

General Introduction

Contemporary scholars' interest in Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā* (henceforth PsP)—an object of investigation of primarily Indian intellectuals from at least the seventh¹ until the twelfth century,² and for the next eight hundred years the domain of scholars in the Himalayas and on the Tibetan plateau—is a relatively recent phenomenon, originally piqued by the work's opening promise to provide elucidation for Nāgārjuna's sometimes terse and, for early researchers, often puzzling *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (henceforth MMK). In the initial years of Western academic inquiry into the two works (the latter is couched in the former),³ debates focussing on the meaning of the Mādhyamaka school's philosophical claims that everything is empty and that the things of the world neither arise nor pass away were sparked; of particular concern was the Mādhyamikas' understanding of the ultimate ontological nature of phenomena and the status of *nirvāṇa* and the person who attains it. These debates, in ever-changing garb, have continued to the present day, stimulated and fecundated by broad-based philosophical engagement with the MMK and PsP. The

¹ Seyfort Ruegg (1981: 71 and n. 228; 1982: 513f.) has estimated Candrakīrti's dates as 600-650 CE. Lang (2003: 7) suggests ca. 550-650. Kimura (1999: 211) argues for 570-640 on the basis of Candrakīrti's reference to Dharmapāla as a contemporary (he proposes 550-620 for Dharmapāla). On Candrakīrti, see, e.g., Tillemans 1990: 13f.; Scherrer-Schaub 1991: xxxiff.; Lang 2003: 8ff.; Kragh 2006: 21, n. 21.

² The text may have been studied into the following century in Kashmir (cf. Nadou 1980: 237ff.).

³ That the MMK also circulated independently has been confirmed by the discovery of a partially preserved Sanskrit manuscript of the work, which Shaoyong Ye dates to the sixth-seventh century; see Ye 2007a, 2008a, 2008b, 2009, 2011b. A complete but still unavailable Sanskrit manuscript of the MMK is thought to be preserved in Drepung monastery in Tibet (cf. Ye 2009: 309).

documentation, analysis and appraisal of Nāgārjuna's and Candrakīrti's critiques of the tenets of their co-Buddhists, as well as the clarification of points of dispute and the identification of non-Buddhist opponents, have contributed to the attempt to fathom the Madhyamaka self-understanding. It is without doubt to the advantage of this quest that Candrakīrti's elucidation of the MMK's twenty-seven chapters makes room for detailed discussion of matters pertinent to him and the sixth/seventh-century intellectuals in his circle, for the topics considered—some directly related to Nāgārjuna's verses, many not—often serve to shed light on his conception of key Madhyamaka tenets and related issues. The first chapter of the PsP, the longest and most wide-ranging of the work, has in recent years drawn the attention of a number of scholars because it is here that Candrakīrti delineates his views on important themes vis-à-vis those of significant peers and adversaries, and in which he defends the earlier MMK commentator Buddhapālita from the criticism of the MMK commentator and logician Bhāviveka.⁴ The appeal of the latter discussion in large part derives from the fact that Tibetan exegetes pinpoint it as the source of the subsequent bifurcation of the Madhyamaka school into discrete streams and as holding the key to the controversial "Prāsaṅgika-Svātantrika distinction."

My own interest in the first chapter of the PsP, like that of other scholars, was kindled by a desire to penetrate the intricacies of the debate with Bhāviveka, and also to investigate and begin to evaluate the until recently neglected portion of this chapter in which Candrakīrti rejects cardinal aspects of Dignāga's epistemological project.

⁴ I employ the name Bhāviveka for the author of the *Prajñāpradīpa*, an appellation found twice in the palm-leaf manuscript that I refer to as ms P, namely, at its equivalents for PsP_M §63 and §67 [PsP_L 36.13 and 38.12]; the name has been "corrected" from Bhāviveka to Bhāvaviveka at P's equivalent for PsP_L 196.4; the text is missing for PsP_L 351.15. The name Bhāviveka is also found twice in my ms D (= de Jong's ms R): at the equivalents for PsP_M §67 and PsP_L 351.15; Bhāvaviveka occurs in D at its equivalents for PsP_M §63 and PsP_L 196.4. The palm-leaf manuscript I refer to as ms Q, of which I have access only to the readings of the first chapter of the PsP, attests Bhāviveka at its equivalent for PsP_M §67 and Bhāvaviveka at PsP_M §63 (for the other manuscripts' readings, see PsP_M). Bhāviveka is found throughout the Sanskrit commentary **Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* (*LT). On the name of this author, see Iida 1980: 5f.; Seyfort Ruegg 1990: 69, n. 1; Lindtner 1995: 37-39; Watanabe 1998: 143, n. 3.

The main task I decided to undertake, however, was the establishment of an improved Sanskrit edition of the first chapter of the PsP. Re-editing the chapter had become a concrete possibility because previously unknown Sanskrit manuscripts of the entire work had been discovered by scholars in the years following the publication of de La Vallée Poussin's edition of the PsP and new emendations had been suggested, though these lay scattered in various publications. My own search had also unearthed additional Sanskrit manuscripts, some of which revealed themselves to be extremely valuable for the determination of correct and/or probable readings. It seemed only fitting that I should also prepare a translation for the entire chapter in order to make my interpretation of the text, especially for challenging passages, transparent to readers, and include annotations that would explicate and justify my choices for the critical Sanskrit text, as well as provide historical and philosophical background.

That critical reconsideration of the PsP's Sanskrit text is necessary has been obvious from de La Vallée Poussin's numerous reports in the notes to his PsP edition about problematic readings and lacunae in the manuscripts he relied on, and from the fact that the manuscripts consulted by later scholars do not always offer better readings for corrupt passages or supply lost text. It has been interesting to note that some of the same textual problems described by de La Vallée Poussin as present in his PsP manuscripts also occur in the oldest manuscripts available to the present study, one of which is estimated to date to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. Clearly, but not unexpectedly since the process of copying new manuscripts invites human error, the text of the PsP had developed a number of blemishes in the centuries following its composition. It is unknown if these defects should also, or indeed predominantly, be attributed to a general neglect of the PsP for its nearly first four centuries, a possibility raised by Kevin Vose's hypotheses on Candrakīrti's importance—or rather lack of it—in India.⁵ According to Vose, the

⁵ Compare the case of Jinendrabuddhi's *Viśālāmalavatī Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā*, in regard to which the writer of the colophon in its sole extant manuscript records that the work had been neglected and that on account of this, the manuscript he dis-

PsP and the *Madhyamakāvatāra* (MA), Candrakīrti's independent, non-commentarial work, met with little or no interest during his lifetime and were basically ignored from the time of their composition until their "rediscovery" in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.⁶ Basing his conclusions on the dearth of commentarial writing on Candrakīrti's works before the twelfth century, the silence of Mādhyamikas such as Avalokitavrata, Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla with regard to his critiques of aspects of Bhāviveka's and Dignāga's positions, the fact that neither the PsP nor the MA was translated during the early diffusion of Buddhism to Tibet, and the lack of information on and writings by the individuals named in Tibetan lists of the Indian Prāsaṅgika lineage, Vose argues that Candrakīrti was an insignificant philosopher in his homeland, too conservative in crucial matters of epistemology to be taken seriously by his Madhyamaka cohorts.⁷ Vose thus speculates that in the years following Candrakīrti's death, his oeuvre may have escaped disappearing altogether because conscientious librarians or scribes concerned with manuscript preservation safeguarded it.⁸ "Most strongly," he writes, "we can imagine the existence of a marginal school of thought that did not champion Candrakīrti with new treatises ... but studied and preserved his texts."⁹ Exactly how Vose envisions this "best case" scenario is unclear, for he later states, "Rather than preserved in an unbroken lineage established by Candrakīrti himself, we see Candrakīrti's main texts—however they may have survived up to this

covered and rescued had suffered serious damage by rats; see Steinkellner et al. 2005: xxxiv-xxxvi.

⁶ Vose (2009: 27) describes the rediscovery of Candrakīrti's works: "Instead, important eleventh- and twelfth-century Indian scholars suddenly took interest in these forgotten texts"

⁷ Vose (*ibid.*, 9) considers Candrakīrti to have held an "obstinately conservative position ... which undoubtedly contributed to his marginal status for hundreds of years afterwards." See *ibid.*, 21ff.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 18: "One can infer that the very survival of Candrakīrti's writings down to the time of Jayānanda could only have been brought about by some kind of following, whether Candrakīrti's writings were preserved in monastic libraries or transmitted in scribal families."

⁹ *Ibid.*

point—receiving broader attention beginning around the year 1000.”¹⁰

As valuable and stimulating as Vose’s hypotheses on Candrakīrti in India are, one suspects, given that his main arguments are in large part derived from the ostensible silence of pre-eleventh-century Madhyamaka philosophers,¹¹ that this silence might admit of slightly less radical conclusions, especially when further factors are taken into consideration.¹² Of his alternatives for explaining the survival of Candrakīrti’s works, the postulation that Candrakīrti’s views inspired a following of philosophers—whether an actual “school” and whether as marginal as Vose would have it remain open questions—who studied and taught his treatises would seem to be the more reasonable one. Indeed, the presumed reflections of Candrakīrti’s ideas in Śāntideva’s *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (8th c.), the references to and close familiarity with his works on the part of Prajñākaramati (10th c.), the fact that Ratnākaraśānti (late 10th c., early 11th c.) apparently found it necessary to refute his views,¹³ and the interest in and broad accessibility of Candrakīrti’s compositions to the tantric writers may rather speak against the supposition that his works lay for centuries sunk in oblivion on library shelves¹⁴ or in the domiciles of scribes. Although probably overshadowed by the early Yogācāra-Madhyamaka tradition, this strand of Madhyamaka thought may in fact have been quite stable and robust, energized by the insights of each succeeding generation, and authoritative and widespread enough to have had the influence it did on the writers and translators of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Considering our present interest, namely, the extant PsP manuscripts, in the light of this scenario, the

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹¹ Vose (*ibid.*) speaks of 1000 CE as being the time that Candrakīrti’s works began to receive more attention but is aware that Prajñākaramati was also active in the 10th c. (he dates him 950-1030).

¹² I shall not go into a detailed discussion of the matter on this occasion.

¹³ See Luo forthcoming.

¹⁴ As Vose (*ibid.*, 18, n. 10) also notes, manuscripts did not last long in India’s hot and humid climate. It is sometimes stated that 200 years was the upper limit of survival; many succumbed much earlier on account of molds, insects and rodents.

corruptions we encounter in the PsP's oldest manuscripts might then equally be the result of the repeated copying of the text within an unbroken and vigorous but non-commentarial lineage of Mādhyamikas who championed Candrakīrti's causes. We do know that the PsP was an important work for, among others, eleventh-century Kashmiri scholars erudite in the intricacies of Madhyamaka thought,¹⁵ and that some of them were cognizant of textual problems in the manuscripts at their disposal. The availability of a PsP manuscript in Lhasa in the early years of the twelfth century that is documented as hailing from eastern Aparānta indicates that the work was also studied in this part of India in the tenth or eleventh century; unfortunately, the exact location of Aparānta is still not known. One of the two palm-leaf manuscripts at the disposal of the present study testifies to interest in the PsP in Nepal in the late twelfth or thirteenth century; the other may also have been copied there but its date is uncertain.¹⁶ Both of these manuscripts testify to attempts, some of which may have occurred in previous centuries, to rectify through comparison with other manuscripts of the PsP a number of the flaws that had crept into the textual tradition. In this connection one should not neglect to mention the *Lakṣaṇaṭīkā (*LT), a commentary cum student notes on the PsP probably composed in the early twelfth century, which Yonezawa holds was written under the supervision of Abhayākara-gupta at Nālandā or Vikramaśīla monastery.¹⁷

Chapter One and its Content

The meticulous defense and elucidation of Madhyamaka positions in the first chapter of the PsP must have been welcomed by Candra-

¹⁵ Note that the colophon of the Tibetan version of Candrakīrti's *Catuhśatakaṭīkā*, which like the PsP, was translated by Pa tshab nyi ma grags in Kashmir, traces Pa tshab's *paṇḍita* collaborator's Madhyamaka lineage back two generations to the renowned scholar Ratnavajra.

¹⁶ It is not certain that the Potala palm-leaf manuscript, i.e., ms Q, was written in Nepal and a detailed analysis of its script is required in order to estimate its date of copying.

¹⁷ See Yonezawa 2001: 4-8, 27 and Yonezawa 2004: 117f.

kīrti's immediate and wider circles. Candrakīrti in fact allots only slightly more than a quarter of his first chapter's commentary to remarks on the two *maṅgala* verses that open Nāgārjuna's MMK and the fourteen *kārikās* that make up its first chapter, and devotes the large remainder of the chapter to addressing a number of pressing issues connected with logical, ontological and epistemological theories and ideas propagated and legitimated by his opponents, most of which would have been familiar to his followers. The principal and potentially most influential competitor who had to be dealt with was the learned Madhyamaka scholar Bhāviveka, who, as stated, had criticized the logical method employed by and various stances of his forerunner, Buddhapālita, numerous times in his *Prajñāpradīpa*.¹⁸ Of primary concern to Candrakīrti was Bhāviveka's critique of Buddhapālita's reliance on consequences (*prasaṅga*) for the demonstration of the ultimate nature of things and Bhāviveka's insistence on independent inferences (*svatantrānumāna*) for such. Candrakīrti allocates nearly a fifth of the chapter to a vindication of Buddhapālita's use of consequences and to the thorough discrediting of Bhāviveka's attempt to enforce the employment of inferences; in the course of his argumentation, however, Candrakīrti makes clear that he does not intend a global rejection of inferences and rather vetoes only the particular type of inference utilized and advocated by Bhāviveka. Indeed, one of Candrakīrti's main goals in the section is, as Bhāviveka's was earlier, to upgrade, i.e., modernize, the methodological tools used by his school in debate. Bhāviveka's criticism of Buddhapālita ensued from his reaction to important developments that had occurred within Buddhism's logical-epistemological fold in the first half of the sixth century, that is, within Dignāga's camp, which had resulted in Bhāviveka's integration of the logical theory and procedure evolved and prescribed there into his own school, which must have appeared to him as one that had been working with obsolete tools and was therefore open to attack. Candrakīrti, born into a period in which Dignāga's logic had become authoritative, himself erudite in the intricacies of logical procedure and well versed in Dignāga's writings on the subject, was aware of the demands of

¹⁸ Saito (1984: xxiv) reports that Ejima counts twenty occasions of criticism noted by Avalokitavrata.

the day and the threat, and his response to Bhāviveka served the secondary purpose of providing him with a platform from which to address and possibly preempt criticism from the logical-epistemological faction itself as regards the Mādhyamikas' logical procedures. Candrakīrti's partial yet calculated acquiescence to Bhāviveka's demand for formal inferences that had him sanctioning the use of inferences acknowledged by the opponent but not by the Mādhyamika (*paraprasiddhānumāna*) was, as Bhāviveka's methodological renovations were, a response to his intellectual environment; he was spurred by it to clarify the Mādhyamika argumentative methods, to distinguish their characteristics from those of the prevailing type employed in debate, and to justify the deviations from Dignāga's rules.

Later on in the first chapter of the PsP, Candrakīrti focusses his attention on fundamental epistemological theories propounded by Dignāga, devoting nearly as much of the chapter to the rebuttal of these ideas as he did to his rebuttal and critique of Bhāviveka. Candrakīrti's overriding aim throughout his lengthy refutation of the particular characteristic (*svalakṣaṇa*), portrayed as the bare percept, and his argumentation against Dignāga's understanding and etymologizing of the word *pratyakṣa* (i.e., as "direct perception") is, first and foremost, to demonstrate the inappropriateness of Dignāga's attempt to establish, via his particular characteristic and the consciousness that knows it, a more "refined" plane of reality that would be situated above the unexamined everyday level—regardless of whether Dignāga might portray it as ultimate reality or, inasmuch as it is reduced to consciousness from the Yogācāra point of view, as a preliminary level of reality. As Candrakīrti asseverates, the positing of such a level is mistaken and misleading, for when the ultimate is not topical, the world and its constituents should simply be accepted as general consensus understands them. When, on the other hand, the ultimate nature of these common-sense phenomena is the matter of interest and for the sake of determining it they are analyzed, they dissolve completely, leaving no room whatsoever for any (provisional or final) entities. Demonstrating that Dignāga's views lead to problems, Candrakīrti points out that Dignāga's postulation of a (*sva*)*lakṣaṇa* that would exist independently of its related *lakṣya* makes a travesty

of the Buddha's teaching of dependent-arising and annihilates the crucial difference, accepted by all Mahāyānists, between the surface level and ultimate reality. Dignāga is accused of confounding the surface level (*saṃvṛti*) with the ultimate level, and thereby of ruining the surface level, a level of "reality" that, as such, is to be accepted without any philosophical analysis. A substantial point of interest in Candrakīrti's critique of Dignāga's understanding of *pratyakṣa*—for Dignāga the cognition direct perception—is Candrakīrti's position that for Mādhyamikas, as for ordinary persons (and indeed for certain other Buddhists), the primary referent of the word *pratyakṣa* is not consciousness, but rather the object perceived. Even though later interpretations, especially in Tibet, of Candrakīrti's critique of Bhāviveka would substantially affect the characterizations, internal demarcations and, as a result, the self-understanding of the Madhyamaka school, his remarks in regard to Dignāga's views had virtually no impact on the logical-epistemological tradition in India; they did, however, lead to heated debates in Tibet. For the Mādhyamikas in Candrakīrti's immediate and subsequent tradition, however, the conversation with Dignāga explained precisely why their fellow Mahāyānist's seductive epistemological theories, particularly that of *saṃvṛti*-level bare particulars, had to be rejected.

In the section just antecedent to the attack on Dignāga's epistemological views, Candrakīrti addresses opponents (previously presumed by scholars to belong to Dignāga's tradition, or to be Dignāga himself—or even Bhāviveka) who can only be identified as Naiyāyikas.¹⁹ These opponents dispute the Madhyamaka claim that things do not come into being on the ground that such an assertion requires ascertainment via some sort of valid cognition, arguing that if the Mādhyamikas admit that this cognition exists, then something, i.e., the means of valid cognition, must itself come into being and exist, which would thus confute the Madhyamaka assertion. If, on the other hand, the Madhyamaka position is that not even valid cognition exists, then the view that things do not arise is bereft of certitude. The same argumentation, in a more abbreviated form than Candrakīrti

¹⁹ See MacDonald 2011.

presents it, is encountered in Pakṣilasvāmin Vātsyāyana's Nyāya-bhāṣya and on two occasions in Uddyotakara's Nyāyabhāṣyavārttika.

A less philosophical discussion with the Conservative Buddhists (the so-called "Hīnayānists") is sandwiched between the argumentation directed toward Bhāviveka and the confrontation with the Naiyāyikas. The Conservative Buddhist opponent objects to the Madhyamaka school's radicalizing of the principle of dependent-arising to the extent that dependent-arising is characterized, as it is in the opening verses to the MMK, as being *without* arising or ceasing, without one thing or separate things, and without coming or going, and charges the Mādhyamikas with contradicting the verbal testimony of the highest authority, namely, the Buddha. The Conservative Buddhist's citing of Canonical verses and prose statements which unequivocally refer, for example, to the coming into existence and subsequent cessation of things and which thus appear to confirm that dependent-arising is indeed qualified by arising and ceasing, is taken as an opportunity by Candrakīrti to edify his co-Buddhists as to the difference between interpretive and definitive scriptures, and inspires him to cite a number of passages from both the Conservative Buddhists' and the Mahāyānists' scriptural collections in support of the actual non-arising, etc., of things that dependently arise. Presented in the section are passages from the Āgamas, the Vinaya, the Udānavarga, the Akṣayamatisūtra, the Samādhirājasūtra, the Kāśyapaparivartasūtra, the Dṛḍhādhyāśaya-paripṛcchāsūtra, the Vajramaṇḍadhāraṇī, and the Upāliparipṛcchā, some of which preserve the only known Sanskrit for their respective work.

Further citations from the Āgamas, and from *sūtras* not mentioned above, as well as from *śāstras*, are found in the other sections of the PsP's first chapter. Of relevance to our knowledge of the temporal succession in which the individual works in Candrakīrti's oeuvre were produced are the references to and citations from the Madhyamakāvatāra, which appear to indicate that this work was composed prior to the PsP, and the lack of references to any of the

other commentaries attributed to Candrakīrti.²⁰ The brief citations from Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* and Bhāviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa*, for which only the Tibetan translation is otherwise available,²¹ are of significance in that they provide the original Sanskrit or a close approximation thereof for the quoted passages.²² Candrakīrti additionally cites from works other than the MMK that he attributes to Nāgārjuna, namely, the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, the *Vigraha-vyāvartanī* and the *Lokūtitastava*, from Āryadeva's *Catuhśataka*, Vasubandhu's *Madhyantavibhāga*, from Mahāyāna *sūtras* such as the *Śālistambasūtra*, the *Lalitavistara*, the *Ratnacūḍaparipṛcchā* and the *Ratnākaraśūtra*, as well as from Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Candrakīrti has the tendency to classify the canonical Abhidharma material he makes reference to as authoritative testimony (*āgama*).

The final section of the chapter is devoted to the explication of MMK I.2-14, the *kārikās* by way of which Nāgārjuna refutes the four conditions (*pratyaya*) held to be responsible for the coming into being of things, their effects. The opponent party in this section is again the Conservative Buddhists, who substantiate their view that the conditions are truly existent things which bring about the arising of other truly existent things by arguing that the Buddha himself taught the four conditions. Candrakīrti must have had Buddhapālita's commentary on the MMK before him, either in memorized or manuscript form, as he composed his commentarial remarks on the *kārikās* of this section: he often reiterates Buddhapālita's interpretation of specific *kārikās*, or elements thereof, and thus demonstrates

²⁰ Felix Erb (1997: 14; see also 9ff.) suggests that Candrakīrti's works were produced in the following order: *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya*, *Prasannapadā*, *Yukti-ṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*, *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti*, *Catuhśatakaṭīkā*. My ms Q contains a few references to the *Madhyamakāvatāra* that are clearly interpolations, which leads one to wonder if some of the others in the PsP text we have received might not also be later additions, although at least one seems to be necessary for Candrakīrti's argumentation and thus intrinsic to the work.

²¹ The first chapter of Buddhapālita's commentary on the MMK is not preserved in the BP manuscript discovered and edited by Shaoyong Ye.

²² As pointed out and discussed in my translation's annotation to the relevant passages, Candrakīrti does not always quote his sources literally (or did his sources read differently?).

his endorsement of it. Whether he also had Bhāviveka's commentary before him is less clear; his tendency to repeat, sometimes in a revised form, Buddhapālita's comments but to overwhelmingly ignore variant interpretations given by Bhāviveka may betray an intent to restore pride of place (at least as concerns earlier commentators) to Buddhapālita's work. On occasion Buddhapālita, Bhāviveka and Candrakīrti present similar interpretations for the MMK I verses; at times Candrakīrti apparently finds the explanations and arguments of both of his predecessors unsatisfactory, and deviating from these, offers an alternative analysis.²³ I considered it meaningful, given that most translations of chapters of the PsP focus only on Candrakīrti's comments, to begin to investigate in a very preliminary way the degree to which Candrakīrti relies on the remarks and commentarial style of Buddhapālita and Bhāviveka, and have therefore included in my annotation some basic observations regarding the interpretation of the *kārikās* presented by the earlier commentators.²⁴

Previous Investigations, Editions, and Translations

The first reference to the PsP by a European was made by Brian Houghton Hodgson (1801-1894), a British civil servant appointed in 1820 to Residentsip in Kathmandu, when he included it in a list of Buddhist Sanskrit literature in Nepal in an essay published in 1828.²⁵ Misled, however, by an erroneous designation of the work, Hodgson

²³ Unfortunately, the MMK commentaries composed by, according to Avalokitavrata, Devaśarman, Guṇaśrī, and Guṇamati, are neither extant in Sanskrit nor available in translation (see Kajiyama 1963: 37f.); it is thus impossible to know if Candrakīrti draws on their comments when he deviates from the interpretations of Buddhapālita and Bhāviveka. Scholars who read Chinese will be able to determine if he ever relies on Sthiramati's commentary.

²⁴ For detailed remarks on the PsP's relationship to earlier commentaries, especially as regards MMK XVII, see Kragh 2009.

²⁵ See Hodgson 1828: 431 and Hodgson 1874: 20.

wrongly recorded the PsP's name as "*Vineya Sūtra*."²⁶ This mistake in appellation was rectified shortly after Hodgson passed on one of his manuscripts of the PsP to the Société Asiatique in Paris by the French scholar Eugène Burnouf (1801-1852), who identified the work, in accord with the name found in manuscript's colophon, as the "Madhyamakavṛtti" and who realized, upon reading Candrakīrti's opening verses, that the composition was specifically a commentary on Nāgārjuna's MMK. The revised determination of the name and character of the work as well as Burnouf's brief but somewhat perplexed observations on Madhyamaka philosophy were presented in his 1844 "Introduction à l'histoire du Bouddhisme indien," where alongside his careful description of and comments on the work he noted that the Prajñāpāramitā literature's proclivity for negations—characterized by him as "audacious"—is in the MMK taken even further ("si cela est possible") to intend metaphysical non-existence. Burnouf admitted that he found it difficult to understand how the MMK could have presented itself as an authority on Śākyamuni Buddha's doctrine, since, he opined, any Brahmin who wanted to decimate Buddhism would need to do little more than adopt Nāgārjuna's and Candrakīrti's arguments.²⁷ Comments like these by Burnouf with respect to Prajñāpāramitā and Madhyamaka literature and his pegging of Nāgārjuna's (and by implication Candrakīrti's) general philosophical view as a "scholastic nihilism"²⁸ profoundly influenced other nineteenth-century scholars, some of whom cast severe value judgements on Buddhism as a whole, and were at least

²⁶ Hodgson corrects his 1828 reference "*Vineya Sūtra*" to "*Vinaya Sūtra*" in the 1874 reprint of the essay. Hodgson collected at least two manuscripts of the PsP. The manuscript that he passed on to the Société Asiatique in Paris had, Burnouf reports, the words "*vinaya patra*" written on its first folio; the manuscript that Hodgson presented to the Asiatic Society of Bengal has "*vinaya*" written in the left margin of its folios.

²⁷ Burnouf (1844: 560): "On a peine à comprendre comment ce livre peut se donner pour une des autorités de la doctrine de Śākyamuni. Il semble qu'un Brâhmane voulant réduire au néant cette doctrine, ne pourrait mieux faire que d'adopter les arguments négatifs de Nâgârdjuna et de son commentateur."

²⁸ See Burnouf 1844: 522, 559ff.; Tuck 1990: 32f.; de Jong 1949: ix. On Burnouf and his work, cf. de Jong 1974: 66-74; Buffetrille and Lope 2010: 5ff.

partially or indirectly responsible for a general rejection of the tenets of Madhyamaka philosophy.

Presumably in some measure a result of the reception of Burnouf's remarks, Candrakīrti's PsP was ignored for nearly the rest of the century. In the mid-1890's, however, the manuscript that had been delivered to Paris by Hodgson was, as luck would have it, finally dusted off by the brilliant young Belgian scholar Louis de La Vallée Poussin (1869-1938). De La Vallée Poussin undertook as his initial project an analysis of the twenty-fourth chapter of the PsP, which was published in 1897.²⁹ He subsequently, over the years 1903-1913, painstakingly created a critical edition of the entire text,³⁰ an edition that would introduce and render accessible to modern scholarship both Nāgārjuna's MMK and Candrakīrti's commentary on it, and that would serve as the basis for all subsequent study of the two works. The manuscript in Paris was one of a trio of manuscripts collated by de La Vallée Poussin for his edition of the PsP: he sought out in addition to the relatively poor quality Paris manuscript³¹ a manuscript of the PsP that had been acquired by the Cambridge University Library from Dr. Daniel Wright and another held by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta, which had also been received from Hodgson.³² In the course of working with these manuscripts de La Vallée Poussin discovered, as he asserts in the *Avant Propos* to his edition, that all three were "copies médiocres d'un original qui ne paraît pas avoir été irréprochable." Yet in spite of the scribal errors

²⁹ L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Caturāryasatyaparikṣā," in *Mélanges Charles de Harlez*, 1897, pp. 313-320.

³⁰ I refer to his edition as PsP_L. The so-called "Calcutta edition" of 1894 by Śārat Candra Dās and Pandit Harimohan Vidyābhūṣaṇa was little more than a printed version of the Calcutta manuscript of the PsP; see May 1959: 6. The PsP edition was not de La Vallée Poussin's only project during these years: he also produced a Sanskrit edition of Prajñākaramati's commentary on the Bodhicaryāvatāra (1901-1912) and a Tibetan edition (1907-1912) and translation (1907, 1910, 1911) of Candrakīrti's MABh.

³¹ Burnouf (1844: 559) remarks: "... et quoique le manuscrit soit fort incorrect, il est facile de voir quelles sont les opinions de l'auteur primitif et de son commentateur."

³² For details see MacDonald 2000: 165 as well as *infra* Manuscript Description: Paper Manuscripts (mss L, M and N).

and lacunae shared by the manuscripts, de La Vallée Poussin managed to create, with the aid of the Tibetan translation, a truly commendable edition of both the MMK and the PsP which embeds and explains it. The resultant utility of this first edition based on limited material was—aside from de La Vallée Poussin’s admirable skill as an editor—in large part due to the quality of the Cambridge University Library manuscript. Of the sixteen manuscripts I consulted for my Sanskrit edition of the first chapter of the PsP, fourteen of which are paper manuscripts, the Cambridge manuscript (in the present study designated “ms L”), copied in Nepal in A.D. 1781, ranks as one of the four “best” paper manuscripts of the PsP. Its errors, however, cause it to place last on my list of “best” paper manuscripts. The problematic readings that de La Vallée Poussin was not able to solve because of its corruptions and the corresponding and further complicating readings in the Paris and the Calcutta manuscripts mean that numerous passages in de La Vallée Poussin’s otherwise impressive edition stand in want of improvement.

As de La Vallée Poussin noticed early on in his editorial work on the PsP, the Tibetan translation of the work often preserves equivalents for readings lost from or corrupted in the three Sanskrit manuscripts he collated for his edition. The colophon appended to the translation reveals that Candrakīrti’s work was rendered into Tibetan in Kashmir, at the Ratnagupta monastery in Grong khyer dpe med (probably Śrīnagar),³³ by the Indian *paṇḍita* and great logician (*mahātārkika*) Mahāsumati and the Tibetan translator Pa tshab nyi ma grags.³⁴ Tibetan sources record that Pa tshab was born in 1055, travelled to Kashmir in his youth to devote himself to Buddhist scholastic activities, and remained there for the next twenty-three

³³ On the name Kha che’i grong khyer dpe med, see Naudou 1980: 208f. Naudou (ibid., 210) writes, “Monasteries were numerous at Grong-khyer dpe-med, but their identification proves very difficult. ... But, according to our information, the most active monastery during the 11th century was the Ratnaguptavihāra (Rin-chen sbas-pa), where sojourned the Tibetan Nyi-ma grags.”

³⁴ On Pa tshab nyi ma grags’s life and translations, see Naudou 1980: 212f., Erb 1997: 29 and n. 123 and 125, Lang 1990: 132-134. On Mahāsumati, see Naudou 1980: 230. On the PsP and MABh colophons and their importance for text-critical work, see MacDonald 2015.

years, after which he returned to his homeland and commenced teaching. I estimate that the PsP translation was prepared sometime during the last decade of the eleventh century.³⁵ It was made in reliance on a local Sanskrit manuscript, in all likelihood written in a version of the Śārada script, the text of which, scribed possibly four hundred years after the PsP was composed, was also not completely free of the mistakes that result from repeated copying.³⁶ One presumes that it was his awareness of specific problems related to the transmission of the text that inspired Pa tshab, after returning to Tibet at the end of the eleventh century or the turn of the twelfth, to check his Tibetan translation against a second Sanskrit manuscript located in Lhasa that had been copied in “eastern Aparānta.”³⁷ Aided in this collation work by the Kashmiri scholar Kanakavarman,³⁸ he corrected the translation and closed work on it. Manuscripts of the

³⁵ The MABh colophon and other colophons to works translated by Pa tshab record that these translations were made during the reign of the king 'Phags pa lha, presumably an appellation for King Harṣadeva who held the throne from 1089-1101. There are no references in the colophons to Harṣadeva's successor Uccala. Lang (1990: 134) tentatively suggests placing Pa tshab in Kashmir between the years 1077/8 and 1101.

³⁶ It has been interesting to learn that Pa tshab noted a couple of the variant readings he encountered in his Kashmiri manuscript in his “Explanation of Difficult Points in the Prasannapadā” (Tshig gsal ba'i dka' ba bshad pa [55a-88a]), which is found in the bKa' gdams gsung 'bum (vol. eleven). My thanks to Kevin Vose and Chizuko Yoshimizu for bringing the comments on the variants to my attention.

³⁷ The geographical location of “eastern Aparānta” referred to in the colophon remains uncertain. Aparānta is given variously as, e.g., the western seaboard of India, the northern Koṅkana region, Koṅkana and Malabar, the central portion of Bombay Province, and Western India in general (see Chaudhury 1969, ch. III; N.N. Bhattacharyya, *The Geographical Dictionary, Ancient and Early Medieval India*, Delhi: Munshiram Monoharlal, 1991, p. 70; Nundo Lal Dey, *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 3rd ed., 1971 [1st published 1927], p. 9; K.D. Bajpai, ed., *The Geographical Encyclopaedia of Ancient and Medieval India*, Part I, Varanasi: Indic Academy, 1968, p. 29). The *Blue Annals* records that the Sanskrit manuscripts used by Pa tshab and Kanakavarman to revise Pa tshab's translations came from *yul dbus* (translated by Roerich as Magadha); see Erb 1997: 114, n. 125. Erb states, “d.h. wohl auch aus Nālandā und Vikramaśīla.” He notes that according to Tāranātha, Bhaṅgala and Oḍiviśa belong to eastern Aparānta.

³⁸ On Kanakavarman, see Naudou 1980: 231ff.

PsP translation then “free-floated” for the next two centuries or entered small collections, until finally one of them was incorporated into the Old Narthang Tanjur; the translation was printed in the four block-print editions of the Tanjur relied on by modern scholars only in the mid-eighteenth century. Only the Peking edition of the PsP translation appears to have been available to de La Vallée Poussin (he refers to it as the “Tandjour rouge”). Examination of Pa tshab’s and his collaborators’ translation reveals that it is a meticulously transposed composition that is often able to support unique readings in the Sanskrit manuscripts, thus aiding our efforts to correct the Sanskrit text, and that not infrequently contributes to our understanding of challenging argumentative and explanatory sections in the PsP. On the other hand, the use of the Tibetan translation to edit words and passages in the Sanskrit also calls for a great deal of care and reflection owing to the fact that readings from two different Sanskrit manuscripts are mirrored in it, and especially because one of these manuscripts was contaminated with material not introduced by Candrakīrti but rather interpolated by later scribes and scholars (see *infra* Manuscript Description: Manuscript Relationships). De La Vallée Poussin was not aware that the translators had appropriated much of the extraneous material they found in the contaminated manuscript, or that some of the contamination had also made its way into his three manuscripts. He further did not realize that most of the *śāstra* and *sūtra* passages cited by Candrakīrti were not rendered into Tibetan by Pa tshab from the PsP Sanskrit but had rather been copied directly from the Tibetan translations of the source texts available to him at the end of the eleventh and/or early twelfth century.³⁹ De La Vallée Poussin’s edition, emended in reliance on the Tibetan translation, thus includes material not intrinsic to the PsP and attests a number of inappropriate changes to Sanskrit citations.

A slightly reworked version of de La Vallée Poussin’s edition was published by P.L. Vaidya in 1960.⁴⁰ Vaidya introduces his own

³⁹ See MacDonald 2015.

⁴⁰ Vaidya (1960b: vii) states in the introduction to his edition: “Poussin’s edition is long out of print. I had the good fortune of studying this very work at his feet in 1921-22, and hence I thought it my duty to bring out a new edition with a number of

emendations into the text established by de La Vallée Poussin, attempting to address with them both problematic readings already noted by de La Vallée Poussin and readings deemed by Vaidya himself to be in need of change. While some of his emendations succeed in improving the text,⁴¹ or suggest new avenues for consideration, many, if not most, of his emendations for the first chapter of the PsP cannot be accepted. Vaidya's decision to use only de La Vallée Poussin's edition as his material basis, i.e., to forgo consultation of any of the three manuscripts used by the previous editor as well as the editions of the Tibetan translation, is partly responsible for their unacceptability.⁴² A further contributing factor was Vaidya's manner of dealing with the Tibetan readings supplied in de La Vallée Poussin's annotation: although the extent to which Vaidya has reflected on these Tibetan words and phrases remains unclear to me, he has a tendency to accept, without consideration of the possibility of mistranslation or rewording, and with no thought to the translators' program, sometimes questionable individual manuscript readings that the Tibetan appears to support. Definitely disturbing is the Vaidya edition's integration of all of de La Vallée Poussin's conjectures (in the original edition enclosed in square brackets) with rarely an indication that the text in these cases is

additions and alterations. I have made use of additional material published since then, and therefore I hope this edition will be more useful than the former to our Indian scholars."

⁴¹ Cf., e.g., his silent emendation *paraḥ* (read: *paraś*) for de La Vallée Poussin's *param* at PsP_L 34.6, a reading attested by the manuscripts but rejected by de La Vallée Poussin. I count less than a dozen emendations to the MMK; his emendations for MMK XIII.6 and XXII.8 are correct. Unfortunately, Vaidya usually emends silently, and never gives the reasons for his choices.

⁴² Vaidya (1960b: vii) wrongly describes de La Vallée Poussin's manuscript basis, claiming that he did not directly use the Calcutta manuscript and rather relied on Rao Śarat Candra Dās and Pandit Harimohan Vidyābhūṣaṇa's "edition" of the Calcutta manuscript. S. Tripathi, the "editor" of the 1987 reprint, states in the edition's Preface that no changes were made to Vaidya's original text because "nothing new" regarding the PsP had appeared since the publication of the first edition in 1960. Perhaps symptomatic of the poor exchange of information between east and west at the time, Tripathi seems to have been unaware that de Jong had published his important Textcritical Notes already in 1978, and that nine manuscripts of the PsP were available by 1987.

hypothetical and unsupported by the manuscripts. In addition to revising the text of the previous edition, Vaidya changes its annotation. He reports that he has “retained with some modifications” de La Vallée Poussin’s philological notes, dropping, for example, Tibetan citations,⁴³ but he does not mention that his modifications involve further simplification in the form of expunging other valuable material, such as numerous variant manuscript readings and de La Vallée Poussin’s comments on these. Unfortunately, in taking over de La Vallée Poussin’s notes Vaidya also repeats their errors, but more seriously, he misreports many of the retained variant readings, as well as their relationship to the Tibetan.⁴⁴ The edition as a whole has the further defect of containing a host of printing errors: dropped *akṣaras* and words, sometimes entire sentences, are not uncommon, and most pages are marred by one or two, often up to four, misprints. I refer to Vaidya’s edition only when his emendations contribute to the discussion of a reading.

In the half-century following the publication of de La Vallée Poussin’s annotated Sanskrit edition, all twenty-seven chapters of the

⁴³ Vaidya informs the reader in his Introduction that he has excised from the annotation all Tibetan citations, including those of the MMK, but in many cases he does preserve de La Vallée Poussin’s references to instances where the Tibetan confirms the Sanskrit or lacks an equivalent. Vaidya (1960b: vii) states: “The foot-notes of Poussin containing Tibetan translation of Kārikās and of extracts of the commentary have been omitted from this edition as they are no longer useful to Sanskrit scholars. I do not, however, underrate the value of Poussin’s edition, and of extracts from Tibetan given by him, but once the purpose of checking the accuracy of Sanskrit text is achieved, the value of Tibetan translations to Sanskrit paṇḍits becomes secondary.”

⁴⁴ Cf., e.g., his note for PsP_L 6.2’s emended *vo* that reports “Mss. *bodhi vo* which is confirmed by T,” when in fact de La Vallée Poussin notes the variant *bodhi*; his note for PsP_L 10.8’s *hrasvaṃ pratītya hrasvaṃ prāpya hrasvaṃ apekṣya*, which reports “T *pratītya* for *apekṣya*,” when in fact de La Vallée Poussin has noted that the Tibetan reads *hrasvaṃ prāpya hrasvaṃ pratītya hrasvaṃ apekṣya*; his note for PsP_L 16.1’s *praveśayan* which reports “*praveśayet* for *praveśayan*,” when de La Vallée Poussin has noted that the manuscripts read *praveśayena*. Most unhelpful is his use of the abbreviation “P” for both “Paris” and “Poussin.”

PsP were translated into European languages.⁴⁵ The translations were undertaken by Stcherbatsky (chapters one and twenty-five; in English); May (chapters two to four, six to nine, eleven, twenty-three, twenty-four, twenty-six and twenty-seven; in French); Schayer (chapters five, ten, twelve to sixteen; in German); Lamotte (chapter seventeen; in French); and de Jong (chapters eighteen to twenty-two; in French).⁴⁶ As de Jong has noted, the only scholar in this group to have consulted a manuscript was Jacques May, who on the rare occasion refers to the Paris manuscript used by de La Vallée Poussin in order to correct the edition.⁴⁷ Both de Jong and May recognized the importance of the Tibetan translation, and included alongside their French translations of the respective chapters editions of the Tibetan made in reliance upon the Peking and Narthang editions of the text.

As might be expected, a good number of the problematic and misleading passages in these European-language translations have their source entirely in the faulty text-basis, i.e., de La Vallée Poussin's edition. It was only with the discovery of a fourth manuscript of the work by Giuseppe Tucci that serious text-critical work on the PsP again became possible. De Jong, his interest in the text rekindled, collated his wife's transcription of a photocopy of this manuscript against de La Vallée Poussin's edition and compiled an extensive list of variant readings for the entire PsP, together with suggestions for emendations, and in 1978 published this as "Textcritical Notes on the Prasannapadā." He published his findings for Nāgārjuna's *kārikās* in a new MMK edition in 1977 but, despite being encouraged to, refrained from preparing a new edition of the PsP on account of the considerable amount of manuscript material, viz., the Paris, Cambridge and Calcutta manuscripts, that would additionally have to

⁴⁵ See May 1959: 7-10; de Jong 1978: 25. May's (1959: 6) critique of de La Vallée Poussin's annotation to his edition ("Elle est en général correcte pour les *kārikā* et le commentaire; mais les notes critiques sont peu explicites, parfois même sibyllines") may be intended as a footnote to de Jong's (1949: ix) praise of the "édition copieusement annotée."

⁴⁶ See Stcherbatsky 1927; May 1959; Schayer 1930 and 1931; Lamotte 1936; de Jong 1949.

⁴⁷ See de Jong 1978: 26 and May 1959: 6.

be investigated for such a project. The fourth manuscript, a holding of the Keshar Library in Kathmandu, has in fact proved to be one of the most important manuscripts for the present study. It is a deceptive manuscript in that its mess of senseless scribal errors gives the impression that the manuscript is relatively useless as a witness, but closer examination reveals that it preserves many readings that have become corrupted in the other manuscripts; these new readings of the Tucci manuscript (termed “R” by de Jong; referred to as “ms D” in the present study) often tend to be supported by the Tibetan translation.⁴⁸

De Jong’s reluctance to take on the task of consulting manuscripts beyond the manuscript unearthed by Tucci was amplified when he became aware of the existence of two more manuscripts of the PsP, also from Nepal, which had been filmed by the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions (IASWR).⁴⁹ He nevertheless acquired microfiche copies of the two new manuscripts in order to compare their readings of difficult passages with the readings supplied by de La Vallée Poussin on the basis of his manuscripts. Not finding better readings in the two IASWR manuscripts, he concluded that they must stem from the same original as the three used for de La Vallée Poussin’s edition, adding, however, that a more careful study of these manuscripts would be required. The examination of manuscripts undertaken for the present study confirms de Jong’s assessment of these two manuscripts: they are relatively unimportant manuscripts, both proving to be of less value than de La Vallée Poussin’s Cambridge manuscript.

Three more manuscripts of the PsP, also of Nepalese origin, held by the Tokyo University Library—increasing the number of Nepalese paper manuscripts of the PsP to nine—were brought to the attention of scholars by Akira Saito in his 1985 article “Textcritical Remarks

⁴⁸ This manuscript, although littered with scribal errors, often has the distinction of being the “best” of the four “best” paper manuscripts.

⁴⁹ For details, see de Jong 1978: 26. The two manuscripts are referred to in the present study as ms G and ms K.

on the *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā* as Cited in the *Prasannapadā*.⁵⁰ One of these manuscripts, termed “ms J” in the present study, belongs to the group of the four “best” paper manuscripts of the PsP manuscripts available to date. It descends from the same exemplar that de La Vallée Poussin’s Cambridge manuscript (= my ms L) does and on occasion attests correct readings where the Cambridge manuscript is marred by scribal error. I was able to locate another five previously unknown paper manuscripts of the PsP through the Nepal-German Manuscript Project (NGMPP), one of which bears readings valuable enough to place it among the four “best” paper manuscripts.⁵¹ After concluding my search I was informed of the existence of still two more paper manuscripts, both of which, however, are of no import for editing purposes.⁵²

While the coming to light of twelve⁵³ paper manuscripts more than de La Vallée Poussin had access to is reason enough for a re-editing of the PsP, the discovery of two palm-leaf manuscripts of the work veritably demands it. The first of the new finds is a Nepalese manuscript kept in the Bodleian Library in Oxford that I estimate was copied in the late twelfth or thirteenth century, thus possibly not much more than a century after Mahāsumati and Pa tshab translated the PsP in Kashmir; I refer to it as “ms P”.⁵⁴ It preserves numerous readings that became spoiled in or lost to the PsP manuscript tradition over the centuries of repeated copying, some of which support emendations and conjectures made by de La Vallée Poussin, de Jong and other scholars, others of which allow for further correction of Candrakīrti’s important commentary and the root text couched in it. It should be mentioned that it was primarily on the basis of this manuscript that I was able to emend over twenty *kārikās* of the

⁵⁰ For details, see *infra* Manuscript Description: Paper Manuscripts. The manuscripts are referred to in the present study as ms H, ms I and ms J.

⁵¹ I refer to this manuscript as ms B.

⁵² See *infra* Manuscript Description: Introduction and MacDonald 2008: 17f.

⁵³ The manuscript whose first folios I saw as photocopies in Kyoto in 2005 is now unlocatable and thus not counted here.

⁵⁴ See *infra* Manuscript Description: Palm-leaf Manuscripts: Ms P. See also Kragh 2006: 36f.

MMK.⁵⁵ This palm-leaf manuscript, although incomplete (complete, however, for the first chapter) and often badly damaged, is extremely important because it is the only manuscript among the known extant manuscripts of the PsP not to have been affected by the contamination that has entered the rest of the witnesses, and which also affects the Tibetan translation. The second palm-leaf manuscript of the PsP is the so-called Potala manuscript, first announced and described by Yoshiyasu Yonezawa in 2005; I refer to it as “ms Q”.⁵⁶ This manuscript, presumably also of Nepalese origin, is nearly complete (it is missing one folio for the first chapter) and is very well preserved. It contains text for the many lacunae in ms P and greatly aids in the restoration of the PsP. Perhaps its cardinal relevance lies in its having revealed itself to be the key to understanding many of the discrepancies between ms P and the Tibetan translation, for without access to its readings it would have been much more difficult to determine that it (Q) bears extraneous material and to establish the influence of its line on both the Tibetan translation and the paper manuscripts. My work has also benefited from Yonezawa’s diplomatic and critical editions of the *LT, which, he estimates, belongs to the twelfth century and which cites words and phrases from another early manuscript of the PsP.⁵⁷

In the years since the discovery of the additional manuscripts of the PsP, readings attested by some of the new manuscripts have been taken into consideration by scholars investigating the work.⁵⁸ In 2001, Brian Galloway, who did not directly consult a manuscript, published a new Sanskrit edition (and translation) of PsP chapter thirteen that emends de La Vallée Poussin’s text by taking reference

⁵⁵ The emendations suggested in MacDonald 2007 have been incorporated into Ye 2011a.

⁵⁶ See *infra* Manuscript Description: Palm-leaf Manuscripts: Ms Q; Yonezawa 2005a and 2005b.

⁵⁷ See Yonezawa 1999 and 2004, both of which focus on the first chapter of the PsP.

⁵⁸ For instance, both William Ames, who translated PsP chapter sixteen in his 1982 University of Washington Masters thesis, and Paul Nietupski, who translated chapter thirteen as an appendix to his 1996 article, relied on de Jong’s “Textcritical Notes” and on editions of the Tibetan translation.

to de Jong's "Textcritical Notes."⁵⁹ The same year, Toshiyuki Kishine published the first two of three installments of his new Sanskrit edition of PsP chapter twenty-four, which consider the readings as attested in eleven PsP paper manuscripts,⁶⁰ but do not refer to those in ms P (ms Q was unknown at the time). The most exhaustive philological project to date was undertaken by Ulrich Timme Kragh, who in 2006 published a new edition and translation of PsP chapter seventeen for MMK XVII.1-20, which is based on the four "best" paper manuscripts utilized for the present study as well as on ms P.⁶¹

A satisfactory interpretation of the ideas presented in the PsP's long first chapter—it constitutes approximately one-sixth of the entire PsP—is of course contingent on the accuracy of the Sanskrit text, as well as on a close understanding of Candrakīrti's Madhyamaka views and his argumentation, and familiarity with the works and tenets of, and the influences upon, those Candrakīrti portrays as his opponents. It is well known that Stcherbatsky's free translation of the first chapter of the PsP, besides being disadvantaged by problematic text in de La Vallée Poussin's edition, suffers from Stcherbatsky's intentional superimposition of Kantian and other European philosophical views onto positions held by the Madhyamaka and logical-epistemological schools, and as a result often grossly misrepresents Candrakīrti's intent.⁶² Among others, de Jong has critiqued the translation for this intrusion of foreign ideas. He states:⁶³

Stcherbatsky's translation appeared in 1927 (*The conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, pp. 69-212). His work comprises the first chapter which is by far the most difficult. One cannot but have

⁵⁹ See Galloway 2001: 321-350.

⁶⁰ See Kishine 2001a, 2001b, 2002, and Kragh 2006: 23.

⁶¹ See Kragh 2006. On my recommendation, Kragh excluded the ten witnesses that stem from mss J and L. Kragh 2003 contains critical Sanskrit text for the entire chapter.

⁶² See, e.g., Tuck 1990: 36-47.

⁶³ De Jong 1981: 227.

the greatest admiration for the way in which he translated it. There are very few places where Stcherbatsky misunderstood the Sanskrit text but his interpretation is sometimes marred by a tendency to read into the text ideas which are not there. Stcherbatsky even went so far as to make changes in the text in order to bring it into line with his interpretation, as has been pointed out by de La Vallée Poussin (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* I, 1932, p. 390, n. 1). A new English translation of chapters I and 25 is therefore fully justified.

While Stcherbatsky's translation indeed deserves to be appreciated as an impressive pioneering attempt that made aspects of the thought of the demanding first chapter available for the first time to modern scholars of Buddhism, it cannot be denied that he frequently misunderstood the Sanskrit text, so that Candrakīrti's words, in addition to being veiled by Kantian superimposition, etc., are often taken in directions that have little or nothing to do with the argument or explanation at hand.⁶⁴ Tillemans is more to the point:⁶⁵

In addition to the Japanese translation published in the 1940's by Susumu Yamaguchi, we now possess a new translation of *Prasannapadā* I into Japanese by Prof. Tanji. However, as for translation into a European language, this remains a project which urgently needs to be reundertaken, for the translation by Stcherbatsky is exceedingly misleading, both because of its outdated philosophical terminology and because of its translational errors.

⁶⁴ De Jong's statement that "[t]here are very few places where Stcherbatsky misunderstood the Sanskrit text" probably has to be viewed in its context, i.e., Stcherbatsky's translation being intended as a point of contrast for Mervyn Sprung's problematic 1979 translation of the first chapter of the PsP. It should also be remarked that Stcherbatsky presented more literal translations of passages in the notes to his translation, and these capture Candrakīrti's intent more often than the free paraphrase. On Stcherbatsky's mode of translation, see Seyfort Ruegg 2002: 12.

⁶⁵ Tillemans 1992: 315.

The 1979 translation of the chapter by Mervyn Sprung, as de Jong pointed out in his critique of Sprung's English translation of chapter one and sixteen other chapters of the PsP ("Lucid Exposition of the Middle Way: The Essential Chapters from the Prasannapadā of Candrakīrti"), unfortunately did not manage to improve upon Stcherbatsky's translation of the first chapter.⁶⁶ His work, Sprung states, however, is "not directed at Sanskritists who themselves have access to the original and whose interest would be more in the translation of technical terms and in the interpretation of the Prasannapadā within Buddhist and Indian philosophy," but rather aims to make the PsP available "to philosophers who read English." With this goal in mind he therefore abridges or omits numerous important passages from the chapter, justifying his decisions by arguing that to include them "is to make access to the work for contemporary readers difficult and discouraging."⁶⁷ Sprung follows Stcherbatsky's interpretations for most of the remaining challenging passages, and even though he discards the blatant western philosophical overlay, he introduces many new errors of interpretation and translation. In referring to his primary material Sprung does mention that he has viewed the Cambridge manuscript and briefly describes it, but not interested in philological details, notes that in preparing his translation he consulted neither it nor the Tibetan translation, and relied solely on de La Vallée Poussin's edition.⁶⁸

In 1988, Cesare Rizzi published the small monograph "Candrakīrti," which deals with the PsP's first chapter. Rizzi does not translate the chapter and rather paraphrases and briefly explains the thought of selected passages, tending in general to follow Stcherbatsky's interpretations. He omits the entire attack on Dignāga's epistemological

⁶⁶ See de Jong 1981.

⁶⁷ Sprung 1979: xii. For the list of passages Sprung abridged or omitted in his translation of the first chapter, see *ibid.*, xii-xiii.

⁶⁸ Sprung (1979: x-xi) writes, "The manuscript I have seen, the one in Cambridge, is in excellent condition but is replete with scribe's errors and, in Poussin's view, is not as reliable as the Tibetan translation. None the less, I have throughout used only the Sanskrit text as edited by Poussin, even though at many places the Tibetan text is said to be clearer."

project. The paraphrased passages are minimally annotated, and on account of translational/interpretational problems and the imprecision of the paraphrase, the work, not contributing to an improved understanding of the chapter, has largely been ignored by me. Teruyoshi Tanji's important Japanese translation of the entire first chapter of the PsP also appeared in 1988.⁶⁹ His "Prasannapadā Madhyamakavṛtti I" includes substantial philosophical and text-critical annotation, in which Tanji takes into consideration the readings of the Tucci manuscript noted by de Jong in his "Textcritical Notes" as well as those of the two paper manuscripts filmed by the IASWR.⁷⁰ Regrettably, I do not read Japanese and thus am not able to comment on this work or any other Japanese translations of the PsP.

A partial translation of the first chapter of the PsP is presented in Jeffrey Hopkins' "Meditation on Emptiness," published in 1983. Hopkins translates the section of the chapter in which Candrakīrti defends Buddhapālita's use of consequences (*prasaṅga*) to refute the opponent's belief that things come into existence and critiques Bhāviveka's insistence on the use of inferences (*svatantrānumāna*) to accomplish this.⁷¹ The basis for his translation, unlike the translations of previous scholars which rely on de La Vallée Poussin's Sanskrit edition, is the Tibetan translation of the PsP, in this case primarily as it appears in the seventeenth-eighteenth century Tibetan dGe lugs pa scholar 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa's "Great Exposition of the Middle Way,"⁷² in which the entire text of the defence and critique as found

⁶⁹ Two more translations of the entire first chapter of the PsP, by Megumu Honda and Takeki Okuzumi, both in Japanese, were published in 1988. Susumu Yamaguchi had earlier, in 1947, published a translation of the entire chapter. See Yotsuya 1999: xiv and his bibliography. Shiro Matsumoto published a partial translation of the first chapter in 1985. Yotsuya (1999) occasionally refers in his annotation to the translation choices and interpretations of Tanji, Honda, Okuzumi and Yamaguchi.

⁷⁰ See Yotsuya 1999: xiv.

⁷¹ See Hopkins 1983: 455-530.

⁷² Tibetan title: dBu ma 'jug pa'i mtha dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs.

in the first chapter of the PsP is cited.⁷³ The paragraphs on the etymology of the compound *pratītyasamutpāda* (dependent-arising) are presented in Hopkins' translation of the section on dependent-arising in 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa's "Great Exposition of Tenets."⁷⁴ Hopkins has corrected the citations of the Tibetan translation of the PsP in the "Great Exposition of the Middle Way" in dependence on the Peking edition of the translation.⁷⁵ Although he translates the PsP citations from the Tibetan, Hopkins has checked them against the Sanskrit of de La Vallée Poussin's and Vaidya's editions and records major discrepancies; he also refers to some of the emendations and comments in de Jong's "Textcritical Notes." Hopkins' translations of these sections of the first chapter substantially improve upon those of the Western translators mentioned thus far, and the (Tibetan-source based) comments which he intersperses between translated paragraphs are often informative and illuminating. These same translations, however, on occasion suffer from a neglect of the Sanskrit and/or reliance on problematic Tibetan representations of Sanskrit passages. And even though it is true that Tibetan exegesis is sometimes able to clarify aspects of abstruse discussions within Indian texts, it is well known that it has a tendency to superimpose later conceptual and logical developments onto the debates of a different time and context; as might be expected, Hopkins' translations of the passages, and especially, given his sources, his comments on them, are impressed with the dGe lugs pa stamp.

⁷³ See Hopkins 1983: 813, n. 346; 818, n. 374; 823, n. 415. The argumentation of the same section of the PsP has been paraphrased and explained by Peter della Santina following the interpretation found in the dBu ma spyi ston composed by the fifteenth-century Sa skya scholar bSod nams Sen ge; see della Santina 1986: 140-169.

⁷⁴ Tibetan title: Grub mtha'i nram bshad rang gzhan grub mtha' kun dang zab don mchog tu gsal ba kun bzang zhing gi nyi ma lung rigs rgya mtsho skye dgu'i re ba kun skong. See Hopkins 1983: 664-673.

⁷⁵ See, e.g., Hopkins 1983: 835, n. 447; 836, n. 454. Hopkins (*ibid.*, 818, n. 374) states at the outset of his Part Five, chapter four that he has used the Peking edition of the translation and the Tibetan Publishing House gSung rab gces btus dpar khang edition of 1968.

The textually most punctilious investigation of major passages of Candrakīrti's first-chapter confrontation with Bhāviveka and the translation of these passages that to date most clearly reflects Candrakīrti's intent has been carried out by Kodo Yotsuya in "The Critique of Svatantra Reasoning by Candrakīrti and Tsong-kha-pa," published in 1999. Yotsuya is one of the few translators of the chapter to have consulted Sanskrit manuscripts. For the selections from the Sanskrit examined by him, he collated the three manuscripts held by the Tokyo University Library, recording in his notes their variant readings, along with the Tucci manuscript readings and emendations made by de Jong in his "Textcritical Notes," references to readings in the two manuscripts filmed by the IASWR documented in Tanji 1988, and the manuscript readings provided by de La Vallée Poussin in the notes to his edition. The edition's Sanskrit text for the passages Yotsuya translates are emended on the basis of the Tokyo manuscripts and the references to manuscript readings, and the Tibetan for the same passages is presented and emended in reliance on the Peking and Derge editions of the PsP translation; all cases of discrepancy between the Sanskrit and the Tibetan are noted. Yotsuya's analysis of the demanding passages he has chosen to focus on is precise and enlightening, and it has been a source of aid and inspiration for my own translation of the section.

A translation of PsP chapter one that runs from Candrakīrti's citation of MMK I.1 through the critiques of his opponents—thus including the discussion on the etymology of *pratītyasamutpāda* and the refutation of Bhāviveka—up to, but not including, the citation of MMK I.2 (thus sixty-three pages in de La Vallée Poussin's edition) was published by David Seyfort Ruegg in 2002 as the first half of the monograph "Two Prolegomena to Madhyamaka Philosophy." Taking de La Vallée Poussin's edition as his textual basis, Seyfort Ruegg also refers to de Jong's "Textcritical Notes" and pays careful attention to the Tibetan translation, having consulted the readings in the Peking, Derge and Narthang xylograph editions and the Golden Manuscript. The translation is provided with learned annotation and enables readers to gain a far clearer picture of Candrakīrti's conversations with his adversaries, his argumentation and agendas than they could on the basis of Stcherbatsky's translation. Given the

importance of Seyfort Ruegg's translation, I often attempt in my annotation to note cases where my interpretation of Candrakīrti's or the opponents' intent diverges from his, and to provide reasons for my difference of opinion.

A further investigation and translation of a section of the first chapter of the PsP requiring mention is Mark Siderits' 1981 article "The Madhyamaka Critique of Epistemology," in which he presents and discusses most of the passages constituting Candrakīrti's response to the Naiyāyika critique of the Madhyamaka conclusion that things have not arisen as well as Candrakīrti's extensive attack on Dignāga's postulation of the object of perception as the particular characteristic (*svalakṣaṇa*) and on Dignāga's etymology of *pratyakṣa*. Siderits' interest is primarily philosophical and he thus relies only on Vaidya's edition and ignores the Tibetan. The translations of the passages he presents are often problematic, and although he misinterprets the meaning of a number of these passages, his comments as regards others are elucidative.⁷⁶

This same section was translated in its entirety and richly annotated by Dan Arnold in his 2005 article "Materials for a Mādhyamika Critique of Foundationalism: An Annotated Translation of *Prasannapadā* 55.11 to 75.13," and analyzed in his monograph "Buddhists, Brahmins and Belief," also published in 2005. Arnold's translation is based on de La Vallée Poussin's edition, and he presents in his notes to his 2005 article the edition's text for each passage translated, additionally including, where appropriate, variant readings from Vaidya's edition, emendations proposed by de Jong in his "Text-critical Notes," the relevant Tibetan (Derge), and/or comments made by the author of the *LT. In reliance on this material, he occasionally proposes emendations for the Sanskrit text. His translation as a whole represents a fundamental improvement over that by Siderits, and often provides carefully weighed and well-argued alternatives for the translation choices and interpretations advanced by Seyfort Ruegg for the same section. Given that it is Arnold's translation of this

⁷⁶ A few passages from this section are also translated from Tibetan in Thurman 1991.

section which comes closest to reflecting Candrakīrti's intent, I deemed it necessary to consider it in some detail in my own annotation to the segment, and thus note where I concur but also where I understand the Sanskrit expression or argumentation slightly differently, and attempt to substantiate as much as possible any divergent interpretations.

It goes without saying that my own understanding of the text and thus my translation is greatly indebted to the work of nearly all of the above scholars.

Miscellaneous

Notes to the translation that had become too bulky for the page format were transformed into appendices that appear at the end of the translation.

I relied on de La Vallée Poussin's edition of the Tibetan of the MABh for the MABh citations in the notes to my translation and was made aware of Uryuzu and Nakazawa's 2012 MABh Tibetan edition (MABh_{UN}) only after my annotation had been completed. I have nevertheless tried to record relevant variant readings from MABh_{UN} within brackets in my citations of de La Vallée Poussin's text.

Citations from the MMK rely on Ye 2011a. Siderits and Katsura's 2013 translation of the MMK arrived too late for in-depth consideration and is thus rarely referred to in the translation notes.

All citations from Pāli texts appearing in the annotation of the translation are reproduced as they have been printed in the PTS editions; no attempt has been made to regularize the *sandhi*.

