

Camillo A. Formigatti

Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library: Three Centuries of History and Preservation

Abstract: This article describes the history of the collections of Sanskrit manuscripts at the Cambridge University Library over a time-span of three centuries. It provides detailed descriptions of archival material as well as transcriptions of letters written by 19th-century Indologists in order to delineate the importance and influence of the manuscript collections in the 19th and 20th century—mainly for Buddhist studies, but also for Jaina and Hindu studies. The last part of the contribution is dedicated to the fate of the collections in the 21st century and the Sanskrit Manuscripts Project.

The patient work of Sanskrit scholars, tracking manuscripts of old, cataloguing them and edit impo[r]tant texts from them may not strike the politician and the public as spectacular, but slowly and steadily it is contributing to the proper understanding and adjustment of the ideology of culture for which India stood, and for which it is hoped she will stand, in and through the exigencies of historical upheavals.

(V. Raghavan, 1963, 7)

1 Introduction

Manuscripts—and consequently manuscript collections and catalogues—played a seminal role in the development of South Asian studies in 19th-century Europe. Many European scholars travelled to the Indian subcontinent in search of manuscripts of texts in Sanskrit and Middle Indo-Aryan languages, very often working with the help of local Pandits. The second half of the 19th century saw a boost of interest in collecting and cataloguing South Asian manuscripts. In 1853 the German

This article is a companion to Formigatti (forthcoming), which provides an explanation of the theoretical background and the cataloguing practices of the Sanskrit Manuscripts project (alongside an examination of the history of cataloguing Sanskrit manuscripts). The first two sections of this article consist partly of a revised version of sections from Formigatti (2014) and Formigatti (forthcoming). I would like to express my gratitude to Vincenzo Vergiani and Daniele Cuneo for their insightful comments on a first draft of this article.

scholar Albrecht Weber published his *Verzeichnisse der Sanskrit- und Prâkrit-handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, and in 1864 another German scholar, Theodor Aufrecht, published a catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts kept in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. In 1868 the Indian Government began to take an active role in securing and cataloguing South Asian manuscripts. This new enterprise was seemingly prompted by the growing demands of European scholars of Indian languages and literatures for better and more comprehensive tools with which to pursue their research.¹ It is thanks to the reports and catalogues written by scholars who travelled through the whole of South Asia, collecting and buying manuscripts, and to the catalogues of South Asian manuscripts kept in European libraries, that in the second half of the 19th century the knowledge of Sanskrit literature made a huge step forward. Many texts hitherto unknown – and others that had been deemed lost – were (re)discovered.

The latest remark holds true all the more for the collections of South Asian Manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library (hereafter UL).² The history of Sanskrit studies at the University of Cambridge goes hand in hand with the history of its collections of South Asian manuscripts. We speak of ‘collections’ in the plural, rather than of a single collection, because it is possible to recognize different sections according to the provenance of the manuscripts. In the first part of this article I delineate a short history of the collections of Sanskrit manuscripts. The central section is dedicated to the importance and influence of the collections in the 19th and 20th century—mainly for Buddhist studies, but partly also for Jaina and Hindu studies. Finally, the last part of this contribution is dedicated to the fate of the collections in the 21st century and the Sanskrit Manuscripts Project.

2 South Asian manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library

The origin of the collections of South Asian manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library dates back to the beginning of the 19th century, but most of the

¹ This is clearly stated in a letter sent by Pandit Rādhākṣṣṇa, Chief Pandit of the late Lahore Durbar, to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, dated May 10th, 1868 (Gough, 1878, 1). This topic, as well as the history of collecting and cataloguing Sanskrit manuscripts in the 18th and 19th century, is dealt with in more detail in § 1 in Formigatti (forthcoming).

² Unless specifically noted (for instance, as in Bodleian MS Or. Raghavan 3), all shelfmarks beginning with Add. and Or. should be understood as Cambridge University Library manuscript shelfmarks (i.e. UL MS Add.1711 will be cited as Add.1711 or UL MS Or.2259 as Or.2259.)

material accessed the library during the last thirty years of that century. Among the very first written documents from South Asia that arrived in Cambridge is a set of brass plates reproducing the text of the original Kollam Plates in reverse, to be used for printing, presented by the Scottish missionary Claudius Buchanan to the University Library in 1809.³ These plates were commissioned by him in 1805 in Cochin and were later used to produce a set of prints, also held in the University Library.⁴ These copper plates draw their name from Kollam, an ancient port town on the coast of Kerala, and are also known as the Sthanu Ravi Plates, after the local ruler under whom they were issued (c. 849 CE). They award trade privileges to two merchant associations, the Manigramam, an indigenous south Indian group, and the Anjuvanam, probably representing West Asian interests, who were associated to an eastern Christian church at Kollam.

During the 19th and 20th century the collections grew steadily thanks to acquisitions and donations by different individuals. The collections comprise manuscripts written in many different languages, ranging from Old and Middle Indo-Aryan languages like Vedic, Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit to Modern Indo-Aryan languages like Sinhala, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi and Urdu. Moreover, they include several manuscripts in Dravidian languages, mostly Tamil and Malayalam, but also a few in Telugu. The material related to the history of UL South Asian manuscripts collections is scattered between various institutions in Cambridge. It consists of both manuscripts (handwritten catalogues, hand-lists, slips of paper kept with the manuscripts, letters), as well as of printed material (catalogues, reports and articles).⁵ According to these sources, I was able to identify at least six different homogeneous collections that include Sanskrit manuscripts:

Wright Collection

Daniel Wright (1833–1902) was Surgeon-Major in the Indian Medical Service in 1866–76 and Surgeon to the British Residency, Kathmandu in 1873–76. During this period, with the help of the Residency Pandit, Guṇānanda, he collected approximately 450 manuscripts, more than a half of which are Buddhist manuscripts. Guṇānanda was the grandson of Amṛtānanda, the Paṇḍit who wrote the *Buddhacarita* manuscript Or.342, adding at the end three cantos composed by

³ Buchanan provided the library also with South Asian manuscripts (none of them is in Sanskrit; cf. also Dalby 1988, 257–59).

⁴ The plates are shelved with the class-mark Oo.1.41; prints from the copper plates are shelved at 899.bb.149 and Buchanan's autograph facsimile of the inscriptions at Or.2259.

⁵ The most relevant sources I was able to trace are listed in Appendix 1.

himself (cf. Cowell 1893, v–vii and Bendall 1893). Other important sections of this collection include numerous palm-leaf manuscripts of Śaiva tantric texts, of *kāvya* and *jyotiṣa* texts, and several palm-leaf manuscripts of *vyākaraṇa* works belonging to the Cāndra school.

Cowell Collection

Edward Byles Cowell (1826–1903) (Fig. 1) was the first Professor of Sanskrit at Cambridge from 1867 to 1903. On his behalf, between 1873 and 1878 R. T. H. Griffith, then Principal of the Benares Sanskrit College, procured for the University Library 77 Sanskrit manuscripts (mostly Vedic and Mīmāṃsā texts). In 1877, at Cowell's request 17 more manuscripts were sent to Cambridge by J.C. Nesfield, again from the Benares Sanskrit College. In 1903, Cowell bequeathed hundreds of books and manuscripts to the Cambridge University Library, 45 of which are manuscripts of Sanskrit works.




Fig. 1: Edward Byles Cowell (1826–1903).



Fig. 2: Georg Bühler (1837–98).

Bühler Collection

In 1877, the German Indologist Georg Bühler (1837–98) (Fig. 2) sold to the Library 68 Jaina manuscripts bought by him in Western India during his tour in search of Sanskrit manuscripts in Kaśmīr, Rājputāna and Central India (on this journey, see Bühler 1877).

Corpus Christi or Honner Collection

Colonel Augustus Cotgrave Honner of the 1st Bombay Grenadiers collected approximately 300 Indian manuscripts in Lucknow around 1860–1870. The collection passed to Francis Hodder and was deposited in the Cork Royal Institute, then was given to Corpus Christi College, and is now on deposit at the University Library.




Fig. 3: Cecil Bendall (1856–1906).

Bendall Collection

The biggest collection (more than 630 manuscripts) has been gathered for the Library by Cecil Bendall (1856–1906) (Fig. 3), Professor of Sanskrit in Cambridge from 1903 to 1906, during his two journeys to North India and Nepal in 1884–85 and 1898–9. In his search for manuscripts he was helped by several Pandits, both in Nepal and India: in Nepal by Indrānanda, the son of Guṇānanda (the Pandit who helped D. Wright), in India by Bhagvāndās Kevaldās, Ciman Lāl, and Sudhākara Dube.

Stolper Collection

In 1990–91 the University Library acquired a set of South Indian manuscripts from the book dealer Robert E. Stolper. This collection includes palm-leaf manuscripts in Grantha, Malayalam, and Tamil scripts (the latter include texts in both Sanskrit and Malayalam languages). It is the least documented part of the UL collections as far as the history of the provenance is concerned.

A seventh group consists of Sanskrit manuscripts hailing from different regions of South Asia (for instance, Kashmir, the North Western Provinces and Tamil Nadu) donated to the UL by various private individuals. Mention should also be made of the two main collections of Pali manuscripts, the Rhys Davids and the Scott collections (about these two collections, see Dalby 1988). Some manuscripts included in the Rhys Davids collection are Sanskrit texts with a commentary in Sinhala (for instance Add.960, a palm-leaf manuscript of the *Pratyayaśataka*).⁶

It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of Sanskrit manuscripts in the UL, for very often what is listed as a single manuscript in the old catalogues and handlists turns out to be a bundle of fragments from different manuscripts, and sometimes two texts originally listed as separate manuscripts turn out to be one manuscript.⁷ There is always a certain degree of arbitrariness in decisions such as splitting a bundle of folios into more manuscripts, or conversely group together into one single entry manuscripts previously catalogued separately. It is all the more difficult to reach a decision in the case of the numerous bundles of fragments, like for instance for the fragments of manuscripts grouped together under the shelfmarks Add.1679 and Add.1680. After his tour in Europe for the compilation of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, in 1963 V. Raghavan counted 1262 manuscripts kept in three different places in Cambridge: the UL, Trinity College and the private collection of Prof. H.W. Bailey (Raghavan 1963, 65). At the moment of writing, the total amount of Sanskrit manuscripts in the UL is estimated to be between 1600 and 1700 (due to the numerous still unidentified fragments, it is very difficult to provide an exact figure). We might add to this figure the Sanskrit manuscripts kept in Trinity College,⁸ in Christ's College,⁹ in the Ancient India and Iran Trust, as well as some Sanskrit manuscripts in the Museum for Archaeology and Anthropology.¹⁰

⁶ The Pali manuscripts of the Rhys Davids collection in the UL are listed in Rhys Davids 1883, 145–46 (see also Appendix 1, List Add.; on the role of Rhys Davids in the acquisition of Pali manuscripts in general and the impact on Pali studies in the 19th century, see Gornall 2015, 478–79).

⁷ For instance, Add.1380 and Add.1381 are listed as separate manuscripts in Bendall's catalogue (Bendall 1883, 80–81).

⁸ Catalogued by Theodor Aufrecht 1869.

⁹ Eight manuscripts, described by D. Cuneo in a tabular e-catalogue available on the college website: <https://www.christs.cam.ac.uk/sites/www.christs.cam.ac.uk/files/Library/Catalogues/Sanskrit-catalogue.pdf>.

¹⁰ These last two small collections are still uncatalogued. The author of this article has started cataloguing the AIIT Sanskrit manuscripts, but the project has been put on hold for the time being.

Until very recently, only two printed catalogues describing the Sanskrit manuscripts kept in the UL were available: the *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*, prepared by C. Bendall in 1883, which contains descriptions of 248 manuscripts in the Wright collection, and the list of South Asian manuscripts belonging to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, compiled by Grahame Niemann in 1980. Strictly speaking, the latter is a catalogue of manuscripts belonging to a college and not to the UL, but since the manuscripts are kept in the UL, it has been mentioned alongside Bendall's catalogue. Moreover, two other catalogues of South Asian manuscripts in Cambridge ought to be remembered: T. Aufrecht's *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Cambridge* (1869, mentioned above), and T.W. Rhys Davids' *List of Pāli Manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library* (1883).

An integral part of the cataloguing process consisted of tracing the provenance of the manuscripts. While pursuing this task, I soon realized that it is possible to reconstruct the history that lies behind the transfer of the manuscripts from South Asia to Cambridge. The reconstruction of this history provides a means for a better understanding not only of the scholarly/academic and intellectual milieu that shaped South Asian studies in Europe in the 19th century, but occasionally also of the reception of South Asian religions and culture in the West. In the following sections (§ 3 and § 4), hopefully it will become clear that the publication of catalogues is of utter importance for at least two correlated reasons: as they are the main gateways to access collections, they also have a direct impact and influence on scholarly research.

3 The collections in the 19th century: Laying the foundations

Most of the South Asian manuscripts reached the UL in the 19th century. Five of the six major collections listed above were acquired before 1900: the Wright, the Cowell, the Bühler, the Bendall,¹¹ and the Honner collections. Together they include more than 1400 manuscripts. In terms both of the numbers as well as of the importance of the manuscripts, it is this century that indelibly shaped the character of the Cambridge collections of Sanskrit manuscripts.

¹¹ With the exception of very few manuscripts that were bequeathed after Bendall's death in 1906 or were found in his papers and thus reached the UL in the first decades of the 20th century (cf. Appendix 2).

3.1 The ‘Cambridge Buddhist Manuscripts’, or the collections as they are

Buddhist Sanskrit literature has been my special study, and for it materials exist nowhere in Europe comparable to those of Cambridge.

(Bendall 1903, 8)

These words, used by Cecil Bendall in his application for the professorship of Sanskrit, were surely not a hyperbole—in fact, to a certain extent they still hold true. Before the 19th century, due to the fragmentary character of the primary sources, the knowledge of Buddhism in the West was full of misconceptions—to say the least. In his book *The Awakening of the West*, Stephen Batchelor devotes part four to the history of Buddhist studies in 18th- and 19th-century Europe. This passage from the fourteenth chapter provides a lively description of what, at the end of the 18th century, Westerners thought Buddhism was:

With no Buddhists to consult, no Sanskrit Buddhist texts to read, and in a climate of brahmanical anti-Buddhist prejudice, these pioneers of Indian studies [i.e. Sir William Jones, Charles Wilkins, and other members of the Asiatic Society of Bengal at the end of the 18th century] gave little attention to the obscure figure they knew as Boudh. Jones believed that Buddha was the teutonic god Wotan or Odin. The clan name ‘Shakya’ reminded him of that of the ancient Egyptian king Shishac. In the statues of the Buddha he noted strikingly Ethiopic features. The ‘mild heresy of the ancient Bauddhas’, he concluded, must have been imported to India from north Africa.

(Batchelor 1994, 233)

This situation started to change during the first half of the 19th century, when Western scholars gained access to the primary sources in Sanskrit and Pali.¹² The two central figures of this period are Brian Houghton Hodgson and the French scholar Eugène Burnouf. From 1820 onwards, Hodgson held different posts for the British civil service in the Nepalese capital Kathmandu (Assistant Resident, Resident Postmaster and finally, in 1833, Resident). He was also a keen collector of Sanskrit manuscripts and Tibetan block prints of Buddhist texts, which he sent to various institutions around the world (for instance the libraries of the College of Fort William and of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, the Royal Asiatic Soci-

¹² For practical reasons, I do not dwell here on the great influence of T. W. Rhys Davids in the field of Pali and Theravāda Buddhist studies; suffice it here to mention again the fact that he was the founder of the Pali Text Society.

ety, the India Office and the Bodleian Library). In 1837 he sent a total of 147 Nepalese manuscripts of Buddhist texts to the Société asiatique in Paris and to Burnouf personally, and '[s]uddenly Burnouf had before him more Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts than had been available to any previous European scholar, with the obvious exception of Brian Hodgson in Kathmandu. But unlike Hodgson, Burnouf was able to read them.'¹³ It is on these manuscripts that Burnouf based his seminal study *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, published in 1844. The importance of this work for the understanding and the reception of Buddhism in Western culture cannot be overestimated, for Burnouf managed to 'construct from this fresh field of unexamined documents an intelligible scheme of ideas which would henceforth be the prototype of the European concept of Buddhism' [Batchelor 1994, 239].

Like the Hodgson collection in Paris used by Burnouf, the Wright and Bendall collections of Sanskrit manuscripts played a pivotal role in the spread of knowledge about Buddhism in the West. While the manuscripts sent to Europe by Hodgson were mostly modern copies on paper copied for him by Nepalese scribes, Daniel Wright was able to procure original palm-leaf manuscripts of most of the works studied by Burnouf. Among these palm-leaf manuscripts one can find manuscripts that are interesting from many points of view in various disciplines (literature, palaeography, codicology, art history, etc.), as Bendall aptly pointed out in the introduction to his 1883 catalogue:

The first discovery of a large unexplored literature in Nepal was due to Mr Brian Houghton Hodgson, whose untiring zeal and well-used opportunities have enabled him to supply a greater quantity of material for the study of the literature and natural history of India and Tibet than any person before or since. After such achievements, immortalized by the great work of Burnouf, it was but natural to hope that further material for research might still be forthcoming in the same country. Accordingly on the suggestion of Professor Cowell, Dr Wright was requested by Professor W. Wright to procure specimens of such copies as could be made to order from works still extant in Nepal. These specimens were sent, and form Add. 1042 [...] in our collection. Dr Wright however soon found that originals were procurable, and the result of his energetic and persevering negotiation and the well-timed liberality of the University has been the acquisition of a series of works which, apart from their literary interest, will be seen from the following pages to be from a merely antiquarian and palaeographical point of view, the most important collection of Indian MSS. that has come into the hands of scholars.

(Bendall 1883, VII-VIII)

¹³ Introduction by D. S. Lopez Junior to the English translation of Burnouf's *Histoire* (Burnouf 2010, 11).

I have included this long quotation because it contains fundamental observations on which I would like to expand. Bendall mentions Add.1042, four loose paper folios ‘sent over from Nepal by Dr D. Wright in 1873, when it was proposed to obtain copies of various Sanskrit manuscripts existing in Nepal, for the University Library’ (Bendall 1883, 26–27). They contain part of the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* and part of the *Laṅkāvatāra*. Although at least one other Sanskrit manuscript had already reached the UL before 1873,¹⁴ Add.1042 can be considered the foundation stone of the Cambridge collections. Unlike in the case of the Nepalese manuscripts sent to Europe by Hodgson, up to now the historical impact of the Cambridge collections of Sanskrit manuscripts on 19th century Buddhist studies has not always been adequately recognized. For instance, in the book by S. Batchelor mentioned above there is no mention of the importance of these collections or of Cowell’s and Bendall’s scholarly achievements in the field of Buddhist studies. This is particularly regrettable, since both scholars managed to create an international scholarly network centred around the manuscript collections.

A good example is Or.1290, which contains a series of letters sent by the Tibetologist H. Wenzel to Cowell in 1891 and 1892, at a time when Cowell was preparing his critical edition of Aśvaghoṣa’s *Buddhacarita* (published in 1893). This work was translated into Tibetan in the 7th or 8th century, and in order to improve his edition Cowell asked Wenzel to check the Tibetan translation. These and similar letters sent to Cowell by other Indologists allow us to get a glimpse in the workshop of a 19th century Indologist and philologist and to reconstruct his editorial methods. Cowell’s *editio princeps* of the *Buddhacarita*, based on two manuscripts in the UL,¹⁵ made available to scholars for the first time the oldest known *mahākāvya*, dated between the first century and the second quarter of the second century CE. His edition was used and commented by several scholars for around forty years and was replaced only in 1936 by E. Johnston’s edition. Cowell’s contribution to the field of Buddhist studies¹⁶ includes also another milestone, the *editio princeps* of the

14 Add. 572, a modern manuscript of the first chapter (*Mitrālābha*) of the *Hitopadeśa*, donated by Robert Cotton Mather in 1868. It is in the format of a Western notebook and most probably was written for didactic purposes for Western scholars. (Add.285.67 entered the UL most probably before or around the 1860s, but no precise information is available.)

15 Cowell 1893, iv. The manuscript labelled C is Add.1387 (the UL copy), while manuscript D is Or.342 (Cowell’s private copy, bequeathed to the UL after his death).

16 Cowell’s contribution to Buddhist studies includes also his editorship of the English translation of the Pali *jātakas* prepared by various scholars and published in six volumes from 1895 to 1907 (vol. I translated by Robert Chalmers, 1895; vol. II by W.H.D. Rouse, 1895; vol. III by H.T. Francis and R.A. Neil, 1897; vol. IV by W.H.D. Rouse, 1901; vol. V by H.T. Francis, 1905; finally, vol. VI by E.B. Cowell and W.H.D. Rouse, 1907).

Divyāvadāna in collaboration with R. A. Neil, published in 1886. Again based mostly on the manuscripts kept in the UL,¹⁷ this contribution endured the time better and it is still the reference edition used nowadays.¹⁸

Scholars from all over the world (for instance, Nepal, India, Europe, the United States and Japan) were in regular correspondence with Bendall—not only Indologists, but also Sinologists, Semitists, and many others. The wide range of Bendall's academic contacts is clearly seen in the testimonials to his application for the professorship of Sanskrit in 1903.¹⁹ Even more than in the case of Cowell, his research interests were deeply influenced by the UL Sanskrit collections. Although based on limited manuscript evidence and inevitably dated, Bendall's editions and studies of the *Meghasūtra* (1880) and Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (1902) have stood the test of time well. It is however with his pioneering work in the field of the history of Nepal and of palaeography of Nepalese scripts that Bendall left an indelible mark in Sanskrit studies. As soon as he started cataloguing the manuscripts in the Wright collection, he recognized immediately their importance as historical documents. In 1881, two years before the publication of his *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts*, he published an article in which he draws attention to the manuscript colophons as sources for the reconstruction of Nepalese history. Moreover, he addresses the doubts about the antiquity of the manuscripts raised by other scholars who were sceptical evidently because they had not yet seen similarly ancient manuscripts before.²⁰ Bendall's discoveries about Nepalese history and his palaeographical acumen allowed him to enrich his 1883 *Catalogue* with an *Historical* and

¹⁷ Cowell 1886, vi; manuscript A in the edition is Add.865, manuscript B is untraced, manuscript C is Add.2598, and manuscript F is Add.1680.3.

¹⁸ P. L. Vaidya's 1959 edition is basically a reprint of Cowell's and Neil's edition. Among the numerous publications about the *Divyāvadāna* still based on Cowell's and Neil's edition, see for instance the recent translations by Rotman (2008) and Tatelman (2000 and 2005); a discussion and preliminary analysis of the manuscript tradition of the *Divyāvadāna* and its position in the *avadānamālā* literature is provided by Formigatti (2016a).

¹⁹ The list includes scholars based in India (G.A. Grierson), Germany (J. Jolly, F. Kielhorn, H. Oldenberg, P. Deussen, E. Leumann—professor in Strasbourg, at that time part of the German Empire), France (E. Senart), Italy (A. de Gubernatis), England (T. W. Rhys Davids), and Scotland (J. Eggeling) (Bendall 1903).

²⁰ 'The early dates of some of these MSS. have been, indeed, received in some quarters with certain incredulity; but for myself, I must testify that, after about two years study, both of the great Cambridge collection, of which I have been during this time engaged in preparing a catalogue, and of various Buddhistic MSS. in other libraries, the truthfulness and genuineness of the colophons is placed in almost every case beyond a doubt by evidence both varied and conclusive' (Bendall 1882, 190). Bendall then lists the varied and conclusive evidence: the climate and

a *Palaeographical Introduction* of such importance that the latter is still used as a reference work for the palaeography of Nepalese scripts. His work on the history of Nepal culminated in the publication of a revised and enlarged version as a *Historical Introduction* to Haraprasad Shastri's 1905 catalogue of manuscripts in the Durbar Library, Nepal, with the title *The History of Nepal and Surrounding Kingdoms (1000-1600 A.D.) compiled chiefly from MSS. lately discovered*. Finally, Bendall's 1883 *Catalogue* as whole is such a fundamental piece of scholarship that it was reprinted in 1992 in the VOHD series as Supplementband 33.²¹ Another palaeographical endeavour of this untiring scholar worth mentioning is his discovery and study of the Bhaikṣukī/Sindhu(ra) script²² (Bendall 1886b and 1890). For 120 years, his articles were the primary studies available on this subject, until the recent contributions by A. Hanisch (2009) and D. Dimitrov (2010). Even though Bendall died at the young age of 50, his list of publications is long and includes several important works. I hope these few examples suffice to bring to light both his scholarly stature as well as the importance of the UL collections of Sanskrit manuscripts for Buddhist and Sanskrit studies in the 19th century.

3.2 Interlude: Manuscripts of Jaina, Hindu, and secular works

In the 19th and 20th century, the UL collections of Sanskrit manuscripts were known and tapped into mostly by scholars of Buddhism precisely thanks to Bendall's catalogue. However, in terms of sheer number the Jaina manuscripts in the UL almost match the Buddhist manuscripts: the former amount to 324, while the latter to 381. The figure for the Jaina manuscript is provided in N. Balbir's article in this volume and refers to 'manuscripts where a Jain work is copied. This means religious scriptures of all kinds ('canon', liturgy, ritual, narratives, *stotras*, etc.) and contributions

remoteness of Nepal, the physical features of the manuscripts, the comparison of the scripts with inscriptions.

21 'The reason for making it available again lies firstly in the fact that the information contained in the colophons of the MSS. belonging to this collection, viz. the Daniel Wright Collection, still retains the importance it had for the historian and philologist when it first appeared [...]; secondly, what justifies the reprint of the latter is simply that descriptions – of the high standard of Bendall's – of manuscripts like those of the collection at Cambridge, are now attracting more and more attention, and a major reason for this is the very activity of the NGMPP' (Wezler in Bendall 1992, v).

22 Also known as 'arrow-headed' or 'nail-headed' script; the original name of this script is discussed in Dimitrov 2010, 6–9.

by Jain authors to disciplines of knowledge such as grammar, lexicography, astronomy, mathematics, etc' (Balbir, p. 54). Consequently, our definition of 'Buddhist manuscript' is also broad enough to include manuscripts of works composed by Buddhist authors but belonging to various disciplines of knowledge.²³ Since in her article in this volume N. Balbir masterly describes and analyses the UL collection of Jaina manuscripts,²⁴ we can turn directly to the manuscripts of Hindu and secular works. It would be beyond the scope of this article, to provide a full account even of selected manuscripts belonging to these two groups and of their importance for Sanskrit studies. I will therefore limit myself to the description of a specific category of manuscripts, in order to elucidate how E. B. Cowell made use of a particular section of the collections. Finally, I will introduce three instances of circulation of manuscripts among 19th-century European scholars as examples of the network of scholars with which Bendall was in contact.

Cowell was elected the first Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Cambridge in 1867.²⁵ We have already mentioned his achievements in the field of Buddhist studies. However, Cowell's scholarly interests were very wide, and very often the only testimony of them is preserved in his unpublished papers. In 1873, he instructed Ralph T. H. Griffith of the Benares Sanskrit College to procure manuscripts of texts belonging to specific literary genres for his personal study, as well as for the Cambridge University Library.²⁶ Until 1878 Griffith continued to send manuscripts to Cambridge. After Cowell's death in 1903 they were bequeathed to the UL. It is not by chance that the great majority of the manuscripts sent to Cambridge by Griffith consist of Vedic and Mīmāṃsā works. Cowell's interest in this branch of Indian knowledge is testified by a series of twelve manuscripts containing his notes and an unpublished translation of the *Ṛgveda* (Or.372 to Or.383). The following note on folio 1r of Or.372 provides an insight into his scholarly attitude and his care for the interests of his pupils:

23 In our count we have included nine manuscripts of grammatical texts of the Cāndra school, seventeen manuscripts of the *Amarakośa*, and eight manuscripts of Buddhist *kāvya* works (three of Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddhacarita*, three of Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā*, and two of Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*).

24 On the role of G. Bühler in building the UL collection of Jaina manuscripts see also Formigatti forthcoming, § 1.1 and Appendix 1.

25 It is interesting to note that the contest was between Cowell and Theodore Aufrecht. Cowell was elected with a great majority of votes, as he 'was warmly supported by Max Müller and many eminent scholars and friends' (Oxford DNB, s.v. Cowell, Edward Byles).

26 To these manuscripts we should add also Add.1934–50, bought in 1878 from J.C. Nesfield, who was also based at the Benares Sanskrit College.

N.B. This translation of the Ṛig Veda is not intended for publication. It was prepared for my own use, as I have several years past been reading the R.V. with various classes + I never knew at the beginning of a term which book my pupils might want to read. My authorities have been mainly Grassmann (Lexicon + transl.), Ludwig (vols. i. ii. iv. v.) with continual reference to Sāyaṇa. Mar. 23. 1899. E.B.C.

Cowell's interest in Vedic knowledge was not limited to the *Ṛgveda*, and in fact a series of 22 manuscripts of texts belonging to the Vedalakṣaṇa branch of knowledge are a good example of manuscripts commissioned by him to be copied for the purpose of his own study.²⁷ Ten manuscripts contain Śikṣā texts, works on phonetics and phonology dealing with the pronunciation and recitation of both Vedic and Classical Sanskrit, and other theoretical topics such as the accent-bearing unit, or providing list of Vedic words to be memorised on account of the ambiguity of their articulatory features.²⁸ Another class of Vedalakṣaṇa texts, represented by four manuscripts, are the Anukramaṇīs, lists of various features of the Vedic *saṃhitās*, for instance number and attribution of meters to different deities, indexes of titles of works about the Vedas etc.²⁹ Furthermore, we can add a smaller group of three manuscripts of Paṇīni's texts,³⁰ as well as one manuscript of a text on Vedavikṛti, the *Jaṭāpaṭaladīpikā*.³¹ Many of these manuscripts are modern copies commissioned by Griffith to scribes, and thus they share many common features. For instance, it is possible to distinguish a series of three manuscripts all written in 1877: one manuscript of the *Lomaśīśikṣā* (Add.1709), one of the *Keśaviśikṣā* (Add.1710) and one of the *Laghvamoghanandiniśikṣā* (Add.1711). Although only the first manuscript is dated, it is clear from the script that all three have been written by the same scribe. Most probably they were conceived as a single collection of śikṣā texts, as they share many common features: paper and layout are identical, and at the end of Add.1709 the catch number 18 is written, which is repeated on the first folio of Add.1710 and on the verso of Add.1711 (which consists of a single folio).

²⁷ Add.879, Add.907, Add.1709–11, Add.1720, Add.1909–10, Add.1914, Add.1920–21, Add.1923–25, Add.1934–38, Add.1944, Add.1946–47 (Add.1934–38 were bought from J.C. Nesfield in Benares in 1877, see Appendix 2, Table 1; other manuscripts of Vedalakṣaṇa works—not listed here—were acquired by Bendall). We would like to acknowledge the fundamental help provided by our collaborator Giovanni Ciotti for the cataloguing of these manuscripts.

²⁸ Add.1709–11, Add.1923–25, Add.1934, Add.1936–38, (Add.1936–38 were bought from J.C. Nesfield Benares in 1877, see Appendix 2, Table 1).

²⁹ Add.879, Add.1909, Add.1914, Add.1920.

³⁰ Add.1944, Add.1946, Add.1947.

³¹ Add.1910; Vedavikṛti means literally '[textual] modifications of the Vedic texts', i.e. recombinations of words for mnemonic purposes.

The centrality of manuscripts for research in 19th century is confirmed by the information we can gather from the correspondence of scholars. At a time when many texts had yet to be edited, scholars often had to rely directly on manuscripts for their research. They were even willing to send manuscripts all over Europe—sometimes, even precious palm-leaf manuscripts. Add.7603/18 is a letter sent by the Russian Indologist Ivan P. Minayev to Cecil Bendall in 1887. At that time, Bendall was working on an article about the *Tantrākhyāna*, the Nepalese recension of the *Pañcatantra* (Bendall 1888b). According to this letter, Minayev provided Bendall with one manuscript of the *Tantrākhyāna* from the library of the University of St Petersburg. I provide here a diplomatic transcription of this very short letter:

University of St Petersburg, 9 Oct 87

Dear Bendall,

I hope the *Tantrākhyāna* is now with you. I am very sorry for the delay. It took some time to find out the Ms., and to get the necessary permission for the loan. The translation is not Newari, but Gorkhali. I do not think the Ms. will be of great use to you, however. Your edition, I hope, will be soon out

Sincerely Yours

I Minayeff

This is a case in which a manuscript was sent to Cambridge, but we know of manuscripts in the UL collections that Bendall sent to other scholars. In this case, our source is not a letter, but the original envelopes with which the manuscripts were wrapped when they were sent back to Cambridge. A first example is Add.2137, a unique manuscript of the *Nyāyavikāsinī*, a Newārī commentary/translation on the *Nāradaśmṛti* by the Nepalese author Maṇika, dated 1407 CE.³² In 1885 the manuscript was sent to J. Jolly, professor in Würzburg, who was preparing a critical edition of the *Nāradaśmṛti*.³³ The manuscript is still wrapped in the cardboard cover used by J. Jolly to ship the manuscript back to C. Bendall (after the loan mentioned in both Bendall 1886a and Jolly 1885). On the front cover of the box we read in pencil in Latin characters ‘Nāradaśmṛti Bendall,’ and on the back cover, written in pen in Latin characters: ‘Professor C. Bendall British Museum London W.C.’ and ‘Geschaeftspapiere. einschreiben.’ On the side of the box, the sender’s name is written

³² On the importance of this commentary for the cultural history of 14th-century Nepal and Maṇika, the author of the commentary, see Formigatti 2016b, 56–63; on the manuscript and its importance for the textual tradition of the *Nāradaśmṛti*, see also Jolly 1885, *passim*, Bendall 1886a, 56–9, and Lariviere 1989: ix–xxx.

³³ Although the volume is dated 1885, at the end of the introduction Jolly reports the place and date of completion as ‘Würzburg, February 16th, 1886’ (Jolly 1885, 16).

in pen in Latin characters: ‘From Prof. J. Jolly Wuerzburg.’ Unfortunately, the stamp is illegible, so that we don’t know the exact date when it was posted. Interestingly, the manuscript was sent back to Bendall’s office at the British Museum in London and not to Cambridge.

In 1902, Bendall sent another manuscript (Or.1279) to Jolly requesting him to identify the work, as the latter was an expert on Indian medicine. It is an old Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript containing Vaṅgasena’s *Cikitsāsārasaṅgraha*, a long treatise on *Āyurveda*. In this case, not only the top of the original wrapping box³⁴ was preserved together with the manuscript, but also the letter dated 21 May 1902, in which Jolly identifies the work and provides a first evaluation of its philological importance.³⁵

Several other letters kept in the UL archives further confirm how well connected Bendall was with the most important Sanskrit scholars of his time.³⁶ These letters are clear evidence that his work on the palaeography of Nepalese scripts and his expertise in Buddhist Sanskrit texts, acquired thanks to his untiring work on the UL Buddhist manuscripts, was widely recognized.

3.3 A notable absence, or the collections as they could have been

As we have seen, the UL collections of Sanskrit manuscripts are particularly important for their high number of old Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts. If you are interested in Buddhist Sanskrit texts or the study of Nepalese medieval culture, you might probably think to pay a visit to Cambridge and consult the UL collections. On the other hand, if you are interested in the Sanskrit tradition and the history of Kashmir, you would probably want to travel to Oxford and consult the manuscripts of the Stein collection. In the Bodleian Library there is however another collection that features Kashmirian manuscripts: the Hultzsche collection. Usually, it is not referred to as a homogenous collection because—unlike for instance the Stein manuscripts—it was not kept as such under the name of their former owner. The manuscripts are described in the 1905 catalogue by M. Winternitz and A. B Keith together with manuscripts from other collections. In the preface, E. W. B. Nicholson summarizes the circumstances of the acquisition as follows:

³⁴ The name of the sender (‘Jolly Würzburg’) is recognizable on the box, as well as partially the name and address of the addressee (‘[Pro]fessor Bendall [?] Castle Str. Cambridge’).

³⁵ The letter is partially transcribed in the description of the manuscript on the Cambridge Digital Library (<https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OR-01279/1>).

³⁶ They are kept in the UL as Add.7603.

On Oct. 22, 1884 Dr. Eugen Hultzsch, afterwards epigraphist on the Madras Archaeological Survey, had landed in Bombay from Trieste, and on May 2, 1885, he had re-embarked at Bombay: in the interval he had obtained 483 vols. of MSS., a list of which, and of the chief places he visited, will be found in an article by him [...] Of these 483 he offered 465 to the Bodleian for a sum of £225, which, in view of the financial condition of the library and the heavy cost involved in binding and repairing, was reduced to £200, and for this sum the collection was purchased, in 1887, under the advice of Prof. Max Müller. In extent it outnumbered the Mill, Walker, Hodgson, and Fraser MSS. combined, and it distinctly improved the average antiquity of the Bodleian Sanskrit collection.

(Winternitz 1905, iii)

In reality, the story behind this acquisition is much more interesting and involves many people and institutions between England, Germany, and India. It can be reconstructed by means of the correspondence of the people involved (preserved in the Bodleian Library at Library Records d.1088). On 19 October 1886 Reinhold Rost, the India Office librarian, sends a letter to the Principal Librarian of the Bodleian Library, writing that he has been 'requested by Dr. E. Hultzsch, of Dresden, to send you the enclosed list of Sanskrit MSS. He proposes to sell 465 out of the 483 numbers of which the collection consists for £225'. Rost then suggests to consult Prof. Max Müller on this matter, who promptly replies two days after. Obviously, the Bodley's Librarian E. W. B. Nicholson must also be involved, and an arrangement is made to send the manuscripts to the Bodleian for inspection. At that time, E. Hultzsch is in India, holding the post of epigraphist at the Madras Presidency. It is therefore Hultzsch's father who sends the manuscripts from Dresden to Oxford in November of the same year. In a letter dated 22 November, Max Müller suggests that it would be better to ask the 'Professor of Sanskrit' to write a report on them—that is, the Boden Professor for Sanskrit, M. Monier-Williams. Four days pass after M. Monier-Williams's reply, in which he writes that he regrets that the request came too late, as he now has 'only a few days left before starting for the South of France' and he is 'utterly overwhelmed with work.'³⁷ At this point, R. Rost steps in again and on the 8 December writes a letter in which he kindly requests Monier-Williams to ask either E. W. B. Nicholson or A. A. Macdonnell for their opinion on the manuscripts, for otherwise everything would have to wait 'till end of February.' Moreover, he adds the following suggestion:

³⁷ Any resemblance of this account with contemporary persons or real events is purely accidental.

‘The work of assessing the value of the MSS. will be greatly facilitated by the descriptive catalogue which has been conscientiously made.³⁸ Would you allow Prof. Cowell, of Cambridge, or anyone whom he may depute, to inspect the MSS. in the course of the ensuing recess?’ With the Christmas break approaching, all the persons involved in this delicate matter would probably like to pass the responsibility to somebody else. At this point, Max Müller comes into play again, writing the following letter:

12 Dec. 86

Dear Mr. Nicholson,

I have carefully gone through the titles of the MSS. Offered to us by Dr. Hultzsich, and I quite approve of Dr. Rost’s suggestion that they should go to Cambridge. We possess MSS. of nearly all the texts, excepting the Jaina texts, which the collection contains while Cambridge does not. As long as the Collection is kept in England, the MSS will be accessible to scholars at Cambridge as at Oxford. I shall be sorry if they went to the British Museum, still even there they might be consulted. If Cambridge shall decline to buy them, the matter might be reconsidered, but I will strongly advise the Bodleian not to compete with Cambridge.

The price is not too high, but I am afraid the expense of binding, and still more of carefully mending the MSS, will be considerable.

Yours very truly
F. Max Müller

A few days later, Cowell sends a short reply directly to Rost (as a reply to a letter now probably kept in his correspondence in the UL):

Cambridge
Dec. 16. 86.

My dear Rost

I fear there is no chance of our buying any of the MSS. The Library is very poor and they cant [sic] afford it. Most of the MSS, are, I fear, in Southern alphabets, so that I feel less keen for them.

Yours sincerely,
EB. Cowell

Rost’s reply to this letter is not included in Library Records d.1088 (as it was sent to Cowell, it must be in the UL archives). Cowell’s reply to Rost transcribed above

38 To my knowledge, the only catalogue to which Rost could have referred is the list of the manuscripts compiled by Hultzsich and published in the same year, which however is not a descriptive catalogue, but a mere list of titles (Hultzsich 1886, 11–26). Was this a sly attempt by Rost to settle the matter as quickly as possible?

is in the Bodleian archives because Rost enclosed it in a letter he sent to Max Müller on 17 December,³⁹ in which he suggests that the two libraries should purchase Hultzsch's collection in a shared effort. Still, Cowell's argument about the manuscripts being in South Indian alphabets and therefore not interesting to him sounded legitimate and for this reason on the 19th December Max Müller writes to Nicholson, clarifying that no manuscript in Hultzsch's list is in a South Indian alphabet. Nevertheless, even this last attempt fails, as it is clear from this last letter that Cowell sent a few days after Christmas:

Cambridge
Dec. 28. 1886

My dear Sir

Every body has been away from Cambridge lately, but I saw Prof. Wright the other day and had some talk with him. I fear the Library has no money at present; so that we cannot indulge in MSS. just now.

I suppose there is no list of the MSS. which the Bodleian would not take. I cannot get away from Cambridge at present, so cannot come to examine them. Thanking you for your letter I remain

Yours faithfully
Edw. B. Cowell

After this letter, it is clear that the Hultzsch collection wouldn't have gone to Cambridge. (The rest of the letters deals with the negotiations about the price between the Bodleian and Hultzsch's father, as well as with some missing manuscripts which were on loan to European scholars when the manuscripts were first sent to the Bodleian for inspection.) It is interesting to reflect closely about how the whole story evolved and ended. First of all, the picture that emerges from the letters is that of a close collaboration between Sanskrit scholars at Oxford and Cambridge. Secondly, it is clear that to the scholars involved the manuscripts were interesting mainly for their textual content and not for their antiquity or any other feature. Max Müller's letter is particularly instructive in both these aspects, as are Cowell's replies. Also, we see that apparently the financial situation of the Bodleian and the UL was very different: Max Müller's remark that 'the price is not too high' is in sharp contrast with Cowell's statements that 'the Library is very poor and they can't afford it' and 'the Library has no money at present.' We have to remember that just one year before, in 1884–5, Bendall had gone on his first tour in search of manuscripts in Nepal and Northern India, where he had purchased manuscripts for the UL and for his own personal library. It is possible that in 1886 the UL financial situation could have been dire because of this expenditure (and

39 As a reply to a letter by Max Müller dated 14 December, but again not included in this record.

surely others) in the previous year. On the other hand, Bendall had bought the manuscripts with a special grant from the Worts Fund, so we could also imagine that there was simply no interest in buying another large collection of Sanskrit manuscript after Bendall's tour. Either way, the failed purchase of Hultzschn's manuscript was a loss for the UL. In his journey, Bendall personally collected 212 manuscripts, to which we have to add 294 collected by Bhagvāndās Kevaldās. If we sum up these manuscripts to the c. 450 in the Wright collection, we come to a total of around 950 manuscripts. Not only Hultzschn's collection of 465 manuscripts would have considerably bolstered the UL collections from the point of view of quantity, but also of quality. There are only three birch-bark manuscripts in the UL collections,⁴⁰ but with the acquisition of the Hultzschn's manuscripts it would have gained 26 Kashmirian birch-bark manuscripts,⁴¹ not to speak of the other Śāradā manuscripts on paper. If we think that the Stein collection in the Bodleian comprises around 30 birch-bark manuscripts, we can better understand how important this acquisition was for the Bodleian—and could have been for the UL. As we have seen, C. Bendall's research interests focused on Sanskrit Buddhist texts and the history of Nepal due to the character of the UL manuscript collections: what if the UL would have bought these Kashmirian manuscripts? Would Bendall have edited for instance Jonarāja's *Kirātārjunīyaṭīkā* or *Śrīkaṇṭha-caritaṭīkā*⁴² instead of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*? Would have he written an article on the palaeography of the Śāradā script as influential as his work on the palaeography of Nepalese scripts?

40 Two of them are in such an extremely bad physical condition that no proper examination was possible. Both are Kashmirian *codices*: Or.948 contains Māgha's *Śiṣupālavadha*, Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* and Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava*, while Or.2264 is a manuscript of an unidentified *Naiṣadhacaritaṭīkā*. The third birch-bark manuscript is Add.1578, a single birch bark sheet in excellent condition, containing a *Devikavaca*. It was written in Devanāgarī in Nepal, most probably in the 19th century.

41 This figure refers to the manuscripts as listed in Hultzschn's 1886 article. Several manuscripts have been bound together and are now found under one single shelfmark.

42 Hultzschn's manuscript 53 and 88 respectively, now bound together and shelved in the Bodleian at MS Sansk.d.65.

4 The collections in the 20th century: on handwritten catalogues and more critical editions

The history of the collections in the 20th century is marked by a continuing—albeit little known—cataloguing activity, as well as by an increased awareness of its importance within the international scholarly community. In 1916, the manuscripts of the Bühler, the Cowell and part of the Bendall collections were described by Louis de la Vallée Poussin (1869–1938) (Fig. 4) with the help of Caroline Mary Ridding (1862–1942).⁴³ They recorded on paper index cards the basic features of some of the still uncatalogued manuscripts: title, writing material, number and dimensions of folios (Figs. 6–8). Occasionally, they transcribed some excerpts from the manuscripts and provided bibliographical references. Their card catalogue includes all Sanskrit manuscripts in the Add. series⁴⁴ and two manuscripts in the Or. series (Or.407 and Or.722). The catalogue is kept in a wooden box (Figs. 5a and 5b; it is described in Appendix 1). The box has two compartments: in the right-hand side compartment, the cards with the manuscript description are arranged according to the increasing shelfmark, while on the left-hand side there are reference cards arranged according to the titles of the work, provided with the shelfmark for the consultation of the descriptive card on the right-hand side. Inside the box there is a letter by de la Vallée Poussin about the completion of the card catalogue:

⁴³ On the life and work this (unfortunately neglected) scholar, see Diemberger 2012 and Huett 2012.

⁴⁴ It does not include Add.2396–2405, Add.2408, Add.2458, Add.2841, and Add.3437.




Fig. 4: Louis de la Vallée Poussin (1869–1938).

Sir

I think I have now completed the catalogue of the Sanskrit and Jain Sanskrit MSS. in the Library.

(1) Short notices of the MSS.: titles of the works, author, material, writing, date, size (with occasional additional notes, references to Catalogues or to editions, data useful for identification, etc.)

(2) Index of the titles.

(3) Index of the authors.

According to the instructions I had received, I have only been concerned with the MSS. that had not been hitherto studied. The work proved to be more complicated than I had expected it to be.

There remains a small number of MSS., chiefly fragments, which I have not been able to identify. I shall spare us pain in order to ascertain what they are. But, as further progress depends largely on chance, as the number of the MSS. is small, I believe that I may honestly state that 'I have accomplished what I had to do', as the Buddhist Saints are accustomed to say, at death.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Louis de la Vallée Poussin

To the Librarian of the Cambridge University Library

1ere juin [1]916

Actually, the ‘small number’ of manuscript still left to be catalogued consisted of more than 200 manuscripts, for all other manuscripts in the Or. series acquired until 1916 (i.e. those in the Cowell and in the Bendall collections) were not catalogued.⁴⁵ Moreover, after de la Vallée Poussin and Ridding completed their catalogue, several individuals donated or bequeathed manuscripts to the UL (including Cowell and Bendall), and single manuscripts were bought from different sources (see Appendix 2, Table 1). All these manuscripts were left uncatalogued until the Digital Catalogue was launched. However, they were examined by V. Raghavan in his 1954 tour and are included in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*. In some of the Or. manuscripts it is still possible to find notes by Raghavan, who identified many hitherto unidentified texts. His notes on the UL Sanskrit collections are now kept in the Bodleian Library (Or. Raghavan 3; see Appendix 1).⁴⁶

After Raghavan’s visit to the UL, the library acquired more manuscripts, which consequently are not included in the NCC. Apart from a series of small acquisitions from different sources,⁴⁷ the only fairly big and homogenous collection acquired by the UL in this century is the Stolper collection. In 1990–91 the UL bought from the art dealer Robert E. Stolper hundreds of South and South-East Asian manuscripts. The South Asian manuscripts are all palm-leaf manuscripts of texts in Sanskrit and Malayalam. Around 100 manuscripts contain Sanskrit texts written in Grantha or Malayalam script. They were hardly known outside the UL and no information was available until they were catalogued for the first time by the project team.⁴⁸

The UL South Asian manuscript collections continued to provide research material for scholars all around the world throughout the 20th century. Several seminal studies on and editions of Buddhist texts based on UL manuscripts were published. A full list would probably cover several pages, therefore I will provide here just a few, representative examples. Continuing the tradition started by Cowell and Neil with their edition of the *Divyāvadāna*, numerous scholars exploited the UL collections and consulted manuscripts of *jātakas* and *avadānas* to prepare critical editions of unpublished texts. In 1902, J. S. Speyer published his *editio*

⁴⁵ Dalby (1988, 278–279) states that ‘descriptions of the other Sanskrit manuscripts [i.e. not described in Bendall 1883] by Aufrecht, Bendall and la Vallée-Poussin remain unpublished.’ Despite great efforts by the UL staff, we were not able to trace any other handwritten catalogue, apart those listed in Appendix 1.

⁴⁶ On the UL manuscripts examined by Raghavan, see also Formigatti forthcoming.

⁴⁷ As shown in Appendix 2, Table 1, a total of 26 manuscripts were acquired between 1954 and 1990.

⁴⁸ Some of the Sanskrit manuscripts in Malayalam were examined by Gavin Flood in 1999 (personal e-mail communication on 5 July 2014).

princeps of the *Avadānaśataka*, which is mainly based on Add.1611, the oldest complete witness of this text, dated 1645 CE. Even though this text belongs to the *sūtra* genre, it is worth mentioning L. Finot's 1901 edition of the *Rāṣṭrapāla-paripṛcchā*, in fact based solely on Add.1586, a manuscript dated 1661.⁴⁹ Most probably, these two manuscripts were copied by the same scribe, Jayamuni, who was also responsible for copying a manuscript of the *Sumāgadhāvadāna* (Add.1585) and of Yaśomitra's *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (Add.1041).⁵⁰

We now jump to the second half of this century. Among the Cambridge Indologists who continued to study material in the collections special mention should be made of Prof. John Brough (1917-84), who devoted part of his scholarly efforts to the study of important Nepalese Buddhist manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library. His correspondence and papers are stored in the archives of the Library of the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies of the University of Cambridge, and include unpublished editions of texts and numerous notes on Nepalese Buddhism. R. Handurukande published two *editiones principes* of *avadānas* in which she made extensive use of UL manuscripts. The first one is the edition of the *Maṇicūḍāvadāna* (1967), a revised version of her PhD thesis, for which she collated Add.874, Add.1375, Add.1398, and Add.1680.4. In 1984 she used Add.1598 in her edition of the first five chapters of the *Avadānasārasamuccaya*, a unique collection of *jātakas* and *avadānas* of heterogeneous character. Finally, I would like to mention one last important manuscript, Add.1306, dated 1302 CE. It is the oldest and arguably most reliable witness of Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, very recently used by M. Straube for his editions of selected *avadānas* from Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (Straube 2006 and 2010).

The UL boasts also several finely illuminated manuscripts, among which there are some of the oldest specimens of Buddhist illuminated manuscripts.⁵¹

49 'Cette édition a été faite d'après un Ms. unique conservé à la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Cambridge sous la cote Add. 1586, et décrit dans le Catalogue de M. Bendall, p. 130 et 206. Le Ms. de la Bibliothèque Nationale Devanagari 83 n'étant manifestement qu'une copie du premier, je n'avais pas à en tenir compte' (Finot 1901, xv).

50 On the role of Jayamuni in shaping the *avadānamālā* genre in 17th century Nepal, see Formigatti 2016a.

51 'The collection has contributed to studies of Indian art: see A. Foucher, *Etude sur L'iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde*, 2 vols, Paris 1900–1905 on Add.1595 and Add.1643; J. P. Losty, *The art of the book in India*, London 1982 including Add.1364, Add.1464, Add.1643, Add.1688; P. Pal, *The arts of Nepal. Painting*, Leiden 1978, on Add.864, Add.1464, Add.1643, Add.1645. The Library copy of Pal's book at S849.c.1.12 has been annotated to show class-marks, which Pal omits; his Cambridge thesis (Ph.D. 5275-5276) is also relevant' (Dalby 1988, 279).

Several other editions and studies featuring UL manuscripts have been published, not only in the field of Buddhist studies. The modest aim of this admittedly short and incomplete list is to highlight once again how influential the UL collections have been, and continue to be, even in a specific field of study. The main reason why I focused on the UL Buddhist manuscripts is that they were more widely known and more accessible precisely thanks to Bendall's catalogue of the Buddhist manuscripts in the Wright collection. Luckily, the wider scholarly community was made aware of the existence of the other manuscripts thanks to V. Raghavan's work and the inclusion of the UL Sanskrit manuscripts in the NCC. I believe that we could repeat this exercise for other fields of Sanskrit literature and reach quite similar results.

5 The collections in the 21st century: on the digital catalogue and beyond

Among libraries outside South Asia, the Cambridge collections can be considered mid-sized, yet their Sanskrit (c. 1450) and Prakrit (c. 150) manuscripts are astonishing under many aspects. Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism, as well as all major literary genres (Veda, Śāstra, Kāvya, Purāṇa, Tantra, Jyotiṣa, the Darśanas, Vyākaraṇa etc.) are represented with manuscripts important from many points of view (such as antiquity, textual and historical significance, artistic value). The collections include manuscripts in the three most widespread South Asian writing materials: palm leaf, paper, and birch-bark (the former two include two of the oldest Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts,⁵² as well as one of the oldest dated Nepalese paper manuscripts⁵³). Furthermore, the manuscripts are written in a wide array of South Asian scripts (the full range of Nepalese scripts, various kinds of Nāgarī, Bengali, Oriya, Malayalam, Tamil, Telugu, Grantha, Śāradā). Finally, the geographical areas of provenance cover virtually the whole Indian subcontinent and the time span ranges from the 8th century to the 20th century. After a very long way from South Asia to Europe (and in some cases, again within Europe) in the 19th and 20th century, these manuscripts in the UL collections now enjoy a deserved rest on the shelves. However, they could have undertaken all their travels in vain, for they cannot speak to the scholarly community as long as they remain uncatalogued. As we have seen, the only catalogue printed in the 19th century was

⁵² Add.1049 (dated 828 CE) and Add.1702 (dated to the 8th century).

⁵³ MS Add.1412 (dated 1278 CE).

Bendall's (1883), and the only one printed in the 20th century was Niemann's (1980). Together, they cover less than one fourth of the collections. The Sanskrit Manuscripts Project, Cambridge made available on the Cambridge Digital Library platform the descriptions of more than 1600 South Asian manuscripts, covering the totality of the Sanskrit and Prakrit manuscripts (and some Tamil manuscripts as well). Approximately one third has been digitized and the images are now accessible online. As in the case of printed catalogues, some descriptions are very exhaustive and include excerpts of the texts as well as a full codicological analysis, while others provide only basic information (such as author, title, writing material, number of folios etc., like in a tabular catalogue).⁵⁴ Regardless of the type of description, it is now possible to navigate the totality of the collections. The impact of the digital catalogue on research is yet to be assessed, but it has surely made available to the scholarly community manuscripts that otherwise would have been accessible with more difficulty—if at all.

Catalogues give manuscripts a voice, but the language in which they speak varies according to the interests and priorities of the scholars who catalogue them. For instance, in a masterpiece of scholarship such as A. Weber's *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliotheken* (compiled in 1853), the manuscripts are classified under a textual criterion, i.e. all manuscripts of one work are grouped together. This criterion is a clear hint of the priority assigned to the textual element over the physical features of manuscripts, and indeed the description of the codicological aspects of the manuscripts is kept to a minimum.⁵⁵ This methodological approach was adopted also by V. Raghavan during his work for the compilation and supervision of the NCC, with the consequence that 'catalogues of Indian manuscripts normally present lists of works as if they were lists of manuscripts, silently asserting a false identity between work and manuscript' (Wujastyk 2014, 180). In the case of the Cambridge Digital Library, as the readers have access to images of the manuscripts their physical aspect gains more prominence and can be more easily exploited for research purposes. We obviously kept the description of the textual elements in the foreground. On the other hand, we devoted particular attention precisely to codicological aspects (like layout and binding) often barely included—or even neglected—in catalogues.⁵⁶ The tendency

⁵⁴ The reasons for this choice are explained in Formigatti forthcoming, § 2.1.

⁵⁵ On this aspect and the history of cataloguing of Sanskrit manuscripts, see Formigatti forthcoming, § 1.2 and § 2; see also Wujastyk 2014, 179–181.

⁵⁶ This aspect of our cataloguing methodology is partly explained in Formigatti forthcoming, § 3.2.1 and § 3.2.2.

to give more importance to the text is seen also in more recent digital catalogues.⁵⁷ In contrast with the common idea that manuscripts are mainly carrier of texts significant only from a literary or philological point of view, we decided also to transcribe precisely those textual elements that are usually left out of descriptions of manuscripts, i.e. the ‘written materials that are not classical works as such, for example scribal comments, marginal glosses, ownership notes’ (Wujastyk 2014, 180). This obviously does not mean that we were able to follow through this plan in all cases. For instance, we certainly could not provide transcriptions or even full assessments of the characters of the marginal annotations found in several manuscripts. Yet we strove to provide as many complete transcriptions of this type of textual material as possible. Our hope is that the digital catalogue will not only be the means for the navigation of the collections, but also a useful tool for researchers interested in the materiality of the South Asian manuscripts.

57 See for instance Scharf 2015, 243–264.

6 Appendices

6.1 Sources for the history of the UL collections of Sanskrit manuscripts

6.1.1 Manuscript sources

Besides information about the provenance of the manuscripts, the first seven handlists provide only shelfmark and title of manuscripts.

List Add. = List of Additional Manuscripts 923-1827

Handwritten list compiled by various authors, kept in the Cambridge University Library. It contains following lists of South Asian manuscripts:

- List of the Pāli and Sinhalese manuscripts acquired by T.W. Rhys Davids, compiled by him on the 31 March 1874 (Add. 923–998, 76 manuscripts sold to the Library on 30 March 1874, plus an addition of two manuscripts under the shelfmark Add.999);
- List of the manuscripts bought in Nepal by Dr. D. Wright in 1873–76 (including the Tibetan manuscripts and blockprints);
- List of Sanskrit manuscripts bought in Benares on behalf of Prof. E. B. Cowell ('Sanskrit MSS recd. [received] from Benares, sanctioned May 8, 1878' = Add.1709-1725);
- List of the Jaina manuscripts acquired by the University Library from Prof. G. Bühler ('Jaina MSS recd. from Dr. G. Bühler sanctioned by the Syndicat March 22, 1876' = Add. 1755–1822; 'Jaina MSS recd. from Dr. G. Bühler sanctioned by the Syndicat May 2, 1877');
- List of five manuscripts of other provenance bought through Prof. E. B. Cowell and sanctioned on January 31, 1877.

Handlist = List of Oriental MSS. Class Catalogue of Oriental MSS

Handwritten list of all Oriental manuscripts acquired up to September 1900, further inspected on September 1913 ('Inspected, September 1913, by W.J. Dunn and A. Anable, and all accounted for, except: [...] a list of missing manuscripts follows, but the Sanskrit manuscripts allegedly missing have been struck through, since they have been found; only a Tamil manuscript, Add.1579, seems to be missing since 1900).

ULIB 7/1/4 = Assorted Lists of Manuscripts and Books, Chiefly Oriental, Acquired by the Library, with Related Papers

Handwritten list and notes by Ralph T. H. Griffith and Daniel Wright of Sanskrit manuscripts acquired by the UL in 1873.

ULIB 7/3/55 = Notes on the Collections of Oriental, Thibetan and 'Additional' Manuscripts

Handwritten list by Henry Bradshaw, providing the year of acquisition of the manuscripts of the Wright collections for the years 1870–80.

Oriental MSS: Shelf List 1

Handwritten list of all Oriental manuscripts compiled according to their size.

Oriental MSS: Language List 2

Handwritten list of all Oriental manuscripts compiled according to their language.

List of Printed Books Notebooks Portraits m.s.s. in the Cowell Collection

The handwritten list of the manuscripts bequeathed by Prof. E. B. Cowell to the University Library is found on folio 29.

Or. 345 = Sanskrit MSS in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

Handwritten short catalogue of the manuscripts belonging to Corpus Christi College. Each entry usually contains the title and a very brief description of the manuscript.

LVP = U. L. C. Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS by Miss C. M. Ridding and Louis de la Vallée Poussin

Card catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the Add. class not catalogued by Bendall. The descriptions are written on index cards by Prof. L. de la Vallée Poussin and C.M. Ridding. The catalogue was completed in 1916. The cards are kept in



Figs 5a and b: 'Colman's' wooden box containing the card catalogue by L. de la Vallée Poussin and C.M. Ridding.

a picturesque wooden box with advertisements for Colman's products such as mustard oil, corn flour, and starch impressed on the sides (Figs. 5a and 5b).

Raghavan = Bodleian MS Or. Raghavan 3.

MS Or. Raghavan consists of three boxes containing the notes taken by Raghavan during his European tour for the compilation of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*. The UL collections are described in the notes in box 3. The boxes include also letters by Raghavan to various individuals, all relating to his European tour.

6.1.2 Printed sources

- (1) Bendall's *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts* (1883);
- (2) Bendall's reports and articles (Bendall 1882, 1886, 1888a, 1899 [1900]);
- (3) Grahame Niemann's article on the Corpus Christi College South Asian manuscripts (Niemann 1980);
- (4) Andrew Dalby's article on the Oriental Collections in the UL (Dalby 1988).




Fig. 6: Catalogue card of MS Add.1694, recto.




Fig. 7: Catalogue card of MS Add.1694, verso.




Fig. 8: Catalogue card of MS Add.1936, recto (verso blank).

6.2 Tables of Manuscripts Provenance

Tab. 1: Manuscripts Provenance. General Table

Shelfmark	Collection	Provenance	Date of Acquisition	Sources
Add.285.67	Miscellanea	Unknown	19 th century	Handlist
Add.572	Miscellanea	Cotton Mather	1868 (donated)	Handlist
Add.960, 994	Miscellanea	Rhys Davids	1873–76 (bought)	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.1033	Miscellanea	Unknown	After 1873	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.864–875, 899–901, 912–918, 1032, 1041, 1049, 1108, 1160–1164, 1267–1415, 1464–1488, 1533–1545, 1585–1708	Wright	D. Wright (bought)	1873–76	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.1039, 1040, 1042, 1050, 1104–1107, 1156, 1416–1463, 1546–1557, 1576–1581, 1952	Wright	W. Wright and D. Wright (donated)	1873–76	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.1157–59	Miscellanea	Fischl Hirsch (bought)	1875	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.1266.01	Miscellanea	Reinhold Rost (bought)	1875	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.1755–1822	Bühler	G. Bühler (bought in Bikaner? See the envelopes)	1875	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55, original envelopes wrapping the manuscripts

Shelfmark	Collection	Provenance	Date of Acquisition	Sources
Add.1853	Miscellanea	Pots	19 th century	Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.876-885, 889-898, 902-911, 1034-1038, 1709-1725, 1824-1827, and 1908-1927	Cowell	R. Griffith, bought in Benares	1873-78 (Add.876-885, Add.889-898, Add.902-909 bought in 1873, see ULIB; Add.1024 and Add.1025 in 1875; Add.1826 and Add.1827 in 1876)	List Add., Handlist, ULIB 7/1/4, ULIB 7/3/55
Add.1934-1951	Cowell	E. B. Cowell; 'Copied at 1877 in Benares [...] bought from J.C. Nesfield Benares Skt College' (note in Add.1934)	1877	Handlist, ULIB 7/3/55, note in Add.1934
Add.2185	Miscellanea	Unknown	19 th century	Handlist
Add.2079-2251	Bendall	C. Bendall; 'MSS 2079-2250 were collected by me in Northern and Western India, as shown in my "Journey in Nepal etc" especially pp. 41-49. CBendall' (note in the Handlist of Oriental MSS)	1884-85	Handlist, Bendall's Journey
Add.2252-2545	Bendall	C. Bendall; 'MSS 2252-2545 were bought by me from Bhagvan Dās Kevaldas at Bombay in 1885 CBendall' (note in the Handlist of Oriental MSS)	1885	Handlist, Bendall's Journey
Add.2574	Miscellanea	Unknown	19 th century	Handlist

Shelfmark	Collection	Provenance	Date of Acquisition	Sources
Add.2598	Cowell	Cowell (bequeathed after his death?)	1903 (?)	Cowell 1886, vi: 'Our own MS. [of the <i>Divyāvadāna</i>], 274 leaves, 14–15 lines'; this description corresponds to this manuscript
Add.2800	Miscellanea	Sotheby's	1887	Handlist
Add.2831–2838	Bendall	C. Bendall; received from Dr G. H. D. Gimlette of Kathmandu	1887	Handlist, Bendall 1888a
Add.2840–41	Bendall	C. Bendall; received from Dr G. H. D. Gimlette of Kathmandu	19 th century	Handlist
Add.3437	Miscellanea	Doughby	19 th century	Handlist
CC.31.B.08.1–3, CC.31.B.47.1, CC.32.Add.B.01, CC.32.B.06, CC.32.B.29, CC.32.B.30, CC.33.B.04.1–2, CC.33.B.5, CC.33.B.9, CC.33.B.11–15, CC.33.B.25.1–5, CC.33.B.25.7, CC.33.B.26, CC.33.B.27.1, CC.33.B.27.2, CC.33.B.28, CC.34.B.7.1, CC.34.B.17–24, CC.37.Add.B.5	Corpus Christi	A.C. Honner	1860–1870	Or.345, Niemann
Nn.3.59–70	Miscellanea	Robert Lubbock Bensly	1890s	Handlist
Or.72–162	Bendall	C. Bendall (bought); Or.72–83 received from Pandit Ciman Lal; Or.85–92 received from Syed 'Aii Bilgrami of Hyderabad	1898–9	Handlist; Bendall 1899

Shelfmark	Collection	Provenance	Date of Acquisition	Sources
Or.235-383, 407 (Or.344-383 are handwritten notes on various topics and translations by Cowell)	Cowell	E.B. Cowell (bequeathed);	1903	Handlist
Or.462	Miscellanea	H. Bradshaw	1887	Handlist
Or.679, 713-732, 810-822, Or.838, 845, 1278-1279	Bendall	C. Bendall (bequeathed); '1906 March Bequeathed by Professor Cecil Bendall See also Or.810-822' (handwritten note in pencil in the List of Oriental MSS)	1906-1934	Handlist
Or.688-89	Miscellanea	Bought from Mrs Gwendolen Crosse (formerly belonged to General Willough- by Osborne, Advocate general of India, her grandfather)	1906	Handlist
Or.1372-73	Miscellanea	Walter Sibbald Adie (donated)	24 January 1924 (?)	Handlist
Or.845	Miscellanea	Guignard	1911	Handlist
Or.860	Miscellanea	A.S.B. Miller, library assistant (donated)	1911	Handlist
Or.905	Miscellanea	C. J. Sawyer (bought)	1914	Handlist
Or.948	Miscellanea	A.E. Wade (gift in memory of her hus- band, the reverend T. Russell Wade)	20 th century	Handlist
Or.975	Miscellanea	A.G.W. Murray	1919	Handlist
Or.1040	Miscellanea	John Whitaker (bought)	1924	Handlist
Or.1085	Miscellanea	B.F.C. Atkinson (donated)	1926	Handlist

Shelfmark	Collection	Provenance	Date of Acquisition	Sources
Or.1278-79	Bendall	Bendall; 'Found among C Bendall's papers. Dec. 1934. AFSchofield Librarian'	1884-85	Handlist; handwritten note on the box lid of Or.1278 on the envelope of Or.1279
Or.1372-73	Miscellanea	W.S. Adie (donated) 'Presented by W.S. Adie, Trinity College, in 3 February 1943'	1943	Handwritten note on folio 1r of Or.1372
Or.1730	Miscellanea	Faculty of Oriental Languages (donated)	20 th century	Handlist
Or.1743.8	Miscellanea	Faculty of Oriental Languages (bought)	1954	Handlist
Or.1743.20	Cowell	Presented by A.N.L. Munby, Esq. Librarian of King's College. From the M.R. James collection, Cowell Collection	1948	Handlist
Or.1748.1	Miscellanea	W.S. Adie (donated); 'Presented by W.S. Adie, formerly Fellow of Trinity College in 3 February 1943'		Handlist
Or.1810-20	Miscellanea	E.K. Waterhouse	1957	Handlist
Or.1932-35		Transferred from the Faculty of Oriental Studies in 4 December 1959	1959	Handlist
Or.2025-30	Miscellanea	W.H.D. Rouse (bequeathed)	1961	Handlist
Or.2031	Miscellanea	Mrs Dorothy B. G. Line and Lt.-Col. Dimmock (donated)	1961	Handlist
Or.2258, 2262-64	Miscellanea	Sotheby's (bought)	1982	Handlist and label attached to Or.2258
Or.2260	Miscellanea	Harding (bought)	1982	Handlist
Or.2338-69, 2380-2435, 2471	Stolper	Robert E. Stolper (bought)	1991	Handlist
Or.2555-73	Griffiths	Arlo Griffiths (donated)	2013	

Tab.2: Manuscript Provenance. MSS Add.2079–2250, Bendall's Manuscripts from the 1884–85 Journey.

Shelfmark	Provenance	Additional Notes
Add.2079–85, 2087–98 [2098(?)], 2101–02, 2107, 2110–11, 2113, 2115, 2120, 2123–24, 2126–27, 2129, 2131, 2133, 2136, 2138, 2142–43, 2145– 55 [2147?], 2157, 2159–60, 2165–70, 2172–85 [2176?]	Benares and the North-West Provinces	
Add.2086, 2099–2100, 2103–06, 21089, 2112, 2116, 2121, 2137, 2194–99, 2248–51	Nepal	'With Add. 2112 were formerly preserved 4 leaves not iden- tified. In 1903 I recognized these as forming part of Or. 137 (bought by me in my late journey (1898) in Nepal, at Bhatgaon. I transferred them to this MS. accordingly C.B. 4 Sp. 1903' (Handlist, s.v. Add.2112)
Add.2117, 2128, 2130, 2132, 2134–5, 2140–1, 2156, 2158, 2200–2247, 2394	Rājputāna	
Add.2118, 2252–2545	Bombay	'MSS 2252–2545 were bought by me from Bhagvan Dās Keval- das at Bombay in 1885 CBen- dall' (note in the Handlist)
Or.116, 811, 817–9, Or.727	Rājputāna Nepal	
Or.730, 822	Benares and the North-West Provinces	

6.2 Manuscripts listed in Bendall's *Journey* but not found in the lists or on the shelves

The titles and the notes before the page number are quoted directly as they appear in Bendall 1886a. The letters following the title refers to the provenance of the manuscript: B. = Benares and the North-West Provinces, N. = Nepal, R. = Rājputāna. The final bracketed figures provide the reference to the page in Bendall 1886a in which the manuscript is mentioned. Manuscripts marked with * were 'reserved and not sent to the University Library' (Bendall 1886a, 41). Most probably, these were manuscripts that Bendall kept at home for his own research (like Or.727, a manuscript of the *Tantrākhyāna*, a work of which Bendall published a partial edition in 1888b). In his *Application for the Professorship of Sanskrit*, Bendall states that 'of about 500 Sanskrit MSS.' acquired by him '487 are now in the Library (Add. 2079–2845)' (Bendall 1903, 6). Some of Bendall's private manuscripts were subsequently acquired by the UL after his death (like Or.727), some were later found in his papers (like Or.1278, a manuscript of the *Can-drālamkāra* in the Bhaikṣukī script), but some are still missing (for instance, the *Kāraḥkaumudī* manuscript listed below as 6).

1. Vṛishasārasaṅgraha. B. (?) (42)
2. Meghadūta with anonymous commentary. Kashmiri-Nāgari writing.
3. Sāraṅgasāratattva, circa 1690. B. (42)
4. Damayantīkathāhvṛtti (comm.), begun by Candrapāla and finished by Guṇavinayagaṇi. 1853. R. (43)
5. *Mādhavānalopākhyāna. 1751. N. Paper. (43)
6. *Kāraḥka-kaumudī. R. (43)
7. *Sūtras with comm. not identified. N. (43) (= Or. 729?)
8. *Tājikasāra by Haribhadra Sūri. 1404. R. (43) (= Add.2394? The date does not correspond)
9. Bhīmavinoda (?). Imperfect. N. (44)
10. *'Gaurīkantī' (another copy)? complete. B. (44)
11. Māthurī. Comm. by Mathuranātha on Tattvacintāmaṇi. (Part of Khaṇḍa 1 only). Beng. hand xvii—xviii cent. B. Imperf. (44)
12. Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī 1760. (44)
13. Advaitasiddhi by Madhusūdana Sūri. B. (45)
14. Advaitasiddhi, commentary by Brahmānanda. B. (45); in the Handlist, between Add. 2162 (Laukikaviśayavicāra) and Add.2165 (Aparokṣānubhūti) a blank space has been left for Add.2163 and Add.2164 and accordingly there are no paper slips in LVP; has the place been left for these

two manuscripts of the Advaitasiddhi (see Bendall 1886a, 45 for this section of the 1884–5 manuscripts)?

15. *Aparokṣānubhūti (another copy). B. (45); in the Handlist, between Add.2170 (Jñānasvaprakāśa) and Add.2172 (Praśnāvalī by Jaḍubharata) a blank space has been left for Add.2171, and accordingly there is no paper slip in LVP; has the place been left for this manuscript (see Bendall 1886a, 45 for this section of the 1884–5 manuscripts)?
16. Kaivalyakalpadruma by Gaṅgādhara Sarasvatī. B. (45)
17. *Nyāya-makaranda and its ṭīkā (or vivṛiti) by Citsukha Muni. Text by Anandabodha. Kashmiri-Nāgarī character. 184 l. B. (45)
18. Siddhāntaleśasaṅgraha. (End of last chapter wanting). B. (45)
19. Siddhāntaleśasaṅgraha. (commentary) defective at end. B. (45)
20. Svarūpanirṇaya by Sadānanda. B. (45)
21. *[Vākyavṛitti-prakāśikā, comm. on Śaṅkara's Vākya-vṛitti. B] (another copy). B. (45)
22. Vedānta-kalpataru. B. (46)
23. *Pañcarakshā. Palm-leaf (modified Kuṭila writing) with modern paper supply. Dated in reign of Vīrahapāla of Bengal (c. 1080). (46)
24. *Daśavaikālikā (text only). 1469. (47)
25. *Śāntināthacaritra. (47)
26. Śrāvakāṇām mukhavastrikārajohāraṇavicāra. 1597. (47)
27. Chandonuśāsana. (47)
28. *Harivaṃśa-purāṇa. (47)
29. Several Paṭṭāvalis. (48)
30. A treatise by Somasundara, ff. 4, 64 verses. (48)
31. Padyosavaṇa with ṭippanī (49)
32. Kalpāntarvācyānī (A.D. 1457). (50)

References

- Aufrecht, Theodor (1869), *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & co.
- Batchelor, Stephen (1994), *The Awakening of the West. The Encounter of Buddhism and Western Culture: 543 BCE-1992*, London: Aquarian.
- Bendall, Cecil (1882), *On European Collections of Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal: Their Antiquity and Bearing on Chronology, History and Literature*, Berlin: A. Asher & Co., Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Bendall, Cecil (1883), *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge: With Introductory Notices and Illustrations of the Palæography and Chronology of Nepal and Bengal*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Bendall, Cecil (1886a), *A Journey of Literary and Archæological Research in Nepal and Northern India, during the Winter of 1884-5 / by Cecil Bendall*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Bendall, Cecil (1886b), 'On a Newly Discovered form of Indian Character', in *International Congress of Orientalists*, 7, 1886, Wien [Congrès International des Orientalistes]. Nendeln, 1886, 111–125; 1 pl.
- Bendall, Cecil (1888a), 'Notes on a Collection of MSS. Obtained by Dr. Gimlette, of the Bengal Medical Service, at Kathmandu, and Now Deposited in the Cambridge University Library, and in the British Museum', in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, New Series, 20, no. 4 (1888): 549–554.
- Bendall, Cecil (1888b), 'The Tantrākhyāna: A Collection of Indian Folklore, from a Unique Sanskrit Ms Discovered in Nepal', in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (20 (N.S.)), 1888, 465–501.
- Bendall, Cecil (1890), 'An Inscription in a Buddhistic Variety of Nail-headed Characters', in *The Indian antiquary*, 19, 1890, 77–78, 1 pl.
- Bendall, Cecil (1903), *Application and Testimonials for the Professorship of Sanskrit*. Cambridge.
- Bendall, Cecil (1899), 'Outline-Report On a Tour in Northern India in the Winter 1898–9', in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1900, 162–64 [originally published in *Cambridge University Reporter*, 5th December, 1899].
- Bendall, Cecil (1902), *Çikshāsamuccaya: a Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Edited by Cecil Bendall, M.A., Bibliotheca Buddhica, vol. I. St. Pétersbourg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- Bendall, Cecil (1992). *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. Publications of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project; 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Bühler, Georg (1877), *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts Made in Kaśmīr, Rajputana, and Central India*. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 12, extra number no. 34A. Bombay: Society's Library.
- Burnouf, Eugène (2010), *Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism* (English translation of *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, Paris, 1844), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Clemente, Michela, Hildegard Diemberger, and Mark Elliott (eds) (2014), *Buddha's Word: The Life of Books in Tibet and Beyond*. Cambridge: Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology University of Cambridge.
- Cowell, E.B. (1893), *The Buddha-Karita of Asvaghosha. Edited from Three Manuscripts*. Anecdota Oxoniensia, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cowell, E. B. and R. A. Neil (eds) (1886), *The Divyâvadâna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Dalby, Andrew (1988), *A Dictionary of Oriental Collections in Cambridge University Library*. Cambridge: Cambridge Bibliographical Society.
- Diemberger, Hildegard (2012), 'The Younghusband-Waddell Collection and Its People: The Social Life of Tibetan Books Gathered in a Late-colonial Enterprise', in *Inner Asia* vol. 14, issue 1 (2012): 131–171.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir (2010), *The Bhaikṣukī Manuscript of the Candrālaṃkāra: Study, Script Tables, and Facsimile Edition*. Harvard Oriental Series 72. Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University.
- Formigatti, Camillo A. (2014), 'The South Asian Manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library', in Clemente, M., H. Diemberger, and M. Elliott (eds), *Buddha's Word. The Life of Books in Tibet and Beyond*, Cambridge: Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology University of Cambridge, 127–130.
- Formigatti, Camillo A. (2016a), 'Walking the Deckle Edge: Scribe or Author? Jayamuni and the Creation of the Nepalese *Avadānamālā* Literature', in *Buddhist Studies Review*, 33.1–2: 101–140.
- Formigatti, Camillo A. (2016b), 'Towards a Cultural History of Nepal, 14th-17th Century. A Nepalese Renaissance?', in *Supplemento numero 1 alla Rivista degli Studi Orientali. Studies in Honour of Luciano Petech. A Commemoration volume, 1914-2014*, Nuova Serie, vol. LXXXIX, 51–66.
- Formigatti, Camillo A. (forthcoming), '<title type="alt" xml:lang="eng"> From the Shelves to the Web: Cataloging Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Digital Era</title>', in Elena Mucciarelli and Heike Oberlin (eds), *Paper & Pixel: Digital Humanities in Indology*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gornall, Alastair (2015), 'Fame and Philology: R.C. Childers and the Beginnings of Pāli and Buddhist Studies in Britain', in *Contemporary Buddhism*, 16:2: 462–489. DOI: 10.1080/14639947.2015.1031930
- Gough, Archibald Edward (1878), *Papers Relating to the Collection and Preservation of the Records of Ancient Sanskrit Literature in India*, Calcutta: Office of Superintendent of Government Printing.
- Hanisch, Albrecht (2009), 'Sarvarakṣita's Mañicūḍajāṭaka. Reproduction of the Codex Unicus with Diplomatic Transcript and Palaeographic Introduction to the Bhaikṣukī Script', in *Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection, Part I*. Manuscripta Buddhica, I, 195–342. Edited by Harunaga Isaacson and Francesco Sferra. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.
- Huett, Bruce (2012), 'A Woman of Books: Miss C.M. Ridding and the Younghusband-Waddell Collection', in *Inner Asia* vol. 14, issue 1: 173–188.
- Hultzsch, Eugen (1886), 'Ueber eine Sammlung indischer Handschriften und Inschriften', in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 40, 1886, S. 1–80, 2 pls. (Corrections p. 188).

- Jolly, J. (1885), *Nāradasmṛti. The Institutes of Nārada together with copious notes from the Nāradabhāṣya of Asahāya and other standard commentaries*, Calcutta: Bibliotheca Indica.
- Lariviere, Richard W (1989), *The Nāradasmṛti*. University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia vol. 4-5. Philadelphia: Department of South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania.
- Martin, Dan (2015). Tibskrit Philology: April 21, 2014. *A Bio-bibliographical Resource Work*. Compiled by Dan Martin, edited by Alexander Cherniak.
- Niemann, Grahame (1980), 'Uncatalogued Indian manuscripts of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: the Honner collection', in *IAVRI Bulletin*, 9 Vrindaban, 3–15.
- ODNB = Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, s.v. Griffith, Ralph Thomas Hotchkin (1826–1906), online version (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33580>).
- Quenzer, Jörg B., Dmitry Bondarev, and Jan-Ulrich Sobisch (eds) (2014), *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures 1). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Raghavan, V.(1963), *Manuscripts, Catalogues, Editions: Steps Taken for the Collection, Preservation and Utilisation of Manuscripts*. Madras: Bharati Vijayam Press.
- Rotman, A. (2008), *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna, Part I*. Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. (1883), 'List of Pāli Manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library', in *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 145–151.
- Scharf, Peter M. (2015), 'Providing Access to Manuscripts in the Digital Age', in McDaniel, Justin, and Lynn Ransom (eds), *From Mulberry Leaves to Silk Scrolls: New Approaches to the Study of Asian Manuscript Traditions*. Philadelphia.
- Tatelman, J. (2000), *The Glorious Deeds of Pūrṇa: A Translation and Study of the Pūrṇāvadāna*. Curzon critical studies in Buddhism. Richmond: Curzon.
- Tatelman, J. (2005), *The Heavenly Exploits: Buddhist Biographies from the Divyāvadāna*. Volume One. Edited and Translated by Joel Tatelman. Clay Sanskrit Library. New York: New York University Press: JJC Foundation.
- Waterhouse, David M. (2004), *The Origins of Himalayan Studies: Brian Houghton Hodgson in Nepal and Darjeeling 1820-1858*. Royal Asiatic Society Books. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Weber, Albrecht (1853). *Verzeichnisse der Sankrit- und Prākṛit-handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Die Handschriften-verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, Berlin: A. W. Schade.
- Winternitz, Moriz (1905), *Catalogue of Sanscrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, vol. 2 of Aufrecht – Winternitz – Keith 1864.
- Wujastyk, Dominik (2014), 'Indian Manuscripts', in Jörg B. Quenzer, Dmitry Bondarev and Jan-Ulrich Sobisch (eds), *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures 1), Berlin: De Gruyter.

