



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## History of the \*Kāśyapaparivarta in Chinese translations and its connection with the Mahāratnakūṭa (Da Baoji jing 大寶積經) collection

Silk J.A., Nagao Gadjin M.

### Citation

Silk J.A., N. G. M. (2022). History of the \*Kāśyapaparivarta in Chinese translations and its connection with the Mahāratnakūṭa (Da Baoji jing 大寶積經) collection. *Journal Of The American Oriental Society*, 142(3), 671-697.  
doi:10.7817/jaos.142.3.2022.ar028

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3590732>

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

# The History of the \**Kāśyapaparivarta* in Chinese Translations and Its Connection with the *Mahāratnakūṭa* (*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經) Collection

JONATHAN A. SILK  
LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

and

GADJIN M. NAGAO †  
KYOTO UNIVERSITY

The \**Kāśyapaparivarta*, an early Mahāyāna sūtra, has a complex history. Sanskrit and Tibetan versions, and some of its Chinese translations, have been available to scholars for almost a century, thanks to Staël-Holstein's 1926 *editio princeps*. Yet no comprehensive survey of available sources, or critical appraisal of their antecedents, has been published, and most importantly, essential Chinese materials have long been overlooked. The present contribution focuses most centrally on the Chinese translations of the scripture. In addition, the relation of the sūtra to the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection of forty-nine texts and the possible Indic origins of the latter are explored.

Mahāyāna Buddhism in India produced a vast number of scriptures, classified primarily into sūtra and tantra. How much of this production has been lost to the vagaries of time is impossible to know, but even of the extant sūtra literature—the vast majority of which is so far known not in its original Indic forms but only through Chinese and Tibetan translations—it is fair to say that most remains unstudied. Among the exceptions are a number of works that for one reason or another drew the attention of modern scholars. Some of these, such as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Lotus Sūtra) or the Larger and Smaller *Sukhāvaiṣvṛyūha* (Pure Land Sūtras), drew attention primarily because, in their Chinese guises, they came to hold a central position in East Asian, and particularly Japanese, Buddhism, although the position of these texts within Indian Buddhism was peripheral. Other sūtras, however, garnered attention for other reasons, some of them seemingly random, such as a scholar's chance encounter with a manuscript. Of these, the \**Kāśyapaparivarta* may be one of the most significant, if by “significant” we understand, for instance, the frequency with which the scripture was quoted

*Author's note:* This study began life more than thirty years ago as an updated translation of Nagao 1973. It owes its basic frame and some of its data to that now fifty-year-old paper, but considerable revision has become possible. For this reason, and because Gadjin Nagao (d. 2005) had agreed to my translation of the paper in the first place, I feel that a claim of joint authorship is justified. However, I must clearly state that I alone am responsible for all errors of fact or interpretation, and overall the article is very different from what Nagao himself originally published. I have profited, as always, from the corrections of Rafal Felbur, Antonello Palumbo, and, most especially, Michael Radich. Jan Nattier kindly offered some suggestions, and if I have not adopted all of them, surely I am to blame. Further, the anonymous reader for *JAOS* offered valuable suggestions and corrections.

My work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) through their funding, under the Horizon 2020 program (Advanced Grant agreement No 741884), of the Open Philology project based at Leiden University ([www.OpenPhilology.eu](http://www.OpenPhilology.eu)).

by later authors and the authority it was apparently granted within the Indian tradition itself. It is another question—considered below—how we should understand the current location of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* in the Chinese (and thence Tibetan) *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, an anthology of forty-nine sūtras, most likely compiled on Chinese soil, and thus not necessarily relevant for the status of the text in its Indian homeland.

Alexander von Staël-Holstein (1877–1937) prepared his *editio princeps* of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (below, KP), published in 1926, centrally on the basis of a Sanskrit manuscript found in Central Asia, which he was able to access first in the Imperial Academy in St. Petersburg (see below). In addition to Sanskrit and Tibetan editions, however, Staël-Holstein also presented four Chinese translations of the text. If we include the substantially complete version contained in quotations in the Chinese translation of the commentary on the sūtra, likewise published by Staël-Holstein only a few years later in 1933, five Chinese versions of the text have been available to scholars in modern editions for almost a century. However, there also exist two additional Chinese translations, one partial, the other complete, which have remained largely unknown. Thus, even if for no other reason, a reconsideration of available materials is timely. These hitherto often overlooked Chinese sources are not, in fact, newly discovered: the first, an extract of a small section of the sūtra, was discussed already by Ōno Hōdō 大野法道 (1883–1985) in the same year that Staël-Holstein published the commentary, and positively identified two years later,<sup>1</sup> and the second, containing the complete sūtra, was again first noticed by Ōno; this discovery was published some twenty years further on.<sup>2</sup> Unaware of Ōno’s remarks, this otherwise unnoticed translation was “rediscovered” almost simultaneously (and independently of each other) by Nagao Gadjin 長尾雅人 (1907–2005) and Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道 (1926–2013) another twenty years later.<sup>3</sup> As a result of this scholarship, there are now known to be seven Chinese translations of the KP (six of which are complete, or almost so), in addition to the materials in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and several other languages.

Since the original version of this article submitted to *JAOS* was accepted provided its length would be significantly reduced, with the permission of the editors I here present a much pared-down version of the paper, which will appear in its full form in a volume of the forthcoming Brill series of the Open Philology project, tentatively titled *Ratnakūṭa Studies I*.

The following abbreviations of catalogue titles are used below:

CSZJJ, *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集, T. 2145. 515 CE, by Sengyou 僧祐.

ZM (I), *Zhongjing mulu* 衆經目錄, T. 2146, 594 CE, by Fajing 法經 et al.

LSJ, *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀, T. 2034, 598 CE, by Fei Zhangfang 費長房.

ZM (II), *Zhongjing mulu* 衆經目錄, T. 2147, 602 CE, by Yancong 彥琮/棕.

DTNL, *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄, T. 2149, 664 CE, by Daoxuan 道宣.

GYT, *Gujin yijing tuji* 古今譯經圖紀, T. 2151. 664–665 CE.

XGYT, *Xu Gujin yijing tuji* 續古今譯經圖紀, T. 2152. ?669–740 (? 730) CE, by Zhisheng 智昇.

DZKZM, *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄, T. 2153, 695 CE, by Mingquan 明佺 et al.

KSL, *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, T. 2154 (LV). 730 CE, by Zhisheng 智昇.

ZXSMS, *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄, T. 2157. 800 CE.

Quoted Chinese passages are drawn principally from the SAT database of the digitized Taishō edition; the passages therefore have not been critically edited. When I speak of the “attribution” of a translation, I refer to what is found in the first place in the Taishō edition; such attributions are frequently to be reconsidered. This is one of the main goals of the very valuable <https://dazangthings.nz>.

1. Ōno 1933: 388–93; 1935; revised ideas in 1954: 106–10. The identification was noted, with reference to Ōno 1935, already by Kuno 1938: 96.

2. Ōno 1954: 102–4.

3. Nagao 1973 and Takasaki 1974: 449. Cf. Itō 2013a, 2013b.

## I. THE VERSIONS OF THE KP

A nearly complete Sanskrit version of the sūtra exists, primarily reliant on a manuscript recovered from the Central Asian site of Khotan and purchased by Nikolaj Fëdorovič Petrovskij (1837–1908), who deposited it in the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg in 1895 (catalogued now as SI P/2). It was later studied there and in China (from photographs, the manuscript itself remaining in what became Leningrad) by Staël-Holstein.<sup>4</sup> This manuscript is missing about eight leaves, many leaves are partially damaged, and it contains, as do all manuscripts, a number of mistakes. In 1926, utilizing only this Sanskrit manuscript and his own ingenuity and that of his collaborators, perhaps chiefly Friedrich Weller (1889–1980), Staël-Holstein published the Sanskrit text, together with a version of the Tibetan translation found in the Kanjurs, and four Chinese translations. The edition, largely following the logical segments of the sūtra itself, divides the text into one paragraph of preamble (§0) and 166 paragraphs of text. (Below we adopt the standard form of reference to Staël-Holstein's paragraphs, referring to §1 for the first true paragraph of the text, and so on.) Later, in 1933, Staël-Holstein published the commentary in an interlinear edition containing its Tibetan (*'Od srungs kyi le'u rgya cher 'grel pa*) and Chinese (*Da Baoji jing-lun* 大寶積經論) translations. Subsequently a number of scholars studied the sūtra, among whom special attention must be drawn to Friedrich Weller, who published complete Tibetan and Sanskrit indices (1933, 1935),<sup>5</sup> translated the Sanskrit text into German (supplementing it from Tibetan when the Sanskrit was missing, 1965) and individually all of the four then-known Chinese translations (see below), and who did not fail even to study the Mongolian translation in detail (e.g., 1962).

The Tibetan translation of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection of forty-nine sūtras (below, MRK), within which the translation of KP is to be found, was investigated as a whole by Marcelle Lalou (1890–1967) in 1927 and Sakurabe Bunkyō 櫻部文鏡 (1898–1982) in 1930, and although some other individual texts included in the collection have received scholarly attention, little work had been done on what we now must recognize as the Tibetan versions of the KP for almost ninety years, until James Apple identified and published large portions of a recension recovered from a number of separately catalogued Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts.<sup>6</sup> Nothing is known of its translators because the latter portion of the text is lost, although in fact such Dunhuang manuscripts often do not, in any case, contain colophons. As for the other translation, catalogues and colophons assert that the KP preserved in the Kanjurs was translated into Tibetan by Jinamitra, Śilendrabodhi, and Ye shes sde. The Tibetan text of the sūtra quoted in the commentary, the names of the translators of which are not recorded, agrees in the main with the sūtra version, with a few exceptions that show readings different from, and sometimes better than, the readings of the latter. As the Tibetan translations require their own treatment, they are henceforth left aside here.

The four Chinese translations usually referred to by modern scholarship, and included in Staël-Holstein's edition, are as follows, listed in chronological order, as indicated by the reigns under which they were translated, with the titles as usually cited:

4. Staël-Holstein 1926: xviii n. 13. The manuscript was later retranscribed, and color photos published, in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. 2002. Reference should henceforth be made to this edition for the most reliable readings.

5. We learn from Wang and Deng (2014: 201, 247) that Lin Liguang 林藜光 (1902–1945) compiled a Chinese-Sanskrit index, completed by Walter Liebenthal (1886–1982), but it was never published. This index was taken as the basis of Liebenthal 1935, which appears to be its only published trace.

6. Apple 2017, 2018. The manuscripts, now in London and Paris, are catalogued as IOL Tib J 55, 56, 59, and 153, and Pelliot tibétain 671, 672, 673, and 676.

- 1) (*Foshuo*) *Yiri monibao jing* (佛說)遺日摩尼寶經. Attributed to Lokakṣema (Zhi Loujichen 支婁迦讖) of the Later Han 後漢; dated 179 CE. T. 350. (Hereafter H.)<sup>7</sup>
- 2) (*Foshuo*) *Moheyan baoyan jing* (佛說)摩訶衍寶嚴經. Attributed to an unknown translator of the [Western] Jin 晉 dynasty, 291–299 CE. T. 351. (Hereafter J.)<sup>8</sup>
- 3) *Da Baoji jing Puming pusa hui* 大寶積經普明菩薩會. Attributed to an unknown translator of the [Western] Qin 秦 dynasty, 384–431 CE. T. 310(43) (XI) 631c14–638c4. (Hereafter Q.)<sup>9</sup>
- 4) (*Foshuo*) *Dajiashe wen da baoji zhengfa jing* (佛說)大迦葉問大寶積正法經. Attributed to Shihu 施護 (\*Dānapāla?) of the Song 宋 dynasty, end of the tenth century. T. 352. (Hereafter S.)<sup>10</sup>

### The Han Translation

Catalogues tell us that the first translation is dated to the Guanghe 光 and reign period (178–184), which establishes that the KP already existed by the second half of the second century CE. We will turn to these catalogues in a moment, but first we must clarify the title of this translation. What is cited above—*Foshuo Yiri monibao jing* 佛說遺日摩尼寶經—is the form in which the text is nearly always cited in modern scholarship. But, as has been known since the time of Staël-Holstein, this reading of the title is based on several early mistakes or omissions, a fact often, even almost always, overlooked by subsequent scholars.<sup>11</sup> In the first place we must note the obvious fact that the characters *ri* 日 and *yue* 曰 are in many styles of writing virtually indistinguishable.<sup>12</sup> Further, the term *yiri* 遺日 in the title (taking it provisionally in this form) occurs in the sūtra itself (§52) more fully as *yiriluo* 遺日羅. However, Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲來 (1869–1937) already suggested to Staël-Holstein while the latter was preparing his *editio princeps* that this is probably an error for 遺日羅, “an imperfect transliteration of [the Sanskrit term] *vipula* or of *vaipulya*.”<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, the character 遺 must be read *wei*, rather than *yi*. Staël-Holstein agreed, and thus it is clear that the solution was already known at the time Staël-Holstein published his edition in 1926. It should thus have been clear from early on that the characters 遺日羅 are most likely to be understood as what we would now write in Pinyin as *weiyueluo*, to be reconstructed following the Late Han reconstructions in Schuessler 2009 as *wi-wat-la*. While Pelliot apparently saw this as a phonetic rendering of Prakritic *\*vivula* = *vipula*, the *-t* final in the second element of the string seems to signal a gemination.<sup>14</sup> If the first vowel can render also an Indic *-e-*, we might more comfortably have to imagine a Middle Indic equivalent of *vaipulya* than *vipula*.

There is other evidence for *vaipulya* in this period. As Tsukinowa noticed already in 1935, the Han translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*, the *Daoxing banre jing* 道行般若經, a genuine text of Lokakṣema, contains the term *mohe weiyueluo* 摩訶惟日羅, which Karashima suggested refers to *\*Mahāvevulla* < *\*Mahāvaipulya*.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集 of Sengyou 僧祐, dating to 515, lists a *Da Zhenbaoji weiyue jing* 大珍

7. Trans. Weller 1970. It is highly questionable whether *foshuo* was ever an originally integral part of a translation title and therefore I parenthesize it here. See Funayama in press.

8. Trans. Weller 1966a.

9. Trans. Weller 1964. See also Chang et al. 1983: 387–414.

10. Trans. Weller 1966b.

11. An exception is, unsurprisingly, Karashima (2015, esp. 117–19), who discusses the data in detail.

12. Therefore, in all relevant citations below where appropriate 日 is corrected to 曰.

13. See Staël-Holstein 1926: ix and xxii n. 22.

14. Karashima 2015: 118 n. 15.

15. T. 224 (VIII) 468c12. Tsukinowa 1935: 395; Karashima 2010: 324; 2013: 176; 2015: 117, 118 n. 15.

寶積惟曰經.<sup>16</sup> The same is found in the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, which in so many respects simply copies CSZJJ.<sup>17</sup> This is very similar to the reading in the Han translation of the KP itself, §52: 極大珍寶積遺曰羅經. This structural parallel between 惟 and 遺 bolsters the suggestion that the latter is to be read *wei*, which, along with the trivial graphic correction of 日 to 曰, brings us toward the proper title. There is other evidence that *vaipulya*, or a Middle Indic version thereof, stood in the title, which is provided by a reference to the KP in the Sanskrit *Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvātārajñānālokāṃkāra*, which includes this element, namely the expression *Ratnakūṭavaipulyasūtrapariṣchākuśalāiḥ* “[The monks] skilled in inquiring about the *Ratnakūṭa vaipulya-sūtra*.”<sup>18</sup>

The term *monibao* 摩尼寶 is of course, as later in the tradition, a standard transcription-cum-translation of *maṇi-ratna*. Accepting these revisions, that the preceding element is a part of the title, and leaving aside the term *foshuo*,<sup>19</sup> the title of H should probably be *Weiyueluo monibao jing* 遺曰羅摩尼寶經. This is most likely to have reflected a Middle Indic version parallel to Sanskrit *\*Vaipulya-maṇiratna*.

Paul Pelliot, while offering a discussion of the KP Chinese translations in general, concentrated on this oldest version. He pointed out that the *Chu sanzang ji ji* puts the date of the translation at 179, on the authority of the lost catalogue of Dao'an 道安. The passage says: 寶積經, 一卷, then in small characters: 安公云: 一名摩尼寶, 光和二年出。舊錄云: 摩尼寶經, 二卷 “*Baoji jing*, in one *juan*. Master [Dao-]An[’s catalogue] says: this is an alternate name for the *Monibao*. It was translated in the second year of Guanghe [179 CE]. The Old Catalogue says: there is a *Monibao jing* in two *juan*.”<sup>20</sup> Just a few lines before, however, in the text of Sengyou as we have it, there is reference to a *\*Vaipulya* section (*fangdengbu*), followed by the (apparent) statement that the *gupin* speak(s) of a *Weiyue shuo banre jing* 遺曰說般若經, some sort of Prajñā sūtra, in one *juan*, already missing at that time: 方等部, 古品曰: 遺曰說般若經, 一卷。今闕。<sup>21</sup> This appears to be a red herring, however, though one that caused considerable confusion in the tradition. What would *gupin* be here?

Both what is evidently the KP and this Prajñā sūtra are listed by Sengyou in the group that Dao'an felt to “resemble translations of Lokakṣema, 似支讖出,”<sup>22</sup> and as Michael Radich points out to me, the classification *\*Vaipulya* section (*fangdengbu*) also belongs to Dao'an. Furthermore, Sengyou also lists a one *juan Fo Weiyue monibao jing* 佛遺曰摩尼寶經 in the category of “Newly Compiled Continuation of the Assorted List of Anonymous Translations” 新集續撰失譯雜經錄.<sup>23</sup> Whence the attribution to Lokakṣema? This seems to stem from an entry in Fajing's *Zhongjing mulu* (ZM [I]) of 594, in which he says 佛遺曰摩尼寶經一卷。後漢光和年。支讖譯, that is, giving the same date of 179 but then explicitly saying that it is a translation of Lokakṣema.<sup>24</sup> Given all of this, just how many texts are we dealing with here?

The answer must be that the *Weiyue banre jing* 遺曰說般若經, that is, the *\*Vaipulya prajñā[pāramitā]*, and KP were two different texts, that both were, for Sengyou and earlier

16. CSZJJ, 19b19.

17. KSL, 518b16, with remarks c1–6.

18. Ed. Kimura et al. 2004: 19.18–19. I learned of this reference from Karashima 2015: 118, who also cites the Tibetan and the Chinese versions, the earliest of which dates to CE 501. Karashima 2015 discusses in detail a number of sūtras that, as he shows, contain *vaipulya* in their titles.

19. See n. 7 above.

20. CSZJJ, 6b17. Pelliot 1936: 69–72.

21. T. 2145 (LV) 6b14.

22. CSZJJ, 6b27. See Nattier 2008: 84.

23. CSZJJ, 29c17; I adopt the translation of the section from Michael Radich.

24. ZM (I), 118b17.

for Dao'an, part of a group of scriptures known as *\*Vaipulya*, which later came to be known as the *Fangdeng* group, and finally, that from a very early date KP was part of some sort of collection, albeit different from the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. We must conclude, then, that 方等部古品曰遺日說般若經, listed as lost, is the same text later listed as an alternate translation of the smaller *Prajñāpāramitā* text, and that its title is to be construed as “The Old Version of the *\*Vaipulya* Explanation of *Prajñā*, from the *Fangdeng* Group,” the title incorporating a simultaneous translation (方等) and transcription (遺日) of the word *\*Vevulla* = *Vaipulya*.<sup>25</sup>

#### The Jin Translation

The title recorded for J, *Moheyan baoyan jing* 摩訶衍寶嚴經, likely represents an Indic *\*Mahāyāna-Ratnakūṭa*, but after the title we find the phrase *yiming Dajiashe pin* 一名大迦葉品 “Alternate name: *\*Mahākāśyapa* section.” The received text lists no translator and assigns it only to some time during the Western Jin (265–316). The earliest catalogue to mention the text, ZM (I), simply lists it along with a *Fo Weiyue monibao jing* 佛遺曰摩尼寶經 and *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經, as noted above.<sup>26</sup> The same is found in LSJ.<sup>27</sup> KSL lists a one *juan Baoyan jing* by an unknown translator dating from the Western Jin, citing earlier catalogues, LSJ, and others.<sup>28</sup> However, the same catalogue lists a *Moheyan baoyan jing* in one *juan* dating from the Jin, due to an unknown translator.<sup>29</sup> Since this is recorded as extant, it may be different from the *Baoyan jing*. In the second and third *juan* of the *Zongkuoqun jinglu* 總括群經錄 section of KSL, which covers the Western and Eastern Jin periods, only the *Baoyan jing* is listed, without any mention of the *Moheyan Baoyan jing*.

#### The Qin Translation

Translation Q, *Da Baoji jing Puming pusa hui* 大寶積經普明菩薩會, appears in the Chinese sūtra catalogues as *Baoji jing* 寶積經 or *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經. The use of *hui* 會 arises from the inclusion of this translation in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* (*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經) collection, while catalogues produced prior to 713, the date of Bodhiruci's formal presentation of the MRK to the throne, use instead the term *jing* 經. DTNL knows neither the translator nor the date of translation, only classifying the text in the category of “Primary Versions of Mahāyāna sūtras” (大乘經正本).<sup>30</sup> However, KSL lists the translation with the annotation that it was translated during the Western Qin, which, if correct, would place it between 385–431;<sup>31</sup> this catalogue also duly notes its present inclusion in the MRK as its forty-third section. Concerning the title of this translation, *Puming pusa* 普明菩薩 obviously represents Samantāloka bodhisattva, a personage who appears only in one section of the sūtra (§§150–56). Bodhiruci, in editing the forty-nine texts that make up the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, utilized translation Q, naming it *Puming pusa hui* evidently with reference to this group of passages. But as Staël-Holstein (1926: x) pointed out, Samantāloka bodhisattva

25. I owe the germ of this summary to the anonymous reviewer for *JAOS*.

26. ZM (I) 118b17–19.

27. LSJ, 111c8–9, with a note very similar to that in ZM (I), 上三經, 同本別譯異名.

28. KSL, 501b26: 長房等錄, 西晉失譯; 635b26: 西晉失譯.

29. KSL, 587c17–18: 摩訶衍寶嚴經一卷, then small character note: 一名大迦葉品, followed by 晉代譯失三藏名, with the note 舊在漢錄今且依舊第二譯.

30. DTNL, 313b6, 319a15–17: 大寶積經。二十一紙。別譯失人代。右一經。三譯。與支識佛遺日寶及摩訶衍寶嚴經同。

31. KSL, 518c7–8: 大寶積經一卷。今編入寶積當第四十三會。改名普明菩薩會。第三出與摩訶衍寶嚴、佛遺曰摩尼寶, 二經同本異譯。

plays only a secondary role in the text as a whole. The chief message of the KP concerns the bodhisattva path, especially the contemplation of the truth of the Middle Path freed from the two extremes, and the teaching of what makes one a true or false śramaṇa. Although it is not true that the section of Samantāloka bodhisattva has absolutely nothing to do with this main point, certainly that section of passages cannot be called the center point of the text, and thus it makes a strange choice for an overall title. When he compiled the text into the larger MRK collection, Bodhiruci probably assigned to the KP the name *Puming pusa hui* in order to distinguish it from another text also included in the MRK, chapter 23, which bears the Chinese title *Mahe jiashe hui* 摩訶迦葉會. According to the Sanskrit recorded in the Tibetan canons, the title of this work is *Maitreyamahāsimhanāda-sūtra*, but the Chinese version is reconstructible as *\*Mahākāśyapaparivarta*. Bodhiruci may have feared that confusion would result from (also) calling the KP *\*Jiashe hui*, and while such a decision would be understandable, the title *Puming pusa hui* is not, it must be admitted, a very apt choice in view of the main thrust of the sūtra itself.

In this regard, we should also notice a passage in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*, in which the bodhisattva Samantaraśmi has a discussion with the Tathāgata Ratnākara. In the Sanskrit text we find *Ratnākaro nāma tathāgata* and *Samantaraśmir nāma bodhisattvo mahāsattva*, names rendered in the Chinese translation of Kumārajīva (350–409) as Baoji 寶積 and Puming 普明.<sup>32</sup> While in Sanskrit Ratnakūṭa is not equivalent to Ratnākara, as far as Kumārajīva’s translation goes, the names are the same as those we see in KP. If nothing else, this at least shows a possible connection, in the minds of those who knew Kumārajīva’s translation, between these two names, Baoji and Puming, and it is conceivable that this too served, consciously or not, as some sort of rationale for the name Bodhiruci assigned the KP in the MRK.

Furthermore, it is with this section §156 that this translation ends (save for the stock closing phrases at §166), and this fact may well have also contributed to the title. Now, as James Apple noticed, important information is found on a Dunhuang manuscript, IOL TibJ 152:

The text of the fragment is actually from the *Kāśyapaparivarta* but the Tibetan title given in this colophon is translated as “The Assembly (‘*dus pa* = 會) of *\*Samantaprabhāsa-bodhisattva*.” In other words, the Tibetan text preserved on side 1 of the Dunhuang fragment IOL Tib J 152 indicates the final lines and colophon of this version was [sic] translated from the Chinese version of Bodhiruci’s renamed version found in his *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. This evidence indicates that the Tibetans were aware of Bodhiruci’s forty-third section of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection with the title *\*Samantaprabhāsa-bodhisattva-paripṛcchā*. This evidence also indicates that the title *Kāśyapaparivarta* came from an Indian source from either Central Asia or India while the *Ratnakūṭa* Collection circulated in the 8th century. Vulgate versions of Western Kanjurs, such as the Hemis and Basgo Kanjurs, as well as fragments from Tabo, preserve in their colophons the alternative title from Bodhiruci’s collection in addition to the title from the Indian based Tibetan translation.<sup>33</sup>

With the exception of the fact that *\*Samantaprabhāsa* is evidently a mere oversight for the well-attested Samantāloka of the extant Sanskrit text, this portrayal is in most regards correct. The colophon identifies the text as the forty-third section (‘*dus pa* = *hui* 會, as Apple notes, in contrast to *le’u*, on which see below) of the MRK. Furthermore, it names the section

32. Sanskrit in Dutt 1934: 12.18, 12.21; Kumārajīva, T. 223 (VIII) 218a24ff. Other Chinese translations have Baoshi rulai 寶事如來 and Puming pusa 普明菩薩 in the translation of Mokṣala (circa 300), T. 221 (VIII) 2a9ff.; and Baoxing 寶性 and Puguang 普光 in that of Xuanzang, T. 220 (VII) 2c19ff.

33. Apple 2017: 209.



*Byang chub sems dpa' kun tu snang ba'i 'dus pa*, which is plainly a calque on 普明菩薩會. Although he points out that the text is translated from Chinese, Apple does not specify that this single manuscript leaf is evidence for the erstwhile existence of a Tibetan translation from Chinese of Q, another example to be added to the list of Tibetan sūtras translated from Chinese.<sup>34</sup> I do not understand Apple's conclusion that "This evidence also indicates that the title *Kāśyapaparivarta* came from an Indian source from either Central Asia or India while the *Ratnakūṭa* Collection circulated in the 8th century." I cannot see any evidence to support this view (and see below).

#### *The Song Translation*

The fourth translation, S, *Dajiashe wen da baoji zhengfa jing* 大迦葉問大寶積正法經, is in some respects the least problematic, in others the most. A product of the tenth-century translator \*Dānapāla, it is the closest to the extant Sanskrit and Tibetan texts in terms of extent and content, and the only Chinese translation to render the verses that follow the prose of each section,<sup>35</sup> but it is often difficult to understand, especially in terms of its relationship to the Sanskrit text. There is evidence that the translators had access to at least some of the earlier translations, but they nevertheless rather often seem to have failed to construe their source correctly.<sup>36</sup> The translation's title seems very similar to the end title of the Tibetan translation (which it, however, postdates), and we can imagine *Dajiashe wen Da Baoji zhengfa jing* 大迦葉問大寶積正法經 representing something like \**Mahākāśyapaparipṛcchā Mahāratnakūṭa(-sūtra)*.

#### *The Sanskrit Title*

The original titles of the four translations listed above may well have been, or included as an element, \**Ratnakūṭa*. Since the last two leaves of the unique nearly complete Sanskrit manuscript are missing, and no additional relevant Indic manuscript evidence has yet come to light, we can only guess at how the manuscripts of the sūtra would have presented its end-title, which we would expect to be found there. However, in section §52 the sūtra refers to itself as the (or a) *Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāya*, a term that also occurs in sections §§150, 157, 159, and 160. The same term appears in the Tibetan translation and in the commentary. The commentator makes a point of explaining the meaning of the term *ratnakūṭa* in the beginning of his commentary.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, when the sūtra is quoted or cited in Sanskrit in the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and its *ṭīkā*, *Prasannapadā*, *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* and other sources, it is always under the name *Ratnakūṭa*. Despite this, when Staël-Holstein edited the text he gave it the name *Kāśyapaparivarta*, fearing that if he referred to it as

34. See Silk 2019. To this list we should also add that IOL TibJ 165 and 166 contain the opening portion of the *Ratnarāśi* translated from Chinese, previously unidentified as a translation from Chinese and thus not included in my list. Note that while these two sources come from the beginning of the sūtra, and thus cannot necessarily be understood to imply the one-time existence of a complete translation, the fragment IOL TibJ 152 comes from the very end, making it much more likely that a complete translation once existed.

35. On these verses and their status, see Silk 2013.

36. Clear proof that they had access to a Sanskrit manuscript, already evident from the presence of the verses, comes also from a note at the end of third *juan* in the Korean edition (corresponding to §103 in the edition; I have not yet collated other sources), which reads: 無分別故下, 此處元少一葉梵文. Weller (1966b: 310) translates: "Angefangen von der Stelle nach (den Worten:) weil es unterschiedslos ist, fehlt ein Blatt Sanskrittext." Sections §104–7 are consequently missing in the Song translation. The sentence referring to the absent leaf was already noted by Staël-Holstein (1926: x) and discussed by Tsukinowa 1934.

37. Staël-Holstein 1933: 2.

*Ratnakūṭa* it would be confounded with the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection (MRK) as a whole. In the absence of a colophon or end-title in the Sanskrit manuscript, he based his choice on the title found in the Kanjur, namely *Ārya-Kāśyapaparivarta nāma mahāyānasūtra*, in Tibetan 'Phags pa 'od srung gi le'u zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo. Although Kāśyapa as equivalent to 'Od srung is quite a normal correspondence, there are reasons to doubt the historicity of the Sanskrit suggested here. This is because most—though not all—instances in which *le'u* is actually attested as a translation of *parivarta* refer to chapters of larger works. While the title element *parivarta* for an independent text is not absolutely impossible, it seems fully justified to doubt the form *Kāśyapaparivarta*, and to note that the most germane piece of information, and a key to the origin of this title, is that in the extremely influential early ninth-century Tibetan–Sanskrit lexicon, the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (§§ 1334, 1467), *parivarta* is offered as the only equivalent to *le'u*. I believe, therefore, that a very likely scenario is that *Kāśyapaparivarta* is a Sanskrit title invented by the Tibetan editors, who largely based their understanding of the status of the text as a chapter of a larger work (hence *parivarta* as chapter) on its presence in the MRK, and on this basis constructed the Sanskrit title from the Tibetan rendering, subsequently offering a title in line with the equivalents offered by their glossaries. Further evidence for this may be found in the Dunhuang manuscript version of the Tibetan translation of KP, evidently earlier than that preserved in the Kanjur, which has the title instead as *Aryaradnakūṭa nama mahayana sutra*, in Tibetan *Dkon mchog brtsegs pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*.<sup>38</sup> The title here in both Sanskrit and Tibetan is transparently *Ratnakūṭa*, and it is quite conceivable that this title was applied to the sūtra when it was first translated, at some point before the structuring principle of the MRK was adopted by the Tibetans. This hypothesis fully conforms to the fact, discussed above, that the titles of the four Chinese translations so far treated likewise, on the whole, refer to the title *Ratnakūṭa*, with only the late S reflecting *\*Mahākāśyapaparipṛcchā* and J having, in the present Chinese canon, the alternate end-title *\*Mahākāśyapa Section*.

In addition to the four Chinese translations listed above, there is a fifth, embedded in the commentary, which, as noted above, has likewise been long known to scholars:

5) *Da Baoji jing lun* 大寶積經論. Attributed to Bodhiruci of the Later Wei 後魏, between 508 and 535. T. 1523. (Hereafter Cy)

Although the sūtra is not contained in this commentary in its entirety, the vast bulk of it is cited. It is relatively easy to extract the sūtra quotations from the Tibetan translation of the commentary, and the text therein agrees almost completely with the Kanjur translation of the sūtra. There can be very little doubt that the Tibetan translators of the commentary, conforming to normal Tibetan practice, adopted for these quotations the preexisting Tibetan sūtra translation. This evidence therefore is, with very few exceptions, not independent of that found in the Kanjur tradition. But the translator of the Chinese version seems to have been only imprecisely aware of which sentences were quotations of the sūtra, and the work of extracting the sūtra portion is consequently often more complicated than it first appears. There are, moreover, ambiguities in the renderings of sūtra material.

The translation is attributed to Bodhiruci of the Later Wei, therefore to the years 508–535. This Bodhiruci (entirely distinct from the centuries-later Bodhiruci responsible for the MRK) is well known for translating the *Ratnagotravibhāga* into Chinese, and for quarreling with his contemporary Ratnamati. According to the sūtra catalogues, these two translators produced

38. Edited in Apple 2017: 211. I differ from his reading of IOL TibJ 152 only in seeing instead of a blotted [ta], as he transcribes, an attempt rather to write a reversed ta, namely to indicate ṭa.

competing translations of the KP commentary, and these two translations were combined by later persons.<sup>39</sup> The vocabulary is very close to that of the Qin translation (our Q). Probably this reflects the fact that the translator of Cy knew Q, but if so, this raises the question why the identification of actual sūtra quotations would have posed a problem, and this question remains to be addressed.

The author of the commentary is not recorded in the Chinese translation, but the Tibetan text attributes it to Blo brtan, which has generally been understood to mean Sthiramati. However, there are serious problems with this hypothesis, which I discuss elsewhere.<sup>40</sup>

## II. THE *JIASHE JINJIE JING* 迦葉禁戒經

So far, we have discussed the previously well-known Chinese translations of the KP, five in number. Among them S dates to the Song dynasty and is by far the latest, but the others all predate the Sui-Tang period. In addition to these five well-known translations, we must be aware of two others:

- 6) *Jiashe jinjie jing* 迦葉禁戒經. Attributed to Juqu Jingsheng 沮渠京聲 of the Liu-Song 劉宋 dynasty (420–479). T. 1469. (Hereafter L.)<sup>41</sup>
- 7) *Dasheng Baoyun jing* 大乘寶雲經, *juan 7*, the *Baoji pin* 寶積品. Attributed to Mantuoluo xian 曼陀羅仙 (\*Maṇḍalasena?) and Sengqiepoluo 僧伽婆羅 (\*Saṃghapāla? Saṃghavarman?). T. 659 (XVI) 241b5–283b16. (Hereafter M.)

### *The Jiashe jinjie jing*

The *Jiashe jinjie jing* is a short text, not even a full page in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon. In terms of content, it corresponds almost word for word with §§111–38 of KP. This correspondence was recognized for the first time by Ōno Hōdō in 1935. Chinese sūtra catalogues (see below) class this short work as a Hīnayāna Vinaya text, and accordingly the Taishō editors in their turn included it in the Vinaya section. Probably the text was so assigned since in it the Buddha instructs Kāśyapa in monastic discipline, or because it was considered a Vinaya text somehow connected with the Kāśyapīya lineage.

Stylistically, L is very close to the Han translation H. As Staël-Holstein already pointed out,<sup>42</sup> there are many spots in the Han translation that look like mistranslations of its Indic Vorlage, or where the meaning is not clear, at least to us today, with our still imperfect understanding of this early idiom. At the same time, there are also instances of valuable remnants of an Indic Vorlage. As one example, in §112 the extant Sanskrit text reads *ātmadr̥ṣṭīkṛtabandhana*, which (or the structural equivalent of which) both J and Q render as *jianfu* 見縛 (見 = *dr̥ṣṭi*, 縛 = *bandhana*), while the Kanjur texts read *lta bar gyur pa'i 'ching ba*, and the Dunhuang version nearly identically *lta bar byas pa'i 'ching ba*, both likewise without equivalent to *ātma*. It is only H and L that render 言是我所. While the meaning of the latter is not obvious, with *wo* 我 both H and L evidently represent the *ātma*- of the extant Indic text, not reflected in any other extant version. This example and others like it show, among other things, the close relation between H and L.

39. See DTNL, 269b28–c7, and KSL, 540b8ff., 541a12, 637a19. See also Silk 2015: 7–8.

40. Silk 2009, and forthcoming.

41. Note also Dunhuang Stein 4540, reproduced in *Dunhuang baozang* 敦煌寶藏 36:514, containing text equivalent to T. 1469 (XXIV) 912c5–18.

42. Staël-Holstein 1926: xxv n. 35.

The similarity between L and H extends to the domain of the sections actually translated. That is, §126 and §119 are found only in the newer versions, S and the Sanskrit and Kanjur Tibetan; the older translations H, J, Q, and Cy omit them (though §119 is missing in Tibetan as well). L also omits these passages, conforming to the older pattern. One point that should especially be noticed occurs in §120, which J, Q, S, and Cy omit, but which is found in H, L, Sanskrit, and Tibetan. In the manner of the arrangement of sections too we find a close correspondence between H and L. Those topics that are arranged in the Sanskrit text and other translations as §§115–20 are ordered in H as §§116–115–120–117–118 (as mentioned above, §119 is omitted), and L follows exactly the same ordering.

§§136–137 are made up of ten verses in the post-Han versions of the KP. These are particularly important, since these verses can be shown to have been included in the earliest stratum of the sūtra now recoverable. In most sections of the sūtra, a set of verses follows the main prose in the Sanskrit and Tibetan Kanjur versions and the Song translation. These verses are not found in the older translations, not commented upon by Cy, not included in the Sanskrit text in the Ceylonese inscribed plates edited by Paranavitana (1939), in the Central Asian manuscript fragments (in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. 2002), or in the Dunhuang Tibetan version. They were almost certainly added later, although it is of course possible, and even likely, that versions of the sūtra with and without the verses circulated concurrently (for detailed considerations, see Silk 2013). The verses in §§137–38 are original; only in H and L are they reproduced in prose.

As a number of examples show, although L is extremely close to H, it is somewhat abbreviated in its wording. Despite any appearance that L, more concise than H and focused on the sūtra's central theme, might have been the core of KP,<sup>43</sup> it is virtually certain that, rather than being an independent translation of an Indian (or Central Asian) sūtra, L is an excerpt or abstract of H, containing a number of misunderstandings of, and miscopyings from, the latter. There is no good way to understand it as independent of H.

As an example, in §117(d) H has the sentence 身不自持戒, 持戒比丘反承事,<sup>44</sup> while L has 身不持戒, 不承事持戒沙門. The extant Sanskrit has *śilavāntā guṇavāntā cāntikād upasthānaparicaryāsvikaraṇam* “accepting worship and devotion from those who uphold the precepts and those who uphold the virtues.” H has “One does not oneself uphold the precepts, [but] monks who do uphold the precepts, contrarily, offer [one] service.” The meaning is not, as L has it, that one, not upholding the precepts, does not serve those monks who do uphold the precepts. Following our hypothesis, H appears to have been misunderstood or miscopied.

Another example of disparity between H and L is found in §125(g), in which H has 亦無泥洹, while correspondingly L has 於佛法中得泥洹. This passage expresses the attitudes of the true śramaṇa from the viewpoint of emptiness in which, for the true śramaṇa, saṃsāra does not exist, “neither does nirvāṇa exist.” (The Sanskrit text has *na saṃsarati na parinirvāyati* “he does not circle in saṃsāra, nor does he Parinirvāṇize.”) In contrast to this, L understands that the true śramaṇa “obtains nirvāṇa within the Buddha's teaching.” This is doctrinally unobjectionable, but shallow and not characteristic of the KP's thought. However, the entire section here in L, while plainly corresponding, is significantly different from H.

In §135(c), H has the sentence 無身所犯, 無口所犯, 無心所犯 “there is no violation of morality by acts of body, there is no violation of morality by acts of speech, there is no

43. This brevity led Ōno Hōdō (1935: 575) to suggest that L contained the original, essential meaning of the sūtra; from this core, he posited, the post-Han versions of the KP developed. However, this idea is to be rejected, as Ōno himself later saw (1954: 107).

44. Weller 1970: 141: “Hält (er) persönlich die Sittengebote selbst nicht, allem zuwider Dienstleistungen empfangen von Bhikṣu, welche die Sittengebote halten.”

violation of morality by acts of mind.”<sup>45</sup> No such expression appears in other versions, save L, in which the corresponding sentence reads 無身無所犯, 無口無所犯, 無心無所犯, with one too many 無 per phrase. How are we to understand the sentences in L? “There is no body, and nothing that is violated”? Or “With respect to the body, there is no thing that is not violated,” that is, there is constant violation? It is hard to imagine this as anything other than a mistaken copy of H.

Given the above, despite some lingering unknowns, we thus cannot but say that, rather than being an independent translation, L is something similar to an edited or revised excerpt. There are, in fact, many excerpts of sūtras, and actually we find in the catalogues references to both *chao Baoji jing* 抄寶積經 and *Baoji jing chao* 寶積經抄<sup>46</sup> “extract of the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*,” with explicit identification with the KP, though this expression is apparently nowhere connected with L.

In addition to the difficulties discussed above, from the point of view of the entries in the Chinese sūtra catalogues too there are various problems connected with L. The work seems to have been known to Dao'an, according to an entry in the CSZJJ's section reporting Dao'an's list of anonymous translations, which gives two similar titles, *Jiashe jie jing* 迦葉戒經 and *Jiashe jinjie jing* 迦葉禁戒經.<sup>47</sup> For ZM (I), the *Jiashe jinjie jing* belongs to the category of Hīnayāna Vinaya texts (小乘毘尼藏錄).<sup>48</sup> Despite earlier catalogues having treated this text as of unknown translatorship, the LSJ and DTNL attribute the *Jiashe jinjie jing* to Shi Tuigong 釋退公 of the late Eastern Jin (316–420), inserting a note that alternate titles are *Mohe biqui jing* 摩訶比丘經 or *Zhenwei shamen jing* 真偽沙門經.<sup>49</sup> A one *juan* work known by the name *Zhenwei shamen jing* 真偽沙門經, alternately titled *Zhenwei jing* 真偽經, was already found in the CSZJJ, considered anonymous and not connected to the *Jiashe jinjie jing*.<sup>50</sup> The DTNL, as above, identifies the two texts, but also lists them separately.<sup>51</sup> Since the title expression *Zhenwei shamen jing* can be imagined to refer to the three types of false śramaṇas and one true śramaṇa mentioned above, it is possible to understand this as an alternate title for the *Jiashe jinjie jing*. KSL, following DTNL, lists the Tuigong translation as lost.<sup>52</sup> However, in other places discussing the texts translated by the Liu-Song translator Juqu Jingsheng, it mentions that this is a second translation of Tuigong's *Jiashe jinjie jing*, this moreover being exactly the same text as the *Zhenwei shamen jing*.

Following a now well-recognized pattern of such later attributions, which appear to be otherwise unattested and largely unjustified, LSJ is the first catalogue to list the *Jiashe jinjie jing* as a translation of Juqu Jingsheng, but at the same time it also contains separate mention of a *Mohe biqui jing* in one *juan*, also known as the *Zhenwei shamen jing*, 摩訶比丘經一卷, 亦云真偽沙門經, following which it lists the *Jiashe jinjie jing* in one *juan*.<sup>53</sup> In the Taishō edition, the *Jiashe jinjie jing* is considered to be the same text as the *Zhenwei shamen jing*, and is attributed to Juqu Jingsheng, but these indications seem to be based on the information provided in KSL. But our conclusion is beyond doubt: since there is no question that L is an

45. Weller 1970: 147: “ohne alles Verletzen durch eine Tat, ohne alles Verletzen durch ein Wort, ohne alles Verletzen durch einen Gedanken.”

46. CSZJJ, 18b1; ZM(I), 124c29; ZM(II), 163c2; T. 2148 (LV) 198b8; KSL, 651b19; ZXSM, 988a17–18.

47. CSZJJ, 17b5.

48. ZM (I), 140b19.

49. LSJ, 72a18–20, and DTNL, 248a9–11, but also 300b28.

50. CSZJJ, 24a26.

51. DTNL, 310c6, 8; 324b22, 24, and see the entirely separate entry 261a6.

52. KSL, 509a29.

53. LSJ, 93a2, 119c5–6.

excerpt of H, regardless of who was responsible for the creation of L, that individual cannot be spoken of here as a translator as such.

A final interesting point about L is that it was, in its turn, cited at some length by two other early texts. Passages from L are cited in both the *Rulai du zheng zi shi sanmei jing* 如來獨證自誓三昧經 (T. 623) and the *Zi shi sanmei jing* 自誓三昧經 (T. 622). This was pointed out by Ōno.<sup>54</sup> It would take us rather far afield here to discuss the complications of these two obviously closely related texts, which, if for no other reason than their early date, deserve attention, but it is evident that the *Rulai du zheng zi shi sanmei jing* has some priority over the *Zi shi sanmei jing*, and thus it seems that while the former had direct knowledge of and accepted the influence of L, copying it in a manner somewhere between citation and rephrase, the latter took this process further still, evidently basing itself not directly on L but rather on the *Rulai du zheng zi shi sanmei jing*.

*The Baoji pin in the Dasheng baoyun jing, a Version of the Ratnamegha-sūtra*

A Sanskrit manuscript (albeit incomplete) of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra* has recently become available from Tibet, and an edition is in preparation by Vinitā Tseng in Munich. It is moreover often quoted in Sanskrit in such works as the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Prasannapadā*, and *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*. The text exists also in Tibetan and in four Chinese translations. Only the latter are relevant for us here, and only one of these. In chronological order these Chinese versions are:

- a) *Baoyun jing* 寶雲經. Attributed to \*Maṇḍalasena (Mantuoluoxian 曼陀羅仙) of the sixth-century Liang 梁 dynasty. T. 658.
- b) *Dasheng Baoyun jing* 大乘寶雲經. T. 659, our M.
- c) *Foshuo Baoyun jing* 佛說寶雨經. Attributed to Dharmaruci (Damoliuzhi 達摩流支 = Bodhiruci) of the Tang. T. 660.<sup>55</sup>
- d) *Foshuo Chugaizhang pusa suowen jing* 佛說除蓋障菩薩所問經. Attributed to \*Dharmapāla (Fahu 法護, 963–1058) and others of the Song. T. 489.

Among the very curious points raised by this array of translations is that, as has been pointed out, the third text listed above, T. 660, contains spurious interpolations connected with the political aspirations of the empress Wu Zhao 武曩 (r. 690–705).<sup>56</sup> What makes this interesting, in light of the earlier version T. 659, is that the scholar to whom T. 660 is attributed is the same Bodhiruci who is credited with the overall compilation of the *Da Baoji jing* collection. Leaving this odd situation aside, the four translations are in basic agreement with one another in terms of their content. However, at the end of T. 659, the *Dasheng Baoyun jing*, we find a section called *Baoji pin*, no equivalent of or parallel to which is found in the other Chinese translations or in the Tibetan translation. This *Baoji pin* is in fact nothing other than a translation of the KP. What is more, this translation is transmitted only in one known canon, the so-called Fuzhou 福州 edition(s), of which only the eleventh-century Pilu 毗盧 (no. 132, dating to 1151), printed in the Kaiyuan 開元 temple, is currently available. This version appears to have remained basically unknown even in China until printed by the Taishō editors in the twentieth century.

We must first of all investigate the relationship between the *Baoyun jing*, T. 658, and the *Dasheng baoyun jing*, which contains the *Baoji jing*, T. 659. The reason for this neces-

54. Ōno 1954: 108–10. See the detailed discussions at <https://dazangthings.nz/abc/text/2085/>.

55. See Forte 2005: 88 n. 5.

56. Forte 2005: 189ff., and elsewhere in this splendid book.

sary consideration is that while sources present both as the work of the Liang translator Maṅḍalasena, it is not clear whether the same person retranslated one and the same work. All scripture catalogues give the name of the translator of T. 658 as Mantuoluoxian, but the term *Dasheng*, Mahāyāna, is not necessarily found at the head of the title in each case. However, a *Dasheng Baoyun jing* in eight *juan* appears in both LSJ and DTNL, but with the notation that it was translated by the śramaṇa \*Subhūti (Xuputi 須菩提) of Funan 扶南 for the ruler of Chen 陳主.<sup>57</sup> KSL and the *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 give the name as *Dasheng Baoyun jing*, listing it as a lost translation of Subhūti.<sup>58</sup> In sum, the catalogues list the *Baoyun jing* with the appended *Dasheng* at the head as a translation of Subhūti. The attribution of the *Dasheng Baoyun jing* to Maṅḍalasena and Sengqiepoluo (梁扶南三藏曼陀羅仙共僧伽婆羅譯) found in the Pilu canon (and thence in the Taishō) does not appear in the catalogues, and it is not clear upon what tradition this identification of shared responsibility would have been based.

As Sakurabe Bunkyō showed,<sup>59</sup> a comparison of the *Dasheng Baoyun jing* with the *Baoyun jing* makes it clear that the vocabulary of the two is not the same, and even the contents differ. With regard to the chapter divisions, he wrote, “the originals were not the same, and moreover they seem not to have passed through the hands of the same translator.” Further, he continued: “The sūtra catalogues and biographies of monks nowhere record that [Maṅḍalasena] translated the text again.” He concluded that although further investigation is required, apparently the present eight-*juan* version of the *Dasheng Baoyun jing* is due not to Maṅḍalasena but is in fact the “lost” translation of Subhūti. This hypothesis of Sakurabe’s is the most plausible interpretation of the question. If correct, it would mean that the *Dasheng Baoyun jing* has nothing to do with Maṅḍalasena (of around 503), but belongs instead to Subhūti (of the Chen 陳, 557–589), making it fifty to sixty years later than has generally been thought.

Given that the *Baoji pin* corresponds exactly to the KP, it follows that the *Dasheng Baoyun jing* is a composite of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra* and the KP. What, then, can we say about the KP as it appears in the *Baoji pin*? In both its manner of translation and in its general structure, M bears the closest resemblance to Q. To deal with the question of structure first, both Q and M lack the following sections of the text: §§27, 28, 33, 55, 84, 89, 119, 120, 126. However, Q also omits §§21, 22, 50, 51, which are found in M, while the latter omits §§54, 80, 81, 82, 90, 91, and 92, which are found in Q. Especially characteristic is the fact that the section comprising §§150–56, in which the Bodhisattva Samantāloka appears, while missing in the older translations (namely H, J, and Cy), is found in Q and M. On the other hand, §§157–63 appear in J and Cy but are omitted in Q and M. These correspondences make the close affiliation between Q and M obvious. On the basis of these facts, therefore, it is one hypothesis that these two translations are based on a Sanskrit tradition of the KP different from other extant versions. At the same time, there are good reasons not to consider the two translations as entirely independent witnesses.

The extreme similarity in style of translation and choice of vocabulary provides evidence additional to that of structure for a close affiliation between Q and M. For example, in §41 M is almost a calque of Q, and in remarkable contrast to the other Chinese translations. It is possible to find similar examples virtually everywhere throughout the text. Since M may be considered a later translation than Q, with the language tidied up and certain clarifications

57. LSJ, 88b26–29; DTNL, 274a26–29.

58. ZXSM, 845b25; KSL, 547a25, a25–26 reads, 547a28–b2.

59. In Ono 1932–1935: 10.136c.

added, in some sense it is a better translation than Q, and almost certainly should be considered its revision or amended version, and therefore dependent on Q, even if its creators also had access to a Sanskrit manuscript of KP. For a particularly vivid example, in §68 we find an analogy: A magician conjures up a magical creation, but then that magical creation turns and devours that very magician. In the Chinese translations we find the creation rendered: H 化作人, J 化作幻人, Q 作幻人, S 作幻化. All of these point clearly to a created, or magically created, person. In contrast, M renders 幻作猛虎, a magically created wild tiger. The term “wild tiger” 猛虎 does not occur in the Sanskrit as we have it, and seems to be either the translator’s interpretation, or to reflect a different Indic tradition. If we imagine a “wild tiger,” certainly the idea that the creation devours the magician makes greater sense. The Sanskrit text (available quoted in the *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*) contains the term *puruṣa*, but this refers to the magician himself and not to his creation.<sup>60</sup>

A problem does arise, however, with regard to the group of passages §§150–56, found in Q and M (and incidentally in S), but not in H or J. This set of passages is out of character with the KP taken as a whole. Until this point in the text, KP has consisted of a discourse of the Buddha delivered to Kāśyapa, and for this reason it has made sense to refer to KP as the “Kāśyapa chapter.” Starting with §150, however, the Buddha begins to preach to the bodhisattva Samantāloka, as noted above in our discussion of Q. Herein is preached the homily that just as one rides in a boat and seeks to pass over the Ganges river, so the bodhisattva should swiftly concentrate his energies and seek to pass over to the other shore of the Buddha’s teachings, not using a boat but instead readying the steady ship of the Dharma.<sup>61</sup>

*Baoji pin*, used as the title of M, seems to constitute evidence that the translator (using that term broadly here; perhaps tradent, or even editor, is better) knew that this section of the text was in fact the KP. However, although the KP calls itself *Mahāratnakūṭa* in §52, the wording corresponding to this in M is *Baoyun weimiao jing* 寶雲微妙經, in which the word *baoyun*, \**Ratnamegha*, indicates that M itself was completely absorbed into the *Baoyun jing*, the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*. This can only have been a self-conscious choice of the compiler/editor. *Baoji pin* seems to have been applied to the text since the bodhisattva to whom the Buddha directs his preaching from the beginning through the majority of the text is called Baoji. But there is not complete consistency here. In the KP from §§1–140 the Buddha preaches to Kāśyapa, then in the episode from §§141–49 Subhūti enters the picture. In the anomalous section §§150–56, the interlocutor is Samantāloka, and with §157 Kāśyapa returns. At the beginning and end of the sūtra, the representative listener is Kāśyapa. But in M, Baoji bodhisattva appears only in §§1–135, and the other sections from §139 on correspond with the description just given. That is, in the first part of the text in M the name Jiashe (Kāśyapa) is replaced by Baoji bodhisattva, but later this is not maintained, and what we might well understand as vestiges of the original text, with the name Jiashe, remain. This suggests a process of revision which was largely but not completely carried through.

### III. THE DATES OF THE SEVERAL VERSIONS OF THE KP

Among the seven Chinese translations discussed above, the Song version is the newest. Forming a group together with the Tibetan Kanjur translation and the Sanskrit text, these three versions contain a set of verses attached to almost every section of the sūtra. As indi-

60. Yamaguchi 1934: 247.12–16: *tadyathā kāśyapa māyākāraḥ puruṣo māyākṛtan nirmimīte, atha sa māyā-nirmītas tam eva māyākāraṁ khādeta. evam eva kāśyapa yogācāro bhikṣur yad yad evāmbanāṁ manaskaroti tat sarvaṁ aśya rīktakam eva khyāti . . .* The passage has been discussed in detail by Chen 2018, with superb insight.

61. On these passages see Silk 2010.



cated above, these verses are either additions to an original core sūtra text, or belong to a lineage of the scripture separate from that transmitted in other versions without these verses (Silk 2013). But even within the group of three late versions—Sanskrit, Kanjur Tibetan, and S—we can determine a relative chronology.

The oldest is the Tibetan Kanjur translation. We know this since the translator Jinamitra is a figure of the early ninth century, of the time of King Ral pa chen, and the translation is already included in the *Lhan kar ma* and *'Phang thang ma* catalogues, both of the early ninth century.<sup>62</sup> The Tibetan translation of the KP thus belongs to the eighth or very early ninth century and is older than the Song Chinese translation. The Song translation is due to Shihu, who arrived in the Northern Song in 980, and thus his KP translation belongs to the end of the tenth century. This does not, however, prove that his Sanskrit Vorlage dates from this period as well.

It is difficult to ascertain the chronological relation between this Song translation and the available Sanskrit text. Staël-Holstein thought that his Sanskrit manuscript belonged to the ninth or tenth century, though more recently Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. (2002: vii) place it in the seventh to eighth century. In any event, although differences due to recensional variation must always be considered as well, its contents seem to be later than the text upon which the Song translation was based. For example, in §131 after the verses the main Sanskrit text contains an additional section in prose, not found in any of the other versions, and also missing in other Sanskrit fragments (Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. 2002: 61). In §146 the Sanskrit text is greatly expanded in comparison with all other versions, and the same tendency can be detected in section §103 and elsewhere. Such examples raise the question whether the main Sanskrit manuscript might contain a text representing the newest available version of the text (remembering that while a text in a given material form cannot be newer than that material form, it may well be older), or whether we confront here questions of divergent lineages rather than of chronological priority. Part of the complication is the presence in §§33, 84, and 89 of the Song translation of verses absent in all other versions, which gives the impression that the Song version contains a more developed form of the text. Likewise, in §120 the Tibetan contains a verse not in the Sanskrit text, but of course, we must also reckon with the fact that our manuscript is a *codex unicus*, and therefore in no way should be understood to represent “the” Sanskrit tradition. All of these examples, taken together, suggest that it will be more fruitful to think in terms of divergent textual developments than of a single linear evolution over time.

Setting aside the question whether they should properly be placed in a single line, one linked to the other, the witnesses we have do belong to different moments in time. Thus, recapitulating what we have said above, we can tentatively place the available versions of the KP in chronological order as follows:

- H**, Later Han translation: 179
- J**, (Western) Jin anonymous translation: 291–299
- Q**, (Western) Qin anonymous translation: 384–431
- L**, *Jiashe jinjie jing*: (400–470)
- Cy**, Later Wei, *Baoji jinglun*: 508–535
- M**, Chen, *Dasheng Baoyun jing*: 557–589
- Sanskrit** Manuscript (SI P/2): 7th–8th centuries
- Tibetan Dunhuang** version: 8th–9th centuries?
- Tibetan Kanjur** translation: 788–824

62. Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 38, no. 67; Kawagoe 2005: 8, no. 25.

S, Song translation: end of tenth century

In addition to the above, we have the Tibetan translation of the commentary, the Chinese version of which is referred to by the abbreviation Cy in the list above. Since the name(s) of the translator(s) is (/are) not given, we cannot be sure, but probably the Tibetan translation of the commentary is later than the translation of the sūtra itself. This text also underwent a remarkable change, and the Tibetan version is much expanded in comparison with the Chinese, the views of the teacher Chos kyi bdag po (= Dharmasvāmin?) being introduced, for instance.

Having examined the dating of the various versions of the KP, we can see that the existence of seven Chinese translations, beginning with that from the Later Han, illustrates the interest some had in the sūtra over a long span of centuries, or at least the interest some had in making translations available, for the text never generated the type of attention in China that could lead to the production of a considerable commentarial literature, such as that produced on the *Lotus Sūtra*, *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, the Pure Land sūtras, and the like. The text therefore, despite the existence of these multiple translations, in another sense did not deeply penetrate the Chinese Buddhist intellectual world, and this fact raises a host of questions of its own, which should be addressed separately elsewhere.

While giving due weight to the idea that we most likely do not see here a linear development of a single core text,<sup>63</sup> it is still possible that in addition to illustrating some (yet undetermined) kind of sustained attention to this text, consideration of the date of compilation and of composition of the different versions would allow us to make some suggestions about the ways that at least this particular sūtra was formed and developed.

First, it is fair to say that even the oldest version of the KP as we have it today, the Han translation, represents a snapshot of but one form of textual evolution, and certainly not the earliest. It is difficult to imagine that sūtras, even relatively short ones like the KP, were composed in one stroke. Probably the germ of the text developed out of many episodes or pericopes, “elements” that served as constituent parts integrated into a composite version. These pericopes or “elements” were gradually collected together until ultimately a single sūtra was formed, but this single sūtra was never frozen into one and only one form. Such a process of collection in some respects accounts for the large and small differences and for the variations in the doctrinal, literary, and structural nature of the versions to which we now have access, and of course we know that these versions represent only a—to some extent random—preservation of the once much richer variety of forms of expression of “the same” literary work. Some scholars have, however, imagined a different form of evolution.

For instance, as noted above (n. 43), Ōno Hōdō once suggested that the *Jiashe jinjie jing* (our L, corresponding to §§111–38) represents the earliest form of the KP, finding evidence for this in the fact that the “attainment of merit” section at the end of this group of passages signals the end of a sūtra. But the *Jinjie jing* is clearly an excerpt, a Chinese production based on the Han translation, and therefore certainly not an independent witness to any Indian state of the text. This early suggestion of Ōno, then, as he himself later concluded, can confidently be rejected.

However, it is, of course, theoretically possible to consider a stratum corresponding to the *Jiashe jinjie jing* as one of the pericopes that was drawn upon to compile the present KP, but the other elements antecedent to the KP as the unit we now know also include the stratum comprising the sixteen (or twenty or twenty-two) sections of four qualities concerning the bodhisattva’s practice (§§1–22) and the stratum in which is described the Middle Way and

63. See Silk 2021: 156 for a visualization.

the practice of seeing things in accord with reality (§§52–71). It is hard to argue on any objective ground that any of these, alone or in combination, might represent an “original core” of the KP.

Next, the episode (§§139–49) of five hundred monks leaving the assembly, having been unable to understand the Buddha’s preaching, is paralleled in a number of other Buddhist scriptures, and while it can be considered as a pericope of the sūtra, it is difficult to consider it too as an original core element peculiar to the KP. Furthermore, the stratum in which the bodhisattva Samantāloka appears (§§150–56) represents a secondary stratum almost certainly added, as argued above, at a later stage. Therefore, even our earliest witness of the KP shows strong and indeed compelling evidence that it represents a developed form of some evidently earlier forms of the work. If we cannot be certain about the process of development of the KP, what of its present location within the MRK collection?

#### IV. THE FORMATION OF THE MRK

It is only possible here to briefly address the question (or better, questions) of the origins of the collection of forty-nine sūtras within which the KP is now classified, the MRK. Already Staël-Holstein (1926: xvi n. 9) questioned the idea that the Sanskrit text of the MRK was formed in India, pointing out by way of proof, as noted above, that in Indian works the KP is always quoted by the name *Ratnakūṭa*, while other texts included in the MRK series, such as the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*, are quoted as independent texts and not considered to be part of any larger unit. Thus the Sanskrit appellation “*Ratnakūṭa*” is limited to the KP. But does this adequately demonstrate that no MRK existed prior to the time of Bodhiruci, responsible for the MRK as we now know it?

An important question for understanding the place and status of the KP in China is whether the larger collection into which Q was incorporated—what we now know as the MRK—existed before Bodhiruci presented this collection to the throne in 713. To anticipate the answer to this question, there is little reliable evidence pointing to the existence of an MRK collection before its compilation by Bodhiruci, at least in any unambiguous manner.

One piece of evidence that has been brought forward to argue for the contrary conclusion is a passage in the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (our LSJ) of 598, that is, significantly before the 713 date, in which reference is made to Jñānagupta’s having seen a \**Ratnakūṭa* (*Baoji* 寶積) in what may be Karghalik (Zhejujia 遮拘迦), in Central Asia.<sup>64</sup> Upon this basis some place the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection as a whole in the sixth century. It seems evident, however, that the reference can only be to the single sūtra we know as KP, that is, the *Ratnakūṭa par excellence*, all the more so as immediately following in the list comes *Lengjia* 楞伽, that is, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. The LSJ passage further refers to the texts as “all of 100,000 verses” 皆十萬偈, but lists, side by side with the *Baoji*, the *Laṅkāvatāra*, the *Anantamukhadhāraṇī*, the *Mahāmegha-sūtra*, and others. It is possible that “all” here means “all together,” that is, the total of the texts, in which case we might understand “hundreds of thousands of verses.” However, if it means that each text is 100,000 verses in length, this may allude to the idea that Buddhist scriptures were originally of magnificent lengths, with only much abbreviated versions having survived in this Sahā world. Whether or not that idea is relevant here, it is hardly possible to accept this kind of legendary language as evidence for the historical existence of a collection. While the cited passage, therefore, may well stand as evidence for the

64. I briefly discussed this in Silk 2019: 231 n. 7, referring to Sakurabe 1930: 134. The *Lidai sanbao ji* passage is found at T. 2034 (XLIX) 103a21, and see Chavannes 1905: 353 for a translation. The full passage is LSJ, 103a20–23.

existence of KP itself in the sixth century, since the existence of the Han translation makes it certain that it existed already in the second century, we learn nothing new here.

A more significant complication comes in the story that Xuanzang 玄奘 (ca. 600–64), at least fifty years before Bodhiruci, planned to translate the serial MRK, but was prevented from doing so by old age. If reliable, this would demonstrate that the collection existed as a collection—in whatever form—before Bodhiruci began his efforts. The relevant passage reads:<sup>65</sup>

麟德元年春正月朔一日翻經大德及彼寺衆慙懃啓請翻大寶積經。法師見衆情專，至俛仰，翻數行訖，便收梵本，停住告衆曰：「此經部軸與大般若同。玄奘自量氣力，不復辦此。死期已至，勢非賒遠。今欲往蘭芝等谷禮辭俱胝佛像」。於是與門人同出。僧衆相顧，莫不潸然。禮訖還寺，專精行道。遂絕翻譯。

On the first day of the first month, in the spring of the first year of Linde (= February 2, 664), the *bhadanta* monks responsible for translation, as well as the community of that [Yuhua] monastery, earnestly requested [the Master] to translate the *Mahāratnakūṭa sūtra*. Upon seeing the sincerity of the monks, the Dharma Master exerted himself, but after translating just a few lines he closed the Sanskrit text and stopped the task. He told the monks, “This sūtra is as voluminous as the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra*. Estimating my own strength, I shall not be able to complete this work. I am approaching my death, and my energy will not continue for long. Now I wish to go to the Lanzhi Valley and other places to worshipfully bid farewell to a *koṭi* of Buddha images.” Then he set off together with his disciples, and when the monks gazed at one another, each and every one of them dissolved into sobbing. After worshipping, [Xuanzang] returned to the monastery and engaged exclusively in practicing the Way. From then on, he absolutely stopped with translation work.

This passage comes from the well-known *Da ci'en si Sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, a work claimed to have been completed by Yancong 彥悰 in 688, following on the uncompleted task of Huili 慧立 (614–?), though there are significant problems with this traditional account. In any event, the first catalogue to list the work is the KSL of 730, and one cannot entirely rule out the possibility of interpolations made after 688, although a rationale for such an interpolation in the present case is not self-evident. But that does not mean that no such rationale exists. I believe, in fact, that the reference to the *Mahāratnakūṭa* here may well be anachronistic, and the result of later editing. If it is correct (and see n. 66) that this account was written as part of the efforts of the future empress Wu Zhao (Wu Zetian 武則天) to consolidate her power, it is also possible that a reference to the *Da Baoji jing* was inserted in the text and connected with Xuanzang as part of an effort to connect him and his charisma directly with the (perhaps then contemporary) project of Bodhiruci to actually produce the collection. As it is, it is obvious that the tone of the passage is fawning and we are compelled by modern standards to judge it as in at least some respects fictional.<sup>66</sup> We also need to recall several things about the situation of Xuanzang at the point in time here referred to. Namely, from 659 Xuanzang moved to the Yuhua monastery, a move that, as Liu Shufen (in press) argues, was designed to shield him from the political purges going on at the time. Indeed, it was at this monastery that he completed the enormous *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* in 600 *juan*. It is hard, however, to understand what the authors could have meant by putting into Xuanzang's mouth the claim that the MRK is in terms of the number of its scrolls equal

65. T. 2053 (L) 276c2–9. The translation is based on that of Li 1995: 331, significantly modified. I accept the following variants from the Taishō apparatus: for 玉華 I read 彼; for 攝, I accept 收; for 禮拜 I accept 禮, all of these based on the readings reported for 三, 宮, 甲.

66. Kotyk 2019 demonstrates the extent to which some passages in the work can, in comparison with official documents reporting on the same events, be shown to have been fictionalized.

to the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* (此經部軸與大般若同), since it is five times smaller (600 vs. 120 *juan*).

That being said, is it entirely impossible to imagine that Xuanzang knew of something he understood as a *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection? It is difficult to deny absolute impossibility, but the evidence seems to be against it, and not only the Indian evidence, which, as we have noted above, alongside a great many references to a *Ratnakūṭa* scripture equivalent to our present KP, preserves not a single trace of a collection. Moreover, there is another complication in understanding the passage just cited as evidence for the existence of the MRK as a collection in 664, and that comes from a spot earlier in precisely the same *Da ci'en si Sanzang fashi zhuan*. The relevant passage reads:<sup>67</sup>

丁卯法師方操貝葉，開演梵文。創譯：菩薩藏經、佛地經、六門陀羅尼經、顯揚聖教論等四部。其翻六門經當日了。佛地經至辛巳了。菩薩藏經、顯揚論等歲暮方訖。

On the first day (of the seventh month) the Master started to translate the palm leaf Sanskrit texts. He began [on that day] translating four texts: the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, the *Buddhabhūmi*, the \**Ṣaṇmukhī-dhāraṇī*, and the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*. Of these, the translation of the *Ṣaṇmukhī-dhāraṇī* was completed on that same day, and the *Buddhabhūmi* was finished on the fifteenth day (of the seventh month), while the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* were done by the end of the year.

The obvious problem here is that while reference is made matter-of-factly to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, no mention is made of its inclusion in any MRK collection, where we find it now. It is hard to imagine that if there had been an awareness of this inclusion it would have been overlooked, especially in light of the passage later in the same work, cited above. Of course, one could argue that while Xuanzang knew a Sanskrit manuscript of some *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, it did not contain forty-nine texts, or at any rate did not contain the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, which then would have been added to the collection later by Bodhiruci. It is evident, however, that such reasoning adds hypothesis upon hypothesis until almost anything is possible. If we are to be sober, we probably should conclude that the first cited passage—that claiming that Xuanzang had a copy of the complete MRK in Sanskrit—is a later addition, and does not refer to any historical event actually taking place during Xuanzang's lifetime.

Another parallel passage may not after all be independent evidence, and it is difficult to know how to treat the *Da Tang gu Sanzang Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang* 大唐故三藏玄奘法師行狀, the history of which is unclear. The passage relevant for us reads:<sup>68</sup>

至麟德元年正月一日。玉花寺衆及僧等請翻大寶積經。法師辭曰：「知此經於漢土未有綠。縱翻亦不了」。固請不免。法師曰：「翻必不滿五行」。遂譯四行止。謂弟子及翻經僧等有爲之法，必歸磨滅，泡幻之質，何得久停

In the first year of Linde, on the first day of the first month, the community in the Yuhua monastery and the monks requested [Xuanzang] to translate the *Da Baoji jing*. The Dharma Master demurred, saying: "I understand that as yet there are not the karmic conditions for this scripture in China. Even were I to try to translate it, this would come to nothing." They earnestly entreated him, not relenting. But the Dharma Master said: "If I were to translate it, there is no way I could make it through five lines." Thereupon he translated four lines, and stopped, telling the disciples and translator-monks that all conditioned dharmas are certain to end in destruction: since they have the nature of foam and illusion, how could they last for long?

67. T. 2053 (L) 254a6–10, trans. Li 1995: 181, modified.

68. The passage is T. 2052 (L) 219a13–18. On the text, see Kotyk 2019: 521–24, who is inclined to date it to the early Song.

The similarity of this passage to the first passage quoted above from the *Da ci'en si Sanzang fashi zhuan*, and the uncertainty over the history of the *Da Tang gu Sanzang Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang*, suggest that it would be unwise to treat it as other than a later reworking of the former's account, rather than as independent corroborating evidence.

Also dated many years after the fact is a passage in the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 in which we read:<sup>69</sup>

此經都有四十九會。上代譯者，摘會別翻，而不終部帙。往者，貞觀中玄奘法師往遊印度，將梵本還。於弘福寺，譯大菩薩藏經，即是寶積第十二之一會。後於玉華宮寺，翻大般若竟，諸德懇懇請翻寶積。奘法師云：「譯寶積之功不謝於般若。余生涯已窮，恐不終其事」。固請不已遂啓夾譯之。可得數行乃嗟歎曰。「此經與此土群生未有緣矣。余氣力衰竭不能辦也」。因而遂輟。流志來日，復齋其梵本。和帝命志續其餘功。

This sūtra consists of forty-nine sections (*hui* 會). The translators of previous epochs had chosen some of the sections and had translated them separately, so it was not complete. Formerly, during the Zhenguan era, the Master of the Law Xuanzang traveled to India and came back with the Sanskrit text. He translated the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, the twelfth section of the *Ratnakūṭa*, at the Hongfu Monastery. Then, when he finished the translation of the *Mahāprajñā[pāramitā]* at the monastery of the Yuhua palace, the *bhadantas* warmly asked him to translate the *Ratnakūṭa*.

The Master of the Law [Xuan]zang said: “The work of translating the *Ratnakūṭa* is not inferior to that [necessary for translating the] *[Mahā]prajñā[pāramitā]*. My life is going to end and I am afraid that I will not be able to bring to completion this work.” Since he was insistently asked, he opened the [Sanskrit] text to translate it; he was able to translate some lines, then, sighing, said: “The conditions for the transmission of this sūtra to the beings of this land [China] are not yet present. My energies are weakening and I cannot succeed.” Then he stopped.

When [Bodhi]ruci came, he too brought the Sanskrit text [of this sūtra]. Hedi (Zhongzong) ordered [Bodhi]ruci to continue [Xuan]zang's remaining work.

I would venture to suggest that the wording of parts of this account are so close to those in the hagiography of Xuanzang quoted above that they either were borrowed from, or at the very least inspired by, it. Furthermore, there is again an apparent incoherence in this account that mirrors that in the hagiography, namely that a distinction is made between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and the MRK.

Now, these are not the only sources that present a challenge to a clear picture of the history of the MRK collection, and we must consider one final reference found in a work the Indian origins of which seem fairly secure. Several times in offering quotations, the *\*Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* 十住毘婆沙論, traditionally considered to have been translated by a group associated with Kumārajīva, refers to a *Baoding jing* 寶頂經, within which are to be found both a Kāśyapa chapter (the reference is 寶頂經迦葉品中)<sup>70</sup> and an *\*Akṣayamatibodhisattva* chapter. The former refers to the present KP, but interpreting *Baoding jing* here is not straightforward, since the very same *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* quotes the KP elsewhere a number of times, sometimes without reference,<sup>71</sup> but also by calling it the *\*Kāśyapa sūtra* 迦葉經,<sup>72</sup> in these cases without reference to any *Baoding jing*. As just noted, the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* also quotes an *\*Akṣayamatibodhisattva* chapter in the same manner, that is, apparently attributing it to a *Baoding jing*. The passage begins: 寶頂經中無

69. T. 2154 (LV) 570b3–12. The translation is that of Forte 2002: 97–98, slightly modified, translated earlier by Lamotte 1976: 1844–45, in the note.

70. T. 1521 (XXVI) 118c13.

71. T. 1521 (XXVI) 67b7.

72. T. 1521 (XXVI) 110c25, citing KP §135.

盡意菩薩第三十品檀波羅蜜義中說,<sup>73</sup> meaning that the passage that follows this is claimed to come from the *Baoding jing*'s \**Akṣayamatibodhisattva*, chapter 30, the explanation of the *dāna pāramitā*. Now, there is an \**Akṣayamatipariṣcchā* included in the MRK as sūtra 45, but the cited text has been identified rather with a passage in a different *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*, this found not in the MRK but in another sūtra collection, the *Mahāsaṃnipāta*, and although the passage deals with *dāna*, it appears in the twelfth chapter of the sūtra. In light of these references from the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, while it is difficult to know what to conclude about its idea of a *Baoding jing*, it is nearly impossible to consider that it might refer to a *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. However, the case is not yet complete, since we have a single instance in Kumārajīva's *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 (\**Mahāprajñāparamitopadeśa*) of a citation of the KP (§83) under the title *Baoding jing* 寶頂經.<sup>74</sup> However, in the other places in which KP is quoted in this work, the citations are not attributed. It is hard to know what to make of these instances in the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* and *Da zhidu lun*, but it is impossible to conclude that, since these works are traditionally ascribed to Nāgārjuna, there existed a large sūtra collection that was the *Baoding jing*, that is, the *Ratnakūṭa*, in the time of Nāgārjuna. The present MRK, according to this way of thinking, would represent a reorganization of this *Baoding jing*, with some differences in terms of which texts are included and in the extent of the collection. I think this idea can be dismissed; it seems to me indisputable that Indian authors of treatises display no knowledge of the MRK as a unit, and certainly not the unit that we know today.

Several further pieces of evidence cannot be overlooked, however. In his translation of the *Madhyāntavibhāṅgabhāṣya*, Paramārtha (499–569) renders *Ratnakūṭa* with none other than *Baoding jing*.<sup>75</sup> Likewise, in the Northern Liang 北凉 (397–439) *Ru Dasheng lun* 入大乘論, we find another such usage, though so far I have not identified the sūtra cited,<sup>76</sup> and moreover, when this text actually does quote KP, it does so under the title *Baoji jing* 寶積經.<sup>77</sup> One final reference, while not clear, is also certainly not relevant to the KP, namely a passage in Yijing's 義淨 (635–713) translation of the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事, which refers to a sūtra in the *Saṃyuktāgama* as follows: 又於相應阿笈摩佛語品處寶頂經中說 “In the *Baoding jing* of the Buddha's Preaching section of the *Saṃyuktāgama*.”<sup>78</sup> Though I cannot identify it, the reference is obviously to an Āgama text.

Now, one of the things we know from a number of recent discoveries of Sanskrit manuscripts is that there existed any number of what we might think of as ad hoc collections of scriptures. I would venture to suggest that all such collections were originally ad hoc, and it was only their (also ad hoc) canonization that led to a situation in which there is, for instance, a recognized *Mahāsaṃnipāta* collection, but that when we find other (albeit fragmentary) evidence of multi-text bundles, or we find compilations such as that studied by Bhikṣuṇī Vinītā (2010), we consider them differently from the canonized collections. In this light, it is far from impossible to imagine that there might once have existed a collection, called by some Chinese *Baoding jing*, which contained a number of texts that are not now associated with each other in collections as we have them. I cannot prove this hypothesis, but I also see no good evidence against it.

73. T. 1521 (XXVI) 50a9–10.

74. T. 1509 (XXV) 266c28.

75. 中邊分別論 T. 1599 (XXXI) 462b19, with the title *Ratnakūṭa* in Sanskrit at Nagao 1964: 69.19.

76. T. 1634 (XXXII) 43a20.

77. T. 1634 (XXXII) 48a6 = KP §88.

78. T. 1451 (XXIV) 413a22.

Given the current state of scholarship, we cannot yet say how and why Bodhiruci conceived the 120 *juan* MRK around a core of the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*, if indeed this is what he did. He plainly rejected the title *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra* for the KP itself, calling it instead *Puming pusa hui*, which does not seem to imply any connection between the latter and the *Ratnakūṭa*. But other curious problems certainly remain. For instance, the individual named Dharmaruci, credited as the translator of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*, is the same personage as Bodhiruci, credited as the compiler of the MRK: it is merely that the name Dharmaruci was later changed to Bodhiruci at the command of Empress Wu Zhao. But although there is a close connection between the KP and (one form of) the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*, as is evident from the KP's presence as the final section of the *Dasheng Baoyun jing*, still evidently neither Bodhiruci nor any member of the team he led appear to have noticed this. The significance of this remains unclear. Why, to point to another mystery, are there two versions of the *NandaĀnanda-Garbhāvīkrānti* in the MRK, one after the other? This can hardly be put down to an editing error, but there is no apparent logical reason for this duplication. From another point of view entirely, although scriptures such as the Larger *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha*, the *Śrīmālādevisiṃhanāda*, and others of various tendencies are included in the MRK, few of them have any clear connection, doctrinally or stylistically, with the KP. From this point of view, rather than viewing the 120 *juan* MRK as some sort of an extension of the KP, it may be better to see it as a collection of texts to which the borrowed name *Ratnakūṭa* was applied, and the principle of compilation of which remains unknown.<sup>79</sup> These are not the only mysteries.

For instance, Bodhiruci in a considerable number of cases retained old and, at least to our eyes, difficult to understand translations of Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護, perhaps better, \*Dharmarakṣita?), while in other cases he chose to retranslate sūtras that already existed in Chinese. Zhisheng in his KSL tells us:<sup>80</sup>

遂廣鳩碩德，并召名儒。尋繹舊翻之經，考校新來之夾。上代譯者，勘同即附。昔來未出，案本具翻。兼復舊義擁迷，詳文重譯。

[Zhongzong] assembled greatly virtuous [monks] and invited famous Classical scholars (*ru* 儒) in large number, who deeply studied [the parts of the] sūtra in the old translations, collating them with the Sanskrit text recently brought. The previous translations, which, after examination, revealed themselves to conform [to the new Sanskrit text] were adopted to be a part [of the final version]; what had not yet been translated was completely translated according to the original. Moreover, when the meaning of the old [translations] contained confusions, they were retranslated after careful examination [of the Sanskrit text].

One challenge of this portrayal is that at least some of the evidence of the collection as we have it seems not to support the actual implementation of these guidelines. In other words, while we do have two serious limitations in our evaluation here—we do not know what were the forms of the Vorlagen upon which the translations were made, and we cannot judge what was felt to “contain confusions”—we are now able to compare extant versions of sūtras in the MRK in Chinese with Tibetan translations, on the one hand, and with other Chinese sources on the other. And at least in some cases, such comparison unearths interesting problems. Ongoing work of Rafal Felbur, for example, makes clear just how complicated the situation is with the *\*Sūrataparipṛcchā*, the MRK version of which differs radically from

79. I was once keen to entertain the hypothesis that the original goal was to create a sort of mini-canon, with one Pure Land text, one Tathāgatagarbha text, and so on, but I admit that I see very little extrinsic evidence in support of this idea.

80. KSL, 570b12–15. The translation and punctuation are those of Forte 2002: 103, of which I have slightly modified the former.



the earlier translation, ascribed to Dharmarakṣa, which in turn agrees quite closely with the Tibetan translation found in the Kanjur.

Although much is known about the KP and about the MRK, a great many questions remain, waiting for proper solutions. What we can say, however, is that the history of the Chinese translations of the KP is becoming clearer. It can only be hoped that a better appreciation of the available evidence will contribute both to more reliable treatments of the sūtra itself, in its historical complexity, but also to an increased awareness of the complications of the history of Chinese Buddhist translation practices more broadly speaking.

#### REFERENCES

- Apple, James. 2017. The Old Tibetan Version of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* Preserved in Fragments from Dunhuang (1). *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 20: 205–30.
- . 2018. The Old Tibetan Version of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* Preserved in Fragments from Dunhuang (2). *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 21: 335–57.
- Bhikṣuṇī Vinitā. 2010. *A Unique Collection of Twenty Sūtras in a Sanskrit Manuscript from the Potala: Editions and Translation*. Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region, vol. 7. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House / Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences.
- Chang, Garma C. C., et al. 1983. *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press.
- Chavannes, Édouard. 1905. Jinagupta (528–605 après J.-C.). *T'oung Pao* 6.3: 332–56.
- Chen, Ruixuan. 2018. An Opaque Pun: Tentative Notes on *Kāśyapaparivarta* § 68. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 61.4: 369–95.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1934. *The Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Calcutta Oriental Series, vol. 28. London: Luzac & Co.
- Forte, Antonino. 2002. The South Indian Monk Bodhiruci (d. 727): Biographical Evidence. In *A Life Journey to the East: Sinological Studies in Memory of Giuliano Bertuccioli (1923–2001)*, ed. Antonino Forte and Federico Masini. Pp. 77–116. Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale Essays, no. 2. Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale.
- . 2005. *Political Propoganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century: Inquiry in the Nature, Authors and Function of the Dunhuang Document S.6502, Followed by an Annotated Translation*. Italian School of East Asian Studies Monographs, vol. 1. Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale.
- Funayama, Tōru. In press. Jizang's 吉藏 Sanskrit. In *Chinese Buddhism and the Scholarship of Eric Zürcher*, ed. Stefano Zacchetti and Jonathan A. Silk. Leiden: Brill.
- Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 2008. *Die lHan kar ma: Ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte. Kritische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Itō Shinden 伊藤進傳. 2013a. *Daijō hōunkyō Hōshakubon wa Daihōshakkyō* “Fumyō bosatsu e” o sōnyū shita mono ka 「大乘宝雲經」 「宝積品」 は『大宝積經』 「普明菩薩会」 を挿入したもののか. *Eizan gakuin kenkyū kiyō* 叡山学院研究紀要 35: 21–39.
- . 2013b. *Hōunkyō to Daijōhōunkyō: Funan bukkyō o kangaeru ichi shiron* 『宝雲經』 と 『大乘宝雲經』 一扶南仏教を考える一試論. *Tendai gakuhō* 天台学報 55: 13–23.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2010. *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典. *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica*, vol. 11. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University.
- . 2013. Was the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī? *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 16: 171–88.

- . 2015. Who Composed the Mahāyāna Scriptures? The Mahāsāṃghikas and Vaitulya Scriptures. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 18: 113–62.
- Kawagoe Eishin 川越英真. 2005. *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma*. Tohoku Society for Indo-Tibetan Studies Monograph Series, vol. 3. Sendai: Tōhoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyūkai 東北インド・チベット研究会.
- Kimura Takayasu 木村高尉, Otsuka Nobuo 大塚伸夫, Kimura Hideaki 木村秀明, and Takahashi Hisao 高橋尚夫. 2004. Bonbun kotei “Chikomyoshogon-kyo” Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārājñānālokālankāra nāma mahāyānasūtra Sanskrit Text 梵文校訂『智光明莊嚴經』: Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārājñānālokālankāra nāma mahāyānasūtra. In *Onozuka Kichō Hakushi Koki kinen ronbunshū: Kūkai no shiso to bunka* 小野塚幾澄博士古希記念論文集『空海の思想と文化. Tokyo: Taishō daigaku sōgō Bukkyō kenkyūjo 大正大学総合佛教研究所: 1–89 (596–508).
- Kotyk, Jeffrey. 2019. Chinese State and Buddhist Historical Sources on Xuanzang: Historicity and the *Da ci'en si sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳. *T'oung Pao* 105: 513–44.
- Kuno Hōryū 久野芳隆. 1938. Saiiki shutsudo bukkyō bonpon to sono seitenshironjō no chii (jō): Daihōshakukyō to Zōagonkyō no genten: Daiichi: Uten shutsudo Daihōshakukyō bonpon danpen to sono kachi 西域出土仏教梵本とその聖典史論上の地位(上)・大寶積經と雜阿含經の原典・第一・于門出土大寶積經梵本断片とその価値. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 2.3: 71–110.
- Lalou, Marcelle. 1927. La version tibétaine du Ratnakūṭa: Contribution à la bibliographie du Kanjur. *Journal Asiatique* 211.2: 233–59.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1976. *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, vol. 4. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, vol. 12. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste.
- Liebenthal, Walter. 1935. On Chinese-Sanskrit Comparative Indexing. *Monumenta Serica* 1.1: 173–85.
- Li Rongxi. 1995. *A Biography of the Tripiṭaka Master of the Great Ci'en Monastery of the Great Tang Dynasty*, tr. from the Chinese of Śramaṇa Huili and Shi Yancong. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Liu Shufen. In press. The Waning Years of the Eminent Monk Xuanzang and His Deification in China and Japan. In *Chinese Buddhism and the Scholarship of Eric Zürcher*, ed. Stefano Zacchetti and Jonathan A. Silk. Leiden: Brill.
- Nagao, Gadjin 長尾雅人. 1964. *Madhyāntavibhāga-Bhāṣya*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- . 1973. “Kashōbon” no shohon to “Daihōshakukyō” seiritsu no mondai 『迦葉品』の諸本と『大宝積經』成立の問題]. *Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan Kenkyū Nenpō* 鈴木学術財団年報 10: 13–25.
- Nattier, Jan. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, vol. 10. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 1932–35. *Bushsho Kaisetsu Daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典. 12 vols. Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版.
- Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1933. Shōjōritsu toshite toriatsukawaretaru Daijō kaikyō: Kashōgonkaikyō, Shamikaikyō, Daiāidōbikunikyō 小乘律として取扱われたる大乘戒經一迦葉禁戒經・沙彌尼戒經・大愛道比丘尼經一. In *Imaoka kyōju kanreki kinen ronbunshū* (Jōdogaku 5–6) 今岡教授還曆記念論文集(淨土学五・六), ed. Kishi Kakuyū 岸覚勇. Pp. 386–99. Tokyo: Taishō Daigaku Jōdogaku Kenkyūkai 大正大學淨土研究會.
- . 1935. Kashōgonkaikyō no kenkyū 迦葉禁戒經の研究. In *Bukkyōgaku no Shomondai* 佛教學の諸問題, ed. Bukkyō Nisengohyakunen Kinen gakkai 佛教二千五百年記念學會. Pp. 567–80. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- . 1954. *Daijō Kaikyō no Kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林.
- Paranavitana, S[enarat]. 1939. A Note on the Indikaṭusāya Copper Plaques. *Epigraphia Zeylanica* IV/5: 238–46. London: Government of Ceylon.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1936. Review of Staël-Holstein 1926 and 1933 and Weller 1933. *T'oung Pao* 32: 68–76.
- Sakurabe Bunkyō 櫻部文鏡. 1930. Chibettoyaku Daihōshakukyō no kenkyū 西藏譯大寶積經の研究. *Ōtani Gakuhō* 大谷學報 11.3: 514–55 (134–75).

- Schuessler, Axel. 2009. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese. A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2009. Remarks on the *Kāśyapaparivarta* Commentary. In *Pāsādikadānaṃ: Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*, ed. Martin Straube et al. Pp. 381–97. Indica et Tibetica, vol. 52. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- . 2010. Test Sailing the Ship of the Teachings: Hesitant Notes on *Kāśyapaparivarta* §153–154. In *From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Eli Franco and Monika Zin. Vol. 2: 897–924. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute.
- . 2013. The Nature of the Verses of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (*Evo ſuyadi: Essays in Honor of Richard Salomon's 65th Birthday*): 181–90.
- . 2015. *Buddhist Cosmic Unity: An Edition, Translation and Study of the Anūnatvāpūrṇatva-nirdeśaparivarta*. Hamburg Buddhist Studies, vol. 4. Hamburg: Hamburg Univ. Press.
- . 2019. Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation: A Preliminary Survey. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 22: 227–46.
- . 2021. Editing without an Ur-text: Buddhist Sūtras, Rabbinic Text Criticism, and the Open Philology Digital Humanities Project. *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報 / *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 24: 147–63.
- . Forthcoming. Which Sthiramati Wrote the Commentary on the \**Kāśyapaparivarta*?
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander von. 1926. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class. Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese*. Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- . 1933. *A Commentary to the Kāśyapaparivarta: Edited in Tibetan and Chinese*. Peking: National Library of Peking and the National Tsinghua University.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1974. *Nyoraijō Shisō no Keisei: Indo Daijō Bukkyō Shisō Kenkyū* 如來藏思想の形成・インド大乘仏教思想研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1934. “Daihōshakushōbōkyō no ketsubun ni tsuite” 大寶積正法經の缺文に就て. *Seizan gakuō* 西山学報 7: 64–73. [Repr. in Tsukinowa 1971: 356–63; cited after reprint.]
- . 1935. Kohon ‘Daihōshakukyō’ ni tsuite 古品「大寶積經」に就て. In *Bukkyōgaku no Shomondai* 佛教學の諸問題, ed. Bukkyō Nisengohyakunen Kinengakkai 佛教二千五百年記念學會. Pp. 849–65. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店. [Repr. in Tsukinowa 1971: 393–407; cited after reprint.]
- . 1971. *Butten no Hihanteki Kenkyū* 仏典の批判的研究. Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, Margarita, Seishi Karashima, and Noriyuki Kudo. 2002. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, vol. 5. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Wang, Qilong, and Deng Xiaoyong. 2014. *The Academic Knight between East and West: A Biography of Alexander von Staël-Holstein*. Andover, Hampshire, UK: Gale Asia / Singapore: Cengage Learning.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1933. *Index to the Tibetan Translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta*. Harvard Sino-Indian Series, vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard-Yenching Institute.
- . 1935. *Index to the Indian Text of the Kāśyapaparivarta*. Harvard Sino-Indian Series, vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard-Yenching Institute. [Repr. in Weller 1987: Vol. 1: 543–605.]
- . 1962. *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta*, vol. 1: *Mongolischer Text*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: Phil.-hist. Klasse 54–2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- . 1964. *Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Tjin-Übersetzung verdeutscht*. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 13.4: 771–804.
- . 1965. *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta*, vol. 2: *Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Texts*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: Phil.-hist. Klasse 57–3. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

- . 1966a. Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Djin-Fassung verdeutscht. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 12: 379–462.
- . 1966b. Die Sung-Fassung des Kāśyapaparivarta. *Monumenta Serica* 25: 207–361. [Repr. in Weller 1987: Vol. 2: 1305–1459.]
- . 1970. Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Han-Fassung verdeutscht. *Buddhist Yearly* 1968–1969 (Jahrbuch für Buddhistische Forschung, Halle): 57–221. [Repr. in Weller 1987: Vol 2: 1136–1304.]
- . 1987. *Kleine Schriften*. Glasenapp-Stiftung, vol. 26. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Yamaguchi, Susumu. 1934. *Madhyāntavibhāṅgāṅikā: Exposition systématique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda*. Vol. 1: *Texte*. Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series, vol. 7. Nagoya: Librarie Hajinkaku. [Repr.: Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1966.]