



Madhyamaka

Paul Donnelly

Introduction

The Madhyamaka (Middle Way) school, along with the Yogācāra, is one of the two major schools of Indian Mahayana Buddhist thought, which flourished there from the 3rd century CE to the final destruction of Buddhism in India in about the 12th century. It was carried to East Asia and Tibet prior to this time and continues there to this day, surviving in scholastic Tibetan Buddhism, Zen, and even Pure Land, frequently regarded as the cornerstone of Mahayana thought. The name “middle way” refers to a fundamental claim in Buddhism that the teachings of the Buddha constitute a middle way between eternalism and annihilationism; that is, between the doctrine that things have a stable and eternal essence, and the doctrine that things pass utterly out of existence when they cease. “Mādhyamika” is the adjectival form, and refers to adherents of the Madhyamaka school. Though central Madhyamaka ideas such as the Two Truths and Emptiness can be found in Nikaya Buddhism and in Mahayana sutras, it is with the treatises of Nāgārjuna (2nd–3rd centuries CE) that we have a fully formed and distinct system of thought that we can call Madhyamaka. In Nāgārjuna’s texts, he subjects all phenomena, including the Abhidharma categories of dharmas and the structure of the Two Truths, to radical analysis, declaring all things, including the Four Noble Truths and the Buddha himself, to be empty of inherent nature. For the Abhidharmikas, dharmas possess their characteristics intrinsically, which make them uniquely what they are, despite accepting the paradigmatic Buddhist position that all things exist dependently. Nāgārjuna and the Mādhyamikas assert that dharmas cannot possess their own nature precisely because they exist dependently. In place of inherent nature, Nāgārjuna asserts that things exist only dependently, at least in conventional terms, and that ultimately, emptiness of inherent nature is the truth and reality of all things. Not surprisingly, numerous interpreters arose to elucidate this difficult philosophy. The question of which commentator is definitive has occupied many generations of Indian, East Asian, and Tibetan Buddhists, and the issue remains very much alive in modern scholarship. Much of the interest in Western scholarship has come, unsurprisingly, from philosophy, but it warrants noting that the intent of Madhyamaka, like all Buddhist thought, is primarily soteriological in nature.

General Overviews

Hamilton 2001 is an overview of Indian philosophy that contextualizes Madhyamaka in Buddhism and in the broader trends of Indian thought. Robinson, et al. 2005 is the best, most comprehensive volume on Buddhism overall. Hayes 2010 is an excellent online overview of Madhyamaka. Ruegg 1981 covers the entire development of Madhyamaka in India, from the works of Nāgārjuna to those of the last Indian commentators. Nagao 1989 is significant in that it examines Madhyamaka in relation to Yogācāra, which is the other fundamental school of thought that informs Mahayana Buddhism in India and the regions to which it spread. Ruegg 2010 is a ground-breaking analysis of the argumentative method of Nāgārjuna by a great Madhyamaka scholar. Siderits 2007 surveys the philosophical positions of early Buddhists, and Mahayana thought, in order to assess the philosophical contributions of Madhyamaka. Westerhoff 2009 provides an overview of Madhyamaka and argues that the writings of Nāgārjuna constitute a coherent philosophical system.

Hamilton, Sue. *Indian Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

This wonderfully clear and concise book on Indian philosophy has an excellent discussion of Nāgārjuna’s thought as laid out in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, and situates it within the religious and philosophical context in India.

Hayes, Richard. “Madhyamaka.” In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. 2010.

A comprehensive and insightful overview of the Madhyamaka tradition, including the major figures in India and their works and contributions.

Nagao, Gadjin. *The Foundational Standpoint of Mādhyamika Philosophy*. Translated by John P. Keenan. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.

A seminal work of the great Japanese scholar; Nagao sees Madhyamaka as forming a coherent whole with Yogācāra, which is the foundation of all Mahayana thought and practice.

Robinson, Richard, Willard Johnson, and Thanissaro Bhikkhu. *Buddhist Religions: A Historical Introduction*. 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2005.

This work is probably the best overall overview of Buddhist history and doctrine. Chapters 4 and 5 cover the rise of the Mahayana and contextualize the Madhyamaka within the greater complex of changes that characterized the Mahayana.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India. A History of Indian Literature 7*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981.

A foundational work in Madhyamaka studies, this work covers all the important figures of the tradition with in-depth studies of some of the most influential texts.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. “The Uses of the Four Positions of the *Catuṣkoṭi* and the Problem of the Description of Reality in Mahāyāna Buddhism.” In *The Buddhist Philosophy of the Middle: Essays on Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka*. By David Seyfort Ruegg, 37–112. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2010.

A foundational article from one the greatest scholars of Madhyamaka studies. The volume also includes essays on other issues in Nāgārjuna’s texts, Tibetan interpretations, and the role of philosophy in the study of Buddhism.

Siderits, Mark. *Buddhism as Philosophy: An Introduction*. Ashgate World Philosophies Series. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007.

A masterful overview of Buddhist thought from a philosophical perspective, by one of the foremost scholars of Madhyamaka. Chapter 9 specifically examines Madhyamaka as philosophy.

Westerhoff, Jan. *Nāgārjuna’s Madhyamaka: A Philosophical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

An excellent overview of Madhyamaka based on the works of Nāgārjuna. Westerhoff contextualizes Madhyamaka within Indian thought and Buddhism, highlighting central Buddhist philosophical issues such as the question of inherent nature and the Two Truths, and examines Madhyamaka assumptions about argumentation and epistemology.

Key Texts

The rise of the Mahayana is characterized by the appearance of new texts attributed to the Buddha himself. These new sutras included some, most notably the Perfection of Wisdom sutras, that questioned or flatly rejected the position that, while self was utterly illusory, the dynamic processes upon which a self was wrongly imputed actually had an ontological status. In these sutras we read that the five aggregates are empty of inherent nature. Madhyamaka thought is traditionally understood as elucidating the meaning of such assertions in the Perfection of Wisdom sutras, but more significant to Madhyamaka are the numerous treatises (śāstras) by Nāgārjuna and his commentators. In these texts, arguments are made to demonstrate how and why this way of expressing the dharma is not only justified, but is in fact the actual and final intent of the Buddha’s teachings.

PERFECTION OF WISDOM (PRAJÑĀPARĀMITĀ) SUTRAS

Mahayana Buddhists in India, as well as in East Asia and Tibet, regarded the canonical sources of Madhyamaka thought to be found in the Perfection of Wisdom sutras. This genre of sutra focuses on the six, or ten, perfections of the Bodhisattva, culminating in the perfection of wisdom itself, called, among other things, the “mother of all the Buddhas.” It is in these texts that we find the bald assertion that all things, even the categories of existent things accepted in the Abhidharma, are said to be empty, or lack any inherent nature. This is typically asserted without argumentation, but it is said to be true from the perspective of a Buddha’s wisdom. Gomez 1976 explores the precedents for the Madhyamaka concept of emptiness in the Pali Canon. Conze 1985 is the classic translation of the 18,000-line version of the text. Conze 1994 is a translation of the shorter 8,000-line text. Conze 2001 contains translations of the *Heart Sūtra*, undoubtedly one of the most important sutras in Mahayana Buddhism, and the *Diamond Sūtra*. Lopez 1998 is a study of *The Heart Sūtra* utilizing Indian commentaries.

Conze, Edward, trans. *The Perfection of Wisdom Sutra in Eight Thousand Lines with Its Verse Commentary*. Delhi: Sri Satguru, 1994.

The classic English translation of the 8,000-line *Prajñāpāramitā*, first published in 1973.

Conze, Edward, trans. *The Large Sutra on the Perfection of Wisdom: With the Divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra*. Berkeley, CA: Center for South and Southeast Asia Studies, 1985.

A translation of the 18,000-line version, with the classic text by Asaṅga, first published in 1975.

Conze, Edward, trans. *Buddhist Wisdom: Containing the Diamond Sutra and the Heart Sutra*. New York: Vintage, 2001.

First published in 1959, this volume contains standard translations of two fundamental Mahayana texts, with introductions and commentaries by Conze.

Gomez, Luis. “Proto-Madhyamaka in the Pali Canon.” *Philosophy East and West* 26.2 (1976): 137–165.

This pioneering article examines precedents for the Madhyamaka concept of emptiness in the *suttas* of the Pali Canon.

Lopez, Donald S. *Elaborations on Emptiness: Uses of the Heart Sutra*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

An insightful translation and commentary of eight Indian commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra*.

TREATISES BY NĀGĀRJUNA

Nāgārjuna (2nd–3rd centuries CE) is recognized, both traditionally and by modern scholarship, as the founder of the Madhyamaka

tradition. In the Tibetan canon, there are 116 texts of various kinds ascribed to Nāgārjuna. The focus of most modern scholarly interest has been on just a few of these. Disagreement remains about which of them can be reliably attributed to Nāgārjuna. Tibetan Buddhist traditions frequently divide the works of Nāgārjuna into three categories: the argumentative texts (*rigs tshogs*), the hymns (*bstod tshogs*), and advice texts (*gtam tshogs*). This discussion follows this organization for the sake of consistency, but it does not include the advice texts, since they are not typically emphasized traditionally or in modern treatments of Madhyamaka, and it adds a selection of modern collections that include texts from more than one of the traditional categories.

Critical Editions of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*

The majority of the modern scholarship on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, the paradigmatic Madhyamaka text, has been done on the basis of La Vallée Poussin 1970, accompanied by the Sanskrit text of Candrakīrti's (6th–7th centuries CE) commentary, the *Prasannapadā*. This edition was compiled from three manuscripts and utilized the Tibetan translation to correct scribal errors or lacunae. The Tibetan text is included in the footnotes. Building on this edition, de Jong 1977 integrated many corrections based on a fourth Sanskrit manuscript discovered in Nepal. Ye 2011 is the newest edition of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, though it is an incomplete version of the text.

de Jong, J. W., ed. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ*. Adyar Library Series 109. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1977.

This edition was created on the basis of La Vallée Poussin, with corrections based on a fourth manuscript. The text consists only of Nāgārjuna's verses; it does not include Candrakīrti's commentary.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de, ed. *Mūlamadhayamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. Osnabrück, Germany: Biblio Verlag, 1970.

This is the reprint of the original publication from the 1903–1913 edition, on which most translations and studies are based.

Ye Shaoyong 叶少勇. “*Zhong lun song*” *yu* “*Fohu shi*”: *ji yu xin fa xian Fan wen xie ben de wen xian xue yan jiu* (“中论颂” 与 “佛护释”: 基于新发现梵文写本的文献学研究. 中西書局). Shanghai: Zhong xi shu ju, 2011.

The most recent, but partial, critical edition of the *Mūlamadhayamakakārikās*, which takes into account a newly discovered Sanskrit manuscript of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* with the commentary of Buddhapālita found in Tibet.

Translations of Nāgārjuna's Works

As some modern scholars have pointed out, modern translations of Nāgārjuna's texts, like all translations, reflect various interpretive assumptions, both traditional and modern. Whether one takes the Chinese or Tibetan translations and interpretations as authoritative, whether Nāgārjuna is seen principally as a religious or philosophical writer, or whether Nāgārjuna's arguments are primarily about what one can say about reality (the semantic interpretation), or about that reality itself (the metaphysical interpretation), will inform how the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and other Madhyamaka texts will be expressed in English or other European languages.

THE *MŪLAMADHYAMAKAKĀRIKĀ*

The *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* is uncontroversially regarded as Nāgārjuna's masterwork and has been used by many modern scholars as the test case by which texts are judged authentic compositions of Nāgārjuna. Other texts of the Collection of Argumentative Works are the *Śūnyatāsaptatī*, *Yuktiśaṣṭikā*, *Vaidalyaprakaraṇa*, and *Vigrahavyāvartanī*.

English Translations

Streng 1967 consists of an extensive study of the religious significance of Nāgārjuna's use of the concept of emptiness, and a full translation of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* is given as an appendix. Inada 1970 is a translation from the Sanskrit, and in the brief introductory chapter and the short introductions to the chapters of the translation, Inada takes the Chinese translation and commentaries into account. Each chapter of Inada's translation begins with a brief introduction to the subject of that chapter of Nāgārjuna's text, followed by the translation without commentary. Kalupahana 1986 is a translation from the Sanskrit that includes a running verse-by-verse commentary. Kalupahana asserts that the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* is, in fact, a commentary on the *Kaccāyanagotta Sutta* found in the Theravada Pali Canon, and hence is not a text that should be classified as a Mahayana work. Bocking 1995 is a translation from Kumārajīva's (b. 44–d. 413) Chinese translation and includes a discussion of Nāgārjuna's impact on Chinese Buddhist lineages. Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso 2002 is a practitioner-oriented full translation of the text that includes several useful appendices. Garfield and Samten 2006 (cited under Geluk) is a translation of the commentary by Tsong kha pa (b. 1357–d. 1419) and aims to bring Nāgārjuna's text into modern philosophical discourse. Siderits and Katsura 2013 is the latest, and best, English translation of the root text available, and it provides a sophisticated yet accessible introduction to Madhyamaka.

Bocking, Brian, trans. *Nāgārjuna in China: A Translation of the Middle Treatise*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1995.

English translation of Kumārajīva's translation into Chinese. Includes the commentary of the Chinese monk Piṅgala as well as a discussion of Nāgārjuna's importance in East Asian Buddhism.

Inada, Kenneth K., ed. *Nāgārjuna: A Translation of His Mūlamadhyamakakārikā with an Introductory Essay*. Tokyo: Hokuseido, 1970.

The translation is from the Sanskrit, but Inada also draws from Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of Nāgārjuna's text with the commentary by Piṅgala, as well as on the *Prasannapadā*.

Kalupahana, David J., ed. *Nāgārjuna: The Philosophy of the Middle Way*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986.

This translation from the Sanskrit includes a verse-by-verse commentary. Kalupahana argues that Nāgārjuna's ideas were not original and are, in fact, wholly consistent with early Buddhist thought.

Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso. *The Sun of Wisdom: Teachings on the Noble Nagarjuna's Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way*. Translated by Ari Goldfield. Boston and London: Shambhala, 2002.

Khenpo Gyamtso's teachings on the text are based on the Tibetan translation and utilize the commentary of 'Ju Mi pham (b. 1846–d. 1912). Appendices include selections from Nāgārjuna's root text, the *Heart Sūtra*, selections from Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvatāra*, and a song of Milarepa.

Siderits, Mark, and Shōryū Katsura. *Nāgārjuna's Middle Way: the Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2013.

A translation from the Sanskrit that draws upon the four extant Indian commentaries and includes a modern commentary that is clear and concise, yet lets the reader see how the text has been interpreted from numerous perspectives, both ancient and modern.

Streng, Frederick. *Emptiness: A Study in Religious Meaning*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1967.

This was the first full English translation of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Unlike most of the subsequent translations, Streng emphasizes the soteriological nature of the text, especially the concept of emptiness.

Translations into Other European Languages

Translations of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* into the other major European languages were made from the very beginning of modern scholarship on Buddhism. The translations included here are all relatively recent and thus benefit both from the early translations and from more recent scholarship. Bugault 2002 and Driessens 1995 are translations into French. Bugault 2002 is a translation from the Sanskrit text, and Driessens 1995 is from the Tibetan. Geldsetzer 2010 and Weber-Brosamer and Back 1997 are German translations. Geldsetzer 2010 is translated from the Chinese translation of the original text. Weber-Brosamer and Back 1997 is based on the Sanskrit text. Gnoli 1961 is a translation of the Sanskrit text into Italian.

Bugault, Guy, ed. and trans. *Stances du milieu par excellence de Nāgārjuna Madhyamaka-kārikās*. Paris: Gallimard, 2002.

This work is a French translation of the Sanskrit text, with commentary by the translator.

Driessens, Georges, trans. *Le Traité du Milieu*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1995.

A translation into French of the Tibetan translation.

Geldsetzer, Lutz, ed. and trans. *Die Lehre von der Mitte: Chinesisch-Deutsch*. Philosophische Bibliothek 610. Hamburg, Germany: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2010.

This work is a German translation of the Chinese translation by Kumārajīva. It includes a commentary on the text by the translator.

Gnoli, Raniero, ed. and trans. *Nāgārjuna: Madhyamaka Kārikā: Le stanze del cammino di mezzo*. Enciclopedia di autori classici 61. Turin, Italy: P. Boringhieri, 1961.

This pioneering work is an Italian translation of the Sanskrit verses.

Weber-Brosamer, Bernhard, and Dieter M. Back. *Die Philosophie der Leere: Nāgārjunas Mūlamadhyamaka-Kārikās: Übersetzung des buddhistischen Basistextes mit kommentierenden Einführungen*. Beiträge zur Indologie 28. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997.

This abundantly annotated translation is based on the de Jong Sanskrit edition and includes a commentary by Weber-Brosamer.

OTHER TEXTS OF THE COLLECTION OF ARGUMENTATIVE WORKS

The *Śūnyatāsaptatī* is a short text of seventy-three verses that deals with the central Madhyamaka concept of emptiness (*śūnyatā*). It is accompanied by a commentary said to be authored by Nāgārjuna himself. It exists only in Tibetan translation. Erb 1990 is a German translation that includes a partial translation of Candrakīrti's commentary on the text. The *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* is a text consisting of sixty-one verses that deal with dependent arising (*pratītyasamutpāda*) as free from the conceptual extremes of existence and nonexistence. It is extant in both Chinese and Tibetan translations. Loizzo 2007 is a translation into English that includes an extensive commentary. Schrerrer-Schaub 1991 is a French translation of the text with the commentary by Candrakīrti. A translation by the modern-day Tibetan scholar Thupten Jinpa is available through the Institute of Tibetan Classics. The *Vaidalyaprakaraṇa* is a work that critiques the sixteen

logical categories of Nyāya philosophy. It exists only in Tibetan translation. Tola and Dragonetti 1995 is a translation with modern commentary. The *Vigrahavyāvartinī* is a seventy-verse text that answers objections to Nāgārjuna’s views expressed in his other works. It is available in the original Sanskrit and also in Chinese and Tibetan translations. Bhattacharya, et al. 1990 is a critical edition of the Sanskrit text and a translation. Westerhoff 2010 includes a translation along with an extensive philosophical commentary. Lindtner 1987 is a very useful single-volume collection of Nāgārjuna’s shorter argumentative works, with translations, editions, and studies of several of them. Della 2002 is an online resource for some of this material.

Bhattacharya, Kamaleswar, E. H. Johnston, and Arnold Kunst, eds. and trans. *The Dialectical Method of Nāgārjuna: Vigrahavyāvartinī*. 3d ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.

This volume contains the Sanskrit text in both Devanāgarī and Roman script, and a translation.

Della Santina, Peter. *Causality and Emptiness: The Wisdom of Nāgārjuna*. Singapore: Buddhist Research Society, 2002.

This accessible work contains translations of the *Suḥrillekha*, *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā*, *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, and *Śūnyatāsaptatī*.

Erb, Felix Raymond. “Die Śūnyatāsaptatī des Nāgārjuna und die Śūnyatāsaptatīvr̥tti [verse 1–32] (unter Berücksichtigung der Kommentare Candrakīrtis, Parahitas und des zweiten Dalai Lama).” PhD diss., University of Hamburg, 1990.

A German translation of the text and thirty-two verses of the commentary by Candrakīrti.

Lindtner, Christian. *Nāgārjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987.

This volume includes full translations and editions of *Śūnyatāsaptatī* and the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, editions of the *Vigrahavyāvartinī*, and the existing fragments of *Vyavahārasiddhi*.

Loizzo, Joseph, trans. *Nāgārjuna’s Reason Sixty (Yuktiṣaṣṭikā) with Candrakīrti’s Commentary (Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvr̥tti)*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

This is the first book-length study of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* with its commentary by Candrakīrti. It includes interpretive essays, a thoroughly annotated translation from the Tibetan, editions of Nāgārjuna’s and Candrakīrti’s texts, topical outlines, and a glossary.

Schrerrer-Schaub, Cristina Anna, trans. *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvr̥tti: Commentaire à la soixantaine sur le raisonnement ou Du vrai enseignement de la causalité par le Maître indien Candrakīrti*. Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 25. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoise, 1991.

A French translation of Candrakīrti’s commentary that includes Nāgārjuna’s text.

Tola, Fernando, and Carmen Dragonetti, eds. and trans. *Nāgārjuna’s Refutation of Logic (Nyāya): Vaidalyaprakaraṇa*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995.

This work consists of a complete translation of Nāgārjuna’s text with an extensive verse-by-verse commentary.

Westerhoff, Jan, ed. and trans. *The Dispeller of Disputes: Nāgārjuna’s Vigrahavyāvartinī*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,

2010.

A translation from the Sanskrit, with an excellent extensive commentary on the text.

The Collection of Hymns

The hymns have received relatively little attention in Western scholarship, despite their importance in the Tibetan traditions and many scholars’ acceptance that at least some of these texts were likely written by the same author as the *Mūlamadhyakakārikā*. In Tibet, for the proponents of the more cataphatic “other-emptiness” (*gzhan stong*) doctrine, the hymns have been revered as expressing Nāgārjuna’s final philosophical position. The group of four hymns that constitutes the *Catuhstava* are accepted by the Tibetan traditions and many Western scholars as authentic writings of the author of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Tucci 1932 offers a translation of two of the four hymns, and Lindtner 1987 features the two remaining hymns of the collection. Tola and Dragonetti 1985 is a study and translation of all four. Though not accepted by most modern scholars as authored by Nāgārjuna, the *Dharmadhatustava* has been important in the Tibetan tradition and is the only one of Nāgārjuna’s hymns to be translated into Chinese. Ruegg 1971 is the first extensive study of this hymn. Brunnhölzl 2007 is a complete translation of the text and includes an introductory essay that provides a welcome overview of the Kargyü sect’s understanding of Nāgārjuna and his works.

Brunnhölzl, Karl, trans. *In Praise of Dharmadhātu*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2007.

A translation of the hymn attributed to Nāgārjuna by the Tibetan traditions. This volume includes the commentary by the Third Karmapa, Rangjung Dorje (b. 1284–d. 1339) and a very useful discussion of the hymns more generally, including the question of their authorship.

Lindtner, Christian. *Nāgārjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987.

Contains translation of the *Lokāṭīṭastava* and *Acintyastava*.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. “Le *Dharmadhātustava* de Nāgārjuna.” In *Études tibetaïnes de la memoire de Marcelle Lalou*. Edited by Ariane Macdonald, 448–471. Paris: A. Maisonneuve, 1971.

This work in French is the definitive scholarly study of this important text.

Tola, Fernando, and Carmen Dragonetti. “Nāgārjuna’s *Catuhstava*.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 13 (1985): 1–54.

This article contains an exhaustive discussion of the *Catuhstava*, including a summary of the earlier scholarly discussion of these texts. There are editions of the Sanskrit texts and translations for each of the four hymns, as well as an appendix that consists of an edition and translation of the Tibetan text of another hymn, the *Cittavajra*, which some scholars have held to be a part of the *Catuhstava*.

Tucci, Giuseppe. “Two Hymns of the *Catuh-stava* of Nāgārjuna.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 2 (1932): 309–325.

Tucci’s article includes translations of the *Niraupamyastava* and *Paramārthastava*.

Treatises of Āryadeva

Āryadeva (2nd–3rd centuries CE) is traditionally understood to have been a direct disciple of Nāgārjuna. His major text, the *Catuhśataka*, traces the bodhisattva’s path from the cultivation of virtues all the way to the attainment of full awakening. Candrakīrti wrote a commentary that emphasizes the practical overcoming of obstacles to the realization of truth and awakening. The complete text is extant only in Tibetan, and Lang 1986 is the first full translation of Āryadeva’s text into English. Tillemans 1990 contains a translation of chapters 12 and 13, as well as the commentaries of Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti. Lang 2004 is a full translation of Candrakīrti’s commentary, along with an extensive introductory chapter. Geshe Sonam Rinchen 2008 is a translation of the *Catuhśataka* along with the commentary by Geluk scholar rGyal-mtshabs dar-ma rin-chen and a contemporary commentary from the Geluk perspective.

Geshe Sonam Rinchen, Ruth Sonam, trans. *Āryadeva’s Four Hundred Stanzas on the Middle Way, with Commentary by Gyeltsap*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion. 2008.

A practitioner-oriented translation from the Tibetan, with commentary by Geluk scholar rGyal-mtshabs Dar-ma Rin-chen.

Lang, Karen C. *Āryadeva’s Catuhśataka: On the Bodhisattva’s Cultivation of Method and Knowledge*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag. 1986.

The first complete translation of the *Catuhśataka* into English.

Lang, Karen C. *Four Illusions: Candrakīrti’s Advice for Travelers on the Bodhisattva Path*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

A translation of Candrakīrti’s commentary on the *Catuhśataka*.

Tillemans, Tom J. F. *Materials for the Study of Āryadeva, Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti: The Catuhśataka of Āryadeva, Chapters XII and XIII, with the Commentaries of Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti: Introduction, Translation, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese Texts, Notes*. 2 vols. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 36. Vienna: Arbeitskreis Für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 1990.

An extensive text-critical resource for study of Āryadeva’s text. This work is particularly valuable in that we have, in addition to Candrakīrti’s commentary, one by the Yogācāra writer Dharmapāla.

Treatises of Buddhapālita

Buddhapālita (b. 470–d. 540) is considered by Tibetan scholars to be the originator of the Prāsaṅgika school of Madhyamaka interpretation, though this is essentially because Buddhapālita’s commentary is vigorously defended by Candrakīrti against the critiques of Bhāvaviveka. Saito 1984 is an unpublished but invaluable edition of the text that includes a partial English translation. Ye 2011 contains an incomplete edition of Buddhapālita’s commentary, and an incomplete edition of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

Saito, Akira. “A Study of the *Buddhapālita-Mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti*.” PhD diss., Australian National University, 1984.

This dissertation includes a critical edition of the entire text and an English translation of chapters 1–16.

Ye Shaoyong 叶少勇. “*Zhong lun song*” *yu* “*Fohu shi*”: *Ji yu xin fa xian Fan wen xie ben de wen xian xue yan jiu* (“中论颂”与

“佛护释”: 基于新发现梵文写本的文献学研究). Shanghai: Zhong xi shu ju, 2011.

If Ye's dating is correct, these 7th-century manuscripts, discovered in Tibet, are the oldest extant Sanskrit Madhyamaka texts.

Treatises of Bhāviveka

The sixth-century Mādhyamika Bhāviveka (much of the early scholarship accepted the form *Bhāvaviveka*) provides a thorough commentary on Nāgārjuna's text, the *Prajñāpradīpa*, and critiques the commentary of Buddhapālita on numerous points, most importantly his perceived failure to establish arguments capable of refuting his opponents' views. His approach shows the influence of developments in Buddhist epistemology associated with Dignāga (c. 480–540). Bhāviveka is considered by the Tibetan traditions to be the founder of the Svātantrika school of interpretation. Bhāviveka also wrote an independent verse treatise on Madhyamaka, the *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā*, with a prose commentary. In this work he surveys and critiques the perspective of non-Mahayana Buddhists, Yogācārins, and the six philosophical systems of Hinduism. Hence, this text contains a snapshot of the range of philosophical positions current in India in the 6th century.

THE *PRAJÑĀPRADĪPA*

Walleser 1914 is an edition of the Tibetan text of the first chapter and part of the second. The text has been partially translated into European languages. Kajiyama 1963 is a German translation of the important first chapter. Ames 1994, Ames 1995, Ames 1999, and Ames 2000 translate the first seven chapters into English.

Ames, William. “Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa*: A Translation of Chapter One: ‘Examination of Causal Conditions’ (*Pratyaya*), Part One.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 21 (1994): 209–259.

Contains a translation of the first chapter of the *Prajñāpradīpa*.

Ames, William. “Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa*: A Translation of Chapter Two: ‘Examination of the Traversed, the Untraversed, and That Which Is Being Traversed.’” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 23 (1995): 295–365.

A translation of the second chapter of Bhāviveka's commentary.

Ames, William. “Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa*: A Translation of Chapters Three, Four, and Five: Examining the Āyatanas, Aggregates, and Elements.” *Buddhist Literature* 1 (1999): 1–119.

Translates three chapters of the *Prajñāpradīpa*.

Ames, William. “Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa*: A Translation of Chapters Six, Examination of Desire and the One Who Desires, and Seven, Examination of Origin, Duration and Cessation.” *Buddhist Literature* 2 (2000): 1–91.

Contains a translation of two chapters of the *Prajñāpradīpa*.

Kajiyama, Yūichi. “Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa* (1. Kapitel).” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 7 (1963): 37–62.

This work is a German translation of the first chapter of Bhāviveka's text.

Walleser, Max. *Madhyamakakārikā's 1.1–2.25 (with Bhāvaviveka's "Prajñāpradīpa")*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1914.

An edition of the first chapter and part of the second chapter, from the Tibetan translation.

THE *MADHYAMAKAHRDAYAKĀRIKĀ* WITH ITS COMMENTARY, THE *TARKAJVĀLA*

Watanabe 1998 contains a translation of the third chapter of the text, where Bhāviveka lays out his own position on the knowledge of reality. Heitmann 2004 contains a translation of the first three chapters of the text. Eckel 2009 contains a translation and study of the fourth and fifth chapters, on the view of the Śrāvakas and the Yogācārins. Hoornaert 1999, Hoornaert 2000, Hoornaert 2001a, and Hoornaert 2001b are translations of the chapter on Yogācāra.

Eckel, Malcolm David. *Bhāviveka and His Buddhist Opponents: Chapters 4 and 5 of the Verses on the Heart of the Middle Way (Madhyamakahrdayakārikā) with the Commentary Entitled the Flame of Reason (Tarkajvāla)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

A translation and in-depth study of the chapters on the Śrāvakas and the Yogācārins.

Heitmann, Annette L. *Nektar der Erkenntnis: Buddhistische Philosophie des 6. Jh.: Bhavyas Tarkajvala I-III*. 26. Aachen, Germany: Shaker, 2004.

A German translation of the first three chapters of the *Tarkjvālā*, which cover the cultivation and maintenance of *bodhicitta*, Buddhist vows, and the striving for ultimate truth.

Hoornaert, Paul. “An Annotated Translation of *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā/Tarkajvāla V 1–7*.” *Studies and Essays: Behavioral Sciences and Philosophy* 19 (1999): 127–159.

Translation of chapter five, verses 1–7 of Bhāviveka's root text, with his sommentary.

Hoornaert, Paul. “An Annotated Translation of *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā/Tarkajvāla V 8–26*.” *Studies and Essays: Behavioral Sciences and Philosophy* 20 (2000): 75–111.

Translation of chapter five, verses 8–26.

Hoornaert, Paul. “An Annotated Translation of *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā/Tarkajvāla V 27–54*.” *Studies and Essays: Behavioral Sciences and Philosophy* 21 (2001a): 149–190.

Translation of verses 27–54 of chapter five.

Hoornaert, Paul. “An Annotated Translation of *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā/Tarkajvāla V 55–68*.” *Hokuriku-Shūkyōbunka* 13 (2001b): 13–47.

Translation of chapter five, verses 55–68.

Watanabe, Chikafumi. “A Translation of the *Madhyamakahrdayakārikā* with the *Tarkajvālā* III. 137–146.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 21.1 (1998): 125–155.

An English translation of part of chapter three of Bhāviveka’s text. This chapter is the one in which he establishes his Madhyamaka view.

Treatises of Candrakīrti

From the 11th century on in Tibet, Candrakīrti came to be regarded by most of the major scholars and sects in Tibet as the definitive interpreter of Nāgārjuna’s *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, and his independent work, the *Madhyamakāvatāra*, became one of the most important introductions to Madhyamaka in Tibet. It appears, however, that Candrakīrti was not regarded as a major commentator in India, as the syncretic interpretations of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla were more influential there and in the earlier propagation of Madhyamaka in Tibet. Though modern scholarship evinces a more nuanced view on Candrakīrti’s status as the definitive interpreter of Nāgārjuna, it remains the case that the *Prasannapadā* has received the most comprehensive scholarly attention of any of the commentaries. Candrakīrti defended the commentary of Buddhapālita against the criticisms of Bhāviveka, and asserted that Nāgārjuna’s arguments should be understood to simply demonstrate that his opponents’ positions were untenable without attempting to establish a position of his own. A complete translation of the *Prasannapadā* has come together through the complementary efforts of several exemplary scholars over several decades. Stcherbatsky 1977 was the pioneering effort in the translation both of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and Candrakīrti’s commentary. Schayer 1929–1930 and Schayer 1931 translated a total of seven chapters into German. Lamotte 1936 translated chapter 17 into French. De Jong 1949 produced a French translation of six chapters, and May 1959 translated the remaining twelve chapters into French. Huntington and Geshe Namgyal Wangchen 1989 includes a full translation of the *Madhyamakāvatāra* and an extensive overview of Candrakīrti’s thought and importance. Chandrakīrti and Ju Mipham 2004 contains a practitioner-oriented translation and commentary on the *Madhyamakāvatāra*.

Chandrakirti, and Ju Mipham, Padmakara Translation Group, trans. *Introduction to the Middle Way: Chandrakirti’s Madhyamakavatara with Commentary by Ju Mipham*. Boston and London: Shambhala, 2004.

Translation of the *Madhyamakāvatāra* from the Tibetan, with the extensive commentary by the great 19th century Nyingma scholar Jamgön Mipham.

de Jong, J. W. *Cinq chapitres de la Prasannapadā*. Paris: Geuthner, 1949.

This work is a French translation of chapters 18–22.

Huntington, C. W., Jr., with Geshe Namgyal Wangchen. *The Emptiness of Emptiness: An Introduction to Early Indian Mādhyamika*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989.

A scholarly study of the *Madhyamakāvatāra* that emphasizes the ethical and practical aspects of Candrakīrti’s thought along with the philosophical.

Lamotte, Étienne. “Le Traité de l’acte de Vasubandhu, Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa.” *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques* 4 (1936): 265–288.

This work includes a French translation of *Madhyamakakārikā* chapter 17, with Candrakīrti’s *Prasannapadā*.

May, Jacques. *Candrakīrti: Prasannapadā Madhyamakavṛtti, douze chapitre traduit du sanscrit et du tibétain*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1959.

This work completed the translation of the *Prasannapadā*, with a French translation of chapters 2–4, 6–9, 23, 24, 26, and 27.

Schayer, S. “Feur und Brennstoff.” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 7 (1929–1930): 26–52.

A German translation of *Madhyamakakārikā* chapter 10, with Candrakīrti’s commentary.

Schayer, S. *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannapadā*. Kraków, Poland: Nakładem Polskiej Akademji Umiejetnosci, 1931.

This work is a German translation of chapter 5, and chapters 12 through 16.

Stcherbatsky, T. *The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977.

First published in 1927, this work includes an English translation of chapters 1 and 25 of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* with Candrakīrti’s *Prasannapadā*.

Treatises of Late Indian Madhyamaka Commentators

In India, Madhyamaka was followed by Yogācāra, which responded to the potential accusations of Madhyamaka nihilism by emphasizing the subjective basis of experience of practice and awakening. It seems that, for the most part, Madhyamaka and Yogācāra became synthesized into a complementary whole that addressed both the negation of pernicious views and the establishment of ultimate truth as consciousness. Though this was the case in India, later Tibetan writers tended to see Yogācāra as an inferior philosophical position to a pure Madhyamaka view exemplified by Candrakīrti, though this was far from unanimous. Eckel 1987 is an excellent study and translation of a text by an 8th-century thinker who was highly influential in the subsequent development of Indian and early Tibetan Madhyamaka. Ichigō 1989 contains a translation of the *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* of Śāntarakṣita, who was instrumental in the establishment of Buddhism in Tibet. Blumenthal 2004 is a full translation of this same text, with a Geluk commentary. Padmakara Translation Group 2005 also translates this text, with Nyingma commentary. Keira 2004 is a translation of parts of chapter two of the *Madhyamakāloka* of Kamalaśīla, who was the disciple of Śāntarakṣita. Ichigō 2000 also considers a section of Kamalaśīla’s text. Śāntideva 2008 consists of a translation and study of the highly influential *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, with modern commentary and introduction.

Blumenthal, James. *The Ornament of the Middle Way: A Study of the Madhyamaka Thought of Shantarakshita*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2004.

A translation of the *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* and the commentary by rGyal-tshabs dar-ma rin-chen, with an analysis of the Geluk sect’s interpretation and critique of Śāntarakṣita’s Madhyamaka.

Eckel, Malcolm David. *Jñānagarbha’s Commentary of the Distinction between the Two Truths: An Eighth-Century Handbook of Madhyamaka Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.

This work is the only book-length study of the thought of the pivotal Madhayamaka writer Jñānagarbha, who deeply influenced Śāntarakṣita and the first wave of Madhyamaka thought in Tibet.

Ichigō, Masamichi. “Śāntarakṣita and Bhāvaviveka as Opponents of the Mādhyamika in the *Madhyamakāloka*.” In *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*. Edited by Jonathan Silk, 147–170. Honolulu : University of Hawai’i Press, 2000.

A text-critical study of Kamalaśīla’s arguments against the idea that Bhāviveka and Śāntarakṣita are opponents of Madhyamaka. Includes an edition of the Tibetan text of the relevant passages, a translation, and a concluding study.

Ichigō, Masamichi. “Śāntarakṣita’s Madhyamakālaṃkāra: Introduction, Edition and Translation.” In *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*. Edited by Luis Gómez and Jonathan Silk, 141–240. Ann Arbor: Collegiate Institute for the Study of Buddhist Literature and Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 1989.

Translation with a useful overview of Śāntarakṣita’s understanding of Madhyamaka and its relationship to other interpretive texts.

Keira, Ryusei. *Mādhyamika and Epistemology: A Study of Kamalaśīla’s Method for Proving the Voidness of All Dharmas: Introduction, Annotated Translations and Tibetan Texts of Selected Sections of the Second Chapter of the Madhyamakāloka*. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 2004.

Consists of a critical edition, translation, and critical study of a number of sections from Kamalaśīla’s major Mādhyamika work.

Padmakara Translation Group, trans. *The Adornment of the Middle Way: Shantarakshita’s Madhyamakalankara with Commentary by Jamgön Mipham*. Boston: Shambhala, 2005.

A translation of Śāntarakṣita’s text with a commentary by the Nyingma scholar Mipham.

Śāntideva. *The Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Translated with an introduction and notes by Kate Crosby and Andrew Skilton; general introduction by Paul Williams. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

This work was first published in 1995 as part of the Oxford World Classic Series. Though only chapter nine of this work deals specifically with Madhyamaka, Śāntideva’s work has had a major impact on Tibetan views on Madhyamaka and is much admired for its poetic description of the bodhisattva path.

In East Asia

Madhyamaka texts and teachings were brought to China by Kumārajīva (b. 350–d. 409) and these eventually became the foundation of an independent school, Sanlun. Though Sanlun faded from importance as a distinct school of thought, Madhyamaka remained significant throughout the later development of Chinese Buddhism, influencing Tiantai, Huayan, and especially Chan. Takakusu 1975 provides an early overview of Chinese Buddhist schools and situates Chinese Madhyamaka within them. Arnold 2005 provides a concise overview of Madhyamaka in China. Robinson 1978 remains a standard resource on Nāgārjuna and Chinese Madhyamaka. Liebenthal 1968 is an English translation of the major text by Sengzhao (Seng-chao), the 5th-century student of Kumarajīva. Ichimura 1992 examines Sengzhao’s place in the establishment and development of Chinese Madhyamaka. Liu 1994 is a thorough study of the appropriation of Nāgārjuna and his works in the early major Chinese schools. Bocking 1995 is a translation of Nāgājuna’s *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* that includes a discussion of the importance of Madhyamaka in China. Magiola 2004 responds to a modern Chinese philosopher’s critique of Madhyamaka utilizing the writings of the later Chinese Madhyamaka writer Jizang (Chi-tsang).

Arnold, Dan. “Madhyamaka Buddhist Philosophy: Madhyamaka in East Asia.” In *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by James Fieser and Bradley Dowden. 2005.

An overview of the development of Madhyamaka thought in China and a discussion of the defining characteristics of Chinese interpretations of it.

Bocking, Brian, trans. *Nāgārjuna in China: A Translation of the Middle Treatise*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1995.

English translation of Kumaraśīla’s Chinese translation of the fundamental Madhyamaka text.

Ichimura, Shohei. “On the Paradoxical Method of the Chinese *Mādhyamika*: Seng-chao and the *Chao-lun* Treatise.” *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 19 (1992): 51–71.

This important article argues that Sengzhao’s understanding of Madhyamaka is true to its Indian sources yet reflective of Chinese religious and philosophical concerns, and that his work set important precedents for the subsequent development of Chinese Buddhist thought.

Liebenthal, Walter. *Chao Lun: The Treatises of Seng-chao: A Translation with Introduction, Notes and Appendices*. 2d rev. ed. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1968.

This work contains a translation of the major work of the paradigmatic figure of early Chinese Madhyamaka.

Liu, Ming-Wood. *Madhyamaka Thought in China*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1994.

After a brief discussion of Nāgārjuna and his school in India, Liu examines the origins and development of the Chinese Madhyamaka school and the Madhyamaka elements in Tiantai.

Magiola, Robert. “Nagarjuna and Chi-tsang on the Value of ‘This World’: A Reply to Kuang-Ming Wu’s Critique of Indian and Chinese Madhyamika Buddhism.” *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 31.4 (2004): 505–516.

A response to Kuan-ming Wu that takes the form of a comparison of Nāgārjuna’s and Jizang’s Madhyamaka, and a defense of both against the charge of nihilism.

Robinson, Richard H. *Early Mādhyamika in India and China*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978.

Originally published in 1967, this foundational work examines Nāgārjuna and his works through Chinese sources and discusses the influence and development of Madhyamaka in China.

Takakusu, Junjirō. *The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975.

Originally published in 1949, this is an overview of the schools of East Asian Buddhism, chapter seven deals with the Madhyamaka school (*Sanron*).

Interpretations in Tibet

The Tibetans received Mādhyamika texts in both the first and second waves of the establishment of Buddhism there. Because scholastic monasticism was part of the institutional form that was imported, Madhaymaka was always important. In the early period, it was the syncretic Madhyamaka of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla that were orthodoxy, but in the second wave, Candrakīrti's interpretations became far more influential, though this has differed according to sect down to the present day. The Nyingma and Kagyu sects have typically been more inclined to a complementary understanding of Yogācāra and Madhyamaka, and one in which tantra was more integral, while the Sakya and (especially) the Geluk have tended to privilege Candrakīrti as definitive, and to keep Mādhyamika doctrine and tantra more separate.

NYINGMA

The Nyingma sect is the only one of the Tibetan sects with a claim to have been established during the first propagation of Buddhism in Tibet. Though modern scholarship regards this as untenable, it remains the case that Nyingma, along with Kagyu, tended to retain and privilege the more syncretic and inclusive Madhyamaka of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, and to be more willing to seamlessly integrate Madhyamaka with tantric teachings and practices. It is also the case that Nyingma figures were less scholastically inclined than in other sects, but there were great scholars and systematizers among the ranks of the Nyingma. In the early period, Rongzom Chökyi Zangpo was the greatest such figure. Koppl 2008 is an important contribution to Nyingma Madhyakama studies, in that this work contains a translation and thorough study of the major work of 11th-century Nyingma master Rongzom. Cabezón 2013 is a translation and study of the major text of another such figure, Rog Bande Sherab. Much later, in the wake of the 18th- and 19th-century ecumenically minded movement, Mipham skillfully defended Nyingma thought against the predominant Geluk orthodoxy and created the foundation of subsequent Nyingma philosophical thought. Chandrakirti and Mipham 2004 is a translation of the *Madhyamakāvatāra*, with the commentary by Mipham. Duckworth 2008 is a study of Mipham's system, which unifies Mahayana doctrine, buddha-nature, and Dzogchen. Śāntarakṣita 2005 contains a translation of the root text and the commentary by Mipham. Pettit 1999 is a translation of Mipham's renowned Madhyamaka text. Phuntsho 2005 compares the Madhyamaka system of Mipham with that of Tsong pha pa, and Williams 2000 covers some of the same ground, though particularly on the subject of reflexive self-awareness.

Cabezón, José Ignacio. *The Buddha's Teachings and the Nine Vehicles: Rog Bande Sherab's Lamp of the Teachings*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Translation of the major work of this 12th- and 13th-century Nyingma master. Chapter 12 specifically examines his Madhyamaka views.

Chandrakirti, and Jamgön Mipham. *Introduction to the Middle Way: Chandrakirti's Madhyamakavatara, with Commentary by Ju Mipham*. Translated by Padmakara Translation Group. Boston: Shambhala, 2004.

Translation of the *Madhyamakāvatāra* from the Tibetan, with the extensive commentary by Jamgön Mipham.

Duckworth, Douglas S. *Mipham on Buddha-Nature: The Ground of the Nyingma Tradition*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008.

This work is a study of the thought of Mipham, for whom there is a unity of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra, which is the foundation of Dzogchen. This work also contains translations of primary Nyingma texts, the *Lion's Roar* and *Notes on the Essential Points of Exposition*.

Koppl, Heidi I. *Establishing Appearances as Divine: Ronzom Chökyi Zangpo on Reasoning, Madhyamaka, and Purity*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2008.

Studies of the Nyingma perspective on Madhyamaka, other than those of Mipham, are few, so this work is a major contribution. Though

only chapter three is specifically about Madhyamaka, the entire work demonstrates how Rongzom integrated Madhyamaka into the essentially tantric view of Dzogchen.

Pettit, John Whitney. *Mipham's Beacon of Certainty: Illuminating the View of Dzogchen, the Great Perfection*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1999.

A translation and study of Mipham's *Precious Beacon of Certainty*, in which the great 19th-century Nyingma scholar presents his view of Madhyamaka and its harmony with Dzogchen. Includes an extensive contextualizing introduction.

Phuntsho, Karma. *Mipham's Dialectics and the Debates on Emptiness: To Be, Not to Be or Neither*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005.

A masterful study of Mipham's concept of emptiness that includes a history of the debates about this concept both in India and Tibet, and juxtaposes Mipham's view with Tsong kha pa's.

Śāntarakṣita. *The Adornment of the Middle Way: Shantarakshita's Madhyamakalankara with Commentary by Jamgön Mipham*. Translated by Padmakara Translation Group. Boston: Shambhala, 2005.

A translation of Śāntarakṣita's text with the extensive commentary by Mipham.

Williams, Paul. *The Reflexive Nature of Awareness: A Tibetan Madhyamaka Defence*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000.

A scholarly examination of the conflict and potential resolution between self-awareness and emptiness that contrasts the views of the great Nyingma scholar Mipham, in his commentary on the ninth chapter of his commentary on the *Madhyamakāvatāra*, with those of the Geluk sect.

SAKYA

The Sakya sect is known for its emphasis on scholasticism and doctrinal rigor, partially because of its greatest intellectual figure, the brilliant 13th-century polymath Sakya Paṇḍita Kunga Gyaltsen, but also the great subsequent figures Rongtön Shakya Gyaltsen, Gorampa Sönam Senge, and Shakya Chokden. Tsongkhapa, the founder of the Geluk sect, also began in the Sakya sect. Jackson 1985 discusses the understanding of Madhyamaka held by Sakya Paṇḍita and other early Sakya writers. Della Santina 1995 discusses the development and categorization of Madhyamaka according to the Sakya sect. Cabezón 2005 examines the position of Rongtön on the issue of how a Mādhyamika understands a philosophical thesis. Cabezón and Lobsang Dargyay 2007 contains a translation of a polemical treatise by Gorampa that defends the Sakya view against the Geluk. Thakchoe 2007 covers similar ground in its examination of the differences between the Sakya and Geluk understandings of the Madhyamaka concept of the Two Truths. Tillemans and Tomabechi 1995 is a pioneering study of Shakya Chokden's text on the history of the Madhyamaka, and Komarovski 2011 is the first book-length study of Shakya Chokden's unique concept of Madhyamaka thought.

Cabezón, José Ignacio. "Rong ston Shākya rgyal mtshan on Mādhyamika Thesislessness." In *Tibetan Studies*. Vol. 1, *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995*. Edited by Hemut Krasser, Michael T. Much, Ernst Steinkellner, and Helmut Tauscher, 97–105. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 1997.

This paper examines Rongtön's idea that a Mādhyamika has no thesis of his own, but rather than he only uses the opponent's position against itself.

Cabezón, José Ignacio, and Geshe Lobsang Dargyay. *Freedom from Extremes: Gorampa’s “Distinguishing the Views” and the Polemics of Emptiness*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2007.

A masterful translation of the Gorampa’s text that refutes the Geluk view and establishes the Sakya view that would become the standard one.

Della Santina, Peter. *Madhyamaka Schools in India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995.

This work covers the distinction between Svāntika and Prāsaṅgika as consisting in the argumentative method used to establish the teaching of emptiness. First published 1986.

Jackson, David P. “Madhyamaka Studies among the Early Sa-skyapas.” *Tibet Journal* 10.2 (1985): 20–34.

This ground-breaking study examines the understanding of Madhyamaka prior to the establishment of the familiar doxographical categories used by later Sakyapas and other sects.

Komarovski, Yaroslav. *Visions of Unity: The Golden Paṇḍita Shakya Chokden’s New Interpretation of Yogācāra and Madhyamaka*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011.

A groundbreaking study of the 15th-century Sakya scholar Shakya Chokden and his unique understanding of the complementary nature of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra.

Thakchoe, Sonam. *The Two Truths Debate: Tsongkhapa and Gorampa on the Middle Way*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2007.

A study of fundamental concept of the Two Truths in Tibetan Madhyamaka, juxtaposing the systems of the Sakya and Geluk sects.

Tillemans, Tom J. F., and Tōru Tomabechi. “Le dBu ma’i byuñ tshul de Śākya mchog ldan.” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 49.4 (1995): 891–918.

An article in French on Śākya mchog-ldan’s categorization of Madhyamaka. Includes a discussion of Tārānātha’s comparison of Śākya mchog-ldan and Dol-po-pa views on other-emptiness (*gzhan stong*).

KAGYU

Like the Nyingma sect, the Kagyu tended to be more focused on practice than scholarly knowledge, but there were nonetheless significant figures who established the doctrinal foundations of Madhyamaka thought in the sect. Khenpo Tsültrim Gyamtso 2002 is a traditional teaching on Nāgārjuna’s root text from a contemporary Kagyu master. Nāgārjuna 2007 is a translation of the hymn *Praise of the Dharmadhātu* with commentary from the Kagyu perspective. Williams 1983 is a scholarly article on Kagyu critiques of the Madhyamaka position of the Geluk sect. Dorje 2008 is a translation of the 9th Karmapa’s commentary on Candrakīrti’s *Madhyamakāvatāra*. Mikyö Dorje 2005 translates the 8th Karmapa’s extensive commentary on the sixth chapter of the same text by Candrakīrti. Jamgön Kongtrul Lodrö Tayé 2007 is a translation of the philosophy section of Jamgön Kongtrul’s encyclopedic *Treasury of Knowledge*. Brunnhölzl 2004 is an extensive study of the Kagyu Madhyamaka view.

Brunnhölzl, Karl. *The Center of the Sunlight Sky: Madhyamaka in the Kagyu Tradition*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2004.

An extensive overview of the Kagyu sect's understanding of Madhyamaka, drawing largely on the works of the 8th Karmapa, Mikyö Dorje (b. 1507–d. 1554) and including a translation of the commentary on the ninth chapter of Śāntideva's *Bodhicāryāvatāra* by the 2nd Pawo Rinpoche Tsugla Trengwa (b. 1504–d. 1566).

Dorje, Wangchuk. *The Karmapa's Middle Way: Feast for the Fortunate*. Translated by Tyler Dewar. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2008.

A translation of the commentary on Chandrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvatāra* by the 9th Karmapa, Wangchuk Dorje (1556–1603). This text is an abridgement of the more extensive commentary by the 8th Karmapa, Mikyö Dorje.

Jamgön Kongtrul Lodrö Tayé. *The Treasury of Knowledge: Book Six, Part Three: Frameworks of Buddhist Philosophy: A Systematic Presentation of the Cause-Based Philosophical Vehicles*. Translated, introduced and annotated by Elizabeth M. Callahan. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2007.

Kongtrul was one the major figures of the 19th-century ecumenical movement (*ris med*) that sought to harmonize and record the wisdom of Nyingma, Kagyu, and Sakya, and to defend the doctrines of these sects against the Geluk. This work contains a translation of the Buddhist philosophy section of Kongtul's work in which he surveys Buddhist views, especially Mahayana.

Khenpo Tsültrim Gyamtso. *The Sun of Wisdom: Teachings on the Noble Nagarjuna's Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way*. Translated by Ari Goldfield. Boston and London: Shambhala, 2002.

A practitioner-oriented teaching on Nāgārjuna's root text by a modern Kagyu teacher, based on the commentary of Ju Mipham.

Mikyö Dorje, Karmapa VIII. *The Moon of Wisdom: Chapter Six of Chandrakirti's Entering the Middle Way, with commentary from the Eight Karmapa Mikyö Dorje's Chariot of the Dagpo Kagyü Siddhas*. Translated by Ari Goldfield, Jules Levenson, Jim Scott and Birgit Scott; under the guidance of Khenpo Tsültrim Gyamtso Rinpoche. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2005.

This work is a translation of a commentary on the chapter of Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvatāra* that most extensively discusses Madhyamaka and its refutations of other Buddhist schools.

Nāgārjuna. *In Praise of Dharmadhātu*. Translated by Karl Brunnhölzl. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2007.

A translation of probably the most important of Nāgārjuna's hymns, with a commentary by the 3rd Karmapa, Rangjung Dorje (b. 1284–d. 1339). Though the hymn is primarily about the luminous nature of the mind, it is relevant because the hymns have long been regarded as part of Madhyamaka among many Tibetan thinkers.

Williams, Paul. "A Note on Some Aspects of Mi bskyod rdo rje's Critique of dGe lugs pa Madhyamaka." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 11 (1983): 125–145.

An incisive study of the crucial differences between Kagyu and Geluk interpretations of Madhyamaka.

JONANG

The Jonang tradition was founded in the 12th century by Yumo Mikyö Dorje, but it is more associated with Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen

(b. 1292–d. 1361) and Tāranātha (b. 1575–d. 1635). The tradition was highly influential in its time, but it was suppressed by the Fifth Dalai Lama and disappeared except for some regions along the Sino-Tibetan border. The 19th-century ecumenical movement (*ris med*) helped revive the knowledge of this once significant Madhyamaka vision. Jonang Madhyamaka thought is characterized by its emphasis on “other-emptiness,” (*gzhan stong*), which is the idea that the absolute is empty of conventional appearances, but not of its own pure nature. The website of the Jonang Foundation is a very useful online resource for accessible and authoritative information on this tradition. Ruegg 1963 is an early examination of Jonang doctrine, based on a Geluk source. Broido 1989 is a brief but useful study of Jonang Madhyamaka. Stearns 2010 is the first extensive study of the life and thought of Dolpopa. Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen 2006 is the translation of Dolpopa’s major Madhyamaka work by Jeffrey Hopkins, who also translated the major Madhyamaka work of Tāranātha in Tāranātha Kun-dGa’ sNying-po 2007. Kapstein 2001 compares the Madhyamaka systems of three great figures of the Jonang sect.

Broido, Michael. “The Jo-nang-pas on Madhyamaka: A Sketch.” *Tibet Journal* 14.1 (1989): 86–90.

A brief overview of the unique understanding of Madhyamaka by the major figures of the Jonang sect.

Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen. *Mountain Doctrine: Tibet’s Fundamental Treatise on Other-Emptiness and the Buddha Matrix.* Translated by Jeffrey Hopkins. Edited by Kevin Vose. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2006.

The first translation of the major work of the paradigmatic figure of the Jonang school.

Jonang Foundation.

A wonderful resource for the beginner for understanding this little-known, and often misunderstood, Tibetan school. Includes introductory essays and translations of important Jonang texts.

Kapstein, Matthew T. “From Kun-mkhyen Dol-po-pa to ‘Ba’-mda’ dge legs: Three Jo-nang-pa Masters in the Interpretation of the Prajñāpāramitā.” In *Reason’s Traces: Identity and Interpretation in Indian and Tibetan Buddhist Thought*. By Matthew T. Kapstein, 301–317. *Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2001.

This work is an overview of Dolpopa’s, Tāranātha’s, and Bamda Gelek’s interpretations of the Prajñāpāramitā literature.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. “The Jo-nang-pas: A School of Buddhist Ontologists According to the *Grub-mtha’ sel-gyi me-long*.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 8.2 (1963): 73–91.

This pioneering work on the Jonangpas is based on a chapter of *The Crystal Mirror of Philosophical Systems* by the 18th-century Geluk scholar Thuken Losang Chökyi Nyima.

Stearns, Cyrus. *The Buddha from Dolpo: A Study of the Life and Thought of the Tibetan Master Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen.* Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2010.

The revised and expanded edition of the 1st edition (1999), which was the first book-length study of the life and thought of the most important figure of the Jonang tradition, Dolpopa Sherab Gyaltsen. Chapter two is a concise history of the “other-emptiness” (*gzhan stong*) tradition of Madhyamaka interpretation in Tibet.

Tāranātha Kun-dGa’ sNying-po. *The Essence of Other-Emptiness*. Translated and annotated by Jeffrey Hopkins, in collaboration with Lama Lodro Namgyel. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2007.

An annotated translation of Tāranātha’s concise text on other-emptiness (*gzhan stong*).

GELUK

The Geluk sect was founded by Tsongkhapa (b. 1357–d. 1419), and was the last of the major sects to be established in Tibet. It eventually came to prominence in the 17th century due to the support of powerful Mongol tribes, leading to the Fifth Dalai Lama becoming the spiritual and political ruler of central Tibet. Tsongkhapa was a champion of the Prāsaṅika interpretive tradition of Madhyamaka, and this has remained definitive for the Geluk sect. Until fairly recently, most of the Western scholarship on Tibetan Madhyamaka has been from a Geluk perspective, but this situation is now changing. Dalai Lama 2009 is a straightforward exposition of Nāgārjuna’s fundamental text. Garfield and Samten 2006 is a translation of Tsongkhapa’s commentary on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Newland 1992 is a useful overview of Geluk Madhyamaka. Yoshimizu 1993 presents Geluk critiques of competing Madhyamaka views. Thurman 1991 is a translation and study of Tsongkhapa’s text on ascertaining Madhyamaka texts that are definitive and those that need interpretation. Jinpa 2002 is an incisive study of Tsongkhapa’s view across his life and texts, and Hopkins 2008 examines Tsongkhapa’s mature Madhyamaka view and puts it in its historical context. Lopez 2007 is a study and translation of a Mādhyamika work by the controversial 20th-century Geluk scholar Gendun Chopel (b. 1903–d. 1951).

Dalai Lama. *The Middle Way: Faith Grounded in Reason*. Translated by Geshe Thupten Jinpa. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2009.

Contains an accessible introduction to Madhyamaka and commentary on portions of Nāgārjuna’s *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, as well as an explication of Tsong Kha pa’s *Three Principle Aspects of the Path*.

Garfield, Jay L., and Ngawang Samten, trans. *Ocean of Reasoning: A Great Commentary on Nāgārjuna’s Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

This work is a translation and philosophical exegesis on Tsongkhapa’s commentary on Nāgārjuna’s *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

Hopkins, Jeffrey. *Tsong-kha-pa’s Final Exposition of Wisdom*. Edited by Kevin Vose. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 2008.

Drawing on Tsongkhapa’s middle-length *Stages of the Path* text and his *Illumination of the Intent of the Middle Way* (*dbu ma dgongs pa rab gsal*), Hopkins describes and analyzes the Geluk founder’s mature Madhyamaka view. The book also contains an invaluable section comparison between Tsongkhapa’s and Dolpopa’s understanding of Madhyamaka.

Thupten Jinpa. *Self, Reason, and Reality in Tibetan Philosophy: Tsongkhapa’s Quest for the Middle Way*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002.

A masterly and sophisticated discussion of Tsongkhapa’s interpretation of Madhyamaka.

Lopez, Donald S., Jr. *The Madman’s Middle Way: Reflections on Reality of the Tibetan Monk Gendun Chopel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

A scholarly study and translation of the 20th-century Madhayamaka work *Adornment for Nāgārjuna’s Thought*, composed by controversial monk Gendun Chopel.

Newland, Guy. *The Two Truths in the Mādhyamika Philosophy of the Ge-luk-ba Order of Tibetan Buddhism*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion, 1992.

A comprehensive study of the Geluk sect's understanding of Madhyamaka, drawing on the works of Tsongkhapa as well as the writings of his disciples and later monastic textbooks.

Thurman, Robert A. F. *The Central Philosophy of Tibet: A Study and Translation of Jey Tsong Khapa's Essence of True Eloquence*. Foreward by the Dalai Lama. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Study and translation of the *Legs bshad snying po*, a pivotal text of Tsongkhapa that treats the subjects of the definitive and interpretable status of Buddhist scriptures.

Yoshimizu, Chizuko. "The Madhyamaka Theories Regarded as False by the dGe lugs pas." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 37 (1993): 201–227.

Scholarly examination of Geluk critiques of alternative understandings of Madhyamaka.

On the Issue of Doxographical Categorizations

Nāgārjuna's texts spawned waves of commentary over the centuries, and each subsequent commentator tended to either side with or refute the commentators who came before. Furthermore, Madhyamaka was followed by Yogācāra, which, depending on one's perspective, complemented or refuted Nāgārjuna's position on ultimate truth. In India, at least some early Yogācāra authors seem to have thought of themselves as further elucidating the Madhyamaka rather than replacing it, and toward the end of Buddhism in India, it appears that the two "schools" were seen as complementary. Nonetheless, some later scholastically inclined Indian and Tibetan authors saw these "schools" as fundamentally incommensurable, and thus it was deemed necessary to determine what exactly the views of each of these schools was, and which was definitive. A similar move took place in the understanding and ranking of the commentators on Nāgārjuna, and modern scholarship, up until quite recently, has largely accepted these presuppositions. The works listed in this section are examples of how this is changing. Coseru 1995, Harris 1991 and King 1994 all explore the relationship between Madhyamaka and Yogācāra, and all come to the conclusion that regarding them as distinct schools with opposing views is unsupported by the texts themselves. Nagao 1991 collects a number of the author's essays in which the complementarity and common intent of the two Mahayana philosophies are demonstrated. Ruegg 2000 masterfully lays out the stages of the development of the categorization of Madhyamaka in Tibet. Katz 1976 is a pioneering article that questions the Tibetan categorization of Madhyamaka into Svātantrika and Prāsaṅgika. Vose 2009 is a comprehensive study of how Candrakīrti came to be regarded as the definitive interpreter of Madhyamaka in Tibet after the 11th century. Dreyfus and McClintock 2003 is an exemplary collection of the latest scholarship on the differences between Svātantika and Prāsaṅgika, and interrogates the doxographical structure itself.

Coseru, Christian. "The Continuity between Madhyamaka and Yogācāra Schools of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 37.2 (1995): 48–83.

This article examines the continuity between the two great Mahayana systems of philosophy, and argues that there is really not much difference between the Madhyamaka Two Truths doctrine and the Yogācāra Three Natures doctrine.

Dreyfus, Georges B. J., and Sara McClintock, eds. *The Svātantrika-Prāsaṅgika Distinction: What Difference Does a Difference*

Make? Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2003.

A paradigm-changing collection of essays exploring the issues surrounding the Tibetan categorization of Mādhyamika interpretation into the Svātantrika and Prāsaṅgika schools.

Harris, Ian Charles. *The Continuity of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra in Indian Mahayana Buddhism*. Leiden, The Netherlands, and New York: Brill, 1991.

This work reexamines the relationship between Madhyamaka and Yogācāra within Mahayana Buddhist philosophy, and argues that the two are more complementary and consistent than many later Indian and Tibetan, and Western, commentators have supposed.

Katz, Nathan. “An Appraisal of the Svātantrika-Prāsaṅgika Debates.” *Philosophy East and West* (July 1976): 253–267.

An early examination of the assumptions about the Svātantrika and Prāsaṅgika schools of interpretation of Madhyamaka, that also raises questions about the widespread Tibetan assumption that Prāsaṅgika is the definitive understanding of Madhyamaka.

King, Richard. “Early Yogācāra and Its Relationship with the Madhyamaka School.” *Philosophy East and West* 40 (1994): 659–683.

This article examines and criticizes the tendency among modern Buddhist scholars to make a sharp distinction between the Madhyamaka and Yogācāra.

Nagao, Gadjin M. *Mādhyamika and Yogācāra: A Study of Mahāyāna Philosophies*. Translated by Leslie S. Kawamura. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.

This is a collection of essays by the great Japanese Buddhist scholar. Nagao brings in East Asian understandings of Buddhist philosophy, as well as Tibetan, and throughout the essays, he considers the two Mahayana philosophical systems as complementary perspectives that form a complete Mahayana worldview and map for practice.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. “An Outline of the Earlier History of the Tibetan Madhyamaka (*dbu ma*) from its Origins in the Eighth Century to the Beginning of Its ‘Classical Period’ in the Early Fifteenth Century.” In *Three Studies in the History of Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Philosophy: Studies in Indian and Tibetan Madhyamaka Thought*. Part 1. By David Seyfort Ruegg, 1–104. Vienna: Arbeitskreis Für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2000.

An authoritative analysis of the early transmission and categorization of Madhyamaka in Tibet.

Vose, Kevin. *Resurrecting Candrakīrti: Disputes in the Tibetan Creation of Prāsaṅgika*. Boston: Wisdom Publications. 2009.

An incisive study of how Tibetan Buddhist scholastics came to accept Candrakīrti as Nāgārjuna’s definitive interpreter, and how this required a major recategorization of earlier Madhyamaka in Tibet.

Modern Philosophical Appraisal

Most of the modern academic interest in Nāgārjuna and the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* has been philosophical, and over time what has been of philosophical interest has evolved. Early works tended to examine similarities between Madhyamaka and one or another

European philosopher. In recent years, the more important issue has come to be the question of whether Madhyamaka thought is primarily about ultimate reality (the metaphysical interpretation), or what can be said about reality (the semantic interpretation). In the past few decades the semantic interpretation has come to the fore, though this approach is not unanimously accepted, and thus the works listed represent both approaches. Westerhoff 2009 is an excellent introductory resource. The author argues here that Nāgārjuna has a consistent and coherent philosophical system, which is found throughout all of his works. Tuck 1990 argues that the many translations and interpretations of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* are reflective of modern philosophical concerns more than they are true to Nāgārjuna's thought in its own historical context. Hayes 1994 agrees to some degree, and points out how some modern scholars have mistranslated the work in order to make Nāgārjuna's arguments more convincing, but Hayes also argues that some have indeed succeeded in reading Nāgārjuna in his own context. Burton 1999 examines the nature of truth claims in regard to ultimate truth in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and other texts of Nāgārjuna. Siderits 2007 examines the arguments made for emptiness in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and how that philosophical claim should be understood. Garfield 2002 is a culmination of a decade of Madhyamaka scholarship that contextualizes and compares Madhyamaka with other trends in Buddhist thought and with modern philosophy. The Cowherds 2011, by a group of renowned Madhyamaka specialists, shifts from the usual emphasis on ultimate truth in Madhyamaka and examines instead conventional truth in Madhyamaka. Ferraro 2013 critiques the semantic interpretation.

Burton, David. *Emptiness Appraised: A Critical Study of Nāgārjuna's Philosophy*. Richmond, UK: Curzon, 1999.

An examination of Nāgārjuna's thought in terms of its assertions about ultimate reality. Burton evaluates several modern understandings of Nāgārjuna's thought.

The Cowherds. *Moonshadows: Conventional Truth in Buddhist Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

A unique collaboration of scholars, including Georges Dreyfus, Jay Garfield, Mark Siderits, and Tom Tillemans, on the issue of conventional truth and its implications in Madhyamaka.

Ferraro, Giuseppe. "A Criticism of M. Siderits' and J. L Garfield's 'Semantic Interpretation' of Nāgārjuna's Theory of Two Truths." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 41 (2013): 195–219.

Writing against the dominant semantic interpretation of Madhyamaka, Ferraro argues that this approach is flawed on logical grounds and is inconsistent with numerous verses of Nāgārjuna's works.

Garfield, Jay L. *Empty Words: Buddhist Philosophy and Cross-Cultural Interpretation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Though the entire work raises pertinent issues, Part One focuses on Madhyamaka.

Hayes, Richard P. "Nāgārjuna's Appeal." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22 (1994): 299–378.

In a response to Tuck 1990, Hayes evaluates several of the recent translations of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* and argues that many mistranslate it in order to save Nāgārjuna from accusations of logical fallacies. Hayes argues, against Tuck, that some translators have been successful in presenting Nāgārjuna in his own historical context.

Siderits, Mark. "Madhyamaka: The Doctrine of Emptiness." In *Buddhism as Philosophy: An Introduction*. By Mark Siderits, 180–207. Ashgate World Philosophies Series. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007.

Chapter 9 of this work focuses on the arguments for emptiness in Nāgārjuna's magnum opus.

Tuck, Andrew P. *Comparative Philosophy and the Philosophy of Scholarship: On the Western Interpretation of Nāgārjuna*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Tuck argues that modern translations and interpretations of Nāgārjuna's works are more indicative of the ideological or methodological interests of the authors than they are true to Nāgārjuna's thought in its historical context.

Westerhoff, Jan. *Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka: A Philosophical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

A thorough elucidation of Nāgārjuna's works that argues that his numerous texts constitute a unified philosophical project. Though the work does take account of other of Nāgārjuna's texts, it focuses primarily on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

LAST MODIFIED: 05/29/2014

DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780195393521-0199

[BACK TO TOP](#)

Copyright © 2014. All rights reserved.