



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Remarks on the Kāśyapaparivarta Commentary

Silk, J.A.; Straube, M; Steiner, R; Soni, J; Hahn, M; Demoto, M

Citation

Silk, J. A. (2009). Remarks on the Kāśyapaparivarta Commentary. In M. Straube, R. Steiner, J. Soni, M. Hahn, & M. Demoto (Eds.), *Pāsādikadānaṃ : Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika* (pp. 381-397). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14661>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14661>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Remarks on the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* Commentary

Jonathan A. Silk (Leiden)

The scripture commonly known by the title *Kāśyapa-parivarta* ([KP]; more originally, *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*) has drawn the attention of many scholars, including the honoree of this volume, Ven. Bhikkhu Pāsādika.¹ While it may be commended to readers above all for its clear and vibrant presentation of the bodhisattva path and the teaching of emptiness, among the attractions of the text for the philologist is the happy circumstance that it is preserved almost entirely in Sanskrit, was translated into Tibetan (which was at some point revised)² and Chinese (five complete versions and one partial rendering, dating from the Han to the Song, now exist),³ not to mention Khotanese and Mongolian, and that it is provided with an Indian commentary. Of these sources, the last, despite being one of the few known Indian Mahāyāna sūtra commentaries, has received little attention.⁴ It is this commentary to which I wish to devote a few words here, occasioned by the very recent publication (in Autumn 2008) of a careful rendering of the commentary in the Shin Kokuyaku Daizōkyō 新国訳大蔵經 series by a young Japanese scholar, Ōtake Susumu 大竹晋.

Far too often Japanese *kakikudashi* 書き下し ‘translations,’ through which Chinese texts are re-presented in Japanese grammar with all vocabulary intact, are of limited utility, since they do not necessarily require the ‘translator’ to do more than understand the grammatical construction of the original. It is perfectly possible, and not at all uncommon, for such renderings to correctly gloss the grammatical relations between terms, yet not move the reader significantly forward in terms of understanding. Moreover, while there is a long tra-

1 Inter alia, he translated the text in a series of articles thirty years ago, Pāsādika 1977–1979.

2 See Pelliot tibétain 676 = KP §§ 19–24, but without the verses.

3 The editio princeps is Staël-Holstein 1926. This prints an edition of the Sanskrit text, its canonical Tibetan translation, and four Chinese versions, namely T. 350 *Weiyue monibao jing* 遺曰摩尼寶經, T. 351 *Moheyan baoyan jing* 摩訶衍寶嚴經, T. 310 (43) *Puming pusa-hui* 普明菩薩會, and T. 352 *Dajiashe-wen da baoji zhengfa jing* 大迦葉問大寶積正法經. To these are to be added T. 1469 *Jiashe jinjie jing* 迦葉禁戒經, essentially a copy of §§ 111–138 of T. 350, and T. 659 *Dacheng baoyun jing* 大乘寶雲經, *juan* 7, the *Baoji pin* 寶積品, the complete sūtra. This list excludes the extensive quotations of the sūtra in its commentary, and elsewhere.

4 See the literature list at the close of this essay for the publications on this commentary which have come to my attention; almost all are in Japanese. Cf., however, Yoshimura 1966 and Kawamura 2000.

dition in Japanese scholarship of the production of such renderings of Chinese translations of Indian Buddhist texts, particularly in series such as the Kokuyaku Issaikyō 国訳一切経 or the original Kokuyaku Daizōkyō 国訳大蔵経, even when the works being rendered possess parallel Tibetan translations, or even Indic ‘originals,’ it has not always been the custom to consult such versions for guidance.⁵ Ōtake’s work marks a departure from this myopia, which he signals clearly on the first page of his introduction (*hanrei* 凡例), saying “As a general rule, I have taken the diction of the Tibetan translation of the *Kāśyapaparivarta Commentary* as the guide for my Sino-Japanese rendering of the Chinese text.”⁶

In the following I would like very briefly to introduce the work done heretofore on this text, with a special focus on Ōtake’s book, in the hope both of drawing attention to this difficult but important text, and of—once again—highlighting the importance of Japanese scholarship for the study of Indian Buddhism.

The *Kāśyapaparivarta* commentary (hereafter KPCy) is preserved in Tibetan and Chinese translations, but its correct Indic title remains unknown.⁷ The Tibetan translation is noted as early as the *Ldan dkar ma* catalogue (Lalou 1953), which lists it as item 546: *’phags pa dkon brtsegs pa’i ’od srungs kyi le’u’i ’grel pa | 1800 ślo ka | 6 bam po ||*. The Chinese version is called *Da Baoji jinglun* 大宝積經論, translated by Bodhiruci (I) of the Later Wei 後魏 between 508 and 535.⁸ These two translations were edited in interlinear fashion as long ago as 1933 by Alexander von Staël-Holstein, also responsible for the *editio princeps* of the sūtra itself, as noted above.

It is extremely interesting that the overall structure, or conceptual outline, of the KPCy is paralleled in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the two works in Tibetan translation sharing considerable wording. This relation, which is key to understanding the structure of the KPCy, was recognized al-

5 It is another question whether such renderings help modern readers understand how the texts were read in China. They do, of course, often help us understand Japanese traditions, at least in the case of texts which were actively studied in Japan (perhaps a minority of the works found, for instance, in the Kokuyaku Issaikyō series).

6 Ōtake 2008: 13: 原則として『大宝積經論』の蔵訳の語法を根拠として訓読した。

7 The Tanjurs (Pek. 5510, Derge 4009) give the text’s title as *Ārya-Mahāratnakūta-dharmaparyāya-parivarta-śatasāhasrika-Kāśyapaparivarta-ṭīkā*. This looks like a Tibetan Sanskritization of the Tibetan title *’Phags pa dkon brtsegs pa chen po chos kyi rnam grangs le’u stong phrag brgya pa las ’od srungs kyi le’u rgya cher ’grel pa*, as Staël-Holstein himself suggested. Note that this title assumes the embedding of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* within the Mahāratnakūta collection, and for this reason too is unlikely to be original.

8 T. 1523 (XXVI) 204a3–230c9.

ready by the late-seventh early-eighth century Korean scholar Toryun 遁倫 (or Tullyun 道倫) in his commentary on the *Yogācārabhūmi*, *Yugaron ki* 瑜伽論記.⁹ This reference was noticed by Ui Hakuju (1958: 108–112), who felt it beyond doubt that the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* had quoted the KPCy. Ui’s opinion was shared by Takeuchi (1967), while other scholars such as Takasaki (1988) and Ōtake himself have come to a different conclusion about the question of priority, concluding that the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* precedes the KPCy.¹⁰ There would appear to be arguments on both sides. For example, while the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* makes no explicit reference to the sūtra itself, and does not quote it, it might seem hard to understand how its presentation might be understood without reference to the sūtra. On the other hand, from the point of view of the history of ideas, the KPCy makes reference to the so-called Three Nature theory (*trisvabhāva*), while in the corresponding spot in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* no such reference is found; if the latter were dependent upon the former we would be forced to conclude that the compilers of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* explicitly removed mention of this idea from their treatment of the same material. Since the *Yogācārabhūmi* (although clearly a composite composition) is thought to belong to the earlier phases of the Yogācāra movement, this scenario would compel us to imagine a willful step backwards in doctrinal development. Moreover, were the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* based on the KPCy, this would mean that its compilers had systematically removed all explicit references to, and citations from, the sūtra in the process of creating their summary. At the same time, as Ōtake (2008: 30f.) points out, the KPCy does not know the theory of the *kliṣṭamanas*, and is therefore to be dated prior to Asaṅga. But the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* does mention the *kliṣṭamanas*. All of this makes it difficult to imagine a clear scenario within which the KPCy could comfortably sit.

These issues are intimately connected with the problem of the authorship of the KPCy. On this the Chinese tradition is silent, while the Tibetan trans-

9 T. 1828 (XLII) 792c28–793a2: 已下經一卷又是釋寶積經文。此寶積經舊此間已翻有三四卷也。今不見得。寶積經論四卷釋十六種相。學者應勘準之。“The following [passages of the *Yogācārabhūmi*] stretching over one *juan* [that is, running from the middle of *juan* 79 to the middle of *juan* 80] comment on the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*. In the past this *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra* was translated here (in China) in three or four *juan*, but now that is not accessible. The *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra* commentary in four *juan* explains the sixteen aspects. Scholars should compare and follow it (the commentary).” (For this translation I am indebted to Ōtake Susumu.)

10 Tsukinowa 1935: 407, who may have been the first modern scholar to notice the connection between the two works, nevertheless offers no reasons for his assertion that the KPCy is based on the *Yogācārabhūmi*. See below for the stimulating ideas of Suguro 1989.

lation attributes the work to *Sthiramati (*slob dpon blo brtan*). Whether this Sthiramati—assuming (very provisionally) that the attribution has any validity at all—should be the same as the famous Sthiramati is highly questionable, both in terms of the apparent date of the text, and in light of its philosophy. The problems come in many forms. The *Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā*, for instance, a work firmly attributed to Sthiramati, quotes the sūtra at some length, but its treatment of the quoted passages differs from that in the KPCy, which seems to argue against a common authorship for the two works. Takeuchi (1967) sees in the *Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā* (as in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācāra-bhūmi*) the influence of the KPCy, and agrees with Ui that the author of the latter is not the Yogācāra Sthiramati. (In a seeming afterthought, Takeuchi suggests that the Tibetan attribution of the work should rather be to Sāramati, the author of the *Ratnaḡotravibhāga*. As far as I know, he never followed up his promise to investigate this on a later occasion.)¹¹

I believe it very likely that there was more than one important author sharing the name Sthiramati. As Staël-Holstein points out (1926: XVII), the ninth century translators of the commentary into Tibetan, Jinamitra and Śīlendra-bodhi, are considered as grand-pupils of a Sthiramati, which would place this scholar around the seventh or eighth century, while the Chinese translation of the KPCy belongs to the beginning of the sixth century. Not all scholars have accepted this logic. Kajiyama (1968/1969) accepts Frauwallner’s dating of Sthiramati to 510–570, citing as “the most important clue” that Valabhī inscriptions (the plural is Kajiyama’s) of the king Guhasena (r. 558 ~ 566) speak of “a

11 The final verse of the KPCy reads: 作此寶積論 我所得功德 以勇意請故 願世得究竟;
*rgyal ba'i blo gros kyis ni byed bcug ste || dkon mchog brtsegs pa bshad pa byas pa yis || bsod
 nams bdag gis thob pa gang yin pa || des ni 'gro ba rgyal ba thob gyur cig ||*. I understand the
 Tibetan: “*Jina-/Jaya-mati caused [this] to be composed; by whatever merit I obtain
 through having made [this] commentary on the *Ratnakūṭa* may beings obtain victory!”
 Ōtake understands the expression *byed bcug ste* to mean that *Jinamati requested the
 author to write the commentary, and suggests that this *Jinamati is the disciple of the
 author: ジナマテイによって作成を請われて、『宝積(經)』の注釈が作られたこと
 によって、我れによって得られた福德なるもの、それによって世の者は勝者たる
 を得よ。 While it is true that Chinese 請 suggests that *Jinamati requested the compo-
 sition of the commentary, I wonder if we might have to do with a signed verse, in which
 there is a pun on the name, Jina- or Jayamati (Chinese 勇 suggests rather *Jina), ex-
 pressing the prayer that the merit from the composition will lead other beings to vic-
 tory, to become Jinas, that is, buddhas. (Or might *rgyal ba thob gyur cig* reflect a Sanskrit
 imperative “they shall be victorious,” *jayantu*, punning on *Jaya*?) I do not perfectly un-
 derstand what is meant here.

monastery erected for Sthiramati.” There is more than one problem here.¹² What Lévi (1896), on whose discussion of these inscriptions Kajiyama relies, says is that, of certain monasteries, the Śrī-Bappapādīya-vihāra “avait été élevé à Valabhî par le savant docteur (*âcārya bhadanta*) Sthiramati.” Lévi identifies this with the Guhasena-vihāra,¹³ and asserts without doubt that Sthiramati “est certainement identique au fameux disciple de Vasubandhu.”¹⁴ Here he follows and expands upon the identification already offered by the editor of the single inscription in question, Georg Bühler (1877), who published a plate containing the expression (plate II ll. 3–4) *âcāryyabhadanta-Sthiramati-kārita-śrī-bappapādīya-vihāre*. Neither Kajiyama nor Lévi seem to take seriously the idea that there might have been more than one Sthiramati.

It seems most fruitful to try to decide the relation between the authors of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-tīkā* and the KPCy, and the relation between the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* and the KPCy, on internal grounds. In regard to the latter question, the very first thing to note is that the KPCy is structured in a duplex fashion: it is, in a sense, two commentaries in one. The first, referred to in Japanese scholarship as the “abbreviated commentary” (*ryakushaku* 略釈) is the more closely textual, offering a largely word-by-word commentary on the exact terms in the sūtra. Following this, the commentary offers a reprise in what Japanese scholars called the “extended commentary” (*kōshaku* 広釈), more abstract and philosophical, as it were. This extended commentary closely reflects the wording of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*. As an example, see Table II, below, which quotes the schematic outline of sixteen topics from both texts.

The basic questions concerning the commentary can, of course, only be addressed in the content of an overall careful study of the work. Such a study will certainly be facilitated by Ōtake’s work, copiously annotated, and in which, although in principle a rendering of the Chinese translation, much of the Tibetan translation is rendered into modern Japanese in the notes, which fill more than double the space of the text itself. Despite its great value, Ōtake’s book is, unfortunately, from several points of view rather difficult to navigate. For instance, it employs nine (9!) simultaneous page numbering systems. One

12 Inter alia, it is clear that the monastery in question was erected by (not “for”) Sthiramati.

13 A further grant of Śīlāditya III (dated 661/2 C.E.) published long after Lévi wrote by Diskalkar 1925: 37–40 also speaks of a monastery erected by Sthiramati, *âcāryyabhikṣu-Sthiramati-kāritavihāra*, a sub-temple of the larger Duḍḍāvihāra.

14 Lévi in fact seems to have resorted to rather indirect reasoning (1896: 231–232; see Bloch 1895). Although Lévi’s paper appears to have been unknown to her, Njammasch 2001: 205, 210–211, also asserts the identification. See, however, in casu von Hinüber 2004.

system indicates continuous pagination, in Arabic numerals. Eight others are in Chinese numerals, all independent of one another. While my references here are to the Arabic system, as is the Table of Contents of Ōtake's book, other internal references in the text are not, and are consequently sometimes hard to understand. Correspondences are as follows, with the independent Chinese numberings in parentheses:

1. Table of Contents and Introduction (*hanrei* 凡例): 1–16
2. Explanatory matter (*kaidai* 解題): 17–41 = (1–25)
3. Translation proper: 45–379 (1–335)
4. Supplementary notes (*hochū* 補註): 381–437 (1–57)¹⁵
5. Appendix 1: Tibetan & Chinese *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*: 439–508 (1–70)
6. Appendix 2: Comment on KP §§ 140, 136–137, Tibetan only: 509–519 (1–11)
7. Appendix 3: Comment on KP §§ 161–163, 165–166, Tibetan only: 520–521 (1–2)
8. Appendix 4: On the works of Bodhiruci: 522–526 (1–5)
9. Index: 532–527 [sic] (1–6)

Table I, below, provides an overview of the contents of the KPCy, listing the pages in Staël-Holstein's edition, the pages in Ōtake's translation and notes, locations in the Taishō and Tibetan canons, and the paragraph numbers in Staël-Holstein's edition of the sūtra itself.¹⁶ The internal structure of the KPCy is actually somewhat more complex than my table suggests, and the Tibetan and Chinese versions are not in perfect agreement. However, this schematic overview should suffice for one to gain a general sense of the work's outlines, and facilitate use of Ōtake's book.

Finally, how might we resolve the problem of the relation between the KPCy and the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*? I think the clue lies with the hypotheses of Suguro (1989: 217–241). What seems to have happened is that, in its effort to sum up the bodhisattva path, the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* was inspired to formulate its presentation by the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra* (KP). But its authors did not understand their product to be a commentary on the sūtra as such. When some later scholar set out to compose such a commentary, he based his overall approach

15 These notes refer to the Japanese translation (3), by the Chinese page and line numbers. The existence of these notes is indicated in the footnotes in the Japanese translation, but without any reference to the page on which the note will be found. It is rather difficult to use this cumbersome system.

16 For an earlier attempt at such a table, see Takasaki 1988. I am grateful to Ōtake for sharing his bilingual edition of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* parallel, which greatly assisted my compilation of this table.

on the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, but added significant additional material, referring directly and explicitly to the wording of the sūtra, which on the whole he analyzes in a word-for-word fashion. Alongside this word commentary (the “abbreviated commentary”) the author incorporated the earlier material from the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* (in the “expanded commentary”), leading to the duplex format of the KPCy as we have it.

Ōtake is aware of the limitations of his work, and expresses his interest (40 n 17) in preparing an English translation of this important but difficult commentary. I hope it proves possible to carry out this work together with him, one contribution of which will be a furtherance of the studies of the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* so encouraged by Ven. Pāsādika himself.

Table I

	KP Cy edition (Staël-Holstein 1933 page)	Ōtake 2008 page	KP Cy Chin. Taishō 1523	KP Cy Tib. Derge 4009	YBh Chin. Taishō 1579	YBh Tib. Derge 4042	Ōtake 2008 page (YBh Tib.)	KP sūtra paragraphs (Staël-Holstein 1926)
(0)	1	45	204a4	199b4	738c28	102b6	439	
	7	52	204c6	201a4				§ 0
I-II	12	57	205a21	202a6	739a13	103a4	440	
	15	60	205b19	203a1	739a22	103b1		§ 1
	25	72	206c4	205b1	740a27	105b4		§ 2
	29	78	207a10	206a6	739b18	103a3		§ 3
	34	84	207c4	207b2	740b11	106a1		§ 4
	40	92	208b4	209a1	739b27	104a6		§ 5
	43	96	208c9	209b5	740b27	106a7		§ 6
	47	102	209a18	210b4	739c9	104b2		§ 7
	50	104	209b15	211a6	740c14	106b6		§ 8
	53	110	209c19	212a2	739c24	104b7		§ 9
	56	113	210a25	212b5	740c27	107a4		§ 10
	59	118	210b25	213a7	740a4	105a3		§ 11
	62	122	210c28	214a4	741a11	107b2		§ 12
	64	"	211a10	214b2	740a14	105a6		§ 13
	65	125	211a29	214b7	741a18	107b4		§ 14
67	128	211b18	215a7	740a17	105a7		§ 15	

	69	130	211c6	215b6	741a24	107b6		\$ 16
III	91	158	214a26	221a1	741b3	108a2	458	
	92	159	214b10	"	741b8	108a4		\$ 17
	93	160	214b21	221b2	741b11	108a5		\$ 18
	94	162	214b28	221b5	741b14	108a6		\$ 19
	95	162	214c8	222a1	741b17	108a7		\$ 20
	96	164	214c16	——		——		\$ 21
	"	"	214c19	——		——		\$ 22
IV	"	165	214c21	222a4	741b21	108b2	460	\$ 23
	97	166	214c28	222a6	741b24	108b3		
	99	168	215a12	222b5	741c4	108b5		\$ 24
	101	170	215b1	223a4	741c14	109a1		\$ 25 (\$ 26 0)
	102	172	215b12	223a7	741c23	109a4		
V	105	176	215c10	224a3				\$ 29
	106	(395-396)	——	224a5				§§ 30-32 (\$ 33 0)
	107	178	215c17	224b1				\$ 34
	107	(396)	——	224b2				\$ 35
	108	178	215c20	224b4				\$ 36
	"	"	215c22	224b5				\$ 37
	"	"	215c24	224b6				\$ 38
	109	180	215c25	224b7				\$ 39
	"	"	215c27	225a1				\$ 40
	110	"	215c29	225a3				\$ 41
	"	"	216a4	225a5				\$ 42 (\$ 43 0)
	111	182	216a6	225a6				\$ 44
	"	"	216a10	225a7				\$ 45
	"	"	216a12	225b1				\$ 46
	112	"	216a13	225b2				\$ 47
"	"	216a15	225b4				\$ 48	
113	"	216a16	225b5				\$ 49 (§§ 50-51 0)	

V- bis	113–119	184– 191	216a20	225b7	742a13	109b3	464	§§ 29–49
VI	119	191	216c13	227a3				§ 52 (§§ 54– 55ø)
	"	192	216c15	227a4				§ 56
	121	194	217a4	227b2				§ 58
	"	195	217a10	227b4				§ 59
	123	198	217a27	228a4				§ 60
	126	202	217b25	228b6				§ 64
	128	204	217c15	229a5				§ 65
	"	"	217c18	229a6				§ 66
	129	206	217c23c	229b1				§ 67
	"	"	217c28	229b3				§ 68
	130	207	218a4	229b4				§ 69
	"	208	218a7	229b5				§ 70
VI- bis	130–152	208– 232	218a11	229b7	742c17	111a1	467	§§ 56–71
VII	152	232	219c13	235a4				§ 72
	"	"	219c15	235a5				§ 73
	"	233	219c23	235b1				§ 75
	155	236	220a6	235b5				§ 76
	"	"	220a8	235b6				§ 77
	"	"	220a9	235b7				§ 80
	156	"	220a12	236a1				§§ 81–83, 86, 85, 87 (§ 84ø)
	157	236– 238	220a18	236a4				§§ 90, 88, 91–92 (§ 89ø)
VII- bis	"	238	220a25	236a7	744a16	113b7	479	§§ 72, 74– 75
	160	242	220b19	237a2				
	161	"	220b25	237a6				§§ 76–77

	162	242-243	220b28	237a7				§§ 78-79, 80-82
	163	244	220c15	237b5				§§ 83, 86
	164	244-246	220c19	238a1				§§ 85, 87, 90
	165	246	220c26	238a3				§§ 88, 91
	166	246	221a7	238a7				§ 92
VIII	166	248	221a9	238b1				§ 93
	"	"	221a13	"				§ 73
	168	250	221a29	239a1				§ 94
	170	252	221b13	239a6				§ 95
	"	254	221b20	239b1				§ 96
	172	256	221c9	240a2				§ 97
	173	"	221c15	240a4				§ 98
	175	258	221c26	240b2				§ 99
	176	260	222a9	240b7				§ 100
	177	262	222a14	241a3				§ 101
	178	"	222a18	241a5				§ 102
	180	264	222b9	241b5				§ 103
	181	266	222b19	242a3				§ 104
VIII -bis	183	270	222c9	242b2	744c18	115b2	485	§ 93
	185	271	222c21	243a1	744c22	115b4		§ 94
	187	274	223a7	243b3	744c29	115b6		§ 95
	190	(406)	—	244a6				§ 96
	191	276	223a19	244b2	745a12	116a4		§ 97
	192	278	223b3	245a1				§ 98
	194	280	223b16	245a6				§ 99
	196	282	223b25	245b5				§ 100
	197	"	223b28	246a1				§ 101
	198	"	223c5	246a5				§ 102
	200	286	223c22	246b7				§ 103
203	288	224a8	247b2				§ 104	
IX	205	291	224a25	248a2				§ 105
	206	294	224b15	248a7				§ 106

	207	"	224b22	248b3				§ 107
	208	296	224b23	248b5				§ 108
	"	"	224b27	248b6				§ 109
	209–210	296–298	222b29	249a1				§ 111–118 (§§ 119–120ø)
IX-bis	210	300 (409)	224c18	249a7	745c15	117b7	494	§ 105
	211	(409)	—	249b2				§ 106
	212	"	—	249b6				§ 107
	213	(411)	—	250a2				§ 108
	214	"	—	250a4				§ 109
	"	(412)	—	"				§ 110
	217	302	225a15	250b7				§ 111
	"	"	—	251a2				§ 112
	218	(412)	—	251a4				§ 113
	"	(413)	—	251a5				§ 114
	219	"	—	251a7				§ 115
	"	(414)	—	251b1				§ 116
	"	"	—	251b3				§ 117
	220	"	—	251b5				§ 118
X	"	305	225b4	251b6				§ 121
	222	306	225b13	252a3				§ 122
	223	308	225b21	252a7				§ 123
	224	310	225c2	252b4				§ 124
XI	225	"	225c8	253a2				§ 125 (§ 126ø)
	229	314	226a9	254a1				§ 128 (≈ § 127)
	230	316 (415)	—	254a3				§ 129
	231	316 (416)	—	254a5				§ 130
	"	"	—	254a6				§ 131

	"	"	—	254a7				§ 132
	"	"	—	254b1				§ 133
XII	232	316 (417)	226a15	254b2				§ 134
XIII	234	318 (418)	226a23	255a4				§ 135
X- bis	238	322 (419)	226b14	256a2	746a9	118b1	496	§ 122
	239	324 (419)	226b25	256a6				§ 123
	241	"	226c4	256b4				§ 124
XI- bis	242	324 (420)	226c8	257a2	746a16	118b4	497	§ 125
X- bis	245	329n	(226c22)	257b5				§ 127
	246	"	—	258a2				§ 128
	"	"	—	"				§ 129
	247	(420)	—	258a3				§ 130
	"	329n	—	258a4				§ 131
	"	330n	—	258a5				§ 132
XI- bis	"	"	—	258a6				§ 133
XII- bis	248	330 (331n)	227a3	258a7*	746b7	119a4	499	§ 134
XIII- bis	250	332	227a17	(259b5)	746b17	119a7	"	§ 135
	254	338	227b20	(259a3)				§ 136
	259	342	227c26	261a5				§ 137
XIV	264	345	228a24	262a5				§ 138
	"	(426)	—	262b1				§ 139
	265	Appen. 2	—	262b3				§ 140
	266	"	—	262b7				§§ 136- 137
	288	346n	228b6	268a3				§ 141
	289	(426)	—	268b1				§ 142
	290	(427)	—	268b4				§ 143

	291	348	228b19	269a2				§ 144
XIV -bis	293	350	228b28	269b1	746c12	120a2	501	§ 139
	294	352	228c11	269b6				§ 142
	295	"	228c13	269b7				§ 143
	296	354	228c18	270a3				§ 144
XV	297	355	229a2	270b2				§ 145
	298	356	229a12	270b7				§ 146
	299	358	229a19	271a3				§ 147
	301	360	229b4	271b2				§ 148
XV -bis	304	364 (366n)	229b27	272a4	746c28	120b1	503	§ 145
	306	366	229c16	272b6				§ 146
	307	"	229c20	273a1				§ 147
	308	(431)	—	273a7				§ 148
	310	370	230a8	274a1				§ 149 (§§ 150–156ø)
XVI	311	"	230a12	274a3	747a21	121a2	505	§ 157
	312	370 (433)	230a17	274a6				§ 158
	314	(434)	—	274b6				§ 159
	"	374 (434)	230b1	275a2				§ 160
	315	374 (520)	230b3	275a4				§ 161
	317	"	230b10	275b3				§ 162
	318	(521)	—	276a2				§ 163
	321	"	—	276b3				§§ 161–166 (§ 164ø)

* There is a bizarre displacement of text in the Derge edition. The block from 258b3 to 259a6 (Staël-Holstein 252.5–255.5), in the middle of a line in both cases, belongs between 260a2 and 3. Peking 5510 (mdo tshogs 'grel pa, ji, 324b1~) has the correct text. I cannot at present explain what happened in the Derge edition.

Table II

	Viniścayasamgrahaṇī D 102b6-103a4	Kāśyapaparivarta Commentary D 199b7-200a5
I	<i>gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa'i log par sgrub pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>ji ltar byang chub sems dpa' sgrub pa na log par zhugs par 'gyur ba log par sgrub pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
II	<i>yang dag pa'i sgrub pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>ji ltar byang chub sems dpa' sgrub pa yang dag par zhugs par 'gyur ba yang dag par sgrub pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
III	<i>yang dag pa'i sgrub pa'i phan yon yang rig par bya </i>	<i>yang dag par sgrub pa'i legs pa'i rnam pa dang</i>
IV	<i>yang dag par sgrub pa la rnam par gnas pa'i byang chub sems dpa'i chos spyod pa dang snyoms par spyod pa dang dge ba spyod pa dang chos la gnas pa'i rnam pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>byang chub sems dpa' yang dag par sgrub pa la gnas pa chos spyod pa mnyam par spyod pa dge ba spyod pa chos la gnas pa'i tshul gyi rnam pa dang </i>
V	<i>byang chub sems dpa' la dad pa skyed pa'i dpe dag kyang rig par bya </i>	<i>byang chub sems dpa' la gnod* par sems pa dad pa yang dag par bskyed pa'i phyir dpe'i rnam pa dang </i> <i>(*Ōtake suggests reading gus for gnod/ gnong)</i>
VI	<i>yang dag pa'i sgrub pa la rnam par gnas pa'i byang chub sems dpa'i bslab pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>byang chub sems dpa' yang dag par sgrub pa la gnas pa'i bslab pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
VII	<i>nyan thos kyi bslab pa dang byang chub sems dpa'i bslab pa'i khyad par yang rig par bya </i>	<i>nyan thos kyi bslab pa dang byang chub sems dpa'i bslab pa'i khyad par gyi rnam pa dang </i>
VIII	<i>byang chub sems dpa'i bslab pa la legs par bslab pa'i byang chub sems dpa'i 'jig rten dang 'jig rten las 'das pa'i shes pa dag gis gzhan gyi don bya ba yang rig par bya </i>	<i>byang chub sems dpa'i bslab pa la shin tu bslabs pa'i byang chub sems dpa'i 'jig rten pa dang 'jig rten las 'das pa'i ye shes kyis gzhan gyi don bya ba'i rnam pa dang </i>

IX	<i>byang chub sems dpa'i gdams ngag 'di la nyan thos kyi bslab pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod kyi gdams ngag de la nyan thos kyi bslab pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
X	<i>legs par ma bslabs pa'i dge sbyong yang rig par bya </i>	<i>dge sbyong legs par ma bslabs pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
XI	<i>legs par bslabs pa'i dge sbyong yang rig par bya </i>	<i>dge sbyong legs par bslabs pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
XII	<i>brdar btags pa'i sdom pa la gnas pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>brda'i sdom pa la gnas pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
XIII	<i>don dam pa'i sdom pa la gnas pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>don dam pa'i sdom pa la gnas pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
XIV	<i>de bzhin gshegs pa'i 'dul ba'i thabs kyang rig par bya </i>	<i>de bzhin gshegs pas 'dul ba'i thabs kyi rnam pa dang </i>
XV	<i>dgongs te gsungs pa yang rig par bya </i>	<i>ldem po ngag tu smras pa'i rnam pa dang </i>
XVI	<i>byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod kyi gdams ngag la mos pa'i phan yon yang rig par bya ste de ni byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod kyi gdams ngag mdor bstan pa yin no </i>	<i>byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod gdams ngag la mos pa'i legs pa'i rnam pa ste bcom ldan 'das kyi byang chub sems dpa' rnam las brtsams nas theg pa chen po rnam pa bcu drug po 'di dag gis chos bstan te rnam pa 'di dag thams cad kyang chos kyi rnam grangs 'di la snang ngo </i>

Literature

- Bloch, Th. 1895. "An unpublished Valabhī Copper-plate Inscription of King Dhruvasena I." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1895: 379–384.
- Bühler, Georg. 1877. "Further Valabhī Grants." *Indian Antiquary* 6: 9–21.
- Diskalkar, D. B. 1925. "Some Unpublished Copper-Plates of the Rulers of Valabhī." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1 (new series): 13–64.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 2004. Review of Njammasch 2001. *Indo Iranian Journal* 47: 308–320.
- Kajiyama, Yuichi. 1968/1969. "Bhāvaviveka, Sthiramati and Dharmapāla." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 12–13: 193–203. Reprinted in Y. Kajiyama, *Studies in Buddhist philosophy (Selected Papers)*. Ed. Katsumi Mimaki et al. (Kyoto: Rinsen Book, 1989): 177–187.
- Kawamura, Leslie. 2000. "The Middle Path According to the *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra*," in J. A. Silk, ed., *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy*

- of *Gadjin M. Nagao*. Studies in the Buddhist Traditions 3 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press): 221–232.
- Lalou, Marcelle. 1953. “Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan.” *Journal Asiatique* 241: 313–353.
- Lévi, Sylvain. 1896. “Les donations religieuses des rois de Valabhī.” Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études, Sciences religieuses 7. *Études de critique et d'histoire* 2: 75–100. Reprinted in *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (Paris: Paul Hartmann, 1937): 218–234.
- Njamasch, Marlene. 2001. *Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen*. Asien- und Afrika-Studien der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
- Ōtake Susumu 大竹晋. 2008. *Daihōshaku kyōron* 大宝積經論. Shin Kokuyaku Daizōkyō 新国訳大蔵經, Shakyōyōronbu 釈經論部 15 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).
- Pāsādika, Bhikkhu. 1977–1979. “The Dharma-Discourse of the Great Collection of Jewels: The Kāśyapa Section: Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāya-Kāśyapaparivarta: English translation and Restoration of the Missing Sanskrit Portions.” *Linh Sơn Publication d'Études Bouddhologiques* 1: 26–41; 2: 31–42; 3: 41–48; 4: 34–42; 5: 28–39; 6: 35–45; 7: 27–37; 8: 31–43; 9: 26–41.
- Sasaki Masatoshi 佐々木雅敏. 1974. “Daihōshakukyōron (Kāśhyapa no shō no chūshaku): ‘Kāshyapa no shō’ no jo ni taisuru chūshaku made no shiyaku” 『大宝積經論 (カーシャパの章の註釈)』: 「カーシャパの章」の序に対する註釈までの試訳 [The Kāśyapaparivarta commentary: An experimental translation of the introduction]. *Komazawa Daigaku Daigakuin Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūkai Nempō* 駒沢大学大学院仏教学研究会年報 8: 71–82.
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander von. 1926. *The Kācyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).
- . 1933. *A Commentary to the Kācyapaparivarta*: Edited in Tibetan and Chinese (Peking: The National Library of Peking and the National Tsinghua University).
- Suguro Shinjō 勝呂信静. 1989. *Shoki Yuishiki Shisō no Kenkyū* 初期唯識思想の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1988. “‘Hōshakukyōron’ to ‘Yugaron Jōketchakubun’” 「宝積經論」と「瑜伽論撰決択分」 [The Kāśyapaparivarta commentary and the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*]. In *Fujita Kōtatsu Hakase Kanreki Kinen Ronshū: Indo Tetsugaku to Bukkyō* 藤田宏達博士還暦記念論集・インド哲学と仏教 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 473–95.
- Takeuchi Shōkō 武内紹晃. 1967. “Kācyapaparivarta no chūdōsetsu o megutte” Kācyapaparivarta の中道説をめぐって [On the *Madhyama* (sic) *pratipad* Theory in the Kācyapaparivarta]. *Ryūoku Daigaku Ronshū* 龍谷大学論集 383: 55–78.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1935. “Kohon ‘Daihōshakukyō’ ni tsuite” 古品「大寶積經」に就て [On the old Kāśyapaparivarta]. In *Buttan Nisengohyakunen Kinengakkai* 佛誕二千五百年記念學會 (ed.) *Bukkyōgaku no Shomondai* 佛教學の諸問題 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店): 849–65 Reprinted in his *Buttan no Hihanteki Kenkyū* 仏典の批判的研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1971): 393–407.
- Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本啓祥. 1996. *Indo Bukkyō Himei no Kenkyū* インド仏教碑銘の研究 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店).
- Ueda Yumiko 上田愉美子. 1995a. “Daihōshakukyōron no chūshakukeitai” 『大宝積經論』の注釈形態 [A Study of the Commentary on “Kāśyapaparivarta”]. *Ryūoku Daigaku Daigakuin Kiyō: Bungaku Kenkyūka* 龍谷大学大学院紀要: 文学研究科 16: 1–16.

-
- . 1995b. “*Daihōshakukyōron* no kyōten kaishaku o megutte” 『大宝積經論』の經典解釈をめぐって [Sūtra interpretation in the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* commentary]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 303: 243–244 (935–936).
- . 1997. “Shishu shamon o megutte: *Kāśyapa parivarta* § 121~133 ni taisuru *Daihōshakukyōron* ryakushaku, kōshaku no chigai” 四種沙門をめぐって: 『*Kāśyapa parivarta*』 § 121~133 に対する『大宝積經論』略釈・広釈の解釈の違い [A Study on *Mahā-Ratna-kūṭa-sūtra-śāstra* § 121–133]. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 仏教学研究 53: 28–56.
- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1958. *Yugaron Kenkyū* 瑜伽論研究. *Daijō Bukkyō Kenkyū* 大乘佛教研究 II (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店).
- Yoshimura Shyūki. 1966. “The Thirty-two Instructions in the *Kāśyapa-parivarta*,” In Kanakura Hakase Koki Kinen Ronshū Kankōkai (ed.), *Kanakura Hakase Koki Kinen: Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronshū* 金倉博士古稀記念・印度学仏教学論集 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 55–71.

ISBN 978-3-923776-53-5

Inhaltsverzeichnis

<i>Tabula Gratulatoria</i>	ix
<i>Publications of Bhikkhu Pāsādika</i>	xi
Anālayo	
Karma and Liberation —	
The <i>Karajakāya-sutta</i> (AN 10.208) in the Light of its Parallels	1
Jin-il Chung	
Eine Sanskrit-Version des <i>Ānanda-Sutta</i> (<i>Samyuttanikāya</i> 22.21)	
in der Sammlung Stein (British Library, London).....	25
Max Deeg	
Writing for the Emperor — Xuanzang Between Piety,	
Religious Propaganda, Intelligence, and Modern Imagination	31
Mitsuyo Demoto	
Die 128 Nebenhöllen nach dem <i>Saddharmasmṛtyupasthānasūtra</i>	61
Siglinde Dietz	
Der <i>*Pañcakāmaguṇādīnavanirdeśa</i> —	
Ein dem Vasubandhu zugeschriebenes Lehrgedicht	89
Dragomir Dimitrov	
Critical Editions Critically Needed	
(On the Transmission of the <i>Sñan ñag me loñ</i> in Tibet)	97
Helmut Eimer	
Die Hymne des Dge-'dun-rgya-mtsho auf Atiśa	
und die biographische Überlieferung	117
Camillo Alessio Formigatti	
The Story of Sundarī and Nanda in the <i>Mūlasarvāstivādinaya</i>	129
Karl-Heinz Golzio	
Kauṇḍinya in Südostasien	157
Hans-Jürgen Greschat	
Begegnung, interreligiös	167
Michael Hahn und Naoki Saito	
Vasubandhus Mahnrede über die Sittlichkeit	
mit dem Kommentar des <i>Prakāśakīrti</i>	177

Jürgen Hanneder	
Modernes Sanskrit — Eine vergessene Literatur	205
Jens-Uwe Hartmann	
Neues zum <i>Varṇārhavaṇa</i>	229
Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt	
A First Schedule for the Revision of the Old Narthang —	
Bu ston's <i>Chos kyi rnam grais dkar chag</i>	243
Seishi Karashima	
A Sanskrit Fragment of the <i>Sūtrasamuccaya</i> from Central Asia	263
Petra Kieffer-Pülz und Anne Peters	
Die <i>Pātimokkhapadattha-anuvaṇṇanā</i>	
des Vicittālaṅkāra aus Ca-laṅḥ	275
Hōjun Nagasaki	
The 11 th Verse of the Rhinoceros Sūtra in the <i>Suttanipāta</i>	293
Thomas Oberlies	
„König Śibi“ bei den Jainas — Das <i>Śāntināthacarita</i>	303
Kiyoshi Okano	
A Summary of the <i>Mahāsaṃvartanīkathā</i> —	
A Chronology of the Universe According to the <i>Sāṃmitīyas</i>	323
Ulrike Roesler	
Once Again on the “Three Kinds of Individuals”	
in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism	343
Gregory Schopen	
The Urban Buddhist Nun	
and a Protective Rite for Children in Early North India	359
Jonathan A. Silk	
Remarks on the <i>Kāśyapaṭṭhivarta</i> Commentary	381
Peter Skilling	
Commentary at Nālandā in the Age of Dharmapāla —	
Vīryaśrīdatta's <i>Nibandhana</i> on the <i>Arthaviniścaya-dharmaparyāya</i>	399
Jayandra Soni	
A Section of Vidyānandin's Critique of Buddhism	449
Roland Steiner	
Drei <i>Buddhacarita</i> -Strophen im <i>Divyāvadāna</i>	459
Martin Straube	
Dharmakīrti als Dichter	471