Review of: "On possible formal expressions of catuṣkoṭi and Śūnyatā"

Alberto Anrò[1]

1 University of Turin

Review

_____

Journal: Qeios

Title: "On possible formal expressions of *catuṣkoṭi* and *śūnyatā*"

Date: June 2023

_____

The use of Category theory to overcome the limitations of classical set theory is an intriguing frontier and the author's intention to discuss the connection between Category theory and Buddhist logic (the latter being argued to be a possible attempt to formalize the former) could be highly relevant.

Nevertheless, I am afraid that this version of the paper is insufficiently informative. The manuscript appears as a rhapsodic journey in its current form. Overall, many key passages remain implicit, forcing the reader to fill in the blanks.

The topic's importance necessitates a clarification of the goal. The abstract itself is of little help in understanding the content, as well as the issue of the "formal expression" that the author declares in the title is not addressed in course of the paper. If the author's answer to the question of whether it is possible to formalize Buddhist logic using Category theory is negative, the ultimate reason for this impossibility remains implicit and thus unclear, along with its technicalities.

For example, on page 5, the crucial link between Roy&Rayudu (2020) and Lawvere (1991, 2003) is missing or not visible. In this way, the author forces the reader to read both of the quoted texts in order to understand the passage.

Furthermore, as far as I understand the manuscript, it appears to me that the text answers questions other than the one stated in the title, which explicitly refers to formalization of *catuṣkoṭi* and *śūnyatā*. For example, can vague or empty terms adequately describe Buddhist 'both options' (i.e., 'a & not-a')? Can Category Theory explain them? Is Roy&Rayudu's account credible?

As a result, an extra effort at communicativeness is required, for the sake of the reader's comprehension and the quality of the manuscript itself, either delving into technical and formal aspects or broadening the discourse into a more historical

and text-based format.

The bibliography is incomplete. For example, major contributions in key passages, such as Sisir Roy and Venkat Rayudu (2020), Lawvere (1991, 2003), French and Krause (2006), are not even mentioned.

Furthermore, references should follow a consistent format, such as APA, Chicago, Oxford, and so on. Consider the following in this regard: [1], p. 6.

Text formatting (such as punctuation, inconsistent use of hyphens and dashes, spaces, and capitalization) must be improved. Consider the terms "Dialogical engagements," "Infinite," "Body" (p. 7-8), and so on. Is the author implying anything specific with these iterated capitalizations? If this is the case, an explanation is required. If not, it is preferable not to leave the reader perplexed.

There are numerous errors and inconsistencies with academic standards in Sanskrit names and quotations. A general overhaul is required.

A few examples follow, but the flaw reverberates throughout the text.

p. 7: *Sakyamuni* -> Śākyamuni.

Please, consider also that proper names should not be italicized.

p. 7: *Rājgir* -> I suggest the author use either the simplified spelling without diacritics (i.e., Rajgir) or the Sanskrit name with the correct diacritics (i.e., Rājagṛha). Proper names should not be italicized.

p. 7 et passim: *Śūnyatā* -> *śūnyatā*. Lowercase letters, except for proper names and titles.

p. 7: *Prajñapāramita* -> *Prajñāpāramitā*

p. 8: *Mallika* of *Koshal* -> Mallikā of Kosala

p. 8: *Prithvī* -> *pṛthivī*

p. 8: *Digh Nikaye* -> *Dīgha Nikāya*.

Furthermore, full references (here and elsewhere) should be provided so that the quoted passages can be easily identified by the reader.

…

Hoping that this small contribution of mine will be helpful to the author to improve his paper.