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ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti (BP). It aims at clarifying Buddhapālita's interpretation of the Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikās and his characteristic method of explanation in comparison with other commentators.

The present work is divided into two parts. After a brief Introduction (pp.ix-xxx), which outlines the BP and also discusses some of its main problems, the major portion of Part I is devoted to an annotated English translation (pp.1-285) of the Tibetan text of the BP. The Notes to English translation, which covers chapters one to sixteen, are collectively placed after p.219.

Two related problems have drawn my special interest: that is, the textual question of the Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikās cited in the commentaries, and the different interpretations of a kārikā amongst the commentators. In the Notes those instances are treated with considerable detail when necessary. The list of abbreviations and works, which are referred to in this thesis, follows the Notes (pp.286-292).

Part II contains the entire Tibetan text of the BP (pp.1-375) based upon the four canonical blockprints [PNDC] of bsTan hgyur. The fundamental principle of my critical edition is that the reading of sDe dge edition should be adopted in the text unless it is proved wrong. However, if another reading is preferable for one or more reasons, it is marked with an asterisk in the footnote. The English translation follows the preferred reading.
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INTRODUCTION

0. This thesis is intended as an investigation of the Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamakavyrtti (BP). Although, according to the colophon and a Tibetan tradition, 1 Buddhapālita (c. 470-540) wrote commentaries on a number of Mahāyāna treatises, BP is the only complete text extant. Therefore, in order to discuss his method of explaining the Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā (MK), his thought and his philosophical position in the history of the Mādhyamika school, we are at present given no choice but to examine BP. 2

The importance of studying BP can briefly be explained from the following three points of view:

[1] For the study of MK itself, it goes without saying that we should consult all the commentaries extant in Sanskrit, Tibetan, or Chinese before giving definitive interpretations of each kārikā. Still more, since a good few differences have been found among the kārikā texts quoted in the commentaries, a careful inquiry into the reason for their different interpretations is an urgent need. In this respect not only the BP but also the texts of the Akutobhayā (ABh), Prajñāpradīpa (PP), and Prasannapadā (PSP) still demand further investigation.

[2] The BP marked a turning-point in the history of the Mādhyamika school. That is, Buddhapālita's prasaṅga-vākyā 3 and some of his interpretations of MK faced the criticism of Bhāvaviveka (c. 490-570).

---

2 In the Catuḥsatakātīkā of Candrakīrti [D Ya 144b3-4] a verse is ascribed to Buddhapālita: "The master Buddhapālita has stated, 'Although you indeed see the world to be empty, you, wishing to remove the suffering of the world, have long been distressed; this is extremely wonderful.'"
3 For prasaṅga-vākyā and sāvakāśavacana, see Ejima, Chūganshisō, pp. 173-184.
Afterwards, in PSP Candrakīrti (c. -650-), discussing some of the main points in dispute, vindicated Buddhapālita's way of explanation with a methodological criticism of Bhāvaviveka.\(^1\) It is generally accepted that this argument among the three commentators has, as a result, led to a split in the Mādhyamika school, i.e. Thāl hgyur ba (Prāsaṅgika) and Raṅ rgyud pa (Svātantrika).\(^2\)

[3] As will be discussed later, the BP is to some extent related to other commentaries, ABh, PP, PPT, and PSP. Whether it is criticism or vindication, quotation or incorporation, the relationship among the commentaries is an important task awaiting future research.

1. Before entering upon an analysis of the text, it is fitting to make a brief survey of modern studies dealing with BP. In chronological order these are the following:


1932-1936 Otake, Sh.: "Chūron Butsugoshaku Wayaku", Mikkyōkenkyū 42, pp. 152-160; 45, pp. 82-90; 59, pp. 77-86. [Chap.I Jap.tr.]


1954 Hirano, T.: "Muichū to Butsugochū no Idō nitsuite", IBK 3-1, pp. 236-238. [The author shows that the text of Chap. XXIII-XXVII is the same in both ABh and BP]

1968 Ejima, Y.: "Bhāvaviveka Kenkyū (4-3: Buddhapālita Hihan)", Tōyōbunka kenkyūjo Kiyō 54, pp. 32-40. [A study of Bhāvaviveka's criticism of Buddhapālita]

\(^1\) See Ejima, ibid., pp. 171-193; Tachikawa, "Kibyūronshōha", pp. 122-129.


1981 Lindtner, Chr.: "Buddhapālita on Emptiness", IV 23, pp. 187-217 [Chap. XVIII Text based on PN and Eng. tr.]

In addition, since of Chap. XXIII-XXVII ABh and BP have almost the same text, the following studies of ABh should also be referred to:


1925 Ikeda, Ch.: Konponchūronsho Muiron Yakuchū (Tōyobunkoronsō 16), Tokyo. [Jap. tr.]


2. BP was rendered into Tibetan by the Indian scholar Jñānagarbha and the Tibetan translator Kluḥī rgyal mtshan - presumably at the beginning of the ninth century. Except for a few inadequate or careless translations which will be discussed later, their version as a whole is quite reliable.
2.1. For the critical edition of \textbf{BP}, four canonical blockprints [PDNC] of \textit{bsTan hgyur} were consulted as primary sources:


sNar thān ed. [Tsa 169a6-310b3], printed from a microfilm kept in the Tōyō Bunko, the original copy of which is preserved in the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo. This printed copy was sent to me through the kindness of Mr. R. Uesugi, former Research Officer at the Section for Tibetan Studies in the Tōyō Bunko.

sDe dge ed. [Tsa 158b1-281a4], reproduced as a facsimile copy from the original blockprint preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo (sDe dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka bsTan hgyur, dbu ma 1, The World Sacred Text Publication Society, Tokyo, 1977).

Co ne ed. [Tsa 154b7-276a4], published in microfiche form by the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, New York, 1974, vol. 17.

As is often found in these four editions, PN and DC regularly differ in transcribing the following words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PN</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>Skt. equivalent</th>
<th>E.g.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la(s) bltos pa</td>
<td>la ltos pa</td>
<td>(apēkṣā)</td>
<td>p.22,11.16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bslu ba</td>
<td>slu ba</td>
<td>(mosa, v/mus)</td>
<td>p.179,1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdzun pa</td>
<td>brdzun pa</td>
<td>(mṛṣā)</td>
<td>p.184,1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sreg bzin pa</td>
<td>bsreg bzin pa</td>
<td>(dahyamāna)</td>
<td>p.145,1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lta bar bya</td>
<td>blta bar bya</td>
<td>(draṣṭavya)</td>
<td>p.56, 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go rim</td>
<td>go rims</td>
<td>(anukrama, krama)</td>
<td>p.357,11.9-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, other characteristics to be noticed are as follows:

(1) In DC la sogs (= ådi) is occasionally replaced by a rather old script la stogs, e.g. p. 356, 1.21; p.363, 1.10.¹

(2) PN have in several cases a wrong transcription sms dpah for sms pa (= citta), e.g. p. 44, 1.15; p.225, 11.3.⁴

(3) N frequently uses an abridged writing of two words such as ḥgyuro (ḥgyur ro); sǹegsō (sǹegs so); brtags so; gdags so; pасо (pas so); phyiro (phyir ro); byasa (byas so); byedo (byed do); ḥbyuṅo (ḥbyuṅ ho); dmigso (dmigs so)²; tshigo (tshig go); yino (vīn no); yodo (yod do); rǐgso (rīgs so); gṣuṅso (gsuṅs so); rjesu (rjes su); gṣisu (gṣis su); rnamgs (rnam s so); byedam (byed dam)³. In p.301, 1.14, only C transcribes lugs sal for lugs gsal. Since in my edition each abridged expression is transliterated as two divided words, i.e. ḥgyur ro instead of ḥgyuro, they are not mentioned in the footnotes.

(4) In most cases DC do not count a right vertical line of go and ko as equivalent to chig ṣad:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PN</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>E.g.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㄱㄱ</td>
<td>ㄱㄱ</td>
<td>P.179,1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄱㄱ</td>
<td>ㄴㄱ</td>
<td>P.190,1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Since BP incorporated many explanations from Abh and also a number of sentences of BP were taken up into PFT, in such cases consultation of these two texts is an important help in establishing a critical edition of BP. For that reason the variant readings of Abh, PFT, or both of them are mentioned in footnotes if necessary. In addition, for editing the text of Mk quoted in BP, other texts such as Prajñā-MK, PP, or PSP are also consulted as secondary sources.

¹. The same difference is found between DC and PN in their Tibetan texts of the Ratnāvalī. See Hahn, Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī, p. 11.
². P also uses this abridged writing dmigso in p.190, 1.1.
³. In p. 100, 1.17, P has also byedam.
2.3. The Skt. text of MK is extant only as embedded in PSP. From 1903 to 1913, L. de La Vallée Poussin published a monumental edition of PSP ("Bibl. Buddh. IV", St.-Pétersbourg) which has greatly facilitated not only the study of PSP but also our study of the Mādhyamika philosophy in general. This edition is based upon three manuscripts kept in Cambridge, Paris, and Calcutta. In 1977 and 1978 J.W. de Jong made an important contribution to the study of both MK and PSP with two related publications, i.e. Nāgārjuna Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1977; and "Textcritical Notes on the Prasannapadā", IIJ 20, pp. 25-59, 217-252, 1978.¹ Both of them are based upon an excellent manuscript "R" which was originally photographed by G. Tucci and was sent to J.W. de Jong.² Through his emendations of LVP's edition or his confirmation of readings suggested by LVP, the textual situation of MK has reached a considerable height of perfection.

Besides manuscript R, the following five manuscripts were used in studying the textual problems of each kārikā.

TD 250: Prasannapadā, paper, 249 leaves, kept in the Tokyo University Library, Catalogue³ No. 250.

TD 251: Prasannapadā, paper, 241 leaves, kept in the Tokyo University Library, Catalogue No. 251.

TD 252: Prasannapadā, paper, 303 leaves, kept in the Tokyo University Library, Catalogue No. 252.


MBB-II: Prasannapadā nāma madhyamakavṛtti, paper, 142 leaves, published in microfiche form by the above Institute, New York, 1975. [Not complete, = PSP pp. 1-377].

As far as the three manuscripts kept in the University of Tokyo are concerned, TD 250 and 252 reveal in many cases their close kinship and TD 251 is as a whole superior to both of them.

So far our textcritical study of MK has disclosed that at least nine more emendations should be added as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza</th>
<th>La Vallée Poussin</th>
<th>Emendations</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 12bcd</td>
<td>[pratyayebhyaḥ pravartate/]</td>
<td>[pratyayebhyaḥ] pravartate/</td>
<td>I n.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[apratyayebhyaḥ 'pi kasmān phalam]</td>
<td>apratyayebhyaḥ 'pi kasmān phalam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 13a</td>
<td>[na pūrvam]</td>
<td>prāg asti</td>
<td>II n.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI 6d</td>
<td>sahabhāvo yatas</td>
<td>sahabhāvas tatas</td>
<td>VI n.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX 24a</td>
<td>na sāmagrīkṛtam phalam</td>
<td>tasmān na sāmagrīkṛtam</td>
<td>VIII n.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI 3c</td>
<td>caiva</td>
<td>caiva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII 3c</td>
<td>so 'nātmetṛ</td>
<td>sa nātmetṛ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV 3b</td>
<td>catvāry āryaphalāṇi</td>
<td>catvāry api phalāṇi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV 9d</td>
<td>gambhiram</td>
<td>gambhiram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII 2b</td>
<td>anyo</td>
<td>anyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is, however, still a notable question as to the text of MK.

In quite a few cases the present Skt. text of MK quoted in PSP does not agree with the Tibetan translation of MK found in ABh, BP, PP, and PPT. Since this problem must be treated by a thorough study of all the related texts, we shall at this stage confine ourselves to pointing out the following twenty two discrepancies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza</th>
<th>MK in PSP</th>
<th>MK in PP etc.</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 14a</td>
<td>pratyayāpratyayāh</td>
<td>pratyayo 'pratyayah</td>
<td>I n.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI 2a</td>
<td>rakte 'sati</td>
<td>rakte sati</td>
<td>VI n.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 17a</td>
<td>utpadyate 'sati</td>
<td>utpadyate sati</td>
<td>VII n.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII 21a</td>
<td>kasmān</td>
<td>yasmān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII 26a</td>
<td>tatttvataḥ</td>
<td>tatkrtaṃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX 13a</td>
<td>na jātasya</td>
<td>nājātasya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX 14a</td>
<td>nājātasya</td>
<td>na jātasya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI 2c</td>
<td>vınaiva</td>
<td>vineva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI 3c</td>
<td>caiva (LVP caivam)</td>
<td>ceva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI 5c</td>
<td>caiva</td>
<td>ceva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI 12bcd</td>
<td>bhāvo 'bhāvān na jāyate/</td>
<td>'bhāvo bhāvān na jāyate/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nābhāvāj jāyate 'bhāvo</td>
<td>nābhāvāj jāyate bhāvo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'bhāvo bhāvān na jāyate //</td>
<td>'bhāvo 'bhāvān na jāyate//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII 1abc</td>
<td>skandhā na nānyaḥ skandhebhya</td>
<td>kāyā na nānyaḥ kāyebhya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nāsmin skandhā na teṣu saḥ/</td>
<td>nāsmin kāyā na teṣu saḥ/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tathāgataḥ skandhavān na</td>
<td>tathāgataḥ kāyavān na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII 10c</td>
<td>pratītya śubham</td>
<td>pratītyāśubham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII 11c</td>
<td>pratītyāśubham</td>
<td>pratītya śubham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII 13bc</td>
<td>nāṇityam vidyate śūnye</td>
<td>na nītyaṃ vidyata śūnye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kuto grāho viparyayah//</td>
<td>kuto grāho 'viparyayah//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII 14</td>
<td>anitye nityam ity evam</td>
<td>anitye 'nityam ity evam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yadi grāho viparyayah/</td>
<td>yadi grāho 'viparyayah/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nāṇityam vidyate śūnye</td>
<td>nāṇityam vidyate śūnye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>śūnye kīṃ na viparyayah//</td>
<td>kuto grāho 'viparyayah//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV 13c</td>
<td>doṣaprasaṅga nāsmākaṃ</td>
<td>doṣaprasaṅgaṇēsmākaṃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanza</td>
<td>MK in PSP</td>
<td>MK in PP etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV 36cd</td>
<td>yat pratītyasamutpādaśūnyatām</td>
<td>yah pratītyasamutpādaḥ śūnyatām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV 3d</td>
<td>ucyate</td>
<td>isyate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV 13b</td>
<td>katham</td>
<td>yadi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV 14b</td>
<td>katham</td>
<td>yadi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI 10ab</td>
<td>samskārāṇa avidvān</td>
<td>samskārāṇa na vidvān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. Jñānagarbha and Kluṭi rgyal mtsan translated not only BP but also Prajñā-MK, Abh, PP, and PPT. Prajñā-MK consisting of 449 śloka-s was, according to its colophon, first rendered by them and was later retranslated by the Indian scholar Ḥasumati of Kashmir and the Tibetan translator Ṛni ma grags (1055- ) in conformity with the explanations of PSP.¹ This is the reason why the present Tibetan version of Prajñā-MK is almost the same as that of the kārikā texts cited in PSP, though a few traces of the original translation can still be found in the editions of Prajñā-MK.² The present text of Prajñā-MK is therefore of little use for dealing with textual problems relating to MK as quoted in Abh, BP, PP, and PPT.

A more serious problem lies in the fact that except for a few minor differences, Jñānagarbha and Kluṭi rgyal mtsan always gave the same translation of MK embedded in Abh, BP, PP, and PPT even though these commentaries obviously differ in their interpretation of the kārikās. And more important, in most of such cases the translation reflects Bhāvaviveka's interpretation. In the following list, at the left side of the hyphen, are the commentaries whose interpretation agrees with the Tibetan translation of MK cited in them; however, this translation does not accord with the other commentaries on the right side of the hyphen.

---

¹ See Prajñā-nāma-mūlamadhyamakā-kārikā, D Tsa 19a5-6.
² The following translations, for instance, are the same as those of Abh etc., but not PSP. MK II 2b [DC] yatāḥ - gañ gi; VII 3c [PNJ] anavasthā - thug pa med; VII 11c [PNJ] ihaṣṭhaḥ - ḍu ḍu na ḍu ḍu pa; XXVI 4c [PNDC] nāmarūpaṃ pratītya - miṃ dañ gugs brten nas; XXVI 8b [PNDC] bhavāt - srid pa las ni; XXVII 13d [PNDC] eṣā - ḍe dag.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 3ab</td>
<td>ABh, PP</td>
<td>BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 12</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>ABh, BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 4d</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>ABh; [BP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 7ab</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>ABh, BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 16ab</td>
<td>ABh, PP</td>
<td>BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 17cd</td>
<td>ABh, PP</td>
<td>BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 18cd</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>ABh, BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 28</td>
<td>ABh, PP</td>
<td>BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI 1ab</td>
<td>ABh, PP</td>
<td>BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII 5</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>ABh, BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII 17</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>ABh, BP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This fact leads us to the following conclusion concerning the chronological order of translation. Kluahi rgyal mtshan etc. first rendered PP and PPT, along with Prajñā-MK, and subsequently ABh and BP without changing the translation of kārikā texts quoted in both of them. After more than two hundred and fifty years, Ni ma grags etc. translated FPS, and Prajñā-MK was then retranslated in accordance with this commentary. [ 1 PP, PPT, Prajñā-MK1, 2 ABh, BP; 3. FPS, Prajñā-MK2 ].

2.5. The translation of Kluahi rgyal mtshan etc. is, on the whole, no less reliable than that of Ni ma grags etc. However, there is a slight diversity in their preference of terms as to rendering a few Skt. words used in MK:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skt.</th>
<th>Kluahi rgyal mtshan etc. Ni ma grags etc. References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>svabhāva</td>
<td>nbo bīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-maya</td>
<td>-las byuā (ba)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See Tr. I n.16.
2.6. The Tibetan text of BP contains several noteworthy words and expressions:

yoḥ ni, yoḥ: emphatic particle, "certainly, in any case", etc. These words should carefully be recognized since yoḥ ni is easily mistaken as yod na or yod ni and yoḥ as yod or yoḥ. See II n.46; Text p.218, n.6, p.289, n.1.

ko: ending particle for emphasis. In BP this word is only used in such expressions as: ci khyod...ham/ khyod... ko//, e.g. Text XV p.198, 11.11-13, ci khyod rta la ḍon bzin ōid du rta ma mthoṅ ham/ khyod džos po rnams rtam ciṅ hbrecl par ḍbyuṅ ba ōes kyan smra la/ de dag gaṅ gi ḍo bo ōid med pa ōid kyan ma mthoṅ ko// "Do you not see the horse though you are riding on it? Although you say that "things are produced dependently", you do not see [indeed] their absence of own-nature." This unknown particle follows various verbs such as sgrub par byed ko (Text p.241, 1.5), brjod ko (p.39, 1.3), ston par byed ko (p.117, 1.8), mthoṅ ko (p.159, 1.17, p.198, 1.13), rtsod ko (p.232, 1.14), rtsom ko (p.193, 1.23), rtsom par byed ko (p.101, 1.23), sun ḍbyin ko (p.100, 1.18), and sens ko (p. 190, 11.19-20). A few exceptional cases are the following: In the Text p.18, 1.12, DC have ḍnod do instead of ḍnod ko (= PN) though in the same chapter p.19, 1.6, ḍnod ko is used in the four editions. The same difference is also found on p.279, 1.8, i.e. DC has khoṅ du ma chud do and PN
khoṅ du ma chud ko. This may be ascribed to a later alteration by a
抄写者 or a reviser in the course of the transmission of the Tibetan
texts [DC]. Another exception is that in the same type of statement
found in chapters II and XIII (p.41, 1.3, p.46, 1.16; p.179, 11.6-7),
PNDC equally have rtog go for rtog ko, the reason for which is
probably that the pronunciation of rtog ko is liable to be mistaken
as rtog go.

(h)grub po, btab po, bthob po: Although, according to the so-called
classical Tibetan grammar, these verbs require bo as an ending
particle, po is quite often employed at the end of a sentence. This
cannot simply be judged to be a clerical error. See, for instance,
Text p.29,1.13, p.30,1.2; p.53,1.14; p.222,1.18.

so na: adverbial phrase, "as before", "in the same condition" etc. E.g.
so na gnas pa "to remain as before", so na hdug pa "to exist as
before", and so na bāg na "if placed as before". See X n.13.

gyi na(ho): "[It is] worthless", "[It is] nonsense" etc. See I n.22.

3. The main principle in editing the Tibetan text of BP is that the
reading of D edition should be adopted in the text unless it is proved
wrong. This principle aims at avoiding arbitrary or inconsistent usage
of readings. Editing the text on this principle can also make clear the
characteristics of each edition. As far as BP is concerned, D edition
and N edition are, on the whole, almost equal in their reliability.
However, the illegibility of N edition obliged us to use D edition as
a basic text.

Criteria according to which a reading of D edition is judged correct
or incorrect are the following: Whether or not it is [1] adequate in
of MK if it belongs to kārika Tibetan, and [4] confirmed by comparison
with a similar sentence found in ABh or PPT. Therefore, if there are two readings both of which are equally justifiable, the reading of D edition should always be chosen, even though it is not consistently used in the same edition. E.g., khyod, khyed; gñi ga, gñis ka; brag cha, brag ca; de lta na, de ltar na; de lta yin na, de ltar yin na; de bas na, de lta bas na; de phyir (especially in a stanza), dehi phyir; gal te... hgyur na, gal te... gyur na; gal te... btags na, gal te... btags na.

Another principle concerns preferable readings which our English translation follows. We often come across instances where, even though the reading of D edition cannot be regarded as wrong, the other variants are preferable from one or more points of view; that is, [1] extent of conformity to the context, [2] ordinary usage, and [3] comparison with other expressions in the same context. For instance, [1] in Text I, p.10,1.3, DC read te por bstan par byaho// "[It] should be explained properly", while PN have de dañ por bstan par byaho/ "It should be explained first". Judging from the context, the variant reading of PN is preferable to the reading of DC though this reading itself is quite possible in Tibetan. Next, [2] Text II, p.32,1.23-p.33,1.2 may offer an example of the second case: de la gañ gi tshe hgro ba žes bya ba de hgro bahi bya ba dañ bral bas mi hthad pas dehi tshe bgom pa la hgro ba yod par ji ltar hthad par hgyur/ "Here, when 'there is going' is not possible because it is bereft of the action of going, then how could there be going on that which is being gone over?" As to the doubly underlined part, the variant reading of PN mi hthad pa is preferable in accordance with ordinary usage. For an example of the third criterion [3], see Text II p.96, n.1, p.91, n.5.

In these cases the reading of D edition is left in the text and we mark the other and preferable variant reading with an asterisk in the footnote.
4. **BP** is one of the six commentaries of **MK** extant in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese. The following list shows the position of **Buddhapālita** among the eight commentators which **Avalokitavrata** (c.-700-) enumerates in **PPT**.¹

- **Nāgārjuna** (c.150-250) 0,1
- **Aryadeva** (c.170-270)
- **Rāhulabhadra** (c.200-300)
  - **Piṅgala** (c.300-350) 2
  - **Maitreya** (c.350-430)
  - **Asaṅga** (c.395-470)
  - **Vasubandhu** (c.400-480)
- **Buddhapālita** (c.470-540) 3
  - **MĀDHYAMIKĀ**
  - **Bhāvaviveka** (c.490-570) 4
    - **Gunaśrī**
    - **Guptamati** (c.460-540)
    - **Sthiramati** (c.510-570) 5
  - **Devaśarman**
- **Candrakīrti** (c.-650-) 6
  - **Avalokitavrata** (c.-700-)

---

: Eight Commentators

0 **Prajñā-nāma-mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā** D No.3824, P No.5224
1 **Mūlamadhyamaka-vṛttty-akutobhayā** D No.3829, P No.5229
2 **Zhōng-lùn 中論** T No.1824
3 **Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti** D No.3842, P No.5242
4 **Prajjñāpradīpa-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti** D No.3853, P No.5253; T No.1566
5 **Dà-chéng-zhōng-guān-shì-lùn 大乘中觀釋論** T No.1567, pp 26-1
6 **Mūlamadhyamaka(Mūlamādhyamika)-vṛtti-prasannapādā** La Vallée Poussin ed., 1903-1913 (Bibl.Buddh.IV); D No.3860, P No.5260.

¹. **PPT** D Wa 73a4-5, 102a2-3, 153b2-3. The eight commentators are also referred to in the colophon of **ABh** [D Tsa 99a6-7].
4.1. In considering the relationship of BP to other commentaries, ABh is to be referred to in the first place. Concerning the chapters one to twenty-two, Buddhāpālita sometimes incorporates a few sentences from ABh into BP and in other cases he enlarges the explanations of ABh before taking them up into BP. However, as far as the above chapters are concerned, the originality of BP is but little vitiated by such direct or enlarged incorporation. The characteristic method of his explanation, i.e. prasaṅga-vākyā, is retained throughout the chapters; and more important, in several cases ABh and BP differ in their interpretation of a kārikā (see section 2.4.). The number of folios used for the twenty-two chapters in BP is, incidentally, almost twice as many as that of ABh.

On the other hand, the Tibetan texts of the remaining five chapters of both works are practically identical. Although this problem requires a further investigation of both texts, the following two points may be ascertained at this stage:

1 Concerning the last five chapters of BP, the original Skt. text must have been borrowed from or supplemented by that of ABh, but not otherwise.

2 In these five chapters Bhāvaviveka gives no criticism of Buddhāpālita, and also in PPT of Avalokitavrata we cannot find any similar passages incorporated from BP or ABh. This fact may suggest that at the time of Bhāvaviveka the original Skt. text of the last five chapters of BP was already borrowed from or supplemented by that of ABh. However, whether this was done by Buddhāpālita himself or by someone else in later times is still uncertain.
4.2. According to the subcommentary of Avalokitavrata [PPT], Bhāvaviveka criticized Buddhapālita more than twenty times in PP. His criticism was directed both at Buddhapālita's method of explaining kārikā-s, i.e. sāvakāśavacana (glags yod paḥi tshig), and at the latter's interpretation and explanation of kārikā-s. In most cases his criticism follows a summarized or abridged quotation from BP.

4.3. The relationship of PPT to BP is of two kinds: Whenever Bhāvaviveka criticizes Buddhapālita without giving the two personal names, Avalokitavrata plays a role in identifying the two persons as Bhāvaviveka and Buddhapālita, and he explains minutely the point in dispute. PPT bears, however, another relation to BP. As is pointed out in the Notes, quite a few passages of BP were incorporated into PPT without any reference to the original source. A relationship of this kind between BP and PPT is noticeable in the chapters IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, and XXI.

4.4. It was due to Candrakīrti, who vindicated Buddhapālita's method of explaining MK, that in later ages Buddhapālita was called the founder of Thal ḫgyur ba (Prāsaṅgika). Moreover, except for such cases where PSP has different texts of kārikā-s from those of ABh, BP, and PP, Candrakīrti mostly agrees with Buddhapālita if there is a discrepancy between BP and ABh or PP in their interpretation of a kārikā. In this respect a careful study of their mutual relationship will be an interesting topic for future research.

Having come to the end of this Introduction, it may be helpful to give a brief sketch of the fundamental logic with which Buddhapālita expounds each kārikā, of some of the characteristic explanations found in his commentary, and of his authorities.

5.1. The fundamental rule of inference with which Buddhapālita builds up his argument is Modus tollens (MT): \( p \land q, \neg q, \therefore \neg p \). And if in this rule we substitute \( p \) by \( \neg p \), it becomes the so-called reductio ad absurdum. There are three types of argument in BP, which have basically the same logical form.

\[ 
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad p \land (q \lor r) \\
2 & \quad (q \land x) \cdot (r \land y) \\
3 & \quad \neg x, \neg y \\
4 & \quad \neg q, \neg r \\
5 & \quad \neg (q \lor r) \\
6 & \quad \neg p \\
\end{align*} 
\]

The disjunction \((q \lor r)\) can be \((q \lor r \lor s)\) or \((q \lor r \lor s \lor t)\). E.g.

Text I p.14,11.15-23, p.15,11.2-4: ḫdi la skye baḥi bya ba ni rnam par šes pa ma skyes pa ham skyes pa la ḫjug par ḫgyur graṅ na/ de la re ḫig ma skyes pa la ni mi ḫjug ste/ gnas pa med paḥi phyir ro/ ḫdi ltar skye baḥi bya ba ni rnam par šes paḥi gnas la ḫjug gi/ gnas med pa la mi ḫjug pas rnam par šes pa ma skyes pa de yaṅ med pa yin la/ de med na skye baḥi bya ba de la gnas pa yod pa rnam par šes pa skyes pa la yaṅ skye baḥi bya ba mi ḫjug ste/ ciḥi phyir še na/ rnam par šes pa skyes pa skyes zin paḥi phyir te/ ḫdi ltar skyes zin pa la ni yaṅ skye ba med do// .../ skyes pa daṅ ma skyes pa ḡhis la skye baḥi bya ba mi ḫjug par ni bstan zin pas deḥi phyir skye baḥi bya ba med do// =

"Here, the action of producing would operate either on consciousness which has not yet originated or on that which has originated. First, it does not operate on that which has not yet originated, because it
[what has not yet originated] is not established. In fact, the action
of producing might operate on consciousness which is established, but
does not operate on that which is not established. Therefore, the
consciousness which has not originated does not exist at all. And if
it does not exist, how could the action of producing be established
on it? [Next], the action of producing does not also operate on
consciousness which has originated. Why? Because the consciousness
has already originated. In fact, there is no origination once again
for that which has already originated. ... It has already been explained
that the action of producing does not operate on the two, what has and
what has not originated. Consequently, there is no action of producing."

This type of argument is proved valid by the Modus tollens rule. E.g.
Text V p.71,11.l1-13: ḫdi ltar gal te nam mkha' ḥes bya ba cuṅ ūg
yod par gyur na de bzi po de dag las gaṅ yah ruṅ ba ūg tu ḥgyur graṅ
na/ bzi po de dag kyaṅ med pas dehi phyir nam mkha' yod pa ma yin no// =
"If in fact anything called "Space" existed, it would be one of these
four; however, these very four do not exist. In consequence, Space does
not exist."

This third type of argument has often been taken as invalid because it
is apparently against the rule of inference; however, it exactly observes
the Modus tollens rule. We note that this argument cannot be symbolized
as p J q, -p, :: -q. And if q is substituted by p, this argument is
the same as the second type.
E.g. Text XI p.160,11.17-19: gal te dbus疏导 yod par gyur na ni dbus yod
pañi phyirḥkhhor ba yaḥ yod par ḥgyur graṅ na / deḥi dbus疏导 mi ḥṭhad
pas de med pañi phyir ḥkhor ba yod par ga la ḥgyur/ = "Only if the very
middle exists, transmigration may also exist as [= its] middle exists;
however, its middle is not possible. Because it [= its middle] does
not exist, how will transmigration exist?"

5.2. Compared with other commentaries, a few distinctive explanations
are to be noted in BP. The first characteristic is found in his intro-
duction to several chapters. In the chapters II, III, VI, VII, and VIII
Buddhapālita introduces a question as follows: E.g.

Text II p.31,11.2-4: smras pa/ khyed kyis skye ba med pañi rigs pa ḥdī
rjes su rab tu bstan pas kho boḥi yid stōḥ pa ḥdī ḥan pa la ḥo mtshar
ṣnīṅ po can du byas kyis/ ji ltar ḥjig rten gyi mḥon sum gyi ḥgro ba
daṅ ḥōṅ ba mi ḥṭhad pa de je smros ṣīg// = "Question: Having explained
the reasoning of non-origination, you have caused my mind to be filled
with wonder at hearing [the teaching of] Emptiness (ṣūnyatā). Now,
therefore, tell how neither going nor coming, which can be seen directly
by the people, is possible."

In PP Bhāvaviveka criticized this introductory explanation. See Tr. II
n.2.

Another characteristic which has already been shown under section 2.6.
may be called a metaphorical criticism. To cite an example:

Text II p.41,11.2-3: bṣad pa/ ci khyod bu ma btsas par ḥchi baḥi mya ḥan
byed dam/ khyod soṅ ba med par ma soṅ ba la rtog go// = "Answer: Although
you have not begotten a son, are you distressed about his death? You
are imagining that which has not yet been gone over (agata), though that
which has already been gone over does not exist (gata)."

These two kinds of characteristic explanation, incidentally, are not found
after chapter twenty-two.
Apart from several brief quotations from sūtras Buddhapālita's main authorities are Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. From Nāgārjuna he only uses MK to authorize his argument. From Āryadeva's Catuḥsatakāstrastraṇī (CSK) he quotes twenty-three verses. Five stanzas of them are, however, unidentified in the present text of CSK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSK</th>
<th>BP text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII 9</td>
<td>XVIII p.256,11.2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>IV p.64,1.22-p.65,1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>XVIII p.250,1.23-p.251,1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>XVIII p.261,11.8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Intro. p.9,11.4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX 18</td>
<td>XIV p.270,11.13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X 20</td>
<td>XVIII p.247,11.4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>XVIII p.260,11.8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI 17</td>
<td>VII p.87,11.8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>VII p.87,11.12-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>VII p.87,11.16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII 23</td>
<td>XVIII p.249,11.5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII 16</td>
<td>III p.51,11.15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV 13</td>
<td>I p.28,11.15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>III p.52,11.16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Intro. p.3, 11.18-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV 5</td>
<td>XI p.161,11.3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI 23</td>
<td>XXII p.318,11.19-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>XVI p.212,11.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX p.288,11.2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX p.289,11.9-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In chapter eighteen a verse is found from Rāhulabhadra's Prajñāpāramitā-stotra. Another verse by the unknown Āryābhaya (?) is quoted in chapter eleven (see Tr. XI n.18).

6. To turn now to the presentation of the main body, we shall give some explanatory remarks with regard to the English translation, Notes, and the Tibetan text.

6.1. The English translation covers chapters one to sixteen (pp.1-219).
1 Each page contains the translation of one page of the Tibetan text.
2 Every five lines the number of lines is shown in the left-hand margin.
3 Every chapter is sectionalized according to the process of Buddhapālita's argument. For each section a brief title is added by me in square brackets.
4 The beginning of a paragraph is indicated by an indentation of five spaces.
5 The translation of the kārikā text is underlined and every line (abcd) of a stanza is indented by ten spaces. The dot on a line-symbol, for instance kā.lód, shows an incomplete quotation of the corresponding line.
6 Probable Sanskrit equivalents to some of the key words in a chapter are added in parentheses.
7 Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese, and the title of a book are underlined.
8 Notes to the English translation are placed collectively after p.219.

1. See Lindtner, "Buddhāpālita", p.216, n.94.
D and P editions are used for all other texts than BP. Locations are shown by the folio-number, obverse or reverse, and line-number of D edition.

Passages incorporated from ABh to BP and from BP to PPT are indicated by three signs: =, ], [. For instance, = ABh means that "this passage is exactly incorporated from ABh", and ] ABh means that "this passage is incorporated from ABh with a few words supplemented".

6.2. Part II of this thesis contains the entire Tibetan text of BP critically edited in accordance with the principles explained under section 3. The second and fourth remarks to the English translation are also applicable here. Other explanatory remarks are the following:

1. Apart from the translation of the kārikā text quoted, the main body of the Tibetan text is not underlined.

2. Within parentheses folio-number, obverse or reverse of the four editions is given. Only D edition is given a line-number in parentheses.

3. In the footnotes the variant readings are found. As explained before, preferable readings which our English translation follows are marked with an asterisk.

4. Except for the translation of the kārikā text, all references to ABh, PPT and other Tibetan texts are made to the page and line number of the D edition and to the P edition if necessary.