

Offprint from:

『創価大学・国際仏教高等研究所・年報』
平成18年度（第10号）2007年3月発行

*Annual Report of
The International Research Institute
for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2006
[= ARIRIAB], vol. X, pp. 149–170, March 2007*

YE Shaoyong 葉 少勇

A Re-examination of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* on the Basis of the
Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts from Tibet

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology

Soka University

Tokyo • 2007 • Hachioji

JAPAN

創価大学・国際仏教高等研究所

東京・2007・八王子

A Re-examination of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* on the Basis of the Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts from Tibet*

YE Shaoyong

The *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (MK), as indicated by its name, is the fundamental Sanskrit text of the Madhyamaka school. It became known to the modern world through Candrakīrti's commentary, the *Prasannapadā* (PSP), which was first edited by Chandra Das and Chandra Sastri¹ and later appeared in a better edition by Louis de La Vallée Poussin from 1903 to 1913 (LVP). One century has passed and more than a dozen new manuscripts have been discovered² and scholars such as J.W. de Jong, Christian Lindtner, Akira Saito and Anne MacDonald have made great efforts to suggest emendations to the text³. But the case of the MK is not yet ended.

Although the work was composed by Nāgārjuna as early as the 2nd or 3rd century CE, no relevant Sanskrit manuscript older than the 12th century had been found. And what is more frustrating is that all the sources are monogenic, namely, extracted from Candrakīrti's commentary. This situation remained until 2003, when some miscellaneous palm-leaves drew my attention in the process of checking the microfilms of the collection of Sanskrit manuscripts formerly preserved in the China Ethnic Library.⁴ With the help of my supervisor, Dr. Duan Qing, I was able to identify 14 folios belonging to two incomplete manuscripts (hereafter referred to as our manuscripts), among which 3 folios are from a separate copy of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (MK_{MS}) and 11 folios are from Buddhapālita's commentary

* I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai for making my stay in Japan possible. My thanks are also due to Professor Seishi Karashima for his kind support and guidance during my time at the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University. Thanks to my supervisor, Professor Duan Qing of Peking University, for the help and advice in many aspects. I am very grateful to Professors Akira Saito, Jan Nattier and Anne MacDonald who were kind enough to read through my draft and provided valuable suggestions. I am also benefited from Professor Harunaga Isaacson and Dr. Jundo Nagashima who generously afforded me some needed materials. Thanks to Professor Shoryu Katsura who provided me an opportunity to give a lecture in Ryukoku University on this topic and thanks all the participants for their insightful comments. Finally, I would like to thank Mr. Yang Zhaohua of Stanford University who took the trouble of checking my English. Needless to say, any errors that remain are my own.

¹ *Mādhyamika Vṛtti: The Philosophy of the Mahāyāna School Containing the Aphorisms of Nāgārjuna with Its Commentary of Āchārya Chandrakīrti*, Buddhist Text Society of India, Calcutta, 1894-1897.

² For the review of the *Prasannapadā* manuscripts and new discoveries see Tsukamoto 1990: 237ff.; MacDonald 2000: 166-168; Yonezawa 2005: 160.

³ Cf. dJ; de Jong 1978; Lindtner 1982a: 177-215, 1982b: 25-26 (note 79), 1988; Saito 1984: xv, 1985; MacDonald 2000: 169-171, 2007.

⁴ The original manuscripts are now kept in Tibet Museum in Lhasa, and are not accessible to me so far. The microfilms I used belong to the Research Institute of Sanskrit Manuscripts and Buddhist Literature at Peking University. For the history of these Sanskrit manuscripts see Steinkellner 2004; Hu-von Hinüber 2006.

(BP_{Ms}). I first reported on these manuscripts at the 14th Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held in London in 2005.

These 14 folios, mixed with some other palm-leaves, had been cataloged by Wang Sen as “No. 17, Sanskrit miscellaneous leaves”.⁵ No colophon or date has been found in the manuscripts. Their script, which could be called an eastern variety of the post-Gupta script, suggests a paleographical date of the 7th century. These manuscripts are not only the oldest extant Sanskrit manuscripts insofar as the Madhyamaka texts are concerned, but also mark the first time that the Sanskrit copies of an independent MK and of Buddhapālita’s commentary were found. I have provided a complete edition of MK_{Ms} and the first portion of BP_{Ms} in an article published in this same issue (Ye 2007).

In this article I will re-examine some verses of the MK on the basis of these two newly identified manuscripts, from two aspects. First, some verses require emendation. In using the word “emendation”, I assume that in these cases there were originally no differences among specific verses cited in different commentaries as reflected in different languages, and that our two manuscripts suggest better readings than those in the editions of dJ and LVP. That is to say, different commentators at their times may have had the same readings, and what is suggested here is most likely closer. As to the second aspect, things are much more complicated. It has been conjectured earlier by scholars that the Sanskrit text of the MK may have existed in different versions, given that discrepancies can be found in the same verse embedded in different commentaries.⁶ This is now confirmed by these two old manuscripts. Therefore the philological task of scholars working on the MK is no longer as simple as to pursue a “better” reading, but to draw a genealogy of its transmission. Needless to say, the task cannot be achieved only on the basis of these two manuscripts. It is not intended here to carry out a systematic study of the MK's lineage, but rather to focus on some minor points where, based on our manuscripts, some hints of the textual lineage can be traced. By doing so, I hope to shed a little light on the further study of the MK.

1. Emendations to the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*

No.	Verse	dJ	LVP	Emendations
1.1	VII.14c	<i>utpadyate tad ākhyātaṃ</i>	<i>utpadyate tathākhyātaṃ</i>	<i>utpadyate tad vyākhyātaṃ</i> (BP _{Ms})
1.2	X.9c	<i>evaṃ satīndhanaṃ cāpi</i>		<i>bhaviṣyatīndhanaṃ cāpi</i> (MK _{Ms})
1.3	XX.11c	<i>na hy adṛṣtvā na dṛṣtvāpi</i>	<i>na hy adṛṣtvā vā dṛṣtvā vā</i>	<i>na hy adṛṣtvā ca dṛṣtvā ca</i> (MK _{Ms})
1.4	XX.23d	<i>sā kathaṃ janayet phalaṃ//</i>	<i>[sā] kathaṃ janayet phalaṃ//</i>	<i>kathaṃ janayate phalaṃ//</i> (MK _{Ms})
1.5	XX.24a	<i>na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ phalaṃ</i>		<i>na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ tasmān</i> (MK _{Ms})
1.6	XXI.11b	<i>vibhavaś caiva te bhavet/</i>		<i>vibhavaś ceti te bhavet/</i> (MK _{Ms})
1.7	XXI.14d	<i>nityo 'nityo 'tha vā bhavet//</i>	<i>nityo 'nityo ['tha] vā bhavet //</i>	<i>nityo 'nityo 'pi vā bhavet//</i> (MK _{Ms})
1.8	XXI.21cd	<i>triṣu kāleṣu yā nāsti</i> <i>sā kathaṃ bhavasamṭatiḥ//</i>	<i>[triṣu kāleṣu yā nāsti</i> <i>sā kathaṃ bhavasamṭatiḥ//]</i>	<i>yā nāsti triṣu kāleṣu</i> <i>kutaḥ sā bhavasamṭatiḥ//</i> (MK _{Ms})
1.9	XXII.1d	<i>katamo 'tra tathāgataḥ//</i>		<i>katamo nu tathāgataḥ//</i> (MK _{Ms})

⁵ Wang Sen 王森, 民族圖書館藏梵文貝葉經目錄 (A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts Preserved in the China Ethnic Library), 1985. See Hu-von Hinüber 2006: 297-335.

⁶ Cf. Yamaguchi 1944; Lindtner 1982b: 26; Saito 1984: xv-xvii, 1987a, 1987b, 1995.

1.1 MK VII.14

BP_{Ms} (*notpadyamānaṃ notpannaṃ nānutpannaṃ kathaṃ cana /*)
*utpadyate tad vyākhyātāṃ gamya[māna]gatā[gat](ai)ḥ //*⁷

“The originating, the originated and the not-yet-originated do not originate whatsoever. This has been explained by [the analysis of] the being-gone-over, the gone-over and the not-yet-gone-over.”

tad vyākhyātāṃ: dJ *tad ākhyātāṃ*; LVP, Mss C, T, K *tathākhyātāṃ*; Ms R *tad yākhyātāṃ*.

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} ལྷོས་དང་མ་ལྷོས་ལྷོ་བཞིན་པ། ཇི་ལྟ་བུར་ཡང་སྐྱེད་མི་བྱེད།
སོང་དང་མ་སོང་བཞིན་པ་ཡིས། དེ་དག་རྒྱམ་པར་བཤད་པ་ཡིན།

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} ལྷོས་དང་མ་ལྷོས་ལྷོ་བཞིན་པ། ཇི་ལྟ་བུར་ཡང་མི་སྐྱེད་པ།
དེ་ནི་སོང་དང་མ་སོང་དང་། བཞིན་པ་སྐྱམ་པར་བཤད་པ་ཡིན།

The prefix རྒྱམ་པར་ found in all the Tibetan translations agrees with the prefix *vy-* in BP_{Ms}. And also in the context, the word *vyākhyātāṃ* “explained in detail” is more suitable than *ākhyātāṃ* “declared”. Ms R reads *tad yākhyātāṃ*, which seems to be a scribal error for *tad vyākhyātāṃ*.

1.2 MK X.9

MK_{Ms} *yadīndhanam apekṣ(y)āgnir agneḥ siddhasya sādha(nam /)*
bhaviṣyatīndhanam cāpi bhaviṣyati niragnikam //

“If fire exists depending on fuel, there will be an establishment of an already established fire, and fuel will exist without fire.”

bhaviṣyatīndhanam: dJ, LVP *evam satīndhanam*.

Tib. གཤམ་ཏེ་ཤིང་ལྷོས་མེ་ཡིན་ན། མེ་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་སྐྱབ་པར་འགྱུར།
བྱུང་པར་བྱ་བའི་ཤིང་ལ་ཡང་། མེ་མེད་པར་ནི་འགྱུར་པ་ཡིན།

As to this verse, the problem is not about some reading to be emended, but about how to extract the verse from the prose, i.e., where the verse starts and ends.

Thus reads LVP:

evam api /

yadīndhanam apekṣyāgnir agneḥ siddhasya sādhanam /

bhaviṣyati / yadīndhanam apekṣyāgnir bhaviṣyatīti parikalpyate ... tasmād indhanam apekṣyāgnir bhavatīti na yuktam //

api ca / yadīndhanam apekṣyāgnir bhavatīti parikalpyate /

evam satīndhanam cāpi bhaviṣyati niragnikam // 9 (LVP 207, ll. 10-19)

The underlining by de La Vallée Poussin shows his understanding of the verse. Now based on MK_{Ms}, we know that *bhaviṣyati* in LVP after pāda b is actually the beginning of

⁷ All the verses cited from MK_{Ms} and BP_{Ms} are diplomatic transcriptions. For the conventions see the end of this article.

pāda c, and *evam sati* which was taken as the beginning of pāda c is nothing but part of the prose. Probably this is because the *sandhi* occurs between *sati* and *indhanam* and the metrical feasibility is misleading. Therefore our reading of this verse can well answer the question, already posed by Saito (1984: Chapter X, note 23), why all the Tibetan translations did not put *evam sati* into the verse, yet gave an “unnecessarily long equivalent” for *indhanam*, i.e., ལུད་པར་བྱ་བའི་ཤིང་, to meet the required number of syllables.

1.3 MK XX.11

MK_{Ms} *athāvṛtaḥ phalenāsau katamaṃ* janayet phalaṃ /*
 na hy ad[rṣṭvā ca drṣṭv]ā ca hetur janaya[te] phalaṃ //

* *katamaṃ*: cf. BHS §21.11; dJ, LVP *katamaj*.

[*ca drṣṭv]ā ca*: dJ *na drṣṭvāpi*; LVP *vā drṣṭvā vā*; Ms R *ca drṣṭa ci*; Mss C, T, K *ca drṣṭā ca*.

Our reading is supported by Ms C, T and K and partly by Ms R, putting their scribal errors aside.

1.4 MK XX.23

MK_{Ms} *na ca pratyayahetūnām iyam ātmānam ātmanā /*
 yā sāmagrī janayate katham janayate phalaṃ //

“The combination of causes and conditions does not produce itself by itself. How could [it] produce a result?”

katham janayate: = Mss C, R, T, B; dJ *sā katham janayet*; LVP [*sā*] *katham janayet*.

Tib. ལྷོ་ནམས་དང་ནི་རྒྱུ་ནག་གི། ཚོགས་པ་གང་ཡིན་དེ་ཡིས་ནི།
 བདག་གིས་བདག་ཉིད་མི་རྒྱུ་དེ། འབྲས་བུ་ཇི་ལྟར་རྒྱུ་དཔར་བྱེད།

The *sā* in brackets in LVP is reconstructed to meet the required number of syllables, and dJ simply followed this. If we have *janayate* instead of *janayet*, there is no need for *sā*. Our reading is supported by all the manuscripts of the PSP that I have consulted and by all the Tibetan translations. In Tibetan the two pronouns in pāda b, namely གར and རི, were translated respectively from *iyam* in pāda b and *yā* in pāda c. There is no equivalent for another *sā*.

1.5 MK XX.24

MK_{Ms} *na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ tasmān nāsāmagrīkṛtaṃ phalaṃ //*
 asti pratyayasāmagrī kuta eva phalaṃ vinā //

“Therefore, there exists no result made by combination or made by non-combination. Without a result, where is the combination of conditions?”

na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ tasmān: dJ *na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ phalaṃ*; Saito 1985 *tasmān na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ*.

LVP ... *tasmāt / na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ phalaṃ /* (LVP 406, 1.14-15);
 Mss C, R, T, K ... *tasmān na sāmagrīkṛtaṃ phalaṃ /*;

ABh, PP_{Tib}, BP_{Tib} དེ་ལྟར་ཚོགས་པས་བྱས་པ་དང་། ཚོགས་མིན་བྱས་པའི་འབྲས་བུ་མེད། །
 འབྲས་བུ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ན། རྒྱུ་གྱི་ཚོགས་པ་གཤམ་ཡོད། །

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} དེ་ལྟར་ཚོགས་པས་བྱས་པ་མེད། ཚོགས་མིན་བྱས་པའི་འབྲས་བུ་མེད། །
 འབྲས་བུ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ན། རྒྱུ་གྱི་ཚོགས་པ་གཤམ་ཡོད། །

PG 是故果不從，緣合不合生，若無有果者，何處有合法。
 PP_{Ch} 是故果不從，緣合不合生，以果無有故，和合法亦無。
 SM 若因緣和合，所作得成者，果若無集因，即因緣不合。

LVP underlined *na sāmāgrīkṛtaṃ phalaṃ* as pāda a. Saito rightly noticed that there is དེ་ལྟར་ in all the Tibetan translations as the equivalent for *tasmāt*, but no equivalent for *phalaṃ*. So he suggested *tasmān na sāmāgrīkṛtaṃ* as pāda a, which unfortunately does not meet the metrical requirement. The word order in our manuscript solves this problem, and also shows that this sentence in PSP is not a citation in its proper order.

1.6 MK XXI.11

MK_{Ms} *drśyate saṃbhavaś caiva vibhavaś ceti te bhavet /*
(dr)śya(te) saṃ(bhava)ś c(aiva mohād vibha)va eva ca //

“If you think that rising and decaying can be seen, [it must be] because of delusion that rising is seen, and so for decaying.”

ceti: dJ, LVP, Ms C, R, T, K *caiva*.

Tib. འབྲུང་བ་དང་ནི་འཛིན་པ་དག། མཐོང་དོ་སྣང་དུ་ཁྱོད་སེམས་ན། །
 འབྲུང་བ་དང་ནི་འཛིན་པ་དག། གཉི་ལྷན་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་མཐོང་བ་ཡིན། །

Although the reading *eva* is not impossible, the word *iti* in our manuscript makes it clear that the previous sentence is the quotation of the opponent’s view; and it also fits the context better than *eva*.

1.7 MK XXI.14

MK_{Ms} *[bhā]vam abhyupapannasya śāśvatocchedadarśanam /*
prasajyate sa bhāvo hi nityo (')nity(o) (')[p]i [v](ā) [bhavet] //

“For him who asserts the existence of things, the views of eternity and annihilation will follow, because existing things are either permanent or impermanent.”

(')[p]i: dJ *'tha*; LVP [*'tha*]; Mss C, R, T, K omit this *akṣara*;

This *akṣara* is not seen in any of the manuscripts of the PSP that I have consulted. It must have been omitted in an earlier exemplar which has affected all its descendants. The word [*'tha*] is LVP’s conjecture, which was then taken over by dJ.

1.8 MK XXI.21

MK_{Ms} *e[va]ṃ tri[ṣ]v ap(i) [kāleṣu] na yuktā [bhava]santatiḥ /*
y(ā) nāsti tri[ṣu] kāle[ṣu] kutah s(ā) [bhavasam̐tatiḥ] //

“Thus the continuity of being is not reasonable in the three times.

Where is the continuity of being that does not exist in the three times?”

Pādas cd: dJ *triṣu kāleṣu yā nāsti sā katham̐ bhavasam̐tatiḥ;*

LVP [*triṣu kāleṣu yā nāsti sā katham̐ bhavasam̐tatiḥ*]; Ms C, R, T, K omit these two pādas;

Tib. རྣམ་གསུམ་དག་ཏུ་གང་མེད་པ། དེ་ནི་ཇི་ལྟར་སྲིད་པའི་རྒྱུ་།

According to all the manuscripts of the PSP that I have consulted, these two pādas are absent either because an earlier exemplar omitted them or because Candrakīrti did not cite them at all. Except for the word order and *kutah*, the reading of our manuscript is identical with de La Vallée Poussin’s reconstruction.

1.9 MK XXII.1

MK_{Ms} *skandhā na n{y}ā{na}nyah skandhebhyo nāsm̐n skandhā na teṣu saḥ /*
tathāgataḥ skandhavān na katamo nu tathāgataḥ //

“[The Tathāgata is] not aggregates, nor different from aggregates; aggregates are not in him; he is not in them. The Tathāgata does not possess aggregates. Then which is the Tathāgata?”

nu: dJ, LVP *’tra*; Mss C, R, T, B, P *tra*;

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} ལྷ་མིན་ལྷ་ལས་གཞན་མ་ཡིན། དེ་ལ་ལྷ་མེད་དེར་དེ་མེད།
དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པ་ལྷ་ལྷན་མིན། དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པ་གང་ཞིག་ཡིན།

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} ལྷ་མིན་ལྷ་ལོ་ལས་གཞན་མིན། དེ་ལ་ལྷ་མེད་དེ་དེར་མེད།
དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པ་ལྷ་ལྷན་མིན། དེ་བཞིན་གཤེགས་པ་གང་ཞིག་ཡིན།

In pāda d, there is no equivalent for *’tra*, such as དེར, in any of the Tibetan translations. The reading *’tra* found in dJ and LVP and *tra* in all the PSP manuscripts I have consulted could be the result of miscopying *nu* as in our manuscript, due to the confusion between these two *akṣaras*. In our manuscripts, which are as old as post-Gupta period, the shapes of *tra* (𑖦) and *nu* (𑖧) are different. Saito (1987b: 762-760) suggested that this verse in the Sanskrit text of the PP might have the reading *kāya* rather than *skandha*. Our manuscript does not have this reading.

2. Hints of the lineage of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*

As a first step, the text of the MK in different sources and languages can be roughly divided into two groups.

Group I, earlier commentaries:

ABh. The *Mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtṭy-akutobhayā*, written probably in the 4th century, was translated into Tibetan by Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan in the early 9th century. It is claimed in Tibetan to be Nāgārjuna's auto-commentary, but this is not plausible.

PP_{Tib}, PP_{Ch}. The *Prajñāpradīpa-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtṭi*, written by Bhāviveka (ca. 490-570) in the 6th Century, was translated into Tibetan by Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan in the early 9th century, and into Chinese by Prabhākaramitra (波羅頗蜜多羅, 565-633) in 631 CE.

BP_{Tib}. The *Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtṭi*, written by Buddhapālita (ca. 470-540) at the end of the 5th century or the beginning of the 6th century, was translated into Tibetan by Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan in the early 9th century.

PG. The *Zhonglun* 中論, written by Piṅgala (ca. 300-350), was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva (鳩摩羅什, 343-413 or 350-409) in 409 CE.

SM. The *Dasheng zhongguan shilun* 大乘中觀釋論, written by Sthiramati (ca. 510-570), was translated into Chinese by Dharmapāla (法護) and Weijing (惟淨) etc. at the beginning of the 11th century.

Group II, the PSP tradition:

LVP, PSP_{Tib}. The *Mūlamadhyamakakārika-vṛtṭi-prasannapadā*, written by Candrakīrti (ca. 600-650), was translated into Tibetan by Pa tshab Nyi ma grags (1055-?) who collaborated with the Indian scholar Mahāsumati at the close of the 11th century, and was later revised by Nyi ma grags and the Indian scholar Kanakavarman at the beginning of 12th century.

MK_{Tib}, the Tibetan translation of *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā*, was first translated by the Indian scholar Jñānagarbha and the Tibetan translator Klu'i rgyal mtshan in the early 9th century, and then was revised or retranslated to some extent in accordance with PSP_{Tib} by Nyi ma grags with some Indian scholars at the close of the 11th century and the dawn of the 12th century. This is the reason why MK_{Tib} agrees with the verses embedded in PSP_{Tib} in most cases, although a few verses escaped revision (Saito 1986).

As to group I, as was already pointed out by Saito (1987a, b, 1995), the fact that the three Tibetan translations have the identical text of the verses may be due to the fact that the translator first completed the translation of Avalokitavrata's *Prajñāpradīpaṭīkā*, and then fit the rendering of verses into the others, as some verses which are discordant with the commentary can be found in ABh, BP_{Tib} and even in PP_{Tib}. The so-called group I is thus a provisional classification and later I will also point out some divergences within it⁸. In the following seven cases, I will first deal with MK_{Ms} and BP_{Ms} as a whole and show that their readings are closer to those of group I.

⁸ This idea was originally suggested to me by Professor Akira Saito at the 14th Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held in London in 2005.

		Group I				Group II
		ABh, BP _{Tib} , PP _{Tib}	PG	PP _{Ch}	SM	LVP, PSP _{Tib} , MK _{Tib}
2.1	BP _{Ms} : VII.32	○	○	○	○	×
2.2	MK _{Ms} : X.1	○	—	—	—	×
2.3	MK _{Ms} : XVIII.2	○?	○?	○?	○?	×
2.4	MK _{Ms} : XVIII.8	○	—	—	—	×
2.5	MK _{Ms} , BP _{Ms} : XX.13, 14	○	○	—	—	×
2.6	MK _{Ms} : XXI.8	○	○	○	—	×
2.7	MK _{Ms} : XXI.20	○	—	—	—	×
2.8	MK _{Ms} : chapter IX title	×	—	×	—	×
2.9	MK _{Ms} : X.13	×	○	×	○?	×
2.10	MK _{Ms} : chapter XI title	×	∅	×	×	○
2.11	MK _{Ms} : XII.6	×	○	×	○	○
2.12	MK _{Ms} : absence of PSP XXI.5	×	—	×	○	×

○ agree ∅ partly agree × different — unclear [empty] no equivalent

2.1 MK VII.32

BP_{Ms} *na svātmanā nirodhasya nirodho na parātmanā /*
utpādasya ya[tho]tpā[do] [nā](tma)[nā na pa](rā)[tma](nā //)

“Cessation’s ceasing is not [caused] by itself nor by another [cessation], just as origination’s origin is not [caused] by itself nor by means of another [origination].”

dJ, LVP *na svātmanā nirodho ’sti nirodho na parātmanā /*
utpādasya yathotpādo nātmanā na parātmanā //

“Cessation does not exist by itself nor by means of another [cessation], just as origination’s origin is not [caused] by itself nor by means of another [origination].”

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} འགག་པ་འགག་པ་གཞན་དང་ནི། དེ་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་འགག་མི་རིགས། །
 ཇི་ལྟར་སྐྱེ་བ་རང་དང་ནི། གཞན་གྱིས་བསྐྱེད་པ་མ་ཡིན་བཞིན། །

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} འགག་པ་རང་གི་བདག་ཉིད་ཀྱིས། ཡོད་མིན་འགག་པ་གཞན་གྱིས་མིན། །
 ཇི་ལྟར་སྐྱེ་བ་རང་དང་ནི། གཞན་གྱིས་བསྐྱེད་པ་མ་ཡིན་བཞིན། །

PG 法不自相滅，他相亦不滅，如自相不生，他相亦不生。

PP_{Ch} 法不自體滅，他體亦不滅，如自體不起，他體亦不起。

SM 法不自體滅，他體亦不滅，如生不自生，他體亦不生。

As is shown above, the two groups of Tibetan translations are confirmed by the Sanskrit reading of our manuscript and that of dJ and LVP respectively.

The genitive *nirodhasya* in our manuscript accords with its parallel verse, i.e.

sthityānyayā sthiteh sthānaṃ tayaiva ca na yujyate /
utpādasya yathotpādo nātmanā na parātmanā // VII.25

“it is not possible that the duration’s enduring is [caused] by the duration itself or by means of another duration, just as origination’s origin is not [caused] by itself nor by means of another [origination].”

These two verses have the same pādas c and d, in which the genitive form is also supported by the word *utpādasya* as an analogue. In VII.32, pāda b, the word རྟོགས found in ABh, BP_{Tib} and PP_{Tib} has no equivalent in Sanskrit. It must have been understood by the Tibetan translator as having a verb to be supplied, or one that had to be carried over from VII.25, i.e., *yujyate*. In the translation of MK_{Tib} and PSP_{Tib}, this supplement is not needed for the verb *asti* is already there.

From the context we know that the topic here is how cessation ceases or more literally, cessation's ceasing (*nirodhasya nirodha*).

Candrakīrti seems to have been fully aware of this, though he had a different reading in his citation of the verse. He wrote in his commentary,

yadi nirodho nāma bhāvānāṃ nirodhaka iti kalpyate tasyedānīṃ kim anyo nirodha iṣyate uta na / (LVP 171, ll. 4-5)

“if one thinks that cessation can cause things to cease, now, is another cessation admitted as [the cause] of that [cessation] or not?”

and later,

evaṃ nirodho 'pi svātmānaṃ na nirodhayati

“thus cessation does not cause itself to cease” (*op. cit.*, p.171, ll. 11-12).

Meanwhile there are words which show that Candrakīrti must have had the reading *nirodho 'sti*, i.e.,

evaṃ na svātmanā nirodho 'sti // nirodha idānīṃ parātmanāpi nāsti / (*op. cit.*, p. 172, ll. 1-2, emendated according to de Jong 1978, p. 46)

“thus cessation does not exist by itself. Now [we will discuss the fact that] cessation also does not exist by means of another entity.”

Although the reading *nirodho 'sti* is a bit strange and not consistent with the previous verses, it is not completely wrong in meaning. The discussion here is premised on the assumption that the possibility that the characteristics of conditioned phenomena themselves be unconditioned has been eliminated.⁹ Being the characteristic of the conditioned, cessation must exist in the way that the conditioned exists, namely, it must also cease. Therefore we can say that “cessation exists” (*nirodho 'sti*) in the context here has a meaning similar to “cessation's ceasing” (*nirodhasya nirodhaḥ*), and this is also the way Candrakīrti understood it. The reading *nirodho 'sti* might originally have been a scribal error for *nirodhasya*, which was then taken over by Candrakīrti, and eventually the two readings were rendered into Tibetan translations respectively.

As far as the Chinese translations are concerned, the word *fa* 法 in 法不自相滅 “dharma do not cease by themselves” looks doubtful. But later we have a perfect explanation in PG, 滅法亦如是, 不自相滅不他相滅 “so it is for the dharma of cessation: it is neither caused to cease by itself nor by means of another”, which shows that the Chinese translations of this verse agree with our manuscript. However, it is beyond my understanding why all the Chinese translations choose the word *fa* 法 instead of directly using *mie* 滅 as in 滅不自相滅.

⁹ Cf. *yadi saṃskṛta utpādas tatra yuktā trilakṣaṇī / athāsaṃskṛta utpādaḥ katham saṃskṛtalakṣaṇam // VII.1*

2.2 MK X.1

MK_{Ms} *yadīndhanam bhaved agnir ekatvam kartṛkarmmaṇoḥ /
anyaś ced indhanād agnid (read agnir) indhanād apy ṛte bhavet //*

“If fuel were fire, agent and action would be one. If fire were different from fuel, it would exist even without fuel.”

yadīndhanam bhaved: dJ, LVP *yad indhanam sa ced*.

ABh, BP_{Tib} (PNG), PP_{Tib} གལ་ཏེ་ཤིང་དེ་མེ་ཡིན་ན། རྗེད་པ་པོ་དང་ལས་གཅིག་འགྱུར། །
གལ་ཏེ་ཤིང་ལས་མེ་གཞན་ན། ཤིང་མེད་པར་ཡང་འགྱུར་བར་འགྱུར། །

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib}, BP_{Tib} (DC) རྗེད་ཤིང་གང་དེ་མེ་ཡིན་ན། རྗེད་པ་པོ་དང་ལས་གཅིག་འགྱུར། །
གལ་ཏེ་ཤིང་ལས་མེ་གཞན་ན། ཤིང་མེད་པར་ཡང་འགྱུར་བར་འགྱུར། །

PG 若然是可然，作作者則一，若然異可然，離可然有然。

PP_{Ch} 若火即是薪，作者作業一，若火異於薪，離薪應有火。

SM 若火即是薪，作作者一性，若薪異於火，離薪應有火。

As is shown above, although the meaning does not differ, the reading *yad* in dJ and LVP has its equivalent, i.e., གལ, only in MK_{Tib} and PSP_{Tib}, but not in ABh, BP_{Tib} and PP_{Tib}. As to the Chinese translations, since the pronoun is absent and the word *ruo* 若 can be translated either from *yadi* or from *ced*, it is not clear from which Sanskrit text they were translated.

It is interesting to note that the readings found in BP_{Tib} as a whole may be divided into two groups of editions, i.e., P, N, G and D, C. The original reading must be preserved in P, N and G because ABh, PP_{Tib} and BP_{Tib} have the same translator. Thus we can imagine that BP_{Tib} must have been proofread against MK_{Tib} or PSP_{Tib} and revised when the Derge edition was compiled, while this does not seem to have happened to the other two Tibetan translations.

2.3 MK XVIII.2

MK_{Ms}: *ātmany asati cātmīyaṃ kuta eva bhaviṣyati /
nirmamo nirahaṃkāraḥ śamād ātmātmanīyayoḥ //*

“When self does not exist, from where would mine arise? Because of the appeasement of self and mine, unselfishness and non-egotism arise.”

ātmātmanīyayoḥ: dJ, LVP *ātmātmanīyayoḥ*.

Tib. བདག་ཉིད་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ན། བདག་གི་ཡོད་པར་གལ་འགྱུར། །
བདག་དང་བདག་གི་ཞི་བའི་ཕྱིར། །རར་འཛིན་པ་ཡིར་འཛིན་མེད་འགྱུར། །

PG 若無有我者，何得有我所，滅我我所故，名得無我智。

PP_{Ch} 我既無所有，何處有所，無我無我所，我執得永息。

SM 若或無有我，我所當何有，無我無我所，我我所即滅。

In pāda d, the word *ātmanīya* found in our manuscript and *ātmanīna* in PSP refers to the *ātmanīya* mentioned in pāda a, and its equivalent word in all the Tibetan and Chinese

translations is the same as that of *ātmīya*, i.e., བདག་གི་ and *wo suo* 我所. For the sake of the metre, a synonym of *ātmīya* with one more syllable was required. *Ātmanīya*, as seen in our manuscript, has the same meaning as *ātmīya*, “one’s own”,¹⁰ while *ātmanīna*, which is found in PSP, means “beneficial to oneself” (cf. Lindtner 1988: 246, ll. 12-14). The word *ātmanīna* is explained in *Pāṇini* V.1.9 as the stem *ātman* plus a *taddhita* affix *kha* (*īna*). The meaning of this affix is stated in *Pāṇini* V.1.5 as *tasmai hitam*, “beneficial to that”. According to Buddhist terminology, the term *ātmīya* refers to what is mine, namely, one’s possessions, and they are not necessarily beneficial to oneself.¹¹ So the reading *ātmanīna* seems to be a mere scribal error. But what is more interesting is that Candrakīrti wrote in his commentary:

ātmani hitam ātmanīnaṃ skandhapañcakam ātmīyam ity arthaḥ / (LVP 347, l. 13)

“*ātmanīna* means beneficial to oneself. It refers to the [body] consisting of five aggregates, namely, [what is] mine (*ātmīya*)”.

It appears that the text in Candrakīrti’s hand may have already been changed into *ātmanīna*. His explanation, *ātmani hitam*, which is close to *Pāṇini* V.1.5, is certainly correct. But the association he made with *ātmīya* is hardly acceptable. To the best of my knowledge, except for this instance, the word *ātmanīna* never means *ātmīya*. Candrakīrti might also have thought this word was strange and needed clarification. As reflected in the Tibetan translations, however, the authors of the other commentaries appear to have no such sense of obligation. A daring guess could be that the text in their hands may have read *ātmanīya* rather than *ātmanīna*.

2.4 MK XVIII.8

MK_{Ms} *sarvvan tathyaṃ na vā tatthyaṃ tathyaṃ cātatthyaṃ eva ca /
naivātatthyaṃ naiva tathya{ṃ}m etat tad buddhaśāsanam //*

“Everything is real; or not real; or both real and not real; or neither not real nor real. This is the teaching of the Buddha”.

etat tad buddhaśāsanam: dJ, LVP *etat buddhānuśāsanam*.

ABh, BP_{Tib} (PNG), PP_{Tib} བཅས་ཅད་ཡང་དག་ཡང་དག་མིན། ། ཡང་དག་ཡང་དག་མ་ཡིན་ཉིད། །
ཡང་དག་མིན་མིན་ཡང་དག་མིན། ། དེ་ནི་སངས་རྒྱལ་བསྟན་པའོ། །

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib}, BP_{Tib} (DC) བཅས་ཅད་ཡང་དག་ཡང་དག་མིན། ། ཡང་དག་ཡང་དག་མ་ཡིན་ཉིད། །
ཡང་དག་མིན་མིན་ཡང་དག་མིན། ། དེ་ནི་སངས་རྒྱལ་ཇེས་བསྟན་པའོ། །

¹⁰ Cf. ... *te pi śāriputra dharmā jātā bhūtā saṃskṛtā vedayitā pratītya samutpannā naivātmā naivātmanīyā sūnyā ātmena vā ātmanīyena vā* // (MV, 3, p. 66, ll. 7-8); *nāme ca rūpe ca asaktamānasah samāhitas so hi sudāntacittaḥ yasyeha ātmā na ca ātmanīyā-m-etāvata śīlas[thi]to nirucyate* • (KP, 2002, p. 48, ll. 4-8 = 1926, p. 198, ll.1-4).

¹¹ Cf. T1579, 30.628a10-13, 瑜伽師地論：薩迦耶見及邊執見，若於樂俱行蘊觀我我所，或觀為常，喜根相應；若於苦俱行蘊觀我我所，或觀為常，憂根相應；若於捨俱行蘊觀我我所，或觀為常，捨根相應。 “If those who have the view of existence of the body and the view of attachment to extremes, observe self (*ātman*) and mine (*ātmīya*) in the conditioned and the aggregates which co-exist with pleasure, and observe them as permanent, [their views] will correspond to the root of satisfaction. If they observe self and mine in the conditioned and the aggregates which co-exist with suffering ... [their views] will correspond to the root of sorrow...”

The prefix *anu-* in LVP and dJ has its exact equivalent in MK_{Tib} and PSP_{Tib}, i.e., ཇེས, whereas the absence of ཇེས in ABh, BP_{Tib} (PNG) and PP_{Tib} is confirmed by our manuscript. Again here BP_{Tib} of Derge and Cone edition was revised to be consistent with MK_{Tib} or PSP_{Tib}.

As to the word *anusāsana* (accordant teaching) or *sāsana* (teaching), these commentaries explain it as follows:

ABh:

འདིས་སློབ་མའི་ཚོགས་རྣམ་པ་མང་པོ་དག་ལ་དབང་པོ་དང་བསམ་པ་དང་བག་ལ་ཉལ་དང་དུས་གྱི་དབང་གིས་མཐོ་རིས་དང་བྱང་སྲོལ་གྱི་ལམ་ལྟེན་
ཅི་མ་ལོག་པར་ཇེས་སུ་སློབ་པས་བསྟན་པ་ལོ། (D tsa 71b5-6)

“For the numerous disciples, according to [their] faculties, dispositions, dormant afflictions and the occasions, he (the Buddha) teaches the path to heaven and salvation accordingly without error. This is the [Buddha’s] teaching.”

PP_{Tib}:

བསྟན་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་ལྷ་དང་། མིའི་མཐོ་རིས་དང་། བྱང་སྲོལ་གྱི་བདེ་བ་འདོད་པ་རྣམས་ལ། དབང་པོ་དང་། བསམ་པ་དང་། བག་ལ་ཉལ་དང་། དུས་
གྱི་དབང་གིས་མཐོ་རིས་དང་། བྱང་སྲོལ་གྱི་ལམ་ལྟེན་ཅི་མ་ལོག་པར་ཇེས་སུ་བསྟན་པ་ལོ། (D tsha 189b5-6)

“The ‘teaching’ means, to those who desire the pleasure of heaven and salvation belonging to the celestial beings and human beings [respectively], according to [their] faculties, dispositions, dormant afflictions and the occasions, [the Buddha] teaches the path to heaven and salvation accordingly without error.”

BP_{Tib}: no explanation of this word.

PSP:

*etac ca buddhānām bhagavatām anusāsanam / ... evam anupūrvyā śāsanam anusāsanam /
vineyajanānurūpyeṇa vā śāsanam anusāsanam /* (LVP 371, l. 13-14).

འདི་ནི་སངས་རྒྱལ་བཅོམ་ལྷན་འདས་གྱིས་ཇེས་སུ་བསྟན་པ་སྟེ། ... དེ་ལྟར་མཐར་གྱིས་སློབ་པ་ནི་ཇེས་སུ་སློབ་པ་ལོ། །ཡང་ན་གདུལ་བྱའི་སློབ་དོན་
འཚམ་པར་སློབ་པ་ནི་ཇེས་སུ་སློབ་པ་ལོ། (D 'a 119b6)

“This is the Buddha’s, the blessed one’s accordant teaching. ... Thus the teaching according to the grade is the accordant teaching (*anusāsanam*), or the teaching corresponding with the people to be instructed is the accordant teaching.”

As is shown above, ཇེས་སུ་བསྟན་པ་ (*anusāsana*) or ཇེས་སུ་སློབ་པ་ (*anu-√śās*) is the expression which ABh and PP_{Tib} used to explain བསྟན་པ་ (*sāsana*). Maybe due to this explanation, the prefix *anu-* was eventually introduced into the verse, as it appears in PSP, and is confirmed by Candrakīrti’s commentary.

As to the expression of *etat tad* in our manuscript, it is also attested in MK XVIII.11, *Acintyastava* 52 and *Buddhacarita* XII.65¹².

2.5 MK XX.13, 14

MK_{Ms}, BP_{Ms} *nājātasya hi* ajātena phalasya saha hetunā /
nātītena na jātena saṃgatir jātu vidyate // XX.13*

* *nājātasya hi*: MK_{Ms} *nājātasypy*.

¹² MK XVIII.11: *anekārtham anānārtham anucchedam aśāsvatam / etat taḥ lokanāthānām buddhānām
śāsanāmrtam//*(dJ 25, LVP 377). *Acintyastava* 52: *etat tat paramam tattvam niḥsvabhāvārthadeśanā /
bhāvagrahagrhītānām cikitsyam anuttarā //* (Lindtner 1982b: 156). *Buddhacarita* XII.65: *etat tat paramam
brahma nirlīṅgam dhruvam akṣaram / yan mokṣa iti tattvajñāḥ kathayanti manīṣiṇaḥ //* (E. H. Johnston, *The
Buddhacarita: or, the Acts of the Buddha*, Panjab University Oriental Publications No. 31, Calcutta: Baptist
Mission Press, 1935, p.101).

“Because no combination is found of an unborn result with an unborn cause, nor with a past [cause], nor with a present [cause].”

*na jātasya hi jātena phalasya saha hetunā /
nājātena na naṣṭena saṃgatir jātu vidyate // XX.14*

“Because no combination is found of a present result with a present cause, nor with an unborn [cause], nor with a [cause] that has perished.”

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} *na jātasya hy ajātena phalasya saha hetunā /
nātītena na jātena saṃgatir jātu vidyate // XX.13*

“Because no combination is found of a present result with an unborn cause, nor with a past [cause], nor with a present [cause].”

*nājātasya hi jātena phalasya saha hetunā /
nājātena na naṣṭena saṃgatir jātu vidyate // XX.14*

“Because no combination is found of an unborn result with a present cause, nor with an unborn [cause], nor with a [cause] that has perished.”

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} འབྲས་བུ་མ་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་མ་སྐྱེས། འདས་པ་དང་ནི་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་། །
ལྷན་ཅིག་སྤང་པར་འགྱུར་བ་ནི། ནམ་ཡང་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། ། XX.13
འབྲས་བུ་སྐྱེས་པ་ཀྱི་སྐྱེས་དང་། མ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་འདས་པ་དང་། །
ལྷན་ཅིག་སྤང་པར་འགྱུར་བ་ནི། ནམ་ཡང་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། ། XX.14

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} འབྲས་བུ་སྐྱེས་པ་ཀྱི་མ་སྐྱེས། འདས་པ་དང་ནི་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་། །
ལྷན་ཅིག་སྤང་པར་འགྱུར་བ་ནི། ནམ་ཡང་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། ། XX.13
འབྲས་བུ་མ་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་སྐྱེས་དང་། མ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་འདས་པ་དང་། །
ལྷན་ཅིག་སྤང་པར་འགྱུར་བ་ནི། ནམ་ཡང་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། ། XX.14

PG 若言未來因，而於未來果，現在過去果，是則終不合。 XX.13
若言現在因，而於現在果，未來過去果，是則終不合。 XX.14

As to these two verses, our manuscripts share the the same pādas b, c and d with LVP and dJ, but have the reversed pāda a. These two verses in dJ and LVP agree with those in MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib}, while our readings agree with ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} and PG. Two other Chinese translations from group I, PP_{Ch} and SM, appear to have rearranged these two verses which made a comparison impossible.

2.6 MK XXI.8

MK_{Ms} *sambhavaṃ vibhavaṃ caiva vinā bhāvo na vidyate /
(sambhavo vibhavaś caiva) vinā bhāvān* na vidyate //*

* bhāvān: abl.

“No thing exists without rising and decaying, and also no rising and decaying exist without a thing.”

dJ, LVP *sambhavo vibhavaś caiva vinā bhāvaṃ na vidyate /*
sambhavaṃ vibhavaṃ caiva vinā bhāvo na vidyate //

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} འགྲུང་དང་འཇིག་པ་མེད་པར་ནི། དངོས་པོ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ།
དངོས་པོ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་པར། འགྲུང་དང་འཇིག་པ་ཡོད་པ་ཡིན།

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} དངོས་པོ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་པར། འགྲུང་དང་འཇིག་པ་ཡོད་པ་ཡིན།
འགྲུང་དང་འཇིག་པ་མེད་པར་ནི། དངོས་པོ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ།

PG 若離於成壞，是亦無有法，若當離於法，亦無有成壞。

PP_{Ch} 若離彼成壞，則無有物體，是成壞二法，離物體亦無。

Compared with PSP, our manuscript has reversed the order of pādas ab and cd. ABh, PP_{Tib}, BP_{Tib}, PG and PP_{Ch} follow the same pāda order as our manuscript, while MK_{Tib} and PSP_{Tib} follow the order of dJ and LVP. No equivalent verse is found in SM.

2.7 MK XXI.20

MK_{Ms} *na cen niruddhyamānaś ca jāyamānaś ca vidyate /*
sārdhdhaṃ ca yeṣu mriyate teṣu skandheṣu jāyate //

“[Such a case] is not found that ceasing and rising occur together. [If so] the aggregates where [one] dies will be that where [one] arises?”

dJ, LVP *na cen nirudhyamānaś ca jāyamānaś ca yujyate /*
sārdhaṃ ca mriyate yeṣu teṣu skandheṣu jāyate //

“It is not reasonable that ceasing and rising occur together. [If so] the aggregates where [one] dies will be that where [one] arises?”

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} གལ་ཏེ་འགག་བཞིན་སྐྱེ་བཞིན་དག། ལྷན་ཅིག་སྐྱོར་བའང་ཡོད་མིན་ན།
སྤང་པོ་གང་ལ་འཚི་འགྱུར་བ། དེར་ནི་སྐྱེ་བའང་འགྲུང་བར་འགྱུར།

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} གལ་ཏེ་འགག་བཞིན་སྐྱེ་བཞིན་དག། ལྷན་ཅིག་ཏུ་ཡང་རིགས་མིན་ན།
སྤང་པོ་གང་ལ་འཚི་འགྱུར་བ། དེ་ལ་སྐྱེ་བ་འགྲུང་འགྱུར་རམ།

The word *vidyate* found in our manuscript agrees with ཡོད in ABh, PP_{Tib} and BP_{Tib}, while the reading *yujyate* in dJ and LVP is confirmed by རིགས in MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib}. This discrepancy is not reflected in Chinese translations.

As to the second step, in the following five cases I will discuss discrepancies found between MK_{Ms} and the commentaries of group I.

2.8 The title of chapter IX

Before entering upon a comparison of the chapter titles, let me remark that the identical chapter titles found in ABh, BP_{Tib} and PP_{Tib} may again be due to the fact that the translator first completed one rendition, and then fit the titles into the others. In BP_{Ms} the title of chapter

XIII is *(śū)nya[tāparī](k)[ṣā]*, whereas in BP_{Tib} it is དེལོ་ན་ཉིད་བརྟགས་ (= *tattvaparikṣā*), the same as ABh and PP_{Tib}. In LVP it is *samskāraparikṣā* (= PSP_{Tib} འདུ་བྱེད་བརྟགས་).

MK_{Ms} (v)[y](a)[va]sthitaparikṣā; LVP, Mss C, R, T, K *pūrvaparikṣā*; Ms P *pūrvasthitaparikṣā*;

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} ལྷོ་ལོ་ན་གནས་པ་བརྟགས་ (= *pūrvasthitiparikṣā*); ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} ཉེ་བར་ལེན་པ་ལོ་
དང་ཉེ་བར་སྒྲུབ་པ་བརྟགས་ (= *upādātrupādānaparikṣā*);

PG 觀本住; PP_{Ch} 觀取者 (= *upādātṛparikṣā*); SM 觀先分位。

It is difficult to decide whether *benzhu*本住 in PG was translated from *vyavasthita*, as in PG IV. 2, 3, 4 (where *vyavasthita* was rendered as *benzhu*本住), or from *pūrva*, as in PG IV. 6, 7 (where *pūrva* corresponds to 本住), or rather from *pūrvasthiti* as in Ms P. The same confusion occurs with the rendering of *xianfenwei*先分位 in SM. But it is certain that the title of chapter IX in MK_{Ms} is completely different from that in ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} and PP_{Ch}, namely, ཉེ་བར་ལེན་པ་ལོ་དང་ཉེ་བར་སྒྲུབ་པ་ and *guanquzhe* 觀取者。

2.9 MK X.13

MK_{Ms} *āgacchaty anyato nāgnir indhane (')g[n]ir na vidyate /
athendhanam(←tathedhanam) śeṣam uktaṃ gamyamānagatāgatāiḥ //*

“Fire does not come from another thing. In fuel fire is not found.

The same [goes for] fuel. The remaining [statements] have been explained by [the analysis of] the being-gone-over, the gone-over and the not-yet-gone-over.”

athendhanam: dJ, LVP, Mss C, R, T, K *atrendhane*.

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} མི་ནི་གཞན་ལས་མི་འོང་སྟེ། ཤིང་ལའང་མི་ནི་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན། །
སོང་དང་མ་སོང་བཞོམ་པ་ཡིས། དེ་བཞིན་ཤིང་ལ་ལྷག་མ་བསྟན། །

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} མི་ནི་གཞན་ལས་མི་འོང་སྟེ། ཤིང་ལའང་མི་ནི་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན། །
དེ་བཞིན་ཤིང་གི་ལྷག་མ་ནི། སོང་དང་མ་སོང་བཞོམ་པས་བསྟན། །

PG 然不餘處來，然處亦無然，可然亦如是，餘如去來說。

PP_{Ch} 火不餘處來，薪中亦無火，如薪餘亦遮，去來中已說。

SM 火不餘處來，薪中亦無火，餘法亦復然，如去來品說。

Although in PSP_{Tib} the translation of the verse itself suggests the reading *tathendhane* “likewise concerning fuel”, Candrakīrti’s commentary seems to support the reading *atrendhane* “concerning this fuel”:

*agninendhanam dahyamānam upalabhyata ity atrendhanaprastāve śeṣam dūṣaṇam
gamyamānagatāgatadūṣaṇena samam veditavyam / (LVP 211, ll. 8-9)*

“Against this topic of fuel saying that fuel being burned by fire is perceived, the remaining refutations should be known as the same as that of the being-gone-over, the gone-over and the not-yet-gone-over.”

We may conclude that the original Sanskrit text of this verse in PSP indeed read *atrendhane*,

and that its Tibetan translator, Nyi ma grags, simply accepted the rendering དེ་བཞིན་ (= *tathā*) he found in ABh, BP_{Tib} and PP_{Tib}, failing to make it consistent with Candrakīrti's commentary, as happened in the case of II.2 and VII.16 etc (cf. Saito 1984: chapter X, note 37, 1987a, 1995). The reading *atha* in our manuscript may indicate how the reading changed from *tathā* to *atha* and eventually to *atra*.

All the Commentaries other than PSP appear to have had the reading *tathā*, as confirmed by both the renditions of the verse and the commentaries. As far as the case ending for *indhana* is concerned, however, they can further be divided into two groups. The reading *indhanaṃ* suggested by our manuscript is supported by PG and probably SM as well, while the reading *indhane* is confirmed by ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} and PP_{Ch}.

PG:

然不餘處來，然處亦無然。可燃亦如是，餘如去來說。

然不於餘方來入可燃中，可燃中亦無然。析薪求然不可得故。可燃亦如是，不從餘處來入然中，然中亦無可燃。如然已不然，未然不然，然時不然，是義如去來中說。(PG 963-964)

“Fire does not come from another place. In fuel there is no fire. The same [goes for] fuel. The remaining [statements] have been explained by [the analysis of] going.

Fire does not come from another place and enter fuel, and in fuel there is no fire, because fire is not to be found by investigating fuel. The same [goes for] fuel. [It] does not come from another place and enter fire, and in fire there is no fuel. Just as the burned is not to be burned, the not-yet-burned is not to be burned and the being-burned is not to be burned, this has been explained in [the chapter] of going.”

As we can see both from the rendition of the verse and the comment by Piṅgala, pādas c and d were understood as two sentences. One is *tathendhanam*; the other is *śeṣam uktaṃ gamyamānagatāgatāiḥ*. This can happen only when the reading is *tathendhanam*. If it is read *tathendhane*, the only way left to us to understand pādas c and d is that taken by ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} and PP_{Ch}, i.e., to deem it as one sentence, “likewise concerning fuel the remaining [statements] have been explained by [the analysis of] the being-gone-over, the gone-over and the not-yet-gone-over”.

ABh, BP_{Tib}:

སོང་དང་མ་སོང་བཞིན་པ་ཡིས། དེ་བཞིན་ཤིང་ལ་ལྷག་མ་བསྟན།

རྣམ་པ་དེ་དག་གིས་དེ་བཞིན་དུ་བུད་ཤིང་ལ་ཡང་བརྗོད་པ་ལྷག་མ་དག་བསྟན་པར་ཁོང་དུ་ཚུད་པར་བྱའོ། (D tsa 54b6-7; D tsa 208a6-7)

“By [the analysis of] the gone-over, the not-yet-gone-over and the being-gone-over, likewise, the remaining [statements] on fuel have been explained.

It should be understood that in these ways the remaining statements on fuel have likewise been explained.”

PP_{Tib}:

སོང་དང་མ་སོང་བཞིན་པ་ཡིས། དེ་བཞིན་ཤིང་ལ་ལྷག་མ་བསྟན།

ཇི་ལྟར་རྗེས་སུ་དཔག་པ་ལས་སོང་བ་དང་མ་སོང་བ་དང་། བཞིན་པ་ལ་འགྲོ་བ་མེད་པ་དེ་བཞིན་དུ་བསྟེན་པ་དང་། མ་བསྟེན་པ་དང་། སྟེན་བཞིན་པ་ལ་ཡང་སྟེན་པ་མེད་དེ། ... (D tsha 135b2-3)

“By [the analysis of] the gone-over, the not-yet-gone-over and the being-gone-over, likewise the remaining [statements] on fuel have been explained.

Just as one infers that there is no going in the gone-over, the not-yet-gone-over and the being-gone-over, likewise there is no burning in the burned, the not-yet-burned and the being-burned”

PP_{Ch}:

如薪餘亦遮，去來中已說。

釋曰：如第一義中已去，未去，去時無去，已燒，未燒，燒時無燒義亦如是。(PP_{Ch} 86a13-15).

“Like fuel, others are also to be denied. [This] has been explained in the chapter of going.

Just as one can deduce¹³ that there is no going in the gone-over, the not-yet-gone-over and the being-gone-over, likewise there is no burning in the burned, the not-yet-burned and the being-burned.”

In SM the matter is rather confused.

火不餘處來 … 薪中亦無火。

釋曰：離火亦無差別因性，彼火因果無異性火故。此應思擇。又復能取發起所得，彼即不有，是故無別異性薪從餘處而來至火，亦非無火。故下頌言

餘法亦復然，如去來品說。¹⁴ (K 41.131b7-c10; 卍正藏 49. 97b20-98a17)

“Fire does not come from another place ... In fuel there is no fire.

Commentary: apart from fire there is no distinct cause (i.e., fuel), because [in] the cause and effect of the fire, there is no fire of a different nature. One should consider in this way. Moreover, if the agent (i.e., fuel) has produced an effect (i.e., fire), it will no longer exist. Therefore no fuel of a different nature comes from another place and reaches fire, and it is not the case that there is no fire.

The same [goes for] the other things. They have been explained in the chapter of going”

Due to the poor quality of the translation, the commentary of Sthiramati is not always intelligible, and my above English translation is thus very tentative. But the analysis (underlined) of pāda b might imply something. The context here is the discussion of the relation between cause and effect represented by fuel and fire respectively. Thus 離火亦無差別因性 “apart from fire there is no distinct cause (i.e., fuel)” looks like a paraphrase of “fuel does not come from another place”, and 能取發起所得，彼即不有 “if the agent (i.e., fuel) has produced an effect (i.e., fire), it will no longer exist.”, a paraphrase of “in fire there is no fuel”. This is exactly the explanation of *tathendhanam* and same as the understanding of Piṅgala! It is also confirmed by the conclusion, 是故無別異性薪從餘處而來至火，亦非無火 “Therefore no fuel of a different nature comes from another place and reaches fire, and it is not the case that there is no fire”, although the final part of the sentence is intelligible. Hence a daring hypothesis would be that here Sthiramati might have cited pāda b followed by *tathendhanam*, which is unfortunately not reflected in the rendition of the verse. If this is the case, the reading of our manuscript is also supported by SM. Based on the knowledge now available, however, this conclusion must remain speculative.

Therefore, as to this verse, the different Sanskrit readings in the hands of different commentators might be as follows:

PSP: *atrendhane*;

PG, SM(?): *tathendhanam*;

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib}, PP_{Ch}: *tathendhane*.

2.10 The title of chapter XI

MK_{Ms} *pūrvvāpa[ra]koṭiparī[kṣā]* = LVP, Mss C, R, T, K, P;

MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} ལྷོན་དང་བྱི་མའི་མཐའ་བརྟགས་;

ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} བཞོན་བ་བརྟགས་;

PG 觀本際 (= *pūrvakoṭiparīkṣā*); PP_{Ch}, SM 觀生死 (= *saṃsāraparīkṣā*).

¹³ Also in other places of PP_{Ch}, the word *diyiyi* 第一義 is used by Prabhākaramitra as the equivalent for ལྷོན་ལུ་དབུགས་ (= *anumāna*).

¹⁴ The Chinese text continues as follows: 釋曰：若或無薪，云何得有能燒所燒？若有所燒時，非無能燒，亦無能燒中有能燒發起。若有能燒時，非無所燒，是故無能燒所燒亦非相離。 This offers no help, however, to our current topic.

Here our reading is identical to LVP, MK_{Tib} and PSP_{Tib}, and agrees with PG except that the reading *apara* has no equivalent, but completely differs from ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} and SM.

2.11 MK XII.6

MK_{Ms} *[para]pud(g)alajaṃ duḥkhaṃ yadi kaḥ parapudgalaḥ /
vinā (du)[hkkhena] yaḥ kṛtvā (paras)m[ai prahiṇoti] (ta)[t]//*

This verse appears in dJ, LVP, MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib}, PG and SM, but is absent in ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib} and PP_{Ch}.

2.12 PSP XXI. 5

dJ, LVP *saṃbhavo vibhavaṇaiva kathaṃ saha bhaviṣyati /
na janma maraṇaṃ caiva tulyakālaṃ hi vidyate //*
“How could rising be together with decaying?
For birth and death are not found at the same time.”

This verse, which appears in dJ and LVP as XXI. 5, is found in all the Tibetan translations and PP_{Ch}, but absent in our manuscript MK_{Ms}. The content of this verse is related to PSP XXI.3,

*saṃbhavenaiva vibhavaḥ kathaṃ saha bhaviṣyati /
na janma maraṇaṃ caivaṃ tulyakālaṃ hi vidyate //*
“How could decaying be together with rising?
For birth and death are not found at the same time.”

PG seems to have merged these two verses into one, as the 3rd verse of this chapter:

成壞共有者，云何有成壞，如世間生死，一時俱不然
“If rising and decaying exist together, how could there be rising and decaying?
Just as it is not tenable that in the world birth and death are together at the same time.”

This is also confirmed in the commentary of PG. Both *gong cheng you huai* 共成有壞 “decaying exists together with rising” and *gong huai you cheng* 共壞有成 “rising exists together with decaying” are explained. But it seems impossible that a Sanskrit verse could have combined these two aspects, because it would have disrupted the metre. It can not be determined whether the Sanskrit text of Piṅgala had one of these two verses or both.

In SM, There is no verse equivalent to PSP XXI. 5, but instead a rather unintelligible verse is found:

若離成有壞，云何當可得，亦如生與死，非同時而有。

And the comment follows:

若法未生即無壞體可得和合，以生死等互相違故。(K 41.154a20-23; 卍正藏 49. 127b6-8)

Considering the meaning of the second half of this verse, the word *li* 離 in pāda a makes no sense. We may understand how the unintelligible rendition was made by reconstructing the Sanskrit text. The translator might have had the same text as PSP XXI.3, but wrongly understood pāda a as *saṃbhava naiva vibhavaḥ* or *saṃbhavo naiva vibhavaḥ* and thus translated it as a conditional clause, 若離成有壞 “if there is decaying apart from rising”. Accordingly, we may reconstruct the comment on this verse as follows:

na saṃbhavenaiva vibhavaḥ saha bhaviṣyati / janmamaraṇayor virodhāt //

Decaying should not occur together with rising, because birth and death are opposed.”

He must have understood this sentence as *na saṃbhave, naiva vibhavaḥ saha bhaviṣyati*, and wrongly rendered as 若法未生, 即無壞體可得和合 “if a thing is not born, nothing can be found to combine”. Then we may understand the strange expression, *kade hehe* 可得和合, as from *saha bhaviṣyati*. If my conjecture is correct, this verse found in SM is identical to PSP XXI.3.

3. Conclusions

3.1 These two newly identified manuscripts preserve a significant number of the older readings of the MK, which have unfortunately become corrupted over the centuries.

3.2 As far as the lineage of the MK is concerned, the two groups of translations, i.e., the earlier (ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib}, PG, PP_{Ch}, SM) and the later (PSP_{Tib}, MK_{Tib}), derive not only from the fact that they had different translators but also from the fact that they were based on different Sanskrit readings. The verses of the MK found in our two manuscripts are, as a whole, much closer to the first group than to the second (cf. 2.1-7).

3.3 Despite the fact that our two manuscripts have been put together in the same bundle, and were most probably copied by one and the same scribe, the stanzas found in MK_{Ms} are not those extracted from BP_{Ms}, but rather go back to a separate lineage. In some examples, they show features which can only be traced in PG or SM, but not in ABh, PP_{Tib}, BP_{Tib} and PP_{Ch} (cf. 2.8-12).

3.4 As for the reason why the verses in the PSP tradition are sometimes different from those found in the older commentaries, we indeed cannot exclude the possibility that Candrakīrti modified them intentionally. However, we can at least say that in two cases (2.1, 2.3) he kept the readings as passed down to him, even though he apparently found them rather strange. In two cases (2.10, 2.11), PSP shares features with PG and MK_{Ms}, but not with ABh, PP_{Tib}, BP_{Tib}, which implies that some of the different readings found in PSP are not later developments.

Appendix: Other discrepancies

There are some more discrepancies of the MK found in our manuscripts, which I could not explain. They are listed below waiting for the discovery of new materials.

II.10 b: BP_{Ms} *na yujyate*; dJ, LVP *prasajyate*;

VII.9 b: BP_{Ms} *vya(va)[sthitah]*; dJ, LVP *pratiṣṭhitah*;

VII.10 c: BP_{Ms} (*'*)*pi*; dJ, LVP *hi*;

VII.33 b: BP_{Ms} [*k*](*u*)*taḥ*; dJ, LVP *katham*;

X.7 b: MK_{Ms}, BP_{Ms} *prāpnuyāt kāmam indhanam*; dJ, LVP *indhanam kāmam āpnuyāt*;

XI.8 c: MK_{Ms} *eva dharmmāṇām*; dJ, LVP *api bhāvāṇām*;

XX.17 a: MK_{Ms}, BP_{Ms} *notpadyate*; dJ, LVP *notpatsyate*;

XXI.10 b: MK_{Ms} *naikam*; dJ, LVP *naika*

XXI.12: no *avagraha* is found in MK_{Ms}. So it can be understood either as *na bhāvāj jāyate*

bhāvo bhāvo 'bhāvān na jāyate / nābhāvāj jāyate 'bhāvo 'bhāvo bhāvān na jāyate //, or *na bhāvāj jāyate bhāvo 'bhāvo bhāvān na jāyate / nābhāvāj jāyate bhāvo 'bhāvo 'bhāvān na jāyate //*. The former reading is the same as dJ and LVP, and is followed by MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} and partly by SM, while the latter is followed by ABh, BP_{Tib}, PP_{Tib}, PG and PP_{Ch}.

Symbols of transcription:

()	restored <i>akṣara</i> (s)
[]	damaged <i>akṣara</i> (s)
<>	omitted (part of) <i>akṣara</i> (s)
{ }	superfluous <i>akṣara</i> (s)

Bibliography and Abbreviations:

ABh	Tibetan translation of the <i>Mūlamadhyamakakārikāvṛtti-akutobhayā</i> (དབུ་མཚུ་བའི་འགྲེལ་པ་གལ་ལཱ་འཛིན་པ་མེད། D 3829)
BP _{Ms}	Sanskrit manuscript of the <i>Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamakavṛtti</i> (Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts formerly kept in the China Ethnic Library, Beijing)
BP _{Tib}	Tibetan translation of the <i>Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamakavṛtti</i> (དབུ་མཚུ་བའི་འགྲེལ་པ་བུད་རྒྱ་སྤྲེལ་ཏེ། D 3842)
C	Cone blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
D	Derge (sDe dge) blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
de Jong 1978	J. W. de Jong, “Textcritical Notes on the <i>Prasannapadā</i> ”, <i>Indo-Iranian Journal</i> 20, 1978, pp. 25-59, pp. 217-252.
dJ	J. W. de Jong, <i>Nāgārjuna: Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ</i> , Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1977.
G	dGa’-ldan (or Golden) <i>bsTan 'gyur</i>
Hu-von Hinüber 2006	Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, “some Remarks on the Sanskrit Manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Prātimokṣasūtra found in Tibet”, <i>Jaina-itihāsa- ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag</i> , Indica et Tibetica 47, Ute Hüsken, Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Anne Peters, ed., Marburg, 2006.
K	高麗大藏經
KP	<i>Kāśyapa-parivarta</i> : Baron A. von Staël-Holstein, <i>The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class</i> , Shanghai, 1926. M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, <i>The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles</i> , Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, 2002.
Lindtner 1982a	Christian Lindtner, <i>Nāgārjunas Filosofiske Vaerker</i> , Indiske Studier 2, Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982.
1982b	<i>Id, Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna</i> , Indiske Studier 4, Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982.
1988	<i>Id.</i> , “Review of Saigusa Mitsuyoshi 三枝充憲, <i>Chūron geju sōran</i> 中論偈頌總覽, Tokyo: Daisan Bummeisha 第三文明社, 1986”, <i>Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie</i> 4, Special Issue on Taoist Studies 1, 1988, pp. 244-247.

- LVP L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Madhyamakavṛttiḥ, Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamakasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*, Bibliotheca Buddhica 4, 1903-13, reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1992.
- MacDonald 2000 Anne MacDonald, “The Prasannapadā: More Manuscripts from Nepal”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasien* 44, Wien, 2000, pp. 165-181.
- 2007 *Id.*, “Revisiting the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*: Text-Critical Proposals and Problems”, *インド哲学仏教学研究 Studies in Indian Philosophy and Buddhism* 14, Department of Indian Philosophy and Buddhist Studies, Graduate School of Humanities, the University of Tokyo, 2007.
- MK *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā* by Nāgārjuna
- MK_{Ms} Sanskrit manuscript of the *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā* by Nāgārjuna (Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts formerly kept in the China Ethnic Library, Beijing).
- MK_{Tib} Tibetan translation of the *Prajñānāma-mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā* by Nāgārjuna (དབུ་མཚན་བའི་ཚིག་ལེན་རྒྱལ་ཤེས་རབ་ཅེས་བྲལ། D 3824)
- Ms K The *Prasannapadā* manuscript (N.S. 959 = 1839 AE) in a private collection in Pathan, Nepal, described as KA 45, *A Microfilm Catalogue of the Buddhist Manuscripts in Nepal*, vol. 1, H. Takaoka, ed., Nagoya: Buddhist Library, 1981.
- Ms C The *Prasannapadā* manuscript (N. S. 901 = 1781AE) preserved in the Cambridge University Library, described as Add. 1483, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*, C. Bendall, Cambridge, 1883.
- Ms P The palm-leaf manuscript of the *Prasannapadā* preserved in the Bodleian Library of Oxford.
- Ms R The *Prasannapadā* manuscript discovered by Giuseppe Tucci, held by the Keshar Library in Kathmandu, Nepal (catalogue no. 9-182).
- Ms T The *Prasannapadā* manuscript (N. S. 851 = 1731 AE) preserved in the Tokyo University Library, cataloged as No. 251, *A catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in in the Tokyo University Library*, S. Matsunami, Tokyo, 1965.
- MV *Mahāvastu*: É. Senart, *Le Mahāvastu*, Collection d’Ouvrages Orientaux 2, Paris, 1882-1897.
- N Narthang (sNar thang) blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
- P Peking blockprint edition of the Tibetan Tipiṭaka
- PG Chinese translation of Piṅgala’s commentary on the *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā* (中論, 藏要 2, 上海書店, p. 903).
- PP *Prajñā-pradīpa-mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* by Bhāviveka
- PP_{Ch} Chinese translation of the *Prajñā-pradīpa-mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* by Bhāviveka (般若燈論釋, T1566, 30.50c3)
- PP_{Tib} Tibetan translation of the *Prajñā-pradīpa-mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* by Bhāviveka (དབུ་མཚན་བའི་འགྲེལ་པ་ཤེས་རབ་རྫོགས། D 3853)
- PSP *Mūlamadhyamakakārikavṛtti-prasannapadā* by Candrakīrti
- PSP_{Tib} Tibetan translation of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikavṛtti-prasannapadā* by Candrakīrti (དབུ་མཚན་བའི་འགྲེལ་པ་ཚིག་ཀུན་ལ་བཞེས་བྲལ། D 3860)
- Saito 1984 Akira Saito 齋藤明, A study of the *Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti*, unpublished dissertation, Australian National University, 1984.
- 1985 *Id.*, “Textcritical Remarks on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* as Cited in the *Prasannapadā*”, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 33, 2, 1985, pp. 846-842.

- 1986 *Id.*, “A Note on the *Prajñā-nāma-mūlamadhyamakakārikā* of Nāgārjuna”, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 35, 1, 1986, pp. 487-484.
- 1987a *Id.*, “Konponchūron chibettoyaku hihan 「根本中論」チベット訳批判”, *Bukkyō kenkū no shomondai, bukkōgaku sōkan jūshūnen tokushū* 「仏教研究の諸問題」仏教学創刊十周年記念特輯, 東京: 山喜房, 1987, pp. 246-221.
- 1987b *Id.*, “Konponchūron tekusuto kō 根本中論テキスト考”, *Indogaku bukkōgaku ronshū, Takasaki Jikido hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* 「インド学仏教学論集」高崎直道博士還暦記念論集, 東京: 春秋社, 1987, pp. 764-755.
- 1995 *Id.*, “Problems in Translating the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* as Cited in its Commentaries”, *Buddhist Translations: Problems and Perspectives*, Delhi: Manohar, 1995, pp. 87-96.
- SM Chinese translation of Sthiramati’s commentary on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (大乘中觀釋論, T1567, 30.136a5, chapters 1-13; K1482, 41.102c14; 卍正藏經, 49, p. 62, chapters 1-27)
- Steinkellner 2004 Ernst Steinkellner, *A Tale of Leaves: On Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibet, their Past and their Future*, 2003 Gonda Lecture, Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2004.
- T *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經
- Tib. MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib}, ABh, BP_{Tib} and PP_{Tib}
- Tsukamoto 1990 Keisho Tsukamoto 塚本啓祥, Yukei Matsunaga 松長有慶 and Hirofumi Isoda 磯田熙文, ed., *梵語仏典の研究 III 論書篇 A Descriptive Bibliography of the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature, Vol. III: Abhidharma, Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, Buddhist epistemology and logic*, 京都: 平樂寺書店: 1990.
- Yamaguchi 1944 Susumu Yamaguchi 山口益, “Chūronge no shohon taishō kenkyū yōron 中論偈の諸本對照研究要論”, *Chūkan bukkō ronkō* 中觀佛教論攷, 京都: 弘文堂書房, 1944, pp. 3-28.
- Ye 2007 Ye Shaoyong, “The *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and Buddhapālita’s Commentary (1): Romanized Texts Based on the Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscripts from Tibet”, *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2006*, Tokyo, 2007, pp. 117-147.
- Yonezawa 2005 Yoshiyasu Yonezawa, “**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*: Sanskrit Notes on the *Prasannapadā* (2),” *Naritasan bukkō kenkyūsho kiyō* 成田山仏教研究所紀要 28, 2005, pp. 159-179.

Errata

- p. 152, l. 20: Mss C, R, T, B → Mss C, R, T, K
- p. 154, l. 19: Mss C, R, T, B, P → Mss C, R, T, K, P
- p. 161, l. 7: MK_{Tib}, PSP_{Tib} → dJ, LVP
- p. 163, l. 9: PG IV.2, 3, 4 → PG IX.2, 3, 4
- p. 167, l. 3: kade → kede