuscript.[4]

[3] For the Indian classification of genres see, e.g., chapter 1 of Daṇḍin's treatise "Mirror of Composition" (*Kāvyādarśa*) as edited and translated in Dimitrov (2002, pp. 152–228).

[4] For the progress made with regard to the texts of the *Avadānaśataka*, the *Lalitavistara*, the *Mahāvastu*, and the *Divyāvadāna*, see the references to the primary sources in the bibliography, and Demoto (2006; 2007; 2008; 2009a).

B. Verse compositions

1a. The *sargabandha* genre has been enriched by an outstanding work, Śivasvāmin's *Kapphiṇabhyudaya*. A very distorted version was published by Gauri Shankar in 1937. A substantially improved edition (Kyoto 2007) became possible because of the work of the *Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project* (1970–2001). This gave access to the only reliable manuscript that is preserved in the National Archives, Kathmandu, and access to it led to the discovery of 18 of its 22 missing folios in the manuscript collections of Ryūkoku University, Kyoto. A colour facsimile of this important manuscript is included in the new edition. The *Kapphiṇabhyudaya* is a poetic and scholarly work of the highest order and it will require the joint efforts of many specialists to disclose all the layers and puns of this poem. One of the greatest challenges of the *Kapphiṇabhyudaya* is the bilingual canto xix, which by an ingenuous separation of words allows to read each of its 45 stanzas first as a Sanskrit and then as a (different) Prakrit text. The task of unravelling the many *citrakāvya* stanzas in cantos vi, xviii, and xix will be greatly facilitated if access were granted to the sole surviving commentary that according to reliable and verified information belongs to the Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in Tibet. Two cantos of the poem are already available in an annotated English translation.

1b. There are two subsections of the *sargabandha* genre that consist of works in which philosophical or other shastric topics are dealt with in a poetic or at least semi-poetic style. A well-known example is Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, an introduction in ten chapters into the basic tenets of Mahāyāna Buddhism for lay people from the point of view of Madhyamaka philosophy. A work of a more limited scope, but of greater poetic merits, is Āryaśūra's *Pāramitāsamāsa*, which describes the six moral perfections of giving, morality, forbearance, energy, meditation, and wisdom in six chapters. Its 363 stanzas are composed in a variety of metres that always change at the end of a chapter. They are written in an elegant, yet not overloaded *kāvya* style. The question whether the author is identical with the famous composer of the *Jātakamālā* is not yet convincingly settled. The latest edition of the Sanskrit text (2005) by Naoki Saito, which is accompanied by critical edition and annotated translation of its Tibetan version, replaces the two earlier editions by Alfonsa Ferrari (1946) and Carol Meadows. So far the work has not received the attention it deserves. In his *Lam rim chen mo*, Tsongkhapa quotes about 20% of the work which shows the great esteem in which it was held in Tibet.

1c. A most remarkable work is, in several respects, Sarvarakṣita's *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā*. It has survived in the Sanskrit literature of Nepal and was edited and translated by Kiyoshi Okano in his Ph.D. thesis of 1998. A preprint was published in the same year, a revised and enlarged edition is under preparation. Sarvarakṣita was a Buddhist grammarian and poet who lived in the 12th century CE. His *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā* describes the Buddhist cosmology from the point of view of the Sāṃmitīya school. It is in fact the first (or second) work that can safely be ascribed to this school.

The *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā* consists of six chapters all of which are divided into four subsections. The work is composed in a variety of metres among which the āryā dominates with about 25%. The style is very elegant and partly difficult. Sarvarakṣita is particularly fond of the figure of speech *yamaka* which he handles with great skill. By a lucky coincidence, Daśabalaśrīmitra's huge doxographical work *Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛtaviniścaya*, which is available only in a Tibetan translation, has preserved a long canonical passage on which Sarvarakṣita's work is based. Since he follows his source very faithfully, it helped to understand many of the difficult or corrupt passages of the Sanskrit text. The study of the *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā* enabled Dr. Okano to determine the affiliation or sources of two other cosmological work, the Pali *Lokapaññati* and the **Lokaprajñapti-abhidharmaśāstra*, translated into Chinese by Paramartha in 559 CE. The *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā* is both an invaluable source for further studies of Buddhist cosmology and a fine piece of the latest stage of Buddhist *kāvya* works.

1d. In the middle of the 11th century, the Kashmirian author Kṣemendra, who himself was not a Buddhist but a Hindu, wrote a monumental collection of Buddhist legends in verse, the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. Kṣemendra wrote 100 + 7 legends, his son Somendra added the story of Jīmūtavāhana so as to reach the auspicious number 108. By its excellent Tibetan translation, Kṣemendra's work exercised great influence upon Tibetan literature and it also became seminal for the later Buddhist verse epics of Nepal. Many of them contain adaptations of Kṣemendra's stories. The *editio princeps*, which appeared in the *Bibliotheca Indica* between 1888 and 1918, is now being revised by a team of scholars from Germany and Nepal, who thus continue the work begun by the late J. W. de Jong.

A truly sensational finding is the *Maṇicūḍajātaka* composed by the same Sarvarakṣita who also wrote the *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā*. The manuscript was microfilmed by Giuseppe Tucci in a Tibetan monastery in 1948. For about 50 years the microfilm was thought to be lost until it was rediscovered in a cupboard. The work consists of 376 āryā stanzas and its style is very similar to that of the *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā*. However, the language used in the latter work is different; it is composed in a hitherto unknown middle Indic language that looks like a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit. A second unusual feature is the script in which it is written, namely the very little known *bhaikṣukī lipiḥ*. A facsimile of this precious manuscript, accompanied by a copiously annotated diplomatic transcript and a comprehensive table of all the single and conjunct letters prepared by Albrecht Hanisch, has just appeared in Rome in the new series *Manuscripta Buddhica*. A second volume containing the edited text with an English translation and a grammatical sketch of the language of the *Maṇicūḍajātaka* is under preparation.

2. Hymns (*stava*, *stuti*, *stotra*) form one of the largest sections of Buddhist *kāvya* literature. They have recently been subject of a comprehensive analysis in the as yet unpublished Ph.D. thesis by the Russian scholar Alexander Zorin. The Buddhist hymns are so different in style, quality, and form that it is almost impossible to describe them in a few words. The general impression is that the Sanskrit manuscripts

from Nepal contain only a few specimens of outstanding literary quality. The situation is much better with regard to the Tibetan Tanjur, which has preserved some of the best pieces of the genre. The oldest and most valuable hymns were found in Central Asia, many of which were edited by Dieter Schlingloff. Unfortunately, most of them are incomplete. Special mention deserve the following works:[5]

2a. The two great hymns by Māṭṛceṭa (*Prasādapratibhodbhava*, also called *Śatapañcāśatka*, and *Varṇārhavarṇa*). The former work is completely preserved in a Sanskrit manuscript from Tibet. It was competently edited by Shackleton Bailey in 1951. The latter work, *Varṇārhavarṇa*, was reconstructed by Uwe Hartmann from fragments found in Central Asia. In 1987, he published an edition that contains more than 82% of the work. In the meantime, he has been able to identify several new pieces of that hymn.

2b. Triratnadāsa's *Guṇāparyantastotra***.** This hymn praises, in 51 śikhariṇi stanzas, the unlimitedness of the virtues of the Buddha. About 50% of the text have been identified in the fragments of Sanskrit texts from Central Asia. An edition by M. Hahn and U. Hartmann is currently under preparation.

2c. *Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin's *Viśeṣastava* and its *Ṭīkā* by Prajñāvarman. This hymn is an early apologetic hymn by a Brahmin convert to Buddhism who praises the superiority of the Buddha's virtues and doctrine. Prajñāvarman's *Ṭīkā* is remarkable because of its many quotations from a great variety of literary works. Both texts are available only in Tibetan translation. They were competently edited and translated by Johannes Schneider in 1993.

2d. Another interesting piece is Candragomin's *Deśanāstava*, a hymn in the form of a confession of sins that consists of 51 stanzas, most likely composed in the anuṣṭubh metre. This is a very original combination of two forms. It has obviously inspired Śāntideva's treatment of the same topic in his *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Both texts are available only in Tibetan translation. They were translated into English by Mark Tatz.

2e. The Tibetan Tanjur has preserved two hymns not only in translation, but also in their Sanskrit, written in Tibetan characters: the *Jātakastava* by Jñānayaśas and the *Daṇḍakavṛttastotra* attributed to Nāgārjuna. The first hymn, edited and translated by Shackleton Bailey in 1954, again combines two different literary genres. The second hymn consists of a single stanza that is composed in the 'hyper-metre' Daṇḍaka, with each line (only one is defective) consisting of 104 *gaṇa*s of three syllables. Thus the single stanza is equivalent to almost 39 ślokas. It contains the elements of the Buddhist doctrine in a nutshell and can therefore be regarded as a kind of Buddhist catechism. This hymn was published by M. Hahn in 1988.

[5] I deliberately refrain from giving even a select bibliography of this vast field because an almost complete documentation of this genre can be found in the excellent Ph.D. thesis by Alexander Zorin (2010, pp. 378–389), which is currently being published.

2f. Another peculiar hymns is Carpaṭi's *Avalokiteśvarastotra* or *Lokanāthastotra*. It is a late work consisting of 25 stanzas in the *mātrāsamaka* metre (4 × 4 morae), which is also the basis of the Indian national anthem, and it uses the rhyme throughout. There exist three independent Tibetan translations with three different titles and attributed to three different authors. The first alternative name is Candragomin, the second Caryadīpa. There can be little doubt that the last name is nothing but a corruption of Carpaṭi-pā(da).

3. The sermon (*kathā*, *parikathā*) section in the Tibetan Tanjur consists of some 20 works of different style, length, and quality. The longest sermon comprises 60 folios of prose text, the second longest 500 stanzas. The shortest sermons consist of six stanzas only. The most famous sermon is Nāgārjuna's *Rājaparikathā Ratnāvalī*, which is incompletely preserved in Nepal; 200 of its 500 stanzas are missing in the sole palm leaf manuscript in the National Archives. Allegedly a complete manuscript has survived in Tibet, as well another one of a commentary. Other illustrious names like Aśvaghoṣa, Mātṛceṭa, Āryaśūra, Vasubandhu, etc. can be found among the authors of the other sermons. During the last 25 years, most of the *parikathā*s were edited by scholars in Germany or Japan. The *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*, consisting of 191 stanzas most of which praise the donations of various objects to Buddhist monks in a flowery, but rather shallow style, is also available in its Sanskrit original. It was edited thrice, in 1959 (A. C. Banerjee), 1975 (H. Zimmermann), and 1982 (M. Hahn). Its Tibetan translation is the faultiest and nonsensical work I have ever seen in the Tibetan Buddhist canon.

4. The epistle (*lekha*) section in the Tibetan Tanjur consists of 12 works of different length and style. The have been described in a monograph by Siglinde Dietz (1985) who also edited the nine later epistles and translated them into German. The three earlier letters, Nāgārjuna's *Letter to a Friend* (*Suhṛllekha*), Mātṛceṭa's *Letter to the Great King Kaniṣka* (*Mahārājakaniṣkalekha*), and Candragomin's *Letter to a Disciple* (*Śiṣyalekha*) were edited by other scholars. An annotated German translation of all the twelve epistles was published in 2008 in a new series for general readers that offers important texts of the major world religions. This means that the complete section is now available for further studies and interpretations.[6]

5. The Tibetan Tanjur contains a section in which the translations of eight Indian *nīti* works can be found. They are attributed to Nāgārjuna (1–3), Ravigupta (4), Vararuci (5), Amoghavarṣa (6), Cāṇakya (7), and Masurākṣa (8). As I have shown earlier, Nos 6 (*Vimalapraśnottararatnamālā*), 7 (*Rājanītiśāstra*), and 8 (*Nītiśāstra*) are clearly non-Buddhist works. Amoghavarṣa, also called Amoghodaya, was a Jain author, and Masurākṣa's stanzas belong to what Sternbach called the wider Cāṇakya Nīti Text Tradition. No. 5 (*Gāthāśataka*) is little more than an abstract of No. 2 (*Prajñādaṇḍa*) with some additions. No. 4 (*Āryākośa*), the most important work from the literary

[6] Bibliographical references can be found in Hahn – Dietz (2008, pp. 468–478).

point of view, seems to be an abstract of a larger work entitled *Lokasaṃvyavahāra-pravṛtti* "How to deal with worldly business" that was given a Buddhist varnish by altering a few terms (e.g. *śākinī* became *ḍākinī*) and by adding three Buddhist stanzas at the end. It is not clear whether its author Ravigupta is identical with the author of the medical work *Siddhasāra* and a commentary on a Buddhist philosophical text. No. 3 (*Janapoṣaṇabindu*) shows Buddhist traits in its second half. The term *kālacakra* occurs twice, which makes it unlikely that the famous founder of the Madhyamaka system was its author. No. 2 (*Prajñādaṇḍa*) is an early anthology of Sanskrit and Prakrit stanzas, two third of which I was able to identify in other works. It contains stanzas by authors like Māgha, which excludes the possibility that it was compiled by the Buddhist philosopher bearing the same name. Only in the case of No. 1 (*Prajñā-śataka*), Nāgārjuna's authorship cannot be safely excluded. If it were genuine, this would be his first known work without a clear Buddhist message. All eight works have now been edited in one form or another, the latest being the editions of the *Āryākośa* (in its expanded form) and the *Prajñādaṇḍa* by M. Hahn in a Japanese journal. As a whole, these works can be compared to the *nīti* literature in Pāli of Sri Lanka and Myanmar.[7]

When talking about Buddhist *nīti* literature I am inclined to include into this genre single stanzas and grouped collections that are otherwise classified differently. By this, I mean the many utterances in verses that are attributed to the Buddha himself. Whether they were actually spoken by him – in whatever form or language – or not, no serious reader can deny that they contain some of the finest sayings on worldly wisdom in Indian literature. The majority of them can be found in the sermons attributed to the Buddha. Later they were extracted and arranged subject-wise in collections auch as the *Dhammapada*, the *Udānavarga* or the *Dharmasamuccaya*. While the *Dhammapada* is well known for a long time and was translated into many languages, the situation is less favourable with regard to the other two collections. The full text of the Central Asian *vulgata* of the *Udānavarga* is known only since 1965 when it was edited by F. Bernhard. So far it has been translated only into Japanese (1978) and German (2007). The *Dharmasamuccaya* was edited and translated into French by Lin Li-kouang in 1946, 1969, and 1973. A thoroughly revised text, based on new and better source material from Nepal and China, is currently under preparation.

6, 7. Two minor categories of verse texts are works on riddles and the illustrations of Sanskrit metres. Like Sarvarakṣita's *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā*, they illustrate the versatility and erudition of the late Buddhist teachers of India. Most probably as kind of pastime, two famous professors of Buddhist philosophy and tantra at the university of Vikramaśīla, Ratnākaraśānti and Jñānaśrīmitra, who flourished in the 11th century CE, wrote their *Vidagdhavismāpana* "How to impress even the most shrewd" and *Vṛttamālāstuti* "Praise [of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī] in the form of a garland of metres". The former work can be regarded as an application and illustration of the fa-

[7] For a select bibliography see Hahn (2007a, pp. 469–476). See also Hahn (2008; 2009; 2010).

mous handbook of riddles, Dharmadāsa's *Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana*. Incidentally, Dharmadāsa was also a Buddhist, and the occurrence of *vidagdha*° at the beginning of both titles is certainly not a coincidence. Both works have been preserved in a *codex unicus*, and in both cases a commentary is also available. Without a commentary the reader would be lost at many places, especially in the *Vidagdhavismāpana*, which abounds in ingenuous bilingual puns and complicated *cakra*s. An analysis and specimen of the *Vidagdhavismāpana* (stanzas 1–60), together with Paṇḍita Aśoka's commentary and a German translation of both, was published in the French journal *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* in 2001. The rest of the work (stanzas 61–175) is under preparation. The revised Sanskrit text of Jñānaśrīmitra's *Vṛttamālāstuti* was published in *Bauddhasāhityastabakāvalī*, the felicitation volume for Claus Vogel, in 2008. From Śākyarakṣita's commentary *Vṛttamālāvivṛti* we know that other (Buddhist) works of this type existed at his time.

C. Mixed style

The works in the "mixed style" are not only the most developed forms of classical Sanskrit literature, they also contain some of the finest specimens of the Buddhist contribution to it. This concerns primarily the genres of drama and *campū*. Sermons and epistles written in this form do not contribute anything new to their respective genres.

1. About one century ago, Heinrich Lüders published fragments of Buddhist plays (*nāṭaka*, *prakaraṇa*) found in Central Asia. He dated these texts to the 2nd century CE, so that they are the oldest specimens of the genre so far known. The fragments belong to three plays, one of which bears the title *Śāradvatīputraprakaraṇa* and is attributed to the famous poet Aśvaghoṣa. Form Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya* we know that Aśvaghoṣa composed at least one more play entitled *Rāṣṭrapālanāṭaka* and recently the fragment of another play found in Afghanistan was published by Uwe Hartmann (2007). This proves that this genre was very popular among the Buddhists already at a very early time.

The oldest completely preserved Buddhist play, albeit in a very late and poor Tibetan translation, is Candragomin's *Lokānandanāṭaka*. It was edited and translated into German by M. Hahn in 1974. An English translation followed in 1987. The analysis of the play yielded some important results. It could be shown that its author is identical with the famous Buddhist grammarian, who lives in the middle of the 5th century CE, since the playwright expressly states in the prologue that he also wrote a grammar which he specifies as "concise, clear, and yet comprehensive". Behind these attributes one can easily recognise the Sanskrit terms *laghu*, *vispaṣṭa*, and *saṃpūrṇa*, which are used elsewhere to characterise Candragomin's grammar. Moreover, the access to the complete text of the *Lokānanda* showed to which extent Harṣadeva's *Nāgānanda* is dependent on it. On the other hand, the *Lokānanda* has 15 scenes that are clearly influenced by Kālidāsa's *Abhijñānaśakuntala*. This goes well with the opinion

of Western scholars that Kālidāsa must have lived around the beginning of the 5th century AD.

The Buddhists of Nepal have also preserved the oldest manuscript of Harṣadeva's *Nāgānanda*. It is dated 1155 CE, and thus it predates the Tibetan translation by a century and Śivarāma's famous commentary by one or two centuries. This manuscript represents the most authentic version of the play and it shares with the Tibetan translation two features that distinguish it from all other Indian recensions: the division of act v into two acts, v and vi, and two additional stanzas: one at the beginning of the play, the other one between v.12 and v.13 of the Indian recensions. The second stanza concludes act v and v.13 becomes vi.1 in the Nepalese and Tibetan recensions. An edition of the Nepalese recension is under preparation.

2. The most important contribution of Buddhism to classical Sanskrit literature is, in my opinion, the *campū* genre. There is good reason to assume that this genre developed within Buddhist literature, because we can find all stages represented there: the early forms in the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the intermediate stages in early independent poetical works like Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Dṛṣṭāntapaṅktiḥ* and Saṅghasena's *Jātakamālā*, and finally the three examples of the fully fledged form in the works of the three masters Āryaśūra, Haribhaṭṭa, and Gopadatta. Of them, Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* was generally accessible though H. Kern's *editio princeps* of 1891, which for a long time was held to be also the final edition. Twenty-five years ago it became clear that much better manuscripts and ancillary sources have become accessible which permit a substantially improved edition. The first volume of a new edition by Albrecht Hanisch was published in 2005.[8]

For a long time, Āryaśūra's work was held to be the sole representative of its genre. The first major breakthrough was the identification and publication of the fragments of Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Dṛṣṭāntapaṅktiḥ* by Heinrich Lüders in 1926. He could show that the fragments represent the Indian original of a work that was already known from its Chinese translation – however under a different title, *Sūtrālaṃkāra*, and attributed to another famous author, Aśvaghoṣa. Kumāralāta, the founder of the Dārṣṭāntika school, is generally placed in the second century CE.

The second important identification was that of the Central Asian fragments from Saṅghasena's *Jātakamālā* by Dieter Schlingloff. Again, the complete work is available in its Chinese translation. The fragments are currently prepared for publication by Mitsuyo Demoto. Unfortunately, the attribution of the Chinese translation to Zhiqian (middle of the 3rd century CE) is most likely incorrect. Therefore, we have no other clue for dating the work than its style. To me it seems that it is earlier than Āryaśūra.

The Tibetan Tanjur contains the translation of another *Jātakamālā* by a certain Haribhaṭṭa. It exceeds Āryaśūra's work in length by 60–70%, although the number of legends is the same if we disregard the last story, the *Śākyasiṃhajātaka* (No. 35),

[8] This publication contains an up-to-date bibliography of the most important recent studies on this work. See under Āryaśūra, *Jātakamālā*.

which is undoubtedly a later addition. Between 1970 and 1973, I prepared five legends for publication (Nos 31, 21, 30, 14, and 6), until I discovered that 10 of the genuine legends plus the *Śākyasiṃhajātaka* are still available, hidden in anonymous and unpublished collections of Buddhist legends. The access to 30% of the original confirmed my earlier assessment that the Tibetan translation is of rather mediocre quality, to put it mildly. At many places the Sanskrit text was misunderstood and additional mistakes crept in in the course of its inner-Tibetan transmission. Until 1992, legends Nos 2, 4, 5, 6, and 11 were published, the edition of all the legends preserved in Nepalese manuscripts followed in 2007. The lover of Sanskrit is now in a position to assess the quality of Haribhaṭṭa's work, which I regard as one of the best extant pieces of the early classical Sanskrit literature, absolutely on par with Āryaśūra and Kālidāsa, of whom Haribhaṭṭa might have been a contemporary.[9]

Fortunately, it was possible to determine Haribhaṭṭa's date – or at least his *terminus ante quem* – with great certainty. A long passage from the first legend of his work is quoted in a Chinese work that was compiled 445 CE, after a group of Chinese monks had visited Central Asia and studied several Indian works there. Therefore his *Jātakamālā* must have existed already in the first decades of the 5th century. There are several reasons for the fact that his *Jātakamālā* was very popular in Central Asia and the north-western parts of India: a complete folio of a Sanskrit-Uigur bilingual version of legend No. 32 (*Siṃha*); legend No. 25 (*Kinnarīsudhana*) has served as model of a Khotanese tale; legend No. 6 (*Rūpyāvatī*) is retold in Tocharian; two fragments of legend No. 32 were found in Afghanistan; the Kasmirian poet Kṣemendra based his *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* (No. 64) on Haribhaṭṭa's version of the same story (No. 25); and recently a complete folio of the Gilgit manuscript could be determined as belonging to legend No. 32. According to the colophon of the Tibetan translation, Haribhaṭṭa ended his life in Kashmir, and his work contains many hints that he was familiar with the mountainous regions of north-west India.

In 2004, I got access to the first original manuscript of Haribhaṭṭa's *Jātakamālā*. 27 of its 90 folios are missing. Unfortunately, they are taken out at random. The present situation is that together with the manuscript from Nepal 18 legends are complete, 2 more almost complete, 8 are in a rather fragmentary state and 6 are completely lost. It is planned to bring out an Indian edition that will contain the 10 genuine legends preserved in Nepal plus 7 complete legends from the new source. A complete manuscript is allegedly preserved in Tibet, so that at some time in the future we might have a complete edition of Haribhaṭṭa's work.

In 1977, I established my "Gopadatta hypothesis", i.e., the claim that the *Saptakumārikāvadāna*, which is available in Sanskrit and Tibetan and attributed to Gopadatta, as well as 15 anonymously transmitted Buddhist legends, belong to Gopadatta's *Jātakamālā* whose existence is attested by Somendra's postscript to his father's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* and a fragmentary copy of the whole work that Giuseppe Tucci saw in Nepal in 1930. Until today, all but two of these 16 legends have been

[9] A bibliography of the older publications can be found in Hahn (1992, pp. 73–76). For the more recent publications see under Haribhaṭṭa, *Jātakamālā*.

edited, mostly accompanied by translations into English or German. Since all attempts at locating the fragmentary manuscript have failed and since according to my calculation the 16 legends cover at least 90% of the whole text,[10] it might be worthwhile to present the 16 legends in one volume in a not too distant future. Gopadatta's legends cannot compete with those of his two predecessors, but nevertheless they contain a substantial amount of good poetry.[11]

I hope to have given a brief summary of how much our knowledge of the Buddhist contribution to classical Sanskrit literature has increased thanks to the systematic analysis of the existing manuscript collections and how many valuable works have come to light in the last century, particularly during the last forty years. And this might be little in comparison with what we can expect once the locked treasures in Tibet become gradually accessible through careful editions and studies.

Bibliography

Āryaśūra, *Jātakamālā*

Hanisch, A. (2005): *Āryaśūras Jātakamālā. Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Legenden 1 bis 15. Teil 1.2*. Marburg (Indica et Tibetica 43.1 and 43.2).

Āryaśūra, *Pāramitāsamāsa*

Meadows, C. (1986): *Ārya-Śūra's Compendium of the Perfections: Text, Translation and Analysis of the Pāramitāsamāsa*. Bonn (Indica et Tibetica 8).

Saito, N. (2005): *Das Kompendium der moralischen Vollkommenheiten*. Vairocanarakṣitas tibetische Übertragung von Āryaśūras *Pāramitāsamāsa* samt Neuausgabe des Sanskrittextes. Marburg (Indica et Tibetica 38).

Avadānaśataka

Demoto, M. (2006): Fragments of the *Avadānaśataka*. In: *Buddhist Manuscripts*. Oslo (Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection) Vol. 3, pp. 207–244.

Demoto, M. (2007): A Japanese Translation of the *Avadānaśataka* (1) – No. 32 "A Mouthful" and No. 83 "The Youngster Hiraṇyapāṇi". *Minami-Ajia Kotengaku/South Asian Classical Studies* 2, pp. 183–199. [In Japanese.]

Demoto, M. (2008): A Japanese Translation of the *Avadānaśataka* (2), *Minami-Ajia Kotengaku / South Asian Classical Studies* 3, pp. 39–56. [In Japanese.]

See also Demoto (2009a)

Candragomin, *Lokānandanāṭaka*

Hahn, M. (1974): *Candragomins Lokānandanāṭaka. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben und übersetzt. Ein Beitrag zur klassischen indischen Schauspieldichtung*. Wiesbaden (Asiatische Forschungen 39).

Hahn, M. (1987): *Joy for the World. A Buddhist Play by Candragomin*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes. Berkeley.

[10] This we know from the colophon of the fragmentary manuscript that was quoted by Tucci and that says that the whole work comprises 3000 granthas.

[11] A bibliography of the older publications on Gopadatta can be found in Hahn (1992, pp. 73–76). For the more recent publications see under Gopadatta, *Jātakamālā*, and Hahn (2007c).

Daṇḍin, *Kāvyādarśa*

Dimitrov, D. (2002): *Mārgavibhāga. Die Unterscheidung der Stilarten*. Kritische Ausgabe des ersten Kapitels von Daṇḍins Poetik *Kāvyādarśa* und der der tibetischen Übertragung *Sñan ṅag me loṅ* nebst einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrittextes. Marburg (Indica et Tibetica 40).

Demoto, M. (2009a): A Japanese Translation of the *Avadānaśataka* (3), *Minami-Ajia Kotengaku / South Asian Classical Studies* 4, pp. 79–93. [In Japanese.]

Demoto, M. (2009b): How It All Began (II) – The Prabhāsa Legends of the Xianyujing. *Journal of Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 7, pp. 1–20. [Confirms the dating of Haribhaṭṭa.]

Divyāvadāna

Hiraoka, S. (2002): *Setsuwa no kōkogaku*. Tokyo. [A study of the *Divyāvadāna*.]

Hiraoka, S. (2007): *Budda ga nazotoku sanze no monogatari*. 1.2. Tokyo. [A Japanese translation of the *Divyāvadāna* with numerous text-critical remarks.]

Rotman, A. (2008): *Divine Stories. Divyāvadāna. 1*. Somerville. [A richly annotated English translation of *Divyāvadāna* 1–17.]

Tatelman, J. (2005): *The Heavenly Exploits. Buddhist Biographies from the Dívavadána*. 1. New York. [Texts and translations of *Divyāvadāna* 1, 2, 30, 36.]

Eimer, H., assisted by R. Paffen (1988): Microfilms, Microfiches and Other Reproductions of North Indian Manuscripts Kept in the Indological Institute of Bonn University. In: Eimer, H. (ed.): *Indology and Indo-Tibetology. Thirty Years of Indian and Indo-Tibetan Studies in Bonn*. Bonn (Indica et Tibetica 14), pp. 97–192.

Gopadatta, *Jātakamālā*

See Hahn (2007d)

Hahn, M. (1981): Zu einer Neuedition von Harṣadevas *Nāgānanda*. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 25, pp. 131–137.

Hahn, M. (1988): Indische und nepalesische Handschriften im Indologischen Seminar der Universität Bonn. In: Eimer, H. (ed.): *Indology and Indo-Tibetology. Thirty Years of Indian and Indo-Tibetan Studies in Bonn*. Bonn (Indica et Tibetica 14), pp. 81–96.

Hahn, M. (1990): Śivasvāmins *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement VIII* (XXIV. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 23. bis 29. September 1988 in Köln, Ausgewählte Vorträge, hrsg. von Werner Diem und Abdoldjavad Falaturi. Wiesbaden), pp. 459–470.

Hahn, M. (1992): *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta. Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra. On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās*. Second edition. Thoroughly revised and enlarged. Tokyo (Studia Philologica Buddhica. Occasional Paper Series 1).

Hahn, M. (1997): Doctrine and Poetry – Śivasvāmin's Essentials of Buddhism. Text and Translation of Canto xx of His *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*. In: *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ*. Swisttal–Odendorf (Indica et Tibetica 30), pp. 207–232.

Hahn, M. (2007a): *Vom rechten Leben*. Frankfurt.

Hahn, M. (2007b): Ravigupta and his Nīti Stanzas (I). *Minami Ajia Kotengaku / South Asian Classical Studies* 2, pp. 303–355.

Hahn, M. (2007c): Gopadatta's *Jātakamālā*. On the First Complete Edition of its 16 Extant Legends. *Indogakubukkyōgakukenkyū* (= *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*) 55.3, pp. 1043–1051 [= (15)–(23)].

Hahn, M. (2007d): Gopadatta's *Kapīśvarajātaka*. Re-edited and Translated. *Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* [= Bulletin of Research Institute for Buddhist Culture, Ryūkoku University] 46, pp. 47–74.

Hahn, M. (2007e): In Defense of Haribhaṭṭa. In: Kellner, B. – Krasser, H. – Lasic, H. – Much, M. T. – Tauscher, H. (eds): *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ*. Papers Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday. Pts 1.2, Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 70.1 and 2), pp. 213–227.

Hahn, M. (2007f): *Haribhaṭṭa in Nepal. Ten Legends from His* Jātakamālā *and the Anonymous* Śākyasiṃhajātaka. Editio minor. Tokyo (Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 12).

Hahn, M. (2007g): *King Kapphiṇa's Triumph. A Ninth Century Kashmiri Buddhist Poem*. Kyoto.

Hahn, M. (2008a): Ravigupta and his Nīti Stanzas (II). *Minami Ajia Kotengaku / South Asian Classical Studies* 3, pp. 1–38.

Hahn, M. (2008b): The Sanskrit Text of Jñānaśrīmitra's *Vṛttamālāstuti*. In: *Bauddhasāhityastabakāvalī. Essays and Studies on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*. Dedicated to Claus Vogel by Colleagues, Students, and Friends. Marburg (Indica et Tibetica 36), pp. 93–170.

Hahn, M. (2009): The Tibetan *Shes rab sdong bu* and its Indian Sources. *Minami Ajia Koten-gaku / South Asian Classical Studies* 4, pp. 1–78.

Hahn, M. (2010): The Tibetan *Shes rab sdong bu* and its Indian Sources. *Minami Ajia Koten-gaku / South Asian Classical Studies* 4, pp. 1–50.

Hahn, M. – Dietz, S. (2008): *Wege zur rechten Erkenntnis. Buddhistische Lehrbriefe*. Aus dem Sanskrit und aus dem Tibetischen herausgegeben. Frankfurt.

Haribhaṭṭa, *Jātakamālā*

Hahn, M. (2005): Haribhaṭṭa and the *Mahābhārata. Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 3, pp. 1–41.

Hahn, M. (2006): How It All Began. The Very Beginning of the Buddha's Bodhisattva Career. I. Haribhaṭṭa's Version of the *Prabhāsajātaka*. *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 4, pp. 1–80.

See also Hahn (2007e; 2007f)

Harṣadeva, *Nāgānandanāṭaka*

See Hahn (1981)

Hartmann, J.-U. (2007): Ein Schauspielfragment aus Zentralasien. In: Klaus, K. – Hartmann, J.-U. (eds): *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn*. Zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht. Wien (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66), pp. 249–258.

Jñānaśrīmitra, *Vṛttamālāstuti*

See Hahn (2008b)

Kumāralāta, *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Dṛṣṭāntapaṅktiḥ*

Hahn, M. (1982): Kumāralātas *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Dṛṣṭāntapaṅkti* Nr. 1. Die Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 16, pp. 306–336.

Lalitavistara

Hokazono, K. (1994): *Lalitavistara* [Raritavisutara] *no kenkyū*. Tokyo. [A new edition of the *parivarta*s 1–14, accompanied by a Japanese translation.]

Mahāvastu

Hiraoka, S. (2010): *Budda no ōi naru monogatari. Bonbun 'Mahāvastu' zenyaku*. 1.2. Tokyo. [A Japanese translation of the Mahāvastu with numerous text-critical remarks.]

Nāgārjuna, *Prajñādaṇḍa*

See Hahn (2009; 2010)

Ratnākaraśānti, *Vidagdhavismāpana*

Hahn, M. (2001): Ratnākaraśānti's *Vidagdhavismāpana* – An Old and Unpublished Work on Sanskrit Riddles. *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 20.2, pp. 3–81.

Ravigupta, *Lokasaṃvyavahārapravṛtti*
See Hahn (2007b; 2008a)
Sarvarakṣita, *Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā*
Okano, K. (1998): *Sarvarakṣitas* Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā*. Ein Sanskrit-Kāvya über die Kosmologie der Sāṃmitīya-Schule des Hīnayāna-Buddhismus*. Sendai (Tōhoku Indo-Tibetto Kenkyūsho Kankōkai Monograph Series 1).
Sarvarakṣita, *Maṇicūḍajātaka*
Hanisch, A. (2008): Sarvarakṣita's *Maṇicūḍajātaka*. Reproduction of the Codex Unicus with Diplomatic Transcript and Palaeographic Introduction to the Bhaikṣukī Script. In: Sferra, F. (ed.): *Manuscripta Buddhica 1. Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection. 1*. Rome.
Śivasvāmin, *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*
Gauri Shankar – Hahn. M. (1989): *Śivasvāmin's Kapphiṇābhyudaya. The Exaltation of King Kapphiṇa.* Ed. with an introduction by Gauri Shankar with an appendix and romanized version of cantos i – viii and xix by M. Hahn. Delhi.
See also Hahn (2007g)
Zorin, A. (2010): At the Source of Tibetan Poetry. Hymns in Tibetan Literature: 8th – 14th Centuries. [У истоков тибетской поэзии. Буддийские гимны в тибетской литературе VIII – XIV вв.] St. Petersburg.