

Walking the Deckle Edge. Scribe or Author? Jayamuni and the Creation of the Nepalese Avadānamālā Literature

CAMILLO A. FORMIGATTI

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
camillo.formigatti@bodleian.ox.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

The article presents a preliminary survey of textual reuse in Nepalese collections of *jātakas* and *avadānas*, focusing in particular on three works: the *Avadānaśataka*, the *Divyāvadāna*, and the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*. The reassessment of the manuscript tradition of these three Sanskrit collections, based on Nepalese manuscripts and Tibetan translations, sheds more light on the role of scribes in the creation of these collections and of the Nepalese *avadānamālā* literature. In particular, the great role played in the 17th century by the Nepalese scribe and scholar Jayamuni in shaping the text of the *Avadānaśataka*, the *Divyāvadāna*, and many other Buddhist narrative works is brought to light. The result of this preliminary survey shows that a study of this type of collections based on the available critical editions should be rethought in the light of the specific character of their manuscript and textual transmission in medieval and early modern Nepal.

Keywords: Nepalese manuscripts, textual reuse, *avadānamālā* literature, *jātaka* & *avadāna*, codicology.

1 Introduction

The central role of narrative literature in all Buddhist traditions and Buddhist countries over Asia cannot be overestimated. *Jātakas* and *avadānas* constitute a key part of the narrative framework of canonical literature, and in some cases even of philosophical texts.¹ They inspired artists throughout history: many masterpieces of Buddhist visual art are representations of stories from previous lives of the Buddha Śākyamuni or of Bodhisattvas. As a consequence of such popularity, tracing the sources of the narrative material employed by the author is a fundamental task in the preparation of a critical edition of a *jātaka* or *avadāna*. A correct assessment of the various textual and visual sources of the story is necessary for at least two reasons. First of all, it helps the editor to choose between the different textual variants. Secondly, it enables both editor and readers to give a better appraisal of the author's literary skills in re-using the raw material for his artistic purposes. This approach however presupposes the figure of an author and takes into consideration only one or two layers of intertextuality: the reuse of narrative motifs and/or the reuse of stylistic devices. In this article I propose to analyze one additional layer of intertextuality which has largely been neglected so far: the reuse of whole texts for the creation of new 'Frankenstein-like' works.

The distinction between *text* and *work* applied in this article is rather intuitive. Nevertheless, I hope it will prove helpful for the reader. It is based on C. Segre's definition

¹ For instance, the story of king Ajātaśatru's parricide is the frame story of the *Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana-sūtra* (Harrison and Hartmann 2000).

of text:²

The text is therefore the linguistic texture of a discourse. In the meaning most prominent until the present century [Segre writes in the 20th century], it is a written discourse (whose oral utterance cannot be defined as text anymore). When we speak of the *text of a work*, we point to the linguistic texture of which the work is formed; on the other hand, if we are referring to the content, work and text are almost identical [emphasis mine].

The corpus of Buddhist narrative literature is immense. It includes texts and works belonging to different literary genres, composed in various languages (Pali, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese, Uyghur, Mongolian, Japanese etc.) over a time span of more than two millennia. Yet the scope of this article cannot possibly cover all range of texts in all languages. Focusing on three case studies, the aim of this contribution is merely to present a few reflections about the nature of textual reuse in some central works of Sanskrit Buddhist narrative literature by shedding some light on their manuscript transmission.

At a first glance, the choice of texts and works to be examined might seem random, yet they have indeed a common denominator: in what is thought to be their complete form, they have all been transmitted in Nepalese manuscripts. As we will see, this feature bears specific consequences on the shape of the text as it has been handed down to us. The literary genre of *jātakas* and *avadānas* is very widespread and well represented in Nepalese Buddhist literature. These texts played – and still play – a very important role in the life of the Nepalese Buddhist lay community.³ Many Sanskrit works and collections belonging to this genre have been composed in Nepal or transmitted mainly (often exclusively) in Nepalese manuscripts.

The importance of Nepalese manuscripts for the reconstruction and understanding of Sanskrit Buddhist literature is widely recognized. It is precisely thanks to the Nepalese manuscripts sent to Paris by Brian Houghton in 1837 that the French scholar Eugène Burnouf wrote his seminal study *Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, published in 1844. Other important collections that played a pivotal role in the spread of knowledge about Buddhism in the West are the Wright and Bendall collections of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library (henceforth CUL). They include important manuscripts of *jātaka* and *avadāna* collections, on which numerous *editiones principes* are based: for instance E.B. Cowell's and R.A. Neil's edition of the *Divyāvadāna* (published in 1886), J. S. Speyer's edition of the *Avadānaśataka* (published in 1902 and based on manuscript Add.1611, the oldest complete witness of this text), R. Handurukande's edition of the *Avadānasārasamuccaya* (published in 1984), and more recently M. Straube's editions of selected *avadānas* from Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (Straube 2006 and Straube 2009).

While cataloguing the Cambridge manuscripts, I started to look at *jātaka* and *avadāna*

² The original Italian is as follows: 'Il testo è dunque il tessuto linguistico di un discorso. Nell'accezione prevalsa fino a questo secolo, si tratta di discorso scritto (la cui realizzazione vocale non è più denominabile come testo). Quando si parla del testo di un'opera, si indica il tessuto linguistico del discorso che la costituisce; se viceversa si allude al contenuto, opera e testo sono pressoché identici' (Segre 2014, 298). Mieke Bal provides a very similar definition of text, broadening the picture by including non-verbal elements: 'A text is a finite, structured whole composed of signs. These can be linguistic units, such as words and sentences, but they can also be different signs [...] The finite ensemble of signs does not mean that the text itself is finite, for its meanings, effects, functions, and background are not. It only means that there is a first and a last word to be identified' (Bal 2009, 5).

³ On the role of *avadānas* in the rituals of Newar Buddhists, see for instance Lewis et al. 2000.

collections with different eyes. Although as a student I started reading and studying Buddhist narrative literature, in recent years my research efforts have been focused mainly on manuscripts studies. Accordingly, the approach of the present study is more codicological in nature, dealing with the history of the book, rather than focusing on the content of the works.

2 Once again about a *vexata quaestio*

The difference between *jātakas* and *avadānas* is a topic that is still debated nowadays: at the conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies that took place in 2014 in Vienna, a whole panel was more or less dedicated to this question (Panel 04: Buddhist Narrative Genres). Obviously I cannot possibly provide here an exhaustive treatment of this topic. Nevertheless, I believe I should at least mention some aspects of this *vexata quaestio*, in order to better understand the peculiar role played by the Nepalese tradition in the textual transmission of important works of the Sanskrit Buddhist narrative literature. Matsumura (1980, xi–xv) provides a summary of the various theories about the origin of the term *avadāna/apadāna*, the definitions of what is an *avadāna*, its function and position in the *navāṅga-* or *dvādaśāṅga-pravacana*, as well as the differences between *avadāna* and *jātaka*. Setting aside the question of the etymology of the term *avadāna*,⁴ it is worth stressing that the criteria usually adduced to distinguish *avadānas* from *jātakas* concern mostly the content and inner structure of these texts (Matsumura 1980, xv–xvii and xxx–xxxiii). For instance, one criterion is that ‘where the main actor is a Bodhisattva, the story is called a *jātaka*’, another one is that ‘while the *avadāna* is merely a story of the past, the *jātaka* is a story which narrates past events in connection with the present’ (Matsumura 1980, xxx). However, a distinction between *jātakas* and *avadānas* based solely on the content is very difficult. In fact, the classification of a story as *jātaka* or *avadāna* according to its content and structure is often defied by the ‘inherently structural and thematic closeness of the two genres’; more importantly, the resemblances of the two genres ‘seem to have increased in the course of time’ (Straube 2015, 492). It is therefore not surprising that,

not infrequently different versions of the same story were entitled *avadāna*, and on other occasions, they were referred to as *jātaka*. *Jātakas* were also sometimes interpreted as just special forms of *avadānas*, as can be inferred by the term *bodhisattvāvadāna* (*avadāna* of the Bodhisattva) used as a synonym for *jātaka* (Straube 2015, 492).

Interesting as it may be for other reasons, still I believe that the answer to the question ‘*jātaka* or *avadāna*?’ would not help us much in understanding the different forms of textual reuse in Nepalese Buddhist narrative literature.⁵

A classification of Buddhist narrative literature based on different criteria might be more helpful for our task. In his 1992 monograph *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta. Two*

⁴ About this topic, see: Handurukande 1967, xix–xxii, Matsumura 1980, xi–xviii and xxx–xxxiii, Ohnuma 2007, 291n31. The most plausible hypothesis is that the term *apadāna/avadāna* derives from agricultural terminology (‘reaping; harvesting’) and refers metaphorically to the harvesting of the fruits of a person’s past deeds, as pointed out by Tatelman (2000, 5–6) and Straube (2015, 490–491).

⁵ See also the following remark by Matsumura: ‘Because originally *jātakas* and *avadānas* did not have a standard of classification in the same dimension, if the form and purpose of the usage is fulfilled, the same story can be a *jātaka* and it can also be an *avadāna*. Winternitz makes the following shrewd observation: ‘Auf diese Weise war es möglich, jede beliebige Geschichte, die sich das Volk erzählte oder die man aus der weltlichen Literatur kannte, in ein *Jātaka* zu verwandeln’ (Matsumura 1980, xxxviii).

Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra, M. Hahn proposes a four-fold typological scheme based on the stylistic features of the different texts and works: 1. narrations in prose, 2. narrations in verse, 3. mixture of prose and verse, and 4. hybrid forms.⁶ More recently, Leif Asplund proposed a five-fold classification, partly based on stylistic and formal features, and partly based on historical considerations (Asplund 2013, 2): ‘1. Prose avadāna collections; 2. Vinaya texts and sūtras containing jātakas and avadānas among other material; 3. Literary avadāna-collections; 4. The metrical avadānamālā collections [...] which were at least partly composed in Nepal; 5. Single avadānas of diverse types and ages.’

In both lists, works which according to their title are collections of exclusively *jātakas* or of *avadānas* are listed under the same category. For instance, in Hahn’s list, Āryaśūra’s, Haribhaṭṭa’s, and Gopadatta’s *Jātakamālās* are all listed under the category ‘Mixture of prose and verse’ together with the *Sumagadhavadāna* and *Viśvāntarāvadāna*. On the other hand, in Asplund’s list the three *Jātakamālās* are subsumed under the category ‘Literary avadāna-collections’, together with Kṣemendra’s *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. This is not surprising, as we have seen it is difficult to distinguish between *jātakas* and *avadānas*. What is then so different about these two schemes? Why are they more useful for our purpose? In their classifications, the two scholars introduce a stylistic criterion that leads them to group together works which share an important common feature. All works listed under Hahn’s subcategories of the ‘Mixture of prose and verse’ (‘early Campū’, ‘full-fledged, classical Campū’ and ‘late, epigonal Campū’) are original compositions of authors, not compilations of older material of different provenance like the *Avadānaśataka* or the *Divyavadāna*, both listed under a different category (Narrations in prose). This aspect is reflected more clearly in Asplund’s category ‘Literary avadāna-collections’, in which the works listed are all *kāvya*s, ornate poems that not only fulfill the religious purpose of spreading the Dharma, but have also an aesthetic value.⁷

Three important collections not directly mentioned in the two schemes are the *Mahajjātakamālā*, the *Bhadrakalpāvadāna*, and the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*. The first two belong to the *avadānamālā* literature, while the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* represent yet a different case.⁸ The forms of textual reuse we observe in such anonymous collections (or in canonical texts) are obviously different than the ones found in authorial works. The *kavis*’ effort for originality is seen in their reuse of the narrative material, which is reshaped by means of poetical figures (*artha-* and *śabdālāṅkāras*). In authorial poetical works, we might be able to spot also indirect homages to previous poets, or maybe even direct homages acknowledging the merits of predecessors (like in the well-known stanza by Kṣemendra’s son Somendra at the end of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*). Maybe we would be able trace the influence of other authors in terms of themes or lexical choices, but most probably we would not find passages quoted word for word without acknowledging the source. On the other hand, the compilers of anonymous collections of *jātakas* and *avadānas* had a totally different understanding of the notions of authenticity and authoriality. Almost invariably, they did not feel the necessity of mentioning the texts or works they were adapting, with the effect that the boundaries between authorial work, compilation, and semi-authorial adapted work are blurred. In

⁶ The complete and detailed classification is provided in Hahn 1992, 4.

⁷ Notably, also in Straube’s entry we find distinct sections devoted to anonymous collections (*Narratives Dispersed in Canonical Texts* [...], *Narratives Dispersed in Commentaries*, *Anonymous Collections in Sanskrit Prose with Interspersed Verse*, etc.) and authorial works (*The Jātakamālās and Their Predecessors*, *Kṣemendra’s Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*) (Straube 2015, *passim*).

⁸ As I explain in the section of this article dedicated to it (in which I mention the *Mahajjātakamālā* as well).

this article I will focus on three such collections: the *Avadānaśataka*, the *Divyāvadāna*, and the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*. Each of them represents a different type of anonymous Buddhist narrative work and they bear traces of different forms of textual reuse.

3 *Avadānaśataka*

The *Avadānaśataka* (AvŚ) is considered one of the most ancient collections of Buddhist legends. In its earliest form, it is dated to the early centuries CE. It was translated into Chinese and Tibetan during the first millennium CE, gaining large popularity across Asia. Together with the *Divyāvadāna*, it was taken by Burnouf as representative of the literary genre of the *avadāna*.⁹ According to M. Demoto, based on the date of the Chinese translations and the character of the language, the original core of this collection is to be dated between the first half of the 5th century and the beginning of the 6th century CE at the latest.¹⁰ More importantly, the *Avadānaśataka* underwent a redactional process around the 7th century CE in a Mūlasarvāstivāda environment.¹¹ For the sake of clarity, I provide here the tentative chronology of the different stages in the formation of the *Avadānaśataka* according to Demoto (2006, 212):

Compilation of the Ur-AvŚ	2nd ~ 6th (beginning) century A.D.
Chinese translation of the AvŚ	5th (mid) ~ 6th (end) century A.D.
Revision of the Sanskrit AvŚ	? ~ 7th century A.D.
Schøyen fr.[agment]	6th ~ ? century A.D.
Tibetan translation of the AvŚ	9th century A.D.
Sanskrit ms F (the oldest manuscript used by Speyer)	14th ~ 15th century A.D.
Sanskrit ms B (the main source of Speyer's edition)	1645 A.D.

The Sanskrit text of the *Avadānaśataka* as we read it in the printed editions¹² is basically transmitted by one single manuscript kept in the Cambridge University Library, CUL Add.1611, a Nepalese manuscript dated 1645 CE.¹³ Older fragmentary manuscripts have survived, but this is the oldest complete source for the reconstruction of the text. For the sake of convenience, a short list of the manuscripts of the *Avadānaśataka* grouped according to provenance and writing material is provided here, while the complete

⁹ See Burnouf 2010 (p.?), and Demoto 2006, 207.

¹⁰ '[T]he estimate of the latest possible date of the Sanskrit AvŚ [...] is now some time before the latest possible date of the Chinese AvŚ. Reasonably one has to reckon with a span of at least several decades between the first appearance of a new work in India and the completion of its Chinese translation. Hence the latest possible date for the Sanskrit original would be the beginning of the 6th century A.D. However, the language and style of the AvŚ make such a late date rather unlikely. In our opinion it should have come into being not later than the first half of the 5th century. We have no proof of any Buddhist work written in that archaic form of Sanskrit later than the 4th century. Without further circumstantial evidence it will not be possible to determine the *terminus ante quem* more precisely' (Demoto 2006, 210).

¹¹ 'And it has to be born in mind that we are speaking of the Sanskrit text that formed the basis of the Chinese AvŚ, which is not necessarily identical with the Sanskrit text in the present form. On the contrary: a close comparison of both texts has revealed that the latter is the result of a revision done probably by the Mūlasarvāstivādins' (Demoto 2006, 210).

¹² Speyer (1902) and Vaidya (1958).

¹³ 'The *Avadānaśataka* text rests on one MS, the Cambridge Add.1611 [...] The other three MSS I have collated, CDP have been copied from it' (Speyer 1902, CIII–CVII).

description is provided in Appedix 1:

1. Greater Gandhāra and Central Asian fragments, 6th–8th century CE:
 - Schøyen Collection (Afghanistan): 38 birch-bark fragments of ten different folios, from two different manuscripts;
 - Fragments on paper from Turfan (SHT V 1318a and SHT I 35).
2. Nepalese incomplete palm-leaf manuscripts, in Nepālākṣarā script, 12th–15th century CE (CUL Add.1680.2.1-4 = F in Speyer’s edition; NGMCP E 1554-24, A 936-2, and B 2443);
3. Nepalese paper manuscripts, 17th–19th century CE (CUL Add.1611 = B in Speyer’s edition; NGMCP A 118-4; Hodgson manuscript in the India Office Library; CUL Add.1386 (C in Speyer’s edition), NGMCP B 101-20; Hodgson manuscript D. 122 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris = P in Speyer’s edition; NGMCP B 95-11).

As we have seen, the Greater Gandhāra fragments in the Schøyen collection belong to the period in which the text of the *Avadānaśataka* underwent a process of revision by the Mūlasarvāstivādins. But what is the difference between the older strata of the *Avadānaśataka* transmitted in these fragments, the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts, and the Nepalese paper manuscripts? It consists precisely of a type of textual reuse typical of this kind of Buddhist narrative literature: the use of clichés and formulas. Jens-Uwe Hartmann has already provided an analysis of the linguistic peculiarities of the *Avadānaśataka* in order to establish its school affiliation (Hartmann 1985). Although mostly restricted to small formulaic expression, his article contains also very useful references to other Buddhist texts in which passages occur that are found *verbatim* in the *Avadānaśataka* as well. In my analysis I would like however to focus more on the overall structure of the work, at least at the outset.

In the revised Sanskrit text as well as in the Tibetan translation, at the beginning of each story the Buddha is introduced by means of an expanded formulaic opening. On the other hand, this formula is absent in the fragments from Afghanistan and in the Chinese translation.¹⁴ A stroke of serendipity allows us to compare the use of clichés and formulas throughout the transmission of the Sanskrit text of the *Avadānaśataka*, from the Greater Gandhāra fragments in the Schøyen collection to the Nepalese paper manuscripts. The text of the *Śibyāvadāna* (AvŚ 34), the *Surūpāvadāna* (AvŚ 35), and the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* (AvŚ 39) are extant in all stages of the transmission of the Sanskrit version, even though in some cases only in a fragmentary form (see Appendix 1). In what follows, I will compare the use of clichés in the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* as transmitted in the fragments from Afghanistan, in CUL Add.1680.2.3, in CUL Add.1611, and in the Tibetan translation. For the sake of the readers’ convenience, I provide here a brief summary of the story.¹⁵ The Buddha is residing at Śrāvastī, in Anāthapiṇḍada’s garden, the Jeta Grove. One day he decides to go to the city for alms and while he is roaming the royal road, he encounters a brahmin. After having recognized the Buddha thanks to the supernatural light radiating from him, the brahmin draws a line in the sand and orders the Buddha not to cross it until he is given five hundred *purāṇas* (*karṣāpaṇa* in the Tibetan translation). On hearing this news, many people and gods come to help the Buddha, offering to make the payment for him. The Buddha refuses help from everybody except from Anāthapiṇḍada, whom he tells to pay the brahmin the five hundred *purāṇas*.

¹⁴ ‘[T]he Chinese translation as well as the fragments from Afghanistan [...] simply inform us about the place where the Buddha stays’ (Demoto 2006, 212).

¹⁵ The whole Sanskrit text of the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* and the Tibetan translation are provided in Appendix 2.

Anāthapiṇḍada has to pay because of his actions in a previous life, when he was the son of a counsellor of king Brahmadata. At that time, the Buddha was the crown prince and they were both friends. One day the counsellor's son was playing a game of dice with a gambler, to whom he lost five hundred *purāṇas*. The counsellor's son could not pay his debt and thus the crown prince first vouched for his friend, offering to pay the debt. Afterwards he thought however that since he was the crown prince, he was entitled not to pay the debt. Since in this previous life the brahmin was the gambler, Anāthapiṇḍada has to repay his debt to him in his present life.

The structure of *jātakas* and *avadānas* is tripartite, consisting of a story of the present (*pratyutpannavastu*, set at the time of the narrator, usually the Buddha or a Buddhist saint), a story of the past (*atītavastu*), and the identification of the characters in the present with the characters in the past, i.e. in their former births (*samavadhāna*).¹⁶ As invariably is the case in the *Avadānaśataka* (and often in other collections too), in the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* clichés and formulas are used where the time and place of action of the two stories are set, namely at the beginning of the *pratyutpannavastu* and of the *atītavastu*, and in the *samavadhāna*. In the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* they are of a twofold character:

1. Stock descriptions:¹⁷

- The Buddha is residing in a place near a city and decides to go to the city for alms (*buddho bhagavān satkrto gurukrto [...] saśrāvakaśaṅghaḥ [city] viharati [Buddha's place of residence] atha bhagavān pūrvāhne nivāsya pātracīvaram ādāya [city] piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat*); somebody sees the Buddha walking on the street, endowed with the thirty-two marks of a great man etc. ([person seeing the Buddha] *dadarśa buddhaṃ bhagavantaṃ [...] jaṅgamam iva ratnaparvataṃ samantato bhadrakam*).
- The prosperous reign of a virtuous king ([name of the king] *raja rājyaṃ kārayati rddhaṃ [...] ekaputram iva rājyaṃ pālayati*).
- The spring time (*so 'pareṇa samayena vasantakālasamaye [...] vanaṣaṇḍe amāyaputrparivṛtaḥ krīḍati ramate*).

2. The ripening of the fruits of past deeds:

- *bhagavān āha: icchatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ śrotum [...] na praṇaśyanti karmāṇy kalpakotiśatair api | sāmagrīm prāpya kālaṃ ca phalanti khalu dehinām;*
- *iti hi bhikṣavaḥ ekāntakṣṇānāṃ karmaṇām [...] ekāntaśukleṣv eva karmasv ābhogaḥ karaṇīyaḥ.*

These clichés occur verbatim not only in other stories of the *Avadānaśataka*, but – as to be expected – in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (hereafter MSV) and in the *Divyāvadāna* as well. In the case of the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna*, the clichés of the ripening of the fruits of past deeds are particularly helpful for our purpose. The two passages in which they occur are a sort of litmus test, enabling us to shed more light on the process of textual reuse and its role in the shaping of the *Avadānaśataka* as we know it. Apparently, already at an early stage in the transmission the end of this story suffered the loss of parts of the text. Due to an apparent inconsistency in the narration, Speyer presupposed the loss of a

¹⁶ On this topic, see von Hinüber 1998 and 1998a.

¹⁷ When occurring in other stories, the only differences in these stock descriptions are obviously the name of the place where the Buddha was residing and the names of the other characters in the story. Other stock descriptions occurring quite often include for instance the description of the birth, naming ceremony and education of a child.

significant portion of text between the sentences *tato 'mātyaputras tena puruṣeṇa pañca purāṇaśatāni [...]* *pratibhūr avasthitah* and *tena me saṃsāre 'nantam bhogavyasanam anubhūtam*. Moreover, if we were to read the text as printed by Speyer, a second loss would be represented by the apparent absence of the *samavadhāna*. On the other hand, the text of this story was edited by Speyer in a rather eclectic way, partly following the shorter version transmitted in CUL Add.1680.2.3, and partly following the expanded version of CUL Add.1611. Firstly, he chose to follow the text of CUL Add.1680.2.3, in which the *samavadhāna* is absent. Accordingly, he did not include it in the main text, merely recording its presence in CUL Add.1611 in the critical apparatus, where he also mentions in brief that this passage is present in the Tibetan translation as well. The synoptic table in Appendix 2 enables us to compare easily the text transmitted in CUL Add.1680.2.3 with the one in CUL Add.1611. We notice immediately that in the latter manuscript the story is expanded precisely by means of the first cliché about the ripening of the fruits of deeds (*bhagavān āha icchatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ śrotum [...]* *sāmagrīm prāpya kālaṃ ca phalanti khalu dehinām*). In this case, Speyer decided to include the cliché in the main text of his edition, even though he recognized its nature of probable interpolation and put part of it within brackets (from *tathāgatenaītāni bhikṣavaḥ pūrvam* to *phalanti khalu dehinām*): ‘This commonplace is here much shorter than it is ordinarily. It is also put in the wrong place. For this reason, and because F omits it, I have bracketed it (Speyer 1902, 225 fn. 3). The result of this editorial choice is that the actual process of textual transmission is disguised. Speyer decided to retain this cliché even though it is absent in the two oldest witnesses at his disposal, the Tibetan translation and CUL Add.1680.2.3 (as it is immediately clear from the synoptic table in Appendix 2). On the other hand, he decided to exclude the text of the *samavadhāna*, although it is present in the oldest witness used by him, the Tibetan translation, and in his main source, CUL Add.1611. Truly, in the latter manuscript the *samavadhāna* is inserted in the wrong place, but probably this is also the case of the cliché about the ripening of the fruits of deeds, as we have seen. If we look only at the evidence of the Sanskrit witnesses, apparently there is no cogent reason to treat these two passages differently. Had Speyer followed the text as transmitted in CUL Add.1680.2.3, he should have excluded both passages. He could have also chosen to follow CUL Add.1611, retaining both passages (although probably in the wrong place). Instead, he decided to include one passage and exclude the other. In any case, we have to say to his credit that regardless of his choice, he would have printed a text that was clearly corrupted. In my opinion, the solution to this conundrum lies in the Tibetan translation.

Undoubtedly, the whole passage after *bhagavān āha icchatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ śrotum* up to the end of the story underwent some process of deterioration during the early stages of transmission. According to Demoto, already the passage containing the stock description of spring is corrupt, since the wording of this cliché in other stories of the *Avadānaśataka* is different. In other *avadānas*, its initial part runs as follows: *apareṇa samayena saṃprāpte vasantakālasamaye saṃpuṣpīteṣu pādapeṣu haṃsakrauñcamayūraśuka-śārikākokilajīvañjīvakanirghoṣite vanaṣaṇḍe* (*Dharmapālavadāna*, AvŚ vol. 1, p.179.3; *Śrīmatyavadāna*, Avś vol. 1, p. 307.10; *Kapphiṇāvadāna*, AvŚ vol. 2, p.109.15). She therefore concludes that since ‘the Tibetan translation reflects the wording of ms B [CUL Add.1611], without *saṃprāpte* and with *krīḍati ramate*, [...] the mistake occurred already before the 9th century A.D.’ (Demoto 2006, 230, fn. 98).

A closer comparison of the Schøyen fragment with the Sanskrit original of CUL Add.1611 and the Tibetan translation might shed some light about the various stages of this

process of textual corruption. As we have seen, the Schøyen manuscripts represent an early stage of the transmission. Although the fragments containing the story of *Anāthapiṇḍada* are very small, luckily it is possible to determine whether the text contained the clichés or not. Surely the simile of the Buddha with a mountain was already an integral part of the story, for precisely the words *iva ratnaparvatam* survived (Demoto 2006, 229–230). Also the cliché of the ripening of the fruits of black, white and mixed deeds had already been incorporated in the story, as confirmed by the presence of the words *tarhi bhikṣava ekā°* and *śikṣitavyam ida°* (Demoto 2006, 229 and 231). More interesting is the case of the *samavadhāna* and of the first cliché of the ripening of fruits of past deeds. According to Demoto’s calculation of the length of the complete folio containing the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna*, it is possible to ‘say with great certainty that our old manuscript also lacked the passage’, like in the case of CUL Add.1680.2.3 (Demoto 2006, 231, fn. 99). This fact brings up one question: how come that the *samavadhāna* and the cliché occur both in the Tibetan translation as well as in CUL Add.1611?

The Sanskrit original used by the Tibetan translators in the 9th century most probably was different from the source used by the scribe of CUL Add.1611.¹⁸ Although it might have been already defective, it was still in a far better form than the source of CUL Add.1611. Even though the *samavadhāna* is present in both witnesses, in the Tibetan translation it occurs in the right place and contains sentences that connect the story of the past with the identification in a more consistent and understandable way than in its late Nepalese counterpart, CUL Add.1611. In the *atītavastu* of the Tibetan translation, the prince is playing in a park accompanied by his retinue, consisting of the sons of the king’s counsellors. One of his friends, the son of a counsellor, was playing a game of dice with another man.¹⁹ When his friend lost five hundred *kārṣāpaṇas* to the other man, ‘the king’s son vouched for him. Conscious of his power, the prince thought “I am the king’s son” and did not pay.’²⁰ The identification is provided only after this passage, and is followed by a brief statement about the consequences of the Buddha’s past actions in the present. The story then concludes with the clichés of the ripening of the fruits of black, white and mixed deeds. Demoto proposes two alternative explanations for this discrepancy with the text of the Schøyen fragments. The first one is that the Tibetan translators had access to a more correct manuscript belonging to a different line of transmission. However, she leans toward the second explanation, apparently corroborated by the Chinese translations: the Sanskrit manuscript used by the Tibetan translators ‘must have had the same corrupt text similar to that of ms B [CUL Add.1611] [...] The Tibetan translators supplemented the passage by conjecturing the plot from the remaining passages’ (Demoto 2006, *ibidem*). Both explanations are plausible – as we have seen, the Tibetan translation provides a meaningful text.

On the other hand, the text of this passage in CUL Add.1611 represents a different case. The identification occurs at the wrong place, directly after the passage in which the Buddha explains why, due to his past deeds, he is experiencing distressing events in the present.²¹ Logically it should occur before this passage, as in the Tibetan translation. Not

¹⁸ The complete Tibetan translation of the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* is provided in Appendix 2.

¹⁹ Tib. *de’i grogs po blon po’i bu zhig yod pa de rgyan po byed pa’i mi gzhan zhig dang lhan cig tu cho los rtses pa las.*

²⁰ Demoto (2006, 231, fn. 99); Tib. *blon po’i bu de mi des kār ṣā pa ṅa lnga brgyas pham par byas nas | rgyal po’i bus kyang de’i gnya’ byas pa las de mithu dang ldan te | nga ni rgyal po’i bu’o snyam nas ma byin no.*

²¹ Skt. *tena me saṃsāre ’nantam bhogavyasanam anubhūtam | idānīm apy abhisambuddhabodhir anena bādhitah;* see the synoptic table in Appendix 2.

only did the scribe insert the *samavadhāna* at the wrong place, but he did so in a rather mechanical way. It almost seems that he considered the whole passage as the piece of a puzzle – or if you prefer, as a limb of Frankenstein’s creature. He moved it around, trying to find the right position for it, but at the end he inserted it where it didn’t fit at all: the passage that ends with the words *yo (')sau puruṣaḥ sa brāhmaṇa iti* is immediately followed by a cliché that starts again with the word *iti*. On the other hand, if we play this game and move the piece to a more suitable position in the puzzle, we obtain an almost meaningful text, anyway much closer to the Tibetan translation. For the sake of clarity, I provide here a restored passage from CUL Add.1611, in which the *samavadhāna* is moved to the more appropriate place, followed by the corresponding passage in the Tibetan translation. In the Sanskrit text, the passage included between ***three asterisks*** is the part moved from its original position in CUL Add.1611 (cf. Appendix 2; in the Tibetan translation it is also included between ***three asterisks***:

*vayasyo 'matyaputraḥ vayasyaḥ | so 'pareṇa puruṣeṇa sārddham akṣaiḥ krīḍitavān | tato 'mātyaputraḥ tena puruṣeṇa pañca purāṇasātāni nirjitaḥ | rājaputraś cāsya pratibhūr avasthita ***iti | kiṃ manyadhve bhikṣavo yo 'sau tena kalena tena samayena jyeṣṭhakumāro yuvarājo babhūvāhaṃ || yo 'sau amātyaputra sa anāthapiṇḍado gṛhapati yo 'sau puruṣaḥ sa brāhmaṇa iti |*** tena adattādānena me saṃsāre 'nantam bhogavyasanam anubhūtam | idānīm apy abhisambuddhabodhir anena bādhitā iti | hi bhikṣavaḥ ekāntakṛṣṇānām karmaṇām ekāntakṛṣṇo vipākāḥ [...]*

One of his [i.e. the prince’s] friends, the son of a courtier, played a game of dice with another man. That courtier’s son lost five hundred *purāṇas* to the other man, and the king’s son provided surety for the debt. ***What do you think, monks? He who at that time and on that occasion was the eldest prince, that was me. He who was the counsellor’s son, that was the householder Anāthapiṇḍada; he who was the [other] man, that is the brahmin.*** *Thus, because [I] did not give the money [owed], during my transmigration I experienced endless misfortunes concerning my wealth, and even now my completely awakened buddhahood is oppressed by him. For thus, monks, entirely black deeds have entirely black fruits [...]*²²

*de'i grogs po blon po 'i bu zhig yod pa de rgyan po byed pa 'i mi gzhan zhig dang lhan cig tu cho los rtse pa las blon po 'i bu de mi des kār sā pa ṇa lnga brgyas pham par byas nas | rgyal po 'i bus kyang de'i gnya' byas pa las de mthu dang ldan te | nga ni rgyal po 'i bu'o snyam nas ma byin no || ***dge slong dag ji snyam du sems | de'i tshe de'i dus na rgyal po 'i bur gyur pa gang yin pa de ni nga yin no || blon po 'i bu ni khyim bdag mgon med zas sbyin yin no || rgyan po byed pa ni bram ze 'di kho na yin te |*** ngas gnya' byas pa las nga ni rgyal po 'i bu yin no snyam nas rgyan po byed pa de la kār sā pa ṇa ma byin pa des na nga 'khor ba na longs spyod kyis phongs pa mtha' yas pa myong la da ltar byang chub mngon bar rdzogs par sangs rgyas pa na yang 'dis bu lon bdas so | dge slong dag de ltar na las gcig tu nges par gnag pa rnams ni rnam par smin pa yang gcig tu nges par gnag par 'gyur ro | [...]*

He [i.e. the prince], had a friend, a son of a courtier. Having played a game of dice with another man, a gambler, the courtier’s son lost five hundred *karṣāpaṇas* to the man. The king’s son vouched for him, but then, conscious of his power, the prince thought ‘I am the king’s son’ and did not pay. ***What do you think, monks? At that time and on that occasion, he who was the prince, that was me. He who was the counsellor’s son, that was the householder Anāthapiṇḍada; he who was the gambler, that is this brahmin.*** *After having vouched, because I thought ‘I am the king’s son’, I did not give him the five hundred karṣāpaṇas; for this reason, during my transmigration I experienced endless misfortunes due to my wealth, and*

²² Except for the part between asterisks and the emphasized expression (translated by me), this translation is quoted from Appleton (2014, 27).

even now that in awakened buddhahood I am a Buddha completely, this [brahmin] urges for [the payment of] the debt. For thus, monks, entirely black deeds have entirely black fruits [...]²³

If we compare these two passages, we notice that after the *samavadhāna* has been moved, the Sanskrit text corresponds almost exactly to the Tibetan translation, at least as far as their basic structures is concerned. Moreover, in CUL Add.1611 the insertion of the word *adattādānena* in the margin solves – at least partly – the apparent inconsistency of the passage, linking the identification to the following sentence, in which the Buddha relates the difficulties experienced by him in the present to his actions in previous lives (*tena adattādānena me saṃsāre [...] idānīm apy abhisambuddhabodhir anena bādhitā*). Indeed this short expression (*tena adattādānena*) does not correspond word for word to the Tibetan translation (*rgyan po byed pa de la kār śā pa ṅa ma byin pa des na*), but still it provides a more meaningful text than the one of the printed edition. This passage was probably corrupt already in the 14th–15th century, for it is missing in CUL Add.1680.2.3. We have seen that also the cliché about the ripening of deeds (*tathāgatānaitāni bhikṣavaḥ pūrvam anyāsu [...] karmāṇi kṛtāni vipacyante śubhāny aśubhāni ca*) is absent in CUL Add.1680.2.3. As in the case of the Tibetan translation, I believe that also for the text of CUL Add.1611 we have two possible explanations: either the scribe had access to a different manuscript in which the text was in a better state and from which he copied the clichés and the *samavadhāna* (however inserting them in the wrong place); or he edited the text himself, supplying the missing parts (the clichés, the *samavadhāna*, and the explanation *adattādānena* in the margin), taking them from other sources (like the *Dīvyāvadāna* or a passage from the MSV, or even the Tibetan translation). Indeed if we examine CUL Add.1611 more closely, we notice that on numerous folios the scribe added corrections and missing passages in the margins (for instance on f. 36v and 38v). Apparently he was rather scrupulous, he wasn't copying the text without paying attention to its meaning.

Who was this scribe? Unfortunately, the colophon simply provides the date of completion of the manuscript, without mentioning the scribe. I believe however that it is possible to identify him. In terms of its codicological and palaeographical features, CUL Add.1611 is incredibly similar to CUL Add.1586, a paper manuscript of the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā* dated 1661 CE and written by the Buddhist scribe Jayamuni.²⁴ Most probably he was also the scribe of CUL Add. 1585, a manuscript of the *Sumāgadhāvadāna* – unfortunately incomplete, undated and with no mention of the scribe, but which shares the same codicological and palaeographical features with the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā* manuscript. Moreover, this manuscript starts with the very same stock description *buddho bhagavān satkṛto gurukṛto* etc. as the stories of the Nepalese recension of the *Avadānaśataka*.

Jayamuni wrote many other manuscripts of important Buddhist works and texts. He is mentioned in the colophon of a manuscript of the *Mahāvastu* written in 1657 CE.²⁵ He is credited to have written also a manuscript of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* in 1643 CE (NGMCP H 380/8; Nepāla Saṃvat 764), as well as an undated manuscript of the

²³ The emphasized sentences provide a fuller explanation than the one in the Sanskrit original of CUL Add.1611, in which it is merely hinted at by the word *adattādānena* added in the margin.

²⁴ CUL Add.1586, f. 20v8: *saṃvat 781 jeṣṭhaśukla ekadāśyām saṃpūrṇṇayātam (!) iti | śrīmahābuddhopāsikaśrījayamunilikhitam iti śubham astu sarvadā sarvam jagatām śivam bodhilābham iti ||*.

²⁵ Described in NGMCP B 98-14; on this manuscript, see also Tournier 2012 and forthcoming.

Sugatāvadāna (NGMCP H380/7).²⁶ Several other manuscripts can be attributed to him with a good degree of certainty. The most interesting are the oldest known manuscript of a metrical adaptation of the *Avadānaśataka*, the *Kalpadrūmāvadānamālā* (NGMCP A 117-13 to A 118-1),²⁷ as well as the oldest known manuscript of the *Mahājātakamālā* (NGMCP B 98-15).²⁸ In a private communication, Vincent Tournier pointed out to me the existence of another manuscript possibly written by Jayamuni, NGMCP A 131/14, a paper manuscript of the *Dhīmatīparipṛcchāvadāna*. Unfortunately, since we did not have access to a reproduction, this identification remains hypothetical. Finally, also a manuscript of Yaśomitra's *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (CUL MS Add.1041) is probably to be assigned to Jayamuni. Although the colophon provides the date 1551 CE and the name of the scribe as Paṇḍita Siddhasena, already Bendall doubted the original character of the date and the name of the scribe.²⁹ If we compare the handwriting, layout and paper, again we notice many close similarities between this manuscript and the other manuscripts listed above.³⁰

The editorial work that the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* underwent is a further confirmation of the correct identification of the scribe of CUL Add.1611 with Jayamuni. In a recent article, V. Tournier describes a trajectory of transmission for the *Mahāvastu* which is very similar to the one of the *Avadānaśataka* as described above. The earliest complete manuscript of 'a vinaya text called *Mahāvastu* [...] labelled as manuscript "Sa" by its editor Yuyama' is written in a variety of Nepālākṣarā script dated to the 12th–13th century (Tournier 2012, 95). As described by Tournier at length, Jayamuni played a fundamental and active role in the transmission:

The second oldest manuscript after Sa is dated (Nepāla-)Saṃvat (N.S.) 777, corresponding to 1657 AD, and this copy, which I called Ta, is demonstrably an apograph of Sa. There is therefore a gap of four to five centuries between the copy of Sa and its direct copy, which is considerable indeed. We should take into account such a gap to put into perspective the reception of the *Mahāvastu* at the end of the Malla period. My impression is that manuscript Sa was re-discovered by the copyist of Ta himself, named Jayamuni. This Jayamuni was not a mere scribe, but an important figure of the religious landscape of his time. He is known by the so-called 'Buddhist-*vaṃśāvalī*' as the 'great paṇḍita of [the] Mahābuddha[-vihāra]' [...] We learn from the same source two important facts about Jayamuni's career. First, he

²⁶ See Tournier forthcoming and Marciniak 2014, 65.

²⁷ For a description of this manuscript, see Asplund 2013, 56-59; see also the NGMCP Wiki.

²⁸ For a description of this manuscript, see Bühnemann-Hahn 1985, 66-68; see also the NGMCP Wiki. The attribution of this manuscript to Jayamuni is almost certainly correct. In the *editio princeps* of this work, Hahn states that unfortunately some useful information about the scribe is lost due to the damaged colophon. Moreover, in the description of another manuscript of the *Mahājātakamālā* kept in Paris he adds the remark that the colophon was copied from NGMCP B 98-15, attributing this manuscript to Amṛtānanda, who should have written it in 1773-74 CE (Nepāla Saṃvat 894) (Bühnemann-Hahn 1985, 68). This attribution must be rectified, for what Hahn considers to be the colophon of NGMCP B 98-15 is in reality a reader's note, maybe even written by the famous Paṇḍit Amṛtānanda, B. H. Hodgson's close collaborator. In fact, in the versified colophon of NGMCP B 98-15 we can still read the words *li[khīvedam] jagannātha-mahābuddha-prasādāt | śra [334v1] nir[dh]ā jagaddhite || etatpunyānubhāvena sambodhisādhanam vrotam | ja[ya] mun. .. s. .. [bhadradam] ||* (according to Demoto's transcription). This corroborates further the attribution of this manuscript to Jayamuni.

²⁹ '[T]he date is not wholly trustworthy, as there this line and that above have been retouched' (Bendall, 1883, 26).

³⁰ See also the description by Bendall (1883, 25): '[t]he writing resembles that of MS. 1586 (A.D. 1661) [...] This was said to be the only copy of the work existing in Nepal, and the owner had a copy made for himself.' Another manuscript that can be tentatively assigned to Jayamuni is NGMCP A 179-5, which however contains a Śaiva text, the *Mahākālasaṃhitā*.

was trained in Sanskrit, as he undertook a travel to Vārāṇasī to learn grammar and other *vidyās* with *paṇḍitas*. Second, he is said to have brought back from India an important textual collection.³¹ [...] Learned as he was, Jayamuni did not behave as a slavish copyist, but he attempted very often to improve the text. This is done by correcting obvious copying mistakes of manuscript Sa, but also by frequently normalizing the syntax, and by sanskritizing some of the readings.

(Tournier 2012, 96–7)

Is it merely a chance that also NGMCP E 1554-24 (the antigraph of CUL Add.1611) and CUL Add.1680.2.3 are dated to the 12th–14th century, the same period of the manuscript Sa of the *Mahāvastu*? Is it possible that these manuscripts belonged to Jayamuni’s ‘important textual collection’? I believe that I have demonstrated that the scribe of CUL Add.1611 did not merely copy his antigraph, but undertook some editorial work, like Jayamuni did for the *Mahāvastu* manuscript he wrote in 1657 CE. For these reasons, I think that this identification rests on solid ground.

We have seen that in the case of the *Avadānaśataka* Jayamuni took formulaic passages from canonical texts and inserted them at various places in the text. This practice takes a whole other dimension in the case of the *Divyāvadāna*, where whole stories are extrapolated from the *vinaya* and put together to form a new collection.

4 *Divyāvadāna*

Since the publication of the *editio princeps* by E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil in 1886, the *Divyāvadāna* has enjoyed great popularity among scholars of Buddhism. Often considered a unitary work (albeit anonymous), it quickly became the object of study not only from a literary viewpoint, but in some cases also as a witness of society and Buddhist culture of the first millennium of the modern era.³² Many scholars however have highlighted the heterogeneous nature of the stories included in the *Divyāvadāna*.³³ In his seminal work *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya analysiert Grund auf der tibetischen Übersetzung*, J.L. Panglung provides a table of concordance according to which, out of the thirty-eight stories of the *Divyāvadāna*, twenty-one have a canonical parallel in the Tibetan translation of the MSV. Nine of these twenty-one stories have a direct parallel in the Sanskrit original of the MSV as transmitted in the Gilgit manuscripts (Panglung 1981, xiv–xvii). Furthermore, in Panglung’s opinion the fact that the other 12 stories are attested in the *Divyāvadāna* means that ‘also parts of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* and of the *Vinayakṣudraka* that are not attested in the G[ilgit] M[anuscripts] can be considered to have been transmitted in Sanskrit.’³⁴ More recently, in a review article to A. Rotman’s

³¹ The ‘Buddhist-*vaṃśāvalī*’ is manuscript CUL 1952a, the so called ‘Wright’s *vaṃśāvalī*’, where the following account is provided: ‘Jayamuni, the son of Jīvarāja, became concerned about the fact that Buddhism in Nepāla had been deteriorating, owing to the disappearance of Buddhist texts and the learned ones. Disguised as *daṇḍin* ascetic, he went to the Vārāṇasī region in Madhesa. He approached the Brahmin *paṇḍitas*, studied grammar and other texts, and collected several Buddhist texts. He returned from Vārāṇasī and revived the Buddhist tradition which had been in decline. Since then, he became known as ‘Jayamuni Paṇḍita of Mahābauddha’. (Bajracharya – Michaels 2016, 103).’ See also Singh et al. 1877, 126 and 208, and Tatelman 1996, xv–xvi.

³² This approach is still partially in vogue nowadays, see for instance the introduction in Rotman 2008; for a review of Rotman’s book and a discussion of his approach, cf. Hiraoka 2011, 233–234.

³³ For instance Hiraoka (1998); K. Klaus and M. Hahn attributed the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* (story 38 in Cowell and Neil’s edition) to a specific author, Gopadatta, on stylistic grounds (see Klaus 1983; see also Hahn 1992 and Hahn 2007).

³⁴ ‘Wie S. Lévi anhand der chinesischen Übersetzungen des MSV nachwies, sind 21 der 38 im *Divyāvadāna*

translation of the *Divyāvadāna*, S. Hiraoka provided a more comprehensive list of parallel stories in the Gilgit manuscripts as well as in the Tibetan and Chinese translations.³⁵

Numerous scholars have already underlined the close affinity, nay the identity of some of the stories of the *Divyāvadāna* with the same stories found in the MSV. Even more doubts about the unitary nature of this work arise when we take a closer look at the manuscript transmission. Indeed, already the first editors noticed that the title *Divyāvadāna* does not occur in all manuscripts. They mention an older manuscript examined by Bendall in Nepal, dated to the 17th century and in which the title *Divyāvadāna* does not occur at all – neither at the end of each *avadāna* nor at the end of the whole work. Unfortunately, they were not able to consult it, and thus their edition of the *Divyāvadāna* is based only on modern Nepalese paper manuscripts directly or indirectly derived from it (Cowell and Neil 1886, vi–vii). The only notable exception is Add.1680.3, an old Nepalese palm-leaf fragment of 21 folios kept in the Cambridge University Library, of which they give a collation of the variants (Cowell and Neil 1886, appendix B, 660–663). In his catalogue of the Buddhist manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library, Bendall states that ‘the complete MS. was divided into volumes with independent numbering’ (Bendall 1883, 168). However, a closer look at the fragments casts serious doubts about the fact that all fragments originally belonged to one single ‘volume’. The 21 folios can be divided into five distinct bundles:

1. Add.1680.3.1: 11 folios containing the last part of the *Pūrṇāvadāna* (Divy 2, from p. 42, line 9 to p. 54, line 17);
2. Add.1680.3.2: 2 folios containing a part of the *Candraprabhāvadāna* (Divy 22, from the beginning on p. 314 to p. 315, line 4);
3. Add.1680.3.3: 8 folios containing the beginning of the *Svāgatāvadāna* (Divy 13, from p. 167, line 16 to p. 185, line 10, with several missing folios);
4. Add.1680.3.4: 2 folios containing the beginning of the *Jyotiṣkāvadāna* (Divy 19, from the beginning on p. 262 to p. 275, line 11);
5. Add.1680.3.5: 2 folios containing a part of the *Saṅgharakṣitāvadāna* (Divy 23, from p. 343, line 21 to p. 345, line 20).

Even though the script of the various leaves looks very similar, yet it differs slightly from fragment to fragment. The script in Add.1680.3.1 is different than the one in all other fragments. The scripts in Add.1680.3.3 and Add.1680.3.4, although more similar with each other, still are slightly different. Moreover, Add.1680.3.1, Add.1680.3.4 and Add.1680.3.5 all have five to six lines per page, while Add.1680.3.2 has four or five lines, and Add.1680.3.3 has five lines per page. Finally, in Add.1680.3.3, Add.1680.3.4, and Add.1680.3.5 folio 1r is left blank as a cover, and on folio 1v the foliation starts anew from one. Nevertheless, on account of codicological and palaeographical features we can tentatively date all five bundles to the 14th or 15th century. What does this mean? In my opinion, there are two possibilities. The first one is that originally these fragments were

enthaltenen Erzählungen dem MSV zuzuordnen. Von diesen 21 Erzählungen, die in der tibetischen Übersetzung des MSV enthalten sind, sind nur neun Erzählungen in den GM erhalten, die ebenso wie fünf weitere Erzählungen des *Divyāvadāna* dem *Vinayavastu* angehören. Sieben Erzählungen des *Divyāvadāna* haben ihre Parallele im *Vinayavibhaṅga* und *Vinayakṣudraka*. Dies bedeutet, dass mittels des *Divyāvadāna* auch Teile des *Vinayavibhaṅga* und des *Vinayakṣudraka*, die nicht in den GM erhalten sind, als in Sanskrit überliefert betrachtet werden können’ (Panglung 1981, XV).

³⁵ Hiraoka (2011); I owe this reference to Vincent Tournier. On other fragments of the Gilgit manuscript transmitting parts of the MSV, see also von Hinüber 2014.

all part of a single manuscript written by different scribes, but at some point in history they were taken away from the manuscript to be read or copied as single chapters, and then put back into the manuscript again (though after losing almost all folios). Another, more plausible possibility is that these fragmentary bundles are remnants of different manuscripts originally transmitting single *avadānas*, and that they were put together when they were sold to D. Wright in the last quarter of the 19th century. A further corroboration of this hypothesis is that also the *Avadānaśataka* fragments mentioned in the previous section are found in CUL Add.1680, together with many other scattered fragments of different works.

In the last decades, thanks to the efforts of the Nepal German Manuscripts Preservation Project (NGMPP), more manuscripts of the *Divyāvadāna* have been recovered and photographed. The NGMCP online catalogue lists numerous manuscripts under the title *Divyāvadāna(mālā)*. The following list includes only manuscripts for which a full description is provided in the NGMCP Wiki³⁶ As in the case of the *Avadānaśataka*, I provide here only a short list of the manuscripts in chronological order (the complete description is provided in Appedix 1):

1. Palm-leaf manuscripts: NGMCP A 38-14, A 38-15.
2. Paper manuscripts: NGMCP A 123-6, A 120-2 (retaken as A 874-3), B 97-4.

In addition to these, more manuscripts transmitting single or a small group of *avadānas* should be considered for future studies.³⁷ Unfortunately the two palm-leaf manuscripts are fragmentary, making the task of reconstructing the structure of the whole work and the original number of stories more difficult. Luckily, it is still possible to get a general idea of the content. In the case of NGMCP A 38-14, three final rubrics are extant:

- *pāṃsupradānāvadānaṃ ṣadvimśatimaḥ* // [170r5, Divy 26]
- *kunālāvadānaṃ sapt(ā)avimśatima samāptam* // [185r5, Divy 27]
- *rūpāvatyā(!)vadānaṃ dvātriṃśattamaṃ slo śa ā tha* // [237r3, Divy 32]

We are even luckier in the case of NGMCP A 38-15, of which 15 final rubrics are extant:

- *maitreyāvadānan trītyaḥ* [25v4, Divy 3]
- *brāhmaṇadārikāvadānaṃ caturthaḥ* [27r7, Divy 4]
- *stutibrāhmaṇāvadānaṃ pañcamaḥ* [28r4, Divy 5]
- *indro-nāma-brāhmaṇāvadānaṃ ṣaṣṭhaḥ* [30r4, Divy 6]
- *prātihāryasūtraṃ dvādaśamaḥ* [63r4, Divy 12] †
- *svāgatāvadānaṃ nāma trayodasamaḥ* [72v7, Divy 13]

³⁶ The following paper manuscripts are listed with the title *Divyāvadāna(mālā)*, but with no description: D 64-7, E 360-9(2), E 594-8, B 688-2, E 1257-7, E 1257-5, A 1332-19, and X 1637-1.

³⁷ I was able to trace the following manuscripts, all on paper: A 127-7 (*Pāṃsupradānāvadāna*), B 98-14(2) (*Meṇḍakagrhapativibhūtipariccheda*), *Meṇḍakāvadāna*, *Sahasodgatasya Prakaraṇāvadāna*, A 1332-19 (*Kuśāvadāna*), B 96-13 (*Jyotiṣkāvadāna*), A 125-14 *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*, A 119-6 (*Kuṇālāvadāna*, written in 1670 CE by Jayadharmācārya in the Guṇakīrtimahāvihāra in Madhyapura), B 100-6 (*Vīrakuśāvadāna*), E 360-9(1) (*Vasiṣṭhāvadāna*). Another manuscript containing some stories from the *Divyāvadāna* is NGMCP B 97-5. Judging from the description it seems that it is not a single manuscript, but rather a composite manuscript consisting of six different codicological units, or even simply six different manuscripts put together by a librarian because of their affinity in content. Moreover, a series of manuscripts (not fully described, but apparently all on paper) with the title *Vīrakuśakathā* (or *Vīrakuśoddhārakathā*) are assigned to the *Divyāvadāna* (X 1354-1, X 1171-1(1), X 1122-1, X 1082-1, E 1711-25). Similarly, one should mention E 964-8 *Aṣṭamīvratakathā*, and X 1346-1, X 1347-1 (*Aṣṭamīvrataṃmāhātmya*).

- *sūkarikāvadānaṃ caturdaśamaḥ* [73v6, Divy 14]
- *anyatamabhikṣuṅ(!)cakravartiviyākṛtam pañcādaśa[-]* [74r5, Divy 15]
- *sukapotakāvadānaṃ śoḍaśaḥ* [75r4, Divy 16]
- *māndhātāvadānaṃ saptādaśamaḥ* [85v7, Divy 17]
- *dharmaruci-avadāna aṣṭādaśaḥ* [99r7, Divy 18]
- *kunālāvadānaṃ saptāviṃśatimaṃ samāptam* [156v7, Divy 27]
- *sudhanakumārāvadānaṃ ekaṃtriṃśattamaṃ* [192r5, Divy 31]
- *mākandikāvadānaṃ samāptam* [242r5, Divy 36]
- *rudrāyaṇāvadānaṃ samāptam* [256r6, Divy 37]

Since NGMCP A 38-14 and in NGMCP A 38-15 are incomplete, we cannot be sure with all certainty that they contained all the stories printed in Cowell and Neil's edition. Although their text is at times slightly different than the one of the printed edition, a comparison of the titles of the extant *avadānas* and of their order enables us to state with a good degree of certainty that in the 11th century the structure of the collection was more or less already fixed (although without the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* and the title *Divyāvadāna*). This consideration clashes only apparently with the hypothesis that the series of fragments in CUL Add.1680.3 belonged to different manuscripts rather than to a single volume. As it is well known, it is not unusual to find independent manuscripts of single stories taken from the *Divyāvadāna* (or from other collections of *jātakas* and *avadānas*).

On the other hand, we find a rather different situation when we turn to the paper manuscripts. Unfortunately, I did not have access to reproductions of NGMCP A 120-2, NGMCP B 97-4, and NGMCP B 97-5, and therefore I have no certain means to date them. If we consider however that in Nepal paper virtually replaced palm-leaf as a writing material starting with the 17th century, it is safe to suppose that they probably date after this century.³⁸ Instead of 38 as in the printed edition, both NGMCP A 120-2 and NGMCP B 97-4 contain a different number of *avadānas*, 42 and 25 respectively. In NGMCP A 120-2, the order of the stories corresponds to the printed edition up to *Nāgakumārāvadāna* (Divy 24).³⁹ After this story, we find a *Samgharakṣitasya Karmaṇplotikāvadānaṃ* as story 25 (in the edition, no title is given for this story) and an *Upaguptāvadāna* as story 26 (*Pāṃśupradānāvadāna* in the edition). Moreover, the manuscript has three additional *avadānas* the titles of which have no parallels in the editions – a *Pañcakārṣakāśatānimvadāna* as story 34, a *Kṛṣitobrāhmaṇāvadāna* as story 35, an *Ahorātravratacaityasevānuśānsāvadāna* as story 42 – and finally a *Supriyāvadāna* as last story. NGMCP B 97-4 contains the first 25 stories of the *Divyāvadāna* as in the printed edition, but:

[s]tory number '22' is given twice to the *Candraprabhāvadāna* and the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna* (1), so that the last two stories, the *Nāgakumārāvadāna* and the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna* (2), have number '23' and '24' each [...], as in the mss used by Cowell & Neil. The text from the end of the first line of fol. 94r up to its last line is a dittography of the passages from the end of the *Maitreyāvadāna* (no. 3) and the beginning

³⁸ As a cautionary remark, there are obviously instances of older Nepalese paper manuscripts. The first attestation of a dated Nepalese paper manuscript is still debated (in the CUL collections the oldest Nepalese paper manuscript is Add.1412.02, dated 1278 CE). In Nepal, paper was increasingly employed as writing material from the 16th century, and even though there is possibility for these three manuscripts being older, it is still necessary to examine them before drawing any definitive conclusion.

³⁹ The missing folios 102–114 most probably contained the *Dharmarucyavadāna* (Divy 18) and the *Jyotiṣkāvadāna* (Divy 19).

of the *Brāhmaṇadārikāvadāna* (no. 4).⁴⁰

With only incomplete palm-leaf manuscripts to rely on, and paper manuscripts containing a number of stories different than the printed edition, we are still left with the question of how many stories the *Divyāvadāna* consisted of. We can safely assume that it is a compilation of heterogeneous texts taken from different sources. But when did this compilation take the form we know thanks to Cowell's and Neil's edition? In other words: what exactly is the *Divyāvadāna*? Is it the creation of an anonymous Nepalese scribe? In my opinion, the answer to this question is provided by NGMCP A 123-6, the first paper manuscript listed above. As we have seen, this manuscript was the archetype of the seven manuscripts used by Cowell and Neil for their edition. Demoto dates it to Nepāla Saṃvat 777 (1657 CE) with a question mark. Surely the reason for her uncertainty is that the date in *bhūtasamkhyā* (*muni-vāḥy-adrau khyāte naipālavatsare*) is found in a long colophon on a folio added at the end of the manuscript. This folio is not only smaller than the rest of the manuscript, but is evidently written in a different hand. Even if we take this fact into consideration, we can be fairly sure that the manuscript was written in the 17th century. In fact, this is the manuscript examined by Bendall in Nepal. In the introduction, the two editors state that with the exception of CUL Add.1680.3, all the manuscripts they used are 'only modern copies, made with more or less care from one original, which is now in the possession of Pandit Indrānand of Patan, Nepal, the son of Guṇānand, the old Pandit attached to the residency' (Cowell and Neil 1886, vi). They also provide Bendall's description of the manuscript, which correspond exactly to the description of NGMCP A 123-6:

Pandit Indrānand lent me the MS. when I was in Nepal [...] The material is paper, and the writing is of the fine and small kind described at p. xxxii of my 'Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS.', and thus I assign the MS. to the XVIIth century, A.D. The MS. measures 13 in x 3, and has 265 leaves with 9 or 10 lines on each page. (Cowell and Neil 1886, vi-vii)

What exactly does Bendall mean in his catalogue by 'the writing is of the fine and small kind'? It is one of the two type of writings most commonly found in 17th century Nepalese manuscripts:

The first is a thick, bold and square style [...] In contradistinction to this, we find several MSS., as M. Feer says of one of them, Add.1611 (A.D. 1645), 'd'une écriture fine et serrée'. These MSS. are usually written with ruled lines, which are exceedingly prominent. Other examples are Add. 1586 (A.D. 1661), and to some extent Add. 1631 (A.D. 1652) and 1638 (A.D. 1682), though in these last the writing is less fine. (Bendall 1883, xxxii-xxxiii)

CUL Add. 1586 and CUL Add.1611 are nothing other than the manuscripts of the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣecchā* and the *Avadānaśataka* written by Jayamuni.⁴¹ In other words, also this manuscript of the *Divyāvadāna* was written by this prolific scholar. In the light of this fact, we would like to propose a hypothesis about the process that led to the formation of the *Divyāvadāna*. As we have seen, the oldest known witnesses of this work are the palm-leaf manuscripts NGMCP A 38-14, NGMCP A 38-15 and CUL Add. 1680.3.

⁴⁰ NGMCP Wiki, description by Demoto.

⁴¹ A closer examination of CUL Add.1631 and CUL Add.1638 reveals that these two manuscripts are written in a slightly different hand, as already noticed by Bendall. Moreover, they also differ in terms of codicological features such as paper and layout.

The first two can be dated to the 11th century and preserve a collection of *avadānas* that almost certainly had already a structure of 37 stories. All of them are present in the same order, the same as in the collection of *avadānas* in Jayamuni's manuscript. Moreover, as in NGMCP A 38-14, NGMCP A 38-15, also in Jayamuni's manuscript the title *Divyāvadāna* does not occur in any final rubric. The only discrepancy between the structure of the early palm-leaf manuscripts and that of Jayamuni's manuscript is the presence of the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* in the latter. As already mentioned, this story has been attributed to Gopadatta and clearly did not belong to the original structure of the *Divyāvadānā*. More interestingly, in Jayamuni's manuscript of the (yet to be named thus) *Divyāvadāna*, in the penultimate line of fol. 259 'the *Rudrāyaṇāvadāna* ends and the last story *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* begins. On the next folio, however, one reads first the ending of a *Siṃhajātaka* [...] After that the beginning of the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* is repeated.'⁴² The reason for this repetition is that the six folios containing the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* originally belonged to the manuscript of the *Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamālā* (NGMCP B 98-4) as folios 32–37; they were subsequently added to this manuscript, and the foliation rewritten accordingly (Hahn 1992, 5). Why have they been moved to this particular manuscript of the *Divyāvadāna*? Maybe the last part of the manuscript was missing, and a reader who wanted to have a complete *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* took out the folios of this story from another manuscript in order to add them to his defective volume. So far this is not surprising, this process being very well-known for South Asian manuscripts. What is indeed surprising is that these folios were taken out from another manuscript most probably written by Jayamuni, for the *Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamālā* manuscript is also written in the same minute hand of the *Divyāvadāna* manuscript and has an almost identical layout. This similarity is likely to have created in later scribes the illusion that the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* rightly belonged to this manuscript of the *Divyāvadāna*, leading them to include it in their copies without questioning its provenance.

On the other hand, CUL Add. 1680.3 is dated to the 14th–15th century and consists of fragments of single *avadānas*; according to the editors, it is the only witness of the *Divyāvadāna* not directly derived from NGMCP A 123-6 (Cowell and Neil 1886, vi). We have described a similar pattern for the transmission of the *Avadānaśataka*: the fragments of CUL Add.1680.2.3 are also from the 14th–15th century and belong to a line of transmission different from the one of Jayamuni's manuscript CUL Add. 1611. The latter is probably based on a source written later than the 9th century Tibetan translation.⁴³ Is it too far fetched to reconstruct a picture in which Jayamuni used old palm-leaf manuscripts recovered during his trip to India to compile anthologies of *jātakas* and *avadānas* (like the *Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamālā*), or to revise the text of very well known works of Buddhist narrative literature, like the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Divyāvadāna*? The only means to confirm this hypothesis is to produce a new edition of the *Divyāvadāna*, as well as to carefully compare the text of the *Avadānaśataka* in CUL Add.1611 with the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts and the Tibetan translation. At the same time it would be worth examining the usage of clichés in the text of the older palm-leaf manuscripts and of the 17th century paper manuscripts, in order to verify the relationship between the various stages of textual transmission and Jayamuni's practice of revision.

5 From *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* to *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*

⁴² From Demoto's description of the manuscript, see Appendix 1.

⁴³ As we have seen, the Sanskrit AvŚ from which the Tibetan translation was prepared shares textual corruptions similar to the ones in CUL Add.1611.

We now come to the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*, which represents yet a different case: the reuse of whole texts with the aim of creating a whole new work. This collection of *avadānas* has been edited by Mamiko Okada in 1993 on the basis of 22 Nepalese manuscripts.⁴⁴ As the title goes, this work contains twenty-two *avadānas*, more precisely stories ‘illustrating the merits of devotion to Buddhism and to the duties enjoined by it. The author’s name is not given; but from the form of salutation at the beginning of the work, it is evident that the work is accepted by the Buddhists to be due to a private person’ (Mitra 1882, 85). This work is a particularly interesting example of textual reuse in the Nepalese *avadānamālās* genre. Mitra’s remark about the authorial nature of this work is particularly important. In fact, this work has a different character than the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Divyāvadāna*. As we will see, even though the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* is completely based on another work, the anonymous author still managed to create a new work combining the creative reuse of older texts with the composition of whole new passages.

Already the German translation of the title provided by the editor is very telling about the origin and structure of the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*: ‘Die Avadāna-Erzählungen, [insbesondere die Spendenerzählungen], [in Anlehnung an die] zweiundzwanzig [Artikel der Merkverse (*saṃgrahaśloka*) des Werkes *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*]’ (Okada 1993, viii). In other words, the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* is a late composition expanding on a previous work, the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*, a text consisting of 191 didactic and gnomic stanzas in 22 (!) different metres.⁴⁵ Traditionally this work was attributed to Āryaśūra, Hahn has however convincingly demonstrated that the author of this work is not Āryaśūra, as previously supposed, but a certain *Ācārya Śūra (Slob dpon dpa’ bo) mentioned by Tāranātha, probably a contemporary of Gopāla II (10th century). Anyway, the upper limit for the composition of this work is the 11th century, when it was translated into Tibetan by Śākya ’Od. In Hahn’s critical edition, the work consists of 28 chapters, with a clear tripartite structure:

1. An introduction consisting of three chapters: since it is extremely difficult to be reborn as a human being, the reader should accomplish good deeds during his life, following the Buddhist doctrine;
2. The core of the work consists of chapters 4–22, in which different types of donation to the Buddhist community and monks are described, as well as the karmic fruit for these donations; chapter 22 is followed by two *saṃgrahaślokas*;
3. Five additional chapters on five of the six *pārāmitās*: the *Śīla*-, *Kṣānti*-, *Vīrya*-, *Dhyāna*-, and *Prajñākathā*.

The *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* has an identical structure and identical chapter titles up to chapter 22. All stanzas of each of the first 22 chapters of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* are embedded in each corresponding chapter of the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*. The great popularity enjoyed by the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* is witnessed also by the indirect transmission of big parts of it in at least two other works: the *Mahājñātakamālā* and the *Sarvajñāmitrāvadāna*. The first one has been edited by Hahn, and in its 6th chapter (*Cakravartijanmasugatabhajanāvadāna*), 85 stanzas of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* are used as a sermon told by the Buddha Aparājitadhvaṃsa to the *cakravartin* Maheśa. The stanzas used

⁴⁴ Eerily enough, the number 22 will occur very often in this section of the article.

⁴⁵ For editions of this text, see Zimmermann 1975 and Hahn 1982.

are taken from the first five chapters and from chapters 22 to 27, and include also the last stanza of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*. The *Sarvajñāmitrāvadāna* is an unpublished work, but according to Hahn, who examined Nepalese manuscripts photographed by the NGMPP, 77 stanzas from the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* are inserted in the various *avadānas* (the stanzas are taken from the chapters 1–3, 5, 11, 19, 22–27).⁴⁶

If we go back to the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* and its relation with the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*, a striking feature comes to light out of the comparison of the structure of the two works. The *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* contains 27 chapters in both Heinz Zimmermann's and Hahn's editions, but after chapter 22 there are two *saṃgrahaślokas* listing the content of the work up to that point. For this reason, in his 1975 edition of the Tibetan translation, Zimmermann suggested the existence of an older recension of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* in 22 chapters.⁴⁷ However, this hypothesis was criticized by Hahn, who stressed the fact that all the manuscripts of this work, as well as the Tibetan translation, hand down a recension in 27 chapters. Moreover, verses from the last five chapters are included in the *Mahājñātakamālā*.⁴⁸ The NGMCP comes to our help to also solve this problem, this time with A 922-6, a manuscript of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*, written in the Nepālākṣarā script and containing a version in 22 chapters (amazingly enough, on 22 folios). The manuscript has been described in the NGMCP online catalogue by M. Demoto, who immediately recognized its importance:

The manuscript contains the core of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍaka*, the first 22 chapters on the *dāna-pāramitā*. This may be a good evidence that the work was first composed of 22 chapters only and 5 chapters on the other five *pāramitā* have been added later. It is not clear whether the original work was already entitled *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍaka*.

Unfortunately, the manuscript is not dated. A dating based on the palaeographical and codicological features on the basis of the images is really challenging – if not impossible –, but if forced, we could date this manuscript to the 17th or more probably to the 18th century. In any case, it would precede or be contemporary to the oldest dated manuscript of the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* known so far, dated 1786. In my opinion, this manuscript is not only good evidence, it is the confirmation of Zimmermann's hypothesis that the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* consisted originally of only 22 chapters.

Going back to the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā*, we notice that, despite the title, the printed edition contains 24 stories. After the *maṅgala* stanza in the *Sragdharā* metre, a short metrical prologue in three *ślokas* sets the stage of the frame story. King Aśoka is residing at the Kukkuṭa hermitage near Rājagṛha, desiring to listen to the twenty-two stories. The king asks Upagupta to fulfill this desire, and thus the saint narrates the twenty-two *kathās*. After the end of the twenty-second story, we find the same two *saṃgrahaślokas* as in the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍaka*, followed by two additional stories, a *Dānakathā* divided into three parts (*Vastra*, *Śibi*, and *Surūpa*) and a *Puṇyotsāhāvadānasūtra*. In the introduction of the edition, no remark about the status of these two stories is mentioned (unfortunately,

⁴⁶ I started examining further manuscripts of this work to prepare a preliminary edition.

⁴⁷ 'Mir scheint kaum ein Zweifel daran möglich, dass die Ssl. das echte und vollständige Themenverzeichnis einer älteren, 22 Kp. umfassenden SRKK bilden' (Zimmermann 1975, 15).

⁴⁸ 'So bestechend diese Abtrennung einer 'älteren SRKK' (Kap. 1 bis 23) von der 'endgültigen SRKK' (Kap. 1 bis 27) aufgrund der beiden angeführten Argumente auch sein mag, so muß doch darauf hingewiesen werden, daß nur eine gemeinsame Überlieferung aller 27 Kapitel bekannt ist, in den zugänglichen Sanskrithandschriften ebenso wie in der tibetischen Version der SRKK wie auch in den Nebenüberlieferungen' (Hahn 1982, 320).

the second volume of the edition with the philological commentary has not been published). On the other hand, their titles are between square brackets, probably a sign that the editor considered them spurious. Given the title, the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* must have certainly consisted of 22 chapters – all the more if the theory about the original *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* in 22 chapters is correct.

It is not possible to provide here a thorough analysis of the composite nature of the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* and of the various typologies of textual reuse it presents. Nevertheless, I think it is worth mentioning at least some of them. The most important feature is that the titles of the works from which the texts are borrowed are never mentioned.⁴⁹ Many prose passages have been composed by the anonymous author in a form of ‘Newar Hybrid Sanskrit’ close to correct Sanskrit,⁵⁰ while the stanzas from the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* are either embedded in the story, or in some cases they constitute the whole of the *kathā* (as for instance in the second chapter, the *Dharmaśravaṇaprotsāhanakathā*). Finally, it should be mentioned that some of the stock descriptions and clichés used in the *Avadānaśataka* occur in the prose parts of the work. In the light of the typology of textual transmission described above for the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Divyāvadāna*, it is not surprising that a text like the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* was composed (or rather compiled?) in Nepal.

6 Conclusion

The three collections examined above present examples of three different types of intertextuality. The simplest and most widespread case in *avadāna* literature is witnessed in the *Avadānaśataka*, in which textual building blocks (like formulaic clichés and stock descriptions) are inserted in the body of a work that however retains its original structure.

The case of the *Divyāvadāna* takes us to another level, in which large texts (and even whole works, like the *Māitrakanyakāvadāna*) are put together by a compiler to create a new collection. This practice was very common in Nepal, and numerous similar collections have come down to us: for instance, the *Avadānasarasamuccaya*, the *Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamālā*, the *Jātakamālāvadāna-sūtra*, the *Aśokāvadānamālā*, and the *Ratnamālāvadāna*. In fact, the *Jātakamālā* of Gopadatta, an epigone of Āryaśūra, has been transmitted in such anonymous collections. Hahn was able to trace 15 of Gopadatta’s legend in the collections just mentioned.⁵¹

Finally, the *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā* was composed taking a previous work, the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*, as a model for its structure, expanding and building around it a whole new work.⁵² The fluid character of these type of works and of their composition in Nepal is further confirmed by yet another fact: an anonymous compiler felt free to add five chapters at the end of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā*, even though this

⁴⁹ In fact, also the author of the *Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā* (SRKK) quoted whole stanzas from well-known Buddhist *stotras* and *lekhas* without mentioning their source. Prof. Jens-Uwe Hartmann kindly provided me with the following list of sources (the first numbers refer to the number of the stanza in Hahn’s edition): SRKK 15 = Candragomin’s *Śiṣyalekha* 63; SRKK 17 = Śāntideva’s *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (BCA) 4.17; SRKK 18 = Śāntideva’s BCA 4.32; SRKK 19 = Śāntideva’s BCA 4.21; SRKK 20 = Śāntideva’s BCA 4.20; SRKK 20 = Mātrceta’s *Prasādapratibhodbhava* 5; SRKK 30 = Āryaśūra’s *Jātakamālā* 3.21; SRKK 87 = Mātrceta’s *Varṇārharvaṇa* (VAV) 2.73; SRKK 89 = Mātrceta’s VAV 2.74; SRKK 167–169 = Śāntideva’s BCA 6.1–3; SRKK 173–175 = Śāntideva’s BCA 6.47–49; SRKK 176 = Śāntideva’s BCA 6.41.

⁵⁰ About this type of Sanskrit, see for instance Kölver 1999 and Michaels 2010.

⁵¹ See for instance Hahn 2007.

⁵² A similar process is seen in the *Kalpadrūmāvadānamālā*, where the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* from Kṣemendra’s *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* has been expanded (see Straube 2009).

work wasn't originally supposed to be a compendium of the six *pārāmitās*. Could it be that he thought its author to be Āryaśūra (as many other after him did), and mindful of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* (another work on the six *pārāmitās* attributed to Āryaśūra), he thought it would be fitting to complete the series of *pārāmitās*, in order to create a similar work?

From all these considerations, another question arises: why bother to create such manuscripts of *avadānamālās* from heterogenous works? I would like to present here some considerations and a preliminary hypothesis. The 14th and 15th centuries are crucial for the history of Nepal (*nepālamaṇḍala*, i.e. the Kathmandu Valley). In this period, the reign of king Jayasthitirājamalla (1382–1395) marked a dynastic, but above all a cultural change. It is surely not by chance that in a recent study about the *Guṇakāraṇḍavyūha*, W. Tuladhar-Douglas stressed the fact that these two centuries were fundamental for the development of Newar Buddhism. He places the flowering of the 'Garland Texts' (the *avadānamālā* literature) precisely in the 15th century (Tuladhar-Douglas 2006, 38–52, particularly 39). In fact, if we take a look again at the textual transmission of the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Divyāvadāna*, we notice that the fragments in the CUL Add.1680 series are all dated precisely to this period. They might reflect a stage in which these collections were only partly fixed in Nepal. If the attribution of CUL Add.1611, CUL Add. 1585 and NGMCP A 123-6 to Jayamuni is correct, his role in the transmission of the vast corpus of Buddhist narrative literature in Nepal is astonishing. Around the middle of the 17th century he copied, revised, and gave shape to an impressive number of important works: among others, the *Avadānaśataka*, the *Divyāvadāna*, the *Mahāvastu*, the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣecchā*, and the *Sumāgadhāvadāna*. Even if we are cautious and hesitate to attribute all these manuscripts to Jayamuni himself, still it is not too far-fetched to assume that he could have been the head of a Buddhist scriptorium in the Mahābuddhavihāra in Patan:⁵³ after all, all these manuscripts share many common codicological and palaeographical features.

The efflorescence of Newar Buddhism in the 14th and 15th century can be seen as a reaction to the cultural change fuelled by Jayasthitirājamalla's and his successors' political activity, and would explain the need for this type of compendia. On the other hand, the attribution to Jayamuni of the oldest extant manuscripts of the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* and of the *Mahajjātakamālā* casts a very different light on the process of formation of the *avadānamālā* literature. Apparently, all other extant manuscripts of these two works have been written after Jayamuni's manuscripts, and most of them derive directly from the latter.⁵⁴ As we have seen, Jayamuni was not a simple scribe with a shaky knowledge of the Sanskrit language, but a careful editor and reviser of many collections of *jātakas* and *avadānas* (and of philosophical texts as well). We could thus even be tempted to consider him to be the author of these two huge compendia of Buddhist narrative literature! This hypothesis can be confirmed only after the preparation of a critical edition of the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā*, which would enable a detailed comparison of this versified version of the *Avadānaśataka* with the text as revised by Jayamuni.

Nevertheless, even if we don't go so far as to attribute both the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* and the *Mahajjātakamālā* to Jayamuni, in my opinion one thing becomes clear: if we think that seemingly almost all manuscripts of *avadānamālā* works have been written after the 17th century, we might perhaps assume that the flowering of the 'Garland Texts' occurred in or after the 17th century, rather than in the 14th and 15th centuries (as suggested by Tuladhar-Douglas). This would mean that the Buddhist

⁵³ Mahabuddha Bahā, also known as Bodhimaṇḍapavihāra; on this monastery, see Locke 1985, 97–101.

⁵⁴ For the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā*, see Asplund 2013, 71–72; for the *Mahajjātakamālā*, see Bühnemann-Hahn 1985, 66–69, particularly 66.

efflorescence lasted longer than previously supposed.

What conclusion can we draw from all these speculations? Even with new manuscript material at our disposal, almost all studies of anonymous texts and collections of Sanskrit Buddhist narrative literature are still based on old printed editions. In this respect, it is very important to consider the history of the relationship of Jayamuni's manuscripts of the *Divyāvadāna* and of the *Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamālā*. As outlined above, except for CUL Add.1680.2.3, all manuscripts used by Cowell and Neil for their edition of the *Divyāvadāna* are derived from Jayamuni's manuscript. Since they all contain the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna*, surely they were copied after the six folios from the *Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamālā* were added to Jayamuni's manuscript of the *Divyāvadāna*. The physical structure of South Asian manuscripts in the *pothī* format makes it easy to move folios from one manuscript to another. It is precisely this characteristic of South Asian manuscripts, combined with the efforts of 19th century European philologists, that created the *Divyāvadāna*, a work that did not exist before. This example introduces a fourth level of textual reuse, which goes beyond the textual aspect to reach directly into the domain of material culture.

In my opinion, not only do we need more reliable critical editions of the unpublished *avadānamālās*, but more importantly we should look with different eyes at the available editions of works like the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Divyāvadāna*. Perhaps the time has come to re-edit them.

Appendices

1 Description of Manuscripts

Avadānaśataka

I was able to consult directly only CUL Add.1680.2.1-4, CUL Add.1611 and CUL Add.1386; for all other manuscripts I rely solely on descriptions in catalogues and secondary literature. Except for NGMCP E 1554-24 (described in Demoto 2006, 214) and NGMCP B 101-20 (described by BK), all descriptions of manuscripts photographed by the NGMPP are based on Demoto's descriptions provided in the NGMCP Wiki (the passages between quotation marks are direct quotations, the rest is adapted).

1. Greater Gandhāra and Central Asian fragments, 6th–8th century CE:

- Schøyen Collection (Afghanistan): 38 birch-bark fragments of ten different folios, from two different manuscripts:
 - The first manuscript consists of fragments of nine folios, and ‘the complete size of a folio can be calculated as *c.* 8.5 x 50 cm [...] the script belongs to the ‘Gilgit/Bāmiyan type I’ that was used from the 6th century onward. There are nine lines per folio [...] and the average number of akṣaras per line is 70. The string hole is placed approximately one third from the left margin’ (Demoto 2006, 218); it contains parts of the following *avadānas*: AvŚ 23 (*Cakra*), AvŚ 34–35 (*Śibi* and *Surūpa*), AvŚ 37–38 (*Śaśa* and *Dharmagaveśin*), AvŚ 39–40 (*Anāthapiṇḍada* and *Subhadra*), AvŚ 47–48 (*Jātyandhā* and *Śreṣṭhin*), AvŚ 52–53 (*Candra* and *Sāla*), AvŚ 62–63 (*Sugandhi* and *Vapuṣmat*), AvŚ 87 (*Śobhita*) (Demoto 2006, 218–219).
 - The second manuscript consists of a single small fragment; ‘[i]t comprises *c.* 80 akṣaras [...] Lore Sander is of the opinion that for palaeographic reasons this ms is older than MS I and that it belongs to the 6th century. [...] one can calculate the width of a complete folio as *c.* 36

cm and the average number of akṣaras per line as 58' (Demoto 2006, 219); it contains a passage of the *Kṛṣṇasarpāvadāna*.

- Sanskrit manuscripts from Turfan: fragments on paper (SHT V 1318a and SHT I 35).

2. Nepalese incomplete palm-leaf manuscripts, in Nepālākṣarā script, 12th–15th century CE:

- CUL Add.1680.2.1-4: eight folios possibly from four different manuscripts (as explained below), Nepālākṣarā, 14th–15th century. They contain respectively: (a) the beginning of the *Dharmapālāvadāna* (AvŚ 33), (b) the almost complete text of the *Śibyāvadāna* (AvŚ 34) and the complete *Surūpāvadāna* (AvŚ 35), (c) the end of the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* (AvŚ 39), and (d) the beginning of the *Guḍaśālāvadāna* (AvŚ 41); this manuscript (F in Speyer's edition) is 'the only source independent from B' (Demoto 2006, 208).

- NGMCP E 1554-24: 43 folios (extant folios 250–288, 300–304), incomplete; 32.5 x 4.8 cm, 5–6 lines per page; Nepālākṣarā, dated by Demoto to the 12th–14th century on palaeographical grounds. This manuscript was probably the antigraph of CUL Add.1611: '[a]fter having compared one third of this ms with Speyer's edition we gained the impression that the new manuscript is the direct source of B' (Demoto 2006, 214–215); (B is Speyer's siglum for CUL Add.1611). It contains AvŚ 87 (*Śobhitāvadāna*, partial) to 96 (*Guptikāvadāna*, partial), AvŚ 99 (*Dīrghanakhāvadāna*, partial) and AvŚ 100 (*Samgītyavadāna*, partial).

- NGMCP A 936-2: one folio, incomplete; 29.0 x 4.3 cm, one string hole (centre-left), 5 lines per page; Nepālākṣarā, dated 1266 CE (Nepāla Saṃvat 386); it contains the end of the *Dharmapālāvadāna* (AvŚ 33).

- NGMCP B 24-43: 4 folios, complete; 29.5 x 4.5 cm, one string hole (centre-left), 5 lines per page, foliation in the right margin of the verso (numbered 1–4); Nepālākṣarā, dated palaeographically to the 14th century ('it appears that this manuscript was written at the same time as A 936-2 Dharmapālāvadāna'); it contains the whole *Kāśīsundaryavadāna* (AvŚ 76).

3. Nepalese paper manuscripts, 17th–19th century CE:⁵⁵

- CUL Add.1611 (B in Speyer's edition): 98 folios, complete; 36.1 x 10.1 cm, 13 lines per page; Nepālākṣarā, dated 1645 CE. This manuscript is the main source of Speyer's *editio princeps*.

- NGMCP A 118-4: 236 folios, complete; 33.5 x 7.5 cm, 6–8 lines per

⁵⁵ The following paper manuscripts are listed in the NGMCP Wiki under the title *Avadānaśataka*, but with no description: E 664-2, E 1344-4, D 42-11, A 918-3, A 844-8, X 1071-1. I have not been able to consult the PhD dissertation *Die Sanskrit-Überlieferung des Avadānaśataka: Textkritik und Stammbaum der neu gefundenen Manuskripte* submitted (?) by Heike Michael at the University of Mainz.

page, string hole space in centre-left without hole; Nepālākṣarā, dated 1669 CE, written by Vīradeva Vajrācārya; ‘[t]he manuscript obviously goes back to the common archetype as the Cambridge manuscript used by Speyer for his edition of the *Avadānaśataka*.’

- Hodgson manuscript in the India Office Library (entitled *Śatakāvadāna*, D in Speyer’s edition): Nepālākṣarā, dated 1792 CE.
- CUL Add.1386 (C in Speyer’s edition): Nepālākṣarā, undated but probably 18th–19th century.
- NGMCP B 101-20: 248 (187+ 61) folios, incomplete; 31 x 15 cm, 11 lines per page; Devanāgarī, dated 1836 CE, incomplete; from the excerpts transcribed in the NGMCP description, apparently a very faulty copy.
- Hodgson manuscript D. 122 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (P in Speyer’s edition): Devanāgarī, undated but before 1837.⁵⁶
- NGMCP B 95-11; 189(?) folios, incomplete; 33 x 15.5 cm, 11 lines per page, Nepālākṣarā, undated.

Divyāvadāna

I had access only to reproductions of A 38-14, A 38-15, and A 123-6. The dating of these manuscripts is tentative and based solely on palaeographical grounds. All descriptions of NGMCP manuscripts are based on Demoto’s descriptions provided in the NGMCP Wiki (the passages between quotation marks are direct quotations, the rest is adapted).

1. Palm-leaf manuscripts:

- NGMCP A 38-14: 65 folios, incomplete; 55 x 5 cm, 2 string holes, 6 lines per page (except fol. 322 with 7 lines on both sides); early Nepālākṣarā, probably 11th century. The available folios contain parts of the following *avadānas*: *Pūrṇa* (Divy 2), *Maitreya* (Divy 3), *Pāṃśupradāna* (Divy 26), *Kunāla* (Divy 27), *Vītāśoka* (Divy 28), *Rūpāvatī* (Divy 32), *Śārdūlakarṇa* (Divy 33), *Udrāyaṇa* (Divy 37), *Maitrakanyaka* (Divy 38). ‘The folio numbers from 325 onward are rewritten. The leaves with the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* (fols. 325–332) have the second foliation beginning with 1 with numerals in the right margin.’
- NGMCP A 38-15: 117 folios, incomplete; 57 x 6cm, 2 string holes, 6–7 lines per page; early Nepālākṣarā, probably 11th century. ‘The text on the available folios corresponds to pp. 19.20–607.9 of the edition of Cowell & Neil with many breaks. As the 30th story a version of the *Manicūḍāvadāna* is found (fols. 170, 171, 173, and 178). This story is included in the mss of the *Divyāvadānamālā* in Paris, Bengal, and Kyoto too. The 30th story in the

⁵⁶ As explained in the introductory section, this is the year when Burnouf received the manuscripts sent by Hodgson.

printed edition, *Sudhanakumārāvadāna* (1), is joined with the 31st story *Sudhanakumārāvadāna* (2) in this ms. Otherwise, the order of the stories is the same as in the printed edition.’

2. Paper manuscripts:

- NGMCP A 123-6: 265 folios, incomplete (ff. 161–175 missing); 35.5 x 9.5 cm, 9–12 lines per page; Nepālākṣarā, 17th century (the dating is discussed in detail below). ‘There is no folio with number 216. The text is continuous. In the second last line of fol. 259 the *Rudrāyaṇāvadāna* [i.e. *Udrāyaṇāvadāna*] ends and the last story *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* begins. On the next folio, however, one reads first the ending of a *Siṃhajātaka*: (fol. 260r1) *tasyaiva nānyad asti sukhaṃ nṛṇāṃ || [...] sa yuṣmābhir atyantam sukham iccha[d]bhiḥ || || siṃhajātakam iti || ||* After that the beginning of the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* is repeated. From this fact the ms can be supposed to be the archetype of the seven mss used by Cowell & Neil (cf. Cowell & Neil 1886, p. 711, note to p. 586, l. 10). The six folios with the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna* numbered with rewritten figures 260–265 were originally fols. 32–37 of the ms of the *Bodhisattvajātakāvadānamālā* (NGMPP B 98-4). Cf. Hahn 1977, p. 5.’
- NGMCP A 120-2 (retaken as A 874-3): 338 folios extant (out of 351), incomplete; 51 x 10.5 cm; 8–9 lines per page; Nepālākṣarā, at least two different hands (first scribe ff. 1–35 and 50–168, second scribe ff. 36–49 and 169–351), undated. This manuscript contains 43 *avadānas* (the discrepancies with the edition are discussed below). ‘Fols. 102–114 are missing. It seems that the second scribe supplemented missing folios. His text abounds in primitive errors and omissions. This manuscript shows a similar story order to the manuscript kept in Kyoto. See Iwamoto 1978, pp. 145–147.’
- NGMCP B 97-4: 290 folios, complete; 31.0 x 6.5 cm, 5–7 lines per page, string hole space in the centre-left without hole; Nepālākṣarā. This manuscript contains 25 *avadānas* (the discrepancies with the edition are discussed above). ‘Story number “22” is given twice to the *Candra-prabhāvadāna* and the *Samgha-rakṣitāvadāna* (1), so that the last two stories, the *Nāgakumārāvadāna* and the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna* (2), have number “23” and “24” each [...] as in the mss used by Cowell & Neil. The text from the end of the first line of fol. 94r up to its last line is a dittography of the passages from the end of the *Maitreyāvadāna* (no. 3) and the beginning of the *Brāhmaṇadārikāvadāna* (no. 4). Additions in the margins.’

2 *Avadānaśataka* 39. *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna*

The following table provides a synoptic presentation of four different versions of the *Anāthapiṇḍadāvadāna* in the *Avadānaśataka*. In the first two columns, diplomatic transcriptions of CUL Add.1680.2.3 and CUL Add.1611 are provided. The text as edited by Speyer is provided in the third column (Speyer 1902, vol. I, 223–226). Finally, the fourth column provides a diplomatic transcription of the Tibetan translation *Gang po la sogs pa’i rtogs pa brjod pa brgya pa*, as printed in *The Sde-dge Black Bka’-’gyur: a reprint of a print from the Sde dge blocks originally edited by Si-tu Chos-kyi-’byung-gnas*, Tibetan

Buddhist Resource Center (TBRC); TBRC Volume Number 960, Work Number (W) 22084, folios 110r7 (image 220) - 111r2 (image 223).

Unless otherwise stated, the text of each witness is to be considered as being complete and unitary; a blank cell in a column merely indicates that a passage is absent in that specific textual witness.

The following conventions have been used for the diplomatic transcriptions:

- The symbol | represents a line filler;
- The symbol ○ represents the string hole;
- The symbol * represents a *puṣpikā*;
- Characters within [square brackets] are damaged, but still legible;
- Characters within <angle brackets> were omitted by the scribe, and have been restored in the diplomatic edition;
- Characters within [⟨angle and square brackets⟩] are damaged and illegible in the manuscript, and have been restored in the diplomatic edition;
- Characters that are ~~struck through~~ have been deleted by the scribe;
- Words and characters within `grave and acute accents´ are interlinear and marginal insertions by the scribe.

Parts in boldface correspond to clichés and formulas; the passage included between ***three asterisks*** is the *samavadhāna*, the position of which is discussed at length above in the section about the *Avadānaśataka*.

<i>CUL Add.1680.2.3</i>	<i>CUL Add.1611</i>	<i>Speyer</i>	<i>Tibetan</i>
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	[37r11] anāthapiṇḍada iti	anāthapiṇḍada iti 39	[109r7] mgon med zas zhes bya ba ni
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	[37r11] buddho bhagavān satkr̥to gurukr̥to mānitaḥ pūjito rājabhī rājamātrair dhanibhiḥ pauraiḥ śreṣṭhibhiḥ sārthavāhair devair nāgair yakṣair asurair garuḍaiḥ kinnarair ma [37r12]horagair iti	buddho bhagavān satkr̥to gurukr̥to mānitaḥ pūjito rājabhī rājamātrair dhanibhiḥ pauraiḥ śreṣṭhibhis sārthavāhair devair nāgair yakṣair asurair garuḍaiḥ kinnarair mahoragair iti	sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la rgyal po rnam dang blon po [109v1] chen po rnam dang phyug po rnam dang pho brang 'khor gyi mi rnam dang tshon dpon rnam dang ded dpon rnam dang lha rnam dang klu rnam dang gnod sbyin rnam dang lha ma yin rnam dang nam mkha' lding rnam dang mi 'am ci rnam dang lto 'phye chen [109v2] po rnam kyis dkur sti byas bla mar byas ri mor byas mchod pa byas te
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	devanāgayakṣāsura garuḍa kinnara- mahoragābhycito buddho bhagavān jñāto mahāpuṇyo lābhī cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglāna- pratyayabhaiṣajya pariṣkāraṇām saśrāvaka samghaḥ śrāvastyāṃ viharati jetavane anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme	devanāgayakṣāsura garuḍa kinnara- mahoragābhycito buddho bhagavān jñāto mahāpuṇyo lābhī cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglāna- pratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkāraṇām saśrāvaka samghaḥ śrāvastyāṃ viharati jetavane 'nāthapiṇḍadasyārāme	lha dang klu dang gnod sbyin dang lha ma yin dang nam mkha' lding dang mi 'am ci dang lto 'phye chen po rnam kyis mchod cing shes pa'i sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das bsod nam [109r3] chen po dang ldan pa na bza' dang zhal zas dang gzims cha dang gdan dang snyun gos dang smon zod rnam brnyes pa nyam thos kyi dge 'dun dang bcas pa mnyam du yod par rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal khyim bdag mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na [109r4] bzhugs so
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	atha bhagavān pūrvāhne ni [37r13] ivāsya pātracīvaram ādāya śrāvastīm piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat yāvad anupūrveṇa cañcūryamāṇo rājamārgam avatīrṇaḥ tatra ca rājamārge nyatamo brāhmaṇo 'bhyāgataḥ	atha bhagavān pūrvāhne nivāsya pātracīvaram ādāya śrāvastyāṃ piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat yāvad anupūrveṇa cañcūryamāṇo rājamārgam avatīrṇaḥ tatra ca rājamārge 'nyatamo brāhmaṇo 'bhyāgataḥ	de nas bcom ldan 'das snga dro sham thabs dang chos gos gsol te lhung bzed bsnams nas mnyan du yod par bsod snyoms la gshegs so de nas re zhig mthar gyis gshegs te lam po cher zhugs pa dang bram ze zhig kyang lam po che der [109r5] ongs so
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	athāsau dadarśa buddhaṃ bhagavantam dvātriṃśatā mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṃkṛtam aśītyānuvyañjanair vi [38v1] irājita- gātram vyomaprabhālaṃkṛtam sūryasahasrāṭirekaprabhaṃ jaṅgamam iva ratnaparvataṃ samantato bhadrakam	athāsau dadarśa buddhaṃ bhagavantam dvātriṃśatā mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṃkṛtam aśītyā cānuvyañjanair virājitagātram vyāmaprabhālaṃkṛtam sūryasahasrāṭirekaprabhaṃ jaṅgamam iva ratnaparvataṃ samantato bhadra- kam	de nas des sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das sku skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu rtso gnyis kyis legs par brgyan pa dpe byad bzang po brgyad cus mdzes par byas pa 'od 'dom gang gis brgyan pa nyi ma stong bas lhag pa'i 'od mnga' ba rin po che'i [109r6] ri bo 'gro ba lta bu kun nas bzang ba mthong ngo

<i>CUL Add.1680.2.3</i>	<i>CUL Add.1611</i>	<i>Speyer</i>	<i>Tibetan</i>
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	<p> <i>dr̥ṣṭvā ca punaḥ, suciraṃ nirīkṣya pr̥thivyāṃ lekḥāṃ nikṛṣya [sic] bhagavantam uvāca bho gautama na tāvad ut te lekḥā laṃghayitavyā yāvan me pañca purāṇasātāni nānuprayacchāsīti tato bhaga[37v2]vāṃ karmaṇām avipraṇāśasandarsānārtham adattādānavairamaṇyārtham ca indrakīla iva tasmim̐ pradeśe sthitaḥ</i> </p>	<p> <i>dr̥ṣṭvā ca punaḥ suciraṃ nirīkṣya pr̥thivyāṃ lekḥāṃ nikṛṣya bhagavantam uvāca bho gautama na tāvad ut te lekḥā laṃghayitavyā yāvan me pañca purāṇasātāni nānuprayacchāsīti tato bhagavān karmaṇām avipraṇāśasam- darsānārtham adattādāna- vairamaṇyārtham ca indrakīla iva tasmin̐ pradeśe sthitaḥ </i> </p>	<p> <i>mthong nas kyang shin tu yun ring ngu brtags nas sal ri mo bris te bcom ldan 'das la gsol pa kye gau ta ma bdag la kār s̄a pa ṅa lnga brgya tsam ma stsal gyi bar du khyod kyis ri mo 'di 'ba' bar gsol de nas bcom ldan 'das [109r7] kyis las chud mi za bar bstan pa dang ma byin par len pa las bzlog pa'i phyir sgo skyes btsugs pa bzhin du gzhes so </i> </p>
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	<p> <i>eṣa ca śabdaḥ śrāvastyāṃ samantato visṛtaḥ yathā kila bhagavān rājamārge 'nyatamena brāhmaṇena pañcānām purāṇasātānām artham vidhā' dhā' rita iti tato rājā prasenajī[37v3]t kośalah sahaśravaṇād evāmātyagaṇaparivṛtto yena bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ upasaṃkramya bhagavantam idam avocat, gacchatu bhagavān ahaṃ pradāsyāmīti </i> </p>	<p> <i>eṣa ca śabdaḥ śrāvastyāṃ samantato visṛtaḥ yathā kila bhagavān rājamārge 'nyatamena brāhmaṇena pañcānām purāṇasātānām artham vidhārita iti tato rājā prasenajit kauśalah sahaśravaṇād evāmātyagaṇaparivṛto yena bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ upasaṃkramya bhagavantam idam avocat gacchatu bhagavān ahaṃ pradāsyāmīti </i> </p>	<p> <i>de nas mnyan du yod pa thog thag tu bcom ldan 'das lam po cher bram ze zhig gis kār s̄a pa ṅa lnga brgya'i phyir 'gror mi ster ro zhes de skad du gtam grag [110r1] par gyur to de nas ko sa la'i rgyal po gsal rgyal gyis thos ma thag tu blon po'i tshogs kyis zhabs 'bring byas nas bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der song ste phyin nas bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to bdag gis stsal gyis bcom [110r2] ldan 'das gshegs su gsol </i> </p>
[This part is lost in the manuscript]	<p> <i>bhagavān āha na mahārāja tvayaitāni dātavyāny api tv anyenaitāni dātavyānīti tathā viśākhā mṛgāramātā riṣi[37v4]dattapurāṇau sthapatīśakra- brahmādayo devā vaiśravaṇa- prabhṛtayaś catvāro lokapālā hiraṇyasuvarṇam upādāya bhagavantam upasṛtāḥ tān api bhagavān uvāca na bhavadbhir etāni dātavyānīti </i> </p>	<p> <i>bhagavān āha na mahārāja tvayaitāni dātavyāny api tv anyenaitāni dātavyānīti tathā viśākhā mṛgāramātā riṣidattapurāṇau sthapatī śakrabrahmādayo devā vaiśravaṇaprabhṛtayaś catvāro lokapālā hiraṇyasuvarṇam upādāya bhagavantam upasṛtāḥ tān api bhagavān uvāca na bhavadbhir etāni dātavyānīti </i> </p>	<p> <i>bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa rgyal po chen po de dag ni khyod kyis sbyin par bya ba ma yin gyi de dag ni gzhan zhig gis sbyin dgos so de bzhin du ri dags 'dzin kyi ma sa gdang btsun mo'i 'khor gyi bla drang srong sbyin dang gna' mi dang brgya [110r3] byin dang tshangs pa la sogs pa lha rnams dang rnam thos kyi bu la sogs pas kyang gser dngul khyer te bcom ldan 'das kyi thad du song na de dag la yang bcom ldan 'das kyis de dag ni khyed kyis kyang sbyin par bya ba ma yin no zhes bka' stsal to </i> </p>

<i>CUL Add.1680.2.3</i>	<i>CUL Add.1611</i>	<i>Speyer</i>	<i>Tibetan</i>
<p>----- ----- ----- ----- -----</p> <p>[18r1]m iti bhagavān āha grhapate tvayā etāni dātavyāni dīyatām brāhmaṇāyeti tato nāthapiṇḍadena grhapatinā sā suvaṇṇahelā brāhmaṇāya dattāḥ</p>	<p>yāvad anāthapiṇḍadena grhapatinā śrutam sa hiraṇyasuvarṇasya helām pūra[37v5]yitvā upari pañca purāṇasātāni datvā bhagavantam upagato bhagavann idam pratigrhyatām iti bhagavān āha grhapate tvayā etāni dātavyāni dīyatām brāhmaṇāyeti tato 'nāthapiṇḍadena grhapatinā sā suvarṇahelā brāhmaṇāya dattāḥ </p>	<p>yāvad anāthapiṇḍadena grhapatinā śrutam sa hiraṇyasuvarṇasya helām pūrayitvā upari pañca purāṇasātāni datvā bhagavantam upagato bhagavann idam pratigrhyatām iti bhagavān āha grhapate tvayā etāni dātavyāni dīyatām brāhmaṇāyeti tato 'nāthapiṇḍadena grhapatinā sā suvarṇahelā brāhmaṇāya dattā </p>	<p>de nas re zhig na khyim bdag [110r4] mgon med zas sbyin gyis thos nas gser gyi gzhong pa gser dngul gyis bkang ba'i steng ngu kār s̄a pa ṇa lnga brgya bzhag ste bcom ldan 'das kyi thad du song nas bcom ldan 'das 'di bzhes su gsol zhes byas so bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa khyim bdag 'di [110r5] dag ni khyed kyis sbyin par bya ba yin gyis bram ze la byin cig de nas khyim bdag mgon med zas sbyin gyis gser gyi gzhong pa gang ba de bram ze la byin no </p>
<p>bhikṣavaḥ saṃśayajātāḥ sarāji[18r2]kā ca parṣat sarvvaśaṃsaya[cchettāraṃ] buddham bhagavantam papracchuḥ kasya bhaga Dvan yāvad anena brāhmaṇena bhagavān vidhārito nāthapiṇḍadena ca kārṣāpaṇā dattāḥ kutaś ca prabhṛti bha[18r3]gavān asmai dhārayata iti bhagavān āha icchatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ śrotum evaṃ evaṃ bhadanta tena hi bhikṣavaḥ śṛṇuta sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasi kuruta, bhāṣiṣye</p>	<p>bhikṣavaḥ saṃśayajātāḥ sarā[37v6]jikā ca parṣat sarvasaṃśayacchettāraṃ buddham bhagavantam papracchuḥ bhagavan yāvad anena brāhmaṇena bhagavān vidhārito 'nāthapiṇḍadena ca kārṣāpaṇā dattāḥ kutaś ca prabhṛti bhagavan asmai dhārayata iti bhagavān āha icchatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ śrotum evaṃ bhadanta tena hi bhikṣavaḥ [37v7] śṛṇuta sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasi kuruta bhāṣiṣye</p>	<p>bhikṣavaḥ saṃśayajātāḥ sarājikā ca parṣat sarvasaṃśayacchettāraṃ buddham bhagavantam papracchuḥ paśya bhagavan yāvad anena brāhmaṇena bhagavān vidhārito 'nāthapiṇḍadena ca kārṣāpaṇā dattāḥ kutaś ca prabhṛti bhagavān asmai dhārayata iti bhagavān āha icchatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ śrotum evaṃ bhadanta tena hi bhikṣavaḥ śṛṇuta sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasi kuruta bhāṣiṣye </p>	<p>de nas dge slong dag the tsom skyes te the tsom thams cad gnod pa sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das la zhus pa bcom ldan [110r6] 'das bram ze 'dis bcom ldan 'das kyang gshegs su ma ster nas mgon med zas sbyin gyis kār s̄a pa ṇa stsal ba la gzigs bcom ldan 'das ci srid cig nas 'di'i bu lon chags lags bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal ba dge slong dag khyed nyan par 'dod [110r7] dam btsun pa nyan par 'tshal lags so dge slong dag 'o na legs par rab tu nyon la yid la zung shig dang ngas bshad do </p>

<i>CUL Add.1680.2.3</i>	<i>CUL Add.1611</i>	<i>Speyer</i>	<i>Tibetan</i>
	tathāgatenaitāni bhikṣavaḥ pūrvam anyāsu jātiṣu amvaśyambhāvīni [sic] karmāṇi kṛtāny upacitāni ko nyaḥ pratyanubhaviṣyati na bhikṣavaḥ bāhye pṛthivīdhātau nābdhātau na tejodhātau na vāyudhātau api tūpāttesv eva skandhadhā[37v8]tv āyataneṣu karmāṇi kṛtāni vipacyante śubhāny aśubhāni ca na praṇaśyanti karmāṇi api kalpaśatair [sic] api sāmagrīm prāpya kālaṃ ca phalanti khalu dehinām	tathāgatenaitāni bhikṣavaḥ pūrvam anyāsu jātiṣu avasāyambhāvīni karmāṇi kṛtāny upacitāni ko 'nyaḥ pratyanubhaviṣyati na bhikṣavaḥ bāhye pṛthivīdhātau nābdhātau, na tejodhātau na vāyudhātau api tūpāttesv eva skandhadhātvāyataneṣu karmāṇi kṛtāni vipacyante śubhāny aśubhāni ca na praṇaśyanti karmāṇi kalpakoṭīśatair api sāmagrīm prāpya kālaṃ ca phalanti khalu dehinām	
bhūtapūrvam bhikṣavo 'tī[18r4]te 'dhvani vārāṇasīnagaryām brahmadatto nāma rājā rājyaṃ kārayati ○ rddhañ ca sphītañ ca kṣemañ ca subhikṣaṇ cākīrṇabahuja-namanuṣyañ ca praśānta-kalikalaḥaḍimbaḍamarataskara-rataskara,[18r5]rogāpagataṃ śālīkṣugomahiṣīsampaṇnam akhilam akaṇṭakam ekaḍputram iva rājyaṃ pālayati	bhūtapūrvam bhikṣavo tīte 'dhvani vārāṇasyām nagaryām brahmadatto nāma rājā rājyaṃ kārayati rddham ca [37v9] kṣemaṃ ca subhikṣaṇ cākīrṇabahujanamanuṣyaṃ ca praśāntakalikalaḥaḍimbaḍamarataskara-roḡāpagataṃ śālīkṣugomahiṣīsampaṇnam akhilam akaṇṭakam ekaḍputrakam iva rājyaṃ pālayati 	bhūtapūrvam bhikṣavo 'tīte 'dhvani vārāṇasyām nagaryām brahmadatto nāma rājā rājyaṃ kārayati rddham ca sphītaṃ ca kṣemaṃ ca subhikṣaṃ cākīrṇabahujanamanuṣyaṃ ca praśāntakalikalaḥaḍimbaḍamarataskara-roḡāpagataṃ śālīkṣu-gomahiṣīsampaṇnam akhilam akaṇṭakam ekaḍputram iva rājyaṃ pālayati 	dge slong dag sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na grong khyer bā rā ṇa sī na rgyal po tshangs pas byin zhes bya ba rgyal po [read rgyal srid?] byed de de'i ring la 'byor pa [110v1] dang rgyas pa dang bde ba dang lo legs pa dang skye bo dang mi mang pos gang ba dang rtsod pa dang 'thab pa zhi ba dang 'khrug pa dang nang 'khrug pa dang chom rkun dang mu ge dang nad rnames med pa dang 'bras sā lu dang bu ram shing dang ba lang dang ma he [110v2] dang ldan par 'dug ste gnod pa med cing tsher ma dkrugs la bu gcig pa la bya ba bzhin du rgyal srid bskyangs so

<i>CUL Add.1680.2.3</i>	<i>CUL Add.1611</i>	<i>Speyer</i>	<i>Tibetan</i>
tasya jyeṣṭha`h´ kumāro yuvarājah so pareṇa samayena vasantakālasama [183r6] ye saṃpuṣṭiteṣu pādapeṣu haṃsakrauñcamayūraśukaśāri- kākokilajīvaṃjīvakanirghoṣite vanaṣaṇḍe 'mātyaputraparivṛtaḥ krīḍati ramate vayasyo matyaputro vayasyaḥ [18v1] so pareṇa puruṣeṇa sārddham akṣaiḥ krīḍitavān, tato mātyaputraḥ tena puruṣeṇa pañca purāṇaśatāni nirjitaḥ rājaputraś cāsya pratibhūr avasthitaḥ	tasya jyeṣṭha`h´ kumārah yuvarājah so pareṇa samayena vasantakālasamaye saṃpuṣṭi [37v10] teṣu pādapeṣu haṃsakrauñcamayūraśukaśārikāko- kilajīvaṃjīvakanirghoṣite vanaṣaṇḍe 'mātyaputraparivṛtaḥ krīḍati ramate vayasyo matyaputro vayasyaḥ so pareṇa puruṣeṇa sārddham akṣaiḥ krīḍitavān, tato mātyaputraḥ tena puruṣeṇa pañca purāṇaśatāni ni[r] [(j)] [i] {taḥ } [37v11] rājaputraś cāsya pratibhūr avasthitaḥ	tasya jyeṣṭhaḥ kumāro yuvarājah so ' pareṇa samayena vasantakālasamaye saṃpuṣṭiteṣu pādapeṣu haṃsakrauñca- mayūraśukaśārikākokilajīvaṃjī- vakanirghoṣite vanaṣaṇḍe amātya- putraparivṛtaḥ krīḍati ramate *vayaso 'matyaputraḥ vayasyaḥ* so 'pareṇa puruṣeṇa sārddham akṣaiḥ krīḍitavān tato 'mātyaputras tena puruṣeṇa pañca purāṇaśatāni nirjitaḥ rājaputraś cāsya pratibhūr avasthitaḥ	de'i phyi zhig na de'i bu rab rgyal tshab byed pa de'i dpyid kyi dus kyi tshe shing rnams me tog rgyas shing dang pa dang ngur pa dang rma bya dang ne tso dang ri [110v3] skegs dang khu byug dang shang shang te'u rnams skad 'byin pa'i nags khrod na blon po'i bu rnams kyis g.yog byas te rtse zhing dga' la dga' mgu spyod do de'i grogs po blon po'i bu zhig yod pa de rgyan po byed pa'i mi gzhan zhig dang lhan cig tu cho los rtses pa las [110v4] blon po'i bu de mi des kār sā pa ṅa lṅa brgyas pham par byas nas rgyal po'i bus kyang de'i gnya' byas pa las de mthu dang ldan te nga ni rgyal po'i bu'o snyam nas ma byin no
[#### gap according to Speyer####]	[#### gap according to Speyer####]	[#### gap according to Speyer####]	***dge slong dag ji snyam du sems de'i tshe de'i dus na rgyal po'i bur gyur pa gang yin pa de ni nga yin [110v5] no blon po'i bu ni khyim bdag mgon med zas sbyin yin no rgyan po byed pa ni bram ze 'di kho na yin te ***
tena me saṃsāre nantam bhogavyasanam anu [18v2] bhūtam idānīm apy abhisambuddhabodhir anena bādhita iti	tena `adattādānena' me saṃsāre 'nantam bhogavyasanam anubhūtam idānīm apy abhisambuddhabodhir anena bādhita iti	tena me saṃsāre 'nantam bhogavyasanam anubhūtam idānīm apy abhisam- buddhabodhir anena bādhitaḥ	ngas gnya' byas pa las nga ni rgyal po'i bu yin no snyam nas rgyan po byed pa de la kār sā pa ṅa ma byin pa des na nga 'khor ba na longs spyod kyis phongs pa mtha' yas pa [110v6] myong la da ltar byang chub mngon bar rdzogs par sangs rgyas pa na yang 'dis bu lon bdas so

<i>CUL Add.1680.2.3</i>	<i>CUL Add.1611</i>	<i>Speyer</i>	<i>Tibetan</i>
	<p>***kiṃ manyadhve bhikṣavo yo sau tena kalena tena samayena jyeṣṭhakumāro yuvarājo babbhūvāhaṃ yo sau amātyaputra sa anāthapiṇḍado gr̥hapa[ti] [37v12] yo sau puruṣaḥ sa brāhmaṇa iti ***</p>		
<p>hi bhikṣava^{Oh} ekāntakṣṇānām karmaṇām ekāntakṣṇo vipākaḥ ekāntaśuklānām ekāntaśuklaḥ vyatimiśrānām vya [18r3]timiśras tasmāt tarhi bhikṣavaḥ ekāntakṣṇāni karmāṇy apāsya vya timiśrāni ca ekāntaśukleṣv eva karmmasv ābhogaḥ karaṇiyo dattādānasya ca prahāṇāya vyāyan tayaṃ ya [18r4]thā evaṃvidho doṣo tasya evaṃ vo bhikṣavaḥ śikṣitavyaṃ idam avo^Ocad bhagavān āttamanasas te bhikṣavo bhagavato bhāṣitam abhyanaṃdam, </p> <p>anāthapiṇḍadāvadānaṃ samāptaṃ </p>	<p>iti hi bhikṣavaḥ ekāntakṣṇānām karmaṇām ekāntakṣṇa [sic] ekāntaśuklānām ekāntaśuklo vyatimiśrānām vyatimiśraḥ tasmāt tarhi bhikṣavaḥ ekāntakṣṇāni karmāṇy apāsya vyatimiśrāni ca ekāntaśukleṣv eva karmmasv ābhogaḥ [37v13] karaṇiyo dattādānasya ca prahāṇāya vyāyantavyaṃ yathā evaṃvidhā doṣā tasya evaṃ vo bhikṣavaḥ śikṣitavyaṃ idam avocad bhagavān āttamanasas te bhikṣavo bhagavato bhāṣitam abhyanaṃdan </p>	<p>iti hi bhikṣavaḥ ekāntakṣṇānām karmaṇām ekāntakṣṇo vipākaḥ ekāntaśuklānām ekāntaśuklo vyatimiśrānām vyatimiśras tasmāt tarhi bhikṣavaḥ ekāntakṣṇāni karmāṇy apāsya vyatimiśrāni caikāntaśukleṣv eva karmmasv ābhogaḥ karaṇiyo `dattādānasya ca prahāṇāya vyāyantavyaṃ yathā evaṃvidhā doṣās tasya evaṃ vo bhikṣavaḥ śikṣitavyaṃ idam avocad bhagavān āttamanasas te bhikṣavo bhagavato bhāṣitam abhyanaṃdan, </p>	<p>dge slong dag de ltar na las gcig tu nges par gnag pa rnam ni rnam par smin pa yang gcig tu nges par gnag par 'gyur ro las gcig tu nges par dkar ba [110v7] rnam ni rnam par smin pa yang gcig tu nges par dkar bar 'gyur ro las 'dren ma rnam ni rnam par smin pa yang 'dren mar 'gyur ro dge slong dag de bas na las gcig tu nges par gnag par rnam dang 'dren ma rnam spangs la las gcig tu nges par dkar pa [111r1] rnam 'ba' zhid la gtad par bya'o ma byin par len pa spang ba la yang 'bad par bya ste ci nas de lta bu'i nyes par mi 'gyur par dge slong khyed kyis de ltar bslab par bya'o bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad ces bka' stsal nas dge slong de dag yid [111r2] rangs te bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa la mngon par bsod do </p>

Acknowledgements

I would like to dedicate this small contribution in the field of Buddhist narrative literature to the memory of Prof. Dr Michael Hahn, who first introduced me into the world of *jātakas* and *avadānas*, of Buddhist *kāvya* and of philology. Without his untiring work in this field, in the form of critical editions and studies, I wouldn't have been able to write this article.

Abbreviations

AvŚ	<i>Avadānaśataka</i>
BCA	Śāntideva's <i>Bodhicaryāvatāra</i>
CUL	Cambridge University Library
MSV	<i>Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya</i>
NGMCP	Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloging Project
NGMCP Wiki	http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki/Main_Page
SHT	Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden
SRKK	<i>Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā</i>
TBRC	Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center
VAV	Mātṛceṭa's <i>Varṇārhavarṇa</i>

Bibliography

- Appleton, N. 2014. 'The Fourth Decade of the Avadānaśataka'. *Asian Literature and Translation* 2(5): 1–35.
- Asplund, L. (Ed.) 2013. *The Textual History of Kavikumārāvadāna: the Relations Between the Main Texts, Editions and Translations*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Bal, M. 2009. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (3rd ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bajracharya, M., Michaels, A., Gutschow, N., Social Science Baha, & Saraf Foundation for Himalayan Traditions Culture. (2015). *Nepālikabhūpavaṃśāvalī = History of the kings of Nepal : A Buddhist chronicle*. (First ed., Himalayan traditions and culture series; 4-6).
- Bechert, H. (Ed.) 1985. *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bendall, C. 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.
- Braarvig, J., M. Allon, and M. Schøyen (Eds.). 2000. *Buddhist Manuscripts. Volume 1. Number I in Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Bühnemann, G. and M. Hahn. 1985. *Der grosse Legendenkranz (Mahajjātakamālā): Eine mittelalterliche buddhistische Legendensammlung aus Nepal*. Wiesbaden: Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 88,

Burnouf, E. 2010. *Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism*. Transl. [Katia Buffetrille](#) and [Donald S. Lopez Jr.](#) Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Canfora, Luciano. 2002. *Il copista come autore*. Palermo: Sellerio.

Cowell, E. B. and R. A. Neil (Eds.). 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A collection of early Buddhist legends*. Cambridge: The University Press.

Demoto, M. 2006. 'Fragments of the Avadānaśataka'. In *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Volume III of *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, Jens Braarvig (Ed), 207–244. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.

Eimer, H., M. Hahn, M. Schetelich, and P. Wyzlic. 1999. *Studia Tibetica et Mongolica: (Festschrift Manfred Taube)*, Indica et Tibetica Volume 34. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica.

Hahn, M. 1982. *Die Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā: ein spätbuddhistischer Text zur Verdienstlehre*, Volume 9 of *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

----- 1992. *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta: Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra. On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās* (2nd, thoroughly revised and enlarged ed.), Volume 1 of *Studia philologica Buddhica Occasional paper series*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

----- 2007. 'Gopadatta's Jātakamālā. On the First Complete Edition of its 16 Legends'. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 55(3): 1043–1051.

Handurukande, R. 1967. *Maṇicūḍāvadāna: Being a translation and edition, and Lokānanda: a transliteration and synopsis*, Volume 24 of *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*. London: Luzac.

Harrison, P. M. and J.-U. Hartmann. 2000. 'Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra'. In Braarvig, Allon, and Schøyen (Eds.), 167–216.

Harrison, P. M. and J.-U. Hartmann (Eds.). 2014. *From Birch Bark to Digital Data. Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: the State of the Field*, Volume 80 of *Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Hartmann, J.-U. 1985. 'Zur Frage der Schulzugehörigkeit des Avadānaśataka'. In Bechert 1985, 219–224. Göttingen.

Hiraoka, S. 1998. 'The Relation Between the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 26: 419–434.

Hiraoka, S. 2011. 'The *Divyāvadāna* in English'. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 54(3): 231–270.

Klaus, K. 1983. *Das Maitrakanyakāvadāna (Divyāvadāna 38): Sanskrittext und deutsche Übersetzung*, Volume 2 of *Indica et Tibetica*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Kölver, B. 1999. 'Actives into Ergatives, or, Newari into Sanskrit'. In Eimer, Hahn, Schetelich, and Wyzlic, 1999, 189–206.

Lewis, T., S. M. Tuladhar, and L. R. Tuladhar. 2000. *Popular Buddhist Texts from Nepal: Narratives and Rituals of Newar Buddhism*. SUNY series in Buddhist studies. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Locke, J. K. 1985. *Buddhist Monasteries of Nepal. A Survey of the Bāhās and Bahās of the Kathmandu Valley*. Kathmandu, Nepal: Sahayogi Press.

Marciniak, K. 2014. *Studia nad Mahāvastu: sanskryckim tekstem buddyjskiej szkoły mahasanghików-lokottarawadinów*. Warsaw: Research Centre of Buddhist Studies, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw.

Matsumura, H. 1980. *Four Avadānas from the Gilgit Manuscripts*. Canberra: The Australian National University.

Michaels, A. 2010. 'Newar Hybrid Ritual and its Language in Hindu Initiations'. In Zotter and Zotter, 2010, 137–150.

Mitra, R. 1882. *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Ohnuma, R. 2007. *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood: Giving Away the Body in Indian Buddhist Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Okada, M. 1993. *Dvāviṃśatyavadānakathā: ein mittelalterlicher buddhistischer Text zur Spendenfrömmigkeit*, Volume 24 of *Indica et Tibetica*. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Panglung, J. L. 1981. *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung*, Volume 3 of *Studia philologica Buddhica. Monograph series*. Tokyo: Reiyukai Library.

Preissler, H., and H. Stein. 1998. *Annäherung an Das Fremde: XXVI. Deutscher Orientalistentag Vom 25. Bis 29. 9. 1995 in Leipzig: Vorträge*. Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Supplement; 11. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Rotman, A. 2008. *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna, Part I*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Segre, C. 2014. *Opera critica* (1st ed.). I meridiani. Milano: Mondadori.

Singh, S. S., P. Gunanand, and D. Wright. 1877. *History of Nepāl. Translated from the Parbatiyā by Shew Shunker Singh and Pandit Gunānand; with an Introductory Sketch of the Country and People of Nepāl by the Editor, Daniel Wright*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Speyer, J. S. 1902. *Avadānaçataka. A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. St. Pétersbourg: Académie Impériale des Sciences.

Straube, M. 2006. *Prinz Sudhana und die Kinnarī: eine buddhistische Liebesgeschichte von Kṣemendra. Texte, Übersetzung, Studie*, Volume 46 of *Indica et Tibetica*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

----- 2009. *Studien zur Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā. Texte und Quellen der Parallelen zu Haribhaṭṭas Jātakamālā*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

----- 2015. ‘Narratives: South Asia’. In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Volume 1, J.Silk (Ed.), 1–18. Leiden: Brill.

Tatelman, J. 1996. *The Trials of Yaśodharā. A Critical Edition, Annotated Translation and Study of Bhadrakalpāvadāna II–V*. (D.Phil. thesis ed.). Oxford: University of Oxford.

----- 2000. *The Glorious Deeds of Pūrṇa: A Translation and Study of the Pūrṇāvadāna*. Curzon critical studies in Buddhism. Richmond: Curzon.

Tournier, V. 2012. ‘The Mahāvastu and the Vinayapiṭaka of the Mahāṃghika-Lokottaravādins’. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology XV*: 87–104.

----- Forthcoming. *Le Mahāvastu et la formation des conceptions relatives à la carrière du bodhisattva*. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient.

Tuladhar-Douglas, W. 2006. *Remaking Buddhism for medieval Nepal: the Fifteenth-Century Reformation of Newar Buddhism*. Routledge critical studies in Buddhism. London: Routledge.

Vaidya, P. L. 1958. *Avadāna-śataka*, Volume 19 of *Buddhist Sanskrit texts*. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

von Hinüber, O. 1998. *Entstehung und Aufbau der Jātaka-Sammlung*. Studien Zur Literatur Des Theravāda Buddhismus; 1. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

----- 1998a. ‘Aufbau und Entwicklung der Jātaka - Sammlung’. In Preissler and Stein (Eds.). 1998, 515–522.

----- 2014. ‘The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research’. In Harrison and Hartmann (Eds.). 2014, 79–136.

Zimmermann, H. 1975. *Die Subhāṣita-ratna-karaṇḍaka-kathā (dem Āryaśūra zugeschrieben) und ihre tibetanische Übersetzung: ein Vergleich zur Darlegung der Irrtumsrisiken bei der Auswertung tibetanischer Übersetzungen*, Volume 8 of *Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zotter, A. and C. Zotter. 2010. *Hindu and Buddhist Initiations in India and Nepal*, Volume

10 of *Ethno-Indology*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.