

A Reconsideration of *Catuḥstava**

TSUDA Akimasa

0. Geographical Situation

In determining the authenticity of the many writings that are ascribed to Nāgārjuna, his date and region(s) of activity are important factors. However, the situation is very complicated: over the course of more than half a century, there lived many Nāgārjunas (cf. Ray), whose hagiographies are sometimes mixed with each other's or include mythological episodes.

Ian Mabbett has reexamined the relevant information, as has Joseph Walser, who has arrived at a conclusion. Walser, assuming that “Nāgārjuna, the author of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, was also the author of the *Ratnāvalī*” and that “a Sātavāhana king was Nāgārjuna's patron,”¹⁾ speculates that *Ratnāvalī* was written during the reign of Yajña Śrī Sātakarṇi (ca. 175–204) in the Andhra region, more precisely, in the Lower Krishna Valley, and that *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* was written some years before *Ratnāvalī* in Mathurā.²⁾ This means that Nāgārjuna was active at first in North India (Mathurā) and later in South India (Andhra). The difference of the writings, he assumes, depends mainly on geographical factors, especially “the audience that is geographically local.”³⁾ According to him, *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* was influenced by Mahāsāṅgika, Pudgalavādin and Sarvāstivādin; and *Ratnāvalī* by Pūrvaśāilya, Aparāśāilya and Caityāka. *Ratnāvalī* was also influenced by *tathāgatagarbha* thought, which is supported by Drasko Mitrikeski.⁴⁾ For now, these conclusions are the most plausible, given the paucity of evidence. Henceforth we should investigate whether not only these two but also the other works of Nāgārjuna were composed in either of the two regions.

As for *Catuḥstava*, with which we are dealing in this paper, Mitrikeski suggests that, because of the influence of *tathāgatagarbha* thought in *Nirau-pamyastava* and *Paramārthastava*, these two hymns may have been written in Andhra by the same author as *Ratnāvalī*, that is to say, Nāgārjuna.⁵⁾

If these conclusions are correct, Nāgārjuna was active first in North India and afterwards in South India and was influenced by various new ideas or their precursors in his later years. On the other hand, it should

be noted that another possibility remains, that the works attributed to Nāgārjuna were written by more than one person with the same name. It might be reasonable to consider that some of his works were written by other authors. We could also deduce that Nāgārjuna's immediate successors wrote treatises in his name at different times and in different regions.⁶⁾ It would be difficult to judge the authenticity of such works because they were written 'in the name of Nāgārjuna,' but the presence of certain terms could reveal the date of composition or any philosophical influences. Thus we need to examine the writings of Nāgārjuna without discarding either of the two possibilities: one author or several.

1. *Catuḥstava*

Catuḥstava consists of *Lokātītastava*, *Nirauḥpamyastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava*, all of which are attributed to Nāgārjuna. Praising the Buddha, each hymn proclaims Mādhyamika thought in the same way as *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

The text of *Catuḥstava* has been transmitted in Sanskrit and in Tibetan, but not in Chinese. In Tibetan, the four hymns are contained in Tripiṭakas, not as parts of *Catuḥstava* but as separate texts: *Nirauḥpamyastava* (Peking [P] 2011), *Lokātītastava* (P 2012), *Paramārthastava* (P 2014) and *Acintyastava* (P 2019). There is another Tibetan version of *Paramārthastava* entitled *Āryabhaṭṭārakamañjuśrī-paramārthastuti* (P 2022), which is not a different translation of *Paramārthastava* but another hymn that must have been created by using the text of *Paramārthastava*. The object of praise in *Āryabhaṭṭārakamañjuśrī-paramārthastuti* is not the Buddha, but Mañjuśrī.

2. Previous Studies and Discussion of the Compilation of *Catuḥstava*

The beginning of the study of *Catuḥstava* lies in a publication of the critical edition of *Bodhicaryāvatāra-ṣaṣṭikā* by Louis de La Vallée Poussin. In *Bodhicaryāvatāra-ṣaṣṭikā*, five verses are cited as *Catuḥstave*.⁷⁾ La Vallée Poussin identified these verses as belonging to *Nirauḥpamyastava* and *Lokātītastava*. He deduced that the other two hymns might be *Cittavajrastava* (P 2013) and *Paramārthastava* because they are contained in Tibetan Tripiṭakas just after *Nirauḥpamyastava* and *Lokātītastava*.⁸⁾ They are translated by the same translators as those of *Nirauḥpamyastava* and *Lokātītastava*.⁹⁾

In the 1930's, Giuseppe Tucci, having found a Sanskrit manuscript of *Nirauḥpamyastava* and *Paramārthastava* with a commentary, published an edi-

tion of only the verse text of both hymns. According to him, the remaining two hymns are missing, but we do not know whether or not Tucci's manuscript originally contained all four hymns.¹⁰⁾

Prabhubhai Patel identified two possibilities concerning the process of the establishment of *Catuhstava*: 1) several independent hymns were gathered, and four of them were transcribed in a manuscript, that Prajñākaramati misunderstood to be a separate work (86); 2) although a work entitled *Catuhstava* originally existed, the four hymns were gradually thought to be separate works (87).

In the 1950's, Tucci found and edited a folio of a manuscript of Amṛtākara's commentary, *Catuhstavasamāsārtha*.¹¹⁾ This is the second half of the commentary, which comments on *Nirauṇḍamastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava*, including each title in the text. Although the first half of the manuscript (the first folio) was missing, Tucci suggested that it could be a commentary on *Lokātītastava*. Thanks to this manuscript, the four hymns of *Catuhstava* and their order in *Catuhstava* were revealed: the citations of *Catuhstava* in *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* made it clear that *Lokātītastava* and *Nirauṇḍamastava* are contained in *Catuhstava*, and the commentary of Amṛtākara made us know that *Nirauṇḍamastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava* are contained in the last part of *Catuhstava* in this order.

In the 1980's, Christian Lindtner obtained copies of four Sanskrit manuscripts of *Catuhstava*, all of which contain the four hymns, and published editions of *Lokātītastava* and *Acintyastava*.¹²⁾ This completed the editions of all four hymns of *Catuhstava*. Later Gyaltzen Namdol published another edition of *Catuhstava*, which are based on Sanskrit manuscripts different from Tucci's and Lindtner's.¹³⁾ Lindtner says that the oldest mention of *Catuhstava* is in *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* of Vairocana-rakṣita, but, since the author of *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā*, Prajñākaramati, is older than Vairocanarakṣita, we must say that the oldest reference to *Catuhstava* is in *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā*.¹⁴⁾ Lindtner maintains that the author of *Catuhstava* is Nāgārjuna because the doctrine and the style, especially of *Lokātītastava* and *Acintyastava*, correspond to *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. On the other hand, he mentions that there remains a problem concerning the philosophical contents: *Acintyastava* 45 might refer to the *trisvabhāva* theory of Vijñānamātra.¹⁵⁾ *Acintyastava* 45cd is almost identical to *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* II-191ab.

nāsti vai kalpito bhāvo paratantras tu vidyate || *Acintyastava* 45cd
nāsti vai kalpito bhāvaḥ (*sic*) paratantraś ca vidyate | *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*

II-191ab¹⁶⁾

Lindtner says that *Acintyastava* 45cd is cited from *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* II-191ab, which explicitly expresses the *trīṣvabhāva* theory and that it does not reflect on the authenticity of *Acintyastava* because Nāgārjuna was familiar with the *trīṣvabhāva* theory from *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*.¹⁷⁾ However, we cannot accept his assumption that Nāgārjuna knew the *trīṣvabhāva* theory of *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*.

In a review of Lindtner's book, Paul Williams interprets *Acintyastava* 45 differently from Lindtner and maintains that it does not contradict the thought of Nāgārjuna.¹⁸⁾ We cannot agree with Lindtner's and William's claim that *Acintyastava* 45cd is cited from an ur-text of *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*.¹⁹⁾

Adopting the reading of the Tibetan, which is different from that of the Sanskrit, Fernando Tola and Carmen Dragonetti say that *Acintyastava* 45 is not related to the *trīṣvabhāva* theory.²⁰⁾ But even in the reading of the Tibetan, it would not be necessarily true that *Acintyastava* 45 is not related to the *trīṣvabhāva* theory.²¹⁾ Furthermore, the reading of the Phu-brag manuscript (F and F') corresponds to the Sanskrit, noted first in this paper (see below). The Tibetan translation of this line and the reconstructed Sanskrit are:

brtags pa'i dños po med pa ñid || g'zan gyi dbaṅ ni yod ma (pa F, F')
lags || 45cd
= nāsti vai kalpito bhāvo paratantro *na (tu Skt, F, F') vidyate ||

Tsuda, *Catuhṣtava to Nāgārjuna* consists of a revised edition of Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana*; a few corrections of the text of *Catuhṣtava* based mainly on the commentary, T, and an analysis of the colophons of T.²²⁾

Drasko Mitrikeski, one of the authors of several other studies of *Catuhṣtava*,²³⁾ regards *Niraupamyastava* and *Paramārthastava* as authentic, based on the similarities with *Ratnāvalī*. Similarly, he suggests that *Dharmadhātustava* and *Cittavajrastava* are likely authentic, which would imply that Nāgārjuna was familiar with the *tathāgatagarbha* thought. This is an interesting hypothesis, but it should be investigated carefully.²⁴⁾

Akira Saito points out three remaining questions: 1) Why were *Lokātītastava*, *Niraupamyastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava* collected later under the title *Catuhṣtava*? 2) Why is the Sanskrit slightly different from the Tibetan translation in both the text and the number of verses?²⁵⁾ 3) How can we explain why *Acintyastava* 45 has a parallel passage to the

trīṣvabhāva theory of Vijñānamātra? This last question is examined in Tsuda, “Acintyastava to Sanshōsetsu.” Among these problems, some of the differences of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan are resolved by the readings of the Phug-brag manuscript. Here listed are the corrections from the Phug-brag manuscript²⁶):

Lokātītastava

9c: gaṅ F, F' / kyaṅ P, S, D, N, C

*26c: śes pas F, F' / śes par P, S, D, N, C

Nirauṇāmyastava

23c: kyis F / kyi F', P, S, D, N, C

Acintyastava

*5d: de med F / med F' / dpe med P, S, D, N, C

*8d: ji la ltos F, F' / ji ltar ltos D / ji ltar bltos P, S, N, C

9d: gaṅ F, F', Lindtner / gžan P, S, D, N, C

14c: rnam byaṅ F, F', Lindtner / rnams kyaṅ P, S, D, N, C

16d: gdon gyis thebs F, F', (Lindtner) / don gyi theg P, S, D, N, C

19d: de tshe F, Lindtner / gaṅ tshe F', P, S, D, N, C

*21a: ji bžin mi rtogs F' / ci bžin mi rtogs F / ci žig ma rtogs P, S, D, N, C

23d: tshig gi spyod yul ga la lags || F, F' / om. P, S, D, N, C

29a: la F, F', Lindtner / las P, S, D, N, C

*30c: yaṅ F, F' / 'am P, S, D, N, C

41a: dam F, F', Lindtner / daṅ P, S, D, N, C

*45d: yod pa F / yoṅs pa F' / yod ma P, S, D, N, C

47b: bžed F', Lindtner / bžad F / bšad P, S, D, N, C

*51a: dpes F' / bdes F / dpe P, S, D, N, C

53a: chos kyi mchod sbyin bla (bla F / bla na F') med pa || F, F' / om. P, S, D, N, C

*56c: stoṅ pa ṇid F, F' / ṇo bo ṇid P, S, D, N, C

*58b: rab phyin F, F' / raṅ phyin P, S, D, N, C

*58d: khyod kyi F, F' / mgon khyod P, S, D, N, C

Some of these corrections show that the Sanskrit and the Tibetan transmit the same text of *Acintyastava* 9, 23, 45 and 56, and that *Acintyastava* 23 and 53, which are translated in three *pādas* in P, S, D, N and C, were originally translated in four *pādas*. The remaining differences, especially the absence in the Tibetan of *Lokātītastava* 15, 16, *Acintyastava* 13 and 25, have yet to be resolved.

Finally, in sorting out the process of the establishment of *Catuḥstava*, we can arrive at two possibilities:

1. The four chapters of *Catuḥstava* were misunderstood to be four independent hymns, and they were transmitted separately.
2. The four independent hymns were later combined into one, which was called *Catuḥstava*.

Which is correct? First, there is an evidence of transmission as *Catuḥstava*: The oldest mention of *Catuḥstava* is by Prajñākaramati (late 10th to early 11th century?).²⁷⁾ In the 13th (?) century commentary on *Catuḥstava* by Amṛtākara the title *Catuḥstava* is attested.²⁸⁾ Six Sanskrit manuscripts of *Catuḥstava* are extant: T, W, M, G, Ka and *Catuḥstavasamāsārtha*. None is particularly old.²⁹⁾

On the other hand, there is another evidence of transmission as separate hymns: *Lokātītastava* is contained in some *Dhāraṇīsaṃgrahas* as an independent work.³⁰⁾ The Tibetan Tripiṭakas do not include *Catuḥstava*, only the four independent hymns. Similarly the four catalogues: *Idan dkar ma* (A.D. 824),³¹⁾ *'Phaṅ thaṅ ma*³²⁾ and Bu-ston's two catalogues (A.D. 1322, 1362)³³⁾ only list the four independent hymns. *Lokātītastava*, *Nirau-pamyastava*, *Acintyastava* and *Paramārthastava* were translated in the 8th–9th century and seem to have been revised in the 11th century (*Lokātītastava*, *Nirau-pamyastava* and *Paramārthastava*) and by the first half of the 12th century (*Acintyastava*).³⁴⁾ None of the Tibetan treatises that quote verses of *Catuḥstava* mentions the title *Catuḥstava*. Atiśa, who visited Tibet from India in the first half of the 11th century, does not seem to have been aware of a work titled *Catuḥstava*.³⁵⁾ Thus in Tibet, there is no trace of the existence of *Catuḥstava*.

Considering these facts, we are inclined to take the second possibility: the four hymns of Nāgārjuna were combined around the time of Prajñākaramati. But the problem has not been completely solved yet as seen in non-recognition of *Catuḥstava* in Tibet. As there is no trace of the existence of *Catuḥstava* in Tibet, and even Atiśa does not seem to have known *Catuḥstava*, *Catuḥstava* might be a collection that was known only in a restricted area of India. Perhaps this was Vikramaśīla, where Prajñākaramati is said to have been one of the gate-keeper-*paṇḍitas*. But this supposition contradicts itself because Prajñākaramati's date might be overlapped with the period during which Atiśa was at Vikramaśīla. Atiśa was at Vikramaśīla until 1040 (Roerich 247). We should investigate fur-

ther Prajñākaramati's date and region of activity.

In summing up, we could suppose that the four hymns, which were independently written, might have been collected at the time of Prajñākaramati in India or in a restricted region of India (Vikramaśīla?), under the title *Catuḥstava*, but this collection was not transmitted to Tibet, where the four hymns were translated separately.

Comparison of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan of *Catuḥstava*

Symbols ○: the text is [almost] the same.

※: a part or parts of the text are different.

X: no text exists.

upper-frame number: verse number

lower-frame number: irregular number of *pādas*

<i>Ls</i> (Skt.)	1-13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20-23	24	25	26	27-28
(Tib.)	○	※	X	X	○	※	※	○	※	○	3	○

<i>Ns</i> (Skt.)	1-9	10	11-12	13	14	15	16	17	18-19	20	21-25
(Tib.)	○	※	○	※	○	※	○	※	○	※	○

<i>As</i> (Skt.)	1-5	6	7-9	10	11-12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19-24
(Tib.)	○	※	○	※	○	X	※	○	※	○	※	○
	25	26-31	32-35	36-41	42	43-48	49	50-52	53	54-59		
	X	○	※	○	※	○	※	○	※	○		

<i>Ps</i> (Skt.)	1-11	<i>Ps*</i> (Skt.)	1	2	3-5	6-9	10	11
(Tib.)	○	(Tib.)	5 ※	3	○	※	3 ※	※

Number of verses and order of the four hymns

	<i>Ls</i>	<i>Ns</i>	<i>As</i>	<i>Ps</i>	<i>Ps*</i>	order of the hymns
<i>Catuḥstava</i> (Skt.)	28	25	59	11	—	<i>Ls, Ns, As, Ps</i>
Tibetan Tanjur (P, S, D, N, C)	26	25	57	11	11	<i>Ns, Ls, Ps, As, Ps*</i>
Phug-brag manuscript (1696–1706)	26	25	57	11	—	<i>Ps, Ns, Ls, As</i>
Bu-ston's Tanjur catalogue (1362)	<i>n.i.</i>	<i>n.i.</i>	<i>n.i.</i>	<i>n.i.</i>	<i>n.i.</i>	<i>Ns, Ls, Ps, As, Ps*</i>
<i>Bu-ston chos 'byuṇ</i> (1322)	22	25	50	10	<i>n.i.</i>	<i>Ns, Ls, Ps, As, Ps*</i>
<i>'Phaṇ thaṇ ma</i>	22	25	50	10	—	<i>As, Ls, Ns, Ps</i>
<i>lDan kar ma</i> (824)	22	25	50	10	—	<i>As, Ns, Ls, Ps</i>

n.i.: no indication of the number of verses

The catalogue of Tibetan documents that were found in Dun-huang³⁶⁾ contains neither *Catuḥstava* nor any of the individual hymns.

3. Quotations

The verses of *Catuḥstava* are cited in many treatises. Listed here are the quotations that have been already referred to in previous studies³⁷⁾ and those that have been never mentioned,³⁸⁾ which are preceded by an asterisk.

Among them, *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā*³⁹⁾ and *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-pañjikā*⁴⁰⁾ refer to the text that they are quoting as *Catuḥstava* (*bsTod pa bzhi pa*). Six manuscripts include all four hymns as *Catuḥstava*: the manuscript of the University of Tokyo (T), the Mongolian manuscript (M), the Gokhale manuscript (G) and the Kathmandu manuscript (W), all of which were consulted by Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana*; one of Namdol's manuscripts (Ka) and the manuscript of a commentary, *Catuḥstavasamāsārtha*. Among them, the title *Catuḥstava* is seen in *Catuḥstavasamāsārtha*⁴¹⁾ but not in T and W, and Nāgārjuna is named as the author in T and G⁴²⁾ but not in W and *Catuḥstavasamāsārtha*.

Lokātītastava

- 4: *Prasannapadā* (La Vallée Poussin 413), *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 583), *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* (P 4534, nu95r2–3), *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (P 5277, śa183v3).
- 5: *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya* (La Vallée Poussin 200), *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* (P 4534, nu95r3–4), **dGoṅs pa rab gsal* (P 6143, ca184v2–3).
- 8: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 476).

- 9: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 476).
 10: *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya* (La Vallée Poussin 165), **dGoṅs pa rab gsal* (P 6143, ca156r3–5).
 11: *Prasannapadā* (La Vallée Poussin 64).
 12ab: *Abhisamayālaṃkāṛāloka* (Wogihara 299), *Sekanirṇaya* (Shastri 28).
 13: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 587).
 18: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 533), *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya* (La Vallée Poussin 97), **Catuḥśataka-ṭīkā* (P 5266, ya64r1–2).
 19: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 533).
 20: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 533).
 21: *Prasannapadā* (La Vallée Poussin 54, 234), **Lam rim 'briñ po* (Tsultrim Kelsang and Takada 68).
 22: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 417), *Pañcaskandha-prakaraṇa* (Lindtner 120), **Lam rim 'briñ po* (Tsultrim Kelsang and Takada 69).
 22ab: *Abhisamayālaṃkāṛāloka* (Wogihara 348, 381, 405, 441, 482, 490, 536), *Sākārasiddhiśāstra* (Thakur 481).
 23: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 359, 415), *Tattvasāra-saṃgraha* (P 4534, nu98v5–6), *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya* (La Vallée Poussin 310), **dGoṅs pa rab gsal* (P 6143, ca239v6–7), **Legs bsad sniñ po* (Katano and Tsultrim Kelsang 23), **Lam rim 'briñ po* (Tsultrim Kelsang and Takada 146), **lHa'i rñā sgra* (Roñ-ston Śes-bya-kun-rig 289).
 24: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 489), *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* (P 4534, nu98v6–7).
 26: *Śūnyatāsaptati-vṛtti* (Erb 222).
 27: *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya* (La Vallée Poussin 23), **dGoṅs pa rab gsal* (P 6143, ca37v7–8).

Nirauḥpamyastava

- 7: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 420), *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (P 5277, śa169r2–3), **Tattvaratnāvalī* ([Skt.] Shastri 22; [Tib.] Kajiyama and Mimaki 17–18).
 9: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 488, 489), *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (P 5277, śa174v8), **Madhyamakopadeśa* (Miyazaki 53).
 13: *Prasannapadā* (La Vallée Poussin 215), *Śūnyatāsaptati-vṛtti* (Erb 253).
 15: *Tattvasiddhi* (P 4531, nu30v3–4).
 18: *Pañcakrama* (Mimaki and Tomabeche 31, III-2), *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (P 2668, gi104r8), *Pradīpoddyotanābhisaṃdhiprakāśikā* (P 2658, a212r6–7), *Śṛīguhyasamājamāṇḍalavidhi* (P 2663, gi33r3–4).

- 19: *Pañcakrama* (Mimaki and Tomabechei 31, III-3), *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (P 2668, gi104v1), *Pradīpoddyotanābhisamdhīprakāsikā* (P 2658, a212r7-8), *Śṛīguhyasamājamandalavidhi* (P 2663, gi33r4).
- 21: *Subhāṣitasamgraha* (Bendall 388), *Bodhimārgapradīpa-panjikā* (P 5344, ki298v3-4), *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu92v3-5), *Tattvāvatārākhyasakalasugatavacastātparya-vyākhyāprakaraṇa* (P 4532, nu46r8-46v1), **Tattvaratnāvalī* ([Skt.] Shastri 22; [Tib.] Kajiyama and Mimaki 17), **Munimatālaṅkāra* (Li and Kanō 12).
- 24: *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (P 5254, tsha361r4-5), **Madhyamakopadeśa* (Miyazaki 53), *Kudrṣṭīnirghātana* (Shastri 1, Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai 10)⁴³).

Acintyastava

- 1: **Legs bsad sn̄in po* (Katano and Tsultrim Kelsang 21).
- 9: *Tattvasiddhi* (P 4531, nu40r3-4).
- 19: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 375), *Bhavasamkrāntītikā* (Sastri 82), *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu105r6-8), *Viśeṣadyotanī* (P 5282, śa308v8), **Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (P 5254, tsha327r3).
- 20: **Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (P 5254, tsha327r5-6).
- 22ab: **Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (P 5254, tsha345v2).
- 25ad: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 573).
- 29: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 528).
- 36: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 573).
- 38: *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu102r2-3).
- 39: *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu102r3-4).
- 40: *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu102r4-5), *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 528).
- 40ab: *Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka* (Wogihara 348, 381, 405, 441, 482, 490, 536).
- 41: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 528).
- 41ab: *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu102r5).
- 42: *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 590).
- 42ab: **Madhyamakopadeśa* (Miyazaki 49).
- 43ab: *Pañcatathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa* (Shastri 24), *Caryāgītikośa-vṛtti* (Kværne 209).
- 47: *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu97r7-8).
- 48: *Tattvasārasamgraha* (P 4534, nu97r8-97v1).
- 57: *Tattvasiddhi* (P 4531, nu39v8-40r1).

Paramārthastava

- 3: **Madhyamakopadeśa* (Miyazaki 49).
 4d: *Sākārasiddhiśāstra* (Thakur 489).
 5ab: *Caryāgītikośa-vṛtti* (Kværne 190).
 5a: *Sākārasiddhiśāstra* (Thakur 489).
 7: **Tattvasārasaṃgraha* (P 4534, nu102r1-2).
 8: **Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (P 5254, tsha357r7-8), **Madhyamakopadeśa* (Miyazaki 48).
 9cd: *Bodhimārgapradīpa-panjikā* (P 5344, ki284r5).
 10: *Bodhimārgapradīpa-panjikā* (P 5344, ki284r5-6).

4. The Four Hymns**4.1. Lokātīstava**

The first hymn of *Catuḥstava* is *Lokātīstava*. The Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation (P 2012) have been edited by Lindtner and Namdol.⁴⁴⁾ As for Sanskrit manuscripts of *Lokātīstava*, in addition to those included in *Catuḥstava*, there are some that are contained in esoteric Buddhist texts, *Dhāraṇīsaṃgrahas*: DhI-DhV. It has yet to be determined why these collections include *Lokātīstava*.

The meter of *Lokātīstava* is *śloka*. There are twenty-eight verses in Sanskrit, twenty-six in Tibetan, and twenty-two in the Tibetan catalogues, *lDan dkar ma* (no. 448) and *'Phan than ma* (no. 653).

Treatises that cite *Lokātīstava* include *Prasannapadā* (*Lokātīstava* 4, 11, 21), *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (4, 8, 9, 13, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24), *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-panjikā* (4), *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* (4, 5, 23, 24), *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya* (5, 10, 18, 23, 27), *dGoṅs pa rab gsal* (5, 10, 23, 27), *Abhisamayālaṃkāraloka* (12ab, 22ab), *Sekanirṇaya* (12ab), *Catuḥśataka-ṭīkā* (18), *Lam rim 'briñ po* (21, 22, 23), *Sākārasiddhiśāstra* (22ab), *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa* (22), *Legs bśad sniñ po* (23), *lHa'i rñā sgra* (23) and *Śūnyatāsaptati-vṛtti* (26). Among them, only *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (*Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-panjikā*) refers to the title *Catuḥstava*.⁴⁵⁾ The oldest quotations are found in Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā*, *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya*, *Catuḥśataka-ṭīkā*, *Śūnyatāsaptati-vṛtti* and *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*. *Prasannapadā* refers to the author as *ācāryapāda*,⁴⁶⁾ and *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa* and *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya* describe him as *slob dpon gyi źal sna nas* (**ācāryapāda*)⁴⁷⁾: both designations refer to Nāgārjuna, Candrakīrti's teacher. Dharmendra's *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* ascribes two verses to Nāgārjuna's

Lokātītastava.⁴⁸⁾ Tson kha pa's *dGoñs pa rab gsal*, *Lam rim 'briñ po* and *Legs bśad sñiñ po* and Roñ ston's *lHa'i rñā sgra* are Tibetan treatises. *dGoñs pa rab gsal* cites verses as *Lokātītastava* without mentioning the author,⁴⁹⁾ as do *Lam rim 'briñ po*⁵⁰⁾ and *Legs bśad sñiñ po*.⁵¹⁾ On the other hand, the two catalogues, *lDan dkar ma* and *'Phañ than ma*, say that *Lokātītastava* is by Nāgārjuna. Thus, we can say that *Lokātītastava* was regarded as an authentic work of Nāgārjuna in both India and Tibet, and that in the time of *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā*, *Lokātītastava* was considered as a part of *Catuhstava*.

The Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of *Lokātītastava* 14, 18, 19 and 24 do not correspond completely.

Almost all the verses of *Lokātītastava* finish with phrases such as *tvayōktam*, "[that] was proclaimed by you,"⁵²⁾ in which the author's ideas are attributed to the Buddha. The contents of *Lokātītastava* are very close to those of *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Especially *Lokātītastava* 22ab, which proclaims that *pratītyasamutpāda* is *sūnya*, is almost the same as *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XXIV-18ab. We have found no other evidence against the authenticity.

4.2. *Niraupamyastava*

The second hymn of *Catuhstava* is *Niraupamyastava*. The Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation (P 2011) have been edited by Tucci and Namdol.⁵³⁾ There are twenty-five verses in all texts and the two catalogues, *lDan dkar ma* (no. 447) and *'Phañ than ma* (no. 654). The meter of the first twenty-four verses is *śloka*, and that of the twenty-fifth verse is *Puṣpitāgrā* of *Ardhasamavṛtta* (number of syllables: 12, 13, 12, 13).⁵⁴⁾

Treatises that cite *Niraupamyastava* include *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (*Niraupamyastava* 7, 9), *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (7, 9), *Kudṛṣṭinirghātana* (24), *Tattvaratnāvalī* (7, 21), *Madhyamakopadeśa* (9, 24), *Prasannapadā* (13), *Sūnyatāsaptati-vṛtti* (13), *Tattvasiddhi* (15), *Pañcakrama* (18, 19), *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (18, 19), *Pradīpodyotanābhisamdhīprakāśikā* (18, 19), *Śṛīguhyasamājamāṇḍalavidhi* (18, 19), *Subhāṣitasamgraha* (21), *Bodhimārgapradīpa-pañjikā* (21), *Tattvasārasamgraha* (21), *Tattvāvatārākhyasakalasugatavacastātparya-vyākhyāprakaraṇa* (21), *Munimatālaṅkāra* (21) and *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (24). Among them, only *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (*Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-pañjikā*) refers to the title *Catuhstava*.⁵⁵⁾ The oldest quotations are from Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā* and *Sūnyatāsaptati-vṛtti*. Bhavya quotes a verse in *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*. *Niraupamyastava* is also cited in esoteric Buddhist texts, *Kudṛṣṭinirghātana*, *Tattvaratnāvalī*, *Pañcakrama*,

Śrīguhyasamājamāṇḍalavidhi, *Subhāṣitasamgraha* and *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*. Among them, *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa*⁵⁶⁾ and *Tattvaratnāvalī*⁵⁷⁾ refer to Nāgārjuna as the author, while *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* refers to *rje btsun gyi źal śna nas* (**bhaṭṭāarakapāda*),⁵⁸⁾ who can be identified as Nāgārjuna. Atiśa also cites verses in *Madhyamakopadeśa* and *Bodhimārgapradīpa-panjikā*. In *Madhyamakopadeśa*, the author is referred to as Nāgārjuna,⁵⁹⁾ while in *Bodhimārgapradīpa-panjikā*, the author is called *slob dpon gyi źal śna nas* (**ācāryapāda*),⁶⁰⁾ that is to say, Nāgārjuna. Śāntarakṣita in *Tattvasiddhi*⁶¹⁾ and Dharmendra in *Tattvasārasamgraha*⁶²⁾ also consider the author to be Nāgārjuna. Abhayākara Gupta cites a verse in *Munimatālaṅkāra* (ca. 1113) and refers to the author as *ārya*.⁶³⁾ Both catalogues, *lDan dkar ma* and *'Phaṅ than ma*, regard the author as Nāgārjuna.

The Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of *Nirauṇpamyastava* 10, 13, 15, 17 and 20 do not completely correspond.

All the verses of *Nirauṇpamyastava* are written either in praise of the Buddha or as Buddha's words, which implicitly express the author's thought.⁶⁴⁾ The principal thought of *Nirauṇpamyastava* is common with that of *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*: the thought of *śūnya*, though the word *śūnya* does not appear in *Nirauṇpamyastava*. On the other hand, *Nirauṇpamyastava* tends to refer to something absolute as "the *dharmatā* that is not seen" (*Nirauṇpamyastava* 17) or "the *dharmadhātu* that has no distinction" (*Nirauṇpamyastava* 21). Seyfort Ruegg regards the descriptions of the *dharmadhātu* and the *dharmakāya* in *Nirauṇpamyastava* 21 and 22 as having some relationship to *tathāgatagarbha* thought, as does Mitrikeski.⁶⁵⁾ We should carefully examine whether these descriptions are ascribed to Nāgārjuna himself or to someone else who might have written *Nirauṇpamyastava* in the name of Nāgārjuna.

4.3. *Acintyastava*

The third hymn of *Catuḥstava* is *Acintyastava*. The Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation (P 2019) have been edited by Lindtner and Namdol.⁶⁶⁾ The meter of *Acintyastava* is *śloka*. There are fifty-nine verses in the Sanskrit, fifty-seven in the Tibetan, and fifty in both *lDan dkar ma* (no. 446) and *'Phaṅ than ma* (no. 652). Among the four hymns of *Catuḥstava*, *Acintyastava* has the most verses.

The Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of *Acintyastava* 6, 10, 14, 16, 18, 32, 33, 34, 35, 42, 49 and 53 do not completely correspond.

This hymn is attributed to Nāgārjuna by some Sanskrit manuscripts,

lDan dkar ma, *'Phaṅ thaṅ ma*, the Tibetan Tripiṭakas and some of the treatises that quote verses of *Acintyastava*.

Treatises that cite *Acintyastava* include *Legs bsad sñiṅ po* (*Acintyastava* 1), *Tattvasiddhi* (9, 57), *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* (19, 25ad, 29, 36, 40, 41, 42), *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* (19, 38, 39, 40, 41ab, 47, 48), *Viśeṣadyotanī* (19), *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (19, 20, 22ab), *Bhavasamkrānti-ṭikā* (19), *Abhisamayālaṃkāṛāloka* (40ab), *Madhyamakopadeśa* (42ab), *Pañcatathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa* (43ab) and *Caryāgītikośa-vṛtti* (43ab). Among them, Bhavya's *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* identifies Nāgārjuna as the author.⁶⁷⁾ *Bhavasamkrānti-ṭikā*, which was written after the eighth century,⁶⁸⁾ cites *Acintyastava* 19 without mentioning either the author or the source.⁶⁹⁾ Atiśa calls the author *slob dpon ñid kyi źal sñā nas* (**ācāryapāda*) in *Madhyamakopadeśa*.⁷⁰⁾ *Tattvasārasaṃgraha*, *Pañcatathāgatamudrāvivarāṇa* and *Caryāgītikośa-vṛtti* are esoteric Buddhist texts. Among them, *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* attributes to Nāgārjuna verses that it cites as coming from *Acintyastava*.⁷¹⁾ *Legs bsad sñiṅ po*, the author of which is Tibetan, cites a verse as coming from *Acintyastava* without mentioning its author.⁷²⁾

Acintyastava contains many verses that, like most of the verses of *Lokāṭīṭastava*, put the author's ideas into the mouth of the Buddha. On the other hand, twenty-seven of the fifty-nine verses have the same style as the verses in *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*: they directly express the author's thought. Thus, the contents of *Acintyastava* are philosophical rather than religious, and are the most similar to *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* of the four hymns. Especially *Acintyastava* 40ab, which proclaims *pratītyasamutpāda* to be *sūnya* and which is parallel to *Lokāṭīṭastava* 22ab, is almost the same as *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XXIV-18ab.

Acintyastava and *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* are also in close agreement regarding *antadvaya*, the two extremes. *Acintyastava* 22 refers to *antadvaya* as *śāśvatī dṛṣṭi* and *uccheda-darśana*. Similar terms are seen in *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XXI-14b as *śāśvatōccheda-darśana*. *Acintyastava* 22ab, which explains the two extremes, is almost the same as *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XV-10ab.⁷³⁾ *Acintyastava* 46 presents the two extremes as *samāroṇa* and *uccheda*, and *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XVI-10ab as *samāroṇa* and *apakarśaṇa*.⁷⁴⁾ Furthermore, *Acintyastava* 46 is the same in meaning as *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XV-11.⁷⁵⁾

Some of Nāgārjuna's ideas were inherited by Yogācāra-vijñānamātra school: for example, the notion of two extremes, already established by Nāgārjuna, were later adopted by Vijñānamātra, though it is said that Vijñānamātra was the first to express them as *samāroṇa* and *apavāda*.⁷⁶⁾

On the other hand, there is speculation that *Acintyastava* may have been influenced by Vijñānamātra thought. For example, the terminology of *Acintyastava* 45, which includes the word *paratantra*, might be related to the *trīsvabhāva* theory, and the term *dharmanairātmya* in *Acintyastava* 2b might have been used to refer to one of the two kinds of non-existence of *ātman*.

In the light of these speculations, *Acintyastava* could have been written either in Nāgārjuna's later years or just after Nāgārjuna and before the appearance of Vijñānamātra, more precisely, before *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*.⁷⁷⁾

4.4. *Paramārthastava*

The last hymn of *Catuḥstava* is *Paramārthastava*. The Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation (P 2014) have been edited by Tucci and Namdol.⁷⁸⁾ The Sanskrit and Tibetan texts correspond well. The meter of *Paramārthastava* is *śloka*. There are eleven verses in both the Sanskrit and the Tibetan, and ten in both *lDan dkar ma* (no. 450) and *'Phaṅ than ma* (no. 656). All the verses of *Paramārthastava* purely praise the Buddha, which is not the case with other three hymns. As mentioned above, there is another translation of *Paramārthastava*, *Āryabhaṭṭāarakamañjuśrī-paramārthastuti* (P 2022), which is based on the text of *Paramārthastava* but is arranged as a hymn that praises Mañjuśrī. Our text of *Āryabhaṭṭāarakamañjuśrī-paramārthastuti* is not always four *pādas* in each verse. Though it is attributed to Nāgārjuna, it is obviously later than *Paramārthastava*.

Treatises that cite *Paramārthastava* include *Sākārasiddhiśāstra* (*Paramārthastava* 4d, 5a), *Caryāgītikośa-vṛtti* (5ab), *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* (7), *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* (8), *Madhyamakopadeśa* (3, 8) and *Bodhimārgapradīpa-panjikā* (9cd, 10). Among them, Dharmendra's *Tattvasārasaṃgraha* cites a verse as coming from Nāgārjuna's *Paramārthastava*.⁷⁹⁾ Bhavya's *Madhyamakaratnapradīpa* cites a verse as coming from *Paramārthastava*, mentioning the title but not the author.⁸⁰⁾ *Caryāgītikośa-vṛtti*,⁸¹⁾ an esoteric Buddhist text, and Atiśa's *Bodhimārgapradīpa-panjikā*⁸²⁾ attribute verses to Nāgārjuna without mentioning the source. *Madhyamakopadeśa* identifies two verses as a work of the *sloṇ dpon ṅid kyi ṅal śna nas* (**ācāryapāda*).⁸³⁾

Paramārthastava contains little philosophical terminology, and only in the form of adjectives describing the Buddha.⁸⁴⁾ The word *sūnya* is seen at *Paramārthastava* 9c. It is interesting that the text refers to the limits of praising the Buddha with words, in spite of a hymn actually praising the Buddha.⁸⁵⁾

According to Mitrikeski, “The *Paramārthastava* shows very close similarities with the *Nirauṇpamyastava* in terms of reference to *bhakti*, *dharmadhātu* and *buddhānusmṛti*,”⁸⁶⁾ but we should carefully examine the relationship between *Nirauṇpamyastava* and *Paramārthastava*. This is because we cannot determine if *dharmadhātu*, which occurs only once at *Paramārthastava* 8b, is related to the idea of *tathāgatagarbha*,⁸⁷⁾ and because the other two terms, *bhakti* (*Paramārthastava* 2d) and *buddhānusmṛti* seem to appear widely, though implicitly in most cases, in hymns to the Buddha.

In any case, there is no conclusive reason to deny the authenticity of *Paramārthastava*.

5. Conclusion

An examination of the hymns of *Catuḥstava* raises some points that cast doubt on their authenticity: *Acintyastava* might be related to the *trīsvabhāva* theory of Vijñānamātra, and *Nirauṇpamyastava* and *Paramārthastava* may have been influenced by *tathāgatagarbha* thought. But so far, we have found no strong evidence against their authenticity.

If the three hymns are really authentic, the suspicious terms owe their presence to ideas that may have just emerged during Nāgārjuna’s later years. Or if the three hymns are not authentic, as Goshima suggests, they might have been composed in Nāgārjuna’s name during the first or second century after his death.⁸⁸⁾ If we accept the authenticity of the hymns, we have to revise our idea of Nāgārjuna’s character to a greater or lesser degree. If the hymns are not authentic, it would be proof that many of the texts attributed to Nāgārjuna are the works of not one person but several, and this would successfully explain the subtle differences of ideas and terminology among the various texts.

Keeping these two possibilities in mind, we should investigate not only *Catuḥstava*, but also all of Nāgārjuna’s writings.

Notes

* I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Robert Kritzer of Kyoto Notre Dame University for his proofreading with accuracy and offering many useful suggestions.

1) Walser, “Nāgārjuna and Ratnāvalī” 212.

2) *ibid.*; Walser, *Nāgārjuna in Context* 88, 267–270; Mabbett 343–345.

3) Walser, *Nāgārjuna in Context* 267.

4) Mitrikeski, *Nāgārjuna’s Religious Practices* 90–111, 116–126, 426–428.

- 5) *ibid.* 93–111 (*Niraupamyastava*), 117–126 (*Paramārthastava*); Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna’s Devotional Practices”; Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna and Tathāgatagarbha.”
- 6) Goshima, “Indo Daijōbukyō.”
- 7) All five verses are cited as *Catustave* (*sic*): La Vallée Poussin, *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* 420 (*Niraupamyastava* 7), 488–489 (*Niraupamyastava* 9), 533 (*Lokātīstava* 18, 19, 20). Although he does not mention it, *Acintyastava* 25ad and 36 are also cited in *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā* (La Vallée Poussin 573). The citation of *Acintyastava* 25ad may be a mistranscription of the whole verse.
- 8) La Vallée Poussin, “Les Quatres Odes de Nāgārjuna” 1.
- 9) The colophones of P, D, N, C and S say that the translators of *Niraupamyastava*, *Lokātīstava* and *Paramārthastava* are Kṛṣṇapaṇḍita and Tshul khrims rgyal ba, but they do not specify the translators of *Cittavajrastava*. Only the Tohoku catalogue refers to the translators of *Cittavajrastava* as Kṛṣṇapaṇḍita and Tshul khrims rgyal ba.
- 10) Tucci, “Two Hymns of Catuḥstava” 311.
- 11) Tucci, “Catuḥstavasamāsārtha.”
- 12) Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana* 121–161.
- 13) Namdol III, 90.
- 14) In *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-panjikā*, *Niraupamyastava* 7 is cited as *bsTod pa bži pa las kyañ* (P 5277, śa169r2–3) and *Niraupamyastava* 9 is as *bsTod pa bži pa las kyañ* (śa174v8–175r1). Since these cited passages, including the sentence just before them, are identical to the corresponding cited passages in *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā*, they were probably quoted from *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā*, not directly from *Niraupamyastava*. *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra-panjikā* also uses the phrase *de skad du yañ* in citing *Lokātīstava* 4 (śa183v3). This is equivalent to the corresponding phrase, *tad uktam*, in *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā*. About these quotations, see Ejima. Thus we should say that the oldest reference to *Catuḥstava* can be found in Prajñākaramati’s *Bodhicaryāvatāra-panjikā*.
- 15) Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana* 122, note 149. This problem had been already pointed out by Gnoli (12). He made Italian translations of *Niraupamyastava* and *Paramārthastava* from Tucci’s Sanskrit edition and of *Lokātīstava* and *Acintyastava* from the Tibetan translations. Note that he consulted only the Tibetan in translating *Acintyastava* 45.
- 16) Nanjio 131.
- 17) Lindtner, “Laṅkāvatārasūtra” 253.
- 18) Williams 94: “So the only new fact derived from the discussion in the *Acintyastava* is that Nāgārjuna used the word ‘*paratantra*’ in connection with *saṃvṛti*. It doesn’t follow, therefore, that these verses entail a reference to Vijñānavāda, or that Nāgārjuna knew of the Vijñānavāda.”
- 19) Williams 94: “What we *may* indicate is that the ur-text of LS (= *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*), which Nāgārjuna was presumably familiar with, did speak of *paratantra* and contrast it with the false construction habitually indulged in by the *prthagjana*, and this may therefore be Nāgārjuna’s source for the term and its use.” On the relationship between *Acintyastava* and *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*,

see Tsuda, “Acintyastava to Sanshōsetsu.”

- 20) Tola and Dragonetti 49, note 191.
- 21) I have already examined this problem on the *trīṣvabhāva* theory: Tsuda, “Acintyastava to Sanshōsetsu”; Tsuda, *Catuḥstava to Nāgārjuna* 47–68.
- 22) Tsuda, “Catuḥstava Tekisuto”; Tsuda, “Catuḥstava Chūshakusho”; Tsuda, *Catuḥstava to Nāgārjuna* 181–289, 22–28.
- 23) Sakai, “Shōgisān”; Sakai, “Shinkongōsan”; Sakai, “Ryūju ni kiserareru Sanka”; Sakai, “Chōsantansan”; Hachiriki, “Nāgārjuna no Shisanju”; Hachiriki, “Chōsekensan Hukashigisan”; Mitrikeski, *Nāgārjuna’s Religious Practices*; Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna’s Devotional Practices”; Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna and Tathāgatagarbha”; Mitrikeski, “Stutyatīstava and Catuḥstava”; Varghese.
- 24) Mitrikeski, *Nāgārjuna’s Religious Practices* 90–111, 116–126, 231–247, 252–256; Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna’s Devotional Practices”; Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna and Tathāgatagarbha.” The works attributed to Nāgārjuna differ considerably in style and contents. Depending on which of them are accepted as authentic, ideas about Nāgārjuna’s character and philosophy will differ considerably. Mitrikeski, recognizing the difference between *Ratnāvalī* and *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, accepts *Nirauḥpamyastava*, *Paramārthastava*, *Dharmadhātustava* and *Cittavajrastava* as authentic because of their similarity with *Ratnāvalī*, especially with the idea of *tathāgatagarbha*, which was characteristic of the time and place of its composition, “between 174 and 205 CE in Andhra” according to Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna and Tathāgatagarbha” 153. On the other hand, since the authenticity of *Ratnāvalī* has not yet been definitely established [ex. Vetter says: “Concluding these remarks on style we might state: The observations are not so strong as to force us to deny authenticity to the *Ratnāvalī*, but if it was composed by Nāgārjuna, it is difficult to imagine that it was written in the same period as the *Kārikās* (*Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*)” (504). And Goshima indicates in “Ryūju no Buddha Kan” differences of concept of Buddha between *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and other Nāgārjuna’s writings including *Ratnāvalī*], we have to investigate Mitrikeski’s hypothesis more carefully. Or perhaps, these works, which seem to include the idea of *tathāgatagarbha*, belong to a group of works like those that, Goshima thinks in both “Ryūju no Buddha Kan” and “Indo Daijōbukkyō,” were composed in the name of Nāgārjuna between Nāgārjuna’s death and the appearance of the early Yogācāra treatises. *Acintyastava* could be this kind of work, as I have already suggested elsewhere: Tsuda, “Acintyastava to Sanshōsetsu.”
- 25) The differences between the two texts are shown below in two tables.
- 26) Some of these have been already noted in Tsuda, “Pudaku Shahon” 154. The readings preceded by an asterisk are newly reported here.
- 27) Prajñākaramati’s dates have not yet been definitely determined. According to *Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India*, he was the protector of the south gate among the six gate-keeper-*paṇḍitas* in the reign of the king, Canaka (Teramoto 318, Tāranātha 294–296). According to *The Blue Annals*, on the other hand, he was the protector of the west gate (Naudou 206). Modern scholars accept various different dates: ca. 950–1000 (Seyfort Ruegg 116);

- the 11th century (Steinkellner 19); ca. 1078 (Murti 101, note 2); 775–825 (Vaidya Introduction 10). None of these scholars refers to any source. Although some studies have tried to determine the date, for example, Tamura and Shirasaki, who says, “he could be said to be a scholar who was active from the 10th century to the 11th” (78), further investigation would be necessary.
- 28) The commentary ends with the title *Catuhstava-samāsārthaḥ* (Tucci, “Catuhstavasamāsārtha” 246). The date of Amṛtākara is unknown, but we follow Tucci (*ibid.* 237) and Sakai (“Ryūju ni kiserareru Sanka” 4) for the time being.
- 29) T, W, M, G: Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana* 123–124; Ka: Namdol 90.
- 30) In addition to the three Sanskrit manuscripts of *Lokātītastava* in *Dhāraṇīsamgrahas* that are noted in Tsukamoto, et al. 140, others in the same style have been found: Tsuda, *Catuhstava to Nāgārujuna* 23.
- 31) Lalou, “Textes Bouddhiques du Khri-sroṅ-lde-bcan” 329. This catalogue was established in 824. Cf. Yamaguchi, “Toban Ōkoku” 18–20; Mimaki 280–281. For a date of 836, see Harada, “IDan dkar ma”; Harada, “Toban Ōkoku Yakkyōshi”; Harada, “Toban Yakkyōshi”; and Hadano, “Chibetto Ruden Zenki.” Yamaguchi (“Denkaruma 824”) discusses the controversy regarding the date.
- 32) *dKar chag 'Phaṇ than ma* 46; Kawagoe, *'Phang thang ma* 31; Kawagoe, “Pantan Mokuroku.”
- 33) For a brief explanation of these catalogues, see Mimaki 281–282. For the catalogue portion of Bu-ston’s *The History of Buddhism*, see Nishioka 65. For the Tanjur catalogue that was edited by Bu-ston in 1362, see Ochi 70–79.
- 34) *Lokātītastava*, *Nirauṇpamyastava* and *Paramārthastava* were revised in the 11th century, while *Acintyastava* was revised sometime after them before the first half of the 12th century. As for *Lokātītastava*, *Nirauṇpamyastava* and *Paramārthastava*, according to Hadano (“Kādamuha Shi” 21–22), one of the translators, Tshul khrims rgyal ba, was a Tibetan, also called Nag tsho, who guided Atiśa from India to Tibet and studied with him for a long time. Nag tsho was born in 1011 according to *The Blue Annals* (Roerich 328). According to ‘Jam dbyaṅs bṣad pa’s Tibetan chronology (1716), “Nag-tsho lo-tṣā-ba arrived to invite Jo-bo (Atiśa)” in 1037 (Chattopadhyaya 3). Thus, the three hymns were probably translated during the 11th century. As far as *Acintyastava* is concerned, the catalogues of P and N do not give a translator’s name, but the Tohoku catalogue and Bu-ston’s Tanjur catalogue (Lokesh Chandra 356) refer to Tilaka and Pa tshab ṇi ma grags as translators. These two were the translators of *Āryabhaṭṭārakamañjuśrī-paramārthastuti*. According to Patel (89), Tilaka was a Kashmirian scholar, also called Tilakakalaśa, and Pa tshab ṇi ma grags was a Tibetan translator, also called Sūryakīrti. Both of them are said to have lived later than Kṛṣṇapaṇḍita and Tshul khrims rgyal ba. According to the ‘Jam dbyaṅs bṣad pa’s Tibetan chronology, Pa tshab ṇi ma grags was born in 1055 (Chattopadhyaya 10). His date is discussed in Lang 133–135; Kuijp 4; Roerich 272, 341–343.
- 35) *Ratnakaraṇḍoghāṭa-nāma-madhyamakopadeśa* (*Madhyamakopadeśa*) lists works of

- Nāgārjuna, not including *Catuḥstava* but including *Paramārthastava*, *Acintya-stava* and *Lokātīstava* in this order: Miyazaki 60.
- 36) Lalou, *Manuscrits Tibétains de Touen-houang*; La Vallée Poussin, *Catalogue from Tun-huang*.
- 37) Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana* 125–127; Tola and Dragonetti 40–44.
- 38) I am grateful to Dr. Izumi Miyazaki for kindly informing me of many of these citations.
- 39) La Vallée Poussin, *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* 533, 420, 488: *Catustave* (sic) in all three parts.
- 40) P 5277, śa169r2, śa174v8: *bsTod pa bzi pa las* in both parts.
- 41) Tucci, “Catuḥstavasamāsārtha” 246: *Catuḥstava-samāsārthaḥ*.
- 42) Tola and Dragonetti 4, lines 27–29.
- 43) This is mentioned in Miyazaki 53, note 109.
- 44) Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana* 128–139; Namdol 1–18.
- 45) *Catustave* (sic) ’py uktam: La Vallée Poussin, *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* 533.
- 46) *yathōktam ācārya-pādaiḥ*: La Vallée Poussin, *Prasannapadā* 413.
- 47) *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*: *des na slob dpon gyi źal śīa nas kyis kyañ*: Lindtner, “Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa” 120; *Madhyamakāvatāra-bhāṣya*: *ji skad du slob dpon gyi źal śīa nas kyī*: La Vallée Poussin, *Madhyamakāvatāra* 23.
- 48) *’phags pa Klu sgrub kyi źal śīa nas kyis ’Jig rten las ’das pa’i bstod pa las*: P 4534, nu95r2–3, 98v5–6; D 3711, tsu86r3–4, 89v2.
- 49) *’Jig rten las ’das par bstod pa las*: P 6143, ca37v7, 156r3, 184v2, 239v6; Ogawa 175, 224, 324.
- 50) *’Jig rten las ’das par bstod pa las*: Tsultrim Kelsang and Takada 68, 146.
- 51) *’Jig rten las ’das par bstod pa las kyañ*: Katano and Tsultrim Kelsang 22.
- 52) Exceptionally, *Lokātīstava* 13, 14, 16 and 26 do not praise the Buddha or are not expressed as the Buddha’s words. They are in the same style as *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, which does not praise the Buddha in general.
- 53) Tucci, “Two Hymns of Catuḥstava” 312–321; Namdol 19–35.
- 54) Apte appendix 11, left 10–20.
- 55) *Catustave* (sic) ’py: La Vallée Poussin, *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* 420, 488; *bsTod pa bzi pa las kyañ*: P 5277, śa169r2, 174v8; D 3875, śa143v6, 148v6.
- 56) P 5254, tsha327r2–3: *slob dpon ’phags pa Klu sgrub kyi źal mña’* (sic) *nas*; tsha327r5: *slob dpon ’phags pa Klu sgrub ñid kyi źal śīa nas kyañ*; tsha361r4: *slob dpon ñid kyi źal śīa nas*.
- 57) *Nāgārjuna-pādair apy uktam*: Shastri 22; *Klu sgrub kyi źal śīa nas kyañ*: Kajiyama and Mimaki 17.
- 58) P 2668, gi104r8.
- 59) *’phags pa Klu sgrub kyi źal śīa nas kyañ*: P 5344, ki298v3; D 3948, khi259r2.
- 60) Miyazaki 52.
- 61) *slob dpon Nāgārjuna’i źal śīa nas kyis kyañ*: P 4531, nu30v3; D 3708, tsu28v3.
- 62) *’di ñid slob dpon Klu sgrub kyi źal śīa nas kyis mÑam pa med par bstod pa las gsal bar mdzad pa ni*: P 4534, nu92v4; D 3711, tsu84r7.
- 63) *yad uktam āryena*: Li and Kanō 133.
- 64) On the other hand, in *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* the ideas of the author are expressed directly, not as the words of the Buddha. This difference between

- the two can be said to represent a difference between treatises and hymns.
- 65) Seyfort Ruegg 31–32; Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna and Tathāgatagarbha”; Mitrikeski, *Nāgārjuna’s Religious Practices* 90–111.
 - 66) Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana* 140–161; Namdol 37–72.
 - 67) *slob dpon ’phags pa Klu sgrub nid kyi ’zal sna nas*: P 5254, tsha327r2, r5; D 3854, tsha260r4, r6.
 - 68) Tsuda, “Bhavasamkrānti” 136.
 - 69) Sastri 82.
 - 70) Miyazaki 48–49.
 - 71) *slob dpon Klu sgrub kyi ’zal sna nas kyi bSam gyis mi khyab par bstod pa las*: P 4534, nu105r6–7; D 3711, tsu95v7; *’phags pa Klu sgrub kyi ’zal sna nas kyi bSam gyis mi khyab pa’i bstod pa las*: P nu102r2–3, 97r7–8; D tsu93r2, 88v5–6.
 - 72) *bSam gyis mi khyab par bstod pa las kyañ*: Katano and Tsultrim Kelsang 20.
 - 73) astiti śāśvata-grāho nāstīty uccheda-darśanam | *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XV-10ab.
astiti śāśvatī drṣṭir nāstīty uccheda-darśanam | *Acintyastava* 22ab.
 - 74) na nirvāṇa-samāropo na saṃsārāpakarṣaṇam | *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XVI-10ab.
 - 75) asti yad dhi svabhāvena na tan nāstīti śāśvatam |
nāstīdānīm abhūt pūrvam ity ucchedaḥ prasajyate || *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XV-11.
astīti kalpite bhāve samāropas tvayōditaḥ |
nāstīti kṛtakōcchedād ucchedaś ca prakāśitaḥ || *Acintyastava* 46.
 - 76) Tanji 347.
 - 77) Tsuda, “Acintyastava to Sanshōsetsu”; Tsuda, *Catuḥstava to Nāgārjuna* 47–68.
 - 78) Tucci, “Two Hymns of Catuḥstava” 322–325; Namdol 73–79.
 - 79) *’di dag nid ’phags pa Klu sgrub kyi Don dam par bstod pa las*: P 4534, nu102r1; D 3711, tsu93r1.
 - 80) *Don dam par bstod pa las kyañ*: P 5254, tsha357r7; D 3854, tsha283v2.
 - 81) *tathā ca Nāgārjunapādāḥ*: Kværne 190.
 - 82) *slob dpon ’phags pa Klu sgrub kyi ’zal (sic) nas kyañ*: P 5344, ki284r5; D 3948, khi246v4.
 - 83) Miyazaki 48–49.
 - 84) For example: katham stoṣyāmi te nātham anutpannam anālayam | 1ab,
na bhāvo nāpy abhāvo ’si nōcchedo nāpi śāśvataḥ | 4ab.
 - 85) *Paramārthastava* 1, 2, 9 and 10.
 - 86) Mitrikeski, “Nāgārjuna’s Devotional Practices” 164.
 - 87) T, one of the commentaries of *Catuḥstava*, explains that *dharmadhātu-gati* (*Paramārthastava* 8b) means *sarvadharmasūnyatā-mārga* (35r5).
 - 88) Goshima, “Indo Daijōbukkū” 24.

Abbreviations

As	<i>Acintyastava</i>
C	Cone edition of Tibetan Tripiṭaka
D	Derge edition of Tibetan Tripiṭaka
DhI–DhV	five Sanskrit manuscripts of <i>Lokātītastava</i> contained in <i>Dhāraṇī-saṃgrahas</i>
F (F')	Phug-brag manuscript
G	Gokhale manuscript of <i>Catuḥstava</i> (Lindtner, <i>Nagarjuniana</i> 123–124)
Ka	a Sanskrit edition of <i>Catuḥstava</i> (Namdol 90)
Kha	a Sanskrit edition of the four hymns, not as <i>Catuḥstava</i> (<i>ibid.</i> 90)
Ls	<i>Lokātītastava</i>
M	Mongolian manuscript of <i>Catuḥstava</i> (Lindtner, <i>Nagarjuniana</i> 123)
N	Narthaṅ edition of Tibetan Tripiṭaka
Ns	<i>Nirauḥpamyastava</i>
P	Peking edition of Tibetan Tripiṭaka
Ps	<i>Paramārthastava</i>
Ps*	<i>Āryabhaṭṭārakamañjuśrī-paramārthastuti</i>
S	Golden manuscript (gSer bris) of Tibetan Tripiṭaka
T	a manuscript of <i>Catuḥstava</i> kept in the University of Tokyo (Lindtner, <i>Nagarjuniana</i> 123)
W	Kathmandu manuscript of <i>Catuḥstava</i> (<i>ibid.</i> 124)

Bibliography

- Apte, Vaman Shivram. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. 1957–1959. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company, 1978.
- Bendall, Cecil. “Subhāṣita-saṃgraha.” *Le Muséon, Nouvelle Série* 4 (1903): 375–402.
- Chattopadhyaya, Alaka. *Tibetan Chronological Tables of 'Jam-dbyaṅs bzad-pa and Sum-pa mkhan-po*. The Dalai Lama Tibeto-Indological Series 12. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1993.
- dKar chag 'Phan than ma / sGra 'byor bam po gñis pa*. Peking: Min-zu publishing 民族出版社, 2003.
- Ejima Yasunori 江島恵教. “Nyūbodaigyōron no Chūshakubunken ni tsuite [『入菩提行論』の註釋文獻について].” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究14.2 (1966): 190–194.
- Erb, Felix. *Śūnyatāsaptativṛtti: Candrakīrtis Kommentar zu den „Siebzig Versen über die Leerheit“ des Nāgārjuna [Kārikās 1–14]: Einteilung, Übersetzung, textkritische Ausgabe des Tibetischen und Indizes*. Tibetan and Indo-Tibetan Studies 6. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997.
- Gnoli, Raniero. *Nāgārjuna: Le Stanze del Cammino di Mezzo (Madhyamaka kārikā)*. 1961. Biblioteca Boringhieri 205. Torino: Paolo Boringhieri, 1979.
- Goshima Kiyotaka 五島清隆. “Ryūju no Buddha Kan: Ryūju Bunkengun no Choshamondai wo Shiya ni irete [龍樹の佛陀觀：龍樹文獻群の著者問題を視野に入れて].” *Indogaku Chibettogaku Kenkyū* インド學チベット學研究 12

- (2008): 137–169.
- . “Indo Daijōbukkū ni okeru Gisho Gitaku no Mondai: tokuni Ryūju no Chosaku wo Chūshin ni shite [インド大乘佛教における偽書・擬託の問題：とくに龍樹の著作を中心にして].” *‘Gi’ narumono no ‘Shatei’: Kanjibunkaken no Shinbutsu to sono Shūhen* [「偽」なるものの「射程」：漢字文化圏の神佛とその周辺]. ed. Chimoto Hideshi 千本英史. (*Ajia Yūgaku* アジア遊學 161). Tokyo: Bensei Publishing, 2013. 18–30.
- Hachiriki Hiroki 八力廣喜. “Nāgārujuna no Shisanju: tokuni Lokātīstava to Acintyastava [ナーガルジュナの『四讃頌』：特にLokātīstavaとAcintyastava].” *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 155 (1986): 124–111.
- . “Chōsekensan Hukashigisan Shiyaku [『超世閑讃』・『不可思議讃』試譯].” *Indotetsugaku Bukkyōgaku* 印度哲學佛教學 1 (1986): 72–88.
- Hadano Hakuyū 羽田野伯猷. “Kādamuha Shi: Shiryōhen [カーダム派史：資料篇].” *Tōhoku Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyūnenpō* 東北大學文學部研究年報 5 (1956): 1–105.
- . “Chibetto Ruden Zenki no Ōshitsu Bukkyō Bikō: Chokusai Shōhin Vyutpatti to Mokuroku “Denkanruma” wo Megutte [チベット流傳前期の王室佛教備考：勅裁小品Vyutpattiと目録『デンカルマ』をめぐって].” *Chibetto Indo Gaku Shūsei* [チベット・インド學集成]. Vol. 1, 1983. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1986. 304–336.
- Harada Satoru 原田覺. “lDan dkar ma Mokuroku Kō [lDan dkar ma 目録考].” *Bukkyō Kyōri no Kenkyū: Tamura Yoshirō Hakase Kanreki Kinen Ronshū* [佛教教理の研究：田村芳朗博士還暦記念論集]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1982. 607–617.
- . “Toban Ōoku Yakkyōshi [吐蕃王國譯經史].” *Tōyō Gakujutsu Kenkyū* 東洋學術研究 21.2 (1982): 29–41.
- . “Toban Yakkyōshi [吐蕃譯經史].” *Kōza Tonkō 6: Tonkō Kogo Bunken* [講座敦煌 6: 敦煌胡語文獻]. ed. Yamaguchi Zuihō 山口瑞鳳. Tokyo: Daitō Publishing, 1985. 419–448.
- Kajiya Yūichi 梶山雄一 and Mimaki Katsumi 御牧克己. *Shōwa 59, 60 Nen-do Kagakukenkyūhi Hojokin (Ippankenkyū B) Kyōryōbu (Sautrāntika) Kenkyū Kenkyūseika Hōkokusho* [昭和59・60年度科學研究費補助金 (一般研究B) 經量部 (Sautrāntika) 研究 研究成果報告書]: 1) *The Tattvaratnāvali of Advayavajra (Tibetan Text)*, 2) *The Ye ses sñin po kun las btus pa'i mchan 'grel mu tig gi phren ba of 'Jam mgon 'ju Mi pham rgya mtsho*. 1986.
- Katano Michio 片野道雄 and Tsultrim Kelsang ツルティム・ケサン. *Tsonkapa Chūkantsugaku no Kenkyū II: Rekushēninpo Chūkanshō Wayaku* [ツォンカパ中觀哲學の研究 II: 『レクシェニンポ』中觀章 和譯]. Kyoto: Bun'eidō, 1998.
- Kawagoe Eishin 川越英眞. *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma*. Sendai: Tōhoku Indo Chibetto Kenkyūkai [東北インド・チベット研究會], 2005.
- . “Pantan Mokuroku no Kenkyū [『パンタン目録』の研究].” *Nihon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihō* 日本西藏學會々報 51 (2005): 115–131.
- Kuijp, Leonard W. J. van der. “Notes on the Transmission of Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvali in Tibet.” *The Tibet Journal* 10.2 (1985): 3–19.
- Kværne, Per. *An Anthology of Buddhist Tantric Songs*. 1977. Bangkok: White Orchid Press, 1986.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. *Prajñākaramati's Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of*

- Çāntideva (Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā)*. Bibliotheca Indica 983-1399. Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1901-1914.
- . *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. 1903-1913. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.
- . *Madhyamakāvatāra par Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 9. 1907-1912. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.
- . “Les Quatres Odes de Nāgārjuna.” *Le Muséon, Nouvelle Série* 14 (1913): 1-18.
- . *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Lalou, Marcelle. *Inventaire des Manuscrits Tibétains de Touen-houang, Conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Pelliot Tibétain)*. 3 vols. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1939-1961.
- . “Les Textes Bouddhiques au Temps du Roi Khri-sron-lde-bcan.” *Journal Asiatique* 241.3 (1953): 313-353.
- Lang, Karen Christina. “sPa-tshab nyi-ma-grags and the Introduction of Prāsaṅgika Madhyamaka into Tibet.” *Reflections on Tibetan Culture: Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie*. ed. L. Epstein and R. F. Sherburne. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990. 127-141.
- Li Xuezhu 李學竹 and Kanō Kazuo 加納和雄. “Bonbun Muni-ishu-shōgon Dai 1 Shō Matsubi no Kōtei to Wayaku (fol. 67v2-70r4): Chūkankōmyō Ichijōronshōdan no Genbun Kaishū [梵文『牟尼意趣莊嚴』第1章末尾の校訂と和譯 (fol. 67v2-70r4): 『中觀光明』一乘論証段の原文回収].” *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 232 (2014): 7-42.
- Lindtner, Christian. “Candrakīrti’s Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa.” *Acta Orientalia* 40 (1979): 87-145.
- . *Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1982.
- . “The Laṅkāvatārasūtra in Early Indian Madhyamaka Literature.” *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 46.1 (1992): 244-279.
- Lokesh Chandra. *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*. Vol. 28. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971.
- Mabbett, Ian. “The Problem of the Historical Nāgārjuna Revisited.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118.3 (1998): 332-346.
- Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai 密教聖典研究會. “Adovayavajura Chosakushū: Bonbun Tekisuto, Wayaku 1 [アドヴァヤヴァジュラ著作集：梵文テキスト・和譯1].” *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Nenpō* 大正大學綜合佛教研究所年報10 (1988): 1-57.
- Mimaki Katsumi 御牧克己. “Chibettogo Butten Gaikan [チベット語佛典概観].” *Chibetto no Gengo to Bunka: Kitamura Hajime Kyōju Taikankinen Ronbunshū* [チベットの言語と文化：北村甫教授退官記念論文集]. ed. Nagano Yasuhiko 長野泰彦 and Tachikawa Musashi 立川武藏. Tokyo: Tōjusha, 1987. 277-314.
- Mimaki, Katsumi and Tōru Tomabechi. *Pañcakrama: Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts Critically Edited with Verse Index and Facsimile Edition of the Sanskrit Manuscripts*. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 8. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, 1994.

- Mitrikeski, Drasko. *Nāgārjuna's Religious Practices Seen through the Analysis of his Hymns*. Diss. University of Sydney, 2008.
- . “Nāgārjuna's Devotional Practices: A Closer Look at the Paramārthastava.” *Literature and Aesthetics* 18.2 (2008): 156–170.
- . “Nāgārjuna and the Tathāgatagarbha: A Closer Look at Some Peculiar Features in the Niraupamyastava.” *Journal of Religious History* 33.2 (2009): 149–164.
- . “Nāgārjuna's Stutyatīstava and Catuḥstava: Questions of Authenticity,” *Modern Greek Studies* 14 (2010): 181–194.
- Miyazaki Izumi 宮崎泉. “Chūkan'upadēshakaihōkyō Tekisuto Yakuchū [『中觀優波提舍開寶篋』 テキスト・譯注].” *Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyūkiyō* 京都大學文學部研究紀要 46 (2007): 1–126.
- Murti, T. R. V. *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism: A Study of the Mādhyamika System*. 1955. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1960.
- Namdol, Gyaltzen. *Catuḥstavah of Ācārya Nāgārjuna (Sanskrit text with Tibetan version and Hindi translation)*. Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica Series 50. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2001.
- Nanjio, Bunyiu. *The Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1. Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1923.
- Naudou, Jean. *Les Bouddhistes Kaśmīriens au Moyen Age*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968.
- Nishioka Soshū 西岡祖秀. “Putun Bukkyōshi Mokurokubu Sakuin II [『プトゥン 佛教史』 目錄部索引 II].” *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Bunkakōryūkenkyūshisetsu Kiyō* 東京大學文學部文化交流研究施設紀要 5 (1981): 43–94.
- Ochi Junji 越智淳仁. “Puton no Ronsobu Mokuroku: 1. Raisanbu [プトンの論疏部 目錄：1. 禮讚部].” *Kōyasan Daigaku Ronsō* 高野山大學論叢 15 (1980): 53–132.
- Ogawa Ichijō 小川一乘. *Kūshōshisō no Kenkyū II* [空性思想の研究 II]. Kyoto: Bun'eidō, 1988.
- Patel, Prabhubhai. “Catustava.” *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 10 (1934): 82–89.
- Ray, Reginald A. “Nāgārjuna's Longevity.” *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia*. ed. Juliane Schober. 1997. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002. 129–159.
- Roerich, George N. *The Blue Annals*. Part 1. Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1949.
- Roñ-ston Śes-bya-kun-rig. *Roñ-ston Śākya-rgyal-mtshan gyi gSuñ skor*. Vol.B. Kathmandu: Sa skya rgyal yon's gsuñ rab slob gñer khañ, 1999. 267–362.
- Saito Akira 齋藤明. “Ryūju Saku Shisanju ni tsuite [龍樹作『四讚頌 (Catuḥstava)』 について].” *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 267 (1986): 163–165.
- Sakai Shinten (Shirō) 酒井眞典 (紫朗). “Ryūju Daishi no Shōgisan ni tsuite [龍樹大士の勝義讚について].” *Shitennōji* 四天王寺 214 (1958): 14.
- . “Shinkongōsan [心金剛讚 (龍樹讚歌集第2)].” *Shitennōji* 四天王寺 218 (1958): 24–25.
- . “Ryūju ni kiserareru Sanka: tokuni Shisan ni tsuite [龍樹に歸せられる讚歌：特に四讚について].” *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai Nenpō* 日本佛教學會年報 24 (1959): 1–44.
- . “Chōsantansan [超讚嘆讚 (龍樹讚歌集6)].” *Kōyasan Jihō* 高野山時報 1691

- (1963): 5.
- Sastri, N. Aiyaswami. *Bhavasāṅkrānti Sūtra and Nāgārjuna's Bhavasāṅkrānti Śāstra with the Commentary of Maitreya-nātha*. Madras: Adyar Library, 1938.
- Seyfort Ruegg, David. *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981.
- Shastri, M. H. *Advaya-vajrasaṃgraha*. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1927.
- Shirasaki Kenjō 白寄顯成. "Jitāri to Prajñākaramati: Jitāri no Ushinron Hihan [JitāriとPrajñākaramati: Jitāriの『有神論批判』]." *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 152 (1985): 96-74.
- Steinkellner, Ernst. *Śāntideva: Eintritt in das Leben zur Erleuchtung (Bodhicaryāvatāra)*. 1981. München: Eugen Diederichs Verlag, 1989.
- Tamura Chijun 田村智淳. "Purajunākaramati no Ushinron Hihan [プラジュナカラムティの有神論批判]." *Nanto Bukkyō* 南都佛教 27 (1971): 1-22.
- Tanji, Teruyoshi. "On Samāropa: Probing the Relationship of the Buddha's Silence and his Teaching." *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gad'jin M. Nagao*. ed. Jonathan A. Silk. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000. 347-368.
- Tāranātha. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*. Trans. Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya. ed. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1970.
- Teramoto Enga 寺本婉雅. *Tāranāta Indo Bukkyōshi* [ターラナータ印度佛教史]. Tokyo: Shūei-sha, 1928.
- Thakur, A. *Jñānaśrīmītra-nibandhāvali*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 5. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1959.
- Tola, Fernando and Carmen Dragonetti. "Nāgārjuna's Catustava." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 13.1 (1985): 1-54.
- Tsuda Akimasa 津田明雅. "Catuḥstava Tekisuto no Saikentō: Chūshakusho wo riyōshite [Catuḥstavaテキストの再検討：注釋書を利用して]." *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 44.2 (2002): 1-26.
- . "Acintyastava to Sanshōsetsu no Kankei ni tsuite [Acintyastavaと三性説の関係について]" *Nanto Bukkyō* 南都佛教 83 (2003): 98-128.
- . "Catuḥstava Chūshakusho ni tsuite [Catuḥstava注釋書について]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 52.1 (2003): 107-110.
- . *Catuḥstava to Nāgārjuna: Shochosaku no Shingisei* [Catuḥstavaとナーガールジュナ：諸著作の眞偽性]. Diss. Kyoto University, 2006.
- . "Nāgārjuna ni kiserareru Bhavasamkrānti ni tsuite [Nāgārjunaに歸せられるBhavasamkrāntiについて]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 62.1 (2013): 134-139.
- . "Pudaku Shahon ni osamerareru Shosanka ni tsuite [ブダク寫本に收められる諸讃歌について]." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 63.1 (2014): 152-157.
- Tsukamoto Keishō 冢本啓祥, Matsunaga Yūkei 松長有慶 and Isoda Hirofumi 磯田熙文. *Bongo Butten no Kenkyū* III: Ronsho Hen [梵語佛典の研究 III 論書篇]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1990.
- Tsultrim Kelsang ツルティム・ケサン and Takada Yorihiro 高田順仁. *Tsonkapa Chūkantetsugaku no Kenkyū I: Bodaidōshidairon Chūhen Kan no Shō Wayaku* [ツォ

- ンカパ中觀哲學の研究 I : 「菩提道次第論・中篇」觀の章 和譯]. Kyoto: Bun'eidō, 1996.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. "Two Hymns of the Catuḥstava of Nāgārjuna." *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1932): 309–325.
- . "Catuḥstavasamāsārtha of Amṛtākara." *Minor Buddhist Texts I*. Roma: Is. M. E. O., 1956. 233–246.
- Vaidya, P. L. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā: with Haribhadra's Commentary Called Āloka*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 4. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960.
- Varghese, Mathew. *Exploring the Structure of Emptiness: Philosophical Hermeneutics of the Text Catuḥstava of Nāgārjuna: A Translation and Interpretation*. New Delhi: Sanctum Books, 2012.
- Vetter, Tilmann. "On the Authenticity of the Ratnāvalī." *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 46.1 (1992): 492–506.
- Walser, Joseph. "Nāgārjuna and the Ratnāvalī: New Ways to Date an Old Philosopher." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25.1/2 (2002): 209–262.
- . *Nāgārjuna in Context: Mahāyāna Buddhism and Early Indian Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Williams, Paul. Rev. of *Nagarjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*, by Christian Lindtner. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 12.1 (1984): 73–104.
- Wogihara, Unrai. *Abhisamayālaṃkāra'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*. 1932–1935. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1973.
- Yamaguchi Zuihō 山口瑞鳳. "Toban Ōoku Bukkyōshi Nendai Kō [吐蕃王國佛教史年代考]." *Naritasan Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Kiyō* 成田山佛教研究所紀要 3 (1978): 1–52.
- . "Denkaruma 824 Nen Seiritsusetsu [『デンカルマ』 八二四年成立説]." *Naritasan Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Kiyō* 成田山佛教研究所紀要 9 (1985): 1–61.