SANSKRIT FRAGMENTS OF THE KĀSYAPAPARIVARTA
by J. W. de Jong, Canberra

In 1938 Kuno Höryū edited two fragments of a manuscript of the Kāsyapaparivarta. They had been sent to Hoernle by P. J. Miles in 1903. According to Hoernle the fragments had been found in Khadalik. The two fragments [Hoernle No. 143 S.B. 38 and No. 143 S.B. 39] are at present in the India Office Library to which institution I am obliged for having put at my disposal excellent photocopies. Kuno had no difficulty in showing that they belong to one and the same leaf. The text corresponds to sections 128–136 of the edition of the Kāsyapaparivarta published by A. von Staël-Holstein (Shanghai, 1926). In von Staël-Holstein's edition each of the sections 128–133 consists of a prose part and a verse part, but in the fragments the verses are missing. However, the fragments do contain the first words of section 136: atha khalu bhagavāṁ tasyā[m] velā(y)[ām imāṁ gāthām abhāṣata]. Kuno pointed out that of the four Chinese versions the two versions dating from the periods of the Chin and Ch'in dynasties, correspond more closely to the Sanskrit text of the fragments. He concluded that this text must have been in existence in the 3rd–5th centuries A.D. Comparing the fragments with the corresponding prose parts in von Staël-Holstein's edition, Kuno tried to reconstruct the missing parts of the entire leaf. His readings of the manuscript are not always correct and his reconstruction does not take into account the exact extent of the missing portions. Even more important is the fact that Kuno was not aware of the fact that a fragment of the same leaf was edited twenty years before by J. N. Reuter. The fragments, published by Reuter, were brought back from his expedition to Central Asia and North China in 1906–1908 by Colonel Baron Gustav Mannerheim. The third fragment contains a passage of the Kāsyapaparivarta corresponding to sections 130–135. It exactly fills one gap in the leaf, edited by Kuno, between lines 3 to 8 of the recto and lines 1 to 6 of the verso. The following edition of the three fragments of this leaf is based upon a photocopy of the two fragments in the India Office Library and a photocopy of the Manner-
heim fragment which Professor Pentti Aalto has been so kind as to send me at my request. [M] indicates the beginning and end of the Mannerheim fragment. Missing syllables are indicated with — and missing letters with . . As in von Staël-Holstein's edition a single oblique stroke represents a dot, a pair of oblique strokes two upright strokes. Moreover, a colon stands for a colon in the manuscript, a punctuation mark which was not recognized as such by von Staël-Holstein³. Akṣaras which can only be read partially are put between round brackets and restored akṣaras between square brackets. O is used to indicate the circle round the hole in the right half of the leaf.

RECTO

1. m eva kāśyapaikatyā śramaṇabrāhmaṇā bahūmī darmāmī paryāpya na rāg . —
   — — — — — — — — — — — m[o] haṭṛṣṇā vinodayamī / tte dharmārṇavānōhya-
   mānne : klāśa[t]ṛṣṇayā kā[la] — — —

2. tigāmino bhavamī // tadyathā kāśyapa vaidya auṣa[da]bhṛṣṭa grhi[t] —
   — — — — — — — — — — — utpadyeta / na ca taṃ vyādhi / śaknuyā
cikitsītu / evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya — — —

3. draṣṭavyah yaḥs tena śrutëna na knoty ātmānāṃ klāśāvyādhīṃ citsī —
   irarthakam (tasya) taṃ śrutam bhavatt[i] [M] // tadya[thā kā]śyapa
glānapu[ru]s[o] r [M] ajāṛham bhaisajyamīṃ upayujyātāṃsvatsarēṇa
cālam — —

4. evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya klāśāvyādhi draṣṭa — yaḥs tenāṃsva-
sareṇa kā [M] lam karotti // tadyathā kāśyapa maṇ[i] [M] ratnam ucaere
patita akāryopagam bhavaty evam e[vā] — —

5. pa bahuśrutasya lābhastakāśca[ra]pa — O — śṭavyah niṣkimcana
evam eva kāśyapa duśilasya kāṣṭa[ya]ndra — —

6. vyaḥ // tadyathā kāśyapa susnātasya suvili — {ṣya} — innakeṣana-
khaṣyāvadā[ta] [M] vastrapravṛtasya pravaracandānānuliptasya śre [M]
ṭiprutasya śirṣe caṇpikamāḷā evam eva kāṣya — — —

kāśyapa duśilā śilavapratirūpakāḥ kata [M] m[e] catvāra iha kāṣya — —
katyo bhikṣu — — —

vadṛṣṣu bhayadarṣi samādāya [ṣi]l[ṣa] [M] ti śikṣāpa[de] — — (iśuddha)

VERSIO

1. —— ga(t)a(r) [v]iharati pa[...]+ (M) yam kāṣṇa praθhama duśila śivalavapapakāh // (M) [p]unar apa(ra)m kāṣya(ya) — (i)haikatyobhiṣu vvina(ya) —

2. — vati pravṛta — nāv v[...]+yata — pto — — (y)drstīṃ cāṣya(n)nuca (M) litam bhavatī : ayam kāṣṇapa dvitiyo duśila (M) vaprattirūpakaḥ // puna paraṃ kāṣṇapa (i)haikat —

3. kṣu maitrāvīḥāri bhavati / satvāraṁbhaṇa — — — — manvagatto bhavati / (a) (M) jātīm ca sarvvasamskārāṇām śrutā : utrasatī saṃ (M) trasati samtrāsam āpyate / ayam kāṣṇapa tṛtī —

4. śilah śivalavapapakāh // pu(n)ar aparā(m) ○ kāṣṇapa ihaikeyo bhikṣuḥ dv (M) ādāsa dhuttgatūn samā — ya vartatte / (M) upalambha-duṇṣṭiṣa ca bhavati / ahamkāramamamākāra — —

5. ayam kāṣṇapa caturtho duśilah śivalavapra ○ tirūpakaḥ // ime kāṣṇapa ca (M) tvāro duśila śivalavaprapapā (M) śilaṃ śilam itti kāṣṇapa ucate / yatra nātmā (n) —

6. yam : na kriyā nākriyā / na karaṇām nākaraṇām : na cāro nācāro na pracār. (M) na nāmarūpam / na nimittaṃ : na samā (M) na praśamaḥ na graho notsargaḥ na grāhyāṃ : na satvo na — —


8. nā : na saṃkalpanā : idam ucate kāṣṇapa aryaṃṃ śilam / a — — — — — — — āpataqam // sarvvanīśrayavigatam // atha khalu bhagavāṃ tasyā velā(y)

In line 5 of the recto the word devamanusyeṣu has to be read. Fragment 143 S.B. 38 has devaman and the vowel e. M contains the subscript y and the syllable su. Reuter read xyana, x indicating a deleted consonant. In line 7 of the verso Reuter read only the word [du][śile]. It is possible to read ilo — r — a. The fragment 143 S.B. 39 has āṭmaś — tka . . a [ṣa] — . It is therefore possible to reconstruct the word āṭmaśloṃ-karṣanā. The scribe has the habit of doubling the t and the n, cf. recto [tī] tte, -ohyamāṇe; [2] cikisittu; [3] śrutenna, śruttam, etc. Several syllables have been omitted by him, cf. recto [3] knety for śaknety; [4] citsi — for cikitsi —, verso [2] puna paraṃ for punar aparām. In recto [3] and [4] the scribe wrote asamvatsareṇa which must be a mistake for asamvareṇa, cf. Weller's translation of the corresponding passage in the Chin version: "Gerade wie wenn ein kranker Mensch die wunderbare Arznei eines Königs einnimmt, sein Ende erreicht, (da er) sich nicht an die Regel hält, so, Kāṣṇa, verhält es sich wiederum auch (damit) so, daß es vielfach Sramaṇa, Brahmanen gibt, (die) das der Lehre nicht Gemäß ausführen, (sondern) alle Krankheiten der Bindungen aufkommen lassen, (und sie nach ihrem) Ende auf dem schlim-
men Wegen (wieder) geboren werden.

It is difficult to know how far the scribe has correctly reproduced the language of the text. In sāmdhi between vowels, a hiatus usually occurs, but in the first line of recto the scribe wrote kāśyapaikatyā. In reconstructing the text of the leaf I have normalized the spellings and the sāmdhi, although I am aware of the fact that the language of the original may have been more irregular. Apart from this aspect, it does not seem too difficult to reconstruct the text of the leaf. It is possible that the original had na pracāro nāpracārah instead of na pracārah and na nāma na rūpaṁ instead of na nāmarūpaṁ (cf. § 135).

RECONSTRUCTED TEXT OF THE LEAF

128. evam eva kāśyapaikatyāḥ śrāmanabrāhmaṇā bahūn dharmān paryāpya na rāgaṭṣṇāṃ vinodayanti / na dveṣṭṣṇāṃ na mohatṛṣṇāṃ vinodayanti / te dharmānṛavenohyamānāḥ klesāṭṣṇayā kālagata durgatigāmino bhavanti /

129. tadyathā kāśyapa vaidya ausadhabhastraṃ gṛhitvānvicaret / tasya kaścid eva vyādhir utpadyeta / na ca taṃ vyādhīṃ śaknuyāc cikitṣitum / evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya klesāvyādhir draṣṭavyo yas tena śrutena na śaknoty ātmanaḥ klesāvyādhīṃ cikitṣitum / nirarthakaṃ tasya tac chrutam bhavati /

130. tadyathā kāśyapa glānaḥ puruso rājārhaṃ bhaiṣajyam upayuṣyāsamvareṇa kālam kuryāt / evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya klesāvyādhir draṣṭavyo yas tenāsamvareṇa kālaṃ karoti /

131. tadyathā kāśyapa maniratnam uccāre patitam akāryopagam bhavaty evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya lābhasatkārocārapatanama draṣṭavyam / niścikmca devamanuṣyesu /

132. tadyathā kāśyapa mṛṣasya mālā / evam eva kāśyapa duhṣilasya kāṣyamā draṣṭavyam /

133. tadyathā kāśyapa susnātasya suviliptasya sukhinnakeśanakasyāvadātavastraprāvrtytasya pravaracandananuliptasya śreṣṭhiprutrasya śīrṣe campakamālā evam eva kāśyapa duhṣilavato bahuśrutasya kāṣayadhāranaṃ draṣṭavyam /

134. catvāra ime kāśyapa duhṣilāḥ śilavatpratirūpakāḥ / katame catvāraḥ / iha kāśyapaikatyo bhikṣuḥ prātimokṣasamāśaṃvarasamvṛto bhavati / ācāragocarasampannā anumātretv api vadyeṣu bhayadarśī samādāya śikṣate śikṣapadesu pariśuddhakāyavāńmanaskarmanā samanvāgato vihratī pariśuddhājivaḥ sa ca bhavaty ātmavādi / ayaṃ kāśyapa prathamo duhṣilāḥ śilavatpratirūpakāḥ //

punar aparâm kāsyapehaikatyo bhikṣur vinayadharo bhavati pravṛtavinayo
vinayaguptau sthitah\(^a\) satkāyadṛṣṭiś cāsāyānucalītā bhavati / ayaṁ
kāsyapa dvitiyo duḥśilah śilavatpratirūpakaḥ //
punar aparâm kāsyapehaikatyo bhikṣur maitraśvāhī bhavati /
sattvāraṁbaṇyā karunayā samanvāgato bhavati / ajātiṃ ca sarvasaṁśkāraṃ
śrutvā / uttrasati samṛtrasati samāsasam āpāyate / ayaṁ kāsyapa tṛtiyo
duḥśilah śilavatpratirūpakaḥ //
punar aparâm kāsyapehaikatyo bhikṣur dvādaśa dhutaganūn samādāya
vartate / upalambhadṛṣṭikaś ca bhavati / ahaṁkāramamakāraṣṭhitaḥ /
ayaṁ kāsyapa caturtho duḥśilah śilavatpratirūpakaḥ //
ime kāsyapa catvāro duḥśilah śilavatpratirūpakaḥ //

135. śilam śilam iti kāsyapoccyate / yatra nātmā nātmīyam / na kriyā nākriyā /
na karaṇam nākaraṇam / na cāro nācāro na pracāraḥ / na nāmarāpaṃ na
nimmittam / na śamo na praśamaḥ / na grāho notsargaḥ / na grāhyam na
sattvo na sattvaprajñaptīḥ / na vān na vākprajñaptīḥ / na cittam na
cittaprajñaptīḥ / na loko nālōkah / na niśrayo nāniśrayah / nātma-
śīlotkarśanā na parasīlapaṃsanā / na śīlamanyanā / na śīlavikalpanā (?)/
na saṃkalpanā / idam ucyate kāsyapāryānāṃ śilam anāsravam aparāyāpannaṃ
traidhātukāpaṃtaṃ sarvanīśrayavigatam //

136. atha khalu bhagavāṃs tasyāṃ velāyām

\(^a\) Cf. Tib. ‘dul-ba’i tshul-la gnas-pa and the Indikāṭusāya copper plaque no. 67:
vanaya-gupto sthitah (S. Paranavitana, ‘A Note on the Indikāṭusāya copper plaques’,
Epigraphica Zeylanica, vol. IV, pt. 5, 1939, p. 241). Thanks are due to Mr. G. Schopen
for drawing my attention to this article.

In 1957 V.S. Vorob‘ev-Desjatovskij published two fragments of Sanskrit manuscripts
of the Kāsyaparivarta\(^5\). The first fragment is an almost complete leaf. It carries the
number three and forms part of the manuscript published by von Staël-Holstein.
Weller is of the opinion that this leaf does not agree in all details with the manu-
script published by von Staël-Holstein\(^6\). As his only reason Weller adduces the fact
that this leaf contains the words: idam uvāca bhagavāṃs which are absent in the
Tibetan version. This only proves that the Sanskrit original on which the Tibetan
version is based is different. Vorob‘ev-Desjatovskij points out that the dimensions
of the leaf are the same as those of the other leaves of the manuscript. His conclusion
that this leaf is the formerly unknown third leaf of the manuscript is undoubtedly

\(^5\) ‘Vnov’ najdennye listy rukopisej Kāsyaparivarty’, Rocznik Orientalistyczny, 21
[1957], pp. 491–500.

\(^6\) Zum Kāsyaparivarta, p. 63, n. 3.


Weller is of the opinion that this fragment does not entirely agree with the Chinese Chin version, as Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij had maintained7. This is not quite correct because Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij said only that "of all Chinese versions only the Chinese version reproduces exactly mārasamātikramanā dharmāḥ in section 18 and that this represents a distinctive peculiarity of this version" [p. 498].

Although Weller agrees with him on this point, I fail to see in what way the Chin version is any closer to the Sanskrit text of the fragment than the Han and Ch'in versions. None of the three versions translates only the word māra. According to Weller's translations of the three versions, the Han version has "die Welt Māras", the Chin version "alle māra" und the Ch'in version "māras Angelegenheiten"8.

---

Again according to Weller, the fragment agrees with the Chin version in section 19: śrutārthaṭptatā sarvavakuṣalamūlasamudānayan[āya]. The Chin version has: “Die Lehre zu suchen gibt es (für ihn) keinen Überdruss (und kein) Genügen, weil [er] jedwede Wurzel des Heilsamen aufsammelt.” However, “die Lehre zu suchen” does not correspond to śrutārtha but to saddharmaparyeṣṭim ārabhyā which belongs to the third category in this section. It is interesting to note that in this instance the text of the fragment corresponds better to the Sung version and the Tibetan version than the text of von Staël-Holstein’s manuscript. The latter has atptitā as against śrutārthaṭptatā which is confirmed by the Tibetan version: thos-pa dan don-gyis noms mi-myon žin and the Sung version: “Der Sinn [der Lehre] zu hören findet er kein Genügen”10. Another example is niśkuhaṃātranyāvāśaḥ in section 19. In this case the fragment agrees with the Tibetan version [tshul-chos-pa med-par dgon-pa na gnas-pa] and von Staël-Holstein’s manuscript [niśkuhaṃātranyāvāsābhīratiḥ] with the Sung version: “Er freut sich, im Walde zu weilen, [ist] völlig still und zurückgezogen”11. In section 14 von Staël-Holstein’s manuscript has bhūtakalyāṇamitrāṇi as against kalyāṇamitrāṇi in the fragment and in the Tibetan version [dge-ba'i būṣes-gnien]. Von Staël-Holstein’s manuscript adds after each category the word saṃvartate which is missing in the fragment and in the Tibetan version.

The oldest Chinese version does not contain any verses in sections 136—137. In spite of this, it is not certain that the Sanskrit original, on which this version is based, was written in prose. The Chinese version is very primitive and it is possible that the translator rendered the original Sanskrit verses into prose. It is noteworthy that section 136 in the Han translation begins with a solemn statement which is not found anywhere else in the text: “At that time the Buddha spoke, saying’. As to the date and the author of this translation, both Pelliot and Ōno Hōdō have drawn attention to the fact that, although the oldest extant Chinese catalogue, the Ch’u san-tsang chi-chi [about 515 A.D.], states that the text was translated in 179 A.D. by Lou-chia-ch’an [Taishō no. 2145, p. 61815], this is very doubtful12. Pelliot supposes that Lou-chia-ch’an’s translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāśūtra was confused with the translation of the Kāsyapaparivartavā. However, Pelliot points out that the translation judging by its archaic aspect could well have been made in the Han period: Ōno declared peremptorily that the language of the text proves that it was translated during the Eastern Chin. It is impossible to adhere to his point of view.

9 Zum Kāsyapaparivartavā, p. 10.
11 Ibid., p. 239.
12 P. Pelliot, Compte rendu de The Kāsyapaparivarta, etc., T’oung Pao, 32 (1936), pp. 68—76; Ōno Hōdō, Daijō kaikyō no kenkyū (Tōkyō, 1954), pp. 98, 101—102. Cf. also Taishō no. 2145, pp. 19b19 and 29c17.
Already von Staël-Holstein remarked that the translation uses the same equivalent for *bhagavat* as Lou-chia-ch’an’s translation of the *A-ch’u fo-kuo ching* (Taishō no. 313). The transliterations of *cakravartin*, *upāyakausalya* and *abhisijñā* are the same as those found in Lou-chia-ch’an’s translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*. It is therefore probable that this translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta is indeed due to Lou-chia-ch’an.

According to von Staël-Holstein the manuscript edited by him was probably written in the ninth and tenth centuries. His main argument seems to be the agreement of the text with the Chinese Sung version. This version was made in the year 986. Whatever the date of the manuscript may be, the text must already have been more or less the same at the time of the Tibetan translation, which dates from the beginning of the ninth century. It is possible to push the *terminus ad quem* even further back. The Kāśyapaparivarta is quoted in many texts. Von Staël-Holstein listed quotations in the Sīksāsamuccaya, the Mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra and the Bodhicaryāvatārapaṇijīka. Japanese scholars have pointed out quotations in the Prasannapadā, the Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīka, the Lankāvatārasūtra and the Ratnagotravibhāga and in texts, preserved only in Chinese and/or Tibetan translation, such as the Mahāyānasamgraha, the Daśabhūmivibhāga [Taishō no. 1522], the Prajñāpāramitopadeśa [Taishō no. 1509], the Mahāyānāvatāra [Taishō no. 1634], the Fo-hsing lun [Taishō no. 1610], the Chi chu-fa-pao tsui-shang-i lun [Taishō no. 1638], the Anuttarāsrayasūtra [Taishō no. 669] and the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra [Taishō nos. 374–377]. Tsukinowa drew attention to the fact that the four verses of section 71 are quoted in the Prasannapadā pp. 156–157. As Sthiramati, the commentator of the Kāśyapaparivarta, did not yet know a text which contained verses apart from those in sections 136–137, he concluded that the text, as transmitted in von Staël-Holstein’s manuscript, the Tibetan version and the Sung version, was established in the period

---


between Sthiramati and Candrakīrti. This is certainly possible, although it must be pointed out that other quotations in the Prasannapadā do not entirely agree with the text of von Staël-Holstein's manuscript. This, however, is only to be expected in the case of a text which has been transmitted over centuries and which has been continually expanded. In any case, the quotations of the Kāśyapaparivarta are capable of throwing much light on the history of the text. For instance, it is very interesting to see that the comparison of the bodhisattva with the kalaviṅka in section 84 is absent in the Chin and Ch'in versions, but is already quoted in the Prajināparamitopadeśa which was translated about 404 A.D.\textsuperscript{17} It is interesting to note that this comparison is also absent in Sthiramati’s commentary which was translated into Chinese in the period 508–535, and in a hitherto unnoticed Chinese version of the Kāśyapaparivarta, chapter 7 of the Ratnameghasūtra [Taishō no. 659, vol. XVI, pp. 276–283]. This latter version was recently discovered almost simultaneously by Takasaki Jikidō\textsuperscript{18} and by Nagao Gajin\textsuperscript{19}. Nagao shows that this version is closely related to the Ch'in version. According to him the translator of it was not Man t'o lo hsien from Funan, but Subodhi from Funan who worked as translator during the Ch'en dynasty (557–589).

The Sanskrit fragments in London, Helsinki and Leningrad confirm the evidence which can be gained from the Chinese versions and the quotations of the Kāśyapaparivarta in other texts. The Kāśyapaparivarta, in which the verse parts are later than the prose parts, offers an interesting example of a text in which the verses, written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, are definitely later than the prose parts, the language of which is much closer to standard Sanskrit.


\textsuperscript{18} Cf. Nyoraizō shisō no keijō [Tōkyō, 1974], p. 449.

\textsuperscript{19} ‘"Kashōhon no shohon" to "Daihōshakkyō" seiritsu no mondat', Suzuki gakujutsu kenkyū nenpō, 10 (1973) [published in 1974], pp. 13–25.