

Preface

The present volume is the outcome of our project funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).¹ The main aim of the project, which is called the “Vikramaśīla project” by the research members, is to clarify the relationship between tantric and non-tantric doctrines in late Indian Buddhism, focusing on the works of the monk-scholars of the Vikramaśīla monastery—a center for tantric Buddhism from the 9th to the 13th century. The two doctrines seem to have been treated more or less independently of each other in the field of modern Buddhist studies. In the monastic tradition of late Indian Buddhism, however, both doctrines came to be integrated into the whole system of thought and practice. It would then be essential to make clear how these two doctrines are related to each other, especially when we try to describe the history of late Indian Buddhism properly. This leads on to the following individual questions:

- (1) What kinds of tantric and non-tantric sources were used by the monk-scholars of the Vikramaśīla monastery?²
- (2) How is the relationship between tantric and non-tantric doctrines explained by the monk-scholars of the Vikramaśīla monastery?
- (3) Is there any community of thought with regard to the relationship between tantric and non-tantric doctrines among the monk-scholars of the Vikramaśīla monastery?

¹ This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22320014 (Head Investigator: Taiken KYUMA, Mie University; Title of Research: Comprehensive Studies in the Position of *mantranaya* in the Works of the Monk-scholars of the Vikramaśīla Monastery; Term of Research: April 2010-March 2013).

² To tackle the first question, the research members of the project, in collaboration with the “Indo-Tibetan Lexical Resource” (<http://www.kc-tbts.uni-hamburg.de/index.php/projects/79-indo-tibetan-lexical-resource-itlr>) and the International Institute for Digital Humanities (<http://www.dhii.jp/>), have been working on a database of various sources quoted in the works of monk-scholars of Vikramaśīla monastery, as well as of colophons of Sanskrit manuscripts relating to the monastery.

During the term of our research, we had a number of occasions to read papers concerned with these three questions³. Besides the regular meetings of the project, we organized a panel named “Reconstructing the History of Late Indian Buddhism—Relationship between Tantric and Non-Tantric Doctrines” at the 16th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, which was held June 20–25, 2011 at the Dharma Drum Buddhist College in Jinshan, Taiwan. The list of the speakers and their titles was as follows:

(June 25, 2011)

- 09:00–09:30 Taiken KYUMA (Mie University): Bu ston on pāramitānaya and mantranaya
- 09:30–10:00 Mei YANG (University of Hamburg): The Concept of the Yoginī in the *Abhayapaddhati* of Abhayākara-gupta
- 10:00–10:30 Toru TOMABECHI (International Institute for Digital Humanities): Bhavyakīrti’s Sub-commentary on the *Pradīpoddyotana* as a Doxography—Some Preliminary Remarks—
- 10:30–11:00 Kaie MOCHIZUKI (Minobusan University): On the *Guhyasamāja* Literature Attributed to Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna
- 11:00–11:30 Dorji WANGCHUK (University of Hamburg): The Legacies of Vikramaśīla and Nālandā Monastic Seminaries in Tibet
- 11:30–12:00 General Discussion

Fortunately, we were also given the opportunity to arrange an international workshop for the project at the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, the University of Tokyo. During the workshop (September 14–17, 2012), we had a meeting on how best to create and use a database for the Vikramaśīla monastery, as well as reading sessions on some tantric texts, i.e., the *Padminī* of Ratnarakṣita, the *Sarvarahasyanibandha* of Ratnākaraśānti, and the *Tattvasiddhi*. Some of our research members also made their presentations, according to the following program:

(September 15, 2012)

- 16:00–16:30 Martin DELHEY (Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures, University of Hamburg): Tracing a Manuscript Collection from the Indian Buddhist Monastery of Vikra-

³ Concerning the third one, it should be noted that most of the authors of the Vikramaśīla monastery agree on the superiority of tantric doctrines to non-tantric ones, but they seem to differ in explaining how the former is superior to the latter. So it would be safe to assume that there were some sects/parties in the same monastery, concerning this topic, as in the case of the distinction between *sākāravāda* and *nirākāravāda*.

- maśīla
 16:30–17:00 Kenichi KURANISHI (Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University): Quotations in Ratnarakṣita's *Padminī*—A Study on Scholarly Activities in the Last Period of the Vikramaśīla Monastery
 17:00–17:30 General Discussion

(September 16, 2012)

- 16:00–16:30 Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ (Merton College, Oxford): The Exegesis of the *Catuṣpīṭha* by Scholars of Vikramaśīla and Localizing Tantric Buddhist Traditions
 16:30–17:00 Ryugen TANEMURA (Nishogakusha University): Tantric Practice Taught by Abhayākara-gupta
 17:00–17:30 General Discussion

(September 17, 2012)

- 16:00–16:30 Dorji WANGCHUK (University of Hamburg): On the Identity and Authenticity of the **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*: A Tantric Scripture Associated with the Vikramaśīla Tradition
 16:30–17:00 Ryūta KIKUYA (Tohoku University): On the Tradition of *utpattikrama* in the Jñānapāda School
 17:00–17:30 General Discussion

Most of the articles included in the present volume are revised and enlarged versions of the papers read on the above-mentioned occasions. It should be noted that we decided to respect the authors' own styles in principle and to avoid unifying bibliographical conventions and so forth, although we tried our best to remove any stylistic inconsistency within each contribution.

Kazuo KANO, who has been engaged in the study of the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, deals with the theory of the Buddha-body (*buddhakāya*) in late Indian Buddhism. His analysis also contains annotated translations of many important passages from the *Sākārasiddhi* of Jñānaśrīmitra, one of the most famous monk-scholars of the Vikramaśīla monastery.

Kenichi KURANISHI's remarkable contribution presents a list of tantric and non-tantric sources quoted in the *Padminī* of Ratnarakṣita, who is said to have been active as a disciple of Abhayākara-gupta at the Vikramaśīla monastery. This sort of list will serve as one of the most vital clues to the first question mentioned above.

Kaie MOCHIZUKI, a specialist of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna, describes this famous monk's activities at the Vikramaśīla monastery, considering his relationship with the Pāla dynasty. The kingship of the Pāla dynasty should have been of crucial importance to the monastic community in late Indian Buddhism.

Toru TOMABECHI, who is well versed in many kinds of tantric texts, draws our attention to the doxographic character of Bhavyakīrti's sub-commentary on the *Pradīpodyotana*. In Tāranātha's *History of Indian Buddhism*, Bhavyakīrti is explained as a tantric master of the Vikramaśīla monastery. TOMABECHI's article provides us for a lot of information on the usage of tantric and non-tantric sources in Bhavyakīrti's times.

Scholars in Tibet had a tendency to judge the authenticity of a scripture based on what is said by Indian scholars of the Vikramaśīla monastery. Viewed in this light, Dorji WANGCHUK scrutinizes some important discussions found in Tibetan sources with regard to the identity and authenticity of the scripture named **Sarvadharmacaryopadeśābhisamayatantra*. His contribution indicates how Tibetan Buddhism was influenced by the tradition of the Vikramaśīla monastery in India.

In her article, Mei YANG examines the role of the Yoginī described in Abhayākaragupta's *Abhayapaddhati*, a commentary on the *Buddhakaṭālantra*. It has recently been pointed out that Abhayākaragupta should be treated as one of the key figures in the last period of the Vikramaśīla monastery. Her valuable contribution based on the very latest research is to be seen as essential to our project.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, the University of Tokyo, for giving generous support to the publication of the present volume. I am also indebted to Prof. Norihisa BABA at the Institute, who not only assisted us in organizing the workshop in 2012, but also enabled us to publish the results of our research as a volume of the *Oriental Culture*. Last but not least, my special thanks go to all the research members of the project for their constant cooperation. Another purpose of the project was to promote academic exchanges between tantric and non-tantric studies, and between Japanese and foreign scholars. I hope that it was more or less achieved through the research activities of our four-year project, and that this publication will help us go beyond the boundary between tantric and non-tantric doctrines.

Taiken KYUMA
Associate Professor,
Mie University