

Mūlamadhyamakakārikā 再考

— 文献批判に基づく諸提案と諸問題 —

Anne MacDONALD

本論文は、de La Vallée Poussin 版および de Jong 版の *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (MMK, Nāgārjuna 作の中観派の基礎的著作) の内の若干の *kārikā* を、誤読の校訂という観点から精査するものである。この論文で考察されている諸校訂点は、ボドレー図書館（在オクスフォード）所蔵の *Prasannapadā* のサンスクリット語貝葉写本の読みに主として依拠している。そしてまたこの校訂点の多くは、第二の *Prasannapadā* のサンスクリット語貝葉写本（いわゆるポクラ写本）と、新たに発見された MMK および MMK の *Buddhapālita* 註のサンスクリット語写本（不完全本、おそらくは七世紀）の読みによって支持されている。

その新たな読みにより次のことが明らかにされた、つまり、Nāgārjuna は、彼の *kārikā* を著述するにあたり、一般的な *śloka* 作成規則に従ったのであり、先人によって想定されていたのとは逆に、変則的な *vipulā* を用いなかった、ということである。さらに Nāgārjuna の文体の特徴が、いくつかのテキスト改正点によって顕示されている。特に目立つのは、彼が古典的でない動詞形を用いていること、そしてある動詞形の種々の態をただ一詩節の内でも併用することを彼は好むということである。彼が非古典的な動詞形を使用するのは、彼自身の言語的背景と環境の諸相を反映している。そして、MMK のテキストから非古典形を排除してきたのは、まず何よりも、Nāgārjuna の口、あるいは筆から古典的なサンスクリット語のみが発せられたと思込んでいる、過度に熱心な写本筆記者と校訂者たちの干渉に他ならないのである。

彼の文体の特徴についてのこの発見は、他のテキストを彼の著作であるとする主張が妥当か否かを確定する助けとなろう。

Revisiting the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā: Text-Critical Proposals and Problems*

Anne MacDONALD

Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā (henceforth MMK), the foundational work of the Madhyamaka school, was, as is well known, first edited in the early years of the past century by Louis de La Vallée Poussin in the process of editing Candrakīrti's Prasannapadā, in which the MMK is embedded. De La Vallée Poussin established his text of the root *kārikās* and the text of Candrakīrti's commentary on them in reliance on three Sanskrit manuscripts that he recognized and described as "mediocre copies" of an original that was itself not faultless; he therefore repeatedly turned to the Tibetan translation of the Prasannapadā for clarification and inspiration. I have been able to determine that even the oldest of de La Vallée Poussin's manuscripts was copied later than A.D. 1731;¹ all three of the manuscripts he used are thus relatively recent testimonies of the Prasannapadā, a seventh-century work, and of Nāgārjuna's *kārikās*, estimated to have been composed in the second or third century A.D. Over the past half-century, a number of scholars have proposed emendations for de La Vallée Poussin's text of the MMK and/or published material which has contributed to text-critical work on the MMK. P.L. Vaidya's attempts to emend several of the *kārikās* for his 1960 edition of the Prasannapadā largely failed, primarily because he limited his textual evidence to the manuscript variants reported in the footnotes of de La Vallée Poussin's edition.² It was Giuseppe Tucci's discovery of a fourth manuscript of the Prasannapadā in Nepal which allowed for considerable progress in the rectification of *kārikā* readings.³ On the basis of a photocopy of this manuscript, and in reliance on the Tibetan translation of the Prasannapadā, J.W. de Jong was able to confirm many of the improvements de La Vallée Poussin had made to the *kārikās* as handed down by the manuscript tradition, and to emend numerous other *kārikās*. In 1977 he published an edition of the MMK alone, replete with the new emendations. Five years later Christian Lindtner issued his own edition of

* The present article is the slightly revised version of a paper presented at Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan, on Dec. 12, 2005, at the University of Tokyo on Dec. 15, 2005, and at Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan, on Dec. 16, 2005. I am very grateful to Akira Saito for a number of references and for stimulating and informative discussions on the material presented here, and to Shoryu Katsura, Takashi Iwata and Lambert Schmithausen for their remarks on the lecture paper. I owe special thanks to Karin Preisendanz for her astute comments in regard to many of the manuscript readings discussed here, and for her careful reading of the present paper. Sincere thanks are due Yoshiyasu Yonezawa and Shaoyong Ye for sharing with me the readings in the valuable manuscripts they are investigating. I am also grateful for the information shared and comments made by Chlodwig Werba and Roland Steiner.

¹ See MacDonald 2000: 166.

² I count less than a dozen emendations to the MMK in Vaidya's edition of the Prasannapadā. His emendations for MMK 13.6 and 22.8 are correct (see below).

³ The manuscript is held by the Keshar Library in Kathmandu, Nepal (catalogue no. 9-182); it has been filmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (reel no. C 19/8).

the MMK, in which he reproduced de Jong's edition but removed many of its misprints, and introduced a few more emendations.⁴ In 1985 Akira Saito presented and provided grounds for eight *kārikā* emendations in an article entitled "Textcritical Remarks on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* as Cited in the *Prasannapadā*." These emendations were the fruit of his careful comparison of the *kārikās* as presented in de La Vallée Poussin's and de Jong's editions with those found in the manuscript used by de Jong and in five other manuscripts of the *Prasannapadā*, also of Nepalese origin. In 1986 Mitsuyoshi Saigusa published the Sanskrit text of the MMK again, complete with its Tibetan translations by the two translator teams Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan, and Mahāsumati and Pa-tshab nyi-ma grags,⁵ respectively, three Chinese translations of the *kārikās*,⁶ and a Japanese translation. However, as the purpose of the publication was to make available the various versions of the *kārikās* — and not to critically edit them — Saigusa presented as his Sanskrit text de La Vallée Poussin's version of the *kārikās*; he refers to de Jong's emendations only in notes. Christian Lindtner, in his 1988 review of Saigusa's book, provided a two-and-a-half page list of corrections for Saigusa's presentation of de La Vallée Poussin's Sanskrit text which primarily aims to bring de Jong's and Saito's emendations into the text.⁷ Lindtner further added to the list several of his own suggestions for emendation, most of which he had included in his earlier edition of the MMK.⁸ Finally, thirteen misprints alleged to occur in the de Jong edition and their corresponding corrections have been listed in the Foreword (Vorwort) to Weber-Brosamer and Back's 1997 German translation of the MMK; two of the readings presented as misprints, however, are correct readings.⁹

⁴ See Lindtner 1982a: 177–215. Lindtner's emendation of *ataḥ* to *uta* in 17.29d is not supported by the three best manuscripts (Ms P, D and B) I relied on to make a new edition of the first chapter of the *Prasannapadā*. His emendations of 20.7d's *yaś ca* to *yac ca*, 21.7b's *nākṣayasāyāsti* to *nākṣayasāyāpi*, and of 27.19d's *samsāraḥ* to *śāśvataḥ* are also not supported by the manuscripts at my disposal (Ms P lacks 20.7 and 21.7), but should be checked against other available material.

⁵ Mahāsumati and Pa-tshab nyi-ma grags' "translation" is more accurately the revised version of the previous team's translation. Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan translated the MMK in the early ninth century; Mahāsumati and Pa-tshab nyi-ma grags revised the translation in the late eleventh century.

⁶ The three Chinese translations included are: 1) Kumārajīva's translation of the MMK, 2) the MMK as extracted from the *Prajñāpradīpa*, and 3) the MMK as presented in Sthiramati's commentary on the MMK.

⁷ Lindtner (1988: 244) erroneously refers to Saigusa's Sanskrit text as "with a few exceptions, a faithful reprint of de Jong's revised edition (Madras 1977) of La Vallée Poussin's old edition incorporated in the *Prasannapadā*." He also somewhat imprecisely refers to the Tibetan as "two of the six almost identical extant Tibetan versions."

⁸ Three of the emendations are also mentioned in a note in Lindtner's "Nāgārjuniana"; see Lindtner 1982b: 26 (n. 79). His new suggestion (1988: 246) *yujyate* for MMK 17.13's *yojyate* in the list of corrections for Saigusa's text is not supported by Ms P, nor is the proposed *pragacchati* for 2.23 (245). His suggestions for 2.8 and 13.6 are referred to below.

⁹ See Weber-Brosamer and Back 1997: X–XI. De Jong's *visabhāgānām* in MMK 17.17a should be retained (cf. BHSD s.v. *visabhāga*; see also de Jong 1978: 222); this reading occurs in the better of the manuscripts. De Jong's emendation *doṣasya* in MMK 23.7c, attested by the better manuscripts and already confirmed by comments in Imanishi (1988: 96ff.) and Vetter (1992: 501, n. 34), should

In my article “The Prasannapadā: More Manuscripts from Nepal,” published in 2000, I reported on the palm-leaf manuscript of the Prasannapadā (henceforth Ms P) conserved in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, England. The manuscript, written in old Nevārī script, was probably copied in the thirteenth or even late twelfth century, thus possibly not much more than a century after Mahāsumati and Pa-tshab translated the Prasannapadā into Tibetan. Nearly a third of Ms P’s leaves are missing, such that much of chapter 7, most of chapter 18, all of chapters 19 and 20, and most of chapter 21, are wanting. The leaves which remain of the other two-thirds of the manuscript often lack some of their text due to breakage and worm damage, which unfortunately means that we lack testimony for quite a few of the *kārikās*. Nevertheless, the manuscript is able to confirm many of de La Vallée Poussin’s conjectures and de Jong’s emendations for the *kārikās* still preserved by it. It also supports four of Saito’s eight emendations; the other four *kārikās* for which the emendations are not confirmed are either damaged or missing in Ms P.¹⁰ I announced in my above-mentioned article that Ms P additionally appears to supply new readings for nine *kārikās*, but further examination has revealed that well over twice that number benefit from the evidence contained in it. Given that other valuable manuscripts (cf. below) have recently come to light and are in the process of being analyzed, the time seems ripe to present some of the pertinent readings in Ms P, for the purpose of correcting specific *kārikās*, and for the sake of making available the material for comparison and discussion.

The restitution of the *kārikās* is now aided, but also made slightly more complicated, by the recent discovery of an incomplete, but possibly seventh-century, Sanskrit manuscript consisting of three folios of the MMK and eleven folios of Buddhapālita’s commentary on it, which also contains *kārikā* citations. Prior to its discovery, Akira Saito, Christian Lindtner and others had pointed out discrepancies between the Sanskrit of some of the *kārikās* embedded in the Prasannapadā and that reflected by the Tibetan of the same *kārikās* embedded in the Akutobhayā and in Buddhapālita’s and Bhāviveka’s (and Avalokitavrata’s) commentaries.¹¹ Shaoyong Ye’s transcription of the newly available manuscript (I shall refer to it as the Peking U. manuscript) now confirms that the Sanskrit of certain *kārikās* does indeed read differently than the corresponding *kārikās* in the Prasannapadā manuscripts.¹² One of the challenges we now face, regardless of our successes in emending the *kārikās* as they have been transmitted

definitely not be changed back to the *dveṣasya* found in LVP.

¹⁰ Ms P supports Saito’s emendations for MMK 2.13a, 22.3b, 24.3b and 24.9cd. It does confirm the words *pratyayebhyaḥ pravartate* in MMK 1.12b, but owing to an eye-skip of the scribe, it is not able to corroborate *pādas* c and d. MMK 6.6d, 20.24 and 21.3 are damaged or missing in Ms P.

¹¹ See, e.g., Saito 1984: xvi–xviii; Lindtner 1982b: 26 (n. 79). For information on Jñānagarbha and Klu’i rgyal mtshan’s translation procedure, see Saito 1995.

¹² A sixty-three page hand-out with a manuscript description and a transcription of the manuscript’s content was made available by Mr. Ye at the 2005 International Association of Buddhist Studies conference in London, England. Mr. Ye informs me that he plans to publish a revised version of the manuscript’s content later this year. The manuscript is at present in the Tibet Museum in Lhasa.

within the Prasannapadā tradition, is explaining the variants among the commentarial traditions. Whether we can explain them, and whether we will be able to distinguish, at least in some cases, “better” versions from among the variant versions and thereby hypothesize that one has a higher probability of having been an organic part of an early, or — if one is perhaps too daring — the “original,” version of the MMK remains to be seen. For the time being, I can merely hope to make a small contribution by reporting on a number of readings in Ms P and proposing emendations for the MMK based on them. The decisions whether to accept certain manuscript readings have been greatly aided by the generosity of two scholars, namely, Dr. Yoshiyasu Yonezawa of Taisho University, Tokyo, who took the time to check many of the variant readings I had located in Ms P against the readings of the Potala manuscript, a second palm-leaf manuscript of the Prasannapadā to which I do not have access¹³ (henceforth Ms Q), and the aforementioned Mr. Shaoyong Ye, M.A., of Peking University, Beijing, who at my request re-checked certain *kārikās* in the Peking U. manuscript, and kindly sent me his revised transcription of this manuscript.

In the following, I present primarily those manuscript readings from Ms P which provide or suggest improved readings for the *kārikās* as established by de La Vallée Poussin or emended by later scholars; in some cases, readings from Ms P which support earlier emendations also appear. I basically relied on two tactics in my endeavour to ferret out problems and improve readings in the existing Sanskrit editions. In order to avoid being influenced by de Jong’s interpretation of the manuscript he relied on, I first recorded and compared all of Ms P’s available *kārikās* with the corresponding *kārikās* in de La Vallée Poussin’s edition, and only afterwards compared the variant readings with those in de Jong’s edition. I then checked the metre of all 447 of the *kārikās* in de Jong’s edition. This latter exercise revealed that this edition’s *kārikās*, with a few problematic exceptions, conform to the rules for *pathyā* and *vipulā* composition as they have been set forth by Roland Steiner in Appendix 4 of his article “Die Lehre der Anuṣṭubh bei den indischen Metrikern.” (An English version of this appendix may be found at the end of the present article.) The *kārikās* in the edition exhibiting metrical problems were checked against Ms P’s reading of the relevant *kārikā*.¹⁴ This comparison prompted by metrical irregularities proved to be important, for it more than once led to the detection of previously unnoticed *akṣara* characteristics in Ms P’s old Nevārī script, especially in the damaged or unclear parts of the manuscript, which then could be seen to have a bearing on the reading of the relevant *kārikā*.

I have selected for inclusion in section I. of this paper a number of *kārikās* whose emendations are representative of specific types of changes required in the MMK. Some of the changes contribute to a better understanding of Nāgārjuna’s compositional style, while others modify the sense of a *kārikā*. I include other *kārikās* and their emendations in sections II.-V.

¹³ For a brief description of this valuable manuscript, see Yonezawa 2005: 159f.

¹⁴ In two cases, Ms Q provides the sole correct reading.

Throughout the paper, I do not present the *kārikās* in the order they occur in the MMK; in section I., I broadly group them according to the type of emendation required. The bold mark-up in all of the *kārikās* is my own; it aims to draw attention to words requiring emendation and to their emendations.

I.a *kārikās* requiring the emendation of verb forms in the *parasmaipada* voice to *ātmanepada*, and thus to non-classical forms

i. MMK 2.15

My investigation of the metre in the second chapter of the MMK has revealed that the metre of *kārikā* 2.15 as presented in the editions is faulty. De La Vallée Poussin’s and de Jong’s version of the *kārikā* reads:

LVP, DJ 2.15: *gantā na tiṣṭhati tāvad agantā naiva tiṣṭhati |*
anyo gantur agantuś ca kas tṛtīyo ’tha tiṣṭhati ||

“To begin, a goer does not stand still; a non-goer definitely does not stand still.

What third other than a goer and a non-goer, then, stands still?”¹⁵

pāda a of the *kārikā* is unmetrical, not conforming to regular *śloka* metre or any of its *vipulās*. Ms P reads as the editions do, but the manuscript de Jong relied on — I term it Ms D — presents the reading:

Ms D: *gantā na tiṣṭhate tāvad agantā naiva tiṣṭhati |*
anyo gantur agantuś ca kas tṛtīyo tha tiṣṭhati ||

The reading *tiṣṭhate* allows for regular *śloka* metre.¹⁶ De Jong does not mention this variant in his “Textcritical Notes.” It is also found in the third most valuable manuscript — I term it Ms B — of the fifteen mss I used to make my edition of the first chapter of the Prasannapadā (publication forthcoming);¹⁷ this manuscript is dated Nepal Samvat 959, thus A.D. 1839. According to Mr. Ye’s transcription of the Peking U. manuscript, Buddhapālita’s commentary likewise attests *tiṣṭhate*, both in Buddhapālita’s citation of the entire *kārikā* 2.15 and in his following citation of 2.15a. The relevant folio is missing in Ms Q.

Emend 2.15 to: *gantā na tiṣṭhate tāvad agantā naiva tiṣṭhati |*

¹⁵ Given the philological focus of this paper, and to avoid complicating matters, I translate the *kārikās* following Candrakīrti’s understanding of them; I am of course aware that other interpretations are possible.

¹⁶ The medial *i* of the final *aḥsara* of Ms P’s *tiṣṭhati* is a later addition, thus leading one to suspect that Ms P’s exemplar also read *tiṣṭhate*.

¹⁷ Ms B is in a private collection in Pathan, Nepal; it was filmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (reel number E 1294/3) and by Takaoka (catalogue no. KA 45; reel no. R-KA 1).

anyo gantur agantuś ca kas ṛṭīyo 'tha tiṣṭhati ||

Also to be noted in this respect are the two instances of *tiṣṭhati* in MMK 7.22a and c, respectively, in de La Vallée Poussin's edition that have been changed, in the course of a more extensive emendation, by de Jong to *tiṣṭhate* on the basis of the readings in Ms D. Although de Jong does not comment on his reasons for accepting Ms D's *ātmanepada* forms, *tiṣṭhate* is required by the metre in both cases.¹⁸

LVP 7.22: *na sthītabhāvas tiṣṭhaty asthītabhāvo na tiṣṭhati |*
na tiṣṭhati tiṣṭhamānaḥ ko 'nutpannaś ca tiṣṭhati ||

DJ 7.22: *nāsthitas tiṣṭhate bhāvaḥ sthīto bhāvo na tiṣṭhati |*
na tiṣṭhate tiṣṭhamānaḥ ko 'nutpannaś ca tiṣṭhati ||

ii. MMK 2.17

An emendation similar to the previous one is required in MMK 2.17. De La Vallée Poussin's edition reads:

LVP 2.17: *na tiṣṭhati gamyamānān na gatān nāgatād api |*
[gamaṇam] sam[pra]vṛttiś ca nivṛttiś ca gateḥ samā ||

In reliance on Ms D, de Jong confirms the two conjectures and presents the *kārikā* as:

DJ 2.17: *na tiṣṭhati gamyamānān na gatān nāgatād api |*
gamaṇam sampravṛttiś ca nivṛttiś ca gateḥ samā ||

“One does not stop from that being traversed, nor from that which has been traversed, nor from that which has not [yet] been traversed. Going, starting and ceasing are similar to going.”

Even though de Jong was able to confirm the correctness of the word *gamaṇam* and the *akṣara pra* of the second verse-half, the *kārikā* is unmetrical.

2.17ab has been erased and then tightly rewritten in Ms P; *tiṣṭhati* is the post-correction reading. However, Mss D and B both present 2.17ab as attesting *tiṣṭhate* (the relevant folio is missing in Ms Q and in the Peking U. manuscript). Ms D also attests *tiṣṭhate* when Candrakīrti repeats 2.17ab in his commentary on 2.17cd (see LVP 104.3).¹⁹ This reading resolves

¹⁸ Imanishi (1988: 98) comments on the alternating forms *tiṣṭhati/tiṣṭhate* in MMK 7.22 and cites verse quarters and halves from the Udānavarga and Dharmapada which provide parallels for the non-classical usage found in 7.22. The folio in Ms P containing this *kārikā* is not available.

¹⁹ Although Ms P presents *tiṣṭhati* when 2.17ab is repeated, in Candrakīrti's following reformulation (*pāṭhaparivarta*) of 2.17ab (LVP 104.5: *na gacchati sthīyamānān na sthītān nāsthītād api*), where *gacchati* is the correct reading, it presents *tiṣṭhate* (also metrically correct). The Tibetan translators may also have read *na tiṣṭhate* (or *na tiṣṭhati*) instead of *na gacchati* in the reformulation of the verse-half; they translate *mi ldog*. Ms D reads *na gacchate*, and Ms B attests *ni gacchate*.

pāda a's metre to *ra-vīpulā*, with an expected *caesura* after the fourth syllable.

Emend 2.17 to: *na tiṣṭhate gamyamānān na gatān nāgatād api |*
gamaṇaṃ saṃpravṛttiś ca nivṛttiś ca gateḥ samā ||

iii. MMK 3.5

The next *kārikā* requiring attention is MMK 3.5. In de La Vallée Poussin's edition it reads:

LVP 3.5: *paśyati darśanaṃ naiva naiva paśyaty adarśanam |*
vyākhyāto darśanenaiva draṣṭā cāpy upagamyatām ||

De Jong corrects the *kārikā* to read:

DJ 3.5: *paśyati darśanaṃ naiva naiva paśyaty adarśanam |*
vyākhyāto darśanenaiva draṣṭā cāpy avagamyatām ||

"A faculty of sight certainly does not see; what is not a faculty of sight definitely does not see.

And the seer as well should be understood as explained precisely by the faculty of sight."

pāda cd is damaged in Ms P, but *pāda* ab reads:

Ms P: *paśyate darśanaṃ naiva naiva paśyaty adarśanaṃ |*

Both Mss D and B also read *paśyate*. Dr. Yonezawa informs me that Ms Q similarly attests *paśyate*. The verb in *pāda* a of the *kārikā* as it is quoted in Candrakīrti's commentary on MMK 3.5ab is not available in Ms P owing to damage to the folio, but it is written in both Mss D and B as *paśyate*. The reading *paśyati* has to be rejected because it leaves *pāda* a with two short syllables in the second and third positions, which the second general rule for *śloka* metre forbids; the reading *paśyate* provides for a long syllable in the third place. This *ātmanepada* form may be slightly unusual, and at first sight seem strange in a verse-half that also attests the form *paśyati*, but as the manuscript readings for *kārikās* 2.15, 2.17 and 7.22 demonstrate, Nāgārjuna is not averse to employing the two voices side by side. The present *kārikā* and the next indeed confirm that the juxtaposition of the different voices of a verb form is in fact a distinctive feature of his style.²⁰

²⁰ One also notes that the active form of the present participle used in the immediately preceding verse, viz., MMK 3.4, is *apaśyamānam*. The substitution of *ātmanepada* forms for *parasmaipada* in verses is common in both Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (see Edgerton 1993: 181[37.1]) and Epic Sanskrit. Thomas Oberlies (2003: XXXI), commenting on types of deviations from "Pāṇinian" Sanskrit in Epic Sanskrit, among which he includes "change of voice," writes, "The Epic language presents itself as a mixture of correct and incorrect forms, always met with side by side, within one and the same stanza. Decisive for the use of grammatically incorrect forms is — in the overwhelming majority of cases — their position within the *pāda*. Almost always it is metrical exigencies which forced the poets to use a form not sanctioned by traditional grammar (see Hopkins 1901: 245) — the 'irregularities' are very often found

Emend 3.5 to: *paśyate darśanaṃ naiva naiva paśyaty adarśanam |*
vyākhyāto darśanenaiva draṣṭā cāpy avagamyatām ||

iv. MMK 2.8

Now that it has become clear that certain *parasmaipada* verb forms in the existing editions need, for the sake of the metre, to be modified to the *ātmanepada* forms appearing in the better of the manuscripts, let us backtrack to MMK 2.8. My investigation of the metre in the second chapter shows that the metre of this *kārikā* as presented in the editions is faulty.

De La Vallée Poussin’s version of the *kārikā* reads:

LVP 2.8: *gantā na gacchati tāvad agantā naiva gacchati |*
anyo gantur agantuś ca kas ṛṭīyo hi gacchati ||

De Jong corrected *pāda* d such that the *kārikā* in his edition reads:

DJ 2.8: *gantā na gacchati tāvad agantā naiva gacchati |*
anyo gantur agantuś ca kas ṛṭīyo ’tha gacchati ||

“To begin, a goer does not go; a non-goer definitely does not go.
 What third other than a goer and a non-goer, then, goes?”

Ms P confirms the emendation of *hi* to *atha*. The *kārikā* is given there as:

Ms P: *gantā na gacchati tāvad agantā naiva gacchati |*
anyo gantur agantuś ca kas ṛṭīyo tha gacchati ||

However, the emendation of *hi* to *atha* does not solve the metrical problem in the *kārikā*: in *pāda* a, the sixth syllable is short, but the sixth position in regular *śloka* metre expects a long syllable. The recovery of the correct reading *tiṣṭhate* for MMK 2.15 and the improvement it brings to the metre inspired me to re-check Ms P for its reading of MMK 2.8. The re-examination of *pāda* a in Ms P revealed that the °*ti* of *gacchati* is the result of a correction made by Ms P’s scribe. *gacchati* of *pāda* a read *gacchate* before the correction. A medial *i* stroke had merely been added to the original *aḥsara te*, but the unique form taken by the *te* of the old Nevārī script (the *e* indicated by a short *ṛṣṭhamātrā*) remained, betraying the fact that Ms P’s scribe had first copied *gacchate* from his exemplar but, accustomed to √*gam* only in its classical forms, changed the *ātmanepada* form to *parasmaipada*, all the while overlooking that his modification disturbed the metre. Mss D and B support an original reading *gacchate*: Ms D reads *gacchatai*, i.e., the *aḥsara tai* bears both a short *ṛṣṭhamātrā* stroke and a diagonal medial *e* stroke, while Ms B clearly reads *gacchate*.²¹ The *kārikā* as cited in Buddhapālita’s

at a *metrically relevant position* of the stanza: ‘Metre surpasses grammar’ (Hopkins 1901: 263).” See also Oberlies’ notes 4 and 5 on the same page.

²¹ The relevant folio is missing in Ms Q.

commentary in the Peking U. manuscript also attests *gacchate*.

As unusual as *gacchate* may sound to classically trained ears, its attestations are numerous. *gacchate* used as a finite verb can be found, e.g., in the Divyāvādāna, the Brahmapurāṇa, the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, the Śīvopaniṣad, in various books of the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and in various tantric texts such as the Saṃvarodayatantra and the Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra.²² Only after I had decided that the reading *gacchate* had to be accepted as the original reading did I notice that Lindtner had already, in his review of Mitsuyoshi Saigusa’s book, noted *gacchate* as a *lectio difficilior* for 2.8, and submitted it as the preferred reading. Lindtner, not basing himself on manuscript evidence or considerations of metre, deems the emendation to be confirmed by the alternating voice parallels in MMK 7.22 and 10.10,²³ and by the fact that Bhāviveka “clearly read *gantā na gacchate*” (1988: 245). Indeed, a perusal of Bhāviveka’s commentary on 2.8 shows him vigourously defending the *ātmanepada* form *gacchate* via two syllogisms and by arguing that Nāgārjuna used this voice to cause the grammarians to abandon attachment to words.²⁴ William Ames, in a note to this section of the commentary in his 1995 translation of the Prajñāpradīpa on the second chapter of the MMK, remarks that Bhāviveka must have read *gacchate* in MMK 2.8, but he does not emend *gacchati* to *gacchate* in his edition of the Sanskrit *kārikās* of the second chapter that he appends to his translation.²⁵ Although Ames’ reluctance to emend *kārikā* 2.8 solely on the basis of the fact that Bhāviveka’s MMK manuscript read *gacchate* is understandable, the metrical inacceptability of *gacchati* and the new manuscript evidence, together with Bhāviveka’s comments, now confirm *gacchate* as the original reading.

Emend 2.8 to: *gantā na gacchate tāvad agantā naiva gacchati |*
 anyo gantur agantuś ca kas tṛtīyo ’tha gacchati ||

This *kārikā* and 2.15 now mirror each other.

I.b *kārikās* requiring the emendation of adjectives to non-classical forms

v. MMK 12.9

The emendation necessary in MMK 12.9 is a minor one, but mention of the reason for it may contribute to dispersing some confusion regarding the appearance of both the forms *ahetuka* and *āhetuka* in the MMK. In regard to *kārikā* 4.2, Lindtner writes, “It is hard to explain why

²² I am grateful to Csaba Dezső for providing me with references for *gacchate* used as a finite verb in the texts mentioned.

²³ MMK 10.10: *yo ’pekṣya sidhyate bhāvas tam evāpekṣya sidhyati | yadi yo ’pekṣitavyaḥ sa sidhyatām kam apekṣya kaḥ ||*.

²⁴ See Prajñāpradīpa Peking 79a7ff., Derge 66a6ff.

²⁵ See Ames 1995: 309 and n. 62. His edition of MMK Chapter 2, on p. 355f., includes both de Jong’s and Saito’s emendations.

we here have *āhetukaṃ* and *āhetukaḥ* when VIII.3 has *ahetukaṃ* and, probably, *ahetuko*, as in VIII.3, XI.4, XII.1, etc. — XX.8 also has *āhetukaṃ*” (1988: 245). The explanation is a simple one: *ahetuka* appears to be Nāgārjuna’s preferred form, but Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit *āhetuka* is introduced when the metre demands that the compound begin with a long syllable.²⁶

MMK 12.9 in de La Vallée Poussin’s and de Jong’s editions reads:

LVP, DJ 12.9: *syād ubhābhyāṃ kṛtaṃ duḥkhaṃ syād ekaikakṛtaṃ yadi |*
*parākārāsvayaṃkāraṃ duḥkham **āhetukaṃ** kutaḥ ||*

“Suffering might be created by both [self and other] if it would be created by one [of them]. How, not made by self or other, is there suffering without a cause?”

The third syllable in *pāda* d is short, but needs to be long to prevent the second and third syllables of the *pāda* from having the unallowed metrical sequence short-short. Ms P’s *pāda* d is metrically correct:

Ms P: *parākārāsvayaṃkāraṃ duḥkham **āhetukaṃ** kutaḥ ||*

Ms Q similarly attests *āhetukaṃ*, as do Mss D and B.

Emend 12.9 to: *syād ubhābhyāṃ kṛtaṃ duḥkhaṃ syād ekaikakṛtaṃ yadi |*
*parākārāsvayaṃkāraṃ duḥkham **āhetukaṃ** kutaḥ ||*

vi. MMK 13.1

The emendation necessary in *kārikā* 13.1 is based on manuscript evidence and supported by metrical considerations. The *kārikā* in both de La Vallée Poussin’s and de Jong’s editions reads:

LVP, DJ 13.1: *tan mṛṣā **moṣadharmā** yad bhagavān ity abhāṣata |*
sarve ca moṣadharmāṇaḥ saṃskārās tena te mṛṣā ||

“The Blessed One said that that which has a deceiving nature (lit. “the attribute of theft”) is false. And all conditioned things have a deceiving nature; therefore they are false.”

The reading in Ms P is:

Ms P: *tan mṛṣā **moṣadharmaṃ** yad bhagavān ity abhāṣat |*
sarve ca moṣadharmāṇaḥ saṃskārās tena te mṛṣā ||

²⁶ Tilmann Vetter has already noted that *āhetuka* is used by Nāgārjuna in the MMK in place of *ahetuka* on account of metrical exigencies; see Vetter 1992: 501, n. 34. De Jong in fact suggests the emendation in his “Text-Critical Notes” (1978: 54).

Ms P's *abhāṣat* is unacceptable because it reduces the syllables in *pāda* b from eight to seven. *pāda* a as it stands in the editions is, however, unmetrical, not conforming to regular *śloka* metre or any of its *vipulās*. The modification of the editions' reading *moṣadharmā* to *moṣadharmam* resolves the metrical problem; the *pāda* is returned to regular *śloka* metre. Ms D bears the same reading as Ms P. Dr. Yonezawa notes that Ms Q also attests *moṣadharmam*.

We may conclude that Nāgārjuna used the irregular *bahuvrīhi moṣadharmam* in the first verse-half merely for the sake of the metre. The expected classical form appears in the second verse-half with the nominative plural *moṣadharmāṇaḥ* (cf. Pāṇini 5.4.124 where it is stated that *dharma*, when preceded by a single word in a *bahuvrīhi* compound, becomes *dharman*). Although de La Vallée Poussin corrects the forms *moṣadharmam* and *amoṣadharmam* in Candrakīrti's subsequent citation of the Canonical formulation of the statement that he found in his three manuscripts to °*dharma*, the same citation in Mss P, D and B also contains °*dharmaṃ*.²⁷

Emend 13.1 to: *tan mṛṣā moṣadharmam yad bhagavān ity abhāṣata |*
sarve ca moṣadharmāṇaḥ saṃskārās tena te mṛṣā ||

vii. MMK 13.2

The exact same change required in 13.1 should be made in the following *kārikā*. In de La Vallée Poussin's and de Jong's editions, *kārikā* 13.2 reads:

LVP, DJ 13.2: *tan mṛṣā moṣadharmā yad yadi kiṃ tatra muṣyate |*
etat tūktam bhagavatā śūnyatāparidīpakam ||

As in the case of the non-emended version of 13.1, *pāda* a is unmetrical. Ms P bears the correct reading:

Ms P: *tan mṛṣā moṣadharmam yad yadi kiṃ tatra muṣyate |*

Ms Q also attests *moṣadharmam*; Ms B attests *moṣadharmamam*. As before, the non-classical form attested by the manuscripts should be retained.

Emend 13.2 to: *tan mṛṣā moṣadharmam yad yadi kiṃ tatra muṣyate |*
etat tūktam bhagavatā śūnyatāparidīpakam ||

I.c *kārikās* revealing a further characteristic mark of Nāgārjuna's compositional style

viii. MMK 2.13

The first two words of *kārikā* 2.13 were left as a conjecture by de La Vallée Poussin. The *kārikā* in his edition appears as:

²⁷ Candrakīrti's preferred paraphrase of *moṣadharmam* after the citation is via forms of the unambiguous *bahuvrīhis moṣadharmakam, moṣadharmakatvena, moṣadharmakatvāt* and *moṣadharmakāḥ*.

LVP 2.13: **[na pūrvam]** *gamanārambhād gamyamānaṃ na vā gatam |*
yatrārabhyeta gamanam agate gamanam kutaḥ ||

Even though Ms D reads *gasti* instead of *na pūrvam*, de Jong removed the square brackets that de La Vallée Poussin had cautiously placed around his conjecture and presents the *kārikā* in his edition as:

DJ 2.13: **na pūrvam** *gamanārambhād gamyamānaṃ na vā gatam |*
yatrārabhyeta gamanam agate gamanam kutaḥ ||

Saito (1985: 844), reading *gasti* in Ms D and *agasti* in five other manuscripts of the Prasannapadā, conjectures that the *akṣara prā* was misread as an initial *a* and emends 2.13 to read:

Saito: **prāg asti** *gamanārambhād gamyamānaṃ na vā gatam |*
yatrārabhyeta gamanam agate gamanam kutaḥ ||

“Prior to the commencement of going there is not something being traversed or [already] traversed where going might be begun.

How is there going in the not [yet] traversed?”

His emendation is now confirmed by Ms P’s version of the *pāda*, the first two words of which clearly read *prāg asti*. Ms P, however, additionally attests *no* in place of *vā* in *pāda* b:

Ms P: **prāg asti** *gamanārambhād gamyamānaṃ na no gatam |*

Ms D also attests *pāda* b as reading *gamyamānaṃ na no gatam*. Ms B reads *gamyamānaṃ na codgatam*, its *co* probably the corruption of an original *no*. The Tibetan translation of the *kārikā* as embedded in the Prasannapadā also contains two negations:²⁸

’gro ba rtsom pa’i snga rol na ||
gang du ’gro ba rtsom ’gyur ba ||
bgom pa med cing song ba med ||
ma song ’gro ba ga la yod ||

Mr. Ye informs me that the Peking U. manuscript attests *no*, not *vā* (Ms Q lacks the relevant folio).

Emend 2.13 to: **prāg asti** *gamanārambhād gamyamānaṃ na no gatam |*
yatrārabhyeta gamanam agate gamanam kutaḥ ||

In my 2000 article, I stated that the recovery of correct readings for the MMK allows us to note certain recurring features which can be viewed as “trademarks” of Nāgārjuna’s style,

²⁸ Here and in the remainder of this paper, unless otherwise indicated, Jñānagarbha and Klu’i rgyal mtshan’s translation does not deviate.

and that these may aid in determining the viability of claims attributing his authorship to other texts. This comment was made in the context of discussing my emendation of MMK 17.28's negation *na* to the negation *no* (see section V).²⁹ The negation *no*, although common in, e.g., the Mahābhārata,³⁰ occurs with much less frequency in philosophical literature. This recovery of the negation in 2.13 and of the *no* in 17.28 confirms the “trademark” status of the particle *no* in the MMK.³¹

I.d *kārikās* requiring emendations affecting the content

ix. MMK 9.11

The emendation required in MMK 9.11 does not substantially alter the meaning of the *kārikā* but is nevertheless significant in view of Nāgārjuna's argumentational style. The *kārikā* as found in de La Vallée Poussin's and de Jong's editions reads:

LVP, DJ 9.11: *darśanaśravaṇādīni vedanādīni cāpy atha |*
 na vidyate ced yasya sa na vidyanta imāny api ||

“The faculties of sight, hearing, etc., and also feeling, etc. — if **that** of which [they are / will be] does not exist, these too do not exist.”

Once again, there is a metrical problem: *pāda* c is irregular, not conforming to regular *śloka* metre or any of its *vipulās*.

Ms P attests a different reading:

Ms P: *darśanaśravaṇādīni vedanādīni cāpy atha |*
 na vidyate ced yasya syur na vidyanta imāny api ||

“The faculties of sight, hearing, etc., and also feeling, etc. — if [that] of which they **might be** does not exist, these too do not exist.”

With the seventh syllable of *pāda* c now long, the *pāda* presents itself as a *ma-vipulā*, with an expected *caesura* after the fifth syllable. The change from *syur* to *sa* is easily explained: medial *u* and superscript *r* are not uncommonly omitted during copying, and once one or both of them had disappeared from the manuscript, the remaining *sy* would soon have become interpreted and written as *sa*.

The Tibetan of the *kārikā* supports the emendation of *sa* to *syur* since the *yin pa* of its *pāda* c must be translating a verb, and not a correlative pronoun.

²⁹ My earlier emendation of the editions' *na* of 17.28c to *no*, which was made on the basis of Ms P's reading *naḥ*, is now supported by Ms Q's attestation of *no*.

³⁰ I am grateful to Kengo Harimoto for providing me with references to occurrences of *no* in the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, and other texts.

³¹ Cf. also the string *no na* in MMK 24.3 and 24.29.

lta dang nyan la sogs pa dang ||
tshor ba dag la sogs pa yang ||
*gang gi **yin pa** gal te med ||*
de dag kyang ni yod ma yin ||

Dr. Yonezawa reports that Ms Q also reads *syur*. Mr. Ye, upon rechecking the Peking U. manuscript, informs me that it reads *sur*, probably a scribal error for *syur*.

The reading with *syuḥ* allows for a smoother word order: the correlative clause with the elided correlative pronoun (*na vidyate cet*) forms a unit, and the relative clause (*yasya syuḥ*) forms another unit, certainly more natural constructions than the reading as it stands in the editions where the relative pronoun “invades” the correlative clause. The change to the optative verb form is further supported by Nāgārjuna’s mode of argumentation in other verses of the MMK. This style of argumentation has been explicated in detail by Claus Oetke in his article “Pragmatic Implicatures and Text-Interpretation (The Alleged Logical Error of the Negation of the Antecedent in the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās).”³² The propositions set forth by Nāgārjuna that Oetke terms “pragmatic implicatures” involve conditional statements with a verb form in the optative mood in the apodosis, which is intended in the meaning of “might” or “could.” Although it could be argued that an optative is implied in the editions’ version of MMK 9.11, as my translation of this version demonstrates, other alternatives are possible. *kārikā* 9.11’s emended relative clause with its explicit verbal predicate may in the context be seen as intending the proposition “If [the appropriator] existed, the faculties of sight, hearing, etc., and also feeling, etc., might exist,” a proposition which “pragmatically” implies its negative counterpart, viz., “If [the appropriator] does not exist, these too do not exist.”

Emend 9.11 to: *darśanaśravaṇādīni vedanādīni cāpy atha |*
*na vidyate ced yasya **syur** na vidyanta imāny api ||*

x. MMK 24.25

The new manuscript evidence solves the interpretational problem in *kārikā* 24.25.

De La Vallée Poussin’s and de Jong’s versions of 24.25 read:

LVP, DJ 24.25: *yadā duḥkhaṃ samudayo nirodhaś ca na vidyate |*
*mārgo **duḥkhanirodhatvāt katamaḥ** prāpayiṣyati ||*

“When suffering, the origin and cessation do not exist, what path, due to [there] being the cessation of suffering, will cause [one] to attain?”

The verse as it stands is metrical, with the first *pāda* constructed as a *na-vipulā* and the other

³² For possible (and plausible) reasons for Nāgārjuna’s predilection for this style of argumentation, see Oetke 1992: 211f.

three *pādas* in regular *śloka* metre. The problem is that the second verse-half, besides not having an object for its verb, does not make much sense. This verse-half is also not mirrored in Tibetan.

The Tibetan translation reads:

gang tshe sdug bsngal kun 'byung dang ||
'gog pa yod pa ma yin na ||
lam gyis sdug bsngal 'gog pa ni ||
gang zhig 'thob par 'gyur bar 'dod ||

De La Vallée Poussin adds in a note to the *kārikā* that he considers *pādas* c and d to correspond to an original *mārgena duḥkhanirodhaḥ katamaḥ prāpayiṣyati*.³³

Interestingly, the *kārikā* in Ms P reads:

Ms P: *yadā duḥkhaṃ samudayo nirodhaś ca na vidyate |*
*mārgo **duḥkhanirodhaṃ tvāṃ katamam** prāpayiṣyati ||*
 “When suffering, the origin and cessation do not exist,
 what cessation of suffering will the path cause you to attain?”

Both Mss D and B attest the accusative form *katamam*. Dr. Yonezawa reports that Ms Q presents 24.25c as *mārgo duḥkhanirodhaṃ kṛtvā*, a reading that cannot be accepted because it gives the *pāda* an extra ninth syllable. A reading with *kṛtvā* is further not supported by the Tibetan. Even though Ms P’s *tvāṃ* is also not reflected by the Tibetan, it is found again in Ms P in Candrakīrti’s commentary on the *kārikā*. The relevant part of Ms P’s commentary reads: *nāsty evāsau duḥkhanirodho yaṃ nirodhaṃ tvāṃ {mārgo}*³⁴ *bhāvitaḥ san prāpayiṣyati | tasmād āryamārgo py evaṃ nopapadyata iti |*.

I assume that *mārgo* has dropped out of Ms P given that the same sentence in Ms D reads: *nāsty evāsau duḥkhanirodhā yaṃ nirodhatvān **gargo** bhāvitaḥ san prāpayiṣyati | tasmād āryamārgo py evaṃ māpapadyata iti ||*.³⁵ Ms B also attests *mārgo*, as does de La Vallée Poussin’s edition (see LVP 508.9).

³³ See LVP 508, n. 1. The translation *'thob par 'gyur bar 'dod* for causative *prāpayiṣyati* is problematic. It seems unlikely that the translators would have interpreted the causative as a desiderative. One conjectures that they may have read *iṣyate* with a form of *pra√āp*. See also LVP 508, n. 2.

³⁴ Curly brackets enclose editorial conjectures.

³⁵ The wording of the commentary on the second verse-half by the author of the Akutobhayā suggests that he too read the relevant part of the *kārikā* as containing a *tvāṃ*. He writes: *khyod kyi sdug bsngal 'gog pa gang zhig lam gyis 'thob par 'gyur bar 'dod* (Buddhapālita’s commentary is identical). Was the *tvāṃ* considered superfluous/dispensible when 24.25 was translated inasmuch as *te*, the enclitic form of the second person pronoun, had just been translated in 24.20 (*khyod la*) and in 24.24 (*khyod kyi*) and would again have to be translated in 24.27 (*khyod nyid kyi*), or were the translators confronted with a corrupt text?

Emend 24.25 to: *yadā duḥkhaṃ samudayo nirodhaś ca na vidyate |*
mārgo duḥkhanirodhaṃ tvāṃ katamaṃ prāpayiṣyati ||

II. Solutions for the seeming occurrence of irregular *vipulās* in the MMK

The emendations discussed above allow for the revision of certain conclusions set forth earlier by Tilmann Vetter in his article “On the Authenticity of the Ratnāvalī.” Vetter, lacking the benefit of the new manuscript material, surmised that Nāgārjuna, in addition to fashioning *kārikās* with *na-*, *bha-*, *ma-* and *ra-vipulās*, also composed them using *sa-*, *ta-* and *ja-vipulās*.³⁶ The three *sa-vipulās* he found in de Jong’s edition, viz. MMK 2.8a, 2.15a and 17.28c, have, post-emendation, been resolved to regular *śloka* metre. The single *ta-vipulā* Vetter notes, viz. MMK 9.11c,³⁷ has been resolved to a *ma-vipulā*. Three of the six *pādas* Vetter reads as *ja-vipulās*, viz. MMK 13.1a, 13.2a and 13.6c (for the latter, see section IV.), are also now resolved to regular *śloka* metre. Indeed, according to Roland Steiner, it is questionable whether *pādas* whose 5th, 6th and 7th syllables form a *sa-gaṇa* (U U –) are actually “regular” *vipulās*.³⁸ *ta-vipulās*, i.e., *pādas* whose syllables 5-7 form a *ta-gaṇa* (– – U), are mentioned by certain metrical theorists, but are not used in literary practice.³⁹ *ja-vipulās*, with syllables 5-7 forming a *ja-gaṇa* (U – U), are neither considered *vipulās* in theory nor employed as such in literary works. Thus, the remaining three *kārikās* in which Vetter finds “*ja-vipulās*” have been checked against the corresponding *kārikās* in Ms P and, where possible, the other valuable manuscripts. The relevant *pādas* in the *kārikās* are MMK 16.1a, 22.13c and 25.5c.

xi. MMK 25.5

The first problematic *kārikā* to be discussed here, namely MMK 25.5, reads in de La Vallée Poussin’s and de Jong’s editions as follows:

LVP, DJ 25.5: *bhāvaś ca yadī nīrvāṇaṃ nīrvāṇaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ bhavet |*
nāsaṃskṛto hi vidyate bhāvaḥ kva cana kaś cana⁴⁰ ||

pāda c is unmetrical, not corresponding to regular *śloka* metre or to a *na-*, *bha-*, *ma-* or *ra-vipulā*. Ms P is damaged at this point and attests neither the *kārikā* nor the citation of 25.5cd in Candrakīrti’s commentary. Mss D and B also read *nāsaṃskṛto hi vidyate*, both when the *kārikā* is first presented and at the citation of its *pādas* cd in the commentary. According to

³⁶ See Vetter 1992: 500–501; see nn. 34–36.

³⁷ Vetter refers to the *ta-vipulā kārikā* as 9.9 in n. 36, but he must mean 9.11.

³⁸ Steiner (private communication) describes the *sa-vipulā* (with *caesura* after the 4th syllable, which exceptionally need not be long) as a rare *vipulā* form; the question of whether it can be considered a “regular” *vipulā* form, and not the result of textual corruption, has to be decided on the basis of the examination of individual texts, and with consideration of text type, time of origin, etc.

³⁹ See Steiner 1996: 240 and n. 40.

⁴⁰ LVP presents *kaścana*.

Dr. Yonezawa, however, Ms Q attests *pāda c* as reading *nāsaṃskṛto vidyate hi*. This reading renders *pāda c* a *ra-vipulā*, with the expected *caesura* after the 4th syllable. I would therefore suggest that MMK 25.5 be emended to accord with Ms Q's reading.

Emend 25.5 to: *bhāvaś ca yadi nirvāṇaṃ nirvāṇaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ bhavet |*
nāsaṃskṛto vidyate hi bhāvaḥ kvacana kaścana ||

xii. MMK 22.13

The second problematic *kārikā* reads in LVP:

LVP 22.13: *yena grāho gṛhītas tu ghano 'stīti tathāgataḥ |*
nāstīti sa vikalpayan nirvṛtasyāpi kalpayet ||

In reliance on Ms D, de Jong emended *pādas* ab such that the *kārikā* reads:

DJ 22.13: *ghanagrāho gṛhītas tu yenāstīti tathāgataḥ |*
nāstīti sa vikalpayan nirvṛtasyāpi kalpayet ||

This emendation, however, does not provide a solution for unmetrical *pāda c*.

Following Candrakīrti's commentary, the *kārikā* means: "By whom there is the firm grasping that the Tathāgata exists, he, imagining, would imagine also that [the Tathāgata who] has passed into *nirvāṇa* does not exist."

Mahāsumati and Pa-tshab's translation of the *kārikā*, as might be expected, reflects Candrakīrti's understanding of it:

gang gis de bzhin gshegs yod ces ||
'dzin pa stug po gzung gyur pa ||
de ni mya ngan 'das pa la ||
med ces rnam rtog rtog par byed ||

The author of the Akutobhayā, Buddhapālita and Bhāviveka, on the other hand, understood the *kārikā* as it is reflected in Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan's Tibetan translation:

gang gis 'dzin stug gzung gyur pa ||
de ni mya ngan 'das pa la ||
de bzhin gshegs pa yod ce 'am ||
med ces rnam rtog rtog par byed ||

Thus the author of the Akutobhayā, Buddhapālita and Bhāviveka understood the *kārikā* to mean that the person who conceptualizes will imagine that the Tathāgata who has passed into *nirvāṇa* either exists or does not exist. As stated, Candrakīrti understood the *kārikā* to mean that the person who produces the idea that the Tathāgata exists will imagine, when the Tathāgata passes into *nirvāṇa*, that he does not exist.

Note that a *vā* ('*am*) appears to have been translated by Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan, but not by Mahāsumati and Pa-tshab. Further, the *api* of the editions does not appear in either of the Tibetan translations.

Interestingly, Ms P attests a *vā*.

Ms P reads: *//// gṛhītas tu yenāstīti tathāgataḥ |*
nāstīti vā vikalpayan sa nirvṛtasyāpi kalpayet ||

All of the mss, in fact, including those used by de La Vallée Poussin, attest a *vā* after *nāstīti*; the *sa* in the editions is de La Vallée Poussin's conjecture.⁴¹ Although Ms P's reading, with an extra syllable in the second verse-half and an unmetrical *pāda* c, is corrupt, it does provide some important information. The *sa* would seem to be an integral part of the verse, for it supplies the correlative *sa* testified to by the *de* in both Tibetan translations. Ms P's attestation of *vā*, in addition to *sa*, and the *vā*'s equivalent '*am* in Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan's translation, suggest that *vā* is also an integral part of the *kārikā*. It would thus seem that the early Prasannapadā tradition of the *kārikā* contained the same *vā* that was read by the commentators prior to Candrakīrti.

According to Dr. Yonezawa, Ms Q presents *pādas* cd as *nāstīti sa vā vikalpaṃ sa nirvṛtasya vikalpayet*, a reading that lacks the *api* of the other Sanskrit witnesses but leaves *pāda* c unmetrical and the verse-half with an extra syllable. That both *vā* and *sa* indeed belong in the *kārikā*, but that the *api* not found in Ms Q and not accounted for by the Tibetan does not, is confirmed by a later citation of 22.13 in Candrakīrti's commentary on MMK 25.17 (see LVP 534.8–9). Ms B has preserved the correct reading at this point (*pādas* cd are damaged in Ms P):⁴²

ghanagrāho gṛhītas tu yenāstīti tathāgataḥ |
nāstīti vā kalpayan sa nirvṛtasya vikalpayet ||

With this reading, *pāda* c's metrical problem is resolved: the *pāda* is now a *ra-vipulā*, with the expected *caesura* after the 4th syllable.

Emend 22.13 to: *ghanagrāho gṛhītas tu yenāstīti tathāgataḥ |*
nāstīti vā kalpayan sa nirvṛtasya vikalpayet ||

But how do we explain the fact that Candrakīrti interprets the *kārikā* differently than the other commentators? One might hypothesize that, accustomed to Nāgārjuna's tendency to revert to non-classical forms, he interpreted the *vā* (or did his manuscript erroneously read *va*?) as the

⁴¹ See LVP 447, n. 1.

⁴² Ms D's reading is similar, but is marred by scribal errors: *nāstīti cā kalpayan sa nirvatasya vikalpayet*. Interestingly, the reading presented for 22.13cd at LVP 534.8–9 is correct, i.e., identical with that of Ms B (I thank Akira Saito for the reference to this later citation).

Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit form for *eva*; he indeed appears to gloss this word with *niyatam* in his commentary to the *kārikā*.⁴³

xiii. MMK 16.1

The final problematic *kārikā* noted by Vetter is 16.1.

LVP, DJ 16.1: *saṃskārāḥ saṃsaranti cen na nityāḥ saṃsaranti te |*
saṃsaranti ca nānityāḥ sattve 'py eṣa samaḥ kramaḥ ||

pāda a is unmetrical, but Mss P and D read as the editions do.⁴⁴ As it is highly unlikely that the MMK would contain a single renegade “*ja-vipulā*,” and since the Tibetan translation does not deviate from the Sanskrit, one might conjecture that a transposition of words has caused the problem. The switching of the second and third words in *pāda* a render the *pāda* a *ra-vipulā*.

saṃskārāś cet saṃsaranti na nityāḥ saṃsaranti te |
saṃsaranti ca nānityāḥ sattve 'py eṣa samaḥ kramaḥ ||

Alternatively, one could conjecture that the *pāda* originally read *saṃskārāḥ saṃsarante cen*.⁴⁵ The change of voice would resolve the metre to regular *śloka* metre.

saṃskārāḥ saṃsarante cen na nityāḥ saṃsaranti te |
saṃsaranti ca nānityāḥ sattve 'py eṣa samaḥ kramaḥ ||

In conclusion, the new manuscripts provide textual evidence which allows for the correction of two of the three cases of “*ja-vipulā*” to *ra-vipulā*. The proposed solutions for the third case await further evidence.

III. Emendations for further non-metrical *kārikās*

The *kārikās* which have been discussed in sections I. and II. do not exhaust the non-metrical *kārikās* to be found in the editions.

xiv. MMK 25.22

kārikā 25.22c is a further problem *kārikā*.

LVP, DJ 25.22: *sūnyeṣu sarvadharmeṣu kim anantaṃ kim antavat |*
kim anantam antavac ca nānantam nāntavac ca kim ||

⁴³ LVP 447.8: *sa niyataṃ parinirvṛte tathāgate na bhavati tathāgataḥ paraṃ maraṇān maraṇād ut-tarakālaṃ na bhavaty ucchinnaṃ tathāgato na saṃvidyata iti parikalpayet |*

⁴⁴ Ms B reads *saṃskārāḥ saṃsarati cen*.

⁴⁵ I do not have Ms Q's reading for the entire *pāda*, although Dr. Yonezawa informs me that Ms Q does attest *saṃsaranti*.

pāda c is unmetrical, not conforming to regular *śloka* metre or any of its *vipulās*. Ms P's reading lacks three syllables, two, it would seem, from *pāda* c.

Ms P: *śūnyeṣu sarvadharmeṣu kim antaṃ kim anantavat |*
*kim **anantavac cānantam** nāntavac ca kim ||*

Ms Q is said to read for *pāda* c *kim antavac cāntañ ca*. This reading leaves the *pāda* with only seven syllables, but it does include the second expected *ca* for the third of the four alternatives presented in the verse.

I would propose, on the basis of the wording of *pāda* d and the clear intent of the *kārikā* to list the four alternatives, that *pāda* c originally read *kim anantaṃ cāntavac ca*; this would render the *pāda* a *ra-vipulā* with *caesura* after the 4th syllable. Ms P's reading *anantavac* probably resulted from an early eye-skip from the *nta* of *anantaṃ* to the *nta* of *cāntavac* (the merging of the following *ca* with *nānantam* would have been a secondary error). Ms P's *antaṃ* for *anantam* and *anantavat* for *antavat* in *pāda* b is presumably the result of early interference which occurred because the Canonical and usual, more natural sequence of the alternatives commences with the positively formulated *antavat* (the Tibetan for *pāda* b reads *mtha' yod ci zhig mtha' med ci*).

Emend 25.22 to:⁴⁶ *śūnyeṣu sarvadharmeṣu kim anantaṃ kim antavat |*
*kim **anantaṃ cāntavac ca nānantam** nāntavac ca kim ||*

xv. MMK 22.11

A troubling *kārikā* is MMK 22.11, the single *kārikā* among all 447 *kārikās* that appears to break the general rule for *śloka* metre which states that the second and third syllables of *pāda* a may not both be short (see Appendix, n. 2).

DJ 22.11: *śūnyam **iti na vaktavyam** aśūnyam iti vā bhavet |*
ubhayaṃ nobhayaṃ ceti prajñaptyarthaṃ tu kathyate ||

De Jong found the words *śūnyam iti na vaktavyam*, which de La Vallée Poussin had set within brackets, in Ms D, and thus presented them as a confirmed reading in his edition. Mss P and B give the same reading as Ms D. As in the case of MMK 25.5, the sole witness bearing the correct reading appears to be Ms Q. This manuscript presents *pāda* a as *śūnyam ity apy avaktavyam*, a reading which resolves the metre to regular *śloka*.

The Tibetan translation of *pādas* ab reads:

⁴⁶ This emendation may need to be viewed as preliminary. If Ms Q's *pāda* c is emended from *kim antavac cāntañ ca* to *kim antavac cānantam ca*, the *pāda* reads as a *ma-vipulā* without *caesura* (the MMK contains other *ma-vipulās* without *caesura*: MMK 3.7c, 7.21a, 15.3a, 20.6a, 20.16c, 20.21c, and 27.6c). On the other hand, Ms Q's reading with the expected order of predicates may make it a *lectio facilior*.

*stong ngo zhes kyang*⁴⁷ *mi brjod de* ||
mi stong zhes kyang mi bya zhing ||

This translation includes, with its *kyang* . . . *kyang* plus negated verb construction, an equivalent for the Sanskrit “neither . . . nor” construction expressed by way of *api*, negated optative participle . . . *vā*, optative verbal form. The initial *kyang* may even suggest a reflection of Ms Q’s *api*. One might speculate that the *akṣara tya* of *ity a°* and the *akṣara pya* of *apy a°* were slightly damaged in Ms P’s exemplar such that what remained of the *tya* was read as a *ta* (and therefore “corrected” to *ti*) and the *pya* — perhaps due to damage to the *p* — was read as a *na akṣara*, either naturally because the remains resembled a *na* or forcibly because a negation was needed.

Emend 22.11 to: *śūnyam ity apy avaktavyam aśūnyam iti vā bhavet* |
ubhayaṃ nobhayaṃ ceti prajñaptiarthaṃ tu kathyate ||

xvi. MMK 22.8

kārikā 22.8 as presented in the editions is metrically unacceptable.

LVP, DJ 22.8: *tattvānyatvena yo nāsti mṛgyamāṇas ca pañcadhā* |
upādānena sa kathaṃ prajñāpyate tathāgataḥ ||

pāda d exhibits the prohibited string long second syllable, short third syllable, long fourth syllable. Ms P attests the correct reading:⁴⁸

Ms P: *tattvānyatvena yo nāsti mṛgyamāṇas ca pañcadhā* |
upādānena sa kathaṃ prajñāpyeta tathāgataḥ ||

Ms Q also attests *prajñāpyeta*.

Emend 22.8 to: *tattvānyatvena yo nāsti mṛgyamāṇas ca pañcadhā* |
upādānena sa kathaṃ prajñāpyeta tathāgataḥ ||

IV. Additional emendations

xvii. MMK 22.10

Although metrical as presented in the editions, MMK 22.10 probably requires the same emendation as 22.8 (see above).

DJ 22.10: *evaṃ śūnyam upādānam upādātā ca sarvaśaḥ* |
prajñāpyate ca śūnyena kathaṃ śūnyas tathāgataḥ ||

⁴⁷ The Peking version of the Tibetan translation of the MMK alone presents *ni* in place of *kyang*.

⁴⁸ Vaidya (1987: 214.14) emends *prajñāpyate* to *prajñāpyeta*.

De Jong was able to confirm the *ca* of *pāda* b that de La Vallée Poussin had set in brackets as a conjecture, but he does not note that Ms D reads *prajñapyeta* for *prajñapyate* in *pāda* c, a reading which is also metrically correct. Ms P is unfortunately not available for 22.10cd. Dr. Yonezawa, however, informs me that Ms Q attests *prajñapyeta*.

Emend 22.10 to: *evaṃ sūnyam upādānam upādātā ca sarvaśaḥ |*
prajñapyeta ca sūnyena katham sūnyas tathāgataḥ ||

xviii. MMK 10.3

kārikā 10.3 is metrical, but a superior reading is found in the manuscripts.

LVP, DJ 10.3: *paratra nirapekṣatvād apradīpanahetukaḥ |*
punarārambhavaiyarthyam nityadīptaḥ prasajyate ||

Ms P has a somewhat problematic, but in one point valuable, reading.

Ms P: *paratra nirapekṣatvād apradīpanahetukaḥ |*
punarārambhe vaiyarthyanityadīpte prasajyate ||

The Peking U. manuscript of the MMK attests for *pādas* cd: {*pu*}*narārambhavaiyarthyam nityadīpte prasajyate*. Dr. Yonezawa notes that Ms Q attests *nityadīpte*. The Tibetan translations support the manuscripts' *nityadīpte* with *rtaḡ tu 'bar ba yin na ni* (Mahāsumati and Pa-tshab nyi-ma grags) / *rtaḡ tu 'bar ba nyid yin na* (Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal mtshan).

Emend 10.3 to: *paratra nirapekṣatvād apradīpanahetukaḥ |*
punarārambhavaiyarthyam nityadīpte prasajyate ||

xix. MMK 15.10

LVP, DJ 15.10: *astīti śāsvatagrāho nāstīty ucchedadarśanam |*
tasmād astitvanāstīte nāśrīyeta vicakṣaṇaḥ ||

The *kārikā* is metrically correct, but the passive optative form *āśrīyeta* hardly makes sense. Note the variant reading in Ms P's second verse-half:

Ms P: *tasmād astitvanāstīte nāśrayīta vicakṣaṇaḥ ||*

Ms Q bears the identical reading *nāśrayīta*. The individual responsible for the reading inherited by both Ms P and Ms Q, who clearly intended the active optative form, must have forgotten that the verb is thematic.

Emend 15.10 to: *astīti śāsvatagrāho nāstīty ucchedadarśanam |*
tasmād astitvanāstīte nāśrayeta vicakṣaṇaḥ ||

xx. MMK 17.24

LVP, DJ 17.24: *vyavahārā virudhyante sarva eva na saṃśayaḥ |*

puṇyapāpakṛtor *naiva pravibhāgaś ca yujyate* ||

The *kārikā* is metrically correct. Ms P, however, attests *puṇyapāpakṛtān* for *pāda* c's *puṇyapāpakṛtor*. Ulrich Kragh, interpreting and explaining Ms P's *puṇyapāpakṛtān* as intending *puṇyapāpakṛtām*, the genitive plural for *puṇyapāpakṛt*, emends to *puṇyapāpakṛtān* (sic) in his new edition of the 17th chapter of the Prasannapadā.⁴⁹ Ms Q now supports Kragh's interpretation of Ms P's reading with its attestation of *puṇyapāpakṛtām*. Candrakīrti's employment of the dual form *puṇyapāpakṛtor* in his commentary is for the sake of clarification and precision, and does not indicate that he read the dual form in the *kārikā* (as de La Vallée Poussin assumed).

Emend 17.24 to: *vyavahārā virudhyante sarva eva na saṃśayaḥ* |
puṇyapāpakṛtām *naiva pravibhāgaś ca yujyate* ||

xxi. MMK 18.4

LVP, DJ 18.4: *mamety aham iti kṣīṇe bahirdhādhyātmam eva ca* |
nirudhyata upādānaṃ tatksayāj janmanaḥ kṣayaḥ ||

Ms P: *mamety aham iti kṣīṇe bahiś cādhyātmam eva ca* |
nirudhyata upādānaṃ tatksayāj janmanaḥ kṣayaḥ ||

Ms P's reading is supported by Ms Q, which also attests *bahiś cādhyātmam*. The Peking U. manuscript of the MMK attests *bahiś cāddhyātmam*.

Emend 18.4 to: *mamety aham iti kṣīṇe bahiś cādhyātmam eva ca* |
nirudhyata upādānaṃ tatksayāj janmanaḥ kṣayaḥ ||

xxii. MMK 24.19

LVP 24.19: *apratītya samutpanno dharmāḥ kaścīn na vidyate* |
yasmāt tasmād aśūnyo 'hi dharmāḥ kaścīn na vidyate ||

De Jong, considering the *avagraha* to be an error in LVP, emends the faulty *'hi to hi*, but without manuscript support, for Ms D lacks text from MMK 24.16a to MMK 24.20a (= LVP 502.7-505.18). Ms P, however, attests *pi* instead of *hi*, and Ms Q reads *'pi*.⁵⁰ Ms B (in Devanāgarī script) attests *dhi*, the *dh* almost certainly the result of the mistaken reading of an old Nevārī *p* for an old Nevārī *dh*, which closely resembles it.

⁴⁹ See Kragh 2003: 74 and n. 9.

⁵⁰ It is somewhat unusual, however, that a translation for *api* is not included in the Tibetan: *gang phyir rten 'byung ma yin pa'i* || *chos 'ga' yang yod pa ma yin pa* || *de phyir stong pa ma yin pa'i* || *chos 'ga' yang yod pa ma yin no* ||. The author of the Akutobhayā tends to reproduce all of the words of many of the *kārikās* in his commentary, but the expected *kyang/yang/ang* does not appear in the translation of his expansion of the *kārikā*: *gang gi phyir rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba ma yin pa'i chos 'ga' yang yod pa ma yin de'i phyir stong pa ma yin pa'i chos ni 'ga' yang yod pa ma yin no* ||. On the other hand, the *ni* may correspond to *api* taken as a focus particle.

Emend 24.19 to: *apratītya samutpanno dharmah kaścīn na vidyate |
yasmāt tasmād asūnyo 'pi dharmah kaścīn na vidyate ||*

xxiii. MMK 24.36

LVP, DJ 24.36: *sarvasaṃvyavahārāṃś ca laukikān pratibādhase |
yat **pratītyasamutpādaśūnyatām** pratibādhase ||*

De Jong accepts LVP's *pratītyasamutpādaśūnyatām* even though Ms D attests *pratītya-samutpādaṃ śūnyatām*. Both Mss P and Q, as well as Ms B, attest *pratītyasamutpādaṃ śūnyatām*. Nāgārjuna is again stressing his equation of emptiness and dependent-arising here (cf. MMK 24.18). LVP's compound *pratītyasamutpādaśūnyatām* is open to more than a *karmadhāraya* interpretation; the manuscripts' reading makes the equation unambiguous.

Emend 24.36 to: *sarvasaṃvyavahārāṃś ca laukikān pratibādhase |
yat **pratītyasamutpādaṃ śūnyatām** pratibādhase ||*

xxiv. MMK 27.11

kārikā 27.11 is missing in the manuscripts used by de La Vallée Poussin, but it does occur in Ms D, relied on by de Jong.

DJ 27.11: *ucchedaḥ karmaṇām nāśaḥ kṛtam anyena karma ca |
pratisaṃvedayed anya **evam ādi** prasajyate ||*

Both Mss P and Q attest *pratisaṃvedayatī* instead of *pratisaṃvedayed*.

Emend 27.11 to: *ucchedaḥ karmaṇām nāśaḥ kṛtam anyena karma ca |
pratisaṃvedayatī anya **evamādi** prasajyate ||*

xxv. MMK 13.6

With the mention of *kārikā* 13.6, I merely wish to confirm an emendation already suggested by Vaidya, Lindtner and Saito on the basis of the manuscript readings *kasyārtha* and *kasyārtham*.

LVP, DJ 13.6: *tasya ced anyathābhāvaḥ kṣīram eva bhaved dadhi |
kṣīrād anyasya **kasyacid**⁵¹ dadhibhāvo bhaviṣyati ||*

As Saito has noted (1985: 842, n. 3), the *kārikā* is unmetrical; *pāda* c does not present regular *śloka* metre or any of its *vipulās*. The proposed emendation *kasyārtha*, which allows for regular *śloka* metre, is now confirmed by Ms P.

Ms P: *kṣīrād anyasya **kasyārtha** dadhibhāvo bhaviṣyati ||*

Emend 13.6 to: *tasya ced anyathābhāvaḥ kṣīram eva bhaved dadhi |*

⁵¹ LVP presents *kasya cid*.

kṣīrād anyasya kasyātha dadhibhāvo bhaviṣyati ||

V. Emendations proposed in MacDonald 2000

xxvi. MMK 2.23

LVP 2.23: *gatyā yayocyate gantā tato 'nyāṃ sa na gacchati |
gatī dve nopapadyete yasmād eke pragacchati ||*

DJ 2.23: *gatyā yayājyate gantā tato 'nyāṃ sa na gacchati |
gatī dve nopapadyete yasmād eke tu gantari ||*

Ms P attests *yayājyate*, and also *ekatra gantari* in place of *eke tu gantari*. I therefore emended the *kārikā* to read:⁵²

Emendation: *gatyā yayājyate gantā tato 'nyāṃ sa na gacchati |
gatī dve nopapadyete yasmād ekatra gantari ||*

Both *yayājyate* and *ekatra gantari* are now reported to be attested by Ms Q.

xxvii. MMK 17.28

LVP, DJ 17.28: *avidyānivrto jantus tṛṣṇāsamyojanaś ca saḥ |
sa bhoktā sa ca na kartur anyo na ca sa eva saḥ ||*

Ms P: *avidyānivrto jantus tṛṣṇāsamyojanaś ca saḥ |
sa bhoktā sa ca naḥ kartur anyo na ca sa eva saḥ ||*

Interpreting the *naḥ* as a *no* “corrected” for the sake of *sandhi*, I emended the *kārikā* to read:

*avidyānivrto jantus tṛṣṇāsamyojanaś ca saḥ |
sa bhoktā sa ca no kartur anyo na ca sa eva saḥ ||*

This emendation is now confirmed by Ms Q, which attests the *no*. Ulrich Kragh, perhaps unaware of my emendation, retains the editions’ *na* in his version of the *kārikā* in his new edition of Prasannapadā Chapter 17, but does emend *pāda* b’s *saḥ* to *yaḥ* on the basis of the Tibetan translation’s *gang*.⁵³ Kragh’s emendation *yaḥ* is now supported by Ms Q’s attestation of *yaḥ*.

Emend 17.28 to: *avidyānivrto jantus tṛṣṇāsamyojanaś ca yaḥ |
sa bhoktā sa ca no kartur anyo na ca sa eva saḥ ||*

⁵² For further details, see MacDonald 2000.

⁵³ Kragh 2003: 82.

VI. Problems and Conclusion

There are a few more interesting variant readings in Ms P that I hesitate, without further evidence, to present as correct readings. One of these involves *kārikās* 2.18 and 2.19. De La Vallée Poussin and de Jong present 2.18 as follows:

LVP, DJ 2.18: *yad* eva gamanaṃ gantā sa eveti na yujyate |
 anya eva punar gantā gater iti na yujyate ||

Although *yad* may be the expected reading in *pāda* a, both Mss P and Q attest *tad* instead of *yad*. The Tibetan for this *kārikā* attests *de*, not *gang*.⁵⁴ It would seem, then, that already at the beginning of the ninth century the Prasannapadā manuscripts read *tad*. I refrain for the time being from emending the editions' *yad* to the manuscripts' *tad* on account of the Tibetan translation for 2.19. The editions present the Sanskrit of the *kārikā* as:

LVP, DJ 2.19: *yad* eva gamanaṃ gantā sa eva hi bhaved yadi |
 ekībhāvaḥ prasajyeta kartuḥ karmaṇa eva ca ||

One expects, given Nāgārjuna's style, the wording in 2.19a to be identical to that in 2.18a. As in the case of the previous *kārikā*, the *yad* found in the editions appears as *tad* in Mss P and Q, as well as in Ms D. The Tibetan for 2.19ab, on the other hand, translates a *yad*.⁵⁵ While the *tad* in 2.18 and 2.19 may indeed represent the original reading,⁵⁶ the Tibetan's *gang* in 2.19 could, on the other hand, indicate that *yad* was the original reading in both. Alternatively, it is certainly possible that Nāgārjuna used *tat* in one *kārikā* and *yat* in another. The Tibetan translation may correctly reflect the original Sanskrit, and the manuscript readings merely expose an attempt to harmonize the readings.

Another *kārikā* whose reading should not be decided without further evidence is MMK 24.15.

LVP, DJ 24.15: *sa tvaṃ doṣān ātmanīyān* asmāsu paripātayan |
 aśvam evābhirūḍhaḥ sann aśvam evāsi vismrtaḥ ||

Lindtner, commenting on Saigusa's reproduction of LVP's °*ātmanīyānoḥ* in MMK 18.2d, states that he "hesitates to accept this hapax," and points to the *ātmanīyān* of the editions' *kārikā* 24.15 (1988: 246). However, Ms P attests °*ātmanīyānoḥ* in 18.2 and *ātmīnān* rather than *ātmanīyān* in 24.15. Ms D attests *ātmīnān* in 24.15. I do not have Ms Q's reading for 24.15 or for 18.2. *kārikā* 24.15 is not available in the Peking U. manuscript, but it should be

⁵⁴ The *kārikā* has been translated 'gro ba *de* dang 'gro ba po || de nyid ces kyang byar mi rung || 'gro ba dang ni 'gro ba po || gzhan nyid ces kyang byar mi rung ||.

⁵⁵ Tibetan: gal de 'gro ba *gang* yin pa || de nyid 'gro bo yin 'gyur na || byed pa po dang las nyid kyang || gcig pa nyid du thal bar 'gyur ||.

⁵⁶ The reading *tad* for 2.19 could be seen as supported by, e.g., MMK 9.8ab, which reads *draṣṭā sa eva sa śrotā sa eva yadi vedakaḥ*, and possibly by MMK 27.15ab, which reads *sa devaḥ sa manuṣyaś ced evaṃ bhavati śāśvatam*.

noted that 18.2 there is said to attest °*ātmanīyayoḥ*.

Other examples of uncertain readings include MMK 17.26's final *katham*, which Ms Q supports, but Ms P does not, presenting instead *kutaḥ*;⁵⁷ and MMK 27.2b's *anyo*, which reads *manye* in Ms P, perhaps indicating an original *anye*, a reading that may be supported by the Tibetan of the Akutobhayā (and Buddhapālita's commentary, which merely reiterates the Akutobhayā here).

It is very unlikely that the emendations suggested for the *kārikās* presented in this paper exhaust the corrections owed to the MMK. As stated at the beginning of the paper, entire chapters are lacking in Ms P, and numerous *kārikās* in its extant chapters are partially damaged or completely missing. It is hoped that Ms Q preserves readings for many of these *kārikās*.⁵⁸

To conclude, a monitoring of the metre of Nāgārjuna's *kārikās* as edited by de La Vallée Poussin and de Jong and the scrutiny of the *kārikās* as preserved in Ms P and other new manuscripts have led to the discovery of new readings for the MMK. Some of the improvements expose distinctive traits of Nāgārjuna's style. Especially striking is his use of non-classical verb forms, and his predilection for juxtaposing the different voices of a verb form in one and the same verse. Also to be mentioned in this regard is the employment in the 27th chapter of the non-classical, presumably Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit first-person singular root-aorist *abhūm*, which is used next to the classical *abhūvam* in four *kārikās*. It has primarily been the interference of overly zealous scribes and editors who expect only classical Sanskrit from the lips, or pen, of Nāgārjuna that has caused the loss of various of the non-classical forms from the text of the MMK. Commenting on de Jong's recovery of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit noun *doṣa* for MMK 23.7, Tilmann Vetter states that in view of the Prakrit background of Buddhist transmission, Nāgārjuna's employment of it *metri causa* for *dveṣa* would hardly have led to misunderstanding among his readers (1992: 501, n. 34). We may want to add that Nāgārjuna's employment of this and other non-classical forms reflects aspects of his own linguistic background and literary environment, and, given his early date, should actually come as no surprise.

⁵⁷ Kragh (2003: 76) changes *katham* to *kutaḥ* on the basis of Ms P's reading and Candrakīrti's use of *kutaḥ* in his commentary to the *kārikā*. All other manuscripts attest *katham*.

⁵⁸ Dr. Yonezawa recently informed me that he plans to publish Ms Q's *kārikā* readings.

Appendix: Metrical rules for *anuṣṭubh*¹

An *anuṣṭubh*-verse consists of 4 verse-quarters (*pāda*) with 8 syllables each (= 32 syllables).
1 and 3 = odd verse-quarters; 2 and 4 = even verse-quarters

General rules (for *pathyā* and *vipulās*)

1. The 1st and 8th syllables of *each* verse-quarter is *anceps* (x), i.e. either long (–) or short (U).
2. Syllables 2 and 3 may in *none* of the verse-quarters both be short; thus the only three combinations allowed are U –, – U and – –.
3. Syllables 2–4 in *both* of the *even* verse-quarters may not form a *ra-gaṇa* (– U –).
4. Syllables 5–7 must measure U – U in *both* of the *even* verse-quarters.

The Normal Form (*pathyā*)

Syllables 5–7 *must* measure U – – in *both* of the *odd* verse-quarters.

$$\begin{array}{l} x \circ \circ^2 x U - - x \mid x \circ \circ \circ^3 U - U x \mid \\ x \circ \circ x U - - x \mid x \circ \circ \circ U - U x \mid \end{array}$$

The Regular Extensions (*vipulā*)

Concerns the structure of syllables 2–7 in at least one *odd* verse-quarter; the respectively other *odd* verse-quarter can take the form of a *pathyā* or any other regular *vipulā*. In accordance with the 4th general rule, *both* of the *even* verse-quarters are always constructed in the normal form.

1. *na-vipulā*:

$$x \circ \circ - U U U x \mid$$

2. *bha-vipulā* (structure *ra-bha*; seldom: *ma-bha* with a *caesura* after the 4th syllable):

$$x - U - - U U x \mid \text{(seldom: } x - - - \mid - U U x \mid \text{)}$$

3. *ma-vipulā* (structure *ra-ma* with a *caesura* after the 5th syllable):

$$x - U - - \mid - - x \mid$$

4. *ra-vipulā* (*caesura* after the 4th syllable):

$$x \circ \circ - \mid - U - x \mid$$

5. Old (vedic) *anuṣṭubh*:

$$x \circ \circ x U - U x \mid$$

¹ Taken from: Roland Steiner. “Die Lehre der Anuṣṭubh bei den indischen Metrikern.” In *Suḥṛllekhāḥ. Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*. Eds. M. Hahn, J.-U. Hartmann, R. Steiner. Swisttal-Odendorf, 1996. 227–248 (Steiner’s Appendix 4 translated from the German by the author of the present paper).

² $\circ \circ$ according to the 2nd general rule may *not* both be short.

³ $\circ \circ \circ$ according to the 2nd and 3rd general rules may measure *neither* U U x *nor* – U –.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

Ames, William.

- [1995] “Bhāvaviveka’s *Prajñāpradīpa*. A Translation of Chapter Two: ‘Examination of the Traversed, the Untraversed and that which is being Traversed.’” In *JIP* 23 (1995): 295–365.

BHSD *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*; see Edgerton

Weber-Brosamer, B. and Back, D.M.

- [1997] *Die Philosophie der Leere. Nāgārjunas Mūlamadhyamaka-Kārikās. Übersetzung des buddhistischen Basistextes mit kommentierenden Einführung* (Beiträge zur Indologie, Band 28). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997.

De Jong, J.W., ed.

- [1977] *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ*. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1977.

Ibid. [1978] “Textcritical Notes on the Prasannapadā.” *IJ* 20 (1978): 25-59; 217–252.

DJ de Jong. See de Jong, J.W., ed. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ*

Edgerton, F.

- [1953] *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. New Haven, 1953. Reprint New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1993.

Huntington, C.W. Jr.

- [1986] *The Akutobhayā and Early Indian Madhyamaka*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Michigan, 1986.

Imanishi, J.

- [1988] “On the Text of the MMK.” (in Japanese) *Naritasan bukkyo kenkyusho Kiyo (Journal of the Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies)* 11 (1988): 91–104.

Kragh, Ulrich T.

- [2003] *Karmaphalasambandha in verses 17.1–20 of Candrakīrti’s Prasannapadā*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Copenhagen, Denmark, 2003.

Ibid. [2006] *Early Buddhist Theories of Action and Result. A Study of Karmaphalasambandha. Candrakīrti’s Prasannapadā, Verses 17.1–20*. Vienna: ATBS, 2006.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de, ed. [1903–1913]

Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. St. Petersburg, 1903–1913. Reprint Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.

Lindtner, Christian.

- [1988] Review of M. Saigusa’s *Chūron geju soran*. *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 4

- (1988): 244–247.
- Ibid. [1982a] *Nāgārjunas Filosofiske Vaerker*. Indiske Studier II. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982.
- Ibid. [1982b] *Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Indiske Studier IV. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982.
- LVP see La Vallée Poussin
- MacDonald, Anne.
- [2000] “The Prasannapadā: More Manuscripts from Nepal.” In *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens (WZKS) (Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies)* 44 (2000): 165–181.
- Oberlies, Thomas.
- [2003] *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies No. 5. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter, 2003.
- Oetke, Claus.
- [1992] “Pragmatic Implicatures and Text-Interpretation (The Alleged Logical Error of the Negation of the Antecedent in the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās).” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 16 (1992): 185–233.
- Saigusa, Mitsuyoshi.
- [1986] *Chūron geju Sōran*. Tokyo: Daisan bummeisha, 1986.
- Saito, Akira.
- [1984] *A Study of the Buddhapālita-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Australian National University, 1984.
- Ibid. [1985] “Textcritical Remarks on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* as Cited in the *Prasannapadā*.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū)* 33-2 (1985): 846–842.
- Ibid. [1986] “A Note on the Prajñā-nāma-mūlamadhyamakakārikā.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū)* 35-1 (1986): 487-484.
- Ibid. [1995] “Problems in Translating the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā as cited in its Commentaries.” *Buddhist Translations: Problems and Perspectives*. Ed. Doboorn Tulku. New Delhi: Manohar, 1995. 87–96.
- Seyfort Ruegg, D.
- [1980] Review of J.W. de Jong’s *Nāgārjuna: Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ*. *JIP* 22 (1980): 247–249.
- Steiner, Roland.
- [1996] “Die Lehre der Anuṣṭubh bei den indischen Metrikern.” *Suhṛllekhāḥ. Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*. Eds. M. Hahn, J.-U. Hartmann, R. Steiner. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1996. 227–248.
- Vaidya, P.L., ed.

Revisiting the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā

[1960] *Madhyamakaśāstra of Nāgārjuna with the Commentary: Prasannapadā by Candrakīrti*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, No. 10. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1960. Reprint 1987.

Vetter, Tilmann.

[1992] “On the Authenticity of the Ratnāvalī.” *Asiatische Studien* 46 (1992): 492–506.

Ye, Shaoyong.

[2005] “A Sanskrit Manuscript of Madhyamaka-kārikā and Buddhapālita’s Commentary from Tibet” (Handout). 14th IABS Conference, London, England, 2005.

Yonezawa, Yoshiyasu.

[2005] “**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā* Sanskrit Notes on the *Prasannapadā* (2).” *Naritasan bukkyo kenkyusho Kiyō (Journal of the Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies)* 28 (2005): 159–179.

2007.2.5

Dept. of South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna