A Shape in the Mist: On the Text of Two Undetermined Sūtra Citations
in the Prasannapadā

Saitō, Akira

In Chapter 25 of Candrakīrti’s Prasannapadā (hereafter abbreviated PSP), entitled “The Examination of Nirvāṇa”, there still remain two citations given from sūtras whose origins have not yet been clearly determined. Written in what appears to be Middle-Indic — Pali or so-called “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” —, both stanzas are cited as part of the explanation of the characteristics of nirvāṇa and saṃsāra respectively. The present paper aims at resolving the difficulty in editing the text of these two citations, by examining extant manuscripts of the PSP, the anonymous sub-commentarial work *Lakṣaṇatīkā, the Tibetan translation of the PSP, and relevant sūtras.

I. The Two Citations in the Context of the Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā, Chapter 25

Chapter 25 of Nāgārjuna’s Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā (hereafter abbreviated MMK), entitled “The Examination of Nirvāṇa” starts with the opponent’s objection against “emptiness”(śūnyatā) in relation to the possibility of nirvāṇa. The text, and its translation runs as follows:

\[
yadi śūnyam idaṃ sarvam udayo nāsti na vyayaḥ/
prahāṇād vā nirodhād vā kasya nirvāṇam iṣyate // (MMK 25.1; PSP 519.4–5)
\]

“[Objection]: If all this is empty, there is neither origination nor cessation. Due to the abandonment or cessation of what, is nirvāṇa then acknowledged?”

In Candrakīrti’s commentary on the above verse, the first undetermined sūtra citation is found in his theoretical opponent’s explanation of nirupadhiśeṣam nirvāṇam, or “nirvāṇa without remainder”, and is presented in La Vallée Poussin’s (hereafter abbreviated LVP) edition as follows:

Citation No.1 (PSP 520.4–5):

\[(1)\] abhedi kāyo * * * * * *

Although, as can be seen, LVP did not give the full edited text for this passage, he left a rather detailed note in his footnotes (PSP 520, n.1):

\* This article was read at “Japan-Austria International Symposium on Transmission and Tradition: The Meaning and the Role of ‘Fragments’ in Indian Philosophy” held at Matsumoto, from Aug. 20 to 24, 2012. I am indebted to Profs. Y. Yonezawa, A. MacDonald, and K. Harimoto who made valuable comments on my draft as well as making important manuscripts of the Prasannapadā accessible to me. Thanks are also due to Prof. T. Unebe who kindly shared me with his hypothesis that the Citation No. 2 is most probably from the Rgs 22.6, which is confirmed by the present discussion.

1 In this paper, six “better” manuscripts of the PSP are used. For the six mss., see MacDonald [2008: p. 13].

2 See Yonezawa [2004: pp. 115–126].
“Mss. abhedhi kāyo nirodhī saṃvedānāpanṭhai (pathai) rahinsu(itsu) sahinsu(itsu) saccadhīna samo sasvarānām vijñānam arthagamed iti. — नास्तिकप्रकपितकेषपत्थास् हृदयामकम्यत् जयति जयति सत्त्वरास्त्वादेयति abhedhi kāyo vyārodhī samjñā sarvavedānā vyayacchat yasya, sanskārānām upāsamo vijñānasyāstamgamaś cābhavat. — विज्ञान = vyayacchat, vyaraḥ; avec une lecture ज्ञान, on aurait sarvā vedānā daḥiṃsu. — M. R. O. Franke me signale la stance Udāna viii.9.

abhedi kāyo nirodhī saññā vedanā pi ti dahāṃsu sabbā
vūpasaṃniṇṣu saṃkārā vīññāṇam attham agāmā ti.

M. Ed. Müller attire mon attention sur les variantes du Ms. de Mandalay (J. P. T. S. 1890, p. 107) qui porte vedanā sitim. daḥiṃsu.” (*sic, read as P and D ज्ञान)

Another citation that LVP did not give a full edited text of is found in Candrākirti’s commentary on the MMK 25.3. The following are the two stanzas placed after the above-cited MMK 25.1:

yady aśānyam idam sarvam udayo nāstri na vyayāḥ /
prahāṇād vā nirodhād vā kasya nirvāṇam iṣyate // (MMK 25.2; PSP 521.2-3)

“[Reply]: If all this is non-empty, there is neither origination nor cessation. Due to the abandonment or cessation of what, is nirvāṇa then acknowledged?”

aprhaṇāṇaḥ asamoṃprāptam anucchinnam aśāśvatam /
aniruddham anuppannam etan nirvāṇam ucyate // (MMK 25.3; PSP 521.10-11)

“Not abandoned, not acquired, not annihilated, not eternal, not ceased, not arisen, this is said to be nirvāṇa.”

In the PSP Candrākirti explains why and how people go into transmigration, with regard to the above MMK 25.3 by quoting a sūtra as follows:

Citation No.2 (PSP 524.1-4):
yathā(1) śaṅkiteṇa viśasmanjña abhyupaiti
no cāpi kośṭhaga * * * * * * * * * (2)/
evem eva bālu ‘pagato * * * * * (3)

* * * jāyi mriyate sadā abhūto // iti /

LVP gives three footnotes to the above passage as follows:

“1) Mss. yathā.
2) kośṭha gantu āviṣṭa papadyate.
3) upagato aṅgamaṇjñaya jāpi triyate.”

It is unfortunate to note that LVP’s intention for the above footnotes as well as his text, with marks for indicating short and long syllables, is unclear. In the following discussion, let us focus on what texts Candrākirti is thought to have used when he made the above two citations in the PSP.
II. The Edited Text of Citation No.1

In order to edit the text of the above Citation No.1, let us refer to the six “better” manuscripts of the PSP, the gloss on a certain word given in the *Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*, and the Tibetan translation of the cited verse.

First, the following are those readings of the sūtra given as Citation No.1 (PSP 520.4–5):

Ms. C(ambridge Library): \( \text{abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā paṭthai rahinsu saccadhimaṃ samvarāṇāṃ viññānam arthagamed iti} \) (154b8–9)

Ms. T(okyo University Library No.251): \( \text{abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā paṭthai rahinsu saccadhimaṃ samvarāṇāṃ viññānam arthagamed iti} \) (209b6–210a1)

Ms. N(epal-German Manuscript Preservation Project No.1294/3): \( \text{abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā paṭthai rahinsu saccadhimaṃ samvarāṇāṃ viññānam arthagamed iti} \) (179b4–5)

Ms. K(eshar Library, used by de Jong [1978]): \( \text{ahodi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā paṭthai rahinsu saccadhipasamo samvarāṇāṃ viññānam arthagamed iti} / (97a1)

Ms. O(xford, Bodleian Library): \( \text{abhedi kāyō nirodhi} \) \( \text{sānkhārāṇāṃ viroṇam(sic) arthe gamēti} \) (102a6)

Ms. P(otala Palace): \( \text{abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṅnā vedanā yaccha rahimśu savvā vopāśamo saṃskārāṇāṃ viññānam arthe gamedīti} / (74b4)

Furthermore, with regard to the above citation, the *Laks. an. at.ıkā* glosses only the first word “abhedi”, 3 sg. aor. pass. of \( \sqrt{bhid} \), as \( \text{vinaṣṭam} \), meaning “destroyed” (6a5).

Finally, the Tibetan translation renders the above citation as follows:

\( \text{gang na lus zhig ’du shes ’gags(P ’gal) // tshor ba thams cad bral gyur zhang // } \)

\( \text{’du byed nye bar zhi ba dang // rnam par shes pa nub gyur pa j(D ’a 173b5–6, P ’a 196b4–5) } \)

“Where the body collapsed, representation ceased, all feelings vanished, formative forces were calm, and consciousness became extinct.”

The underlined “gang na” supports yattha, i.e. yatra in Sanskrit.

Based on the above three sources, let me suggest the following readings for the text in question:

\( \text{abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṅnā vedanā yattha rahimśu sabbā} \)

\( \text{vyupāśamo saṃskārāṇāṃ viññānam attham gamed iti} // \)

“Where the body was broken, representation became ceased, all feelings vanished, formative forces were calm, and consciousness became extinct.”

It is clear that the above citation corresponds with the following excerpt from the Pali *Udāna* 8.9:

---

3 See Yonezawa [2010: pp. 126, 130].
abhedi kāyo, nirodhi saññā, vedanā (1) sīti-bhaviṃsu (1) sabbā,
vūpasamiṃsu saṅkhārā, viññāṇam attham agamā ’tī //
“The body was broken, representation became ceased, all feelings cooled, formative forces
became calmed, and consciousness became extinct.”


Compared with the corresponding text in Pali above, this citation in the PSP has a few
characteristic features. First, the citation is regarded as having been partially Sanskritized to
be rendered as a nominal construction, i.e., from vūpasamiṃsu saṅkhārā “formative forces
became calmed” to vyupaśamo sanskārāṇāṃ (= Pali vūpasamo sanskārāṇam) “formative
forces were calm”.

Furthermore, the word agamā has become gamed in which the optative, 3rd singular, is
used as an aorist, as explained in BHSG §32.85. The reading in the Potala Ms., vopasaśmo,
shows a partial Middle-Indic form of Sanskrit vyupaśamo (< vopasaśmo Middle-Indic [BHSG
§3.71] < vūpasamo in Pali).

Although the content of the above citation is rather clear, the question remains as to
whether Candrakīrti used a version of the text that was completely written in Pali, or a version
that already contained partially Sanskritized readings, as presented above. If the former were
the case, which the present author is more inclined to think, owing to the fact that except
for the above phrase vyupaśamo sanskārāṇāṃ almost all words are written in Pali, the text
would be:

abhedi kāyo nirodhi saññā vedanā yattha rahimsu sabbā
vyupaśamo sanskārāṇaṃ viññāṇam attham agamā ’tī //

The underlined readings are different from the above-cited Pali text of Udāna 8.9.

III. The Edited Text of Citation No.2

Next, we shall proceed to the Citation No.2. As was mentioned above, in his commen-
tary on the MMK 25.3, Candrakīrti explains how humans transmigrate by quoting a sūtra
(Citation No.2). For the purpose of editing the text of the sūtra, let us here again refer to the
six manuscripts of the PSP, the glosses on certain words in the *Laksanañatīka and the Tibetan
translation of the cited verse, as above.

First, the following are those readings of the sūtra cited in the PSP 524.1–4:

Ms. C: yathā saṃkritena viśasamāñjñata abhyupaiti // no cāpi kośṭhagatu sā viṣūpapadyate //
evam eva bāulpagato aṅgamajñā ēṣā saṃjñāya jāpi triyate sadā abhūto iti // (156a6–7)

Ms. T: yathā saṃkritena viśasamāñjñata abhyupaiti // no cāpi kośṭhagamantu sā viṣūpapadyate //
evam eva bāulpagato aṅgamajñā ēṣā saṃjñāya jāpi triyate sadā abhūto iti // (211b3–4)

Ms. N: yathā saṃkritena viśasamāñjñata abhyupaiti / no cāpi kośṭhagatū sā viṣūpapadyate /
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evam eva bālūpagato aṅgasamāṇḍa esā saṃjñāya jāpi mriyate sadā abhūto iti // (181a4–5)

Ms. K: yathā saṃkjītena viśasamāṇḍata abhyupaiti // no cāpi koṣṭhagatu sā viṣūpapadyate // evam(m sic) eva bālūpagato aṅgamajñā esā saṃjñāya jāpi mriyate sadā abhūtā iti // (97b10–11)

Ms. O: yathā saṅkititena viśasamāṇḍita abhyupaiti no cāpi koṣṭhagatu so viṣūpapadyate // evam eva bālugato(sic) aṅgamajñā eso saṃjñāya jāyi mriyate sadābhūto iti // (103a3)

Ms. P: yatha saṃkjītena viśasamāṇḍita abhyupaiti no cāpi koṣṭhagatu so viṣu pātyate ca / evam eva bālūpagato ahumahya eso saṃjñāya jāyi mriyate ca sadā abhūto iti // (75a4)

On the above citation, the *Laksānatīkā glosses several words beginning with “yathā” (6a5)4 as follows, in which the words written in bold-faced characters correspond to the sūtra citation in the PSP:

yathā śuṃṭhīṃ viṣabuddya(sic, read -ā) bhakṣītvā maraṇātṛāsād udaragatam api pātayati / na paramārthatas tad viṣaṃ / evaṃ bāla apīti / viṣe viṣasamāṇṇitayā / ahu / aham / mahya / mama / (6a5)

“As dry ginger in the stomach, having been eaten by someone who suspected that it was poison, may well strike him down because of his fear of death though in reality it is not poison, just so a fool also [eternally is born and dies] by the notion of poison[-like ‘I’ and ‘mine’] in the [simile of] poison. Ahu means [in Sanskrit] aham or ‘I’ and mahya mama or ‘mine’.”

To the above citation in the PSP, the Tibetan translation gives the following rendering (D ’a 175a4–5, P ’a 198a5–6):

ji ltar dogs pa’i ’du shes kyi ni dug langs pa //

dug de khong du song ba med kyang brgyal bar ’gyur //
de bzhin byis pa bdag dang bdag gir khas len pa //

bdag der ’du shes yang dag min rtag skye zhiṅ ’chi ///</P /)

zhes kyang gsungs so //

(* yathā saṅkititasya viṣaṃ samajñayā abhyupaiti

no cāpi koṣṭhagatam tad viṣaṃ pātyate /

 evam eva bāla upagato ahum-mamety eso

aham iti saṃjñayā janya mriyate sadā abhūtayā //, if back-translated to Skt.)

“As poison arises by someone’s notion of fear and he is made to faint even though the poison has not got into his stomach, just so, admitting [the conception of] ‘I’ and ‘mine’, a fool eternally is born and dies by the false conception of ‘this is I’. ”

Based on the above three sources, we may suggest the text that appears nearest to Candrakīrti’s citation is as follows:

4 See Yonezawa [2010: pp. 126, 132].
As someone who, with fear, takes something mistaken to be poison may well have cause to faint even though no poison has entered into his stomach, just so, having [the conception of] 'I' and 'mine', a fool eternally is born and dies by that false conception.

This verse, then, corresponds to the Prajñāpāramitā-ratnagun. asam. caya-gāthā (hereafter abbreviated Rgs) 22.6, which has been transmitted in both recensions A and B as follows:

[Recension A: 303 verses in total, Yuyama [1976: p. 90]]:

\[
yatha śaṅkiteṇa viṣa-śaṁjñata abhyupaiti \\
no cāsyā kośṭha-gatā so viṣu pātyate ca / \\
em eva bāl’ upagato ahuma-hyā eso \\
saṁjñāya jāyi mriyate ca sadā a-bhūto //
\]

[Recension B: 302 verses in total, Obermiller [1937: p. 85]]:

\[
yatha śaṅkiteṇa viṣaśaṁjñata abhyupaiti \\
no cāsyā kośṭha-gatā so pi pātyate ca / \\
em eva bāl’ upagato ahumahyā eso \\
ahaśaṁjñī jāyi mriyate ca sadā abhūto //
\]

“As someone who suspects that he has been poisoned
May well be struck down, although no poison has got into his stomach;
Just so the fool who has admitted into himself [the notions of] I and Mine
Is forced by that quite unreal notion of an I to undergo birth and death again and again.”

(Recension B tr. by Conze [1973: p. 51]).

The above verse has so far escaped scholars’ scrutiny, including Yuyama [1970][1976] who has succeeded in identifying two stanzas of the Rgs quoted in the PSP. Therefore, if we include this new evidence that the verse found at the PSP p. 524.1–4 is a citation of Rgs 22.6, with Yuyama’s findings, it can now be said that three stanzas from the Rgs are quoted by Candrakīrti in his PSP.

As Yuyama [1973a] has determined, the Sanskrit text of the Rgs is composed exclu-
sively in the metrical form called Vasantatilakā, with 14 syllables in a quarter verse (pāda) of the form: ta-bha-ja-ja-ga-ga/ga, i.e. – – U – U – U – U – U – U (whereby – represents a long syllable, U a short syllable, and either a long or short syllable) with occasional variations.

While the above standard type was called “Type A” by Yuyama [1973a], another type of the form, which has two short syllables instead of a long one at the beginning of a pāda: U U – U – U – U – U – U, is named “Type B”. Of all 1212 pādas in recension A, 407 are composed in the standard Type A and 274 in Type B, according to Yuyama’s analysis. Each of the remaining 531 pādas is, according to Yuyama, composed of a variation of either Type A or B.7

Metrically, the above 22.6 in recension A of the Rgs is composed with a mixture of both Type A and B, pāda a being of Type B and pāda b, c, and d being of Type A.

Then, our final concern is what version of the Rgs 22.6 Candrakīrti used when he quoted it in the PSP. Taking both recensions A and B of the Rgs into consideration, of the six “better” manuscripts of the PSP, the palm leaf Ms. preserved in Potala Palace appears to closest to what Candrakīrti used. Let me first finalize the text that Candrakīrti appears to have used when he cited it from the Rgs as follows:

\[
yatha saṅkṣitenā viṣasarmanjñata abhyupeiti
\]
\[
no cāpi koṣṭhagatu so viṣu pāyate ca /
\]
\[
to m eva bāl’ upagato ahamāhya eṣo
\]
\[
saṃjñāya jāyī mriyate ca sadā abhūtā /
\]

“As someone who, with fear, takes something mistaken to be poison may well have cause to faint even though no poison has entered into his stomach, just so, having [the conception of] ‘I’ and ‘mine’, a fool eternally is born and dies by that false conception.”

The above verse is composed in the metrical form of Vasantatilakā though the underlined readings are different from those in recension A of the Rgs. The first pāda is composed in the above-mentioned Type B and the other three pādas in Type A.8 The first word “yatha” instead of “yathā” is attested in the Potala Ms. which, unlike the other five manuscripts, also rightly retains two cas, pāyate ca in pāda b and jāyī mriyate ca in pāda d. Also for meeting the metrical requirement of Vasantatilakā, “em eva” in the beginning of pāda c, the Middle-Indic form of the Skt. evam eva, seems to have been used by Candrakīrti though all the six “better” Ms. already have the latter Sanskritized form.

Using the simile of viṣasamjñā or “the misapprehension of poison”, the Rgs XXII.6 explains why and how human beings transmigrate. Here, viṣasamjñā is compared to people’s false conception of ahu-mahya or “I” and “mine”, and someone who faints by his misapprehension of poison is therein compared to one who eternally is born and dies, and goes into

---

7 See Yuyama [1973a: pp. 243–244].
8 For the double consonants “mriyate” prosodically treated as single, see Yuyama [1973b: §2.81].
transmigration upon death.

From the above discussion, we can conclude that, first, it appears that these two citations, whose origins have until now not been clearly identified, correspond to the Pali Udāna 8.9 and Rgs 22.6 respectively. Secondly, Citation No.1 most probably comes from the Pali Udāna though it contains slight differences from the present Pali text. Thirdly, we can conclude with some certainty that Citation No.2 comes from the Rgs with slight differences from both recensions A and B.

The above facts should hopefully encourage future inquiry into these two sūtra citations in the PSP as well as those readings found in the edited texts of the Pali Udāna 8.9 and Rgs 22.6.

Abbreviations

BHSG  

LVP  
La Vallée Poussin, L. de

MMK  
*Mūlamadhyamakārikā*, ed. by de Jong [1977].

PSP  
*Prasannapadā*, ed. by La Vallée Poussin [1903–1913].

Rgs  
Prajñāpāramitā-Ratnagun. asam. cayagāthā, ed. by Obermiller [1937] (= Recension B) and Yuyama [1976] (= Recension A).

References


De Jong, J. W.  


La Vallée Poussin, L. de  

MacDonald, A.  

Obermiller, E.
A Shape in the Mist


Yonezawa, Y. (米澤嘉康)


Yuyama, A. (湯山明)


2013.3.20
Professor, University of Tokyo
霧の中のかたたち
—『プラサンナパダー（明句論）』に引用される２つの経典偈—

斎藤 明

チャンドラキールティ作『プラサンナパダー（明句論）』Prasannapadāの第25「涅槃の考察」章には、校訂者のラ・ヴァレ・ブサムも完全なかたたちの校訂を断念した2つの経典引用がある。2つの経典引用は、それぞれ第1偈（涅槃の可能性をめぐる、反論者による空批判）および第3偈（ナーガールジュナによるニルヴァーナの特徴づけ）をチャンドラキールティが注釈する中で引用される。

ラ・ヴァレ・ブサムが校訂を断念した背景には、校訂者が利用した『プラサンナパダー』の3写本（カルカッタ、ケンブリッジ、パリ）が比較的新しい類似写本で、カトマンドゥ・ケーサル図書館蔵の紙写本、オックスフォード大学・ボドレー図書館蔵の貝葉写本、およびラサ・ポタラ宮殿蔵の貝葉写本等の古記の写本が発見されていなかったという事情もあり、これに加えてまた、今日では『プラサンナパダー』に対する著者の不明の貴重な複注文献も公にされ、米澤嘉康によって研究が進められている。

本研究は、『プラサンナパダー』をめぐるのような研究環境の進展と、近年におけるバリ語仏典（本稿との関連では『ウダーナ』）および初期大乗仏典（同じく『聖般若波羅蜜多寶徳蔵経』、以下『宝徳蔵経若』と略す）の研究の蓄積を踏まえ、あらためてこの2つの経典引用のテキストとその典拠を考察した。

その結果、第1の経典引用は『ウダーナ』8.9に対応するもので、現行のバーリ本と比較すると、いくつかの特徴が注目される。チャンドラキールティの引用は基本的にバーリ文であったと推定されるが、部分的にサンスクリット化され、それにまた動詞（アオリスト）表現の一文に代わって、名詞構文が採用されている事実も確認された。

第2の経典引用は『宝徳蔵経若』22.6に対応するもので、異なる系統の写本にもとづきA（湯山本）とB（オーバーミラー本）2つの校訂本が公にされるなか、基本的にVasantatilakā聖師に従い、部分的なならばA、B両校訂のいずれとも異なる読みを採用している点は注目される。本引用の典拠が確認されたことにより、『プラサンナパダー』に引用される『宝徳蔵経若』偈は、従来の研究で知られていた2つの偈の他に、新たに当該偈が加わり、総計で3偈の引用が確認されることになった。

本論文では、20近くの存在が報告される『プラサンナパダー』写本の中で、とくに重要と目される古記の3本を含む6写本をもとに、上述の複注文献およびチベット語訳を参照しながら、チャンドラキールティが引用した際の両経典のテキストの復元を試みた。本研究の成果が、今後の『プラサンナパダー』所引経典の精査とともに、典拠となった経典の再検討をうながす一つの契機となれば、本稿の主要な目的は果たされたといえよう。