

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年報

平成30年度  
(第22号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism  
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2018

Volume XXII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2019・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2019

The *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* (ARIRIAB), published annually since 1997, contains papers on a wide range of Buddhist studies, from philological research on Buddhist texts and manuscripts in various languages to studies on Buddhist art and archaeological finds. Also, by publishing and introducing newly-discovered manuscripts and artefacts, we aim to make them available to a wider public so as to foster further research.

#### **Editors-in-chief**

Seishi Karashima (IRIAB, Soka University; skarashima@gmail.com)  
Noriyuki Kudō (IRIAB, Soka University; nkudo@soka.ac.jp)

#### **Editorial Board**

Mark Allon (Sydney)	Xinjiang Rong (Beijing)
Timothy Barrett (London)	Alexander von Rospatt (Berkeley)
Jens Erland Braarvig (Oslo)	Richard Salomon (Seattle)
Jinhua Chen (Vancouver)	Gregory Schopen (Los Angeles)
Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā (Taiwan)	Francesco Sferra (Naples)
Qing Duan (Beijing)	Weirong Shen (Beijing)
Vincent Eltschinger (Paris)	Jonathan Silk (Leiden)
Harry Falk (Berlin)	Nicholas Sims-Williams (London/Cambridge)
Gérard Fussman (Paris/Strasbourg)	Peter Skilling (Bangkok)
Paul Harrison (Stanford)	Tatsushi Tamai (Tokyo)
Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich)	Katsumi Tanabe (Tokyo)
Oskar von Hinüber (Freiburg)	Vincent Tournier (Paris)
Matthew Kapstein (Paris/Chicago)	Klaus Wille (Göttingen)
Chongfeng Li (Beijing)	Shaoyong Ye (Beijing)
Xuezhu Li (Beijing)	Yutaka Yoshida (Kyoto)
Zhen Liu (Shanghai)	Stefano Zacchetti (Oxford)
Mauro Maggi (Rome)	Peter Zieme (Berlin)
Muhammad Nasim Khan (Peshawar)	Michael Zimmermann (Hamburg)
Irina Fedorovna Popova (St. Petersburg)	Monika Zin (Leipzig)
Juhyung Rhi (Seoul)	

Manuscript submission:

Manuscripts should be submitted by e-mail to the Editors-in-chief both in PDF-format and in Rich-Text-Format (RTF).

*Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
(ARIRIAB)*

*at Soka University for the Academic Year 2018*

Vol. XXII (2019)

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報  
平成30年度（第22号）

CONTENTS

• **RESEARCH ARTICLES:**

Bhikkhu ANĀLAYO: Pārājika Does Not Necessarily Entail Expulsion	3
DHAMMADINNĀ: Soreyya/ā's double sex change: on gender relevance and Buddhist values [4 figures]	9
Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ: “[If some]one says in this connection” The usage of etthāha in Pāli commentarial literature	35
Katarzyna MARCINIAK: <i>Editio princeps</i> versus an old palm-leaf manuscript Sa: Verses in the <i>Mahāvastu</i> revisited (II)	59
Seishi KARASHIMA and Katarzyna MARCINIAK: <i>Sabhika-vastu</i>	71
Seishi KARASHIMA and Katarzyna MARCINIAK: The story of Hastinī in the <i>Mahāvastu</i> and <i>Fobenxingji jing</i>	103
Peter SKILLING and SAERJI: Jātakas in the <i>Bhadrakalpika-sūtra</i> : A provisional inventory I	125
James B. APPLE: The Semantic Elucidation (nirukta) of Bodhisattva Spiritual Attainment: A Rhetorical Technique in Early Mahāyāna Sūtras	171
LIU Zhen: An Improved Critical Edition of <i>Maitreyavyākaraṇa</i> in Gilgit Manuscript	193
LU Lu: An Analogy of Pots in <i>Dao di jing</i> 道地經 and its Sanskrit Parallel	209
Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ: A Fragment of the <i>Prasannapadā</i> in the Bodleian Library [2 figures]	213
LI Xuezhū: Diplomatic Transcription of the Sanskrit Manuscript of the <i>Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā</i>	217
Jonathan A. SILK: Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation: A Preliminary Survey	227
Mauro MAGGI: Bits and bites: the Berlin fragment bi 43 and Khotanese * <i>druṣ-</i> [2 figures]	247
Yutaka YOSHIDA: On the Sogdian articles	261
Tatsushi TAMAI: The Tocharian <i>Maitreyasamitināṭaka</i>	287
Peter ZIEME: A fragment of an Old Uighur translation of the <i>Śatapañcāśatka</i> [2 figures]	333
Isao KURITA: The Great Passing of the Buddha and Māra [7 figures]	345

M. Nasim KHAN:	
Studying Buddhist Sculptures in Context (I):	347
The Case of a Buddha Figure from But Kara III, Gandhāra [20 figures]	
Tadashi TANABE:	
Gandhāran Śibi-Jātaka Imagery and Falconry —Gandhāra, Kizil and Dunhuang— [20 figures]	359
Haiyan Hu-von HINÜBER:	
From the Upper Indus to the East Coast of China:	377
On the Origin of the Pictorial Representation of the Lotus Sūtra [8 figures]	

• **EDITORIALS:**

Contributors to this Issue

New Publications:

*Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India*, vol. II.2. *Mahāyāna Texts: Prajñāpāramitā Texts* (2).

Ed. by Seishi KARASHIMA and Tatsushi TAMAI.

The *Mahāvastu*. A New Edition. Vol. III

Ed. by Katarzyna MARCINIAK. *BIBLIOTHECA PHILOLOGICA ET PHILOSOPHICA BUDDHICA* vol. XIV, 1.

Contents of Back Issues [ARIRIAB, BPPB, BLSF, StPSF, GMNAI]

• **PLATES**

DHAMMADINNĀ: Soreyya/ā's double sex change	PLATES	1–2
P. SZÁNTÓ: A Fragment of the <i>Prasannapadā</i> in the Bodleian Library	PLATE	3
M. MAGGI: Bits and bites: the Berlin fragment bi 43 and Khotanese * <i>druṣ-</i>	PLATES	4–5
P. ZIEME: A fragment of an Old Uighur translation of the <i>Śatapāñcāśatka</i>	PLATE	6
I. KURITA: The Great Passing of the Buddha and Māra	PLATES	7–9
M. Nasim KHAN: Studying Buddhist Sculptures in Context (I)	PLATES	10–16
T. TANABE: Gandhāran Śibi-Jātaka Imagery and Falconry	PLATES	17–22
Haiyan Hu-VON HINÜBER: From the Upper Indus to the East Coast of China	PLATES	23–24

2019年3月31日発行

編集主幹 辛嶋静志・工藤順之

発行所 創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町 1-236, Tel: 042-691-2695, Fax: 042-691-4814

E-mail: [iriab@soka.ac.jp](mailto:iriab@soka.ac.jp); URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

印刷所 清水工房

〒192-0056 東京都八王子市追分町 10-4-101, Tel: 042-620-2626, Fax: 042-620-2616

Published on 31 March 2019

Editors-in-Chief: Seishi KARASHIMA and Noriyuki KUDO

Published by The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University

1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, JAPAN

Phone: +81-42-691-2695 / Fax: +81-42-691-4814; E-mail: [iriab@soka.ac.jp](mailto:iriab@soka.ac.jp); URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

Printed by Simizukobo, Co.Ltd., Hachioji, Tokyo, JAPAN

# A Fragment of the *Prasannapadā* in the Bodleian Library

Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ

## Abstract

This short paper identifies and diplomatically edits a fragment hitherto unidentified, Bodleian Library Oxford Ms. Sansk. a. 11 (R), a few lines from chapter 24 of Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā*. After briefly discussing the extraneous (tantric) material in this bundle, I collate the text with the two available editions and argue that the folio fragment might very likely be a part of the Oxford Manuscript (the so-called Ms. P).

## Keywords

Madhyamaka, Candrakīrti, *Prasannapadā*, Bodleian Library, manuscript studies.

This very short paper is, as so many things in our field, the result of serendipity and generosity. In early November of 2018, I became involved in an e-mail exchange discussing Prof. Seishi Karashima and Dr. Vincent Tournier's visit to the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Naturally, they were looking for witnesses of earlier Buddhist literature, so I suggested that they might wish to look at what I thought to be an "Abhidharmic" fragment hiding in a less than obvious place, shelf no. Ms. Sansk. a. 11 (R), described in the catalogue as "Tantric Mantras".<sup>1</sup>

I became interested in this small bundle after having read Tanaka 1995, in which he describes some of its contents as possibly hailing from the middle period of tantric Buddhism and therefore of potentially great importance. Dr. Tanaka promised a study of this text, but as far as I know this has not yet materialised. After some research of my own, I came to the conclusion that this fragment is part of an obscure corpus of texts centred on the cult of the goddess Praçaṇḍavegavatī (also called Svedāmbujā or Vidyujjvālākārāliṇī). The chief scripture, which in actual fact is a collection of three texts, can be found in a long manuscript finished on July 10th, 1024 CE. This is National Archives Kathmandu 3-359 *vi. bauddhatantra* 62, archived by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, reel no. A 47/16. I am aware of at least two more items from the literature of this cult.<sup>2</sup>

After having read the folios with the tantric material, I found that this small collection contained another fragment, which was completely unrelated to tantric literature. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Winternitz & Keith 1905, item 1456, p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> In 2015 I presented a paper dealing with this cult at the Tantric Communities in Context conference in Vienna. I wish to thank the organisers for this opportunity. I shall present my findings related to this corpus elsewhere.

catalogue and Dr. Tanaka barely acknowledge its presence and I could not identify it either back in 2009. I almost completely forgot about it until the aforementioned exchange of letters, in which I also forwarded my transcript. Dr. Tournier promptly identified it as a fragment of the *Prasannapadā* and Prof. Karashima suggested that I should publish this find. While I am very grateful to both for their kindness, I do so with some reluctance, primarily because this text is beyond the scope of my primary interests and expertise. I nevertheless hope that future editors of this section of the *Prasannapadā* might find the fragment useful. I am also very grateful to Dr. Camillo Formigatti who took photographs of the fragment at my request. This allowed me to check my initial transcript and saved me from a few blunders.

There is a good chance that this fragment is part of Bodleian Library Ms. Sansk. a. 9 (R),<sup>3</sup> in other words what is referred to as ms. P in the most recent edition of the first chapter of the *Prasannapadā*.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, at the time of writing this paper I could not visit the Bodleian Library to confirm this possibility. However, many of the features in MacDonald's description are shared by our fragment, e.g. the tripartite format of the folio and the number of lines. One such feature might prove conclusive, namely the style in which corrections are applied,<sup>5</sup> cf. n. 20 & n. 26 here. In a subsequent e-mail exchange, Dr. MacDonald very kindly confirmed that there is indeed a major lacuna in ms. P at this point, namely folios 95 and 96. Having consulted microfilm images of folios 94 *verso* and 97 *recto*, we agreed that the scribal hand of our fragment does not conclusively match with that of ms. P, however, this could be due to fact that *akṣaras* on a colour image and a black and white microfilm image might seem slightly different to the human eye. Moreover, once the *lacuna* at the beginning of the fragment has been accounted for, it seems that our fragment could indeed be a piece of folio 95 of ms. P. Preferring to err on the side of caution, I give the folio number as X. Each + sign stands for a lost or illegible *akṣara*.

The single-folio fragment is badly mutilated; only a little more than the third column is preserved. In La Vallée Poussin's edition (henceforth LVP), the corresponding passage is on p. 484, l. 7 up to p. 489, l. 7. I have also collated the fragment with the constituted text in Kishine 2001 (henceforth K), disregarding minor issues such as typographical/typesetting errors; the relevant passage is on p. 1762 (2), l. 15 up to p. 1764 (4), l. 26. I wish to thank Dr. MacDonald for providing me with a scan of this article. The string space (which is left empty in all lines) is marked here with a circle. The editions allow me to estimate that the *lacuna* at the beginning of the lines consists of approximately 80 *akṣaras*. The incorporated *kārikā* is marked in bold. Restored readings are placed in brackets. The asterisk marks a *virāma*.

[*incipit*]

[X *recto*, l. 1] [*deest*] sthitaḥ sa śro○taāpanna<sup>6</sup> ity ucyate | ta ete 'ṣṭāśītir anuśayāḥ satyānām

<sup>3</sup> Winternitz & Keith 1905, item 1440, p. 254.

<sup>4</sup> MacDonald 2015, see pp. 35–50.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 40.

<sup>6</sup> The ligature *-nna* is the result of a correction. The *ante correctionem* reading cannot be made out, but contained an *-ū*. K prints *srotāpanna* erroneously.

darśanamātreṇa bhāvanām anapekṣaiva<sup>7</sup> prahī-  
[X *recto*, l. 2] [*deest*] pratighavarjji○tās trayah | ārūpyāvacarās ca traya eta eveti daśa  
bhavanti | ete ca yathoktena nyāyena bhūmau bhūmau<sup>8</sup> navadhā nava<sup>9</sup>  
[X *recto*, l. 3] [*deest*]kleśaparakāro ○ mṛdumṛdubhyām ānantarya<sup>10</sup>vimuktimārgābhyām  
prahīyate | yāvan mṛdumṛdukleśaparakāro 'dhimātrādhimā-  
[X *recto*, l. 4] [*deest*]pratipakṣa<sup>11</sup>○vimuktimārgākhyajñānād arvāg<sup>12</sup>jñānakṣaṇāvasthita  
āryah<sup>13</sup> sakṛdāgāmiphalapratipannaka ity ucyate  
[X *recto*, l. 5] [*deest*]ārgakṣaṇā○d arvāg<sup>14</sup>jñānakṣaṇeṣu varttamāna āryo  
'nāgāmiphalapratipannaka ity ucyate | anāga<sup>15</sup>.e + .(okam) -  
[X *recto*, l. 6] [*deest*]vamakleśa○prakāraprahāṇe<sup>16</sup> vimuktimārggkṣaṇād arvāk\*kṣaṇeṣu<sup>17</sup>  
varttamāna āryo 'rhatphalapratipa + + + + + -  
[X *recto*, l. 7] [*deest*]

[X *verso*, l. 1] [*deest*]  
[X *verso*, l. 2] [*deest*]vaty abhedya○tvād avetyaprasāda<sup>18</sup>lābhena samghaḥ sa na syāt\* | na  
cet santi te 'ṣṭ(au p)uruṣ(a)pu + + + + + + + + + + -  
[X *verso*, l. 3] [*deest*] eṣa ā○ryasatyānām abhāve sati nāstīti | **abhāvāc cāryasatyānām**  
**saddharmo pi na vidyate | sa + + cāsa**<sup>19</sup>  
[X *verso*, l. 4] [*deest*]saṃbhāras ta○ddānamānasaraṇagamanādibhiś copacīyamāna<sup>20</sup>puṇya-  
saṃbhāraḥ kramād buddho bhavet\* | atha vā asati<sup>21</sup> saṃ-  
[X *verso*, l. 5] [*deest*]ty eva bhagavā○n<sup>22</sup> bhavati | saṃghe cāsati niyatam nāsti bhagavān\*  
buddhaḥ | atha vā<sup>23</sup> bhagavān apy aśaikṣe ntarbhāvāt<sup>24</sup> saṃghānta-

7. Read with LVP & K: *anapekṣyaiva*.

8. The *akṣaras -na bhūmau bhūmau* are the result of a correction, very likely that of a haplography, *i.e.* a single *bhūmau*.

9. LVP & K have *navadhā* only once. It is possible that this is the result of a haplography, and that thus here we have a superior reading (assuming that the next *akṣara* was *-dhā*).

10. K has *ānantarya*<sup>o</sup>, probably a typographical error.

11. The scribe started to write a *va*, but realised that he is running into the string space, hence he cancelled it.

12. LVP (followed by K, except interpreting *arvāg* not in compound) wished to read <sup>o</sup>*ākhyajñāna[kṣaṇā]d arvāg*<sup>o</sup>, but this witness disagrees.

13. LVP has *ārya[h]*; our witness confirms the correction. So does the Rome witness, see de Jong 1978, p. 242.

14. K prints <sup>o</sup>*vimuktimārgajñānakṣaṇād arvāg*.

15. After this a *mātrā* was probably rubbed out.

16. LVP & K have <sup>o</sup>*prahāṇa*<sup>o</sup> for <sup>o</sup>*prahāṇe*.

17. LVP & K (except *arvāg* not in compound) have *arvāgjñānakṣaṇeṣu* for *arvākkṣaṇeṣu*.

18. The *akṣara -sā-* is the result of a correction. The *ante correctionem* reading has been rubbed out. K prints *avetya pratisāda*<sup>o</sup>.

19. LVP & K have *dharme cāsati*. The *akṣaras cāsa-* (as well as the final *saṃ* in the next line) are not visible on the current photographs, because in the meantime a small part of the palm leaf has broken off and folded back on itself. I supply these from my previous transcript.

20. The *akṣara -ya-* is the result of a correction. The *ante correctionem* reading has been rubbed out. The initial correction in the lower margin (*-ya-4*) is faint but still visible. The number refers to the line number when counted from the lower margin.

21. The *akṣaras asati* are the result of a correction. The *ante correctionem* reading (possibly with *sandhi* not in *pausa*) has been rubbed out.

22. The *ā* in *bhagavān*, just before the string space, is spelt with a *dhvaja*; perhaps a correction.

23. LVP & K read only *atha*. Our fragment seems to have a slightly superior reading.

24. LVP & K read *aśaikṣāntarbhāvāt*. It is not entirely out of the question that the scribe meant the mark looking like an *-e* as a *dhvaja*. The Rome witness (90 *verso*, l. 12) agrees with our fragment, but this is not recorded in de Jong 1978. I am grateful to Prof. Jundo Nagashima for this information.

[X verso, l. 6] [deest]s tu<sup>25</sup> mahāva○stūpadiṣṭabhūmivyavasthayā<sup>26</sup> prathamabhūmisthitam  
bodhisattvam utpannadarśanamārgam vyācakṣyāṇāḥ<sup>27</sup> samghā-  
[X verso, l. 7] [deest]n\* buddhadharmasam○ghākhyāni trīṇy api durllabhatvāt\* kadācid  
evotpattiḥ | alpa<sup>28</sup>puṇyānāṅ ca tadapṛāpter<sup>29</sup> mahā-

[explicit]

### Bibliography

- Anne MacDonald, *In Clear Words: The Prasannapadā, Chapter One. Vol. I. Introduction, Manuscript Description, Sanskrit Text*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 2015.
- Jan Willem de Jong, “Textcritical Notes on the Prasannapadā”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* Vol. 20, No. 1/2 1978, pp. 25–59 and 217–252.
- Toshiyuki Kishine, “A Critical Text of Chap. XXIV “Āryasatyaparīkṣā” of *Prasannapadā* (2)”, *Fukuoka University Review of Literature & Humanities*, Vol. XXXIII No. II (No. 130), December 2001, pp. 1761–1782 (1–22).
- Kimiaki Tanaka, “Some Buddhist Tantric Manuscripts Identified during a Stay at Oxford University”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 43, No. 2, March 1995, pp. 45–49 (1008–1004).
- Vincent Tournier, *La formation du Mahāvastu et la mise en place des conceptions relatives à la carrière du bodhisattva*. École française d’Extrême-Orient; Monographies, n° 195, Paris, 2017.
- Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *Madhyamakavṛttiḥ. Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, 1903-1913.
- Moriz Winternitz & Arthur Berriedale Keith, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Vol. II*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1905.

---

<sup>25</sup> LVP reads (after correction) *madhyoddesikās ca*. K follows this solution. The adversative particle here is perhaps clearer. (For a discussion of this passage, see Tournier 2017, pp. 260 ff.) However, our initial surviving *akṣara* looks more like a *mtu* rather than a *stu*, but that reading is quite impossible.

<sup>26</sup> The *akṣaras -bhūmivya-* are the result of a correction. The *ante correctionem* reading has been rubbed out. The initial correction in the lower margin (*-mi-* 2) is faint but still visible. The number refers to the line number when counted from the lower margin.

<sup>27</sup> The second *-ā-* is the result of a correction (perhaps in a second hand). Read with LVP & K: *vyācakṣyāṇāḥ*.

<sup>28</sup> LVP & K read °*otpattito* 'lpa°.

<sup>29</sup> K prints *tadapṛapter*, probably a typographical error.

Fig. 1. Folio x, *recto*



Fig. 2. *verso*

