

## A Brief Survey on the Sanskrit Fragments of the Lokaprajñaptiśāstra

Siglinde Dietz  
University of Göttingen

The *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* “the treatise on the arrangement of the world” is the first part of the *Prajñaptiśāstra* which originally consisted of three parts and is attributed to Maudgalyāyana.<sup>[1]</sup> It is one part of the seven books of the canonical *Śaḍpādābhidharma* “Abhidharma with six feet”, of the Sarvāstivādin. Together with the *Dharmaskandha* and the *Samgītiparyāya* the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* belongs to the group of *Abhidharma* books of the early period.<sup>[2]</sup> These early *Abhidharma* works are attributed to contemporaries and immediate pupils of the Buddha and they are mainly summarizing Sūtras and commenting on them. In the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* we find e.g. quotations from the following Sūtras:

1. (Peking Bd 115, *Khu*, Fol.59b3) *Mu khyud brtan luñ bstan pa* \* *Dr̥ḍhanemivya-ākaraṇa* which corresponds to the *Cakkavatti-Sihanāda-Suttanta* of *Dīghanikāya* (III 58–79) and to the \* *Cakravarti-Sūtra* (Nr.70) of *Madhyamāgama*.
2. (Peking Bd 115, *Khu*, Fol.66a3) *Ñi ma bdun luñ bstan pa* \* *Saptasūryavyākaraṇa* which has a parallel in *Ānguttaranikāya* (IV 100–106) and in Taishō Nr.30 \* *Saptasūryodayasūtra*.
3. (Peking Bd 115, *Khu*, Fol.76b2) *gNas 'jog dan Ba ra dva dza luñ bstan pa* \* *VāsiṣṭhaBhāradhvāja-Vyākaraṇa* which corresponds to the *Aggañña-Suttanta* of *Dīghanikāya* (III 80–98).
4. (Peking Bd 115, *Khu*, Fol.109al) *lHa'i pho ña lna luñ bstan pa'i mdo* \* *Pañcādevadūtavvyākaraṇasūtra* which has a parallel in the *Devadūtasutta* of *Majjhimanikāya* (III 178–187)

By these Sūtra quotations detailed descriptions and commentaries are concluded:

1. The *Dr̥ḍhanemivyaākaraṇa* quotation concludes the description of the intermediate kalpa named “sword”.
2. With the *Saptasūryavyākaraṇa* quotation the description of the “devolution by fire” is ended.
3. The *VāsiṣṭhaBhāradhvāja-Vyākaraṇa* is quoted as a source for the description of

the evolution of the world and the mankind.

4. The *Pañcādevadūtavyākaraṇasūtra* quotation concludes the description of the various hells.

In the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* the cosmological and cosmogonical ideas of the Hīnayāna are described. Three complete versions are available:

1. The earliest version is the Chinese translation *Li shih A p'i t'an lun* (Taishō No.1644) \* *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* of Paramārtha from the year 558.

2. The Tibetan version *Jig rten g'zag pa* was translated by Jinamitra, Prajnāvarman and Ye šes sde, who were working at the time of King Khri sroñ lde btsan (8/9th century).

3. The *Lokapaññatti* which is a Pāli compilation of several texts and is dated by its editor Eugène Denis to the 11th-12th century.

Moreover, four translations of a *Lokaprajñaptisūtra* of the *Dirghāgama*<sup>[3]</sup> are transmitted in the Chinese Tripiṭaka for which we do not have a parallel in the Pāli Suttapiṭaka. A Sūtra which was similar to this *Dirghāgama* Sūtra, seems to have been the original main source for the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* versions even though their arrangement is quite different.

Neither of the above mentioned *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* versions is the original Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma work, since the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* is missing in the Chinese translation of the *Prajñaptiśāstra* (Taishō 1538). With regard to this work Junjirō Takakusu states in his article "On the Abhidharma Literature of the Sarvāstivādins" (JPTS 1904–1905), p.116:

"The text preserved among the Chinese books is of doubtful character. First of all, it was not translated until the eleventh century (A.D. 1004–1058), and the name of its author is said to have been lost. In its contents the first section, called the "Lokaprajñapti", is missing, though the title is given there . . . In a note it is stated that the first section, "Lokaprajñapti", exists in the commentary, but the text does not exist in the original . . . However, no such commentary seems to exist in the Chinese collection, so far as I am aware, and nothing can be ascertained as to the real state of the text. There is no indication that this work belongs to the Sarvāstivāda school, as in the cases of the other pādas."

If one compares the analysis of the Chinese *Prajñaptiśāstra* with that of the *Kāraṇaprajñaptiśāstra*, which is preserved in the Tibetan Tanjur (Peking No.5588), one can see, that the subjects and their arrangement closely agree, but whereas the Chinese *Prajñaptiśāstra* has 14 sections the Tibetan translation has

19, of which the sections 15–19 are not contained in the Chinese version. Therefore, the Chinese *Prajñaptiśāstra* might be a translation of the *Kāraṇaprajñaptiśāstra*,<sup>[4]</sup> whereas translations of the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* and *Karmaprajñaptiśāstra* are missing.

Only few fragments of the Sanskrit original of *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* are available. These fragments could be identified, because they closely correspond to the Tibetan translation which is a recension of the Mūlasarvāstivāda school. The fragments come from three different sources:

1. 6 complete leaves of a birch-bark manuscript from Gilgit are contained in the Ms. No.4737 Bauddhāgama which is preserved in the Scindia Oriental Museum/Ujjain. This manuscript is written in the script of the so-called Gilgit/<sup>[5]</sup>Bamiyan type II (or Protośāradā) which was in use from the 6th-10th century. The *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* fragments retain still some archaic forms in the manner of writing vowels; e.g. *e* is written as well in the Pṛṣṭhamātra form as in the superscribed form; the *ya* occurs in the older tripartite form as well as in the new bipartite etc. Therefore, the manuscript might be written in the middle period, i.e. ca. the 8th century. The *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* leaves were transliterated by Sudha Sengupta, “Fragments from Buddhist Texts”, in Ramchandra Pandeya, *Buddhist Studies in India*, Delhi 1975, pp.195–208. The leaves were quite mixed up and the transliteration is full of mistakes. In the following list you find the correct arrangement and the corresponding Tibetan text, which I have quoted only according to the Peking Tanjur (Vol.115, *Khu*, fol. 1–112a) here, but in the edition of the fragments the *variae lectiones* of the Cone, Derge, Narthang Tanjur as well as of the London, Toyo Bunko and Tog Palace Kanjur Manuscripts will be collated and discussed.

No.	Chapter	Sengupta	Leaf	Peking fol.
1.	6.5–7	200	10r	19b2–20a7
		197	10v	20a7–21a3
2.	7.3–4	198	18r	34b4–35a8
		201	18v	35a8–36a6
3.	11.I(2)–	202	34r	60a5–60b7
	11.I(3)–	204	34v	60b7–61b3
	11.II	203	35r	61b3–62a1
		205	35v	62a1–62b7
4.		207	5[1]r	-----

12.1–8	206	5[1]v	82a6–82b7
	195	52r	82b7–83b1
	196	52v	83b1–84a3

2. 4 leaves of a palmleaf manuscript which are deposited in four different temples in Japan and were brought to Japan from China in the 9th century.<sup>[6]</sup> Also this manuscript is written in the script of the Gilgit/Bamiyan type II and, as Akira Yuyama states in his article, “Remarks on the Kōkiji Fragment of the Lokaprajñapti” (cf.n.6), p.217, it might have been brought from the Northwestern part of the Indian sub-continent or from Kashmir to China. Since the script is rather similar to that of the Gilgit manuscripts belonging to the older period it may have been copied between the 6th and 8th century. These fragments are named after the temples where they are deposited. They were identified by Kazunobu Matsuda and described in his article “Bonbun Danpen Loka-prajñapti-ni tsuite-Kōkiji, Gyokusenji, Shitennōji, Chionji Baiyō, Indo Shoden Shahon-no Bunrui to Dōtei- (“On the Sanskrit fragments of the Loka-prajñapti- Classification and identification of the palmleaf fragments kept at Kōki-ji, Gyokusen-ji, Shitennō-ji and Chionji-”), in *Bukkyōgaku* 14, Tokyo 1982, p.(1)–(21). Fuller information may be looked up in the above mentioned article of Akira Yuyama. The fragments correspond to the following Tibetan portions:

No.	Chapter	Name of the temple	leaf	Peking fol.
1.	11.II	Kōki-ji	99	64b7–65b1
2.	12.6–7	Gyokusen-ji		83a1–83b2
3.	14.6	Shitennō-ji	171	109a8–109b8
4.	14.6	Chion-ji	172	109b8–110b3

3. Fragments of 4 leaves in the Turfan collection. The fragments 1 and 3 are written in the script of type VI, i.e. the Brāhmī of Northern Turkestan type b, and were found in Murtuq. The fragment 2 is written in the script of type V, i.e. the Brāhmī of Northern Turkestan type a, and was found in šorčuq. Both types of script were in use since the 7th century.

No.	Chapter	Fragment No.	leaf	Peking fol.
1.	6.9	SHT (V) 1177 bA + 1134 + 1177 aB	39r	21b7–22a5

	SHT (V) 1177 bB +	39v	22a6–22b5
	1134 + 1177 aA		
6.9	SHT (V) 1334 + 4214	40r	22b5–23a2
6.9–10		40v	23a3–24a1
2.	11.II SHT 1678 a + c		64a3–64a7
			64a8–64b4
3.	12.5–7 SHT (VI) 1594 b		82b8–83a4
			83a6–83b3

In addition to these Sanskrit fragments we find some very short quotations from *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* in Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*. The cosmogony and śākya genealogy of *Sanghabhedavastu* (ed. R. Gnoli, I 7–21 etc.) in the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin very closely corresponds with *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra*, Chapter 11.IV (1)–(21) (Peking fol. 70b4–82a6). This is the end of Chapter 11 in the Tibetan translation of the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra*.

In *Dharmasamuccaya* XVI, verses 1–9ab, we find a Sanskrit parallel to 9 of those verses which are quoted in *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* Chapter 14.2 (Peking fol. 92a4–92b2) and which are commented on in *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* Chapter 14.6 (Peking fol. 109a8–111b4). Also the commentary is only on verses 1–9.

If we arrange all the fragments according to the order of the Tibetan translation, we see that Sanskrit fragments of the following parts are preserved:

Chapter	Fragment	Peking fol.
6.5–7	Gilgit 1	19b2–21a3
6.9–10	SHT 1177 + 1134 + 4214	21b7–24a1
7.3–4	Gilgit 2	34b4–36a6
11.I(2)–(3) + 11.II	Gilgit 3	60a5–62b7
11.II	SHT 1678 a + c	64a3–64b4
11.II	Kōki-ji	64b7–65b1
11.IV (1–21)	Sanghabhedavastu	70b4–82a6
List of Kings	Gilgit 4 (5[1]r)	-----
12.1–8	Gilgit 4	82a6–84a3

(12.5–7	SHT 1594 b	82b8–83b3)
(12.6–7	Gyokusen-ji	83a1–83b2)
14.2	Dharmasamuccaya	92a4–92b2
14.6	Shitennō-ji, Chion-ji	109a8–110b3

If one sums up, 48 pages of 222 pages of the Tibetan translation are preserved in the Sanskrit fragments, i.e. 21.62% of the original Sanskrit work.

In these fragments the following topics are discussed: In Chapter 6 Jambudvīpa and its inhabitants are described.

- 6.5 contains a description of the black mountains, the Himavat, the Gandhamādana mountain, the lake Anavatapta and the four rivers Gangā, Sindhu, Vakṣu and Sītā which issue from this lake.
- 6.6 The overhanging rock Asurapārśva.
- 6.7 The Sāl tree Supratiṣṭhita.
- 6.9 The King of Elephants Supratiṣṭhita who lives near the pond Mandākīnī and under the Sāl tree Supratiṣṭhita.
- 6.10 The guardians and their character.

Chapter 7 contains a description of Sudarśana, the capital town of the Trāyas-trimśa Gods.

- 7.3 contains the description of the roads of this town.
- 7.4 Indra's palace Vaijayanta with its different buildings and the pond Vijaya with its surroundings.

Chapter 11 is the longest chapter of the whole *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra*. It comprises the folios 54b1–82a6 of the Tibetan translation and contains the description of kalpas and intermediate kalpas.

- 11.I (2) contains the description of the intermediate kalpa named "sickness".
- 11.I (3) The intermediate kalpa named "famine".
- 11.II The devolution (*saṃvartanī*) by fire.
- 11.IV The evolution of the present world and of the mankind which is described as follows: The mankind comes into being the moment after the empty state of the world has evolved. During this empty state the beings are reborn among the Ābhāsvara-Gods.

When their life in the world of Gods has expired the beings are reborn in successively deteriorating states. When they are reborn in this world of men their bodies are still luminous and shining, they can walk in the sky

and have miraculous powers. Their life-span is 80,000 years. Through eating successively coarse food their bodies become heavy and lose their luminosity and other supernatural powers. Because of their increasing greed for food life becomes shorter and various impurities and vices appear. The beings begin to quarrel. At that state a king is elected called Mahāsammata. Here two lists of names of kings are added: the first one is quoted from the *Abhidharma* and contains about 50 names, the second one is quoted from the *Vinayavastu* and contains about 150 names. The śākya genealogy is included in this lineage of Mahāsammata. The last king in this lineage is Rāhula, the son of the Buddha.

Herewith, the 11th Chapter of the Tibetan *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* is concluded, but in the Sanskrit fragments we find a fragmentary list of Maurya Kings<sup>[7]</sup>, just before the beginning of Chapter 12. In the Tibetan and Mongolian historical literature this usage of connecting local dynasties with the śākya genealogy was taken up again.

Chapter 12 contains a description of the Cakravāḍa world system.

12.1 The wind circle.

12.2 The water circle.

12.3 The earth.

12.4 The inner and outer ocean.

12.5 Sumeru: the sides of Sumeru.

12.6 The peaks of Sumeru.

12.7 The terraced steps to the summit of Sumeru.

12.8 The first surrounding mountain Yugandhara.

Chapter 14 contains the description of the eight hells and of the actions which cause the rebirth in those hells.

14.2 10 verses are quoted which were spoken by the Bhagavān with reference to the eight hells.

14.6 contains the commentary on these verses. In the Shitennō-ji and Chion-ji fragments the commentary on verses 1 to 5 are preserved.

Since all the fragments of this *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* version were copied in the 7th to 10th century in Northern India or Central Asia and also the Tibetan translation was compiled at that time, we can draw the conclusion that the *Lokaprajñaptiśāstra* must have enjoyed some popularity among the Buddhists of that time.

Notes

- [1] Cf. *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (Ed. U. Wogihara), p.11; Buston, *History of Buddhism* (Transl. E. Obermiller), I, p.49; E. Lamotte, *History of Buddhism*, Louvain 1988, pp.184–188.
- [2] Cf. E. Lamotte, *op.cit.* (n.1), p.188; G.P. Malalasekera, *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Ceylon 1961–65, s.v. Abhidharma Literature, pp.69b–70a.
- [3] Taishō No.1, Sūtra 30; Taishō Nos. 23–25.
- [4] Cf. Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism. A survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Osaka 1980 (International Research Institute Monograph No.9), p.106.
- [5] Cf. Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfan-sammlung*, Wiesbaden 1978 (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Suppl.8), plates 22–26.
- [6] Cf. Akira Yuyama, “Remarks on the Kōkiji Fragment of the Lokaprajñapti”, in *India and the Ancient World . . . Professor P.H.L. Eggermont Jubilee Volume*, Leuven 1987 (Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 25), pp.215–217.
- [7] Cf. S. Dietz, “Remarks on a Fragmentary List of Kings of Magadha in a Lokaprajñapti fragment”, WZKS 33, 1989, pp. 121–128.