

## SANSKRIT FRAGMENTS OF THE KĀŚYAPAPARIVARTA

by J. W. DE JONG, Canberra

In 1938 Kuno Hōryū edited two fragments of a manuscript of the Kāśyapaparivarta<sup>1</sup>. 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 Kāśyapaparivarta 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 bhagavāṃ tasyā[ṃ] velā(y)[ā]m imāṃ gāthāṃ 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<sup>2</sup>. 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 Kāśyapaparivarta 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-

<sup>1</sup> 'Saiiki shutsudo bukkyō bonpon to sono seiten shiron-jo chii (jō). Daihōshakkyō to Zōagonkyō no genten, I. Uten shutsudo Daihōshakkyō bonpon to sono kachi', *Bukkyō kenkyū*, II,3 (1938), pp. 71–110.

<sup>2</sup> J. N. REUTER, 'Some Buddhist Fragments from Chinese Turkestan in Sanskrit and "Khotanese"', *Journal de la société finno-ougrienne*, 30 (1913–1918), pp. 1–37 [Reprinted in: C. G. Mannerheim, *Across Asia from West to East in 1906–1908*, vol. II, Helsinki, 1940].

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-Holstein<sup>3</sup>. Akṣaras which can only be read partially are put between round brackets and restored akṣaras between square brackets. ○ is used to indicate the circle round the hole in the right half of the leaf.

## RECTO

1. m eva kāśyapaikatyā śramaṇabrāhmaṇā bahūṃn darmām paryāpya na rāg . —  
 ----- m(o) hatṛṣṇā vinodayamti / tte dharmāṇavānohya-  
 mānne : klaiśa(tr)ṣṇayā kā(la) ----
2. tigāmino bhavamti // tadyathā kāśyapa vaidya auṣa(da)bhrastā gr̥hi(t) —  
 ----- utpadyeta / na ca taṃ vyādhi / śaknuyā  
 cikitsittu / evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya ----
3. draṣṭavyaḥ yaḥ tena śrutenna na knoty ātmānaṃ klaiśavyādhiṃ citi — .  
 irarthakaṃ (tasya) taṃ śruttaṃ bhavatt(i) (M) // tadya[thā kā]śyapa  
 glānapu[ru]ṣ[o] r (M) ājārhaṃ bhaiṣajyaṃ upayujyattāsaṃvatsareṇa  
 kālaṃ — —
4. evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya klaiśavyādhi draṣṭa — yaḥ tenāsaṃvat-  
 sareṇa kā (M) laṃ karotti // tadyathā kāśyapa maṇ[i] (M) ratnaṃ ucāre  
 patita akāryopagaṃ bhavaty evam e(va) — —
5. pa bahuśrutasya lābhasatkāro(cārapa) — ○ — — ṣṭavyaḥ niṣkīncana  
 devaman(u) . . e (M) . yaṣu // tadyathā kāśyapa mṛtasya mālā (M) /  
 evam eva kāśyapa duśilasya kāṣ(ā)ya(ndra) —
6. vyaḥ // tadyathā kāśyapa susnātasya suvili — (sya) — — innakeśana-  
 khaśyāvadā(ta) (M) vastraprāvṛtasya pravaraṇacandanānuliṭṭasya śre (M)  
 ṣṭiputrasya śīrṣe caṇpakamālā evam eva kāśya — —
7. lavato (ba)huśrutasya kāśāya(dhā)ra ---- // catvāraḥ ime (M)  
 kāśyapa duśilā śilavapratirūpakāḥ kata (M) m(e) catvāra iha kāśya — —  
 katyo bhikṣu — —
8. mok(ṣa)saṃ ---- rto bhavati / ācā ---- aṇ — (M) treṣv api  
 vadyeṣu bhayadarśi samādāya (śi)kṣa (M) ti śikṣāpa(de) --- (iśuddha)  
 -----

<sup>3</sup> F. WELLER, *Zum Kāśyapaṇḍita. Heft 2. Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Textes* (Berlin, 1965), p. 63, n. 3.

## VERSO

1. ---- ga(t)o (v)iharati pa(ri)śu ----- (M) yaṃ  
kāśyapa prathamo duśila śilavapratirūpakah // (M) (p)unar apa(ra)m  
kās(ya) - (i)haikatyo bhikṣu vvina(ya) --
2. - vati pravṛta - nayo v(i)naya - pto ---- (ya)dr̥ṣṭiṃ  
cāsy(a)nuca (M) litam bhavati : ayam kāśyapa dvitiyo duśila śila  
(M) vapratirūpakah // puna param kāśyapa (i)haikat --
3. kṣu maitrāvihārī bhavati / satvārambaṇa ----- manvāgatto  
bhavati / (a) (M) jātiṃ ca sarvvasaṃskārāṇāṃ śrutvā : utrasati saṃ (M)  
trasati saṃtrāsam āpadyate / ayam kāśyapa tr̥ti --
4. śilāḥ śilavapratirūpakah // pu(na)r apara(m) ○ kāśyapa ihaikatyo  
bhikṣuḥ dv (M) ādaśa dhuttaguṇān samā - ya varttatte / (M) upalaṃbha-  
dr̥ṣṭikaś ca bhavati / ahaṃkāramamaṃkāra ---
5. ayam kāśyapa caturtho duśilaḥ śilavapra ○ tirūpakah // ime kāśyapa  
ca (M) tvāro duśila śilavapratirūpakā (M) śilam śilam itti kāśyapa  
ucyate / yatra nātmā (n) --
6. yaṃ : na kriyā nākriyā / na karaṇam nākaraṇam : na cāro nācāro na  
pracār. (M) na nāmarūpam / na nimittam : na śamo (M) na praśamaḥ na  
graho notsargaḥ na grāhyam : na satvo na ----
7. ptiḥ na vā na vāprajñaptiḥ na citam na citaprajñapti / na lo(k)o  
nālokaḥ na niś[ra]yo nān(i)śrayaḥ nātmaś -- tka . (ṣa) --  
parākarmaśilyapamnsanā : na śilamannyanā / na śi ----
8. nā : na saṃkalpanā : idam ucyate kāśyapa aryāṇām śilam / a ----  
----- āpagatam // sarvvaniśrayavigatam // atha khalu  
bhagavāṃ tasyā velā(y)

In line 5 of the recto the word *devamanuṣyeṣu* has to be read. Fragment 143 S.B. 38 has *devaman* and the vowel *e*. M contains the subscript *y* and the syllable *śu*. Reuter read *xyanu*, *x* indicating a deleted consonant. In line 7 of the verso Reuter read only the word *[du][śile]*. It is possible to read *īlo - r - . ā*. The fragment 143 S.B. 39 has *ātmaś - tka . - . ā (ṣa) - .* It is therefore possible to reconstruct the word *ātmaśīlotkarṣaṇā*. The scribe has the habit of doubling the *t* and the *n*, cf. recto (1) *tte*, *-ohyamānne*; (2) *cikisittu*; (3) *śrutenna*, *śruttam*, etc. Several syllables have been omitted by him, cf. recto (3) *knoty* for *śaknoty*; (4) *citsi* — for *cikitsi* —; verso (2) *puna paraṃ* for *punar aparaṃ*. In recto (3) and (4) the scribe wrote *asaṃvatsareṇa* which must be a mistake for *asaṃvareṇa*, 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, Kāśyapa, verhält es sich wiederum auch (damit) so, daß es vielfach Śramaṇa, Brahmanen gibt, (die) *das der Lehre nicht Gemäße ausführen*, (sondern) alle Krankheiten der Bindungen aufkommen lassen, (und sie nach ihrem) Ende auf dem schlim-

men Wegen (wieder) geboren werden<sup>4</sup>." It is difficult to know how far the scribe has correctly reproduced the language of the text. In *saṃdhi* between vowels, a hiatus usually occurs, but in the first line of recto the scribe wrote *kāśyapaikatya*. In reconstructing the text of the leaf I have normalized the spellings and the *saṃdhi*, 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 rūpaṃ* instead of *na nāmarūpaṃ* (cf. § 135).

#### RECONSTRUCTED TEXT OF THE LEAF

128. evam eva kāśyapaikatyaḥ śramaṇabrāhmaṇā bahūn dharmān paryāpya na  
rāgaṭṭṣṇāṃ vinodayanti / na dveṣaṭṭṣṇāṃ na mohatṭṣṇāṃ vinodayanti /  
te dharmārṇavenohyamānāḥ kleśatṭṣṇayā kālagatā durgatigāmino  
bhavanti /
129. tadyathā kāśyapa vaidya auśadhabhastrāṃ gṛhītvānuvicaret / tasya  
kaścid eva vyādhir utpadyeta / na ca taṃ vyādhim śaknuyāc  
cikitsitum / evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya kleśavyādhir  
draṣṭavyo yas tena śrutena na śaknoty ātmanaḥ kleśavyādhim  
cikitsitum / nirarthakaṃ tasya tac chrutaṃ bhavati /
130. tadyathā kāśyapa glānaḥ puruṣo rājārhaṃ bhaiṣajyam upayujyāsaṃ-  
vareṇa kālaṃ kuryāt / evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya kleśavyādhir  
draṣṭavyo yas tenāsaṃvareṇa kālaṃ karoti /
131. tadyathā kāśyapa maṇiratnam uccāre patitam akāryopagaṃ bhavaty  
evam eva kāśyapa bahuśrutasya lābhasatkāroccārapatanaṃ draṣṭavyam /  
niṣkīṃcana devamanuṣyeṣu /
132. tadyathā kāśyapa mṛtasya mālā / evam eva kāśyapa duḥśīlasya  
kāśāyaṃ draṣṭavyaṃ /
133. tadyathā kāśyapa susnātasya suvilīptasya suchinnakeśanakhasyā-  
vadātavastraprāvṛtasya pravaraṇacandanānūliptasya śreṣṭhiputrasya  
śīrṣe campakamālā evam eva kāśyapa duḥśīlavato bahuśrutasya  
kāśāyadhāraṇaṃ draṣṭavyaṃ /
134. catvāra ime kāśyapa duḥśīlāḥ śīlavatpratirūpakāḥ / katame catvārah /  
iha kāśyapaikatyo bhikṣuḥ prātimokṣasaṃvarasaṃvṛto bhavati / ācāra-  
gocarasampanna aṇumātreṣv api vadyeṣu bhayadarśī samādāya śikṣate  
śikṣāpadeṣu parīśuddhakāyavāñmanaskarmaṇā samanvāgato viharati parī-  
śuddhājīvaḥ sa ca bhavaty ātmavādī / ayaṃ kāśyapa prathamō duḥśīlaḥ  
śīlavatpratirūpakāḥ //

<sup>4</sup> 'Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Djin-Fassung verdeutscht', MIO, XII (1966), p. 419.

- punar aparaṃ kāśyapehaikatyo bhikṣur vinayadharo bhavati pravṛtavinayo  
vinayaguptau sthitaḥ<sup>a</sup> satkāyadṛṣṭiś cāsyānucalitā bhavati / ayaṃ  
kāśyapa dvitīyo duḥśīlaḥ śīlavatpratirūpakaḥ //
- punar aparaṃ kāśyapehaikatyo bhikṣur maitrāvihāri bhavati /  
sattvāraṃbaṇayā karuṇayā samanvāgato bhavati / ajātiṃ ca sarvasaṃskārāṇāṃ  
śrutvā / uttrasati saṃtrasati saṃtrāsam āpadyate / ayaṃ kāśyapa tṛtīyo  
duḥśīlaḥ śīlavatpratirūpakaḥ //
- punar aparaṃ kāśyapehaikatyo bhikṣur dvādaśa dhutaḡuṇān samādāya  
vartate / upalaṃbhadṛṣṭikaś ca bhavati / ahaṃkāramamakāraṣṭhitaḥ /  
ayaṃ kāśyapa caturtho duḥśīlaḥ śīlavatpratirūpakaḥ //
- ime kāśyapa catvāro duḥśīlāḥ śīlavatpratirūpakāḥ //
135. śīlaṃ śīlaṃ iti kāśyapocyate / yatra nātmā nātmīyam / na kriyā nākriyā /  
na karaṇaṃ nākaraṇaṃ / na cāro nācāro na pracāraḥ / na nāmarūpaṃ na  
nimittam / na śamo na praśamaḥ / na grāho notsargaḥ / na grāhyaṃ na  
sattvo na sattvaprajñaptiḥ / na vān na vākprajñaptiḥ / na cittam na  
cittaprajñaptiḥ / na loko nālokaḥ / na nīśrayo nānīśrayaḥ / nātma-  
śīlotkarṣaṇā na paraśīlapaṃsanā / na śīlamanyanā / na śīlavikalpanā (?) /  
na saṃkalpanā / idam ucyate kāśyapāryāṇāṃ śīlam anāśravam aparyāpannaṃ  
traidhātukāpagataṃ sarvaniśrayavigatam //
136. atha khalu bhagavāṃs tasyāṃ velāyām

<sup>a</sup> Cf. Tib. 'dul-ba'i tshul-la gnas-pa and the Iṇdikaṭuṣāya copper plaque no. 67: *vanaya-gupto sthitaḥ* (S. Parānavitana, 'A Note on the Iṇdikaṭuṣāya 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 Kāśyapaparivarta<sup>5</sup>. 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 manuscript published by von Staël-Holstein<sup>6</sup>. 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

<sup>5</sup> 'Vnov' najdennye listy rukopisej Kāśyapaparivarty', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 21 (1957), pp. 491-500.

<sup>6</sup> *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta*, p. 63, n. 3.

correct. The Institute of Oriental Studies has kindly put at my disposal a photocopy. Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij's transliteration has to be corrected in the following points: recto (3) *vākṣyaparamaḥ*; read: *vākyaparamaḥ*; verso (2) *dhāritvā*; read: *dhāritva*; (3) *taparo*; read: *ca taparo*; (4) *vartate*; read: *vartaṃte*; (5) *-visaṃvādanataya*; read: *-visaṃvādanatayā*. Recto (1) Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij reads *ādīptaśīras ce [la . . śru]* and adds in a note that he is unable to restore the missing word. The Tibetan version has *mgo-'am-gos-la me 'bar-ba bžin* which renders *ādīptaśīrascelopama*, cf. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* s.v. *ādīptaśīrascelopama*. Recto (2) *śrutaś* for *śrutāś* and verso (2) *pratipattiya* for *pratipattiyā* are misprints as is obvious from Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij's notes. At the beginning of verso (1) Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij reads . . y . . . *taḥ*. I fail to see any trace of a y on the photocopy. Also the photocopy does not show the syllable *ka* which Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij adds at the end of recto (5): *lābhasatkāraśiloka*.

The second fragment corresponds to sections 14–19. The text does not contain the verses which are to be found in von Staël-Holstein's text. The Institute of Oriental Studies has kindly given me a photocopy of this fragment also. In recto (6) read *bh[ūtagu]ṇāḥ* for *bh[uta gu]ṇāḥ*; (7) read *cābhiśraddhadāti* for *cābhiśraddadhāti*; verso (2) read *ṣaṭpāramitā-* for *ṣaṭpāramita-*; (2–3) read *dharmabhāṇakadar[śa]* (b3) *naṃm* for *dharmābhāṇakadar[śa]* (b3) *nāṃ*; (4–5) read *sarvvadṛṣṭikṛ[tānā]* (b5) *m* for *sarvvadṛṣṭikṛta[na]* (b5) *m*; (6) read *niṣkuhakasy[āra]ṇyavāsaḥ* for *niṣkuhasy[āra]ṇyavāsaḥ*, *pratikārāpratikaṃkṣiṇaś* for *pratikārakratikaṃkṣiṇaś*; (7) read *saddharma-paryeṣṭim* for *saddharmamaryaṣṭim*.

Weller is of the opinion that this fragment does not entirely agree with the Chinese Chin version, as Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij had maintained<sup>7</sup>. This is not quite correct because Vorob'ev-Desjatovskij said only that "of all Chinese versions only the Chin version reproduces exactly *mārasamatikramaṇā 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" and the Ch'in version "māras Angelegenheiten"<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

<sup>8</sup> 'Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Han-Fassung verdeutscht, Buddhist Yearly 1968/69 (Halle, 1970), p. 114; 'Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Djin-Fassung verdeutscht', MIO, XII (1966), p. 394; 'Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Tjin-Übersetzung verdeutscht', Wiss. Z. der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, 13 (1964), Gesellschafts- und Sprachw. Reihe, Heft 4, p. 775.

Again according to Weller, the fragment agrees with the Chin version in section 19: *śrutārthātṛptatā sarvvakuśālamūlasamudānayan[āya]*<sup>9</sup>. 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 ārabhya* 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 *atrptitā* as against *śrutārthātṛptatā* which is confirmed by the Tibetan version: *thos-pa dan don-gyis noms mi-myon' zin* and the Sung version: "Der Sinn (der Lehre) zu hören findet er kein Genügen"<sup>10</sup>. Another example is *niṣkuhakasyāraṇyavāsaḥ* 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 (*niṣkuhakasyāraṇyavāsābhiratiḥ*) with the Sung version: "Er freut sich, im Walde zu weilen, (ist) völlig still und zurückgezogen"<sup>11</sup>. In section 14 von Staël-Holstein's manuscript has *bhūtakalyāṇamitrāṇi* as against *kalyāṇamitrāṇi* in the fragment and in the Tibetan version (*dge-ba'i bśes-gñen*). 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. 617), this is very doubtful<sup>12</sup>. Pelliot supposes that Lou-chia-ch'an's translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra was confused with the translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta. 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.

<sup>9</sup> Zum Kāśyapaparivarta, p. 10.

<sup>10</sup> 'Die Sung-Fassung des Kāśyapaparivarta', Monumenta Serica, 25 (1966), p. 240.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 239.

<sup>12</sup> P. PELLIOU, Compte rendu de *The Kāśyapaparivarta*, 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. 1919 and 2917.

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*, *upāyakaśālya* and *abhijñā* are the same as those found in Lou-chia-ch'an's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*<sup>13</sup>. 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<sup>14</sup>. 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 *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* and the *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*. Japanese scholars have pointed out quotations in the *Prasannapadā*, the *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā*, the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* and the *Ratnagotravibhāga* and in texts, preserved only in Chinese and/or Tibetan translation, such as the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, the *Daśabhūmivibhāṣā* (Taishō no. 1522), the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* (Taishō no. 1509), the *Mahāyānāvātāra* (Taishō no. 1634), the *Fo-hsing lun* (Taishō no. 1610), the *Chi chu-fa-pao tsui-shang-i lun* (Taishō no. 1638), the *Anuttarāśraya-sūtra* (Taishō no. 669) and the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Taishō nos. 374–377)<sup>15</sup>. Tsukinowa drew attention to the fact that the four verses of section 71 are quoted in the *Prasannapadā* pp. 156–157<sup>16</sup>. 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

<sup>13</sup> Cf. F. WELLER, *Buddhist Yearly 1968/69*, pp. 91, 85 and 75; L. R. LANCASTER, *An Analysis of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra from the Chinese Translations* (The University of Wisconsin, Ph.D. 1968), pp. 393, no. 198, p. 388 no. 144 and p. 392, no. 185. Cf. also PAUL PELLIOU, *Pāpīyān > Po-siun'*, T'oung Pao, 30 (1933), p. 92.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. MOCHIZUKI SHINKŌ, *Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 8 (Tōkyō, 1958), p. 259.

<sup>15</sup> SHIOMI TETSUDŌ, 'Ryūju shoin no Daijō kyōten no ni-san ni tsuite', *Shūkyō kenkyū*, N.S. IX, 6 (1932), pp. 1031–1044; TSUKINOWA KENRYŪ, 'Kohon Daihōshakkyō ni tsuite', *Bukkyōgaku no shomondai* (Tōkyō, 1935), pp. 849–869 [= Butten no hihan-teki kenkyū (Kyōto, 1971), pp. 393–407]; KUNO, *op. cit.*; ŌNO, *op. cit.*; HASEOKA KAZUYA, 'Jūjūji-basharon ni okeru Kāśyapaparivarta no inyō ni tsuite', *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, 2 (1954), pp. 553–556; AMANO HIROFUSA, 'Hōchōkyō ni tsuite', *ibid.*, 4 (1956), pp. 464–465; HACHIRIKI HIROKI, 'Purasannapadā no inyō kyōten (2). Ratnakūṭasūtra no inyō ni tsuite', *ibid.*, 15 (1967), pp. 720–723.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 863.



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 Prajñāpāramitopadeśa which was translated about 404 A.D.<sup>17</sup> 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<sup>18</sup> and by Nagao Gajin<sup>19</sup>. 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.

<sup>17</sup> Taishō no. 1599, p. 266c. Cf. KUNO, *op. cit.*, p. 92. The same comparison is already found in the Ratnakaraṇḍasūtra, cf. Śikṣāsamuccaya (ed. CECIL BENDALL, Bibliotheca Buddhica, vol. I, 1897–1902), p. 6.11–15; Taishō no. 461, p. 454c5–9, no. 462, p. 468b25–29. Taishō no. 461 was translated by Chu Fa-hu in 289, cf. Taishō no. 2145, p. 7c.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Nyoraizō shisō no keijō (Tōkyō, 1974), p. 449.

<sup>19</sup> “‘Kashōhon no shohon’ to ‘Daihōshakkyō’ seiritsu no mondai”, Suzuki gakujutsu kenkyū nenpō, 10 (1973) [published in 1974], pp. 13–25.