

The Composition of the Pañcarakṣā (Presentation Abstract)

Sonoda Sayaka

Visiting Researcher,

The Institute of Oriental Studies, Toyo University

The Pañcarakṣā (PR) comprises five dhāraṇī, early Buddhist Tantric texts. Of these texts, those entitled *Mahāśūtavatī* (ŚV) and *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī* in the Tibetan translation differ in content from those in the Sanskrit text and Chinese translation.

While *Mahāśūtavatī* in the Sanskrit text is rendered as *dàhán lín shèng nán ná tuólúóní jīng* 大寒林聖難拏陀羅尼經 in the Chinese translation, in the Tibetan translation, it has been given the name *'phags pa be con chen po zhes bya ba'i gzungs* 聖持大杖陀羅尼 (*Ārya-mahādaṇḍa-nāma-dhāraṇī*). Despite the variation in these three ŚV titles, their content is roughly the same (hereinafter ŚV-A). However, the text entitled ŚV in the Tibetan lineage is *bSil ba'i tshal chen po'i mdo*, with content differing substantially from ŚV-A (hereinafter, ŚV-B.) This indicates that ŚV is an important sutra for purposes of differentiating between the two PR lineages.

This presentation addresses issues related to the composition of PR and the naming of its texts, covering the annotated edition of ŚV written by Karmavajra, the *Mahāśūtavatīvidyārājñī-sūtra-śatasahasraṭīkā-nāma* 明呪大妃大寒林經十萬註 (ŚVŚS). Although, as noted above, there are two separately collected dhāraṇīs recognized as ŚV, in ŚVŚS they were found to have been annotated together.

As demonstrated by Sonoda (2016), I have revealed that the relationship between ŚV-A and ŚV-B is not one between the full and abridged versions of the same text because of the major differences in the composition found through a comparative analysis of their content. It remains unknown as to why ŚV-A and ŚV-B were both recorded as ŚV in the Tibetan translation. However, at least in Karmavajra's Tibetan annotated edition from the early 11th century, both dhāraṇīs are considered ŚV, and the annotation of the content of ŚV-A expresses the core meaning of ŚV-B.

Consequently, two theories have been proposed to explain the inclusion of these two dhāraṇīs in the annotated edition of ŚV. On the one hand, the author may have combined two texts that were both considered ŚV at the given time. On the other hand, the author might have used a text in which ŚV-A and ŚV-B were not originally separated. The latter would suggest that a third ŚV text existed in addition to ŚV-A and ŚV-B, which is an area of future research that I would like to further investigate.

(This research was supported by JSPS KAKEN HI Grant-in-Aid Number JP19K12950.)

*This presentation is planned for submission to Volume 69 of JIBS (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies, Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū). Currently under review as of 7/21.