

Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Literature

By Bhikkhu Pāsādika

ABSTRACT

Indo-Tibetan Buddhist literature is a vast field so that it is unavoidable for a feasible treatment of the present topic to drastically limit the scope of literature to pieces of writing valued as works of art, viz. to plays and poetry, including, however, technical works of poetics.

Although the 'five branches of science' which a Bodhisattva is required to master, do not include poetics and the art of creating metrical compositions, right from the origins of Buddhism poetry has been playing an important role. Three reasons for its importance are given: 1) Poetry seemed best suited to convey supramundane experiences of enlightened persons such as, for example, the historical Buddha's 'solemn utterances'. 2) Through the ages, poetry has been considered an excellent means to propagate Buddhist teachings. 3) Composing poetry has a soteriological dimension. The teaching of two levels of truth is a common thread – first implicitly and later on explicitly – running through the whole fabric of Buddhist thought; it implies practice and insight in accordance with absolute and conventional truth as being prerequisite to the realization of ultimate release. The indispensable counterpart of teachings at the level of absolute truth are devotion, benevolence and compassion, most adequately conveyed by means of hymns in praise of the Buddha and Bodhisattvas and encomiums of Bodhicitta.

Six categories bearing on the present theme are briefly introduced, and with the help of quotations it is attempted in a heuristic manner to highlight the salient features pertaining to each of them: to 1) hymnic literature, 2) epistolary literature, 3) narrative literature, 4) dramas, 5) Indian poetics and their Tibetan reception, and 6) autochthonous Tibetan poetry.

In this paper, 'Indo-Tibetan Buddhist literature' is taken to mean a) to the largest extent Buddhist literature of Indian provenance that either has come down to us both in its Indic originals and Tibetan translations or only in Tibetan translations due to loss of the Indian originals, and b) to a lesser extent autochthonous works of Tibet. Generally speaking, it can be said that Indo-Tibetan literature is enshrined in the *Kanjur* and *Tanjur*, the former standing for what its compilers considered as 'canonical literature in Tibetan translation' (*bKa' gyur*, [*Buddha-*]vacana-vipariṇāma), the latter for the vast paracanonical literature of 'exegetical and scientific treatises' (*bsTan gyur*, Śāstra-vipariṇāma). Both the *Kanjur* and *Tanjur* collections comprise scriptures pertaining to exoteric and esoteric Buddhism. With the solid foundation of the *Kanjur* and *Tanjur* corpora a surprisingly rich indigenous Tibetan literature, both religious and secular, could develop – so much so that in dealing with the present topic it is unavoidable to drastically limit the scope of literature to pieces of writing valued as works of art, viz. plays and poetry, including, however, technical works of poetics.

Since according to Indo-Tibetan exegetical literature there are five branches of science (*rig gnas*, *vidyāsthāna*), constituting the 'complete science' in which a Bodhisattva should be proficient¹ but in which poetry and poetics are

not included, one may find the list of *vidyāsthānas* wanting in the art or work of a poet as one more branch. This impression is fully confirmed when considering the fact that among the most ascetic monks and nuns of the order of ancient Buddhism poems were composed 'which can stand with dignity by virtue of their power and beauty by the side of the best products of Indian lyric – right from the hymns of the Rgveda up to the lyrical poems of Kālidāsa and Amaru.'² Similarly, Balkrishna Govind Gokhale in his excellent paper 'The Image-World of the Thera-, Therīgāthās'³ or Ang Raj Chaudhary in 'Nature in the Theragāthā'⁴ attest to the flourishing poetry among truly anchoretic members of the ancient Sangha. In like manner, as we shall see, in the history of the indigenous literature of Tibet it was the extreme reclusiveness of hermits and mystics that produced Tibet's national poet and poet-saint Mila ras pa or, centuries later, his worthy successor žabs dkar.

Although poetry and poetics are conspicuous by their absence in the five branches of science, right from the beginning of the historical Buddha's teaching *kāvya* has been playing an important role even to the present day. Three main reasons for this can be given:

a) The word *kāvya* which, according to Monier Williams, means 'wisdom, intelligence, prophetic inspiration, high power and art, poem, poetical composition with a coherent plot...', derives from *kavi* which does not only denote 'poet', but stands for the Vedic seer or prophet, the sage who knows and is enlightened. So we have the time-honoured tradition of handing down the utterances of insight-knowledge and wisdom pertaining to enlightened beings encapsulated in verses which are most congenial to memorizing. The solemn utterances (*udāna*) of the Buddha, for instance, or the poetic declarations of his most advanced disciples, as mentioned, are examples of poetry in Pāli, Sanskrit and in corresponding Tibetan translations designed to convey supramundane experiences.

b) The second *raison d'être* for Buddhist poetry is, of course, the 'skillful employment' of poetry as an excellent means (*upāya*) to propagate the Buddhist teaching. The foremost model of applied *upāyakaūśalya* for promulgating early Buddhist teachings is the *Dhammapada* or its Sanskrit equivalent, the *Udānavarga*.⁵ The first centuries of the common era saw an extraordinary development of the paracanonical Buddhist literature in classical Sanskrit. The luminaries of edifying poetic works of great literary merit of that era are Aśvaghōṣa, Kumāralāta, Mātṛceta and Āryaśura. Aśvaghōṣa himself, of Brahminic stock, was converted to Buddhism; accordingly, his *Buddhacarita*, Siddhārtha Gautama's versified biography in exquisite style, and his *Saundarananda* are the best examples of pieces of poetry composed for the sake of 'bringing to spiritual maturity' and converting people.

c) The third reason for composing poetry has a soteriological dimension. This aspect is best exemplified in the works of Nāgārjuna who, for innumerable followers of Māhāyana in general and of Tibetan Buddhism in particular was to become second only to the historical founder of Buddhism in terms of influence on the ways of their thinking. Mahayana Buddhists revere Nāgārjuna as the first systematizer of the Great Vehicle who was also the first explicitly to set forth the teaching of two levels of truth (*satyadvaya*), viz. of the levels of absolute and conventional truth. In his main work he insists that a genuine understanding of

the said two levels of truth and the faultless practice and insight in accordance with them be prerequisite to the realization of *nirvāṇa* (*Mūlamadhyamakakārikās* XXIV, 9-10). A number of modern scholars tend to misrepresent Nāgārjuna by axiomatically taking his dialectical treatises and his *via negativa* therein by way of *reductio ad absurdum* solely to represent Nāgārjunian thought. In order to do justice to Nāgārjuna, whom even some contemporary indologists consider a nihilist, it should be appreciated that he was indeed faithful to the dictum of ancient Buddhism according to which devotion and wisdom should be in perfect equilibrium; for it was Nagarjuna to whom hymns of praise (*stava*, *stuti*) to the Buddha have creditably been ascribed. In the opening verses of his *Lokāṭīastava*, for example, he impressively demonstrates as to how his words referring to *paramārtha*- as well as *saṃvṛtisatya* blend together perfectly:

lokāṭīta namas tubhyaṃ viviktajñānavedine /
yas tvam jagaddhitāyaiva khinnah karuṇayā ciram // 1
skandhamātravinirmukto na sattvo ' stī ti te matam /
sattvārtham ca param khedam agamas tvam mahāmune // 2

O You who are beyond the world! Obeisance to You versed in the cognition of the void. Solely for the benefit of the world You have for long been exhausted by compassion! (1)

You are convinced that apart from the mere skandhas no soul (*sattva*) exists, and yet, great sage, You have suffered great pain for the sake of the living beings (*sattva*)! (2)⁶

In spite of its relevance in the present context, the harmonization of theory and practice in terms of the two levels of truth complementing each other does not only refer to devotion (*bhakti/śraddhā*) and wisdom (*prajñā*); it also refers to benevolence-cum-compassion (*maitri-karuṇā*) compatible with *prajñā* as Nāgārjuna's *Lokāṭīastava* reveals.⁷ The union of wisdom with compassion crystallizes into *bodhicitta/byan chub sems* ('thought [focused] on awakening'), a *Mahāyāna* key term of the first order.⁸ The most influential work of Indo-Tibetan poetry with a soteriological dimension certainly is Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* which occasioned a stately Indo-Tibetan exegetical and a modern Buddhological literature of its own. Through the ages, numerous authors, especially Tibetan poets, drew their inspiration from Śāntideva's ingenuous as well as ingenious masterpiece. To conclude this section, a few verses may be quoted from a contemporary piece of Tibetan poetry which has been acclaimed as a classic in the tradition of Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and whose author (died in 1977), Negi Lama Tenzin Gyaltzen, better known as Khunu Rinpoche, is venerated by Tibetans of all schools both as the past master of Tibetan grammar, poetry and composition and as 'the very embodiment of altruism':

'byor ba'i tshe na kheṅs pa med / rgud pa'i tshe na žum pa med //
gžan gyis rdži bar mi nus pa / rin chen dan po'i byan chub sems // 42

Without arrogance when things go well, not depressed when times are hard, unharmable by anything – this bodhicitta gold. (42)

*srid na sñan pa'i sgra gan' zes / dam pa du mas dpyad na yan' /
byan' chub sems zes bya ba'i sgra / 'di las gzan du mi gsan sñam // 44*
If you ask what is the sweetest sound in the world,
even if many refined people were to investigate it,
I don't think you will hear anything
But the word 'bodhicitta'. (44)

*de bzin ñid kyi lha lam du / glo bur dri ma'i sprin gyis sgrib /
byan' chub sems kyi 'thor rluñ gis / sgron mas mun pa bzin du sel // 269*
The sky of reality is obscured by clouds of adventitious stains.
Gusts of bodhicitta wind clear them away, like a lamp [clears away] the darkness.
(269)⁹

My further treatment of the present topic falls into six parts containing sketches of six genres whose salient features I shall attempt to highlight with the help of short quotations; the genres are: 1) hymnic literature (*stotras*), 2) epistolary literature (*lekhas*), 3) narrative literature, 4) dramas, 5) Indian poetics and their Tibetan reception, and 6) autochthonous Tibetan poetry. Unfortunately, for want of space and time, in this brief survey it is not possible to treat the topic exhaustively,¹⁰ and only select bibliographical information, mainly covering more recent pieces of research by M. Hahn and his pupils, can be given.

1) In dealing with hymnic literature, it will suffice to focus on the most important representative of this genre, viz. on Mātr̥ceṭa. Two hymns in praise of the Buddha are considered as his main works: the shorter one is the *Prasādapratibhodbhava* ('The Becoming Visible of the Light of Trust'), better known as the *Śatapañcāśatka* ([Hymn Consisting] of a Hundred and Fifty [Verses]); Mātr̥ceṭa's second celebrated work is the *Varṇarhavarṇastotra* ('Hymn in Praise of Him who Deserves Praise'). After comprehensive preparatory research done by many scholars, it was D.R. Shackleton Bailey who completed the definite edition of the former *stotra* in the Sanskrit original together with its Tibetan and Chinese translations and of a commentary on it preserved only in Tibetan; the definite edition of the latter *stotra* is due to J.U. Hartmann on whose work¹¹ the following observations about Mātr̥ceṭa are based. In Hartmann's edition of the Sanskrit text and Tibetan translation of the *Varṇarhavarṇastotra* a full account is given of research on Mātr̥ceṭa, beginning shortly after the discovery of a substantial amount of Sanskrit MS remains from Eastern Turkestan, i.e. around 1900. He also discusses sources relevant to Mātr̥ceṭa's biography, the problems of authorship and dating, the structure of the *stotra*, meters and poetics related to the edited text, etc.

As one of the earliest Buddhist poets writing in Sanskrit Mātr̥ceṭa (at the latest he lived in the 4th century CE) was as renowned as Aśvagoṣa whom, however, for many centuries he surpassed by dint of his influence on followers of all Buddhist traditions and schools. Mātr̥ceṭa's importance to the history of Indian Buddhism is, in fact, incontestable and, likewise, his poetry was highly appreciated by Central Asian Buddhists as can be inferred from the comparatively large number of Sanskrit MS remains of his works and also from

the fondness of Tibetan authors to quote him. Although Mātṛceṭa's hymns in praise of the Buddha could have lent themselves to incorporating doctrinal peculiarities belonging to a specific school, their author evidently succeeded in connecting form and content in such a way that his *stotras* not only proved equally acceptable to the followers of the Śrāvākayāna and of the Great Vehicle, but also formed an integral part of all Buddhist training centers' curriculum for *navaka* monks, as the pilgrim and monk scholar Yi jing admirably reported from Sumatra in 692.¹²

Here is a sample of Mātṛceṭa's refined *Buddha-bhakti* :

*Sati pradīpe saty agnau satsu tārāmaṇinduṣu /
apūrṇa evārkaṃ ṛte prakāśo bhavati kṣitau //
tāsu cānyāsu cābhāsu tadviśiṣṭatamāsv api /
satīsv eva nirālokaṃ bhavati tvadyte jagat //
ity avidyāndhakārograpaṭalāvṛtacetasaḥ /
tamobhūtasya lokasya jyotirbhūtasya te namaḥ//*

There may be a lamp, there may be fire, there may be stars, jewels, and the moon; Still, light on earth will be incomplete without the sun. In spite of these [kinds of] light and even if other [kinds] would exist surpassing them, the world will be without light without You. [Thinking] thus, [I] bow down before You who has become the light of the world that has sunk into darkness and whose mind is covered with the terrible veil of spiritual blindness.¹³

In 'Das *Vanaratnastotra* des Āditya'¹⁴ M. Hahn says that the genre of hymnic literature has been enjoying great popularity in India for nearly two thousand years and that the literary creations of this genre are indeed vast. Among them one can find the whole gamut of literary output from works of little or no literary value to those of outstanding merit, ensuring their respective author's 'lasting fame as a Buddhist poet of the golden age of Sanskrit literature.'¹⁵

Before concluding this *stotra* section, mention should be made of a study by J. Schneider in which the Tibetan translation of Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin's *Viśeṣastava* and Prajñāvarman's commentary on it are edited and translated. As Schneider shows, Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin converted to Buddhism and might have been the earliest Buddhist *stotra* author.¹⁶ According to tradition, Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin's brother, Śaṅkarasvāmin, also was a *stotrakāra* who composed the apologetic hymn *Devatāvimarśastuti*. Hahn edited and translated this hymn and raised an important point in his introduction which should not go unnoticed in the present context.

Above, I have referred to 'a soteriological dimension' for composing poetry, viz. for composing hymns of praise. Apart from this doctrinal aspect, with reference to both Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmin's and his brother's *stotras*, Hahn appositely gives a psychological reason, as it were, for composing *stotras* each of whose authors stresses the superiority of the Buddha in comparison with the Hindu gods – this feature which seems to be so characteristic of proselytes can also be found in the first story of Kumāralāta's *Kalpanamaṇḍitikā Drstantapankti* and in the first stanzas of Mātṛceṭa's *Vaṇnarhavarṇastotra*.¹⁷

2. For my sketch of the *lekha* genre I am much indebted to S. Dietz' comprehensive treatment of Indo-Tibetan Buddhist epistolary literature.¹⁸ In her exhaustive treatment of the topic, she provides detailed bibliographical information on the *lekha* genre, discusses the position of the epistles in the *Tanjur* and gives a full account of previous publications on the subject in hand. Then, with reference to each epistle, she analyzes the *lekhas* by mentioning the addresser, addressee, occasion and purpose, characteristics of content, and with remarks on meter and language, date of composition, utilized sources and their treatment. Moreover, Dietz examines the *lekha* as a particular kind of Sanskrit literature of its own which seems to be peculiar to Buddhist literature (unlike the information letters, for example, incorporated into dramas in *Kālidāsa*). The bulk of Dietz' *magnum opus* are her editions of the Tibetan texts and translations of altogether nine epistles eight of which are made accessible in a Western language for the first time, including, for instance, the letters by Jitāri, Atiśa, Kamalaśīla, and Śrīghoṣa. The oldest epistles that have come down to us (2nd century CE) are Nagarjuna's *Suḥrillekha* ('Letter to a Friend') and Mātṛceṭa's *Mahārājakanīṣkalekha*. In the further development of epistolary literature both exerted the greatest influence on subsequent works. Whilst the two oldest *lekhas* and those dealt with by Dietz are preserved only in Tibetan and Mongolian – the *Suḥrillekha* is available also in Chinese – the only epistle that has been preserved in the Sanskrit original is Candragomin's *Śiṣyalekha*.¹⁹ On the whole, the contents of the *lekhas* can be characterized as didactic. Thanks to their position as spiritual teachers, the addressers impart to the addressees – in the main laypersons – religious and moral counsel and instruction whose forcefulness is enhanced by the authors' personally addressing the recipients of advice.²⁰ As far as literary ornateness is concerned, only Mātṛceṭa and Candragomin make full use of the *kāvya* style in their *lekhas*, whereas the other *lekhakāras*, chiefly Buddhist *ācāryas* and philosophers, also wrote their epistles in verse but were no poets.²¹ This second part on epistolary literature may be concluded with a quotation from Candragomin's *Śiṣyalekha*:

*svayaṃ ghāsagrāsaṃ paśur api karoty eva sulabhaṃ
yadrccchālabdhaṃ vā pibati salilaṃ gāḍhatṛṣitaḥ /
parasyārthaṃ kartuṃ yad iha puruṣo 'yaṃ prayatate
tad asya svaṃ tejaḥ sukhaṃ idam aho pauraṣam idam // 101*
By and for themselves, even the beasts of the field
eat that grass which is easy to find
or drink water which happens to be at hand
when plagued by a strong thirst.
The specific dignity of man, on the other hand,
consists in this: that he is able to care
about the welfare of others.
Yes, this alone is true happiness and true humanity! (101)²²

3. In the present context, Buddhist narrative literature is taken to denote ancient *Jātaka* and *Avadāna* literature recast as poetic works in ornate, elegant Sanskrit. The first celebrated representative of this genre to be mentioned is Aryasura (fourth century CE), famous for his *Jātakamālā* ('Garland of *Jātakas*'). This work in Campū style, i.e. elaborate composition alternating between prose and, prevailing, verse, contains thirty-four stories about the

would-be Buddha's noble deeds in his previous lives, designed to exemplify the achievement of the *pāramitās*, perfections, of liberality, morality etc., necessary for the attainment of Buddhahood. In the introduction to his translation of the *Jātakamālā*, J.S. Speyer, well-known to every student of Sanskrit through his classic study tool, viz. his *Sanskrit Syntax*, considers Āryaśūra's work a masterpiece of Sanskrit Buddhist literature, perhaps being the most perfect writing of its kind. It is distinguished no less by the superiority of its style than by the loftiness of its thoughts. Its verses and artful prose are written in the purest Sanskrit, and charm the reader by the elegance of their form and the skill displayed in the handling of a great variety of meters... Above all, I admire his moderation... he does not allow himself the use of embellishing apparel and the whole luxuriant *mise en scène* of Sanskrit *alamkara* beyond what is necessary for his subject.²³

H. Kern's *editio princeps* on which Speyer's translation is based is a very meritorious achievement. Notwithstanding, recently Albrecht Hanisch completed his 'Philological Examination of the Legends 1-15 in Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā*'²⁴ and succeeded in producing a much improved new edition and translation of about the first half of Āryaśūra's chef-d'oeuvre thanks to his judicious handling of *variae lectiones* and drawing on the abundant *Jātakamālā* research done during the last twenty-seven years.

Apropos *pāramitās*, there is a second poetic work consisting of 363 verses that is ascribed to Āryaśūra, viz. the *Pāramitāsamāsa*, 'Compendium of the Perfections'. After the *editio princeps* of this text by Alfonso Ferrari, Carol Meadows re-edited the same²⁵ and reached the conclusion that the author of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* and the poet who composed the *Jātakamālā* cannot be identical. In his 'Notes on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature', Hahn agrees with Meadows about the authorship of the *Pāramitāsamāsa*, the criteria being stylistic differences and a varying doctrinal background. The *Pāramitāsamāsa* by Aryasura II (ca. 6th century CE or earlier), all the same, as Hahn says, is clearly a work of high literary standard... even though he...quoted from another literary composition.²⁶

Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* inspired another two poets each of whom composed his own *Jātakamālā* modeled on that of their illustrious precursor, viz. Haribhaṭṭa (beginning of the 5th century CE) and Gopadatta (second half of the 5th century at the earliest, second half of the 8th century at the latest). Like Āryaśūra's opus, Haribhaṭṭa's *Jātakamālā* consists of thirty-four legends in Campu style, illustrating the perfections of liberality, morality, forbearance, exertion, meditation, and wisdom. Apart from the joint publication – in collaboration with K. Klaus – of Haribhaṭṭa's *Mygajātaka* (edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts along with a translation)²⁷, it is Hahn who took the initiative in retrieving a handsome part of the poet's masterpiece of the highest caliber. He has to his credit to have drawn the interested reader's attention to the fact that the nowadays wellnigh unknown Buddhist poet Haribhaṭṭa must have been one of the most distinguished representatives of *kāvyaśāstras*. Already in 1964 Hahn had begun to study Haribhaṭṭa's legends in Tibetan translation. He gives a résumé of all his efforts and comes to the following conclusion:

After having studied the ten legends which are available in their original Sanskrit and seven more legends according to their Tibetan translation I gained the impression that Haribhatta is one of the most brilliant stars in the galaxy of early classical Sanskrit literature.

In my opinion he can be compared only with poets like Āsvaghoṣa, Āryaśura or Kālidāsa.²⁸

In the October 2004 issue of the Marburg University journal, finally, Hahn published his 'Treasures of Buddhist Belles-lettres'²⁹; in his contribution, he breaks the news about the discovery of most valuable manuscripts among which are found sixty-three folios of an old palmleaf MS containing most of Haribhaṭṭa's masterpiece in its Sanskrit original about one half of which had been thought irretrievably lost. In spring 2004 at a buddhological conference in Canada, Hahn was told that a collection of Sanskrit MSS – in all likelihood from Tibet and amongst them a MS of Haribhaṭṭa's *Jātakamālā* - had been taken abroad for a short time and that photos of them were taken; that because of his long-standing familiarity with the work one would be pleased to put the photos of the Haribhaṭṭa MS at his disposal. On receipt of them, the quality of the photos and the legibility of the folios surpassed Hahn's highest expectations. Now about four fifths of the *Jātakamālā* have become available for detailed exploration. In view of Haribhaṭṭa's stature in Sanskrit literature, Hahn underlines the importance of this discovery by comparing it with the rediscovery of fragments of Menander's dramas or of the Brandenburg Concertos by J.S. Bach. As a specimen of Haribhatta's *kāvya* the opening verses of his story about the Bodhisattva as leader of a herd of deer may be quoted:

tṛṇam iva jīvitam iṣṭam
karuṇānugatāḥ parārtham ujjhantaḥ /
kāthinamanasām api mano
nayanti mṛdutām mahātmānaḥ //
 Moved out of compassion, the magnanimous who give
 away – for the sake of others – their lives, [no more]
 cherished [by them] than blades of grass, melt the hearts
 even of the hard-hearted.³⁰

As for one more *Jātakamālā* by Gopadatta, in 1974 the Tibetan scholar Lobsang Dargyay submitted his dissertation (published in 1978 in Vienna) in which he deals with Gopadatta's 'Legend of the Seven Princesses' (*Saptakumārikāvadāna*) by editing, translating, and analyzing the Tibetan version of the text. Since other legends were found in anonymous and unpublished *Jātaka* and *Avadāna* collections from Nepal, as Hahn writes, Sanskrit originals became accessible and thus could be attributed to Gopadatta. Hahn very plausibly surmises that Gopadatta's *Jātakamālā*, too, contained thirty-four legends. So far thirteen of them have been edited, five by Ratna Handurukande, seven by Hahn, and one by Klaus, six of which have also been translated into English and three into German.³¹

To conclude part 3 on narrative literature, I should not fail to mention at least the *Avadānakalpalatā*, Kṣemendra's truly remarkable work which was

completed in 1052; it contained 107 legends, and his son Somendra composed one more legend so as to make the collection consist of 108 – a sacred figure - *avadānas*. A tremendous amount of research on Kṣemendra has been done since 1888.

4. In the introduction to his study of Central Asian MS fragments of Buddhist dramas³² being, on the whole, the oldest MS remains of Indian provenance, H. Lüders informs us that quite early in Buddhism the originally strong opposition to the theater had been given up, since the stage was ideally suited to the propagation of Buddhist teachings. He refers to S. Lévi's *Théâtre indien* (p. 319f.), where it says that the *Avadānaśataka* (ca. 1st century CE) narrates the performance of a *bauddha nāṭaka* (Buddhist drama) by a group of actors from the Deccan whom the Buddha Krakucchanda had told to perform in front of the king of Śobhāvati; in this play, the stage director is reported to have acted, being costumed as the Buddha, the other actors as bhikṣus. There is another story narrated in the *Kanjur*: An actor, also from the south, wrote a drama after the *Abhinīskramanasūtra* and enacted it with his troupe at a festival sponsored by King Bimbisāra. As can be gleaned from the narrative, in what can be referred to as the oldest Buddhist dramas, we have characteristics also to be found in the later dramas of the classical period: one has no qualms about letting appear the Buddha personally on the stage. Moreover, in spite of the themes enacted for the sake of the spectators' spiritual uplift, the plays are by no means wanting in interludes of slapstick comedy in which, for example, two bhikṣus are ridiculed as lovers of gourmet food. In his masterly handling of the MS remains, Lüders assigns the fragments to two dramas. Luckily, the colophon belonging to the second has survived, according to which the drama was entitled *Śāradvatīputraprakaraṇa*, authored by Asvaghosa. In relation to the fragments, as far as possible, Lüders discusses the following aspects: the techniques pertaining to the dramas, their meters, and languages, viz. Sanskrit and three kinds of dialects to be considered as forerunners of three later Prakrits, viz. Māgadhī, Ardhamāgadhī, and Śaurasenī. Here, again, we have a special feature that was to become a characteristic peculiar to the Indian drama, viz. multilingualism. Thus, as Lüders shows, the fragments of the dramas yield up as dramatis personae the Buddha, some of his disciples, the allegorical figures Buddhi (Wisdom), Dhṛti (Constancy), and Kīrti (Renown), speaking Sanskrit; the Prakrits are spoken by the villain, the hetaera, the *vidūṣaka* (clown), by a servant, etc. On epigraphic grounds (the script of the palmleaf fragments tallies with that of the Mathura inscriptions) Lüders dates the fragments at about the beginning of the common era, others at ca. 2nd – 3rd century CE.

Among the works of the classical Indian drama, two are relevant to the present topic: a) Candragomin's *Lokānanda*, the Buddhist play entitled 'Joy for the World', and b) King Harsavardhana's (or Harsadeva's) (first half of the 7th century CE) Buddhist-inspired *Nāgānanda*, the 'Snakes' Felicity'. Since the latter drama is extant in Sanskrit whose *editio princeps* appeared in 1864, it has become well-known thanks to the efforts of many scholars, and Winternitz considered it one of the most interesting pieces of Indian literature. Although at least 58 editions and translations of the *Nāgānanda* have been published, a number of more or less general as well as special problems had remained

unsolved. In 1997 R. Steiner published his meticulous investigation into the *Nāgānanda* in which he has made use of all the available recensions of the drama and of its Tibetan translation. He addressed himself to a wide range of problems of a philological, dramaturgic, and metrical nature.³³ A digest of the *Nagananda* is conveniently given by L. Renou who speaks of the playwright's free use of the supernatural, his appeal for sentiments of magnanimity and for self-sacrifice, presented with an extraordinary richness of expressions which, nevertheless, remain unaffected by grandiloquence and verbiage.³⁴

Apart from a few verses preserved in Sanskrit, Candragomin's *Lokānanda* ('*Jig rten kun tu dga' ba'i zlos gar*) has been handed down only in its Tibetan translation. Again, we are indebted to M. Hahn who has made accessible 'Joy for the World' both to the interested general reader and the scholar. Thirty years ago he published the first critical edition of the Tibetan text of Candragomin's *nāṭaka* together with a complete German translation, the pertinent scholarly apparatus and a detailed analysis.³⁵ Thirteen years later, Dharma Publishing at Berkeley brought out beautifully Hahn's English translation of the *Lokānanda*.³⁶ In the introduction to 'Joy of the World', the translator makes it clear that the earliest specimens of the various types of ornate literature, including that of *nāṭaka*, originate from Buddhist authors.

We cannot say whether it was Buddhist authors who developed these forms, or whether these authors simply brought them to such a degree of perfection that earlier works were consigned to oblivion. In either case, the contribution of Buddhist authors was decisive.³⁷

After a lot of research and scholarly controversy over Candragomin's life and works the following facts seem to have become clear and fixed:

Candragomin is the author of both the *Lokānanda* and the *Śiṣyalekha*... He also gained fame among Sanskrit grammarians as the founder of the so-called *Cāndra* system of Sanskrit grammar. As for his dates, the reliable evidence, including stylistic criteria, all points to the fifth century CE.

The statement by the seventh century pilgrim Yi-jing that Candragomin was his contemporary has made for some confusion on this score, but it seems necessary on the basis of the record as a whole to conclude that Yi-jing was simply misinformed or misunderstood his sources.³⁸

The general theme of 'Joy for the World' is the same as that of the *Nāgānanda*: the lofty ideal of magnanimity, generosity, and self-sacrifice, the latter being taken literally, viz. the readiness to sacrifice oneself for the sake of other sentient beings. The hero of the *Lokānanda* is Mañicūḍa, well known from accounts of the Buddha in a previous life as a Bodhisattva. In Hahn's estimation of the classical Indian drama in general and of the *Lokānanda* in particular, it says:

The language of the characters is a mix of prose and verses. The stanzas were usually sung, with many repetitions and accompanied by musical instruments. Thus, the total effect resembled that of a Western opera or musical. The audience for such a play knew and respected all the conventions of the

form. They expected from the author that he show his skill in handling these formal requirements, creating an ideal blend of a well-structured story told in elegant language and dramatic form, mixing moral and ethical teachings with beautiful verses and songs, dances, and the extensive use of humor.³⁹ Now a specimen of Candragomin's ingenuity and originality should not be lacking here. The following quotation is taken from the prelude of the drama, viz. the second stanza of the benediction, in which the author indicates the theme of the whole play by alluding to the four 'infinitudes' (*apramāṇa*) and also to Māra's daughters who unsuccessfully tried to tempt the Buddha while ironically referring to his 'equanimity' towards his former wife Yaśodharā which certainly differed from that shown towards them:

byams pa'i thugs ni rgya chen dga' bas mgul nas yañdag 'khyud gyur pa //
khyed kyi sñiñ rjes bdag cag kyan ni de bzin btañ sñoms mtshuñs mdzad rigs //
legs pa'i lha mo grags 'dzin mdzad bzin bdag cag gis ni rjes mi 'gro //
bdud kyi bu mos phrag dog gis smras khyed rnam sañs rgyas rtoḡs par śoḡ //⁴⁰

'O you whose loving (*maitrī*) character is vast
 beyond all measure (*apramāṇa*),
 you who were once so blissfully (*muditā*)
 embraced by your wife Yaśodharā
 in your great compassion (*karuṇā*)
 should you also not show
 toward us a similar equanimity (*upekṣā*) ?
 But we of course must not behave as did
 The noble mistress Yaśodharā!
 O, may you gain the knowledge of the Buddha
 who was so addressed by the envy-drunk daughters of
 Māra, the god of desire!⁴¹

5. Concerning Indian poetics and their Tibetan reception, the key figure is Daṇḍin (ca. 1st half of the 8th century), the famous author of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* ('Mirror of Poetry'), which is one of the oldest Indian treatises on poetics, enjoying immense popularity to the present day in India, Sri Lanka, South-East Asia, in Tibet and Mongolia. Ever since its *editio princeps* of 1863 the *Kāvyaḍarśa* has been an oft-published and much-cited work. In view of the textual condition of the Sanskrit original, which is unsatisfactory in many respects, it is all the more astonishing that a definite edition of the whole treatise still is a desideratum. A.C. Banerjee's *editio princeps* of the Tibetan version of Daṇḍin's work, of the *Sñan nag me loñ*, too, is not very reliable and helpful – he edited a translation which was done 500 years after the first complete, unsurpassed rendering into Tibetan by Śoñ-ston Rdo-tje rgyal-mtshan and the Indian *pañḍita* Lakṣmīkara in the second half of the 13th century. So as to facilitate a better understanding of both the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and its Tibetan version and further developments in indigenous poetry, some years ago J.F. Epling did research on the 'central chapter' of Daṇḍin's treatise,⁴² and R.R. Jackson published his 'Poetry in Tibet: *Glu, mGur, sNyan ngag* and Songs of Experience'.⁴³

Recently, the Bulgarian scholar D. Dimitrov completed a new edition of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and its Tibetan translation (a version being fairly close to the first rendering of the treatise in the 13th century) by strictly complying with the

principles of textual criticism; thus he very convincingly re-edited and translated the first chapter of the 'Mirror of Poetry', viz. the *Mārgavibhāga*, 'Differentiation of Styles', and the third chapter, the *Śabdālamkāradoṣavibhāga*, 'Differentiation of Embellishment of the Sound by Rhymes, etc.'⁴⁴ One of the preconditions for Dimitrov's successful re-edition was the discovery of some valuable Nepalese MSS of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* which have become accessible through the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP). In comparison with the *Kāvyaḍarśa* MSS from India those handed down in Nepal often reflect a better and, first of all, an older textual condition. In this respect, a completely preserved MS in Newārī script proved most important which, though undated, gives the impression of being very old, perhaps dating back to a period between the 10th and 13th century. Frequently, as Dimitrov discovered, there exists a remarkable agreement between the readings of this old Nepalese palmleaf MS and the text commented upon by Ratnaśrījñāna (10th century), author of the oldest extant *Kāvyaḍarśa* commentary in Sanskrit.⁴⁵

Daṇḍin's 'Mirror of Poetry' is divided into three chapters; the first is entitled 'Differentiation of Styles', in a lucid presentation providing the fundamentals of poetics. The second chapter concentrates on 'Differentiation of Embellishment of the Sense by Poetical Figures, etc.', the third deals with three topics: a) difficult figures – embellishment of the sound by rhymes, etc., b) puzzling questions or riddles, and c) poetic faults (in his dissertation, however, Dimitrov treats a) and b) as one topic). Under poetic faults, Daṇḍin exemplifies the following points: irrelevancy, nonsensicality, tautology, obscurity, wrong sequence, deficiency in diction, breach of caesura, defective meters, neglect of euphonic junction, and contradictions. Naturally, due to the delicate composition of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and its extremely technical nature, the handing down of a tolerably reliable text has been proving a very difficult venture. Luckily, Dimitrov could draw upon a MS photographed in Nepal, containing considerable parts of the oldest commentary on the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* by the erudite Sri Lankan monk scholar Ratnaśrījñāna (ca. 1st half of the 10th century). On account of the difficult subject-matter and conciseness of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*, its MS, too, abounds in mistakes. So Dimitrov got the happy idea also to include in his exploration of the 'Mirror of Poetry' the oldest Tibetan commentary on the *Kāvyaḍarśa* viz. the *Dpañ tīkā*, heavily relying on Ratnaśrījñāna's work, by Dpañ lo tsā ba Blo gros bstan pa, written in the first half of the 14th century. As far as Dimitrov's work on Daṇḍin's treatise, especially on the third chapter, is concerned, it is a contribution of great scientific value in terms of textual and conjectural criticism. Furthermore, it is a most informative study of the reception of the 'Mirror of Poetry' first on the part of Ratnaśrījñāna, the highly competent *paṇḍita* who taught at a North Indian Buddhist university, then on Śoñ-ston's, the equally impressive Tibetan monk scholar's part. Śoñ-ston's disciple was Dpañ lo-tsā-ba, author of the *Dpañ tīkā*, as mentioned. With his work, Dpañ lo-tsā-ba has documented a brilliant feat of authentic reception of a masterpiece of Indian poetics in the Land of Snows with an ethnicity and linguistic conditions entirely different from those of India.

Thanks to such a successful reception of *paṇḍita* in Tibet an essential prerequisite was met for a subsequent adaptation.

6. With respect to autochthonous Tibetan poetry, alas, a long story has to be cut short. At least mention should be made of Tibet's national poet-saint Milarepa (Mila ras pa), the eleventh-century yogin, ever since held in the highest reverence by millions of inhabitants of the Land of Snows and areas bordering on it. In the preface to his second edition of *Milarepa. A Biography from the Tibetan* (p. XIII), W.Y. Evans-Wentz wrote in 1950, in San Diego, about the poet-saint:

For him, it is not exploitation and physical conquest of the world by science which really matters, but the conquest of the self and the breaking of every fetter that binds man to the treadmill of incarnate existence.⁴⁶ As for *The Hundred Thousand Songs of Milarepa (mGur 'bum)*, in the foreword to Garma C.C. Chang's admirable pioneering translation, P. Gruber writes:

If to evaluate the *Mila Grubum* is difficult, to praise it is even more so. Words, after all, may not be a good means of praise for a book of this kind.⁴⁷

In the field of tibetology, an enormous amount of work remains to be done. One of the leading experts in Buddhist Studies, the late J.W. de Jong, published the first critical edition of the complete text of *Mi la ras pa'i rNam thar*, Milarepa's biography.⁴⁸ In my review of de Jong's *Tibetan Studies*, which also contains an updated bibliography concerning publications on Milarepa, I quote him as saying that a critical edition of the *mGur 'bum* would be a real desideratum. Milarepa's Songs would, indeed, merit being studied with the same care as classical scholars concentrate on the poetical works in Greek or Latin. Tibetologists still would have the advantage over them in that they could avail themselves of the help from those belonging to an uninterrupted living tradition.⁴⁹ Here, in conclusion, is a quotation from Milarepa's 57th song:

/ sñiñ rje ma nus pa la byas pa de /
 / dus gsum sañs rgyas mchod dan 'dra /
 / da sñiñ rjes sprañ la byin pa na /
 / mi la ras pa mchod pa yin /
 / 'gro kun pha dan ma yin pas /
 / de la sel 'byed byed pa rnams /
 / ma šes btsan dug za ba 'dra /
 / mkhas btsun thams cad thugs mthun pas /
 / pha rus chags sdañ byed pa rnams /
 / bslab (bslabs) tshad chu la pho ba yin /
 / chos la dkar nag med pa la /
 / grub mtha' kha 'dzin chos la dmod (smod) /
 / thar pa'i 'ju thag chad pa yin /
 / rañ bde thams cad gžan las byuñ /
 / gžan phan thams cad rañ bde'i rgyu /
 / gnod pa thams cad rañla sdig /⁵⁰

To give alms to the needy with compassion
 Is equal to serving Buddhas in the Three Times.
 To give with sympathy to beggars is
 To make offerings to Milarepa.
 Sentient beings are one's parents; to
 Discriminate between them is harmful and
 Ignorant. True sages and
 Scholars are always in accord;

Clinging to one's School and condemning others
 Is the certain way to waste one's learning.
 Since all Dharmas equally are good,
 Those who cling to sectarianism
 Degrade Buddhism and sever
 Themselves from Liberation.
 All the happiness one has
 Is derived from others;
 All the help one gives to them
 In return brings happiness.
 One's pernicious deeds
 Only harm oneself.⁵¹

Endnotes

¹ See *Hsi Lai Journal of Humanistic Buddhism*, Vol. 4 (2003), 73.

² Winternitz, Maurice, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II (revised edition) (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983), 98.

³ See Wijesekera, O.H. de A. (ed.), *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume* (Colombo: Kularatne, 1976), 97ff.

⁴ Mookerjee, Satkari (ed.), *The Nava-Nālandā-Mahāvihāra Research Publication*, Vol. II (Nalāndā, 1960), 537ff. See also Dhirasekera, Jotiya, 'Poetic Beauty Reflected in the Buddhist Vision' in: Dhammapala, G., Gombrich, R., and Norman, K.R. (eds.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhātissa* (Nugegoda, 1984), 88-90.

⁵ Whilst the latter verse collection in Tibetan translation is found both in the *Kanjur* and *Tanjur*, the Pāli *Dhammapada* was translated into Tibetan only in the last century: *Chos kyi tshigs su bcad pa bžugs so. Dhammapada*. Translated into Tibetan by Gedun Chomphel (dGe 'dun Chos 'phel) (Gangtok: Anagarika Dharmapala Trust Publication Series No. 2, 1946).

⁶ Edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts and translation in: Lindtner, Christian, *Nagarjuniana*, Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982), 128f.

⁷ As for this compatibility in the context of Theravāda and the origins of Mahāyāna, see Maithrimurthi, Mudagamuwe, 'Entfaltung des Wohlwollens als eine meditative Übung' (Cultivating Benevolence as a Meditative Exercise) in *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies*, Akira Hirakawa Memorial Volume, VII (2004), 165-214.

⁸ On this term see Gómez, Luis O., 'Bodhicitta (Thought of Awakening)' in: *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. I (New York...: Macmillan Reference USA, 2004), 54-56.

⁹ Khunu Rinpoche, *Vast as the Heavens, Deep as the Sea*, Verses in Praise of Bodhicitta. *Byaṅ chub sems kyi bstod pa rin chen sgron ma žes bya ba bžugs so*. Translated into English by Thubten Thardo (Gareth Sparham). (Somerville MA: Wisdom Publications, 1999), 38f., 114f.

¹⁰ Regrettably the following genres can just be mentioned in brief (they have impressively

and extensively been dealt with elsewhere): 1) *mahākāvya* works (e.g. Aśvagoṣa's

Buddhacarita or Śivasvāmīn's *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*; see Hahn, Michael, 'Doctrine and Poetry; Śivasvāmīn's Essentials of Buddhism. Text and Translation of Canto XX of His *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*' in: Kieffer-Pülz, Petra and Hartmann, Jens-Uwe (eds.),

Bauddhavidyāsudhākarāḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica <in the following abbreviated to 'I. et T.' > 30, 1997), 207-232; 2) admonitive speeches (*parikathas*) (e.g. Nāgārjuna's

Ratnāvalī; see Hahn, M., *Ratnāvalī*, The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese) (Bonn: I. et T. 1, 1982);

3) *nīti* literature (prudential maxims) (e.g. Nāgārjuna's *Prajñāśśataka*; 1st critical edition and translation by Hahn, M. (Bonn: I. et T. 18, 1990).

¹¹ Hartmann, Jens-Uwe (ed., transl.), *Das Varṇārhavarnastotra des Mātrceṭa*, Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XII (Göttingen: V&R, 1987).

¹² Hartmann 1987: 7, 13.

¹³ After *ibid.*, 123f. (*Varṇārhavarnastotra* 2. 57-59).

¹⁴ I.e. Hahn's ed. of Aditya's *stotra* in Sanskrit and Tibetan translation along with a German translation of the hymn in praise of Bhikṣu Vanaratna, which is a work belonging to the late period of Buddhist Sanskrit literature, published in: Hahn, Michael, Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, and Steiner, Roland (eds.), *Suhyllekhāḥ*, Helmut Eimer Felicitation Volume (Swisttal-Odendorf: I. et T. 28, 1996), 29-42.

¹⁵ See Hahn, Michael, 'Notes on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, Chronology and related topics', in: *Original Buddhism and the Mahāyāna Doctrine*. Commemoration Volume for Dr. Fumimaro Watanabe (Kyoto, 1993).

¹⁶ Schneider, Johannes, Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmins *Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha* (Bonn, I. et T. 23, 1993), 11-13.

¹⁷ Hahn, Michael, 'Śaṅkarasvāmin's *Devatāvimarśastuti*' in: Chojnackí, Christine, Hartmann, J.-U., and Tschannerl, Volker (eds.), *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka*, Adelheid Mette Felicitation Volume (Swisttal-Odendorf: I. et T. 37, 2000), 313-329.

¹⁸ Dietz, Siglinde, *Die buddhistische Briefliteratur Indiens*. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984).

¹⁹ See the gorgeous publication Hahn, Michael, *Invitation to Enlightenment*. Letter to the Great King Kaniṣka by Mātrceṭa, Letter to a Disciple by Candragomin (critical ed. of the texts, translations, glossaries, facsimiles of a palmleaf MS of the *Śiṣyalekha*) (Berkeley: Dharma Publishing, 1999).

²⁰ Dietz 1984: XV.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 93.

²² Hahn 1999: 118f.

²³ Speyer, J.S., *The Jātakamālā* (London: 1895), XXIII f.

²⁴ In preparation for publication in I. et T. Hanisch's work benefitted, for instance, from Tissa Rajapatirana's study of the Tibetan translation of the *Jātakamālā*, from Peter Khoroché's new English translation of the text, Ratna Basu's edition of the completely preserved Sanskrit commentary on the said legends 1-15, and from the following two textcritical studies: a) Hahn, M., 'Variant Readings on Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* as Found in the *Jātakamālāṭīkā*' in: *The Journal of Oriental Research*, Dr. S.S. Janaki Felicitation Volume (Madras: 1992), 233-253; b) Hahn, M., Steiner, R., 'Textcritical Remarks on Āryaśūra's Yajñajataka, Studies in Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* II' in: Rani, Vijaya, Goyal, V.K. (eds.), *Srijñanamrtam*, A Memorial Volume in Honour of Prof. Shri Niwas Shastri (Kuruksheṭra, Delhi: 1996), 101-134. The most recent piece of research on the *Jātakamālā* is Hahn, M., 'Text-critical Remarks on Aryasura's Mahisa- and Satapatrajataka (Studies in Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā* III) in: Torella, Raffaele *et al.* (eds.), *Le parole e i marmi*, Raniero Gnoli Felicitation Volume (Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2001), 377-397.

²⁵ Meadows, Carol, *Āryaśūra's Compendium of the Perfections: Text, translation and analysis of the Pāramitāsamāsa* (Bonn: I. et T. 8, 1986).

²⁶ Hahn 1993: 38.

²⁷ Hahn, M. and Klaus, Konrad, *Das Mṛgajātaka (Haribhaṭṭajātakamālā XI)*. Studie, Texte, Glossar (Bonn: I. et T. 3, 1983).

²⁸ Hahn 1993: 41.

²⁹ *Marburger UniJournal* No. 20 (Philipps-Universität Marburg), 15ff.

³⁰ After Hahn, Klaus 1983: 29, 39.

³¹ For bibliographical details see Hahn 1993: 49-52. Meanwhile two more editions and German translations of Gopadatta's *Nāgajātaka* and *Meghajātaka* by M. Hahn appeared in *Berliner Indologische Studien* 8 (1995), 87-135, and 9/10 (1996), 157-201, respectively.

- ³² Lüders, Heinrich (ed.), *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*. Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, Heft I (with six plates of facsimiles of fragments) (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1911) – reprinted in: Härtel, Herbert (ed.), *Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie*, Vol. I (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1979).
- ³³ Steiner, Roland, *Untersuchungen zu Harṣadevas Nāgānanda und zum indischen Schauspiel* (Swisttal-Odendorf: I. et T. 31, 1997).
- ³⁴ Renou, Louis and Filliozat, Jean, *L'Inde classique. Manuel des études indiennes* II (Paris: EFEO, 1953; réimpression 2000), 282.
- ³⁵ Hahn, Michael, *Candragomins Lokānandanāṭaka*. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben und übersetzt (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1974).
- ³⁶ Hahn, M., *Joy for the World*. A Buddhist Play by Candragomin (Berkeley: Yeshe De Project, Dharma Publishing, 1987).
- ³⁷ Hahn 1987: XVI.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, XVII (slightly adapted). See also Hahn's perfectly plausible defense of the traditional stance on Candragomin as author and his convincing argument about Yi-jing's error in respect of Candragomin's dates: 'Über den indirekten Beweis bei literarhistorischen Fragestellungen' in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* XXXVI (Vienna: 1992), 91-103.
- ³⁹ Hahn 1987: XXI.
- ⁴⁰ Hahn 1974: 38 (adapted).
- ⁴¹ Hahn 1987: 2f., see also Hahn 1993: 48.
- ⁴² Epling, John Frederick, *A Calculus of Creative Expression: The Central Chapter of Daṇḍin's Kāvyaḍarśa*. PhD thesis submitted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998 (UMI Calatog No. 8914509).
- ⁴³ In: Cabezón, José Ignacio and Jackson, Roger R. (eds.), *Tibetan Literature. Studies in Genre*. Essays in Honor of Geshe Lhundup Sopa (Ithaca, New York: 1996), 368-392.
- ⁴⁴ a) Dimitrov, Dragomir, *Mārgavibhāga. Die Unterscheidung der Stilarten*. Kritische Ausgabe des ersten Kapitels von Daṇḍins Poetik *Kāvyaḍarśa* und der tibetischen Übertragung *Sñan nag me lon* nebst einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrittextes (Marburg: I. et T. 40, 2002); b) Dimitrov, D., *Śabdālamkāradoṣavibhāga. Die Unterscheidung der Lauffiguren und der Fehler*. Kritische Ausgabe des dritten Kapitels von Dandins Poetik *Kāvyaḍarśa* und der tibetischen Übertragung *Sñan nag me lon* samt dem Sanskrit-Kommentar des Ratnaśrījñāna, dem tibetischen Kommentar des Dpan Blo gros brtan pa und einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrit-Grundtextes. PhD thesis submitted at Marburg University, 2004.
- ⁴⁵ Dimitrov 2002: XI f.
- ⁴⁶ Published by Oxford University Press, London, Oxford, New York, 1951.
- ⁴⁷ Published in 2 vols., New York: Oriental Studies Foundation, 1962.
- ⁴⁸ 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1959.
- ⁴⁹ Review of Hahn, M., Hartmann, J.U., and Klaus, K. (eds.), *Tibetan Studies by Jan Willem de Jong* (Swisttal-Odendorf: I. et T., 1994) in: *The Tibet Journal* XXV, 4 (Winter 2000), 91-94.
- ⁵⁰ Tsultim, Lobsang, *rje btsun Mi la ras pa'i rnam thar rgyas par phye pa mGur 'bum (zes bya ba) bzugs so* (Sarnath, Varanasi: 1971), 769f.; see also the xylographic print (or reprint?) of ca. 1975 from 'Ci ta ri'i dGon pa', Ku lu Mu na li (Kullu, Manali, Himacal Pradesh), fol. 302b, 2-5 (the variant readings found in this print are given in brackets in the above quotation).
- ⁵¹ Garma C.C. Chang's translation, vol. II, p. 639. Chang's above translation is rather free, but he felicitously brings out the meaning. His rendering 'Discriminate between them is harmful and Ignorant' more literally runs: 'Discriminate between them is [sheer] ignorance and tantamount to taking virulent poison.' After his 'Scholars are always in accord', for a semicolon one had better put a colon.