

Stanislav Jager

## Editing Rājānaka Ratnakaṅṭha's Sūryastutirahasya and Ratnaśataka\*

The following is a brief and preliminary report on some philological observations made while editing two Sanskrit *stotra* compositions, namely, the Sūryastutirahasya (henceforth SSR)<sup>1</sup> and the Ratnaśataka (henceforth RŚ)<sup>2</sup> of the Kashmirian commentator and author Rājānaka Ratnakaṅṭha. Subsequent to an introduction to the author and the two devotional poems, the editorial process and the genealogical relationship between the two available textual witnesses will be briefly discussed.

### AUTHOR AND WORKS

Given that more detailed information will be provided in the forthcoming publication of the edition of the two *stotras*,<sup>3</sup> a cursory overview of the author and his works may suffice here. Rājānaka Ratnakaṅṭha was a Kashmirian pandit who flourished in the second half of the seventeenth century. He is particularly known for his peculiar handwriting, which is difficult to decipher, apparently because he wrote very quickly. M.A. Stein recounts in the introduction to his translation of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī some related anecdotes heard during his stay in Kashmir at the end of the nineteenth century. According to one of these, Ratnakaṅṭha wrote out the entire Bhagavadgītā during a rest-stop on a journey while his companion prepared their meal. Stein further notes a Kashmirian saying, popular among Kashmirian pandits, which refers to nearly illegible writing as being “Rājānaka Ratnakaṅṭha’s letters”.<sup>4</sup> Many manuscripts from his hand have been preserved, including the important codex archetype of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī that was discovered by G. Bühler and eventually used by M.A. Stein for his edition of the work.<sup>5</sup> As an

---

\* I would like to thank Jens Rosenmeyer for reading a draft version of this article.

<sup>1</sup> Alternative titles: Ravistutirahasya, Bhāskarastutirahasya.

<sup>2</sup> Alternative title: Citrabhānuśataka.

<sup>3</sup> Hanneder and Jager, under preparation.

<sup>4</sup> See M.A. Stein, *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kaśmīr*. Translated, with an Introduction, Commentary, and Appendices. Vol. I-II. Westminster 1900 (repr. Delhi 1961), Vol. I: Introduction, p. 47b, n.

<sup>5</sup> *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī or Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir*. Vol. I: *Sanskrit Text with Critical Notes*. Bombay 1892 (repr. Delhi 1960).

author, Ratnakaṅṭha composed the two *stotras* mentioned above as well as some astronomical works and a number of commentaries on grammatical, poetological and poetic works, such as commentaries on Ratnākara's Haravijaya and Mammaṭa's Kāvyaṣaṣa.<sup>6</sup> Of the commentaries, only those on Vāsudeva's Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya,<sup>7</sup> Jagaddhara's Stutikusumāñjali<sup>8</sup> and his compilation of Yaśaskara's Devīstotra with Śobhākara's Alamkāraratnākara<sup>9</sup> have been published.

The two *stotra* compositions, the SSR and the RŚ, both eulogize the sun god Sūrya in an elaborate manner. The SSR consists of twenty-five verses, with the closing verse promising welfare and final beatitude to the person reciting the text in the morning. Praising Sūrya in every verse, it does not attempt to develop a particular idea; at first sight, the verses even seem to be interchangeable. However, Ratnakaṅṭha demonstrates his poetical skills by applying various metres and using different rhetorical figures, including three riddle verses. To this he adds an additional puzzle that is not easily detectable. The title of this composition, Sūryastutirahasya, already indicates that it deals with the secret of praising Sūrya. In fact, when one combines the first syllable of each single verse successively, one reads, as an *akrostichon*, the Vedic Gāyatrī-mantra: *tat savitur vareṇyam bhargo devasya dhīmahi | dhīyo yo nah pracodayāt ||* (RV 3.62.10). This mantra consists of twenty-four syllables, and with this, the rationale behind the number and order of the verses in the SSR becomes clear.

The second work, the RŚ, consists of one hundred verses in praise of Sūrya and two closing verses, which give the date of composition as 1587 of the Śaka era and 41 (of the *laukika* era), i.e., A.D. 1665.<sup>10</sup> Only the *sragdharā* and the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metres are used throughout. It seems that Ratnakaṅṭha took Mayūra's Sūryaśataka as his model as regards content and formal structure.<sup>11</sup> The order in which attributes of Sūrya are treated is the same. Both works begin by praising Sūrya's rays and lustre, continue with portrayals of the horses of the sun's chariot, the

<sup>6</sup> A comprehensive list of Ratnakaṅṭha's works will be provided in the forthcoming edition of the *stotras*.

<sup>7</sup> Śivadatta and Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab (ed.), *The Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya of Vāsudeva with the Commentary of Rājānaka Ratnakantha*. [Kāvyaṣaṣa 60]. Bombay 1897.

<sup>8</sup> Durgāprasād and Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab (ed.), *The Stutikusumāñjali of Śrī Jagaddhara Bhatta with the Commentary of Rājānaka Ratnakantha*. [Kāvyaṣaṣa 23]. Bombay 1891.

<sup>9</sup> K. Dube (ed.), *Devīstotra*. [Laghu-Granthamālā 57]. Varanasi 2001.

<sup>10</sup> The colophons of both texts supply the author's name, Rājānaka Ratnakaṅṭha, his father's name, Rājānaka Śaṅkarakaṅṭha, and his native country, Kashmir.

<sup>11</sup> Mayūra's Sūryaśataka is composed in the *sragdharā* metre only.

charioteer Aruṇa, Sūrya's vehicle and the sun disc, and end with an exaltation of the sun god himself. They merely differ in the number of verses employed to describe the individual attributes of the sun.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

Both the SSR and the RŚ are preserved in paper manuscripts in Śāradā script. One textual witness belongs to the Stein Collection of the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the two separated parts of the single manuscript bear the shelf numbers Ms. No. 179<sup>12</sup> (for the SSR) and Ms. No. 115<sup>13</sup> (for the RŚ). Another textual witness, bearing the shelf number alpha 1219,<sup>14</sup> is stored in the Wellcome Library, London; it also contains both *stotras*, but is listed, without any reference to the SSR, under the title Citrabhānuśataka, which is an alternate title for the RŚ.

Both Ms. No. 179 and Ms. No. 115 of the Bodleian Library have the auspicious word *śrī* and page numbers in Śāradā characters in the bottom left-hand margin of the verso of each folio. As the manuscripts have a continuous pagination, were written by the same hand and show the same type of damage to their leaves, it is obvious that they belong together; the SSR has to be placed before the RŚ.

G. Clauson describes the Bodleian manuscripts in his "Catalogue of the Stein Collection of Sanskrit MSS from Kashmir"<sup>15</sup> and considers them to be autographs. However, the handwriting is in no way similar to the handwriting of the codex archetype of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, which was definitely written by Ratnakaṅṭha; a facsimile sample is supplied at the beginning of Stein's edition.<sup>16</sup> Clauson further notes that all the manuscripts in this collection were bought by Stein in Kashmir between 1888 and 1905. Thus, the manuscript is at least a hundred years old but not older than 340 years; it must have been copied some time between 1665, the date of the composition of the work, and 1905. Its state of preservation suggests an early date.

<sup>12</sup> Serial No. CCCLVII.

<sup>13</sup> Serial No. CCCXLII.

<sup>14</sup> Serial No. 592.

<sup>15</sup> G. Clauson, Catalogue of the Stein Collection of Sanskrit MSS. from Kashmir. *JRAS* (1912) 587-627. The manuscripts are listed separately, without mention of their connection.

<sup>16</sup> See Stein, *op. cit.* (n. 5). An additional sample of Ratnakaṅṭha's distinctive handwriting will be provided by way of an illustration in the forthcoming publication of the *stotras*.

The Bodleian manuscript contains all the verses of the SSR and the RŚ, but the margins of all leaves are damaged, resulting in the occasional loss of a few syllables. In a number of places, the writing of the RŚ section of the manuscript has faded to varying degrees, affecting, however, only some of the intermediate colophons concluding the description of a particular attribute of Sūrya; e.g., *iti tejo varṇanam* and *ityaśvavarṇanam*, and in some places the transitional phrase *api ca* between two verses have been affected.

The phrase *api ca* is stylistically not very fitting in a *stotra*-type work.<sup>17</sup> However, in our case it serves to mark a change of metre. As mentioned above, the RŚ, unlike the SSR, employs (with the exception of the closing verse) only two different metres, namely, the *sragdharā* and the *śārdūlavikrīḍita*. The individual descriptions of Sūrya's attributes thus start with verses in *sragdharā* metre that change to *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre after the indicator *api ca*. This metre continues until the end of a specific description, which is marked by an intermediate colophon, e.g., *iti rāsmivarṇanam*. Following this pattern, the majority of verses are composed in *sragdharā* metre, with *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre sometimes being limited to a single verse within a specific description. Whether the use of *api ca* as a marking device was introduced by the author himself or by a copyist cannot be determined.

The employment of half and quarter *daṇḍas*, frequently used to mark the end of a *pāda* and sometimes to mark word divisions, is a noteworthy scribal peculiarity. Some corrections, primarily written above *akṣaras* that are illegible due to smearing or inaccurate writing, as well as a few insertions of missing (parts of) *akṣaras* can be observed. Most of these corrections seem to originate from a second hand or at least were written with a second writing implement that produced a thinner line.

The most substantial modification of the text occurs in RŚ verse 11, *pāda* d:

<sup>17</sup> When R. Steiner examined the *maṅgala ślokas* of Harṣadeva's Nāgānanda, he had to deal with three verses which M. Hahn had previously found in a work belonging to the *stotra* section (*bstod tshog*) of the Tibetan Tanjur entitled bDud btul ba la bstod pa (\*Mārajitstotra). Its first two verses correspond – with minor differences – to the second and third verses of the three *maṅgala* verses of the Nāgānanda. The question arose as to which text was the source and which the borrower of these two verses. Both texts contained the phrase *api ca* (or its Tibetan equivalent *gzan yan*) between the two verses. As *api ca* is not typical of *stotra* composition but appears as a characteristic phrase in Sanskrit *nāṭakas*, Steiner concluded that the *maṅgala* verses of the Nāgānanda must have been the source for the \*Mārajitstotra; cf. his *Untersuchungen zu Harṣadevas Nāgānanda und zum indischen Schauspiel*. [*Indica et Tibetica* 31]. Swistal-Odendorf 1997, p. 44-48.

*tanvānā vo harantu pratibhayam udaye tigmabhānor mayūkhāḥ || 11 ||*

May the spreading beams of the sharp-rayed [Sūrya] remove your fear at sunrise!

Here, a still visible *-dinam* in the original form *pratidinam* was crossed out and substituted with *-bhayam*, which not only makes more sense, but is also needed as the accusative object of the verb *harantu*. The word *pratidinam* appears a couple of times in the text, notably in verse 9, *pāda* d; it is therefore not unlikely that a scribe unwittingly replaced *-bhayam* with *-dinam*.

In spite of many scribal corrections, there remain a few instances where the rules of external *sandhi* are wrongly applied or not applied at all. These faults consist in missing<sup>18</sup> or superfluous *visargas* (e.g. RŚ 86d: *-nalinajā pāvanā* instead of *-nalinajāḥ pāvanā*, SSR 21d: *sūryabhaktāḥ japanti* instead of *sūryabhaktā japanti*). Further examples of incorrect *sandhi* can be seen at RŚ 38c (*senānī nirjarāṇām* instead of *senānīr nirjarāṇām*), at RŚ 42d (*śreyor bhānor* instead of *śreyo bhānor*), at RŚ 59cd (*dayāluḥ devaḥ* instead of *dayālur devaḥ*), etc. In two instances, unaspirated consonants occur instead of aspirated ones (RŚ 41c: *lunṭi*, 66a: *chindi*). Some of these features can be explained as reflecting peculiarities of the Kashmirian pronunciation of Sanskrit.<sup>19</sup>

The second textual witness for Ratnakaṅṭha's two *stotras* is described in Wujastyk's *Handlist*,<sup>20</sup> which does not provide information about the purchase of the manuscript or its place of origin, but includes a transliteration of the colophons of both texts and an (incorrect) transliteration of both closing verses of the RŚ. The manuscript is complete and in good condition. Page numbers occur on each leaf in the left-hand bottom margin of the verso page in Śāradā characters and in the right-hand top margin of the recto page in Arabic numerals; these latter numerals are apparently a later addition, as is the heading *citrabhānuśatakam || patra 12 ||* on folio 1 recto written in Devanāgarī characters. Contrary to the copyist of the Bodleian manuscript, the scribe of the

<sup>18</sup> This is quite probably due to the peculiar Kashmirian pronunciation, where *visarga* is almost inaudible. Cf. G. Bühler, *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. Made in Kaśmīr, Rājputana, and Central India*. [Extra number of the *JBBRAS*]. Bombay – London 1877, p. 26. Cf. also M. Witzel, *Kashmiri Manuscripts and Pronunciation*. In: Y. Ikari (ed.), *A Study of the Nīlamata – Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir*. Kyoto 1994, p. 1-53.

<sup>19</sup> See Bühler, op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>20</sup> D. Wujastyk, *A Handlist of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine*. Vol. 1. London 1985.

Wellcome manuscript does distinguish between *ṣṭha* and *ṣṭa*, which is, as Goodall and Isaacson remark, “a feature of relatively recent Śāradā hands”.<sup>21</sup> This second textual witness does not present substantial variant readings for the text of the Bodleian manuscript; it contains, however, a number of particular errors.

#### THE PROCESS OF TEXT EDITING

The text of the SSR was edited as part of the present author’s Master’s thesis, and the text of the RŚ is currently being worked on. Both texts were initially considered only on the basis of the Bodleian manuscript because other textual witnesses for the SSR could not be located, even under its alternate titles Ravistutirahasya and Bhāskarastutirahasya.

Where *akṣaras* were missing on account of the damaged margin of the Bodleian manuscript the text had to be reconstructed by means of conjectures. In most cases this was not a difficult task: usually only one *akṣara* was missing, and the lacunae never exceeded two syllables; moreover, the fixed prosodical quantity of the metrical text reduced the number of options considerably.

It was only upon completion of the Master’s work that the second manuscript was located in the Wellcome Library. Both texts were collated to determine whether the conjectures made on the basis of the Bodleian manuscript were correct. In almost every case – except a few where a solution had not been found – they agreed with the text of the Wellcome manuscript. As this manuscript has a number of particular errors, it initially appeared to be an independent, more complete and reliable witness. The initial confidence in our conjectures was weakened when we discovered a gap in verse 67, *pāda* c of the RŚ, where the scribe had left some space for a single prosodically long unit. This space coincides with a gap in the text of the Bodleian Library manuscript, where the syllable is missing due to damage to the folio. Our suspicion that one manuscript was a direct copy of the other increased when we proceeded to verse 91, *pāda* c, and found a lacuna extending over two long metrical units. These syllables are also missing in the Bodleian manuscript on account of physical damage.

---

<sup>21</sup> See D. Goodall – H. Isaacson (ed.), *The Raghupāñcikā of Vallabhadeva. Being the Earliest Commentary on the Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa*. Vol. 1: *Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes*. [Groningen Oriental Studies 17]. Groningen 2003, p. lxxiv.

According to Maas,<sup>22</sup> the relationship between two textual witnesses can sometimes be established on the basis of a single place of variation, namely, when an error in text version B can confidently be ascribed to the physical condition of the surviving source A; e.g., when physical damage to source A caused the loss of letters or groups of letters and the same portion of the text is also missing (albeit without apparent reason) in the descendant text-version B. This reasoning seems to be very much applicable in our case. However, while in the Bodleian manuscript quite a number of syllables are missing on account of physical damage, the Wellcome manuscript has only two such gaps at places where the Bodleian manuscript is damaged. How might this fact best be accounted for?

One possible scenario is that the scribe of the Wellcome manuscript used an exemplar that already (and only) contained these two gaps, either as its sole source or in addition to the Bodleian manuscript. This hypothesis would accord with the fact that the Wellcome manuscript does not attest all the errors of the Bodleian manuscript and has at least one additional error. The hypothesis is of course based on a number of pre-suppositions, in particular, the assumption that scribes copy mechanically and do not correct mistakes.

In a different scenario the Wellcome manuscript would have been directly copied from the Bodleian manuscript which, at the time of copying, was damaged only where the Wellcome manuscript has the two lacunae. This, however, is unlikely, because all the leaves of the Bodleian manuscript show the same pattern of damage, i.e., the outer edges of each folio are identically shaped and fit on top of each other. There is no peculiar damage to the two folios which contain the passage of text where the gaps in the Wellcome manuscript appear.

Therefore the most likely scenario is that the Wellcome manuscript was copied directly from the Bodleian manuscript, which at the time of copying was already damaged. The scribe would not have mechanically copied the text in front of him, but also corrected obvious errors, made some mistakes of his own, and emended the text to the best of his ability. We find corroborating evidence for this.

In RŚ verse 4, *pāda* d, a peculiar Kashmiri spelling can be observed in both manuscripts:

*rakṣantām auṣasā vā daśaśatakīranābhīmṣavo duṣkṛtaughāt || 4 ||*

May the early beams of the thousand-rayed [Sūrya] save you from the flood of sins!

<sup>22</sup> P. Maas, *Textkritik*. Leipzig 1960, p. 6 (§ 8a, n.).



In an article on his edition of the Mañkhakośa,<sup>23</sup> Th. Zachariae states that he, in contradistinction to Stein in his edition of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, preserved the orthographic peculiarities of Kashmirian Śāradā manuscripts when a particular spelling was based on reliable manuscript transmission or appeared frequently in a specific manuscript. He adds that many of the peculiar spellings are expressly approved of in other *kośas*. Among his examples, Zachariae lists *abhīṃśu* (Mañkhakośa 892) and *abhīṃśu* (Mañkhakośa 907), and remarks that the spelling with *anusvāra* is very striking. He points out that this spelling is also found in the Kashmirian Śakuntalā manuscript. Therefore it seems that the spelling with *anusvāra* is conventionally sanctioned in Kashmirian Śāradā manuscripts and should not be regarded as an orthographic error.

The Bodleian manuscript appears to read *-kiraṇām bhīṣavo*, the Wellcome manuscript *-kiraṇām bhīṃśavo*. This can best be explained if we assume that the scribe copied the text directly from the Bodleian manuscript. There the scribe had placed the *anusvāra* equivocally between the *akṣaras ṇā* and *bhī*. The reading of the Bodleian manuscript should thus be interpreted as *-kiraṇābhīṃśavo* with a slightly displaced *anusvāra*. The scribe of the Wellcome manuscript, having the word *abhīṃśavo* in his mind, most probably misunderstood his source, i.e., the Bodleian manuscript, which resulted in his writing *-kiraṇām bhīṃśavo*.

Further support for the assumption that the Wellcome manuscript is an apograph of the Bodleian manuscript might be gained from additional observations on orthographic details. I would assume that agreement in orthography in cases where different spellings are equally correct or where identical deviations from the conventional spelling occur at the same place might indicate that the scribe of the Wellcome manuscript copied the Bodleian manuscript to the letter. Of course, these observations could not be regarded as hard but rather as corroborative evidence.

In the text of the two stotras under consideration, both scribes generally do not use *jihvāmūṭīya* instead of *visarga*. However, on three occasions, at SSR 23a (*duḥkhita*), RŚ 68b (*tamaḥkajjalāni*) and RŚ 71a (*duḥkham*), *jihvāmūṭīya* is used in both manuscripts. Since the words *duḥkha* and *duḥkhita* do not occur elsewhere in these texts, one might argue that this particular orthographical feature occurs within a specific word and may even be a conventional spelling only for these two words; however, *tamas* occurs a couple of times, e.g., in RŚ 19b, 21b and 42c, where it is consistently written with *visarga*. Unfortunately, the

<sup>23</sup> Th. Zachariae, *Epilogomena zu der Ausgabe des Mañkhakośa*. [SKAWW 141, Abh. 5]. Wien 1899, p. 9 (= *Opera Minora*, ed. C. Vogel. Wiesbaden 1977, Teil 1, p. 395).



same unequivocal situation does not obtain with regard to the use of *upadhmanīya*. The scribe of the Bodleian manuscript never resorts to using this character, whereas the scribe of the Wellcome manuscript employs it in a few instances without following any apparent underlying system.

As for the option of writing a *visarga* or the corresponding sibilant before a sibilant, both textual witnesses agree to a large extent because they usually attest the *visarga*; there is only one case where in both manuscripts a final sibilant is written instead of *visarga* (SSR 9b *mugdhāsamarabhuvam*). Another instance is found only in the Bodleian manuscript (RŚ 55d *citrabhānus sadā*). In the case of the corresponding internal *sandhi*, both scribes generally opt for the writing of double sibilants (with one exception: RŚ 41a *niśśeṣa* in the Wellcome manuscript against *niḥśeṣa* in the Bodleian manuscript).<sup>24</sup> With regard to the writing of the homorganic nasal before a consonant instead of *anusvāra*, no uniformity could be detected. Both scribes variably follow both conventions.

#### CONCLUSION

The two manuscripts of Rājānaka Ratnakaṅṭha's SSR and RŚ exhibit a number of features which suggest that the Wellcome manuscript is a direct copy of the Bodleian manuscript. The most striking are the occurrence of two lacunae in the Wellcome manuscript where the text of the Bodleian manuscript has suffered physical damage and a peculiar Kashmirian spelling in RŚ 4d which is common to both manuscripts. Further orthographic peculiarities common to both manuscripts support this hypothesis, although the overall evidence is not unequivocal.

The damage to the Bodleian manuscript extends beyond the two passages where the scribe of the Wellcome manuscript left gaps. Because the leaves of the Bodleian manuscript show a regular pattern of damage, it is likely that the copyist was confronted with more than just these two instances of missing syllables. Therefore, it can be safely concluded that the scribe did not copy his source mechanically, but edited the text: he filled the lacunae with emendations and furthermore corrected most mistakes.

---

<sup>24</sup> In RŚ 27a, the scribe of the Bodleian manuscript most probably wrote *niśśeṣa*. Actually, the lower and the left-hand part of the conjunct are lost, leaving only the *akṣara śe* partly legible. However, this occurs at the beginning of a new line and the scribe would not have separated the *visarga* from the *akṣara* it belongs to and moved it to the beginning of a new line.

Bühler reports that manuscripts are “not unfrequently [*sic*] ‘cooked,’ i.e. the lacunae and defects in the original are filled according to the fancy of the Pandit who corrects them. This most objectionable habit prevails in Kaśmîr to a very great extent, perhaps to a greater extent than in India proper”.<sup>25</sup> He further states: “In no part of India have I, however, been told of the practice of restoring or ‘cooking’ Sanskrit books with so much simplicity as in Kaśmîr”.<sup>26</sup>

Bühler made this observation with regard to Kashmirian manuscripts written in Devanāgarī script; the Wellcome manuscript is an example of a “cooked” manuscript written in Śāradā script. Hence Bühler’s warning “that complete Kaśmîr MSS. have to be used with great care, especially if they are new and the older MSS. are mutilated”<sup>27</sup> should be extended to Śāradā-script manuscripts.

Another observation worth mentioning concerns the orthography of the two manuscripts. The evidence of both textual witnesses complies neither with the Kashmirian scribal peculiarities listed by Witzel<sup>28</sup> nor with the orthographic traditions of North and West Indian Devanāgarī manuscripts, which have become the modern standard for Sanskrit editions. Instead, both witnesses present a mixture of both sets of conventions. Except for a few instances *visarga* is written before initial sibilants, whereas within words it is usually assimilated to the following sibilant. *jīhvāmūliya* before velar consonants is used in just three cases; in the majority of cases *visarga* is written. *upadhmānīya* is only found in a small number of instances in the apograph, i.e., in the Wellcome manuscript. The writing of *anusvāra* or a homorganic nasal before consonants also lacks consistency.

Finally, if the scribe of the Wellcome manuscript had not left the two lacunae in his text and had supplemented the missing text on the basis of conjecture, it would have been difficult to clarify the actual relationship between the two manuscripts. This is of particular importance because the scribe of the Wellcome manuscript did not reproduce all the errors of the Bodleian manuscript and added his own particular mistakes to the text. The application of the traditional stemmatic method would thus have led us to assume two different lines of textual tradition and to propose an incorrect stemma.

<sup>25</sup> Bühler, op. cit. (n. 18), p. 33.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Bühler, op. cit., p. 33f.

<sup>28</sup> Witzel, op. cit. (n. 18), p. 4f.