

Parallel Stories in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*: A Preliminary Investigation

JUAN WU

TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY

While it has been known for several decades that the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* of the Śvetāmbara Jaina tradition and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* of the Buddhist tradition share some common narrative plots or motifs, so far no detailed study has been made to understand the different ways in which parallel narrative material is utilized in the two texts. Through a comparative study of stories of three characters (Prince Abhaya, the physician Jīvaka, and King Udrāyaṇa) in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and their counterparts in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, this paper demonstrates that the Buddhists and the Jains who composed or redacted the two texts exploited parallel narrative plots or motifs along different lines and for different purposes. In particular, with regard to Jīvaka, who is widely known among Buddhists as a model of medical skill and religious faith, this paper argues that the fact that Jīvaka is prominently featured in Buddhist literature but finds no parallel in Jaina literature may be explained by the different attitudes of the two religions to medical healing and to the role of secular physicians in general.

As is well known, the exegetical literature that developed around the *Āvaśyakaśūtra*, one of the four basic scriptures (*mūlasūtras*) of the Śvetāmbara canon, forms a very important part of the textual heritage of ancient Jains.¹ The oldest commentary on the *Āvaśyakaśūtra* is the versified *Āvaśyakaniryukti* (ĀvN).² A number of works expound the ĀvN, among which three prose commentaries—the *cūrṇi* attributed to Jinadāsa (seventh century) and two *ṭīkā*s (or *vṛttis*) separately by Haribhadra (eighth century) and by Malayagiri (twelfth century)—as a whole constitute a vast and coherent corpus of ancient Jaina narrative lore.³ The fact that these *Āvaśyaka* prose commentaries and the Buddhist Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* share some common narrative material was pointed out decades ago by Adelheid Mette (1983: 137–38) and Nalini Balbir (1993: 124–25, 184, 349), both of whom identified a number of parallels

An earlier version of this paper was presented in the panel on “Jaina Studies” at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference (Bangkok, 2015). I thank the panel organizer, Peter Flügel, for his kind encouragement. I also want to express my gratitude to Jonathan A. Silk, Willem B. Bollée, Klaus Wille, Shayne Clarke, Naomi Appleton, and Seishi Karashima for their invaluable suggestions, and to Stephanie Jamison for her editorial advice. Jonathan A. Silk, in particular, read and commented upon successive drafts of this paper with great patience. Shayne Clarke carefully read through the final draft and made a number of incisive and helpful comments. This research was made possible due to the generous financial support from the Jan Gonda Foundation and from the Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation administrated by the American Council of Learned Societies. All remaining shortcomings are my own alone.

1. For detailed overviews of *Āvaśyaka* exegetical literature, see Leumann 1934: 14a–55b; Bruhn 1981; Balbir 1990: 70–73; 1993: 38–91.

2. Leumann (1934: 29b–31b) differentiates four redactions of the ĀvN, among which the first and oldest redaction is traditionally attributed to Bhadrabāhu, who may have lived in the first century C.E. For the most thorough survey to date of the ĀvN, see Balbir 1993: 38–75.

3. The *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* (ĀvC) is written primarily, though not entirely, in Prākṛit (Balbir 1993: 81–82). Both Haribhadra’s *ṭīkā* (ĀvH) and Malayagiri’s *ṭīkā* (ĀvM) are written in mixed Prākṛit and Sanskrit, with stories in Prākṛit and dogmatic and philosophical discussions in Sanskrit (ibid., 83, 88). The three commentaries are based on different versions of the ĀvN (see Leumann 1934: 30b–31a; Koch 1991–92: 225–26); the version of ĀvN commented on by Haribhadra is regarded as the vulgate (see Balbir 1993: 45).

between the two corpora. Written in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* has its provenance in western India, and despite its relatively late date there can be little doubt that it preserves at least partially story traditions traceable to the first centuries C.E. or even earlier.⁴ The Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* is widely considered to have been compiled in northwestern India, and although its date is uncertain, it most likely belongs to the first centuries C.E.⁵ The existence of the parallels between the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* suggests that the compilers or redactors of these two texts probably shared, either directly or indirectly, some common oral or written narrative sources circulating around the beginning of the Common Era.

This article seeks to further our understanding of the parallels between the *Āvaśyaka* commentaries and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* through considering how differently the *Āvaśyaka* commentators and the Mūlasarvāstivāda compilers/redactors utilized, developed, and interpreted parallel narrative material within their own literary frameworks and for their own didactic ends. Since stories in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* are usually “considered to be older” and appear to have been “less affected by the process of Sanskritisation” (Balbir 1990: 72) than their counterparts in the two *īkās*, my discussion below will mainly deal with the *cūrṇi* version of stories. It is impossible to examine exhaustively all parallels between the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* here. In what follows I will first focus on two groups of stories in the *cūrṇi*, which serve respectively as illustrations of the notions of *buddhisiddha* (‘perfect in intelligence’) and *śikṣā* (Pkt. *sikkhā*, ‘learning’). I will offer an overview of these two groups of stories along with their parallels in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and will then look in more detail at two examples separately concerning Prince Abhaya of Magadha and his physician half-brother Jivaka. After this, I will introduce yet another story in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, which concerns King Uddāyaṇa (alias Udāyaṇa) of Vītabhaya, and its counterpart in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga*. Although the Uddāyaṇa story does not belong to the aforementioned two groups, it deserves attention particularly from a comparative point of view. As I hope to demonstrate, these three examples offer us windows for observing not only parallel plots or motifs shared between the Buddhist and Jaina traditions, but also some didactic or ideological features that are more salient in one tradition than in the other.

PARALLELS BETWEEN TWO SECTIONS OF THE *ĀVAŚYAKACŪRṆI* AND THE MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDA *VINAYA*: AN OVERVIEW

Mette (1983: 136–38) notes that the section of the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* (I 543.13–568.2) that illustrate the fourfold *buddhi*—*autpattikī* (Pkt. *uppattiyā*) *buddhi* ‘spontaneous intelligence’, *vainayikī* (*veṇaiyā*) *buddhi* ‘intelligence based on discipline’, *karmajā* (*kammayā*) *buddhi* ‘intelligence resulting from practice’, and *pāriṇāmikī* (*pāriṇāmiyā*) *buddhi* ‘deductive intelligence’—has a close relationship with the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.⁶ As indicated in the

4. As Balbir (1993: 113) puts it, the ĀvC “représente un stade transitoire, non encore sévéré de l’héritage ancien.” She observes that the ĀvC frequently cites, in a mechanical manner, narrative passages from the Jaina *āgamas* and from earlier non-canonical sources such as the *Vasudevahiṇḍī* (pp. 82, 112–14). Both the ĀvC and the ĀvH also contain oral narrative traditions indicated by technical terms such as *vibhāsā* (Skt. *vibhāṣā*), *ahavā* (*athavā*), *anne* (*anye*) *bhaṇantī*, and so on (pp. 115–16).

5. Gnoli (1977: xix) places the compilation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* at the times of Kaniṣka in the second century C.E. Schopen (2004: 20–22) suggests that at least parts of the text may be dated to a time before the Kuṣāṇas, or to the early Kuṣāṇa period before Kaniṣka.

6. This section (corresponding to ĀvH 414b5–437b9; ĀvM 516a8–534a9) forms part of a larger section that expounds the term *siddha* in the *namaskāra* (Pkt. *namokkāra*, ‘homage’) formula. The term *siddha* is explained in eleven aspects, one of which is *abhiprāya* (*abhippāya*, ‘intention’). In the ĀvC (I 543.13–544.1) *abhiprāya* is considered a synonym of *buddhi* (*abhippāo ṇāma buddhīe pajjāo*), and the four types of *buddhi* are introduced accordingly; in the ĀvN cited by Haribhadra, the replacing of *abhiprāya* with *buddhi* occurs in stanza 936, and the fourfold

chart series below, five stories belonging to this section have parallels or partial parallels in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* ('Section on Medicines'), the *Cīvaravastu* ('Section on Robes'), and the *Kṣudrakavastu* ('Section on Miscellany'), with A 1–5 corresponding to B8, B4, B5, B1, and B7 respectively. In three cases (A1, A3, and A4) Buddhist and Jaina versions concern different characters; in two other cases (A2 and A5) the characters are the same in both traditions. In commenting on these parallels, Mette (1983: 138) suggests that the motifs or themes found in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* "are probably borrowed from Buddhist sources in later times." It seems, however, more likely that the motifs belong to the common narrative lore shared between Buddhists and Jainas, without borrowing from one side to another. In particular, in the cases of A1, A3, and A4 separately corresponding to B8, B5, and B1, the parallel motifs might have belonged to pan-Indian folklore, since they contain nothing intrinsically religious and are associated with different narrative characters in Buddhist and Jaina versions.

CHART SERIES A, B, AND C: CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN TWO GROUPS OF
ĀVAŚYAKA STORIES AND FOUR SECTIONS OF THE MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDA VINAYA

Correspondences: A1↔B8;⁷ A2↔B4;⁸ A3↔B5;⁹ A4↔B1;¹⁰ A5↔B7;¹¹ B2↔C13;¹² B3↔C14;¹³ B6↔C18;¹⁴ B9↔C7¹⁵

buddhi is introduced in stanza 938, which may have been adopted from the *Nandīsūtra* (see stanza 56 in NandīC 33.2–3 = stanza 58 in NandīH 46.22–23 = stanza 61 in NandīM 144a4–5). The *Āvaśyaka* stories that illustrate the fourfold *buddhi* find parallels in NandīH 133.7–144.1 (belonging to the *ṭippanaka* ['gloss'] of Śrīcandra [twelfth century]) and in NandīM 145a5–168a1. The section of the *Āvaśyaka* commentaries that deals with the *namaskāra* formula has been, in its entirety, edited and translated by Koch 1990; in cases where the ĀvC is notably briefer than the ĀvM, Koch's translations are usually based on the more elaborate accounts in the ĀvM. For an inventory of the *Āvaśyaka* stories expounding *namaskāra*, along with their parallels in other Jaina texts, see Balbir 1993: 154–70.

7. See Koch 1990: 172–87; 1991–92: 251–59 (tr. of A1); Balbir 1993: 159, IX54,1 (Jaina parallels of A1); Schiefner 1875: 1–7 (tr. of the Tibetan version of B8); Panglung 1981: 182 (summary of the Tibetan). No Sanskrit version of B8 is available; see the Chinese counterpart at T. 1451 (xxiv) 300a6–301c10 (*juan* 20).

8. See Koch 1990: 190–93 (tr. of A2, largely based on the ĀvM); Balbir 1993: 159, IX 54,4 (summary and Jaina parallels of A2). For a comparison of A2 and B4, see below.

9. See Koch 1990: 236–39 (tr. of A3, largely based on the ĀvM); Balbir 1993: 163, IX,58,1 (Jaina parallels of A3). For a comparison of A3 and B5, see below.

10. See Koch 1990: 258–59 (tr. of A4); Balbir 1993: 164, IX,58,10 (summary and Jaina parallel of A4). For the Sanskrit version of B1, see GM III. 1.116.4–121.22; GBM 6.1012.7–1015.6 (folios 172r7–173v6); Clarke 2014: 81–82. For the Tibetan version, see Schiefner 2007: 72–75 = Ralston 1882: 31–36 (tr.); Panglung 1981: 39 (summary); Yao 2013: 340–44 (Japanese tr.). There is no counterpart in the Chinese version of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (T. 1448). Other Buddhist sources on the unlucky man Daṇḍin include, for instance, the *Ādarśamukhajātaka* written by Haribhaṭṭa before 445 C.E. and extant in Tibetan (Hahn 1974: 61–70 [text], 73–84 [tr.]), and Chapter 39 of the *Mdzangs blun* ("The Wise and the Fool"; D 341, *mdo sde*, A 271a7–274a2; P 1008, *mdo sna tshogs*, Hu 276a5–278b6; Schmidt 1845: I. 272.3–277.2 [text]; II. 340–46 [tr.]; see also the Chinese parallel at T. 202[iv] 428b4–492b28 [*juan* 11]).

11. See Koch 1990: 325; Watanabe 1990 (tr. of A5); Balbir 1993: 168, IX,64,5 (summary and Jaina parallels of A5). No Sanskrit version of B7 is available. For the Tibetan version, see Panglung 1981: 175–76 (summary); Formigatti 2009 (ed. and tr.); for the Chinese version, see T. 1451 (xxiv) 251a15–253a15 (*juan* 11). For other Buddhist sources on Nanda and Sundarī, see Schlingloff 1975: 85–86; 2000: 415–26; Zin 2006: 167–90.

12. See Koch 2009: 278–79 (paraphrase of C13); Balbir 1993: 182 (Jaina parallels of C13); Schiefner 2007: 158–61 = Ralston 1882: 78–83 (tr. of the Tibetan version of B2); Panglung 1981: 63 (summary of the Tibetan); Wu 2014a (comparison of B2 and C13).

13. See Koch 2009: 282–83 (paraphrase of C14); Wu 2014b (comparison of B3 and C14). B3 finds a partial parallel in the Chinese Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāna-mahāsūtra* (T. 374 [xii] 483c13–20 [*juan* 20]; T. 375 [xii] 726c29–727a8 [*juan* 18]; tr. in Wu 2014b: 111).

14. See Silk 1997: 194–97 (tr. of B6), 207–8 (tr. of C18).

15. See Koch 1995–96: 188–91 (tr. of C7); Zin 1991: 97–100 (tr. of C7 and its Jaina parallels). No Sanskrit version of B9 is available. For the Tibetan version, see Schiefner 1875: 35–40 (tr.); Panglung 1981: 187–88 (summary); for the Chinese counterpart, see T. 1451 (xxiv) 314c14–315c17 (*juan* 23).

A	B	C
Āvaśyaka Commentaries	Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya	Āvaśyaka Commentaries
Section One: stories illustrating the fourfold <i>buddhi</i>	Bhāiśajyavastu	Section Two: stories expounding <i>sikkhā</i> ; synopses below cited from Leumann (1934: 24b = 2010: 68)
<i>uppattiyā buddhi</i> 1st example: Rohaka's witty reaction to a king's insomnia (A1)	The brahmin Daṇḍin getting into a series of troubles (B1)	1 Founding of Rājagrha
4th example: Abhaya's birth and his cleverness (A2)	Civaravastu	2 Seṇiya (= Bimbisāra) as a prince
1st example: A semiologist's two pupils able to read an elephant's footprints (A3)	Bimbisāra's marriage with Celā/Vaidehī (B2)	3 Abhaya helps him against Pajjoṃya (Skt. Pradyota)
14th example: An unlucky man getting into a series of troubles (A4)	Ajātaśatru's previous life as a vengeful ascetic and his ensuing birth (B3)	4 Abhaya is kidnapped
<i>kammayā buddhi</i> —	Abhaya's birth, without mentioning his cleverness (B4)	5 Abhaya's wife
14th example: The monk Nanda and his wife Sundarī (A5)	Jivaka's ability to read an elephant's footprints (B5)	6 Pajjoṃya's runner is saved by Abhaya
	Samghabhedavastu	7 Udayana robs Vāsavadattā
	Bimbisāra's imprisonment and death (B6)	8 Another version of 7
	Kṣudrakavastu	9 Abhaya prevents the burning of the city
	The monk Nanda and his wife Sundarī (B7)	10 Abhaya averts a calamity
	A Gandhāran man's witty reaction to King Pradyota's insomnia (B8)	11 In order to gain satisfaction Abhaya also kidnaps Pajjoṃya
	Romance of Udāyaṇa and Vāsavadattā (B9)	12 The 32 sons of Sulasā
		13 Cellaṇā from Vesālī becomes Seṇiya's wife
		14 Birth of Koṇiya (= Ajātaśatru)
		15–16 The pearl necklace (<i>hāra</i>) and the elephant (<i>seyaṇaga</i>) trained in water arts
		17 Former birth of the aforementioned elephant
		18 Seṇiya's imprisonment and death
		19 Cause of war between Kūṇiya and his half-brothers
		20–36 (omitted here, but given in full by Leumann)

Another section of the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* (II 158.2–188.10), which serves to explain the term *sikkhā* in stanza 1274 of the *ĀvN* (cited in *ĀvH* 663b12), is also closely linked with the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.¹⁶ This section presents a Jaina account of the early political history of northern India. Four stories belonging to this section find parallels or partial parallels in the *Cīvaravastu*, the *Samghabhedavastu* (‘Section on Schism’), and the *Kṣudrakavastu*, with C7, C13, C14, and C18 corresponding to B9, B2, B3, and B6 respectively. In all cases the characters are the same in Buddhist and Jaina versions, including King Śreṇika Bimbisāra, his son Kūṇika Ajātaśatru, King Udāyaṇa,¹⁷ and his wife Vāsavadattā (daughter of King Pradyota). The parallel stories of these royals in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* represent part of the shared memory (or rather, the shared *imaginaire*) of Buddhists and Jainas about the ancient Indian political world in which the Buddha and Mahāvīra lived.¹⁸

Notwithstanding all the parallels mentioned above, it should be noted that in no case do the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* tell a story in the same way. Even when the two texts present similar plots or motifs, there are still differences in terms of narrative contexts, structures, functions, and/or purposes. A close look at such differences may help to distinguish the ideological preoccupations of Buddhist and Jaina compilers/redactors of these two texts. In an effort to better understand the different ways in which Buddhists and Jainas exploited and developed parallel narrative material, I will compare the stories of Abhaya and Jīvaka in the *Cīvaravastu* (indicated separately as B4 and B5 in the chart series above) with their counterparts in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* (A2 and A3).

TWO EXAMPLES: STORIES OF ABHAYA AND JĪVAKA

The Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* gives only one detailed account of Abhaya, which is found in the *Cīvaravastu* and concerns his birth. While its title claims it to be a text dealing with monastic robes, the *Cīvaravastu* is in fact not just about robes. Its former part narrates the deeds of Bimbisāra and his three sons—Ajātaśatru, Abhaya, and Jīvaka—with Jīvaka, a great physician and pious disciple of the Buddha, described most extensively. The birth of Abhaya is told immediately before the birth of Jīvaka, and, according to the text, it is Abhaya who brings Jīvaka to adulthood. In this context the story of Abhaya may be seen as a prelude to the subsequent featuring of Jīvaka and his medical career.¹⁹ The *Cīvaravastu* has come down to us mainly in two versions: a nearly complete Sanskrit version that forms part of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavastu* manuscript found near Gilgit, dating perhaps from the sixth or seventh century, and a full Tibetan translation made in the ninth century.²⁰ The

16. This section (corresponding to *ĀvH* 670b6–698b1) belongs to a larger section (*ĀvC* II 152.9–212.9; *ĀvH* 664b14–724b8) that explains thirty-two catchwords defining Jaina *yoga* (tr. in Balbir 1990: 42–66; 1993: 179–87 [inventory of stories]; see also Leumann 1934: 24b).

17. This is a king of Kauśāmbī (capital of Vatsa), who should not be confused with King Udāyaṇa (alias Udāyaṇa) of Vitabhaya (capital of Sindhu-Sauvīra) to be discussed later.

18. The romance of Udāyaṇa and Vāsavadattā was also known outside Buddhist and Jaina circles. For instance, it is shown in two plays (the *Pratijñāyauṅdharāyaṇa* and the *Svapnavāsavadatta*) attributed to the Brahmin dramatist Bhāsa (date uncertain), in the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* of the Vaiṣṇava poet Kṣemendra (eleventh century), and in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of the Brahmin poet Somadeva (eleventh century). For further discussion, see Adaval 1970.

19. In the *Cīvaravastu* the depiction of Jīvaka ends with an episode in which he donates his robes to the Buddhist community, which in turn leads to the Buddha’s stipulation of rules on robes.

20. The *Cīvaravastu* occupies thirty-six folios and ten lines in the Gilgit Sanskrit manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavastu* (GBM 6.791.8–863.10 [fols. 239v8–275v10]; Clarke 2014: 60–62, 135–70). While most of those folios are well preserved, at least one (271r1–3, v8–10) is incomplete. There are also quite a few small Sanskrit fragments of the *Cīvaravastu* found in Central Asia and published in volumes I–XII of the *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden* (SHT); for more detail, see Wille 1990: 137–47; 2014: 193 [taking into account the

Gilgit Sanskrit text of the *Cīvaravastu* was edited and published by Nalinaksha Dutt in 1942. As previous scholars have noted, Dutt's editions of the Gilgit manuscripts have various problems and frequently do not convey the actual readings of the manuscripts.²¹ In order to establish a solid textual basis for the following discussion, I have transliterated the story of Abhaya from the Gilgit manuscript of the *Vinayavastu* (fols. 243v7–244v5), using the newly published high-resolution color photographs.²² The translation below is made from my transliterated text (see Appendix I):²³

[§1] At a later time King Śreṇya Bimbisāra of Magadha, standing on the upper terrace of the palace, surrounded by a group of ministers, indulged in improper talk, “Sirs, has anyone seen any kind of courtesan?” Gopa said, “Lord, forget about the others! In Vaiśālī is a courtesan named Āmrāpālī, endowed with surpassing beauty and youth, having the knowledge of sixty-four kinds of arts, deserving to be enjoyed only by you, Lord.” [Bimbisāra] said, “Gopa, if that’s the way it is, let’s go to Vaiśālī. We’ll have sex with her.” [Gopa] said, “The Licchavis of Vaiśālī have long been intending to kill you, opposing and hostile to you, Lord. I hope that they will not do you harm.” The king said, “Men, of course, have manly boldness. Let’s go.” [Gopa] said, “If you, Lord, insist at all events, let’s go.” Having mounted the chariot, he set out to Vaiśālī with Gopa. He reached Vaiśālī in due course. Gopa waited in the garden. The king entered Āmrāpālī’s house. Meanwhile the bell began to ring. The people of Vaiśālī became agitated, “Sirs, an enemy of ours has come in. The bell is ringing.” A loud and noisy sound arose. King Bimbisāra asked Āmrāpālī, “My dear lady, what is this?” “Lord, the search of houses is underway.” “On whose account?” “On your account, Lord.” “What is to be done? Should I run away?” “Lord, please do not become faint-hearted. The search of my house takes place on the seventh day. For seven days, please just have fun, enjoy yourself, and have sex. When seven days are over, I will know the time [for your departure].” He had fun, enjoyed himself, and had sex with her. When Āmrāpālī became pregnant, she told this to Bimbisāra, “Lord, I am pregnant.” He gave her a thin garment and a seal ring. He told her, “If it be a girl, she is only with you. But if it be a boy, after putting on him this thin garment and tying the seal ring to his neck, send him to me.” Having gone out [of Āmrāpālī’s house], having mounted the chariot with Gopa, he departed. The bell remained silent.²⁴ [The Licchavis of Vaiśālī] said, “Sirs, our enemy has come out. Let’s search [for him].” Five hundred Licchavis equipped with leather vambraces and finger-protectors followed behind King Bimbisāra.²⁵ Gopa saw them. He said, “Lord, the Licchavis of Vaiśālī have come. Will you fight with them, or will you drive the chariot?” [Bimbisāra] said, “I am tired.

volume SHT XII, which was not yet published in 2014 but was published in 2017]. As far as I can tell, none of these fragments contains anything directly related to Abhaya or Jivaka.

21. On Dutt’s unsatisfactory editorial principles, see, for instance, critical observations by Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 107–18; Matsumura 1996: 174–75; Clarke 2014: 2 n. 12, 10–11.

22. For the photographs, see Clarke 2014: 138–39. In the footnotes to my transliteration, I have made references to Dutt’s edition (GM III. 2.19.14–22.20) and to the old facsimile edition published by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra (GBM 6.799.7–801.5) as occasion demands.

23. I have divided the Sanskrit text into two passages (§1 and §2). The first passage (fols. 243v7–244r7) has been rendered into French (Lamotte 1944–80: II. 992 n. 1 [based on Dutt’s edition]); both passages have been summarized in English (Majumdar 1945: 137–38 [based on Dutt’s edition]). For the Tibetan counterpart, see D 1, ‘*dul ba*, Ga 57b1–58b7; P 1030, ‘*dul ba*, Ñe 54b6–56a5; S 1, ‘*dul ba*, Ga 66b3–6 and 68a1–69b5 (tr. in Schiefner 2007: 163–65 = Ralston 1882: 88–90). For a summary of the Tibetan, see Banerjee (1957: 208–9 [based on Narthang and Derge editions]). In the sTog edition, Ga 67a1–b7 (corresponding to D 1, Ga 56a7–57a2; P 1030, Ñe 53b5–54a7) concerns a preceding story of Abhaya’s mother Āmrāpālī and has been mistakenly inserted into the present story of Abhaya.

24. The manuscript reads *ghaṃṭā tūṣṇīm avasthitā*, but the context seems to require the opposite. In the Tibetan, while the sTog edition (Ga 68b1) has *dril bu ma ’khrol bar ’dug go* (“The bell was not ringing”), both the Derge edition (Ga 58a2) and the Peking edition (Ñe 55a7) read *dril bu ’khrol bar ’dug go* (“The bell was ringing”).

25. On *godhā* (“ein am linken Arm befestigtes Leder um denselben vor dem Schlag der Bogensehne zu schützen”), see pw, II 180, s.v. *godha*.

I'll drive the chariot. *You* fight with them.” [Gopa] started to fight with them, and the people of Vaiśālī recognized him.²⁶ They said, “Sirs, this one is a demon in the form of a man. Let’s escape.” They turned back. Having returned to Vaiśālī, they gathered and once again made an agreement, “Sirs, we should repay this hostility too to Bimbisāra’s sons.”²⁷

[§2] When nine months had passed, Āmrāpālī gave birth. A boy was born, handsome, good-looking, pleasing. Later he was raised, brought up, and became a big boy. When he was playing with the Licchavi lads of Vaiśālī, they spoke to him in an unfriendly way, “Sirs, who is the father of this son of a female slave? His father could be any one of many hundreds of thousands of men.” In tears he went to his mother. She said to him, “Son, why are you crying?” He told her everything in detail. She said, “Son, if they ask again, tell them, ‘I have such a father that not a single one of you have.’ If they say, ‘Who,’ tell them, ‘King Bimbisāra.’” Later he started to play with them again. They asked him exactly in this way. He said, “I have such a father that not a single one of you have.” “Who?” “King Bimbisāra.” They started to beat him even more, saying, “Guys, his father is our enemy.” In tears he told his mother what had happened. She pondered, “The Licchavis of Vaiśālī are vicious and violent. There is a possibility that they will have [my son] killed.” In this way she was lost in thought. There were many merchants travelling with goods to Rājagṛha. She found them and said, “Please leave after stamping your goods with this seal ring. You will pass without paying taxes. Please take this boy to Rājagṛha. After tying this seal ring to his neck, you shall place him at the gate of the royal palace.” They agreed, “Let it be so.” Moreover, having given her son a string of pearls, she said to him, “Son, when the king is seated at the place of legal judgement,²⁸ laying this string of pearls at his feet, climbing up, seat yourself on his lap. If anyone says, ‘This boy has no fear,’ tell him, ‘Is there any son who fears his own father?’” Together with the merchants, [the boy] reached Rājagṛha in due course. Having bathed him and decorated him with the seal ring, they placed him at the royal gate. He went to the king. Having approached, he laid the string of pearls at [the king’s] feet and sat down on his lap. The king said, “Sirs, this boy has no fear.” He said, “Father, is there any son who fears his own father?” The king thenceforth addressed him with the word *Abhaya* (‘Fearless’), and thus he was called Prince *Abhaya*. [Hence] the name Prince *Abhaya* came about.²⁹

The *Cīvaravastu* proceeds to recount Bimbisāra’s affair with another woman and the birth of their son *Jīvaka*, without saying anything more about *Abhaya*. In the rest of the text *Abhaya* is mentioned again only on two occasions, both in connection with *Jīvaka*. On the first occasion the text explains that *Jīvaka* is called *Kumārabhṛta* for he is nourished by *Abhayakumāra* (‘Prince *Abhaya*’);³⁰ on the second occasion it shows that, after having a

26. An earlier episode in the *Cīvaravastu* (re-ed. and tr. in Wu 2014a: 24–25, 40) tells us that Gopa fights with the Licchavis in order to help Bimbisāra secretly bring *Celā* to Rājagṛha.

27. The Licchavis make a similar agreement earlier in the text, when they find out that Bimbisāra steals away *Celā* (see n. 26).

28. The exact meaning of *arthādhikaraṇe* is unclear to me. The word *adhikaraṇa* can mean both ‘department’ and ‘court’ (Olivelle 2015: 17). The Tibetan version (D 1, Ga 58b4; P 1030, Ņe 56a2; S 1, Ga 69b1) reads *bu rgyal po dgos pa’i ched du ’dus dang*, translated by Schiefner (2007: 165 = Ralston 1882: 90) as “O Sohn, begib dich in Geschäften zum Könige.”

29. Kṣemendra reworks this story into poetic form in the *Āmrāpālyavadāna* (Pallava 20) of his *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (Das and Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1888–1918: I. 565–73, verses 70–97; summarized in Signe 2004: 56). In his *Theṛīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā* Dhammapāla (sixth/seventh century) gives another account of *Abhaya*, according to which *Abhaya* is born of the prostitute *Padamavatī* in *Ujjeni* (see *Thī-a* 37,16–22; tr. Pruitt 1998: 56). The Pāli version agrees largely with the *Cīvaravastu* version but differs in some details. For instance, it speaks of an overnight encounter, rather than a period of cohabitation, between Bimbisāra and *Abhaya*’s mother. It does not explain the name *Abhaya* and makes no mention of his desire to know his father. In comparison, the *Cīvaravastu* version shows more similarities to the Jaina story of the birth of *Abhaya* in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*.

30. The text describes how *Abhaya* takes on the task of raising the abandoned baby *Jīvaka* (GBM 6.802.4–7 [fol. 245r4–7]; Clarke 2014: 140). In explaining the name *Kumārabhṛta* it says (245r7): *rājñā jīvakaṇvādēna samudācarito ’bhayena ca rājākumāreṇa bhṛta iti jīvakaḥ kumārabhṛto* (“He was addressed by the king with the

conversation with Abhaya, Jivaka adopts the medical profession as a means of livelihood.³¹ In the Gilgit manuscript of the *Cīvaravastu* the story of Abhaya occupies less than one double-sided folio (243v7–244v5), while the stories of Jivaka, mainly on his medical career, occupy nearly six double-sided folios (244v5–250v5). It is clear that the compilers/redactors of the text had far less interest in Abhaya than in his physician brother Jivaka.

The Jaina story of the birth and youth of Abhaya in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* presents a different scenario, in which Abhaya stands at the center of attention and is used as a model to illustrate *uppattiya buddhi* ('spontaneous intelligence'). The story serves to explain the catchword *khuddaga* in stanza 940 of the ĀvN.³² Although the story is well known, it has never been compared with its counterpart in the *Cīvaravastu* and is therefore worth introducing here.³³

khaddue pasenati rāyā. putto se seṇio rāyalakkhaṇasaṃpaṇṇo. tassa kimci na deti mā mārijjhi tti. so addhiie ṇiggato. beṇṇātadaṃ āgato. vaṇiyasālayāe ṭhito. tassa lābho tappabhāveṇaṃ. so bhattaṃ deti. dhūtāe saṃpakko. diṇṇā. rāyāe leho visajjito. so āpucchati. sā bhaṇati tubbhehiṃ kaḥiṃ. so bhaṇati amhe paṃḍarakuṃḍagā rāyagihe govālā pasiddhā. gato ya. āvaṇṇasattāe dohalo devalogacuyassa abhayaṃ suṇejjāmi. vāṇito davvaṃ gahāya uvatṭhito raṇṇo. raṇṇā gahiyaṃ. ugghosāviyaṃ putto jāto. abhayaṃ tti nāmaṃ kataṃ. pucchati mama pitā kaḥiṃ ti. tāe kaḥitaṃ. bhaṇati vaccāmo tti. sattheṇa samaṃ vaccati.³⁴ rāyagihassa bahiyā ṭhitā. naḡaragavesato gato. rāyā maṃti maggati. sukkakūve khuddagaṃ pāḍiyaṃ. jo geṇḥati hattheṇaṃ taḍe ṭhito tassa rāyā vittiṃ deti. abhaṇeṇa diṭṭhaṃ. āhataṃ chāṇeṇaṃ. sukke pāṇiyaṃ mukkaṃ. taḍe saṃtaeṇa gahiyaṃ. raṇṇo samivaṃ ṇīto. pucchati tumaṃ ko. bhaṇati tumha putto tti. kiha vā kiṃ vā. savvaṃ paḍikahiyaṃ. tuṭṭho. ucchaṃge kato. mātā pavesijjantī maṇḍeti. teṇa vāriyā. amacco jāto | (ĀvC I 546.12–547.5)³⁵

Regarding a small ring: There was a king, Prasenajit. His son Śreṇika was endowed with characteristics of a king. Thinking, "I hope that he will not be killed," [Prasenajit] did not grant him anything. Being impatient, [Śreṇika] left [Rājagrha]. He came to Bennātata and stayed at a merchant's house. With his help [the merchant] made profit. He offered [Śreṇika] food.³⁶ [Śreṇika]

word Jivaka and nourished by Prince Abhaya. Thus he was called Jivaka Kumārabhṛta"). On *kumārabhṛta* (Pāli *komārabhacca*) as a synonym of *kaumārabhṛtya* referring to obstetrics and pediatrics, see Zysk 1991: 53–54.

31. GBM 6.802.7–8 [fol. 245r7–8]; Clarke 2014: 140: *yāvad apareṇa samayena jivakaḥ kumārabhṛto mahāṃ saṃvṛttaḥ so 'bhayena sārḍhaṃ saṃgaṇikayā tiṣṭhaty ajātaśatruḥ kumāra ajñāta* [read: *ajāta*; Tib. *ma btsas pa*] *eva rājate vyākṛto vayaṃ api kimci c hilpaṃ śikṣāma | yad āsmākam uttarakālaṃ jivikā bhaviṣyatīti | tau caiva-m> maṇṭrayatau* [read: *ṛtrayitau*] ("Later Jivaka Kumārabhṛta grew up. He stayed in company with Abhaya. The two talked like this, 'Even unborn, Prince Ajātaśatru was predicted [to be established] in kingship. Let's learn some craft which will become our livelihood in the future.'"). Abhaya and Jivaka then decide to learn chariot-making (*rathakāratvaṃ*) and medicine (*vaidyakaṃ*) respectively.

32. According to the Sanskrit gloss (*chāyā*) in ĀvH 417b, *khuddaga* (*ksudraka* 'small') refers to *mudrāratna* ('seal-jewel'); see also ĀvM 519a12: *khuddagaṃ nāma aṃgulīyakaratmaṃ* ("The small one' is namely a finger-jewel"). Stanza 940 of the ĀvN corresponds to stanza 58 in NandīC 33.6–8 (= stanza 60 in NandīH 46.26–28; stanza 63 in NandīM 144b12–13).

33. Nagarajaiiah (2008: 14–15) compares the Jaina story with the Pāli story of Abhaya (see above n. 29), but mentions the *Cīvaravastu*'s account only in passing (p. 64).

34. Here *vaccati* should be emended to *vaccanti* (cf. ĀvH 418b1; NandīH 134.25).

35. See almost the same account, with minor variation in wording, in NandīH 134.20–28. The counterparts in ĀvH 417b8–418b5 and ĀvM 519a12–b12 are more elaborate and contain some different details. Koch (1990: 190–93) has re-edited this story based on the four versions, and, comparatively speaking, his re-edition is closest to the ĀvM version. See also a Sanskrit version in NandīM 149b12–151a13. For parallels in other Jaina texts, see Balbir 1993: 159.

36. ĀvH (418a1–5) describes in more detail Śreṇika's encounter with the merchant: *khīnavibhavaseṭṭhissa viḥie uvaviṭṭho. tassa ya tappuṇṇapaccayaṃ taddivasaṃ vāsadeyabhaṃḍāṇaṃ vikkao jāo. khaddhaṃ khaddhaṃ viḍhattaṃ. anne bhaṇanti seṭṭhiṇā rayaṇāyaro sumiṇaṃmi gharam āgao niyakaṇṇaṃ pariṇeṃtago diṭṭho. tao 'ṇeṇa cīṃtiyaṃ eie pasāeṇa mahā viḥūi bhavissati. pacchā so viḥie uvaviṭṭho. teṇa tam aṇaṇṇasarīsāe āgāie daṭṭhūna cīṃtiyaṃ eso so rayaṇāyaro bhavissai. tappahāveṇa yāṇeṇa milakkhuhatthāo aṇaggejḥjā rayaṇā pattā. pacchā puc-*

lived with his daughter. She was given [to him in marriage].³⁷ King [Prasenajit] sent a letter [to Śreṇika]. He bade farewell [to her]. She said, “Where are you going?” He said, “We are shepherds at Rājagṛha, known as Pāṇḍurakuṇḍakas [‘those with white pots’].” He left. When she was pregnant, she had a pregnancy-whim [for an embryo] descending from heaven, wishing, “May I hear one who has no fear.”³⁸ The merchant, bringing along some gift, visited the king [Śreṇika?]. The king accepted the gift. [Later] it was announced: “A son is born.” He was named Abhaya. He asked, “Where is my father?” She told him [about his father]. He said, “We should go [to Rājagṛha].” They went with a caravan. They stayed outside Rājagṛha. [Abhaya] went searching [for his father] in the city. [Meanwhile] the king was seeking a minister. A small ring was dropped into a dried well. If anyone standing on the rim can seize it with his hand, the king would offer him livelihood. Abhaya saw [the ring]. He struck it with cow-dung. When [the cow-dung] became dried, he poured water [into the well]. Standing on the rim, he seized [the ring]. He was brought to the king’s presence. [The king] asked, “Who are you?” He said, “I am your son.” “How come? What happened?” He reported everything. [The king] was delighted and put him on his lap. While being brought into [the palace], the mother dressed herself up [but] was stopped by [Abhaya].³⁹ He became a minister [of King Śreṇika].

When comparing the stories of Abhaya in the *Cīvaravastu* and in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, we can identify a number of similarities. Both the Buddhist and Jaina stories associate the birth of Abhaya with a ring (called *aṅgulimudrā* ‘seal ring’ in the Buddhist story and *khuḍḍaga* ‘small [ring]’ in the Jaina story). Both show that Abhaya is born outside the royal palace as a result of King Śreṇika Bimbisāra’s encounter with a commoner woman, thus both suggesting the controversial nature of Abhaya’s maternal lineage. Both tell us that when growing up Abhaya asks his mother who his father is and then goes to Rājagṛha to meet his father. Both agree that it is Abhaya who takes the initiative to reveal his identity to his father in their first meeting. These similarities reflect a shared understanding (whether historically true or not) of the character of Abhaya among ancient Buddhists and Jainas. Besides such similarities, there are also clear differences between the Buddhist and Jaina stories. While the Jaina story serves to illustrate *uppattiyā buddhi*, the Buddhist story functions as a prelude to the subsequent portrayal of Abhaya’s brother Jīvaka. The Jaina story describes vividly Abhaya’s cleverness in retrieving a ring from the bottom of a well, but there is no such plot in the Buddhist story. It is worth noting that Abhaya is a very important character in Jaina narrative literature in general, for he embodies “intelligence and wisdom *par excellence* for the

chio kassa tubbhe pāhuṇagā. teṇa bhaṇiyam tujjham ti. gharam ṇio. (“[Śreṇika] entered the shop of a guild-leader who had lost his fortune. On that day, because of his meritorious help, [the guild-leader] sold out all the goods to be sold for a whole year and gained plenty. Others say: In his dream the guild-leader saw a goldsmith [*rayaṇāyara*, lit. ‘jewel-mine’] coming to his house and marrying his daughter. Then he thought, ‘Through her graciousness I will gain a great fortune.’ Later [Śreṇika] entered his shop. Having seen him in an unparalleled body shape, [the guild-leader] thought, ‘He will be that goldsmith.’ With his help [the guild-leader] obtained a priceless jewel from the hand of a barbarian. Later [the guild-leader] asked him, ‘Whose guest are you?’ He said, ‘Yours.’ [The guild-leader] brought him to his own house.”); see also almost the same account in ĀvM 519a13–b3.

37. ĀvH (418a5) adds: *kāleṇa ya naṃdāe sumiṇaṃmi dhavalagayapāsaṇam, āvaṇnasattā jāyā* (“In due course Nandā saw a white elephant in her dream. She became pregnant”); see also ĀvM 519b4.

38. The text seems corrupt here; cf. ĀvH 418a7–8: *tī dohalao devalogacuyagabbhāṇubhāveṇa varahatthikhaṃdhagayā abhayaṃ suṇejjāmi tti* (“Due to the power of an embryo falling from heaven, she had a whim, ‘May I, sitting on the back of the best elephant, hear one who has no fear.’”); ĀvM 519b6–7: *devalogacuyagabbhāṇubhāveṇa tī dohalo varahatthikhaṃdhagayā abhayaṃ savvajamṭūna demi tti* (“Due to the power of the embryo falling from heaven, she had a whim, ‘May I, sitting on the back of the best elephant, give all living beings freedom from fear.’”).

39. Cf. NandīM 151a10–11: *tataḥ sātmānaṃ maṇḍayitum pravṛtā niṣiddhā cābhayakumāreṇa mātara na kalpate kulastrīṇāṃ nijapativirahitāṇāṃ nijapatidarśanam antareṇa bhūṣaṇaṃ karttum iti* (“Then she started to decorate herself, [but] was stopped by Prince Abhaya, who said, ‘Mother, it is not suitable for women of good families, who have been abandoned by their husbands, to make decoration without seeing their husbands.’”).

Jains.”⁴⁰ He almost always appears as a highly intelligent man capable of solving problems or using stratagems in Śvetāmbara and Digambara texts, whereas in Buddhist literature his problem-solving capability is little featured.⁴¹ As can be seen from the chart series above, Abhaya’s wisdom is highlighted in a number of stories in the section of the *Āvaśyakacūṛṇī* that expounds the term *sikkhāśikṣā* (i.e., C 3–6 and 9–11), but none of these stories finds a parallel in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* or in any other extant Buddhist text. In the cases of C13 and C14, as I have shown elsewhere, while Abhaya plays an active role in the Jaina stories, his role is replaced by other characters in the Buddhist parallels (Wu 2014a: 21–34). Within the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* the only detailed treatment of Abhaya is the story of his birth translated above. It is hard to say exactly why the compilers/redactors of this text did not have much interest in Abhaya. Some Buddhist texts do speak of Abhaya’s support of Nirgrantha Jñātaputra (= Mahāvīra) before his conversion to Buddhism.⁴² Although the compilers/redactors of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* kept silent on this matter, it is not impossible that they were likewise aware of Abhaya’s Jaina background and perhaps also of his high profile within the Jaina tradition. This might have been a factor that led them to deliberately play down his status in their text.⁴³

In contrast to Abhaya, the lay physician Jīvaka, who does not appear in Jaina literature and is therefore unique to the Buddhist tradition, receives much attention in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, particularly in the *Cīvaravastu*.⁴⁴ While the *Cīvaravastu* says nothing about Abhaya’s cleverness, it describes in detail Jīvaka’s wisdom and his medical skills. One of the examples that illustrate Jīvaka’s intelligence is the story of his deciphering of an elephant’s footprint. I have transliterated this story from the aforementioned color photographs of the Gilgit manuscript of the *Vinayavastu* (fol. 246r6–v3). The translation below is made from my transliterated text (see Appendix II):⁴⁵

Later the boys saw an elephant’s footprint in the middle of the road. They started to investigate it. Jīvaka came and said, “What is this?” “An elephant’s footprint.” “This is not a footprint of a male elephant. This is a footprint of a female elephant. She is blind in the right eye and will give birth to a young male elephant *today*. There a woman mounted [her]. She, too, is blind in the right eye, pregnant, and will give birth to a son *today*.” Later they went to [their teacher] Ātreya. Each one showed [to him] what he had brought. Ātreya said, “Boys, all this is medicine. Now

40. See Balbir’s foreword in Nagarajaiah 2008: x.

41. For an informative survey of stories about Abhaya’s intelligence in Jaina literature, see Nagarajaiah 2008; also Mehta and Chandra 1970–72: I. 49–50, s.v. Abhaa. The thirteenth-century Śvetāmbara monk Candratilaka gave a poetic biography of Abhaya in his *Abhayakumāracarita* (on this work, see Cort 2009: 20). For stories of Abhaya in Buddhist sources, see Akanuma 1931: I, s.v. Abhaya¹; Malalasekera 1937–38: I. 127–28, s.v. 2. Abhaya.

42. For instance, in the *Abhayarājakumārasutta* (MN I 392–96) Abhaya, on behalf of his Jaina master, poses a two-horned question to the Buddha regarding what kinds of speech he would use. After hearing the Buddha’s reply, Abhaya becomes convinced and takes refuge in him (on this *sutta*, see Balbir 2000: 6; Anālayo 2011: I. 334–35). In the Chinese *Dirghāgama* version of the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra* (T. I [i] 107c9–12 [juan 17]) Abhaya recommends to the guilt-ridden Ajātaśatru to visit Nirgrantha Jñātaputra so that he may regain peace of mind. This detail does not appear in the other extant versions of the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra*.

43. In comparison, the Theravāda tradition devotes more attention to Abhaya. The Th-a (I 87–89) narrates in detail his past and present lives culminating in his attainment of *arahat*-ship. I have not found such a biography of Abhaya in Sanskrit, Chinese, or Tibetan texts. In the Jaina tradition, according to the *Anuttaraupapātikadaśāḥ* (Pkt. *Aṇṭṭaravavāiyadasāo*) Abhaya will be reborn in the Vijaya heaven and then attain liberation in Mahāvīdeha (see Barnett 1907: 111 [tr.], 126 [text]).

44. The *Samghabhedavastu*, the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, and the *Kṣudrakavastu* also give accounts of Jīvaka’s medical expertise and/or his devotion to the Buddha (see summaries in Panglung 1981: 114, 139, 168, 182).

45. See the Tibetan counterpart at D 1, ‘dul ba, Ga 61b2–62a7; P 1030, ‘dul ba, Ne 58b7–59b4; S 1, ‘dul ba, Ga 73b4–75a1 (tr. in Schiefner 2007: 168–69 = Ralston 1882: 96–98).

this one together with water, in this manner, can be used for such-and-such illness. The others are also the same [which is to say, they can also be used for other illnesses].” Jivaka was asked, “What have you brought?” He said, “Teacher, everything is medicine. There is nothing that is not medicine. Nevertheless, I have brought the root of reed, gravel, and a lump of iron-rust.” “What is the use of these?” “With the roots of reed, fumigant can be given to a person stung by a scorpion. With the lump of iron-rust, a poultice can be given. With the gravel, pots of curdled milk can be broken in due time.” Ātreya laughed. The boys thought, “The teacher is angry with him.” They said, “Teacher, [do you think] this is the only [foolish thing he did]? While coming back, we saw an elephant’s footprint in the middle of the road. He said, ‘This is a footprint of a female elephant. She is blind in the right eye, pregnant, and will give birth *today*. She will deliver a young male elephant. There a woman mounted [her]. She, too, is blind in the right eye, pregnant, and will give birth *today*. She will deliver a son.’” Ātreya asked, “Jivaka, is this true?” “It is true, Teacher.” “How can you know that this footprint of an elephant is a footprint of a female elephant?” He said, “Teacher, we were brought up in the royal family. How can we not know? A male elephant’s footprint is round, while a female elephant’s is oblong.” “How can you know that she is blind in the right eye?” “While walking, she moved by her left flank.”⁴⁶ “How can you know that she is pregnant?” “While walking, she pressed her two back feet.” “How can you know that she will give birth *today*?” “She discharged urine with a white substance.” “How can you know that she will give birth to a young male elephant?” “While walking, she pressed her right foot harder.” “How can you know that there a woman mounted [her]?” “Having dismounted, [the woman] discharged urine between her two feet.” “How can you know that she is also blind in the right eye?” “While walking, she collected flowers on her left side.” “How can you know that she is also pregnant?” “While walking, she pressed her heel harder.” “How can you know that she will give birth *today*?” “She discharged urine with a white substance. However, if the teacher has doubt, please send a boy there [since] there is a caravan in that area.” [Ātreya] sent out a boy. Everything was exactly the same as Jivaka had said. Ātreya said to the boys, “Boys, have you heard it?” “Teacher, we heard it. Such is the wisdom of Jivaka.”⁴⁷

The wisdom of Jivaka described above comprises two aspects: his broad knowledge of medicinal value of natural materials and his outstanding capability in deductive reasoning. The motif of deciphering an elephant’s footprint is used to illustrate the second aspect. Mette (1983: 137) notes that this motif finds a parallel in the *Āvaśyaka* commentaries, where an anonymous pupil studying semiology is shown as having a similar capability of reading an elephant’s footprints, and the story serves to explain the catchword *nimitta* (‘sign’) in stanza 944 of the ĀvN.⁴⁸ The *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* version of the story runs as follows:

*nimitte egassa siddhaputtassa do sīsagā nimittaṃ sikkhaṃti. aṇṇadā taṇakaṭṭhassa vaccaṃti. tehiṃ hatthiyapadā dīṭṭhā. ego bhaṇati hatthiṇiyāe pādā. kahaṃ. kāyaṇa. sā hatthiṇī kāṇī. kahaṃ. egapāseṇa taṇāiṃ khaitāiṃ. teṇa kāieṇa nātaṃ jathā itthī puriso ya vilaggāṇi. so vi nāto so ya juvāṇa tti nāto.*⁴⁹ *hatthiṇiṃ rumbhittā utṭhitā. dārao se bhavissati jeṇa dakkhiṇapādo guru. potarattā dasi rukkhe laggā* | (ĀvC I 553.1–4)⁵⁰

46. The Tibetan (D 1, Ga 62a3; P 1030, Ñe 59a8; S 1, Ga 74b2) reads: *g.yon phyogs su ran 'tshal zhing mchis pa las* [S: *lags*] *so* (“It is because while walking she ate grass on her left side”). The parallel episode in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* contains a detail similar to the Tibetan (see below).

47. This story of Jivaka finds no parallel in the surviving *vinayas* of five other Buddhist sects (Theravādins, Mahāsāṃghikas, Dharmaguptakas, Mahīśāsakas, and Sarvāstivādins).

48. Stanza 944 of the ĀvN corresponds to stanza 62 in NandīC 33.15–16 (= stanza 64 in NandīH 47.6–7; stanza 67 in NandīM 159b4–5).

49. The text seems corrupt here; cf. NandīH 137.15: *so vi nāto [juvāṇo tti] sā ya guvviṇi tti nātā* (brackets in original); ĀvH 423b3–4: *sā ya guvviṇi tti*; ĀvM 523b11: *sā ya itthī guvviṇi*.

50. See almost the same account in NandīH 137.13–16 and ĀvH 423b1–5. ĀvM 523b7–12 (tr. in Koch 1990: 237–39) is more elaborate. For other Jaina parallels, see Balbir 1993: 163.

Regarding sign: Two pupils of a *siddhaputra* studied sign.⁵¹ One day they wandered in search of grass and wood. They saw footprints of an elephant. One said, “These are the footprints of a female elephant.” “Why?” “[This can be known] from the bodily trace. The female elephant is one-eyed.” “Why?” “She chewed grass on one side of her body. From the bodily trace it can be known that a man and a woman dismounted. Also, he is known [to be young] and she is known to be pregnant. She was supported after having mounted the female elephant. She will give birth to a boy for her right footprint is deeper. She wore a red garment [given that] the fringe is stuck on the tree.”

The text proceeds to tell another story of how the two pupils help an old lady deduce whether her son will soon return home after a long absence. Although in the *Āvaśyaka* commentaries the two stories joined together as one unit stand among examples of *veṇaiyā buddhi* (‘intelligence based on discipline’), given their apparent relation to deductive reasoning, Mette (1983: 138) rightly suggests that we may transfer them to the group concentrating upon *pāriṇāmiyā buddhi* (‘deductive intelligence’).

Perhaps the most significant difference between the Buddhist and Jaina illustrations of the motif of deciphering an elephant’s footprints lies in the fact that while in the *Cīvaravastu* the motif serves to demonstrate the wisdom of Jīvaka, in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* it is associated with an anonymous character. The question why the lay physician Jīvaka is prominently featured in Buddhist literature but makes no appearance in Jaina literature is intriguing.⁵² There could be various reasons. One reason, it seems to me, is that Buddhist and Jaina monastic authors held different attitudes toward medical treatment and the role of physicians. While it is impossible here systematically to compare Buddhist and Jaina discourses on medicine and healing, it is noteworthy that Jainas in general adopted a much more ambivalent stance on medical care than Buddhists. In the Buddhist traditions medical knowledge forms an integral part of monastic discipline, for which the most direct evidence is the inclusion of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* (Pāli *Bhesajjakhandhaka*) in all six extant monastic law codes. Buddhist monks are frequently depicted both as offering medical care to their fellow monks, and as receiving advice or cures from secular physicians.⁵³ In Jainism the situation is radically

51. The exact meaning of *siddhaputra* is unclear to me. According to Hemacandra (twelfth century), this term denotes “a man in the state between a Jain *sādhu* and a layman” (Johnson 1931–62: IV. 42 n. 28). Mette (1983: 137) construes it as referring to an astrologer.

52. For Buddhist stories of Jīvaka, see Akanuma 1931: 248–50, s.v. Jīvaka-komārabhacca; Malalasekera 1937–38: I. 957–58, s.v.; Zysk 1991: 52–61; Mori 2014: 45–78. He is said to have provided medical services not only to royalty, but also to the Buddha. The most detailed Buddhist account of Jīvaka is that found in the *Cīvaravastu*. As Fish (2014: 47–57) rightly suggests, by making Jīvaka a devotee of the Buddha, the authors/redactors of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* subsume the efficacy of worldly medicine under the power of the Buddhist Dharma.

Although the name Jīvaka does appear in Jaina literature, it refers to persons apparently different from the Buddhist Jīvaka. For instance, the *Cīvakacintāmaṇi* written by the Digambara Tiruttakkatēvar probably in the ninth century, one of the best-known Tamil epics, tells how King Jīvaka (or Jivandhara), after marrying eight wives, finally abandons them all and becomes a Jaina monk in the preaching arena (*samavasaraṇa*) of Mahāvīra (tr. Ryan 2005; Ryan and Vijayavenugopal 2012); see also a Sanskrit version of this story in Guṇabhadra’s ninth-century *Uttarapurāṇa* [abbr. UP] 75.183–691 (tr. in Hultsch 1922: 320–48). The *Tiṭhogālī* (verse 492), one of the miscellaneous (*prakīrṇaka*) texts of the Śvetāmbara Jainas, mentions a contemporary king of the twenty-second Jina Ariṣṭanemi who is also called Jīvaka (see Puṇyavijaya and Bhojak 1984: 454.12).

53. On the recensions of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu/Bhesajjakhandhaka* in the extant *vinayas* of six Buddhist sects, see Frauwallner 1956: 91–97. On Buddhist monks’ practices in medical healing, see Demiéville 1974: 236–49 (= Tatz 1985: 31–63); Zysk 1991: 38–49. According to Demiéville (1974: 236a–240b = Tatz 1985: 31–40), while medical knowledge was spread among Buddhist monastics, the practice of medicine was deemed a worldly profession and discouraged in *vinaya* literature. Buddhist monks and nuns were generally prohibited from earning their livelihood through practicing medicine. They were authorized to offer medications and medical treatments to their fellow monastics, but not to laypeople. This situation seems to have gradually changed for, as Demiéville points

different. As Kenneth Zysk (1991: 38) points out, “Jainas did not codify medicine in their monastic tradition,” since they believed that bodily suffering can be efficacious for spiritual cultivation and therefore should be endured rather than removed or eased. The Jaina monastic antipathy to medication is most visible in the oldest Śvetāmbara canonical texts (for instance, the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* [ĀS], the *Uttarādhyayana* [Utt], and the *Daśavaikālikasūtra* [DVS]), where monks are advised not to seek medical care but to bravely put up with illnesses.⁵⁴ Moreover, in the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* and the *Niśīthasūtra* (NiśS) surgical operations are seen as acts of violence and thus running against the Jaina principle of nonviolence.⁵⁵ Such antipathy was softened somewhat at a later time. Mari Jyväsjarvi Stuart (2014) has convincingly shown that there was a historical shift in Śvetāmbara Jaina attitudes toward medical healing, from the early canonical texts to post-canonical commentaries on monastic rules.⁵⁶ She observes that in at least three commentaries written around the sixth and seventh centuries C.E.—the *Niśīthabhāṣya*, the *Vyavahārabhāṣya*, and the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*—medical care is explicitly permitted for Jaina monks and even encouraged in cases of serious illnesses. She further notes that these commentaries not only compare learned Jaina monks to skilled doctors but also indicate that there were indeed monk-doctors in the Jaina community.⁵⁷ Since her study focuses primarily on medieval monastic commentaries, Stuart does not discuss whether the same historical shift is also discernible in other genres of Jaina literature. It seems to me that even at such a time when the necessity of medical care was recognized by Jaina monastic legal commentators for the pragmatic purpose of community survival, within the range of narrative literature we can still discern some antipathy to medical healing and to the role of doctors (especially secular doctors). In this connection it is interesting to note that the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* (I 460.9–461.13) tells a story about two doctors at the city of Dvāravatī, the good doctor Vaitaraṇi, who treats Jaina monks kindly and prescribes suitable remedies, and the bad doctor Dhanvantari, who treats them harshly and prescribes unsuitable remedies.⁵⁸ Despite the seemingly positive image of Vaitaraṇi, in commenting on the medical career of the two doctors, the text says, “So the two performed medical practice in

out, “les Moines se laissaient de plus en plus attirer par l’étude et l’exercice de la médecine et cherchaient à tourner par mille échappatoires les vieux interdits disciplinaires” (1974: 240b). Schopen observes that Indian Buddhist monasteries envisioned in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* were “ideally suited to provide care to the old and infirm, and to the sick and dying” (2000: 94), and that medical services were offered not only to monks but also to wealthy laity (ibid., 96–99).

54. See Utt 2.32–33 and DVS 3.20, discussed by Granoff (1998: 222) and Stuart (2014: 69). According to Utt 15.8, if one renounces a series of things including, inter alia, “every thought of medication” (*vivihaṃ vejjacimtaṃ*), one is a true monk. ĀS I.9.4.1 says, “whether nourished or not, [Mahāvira] did not take medicine” (*puṭṭhe vā se apuṭṭhe vā no se sātijjati teicchaṃ*); however, as Ohira (1994: 203, §547) and Granoff (1998: 222) note, the *Bhagavatisūtra* (BhS) 15.557 shows that Mahāvira took sin-free meat as medicine when he was sick (for a summary of this story, see Deleu 1970: 219). On Jaina attitudes toward medicine reflected in canonical texts, see also Deo 1956: 209–10. According to Ohira (1994: 1), ĀS I, a large part of the Utt (including Utt 2 and 15), and the DVS (except *cūlikās*) may be dated to the sixth/fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E.

55. See ĀS I.1.94 and NiśS 15.112–17, discussed in Stuart (2014: 69–70). In some post-canonical Śvetāmbara texts, the practice of medicine (*vidyā*) is listed as one of the occupations suitable for Jaina laity (see Williams 1963: 122). Jaini (1979: 171) points out, “Surgeons . . . may cause pain or even death during a delicate operation, but are guilty only of the much less serious ārambhajā-hiṃsā.” But even such licensed harm still has bad karmic effect, for as Jaini goes on to stress, “one who has taken the vow of noninjury must exercise a high degree of care in order to minimize even ārambhajā-hiṃsā.”

56. Granoff (1998: 222) has also briefly discussed this change based on the evidence in the *Bhagavatisūtra* 15 (see above n. 54) and in the *Niśīthacūrṇi* (see Sen 1975: 181–90).

57. Stuart 2014: 81–83. See also Granoff (2015: 25–26) on the comparison of a Jina to a skilled doctor in the *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcakathā* written by the Śvetāmbara monk Siddharṣi in 906 C.E.

58. On this story see Balbir 1990: 19–20 (tr.); 1993: 149 (parallels in other Jaina texts).

the whole of Dvāravatī, doing much harm and making much money.”⁵⁹ It then predicts that while Dhanvantari will be reborn in hell, Vaitaraṇi will be reborn as a monkey who uses his memory of past medical skills to heal a wounded Jaina monk and eventually attains liberation under the monk’s influence. This story expresses clear ambivalence toward secular doctors and shows that the medical profession as such leads to unpleasant rebirths, either in hell or in the animal realm. It also shows that while the monkey-doctor cures the monk and helps him attain temporary physical well-being, it is the monk who inspires the monkey and guides him to attain eternal spiritual well-being. In her masterful study of medieval Jaina narratives on healing, Phyllis Granoff (1998: 223) observes,

There seems to be a fundamental ambivalence towards cures of any type in the Jain tradition; while monks as healers may be singled out for praise, monks as recipients of cures are less highly regarded.

The reluctance to make monks recipients of cures as reflected in medieval Jaina narratives should not surprise us, for such reluctance is essentially consistent with the Jaina ascetic ideal of “indifference towards bodily needs and bodily pain.”⁶⁰ The somewhat divergent stances on medical healing in medieval Jaina narratives and legal commentaries might be explained in view of the different genres of the two types of sources.⁶¹ While legal commentaries address pragmatic concerns of mendicants and thus tend to accommodate the needs of physical care, narrative literature functions as a medium instantiating religious ideals and values, thus laying more emphasis on the ascetic commitment to tolerating bodily suffering. Taken as a whole, given the overall ambivalence toward medical treatments in the early and medieval Jaina traditions (particularly in the narrative literature of the tradition), it is hard to imagine that Jaina authors would have been interested in promoting a lay physician, like the Buddhist Jīvaka, as a model of human intelligence or religious faith.

A THIRD EXAMPLE: THE DEATH OF KING UDDĀYAṆA/UDRĀYAṆA

The Jaina emphasis on tolerating rather than alleviating bodily discomfort can also be seen in the story of the death of King Uddāyaṇa (alias Udāyaṇa). Jozef Deleu (1970: 43–44) notes that there is a cycle of stories concerning King Uddāyaṇa of Vītabhaya in Jaina literature, which corresponds to Buddhist stories of King Udrāyaṇa (alias Rudrāyaṇa) of Roruka in interesting ways.⁶² Both Buddhist and Jaina traditions agree that Uddāyaṇa/Udrāyaṇa, after

59. ĀvC I 460.12: *te do vi mahāraṃbhā mahāpariggahā ya savvāe bāravatīe tigicchaṃ kareṃti*; see also almost the same sentence in ĀvH 347b11–348a1; ĀvM 461a6.

60. Granoff 1998: 252. Similarly, the Buddhist acceptance of medical care is consistent with (but certainly not determined solely by) the doctrine of the middle way between the extremes of self-indulgence and self-mortification. As Zysk (1991: 39) puts it, “Providing the means to restore and maintain a healthy physical balance, medicine therefore was ideally suited to this philosophy of the Middle Way.”

61. I thank Dr. Mari Jyväsjarvi Stuart (email 1 September 2015) for reminding me of the importance of the genre difference in this context.

62. For Jaina stories of Uddāyaṇa, see Mehta and Chandra 1970–72: I.122, s.v. 1. Udāyaṇa; for Buddhist stories of Udrāyaṇa, see Akanuma 1931: 550, s.v. Rudrāyaṇa. For a survey of Buddhist and Jaina stories of Uddāyaṇa/Udrāyaṇa, particularly focusing on his relationship with Pradyota, see Zin 1991: 100–105. Before Deleu (1970), Lüders (1940: 653–57) and Watanabe (1964) also compared Buddhist and Jaina stories of this character. It has been suggested that Uddāyaṇa is probably the original correct spelling, while Udāyaṇa is a later variant (see Jacobi 1895: 87 n. 3; Lüders 1940: 656; Deleu 1970: 43). Uddāyaṇa clearly corresponds to the Buddhist spelling Udrāyaṇa. The authenticity of the form Rudrāyaṇa is doubtful, for it only appears in the text of the *Divyāvadāna* (No. 37 *Rudrāyaṇāvadāna*), edited by Cowell and Neil (1886: 544–86) on the basis of relatively late and often poorly written Nepalese manuscripts. Lüders (1940: 631–32) considers Rudrāyaṇa to be an error for Udrāyaṇa caused by the confusion of the Brāhmī letters *u* and *ru* (“Die Entstellung von Udrāyaṇa zu Rudrāyaṇa erklärt sich aus der

renouncing his kingship, receives ordination from the teacher (Buddha or Mahāvīra) and later suffers a tragic death, while visiting his hometown (Vītabhaya or Roruka), at the hands of his successor to the throne (i.e., his son Śikhāṇḍin according to Buddhists, or his nephew Keśin according to Jains). In his discussion Deleu makes no comment on the didactic implications of Buddhist and Jaina stories of Uddāyaṇa/Udrāyaṇa. It seems to me that there is a significant difference between Buddhist and Jaina accounts of the death of this character in terms of their didactic focuses: while the Jaina story demonstrates negative effects of seeking means to relieve bodily suffering, the Buddhist story illustrates the working of *karma* in both individual and communal dimensions. Let us first look at the Jaina story, of which the oldest extant version, preserved in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, runs as follows:

jadi akappo hojjā to uddāiṇo rajjam paricattā ṇa taṃ bhumjejjā. tassa uppattī. udāiṇo rāyā pavvaio. tassa bhikkhāhārassa vāhi jāto. so vejjena⁶³ bhaṇito dadhiṇā bhumjāhi. so kira bhattārao vatiyāe⁶⁴ patthito. aṇṇadā taṃ nagaraṃ gato vitibhayaṃ. tassa bhāiṇeṇṇo keśi teṇaṃ ceva rajje ṭhavītao. so kumārāmaccehiṃ bhaṇṇati⁶⁵ esa parisahaparājito āgato rajjam maggati. demi. te bhaṇṇati na esa rāyadhammo tti. vuggāheṃti. sucireṇa paḍissutaṃ. kiṃ kajjatu. visaṃ se dijjau. egāe pasuvāliyāe ghare pauttaṃ dahiṇā samaṃ dehi tti. sā paḍiṇṇā. devatāe avahitaṃ. bhaṇṇo ya maharīsī tubbhaṃ visaṃ diṇṇaṃ. pariharāhi dadhiṃ. so pariharati. so rogo vaddhati. puṇo ya jimito.⁶⁶ puṇo devatāya avahitaṃ. tatiyāe velāe devatāe vuccati punar avi diṇṇaṃ ti. taṃ pi avahitaṃ. sā tassa pahimḍitā.⁶⁷ aṇṇadā pamattāe devatāe diṇṇaṃ. kālagato. tassa ya sejjātaro kuṃbhāro sāvaio. taṇṇi kālagae devatāe paṃsuvarisaṃ pāditaṃ. so sejjātaro avahito nāhaṃ abbhāṃtaro tti. siṇavallīe kuṃbhārapakkhevaṃ nāma paṭṭaṇaṃ tassa nāmaṇaṃ jātaṃ. tattha so avahito. taṃ savvaṃ nagaraṃ paṃsunā pellitaṃ. ajja vi pavvato acchati. (ĀvC II 36.10–37.4, corresponding to ĀvH 537b10–538a7)⁶⁸

Schrift; in der nördlichen Brāhmī sind vom 4. bis etwa zum 7. Jahrhundert *u* and *ru* meist überhaupt nicht zu unterscheiden"); this opinion is adopted by Nobel (1955: xx–xxi); see also Zin 1991: 101 n. 109. The name Udrāyaṇa is attested in the *Udrāyaṇāvadāna* (Pallava 40) of Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (Das and Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1888–1918: I. 973–1027; partly tr. in Formigatti 2004: 113–47). It is also indicated by the transliteration *u-tra-ya-na* or *u-dra-ya-na* in the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga*. The variant Uddāyaṇa seems to have been used by some Buddhists (see, for instance, the transliteration of the king's name as *you-tuo-yan* 優陀延 [Early Middle Chinese pronunciation according to Pulleyblank 1991: *ʔuw-da-ʃian] in the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* at T. 1421 [xxii] 126b23 [juan 18]). Both Vītabhaya and Roruka are names of the capital city of Sindhu-Sāvira in the lower Indus basin (see Mehta and Chandra 1970–72: II. 720, s.v. Vīyabhaya; Akanuma 1931: 549, s.v. Roruka¹, Roruka²; Malalasekera 1937–38: II. 758, s.v. 1. Roruka; for the identification of Roruka with Aror/Alor [capital of Sindh, modern Rohri], see Lüders 1940: 652; Nobel 1955: xix–xx; for the identification of Roruka with the legendary town of Harmatelia [located possibly in modern Baluchistan], see Eggermont 1975: 148–59; Tucci 1977: 62 n. 85).

63. ĀvH 537b10: *vijjehiṃ* ('doctors').

64. ĀvH 537b11: *vaiyāesu*. While Haribhadra gives *vrajikāsu* as its equivalent, it is more likely that *vaiyā* corresponds to *vratitā* ('fulfillment of vows'; see Jacobi 1886: 141, s.v. *vaiyā*).

65. Emend to *bhaṇṇo* (cf. ĀvH 538a1: *kesikumāro* 'maccehiṃ bhaṇṇo').

66. Emend to *puṇo ya pagahio* (?). Here the word *jimita* ('eaten'; see Sheth 1963: 357, s.v. *jimia*) seems problematic because, if Uddāyaṇa eats the poisoned curdled milk, he would die immediately. ĀvH 538a3–4 reads differently: *puṇo pagahio puṇo pauttaṃ visaṃ* ("Once again he accepted [the curdled milk]; once again the poison was employed [to kill him].").

67. Emend to *pacchao pahimḍitā* (cf. ĀvH 538a4–5: *sā tassa pacchao pahimḍiyā*).

68. For a synopsis, see Balbir 1993: 172. Largely the same account is found in Devendra's eleventh-century commentary on the *Uttarādhyāyana* (Jacobi 1886: 33.29–34.10 [text]; Meyer 1909: 114–16 [tr.]); see a more elaborate version in Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacarita* (Śāha 1977: 349–51, verses 3–24 [text]; Johnson 1931–62: VI. 306–7 [tr.]). In his commentary on the *Sthānāṅgasūtra* Abhayadeva (eleventh century) relates the death of Uddāyaṇa as follows (Sth III. 741.2–7): *tathā 'bhijinnāmaṇaṃ snehānugatānukampayā rājyagrddho 'yaṃ mā durgatīm yāsīd iti bhāvayatā* [emend to *bhāvayitā*?] *svaputraṃ rājye avyavasthāpya keśināmaṇaṃ ca bhāḡineyaṃ rājānaṃ vidhāya mahāvīrasamīpe pravavrāja. yaś caikadā tatraiva nagare vijahāra, upannarogaś ca vaidyopadeśād dadhi bubhuje. rājyāpahāraśaṅkinā ca keśirājena viṣamīśradadhidāpanena pañcatvaṃ gamitāh. yadgūṇapakṣapātīnyā*

If [alms-food] should become unacceptable, then, having renounced kingship, Uddāyaṇa should not consume it. This occurred to him: King Udāyaṇa left home for the [Jaina] ascetic life. When he was begging alms, illness arose. A doctor told him, “Have a meal with curdled milk.” However, this venerable one stayed in observance of the vow [to abstain from curdled milk]. One day he went to the city of Vītabhaya. [Earlier] he himself had placed his nephew Keśin on the throne. Some ministers said to the prince [Keśin], “That one [Uddāyaṇa], defeated by ascetic afflictions, has come. He seeks the throne.” “I will give [it to him].” They said, “That [i.e., your abdication] is not the norm of a king.” They persuaded [Keśin not to give up the throne]. After a long time he agreed, asking, “What should be done?” “You should give him poison.” In a herdsman’s house it was ordered, “Give [poison] together with curdled milk!” She did so. A goddess took away [the poisoned curdled milk] and told [Uddāyaṇa], “Great sage! You have been given poison. Avoid the curdled milk!” He avoided it. His illness got worse. Once again he accepted [the curdled milk]. Once again the goddess took it away. On a third occasion [when he was given the poisoned curdled milk], the goddess said, “You have been given poison once again.” Again she took it away. She followed behind him. One day, when the goddess was heedless, [the poisoned curdled milk] was given to him. [Having eaten it] he died. A potter, who was a lay Jaina, offered him a shelter. When [Uddāyaṇa] died, the goddess rained down sand. She took away the shelter-offering [potter], who said, “I am innocent.”⁶⁹ She built a town at Sinapalli, called Kumbhakāraprakṣepa (‘Settlement of a Potter’) after his name. He was brought there [i.e., to that town]. The whole city [of Vītabhaya] was buried with sand. Even to this day a hill remains there.

The tragic death of Uddāyaṇa/Udāyaṇa described above may be seen as resulting partly from his wrong decision to alleviate illness through consuming curdled milk (*dadhi*), which is one of the ten types of modified or processed foodstuff (*vikṛtis*) usually forbidden to Jaina mendicants.⁷⁰ Although, according to some medieval Śvetāmbara monastic commentaries (for instance, the *Niśīthacūrṇi* and the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*), Jaina monks can eat curdled milk in cases of serious illness or other exceptional circumstances, from the perspective of ascetic practice the most advisable method of handling illness is to perform a fast or starvation, rather than resorting to curdled milk or other highly nutritious foods.⁷¹ The behavior of Uddāyaṇa/

ca kupitadevatayā pāṣāṇavarṣeṇa kumbhakārasāyyātaravarjaṃ sarvvaṃ tan nagaraṃ nyaghāṇīti | “Thus, out of compassion and affection, thinking, ‘This one [= my son] is desirous of kingship. Let him not go to the evil destiny,’ having bestowed the kingdom on his nephew Keśi, instead of placing his own son Abhijit on the throne, the begetter [= Udāyaṇa] took ordination in the presence of Mahāvīra. At one time when he was wandering right there in the city [of Vītabhaya], he suffered illness and consumed curdled milk according to a doctor’s advice. He was killed by King Keśi who was afraid of his taking away of kingship and ordered to give him curdled milk with poison. An angry goddess, who favored his [= Udāyaṇa’s] virtue, struck the whole city with a rain of sand, leaving out a potter who had offered a shelter [to Udāyaṇa at the time of his death].”

69. ĀvC II 37.3: *ṇāhaṃ abbhaṃtaro tti* (literally “I am not included”). ĀvH 538a6 has *aṇavarāhi* (< *anaparādhī*, ‘innocent’) instead of *abbhaṃtaro* (< *abhantara*, ‘being inside’). Devendra’s commentary on the *Uttarādhyāyana* (Jacobi 1886: 34.7) agrees with the ĀvH.

70. On the ten *vikṛtis* and the rule of refraining from them, see Schubring 1935: 175, §156; Williams 1963: 39–40.

71. Although the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya* does not specify that a sick Jaina monk can eat curdled milk, it does mention in a general way that in cases of severe illness a Jaina monk is allowed to consume whatever food is necessary, whether it is free from living beings (*phāsuga*) or not (see BKBh 1906). NiśC II. 243.1–3 (ad Bh 1614) says, *kamhi ya dese gāme vā so ceva dahikkhīrāti āhāro havejja, tattha viṇā kāraṇeṇa āhārejja, asivādhiṃ vā kāraṇehiṃ egāgi vigatī dhāra lambhejjā, āyariyauvajjhāhehiṃ aṇṇuṇṇāo* [emend to *aṇṇuṇṇāo*] *vigatiṃ bhumjejjā* (“Supposing in a certain region or village curdled milk, milk, and so on become the only diet, then one may consume [them] if there is no cause for concern; if there are causes for concern, namely anything inauspicious or the like, anyone who is alone should abstain from *vikṛti*, [but] one may consume *vikṛti* when allowed by one’s teachers and/or preceptors.”) Professor Willem Bollée kindly pointed out to me that here *asiva* [‘inauspicious’] may refer to the unhealthiness or unfreshness of milk products caused by inauspicious accidents or magic dangers such as the evil eye [email 20 January 2016]; on the former part of this rule, see also Sen 1975: 128. On fasting during illness, NiśC III. 97.25

Udāyaṇa in this story thus serves as a negative example illustrating the detrimental consequence of easing pain or discomfort through physical fulfillment. The point that fasting is the best treatment of illness is made explicit in some other versions of this story. For instance, in the retellings by Devendra/Nemicandra and by Hemacandra, which were almost certainly based on some now-lost earlier sources, we are told that Udāyaṇa performs a prolonged fast before his death and then attains emancipation.⁷² The retellings, moreover, contain a portrayal of Udāyaṇa's eldest son Abhijit, perhaps adapted from the *Bhagavatīsūtra* 13.6.492, which shows how Abhijit harbors an enduring hatred toward his father because he entrusts the throne to Keśin, and how such hatred leads Abhijit to be reborn as a demon (*asura*) before attaining ultimate liberation.⁷³ In the Buddhist narrative tradition of Udrāyaṇa, as we will see, this motif of father-son conflict becomes a central focus, and the death of Udrāyaṇa unfolds in a way significantly different from that seen in the Jaina tradition.

There are at least five Buddhist texts recounting the death of Udrāyaṇa, including the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga* in Chinese and Tibetan translations, the *Rudrāyaṇāvadāna* (No. 37) of the *Divyāvadāna*, the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* in Chinese translation, the *Zabaozang-jing* ('Storehouse of Sundry Treasures') also in Chinese, and the *Udrāyaṇāvadāna* (Pallava 40) of Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*.⁷⁴ The entire story of Udrāyaṇa in the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga*, which is of considerable length, was edited and translated into German by Johannes Nobel (1955), who mentions only briefly the late Jaina account of Uddāyaṇa in Devendra's commentary on the *Uttarādhyayana*.⁷⁵ In order to facilitate comparison with the earlier Jaina account of Uddāyaṇa in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, below I translate three passages from the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga* that are most relevant to the present study. The first two passages concern the murder of Udrāyaṇa by his son Śikhhaṇḍin, and the third one narrates the ruination of the city of Roruka by a rain of sand.

(ad Bh 3006) says, *viseṣeṇāsajjhe roge ajiṇṇajaragādige jāva ṇa muccati tāva abbhataṭṭhaṃ kareti* ("When illness such as indigestion, fever, and so on cannot be cured through special [medical] treatment, as long as it does not go away, one should practice fasting until the eighth meal.").

72. For Devendra's account, see Jacobi 1886: 34.3–5 (text); Meyer 1909: 115 (tr.). For Hemacandra's account, see Śāha 1977: 350, verses 18–19 (text); Johnson 1962: 307 (tr.).

73. For Devendra's account, see Jacobi 1886: 34.11–20; Meyer 1909: 116–17. For Hemacandra's account, see Śāha 1977: 351, verses 25–35; Johnson 1962: 308. The *Bhagavatīsūtra* 13.6.492 mentions that Abhijit's rebirth as an *asura* takes place in hell (Āgamodaya Samiti 1918–21: II. 620b5–6: *teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ imiṣe rayaṇappabhāe puḍhaviṇe nīrayāparisāmaṇṇesu coṣaṭṭhiṃ asurakumārāvāsasayasahasā pannattā*, "In due course, sixty-four hundred thousand years of abiding as an *asura* within the hell boundaries in the infernal world Ratnaprabhā are assigned [to him]."). In the Buddhist story of the death of Udrāyaṇa, his son Śikhhaṇḍin is also predicted to go to hell due to his patricide (see below).

74. The *Divyāvadāna* is a collection of tales mostly extracted from the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. There can be little doubt that the *Rudrāyaṇāvadāna* is based on the story of Udrāyaṇa in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga* (of which no complete Sanskrit version has survived). For a translation of this *avadāna*, see Hiraoka 2007: II. 466–547. For the story of the death of Udrāyaṇa in the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, see T. 1421 (xxii) 126b23–127a12 (*juan* 18). For the story in the *Zabaozang-jing*, see T. 203 (iv) 495a1–496b11 (*juan* 10); tr. in Chavannes (1910–34: III. 127–36) and Willemen (1994: 234–40). Kṣemendra's *Udrāyaṇāvadāna* is a poetic retelling based chiefly, but perhaps not entirely, on the story of Udrāyaṇa in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga*. Nobel (1955: xxi) notes that a number of anonymous characters in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* have been given names by Kṣemendra in his retelling. For the portion of the *Udrāyaṇāvadāna* that narrates the death of Udrāyaṇa and the ruination of Roruka, see Das and Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1888–1918: I. 991–1019, verses 66–171; partly tr. in Formigatti 2004: 138–47.

75. See Panglung (1981: 151) for a summary of the Tibetan. Following Lüders (1940: 656), Noble (1955: xxi) considers Devendra's story of Uddāyaṇa to be "eine Nachbildung der buddhistischen Legende." However, so far as I am aware, there seems to be no definitive evidence suggesting a genetic relationship between the Buddhist and Jaina stories of Udrāyaṇa/Uddāyaṇa. Devendra's story is largely a retelling of the earlier story in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, which, as such, is not necessarily later than the story in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga*.

According to the text, having renounced kingship, Udrāyaṇa is ordained by the Buddha at Rājagṛha. After being appointed king by his father, Śikhaṇḍin rules unjustly. He turns away from two righteous ministers (Heruka and Bhiruka) and trusts two evil ministers who flatter him. A merchant informs Udrāyaṇa of his son's unjust reign. Udrāyaṇa asks the merchant to spread the news that he will soon return to Roruka to persuade his son to rule justly. Having heard this news, the two evil ministers incite Śikhaṇḍin to kill his father as follows:⁷⁶

The two said to King Śikhaṇḍin, “Lord, people say that the old king is coming back.” [Śikhaṇḍin] said, “He has become a monk. Why would he come here?” The two said, “Lord, if one is entitled to exercise kingship [even] for one day, how can he be happy without kingship? He seeks to exercise kingship again.” Śikhaṇḍin said, “If he becomes king, I would become prince. What is the point of opposing him?” The two said, “Lord, that [= your abdication] is unsuitable. After exercising kingship, being worshipped by princes, ministers, palace servants, and subjects of this kingdom with thousands of tributes, how can you stay again in the status as a prince? If you do not want to give up the kingdom, it would be unsuitable to stay in the status as a prince.⁷⁷ It is just like a man who, after riding on the neck of an elephant, would ride on the back of a horse. After riding on the back of a horse, he would go by chariot. After going by chariot, he would go only on his feet. One who, after exercising kingship, stays in the status as a prince is exactly the same.” Deceived by the two ministers, [Śikhaṇḍin] said, “Well then, what is suitable in this case? How to handle this?” The two said, “Lord, you should have him killed. If you do not have him killed, he will surely, associating with evil ministers, kill you.” After they said this, [Śikhaṇḍin] changed his mood. Having fallen into silence for a short while, choked up with tears, in dismay, and out of compassion, he said with broken syllables, “Sirs, how is it reasonable to kill my father?”

The two evil ministers then use various means to persuade Śikhaṇḍin, who eventually agrees to kill his own father. On behalf of Śikhaṇḍin they send out assassins. Meanwhile at Rājagṛha Udrāyaṇa asks the Buddha's permission to visit his hometown Roruka. The Buddha advises him, “Udrāyaṇa, go but keep in mind the *karma* created by yourself!”⁷⁸ The next day, after finishing his alms round in Rājagṛha, Udrāyaṇa sets out toward Roruka. On his journey he encounters the assassins who tell him that Śikhaṇḍin hired them to execute him. Udrāyaṇa thereupon remembers the Buddha's advice and realizes the worthless nature of the cycle of rebirths. He requests the assassins, “Gentlemen, since I have not yet attained the purpose for which I left home for the religious life, please wait for a while so that I can fulfill my own purpose.”⁷⁹ They permit him to do so. Having taken a seat under a tree, having thoroughly meditated on the five-part wheel of rebirths and on the impermanence of all states of being, Udrāyaṇa rids himself of all defilements and attains arhatship. The text goes on to say:⁸⁰

76. My translation is made from D 3, 'dul ba, Ña 117a7–b7; P 1032, 'dul ba, Te 109b7–110a6; S 3, 'dul ba, Ja 329a1–b3. See also Nobel 1955: 25.23–26.11 (text edited on the basis of Lhasa, Narthang, Peking, and Berlin editions); 81–82 (tr.). The Chinese version appears at T. 1442 (xxiii) 878b6–10 (*juan* 46). Divy 564.12–565.2 (tr. in Hiraoka 2007: II. 487–88) agrees closely with the Tibetan.

77. D 3, Ña 117b3–4; P 1032, Te 110a2–3; S 3, Ja 329a5–6: *yul* [D: + 'khor] *yongs su btang ba ni mi ngo yi* [S: *dn̄go'i*] *gzhon nu'i gn̄as su gn̄as pa ni mi rung ste*; cf. Divy 564.21: *varam̄ deśaparityāgo na tu kumāravāsena vāsam* (“It would be better to give up the country than to stay as a prince”).

78. D 3, Ña 118b2; P 1032, Te 111b8; S 3, Ja 330b3: *u dra ya na song la khyod kyis las bdag gir bya ba yid la bya'o*.

79. D 3, Ña 119a5; P 1032, Te 111b2–3; S 3, Ja 331b4: *bzhin bzangs dag nga don gang gi phyir rab tu byung ba'i don de ngas da dung ma thob kyis | re zhig* [P: *shig*] *nga rang gi don rjes su sgrub kyī bar du yud tsam zhig sdod cig*.

80. My translation is made from D, Ña 119b5–120a5; P, Te 112a2–b1; S, Ja 332a7–333a4. See also Nobel 1955: 29.22–30.14 (text); 85–86 (tr.). The Chinese version appears at T. 1442 (xxiii) 878c25–879a18 (*juan* 46). Divy 567.17–568.6 (tr. in Hiraoka 2007: II. 491–92) agrees closely with the Tibetan.

Then, having attained the state of *arhat*, experiencing the bliss and joy of freedom [from all defilements], at that time the venerable Udrāyaṇa spoke a verse:

“The monk Udrāyaṇa, although liberated from bonds, fetters, torments, and obstructions, today cannot escape the [karmic] condition of [previous] kingship.”⁸¹

Having spoken this verse, he said to the executioners, “Gentlemen, now I have attained what should be attained. You can fulfill the purpose for which you come here.” They said, “Lord, if King Śikhaṇḍin asks us, ‘What did the old king say at the time of his death,’ how should we reply to him?” “Gentlemen, you should reply as follows:

‘Through killing your father for the sake of kingship, you have incurred many demerits. I will attain Parinirvāṇa, [whereas] you will go to the Avīci.’

You should also say, ‘You have committed two crimes of immediate karmic retribution (**ānantaryakarma*). One is killing your father; another is killing an *arhat* monk who has removed all depravities. You will have to stay in the great hell Avīci for a long time. You should abandon all kinds of evildoings. In that way [your bad *karma*] would become diminished, completely exhausted, and come to an end.’” The venerable Udrāyaṇa then thought, “It would be no good if that being [= my son] became absorbed into the great hell. I will take flight with my supernatural power.” Having thought so, no matter what magic skills he initiated, being overcome by his *karma*, he could not even remember the first syllable of any magic spell,⁸² to say nothing of performing magic power. Then, one of those executioners who was merciless and had abandoned other worlds,⁸³ pulling out a sword from a sheath, cut off [Udrāyaṇa’s] head, and the head fell onto the ground.

The text proceeds to give a formulaic depiction of the Buddha’s smile, and then Ānanda asks the Buddha about the reason for his smile. In response, the Buddha affirms that despite his attainment of arhatship Udrāyaṇa cannot avoid being murdered by his son, and that in consequence of his two *ānantarya* crimes Śikhaṇḍin will fall into the Avīci hell. Later, upon hearing that Udrāyaṇa has been executed, Śikhaṇḍin feels remorse. He asks the executioners about his father’s last words. The executioners report Udrāyaṇa’s prediction of Śikhaṇḍin’s descent into the Avīci hell. Śikhaṇḍin is terrified. He blames the two evil ministers for inciting him to kill his father who has attained arhatship. In order to regain Śikhaṇḍin’s favor, the two evil ministers use deceptive strategies to make him believe that no *arhat* really exists in this world. Under their influence Śikhaṇḍin acquires a strong aversion to the Buddhist community and ceases almsgiving. As a result, many monks and nuns leave Roruka to seek for alms elsewhere. The elder Mahākātyāyana, who was earlier sent by the Buddha as a missionary to Roruka, chooses to stay. One day a direct clash occurs between Śikhaṇḍin and Mahākātyāyana, which eventually leads to the ruination of Roruka by a rain of sand. The text says:⁸⁴

81. Tib. *rgyal po'i chos las deng ma thar*. Here *rgyal po'i chos* (**rājadharma*) seems to refer to the karmic result following from having, previously, exercised kingship. Divy 567.20 gives the plural *rājadharmair* (‘[karmic] conditions of kingship’).

82. Tib. *rdzu zhes bya ba tsam yang snang bar ma gyur na* (lit. “even the word *rdzu* does not appear [in his mind]”). Since *rdzu* *'phrul* indicates **ṛddhi* (‘magic power’), *rdzu* may mean the ‘initial syllable of a magic spell’ (see also Noble 1955: 86 n. 6); cf. Divy 568.3–4: *ṛkāro 'pi na pratibhāti* (“even the syllable *ṛ* [of *ṛddhi*] did not appear”).

83. Tib. *'jig rten pha rol btang ba* (**tyaktaparaloka*). By denying the existence of other worlds (*paraloka*), one rejects that actions in this life have future consequences, which is to say, the law of *karma*.

84. My translation is made from D 3, Ņa 124a4–125a6; P 1032, Te 116a6–117b2; S 3, Ja 339a2–340b6. See also Nobel 1955: 36.18–38.5 (text); 94–96 (tr.). Divy 573.13–575.2 (tr. in Hiraoka 2007: II. 499–501) agrees closely with the Tibetan. In comparison, the counterpart in the Chinese version (T. 1442 [xxiii] 880b27–c10 [*juan* 46]) is less detailed.

Later, when King Śikhāṇḍin was going out of the city of Roruka, the venerable Mahākātyāyana entered the city of Roruka for alms. Upon seeing the king, thinking, “It would not be good if the king falls into a bad mood [because of seeing me],” he went to one side [of the road] and stood there. King Śikhāṇḍin saw him standing on one side. Having seen him, the king asked his ministers, “Sirs, why does this noble Mahākātyāyana, upon seeing me, move to one side and stand there?” The two chief ministers Heruka and Bhiruka were walking behind [the king]. They said, “Lord, the noble Mahākātyāyana’s course of thinking is as follows: he thought, ‘The Lord is going somewhere with great ceremony and spectacle. It would not be good if he becomes unhappy.’ He also thought, ‘Since it is difficult to do the work of dyeing [monastic robes], it would not be good if the robes get sullied with dust.’” The king silently moved on. The venerable Mahākātyāyana wandered for alms in the city of Roruka, and when he came out, King Śikhāṇḍin happened to enter the city. The venerable Mahākātyāyana went again to one side and stood there. King Śikhāṇḍin saw him standing on one side. Having seen him, the king asked his ministers again, “Sirs, if earlier there was a reason why the noble Mahākātyāyana, upon seeing me, went to one side and stood there, what could be the reason for the fact that now he once again goes to one side and stands there?” The two evil ministers [i.e., the two who had earlier incited Śikhāṇḍin to kill his father] were walking behind [Śikhāṇḍin]. They said, “Lord, he [= Mahākātyāyana] said, ‘I shall not be touched by the dust of this one who has killed his own father.’” Having heard this, the king, without any investigation, overwhelmed with wrath, said to his entire retinue, “Sirs, anyone of you who favors me, each throw a handful of earth at the head of this bald-headed ascetic!” Of the entire retinue, each one threw a handful of earth. As this king had a big troop, when each one threw a handful of earth at the head of the venerable Mahākātyāyana, a huge earth-heap was formed over him. The venerable Mahākātyāyana thereupon conjured up a leafless thatched hut in the middle of the heap and stayed inside. While these people were throwing earth at him, some cowmen and shepherds, having seen it, censured them and stood on the circumference [to protect him]. The chief ministers Heruka and Bhiruka came following behind, and having reached there, the two asked, “Sirs, what is the matter?” They [= the cowmen and shepherds] said, “This assaultive king, a murderer of his own father, covers the noble Mahākātyāyana, who is innocent and has done nothing wrong, with sand.” The two [= Heruka and Bhiruka], with weeping faces, choked with tears, together with the cowmen and shepherds, started to clear away the earth.⁸⁵ When the venerable Mahākātyāyana emerged [from inside the heap], the two fell down at his feet and asked, “Noble One, what is going on?” He said, “It is *karma*. What else would it be?”⁸⁶ The two asked, “Noble One, what would be the result of such an action done by Śikhāṇḍin and the great crowd of people?” He said, “Within seven days from today, the city of Roruka will be covered by sand.” “Noble One, what will happen successively?” “Sirs, first of all, on the first day a great wind will arise, and the city of Roruka will be made completely free from stones, pebbles, and gravel. On the second day a rain of flowers will fall. On the third day a rain of clothes will fall. On the fourth day a rain of silver will fall. On the fifth day a rain of gold will fall. Afterwards, those living in the surrounding areas of the city of Roruka, who have done a concomitant deed,⁸⁷ will enter the city of Roruka. After they enter, on the sixth day a rain of jewels will fall. On the seventh day a rain of sand will fall.” The two asked, “Noble One, are we also [considered as] taking part in this action?” “Gentlemen, you are not taking part in this action.” “Noble One, if so, how can we escape from

85. Here the text shows that the two virtuous ministers feel sympathy for the elder Mahākātyāyana upon seeing him being maltreated by Śikhāṇḍin.

86. Tib. *las dag yin mod gghan ci zhig 'byung bar 'gyur*. There is no counterpart in the Chinese version. The Divy (574.15) only has *kim anyad bhaviṣyati* (“what else would it be?”).

87. Tib. *las mthun par byas pa*, corresponding to *sāmavāyikaṃ karma kṛtaṃ* at Divy 574.23. There is no counterpart in the Chinese version. Both Tib. *mthun pa* and Skt. *sāmavāyika* have the meaning of ‘concomitant, associative’. Here the text seems to refer to those people who do not belong to Śikhāṇḍin’s royal retinue but join in assaulting Mahākātyāyana.

the city?” He said, “Gentlemen, have a channel dug out from your own houses up to the river, and put a boat near your houses. At the time when a rain of jewels falls, have the boat filled with jewels and run away!”

The text goes on to tell that the two righteous ministers Heruka and Bhiruka report Mahākātyāyana’s prophecy to Śikhaṇḍin, who, however, refuses to believe it. What happens in the next seven days is exactly the same as Mahākātyāyana predicts. On the seventh day, adopting the advice of Mahākātyāyana, Heruka and Bhiruka manage to escape from Roruka. Each of them finds a new land to settle in and builds a new city there. They call the two cities *Herukavana and *Bhirukavana, after their own names.⁸⁸

Although the story of Udrāyaṇa in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga* is considerably longer than the story of Uddāyaṇa in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, we can still discern some essential parallels. First, both stories show that the new king Keśin or Śikhaṇḍin initially has no intention to kill Uddāyaṇa/Udrāyaṇa, but eventually changes his mind at the instigation of some evil ministers. Second, in both stories the narrative theme of the death of Uddāyaṇa/Udrāyaṇa is combined with another theme of the destruction of the capital city (Vītabhaya or Roruka) of Sindhu-Sauvīra by a sandstorm, which is in turn followed by the founding of one or two new cities elsewhere. Third, in both stories the ones who are given the privilege of escaping the sandstorm, namely, the potter in the Jaina story and the ministers Heruka and Bhiruka in the Buddhist story, are lay supporters willing to offer a shelter or a timely rescue to a monk (i.e., Uddāyaṇa in the Jaina story or Mahākātyāyana in the Buddhist story). Thus both stories show an attempt to separate the fate of the faithful from the fate of other inhabitants in the same city.⁸⁹ Moreover, both Buddhist and Jaina traditions agree on Uddāyaṇa’s/Udrāyaṇa’s spiritual liberation at the time of his death. According to the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, Udrāyaṇa attains arhatship before his execution, and thus his death marks the end of his saṃsāric existence. In the Jaina tradition, while the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* keeps silent on Uddāyaṇa’s spiritual status, the later retellings by Devendra and Hemacandra inform us that he attains liberation after performing a prolonged fast.⁹⁰ Parallels such as these are probably not accidental. As a whole, they reflect part of the common narrative lore shared between Buddhists and Jains about the renunciant king Uddāyaṇa/Udrāyaṇa and his kingdom.

Perhaps even more remarkable are the different ways in which the parallel themes or motifs are unfolded in the Buddhist and Jaina stories. While both the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the *Vinayavibhaṅga* tell of Uddāyaṇa’s/Udrāyaṇa’s death at the hands of his successor (Keśin or Śikhaṇḍin), they give different causes for his death and use this tragedy to convey different didactic points. In the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, Uddāyaṇa is depicted as being severely ill on his way back to Vītabhaya, and he dies from eating the poisoned curdled milk offered by his nephew

88. The two cities are called *he ru ka’i tshal* (*Herukavana ‘Heruka’s grove’) and *bhi ru ka’i tshal* (*Bhirukavana ‘Bhiruka’s grove’) in the Tibetan text (D 3, Ņa 126a7–b1; P 1032, Te 118b4–5; S 3, Ja 342a7–b1; Nobel 1955: 39.21–25). Divy 576.22–26 gives the names as Hiruka (abbreviated form of Hirukaccha ‘Hiru’s marsh’) and Bhirukaccha (‘Bhiru’s marsh’). According to Eggermont (1975: 159–60) and Karttunen (1989: 207), Hirukaccha/Hirukaccha and Bhirukaccha may be identified, respectively, with Barbaricum (near modern Karachi) at the mouth of the Indus and Baryagaza (Bharuch) in Gujarat. Sircar (1965: 344) associates Barbaricum with the people of Varvara/Barbara mentioned in some Indian sources (see also Karttunen 1989: 207 n. 95). Tucci (1977: 63) says that Herukaccha “might as well be Bambhore (Sindhī) whose excavations were undertaken SW. [southwest] of Tatta in the mouth of an old channel of the Indus about 60 miles north of Karachi.”

89. Curiously, the *Vinayavibhaṅga* does not mention the fate of those cowmen and shepherds who try to stop Śikhaṇḍin and his retinue from assaulting Mahākātyāyana and stand around the sand heap to protect him.

90. See above, n. 72.

Keśin. Since curdled milk as one type of *vikṛti* is forbidden to Jaina mendicants, Uddāyaṇa's death is therefore due at least in part to his mistake of breaking the vow of abstinence from such food. The key point of the Jaina story thus lies in the negative effect of taking forbidden food as medicine to alleviate illness rather than calmly tolerating it. The *Vinayavibhaṅga* says nothing about Udrāyaṇa's illness or his eating of any forbidden food. Rather, it tells us that he is murdered on his way back to Roruka at the hands of the assassins sent by his son Śikhaṇḍin. More significantly, by having the Buddha remind Udrāyaṇa of the *karma* he has created, the text suggests that Udrāyaṇa's own bad *karma* is the ultimate cause of his tragic death in the present life.⁹¹ This point is made explicit later in the text, where the Buddha explains to the monks that it is because in his past life as a hunter Udrāyaṇa shot a *pratyekabuddha* with a poisoned arrow that he has to undergo execution in this life, despite his attainment of arhatship.⁹²

Further, while both the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the *Vinayavibhaṅga* tell of the ruination of the capital city of Sindhu-Sauvīra by a sandstorm, they offer different interpretations about what this event means. In the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* the sandstorm is caused by a goddess who gets angry over Keśin's repetitive attempts to poison Uddāyaṇa, and thus represents a divine punishment for human transgression.⁹³ In the *Vinayavibhaṅga* the arising of a sandstorm and its ruination of Roruka have no direct relation to the death of Udrāyaṇa, and there is no divine agency intervening. The sandstorm represents a karmic punishment for the collective assault committed by King Śikhaṇḍin and his retinue on the elder Mahākātyāyana, and illustrates the working of *karma* in a communal dimension. Since a large-scale natural disaster such as a sandstorm is morally blind and strikes indiscriminately at the good and the bad alike, strictly speaking, it involves not only the fruition of the bad *karma* of the guilty party, but also an overflow of their bad *karma*, or a transfer of their demerit, to innocent beings (including both humans and animals) living in the same geographical region.⁹⁴ The rationalization of a natural disaster or disorder as a karmic effect of misconduct of certain potent individuals

91. On the Buddha's reminding of Udrāyaṇa of his karmic status, see above n. 78.

92. According to the Tibetan text (D 3, Ņa 125a7–131b3; P 1032, Te 122b6–124a2; S 3, Ja 348a6–350a6; Nobel 1955: 45.15–47.3), in his past life as a hunter Udrāyaṇa shot a *pratyekabuddha* in his belly, and having witnessed the wounded *pratyekabuddha*'s display of supernatural power, he repented. After the *pratyekabuddha* died, he erected a *stūpa* over the *pratyekabuddha*'s relics and then vowed to be reborn in a wealthy family and to "take delight in the teaching of one even more excellent than this [*pratyekabuddha*]" ('*di las ches khyad par du 'phags pa'i ston pa mnyes par byed cing*). The Buddha explains that because of his shooting of the *pratyekabuddha* Udrāyaṇa was tortured in the Avīci hell for eons, then reborn as a deer in 500 lifetimes during which it had always been shot by a poisoned arrow, and eventually "attained Parinirvāṇa [while being killed] with a sword" (*de mtshon gyis yongs su mya ngan las 'das*) in this life. The Chinese version (T. 1442 [xxiii] 881c9–c12 [*juan* 46]) agrees with the Tibetan, except that it mentions Udrāyaṇa's 500 rebirths as a human instead of a deer. The counterpart in the Divy (584.4–8) is similar to, but still different from, the Tibetan. In the Tibetan version the Buddha also explains that because of the vow he had previously made, in this life Udrāyaṇa was reborn in a wealthy family and attained arhatship after becoming a Buddhist monk (see D 3, Ņa 131b3–4; P 1032, Te 124a2–3; S 3, Ja 350a6–7; Nobel 1955: 47.3–6 [text], 109 [tr.]). This explanation finds no parallel in the Divy (as indicated by Hiraoka 2007: II. 545 n. 502).

93. That angry deities (either good or evil) cause natural disasters to punish humans is a pan-Indian motif. The present story gives little information on the identity of the goddess, who appears like a tutelary deity of the Jaina religion (*sāsanadevatā*) supporting and protecting the faithful. For another story of a presiding goddess of the Jaina faith causing a human disaster, though for a very different purpose, see Granoff 1989: 207–9.

94. The notion of "overflow *karma*" refers to the effects of the *karma* of one person (usually a potent character such as a king or the Buddha) upon the *karma* of others (on this concept, see McDermott 1976: 68–71; Walters 2003: 19–20). In the present case, while one might argue that innocent inhabitants of Roruka suffer a sandstorm not because of the overflow of the bad *karma* of Śikhaṇḍin but because of their own bad *karma* accrued in their past

(particularly kings) is common in Buddhist literature. A *sutta* in the Pāli *Aṅguttaranikāya* offers an early example in this regard, which shows that the unrighteousness of a king and his ministers can lead to the deviation of the sun, the moon, and the stars from their normal courses, wrong shifts of day and night, seasonal disorders, windstorms, droughts, poor crop yields, and so on, whereas the righteousness of those people can lead to astrological and ecological harmony and balance.⁹⁵ Such a karmic rationalization of natural disasters seems to be less salient in the Jaina tradition. Jaina doctrine on *karma*, overall speaking, lays more emphasis on individual responsibility than Buddhist doctrine, and Jaina philosophers have generally ruled out the possibility that one individual's good or bad *karma* can be transferred to another individual.⁹⁶ In Jaina narrative literature, while there is sufficient evidence for the ability of one person's actions to affect another person's karmic status in the small circle of family and friends, there are few cases in which the karmic effects of one person's actions manifest themselves on a widespread scale in the form of natural disasters.⁹⁷ The attribution of sweeping natural disasters to the bad *karma* of one or more potent individuals seems to be rare in Jaina texts, or at least less common than in Buddhist texts. The rarity of such attribution might suggest a general ambivalence among Jaina authors toward the mobility or overflow of *karma* in the ecological or environmental sphere.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The comparative examination of the stories of Abhaya, Jivaka, and Udrāyaṇa in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and their counterparts in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* presented above shows that the Buddhists and the Jains who compiled or redacted the two corpora exploited parallel narrative plots or motifs along different lines, with different didactic emphases. While both the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* tell of the birth of Abhaya outside the royal palace and both relate his birth to a ring, only the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* features him as a model of human creativity and resourcefulness. The Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* does not display much interest in Abhaya and instead devotes much attention to the doctor Jivaka, who has no parallel in the Jaina tradition. While in the *Cīvaravastu* the motif of deciphering an elephant's footprint is used to show Jivaka's wisdom, in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* the same motif is associated with an anonymous character. The fact that Jivaka is prominently featured in

lives, the text itself nonetheless gives no information on the past deeds of those inhabitants, but instead its main point is to show the disastrous impact of the misdeed of Śikhaṇḍin and his retinue upon the entire city.

95. See AN II 74.28–76.12. This *sutta* finds a parallel in the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* (T. 125 [ii] 586c20–587a23 [Juan 8]). Also, according to the *Kurudhammajātaḥ* (No. 276) of the Pāli *Jātakatthavaṇṇanā*, the kingdom of Kāliṅga suffers a drought that is not dispelled until the king observes the five precepts (on this *jātaka*, see Appleton 2014: 130).

96. On Jaina doctrinal discourses unequivocally refuting the idea of karmic transfer, see Cort 2003: 130–32.

97. Cort (2003: 141–42) discusses several Jaina stories that demonstrate merit transfer between relatives or friends (or sometimes even adversaries). Appleton (2014: 132–35) observes that there are many Jaina multi-life stories illustrating the ways of affecting another's karmic status, although a direct transfer of one person's good or bad *karma* to another is rare. To be sure, there is some Jaina textual material speaking of the outbreak of a natural disaster under the reign of a wicked king. For instance, according to Dundas (2014), the *Tiṭhogālī*, dating perhaps from the fifth/sixth century C.E., contains an apocalyptic prophecy of a series of disasters to be experienced by the Jaina community during a period of cruel oppression by King Duṣṭabuddhi. In particular, the text narrates in detail the devastating impact of the flooding of Pāṭaliputra. While it is tempting to attribute the flooding to King Duṣṭabuddhi's bad *karma*, the text itself makes no attempt to interpret the flooding karmically but only presents it as a historical or quasi-historical event (on the possible historicity of the flooding of Pāṭaliputra, see Dundas 2014: 237; I thank Prof. Paul Dundas for drawing my attention to his valuable study of the *Tiṭhogālī* [email 17 December 2015]).

Buddhist literature but finds no parallel in Jaina literature may be explained by the different views of the two religions on medicine and on the role of secular physicians. The Buddhists integrated medical knowledge into their monastic discipline. According to extant *vinaya* sources, Buddhists monks and nuns were encouraged to provide medical care to their fellow monastics, as well as to wealthy laity.⁹⁸ Meanwhile they also regularly consulted secular physicians, without showing any antipathy toward them. The Jainas, given their emphasis on ascetic austerities, were more ambivalent over medical healing than the Buddhists. Although, compared with early Jaina canonical texts, medieval Jaina monastic commentaries are less prohibitive about medical care due to pragmatic concern for community survival, in Jaina narrative literature there is still a consistent ambivalence toward medical cure of any type. Since the role of secular physicians is essentially incompatible with the Jaina ascetic ideal of tolerating bodily suffering, it is not surprising that the Jainas showed little interest in promoting a model lay doctor as a parallel to the Buddhist Jivaka.

The story of Uddāyaṇa in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* offers us another example of Jaina ambivalence toward medicine, in which the death of Uddāyaṇa illustrates the pernicious effect of alleviating illness through consuming forbidden food. The Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga* also tells of the death of Udrāyaṇa, but uses this motif for an entirely different purpose, to illustrate individual karmic responsibility. Furthermore, while both the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the *Vinayavibhaṅga* show the destruction of the capital city of Sindhu-Sauvīra by a sandstorm, the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* presents it as a divinely initiated disaster, whereas the *Vinayavibhaṅga* interprets it as a karmically initiated disaster that represents a karmic punishment for the collective misdeed committed by King Śikhaṇḍin and his retinue. Given its massive scale and morally blind nature, this disaster illustrates not only collective karmic responsibility, but also the widespread effect of a king's action upon his kingdom.

As two grand repertoires of Indian religious tales and folktales circulating in the early centuries of the Common Era, the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* constitute two extremely valuable sources for our understanding of the relationship between ancient (or early medieval) Buddhist and Jaina narrative traditions. Although the present paper offers only several case studies, it aims to show that it is worthwhile not only to identify similar plots or motifs shared between Buddhists and Jainas so as to appreciate their common narrative heritage, but also to examine the different ways in which the two traditions handled similar narrative material in order to distinguish their didactic focuses or ideological priorities. In this sense, the paper has methodological implications not only for the study of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*, but also for comparative research on other Buddhist and Jaina narrative literature as well.

APPENDIX I

The following is a diplomatic transliteration of the story of Abhaya in the Gilgit Sanskrit manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Cīvaravastu* (GBM 6.799.7–801.5 [fols. 243v7–244v5]; GM III. 2.19.14–22.20; Clarke 2014: 138–39; corresponding to D 1, 'dul ba, Ga 57b1–58b7; P 1030, 'dul ba, Ņe 54b6–56a5; S 1, 'dul ba, Ga 66b3–69b5):⁹⁹

98. See n. 53 above.

99. I am very grateful to Dr. Klaus Wille, who kindly read through my transliteration and made careful and critical comments. As Matsumura (1996: 175) notes, “[o]rthographical deviations between the manuscript and DUTT’s text are so numerous that it is difficult, and moreover entirely meaningless, to point out all of them.” In the footnotes to my transliteration below I have not reported all errors in Dutt’s edition (GM), but only those substantial misreadings or misinterpretations.

Symbols used in the transliteration:

[]	<i>akṣara</i> damaged or whose reading is uncertain
{ }	superfluous <i>akṣara</i> (s)
< >	omitted (part of) <i>akṣara</i> (s) without gap in the manuscript
{ { }	correction mark in the manuscript
	<i>daṇḍa</i>
•	single dot (punctuation mark)
:	double dot (<i>visarga</i> used as punctuation mark)
*	<i>virāma</i>
,	<i>avagraha</i> , not written in the manuscript, but added in the transliteration
ḥ	<i>jihvāmūliya</i>
ḥ	<i>upadhmāniya</i>
○	string hole

[§1] (243v7. . .) yāvad a(v8)pareṇa samayena rājā māgadhaḥ śr[e]ṇyo bimbisāraḥ¹⁰⁰ upariprāsādatalagato 'mātyagaṇaparivṛto 'satkathayā¹⁰¹ tiṣṭhati • bhavantaḥ kena kīḍṣī veśyā dṛṣṭā : gopaḥ kathayati deva tiṣṭhantu tāvad anye¹⁰² | vaiśālyām āmrāpālī nāma veśyā atīva rūpayauvana(v9)saṃpannā catuṣṣaṣṭikalābhijñā devasyaivopabhogyā • sa kathayati gopa yady evaṃ gacchāmo vaiśālīm tayā sārđhaṃ paricārayāmaḥ sa kathayati | devasya vaiśālakā licchavayo dīrgharātraṃ vadhakāḥ¹⁰³ pratyarthinaḥ pratyamitrāḥ mā te anarthaṃ kariṣyanti | (v10) rājā kathayati bhavanti¹⁰⁴ khalu puruṣāṇāṃ puruṣasāhasā gacchāmaḥ sa kathayati yadi devasyāvaśyanirbandho gacchāmaḥ sa ratham abhiruha gopena sārđhaṃ vaiśālīm saṃprasthito 'nupūrveṇa vaiśālīm gataḥ gopa udyāne sthito rājā āmrāpālyā gṛhaṃ praviṣṭaḥ yāvad ghaṇṭā (244r1) raṭitum ārabdhā : vaiśālakā kṣubdhā bhavaṃtaḥ ko 'py asmāka{ḥ}m amitrakāḥ praviṣṭo ghaṇṭā raṭatīti : uccaśabdamaḥāśabdo jātaḥ rājā bimbisāraḥ āmrāpālīm pṛcchati bhadre kim etat* deva gṛhavicayaḥ kṛyate¹⁰⁵ kasyārthāya devasya kathaṃ pratipa(r2)ttavyaṃ¹⁰⁶ kiṃ niṣpālāye deva mā kāhalo bhava saptame divase mama gṛhavicaya prāpadyate saptāhaṃ tāva<t> krīḍa ramasva paricāraya saptāhasyātyayā<t> kālajñā bhaviṣyāmīti • sa tayā sārđhaṃ krīḍati ramate paricārayati yāvad āmrāpālī ā(r3) pannasatvā saṃvṛttā : tadā bimbāsārāya¹⁰⁷ niveditaṃ deva āpannasatvāsmi{m} saṃvṛtteti

100. In the Gilgit manuscript of the *Vinayavastu*, *ba* and *va* are represented by the same *akṣara*. Below, this *akṣara* is transcribed either as *ba* or as *va* depending on the lexical context in which it occurs. It has been noted that sandhi rules are applied aberrantly in this manuscript (see Wille 1990: 36–37, §3.3.3; Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 48–49, §II.9; Matsumura 1996: 181–83, §5.3.1). This may have been caused by scribal negligence. In my transliteration I have retained aberrant sandhi formations in order to provide a faithful representation of the readings of the manuscript.

101. GM: *satkathayā* (wrong reading [= w.r.]). Here °vṛto 'saḥ' is to be understood; otherwise, the manuscript would read °vṛtaḥ saḥ. The Tibetan reads *tshul ma yin pa'i gtam smras pa* ('improper talk'), which suggests *asatkathayā*.

102. This must be a scribal error for *anyāḥ*.

103. GM: *bādhakāḥ* (w.r.). On *vadhaka* ('intending to kill'), see BHS, 120, §22.3.

104. GM: *bhavati* (w.r.). The Tibetan reads *shes ldan dag mi rnam ni skyes bu'i dpa' snying can yin pas* ("Sirs, men have men's boldness"), where *shes ldan dag* suggests **bhavantaḥ*.

105. The alternation between *r* and *ri* is common in Gilgit manuscripts (see Wille 1990: 36, §3.3.2 [6]).

106. Based on Dutt's wrong reading *devasya pratipattavyam*, instead of the actual reading *devasya kathaṃ pratipattavyam* in the manuscript, Edgerton misinterprets *pratipattavya* ('to be done, to be handled') as 'on account of' (see BHSD, 364, s.v. *pratipattavya*).

107. On Bimbāsāra, see SWTF 19, 255b, s.v. Similar to the alternation of *bimbi-/bimba-* in Buddhist texts, there is an alternation of *bhimbhi-/bhambha-* in Jaina texts (see Mehta and Chandra 1970–72: II. 512 [s.v. *Bhambhasāra*], 528 [s.v. *Bhimbhisāra*]).

tena tasyā viralī aṅgulimudrā ca dattāḥ uktā ca yadi dārikā bhavati tavaiva atha dāraḥ
 etāṃ vṛralī<ṃ>¹⁰⁸ prāvṛtya aṅgulimudrā<ṃ> ca grīvāyāṃ ba<d>dhvā matsa(r4)kāśaṃ
 preṣayasi sa nirgatyā gopena sārḍhaṃ ratham abhiruhya saṃprasthitāḥ ghaṃṭā tūṣṇīm
 avasthitā te kathayanti bhavaṃto 'mitrako nirgataḥ samanveṣāma iti • paṃca licchaviśatāni¹⁰⁹
 baddhagodhāṅgulitrāṇāni rājño bimbāsārasya pṛ(r5)ṣṭhata<ḥ> samanubaddhāni gopena
 dṛṣṭāni sa kathayati deva vaiśālikā lacchavaya¹¹⁰ āgatā kim ebhiḥ sārḍhaṃ devo yudh-
 yate | āhosvid ratham vāhayasi sa kathayati ahaṃ śrāntako ratham vāhayāmi tvam eva
 ebhis sārḍhaṃ yudhyasveti | (r6) sa tai<ḥ> sārḍhaṃ yoddhum ārabdhaḥ vaiśālikai<ḥ>
 pratyabhijñātaḥ te kaṭhayananti bhavantaḥ sa evāyaṃ puruṣārākṣaso nivarttāmaha¹¹¹ iti |
 te pratinivṛttāḥ vaiśāliṃ gatvā : saṃni<pa>-tya punaḥ kṛyākāraṃ¹¹² kṛtaḥ bhavanta etad api
 vairam asmābhi<ḥ> (r7) bimbisāraputrāṇāṃ niryātayitavyam iti |

[§2] yāvan navānāṃ māśānā{ṃ}m atyayā{t*}d āmrpālī prasūtā dārako jātaḥ abhirūpo
 darśanīyaḥ prāsādika<ḥ> yāvad unnīto vardhito¹¹³ mahāṃ sa<ṃ>vṛttaḥ sa vaiśālikail¹¹⁴
 licchavidāraḥ sā(r8)rdhaṃ krīḍaṃs tair aṇyam uktaḥ bhavaṃto 'sya dāsiputrasya kaḥ
 pitā aneḥśatasahasraṇi[r]jāto 'yam iti sa prarudaṃ mātus sakāśaṃ upasaṃkrāntaḥ tayocy-
 ate putra kimarthaṃ roḍiṣiti tena sarvaṃ vistareṇa samākhyātaṃ | sā kathayati putra yadi
 bhūyaḥ (r9) pṛcchanti{ṃ} vaktavyāś tādṛśo mama pitā yo yuṣmākam ekasyāpi nāstīti yadi
 kathayanti katara iti vaktavyā rājā bimbāsāra iti • yāvata sa tai<ḥ> sārḍhaṃ bhūyaḥ krīḍitum
 ārabdhaḥ sa tais tathaivoktaḥ sa kathayati tādṛśo me pitā yo yuṣmākam e(r10)kasyāpi nāsti :
 kata<raḥ> rājā bimbāsāraḥ te bhūyasyā mātrayā tāḍayitum ārabdhāḥ bhavaṃto yo 'smākam
 śatru so 'sya piteti tena rudatā yathāvṛttaṃ mātur ākhyātaṃ • sā saṃlakṣayati vaiśālakā
 licchavayo vyādā vikrāntā sthānam etad vidyate • (244v1) yad enaṃ pratighātayīṣyanti
 sā caivaṃ cintāparā saṃbahulāś ca vaṇijaḥ paṇyam ādāya rājagṛhaṃ saṃprasthitāḥ tayā
 te upalabdā uktāś ca anenāṅgulimudrakena bhāṇḍaṃ mudrayitvā gacchata : aśulkā
 gamīyatha etaṃ ca dārakaṃ rā(v2)jagṛhaṃ nayata : etad aṅgulimudrakam grīvāyāṃ
 baddhvā rājikuladvāre sthāpayīyatha tai<ḥ> pratijñāta{ṃ}m evaṃ bhavaty iti | putro 'pi
 muktāhāraṃ datvā<bhi>hita<ḥ>¹¹⁵ putra tvayā rājñāḥ arthādḥikaraṇe niṣaṃṣasya muktāhāraṃ
 pādayo<ḥ> sthāpayitvā abhiruhyotsaṃge niṣa(v3)ttavyaṃ • yadi kaścit kathayati nāyaṃ
 dārako bibhetīti : sa vaktavya asti kaści<t> putra pitur bibhetīti : sa vaṇigbhi<ḥ> sārḍhaṃ
 anupūrveṇa rājagṛhaṃ gataḥ tai<ḥ> snapayitvā aṅgulimudra{yā}kenālamkṛtya¹¹⁶ rājadvāre
 sthāpitaḥ sa yena rājā tenopa(v4)s<aṃk>rāntaḥ¹¹⁷ upasaṃkramya muktāhāraṃ pādayo<ḥ>
 sthāpayitvā utsaṃgam abhiniṣaṇṇaḥ rājā kathayati bhavaṃto nāyaṃ dārako bibhetīti • sa
 kathayati tātāstīti kaścit* putra pitur bibhetīti | tato rājñā abhayaśabdena samudācarita (v5)
 iti • abhaya rājakumāra abhaya rājakumāra i<ti> saṃjñā saṃvṛtta : ||

108. Here *vṛralī* is a hyper-sanskrit form of *viralī* (on Pkt. *viralī* ['a kind of garment'], see Sheth 1963: 796, s.v.).

109. Read *licchaviśatāni*.

110. Read *licchavaya*.

111. The germination of consonants before and after *r* is common in Gilgit manuscripts.

112. Read *kṛyākāraḥ*. On the alternation between *r* and *ri*, see above, n. 105.

113. GM: *carito* (w.r.).

114. Here **kail li°* is a scribal error for **kair li°*.

115. The emendation is made in view of the Tibetan *bu la yang mu tig gi do shal cig* [S: *zhig*] *byin nas smras pa* ("Having also given her son a string of pearls, she said [. . .]"), where *smras pa* suggests **abhihita* ('told, spoken').

116. This form appears to be a conflation of *aṅgulimudrayā* (instrumental of *aṅgulimudrā*) and *aṅgulimudrakena* (instrumental of *aṅgulimudraka*).

117. Cf. Tib. *de rgyal po gang na ba der song ste* ("He went to where the king was").

APPENDIX II

The following is a diplomatic transliteration of the story of Jivaka's deciphering of an elephant's footprint in the Gilgit manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Cīvaravastu* (GBM 6.804.6–805.3 [fol. 246r6–v3]; GM III. 2.29.1–30.16; Clarke 2014: 141; corresponding to D 1, 'dul ba, Ga 61b2–62a7; P 1030, 'dul ba, Ne 58b7–59b4; S 1, 'dul ba, Ga 73b4–75a1):

(246r6 . . .) yāvat tair māṇavakair antarmārge hastipadaṃ dṛṣṭa<ṃ> te taṃ nirīkṣitum ārabdhāḥ jīvakaś cāgataḥ kathayati kim etad dha(r7)stipadaṃ naitad dhastipadaṃ hastinyā etat padaṃ sā ca dakṣiṇakāṇā adyaiva kalabhakaṃ janayiṣyati tatra strī abhirūḍhā sāpi dakṣiṇakāṇā gurviṇī adyaiva putraṃ janayiṣyati yāvad ātreyasakāśaṃ gatā yena yad ānītaṃ tat tenopadarśitaṃ ātreyaḥ kathayati māṇavakā sarvaṃ etad bhaiṣajyaṃ eta(r8)t tāvad udaya-kena <e>vaṃ vidhinā amukasya rogasya evam anyāny apīti jīvakaḥ pṛṣṭa<s> tvayā kim ānītaṃ sa kathayaty upādhyāya sarvaṃ eva bhaiṣajyaṃ nāsti kiṃcid abhaiṣajyaṃ api tu mayā śaramūlam ānītaṃ pāṣānavarttikā kiṭālapinḍāś ceti • kim ebhiḥ prayojanaṃ śaramūle¹¹⁸ vṛścikaviddhasya dhūpo dīya(r9)te kiṭālapinḍena upanāho dīyate pāṣānaśarkarāyā kāle dadhighaṭakā bhidyante ātreyeṇa vipuṣpitaṃ māṇavakā saṃlakṣayaṃty upādhyāyo 'sya ruṣita iti te kathayanty upādhyāya kim etad eka asmābhir āgacchadbhir antarmārge hastipadaṃ dṛṣṭaṃ eṣa kathayati hastinyā etat padaṃ sā ca dakṣiṇakā(r10)ṇā gurviṇī adyaiva prasaviṣyati kalabhakaṃ janayiṣyati strī [t]atrābhirūḍhā sāpi dakṣiṇakāṇā gurviṇī adyaiva prasaviṣyati putraṃ janayiṣyatīti ātreyaḥ pṛcchati jīvaka satyaṃ satyam upādhyāya katham etaj jñāyate hastipadaṃ hastinyā padaṃ iti sa kathayaty upādhyāya vayaṃ rājakule saṃvṛddhā (246v1) katham na jānīma<ḥ> hastipadaṃ parimaṇḍalaṃ hastinyās tu dīrghaṃ katham jñāyate dakṣiṇakāṇeti vāmena pārśvena carantī gatā katham jñāyate gurviṇīti paścimau pādaṃ nipīḍyantī gatā katham jñāyate adyaiva prasaviṣyatīti saṅkraprasrāva<ḥ> kṛta<ḥ> katham jñāyate kalabhakaṃ prasaviṣyatīti • bhūyasā dakṣiṇaṃ pāda(v2)m abhipīḍyantī gatā • katham jñāyate tatra strī abhirūḍheti avatīrya pādāyor madhye prasrāvaḥ kṛta<ḥ> katham jñāyate sāpi dakṣiṇakāṇeti vāmena pārśvena puṣpāny uccinantī¹¹⁹ gacchati katham jñāyate sāpi gurviṇīti bhūyasā pārśni<ṃ> nipīḍyantī gatā katham jñāyate adyaiva prasaviṣyatīti • saṅkrah prasrāvaḥ kṛtaḥ (v3) api tu yady upādhyāyasya vimarśaḥ sa sārtho 'muṣmiṃ pradeśe tatra kaścin¹²⁰ māṇavaṃ preṣaya tena māṇavaḥ preṣita<ḥ> sarvaṃ tan tathaiva yathā jīvakena samākhyātaṃ ātreyo māṇavakā{{ṃ}}n āmantrayate • māṇavakā śrutaṃ vaḥ upādhyāya śrutaṃ idrśo jivakaprajñā<ḥ> • ||

ABBREVIATIONS

- AN II *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, pt. II: *Catukka Nipāta*. Ed. Richard Morris. 1888. [Rpt. London: Pali Text Society, 1976]
- ĀS *Āyārāṅgasuttam (Ācārāṅgasūtram)*, ed. Muni Jambūvijaya. Jaina-Āgama-Series, vol. 2. Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1976.
- ĀvC *Āvaśyakacūrṇi (Āvassayacuṇṇi)* of Jinadāsa. *Śrīmaḥ-Jinadāsagaṇi-mahattara-kṛtayaḥ sutracūrṇīyā sametaṃ śrīmad-Āvaśyakasūtram*. 2 vols. Ratlam: Śrīrṣabhadevajī Keśarīmalajī Śvetāmbara saṃsthā, 1928–29.

118. Read *śaramūlāir*.

119. GM: *uccinvantī* (w.r.); cf. Pāli 3rd person singular present-tense inflection *uccināti* ('gathers, collects'; Skt. *uccinoti*).

120. Read *kaṃcin*.

- ĀvH *Āvaśyakaṭīkā* of Haribhadra. *Śrīmad-bhavaviraha-Haribhadrasūri-sūtrītavṛtṭy-alaṃ-kṛtaṃ Śrīmad-Āvaśyakasūtram*. 2 vols. Bombay: Āgamodaya Samiti, 1916–17.
- ĀvM *Āvaśyakaṭīkā* of Malayagiri. *Śrīman-Malayagiryācārya-kṛtavivaraṇayutaṃ śrī-Āvaśyakasūtram*. 3 vols. Bombay: Āgamodaya Samiti, 1928–36.
- ĀvN *Āvaśyakaniryukti (Āvassayanijjuttī)*. Quotations and numbering of verses following the edition cited in ĀvH.
- BhS *Bhagavatīsūtra (Bhagavaī Viyāhapaṇṇatti)*. *Śrīmaccandrakūlāṅkāra-śrīmad-Abhayadevasūri-sūtrītavivaraṇayutaṃ Śrīmad-Bhagavatīsūtram*. 3 vols. Mehesana: Āgamodaya Samiti, 1918–21.
- BHSG *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. I: *Grammar*. By Franklin Edgerton. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1953.
- BHSD *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. II: *Dictionary*. By Franklin Edgerton. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1953.
- BKBh *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*. In *Bhadrabāhu Bṛhat-Kalpa-Niryukti and Saṅghadāsa Bṛhat-Kalpa-Bhāṣya*. Ed. Willem B. Bollée. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998.
- D *Derge Kanjur*. Ed. Chos kyi 'byung gnas. *Bka' 'gyur (sde dge par phud)*. 103 vols. Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center, TBRC W22084. Delhi: Delhi karmapae chodhey gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1976–79.
- Divy *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends. Sanskrit Text in Transliteration*. Ed. Edward B. Cowell and Robert A. Neil. 1886. [Rpt. Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970]
- DVS *Daśavaikālikasūtra (Dasaveyāliyasutta)*. In *Dasaveyāliyasuttaṃ [sic], Uttarajhayaṇāim and Āvassayasuttaṃ*. Ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya and Amṛtīlā Mohanlāl Bhojak. Jaina-Āgama-Series, vol. 15. Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1977.
- GBM *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*. Ed. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Śata-Piṭaka Series, vol. 10 (1)-(10). New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1959–74.
- GM *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Ed. Nalinaksha Dutt. 4 volumes in 9 parts. Srinagar and Calcutta: J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press, 1939–59.
- MN I *Majjhima-Nikāya.*, vol. 1. Ed. V. Trenckner. London: Pali Text Society, 1888–99.
- NandīC *Jinadāsa's cūrṇi on Nandīsutta*. In *Nandīsuttaṃ by Devavācaka, with the Cūrṇi by Jinadāsagaṇi Mahattara*. Ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya. Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society, 2004.
- NandīH *Haribhadra's vṛtti on Nandīsutta*. In *Nandīsuttaṃ by Devavācaka, with the Vṛtti by Haribhadra, Durgapadavyākhyā by Śrīcandra and Viṣamapadaparyāya on Vṛtti*. Ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya. Varanasi: Prakrit Text Society, 1966.
- NandīM *Malayagiri's vṛtti on Nandīsutta*. In *Śrīman-Malayagiryācārya-praṇīta-vṛttiyutaṃ Śrīman-nandīsūtram*. Bombay: Āgamodaya Samiti, 1924.
- NiśC *Niśīthacūrṇi* (see below NiśS).
- NiśS *Niśīthasūtra*. In *Niśīth Sūtram (with Bhashya) by Sthavir Pungava Shri Visahgani Mahattar and Vishesh Churni by Acharya Pravar Shri Jindas Mahattar*. Ed. Amara-muni and Muni Kanhaiyālāl. 4 vols. 1957–60. [Rpt. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 2005]
- P *The Tibetan Tripitaka: Peking Edition, Kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto. Reprinted under the Supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto*. Ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki. 168 vols. Tokyo-Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1955–61.
- pw *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*. Ed. Otto von Böhtlingk. 7 vols. St. Petersburg, 1879–89. [Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991]
- S *sTog Kanjur. Bka' 'gyur (stog pho brang bris ma)*. 109 vols. Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center, TBRC W22083. Leh: Smarntsis shesrig dpemzod, 1975–80.

- Sth *Sthānāṅgasūtra with the Commentary by Ācārya Śrī Abhayadev-Sūri Mahārāja*. Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya. 3 vols. Jaina-Āgama-Series, vol. 19 (1)-(3). Mumbāi: Śrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 2002–3.
- SWTF *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule*, begonnen von E. Waldschmidt, hg. von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen unter der Leitung von Heinz Bechert, Lieferung 1–26, Göttingen 1973–2014.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō daizōkyō kankokai 大正一切経刊行会, 1924–34.
- Thī-a *Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā* of Dhammapāla, Ed. William Pruitt. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1998.
- UP *Uttarapurāna* of Guṇabhadra. In *Mahāpurāna* vol. II: *Uttarapurāna of Ācārya Guṇabhadra*. Ed. and tr. Pannālāl Jain. Varanasi: Bhāratiya Jnānapitha Kāshi, 1954.
- Utt *Uttarādhyayana (Uttarajjhayaṇa)*. Ed. Muni Puṇyavijaya (see above DVS).

REFERENCES

- Adaval, Niti. 1970. *The Story of King Udayana as Gleaned from Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Sources*. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智善. 1931. *Indo bukyō kyō meishi jiten* 印度佛教固有名詞辞典 [Dictionary of Proper Names in Indian Buddhism]. 2 vols. with continuous pagination. Nagoya: Hajinkaku shobō. [Rpt. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967.]
- Anālayo. 2011. *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*. 2 vols. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Appleton, Naomi. 2014. *Narrating Karma and Rebirths: Buddhist and Jain Multi-life Stories*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Balbir, Nalini. 1990. Stories from the Āvaśyaka Commentaries. In *The Clever Adulteress and Other Stories: A Treasury of Jain Literature*, ed. Phyllis Granoff. Pp. 17–74. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press.
- _____. 1993. *Āvaśyaka-Studien: Introduction générale et traductions*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, vol. 45,1. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- _____. 2000. Jain-Buddhist Dialogue: Material from the Pāli Scriptures. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 26: 1–42.
- Banerjee, Anukul Chandra. 1957. *Sarvāstivāda Literature*. Calcutta: J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press.
- Barnett, L. D. 1907. *The Antagaḍa-dasāo and Anuttaravavāiya-dasāo*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Bruhn, Klaus. 1981. Āvaśyaka Studies I. In *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, ed. Klaus Bruhn and Albrecht Wezler. Pp. 11–49. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Chavannes, Édouard. 1910–34. *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripitaka chinois et traduits en français*. 4 vols. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2014. *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India: Facsimile Edition*, vol. I: *Vinaya Texts*. Delhi: The National Archives of India; Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Cort, John. 2003. Doing for Others: Merit Transfer and Karma Mobility in Jainism. In *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*, pt. I, ed. Olle Qvarnström. Pp. 129–49. Fremont, California: Asian Humanities Press, 2003.
- _____. 2009. An Epitome of Medieval Śvetāmbara Jain Literary Culture: A Review and Study of Jinaratnasūri's *Līlāvātīsāra*. *International Journal of Jaina Studies* (Online) 5: 1–33.

- Das, Sarat Chandra, and Hari Mohan Vidyābhūṣaṇa (and Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa). 1888–1918. *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. 2 vols. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Deleu, Jozef. 1970. *Viyāhappannatti (Bhagavati): The Fifth Anga of the Jaina Canon. Introduction, Critical Analysis, Commentary & Indexes*. Bruges: De Tempel, Tempelhof 37. [Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996]
- Demiéville, Paul. 1974. Byō. In *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, 3rd fasc. Pp. 224b-270a. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient. [Tr. Mark Tatz: *Buddhism and Healing*. 1985. Lanham: Univ. Press of America.]
- Deo, Shantaram Bhalchandra. 1956. *History of Jaina Monachism from Inscriptions and Literature*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Dundas, Paul. 2014. Floods, Taxes, and a Stone Cow: A Jain Apocalyptic Account of the Gupta Period. *South Asian Studies* 30: 230–44.
- Eggermont, P. H. L. 1975. *Alexander's Campaigns in Sind and Baluchistan and the Siege of the Brahmin Town of Harmatelia*. Leuven/Louvain: Leuven Univ. Press.
- Fish, Jessica. 2014. Health Care in Indian Buddhism: Representations of Monks and Medicine in Indian Monastic Law Codes. M.A. thesis, McMaster Univ. Available at <https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/handle/11375/16281>.
- Formigatti, Camillo Alessio. 2004. L'episodio di Udrāyaṇa nel quarantunesimo capitolo dell'Avadānakalpalatā di Kṣemendra. MA thesis, Università degli Studi di Milano.
- _____. 2009. The Story of Sundarī and Nanda in the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*. In *Pāsādikādānam: Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*, ed. Martin Straube, Roland Steiner, Jayandra Soni, Michael Hahn, and Mitsuyo Demoto. Pp. 129–55. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Frauwallner, Erich. 1956. *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. Rome: Is. M. E. O.
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1977. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, pt. I. Rome: Is. M. E. O.
- Granoff, Phyllis. 1989. Religious Biography and Clan History among the Śvetāmbara Jains in North India. *East and West* 39: 195–215.
- _____. 1998. Cures and Karma: Healing and Being Healed in Jain Religious Literature. In *Self, Soul and Body in Religious Experience*, ed. Albert I. Baumgarten with Jan Assmann and Guy G. Stroumsa. Pp. 218–55. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. 2015. *A Space for Tolerance: Responses to Other Religious Groups in Medieval Indian Literature*. Amsterdam: J. Gonda Fund Foundation of the KNAW.
- Hahn, Michael. 1974. Die Haribhāṭṭajātakamālā (I): Das Ādarśamukhajātaka. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 18: 49–88.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi 平岡聡. 2007. *Budda ga nazo toku sanze no monogatari: Diviya avadāna zenyaku* ブッダが謎解く三世の物語: デイヴィヤ・アヴァダナ全訳 [A Complete Japanese Translation of the *Divyāvadāna*]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.
- Hultzsch, E. 1922. The Story of Jivandhara: Translated from the *Uttarapurāṇa*. *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* 12: 317–48.
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1994. *Das Poṣadhavastu: Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, monograph 13. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler, Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen.
- Jacobi, Hermann. 1886. *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī: Zur Einführung in das Studium des Prakṛit*. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel.
- _____. 1895. *Gaina Sūtras: Translated from Prakrit*, pt. II: *The Uttarādhyayana sūtra; The Sūtrakaritāṅga sūtra*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. 1979. *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.
- Johnson, Helen M. 1931–62. *Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacaritra or the Lives of Sixty-Three Illustrious Persons, by Ācārya Śrī Hemacandra*. 6 vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute.

- Karttunen, Klaus. 1989. *India in Early Greek Literature*. Studia Orientalia, vol. 65. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- Koch, Rolf Heinrich. 1990. Die Namaskāra-vyākhyā der Āvaśyaka-Tradition. Ph.D. diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München.
- _____. 1991–92. *Āvaśyaka-Tales from the Namaskāra-Vyākhyā*. *Indologica Taurinensia* 17–18: 221–71.
- _____. 1995–96. Udayana and Vāsavadattā according to the Āvaśyaka Tradition. *Indologica Taurinensia* 21–22: 183–96.
- _____. 2009. On the Interrelation of Certain Prakrit Sources. *Indologica Taurinensia* 35: 275–86.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1944–80. *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. 5 vols. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institute Orientaliste.
- Leumann, Ernst. 1934. *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur*. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter. [Tr. George Baumann, 2010. *An Outline of the Āvaśyaka Literature*. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology.]
- Lüders, Heinrich. 1940. *Philologica Indica: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstage*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Majumdar, R. C. 1945. Historical Materials in Gilgit Manuscripts. In *B. C. Law Volume*, pt. I, ed. D. R. Bhandarkar et al. Pp. 134–41. Calcutta: The Indian Research Institute.
- Malalasekera, G. P. 1937–38. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*. 2 vols. Indian Text Series. London: John Murray, Published for the Government of India. [Rpt. London: Pali Text Society, 1974.]
- Matsumura, Hisashi. 1996. The Kāthinavastu in the Vinayavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen. Dritte Folge*. Pp. 145–240. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- McDermott, James P. 1976. Is There Group Karma in Theravāda Buddhism? *Numen* 23/1: 67–80.
- Mehta, Mohan Lal, and K. Rishabh Chandra. 1970–72. *Prakrit Proper Names*. 2 vols. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.
- Mette, Adelheid. 1983. The Tales Belonging to the Namaskāra-vyākhyā of the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi: A Survey. *Indologica Taurinensia* 11: 129–44.
- Meyer, John Jacob. 1909. *Hindu Tales: An English Translation of Jacobi's Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī*. London: Luzac & Co.
- Mori, Shōji 森章司. 2014. *Genshi bukkyō seiten shiryō niyoru shakuson den no kenkyū* 原始仏教聖典資料による釈尊伝の研究 [A Study of the Biography of Sakyamuni Based on the Early Buddhist Scriptural Sources], pt. 19. Thematic Research IV. Tokyo: Chūō Academic Research Institute.
- Nagarajaiah, Hampa. 2008. *Stories of Abhayakumāra*. Bangalore: K. S. Mudappa Smaraka Trust-Krishnapuradoddi.
- Nobel, Johannes. 1955. *Udrāyaṇa, König von Roruka: Eine buddhistische Erzählung, die Tibetische Übersetzung des Sanskrittextes*, pt. 1: *Tibetischer Text, deutsche Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ohira, Suzuko. 1994. *A Study of the Bhagavatīsūtra: A Chronological Analysis*. Prakrit Text Society Series, vol. 28. Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2015. *A Sanskrit Dictionary of Law and Statecraft*. Delhi: Primus Books.
- Panglung, Jampa Losang. 1981. *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung*. Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library.
- Pischel, Richard. 1900. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Pruitt, William. 1998. *The Commentary on the Verses of the Therīs*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Puṇyavijaya, Muni, and Amritlal Mohanlal Bhojak. 1984. *Paiṇṇayasuttāim*, pt. I. Jaina-Āgama-Series, No. 17 (Part 1). Bombay: Shri Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya.
- Ryan, James D. 2005. *Civakacintāmaṇi: The Hero Civakaṇ, the Gem that Fulfills All Wishes by Tiruttakkatēvar. Verses 1–1165. Translated with Notes and Introduction*. Fremont, CA: Jain Publishing Company.

- _____, and G. Vijayavenugopal. 2012. *Civakacintāmaṇi: The Hero Cīvakaṇ, the Gem that Fulfills All Wishes by Tiruttakkatēvar. Verses 1166–1884. Translated with Notes and Introduction*. Fremont, CA: Jain Publishing Company.
- Śāha, Subodhacandra Nānālāla. 1977. *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritam Mahākāvyaṃ: Daśamaṃ Parva*. Mumbāi: Śrīmatī Gaṃgābāī Jaina Cerīṭebala Ṭraṣṭa, 1977.
- Schiefner, Antonius. 1875. Mahākātjājana und König Tshaṇḍa-Pradjota: Ein Cyklus buddhistischer Erzählungen. *Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Petersbourg*, VII^e Série. Vol. 22, no. 7: 1–67.
- _____. 2007. *Übersetzungen aus dem tibetischen Kanjur: Beiträge zur Buddhismuskunde und zur zentralasiatischen Märchenforschung*. Ed. Hartmut Walravens. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. Originally published between 1860–79. [Engl. tr. W. R. S. Ralston. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., 1882]
- Schlingloff, Dieter. 1975. Aśvagoṣas Saundarānanda in Ajanta. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 19: 85–102.
- _____. 2000. *Ajanta: Handbuch der Malereien / Handbook of the Paintings 1: Erzählende Wandmalereien / Narrative Wall-paintings*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schmidt, Isaak Jakob. 1845. *'Dzangs blun oder der Weise und der Thor: Aus dem Tibetischen übersetzt und mit dem Originaltexte herausgegeben*. Erster Theil: *Der tibetische Text nebst der Vorrede*; Zweiter Theil: *Die Übersetzung*. St. Petersburg: W. Gräff's Erben / Leipzig: Leopold Voss.
- Schopen, Gregory. 2000. The Good Monk and His Money in a Buddhist Monasticism of “The Mahāyāna Period.” *The Eastern Buddhist* 32.1: 85–105.
- _____. 2004. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
- Schubring, Walther. 1935. *Die Lehre der Jainas, nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sen, Madhu. 1975. *A Cultural Study of the Niśītha Cūrṇi*. Amritsar: Sohanlal Jaindharma Pracharak Samiti.
- Sheth, Hargovind Das T. 1963. *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo: A Comprehensive Prakrit-Hindi Dictionary with Sanskrit Equivalents, Quotations and Complete References*, 2nd ed. Prākṛit Text Society Series, no. 7. Varanasi: Prakrit Text Society. [Rpt. Dehli: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986. 1st ed. 1928.]
- Signe, Kirde. 2004. On the Courtesan in Buddhist Literature with Selected Examples from Kṣemendra's Bodhisattvādānakalpalatā. In *Aspects of the Female in Indian Culture: Proceedings of the Symposium in Marburg, Germany, July 7–8, 2000*, ed. Ulrike Roesler and Jayandra Soni. Pp. 41–65. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 1997. The Composition of the *Guan Wuliangshoufo-jing*: Some Buddhist and Jaina Parallels to Its Narrative Frame. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25: 181–256.
- Sircar, Dinesh Chandra. 1965. Alasanda and Varvara. *Journal of Indian History* 43: 343–48.
- Stuart, Mari Jyväsjarvi. 2014. Mendicants and Medicine: *Āyurveda* in Jain Monastic Texts. *History of Science in South Asia* 2: 63–100.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. 1977. On Swāt: The Dards and Connected Problems. *East and West* 27: 9–103.
- Walters, Jonathan S. 2003. Communal Karma and Karmic Community in Theravāda Buddhist History. In *Constituting Communities: Theravāda Buddhism and the Religious Cultures of South and South-east Asia*, ed. John Clifford Holt, Jacob N. Kinnard, and Jonathan S. Walters. Pp. 9–40. Albany, NY: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Watanabe, Kenji 渡辺研二. 1990. Jaina-kyō shoden “Nanda to Sundarī monogatari” ジャイナ教所伝「ナンダとスンダリー物語」[The Nanda-Sundarī Tale in the Jaina Tradition]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 38: 901–897 (sic).
- Watanabe, Shōkō 渡辺照宏. 1964. Udāyaṇa ō to Rudrāyaṇa ō Udāyaṇa 王とRudrāyaṇa王 [King Udāyaṇa and King Rudrāyaṇa]. In *Hikata Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronbunshū* 干潟博士古稀記念論文集 [Festschrift for Dr. Hikata Ryūshō on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday], ed. Matsunami Seiren 松涛誠廉. Pp. 81–96. Fukuoka: Hikata hakushi koki kinenkai 干潟博士古稀記念会.
- Wille, Klaus. 1990. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

- _____. 2014. Survey of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Turfan Collection (Berlin). In *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, Stanford, June 15–19 2009*, ed. Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Pp. 187–211. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Williams, Robert. 1963. *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Medieval Śrāvakācāras*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Willemsen, Charles. 1994. *The Storehouse of Sundry Valuables*. BDK English Tripiṭaka 10–I. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Wu, Juan. 2014a. Stories of King Bimbisāra and His Son Ajātaśatru in the *Cīvaravastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and Some Śvetāmbara Jaina Texts. *Indo Tetsugaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* インド哲学仏教学研究 [*Studies in Indian Philosophy and Buddhism*] 21: 19–47.
- _____. 2014b. The Story of the Previous Life of Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika in Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jain Texts. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 62: 1173–78.
- Yao, Fumi 八尾史. 2013. *Konpon setsuissaiubu ritsu yakuji* 根本説一切有部律彙事 [The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (An Annotated Japanese Translation)]. Tokyo: Rengō shuppan.
- Zin, Monika. 1991. Udayana-Schauspiele aus Trivandrum in der Entwicklungsgeschichte der Udayana-Erzählung. Inaugural-Dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München.
- _____. 2006. *Mitleid und Wunderkraft: Schwierige Bekehrungen und ihre Ikonographie im indischen Buddhismus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Zysk, Kenneth G. 1991. *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.