Camillo A. Formigatti

A Gateway to the Six Languages: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add.1698

Abstract: This late fourteenth-century palm-leaf manuscript from Nepal bears witness to close scholarly engagement with Sanskrit texts by speakers of the Tibeto-Burmese language Newari. It contains a Newari translation-cum-commentary of Amarasiṃha's lexicographical masterpiece, the *Nāmaliṅgānu-śāsana*, prepared by the scholar Maṇika. According to the author, the purpose of this Newari commentary is to provide a tool to become proficient in the Six Languages, i.e Sanskrit as well as the Prakrit languages needed to compose dramatic works. It is an example of the vibrant cultural programme that flourished in Nepal under the King Jayasthitimalla.

1 Historical background

Colophons of manuscripts are an invaluable source for the reconstruction of both the political and the cultural history of late fourteenth-century Nepal.[1] The second half of this century witnessed a struggle for power between different kingdoms in the Kathmandu Valley (in Sanskrit *Nepālamaṇḍala*, 'the country of Nepal'). The two most important centres were Pātan and Bhaktapur, which rivalled each other in terms of political as well as cultural influence. Pātan was officially ruled by King Jayārjunadeva (r. 1361–1382 CE), the scion of the two royal houses of Bhonta and Tipura, while Bhaktapur was witnessing the rise of a newcomer in the political arena of the Valley, King Jayasthitimalla. Although he was the protégé of the powerful noblewoman Devaladevī,[2] his political influence amounted to *de facto* rule over the city and its kingdom. The tension between these two centres of power most probably started already during Jayarājadeva's reign over Pātan (1347–1361).

---

1 This article is partly an abridged and revised version of Formigatti 2016, with some additions.

2 On Devaladevī's origins and political role see Regmi 1965, 306–342 *et passim*; Slusser 1982, 54–55; Petech 1984, 119–133.

Jayasthitimalla's strong political influence is reflected in many documents. He is first mentioned in an ancient Nepalese chronicle,[3] in a passage in which it is said that immediately after the invasion of Nepal from Bengal by the army of Sultān Shams ud-dīn in 1349, Jayasthitimalla rose to power and celebrated his marriage with Rājalladevī, Devaladevī's grand-daughter. Both Petech and Slusser seem to agree that he was not from the Kathmandu Valley, and they trace his origin back to Mithilā.[4] On the other hand, Brinkhaus is more cautious and points out that the descent of the late Mallas from the Karṇāṭa line of Tirhut, as described in late chronicles, seems to be a later construction, fostered by the Malla kings in order to justify their claim to power.[5] The position of the legitimate rulers was becoming weaker during the second half of the fourteenth century. They owed much of their power to the influential Rāmavardhana family, who ruled in the neighbouring region of Banepa and from whose ranks came the king's chief ministers and counsellors (*mahātha*, *mahattaka*). During Jayarājadeva's reign the *mahātha* was Anekarāmavardhana (also spelled Anekha), whose son Jayasiṃharāma was the attendant of Prince Jayārjunadeva.[6] Anekarāma died only two years after Jayasthitimalla's wedding with Rājalladevī,[7] leaving the actual power over Pātan to his son Jayasiṃharāma.

The political history of this period has been described and examined by numerous scholars,[8] while very little attention has been devoted to the cultural environment in these two centres of power. The importance of Jayasiṃharāma is not only evident from chronicles and inscriptions, it is also reflected in the colophons of manuscripts dated to his reign.[9] He commissioned the writing of

---

3 *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*, fols 28ᵛ8–29ʳ. The *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*, 'Chronicle of the Lineage of King Gopāla', was edited and translated into Nepali and English by Malla and Vajrācārya in 1985. It is not a unitary work, but consists of different parts. Bendall and Petech think that the manuscript contains three different chronicles, while Malla divides it into two parts. It is not my aim here to provide an examination of these two hypotheses. It is worth noticing that the reliability of Malla's and Vajrācārya's edition and translations has been called into question by Mahes Raj Pant in a long review article (Pant 1993).

4 Petech 1984, 127–129; Slusser 1982, 58.

5 Brinkhaus 1991.

6 Petech 1984, 124.

7 According to the *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*, the date is *476 dvirāśāḍha vadi 11*, corresponding to 24 July 1356 (Petech 1984, 129). All dates mentioned have been verified by Petech 1984.

8 Overviews of this turbulent period are provided in Regmi 1965, 345–372; Slusser 1982, 57–61; Petech 1984, 137–146.

9 On Jayasiṃharāma's political career, see Petech 1984, 151–157.

numerous manuscripts, among which an edition of the *Mahābhārata* stands out for its cultural (and possibly political) importance.[10]

2 MS Add.1698 and courtly cultural policy

The palm-leaf manuscript discussed in this article played a central role in the cultural battle between the Pātan and Bhaktapur courts.[11] It was written in Bhaktapur in 1386 CE (506 Nepāla Saṃvat), during the reign of Jayasthitimalla (1382–1395 CE). At first sight, it might seem a rather unspectacular manuscript, but in fact it provides us with a direct glimpse of this king's cultural policy. It contains a commentary in the Newari language on the Sanskrit work entitled *Amarakośa* (also known as *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*).

The *Amarakośa* ('Amara's Dictionary')[12] is the most renowned Sanskrit lexicographical work, seemingly composed around the middle of the first millennium CE by Amarasiṃha, probably a Buddhist author. Like many other Sanskrit lexicographical works, 'the *Amarakośa* is a synonymic dictionary whose articles are grouped subjectwise'.[13] The fame of the 'Immortal Lexicon' goes far beyond the boundaries of the Indian subcontinent, as testified by its renderings into Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolian, Sinhalese and Burmese, among other languages. A further proof of its importance and popularity is the number of commentaries dedicated to it: at least eighty, of which many still remain unpublished.[14]

Who composed this commentary? Who wrote the manuscript? The answer to both questions is the same: Māṇikya, also known as Maṇika (in Sanskrit; Manaku in Newari), an important intellectual at Jayasthitimalla's court.[15] Maṇika is the author of at least five works belonging to different literary genres:

---

10 See Petech 1984, 153–154, 157.

11 See below for a full codicological description of the manuscript.

12 The Sanskrit title *Amarakośa* is a compound consisting of two words and concealing a pun: the last member of the compound is *kośa* ('treasury [of words]; lexicon'), while the first member, *amara*, can be taken both as the personal name of the author, Amara, or in its literal meaning, 'immortal'.

13 Vogel 2015, 22.

14 This information is taken from the description of MS Add.1698 in the Cambridge Digital Library: <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01698/1> (accessed on 16 Febr. 2021).

15 On Maṇika's role at Jayasthitimalla's court and the importance of his works in the cultural history of Nepal in the second half of the fourteenth century, see Formigatti 2016, 56–63.

1 *Nyāyavikāsinī* ('Extensive Explanation of Laws'), Cambridge, University Library, MS Add.2137: fols 28–118; Nepalese-German Manuscript Preservation Project [hereafter NGMPP] A 1160–6;[16]
2 *Amarakośavivṛti* ('Commentary on Amara's / the Immortal Lexicon'), Cambridge, University Library, MS Add.1698;
3 *Abhinavānandarāghavanāṭaka* ('The Novel Drama on Rāma's Joy'), Cambridge, University Library, MS Add.1658.1;
4 *Mahārāmāyaṇanāṭaka* ('The Great Rāmāyaṇa Drama'), NGMPP A 20–2;
5 *Bhairavānandanāṭaka* ('The Drama on Bhairava's Joy'), NGMPP A 1027–9,[17] NGMPP B 15–19, NGMPP T 10–3.

The first work in the list, the *Nyāyavikāsinī*, is an important work that confirms a specific aspect of Jayasthitimalla's political agenda, the reformation of law and administration.[18] Maṇika's poetic endeavours are represented by the three dramas in this list, the *Bhairavānandanāṭaka*, the *Abhinavānandarāghavanāṭaka*, and the *Mahārāmāyaṇanāṭaka*. Sanskrit dramas were usually composed in a mixture of Sanskrit, an Old Indo-Aryan language, and various Prakrits, that is Middle Indo-Aryan literary languages. On the other hand, Maṇika's native language was Newari, a Tibeto-Burmese language with a totally different structure. How could he master these languages to such a degree that allowed him to write these dramas? The best witness of his proficiency in these Indo-Aryan literary languages is precisely our Cambridge manuscript, MS Add.1698. A close reading of the seven stanzas added at the end of the work (fols 161ʳ4–161ᵛ3) helps us to understand why Maṇika's Newari commentary to Amara's Lexicon is a key

---

16 For a description of this manuscript, see Shastri 1905, 43, no. 1230 ca.
17 For a description of this manuscript, see Shastri 1905, 119, no. 1078 kha.
18 Cambridge, University Library, MS Add.2137 is a palm-leaf manuscript, written in Pātan in 527 Nepāla Saṃvat (1407 CE) by a certain Rāmadatta, and contains three works in Newari. Besides two works still unidentified (of which the first one is a legal text), it also contains the oldest recension of the *Nāradasmṛti* ('Nārada's Treatise on Law'), accompanied by the *Nyāyavikāsinī*, Maṇika's Newari commentary/translation. This recension of the *Nāradasmṛti* is the 'one normally found in Nepalese manuscripts as well as in the closely related text called *Nāradīyamanusmṛti*. [...] The *Nāradasmṛti* is the only legal treatise from the first millennium that focuses solely on strictly juridical procedures, lacking therefore the portions on righteous conduct (*ācāra*) and atonements (*prāyaścitta*) common in other legal *smṛti*s. As already hinted at by Lariviere, it is highly possible that the *Nāradasmṛti* was among the legal texts chosen by the Malla kings for the legal administration of their kingdoms' (from the description of the manuscript on the Cambridge Digital Library: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-02137/1> (accessed on 16 Febr. 2021); see also Regmi 1965, 366–367; Shastri 1905, x).

document for understanding his knowledge of Sanskrit and Prakrit as well as Jayasthitimalla's cultural programme:[19]

> *śrīśrījayasthitīśasya malladevasya bhūpateḥ |*
> *amātyaśrījayadbrahmā svāmikāryaparāyaṇaḥ || 1 ||*

[1] The glorious Jayadbrahmā, the minister of the twice glorious king Jayasthitimalla, ruler of the earth, was completely devoted to the service of his master.

> *sa svaputrāya vidhivad imāṃ ṭīkām acīkarat |*
> *śrīmatpātrakulānāṃ yo viśiṣṭo maṇḍanocitaḥ || 2 ||*

[2] He, who was the foremost delightful ornament among the venerable community of ministers, commissioned [the composition of] this commentary for the sake of his own son and according to the rules.

> *māṇikyam iva māṇikyanāmā paṇḍitasattamaḥ || 2a ||*
> *kṛtaiṣāmarakoṣasya tena nepālabhāṣayā*
> *vivṛtir nāma liṅgānāṃ ṭippanī bālabodhinī || 3 ||*

[3–3a] The chief of the pandits was Māṇikya, similar to a ruby. He created this short commentary (*ṭippanī*) of the *Amarakośa* on grammatical genders (*liṅga*) in the language of Nepal (i.e. Newari), entitled 'Explanation' (*vivṛti*), which enlightens the ignorant.

> *ṣaṭuttare pañcaśate gate 'bde |*
> *nepālike māsi ca caitrasaṃjñe ||*
> *kṛṣṇe ca pakṣe madanābhidhāyāṃ |*
> *tithau śaśāṅkātmajavāsare ca || 4 ||*
> *śrījayasthitibhūpale nepālarāṣṭraśāstari |*
> *śrimadbhaktapure deśe grathitvā likhitā tadā || 5 ||*

[4–5] In the venerable region of Bhaktapur, he first composed it (*grathitvā*) and then wrote it down (*likhitā tadā*), in the expired Nepalese year five hundred and six, in the month called Caitra, during the dark half of the lunar month, in the lunar day called Madanā, and in the weekday of Wednesday, when the glorious king Jayasthiti was ruling the country of Nepal.

> *imāṃ vijñāya loko 'yaṃ turṇṇam astu mahākaviḥ |*
> *ṣaḍbhāṣasāgarasyāpi pārīṇaḥ śāstrakovidaḥ || 6 ||*

---

19 The stanzas are written in two different metres: stanzas 1–3 and 5–7 are *anuṣṭubh*, stanza 4 is an *upajāti*; one stray *anuṣṭubh* verse, numbered here as 2a, is inserted between stanza 2 and 3. The text presented here has been normalized and small errors have been silently corrected. In the manuscript, the same information is provided in prose in the colophon. A full diplomatic transcription of the stanzas and the prose colophon is provided below, section 3.4.2.

[6] After having learned this [commentary], the people will quickly become great poets, cross the ocean of the Six Languages, and become knowledgeable about the technical treatises (*śāstra*).

prajāḥ sukham avāpnuvantu viprā devān yajantu ca |
daṇḍanītyā nṛpāḥ yāntu, kāle varṣantu toyadāḥ || 7 ||

[7] May the subjects obtain happiness and the Brahmins worship the Gods, the kings proceed with the administration of justice, the clouds rain at the proper season!

As we read in the stanzas, this work was composed for the sake of the son of Jayasthitimalla's minister Jayadbrahmā (also known as Jayata).[20] Moreover, this manuscript is unique for another reason: not only it is the personal copy of Jayadbrahmā's son, it is also Maṇika's autograph. This commentary on the most famous Sanskrit lexicographical text is a fundamental witness to this author's broad intellectual interests. In fact, it represents the link between Maṇika's political and cultural roles at Jayasthitimalla's court. According to the author, the purpose of this Newari commentary is not only to become skilled in the Sanskrit technical treatises (*śāstra*s, i.e. treatises on various topics, including law), but also to enable people to become great poets quickly, and proficient in the ocean of the Six Languages. What are these Six Languages? They are precisely Sanskrit and the Prakrit languages needed to compose dramatic works.[21] Moreover, MS Add.1698 is among the earliest manuscript witnesses of Classical Newari literature. As pointed out by Malla,

> Classical Newari literature exists in all the three major genres – prose, poetry, and drama. It began as a bilingual literature of translation and commentary in prose under the court patronage of Jayasthiti Malla (A.D. 1380–1395). The earliest group of manuscripts belongs to this period.[22]

It is striking that the composition by Maṇika of two Newari commentaries of fundamental Sanskrit works, one of which is precisely the *Amarakośavivṛti*, coincides with the beginnings of Classical Newari literature.

---

20 For the identification of Jayadbrahmā with Jayata, see Formigatti 2016, 57–58.
21 Different lists of the 'six languages' are extant, some of them including Sanskrit and various Prakrits, some of them including only Prakrits and Apabhraṃśa. However, it is obvious from the context that Maṇika meant Sanskrit and the Prakrits of the dramas.
22 Malla 1982, 2; see also Lienhard 1988, xii- xiii.

3 Description of Cambridge, University Library MS Add.1698

The present description is based on the description in the Cambridge Digital Library, <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01698/1>. A brief description of this manuscript is also provided on the page *Description of Source Manuscripts of Amarakośas* on the website Newari Lexicon, <https://newari.net/source.html> (accessed on 16 Febr. 2021).

Previous descriptions of MS Add.1698 are found only in handwritten lists and catalogues, all listed below in chronological order:[23]

1 Bradshaw, Henry, 'Notes on the Collections of Oriental, Thibetan and 'Additional' Manuscripts' [unpublished manuscript] (Cambridge, 1870-1880). Shelfmark: ULIB 7/3/55.

2 Griffith, Ralph T. H. and Daniel Wright, 'Assorted Lists of Manuscripts and Books, chiefly Oriental, acquired by the Library, with Related Papers' [unpublished manuscript] (Cambridge, 1873). Shelfmark: ULIB 7/1/4.

3 'List of Additional Manuscripts 923–1827' [unpublished manuscript] (Cambridge, 1878).

4 'List of Oriental MSS. Class Catalogue of Oriental MSS.' (Cambridge, 1900–).

3.1 Previous editions of the texts in the manuscript

The *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* is available in several printed editions together with commentaries. In the present study I relied on Śarmā and Sardesai's 1941 edition, which includes Kṣīrasvāmin's commentary, the *Amarakośodghāṭana*. The *Amarakośavivṛti* is unpublished in book form. A draft edition by John Brough is kept in the library of the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge (Classmark JB N/2):

– Brough, John, 'Notes on the *Amarakośa* Based on a Manuscript in Cambridge University Library (Add.1698). With an Earlier Sanskrit Vocabulary English, Sanskrit and Newari' [unpublished manuscript] (Cambridge: Undated)

---

[23] The present description is slightly adapted from the description in the Cambridge Digital Library, <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01698/1>.

A digital edition of both the Sanskrit and Newari texts is available online at <http://newari.net/index.html> (accessed on 30 Oct. 2021).

3.2 Conventions and symbols

The following tables provide a short reference to the conventions employed for the transcription of excerpts from the manuscript. The aim of the transcription is to provide a *diplomatic transcription*, i.e. every error in the original is faithfully reproduced (*yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā likhitam*). A *sic* symbol (!) follows a word or passage which for some reason is considered to be either incorrect or unusual.[24]

ꣳ	Treatise–initial symbol (*siddhi*)	¦	Line–filler
◎	String–hole	,	Word and *sandhi* divider

sa[-1-]pteti, [.rī]	Physically damaged character(s); if these are no longer readable, digits indicate the missing number of *akṣaras*, while each dot indicates a single missing element of an *akṣara*, for instance part of a ligature.
[ja]gad	Character(s) difficult to read.
⟦⟧ ⟦-4-⟧	Characters or words deleted (expuncted or erased) by the scribe (including later deletions; numbers and dots as above).
\ta/thā, ra\ā/jāya	Insertion by the scribe (interlinear or marginal; if used to add a vowel replacing the inherent short a, the latter is retained in the transcription).
⟦-4-⟧ \rājādhirā/ja	Correction: deletion of text and addition by the scribe.

---

24 An exception to this practice is the reduplication of a final nasal, which is pretty common in Nepalese manuscripts, but the function of which has yet to be explained. Since I consider it as a simple orthographic variant, I retain it in the transcription without adding a *sic* symbol. Another similar instance is the use of *visarga* as a segmentation mark, which has so far escaped the attention of most scholars, who consistently use *sic* for forms ending with what only seemingly is a superfluous *visarga*.

3.3 Description

Physical location: Cambridge, University Library. Classmark: MS Add.1698.
Alternative titles: *Amarakoṣaṭippaṇī*; *Amarakoṣaṭīkā*; *Naipālabhāṣāṭippanī*; *Bālabodhinīvivṛti*.
Date of creation, origin, place, and scribe: 506 Nepāla / 1386 CE, Wednesday March 28; Bhaktapur; written by Maṇika/Māṇikya.
Languages: Sanskrit (main text) and Newari (commentary).
Material, extent, and dimension: palm leaf; 159 folios (fols 4 and 88 are missing); folio height 4.5 cm, width 32.5 cm.
Condition: incomplete. The first folio is damaged with loss of text. Many folios are damaged at the margins. The writing is often faded and difficult to read. Some passages seem to have been retraced (see, for instance, fol. 97ᵛ). Many modern restorations.
Binding: wood cover, original binding. On the inner front cover, a note in pencil in Latin script: 'Amara Kosha with Parbatiya translation NS 506 AD 1386.' On the right side of the inner back cover, a note in Nepālākṣara script: '[l1] ꘈ śrī kāma[sa]śā[strasa] [l2] [ddha].' One string hole.
Script: first hand: Nepālākṣarā in black ink (main text and commentary); second hand: Nepālākṣarā in black ink (main text and commentary).
Scribe: although in the colophon it is stated that the manuscript was written by a single person, Maṇika/Māṇikya, it seems that at least two different hands alternate without a definite pattern; third hand: Nepālākṣarā in black ink (annotations and corrections).
Foliation: 1. original: Nepālākṣarā letter-numerals, mid-left margin, verso. 2. original: Nepālākṣarā numerals, mid-right margin, verso.
Layout: written area height: 3 cm, width: 29 cm. 5 lines per page, approximately 55 *akṣara*s per line. Akṣara height: 4-5 mm. Interlinear space height: 2-3 mm. One string hole, in the left part of the folio, approximately in the middle of a blank space. String-hole spaces height: 2 cm, width: 2.5 cm. Folio 132 is smaller than other folios, but it seems to belong to the same codicological unit.
Marginalia: some marginal corrections.
Provenance and date of acquisition: bought by Dr. D. Wright on behalf of the Cambridge University Library in 1875. Acquired 4 September 1875 (ULIB 7/3/55).

3.4 Excerpts

In the manuscript, the Sanskrit main text and the Newari commentary are written continuously one after the other. However, for the sake of clarity they are presented separately in the transcription.

3.4.1 Main text

Incipit: [1ᵛ1] [-*2 lines*-] [1ᵛ3] samāhṛtyānyatantrāṇi saṃkṣiptaiḥ pratisaṃskṛtaiḥ | sampūrṇṇam ucyate varggair nāma[1v4]liṅgānuśāsanaṃ ||]

[Amarakośa 1.2. Introduction (Skt. *prastāvanā*)] After having united other treatises, I teach a complete *Treatise on Names and Genders*[25] by means of condensed and structured sections.

Fig. 1: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add.1698, fol. 161ʳ; explicit of the *Amarakośa* and of Maṇika's commentary; reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.

Explicit: [161ʳ1] kṛt̥ karttary asaṃjñāyā[26] [161ʳ2] kṛtyāḥ karttari karmaṇi | aṇādyantās tena raktādyarthe nānārthabhe©dakāḥ | ṣaṭsaṃjñās triṣu samāḥ | yuṣmadasmattiṅvyayaṃ | param virodhe śeṣaṃ[161ᵛ3]m tu jñeyaṃ śiṣṭa-prayogataḥ ||

[Amarakośa 3.5.45] Words derived from *kṛt* affixes (Skt. *kṛtaḥ*)[27] denote the agent (Skt. *karttari*), not in the case of proper nouns (Skt. *asaṃjñāyām*);[28] derivatives from *kṛtya* affixes denote the agent (Skt. *karttari*), the action (Skt.

---

25 Skt. *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, the title of the work. I have rendered the passive form of the Sanskrit as active in order to achieve a less clunky English translation.

26 Read *asaṃjñāyām*.

27 The manuscript reading is wrong, read *kṛtaḥ*.

28 *Saṃjñā* is used here in the sense of *saṃjñāśabda* or *yadṛcchāśabda*, i.e. nouns having special meanings ('a proper noun which is given accidentally without any attention to derivation or authority', Abhyankar and Śukla 1986, 313 and 404).

karmaṇi).[29] Adjectival words with various meanings and derived from secondary affixes (Skt. *aṇādi*)[30] are used in the sense of 'coloured by that and so on' (Skt. *tena raktādi*).[31]

[Amarakośa 3.5.46] Numerals from five to ten (Skt. *ṣaṭsaṃjñā*) are the same in the three genders,[32] as well as personal pronouns in the first and second person (Skt. *yuṣmadasmat*), inflected verbs (Skt. *tiṅ*),[33] and indeclinable words (Skt. *avyaya*). In case of a conflict [between rules], the [rule mentioned last] is superior; as to the rest, it is to be learned from the practice of knowledgeable authors.

Final Rubric, section: [161ʳ3] ity amarasiṃhakṛtau ◎ nāmaliṃgānuśāsanaṃ(!)[34] | sāmānyas tṛtīyaḥ kāṇḍaḥ sāṅga eva samarthitaḥ ‖ ‖

In the *Treatise on Names and Genders* composed by Amara the third chapter on general topics, including all its parts, is finished.

Final Rubric: [161ʳ3] samāptañ cedaṃ [161ʳ4] nāmaliṃgānuśāsanaṃ ‖ ‖

The *Treatise on Names and Genders* is completed.

---

29 *Kṛt* is a technical term used by Sanskrit grammarians to indicate 'affixes applied to roots to form verbal derivatives' (Abhyankar and Śukla 1986, 126), here used in the sense of *kṛdanta*, i.e. declined nouns; *kṛtya* is again a technical term to indicate a specific class of *kṛt* affixes used in the sense of 'should be done' (cf. the Latin gerundive) (*ibidem*).

30 I.e. words derived by adding a *taddhita* (secondary) affix to a noun and not directly to a verbal root like in the case of *kṛt* (primary) affixes: *aṇāditaddhitāntā vācyaliṅgāḥ* (Śarmā and Sardesai 1941, 357).

31 In other words, a word like *hāridrī* (f.) / *hāridra* (m.), 'yellow', is derived from the construction *haridrayā raktā / raktaḥ*, 'coloured by turmeric'; a word like *kārttikī* (f.) / *kārttika* (m.) (a month corresponding to part of October and November) is explained as *kṛttikābhir yuktā kārttikī paurṇamāsī, kārttiko divasaḥ*, 'connected to the Pleiads (Skt. *Kṛttikā*): the lunar month Kārttikī, the day Kārttika' – as for instance in Kṣirasvāmin's commentary (Śarmā and Sardesai 1941, 357).

32 Cf. Pāṇini 1.1.24, *ṣṇāntā ṣaṭ*, '[Numerals] ending in ṣ and n are called ṣaṭ', i.e. numerals from five to ten; this *sūtra* is quoted also by Kṣirasvāmin, who provides examples of numerals precisely in this range (Śarmā and Sardesai 1941, 357); see also Abhyankar and Śukla 1986, 399 (I would like to thank Elisa Freschi for suggesting to add this reference in a note).

33 *Tiṅ* is a technical term used by Sanskrit grammarians to indicate the eighteen personal endings of finite verbs, here however it stands for *tiṅanta*, i.e. all inflected verbal forms.

34 Read °*krte* [...] *nāmaliṅgānuśāsane*.

3.4.2 Commentary

Incipit: [1ᵛ3] [-2 lines-] kasa lakṣmī, paratra mokṣa gāva jñānīlokana sevara◎pā gvana || || [...] [1ᵛ4] meṃva meṃva śāstrasa kāṃsyaṃ, muṃṇa, va◎rga jiyakaṃ, nāma no liṃga no seya dvayakaṃ saṃpūrṇṇa yāṅa thama dvayakaṃ, nāmaliṃgānuśāsana ¦ [1ᵛ5] dhāyā nāma thva graṃtha, amarasiṃha paṃṭisana lhāyā, thva || ||

[Commentary ad *Amarakośa* 1.1.1-2] [...] he who desires prosperity in this world and salvation in the next world, who is served by (those) wise men (?). Having collected (New. *kāṃsyaṃ*), having taken (New. *muṃṇa*), from other treatises (New. *meṃva meṃva śāstrasa*), arranging in sections (New. *varga jiyakaṃ*), in order to teach (New. *seya dvayakaṃ*, lit. 'making to learn') nouns and genders, Paṇḍita Amarasiṃha teaches (New. *Amarasiṃha paṃṭisana lhāyā*) this complete (New. *saṃpūrṇṇa yāṅa*, lit. 'made complete'), i.e. composed by himself (New. *thama dvayakaṃ*), treatise called *Nāmāliṅgānuśāsana*.

Explicit: [161ʳ2] thvataivuṃ vācyaliṃgaḥ || || [*main text*] [161ʳ3] [*main text*] thvate aliṃgaḥ ||

[Commentary ad *Amarakośa* 3.5.45-46] These are also adjectival (New. *thvataivuṃ vācyaliṃgaḥ*). These are genderless (New. *thvate aliṃgaḥ*).

Explicit: [161ʳ4] śrīśrījayasthitīśasya malladeva◎sya bhūpateḥ | amātyaśrījayad-brahmā, svāmikāryaparāyaṇaḥ || sa svaputrāya vidhiva,d imāṃ [161ʳ5] ṭīkām acīkarat_ | śrīmatpātrakulānāṃ yo, viśiṣṭo maṇḍanocitaḥ || māṇikyam iva mānikyanāmā paṇḍita\sattama/ḥ || kṛteṣā(!) 'marakoṣasya, tena nepālabhāṣayā || vivṛ[161ᵛ1]tir nāma liṅgānāṃ ṭippanī bālabodhinī || ṣaṭuttare pañcaśate gate 'bde, nepālike māsi ca caitrasaṃjñe | kṛṣṇe ca pakṣe madanābhidhāyāṃ tithau śaśāṅkātmajavāsare ca [161ᵛ2] || śrījayasthitibhūpale, nepālarāṣṭraśāstari | śrimadbhakta◎pure deśe grathitvā likhitā tadā || imāṃ vijñāya loko 'yaṃ, turṇṇam astu mahākaviḥ | ṣaḍbhāṣasāga[161ᵛ3]rasyāpi, pārīṇaḥ śāstrakovidaḥ || prajāḥ sukham avāpnu◎vantu, viprā devān yajantu ca | daṇḍanītyā nṛpāḥ yāntu, kāle vaṣantu(!) toyadāḥ ||

[This passage is translated above in section 2.]

Final Rubric: [161ᵛ3] iti māṇikyavira[161ᵛ4]cito 'marakoṣasya naipālabhāṣā-ṭippanī samāpteyaṃ || ◎ ||

The Short Commentary of the *Amarakośa* in Newari language, composed by Māṇikya, is completed.

3.4.3 Colophon

[161v4] svasti śrīmannepālikasamvatsare 506 caitrakṛṣṇatrayodaśyāṃ, budhavāsare rājādhirājaparame¦[161v5]śvaraparamabhaṭṭārakaśrīśrīpaśupaticaraṇāravindasvitaśrīmāneśvarīvaralabdhapratāpaśrīśrījayasthitirājamalladevasya vijayarājye māṇikyena grathitvā likhiteyaṃ ||

Prosperity! Māṇikya composed and wrote this [Short Commentary of the *Amarakośa* in Newari language] in the venerated Nepalese year 506, in the thirteenth lunar day of the dark half of the month Caitra, on a Wednesday, during the victorious reign of the venerable Malla king Jayasthiti, foremost of kings, Supreme Lord, Paramount Sovereign, who served at the lotus feet of the venerable Lord of the Beasts (i.e. Śiva) and obtained glory as the groom of the goddess Śrī Māneśvarī.

4 Conclusion

In the Sanskrit lexicographical tradition, Amarasiṃha's position is as authoritative as Pāṇini's in the realm of Sanskrit grammar. Bilingual lexica like Maṇika's were undoubtedly a fundamental help for Newari speakers in the process of learning Sanskrit. They represented the gateway to the world of Sanskrit literature, from which Newari authors drew inspiration for the composition of both new Sanskrit works as well as of a new type of literature in their own native language. As explained in the introductory verse itself, the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* is at the same time a lexicographical treatise (Skt. *nāmānuśāsana*) as well as a treatise explaining the different genders of Sanskrit words (Skt. *liṅgānuśāsana*). This aspect is all the more important for Newari speakers, since the Newari language does not distinguish between genders. Significantly, Maṇika's work is more than a simple translation, for he employs a technique we might consider as a sort of minimal commentary, similar in its style to full-fledged Sanskrit commentaries. In the first stanza extant in his commentary, for instance, Skt. *samāhṛtya* is rendered in Newari with two different synonymic verbs, respectively from the roots *kāye* and *mune*; likewise, Skt. *sampūrṇam* is first translated into Newari as *saṃpūrṇṇa yāṅa*, 'made complete', which in turn is glossed in Newari as *thama dvayakaṃ*, 'composed (literally 'made') by himself (i.e. Amara). Moreover, as Maṇika explicitly states at the end of the work, his commentary is not only an aid to learn Sanskrit, but also Prakrit languages, for mastery of Sanskrit is a prerequisite needed to learn these literary languages in order to be able to compose poetical works and, above all, dramas. In fact, as we have seen

Maṇika himself composed several dramas in which he displayed his knowledge of Sanskrit and Prakrits. Moreover, from the fourteenth century onwards, several other Nepalese authors attempted to compose dramas in Sanskrit, Newari, Bengali, and Maithili – sometimes even using these languages together in the same work.[35] In this respect, Maṇika's commentary acquires even more importance if we consider that apparently very few manuscripts of Prakrit grammatical works were circulating in Nepal before the fifteenth century.[36]

Before Maṇika set out to translate and comment on Amara's masterpiece, seemingly only another Newari translation/commentary to the *Nāmaliṅgā-nuśāsana* had been composed in the Nepālamaṇḍala. This work, called *Putrapautrādibodhana* or *Putrapautrādibodhinī* is transmitted in a *codex unicus* kept in the National Archives in Kathmandu (NGMPP B 14–11, NAK 4/590). According to the colophon, this manuscript is the personal copy (Skt. *svapustako ⟨'⟩ yaṃ*) of a certain Jasaraja, a medical doctor (Skt. *vaidya*), who wrote it in 1381 during the reign of King Jayārjunadeva for the sake of his own use (Skt. *svapadārthahetunā*).[37] If we take into consideration Maṇika's wider role within the cultural landscape of his time, most probably his commentary had more influence and reached a wider audience than the *Putrapautrādibodhana*. All these aspects render Maṇika's work even more central in the history of Newari literature and in the cultural history of Nepal at large.[38]

References

Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev and Jayadeva Mo. Śukla (1986), *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, 2nd revised edition, Baroda: Oriental Institute.

Brinkhaus, Horst (1991), 'The Descent of the Nepalese Malla Dynasty as Reflected by Local Chroniclers', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 111/1: 118–122.

Brinkhaus, Horst (2003), 'On the Transition from Bengali to Maithili in the Nepalese Dramas of the 16th and 17th Centuries', in W. L. Smith (ed.), *Maithili Studies* (Stockholm Studies in

---

35 On this topic, see for instance Brinkhaus 2003.

36 Vergiani 2017, 114–116.

37 NGMPP B 14–11, NAK 4/590, folio 78r, line 1-2; see also <http://ngmcp.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/B_14-11_Amarakośanepālabhāṣāṭippaṇī> (accessed on 27 Oct. 2021) (some readings need correction); the colophon is published also in Pant 2006, however I did not have the opportunity to consult this publication.

38 Classical Newari is still an understudied language, however it is apparently witnessing a small revival (or, if you prefer, renaissance; see for instance Otter 2021). Nevertheless, a thorough examination of Maṇika's works in Newari is still a *desideratum*.

Indian Languages and Culture, 4), Stockholm: Department of Indology, Stockholm University, 67–77.

Formigatti, Camillo Alessio (2016), 'Towards a Cultural History of Nepal, 14th–17th Century. A Nepalese Renaissance?', in Elena de Rossi Filibeck, Michela Clemente, Giorgio Milanetti, Oscar Nalesini and Frederica Venturi (eds), *Studies in Honour of Luciano Petech, A Commemoration Volume, 1914–2014* (Rivista degli studi orientali. Nuova serie. Supplementi), Pisa: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 51–66.

Lienhard, Siegfried (1988), *Nepalese Manuscripts*, Part I: *Nevārī and Sanskrit, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin*, Stuttgart: Steiner-Verlag Wiesbaden.

Malla, Kamal P. (1982), *Classical Newari Literature: A Sketch*, Kathmandu: Educational Enterprise.

Malla, Kamal P. and Dhanavajra Vajrācārya (1985), *The Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*, Stuttgart: Steiner-Verlag Wiesbaden.

Otter, Felix (2021), *A Course in Reading Classical Newari: Selections from the Vetālapañcaviṃśati*, Heidelberg: CrossAsia-eBooks.

Pant, Mahesh R. (1993), 'On Reading the Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī', *Ādarśa*, 1:17–76.

Pant, Mahesh R. (2006), 'Saṃsāradevīko Pratimāsthāpanā garī rākhieko tāmrapatra', *Pūrṇimā*, 122 (VS 2063 Aswin): 1–61.

Petech, Luciano (1984), *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1482)*, 2nd revised edn (Serie orientale Roma, 54), Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Regmi, Dilli R. (1965), *Medieval Nepal*, Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay.

Śarmā, Haradatta and N. G. Sardesai (1941), *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam: Bhaṭṭakṣīrasvāmi-praṇītenāmarakośodghāṭanena sahitam* (Poona Oriental Series, 43), Poona: Oriental Book Agency.

Shastri, Hara Prasad (1905), *A Catalogue of Palm-Leaf & Selected Paper MSS. Belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal*, Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.

Slusser, Mary Shepherd (1982), *Nepal Maṇḍala: A Cultural Study of the Kathmandu Valley*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Vergiani, Vincenzo (2017), 'A Tentative History of the Sanskrit Grammatical Traditions in Nepal through the Manuscript Collections', in Vincenzo Vergiani, Daniele Cuneo and Camillo Formigatti (eds), *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages: Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures, 14), Berlin: De Gruyter, 77–130.

Vogel, Claus (2015), *Indian Lexicography*, revised and enlarged edn (Indologica Marpurgensia, 6), Munich: P. Kirchheim Verlag.