Was the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?[*]

Seishi Karashima

Prologue

Each Mahāyāna scripture must have its own complex background and history. Probably, many of the early ones were originally transmitted in Middle Indic or in a mixed language of Middle Indic with Sanskrit elements, and later "translated" gradually into (Buddhist) Sanskrit. This long cherished hypothesis has been proven by newly-discovered fragments of a Gāndhārī version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Falk/Karashima, 2012, 2013), dating back with an 81.1% probability, based on a C14 test, to between 47~147 CE. Even the oldest Sanskrit Buddhist texts, representing the form in which we usually have access to them, are, in other words, the result of constant sanskritisation, wrong back-formations, reductions, additions and interpolations over the centuries. This means that when we attempt to understand early Mahāyāna scriptures properly so as to draw nearer to their original features or trace their transmission, if we restrict ourselves only to extant Sanskrit manuscripts, most of which date from the eleventh century onwards, an acceptance of the form in which they have come to us very much limits our historical awareness. In addition to Sanskrit texts, we should investigate all other available materials in order to flesh out this history. The Chinese translations, particularly those which were made between the second and the sixth century, thus antedating most of the extant Sanskrit manuscripts, are indispensable sources as, in most cases, the

exact periods of their translations are known. Apart from these Chinese translations, old Sanskrit and Gāndhārī fragments, discovered in Central Asia and "Greater Gandhāra" (present-day Pakistan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan), Khotanese texts, Tibetan translations and so on, may provide substantial clues to trace the origination, development and alternation of Buddhist scriptures. Especially the Gāndhārī manuscripts of Mahāyāna scriptures, dating even back to the first century, which have been discovered in recent years, may change our "common sense" concerning Mahāyāna Buddhism. In addition to written evidence, we should also pay attention to the results of research conducted on archaeological and art historical materials. By doing all this, we might be able to attain new perspectives on early Mahāyāna scriptures and hence, reconsider what we have understood through "eyeglasses", called common sense, by removing them and looking anew at primary materials. In this way, we may be able to draw nearer to the original features of early Mahāyāna scriptures.

(1) Gāndhārī manuscripts of the *Prajñāpāramitā*

In 1999, a collection of Buddhist manuscripts, written on birch bark in Kharoṣṭhī characters, was discovered in the ruins of a Buddhist monastery in the Bajaur area of the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan, bordering Afghanistan. When found, these manuscripts were "in a

deplorable state of preservation" and it took Prof. Nasim Khan two years merely to *unroll* the fragments (Nasim Khan, 2008, 1). Since then, Prof. Khan together with his German colleague, Dr. Ingo Strauch, have been doing research on them and photographs and preliminary transliterations of nineteen fragments in this collection were published in 2008[1]. However, although 13 years have passed since this sensational discovery, careful transliterations and comparative studies of one of the most important collections of Buddhist manuscripts have yet to be undertaken. Amongst these, which are thought to date back to the first or second century based on palaeographical evidence, there are fragments of the *Madhyamāgama*, the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, a Mahāyāna text (Nasim Khan, 2008, 47~93), which refers to the three vehicles (*śravagayaṇa, praceabudhayaṇa, samasabudhayaṇa*) and *Akṣobha* (Skt. *Akṣobhya*) Buddha, a text which refers to *prañaparamida* (Skt. *prajñāpāramitā*) (*ibid*., 113~119) and so on. Apart from this collection, fragments of a Gāndhārī version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* have been discovered as well, dating back to between 47~147 CE, which are therefore, probably contemporary with the original text of the *Daoxing Banruo jing* 道行般若經, the oldest Chinese translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā,* translated by Lokakṣema in 179 CE. With these newly-discovered fragments, we are now entering a new phase of research on early Mahāyāna scriptures and hence, we should make an exhaustive study of these, comparing them in particular with early Chinese translations.

In my *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā*

Prajñāpāramitā (Krsh, 2011), I compared word-for-word the oldest Chinese translation made by Lokakṣema in 179 CE (T. 8, No. 224) with the Sanskrit version, the Tibetan translation, the six Chinese translations and a part of the Gāndhārī fragments of the same text. In this way, I attempted to trace additions, interpolations, deletions, reductions, changes and restructuring during the transmission of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. In general, the older versions — namely the Gāndhārī fragments, the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema, by Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. ca. 220~257 CE; T. 8, No. 225), by Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 (in 382 CE; T. 8, No. 226), by Kumārajīva (in 408 CE; T. 8, No. 227) and by Xuanzang 玄奘 (in 660~663 CE; T. 7, No. 220, pp. 865~920) —— are simpler, while the newer ones — namely another translation by Xuanzang 玄奘 (in 660~663 CE; T. 7, No. 220, pp. 763~865), Shihu's translation (in 982~984?; T. 8, No. 228), the Sanskrit version and the Tibetan translation —— are more detailed. It is quite remarkable that expressions concerning compassion — a notion in fact contradictory to emptiness (*śūnyatā*), the main theme of the *Prajñāpāramitā* scripture — are often wanting in the oldest versions, namely the first three Chinese translations, though later ones give a great deal of elaboration on this theme. On the contrary, the story of *Sadāprarudita* is given in great detail in the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian as compared with later versions. Also, as we shall see below, the theme of the story seems to have changed as it moved from the oldest to the later versions. As I have demonstrated elsewhere recently [2], the

---

[1] Nasim Khan 2008; cf. also the following site: http://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/indologie/bajaur/content/index.html

[2] "Li-yung "fan-pan" yen-chiu chung-ku han-yü yen-pien：i *Tao-hsing Pan-jo Ching* "i-i" yü *Chiu-se-lu Ching* wei li" 利用「翻版」研究中古漢語演變：以《道行般若經》「異譯」與《九色鹿經》為例 [A Study of the Evolution of Middle Chinese Using "Modified Versions": Case Studies of the *Tao-hsing Pan-jo Ching*

Chinese translations by Zhi Qian and Zhu Fonian are none other than "modified versions" of Lokakṣema's oldest translation, which is basically word-for-word, very literal and rudimentary. Zhi Qian merely "sinicised" it, while Zhu Fonian basically copied Lokakṣema's translation, only replacing old-fashioned, vernacular words and expressions within it. Therefore, in order to clarify the original features of *Prajñāpāramitā* thought as well as so-called Mahāyāna Buddhism, one should not rely *only* on the Sanskrit version, the Tibetan translation, the more readable translation by Kumārajīva or the later Chinese translations, all of which show later qualitative and quantitative development, but rather follow Lokakṣema's translation and the newly-discovered Gāndhārī manuscript fragments, which may retain more of the original shape of the text.

The recto of the Gāndhārī fragments of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* corresponds to the beginning part of the first *juan* (卷) of Lokakṣema's translation (T. 8, No. 224, 425c4~426c10), while its verso, to the ending part of the second *juan* (436c17~438a7). Therefore, the original manuscript must have been composed of a huge scroll. Prof. Falk has published the fragments' transliterations together with my

English translation of the parallel parts in Lokakṣema's translation (Falk/Karashima 2012, 2013). In general, the Gāndhārī version is simpler than Lokakṣema's translation, though in some cases, vice-versa can be observed as well. Although they are thus not identical, their similarity is still astonishing. For example, both lack the following phrase AS.3.18 = R.5.14 = AAA.38.23. *prakṛtiś cittasya prabhāsvarā* ("the original nature of thought is luminous"), which denotes a very significant concept i.e., *prakṛti-prabhāsvara-citta* 自性清浄心 "the innately luminous (pure) mind", while all the other Chinese and Tibetan translations have it[3].

(2) The original language of Lokakṣema's translation was probably Gāndhārī

A Dictionary of Gāndhārī (http://gandhari.org/a_dictionary.php) edited by Stefan Baums and Andrew Glass, has made it significantly easier to search for information on Gāndhārī words and documents. With the above-mentioned discoveries of Gāndhārī Mahāyāna texts, the Gāndhārī vocabulary of Mahāyāna Buddhism has increased dramatically. By analysing the transliterations found in Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (hereafter "AS(Lk)") by means of these new tools and materials, it is evident that its original language was Gāndhārī (hereafter "Gā").

(1) *-th- > -s-*
The phonetic development *-th- > -dh- > -s-* is peculiar to Gāndhārī. The transliteration 怛薩阿竭 (429a27, 429c14 *etc.*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 98; EH. tat sat ʔa gjiat; **tasa-agad(a)*), which occurs around 200 times in AS(Lk),

---

and Its Later Modifications and the *Chiu-se-lu Ching*], in: Chung-cheng Ta-hsüeh Chung-wen Hsüeh-shu Nien-k'an 中正大學中文學術年刊, No. 18 (2011): 165~188; "Shoki kan-yaku butten no gengo no kenkyū — Shirukasen yaku to Shiken yaku no taihiwo chūshin toshite" 初期漢訳仏典の言語の研究—支婁迦讖訳と支謙訳の対比を中心として— [A Study of the Language of the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations: Comparison between the translations by Lokakṣema and those by Zhi Qian], in: *Okuda Seiō Sensei Shōju Kinen Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronjū* 奥田聖應先生頌寿記念 インド学仏教学論集: Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha 佼成出版社 (forthcoming).

---

[3] Krsh 2011: 4, n. 25; Falk/Karashima 2012: 34~35, n. 15.

corresponds to Gā. *tasagada*[4] (< BHS. *tathāgata*). It is interesting that this Chinese transliteration demonstrates that the word *tathāgata* was understood not as *tathā-gata* ("one who has thus gone") but rather as *tathā-āgata ("one who has thus come"), which agrees with the later standard Chinese rendering *rulai* 如來 ("one who has thus come").

(2) *-dh-* > *-s-*
The transliteration 末須(←願)揵提 (471c11; cf. Krsh, 2010, 329) may have been based on the Gāndhārī form *masu-ga<ṃ>dhi* (< BHS. *madhu-gandhika* < *mṛdu-gandhika*[5]; cf. Gā. *masu* < Skt. *madhu*). The words *bodhi* and *bodhisat(t)va* become *bosi* and *bosisatva* in Gāndhārī and from their transliterations 佛 (438a2, 460c26 etc.; cf. Krsh, 2010, 164f.) and 菩薩 (425c8, -10 etc.; cf. Krsh, 2010, 351) in AS(Lk), we cannot say for sure what their original forms were.

(3) *-bh-* > *-h-*
The transliterations 首呵 (435a12; EH. śju: ha; *Śuha < *Śubhā*; Krsh, 2010, 454), 波栗多修呵 (435a13; EH. pa ljiət ta sju he; *Parittaśuha < *Parīttaśubha*; Krsh, 2010, 45f.), 首訶迦 (439c25; EH. śju: ha kja[kra]; **Śuhaka-* < *Śubhakṛtsna*; Krsh, 2010, 453) and 阿波摩首訶 (439c24; EH. ʔa pa ma śju: ha; **Apama(ṇa)śuha* < *Apramāṇaśubha*; Krsh, 2010, 1) indicate that the underlying Indian text read *śuha*, which is actually found in the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*[6], instead of *śubha*. Therefore, this shows that the development *-bh-* > *-h-*, common in Middle

Indic, including Gāndhārī[7], occurred in the underlying text.

From the transliteration 須菩提 (425c5 etc.; EH. sjou bo dei; Skt. *Subhūti*; Krsh, 2010, 554), which occurs more than 600 times, one may assume its underlying form to be *Subhuti* or *Subhudi, while, in the Gāndhārī fragments of the same text, both *Suhuti* and *Subhuti* are found[8].

(4) *-h-* > *-'-*
One of the characteristics of Gāndhārī is that the *h* in the medial position, is sometimes elided, or is treated merely as a glide consonant and replaced by another glide consonant[9]. The following transliterations from AS(Lk) indicate that in its underlying text, *h* was either elided or became a mute character: 會波羅 (467b9; EH. γwat- pa la; **Ve'a(p)phala* < *Vehapphala* [= Pā] < BHS. *Vṛhatphala* / *Bṛhatphala*; Krsh, 2010, 234), 梵摩三鉢 (431a27; EH. b(r)jam- ma səm pat; *Brama Sa'aṃpati* < Gā. *Brama Sahaṃpati*[10] < BHS. *Brahmā Sahāṃpati*; Krsh, 2010, 159), 僧那 (443a24; EH. səng na; **sa(ṃ)na'a* < **sa(ṃ)naha* < Skt. *saṃnāha*; Krsh, 2010, 405), 摩訶僧那僧涅 (427b29, 427c2 etc.; EH. ma ha səng na səng niət; **mahasa(ṃ)ṇa'a-saṃnaddha* < Gā. **mahasa(ṃ)ṇaha-saṃnaddha* < BHS. *mahāsaṃnāha-saṃnaddha*; Krsh, 2010, 323).

---

[4] Ajitaseṇa Inscription: 3–4; British Library Fragment 7: a Da1 = Baums 2009: 241; Nasim Khan 73.18f., 77.3f., 81.10 etc.

[5] Cf. Krsh 2010: 329, ns. 181 and 182.

[6] Dhp-G^K: r 19b, r 217a, r 241b.

[7] Cf. Karashima 1994: 24, § 2.4.6.i.

[8] Falk/Karashima 2012: 28(1-02), 30(1-05) etc. *Suhuti*; 30(1-04), 32(1-10) etc. *Subhuti*.

[9] Cf. Brough 1962: § 39; Karashima 1994: 28, § 2.8; von Hinüber 2001: § 223.

[10] Salomon 1995: *Braṃa Saha[ṃ]pati*; Senavarman Inscription: 10 = von Hinüber 2003: 34. *Bramo Sahaṃpati*.

(5) -bh- > -h- or -'-

The following transliterations indicate that in the underlying text, the intervocalic -bh- had already developed into -h- which was, in turn, either elided or became a mute character: 阿波摩那 (467b9; EH. ʔa pa ma na; *Ap(r)amaṇa'a / *Ap(r)amaṇaha < Apramāṇābha; Krsh, 2010, 1), 阿波摩修 (435a13; EH. ʔa pa ma sju; *Ap(r)amaṇaśu'a / *Ap(r)amaṇaśuha < Apramāṇaśubha; Krsh, 2010, 1-2), 阿會亘修 (431a16, 435a12 etc.; EH. ʔa ɣwat- sjwan sju; *Avasvara śu'a / *Avasvara śuha < BHS. Ābhāsvara + śubha? Krsh, 2010, 2-3), 波利陀 (435a11, 439c23; EH. pa ljiəi- da; *Paritta'a / *Parittaha < Parīttābha; Krsh, 2010, 45), 豺(v.l. 盧)波摩那 (435a12, 439c23; EH. ʔap pa ma na; *Ap(r)amaṇa'a? / *Apramaṇaha < BHS. Apramāṇābha; Krsh, 2010, 143), 修 乾 (435a13; EH. sju gjian[kan]; *Su'akiṇṇ(a) / *Suhakiṇṇa < Śubhakṛtsna; cf. Pā. Subhakiṇha, °kiṇṇa; Krsh, 2010, 552). The transliteration 阿彌陀 (EH. ʔa mjiei[mjiei:] da; Amida'a / *Amidaha < Amitābha) for the well-known Mahāyāna Buddha, which Lokakṣema used in his Chinese translation of the Larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, namely the *Da Amituo jing* 大阿彌陀經 (T.12, No. 362), is also an example of this development.

(6) -p- > -v-

The transliterations 優婆塞 (431a15, 451a13 etc.; EH. ʔju ba sək; Gā. *uvasak(a) < BHS. upāsaka; Krsh, 2010, 595), 優婆夷 (431a15, 451a13 etc.; EH. ʔju ba źjiəi; Gā. uvasia < BHS. upāsikā; Krsh, 2010, 595) indicate that in the underlying text, -v- stood instead of -p-. Actually, in the above-mentioned Bajaur fragments, similar forms uvaea (< BHS. upāsaka), uvaia (< BHS. upāsikā) (Nasim Khan, 110.9[11]) occur. Also, the Chinese characters 恕 (EH. ɣwa), 和 (EH. ɣwa), 洹 (EH. ɣwan), 曰 (EH. ɣjwat), 越 (EH. ɣjwat)

---

[11]*uvaśiana* is a misprint of *uvaiaṇa*.

in the following transliterations, show that the same development -p- > -v- took place in the original language of the Chinese translation: 漚惒拘舍羅 (433c7 etc.; EH. ʔou ɣwa kou[kjou] śja- la; *uvaakośalla[12] < BHS. upāyakauśalya or upāyakauśala; Krsh, 2010, 346f.), 波耶和提 (431a1; EH. pa źja[zja] ɣwa dei; *Pajavadi, *Prajapati < BHS. Prajāpati; Krsh, 2010, 48), 和 夷 羅 洹 (455b28; EH. ɣwa źjiəi la ɣwan; *Vajiravāṇi, Vayiravāṇi[13] < BHS. Vajrapāṇi; Krsh, 2010, 212), 提和竭羅 (431a7; EH. dei ɣwa gjiat la; *Diva(ṃ)gara < BHS. Dīpaṃkara; Krsh, 2010, 478f.), 摩訶惟曰羅 (468c12; EH. ma ha źjwəi ɣjwat la; *Maha-vevula[14] < *Mahā-vevulla < BHS. Mahā-vaipulya; Krsh, 2010, 324), 三昧越 (455b14f.; EH. səm mət- ɣjwat; *samavaj(adi)[15] < Skt. samāpadyate; Krsh, 2010, 400-401).

(7) -t- > -d-

The Chinese characters 陀 (EH. da), 檀 (EH. dan) in the following transliterations, indicate that the development -t- > -d- took place in the original language: 阿 陀 波 (435a15; EH. ʔa da pa; *Adapa < BHS. Atapa; Krsh, 2010, 11), 阿比耶陀 (439c25; EH. ʔa bjiəi[bjiəi-] źja[zja] da; *Aviyada(va)? < *Aviha Adava < Pā. Avihā Atapā > BHS. Avṛhāḥ Atapāḥ; Krsh, 2010, 1), 兜術陀 (EH. tou źjwət da; 435a4, 468b-3; Gā. Tuṣida[16] < BHS.Tuṣita; Krsh, 2010, 129f.), 沙羅伊檀 (470a21; EH. sra la ʔjiəi

---

[12]Cf. Gā (Baums 2009: 636~637). *kośala < kauśalya.*

[13]Cf. Gā (Senavarman Inscription: 5; Mount Banj Inscription: 3–2). *vayira-.*

[14]Cf. Gā (Nasim Khan 81.12). *vehula* (< *veulla < vevulla < vaipulya*); Gā (CKI 249: 4; Dhp-G[K]: r 164). *vivula < Skt. vipula.*

[15]Cf. Gā (EĀ-G: r 43, 46, 49, 56, 59). *pradivajadi < pratipadyate*; Gā (Dhp-G[K]: r 232f.). *uvavajadi < Skt. upapadyate.*

[16]Cf. Nasim Khan 73.38. *Tuṣidaṇa.*

dan; **ṣal-ayadaṇ(aṇi)* < BHS. *ṣaḍ-āyatanāni*; Krsh, 2010, 405).

(8) *-d- > -l-, -ḍ- > -l-*

The following transliteration shows the development of *-d- > -l-*: 拘文羅 (471c10; EH. kou[kjou] mjən la; Gā. *kumula*[17] < Skt. *kumuda*; Krsh, 2010, 281f.). The following suggests the changes of *ratna* > MI. *ratana* > Gā. *radaṇa*[18] > **ralaṃna*[19]: 羅蘭(←麟)那枝頭 (461c1, 9; EH. la lan[麟 ljiən] na kie?/tśjei dou; **Ralaṃnakedu?* < *Radaṇa°* < *Ratana°* < BHS. *Ratnaketu*; Krsh, 2010, 315f.). Also, the following transliteration indicates the development of *-ḍ- > -l-*: 沙羅伊檀 (470a21; EH. sra la ʔjiəi dan; **ṣal-ayadaṇ(aṇi)* < BHS. *ṣaḍ-āyatanāni*; Krsh, 2010, 405).

(9) *jñ > (ṃ)ñ*

In Gāndhārī, like other Middle Indic languages, *jñ* becomes *(ṃ)ñ*. The transliterations in AS(Lk) also indicate the same development: 般若波羅蜜 (425c8 etc.; EH. pan nja: pa la mjiət; Gā. *prañaparamida*[20] < BHS. *prajñāpāramitā*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 23), 般遮旬 (433b29, c2 etc.; EH. pan tśja zjwən; Gā. **pa(ṃ)cavi(ṃ)ñ(a)*[21]

---

[17] Cf. Dhp-G^K: r 145d.

[18] Cf. Nasim Khan 77.8, 83.55 etc.

[19] In an old, anonymous Chinese translation of the *Devadatta*-chapter of the Lotus Sutra (T. 9, No. 265, translated in the Western Jin Period [265-316 CE]), we find a transliteration 抱休羅蘭 (EH. bau hju la lan; 197a12), paralleling Skt. *Prabhūtaratna* (> **Prahūtaratana* > **Prahūtaradana* > **Pahū(la)ralan(a)?*), in which 休(EH. hyu) indicates that the Middle Indic development *-bh- > -h-* had already occurred in the underlying text.

[20] Falk/Karashima 2012: 28(1-03), 32(1-13), 34(1-14, 16) etc.

[21] Cf. Gā (Senior Fragment 19: v 30). *aviña~* (< *abhijñā*); Gā (British Library Fragment 9: v

---

< BHS. *pañcābhijñā*; Krsh, 2010, 23f.), 尼惟先 (465a7; EH. nrjiəi[niəi-] źjwəi siən; **Ṇevasaña*[22] < BHS. *Naivasaṃjñā (nāsaṃjñāyatana)*; Krsh, 2010, 336), 薩芸若 (426a24 etc.; EH. sat γjwən nja; Gā. *sarvaña*[23] < Skt. *sarvajña*; Krsh, 2010, 395-396). Thus, the Chinese word 般若 (EH. pan nja:), though pronounced in various ways such as *bo re*, *ban ruo* or *ban re*, should be pronounced *ban re*, due to its being originally a transliteration of the Gāndhārī form *praña* and not that of Skt. *prajñā*. It is probable that the pronunciation *bo re* was a later artificial one, invented in the Tang Period by a Sanskritist who had knowledge only of Sanskrit rather than of Middle Indic.

(10) *-nt- > -nd-, -mp- > -mb-*

The following three transliterations correspond to Pā. *Puṇṇa Mantānīputta* rather than to BHS. *Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra*: 邠那(←祁)文陀弗 (427b29, c21, 23; EH. pjiən na mjən da pjət; cf. Krsh, 2010, 43), 邠那文陀羅弗 (430a14; EH. pjiən na mjən da la pjət; cf. Krsh, 2010, 43), 分漫陀尼弗 (454a21; EH. pjən man da nrjiəi[niəi-] pjət; cf. Krsh, 2010, 163). 文陀 (EH. mjən da) and 漫陀 (EH. man da) in the above-quoted transliterations indicate that *Mantā-* had become *Mandā-* in the underlying text.

Also, from the transliteration 占匐 (471c12; EH. tśjam bjək?; cf. Krsh, 2010, 623), we may assume its original form to have been

---

156 [Baums 2009: 255]). *ṣaḍa[vi]ña* (< *ṣaḍ-abhijñāḥ*).

[22] Cf. Gā (British Library Fragment 1: r 32d; Senior Fragment 5: r 17, 21, v 26; Nasim Khan 75.18, 79.23, 81.1f., Nasim Khan 81.14f., 83.38f. etc.). *saña* (< *saṃjñā*); Pā. *Nevasaññā(nāsaññāyatana)*.

[23] Gā (CKD 399: Obv 2; CKD 272: Obv 3; CKD 358: Obv 3; CKI 241: 7, 10). *sarvaña-*; Gā (EĀ-G: r 3d). *sarvañu*; cf. Pā. *sabbaññū*.

caṃbaka (< Skt. *campaka*; cf. Kho. *cambaa*).

These transliterations show the developments *-nt- > -ṃd-* and *-mp- > -ṃb-*, which are attested in the Gāndhārī Khotan *Dharmapada*, the Gāndhārī documents from Niya and the Gāndhārī loanwords in Khotanese[24].

(11) *-ṇḍ- > -ṇṇ-*
The following three transliterations show the development *-ṇḍ- > -ṇṇ-* peculiar to the Gāndhārī Khotan *Dharmapada* and the Gāndhārī documents from Niya: 不那利 (471c11; EH. pju na ljiəi-; **puṇṇari(a)* < Skt. *puṇḍarīka*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 51f.), 鳩垣 (475b19; EH. kju γjwan; **kuvaṇṇ(a)*[25] < **kubhāṇḍa* < BHS. *kumbhāṇḍa(ka)*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 281).

(12) 波斯匿 = Gā. *Praṣeniga* ≠ BHS. *Prasenajit*
The transliteration 波斯匿 (434a9; EH. pa sjei nrjək; cf. Krsh, 2010, 47), ending with the velar /k/, corresponds to Gā. *Praṣeniga*[26], differing from BHS. *Prasenajit*.

(13) 彌勒 = Bactrian *Metraga*
The transliteration 彌勒 (425c6, 438a-16; EH. mjiei[mjiei:] lək; cf. Krsh, 2010, 318), ending with the velar /k/ differs from BHS. *Maitreya*, Pā. *Metteya*. In the Gāndhārī inscriptions, the personal names *Metreya*[27], *Metrea* (in an inscription dating back to 74

CE)[28] are attested, but they do not refer to the well-known Bodhisattva / Buddha. There are several forms of his name, which contain velars as their endings, as the Chinese transliteration does. Such are the Bactrian spelling Μετραγο Βουδο (*Metrago Boudo*) on the bronze coins of the Kushan king, Kaniṣka I, dating back to the second century CE; the form *Maitraka*, referring to this Bodhisattva, found in the verses of the *Samādhirājasūtra* (four times)[29], in the verses of the 54th chapter (*Maitreya*) of the *Gaṇḍavyūha* (twice)[30] and in the prose part of the *Mekhalādhāraṇī* (once)[31]; and the Tocharian forms *Maitrāk*, *Metrak*[32]. I assume that while the Bactrian form **Μετραγα* (**Metraga*) was sanskritised to *Maitraka* on the one hand, it was Gāndhārīsed to *Metreya*, *Metrea* on the other. From these Gāndhārī forms, BHS. *Maitreya*, Pā. *Metteya* were coined, though it is unlikely that they were the original forms. As I pointed out several years ago[33], there is a description of *Metteya*'s receiving the prediction of Buddhahood from the Buddha in the *Cakkavatti-Sīhananda-suttanta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya* (III, No. 26, p. 75f.) and in the Chinese translation of the same text, namely

---

[24] Cf. Karashima 1994: 34, 71~72 (n. 109).

[25] Cf. Gā (Senavarman Inscription: 13). *kuvhaḍa~*.

[26] British Library Fragment 14: recto 75 = Allon 2001: 304. *P[r]aṣen[i]ga.*

[27] CKI 141 = Peshawar Museum inscription, no. 5: 1 = Konow 1929, 133, pl. 24.7; IBInsc I 988.2.

[28] CKI 564 = Copper Manuscript in Five Sheets: 6 = Falk 2010: 18.

[29] Samādh(D) 165.7 (ch. 11, v. 60), 380.9 (ch. 29, v. 82), 424.12 (ch. 32, v. 137), 580.2 (ch. 37, v. 68) = Samādh(V) 76.15, 183.11, 204.12, 273.10.

[30] Gv 488.25 (ch. 54, v. 171), 489.7 (ch. 54, v. 175) = Gv(V) .392.17, 393.2.

[31] Md 116R2. *bhagava Maitrakaṃ*.

[32] Cf. Bailey 1946: 780; Brough 1962: 92, n. 4; Ji 1998: 57f.

[33] *Gendaigoyaku: Agon-Kyōten, Jō-agonkyō* 現代語訳『阿含経典・長阿含経』[An Annotated Japanese Translation of the Chinese Version of the *Dīrghāgama*], vol. 2, Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppan, 310~311, n. 121.

the *Zhuanlunshengwan xiuxing jing* 轉輪聖王修行經 of the *Dīrghāgāma* of the *Dharmaguptaka* school (T. 1, No. 1, 41c29f.), while their parallel text, namely the *Zhuanlunshengwan jing* 轉輪聖王經 in the Chinese translation of the *Madhayamāgama* of an unknown school (T.1, No. 26, 520b~525a) lacks this description, which is apparently truer to the original. Throughout the Pāli *Nikāya*s, the name *Metteya* occurs only once and therefore, it is unlikely that faith in *Metteya / Maitreya* existed in early Buddhism. I assume that such faith, which occurred first in northwest India, was interpolated into this particular scripture long after the formation of the canon[34]. The original meaning of Μετραγα or *Metreya* is unknown, while its relationship with the Vedic *Mitra* and Avestan *Mithra* has not been clarified as of yet. It is possible that a god or hero, who had been worshipped in the Gandhāra region was, at one time, introduced into Buddhism.

(14) 耆闍崛 = **G(r)ija-guḍa*
From the transliteration 耆闍崛 (425c4 etc.; EH. gjiəi dźja gjwət; cf. Krsh, 2010, 356), we may be able to reconstruct an original form like **G(r)ija-guḍa*, which resembles Gā. *Grija-uḍa*[35] in the AS(Gā) and Pā. *Gijjhakūṭa*, while differing from BHS. *Gṛdhrakūṭa*.

(15) 泥犁 = *ṇirea*
The transliteration 泥犁 (440b14 etc.; EH. niəi liəi[ljiəi]; cf. Krsh, 2010, 337f.) is closer to Gā. *ṇirea*[36] than to Skt. *niraya* ("hell").

---

[34]Cf. Anālayo 2010: 95f.

[35]Falk/Karashima 28, 1-01; cf. MPS-G: r b1. *Gri[ja]* ///.

[36]CKM 252: r 12, 14; cf. Salomon 2003: 88.

(16) 塔 = *thuva*
The character 塔 (435b11; EH. thəp; cf. Krsh, 2010, 475f.) was invented specially to transliterate Gā. *thuba*[37] or Gā. *thuva*[38](< Skt. *stūpa*).

(17) 三耶三菩, 三耶三佛 = **samya-bosi, *samya-budha*
The transliterations 阿耨多羅三耶三佛 (432a13; EH. ʔa nou ta la səm źja[zja] səm bjət; cf. Krsh, 2010, 8), 阿耨多羅三耶三菩 (437b24 etc.; EH. ʔa nou ta la səm źja[zja] səm bo; cf. Krsh, 2010, 8-9), 三耶三佛 (429a28 etc.; EH. səm źja[zja] səm bjət; cf. Krsh, 2010, 403) parallel Skt. *anuttara~ samyaksambodhi~*, *samyaksambuddha~*, while their Gāndhārī equivalents are Gā. *aṇutara~ sa(ṃ)masa(ṃ)bosi~*[39], *aṇutara~ saṃmasa(ṃ)bosi~*[40], *sa(ṃ)masabudha~*[41], *sa(ṃ)mesa(ṃ)budha*[42]. The Chinese 三耶 (EH. səm źja[zja]) in the above-quoted transliterations, indicates that its original form was Gā. *samya-*[43], *saṃya-*[44] (< Skt. *samyak*) rather than Gā. *sa(ṃ)ma-*, *sa(ṃ)me-*.

(18) 曇無竭 = Gā. **Dha<ṃ>mogada*
The transliteration 曇無竭 (471c23 etc.; EH. dam mjo gjiat; cf. Krsh, 2010, 477) suggests that its original form was not Sanskrit but Gāndhārī, such as Gā. **Dha<ṃ>mogada* (<

---

[37]Nasim Khan 77.8.

[38]British Library Fragment 1: r 82c; Senavarman Inscription: 2 etc.

[39]Nasim Khan 73.13, 81.12, 81.29, 83.53.

[40]Falk/Karashima 2013: 5-55.

[41]CKI 176: D2; CKI 334: 4; CKI 564: 3–4.; Nasim Khan 50.20, 52.27, 73.13, 73.18, 73.24 etc.

[42]Dhp-G[K]: r 3b, r 77d, v. 304d.

[43]Mansehra Rock Edict 9: 4. *samya-(paṭipati)*.

[44]Mansehra Rock Edict 11: 12. *saṃya-(paṭipati)*.

BHS. *Dharmodgata*), which is not, attested anywhere.

(19) 阿僧祇, 般泥日, 釋迦文, 釋提桓因, 伊沙
The following various transliterations seem to have been based on Gāndhārī forms: 阿僧祇 (427c5 etc.; EH. ʔa səng gjiei; Gā. *asa(ṃ)khea*[45] < Skt. *asaṃkhyeya*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 10), 般泥日 (438b25; EH. pan niəi ɣjwat; Gā. *pariṇivuda*[46] < BHS. *parinirvṛta*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 22), 釋迦文 (431a10 etc.; EH. śjiak kja mjən; Gā. *Śakamuṇi*[47] < *Śākyamuni*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 447f.), 釋提桓因 (429a11; EH. śjiak dei ɣwan ʔjiən; Gā. *Śakra~ devaṇa iṃtra~*[48]; Gā. *Śakra~ devana i(ṃ)dra~*[49]; Gā. *Śakra de[va]ṇa i(ṃ)dra~*[50]; Gā. *Śakra~ devaṇi(ṃ)dra~*[51] < Skt. *Śakra devānām indra*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 448), 伊沙 (431a2; EH. ʔjiəi sra; Gā. *iṣi*[52] < Skt. *ṛṣi*; cf. Krsh, 2010, 566).

(20) 斯陀含 = *saidagami*, 須陀洹 = *sodavaṇa*
The transliterations 斯陀含 (429b8 etc.; EH. sjei da gəm; cf. Krsh, 2010, 459f.) and 須陀洹 (429b8 etc.; EH. sjou da ɣwan; cf. Krsh, 2010, 555) correspond well with Gā. *saidagami*[53] (< BHS. *sakṛdāgāmin*) and Gā.

sodavaṇa [54] (< BHS. *srotaāpanna*) respectively. However, they occur also in the *Qichusanguan jing* 七處三觀經 (T. 2, No.150A, 877a11~12) and in the Kongōji (金剛寺) Manuscript of the *Anbanshouyi jing* 安般守意經, both of which are attributed to An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148-168 CE).

From the above-quoted transliterations, we may assume that the underlying language of Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* was Gāndhārī or at least contained Gāndhārī elements[55].

---

[45]Nasim Khan 73.12.

[46]Senavarman Inscription: 7 = von Hinüber 2003: 23; Nasim Khan 66.42, 46, 76.12.

[47]Senavarman Inscription: 11 = von Hinüber 2003: 37; Senior Fragment 14: r 21 = Salomon 2008: 354 etc.

[48]Falk/Karashima 2013: 5-57.

[49]BL16+25: r 25 = Lenz 2003: 144.

[50]Loṇa's Reliquary Inscription 1.

[51]Senavarman Inscription: 10 = von Hinüber 2003: 34.

[52]AG-G[L]: r 25a (= Salomon 2008: 220); Nid-G[L]: 9.2 (= Baums 2009: 242); Nid-G[L]: 13.58 (= Baums 2009: 268).

[53]Nasim Khan 36.6; Falk/Karashima 2013: 53.5. *saidagami-*; cf. CKI 358 = Reliquary

Inscription of the Azes year 98, B = Sadakata 1996: 308, Nasim Khan 1997; Senavarman Inscrption: 8b = von Hinüber 2003: 28. *sadagami*.

[54]Nasim Khan 54.26f., 73.34f.; Reliquary Inscription of the Azes year 98, B = Sadakata 1996: 308, Nasim Khan 1997.

[55]The following words in Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* demonstrate that he understood their original words through his knowledge of Middle Indic. Thus, 所語如甘露 (431b29; "the speech is like ambrosia"), corresponding to AS.27.7 = R.53.14 = AAA.197.16. *mṛdu-vacana~ ... mita-vacana~* ("the speech ... will become ... soft, measured") indicate that he confused *mṛdu* ("soft") or *mita* ("measured") with *amṛta* ("ambrosia"; MI. **amita*, Gā. **amṛda*, **amrida*); cf. Krsh 2011: 62, n. 69.

[55]Also, 薩芸若 (457c29; EH. sat ɣjwən nja:; a set transliteration of *sarvajña* "omniscient, all-knowing") in the following sentence 菩薩至無水漿中時，心不畏怖。自念言：" ...... 願我後得阿惟三佛時，使我剎中皆有水漿，令我剎中人悉得薩芸若八味水。" corresponds to AS.179.21 = R.363.5 = AAA.741.6. *tathā ca sarvasattvān punyaih saṃniyokṣye yathā 'ṣṭāṅgopetapānīyalābhino 'mī bhaviṣyanti.* Lokakṣema seems to have confused Skt. *puṇya* (MI. *puñña*; "merit") with MI. *paññā* (< Skt. *prajñā* "wisdom"); cf. Krsh 2011: 337, n. 327.

[55]Moreover, Lokakṣema transliterated Skt. *jana* ("people") sporadically as 禪 (EH. dźjan; cf.

(3) Was the *Prajñāpāramitā* scripture composed in the Gandhāra region?

In the various versions of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā,* there is a prophecy of the Buddha's foretelling the spreading of this scripture after his passing away [56]. Lokakṣema's translation says that this sūtra will first appear in southern India, then spread through western India, finally reaching northern India (北天竺) (T. 8, No. 224, 446a28f; Krsh, 2011, 225f.). The translations by Kumārajīva (T. 8, No. 227, 555a27f.) and Shihu (T. 8, No. 228, 623b2f.) depict the same route, namely from the south through the west and finally to the north. The older version of the two translations by Xuanzang (T. 7, No. 220, 889c26f.) describes the route as directly from the south to the north, though the newer version (T. 7, No. 220, 808b21f.) relates the route as from the southeast → south → southwest → northwest → north → northeast. However, the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions specify that "these sūtras associated with the six perfections will, after the passing away of the Tathāgata, appear in the south (*Dakṣiṇāpatha*). From the south, they will

spread to the eastern country (*Vartani*). From the eastern country, they will spread to the north (*Uttarāpatha*) when the Dharma and Vinaya have just reached their peak and the good Dharma (begins to) disappear". Finally, Zhi Qian's translation states that this scripture will appear in the country of *Śakyan* (釋氏國), then spread to the countries in *Vartani* (會多尼) and then to those in *Uttarakuru* (欝單日) (T. 8, No. 225, 490a24f.). Except for this last one, the other versions agree that this scripture will appear first in southern India and finally reach northern India, though via different routes.

Just after the above-stated descriptions, in all the versions, the Buddha says "In northern India, there will be very many *bodhisattva*s. However, there will be only a few among them who will study the *Prajñāpāramitā*"[57].

These descriptions apparently suggest that the text of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* took shape in northern India, though we can never exclude the possibility that the basis of *Prajñāpāramitā* thought was formed in southern India, such as in the Andhra region where the *Mahāsāṃghika* school, with which this scripture is closely related, predominated, as is often maintained. However, it is evident from the above-stated descriptions that the text itself was composed in *Uttarāpatha* (in Chinese 北天竺 "northern India") which commonly designates the "Northern Region", "encompassing territories from the Gangetic basin in northern India to Mathura, Taxila, and Bactria in northern Afghanistan and western Central Asia"[58]. I assume that, in the above-quoted prophecy by the Buddha, *Uttarāpatha* is none other than the Gandhāra region. As we shall see later, in the story of

---

Krsh 2010: 57~59, s.vv. 禪, 禪法), which he used to render MI. *jhāna*, Skt. *dhyāna* ("meditation") as well, namely 悉逮得禪 (428c7~8, 10; "one, who has attained all the *jhāna*s") and 逮得禪者 (454b-13; "one, who has attained *jhāna*") correspond to AS.15.3, 7, 161.5 = R.29.18f., 20, 323.7 = AAA.120.2f., 10, 666.3. *pṛthagjana~* ("the common people") (cf. Krsh 2011: 33, n. 266; *ibid.,* 304, n. 7), while 悉逮得禪法 (428c11; "one, who has attained *jhāna*-Dharma completely") corresponds to AS.15.7 = R.29.22 = AAA.120.15. *pṛthagjana-dharma~* ("the dharmas which constitute the common people") (cf. Krsh 2011: 33f., n. 269). Presumably, this fact reflects that in the underlying language as with Gāndhārī, both Skt. *jana* ("people") and MI. *jhāna* had merged as *jaṇa, aṇa*.

[56]Cf. Krsh 2011: 225f., n. 289.

[57]AS.112.16 = R.226.7 = AAA.489.3; cf. Krsh 2011: 226f.

[58]Cf. Neelis 2011: 186.

Sadāprarudita, which constitutes the ending part of this scripture, the Bodhisattva *Dharmodgata* is said to live in a palace, where a jewelled box containing the *Prajñāpāramitā,* written with "melted" lapis lazuli (*vilīna vaiḍūrya*) on golden tablets, is placed and to preach this perfection of wisdom in the country of *Gandhāvatī,* whose name seems to hint at Gandhāra.

If this sūtra was really composed in the Gandhāra region, it is quite probable that its language was Gāndhārī, as the newly-discovered Gāndhārī fragments and Lokakṣema's translation, dating back to the first and second centuries, suggest. On the other hand, there are also fragments of a Sanskrit manuscript of the same scripture, discovered in Bāmiyān and now preserved in the Schøyen Collection and elsewhere, which are written in an old Brāhmī script of the Kuṣāṇa Period and are supposed to date back to the second half of the third century CE based on palaeographical evidence (Sander, 2000b, 288). Dr. Sander, who has studied this manuscript, states (2000a, 3f.) that it shows traces of a Middle Indic language, e.g., *tat kisya heto*; *kho, khu* (< Skt. *khalu*); *āvusa*; *thera*, *arahatā*, *unminyata-niminyitāni* (< BHS. *unmiñjita-nimiñjitāni*), *bhoti* (< *bhavati*) etc. In spite of its antiquity, it is remarkably close to the Sanskrit edition based on the manuscripts from Nepal, dating from the eleventh century onwards. Therefore, one may assume that, at an early stage of the transmission of this scripture, it branched into two, i.e., the older versions —— namely the Gāndhārī fragments, the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema, Zhi Qian, Zhu Fonian, Kumārajīva, and a translation by Xuanzang[59] —— and the newer ones — namely the Sanskrit manuscript fragments of the Kuṣāṇa Period, the other

translation by Xuanzang, Shihu's translation, the Sanskrit version and the Tibetan translation[60].

(4) The story of *Sadāprarudita* and the origin of Buddha-images

The final part of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* is the story of Bodhisattva *Sadāprarudita* and his quest for the Dharma. When he was lamenting over his misfortune of being born in a time when there was no *buddha*, a voice from the sky told him "Go East, there you will hear the *Prajñāpāramitā!*" He journeyed in that direction, not knowing how far he should go. Then a *buddha*-figure (*tathāgata-vigraha*; 化佛) appeared and told him to go five hundred *yojana* further to a country called *Gandhāvatī* and to listen to the teaching on the *Prajñāpāramitā* being given by the Bodhisattva *Dharmodgata*. Following these instructions, he went to *Gandhāvatī* and worshipped the *Prajñāpāramitā*, written with melted lapis lazuli on golden tablets and placed in a jewelled box in a storeyed pavilion which the Bodhisattva *Dharmodgata* had made built for the worship of this scripture. Having worshipped there, *Sadāprarudita* went to where *Dharmodgata* was preaching and listened. He then entered into a good many meditations one after another —— only the oldest Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian tell us at the end of the story that infinite numbers of *buddha*s in the ten directions bestowed a prophecy on *Sadāprarudita* of his becoming a *buddha*[61]. This story was adapted in Kang Senghui's *Liuduji jing* 六度集經 (Collection of Stories concerning the Six *Pāramitā*s), under the title *Changbei pusa bensheng* 常悲菩薩本生 (the previous life of

---

[59]Underlying Indian texts of the Chinese translations by Kumārajīva and Xuanzang were written probably in Sanskrit.

[60]Cf. Krsh 2011: xii~xiii.

[61]Cf. Krsh 2011: 531 and n. 190.

Constantly-Lamenting Bodhisattva) (T.3, No.152, 43a13f.).

The story of Bodhisattva *Sadāprarudita*, found in the Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian, is of great detail as compared with later versions — unfortunately Gāndhārī fragments of this portion have not been discovered up to now. Also, the themes of the story found in the oldest Chinese translations and the later versions seem to differ. The following passages (476b17f.; Krsh, 2011, 525f.), which are often referred to as being the first to mention Buddha-images[62], also furnish us with a clue about when and where this *Prajñāpāramitā* text was composed.

> The Bodhisattva *Dharmodgata* said: "... For instance, after the Buddha enters *parinirvāṇa*, somebody makes an image of the Buddha. People, who see the Buddha-image, all kneel and worship it. The image is neat and beautiful and resembles the Buddha perfectly. Everybody who sees it admires it and offers flowers, incense, and variegated silk fabric to it. Do you think, O wise man, that the god Buddha (or "the deity Buddha" 佛神 [63]) is inside the image?"

> Bodhisattva *Sadāprarudita* replied: 'No, he is not inside. The reason for creating a Buddha-image is just in order to make people obtain the

merit (from worshipping it). A Buddha-image is not made on one condition; a Buddha-image is not made on two conditions. (There are three necessary conditions, namely) there is gold; there is a clever person; and somebody who saw the Buddha in his lifetime. Because he thinks of the Buddha after his *parinirvāṇa*, he makes a Buddha-image and wishes to make people in the world worship it and obtain the merit (from worshipping it)".

> Bodhisattva *Sadāprarudita* (further) replied to the master: "Because the Buddha has already entered *parinirvāṇa*, one makes a (Buddha-) image".[64]

Yūichi Kajiyama has assumed that this portion, which is wanting in the later versions, was composed by Lokakṣema[65], but I do not agree with this assumption. Presumably, the composer(s) — he or they might have been a *dharmabhāṇaka* /

---

[62]E.g., Lewis R. Lancaster, "An Early Mahayana Sermon about the Body of the Buddha and the Making of Images", *Artibus Asiae* 36, No. 4 (1974): 287~291; Juhyung Rhi, "Images, Relics, and Jewels: The Assimilation of Images in the Buddhist Relic Cult of Gandhāra— or vice versa", in: *Artibus Asiae* 65, No. 2 (2005), 204f.

[63]Cf. Krsh 2010: 172.

[64]"譬如佛般泥洹後，有人作佛形像。人見佛形像，無不跪拜供養者。其像端正姝好，如佛無有異。人見，莫不稱歎，莫不持華、香、繒綵供養者。賢者！呼佛神在像中耶？" 薩陀波倫菩薩報言："不在中。所以作佛像者，但欲使人得其福耳。不用一事成佛像，亦不用二事成。有金，有黠人，若有見佛時人。佛般泥洹後，念佛故，作像，欲使世間人供養得其福。" 薩陀波倫菩薩報師言："用佛般泥洹後故，作像耳。" Cf. the parallel passages in Zhi Qian's translation: T. 8, No. 225, 507a22f. "譬如佛滅度後，有人作佛形像，端正姝好，如佛無異。人見，莫不稱歎持花、香、繒綵供養者。賢者！謂佛神在其像中耶？" 對曰："不也。所以作像者，但欲使人繫意敬自警脩，得其福耳。亦不用一事、二事成。有金，有智人，若有見佛時人。佛滅度後，念佛故，作像，欲使十方供養得其福。"

[65]Kajiyama 1976: 79.

*dharmabhāṇaka*s —— of the story of *Sadāprarudita* was (were) cynical about the worship of Buddha statues which, at that time, might have just started in Gāndhara. He (or they) must have been convinced that, in a time when there was no *buddha* in the world after Śākyamuni Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*, to worship the *Prajñāpāramitā* — i.e., to worship actual copies of the *Prajñāpāramitā* scripture —, which generates a *buddha*'s omniscience [66] and consequently all the *buddha*s themselves[67], was true worship of the Buddha which actualises meeting him and living in his presence [68], whereas

---

[66]Cf. AS. 116.2 = R.234.10 = AAA.502.24f. *prajñāpāramitā āhārikā sarvajñajñānasya*; AS. 260.14 = R.527.19 = AAA. 989.23. *prajñāpāramitā bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ sarvajña-jñānasyâhārike* etc.

[67]Cf. AS(Lk).477c11f. 般若波羅蜜是怛薩阿竭・阿（←呵）羅訶・三耶三佛母 ("The *Prajñāpāramitā* is the mother of *tathāgata*s, *arhant*s, *samyaksaṃbuddha*s"; ≒ AS[ZQ].508a2f. 是經如來・無所著・正眞道・最正覺母; the other versions lack this phrase; cf. Krsh 2011: 533, n. 203); AS.134.28f. = R.272.4f. = AAA.559.6f. *evaṃ hi Subhūte! prajñāpāramitā tathāgatānām arhatāṃ samyaksambuddhānāṃ mātā jananī janayitrī* (This phrase is wanting in the oldest translations; cf. Krsh 2011: 262, n. 112); AS. 228.4f. = R.461.10f. = AAA.870.2f. *prajñāpāramitā 'tītānāgatapratyutpannānāṃ tathāgatānām arhatāṃ samyaksambuddhānāṃ mātā jananī janayitrī sarvajñatāyā āhārikā* (This phrase is wanting in the older versions; cf. Krsh 2011: 442, n. 34).

[68]Cf. AS(Lk). 477c29f. 是般若波羅蜜汝諦受，諦念。用慈孝於佛故。承用教故。都盧是過去、當來、今現在佛・天中天所施教。用是供養。若於薩和薩爲極大慈具，諸菩薩當視如見佛 ("[The Buddha said to *Ānanda*:] 'You should receive the *Prajñāpāramitā* carefully and think of it attentively. Because you respect the Buddha and because you follow his teachings obediently. [The *Prajñāpāramitā*] is the teaching which all the past, future and present

worshipping a Buddha-image would not afford the same effect at all[69].

---

*buddha*s, Lords teach. Therefore, one [should] serve it. You possess great compassion for *sarvasattva* ["all sentient beings"]. *Bodhisattva*s regard [the *Prajñāpāramitā*] as they see the Buddha. ...' "; ≒ ZQ.508a10~19; the other versions lack this phrase; cf. Krsh 2011: 536f., n. 232); AS. 260.30f. = R.529.2f. = AAA.990.24f. *avirahitās te Ānanda! sattvā buddhadarśanena dharmaśravaṇena saṃghopasthānena ca veditavyaṃ tathāgatāntikāvacarās te Ānanda! sattvā veditavyā ya enāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ śroṣyanti udgrahīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti pravartayiṣyanti deśayiṣyanti upadekṣyanty uddekṣyanti svādhyāsyanti likhiṣyanti satkariṣyanti gurukariṣyanti mānayiṣyanti pūjayiṣyanty arcayiṣyanty apacāyiṣyanti puṣpa-dhūpa-gandha-mālya-vilepana-cūrṇa-cīvara-cchattra-dhvaja-ghaṇṭā-patākābhiḥ samantāc ca dīpamālābhir bahuvidhābhiś ca pūjābhir* ("It should be known that those beings — who will hear this *Prajñāpāramitā*, take it up, study, spread, repeat and write it, will honour, revere, worship and adore it with heavenly flowers, incense, perfumes, wreaths, unguents, aromatic powders, strips of cloth, parasols, banners, bells, flags, with rows of lamps all round, and with manifold kinds of worship — are not lacking in meeting the Buddha, hearing the Dharma and serving the community, and those beings should be known as living in the presence of the Tāthagata."; cf. AsP.tr. 300 = AsP.tr.II 225).

[69]This attitude is quite similar to this scripture's opinion on *stūpa*-worship; Śakra, the king of the gods, asked the Buddha: "Suppose that there are two people. One of them would, having written down (*likhitvā*) the *Prajñāpāramitā* and made it into a manuscript (*pustakagatāṃ kṛtvā*), lay it (in a proper place), honour, revere, worship, and adore it with heavenly flowers, incense, and the like, while the other would place relics of the Tathāgata, who had entered *parinirvāṇa*, in *stūpa*s; he would preserve them, keep them; he would honour, worship and adore them with heavenly flowers, incense, and so on. Which of the two, O Lord, would obtain the greater merit?"

As this story of *Sadāprarudita* mentions the worship of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, "written" with melted lapis lazuli on golden tablets, it must have come into existence later than the other parts of this scripture. It might have taken more than fifty years for a *newly-created text* to become accepted as a *scripture* formulated by the Buddha. If that were the case, then it could be assumed that the original text of Lokakṣema's translation of this scripture had appeared by the beginning of the second century at the latest, though more probably in the latter half of the first. This supposition may be supported by these newly-discovered Gāndhārī fragments, dating back to between 47~147 CE, and this would also agree with the assumption that the appearance of Buddha statues in Gandhāra began to occur in the latter half of the first century. Realising that both making and worshipping Buddha statues were gaining popularity, the compiler of this scripture (or at least of the original texts of the oldest Chinese translations) regarded these new practices or this new movement cynically as merely expedient devices for meeting the Buddha and hence, obtaining the merit from worshipping a statue in a time

when no *buddha* existed after Śākyamuni Buddha's passing away.

As is stated above, this portion is found only in the oldest Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhi Qian —— Zhu Fonian's translation lacks the last ten chapters and no Gāndhārī fragments of the latter part have been discovered as of yet — while it is wanting in the later versions. One may assume that, by the time of the compilations of the later versions, the practice of making statues of the Buddha and worshipping them had become so commonplace that the cynical point of view concerning such practices was felt to be anachronistic as well as irrelevant and consequently, this portion was simply deleted from the text.

In my opinion, one important theme in the oldest Chinese translations was to claim absolute superiority of the worship of the *Prajñāpāramitā* scripture over that of Buddha-images, which was thus deleted in later versions, resulting in the story's contents becoming more abstract and philosophical. This difference may reflect the transition in time, namely from the period when the practice of making statues of the Buddha arose to when it became commonplace to do so. It must be interesting and meaningful to compare and analyse the story of *Sadāprarudita* in different versions from such a historical point of view.

In answering this question, the Buddha replied: " ... the Tathāgata is not named as such from the fact that he has acquired this physical body, but from the fact that he has acquired omniscience (*sarvajñatā*). And this omniscience of the Tathāgata has been generated (*nirjāta*) from the *Prajñāpāramitā*. ... Therefore, the person, who would, having written down the *Prajñāpāramitā* and made it into a manuscript, lay it (in a proper place) and honour it, would beget the greater merit. As by worshipping the *Prajñāpāramitā*, he worships the wisdom of the omniscient (*sarvajña-jñāna*)". (AS. 28.29~29.27 = R.57.5~59.5 = AAA.208.22~212.12; cf. AsP.tr. 105f. = AsP.tr.II 24f.) Thus, the composer of this scripture, by using the Buddha's mouth, placed absolute superiority of the worship of the *Prajñāpāramitā* scripture over that of *stūpa*-worship.

Bibliography, Abbreviations and Signs

AAA = *Abhisamayālaṃkār'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra*, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; Reprint: Tokyo² 1973: Sankibō Busshorin.

AG-Gᴸ = Gāndhārī London *Anavataptagāthā* = Salomon 2008

Allon, Mark, (2001). *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 2).

Allon, Mark and Richard Salomon, (2000). Kharoṣṭhī fragments of a Gāndhārī version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I, Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. I, ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing, pp. 243~273.

Anālayo, (2010). *The Genesis of the Bodhisattva Ideal*, Hamburg: Hamburg University Press (Hamburg Buddhist Studies 1). (http://www.buddhismuskunde.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/pdf/publikationen/HamburgUP_HBS01_Analayo.pdf)

ARIRIAB = *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*

AS = the Sanskrit version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*

AS = *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)

AS(Gā) = fragments of a Gāndhārī version of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Falk/Karashima 2012, 2013)

AS(Lk) = Lokakṣema's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Daoxing Banre jing* 道行般若經 (T. 8, No. 224; 179 CE)

AS(ZQ) = Zhi Qian's translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Da Mingdu jing* 大明度經 (T. 8, No. 225)

AsP.tr. = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā: The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Ślokas*, translated into English by Edward Conze, Calcutta 1970: Asiatic Society (Bibliotheca Indica: A Collection of Oriental Works, no. 284, issue no. 1592)

AsP.tr.II = *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & its Verse Summary*, translated into English by Edward Conze, San Francisco: Four Seasons Foundation, Delhi ²1994: Sri Satguru Publications.

Bailey, Harold Walter, (1946). Gāndhārī, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11: 764~797.

Baums, Stefan, (2009). *A Gāndhārī Commentary on Early Buddhist Verses: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18*, PhD Dissertation. University of Washington.

BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

BL16+25 = Gāndhārī manuscript of Previous-Birth Stories (ed. Lenz 2003)

Brough, John, (1962). *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London: Oxford University Press (*London Oriental Series*, vol. 7).

—— (1982). Amitābha and Avalokiteśvara in an inscribed Gandhāran sculpture, *Indologica Taurinensia*, X: 65~70 (= 1996: 469~473).

—— (1996). *Collected Papers*, ed. by Minoru Hara and J. C. Wright, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

CKD = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Secular Documents from Central Asia (Seattle, 2004–); see: http://gandhari.org/ a_documents.php

CKI = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (Seattle, 2004~); see: http://gandhari.org/a_inscriptions.php

CKM = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts (Seattle, 2004~); see: http://gandhari.org/a_manuscripts.php

Coblin, W. South, (1983). *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*, Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen *et al.*, Copenhagen, Bristol, 1924~2011.

Dhp-Gᴷ = Gāndhārī Khotan *Dharmapada* (ed. Brough 1962)

EĀ-G = Gāndhārī *Ekottarikāgama* (ed. Allon 2001)

EH = reconstructions of the Eastern Han (25-220 CE) Chinese sound system, posited by Coblin (1983)

Falk, Harry, (2010). Signature Phrases, Azes Dates, Nakṣatras and Some New Reliquary Inscriptions from Gandhāra, in: ARIRIAB 13: 13~33.

Falk, Harry and Seishi Karashima, (2012). A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 1 (Text from the Split Collection 1), ARIRIAB 15: 19~61 + plates 5~7.

—— 2013 "A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 5 (Text from the Split Collection 1)", in: ARIRIAB 16.

Fussman, Gérard, (1986). Documents épigraphiques kouchans (IV): Ajitasena, père de Senavarma, *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 75: 1~14.

—— 1999 "La Place des Sukhāvatī-vyūha", in: *Journal Asiatique* 287: 523–86.

Gā = Gāndhārī

Gv = *Gaṇḍavyūha*, ed. Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki, Hōkei Idzumi, Kyoto 1934~36: The Sanskrit Buddhist Texts Publishing Society; new rev. ed. Kyoto 1949: The Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World.

Gv(V) = *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*, ed. P. L. Vaidya, Darbhanga (1960). The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, No. 5).

von Hinüber, Oskar, (2001). *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 2., erweiterte Auflage, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (SbÖAW Bd. 467 = Veröffentlichung der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 20).

—— 2003 *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Senavarma-Inschrift*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 2003, Nr. 1. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

IBInsc = Keishō Tsukamoto (塚本啓祥), *Indo Bukkyō Himei no Kenkyū* インド仏教碑銘 の研究 [*A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions*], part I, Text, Notes and Japanese Translation; part II, Indices, Maps and Illustrations; part III, Inscriptions in Northern Areas, Pakistan, Kyoto 1996~2003: Heirakuji Shoten.

Ji, Xianlin 季羡林, (1998). *Tuhuoluowen Mile Huijian Ji Yishi* 吐火罗文《弥勒会见记》 译释, in: *Ji Xianlin Wenji* 季羡林文集 *Collected Papers of Ji Xianlin*, vol. XI, Nanchang 南昌: Jiangxi Jiaoyu Chubanshe 江西教育出版社.

Kajiyama, Yūichi 梶山雄一(1976). *Hannyakyō — Kū no Sekai* 般若経：空の世界 [*The Prajñāpāramitā — the World of Emptiness*], Tokyo, Chūō-Kōronsha (Chūkō Shinsho 中公新書 422).

Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志 (1994). *Jō-agonkyō no Gengo no Kenkyū — Onshago Bunseki o Chūshin tosite* 「長阿含経」の原語の研 究——音写語分析を中心として [*A Study of the Underlying Language of the Chinese Dīrghâgama——Focusing on an Analysis of the Transliterations*], Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha.

Kho = Khotanese

Konow, Sten, (1929). *Kharoshṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. II, part I. Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch.

Krsh 2010 = Seishi Karashima, *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經 詞典, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI) (available at: <http://buddhistinformatics.ddbc.edu.tw/gl ossaries/download.php#lokaksema> and <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/orc/Publications/B PPB/pdf/BPPB-11.pdf>)

Krsh 2011 = *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經校注, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University

(Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XII). (available at: <http://archives.bukkyo-u.ac.jp/infolib/user_contents/repository_txt_pdfs/soken17/SK017L015.pdf>)

Lee, Mei-huang, (2009). *A Study of the Gāndhārī Dārukkhandhopamasutta ("Discourse on the Simile of the Log")*, PhD Dissertation. University of Washington.

Lenz, Timothy, (2003). *A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25*, Seattle: University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 3).

Md = Chandrabhāl Tripathi, "Gilgit Blätter der Mekhalā-dhāraṇī", in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7 (1981): 153~161.

MI = Middle Indic, MPS-G = Gāndhārī *Mahāpariṇirvāṇa-sūtra* (ed. Allon/Salomon 2000)

Nasim Khan, M. (1997). An Inscribed Relic-Casket from Dir, *The Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 5: 21~33.

—— (2008). *Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts from Gandhāra*, published by Dr. M. Nasim Khan, Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar.

Neelis, Jason, (2011). *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Nid-G^L = Gāndhārī Verse Nideśa (ed. Baums 2009)

Pā = Pāli

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

Sadakata, Akira, (1996). Inscriptions kharoṣṭhī provenant du marché aux antiquités de Peshawar, *Journal Asiatique* 284: 301~324.

Salomon, Richard, (1995). A Kharoṣṭhī Reliquary Inscription of the Time of the Apraca Prince Viṣṇuvarma, *South Asian Studies* 11: 27~32.

—— (2003). The Senior Manuscripts: Another Collection of Gandhāran Buddhist Scrolls.

Journal of the American Oriental Society 123: 73~92.

—— (2008). *Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavatapta-gāthā): British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 and Senior Scroll 14*, Seattle and London, University of Washington Press (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, vol. 5).

Samādh(D) = *Samādhirājasūtra*, in: *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. II, ed. Nalinaksha Dutt, Calcutta 1953; Delhi ²1984: Sri Satguru Publications.

Samādh(V) = *Samādhirājasūtra*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga 1961: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, No. 2).

Sander, Lore, (2000a). Fragments of an Aṣṭasāhasrikā manuscript from the Kuṣāṇa peiod, *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection* I, *Buddhist Manuscripts,* vol. I, ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo 2000: Hermes Publishing, pp. 1~51.

—— (2000b). A brief paleographical analysis of the Brāhmī manuscripts in volume I, *op. cit.*, pp. 285~300.

Skt = Sanskrit

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924-1934.

~ = stem of a word, e.g. *dharma~*

* = a hypothetical form which is not attested anywhere, e.g. **snāru*

α < β = the form α comes from β; e.g. Gā. *masu* < Skt. *madhu*

← = α ← β: the Chinese character β should be changed to α