



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A Textual Study of the *Lakṣaṇaṭīkā

Yonezawa, Y.

Citation

Yonezawa, Y. (2019, October 24). *A Textual Study of the *Lakṣaṇaṭīkā*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/79823>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/79823>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/79823> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Yonezawa, Y.

Title: A Textual Study of the *Lakṣaṇāṭīkā

Issue Date: 2019-10-24

Chapter 3. Proper Names of Sects, Schools, and Individuals in the *LT

As stated above¹, the *LT comprises both Sanskrit and Tibetan notes on the *Pras*, Sanskrit notes on the *MABh* (in which the *MA* is embedded), Tibetan notes on the *VP*, Sanskrit notes on the *CŚT*, and an unidentified Sanskrit text. Among these, the Sanskrit notes on the *Pras*, *MABh*, and *CŚT* are complete, whereas the other texts are fragmentary. Focusing upon the *Pras*, *MABh*, and *CŚT*, called Candrakīrti's 'three main treatises' below, this chapter attempts to clarify the textual significance of the *LT from the viewpoint of its contents.

First, Candrakīrti's three main treatises are briefly surveyed. Emphasis is laid on what survives in the extant Sanskrit manuscripts. Second, the proper names of individuals as well as sects and schools are enumerated as sample data for elucidating Candrakīrti's three main treatises. Finally, in the summary of this chapter I highlight the *LT's position as a Madhyamaka text.

1. Candrakīrti's Three Main Treatises in the *LT

The *Pras*, *MABh*, and *CŚT*, all of which are annotated in the *LT, are commentaries by Candrakīrti.² The Sanskrit notes on these three treatises are complete and comprise a major portion of the *LT.³

¹ See Introduction above (p. 1).

² The other Madhyamaka treatises attributed to Candrakīrti are as follows: the *ŚSV*, the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvyūṭi* (*YṢV*), the *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa* (*PSP*) or the *Madhyamakapañcaskandhaka*, and the *Trīśaraṇa[gamana]saptati* (*TŚS*). The *PSP* is a treatise on Abhidharma topics, and the *TŚS* is a poetic introduction to Buddhism for lay Buddhists from the viewpoint of Mahāyāna. An incomplete Sanskrit MS of the *YṢV* is reported in Ye 2013 and Li, Kano, and Ye 2014. The Sanskrit of the *PSP* and the *TŚS* has been partially retrieved from quotations in Abhayākara Gupta's *MmA*. (See Li & Kano 2015 and Kano & Li 2014 respectively.) However, the attribution of these last two treatises is doubted by some scholars. (See Tillemans 1990a: 13; Kragh 2006: 21, n. 21.)

³ Among Candrakīrti's three main treatises, the *MA(Bh)* appears to have been the most influential historically. Avalokitavratā (ca. 700) seems to be the first to refer to Candrakīrti in India. In his *Prajñāpradīpaṭīkā* (*PPt*), he lists Candrakīrti as one of the eight commentators on the *MMK*. (D 3859: 73a5; P 5259: 85a8. See also Ruegg 1981: 49.) However, apart from citations of the *MA*, the earliest of his extant compositions, we have come across no citations of his in Indian texts. Several verses of the *MA* are quoted by Prajñākaramati (950–1030 CE) in his *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* (*BCAP*). (*BCAP*: 361, 4–7; 353, 1316; 369, 15–360, 2; 353, 3–6.; 365, 2–6; 372, 15–16.) Atiśa (Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna, 982–1054

In addition to Pa tshab Nyi ma grags' translations included in the Tibetan canon, Sanskrit MSS of Candrakīrti's three main treatises are extant and have been utilized for textual studies to greater or lesser degrees. Let us briefly assess the current situation.

1.1 The *Pras*

The *Pras* is a commentary on the *MMK*. Text-critical studies of the Sanskrit *MMK* have relied heavily on the Sanskrit text of the *Pras* because no other Sanskrit MSS of the *MMK* or commentaries on it had been known until recently⁴. Due to the limited textual sources, LVP's edition of the *Pras*—made on the basis of three Sanskrit manuscripts—published in the beginning of the 20th century has been considered the standard source for both the *MMK* and the *Pras*.

However, in recent years the situation has changed dramatically. Since the publication of LVP's edition, many more Sanskrit MSS have been reported and utilized. Among about twenty extant Sanskrit MSS of the *Pras*, MacDonald 2008 points to six, namely, B, D, J, L, P, and Q (in her list of MS *sigla*), that are superior to those used in the LVP edition⁵. Notably, P and Q are palm-leaf MSS, while the others are paper.

The present study utilizes three of these MSS, namely, P, Q, and D. MS P, renamed Ox below, is preserved in the Bodleian Library in Oxford. It contains about one third of the entire text of the *Pras*⁶. Q, renamed Po below, is preserved in the same bundle as the above-mentioned *MABh* MS in the Potala Palace in Lhasa. This MS is almost complete, with only four leaves missing (the 10th, 16th, 43th, and 86th)⁷. I made a handwritten copy of this MS when I visited the Potala Palace as a member of delegation team of Taisho University in 1999 and 2001. MS D, renamed R below, was used by de Jong in his

CE) also quotes this text, as does Abhayākara Gupta (d. 1125 CE) in his *MmA*. (See Vose 2009: 187, note 113.) Quotations are also to be found in esoteric treatises such as the *Subhāṣitasamgraha* (*Subh*). (*Subh*: 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.) Commenting on the relatively small number of references to the author, Vose remarks, “Indians took little notice of Candrakīrti's texts during his lifetime and in the three centuries following his death.” (Vose 2009: 3-4.)

⁴ Sanskrit MSS of the *MMK* and Buddhapālita's commentary have recently been reported. See Ye 2009: 309–310; Ye 2011a; and 2011b.

⁵ See MacDonald 2008: esp. 13ff.; the survey of the *Pras* MSS in MacDonald 2015a: 33–67; and Niisaku 2016: 5–7.

⁶ For further details, see MacDonald *ibid*.

⁷ See Yonezawa 2005: 160.

edition of the *MMK* and in his text-critical notes⁸. Notably, immediately after the *Pras* text, this MS contains the so called *Madhyamakaśāstrastuti* (*MŚS*)⁹.

1.2 The *MABh*

The *MABh*, which consists of the *kārikā* text together with its auto-commentary, is an independent treatise by Candrakīrti, conceived of as a general introduction to his Madhyamaka philosophy. Only one Sanskrit MS of the *MABh* is extant. Ye 2009 gives the following description of it:

palm-leaf, 97 fols. (missing only fol.2), 5 lines, 56.1 x 5 cm, Gupta script, preserved at the Potala Palace when the Luo Cat. was compiled (Luo Cat. II: Tanjur, 128f.; Sandhag Cat.: reel 7, no. 136/1).¹⁰

Li, who published the Sanskrit text of the entire sixth chapter of the *kārikā* text in 2014, describes the MS as follows:

The existence of a Sanskrit manuscript of Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya* in the Sanskrit manuscript collection of the Potala Palace in Lhasa was first reported by Luo Zhao. The manuscript was later microfilmed. At present, we are only able to access the manuscript through the microfilm copy preserved at the China Tibetology Research Centre (CTRC), Beijing. According to Luo Zhao's report, the palm-leaf manuscript consists of 97 folia in total, of which the second folio is missing. The palm leaves measure 56.1 x 5 cm. Each folio has two string holes and five lines (occasionally four lines). The script is the Nepalese hooked style. The colophon includes no specific information with regard to the date or place of writing, and simply reads: "*madhyamakāvatāraḥ ya(sic) samāptaḥ bhāṣyataḥ || || kṛtir ācāryacandrakīrttipādānām ||*."

As indicated by the colophon, the manuscript includes the text of both the basic verses (*kārikā*) and their commentary (*bhāṣya*). Research on the manuscript, which has the aim of presenting a critical Sanskrit edition of the entire text, was begun in 2008 as a collaborative project between the CTRC and the IKGA (Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna). A critical edition of

⁸ See de Jong 1977 and 1978.

⁹ See de Jong 1979.

¹⁰ Ye 2009: 320.

the first five chapters of the *Madhyamakāvatāra* and the *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya* will be published soon.¹¹

I saw this *MABh* MS preserved in the same bundle with the *Pras* MS in the Potala Palace in 1999 and 2001. Based on my observations the following remarks on the MS can be added: (I) The beginning and the end of the *MA kārikās* are marked in red ink, (II) Tibetan notes in *dBu med* script on several Sanskrit sentences and phrases are found between lines and margins, most of which correspond to the Tibetan renderings of the text in Pa tshab's translation included in the *bsTan 'gyur* of the Tibetan canon.

1.3 The *CŚT*

The *CŚT* is a commentary on Āryadeva's *CŚ*. A fragmentary Sanskrit MS of the *CŚT* was discovered by H. Shāstri and is preserved in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

His report on the MS runs as follows:

No. 9 (9977). Catuḥśatikā by Āryadeva, with a commentary by Candra Kīrti: Substance, country-made paper. 22 x 21/2 inches. Leaves are marked from 15 to 36 by the last owner, who effaced the original marks. Of these again the leaf marked 29 does not belong to the Catuḥśatikā at all. Written in the Newari character of the 11th century. Appearance, old and worm-eaten¹².

About one third of the Sanskrit text of the *CŚ* is now available thanks to what is preserved in this manuscript and quotations of the text in other treatises.

As far as the extant Sanskrit text of the *CŚT* is concerned, the critical edition published in Suzuki 1994, based upon the aforementioned MS, serves as the basis of the present study.

1.4 General Remarks on the Commentarial Treatises in the **LT*

As far as the version of the *Pras* that the **LT* follows is concerned, it is noteworthy that the **LT* was based on a MS in which the *MŚS* was included. The Tibetan notes on the *Pras*, though fragmentary, focus on the initial chapter which is mostly devoted to comments on *MMK* I.1, in which the debates between Bhāviveka and Candrakīrti are included. Notably, the Tibetan renderings of the *Pras* in these notes are different from those found

¹¹ Li 2015: 2 (Introduction).

¹² Shāstri 1917. Quoted in Suzuki 2004: ix.

in the extant translation in the *bsTan 'gyur*. It can further be noted that in the Sanskrit notes on of the *MABh* in the **LT*, the number of each chapter of the commentarial treatises is given at the end of the chapter, with the exception of the sixth chapter onward. In other words, the chapter divisions from the sixth chapter in the *MA(Bh)* are not recognized in the **LT*. In the notes on the *CŚT*, several Sanskrit readings are given in the section of the text where only the Tibetan translation had hitherto been available. In other words, Sanskrit notes on the *CŚT* in the **LT* can be considered as a substitute for a Sanskrit MS of the *CŚT*.

The **LT* is one of the few extant Indian texts to explicitly respond to Candrakīrti. In the **LT*, the *Pras*, to which less attention had been paid¹³, is dealt with first in both the Sanskrit and the Tibetan notes. This fact suggests that the main interest of the author of the **LT* lay in the *Pras*.

2. Proper Names in the **LT*

Having confronted a variety of sects and schools, Candrakīrti formulated his own tenets. In his three main treatises, there are several references to the proper names of various schools, sects, and individuals. The **LT* identifies and remarks on some of them. In what follows, the proper names found in the **LT* are enumerated in three categories: non-Buddhists, Buddhist sects and schools, and Madhyamaka scholars. These schools, sects, and individuals play the role of either opponents or proponents in Candrakīrti's three main treatises in the eyes of the author of the **LT*.¹⁴

¹³ See n. 3 above.

¹⁴ In the text quoted from the editions of the part II below, neither grammatical rules (*sandhi*, etc.) of Sanskrit nor Tibetan orthography is strictly standardized with the intention to provide proof of the writings of a Tibetan in the 12th century CE. Concerning the conventions, see “Explanatory Remarks” of each edition.

2.1 Non-Buddhists

In his three main treatises, Candrakīrti refers to various non-Buddhist schools, such as Sāṃkhya¹⁵, Vaiśeṣika¹⁶, Akṣapāda (Naiyāyika)¹⁷, Jaimini (Mīmāṃsā)¹⁸, Jaina (Syādvādin, Digambara, Nirgrantha)¹⁹, Lokāyatika²⁰, etc²¹. The non-Buddhist schools named in the *LT are the Sāṃkhya, Naiyāyika, Kṣapaṇaka, and Cārvāka schools.

2.1.1 Sāṃkhya

1) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §30: gal te **dam 'cha** (*Pras_LVP* 16.12; *Pras_M* 147.7: svatantrā **pratijñā**) na **Grangs can** (*Pras_LVP* 16.12; *Pras_M* 147.7: **Sāṃkhyāḥ**) phyogs snga ma byed par 'gyur te |

If [an independent] proposition [is required], a Sāṃkhya will make the thesis [proposed] previously.

2) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §36: **Grangs can gsal ba las gsal ba 'byung bar mi 'dod pa nyid 'dir dper byed pas so** (*Pras_LVP* 21.9–10; *Pras_M* 157.3: **Sāṃkhyā** hi **na_eva_abhivvyaktarūpasya** puro 'vasthitasya ghaṭasya punar **abhivvyaktim icchanti** | tasyaiva **ca_iha_dṛṣṭāntatvena**_upādānaṃ siddharūpatvāt |; **Grangs can pa dag** mdun na gnas pa'i bum pa **mngon par gsal ba**'i rang bzhin can ni yang **mngon par gsal bar mi 'dod cing** | de nyid **'dir dpe nyid du** grub pa'i ngo bo yin pa'i phyir la) | **nus pa'i rang bzhin kyi skye ba 'gegs pa ni bsgrub bya ba'i khyad par** te (*Pras_LVP* 21.10–11; *Pras_M* 157.5–6: anabhivvyaktarūpasya **śaktirūpa_āpannasya_utpatti-pratiṣedha-viśiṣṭasya sādhyatvāt**; **nus pa'i ngo bor** gyur cing mngon

¹⁵ *Pras_LVP*: 21.5, 275.7 (quotation from the *RĀ* I.61), 360.3, 19, 523.9 (Kapila); *MABh_LVP*: 239.6; *CŚT*: ad IX.20, X.15, XI.15, XII.3, XIV.20. Furthermore, the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* v. 3cd is quoted in the *MABh_LVP* 235.10.

¹⁶ *Pras_LVP*: 29.3, 275.7 (Aulūkyā, quotation from the *RĀ* I.61), 441.6 (Kaṇabhakṣa), 523.9 (Kaṇāda); *MABh_LVP*: 239.9, 241.16, 311.13; *CŚT*: ad IX.19, XI.15, XII.3, XIV.18.

¹⁷ *Pras_LVP*: 441.6 (Akṣapāda).

¹⁸ *Pras_LVP*: 441.6, 523.9.

¹⁹ *Pras_LVP*: 275.7 (Nirgrantha, quotation from the *RĀ* I.61), 400.2 (Nirgrantha), 441.6 (Digambara), 523.9; *MABh_LVP*: 202.10 (Syādvādin), 204.6 (Syādvādin), 184.10 (Nirgrantha, quotation from the *RĀ* I.61); *CŚT*: ad XII.3 (Nirgrantha, quotation from the *RĀ* I.61).

²⁰ *Pras_LVP*: 360.4; *MABh_LVP*: 211.19–20.

²¹ In the *MABh_LVP* 240.8, we find the usage of Vedavādin. In the *CŚT*, moreover, there are quotations from the *Pañcatantra* I.389 (Suzuki 1994: 265), the *Bhagavadgītā* II.37 (Suzuki 1994: 61), and the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* (Suzuki 1994: 66–7).

par gsal ba'i rang bzhin ma yin pa **skye ba bkag pas khyad par du** byas pa ni **bsgrub par bya ba** yin pa nyid kyi phyir | gong du **'jim pa'i gong bu la gnas pa'i** (*Pras_LVP* 21.3; *Pras_M* 155.7: **mṛtpiṇḍa_ādy-avasthāyām**) burn pa gsal bar 'gyur bar mi 'thad par bstan pa 'dir kyang ngo | des na thar 'gyur la Grangs can kyis brjod ^[8a8] pa'i nus pa'i rang bzhin du mi skye na **grub pa la sgrub** la |

[Since] a Sāṃkhya does not claim the manifestation from the manifested [thing], here an example is given. The negation of the arising of a potential form (*śaktirūpa*) is a qualification of what is to be proved. It is said above that it is not tenable for the pot to be manifested in the condition of a lump of clay. Here, it is also [valid]. Therefore, if a potential form uttered by the Sāṃkhya to the Consequentialist (Thal 'gyur) does not arise, [the proposition] is proving that which is [already] established (*siddhasādhana*).

3) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §49: **don dam par ces pa'i khyad par kyi tshig** (*Pras_LVP* 26.2; *Pras_M* 168.2: **paramārthata iti viśeṣaṇam; don dam pa zhes bya ba'i khyad par**) gal te chos can kyi khyad par du byed na don dam pa'i dngos po med pas rgol pa bdag nyid la mi grub la | kun rdzob yin na phyir rgol Grangs can la mi grub ste don dam par brjod par yod par 'dod la don dam par ces khas blangs pa dang 'galo |

[Concerning] the qualification ‘ultimately,’ if it specifies the subject (*dharmin*), then, because of the ultimate unsubstantiality, the dispute is not established for me (the proponent). When it is [employed on] a conventional level, on the other hand, the dispute is not established for the Sāṃkhya. If it is claimed that there exists [something] designated ultimately, it contradicts with the understanding [when] saying ‘ultimately.’

4) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §30 **sattvād** (*Pras_LVP*: 30.15; *Pras_M*: 178.2) iti Sāṃkhyam prati Bhāvivekena_uktam |²²

The statement “because [they] are [already] existing” is said by Bhāviveka to a Sāṃkhya.

5) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §32: **svata** (*Pras_LVP*: 31.5; *Pras_M*: 179.6) iti Sāṃkhyasya |

The saying “from [your] own [point of view]” is [the riposte] of a Sāṃkhya²³.

²² See also MacDonald 2015b: 114, n. 235.

²³ MacDonald (2015b: 116, n. 237) notes the following: “*LT’s author wrongly interprets *svataḥ* (“from

6) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* §33: **vastudharmatvena_upanyastāḥ** Sāṃkhyaena hetvādayo yatra | **svata eva_iti** Sāṃkhyasya | **anena** vicāreṇa Sāṃkhyasya hetavaḥ | (ad *Pras_LVP*: 31.11–13; *Pras_M* 180.7–181.2.)²⁴

[...] where the reasons (*hetus*), etc., are adduced by a Sāṃkhya as properties of real things. “Right from [his] own [point of view]” means [from the point of view of] a Sāṃkhya. “By means of this,” i.e., [by this] analysis, the Sāṃkhya’s reasons are established.

7) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §35: **para** (*Pras_LVP* 31.14; *Pras_M* 181.7)_iti Sāṃkhyāḥ |²⁵ “The other” means a Sāṃkhya.

8) Sanskrit Notes on the *CŚT* in §217: **teṣāṃ hi** (May 1984 (*CŚT* IX): 137.2: **de dag gi ltaṇa**)_iti Sāṃkhyānām |

“Since, for them” means for the Sāṃkhyas.

2.1.2 Naiyāyika

1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §217: **puruṣādikāraṇaṃ** (*Pras_LVP*: 400.1) eṣāṃ astīti Naiyāyikāḥ |

Those who say that these have a cause such as Puruṣa and so on, are the Naiyāyikas.

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §290: **ātmodbhāsimataṃ** (*MABh_LVP*: 408.2: **bdag tu brjod pa** in *MA* XIII.4) Naiyāyikādimataṃ |

The doctrine highlighting the Self is the doctrine of the Naiyāyikas and so on.

2.1.3 Cārvāka

1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §184: **iha** (*Pras_LVP*: 356.10)_ityādinā Cārvākamatam āha |

[your] own [point of view]”) of *saṃvṛtyā cet svato hetor asiddhārthatā* to refer to a Sāṃkhya opponent: *svata iti sām̐khyasya* (cf. Yonezawa 2004: 123, 137 [fol. 2a5]). He seems to have confused the Conservative Buddhist’s reason with Bhāviveka’s own reason *vidyamānatvāt sattvāt*; if this is the case, he is at least correct in understanding that when the *saṃvṛtyā* alternative is applied to *vidyamānatvāt/sattvāt*, it is the opponent, i.e., the Sāṃkhya who only accepts existence from the ultimate standpoint, for whom this reason would be unestablished.”

²⁴ See also MacDonald 2015b: 119, n. 242.

²⁵ Concerning the reading *pare*, see MacDonald 2015b: 119–120, n. 244.

By saying, “Here, etc.,” he states the doctrine of the Cārvākas.

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §158: **tavāpi** (*MABh_LVP* 210.10: **khyod kyi**)_iti | Cārvākasya |

“Even for you” means [even] for a Cārvāka.

3) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §159: Cārvākaḥ prāha | (ad *MABh_LVP*: 211.4–7) A Cārvāka speaks.

2.1.4 Kṣapaṇaka

Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §172: **kecid** (*MABh_LVP* 240.7: **kha cig dag**) iti Kṣapaṇakāḥ |

“Some” means the Kṣapaṇakas (Jainas)²⁶.

2.2 Buddhist Sects and Individuals (Excluding Mādhyamikas)

In his three main treatises, Candrakīrti refers to the Vaibhāṣikas²⁷, the Sāmmittīyas²⁸, and the Sautrāntikas²⁹, as well as to individual scholars such as Vasubandhu, Dignāga, and Dharmapāla. In the **Lṭ*, Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika, Vātsīputrīya, Mahāsāṃghika, and Vijñānavādin/ Yogācāra are the Buddhist sects and schools that appear by name.

2.2.1 Vaibhāṣikas

1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §74: ālambanapratyayo vijñāna eva | hetor nirodho Vaibhāṣikeṇa_ **utpattipratyaya** (*Pras_LVP* 77.3; *Pras_M* 277.6)³⁰ uktaḥ | ... **sahajāta** (*Pras_LVP* 77.5; *Pras_M* 278.2)³¹ | sahabhū Vaibhāṣikenoktaḥ |

The object condition (*ālambanapratyaya*) is nothing but cognition. The cessation of the cause is said by a Vaibhāṣika the condition for the arising. ... the “connascent” (*sahajāta*) is “co-arising” (*sahabhū*)—this statement is made by a Vaibhāṣika.

²⁶ Although the **Lṭ* identifies ‘some’ (*kecid*) as Jainas, Tsong kha pa identifies this as a reference to ‘Vaiśeṣikas’ (by *brag pa kha cig*) in the *dBu ma dgongs pa rab gsal*. See Ogawa 1988b: 258.3.

²⁷ *Pras_LVP*: 523.9; *MABh_LVP*: 406.18; *CŚṬ*: ad XI.6, XI.15, XII.3.

²⁸ *Pras_LVP*: 148.1, 192.8, 276.2.

²⁹ *Pras_LVP*: 444.15; *MABh_LVP*: 406.14; *CŚṬ* ad XI.15, XII.3.

³⁰ See also MacDonald 2015b: 301, n. 556.

³¹ See also MacDonald 2015b: 302–303, n. 558.

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* §101: **bhāro** (*MABh_LVP* 132.2: **khur**) **bhārahārakaś** (*MABh_LVP* 132.3: **khur khur ba**) ceti Vaibhāṣikasya | **pañcaskandha** (*MABh_LVP* 132.2: **phung po lnga**) Sautrāntikasya | yas tad ucyate Vijñānavādinah |
 “The burden and the one carrying the burden” [is the statement] of a Vaibhāṣika.
 The five aggregates [is the statement] of a Sautrāntika. It is the statement of a Vijñānavādin.

2.2.2. Sautrāntikas

- 1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §239: **atrāhur** (*Pras_LVP* 441.4) iti Sautrāntikāḥ |
 “Here they say,” means the Sautrāntikas [say].
- 2) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §240: **Sautrāntikā** (*Pras_LVP* 441.14: Sautrāntikamate)
 avijñaptiṃ necchanti |
 The Sautrāntikas do not accept the existence of *avijñapti*.
- 3) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §281: **tadanyeṣām vā** (*Pras_LVP* 523.10 =ad SR IX.26d)_iti
 Sautrāntikānām |
 “Or of those other than them” means of the Sautrāntikas.
- 4) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* §101: **pañcaskandha** (*MABh_LVP* 132.2: **phung po lnga**)
 Sautrāntikasya
 See 2.2.1.2 above.

2.2.3 Vātsīputrīyas

The term *ihadhārmika* in the *MABh* ad MA IV.86³² is glossed as Vātsīputrīya.

Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §141: **ihadhārmikāḥ** (*MABh_LVP* 184.34, 5: **chos 'di pa dag gis**) Vātsīputrīyāḥ |

“The *ihadhārmikas*” means the Vātsīputrīyas.

³² tasmin(sic.) tasmin varṇitāḥ śāstra ete tīrthyair yuktyā pudgalādyā yathāsvam |
 kartṛtvenāpaśyatā tāt jinena lokasyoktāṃ cittamātraṃ tu kartṛ || (Li 2015) ihadhārmikair api
 pudgalādayaḥ kalpitā eva. “Furthermore, *ihadhārmikas* indeed wrongly imagine [things] like the
 Pudgalas, etc.”

2.2.4 Mahāsāṃghikas

- 1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* §269: **Madhyoddeśikā** (*Pras_LVP* 489.1) Mahāsāṃghikāḥ | “The *Madhyoddeśikas*” are the Mahāsāṃghikas.

Here the term *Madhyoddeśika* in the *Pras*³⁵ is glossed as Mahāsāṃghika³⁶.

- 2) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §328: adbhutaṃ yat śrāvakabodhisatvabuddhānāṃ adbhutāścaryādharmaḥ kathiyanta itī Mahāsāṃghikamataṃ |

The adbhuta literature is that which amazing and astonishing elements of śrāvakas, bodhisattvas, and buddhas are told. This is a doctrine of the Mahāsāṃghikas.

2.2.5 Vijñānavādin/Yogācāra

- 1) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* §101: **bhāro** (*MABh_LVP* 132.2: **khur**) **bhārahārakaś** (*MABh_LVP* 132.3: **khur khur ba**) ceti Vaibhāṣikasya | **pañcaskandha** (*MABh_LVP* 132.2: **phung po lnga**) Sautrāntikasya | yas tad ucyate Vijñānavādinah |

See 2.2.1.2 above.

- 2) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §111: **dhīśakti**_ityādinā itī **ced** ityantena Vijñānavādī | (*ad MA VI.56*³⁷)

A Vijñānavādin [is speaking] from “the capacity for insight” (*dhīśakti*) to “if” (*cet*) .

³⁵ Concerning the meaning of the term *madhyoddeśika*, see AsDh SG 1998: 6–7. *Pras_LVP* (489.1–2): madhyoddeśikās tu(LVP: ca) Mahāvastūpadiṣṭabdhūmivyavasthayā prathamabhūmisthitāṃ bodhisattvaṃ utpannadarśanamārgaṃ vyācakṣāṇāḥ saṅghāntaḥpātinaṃ vyācakṣate. “On the other hand, the Madhyoddeśikas, because of the system of the stages taught in the *Mahāvastu*, having achieved the way of beholding the truth (*darśanamārga*), maintain that a bodhisattva who is staying at the first stage is held to be included in the Saṅgha.” Cf. Sprung 1979: 227.

³⁶ We know that Candrakīrti had a close relationship with the Mahāsāṃghikas. For instance, Karashima (2015: 142) points out: “... in his *Madhyamakāvatāra*, he quotes the same verses, referring to them as “verses of the Pūrvaśailas” (MAv 134.1), again a sub-school of the Mahāsāṃghikas, while in his *Prasannapadā*, he quotes the same verses, saying they are from the Āgama(s) (*Prasp* 548.5. *āgamasūtreṣu*). In his works, he criticised the Vijñānavāda, Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika, all of which seem to have been related to the Sarvāstivāda school, and the Sammitīyas. From these facts, one may assume that Candrakīrti belonged to the Mahāsāṃghika school.”

³⁷ dhīśaktipāko 'sti na śuddhadṛṣṭer yatas tato dhīr na hi jāyate 'sya | na jñeyasadbhāvaviyogataś cet taccaktyabhāvān na hi siddham etat || (Li 2015)

3) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* §124: **tenaiva**(*MABh_LVP* 164.16: **de**)_iti Vijñānavādinā | (ad *MA* VI.71)

“By nobody but him” is said by a Vijñānavādin.

4) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* §155: Mādhyamikā **yathā** (*MABh_LVP* 199.4: **ji litar**)_ityādinā dr̥ṣṭāntena Vijñānavādi-matam anūdya **evam** (*MABh_LVP* 199.5: **de bshin du**) ityādinā dūṣayanti |

The Mādhyamikas, having restated the doctrine of the Vijñānavādins by means of the example beginning with “just as” (*yathā*), criticize [it] by means of [the passage] beginning with “so as” (*evam*).

Candrakīrti himself uses the term *yogācāra* not as a proper noun indicating the name of a school but as a common noun³⁸. In the **Lṭ*, however, it is used as another name for Vijñānavādin³⁹.

5) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §290: anye Yogācārādayaḥ niścayena pāpād avagaccheran | **anyamate** (*MABh_LVP* 408.3: **gzhan lugs**) yogācārādi^[14a7]mate | **tā** (*MABh_LVP* 408.2: **de dag**) iti yogācārāder eva **prakriyāḥ** (*MABh_LVP* 408.3: **sbyar ba**) | (ad *MA* XIII.4)

The others, the Yogācāras, etc., certainly would understand [it this way] due to evil. “In the doctrines of others” means in the doctrines of the Yogācāras, etc. “Those” means nothing but ‘of the Yogācāras, etc.,’ [modifying] “the way of thinking” (*prakriyā*).

³⁸ In the **Lṭ*, the term *yogācāra* is glossed as follows: **yoga** eva **ācāro** (*Pras_LVP* 541.3: *yogācāraḥ*) vyavahāro yasya | “For whom noting but contemplation (*yoga*) is a practice [and] a daily activity (*vyavahāra*).”; laukikalokottarā sampāttir yasya **yogaḥ** (**rnal 'byor**) samādhis tasya **ācāraḥ** (**spyod pa**) śikṣaṇaṁ tadrūpaṁ yac **catuḥśatakaṁ** (**bzhi brgya pa'i bstan bcos**) tasya | (ad *CŚ* I.1)
“[Concerning the title (*Bodhisattva*-)*yogācāra-catuḥśataka*(-ṭīkā), contemplation (*yoga*) means mundane and supermundane meditations and concentration, its practice [is] an instruction, [and the treatise called] *Catuḥśataka* has its form.” See also Silk 1997 and 2000.

³⁹ Bhāviveka uses the term *yogācāra* as the name of a rival school. (See *MHK* chapter V.)

2.2.6 Individuals

In the *MABh* (ad *MA* XIII.3⁴⁰), the names of Vasubandhu, Dignāga, and Dharmapāla are given with the title of ‘sthavira.’⁴¹ The **Lṭ* gives the following glosses:

1) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §289: **sumatāni janena** (*skye bos lugs bzang*) | **Vasubandhv** (*dByig gnyen*)-ādinā |

“Good thoughts [are abandoned] by a person” is said by Vasubandhu and others.

Although neither the *Pras* nor the *CŚT* refer to the names of the above three authors, the name of Dignāga appears in the Sanskrit notes on the *Pras*.

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* §53, 54: **laukika** eva **pramāṇaprameyavyavahāro** yukto na pāramārthika ity asmin pakṣe āha | **atha** ityādi | **asmābhir** (*Pras_LVP* 58.14; *Pras_M* 245.3) Dignāgādibhiḥ | **tadanuvartanasya phalaṁ vācyam** ity atrāryaḥ | **kutārkikair** (*Pras_LVP* 58.15; *Pras_M* 245.5) iti Dignāgaḥ | **sa** iti vyavahāraḥ |

He says that in this view, the conventional usage of valid cognition and object of valid cognition is legitimated as long as [it is employed] wordly, [however it is] not ultimately. [This is what is said in the passage] beginning with “atha.” “[Its correct characteristics have been explained] by us” means by Dignāga, et al. It is the master [i.e., Candrakīrti] who says, at this point, ‘the fruit of this intention should be explained,’ and it is Dignāga who rejoins, ‘[It has been destroyed] by bad logicians.’ ‘It’ [here] means conventional usage.”⁴²

2.3 Madhyamaka scholars

In his treatises, Candrakīrti refers to himself as a Mādhyamika and calls Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Buddhapālita, Dharmadāsa, and Bhāviveka ācāryas. The **Lṭ* refers to these

⁴⁰ Nāgārjunorutaradhīhradavarṇabhītya tyaktāni yāni sumatāni janena dūrāt |
tatkārikākumudakuṣmalabodhatoyair āśāḥ prapūrayati saṁprati Candrakīrtiḥ ||

“Good thinking [ways to the Liberation] are completely abandoned by someone, out of fear of the color of the ocean [reflected in] wider knowledge of Nāgārjuna. Candrakīrti now fulfils the wishes [for the Liberation] by means of his verses [of the *MA*] like [a little] water blooming buds of a white water-lily.”

⁴¹ nanu ca sthavira-Vasubandhu-Dignāga-Dharmapālādayaḥ śāstrāṇāṁ kartāraḥ prakrāntāḥ | “Surely the venerable Vasubandhu, Dignāga, Dharmapāla, etc., are acting as the authors of the treatises...”

⁴² Included in Arnold 2003: 157, n. 43.

names as well. Before enumerating the names of individual scholars, the occurrences of the term Mādhyamika in the *LT are enumerated below.

1) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §28: lan du **dbu ma ba rnam rang rgyud kyi rjes dpag bya bar mi rigs ste phyogs gzhan khas mi len pa'i phyir** (*Pras_LVP* 16.2, *Pras_M* 145.4–146.1: na ca mādhyamikasya svataḥ svatantram anumānam karttuṃ yuktam | pakṣāntarābhyupagamābhāvāt; dbu ma pa yin na ni rang gi rgyud kyi rjes su dpag par bya ba rigs pa yang ma yin te | phyogs gzhan khas blangs pa med pa'i phyir ro||) ces bya ste |

In reply, it is said, “It is not correct for the Mādhyamikas [to employ] reasoning independently, because [they] do not admit the other position.

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §18: **parapratijñānirākaraṇam tu Mādhyamikasya yujyate** | (*ad Pras_LVP* 18.5–9; *Pras_M* 149.3–150.3.)⁴³

On the other hand, it is suitable for a Mādhyamika to refute the other's proposition.

3) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §111: **tacchaktyabhāvād** iti Mādhyamikaḥ | (*ad MA* VI.56)

“Because it has no power” is what a Mādhyamika is stating.

4) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §136: **yady anādi** (*MABh_LVP* 179.1: gal te khyod thog ma med pa'i)_ityādi Mādhyamikaḥ | (*ad MABh* VI.81)

A Mādhyamika speaks from “If [you are content...just as... from] the beginningless [time].”

5) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §147: **hanta vayam** (*MABh_LVP* 189.16: de ltas bdag gis, quotation from the *DBh*) iti Mādhyamikāḥ | (*ad MA* VI.88)

“Oh, we” means the Mādhyamikas.

⁴³ The *Pras* text runs as follows: athāpi syāt — **Mādhyamikānām** pakṣahetudrṣṭāntānām asiddheḥ svatantrānumānābhidhāyivāt svata utpattipratīṣedhapratijñānārthasādhanaṁ mā bhūḍ **ubhayasiddhena vā anumānena parapratijñānirākaraṇam** | parapratijñāyās **tu** svata eva **anumānavirodhacodanāyā** svata eva pakṣahetudrṣṭānta **apakṣālarahitaiḥ pakṣādibhir bhavitavyam** | tatas ca **tadanabhidhānāt taddoṣa** aparīhārāc ca sa eva doṣa iti ||. The *LT glosses as follows: **parapratijñānirākaraṇam tu Mādhyamikasya yujyate** | **ubhayasiddha_anumānena** | **anumānena virodhacodanāyām** tasya_anumānasya **pakṣādibhir bhavitavyam** | kimbhūtaiḥ pakṣādīnām **apakṣāla** doṣas tena **rahitaiḥ** | **tadanabhidhānāt** pakṣa_ādy-ana^[2a1]bhidhānāt | **taddoṣaḥ** pakṣa_ādidōṣaḥ |. Here, the reading “**anumānena virodhacodanāyām**” corresponds to that of the Po MS. Concerning this reading, see MacDonald 2000: 172, n.23; Yonezawa 2004: 58–59; MacDonald 2015b: 69, n. 148, and 371–374 (Appendix IX).

6) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §155: Mādhyamikā **yathā** (*MABh_LVP* 199.4: **ji ltar**)_ityādinā dṛṣṭāntena Vijñānavādi-matam anūdya **evam** (*MABh_LVP* 199.5: **de bzhin du**) ityādinā dūṣayati | (ad *MA* VI.96)

See 2.2.5.4 above.

In the **Lṭ*, furthermore, the term *Madhyamaka* is found in the following passages⁴⁴:

7) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §329: Madhyamake tu **yā moha-parikṣayakathā** pratītyasamutpādarūpā | (ad *MŚS* v.2)

In the *Madhyamaka*, on the other hand, the discourse [described as] “eliminating delusions” has the characteristics of dependent arising.

8) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §332: **Nāgārjuno** Madhyamaka-**matam** upa-**diṣṭavān** | (ad *MŚS* v.6)

“Nāgārjuna” “taught” the *Madhyamaka* “doctrine.”

9) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §333: **matam** Madhyamakamatam | (ad *MŚS* v.7)

The “doctrine” means the *Madhyamaka* doctrine.

10) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §334: **satpathyān** madhyamakanīteḥ | (ad *MŚS* v.8)⁴⁵

“From the real path” means ‘from the means of the *Madhyamaka*.’

11) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §336: **Kārikā** Madhyamakasya | (ad *MŚS* v.10)

“The *Kārikā*” means that of the *Madhyamaka*.

12) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §204: śāstre **Madhyamakaśāstram** (*MABh_LVP* 297.19: **dbu ma'i bstan bcos**) sthitvā |

‘In the treatise’ means ‘basing on the *Madhyamaka* treatise.’

13) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §290: **asmāt** (*MABh_LVP* 408.3: **'di las**) madhyamakamatāt sakāśāt; **parasmin** (*MABh_LVP* 408.3: **gzhan la**) aparamate | (In the *MA* XIII.4)

“From this” means “from the *Madhyamaka* doctrine”; “In the other” means in the other doctrine.

These usages suggest that the term *Madhyamaka* is equivalent to *Mādhyamika* in the **Lṭ*.

⁴⁴ The title *Madhyamakāvatāra* (MS 1b5 and 2b5 ad the *Pras*) is not taken into consideration below.

⁴⁵ In the Tibetan notes on the *Pras* §26, we find *dbu' mar gnas pa'i tshul kyis* (ad *Pras_LVP*: 15.3ff.) as well.

2.3.1 Nāgārjuna

This name appears in the *Pras_LVP* 2.3, 3.1, *MŚS* v. 4, 6, 7, 14 and the *MABh* (three times ad *MA* VI.3, ad *MA* VI.36, *MA* VI.79a, *MA* XII.33d, *MA* XIII.3a, and ad *MA* XIII.5a)⁴⁶. The **Lṭ*’s Sanskrit notes on the *Pras* begin with the following etymological explanation of ‘*nāgārjuna*’:

- 1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* §1: *nāgaś ca_asau Buddhārya-Nāgārjuna-vācye śuklatvād arjunaś ca_iti Nāgārjunaḥ | Śeṣo nāgaḥ sa iva Nāgārjuno ’pi |*
He is a *nāga* and he is white [*arjuna*]*—the latter*] because of his brightness*—[as evidenced]* in the title “Awakened, noble Nāgārjuna,” thus he is called Nāgārjuna;
Also, Nāgārjuna, is like the *nāga* [called] “Śeṣa.”⁴⁷

In the introductory verses of the *Pras* the word *Nāgārjuna* is likewise explained as a *karmadhāraya* compound.

- 2) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §2: *athavā arjunaḥ Pāṇḍavaḥ | nāgaḥ śreṣṭhaḥ | arjunāt śreṣṭho Nāgārjunaḥ |*
“Or, Arjuna means [the] Pāṇḍava [brother]. *Nāga* means the best. [Thus,] Nāgārjuna means [the one who is] superior to Arjuna.”⁴⁸

In the Sanskrit notes on the *MABh*, moreover, we find the following:

- 3) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §71: **pramāṇapuruṣo** (*MABh_LVP* 75.14: **tshad mar gyur pa’i skyes bu**)⁴⁹ **Nāgārjunaḥ** (*MABh_LVP* 75.19, in the *MA* VI.3) |
“Nāgārjuna is a person of authority.”
- 4) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §289: **Nāgārjuno** (*MABh_LVP* 407.10, in the *MA* XIII.3: **klu sgrub**) *nāgapradhāno* |
“The principal *nāga* is Nāgārjuna.”

2.3.2 Āryadeva

In the **Lṭ*, the name Āryadeva⁵⁰ is found in the Sanskrit notes on the *MŚS* and the *CŚṬ*.

⁴⁶ The *Pras* MS Po reads ‘*ācāryapādaiḥ*’ for ‘*āryanāgārjunapādaiḥ*’ (*Pras_LVP*: 428.10) and ‘*ācāryanāgārjunapādaiḥ*’ (*Pras_LVP*: 551.13).

⁴⁷ Included in MacDonald 2015b: 7, n. 13.

⁴⁸ See *ibid*.

⁴⁹ The Tibetan rendering of the term *pramāṇapuruṣa* is *tshad mar gyur pa’i skyes bu* (**pramāṇabhūtapuruṣa*). See Silk 2002.

⁵⁰ *MABh_LVP*: 2.17 (āryadevena), 120.17 (āryadevena), 133.4 (āryadevena), 297.9 (āryadevena);

1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §332: **Devena** (MŚS v.6b)_Indrena_Āryadevena vā | “By Deva” means ‘by Indra’ or ‘by Āryadeva.’

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *CŚT* §4: pūrveṣām ācāryāṇām nyāsavyākhyā | tadanupūrvivyākhyayā ye tatvāvatāraṇam tena_upakartavyās teṣām **Āryadevaḥ** (**‘Phags pa lha**; Suzuki 1994: 434.19)⁵¹ |

The commentary of the old teachers was called the Nyāsā. By means of the commentary following them, Āryadeva is [one of the commentators] who [realize] the penetration into the truth and become helpers.

2.3.3 Buddhapālita

The name Buddhapālita is found in both the **Lṭ*’s Sanskrit and Tibetan notes on the *Pras*.

1) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §8: **’dir yang** (*Pras_LVP* 6.3; *Pras_M* 122.5: **iha tu**) ces pa nas thun mong du dpyad par bya ste | ārya-Buddhapālita ni pratītya prāptaḥ samutpāda utpattir ūhe | Bhāvivekena prati-vīpsārthaḥ | athavā prāptyartha etir gatyartha iti viparītānutpādanāt vivādaḥ | (In the Tibetan notes on the *Pras*)

By saying “but when...,” [the etymology of the word *pratītyasamutpāda*] is generally analyzed. The noble Buddhapālita thinks *pratītya* means ‘attaining’ (*prāpta*) and *samutpāda* means ‘emerging’ (*utpatti*). [On the other hand, it is quoted] by Bhāviveka [that] *prati* has the meaning of distribution (*vīpsā*) [and] rather [thought that] the verbal root] *√i* has the meaning of attaining (*prāpti*) [and] the meaning of going (*gati*). Since the opposite [meaning] does not generate, there is a dispute.

2) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §12: **gang yang** (*Pras_LVP* 7.6; *Pras_M* 124.5: **yas tu**; gang zhig) ces pa la ^[7b3]stsogs pa la **prati bzlas pa’i don la eter thob pa’i don la samutpāda byung ba’i don** (*Pras_LVP* 7.6–7; *Pras_M* 124.6–7: **vīpsārthatvāt praty-upasargasya eteḥ**

Pras_LVP: 16.3 (āryadevena), 199.2 (āryadevena), 220.3 (āryadevapādaiḥ; Po: āryadevena), 359.7 (āryadevapādaiḥ; Po: āryadevena), 376.18 (āryadevapādaiḥ; Po: āryadevena), 393.13 (āryadevapādīye Śatake), 552.1 (āryadevapādaiḥ; Po: āryadevena).

⁵¹ gang gi phyir na slob dpon 'Phags pa lha 'di ni| slob dpon Klu sgrub slob mar gngang bar 'dod gyur pa|| de'i phyir 'di yi de nyid lugs las lugs gzhan min||. “Since Āryadeva is considered to be Nāgārjuna’s disciple, his philosophical system does not differ from his teacher’s.” (Lang 2003: 112, § 3.)

prāptyarthatvāt samutpāda-śabdasya ca **sambhava_arthatvāt**) ces pa la-stsogs pa'o Buddhapālita'i 'dod ||

In the passage [beginning] “however (*yas tu*), etc.,” [the statement] “[the prefix] *prati* has the meaning of distribution, [the verbal root] $\sqrt{i}$ has the meaning of attaining, and the word *samutpāda* has the meaning of emerging, etc.,” is [attributed to] Buddhapālita’s view.⁵²

3) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §6: **yas tu** (*Pras_LVP* 7.6; *Pras_M* 124.5) Bhāviveko **dūṣaṇam abhidhatte** (*Pras_LVP* 8.1; *Pras_M* 125.3) | **tasya_akaśālam eva tāvat sambhāvyata** (*Pras_LVP* 8.1–2; *Pras_M* 125.3–4) iti sambandhaḥ kāryaḥ | **eke** (*Pras_LVP* 7.7; *Pras_M* 125.1) _iti Buddhapālitaḥ | **anye** (*Pras_LVP* 8.1; *Pras_M* 125.2) _iti kaściṭ Ṭīkākāraḥ | “However, he who expresses an objection” means Bhāviveka. [To this,] the passage, “to start, it seems that there is sheer ineptitude (*akaśāla*) on his part,” is to be connected. “Some” means Buddhapālita, while “others” means a certain commentator.⁵³

In the above, the person asserting the first etymology of the word *pratītyasamutpāda*, quoted by Bhāviveka, is identified as Buddhapālita. Since the passage in which the word is etymologized is not found in Buddhapālita’s commentary on the *MMK*, the identification in the above passages of the **LT* might have been based on another treatise of Buddhapālita, which was not translated into Tibetan⁵⁴.

4) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §26: 'dir slob dpon 'dis dbu' mar gnas pa'i tshul kyis slob dpon Sangs rgyas skyong kyī 'dod pa bskyangs pa ni **ji ltar byas na** (*Pras_LVP*:15.3; *Pras_M* 143.1–2: **katham kṛtvā**; ji ltar zhe na) ces pa la-stsogs pa ste | de yang slob dpon Zla grags 'di ni skyē pa dran pas sngon slob dpon Sangs rgyas skyong du skyē ba blangs par shes nas de'i 'dod pa skyong ba la 'bad pa'o ces kha cig kyī'o | kha cig na re thal 'gyur du sgra bar mthun pas ces grag go |

Here this teacher, defending what is accepted by Buddhapālita with the means of the *Madhyamaka* position, says “Why?” and so on. It is also the case that this teacher, Candrakīrti, thinking of arising and knowing that the arising in [the

⁵² See also MacDonald 2015b: 27–28, n. 71.

⁵³ See *ibid.*, esp., p. 28.

⁵⁴ It is to be noted that a verse from an unidentified treatise of Buddhapālita is quoted in the *CŚT* (Suzuki 1994: 156.15–16, ad *CŚ* VIII.25).

statement of] the previous teacher, Buddhapālita, has been discussed, exerts himself to defend what is accepted by him. This is [an opinion] of some people. The others discuss that [it] accords with saying in consequence (*prasaṅga*, *thal 'gyur*).

5) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §23: **anya** (*Pras_LVP* 22.3; *Pras_M* 159.2) iti | pūrvaprayogāt (ad *Pras_LVP* 22.3; *Pras_M* 159.2) Buddhapālitasyaivāpara ity arthaḥ |⁵⁵ “Another [method]” means [a method] different from the previous [logical] formulation of Buddhapālita.

5) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §41: slob dpon Sangs rgyas skyong kyis ^[8b1] tshig gcig las ma **gsungs par spros pa 'di dag gang nas snyed** zhe na (cf. *Pras_LVP* 22.9; *Pras_M* 160.3161.1: **katham** punar **ayam** yathā **uktaś** cārtho vinā_eva_ **ittham** vicārābhidhānāl labhyata iti cet; yang **ji skad smras pa** 'i don gyi rjod par byed pa med par rnam par dpyod pa **'di lta bu 'di ji ltar rnyed ce na**)

If [it is asked]: how are these articulations not mentioned in the statement [made] by the teacher Buddhapālita...

6) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §46: sngar **slob dpon** Sangs rgyas skyong kyi **tshig rnam** don rtso bor byas pas don chen po yin no zhes brjod na **slob dpon** Klu grub kyi **tshig rnam** (*Pras_LVP* 25.3; *Pras_M* 165.6: atha **arthavākyatvād ācārya-vākyānām mahārthatve saty**; ci skye **slob dpon gyi ngag rnam** ni **don gyi ngag yin pa'i phyir don chen po nyid yin pas**) bstan chos kyi rtsa ba yin pa'i phyir de ltar rung kyi cig ^[8b5] shos kyi ni ma yin no ces rtog pa la lan du | ...

When it is said, “the statement” of the previous “teacher” Buddhapālita “possesses great import because of [its] principal meanings,” since “statements of the teacher” Nāgārjuna is fundamental of the treatise, [why] aren't they [considered as] an alternative of such authority? In reply to this reflection,

7) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §221: tadanurodhena **sahetuko vināśa** (*Pras_LVP* 412.2) ityādinā Buddhapālitenā **sādhanam** uktaṁ |

Accordingly, the proof, beginning with “the destruction is due to a cause,” and so on, is said by Buddhapālita⁵⁶.

⁵⁵ See also MacDonald 2015b: 84, n. 181.

⁵⁶ It should be not Buddhapālita but Bhāviveka. See de Jong 1949: 59 and p. 128 below.

2.3.5 Dharmadāsa

Sanskrit Notes on the CŚT §7: **Dharmadāsa** (Chos kyi 'bangs; Suzuki 2004: 435.27) nāmācāryaḥ | (ad CŚT, ad CŚ I.1)

“The teacher called Dharmadāsa.”

The Sanskrit name of this person, known as a commentator on the CŚ, is attested in the Sanskrit notes on this CŚT (ad I.1)⁵⁷. According to Tibetan hagiographies, he is a disciple of Asaṅga and his brother (Vasubandhu)⁵⁸.

2.3.6 Bhāviveka

Although formerly called Bhāvaviveka based on the occurrences of this name in the *Pras_LVP*⁵⁹, his name appears as Bhāviveka throughout the **Lṭ*. His name appears neither in the *MABh* nor in the CŚT, but there are references to him in the Sanskrit notes on these texts in the **Lṭ*. The occurrences are as follows:

1) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §5: **gzhan yang** (*Pras_LVP* 5.7; *Pras_M* 121.6: **apare tu**; gzhan dag) ces pa sngon kyi slob dpon kha cig kyi 'dod pa Bhāvivekasya brjod nas sun 'byin par 'dod pa'o |

“However, others [say]” is the assertion of a certain previous teacher. Through the statement of Bhāviveka, [it] is intended to be refuted.

⁵⁷ 'dir rab tu byed pa brgyad kyi tshig le'ur byas pa dag re re la slob dpon **Chos kyi 'bangs** kyis sbyar ba'i dpe rnams 'don pa de dag dang lhan cig rnam par bshad par bya'o|| (Suzuki 2004: 435.26–8). “In my treatise, the examples Dharmadāsa used are given along with a commentary on each of the stanzas in the first eight chapters.” (Lang 2003: 113). See also Suzuki 1989: 258.

⁵⁸ According to Tāranātha and Sum pa mkhan po, he was a disciple of Asaṅga and his brother. Schiefner 1868: 105.18–22. slob dpon Chos 'bangs ni| shar phyogs bhañ ga lar 'khrungs shing | thogs med sku mched gnyis kar gyi slob ma yin| phyogs bzhi'i yul thams cad du byon nas| 'phags pa 'jam dpal gyi lha khang re bzhengs| rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa yongs su rdzogs pa la 'grel pa mdzad do zhes grag go|. “The teacher Dharmadāsa, born in Bengal in the east, became a disciple of Asanga [and his younger] brother. Having traveled to all regions in the four directions, he erected the Mañjuśrī pavilion and composed a commentary on the **Yogācārabhūmi-pariṇiṣpanṇa*.”; Das 1908: 99.9–11. shar phyogs bhañ ga lar 'khrungs te thogs med mched gyi slob mar gyur cing bzhi brgya pa'i 'grel pa rtsom pa po Chos 'bangs kyang de dus yul nges med du byon nas 'jam dpal gyi lha khang bzhengs pa (dang). “Dharmadāsa, a commentator of the *Catuhśataka*, was born in Bengal in the east, became a disciple of Asanga [and his younger] brother, and erected the Mañjuśrī pavilion without determining the time and the place.” See Ueda 1994: 131, n. 6.

⁵⁹ In the *Pras* there are four occurrences of his name. See Ejima 1990.

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §6: **yas tu** Bhāviveko **dūṣaṇam abhidhatte** (*Pras_LVP* 7.6; *Pras_M* 124.5)

“On the other hand, he who states an objection” means Bhāviveka.

3) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §15: **slob dpon** (*LVP* 8.8–9; *M*: 126.6: *evan tāvad anuvādākausalam ācāryasya*) ni Bhāviveka'o ||

“The teacher” (*ācārya*) means Bhāviveka.

4) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §7: anūdyā Bhāviveko dūṣaṇam āha | **etac ca ayuktam** (*Pras_LVP* 8.10; *Pras_M* 126.7)⁶⁰ iti |

Having restated [that], Bhāviveka expresses an objection: “But this is not correct.”

5) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §19: **gang yang rang kyi 'dod pa rnam par bzhag pa** (*Pras_LVP* 9.7; *Pras_M* 129.3: **yac cāpi svamataṁ vyavasthāpitaṁ; gang yang** 'o na gang yin zhe na | **...rang gi lugs rnam par gzhas pa**) ces pa ni Bhāviveka rang kyi'o |

“As for [his] own opinion [regarding the meaning of *pratītyasamutpāda*] it has been established” means Bhāviveka’s [opinion on that has been established].”

6) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §13: **atraika** (*Pras_LVP* 14.4; *Pras_M* 141.4) iti Bhāvivekaḥ |⁶¹

“In regard to this [statement of Buddhapālita’s], some [criticize]” means Bhāviveka [criticizes].

7) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §14: Bhāvivekaḥ kila svatantrasādhanavādī |⁶² (*Ad Pras_LVP* 14.4–15.4; *Pras_M* 141.4–143.1)

Bhāviveka is reported as a *svatantrasādhanavādin*.

This is the earliest known occurrence of the Sanskrit equivalent to *Rang rgyud pa*⁶³, one of the two branches of the Madhyamaka school in the classification system of later Tibetan doxographies.

8) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* §15: **ācārya** (*Pras_LVP* 16.1; *Pras_M* 145.3) iti Bhāvivekaḥ |⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Here the **LT* quotes the *Pras* text exactly. See MacDonald 2015: 126, n. 75 and 364 (in Appendix VI).

⁶¹ See also MacDonald 2015b: 54, n. 119.

⁶² See MacDonald 2015b: 58, n. 125. On the term *svatantra*, see Yotsuya 1999 and Yonezawa forthcoming b.

⁶³ In the Tibetan notes on the *Pras*, Bhāviveka is designated as *Rang rgyud smra ba*, which is almost identical with *svatantrasādhanavādin*. The text runs as follows: *yang Rang rgyud smra bas brgal pa |* (§31, *ad Pras_LVP* 18.5–9; *Pras_M* 147.5–7) “Again, the *Rang rgyud smra ba* (= Bhāviveka) disputes.”

⁶⁴ See also MacDonald 2015b: 61, n. 131.

“The teacher” means Bhāvivēka.

9) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §27: **tārkikasya** (*Pras_LVP* 25.8; *Pras_M* 167.3)_iti Bhāvivēkasya |⁶⁵

“For a logician” means for Bhāvivēka.

10) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §30: **sattvād** (*Pras_LVP*: 30.15; *Pras_M*: 178.2) iti Sāṃkhyaṃ prati Bhāvivēkena_uktam |

See 2.1.1.4) above.

11) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §67: de ltar **rim pa ’dis** ni Bhāvivēkas **yod pa’i phyir ces** pa’i bsbyor ba ^[9a9] bkod pa la **yang bsbyar ro** (*Pras_LVP* 30.15–16; *Pras_M* 178.1–2: yaś cāyam asiddhādhārapakṣa-doṣodbhāve **vidhir eṣa** eva sattvād ity asya hetor asiddhārthodbhāvane **’pi yojyah**) ||

In this way, “this method should be also employed” in the expression of the [reason] “because [they] are [already] existing” formulated by Bhāvivēka.

12) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §34: Bhāvivēkasya ca **tadyathā** (*Pras_LVP* 31.13; *Pras_M* 181.3)_ityādinoktahetutvaṃ vihanyate |

And by Bhāvivēka’s statement beginning with, “for example,” the existence of the stated reason is rejected.

13) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §35: **asiddham** (*Pras_LVP* 32.2; *Pras_M* 182.1) iti viśiṣṭa Bhāvivēkasya uktavicāreṇa **svasya_eva_**ato boddhaḥ | anena Bhāvivēkena | (... “[they] are other” and so forth (*paratvādika*)) are not established” is qualified by ‘for Bhāvivēka’ by means of the quoted analysis (i.e., logical formulations), namely, for “his own.” Therefore, [it is] understood by this Bhāvivēka.

14) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §36: **svakṛta** (*Pras_LVP* 32.7; *Pras_M* 183.3)_iti Bhāvivēkakṛtam |⁶⁶

“The [proof] formulated by [him]self” means formulated by Bhāvivēka.

15) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §181: **ācārya** (*Pras_LVP* 352.7) iti Bhāvivēkaḥ |

“The teacher” means Bhāvivēka⁶⁷.

16) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §221: tasya **anaikāntikatām** (*Pras_LVP* 413.1) Bhāvivēkaḥ **prāha** (*Pras_LVP* 413.1)

⁶⁵ See also MacDonald 2015b: 91, n. 196.

⁶⁶ See also MacDonald 2015b: 123, n. 250.

⁶⁷ Previously, we find *ācārya-Bhāvivēkas tu* (*Pras_LVP*:351.15)

Bhāviveka declares its [logical] inconclusiveness (*anaikāntika*).

17) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §223: **yac cōktam** (*Pras_LVP* 414.2) iti Bhāvivekena
“It is said ...,” is said by Bhāviveka.

18) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §223: **asya** (*Pras_LVP* 414.7) _iti Bhāvivekasya |
“For him” means for Bhāviveka.

19) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §109: **yas tv (gang zhig,** *MABh_LVP* 143.5, ad MA VI.52a)
iti Bhāvivekaḥ |

“However, ...” says Bhāviveka.

20) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §204: **eka** (*MABh_LVP* 297.19: **kha cig**) iti
Bhāvivekādayaḥ | śāstre **madhyamakaśāstraṁ** (*MABh_LVP* 297.19: **dbu ma'i bstan bcos**)
sthitvā | Bhāvivekena yaḥ **kārahetuḥ** (*MABh_LVP* 297.20: **byed pa'i rgyu**) pratijñātaḥ |
tasya **sādhana** (*MABh_LVP* 298.7: **sgrub pa'i phyir**) visiddhyai |
parigrihītasādhana (*MABh_LVP* 298.8: **yongs su bzung ba'i sgrub byed kyi sun 'byin**
pa mams la) iti | svapakṣa-**sādhana** (*MABh_LVP* 298.7: **sgrub pa'i phyir**) yat svīkṛtaṁ
sādhanaṁ parapakṣabādhanaṁ yat svīkṛtaṁ ^[2] dūṣaṇaṁ | teṣu satsu yaj
jātyuttara (*MABh_LVP* 298.8: **ltag chod**) prasaṅgāpādanaṁ kṛtaṁ pareṇa |
tasya **upakṣepakaṁ** (*MABh_LVP* 298.8–9: **'god par byed pa'i**) nirākāraṁ **parihāram**
(*MABh_LVP* 298.9: **lan**) | **ayaṁ** (*MABh_LVP* 298.9: **'di**) Bhāvivekaḥ parasya prāha | (ad MA
VI.175)

“Some” means Bhāviveka, and so on. ‘In the treatise,’ i.e., ‘basing on the
Madhyamaka treatise.’ “the agent cause” is proposed by Bhāviveka. For the sake
of unfulfillment of “the proof” of it, [it is said that] “in the accepted proof and
disproof.” That which is claimed “for the sake of proving” the own position is
proof, whereas that which is claimed for the sake of opposing the other position
is disproof. When they exist, the false argumentation (*jātyuttara*), namely, falling
into [unwanted] consequence, is made by the other. “Making an allusion” to it,
i.e., making rejection is confutation. “He,” i.e., Bhāviveka, declares [it] to the other.

21) Sanskrit Notes on the *CŚT* in §208: **tārkikā** (Suzuki 1994: 168.6)
Bhāviveka_ādayaḥ | kārikāyāḥ kathitavyākhyānād anyatraiva **vyācakṣate**
(Suzuki 1994: 168.6) | **pareṇa** (Suzuki 1994: 168.6) tīrthikena | **anutpannatvena** (Suzuki
1994: 168.6) nityatvena | **utpannakāryaṁ** (Suzuki 1994: 168.7) | ghaṭādinā | kīrtir
dūṣayati | **svata eva** (Suzuki 1994: 168.11) _iti Bhāvivekasya | **parasya prasiddho** 'yaṁ

hetuḥ | tena mayā_āṅgīkṛta (Suzuki 1994: 168.11) ity uktau **cātiprasaṅgaḥ** (Suzuki 1994: 168.11–12) | (ad CŚ IX.1)

“The logicians” are Bhāviveka, and so on. In a different place from the explanations uttered to the verse, [he] “explains.” “By the other” means ‘by an outsider.’ “Because of not arisen” means ‘because of permanence.’ “The produced result” is [known] by means of a pot, etc. [This] speech is objected. “From its own” is [accepted by] Bhāviveka. When it is said that this reason established for the opponent is admitted by me, [it would be] over-absurdity.

It is to be noted that the opponent whom Candrakīrti calls *tārkika* is identified as Bhāviveka by the author of the *LT⁶⁸.

2.3.6 Candrakīrti

The name Candrakīrti⁶⁹ occurs in the following passages in the *LT:

1) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §8: **ity apara** (*Pras_LVP*: 9.6; *Pras_M* 129.2) ity anena_ātmānaṁ nirdiśati Candrakīrtiḥ |

By means of this saying “the other says,” Candrakīrti indicates himself.

2) Sanskrit Notes on the *Pras* in §14: **vayam** (*Pras_LVP*: 15.4; *Pras_M* 143.1) iti Candrakīrtiḥ |⁷⁰

“We” means Candrakīrti.

3) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §25, 26: de ltar skyon brjod pa slob dpon Zla grags kyis rtsod ba **skyon de dag ni mi 'thad par mthong ste** (*Pras_LVP* 15.3; *Pras_M* 143.1: sarvam **etad dūṣaṇam ayujyamānam** eva vayan **paśyāmaḥ; skyon 'di dag** thams cad ni **rigs pa ma yin par** kho bo cag gis **mthong** ngo||) ces pa-la-stsogs-ste |^[8a1] 'dir slob dpon 'dis dbu' mar gnas pa'i tshul kyis slob dpon Sangs rgyas skyong kyi 'dod pa bskyangs pa ni **ji ltar byas na** (*Pras_LVP* 15.3; *Pras_M* 143.1–2: **katham kṛtvā**; ji ltar zhe na) ces pa la-stsogs pa ste | de yang slob dpon Zla grags 'di ni skye pa dran pas sngon slob dpon Sangs rgyas skyong du skye ba blangs par shes nas de'i 'dod pa skyong ba la 'bad pa'o ces kha cig kyi'o | kha cig na re thal 'gyur du sgra bar mthun pas ces grag go |

⁶⁸ *Pras_LVP*: 25.8, 31.1 (MacDonald 2015a: 167.3, 178.4), 55.4 (*LS* 21), 234.9; *CŚT*: ad IX.1 (twice), 2, XIII.1 (five times). The term *tārkika* is also found in the quotations from the *LS* (in the *Pras*) and the *Lañk* (in the *MABh*).

⁶⁹ *MABh_LVP*: 406.1 (*MA* XIII.1), 407.13 (*MA* XIII.3).

⁷⁰ See also MacDonald 2015b: 58, n. 125.

[Bhāviveka's] enumeration of the [logical] faults as such [against Buddhapālita] is disputed by the teacher Candrakīrti: “we regard these objections as inappropriate,” and so on. See 2.3.3 4) above.

4) Sanskrit Notes on the *MABh* in §289: **Candrakīrtir (Zla ba grags pa;** *MABh_LVP* 407.13, *MA* XIII.3) atra candraḥ |

Candrakīrti is here [figured as] the moon.

5) Sanskrit Notes on the *CŚT* in §3: pratolīkathanārtham ādau mūle ślokadvayaṃ Candrakīrtir eva | (Suzuki 1994: 433.7–16, ad the Introductory part of the *CŚT*).

For the sake of main road description, Candrakīrti expresses two verses in the beginning [of the *CŚT*].

In the Tibetan notes on the *Pras*, Bhāviveka is designated as *Rang rgyud smra ba*,⁷¹ which is almost identical with *svatantrasādhanaṇvādin*. Interestingly enough, the expression (*kho bo cag*) *Thal 'gyur ba* is found just before this. The passage runs as follows:

6) Tibetan Notes on the *Pras* in §30: **gang kyi tshe rang rgyud** mi 'dod pa (*Pras_LVP* 16.11; *Pras_M* 147.5: **yadā** caivaṃ **svatantra** anumānānabhīdhāyitvaṃ mādhyamikasya) de lan kyi **skye mched rnamś ces** (*Pras_LVP* 16.11–12; *Pras_M* 147.5–7: nādhyātmikāny āyatanāni svata utpannāni **iti**) tshad mas grub pa gang la-srid || gal te **darṃ 'cha** (*Pras_LVP* 16.12; *Pras_M* 147. 7: svatantrā **pratijñā**) na **Grangs can** (*Pras_LVP* 16.12; *Pras_M* 147. 7: **Sāṃkhyāḥ**) phyogs snga ma byed par 'gyur te | **'bras bu'i bdag nyid du pas 'bras bu-mi skye na grub pa la sgrub la** (*Pras_LVP* 17.2; *Pras_M* 148.2: **kāryātmanah cet siddhasādhanaṃ**; gal te **'bras bu'i bdag nyid las yin na ni grub pa la sgrub pa yin la**) | ^[8a4] **rgyu'i bdag nyid las mi skye na 'gal te** (*Pras_LVP* 17.2; *Pras_M* 148.2–3: **kāraṇātmanaś ced viruddhārthatā**; rgyu'i bdag nyid las yin na ni **'gal ba'i don nyid du 'gyur te**) **rgyu'i bdag nyid las skye ba'i phyir ro** (*Pras_LVP* 17.2–18.1; *Pras_M* 148.3–4: **kāraṇātmanā** vidyamānasyaiva sarvasyotpattimata **utpādād**; skye ba dang ldan pa thams cad ni **rgyu'i bdag nyid du** yod pa kho na **skye ba'i phyir**) || des kho bo cag Thal 'gyur ba la darṃ bca med pas skyon de ga la srid | skyon med na skyon spong ba'i stsol ba byed par mi 'gyur ro ||

When *svatantra* is not accepted, then where is the establishment [through *pramāṇa*] of the bases in the objection? If there is a proposition, the previous thesis of Sāṃkhya would be formulated. If [originated] from itself as the result, then the result is not originated, then *siddhasādhana*. If not originated from itself as the

⁷¹ See 2.3.6 7) above.

cause, [it would be contradicted, since it is originated from itself as the cause. Therefore, since we, *Thal 'gyur pa*, have no thesis, where is there the fault? If there is no fault, no loss in rejecting faults will come about.

Taking the date of the **LT* into consideration, this can be regarded as one of the earliest occurrences of *Thal 'gyur ba* in a Tibetan text.⁷² From the above passages we can see that the author of the Tibetan notes is a follower of the Madhyamaka school centered on Candrakīrti. In this respect, it is to be noted that the appellations *Rang rgyud smra ba* and *Thal 'gyur ba* in the **LT* do not represent the two branches of the Madhyamaka school as we find them postulated in later Tibetan Buddhism, but are rather an interpretation of the philosophical position of Bhāviveka on the one hand and Candrakīrti as represented in the *Pras* on the other. Although the appellation of *svantantrasādhana* (or *Rang rgyud smra ba*) might have been in circulation in Vikramaśīla in India, the expression *Thal 'gyur ba* seems not to have been based on an actual Sanskrit term, but rather to have been invented by the Tibetan author, presumably gNur D[h]arma grags, in the process of interpreting the *Pras* in his native language. Although information about the division of the Madhyamaka school is also

⁷² The occurrence of the *thal 'gyur* in contrast to *rang rgyud* is found in the Tibetan notes on the *Pras* §52, 53: **gzhan** don dam par 'dod pa la ltos nas ^[8b9] **khyad par de ltar byas so zhe na** (*Pras_LVP* 26.13; *Pras_M* 170.5: **paramatāpekṣam viśeṣaṇam iti cet; gzhan** gyi lugs la **ltos**(P. bltos) te **khyad par du byas so zhe na**) | **kun rdzob du yang** gzhan pas skye ba 'jig rten pa 'thad **mi 'dod pa'i phyir** (*Pras_LVP* 26.13–27.1; *Pras_M* 170.6: **saṃvṛtyāpi** tadīyavyavasthā **anabhyupagamāt**; de dag gi rnam par gzhag pa ni **kun rdzob tu yang khas blangs pa med pa'i phyir ro**) don dam pa kho na'i **khyad par mi 'thad do** (*Pras_LVP* 27.2; *Pras_M* 170.8–9: **paramatāpekṣam api viśeṣaṇa** abhidhānam **na yujyate**; gzhan gyi gzhung la ltos te **khyad par** brjod pa yang **rigs pa ma yin no**) | de lta na yang gzhan kyi 'dod pa la ltos nas sbyor ba byed do zhe na de lta na thal 'gyur yin kyi rang rgyud nyams la | rang rgyud yin na gzhi chos can ma grub pa la-stsogs pa'i skyon 'gyur ro ||. “If [it is argued that] the qualification [“ultimately” has been added not in consideration of our own views, but] with reference to the other’s doctrine (*paramata*),” “because it is not acceptable” for the other about the worldly origination “even from the point of view of the surface [level of reality],” the qualification of “ultimately” is not tenable. Nonetheless, however, if the logical formulation (*prayoga*) is employed with reference to the other’s doctrine, then it is [to be the method of] logical consequence (*prasaṅga*, *thal 'gyur*) and corrupts [itself] independently (*svatantram*). If [one uses the logical formulation] independently, there would be the fault of non-establishment of things as objects, etc.

reported in newer Tibetan works⁷³, it often reflects later developments in interpretation and thus differs from the *LT.

3. The *LT as a Madhyamaka Text

The data presented above, even though far from exhaustive, are enough to demonstrate that the *LT is an invaluable source for understanding Candrakīrti's three main treatises. Although the *LT, which amounts to eighteen palm leaves, is much shorter than the commentarial treatises, and although it glosses words or phrases very selectively, the Sanskrit readings it quotes from the three main treatises can be utilized together with the extant MSS to provide a better picture of the treatises.

As far as the history of Tibetan Buddhism is concerned, although Pa tshab Nyi ma grags and Jayānanda, both of whom produced Tibetan translations of Candrakīrti's treatises, had no connection with the *LT, it is to be expected that the *LT will be a valuable new source of material for further studies of Tibetan Madhyamaka philosophy, especially as it was practiced in the 12th century CE.

In sum, the *LT is an important source of material for Madhyamaka studies centered on Candrakīrti.⁷⁴ We should consider the Tibetan notes on the VP and the unidentified Sanskrit notes included in the *LT valuable as well.

⁷³ The *dBu ma rtsa ba shes rab kyi ti ka* and *Tshig gsal ba'i dka' ba bshad pa*, ascribed to Pa tshab and included in the *bKa' gdams gsung 'bum*, have recently been introduced and discussed in modern scholarship (see Dreyfus and Tsering 2010: 390ff.). In the former work especially, the two branches of the Madhyamaka school are clearly designated as *thal 'gyur smra ba'i dbu ma pa* and *rang rgyud du smra ba'i dbu ma pa* (Yoshimizu & Nemoto 2010: xviii, n. 53).

⁷⁴ See also Ye 2009: 325–326 and Vose 2009: 18–19.