

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 PSP¹, the anonymous sub-commentarial work **Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*,² 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 *nirupadhiśeṣaṃ 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 nirodhi saṃvedanāpaṇṭhai (pathai) rahinsu(itsu) sahinsu(itsu) sac-cadhima samo sasvarāṇām vijānam arthagamed iti.* — གང་ན་ལུས་ཞིག་འདུ་ཤེས་འགལ། ཚོར་བ་ཐམས་ཅད་བྲལ་གྱུར་ཞིང་། འདུ་བྱེད་ཉེ་བར་ཞི་བ་དང་། རྣམ་པར་ཤེས་པ་ཐུབ་གྱུར་བ་ = *abhedhi kāyo vyarodhi saṃjñā sarvavedanā vyagacchat yasya, saṃskārāṇām upāsamo vijñānasyāstamgamaś cābhavat.* — འགལ་ = *vyagacchat, vyarahi* ; avec une lecture འབར་, on aurait *sarvā vedanā dahimsu.* — M. R. O. Franke me signale la stance Udāna viii.9.

*abhedhi kāyo nirodhi saññā vedanā pi ti dahamsu sabbā
vūpasamiṃsu saṅkhārā viññāṇam 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 sitiṃ dahimsu.*” (*sic, read as P and D ཞིང་)

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

*yady aśūnyam idaṃ sarvam udayo nāsti na vyayaḥ /
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?”

*aprahāṇam asaṃprāptam anucchinnaṃ aśāsvatam /
aniruddham anuṭpannam 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 Candrakīrti 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):

*yatha⁽¹⁾ śaṅkitena viśasaṃjñā abhyupaiti
no cāpi koṣṭhaga ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ (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) *koṣṭha gantu āviṣṭa papadyate.*

3) *upagato aṅgamajñaya 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 Candrakīrti 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): *abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā patthai rahinsu saccadhimasamo sasvarāṇāṃ viññānam arthagamed iti* // (154b8–9)

Ms. T(okyo University Library No.251): *abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā patthai rahinsu saccadhimasamo sasvarāṇāṃ viññānam arthagamed iti* // (209b6–210a1)

Ms. N(epal-German Manuscript Preservation Project No.1294/3): *abhedi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā panthai rahinsu saccadhimasamo sasvarāṇāṃ viññānam arthagamed iti* // (179b4–5)

Ms. K(eshar Library, used by de Jong [1978]): *ahodi kāyo nirodhi saṃvedanā patthai rahinsu saccadhipasamo samvarāṇāṃ vijñānam arthagamed iti* / (97a1)

Ms. O(xford, Bodleian Library): *abhedi kā[y]o niro[dh]i ++++++ sāmo saṅkhārāṇāṃ viroṇam(sic) arthe gamād iti* / (102a6)

Ms. P(otala Palace): *abhedi kāyo nirodhi saññā vedanā yaccha rahimsu savvā vopaśamo saṃskārāṇāṃ viññānam arthe gamedīti* / (74b4)

Furthermore, with regard to the above citation, the **Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* glosses only the first word “*abhedi*”, 3 sg. aor. pass. of √*bhid*, as *vinaṣṭam*, meaning “destroyed” (6a5).³

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

gang na lus zhiḡ ’du shes ’gags(P ’gal) // tshor ba thams cad bral gyur zhiḡ // ’du byed nye bar zhi ba dang // rnam par shes pa nub gyur pa //(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:

abhedi kāyo nirodhi saññā vedanā yattha rahimsu sabbā vyupaśamo 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-bhaviṃsu¹) *sabbā,*
vūpasamiṃsu saṅkhārā, viññāṇam attham agamā 'ti //

“The body was broken, representation became ceased, all feelings cooled, formative forces became calmed, and consciousness became extinct.”

[1) = *Udānaṭṭhakathā*, PTS p. 433; *pi 'tidahaṃsu, Udāna*, PTS p. 93]

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 saṃskārāṇāṃ* (= Pali *vūpasamo saṅkhārāṇam*) “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 BHS §32.85. The reading in the Potala Ms., *vopaśamo*, shows a partial Middle-Indic form of Sanskrit *vyupaśamo* (< *vopasamo* Middle-Indic [BHS §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 saṃskārāṇāṃ* almost all words are written in Pali, the text would be:

abhedi kāyo nirodhi saññā vedanā *yattha rahiṃsu sabbā*
vūpasamo saṅkhārāṇam viññāṇam attham agamā 'ti //

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 commentary 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 **Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* 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 saṃkitena viśasaṃjñāta abhyupaiti // no cāpi koṣṭhagatu sā viṣūpapadyate //*
evam eva bālupagato aṅgamajñā eṣā saṃjñāya jāpi triyate sadā abhūto iti // (156a6–7)

Ms. T: *yathā saṃkitena viśasaṃjñāta abhyupaiti // no cāpi koṣṭhagaṃtu sā viṣūpapadyate //*
evam eva bālupagato aṅgamajñā eṣā saṃjñāya jāpi triyate sadā abhūto iti // (211b3–4)

Ms. N: *yathā saṃkitena viśasaṃjñāta abhyupaiti / no cāpi koṣṭhagatu sā viṣūpapadyate //*

evam eva bālūpagato aṅgasamjñā eṣā samjñāya jāpi mriyate sadā abhūto iti //
(181a4–5)

Ms. K: *yathā samkitena viṣasamjñāta abhyupaiti // no cāpi koṣṭhagatu sā viṣūpapadyate //*
evam(m)(sic) eva bālūpagato aṅgamajñā eṣā samjñāya jāpi mriyate sadā abhūta iti //
(97b10–11)

Ms. O: *yathā saṅkitaina viṣasamjñāta abhyupaiti no cāpi koṣṭhagatu so viṣūpapadyate //*
evam eva bālūgato(sic) aṅgamajñā eṣo samjñāya jāyi mriyate sadābhūto iti // (103a3)

Ms. P: *yatha samkitena viṣasamjñāta abhyupaiti no cāpi koṣṭhagatu so viṣu pātyate ca /*
evam eva bālūpagato ahumahya eṣo samjñāya jāyi mriyate ca sadā abhūto iti // (75a4)

On the above citation, the **Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* 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 śuṅṭhūṃ viṣabuddya(sic, read -ā) bhakṣitvā maraṇatrāsād udaragatam api
*pātayati / na paramārthatas tad viṣaṃ / **evam bālā apīti** / viṣe viṣasamjñāyā / **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 kyis 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 zhing ’chi //(P /)
zhes kyang gsungs so //

(* *yathā śaṅkitasya viṣaṃ samjñāyā abhyupaiti*

no cāpi koṣṭhagataṃ tad viṣaṃ pātyate /

evam eva bāla upagato aham-mamety eṣo

aham iti samjñāyā 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].

*yathā(yatha) śaṅkitena⁽¹⁾ viśasaṃjñāta⁽²⁾ abhyupaiti
no cāpi koṣṭhagatu⁽³⁾ so viṣu⁽³⁾ pātyate ca /
evam eva bāl' upagato ahu⁽⁴⁾-mahya⁽⁵⁾ eṣo
saṃjñāya⁽⁶⁾ jāyi⁽⁷⁾ mriyate ca sadā abhūta⁽⁶⁾//*

[1) = Skt. śaṅkitena. 2) = Skt. -saṃjñātam, cf. Ms. O: -saṃjñīta, denom. ppp. of saṃjñā.
3) nom. sg. n. (BHS §8.30), see also the above-mentioned *Lakṣaṇaṭīkā: tad viśaṃ. 4)
= Skt. aham. 5) = Skt. mama. 6) instr. sg. f. (BHS §9.59, 64). 7) ger. (BHS §35.50)]
“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-ratnaguṇasaṃcaya-gāthā* (here-
after abbreviated Rgs) 22.6, which has been transmitted in both recensions A and B⁵ as fol-
lows:

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

*yatha śaṅkitena viśa-saṃjñāta abhyupaiti
no cāsyā koṣṭha-gatu so viṣ' upadyate ca /
em eva bāl' upagato ahu-mahya eṣo
saṃjñāya jāyi mriyate ca sadā a-bhūto //*

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

*yatha śaṅkitena viśasaṃjñāta abhyupaiti
no cāsyā koṣṭhagatu so pi pātyate ca /
em eva bālu pagato ahumahya eṣo
ahasamjñī 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.⁶ 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-

⁵ Yuyama [1976: pp. 89–90] and Obermiller [1937: p. 85]

⁶ Rgs, II.3d = PSP p. 167.4 and XX.5 = PSP p. 166.11–167.2. See Yuyama [1970] and [1976: p. xlix].

sively in the metrical form called *Vasantatilakā*, with 14 syllables in a quarter verse (*pāda*) of the form: *ta-bha-ja-ja-ga-ga/la*, i.e. – – U – U U U – U U – U – U (whereby – represents a long syllable, U a short syllable, and U 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 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 saṅkitena viśasaṃjñāta abhyupaiti
no cāpi koṣṭhagatu so viṣu pātyate ca /
e(va)m eva bāl’ upagato ahumahya eṣo
saṃjñāya jāyi 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*, *pātyate ca* in *pāda b* and *jāyi 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” Mss. already have the latter Sanskritized form.

Using the simile of *viśasaṃjñā* or “the misapprehension of poison”, the Rgs XXII.6 explains why and how human beings transmigrate. Here, *viśasaṃjñā* 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 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar*: F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol.I, New Haven, 1953, rept., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.
- LVP La Vallée Poussin, L. de
- MMK *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, ed. by de Jong [1977].
- PSP *Prasannapadā*, ed. by La Vallée Poussin [1903–1913].
- Rgs *Prajñāpāramitā-Ratnaguṇasamcayagāthā*, ed. by Obermiller [1937] (= Recension B) and Yuyama [1976] (= Recension A).

References

- Conze E. [1973] *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines and its Verse Summary*, rept., Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series no.132, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1994.
- De Jong, J. W.
[1977] *Nāgārjuna Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ*, Adyar: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.
[1978] “Textcritical Notes on the Prasannapadā”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 20, pp. 25–59, 217–252.
- La Vallée Poussin, L. de
[1903–1913] *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna, avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*, Bibliotheca Buddhica IV, St. Petersburg.
- MacDonald, A.
[2008] “Recovering the Prasannapadā”, *Critical Review for Buddhist Studies* 3, pp. 9–38.
- Obermiller, E.

- [1937] *Prajñāpāramitā-Ratna-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā*, St.Petersburg, rept., Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1992.
- Yonezawa, Y. (米澤嘉康)
- [2004] “**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*: Sanskrit Notes on the *Prasannapadā* (1)”, *Journal of Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies* 27, pp. 115–154.
- [2010] “**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*: Sanskrit Notes on the *Prasannapadā* (6)”, *Journal of Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies* 33, pp. 125–137.
- Yuyama, A. (湯山明)
- [1970] “Candrakīrti no *Prasannapadā* ni Inyōsareta *Prajñāpāramitā-Ratna-guṇasaṃcayagāthā* (*Prajñāpāramitā-Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā* Cited in Candrakīrti’s *Prasannapadā*)”, *Shūkyō Kenkyū (Journal of Religious Studies)*, no. 201 (= vol. 43-2), pp. 75–92.
- [1973a] “Remarks on the Metre of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture: Acharya Raghu Vira Commemoration Volume*, vol. 2, New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- [1973b] *A Grammar of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*, Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies in association with Australian National University Press.
- [1976] *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2013.3.20

Professor, University of Tokyo

霧の中のかたち

—『プラサンナパダー（明句論）』に引用される2つの経典偈—

齋藤 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・ブサンも完全なか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・ブサン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層の写本が発見されていなかったという事情もあった。これに加えてまた、今日では『プラサンナパダー』に対する著者不明の貴重な復注文献も公にされ、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』をめぐる以上のような研究環境の進展と、近年におけるパーリ語仏典（本稿との関連では『ウダーナ』）および初期大乘仏典（同じく『聖般若波羅蜜多宝徳蔵偈』、以下『宝徳蔵般若』と略す）の研究の蓄積を踏まえ、あらためて上記の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、現行のパーリ本と比較するとき、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パ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、されにまた動詞（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『宝徳蔵般若』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韻律に従い、部分的ながらも、A、B両校訂本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『宝徳蔵般若』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近くが存在が報告される『プラサンナパダー』写本の中で、とくに重要と目される古層の3本を含む6写本をもとに、上述の復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。