

The Kāçyapaparivarta

A MAHĀYĀNASŪTRA OF THE RATNAKŪṬA CLASS

EDITED

IN THE ORIGINAL SANSKRIT IN TIBETAN AND IN CHINESE

BY

BARON A. VON STAËL-HOLSTEIN, PH. D., M. LITT.

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF PEKING

大寶
經

迦

葉

品

梵藏漢

六

種

合

刊

鋼
和
泰
著

商
務
印
書
館
發
行

大寶積經迦葉品梵藏漢文六種合刻序

大寶經序

藏中諸經典傳譯的形式，惟大寶積最爲新奇：凡大部經典，本是用叢書的體例逐漸編集而成，這是我們所確信的。所以此類大經，都先有許多零譯單本，或每種先後經幾次重譯，到後來得著足本的梵文，遇著一位大譯師，纔把他全部首尾完具重新譯成，華嚴般若諸譯本成立次第都是如此，寶積初期的遼譯，也不違斯例，自漢晉至魏齊，零譯單本不下數十種。到唐中宗神龍二年至先天二年（七〇六至七一三）菩提流志三藏纔泐成現在的百二十卷本。但他有一點極爲別致：全書共分四十九會，內中只有二十六會爲流志新譯，餘下二十三會則採用舊譯。所以這部百二十卷大寶積經，我們可以借用版本學家的術語，名之爲「唐百衲本」。

這種「百衲本」的辦法，想來是先把舊有許多零譯單本拿來和梵文對照，倘若認爲都要不得，便重新另譯；倘若認爲其中有一種要得的，便采用了他。本刻的經文，就是全部四十九會裏頭第四十三會所說。流志以前，曾經三譯：第一次爲漢支婁迦讖譯，名爲佛說遺日摩尼寶經。第二次爲晉時譯，名爲佛說摩訶衍寶嚴經，失却譯者姓名。第三次爲姚秦時譯，也失却譯者姓名。原名何經，亦無可考。流志對勘的結果，認爲秦譯是要得的，自己不另譯，便把秦譯編作全書之第一百一十二卷，名爲普明菩薩會第四十三。那漢晉兩譯，認爲要不得，便把他們淘汰了。

寶積在翻譯史中，還有一段掌故：當玄奘三藏在玉華宮譯成六百卷的大般若經之後，他的門生便請他譯寶積。那時他已經六十九歲了。他拿起寶積梵本，譯上幾行，即便擱起。說道：「此經部軸，與大般若同；玄奘自量氣力，不復辦此。」其後不過一箇多月，他便圓寂了。這部經不能得玄奘這位法匠譯他，真算憾事。據玄奘說他的部軸與大般若同，大般若六百卷，現行百衲本寶積百二十卷，不過得般若五分之一而強。所以我們很疑心流志所譯，還不是足本。後來北宋法護施護諸人所譯，也許有許多是「寶積遺珠」？本刻所錄之第四譯佛說大迦葉問大寶積正法經，便是其一了。

我們六朝唐宋時代寶來成千累萬的梵本，現在一軸也無存了。印度方面梵經也日加稀少，大乘經典尤甚。鋼和泰先生得著這部經的梵文和藏文，又追尋中國舊譯除「百衲本」所收外還有三本，合成六種。據鋼先生說：「這部梵本久已失傳了，」我們別要輕看這點小冊子，這也算人間孤本哩？

鋼先生將全經逐段分開，把六種文字比較對照，他所費的勞力真不小。我們有了這部合刻本，第一，可以令將來研究梵文藏文的人得許多利便，增長青年志士學梵文的趣味，爲佛學開一新路。第二，用四部譯本並著讀，可以看出翻譯進化之跡及其得失，給將來譯家很好的參考，就這兩點論，我們學界拜鋼先生之賜實在多多了。

鋼先生是俄國一位大學者，專研究印度及亞細亞中部的語言和歷史。兩年前，我在北京高等師範學校講演歷史，有涉及大月氏迦膩色迦王事。鋼先生聽見，便找我的朋友丁文江先生介紹見我，說他自己之到東方，專爲「捉拿迦膩色迦」來的。——因爲迦膩色迦歷史聚訟紛紜，所以鋼先生作此趣語。——後來我們還會面好幾次。有一次，我在鋼先生家裏晚飯，他拿出一部北齊時所譯的經，用梵本對照，譯得一塌糊塗，幾乎令我們笑倒了。我因此感覺：專憑譯本去研究學問，真是危險。我又覺得：鋼先生這種研究精神真可佩服，我初見他時，他到中國不過兩年，他對於全部藏經的研究，比我們精深多了。我很盼望他的精神能間接從這部書影響到我們學界。

我最後還要向商務印書館致謝：這部書是鋼先生託我介紹向該館印行的。像這類專門書本不爲社會一般人所需；該館因爲印這區區小冊子，特製梵文藏文字模，還經許多麻煩纔印成。純然是對於學術界盡義務。我們不能不感謝的。

十三年，三月，九日，梁啓超。 大寶經序

PREFACE

The Kāc̥yapaparivarta belongs to the comparatively small group of Mahāyāna works whose existence before the year 200 A.D. can be confidently assumed.¹ Those undoubtedly ancient texts are, with a few exceptions, known to us from translations only, and the publication of the Sanskrit original of one of them which is the main purpose of this volume will, it is hoped, attract the attention of all Sanskritists interested in Buddhism.

Like most Buddhist sūtras, the Kāc̥yapaparivarta concerns itself to a considerable extent with ethics and with philosophy. Great stress is laid on veracity and we read in chapter 8 that a Bodhisattva should renounce his fortune, an entire kingdom, or even his life, rather than suppress a true speech (comp. also chapter 4). Special rewards are in some cases promised to those who follow certain moral precepts, just as is done in the Sermon on the Mount (comp. chapters 2 and 4). Among the philosophical sections of the Kāc̥yapaparivarta it is the exposition of the "middle path", the true way of viewing things (chapters 52-63), which specially attracts our attention. We find much there which reminds us of the writings of Nāgārjuna and of Āryadeva. Some passages ascribed to those doctors of the Madhyamika school look indeed as if they were based on the Kāc̥yapaparivarta.²

The denunciation of the selfish Ārāvakas, who are described as in every respect inferior to the Bodhisattvas, also fills a considerable number of our chapters. In chapters 105-107, for instance, the Ārāvakas are reproached with looking in the wrong direction for the causes of their spiritual misery. They should look inward for those causes, not outward. The Ārāvakas are in those chapters compared with a dog who, after having been hurt by a clod of earth thrown by a man, considers the clod of earth as responsible for its pain, and attacks the clod, instead of attacking the man. I have but very few Sanskrit or Pāli Buddhist books at my disposal in Peking, and I am unable to say whether this simile occurs anywhere besides the Kāc̥yapaparivarta.

This name does not occur in the Sanskrit manuscript of our sūtra³ but it is nevertheless well authenticated.⁴ The compound Kāc̥yapa-parivarta means "Kāc̥yapa section", and the question as to the larger body of which our sūtra forms a part is answered by Tibetan and by Chinese tradition. The name of that larger body of works is Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāya (Dkon-mchog-brcegs-pa-chen-pohi-chos-kyi-rnam-graṅs), Mahāratnakūṭasūtra (大寶積經) or simply Ratnakūṭa. The name Ratnakūṭa or "Accumulation of Jewels" is

attached, in the Chinese Tripiṭaka as well as in the Bkaḥ-hgyur to a collection of more than forty works, among which the Kācāpapaṇḍita appears. That classification existed in China as early as the beginning of the VIII century⁵ and was later on adopted by the editors of the Tibetan Bkaḥ-hgyur.⁶ It is supposed to be founded upon Indian tradition,⁷ but neither Sthiramati⁸ nor Āntideva,⁹ who, according to Winternitz,¹⁰ lived in the VI and VII centuries respectively, seem to be acquainted with it. Neither of them, as far as I know, ever uses the expression Kācāpapaṇḍita, and both evidently consider our sūtra or dharmaparyāya¹¹ as the only Ratnakūṭa.

The nomenclature of the Bkaḥ-hgyur (Ratnakūṭa for the class and Kācāpapaṇḍita for our particular sūtra) must be comparatively modern, but I adopt it nevertheless, in order to avoid confusion.¹²

The only manuscript¹³ of the Sanskrit Kācāpapaṇḍita we possess contains very many clerical and other errors. Moreover a great number of words are mutilated by insects and old age which have eaten away the edges of some leaves. I think that the best plan, under such circumstances, is: to transcribe the manuscript with all its deficiencies, correcting as many mistakes as possible and trying to supply what is destroyed in notes attached to the transcript of the imperfect text. This plan has, with certain exceptions,¹⁴ been followed in the present case, and it is hoped that the notes, forming a second volume, will soon appear.

The use of the sign ✕ constitutes an innovation. It denotes the Virāma which in our manuscript sometimes stands in the stead of a punctuation mark (comp. line 54a 4, chapter 104). The single oblique stroke of the transcript represents a dot, which in the manuscript is placed on a level with the tops of the characters. A pair of oblique strokes stands for two upright strokes in the manuscript. Three oblique strokes occur very rarely in the transcript and denote that there is one dot followed by two upright strokes in the manuscript (comp. chapter 106, line 55b1). The character X in the transcribed text indicates that one Akṣara is missing in the manuscript. One dot means that a part of an Akṣara is missing, and more than one dot: that an indefinite number of Akṣaras is missing.

I am entirely responsible for the division of the text into the chapters¹⁵ which are marked by the big numerals 1-166. The ordinary numerals occurring in the transcribed Sanskrit text outside the brackets represent numerals found only in the Sanskrit manuscript, and not in any of the translations known to me. The numerals enclosed in square brackets refer to the pages and lines of the Sanskrit manuscript.

There are five lines on each page of the manuscript, except 1a, which is left blank, and an average of 39 Akṣaras on each line. The characters used are the Khotan variety of the Indian Gupta alphabet (upright Gupta), described by Hoernle in the introduction to volume I of his "Manuscript remains found in Turkestan." They were written on paper and probably with a calamus pen.¹⁶

It seems to be clear that a manuscript found near Khotan (comp. infra, note 3) and showing an alphabet peculiar to that region must have been written in the neighbourhood of ancient Kustana (瞿薩旦那、于闐). But when was it written? The date, evidently, lies between the introduction of the Gupta alphabet into Khotan and the entire extinction of Buddhism in that region after the Mohammedan conquest of Khotan. The first event cannot have taken place before the Guptas established their empire in the fourth century A. D., and the date of the second one is about 1000 A. D. (comp. Sir Charles Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*; III, 210). I think that our manuscript was written in a period not far apart from the second date, because the Sanskrit text preserved in the manuscript shows certain peculiarities which point to the ninth and tenth centuries, rather than to the earlier epochs (comp. infra, page XI).

The many errors contained in our manuscript and the mutilated state of its existing leaves render many passages contained therein unintelligible without the help of other sources. Even when considering the question as to how the Akṣaras were to be separated and arranged into words, the editor had often to recur to the various available translations and to the commentary of the *Kācāpapaṛivarta* (comp. page XIII below). He had to do so more frequently still when considering the work as a whole, because 8 (out of a total of 81) leaves of our only Sanskrit manuscript are missing.¹⁷

A Mongolian translation of our text is known to exist in the Mongolian *3kaḥ-hgyur*, but no copy of it has proved accessible to my friend Mr. B. I. Pankratoff, an expert Mongolianist, in Peking. The Tibetan translation, however, and four different Chinese translations have been obtained and are published together with the Sanskrit text in this volume.

As important for the history of Mahāyāna Buddhism as these five translations of the text, are the translations of the *Kācāpapaṛivarta* commentary. The latter also deserve to be made easily accessible to Orientalists interested in Indo-Tibetan as well as in Indo-Chinese studies, and it is hoped that they will appear in a separate volume towards the end of this year (1925).

The following are the titles of the five translations of our text, which are published in the present volume, as we find them in the Tibetan Bkaḥ-hgyur (Dkon-brçegs, vol. 6) and in the Tokyo edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka (vol. 地 fasciculi 12 and 6):

Rgya-gar-skad-du / āryakāṣyapaparivartanāmamahāyānasūtra / bod-skad-du / hphags-pa-hod-sruṅ-gi-leḥu-zhes-bya-ba-theg-pa-chen-pohi-mdo /

佛說遺日摩尼寶經

後漢月支國三藏支婁迦讖譯

佛說摩訶衍寶嚴經

一名大迦葉品 晉代譯失三藏名

大寶積經卷第一百一十二

普明菩薩會

第四十三

失譯附秦錄勸同編入

佛說大迦葉問大寶積正法經

西天譯經三藏朝散大夫試鴻臚少卿傳法大師
臣施護奉 詔譯

We learn from the colophon of the Tibetan translation¹⁸ that it was made by Jinamitra (Zinamitra), Āilendrabodhi and Ye-ṣes-sde. It seems to be certain that these translators lived in the IX century and there can, consequently, be no doubt about the date of this translation. Comp. Féer, page 213.

The Kāṣyapaparivarta seems to have been more popular in China during the last seventeen or eighteen centuries, than most other Buddhist works. It has been translated at least four times into Chinese, and it enjoys the rare distinction of possessing a commentary which still exists as a part of the Chinese Tripiṭaka. An edition of the 秦 (Ch'in) translation of our sūtra, accompanied by Sthiramati's commentary, has, furthermore, recently (in 1918) appeared at Nanking.

The oldest Chinese version, which is marked 漢 (Han) in our edition, is ascribed to Lou-chia-ch'an (婁迦讖) who, according to Nanjio (column 381), worked at translations in China during the II century A.D.¹⁹ The editors do not agree as to the correct title of the translation.²⁰ The Tokyo Trip. (2, 12, 30a) gives the following title 佛說遺日摩尼寶經 at the beginning and 佛說日摩尼寶經 at the end (2, 12, 34a). In both cases the character 說, is marked and a note added that it is missing in some of the sources. A Chinese friend of mine suggested that the first title, but without the 說, was to be preferred to the one adopted by the Tokyo editors at the beginning. My Chinese friend evidently considered 日摩尼寶經 as the name of the sūtra and 佛遺 as an addition meaning "bequeathed by Buddha."²¹ But the text of our sūtra shows this suggestion to be inadmissible. Lou-chia-ch'an's translation itself designates (infra page 83) our sūtra as 極大珍寶之積遺日羅經 in chapter 52.

It is evident that 遺日羅 here represents the same thing as 遺日 at the beginning of the translation and that 遺 has nothing to do with 佛. Professor Wogihara of Tokyo suggested that we should read 曰 (yüeh) instead of 日 (jih) and consider 遺曰羅 as an imperfect transliteration of vipula or of vaipulya.²² I accept this suggestion and consider the first title as an equivalent of Skt. Buddha-bhāṣita-vaipulya-maṇi-ratna-sūtra and the second one (chapter 52) as an equivalent of Skt. Mahā-maṇi-ratna-kūṭa-vaipulya-sūtra or of Mahā-ratna-kūṭa-vaipulya-sūtra.²³ In our Skt. text of chapter 52 mahāratnakūṭa-dharmaparyāya corresponds to 極大珍寶之積遺日羅經. In this connection it may be pointed out that the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka calls itself a "vaipulyasūtrarāja" on page 1 (line 3) and a "dharmaparyāya" on page 28.²⁴

Considering what has already been said about the ancient designations of our sūtra, we may safely assume that the title of the second Chinese translation (marked 晉 Djin²⁵ in our edition) viz. 佛說摩訶衍寶嚴經 represents the Skt. words: Buddha-bhāṣita-mahāyāna-ratna-kūṭa-sūtra.²⁶ As to the alternative title comp. note 4 below. The name of the translator is lost, but we know that the translation was made between 265 and 420 A.D. (comp. Nanjio, column 27).

The third Chinese translation is marked as belonging to the Mahāratna-kūṭasūtra (大寶積經) in the Tokyo edition (2, 6, 56a) and bears besides the following title: 普明菩薩會. The Bodhisattva 普明 (or 普光

according to the Sung translation) plays quite a subordinate rôle, while Kāçyapa is the chief interlocutor of the Buddha, in our sūtra. It would, therefore, have been more natural to name the work after Kāçyapa, instead of calling it 普明菩薩會, which almost certainly represents Skt. Samantālokapariṣcchā.²⁷ That name, instead of a more appropriate title containing the word Kāçyapa, has, probably, been chosen by some editor, because the name Kāçyapa forms part of the title of another section of the Chinese Ratnakūṭa: the 摩訶迦葉會 (=Mahākāçyapapariṣcchā?).

Nanjio (column 19) has nothing to say as to the author of the third Chinese translation, except "translator's name is lost." But Forke, while considering the author's name as unknown, definitely asserts that the translation was made when the Ch'in dynasties (350-431) held sway in parts of China.²⁸ I consequently use 秦 (Ch'in) as a short designation of the third Chinese translation.

The Chinese title of the fourth Chinese translation 佛說大迦葉問大寶積正法經 evidently represents the following Sanskrit title:

Buddha-bhāṣita-mahā-kāçyapa-pariṣcchā-mahā-ratna-kūṭa-sad-dharma-sūtra.

The author of this version is 施護 (Shih-hu), a translator who worked under the later Sung dynasty during the last decades of the X century (comp. Nanjio, column 186), and I use 宋 (Sung) as a short designation of the fourth Chinese translation.

The following chapters of the present edition are missing in the Chinese translations:

19 (Han only) 21, 22, 27, 28, 33 (Han, Djin, Ch'in) 37, 38, 47 (Han only) 50, 51 (Han, Djin, Ch'in) 53 (Han only) 55 (Han, Djin, Ch'in) 57, 62, 79 (Han only) 84, 89 (Han, Djin, Ch'in) 92, 107, 110 (Han only) 119 (Han, Djin, Ch'in) 120 (Djin, Ch'in, Sung) 126 (Han, Djin, Ch'in) 150-156 (Han, Djin) 157 (Han, Ch'in) 158 (Han, Djin, Ch'in) 159-163 (Han, Ch'in) 164, 165 (Han, Djin, Ch'in).

The fact that the chapters 104-107 are missing in Sung has not been taken into account in this list, because the omission of those chapters in Sung is evidently due to a defect in the original Sanskrit manuscript used by the Sung translator. Comp. the Chinese note at the end of chapter (Sung) 103, which says: "a leaf of the Sanskrit book is missing here."

The great majority of the omissions enumerated in the list cannot be due to defects in the Sanskrit manuscripts used by the several translators,

because all of the missing chapters, except eleven, are missing in more than one translation, and the assumption that various manuscripts should be damaged in the places containing the same chapters is, of course, inadmissible. The majority, if not all, of the omissions must therefore be explained by assuming that various forms of our sūtra, differing i.a. in size, were current during the epochs of the several translations. If we class the available Chinese translations of our sūtra according to their size and begin with the smallest, the result will be the following:

- 1) Han (127 chapters)
- 2) Djin (143 chapters)
- 3) Ch'in (144 chapters)
- 4) Sung (165 or 161 chapters, comp. above)

It is a well-known fact that Indian literary works, as a whole, have a tendency to grow during the course of the centuries and we would consequently conclude from this list alone, even if we possessed no explicit chronological data, that Han was based on the oldest Sanskrit manuscript, Djin on a younger one, Ch'in on a still younger one, and Sung on the youngest. Han, Djin, Ch'in, Sung is exactly the order of seniority assigned to our translations by Chinese Buddhist literary tradition,²⁹ and this coincidence should surely be taken into consideration by those who have, lately, cast doubt on the accuracy of the ancient annotators of the Chinese Tripiṭaka.

The latter, as regards our particular case, is confirmed not only by the relative size of the different versions but also by the following considerations.

The Han translation represents evidently an earlier stage in the development of the Mahāyāna than the other versions. In the preamble (page 1 of this volume), for instance, we are told by Han that Buddha proclaimed our sūtra to an assembly consisting of 1250 Bhikṣus and of 12000 Bodhisattvas. The numbers given by Djin, Ch'in, Sung and the Sanskrit manuscript are 8,000,³⁰ and 16,000 respectively.

From the Han translation of chapter 106 we learn that certain Bhikṣus will be unable in the future to avoid the 3 undesirable rebirths (apāya, ṇaṇsoṇ, 惡道 or 惡趣). In all the other versions, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese (except Sung in which this chapter is missing owing to a defect in the translator's Sanskrit manuscript) the number of undesirable rebirths,³¹ is given as 4 (niraya, tiryagyoni, yamaloka and asura).

The Chinese equivalents used by the Han translator for a number of Sanskrit expressions also support the assumption that his version is older

than the other Chinese translations. The word bhagavat, which in our sūtra frequently takes the place of the expression Buddha, is generally rendered by 世尊 in Djin, Ch'in and Sung. In the Han translation, however, 佛 generally corresponds to bhagavat when the word is used as a substantive, and 天中天 in chapter 14, where the word bhagavat is used as an adjective qualifying the substantive Buddha.³²

The Sanskrit word dharma in the sense of doctrine is frequently represented by 經 in Han (comp. chapters 1, 2 and 12,) while Djin, Ch'in and Sung regularly render it by 法. But dharma in the sense of doctrine is by no means always translated 經 in Han. Comp. chapter 14 (Han), where 經師 corresponds to dharma-bhāṇaka but 佛法 to Buddha-dharma. 大道 and 小道 as well as 菩薩道 and 羅漢道 are found in Han corresponding with Skt. Mahāyāna and Hinayāna (resp. their constant Tibetan equivalents theg-pa-chen-po and theg-pa-dman-pa.) Comp. chapters 3, 11 and 25. Djin, Ch'in and Sung of course use 乘 for yāna in this connection.

These examples will suffice to show that the Han translation was made before a fixed Buddhist terminology had established itself in China and that the version which is considered as the oldest by tradition is really more ancient than Djin, Ch'in and Sung. If we believe in the accuracy of Chinese Buddhist literary tradition, which assigns the fourth Chinese translation to the X century, we will not be surprised to find that the Sanskrit original of Sung (as it was before being robbed of one leaf, comp. above page IX) and the Sanskrit original of the Tibetan translators (who according to Tibetan tradition lived in the IX century) must have been practically identical in size and in general character. Neither can our Sanskrit manuscript (before losing the eight leaves mentioned above, page VI) have differed much from the Sanskrit manuscript used by the Tibetans.³³ Djin and Ch'in are almost equal in size, and in respect of the latter as well as in time, according to Buddhist tradition, occupy a place between Han on the one hand and the homogeneous group of the Skt. Tib. and Sung versions on the other.

To sum up: the six versions of the Kāṣyapaparivarta published in this volume if classed with regard to their size and seniority fall into three homogeneous groups:

- 1 Han, II century
- 2 Djin and Ch'in III-V cent.
- 3 Tib., Skt. and Sung IX-X cent.

The Sanskrit manuscript, on which Sthiramati's commentary was based, must have belonged to group 2.

The greatest help for understanding the defective and faulty Sanskrit text is, no doubt, to be derived from the Tibetan translation, but the Chinese translations, being less literal, often supply information which cannot be obtained by reading the Tibetan version.³⁴

The best Chinese translation is undoubtedly Ch'in, then follows, in point of quality, Djin, and after that Han and Sung.

Especially the authors of the two last named translations have made many mistakes.³⁵ I do not know how to explain the faulty character of Sung, but the Han translator was one of the pioneers of translation and his errors must, therefore, not be judged too harshly.

The editor of the present volume hopes too to find indulgence for his errors among the readers of this book, because in preparing it he worked at a practically novel task. He had to struggle also against a number of adversities unknown to most European Indianists engaged in research work. The fact that the only considerable vacation coincides with a period of torrential rains and tropical heat in North China proved a serious handicap, but the greatest calamity was the want of a library containing the standard works on Indology. There is not even a Sanskrit grammar or a dictionary in any of the Peking public libraries and the present editor has had to rely solely on his own resources for providing those Indological books, which he could not borrow from his Chinese and foreign friends (tourists included).

On the other hand I enjoyed important advantages which would have been denied to me had I undertaken the present work in a European centre of learning: I had the privilege of living next door to the greatest Chinese scholars. Among the latter it is my friend Professor S. Hu (胡適), the famous philosopher and poet, to whom I owe the deepest gratitude for many valuable suggestions connected with this volume and for furthering generally Indo-Chinese studies. I am also very much obliged to Professors Ivanoff and Lessing, to Mr. D. C. Yü (于道泉) and to Mr. C. Whang (黃建), whose premature death, two years ago, robbed Buddhist studies of a most promising scholar, for assisting me in my task.

Last but not least I have to thank Mr. C. C. Liang (梁啟超) and Mr. V. K. Ting (丁文江), two of the most noted leaders of Chinese thought, for the active interest they took in the publication of this volume. It is entirely due to the influence of these eminent scholars that the Kāc̣yapapariṣṭa was printed at Shanghai.

Baron A. von Staël-Holstein (鋼和泰).
Peking, August 1925.

NOTES TO THE PREFACE

Note 1. Comp. Bunyiu Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka, Oxford 1883, columns 379-384.

Note 2. Comp., for instance, Nāgārjuna's Madhyamikaśāstra, chapter XIII, kārīkā 8, as quoted by Yamakami Sogen (Systems of Buddhist Thought, Calcutta 1912, page 198) with our chapter 64, and Āryadeva's commentary to that kārīkā, as translated by the Japanese scholar on the same page, with our chapter 65.

Note 3. The last two leaves of the Sanskrit manuscript are missing and the colophon where we would expect to find the exact name of the work is not available. The fact that there is no title on what we would call the title page (1a) needs no comment, because we know that the names of the books are very frequently found only at the end of Sanskrit manuscripts.

Note 4. The Sanskrit name Kācāpāparivarta is found at the beginning and its Tibetan equivalent (hod-sruṅ-gi-lehu) at the beginning as well as at the end of the Tibetan text. The Sanskrit title of Sthiramati's commentary of our sūtra also contains the word Kācāpāparivarta. The full title of the commentary is as follows: Āryamahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāyācātasāhasrikā-parivartakācāpāparivartatīkā. Comp. Cordier, Catalogue du Fonds Tibétain, troisième partie, Paris 1915, page 369. The second (晉) Chinese translation gives the equivalent of Mahākācāpāparivarta (大迦葉品) as one of the names of the book. The title of the fourth (宋) Chinese translation contains the characters 大迦葉問 = Mahākācāpāparipṛcchā. Bunyiu Nanjio also adopts Kācāpāparivarta as the correct designation of our sūtra, and so does Wassiljew. Comp. Bunyiu Nanjio Catalogue, Columns 19, 27, and 186, and Ākṣāsamuccaya (ed. Bendall) page 52 note.

Note 5. Comp. Nanjio, column 9.

Note 6. Comp. Féer, Annales du Musée Guimet, vol. II, page 212, and Beckh, Tibetische Handschriften, Berlin 1914, page 16.

Note 7. Comp. Nanjio, column 13.

Note 8. The Sanskrit text of Sthiramati's commentary is lost, but we possess two translations of it, one Chinese and one Tibetan. We owe the Chinese translation to Bodhiruci the elder, who flourished about 520 A.D. The Tibetan translator is unknown. Comp. Nanjio, column 271, and Cordier, page 369. Sthiramati begins his commentary with the words: [let us] suppose [that somebody should] say [to the commentator]: if you want to

explain the "Accumulation of Jewels" (Ratnakūṭa), you should first explain why this exposition of the doctrine (Skt. dharmaparyāya Tib. chos-kyi-rnam graṃs Chin. 法門) is called "Accumulation of Jewels." [In reply to such a question I would] say: because [this exposition of the doctrine] comprehends all the various Mahāyāna jewels. Sthiramati goes on to say that there are sixteen kinds of Mahāyāna jewels (jewel No. 1 is the definition of what is considered sinful conduct, jewel No. 2 the definition of what is right conduct etc.) and proves that each jewel is represented in our sūtra (which we for convenience's sake call the Kācāpāparivarta). He quotes chapters corresponding to all the sixteen jewels and all these chapters are easily recognized as chapters of our sūtra. This and similar facts prove, I think, beyond doubt, that Sthiramati considered our sūtra as the entire and the only Ratnakūṭasūtra. The title which the Tibetan translation of Sthiramati's commentary bears (Āryamahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāyaçatasāhasrikaparivartakācāpāparivartatikā) does not agree with our conclusion, and we must assume, that it has been invented long after Sthiramati, to suit the classification adopted by the editors of the Bkaḥ-hgyur. The Chinese title 大寶積經論 (Mahā-ratna-kūṭa-sūtra-çāstra), on the contrary, supports our conclusion. We find the beginning of Sthiramati's commentary on page 244a of the volume Mdo 37 of the Bstan-hgyur edition catalogued by Cordier, and on page 34a of the fasciculus 10 of the volume 暑 (19) of the Tokyo (17th year of Mei-ji) edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka.

The assumption that Sthiramati himself regarded Ratnakūṭa as the title of the work he had commented upon seems also to be supported by the concluding verse of the commentary. That verse contains the words "by having composed a commentary of the Ratnakūṭa" (dkon-mchog-brçegs-pa-çad-pa-byas-pa-yis, 作此寶積論).

Note 9. All the passages quoted from the Ratnakūṭa and marked as such, which I have found in the Sanskrit books available at Peking, can be identified with passages in our Kācāpāparivarta. In none of these cases do we find any reference to the Kācāpā section of the Ratnakūṭa. The latter, i. e. the Ratnakūṭa is a very large accumulation of jewels, filling six volumes of the Bkaḥ-hgyur and one hundred and twenty fasciculi in the edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka catalogued by Bunyiu Nanjio. If the Sanskrit authors in question had considered the work from which they quoted as a part of such a large collection they would probably have specified the particular section which constitutes the source of the quotations. The fact that such a specification is missing in all the cases referred to must lead to the hypothesis that those

authors considered our sūtra as the only Ratnakūṭa. The text of the Kāṣyapaparivarta is quoted at least eight times in Āntideva's Ākṣāsamuccaya (ed. Bendall, Bibliotheca Buddhica I, pages 52, 53, 54, 55, 146, 148, 196, 233,) and the corresponding passages are to be found in the following chapters of this edition of the Kāṣyapaparivarta: 3, 4, 24, 25, 11, 6, 15, 5, 128, 97-102. In Asaṅga's Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra (ed. Lévi, Paris 1907, page 165) a few words from the 24th chapter of the Kāṣyapaparivarta are quoted. On pages 147, 526 and 527 of Prajñākaramati's commentary of the Bodhicaryāvatāra (ed. Louis de la Vallée Poussin, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta 1901-1914) chapters 11, 97, 98, 99, and 102 of our sūtra are quoted. In all these cases the source of the passages is given as Ratnakūṭasūtra, Āryaratnakūṭa, or Ratnakūṭa. On the other hand I have found a number of works which the Chinese Tripiṭaka as well as the Bkaḥ-hgyur class as belonging to the Ratnakūṭa and which in spite of that fact are quoted under their specific names, without any reference to the Ratnakūṭa. The Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā, for instance, which appears as No. 18 of the Chinese Ratnakūṭa (as 護國菩薩會) and as No. 15 of the Tibetan Ratnakūṭa is quoted under its own name without any reference to the Ratnakūṭa on page 54 of the Ākṣāsamuccaya. Comp. Nanjio, column 14, and Féer, page 216.

The Mahāvyutpatti also ignores the existence of the Ratnakūṭa as a collection of sūtras. In chapter 65 of that dictionary the titles of many Buddhist works are enumerated. Among other well-known titles we find there the following: Pitāputrasamāgama (No. 8), Tathāgatācintyaguhyānirdeṣa (No. 30), Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā (No. 36) and Ratnacūḍāparipṛcchā (No. 38). All these works belong to the Ratnakūṭa, according to the Chinese and Tibetan traditions mentioned above (page IV). In the list of Buddhist works given by the Mahāvyutpatti, however, Ratnakūṭa (No. 39) appears to be coordinated with the Pitāputrasamāgama, etc.

Note 10. Compare Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, vol. II, page 251, note 3, and page 259, and Bendall's introduction to his edition of the Ākṣāsamuccaya, page VI.

Winternitz says that Sthiramati lived "am Ende des 6 Jahrh." But how can the work of an author, who lived at the end of the sixth century, have been translated by a translator (Bodhiruci, the elder) who made all his translations before 536? It is true that the Chinese translation has nothing to say as to the author of the commentary, but the Bstan-hgyur does attribute it to Sthiramati. Compare Cordier, page 369 (Sthiramati author of the commentary), Nanjio columns 271 and 427 (Bodhiruci, the elder, who worked

at translations from 508–535, translator of the commentary). The question as to the age of Sthiramati can, evidently, not be considered as definitely settled.

It has been suggested that there have been two Buddhist commentators bearing that name (Comp. Peri in Bulletin de l'Ecole Française, vol. XI, pages 348 and 349), and there may have been even three, because Jinamitra and Çilendrabodhi who are supposed to have been working at translations in the ninth century (Comp. Annales du Musée Guimet, Vol. II, page 213) are in the Bstan-hgyur called pupils of a pupil of Sthiramati (comp. Cordier page 396). If all these indications be correct, we should have to assume that another Sthiramati lived in the eighth or in the seventh century, at the earliest. Professor Sylvain Lévi rightly remarks that the Sthiramati question is "fort embrouillée" (B.E.F. vol. III, 46-49, quoted after Peri).

To sum up: authoritative writers seem to know three Sthiramatis: 1) The one who wrote before 536. 2) The one who lived towards the end of the sixth century. 3) The spiritual grandfather of Çilendrabodhi; that Sthiramati can not have lived before the seventh century.

I do not suggest that there really were three Buddhist doctors of the name of Sthiramati. I merely want to point out that the discrepancies noticed by Messrs. Peri and Lévi widen in the light of certain hitherto unobserved facts. It will be the task of competent Orientalists who have access to adequate libraries to explain those discrepancies.

Note 11. The expressions "dharmaparyāya" and "sūtra" are often promiscuously used in Buddhist writings. The Saddharmapundarika, for instance, is sometimes designated as a sūtra and sometimes as a dharmaparyāya. Comp. the edition of that work by Kern and Nanjio (St. Petersburg 1912, pages 1, title, and 28).

Note 12. According to Nanjio there have been two Sanskrit sūtras bearing the name of Ratnakūṭa (I ignore here the initial 大, representing Skt. nahā, which appears in the title 大寶積經 = Mahāratnakūṭasūtra on column 9 of Nanjio's catalogue). One was the collection already mentioned, and the other a treatise dealing with the Ratnakūṭasamādhi and with the Dharmakāya. The latter work has evidently nothing to do with the sūtra which we call Kācāyapaparivarta. Comp. Nanjio, column 69.

Note 13. That unique Sanskrit manuscript belongs to the Leningrad Academy of Sciences. It was found near Khotan in Chinese Turkestan about thirty years ago by local treasure hunters and sold to Mr. Petrovsky, the late