

THE LENINGRAD MANUSCRIPT OF THE *Mañicūḍāvādāna*

In the introduction to the prose text of the *Mañicūḍāvādāna* (MA hereafter) I published in 1967, I pointed out that I was not able to collate manuscript No. 291 mentioned in Mironov's *Catalogue des manuscrits Indiens de la Bibliothèque publique de Russie*, Petrograd 1918.¹ A recent publication by G. Bongard-Levin and A. Vigasin made reference to this manuscript as being one of the manuscripts in the M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library in Leningrad.² It has now been possible to get a photocopy of this manuscript through the help of several scholars.³ This copy received in Sri Lanka at the end of August 1986 is now kept in the reference section of the University Library at Peradeniya.⁴ It consists of 107 pages, presumably the copies of 54 leaves of the manuscript which do not appear to have been numbered. There are six lines on each page. The script used is Newari. The manuscript does not contain a colophon.

On collating this Leningrad manuscript (L hereafter) of the *Mañicūḍāvādāna* with the text printed in 1967, I have the following observations to make. L contains the 'common errors' of the seven manuscripts A, B, C, D, E, F and G, which were used in establishing the text of MA. I tabulated these 'errors' alongside the

-
1. Handurukande, Ratna (1967): *Mañicūḍāvādāna*. Being a translation and edition. And (*Lōkananda*. A transliteration and synopsis. London. (Sacred Books of the Buddhists. vol. xxiv).
 2. G. Bongard-Levin and A. Vigasin (1984): *The Image of India. The Study of Ancient Indian Civilisation in the U.S.S.R.* Moscow, Progress Publishers. p. 238-240.
 3. I acknowledge with thanks the help of Professor R.A.L.H. Gunawardana of the University of Peradeniya for giving me the addresses of Dr. G. Bongard-Levin and Dr. Nina Krasnodemb-skaya who in turn informed me of the procedure of acquiring a copy of the manuscript; the Director and staff of the M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library in Leningrad; and the Librarian and staff of the University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka.
 4. R.Skt. 294.3 Accession No. 397371.

emended readings in the introduction to the text and suggested that the manuscripts were copies of a common archetype which contained these errors.⁵ *L* which has the identical errors can therefore be postulated as being related to this archetype. The readings of *L* are also corrupt in the instances where *A, B, C, D, E, F* and *G* had corrupt readings,⁶ which fact strengthens the supposition of it belonging to the common archetype postulated for them. Five manuscripts of the prose *MA* kept in the Tokyo and Kyoto University Libraries in Japan, designated by me as *J1, J2, J3, J4* and *J5* to facilitate reference to them, had the 'common errors' of *A, B, C, D, E, F* and *G* as pointed out in my publication of 1976, entitled '*The Mañicūda Study*'. Here, I listed more instances where all the manuscripts, *A-G* and *J1-J5*, had the same erroneous readings in place of the emended text of the *MA* that was printed in 1967.⁷ *L* agrees with the manuscripts in these instances as well.

The variant readings of *L* are identical with, or correspond closely, in many instances, to those of *A, B, C, D* and *F*,⁸ as opposed to those of *E* and *G* for which I postulated a separate hyparchetype in the stemma on Plate I of my publication of 1967.⁹ Another series of correspondences that *L* has with *A, B* and *F*¹⁰ suggests that *L* is more closely related to these than to *C* and *D* for which also a separate hyparchetype was postulated in the stemma referred to above. It was also noted that *F* appeared to be independent of *A, B, C, D, E* and *G*, in the introduction to *MA*.¹¹ The instances

5. Handurukande (1967) *op.cit.* p. xvi-xvii.

6. *ibid.* p. xvii. n. 122.

7. Handurukande, Ratna (1976): *The Mañicūda Study in Buddhist Studies (Bukkyo Kenkyu)*, Vol. V (p. 309-168) see p. 303, 302.

8. e.g. as at *MA* ३ns. 5 and 18; 5 n. 30; 8 ns. 25, 45; 46, n68.

9. Handurukande (1967) *op.cit.* p. xx.

10. e.g. as at *MA* २7 n. 70; 35 n. 10; 40 n. 14; 45 n. 71; 46 n. 10; 59 n. 10; 64 n. 10; 72 n. 29; 75 n.1.

11. Handurukande (1967) *op.cit.* p. xviii.

where *L* agrees with all the manuscripts except *F*¹² confirms this observation. The variant readings, which *L* has in common with *A* and *B* only,¹³ suggests that it is related to the hyparchetype postulated for them. Finally *L*, like the manuscript *B*,¹⁴ begins with a formula of adoration to the Dhyāni Buddha Vajrasattva viz. *Oṃ namah Śrīvajrasattvāya* and shares many variant readings with it alone. This very close relationship of *L* and *B* prompts one to suggest that either one of them is a copy of the other, or that both are copies of a common manuscript. However some independent readings of *L* are noted at the end of this paper.

L has the following interpolations.

1. A part of a sentence viz. *Punar api sa Mañicūḍo rājā Gautamo nama mahārṣeḥ sakāśam gatva nissāṅgaparityagavratam dhṛtvā mahārṣiṇa saha*.¹⁵ This has been included in the middle of a description of King Mañicūḍa's virtues in *MA*,¹⁶ at the beginning of the sentence: *Abhikṣyam ca sattvān daśasu kuśaleṣu karmapathesu sanniyojayati*. This interpolation is found at the same point in the *MA* text which was interspersed in the *Somavaśīvratamañicūḍamahatmyanirdeśavarnana*, the seventeenth chapter of a *Kapīśāvādāna* manuscript (No. 75) in the Tokyo University Library. It was noted and discussed in my publication, *The Mañicūḍa Study* of 1976.¹⁷ There, this interpolation was marked *C* to facilitate reference to it.

12. e.g. as at *MA* 8 n. 61; 11 n.15; 14 n.44; 19 ns. 47,61; 20 n.31; 23 n.18; 24 n.41; 26 n.36; 29 n.103; 30 n.10; 31 n.2; 49 n.4; 54 n.1; 59 ns. 34, 35; 75 n.19.

13. e.g. as at *MA* 2 n.11; 3 n.28; 6 ns. 17,19; 7 n.44; 9 n.40; 13 n.57; 24 n.10; 48 n.15; 50 ns. 37, 38; 63 n.28; 69 n.40.

14. Compare Ha. durukande (1967) *op.cit.* p.1 n.2.

15. Page 10 lines 3,4 of the Peradeniya University Library copy of *L*=?leaf 5b lines 3,4 of the manuscript. Ms *Mahārṣayasya sakāśam* and *marhaṣayo saha*.

16. § 10.

17. Handurukande (1976) *op.cit.* p. 283, 277, 276.

2. The second interpolation in L,¹⁸ a fairly long prose passage with verses interspersed, is the same as that marked D in the *Kapīśavadāna* printed in the study referred to above,¹⁹ except that the first sentence of D is missing in L. The omission of this sentence appears to be the result of carelessness on the part of the scribe who interpolated the passage in L. He seems to have made yet another mistake in introducing the passage at the end of the third sentence in paragraph 12 of MA. and not after the first as in the *Kapīśavadāna*, which is an appropriate place for this interpolation. The point at which the MA. text is resumed after the interpolation in L and the *Kapīśavadāna* is the same. The text of the interpolation in L is very corrupt and I can make only a few suggestions based on it for improving the text printed as D in the *Kapīśavadāna* insertion. The page numbers refer to my publication of 1976.

- p. 283: read *Tata rddhyānubhāvena* for *Tata (ṛṣiḥ) rṣyanubhāvena; abhirūpā darśaniyā prasādika* for *abhirūpā prasādika; atulyas ca sundarah* for *atulyam ca sundarah;*
- p. 282: *vismitā punar uvāca* for*punar uvāca; atulyas trisu lokesu* for *atratra trisu lokesu;*
- p. 281: *Śarīropataptasamaye* for *śarīropataptasamayam;*
- p. 280: *Na hi mahārāja* for *atra hi mahārāja;*
- p. 279: *jīvadānamdadah* for *jīvoddhāramdadah;*
drastum for *deṣṭum.*

3. The third interpolation in L is a short passage,²⁰ the

-
18. P. 11 line 2 - p. 20 line 3 of the Peradeniya University Library copy =? leaves 6a2 - 10b3 of the manuscript.
19. Handurukande (1976) *op.cit.* p. 283 - 278.
20. P. 20 line 5 - p. 21 line 2 of the Peradeniya University Library copy =? 10b5 - 11a2 of the manuscript.

same as that marked E in the MA. quoted in the *Kapīśavadāna*,²¹ and is introduced at the same place in the text.²²

The events narrated in the second and third interpolations referred to above, relating to the marriage of Mañicuḍa, the bodhisattva, to a maiden called Padmavati, were outlined and discussed in relation to other versions of the Mañicuḍa legend in my study of 1976.²³ These events appear to be part of a longer recension of the Mañicuḍa legend, which Michael Hahn called Rezension A or the Long Version in his edition and translation of the Tibetan version of Candragomin's *Lokānandanāṭaka*,²⁴ a drama, the theme of which is the Mañicuḍa legend. Hahn discussed this Long Version in a subsequent publication based on the same study.²⁵

I also noted a few readings in L, which are different from the printed MA. and the manuscripts used in establishing that text. They are as follows:

- i) 'parena kālena samayena for 'parena samayena of MA § 3;
- ii) sarvālaṅkāravibhūṣitā for sarvālaṅkārabhūṣitā of § 6;
- iii) puṇḍarīkamāndāravamahāmāndāravāṇi for puṇḍarīkamāndāravāṇi of § 9;
- iv) samañinālavālavyañjanam for samañinālavyañjanam of § 9;

21. Handurukande (1976) *op.cit.* p. 278.

22. MA § 12 after the sentence: *Maharṣe na hi puṇyam apuṇyam
vā paraśaṅtanam saṅkrāmati.*

23. p. 276-273.

24. Hahn, Michael. (1974) *Candragomin's Lokānandanāṭaka*
Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz. (*Asiatische Forschungen* Band
39) p. 19-24.

25. Hahn, Michael. (1979). The play *Lokānandanāṭaka* by Candra-
gomin. *Kailash. A Journal of Himalayan Studies*. vol. vii.
no. 1 p. 53-55.

- v) *rājā dvadaśavarsasa(ṃ)parne caturdvāreṣu*²⁶ for *rājā caturṣu nagaradvāreṣu* of § 10;
- vi) *Śakro devānām indro* for *Śakro devendro* of § 28;
- vii) *pr̥thivīprakampo* for *pr̥thivīkampo* of § 32;
- viii) *abhisamrādhyā bodhisattvasya mātāpitarau (cā)mantryā*²⁷ *tatraivā*^o for *abhisamrādhyā tatraivantarhitāḥ* of § 33;
- ix) *Vāhiko nāma maharṣir* for *Vāhiko maharṣir* of § 36;
- x) *Māricir nāmarṣir*²⁸ for *Māricir nāma* of § 36;
- xi) *caturṅgabalakāyam*²⁹ for *balakāyam* of § 41;
- xii) *paraṅ viśmayam moḥam upagataḥ*³⁰ for *param saṃmoham upagataḥ* of § 65;
- xiii) *saṃhr̥ṣṭaromakūpajātas*³¹ for *saṃhr̥ṣṭaromakūpas* of § 66.

-
26. The MA of *Kapīśāvadāna* had this reading. See Handurukande (1976) *op.cit.* p. 187 n. 23.
27. Compare *ibid.* p. 182 n. 177 for a similar reading in the MA of *Kapīśāvadāna* viz. *bodhisattvasya mātāpitṛbhyam camantrya*.
28. Compare *ibid.* for the reading *nāmarṣi* in the MA of *Kapīśāvadāna*.
29. Compare *ibid.* for the same reading in the MA of *Kapīśāvadāna*.
30. Compare *ibid.* n. 178 for the reading *Viśmayamoham* of the MA of *Kapīśāvadāna*.
31. Compare *ibid.* p. 181, n. 178 for the reading *saṃhr̥ṣṭaromakūpajata* of the MA of *Kapīśāvadāna*.

Some of these variants of *L* (e.g. ii, iii, vii) could be changes introduced by an individual scribe. But the incidence of the *MA* inserted in the *Kapīśavadāna* having the identical or similar readings as noted in the respective instances suggests the possible influence of the longer recension of the legend as in the case of the interpolations.

RATNA HANDURUKANDE