

Ratnākaraśānti's theory of cognition with false mental images (**alīkākāravāda*) and the neither-one-nor-many argument

Shinya Moriyama (Shinshu University)

0. Introduction

When we look at a piece of paper in front of our eyes, a mental image (*ākāra*) of the paper arises in our mind. This is the basic understanding within Buddhist epistemology, called *sākāravijñānavāda*. Buddhist epistemology was originated and developed by the philosophers Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and their followers, who insisted on a reflexive nature of our cognition known as “self-awareness” (*svasaṃvedana*), integrating this theory with the traditional Yogācāra doctrine that had been constructed by Maitreya, Asaṅga, and Vasubandhu. According to the Yogācāra doctrine, the phenomenal world in which we live is just a product of the *ālayavijñāna*, and thus, every object that we believe to be true is illusionary. If we take this Yogācāra view into consideration, then, can we conclude that our mental images are also illusionary and false? Certainly, we might consider the possibility that the world we see is different from the world that is, and that the external world we believe to exist does not actually exist; yet, is there any evidence for concluding that mental images are false in the way that external objects are? Can we not say that the mental images still remaining even after we have denied the existence of the external world are true under certain conditions? These questions about the ontological status of mental images were discussed at length by the later Indian Buddhist philosophers Ratnākaraśānti, Jñānaśrīmitra, and Ratnakīrti.

The controversy concerning mental images that took place at the Vikramaśīla Monastery, known as the *sākāra-nirākāra* debate, has been already studied by Yuichi Kajiyama, Kazuhumi Oki and others.¹ However, the material in which this debate is described, which includes Jñānaśrīmitra's *Sākārasiddhiśāstra*, Ratnakīrti's *Citrādvaitaparakāśavāda*, and Ratnākaraśānti's epistemological treatises, has not yet been critically edited or provided with annotated translations.² Under these circumstances, a basic study of the text, and its edition and

¹ See Kajiyama 1965, 1983: xvii-xix, Kajiyama 1998: 154-158 (Appendix II), and Oki 1982. For an overview of previous studies on this problem, see Funayama 2007: 187-192.

² Although Ratnākaraśānti is also known as the author of a number of tantric treatises, he wrote at least five epistemological treatises, namely, the *Antarvyāptisamarthana*, the **Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* (PPU), the **Madhyamakālaṅkāro-padeśa* (MAU), the **Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* (VMS), and the MAV. Of these, the first three treatises have been studied and analyzed by a number of Japanese scholars. See Kajiyama 1965, 1998: 154-158, 1999, Katsura 1976, Matsumoto 1980a, 1980b, Oki 1977, 1982. Moreover, in 2002, Takanori Umino published annotated Japanese translations of these three treatises. Although the translations differ from my understandings of the same texts in not only a few sections, they are very helpful for getting an overview of Ratnākaraśānti's arguments on the *alīkākāravāda* as well as its relation

translation, must progress step by step in order to clarify the perspective of the debate.

My presentation today aims to shed new light on the debate by dealing with Ratnākaraśānti's *Madhyamakālaṅkāravṛtti* (MVV), which has been afforded little attention by modern scholars, with the exception of David Seyfort Ruegg and Takanori Umino.³ In this treatise, Ratnākaraśānti tries to demonstrate his epistemological position that mental images are false, that is, **alīkākaravāda/nirākāravāda*,⁴ by using the neither-one-nor-many argument. As is well known, this argument is found in Śāntarakṣita's *Madhyamakālaṅkāra*, a treatise with the same title as that of Ratnākaraśānti, where it is used for proving the selflessness (*niḥsvabhāvatā*) of all phenomena from the Madhyamaka point of view.⁵ A question arises: Is there any difference between Śāntarakṣita's and Ratnākaraśānti's use of this neither-one-nor-many argument? If they differ from each other, at which point does Ratnākaraśānti diverge from Śāntarakṣita's usage? Or, what is the difference between the **alīkākaravāda* and the Madhyamaka epistemology according to Śāntarakṣita? These are exactly the questions I would like to clarify here by examining Ratnākaraśānti's MAV and other treatises relating to the same topic.

1. The proof of selflessness of phenomena (*dharmanairātmya*) and its analysis

Let us start with a proof most relevant to Ratnākaraśānti's *alīkākaravāda* as found in his MAV.

Proof A

to traditional Yogācāra doctrines.

³ See Seyfort Ruegg 1981: 122f., Umino 2003, 2004. I am presently preparing an edition and annotated translation of this treatise. A synopsis of this treatise, which is a result of this work, is added as an appendix to this presentation. My preliminary study of the treatise shows that it consists of 49 verses and Ratnākaraśānti's own commentary (*Vṛtti*). From the title, "Commentary on the Adornment of Middle Way" (*dBu ma rgyan gyi 'grel pa, Madhyamakālaṅkāravṛtti*) we can assume that the verse text is an independent treatise called, as is Śāntarakṣita's well-known treatise, *Madhyamakālaṅkāra(kārikā)*. Moreover, as its another name "*dBu ma'i lam grub pa, Madhyamapratipatsiddhi*" indicates, the main subject of this treatise consists in the middle way (*madhyamapratipat*). Ratnākaraśānti illuminates the practice by quoting passages from the *Madhamakakārikā*, *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā*, *Madhyantavibhāga*, *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, and *Pramāṇavārttika*. He emphasizes the equality between the Madhyamaka and the Yogācāra, both of which claim the middle way without difference, and rejects Śāntarakṣita's opinion that the Yogācāra is a means for entering the final position of the Madhyamaka, or Candrakīrti's opinion that rejects the Yogācāra's position completely.

⁴ The Sanskrit terms for sub-divisions of the Yogācāra school, *sākārajñānavādin* and *nirākāravādi-yogācāra*, are found in Advayaśāstra's *Tattvaratnāvalī* 4.20 and 5.5. However, the terms *rnam bden pa* (**satyākāravādin*) and *rnam dzun pa* (**alīkākaravādin*) are found in Tibetan doxographies. Cf. Funayama 2007: 191. In the following, I refer to the latter's position with the term **alīkākaravāda*.

⁵ For Śāntarakṣita's argument, see Ichigo 1985 and Blumenthal 2009. As Ejima (1980: 223-226) has pointed out, although the neither-one-nor-many argument can be traced back to some origins, such as Āryadeva's *Catuhśataka* 344 and Dharmakīrti's PV III 359, it is Śrīgupta's *Tattvāvātāra* (P. 5292/D. 3892) v. 1 that has directly influenced Śāntarakṣita's reasoning.

[*Vyāpti*.:] Whatever a cognition (*yang dag par rig pa*, **saṃvedana*) of [an object] that is neither one nor many is, it has the nature of falsehood, like a sleeping person's seeing a drunken elephant.

[*Pakṣadharmatā*.:] And [a waking person's] seeing (*darśana*) [objects like] a body, a tree, and a pond, etc.,⁶ is also such a cognition, since [the object] is neither one nor many.

[Classification of the reason:] This is the reason of essential nature (*svabhāvahetu*).⁷

Ratnākaraśānti introduces this proof immediately after refuting a proof of selflessness by the opponent called “those who claim that everything is false” (*thams cad brdzun par smra ba*), namely, a certain Mādhyamika⁸:

Proof B

[*Vyāpti*.:] Whatever is neither one nor many is selfless, like a rabbit's horn.

[*Pakṣadharmatā*.:] These [objects like] blue, white, etc., are also neither one nor many.⁹

Unsurprisingly this proof reminds us of Śāntarākṣita's famous opening verse in his MA that

⁶ According to Abhidharmic categories, these examples are included in the realm of material (*gzugs kyi khams, rūpadhātu*). Cf. PPU D147a1-2: *gzugs kyi khams kyang gcig ma yin no || lus gang khyim dang | ljon zhing la sogs pa tha dad pa'i phyir ro ||*

⁷ MAV D109a3-4: *gang zhig gcig dang du ma dang* (D : *dang om*. P) *bral ba yang dag par rig pa de ni brdzun pa'i bdag nyid can yin te | dper na gnyid kyi* (em. : *kyis DP*) *log pas glang chen myos pa mthong ba bzhin no || yang dag par rig* (P : *rag D*) *pa 'di yang gcig dang du ma dang bral ba'i phyir lus dang ljon shing dang rdzing bu la sogs pa mthong ba yang* (P : *bzhin no D*) *zhes bya ba ni rang bzhin gyi gtan tshigs so ||*. The proof appears in the commentary on the following verses: *gcig dang gzhan las nges bral ba'i || shes de* (em. : *te DP*) *brdzun pa'i bdag nyid can || ji ltar gnyid kyi* (em. : *kyis DP*) *log pa yis || glang chen myos pa mthong ba bzhin ||23|| lus dang ljon shing mtshe'u la sogs || sad pa rnams kyis mthong ba 'di || gcig dang du ma las grol ba'i || shes pa de nyid yongs su gsal ||24||** (*Derge edition reverses pāda ab with pāda cd.) “The cognition of [an object] that is devoid of singularity and multiplicity has the nature of falsehood, like a sleeping person's seeing a drunken elephant. A waking person's seeing of a body, tree, pond, etc., is a cognition of [an object] that is devoid of singularity and multiplicity. This is perfectly clear.” By comparing the above proof with these verses, we can assume that the reason, *gcig dang du ma dang bral ba yang dag par rig pa*, is probably equivalent to the Skt. *ekānekavirahasamvedanam*, which can be interpreted as a genitive-*tatpuruṣa*, and that the problematic expression *gcig dang du ma dang bral ba'i phyir* in the *pakṣadharmatā*-statement should be understood as an explanation of the nature of objects like bodies, trees or ponds that appear in our minds as real existents.

⁸ Ratnākaraśānti emphasizes the unity between the Yogācāra and the Madhyamaka, and from this point of view, he calls the so-called “Madhyamaka” as “pseudo-Madhyamaka” (dBU ma ltar rñang ba) who holds the view that everything is false. Cf. MAV D120a4. Cf. also Seyfort Ruegg 1981: 122 fn. 408, Matsumoto 1980a: 169f., n. 12.

⁹ MAV D107b7: *gang gcig dang du ma dang bral ba de ni rang bzhin med pa yin te | dper na ri bong gi rva bzhin no || sngon po dang ser po la sogs pa de dag kyang gcig dang du ma dang bral ba'i phyir ro zhe na |*

demonstrates the selflessness of all entities accepted by his and other schools for the reason of “neither one nor many;”¹⁰ it is probably true that Ratnākaraśānti had this proof in mind when he constructed the above proof of an opponent. Ratnākaraśānti casts some severe objections to the proof by pointing out the undesirable consequences resulting from the opponent’s premise that everything is false. With regard to these objections, I would like to call attention here to only two points.

First, Ratnākaraśānti argues that using inference is impossible for an opponent who claims that all cognition is false, because such an erroneous cognition does not deserve to be called perception, and thus, no inference can occur on the basis of perception¹¹.

Second, the locus (*āśraya*) of the inference remains non-established for the opponent. Even if the opponent takes the locus to be established by experience (*nyams su myong ba, anubhava*) or perception, insofar as he holds the view that all cognition is false, the establishment is fundamentally impossible¹².

Ratnākaraśānti’s position is, on the other hand, to recognize the middle way by accepting the non-existence of both objective and subjective aspects (*grāhyagrāhakākāra*) as being the nature of the imagined (*parikalpitasvabhāva*), and the existence of the wrong imagination (*abhūtaparikalpa*)¹³ as being the nature of other-dependent (*paratantrasvabhāva*), which

¹⁰ MA(Ś) 1: *niḥsvabhāvā amī bhāvās tattvataḥ svaparoditāḥ | ekānekasvabhāvena viyogāt pratibimbavat* || Blumenthal 2009: 52 translates it as follows: “These entities, as asserted by our own [Buddhist schools] and other [non-Buddhist schools], have no inherent nature at all because in reality they have neither a singular nor manifold nature, like a reflected image.” Cf. also TSP 677.14-16: *yad ekānekasvabhāvarahitaṃ tad asadvyavahārayogyam, yathā viyadabjam. ekānekasvabhāvarahitās ca parābhimatāḥ paramāṇava iti svabhāvahetuḥ*. For the neither-one-nor-many argument of MA(Ś)’s verse and its Tibetan interpretations, see Tillemans 1983. As for Ratnākaraśānti’s relation to Śāntarakṣita, Matsumoto (1980a: 155-156) and Umino (2003: 11) have already pointed out that in MAV (D105a5-6), Ratnākaraśānti criticizes Śāntarakṣita’s definition of “the conventional” (*kun rdzob pa, samvṛti*) by quoting MA(Ś) 94.

¹¹ Cf. MAV D107b7-108a2: *de ni shin tu 'brel pa med de | 'di ltar de dag gi shes pa thams cad brdzun par rig pa las med par snang ba de 'i phyir 'khrul pa yin te | 'khrul pa yang mngon sum du ma yin no || de bas na rjes su dpag pa yang med de | de 'i phyir tshul gsum pa ma grub pas gtan tshigs thams cad de dag gi gtan tshigs ltar snang bar 'gyur ro || brdzun pa ni gang gi yang rgyur mi 'gyur ro || yang gang rjes su dpag pa la rgyu med na de ji ltar rgyur 'gyur | gal te rjes su dpag pa la rgyu yod na de nyid kyis grub pa 'i mtha' la gnod par 'gyur ro ||* Cf. also MAU D229b3-4, Matsumoto 1980a: 150.

¹² MAV D108a2-3: *gzhan yang sngon po la sogs pa 'i chos 'dir gang las grub | nyams su myong ba las so zhe na | nyams su myong ba 'i shes pa de ni brdzun pa yin te | de la don grub pa med do || mngon sum gyis so zhe na, ma yin te | brdzun par snang ba nyid 'khrul pa yin pa 'i phyir ro ||*

¹³ According to PPU D138b4-139b2, wrong imagination can be classified as follows (The textual sources are identified by Nguyen 2007) :

| Division | Contents | Textual Source |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | <i>citta-caitta</i> | MAVi I.8 |
| 2 | <i>grāhya & grāhaka</i> | MAVi I.1 |
| 3 | <i>ālayavijñāna & klišṭamanas & pravṛttivijñāna</i> | Triṃś |
| 4 | <i>artha & sattva & ātman & pravṛttivijñāna</i> | MAVi I. 3 |
| 6 | <i>deha & bhoga & pratiṣṭhā & manas & upalambha & vikalpa</i> | MAS XI. 40 |

becomes the nature of perfection (*pariniṣpannasvabhava*) when the imagined two aspects are removed. To testify this interpretation of the middle way, he quotes the first two verses of the *Madhyāntavibhāgakārikā*,¹⁴ a classical Yogācāra treatise ascribed to Maitreya, and explains the passage in his own words as follows:

“All [entities] that have the two [aspects of cognition] (i.e., *grāhyākāra* and *grāhakākāra*) as their nature do not exist. The nature of erroneous cognition (i.e., *abhūtaparikalpa*) of the two [aspects] exists. The [same] one is [also] of the nature of emptiness. This is explained as the middle way .”¹⁵

If we take this basic stance of Ratnākaraśānti into consideration, we have a good reason to account for the fact that he formulated **proof A** in such a complex style, not the simpler style of **proof B**. Certainly, it is one purpose of **proof A** to show the illusionary nature of our common experience through refuting its object by means of the neither-one-nor-many argument. For this purpose, he could have chosen the more simple means of taking “everyday objects” as the subject of the proof and “neither one nor many” as the reason, as found in **proof B**. However, as we have seen in the problem of **proof B**, taking non-existence as the subject of the inference involves the fallacy called *āśrayāsiddha*. In order to avoid this fallacy, it is necessary to justify, in some manner, the existence of the subject. Thus, he formulates the proof by using terms relating to “cognition,” which he accepts as truly existent. In fact, Ratnākaraśānti explains the way to avoid the *āśrayāsiddha* in his MA 25:

“[The reason] is not non-established because [its] locus is established. This is because this [cognition] is established to be the intrinsic nature of body, etc., by the self-awareness (*rang rig, svasamvedana*), since [those] multiple [objects] are cognized together [with the cognition].”¹⁶

On this verse, he comments as follows:

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 8 | <i>ālayavijñāna & kliṣṭamanas & 6 vijñāna-s</i> | Triṃś |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|

¹⁴ MAVi I.1-2: *abhūtaparikalpo 'sti dvayan tatra na vidyate | śūnyatā vidyate tv atra tasyām api sa vidyate || na śūnyam nāpi cāśūnyam tasmāt sarvvaṃ vidhīyate | satvād asatvāt satvāc ca madhyamā pratipac ca sā ||* Cf. MAV D103a4-5.

¹⁵ MAV D102b5-6: *gnyis kyi bdag nyid thams cad med || gnyis su 'khrul pa 'i bdag nyid yod || de ni stong pa 'i bdag nyid de || dbu ma 'i lam du 'di (D : de P) bzhed do ||3||*

¹⁶ MAV D109a4-5: *ma grub ma yin gzhi grub phyir || gang phyir 'di ni rang rig pas || lus sogs rang gi ngo bor (D : bo P) grub || sna tshogs lhan cig rig pa 'i phyir ||25||*

“And the reason is not the one whose locus is not established (*gzhi ma grub pa, āśrayāsiddha*). Since one sees [objects like] a body, tree, and pond, etc., the nature of cognition as the property-possessor of body, etc., is determined as it is by [one’s own] experience (i.e., self-awareness).” (MAV ad MA 25)¹⁷

According to the exposition, the subject/locus of the proof, “seeing of objects like a body, etc.,” is established because one experiences these objects being cognized together with the cognition. Through the experience of self-awareness, one knows that these objects are just appearances of “wrong imagination” (*abhūtaparikalpa*). In this manner, presupposing the existence of wrong imagination as the basis of non-existent mental images, Ratnākaraśānti legitimately claims the establishment of the locus of the proof.

Next, in order to make sure that the reason is also not contradictory (*'gal ba, viruddha*), he shows the presence of the reason “being a cognition of objects which are neither one nor many” in similar examples (*mthun pa'i phyogs, sapakṣa*) like the dream of a drunken elephant. Since everybody accepts that mental images in dreams are false and since false mental images are included in the nature of cognitions in dreams, one can say that such cognitions are a similar example of the proof. Subsequently, in order to prove that a cognition in a dream has the nature of the reason, Ratnākaraśānti appeals to the logical implication between falsehood (*alīkatva*), namely, non-existence, and the nature of lacking singularity and multiplicity (*ekānekavirahatva*). Since a dream cognition has falsehood as its nature, it can naturally be concluded that it has the nature of cognition of objects that are devoid of singularity and multiplicity, in other words, that the reason is applicable to all similar examples. This is the argument to show that the reason is not contradictory (*viruddha*).¹⁸

Lastly, he shows that the reason is not inconclusive (*ma nges pa, anaikāntika*). Usually, this final step is justified by one’s non-observation of the reason’s presence in all dissimilar examples. When inferring fire from smoke, this is the non-observation of smoke in dissimilar examples, like a pond, in which the property to be proved (*sādhyadharmā*), namely, fire-ness is

¹⁷ MAV D109a5-6: *gtan tshigs 'di* (D : 'di om. P) *gzhi ma grub pa yang ma yin te | lus dang ljon shing dang rdzing bu la sogs pa mthong bas lus la sogs pa'i chos can rig pa'i rang gi ngo bo nyams su myong bas* (em. : ba DP) *de bzhin du rtogs pa nyid kyis nges pa'i phyir ro ||*

¹⁸ MAV D109b4-6: *gtan tshigs 'di 'gal ba yang ma yin te | mthun pa'i phyogs rmi lam du glang po myos pa mthong ba la yang yod pa'i phyir ro || rmi lam ni brdzun pa mthong ba yin no zhes rab tu grags so || de'i bdag nyid ma yin pa de las snang bar mi rigs so || de'i (P : de'i phyir D) glang po myos pa mthong ba 'di ni brdzun pa'i bdag nyid mthun pa'i phyogs la grub po || mthong ba nyid rang rig pa'o || brdzun pa la yang gcig dang du ma nyid med de | de dag ni dngos po'i chos nyid yin pa'i phyir ro || de bas na gcig dang du ma dang bral ba'i yang dag par rig pa nyid mthun pa'i phyogs la yod par grub pas de'i phyir 'di 'gal ba yang ma yin no ||*

absent. In **proof A**, however, Ratnākaraśānti chooses to justify this step logically, without relying on non-observation of the reason in dissimilar examples. By introducing the concept called “all-including pervasion” (*sarvopasaṃhāravatī vyāptih*), according to which the necessity between the property to be proved (*sādhyadharmā, vyāpaka*) and the property to prove it (*sādhanadharmā, vyāpya*) is ascertained in all similar examples and the subject of the proof,¹⁹ he concludes that the reason is not inconclusive as follows:

“Neither is [the reason] inconclusive (*ma nges pa, anaikāntika*), because by the same example (i.e., a dreaming person’s cognition of a drunken elephant), the [following] pervasion is established [universally] by including all [similar examples and the subject of the proof]. Whatever is a cognition of [an object] devoid of singularity and multiplicity, it has certainly the nature of falsehood.

[Question:] Why is this so?

[Reply:] When [the two properties] pervading “the real existent” (*dngos pa, vastu*), [namely,] singularity and multiplicity, are removed, “real existence” (*dngos po nyid*) is also removed and non-existence is nothing but falsehood. Even though [the cognition] has this [falsehood] as its nature, the cognition is established [to be existent] because the [object’s] connection with the cognition is unreasonable without this [nature of falsehood].

[Question:] How is it proved that “real existence” is pervaded by the two [properties]?

[Reply:] As for the two properties of real entity characterized by mutual exclusion (*phan tshun gzhan sel, parasparaparihāra*), if one is rejected, the other is necessarily established, and thus, a real existent cannot exceed the two [properties]. Consequently, it is proved that a real existent is pervaded by the two properties.”²⁰

It is worth noting that the argument for the necessity that the nature of existence is pervaded by the two mutually excluding natures, singularity and multiplicity, is rendered from Śāntrākṣita’s

¹⁹ For *sarvopasaṃhāravatī vyāptih*, see Ono 2004, Kano 2005, and Shiga (forthcoming). In the VMS (D307b3), too, Ratnākaraśānti uses the concept for the proof of non-difference between common objects like white, singing sound, smell, sweet, roughness, etc., and the conceptual cognition (i.e., *abhūta-parikalpa*). Cf. Moriyama 2011: 33-36.

²⁰ MAV D109b6-110a2: *ma nges pa yang ma yin te | dpe 'di nyid kyis thams cad nye bar bsdus pas khyab pa grub pa 'i phyir ro || gang dang gang (D : gang om. P) gcig dang du ma dang bral ba yang dag par rig pa de dang de dag thams cad ni brdzun pa 'i bdag nyid yin te | de gang las she na | dngos po la khyab par byed pa gcig dang du ma nyid log na dngos po nyid kyang (D : kyang om. P) ldog pas (P : ste | D) dngos po med pa nyid (P : dngos po 'i chos nyid D) brdzun pa kho na ste | de 'i bdag nyid kyang yang dag par rig pa grub pa ste | de med na yang dag par rig pa dang 'brel pa ma (P : mi D) rigs pa 'i phyir ro || dngos po nyid la de dag gis khyab pa ji ltar grub (P : grub pa D) ce na | phan tshun gzhan sel ba 'i mtshan nyid dngos po 'i chos dag ni dngos po gcig bkag na gnyis pa nges par grub pa 'i phyir dngos po de nyid las 'da' bar mi nus so || de nyid kyi phyir gnyis kyi dngos po la khyab par grub po ||*

MA 62,²¹ which explains why the reason “neither one nor many” is free of the fallacy of one whose absence [in dissimilar examples] is doubtful (*sandighavyatireka*). If, in addition to *ekatva* and *anekatva*, there were a third alternative property of the real existent, one might suspect the existence of dissimilar examples that possesses that third property, and thus the reason could conclude the opposite of what should be proved. In the same manner, for Ratnākaraśānti, if there were such third alternative property, the cognition of an object that possesses this property would become the dissimilar example whose existence implies the reason’s inconclusiveness. However, since this possibility is rejected by Śāntarakṣita’s argument, the fallacy is avoidable in Ratnākaraśānti’s proof as well.

2. The scope of the neither-one-nor-many argument

As we have seen above, Ratnākaraśānti incorporates the neither-one-nor-many argument as part of the reason demonstrating the middle way that while the *abhūtaparikalpa* exists, the imagined object does not truly exist. However, does the proof say anything about the epistemological position that refutes mental images in our cognition as false? Certainly, what this proof intends to say is that everyday objects such as bodies, trees, ponds, etc., do not exist truly as we believe they do. However, does it also imply that mental images appearing in our cognition, like the image of blue, are also false?

To answer this question, we should examine Ratnākaraśānti’s various uses of the neither-one-nor-many argument in his different treatises more carefully. Now, as far as I have examined his MAV, MAU, and PPU, the target being criticized by the neither-one-nor-many argument can be classified into three kinds, namely, “external” objects, atoms, and mental images. In the following, I will present only the essence of each argument:

2.1 Refutation of “external” objects

Ratnākaraśānti first applies the neither-one-nor-many argument to reveal that what we believe to be an “external object” is unreal. For instance, a body is not a body because it consists of many parts, such as hands and legs, and these many parts are also divided into many sub-parts, and finally, into many atoms. On the other hand, as we see in the next, neither a single atom nor many atoms in aggregation is established. Therefore, a body is neither one nor many in nature.²²

²¹ MA (Ś) 62: *gcig dang du ma ma gtogs par || rnam pa gzhan dang ldan pa yi || dngos po mi rung 'di gnyis ni || phan tshun spangs te gnas phyr ro ||* Cf. Tillemans 1983: 310.

²² Cf. [1] MAV D109a6-b4: *'di ltar lus ni gcig ma yin te | lag pa dang rkang pa la sogs pa 'di dag du mar de ltar rtogs pa'i phyr ro || du ma yang ma yin te | lus gcig pa nyid du rtogs pa'i phyr ro || gang zhig 'dir phra rab du ma ni cha shas yin la | gang zhig gcig tu rags pa de ni cha shas can yin no zhes zer na | ma yin te | lag pa la sogs pa'i tshogs pa lus po gcig yin gyi | yang de dag las lus po tha dad pa med par rtogs pa'i phyr ro || cha shas can gcig pu khru bzhi ba'i tshad dang ldan pa lag pa dang rkang pa la sogs pa re rer rtogs pa yod do zhes smra ba ji ltar ston pa ma yin te | de lta bas na lag pa la sogs pa du ma ni lus gcig pa yin gyi | gcig dang du ma dang bral bar yang dag par rig pa gtan tshigs kyi rang gi ngo*

2.2 Refutation of atoms

The reasoning for the criticism of atoms runs as follows: an atom is not one object because it is invisible, and what is visible to us is only a gross object. On the other hand, many atoms cannot form an object because if they connect to each other by means of their parts, it contradicts the definition of an atom, “the minimal entity that has no part.” Moreover, if they could come together without being connected through their parts, gross objects would be the size of an atom.²³ It goes without saying that this argument is rendered from Vasubandhu’s *Viṃśatikā* 11-12, a *locus classicus* refuting the existence of atoms²⁴.

2.3 Refutation of mental images

Ratnākaraśānti finally concludes the falsehood of mental images like blue by adopting the same reasoning he used for criticizing external atoms. He introduces an objection that points out the difference between two objects, one being three dimensional (i.e., being surrounded by six atoms) and the other being two dimensional (i.e., being surrounded by four atoms), then refutes

bo chos can la ma (P : ma om. D) *grub pa ma yin no* || *gzhan yang lag pa dang* (P : dang om. D) *rkang pa la sogs pa gcig ma yin te* | *phan tshun rang gi ngo bos* (D : bo P) *gzugs su rnam par dben par snang ba'i phyir ro* || *du ma yang ma yin te* | *re re'i bdag nyid du gyur pa snang ba nyams su myong ba thun mong du rig pa med pas* | *lhan cig tu 'brel par snang ba mi rigs pa'i phyir ro* || *rang dang gzhan gyi sems bzhin no* || *lhan cig so sor snang ba yod de de nyid kyi phyir yang gtan tshigs kyi rang gi ngo bo gcig dang du ma dang bral ba yang dag par rig pa nyid chos can la ma grub pa ma yin no* ||; [2] PPU D147a2-3: *lus kyang gcig ma yin te* | *lag pa dang rkang pa la sogs pa tha dad pa'i phyir ro* || *lag pa yang gcig ma yin te, mdzub mo la sogs pa tha dad pa'i phyir ro* || *mdzub mo yang gcig ma yin te, tshigs la sogs pa tha dad pa'i phyir ro* || *tshigs kyang gcig ma yin te* | *de'i tshe tha dad pa'i phyir ro* || *tshigs la sogs pa'i cha yang cha shas dang bcas pa gcig ma yin no* ||; [3] MAU D227a4-5: *gzhan yang snam bu dang re lde la sogs par snang ba 'di dag gcig gam du ma zhig* | *gal te gcig na thog ma dang tha ma dang dbus kyi cha tha dad par snang bar mi 'gyur te* | *tha dad pa dang tha dad pa ma yin pa 'gal ba'i phyir ro* ||

²³ Cf. [1] PPU D147a3-5: *ci ste rdul phra rab cha shas med pa gcig tu 'gyur ro zhe na* | *ma yin te, rtag tu rags par snang ba'i phyir dang* | *rdul phra rab gcig mthong ba med pa'i phyir ro* || *rdul phra rab mang po phan tshun ldan pas de ltar mthong ba bzhin no zhes zer na* | *gal te cha shas kyi sbyor ba ni* | *cha shas med pa'i rdul phra rab tu mi 'gyur la* | *ci ste cha shas med par sbyor na ni* | *de'i tshe de dag tha mi dad pas* | *sa'i dkyil 'khor yang rdul phra rab gcig tu 'gyur la* | *sa'i dkyil 'khor dang 'brel pa'i gzugs gzhan snang ba rnam kyang* | *sa'i dkyil 'khor dang gnyis su med par thams cad rdul phra rab gcig gi tshad du 'gyur la de ltar ni ma yin te* | *de bas na rdul phra rab mang po'am* | *cig shos kyang rung ste gcig tu gyur pa ni 'ga' yang med do* ||; [2] MAU D227a5-7: *ci ste de ltar na cha shas rnam kyang so sor gcig tu mi rung bas cha shas med pa'i rdul phra rab 'ba' zhig gnas 'grangs na, ma yin te* | *rtag tu stug por snang ba'i phyir dang* | *rdul phra rab gcig tu mthong ba med pa'i phyir ro* || *rdul phra rab mang pos sbyar bas yin no zer na* | *de yang gal te cha shas kyi sbyor na ni cha shas med pa'i rdul phra rab tu mi 'gyur la cha shas med pas sbyor na ni rdul phra mo rnam gcig la gcig zhugs pas ri la sogs pa yang rdul phra rab kyi tshad tsam du thal bar 'gyur ro* || *de bas na snam bu la sogs pa 'di dag gcig dang du ma dang bral ba'i phyir ro* ||

²⁴ Viṃś 11-12: *na tad ekaṃ na cānekaṃ viśayaḥ paramāṇuśaḥ* | *na ca te saṃhatā yasmāt paramāṇur na sidhyati* ||11|| *ṣaṭkena yugapadyogāt paramāṇoḥ ṣaḍamśatā* || *ṣaṇṇām samānadeśatvāt piṇḍaḥ syād aṇumātrakaḥ* ||12|| The verse 12 is quoted in MAU D227a7.

this objection for the reason that both presuppose parts of atoms, regardless of whether they are external or internal. And since here is also no third alternative besides *ekatva* and *anekatva*, mental images like blue are definitely concluded as false (i.e., non-existent).²⁵ From the term *rnam par shes pa'i bdag nyid kyi sngon po*, which appears in the argument,²⁶ we know that his criticism presupposes the existence of mental atoms (*jñānaparamāṇu*), just as Śāntarakṣita's MA 49 and its *vr̥tti* does when criticizing a Sākāra-/*Satyākāra-Yogācāra proponent who accepts an equal number of cognitions as mental images.²⁷

3. Ratnākaraśānti's defense against Śāntarakṣita's criticism of the *alīkākaravijñānavāda*

Concerning Ratnākaraśānti's neither-one-nor-many argument and its application, we have seen so far how it was influenced by Śāntarakṣita's argument in the MA and also how it is different. For Ratnākaraśānti, Śāntarakṣita's argument is too extreme because it denies not only the nature of the imagined but also the basis of our cognitive act, *abhūtaparikalpa*, the nature of other-dependent. On the other hand, we know that Śāntarakṣita wrote a detailed refutation of a Yogācāra proponent of false mental images in his MA 52-60.²⁸ If it is true that Ratnākaraśānti constructed the above argument in order to criticize Śāntarakṣita's understanding of the middle way, we might naturally assume that Ratnākaraśānti also prepared some defensive arguments against Śāntarakṣita's criticism of the *alīkākaravāda*. The final section of this presentation aims

²⁵ MAU D227a7-b3: *ji ltar sngon po la sogs pa phyi rol gyi las thal bar 'gyur ba'i skyon brjod pa 'di dag ni | rnam par shes pa'i bdag nyid kyi sngon po la sogs pa la yang mtshungs te | thal bar 'gyur ba la bye brag med pa'i phyir ro || don dang rnam par shes pa'i bye brag tsam gyis ni cir yang mi 'gyur ro || ci ste don gyi rdul phra rab ni phyogs drug nas ni bskor ba yin la | rnam par shes pa'i rdul phra mo ni phyogs bzhi pa'o zhe na | cha shas dang bcas pa mtshungs pa'i phyir des kyang cir yang mi 'gyur te | gcig dang du ma las ma gtogs pa'i dngos po phung po gsum pa gzhan dag kyang med pas sngon po la sogs pa dag ni phyi rol gyi dngos po dang nang gi dngos por ma grub pas brdzun pa nyid do ||* "Those above-mentioned fallacies that result in external objects like blue are equally [applicable] to [mental images] like blue that are the nature of cognition, since there is no difference in *reductio ad absurdum* (*thal bar 'gyur ba, prasaṅga*) [that occurs for both objects]. Nothing changes only by the difference between [external] object and mental [object]. [Objection:] Whereas an external atom is surrounded by six parts, a mental atom is [surrounded] by four parts. [This is the substantial difference]. [Reply:] Since [both atoms] have parts, nothing changes even by this [difference]. Since there is no third alternative different from oneness and manyness, [objects] like blue, no matter whether they are external or internal, are definitely false."

²⁶ The term is almost equivalent to Ratnakīrti's expression, *vijñānātmakanīlaparamāṇu*. Cf. CAP 130.9f. Ratnakīrti also refutes the view that mental image is composed by mental atoms. However, he does not conclude that therefore there is no singularity of mental images, because the singularity (*ekatva*) is pervaded by the grossness (*sthūlatva*) and through the necessity between the grossness and the nature of illuminating (*prakāśamānatva*), mental images' singularity is proved.

²⁷ Cf. MA(Ś) 49: *ci ste nram pa'i grangs bzhin du || rnam par shes pa khas len na || de tshe rdul phran 'drar 'gyur ba || dpyad pa 'di las bzlog par dka' ||*

²⁸ As for the Yogācāra proponent of the *alīkākaravāda*, Seitetsu Moriyama (1992: 436-433) assumes him to be Kambara, the author of the *Ālokaṃālā*, but this identification is doubtful, at least to me.

to reconstruct Ratnākaraśānti's possible replies to this criticism.

First of all, let us briefly summarize Śāntarakṣita's objections against the Yogācāra proponent of false mental images.²⁹

MA 53: How can one have a clear experience of the mental image of an object if the mental image does not actually exist?

MA 54-56: If the image does not exist in a cognition, and thus is not "mental" at all, the image is neither perceptible nor efficient for causing a cognition similar to the image.

MA 57: A non-existent image is neither identical with nor causally related to a cognition, and therefore, the image is not cognized.

MA 58: If an image arises without a cause, how can it arise at a certain time? If it arises from its cause, it has the nature of other-dependent (*paratantrasvabhāva*)?

MA 59: A crystal-like cognition has no cognitive act by itself.

MA 60: If a non-existent image arises from an erroneous, latent impression, the image has the nature of other-dependent.

One obvious presupposition of the above criticism is that here, the Yogācāra proponent, according to Śāntarakṣita's understanding, accepts a mental image to have the nature of the imagined (*parikalpitasvabhāva*), and therefore he presents a strong argument that mental images of objects should be considered as having the nature of other-dependent. Śāntarakṣita sees the weakness of the Yogācāra argument as the relation between mental images and cognition, in other words, between the nature of the imagined and the nature of other-dependent. If the Yogācāra proponent accepts the non-existence of mental images in the cognition, he cannot explain the undeniable fact that mental images appear in one's cognition when one perceives objects. In order to explain the experience, either identity (*tādātmya*) or causality (*tadutpatti*) must be assumed as being the relation between mental images and the cognition; in any case, the Yogācāra proponent has no other choice than to accept mental images as having the nature of other-dependent.

Ratnākaraśānti replies to the heart of Śāntarakṣita's criticism of the *alīkākaravāda* again by using the neither-one-nor-many argument, or more correctly, one of its interpretations: the neither-identical-nor-different argument. The following is a summary of his discussion in the MAU³⁰ and the PPU³¹:

²⁹ Cf. MA(Ś) 53-60. For translations, see Ichigo 1985: 149-153 [in Japanese], Blumenthal 2009: 59.

³⁰ MAU D 227b4-7: *de bas na gsal ba 'di ni rang gi bdag nyid la ma 'khrul ba'i phyir mngon sum gyi tshad ma yin no || gzhan pa ni nam mkha' la skra'i tshogs snang ba bzhin 'khrul pa yin no|| 'di ltar sngon po la sogs pa gsal ba gcig gi bdag nyid yin no zer na | sngon po dang ser po la sogs pa mtshan nyid phan tshun spangs te snang bas gcig ma yin la | de'i bdag nyid kyis gsal ba gcig dang 'gal ba'i phyir du ma nyid kyang ma yin no || ci ste sngon po la sogs pa 'di ni ji ltar nyams su myong ba de ltar gcig yin te |*

- Illumination and a mental image are not completely identical: An illumination is the perception as a means of valid cognition, because it is non-erroneous with regard to the cognition itself. A mental image is, on the other hand, erroneous like the appearance of a mass of hairs in the sky in the cognition of a patient who has the *timira* eye disease.
- The complete identity between the two results the fallacy as argued against the

lhan cig nyams su myong ba'i phyir ro zhe na | ma yin te, tha dad pa nyid tha dad pa ma yin no zhes smras par 'gyur ro || ci ste de'i bdag nyid yin pa'i phyir || de dang 'dra bar gsal ba yang tha dad do zhe na | de dag bdag nyid so sor myong ba'i phyir | lhan cig tu myong ba med pas gcig gi thams cad myong ba med par thal bar 'gyur ro || de bas na sngon po la sogs pa (em. : pas DP) ni gcig dang du ma ma yin (em. : yin DP) pas na nam mkha'i sgra'i tshogs bzhin no || “Consequently, since illumination (*gsal ba*, *prakāśa*) is non-erroneous with regard to [cognition] itself, it is a means of valid cognition like perception (*mngon sum gyi tshad ma*, *pratyakṣapramāṇa*). The other (i.e., mental image) is erroneous like the appearance of a mass of hairs in the sky [in the cognition of a patient with the *timira* eye disease]. That is, if one argues that [a mental image] like blue has a single illumination as its nature, [we reply that] since mental images like blue and white, etc., appear as being mutually excluded, [they] are not single, and by [their] identity [with the illumination], since [otherwise they would] be contradictory to a single illumination, [they] are not many either. [On the other hand,] if one argues, ‘Mental images are single since they are cognized [by this single luminous cognition], because [mental images and their cognition] are experienced together,’ [then we reply,] ‘No, we will say that [mental images and illumination] are different and identical (*tha dad pa nyid tha dad pa ma yin, bhedābheda?*).’ [Objection:] Since [illumination] is identical to [mental images], illumination that is similar to [mental images] would be also multiple. [Reply: Then,] since that nature (i.e., a mental image) is experienced separately [by each cognition] and since one does not experience [multiple mental images] together [within a single cognition], there would be no experience of everything for a [single cognition]. Therefore, since [mental images] like blue are neither one nor many [in nature], [they] are like a mass of hairs in the sky.”

³¹ After quoting LAS X. 709, in PPU D148a2-6, Ratnākaraśānti states as follows: *sngon po la sogs pa 'di dag shes pa'i rnam pa yin par gyur kyang | dngos po med cing brdzun pa yin te | shes pa'i bdag nyid yin yang gcig dang du ma nyid dang bral ba'i gnas skabs su gyur pa'i phyir dang | bag chags kyis bcom pa'i sgras kyang bag chags kyis nyams pa las skyes pa'i 'khrul pa'i mshan mar gsungs pa'i phyir ro || 'o na brdzun pa de ji ltar der snang bar 'gyur zhe na | gsal ba dang lhan cig tu brdzun pa'i bdag nyid du 'brel pa'i dbang gis so || 'di ltar rnam par shes pa nyid gsal ba'i rang bzhin yin pa las gsal bzhin pa yin la | thog ma med pa'i bag chags kyis bslad pa'i dbang gis 'khrul nas | sngon po la sogs pa'i rnam pa brdzun pa yang | rmi lam bzhin du gsal bzhin bar snang ba yin pas sngon po la sogs pa gsal bar grub ste | gsal ba'i bdag nyid ma btags par de mi rung ba'i phyir ro || sngon po la sogs pa de gsal bzhin pa yin yang gnod pa yod pa'i phyir brdzun pa yang grub po || de brdzun par grub pas na de'i bdag nyid de yang brdzun par grub po ||* “Although these blue and others are mental images (*shes pa'i rnam pa*, **jñānākāra*), they are non-existent and false, because in spite of [their] having the nature of cognition, they are situated in the state of lacing together singularity and multiplicity and because [they] are said to have the erroneous character produced by a mind [perplexed] by latent impressions, by [the phrase] “*vāsanair bhramanīkṛtam*” (LAS X. 624), too. [Question:] Why would such a false [image] appear [in the mind]? [Reply:] This is because [the image] is connected to illumination (*gsal ba*, *prakāśa*) through the false nature [of the image]. To explain: only cognition is illuminating because of its luminous nature. Because of the error through perplexity by beginning-less latent impressions, blue-images, etc., are false. However, since, as in a dream, [they] appear luminously [in the cognition], [mental images] like blue are established as illuminating, because [a mental image's appearance] is impossible without having the nature of illuminating. Although [mental images] like blue are illuminating, [they] are also established to be false because of the existence of [their] invalidation. Since they are established to be false, their identity with the [illuminating] (*de'i bdag nyid*, **tādātmya*) is also established to be false.” Cf. Oki 1977, Moriyama 2011: 28. On the relation between mental image and the cognition in Ratnākaraśānti's epistemology, Iwata 1991: 190-202 provides a detailed analysis.

Sākāvavādin: Different from illumination, mental images are not single, because they appear as being mutually excluded. The Sākāravādin’s claim of their identity for the reason of “being cognized together” is not accepted. If they were identical, illumination would also be multiple like mental images. However, if there were many cognitions in accordance with many mental images, then, Sākāravādin’s reason, “multiple images’ being cognized by a single cognition,” would be damaged.

- The two are not completely different: Although illumination and mental images have two different natures, namely, the non-erroneous nature and the erroneous nature, such a false image appears in the mind by having the nature of illumination. However, since the existence of such a image is invalidated, its identity with illumination is established to be false. That is to say, the two are related by false identity.

We see here Ratnākaraśānti’s tactical defense of the *alīkākāravāda* by using Śāntarakṣita’s attack against it. Ratnākaraśānti accepts that the two alternatives concerning the relation between mental images and cognition both result in undesirable consequences, as argued by Śāntarakṣita. However, according to Ratnākaraśānti’s understanding, this does not imply that mental images therefore have the nature of other-dependent. Rather, he concludes that the relation between mental images and cognition is thus exactly “neither-identical-nor- difference,” since the phrase ‘*ekānyatvavarjita*’ in the *Lankāvatārasūtra* (X. 709) can be interpreted in this way.³² In other words, since mental images and cognition are not identical, both surely have different natures, namely, superficial multiplicity and singularity, or the nature of the imagined and the nature of other-dependent, and since both are not completely different, or rather, since both are connected through false identity, our experience of cognizing objects is well explained.

³² MAU D227b7-228a3: *don de yang* [228a1] |

ji ltar me long la ni gzugs || gcig dang gzhan pa rnam spangs pa ||

snang yang de ni yod ma yin || de bzhin dngos rnams ngo bo nyid || (*Lankāvatāra* X. 709)

ces gsungs so || rnam par spangs pa zhes bya ba ni gcig dang du ma gnyi ga’i ngo bor med pa’o || ‘di ltar sngon po la sogs pa gsal ba las tha dad dam | ‘on te tha dad pa ma yin pa zhig yin | ci ste tha dad pa yin na ni de mi snang bar ‘gyur ro || gal te tha dad pa ma yin na ni de rnams gsal ba’i bdag nyid yin pas gcig tu ‘gyur ba’am | de yang de rnams dang tha mi dad pas du ma gcig tu mi btub pa yang sngar bshad zin to || ji ltar me long gzugs zhes bya ba la sogs pa ni phyogs ‘dir ni gcig dang gzhan pa zhes bya ba ni tha dad pa dang | tha dad pa ma yin pa’o || “What [the above discussion] means is stated [in the *Lankāvatārasūtra*], too: ‘**Just as visible matter, which has neither identity nor difference, is seen on the surface of a mirror, but is not actually there, so too for the being belonging to things.**’ The term ‘*varjita*’ means ‘neither one nor many.’ That is, [mental images] like blue should be either different from illumination or identical with it. If [the two] are different, [mental images] would not appear [in an illuminating cognition]. If [the two] are identical, [on the other hand,] since those [mental images] have the nature of a [single cognition], [they] would also be single. Furthermore, if a [cognition] is identical with those [mental images], [its] multiplicity does not fit the singularity [as the nature of the cognition]. Thus, [this] has already been explained.” Kamlaśīla also quotes LAS X. 709 in his *Bhāvanākrama* and *Madhyamakāloka*. See Keira 2004: 220, fn. 407.

4. Conclusion

To sum up, this study has clarified the following points:

- Ratnākaraśānti demonstrates the selflessness of all phenomena in his proof with a reason that contains an element of the neither-one-nor-many argument. This proof has been influenced by Śāntarakṣita's argument, as can be seen in its treatment of the negation as being implicative (*paryuāda*) and his rejection of a third party in addition to *ekatva* and *anekatva*. However, by presenting the subject and the reason with an additional word, "cognition" (*saṃvedana*), Ratnākaraśānti chooses a different path than that of Śāntarakṣita, and makes the existence of cognition clear, namely, *abhūtaparikalpa*, the basis of Yogācāra ontology.
- Ratnākaraśānti uses the neither-one-nor-many argument for three different types of objects, namely, "external objects" as an appearance of *ālayavijñāna*, external atoms as the minimum basis of external objects, and mental images like blue. Of the three, the last is significant when considering his *alīkākaravāda*. To reveal the falsehood of such mental images, he uses again Śāntarakṣita's method for refuting mental images as an assemblage of mental atoms.
- Śāntarakṣita refutes the Yogācāra argument of false mental images by pointing out its undesirable consequences. If such images are identical with cognition, they would have the nature of other-dependence, like cognition itself. And if the two are different, "cognition" is unexplainable. Against this claim, Ratnākaraśānti defends his position by reversing the same argument. The two different natures remain, since mental images are not identical with cognition, and "cognition" is explainable by finding a "false identity" between them.

Although I believe that the present study has clarified some features of Ratnākaraśānti's epistemological stance, especially its relation to Śāntarakṣita's neither-one-nor-many argument, there remain several points that require further studies. For instance, Ratnākaraśānti's understanding of the system of the means of valid cognition, including self-awareness, which is found in the MAV, should be examined to gain a clear picture of his epistemology.³³ Moreover, in Jñānaśrīmitara's *Sākārasiddhiśāstra* we find an extended criticism of an enigmatic proof based on the neither-one-nor-many reason,³⁴ but its background and relation to Ratnākaraśānti's argument is still obscure. I hope that future studies on these issues will bring us rich and fruitful

³³ See § 6 in the synopsis of MAV. I will examine the section in the coming 62th conference of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies at Ryukoku University.

³⁴ Cf. SSŚ 377.8-9: *yad apy ucyate, yad yena rūpeṇa naikaṃ nānekam, na tat tena sat, tad yathā*

results of the *sākāra-nirākāra* debate between some of the great Indian philosophers of this later period.

Appendix: A synopsis of the MAV

0. Salutation [D Hi 102a6]

1. Homage Verse [102a6]

2. Two truths as the target of this treatise [102a6-b5]

3. Middle way for the Yogācāra [102b5-105a2]

3.1. Explanation of the middle way presented in the *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.1-2 [102b5-103a5]

3.2 Refutation of opponents' views on the middle way [103a5-b7]

3.2.1 Refutation of an opponent who claims that blue and other things exist unless they are not examined [103a5-7]

3.2.2 Refutation of an opponent who conventionally accepts pots, etc. [103a7-b2]

3.2.3 Refutation of an opponent who claims that everything ultimately does not exist [103b2-7]

3.2.4 Some testimonies on the existence of cognition as *paratantrasvabhāva* [103b7-104a6]

3.2.5. An interpretation of non-arising (*anutpāda*) [104a6-b1]

3.2.6. Emptiness, dependent origination, and the middle way [104b1-105a2]

4. Criticism of a Madhyamaka who claims that everything is false [105a2-109a2]

4.1. Five fallacies of the Madhyamaka's claim that everything is false [105a2-5]

4.2. Criticism of Śāntarakṣita's definition of "conventional truth" [105a2-7]

4.3. Criticism of the Madhyamaka proof of selflessness [105a7-b2]

4.4. Ratnākaraśānti's view on the middle way based on his theory of cognition with false mental images [105b2-7]

4.5. The relationship among wrong imagination (*abhūtaparikalpa*), superimposition (*samāropa*), and self-awareness (*svasaṃvedana*) [105b7-107b6]

4.5.1. Difference is caused by wrong imagination, that is, superimposition [105b7-106b2]

4.5.2. The impossibility of proving that wrong imagination as cognition is itself false [106b2-107a4]

4.5.3. Mental images like blue being devoid of one or many natures, and self-awareness as the nature of their cognitions being not invalidated [107a4-b6]

4.6. Refutation of the Madhyamaka's proof of selflessness [107b6-109a2]

4.6.1. The opponent's proof of selflessness on the basis of the neither-one-nor-many argument [107b6-7]

4.6.2. The opponent who regards perception as erroneous cognition cannot present valid

duḥkhaṃ sukhārūpeṇa. naikaṃ nānekaṃ ca vijñānaṃ nīlādirūpeṇeti vyāpakānupalabdhir iti.

- inferences on the basis of perception [107b7-108a2]
- 4.6.3. The opponent's thesis, "Everything is false," has already been refuted [108a2]
- 4.6.4. The subject is non-established [108a2-5]
- 4.6.5. The example is non-established [108a5-7]
- 4.6.6. The opponent who regards everything as false can present neither proofs for his theses nor refutations of others' theses: First interpretation of v. 22d [108a7-b4]
- 4.6.7. Excursion: Refutation of the Sarvāstivādin's proof [108b4-6]
- 4.6.8. The opponent who regards everything as false cannot present any teachings of the Buddha, such as omniscience or other worlds (*paraloka*): Second interpretation of v. 22d [108b6-109a2]
5. Ratnākaraśānti's proof of the self-less-ness cognition with false mental images [109a2-111a1]
- 5.1. Presentation of the proof of cognition with false mental images [109a2-4]
- 5.2 Examination of the reason [109a4-111a1]
- 5.2.1 The reason is not non-established [109a5-b4]
- 5.2.2 The reason is not contradictory [109b4-6]
- 5.2.3 The reason is not inconclusive [109b6-111a1]
- 6 Ratnākaraśānti's classification of means of valid cognition [110a3-113b6]
- 6.1 Buddhas' and Bodhisattvas' wisdoms of emptiness as the ultimate means of valid cognition [111a1-b5]
- 6.2 Seven verses on the conventional means of valid cognition [111b5-113b6]
- 6.2.1. Self-awareness [111b5-112a5]
- 6.2.2. Perception [112a5-b2]
- 6.2.3. Inference [112b2-113b6]
7. Classifications and definitions of two truths [113b6-114a3]
8. The Path of the Mahāyāna and its result [114a3-119a6]
- 8.1. The great mirror of the Mahāyāna teaching [114a3-7]
- 8.2. Twenty-eight incorrect views and their explanation [114a7-116a2]
- 8.2.1. Twenty-eight incorrect views against the Mahāyāna teachings [114a7-b4]
- 8.2.2. Explanation of twenty-eight incorrect views [114b4-116a2]
- 8.3. The practice of mind-only found in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* and the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* [116a2-b3]
- 8.4. Four verses on the non-conceptual wisdom from the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* and their interpretations [116b3-117b7]
- 8.4.1. The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* X. 167, 374, 91, and III. 53 [116b3-7]
- 8.4.1.1. Explanation of *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* X. 167 [116b7-117a5]
- 8.4.1.2. Explanation of *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* X. 374 [117a5-b2]
- 8.4.1.3. Explanation of *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* X. 91 [117b2-4]

- 8.4.1.4. Explanation of *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* III. 53 [117b4-7]
- 8.5. Six ways for entering non-conceptual wisdom [117b7-118a7]
- 8.6. Yoga's four stages [118a7-119a2]
 - 8.6.1. The first stage [118b1-2]
 - 8.6.2. The second stage [118b2-4]
 - 8.6.3. The third stage [118b4-5]
 - 8.6.4. The fourth stage [118b5-119a2]
- 8.7. Liberation through the Mahāyāna path [119a2-6]
- 9. The association between the *trishbhāva*-theory and the middle way [119a6-120a2]
 - 9.1. Ratnākaraśānti's own view based on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.1-2 [119a6-b2]
 - 9.2. Refutation of opponents' views on the middle way [119b2-120a2]
 - 9.2.1. Refutation of an opponent who regards cognition as conventional truth [119b2-3]
 - 9.2.2. Refutation of an opponent who claims that everything is like an illusion [119b3-120a2]
- 10. Brief explanation of the four Buddhist schools: Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika, Yogācāra-Madhyamaka and pseudo-Madhyamaka [120a2-4]
- 11. Closing verses [120a4-b1]

Bibliography

Primary literature

- AVS *Antarvyāptisamarthana* (Ratnākaraśānti): See Kajiyama 1999.
- CAP *Citrādvaitapraśavāda* (Ratnakīrti): RNA 129-144.
- JNA *Jñānaśrīmitranibandhāvali*, A. Thakur (ed.), Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1987 [2nd edition].
- TBh *Tarkabhāṣā* (Mokṣākaragupta): *Tarkabhāṣā and Vādashāna of Mokṣākaragupta and Jitāripāda*, R. Iyengar (ed.), Mysore: The Hindusthan Press, 1952.
- TR *Tattvaratnāvalī* (Advayavajra): In H. Ui, *Daijobutten no kenkyū*. Iwanami Shoten, 1963, pp. 1-52.
- Triṃś *Triṃśikā* (Vasubandhu): *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, deux traités de Vasubandhu: Viṃśatikā et Triṃśikā*, S. Lévi (ed.), Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1925
- TSP *Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā* (Kamalaśīla): D. Shastri (ed.), *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Shāntarakṣita. With the Commentary 'Pañjikā' of Shrī Kamalashīla*. Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati, 1968.
- PPU **Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* (Ratnākaraśānti): D. 4079 / P. 5579, *Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag*.
- PV III *Pramāṇavārttika* (Dharmakīrti), pratyakṣa-chapter: In. H. Tosaki, *Bukkyō ninshiki ron no kenkyū*, 2 vols., Tokyo: Daito Shuppansha, 1979, 1985.

- BhKr I *Bhāvanākrama I* (Kamalaśīla): G. Tucci (ed.), *Minor Buddhist Texts: Part II First Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla*. Roma: Is. M. E. O., 1958.
- MA(Ś) *Madhyamakālaṅkāra* (Śāntarakṣita): M. Ichigo (ed.), *Madhyamakālaṅkāra of Śāntarakṣita: With his own commentary or Vṛtti and with the subcommentary or Pañjikā of Kamalaśīla*. Kyoto: Buneido, 1985.
- MAU **Madhyamālaṅkāropadeśa* (Ratnākaraśānti): D. 4085 / P. 5586, *dBu ma rgyan gyi man ngag*.
- MAV **Madhyamakālaṅkāravṛtti* (Ratnākaraśānti): D. 4072 / P. 5573, *dBu ma rgyan gyi 'grel pa dbu ma'i lam grub pa*.
- MAVi *Madhyāntavibhāgakārikā* (Maitreya): G. Nagao (ed.), *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation 1964.
- MSA *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* (Asaṅga): S. Lévi (ed.), *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*. Tome 1: Texte, Paris: Librairie HonoréChampion, 1907.
- Vimś *Vimśatikā* (Vasubandhu): See Trimś.
- RNA *Ratnakīrtinibandhāvaliḥ*, A. Thakur (ed.), Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1975 [2nd edition].
- LAS *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*: B. Nanjio (ed.), *The Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. Kyoto: Ōtani University, 1923.
- VMS **Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* (Ratnākaraśānti): D. 4259 / P. 5756, *Rnam par rig pa tsam nyid du grub pa shes bya ba*.
- SSŚ *Sākārasiddhiśāstra* (Jñānaśrīmitra): JNA 367-513.

Secondary literature

Blumenthal, James

- 2009 “Śāntarakṣita’s “Neither-One-Nor-Many” Argument from Madhamakālaṅkāra (The Ornament of the Middle Way): A Classical Buddhist Argument on the Ontological Status of Phenomena,” in W. Edelglass & J. L. Garfield (eds.), *Buddhist Philosophy: Essential Readings*, Oxford University Press, pp. 46-60.

Ejima, Yasunori

- 1980 *Chuganshiso no tenkai*, Tokyo: Shunjusha.

Funayama, Toru

- 2007 “Kamalaśīla’s distinction between the two sub-schools of Yogācāra. A provisional survey”, in B. Kellner, H. Krasser, H. Lasic, M. T. Much and H. Tauscher (eds.), *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ: Papers Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, Vienna: Arberitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, pp. 187-202.

Ichigo, Masamichi

- 1985 *Chuganshiso no kenkyu-Śāntarakṣita no shiso*, Kyoto: Buneido.

Iwata, Takashi

1991 *Sahopalambhaniyama*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Kajiyama, Yūichi

1965 “Controversy between the Sākāra- and Nirākāra-vādins of the Yogāchāra School – Some Materials,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 14/1, 418-429 [=Kajiyama 2005: 389-400].

1983 *Bukkyo ni okeru sonzai to chishiki*. Tokyo: Kinokuniya Shoten.

1998 *An Introduction to Buddhist Philosophy*, Vienna: Arberitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

1999 *The Antaryvāptisamarthana of Ratnākaraśānti*, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

2005 Y. Kajiyama, *Studies in Buddhist Philosophy: Selected Papers*, Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., Ltd.

Kano, Kyo

2005 “pakṣa to sapakṣa no ittaika to fuhenteki-henju-kankei no kakuritsu” [Incorporation of *pakṣa* with *sapakṣa* and the Establishment of Universal Pervasion], *Buddhism and Jainism: Essays in Honour of Dr. Hojun Nagasaki on His Seventieth Birthday*, Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, pp. 512-482.

Katsura, Shoryu

1976 “A synopsis of the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* of Ratnākaraśānti”, *Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū*, 25/1, pp. 38-41.

Keira, Ryusei

2004 *Mādhyamika and Epistemology: A Study of Kamalaśīla’s Method for Proving the Voidness of ALL Dharmas*, Vienna: Arberitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

Matsumoto, Shirō

1980a “Ratnākaraśānti no chuganha-hihan (jou)” [Ratnākaraśānti’s Criticism of the Madhyamaka (1)], *Toyogakujutsu-kenkyū*, 19/1, pp. 148-174.

1980b “Ratnākaraśānti no chuganha-hihan (ge)” [Ratnākaraśānti’s Criticism of the Madhyamaka (1)], *Toyogakujutsu-kenkyū*, 19/2, pp. 152-180.

Moriyama, Seitetsu

1992 “Koki-chugan-ha to keisho-shinjitsu-ron, keisho-kyogi-ron: Śākyabuddhi, Prajñākaragupta, Kambala” [Later Madhyamaka and Satyākāravāda and alīkākaravāda: Śākyabuddhi, Prajñākaragupta, Kambala], *Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū* 41/1, pp. 102-108.

Moriyama, Shinya

- 2011 “Keisho-kyogi-ron to tayo-funi-ron (jo)” [Alīkākāravāda and Citrādvaitavāda I], *Studies in Humanities <Human Sciences>, Bulletin of Faculty of Arts, Shinshu University*, 45, pp. 23-41.

Nguyen Tien Yen

- 2007 “Ratnākaraśānti Prajñāpāramitopadeśa ni mirareru sansho-setu no ichi-kosatsu” [A Study of the Three Natures Theory concerned on Ratnākaraśānti’s Prajñāpāramitopadeśa], *Otani-daigaku-daigakuin Kenkyu-kiyo*, 24, pp. 29-52.

Oki, Kazufumi

- 1977 “Ratnākaraśānti no ukeisho-setsu-hihan” [Ratnākaraśānti’s criticism of the Sākāravāda], *Indogaku-Bukkyogaku-Kenkyu*, 25/2, pp. 940-937.
- 1982 “Uso-yuishiki to Muso-yuishiki” [Sākāra- and Nirākāra-Vijñaptimātravāda], *Koza Daijobukkyo* 8, Tokyo: Shunjusya, pp. 177-209.

Ono, Motoi

- 2004 “Bukkyoronrigakuha ni okeru naihenju to gaihenju: Prajñākaragupta wo chushin ni” [“antarvyāpti” and “bahirvyāpti” in the Buddhist Logic], *Studies on Indian Philosophy and Buddshit Thoughts: Volume in Honor of Professor Esho Mikogami*, Kyoto: Nagata-bunso-do, pp. 457-492.

Seyfort Ruegg, David

- 1981 *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Shiga, Kiyokuni

- forthcoming “Remarks on the origin of all-inclusive pervasion,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy*.

Takemura, Makio

- 1995 *Yuishiki-sansho-setsu no kenkyu*, Tokyo: Shunjusya.

Tillemans, Tom J. F.

- 1983 “The ‘Neither One Nor Many’ Argument for śūnyatā and Its Tibetan Interpretations,” in E. Steinkellner & H. Tauscher (eds.), *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy*, Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, pp. 305-320.

Umino, Takanori

- 2002 *Indo-koki-yuishikishiso no kenkyu*, Tokyo: The Sankibo Press.