



# “Madhyamakanising” Tantric Yogācāra: The Reuse of Ratnākaraśānti’s Explanation of *maṇḍala* Visualisation in the Works of Śūnyasamādhivajra, Abhayākara Gupta and Tsong Kha Pa

Daisy S. Y. Cheung<sup>1</sup>

Accepted: 19 June 2023 / Published online: 3 August 2023

© The Author(s) 2023

**Abstract** The eleventh-century Indian Buddhist master Ratnākaraśānti presents a unique Yogācāra interpretation of tantric *maṇḍala* visualisation in the *\*Guhya-samājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*. In this text, he employs the neither-one-nor-many argument to assert that the qualities of the mind represented by the deities in the *maṇḍala* are neither the same nor different from the mind itself. He also provides five scenarios of meditation to explain the necessity of practising both the perfection method (*pāramitānaya*) and the mantra method (*mantranaya*) together in Mahāyāna. Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation exerts a significant influence on the works of later Buddhist masters in India and Tibet, with parts of it being reused in the *\*Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama* by Śūnyasamādhivajra (c. the eleventh century), the eighteenth chapter of the *Āmnāyamañjarī* by Abhayākara Gupta (from the late eleventh to the twelfth century) and the tantric compendium *sNgags rim chen mo* by the Tibetan master Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357–1419). This paper explores how Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation has been reused and modified in these subsequent works. While Śūnyasamādhivajra faithfully reproduced Ratnākaraśānti’s Yogācāra explanation, Abhayākara Gupta modified it to align with his Madhyamaka view. Abhayākara Gupta in turn influenced Tsong kha pa, who accepted Abhayākara Gupta’s Madhyamaka modification in his works. This paper also engages with current scholarly discussions on textual reuse and the underlying reasons behind it. While Śūnyasamādhivajra and Abhayākara Gupta assimilated Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation without acknowledgement, Tsong kha pa quoted the text by name and acknowledged Abhayākara Gupta’s reuse of Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation. This paper concludes by discussing the factors that determine whether

---

✉ Daisy S. Y. Cheung  
daisycheungsy@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, University of Hamburg, Alsterterrasse 1, 20354 Hamburg, Germany

the reused text is acknowledged or not, and the possible reasons behind textual reuse.

**Keywords** Ratnākaraśānti · Neither-one-nor-many argument · Tantric visualisation · Śūnyasamādhivajra · Abhayākara Gupta · Tsong kha pa · Yogācāra · Madhyamaka · Textual reuse · Quotation · Repeat

As is well known, textual reuse is prevalent in many genres of Sanskrit literature. There has been a recent increase in scholarly articles and books focusing on textual reuse in Indian Philosophy and Buddhism. Under the initiative of Elisa Freschi,<sup>1</sup> the *Journal of Indian Philosophy*<sup>2</sup> and the *Buddhist Studies Review*<sup>3</sup> dedicated special issues to textual reuse in Indian philosophy and intertextuality in Buddhist texts respectively. A collection of articles on textual reuse in Indian philosophy, grammar, poetry, religions and epics was also published in Freschi and Maas (2017). Recently, a collection of essays on the reuse of fragments, quotations, paraphrases and allusions in Indian philosophical texts was also published (Prets, 2022). Despite the extensive study of textual reuse in Sanskrit literature in the above publications, Indo-Tibetan tantric Buddhism is underrepresented. Among the abovementioned articles, only Hackett (2016) specifically addresses Indo-Tibetan tantric Buddhism. This paper aims to provide more examples of textual reuse in Indo-Tibetan tantric Buddhism and explore their broader implications.

This paper adopts the concepts discussed by Freschi (2015) and Hugon (2015) and divides textual reuse into two main categories: repeat (unacknowledged textual reuse) and quotation (acknowledged textual reuse). Each of the two main categories can be further divided based on the degree of literality in the reused text, i.e. whether the wording and the meaning both are unchanged or the meaning essentially is the same but the wording is different (such as in the case of paraphrase).<sup>4</sup> The examples discussed in this paper serve as good illustrations of textual reuse, as they encompass both repeat (Śūnyasamādhivajra and Abhayākara Gupta reusing Ratnākaraśānti) and quotation (Tsong kha pa reusing

<sup>1</sup> See especially Freschi (2012, 2015), Freschi and Cantwell (2016) and the chapter “Introduction: Conceptual Reflections on Adaptive Reuse” in Freschi and Maas (2017, pp. 11–25).

<sup>2</sup> *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 43, issues 2–5, 2015.

<sup>3</sup> *Buddhist Studies Review*, Vol. 33, No. 1–2, 2016.

<sup>4</sup> For details see Freschi (2015, p. 88) and Hugon (2015, pp. 454–455, specifically the table on p. 454). I thank Harunaga Isaacson for pointing out that the terms “repeat” (referring to unacknowledged textual reuse) and “quotation” (referring to acknowledged textual reuse) are not a natural pair in English. In the modern context, unacknowledged textual reuse is usually classified as “plagiarism.” However, as many scholars have already noted, the concept of plagiarism in the modern sense does not apply to medieval India and Tibet, as discussed in the section “Some Observations” below. Due to the lack of a more suitable terminology for unacknowledged textual reuse, I continue to use the terminology of Freschi and Hugon, referring to it as “repeat.” Another classification of textual reuse is presented in Steinkellner’s seminal article (1988), which is also summarised in Freschi (2015, p. 89). However, implementing Steinkellner’s classification maybe challenging in cases where the transmission history of a text is unclear or complex. Therefore, Krasser suggested the use of simpler symbols to indicate different cases of textual reuse, see Freschi (2015, p. 90).

Ratnākaraśānti). In the case of repeat by Śūnyasamādhivajra, the form and content are largely unchanged, while in the case of repeat by Abhayākara Gupta, the content is modified.

It is sometimes challenging to detect textual reuse without acknowledgement. However, with the advent of digital humanities, an increasing number of reused passages are being detected by computer databases. This paper uses the BuddhaNexus database, developed by the Khyentse Center for Tibetan Buddhist Textual Scholarship at the University of Hamburg, to detect the reuse of Ratnākaraśānti’s texts.<sup>5</sup> This database has allowed us to identify Śūnyasamādhivajra’s reuse of Ratnākaraśānti’s works.

Section one of this paper investigates Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation of the true nature of the *maṇḍala* and the deities in *maṇḍala* visualisation in the \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā* (Tōh. 1871). Ratnākaraśānti also outlines five scenarios of meditation to illustrate the necessity of practising both non-tantric and tantric methods. Section two examines Śūnyasamādhivajra’s reuse of Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation in the \**Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama* (Tōh. 1262). Section three analyses the reuse of Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation in the eighteenth chapter of Abhayākara Gupta’s *Āmanāyamañjarī* (Tōh. 1198), and investigates how Abhayākara Gupta modified the passage of Ratnākaraśānti to align with his own Madhyamaka doctrine. Section four demonstrates the impact of Abhayākara Gupta’s adjusted passage on the Tibetan master Tsong kha pa in his tantric compendium *sNgags rim chen mo*. Section five offers some observations and concludes by addressing the following questions: What are the reasons for textual reuse? What are the factors which determine whether the reused text is acknowledged or not?

## Ratnākaraśānti on *maṇḍala* Visualisation in the \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*

### Background

The renowned *paṇḍita* Ratnākaraśānti was likely the most well-known teacher during the eleventh century CE at Vikramaśīla monastery.<sup>6</sup> He wrote extensively on major Buddhist topics, covering both non-tantric Mahāyāna doctrine and tantric ritual and meditation. This section examines a passage from Ratnākaraśānti’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*, a commentary on the influential tantric ritual manual \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* (Tōh. 1865) written by the ninth-century CE Indian master Dīpaṃkarabhadra.

A few sentences of introduction to the background of the passage examined are due here. The passage concerns *maṇḍala* visualisation in the ritual of tantric Buddhist initiation (*abhiṣeka*). In the system of Dīpaṃkarabhadra and

<sup>5</sup> BuddhaNexus database: <https://buddhanexus.net/>. For the principles behind the database see Nehrdich (2020).

<sup>6</sup> For the life and works of Ratnākaraśānti see Isaacson and Sferra (2019, pp. 241–243) and Seton (2019). For the philosophical position of Ratnākaraśānti see Seton (2023).

Ratnākaraśānti, a *maṇḍala* is a representation of consciousness shining forth, expressed symbolically by architectural elements of the *maṇḍala* palace and deities in the *maṇḍala*. In the *maṇḍalatattva* (true nature of the *maṇḍala*) and *devatātattva* (true nature of the deities) section of the \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi*, Dīpaṃkarabhadrā states that each component of a nineteen-deity Mañjuvajra *maṇḍala* is purified by a category in the Buddhist path (e.g. the four *dhyānas*, the five faculties, the ten *pāramitās* etc.). For example, the true nature (*tattva*) or purity (*viśuddhi*) of the four arches in the *maṇḍala* is the four meditative absorptions (*dhyāna*), and the true nature of the four raised platforms is the four mental concentrations (*samādhi*). Similarly, the deities in the *maṇḍala* are also purified by categories of the Buddhist path. For example, the true nature of the ten goddesses (the six offering goddesses Rūpavajrā etc. and the four goddesses Locanā etc.) is the ten perfections (*pāramitā*). For a detailed correspondence between the architectural elements or deities and the doctrinal categories see Tables 6 and 7 in the Appendix.

### The Deities are Neither the Same nor Different From the Mind

In \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 348 and the commentary thereon, Dīpaṃkarabhadrā and Ratnākaraśānti explain that the mind has wisdom and means as its nature, and therefore has the *maṇḍala* deities as its nature too.<sup>7</sup> Dīpaṃkarabhadrā further states that:

Because it [i.e. the mind] has qualities which are to be experienced by itself, [it] does not abide in differentiation or nondifferentiation (*bhedābheda*°, *dbye yod dbye med*) and so on. When [the mind] has been made proliferated in this way,<sup>8</sup> the perfections and so on appear as results.<sup>9</sup>

What does it mean to say that the mind “does not abide in differentiation or non-differentiation and so on”? In explaining this, Ratnākaraśānti employs a special use of the neither-identical-nor-different argument (and also the neither-one-nor-many argument). Below is my paraphrase of Ratnākaraśānti’s arguments (the original text

<sup>7</sup> Dīpaṃkarabhadrā’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 348 (A15r5, B20v4): *avikalpāt (avikalpāt ] em.; avikalpā AB) tu gāmbhīryam audāryaṃ svaparodayāt | gāmbhīryaudāryataś cetah prajñopāyātmakam matam*. ‘And from non-conceptualisation, [the mind has] profundity; [it has] vastness, because of the arising of [the fulfilment of the goals of] oneself and others. Because of profundity and vastness, the mind is considered to consist of wisdom and means.’ Dīpaṃkarabhadrā’s verse is a *śloka* recast of Jñānapāda’s *Samantabhadrasādhana* (Tōh. 1855, 1856) verse 125 in Āryā meter, see Cheung (2020, p. 176). For an explanation of Dīpaṃkarabhadrā’s verse see also Ratnākaraśānti’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭīkā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 348 (D120a1-2, P428a4): *de bas na de’i bdag nyid can gyi sems ni lha thams cad kyi bdag nyid can yin no zhes bya ba’i tha tshig go*. ‘Therefore it is as much as to say that the mind (*sems* = \**cetaḥ*) having the nature of them [i.e. wisdom and means] has the nature of all deities.’

<sup>8</sup> Ratnākaraśānti explains in the commentary that “in this way (*evam*)” means the mind has been made proliferated by means of the deities and by means of the true nature of the deities (*lha rnam kyī sgo dang de kho na nyid kyī sgo nas*), see D120b2, P428b7.

<sup>9</sup> Dīpaṃkarabhadrā’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (A15r5, B20v4-5): *pratyātmavedyadharmatvād bhedābhedaḍyasaṃsthitam | evaṃ prapañcite bhānti (bhānti ] B; bhrānti° A) phalāḥ pāramitādayaḥ (° dayaḥ ] A; °yah B)*. The word *phalāḥ* in *pāda* d is a predicate of the word *pāramitādayaḥ* and is therefore feminine plural.

and a more literal translation can be found in the respective footnotes after each sentence).

Ratnākaraśānti anticipates an objection from an opponent: if the qualities of the mind are the deities, then are those qualities of mind, such as faith, different from the mind, or not different? If they are not different from the mind, is the mind having the nature of them one, or many?<sup>10</sup> Ratnākaraśānti then responds that the qualities of the mind such as cognising and feeling are not different from the mind, because both the mind and awareness (*yang dag par rig pa*, \**samyagjñāna*) of the qualities of the mind are characterised by the luminosity (*gsal ba*, \**prakāśa*) of the sky. But the qualities of the mind are not undifferentiated from the mind at the same time too, because of the undesirable consequence that the mind and the qualities being one.<sup>11</sup>

The opponent further asks: then has the single mind become many? Ratnākaraśānti answers: no, because we are aware of the mind and the qualities of the mind as something not different. If the mind were many, the mind would become individual awarenesses like the minds of many beings.<sup>12</sup>

The opponent replies: then in this way, is the single mind endowed with many representational forms (*rnam pa*, \**ākāra*)?<sup>13</sup> Ratnākaraśānti answers: no, because it

<sup>10</sup> Ratnākaraśānti’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (D120a2-3, P428a4-6): *gal te ji skad du bshad pa’i tshul gyis sems kyi chos rnams nyid lha rnams yin na sems kyi chos dad pa (dad pa ) em.; dang ba P; tha dad pa D) la sogs pa de yang ci sems las tha dad pa yin nam tha mi dad pa yin | tha mi dad pa yin na de’i bdag nyid can gyi (bdag nyid can gyi ) em.; bdag nyid can gyis DP) sems gcig yin nam du ma yin zhe na.* ‘If by the manner taught in this way, precisely the qualities of the mind are the deities, [then] those qualities of mind such as faith too, are they different from the mind, or not different? If they are not different [from the mind], the mind having the nature of them is one, or many?’

<sup>11</sup> Ratnākaraśānti’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (D120a3-5, P428a7-8): *de yang rig cing tshor bzhin pa’i chos thams cad ni sems las logs shig (logs shig ] D; logs shing P) na med de | sems dang yang dag par rig pa gnyis ni nam mkha’ gsal ba’i mtshan nyid can yin pa’i phyir ro | dbye ba med pa yang ma yin te | sems gcig las de rnams tha mi dad na gcig pu nyid du thal bar ’gyur ba’i phyir ro.* ‘Furthermore, all the qualities such as cognising and feeling are not different from the mind, because both the mind and awareness are characterised by the luminosity of the sky. They are not undifferentiated [from the mind] too, because if they are not different from the mind which is one, there will be the undesirable consequence of [the qualities and the mind] being one.’

<sup>12</sup> Ratnākaraśānti’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (D120a5, P428a8-b2): *de lta na (P428b) ni sems nyid gcig pa du mar (gcig pa du mar ] em.; gcig pa dang | du mar DP; gcig pa’u mar N (unclear)) ’gyur ro zhe na | ma yin te | tha mi dad par yang dag par rig pa’i phyir ro | du ma yin na ni skyes bu du ma’i sems dang ’dra bar so sor rig par ’gyur ba yin no.* ‘If you ask: in this way, has the mind itself which is one become many? No, because [we are] aware of [the mind and the qualities of the mind] as [something] not different. If the mind were many, they would become individual awarenesses like the minds of many beings.’

<sup>13</sup> I take the word *rnam pa* in *rnam par du ma yin* here to be a translation of the Sanskrit term *ākāra*. However, *rnam pa* could also be a translation of *vidhā* or *prakāra*. Given that the words *rnam pa rnams* appear in the immediately following sentence (see the Tibetan in footnote 14 below) and the importance of *ākāra* in Ratnākaraśānti’s epistemology, it is very likely that the opponent uses the words “representational forms (*ākāra*)” here in this argument. For *ākāra* in Ratnākaraśānti’s philosophy see Moriyama (2014), Tomlinson (2019, 2023) and Seton (2023). Note that there are different English translations of the term *ākāra*, and there are problems with each of the translations which I am not going into detail here. I provisionally adopt the translation “representational form” used by Seton (2023).

is contradictory that representational forms, which are not different from the single mind, are themselves multiple.<sup>14</sup>

The opponent further asks: are they, i.e. the representational forms and the mind, one and many at the same time? Ratnākaraśānti answers: no, because the position of them being different has already been refuted, i.e. both are characterised by luminosity (*gsal ba*, \**prakāśa*).<sup>15</sup>

To sum up, Ratnākaraśānti explains:

Therefore, the mind in this way lacks duality in being free from the duality of having differentiations and not having differentiations, or of being one and being many. And because of [this] non-duality, it has no conceptual proliferation.<sup>16</sup>

From the above passages, we can observe that according to Ratnākaraśānti, the representational forms (*ākāra*) of the deities in the *maṇḍala* and the qualities of the mind such as faith (*śraddhā*), energy (*vīrya*) etc. (representing the true nature of the deities) have a neither-the-same-nor-different (*bhedābheda*) relationship with the mind. How can the representational forms and the qualities of the mind be neither the same nor different from the mind? Although Ratnākaraśānti does not explain it here, he explains in the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* (Tōh. 4079) and the \**Madhyamakālamkāropadeśa* (Tōh. 4085) that although the representational forms (*ākāra*) are ultimately unreal, they possess a special identity (*tādātmya*) relation with the real reflexively aware luminosity (*prakāśa*). The identity between the representational forms and reflexively aware luminosity is a superimposed identity (\**āropitaṃ tādātmyam*) which, while imposing an identity, still maintains a difference between the two.<sup>17</sup>

It should be noted that here Ratnākaraśānti employs the same type of neither-one-nor-many or neither-identical-nor-different argument to establish the non-duality of

<sup>14</sup> Ratnākaraśānti's \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (D120a5-6, P428b2): *de lta na ni sems gcig pu 'di nyid rnam pa du ma yin no (rnam pa du ma yin no ] em.; rnam par du ma yin no D; rnam pa ma yin no P) zhe na \ ma yin te \ sems gcig las tha mi dad pa 'i rnam pa rnam ni (rnam pa rnam ni ] P; rnam pa rnam D) du ma nyid yin par 'gal ba 'i phyir ro.* 'If you say: in that case, is the single mind [endowed with] many representational forms (*rnam pa* = \**ākāra*)? No, because of the contradiction of the manifoldness of many representational forms which are not different from the single mind.'

<sup>15</sup> Ratnākaraśānti's \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (D120a6, P428b2-3): *gcig pa dang du mar 'gyur ro zhe na \ tha dad pa 'i phyogs ni sngar sun phyung ba nyid yin pa 'i phyir ro.* 'If you ask: are they one and many [at the same time]? [No,] because the position of being something different has been refuted before.'

<sup>16</sup> Ratnākaraśānti's \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (D120a7-b1, P428b5-6): *des na 'di ltar dbye ba yod pa dang (yod pa dang ] D; yod dang P) dbye ba med (D120b) pa 'i bdag nyid can nam \ gcig pa nyid dang du ma nyid du 'gyur ba 'i ('gyur ba 'i ] D; gyur pa 'i P) gnyis med pas sems de ni gnyis su med pa nyid yin la \ gnyis su med pa 'i phyir spros pa med pa yin no.*

<sup>17</sup> For details of Ratnākaraśānti's arguments on *ākāra* being unreal and the special relationship between the unreal *ākāra* and the real *prakāśa* see the excellent studies of Moriyama (2014, pp. 345–348), Tomlinson (2019, pp. 143–177), Seton (2023, pp. 590–596) and most recently Tomlinson (2023, p. 393, 396–400).

mind as he does in defending his specific *\*alīkākāravāda*<sup>18</sup> view in the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa* and the *\*Madhyamakālaṃkāropadeśa*.<sup>19</sup> And, as Moriyama has pointed out, this use of argumentation contrasts with Śāntarakṣita’s utilization in his *Madhyamakālaṃkāra* where he employs the neither-one-nor-many argument to prove that entities are lack of intrinsic nature.<sup>20</sup> In fact, Ratnākaraśānti’s specific use of the neither-identical-nor-different argument aligns with the *prasaṅga* argument found in chapter three of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*. In this chapter, the Buddha explains that the character that is ultimate reality (*paramārthalakṣaṇa*) and the character of conditioned factors (*saṃskāralakṣaṇa*) are neither identical nor different.<sup>21</sup> Ratnākaraśānti’s specific use of this type of argument is rooted in the core Yogācāra texts such as the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* and deserves further study.

### Why Tantric Visualisation is Needed (the Five Scenarios)

Now, if in visualisation the representational forms of the deities and the qualities of the mind (i.e. the true nature of the deities) are neither the same nor different from the mind, is it not enough to meditate on the true nature of the deities alone? Why bother to visualise all these deities? In the next passage, Ratnākaraśānti explains why we have to meditate on both the mind as deities and the true nature (*tattva*) of the deities at the same time. According to Ratnākaraśānti, there are five scenarios:

- (1) If one meditates on the mind alone, then one would only obtain mundane mental concentration (*ting nge ’dzin*, *\*samādhi*) like the stage of the infinity of consciousness (*rnam shes mtha’ yas skye mched*, *\*vijñānānantyāyatana*).
- (2) Yet if one meditates on emptiness above all, that [result] too becomes only complete cessation, because of not perfecting the actions of purifying the Buddha qualities.

<sup>18</sup> As far as I know, the term *\*alīkākāravāda* is a back-translation from the Tibetan doxographical term *rnam brdzun pa* or *rnam pa brdzun par smra ba* and is not attested in Sanskrit. For *rnam pa brdzun par smra ba* see for example Rong zom pa’s classification of the *sākāravāda* in Almogi (2009, p. 34). For a further discussion of Ratnākaraśānti’s epistemological position, see Isaacson and Sferra (2014, p. 64, n. 21) and Seton (2023, pp. 590 and 598). Also, for a discussion of the conflation of *nirākāra* and *alīkākāra* by scholars, see Seton (2023, p. 590, see also p. 598, n. 6).

<sup>19</sup> See for example the sources quoted in Moriyama (2014, pp. 346–347). It appears that Ratnākaraśānti’s proof of the non-duality of the mind was not entirely successful in his time. For instance, his contemporary Jñānaśrīmītra, who upheld the *citrādvaīta* view of non-duality, criticised him. For more details, see Tomlinson (2019, p. 8 and pp. 250–261).

<sup>20</sup> The neither-one-nor-many (*ekāneka*) argument is used by Āryadeva, Vasubandhu, Dharmakīrti and other early Mahāyāna thinkers to prove the non-existence of external objects. Śāntarakṣita further uses the neither-one-nor-many argument to demonstrate the emptiness of intrinsic nature for all dharmas. In the *Madhyamakālaṃkāra*, he argues that if an entity lacks both singular nature (*ekatva*) and multiple nature (*anekatva*), then that entity lacks intrinsic nature, see Moriyama (2014, p. 340, 345–348).

<sup>21</sup> The Sanskrit original of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* is not extant, but we have Sanskrit fragments and quotations, a Tibetan translation, two full Chinese translations and two partial Chinese translations. The terms *paramārthalakṣaṇa* and *saṃskāralakṣaṇa* are attested in a Sanskrit fragment of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* found in Central Asia, see Waldschmidt (1971, p. 180, Nr. 923) and also the reconstruction of the sentence containing the terms in Schmithausen (2014, p. 557, n. 2291). For the Tibetan translation of chapter three of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* see Lamotte (1935, pp. 42–47).

- (3) Or, if one meditates on [the mind] only as having the nature of the deities, in this case, one does not even become awakened at all through that alone because the perfection of actions is incomplete.
- (4) Or, if one meditates only on the true nature of what the deities stand for and not the deities, then in this case too, one would attain Buddhahood in many countless aeons but not quickly.
- (5) Therefore, the meditation of both [the mind as deities and the true nature of the deities at the same time], because it is extremely pleasant to the mind and because it is a special kind of empowerment, causes one to obtain the highest perfect awakening very quickly.<sup>22</sup>

The five scenarios describe various tantric and non-tantric practitioners, encompassing both Buddhists and non-Buddhists. The first scenario likely disproves non-tantric and non-Buddhist practitioners of mind-focused meditation. The second scenario likely disproves *śrāvaka* Buddhists who meditate on a specific quality of emptiness (without the aid of Mahāyāna skillful means). The third scenario likely disproves tantric, non-Buddhist practitioners of meditation. The fourth scenario likely disproves Mahāyāna Buddhists following the perfection method. The fifth scenario likely affirms Mahāyāna Buddhists who practise meditation using both the perfection method and the mantra method.<sup>23</sup>

Below is a summary of Ratnākaraśānti's explanation of the five scenarios of meditation (Table 1).

By explaining in this way, Ratnākaraśānti provides a sound philosophical basis for visualising the deities in the *maṇḍala* and contemplating their true nature (*tattva*). In doing so, he emphasises the importance of practising according to both types of Mahāyāna practice, i.e. the perfection method (*pāramitānaya*) and the mantra method (*mantranaya*) at the same time.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Ratnākaraśānti's \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭīkā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349 (D120b2-5, P428b8-429a4): *gal te sems tsam (sems tsam ] em.; sems tsam du DP) bsgoms na rnam shes mtha' yas skye mched dang 'dra bar (P429a) 'jig rten pa'i (pa'i ] D; ma' i P) ting nge 'dzin tsam thob par 'gyur la | 'on te stong pa nyid (stong pa nyid ] D; stong pa nyid kyi P) khyad par du bsgoms na ni de yang yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa (pa ] D; ba P) tsam du 'gyur te | sangs rgyas kyi chos rnam sbyang ba'i las rdzogs par med (med ] P; byed D) pa' i phyir ro || yang na lha' i bdag nyid can 'ba' zhig ('ba' zhig ] D; 'bab zhing P) tsam bsgoms na de lta na ni de tsam gyis (gyis ] D; gyi P) 'ishang rgya ba nyid du mi 'gyur te | las rdzogs pa ma tshang ba' i phyir ro || yang na lha rnam kyi de kho na nyid bsgom gyi lha rnam ma yin na ni de lta na yang bskal pa grangs med pa mang pos sangs rgyas nyid thob par 'gyur gyi myur du ni ma yin no || de bas na gnyi ga bsgom pa ni shin tu yid du 'ong ba yin pa' i phyir dang | byin gyis brlabs (byin gyis brlabs ] P; byin gyi rlab D) kyi khyad par gyis mchog tu myur bar bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa' i byang chub 'thob ('thob ] D; thob P) par 'gyur ro.*

<sup>23</sup> I am grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers for elucidating this passage and correcting my errors.

<sup>24</sup> Ratnākaraśānti's view on the two Mahāyāna methods (i.e. *pāramitānaya* and *mantranaya*) is described in the sixth opening verse of his *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*, see Luo (2014, p. 21). The perfection method is portrayed as slow and painful, while the mantra method is characterised as swift and painless. For Ratnākaraśānti's view on the relationship between these two methods and the *Prajñāpāramitā* see Seton (2019, p. 366).



**Table 1** Ratnākaraśānti’s Explanation of the Five Scenarios of Meditation

Scenarios of meditation	Results	Likely describing
(1) Mind only	Mundane mental concentration ( <i>samādhi</i> ) which results in stages like the stage of the infinity of consciousness ( <i>vijñānāntyāyatana</i> )	Non-tantric and non-Buddhist practitioners of mind-focused meditation
(2) Emptiness above all	Complete cessation, no perfection of actions of purifying the Buddha qualities	<i>śrāvaka</i> Buddhists who meditate on a specific aspect of emptiness (without the aid of Mahāyāna skillful methods)
(3) Mind as deities	No awakening because there is no purification as the true nature of the deities	Tantric, non-Buddhist practitioners of meditation
(4) The true nature of what the deities stand for	One needs many aeons to attain Buddhahood	Mahāyāna Buddhists following the perfection method
(5) Both the mind as deities and the true nature of the deities at the same time	One obtains the highest perfect awakening very quickly	Mahāyāna Buddhists following both the perfection method and the mantra method

## The Reuse in Śūnyasamādhivajra’s \*Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama

Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation of the mind and the true nature of the deities in *maṇḍala* visualisation is unique and exerts an influence in the explanation of the true nature (*tattva*) or purity (*viśuddhi*) of the *maṇḍala* elements and the deities in the later generations. An explanation similar to Ratnākaraśānti’s is found in the \*Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama of Śūnyasamādhivajra (who is said to be identical with Divākaracandra, probably a student of Ratnākaraśānti).<sup>25</sup>

\*Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama is a text comprised of twenty ritual procedures (*cho ga*, \**vidhi*). Śūnyasamādhivajra reuses (without acknowledgement) passages from Ratnākaraśānti’s \**Kusumāñjali* (Tōh. 1851), *Muktāvalī* (Tōh. 1189) and \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā* in this text. The twentieth (i.e. the last) ritual procedure in the text is called the ritual procedure of practising the purity [of the

<sup>25</sup> The name of the author of the \*Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama given in the Tibetan translation is \*Samādhivajra (Ting nge ’dzin rdo rje). His name is sometimes given as \*Śūnyatāsamādhivajra or \*Śūnyatāsamādhi, but his name is most probably Śūnyasamādhivajra as attested in the *Hevajrasādhanasamgraha* codex, see Isaacson (2009, p. 121). For the identification of Śūnyasamādhivajra with Divākaracandra/Devākaracandra, see Roerich (1995, p. 392). For information on Divākaracandra’s floruit and oeuvre, and the sources for his being Ratnākaraśānti’s student, see Isaacson & Sferra (2014, pp. 83–84, n. 105).

*maṇḍala*] (*rnam par dag pa bsgom pa 'i cho ga*), which is comprised of two passages reused from Ratnākaraśānti's texts and one small passage written by Śūnyasamādhivajra himself. The first passage (D341a4-b3) is a resue of Ratnākaraśānti's explanation of the perfection method as expounded in *Muktāvalī ad Hevajratantra* I.i.10,<sup>26</sup> while the second passage (D341b3-7) is about the need for practising both the perfection method and the mantra method together as it was expounded by Ratnākaraśānti in \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā* ad \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349.

To clearly show the resue of Ratnākaraśānti's \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā* in Śūnyasamādhivajra's text, I put the two texts in parallel columns in the following Table (Table 2).

From the first row of Table 2, we can see that Śūnyasamādhivajra frames Ratnākaraśānti's five scenarios with an objection from the opponent: "If through this [perfection method] one obtains quickly the bliss which is perfect awakening, then what is the purpose of other fallacious signs, i.e. palaces, emblems, seed syllables, crescent-shaped ornaments, sound and so on of Heruka and yoginī [used in tantric meditation]?"<sup>27</sup> This objection is probably modelled on another sentence in Ratnākaraśānti's *Muktāvalī ad Hevajratantra* I.i.10.<sup>28</sup> The point here is that the meditation mentioned in the reused passage in the *Muktāvalī* (just before repeating the five scenarios) centres on *prajñāpāramitā* and is non-tantric in nature, and somebody might raise the objection: if a non-tantric method is enough to reach Buddhahood, why take the trouble to visualise all these emblems and seed syllables of the deities which are unreal mental proliferations and are fallacious in nature? Śūnyasamādhivajra then replies that visualising all these has a purpose. He goes on to repeat Ratnākaraśānti's five scenarios to emphasise that both the perfection method and the mantra method are necessary because, through them, there is speedy attainment of awakening.

From Table 2, we can see that although the wording of Śūnyasamādhivajra's may at times differ slightly from Ratnākaraśānti's, the contents of the two texts are more or less the same. Moreover, there are slight differences in the wording in the Tibetan translations of the two texts probably because the Tibetan translations were independently produced by different translators. These two texts may be even more

<sup>26</sup> The corresponding Sanskrit of the reused passage of *Muktāvalī ad Hevajratantra* I.i.10 can be found in Isaacson (2021, pp. 478-479), and the corresponding passages in the Tibetan translation of the *Muktāvalī* can be found in D227a3-b2.

<sup>27</sup> \**Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama* (D341b3-4, P428a5-7): *gal te bsgom pa 'dis myur du mchog gi bde ba yang dag par rdzogs pa 'i byang chub thob na \ gzhan he ru ka dang \ rnal 'byor ma 'i gzhal yas khang dang mtshan ma dang sa bon dang \ zla ba phyed dang sgra tsam la sogs pa phyin ci log gi mtshan nyid ci dgos (ci dgos ) D; ci gos P) she na.*

<sup>28</sup> *Muktāvalī ad Hevajratantra* I.i.10 (Isaacson, 2021, p. 479): *tato yeyam ākāravatī herukasya yoginīnām mantracihnāsanakūṭāgārādīnām ca bhāvanā, sā prapañco viparyāsaḥ saṃsārāvahaḥ prayāso na mokṣāvaha iti kasyacid āsāikā syāt.* 'Somebody might object: "therefore this meditation of Heruka, the yoginīs, [their] mantras, emblems, seats, palace, and so on, involving representational forms, is mental proliferation, a delusion, an effort which causes *saṃsāra*, not one which causes liberation.'" I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing to my attention that this excerpt from the *Muktāvalī* implies that the genitive particle in the phrase "*he ru ka dang \ rnal 'byor ma 'i*" in the Tibetan translation of Śūnyasamādhivajra's text (see footnote 27 above) is likely incorrect. Moreover, the reviewer pointed out that Heruka and the yoginīs should also be included in Śūnyasamādhivajra's list.

**Table 2** The Five Scenarios in Ratnākaraśānti’s \*Gūhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhīkā ad Śrītherukopadésanāmasvādhiṣṭhānākrama and its Reuse in Śūnyasamādhivajra’s \*Śrītherukopadésanāmasvādhiṣṭhānākrama

Ratnākaraśānti’s *Gūhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhīkā ad *Gūhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhī 349 (D120b2-5, P428b8-429a4)	Śūnyasamādhivajra’s *Śrītherukopadésanāmasvādhiṣṭhānākrama (D341b3-7, P428a5-428b3)
(1) gal te sems tsam <sup>α</sup> bsgoms na mam shes mtha’ yas skye mched dang ‘dra bar ‘jig (P429a) rten pa <sup>β</sup> ‘iṅ nge ‘dzin tsam thob par ‘gyur la 	gal te bsgom pa ‘dis myur du mchog gī bde ba yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub thob na l gzhan he ru ka dang l mal ‘byor ma’i gzhāl yas khang dang mtshan ma dang sa bon dang l zla ba phyed dang sgra tsam la sogs pa phyin ci log gī mtshan nyid ci dgos <sup>κ</sup> she na l dgos pa yod de de ‘di ltar gal te mam par shes pa tsam bsgom par bya ba yin na ‘jig rten pa’i ting nge ‘dzin tsam thob ste l rnam shes mtha’ yas skye mched bzhin no ll
(2) ‘on te stong pa nyid kyi khyad par du <sup>γ</sup> bsgoms na ni de yang yongs su mya ngan las ‘das pa <sup>δ</sup> tsam du ‘gyur te l sangs rgyas kyi chos mams sbyang ba’i las rdzogs par med pa’i phyir ro <sup>ε</sup> ll	de nas stong pa nyid rgya cher bsgom par bya ba yin na l mya ngan las ‘das pa tsam yin zhing yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub ma yin te l sangs rgyas kyi chos kyi yan lag med pa’i phyir ro ll
(3) yang na lha’i bdag nyid can ‘ba’ zhiḡ <sup>ζ</sup> tsam bsgoms na de lta na ni de tsam gyis <sup>η</sup> ‘tshang rgya ba nyid du mi ‘gyur te l las rdzogs pa ma tshang ba’i phyir ro ll	de nas yang lha dang (P428b) sngags dang sa bon dang thig le dang sgra tsam gyi bdag nyid bsgom par bya ba yin no ll de kho nas kyang sangs rgyas nyid ma yin te l yan lag stong pa’i phyir ro ll
(4) yang na lha mams kyi de kho na nyid bsgom gyi lha mams ma yin na ni de lta na yang bskaal pa grangs med pa mang pos sangs rgyas nyid thob par ‘gyur gyi myur du ni ma yin no ll	de nas yang lha mams kyi de kho na nyid bsgom par bya ba yin <sup>λ</sup> na l lha la sogs pa ma yin te l de bzhin du yang bskaal pa grangs med pa mang pos sangs rgyas nyid ‘thob kyi myur bar ma yin no ll
(5) de bas na gnyi ga bsgom pa ni shin tu yid du ‘ong ba yin pa’i phyir dang l byin gyis brlabs <sup>θ</sup> kyi khyad par gyis mchog tu myur bar bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub ‘thob par ‘gyur ro <sup>ι</sup> ll	de’i phyir gnyis ga bsgom pa yin na shin tu mdzes pa’i phyir dang l byin rlabs kyi khyad par las shin tu myur bar bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub ‘thob po ll

<sup>α</sup> sems tsam | em.; sems tsam du DP<sup>β</sup> ‘jig rten pa’i D; ‘jig rten ma’i P; <sup>γ</sup> stong pa nyid kyi khyad par du | P; stong pa nyid khyad par du D; <sup>δ</sup> mya ngan las ‘das pa | D; mya ngan las ‘das ba P; <sup>ε</sup> rdzogs par med pa’i phyir ro | P; rdzogs par byed pa’i phyir ro D; <sup>ζ</sup> ‘ba’ zhiḡ | D; ‘bab zhiḡ P; <sup>η</sup> de tsam gyis | D; de tsam gyi P; <sup>θ</sup> byin gyis brlabs | P; byin gyi rlab D; <sup>ι</sup> ‘thob par ‘gyur ro | D; thob par ‘gyur ro P; <sup>κ</sup> ci dgos | D; ci dgos P; <sup>λ</sup> bsgom par bya ba yin | D; bsgom par bya ba ma yin P

similar in their Sanskrit originals if they were extant. It especially is notable that Śūnyasamādhivajra retains the Yogācāra elements of Ratnākaraśānti. This is more evident if we compare Śūnyasamādhivajra's reuse with Abhayākaragupta's reuse in the next section.

## The Reuse in Abhayākaragupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī*

Before discussing Abhayākaragupta's reuse of Ratnākaraśānti's text, I will introduce Abhayākaragupta himself with a few words. He was one of the last great *paṇḍitas* of Buddhism in India and is said to have served as a teacher of both the renowned monasteries of Vikramaśīla and Nālandā during the reign of Rāmapāla (r. *circa* 1078/1079 to at least 1131),<sup>29</sup> Abhayākaragupta exerted a great influence on the development of Tibetan Buddhism through both his influence on Tibetan visitors to Vikramaśīla and Nālandā and his support of his Tibetan students' translations of Sanskrit treatises into Tibetan.<sup>30</sup>

Previous scholarly research has shown that Abhayākaragupta extensively incorporates passages written by other authors into his own works (often without acknowledgement).<sup>31</sup> Among those authors, Ratnākaraśānti seems to be a favourite source, since Abhayākaragupta reproduces in his own work many passages from both the non-tantric and tantric works of Ratnākaraśānti.<sup>32</sup>

Scholarly research also has shown that the focus of this paper, Ratnākaraśānti's \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*, was incorporated without acknowledgement by Abhayākaragupta in his *Āmnāyamañjarī*. Kano has pointed out that Abhayākaragupta incorporates Ratnākaraśānti's explanation of the Buddha-nature in the \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 94 into chapter one of the *Āmnāyamañjarī*, where he "Madhyamakanises"<sup>33</sup> Ratnākaraśānti's explanation by inserting a Madhyamaka phrase indicating that the mind is absent of any intrinsic nature.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, Sakurai has pointed out that Abhayākaragupta reuses Ratnākaraśānti's explanation of the true nature of the deities in the *maṇḍala* (\**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 349) "almost verbatim" in the eighteenth chapter of the *Āmnāyamañjarī*,<sup>35</sup> and that Abhayākaragupta

<sup>29</sup> The colophons of three of Abhayākaragupta's works contain dates in Rāmapāla's reign, see Bühnemann (1992, p. 122). I follow Hori (2019, p. 51) for the date of Rāmapāla's reign.

<sup>30</sup> For a summary of Abhayākaragupta's life see Erb (1997, pp. 27–29) and Isaacson and Sferra (2019, pp. 249–251). For his date see Bühnemann (1992, pp. 121–123). Luo (2020, pp. 59–63) contains a description of his twenty-eight works and a list of self-references in his writings. For the doctrinal position of Abhayākaragupta see Seyfort Ruegg (1981, p. 103 and p. 115) and Kano (2023).

<sup>31</sup> See for example the overview in Isaacson and Sferra (2019, p. 251). For a by-no-means-exhaustive table of Abhayākaragupta's reuse of other people's works see Table 5.

<sup>32</sup> Including Ratnākaraśānti's non-tantric works \**Suddhimaṭī* (Tōh. 3801) and *Sāratamā* (Tōh. 3803), and the tantric works *Muktāvalī* and \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*; see Table 5 for references.

<sup>33</sup> To use Kano's expression in Kano (2023, p. 627).

<sup>34</sup> Kano (2023, p. 626).

<sup>35</sup> Sakurai (1996, p. 147).

adjusts the text according to his Madhyamaka philosophical position.<sup>36</sup> However, Sakurai only mentions the reuse of Abhayākaragupta in passing and does not provide further details. In fact, in *Āmnāyamañjarī* chapter eighteen, when Abhayākaragupta comments on *Samputatantra* V.2.57 with an explanation of the true nature of the deities, he incorporates not one but multiple passages from Ratnākaraśānti. To highlight the reuse, I have included a table with the two texts in parallel columns (Table 3).

As shown in Table 3, Abhayākaragupta repeats (i.e. reuses without acknowledgement) Ratnākaraśānti’s passages from the \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhīkā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 343, 348 and 349 in one continuous passage, adding sentences of his own in between and at the end. Although the wordings between the Tibetan translations of Abhayākaragupta’s text and that of Ratnākaraśānti’s text are quite close, we can sometimes see (for example in the first sentence of row one of Table 3) differences in the use of Tibetan particles between the corresponding sentences in the two texts sometimes lead to divergence in meaning. As mentioned above, these differences in the two texts may be due to the fact that the two translations were independently produced.

In row four of Table 3, the places where Abhayākaragupta modifies Ratnākaraśānti’s text are underlined. The following is the translation of Abhayākaragupta’s text in row four (on the five scenarios):

And in this way, when [the mind] has been made proliferated by means of the deities and by means of the true nature [of the deities], one obtains the qualities of the Buddhas, such as the perfections, which have become the results [of the mind]; they are not [obtained] in any other way.

- (1) If one meditates only on consciousness, one obtains only mundane mental concentration like the stage of the infinity of consciousness.
- (2) If one meditates only on emptiness, at that time too, like a śrāvaka (nyan thos bzhin du), one becomes somebody who has the notion of complete cessation only, because of not purifying the Buddha qualities.
- (3) And if one meditates on [the mind] only [as having] the nature of the deities, then in this case, because of inferior purification, there is no Buddhahood and it is not wholesome.
- (4) If one meditates on the knowledge of emptiness (stong pa nyid kyi ye shes), but not the deities, then in this case too, one would obtain Buddhahood after a long time and it is not the case that [one would obtain it] quickly.
- (5) When one meditates on all three (gsum ka) [i.e. emptiness, the mind as the deities and the true nature of the deities], because they are extremely pleasant [to the mind] and because of a special kind of empowerment, one obtains the highest perfect awakening very quickly.

In the second scenario, Abhayākaragupta introduces the qualification of “like a śrāvaka (nyan thos bzhin du)” to clarify that this is a disproof of non-Mahāyāna Buddhists such as the *śrāvakas* and the *pratyekabuddhas*, who are intent on achieving mere cessation. In the fourth scenario, Abhayākaragupta modifies

<sup>36</sup> Sakurai (1996, p. 158, n. 73).

**Table 3** A Correspondence Table Between Abhayākara Gupta's *Āmnāyamañjārī* Chapter Eighteen and Ratnākaraśānti's *\*Gulhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*

	Abhayākara Gupta's <i>Āmnāyamañjārī</i> chapter eighteen	Ratnākaraśānti's <i>*Gulhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā</i>
1	(D167a3-4, P184b7-8) de ltar ni rten gyi dkyil 'khor ni de kho na nyid las rnam pa thams cad yongs su dag pa'i byang chub bo ll byang chub de la gang rnam pa kun yongs su dag pa'i sems de ni nges pa, <sup>1c</sup> don du na brten pa'i dkyil 'khor ro ll (D167a4-6, P184b8-185a2)	(D116b7-117a1, P 424a5-6, ad <i>*Gulhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi</i> 343) de yang rten gyi dkyil 'khor gyi de kho na nyid rnam pa thams cad yongs su dag pa ni byang chub yin la l byang chub de la sems gang rnam pa (D117a) thams cad du yongs su dag pa de ni brten pa po, <sup>1c</sup> dkyil 'khor yin no ll (D119b7-120a1, P428a2-4, ad <i>*Gulhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi</i> 348)
2	de ltar ni 'di ni thun mong du lha'i de kho na nyid do ll 'dir ni lha (P185a) thams cad shes rab dang thabs kyi bdag nyid can mams so ll de la shes rab kyi de kho na nyid ni zab mo nyid do ll de 'ang rnam par mi rtog pa nyid kyi phyr ro ll thabs kyi de kho na nyid ni <sup>b</sup> rgya che ba ste l de yang rang dang gzhan gyi don phun sum tshogs pa la dbang ba nyid kyi phyr ro ll rnam par mi rtog pa la dbang ba nyid <sup>c</sup> de yang sems kho na'i dag pa'o ll (D167a6, P185a2-3)	gang gi phyr 'di na <sup>h</sup> lha thams cad ni shes rab dang thabs kyi bdag nyid can yin no ll de la shes rab kyi de kho na nyid ni zab pa ste l de yang rnam par mi rtog pa nyid yin (D120a) pa'i phyr ro ll thabs kyi de kho na nyid ni rgya che ba ste l de yang rang dang gzhan gyi don phun sum tshogs pa <sup>h</sup> la dbang byed pa'i phyr ro ll rnam par mi rtog pa nyid dang dbang byed pa de yang sems nyid kyi rnam par dag pa yin no ll No correspondence
3	de'i phyr sems kho na lha thams cad kyi bdag nyid du dang snga ma yang rgyas pa dang beas par bshad zin to ll	

**Table 3** continued

4	<p>Abhayākara Gupta’s <i>Āmnāyamañjarī</i> chapter eighteen</p> <p>(D167a6-b3, P185a3-8)</p> <p>de ltar yang lha’i sgo nas dang de kho na nyid kyi sgo nas sems rab tu rgyas par byed pa na ’bras bur gyur pa pha rol tu phyin pa la sogs pa sangs rgyas ’thob kyi rnam pa gzhan du ni ma yin no ll</p> <p>(1) gal te rnam par shes pa tsam bsgoms<sup>6</sup> na ’jig rten pa’i ting nge ’dzin tsaṃ ’thob ste rnam shes mtha’ yas skye mched pa bzhin no ll</p> <p>(2) ci ste stong pa nyid tsaṃ bsgom pa de’i tshe yang<sup>6</sup> nyan thos bzhin (D167b) du mya ngan las ’das pa tsam gyi ’du shes can nyid du ’gyur te l sangs rgyas kyi chos maṃs yongs su sbyong ba med pa’i phyir ro ll</p> <p>(3) ci ste yang lha’i bdag nyid ’ba’ zhiḡ kho nar bsgoms<sup>6</sup> na de lta na yang yongs su sbyang ba dman pa nyid kyi phyir de tsam gyis sangs rgyas nyid ma yin gyi dge bar mi<sup>n</sup> gyur ro ll</p> <p>(4) ci ste stong pa nyid kyi ye shes bsgom gyi lha ma yin pa de lta na yang yun ring pos sangs rgyas nyid ’thob kyi myur du ma yin la l</p> <p>(5) gsum ka bsgom pa na ni shin tu dga’ bar bya ba nyid kyi phyir dang byin rlab kyi khyad par gyi phyir shin tu myur bar bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub ’thob<sup>6</sup> bo ll</p>	<p>Ratnākaraśānti’s *<i>Gulhyasamājamāṇḍatavādhīhīkā</i></p> <p>(D120b2-5, P428b7-429a4, ad *<i>Gulhyasamājamāṇḍatavādhī</i> 349, the five scenarios)</p> <p>de ltar zhes bya ba ni lha rnam kyi sgo dang de kho na nyid kyi sgo nas spro par byas pa’i sems kyi ’bras bur gyur pa ni pha rol tu phyin pa la sogs pa sangs rgyas kyi chos maṃs su ’gyur zhiḡ snang ba thob par ’gyur ba yin gyi l gzhan du ni ma yin no zhes bya ba’i tha tshig go ll</p> <p>(1) gal te sems tsaṃ<sup>v</sup> bsgoms na rnam shes mtha’ yas skye mched dang ’dra bar ’jig (P429a) rten pa’i<sup>5</sup> ting nge ’dzin tsaṃ thob par ’gyur la l</p> <p>(2) ’on te stong pa nyid kyi khyad par du<sup>o</sup> bsgoms na ni de yang yongs su mya ngan las ’das pa<sup>u</sup> tsam du ’gyur te l sangs rgyas kyi chos maṃs sbyang ba’i las rdzogs par med pa’i phyir ro<sup>l</sup> ll</p> <p>(3) yang na lha’i bdag nyid can ’ba’ zhiḡ<sup>g</sup> tsaṃ bsgoms na de lta na ni de tsaṃ gyis<sup>t</sup> tshang rgya ba nyid du mi<sup>l</sup> gyur te l las rdzogs pa ma tshang ba’i phyir ro ll</p> <p>(4) yang na lha maṃs kyi de kho na nyid bsgom gyi lha rnam ma yin na ni de lta na yang bskal pa grangs med pa mang pos sangs rgyas nyid thob par ’gyur gyi myur du ni ma yin no ll</p> <p>(5) de bas na gnyi ga bsgom pa ni shin tu yid du ’ong ba yin pa’i phyir dang l byin gyis brlabs<sup>v</sup> kyi khyad par gyis mchog tu myur bar bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub ’thob par ’gyur ro<sup>o</sup> ll</p> <p>No correspondence</p>
5	<p>(D167b3-4, P185a8-185b1)</p> <p>de nyid kyi ’phyir mkha’<sup>a</sup> gro ma rdo rje gur du gsungs pa l tha mal nga rgyal gzhom don du ll sgom pa yang dag rab tu bsgrags ll zhes dang l (P185b) slar yang ’on kyang mi gisang ba’i lus sbyang ba’i slad du sangs rgyas kyi sku bsgom par bgyi’o zhes so ll<sup>b</sup></p>	<p>No correspondence</p>

<sup>a</sup> nges pa’i J D; nges par P; <sup>β</sup> ni J P; na D; <sup>γ</sup> dbang ba nyid J D; dbang ba de nyid P; <sup>δ</sup> bsgoms J D; bsgom P; e yang J D; om P; <sup>ε</sup> bsgoms J D; bsgom P; <sup>η</sup> mi J P; ni D; <sup>θ</sup> ’thob J D; thob P; <sup>ι</sup> kyi J D; om P; <sup>κ</sup> brten pa po’i em.; rten pa’i P; rten pa po’i D; <sup>λ</sup> di na J P; di ni D; <sup>μ</sup> phun sum tshogs pa J D; phun tshogs pa P; <sup>ν</sup> sems tsaṃ J em.; sems tsaṃ du DP; <sup>ξ</sup> jig rten pa’i J D; jig rten ma’i P; <sup>ο</sup> stong pa nyid kyi khyad par du J P; stong pa nyid khyad par du D; <sup>π</sup> mya ngan las ’das pa J D; mya ngan las ’das ba P; <sup>ρ</sup> rdzogs par med pa’i phyir ro J P; rdzogs par byed pa’i phyir ro D; <sup>σ</sup> ’ba’ zhiḡ J D; ’bab zhiḡ P; <sup>τ</sup> de tsaṃ gyis J D; de tsaṃ gyi P; <sup>υ</sup> byin gyi rlab D; <sup>φ</sup> ’thob par ’gyur ro J D; thob par ’gyur ro P

<sup>b</sup>Quoted in chapter one of Tsong kha pa’s *sVgags rim chen mo*, see section “Tsong Kha Pa’s Reuse” below

Ratnākaraśānti's phrase "if one meditates only on the true nature of what the deities stand for"<sup>37</sup> to "if one meditates on the knowledge of emptiness (*stong pa nyid kyi ye shes*), but not the deities." For both Ratnākaraśānti and Abhayākara Gupta, the fourth scenario describes the seeing of emptiness by the practitioners while engaging in the perfection method. According to Ratnākaraśānti, the perfection of wisdom (*prajñāpāramitā*) is defined as the seeing of emptiness (on the fourth of the four stages of yoga). And the true nature of the deities can be described as either "the qualities of the mind" or as "emptiness." This is because, during the exploration in the four stages of yoga, the second stage involves perceiving the true nature of the deities solely as mind only. And in the third and fourth stages, a practitioner further sees the true nature of the deities as emptiness, initially with characteristics (*sanimittā*) and then without them (*nirnimittā*).<sup>38</sup> Abhayākara Gupta would largely agree with Ratnākaraśānti's interpretation, but there is a crucial difference between the concept of emptiness of Ratnākaraśānti and that of Abhayākara Gupta. For Ratnākaraśānti, emptiness is the absence of the duality of the apprehended object (*grāhya*) and the apprehending subject (*grāhaka*).<sup>39</sup> The mind itself is not empty, and what is ultimately real is sheer luminosity (*prakāśamātra*).<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, Abhayākara Gupta considers the mind itself to be empty i.e. without intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*), and what is ultimately real is the absence of intrinsic nature (*niḥsvabhāvatā*).<sup>41</sup> In other words, Ratnākaraśānti adopts the Yogācāra understanding of emptiness as an implicative negation (*paryudāsapraṭiśedha*),<sup>42</sup> while Abhayākara Gupta adopts the Mādhyamika understanding of emptiness as a non-implicative negation or absolute negation (*prasajyapraṭiśedha*). Abhayākara Gupta feels to need to distinguish emptiness from the mind, therefore he changes

<sup>37</sup> See section "Why Tantric Visualisation is Needed (the Five Scenarios)".

<sup>38</sup> I am grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers for clarifying Ratnākaraśānti's position here. For more information on Ratnākaraśānti's four stages of yoga (*yogabhūmi*) in the *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*, refer to Namai (1991), Bentor (2002, pp. 42–49), Yiannopoulos (2017, p. 240), Katsura (2018) and Seton (2023, pp. 594–595). For Ratnākaraśānti's application of the four stages of yoga in tantric practices, see especially Bentor (2002, pp. 49–50), Yiannopoulos (2017) and Seton (2017, p. 5).

<sup>39</sup> See Ratnākaraśānti's *Muktāvalī ad Hevajratāntra* II.viii.9-10 (Isaacson, 2013, p. 1040): *tad api cittam na sad dvayārūpeṇa, nāsad dvayaśūnyena rūpeṇeti*. 'The mind too is not real in the form of the two [i.e. in the form of apprehended object (*grāhya*) and apprehending subject (*grāhaka*)], and it is not unreal in the form empty of the two [i.e. apprehended object (*grāhya*) and apprehending subject (*grāhaka*)].' See also *Muktāvalī ad Hevajratāntra* I.i.12 (Isaacson, 2021, p. 482): *ata eva na sat sarvaṃ dvayārūpeṇa dvayākārarūpeṇa ca, nāsat sarvaṃ advayaprakāśamātrarūpeṇeti mādhyamikānāṃ yogācārāṇāṃ ca sadṛśaḥ siddhāntaḥ śreyān*. 'For precisely this reason, it is not the case that everything is real (*sat*) in the form of the two [i.e. in the form of apprehended object (*grāhya*) and apprehending subject (*grāhaka*)] and in the form of the representational forms (*ākāra*) of the two [i.e. in the form of *grāhyākāra* and *grāhakākāra*], and it is not the case that everything is unreal in the form of sheer luminosity without the two [apprehended object (*grāhya*) and apprehending subject (*grāhaka*)] (*advayaprakāśamātra*), therefore the equivalent established position of the Mādhyamikas and the Yogācāras is better.'

<sup>40</sup> Seton (2023, p. 590).

<sup>41</sup> See Abhayākara Gupta's *Munimatālaṃkāra* chapter one (Kano & Li, 2018, p. 130): *paramārthatas tu dharmasya vijñānasya dharmatāyās ca śūnyatāder niḥsvabhāvatvān na bhedaḥ*. 'But ultimately, there is neither differentiation nor non-differentiation, because the emptiness (*śūnyatā*) and so on of factor of existence (*dharmā*), consciousness (*vijñāna*) and the nature of the factor of existence (*dharmatā*) are without intrinsic nature (*niḥsvabhāva*).'

<sup>42</sup> Seton (2017, p. 3).



Ratnākaraśānti’s description of the fourth scenario to highlight the importance of emptiness. Furthermore, in the fifth scenario, Abhayākaragupta changes Ratnākaraśānti’s “if one meditates on both the mind as deities and the true nature of the deities at the same time”<sup>43</sup> to “when one meditates on all three (*gsum ka*) [i.e. the mind as deities, the true nature of the deities, and emptiness].” By including emptiness as a separate item in the final accepted scenario of meditation, Abhayākaragupta “Madhyamakanises” the Yogācāra explanation of Ratnākaraśānti. Here, to help clarify, is a summary table of the explanations of the five scenarios by Abhayākaragupta and Ratnākaraśānti (Table 4).

A few passages down from the previously discussed passage, Abhayākaragupta quotes verses 126-128, 125 and 124ab of the *Sarvarahasyatantra* to explain the true nature of some of the architectural components in the *maṇḍala*.<sup>44</sup> In the \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhīkā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 335, Ratnākaraśānti also quotes the *Sarvarahasyatantra* in the same sequence (with two verses more; Ratnākaraśānti quotes verses 126–130, 125 and 124ab).<sup>45</sup> Abhayākaragupta’s source is probably Ratnākaraśānti. It is interesting to note in passing that Śākyaraḥṣita’s *Hevajrābhisamayatilaka* (Tōh. 1277) also quotes the

**Table 4** The Five Scenarios of Meditation According to Ratnākaraśānti and Abhayākaragupta

Scenarios of meditation according to Ratnākaraśānti	Scenarios of meditation according to Abhayākaragupta	Results
(1) Mind only	Mind only	Mundane mental concentration ( <i>samādhi</i> ) which results in stages like the stage of the infinity of consciousness ( <i>vijñānānantyāyatana</i> )
(2) Emptiness in particular	Emptiness only	Complete cessation, no perfection of actions of purifying the Buddha qualities
(3) Mind as deities	Mind as deities	No awakening because there is no purification as the true nature of the deities
(4) The true nature of what the deities stand for (but not the deities)	Only the knowledge of emptiness but not the deities	One needs many aeons to attain Buddhahood
(5) Both the mind as deities and the true nature of the deities at the same time	All three [i.e. the mind as deities, the true nature of the deities, and emptiness]	One obtains the highest perfect awakening very quickly

<sup>43</sup> See section “Why Tantric Visualisation is Needed (the Five Scenarios)”.

<sup>44</sup> Abhayākaragupta’s *Āmnāyamañjarī* (D169a4-7, P187a4-8).

<sup>45</sup> Ratnākaraśānti’s \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhīkā ad Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* 335 (D113b4-114a1, P420b1-6, Cheung, 2020, pp. 152–154).

*Sarvarahasyatantra* in the same number of verses and sequence as Abhayākara-gupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī*,<sup>46</sup> and just before the *Sarvarahasyatantra* quotation, there is also a large chunk of parallel passage between the two texts. Given that Śākyarakṣita was a student of Abhayākara-gupta,<sup>47</sup> we probably have here a repeat of Abhayākara-gupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī* in Śākyarakṣita's *Hevajrābhisamayatilaka*.

## Tsong Kha Pa's Reuse

Both the writings of Ratnākaraśānti and Abhayākara-gupta had a significant impact on Tsong kha pa Blo bzang grags pa (1357–1419),<sup>48</sup> the renowned founder of the dGe lugs school in Tibet. Tsong kha pa frequently quotes Ratnākaraśānti and Abhayākara-gupta in his *sNgags rim chen mo*.<sup>49</sup> The passage under discussion, the five scenarios of meditation in Ratnākaraśānti's *\*Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*, is not only quoted in Tsong kha pa's *sNgags rim chen mo*, but also reproduced verbatim in Tsong kha pa's *bZhi brgya lnga bcu pa'i skor gyi zin bris gnang ba*.<sup>50</sup>

In the *sNgags rim chen mo*, Tsong kha pa discusses the necessity of practising both the perfection method and the mantra method. He first cites the *Vajrapañjaratantra* and Jñānapāda's *Ātmasādhanaṅvātāra* before quoting verbatim from the third to the fifth scenarios of Ratnākaraśānti in the *\*Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*:

Ratnākaraśānti says in the Commentary to the Four Hundred and Fifty Verses [i.e. the *\*Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā*], “(3) If one meditates on [the mind] only as having the nature of the deities, in this case, one does not even become awakened at all through that alone, because the perfection of actions is incomplete. (4) Or, if one meditates only on the true nature of what the deities stand for and not the deities, then in this case too one would attain Buddhahood in many countless aeons but not quickly. (5) Therefore, the meditation of both [the mind as deities and the true nature of the deities at the same time], because it is extremely pleasant to the mind and because it is a

<sup>46</sup> Śākyarakṣita's *Hevajrābhisamayatilaka* (D117b7-118a3, P510a8-b3). A Sanskrit manuscript containing Śākyarakṣita's *Hevajrābhisamayatilaka* is preserved at the Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Germany; Dr. Torsten Gerloff (Hamburg) is currently preparing a Sanskrit critical edition of this text.

<sup>47</sup> Sanderson (2009, p. 176).

<sup>48</sup> For the date of Tsong kha pa I follow the information given on the BDRC website: <http://purl.bdrc.io/resource/P64>. For his life see Jinpa (2019) and Repo (2019).

<sup>49</sup> In the *sNgags rim chen mo*, Tsong kha pa usually refers to Ratnākaraśānti, Abhayākara-gupta and other Indian masters by name and cites the name of their works. Ratnākaraśānti's *\*Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā* and Abhayākara-gupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī* are among the most quoted tantric treatises in the *sNgags rim chen mo*, and a rough count shows that Abhayākara-gupta is likely the most quoted person in the *sNgags rim chen mo*.

<sup>50</sup> The *bZhi brgya lnga bcu pa'i skor gyi zin bris gnang ba* consists of excerpts from four passages from Ratnākaraśānti's *\*Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭkā* without any added explanation. This text is very likely some kind of study notes or working notes of Tsong kha pa.

special kind of empowerment, causes one to obtain the highest perfect awakening very quickly.”<sup>51</sup>

While Tsong kha pa quotes Ratnākaraśānti, his explanation is based on the Madhyamaka explanation of Abhayākara Gupta in the *Āmnāyamañjarī*. Tsong kha pa continues:

[Here Ratnākaraśānti] says that if one meditates only on deity yoga, one is not able to be awakened at all. And if one does not meditate on the deities, through meditating [only] on emptiness together with other means, one would attain awakening after many countless aeons. And if one meditates on both the deities and emptiness, the path [to awakening] is speedy. Therefore, this *ācārya* [i.e. Ratnākaraśānti] also accepts that because the view of emptiness is common to both [types of] Mahāyāna [i.e. perfection method and mantra method], if there is no deity yoga, then there is a delay in the path like the Perfection Vehicle (*phar phyin gyi theg pa*, \**pāramitāyāna*), and by connecting deity yoga with the view of emptiness, the path is speedy. [His view] follows what has been discussed earlier [in the *Vajrapañjaratantra* and by Jñānapāda in the *Ātmasāadhanāvātāra*].<sup>52</sup>

We can see that, in contrast to Ratnākaraśānti, who expresses the Yogācāra view that the mind and the qualities of the mind are the true nature of the deities in a tantric visualisation, Tsong kha pa, himself a Mādhyamika, interprets the true nature of the deities as the view of emptiness according to Abhayākara Gupta’s Madhyamaka modification but without mentioning Abhayākara Gupta.<sup>53</sup> He only mentions Abhayākara Gupta and his *Āmnāyamañjarī* by name after explaining Ratnākaraśānti’s passage:

<sup>51</sup> Tsong kha pa, *sNgags rim chen mo* (22a4-6): *bzhi brgya lnga bcu pa’i ’grel pa las | yang na lha’i bdag nyid can ’ba’ zhiḡ tsam bsgoms na de lta na ni de tsam gyis ’tshang rgya ba nyid du mi ’gyur te | las rdzogs pa ma tshang ba’i phyir ro || yang na lha rnam kyī de kho na nyid bsgom gyi lha rnam ma yin na ni | de lta na yang bskal pa grangs med pa mang por sangs rgyas nyid thob par ’gyur gyi myur du ni ma yin no || de bas na gnyis ka sgom pa ni shin tu yid du ’ong ba yin pa’i phyir dang | byin gyis brlabs kyī khyad par gyis mchog tu myur bar bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub thob par ’gyur ro || zhes shānti pas gsungs te.*

<sup>52</sup> Tsong kha pa, *sNgags rim chen mo* (22a6-b3): *lha’i rnal ’byor tsam zhiḡ sgom (22b) na gtan ’tshang rgya mi nus pa dang | lha ma bsgoms na stong nyid thabs gzhan dang ldan par bsgoms pas bskal pa grangs med mang pos ’tshang rgya ba dang lha dang stong nyid gnyis ka bsgoms na lam myur bar gsungs so || des na slob dpon ’di yang stong nyid kyī lta ba theg chen pa gnyis ka’i thun mong ba yin pas lha’i rnal ’byor med na phar phyin gyi theg pa ltar lam ’gyang ba dang | lha’i rnal ’byor stong nyid kyī lta ba dang sbrel bas lam myur bar bzhed pa yin te sngar bshad pa’i rjes su ’brang ba’o.*

<sup>53</sup> I am grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing out that Tsong kha pa’s understanding of emptiness underwent significant change following his vision of the deity Mañjuśrī and that there is the possibility that in the *sNgags rim chen mo* he is, in turn, reinterpreting Abhayākara Gupta’s Madhyamaka modification. This is indeed possible, but I do not think Tsong kha pa’s and Abhayākara Gupta’s interpretations diverge significantly here. My impression is that Abhayākara Gupta makes an effort to adhere more closely to Ratnākaraśānti’s wordings, but Tsong kha pa paraphrases more freely and makes the Madhyamaka elements clearer. The *sNgags rim chen mo* was written when Tsong kha pa was 49 (i.e. in 1405. For the date of composition see Seyfort Ruegg’s introduction to the English translation of the *Lam rim chen mo*, Tsong-kha-pa, 2000, p. 28), certainly after Tsong kha pa’s vision of Mañjuśrī during a retreat in 1393 (Jinpa, 2019, pp. 129-130), but further research is needed before we can draw any definite conclusions on this point.

In chapter eighteen of the *Āmnāyamañjarī* too, Abhaya, after explaining in accordance with Śāntipa [i.e. Ratnākaraśānti], cites the scriptural source of that from chapter fourteen of the *Vajrapañjaratantra*: “For the purpose of overcoming ordinary pride, [this] meditation is correctly proclaimed” and “furthermore, in order to purify the impure body, one should meditate on the body of the Buddha.”<sup>54</sup>

Here, Tsong kha pa points out that Abhayākara Gupta’s source is Ratnākaraśānti and reproduces Abhayākara Gupta’s citation of the *Vajrapañjaratantra*.<sup>55</sup>

## Some Observations

Both Śūnyasamādhivajra and Abhayākara Gupta silently incorporate Ratnākaraśānti’s explanation of the five scenarios of meditation, so their reuse fall under the category of “repeat (i.e. unacknowledged textual reuse)” and not under “quotation (i.e. acknowledged textual reuse).” Tsong kha pa’s reuse, on the other hand, is a quotation where he acknowledges Ratnākaraśānti. Specifically, his quotation falls into the category of citation (i.e. acknowledged textual reuse, the same in both form and content). In contrast, Tsong kha pa only says that Abhayākara Gupta’s text follows Ratnākaraśānti’s but does not quote Abhayākara Gupta.

While Śūnyasamādhivajra follows faithfully Ratnākaraśānti’s Yogācāra explanation, Abhayākara Gupta modifies Ratnākaraśānti’s text in accordance with his own Madhyamaka philosophy. Tsong kha pa quotes Ratnākaraśānti’s text verbatim but follows Abhayākara Gupta’s modification in his own explanation. As a Mādhyamaka himself, Tsong kha pa regards Abhayākara Gupta’s Madhyamaka modification as the correct interpretation of Ratnākaraśānti’s teaching. In fact, he intentionally reinterprets Ratnākaraśānti through the lens of Abhayākara Gupta.

What can we glean from these cases of repeat and quotation? According to Hugon, there are two main functions of quotations: (1) to present an opponent’s view, or (2) to support one’s own interpretation or explanation.<sup>56</sup> Tsong kha pa’s quotation has the second function; he quotes Ratnākaraśānti to support his argument that it is necessary to have both types of Mahāyāna meditation together.

But what are the possible reasons for unacknowledged repeats, as in the cases of Śūnyasamādhivajra and Abhayākara Gupta? Scholars already have pointed out that the modern concept of plagiarism does not apply to the intellectual world of medieval India and Tibet.<sup>57</sup> In the literary culture of medieval India or Tibet, a master operates within a tradition of lineages and regards himself as an agent transmitting traditional knowledge rather than as an innovator composing something

<sup>54</sup> Tsong kha pa, *sNgags rim chen mo* (22b3–4): *man ngag snye ma’i snye ma bco brgyad pa las kyang | a bhayas shānti pa ji ltar bzhed pa bzhin bshad nas de’i shes byed du | tha mal nga rgyal gzhom don du || bgom pa yang dag rab tu bsrags || zhes dang | slar yang ’on kyang mi gtsang ba’i lus shyang ba’i slad du sangs rgyas kyi sku bsgom par bgyi’o || zhes gur gyi le’u bcu bzhi pa las gsungs pa drangs so.*

<sup>55</sup> For Abhayākara Gupta’s quotation of the *Vajrapañjaratantra* see row five of Table 3.

<sup>56</sup> Hugon (2015, p. 483).

<sup>57</sup> Freschi (2012, pp. 171–172, 174–176), Hugon (2015, p. 482) and Vergiani (2015, pp. 208–209).

entirely new. And in that literary culture, as the previous scholarship has shown, to silently appropriate (i.e. repeating without acknowledgement) a predecessor’s view indicates a master’s endorsement of and respect towards this predecessor.<sup>58</sup> And lastly, as also has been studied, in India and Tibet to repeat something from another text, even without acknowledgement, would be recognised by the intellectual community in the author’s time, as the source was probably widely known at that time.<sup>59</sup>

However, if the source of a quotation was separated in time and space, by a long time or by great geographic distance, from an author and his audience, the author would be more likely to acknowledge that source by name. Let me use Abhayākaragupta and Tsong kha pa to illustrate. Below is a table of Abhayākaragupta’s reuse of other people’s work which is by no means exhaustive (Table 5).

From Table 5, it appears that the distance in time between Abhayākaragupta and the source texts might be a factor affecting the identification of source texts. The farther away the authors are from Abhayākaragupta in time, the more likely they are quoted by name as an authority. From the table, we can see that Abhayākaragupta quotes Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Maitreya, Asaṅga, and Vasubandhu most often. The closer the authors are to Abhayākaragupta in time, the more likely they are incorporated silently. For example, Abhayākaragupta silently repeats Ratnākaraśānti, Jñānaśrīmitra, Kamalanātha and Bhavabhāṭṭa. It might be argued that Abhayākaragupta also quotes the works of masters who are closer to him in time, such as [tantric] Nāgārjuna’s *Pañcakrama*, [tantric] Āryadeva’s *Sūta*, [tantric] Āryadeva’s *Svādhiṣṭhānaprabheda*, and [tantric] Candrakīrti’s *Pradīpoddyotana*. However, Abhayākaragupta probably equates the later tantric Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Candrakīrti with the earlier Mādhyamika Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Candrakīrti, who wrote the famous Mādhyamika treatises such as the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*.

There are exceptions to the above observations. Abhayākaragupta sometimes cites and sometimes silently borrows from masters from the same period. He cites Śāntarakṣita’s *Tattvasaṃgraha* by name but silently incorporates Kamalaśīla’s *Madhyamakāloka*. Both Sthiramati and Candrakīrti lived hundreds of years before Abhayākaragupta, but Abhayākaragupta assimilates Sthiramati’s *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā* and Candrakīrti’s *Pañcaskandhaka* instead of quoting them. Sometimes Abhayākaragupta not only borrows from but also quotes the same master. He quotes Candrakīrti’s *Madhyamakāvātāra*, *Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya* and *Triśaraṇasaptatī*, citing the text or author by name, but borrows without acknowledging the source from Candrakīrti’s *Pañcaskandhaka*. And he borrows silently from and also quotes three times by name Ratnākaraśānti’s *Sāratamā* in the *Munimatālaṃkāra*.<sup>60</sup> With these exceptional cases, another possible factor for the silent borrowing of other master’s texts might be at play here. The borrowed master’s explanations on certain matters might have become the standard in Buddhist monastic colleges and were

<sup>58</sup> Cantwell and Mayer (2013, p. 196), Hugon (2015, p. 483) and Vergiani (2015, pp. 208–209).

<sup>59</sup> Freschi (2012, p. 171), Hugon (2015, p. 483) and Vergiani (2015, p. 209).

<sup>60</sup> Isoda (1988, p. 76–77).

Table 5 A By-No-Means-Exhaustive Table of Abhayākaragupta's Reuse of Other People's Works

Abhayākaragupta's work	Reuse of	Repeat or quotation?	References
<i>Madhyamakamañjari</i>	Asaṅga's <i>Mahāvāyānasūtrālamkāra</i> , Nāgārjuna's <i>Yuktisāṣṭikā</i> , Maitreyanātha's <i>Abhisamayālamkāra</i> , Dharmakīrti's <i>Pramāṇavārttika</i> (silent quotation), Śāntarakṣita's <i>Tattvasaṅgraha</i> , Vasubandhu's <i>Vīṃśikā</i> , Nāgārjuna's <i>Mūlamadhyamakakārikā</i>	Quotation	Luo (2020, pp. 66–68)
<i>Madhyamakamañjari</i>	Jñānaśrīmitra's <i>Sākārasiddhisāstra</i>	Repeat	Luo (2020, pp. 65–66)
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i> (Tōh. 1198)	Āryadeva's <i>Caṇḍisātaśata</i> , Nāgārjuna's <i>Cittavajrasava</i> , Dharmakīrti's <i>Pramāṇavārttika</i> (silent quotation with <i>iti nyūyāḥ</i> ), [tantric] Nāgārjuna's <i>Bodhicittavivaraṇa</i> , Maitreyanātha's <i>Abhisamayālamkāra</i> , Nāgārjuna's <i>Mūlamadhyamakakārikā</i> , Nāgārjuna's <i>Rājaratnāvalī</i> , [tantric] Candrakīrti's <i>Pradīpoddyotana</i> , [tantric] Āryadeva's <i>Sūtaśata</i> , [tantric] Āryadeva's <i>Svādhiṣṭhānaprabheda</i> , [tantric] Nāgārjuna's <i>Pañcakrama</i> , Śāntideva's <i>Bodhicaryāvatāra</i> , Kāṃha's <i>Dohakośa</i>	Quotation	Tomabechi (2017, 2018a, 2018b)
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i>	Ratnākaraśānti's * <i>Gulhyasamāyamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Gulhyasamāyamaṇḍalavidhi</i> 94	Repeat	Kano (2023, p. 626)
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i>	Ratnākaraśānti's * <i>Gulhyasamāyamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Gulhyasamāyamaṇḍalavidhi</i> 343 and 348	Repeat	See section "The Reuse in Abhayākaragupta's <i>Āmnāyamañjari</i> " of the present paper
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i>	Ratnākaraśānti's * <i>Gulhyasamāyamaṇḍalavidhiṭikā ad Gulhyasamāyamaṇḍalavidhi</i> 349	Repeat	Sakurai (1996, p. 147 and p. 158, n. 73) and section "The Reuse in Abhayākaragupta's <i>Āmnāyamañjari</i> " of the present paper
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i>	Ratnākaraśānti's <i>Sār-atamā</i>	Repeat	Tomabechi and Kano (2008, pp. 24–25)

**Table 5** continued

Abhayākara Gupta’s work	Reuse of	Repeat or quotation?	References
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i>	Ratnākaraśānti’s <i>Muktāvālī</i>	Repeat	Tanemura (2008, p. 70, n. 54)
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i>	Kamalanātha’s <i>Ratnāvālī</i> and possibly Kṛṣṇa’s <i>Yogaratanamālā</i>	Repeat	Tanemura (2008, p. 70, n. 54)
<i>Āmnāyamañjari</i>	Bhavabhāṭṭa’s <i>Catuspīhanibandha</i>	Repeat	Szántó (2012, vol. 1, p. 100)
<i>Abhayapaddhati</i> (Tōh. 1654)	Nāgārjuna’s <i>Rājaratnāvālī</i> <sup>2</sup> and [tantric Nāgārjuna’s] <i>Bodhicittavivaraṇa</i>	Quotation	Isaacson (1999)
<i>Abhayapaddhati</i>	Jñānapāda’s <i>Samantabhadrasādhanā</i> , Śāntideva’s <i>Bodhicaryāvatāra</i> , Saraha’s <i>Caryāgītikosā</i>	Quotation	Luo (2010, p. 5, 29, 43)
<i>Abhayapaddhati</i>	Kamalanātha’s <i>Ratnāvālī</i>	Repeat	Luo (2010, p. 55)
<i>Vājrāvālī</i> (Tōh. 3140)	Nāgabuddhi’s <i>Samājjamaṇḍalopayikā</i>	Quotation	Mori (2009, p. 12)
<i>Vājrāvālī</i>	Ānandagarbha and Ghaṇṭāpāda	Quotation	Mori (2009, p. 12, n. 51)
<i>Vājrāvālī</i>	Dīpaṃkarabhadra’s * <i>Guhyasamājjamaṇḍalavādhī</i>	Repeat and quotation	Mori (2009, pp. 15–16, esp. Table 1)
<i>Vājrāvālī</i>	Ratnākaraśānti’s * <i>Guhyasamājjamaṇḍalavādhī</i>	Repeat	Mori (2009, p. 16)
<i>Manimatālamkāra</i> (Tōh. 3903)	[Tantric] Nāgārjuna’s <i>Bodhicittavivaraṇa</i> , Candrakīrti’s <i>Madhyamakāvātāra</i> and <i>bhāṣya</i> , Nāgārjuna’s <i>Rājaratnāvālī</i> , <sup>3</sup> <i>Rājaratnāvālvivṛti</i> , <sup>4</sup> Candrakīrti’s <i>Trisaranasaptati</i> , Nāgārjuna’s <i>Yuktiśaṣṭikā</i> , Candragomin’s <i>Bodhisattvasamavaraviṃśikā</i> , Vasubandhu’s <i>Daśabhūmikavivṛti</i> , Asaṅga’s <i>Mahāyānasamgraha</i> , Vasubandhu’s <i>Paddhati</i> , Candragomin’s * <i>Trikāyāvatāra</i>	Quotation	Isoda (1988, pp. 76–77)
<i>Manimatālamkāra</i>	Ratnākaraśānti’s <i>Sūratamā</i>	Repeat	Isaacson and Sfera (2019, p. 251)
<i>Manimatālamkāra</i>	Shīramatī’s <i>Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā</i>	Repeat	Akahane and Yokoyama (2014), Kano and Li (2020, pp. 51–52)
<i>Manimatālamkāra</i>	Candrakīrti’s <i>Pañcaskandhaka</i> (Tōh. 3866)	Repeat	Kano and Li (2020, p. 51), Kano (2023, pp. 622–623, 625)
<i>Manimatālamkāra</i>	Kamalaśīla’s <i>Madhyamakāloka</i>	Repeat	

Table 5 continued

Abhayākaragupta's work	Reuse of	Repeat or quotation?	References
<i>Munimatālamkāra</i>	Ratnākaraśānti's <i>Sāratamā</i>	Repeat	Kano (2015, pp. 60–61, see also n. 42–44) and Kano (2023, p. 626)
<i>Munimatālamkāra</i>	Ratnākaraśānti's * <i>Śuddhimatī</i>	Repeat	Isoda (1988, pp. 72–73)

<sup>1</sup> For the title *Rājāratnāvalī* see footnotes 2 and 3 below

<sup>2</sup> In the *Abhayapaddhati* Abhayākaragupta quotes Nāgārjuna's *Ratnāvalī* as *Rājāratnāvalī* (*rājāratnāvayūm coktam*), see Isaacson (1999, p. 56). See also footnote 3 below

<sup>3</sup> In the *Munimatālamkāra*, Abhayākaragupta quotes Nāgārjuna's *Ratnāvalī* as *Rājāratnāvalī* (*yaḥoktam rājāratnāvayūm*), see Kano and Li (2020, p. 54). The title of *Rājāratnāvalī* is also attested in the colophon of the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Ratnāvalī* preserved in Tibet, see *ibid.*, p. 54 and Phutshang (2016, p. 27). For the quotation of the *Rājāratnāvalī* in Abhayākaragupta's *Abhayapaddhati* see footnote 2 above

<sup>4</sup> The *Rājāratnāvalīvyūṭi* quoted by Abhayākaragupta in the *Munimatālamkāra* is different from Ajitmitra's \**Ratnāvalīlīkā*. The author of this *Rājāratnāvalīvyūṭi* is yet to be identified. See Kano and Li (2020, pp. 55–56)



being handed down by tradition.<sup>61</sup> The fact that Ratnākaraśānti is repeated the most by Abhayākara Gupta might indicate that Ratnākaraśānti's explanations were widely accepted at Abhayākara Gupta's time. Although it is not plausible that Abhayākara Gupta was Ratnākaraśānti's student,<sup>62</sup> he certainly had access to Ratnākaraśānti's works in the Vikramaśīla monastery.<sup>63</sup>

Distance in space is probably also a factor affecting the identification of source texts. In the *sNgags rim chen mo*, the Tibetan master Tsong kha pa quotes Indian masters by name, but only refers collectively to the views of "some Tibetan masters" when he does not agree with other Tibetan interpretations.<sup>64</sup> Tsong kha pa regards Indian masters as authoritative and quotes them to lend weight to his arguments in refuting wrong views from other Tibetan masters.

## Conclusion

In this paper, I provide a few examples of textual reuse in tantric texts, primarily focusing on a line of reuse of Ratnākaraśānti by Śūnyasamādhivajra, Abhayākara Gupta and Tsong kha pa. I produce comparative tables of the works of these authors to show that, in contrast to Śūnyasamādhivajra, who retains the Yogācāra flavour of Ratnākaraśānti, Abhayākara Gupta modifies Ratnākaraśānti's text to suit his Madhyamaka philosophy. On the other hand, Tsong kha pa accurately quotes Ratnākaraśānti but utilises Abhayākara Gupta's justification to offer Madhyamaka viewpoints in his commentary on Ratnākaraśānti. After applying the insights of earlier studies, I provide some remarks regarding these authors' compositional processes, employing a variety of sources. In contrast to the accepted customs nowadays, in medieval India and Tibet, a master's endorsement of and respect for a predecessor is demonstrated when he silently appropriates (i.e., repeat without acknowledgement) that predecessor's viewpoint. A master would be more likely to give credit to the source of a quotation if there was a significant period of time or distance between that source and his audience. I hope future research on tantric Buddhist commentaries will further improve our understanding of the nature of textual reuse in late medieval Indian and Tibetan Buddhism.

**Acknowledgements** Part of this study received support from the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) and the Khyentse Foundation, for which I am most grateful. I thank Ryan Conlon, Charlyn Edwards, Harunaga Isaacson, Taewoo Kim, Francesco Sferra and Dorji Wangchuk for commenting on earlier drafts. Earlier versions of this paper were presented on August 16, 2022 at the 19th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (held both online and on-site at the Seoul National University), and on April 26, 2023 at the department colloquium of the Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg. I thank the participants of both the conference and the colloquium for their discussions, feedback and comments. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers

<sup>61</sup> It is also quite common for disciples to consciously or unconsciously repeat their masters' (or masters' masters') explanations.

<sup>62</sup> Isaacson and Sferra (2019, p. 249).

<sup>63</sup> Isaacson and Sferra (2019, p. 251).

<sup>64</sup> Tsong kha pa's strategy is similar to that of Sa skya paṇḍita, who collectively addresses the view of "the Tibetans" in his *Tshad ma rigs gter*, see Hugon (2015, p. 485).

for their helpful corrections, comments and suggestions. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for any remaining mistakes. All English translations of Sanskrit and Tibetan passages are mine.

**Funding** Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

**Conflict of interest** The author has no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

## Appendix

See Tables 6 and 7.

**Table 6** True Nature of the Architectural Elements in the *maṇḍala* According to Dīpaṃkarabhadrā

Verse number in the * <i>Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi</i>	Element of the support <i>maṇḍala</i>	True nature according to Dīpaṃkarabhadrā
327	The square form of the <i>maṇḍala</i> palace ( <i>kūṭāgāra</i> )	Absence of inequality ( <i>avaiṣāmya</i> )
328	Eastern gate	The four spheres of application of mindfulness ( <i>smṛtyupasthāna</i> )
329-330a	Southern gate	The four aspects of heroic energy ( <i>caturvīryam</i> ) = The four <i>prahāṇas</i>
330cd	Western gate	The four foundations of supernatural power ( <i>ṛddhipāda</i> )
331	Northern gate	The five faculties and the five powers ( <i>indriyabala</i> )
332ab	The four arches	The four meditative absorptions ( <i>dhyāna</i> )
332cd	The [four] raised platforms	The four mental concentrations ( <i>samādhi</i> )
333ab	The group of [six] worship goddesses on the raised platform	The set of [four] retention formulas ( <i>dhāraṇī</i> )
333cd	The richness of ornamentations [of the <i>maṇḍala</i> ]	The <i>maṇḍala</i> satisfies all wishes [of all beings] ( <i>sarvāśāparipūraṇam</i> )

**Table 6** continued

Verse number in the * <i>Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi</i>	Element of the support <i>maṇḍala</i>	True nature according to Dīpaṃkarabhadra
334	The resounding of bells sewn into flags which have multi-coloured points shaken by the wind	[The <i>maṇḍala</i> ] is going everywhere (° <i>sarvagam</i> ) with the sound (° <i>rava</i> ) of the nine parts (° <i>navāṅga</i> °) of the excellent dharma (° <i>saddharma</i> ) moved by training ( <i>vinayoddhūta</i> )
335ab	Mirror	The five wisdoms ( <i>jñāna</i> ) starting with mirror-like wisdom
335cd	Pearl strings, half pearl strings, moon discs, sun discs, mirrors, garlands and chowries	The mirror[-like wisdom] ( <i>ādarśa</i> °) and the [seven] limbs of enlightenment (° <i>bodhyaṅga</i> °)
336	The eight interior pillars	The eight liberations ( <i>vimokṣa</i> )
337	The vajra thread that is completely round	The turning [the wheel of the doctrine of the] (° <i>pravartanāt</i> ) Vajra vehicle (° <i>vajrayāna</i> °) by all perfectly awakened ones in all directions and in all three times ( <i>sarvadikṛtyadhvasambuddha</i> °)
338	Coloured powders	The five perfectly awakened Buddhas ( <i>pañcasambuddhāḥ</i> )
339	Consecration vase	The nectar of wisdom ( <i>jñānāmṛta</i> )
339	Filled exterior vase	The natural outflow (° <i>niṣyandah</i> ) of the completion (° <i>pūri</i> °) of the accumulation [of merit and wisdom] ( <i>sambhāra</i> °)
340	The objects of worship: flower, incense, great lamp and scented paste	The [seven] limbs of enlightenment ( <i>bodhyaṅga</i> °)
341a	Cakes for the deities	The taking of dharma ( <i>dharmāhāra</i> )
341b	Garment	Shame ( <i>hrīḥ</i> ) and bashfulness ( <i>apatrāpya</i> °)
341cd	Singing, dancing and instrumental music	The growth of Great Bliss (° <i>mahāsukhavivardhana</i> )
342	The city ( <i>pura</i> ) = <i>kūṭāgāra</i> ?	The city of liberation ( <i>mokṣapura</i> )
342b	<i>maṇḍala</i> ( <i>cakra</i> )	The gathering of essence ( <i>sārasaṃgraha</i> )

Note: See also Sakurai (1996, p. 137, Table 4) for a similar table in Japanese together with the scriptural sources of the verses in Dīpaṃkarabhadra’s text

**Table 7** True Nature of the Deities in the *maṇḍala* According to Ratnākaraśānti

Verse number in the * <i>Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi</i>	Deities	True nature according to Ratnākaraśānti
343	The four gatekeepers	The four faculties of faith ( <i>śraddhā</i> ), heroic energy ( <i>vīrya</i> ), mindfulness ( <i>smṛti</i> ) and meditation ( <i>dhyāna</i> )
344ab	The six offering goddesses (Rūpavajrā etc.)	The first six perfections of the ten perfections
344cd	The four goddesses (Locanā etc.)	The other four perfections of the ten perfections
345	The five Buddhas	The five wisdoms ( <i>jñāna</i> ) = the wisdom of the destruction of defilements ( <i>kṣayaajñāna</i> ) and the wisdom of non-arising of abandoned defilements ( <i>anutpādayajñāna</i> )
346	The lord of the <i>maṇḍala</i>	The mind which has the nature of the wisdom of the destruction of defilements ( <i>kṣayaajñāna</i> ) and the wisdom of non-arising of abandoned defilements ( <i>anutpādayajñāna</i> )
347	The ten goddesses (Rūpavajrā etc. and Locanā etc.)	The ten perfections
347	The first gatekeeper (Yamāntaka)	The first two bodhisattva levels
347	The other three gatekeepers	The third to the fifth bodhisattva levels
347	The five Buddhas	The sixth to the tenth bodhisattva levels
347	The lord of the <i>maṇḍala</i>	The eleventh bodhisattva level

Note: My understanding of Dīpaṅkarabhadra's verses as interpreted by Ratnākaraśānti is slightly different from that of Sakurai (1996, pp. 139–143)

## Abbreviations, Sigla and Symbols

corr. Correction

D Derge edition of the Tibetan canon

em. Emendation

N Narthang edition of the Tibetan canon

om. Omitted

Ōta. Ōtani Catalogue number of the Peking edition, see Suzuki (1961)

P Peking edition of the Tibetan canon

Tōh. Tōhoku Catalogue number of the Derge edition, see Ui et al. (1934)

## References

### Primary Sources by Indic Authors

*Āmnūyamañjarī* of Abhayākara Gupta. For an edition of a Sanskrit fragment preserved in Germany see Tomabechi and Kano (2008). For a facsimile of an incomplete Sanskrit-Tibetan bilingual manuscript see Institute of the Collection and Preservation of Ancient Tibetan Texts of Sichuan Province (2015). Tibetan translation: *dPal yang dag par sbyor ba'i rgyud kyi rgyal po'i rgya cher 'grel pa man ngag gi snye ma*, Tōh. 1198, Ōta. 2328.

\**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṅkarabhadra. Sanskrit manuscripts: A. Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, Cod. ms. sansc. 257. Palm-leaf, proto-Bengali script, a multi-text manuscript consists of five texts, seventeen folios in total, incomplete, last folio (f. 17) missing. Dīpaṅkarabhadra's \**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* covers 11 folios, 6v4-16v6. Dated, eleventh century. B. Cambridge University Library Manuscript Or. 132. Palm-leaf, Old Newārī script, twenty-five folios in total, incomplete, first folio (f. 1) missing, undated (probably twelfth century or slightly later). For Sanskrit editions see section 3.1.1 of Cheung (2020). Tibetan translation: *dPal gsang ba 'dus pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga*, Tōh. 1865, Ōta. 2728.

\**Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhiṭīkā* of Ratnākaraśānti. Sanskrit not extant. Tibetan translation: *dPal gsang ba 'dus pa'i dkyil 'khor gyi cho ga'i 'grel pa*, Tōh. 1871, Ōta. 2734. See also Cheung (2020).

*Muktāvalī* by Ratnākaraśānti. Sanskrit edition: see Tripathi & Negi (2001) and Isaacson (2021). Tibetan translation: *dPal dgyes pa'i rdo rje'i dka' 'grel mu tig phreng ba*, Tōh. 1189, Ōta. 2319.

\**Śrīherukopadeśanāmasvādhiṣṭhānakrama* of Śūnyasamādhivajra. Sanskrit not extant. Tibetan translation: *dPal he ru ka'i man ngag rang byin gyis brlab pa'i rim pa*, Tōh. 1262, Ōta. 2391.

*Hevajrābhisamayatilaka* by Śākyarakṣita. Sanskrit manuscript contained in Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, MS Xc 14/39. Dr. Torsten Gerloff (Hamburg) is preparing an edition of this text. Tibetan translation: *dPal kye rdo rje'i mngon par rtogs pa'i thig le*, Tōh. 1277, Ōta. 2399.

### Primary Sources by Tibetan Authors

Tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa. (1997a). sNgags rim chen mo. In *gSung 'bum tsong kha pa (bkraś lhun par nying dha sar bskyar par brgyab pa)* (Vol. 3, pp. 3–1026). Dharamsala: Sherig Parkhang. [http://purl.bdrc.io/resource/MW29193\\_6D3AEA](http://purl.bdrc.io/resource/MW29193_6D3AEA) [BDRC bdr:MW29193\_6D3AEA]. See also Tsong-kha-pa (2000).

Tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa. (1997b). bZhi brgya lnga bcu pa'i skor gyi zin bris gnang ba. In *gSung 'bum tsong kha pa (bkras lhun par rnying dha sar bskyar par brgyab pa)* (Vol. 7, pp. 821–832). Dharamsala: Sherig Parkhang. [http://purl.bdrc.io/resource/MW29193\\_D3177F](http://purl.bdrc.io/resource/MW29193_D3177F) [BDRC bdr: MW29193\_D3177F]

## Secondary Sources

- Akahane, R., & Yokoyama, T. (2014). The sarvadharmā section of the *Minimatālamkāra*, critical Tibetan text part I: With special reference to Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakapañcaskandhaka*. *Indogaku Chibettogaku Kenkyū* [インド学チベツ学研究. *Journal of Indian and Tibetan Studies*], 18, 14–49.
- Almogi, O. (2009). *Rong-zom pa's discourses on Buddhology: A study of various conceptions of Buddhahood in Indian sources with special reference to the controversy surrounding the existence of gnosis (jñāna: ye shes) as presented by the eleventh-century Tibetan scholar Rong-zom Chos-kyi-bzang-po*. The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Bentor, Y. (2002). Fourfold meditations: Outer, inner, secret and suchness. In H. Blezer (Ed.), *Religion and secular culture in Tibet* (pp. 41–55). Brill.
- Bühnemann, G. (1992). Some remarks on the date of Abhayākaragupta and the chronology of his works. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 142(1), 120–127.
- Cantwell, C., & Mayer, R. (2013). Authors and editors in the literary traditions of Asian Buddhism. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 36, 195–204.
- Cheung, D. S. Y. (2020). *Empowered by Mañjuvājra: A study of the abhiṣeka section of Dīpaṅkarabhadra's \*Guhyasamājanāḍalavidhi and its commentary by Ratnākaraśānti* [unpublished PhD dissertation]. The University of Hamburg.
- Erb, F. (1997). *Śūnyatāsaptatvīrti: Candrakīrtis Kommentar zu den 'Siebzig Versen über die Leerheit' des Nāgārjuna [Kārikās 1–14]; Einleitung, Übersetzung, textkritische Ausgabe des Tibetischen und Indizes*. Franz Steiner.
- Freschi, E. (2012). Proposals for the study of quotations in Indian philosophical texts. *Religions in South Asia*, 6(2), 161–189. <https://doi.org/10.1558/rosa.v6i2.161>
- Freschi, E. (2015). The reuse of texts in Indian philosophy: Introduction. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(2), 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9232-9>
- Freschi, E., & Cantwell, C. (2016). Introduction: Reuse and intertextuality in the context of Buddhist texts. *Buddhist Studies Review*, 33(1–2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1558/bsrv.31638>
- Freschi, E., & Maas, P. A. (Eds.). (2017). *Adaptive reuse: Aspects of creativity in South Asian cultural history*. Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hackett, P. G. (2016). Re-making, re-marking, or re-using? Hermeneutical strategies and challenges in the Guhyasamāja commentarial literature. *Buddhist Studies Review*, 33(1–2), 163–179. <https://doi.org/10.1558/bsrv.31645>
- Hori, S. (2019). On the exact date of the *Pañcarakṣā* manuscript copied in the regnal year 39 of Rāmapāla in the Catherine Glynn Benkaim collection. *Bulletin of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies*, 2, 49–55.
- Hugon, P. (2015). Text re-use in early Tibetan epistemological treatises. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(4), 453–491. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9244-5>
- Institute of the Collection and Preservation of Ancient Tibetan Texts of Sichuan Province 四川省藏文古籍搜集保护编务院 (Ed.). (2015). *Rare and ancient Tibetan texts collected in Tibetan regions series, collection edition 藏区民间所藏藏文珍稀文献丛刊 [精华版]* [bod yul dmangs khrod kyi rtsa chen dpe rnying phyogs bsgrigs (Vol. 1)]. Sichuan Nationalities Publishing House, Guangming Daily Press.
- Isaacson, H. (1999). Citations from the *Ratnāvali* and *Bodhicittavivaraṇa* in the *Abhayapaddhati*. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 22, 55–58.
- Isaacson, H. (2009). A collection of *Hevajrasādhanas* and related works in Sanskrit. In E. Steinkellner, H. Krasser, & Q. Duan (Eds.), *Sanskrit manuscripts in China. Proceedings of a panel at the 2008 Beijing Seminar on Tibetan Studies, October 13 to 17* (pp. 89–136). China Tibetology Publication House.
- Isaacson, H. (2013). Yogācāra and Vajrayāna according to Ratnākaraśānti. In U. T. Kragh (Ed.), *The Foundation for yoga practitioners: The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi treatise and its adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet* (pp. 1036–1051). Harvard University Press.

- Isaacson, H. (2021). A critical edition of Ratnākaraśānti’s *Muktāvalī Hevajrapañjikā*: Commentary on *Hevajratantra* Li.1–12. In *Gateways to Tibetan Studies: A collection of essays in honour of David P. Jackson on the occasion of his 70th birthday* (Vol. 1, pp. 461–508). Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg.
- Isaacson, H., & Sferra, F. (2014). *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreya-nātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla: Critical edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts with English translation and reproductions of the MSS*. Università degli Studi di Napoli ‘L’Orientale’.
- Isaacson, H., & Sferra, F. (2019). Indian Tantric authors: Overview. In J. A. Silk (Ed.), *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism Volume II: Lives* (pp. 228–260). Brill.
- Isoda, H. (1988). Ratnākaraśānti to Abhayākara-gupta [RatnākaraśāntiとAbhayākara-gupta. Ratnākaraśānti and Abhayākara-gupta]. *Naritasan Bukkyōkenkyūsho Kiyō: Bukkyō Shisōshi Ronshū II* [成田山仏教研究所紀要: 仏教思想史論集 II], 11, 67–80.
- Jinpa, T. (2019). *Tsongkhapa: A Buddha in the land of snows*. Shambhala.
- Kano, K. (2015). Ratnākaraśānti’s understanding of Buddha-nature. *China Tibetology*, 2, 52–77.
- Kano, K. (2023). Abhayākara-gupta: A last great Pañḍita. In W. Edelglass, P.-J. Harter, & S. McClintock (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Indian Buddhist philosophy* (pp. 615–629). Routledge.
- Kano, K., & Li, X. (2018). Critical edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Munimatālamkāra* chapter 1 (fol. 61r5–64r2): Excerpts from the saṃvṛti-vyavahāra part and critics to cittamātratā in Kamalaśīla’s *Madhyamakāloka* [梵文校訂『牟尼意趣莊嚴』第一章 (fol. 61r5–64r2) - 『中觀光明』世俗と言説および唯心説批判箇所佚文-]. *Bukkyō Bunka* [密教文化], 241, 136–111.
- Kano, K., & Li, X. (2020). A survey of passages from rare Buddhist works found in the *Munimatālamkāra*. In B. Kellner, J. Kramer, & X. Li (Eds.), *Sanskrit manuscripts in China III. Proceedings of a panel at the 2016 Beijing International Seminar on Tibetan Studies, August 1 to 4*. (pp. 45–78). China Tibetology Publication House.
- Katsura, S. (2018). Four yoga stages in Ratnākaraśānti’s *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*—With a new synopsis. *Journal of Indian and Tibetan Studies*, 22, 210–223.
- Lamotte, É. (1935). *Samādhinirmocana Sūtra: L’explication des mystères*. Université de Louvain.
- Luo, H. (2010). *Abhayākara-gupta’s Abhayapaddhati chapters 9 to 14*. China Tibetology Publishing House, Centre for Tantric Studies (AAI).
- Luo, H. (2014). The opening verses of Ratnākaraśānti’s *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa*. *Maitreya Studies 2013* (pp. 17–29). China Wenshi Publishing House.
- Luo, H. (2020). A first investigation of Abhayākara-gupta’s *Madhyamakamañjarī*. *Indogaku Chibettogaku Kenkyū* [Journal of Indian and Tibetan Studies], 24, 57–75.
- Mori, M. (2009). *Vajrāvalī of Abhayākara-gupta: Edition of Sanskrit and Tibetan versions* (Vol. 1–2). The Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- Moriyama, S. (2014). Ratnākaraśānti’s theory of cognition with false mental images (\**alikākaravāda*) and the neither-one-nor-many argument. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 42, 339–351.
- Namai, C. (1991). Guhyasamāja XV 135 ni taisuru Ratnākaraśānti no chūkai [Guhyasamāja XV 135 に対するRatnākaraśāntiの註解. Ratnākaraśānti ad Guhyasamāja XV 135]. *Mikyōgaku Kenkyū* [密教学研究], 23, 65–78.
- Nehrdich, S. (2020). A method for the calculation of parallel passages for Buddhist Chinese sources based on million-scale nearest neighbor search. *Journal of the Japanese Association for Digital Humanities*, 5(2), 132–153. [https://doi.org/10.17928/jjadh.5.2\\_132](https://doi.org/10.17928/jjadh.5.2_132)
- Phutshang. (2016). Longshu baomanlun song fanwen xieben de chubu baogo [龙树《宝鬘论颂》梵文写本的初步报告. A preliminary report on a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Ratnāvalī* written by Nāgārjuna]. *Xizang Beiyejing Yanjiu* [西藏贝叶经研究. *Tibet Palm-Leaf Manuscript Studies*], 26–36.
- Prets, E. (Ed.). (2022). *Transmission and tradition: Quotations, paraphrases and allusions in texts on Indian philosophy*. Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Repo, J. (2019). Tsong kha pa and his immediate successors. In J. A. Silk (Ed.), *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism. Volume II: Lives* (pp. 1246–1253). Brill.
- Roerich, G. N. (1995). *The blue annals. Parts I & II (Bound in one)* (2nd ed.). Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sakurai, M. (1996). *Indo mikkyō girei kenkyū: Kōki Indo mikkyō no kanjō shidai* [インド密教儀礼研究: 後期インド密教の灌頂次第. A study on Indian Buddhist tantric ritual: Late Indian Buddhist tantric initiation sequence]. Hōzōkan.
- Sanderson, A. (2009). The Śaiva age—The rise and dominance of Śaivism during the early medieval period. In S. Einoo (Ed.), *Genesis and development of Tantrism* (pp. 41–349). Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.

- Schmithausen, L. (2014). *The genesis of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda: Responses and reflections*. The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Seton, G. M. (2017). *Integrating non-tantric and tantric doctrines through Prajñāpāramitā at Vikramaśīla during the mid-eleventh century*. International Association of Buddhist Studies Conference 2017, Toronto.
- Seton, G. M. (2019). Ratnākaraśānti. *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism* (Vol. II, pp. 366–370). Brill.
- Seton, G. M. (2023). Ratnākaraśānti: The illumination of false forms. In W. Edelglass, P.-J. Harter, & S. McClintock (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Indian Buddhist philosophy* (pp. 587–600). Routledge.
- Seyfort Ruegg, D. (1981). *The literature of the Madhyamaka school of philosophy in India*. Otto Harrassowitz.
- Steinkellner, E. (1988). Methodological remarks on the constitution of Sanskrit texts from the Buddhist *pramāṇa*-tradition. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 32, 103–129.
- Suzuki, D. T. (1961). *The Tibetan tripitaka: Peking edition. Catalogue and index*. Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Szántó, P.-D. (2012). Selected chapters from the Catuspīathantra (1/2) Introductory study with the annotated translation of selected chapters. [http://www.academia.edu/3633796/Selected\\_Chapters\\_from\\_the\\_Catu\\_pi\\_hatantra\\_1\\_2\\_Introductory\\_study\\_with\\_the\\_annotated\\_translation\\_of\\_selected\\_chapters\\_](http://www.academia.edu/3633796/Selected_Chapters_from_the_Catu_pi_hatantra_1_2_Introductory_study_with_the_annotated_translation_of_selected_chapters_)
- Tanemura, R. (2008). Justification for and classification of the post-initiatory caryā in later Indian tantric Buddhism. *International Journal of South Asian Studies*, 1, 53–75.
- Tomabechi, T., & Kano, K. (2008). A critical edition and translation of a text fragment from Abhayākara Gupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī*. Göttingen, Cod.ms.sanscr.259b. *Tantric Studies*, 1, 22–44.
- Tomabechi, T. (2017). Abhayākara Gupta saku *Āmnāyamañjarī* shoinbunken—shinshutsu bonbun shiryō dai 1-4 shō yori—[Abhayākara Gupta 作 *Āmnāyamañjarī* 所引文献—新出梵文資料第 1-4 章より]. Quotations in Abhayākara Gupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī* chapters 1-4 (Extracted from a newly available Sanskrit-Tibetan bilingual manuscript). *Annual of the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University* [大正大学総合佛教研究所年報], 39, 99–136(L).
- Tomabechi, T. (2018a). Abhayākara Gupta saku *Āmnāyamañjarī* shoinbunken (2)—shinshutsu bonbun shiryō dai 5 shō yori—[Abhayākara Gupta 作 *Āmnāyamañjarī* 所引文献 (2)—新出梵文資料第 5 章より]. Quotations in Abhayākara Gupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī* (2) chapter 5 (Extracted from a newly available Sanskrit-Tibetan bilingual manuscript). *Journal of Kawasaki Daishi Institute for Buddhist Studies* [川崎大師教学研究所紀要], 3, 1-23(L).
- Tomabechi, T. (2018b). Abhayākara Gupta saku *Āmnāyamañjarī* shoinbunken (3)—shinshutsu bonbun shiryō dai 6-8 shō yori— [Abhayākara Gupta 作 *Āmnāyamañjarī* 所引文献 (3)—新出梵文資料第 6-8 章より]. Quotations in Abhayākara Gupta's *Āmnāyamañjarī* (3) chapters 6–8 (Extracted from a newly available Sanskrit-Tibetan bilingual manuscript). *BIIBS Bulletin of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies* [国際仏教学研究所紀要], 1, 77–94(L).
- Tomlinson, D. K. (2019). *Buddhahood and philosophy of mind: Ratnākaraśānti, Jñānaśrīmitra, and the debate over mental content (ākāra)* [unpublished PhD dissertation, the University of Chicago]. <https://knowledge.uchicago.edu/record/1840>
- Tomlinson, D. K. (2023). Limiting the scope of the neither-one-nor-many argument: The nirākāravādin's defense of consciousness and pleasure. *Philosophy East and West*, 73(2), 392–419. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pew.2023.a898074>
- Tripathi, R. S., & Negi, T. S. (Eds.). (2001). *Hevajratantram: With Muktāvalī Pañjikā of Mahāpaṇḍitācārya Ratnākaraśānti*. Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Tsong-kha-pa. (2000). *The great treatise on the stages of the path to enlightenment* (J. W. C. Cutler & G. Newland, Eds.; The Lamrim Chenmo Translation Committee, Trans.; Vol. 1). Snow Lion Publications.
- Ui, H., Suzuki, M., Kanakura, Y., & Tada, T. (Eds.). (1934). *A complete catalogue of Tibetan Buddhist canons (bkaḥ-ḥgyur and bstan-ḥgyur)*. Tōhoku Imperial University.
- Vergiani, V. (2015). Āgamārthānusāribhīḥ. Helārāja's use of quotations and other referential devices in his commentary on the *Vākyapadīya*. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(2), 191–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9237-4>
- Waldschmidt, E. (Ed.). (1971). *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, Teil 3: Die Katalognummern 802–1014*. Franz Steiner Verlag.



Yiannopoulos, A. (2017). Tantric Yogācāra: Reflexive awareness and the four stages in Ratnākaraśānti’s epistemological works. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 40, 239–267. <https://doi.org/10.2143/JIABS.40.0.3269011>

**Publisher’s Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.