

Offprint from:

『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』
平成24年度（第16号）2013年3月発行

*Annual Report of
The International Research Institute
for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2012
[= ARJRB], vol. XVI, March 2013*

Seishi KARASHIMA

On the "Missing" Portion in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2013 · Hachioji
JAPAN

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2013・八王子

On the "Missing" Portion in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*

Seishi KARASHIMA

The series of editions of Buddhist Sanskrit texts, *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, Darbhanga 1958~1970: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, of which vols. 1, 2~7, 10~12, 17~23 are edited by Parashuram Lakshman Vaidya and vols. 8, 9, 13, 14, 16 are edited by S. Bagchi, are easily accessible and, therefore, used universally by Buddhist students throughout the world. However, anybody, who works on a Buddhist text seriously, may soon realise that these editions are not always reliable, as they are not always faithful copies of the excellent editions, compiled by dedicated Japanese, Indian and Western scholars of the golden age of Buddhist philological studies, namely forty years around the turn of the 20th century, though the editors of the series maintain their faithfulness. Therefore, when I happen to find a title of this series in the bibliography of a book or an article, my evaluation of the seriousness of that particular work decreases automatically, let alone a translation made from an "edition" of this series!

In 2011, I published *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經校注, Tokyo 2011: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XII). For its preparation, I compared, almost word-for-word, the three Sanskrit editions, a Tibetan translation and seven Chinese ones. At times, I checked an old Sanskrit manuscript from Nepal as well. The Sanskrit editions, which I consulted, were:

Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, ed. Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta 1887~1888: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Bibliotheca Indica 110). (abbr. **R**)

Abhisamayālaṃkāra'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; Reprint: Tokyo 2nd 1973: Sankibō Busshorin. (abbr. **AAA**)

Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary called Āloka, ed. P. L. Vaidya, Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960 (*Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, no. 4). (abbr. **AS**)

Wogihara simply copied Mitra's edition of the scripture, while Vaidya changed *Danḍas* and *Samḍhis* frequently and thus, "standardised" the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit text, following the Classical Sanskrit rules.

During my preparation of the above-mentioned work, I found that one long portion is wanting in all the three Sanskrit editions, namely R. 465.1, AAA 874.4, AS 229.30.

In Mitra's edition, p. 464 ends with “*śrāvakayāni-*” and the next page starts with “*gatam arhantaṃ*”. He did not comment on this omission, even though his edition was made very carefully, with added footnotes here and there.

However, Wogihara realised this and wrote: “Acc. to the commentary some passages are wanting” (p. 874) in the footnote given to the word “*śrāvakayāni-*”. What he meant by this, was that some passages were wanting, as Haribhadra had commented on them in his commentary. Thus, Wogihara just edited Haribhadra's comments here (p. 874). After that, the reading in Mitra's edition is quoted, starting with “*gatam arhantaṃ*”.

Vaidya's edition reads: *śrāvakayāni ... gatam arhantaṃ*¹

His footnote (p. 229) on *śrāvakayāni* is as follows:

“It appears that some portion of the text after *śrāvakayāni*^o is missing in all Mss. The commentator *Haribhadra* notes *śrāvakayānikānām* as a *pratīka* and gives explanation of *kṣaṇa*, *lava* etc, though the available text does not contain these words here.”

Anybody, reading this, might believe, naturally, that the manuscripts of this scripture lack this portion, though Mitra did not say anything about this omission. Perhaps, students and scholars have not questioned this, as Vaidya stated confidently “missing in all Mss.”. As well as this, Mitra's edition, published in 1887~1888, is difficult to access. Therefore, it was natural for the Japanese translators of the Sanskrit *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*² to have translated this "missing" portion from the Tibetan translation instead³. Also, an eminent Japanese specialist of the *Prajñāpāramitā* scriptures, Takayasu Kimura, who edited the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*⁴, wrote an article, entitled “On the Omission and its Filling in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*”⁵ in which he tried to restore the "missing" portion from the quotations, found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and its parallels in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* and the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. When writing this article, he checked only the manuscripts of these two *Prajñāpāramitā* scriptures, preserved at the Library of the University of Tokyo, but did not examine any manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* also preserved there.

As I wrote above, it is strange that the very careful Sanskritist, Rajendralala Mitra, did not mention the omission in his edition. It is also strange that the last word of p. 464 ends with “*śrāvakayāni-*” (with a hyphen!), which would suggest a continuation to the next word at the top of the next page, but p. 465 begins with “*gatam arhantaṃ*”, which does not make any sense.

Therefore, I have consulted the relevant portion (folio 221 verso 4~folio 222 verso 3) in a palm-leaf manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, preserved

¹ The original is written in Devanāgarī.

² *Hassenju Hannyakyō* 八千頌般若經, translated by Yūichi Kajiyama (梶山雄一) and Teruyoshi Tanji (丹治昭義), Tokyo 1974~1975, ²1980: Chūō Kōronsha 中央公論社; Tokyo ³2001: Chūō Kōron Shinsha 中央公論新社, 2 vols. (Daijō Butten 大乘仏典 2, 3).

³ See *op. cit.* p. 289, l. 15~ p. 291, l. 15; cf. p. 391f., n. 171.

⁴ *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Takayasu Kimura, Tokyo 1986~2009: Sankibō Busshorin, 6 vols.

⁵ Takayasu Kimura 木村高尉, “Hassenju Hannyā bonpon no ketsuraku to sono hoten” 八千頌般若梵本の欠落とその補填, in: *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 大正大学総合仏教研究所年報 7 (1985): 228~219 (1~10).

now in the Library of the University of Tokyo, no. 47⁶. In it, the "missing" portion can be found and it reads as follows:⁷

“(221 verso 4) sacet tvam Ānanda! **śrāvakayānikānām** pudgalānām śrāvaka-
bhūmau dharmam deśayes tasyām ca dharmadeśanā(221v5)yām ye
trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau satvās te sarve arhatvaṃ sākṣāt kuryus
tathāpi tvayā me śrāvakeṇa dharmacakrapravarttanānupravarttanato
dharmadeśayatā śrāvakakṛtyam na kṛtam syāt sacet punas tvam Ānanda
bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya ekam api prajñāpāramitā(222r1)pratiśamyuktām
(*read: °ktaṃ*) dharmam deśayeḥ samprakāśayeḥ evam ahaṃ tvayā śrāvakeṇa
dharmacakrapravarttanānupravarttanato dharmam deśayanato ārādhitaḥ syān. na tu
tayā paurvikayā dharmadeśanayā yayā te trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau
sarvasatvā arhatvaṃ prāpitās. teṣāṃ cārhatām yad dānamayaṃ
puṇya(222r2)kriyāvastu śīlamayaṃ puṇyakriyāvastu bhāvanāmayaṃ
puṇyakriyāvastu tat kiṃ manyase Ānandāpi nu sa bahu puṇyaskandhaḥ?” |
Ānandaḥ āha | “bahu bhagavan! bahu sugata!” bhagavān āha | “tata sa Ānanda!
śrāvakayānikaḥ pudgalo bahutaram puṇyam prasavati yo bodhisatvānām
mahāsatvānām prajñāpāramitā(222r3)pratiśamyuktām (*read: °ktaṃ*) dharmam
deśayati. ato (°)pi sa Ānanda! bahutaram puṇyam prasavati yo bodhisatvo
mahāsatvo ’parasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya prajñāpāramitā-
pratiśamyuktam dharmam deśayati | antaśa ekadivasam api tiṣṭhatv
Ānandāikadivasam antataḥ (*read: antaśaḥ*) purobhaktam api. tiṣṭhatv
Ā(222r4)nanda! purobhaktam api. tiṣṭhatv Ānanda! purobhaktam deśitaḥ |
antaśa ekanālikām api ekanālikāntaram api vā tiṣṭhatv Ānanda! ekanālikāntaram
antaśo muhūrttam api tiṣṭhatv Ānanda! muhūrttam antaśa ekalavam api tiṣṭhatv
Ānanda! ekalavam antaśa ekakṣaṇasamnipātam api yo hy Ā(222r5)nanda!
bodhisatvo mahāsatvaḥ aparasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya ekakṣaṇalavam
api prajñāpāramitāpratiśamyuktam dharmam deśayanty ayan tato ’tibahutaram
puṇyam prasavati | idaṃ hy Ānanda! tasya bodhisatvasya mahāsatvasya
dharmadānam sarvaśrāvakapratyekabuddhayānikānām (222v1) pudgalānām
kuśalamūlāny abhibhavati || evam Ānanda! kuśalamūlasamanvāgato bodhisatvo
mahāsatva evam etat kuśalamūla<ṃ> samanvāharann asthānam etad
Ānandānavakāśo yat sa bodhisatvo mahāsatvo vivarttetānuttarāyāḥ
samyaksambodher nāitat sthānam vidya(222v2)te” || atha khalu bhagavāms
tasyām velāyām tathārūpam ṛddhyabhisamskāram abhisamskṛtavān yathārūpeṇa
ṛddhyabhisamskṛtena tāś catasraḥ parśado bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikā-
devanāgayakṣagandharvvāsuraḥgaruḍakinnaramahoragā manuṣyāmanuṣyā vā
sarve te (222v3) buddhānubhāvenĀkṣobhyaṃ tathāgatam **arhantaṃ** ...

I asked a colleague in Beijing as well to examine the microfilms of a palm-leaf manuscript of the same text, formerly kept in the Library of the Cultural Palace of the

⁶ See Seiren Matsunami, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*, Tokyo 1965: Suzuki Research Foundation, p. 22.

⁷ I should like to express my gratitude to Dr. Jirō Hirabayashi for his kindness in correcting my reading of the manuscript.

Nationalities, Beijing. It also has the "missing" portion. Therefore, it might not be necessary to check the manuscripts, which P. L. Vaidya maintained he had checked.

The length of the "missing" portion is the same size as a page of Mitra's edition. Most probably, he gave his manuscript, including the missing page (it should have been p. 465), to the publisher, but somehow the latter lost that particular page and without noticing it, pp. 464 and 465 were paginated as they are now. Thus, it was not ancient scribes of the Sanskrit manuscripts but a modern publisher who missed this portion. The editor of this volume in the *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts* is responsible for misleading later scholars by his statement "missing in all Mss.". My above-stated reaction upon finding a name of an edition of this series in a reference of somebody's work is, thus, not unfounded.