

ENGLISH SUMMARY*

Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* was edited for the first time by Sarat Chandra DĀS together with Hari Mohan VIDYĀBHUṢAṆA (Vol. I) and later together with Satis Chandra VIDYĀBHUṢAṆA (Vol. II) between 1888–1918. The edition contains the complete Sanskrit text and its Tibetan translation *Byañ chub sems dpa'i rtogs pa brjod pa dpag bsam gyi 'khri śiñ* which was done towards the end of the 13th century by the famous Tibetan monk and translator Śoñ ston rDo rje rgyal mtshan, in cooperation with the Indian pundit Lakṣmīkara. The editors based their text on two fragmentary Nepalese manuscripts (now in the Cambridge University Library), and a Tibetan block print containing the Sanskrit text in Tibetan script and the Tibetan translation (crafted under the aegis of the Fifth Dalai Lama). Despite its shortcomings this edition can rightly be regarded as an impressive pioneering work, since it made the whole of Kṣemendra's *magnum opus* accessible. Although it was obvious to every careful reader that the edition cannot be regarded as the last word on Kṣemendra's text, it was only in the middle of the second half of the 20th century that the extent to which the text can be improved became apparent. In a series of articles written between 1977–1996 Jan Willem DE JONG made philological remarks on almost every chapter of the *editio princeps* of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, thereby indicating the progress which is possible by carefully studying the textual sources. DE JONG's articles encouraged subsequent studies by various authors who strove to improve and translate the text, and investigated the sources and the context of individual stories of the text. This procedure proved to be useful in solving many problems, because Kṣemendra's complex and often concise style demands a knowledge of the various versions of the individual stories in order to fully understand and appreciate them. This is especially the case with chapters 1–40, the text of which is available today only in a very corrupt form in Tibetan block prints.

The present book, which deals with the longest and perhaps one of the most charming chapters of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* (no. 64), is a revised version of my MA thesis submitted in September 2004 to the Department of "Fremdsprachliche Philologien" (Philologies of Foreign Languages) of the Philipps-Universität Marburg. The book is in six sections. After a short overview of the different versions of the story of Sudhana and the Kinnarī—as transmitted both in texts and artistic representations—which, starting from India, spread over most of the areas influenced by Indian Buddhism (1.1), the main part of the first section (1.2.1–1.2.2) tries to establish which of the Indian versions could have served as a model for Kṣemendra. Only three versions had to be taken in account, a) the *Sudhanakumāravadāna* in the *vinaya* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādins* preserved only partially in the Gilgitmanuscript, in a corrupt but complete form in the *Dīvyāvadāna*, and in Tibetan translation, b) the *Kinnarīsudhanajātaka*, the 25th chapter of Haribhaṭṭas *Jātakamālā*, preserved almost completely in a recently discovered old manuscript, and completely in a rather clumsy Tibetan translation, and c) a short and laconic Khotanese version, translated from an Indian language sometime between the 8th and 10th centuries

* I thank my friend and colleague Dr Jayandra Soni (Marburg) for carefully checking the English of this summary.

and preserved in two slightly differing variations. These three versions represent what—from the point of view of the structure of the plot—could be called a long and complex recension of the story of Sudhana and the Kinnarī, to which also Kṣemendra's version must be counted. The shorter and poorer recension, represented by the *Kinnarījātaka* preserved in the *Mahāvastu*, differs to a large extent from Kṣemendra's text, hence could be excluded as a possible source. By a detailed analysis of the structure of the plot, the use of poetical embellishments, and the names of persons and places, it could be made plausible that for his *avadāna* Kṣemendra took material both from Haribhaṭṭa's version and from a version closely related to, but not identical with, the version in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*. Owing to its terse style the Khotanese version could not be satisfactorily classified. The next chapter (1.2.3) describes the language, style and poetical merits of the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* in its own rights, followed by a metrical analysis (1.2.4). Part three of the first section (1.3) deals with the language of the Tibetan translation of the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* in discussing various lexical and grammatical peculiarities of Śoṅ ston's style of translating.

The second section entails a detailed description and analysis of the textual transmission of the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* (2.1) and its Tibetan translation (2.2). For the first time in any study on Kṣemendra all textual sources which transmit the Sanskrit text of a section of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* have been collected, described in detail and arranged according to their textual relationship. This involved three Tibetan block prints, i.e. the Tanjur editions from Cone (C) and Derge (D) and the Fifth Dalai Lama edition (T), which contain the complete Sanskrit text of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, and four Nepalese manuscripts, one of considerable antiquity (A) and three more recent ones (B, E, and H), all of which transmit the poem only partially. A fifth Sanskrit manuscript in the possession of the Bibliothèque Nationale Paris which also contains only parts of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* was not considered since the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* is not included in it. In order to establish the relationship of the textual sources, first some general arguments concerning their outward appearance, their age, the extent to which they transmit the text, and their colophons were put forward. To these there was added a comparison of the variant readings of the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* which yielded the following results. The Tibetan block prints and the Nepalese manuscripts form two clearly distinct groups. As for the relationship of the Tibetan block prints, it could be established with certainty that T was the source for D, and C in turn is dependent on D. The situation concerning the Nepalese manuscripts is ambiguous. A, by far the oldest and most extensive manuscript, has corrections and additions in many places, and it is sometimes possible to decipher the original readings in spite of the corrections. On the basis of the evidence in these places it becomes clear that T and the Nepalese manuscripts descend from a hyparchetype which in turn, together with an unknown manuscript used for the corrections in A, goes back to the archetype, the fountain head of the whole transmission. The relation of the considerably younger Nepalese manuscripts B, E, and H, both amongst themselves and to A, could only be established in general terms since the various groupings of the variant readings show clear signs of contamination. It seems that they somehow stem from A but cannot be regarded as having A as their only source. Two further sources had to be investigated since they transmit, as *testimonia*, parts of the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna*. These are the *Sudhanakumāravadāna* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavīnaya* tradition which incorporated only a few stanzas, and also the 26th and 29th chapter of

the Nepalese *Bhadrakalpāvadāna* containing as an adaptation 330 stanzas (out of 338) of Kṣemendra's text. Both these sources did not prove to be helpful in establishing the text since they added nothing new to the variant readings already known from the manuscripts of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. As for the transmission of the Tibetan translation, i.e. the Tanjur editions from Cone (C), Derge (D), Ganden (G), Narthang (N), and Peking (Q), and the Fifth Dalai Lama edition (T), an analysis of the variant readings confirmed the observations made with regard to most of the texts from the Tanjur that G, N, and Q on the one hand and D on the other hand form two distinct groups. The paracanonical T turned out to be closely related to D in going back to the same hyparchetype. C could be safely excluded as depending solely on D.

The third and fourth sections, the main parts of the book, provide a critical edition of both the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation of the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* (3) and a German translation (4). It was possible to correct the text of the *editio princeps* in both languages in numerous places and to completely document the textual transmission with all available variant readings. As for the Sanskrit, the progress made in establishing a reliable text is shown in a table in the appendix (6.8). Since the Tibetan text in the *editio princeps* is based only on the block print T, a similar table was not regarded as useful and hence omitted. All editorial decisions which were not based on trivial arguments have been discussed and justified in a philological commentary (3.4). The German translation (4.1), the first ever made in a western language, aims to display the editor's interpretation of the edited text. In addition, the translation strives to render the original Sanskrit in a fairly adequate way, not only in terms of correctness of meaning but also of style and flair. Therefore the translation avoids a clumsy word-by-word paraphrase and tries to give a readable German version of Kṣemendra's poem. Annotations discuss difficult passages of the Sanskrit and explain allusions and metaphors (4.2).

In a fifth section three glossaries are added in order to make accessible remarkable words of both the Sanskrit and the Tibetan text and to provide easy access to words and phrases discussed in the various parts of the book. The sixth section contains additional material documenting the textual transmission of the *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna*.