

## A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO TWO MANUSCRIPTS OF *BODHISATTVĀVADĀNAKALPALATĀ* FOUND IN TIBET\*

LIU Zhen

National Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies at Fudan University  
220 Handan Road, Shanghai, 200433, P.R. China  
e-mail: liuzhen@fudan.edu.cn

There are two Sanskrit manuscripts of Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* preserved at Drepung Monastery in Tibet. The earlier one (according to the colophon) contains all the 108 *avadānas* comprising the whole text, while the later one only includes the last 61 *avadānas*. In this paper, we compare and analyse two paratextual elements of the extant versions, namely, *pallava*-endings and prologue, in order to know how frequently the translator Shong ton Rdo rje rgyal mtshan and the redactor Zha lu lotsāva Chos skyong bzang po used these two manuscripts.

*Key words:* *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, Drepung Monastery, Shong ton Rdo rje rgyal mtshan, Zha lu lotsāva Chos skyong bzang po.

Kṣemendra's (ca. 980–after 1065 C.E.)<sup>1</sup> *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (henceforth: Av-klp) is a highly influential poetic work within Indo-Tibetan Buddhist circles. His son, Somendra, composed an epilogue<sup>2</sup> according to which Kṣemendra composed the Av-klp in 1052.

Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal mtshan and Lakṣmīkara translated it into Tibetan between ca. 1260 and 1280.<sup>3</sup> Subsequently, Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan (1302–1364) included a recension of its translation in the Tanjur edition (van der Kuijp 1994: 139–142), and Zha lu lotsāva Chos skyong bzang po (1441–1528) prepared a bilingual

\* I would like to express my gratitude to Dragomir Dimitrov, Martin Straube and David Fiordalis who gave me many valuable suggestions. Without them, this article would not be the same.

<sup>1</sup> For the year of his birth and death I follow Formigatti (2019).

<sup>2</sup> *samvatsare saptaviṃśe vaiśākhya sitodayo | kṛteyaṃ kalpalatikā jinajanmamahotsave ||* 16 ||, referred by Bendall (1992: 18).

<sup>3</sup> This dating is suggested by de Jong (1979: 5) and followed by Straube (2006: 41). However, there are different hypotheses: 1272 (Das 1888–1913, Vol. I: iii), ca. 1267–1270 (van der Kuijp 1996: 401), ca. 1270–1275 (Mejor 1992: 5, Note 2) and followed by Dimitrov (2002: 45, Note 185). For a brief summary of dating conjectures, cf. Dimitrov (2002: 37, Note 151).

(Sanskrit and Tibetan) version (Mejor 1992: 65ff). During the reign of the Fifth Dalai Lama, a complete and revised Sanskrit text of the Av-klp, together with its Tibetan translation, was printed in 1664 and 1665 (cf. Mejor 1992: 64).

Five printing blocks and one manuscript of the Tibetan translation are known to be preserved. Four printing blocks, Derge, Cone, Narthang and Peking, and one manuscript, Ganden, are in the Tanjur. There is also the printing block prepared under the Fifth Dalai Lama. Derge (henceforth: D1 for its transcription of Sanskrit text in Tibetan script and D2 for the Tibetan translation in Derge-Tanjur, *ke* 1b–366a and *khe* 1b–329a) and Cone include bilingual editions. So does the woodblock prepared under the Fifth Dalai Lama. These editions belong to Straube's hypo-archetype  $\delta$ . The others, which belong to Straube's hypo-archetype  $\beta$ , only contain the Tibetan translation.<sup>4</sup>

Until now, six Sanskrit manuscripts (henceforth Mss.) are known to be extant: (1) Ms. A, at Cambridge University Library (Add. 1306, henceforth: A); (2) Ms. B, at the same library (Add. 913, henceforth: B); (3) Ms. E, at the National Archives of Nepal (reel No. B 95/5); (4) Ms. H, at the Library of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta (Hudson Collection, B. 15); (5) Ms. F, at the Bibliothèque nationale de France (No. 8);<sup>5</sup> (6) and a Ms. at the Kesar Library, Kathmandu (Kesar 519).<sup>6</sup>

All the above-mentioned Mss. are divided into two parts. *Pallavas* 1–49 correspond to the first part, while *pallava* 50 is the first chapter of the second part. E, H, F lack the first part. A and B preserve *pallavas* 41 to 49. B and F preserve the second part, but are incomplete (Straube 2006: 60–69; 2009: 10–11).

Two other Mss. of Av-klp have been found at Drepung (Tibetan: 'Bras spungs) Monastery. Luo, in his catalogue, gives us a brief description of one box of Mss. (213 leaves) preserved at that monastery, which includes thirteen texts Luo (1984: 126–135). However, the Av-klp is not mentioned there. Following Straube's (2006: 60–68) model, I provide detailed descriptions of both Mss. below.

## Ms. C1

**Possessor:** Drepung Monastery (ZX0675-ZB 38).

**Material:** Palm leaf.

**Size:** 33 × 5.5 cm.

**Script:** Old Newārī.

**Number of lines per page:** 7.

**Number of folios:** 296 (complete).

**Pagination:** On the *verso* page of each folio, there are three pagination marks. Pagination mark 1, on the left edge in 'letter-numerals',<sup>7</sup> is written in the same ink and

<sup>4</sup> For his hypo-archetypes, cf. Straube (2006: 90–92; 2009: 18).

<sup>5</sup> For detailed descriptions of Mss. A, B, E, H, cf. Straube (2006: 60–69). For a description of Ms. F, cf. Filliozat (1941: 4–5) and Straube (2009: 10–11).

<sup>6</sup> According to Martin Straube, this Ms. contains 13 folios of the 108th *pallava*, and has been double filmed. One of the films is reel No. C48/9, and the other one is C 104/10 (email communication on 27 May 2018).

<sup>7</sup> I follow Bendall's terminology (1992: liii).

handwriting style as the main text. Pagination mark 2, on the right edge, reflects Hindu-Arabic numbering and a similar Old Newārī style. It was probably written by the same hand. Pagination mark 3, on the right edge beneath pagination 2, written in New Newārī, was probably added by another person in a later period.

**Condition of preservation:** Apart from the fact that some *akṣaras* are beginning to fade (e.g. 83a, 211a, 220a, 256a, 256b, 267a, 268a, 286b, 287a, 290b), the Ms. is still in acceptable condition. On several pages, neighbouring pages in particular, the ink has become blurred. The *akṣaras* there are hardly legible (e.g. 55a, 76a, 199b, 216a, 220b, 233b, 234a, 264b, 275b, 276a, 278b). Almost all titles of the *pallavas* are marked in red.

**Glosses/correction (*tippana*):** Sometimes after a verse, the scribe identified figures of speech (*alaṃkāra*) according to *Alaṃkāraśāstra*. Later, scribes or perhaps common readers marked these terms in red, providing glosses with Tibetan counterparts. These glosses appear on the blank areas near the Sanskrit terms.<sup>8</sup> Occasionally, the words in the main text also present glosses, such as on 282a and 284a.<sup>9</sup> In the upper, lower or right margin of the Ms., one may find scribal corrections. Also, a later person wrote some *akṣaras* either in a script close to Devanāgarī or in Tibetan script. This person did so in order to transcribe these *akṣaras*’ old script into a more familiar script. Additionally, there are some interlinear comments or notes. Assumedly, people who studied the text produced these notes,<sup>10</sup> which reflect four hands,<sup>11</sup> being two in red ink,<sup>12</sup> and two in black ink.<sup>13</sup> Comparing the bilingual Sanskrit–Tibetan glosses on the first page in a Nepalese Ms. of the *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* (NAK Acc. No.: 1/468), the first red note presents a ductus similar to the one in that Ms., i.e., it consists in a possible autograph by Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal mtshan himself.<sup>14</sup>

**Punctuation:** Relatively regular, with one single *danḍa* after each half verse and a double *danḍa* at the end of the verse. At times, a verse number is added between two double *danḍas*.

<sup>8</sup> For example: (134a7) *arthāntaranyāsaḥ* is glossed as *don gzhan bkod pa* below, cf. *Kāvyādarśa* II 166: *jñeyah sorthāntaranyāso vastu prastutya kiñcana | tatsādhanasamarthasya nyāso yonyasya vastunaḥ ||* and Tibetan translation: *gang zhig dngos 'ga' rab bkod nas | de yi sgrub byed nus pa can | dngos po gzhan dag 'god pa de | don gzhan bkod par zhes par bya ||*.

<sup>9</sup> Straube (2009: 22) assumes that Zha lu lotsawa may have only provided glosses in the margins of a Sanskrit Ms. instead of a new copy of a Sanskrit Ms.

<sup>10</sup> For example: (99b, above) *dmar chen gnyis po'i bar gyi snyad 'dod bod dpe la mi snang ngo*, ‘between the two big red [marks] the simile in the Tibetan text with wrong intention does not appear’. Does “the two big red [marks]” indicate the two terms marked with red in the previous page, i.e. (99a4) *śleṣaḥ* and (99a7) *upamā*?

<sup>11</sup> I am not sure if one of them wrote the glosses, too.

<sup>12</sup> 29a above, 31a above, 58a below, 71a below and 99b above by one hand (red 1), and 138a above and 187b below by one hand (red 2).

<sup>13</sup> 287b below and 293a above by one hand (black 1), and 282a above & below, 283b below and 284a above by another hand (black 2).

<sup>14</sup> The possibility that Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal mtshan left his autograph on the first page in a Ms. of *Ratnaśrīṭīkā* was suggested by Dimitrov (2006: 6) who identified the interline notes in red with another ‘autograph’ by Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal mtshan (personal communication, in November 2017).

**Dating:** 1169 C.E. or shortly before/after 1269 C.E.

**Content:** (1) Av-klp 1–107 (1b1–281b7); (2) Somendra’s prologue (281b7–282b6); (3) Av-klp 108 (282b6–291b1); (4) Somendra’s epilogue (291b1–292a4); (5) Somendra’s list of contents (292a4–294a1); (6) *praṇidhāna* (294a1–5); (7) colophon (294a5–7).

**Beginning:**

(1b1) namaḥ śrīlokanāthāya || cittam yasya sphaṭikavimalam naiva grhṇāti rāgam  
kāruṇyārdre manasi nikhilāḥ śoṣitā yena doṣāḥ | akrodhena svayam abhihato yena  
saṃsāraśatruḥ sarvvajño sau bhavatu bhavatām śreyase ni(b2)ścalāya ||

**Colophon:**

(294a5) deyadharmmo (a6) <’>yam pravaramahāyānāyāyinaḥ sakalatathāga-  
t{ā}akṛtānugrahasya mahācīnadeśīyaśākyabhikṣuśrīmatirājasya yad atra || ||  
punyam tat\* bhavatu ācāryopadhyāyamatāpitṛpūrvvagammanam kṛtvā sakala-  
sa(a7)tvārāse{h śukha}r anuttarajñānaphalāvāptaya iti || śūnyam grahaś ca  
bāhuś ca samvad yayau tadā {dya} māghasitarapañcamadavase (<sup>o</sup>davase is  
scribal error for <sup>o</sup>divase) yad alekhi mādhave nityam sarvvasatvārthahetunā || ||  
namo buddhāya namo dharmāya namo saṅghāya.

“‘This is Śākyabhikṣu Śrīmatirāja’s religious gift; he is from *mahācīna*<sup>15</sup>, the follower of the eminent Mahāyāna [, and has received] favors from all Tathāgatas. Having placed the master, teacher, mother and father in the foreground, the entire group of living beings will obtain the merit, which [is created] here, in order to obtain the fruit of the highest knowledge.’ On the fifth day of the black [half] of the winter month in the lapsed year 290 (= 1169 C.E.)<sup>16</sup>, this manuscript, which Mādhave has copied, is [dedicated] to the eternal wellbeing of all living beings. Pay homage to the Buddha, the Dharma and the monk community!”

On the penultimate inscribed page (294b) there is a line written in minute Tibetan *dbu med* script:

pañṭia (scribal error for paṇḍita) dge ba’i dbang pos le’u brgya dang bdun  
mdzad do | dpag bsam ’khri shing le’u brgya dang brgyad yod pa las le’u  
brgyad pa ’di zla ba’i dbang pos mdzad do |

‘Paṇḍita Kṣemendra composed 107 chapters. Since the Av-klp has 108 chapters, the 108th chapter is composed by Somendra.’

Furthermore, after a blank leaf (295), there is a leaf (296) whose *recto* side is inscribed while the *verso* is blank. On the *recto* page lines 1 and 3, there are three and a half verses from Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa* (II 4–7ab) transcribed in Tibetan script, with the corresponding Tibetan translation in lines 2 and 4. Besides these, there are occasional glosses in red ink. All these are in *dbu med*. The words in the Tibetan translation are

<sup>15</sup> *Mahācīna* is rendered as *dbus gtsang* in Tibetan, cf. Roesler (2018: 361 and Note 37).

<sup>16</sup> I am in debt to Christopher Minkowski (Oxford) and Michael Witzel (Harvard) who helped me to calculate the date.

divided with numbering beneath into word unities, which are linked with red dotted lines to their respective counterparts in the Sanskrit text. According to the extant versions, both texts, Sanskrit and Tibetan, have scribal errors and a little different wording.<sup>17</sup> However, the 7th verse stops at Pāda-b; the rest of it cannot be found on the *verso* page. It is difficult to say whether this folio was inserted into the Av-klp by mistake.

## Ms. C2

**Possessor:** Drepung Monastery (ZX0650-ZB 22).

**Material:** palm leaf.

**Size:** 33.5 × 6.1 cm.

**Script:** Old Newārī.<sup>18</sup>

**Number of lines per page:** 5.<sup>19</sup>

**Number of folios:** 230.

**Pagination:** The right edge of the Ms shows only Hindu-Arabic numbering. It is in the same style as that in the main text and is similar to the numbering 2 in C1. However, on 132b, the pagination mark repeats the number '131'. Therefore, from folio 132 to 230, the page number is always wrong, since the corresponding number is one unit smaller than the correct number.

**Condition of preservation:** The Ms. shows an excellent state of preservation. The *akṣaras* are clear. Almost all titles of the *pallavas* are marked in red.

**Glosses/correction (tippana):** The scribe made some corrections in both the upper and the lower margins of the Ms. However, a later person also wrote some *akṣaras* in a script close to Devanāgarī in order to decipher the corresponding old styled *akṣaras* in the text. Unlike C1, this text has no annotations. The text presents almost no glosses, except for 209b–210b, which has many glosses and a verse in Tibetan in the form of notes.<sup>20</sup>

**Punctuation:** Relatively regular, with one single *daṇḍa* after each half verse and a double *daṇḍa* at the end of the verse. Only at times, a verse number is added between two double *daṇḍas*.

<sup>17</sup> The Tibetan text here has the same peculiar readings as in Cone- (C) and Derge-Tanjur (D), against these in Ganden- (G), Narthang- (N) and Peking-Tanjur (P), like, *ldog pa can dang srid pa can* CD vs. *ldog pa can dang srid pa dang* GNP (II 4d) and *lhan cig brjod dang yongs brjes shis* CD and *lhan cig brjod dang yongs brjes smon* GNP (II 7a). For these five Tanjur editions, cf. <https://www.tbrc.org/>.

<sup>18</sup> It has the same ductus as that of C1.

<sup>19</sup> In each above and below margin of 5b, below margin of 153a, and below margin of 170a, a line is added.

<sup>20</sup> It is noteworthy that there is a verse-citation from the Tibetan translation of the 108th *ava-dāna* on the upper margin of 210\*a, *skabs der tsandan 'khri shing rlung gzhon gyis | bskyod cing shugs ring glal ba bsten rnam la | 'dod pa'i grogs por gyur pa dpyid kyi ni | mngon par 'dod pa'i spyod tshul rab tu bstan |*. This corresponds to the 14th verse of the Sanskrit version (210\*a3): *atrāntare candanavallārīṇāṃ dideśa vālānilalolitānām | ucchrasinīnām abhilāṣavṛttaṃ jṛmbhā-juṣāṃ kāmāsuhṛdvasantaḥ ||*. The latter is marked with a cross in the Ms. This means a reader checked or compared this verse in the Ms. with its translation.

**Dating:** 1269 C.E.

**Content:** (1) Av-klp 48–107 (1b1–208\*a1); (2) Somendra's prologue (208\*a1–209\*a5); (3) Av-klp 108 (209\*a5–222b\*4); (4) Somendra's epilogue (222b\*4–224\*a4); (5) Somendra's list of contents (224a\*4–226b\*5); (6) *prañidhāna* (226b\*5–227\*a5);<sup>21</sup> (7) colophon (227\*a5–b2).

**Beginning:**

(1b1) namo lokanāthāya || svārthapravṛttau vigatasprhṛānām paropakāre sata-todyatānām | kleśeṣv abhītāvyasanair anītā vighnair apīḍākaram eti siddhiḥ ||

**Colophon:**

(227\*a5) \*deyadharmmo (<')yam pra(b1)varamahāyānayāyinaḥ sakalatathāgata-śāsanāmṛtasārasya bhoṭadeśīyaśākyabhikṣuśrīvajradhvajasya yad atra puṇyam tat\* bhavatu ācāryopādhyāyamātāpitṛpūrvvaṃ gamam kṛtvā sakala(b2)satva-raśer anuttaraphalāvāptaya iti || samvat(<\*) 389 caitrapaṇcamyām tithau likhitam idam mādhaveneti || śubham astu sarvvajagatām iti ||

‘This is a religious gift from Śākyabhikṣu Śrīvajradhvaja<sup>22</sup> from Bhoṭa,<sup>23</sup> who is a follower of the eminent Mahāyāna [, and has received] the essence of ambrosia from the instruction of all the Tathāgatas! Having placed the master, teacher, mother and father in the foreground, the entire group of living beings, will have the merit, which [is created] here, in order to obtain the highest fruit. On the 5th day of the second spring month in the year 389 (= 1269 C.E.), this is copied by Mādha. May all beings have auspiciousness.’

On 230\*a, there is a line in Tibetan *dbu med* script:

’di ni rgya dpe cig shos mchog tu dag pa’i khyad ’phags |

‘This is the other Indian manuscript, which [contains] the excellence of foremost correctness.’

According to the above information, Mādha copied two Mss. One of these (C1) had a template whose dating can be traced back to 1169 C.E. Mādha probably did not alter the text, but he did replace the previous scribe's name with his own (cf. Bendall 1992: xviii–xix). In 1269 C.E., a Tibetan monk—or even more likely, Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal mtshan himself—commissioned the other Ms. (C2). The colophon of the second version was carefully prepared and does not reveal any information about its template. Both versions are earlier than the oldest Ms. (A), found outside Tibet.

<sup>21</sup> There is one more verse: *anena saddharmmarasāmṛtena sarvvajñavaktrād bhavaśītalena | kleśānalaprajvālītaturasya lokasya duḥkhapraśamo (<')stu nityam iti ||*

<sup>22</sup> This name can be reconstructed into Tibetan as ‘Rdo rje rgyal mtshan’, which is identical to one of the translators, Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal mtshan. Coincidentally, in the colophon of another Sanskrit Ms., *Catuhstotravivaraṇa*, his Sanskrit name is also attested. According to Ye (2011: 175), this Ms. was copied between 1260 and 1269 C.E. However, the Tibetan translation of this text has left no trace in Tibet (cf. Luo 1985: 41–42; Ye 2011: 175–176).

<sup>23</sup> In medieval Nepal (8th–15th century), Bhoṭa can indicate either Tibet or Banepa (cf. Petech 1984: 27–28). According to Roesler (2018: 361), ‘*bhoṭa* was an umbrella term for ethnically Tibetan people’.

A Ms. of the Av-klp could have either been copied in its entirety,<sup>24</sup> or divided into two parts. In the latter case, the division may have taken place either before the 50th *pallava*, as Straube (2006: 60–69) saw, or elsewhere. For instance, it could take place at the beginning of the 48th *pallava*, since the short homage phrase<sup>25</sup> is only found there. As in the Tibetan transcription of the Sanskrit text (D1) and the Tibetan translation (D2), C1 contains *pallava* 10, *Garbhāvākṛāntideśanā(vadāna)*,<sup>26</sup> while we do not find the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* in either of the two Mss.<sup>27</sup> Based on the dating of the Mss., it is possible that C1 and C2 could have been used in translation, redactions and transcription. Due to its better condition of legibility, C2 may have been used more frequently than C1 during some period. This might explain how the first part of C2 became lost.<sup>28</sup>

Comparing C1 and C2 with the Tibetan translation and transcription in the framework of the *pallava*-endings and the prologue can help us to determine whether one or both Mss. were used in the translation and transcription process.

As we know, each *pallava* ends with a formulaic sentence, like *iti kṣemendra-viracitāyāṃ bodhisatvāvadānakalpalatāyāṃ* [a title]-*avadānaṃ* [an ordinal number] *pallavaḥ*. Here are alternative expressions, which trace back to scribal error or to a scribe's arbitrary decision.

## 6. Badaradvīpayātra

C1: (29b3) *iti kṣemendraviracitāyāṃ bodhisatvāvadānamālāyā(ṃ)*<sup>29</sup> *kalpalatāyāṃ badaradvīpayātrā ṣaṣṭhaḥ pallavaḥ*

D1:<sup>30</sup> (*ke* 70b1) *iti kṣe(b3)endraviracitāyāṃ bodhisatvāvadānakalpalatāyāṃ badaradvīpayātrā ṣaṣṭhaḥ pallavaḥ*

D2: (70b2) *zhes pa dge ba'i (b4) dbang pos byas pa'i byang chub sems dpa'i rtoḡs pa brjod pa dpag bsam gyi 'khri shing las ba da ra'i gling du 'gro ba'i yal 'dab ste drug pa'o*

## 13. Hārītakādamana

C1: (56a2) *hārītakādamanāvadānaṃ*

D1: (132a5) *hārītakādamanāvadānaṃ*

D2: (132a6) *'phrog ma'i rtoḡs pa brjod gro ba'i*

<sup>24</sup> Until the colophon, we do not find any other short beginning homage phrase.

<sup>25</sup> 1b1: *namo lokanāthāya*.

<sup>26</sup> 40b4, I am not convinced by de Jong's (1977: 28 ff) hypothesis concerning why this *pallava* has been placed after *pallava* 9.

<sup>27</sup> However, as in the other codices, *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* as *pallava* 49 exists in Somendra's list of C1 and C2, and *Garbhāvākṛāntideśanāvadāna* does not.

<sup>28</sup> We cannot rule out the possibility that C2 is only a partial copy of the whole Av-klp commissioned by Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal mtshan.

<sup>29</sup> This designation, *avadānamālā*, appears twice in C1 (here and 15b6–7, Av-klp 3) and three times in C2 (32a5, Av-klp 54, 40b1, Av-klp 58 and 189\*a3, Av-klp 95).

<sup>30</sup> Instead of Romanising the Tibetan transcription, I transliterate it to make the comparison distinct.

## 45. Ajātaśatrupitṛdroha

C1: (146b7) ajātaśatrupitṛdoha<sup>o</sup>D1: (342a5) ajātaśatrupitṛdroha<sup>o</sup>

D2: (342a6) ma skye dgras pha bsad pa

## 54. Sattvauşadha

C1: (172a6) satvauşadho nāmāvadānaṃ

C2: (khe 32a5) satvauşadho nāmāvadānaṃ

D1: (36b5) satvauşadho (b7) nāmāvadānaṃ

D2: (36b6) sems (b8) can sman zhes bya ba'i rtogs pa brjod pa

## 56. Gopālanāgadamana

C1: (175b6) gopālanāgadamanaṃ ṣaṭ\*paṃcāśaḥ pallavaḥ

C2: (37b1) go(b2)pālanāgadamanāvadānaṃ ṣaṭ\*paṃcāśaḥ pallavaḥ

D1: (45a5) gopālanāgadamanaṃ ṣaṣṭpañcaśaḥ pallavaḥ

D2: (45a6) klu ba lang skyon btul ba'i rtogs pa brjod pa'i yal 'dab ste lnga bcu rtso drug pa'o

## 58. Puṇyabala

C1: (177b5) puṇyavalāvadānaṃ nāma<sup>o</sup>C2: (40b1) puṇyavalāvadānaṃ nāma<sup>o</sup>D1: (47a1) puṇyavalāvadānaṃ nāma<sup>o</sup>

D2: (47a2) bsod nams stobs kyi rtogs pa brjod pa

## 74. pṛthivīpradāna

C1: (229b3) pṛthivīpradāna(m) (b4) catuḥsaptatitamah pallavaḥ

C2: (121b2) pṛthivīpradānāvadānaṃ catuḥsaptati(ta)mah pallavaḥ

D1: (167b3) pṛthivīpradānaṃ catuḥsaptatitamah pallavaḥ

D2: (167b4) sa gzhi phul ba'i rtogs pa brjod pa'i yal 'dab ste bdun cu tsa bzhi pa'o

## 82. Nārapūrvika

C1: (241b2) pallavaḥ

C2: (145\*a3) without *pallavaḥ*

D1: (196a1) pallavaḥ

D2: (196a2) yal 'dab ste

## 83. Rāhulakarmapluti

C1: (242b7) rāhulakarmmapluty

C2: (147\*a) rāhulapūrvvakarmmapluty



D1: (199a1) *rāhulakarmmapluty*

D2: (199a2) *sgra gcan 'dzin*<sup>31</sup>

#### 89. Dharmaruci

C1: (258b7) *dharmmarucyavadānam ekān navatitamah pallavaḥ samāptah*

C2: (171\*b1) *dharmmarucyavadānam ekān navatitamah pallavaḥ*

D1: (236b5) *dharmmarucyavadānam ekān navatitamah pallavaḥ*

D2: (236b6) *chos sred kyi rtogs pa brjod pa'i yal 'dab ste brgyad cu rtsa dgu ba'o*

#### 92. Maitrakanyakā

C1: (264a1) *maitryakanyakā*

C2: (186\*b) *maitrakanyakā*

D1: (248b1) *maitryakanyakā*

D2: (248b2) *mdza' bo'i bu mo*

#### 100. Puṇyaprabhāsa

C1: (273b1) *punaḥ prabhāsāvadānaṃ*

C2: (194\*b3) *puṇyaprabhāsāvadānaṃ*

D1: (270b5) *puṇyaḥ prabhāsāvadāna*

D2: (270b6) *bsod nams rab gsal gyi rtogs pa brjod pa*

#### 105. Raivata

C1: (279b5) *raivatāvadānaṃ*

C2: (204\*b2) *raivatāvadānaṃ*

D1: (285b3) *raivatāvadānaṃ*

D2: (285b4) *rai ba ta'i rtogs pa brjod pa*

#### 106. Kanakavarmā

C1: (280b6) *kanakavarmmāvadāna(m)*

C2: (206\*a2) *kanakavarmmāvadānaṃ*

D1: (288a1) *kanakavarmmāvadāna(m)*

D2: (288a2) *gser gyi go cha'i rtogs pa brjod pa*

Here, the Tibetan translation largely follows C2, only two of its passages conform to C1 (*pallava* 6 and 54). The Tibetan transcription is mostly drawn from C1. It is safe to argue that the Tibetan translation is based on one or more Sanskrit Ms(s)., but there are already several redactions made after the translation had been finished. Therefore, almost all the variations in such formulaic expressions have been eliminated. There

<sup>31</sup> It can be reconstructed as *rāhulaka*, i.e. the 83rd title in Somendra's list of contents.

are several examples reflecting the detailed relationship between C1, C2, the Tibetan transcription, and the translation.

In Somendra's prologue:

- netrāmṛtapracitalepyamayī babhūva  
buddhāvadānavividhādbhutakalpavallī || 1cd
- c: *netrāmṛtapracitalepyamayī* A, B, C1, C2, D1] *mig gi bdud rtsi rab skyed yi ge'i rang bzhin* = \**netrāmṛtaprabhavalekhyamayī* D2, *citrāmṛtapracitalekhyamayī* Das.<sup>32</sup>
- somendranāmā tanayo 'tha tasya  
kavicchannakkāparanāmādheyah | 4ab
- b: *kavicchannakkāpara*<sup>o</sup> A<sup>pc</sup>, C1, C2] *kavicchannakkāparā*<sup>o</sup> D1, *ming gzhan nā ko ... mkhan* D2, *kavir nākāparā*<sup>o</sup> de Jong, *kavir niruddhāpara*<sup>o</sup> A<sup>ac</sup>, B, Das.  
bandhaḥ keralakāminīkucabharākārah param saṃhataḥ  
kāñcīkāntakapolakomalatarah ko 'pi prasādodayah |  
kāññādinayanacchaṭa paricitā karnāntarāsaṅginī  
bhaṅgiryasya taraṅginī rasanidher vāndyah sa sūktodadhiḥ || 5
- a: *°kuca*<sup>o</sup> A, B, C1, Das] *kaca*<sup>o</sup> D1, *skra* D2<sup>o</sup>, *°kara*<sup>o</sup> C2.  
b: *kāñcī*<sup>o</sup> A, B, C1] *kerī*<sup>o</sup> C2, D2, *kāmṛī* D1, *kāñjī*<sup>o</sup> Das.  
umkārāt kuṭilatvam eva paramaṃ yaiḥ śikṣitam nāparam  
yeṣāṃ svastipadaṃ kadācid api na spaṣṭaṃ mukhān nirgataṃ | 6ab
- a: *nāparaṃ* A, C2, D1] *cāparaṃ* B, *gzhan pa yin* D2, om. C1, *līlayā* Das.  
b: *yeṣāṃ* A, B, C1, C2, D1] *yaśya* Das, *gang gi* D2.  
saṃsārorupariśramasya dadhataḥ kāmāsavakṣībatāṃ  
rohaṃ mohatamo nimīlitadrśaḥ suptasya luptasmṛteḥ |  
saṃnaddhaṃ jagataḥ prabodhanavidhau niḥśeṣadoṣāpaham  
bhāsvantaṃ bhagavantaṃ eva satataṃ buddhaṃ prabuddhaṃ namaḥ || 8
- a: *°sava*<sup>o</sup> C1, C2, *chang* D2] *°vaśa*<sup>o</sup> A, B, *°pava*<sup>o</sup> D1.  
b: *rohaṃ moha*<sup>o</sup> C2] *rohanmoha*<sup>o</sup> A, B, *rohasmāha*<sup>o</sup> C1, *mohasmāha*<sup>o</sup> D1, *gti mug rgyas pa* D2; *lupta*<sup>o</sup> A, C1, C2, D1, *nyams pa* D2] *supta*<sup>o</sup> B.  
c: *saṃnaddhaṃ jagataḥ prabodhanavidhau* C1, C2, D1] illegible A, *sambuddhaṃ kramataḥ prabodhanaparaṃ* B, *'gro ba rab tu rtogs par sgrub la chas shing* = \**sādhanam jagataḥ prabodhanavidhau* D2.  
ānandabandhum asakṛt pṛthumānasānām  
sūktāṃśubhir vihitasarvamukhopadeśam |  
kṣemendram ujjalanijābhijanābdhicandraṃ  
kīrttiprakāśajanakaṃ janakaṃ namāmi || 9
- b: *sūktā*<sup>o</sup> C1, C2, D1, *legs bshad* D2] *śuddhā*<sup>o</sup> A, B; *°sarva*<sup>o</sup> A, B, C2, D2] *°sarve*<sup>o</sup> C1, D1.  
c: *kṣemendram ujjalanijā*<sup>o</sup> C1, C2, D1] illegible A, *kṣemendrasaṃjam aniśam* B, *dri med ... dge ba'i dbang* = \**kṣemendram aniśam* D2.

<sup>32</sup> The reference to Ms. A and Ms. B is based on de Jong (1979), but I have also compared his reported readings with the manuscripts; de Jong for de Jong (1979), Das for Das (1888–1913).

vākpākapāvananidhānājināvadāna-

nirmāṇapūṇyakalanākuśalābhiyoge | 10ab

- a: °nidhāna° C1, C2, D1, gter D2] °vidhāna° A, B, Das.

sarasvatī tūlikayā vicitra-

varṇakramair ullikhitāvadānaḥ | 12ab

- a: *sarasvatī* A, B, C1, C2, *dbyangs can* D2] *saratī* D1.

- b: *varṇa*° A, B, C2, D1, D2] *karṇa*° C1; *ullikhitā*° A, C1, C2, D1, *bris* D2] *saṃkalitā*° B, Das.

dikṣu pratiṣṭhāpitapustapālī-

sthiraprasaktapratimāgaṇasya || 13cd

- c: °pustapālī° A, B, C1, C2, *po ti* °phreng ba D2] °pustakālī° D1, °puspapālī° Das.

mādhuryadhuryam amṛtaṃ śrutiśuktiṇā

āmodasadmamukhapadmapade dhvanantīm | 15ab

- a: *śrutiśuktiṇā* A, C1, C2, D1] *śrutiśuktiṇā* B; *thos pa* 'i skyogs<sup>33</sup> *kyis btung bya* 'i D2, *śrutipātraṇā* Das.

- b: *āmodasadma*° A, B, C1, *dri bzang khang pa* D2] *ātmadasadma*° C2, *āmada-padma*° D1.

Some variations are merely caused by misreading, e.g., *u* to *a*, *c* to *r*, *sa* to *pa*, *m* to *s*, etc.

These examples, however, do not allow one to conclude whether the translators or earlier redactors had access to these two Mss. or to another lost Ms.<sup>34</sup>

In the colophon of the hypo-archetype δ of the Tibetan translation, there are two puzzling sentences between the paragraph about the translation by Lakṣmīkara and Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal and the paragraph about the bilingual edition by Zha lu lotsawa:

‘① In the glorious monastery of Sa-skya the revision was accomplished, after [the translation] was carefully compared with a Sanskrit manuscript. ② Since an accurate great revision for the two languages was accomplished, [this] is distinctly superior over the other.’<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> However, *śukti*, ‘shell’, can also serve as a ladle.

<sup>34</sup> In order to draw an ultimate conclusion and add these two Mss. into Straube’s *stemma codicum* (Straube 2006: 73–87; 2009: 12), we have to go through more *avadānas* from the whole codices.

<sup>35</sup> Translated from Straube’s German translation, cf. Straube (2009: 21, Note 2). For the Tibetan text, cf. Mejoir (1992: 65): *dpal sa skya* 'i *gtsug lag khang du rgya dpe dang gtugs nas zhu dag tshar bar byas so* || *skad gnyis ka la zhu chen zhib pa cig grub pas gzhān las khyad du* 'phags so ||. Zha lu lotsawa’s bilingual edition is mentioned Subsequently: *rgyal ba* 'i *rtogs brjod snyan ngag chen po dpag bsam* 'khri shing zhes bya 'i *bstan bcos skad gnyis zung du sbyar ba* 'dir || *yi ge pa dang dag byed pa yi skyon las yig* 'bru lhag chad brda nor 'khrul ba ji snyed mchis pa rnams || 'di yi skad gnyis zung sbyar thog mar byed po 'jig rten mig gyur chos skyong bzang po zhes bya 'i dge slong gis || *legs sbyar gzhung dang sdeb sbyor bstan bcos bod skad brda yi bstan bcos dang bstun blo gros zhib mos dag par byis* ||.

Mejor (1992: 65) builds an independent paragraph with these two sentences and interprets that this revision is that one sponsored by Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan in the 14th century.<sup>36</sup> Since the name of Ta'i si tu does not appear in the hypo-archetype  $\delta$ , and the long praise in the hypo-archetype  $\beta$  looks like a later insertion, Mejor's interpretation remains difficult to accept.

Straube (2009: 20, Note 4) finds the phrase *rgya dpe dang gtugs nas* puzzling and assumes that this Sanskrit Ms. must be another version, not the edition on which the translation relied. However, he notes that the text in the colophon of his hypo-archetype  $\delta$  and *dkar chag* of Derge-Tanjur<sup>37</sup> make the meaning clearer, and distributes sentence ① to the prior paragraph, i.e. record of Lakṣmīkara and Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal, and sentence ② to the following paragraph, i.e. record of Zha lu lotsawa. For sentence ①, he assumes that possibly Lakṣmīkara and Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal used an additional Sanskrit Ms. for their translation and proof-text (Straube 2009: 20). For sentence ②, he regards that the added sentence component, *this*, is the version prepared by Zha lu lotsawa (Straube 2009: 21, Note 2).

Since we have evidence that there are two Mss. and that there were possibly more than two Mss., one or some of them may have been copied in Nepal under Shong ton Rdo rje rgyal mtshan's request<sup>38</sup> for the purpose of translation or, possibly, also for the purpose of the first redaction in the Sa-skyā Monastery taking place just after the translation. It is reasonable that both sentences ① and ② belong to the prior paragraph, which is about Lakṣmīkara and Shong ston Rdo rje rgyal's translation.<sup>39</sup> If so, it could support Straube's assumption, and we could interpret that *this* manuscript was superior over the other manuscripts. However, it is not impossible that Shong ton Rdo rje rgyal mtshan did not use C2, even though he let the scribe put his name in the colophon.<sup>40</sup>

According to *Deb ther sngon po*, Shong ton Rdo rje rgyal mtshan was encouraged by 'Phags pa to study Sanskrit poetics and grammar in India, when the latter returned to Tibet from the Mongolian court. Then he spent five years in Nepal for study (Roerich 1976: 784–785). Since 'Phags pa himself was at the Sa-skyā Monastery from 1265 to 1267 (Petech 1990: 18 and Note 52), their first meeting must have occurred in this period. It then seems reasonable to conjecture that Shong ton Rdo rje rgyal mtshan obtained C2 in 1269 or a third Ms., for the purpose of translation or

<sup>36</sup> Probably his interpretation was based on the colophon of the hypo-archetype  $\beta$  of the Tibetan translation, in which sentence ① remains and sentence ② is replaced by a long praise for the sponsorship of Ta'i si tu Byang chub rgyal mtshan. For the Tibetan text, cf. Mejor (1992: 86ff).

<sup>37</sup> Straube (2009: 21, Note 2): *dpal sa skyā'i gtsug lag khang du rgya dpe dang legs par gtugs nas skad gnyis ka'i cha ma la zhu chen zhib pa cig grub pas gzhan las khyad du 'phags pa | slar yang 'di'i skad gnyis zhung du sbyar ba la | 'jig rten gyi mig tu gyur pa'i zha lu lotsā ba chos skyong bzang po legs par sbyar ba'i skad yi gzung la sogs pa dang bstun te | zhu chen mdzad pa bzhus so ||*.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Note 22.

<sup>39</sup> The text in *dkar chag* of Derge-Tanjur has one more word, *slar yang* 'afterwards', and the paragraph about Zha lu lotsawa can then begin after this word. Cf. Note 37.

<sup>40</sup> He commissioned another Ms., *Catuhstotravivaraṇa*. This text is regarded as one of the Sanskrit texts that have never been translated into Tibetan, cf. Note 22.

redaction. From 1276 to 1280, 'Phags pa spent the rest of his life in Tibet at the Sa-skya Monastery where he saw this translation by Shong ton Rdo rje rgyal mtshan. According to these historical considerations, the period when this translation task took place can be narrowed to 1265–1280.<sup>41</sup>

Finally, in any case, we cannot connect both sentences ① and ② to the paragraph about Zha lu lotsawa. According to the biography of Zha lu lotsawa, he had never been to the Sa-skya Monastery, but had a good relationship with the Sa-skya school. So, it is likely that he did not prepare the bilingual version there, but rather got one or two Ms(s), a little more likely C1, from the Sa-skya Monastery.<sup>42</sup>

## References

- BANERJEE, Anukul Chandra 1939. *Kāvyādarśa, Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
- BENDALL, Cecil 1992. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. [Publications of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, 2; Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 33.] Stuttgart: F. Steiner.
- DAS, Sarat Chandra 1888–1913. *Avadāna Kalpalatā. A Collection of Legendary Stories about the Bodhisattvas by Kshemendra with Its Tibetan Version Called Rtogs brjod dpag bsam hkhri śin by Śoñton Lochāva and Paṇḍita Lakshmīkara. Now First Edited from a Xylograph of Lhasa and Sanskrit Manuscripts of Nepal by Sarat Chandra Dās and Paṇḍit Hari Mohan Vidyābhūṣaṇa* (Vol. II: and Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa). [Bibliotheca Indica.] Vols. I–II. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- DIMITROV, Dragomir 2002. *Mārgavibhāga. Die Unterscheidung der Stilarten. Kritische Ausgabe des ersten Kapitels von Daṇḍins Poetik Kāvyādarśa und der tibetischen Übertragung Sñan ñag me loñ nebst einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrittextes*. [Indica et Tibetica, Bd. 40.] Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- DIMITROV, Dragomir 2006. 'Bilingual Sanskrit–Tibetan Glosses in a Nepalese Ms of the *Ratna-śrīṭikā*.' *Newsletter of the NGMCP* 2: 4–7.
- FILLIOZAT, Jean 1941. *Catalogue du fonds sanscrit*. Fas. I, Nr. 1–165. [Bibliothèque Nationale. Department des Manuscrits.] Paris: Libr. d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- FORMIGATTI, Camillo 2019. 'Kṣemendra.' In: Jonathan SILK *et al.* (eds.) *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. II. Leiden: Brill (forthcoming).
- DE JONG, Jan W. 1977. 'The *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* and the *Ṣaḍantāvadāna*.' In: Leslie S. KAWAMURA and Keith SCOTT (eds.) *Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization. Essays in Honor of Herbert V. Guenther on His Sixtieth Birthday*. Emeryville: Dharma Publishing, 27–38.
- DE JONG, Jan W. 1979. *Textcritical Remarks on the Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā (Pallavas 42-108)*. [Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series, II.] Tokyo: Reiuyukai Library.
- VAN DER KUIJP, Leonard 1994. 'Fourteenth Century Tibetan Cultural History 1: Ta'i-si-tu-Byang-chub-rgyal-mtshan as a man of religion.' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 37: 139–149.

<sup>41</sup> Dimitrov's (2002: 45, Note 185) dating, ca. 1270–1275, relies on the same historical record.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. an English summary of his biography at <https://treasuryoflives.org/bo/biographies/view/ChokiyongZangpo/11285>.

- VAN DER KUIJP, Leonard 1996. 'Tibetan Belles-Lettres: The Influence of Daṇḍin and Kṣemendra.' In: José Ignacio CABEZÓN and Roger R. JACKSON (eds.) *Tibetan Literature. Studies in Genre. Essays in Honor of Geshe Lhundup Sopa*. New York: Snow Lion, 393–410.
- LUO Zhao 罗炤 1984. *Luobulinka suocang beijejing mulu, fu Zhebangsi xiancang beijejing gai-kuang* 羅布林卡所藏貝葉經目錄，附哲蚌寺現藏貝葉經概況 [A catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts preserved at the Norbulingka, together with an appendix of a survey of Sanskrit manuscripts preserved at Drepung monastery]. (Unpublished manuscript.)
- LUO Zhao 罗炤 1985. *Budala gong suocang beijejing mulu (danzhuer)* 布達拉宮所藏貝葉經目錄 (丹珠爾) [A catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts preserved at Potala-Palace (Tanjur)]. (Unpublished manuscript.)
- MEJOR, Marek 1992. *Kṣemendra's Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā. Studies and Materials*. [Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series, VIII.] Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- PETECH, Luciano 1984. *Medieval History of Nepal (c. 750–1482)*. (Second, thoroughly revised ed.) [Serie Orientale Roma, LIV.] Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- PETECH, Luciano 1990. *Central Tibet and the Mongols. The Yüan–Sa-skyā Period of Tibetan History*. [Rome Oriental Series, LXV.] Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- ROERICH, George 1976. *The Blue Annals*. Parts I & II. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- ROESLER, Ulrike 2018. 'Rgya gar skad du–“in Sanskrit”?' In: Oliver VON CRIEGER, Gudrun MELZER and Johannes SCHNEIDER (eds.) *Saddharmāmṛtam. Festschrift für Jens-Uwe Hartmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. [Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 93.] Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 351–368.
- STRAUBE, Martin 2006. *Prinzh Sudhana und die Kinnarī. Eine buddhistische Liebesgeschichte von Kṣemendra. Texte, Übersetzung, Studie*. [Indica et Tibetica, Bd. 46.] Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- STRAUBE, Martin 2009. *Studien zur Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā. Texte und Quellen der Parallelen zu Haribhaṭṭas Jātakamālā*. [Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung, Monographien 1.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- VERHAGEN, Pieter C. 1994. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Volume One, Transmission of the Canonical Literature*. [Handbuch der Orientalistik, Zweite Abteilung, Indien, 8. Bd.] Leiden and New York: Brill.
- YE Shaoyong 2011. *《Zhonglun song》yu 《Fohu shi》— jiyu xin faxian fanwen xieben de wenxianxue yanjiu* 《中论颂》与《佛护释》— 基于新发现梵文写本的文献学研究 [Mūlamadhyamakakārikā and Buddhapālita's Commentary. A philological study on the basis of newly identified Sanskrit manuscripts]. [Fanwen Beijejing yu Fojiao Wenxian Xilie Congshu 梵文贝叶经与佛教文献系列丛书, Series of Sanskrit Manuscripts & Buddhist Literature 1.] Shanghai: Zhong-Xi Shuju.