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1 Introduction

As two prominent contemporaries of the Buddha and Mahāvīra, the Magadhan King Bimbisāra (known to the Jainas mostly as Śreṇiṇa) and his son Ajātaśatru (known to the Jainas as Kūṇika) are widely featured in both Buddhist and Jaina literature. In comparing Buddhist and Jaina sources, previous studies have generally focused on the parallelism between Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jaina versions of the episode of how Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika imprisons his father Bimbisāra/Śreṇiṇa and causes his death, with rather less attention given to other episodes about these two figures.

This paper provides a comparative study of the Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jaina versions of a series of three episodes that describe, first, the marriage between King Bimbisāra/Śreṇiṇa and his queen Celā (who is more commonly known to the Buddhists as Vaidehī and to the Jainas as Cellanā), second, Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s previous life as a vengeful sage or ascetic, and third, his ensuing rebirth in the womb of Celā/Cellanā. Although some scholars have separately introduced the basic contents of the Buddhist and Jaina versions of these episodes, no attempt has ever been made to consider the Buddhist and Jaina versions together, or to examine their parallels and divergences. Given that these three episodes as a whole constitute a background for the well-known episode of Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s causing the death of his father Bimbisāra/Śreṇiṇa, the present study may help us gain a fuller picture of the Buddhist and Jaina narrative traditions surrounding the conflict between the two figures.

So far as I am aware, the Čīravastu (“Section on Robes”), the seventh chapter of the Vinayavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya (henceforth MSV) which was most likely

1 While the names Śreṇiṇa (Pkt. Seniya or Seniya) and Bimbisāra (var. Bimbhasāra, Bhimbhisāra, Bhambhāsāra, etc.) appear in both Buddhist and Jaina literature, the name Kūṇika (Pkt. Kūṇia, Koṇia or Koṇiya) seems to appear only in Jaina sources, and Ajātaśatru is used only in Buddhist sources. For summaries of Buddhist stories about these two figures, see Akunuma [1931: 10–12 (s.v. Ajātasattu Vedehiputta), 99–102 (s.v. Bimbisāra)]; Malalasekera [1937–1938: i. 31–35 (s.v. Ajātasattu), ii. 285–289 (s.v. Bimbisāra)]. For summaries of stories about them in Śvetāmbara Jaina literature, see Mehta and Chandr [1970–1972: i. 196–197 (s.v. Kūṇia)], ii. 856–857 (s.v. 1. Senija)]. Both figures are also briefly mentioned, under the names Vimbiṣāra (or its variants) and Ajātaśatru, in the list of kings of the present Kali Age in the Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Matsya Purāṇas (see Parākita [1913: 21 (text), 68–69 (translation)]).

2 For an exemplary study of Buddhist and Jaina accounts of Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s causing the death of his father in prison, see Salk [1997]. See also earlier observations on this shared episode by Jacobi [1879: 2, 5]; Bührle [1903 (1887): 27–28]; Delley [1969: 87–88] (= de Jong and Wiles [1996: 28]).

3 The Buddhist version of the three episodes has been summarized or paraphrased by several scholars (see below n.7), but none of them mentions the Jaina parallels. On the other hand, to my knowledge, the only scholar who has explored the Śvetāmbara Jaina versions of these episodes is Rolf Heinrich Koch [2009]. Nonetheless, Koch makes no mention of any Buddhist source on Ajātaśatru or Bimbisāra.
composed in the first centuries of the Common Era, is the only extant Buddhist text that contains all the aforementioned three episodes. In this text, the three episodes of Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru are told in the prologue section (that is, the section prior to the Buddha’s stipulation of rules on clothes), where they, together with stories of Bimbisāra’s two other sons (Abhaya and Jivaka), constitute an account of the early history of Magadha. As we will see, these three episodes show remarkable similarities to the episodes of Śreni, Cellanā and their son Kūnīka in three Śvetāmbara Jaina texts, namely, the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇī (“Commentary on the Āvaśyaka [‘Obligatory Duties’]”) written by Jinadāsa (ca. 6th–7th centuries CE), the Āvaśyaka-tīkā (“Sub-commentary on the Āvaśyaka”) by Haribhadra (8th century CE), and the Triṣaṣṭiśālākāpuruṣacarita (“Lives of Sixty-three Illustrious Persons”) by Hemacandra (11th–12th centuries CE). In all three texts, the episodes of Śreni, Cellanā and Kūnīka, together with stories of Śreni’s another son Abhaya, form part of a Jaina account of the early history of Magadha. Thus, both in the Cīvaravastu and in the three Śvetāmbara Jaina texts, the episodes of Bimbisāra/Śreni, Celā/Cellanā and Ajātaśatru/Kūnīka belong to a larger narrative of the ancient Magadha at the time of the Buddha and Mahāvīra. Within this broader context, the present comparative study may not only help us better understand the common narrative lore of the Buddhists and Jainas regarding the conflict between Bimbisāra/Śreni and Ajātaśatru/Kūnīka, but may also help us appreciate the shared memories of the Buddhists and Jainas about the ancient (Greater) Magadha, the historical-geographical milieu out of which both religions emerged.

The paper also includes a re-edited Sanskrit text of the portion of the Cīvaravastu of the MSV that tells the episodes of Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru in question (see the Appendix). The Cīvaravastu has come down to us in two versions—a Sanskrit manuscript found at Gilgit, dating from the 6th or 7th century CE, and a Tibetan translation produced in the early 9th century CE. No Chinese version is available. The Sanskrit text of the Cīvaravastu was edited and published by Nalinaksha Dutt in 1942. As previous scholars have observed, Dutt’s editions of the Gilgit manuscripts have various problems. “[T]he most fatal one,” as Hisashi Matsumura rightly points out, “is that DUTT does not convey the exact reading of the manuscripts in his texts or his footnotes. This fact has made impossible textual or linguistic studies based on DUTT’s editions”. In order to establish a solid textual basis for the discussion in this paper, I have re-edited the relevant portion of the Sanskrit text of the Cīvaravastu based on the manuscript. In my footnotes to the re-edited text, I have indicated all substantial mis-

---

4 For a synopsis of the early history of Magadha as described in the ĀvC and the ĀvH, see LEUMANN [1934: 24b].
5 See MATSUMURA [1996: 174].
6 More precisely, the re-edited text is based on a transliteration of folios 241r1–242v10 (facsimiles 794.1–797.10) kindly provided by Dr. Klaus Wille who has used the scans of a microfilm of the Gilgit manuscript held in the Göttingen office of the “Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden” which is better readable than the facsimile edition published by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra [1959–1974]. I wish to express my deepest thanks to Dr. Wille for his generosity in providing
readings found in Dutt’s edition and have offered textual-critical remarks on specific items in the manuscript.

In what follows, I will first introduce the three episodes of Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru as found in the Cīvaravastu, and will then look at the corresponding three episodes in the aforementioned three Śvetāmbara Jaina texts (the ĀvC, the ĀvH and the TSPC). After this, I will give a comparative appraisal of the Buddhist and Jaina accounts, discussing their parallels and divergences, as well as possible reasons behind the divergences.

2 The Three Episodes of Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru in the Cīvaravastu of the MSV

The Cīvaravastu narrates in detail the episodes of Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru, and moreover combines them with another story about Khaṇḍa (prime minister of Videha) as well as his two sons Gopa and Simha. Below is my translation of the Sanskrit version of the episodes in question, where I have indicated in footnotes significant variants found in the Tibetan version. The Sanskrit text itself contains no section breaks. In my translation, for the convenience of modern readers, I have taken the liberty of dividing the text into three sections (Episodes 1 to 3) indicated with subtitles, and into several paragraphs indicated with numbers ([§1], [§2], etc.). The same treatment will also be applied to my translation of the Jaina text (the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi) later in this paper.

Episode 1: The Marriage of Bimbisāra and Celā

[§1] Khaṇḍa set up Gopa’s and Simha’s households. When Simha was entertaining, enjoying and amusing himself [with his wife], a daughter was born. Having lavishly celebrated her birthday festival, they gave [her] the name Celā. A fortune-teller, having seen her, prophesied, “She will give birth to a son. He will, after killing his father [and] taking the royal diadem for himself alone, rule the country.” Once again, when [Simha] was entertaining, enjoying and amusing himself [with his wife], [an-
other daughter was born. Having also lavishly celebrated her birthday festival, they gave [her] the name Upacelā. She also received a prophecy from the fortune-teller[10] who said, “She will give birth to a son endowed with good characteristics.”

§2 Gopa, violent and mighty, destroyed the parks of the Licchavis of Vaiśālī. The park-guards said, “The Licchavis of Vaiśālī are violent and mighty. Do not destroy their parks.” He remained unrestrained. The park-guards said to Khaṇḍa, “Your son has destroyed the parks of the Licchavis of Vaiśālī. Stop him, [for] the Licchavis are violent and mighty, lest they will do harm to him.” Having summoned [Gopa], [Khaṇḍa] said, “Son, the Licchavis of Vaiśālī are violent and mighty. Do not destroy their parks, lest they will do harm to you.” [Gopa] said, “Father, they have parks, but we do not have any.” He said, “Son, I [will] ask the assembly for a park.” He asked the assembly, “Sirs, my two sons have no park. It is worth doing me a favour [by giving me] a park.”[11] They gave them [= Khaṇḍa’s two sons] a disused park. There was a huge Śāla tree in it. There one [son] had the Blessed One’s image built; the other [son] had a temple erected. Thus even the Elders wrote in the scripture, “The Buddha, the Blessed One, stayed in Vaiśālī, in the Śāla Grove of Gopa and Sinha.” Gopa neglected his duties thousands of times. The Licchavis disregarded, disdained and grumbled about [him]. Then Khaṇḍa, having summoned [Gopa], said, “Son, go to such-and-such a village. Run self-owned businesses there. Stay there, lest the anger of the assembly [of Vaiśālī] will arise.” Having gone there [to that village], he started to run self-owned businesses.

§3 At a later time, the commander of Vaiśālī passed away. The prime minister Khaṇḍa was elected to the post of commander. Having lawfully acted as commander for some time, he also passed away. The assembly of Vaiśālī was gathered, [discussing.] “Whom shall we elect as commander?” Then some said, “The prime minister Khaṇḍa protected the assembly well. [Therefore,] we shall elect his son.” Others said, “His son Gopa is violent and mighty. If he is elected to the post of commander, he will surely cause the assembly to break up. However, his brother Sinha is gentle, [and] pleasant to associate with. He is able to satisfy the will of the assembly. If the assembly can approve of this, let us elect him as commander.” All approved. They went together to Sinha’s side, [saying], “Sinha, please accept the commandship.” He said, “Gopa is my elder brother. You should elect him as commander.” They said, “Sinha, your commandship does not come from the hereditary succession. [Rather,] whoever is acceptable to the assembly becomes commander. If this is not acceptable to you, we will elect someone else as commander.” [Sinha] thought, “If the comman-

[10] The Tibetan version has the plural Ḥas mkhan rmaṅs kyi (“by fortune-tellers”).
danship goes away from our family to elsewhere, that would be inappropriate. In any event, I [should] accept it.” He agreed. With great respect, they elected him to the commandship.

§4] Previously, if the people of Vaiśālī sent a letter to someone, they wrote to that one, “The assembly headed by Khaṇḍa gives orders.” When Simha became commander, then, [they wrote,] “The assembly headed by Simha gives orders.” At a later time, a letter arrived at the village where Gopa was running his self-owned businesses. Gopa, opened [the letter] and read it out. He said, “Sirs, previously, the assembly of Vaiśālī wrote, ‘The assembly headed by Khaṇḍa gives orders.’ Now it writes, ‘The assembly headed by Simha gives orders.’ Has our father passed away?” They said, “He has passed away.” Being enraged, he went to Vaiśālī and said [to Simha], “Brother, is it appropriate [for you] to take the commandship under the circumstance of my being older than you?” Simha told him what had happened. Being enraged at the Licchavis of Vaiśālī, [Gopa] thought, “The people of Vaiśālī have shown disrespect to me. I [shall] go to Rājaagrha.” He sent a messenger to King Bimbisāra, [saying,] “I want to stay in the shelter of the Lord’s arms.” [Bimbisāra] wrote to him, “Welcome! Please come here.” [Gopa] went to Rājaagrha. Subsequently, he was appointed by King Bimbisāra to the post of prime minister.

§5] At a later time, King Bimbisāra’s chief consort passed away. He sat lost in thought, with his cheek in his hand. Gopa saw him and said, “Lord, for what reason are you sitting [here] lost in thought, with your cheek in your hand?” He said, “My chief consort has passed away. How can I not be lost in thought?” “Enough, Lord, be free from grief! My brother has two daughters endowed with youth and beauty, [and] truly suitable for the Lord. Among them, one received a prophecy that she will give birth to a patricidal son, but the other [received a prophecy that she will give birth to a son] endowed with good characteristics. Now, which one shall I bring here for the sake of the Lord?” [Bimbisāra replied,] “The one who received the prophecy that she will give birth to a son with good characteristics.” Then Gopa sent a letter to Simha: “King Bimbisāra’s chief consort has passed away. Send Upacelā here. She will become his chief consort.” [Simha] wrote [Gopa] back in reply, “Even if you have gone far away or to another country, it is you with whom we should consult [about everything], considering that you have supreme authority for what you have done.”

---

12 GBM 6.795.10 (folio 241v10) = GM iii.2,11.11–12: dūram api param api gatvā tvam evāvśānābhī prāṣṭavyo [GM: "tavyah"] <> yad bhavatā kṛtam tat paramānām iti. I have followed Prof. Seishi Karashima’s helpful suggestion to give the present translation. Both the former and latter parts of this sentence also appear, with some variations, in the Divy (see Divy 25.23: āryaputra dūram api param api gatvā dāsy evāhān [“Noble Sir, even if I go far away or to the next world, I will still be a slave”]; 32.19–20: sārthavāhā dūram api param api gatvā tvam eva prāṣṭavyah [“Caravan leader! Since you have travelled far and wide, it is you who should be consulted”]; 563.10: rājā kathayati | yady [emended to yad, cf. Hiraoka [2007: ii.531n.261]] etāhhyāṃ kṛtam tat paramānām [“The king said, ‘They
You yourself know that according to the rule made by the assembly, no daughters are to be given away [in marriage] to [anyone from] elsewhere who is not an inhabitant of Vaiśāli. However, if you come and wait in the park, I will bring [Upacelā] out to the park. You can take [her] and leave.”

§6 Then, having taken leave of the king, and mounted a chariot, Gopa set off for Vaiśāli. He arrived in due course, and waited in the park. At that time, a gatekeeper in Vaiśāli passed away, and was reborn among non-humans. He instructed the people of Vaiśāli, “I have been reborn among non-humans. Please build a yakṣa abode for me, and hang a bell around my neck. If any enemy hostile to the people of Vaiśāli comes, I will make a sound of the bell, so that [the enemy] will either be arrested or run away.” Having made a statue [of the yakṣa] and hung a bell around his neck, they placed the yakṣa [i.e., the statue] in the gate-chamber, and furnished it with offering of oblations and garlands, as well as dancing, singing, and the sound of music. Gopa gave Simha a message, “I am waiting in the park. Please come out!” Having taken leave of the assembly of Vaiśāli and returned home, [Simha] said to Upacelā, “You are given away to King Bimbisāra. Get ready!” Having said this, [he further told her,] “Go to the park!” [Upacelā] started preparing. Celā saw her, and asked, “What are you preparing for?” [Upacelā replied,] “I am given away.” [Celā asked,] “To whom?” [Upacelā replied,] “To King Bimbisāra.” [Celā] said, “I am the elder one. Why are you given away?” [Upacelā said,] “If so, you get ready!” [Celā] then made herself ready. Meanwhile, the bell started ringing. The assembly of Vaiśāli was agitated, [thinking,] “Our enemy has entered into Vaiśāli.” Simha, terrified, hastily went out with Celā after having mistaken her for Upacelā. Gopa, also terrified, having made Celā ascend into the chariot, set off for Rājagrha.

§7 The people of Vaiśāli saw Gopa. They started to fight with him. [Gopa] was adept at five kinds of skills. He struck five hundred Licchavis in their vital points, and said, “Sirs, I have struck five hundred of you in the vital points. I leave the rest with life.” Go away!” They said, “No single living-being among us is killed.” [Gopa said,] “Remove [your] amour!” They removed [their] amour. The five hundred collapsed on the ground, and all were deprived of their lives. Then, thinking, “This one is a demon in the form of a man,” they became terrified and fled away. Having returned to Vaiśāli, they stared to discuss together, “Sirs, we should repay this hostility...
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to Bimbisāra’s sons. After writing a letter on palm leaves, putting it into a casket, and sealing it up with a heated lac-seal, you keep it.16 Having done so, they [i.e., the people of Vaiśālī] kept [the letter].

[§8] Gopa reached Rājāgrha in due course. He said, “Upacelā, get down [from the chariot]!” She said, “Uncle, I am not Upacelā. I am Cela.” “Why did you not tell me?” She became silent. Then, distressed and unhappy, [Gopa] went to the king’s [i.e., Bimbisāra’s] side. The king saw him and said, “Gopa, welcome! You are back.” “Lord, I am back.” “Has Upacelā been brought back?” “Lord, she has been brought back, and she has not been brought back.” “What are you saying?” “Lord, Cela has been brought back after being mistaken for Upacelā.” “Bring [her] here. Let us see [her].” [Cela] was brought in. The king saw her being excessively endowed with beauty and youth, [like] a pearl among women.17 Immediately upon seeing [her], the king was enchanted. He said, “Sirs, a son who kills [his own] father does so for the sake of the throne. If I have a son, as soon as he is born, I will bind the royal diadem [on his head].” She was then married to him who had a great multitude of good fortune. [Since] she was brought from the land of Videha, the name Vaidehi was given [to her]. [King Bimbisāra] entertained, enjoyed and amused himself together with her.

Episode 2: Ajātaśatru’s Previous Life as a Vengeful Sage

[§9] At a later time, King Bimbisāra went out for hunting. At one place, in a hermitage lived a sage with five supernatural powers. When a deer, terrified by a succession of arrows, having entered into that sage’s hermitage, came out [and] was struck with an arrow by the king in a vital point, then the sage said in wrath, “Evil King, my wild deer looks after [this] hermitage, but you killed the deer who was seeking refuge [here].” In this way, the king was reproached by the sage. His troop came forth [and] said, “Lord, who is the one being reproached?” The king said, “Sirs, it is me.” “Lord, what is the punishment of one who reproaches the king?” “He is subject to capital punishment. If the sage is abandoned by me in this way, he should be ready to be executed.” While being executed, [the sage] made an improper vow: “Since I am doing no wrong and not offending, [but] am to be killed by this evil king, [when I am] abandoned [i.e., killed], may I be reborn in a place where I will deprive him of his life.”

He further thought, “These kings are well-guarded, kept in good protection.”18 If I take

---

16 The text has sthāpayatha (“you keep [it]”; on the 2nd person plural imperative ending -tha, see BHSG, 132, §26.13). It is unclear to me to whom this is spoken. Is it spoken by one group of inhabitants of Vaiśālī to another group of inhabitants of Vaiśālī?

17 On hārī strīviṣaye (“pearl among women”), see BHSD, 619, s.v. hārī. The Tibetan translation reads (Derge 1, ga 55a2; sTog 1, ga 63b6): bud med kyi yul gyis phros pa (“[Bimbisāra] was captivated by the object [?] of the woman”), where phros pa seems to suggest Skt. hṛta (“seized”).

18 The Tibetan version has one more phrase shin tu btsas pa (= shin tu btsa’ ba, “well-watched”). On btsa’ ba (“to watch, to look on”) and btsas pa (perfect form of btsa’ ba), see Jäschke (1881: 434, s.v.
rebirth elsewhere, I will never get the opportunity. In any event, by [the power of] this vow, may I be reborn precisely in the womb of his chief consort.” Having made this improper vow, he was reborn in Celâ’s womb.19

Episode 3: The Birth of Ajātaśatru

[§10] On the very day when the rebirth was taken [by the sage], a blood-rain fell. A pregnancy craving arose to Celâ: “Ah! I want to tear off the flesh from the Lord’s back [or, to rip out the Lord’s backbones] and eat it [or, them].20” This matter was reported to the king. The king, having summoned fortune-tellers, consulted with them. They said, “Lord, this is the power of the being who has entered into the queen’s womb.” The king sat lost in thought, [wondering,] “How can her craving be dispelled?” Others who were intelligent by nature suggested, “Lord, after covering yourself with a meat-filled cotton [garment], present yourself to the queen.21” Then the king, having wrapped himself in a meat-filled cotton [garment], offered himself to Celâ. Taking [the meat] as the flesh from his back, she ate it. Thus her craving was dispelled. [Later,] again, a craving arose in her: “Ah! I want to drink the Lord’s blood.” This was also reported to the king. Then the king, having had the veins of his five limbs open, let her drink the blood. Once again, her craving was dispelled. When full nine months had passed, she gave birth. A boy was born, beautiful, good-looking, and pleasing. On the very day when he was born, a blood-rain fell again. Once again, the king, having summoned the fortune-tellers, consulted with them. They said, “Lord, as learnt from the treatise, this boy will surely, after depriving his father of his life [and] taking the btsa’ ba, 435, s.v. btsas pa).

19 There is a similar story about the Buddha’s past life as a sage who rebukes King Brahmadatta for killing a deer and is then sentenced to death by the king in the Saṅghabhedaṇavaśu of the MSV (see Gosu 1977–1978: ii.171.3–13). In that story the sage makes no vengeful vow and is finally rescued from death by a hunter. I thank Dr. Klaus Wille for bringing this story into my attention.

20 GBM 6.797.5 (folio 242v5): devasya prṣṭa[va]rv[ī]r̥āṇy utpāyotpātyā bhaks̥eyam. The reading prṣṭa[va]rv[ī]r̥āṇy remains uncertain. Dutt (GM iii.2,14 n.2) gives the wrong manuscript reading vavṛṇy. The Tibetan translation (Derge 1, ga 55b2; sTog 1, ga 64b2–3) has rgyab kyi sha (“flesh of the back”) which suggests prṣṭhanāṃsa (or its plural māṃsāṇi). In another story told in the Cārvavāstu of the MSV, the same phrase appears (cf. GBM 6.748.7 [folio 83r7]: prṣṭha[va]rv[ī]r̥āṇy utpāyotpāya; GM iii.4,171.14: prṣṭhavamśāṇy ut), where it corresponds to prṣṭhavamśāṇ ut (“having ripped out the backbones”) in a parallel story in the Divy (9.25); see also Hiraoka [2007: i. 41 n.102].

21 GBM 6.797.6–7 (folio 242v6–7): tūlikāyāṃ māṃsapārṇāḥ<yā> prāvṛtya devyā ātmānam upanayeti (The manuscript reading tūlikāyāṃ māṃsapārṇāḥ is problematic. I tentatively emend it into tūlikāyā māṃsapārṇāḥ, in view of a similar phrase māṃsapārṇāyā tūlikāyā ātmānam vēṣayitvā appearing immediately after this sentence; on the instrumental ending -āyā [-āyā] of -ā-stems, see BHSG, 64, §9.48). GM iii.2,15.2–3: tūlikāyā māṃsapārṇāḥ prāvṛtyām devyām ātmānam upanayā iti. Based on Dutt’s wrong reading, Edgerton translates this sentence as “present yourself to the queen as a meat-filled covering in (or on) a cotton mattress” (see BHSD, 393, s.v. prāvṛty). The Tibetan reads slightly differently (Derge 1, ga 55b3–4; sTog 1, ga 64b5): lha ras kyi bar stsdangs[ sTog: rtsangs] shas btaams [sTog: btaams] lha bgyis te gsal la <|> de [Derge: ø] nyid btsun mo la stobs mdzod cig (“Lord, after filling the inside of a cotton [garment] with fresh meat, put [it] on, and then offer yourself to the queen”).
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royal diadem for himself alone, rule the country.” The king thought, “In any event, it is for the sake of the kingdom that he [will] deprive me of my life. [Therefore,] I myself shall give the kingdom to him. [Then,] for what reason would he [still] have to deprive me of my life?”

The Cūravavastu goes on to tell another story about King Bimbisāra’s encounter with Āmrāpāli and the birth of their son Abhaya, which has no direct relation to Ajātaśatru.

The three episodes concerning Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru quoted above, as a whole, constitute a background for the story of Ajātaśatru’s later imprisoning and killing of his father told in the Sanīghabhedavastu (“Section on Schism”) of the MSV.22 Of the three episodes, the first one about the marriage of Bimbisāra and Celā, to my knowledge, finds no parallel in extant Buddhist literature. The second one about Ajātaśatru’s past life as a vengeful sage provides a karmic explanation of his patricide in this life, through interpreting the patricide as the karmic retribution for Bimbisāra’s own wrongful action of putting an innocent sage to death. This episode is also told, with some variation, in the Chinese versions of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra (T. 374 and T. 375), where it serves as one of the arguments used by the Buddha to relieve Ajātaśatru of his guilt over the patricide.23 The third episode about the birth of Ajātaśatru (including the evil dohada [“pregnancy craving”] of his mother and the patricide prophecy) also has parallels elsewhere in Buddhist literature, therefore not unique to the Cūravavastu either.24 Nevertheless, the Cūravavastu is, so far as I know, the only extant Buddhist text that combines the episodes of Ajātaśatru’s previous life and his birth together with the episode of the marriage of his parents. Such a combination seems to only find parallels in Śvetāmbara Jain literature. It is to the Jain parallel that we now turn.

3 The Three Episodes of Śreṇiṇa, Cellaṇā and Kūṇika in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi, the Āvaśyaka-tīkā and the Trīṣaṭṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita

Both Jinadāsa’s Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi (ĀVc) and Haribhadra’s Āvaśyaka-tīkā (ĀvH) belong to the exegetical Āvaśyaka literature.25 The ĀVc is a Prakrit prose-commentary on the Āvaśyaka-

---

22 For the version of this story in the Sanīghabhedavastu, see the Sanskrit text in Gnoli [1977–1978: ii. 155.23–159.10]; translated and discussed in Silva [1997: 194–198].


24 There are two Pāli parallels to this episode, found separately in Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Sūmaṇabhālasutta (see Rhys Davids and Carpenter [1886: 133.28–134.30]) and in the paccupannavatthu (“Story of the Present”) of the Jātakatthavaṃsāna No. 338 “Thusa-jātaka” (see Faure [1877–1896: iii.121.16–122.7, translated in Cowell 1895–1907: iii. 80–81). Both parallels mention the dohada and the patricide prophecy. See also a translation of both Pāli parallels in Wu [2012: 312–315]. The Chinese translation of the Dharmaguptaka-vinaya (T.1428 [XXII] 591c16–23 [juan 4]) also tells a story of Ajātaśatru’s birth, which mentions the patricide prophecy, though nothing is said about the dohada (see a translation in Radch [2011: 40 n.132]).

25 For an overview of the “Āvaśyaka-Literatur” (a term coined by Ernst Leumann to refer to the Āvaśyaka-sūtra and the exegetical literature developed around it), see Balbir [2008 (1990): 70–73].
niryukti which itself is an early Prakrit verse-commentary on the canonical Ávaśyaka-sūtra.\textsuperscript{26} The ÁvH is also a prose-commentary on the niryukti, written in mixed Prakrit and Sanskrit. There is another incomplete Sanskrit prose-commentary on the niryukti written by Malayagiri (11\textsuperscript{th}–12\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE), which does not contain the episodes discussed here. The ÁvH's version of the episodes of Śrenika, Cellañā and Kūnika is basically the same as the version found in the ÁvC, except some differences in wording. Since the narrative material in the ÁvC is usually considered to be “older and was probably less affected by the process of Sanskritisation than the tīkās were,”\textsuperscript{27} here I translate the ÁvC's version of the episodes as follows (significant variants in the ÁvH's version are indicated in footnotes):\textsuperscript{28}

Episode 1: The Marriage of Śrenika and Cellañā

[§1] Now, in the city of Vaiśālī, there was King Ceṭaka of the Haihaya clan. He had seven daughters born by each of his queens—Prabhavati, Padmavati, Mrgavati, Śivā, Jyeṣṭhā, Sujuṣṭhā, and Cellañā. This Ceṭaka was a Jaina layman. He rejected the practice of marriage with others [and therefore] did not give his daughters to anyone. The respective mothers [of the daughters], having asked the permission of the king [Ceṭaka], gave them to others [i.e., the grooms] who were desired and suitable.\textsuperscript{29} Prabhavati was given to Udāyana of Vītabhaya, Padmavati to Dadhivahana of Campā, Mrgavati to Satānika of Kauśāmbī, Śivā to Pradyota of Ujjayinī, and Jyeṣṭhā to Nandivardhana of Kuṇḍagrāma who was the elder brother of Lord Vardhamāna. Sujuṣṭhā and Cellañā, the two, remained maiden. [Later,] a female ascetic came to the apartment [of the girls]. She taught them Jaina doctrine. By Sujuṣṭhā, [the female ascetic] was made to become one who got clear answers to any questions.\textsuperscript{30} She was thrown out [by the girls], treated with monkey-faces.\textsuperscript{31} Filled with hatred, she left. In anger, having

\textsuperscript{26} For a detailed introduction to the Ávaśyaka-niryukti and its commentaries, see Balbir [1993: 38–101].

\textsuperscript{27} See Balbir [2008 (1990): 72].

\textsuperscript{28} Given the page limit of the present paper, it is impossible to include the Prakrit text. For the text, see ÁvC, ii.164.9–167.3 (corresponding to ÁvH, 676b5–679a3). The ÁvC's and ÁvH's accounts of Śrenika and his family (especially, the episode of the previous lives of Kūnika and Śrenika) have been paraphrased by Koch [2009]. In my translation, for the sake of convenience, I have Sanskritised all the Prakrit names. My Sanskrit renderings follow that given in Mehta and Chandra [1970–1972].

\textsuperscript{29} ÁvC: tāo mātimissagāō rāyaṃ āpucchitāt ānnesim icchitakānaṃ sarisasagaṇāṃ deti (māti-missagā < Skt. māti-misra<k> “respective mothers”); āpucchitā < āprecyya (“having asked permission”); icchitaka < *ipsita or *istaṇa (“desired”); sarisasaga < saddr. “suitable”). Prof. Nalini Balbir kindly pointed out to me that it would be better to have the plural demti instead of the singular deti, and that deti as we have it may be a scribal error (anusvāra missing).

\textsuperscript{30} This is a tentative rendition of Sujetṭhā nepāṭṭhataspiṇavākaranā katā (nepāṭṭha-paśina-vākaranā < Skt. nepāṭṭha-praśna-vākaranā [“clear answers to questions”]), which seems to mean that Sujuṣṭhā is so versed in Jaina doctrine that she does not need to be taught by the female ascetic. The ÁvH reads Sujetṭhā nepāṭṭhataspiṇavāgaraṇā kayā (nepāṭṭha-paśina-vāgaraṇā < nispiṇa-praśna-vākaranā [“beaten in questioning and answering?”]), which may be translated as “[The female ascetic] was beaten [i.e., defeated] by Sujuṣṭhā in disputing [over Jaina doctrine].”

\textsuperscript{31} ÁvC: muha-makkadiyāhim < *mukha-markatikā (“with monkey-faces”). On muha-makkadiyā (“ap-
drawn a picture of Sujyeṣṭhā on a board, [the female ascetic] went to Śrenīka’s house. Śrenīka saw [the picture of Sujyeṣṭhā]. He asked [the female ascetic about the picture]. [She] explained [the picture to Śrenīka]. [Having heard her explanation,] he became impatient. An envoy asking for marriage was sent [by Śrenīka to Cēṭaka]. [Cēṭaka] said to [the envoy], “Why should I give [my daughter] to someone from the Vāhīka clan?”32 [Śrenīka] was rejected. His impatience became even more intense. [Śrenīka’s son] Abhaya came as soon as he knew this. When consulted [by Śrenīka], [Abhaya] said, “Be confident [in me]!33 I [will] bring [Sujyeṣṭhā] here.”

[$\S$2] [Abhaya] returned to his own house. Having conceived a strategy, he pretended to be a merchant. Having changed his voice and accent, he went to Vaiśālī. [There] he took over a shop near the apartment of the girls, and drew a picture of Śrenīka on a painting-board. At that time, the maidservants of the apartment of the girls came for shopping. [Abhaya] then gave them an excessive amount [of goods], and pleased them by giving them both gifts and respect.34 They asked, “What is this on the painting-board?” He replied, “[This is] my lord Śrenīka.” “Does he [really] have such an appearance?” [Abhaya said,]35 “Who is able to match his appearance? It is painted as it is.” The maidservants and manservants discussed this inside the apartment of the girls. [Sujyeṣṭhā] told them, “Now bring that board here!” The maidservants solicited [the board from Abhaya], [but] he did not give [them the board and said,] “Please do not speak ill of my lord!” After many entreaties, [the board] was given. Secretly, it was sent [by Abhaya into the apartment]. Sujyeṣṭhā saw [the board]. The maidservants revealed the secret [of Sujyeṣṭhā’s seeing of Śrenīka’s picture]. [Sujyeṣṭhā] asked the merchant [Abhaya], “How can Śrenīka become [my] husband?”36 He said, “If [you wish it to be] so, then I bring Śrenīka here.” [Śrenīka] was brought. Secretly, an underground channel was made, extending up to the apartment of the girls.

[$\S$3] Sujyeṣṭhā asked Cellanā, “Should I go with Śrenīka?” The two [Sujyeṣṭhā and Cellanā] ran away [together]. When Sujyeṣṭhā went [home] for some ornaments, at that time, the people [Śrenīka and his charioteer] turned up in the underground channel.37 Taking Cellanā, they left. [Having returned to the channel and found out this,] Sujyeṣṭhā gave out a cry. [On knowing this,] Cēṭaka armed himself. The charioteer Virāṅgaka said [to Cēṭaka], “Lord! Please do not leave. I [will] bring [Cellanā] back!”

32 ĀvC: Pādiḥyakulac (=? Vāhīkakulāya). On Vāhīka (= Bāhika, literally, “being outside”) as an old and apparently pejorative name of inhabitants of Punjab, see Śircar [1971: 101, §27 “Bāhīka”].
34 ĀvC: tāvā vi ya dānāmaṇasanghītā kareti (lit., “He also made them get both gifts and respect.”)
35 The ĀvH has Abhao bhanai, which finds no correspondent in the ĀvC.
36 This question is missing in ĀvC, but given in ĀvH (677b3–4): khaṃ Şeṇīṣo bhattā bhavijjai?
37 ĀvC: tāvā manuṣṣā suraṃgājī ubedā. The word ubedā is unclear to me. The ĀvH has ubbuḍā. On ubbuḍā (“emerged”) < unmagña (?), see Podda et al. [2008–2009, fascs. 3&4, 1516, s.v.].
[Virāṅgaka] set out. He followed [Śrenika and his charioteer] from behind. There was a secluded path in a cave. There dwelled Sulasaś’s thirty-two sons. With one arrow, Virāṅgaka killed them all. At the moment when [Virāṅgaka] was moving his chariots aside, Śrenika fled away. [Then] he [Virāṅgaka?] also went back. [Having returned to Rājagṛha,] Śrenika called, “Sujyeṣṭhā!” She said, “I am Cellanā.” Śrenika said, “You are [beautiful,] the same as Sujyeṣṭhā.” Śrenika felt joyful and also dismayed. [He felt] joyful because of the acquiring of Cellanā, [but] dismayed because of the death of his charioteer. Cellanā also felt joyful because of [Śrenika’s] handsome appearance, [but meanwhile] she felt dismayed [because] her sister was cheated [by her].38 Sujyeṣṭhā, thinking, “Fie upon love and enjoyment,” went forth [into the ascetic life]. [Later,] Cellanā gave birth to a son named Kūṇika. How was his rebirth?

Episode 2: Kūṇika’s Previous Life as a Vengeful Ascetic

[§4] There was a border city. There Jitaśatru39 had a son [named] Sumaṅgala. A minister’s son named Śrenika was a dwarf [or big-bellied].40 He was ridiculed, [and] forced to drink water placed at a high place.41 [In this way,] he was bullied by Sumaṅgala. For this reason, with disgust [for the worldly life], [Śrenika] went forth [from household] and became a non-Jaina ascetic.42 When his father died, Sumaṅgala became king. One day, [King Sumaṅgala] saw [Śrenika] flying through the open air.43 He asked [people about Śrenika].44 People said, “This one performs such supernatural power.”45 Remembering that [Śrenika] was earlier bullied [by him], the king gave rise to compassion. He invited [Śrenika], “Come to my house!”

---

38 ĀvC: Cellanā vi hariso tassa rūveṇam visādo bhaginī vaṃciyā tī. The ĀvH has bhaginī-vaṃcanaṇa (< bhaginī-vaṃcanena, “because of cheating [her own] sister”) instead of bhaginī vaṃciyā tī.
39 ĀvC: Jitaśatru; ĀvH: Jiyasattu-raggo (“Of King Jiyaṣatu”).
40 ĀvC: amaccaputto Senio tī potiyo. The ĀvH has Sena (< Senaka) instead of Senia. The word potiyo (< *potṭika) may mean “dwarffish” (see CDIAL, §§256 *puṭṭa-²). Koch [2009: 282] seems to construe potṭa as being derived from potṭa (“belly”) and renders it as “big-bellied”.
41 This is a provisional translation of pāṇie uccālagam pajjijjati (pāṇi < pāṇīya [“water”]; pajjijjati < pāyyate [“made to drink”], passive form of the causative pāyyathati of ṭāpā [“to drink”]; the meaning of uccālagā is unclear to me.
42 ĀvC: so teṇa nīveṇaṃ bāḷatavassī pavvaito. The term bāḷa-tavassi (< bāḷa-tapasvins) is usually translated as “foolish or ignorant ascetic”. However, as Mṛṛś [2010: 339] rightly points out, this term more likely refers to a certain type of non-Jaina mendicant. She suggests, “Bāḷatapasvins, unabhängig von den Konventionen und Dogmen der Jainas, bestimmten asketischen Gruppen altindischer Traditionen zuorden lassen.” For more discussion on this term, see Mṛṛś [2010: 336–346].
43 ĀvC: appañā so teṇa ogāṣena voleṇto diṭṭho. The ĀvH reads appañā so teṇa ogāṣena voleṇto pecchai tam bāḷatavassī, which seems to be grammatically problematic and may be emended into appañā so teṇa ogāṣena voleṇto <diṭṭho> pecchai tam bāḷatavassī (“One day, he [= Sumaṅgala] saw him [= Śrenika] flying through the open air. He observed the young ascite [= Śrenika]”).
44 ĀvC: pucchāti; ĀvH: raṇṇā pucchityam ko esa tū (“The king asked, ‘Who is this?’”)
45 ĀvC = ĀvH: esa erissān tavam kareti. Here the word tava (< Skt. tapas) refers to the supernatural power of flying attained through asceticism, rather than asceticism per se. For a specific discussion on the power of flying in the air and its attainment in Jaina sources, see Wiley [2012: 176–183].
After finishing a one-month fast, [Sreneka] came [to King Sumangala’s palace]. The king was sick. [The door] was not opened [for him].46 Once again, he entered the jar.47 [Sumangala] was reminded [of the invitation]. He once again went and invited [Sreneka]. Once again, [Sreneka] came [to the palace], but [the gatekeepers told him], “[The king] is sick.” Once again, he entered the jar. For the third time, [Sumangala] invited him. For the third time, he came [to Sumangala’s palace].48 He was maltreated by the gatekeepers who thought, “Every time he comes, the king becomes sick.” [Sreneka] left discontentedly, thinking, “I am a renunciant. Even so, I am treated with indignity by [Sumangala].” [Sreneka] made a vow: “I take rebirth to kill him.” [Sreneka] died and was reborn as a Vānavyantara god of little divine power.49

Later, the king [Sumangala] also became a renunciant ascetic, and was also reborn as a Vānavyantara god. Śrenika [Bimbisāra] was the king [Sumangala] in the past; Kujika was that ascetic who was mutilated [by the gatekeepers] (kundaya-samaña).

### Episode 3: The Birth of Kujika

[§5] When [the ascetic] was reborn in the womb of Cellanā, he thought, “Why can’t I see the king [Sreneka] with [my] eyes?” She realized, “This fetus is evil.” Even after various means of abortion, [the fetus] did not fall [that is, it did not die]. During the period of pregnancy, a craving [arose to her]. How was it? She wanted to eat the flesh of Śrenika’s belly-folds. She tried to kill [the fetus] inside [her womb], [but] she told nobody. [Later,] when she was persuaded [by others], she told [about the craving]. This was reported to Abhaya. Having prepared some meat with the hare’s skin, [Abhaya] put it on the top of [Sreneka’s] belly-folds. After she had gone into a viewing [room], while she was watching [the flesh of Sreneka’s belly-folds, as it were, being cut off], [the meat with the hare’s skin] was given to her.51 While she was eating[,] the king pretended to faint. When she thought of Śrenika, she felt uneasy,

---

46 ÁvC: na dinam. The ÁvH has a more complete sentence na dinam dārapālehim dāram ("The door was not given [i.e., not opened for him] by the gatekeepers").

47 The text has puno vi utitum (ÁvH: utitum) paviṭho. On utitīya (var. utīkā) < uṣṭrikā, referring to a large high-necked jar in which an ascetic of the Ājīvika sect performs penances (see Poddaret al. [2008–2009, fasc. 2, 1356, s.v. utītīyā-samañā]).

48 ÁvC: anato (< ajñāta, “unknown”). Here I adopt the reading agato (< agato, “came”) in the ÁvH.

49 ÁvC: kālagato appidhitu Vānmanaṭṭara jāto. On Vānmanaṭṭara (< Vānantuṭara) referring to “[a] class of gods living in the oblique regions; gods of the Vānavyantara class”, see Ratnachandrar [1923–1932: vi. 369, s.v.].

50 ÁvC: so vi rāyā tāvase pasvāvito; ÁvH: so vi rāyā tāvasabhatto tāvase pasvāvito (“The king, who was a worshipper of ascetics, also became a renunciant ascetic”).

51 ÁvC: itse olojanagati pecchamānike dījjati. According to an earlier version of this episode in the Nirayāvalīya (see below), after getting some fresh meat from a butcher’s shop, Abbaya “puts Cellanā somewhere high in the palace from where she can see Seniya lying turned towards her. After that he cuts [as it were] the meat of the folds of the belly of the king and puts it in a pot” which is then given to Cellanā (see de Jong and Wiles [1996: 43]; translated from Deleu [1969:102]).
[but] when she thought of the fetus, [she wondered,] “Why do I want to eat it all?” In this way, [her craving] was dispelled. After nine months, a boy was born. This was reported to the king [Sreneika]. He was delighted. [Later, the boy] was abandoned in an aśoka grove [by Cellanā] through a maidservant. This was reported to Şrenika. He came, [and] scolded [Cellanā], “Why did you abandon our first son?” He went to the aśoka grove. [The grove] was illuminated by [the boy]. [Şrenika] said, “[My son is like] the moon in the aśoka grove.” Hence the name Aṣokacandra (“Moon in the Aśoka [Grove]”) was given [to the boy]. There [in the aśoka grove] his tender fingertip [?] was pierced by a cock-feather. It did not recover well, [and] became crooked. After nine months, a boy was born. This Şrenika put that finger [of Kūnika] in his mouth [and] sucked the pus, [Kūnika] stayed [quiet]; otherwise, he would cry. Then, he grew up…

The ĀvC and the ĀvH proceed to tell stories about Cellanā’s two other sons Halla and Vihalla, as well as Şrenika’s prevention of Kūnika from succeeding the kingship by giving royal insignias to Halla and Vihalla, which arouses the hatred of Kūnika who then throws his father into prison. Shortly thereafter, Şrenika commits suicide in prison. Thus, in the ĀvC and the ĀvH, the three episodes concerning Şrenika, Cellanā and Kūnika quoted above, as a whole, provide part of the background for the story of Kūnika’s causing the death of his father told later in the two texts.

The ĀvC is, so far as I am aware, the oldest extant Śvetāmbara Jaina source in which the episode of the marriage of Şrenika and Cellanā and the episode of Kūnika’s previous life as a vengeful ascetic appear. As for the episode of the birth of Kūnika (including the description of Cellanā’s dohada and the etiological details about the names Aṣokacandra and Kūnika), its oldest extant version seems to be that found in the Nīrayāvaluīyāo (“Sequences of Hells”), the eighth Upāṅga of the Śvetāmbara canon. The Nīrayāvaluīyāo mentions neither the marriage of Şrenika and Cellanā nor the former life of Kūnika, but presents the episode of the birth of

---

52 ĀvC: mūṇito (< Skt. māṇita, “honoured”), which does not fit the context. I adopt the reading viṇīto (< vinīta, “removed, dispelled”) in the ĀvH.
53 ĀvC: so bhanati asogavanacandau tri. This sentence finds no correspondent in the ĀvH.
54 ĀvC: kāṇaṃguli; ĀvH: koṇaṃguli. The exact meanings of these two compounds are unclear to me (on kāṇa “blind of one eye”, see CDIAL, §3019, s.v.; koṇa “corner”, see CDIAL, §3504, s.v.).
55 I adopt the reading dāraehi (“by young boys”) in the ĀvH, instead of dāraagārehi (“by boyish forms [?]”) in the ĀvC which makes little sense in the present context. The name Kūnika is clearly derived from Skt. kun (“sich zusammenziehen [to contract]”, see PW, ii.88, s.v.) and therefore synonymous to Skt. kunikūni (“lahm am Arm [crippled in the arm]”), or “Nagelgeschw [a nail sore]”, see PW, ii.72, s.v. kunī, 88, s.v. kūni”. On this name, see also Deleu [1969: 104, §12] (= de Jong and Wiles [1996: 45]); Śī. [1997: 243 n.81].
56 For a summary of these follow-up events as told in the ĀvC and the ĀvH, see Koch [2009: 279–280].
57 For the version of this story in the ĀvC (ii. 171.11–172.8) [corresponding to ĀvH, 682b8–683b5], see Śī. [1997: 206–208 (translation and discussion), 229–230 (text)].
58 For the Nīrayāvaluīyāo version of this episode, see Deleu [1969: 99.20–104.5, §§7–12] (= de Jong and Wiles [1996: 40–45]).
Stories of King Bimbisāra and His Son Ajātaśatru

Kūṇika alone as a prelude to the story of his causing the death of his father.\textsuperscript{59}

In Hemacandra’s \textit{Triṣaṇṭīśalākāpuruṣa\textsc{carita}} (TŚPC), the three episodes of Śrenika, Cellanā and Kūṇika are retold in a much more elaborate form in the sixth chapter of the tenth book entitled \textit{Mahāvīra\textsc{carita}} (“Career of Mahāvīra”).\textsuperscript{60} Hemacandra arranges the episodes in a different sequence: The episode of the former lives of Śrenika and Kūṇika is told in the first place in an earlier section (verses 11–45) of the chapter in question, where it serves as a prelude to the birth of Śrenika, whereas the episode of the marriage of Śrenika and Cellanā and the episode of the birth of Kūṇika are told together in a later section (verses 184–309) of that chapter. Despite this difference in sequence, the plotline of each of the three episodes in the TŚPC is largely the same as that found in the ĀvC and the ĀvH. Also, as in the ĀvC and the ĀvH, the three episodes as a whole constitute a background for the story of the imprisoning and death of Śrenika told later in the same book of the TŚPC.\textsuperscript{61} It is, then, likely that the accounts in the ĀvC and the ĀvH formed at least part of the sources on which Hemacandra’s retelling was based.

4 A Comparative Appraisal

A comparison between the Buddhist episodes about Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru in the \textit{Cī\textsc{varavastu}} of the MSV and the Jaina episodes about Śrenika, Cellanā and Kūṇika in the ĀvC, the ĀvH and the TŚPC reveals two major facts:

First, there are striking similarities between the Buddhist and Jaina versions in terms of overall narrative content and structure. More specifically, in the first episode on the marriage of Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s parents, both versions show that Bimbisāra/Śrenika initially intends to marry Upacelā/Sujyeṣṭhā but later turns out to marry Celā/Cellanā as a result of confusion. In the second episode, both versions agree on Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s former life as a vengeful sage or ascetic, and both, from a karmic perspective, explain Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s hostility towards his father in this life as a kind of revenge, the cause of which can be traced back to his previous life. In the third episode about the birth of Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika, both the Buddhist and Jaina versions agree on Celā’s/Cellanā’s pregnancy craving for the flesh and/or blood of Bimbisāra/Śrenika after the sage or ascetic enters into her womb, and on Bimbisāra’s/Śrenika’s strategic fulfilling of her craving without injuring himself.

How should we understand these similarities? It seems difficult to conclude anything about the genetic relationship between the Buddhist and Jaina versions, or to determine who borrowed from whom, or if there was any borrowing between them at all. To be sure, the ĀvC, the ĀvH and the TŚPC were composed rather later than the \textit{Cī\textsc{varavastu}} of the MSV.

\textsuperscript{59} For the Prakrit text and a paraphrase of this story, see \textsc{Deleu} [1969: 104.28–107.5, §§13–14] (= de Jong and Wiles [1996: 45–47]); see also a translation and discussion in \textsc{Srk} [1997: 205–206].

\textsuperscript{60} See the Sanskrit text in \textsc{Sāna} [1977: 158.2–160.10 (verses 11–45), 171.4–180.8 (verses 184–309)]; translated in \textsc{Johansson} [1962: 138–141, 149–157].

\textsuperscript{61} For the TŚPC version of the story of Śrenika’s death, see \textsc{Sāna} [1977: 357.4–362.10 (verses 108–180)]; translated in \textsc{Johansson} [1962: 313–317]; see also \textsc{Srk} [1997: 208–210].
(if we date the compilation of the MSV to the early centuries of the Common Era). However, given that many stories in the AvC and the AvH were probably drawn from earlier oral or written sources, the episodes of Kūnīka and his parents in these two Jaina texts, as such, are not necessarily later than those in the Cīvavastu. Thus, for the time being, what we can say is perhaps only that the aforementioned similarities suggest that the Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jaina authors in ancient India shared some common narrative traditions surrounding Ajātaśatru/Kūnīka and his parents.

On the other hand, there are also clear differences between the Buddhist and Jaina versions in terms of specific narrative elements. For instance, in the first episode about the marriage of Ajātaśatru’s/Kūnīka’s parents, while in the Cīvavastu Celā’s uncle Gopa arranges the marriage of Bimbisāra and Upacelā (later replaced by Celā), in the Jaina texts it is Śrenīka’s son Abhaya who assists his father to marry Sujyesṭhā (later replaced by Cellañā). Abhaya is also featured in the Jaina versions of the episode of the birth of Kūnīka, where he appears as the one who devises a strategy to fulfill Cellañā’s pregnancy craving without injuring Śrenīka, whereas in the Cīvavastu the originators of such a strategy are anonymous.

Abhaya’s significant role in the Jaina versions may not be accidental. It is worth noting that Abhaya is quite an important character in Jaina narrative literature in general. He is often portrayed as a highly intelligent man capable of solving various problems. For instance, in the Nāyādhammakahāṇā (“Parables and Religious Stories”), the sixth Āṅga of the Śvetāmbara canon, there is a story about Abhaya’s successfully invoking a god to create an unseasonal rain and thereby fulfilling the pregnancy craving of Queen Dhārini (Śrenīka’s another wife) for an untimely monsoon. This (or other) earlier characterization of Abhaya as a solver of problems or user of stratagems may have been a motivating factor that led the Jaina authors to assign him an important role in the episodes of Śrenīka, Cellañā and Kūnīka. In contrast, in Buddhist narrative literature, Abhaya’s problem-solving capability is not strongly featured.

Further, there is also a stark contrast between the Buddhist and Jaina versions in their attitudes towards King Bimbisāra/Śrenīka. According to the Cīvavastu, Bimbisāra’s being killed by Ajātaśatru later in this life is the karmic retribution for his own wrongful action of putting an innocent sage to death. The Jaina versions do not mention such violence of King Śrenīka, or any violence of his previous birth as King Sumaṅgala, but, instead, portray him as a victim of the resentment harbored by an ascetic who is a former incarnation of Kūnīka.

I have not yet found a satisfactory explanation for why King Śrenīka/Sumaṅgala does

---

62 BAHNN [2008 (1990): 72] suggests that stories in the AvC and in the Āvaśyaka-tīkās “represent an intermediate stage between an oral tradition which would give the narrator (a preaching monk) great freedom and a fixed written tradition which would imply a more rigidly unvarying text”.

63 For Jaina sources on Abhaya, see Mehta and Chandra [1970–1972: i. 49–51, s.v. Abhaya (Abhaya)].

64 See the Prakrit text in Jambūdīva [1989: 20.13–34.11]. I am grateful to Dr. Naomi Appleton for bringing this story into my attention.

65 For Buddhist sources on Abhaya, see Akanuma [1931: 1, s.v. Abhaya1]; Malalasekera [1937–1938: i. 127–128, s.v. 2. Abhaya].
not act violently towards the ascetic in the Jaina versions. For now, I can only suggest two possibilities: First, the non-violent depiction of Śrenika might have been motivated by an attempt to keep in line with his prominent status as the first Jina of the coming age.\textsuperscript{66} However, the difficulty with this explanation is that Śrenika is not always portrayed positively in Jaina literature, for he is also said to fall into hell after death as a result of some bad \textit{karma} he had previously bound.\textsuperscript{67}

Second, it is also possible that the non-violent depiction of Śrenika in the Jaina versions was due to an application of a stock narrative pattern. As Rolf Heinrich Koch observes, in the \textit{Vasudevahinīdī} (“Adventure of Vasudeva”) compiled by Saṅghadāsa around 400 CE, there is a story of King Ugrayaśa and his son Kamśa, which also adopts the following narrative pattern: First, an ascetic is repeatedly invited by a king but ignored each time; then, the ascetic vows to destroy the king in his [i.e. the ascetic’s] next life; then, the ascetic is reborn in the womb of the king’s wife; then, he imprisons the king and usurps the throne.\textsuperscript{68} Since the \textit{Vasudevahinīdī} was composed earlier than the ĀvC, it is unlikely that the story of Ugrayaśa and Kamśa was derived from the story of Śrenika and Kūṇika in the ĀvC. The similarity between the two stories suggests that the aforementioned narrative pattern might have been a stock motif familiar to (at least some) ancient Jaina storytellers.

Yet another notable difference between the Buddhist and Jaina versions lies in the prophecy of Ajātaśatru’s/Kūṇika’s causing the death of his father. The Čivaravastu mentions the prophecy twice, whereas the Jaina texts say nothing about the prophecy. The prophecy seems to be unique to the Buddhist narrative tradition, and does not appear in any Jaina account about Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika, so far as I know.

To sum up, the episodes of Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru at the beginning of the Čivaravastu of the MSV show both remarkable parallels to and interesting differences from the episodes of Śrenika, Cellanā and Kūṇika in the ĀvC, the ĀvH and the TŚPC. While further research still needs to be done in order to better understand how and why such differences occurred, the parallels nevertheless clearly suggest that the Buddhists and Śvetāmbara Jainas shared some common narrative lore concerning Ajātaśatru/Kūṇika and his parents, including not only the well-known episode of his causing the death of his father Bimbisāra/Śrenika in prison, but also the less-known episodes of his previous life as a vengeful sage or ascetic, the marriage of his parents, and his birth. Moreover, given that both in the Čivaravastu and in the three Jaina texts, the episodes of Bimbisāra, Celā and Ajātaśatru comprise part of a larger picture of the early history of Magadha, it is necessary to look into whether the Buddhists and Jainas also shared some common narrative material in other parts of this larger picture. Although this topic cannot be pursued here, it is worth exploring systematically in the future.

\textsuperscript{66} Both Śvetāmbara and Digambara Jainas agree on Śrenika’s future attainment of Tīrthāṅkara-hood. For related textual sources, see \textsc{Balbir} [1991: 42–44, 64 n.54].

\textsuperscript{67} On Mahāvīra’s prediction of Śrenika’s next birth in hell, see \textsc{Balbir} [1991: 42].

\textsuperscript{68} See \textsc{Koch} [2009: 284–286].

Symbols Used in the Edition:

- damaged aksara(s)
- omitted (part of) aksara(s) without gap in the manuscript
- interlinear insertion
- superfluous (part of) aksara(s)
- punctation mark
- virāma
- avagraha, not written in the manuscript, but added within round brackets in the edition
- Jihvāmāliya
- Upadhmnāiya
- string hole

[§1] (241r2...) Khaṇḍena Gopasya Sīṃhasya ca niveśanaḥ 69 kṛṣṭaḥ 70 <]> 71 Sīṃhasya kṛḍato ramamāṇasya paricārayataḥ 72 duḥhitā jātā <]> tasyaḥ vistareṇa jātīmaham kṛtvā Cėleti nāmadheyam vyavasthāpitaṁ 73 | sā naimittikena drṣṭvā vyākṛtā <]> putraṁ jana(r3)yisyati

69 In this manuscript, as in other manuscripts in the same script (Gilgit-/Bamiyan-Type II), the aksara ba is always written as va (on this orthographic feature, see Wille [1990: 36, §3.3.2 [7]]; Hu-von Hünüber [1994: 45, §II.8 [1]]; Matsumura [1996: 182, §5.3.1 [1]]; Chung [1998: 126, §7.1.3.1 [7]]). Below the same aksara will be transliterated either as ba or as va according to the lexical context in which the aksara appears.

70 niveśanaḥ kṛṣṭaḥ: application of the masculine ending (-aḥ) to the neutral noun niveśana (“house, household”) and to its qualifying adjective kṛṣṭa; on the confusion of gender-endings in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, see BHSG, 39. §1.1f. GM: niveśanaṁ kṛtam (w.r.).

71 I have taken the liberty of adding danḍas in the text merely for the convenience of modern readers. Occurrences of <> in the edited text should therefore not be taken to suggest scribal lapses.

72 paricārayataḥ duḥhitā: no application of sandhi; note that in this passage almost the same sentence appears (see kṛḍato ramamāṇasya paricārayato duḥhitā jātā 241r3), where the sandhi is applied. As in many other Gilgit and Central Asian Sanskrit manuscripts, the rules of visarga sandhi are not followed systematically in our text. Frequently, -aḥ does not change to -o before the vowel a or a voiced consonant (besides paricārayaḥ duḥhitā mentioned here, see also vikṛtāṁ Vaiśālakānāṁ 241r4, samprasthitāṁ anupūrveṇa 242r1, to list but a few); -aḥ does not drop the visarga before a non-a vowel (see gaṇaḥ aṣṭhapitāti 241v3, samprāptaḥ utdyeṇe 242r1, etc.); -aḥ does not drop the visarga before a vowel or a voiced consonant (see vikṛtāṁ mā 241r5, ārabdhāḥ etad 242r7, etc.); -oḥ does not change to -or before a voiced consonant (see rājyaheṭoh yadi 242r10). Such aberrant uses of visarga have also been observed in other parts of the same Gilgit manuscript of the Vinayavastu of the MSV (see Wille [1990: 36–37, §3.3.3]; Hu-von Hünüber [1994: 49, §II.9 (7.9–15)]; Matsumura [1996: 180–181, §5.3.1 [d]]; Chung [1998: 126, §7.1.3.2]).

73 The use of anuvṛṣa before danḍa is a common phenomenon in the Gilgit manuscript of the Vinayavastu (see Wille [1990: 36, §3.3.2 [2]]; Chung [1998: 125, §7.1.3.1 [2]]). For such cases in the present text, see also vyavasthāpitam | 241r3; dattam | 241r7; abhirucitam | 241v1, etc.
[§2] Gopod vayado vikraonta Vaisalakānām Licchānām udāyānī vināśayati | udyanāpālair ceyate <!--> Vaisalakā Licchavayo vyādā vikrāntā <!--> mā teśām udāyānī vināśayeti <!--> sa nivāryamanō (')pi (r5) na saṃtiṣṭhate | udyanāpālai Khaṇḍasyārociṃ <!--> putras te Vaisalakānām Licchānām udāyānī vināśayati | nivārayānāṃ <!--> Licchavayo vyādā vikrāntā <!--> mā te(r6)sām udāyānī vināśāya | mā te (')narthāṃ kriṣyantī | sa kathayaōti <!--> tātāisām udāyānī santi asmākan tu na santi | sa kathaya | putra udāyānīyārthāya ganaṃ vijnāpayāmiti | tena gaṇo vijnāpatal | bhavanto mama putrayor udāyāṇām nāsti <!--> tad arha<m> (r7) mamodyāne prāsaṇām kartum iti | tais tābhyaṃ jīrṇodyānāṃ datam | tasmin mahāsālavṛksaṇāṃ <!--> tatraikena bhagavataḥ pratimā kārti | dviṭiṇeṇa vihāraḥ pratiṣṭhāpito | tathā sthavirair api sūrāṇte upaniṇdham | buddho bhagavān Vaisālīyaṁ vihari Kopaśinhasā(r8)lavāna iti | Gopa79 akriyāsahasṛṇī karoti | Licchavayo (')vadhāyaṇanti kṣipanti vivacayantō | tataḥ Khaṇḍenāhyuktaḥ | putra gaccha tvam amukam karvataṃ | tatra svādhīṣṭhitān karmmāṇtān Kārāya <!--> tīṣṭha <!--> mā gaṇaprapkopo bhavisyatī | sa tatra gatvā svādhīṣṭhitā(r9)n karmmāṇtān kāravītum ārābdhaḥ <!-->

[§3] vāyad aparēṇe samayena Vaisālīyaṁ senāp(at)īḥ kālagataḥ <!--> tātī Khaṇḍo (')grāmaṁtyaḥ senāpatye shāpitaḥ <!--> so (')pi kaṁ cit kālaṁ dharmmēna senāpayaṃ

74 kṛtvā Upaceliti: vowel unchanged before vowel (see also below sūtrānte upaniṇdham 241r7, gatvā Upacelām 242r3, añitā Upacelā 242r9, cāsramapade ṭiṣṭi 242v1, praṅhārita iti 242v2, etc.). Such cases are ubiquitous in the Gilgit manuscript of the Vinavavastu (see MAFSUMA [1996: 179, §5.3.1[a]]; CHUNG [1998: 126, §7.1.3.2]). GM: kṛtvopaceleti (w.r.).

75 The word bhavanto is missing in GM.

76 GM: *śālavṛksaḥ (w.r.).

77 pratiṣṭhāpito: on the generalization of -ō for the final -as before voiceless consonants and pause in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, see BHSG, 34, §4.38; GM: pratiṣṭhāpitāḥ (w.r.).

78 GM: *śālavane (w.r.).

79 Gopa: nom. sg. masc., no application of sandhi; Gopa < Gopo (on the development of -ō + a- > -a + a- > -ā, see von Hinüber [2001: 204, §265]; NORMAN [1990–2001: iii: 219–224]). Dr. Klaus Wille pointed out to me that Edgerton’s statement that the reduction of the ending -as to -a in sandhi occurs “almost exclusively in verses m.c. [= metri causa]” (BHSG, 34, §4.32) is incorrect, for there are also many instances of this kind found in proses in Central Asian Sanskrit manuscripts. GM: Gopah (w.r.).

80 GM iii 2.9, n.1: baddhāyaṇati ḷṣapanti (w.r.).

81 karmmāṇtin: see KARASHIMA [2012: 191, s.v. karmmāṇta (“Geschäft, Tätigkeit”)]. The germination of consonant before and after r is common in Gilgit and Central Asian Sanskrit manuscripts (other examples of this kind in the present include dharmmēna 241r9, iair ṭmaḥatā 241v3, marmmaṇi 242r6, nibhavatatheti 242r6, and dūrmaṃ 242r8). GM: karmmāṇtin (w.r.).

82 GM: senāpatiḥ (w.r.).

83 dharmmēna: see SWTF, fasc.15, 516, s.v. 2ªdharmah (“~enta) ind. a rechtmaßig; b vorschriftmäßig”). GM: dharmmēna (w.r.).
kārayitvā kālagataḥ <\> Vaiśālako gaṇas sannipatitvā <\> kaṃ senāpatiṃ sthāpa(r10)yāma iti <\> tataike kathayanti | Khaṇḍenāgrāmāntyena gaṇah paripālitaḥ <\> tasyaiva putram sthāpayāma iti | apare kathayanti <\> tasya putro Gopā vyādo vikrāntaḥ <\> yady asau senāpatye sthāpyate niyataṃ gaṇasya bhedāṃ karisyati • yas tu tasya bhṛtā Simhāḥ sa sūrataḥ (241v1) sukhasanvāsāḥ śaknoti gaṇasya cītam arāgayitum <\> yady gaṇasyābhūrhitam taṃ senāpatiṃ sthāpayāma iti • saṃraviṃ abhūrhitam | te saṃbhūyā Simhāsya sakāṣāṃ gataḥ <\> Simhā senāpatitvam prātīccheta • sa kathayanti <\> mama jyeṣṭho bhṛtā Gopās <\> taṃ senāpatiṃ sthāpayati | (v2) te⁶⁴ kathayanti <\> Simhā na yuṣmākam kulakramāgatam saināpayam⁸⁵ <\> yo gaṇasyābhūrhitas sa senāpatir bhavati | yadi bhavati nābhūrhitam vayaṃ anyaṃ senāpatiṃ sthāpayāma iti • sa saṃlakṣayati • yady asmākam grhāt saināpayam⁸⁶ anyatra gamiṣyati naitad yuktam*⁸⁷ <\> sarvatha (v3) prātīcchāmūti • tenādhīvāsītam*⁸⁸ <\> sa tair mmaḥata satkāreṇa senāpatye pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ |

[84] Vaiśālakāḥ pūrvaṃ yasya lekham anupreṣayaṃ | tasya Khaṇḍaprāmukho gaṇaḥ ājñāpayatītī⁸⁹ likhanti • yadā Simhās senāpatiṃ saṃvrītas tadā Simhāprāmukho gaṇa ājñāpayatī(4v)⁹⁰ | yāyada apareṇa samayena yasmin karvatake Gopāḥ svādhīṣhitān karmmāntān kārayati tadā karvatakaṃ lekho gataḥ <\> Gopenodgātī vācītah <\> sa kathayati | bhavantaḥ pūrvaṃ Vaiśālako gaṇaḥ Khaṇḍaprāmukho gaṇa ājñāpayatītī likha(n)ti⁹¹ <\> idāṇīṃ Simhāprāmu(v5)kho gaṇa ājñāpayatītī⁹² likha(n)ti | kim asmākam pitā kālagataḥ <\> te kathayanti <\> kālagataḥ <\> sa saṃjītāmaśro Vaiśālīṃ gatvā kathayati • bhṛtā⁹³ yuktam nāma tava mayi jyeṣṭhatare tiṣṭhāti senāpatyaṃ kartum iti • Simhenā tasya yathāvṛttam ā(v6)rocitam* <\> sa Vaiśālakānāṃ Liśchāvīnāṃ saṃjītāmarśas saṃlakṣa○yati | mama Vaiśālakair asatkārah prayukto <\> gacchāmi Rājaṛhāṃ iti • tena rajñō Bimbiśārasya dūtasamprēṣaṇam⁹⁴ kṛtam* <\> ichāmī devasya bāhucchāyāṃ

---

⁸⁴ GM: ta (w.r.).
⁸⁵ GM: senāpatyam (w.r.).
⁸⁶ GM: senāpatyam (w.r.).
⁸⁷ yuktam*: the virāma used as a punctuation mark (see also below ārocitam* 241v6, kṛtam* 241v6, vas-tam* 241v6, paṭitam* 242v5, samākhyātim* 242v6, upanāmitam* 242v7, bhūkṣitam* 242v7). This is a common phenomenon in the Gilgit manuscript of the Vinayavastu (see, for instance, Hu-von Hinüber [1994: 44, §II.6 (a)]).
⁸⁸ GM: “ādhārvasīta (w.r.). Citing Dutt’s wrong reading, Edgerton explains adhārasīta (lit. “ascertained, determined”) used here as “accepted” (see BHSD, 17, s.v. adhārasīta [3]). On adhārasīta, see BHSD, 15, s.v. adhārvasi (c[2] consents, especially agrees to, accepts [an invitation]).
⁸⁹ gaṇa ājñāpayati: see below gaṇa ājñāpayati 241v4. The two forms ājñāpayati and ājñāpay (see SWFT, fasc.3, 235, s.v. 1ā-jñā. GM: gaṇa ājñāpayatītī (w.r.).
⁹⁰ GM: ājñāpayatītī (w.r.).
⁹¹ Given that the subject of this sentence is the singular gaṇaḥ (“assembly”), likhati is expected.
⁹² GM: gaṇa ājñāpayatītī (w.r.).
⁹⁴ GM: dūtasamprēṣaṇam (w.r.).
vastum* \langle> tenāsya likhitam \langle> svāga(v7)tam \langle> āgaccheti • sa Rājaṅṛham gataḥ \langle>
tato rājoṃ Bimbisārenāgraṁ mātye sthāpitaḥ \langle>

[§5] yāvad apareṇa samayena rājoṃ Bimbisāryāgamaḥiṣi kālagata • sa kare kapolam
datvā cintāpāro vyavasthitah \langle> Gopena sa drṣṭa uktā sa | deva | kasyārthāya (v8) devaḥ
kare kapolam datvā cintāpāro vyavasthita iti • sa kathayaty \langle> aγramahiṣī me kālagata
• kim iti na cintāparas tiṣṭhāmi • alan deva tyajyatām śokah \langle> asti mama bhṛtus
duhiṛtvayaṃ rūpayuvasanapanne95 devārham eva • tatraikā vyākṛtā pītṛmārakam puṭram
jana(v9)yisyaṭitī \langle> dvitiyā tu laṅkāṇasampannam iti • tat katarāṃ devasyārthāyānayāmi
| yā sā vyākṛtā laṅkāṇasampannam puṭram janayiṣyatī | tato Gopena Śiṃhasya lekho
(’nupreśito96 \langle> rājoṃ Bimbisāryāgamaḥiṣi kālagata \langle> tvam Upacelā<ṃ> iha
preṣayāgama(v10)hiṣī97 bhaviṣyatī • tena tasya pratilekho visarjito \langle> dūram api param
api gatvā tvam evāsvāmbhiḥ prastavyo \langle> yad bhavatā kṛtaṃ tat paraḥ pramānam iti98 \langle>
tvam eva jānīṣe \langle> yathā gaṇena kriyākārāḥ kṛto nānyatra kanyā dātavyā rite99 Vaiśālakān
iti \langle> kim tu tvam āgyatodyāne tiṣṭhā \langle> aham enā(242r1)m udyāṇam niṣkāsaiṣyāmi100
\langle> tvam grhītvā gamiṣyasīti |

[§6] tato Gopo rājānam avalokyā raham āruhya Vaiśālīṃ samprasthitatḥ \langle>
anupūrveṇa samprāptatḥ udyāne vyavasthitah \langle> tena khalu samayena Vaiśālyiṃ dauvārikāḥ
kālagato (’)manuṣyakeṣāpapannō \langle> tena Vaiśālakānāṃ nīdaṁṣītam*101 (r2) \langle>
aham amanuṣyeṣāpapanno \langle> mama yakṣasthānāṃ kārayata \langle> ghaṅṭā<ṃ> ca grīvāyāṃ
pralambayatā | yadi kaś cid Vaiśālakānāṃ pratyarthiḥkaṃ pratyāmitraṃ102 āgaṁsiyaty aham
tāvad ghaṅṭāsabdāṃ kariṣyāmi yāvad grhūto vā nispālayito vetti • tair yakṣaḥ pratiṛpuṃ
dṛtvā ghaṅṭāṃ ca grīvāyāṃ baddhivā nṛ(ṛ3)ttagāvāditaśabdena103 balimālyopahāreṇa
dvārakoṣṭhake pratiṭhāpitaḥ \langle> Gopena Śiṃhasya sandiṣṭam \langle> aham udyāne tiṣṭhāmi
\langle> nirgaccheti • sa Vaiśālakaṃ104 gaṇam avalokyā gṛhāṃ gatvā Upacelām āha | tvam

---

95 rūpayuvasanapanne: nominative dual of ”sāmpañṇaḥ, inconsistent with duhiṛtvayam (neut. sg.) and
aham (neut. sg.) both in gender and in number. GM: ”sāmpañṇaḥ (w.r.).
96 GM: ”praṣitaḥ (w.r.).
97 GM: ”praṣayāḥ (w.r.).
98 Here iti may be rendered as ”considering/thinking that”. On this sentence, see above n.12.
99 rite: Middle Indic form of rte. On the change of r to ri in Prakrit, see Pscn. [1981 (1900): 66, §56];
100 niṣkāsaiṣyāmi: see SWTF, fasc.16, 52, s.v. niś-kas (“caus. [”kāsaya-] hinausbringen”). GM: niṣkāsyā8
(w.r.).
101 GM: nirdeśītām (w.r.).
102 kaś cid ... pratyarthikam pratyāmitram: on pratyarthika (mas., “enemy”) and its synonym pratyāmitra
(mas.), see BHSD, 376, s.v. pratyarthika; both pratyarthikam and pratyāmitram seem to have adopted
the nom. sg. neut. ending -aṃ (on the nom. sg. -aṃ of a-stem masculine nouns, see BHSG, 50, §8.26),
and are therefore inconsistent with the preceding kaś (masc.) in gender. GM: pratyarthikaḥ pratyāmitra
(w.r.).
103 nṛtagāvāditaśabdena: see SWTF, fasc.16, 60, s.v. nṛta-gita-vādita (”Tanz, Gesang und Musik”).
GM: nṛtagāvāditra” (w.r.).
104 GM: Vaiśālakaṃ (w.r.).
rajne Bimbisārāya dattā₁₀₅ <> alanḵuruṣvety uktvā₁₀₅ <> udyāṇaṁ nirgcacha ['] (r₄) sā alanḵkartum ārābdhā | Celayā [']drṣṭā₁₀₆ <> sā kathayati <> kimartham alanḵaṁrośi | aham dattā | kasya₁₀₇ | rajne Bimbisārāya | sā kathayati | aham jyeṣṭhatarā <> tvam kathaṁ dattā • yady evam tvam alanḵkuru • sā cālaṅkaroti <> ghanṭā ca ravītum ārābdhā | Vaiśālako gataḥ kṣubdhā <> pra(r₅)tyamitro (')smākaṁ Vaiśālīṁ praviṣṭā iti <> Sinhas saṃstrastāḥ Upaceleti ○ kṛtvā Celāṁ ādāya laghu laghv eva nirgatāḥ <> Gopo (')pi saṃstrastāḥ Celāṁ rathe āropya samprasthitō <>

[§7] Vaiśālakaih prṣṭāḥ₁₀₈ <> te tena sārdhaṁ saṃgrāmayitum ārābdhā <> sa paṃcaśu sthānešu kṛtvā <> tena (r₆) paṃca Ĺicchaviśatāni marmmaṇi tādītāni • sa kathayati <> bhavanto maCyā yuṣmaṇa paṃcaśatāni marmmaṇi tādītāny <> avaśiṣṭaṁ jīvitenācchādayaṁ<> nivarttathetī₁¹₀ • te kathayāṃty <> ekasatvo (')py asmaṇaṁ na praghāḥito <> muṇcata sannāhaṁ¹¹¹ <> tais sannāho muktaḥ <> paṃca(r₇)stāṇi bhūmāu nipatītāni prāṇaṁ ca viyuktāny | tatas te puruṣarākṣaso (')yam iti kṛtvā bhitā nispalāyitaḥ <> Vaiśālīṁ āgatyā samjalpaṁ kartum ārābdhāḥ <> etad vairam asmbhīr bhavanto Bimbisārāpurṭraṇaṁ nirātātyitavyaṁ | patralekhyāṁ kṛtvā pedāyaṁ prakṣipya jatum(r₈)drāṭaṁ kṛtvā sthāpayateti¹¹₂ <> tais tathā kṛtvā sthāpitān <>

[§8] Gopo (')py anupūrvaṇa Rājārgham anuprāptaḥ kathayati <> Upacele avataretī | sā kathayati <> <> tāta nāham Upacelā Celāhām | kim tvayā mama nārocitam <> <> sā tūṣṇīm avasthitā | tato (')sa duḥkhi durmnānaṁ¹¹₃ rājās sakṣāṇaṁ (r₉) gataḥ <> rāj ā drṣṭaṁ uktas ca • svāgataṁ Gopa | āgato (')si • āgato (')smi deva | āṇītā Upacelā | deva āṇītā na āṇītā ca • kim kathayasi • Upaceleti kṛtvā Celā āṇītā | āṇītaṁ paśyāmaḥ <> sā pravesitā | rājā ā drṣṭaṁ atira rūpayauvanasampannaṁ hārī strīvi(r₁₀)ṣaye | sahaḍarṣanād¹¹₄ eva rājā ākṣiptaḥ kathayati | bhavantah yo hi putraḥ pitaṁ gḥatayati¹¹₅ sa rājyahetoḥ <> yadi me putro bhavisyaṁ tasyā¹¹₆ jātasyaivāhaṁ paṭṭabandhaṁ karisyāṁti | tatas tena mahatā śrīsamudayena pariṇītā <> Videhaviśayād āṇītā Vaidehiṁ (2₄₄v₁) saṃjñā saṃvṛtta • sa tayā sārdharā kriḍati ramate paričārayati |

---

105 GM: ukta (w.r.).
106 GM iii.2,12 n.1: kṛṣṭā (w.r.).
107 kasya: on genitive used in place of a dative (see BHSG, 46, §7.63). GM: kasmai (w.r.).
108 Vaiśālakaih prṣṭaḥ: s.e. for Vaiśālakair drṣṭaḥ. GM: Vaiśālakair drṣṭaḥ (w.r.).
109 jīvitenācchādayāṁ: see above n.15.
110 nivarttathetī: on the imperative 2nd person plural ending -thā, see BHSG, 132, §§26.12–13. GM: nivartetī (w.r.).
111 muṇcata sannāhaṁ: this seems to be Gopa’s words, despite the absence of the quotation marker iti.
112 GM: ṣpayatetī (w.r.).
113 durmnānaḥ: nom. sg. masc. of durmanas; see SWTF, fasc.14, 463, s.v. dur-manas (“betrübt, traurig; verdrieβlich”). GM: durmanā (w.r.).
114 sahaḍarṣanād: see SWTF, fasc. 25, 359, s.v. saha-daṛṣanāt (“gleich beim Anblick”).
115 gḥatayati: a denominative verb stemming from the noun gḥāta (“killing, slaying”); see SWTF, fasc.11, 203, s.v. gḥataya.
116 tasyā: on tasyā as a variant form of tasya, see BHSG, 53, §8.58.
[§9] yāvad apareṇa samayena rājā Bimbisāro mṛgayāṅirgataḥ¹¹⁷ ⬃ anyatamasmiṃ cāśramapade rṣiḥ paṃcābhiḥjaḥ prativasati • yāvan mṛgaś śaraparamparayā santrāṣitaḥ tasya ṛṣer āśramapada[ā]ṁ¹¹⁸ praviṣya nirgaḥ(v2)to rājñā śareṇa marmanī tāditaḥ ⬃ tato (’) sau rṣiḥ krudhāḥ kathayati | kalirāja mama caṇḍamṛgo (’)py āśramapadām pariharati ⬃ tavya tu śaraṇopagato mṛgaḥ praghāṭita iti • sa ca rājā evam rṣiṇā paribhāṣyate ⬃ balakāyaś cāgataḥ kathayati ⬃ deva ko (’)yam paribhāṣyate • (v3) rājā kathayati ⬃ aham bhavanto | yo rājāṁ paribhāṣate tasya ko daṇḍaḥ deva ⬃ tasya badho daṇḍaḥ ⬃ yady evam parityakto me ayaṃ rṣiḥ sa praghāṭayitum¹¹⁹ ārabdhaḥ ⬃ sa praghāṭyamāno mithyāpranidhānaṃ¹²⁰ karoti | yad aham anena kalirājena adūṣyapakārī¹²¹ badhya utsṛṣṭaḥ tatro(v4)papadyeyam yatprāṇaṁ jīvitaḥ vyaparopayeyam | punas saṃlakṣayati | rājāna ete suguptās sugopitaḥ ⬃ yady aham anyatropapattiṃ grahiṣyāmi¹²² kadā cit pratyaayaṃ nārāgaiṣyāmi • sarvathā anena me prāṇidhānena asyaivāgramahīṣyā kuksāv upapattis syād iti • sa (v5) mithyāpranidhānam kṛtvā Celāyāḥ kuksāv upapannah ⬃

[§10] yam eva divaḥśam pratisandhir grīñītas tam eva divasam rudhiravarsam pati- tam* ⬃ Celāyāḥ ca dohasad samupannah ⬃ aho batāhaṃ devasya prṣṭhya[варv]ṛṇya¹²³ utpāyotpāta bhakṣayeyam iti • eṣa ca vrīḍā(v6)nto rājñē niveditaḥ ⬃ rājñā naimittikā āhūya prṣṭh<ch> ⬃ ta ucūr ⬃ deva o yo (’)yam satvo devyāḥ kuksim avakrāntas tasyāyaṃ anubhāva iti • rājā cintāpāro vyavasthitāḥ ⬃ katham asyā dohadāḥ prativinod-yatei | aparaiḥ kuṣalajātiyaiḥ samākhyaṭaṃ* ⬃ deva tūli(v7)kāya[m] māṃsaśpūraṇaḥ-yāḥ pravrtya¹²⁴ devyāḥ ātmānāṃ upanayeti • tato rājñāḥ māṃsaśpūrṇāyah tūlikāya ātmānaṃ vēṣṭayītvā Celāyāḥ upānāṃhitam* ⬃ tasyāḥ prṣṭhamāṃsram iti kṛtvā bhakṣitaṃ* ⬃ tatās tasyāḥ yo dohadah sa prativigataḥ ⬃ bhūyo (’)py asyā dohada utp[a](v8)ṁnah ⬃ aho batāhaṃ devasya rudhiram pibeyam¹²⁵ iti • etad api rājñē niveditaṃ | tato rājñāḥ paṃcāṅkikāṁ¹²⁶ śīrāḥ¹²⁷ mociyaṭvā¹²⁸ rudhiram pāyītā ⬃ so (’)py asyā dohadah prativigataḥ ⬃ yāvat paripūrṇair navabhir māṣaḥ prasūtā ⬃ dārakā jātaḥ abhirūpo darśānyāḥ prāsādikāḥ ⬃

¹¹⁷ mṛgayāṅirgataḥ: there are two possibilities to interpret the manuscript at this point — either as the compound mṛgayāṅ-irgataḥ, or as mṛgayāḥ <m> irgataḥ (The anusvāra has been forgotten).

¹¹⁸ GM: āśramapadān (w.r.). The following word praviṣya is missing in GM.

¹¹⁹ GM: praghāṭitum (w.r.).

¹²⁰ mithyāpranidhānaṃ: a compound; see BHSD, 432, s.v. mithyā-pranidhāna (“a wrong, improper, earnest wish”). GM: mithyā pranidhānaṃ (w.r.).

¹²¹ adūṣyapakārī: a compound; on adūṣy-anapakārī (“doing no wrong and not offending”), see BHSD, 11, s.v. adūṣya. GM: adūṣaṇam akārī (w.r.).

¹²² Here iti may have been used to indicate the preceding hypothesis (yady aham ... grahiṣyāmi); on this function of iti, see SWTF, fasc. 4, 314, s.v. *iti (c).

¹²³ prṣṭhya[варv]ṛṇya: see above n.20. GM: prṣṭhamāṃsān (w.r.).

¹²⁴ tūlikāya[m] māṃsaśpūraṇaḥ-yāḥ pravrtya: see above n.21. GM: tūlikāyāṃ māṃsaśpūrṇāṃ pravrtyān (w.r.).

¹²⁵ GM: piveyaṃ (w.r.); the verb ṣvīp does not exist.

¹²⁶ GM: paṃcāṅkikāḥ (w.r.). Citing Dutt’s incorrect reading, Edgerton comments that inkhika (or ṭukk) is “of unknown mg. [= meaning]” (see BHSD, 113, s.v. inkhika).

¹²⁷ GM: śīrā (w.r.).

¹²⁸ On the gerund ending -ītvā, where the initial i represents a Middle Indic feature, see BHSG, 173, §§35.22–23.
The word *divase* is missing in GM.

130 *pitā*: s.e. (?) for *pitaram*. GM: *pitaram* (w.r.).
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『根本説一切有部』「衣事」およびジャイナ教白衣派文献における
ビンビサーラ／シュレーニカとアジャータシャトル／クーニカの物語

呂 娟

マガダ国王ビンビサーラ／シュレーニカとその息子アジャータシャトル／クーニカは、
アッガ、マハーヴィーラと同時代の重要人物として、古代インドの仏教・ジャイナ教両文
献に頻繁に取材される存在である。両教の资料比較においても、アジャータシャトル／
クーニカが父王を幽閉し死に至らしめた物語については、各伝承の平行関係がすでに手厚
く検証されている。しかしこの父子にまつわる他の物語群については、充分に吟味されて
きたとは言い難い。本稿は、仏教・ジャイナ教白衣派伝承において継続して叙述され
る三つの様々 — ビンビサーラ／シュレーニカとチェーラー／チェッラナー（＝ヴァイ
デーハー）の結婚、アジャータシャトル／クーニカの復讐心を抱く聖人／苦行者としての
前生、それに続くチェーラー／チェッラナーの母胎への再生 — について、初めて比較
研究を試みるものである。三様々の仏教・白衣派両ヴァージョンが基本的な内容を共有す
ることは、すでに両側面から指摘されているものの、管見の限り両ヴァージョンを一に
比較検討し、その平行と相違を検証した試みはない。これら三様々がアジャータシャトル
／クーニカの父王幽閉の様式の背景を構成していることに鑑みれば、本稿は、この父子の
人物像の矛盾を起点として、仏教とジャイナ教の説話伝承の全体像把握に資する手がかり
を供しろうと考える。

本稿は三部から構成される。第一部は『根本説一切有部律』「衣事」所収の三様々の翻
訳・分析である。当部では、アジャータシャトルの前生と、それに続くチェーラーの母胎
への転生の様々は「衣事」のみならず他の仏教文献にも表れるが、「衣事」はこれら三様々
をビンビサーラとチェーラーの結婚の様々と結合する現存唯一の仏教文献であり、かつ
この結合こそがジャイナ教白衣派文献との平行を示すことを論ずる。

第二部では、白衣派所伝の三文、ジナダーダ（6-7世紀）の『アーヴァシュヤ・チュー
ルニ』、ハリバドラ（8世紀）の『アーヴァシュヤ・ティーカー』、ヘーマチャンドラ（11–12
世紀）の『トリシャシュティシプラーカーブルシャチャリタ』所収の三様々を検証する。
本部では『アーヴァシュヤ・チュールニ』所収の三様々が白衣派所伝テキスト中で現存最
古のものであることを論じた上で、これを全訳する。ハリバドラ版は基本的に『アーヴァ
シュヤ・チュールニ』所収話と同一であり、ヘーマチャンドラ版は三様々の連続が異なっ
ているものの、各様々内の話型は前二者と同様である。

第三部では、「衣事」所収の仏教般三様々と白衣派所伝のそれを比較し、両ヴァージョ
ンが全編の内容・構造において注目すべき平行関係を持つこと、細部においては明白な相
違を見せることを明らかにする。そしてこの平行関係をもとに、アジャータシャトル／
クーニカとその両親を物語る説話伝承は仏教教とジャイナ教教に共有されており、そこで
は有名な父王幽閉の様々が、彼の前生譚、両親の結婚とその誕生の様々と不可分に結びつ
いていた可能性について考察する。