

Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica

Editor-in-Chief: Hiroshi KAN'NO

Volume II

**The *Kāśyapaparivarta*
Romanized Text and Facsimiles**

M.I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA

in collaboration with
Seishi KARASHIMA and Noriyuki KUDO

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo 2002

The *Kāśyapaparivarta*
Romanized Text and Facsimiles

M. I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA

in collaboration with
Seishi KARASHIMA and Noriyuki KUDO

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
Soka University
Tokyo 2002

Published by The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology (= IRIAB),
Soka University:

1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, Japan

〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町1-236

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

Phone: (+ 81-426) 91-2695

Fax: (+ 81-426) 91-4814

E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp

Permission was granted to reproduce the manuscripts of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* by the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung. Also consent was given by the Institute of Oriental Philosophy to use their colour photographs of the St. Petersburg manuscript (SI P/2). As to the Hoernle fragments, we used photos taken by Prof. Kazunobu MATSUDA, Bukkyō University.

First Published 31, March, 2002

Printed in Japan by Meiwa Printing Co.Ltd., Tokyo, JAPAN

© M. I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA

All rights reserved.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, no part of this book may be reproduced, translated or utilised in any form, either by print, photoprint, microform, multimedia or any other means, now known or hereafter invented, without written permission of the copyright holder and publishers. Enquiries should be made to the publishers.

ISBN 4-9980622-4-7

Correspondence regarding all editorial matters, including manuscripts to be offered for publication, may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief of the Series "Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica" at The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, Tokyo, Japan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	vii
CONVENTIONS.....	xiv
ROMANIZED TEXT OF THE SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS	1
I MANUSCRIPT SI P/2 (St. Petersburg).....	3
II MANUSCRIPT SI P/85A (St. Petersburg)	58
III FRAGMENTS IN THE HOERNLE AND THE MANNERHEIM COLLECTIONS (London/Helsinki)	60
IV A FRAGMENT IN THE TURFAN COLLECTION (Berlin)	63
FACSIMILES	
I MANUSCRIPT SI P/2	Plate 1
II MANUSCRIPT SI P/85A	Plate 75
III FRAGMENTS IN THE HOERNLE COLLECTION	Plate 76
IV A FRAGMENT IN THE TURFAN COLLECTION	Plate 78

INTRODUCTION

There is a unique Sanskrit manuscript of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (hereinafter *KP*) in the collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, which has attracted the attention of scholars since 1926, when Alexander von Staël-Holstein published its transliteration. The reason for this unusual interest becomes clear if we take into consideration that the oldest part of this sūtra, its core, was formed at the earliest stage of development of the Mahāyāna literature (Conze 1968: 302-5; Pāsādika 1991: 59), and that the two most important philosophical schools of Mahāyāna Buddhism — Madhyamaka and Yogācāra — regarded it as one of the basic texts to their doctrines.

Also, the sūtra is of particular interest for the study of moral and ethical rules of Mahāyāna Buddhism, because the moral code of a *bodhisattva* was fully formulated in this text for the first time. This code was quoted in many other Mahāyāna texts and held in high regard in Central and East Asia.

In this introduction, we shall confine ourselves to a brief description of the available Sanskrit manuscript and fragments of the *KP*.

There is only one nearly complete Sanskrit manuscript of this sūtra written in Brāhmī script. It may have been copied in Khotan around the seventh-eighth centuries C.E.. It is now kept in St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies; its call number is SI P/2. The manuscript was brought from Eastern Turkestan by the Russian consul in Kashgar, N. F. Petrovsky, at the end of the nineteenth century. As early as 1926, von Staël-Holstein (Staël-Holstein 1926) published its transliteration with collation of the Tibetan translation in the *bKa' 'gyur* (in transliteration) and four Chinese ones. In 1954, V. S. Vorobyov-Desyatovsky, while sorting the Petrovsky collection, found folio No. 3 belonging to the same manuscript (Vorobyov-Desyatovsky 1957: 491-95). At present, we possess seventy-four folios of the *poṭhi* type: Nos. 1-30, 32, 33, 37 (between folios 33 and 37, only two folios are missing as a result of a mistake in pagination), 40-50, 52-81 (between folios 50 and 52, there is no lacune — again the scribe's mistake).

While publishing his Sanskrit transliteration, von Staël-Holstein divided the Sanskrit text into chapters according to its contents (see his preface p. VI). While Shihu's translation (985-986 C.E.), which is the largest among the Chinese translations, has 166 paragraphs, the Sanskrit text has only 161 paragraphs because of some lacunae. The Sanskrit version was translated twice into European languages: by Friedrich Weller into German and by Bhikkhu Pāsādika into English^[1].

When we compare this manuscript with some other fragments of the sūtra, which belong to the Central Asian manuscript collections of Great Britain, Finland and Germany, we may conclude that at least two Sanskrit versions of the *KP* existed in Eastern Turkestan

^[1] We take into account only the translations of the whole text, see: Weller, 1965; Pāsādika, 1977-79. Bhikkhu Pāsādika has recently published a paper, in which the comparison of both translations is made, with special attention to "purely philological or Buddhological concern" (Pāsādika 1992: 145).

in the first centuries C.E.: a brief and apparently earlier version, and an extended one which took shape later. Manuscript SI P/2 represents the extended version of the *KP*.

Among the Central Asian Sanskrit fragments, two of them in the R. Hoernle Collection were identified by Hōryū Kuno (No. 143, S.B. 38 and No. 143, S.B. 39, the India Office Library, see Kuno 1938: 71-110). J. W. de Jong (1977) has made it clear that another fragment published by J. N. Reuter (Reuter 1913-1918: 1-37) belongs to the same folio. It is now included in the Mannerheim Collection (Finland). The first two fragments were found in Khotan, possibly in Khadalik; the Mannerheim fragment was acquired by him during his expedition to Central Asia in 1906-1908. de Jong reconstructed the complete text of the folio. It corresponds to §§ 128-135 of the *KP* (de Jong 1977: 250-51). This is a folio of the *poṭhi* type, having eight lines on each side. Kuno demonstrated that the text of the Sanskrit fragments corresponds closely to two of the Chinese translations, i.e. those of the Western Qin and Jin dynasties.

V. S. Vorobyov-Desyatovsky was the next to discover another fragment in the Petrovsky Collection (call number SI P/85A). This is a folio of the *poṭhi* type, seven lines on each side, and is paginated as the fifth (Vorobyov-Desyatovsky 1957: 496-500). On the basis of paleographic analysis, Vorobyov-Desyatovsky dated the manuscript as belonging to the sixth-seventh centuries C.E.

The text of the Petrovsky fragment, corresponding to §§ 14-19 of the *KP*, and that of the Hoernle / the Mannerheim fragments, corresponding to §§ 128-135 of the *KP*, contain only prose. On the other hand, the manuscript SI P/2, representing the extended version, contains verses which follow and summarize the prose. In contrast to the extended version, the fragments which consist only of prose represent the brief version.

There is one more difference between the two versions. The prose of the brief version is more contracted than that of the extended one. It is especially evident, when we compare the text of the Hoernle / the Mannerheim fragment with §130 of the *KP*. The former lacks the concluding passage which is extant in the latter, namely:

(68recto5) *yo rājārham bhaiṣajyāṃ paryāpunitvā asaṃvarena apāyagāmī bhavati*
(Whoever takes the medicines not suited [for him], though [these medicines are] of help to a *rāja*, [all the same] will suffer).

This passage is absent from the Chinese and Tibetan translations, too.

Furthermore, the Hoernle / the Mannerheim fragment lacks the following prose passage in § 131 which contains an important comparison:

(65verso4-66recto2) *tadyathāpi nāma kāśyapa tad eva vaidūryam mahāmaṇiratnam ameddhyaṅvaskarād uddhṛtaṃ bhavet sudhauṭam suprakṣālitam suparimāṛjitam • taṃ maṇirat(n)asvabhāvam eva na vijahaty evam eva kāśyapa babuśruto (?)lpaprayatnena sarvakleśān viśodhayati mahāprajñāratna[s]vabhāva[am] (e)va na vijahāti* (Thus, for example, Kāśyapa, when the same precious stone *vaidūrya* is taken out of a heap of sewage, carefully washed, cleaned and wiped, it does not lose its nature as a precious stone. In the same way, Kāśyapa, a learned man cleans off all his defilements with little efforts, and does not lose his jewel-like nature i.e. great wisdom).

Also, *maṇiratna* is used in the fragment instead of *vaidūryamahāmaṇiratna* in the

corresponding passage of the extended version. The word *vaidūrya* is also absent in the Chinese and Tibetan versions.

Unfortunately, § 133 in the extended version is rather damaged, but still one can find some differences. The brief version mentions only "the son of the head of merchants" (*śreṣṭhiputrasya*), while the extended one has "son of the head of the merchants or the king's son" (*śreṣṭhiputrasya vā rājaputrasya vā*). "rājā's son" is missing also in the verses of the extended version.

These examples are sufficient to show that the absence of verses is not the only difference between the two versions. de Jong has noticed that the *KP* could represent a rare case where prose in a language closer to standard Sanskrit served as a core, to which verse parts in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit were added (de Jong 1977: 255)^[2].

One more fragment of the *KP* was found in the German Turfan Collection (Sander / Waldschmidt 1980, No. 374). This is a damaged folio of the *poṭhi* type, four lines on each side. Its text corresponds to §§ 151-153 of the *KP*; as there are no verses in these chapters, it is therefore not possible to say which version this fragment belongs to. The text differs slightly from that of the manuscript SI P/2.

The popularity of the sūtra in Eastern Turkestan and its importance for the Mahāyāna tradition resulted in frequent quoting of the text in various sūtras, śāstras and other Buddhist texts of the first millennium C.E. The limitations of this introduction do not allow us to dwell on details of quotations from the *KP* found in Buddhist works. A list alone would be bulky. A. von Staël-Holstein noted that the *KP* was quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* and in Prajñākaramati's commentary on the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Bhikkhu Pāsādika also studied quotations of the *KP* found in the *Prasannapadā* (or *Madhyamakāśāstra*, according to P. L. Vaidya's edition), and the *Madhyāntavibhāgaśāstra*.

In addition to the above mentioned works, we have a number of other sources which are useful for our study of the *KP*. We should be especially attentive to quotations of the sūtra found in works ascribed to Nāgārjuna by some scholars, namely the *Bodhisambhāraśāstra*, the *Ratnāvalī*, the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, the *Daśabhūmivibhāgaśāstra*, and the *Catuhstava*.

The quotations in the above-mentioned texts were already listed by Staël-Holstein, de Jong, Pāsādika and others. Meanwhile, some new materials related to the sūtra came to be known. Two Khotanese Saka fragments of the *KP* were recently discovered by Professor R. E. Emmerick and myself among manuscripts of the S. E. Malov Collection in St. Petersburg. The preliminary dating of the fragments is the eighth-ninth centuries C.E. Another fragment was identified by Dr. P. O. Skjærvø. It probably belongs to the brief version. Facsimiles and interpretation of the fragments were published by Prof. R. E. Emmerick and by the author of the present book in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum: Saka Documents VII*, Text volume. We have also proposed a new approach to chapter 12 of the so called "Khotanese Manuscript E" — "A Khotanese poem on Buddhism" (translated into English by Prof. R. E. Emmerick). Previously, it was assumed that the *bodhisattva*

^[2] Lin Li-Kouang views this problem differently. He believes that the prose part was specially improved and sanskritized at a later date by some editors (or revisers), see Lin Li-Kouang 1949: 167 ff.

code (Skt. *saṃvara*, "moral restraint of a *bodhisattva*") was introduced into this Khotanese text from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* ascribed to Maitreya according to Tibetan and Chinese traditions, but to Aśaṅga in Indian tradition (Wogihara 1930-36: 152-180). However, our investigation has made it clear that the Khotanese text corresponds more closely with §§ 1-22 of the *KP*. We shall compare here two quotations from the "Khotanese Manuscript E" (translation by Emmerick) and the *KP* (translation by Pāsādika):

"Khotanese Manuscript E" (p. 241 [5-16]):

"Son, these four great things on account of which *Bodhisattvas* are overcome, fall, lose their *saṃvara* should by no means be done. If for the sake of blessing, honour, one despises others (but) honours oneself, this is the first abstention. Secondly: (if) one is greedy with regard to possessions (or) the Law (and) does not give what someone begs from him even when he has it present. (If) he harbours fierce anger (and) thereby harms another (or) distresses him and does not ask his forgiveness (but) is angry, that is the third (case). One who despises, does not value the Mahāyāna Law (but) makes it unauthoritative, (saying): "The Buddha did not proclaim it" — this is the fourth (thing) by which one has become adverse to the *Dharma* (and) has sunk from all goodness, from *bodhi*".

The *KP* (Pāsādika 1977: part 1, p. 29, chapter 1):

"These four traits of character, Kāśyapa, bring about a *bodhisattva*'s loss of wisdom — which four? He is disrespectful to the Teaching (*dharma*) and to one who preaches it (I). He wants to keep (knowledge of) the Teaching to himself, unwilling to share what he knows ("the teacher's list") (II). He proves a hindrance to those persons who are longing for the *dharma*, he puts them off, frustrates them and does not teach but conceals (the *dharma* from them) (III). Inflated with pride he advertises himself and disparages others (IV). These four traits (testify) — a *bodhisattva*'s loss of wisdom".

do. (ibid., p. 30, chapter 3):

"If, Kāśyapa, a *bodhisattva* is given to four modes of behavior, he will be at a loss for his (lofty) aspirations after enlightenment (*bodhicitta*). Which are the four? Breaking one's promise (and thus) deceiving one's preceptor, teachers and (others) worthy of veneration (I). Causing mental disturbance to others who used to be free from it (II). Putting those firmly grounded in the Mahāyāna (teaching) in a bad light by detracting from their renown and good reputation (III). Playing tricks on other(s) and treating them with dishonesty instead of having the lofty disposition (of a *bodhisattva*)".

Furthermore, forty-one offences which cause the loss of the *saṃvara*, and forty-one cases in which *bodhisattva* represents himself as *bhūta-bodhisattva*, and finally four main offences are described in the "Khotanese Manuscript E" (see pp. 242f.); in all, we get eighty-six *dharma*s. In the *KP*, eighty-eight *dharma*s are enumerated, forty-four *dharma*s of a *bhūta-bodhisattva* and forty-four of a *pratirūpaka-bodhisattva*.

To describe this very popular text in detail is beyond the scope of this introduction. I am preparing another article, in which I shall try to connect the *KP* with the history of Central Asian Buddhism and the Buddhist Canon, and formulate a hypothesis as to the formation of the text and its influence on Buddhism in the first centuries C.E.

The publication of the facsimiles of St. Petersburg manuscript of the *KP* has been long since a desideratum, and many scholars who studied the text expressed its necessity. In this monograph, facsimiles of this manuscript are published for the first time, together with a new transliteration. As a result of restoration, the manuscript became more legible and we could improve readings at some places. I started to prepare the facsimile edition a long time ago. Originally, I had planned to publish it in the series of *Indian Manuscripts from Central Asia*, Russian Academy of Sciences, but the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology (IRIAB), Soka University kindly proposed to publish it during my stay at the Institute last year and I accepted the proposal readily.

In this connection, I would like to express my thanks to the IRIAB for having invited me as its visiting professor and allowed me to concentrate on the research of the text during my stay at the Institute from January to March 2001. It is a great honour and pleasure that this work is published as the fifth volume of the *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* monograph series.

I am especially grateful to the former director of the IRIAB, Prof. Dr. Yuichi Kajiyama, as well as Prof. Dr. Seishi Karashima, Mr. Noriyuki Kudo and Dr. Stefano Zacchetti who gave me invaluable help by checking my transliteration of the text and contributing a number of emendations. My gratitude goes to them who called my attention to linguistic peculiarities in the text, which may have resulted from (hyper) sankritization of original Middle Indic forms.

I am thankful also to the Director of the Institute of Oriental Philosophy, Dr. Yoichi Kawada, who has encouraged me to publish this work in Japan. Thanks are also due to his Institute which generously provided me with the coloured photos for the publication. Furthermore, I want to express my thanks to Dr. H.-O. Feistel and the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung for giving me the permission to reproduce the facsimiles of the *KP* in the Turfan Collection and to Dr. Klaus Wille for helping me to acquire photos of the text from the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. I am grateful also to Prof. Kazunobu Matsuda for providing me with the photos of the Hoernle fragments from the British Library taken by him.

M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya