

The intellectual sequence of Ratnkaranti, Jñnarmitra and Ratnakrti

Autor(en): **Mimaki, Katsumi**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **46 (1992)**

Heft 1: **Études bouddhiques offertes à Jacques May**

PDF erstellt am: **04.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146959>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

THE INTELLECTUAL SEQUENCE OF RATNĀKARAŚĀNTI, JÑĀNAŚRĪMITRA AND RATNAKĪRTI*

Katsumi Mimaki, Kyoto

Ratnākaraśānti¹, Jñānaśrīmitra² and Ratnakīrti³ were three well known

* On this occasion I would like to express my sincere and profound thanks to Professor Jacques May for the continuous kindness and encouragement he has given me since my first meeting with him in 1968 in Kyoto, especially during my period of studies in Paris (1972-1975) and throughout my stay in Lausanne (1980-1981). It is difficult to convey adequately how deeply I am indebted to him.

1 No precise date for him has been proposed except by B. Bhattacharya (1968) p. cxi, who proposes c. 978-1030, but most of the writers discussing him (see the bibliographical information that follows in this note) agree with the dating "end of the 10th to the beginning of the 11th century."

I once had an occasion to write on him: Mimaki (1976). Since then the studies on this author and his works have been considerably developed. Here may therefore be a good occasion to put in order the bibliography on him, leaving aside works on his tantric treatises which do not directly concern our present subject.

First of all I have to mention Ruegg (1981: pp. 122-124) in which the doctrinal position of Ratnākaraśānti in such works as the *Madhyamakālamkāravṛtti-Madhyamakapratipadāsiddhi*, the *Madhyam[ak]ālamkāropadeśa*, the *Triyānavyāvasthāna*, the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*, and the *Sūtrasamuccayabhāṣya-ratnālokālamkāra* is clearly summarized.

Concerning one of his main works, the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*, a synopsis was published in Katsura (1976) and a Japanese translation in Umino (1989). See also such articles as Umino (1971) and (1975), Hayashima (1977), Oki (1977), Matsumoto (1980) and Katsura (1981). Concerning his *Madhyamakālamkāropadeśa*, an annotated Japanese translation was published in Umino (1983), (1984) and (1985); see also Takeuchi (1973), Hayashima (1978) and Matsumoto (1980). Concerning his *Madhyamakālamkāravṛtti-Madhyamakapratipadāsiddhi*, see Umino (1971) and Matsumoto (1980). As for his *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* (Pek. 5756, Derge 4259), the Tibetan text (collation of Peking and Derge editions) was published in Umino & Tsultrim Kelsang (1982); a Japanese translation in Umino (1980); see also Umino (1978). Concerning his logical work, the *Antarvyāptisamarthana*, see below n. 6. The Sanskrit text of the *Sāratamā* or *Sārottamā* (Pek. 5200, Derge 3803), his commentary on the *Astasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, is edited in Jaini (1979); see also a short but very instructive book review in Ruegg (1982). The Sanskrit text of his work on metrics, the *Chandoratnākara* is reedited by Michael Hahn in Hahn (1982) from the old edition of Huth (1890). For his *Khasamaṭikā*, see Tucci (1954) and Hakamaya (1981). I classified Ratnākaraśānti under Yogācāra-mādhyamika in Mimaki (1976), pp. 4, 7, 72-73. Strictly speaking this was an error. There was a tendency to classify him together with Śāntaraksita (who is normally considered Yogācāra-mādhyamika by Tibetan doxographers), because the *Madhyamakālamkāravṛtti-Madhyamakapratipadāsiddhi* (Pek. 5573, Derge 4072) of Ratnākaraśānti was wrongly considered to be affiliated with Śāntaraksita's *Madhyamakālamkāra*; cf. Katsura (1969) p. 14 & p. 38 n. 63; and Takeuchi (1973) p. 329 & p. 332 n. 1. Recent research reveals, however, that these two treatises are different works which have no relation to each other. His *Madhyamakālamkāravṛtti-Madhyamakapratipadāsiddhi* is a Vijñānavāda work and what Tibetan doxographers call

Buddhist dialecticians of Vikramaśīlā University who flourished around the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century during the final period of Indian Buddhism. Many scholars have discussed the chronological order and the *guruśiṣyatva* of these three masters, but no unanimous conclusion has yet been reached. The present paper is therefore an attempt to reconsider the problem in order to arrive at a more definitive solution.

The chronology of these three masters is something I also have had the occasion to discuss previously.⁴ What I wrote then can be summed up

the “*Sems tsam rgyan*” (cf. for example *Grub mtha' chen mo*. sGo mañ ed., 19b1, *ICari skya grub mtha'*, Sarnath ed., 156.7, 299.9) should be this *Madhyamakālamkāravṛtti-Madhyamakapratipadāsiddhi* (or his *Madhyamakālamkāropadeśa*: Pek. 5586. Derge 4085). Ratnākaraśānti should not therefore be called carelessly a Yogācāra-mādhyamika; cf. Umino (1985) and Katsura (1976) p. 484. He is considered in general to be a Yogācāra, especially an Alīkākāra- or Nirākāra-vijñānavādin, by most of the authors cited above in the present note. But in the Nirākāra-vijñānavādin, as one reaches the highest level, one approaches closer and closer to the Mādhyamika position, and we find very often in his writings the saying that the doctrine of the Mādhyamika and that of the Yogācāra are the same (cf. PPU Pek. 162a3-4: *rNal 'byor spyod pa pa mams dai / dBu ma pa grub pa'i mtha' mtshuñs pa yin no //*; MAU Pek. 260b2: *rNal 'byor spyod pa pa dai / dBu ma grub pa'i mtha' mtshuñs pa yin no //*; cf. Katsura (1976) p. 486, Haya-shima (1978) p. 1009, and Matsumoto (1980) (1) p. 169 n. 12). Therefore it is significant that his doctrinal position is called Vijñapti-madhyamaka (rNam rig gi dbu ma) by such Tibetan historians as Tāranātha; see Ruegg (1981) p. 56 n. 165, p. 107 n. 341, p. 122. On the other hand, it is also noteworthy that in the Tibetan doxographical (the so-called *grub mtha'*) literature, Ratnākaraśānti is neither classified nominally within the subdivisions of the Madhyamaka school nor in those of the Vijñānavādin.

- 2 His dates were proposed to be c. 980-1030 by Kajiyama (1966) p. 9. For the bibliography, see Frauwallner (1932); Thakur (1959), Introduction; and Mimaki (1976) p. 4. As additional bibliographical items, I should mention Ogawa (1981), Akamatsu (1983), and Katsura (1986), all of which treat his *Apoḥaprakaraṇa*. Concerning his work on metrics, the *Vṛttamālāstuti*, see Hahn (1971).
- 3 His dates were proposed as 1000-1050 by Kajiyama (1966) p. 9. For the bibliography, see Thakur (1975), Introduction; and Mimaki (1986) pp. 4-5. As an additional bibliographical item, we now have Bühnemann (1980), which contains an annotated German translation of his *Sarvajñasiddhi*. A new text entitled *Udayananirākaraṇa* was edited by R.N. Pandey and is ascribed to Ratnakīrti by him; see Pandey (1984). But the precise title of this treatise should be *Vādarahasya* and its authorship by Ratnakīrti is doubtful; see the book reviews by G. Bühnemann in *WZKS* 28 (1984) pp. 228-229 and by T. Much in *Buddhist Studies Review* 4-1 (1987) pp. 88-90. See also Bühnemann (1983) pp. 187-188.
- 4 Mimaki (1976) p. 3: “Esquissons maintenant la situation des logiciens autour de Ratnakīrti. Ce dernier est l'élève de Jñānaśrīmitra (ou Jñānaśrī, 980-1030), lui-même contemporain plus jeune de Ratnākaraśānti. Ces trois maitres sont des personnages importants de l'Université de Vikramaśīla aux environs de la fin du dixième siècle et du onzième siècle. Ils sont à la fois tantristes et logiciens. Ratnākaraśānti connu par ailleurs sous le nom de Śānti-pa ou Śānti-pāda est élève de Nāropa pour l'étude du tantrisme et un des maitres d'Atīśa (982-1054). Nāropa eut aussi

as follows: Ratnakīrti was a disciple of Jñānaśrīmitra, who was the younger contemporary of Ratnākaraśānti. So one can establish the probable chronological order of these three masters as: Ratnākaraśānti-Jñānaśrīmitra-Ratnakīrti. But so far as the development of their logical study is concerned, it is more convincing to think that the order of their *guruśiṣyatva* was: Jñānaśrīmitra-Ratnakīrti-Ratnākaraśānti. Let us reconsider this in the following pages, trying to see whether there is any reason for changing or correcting this account.

One of the first to maintain the opinion that Ratnākaraśānti was a disciple of Ratnakīrti was Mookerjee.⁵ His opinion was based on the observation that Ratnākaraśānti in his *Antarvyāptisamarthana*⁶ presupposes the *Kṣanabhaṅgasiddhi* of Ratnakīrti. I was one of the followers of this opinion,⁷ and through an examination of Ratnakīrti's treatises such as the *Kṣanabhaṅgasiddhi* and the *Sthirasiddhidūṣana* and of Ratnākaraśānti's *Antarvyāptisamarthana*, I arrived also at the same conclusion.⁸

More recently, however, divergent opinions have been presented concerning this point. David Seyfort Rugg, for instance, has maintained that since Ratnākaraśānti was the elder contemporary of Jñānaśrīmitra, it

pour élève Jñānaśrīmitra et Atīśa doit également beaucoup à ce dernier. Ratnakīrti a étudié les *Sūtra* et *Tantra* sous la direction de Ratnākaraśānti. Donc, pour ce qui est des études tantriques, on peut établir ainsi l'ordre chronologique de ces trois logiciens: Ratnākaraśānti-Jñānaśrīmitra-Ratnakīrti.

En revanche, pour ce qui est des études logiques, l'ordre diffère sensiblement. C'est Jñānaśrīmitra qui a achevé la logique bouddhique de l'époque tardive. Ratnakīrti a développé sous sa direction certaines théories typiques de la logique bouddhique tardive, théories telles que celles de l'exclusion conceptuelle (*apoha*) et de l'inclusin (*vyāpti*). D'autre part, l'*Antarvyāptisamarthana*, le seul traité logique de Ratnākaraśānti que nous connaissions, prend visiblement en considération la *Kṣanabhaṅgasiddhi* de Ratnakīrti. Par conséquent, nous pouvons établir ainsi l'ordre chronologique de la progression des études logiques: Jñānaśrīmitra-Ratnakīrti-Ratnākaraśānti."

5 Mookerjee (1935) p. 399.

6 For the bibliography, see Mimaki (1976) p. XIII. As an additional reference it should be noted that the Sanskrit manuscript is now available in microfiche (MBB-II-207, Palm leaf. 6 folios, 1 microfiche, LMhj 000. 365); see *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts*, A Title List of the Microfilm Collection of the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, New York, 1975, p. 19. An English translation was published in Wayman (1985). Kajiyama published the revised Japanese translation in Kajiyama (1989) and his English translation "The *Antarvyāptisamarthana* of Ratnākaraśānti" is to be published in Vienna.

7 Besides myself, Y. Kajiyama and A.C.S. Macdermott followed this opinion; see Kajiyama (1960) p. 220 and Macdermott (1969) p. 5.

8 Mimaki, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-66.

would not be possible for him to be the disciple of Ratnakīrti.⁹ Kamaleshwar Bhattacharya tried to prove that Ratnākaraśānti need not presuppose Ratnakīrti, arguing that the theories which constitute the basic structure of his *Antarvyāptisamarthana* were already formulated by Dharmakīrti, and that the person whom Ratnākaraśānti calls “ācārya” in his *Antarvyāptisamarthana* is not Ratnakīrti, but rather Dharmakīrti.¹⁰

Among these opinions, Bhattacharya’s view that the “ācārya” mentioned by Ratnākaraśānti was Dharmakīrti¹¹ is convincing enough, and I would like to rectify an earlier statement in which I considered the “ācārya” in question to be Ratnakīrti.¹² For the other points, however, it is certainly true that we should be very careful in calling Ratnākaraśānti a disciple of Ratnakīrti. But, as explained above, my hitherto maintained opinion also did not consider him to be a disciple of Ratnakīrti in the narrow sense, but was concerned with showing the intellectual influence of Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti in the *Antarvyāptisamarthana* of Ratnākaraśānti, and hence the likelihood that the latter work was composed after those of Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti. Therefore it does not seem to be necessary to change the order I have hitherto maintained, regarding the logical studies and the development of logical theories of these three masters, namely: Jñānaśrīmitra-Ratnakīrti-Ratnākaraśānti.

So far as Ruegg’s opinion is concerned, the just-mentioned order can be maintained while taking into account the points raised by him. Until it

9 Ruegg (1982) n. 1. The same opinion was already expressed formerly by him in Ruegg (1970) p. 305.

10 Bhattacharya (1983). In his valuable paper “The Logic of the *svabhāva*hetu in Dharmakīrti’s *Vādanyāya*”, (Proceedings of the Second International Dharmakīrti Conference, Wien 1991, pp. 311-324), which he read 1989 in Vienna and in Kyoto, Ernst Steinkellner confirms Bhattacharya’s opinion.

11 Without denying that the “ācārya” mentioned by Ratnākaraśānti was Ratnakīrti, Alex Wayman, in the introduction to his English translation of the *Antarvyāptisamartha* of Ratnākaraśānti, proposed another possibility, namely that it was Dignāga. Cf. Wayman (1985), p. 31. But this is difficult to accept. The forms of the syllogism used by Dignāga and Dharmakīrti were completely different, the former using the so-called three-membered syllogism whereas the latter employing the two-membered syllogism analogous to the Aristotelian type. The syllogism cited by Ratnākaraśānti is of Dharmakīrti’s type, and not that of Dignāga. By the way, neither Kajiyama nor Wayman substituted “ācārya” with any proper name in their translations of the *Antarvyāptisamarthana*. See Kajiyama (1960) p. 231 and Wayman (1985) p. 40. It is only in the introduction that they discussed who is in question (Kajiyama *id.* p. 220, Wayman *id.* p. 31). In his new revised Japanese translation, Kajiyama glosses “ācārya” by Dharmakīrti, though not referring to Bhattacharya’s article (Kajiyama (1989) p. 20).

12 Mimaki (1976) p. 54 & p. 254 n. 198.

can be proved that Ratnākaraśānti and Ratnakīrti were not contemporaries, the suggested intellectual order remains a historical possibility, because it is very possible that an elder contemporary might compose a treatise chronologically later than his younger contemporary's works,¹³ just as my respected elder contemporaries such as Bhattacharya and Ruegg do write articles subsequent to works by an inferior younger contemporary such as myself.

Moreover, there exists a historical document which lends support to our opinion, namely the *dPag bsam ljon bzañ* of Sum pa mkhan po (1704-88), which states that Ratnākaraśānti received teachings of Sūtra and Tantra from Ratnakīrti. Here is the passage in question and a translation¹⁴:

sgo drug las śar sgo bsruñ ba po Rat na ā ka ra śān ti pa ni rgyal rigs zer ba'añ yod la kha cig rje rigs zer źiñ la las bram ze zer te de Ma ga dha'i O tan ta pu rir thams cad yod smra'i sde las rab tu byuñ ste Bi kra ma śi la nas Dze ta ri dañ Rin chen grags dañ / Nag po dam tshig rdo rje dañ Tha ga na sogs las mdo śnags gsan nas Thogs med kyi lugs 'dzin źiñ rgyud brgya rtsa thugs la bzuñ ste Ma la bar lo bdun du bsgom mdzad pas byams 'jam dbyañs sgröl ma'i źal gzigs / rdzu 'phrul gyis nub O rgyan du'añ byon nas 'gro don mdzad zer / physis su Bi kra ma la(sic) śi la'i śar sgo bsruñ ba por rgyal pos bźag ciñ mu stegs kyi rtsod pa las rgyal te mkhas pa'i grags pas lho'i Siñga la'i rgyal po Ka bi na 'bañs bcas kyis spyan drañs pas 'khor bcas byon nas gliñ der bstan pa dar bar mdzad / physis su Nā ro pa las chos gsan źiñ grub rtags ston re mdzad zer źiñ ...

"Ratnākaraśānti, who was the keeper of the eastern gate¹⁵ among the six gate-keepers [of the Vikramaśīlā University], was of the kṣatriya lineage according to some, of the vaiśya lineage according to others, and of the brāhmaṇa [lineage] according to some others. He was ordained in the order of the Sarvāstivādin at Oṭantapurī in Magadha. In [the University of] Vikramaśīlā he learned the Sūtras and Tantras from Jitāri, *Ratnakīrti*, Kṛṣṇa = Samayavajra, Tha ga na and others. He

- 13 We have several instances where the disciple was older than the teacher. For example, it is well known that Śāriputra was much older than the Buddha. In the case of Red mda' ba and Tsoñ kha pa's relation, Tsoñ kha pa was a disciple of Red mda' ba at the beginning, but later the latter became on some occasions the disciple of the former, and we find his name among the disciples of Tsoñ kha pa; see G. Huth, *Geschichte des Buddhismus in der Mongolei*, Zweiter Teil: Übersetzung, Strassburg, 1896, p. 185.
- 14 Das, S.C. (ed.), *Pag sam jon zang*, Calcutta, 1908 (repr. Kyoto, 1984), p. 117. This passage of the *dPag bsam ljon bzañ* was the source of Vidyabhusana for his chronological description (Vidyabhusana (1909) p. 400, *id.* (1922) p. 342). Mookerjee seemed to follow it, even if he did not indicate it clearly (see above n. 5).
- 15 Cf. Tāranātha's *rGya gar chos 'byuñ* (ed. Schiefner) p. 178, 11.11-12, in which the description is very simple, or practically non-existent: *śar sgo bsruñ ba po slob dpon Ratna ā kar śānti pa'i lo rgyus ni gźuan du śes par bya'o //*

took the [philosophical] position of Asaṅga, and memorized a hundred Tantras. Since he practiced meditation for seven years in Mālava (Ma la ba), he had visions of Maitreya, Mañjuśrī and Tārā. After arriving by miracle even at Udyāna in the West he worked benefits for living beings. So it is narrated. Later he was appointed by the king as the keeper of the eastern gate of Vikramaśīlā [University], and was victorious in the debate with non-Buddhists. Owing to the fame of his scholarship, he was invited by Ka bi na, king of Ceylon in the South, accompanied by his attendants; therefore he went [there] and spread the [Buddhist] teaching on that island. It is said that, after receiving teachings from Na ro pa, he did display a few signs of realization..."

As to Bhattacharya's opinion, so far as he could not refute that the *Antarvyāptisamarthana* was composed after those works of Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti, it remains a very real possibility that Ratnākaraśānti wrote his *Antarvyāptisamarthana* after taking into account the full tradition inherited from Dharmakīrti down to Ratnakīrti.

If we supposed that the *Antarvyāptisamarthana* had been written before the logical treatises of Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti, it would indeed be very difficult to explain why those two nowhere mentioned in their treatises the theory of *antarvyāpti* (intrinsic pervasion), which is such an efficient weapon to defend the Buddhist theory of momentariness (*kṣaṇabhāṅga*).¹⁶ This fact becomes even stranger if we take into account the fact that they three were contemporaries living in the same university, Vikramaśīlā. In fact, when Ratnakīrti declared his position of *bahirvyāptivādin* (advocate of the extrinsic pervasion) in his *Citrādvaitaparakāśavāda*¹⁷ in the discussion about the determination of the pervasion of the *sattvānumāna*, he neither mentions nor refutes the theory of *antarvyāpti*. This is the general attitude found in the treatises of Jñānaśrīmitra and Ratnakīrti. On the other hand, Ratnākaraśānti knew well the theory of *bahirvyāpti* and tried to incorporate it with the theory of *antarvyāpti* though in a subsidiary position, saying that the theory of

16 Concerning the theories which contributed to the perfection of the Buddhist proof of momentariness (*kṣaṇabhāṅgasiddhi*), see Ruegg (1970) and Mimaki (1976) pp. 46-66. My translation "preuve qui annule le contraire de l'assertion à prouver" for the term *viparyaye bādhakapramāna* (Mimaki [1976] pp. 59-61, 66) was inaccurate; it should be translated as "valid cognition which shows that the reason does not occur, where the opposite of the property to be proven occurs," as is clearly indicated by Ernst Steinkellner in his valuable paper "Remarks on *viparyaye bādhakapramāna* – Dharmakīrti's Development of a Theorem –," which he read at the First International Dharmakīrti Conference 1982 in Kyoto.

17 Cf. Thakur (1975) p. 130, 11. 27-29 = Thakur (1957) p. 123, 11. 23-24.

bahirvyāpti had been taught to people of low intellectual capacity.¹⁸ Mokṣākaragupta, who came a little bit later than these three masters and whose period of flourishing is supposed to have been between 1050 and 1202,¹⁹ presented both theories, one after the other.²⁰ This may indicate that he knew the *Antarvyāptisamarthana* of Ratnākaraśānti which preceded him. In this way, if a powerful antithesis precedes, a later scholar should at least mention it, even if he does not refute it directly.

Based on these admittedly somewhat hypothetical arguments and also on the existence of that Tibetan historical document, which is, to be sure, late and far-removed from the events, I would still like to argue – contrary to the worthy opinions of Ruegg and Bhattacharya – for the following order of the development in the logical thinking of those three logicians: Jñānaśrīmitra-Ratnakīrti-Ratnākaraśānti.

18 Cf. Kajiyama (1960) p. 231, Mimaki (1976) p. 254 n. 198, Wayman (1985) p. 40, Kajiyama (1989) p. 20.

19 Cf. Kajiyama (1966) p. 11.

20 Tarkabhāṣā of Mokṣākaragupta (ed. R. Iyengar, Mysore, 1952) p. 47, 11. 1-6: *svabhāvahetoh sattvalaksanasya kṣanikatvena vyāptih sādhyadharmīny eva grahītavyēti kecit / teṣām antarvyāpti-pakṣo 'bhīmatah / prasaṅga-prasaṅgaviparyayābhyām drṣtānta-dharmīni ghatātau vyāptir grahītavyēty anye / teṣām bahirvyāpti-pakṣo 'bhīmatah /* “Regarding the pervasion between ‘existence’, reason as essential nature, and ‘momentariness’, some [logicians] are of the opinion that it is to be grasped in the subject itself; they maintain the theory of intrinsic pervasion. Others hold that the [same] pervasion is to be grasped in the subject of example, say, a jar, by means of *prasaṅga* and *prasaṅgaviparyaya*; they maintain the theory of extrinsic pervasion.” See Kajiyama (1966) pp. 111-112 and Singh (1985) p. 111.

Bibliography & Abbreviations

- Akamatsu A. (1983): Évolution de la théorie de l'*apoha* (l'*Apohaprakarana* de Jñānaśrīmitra), Thèse pour le doctorat de 3ème cycle (not yet officially published).
- Bhattacharya, B. (1968): *Sādhnamālā*, vol. II, Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. 41, Baroda.
- Bhattacharya, K. (1983): Ratnākaraśānti and Ratnakīrti, *Sreekrishna Sarma Felicitation Volume*, Tirupati, pp. 131-140.
- Bühnemann, G. (1980): Der Allwissende Buddha. Ein Beweis und seine Probleme, Ratnakīrtis Sarvajñasiddhi, übersetzt und kommentiert, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde Heft 4, Wien.
- (1983): Tarkarahasya and Vādarahasya, *WZKS* 27 (1983) pp. 185-190.
- Frauwallner, E. (1932): Jñānaśrī, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 38, pp. 229-234 (repr. in his *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1982, pp. 361-366).
- Hahn, M. (1971): *Jñānaśrīmitras Vrttamālāstuti*, Eine Beispielsammlung zur altindischen Metrik. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur zusammen mit der mongolischen Version herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von M.H., Asiatische Forschungen Bd. 33, Wiesbaden.
- (1982): *Ratnākaraśānti's Chandoratnākara*, Nepal Research Centre Miscellaneous Papers No. 34.
- Hakamaya N. (1981): Ratnākaraśānti no Tenne-ron (The *āśrayaparāvṛtti* Theory of R°), *Katsumata Shunkyō Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronshū* (Felicitation Volume for Dr. S. Katsumata for his Seventieth Birthday), Tokyo, pp. 235-248.
- Hayashima O. (1977): Ratnākaraśānti no Bosatsudō – *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* ni okeru – (The Bodhisattva-Path according to R° – in his P°). *JIBS* 25-2, pp. 944-941.
- (1978): Ratnākaraśānti no Chūdō Shisō – *Madhyamakālamkāropadeśa* ni okeru – (R°'s thinking on the Middle Way – in his M°), *JIBS* 26-2, pp. 1012-1008.
- Huth, G. (1890): *The Chandoratnākara of Ratnākaraśānti*, Sanskrit text with a Tibetan translation, edited with critical and illustrative notes by G.H., Berlin, Ferd. Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Jaini, P.S. (1979): *Sāratamā: A Pañjikā on the Astasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra by Ācārya Ratnākaraśānti*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series No. 18, Patna.
- JIBS: Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies, Tokyo.
- Kajiyama Y. (1960): Ratnākaraśānti no Ronri-gakusho (A logical treatise of R°), *Bukkyō-shigaku* VIII-4 (1960), pp. 219-238.
- (1966): An Introduction to Buddhist Philosophy, an annotated translation of the *Tarkabhāṣā* of Mokṣākaragupta, *Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters*, Kyoto University. No. 10, Kyoto (repr. in Y. Kajiyama, *Studies in Buddhist Philosophy (Selected Papers)*, Kyoto, 1989, pp. 189-360).
- (1989): Ratnākaraśānti "Naihenjūron" (R°'s *Antarvyāptisamarthana*), *Bukkyō Daigaku Daigakuin Kenkyū Kiyō* 17 (1989), pp. 1-24.
- Katsura S. (1969): Dharmakīrti no Jikoninshiki no Riron (The theory of *svasamvedana* in D°), *Nanto Bukkyō* 23, pp. 1-44.
- (1976): A Synopsis of the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* of Ratnākaraśānti, *JIBS* 25-1, pp. 487-484.
- (1981): Ratnākaraśānti Saikō (Reflexion again on R°), *JIBS* 30-1, pp. 454-451.
- (1986): Jñānaśrīmitra on Apoha, B.K. Matilal and R.D. Evans (eds.), *Buddhist Logic and Epistemology*, pp. 171-183.

- Macdermott, A.C.S. (1969): *An Eleventh-Century Buddhist Logic of 'Exists'*, Dordrecht-Holland.
- Matsumoto S. (1980): Ratnākaraśānti no Chūkanha Hihan (Jō) (R°'s Criticism of the Mādhyamika Philosophy (1)). *Tōyō Gakujutsu Kenkyū* 19-1, pp. 148-174; " " (Ge) (" " (2)), " " 19-2, pp. 152-180.
- MAU: *Madhyam[ak]ālamkāropadeśa* of Ratnākaraśānti.
- MDJK: *Meijō Daigaku Jinbun Kiyō* (Meijo Bulletin of Humanities), Nagoya.
- Mimaki K. (1976): *La réfutation bouddhique de la permanence des choses (sthīrasiddhidūšana) et la preuve de la momentanéité des choses (kṣanabhaṅgasiddhi)*, Paris.
- Mookerjee, S. (1935): *The Buddhist Philosophy of Universal Flux*, Calcutta, 1935 (repr. Delhi, 1975).
- Ogawa H. (1981): Jānāśrīmitra no Gainen-ron (Concept Theory of J°), *Tetsugaku* 33, pp. 67-80.
- Oki K. (1977): Ratnākaraśānti no Ukeishō-setsu Hihan (R°'s criticism against the sākāravāda). *JIBS* 25-2, pp. 940-937.
- PPU: *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* of Ratnākaraśānti.
- Ruegg, D.S. (1970): On Ratnakīrti, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 1, pp. 300-309.
- (1981): *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*, Wiesbaden.
- (1982): Book review of "P.S. Jaini, *Sāratamā: A Pañjikā on the Astasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* by Ācārya Ratnākaraśānti, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, no. xviii, Patna, 1979", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24, pp. 156-158.
- Singh, B.N. (1985): *Bauddha-Tarkabhasa of Moksakargupta* (sic), edited & translated with exhaustive notes, Varanasi.
- Takeuchi, S. (1973): Ratnākaraśānti no Nitai-setsu (The Theory of Two Truths by R°), *JIBS* 22-1, pp. 329-332.
- Thakur, A. (1975): *Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 3 (the second revised edition of the edition of 1957).
- (1959): *Jānāśrīmitranibandhāvalī*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 5, Patna.
- Tucci, G. (1954): Ratnākaraśānti on āśraya-parāvṛtti, *Asiatica*, Festschrift für F. Weller, Leipzig, pp. 765-767 (repr.: *Opera Minora*, pt. II, Roma, 1971, pp. 529-532).
- Umino T. (1971): Ratnākaraśānti no Sanshō-setsu (R°'s Trisvabhāva Theory), *JIBS* 20-1, pp. 383-386.
- (1975): Ratnākaraśānti no Keisō-setsu Hihan (R°'s criticism against the ākāra theories), *JIBS* 24-1, pp. 470-467.
- (1978): Ratnākaraśānti no Jishō-setsu (R°'s Theory of *svasaṃvedana*), *JIBS* 27-1, pp. 464-461.
- (1980): *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* no Wayaku Kaisetsu (Annotated translation of the V°), *MDJK* 22•23, pp. 43-62.
- (1983): *Madhyamakālamkāropadeśa* no Wayaku Kaisetsu (Annotated translation of the M°), *MDJK* 30, pp. 1-22.
- (1984): " ", *MDJK* 32, pp. 1-22.
- (1985): " ", *MDJK* 33, pp. 1-22.
- (1985a): Ratnākaraśānti to Ryūju (R° & Nāgārjuna), *JIBS* 34-1, pp. 350-343.
- (1989): *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* no Wayaku Kaisetsu (Annotated translation of the P°), *MDJK* 40, pp. 80-103.
- Umino T. & Tsultrim Kelsang (1982): The *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* of Ratnākaraśānti, *MDJK* 28, pp. 18-31.

- Vidyabhusana, S.C. (1909): *History of the Mediaeval School of Indian Logic*, Calcutta (repr. 1977, New Delhi).
- (1922): *A History of Indian Logic*, Calcutta (repr. 1971, Delhi).
- Wayman, A. (1985): Ratnākaraśānti's Antaryvāptisamarthana, *Journal of the Asiatic Society* Vol. XXVII No. 2, Calcutta, pp. 31-44.