




## On the Sources of the *Nāgakumārāvadāna* of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*

Xiaoqiang Meng\*

**Abstract:** In this paper, three kinds of Nāgakumāra narratives in the Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions are discerned: 1. *vālukā* ('gravel'); 2. *pravrajyā* ('going-forth'); 3. *mithyāprañidhāna* ('wrong-wish'). The 60<sup>th</sup> chapter of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (BAK) titled *Nāgakumārāvadāna* is identified as the less known *vālukā* story. By close reading of 11 verses in the *Nāgakumārāvadāna* while comparing with the parallel texts in the 55<sup>th</sup> chapter of the *Karmaśataka* (KŚ) titled *Klu* and related passages in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinyaya Pravrajyāvastu* (MPV), I argue that the Nāgakumāra story in the BAK is textually more akin to KŚ than MPV. Moreover, I argue that Kṣemendra fully and actively utilized available sources ranging from KŚ to *Mūlasarvāstivādavinyaya-vastus* when producing a new tradition of Buddhist narrative literature, i.e., BAK.

**Keywords:** *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, *Nāgakumārāvadāna*, *Karmaśataka*, *Mūlasarvāstivādavinyaya Pravrajyāvastu*

---

\*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7834-0425>. Sincere thanks are due to Prof. Liu Zhen, Prof. Kiyoshi Okano, Prof. Martin Straube, Prof. Jonathan A. Silk, Dr. Li Channa and Dr. Péter-Dániel Szántó, as well as the colleagues and friends present at the 12<sup>th</sup> International Indology Graduate Research Symposium at Vienna from 22<sup>nd</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> in July, 2021.

## 1. Introduction

As an exemplar of Indo-Tibetan Buddhist *belles-lettres*,<sup>1</sup> the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* (hereafter, BAK) has long attracted scholars' attention. Its author Kṣemendra (ca. 990—after 1065) was born and raised in a noble Brahmin family in Kashmir and was educated in diverse Hindu studies, and his composition of the BAK had great influence upon mediaeval Buddhist literature.<sup>2</sup> For a long time scholars have been investigating the sources Kṣemendra used to compile this anthology of Buddhist *jātakas* and *avādānas*,<sup>3</sup> and have proved his close relationship with the Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions despite of a generally heterogeneous situation regarding textual sources.<sup>4</sup> This paper offers another case study investigating the sources Kṣemendra used. By focusing on the 60<sup>th</sup> chapter *Nāgakumāravadāna* (hereafter, NK), I argue that the Nāgakumāra story in BAK is textually more akin to the 55<sup>th</sup> chapter, *Klu*, of the *Karmaśataka* (Tib. *Las brgya tham pa*, hereafter, KŚ)<sup>5</sup> than to the parallel passages of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Pravrajyāvastu* (hereafter, MPV). Therefore, Kṣemendra possibly employed KŚ as his textual source when compiling BAK, a hypothesis already forwarded by Okano (2008) and Straube (2009), and this paper tries to add more evidence. Moreover, apart from NK, Kṣemendra substantially relied upon KŚ when compiling several other chapters of BAK, and he seemed to take a more than flexible approach to recreate a Buddhist narrative based on multiple sources.

1 Van der Kuijp (1996: esp. 401–402); Lin (2011: esp. 11–13).

2 For the latest studies with further references on Kṣemendra and his *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* in general, see Formigatti (2019); Straube (2015).

3 For an updated discussion on, as well as a complete bibliography of, the Buddhist narrative literature in the form of *jātaka* and *avādāna*, see Li (2019: 21n5 and n10).

4 As mentioned in Somendra's epilogue to BAK, Kṣemendra was assisted by a Buddhist *ācārya* named Vīryabhadra when compiling BAK, and the latter might be the informant Kṣemendra consulted for the Buddhist narrative sources. Cf. Formigatti (2019); Straube (2015); Straube (2009: 344–345).

5 The original Indic version of the KŚ is lost today, and we can only make use of its Tibetan translation, which already existed in the 8<sup>th</sup> century AD at the latest. KŚ has a close relationship with the Sarvāstivāda school and especially the Mūlasarvāstivāda school. See Feer (1891); Matsumoto (2001); Silk (2008b: 180); Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (2015: 146–147, 311n231); Straube (2015); Jampal & Fischer (2020).

## 2. NK and the *Nāgakumāra* stories in the Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions

The NK story in BAK is a typical Buddhist *avādāna* narrating how an originally non-Buddhist living being grows faith in the Buddha and becomes a pious patron giving generous donations, and thereby obtains the final salvation. It relates that the protagonist Sudhana, a young Nāga (‘serpent’) prince, at first resorts to the Buddha’s refuge for the sake of a more urgent need, i.e., to pacify the destined calamity that Nāgas are born to suffer from the hot gravel falling on and blazing their bodies. The story teaches a lesson exactly based on this key plot point that, as summarized in the opening verse, only the Buddha’s refuge and moral precepts can save bodies and souls that are endlessly suffering either from afflictions or from hell fire.<sup>6</sup> As described in a nutshell in Somendra’s content verse, this story tells how to attain appeasement from the destined ‘wound’ (*vyadha*) as for Nāgas.<sup>7</sup>

The entire story goes as follows: The Nāga king Dhana lives in the sea with his family, but the daily falling of hot gravel tortures all the Nāgas living there (verses 2–3). One day, his beloved son Sudhana comes to consult him about the origin of this fated misery and an antidote (verses 4–6), and gets the reply that only Buddhist moral precepts (*śikṣāpada*) could save them from this fate (verses 7–13). Therefore, Sudhana sets out to the Jetavana Grove in Śrāvastī where the Buddha abides at that time. Once arrived, he is deeply struck when beholding the great marks of the Buddha’s appearance, and immediately pays sincere homage (verses 14–23). Afterwards, the Buddha bestows upon Sudhana the moral precepts and permits him to patronize the Buddhist communities (verses 24–26). Thereafter, because of his gener-

6 *iha kaṣaṭi śarīraṃ kleśarāśir narāṇāṃ dahati ca paraloke nārakaḥ krūravahniḥ | śaraṇagamanapūṇyaprāptiśikṣāpadānāṃ prabhavati na tu dehe duḥkhadāhaḥ kadācit ||* ‘Here (in this world), a heap of affliction harms the human body, and in the other world, the fierce hellish fire burns. However, the burning of sorrow might never come forth in the bodies of (those who) have the merits to go to (the Buddha’s) refuge and have (the powers) to obtain moral precepts.’ All quotations of the text of the NK in this paper are cited from Meng (2020) unless the source is stated separately.

7 Das et al. (1888–1918: xxxvi–xxxvii): *nāgaśāntim vyadhāc ca yaḥ; gang giṣ klu ni zhi bar mdzad.*

ous donations to the Buddhist communities and his meticulous service to the Buddha during the journey of the Buddhist community to the Kalandaka Grove in Rājagṛha (verses 27–31), Sudhana is prophesied to be reborn as a Pratyekabuddha named Supraṇihita in the future (verse 32).<sup>8</sup>

The NK was frequently identified by many scholars as the same story as the 24<sup>th</sup> chapter of the *Divyāvadāna* (hereafter, DIV) titled *Nāgakumārāvadāna* and its MPV parallel,<sup>9</sup> but in the tradition of the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*, especially and perhaps only in the *Pravrajyāvastu*, there are three different stories in which a certain ‘Nāgakumāra’ is a protagonist, and the NK in the BAK only fits the first one (see **table 1**).<sup>10</sup> These stories tell several independent tales, and even though in MPV these Nāgakumāra narratives are collated together and shaped into one sequence of events in the form of the stories of the past (*atītavastu*) and the present (*pratyutpannavastu*), they might have different origins since each of them has parallel texts that are either fuller in content or earlier in date.

In the table below I summarize their general plots with three keywords: 1. *vālukā* (‘gravel’); 2. *pravrajyā* (‘going-forth’); and 3. *mithyā-*

8 For the latest critical edition of the Sanskrit text (based on the earliest Sanskrit manuscripts) and Tibetan translation (Derge 4155, Peking 5655) of the NK as well as the English and Chinese translations, see Meng (2020). For the introduction to the newly discovered Sanskrit manuscripts, see Liu (2019). The Sanskrit-Tibetan edition of the NK by Bhattacharya (1939: 137–151, 295–303) mostly repeated the text of the *editio princeps* of Das et al. (1888–1918). For a summary of the main plots of NK as well as a complete Japanese translation of the whole story, see Hikita (2007: 125–132).

9 Cowell & Neil (1886: 344–346); Vaidya (1999: 213–214); Hiraoka (2007: 1–50, 61); Vogel & Wille (2014: 147–211); Rotman (2017: 157–161, 386–388); Miller (2018: §§ 4.312–329). For the study on the relationship between DIV and *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*, see Panglung (1981: xv–xvii); Hiraoka (1998: 419–420, 426, 431); Straube (2015); Sirisawad (2019: 34). According to Sirisawad (2019: 40–42n65), in the earliest manuscript (ca. 11<sup>th</sup> century) of DIV there seems to be no *Nāgakumārāvadāna* attested yet, thus we have no idea about its nature and the relation to the NK.

10 It seems that only Panglung (1981: 8, 10) distinguished three kinds of Nāgakumāra stories in MPV and equated the NK of BAK with its parallel passage of the Tibetan version of the MPV. Ware (1938) translated the first and second kinds of Nāgakumāra narrative based on Tibetan and Chinese texts but overlooked the parallel texts in NK and KŚ. Hikita (2007: 125) has already noticed that NK is very different from the 24<sup>th</sup> chapter of DIV in content, but he does not write further on this issue.

*praṇidhāna* (‘wrong-wish’), and give their *loci classici* attested in MPV, DIV and BAK, as well as other parallel texts. As seen in **table 1**, the three kinds of *Nāgakumāra* narratives are: 1) *vālukā*, which tells the story of a *Nāga* who resorts to the Buddha to be rescued from the hot-gravel torture; 2) *pravrajyā*, by which it is regulated that the so-called phantom creature (*nirmita*, *sprul pa*, ‘an animal able to transform itself into a human being’) is not allowed to go forth as a Buddhist monk;<sup>11</sup> 3) *mithyāpraṇidhāna*, which relates the story of a young monk who makes an unwholesome wish to be reborn as a *Nāga* for revenge.

Nāgakumāra Stories	BAK	MPV			DIV	Other Sources
		Skt.	Tib.	Chin.		
Nāgakumāra 1 <i>vālukā</i>	§ 60	—	Eimer 1983, ii, pp. 247,17–249.3		—	T749 [XVII] 565c6–8 (?) <sup>12</sup> ; KŚ § 55, Derge 340 <i>ha</i> 189a5–193b5; RM <sup>13</sup>
Nāgakumāra 2 <i>pravrajyā</i>	—	Vogel & Wille 2014, pp.201–205	Eimer 1983, ii, pp. 249.4–255.15		—	Pali Vin. i, 86.36–88.3; T749 [XVII] 565c6–566a9 (?) <sup>14</sup> ; T1435 [XXIII] 154a27–b16
Nāgakumāra 3 <i>mithyāpraṇidhāna</i>	—	Vogel & Wille 2014, pp.162–165, 175–179	Eimer 1983, ii, pp. 302.1–306.25	T1444 [XXIII] 1037c23–1038b27	§ 24	T208 [IV] 533c19–534a7 (?)

**Table 1:** *Nāgakumāra* stories in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* traditions<sup>15</sup>

11 Vogel & Wille (2014: 98n13).

12 Rf. fn.21.

13 *Ratnamālāvadāna*: BNF N<sup>os</sup> 104–105 (ff. 269a1.2–272b1.4), Filliozat (1941: 74–75); Cambridge Ms. Add. 1615 (f. 7r1–6), (Formigatti and Cuneo: <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01615/1>, last access: 28.09.2022); Tokyo University No. 34 (Matsunami New No. 027) (f. 215b4–7), Matsunami (1965: 12). This story is not yet collected in the critical edition of the *Ratnamālāvadāna*, cf. Takahata (1954).

14 Rf. fn. 21.

15 As for the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the MPV, I use the critical editions by Vogel & Wille (2014) and Eimer (1983) respectively, and here in the table I give the *locus classicus* of the text in their editions. As for the Chinese Tripiṭaka, I use

As we can see, only the Tibetan version of the MPV contains all three Nāgakumāra narratives, and furthermore arranges them into one coherent sequence of events with the insertion of two other episodes which are about: 1) a group of six disciples (*ṣaḍvārgika*) and 2) Saṃgharakṣita.<sup>16</sup> And, as Vogel & Wille (2014: 98) have mentioned, the Nāgakumāra narratives are taken to be the ‘frame story’ for the Saṃgharakṣita<sup>17</sup> story in MPV, with the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Nāgakumāra Stories to be the story of the present, while the 3<sup>rd</sup> the story of the past.<sup>18</sup> However, the Sanskrit version (Or. 11878A, British Library) of the MPV only contains the third *mithyāpraṇidhāna* story, which is parallel to the 24<sup>th</sup> chapter of DIV, the Chinese version (T 1444) of MPV and an episode of a Chinese *avadāna*-anthology (T 208).<sup>19</sup> In a Turfan Sanskrit fragment (SHT 1030) we could locate the 2<sup>nd</sup> of the Nāgakumāra narratives of the MPV. And there is also a Kučā Sanskrit fragment (Pelliot Sanskrit: Numéro Rouge 12.2) which records the same story yet belonging to the Sarvāstivāda tradition.<sup>20</sup> It seems that the 2<sup>nd</sup> *pravrajyā* narrative is thematically more relevant to the *Pravrajyāvastu* context by which the phantom creature is

---

the *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. As for the Pali Buddhist text, I use the editions of Pali Text Society.

- 16 Panglung (1981: 8–10). The insertion of two episodes happens to be the chapters 23 and 25 of DIV. The Sanskrit manuscript Or. 11878A of MPV is incomplete, as ‘[t]he whole former part of the Nāgakumāravadāna and roughly the first quarter of the Saṃgharakṣitāvadāna have been lost in the original Sanskrit’ (Vogel & Wille 2014: 98), therefore we do not have the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> of the Nāgakumāra stories in Sanskrit. Moreover, the Chinese translation of MPV (T 1444) available today is also incomplete, and the part lost is rather close to its Sanskrit counterpart, i.e., the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> of the Nāgakumāra narratives as well as the former part of *Saṃgharakṣitāvadāna*, except that the Chinese text is a little bit fuller than the Sanskrit fragment. Cf. Kishino (2013: 15n38).
- 17 For the latest critical edition of the Sanskrit text (based on the earliest Sanskrit manuscripts) and Tibetan translation (Derge 4155, Peking 5655) of the *Saṃgharakṣitāvadāna* as well as the English and Chinese translations, see Meng (2020).
- 18 Cf. Panglung (1981: 8); Eimer (1983: i, 30). However, Vogel & Wille (2014: 98, 153) do not distinguish between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 1<sup>st</sup> of the Nāgakumāra stories.
- 19 To my knowledge, it seems that no scholar of DIV has equated the chapter 24 *Nāgakumāravadāna* of DIV to the story 10 of 眾經撰雜譬喻 (*Zhongjing zhuan za piyu*, T 208).
- 20 Vogel & Wille (2014: 201–205, 206–211).

forbidden to become a Buddhist monk, since we could also attest the same tale type in the Pali Vinaya text, in the Chinese translation of *Sarvāstivādivinaya* 十誦律 (*Shisonglü*, T 1435), and also in 佛說因緣僧護經 (*Foshuo yinyuan senghu jing*, T 749), which is another Chinese translation of *Nāgakumāravadāna* and *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*.<sup>21</sup> As for the 1<sup>st</sup> *Nāgakumāra* narrative, it is less frequently found among the existing Buddhist literature than the other two stories, because we can only attest the complete version of the story in BAK (with its descendent version in RM)<sup>22</sup> and in KŚ, and even in the Tibetan MPV this tale is partially translated: here the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> *vālukā* narrative is taken as the introductory background for the 2<sup>nd</sup> *pravrajyā* narrative. Thus, it seems that in Tibetan MPV the 1<sup>st</sup> *Nāgakumāra* narrative breaks up half way and switches to the 2<sup>nd</sup> suddenly. And after comparing the openings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> *Nāgakumāra* narrative in Tibetan MPV, Pali Vinaya, T 749 and T 1435, we have reasonable doubts on the origin of the 1<sup>st</sup> in the Tibetan MPV (Cf. Appendix 1).

Anyway, the NK in the BAK only represents the 1<sup>st</sup> *Nāgakumāra* story instead of stories 2 or 3, and the KŚ, which is the fullest version of the 1<sup>st</sup> *vālukā* narrative, together with the abridged version in Tibetan MPV, might be its literary source, which I will prove in the next section. However, given the fact that Kṣemendra actively employed the MPV as the source for some chapters of BAK,<sup>23</sup> and when writing the 67<sup>th</sup> chapter *Samgharakṣitāvadāna* he closely followed the *Samgharakṣita* story in MPV which is located exactly in the same section as with all types of *Nāgakumāra* narratives,<sup>24</sup> it is quite puzzling that he chose this *vālukā*

21 Pali Vin. i: 86.36–88.3; Horner (1962: 110–112); Vogel (1926: 187–189); Warren (1953: 401–402). As for whether T 749 is cognate with MPV as belonging to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* traditions, it seems that Ware (1938) and Vogel & Wille (2014) both skip the question and take it for granted to use the T 749 for reference, but a simple glance of the text of *Samgharakṣitāvadāna* and partly of the *Nāgakumāra* stories in T 749 and Tibetan MPV would make it clear that T 749 is quite different from Tibetan MPV, and therefore it might belong to a different Buddhist school.

22 As for the relationship between BAK and the *Avadānamālā* genre in Nepal, see Okano (2005).

23 For example, chapter 19 *Śāriputrapravrajyāvadāna* and chapter 82 *Nārakapūrvikāvadāna*. Rf. Okano (2013: 162–186); Panglung (1981: 5–6, 10–11).

24 Cf. Meng (2020: 92–129).

version to write his only version of Nāgakumāra story instead of other options. Why did he not choose the *mithyāprañidhāna* story which seems more prevalent in the Buddhist literary world, more dramatic in story-plots, and more instructive in Buddhist ethics? Could it be possible that Kṣemendra actually did not have access to the full volumes of MPV, but instead only had certain stories derived from MPV available to him as separate texts?<sup>25</sup> This might be a question no one could answer now, but anyway, Kṣemendra composed his NK based on the 1<sup>st</sup> *vālukā* story, and in the following section I will compare his recomposed version with the possible source texts, the 55<sup>th</sup> chapter, *Klu*, of the KŚ and the incomplete version preserved in Tibetan MPV, so as to scrutinize the textual relation of NK, KŚ and MPV, as well as to better understand Kṣemendra's approach to representing his sources.

### 3. A comparative analysis of NK, KŚ and Tibetan MPV

#### 3.1 Verse 2

*dhananāmā samudrānte nāgo 'bhūd bahubāndhavaḥ |*  
*phaṅāratnojjvalālokakalitāpūrvavāsaraḥ || 2<sup>6</sup>*

‘Once in the sea there was a Nāga named Dhana living with many kinsmen. The splendid light of the gems on his serpent-hood impelled an unprecedented daybreak.’<sup>27</sup>

25 This leads me to a hypothesis precedent scholars have formulated that the original MPV Sanskrit manuscripts were already fragmental even during Yijing's period. Regarding the NK story here, I guess that Tibetan translators (and also Kṣemendra) perhaps also faced a fragmental MPV Sanskrit text, so much so that they had to make up a new opening to the 2<sup>nd</sup> *pravrajyā* story when realizing that this part was lost in manuscripts. And Kṣemendra also had to resort to KŚ for his sources. But this relates to a more important question of the origin of MPV, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

26 **2a** *dhananāmā*] ABC1C2ET(=Ed.): *tad yathābhūt R* || °ānte] AC1C2ERT(=Ed.): °āte B. **2b** *nāgo 'bhūd bahubāndhavaḥ*] ABC1C2ET(=Ed.): *nāgo dhanābhīdhāpurā R. 2c* *phaṅā*] ABR(=Ed.): *phaṅa A(a. c.)C1C2ET* || °ojjvalā°] A(°ojjv{ā}lā°)(=V): °ojjvalā° BC1C2ERT(=Ed.). **2d** °*kālitāpūrvavāsaraḥ*] ABC1(°k{ā}litā°)C2ER: °ka li ta pū rbba ba sa raḥ T.

27 *rgya mtsho'i mthar ni nor zhes pa'i || klu ni gnyen mang ldan pa byung ||*  
*gdengs ka'i rin cen rab 'bar gyis || snang bas sngon med nyin mor byas ||*



This is the second verse of the NK, which begins the whole story. It is clear that only in KŚ<sup>28</sup> we could locate the parallel sentence ‘a nāga king called \*Vasu lived in the great ocean’ (*rgya mtsho chen po’i nang na klu’i rgyal po dbyig ces bya ba zhig gnas te*),<sup>29</sup> yet Tibetan MPV simply starts describing Nāgas’ hot-gravel disaster directly without a detailed background.<sup>30</sup> Here in the NK we learn that the Nāga family live ‘in the sea’ (*samudrānte*; *rgya mtsho’i mthar*), which is corroborated by KŚ.<sup>31</sup> And

---

2a mthar ni| mtha’ ni CD. 2c rin cen] δEap: rin chen β | gyis]: gyi CD. 2d nyin mor byas] δEap, cf. deJ.: nyin mo byas β.

- 28 Derge *ha* 189a5–b1: *klu zhes bya ba ni | gleng gzhi mnyan du yod pa na bzhugs te | de’i tsho rgya mtsho chen po’i nang na klu’i rgyal po dbyig ces bya ba zhig gnas te | des klu’i thabs zlar bab pa las chung ma blangs nas | de de dang lhan cig rtse zhing dga’ la dga’ mgur spyod do || de nas phyi zhig na bu khye’u zhig btsas te de’i btsas ston rgyas par byas nas | bu ’di’i ming ji skad gdags zhes ming ’dogs par byed de | bu ’di dbyig gi bu yin pas na | ’di’i ming dbyig bzangs zhes gdags so zhes zer ro || de nas bu dbyig bzangs ’o ma dang zho dang mar dang zhun mar dang mar gyi nying gu rnams kyis bskyed bsrings nas | de cher skyes te ’gro nus par gyur to.* ‘When the Blessed One was in Śrāvastī, a nāga king called \*Vasu (dbyig) lived in the great ocean. When the time came for him to marry he took a nāga wife, and they enjoyed themselves and coupled. One day she gave birth to a child, and at the elaborate feast celebrating his birth they asked, “What name should we give this child?” And they named him, saying, “Since this is \*Vasu’s child, his name will be \*Vasubhadra (dbyig bzang).” Young \*Vasubhadra was reared on milk, yogurt, butter, ghee, and milk solids, and he grew up, and learned to get around’ (tr. Jamspal and Fischer 2020: § 4.112, bold script and modified by Xiaoqiang Meng).
- 29 While Jamspal and Fischer (2020) reconstructed the name *dbyig* as \**Vasu*, the French translation of KŚ by Léon Feer (1891: 228–229) reconstructed it as \**Nidhi*; and the son’s name *dbyig bzang* here is reconstructed as \**Vasubhadra*, but Feer reconstructed it as \**Bhadranidhi*. In NK the names are *Dhana* (*nor*) and *Sudhana* (*nor bzang*) respectively.
- 30 Eimer (1983: ii, 247.17–18): *sangs rgyas bcom lan ’das mnyan yod na rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga’ rab na bzhugs so.* ‘While the Blessed Buddha was staying at Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍada’s Park near Śrāvastī...’ (tr. Miller 2018: § 4.113).
- 31 While *ante* could be rendered as ‘within, inside’ (PW s.v. *anta*, BHSD s.v. *ante*), I don’t know whether Kṣemendra took it this way, or simply rendered the whole compound *samudrānte* as ‘the end of sea’, i.e., sea-shore, but if he did follow the KŚ as his source, he might be less likely to employ an obscure wording like *ante* here. But Tibetan translation here *mthar* could be interpreted as inner part

further comparison shows that in the NK there are no cliché details as seen in KŚ, such as Dhana’s marriage as well as the birth and naming ceremony of their son Sudhana, but instead other details are added, such as the ‘the gems on his serpent-hood’ (*phaṇāratna*; *gdengs ka’i rin cen*) here. Kṣemendra’s approach to represent his sources is always a topic attracting scholars, since he could sometimes closely follow or even copy his sources, but other times he deleted details according to his own preference or added details out of somewhere.<sup>32</sup> Here the *phaṇāratna* detail can also be found in the 53<sup>th</sup> chapter *Subhāṣitagaveṣyavadāna* of BAK,<sup>33</sup> and it might be his own poetic embellishment he added immediately when rephrasing this plot.<sup>34</sup>

### 3.2 Verses 3–4

*papātāharniṣaṃ tasya bhavane taptavālukā |*  
*yayāṅgeṣu bhujāṅgānām tīvratāpavyathābhavat || 3*  
*kadācit sudhano nāma putraḥ papraccha taṃ priyaḥ |*  
*sukumāraḥ prakṛtyaiva vālukāparipīḍitaḥ || 4<sup>35</sup>*

(WTS s.v. *mtha*’), so we supposed that the Tibetan translators (therefore, also Kṣemendra?) understood *ante* this way. Also, cf. *samudre ’smin*; *rgya mtsho ’di na* in the verse 6 below.

- 32 E.g., Lüders (1930/1940: 44/637); Straube (2006: 32, 35–36); Silk (2008a: 138, 172–175).
- 33 *vyālāḥ phaṇāratnaruciṃ dadhānāḥ krūraṃ tamaḥ krodhamayaṃ vahanti*; *gdengs ka’i rin chen mdzes ’dzin sbrul rnam ni | gdug pa’i mun pa khro ba’i rang bzhin ’dzin*. ‘Schlangen, die mit den Juwelen in ihren Hauben Glanz verbreiten, haben eine bösertige, aus Zorn bestehende Finsternis in sich.’ (ed. & tr. Straube 2009: 158–159, 277).
- 34 This cliché description of Nāgas’ gems can also be attested in the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Madhyamasvayambhūpurāna* with a similar wording, such as *tatra nāgādhipāraktastakṣakākhyah sukāntimān | samujjvalanmahāratnaṃ śrīmatphaṇo vibhūṣitaḥ* (verse 7); *tatra nāgopalālākhyo pītavarṇṇo mahākṛtiḥ | divyaratnaprabhojvāśrīmatphaṇāvibhūṣitaḥ* (verse 43). Cf. <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01469/236> [accessed 22 June 2021]. Sincere thanks are due to Dr. Felix Otter for reminding me of and providing the text.
- 35 **3b** *taptavālukā*] AC1C2ERT(=Ed.): *saptavālukā* B. **3c** *bhujāṅgānām*] ABC1C2ER(=Ed.): *bhu jaṃ gā mā nām* T. **3d** *tīvratāpavyathā*] ABC1C2ERT(ti bra tā pa bya thām)(=Ed.): *tīvratāvyathā* V || ‘ābhavat] BC2R(=Ed.): ‘ābhavata AC1T.

‘Hot gravel fell in his residence day and night, thus severe torment kept torturing the bodies of the serpents. Once his beloved son whose name was Sudhana, tender by nature (yet) suffered from the gravel (from youth), asked him.’<sup>36</sup>

Verses 3 and 4 introduce the inciting incident that furthers the story: the destined torture of the hot gravel (*taptavālukā*; *bye tshan dag*). We soon notice that in KŚ<sup>37</sup> the sands fall ‘three times each day and three times each night’ (*nyin dus gsum mtshan dus gsum du*), while in MPV<sup>38</sup> the fiery sands come ‘three times each day’ (*nyin mo ... .. lan gsum*), and it seems

---

4a kadācit] ABC1ERT(=Ed.): kadāci, <ta>° C2. 4b papraccha tam] ABC1C2ER(=Ed.): pra ccha tām T. 4c prakṛtyaiva] BC2R(=Ed.), cf. Ś (nyid): prakṛtyeva AC1ET.

- 36 *de yi khang par nyin mtshan du || bye tshan dag ni babs gyur te ||  
gang gis lag 'gro rnam kyī lus || gdung ba drag pos nyen par gyur ||  
nor bzang zhes bya gces pa'i bu || rang bzhin nyid kyis rab gzhon pa ||  
bye mas yongs su gzir gyur pas || nam zhig de la rab tu dris ||*

3b babs gyur te] δ(TTdp)Eap: bab gyur te β. 3d nyen par gyur]: nyin par gyur Q.

- 37 Derge *ha* 189b1–2: *klu rnam kyī chos kyis ni nyin dus gsum mtshan dus gsum du lus la klu'i bye ma 'bab ste | gzhi des na de dag gis sdug bsngal drag pa dang mi bzad pa dang tsha ba dang yid du mi 'ong ba'i tshor ba myong bar 'gyur te | bu de byis pa shed ma bye ba'i bar du ni de'i lus la klu'i bye ma de mi 'bab bo || gang gi tshe cher skyes shing shed bye bar gyur pa de'i tshe ni de'i lus la yang klu'i bye ma 'bab par 'gyur te | gzhi des na des sdug bsngal drag pa dang mi bzad pa dang tsha ba dang yid du mi 'ong ba'i tshor ba myong nas | pha ma la dris pa*. ‘Now it is characteristic of the nāgas that **three times each day and three times each night the nāga sands rain down on their bodies**. This causes them to undergo dreadful suffering and extreme, excruciating, unbearable agony. **Until the day the child came into his own, the nāga sands never rained down on his body. But once he had grown and come into his own, the nāga sands rained down on him too** and caused him dreadful suffering and extreme, excruciating, unbearable agony, so he asked his **parents**.’ (tr. Jamspal and Fischer 2020: § 4.113, bold script by Xiaoliang Meng).

- 38 Eimer (1983: ii, 247.18–23): *klu rnam kyī kun tu spyod pa ni lus la nyin mo bye ma me'i mdog lta bu lan gsum 'bab cing | des de dag rus pa'i keng rus tsam zhig lus par byed do || klu gzhon nu skyes nas ring po ma lon pa zhig gi lus la nyin mo bye ma me'i mdog lta bu lan gsum 'bab cing des de rus pa'i keng rus tsam zhig lus par byas pa dang des ma la smras pa*. ‘[It’s the custom of the nāgas that] the nāgas **thrice [each day]** felt fiery sand fall upon them, reducing their bodies to mere skeletons. After fiery sand thrice [each day] fell upon a young nāga **[soon after he was born]**, reducing his body to that of a mere skeleton, he asked his

that NK follows KŚ by using *aharniṣam*; *nyin mtshan du*. About Nāgas' suffering from hot sands, in the 59<sup>th</sup> chapter, *Upoṣadha*, of *Avadānaśataka*, it mentions that hot sands fall seven times day by day, which description is close to MPV except for the times of sand-falling per day.<sup>39</sup>

But when does a Nāga begin to suffer from this? It is told in KŚ that only after fully growing up (*cher skyes shing shed bye bar gyur pa*) will a Nāga be bothered with the fiery sands. But in MPV it is shortly afterwards a Nāga is born (*skyes nas ring po ma lon pa*).<sup>40</sup> This information seems to be processed in a special way by Kṣemendra. In NK the *prakṛtyā* ('by nature') is allocated with *sukumāra* ('tender') by Tibetan translators (*rang bzhin nyid kyis rab gzhon pa*), but in light of the parallel text of MPV, would it be more plausible to pair it also with *vālukāparipīḍita* ('suffered from the gravel'), thereby to interpret the *prakṛtyā* as 'originally' ('from youth') or 'by nature'? Or, Kṣemendra somehow skipped the aforementioned age information after all, and the *prakṛtyā* possibly refers to *klu rnams kyi chos kyis* ('it is characteristic of the nāgas') in KŚ or *klu rnams kyi kun tu spyod pa* ('It's the custom of the nāgas') in MPV, even though both of the Tibetan words might imply their prototype to

---

**mother...**' (tr. Miller 2018: § 4.113, bold script and modification in square brackets by Xiaoqiang Meng).

39 Speyer (1902–1909: iv, 338.10–339.1): *dviṭīyenopavāsaḥ khaṇḍitaḥ | sa kālaṃ kṛtvā nāgeṣūpapannaḥ | tasyopari divase divase saptakṛtvāḥ taptavālukā nipatati yayā so 'sthiṣeṣaḥ kriyate*. Ban de de ba tsan dra sogs kyis bsgyur (1995: 418.2–4): *cig shos kyis ni bsnyen gnas nyams par byas te de ni shi nas klu'i nang du skyes te | de'i steng du nyin gcig bzhin du lan bdun bdun bye tshan bab ste des rus pa 'ba' zhig lus par byed do*. However, in two Chinese translations, this detail is omitted: T 200 [IV] 233a15–1: 求生天者, 即便飲食, 以破齋故, 不果所願, 其後命終, 生于龍中; T 202 [IV] 353c4–5: 願生天者, 由破齋故, 乃生龍中. Another telling allusion comes from the Chinese translation of *Mahāsāṃghikavinaya* 摩訶僧祇律 (*Mohe sengqilü*) which might be the same as MPV mentioning the thrice falling per day of hot sands: T 1425 [XXII] 489a9–15: 商人見龍宮中種種寶物莊嚴宮殿, 商人問言: “汝有如是莊嚴, 用受布薩為?” 答言: “我龍法有五事苦。何等五? 生時龍、眠時龍、姪時龍、瞋時龍、死時龍。一日之中三遇皮肉落地熱沙爆身。”復問: “汝欲求何等?” 答言: “我欲求人道中生。所以者何? 畜生道中苦, 不知法故。” (Bold script by Xiaoqiang Meng).

40 This detail is omitted in Miller (2018: § 4.113) but Ware (1938: 51) translates as 'having been born and having had shortly afterwards [the color of the day of sand, and of fire appear on his body three times]'

be \**dharmatā*?<sup>41</sup> It seems that here Kṣemendra did not follow KŚ but still employed a literarily wording embedded with multiple possibilities of interpretation.

Interestingly, now we spot a typical case where Kṣemendra left the traces of his (careless?) processing of the sources. In NK, Sudhana asks his father about their misfortune (*papraccha tam; de la rab tu dris*),<sup>42</sup> but in KŚ he actually asks his parents (*pha ma la dris pa*), while in MPV he asks his mother (*ma la smras pa*). However, after he gets answered, the verse 14 of NK continues as ‘having heard the words of father and mother’ (*pitur vākyaṃ jananyās ca; pha dang ma yi yang tshig dag*).<sup>43</sup> In KŚ, he also gets answer from and then answers back to his parents (*yab yum*),<sup>44</sup> yet the parallel text in MPV does not specify this detail here but the whole conversation is clearly between him and his mother. Therefore, probably Kṣemendra forgot his former choice to delete the cliché of Dhana’s marriage where the character of his wife is first introduced, also for which he had to rewrite the object Sudhana talks to here in verse 4, but when ending the long conversation in verse 14 he seemed to break the consistency yet simply copied his source, which is KŚ instead of MPV at least regarding this detail. Moreover, after verse 15, the parallel text in MPV abruptly changes to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Nāgakumāra story as said before, so from now on Kṣemendra totally relied on KŚ, and since he cut and pasted

41 Thanks are due to the anonymous reviewer for pointing out the underlying Sanskrit word of the Tibetan words. Cf. § 3.3.

42 Also rf. verse 7: *iti pṛṣṭaḥ sa putreṇa tam uvāca mahāmatiḥ; zhes pa bu yis dris de la || blo gros chen po des smras bu ||*.

43 Rf. § 3.6.

44 Derge *ha* 190a4–5: *klu’i bus smras pa | yab yum bdag gi lhan cig skyes pa’i bye ma’i sdug bsngal ’di zhi bar ’gyur ba ’ba’ zhig gi phyir yang ci nus kyis bsrung bar bgyi’o zhes smras nas | klu’i bu des lha’i me tog ud pa la dang pad ma dang ku mu da dang pad ma dkar po rnam kyis thu ba bkang ste | rgya mtsho chen po’i nang nas mi snang bar gyur nas rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal du phyin pa dang.* “**Mother, Father,**” said the young nāga, “I shall maintain them to the best of my ability, if only to assuage the sufferings of the sands innate to us.” With those words the young nāga filled up the front of his long shirt with divine blue lotus, lotus, white water lily, white lotus, and mandārava flowers, disappeared from beneath the great ocean, and traveled to the garden of Prince Jeta, where the Blessed One sat teaching the Dharma amid a company of hundreds ...’ (tr. Jampal and Fischer 2020: § 4.118, bold script by Xiaoqiang Meng).

many details, some discrepancies within the text could be attested and could only be fully understood by referring to the whole context as preserved in KŚ. But somehow, we can still understand Kṣemendra's rewritten version, and that is because he was a good storyteller.

### 3.3 Verses 5–6

*kasmād asmān iyaṃ tāta bād hate taptavālukā |  
mantramūlaprayogeṇa keneyam upasāmyati || 5  
asmadabhyadhikāḥ kecid asmatpratyavarāḥ pare |  
nāgāḥ santi samudre 'smin duḥkhārtā vayam eva kiṃ || 6<sup>45</sup>*

'Father! Why does this hot gravel (fall and) harass us? Who can stop this in the way rooted in magic? Some (Nāgas) are superior to us, others inferior, (yet they are not suffering like us). Is it only we, the serpents in this sea, who are struck by pains and sorrows?'<sup>46</sup>

From verse 5 to 13, the parallel texts in KŚ and MPV are rather close to each other and much longer, so Kṣemendra abridged long passages and cut out lengthy clichés. Here, for example, in verses 5 and 6 Sudhana raises three separate questions at three occasions to his parents, but Kṣemendra reshaped them into one question and thus avoided extra distraction. In KŚ<sup>47</sup> and MPV<sup>48</sup> the first question is actually about the duration of this hot-

45 **5a** iyaṃ tāta] ABC1C2(iyantā°)ER: i yanta ta T; °iyaṃ tā° Ed. **5b** bād hate] ABC1C2ER(=Ed.): bādha{pta}te C1(a. c.): bā pa te T. **5c** °prayogeṇa] C2, em. V: °prayogena ABC1ERT(=Ed.). **6d** vayam] ABC2ET(=Ed.): {ca bhū}vayam C1.

46 *yab cig bye ma tsha ba 'dis || bdag cag ci slad gdung bar byed ||  
sngags dang rtsa ba'i sbyor ba dag || ci yi nye bar zhi bar 'gyur ||  
'ga' zhig bdag las lhag pa dang || gzhan ni bdag las dman pa yi ||  
klu ni rgya mtsho 'di na gnas || yu nyid sdug bsngal gyis gzir ci ||*

**5a** yab cig] β: ci ga EapTTdp: yab gcig CD: lha cig em. Ed., cf. def. **5d** yi] TTdp, cf. def.:  
yis βCDEap || 'gyur] δEap: gyur β. **6c** klu ni] δEap(=Ed.): klu rnam β.

47 Rf. Derge *ha* 189b2–6 in Appendix 2.

48 Eimer (1983: ii, 247.23–248.13): *ma bdag gis yun ji srid cig tu sdug bsngal 'di lta bu mnag bar bgyi 'tshal | bu ji srid du ris mthun pa yod kyi bar du'o || de na klu rdzu 'phrul che ba dang mthu che ba gzhan gang dag yin pa de dag gi lus la bye ma me'i mdog lta bu mi 'bab nas des smras pa | ma 'di dag la ci'i phyir mi 'bab | mas smras pa | 'di dag ni rdzu 'phrul che ba | mthu che ba | bskal par gnas pa | sa*

sand calamity for Sudhana, while in NK it is about the cause of (and the antidote to) this punishment. Given that in the previous verses 3–4 Kṣemendra omitted the crucial information about the origin of the hot-sand calamity, i.e., Nāgas’ *\*dharma* or *\*samudācāra*,<sup>49</sup> from his sources, it seems consistent and reasonable to raise the question of the origin here in the verses 5–6. Nowhere else had Kṣemendra picked up the question of duration in NK again, and in KŚ and MPV the answer is that Nāgas have to suffer all their lives<sup>50</sup> which somehow contradicts the former passage defining that Nāgas begin to suffer when they are fully grown up (in KŚ) or shortly after being born (in MPV). Could it be possible that Kṣemendra tried to remove this contradiction by simply skipping this question, or by using *prakṛtyā* in verse 4?

The next two questions individually raised in KŚ and MPV are reduced to a half verse in verse 5: *asmadabhyadhikāḥ kecid asmatpratyavarāḥ pare*. Here, two kinds of Nāgas living elsewhere are categorized as those superior (*abhyadhika*; *lhag pa*) and those inferior (*pratyavara*; *dman pa*) to the Nāgas of Sudhana’s family. While in verse 7 Kṣemendra seems to ascribe

---

*’dzin pa | ’dab chags kyi rgyal po ’dab bzañs kyis dbyung bar mi nus pa yin pas de’i phyir ’di dag la mi ’bab bo || de na klu phra mo gzhan gang dag yin pa de dag gi lus la yang bye ma me’i mdog lta bu mi ’bab nas | des smras pa | ma ’di dag la ni rigs na ’di dag la ci’i phyir mi ’bab.* “Mother, **how long must I endure such suffering?**” “Son, **for as long as you are in this life.**” Through all of this, fiery sand had not fallen on other nāgas who **possessed miraculous powers and great might**, prompting him to ask, “Mother, why did it not fall upon them?” His mother replied, “It did not fall upon them because they **possess miraculous powers and great might**; they live for eons and they sustain the earth. Even the garuḍa Suparṇi could not dislodge them.” Through all of this, fiery sand had not fallen on a number of scrawny nāgas either, prompting him to ask, “Mother, why did it not fall upon those of their type?” (tr. Miller 2018: §§ 4.113–115, bold script by Xiaoqiang Meng).

49 Rf § 3.2: *klu rnams kyi chos kyis* (‘it is characteristic of the nāgas’) in KŚ; *klu rnams kyi kun tu spyod pa* (‘It’s the custom of the nāgas’) in MPV. Rf. NEGI s.v. *kun tu spyod pa*; WTS s.v. *kun tu spyod pa*.

50 KŚ: *ji srid du skal ba mnyam pa ’di yod pa*; MPV: *ji srid du ris mthun pa yod kyi bar du*. The anonymous reviewer kindly suggests that ‘the text does not literally say “all their lives” and so can be understood as having the time of the question being asked (when the suffering has already started) as the point of reference.’

both their escapes from the hot sands to their being Buddhist followers,<sup>51</sup> in the parallel texts only those inferior Nāgas are defined so. And those superior Nāgas are spared because of their being great and mighty (*che bar grags pa* in KŚ; *'phrul che ba dang mthu che ba* in MPV).<sup>52</sup>

Even though KŚ and MPV are closer here, it seems that Kṣemendra still chose to follow KŚ more than MPV. As shown in **table 2**, it seems that in BAK as well as in KŚ Sudhana respectively dByig bzang expresses his confused and desperate state more explicitly in the conversation, while in MPV he simply raises questions without any emotional expression. It is *pādas* c and d of verse 6 (*nāgāḥ santi samudre 'smin duḥkhārtā vāyam eva kim*; 'Is it only we, the serpents in this sea, who are struck by pains and sorrows?'), of which the anguished tone is rather similar to KŚ, more so in the context of being compared with Nāgas elsewhere as seen in *pāda* a and b. In KŚ it is told that 'I think we have fallen into a lower realm' (*log par ltung bar gyur pa 'dra na*), which reminds of the *duḥkhārtā vāyam* in verse 6, while in MPV no similar words of moaning can be attested. Also, in KŚ it says: 'Mother, Father, are you telling me that these are all [great] nāgas [famed to be great], and that because of their [being famed to be great] nāgas sand isn't raining down on their bodies? For there are some here who are even more wretched than we are. Why then, if nāga sand isn't raining down on their bodies, is it still raining down on ours?' (*yab yum khyed gnyis na re klu chen po 'di dag ni che bar grags pa yin te | che bar grags pa yin pas na 'di dag gi lus la klu'i bye ma mi 'bab bo zhe na | 'di na bdag cag pas ches ngan pa gzhan dag kyang yod na | ci'i phyir de dag la ni klu'i bye ma mi 'bab la bdag cag la ni 'bab*). Here the great and the wretched Nāgas are juxtaposed in the question, somehow reminding of the similar wording in *pāda* a and b of verse 6: *asmadabhyadhikāḥ kecid asmatpratyaavarāḥ pare*

51 *iti pṛṣṭaḥ sa putreṇa tam uvāca mahāmatiḥ | yathānye phaṇinaḥ putra dharmajñā na tathā vāyam || [7]* 'Thus questioned by the son, that Great-minded told him: "(My) son! Dharma-knowers are the other serpents, but not are we (as like)."'

52 *Che bar grags pa* in KŚ is translated as 'great renown' (Jamspal and Fischer 2020: § 4.114), or 'une grande réputation' (Feer 1891: 228–229). *'phrul che ba dang mthu che ba* in MPV is translated as 'miraculous powers and great might' (Miller 2018: § 4.114), or 'great magic and great witchcraft' (Ware 1938: 51–52). It seems that Kṣemendra's wording of *mantramūlaprayogeṇa* in verse 5 is inspired by MPV here. Thanks to Dr. Péter-Dániel Szántó for helping me with the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts.



(‘some (Nāgas) are superior to us, others inferior’), but such juxtaposition of two groups of Nāgas in a single question is again absent in MPV. In contrast, in MPV we only have two questions concerning the respective conditions of those two groups of Nāgas sequentially and briefly, which suggests a tone more factual and less emotional. Moreover, there is extra information related to the Nāgas with miraculous powers and great might (*’phrul che ba dang mthu che ba*) in MPV which is not seen either in BAK nor in KŚ: ‘... they live for eons and they sustain the earth. Even the garuḍa Suparṇi could not dislodge them ...’ (*bskal par gnas pa | sa ’dzin pa | ’dab chags kyi rgyal po ’dab bzañs kyi dbyung bar mi nus pa yin pas*). Therefore, Kṣemendra here seems to follow KŚ more than MPV regarding speech tone, verbal wording and essential information, though we cannot deny that KŚ and MPV are textually rather close to each other.

### 3.4 Verses 10–11

*śikṣāpadāny avāptāni kleśaprasāmanāni yaiḥ |*  
*teṣāṃ amṛtasiktānāṃ pāpatāpabhayaṃ kutaḥ || 10*  
*śrāvastyāṃ asti bhagavān jino jetavanāśrayaḥ |*  
*loke śākyamuniḥ sarvakleśaprasāmaḥ || 11<sup>53</sup>*

‘With the moral precepts obtained, the affliction tranquillized, they are sprinkled with nectar. (For them,) whence would the misfortune, sorrow and fear come? In Śrāvastī, dwelling in the Jetavana Grove is the victorious World-exalted Śākyamuni, who is the friend tranquilizing all the afflictions in the world.’<sup>54</sup>

Verses 7–9 are skipped since they are mainly the poetic embellishment of Kṣemendra, and seem less helpful for us to understand the relation-

53 **10a** śikṣā°] ABC1C2E: śi kṣa T. **11a** śrāvastyāṃ asti] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): śrā bastya māsti T. **11c** loke śākyā°] ABC1C2ET(=Ed.): loke {na} śākyā° A(a. c.)E(a. c.). **11d** °kleśa°] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): (kla TTdp: klai CD) śa T.

54 *gang gis nyon mongs rab zhi ba’i || bslab pa’i gnas rnam thob gyur cing ||*  
*bdud rtsis bran pa de dag la || sdig dang ’jigs pa gang la spyod ||*  
*shā kya thub pa ’jig rten gyi || nyon mongs thams cad rab zhi’i gnyen ||*  
*rgyal ba rgyal byed tshal gnas pa || mnyan yod na ni bcom ldan yod ||*

**10d** dang] δEap(=Ed.): gdung β || spyod] δEap, cf. def.: yod β. **11a** gyi] δEap(=Ed.): gyis β.

BAK	KŚ	MPV
<p><i>asmadabhyadhikāḥ</i> kecid  <i>asmatpratyavarāḥ</i> pare    <i>nāgāḥ</i> santi samudre śmin  <i>duḥkḥāntā</i> vāyam eva kim   </p> <p>'ga' zhig bdag las <b>lhag pa dang</b>               gzhan ni bdag las <b>dman pa yi</b>               klu ni rgya msho 'di na gnas               yu nyid sdug bsngal gyis gzir ci   </p> <p>Some (Nāgas) are <b>superior</b> to us, others <b>inferior</b>, (yet they are not suffering like us). <b>Is it only we, the serpents in this sea, who are struck by pains and sorrows?</b></p>	<p>de nas bu des bltas na   <b>klu chen po gzhan dag gi lus la klu'i</b> bye ma mi 'bab pa mthong ngo    mthong nas kyang pha ma la dris pa   yab yum <b>log par ltung bar gyur pa 'dra na</b>   ci'i phyir klu <b>chen po 'di dag gi lus la ni klu'i</b> bye ma mi 'bab la   <b>bdag cag gi lus la ni 'bab</b>   pha mas de la smras pa   klu chen po 'di dag ni <b>che bar grags pa yin te</b>   <b>che bar grags pa yin pas na de dag la ni mi 'bab bo</b>    de nas des bltas na rgya msho chen po de'i nang na <b>klu bdag cag pas ches ngan pa</b> de dag gi lus la yang klu'i bye ma mi 'bab par mthong ngo    mthong nas kyang pha ma la smras pa   yab yum khyed gnyis na re <b>klu chen po 'di dag ni che bar grags pa yin te</b>   <b>che bar grags pa yin pas na 'di dag gi lus la klu'i</b> bye ma mi 'bab bo zhe na   'di na <b>bdag cag pas ches ngan pa gzhan dag</b> kyang yod na   ci'i phyir de dag la ni klu'i bye ma mi 'bab la bdag cag la ni 'bab</p> <p>The young nāga looked and saw that the nāga sands didn't rain down on the bodies of other [great] nāgas. Seeing this he asked his parents, "Mother, Father, I think we have fallen into a <b>lower realm</b>. For if the nāga sands don't rain down on those <b>high</b> nāgas there, <b>why do they rain down on our bodies?</b>" "Those <b>high</b> nāgas are [famed to be great]," his parents replied. "It's because of their [being famed to be great] that they aren't rained down upon." Then he looked and saw that in the great ocean there were <b>some nāgas who were even more wretched</b> than they were, but nāga sand wasn't raining down on their bodies. Seeing this, he asked his parents, "Mother, Father, are you telling me that these are all [great] nāgas [famed to be great], and that because of their [being famed to be great] nāga sand isn't raining down on their bodies? For there are <b>some here who are even more wretched</b> than we are. Why then, if nāga sand isn't raining down on their bodies, is it still raining down on ours?"</p>	<p>de na klu rdzu 'phrul che ba dang mthlu <b>che ba gzhan gang dag yin pa de dag gi lus la bye ma me'i mdog</b> ta bu mi 'bab nas des smras pa   ma 'di dag la ci'i phyir mi 'bab   mas smras pa   'di dag ni rdzu 'phrul che ba   <b>mthlu che ba   bska! par gnas pa</b>   sa 'dzin pa   'dab chags kyi rgyal po 'dab bzans kyiis dbyung bar mi nus pa yin pas de'i phyir 'di dag la mi 'bab bo    de na klu <b>phra mo gzhan gang dag yin pa de dag gi lus la yang bye ma me'i mdog</b> ta bu mi 'bab nas   des smras pa   ma 'di dag la ni rigs na 'di dag ta ci'i phyir mi 'bab</p> <p>Through all of this, fiery sand had not fallen on other nāgas <b>who possessed miraculous powers and great might</b>, prompting him to ask, "Mother, why did it not fall upon them?" His mother replied, "It did not fall upon them because they possess <b>miraculous powers and great might; they live for eons and they sustain the earth</b>. Even the garuḍa Suparni could not dislodge them." Through all of this, fiery sand had not fallen on a number of <b>scrawny nāgas</b> either, prompting him to ask, "Mother, why did it not fall upon those of their type?"</p>

Table 2: Comparing BAK 60.6 with the parallel texts in KŚ and MPV

ship between NK and its sources. But verses 10 and 11 are particularly illuminant, since they provide evidence that Kṣemendra indeed followed the parallel text of KŚ, but he seemed to also consult and employ MPV to a fair amount.

As Dhana answers his son why those inferior Nāgas are spared from the sand punishment, he reveals that it is because they are learned in Buddhist doctrine (verse 7: *dharmajñā*) and granted with moral precepts (*śikṣāpada*) that there is no gravel falling on them. Here in verse 10, those inferior Nāgas are described as being ‘sprinkled with nectar’ (*amṛtasiktānām*; *bdud rtsis bran pa*), a metaphor which Kṣemendra seemed to appropriate from KŚ:<sup>55</sup> ‘He [the Buddha] has let fall a rain of nectar’ (*de ni bdud rtsi’i char ’bebs pas*), from which verse 12 ‘he rains down the nectar’ (*amṛtaṃ so ’bhivarṣati*; *bdud rtsi’i char pa mngon par ’bebs*) is directly derived and verse 10 indirectly adapted.<sup>56</sup> Also in verse 12, Buddha is described as giving out moonlight (*karuṇākaumudīsūtir*; *snying rje zla ba’i ’od bskyed*) and raining down the nectar, a comparison which seems to be attested in Mātr̥ceṭa’s *Śatapañcāsatka*: *asmād dhi netrasubhagād idaṃ śrutimanoharam | mukhāt kṣarati te vākyaṃ candrād dravam ivāmṛtam*, ‘For from this mouth of yours, pleasing to the eye, this your most ear-entrancing speech drops like nectar flowing from the moon’.<sup>57</sup> Kṣemendra might be employing a well-known Buddhist allusion here.

55 Derge *ha* 189b7–190a1: *de nas de thos ma thag tu bu de shin tu dga’ bar gyur te | smras pa yab yum de dag gi skyabs su ’gro ba dang bslab pa’i gzhi rnam ga las byung | de gnyis kyis smras pa | yul dbus ’dir sangs rgyas byung ste | de ni bdud rtsi’i char ’bebs pas | de las de dag gi skyabs su ’gro ba dang bslab pa’i gzhi rnam byung ngo*. ‘When he heard this, he surged with joy. “Mother, Father,” he asked, “how is that they came to take refuge and the fundamental precepts?” “A buddha has arisen here, in this central land,” they said. “He has let fall a rain of nectar, and so they have come to take refuge and the fundamental precepts”’ (tr. Jampal and Fischer 2020: § 4.116).

56 *upadeśaṃsunivahaiḥ sattvaśubhrai jagattraye | karuṇākaumudīsūtir amṛtaṃ so ’bhivarṣati* || [12]  
‘Producing the moonlight “compassion”, he rains down the nectar upon the Three-worlds, by multitudes of rays “instruction” which are as radiant as [Bo-dhi-]sattvas’.

57 The Chinese parallel text is: 睹者皆欢喜，闻说并心开，美颜宣妙词，如月流甘露 (T 1680 [XXXII] 760a23–24). Tibetan translation is: *gsung ’di dag ni zla ba las | bdud rtsi ’dzag pa bzhin du ’byung*. dGa’ byed snyan pa’s commentary is: *zla ba*

Then in verse 11, Kṣemendra for the first time introduced the Buddha into the scenario, setting him in the Jetavana Grove of Śrāvastī (*śrāvastyām asti bhagavān jino jetavanāśrayaḥ; shā kya thub pa 'jig rten gyi ... rgyal ba rgyal byed tshal gnas pa*). After comparing with KŚ which briefly mentions that a Buddha has appeared in the central land (*yul dbus, Madhyadeśa*), we assume that Kṣemendra rather chose and adapted the outset sentence of the Tibetan MPV,<sup>58</sup> and enriched the brief and general reference of Buddha's position here in KŚ with the more detailed information present in MPV. In fact, at the outset of the KŚ there is also the information about Buddha's residence: 'When the Blessed One was in Śrāvastī' (*gleng gzhi mnyan du yod pa na bzhugs te*, rf. § 3.1), henceforth it seems that Kṣemendra may well have coined the pāda a and b of the verse 11 himself based on this sentence as well as the following passage in KŚ which reveals that Sudhana goes to Jetavana for Buddha. Therefore, he did not necessarily have to refer to MPV at all. However, given that Kṣemendra tended to copy the factual information from sources, while only adding poetic embellishment only to strengthen the aesthetic sentiment of the representation of the original storyline, he seems less likely to have bothered to add extra information himself, even less so when there is source already available for him to copy.<sup>59</sup> Therefore, Kṣemendra mostly based his NK on the parallel text in KŚ, but sometimes he also appropriated available sources such as MPV in order to enhance plot-coherency.

---

*ni bdud rtsi'i rang bzhin no zhes 'jig rten la grags pa'o || ji ltar de las zhu ba'i rang bzhin gyi bdud rtsi 'dzag pa de bzhin du | bcom ldan 'das kyi zhal gyi zla ba las don dam pa dang mya ngan las 'das pa thob pa'i phyir na gsung kho na bdud rtsi 'dzag pa bzhin 'byung ng.* Rf. Bailey (1951: 88–89, 166). As noted by Bailey, Kṣemendra used the same metaphor in the verse 86 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter *Śrīsenāvādāna* of BAK: *pūrṇendusundarād asmād uditā vadanāt tava | jyotsneva jīvayaty eva vāṇī piyūśavarṣiṇī*, 'The speech issued from your face, lovely like the full moon, revives just like nectar-showering moonlight' (ed. & tr. Rothenberg 1990: 78, 170).

58 Eimer (1983: ii, 247.17–18): *sangs rgyas bcom lan 'das mnyan yod na rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' rab na bzhugs so*. 'While the Blessed Buddha was staying at Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍada's Park near Śrāvastī ...' (tr. Miller 2018: § 4.113).

59 However, as we have no strong evidence of the version of the MPV he consulted, we cannot reject the possibility that he directly copied from HIS MPV when writing verse 11.

## 3.5 Verse 13

*durvinītā na rakṣanti prāpya śikṣāpadāni ye |*  
*tīvratāpamayasa teṣāṃ narakeṣv akṣayaḥ kṣayaḥ || 13<sup>60</sup>*

‘Having obtained the moral precepts, the undisciplined ones cannot guard. As for them, the (only) imperishable thing is to perish in the hell which consists of severe pains and sorrows.’<sup>61</sup>

Having heard that Buddhist precepts can rescue him from the fiery sands, Sudhana proposes to adopt them, too. However, he is then sternly dissuaded since if he could not maintain the bestowed precepts, the ensuing retribution is much harsher than the hot-sand calamity: perishing in hell endlessly (*narakeṣv akṣayaḥ kṣayaḥ*; *dmyal bar mi bzad pas ... brlag par ’gyur*). Compared with KŚ<sup>62</sup> and MPV,<sup>63</sup> the description of the retribution as seen in NK seems closer to MPV than to KŚ. In MPV, one not guarding the precepts, ‘will have to endure suffering as a denizen in the hell realms for a long time to come’ (*yun ring por sems can dmyal bar sdug bsngal mnag par bya dgos*). While in KŚ, if you fail to maintain the

60 **13a** rakṣanti] B(rakṣati)C2E(=Ed.), cf. Ś (srung ba): rakṣyanti AC1T. **13b** śikṣā°] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): śi kṣa T || ye] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): ya T. **13c** °tāpa°] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): tā sa T. **13d** akṣayaḥ] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): a kṣa ya T.

61 *gang zhig rnam par ma thul bas || bslab pa’i gnas thob mi srung ba ||*  
*de dag dmyal bar mi bzad pas || gdung ba drag pos brlag par ’gyur ||*  
**13c** dmyal bar]: dmyal ba Ed. || bzad pas] δEap(=Ed.), cf. deJ.: bzad pa’i β. **13d** gdung  
 ba] βEapTTdp(=Ed.): gdab ba CD.

62 Rf. Derge *ha* 190a1–4 in Appendix 3.

63 Eimer (1983: ii, 248.14–20): *des smras pa | gal te de lta na bdag gis kyang bcom ldan*  
*’das kyi spyang snga nas skyabs su ’gro ba dang | bslab pa’i gzhi dag blang ngo || mas*  
*smras pa | bu tshe gcig gi sdug bsngal ni bla’i | tshe rabs mang po’i ni ma yin te | gal*  
*te khyod kyi bcom ldan ’das kyi spyang snga nas skyabs su ’gro ba dang | bslab pa’i*  
*gzhi dag blangs nas | yang dag par ma bsrungs na | yun ring por sems can dmyal*  
*bar sdug bsngal mnag par bya dgos so.* “If that is so, then I too shall take refuge  
 and adopt the precepts in the presence of the Blessed One.” “Son, a single life’s  
 suffering is easy to bear, that of many lifetimes is not. If you take refuge and  
 adopt the precepts in the presence of the Blessed One, but then do not properly  
 heed them, you will have to endure suffering as a denizen in the hell realms for  
 a long time to come” (tr. Miller 2018: §§ 4.115–116).

precepts, ‘it will be the basis of your taking rebirth as a hell being, an animal, or an anguished spirit, where you will undergo great suffering’ (*gzhi de las sems can dmyal ba dang dud ’gro dang yi dgas su skyes nas sdug bsngal chen po rnams myong bar ’gyur te*). It is obvious that Kṣemendra composed *pāda* c and d by means of poetic reformation of the parallel text in MPV. For example, not mentioned at all in KŚ, but the time limit to suffer in hell, i.e., *yun ring por* (‘for a long time’) in MPV, is adapted into *akṣaya* in NK, of which the Tibetan translation *mi bzad pas* (‘intolerably’, < \**asahya*,<sup>64</sup> or \**asadyas*?) seems to be less accurate. In contrast, the text in KŚ has a slightly different point, since it emphasizes that the great pain comes from being reborn into three unwholesome births, i.e., *naraka*, *preta* and *tiryāṅc*, while MPV simply concentrates on the situation of being in hell, even though it also warns about the danger of numerous rebirths (*tshe gcig gi sdug bsngal ni bla’i | tshe rabs mang po’i ni ma yin te*). Therefore, it is possible that Kṣemendra followed MPV instead of KŚ when composing this line, and he chose to base on a shorter text probably to avoid dispensable information.

### 3.6 Verses 14–15, 23

*iti śrutvā pitur vākyaṃ jananyāś ca bhujāṅgamaḥ |*  
*ādāya divyapuṣpāṇi puṇyaṃ jetavanaṃ yayau || 14*  
*sugatāśramam āsādya dharmāśravaṇasamgatām |*  
*dadarśa parśadam tatra sa santoṣamukhonmukhaḥ || 15*  
*praṇānāma sa taṃ kīrṇasampūrṇakusumāñjaliḥ |*  
*tatpādapadmasparśena sadyaḥ śītalatāṃ gataḥ || 23*<sup>65</sup>

‘Thus, having heard the words of the father and mother, the serpent went to the holy Jetavana Grove, after taking celestial flowers. Having reached Sugata’s hermitage, he saw an assem-

64 Cf. NEGI s.v. *mi bzad pa*.

65 **14b** *bhujāṅgamaḥ*] BC1C2ET(=Ed.): *bhujāṅgamuḥ* A: *bhu’jamṅgamaḥ* B(a. c.). **14d** *puṇyaṃ*] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): *pu ṇya* T || *jetavanaṃ*] ABC1C2ET(=Ed.): *jetava{nāṃ}*] A(a. c.): <je>*tavanaṃ* E(a. c.). **15a** *sugatā*] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): *su ga ta* T. **15d** *°mukhonmukhaḥ*] C1C2, cf. Ś(sgor ni mngon phyogs): *mu khyon-mu khaḥ* T: *°sukhonmukhāṃ* ABE, cf. deJ.: *°sukhonmukhiṃ* Ed. **23a** *praṇā*] ABC1C2E(=Ed.): *pra ṇā*° T || *sa taṃ kīrṇa*] AC1C2(=Ed.): *śataṃ kīrṇa*° BE: *pa taṃ ki rṇa*° T. **23d** *sadyaḥ*] AC1C2ET: *samdyāḥ* B.

bly consisting of people listening to (the Buddha's) Dharma(-preaching). There he looked up with his face in satisfaction ... With handfuls of flowers perfectly scattered, he (Sudhana) paid homage to him (the Buddha) with a touch of his (the Buddha's) foot-lotus, and immediately became cold and calm.<sup>66</sup>

Here again verses 16–22 are skipped because they are more or less Kṣemendra's own poetic composition, though to some degree inspired by the original description present in KŚ, elucidating on the Buddha's great physical appearance.

Resolved to take refuge in the Buddha, Sudhana sets out for the Jetavana Grove where the Buddha abides. Then, substantial divergence regarding the storyline appears between KŚ<sup>67</sup> and MPV,<sup>68</sup> and Kṣemendra again followed the scenario of KŚ in general.

As for Sudhana's preparatory action before meeting the Buddha, KŚ tells that he collects a variety of flowers in order to scatter over the Bud-

---

66 *zhes pa pha dang ma yi yang || tshig dag thos nas lag 'gro ni ||  
me tog mchog dag yongs bzung nas || dag pa'i rgyal byed tshal du song ||  
chog shes sgor ni mngon phyogs des || bde bar gshegs pa'i gnas phyin te ||  
der ni chos dag nyan pa la || tshogs pa'i 'khor dag mthong bar gyur ||  
snyim pa me tog gis gang ba || de la gtor nas des phyag 'tshal ||  
de yi zhabs pad reg pa yis || 'phral la bsil ba nyid du gyur ||*  
23a gang ba] βCDTdp(=Ed): gdu ba T: bkang ba Eap. 23b 'tshal] β, cf. deJ.: btsal δ: la  
Eap: gsal Ed.

67 Rf. Derge *ha* 190a4–b1 in Appendix 4.

68 Eimer (1983: ii, 248.21–249.4): *des bsams pa | sdug bsngal 'di bas ches sdug bsngal  
bar 'gyur ba ci zhig yod kyis | bcom ldan 'das kyi spyen sngar skyabs su 'gro ba  
dang | bslab pa'i gzhi dag len du 'gro 'o snyam nas | des bram ze'i cha lugs su mngon  
par sprul nas rgyal byed kyi tshal du song pa dang | ji tsam na des dge slong dag  
bsam gtan dang | klog pa dang | rnal 'byor dang | yid la byed par brtson zhing | gnas  
pa mthong ngo || mthong nas kyang dad pa skeyes te | des bsams pa | ji je dang por  
skyabs su 'gro ba dang | bslab pa'i gzhi dag blang ngam | 'on te rab tu 'byung bar bya  
snyam mo || des yang bsams pa | rab tu 'byung bar bya'o snyam.* ‘The young nāga  
thought, “What suffering could be worse than my present suffering? I shall take  
refuge and adopt the precepts in the presence of the Blessed One.” Conjuring  
up the appearance of a brahmin, he set off for Jetavana, where he saw monks  
applying themselves to and abiding in meditation, recitation, yoga, and concentra-  
tion. Upon seeing them, he felt faith and thought, “Oh my! Should I first take  
refuge and adopt the precepts or go forth?”’ (tr. Miller 2018: § 4.117)

dha as homage (*klu'i bu des lha'i me tog ud pa la dang pad ma dang ku mu da dang pad ma dkar po rnam kyis thu ba bkang ... bcom ldan 'das la lha'i me tog ud pa la dang pad ma dang ku mu da dang | pad ma dkar po rnam kyis gtor*). And this detail is clearly present in NK as 'after taking celestial flowers' (*ādāya divyapuṣpāṇi; me tog mchog dag yongs bzung*) and 'with handfuls of flowers perfectly scattered' (*kīrṇasampūrṇakusumāñjaliḥ; snyim pa me tog gis ... gtor*). However, as mentioned, after verse 15, the parallel text in MPV switches to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Nāgākumāra story, henceforth in MPV there is a different preparatory work, as the Nāga transforms himself into a brahmin (*bram ze'i cha lugs su mngon par sprul*) before setting off. And this detail could be corroborated in other parallel versions of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Nāgākumāra narrative.<sup>69</sup> So concerning this preparatory action, Kṣemendra obviously followed KŚ rather than MPV.

In verse 15, when Sudhana arrives at the Buddhist hermitage (*sugātāśramam; bde bar gshegs pa'i gnas*), he sees an assembly of people listening to the Buddha's preaching, by which he becomes satisfied (*santoṣa-mukhonmukhaḥ; chog shes sgor ni mngon phyogs des*).<sup>70</sup> In MPV, the Nāga actually sees no Buddha but a group of diligent monks, and by the glance of them he generates faith (*dad pa skyes*). But in KŚ dByig bzang does see the Buddha who is teaching Dharma in an assembly of hundred (*de'i tshes bcom ldan 'das 'khor brgya phrag du ma'i nang na chos ston cing bzhugs*). He sees the Buddha from afar and feels great happiness (*de nas klu'i bu*

69 Rf. Appendix 1. In the Kuçā *Sarvāstivāda* fragment, it is told that 'he [the Nāga] changed into a human body' (*manuṣyavarṇam ātmānam abhinirmīya*). In the Pali *Mahāvagga*, it says that 'in the form of a brahmin youth' (*māṇavakavāṇṇena*). T 749 [XVII] 565c6–8 tells that 'after transforming into a human' (變為人形), while T 1435 [XXIII] 154a27–8 gives 'he changed into a human body' (變爲人身). And the Tibetan MPV specifies that the Nāga transforms into a brahmin (*bram ze*), a detail that is corroborated in the Pali parallel text.

70 Concerning the reading of °*mukhonmukhaḥ* in *pāda* d of this verse, it is notable that the earliest Sanskrit manuscripts C1 and C2, the Tibetan transcription of the Sanskrit text in the Bilingual edition, as well as Tibetan translation all support this reading, while the later Sanskrit manuscripts A, B and E give °*sukhonmukhām*. Considering the parallel text, we know that this compound word is less likely to be allocated with *parśadam*, thus it cannot be f.sg.acc. Rather, it makes more sense to read it as m.sg.nom, thus pairing it with Sudhana (*sa*). Also, the reading °*mukha*° instead of °*sukha*° should be preferred, a situation which also happens in verse 141 of the 59<sup>th</sup> chapter *Kuṇālāvadāna* of BAK. Cf. Yamasaki (2019: 71–72).



*des thag ring po zhig ... mthong nas kyang mchog tu dga' ba skyes te*). So, again Kṣemendra composed verse 15 based on his source KŚ.

Moreover, in verse 23 we learn that after Sudhana pays homage by touching the Buddha's feet, he soon feels cooling down (*śītalatāṃ gataḥ; bsil ba nyid du gyur*). While in MPV the Nāga actually does not meet the Buddha in the beginning at all, in KŚ Sudhana becomes spared from the hot-gravel calamity (*de'i klu'i bye ma med par gyur*) only after he pays homage to the Buddha, obtains fundamental precepts and listens to the Buddhist Dharma. It seems that Kṣemendra used literary language to describe the fact that Sudhana will never be burnt by fiery sands again, thus he is cooling down once and for all. Also, this line recalls verse 11 where the Buddha is featured as 'the friend tranquilizing all the afflictions' (*sarvakleśaprasāmbāndhavaḥ; nyon mongs thams cad rab zhi'i gnyen*). Therefore, verses 14–15 and 23 are written based on the source KŚ in terms of general plot as well as focalized scenes.

#### 4. BAK mirrored in a spectrum of diverse sources

The remaining verses are omitted since, as mentioned above, after verse 15 MPV changes to another type of Nāgakumāra narrative, thus it sheds less light on the understanding of textual relation between NK, KŚ and MPV. But after comparing verses 2–6, 10–11, 13–15 and 23 in light of the parallel texts, with a particular attention to the general plot line, literary embellishment, narrative coherency and close-up scenes, we now arrive at the preliminary conclusion that Kṣemendra chose the *vālukā* version of the Nāgakumāra story, and generally recomposed his version based on the full recension of the story preserved in KŚ, while it seems he was conscious of a 'simpler version' of the same story available in MPV and probably had adopted it to some degree.

Actually, Kṣemendra might have employed KŚ as his source widely when compiling his voluminous BAK, and after a preliminary yet surely not thorough comparison of the texts of all the stories of BAK and KŚ, we have found 16 chapters in BAK, apart from NK, which are textually parallel to the chapters in KŚ, sometimes closer in content than to the other possible sources such as *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya-vastus* (table 3). There is no doubt that more rigorous and detailed analysis should be applied when seeking for textual sources in KŚ, but this table is just used

as a reference. Interestingly, Kṣemendra sometimes repeated the use of one topos in different chapters. For example, it seems that Kṣemendra repeats the Kṣāntivādin narrative in chapter 30, 39 and 76, and there are also parallel tales of these in KŚ.<sup>71</sup>

	BAK		KŚ		Studies on BAK
1	30	Kāsisundara	89	Sa ra na	Okano 2010
2	39	Kṣāntirati			
3	31	Suvarṇpārsva	29	Dom	Hikita & Oba 2015
4	37	Pūrṇa	28	dByig dga'	Hikita & Oba 2017
5	43	Kanaka	47	Kham	—
6	58	Puṇyabala	48	Byams pa'i stobs	Hikita 2010
7	61	Karṣaka	43	Zhing pa	Hikita 2007
8	76	Vidura	18	sGam po	Okano 2010
			85	Long ba	
9	77	Kaineyaka	34	Kai ne ya	Okano 2010
10	78	Śakracyavana	115	brGya byin	Okano 2011
11	80	Subhadra	79	Rab bzang	Okano 2012
12	40	Kapila			
13	81	Hetūttama	49	rLung nag po	Okano 2012
14	87	Padmaka	21	Pad ma'i mdog	Zinkgräf 1940
15	91	Śibisubhāṣita	125, 126	Shi bi	Okano 2008; Straube 2009
16	97	Kacchapa	50, 51	Grog ma	Okano 2009

**Table 3:** Parallel tales between BAK and KŚ

However, the question remains whether Kṣemendra indeed consulted and even based his versions of these individual chapters on the prototypes derived from the very KŚ. We have to admit that the case of NK is rather exceptional, because the *vālukā* Nāgakumāra story is rarely found in the Buddhist literature we have today, yet the perfect matching between NK and the 55<sup>th</sup> chapter, *Klu*, of KŚ proves that Kṣemendra picked the prototype of NK from a text very close to KŚ. In contrast, as for other chapters of which their topoi are more prevalent, is it still the case that Kṣemendra

71 See Okano (2010). In addition, in BAK, chapter 35 *Gr̥hapatisudattāvādāna* and chapter 47 *Śālistambāvādāna* seem to repeat the same topos, and this is also the case in chapter 32 *Kalyāṇakāryavadāna* and chapter 46 *Kṛtajñāvādāna*.

heavily relied on KŚ when writing? When discussing the source of the *Śibisubhāṣitāvadāna*, Okano (2008: 57–60, 127–137) and Straube (2009: 325–328) argue that Kṣemendra based his version on chapters 125 and 126 of KŚ, in spite of the fact that this topos is rather popular and widely attested in various texts. So, it seems that Kṣemendra deployed KŚ not necessarily because that he had no choice. Rather, he might have sound reasons, and taking NK into consideration, it is possible that he borrowed heavily from whichever text that contained fuller details or better aesthetic sentiments.

Another telling example that also suggests this ‘instrumentally rational’ approach is the 61<sup>st</sup> chapter, *Karṣakāvadāna*, of the BAK. This story is about a poor Brahmin peasant, whose field becomes full of gold-sprouts as a merit for his kind donation to the Buddha.<sup>72</sup> Different from NK, this story is more known, and we can locate its parallel texts not only in KŚ (43 *Zhing pa*, Derge 340 *ha* 156b2–160a3), but also in *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya Bhaiṣajyavastu* (hereafter, MBV, Dutt 1947: 68–71; Derge 1 *kha* 157b7–158a2; T1448 [XXIV] 52a22–b25), and even in the *Avadāna*-anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan (69 *Karṣaka*, Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015: 218–219) as well as its parallel texts in 雜寶藏經 (*Zabaozangjing*, T 203 [IV] 469c17–470a13). Since space is limited, we will discuss only two verses, 15–16, as examples.

BAK 61.15–16

*vyaktadāridryaduḥkhasya bhūyān me vibhavodbhavaḥ |*  
*cakāra jinapūjānte praṇidhānam iti dvijaḥ ||*  
*atha gatvā nijam kṣetraṃ vipraḥ śasyayavāṅkurān |*  
*sarvān apaśyat sauvarṇān sahasā tyaktadurgatiḥ ||<sup>73</sup>*

‘At the end of the veneration to the Victorious One, the twice-born made a vow, saying: “I shall have wealth increasing more and more when I am free from the pains of utter poverty!” Then, immediately liberated from misfortune, the Brāhman

72 For an outline of the story and the Japanese translation of the whole story, see Hikita (2007: 128–131).

73 Das et al. (1888–1918: 264–265). The Tibetan translation is:  
*dbul ba'i sdug bsngal rab bsal ba || bdag la 'byor pa 'byung gyur cig ||*  
*ces pa'i smon lam gnyis skyes kyis || rgyal ba mchod pa'i mzung tu byas ||*  
*de nas bram ze rang zhing du || song bas 'bru nas myu gu ni ||*  
*thams cad gser du mthong gyur nas || 'phral la nyid du dbul ba gtang ||*

went to his own field, and he saw that corns, barleys and sprouts had all become gold.’

Compared with the parallel texts in KŚ<sup>74</sup> and in MBV,<sup>75</sup> we soon realize that Kṣemendra drew his prototype for this story from a text so close to KŚ but still with significant differences from it, and we have no clear clues about the characteristics of that text.<sup>76</sup> For example, here in verse 15

74 Derge *ha* 158a3–5: *bram ze de dang bram ze mo de gnyis kyis smon lam btab pa | kye ma dge ba'i rtsa ba 'dis bdag cag gnyis kyi dbul ba'i rgyun chad par gyur cig | bdag cag gnyis kyi zhing 'di las nas kyi myu gu skyes pa thams cad kyang gser gyi myu gur snang bar gyur la | de dag kyang de kho na bzhin du gyur cig | gzhan du ma gyur cig ces byas nas | bram ze dang bram ze mo de gnyis kyis | de skad ces brjod pa'i mod la zhing de las skyes pa'i nas kyi myu gu thams cad gser du mthong ngo.* ‘As soon as the Blessed One left, the two brahmins began to pray, “By this root of virtue, may our poverty come to an end. May all the sprouts of barley growing in our field turn into sprouts of gold. May it be just so! May it not be otherwise!” No sooner had the two brahmins said these words than they saw that all the sprouts of barley growing in their field were gold’ (tr. Jamspal and Fischer 2020: § 3.295).

75 Dutt (1947: 70): *abhinandyānumodya bhagavataḥ pādau śirasā vanditvā bhagavato'ntikāt prakrānto yāvat kṣetram gataḥ | paśyati tasmin kṣetre sauvarṇānyavān saṃpannān | dr̥ṣṭvā ca punar vismayotphullalocano.* Derge *kha* 157b7–158a2: *bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa la mngon par dga' ste rjes su yi rangs nas bcom ldan 'das kyi zhabs gnyis la mgo bos phyag byas te | bcom ldan 'das kyi spyan snga nas song ngo | ji tsam na zhing drung du phyin pa dang | zhing de la gser gyi nas she dag skyes par mthong ngo || mthong nas kyang ya mtshan skyes nas mig bgrad.* ‘... having rejoiced in and praised the words of the Blessed One, the brahmin bowed low until his forehead touched the Blessed One’s feet, and he departed from the Blessed One’s presence. When he arrived at the field, he saw golden barley growing there. Upon seeing it, his eyes opened wide with astonishment ...’ (tr. Bhaiṣajyavastu Translation Team 2021: § 9.25). T 1448 [XXIV] 52b13–15: 聞佛說已歡喜信受，頂禮奉辭，詣種麥處，見其麥苗皆同金色，見已歡笑，生奇特想。

76 As already noted by Straube (2006: 31–35), when composing the 64<sup>th</sup> chapter *Sudhanakinnaryavadāna* Kṣemendra probably made use of a version of MBV which is different from the Sanskrit version that was found in Gilgit and we have today. Could ‘that text’ be the same offshoot version as this, which is textually speaking closer to KŚ? Or, rather, the heterogenous nature of the textual sources seen in Kṣemendra’s BAK did not transmit from a well-defined prototype, but instead it is Kṣemendra himself who coined a contaminated textual tradition under the aforementioned principle of instrumental reason. But as kindly suggested by the anonymous reviewer of this article, Kṣemendra was not under any obligation to

the only protagonist is the male Brahmin peasant, while in KŚ it is the Brahmin couple that make the vow; and even though in MBV there is only the protagonist Brahmin peasant who dedicates the rice soup to the Buddha, he never makes any vow for being rich. Furthermore, in verse 16 the Brahmin peasant goes to his field afterwards (*atha gatvā nijam kṣetraṃ; de nas bram ze rang zhing du song bas*), and there he sees that corn, barley and sprouts all become gold (*śasyayavāṅkurān sarvān ... sauvarṇān; 'bru nas myu gu ni thams cad gser du*). While in KŚ the Brahmin couple treats the Buddha right in their field (*ga la ba de logs su song*),<sup>77</sup> thus they do not have to 'go to their own field'. In MBV, though the male Brahmin peasant donates to Buddha near the field, he afterwards does leave Buddha and goes back to his field (*bhagavato 'ntikāt prakrānto yāvat kṣetraṃ gataḥ; bcom ldan 'das kyi spyān snga nas song ngo | ji tsam na zhing drung du phyin pa; 頂禮奉辭, 詣種麥處*). Therefore, it seems that Kṣemendra 'took over' *kṣetraṃ* and the verbal root  $\sqrt{\text{gam}}$  from his MBV. Moreover, in KŚ, what the couple see is the sprouts of barley turning gold, exactly what they wish (*nas kyi myu gu thams cad gser du*), and this is a little bit different from verse 16 here.<sup>78</sup> But in MBV what the peasant sees is the field full of golden barley (*sauvarṇān yavān saṃpañnān; gser gyi nas she dag skyes pa; 麥苗皆同金色*), and it seems that only the Chinese translation contain \**yavāṅkura* 'sprout of/and barley' (麥苗). Actually, this detail is also found in Merv *Avadāna*-anthology (*sauvarṇā yavāṅkurā prādurbhūtā; 所生苗稼, 變成金禾*).<sup>79</sup> Thus, it seems that both the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of MBV do not inherit the possible older element

---

'faithfully transmit any one of the different versions of the stories available to him,' but he 'composed poetic versions of Buddhist stories on the basis of several versions which he could use and tweak as he saw fit,' which I fully agree with.

77 Derge *ha* 157b5.

78 Tibetan translators of BAK seemed to take *śasyayavāṅkurān* as *dvandva* compound with three individual items ('*bru nas myu gu*).

79 Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (2015: 218–219): *kar[s]akāḥ kṣetraṃ kṛṣati tenāyuṣmān Mahākāśyapo piṇḍakena pratipāditaḥ tasya kṣetre sauvarṇā yavāṅkurā prādurbhūtā vistareṇa avadānaṃ kāryaṃ*. '(A farmer), who ploughed a field, presented Venerable Mahākāśyapa with alms-food. In his field, golden shoots of barley appeared. The *avadāna* should be related in detail' (tr. Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya). T 203 [IV] 469c22–24: 後於一日, 出到田中, 見其田中, 所生苗稼, 變成金禾, 皆長數尺, 收刈已盡, 還生如初。

of *aṅkura*, while other texts all preserve it including the KŚ, which Kṣemendra followed and again added his own poetic decoration to when writing *śasyayavāṅkurān*.

Therefore, it seems that Kṣemendra did fully utilize his available sources (such as the cases here in this paper), and actively and even freely selected whichever elements served his aesthetic taste or roused his poetic sentiment, but in principle he followed his prototype text in respect of the general storyline. However, we have to admit that both *Karṣakāvadāna* and NK are exceptional examples, and we still have to examine all other 15 chapters (or even more) in **table 3**, in order to better understand how Kṣemendra made use of mainly the KŚ as well as other sources. By means of textual comparison, we may even discuss the nature of his prototype sources as mirrored from his invented Buddhist tradition incarnated in BAK.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper investigates the source of NK, the 60<sup>th</sup> chapter of BAK, and by means of close reading of 11 verses therein and a comparison with the parallel texts in KŚ and MPV, we argue that the Nāgākumāra story in BAK is textually more akin to KŚ than MPV in the light of general plot line, literary embellishment, narrative coherency, and focalized scenes. While there are three stories of the Nāgākumāra narrative in the Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions, Kṣemendra chose the ‘less known’ *vālukā* Nāgākumāra tale and based his version on the full recension of the story preserved in KŚ, while he utilized the ‘simpler version’ of the same story available in the Tibetan MPV, which might be an adapted version taken as a new opening to its ensuing *pravrajyā* Nāgākumāra story.

After examining Kṣemendra’s approach and representation of his sources especially in the spectrum from KŚ to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* traditions, we argue that he fully, actively and freely utilized available sources that serve his target, but in principle he followed his prototype text (mainly KŚ here), and thereby he coined a new ‘contaminated’ tradition of Buddhist literature, i.e., BAK, which was, and still is, an exemplar of the Indo-Tibeto Buddhist *belles-lettres*.

## Appendix 1: A comparative reading of the beginnings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Nāgakumāra story

As related before, when comparing the openings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Nāgakumāra story in Tibetan MPV, Pali Vinaya, T 749 and T 1435, we have reasonable doubts on the origin of the 1<sup>st</sup> in the Tibetan MPV. It seems that the 1<sup>st</sup> Nāgakumāra narrative is deliberately adapted from a fuller version of the story (possibly derived from the KŚ version) as the new opening to the ensuing 2<sup>nd</sup> story, which usually starts in a simpler way. For example, in T 749, the separate translation of *Nāgakumāravadāna* and *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*, it begins with: ‘while the Buddha was staying at Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍada’s Park near Śrāvastī, a Nāga king once obtained the first generation of the faithful mind (信心), and came to Jetavana after transforming into a human. He requested to go forth after resorting to the monks.’<sup>80</sup> In the *Sarvāstivādinaya* T 1435, extra information is provided that the Nāga not only obtained the ‘faithful mind’, but also became ashamed of his Nāga-body (羞厭龍身).<sup>81</sup> This extra detail is preserved in the Kuṅcā *Sarvāstivādinaya* fragment mentioned before:

Pelliot Sanskrit: Numéro Rouge 12.2, Verso 3–5: *Buddho Bhagavām Śrāvastyām viharati a[n](yata) ... .. (a)bhiprasannaḥ sa svakena nāgabhogena ṛtiyate jehṛyat[e] vicarati vijugupsate svakena nāgabhoge[n](a) ... .. svakād [bha]vanād abhyudgamyā manuṣyavarṇam ātmānam abhinirmīya [•] sa bhikṣūn upasaṃkramyaivam āha.*

80 T 749 [XVII] 565c6–8: 如是我聞：一時，佛住舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。爾時，有一大海龍王初發信心，變為人形，來至園中。依諸比丘。求欲出家。Ware (1938: 49) translated: ‘Thus have I heard: One time when the Buddha was at Śrāvastī in the Anāthapiṇḍada garden (with a company of bhikṣus numbering 80,000 and bodhisattvas to the number of 36,000), a certain nāgarāja from the great ocean, having conceived faith, changed himself into a man and came into the garden. He besought the bhikṣus to let him enter the monastic life.’

81 T 1435 [XXIII] 154a27–8: 佛在舍衛國。是時有一龍。信心清淨。羞厭龍身。從宮中出。變爲人身詣諸比丘所。‘The Buddha was staying in the city of Śrāvastī. At that time there was a dragon (who was) pure in faith. Embarrassed and disgusted by his dragon body, (when) coming out of (his) palace, he changed into a human body and approached the monks’ (tr. Vogel & Wille 2014: 207–8, modified by Xiaoqiang Meng).

‘Buddha the Exalted One was staying at Śrāvastī, (and also) a certain serpent-demon was living (there) favourably disposed. He was distressed, embarrassed, offended, disgusted by his serpentine coil. Distressed, embarrassed, (and) disgusted by his serpentine coil, he came out of his house (and) changed himself by magic into a human form. He went to monks and spoke as follows’ (tr. Vogel & Wille 2014: 210–211).

Thus, the second reason why the Nāga left his abode in the T 1435, i.e., ‘羞厭龍身’, can be well equated with *svakena nāgabhogena ṛtīyate jehṛyat[e] vicarati vijugupsate* in Sanskrit.<sup>82</sup> However, the fuller version of the opening of the *pravrajyā* Nāgakumāra narrative can be located in the *Mahāvagga* (I.63.1–2) of the Pali Vinaya text:

*tena kho pana samayena aññataro nāgo nāgayoniyā aṭṭiyati harāyati jigucchati. Atha kho tassa nāgassa etad ahoṣi: kena nu kho ahaṃ upāyena nāgayoniyā ca parimucceyyaṃ khippaṇ ca manussattaṃ paṭilabheyyan ti. atha kho tassa nāgassa etad ahoṣi: ime kho samaṇā Sakyaputtiyā dhammacārino samacārino brahmacārino saccavādino sīlavanto kalyāṇadhammā. sace kho ahaṃ samaṇesu Sakyaputtiyesu pabbajeyyaṃ, evāhaṃ nāgayoniyā ca parimucceyyaṃ, khippaṇ ca manussattaṃ paṭilabheyyan ti. atha kho so nāgo māṇavakavaṇṇena bhikkhū upasaṃkamtivā pabbajjaṃ yāci.*<sup>83</sup>

‘Now at that time a certain serpent was troubled about his birth as a serpent, he was ashamed of it, loathed it. Then it occurred to that serpent: “Now, by what means could I be freed quickly from birth as a serpent and get back human status?” Then it occurred to that serpent: “These recluses, sons of the Sakyans, are dhamma-farers, even-farers, Brahma-farers, they are truth-speakers, they are of moral habit, of good conduct. Now if I were to go forth among the recluses, sons of the Saky-

82 Interestingly, the *pravrajyā* Nāgakumāra narrative in T 749 is closer to T 1435 and Kučā *Sarvāstivādavīnaya* fragment, than to the same story represented in the Tibetan MPV or the Turfan Sanskrit fragment (SHT 1030), thus T 749 is less likely to be affiliated with the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. Cf. fn. 21.

83 Pali Vin i.: 86.36–87.9.



ans, so would I be freed quickly from birth as a serpent and could get back human status.” Then that serpent, in the form of a brahmin youth, having approached the monks, asked for the going forth’ (tr. Horner 1962: 110–111).

Here we can not only attest the same passage of the Nāga being ashamed of his body (*nāgayoniyā aṭṭiyati harāyati jigucchati*), but also understand the process of his generating faith for the Buddha by his own question and answer. Interestingly, in the Pali Vinaya text, the Nāga resorts to the Buddha for the sake of salvation, i.e., to be rescued from being reborn as a Nāga (*nāgayoniyā ca parimucceyyaṃ*), while the NK in BAK elucidates on at least one specific reason why the Nāga birth is after all unwanted: because it brings terrible pains.

This self-questioning plot in the Pali Vinaya text, as well as the entire hasty opening in the *pravrajyā* Nāgakumāra tale, is replaced with a more vivid version in the Tibetan MPV, which is fully represented and compared to KŚ and NK before: the young Nāga is tortured by the doomed hot-sand punishment, and after his question and answer with his parents, he generates faith for the Buddha and sets out for him. This is exactly the *vālukā* Nāgakumāra story which is manifested in KŚ and NK. So, I assume that the Tibetan MPV (or its prototype) was once under reedition, by which the fuller version of *vālukā* (represented by the KŚ version) was collected, reformed and placed at the beginning of the *pravrajyā* tale of Nāgakumāra.<sup>84</sup>

## Appendix 2: Derge *ha* 189b2–6

*yab yum bdag gis yun ji srid cig gi bar du sdug bsngal  
'di lta bu myong bar 'gyur | pha mas smras pa | bu ji srid  
du skal ba mnyam pa 'di yod pa de srid du khyod kyis sdug  
bsngal 'di lta bu myong bar 'gyur ro zhes byas so || de nas bu des  
bltas na | klu chen po gzhan dag gi lus la klu'i bye ma mi 'bab pa  
mthong ngo || mthong nas kyang pha ma la dris pa | yab yum log  
par ltung bar gyur pa 'dra na | ci'i phyir klu chen po 'di dag gi lus*

84 Or, the Tibetan MPV reformulated the *pravrajyā* Nāgakumāra story and put the *vālukā* at the beginning of it to collect as many as similar thematic texts about Nāgakumāra in MPV.

*la ni klu'i bye ma mi 'bab la | bdag cag gi lus la ni 'bab | pha mas  
de la smras pa | klu chen po 'di dag ni **che bar grags pa** yin te |  
**che bar grags pa** yin pas na de dag la ni mi 'bab bo || de nas des  
bltas na rgya mtsho chen po de'i nang na klu bdag cag pas ches  
ngan pa de dag gi lus la yang klu'i bye ma mi 'bab par mthong  
ngo || mthong nas kyang pha ma la smras pa | yab yum khyed  
gnyis na re klu chen po 'di dag ni che bar grags pa yin te | che bar  
grags pa yin pas na 'di dag gi lus la klu'i bye ma mi 'bab bo zhe  
na | 'di na bdag cag pas ches ngan pa gzhan dag kyang yod na |  
ci'i phyr de dag la ni klu'i bye ma mi 'bab la bdag cag la ni 'bab.*

“Mother, Father, **how long must I undergo such suffering?**” His parents replied, “**For as long as [you are in this life]**, son, you will undergo [this suffering].” The young nāga looked and saw that the nāga sands didn’t rain down on the bodies of other [great] nāgas. Seeing this he asked his parents, “Mother, Father, I think we have fallen into a lower realm. For if the nāga sands don’t rain down on those high nāgas there, why do they rain down on our bodies?” “Those high nāgas are [**famed to be great**],” his parents replied. “It’s because of their [**being famed to be great**] that they aren’t rained down upon.” Then he looked and saw that in the great ocean there were some nāgas who were even more wretched than they were, but nāga sand wasn’t raining down on their bodies. Seeing this, he asked his parents, “Mother, Father, are you telling me that these are all [great] nāgas [**famed to be great**], and that because of their [**being famed to be great**] nāga sand isn’t raining down on their bodies? For there are some here who are even more wretched than we are. Why then, if nāga sand isn’t raining down on their bodies, is it still raining down on ours?” (tr. Jamspal and Fischer 2020: §§ 4.113–115, bold script and modification in square brackets by Xiaoqiang Meng).

### Appendix 3: Derge *ha* 190a1–4

*klu'i bu des smras pa | yab yum bdag mchi bar gnang bar mdzod  
cig dang | gang dag gi mthus bdag gi lus la klu'i bye ma 'bab par*

*mi 'gyur ba'i skyabs su 'gro ba dang bslab pa'i gzhi de dag bdag  
gis blang bar bgyi'o || pha mas smras pa | bu ma len cig | lhan cig  
skyes pa'i bye ma'i sdug bsngal 'di ni chung gi | skyabs su 'gro ba  
dang bslab pa'i gzhi de dag blangs pa las ma bsrungs na | gzhi de  
las sems can dmyal ba dang dud 'gro dang yi dgas su skyes nas  
sdug bsngal chen po rnam myong bar 'gyur te | sdug bsngal 'di  
ni sdug bsngal 'di'i brgya'i char yang mi phod stong gi char yang  
mi phod 'bum gyi char yang mi phod do.*

“Mother, Father,” the young nāga requested, “please, permit me to go take refuge and maintain the fundamental precepts, by whose power nāga sand will no longer rain down on my body.” “Do not take them, son,” cautioned his parents. “Though the sufferings of the sands are innate to us, they are minor. If you take refuge and the fundamental precepts but do not maintain them, it will be the basis of your taking rebirth as a hell being, an animal, or an anguished spirit, where you will undergo great suffering, compared to which your current sufferings are not even a fraction’s worth—not even a hundredth, not even a thousandth, not even a hundred thousandth” (tr. Jamspal and Fischer 2020: §§ 4.116–117).

#### Appendix 4: Derge *ha* 190a4–b1

*klu'i bus smras pa | yab yum bdag gi lhan cig skyes pa'i bye  
ma'i sdug bsngal 'di zhi bar 'gyur ba 'ba' zhi gi phyir yang ci  
nus kyis bsrung bar bgyi'o zhes smras nas | klu'i bu des lha'i me  
tog ud pa la dang pad ma dang ku mu da dang pad ma dkar po  
rnam kyis thu ba bkang ste | rgya mtsho chen po'i nang nas mi  
snang bar gyur nas rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal du phyin pa  
dang | de'i tshe bcom ldan 'das 'khor brgya phrag du ma'i nang  
na chos ston cing bzhugs so || de nas klu'i bu des thag ring po  
zhig nas sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das mdzes shing yid du 'thad pa  
dbang po dul ba thugs zhi ba thugs dul zhing rnam par zhi ba'i  
mchog dang ldan pa | gser gyi mchod sdong ltar dpal dang gzi  
brjid 'bar ba mthong ngo || mthong nas kyang mchog tu dga' ba  
skyes te | dga' ba skyes nas bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der song ste*

*phyin nas bcom ldan 'das la lha'i me tog ud pa la dang pad ma dang ku mu da dang | pad ma dkar po rnams kyis gtor te | bcom ldan 'das kyi zhabs la mgo bos phyag 'tshal nas | bcom ldan 'das la skyabs su ,gro ba dang bslab pa'i gzhi rnams mnos te | chos mnyan pa'i phyir bcom ldan 'das kyi spyang sngar 'dug go || de nas de'i klu'i bye ma med par gyur nas.*

“Mother, Father,” said the young nāga, “I shall maintain them to the best of my ability, if only to assuage the sufferings of the sands innate to us.” With those words the young nāga filled up the front of his long shirt with divine blue lotus, lotus, white water lily, white lotus, and mandārava flowers, disappeared from beneath the great ocean, and traveled to the garden of Prince Jeta, where the Blessed One sat teaching the Dharma amid a company of hundreds. The young nāga saw the Blessed Buddha, resplendent and agreeable, in the distance. His senses were tamed, his heart was at peace, and his mind was tame and absolutely serene. He was graced with a supreme tranquility, shining and radiant like a golden pillar. He saw the Blessed Buddha, and the sight of him filled him with supreme joy. Full of such joy he approached the Blessed One, and when he arrived he scattered the divine blue lotus, lotus, white water lily, and white lotus flowers over the Blessed One. Then he touched his head to the Blessed One’s feet, took refuge in the Blessed One, received the fundamental precepts, and sat before him to listen to the Dharma. Now that the nāga sands affected him no more’ (tr. Jamspal and Fischer 2020: §§ 4.118–120).

## Abbreviations

### Abbreviations in the philological apparatus

A	Sanskrit-Ms., Cambridge University Library: Add. 1306
B	Sanskrit-Ms., Cambridge University Library: Add. 913
C	Block-print, Sanskrit-Tibetan bilingual, Cone-Tanjur
C1	Sanskrit-Ms., Drepung Monastery: ZX0675-ZB 38
C2	Sanskrit-Ms., Drepung Monastery: ZX0650-ZB 22

- D Block-print, Sanskrit-Tibetan, Derge-Tanjur
- E Sanskrit-Ms., National Archives Nepal: NGMPP reel no. B 95/5
- Eap Tibetan Ms., Phurdrup Gonpa Monastery in Bhutan: Thor bu, *dPag bsam khri shing*, EAP 310/3/3/15
- G Tibetan Ms., Ganden-Tanjur
- H Sanskrit-Ms., Library of the Asiatic Society Calcutta: B. 15
- N Block-print, Tibetan, Narthang-Tanjur
- Q Block-print, Tibetan, Peking-Tanjur
- R Sanskrit-Ms., Cambridge University Library: *Ratnamālāvadāna*, Add. 1615
- Ś Tibetan translation of BAK by Shong ston lotsāba rDo rje rgyal mtshan and Paṇḍita Lakṣmīkara
- T Block-print from Tohoku University in Japan, Sanskrit-Tibetan, 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama version
- Tdp Block-print from the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, New Delhi, India, Sanskrit-Tibetan, 5<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama version
- Ed. *editio princeps* of BAK. See Das et al. (1888–1918)
- V Edition Vaidya (Sanskrit-text reprinted from Ed. with emendations)
- deJ. Conjectures of De Jong (1979)
- β Hyparchetypus, Tibetan, of GNQ
- δ Hyparchetypus, Tibetan, of D(C)I(Tdp)

### Abbreviations in the main text

BAK	<i>Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā</i> , ref. Das et al. (1888–1918), Vaidya (1959).
BHSD	Edgerton, Franklin (1953). <i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary</i> . Vol. 2: <i>Dictionary</i> . New Haven: Yale University Press.
DIV	<i>Divyāvādāna</i> , ref. Cowell & Neil (1886), Hiraoka (2007), Rotman (2017).
KŚ	<i>Karmaśataka</i> , ref. Matsumoto (2001), Jamspal & Firscher (2020).
MBV	<i>Mūlasarvāstivādinaya Bhaiṣajyavastu</i> , ref. Dutt (1947), Bhaiṣajyavastu Translation Team trans. (2021).
MPV	<i>Mūlasarvāstivādinaya Pravrajyāvastu</i> , ref. Vogel & Wille (2014), Miller (2018).
NEGI	Negi, J.S., ed. (1993). <i>Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary</i> . Sarnath: Dictionary Unit, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
NK	<i>Nāgakumārāvādāna</i> , ref. Meng (2020).
PW	Böhtlingk, Otto & Rudolf Roth (1855–1875). <i>Sanskrit-Wörterbuch</i> . Bd.1–7. St. Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.
T	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> , ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taisho Issaikyo, 1924–1934.
Vin.	<i>Vinayaṭīka</i> , ref. Oldenberg (1879), Horner (1962).
WTS	Kommission für zentral- und ostasiatische Studien der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (2005–). <i>Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache</i> . München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Kommission beim Verlag C.H. Beck.

### References

- Ban de de ba tsan dra sogs kyis bsgyur (1995). *Gang po la sogs pa'i rtogs pa brjod pa brgya pa*. Zi ling: mTsho sngon mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- Bhaiṣajyavastu Translation Team trans. (2021). *'Dul ba gzhi las/ sman gyi gzhi. The Chapter on Medicines from The Chapters on Monastic Discipline*. 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha. <https://read.84000.co/translation/toh1-6.html>.
- Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara (1939). *Bhoṭa=Prakāśa: A Tibetan Chrestomathy, with Introduction, Skeleton Grammar, Notes, Texts and Vocabularies*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

- Cowell, Edward Byles & Robert Alexander Neil (1886). *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*. Cambridge: Oriental Press.
- Das, Sarat Chandra, Hari Mohan Vidyabushana & Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana (1888–1918). *Avadāna Kalpalatā [Bodhi Sattvāvadāna Kalpalatā]. A Collection of Legendary Stories about the Bodhisattvas by Kshemendra. With its Tibetan Version Called Rtogs brjod dpag bsam hkhri Śin by Śōnton Lochāva and Paṇḍita Lakshmīkara. [A Buddhist Sanskrit Work on the Exploits and Glories of Buddha by Kṣemendra. With its Tibetan Version]*. 2 Vols. Calcutta: The Baptist Mission Press.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha (1947). *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Vol. 3: Part 1. Srinagar, Kashmir: Calcutta Oriental Press.
- Eimer, Helmut (1983). *Rab tu 'byun ba'i gzi: Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādīns*. Nach Vorarbeiten von Frank-Richard Hamm u. weiteren Materialien hrsg. durch Helmut Eimer. Teil 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Feer, Léon (1891). *Avadāna-Çataka. Cent Légendes Bouddhiques*. Paris: E. Leroux.
- Filliozat, Jean (1941). *Catalogue du Fonds Sanscrit, Fascicule I: Nos 1–165*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Formigatti, Camillo (2019). 'Kṣemendra.' [In:] *Encyclopedia of Buddhism Online*, Editor-in-Chief: Consulting Editors: Jonathan A. Silk, Oskar von Hinüber, Vincent Eltschinger. Consulted online on 08 November 2021. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2467-9666\\_enbo\\_COM\\_2041](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2467-9666_enbo_COM_2041).
- Hikita, Hiromichi 引田 弘道 (2007). 'Two Legends from *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, Chapters 60 and 61 (ナーガ童子物語/農耕夫の物語: 『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第60・61章和訳)'. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters of Aichi Gakuin University* (愛知学院大学文学部紀要) 37: 125–132.
- Hikita, Hiromichi 引田 弘道 (2010). 'Japanese Translation of *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, Chapters 55–58 (サルヴァムダダ王(一切布施王)の物語/ゴーパーラ龍調伏物語/仏塔物語/プニャバラ王物語 – 『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第55・56・57・58章和訳)'. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters of Aichi Gakuin University* (愛知学院大学文学部紀要) 40: 139–153.
- Hikita, Hiromichi 引田 弘道 & Emi Oba 大羽 恵美 (2015). 'The Japanese Translation of *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, Chapters 31 and 34 (『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第31章、34章和訳)'. *Transactions of the Institute for Cultural Studies, Aichi Gakuin University* (人間文化: 愛知学院大学人間文化研究所紀要) 30: 240–213.
- Hikita, Hiromichi 引田 弘道 & Emi Oba 大羽 恵美 (2017). 'The Japanese Translation of *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*, Chapter 37 (『ボーディサットヴァ・アヴァダーナ・カルパラター』第37章和訳)'. *Transactions of the Institute for Cultural Studies, Aichi Gakuin University* (人間文化: 愛知学院大学人間文化研究所紀要) 32: 116–182.

- Hiraoka, Satoshi (1998). 'The Relation between the *Divyāvādāna* and the *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya*,' *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 26.5: 419–434.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi 平岡 聡 (2007). *A Complete Translation of Divyāvādāna* (ブツダが謎解く三世の物語・下 : <ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナ>全訳). Vol.2. Tokyo: Daizoshuppan (大蔵出版).
- Horner, Isaline Blew trans. (1962). *The Book of the Discipline: (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*. Vol. IV. *Mahāvagga*. London: Luzac & Company LTD.
- Jamspal, Lozang & Kaia Tara Firscher trans. (2020). *Las brgya tham pa. The Hundred Deeds. Karmaśataka*. 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha. <https://read.84000.co/translation/toh340.html>.
- De Jong, Jan Willem (1979). *Textcritical Remarks on the Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā (Pallavas 42–108)*. Tokyo: Reiyukai Library.
- Karashima, Seishi & Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (2015). 'The Avadāna Anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan'. [In:] *The St. Petersburg Sanskrit Fragments (StPSF)*. vol. 1. (*Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia*). Eds. Seishi Karashima and Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya. Tokyo: The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences & The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University: 145–524.
- Van der Kuijp, Leonard W. J (1996). 'Tibetan Belles-Lettres: The Influence of Daṇḍin and Kṣemendra.' [In:] *Tibetan Literature: Studies in Genre*. Eds. José Ignacio Cabezón and Roger R. Jackson. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion: 393–410.
- Li, Channa (2019). *Challenging the Buddha's Authority: A Narrative Perspective of Power Dynamics Between the Buddha and His Disciples*. PhD Dissertation. Universiteit Leiden.
- Lin, Nancy Grace (2011). *Adapting the Buddha's Biographies: A Cultural History of the Wish-Fulfilling Vine in Tibet, Seventeenth to Eighteenth Centuries*. PhD Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.
- Liu, Zhen (2019). 'A Brief Introduction to Two Manuscripts of *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* Found in Tibet.' *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 72.1: 33–46.
- Lüders, Heinrich (1930/1940). 'Weitere Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie von Ostturkestan.' [In:] *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1930. [Rpt:] *Philologica Indica: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften von Heinrich Lüders; Festgabe zum siebzigsten Geburtstag am 25. Juni 1939 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940.
- Matsumoto, Junko 松本 純子 (2001). *A Study of Karmaśataka: The Formation of Avadāna Literature in the Tibetan Translation of Karmaśataka*. *Karmaśataka* の研究—チベット訳 *Karmaśataka* にみるアヴァダーナ文献の成立過程. Ph.D. Dissertation. Tohoku University 東北大学.
- Matsunami, Seiren (1965). *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.



- Meng, Xiaoqiang 孟小强 (2020). *A Critical Study of Nāgakumārāvadāna & Saṅgharakṣitāvadāna in Kṣemendra's Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*. 《菩薩譬喻如意藤・龙子/僧护譬喻》研究 MA Thesis. Fudan University 复旦大学.
- Miller, Robert et al. (2018). 'Dul ba gzhi las/rab tu 'byung ba'i gzhi. "The Chapter on Going Forth" from The Chapters on Monastic Discipline. 84000: Translating the Words of the Buddha. <http://read.84000.co/translation/toh1-1.html>.
- Okano, Kiyoshi 岡野 潔 (2005). 'Relationship of *Avadānamālās* to the *Avadānakalpalatā* (*Avadānakalpalatā*から*Avadānamālā*類へ)'. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* (印度学仏教学研究) 54.1: 374-367.
- Okano, Kiyoshi 岡野 潔 (2008). 'Avadānakalpalatā Chaps. 55, 91, 92 and *Karmaśataka* 125, 126. Texts and Translations of *Sarvaṃdada*, *Śibi*, *Maitrakanyaka* (*Avadānakalpalatā* 55章、91-92章と*Karmaśataka* 125-126話 : *Sarvaṃdada*, *Śibi*, *Maitrakanyaka*の校訂・和訳)'. *South Asian Classical Studies* (南アジア古典学) 3: 57-155.
- Okano, Kiyoshi 岡野 潔 (2009). 'Avadānakalpalatā Chaps. 94-97 and SMRAM 23. Texts and Translations of *Yaśomitra*, *Vyāghrī*, *Hastin*, *Kacchapa* (*Avadānakalpalatā* 94-97章とSMRAM 23章 : *Yaśomitra*, *Vyāghrī*, *Hastin*, *Kacchapa*の校訂・和訳)'. *South Asian Classical Studies* (南アジア古典学) 4: 95-177.
- Okano, Kiyoshi 岡野 潔 (2010). 'A Study of the *Avadānakalpalatā* and the *Avadānamālās* (1) - Avadānas of *Vidura*, *Kaṇḍavyāsa*, *Śreṣṭhipretibhūta* - (*Kalpalatā*と*Avadānamālā*の研究 (1): *Vidura*, *Kaṇḍavyāsa*, *Śreṣṭhipretibhūta*の説話)'. *South Asian Classical Studies* (南アジア古典学) 5: 51-127.
- Okano, Kiyoshi 岡野 潔 (2011). 'A Study of the *Avadānakalpalatā* and the *Avadānamālās* (2) - Avadānas of *Śakracyavana*, *Mahendrasena*, *Pretikā* - (*Kalpalatā*と*Avadānamālā*の研究 (2): *Śakracyavana*, *Mahendrasena*, *Pretikā*の説話)'. *South Asian Classical Studies* (南アジア古典学) 6: 165-266.
- Okano, Kiyoshi 岡野 潔 (2012). 'A Study of the *Avadānakalpalatā* and the *Avadānamālās* (3) - Avadānas of *Subhadra*, *Hetūttama*, *Pretikā* - (*Kalpalatā*と*Avadānamālā*の研究 (3): *Subhadra*, *Hetūttama*, *Pretikā*の説話)'. *South Asian Classical Studies* (南アジア古典学) 7: 257-365.
- Okano, Kiyoshi 岡野 潔 (2013). 'A Study of the *Avadānakalpalatā* and the *Avadānamālās* (4) - Tales of *Nārapurva*, *Pretibhūtamaharddhikā* - (*Kalpalatā*と*Avadānamālā*の研究 (4): *Nārapurva*, *Pretibhūtamaharddhikā*など)'. *South Asian Classical Studies* (南アジア古典学) 8: 162-186.
- Oldenberg, Hermann (1879). *The Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. Vol. 1. *Mahāvagga*. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.
- Panglung, Jampa Losang (1981). *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya. Analysiert auf Grund der Tibetischen Übersetzung*. Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library.

- Rothenberg, Bonnie Lynne (1990). *Kṣemendra's Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā: A Textcritical Edition and Translation of Chapters One to Five*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Rotman, Andy (2017). *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna*. Part 2. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Silk, Jonathan A. (2008a). 'The Story of Dharmaruci in the *Divyāvadāna* and Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*.' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 51: 137–185.
- Silk, Jonathan A. (2008b). *Managing Monks: Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sirisawad, Natchapol (2019). *The Mahāprātihāryasūtra in the Gilgit Manuscripts: A Critical Edition, Translation and Textual Analysis*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel (1902–1909). *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales belonging to the Hinayāna*. St.-Petersbourg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- Straube, Martin (2006). *Prinz Sudhana und die Kinnarī. Eine buddhistische Liebesgeschichte von Kṣemendra. Texte, Übersetzung, Studie*. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Straube, Martin (2009). *Studien zur Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā. Text und Quellen der Parallelen zu Haribhaṭṭas Jātakamālā*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Straube, Martin (2015). 'Narratives: South Asia.' [In:] *Encyclopedia of Buddhism Online*, Editor-in-Chief: Consulting Editors: Jonathan A. Silk, Oskar von Hinüber, Vincent Eltschinger. Consulted online on 08 November 2021. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2467-9666\\_enbo\\_COM\\_0045](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2467-9666_enbo_COM_0045). First published online: 2020.
- Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakṣmaṇa (1959). *Avadāna-Kalpalatā of Kṣemendra*. 2 Vols. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Vaidya, Paraśurāma Lakṣmaṇa (1999). *Divyāvadāna*. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Vogel, Claus & Klaus Wille eds. (2014). *The Pravrajyāvastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*. Göttingen: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Vogel, Jean Philippe (1926). *The Indian Serpent Lore; or, the Nagas in Hindu Legend and Art*. London: Probsthain.
- Ware, James Roland (1938). 'The Preamble to the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*.' *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 3.1: 47–67.
- Warren, Henry Clarke (1953). *Buddhism in Translations: Passages Selected from the Buddhist Sacred Books*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Yamasaki, Kazuho 山崎 一穂 (2019). 'Notes on the Fifty-Ninth Chapter of the *Avadānakalpalatā* (*Avadānakalpalatā*第 59 章研究ノ一ト).' *The Annals of the Research Project Center for the Comparative Study of Logic* (比較論理学

研究：広島大学比較論理学プロジェクト研究センター研究成果報告書)  
16: 59–83.

Zinkgräf, Willi (1940). *Vom Divyâvadâna zur Avadâna-Kalpalatâ. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte eines Avadâna*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

