# The *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* and the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna*

J. W. de Jong

THE *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*[1] was published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* in two volumes. Sarat Chandra Das and Paṇḍit Hari Mohan Vidyābhūshaṇa edited the first five fascicles of Volume 1 (Calcutta, 1888–1895, pp. xlii + 1–442) and the first five fascicles of Volume 2 (Calcutta, 1890–1897, pp. 1–480). After a long interval, publication was resumed by Das in 1906, and with Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa he edited the remaining fascicles of both volumes (Vol. I, Fascicles 6–13, pp. 443–1171, Calcutta, 1906–1913; Vol. II, Fascicles 6–11, pp. 481–1093 +13 pp., Calcutta, 1910–1913). In 1959 P. L. Vaidya reprinted the Sanskrit text in Volumes 22 and 23 of *The Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*.

Das's edition is based upon a Tibetan blockprint which contains both the Sanskrit text in Tibetan transliteration and the Tibetan translation. According to him this blockprint consists of 620 folios and was printed in 1662–1663.[2] In editing the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, Das has done some rearrangement of the text. In the Peking edition of the Tanjur the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* occupies Vol. 93 of the *Mdo-'grel*.[3] Story 107 ends on page 346a1. Then follows Somendra's introduction to the last tale composed by himself: 346a1–347b2 (= Das Vol. 2, pp. 1008–1015). This tale oc-

cupies ff. 347b2-357a7 (=Das Vol. 2, pp. 1016-1087). Then follows Somadeva's introduction to the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*: ff. 357a8-358a6. This introduction has been published by Das on pp. xxiv-xxix of his introduction. The table of contents of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* occupies ff. 358a6-360a5 (cf. Das, Introduction, pp. xxx-xli). This table contains 42 verses and not 43. The 43d verse in Das's edition is the first of the four verses of the colophon for which see Das, Vol. 2, pp. 1088-1091 (=Tibetan translation, ff. 360a5-360b3). This colophon is followed in the Peking edition of the Tibetan translation by the colophon of the translation, ff. 360b4-361a8). The first lines of this colophon (ff. 360b4-6) are also found in the colophon of the blockprint used by Das (cf. Vol. 2, p. 1092, lines 1-7 of the Tibetan text). The same blockprint also contains a lengthy text edited with separate pagination (pp. 1-13) by Das at the beginning of Fascicle 11 of Volume 2. According to Das this text contains the "concluding remarks of the last Tibetan editor."

In the Tibetan translation the tenth *pallava* is called *Mngal-las 'byung-ba*. However, the Tibetan blockprint used by Das does not contain the Sanskrit text of this *pallava*. For this reason Das has relegated it to the end of Volume 1 (pp. 1165-1171). Moreover, Das has changed the numbers of *Pallava*s 11-49 to 10-48. Consequently, there is no *Pallava* 49 in his edition. This rearrangement of the *pallava*s agrees with the table of contents, which lists as the tenth *pallava* the story of Sundarīnanda. According to this table the forty-ninth story is the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna*, text and translation, which are lacking in the Tibetan blockprint and in the Peking edition of the Tibetan translation. It is obvious that in the text used by the Tibetan translators one story was missing. According to Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Vol. 1, p. 1171, footnote) the *Mngal-las 'byung-ba* was evidently an interpolation introduced to make up the auspicious total of 108 *pallava*s. Tucci speculates that the forty-ninth *pallava*, the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna*, was lacking in the text on which the Tibetan translation was based and that, for this reason, the editors of the Tibetan translation compiled the *Mngal-las 'byung-ba*.[4] Tucci does not explain why the editors have filled the gap caused by the absence of the forty-ninth story by adding a story after the ninth with the consequence that Stories 10-48 had to be renumbered 11-49.

The *Mngal-las 'byung-ba*, 'The coming forth from the womb', is a sermon preached by the Buddha to Ānanda near Campā on conception, birth, and the miseries of human life. Vidyābhūṣaṇa reconstructs the Sanskrit title as *Garbhakrāntyavadāna*, but Tucci prefers *Garbhāvakrānti*. A *Garbhāvakrānti-sūtra* is quoted in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi* (ed. V. Bhattacharya, Calcutta, 1957, p. 27.5). The *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo, 1932–1936, p. 67.1) refers to the *Garbhāvakrānti-sūtra*, but the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* omits the word *sūtra*. Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāsya* (ed. P. Pradhan, Patna, 1967, p. 24.10): *ṣaḍdhātur iyaṃ puruṣa iti garbhāvakrāntau*. The Tibetan translation of the *bhāṣya* renders *Garbhāvakrānti* with *Mngal-du 'jug-pa*. The *Mngal-du 'byung-ba* is not identical with the text quoted in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and other texts. A reconstructed Sanskrit title would not be *Garbhāvakrānti* but *Garbhotpatti*. As to the *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra*, La Vallée Poussin refers to Chapter 11 of the *Vinayasaṃyuktakavastu* (Nànjio 1121, Taishō 1451), to Chapter 14 of the *Ratnakūṭa* (Nanjio 23.14, Taishō 310.14), and to the *Dhātuvibhaṅgasutta* in the *Majjhima-nikāya* (No. 140).[5] Moreover, he adds that the *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra* is one of the sources of the *Pitāputrasamāgama* which is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, and the *Madhyamakāvatāra*. However, he has not checked whether the quotations of the *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra* in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* can be traced in the texts mentioned by him. He mentions only Chapter 14 of the *Ratnakūṭa*, but both the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the *Ratnakūṭa* contain two texts, entitled *Garbhāvakrāntinirdeśa*. According to the Peking edition of the Kanjur, the full Sanskrit titles are *Āyuṣmannandagarbhāvakrāntinirdeśa* and *Nandagarbhāvakrāntinirdeśa*.[6]

Pelliot has pointed out that the Chinese translation of the *Ratnakūṭa* contains two translations (Taishō 310.13 and 310.14) which correspond to Sūtras 13 and 14 of the Tibetan version of the *Ratnakūṭa*.[7] However, in Taishō 310.13 the Buddha is questioned by Ānanda; in the corresponding Tibetan text the Buddha addresses himself not to Ānanda but to Nanda. Pelliot remarks that in an older Chinese translation by Dharmarakṣa (Taishō 317) Nanda figures in the beginning but is later replaced by Ānanda. Marcelle Lalou has

pointed out that the Tibetan text was translated by Chos-grub from the Chinese translation by Bodhiruci (Taishō 310.13).[8] Pelliot had already advanced the hypothesis that this text was translated from the Chinese and that the translator had substituted the name Nanda for Ānanda.[9] A careful comparison of both texts will be required in order to show whether this is the only substantial difference between the two texts.

As concerns Sūtra 14 of *Ratnakūṭa*, the situation is more complicated. Pelliot had pointed out that Chapters 11 and 12 of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin[10] are absolutely identical with Chapter 14 of the Chinese *Ratnakūṭa*. The *Vinayakṣudrakavastu* was translated by I-tsing, and in compiling the Chinese *Ratnakūṭa* Bodhiruci therefore must have made use of I-tsing's translation of Chapters 11 and 12. The Tibetan translation of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu* contains, according to Csoma's analysis (folios 202–248 of Volume 10 of the Narthang edition of the *Vinaya*) instructions to Nanda on the conditions of existence in the womb and on the gradual formation of the human body.[11] Pelliot concluded that probably this sūtra too had been translated from the Chinese. Sakurabe Bunkyō arrived at the same conclusion in his study of the *Ratnakūṭa*.[12]

Marcelle Lalou, however, compared the Tibetan translation of Chapters 11 and 12 of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu* with *Sūtras* 13 and 14 of the Tibetan *Ratnakūṭa* and showed that the text of *Sūtra* 13 is different from that of *Sūtra* 14 and that the latter is not identical with the text of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu*. This conclusion, though, does not exclude the possibility that *Sūtra* 14 of the Tibetan *Ratnakūṭa* was translated from I-tsing's version of Chapters 11 and 12 of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu*. It is quite possible that I-tsing's translation of these two chapters is not completely identical with the Tibetan translation of the same chapters. A final solution will require a close comparison of the Chinese and Tibetan versions of Sūtras 13 and 14 of the *Ratnakūṭa* with the Chinese and Tibetan versions of Chapters 11 and 12 of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu*.

In *Sūtra* 14 of the Tibetan *Ratnakūṭa*, Buddha is first at Kapilavastu and then goes to Śrāvasti. From Śrāvasti he goes to Campā, and it is here on the banks of the pond of the *ṛṣi* Garga that he teaches Nanda the *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra*. In Chapter 11 of the *Vinayakṣu-*

*drakavastu* Buddha teaches the *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra* to Nanda at exactly the same place.[13] The *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin was well-known to the Tibetans. The fact that Buddha taught a *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra* to Nanda on the banks of the Pond of Garga[14] must have been in the minds of the compilers of the *Mngal-las 'byung-ba*, which is also set on the banks of a lotus-pond near Campā. Although they substituted Ānanda for Nanda they must have been aware of the fact that a *Garbhāvakrāntisūtra* is found in the Buddhist canon in connection with the story of Nanda. This is certainly the reason why the *Mngal-las 'byung-ba* is placed in the Tibetan translation of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* before the story of Nanda, which is No. 11 in the Tibetan translation and No. 10 in Das's edition.

In the Sanskrit text of the table of contents of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* no mention is made of the *Mngal-las 'byung-ba*. However, in the Peking and Cone editions of the Tibetan translation the title of this text has been mentioned in an additional *pāda* of Verse 4: *gang-zhig dpal-sbas la bstan dang // me-skyes skal-ldan du* (Peking: *dus*) *gsung dang // mngal-nas 'byung-ba bstan-pa dang // gang-zhig dga'-bo'i mdzes-ma la // chags-pa dag ni 'bad-pas bsal* (Peking: *gsal*) //. It is obvious that this *pāda* has been added later in order to account for the presence of the *Mngal-las 'byung-ba*.

The *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* is mentioned in both the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation of the table of contents. In his detailed bibliography on the *Ṣaḍdantajātaka*, Lamotte indicates that the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* is not found in the Paris manuscripts of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. However, he points out that the two Cambridge manuscripts, Add. 1306 and Add. 913, contain this *avadāna*.[15] Add. 1306 is a manuscript written in A.D. 1302.[16] According to Somendra's introduction the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* was completed in the twenty-seventh year, i.e., 1051–1052. The Cambridge manuscript is therefore written 250 years after the completion of the work. Bendall has described the manuscript in detail.[17] Leaves 1–174 are missing, and the manuscript begins with the last word, *sahiṣṇavaḥ*, of Verse 7 of Tale 42, *Paṇḍitāvadāna*. Bendall remarks that in the manuscript Tales 41–48 are numbered 42–49. He has changed the numbering according to the metrical table of con-

tents. However, the numbering of the manuscripts agrees entirely with that of the Tibetan translation of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* in which Tale 42 is the *Paṇḍitāvadāna*. In Das's edition this is Tale 41, wrongly called *Kapilāvadāna*. The table of contents also gives the name *Paṇḍita*. If we keep the numbering of the tales as found in Add. 1306, Tale 49 (*Hastakāvadāna*) ends on f. 198b. Tale 50 (*Daśakarmaplutyavadāna*) begins on f. 199b: *namo buddhāya / ye helocchita-*.

However, this manuscript contains seven extra leaves numbered 199-205. Bendall has given them the numbers 199*-205*. The *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* begins on the last line of f. 198b and occupies the leaves 199*-205*. It is obvious that the scribe completed the first part of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (Tales 1-49) on f. 198b and continued with the second part on f. 199b. According to Bendall the scribe had by accident omitted this tale and copied it in afterwards. Bendall's conclusion was certainly justified because the table of contents lists the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* as the Tale 49. However, with the publication of Das's edition it has become evident that the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* was missing in the Sanskrit text translated in Tibet. It must also have been missing in the manuscript used by the scribe of Add. 1306, Mañjuśrībhadrasudhi. When copying the table of contents Mañjuśrībhadrasudhi must have made the same discovery as Bendall, i.e., that the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* is listed as Tale 49.

In order to supply this missing tale the scribe made use of another collection of tales which contains a recension of the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna*: the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā*. Both the Paris and Cambridge manuscripts contain the text of the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna*.[18] In the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* the tale is comprised of 198 verses. They are followed by several additional verses of a moralistic nature which do not belong to the story itself, and which need not be considered. The scribe of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* did not use all 198 verses. He reproduced 110 verses without any alteration and added eight others, most of which were made from *pādas* of verses of the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* recension of the story.

Feer[19] has studied the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* recension of the *Ṣaḍdanta* story together with other recensions. However, in

order to show how the scribe of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* made use of the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* recension, it is necessary to give a summary and to indicate the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* verse-numbers.

Verses 1–4: Introduction. Aśoka asks Upagupta to tell another tale.

5: A good man is purified by the fire of a bad man (*durjanāgni*) just as a jewel shines after having been polished by a whetstone.

6–11: Buddha teaches the law at the Garga Pond near Campā.

12–31: Devadatta warns the *kṣapaṇakas* against the Buddha.

32–37: His words provoke different reactions among them.

38–58: A *kṣapaṇaka* says that he knows a way to destroy the reputation of the Buddha. He asks Cañāmānavikā to simulate pregnancy and to accuse the Buddha of having made her pregnant. She fastens a wooden bowl under her garment.

59–88: Cañcāmānavikā goes to the Buddha and accuses him of having made her pregnant and of having abandoned her. The Buddha is unperturbed but the gods are greatly upset. Śakra creates two rats who cut the cord which holds the wooden bowl. Crying "I am burnt," Cañcāmānavikā disappears in the flames of Hell.

89–94: The Buddha explains that she has been guilty of a grave sin in a previous existence.

95–123: The Elephant King Ṣaḍdanta lived happily in the Himālayas with his two wives, Bhadrā and Subhadrā. Once he played with Subhadrā in the lotus pond Mandākinī. Bhadrā became jealous and decided to take revenge. She went to the forest where the *munis* live and took upon herself a fast in eight parts. She expressed the wish to be reborn as a queen and to obtain a seat of pleasure (*krīḍāsana*) made from the tusks of Ṣaḍdanta. She killed herself by throwing herself from a mountain, and was reborn as the daughter of the minister Khaṇḍita (mistake for Paṇḍita ?) of King Brahmadatta in Kāśi.

The king married her. She asked him for a seat made from the tusks of Ṣaḍdanta. The king summoned an old hunter, who tried to dissuade him from killing Ṣaḍdanta because he was a Bodhisattva.

124–143: The old hunter persuaded the king, but Bhadrā insisted on her wish. The king summoned another hunter, who declared himself willing to kill Ṣaḍdanta.

144–161: Dressed in a yellow robe, the hunter was seen by Subhadrā. She told the king [Ṣaḍdanta] that she was frightened, but the king explained that she had nothing to fear from someone who wears a yellow robe. He had just spoken these words when the hunter pierced him with a poisoned arrow. Subhadrā fainted, but Ṣaḍdanta consoled her and asked the hunter why he wanted to kill him.

162–165: The hunter explained that Queen Bhadrā desired a seat made from his tusks.

166–184: Ṣaḍdanta arrived at the conclusion that he must give his tusks to the hunter, because it was impossible to disappoint someone who came with a request. He broke off his tusks against a mountain. Five hundred elephants arrived, but Ṣaḍdanta protected the hunter with his chest and sent him back with his tusks.

185–189: The hunter brought the tusks to the king, who recompensed him with gold. He sent him back to his own house. Suddenly both his hands were cut off and fell on the ground.

190: Bhadrā mounted the seat made from the tusks. Saying "I am burnt," she fell into Hell.

191–192: Brahmadatta's kingdom was destroyed by terrible plagues.

193–198: The *dramatis personnae* are identified. Ṣaḍdanta = the Buddha; Bhadrā = Cañcāmānavikā; the hunter = Devadatta' the other elephants = monks. There are two verses on the evil behaviour of women. In the last verse the Buddha proclaims that one must speak the truth, refrain from inflicting injuries, and concentrate on śānti.

The scribe of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* took from the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* recension the following verses: 5, 59–123, 144–161, 166–184, 190, and 193–198. In order to fill the lacunae he added five verses (A–E) between Verse 5 and Verse 59, one verse (F) between Verses 123 and 144, one verse (G) between Verses 161 and 166, and one verse (H) between Verses 190 and 193. A–B: The Buddha preaches the law at the Garga Pond near Campā. C–E: The jealous *kṣapaṇaka*s say, "You must destroy the lustre (*dīpti*) of the Buddha by saying that you have been made pregnant by him." The young woman simulates a pregnancy by means of a wooden bowl. F: A second hunter declares himself willing to kill Ṣaḍdanta. G: The hunter says that Queen Bhadrā wants to have a seat made from Ṣaḍdanta's tusks. H: The hunter loses his hands, and Brahmadatta's kingdom is destroyed by excessive rains.

It is obvious that the scribe of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* was more interested in the story of the past concerning Ṣaḍdanta than in the story of the present relating to Cañcāmānavikā. Through the omission of Verses 6–58, nothing is said of the role played by Devadatta, although identification of Devadatta with the hunter (Verse 194) has been maintained. Moreover, verses C–E do not explain why the *kṣapaṇaka*s are jealous nor the identity of the young woman whom they ask to simulate pregnancy. It is equally obvious that the scribe of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* has made use of the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā*. In a long note added to the English translation of his article on the *Ṣaḍdanta-jātaka*, "*Essai de classement chronologique des diverses versions du Ṣaḍdanta-jâtaka*" (*Mélanges d'Indianisme*, Paris, 1911, pp. 231–248) Foucher writes that "The author of the latter collection [*Kalpadrumāvadānamālā*] restricted himself to reproducing, without however (in any way) informing the reader of the fact, the work of Kṣhemendra, except that on two points he has lengthened the narrative of his predecessor, which in his opinion was too much abbreviated."[20]

I hope to be able to publish shortly the text of the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* recension of the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* including the eight verses added by the scribe of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. It will then become absolutely clear that Foucher was wrong in assuming that the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā* recension is based upon the

*Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* recension. It is not possible to prove that the scribe of Manuscript Add. 1306, Mañjuśrībhadrasudhi, himself took the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* from a manuscript of the *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā*, but the similarity of the script in the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* to that in other parts of the manuscript of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* makes this supposition highly probable.

The fact that the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna* is listed in the table of contents as the forty-ninth *avadāna* obliges us to assume that originally the text contained this story. It was, however, already missing in the copy which was translated in Tibet in the second half of the thirteenth century.[21] It is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation for the disappearance of the *Ṣaḍdantāvadāna*. This is not the only problem connected with the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. It was completed by Kṣemendra in 1052, but he did not compose Tale 108. This is surprising in view of the fact that he was still living in 1066 (when he wrote the *Daśāvatāracarita*).[22] Somendra does not explain why his father, after having composed 107 tales, did not complete his work by writing the 108th. If it had been Kṣemendra's wish that his son fulfill this task, one would expect Somendra to have mentioned this.

## NOTES

1. The *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* is often referred to as *Avadānakalpalatā*. However, according to all the colophons and the Tibetan translation the title is *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*.

2. A copy of the same blockprint edition is listed in *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism* (Sendai, 1953), p. 521, No. 7034, but I have not been able to consult it. In the Cone Tanjur the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* occupies two volumes (Vols. 91-92: *Khri-shing*). The Cone edition contains both the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation. I have not been able to consult the Derge edition, but it also probably contains the Sanskrit text, though this is not mentioned in the catalogue of the Tohoku University: *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons* (Sendai, 1934), pp. 633-634, No. 4155. In the Narthang Tanjur the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* occupies only one volume. Cf. Mibu Taishun, *A Comparative List of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka of the Narthang Edition* (Tokyo, 1967), p. 98, No. 3646, Vol. Ge, ff. 1-328. It would appear that the Peking and Narthang editions contain only the Tibetan translation, while the Derge and Cone editions contain both text and translation.

3. Cf. P. Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Troisième Partie (Paris, 1915), pp. 419-421.

4. *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, Vol. 2 (Rome, 1949), p. 613, n. 118.

5. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, Vol. 1 (Paris-Louvain, 1923), p. 49, n. 2.

6. *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka* (Kyoto, 1930-1932), p. 238.

7. "Notes à propos d'un catalogue du *Kanjur*," in *Journal Asiatique*, 1914, Vol. 2, p. 123.

8. "La version tibétaine du *Ratnakūṭa*", in *Journal Asiatique*, 1927, Vol. 2, pp. 240, 245.

9. *Op. cit.*, p. 126, No. 1.

10. Pelliot refers to Chapters 11 and 12 of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu*, the same text which La Vallée Poussin refers to as the *Vinayasamyuktakavastu*. Cf. Taishō, Vol. 24, No. 1451, pp. 251a-263a.

11. Pelliot, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

12. "Chibetto-yaku Daihōshakukyō no kenkyū," *Ōtani Gakuhō*, Vol. 11 (1930), p. 550. In his analysis of this article Serge Elisséef says wrongly that Sakurabe trièd to prove that the whole Tibetan *Ratnakūṭa* had been translated from the Chinese. See *Bibliographie Bouddhique*, Vol. 2 (Paris, 1931), p. 37, No. 110). Sakurabe observed that Chapters 7, 13, and 40 were translated from the Chinese by Chos-grub and suggested that Chapters 11, 14, 17, and 20 must also have been translated from the Chinese.

13. For the Tibetan version see Lalou, *op. cit.*, p. 242. For the Chinese version see Taishō, Vol. 24, No. 1451, p. 253a17-21.

14. In the Sanskrit text of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* the name of the pond is Gargā. Cf. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, p. 210. In Pāli texts the Gaggarā Pond is named after Queen Gaggarā.

15. Ét. Lamotte, *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, Tome 2 (Louvain, 1949), p. 716, n. 1. According to Bendall Add. 913 is a copy of a copy, more or less direct, of Add. 1306.

16. According to Petech the date mentioned in the colophon is Sunday, April 8th, 1302. Cf. L. Petech, *Mediaeval History of Nepal* (Roma, 1958), p. 98.

17. C. Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1883), pp. 41-43.

18. Cf. Bendall, *op. cit.*, p. 131, Add. 1590; also J. Filliozat, *Catalogue du fonds sanscrit*, Fascicule 1 (Paris, 1941), pp. 14-15. For other manuscripts see Seiren Matsunami, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library* (Tokyo, 1965), pp. 230-231.

19. "Le Chaddanta-Jātaka," *Journal Asiatique*, 1895, Part 1, pp. 31-85 and 189-223.

20. A. Foucher, "The Six-Tusked Elephant," *Beginnings of Buddhist Art* (Paris-London, 1917), p. 204, n. 1.

21. The *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* was translated by Lakṣmīkara and the Master fron Shong rDo-rje rgyal-mtshan, at the instigation of 'Phags-pa and the Regent Śākya bzang-po. According to Cordier (*op. cit.*, p. 420) the translation was probably made in the year 1272 A.D. The colophon of the Peking edition does not mention a date, and it is not clear from which source Cordier took the date 1272. From the names mentioned in the colophon it is possible to deduce that the translation was made in the period 1260 to 1280.

22. Cf. Oscar Botto, *Il Poeta Kṣemendra e il suo Daśāvatāracarita* (Torino, 1951), p. 9.