

## BHIKKHU PĀSĀDIKA

### TWO QUOTATIONS FROM THE KĀŚYAPAPARIVARTA IN NĀGĀRJUNA'S SŪTRASAMUCCAYA

My dealing with two quotations from the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (=KP) found in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (=SūS) traditionally ascribed to Nāgārjuna, viz. the author of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās* (=MMK), is meant to serve three purposes: a) of being a humble contribution to this felicitation volume in honour of Professor Bongard-Levin who has indefatigably and impressively been perpetuating the cause of Indology and Buddhist Studies in Russia for a long time and who has, himself, to his credit a new critical edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (which very unfortunately has not yet been published); b) of adding one small item to the textual history of KP; c) of attempting to employ the KP quotations as some piece of evidence in the SūS authorship debate. Before attempting the latter, in the following the KP quotations are examined as they occur in the Tibetan text of SūS.

#### *1. Tibetan Text of the KP Quotations in SūS*

In order to present the SūS text corresponding with two sections of KP, I quote from my romanised edition of SūS for which I had consulted four xylograph editions (Chone, Derge, Narthang,

Peking)<sup>1</sup>. In the meantime two more editions of SūS have been made accessible, viz. the Tanjur text included in a) the *Phug brag Kanjur*<sup>2</sup> and in b) the *Golden Manuscript Tanjur*<sup>3</sup>. For this investigation, the SūS text containing the two KP sections has been collated with von Staël-Holstein's romanised Tibetan version of his KP edition<sup>4</sup> and with the corresponding passages in SūS of the *Phug brag* and *Golden Manuscript Tanjur* editions respectively. The outcome of this collection is first taken down in the footnotes to the Tibetan text of the KP quotations and is subsequently evaluated in an English translation of the said passages.

#### Sigla and Abbreviations

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| F           | <i>Phug brag</i> manuscript <i>Kanjur</i>   |
| G           | "Golden Manuscript" <i>Tanjur</i>           |
| vSH         | A. von Staël-Holstein's Tibetan text of KP. |
| <i>add.</i> | additionally                                |
| <i>om.</i>  | omits, omit                                 |

SūS ed., pp. 22-23:

[F 73a7] [G 240a3] 'Od sruṅs<sup>5</sup> kyi<sup>6</sup> le'u las kyañ | [vSH § 90, p. 132] 'Od sruṅs<sup>7</sup> 'di lta ste |<sup>8</sup> dper na<sup>9</sup> zla ba'i dkyil 'khor btañ ste |

<sup>1</sup> *Nāgārjuna's Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the mDo kun las btus pa* (including a reproduction of the Chinese version of SūS (Taishū ed.)), Copenhagen, 1989.

<sup>2</sup> See JAMPA SAMTEN, *A Catalogue of the Phug-brag Manuscript Kanjur*, Dharamsala, 1992, p. 104f.: No. 271, A 63a4ff. H. EIMER, *Location List for the Texts in the Microfiche Edition of the Phug brag Kanjur*. Compiled from the Microfiche Edition and Jampa Samten's Descriptive catalogue, Tokyo, 1993, p. 27: 271#883 11F-28C/74.

<sup>3</sup> See P. SKILLING, "A Brief Guide to the *Golden Tanjur*", in *The Journal of the Siam Society*, 79 (1991), part 2, Bangkok, p. 143, No. 54, Dbu ma, A (118), B 1-271.

<sup>4</sup> A. von STAËL-HOLSTEIN, *The Kāśyapaparivarta, A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class*. Edited in the Original Sanskrit, in Tibetan and in Chinese; Shanghai, 1926.

<sup>5</sup> *bsruñ* F.

<sup>6</sup> *gi* F.

<sup>7</sup> *sruñ* vSH, F.

<sup>8</sup> | *om.* F.

<sup>9</sup> F. *add.*: |

su<sup>10</sup> yañ<sup>11</sup> skar ma'i gzugs la nam yañ<sup>12</sup> phyag mi 'tshal lo<sup>13</sup> || 'Od sruñs<sup>14</sup> de bzin du mkhas pa rnam kyañ<sup>15</sup> ña'i bslab pa la žugs pa'i byañ chub sems dpa'<sup>16</sup> btañ ste | [F 73b] ñan thos la nam yañ phyag mi 'tshal lo ||

[vSH § 88, p. 130] 'Od sruñs<sup>17</sup> dper na zla ba tshes pa la phyag bya<sup>18</sup> ba de<sup>19</sup> lta zla ba<sup>20</sup> ña ba la ma yin no<sup>21</sup> || 'Od sruñs<sup>7</sup> de bzin du gañ dag gañ<sup>22</sup> ña<sup>23</sup> la rab tu dad pa de dag gis<sup>24</sup> byañ chub sems dpa' rnam<sup>25</sup> la phyag bya'i | de bzin gsegs pa rnam la ni<sup>26</sup> ma yin no || de ci'i phyir že na | byañ chub sems dpa' las<sup>27</sup> ni de bzin gsegs pa rnam skye 'o<sup>28</sup> || de bzin gsegs pa dag<sup>29</sup> las<sup>27</sup> ni<sup>9</sup> ñan thos dañ |<sup>30</sup> rañ sañs rgyas thams cad skye 'o<sup>31</sup> || *žes gsuñs so* |<sup>32</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *su* vSH.

<sup>11</sup> *kyañ* vSH.

<sup>12</sup> vSH add.: *ñion*.

<sup>13</sup> *mi 'tshalo* G, *ma byas so* vSH.

<sup>14</sup> *sruñ* vSH, *bsruñ* F.

<sup>15</sup> F add.: | vSH add.: *byañ chub sems dpa' bdag la phan pa dañ | gzan la phan pa'i sñiñ rje chen po dañ ldan pa*.

<sup>16</sup> (*pa*)'i *byañ chub sems dpa'* om. vSH.

<sup>17</sup> *sruñ* vSH, vSH add.: *'di lta ste* |

<sup>18</sup> *'tshal* vSH.

<sup>19</sup> *de* om. vSH.

<sup>20</sup> *zla ba* om. vSH.

<sup>21</sup> *yino* G.

<sup>22</sup> *gañ* om. vSH.

<sup>23</sup> *ña* om. F.

<sup>24</sup> G (like Chone, Derge, Narthang) add.: | *gi* F.

<sup>25</sup> *rnam* F.

<sup>26</sup> vSH add.: *de lta, ni* om. F.

<sup>27</sup> *la* F.

<sup>28</sup> *skye 'am* F, *'byuñ ño* vSH.

<sup>29</sup> *dag* om. vSH.

<sup>30</sup> | om. vSH, F.

<sup>31</sup> *'byuñ ño* vSH.

<sup>32</sup> *gsuñso* || F.

## 2. Translation of the KP Quotations

Furthermore, [here is a quotation] from the *Kāśyapaparivarta*<sup>33</sup>: [vSH, section 90] "It is like this, Kāśyapa: Nobody would, for example, ever disregard the disc of the moon and worship<sup>34</sup> the [faintly luminous] body of a star; in the same way, Kāśyapa, the wise, too, would never disregard a Bodhisattva who<sup>35</sup> has embarked upon my teachings and pay homage to a Disciple.

[vSH, section 88] «Just as the new moon, Kāśyapa, is to be worshipped<sup>36</sup> rather than the full moon<sup>37</sup>, whoever<sup>38</sup> puts trust in me, Kāśyapa, should pay homage to the Bodhisattvas rather than<sup>39</sup> to the Tathāgatas. For what reason? Because it is from a Bodhisattva that the Tathāgatas originate<sup>40</sup>, and it is from a Tathāgata that all Disciples and Pratyekabuddhas originate». Thus it is said.

## 3. The Importance of the KP Quotations in SūS

Nearly thirty years ago Conze wrote that «in its bulk the *Kāśyapaparivarta* is one of the earlier Mahāyāna Sūtras, though, like most others, it grew over the years»<sup>41</sup>, and much earlier

---

<sup>33</sup> According to dictionaries, all variant readings of the Tibetan translation of 'Kāśyapa' are possible.

<sup>34</sup> After vSH: 'and worship first'; vSH tallies with the Sanskrit: *na... namaskṛta pūrvam*; SūS has *namaskaroti*.

<sup>35</sup> vSH additionally has what is not found in the Sanskrit text either: «who is possessed of great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*) pertaining to what is wholesome (*hita*) for himself and others».

<sup>36</sup> vSH: "just as one worships".

<sup>37</sup> Readings of both vSH and SūS are correct.

<sup>38</sup> vSH: "some"; "whoever" of SūS is to be preferred. As for the particle *dag*, see M. HAHN, *On the Function and Origin of the Particle dag*, Zurich, 1978, pp. 137-147.

<sup>39</sup> vSH additionally: "thus".

<sup>40</sup> Different diction in vSH and SūS but with same meaning.

<sup>41</sup> E. CONZE, review of "F. WELLER, *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta*, Heft 2: Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Textes. Abhandlungen der sächsischen

Winternitz - who also translated from Sanskrit the above section 88 of KP into German - pointed out KP § 1-22 as being reminiscent of "the section of fours in the *Āṅuttara-Nikāya*"<sup>42</sup>. Then, more recently I chewed the cud of this latter remark and ventured the conjecture that the textual arrangement of KP § 1-22 could have been "influenced by that of the *Catukkanipāta* of the *Āṅuttaranikāya* or rather of its *āgama* equivalent"<sup>43</sup>. I moreover took the fact that in KP the designations of *bhikṣu*, *pravrajita* and *bodhisattva*, for instance, are interchangeable<sup>44</sup> as a bit of internal evidence to regard at least the textual nucleus of KP as one of the oldest Mahāyāna texts. If we provisionally speak of Nāgārjuna's SūS on the basis of Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakaśāstrastuti* 10<sup>45</sup> and so long as Candrakīrti's attribution of SūS to the author of the *Mūlamadhyamakārikās* has not been entirely disproved, the approximate date of the compilation of SūS containing numerous citations from mainly Mahāyāna texts could serve as *terminus ad quem* for the scriptures Nāgārjuna (c. 2nd century AC) is held to quote from. He could, indeed, well have drawn on KP since a kind of textual nucleus of this scripture was already translated into Chinese by Lokakṣema who is said to have made his translations under emperor Ling (168-189) of the Han dynasty<sup>46</sup>.

In the above Tibetan text and English translation of the KP quotations (section 90), in one place it is indicated that vSH has

---

Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 57, Heft 3, Berlin, 1965", IJ 10 4, (1968), p. 302.

<sup>42</sup> M. WINTERNITZ, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, English transl. by V. SRINIVASA SARMA, revised ed., Delhi, 1983, p. 317f.

<sup>43</sup> BH. PĀSĀDIKA, "The Kāśyapaparivarta ('Od-srung-gi le'u) - Prolegomena", in *The Tibet Journal* 5 (1980), 4, Dharamsala, p. 50.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>45</sup> See J. W. de JONG, "La Madhyamakaśāstrastuti de Candrakīrti", in GREGORY SCHOPEN (ed.), *Buddhist Studies by J.W. de Jong*, Berkeley, 1979, pp. 542, 545, 547, 549.

<sup>46</sup> On Lokakṣema who is credited with having introduced into China Mahāyāna Buddhism, see the fine article by P. HARRISON, "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, 10 (1993), No. 2, London, pp. 135-177.

additional text not found in SūS. Here the latter on the whole is fairly close to the Sanskrit, whilst the Han version is even shorter than SūS, omitting the vocatives "Kāśyapa" and the relative clause "who has embarked upon my teachings", having for "nobody" "no knowledgeable one" and for "Disciple" "Arhat". The other Chinese translations of KP also given by v. Staël-Holstein along with Han, viz. the Jin, Qin and Song versions, do not contain the above-mentioned textual addition of vSH either. SūS corresponding with section 88 more or less agrees with vSH, but differs from the Sanskrit: SūS does not have *balavaṃtatarāṃ*, and neither the Sanskrit nor Han, Jin and Qin include anything equivalent to "and it is from a Tathāgata that all Disciples and Pratyekabuddhas originate". Even a cursory collation of KP, sections 90 and 88, in SūS with the Sanskrit, the Tibetan and Chinese translations provided by v. Staël-Holstein reveals that, as far as the SūS quotations are concerned, we have one more KP version. However, in view of the shortness of the SūS quotations it would be futile to draw any text historical conclusions regarding these quotations vis-à-vis the other available versions.

#### 4. The KP Quotations in SūS and Their Bearing on the SūS Authorship Debate

An interesting article on Nāgārjuna by Wayman<sup>47</sup> contains remarks on SūS and KP in connection with the authorship of SūS. On p. 83 of his work Wayman says, with reference to the author of MMK, «that certain scriptures, later to be called *Mahāyāna-sūtra*, preceded his own compositions». At the beginning of his article Wayman specifies that among such pre-Nāgārjunian scriptures is a class called *Bodhisattvapitaka* preceding, according to him, the Mahāyāna proper. Then, in a footnote<sup>48</sup>, he refers to SūS as follows:

---

<sup>47</sup> A. WAYMAN, "Nāgārjuna: Moral Reformer of Buddhism", in *Studia Missionalia*, Annual Publication of Gregorian University, Rome, 1985, pp. 63-95.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83, n. 77.

«A *Sūtrasamuccaya* (Compendium of Scriptures) has been attributed to Nāgārjuna. ...However, as the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* is cited several times, and the *Mādhyamika* Nāgārjuna surely precedes this scripture, it is highly unlikely that this *Sūtrasamuccaya* is by Nāgārjuna. Indeed, my own investigation, incorporated in the present essay, leads me to doubt whether he was interested in collecting passages in such manner from these “Mahāyāna scriptures”. Besides, various titles in the list have as last member the term *parivarta*, which means “chapter” or “section”, hence implying scriptures in the Mahāyāna collections called *Mahāsaṃnipāta*, *Ratnakūṭa* and *Avataṃsaka*. The fourth century, A.D. is the earliest possible for such a compendium».

Now with regard to the *Laṅkāvatāra*, Lindtner has dexterously argued that an early recension of this scripture, an *Ur-Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, was in fact known to Nāgārjuna<sup>49</sup>. In the same publication Schmithausen, on the other hand, has serious qualms about the *Laṅkāvatāra* as being prior to the author of MMK «as long as the opposite possibility of its drawing on Nāgārjuna is not convincingly excluded. ...»<sup>50</sup>. Schmithausen, nevertheless, states that, if Nāgārjuna’s being prior to the *Laṅkāvatāra* could in some cases be convincingly excluded, this would only prove that textual material included in the *Laṅkāvatāra* - and by no means the *sūtra* as a whole - did already exist at the time of Nāgārjuna<sup>51</sup>.

Bypassing the *Laṅkāvatāra* quotations in SūS, I should like to make a few remarks on Wayman’s arguing against the Nāgārjunian authorship or rather “compilership” of SūS. Wayman notes that the term *parivarta* occurs in a number of titles, such as KP, being given as sources of SūS. His conclusion seems to be that SūS cannot be a

---

<sup>49</sup> See CH. LINDTNER, "The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* in Early Indian Madhyamaka Literature", in *Asiatische Studien, Études asiatiques* 46, I (1992), *Études bouddhiques offertes à Jacques May*, Bern, pp. 244-279.

<sup>50</sup> See L. SCHMITHAUSEN, "A Note on Vasubandhu and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*", *ibid.*, pp. 392-397.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 397.

work of the second century AC because Mahāyāna collections, i.e. the *Mahāsaṃnipāta*, *Ratnakūṭa* and *Avataṃsaka*, including titles ending in *parivarta*, betray the hands of compilers and redactors posterior to Nāgārjuna. The SūS authorship problem surely remains a matter of further inquiry and perhaps also debate, but Wayman's conclusion here, I think, cuts no ice. Besides the fact that Lokakṣema, as mentioned above, already translated an early recension of KP most probably in Nāgārjuna's lifetime, Seyfort Ruegg produces a piece of internal evidence: «A verse of the *Mūlamadhyamakārikās* (MMK X111.8) appears clearly to presuppose a section of the *Ratnakūṭa* collection, the *Kāśyapaparivarta*; and Nāgārjuna's doctrine based on the analysis of dichotomously opposed pairs of concepts is characteristic of this work also»<sup>52</sup>.

As for Lokakṣema and the *Mahāsaṃnipāta*, Braarvig has done extensive research and draws the conclusion that this collection was «compiled in the second or third century, at the earliest in the first, in the formative period of the Mahāyāna canon»<sup>53</sup>. Dealing with the works of Lokakṣema, Harrison also lists the early translator's *Tou-sha ching*, being a part of the *Avataṃsaka*<sup>54</sup>. Concerning the present topic, the above-mentioned results arrived at by Seyfort-Ruegg, Braarvig and Harrison in their respective researches seem to render Wayman's stand taken on the SūS authorship difficult to bear out.

---

<sup>52</sup> See D. S. RUEGG, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*, Wiesbaden, 1981, p. 6f. Nāgārjuna's *kārikā*, corresponding with KP, sections 64, 65, runs:

*śūnyatā sarvadṛṣṭināṃ proktā niḥsaraṇaṃ jinaiḥ / yeśāṃ tu śūnyatādṛṣṭis tān asādhyān babhāṣire ||*

<sup>53</sup> See J. BRAARVIG, *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. II, The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought, Oslo, 1993, p. xxxix.

<sup>54</sup> See P. HARRISON, *op. cit.*, p. 157f.