

# KANSAI GAIDAI UNIVERSITY

## THE INDIAN BUDDHIST PERCEPTION-THEORY IN TATTVASAṂGRAHA AND ITS PAÑJIKĀ : SOME CORRECTIONS AND REVISED TRANSLATION OF THE TEXT CHAPTER 17 (2)

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: Kansai Gaidai University. Intercultural Research Institute 公開日: 2021-04-07 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): Buddhist-Jainist dispute, direct perception (pratyakṣa), the universal (sāmānya) 作成者: Kaneko, Naoya メールアドレス: 所属: Ph.D. Candidate, University of Tsukuba
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.18956/00007985">https://doi.org/10.18956/00007985</a>

# **THE INDIAN BUDDHIST PERCEPTION-THEORY IN TATTVASAṂGRAHA AND ITS PAÑJIKĀ : SOME CORRECTIONS AND REVISED TRANSLATION OF THE TEXT CHAPTER 17 (2)**

**NAOYA KANEKO**

*Ph.D. Candidate, University of Tsukuba*

This article deals with a Buddhist-Jainist dispute over perception-theory in ancient India. In this article, I take two persons: Buddhist scholar Śāntarakṣita and Jainist scholar Sumati. The former is well known in ancient Tibet and among modern reserchers of Indian thought. On the other hand, the latter is little known because of the lost of his works. For this reason, Śāntarakṣita's work *Tattvasaṃgraha* is almost the only source to know Sumati's thought. In the dispute between them, they show quite contrastive theories of perceptual process. In other words: Sumati maintains that the perceptual content becomes clear in a certain period of time, because the object of perception is qualified by qualifier called the universal (*sāmānya*). Against this, Śāntarakṣita maintains that the perceptual content of individual things at the first stage is the clearest and the universal is a subjective conceptual thing, because it is not experienced by perception. From these standpoints, they develop further argument to defend their doctrines.

*Keywords:* Buddhist-Jainist dispute, direct perception (*pratyakṣa*), the universal (*sāmānya*)

## **I. Introduction**

The aim of this article is to make some corrections to the Sanskrit text and to revise the translation of Indian Buddhist Philosophy book *Tattvasaṃgraha*'s (TS) 17th chapter and its commentary (Pañjikā;

TSP)<sup>1</sup>. This book is written by Śāntarakṣita (ca.725-788) and his disciple Kamalaśīla (ca.740-795) who both belong to Yogācāra-Mādhyaṃika school. In this chapter (kk.1212-1360<sup>2</sup>), they mainly deal with direct perception's (*pratyakṣa*) non-conceptuality and non-erroneousness defined by Buddhist scholar Dharmakīrti (ca.600-660)<sup>3</sup>, and in the part kk.1264-1284, they defend the direct perception's non-conceptuality - which Śāntarakṣita has demonstrated up to k.1263 - against a Jainist's criticism. So as to refute the Jainist's theory of direct perception, Śāntarakṣita cites Digambara school scholar Sumati in this part. Sumati maintains the existence of two kinds of direct perception, in other words, non-conceptual direct perception and conceptual direct perception, then argues that the former arises to the universal of high degree which is contained in a real entity (*vastu*) and the latter arises to the universal of low degree and the particular. Against this, from the viewpoint that direct perception of individual things is precisely non-conceptual, Śāntarakṣita replies that because the universal has a relationship of mutual exclusion (*anyonyāparihāra*) with the particular, on the contrary, it follows that the universal can be grasped by conceptual cognition.

This controversy has already been introduced by Dr. Masaaki Hattori; at the time of his research, neither the background of Sumati's thought nor Dharmakīrti's doctrine which Śāntarakṣita used for his answer was clear. However, later studies have brought new information about the master-disciple lineage of Jainist order, epistemology of Jainism and Dharmakīrti's doctrine. As I had already reported the background of Sumati's thought and the answers from Buddhist side in my article published last year (Kaneko[2019a], *ibid.*[2019b]), by showing corrected text and revised translation based on manuscripts I make Sumati and Śāntarakṣita's dispute clear in this article. This time, subsequent to the text and translation of last year (Kaneko[2019c]), I introduce the latter half part which corresponds to synopsis (3)-(6).

#### Synopsis:

(1) kk.1264-1269

<sup>1</sup> In order to correct the text and revise the translation of Tattvasaṃgraha's 17th chapter, I have had great instruction from Professor Motoi Ono (University of Tsukuba). And I got great advice from Associate Professor Taisei Shida, post-graduate students of University of Tsukuba and Ms. Mai Miyo (JSPS research fellow). For translating this article, Professor Liana Trufas (Nanzan University) helped me to correct my English and gave me useful suggestions. I would like to express heartfelt gratitude here.

<sup>2</sup> In this article, kārikā number of TS and page number of TSP are based on B unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>3</sup> Whether the direct perception is free from conceptual construction or not has been the subject of many and heated debates among the scholars of Indian thought. In this dispute, Grammarians (Vaiyākaraṇa) maintain direct perception's conceptuality, while Mīmāṃsakas and Naiyāyika-Vaiśeṣikas maintain that there are two kinds of direct perception: conceptual and non-conceptual. Those schools who take this position accept the existence of the universals other than individual things as the external entity which brings about certain notion. Against this, Buddhists maintain the direct perception's non-conceptuality on account of the fact that the universal is a subjective conceptual thing and not experienced by perception.

Sumati's objection: Non-conceptual direct perception grasps the universal such as Being itself (*sattā*) and conceptual direct perception grasps the universal such as cowness (*gotva*) and the particular. On the contrary, Kumāṛila of Mīmāṃsaka school thinks that direct perception grasps individual things. But the cognition which grasps the qualified object is conceptual.

(2) kk.1270-1274

Buddhists' answer: Direct perception grasps a particular individual thing by excluding it from homogeneous and heterogeneous things. Consequently, because each individual things are not qualified by qualifier, the direct perception which grasps them is non-conceptual. On the other hand, because the universal is distinguished from the particular, it can be grasped by conceptual cognition.

(3) kk.1275-1276

Sumati's objection: The universal cannot ontologically be distinguished from the particular, because grasping the universal is the same as grasping plural individual things. And as individual things are cognized in terms of similarity and dissimilarity, the existence of the universal and the particular are established.

(4) kk.1277-1280

Buddhists' answer: The universal and the particular are established by mutual exclusion. Then the universal and the particular are not grasped by distinct cognitions but by conceptual cognition together.

(5) kk.1281-1283

Buddhists' answer: The universal is a subjective conceptual thing, but is distinguished from fictitious thing equivalent to non-being.

(6) k.1284

Conclusion of this part: Cognition with regard to individual things is non-conceptual.

The principle of correction and revise:

The principle of correction and revise is as follows:

(1) Based on the passages of two manuscripts, i.e. Jaisalmer (J) and Paṭṭan (Pt)<sup>4</sup>, if there are some errors in Gaekwad (G) and Baudha Bharati (B) editions, I make their corrections. In the case there seem to be some questionable points in one or another of manuscripts and edited texts, I follow Tibetan translations.

---

<sup>4</sup> I obtained monochrome version of J and color version of Pt as image data from Professor Hiroshi Nemoto (Hiroshima University). And I obtained color version of J through Ms. Mai Miyo, which was taken by Ms. Hiroko Matsuoka (Hiroshima University) in Jaisalmer temple in India. Here I express my appreciation to everyone who provided me manuscript data.

(2) I use sDe dGe (D) and Peking (P) editions about Tibetan translation. I put ahead the grammatically appropriate reading, and give another one within ( ). The source locations of Tibetan translation cited in footnotes are based on the numbers of sDe dGe edition.

(3) Marks and Abbreviations:

{ } : Cancellation made by the manuscripts' writers<sup>5</sup>

< > : Margin note of the manuscripts

*ins.* : Insert of words

*lacking in* : Lack of words

*for* : Different translation in Tibetan language

*em.* : Emendation to the content of manuscripts taking into account the consistency of the context.

I don't note down the differences concerning the kind and location of *shad*, adopting those which seemed to me appropriate.

Orthographic variants (e.g. artha : arttha, viśeṣa : viśeṣa, prasaṅga : prasamga, ltos : bltos, slu : bslu etc.) are not noted down.

(4) Each paragraph and section number of the text corresponds to synopsis and translation in separate sheets.

## II. Tattvasaṃgraha's 17th chapter and its Pañjikā

G382 B467 J155a6 Pt181b13 atra kila tenaiva sumatib14nā svayam āśaṅkya sāmānyena <sup>6</sup> hetor anaikāntikatvaṃ parihṛtam. tad evādarśayati – **nirviśeṣam** ityādi.

J64b2 Pt24a16 **nirviśeṣam** gr<sub>a17</sub>**hītāś ced bhedaḥ**<sup>7/8</sup> **sāmānyam ucyate** |

**tato viśeṣāt sāmānyaviśiṣṭatvaṃ na yujyate || (1275)**

na hi **sāmānyam** kiṃ cid asti viśeṣebhyo vyatiriktasvarū<sub>b15</sub>ṣam, yat svarūpeṇa<sup>9</sup> viśiṣṭam grhyamāṇam savikalpakavijñānagocaraḥ<sup>10</sup> syāt. kiṃ tu **ni<sub>a7</sub>rviśeṣam grhītā bheda** eva **sāmānyam** ity **ucyante**. pratiniyatasvarūpanira<sub>b16</sub>pekṣāḥ pratīyamānāḥ sāmānyaśabdābhidheyā iti yāvat. **tataś** ca kutas tasmād **viśeṣāt sāmānyasya viśiṣṭatvam**, yena tadgrāhakasya savikalpatā<sup>11</sup> bhavet.

<sup>5</sup> In the case of TSP, its writer left enormous amounts of corrections and insertions of words and phrases, so that in this article I mainly show the corrections in TS manuscript and I will show the detailed information of TSP manuscript in my doctoral dissertation.

<sup>6</sup> phyis *for* sāmānyena T11a2

<sup>7</sup> ldog pa las *for* bhedaḥ T47a5

<sup>8</sup> grhītāś ced bhedaḥ J, Pt : grhītāś ced bhedaḥ G, B

<sup>9</sup> rang gi ngo bo'i *for* svarūpeṇa T11a3

<sup>10</sup> gocaraḥ J, Pt, G : gocaram B

<sup>11</sup> savikalpa{tva?} {n} tā J : savikalpanā Pt, G, B

katham ta<sub>b17</sub>rhi sāmānyaviśeṣayor asaṅkīrṇā vyavasthety āha – **vaiśamyetyādi**.

**vaiśamyasama<sub>b3</sub>bhāvena jñāyamānā ime kila |**

**prakalpayanti sāmānya<sub>Pt24b1</sub>viśeṣasthitim ātmani || (1276)**

eta eva hi bhedāḥ **samaviśamata<sub>J155b1</sub>yā** <sup>12</sup> / <sup>13</sup> **samprajñāyamānā** yathākramam  
sāmānyaviśeṣābhidhā<sub>Pt182a1</sub>nābhidheyatām <sup>14</sup> anubhūya **sāmānyaviśeṣavyavahārayor**  
viśayabhedam<sup>15</sup> **prakalpayanti**<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>B468</sup> **vaiśamyasamabhāvo 'yam** ityādinā pratividhatte.

**vaiśamyasamabhāvo 'yam pravibhaktō yadiṣyate |**

**sāmānyasya viśiṣṭatvam**<sup>17</sup> **tadavastham viśeṣata<sub>b4h</sub>**<sup>18</sup> || (1277)

**athāvihakta evāyam asaṅkīrṇā sthitiḥ** <sub>b2</sub> **katham**<sup>19</sup> |

**anyonyaparihāreṇa**<sup>20</sup> **sthiter**<sup>21</sup> **gatyantaram na ca || (1278)**

**pravibhakta** iti amīraḥ. anyad eva sā<sub>a2</sub>mānyam, anya eva viśeṣa iti yāvat. <sup>G383</sup> **sāmānyasya viśeṣato**  
**viśiṣṭatvam** ity upalakṣaṇam. tathā viśeṣasyāpi sāmānyato **viśiṣṭatvam** eva, <sub>b2</sub> dvayor api  
parasparasvabhā<sub>a3</sub>vavivekena **pravibhaktatvāt**<sup>22</sup>.

**asaṅkīrṇā sthitiḥ** iti amīrībhūtā. yathoktam tenaiva **sumatinā** –  
sattādisāmānyasvabhāvānuviddha eva viśeṣaḥ sāṅskārikriyate, nānyathā. ta<sub>a4</sub>to vikalpaviśayatvam<sup>23</sup>  
eva viśeṣasya<sup>24</sup> yuktaṁ rūpam<sup>25</sup>. sāmānyam punar aśeṣaviśeṣanirapekṣam sāṅskārtkartuṁ śakyata ity  
aviruddham asyāvikalpa- viśayatvam i<sub>a5</sub>ti. iyam<sup>26</sup> **a<sub>b3</sub>saṅkīrṇā**<sup>27</sup> **sthitiḥ** na syāt. na pravibhaktō  
nāpravibhakta iṣyata iti cet, āha – **anyonyetyādi**. **anyonyaparihārasthitilakṣaṇānām** <sup>28</sup>  
ekasvabhāvanīśedhasyāpa<sub>a6</sub>raavidhināntarīyakatvāt **na rāśyantaram** asti.

api ca nirviśeṣam grhītā bhedā <sup>29</sup> iti parasparavyāhatam iti darśayann <sup>30</sup> āha –  
**viśeṣātmātrekenetyādi**.

<sup>12</sup> samaviśamatayā J, Pt, G : samaviśayatayā B

<sup>13</sup> .i . . . . . maviśamatayā Pt

<sup>14</sup> nyams su myong ba brjod pa *for* abhidhānābhidheyatām T11a5

<sup>15</sup> viśayabhedam J, G, B : viśayabheda Pt

<sup>16</sup> rtogs par byed do *for* prakalpayanti T11a5

<sup>17</sup> v. ś.ṣ ṭatva Pt

<sup>18</sup> bye brag dag las bye brag can || nyid ni spyi dang 'dra bar 'gyur || *for* sāmānyasya viśiṣṭatvam tadavastham viśeṣataḥ || T47a6

<sup>19</sup> 'di ltar *for* katham T47a6

<sup>20</sup> anyonyaparihāreṇa J, Pt, B (cf. phan tshun spangs te T47a7) : anyonyāparihāreṇa G

<sup>21</sup> gnas pa yis *for* sthiter T47a7

<sup>22</sup> pravibhaktatvāt J, Pt, G : pratibhaktatvāt B

<sup>23</sup> vikalpaviśaya° J, B (cf. rnam par rtog pa'i yul T11b1) : viśiṣṭaviśaya° G : viśa?lyaviśaya° Pt

<sup>24</sup> viśeṣasya J, Pt (cf. khyad par T11b1) : viśeṣyasya G, B

<sup>25</sup> ngo bor rigs kyi *for* yuktaṁ rūpam T11b1

<sup>26</sup> 'dir *for* iyam T11b2

<sup>27</sup> asaṅkīrṇā Pt, G, B : asaṅkīrṇā J

<sup>28</sup> anyonyaparihāra° J, B (cf. phan tshun spangs te T11b2) : anyonyāparihāra° Pt, G

<sup>29</sup> khyad par med pa gzung ba dang tha dad pa *for* nirviśeṣam grhītā bhedā T11b3

<sup>30</sup> darśayann J, Pt, G : darśayānn B

**viśeṣātmāṭirekeṇa nāparaṃ bhedalakṣaṇam |**

**tadrūpāspaṃsane<sup>31</sup> teṣu grahaṇaṃ ka<sub>b5</sub>tham ucyate || (1279)**

**tadrūpāspaṃsane vā<sub>b3</sub>pi<sup>32</sup> bhedāntaravibhedinaḥ<sup>33</sup> |**

**grhītā iti vijñānaṃ prāptam eṣu vikalpakam || (1280)**

**bhede**bhyo<sub>a7</sub> hi nānyo **viśeṣaḥ**. tasya ca<sub>b4</sub> viśeṣasya sāmānyagrāhiṇā jñānenāsaṃspaṃsane<sup>34</sup>, **kathaṃ** bhedāś tena grhītā bhavēyuh. agrhīta- svabhāvāvyatirekāt<sup>35/36</sup>, te 'py agrhītā eve<sub>a8ti</sub> bhāvaḥ. atha **grhītā** **iti** matam, tadā **tadrūpa**saṃspaṃsane<sup>37</sup> bhedarūpaṣaṃspaṃsane grahaṇe, grhītāvyatirekād grhītasvabhāvat viśeṣo 'pi<sub>B469</sub> grhīta eveti<sub>a9</sub> **eṣu** bhedēsu yat sāmānyaviśayatvenā<sub>b5</sub>bhimatam<sup>38</sup> jñānam, tad **vikalpa**kaṃ prāptam.

kiṃ ca – mā bhūn nāma sāmānyasya viśeṣāvyatirekāt tato viśiṣṭatvam, ta<sub>a10</sub>thāpi śaśaviśāṇāder nirupākhyāt tasya viśiṣṭatvam asty eveti<sup>39</sup> vikalpajñānagrāhyaṃ syāt. na ca bhavati. tasmād anaikāntikatvam eveti<sup>40</sup> darśayann āha – **ni**<sub>a11</sub>**rupākhyāc**<sup>41</sup> cetyādi.

**nirupākhyāc ca sāmānyam viśiṣṭam<sup>42</sup> sampratīyate |**

**ato vikalpa**<sub>b6</sub>**kajñānagrāhyaṃ tad api te bhavet || (1281)**

**b4 nāsatas tad viśiṣṭam cet<sup>43</sup> kim idānīm tadātmakam |**

**no cet tathāpi vaiśiṣṭyaṃ tasmād asya na kiṃ matam || (1282)**

syād etat – **sāmānyasyābhāvato** na viśeṣaḥ sambhavati, nāpi<sub>b6</sub> sādṛśyam. tathā hi – <sub>G384</sub> yan na kiṃ cit<sup>44</sup>, so 'bhāvaḥ kalpyate<sup>45</sup>, tac ca tādṛśam<sup>46</sup> sāmānyato naiva **vi**<sub>a12</sub>**śiṣṭam**, nāpi samam. bhāvatvaprasaṅgāt.

tathā hi – yadi tac chūnyaṃ sāmānyato **viśiṣṭam** syāt, tad api vastv eva syāt. na hy avastuno viśeṣākhyāḥ svabhāvaḥ<sup>47</sup> sambhavati, na ca viśeṣā<sub>a13</sub>khyāṃ svabhāvam antareṇa **viśiṣṭam** śakyam vaktum<sup>48</sup>.

nāpi samam<sup>49</sup>. vastutvaprasaṅgāt. na hy avastunaḥ kena<sub>b7</sub> cit samānaṃ rūpaṃ bhavati, na ca

<sup>31</sup> ma bzung na *for* aspaṃsane T47a7

<sup>32</sup> vāpi J, Pt (*cf.* 'ang T47a7) : cāpi G, B

<sup>33</sup> ldog pa yi *for* vibhedinaḥ T47a7

<sup>34</sup> °āsaṃspaṃsane *em.* (*cf.* tadrūpāspaṃsane TS1279c') : °āsaṃspaṃse J, Pt, G, B

<sup>35</sup> agrhīta J, G, B (*cf.* ma bzung na ni T11b4) : anagrhīta Pt

<sup>36</sup> dngos po *for* svabhāva T11b4

<sup>37</sup> °saṃspaṃsane Pt, G, B : °saṃspaṃsra J

<sup>38</sup> spyi dang khyad par nyid du *for* sāmānyaviśayatvena T11b5

<sup>39</sup> evety J, Pt, G : ety B

<sup>40</sup> eve.i Pt

<sup>41</sup> nye bar brjod byed las *for* nirupākhyāc T11b7

<sup>42</sup> viśiṣṭam J, B (*cf.* bye brag can T47b1) : viśeṣam Pt, G

<sup>43</sup> ming gis bye brag can yin na *for* nāsatas tad viśiṣṭam cet T47b1

<sup>44</sup> kiṃ cit J, Pt, G : kiṃ cat B

<sup>45</sup> med pa gang yin pa de ni ci yang ma yin par brtag pa *for* yan na kiṃ cit, so 'bhāvaḥ kalpyate T11b7

<sup>46</sup> tādṛśam J, G, B : tādṛś{y}am Pt

<sup>47</sup> viśeṣākhyāḥ | svabhāvaḥ J, viśeṣākhyāḥ svabhāvaḥ G, B : viśeṣākhyasvabhāvaḥ Pt

<sup>48</sup> srid pa ma yin no || ... brjod par mi nus shing *for* na hy ... sambhavati, na ca ... śakyam vaktum. T12a1-2

<sup>49</sup> nāpi samam *lacking in* T

samānarūpaṃ antareṇa samaṃ yuktam atiprasaṅgā<sup>14f</sup>.

tasmāt sāmānyasya śūnyam avadhiṃ kṛtvā na samatvaṃ viśiṣṭatvaṃ vā yuktam<sup>50</sup>. tathā hi – yo yam<sup>51</sup> avadhiṃ kṛtvā samo viśiṣṭo vā bhavati, tena so 'py avadhiḥ samo viśamo vā<sup>52</sup> a<sup>15</sup> dṛśyate<sup>53/54</sup>. yadi hi so 'vadhī tena samo viśamo<sup>55</sup> vā na dṛśyeta, itaro 'py avadhimān samo viśamo vā na dṛśyeta<sup>56</sup>.

kiṃ ca – J156a1 nābhāvo nāma kaś cid bhāvavyatirikto 'sti. a<sup>16</sup> bhāva eva tu bhāvāntaraṃ na bhavatīty abhāva ākhyāyate. tat kuto<sup>57</sup> 'sya<sup>58</sup> vaiśiṣṭyam ity etat sarvaṃ sumatinoktam āgūryāha – **atadātmakam evedam** ityādi.

J65a1 **atadātmakam evedaṃ vaiśiṣṭyaṃ vastuno 'pi hi |**

**nāsadrūpaṃ<sup>59/60</sup> ca sāmā<sup>b5</sup>nyaṃ tad viśiṣṭaṃ na te katham || (1283)**

**vastuno 'pi<sup>61</sup> hi** a<sup>17</sup> sakāśād yad avastuno<sup>62</sup> viśi<sup>B470</sup>ṣṭatvaṃ, tat khalu<sup>63</sup> nānyat kiṃ cit. kiṃ tarhi, tattvaniṣedhaḥ<sup>64</sup>, **atadātmatvaṃ eva<sup>65</sup>** lakṣaṇabheda iti yāvat. tac cāsato 'pi śaśaviṣāṇā<sup>Pt182b1</sup>deḥ<sup>66</sup> a<sup>2</sup> sakāśāt sāmānyasya tulyam eva. tathā hi – asac chaśaviṣāṇādi<sup>67</sup> sarvārthakriyāvirahalakṣaṇam<sup>68</sup>. sāmānyaṃ tu na tatheṣṭam iti vispaṣṭam asya tato<sup>69</sup> vaiśiṣṭyam. tata<sup>b2</sup>s cāsato 'pi sakāśād vaiśiṣṭyam syāt. na ca vastutvaprasaṅgo 'sata iti yat kiṃ cid etat, yad uktam – nābhāvo nāmānya evetyādi<sup>70/71</sup>. tatra tena svabhāṣitasyaivārtho<sup>72/73</sup> na vivecitāḥ. b<sup>3</sup> tathā hi – bhāva eva tu bhāvāntaraṃ na a<sup>3</sup> bhavatīty ukte bhāvāntarāt tasya viśeṣa<sup>74</sup> ukto bhavati, tato vyāvṛttisamvarṇanāt<sup>75</sup>. tad<sup>76</sup> etad dhyāndhyaviijṛmbhitam<sup>77</sup> ity alaṃ prasaṅgena<sup>78</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> na samatvaṃ viśiṣṭatvaṃ vā yuktam J, Pt, G (cf. mtshungs pa'am | khyad par can nyid rigs pa ma yin te T12a3) : samatvaṃ viśiṣṭatvaṃ vā yuktam B

<sup>51</sup> 'di for yam T12a3

<sup>52</sup> vā em. (cf. yo yam avadhiṃ kṛtvā samo viśiṣṭo vā bhavati TSP469,18) : ca J, Pt, G, B

<sup>53</sup> dṛśyate J, G, B : dṛśyamte Pt

<sup>54</sup> de yang ldog mtshams dang mtshungs pa dang mi 'dra bar for so 'py avadhiḥ samo viśamo vā T12a3

<sup>55</sup> viśamo J, Pt, G (cf. mi 'dra bar T12a4) : viśayo B

<sup>56</sup> dṛśyeta J, G, B : dṛśyet Pt

<sup>57</sup> kutaḥ lacking in T

<sup>58</sup> 'di dag las for asya T12a5

<sup>59</sup> na lacking in T

<sup>60</sup> dngos med for asadrūpaṃ T47b2

<sup>61</sup> api lacking in T

<sup>62</sup> dngos po for avastuno T12a5

<sup>63</sup> khalu lacking in T

<sup>64</sup> de nyid yin te for tattvaniṣedhaḥ T12a6

<sup>65</sup> eva lacking in T

<sup>66</sup> śaśaviṣāṇādeḥ J, G, B : śaśaviṣāṇādeḥ Pt

<sup>67</sup> asac chaśaviṣāṇādi J, G, B : asa chaśaviṣāṇādi Pt

<sup>68</sup> don gyi bya ba byed pa for arthakriyā T12a6

<sup>69</sup> <asattvāt> = tato J, Pt margin note

<sup>70</sup> This paragraph's introduction begins with nābhāvo nāma kaś cid ...

<sup>71</sup> eva lacking in T

<sup>72</sup> svabhāṣitasya° J, Pt, G : svābhāṣitasya° B

<sup>73</sup> eva lacking in T

<sup>74</sup> khyad par can for viśeṣa T12b1

<sup>75</sup> °samvarṇanāt J, B (cf. brjod pa'i phyir ro T12b1) : °saṅkīrtanāt G : °saṃkīrṇanāt Pt

<sup>76</sup> tad lacking in T

<sup>77</sup> dhī lacking in T

<sup>78</sup> ha cang thal bar 'gyur bas for prasaṅgena T12b1-2



tasmād<sup>b4</sup> ityādinā pramāṇaphalopasaṃhārah.

tasmāt svalakṣaṇe jñānaṃ yat kiṃ cit sampravartate |

vākpathātītaviśayaṃ sarvaṃ tan nirvi<sup>a2</sup>kalpakam<sup>79</sup> || (1284)

### III. Translation

#### 3.1 [Objection:] The universal cannot ontologically be distinguished from the particular.

According to what I heard (*kila*) in relation to this, it seems that, anticipating the inconclusiveness of the reason about the universal, [the above matter] is rejected by the same Sumati himself. [Sumati] indicates precisely the above matter as "without difference" etc.

**If individual things are grasped without difference, [the object without difference] is called the universal. Therefore, the universal is impossible to be distinguished from the particular. (1275)**

In other words: There is no **universal** which has the essence [ontologically] distinguished from the particulars. Otherwise, [the universal] distinguished and grasped through the essence cannot be but the realm of conceptual cognition. But it is not so. Rather, precisely the **individual things grasped without difference are called the universal**. In other words, this means that [the individual things] understood by ignoring the essences determined individually are expressed by the word "the universal". And **therefore**, how could **the universal be distinguished from that particular**? If not [i.e. the universal differs from the particulars], [the cognition] which grasps it [i.e. the universal] cannot be but conceptual.

#### 3.2 [Objection:] As individual things are cognized in terms of similarity and dissimilarity, the existence of the universal and the particular are established.

How then is the unconfused distinction between the universal and the particular? [Sumati] states "dissimilarity" etc.

**According to what I heard, it seems that, cognized in terms of similarity and dissimilarity, these [i.e. individual things] themselves bring about the establishment of the universal and the particular<sup>80</sup>. (1276)**

<sup>79</sup> Idog pa'i dngos po'i yul can ni || de kun rtag med yin par 'gyur ||, *for* vākpathātītaviśayaṃ sarvaṃ tan nirvikalpakam || T47b2-3

<sup>80</sup> Since the meaning of this passage is difficult, I follow Jha's [1937: 641-642] translation and Hattori's [1959: 120]

In other words: None other than these individual things **cognized** in terms of **similarity and dissimilarity bring about** the respective object of the verbal usage (*vyavahāra*) called **the universal and the particular** in this sequence in accordance with the characteristics expressed by appellations such as **the universal and the particular**<sup>81</sup>.

#### 4.1 [Answer:] The universal and the particular are established by mutual exclusion.

By "The above similarity and dissimilarity" etc. [Śāntarakṣita] replies.

**If the above similarity and dissimilarity are accepted as being differentiated (*pravibhakta*), the fact that the universal is distinguished from the particular stands as it is. (1277)**

**If the above differentiation is not [accepted] at all, how could the unconfused establishment [of the universal and the particular] be possible? But there is no other way to establish [the universal and the particular] except by mutual exclusion. (1278)**

**Being differentiated** means not being mixed up. [In other words: ] it means that the universal and the particular are nothing but different things. "**The universal is differentiated from the particular**" is a designation [of differentiation]. Likewise, the particular too is nothing but a thing **distinguished** from the universal. This is so, because both **are differentiated** by mutually distinguishing their own natures.

**The unconfused establishment** [of the universal and the particular] means [their establishment] in the state of not being mixed up. This is said by the same above-mentioned **Sumati** as follows: "As long as it is penetrated by its own nature i.e. the universal such as Being itself etc., the particular is directly perceived. [The particular] which is in a state other than this is not [directly perceived]. Consequently, it is true that the particular is nothing but the object of conceptual [direct perception]. On the contrary, the universal can be directly perceived by entirely taking no account of the particular, so that there is no contradiction in the fact that it [i.e. the universal] can be the object of non-conceptual [direct perception]." [As to the direct perception of individual things however], the above **unconfused establishment** is not possible. If [Sumati] says "[Similarity and dissimilarity] are neither regarded as being differentiated nor non-differentiated", [Śāntarakṣita] states "**mutual**" etc. To a thing whose characteristic is **established by mutual exclusion**, the negation of its own nature is logically concomitant with the affirmation of the other [own nature], so for it **there is no other category than** [two categories].

---

explanation.

<sup>81</sup> Sumati's other thought is cited in kk.1723-24, kk.1754-56 in TS 20th chapter and kk.1979-1982ab in TS 23th chapter. Wakahara [1995: 79-80] and ibid. [1996: 66-67] translate and explain Sumati's thought in TS 20th chapter.

#### 4.2 [Answer:] The universal and the particular cannot be cognized by distinct cognitions.

Moreover, in order to indicate that [the idea] according to which "individual things are grasped without difference" is contradictory, [Śāntarakṣita] states: "**other than being the same as the particular**" etc.

**For an individual thing, there is no other way but [to be] the same as the particular. If [the cognition which grasps the universal] does not come into contact with the nature of that [i.e. an individual thing], how could the grasp of them [i.e. individual things] be explained?**  
(1279)

**Or even if [the cognition which grasps the universal] comes into contact with the nature of that [i.e. an individual thing], since it distinguishes the other individual things, it follows that the cognition "they are grasped" concerning these [i.e. individual things] is conceptual.**  
(1280)

In other words: There is no **particular** other than an **individual thing**. But, if the particular **does not come into contact** with the cognition which grasps the universal, **how** could individual things be grasped by that [i.e. the cognition which grasps the universal]? This means that, because they are not different from [the thing] whose own nature is not grasped, neither are those [i.e. individual things] grasped at all. If [the opponent] thinks that [individual things] **are grasped**, that is to say, that [the cognition which grasps the universal] **comes into contact with the nature of that** - i.e. comes into contact with the nature of an individual thing and grasps it - , this fact [i.e. the grasp of a plurality of individual things] is not different from the grasp [of a given individual thing]; consequently, like the thing whose own nature is grasped, the particular too is grasped as well. Therefore, if the cognition **concerning these** individual things is accepted as having the universal as its object, **it follows that** this cognition is **conceptual**.

#### 5.1 [Answer:] The universal is a subjective conceptual thing, but it is distinguished from fictitious things.

Moreover, since the universal is not separated from the particular, it cannot be distinguished from that [i.e. the particular], but even so, that [i.e. the universal] is certainly distinguished from fictitious [thing] like rabbit's horn. Therefore [the universal] is an object to be grasped by conceptual cognition. However, [for Sumati] this is not so in fact. Consequently, [in regard to direct perception of the particular, your reason "It has qualified object"] is just inconclusive. In order to indicate the above,

[Śāntarakṣita] states: "**Moreover ... from fictitious [thing]** <sup>82</sup>" etc.

**Moreover, the universal is accepted as being distinguished from fictitious [things]. Therefore it follows that for you that [i.e. the universal] too is the object to be grasped by conceptual cognition. (1281)**

**If that [i.e. the universal] is not distinguished from non-being, in this case is [the universal] identical to that [i.e. non-being] ? Even if it is not so [i.e. it is different from non-being], can not this [i.e. non-being] be regarded as being distinguished from that [i.e. the universal] ? (1282)**

## 5.2 [Counterargument:] The universal is neither same with nor distinguished from non-being.

[Sumati's view] would be as follows: It is neither possible to distinguish **the universal** from non-being, nor could there be any similarity between them. In other words, that which is no thing is assumed to be non-being. And such a thing is neither **distinguished** from the universal, nor identical to it at all. This is so, because it follows that [non-being] means being.

In other words: (1) If that [i.e. that which is no thing], namely the void, is **distinguished** from the universal, it follows that it too is nothing but real entity. It is so, because non-entity cannot have its

<sup>82</sup> *nirupākhyā* is translated into two ways: *dogos po med* in tibetan translation of TS, while *nye bar brjod byed* in that of TSP. This word is used in Dharmakīrti's self-commentary on PVin II k.54, and Steinkellner[1979: 89] translates it into Unbenennbare (unexpressible). cf. na, arthakriyāśaktīlakṣaṇatvād vastunāḥ. sarvasāmarthyopākhyāvirahalakṣaṇaṃ hi nirupākhyam. PVin79,3-4 Tr: It is not right. Because real entity has as its characteristic the ability of efficient action. In other words, The unexpressible thing has as its characteristic the lack of all [factors] like the ability [to bring about efficient action] and expressibleness. ;

Moreover, according to Steinkellner[1979: 89, note323], Dharmottara explains *nirupākhyā* as non-being (*abhāva*). cf. yang ci'i phyir **nus pa nyid dngos po** yin zhe na | bshad pa | gang gi phyir **thams cad nus pa der brjod pa** ni bsnyad pa ste | de dang **bral ba ni ldan pa'i mtshan nyid** gang la yod pa de | 'bras bu bya ba'i rgyu mtshan du | bsnyad ba dang **bral ba ni nye bar brjod pa med pa ste dngos po med pa** yin no || PVinT243b7-244a1 Tr: Moreover, if [the opponent] says "why does **the ability** precisely mean **the real entity**", [Dharmottara] replies. This is so because **all real [entities] are expressed** or explained in terms of their **ability**. In other words, if a certain [thing] **has as its characteristic the lack** of that [i.e. ability] or does not have that [i.e. ability], such a [thing] which is devoid of the factor of explanation as the cause (*\*nimitta*) bringing about its effect is **not expressible**. That is to say, it means non-being. ;

Dr. Steinkellner indicates that Śāntarakṣita also seems to share this point. Śāntarakṣita comments on Dharmakīrti's VN as follows: cf. sarveśam sāmāthyānām upākhyā śrūtiḥ, upākhyāyate anayeti kṛtvā tasyā viraho 'bhāvaḥ. ... **sarvasāmarthyavirahalakṣaṇaṃ nirupākhyam** iti tat kim anenopākhyāgrahaṇeti cet, sūktam etat. sarvasāmarthyarahitasya tu sāmāthyānibandhanasya kasya cid api śabdasyāvṛtteri asadvyaavahāraṇīyavakhyāpanāya saṃjñāyāś cānugatārthatvasiddhyartham idam uktam iti gamyate. VNV8,8-20 Tr: All capacities of [real entities] have their names to be expressed. Because [the capacities] are expressed by this [i.e. their names], the thing which is devoid of it [i.e. its name] means non-being. ... If in this case [an opponent] says that what does [Dharmakīrti maintain] by this expression "**The unexpressible thing has as its characteristic the lack of all [factors] like the ability [to bring about efficient action] and expressibleness**", there is much truth [in what he said]. But all kinds of words depending on their capacity do not work on the thing which is devoid of all kinds of capacities, so that we can understand that [Dharmakīrti] maintains the above [i.e. the sentence of VN] in order to explain the object of expression "non-being" and demonstrate the correspondence of its name (*saṃjñā*) to object.

Furthermore, concerning "cognizable means capable" as a strict meaning of *upākhyā*, Dr. Steinkellner introduces the definition of Kāśikā ad Aṣṭādhyāyī 6,3,80. cf. upākhyāyate pratyakṣata upalabhyate yaḥ sa upākhyāḥ. upākhyād anyāḥ anupākhyāḥ anumeyāḥ. K718,19-20 Tr: *Upākhyā* means perceptible or graspable by direct perception. *Anupākhyā* which differs from *upākhyā* means inferable. (Dr. Steinkellner sees Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇasūtravṛttiḥ kāśikā. (edited by Śobhita Miśraḥ, Benares, 1952, p.565,18))

own nature called the particular and without its own nature called the particular it is impossible to name it a distinguished thing.

(2) Besides, neither are they [i.e. non-being and the universal] identical. It is so, because it follows that [non-being] means real entity. The reason is that non-entity has no identical nature with any other thing's [nature] and that, without the identical nature, it is impossible to be identical. The reason is also that [if there could be identity without identity of nature, this would involve the fault of] overextension.

Therefore, in relation to the void, the universal could neither be identical with nor distinguished from it. That is to say: If A is relatively to B identical with or distinguished from it, its relative B is regarded as similar or dissimilar to A. In other words [saying conversely], if its relative B is not regarded as similar or dissimilar to A, the other side of the relative relationship [i.e. A] would not be regarded as similar or dissimilar [to B] either.

### 5.3 [Answer:] The universal is not identical with non-being, so it is distinguished from it.

Moreover, approving all Sumati's statements such as "There is no non-being [ontologically] distinguished from being. Rather, because one thing itself (A) is not another thing (B), [when not A, but B is not present, this fact] is called non-being. Thus, from what is such a [non-being] distinguished?<sup>83</sup>", [Śāntarakṣita] states: **"in this way ... nothing but non-identity"** etc.

**It is so because even if real entity is distinguished [from non-entity] in this way, [the above] means nothing but non-identity. Besides, the universal does not have non-being as its nature.**

**Why then is for you [the universal] distinguished [from non-entity] ? (1283)**

**It is so because even if real entity** is distinguished from non-entity, in fact it is not a different thing [from non-entity]. In this case, **non-identity** means **nothing but** the negation of their identical characteristics that is, [the affirmation of their] different mode of being. And the above is quite similar to [the case of] the universal [distinguished] from non-being such as rabbit's horn etc. That is: Non-being such as rabbit's horn etc. has as its characteristic the lack of any kind of efficient action. However, the universal is not regarded as stated above [i.e. as without efficient action]<sup>84</sup>, so this [i.e. the

<sup>83</sup> The source of this sentence in Jainism literature is still unknown.

<sup>84</sup> The reason why Buddhists distinguish the universal from non-being in terms of the presence or absence of efficient action is as follows: Since the universal aspect (*sāmānyalakṣaṇa*) is conceptually dependent on individual things, and it has indirect relationship with individual things. However, non-being does not have any relationship with them, consequently it does not bring about any conceptual cognition by excluding it from other objects. This view seems to be based on Dharmakīrti's PV III k.27cd. cf. jātiprasaṅgo 'bhāvasya na apekṣābhāvatasya tayoh (PV III 27cd) Tr: There is no possibility that non-being [i.e. rabbit's horn etc.] is [identical with] a genus, because both are not dependent on each other. :

Devendrabuddhi comments on this as follows: cf. bum pa dang de'i spyi la ltos pa yod pa gang yin pa de la ni bum pa

universal] is clearly distinguished from that [i.e. non-being]. For this reason, it follows that [the universal] is also distinguished from non-being. But non-being does not result in real entity. Hence [Sumati's] statements such as "There is no non-being apart [from being] at all<sup>85</sup>" etc. are no problem. In the above [sentence], the meaning of what he states is not examined. In other words, if it is said that "rather a [given] thing itself (A) is not another thing (B)", this means the reference to the distinction of that [i.e. thing A] from another thing (B). This is so because it mentions the exclusion from that [i.e. another thing B]. Therefore the above is a chitchat based on the blind's thinking, so we desist from further argumentation.

## 6 [Conclusion of this part:] Cognition with regard to individual things is non-conceptual.

By "Therefore" etc., the conclusion of logical considerations is summarized.

**Therefore whatever cognition which arises in regard to the particular aspect is beyond the range of word, and then non-conceptual<sup>86</sup>. (1284)**

(completed)

## Summary:

In the above argument, Sumati wants to defend his perception-theory against Śāntarakṣita's criticism, insisting that when one grasps plural individual things by ignoring their respective nature, the universal can be perceptible. Moreover, he continues to insist that when one perceives individual things in terms of similarity and dissimilarity, this fact demonstrates the existence of the universal and the particular. Against this, Śāntarakṣita answers that one perceives individual things or their particular aspects

---

chos can dang bum pa nyid chos yin no zhes bya ba ni rigs pa yin no || ... de'i snang ba'i stobs kyis chos sam chos can zhes bya ba'i tha snyad 'di byed pa de bas na de dag la ltos pa yod pa yin no || bum pa dang ri bong gi rva dag la ni de 'dra ba'i ltos pa de yang yod pa ma yin pa ... PVP135b2-5 Tr: If a pot is dependent on its universal, it is right that a pot is substratum and potness is its attribute. ... By the manifestation of that [i.e. conceptual construction], [one] expresses [the object] as attribute or substratum. Consequently, both are dependent on each other. On the contrary, a pot is not dependent on rabbit's horn in the same way. (I follow Tosaki[1979: 92-93, note75] about textual correction.)

<sup>85</sup> This paragraph's introduction is described as *nābhāvo nāma kaś cid* ... .

<sup>86</sup> The argument of this had already been dealt with in TS1263. cf. *aśakyasamayo hy ātmā nīlādīnām ananyabhāk | teṣām ataś ca samvittir nābhijalpānuṣaṅgiṇī* || (1263) [(With regard to) the essence of blue etc. — as it has nothing in common with another — verbal agreement is not possible; and hence the cognition of this (blue etc.) is not connected with speech. (1263)] (I follow Funayama[1992: 113, note289] about textual correction and translation.); Professor Funayama thinks that the above view is derived from PV III k.49 and PVin I k.21, but likewise it also seems to be based on linguistic theory in PV I k.92. cf. *śabdāḥ samketitaṃ prāhur vyavahārāya sa smṛtaḥ | tadā svalakṣaṇaṃ nāsti samketas tena tatra na ||* (PV I 92) Tr: The words express [their objects] of verbal convention. It [i.e. verbal convention] is recollected for usual verbal expression. In this case [i.e. when we experience verbal expression], the particular aspect is not [the object of verbal convention]. Consequently, there is no verbal convention with regard to it [i.e. the particular aspect]. (I follow Takenaka[1979: 50-51, note38] about textual correction.)

without conceptual judgement, subsequent to this, one cognizes the universal and the particular by mutual exclusion at the stage of conceptual cognition. Therefore, it follows that the universal and the particular which Sumati intends are grasped by the same conceptual cognition. This means that the universal is a subjective conceptual thing.

Against this, Sumati casts doubt on Buddhist view, asking that how is the universal distinguished from a fictitious thing like rabbit's horn which all people regard it as non-being. Śāntarakṣita's answer is that the universal is not identical with non-being, because the former even if it is only a conceptual thing, brings about some kind of efficient action, but the latter does not so. Consequently, the universal is distinguished from non-being.

In this way, Sumati's perception-theory which consists of non-conceptual and conceptual direct perception is rejected. After that, Śāntarakṣita concludes that direct perception is precisely non-conceptual.

### Abbreviation and Bibliography

<Texts and Manuscripts>

K : Kāśikā, Jayāditya-Vāmana, Pāṇinīyāṣṭādhyāyīsūtravṛttiḥ Kāśikā part II, Sharma Aryendra, Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, Hyderabad, 1970.

PV : Pramāṇavārttika, Dharmakīrti, Pramāṇavārttika-Kārikā, Miyasaka Yūshō, ACTA INDOLOGICA II, Narita-san Shinshō-ji, 1971/72.

(I follow Tosaki[1979] about PV's chapter number and kārikā number.)

PVin : Pramāṇaviniścaya, Dharmakīrti, Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, chapters 1 and 2, Steinkellner Ernst, Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House / Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2007.

PVinṭ : Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā, Dharmottara, The Tibetan Tripitaka, sDe dge editon 4229, Peking edition 5727.

PVP : Pramāṇavārttikapañjikā, Devendrabuddhi, The Tibetan Tripitaka, sDe dge editon 4217, Peking edition 5717 (b).

TS : Tattvasaṃgraha, Śāntarakṣita, see TSP.

TSP : (B) Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā, Kamalaśīla, Tattvasaṃgraha of Ācārya Śāntarakṣita with the commentary 'Pañjikā' of Śrī Kamalaśīla, Shastri Swami Dwarikadas, Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi, 1968.

(G) Tattvasaṁgrahapañjikā, Kamalaśīla, Tattvasaṅgraha of Śāntarakṣita with the commentary of Kamalaśīla Vol. 1, Krishnamacharya Embar, Gaekwad, Baroda, 1926.

J : Jaisalmer manuscript

Pt : Paṭṭan manuscript

T : The Tibetan Tripitaka, sDe dge editon 4266/4267, Peking edition 5764/5765.

VN : Vādanyāya, Dharmakīrti, Dharmakīrti's Vādanyāya with the commentary of Śāntarakṣita, Sāṅkṛtyāyana Rāhula, Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna, 1936.

VNV : Vādanyāyavipañcitārthā, Śāntarakṣita, see VN.

<Works by Modern Scholars>

Funayama[1992] : Funayama Tōru, A Study of *kalpanāpoḍha*, ZINBUN 27: 33-128.

Hattori[1959] : Hattori Masaaki, Shinrikōyō no chokusetsuchikaku (Pratyakṣa) ron, Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō 25: 111-127.

Jha[1937] : Jha Ganganatha, The Tattvasaṁgraha of Śāntarakṣita with the commentary of Kamalaśīla Vol1, Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Kaneko[2019a] : Kaneko Naoya, Jainakyōto no mufunbetsuchirikai eno Bukkyōto no kaitou (On a Buddhist's answer to a Jainist's non-conceptual cognition understanding: *With a focus on Tattvasaṁgraha's 17th chapter*), Chūō-gakujutsu-kenkyūsho Kiyō 48: 89-110.

Kaneko[2019b] : ibid, A study of a Buddhist-Jainist dispute over non-conceptual cognition, IBK (印仏研) 147 (68-3) : 110-113.

Kaneko[2019c] : ibid, The Indian Buddhist Perception-theory in Tattvasaṁgraha and its Pañjikā : Some Corrections and Revised Translation of the Text Chapter 17 (1), The Journal of Intercultural Studies 41: 55-69.

Steinkellner[1979]: Steinkellner Ernst, Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścayaḥ, zweites Kapitel: Svārthānumānam, Teil II Übersetzung und Anmerkungen, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.

Takenaka[1979] : Takenaka Tomoyasu, Dai jūsan shō Fuhēn no kōsatsu (kk.707-738), Shōwa 53 nendo kagakukenkyūhi-hojokin-sōgōkenkyū (A) kenkyūseika-hōkokusho: 33-54.

Tosaki[1979] : Tosaki Hiromasa, Bukkyō ninshikiron no kenkyū : Hosshō cho Pramāṇavārttika no genryō ron (joukan), Daitō shuppan-sha.

Wakahara[1995] : Wakahara Yūshō, Bukkyōto no Jainakyō hihan (1), Ryūkoku daigaku ronshū 447: 67-91.



Wakahara[1996] : Wakahara Yūshō, Bukkyōto no Jainakyō hihan (2), Indogaku Tibetgaku kenkyū 1:  
57-85.