

Bhavyakīrti's Sub-commentary on the *Pradīpoddyotana* as a Doxography*: Some Preliminary Remarks and a Synopsis

Toru TOMABECHI

Introduction

What one may call “Tantricization” is one of the prominent features of late Indian Buddhism. From around the eighth century CE onwards, the Tantric Buddhism in India drastically evolved under the influence of non-Buddhist religious trends, mainly Śaivism, by incorporating a number of doctrinal and practical elements that were apparently alien to the traditional or mainstream Buddhist teachings.¹ In the course of such development, Tantric Buddhism certainly needed not only to establish its authenticity, but also to demonstrate its superiority over non-Tantric Buddhism. To this end, Tantric authors tried to establish a hierarchical order of religio-philosophical tenets in which the Mantranaya is placed above the Pāramitānaya. It is no surprise, therefore, that the proliferation of Buddhist doxographical literature coincided with the advancement of the Tantricization of Buddhism.

*What is presented below is based on the paper I read at the XVth Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held at the Dharma Drum Buddhist College, Taiwan, in June 2011. During the preparation of this article, I happened to know that Prof. Leonard van der Kuijp, Harvard, was also preparing an article focusing upon Bhavyakīrti's survey of Sāṅkhya philosophy in the text which serves as the main source material of my current study. Prof. van der Kuijp was kind enough to provide me with a draft version of his article. The forthcoming article is so rich in detail and so remarkable in breadth and depth as to render my humble attempt here almost redundant. Though I tried as much as possible to avoid overlapping of contents, I fear there remains considerable amount of redundancy which, for various reasons, has been inevitable.

¹ See SANDERSON 2009.

A number of doxographies (*siddhānta*) were thus composed by Buddhist Tantric authors of the later period.² Those works include, to name but a few, the *Tattvaratnāvalī* of Advayavajra (SHASTRI 1927: 14–22; UĪ 1963; MIMAKI 1986), the *Triyānavyavasthāna* of Ratnākaraśānti (D 3712, P 4535), the *Nayatrāyapradīpa* of Tripiṭakamalla (or Tripiṭakamāla, D 3707, P 4530), and the *Jñānasārasamuccaya* ascribed to Āryadeva along with the commentary by Bodhibhadra (cf. YAMAGUCHI 1944: 263–345; MIMAKI 1976: 183–207; MIMAKI 2000). Besides independent doxographical treatises, some Tantras and Tantric commentaries also contain *siddhānta* sections — such texts as *Hevajratantra* 2.8.9–10 (SNELLGROVE 1959: vol. 2, 90) and *Kālacakratantra* 1.161–180 with its commentary *Vimalaprabhā* (UPADHYAYA 1986: 255–271; see also NEWMAN 1992) are well-known examples. Bhavyakīrti's *Pradīpoddyotanābhisandhiprakāśikā* (hereafter PUAP), the work with which we deal in this article, belongs to this latter category.

The PUAP is a sub-commentary on the *Pradīpoddyotana*, a commentary on the *Guhyasamājatantra*, ascribed to Candrakīrti (Skt. ed. CHAKRAVARTI 1984; Tib. D 1785, P 2650). In the rather long introductory part of the PUAP, Bhavyakīrti first presents a detailed overview of the meditation system consisting of two stages (*utpattikrama* and *niṣpannakrama*) according to the tenets of the so-called Ārya School of the *Guhyasamāja* exegesis, then analyses Candrakīrti's intention in composing the commentary on the Tantra. It is in the latter context that we find Bhavyakīrti's view on different religio-philosophical positions. In this article, we shall briefly examine his doxographical survey of non-Buddhist and Buddhist doctrines.

1. Bhavyakīrti: His Dates, Career and Work (s)

Before starting our examination of Bhavyakīrti's doxography, some remarks may be in order on the author and his works. Relatively little studied, Bhavyakīrti and his works remain largely unknown to modern scholarship.³ Given the paucity of source material, historical study on this rather obscure author has had to rely almost exclusively on Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism in India* (*rGya gar chos 'byuñ*), chapter 38, where Bhavyakīrti appears as one of the ten chief Tantric masters of the Vikramaśīla monastery.⁴

² See TANEMURA 2008: 145–146.

³ The PUAP has hitherto been used mainly as an aid for understanding Candrakīrti's Tantric hermeneutics (cf. STEINKELLNER 1978; BROID 1988; ARÈNE 1998). More recently, Haruki Shizuka in his study of Tantric feast (*gaṇacakra*) presented an analysis of Bhavyakīrti's explanation of *gaṇacakra* and a partial Japanese translation of the PUAP (SHIZUKA 2015: 141–163).

⁴ See SCHIEFNER 1868: 195ff and CHATTOPADHYAYA 1980: 325ff.

According to Tāranātha, the historical sequence of the chief Vajrācāryas is as follows:

- (1) Jayabhadra → (2) Śrīdhara → (3) Bhavabhadra (Bhavabhṭṭa) → (4) **Bhavyakīrti** → (5) Līlāvajra → (6) Durjayacandra → (7) Kṛṣṇasamaya-
vajra → (8) Tathāgatarakṣita → (9) Bodhibhadra → (10) Kamalarakṣita

Tāranātha places these ten masters after Jñānapāda and his disciple Dīpaṅkarabhadra (late eighth to early ninth centuries) and before the period of the so-called six Gate Keepers of the Vikramaśīla (early eleventh century). In his discussion on the date of the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*, Alexis Sanderson (2009: 158ff.) argues, with the relative chronology above as a starting point, that the tenure of Jayabhadra, the first of the ten masters, can be dated between 880–892 CE and the last, Kamalarakṣita, towards 1000 CE, though some other historical accounts may present conflicting pictures. With additional philological considerations, Sanderson further hypothesizes that “we shall not be far from the truth if we assign them (*sic*) all these commentators on the *Laghuśaṃvara* to the tenth century (2009: 161).” We have little to add to Sanderson’s argument which seems to present the most plausible picture of the chronology at the moment and we may tentatively date Bhavyakīrti to somewhere around the mid-tenth century.

One problem, however, still lingers. Recently, Péter-Dániel Szántó, in his study of the *Catuṣpīḥatantra*, cast doubt on the identity of Bhavyakīrti, the author of a *Laghuśaṃvara* commentary called the *Vīramanoramā*, with the author of the PUAP (for which Szántó proposes the title “**Sandhyā-prakāśikā*” instead of “**Abhisandhiprakāśikā*”). Szántó points out the discrepancy with regard to a quotation from the *Catuṣpīḥa* in both texts and argues that such discrepancy is unlikely for the same author’s writings (SZÁNTÓ 2012: 43, n. 83). Further, he noticed the stylistic and doctrinal difference between the *Laghuśaṃvara* commentary and the PUAP. According to Szántó, the exposition of the initiatory rites (*abhiṣeka*) in the PUAP “reflects a much more mature phase (*ibid.*)” in that the *Laghuśaṃvara* commentary’s *abhiṣeka* culminates only at the *guhyaḥabhiṣeka* while that of the PUAP includes higher stages of initiation.

If we are to differentiate these two Bhavyakīrti-s and to accept both Sanderson’s and Szántó’s arguments, the author of the PUAP will have to be pushed to a somewhat later period than the mid-tenth century. Unfortunately, little clue is available to us, for the moment, to determine the lower limit for *our* Bhavyakīrti’s dates. Unless a new, datable, testimony that unmistakably refers to the PUAP or its author, we will have to be content with a vague dating — i. e. later than the second half of the tenth century.

* * *

The colophonic verses of the PUAP contain some basic information on Bhavyakīrti's personal career. According to those verses, Bhavyakīrti, after having studied Tantras, Explanatory Tantras, Commentaries, etc., went to the Eastern region (*śar phyogs*) to receive instructions (*man ñag*) from prominent teachers (*dam pa rnam*s), attended yogins who accomplished the highest level of realization (*dños grub gtso mchog*), and obtained an approval (*rjes gnañ*) from Vajrasattva in dream. Then, in the land of Uḍḍiyāna (Urgyan), he, as a disciple of the master *Buddhaśānti (Sañs rgyas źi ba), became proficient in grammar (*sgra*), logico-epistemology (*tshad*), scriptures (*luñ*), and mantras (*sñags*).⁵

As is often the case with a religious figure, the above account contains a mixture of facts, quasi-facts, and mystic experiences. Such events as an encounter with Vajrasattva and a visit to Uḍḍiyāna are almost *cliché* in Tantric hagiographies. On the other hand, two elements in his account are worth noting. First, his visit to the Eastern region, probably Magadha or Bengal, may well suggest that Bhavyakīrti's place of origin or his early whereabouts was very possibly in the Western region. This hypothesis gains support from the fact that Bhavyakīrti's explanation of the purification of mind is very close to the one found in a Kashmiri commentary on the *Pañcakrama* (cf. ed. MIMAKI AND TOMABECHI 1994), the *Pañcakramañikā Kramārthaprakāśikā* (D 1842, P 2705) of Lakṣmī.⁶ Both Bhavyakīrti and Lakṣmī explain the meditation for purifying the mind (*cittaviśuddhi*, *cittaviveka*, *cittanidhyapti*) in terms of the two methods called the "procedure

⁵ PUAP, D khi 154b7–155a4, P ki 244b4–245a3: *man ñag rin chen tshogs kyi rgya msho yi || bla ma chen po'i dgoñs pa la brten te || mtha' yas rgyud don rnam par spyod byed pa'i || 'grel pa mkhan gyi glegs bam rnam mthoñ ste || bśad pa dañ ni yan lag rgyud thos nas || rim pa'i 'grel dañ de bźin rgyud 'grel te || śar phyogs su yañ cuñ zad phyin nas ni || dam pa rnam las man ñag rgyas thob nas || dños grub gtso mchog rnal 'byor pa rnam kyi || źabs kyi padma spyi bos bkur mñes pas || rmi lam rdo rje sems dpa' mthoñ nas kyañ || de las rjes gnañ yañ dag thob nas ni || u rgyan yul du bdag po bdag gis ni || mkhas pa'i gtso bo sañs rgyas źi ba yi || slob ma skal ldan grags pa dge sloñ mchog | sgra tshad luñ dañ sñags la mkhas pa yis || zla ba'i grags pas brtsams pa yi || mtha' drug ces bya 'grel pa yañ || de yi yañ ni ũi kã 'di || de ñid gsal bar byed pas byas || de ñid kyi ni gźuñ gi tshad || stoñ phrag bcu dañ drug yin te || de ni dpal ldan 'dus pa ni || 'grel pa'i don rnam yoñs su bsdus || gañs dañ śel dang mu tig phreñ dañ zla rgyas dañ || mshuñs pa'i bsod nams sa bon bdag gi gañt hob pa || yul sprul gyis rdeg 'khrul pa rnam kyis kun tu bcom || duñ kha bral nas 'gro bas rdo rje 'chañ ñid thob par śog |*

⁶ Lakṣmī is called "Great pandit of Kashmir." See colophon of the *Kramārthaprakāśikā*, D 277a6, P 520a7: *kha che'i mkhas pa chen po dpal la kṣmī'i źal sña nas mdzad pa...*

with *mantra*” (*snags kyi rim pa*) and the “procedure with *mudrā*” (*phyag rgya'i rim pa*),⁷ which are not attested in other commentaries on the *Pañcakrama*. Similarly, the meditation upon the “Clear Light” (*prabhāsvara*) or the absolute truth (*paramārtha*) in the fourth stage of the *Pañcakrama* is also explained by the two authors in the same manner.⁸ It seems quite reasonable to hypothesize that, in his early career, Bhavyakīrti stayed in Kashmir and studied there the Kashmiri interpretation of the Ārya School's *Guhyasamāja* exegesis. Secondly, another concrete information is found in the colophon, i. e. the name of Bhavyakīrti's teacher, though the identity of this figure, *Buddhaśānti, is no less obscure.

According to the colophon to the Tibetan translation, the PUAP was translated into Tibetan by the Indian master Kumāra at the request of the sponsor (*yon gyi bdag po*) 'Brom jo bo dKon mchog khu mtshan.⁹ While the identity of the sponsor remains unknown to us, the translator Kumāra's name is found elsewhere, for example, as the translator of another text belonging to the Ārya School, the **Siddhicaryāvatāra/Sāghanacaryāvatāra* (D 1827, P 2692). Furthermore, a sub-commentary on the *Pradīpoddyotana*, called the **Hṛdayādarśa* (D 1791, P 2656), has Kumāra, a disciple of Lakṣmīkarī, as its author and this latter may well be the same person as gZon nu bum pa can (Kumārakalaśa), the translator of the text in question.¹⁰

⁷ PUAP, D ki 34b5–6, P a 42a1–2: *ñag rnam par dag pa 'i'og tu sems rnam par dag pa la 'bad par bya ste | de la thabs ni gñis te | snags kyi rim pa dan | phyag rgya'i rim pa'o ||* ; *Kramārthaprakāśikā*, D 190a6–7, P 391a2–3: *sems la dmigs pa'i rim pa la thabs gñis te | snags kyi rim pa dan | phyag rgya'i rim pa'o ||*

⁸ PUAP, D ki 37b3–5, P a 45a5–7: *da ni sgyu ma lta bu'i tiñ ne 'dzin yañ rnam par dag par bya ba yin te | rtog pa dan bcas pa'i phyir ro || de'i phyir don dam pa'i bden pa'i ño bo ñid mñon par byañ chub pa'i rim pas de bzin ñid kyi sbyañ par bya ba'i phyir mñon par byañ chub pa'i rim pa bstan par bya ste | de la yañ rnam par gñis yin te | phyag rgya dan | tiñ ne' dzin gyi bye braḡ gis so || phyag rgya'i rim pa la mam pa gñis te phyi'i mñon par byañ chub pa dan | nañ gi mñon par byañ chub pa'o || tiñ ne' dzin gyis mñon par byañ chub pa rnam pa gñis te | ril po 'dzin pa dan lrjes su gzig pa'o ||* ; *Kramārthaprakāśikā*, D 191a7-b1, P 392b1–3: *mñon par byañ chub pa'i rim pa la thabs gñis te | phyag rgya'i rim pa dan | tiñ ne' dzin gyi rim pa'o || phyag rgya'i rim pa la ni rnam pa gñis te | phyi'i mñon par byañ chub pa'i rim pa dan | nañ gi mñon par byañ chub pa'i rim pa'o || tiñ ne' dzin gyi rim pa la yañ rnam pa gñis te | ril por 'dzin pa'i tiñ ne' dzin gyi rim pa dan | rjes su gzig pa'i tiñ ne' dzin gyi rim pa'o ||*

⁹ PUAP, D khi 155a5, P ki 245a4–5: *yon gyi bdag po gtso bo 'brom jo bo dkon mchog khu mtshan gyis žus nas | rgya gar gyi mkhan po chen po ku mā ra ñid kyis bsgyur ciñ žus te gtan la phab pa'o ||*

¹⁰ *Hṛdayādarśa*, colophon, D 201b3–4, P 242b3–4: *... dpal lakṣmī ka rī'i žal śna nas kyi slob ma | pa ñḍi ta ku mā ras mdzad pa rdzogs s-ho || rgya gar gyi mkhan po pa ñḍi ta gžon nu bum pa can dan | bod kyi lo tsā ba dge sloñ sā kya blo gros kyis bsgyur ciñ žus te gtan la phab pa'o ||*

A *Guhyasamāja* commentary ascribed to Nāgārjuna (D 1784, P 2648) also has gZon nu bum pa as its translator.¹¹ Here, if the identification of Kumāra with Kumāarakalaśa is correct, we may further speculate that he belonged to the family lineage of scholars with -kalaśa in their names. Mantrakalaśa, the translator of Lakṣmī's commentary on the *Pañcakrama*, is said to have been a son of Tārakalaśa.¹² The fact that Mantrakalaśa translated the Kashmiri author Lakṣmī's commentary into Tibetan seems to suggest the “Kalaśa” family's connection with Kashmir. And, if Kumāra/Kumāarakalaśa's teacher Lakṣmīkarī can be identified with the author of the *Pañcakrama* commentary, the hypothesis would gain further strength, and this again would point to Bhavyakīrti's early career in that region. Besides, a quotation from the *Spandakārikā* found in the PUAP also suggests Bhavyakīrti's acquaintance with Kashmir Śaivism.¹³ Though, admittedly, our argument here is little more than a chain of mere speculations, the circumstantial evidence seems to converge towards Bhavyakīrti's connection with the Kashmiri tradition of Tantric scholarship.

* * *

The Tibetan canon transmits the following three works ascribed to Bhavyakīrti:

1. *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* **Vīramānoramā*¹⁴ (D 1405, P 2121)
2. **Pradīpoddyotanābhisandhiprakāśikā* (PUAP; D 1793, P 2658)
3. **Pañcakramapañjikā* (D 1838, P 2696)

As remarked earlier, the *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* **Vīramānoramā* is very possibly a work of another Bhavyakīrti who seems to have been active before the author of the PUAP. The **Pañcakramapañjikā*, a rather brief commentary (7 folios in D) on the *Pañcakrama*, is also ascribed to Bhavyakīrti,

¹¹ Incidentally, this commentary ascribed to Nāgārjuna displays some similarity with the PUAP: the two texts share several quotations and the fivefold division of Tantras in which the *Śrīparamādyā* is classified as Caryātantra rather than Yogatantra. Compare, for example, PUAP, D ki 2b5–3a2, P a 3a7–b6 and *Guhyasamājatantraṭīkā*, D2b1–5, P2b7–3a4.

¹² *Kramārthaprakāśikā*, colophon, D 277a7, P 520a7–8: *yon gyi bdag po rab gza' yis źus te | rgya gar gyi mkhas pa pa ŋdi ta chen po | tā ra ka la śa'i sras ma ntra ka la śa ŋid kyis bsgyur ciñ gan la phab pa'o ||*

¹³ PUAP, D ki 53a1, P a 62b5: *ji skad du | 'dir ni gnas skabs gñis yin te || bya ba byed pa ŋid du grags || bya ba ŋid ni zad gyur pa || byed pa ŋid ni zad med do || (=Spandakārikā 14 [ed. CHATTERJI 1916: 12]: avasthāyugalaṃ cātra kāryakartṛtvasābdītam | kāryatā kṣayaṇī tatra kartṛtvam punar akṣayam ||) źes 'byuñi ño ||*

though, at the moment, we have little clue whether this is a work of the same Bhavyakīrti as the PUAP's author or not.

The PUAP is a voluminous work which occupies more than 530 folios in the Peking edition and nearly 450 in the Derge edition of the Tibetan canon. Both in the Derge and the Peking editions, the text spreads over two volumes in the Tanjur, *rGyud 'grel* section—vols. *ki* 1–292a + *khi* 1–155a in D and *a* 1–348a + *ki* 61b–245a in P.¹⁵ The extensive introductory part of the PUAP, which takes up roughly one-sixth of the whole text (75 folios in D, 89 in P), can compare with an independent treatise both in length and in contents. This introduction can be divided into two major sections: the first section deals with the meditation system of the Ārya School in detail and the second discusses the purpose of composition of the *Pradīpoddyotana*. It is in the latter context that we find Bhavyakīrti's doxographical exploration of non-Buddhist and Buddhist schools. In the following, we will briefly examine the context and contents of Bhavyakīrti's doxography.

2. Bhavyakīrti's Doxography: Its Context and Contents

Bhavyakīrti's discussion on the purpose of composition of the *Pradīpoddyotana* consists of three parts. He first discusses the purpose of composition in terms of its three aspects, i. e., the act of composition (*bya ba*, **kriyā*), the effect of the act (*bya ba'i 'bras bu*, **kriyāphala*), the latter's effect (*bya ba'i 'bras bu'i 'bras bu*, **kriyāphalasya phala*).¹⁶ The second discussion concerns the five elements of textual composition, i. e., the title of the work (*rjod par byed pa*, *abhidhāna*), the subject matter (*brjod par bya ba*, *abhidheya*), the connection (*'brel pa*, *sambandha*), the purpose of composition (*dgos pa*, *prayojana*) and the purpose of the purpose (*dgos pa'i dgos pa*, *prayojanaprayojana*).¹⁷

The third part of Bhavyakīrti's discussion concerns the target audience of the doctrine of Buddhist Tantrism. He first classifies the audience into five categories in terms of different levels of intellectual capacity as described in the *Pradīpoddyotana*.¹⁸ He next introduces another, fourfold, classifica-

¹⁴The text has been somewhat clumsily called the “*Śūramanojñā*” on the basis of the title found in the Tibetan canon. Alexis Sanderson proposed an alternative, more elegant, reconstruction “*Vīramanoramā*” (SANDERSON 2009: 158–159, n. 363).

¹⁵In the gap in P, *ki* 1–61, another sub-commentary (P 2659, which corresponds to D 1794) on the *Pradīpoddyotana* is inserted.

¹⁶PUAP, D *ki* 43b4–44a1, P *a* 52a2–8.

¹⁷PUAP, D *ki* 44a1–46b3, P *a* 52a8–55b2. On the purpose of textual composition and the notion of *abhidheya*, etc., see ICHIGŌ 1980: 1–11; FUNAYAMA 1995; YAMAMOTO 2003.

tion of the possible audience based on different stances towards doctrinal tenets.¹⁹ The first two categories of audience are (1) “ignorant” (*mi śes pa*) and (2) “doubting” (*the tshom za ba*). These two types of audience are each divided further into two sub-classes, i. e., “following *pramāṇa*” (*tshad ma’i rjes su ’brañ ba*, **pramāṇānusārin*) and “following non-*pramāṇa*” (or “not following *pramāṇa*”; *tshad ma ma yin pa’i rjes su ’brañ ba*, **apramāṇānusārin*).²⁰ The third category of audience is (3) “wrong-minded” (*phyin ci log pa’i blo*), which is further classified into (3.1) “ignorant,” (3.2) “doubting” and (3.3) “knowing” (*śes pa*).²¹ This last category (3.3), “knowing and wrong-minded” (*śes pa la phyin ci log pa’i blo*), is again classified into (3.3.1) “following non-*pramāṇa*” (or “not following *pramāṇa*”) and (3.3.2) “following *pramāṇa*.”²² This latter sub-category (3.3.2) includes six non-Buddhist schools. The last and fourth category is (4) “sure-minded” (*ñes pa can gyi blo can*) and includes four doctrinal positions of Buddhist philosophy.

Bhavyakīrti’s doxographical exposition in the PUAP covers the last two categories of prospective audience, i. e., (3.3.2) and (4), who would potentially be converted to Buddhist Tantrism through rational argument. As for non-Buddhist schools (3.3.2), he deals with (3.3.2.1) Sāṅkhya, (3.3.2.2) Naiyāyika-Vaiśeṣika, (3.3.2.3) Lokāyata, (3.3.2.4) Jaina, (3.3.2.5) Śaiva and (3.3.2.6) Mīmāṃsaka.²³ The category (4), i. e., Buddhist schools, includes (4.1) Śrāvaka, (4.2) Pratyekabuddha (actually Sautrāntika), (4.3) Yogācāra and (4.4) Mādhyamika.²⁴ Detailed analysis of the doxoigraphical contents

¹⁸ PUAP, D ki 46b3–47a1, P a 55b2–7. Cf. *Pradīpoddyotana*, ed. CHAKRAVARTI 1984: 4, 9–26.

¹⁹ PUAP, D ki 47a1, P a 55b7–8: *gžan dag na re gañ zag bži yod de | mi śes pa dan | the tshom za ba dan | phyin ci log pa’i blo dan | ñes pa can gyi blo can no ||*.

²⁰ PUAP, D ki 47a1–2, P a 55b8: *de la mi śes pa ni rnam pa gñis te | tshad ma’i rjes su ’brañ ba dan | tshad ma ma yin pa’i rjes su ’brañ ba’o ||*; D ki 47a3, P a 56a2–3: *the tshom za ba la yañ rnam pa gñis te sna ma bžin te | the tshom za ba tshad ma’i rjes su ’brañ ba ni yañ dag par tshad ma brjod pas the tshom las log ciñ yañ dag pa’i lam la gžag par bya ba žes rjes su bzun bar bya’o ||*.

²¹ PUAP, D ki 47a5, P a 56a4–5: *phyin ci log pa’i blo can ni rnam pa gsum ste | the tshom za ba la phyin ci log pa dan | mi śes pa la phyin ci log pa dan | śes pa la phyin ci log pa’o ||*.

²² PUAP, D ki 47a6–7, P a 56b7–8: *śes pa la phyin ci log pa la yañ gñis te | tshad ma’i rjes su ’brañ ba dan | tshad ma’i rjes su ’brañ ba ma yin pa’o ||*.

²³ PUAP, D ki 47b1, P a 56a8-b1: *śes pa la tshad ma’i rjes su ’brañ ba phyin ci log pa’i blo can la rnam pa drug ste | grañ can pa dan | rigs pa pa dan | ’jig rten rgyaṅ phan pa dan | mchod ’od pa dan | ži ba pa dan | dpyod pa pa’o ||*.

²⁴ PUAP, D ki 58b7, P a 69b4: *ñes pa’i blo can ni rnam pa bži ste | ñan thos dan rañ sañs rgyas dan rnal ’byor spyod pa dan dbu ma’i dbye bas so ||*.

is, however, beyond the scope of the present paper and should be carried out on another occasion along with an annotated translation of the text. Here, we shall limit ourself to a few general remarks on the style and features of Bhavyakīrti's doxography.

Bhavyakīrti's exposition of different doctrinal tenets aims at establishing the correctness of the position of Mādhyamika, i. e., *niḥsvabhāvavāda*, which in turn serves as the basis for Tantric practice.²⁵ To this end, other doctrinal positions, from Sāṅkhya to Yogācāra, are each described and then criticized, though their treatment is rather uneven. Bhavyakīrti spends much space describing and criticizing non-Buddhist schools and Yogācāra, while Śrāvaka and Sautrāntika positions are treated only passingly. Also, Bhavyakīrti's style of doxographical description appears somewhat inconsistent. In some cases, he deals with both the ontological and epistemological aspects of the doctrine under discussion. In his description of the Sāṅkhya philosophy, for example, Bhavyakīrti first describes in detail the Sāṅkhya ontology, i. e., the theory of twenty-five *tattvas*, three *guṇas* and the nature of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*, with quotations from the *Sāṅkhyakārikā*.²⁶ He then presents three kinds of *pramāṇa* accepted by the Sāṅkhya school, i. e., *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna* and *āptavacana*.²⁷ In some other cases, however, Bhavyakīrti focuses heavily on ontology, as in his description of the Śaiva doctrine where he examines only Śiva's status as the ultimate cause or agent (*byed pa po, kartṛ*) and his connection (*'brel pa, sambandha*) with threefold *sakti* (*nus pa gsum*) without dealing with epistemological questions.²⁸

As mentioned above, Bhavyakīrti's own *philosophical position* is that of Mādhyamika. He argues that all things, including Īśvara, etc., are neither one nor many (*gcig dan du ma bral ba, ekānekaviyoga*) and are therefore empty.²⁹ After establishing the *niḥsvabhāvavāda* of Mādhyamika as superior to other tenets, Bhavyakīrti then tries to demonstrate the superiority of Mantranaya to Mādhyamika by referring to the oft-quoted verse of the *Nayatrāyapradīpa*.³⁰ The verse in question lists four features that are sup-

²⁵PUAP, D ki 61b1–2, P a 72b6–7: *dbu ma pa de rnams gal te rañ bžin med par smra na yañ snags kyi theg pa chen po ni thabs du mas khayd par du 'gyur te | ...*

²⁶PUAP, D ki 47b1–49a2, P a 56b1–58a5. In this section, Bhavyakīrti quotes *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 3, 13, 7, 8, 44, 57, 21cd, 47, 51 abc (in the order of occurrence in the PUAP).

²⁷PUAP, D ki 49a2–5, P a 58a5–8.

²⁸PUAP, D ki 52b6–54a6, P a 62b2–64a7.

²⁹PUAP, D ki 60a2–7, P a 71a3–b1.

³⁰PUAP, D ki, P a 72b6–8: *dbu ma pa de rnams gal te rañ bžin med par smra na yañ snags kyi theg pa chen po ni thabs du mas khyad par du 'gyur te | ji skad du | don gcig pa la ma rmoñs phyir || thabs mañ bas ni dka 'thub med || dbañ po rno ba'i dbañ byas*

posed to constitute the comparative merit of Mantranaya as a *practical method*, i. e., (1) “no confusion” (*asaṃmoha*), (2) “multiplicity of methods” (*bahūpāya*), (3) “no asceticism” (*aduṣkara*), and (4) “being intended for those with superior capacity” (*tīkṣṇendriyādhikāra*). Commenting upon each of these four features, Bhavyakīrti places the Mantranaya over the Pāramitānaya, while the two ways have the common ultimate objective (*ekārtha*).³¹

In the subsequent part of the PUAP, Bhavyakīrti discusses the practitioner of the Mantranaya, the means of cognition (*pramāṇa*) to validate the result of Tantric meditation, and the position of the *Guhyasamāja* cycle within Buddhist teachings. Along with the description of meditation system and the doxographical exposition examined above, Bhavyakīrti’s discussion on these subjects also provides a rich and interesting source for studying the thought and practice of Tantric Buddhism in India. These subjects certainly need further, more detailed, examination, but this must be postponed to future occasion. In place of a conclusion to this paper, we shall present below a synopsis of the PUAP’s introductory part with hope that it will somehow help further investigation of the text.

3. A Synopsis of the Introductory Part of the PUAP (D ki 1–75a6, P a 1–89a4)

1. Opening verses [D1a2–2b2, P1a4–3a3]
2. Two stages of meditation (*utpattikrama*, *niṣpannakrama*) [D2b1–, P3a3–]
 1. General introduction and outline [D2b1–, P3a3–]
 2. *Utpattikrama* [D4a4–, P5a5–]
 1. *Ādiyoga* [D4a4–, P5a5–]
 2. *Maṅḍalarājāgrī* [D11a5–, P13b4–]
 3. *Karmarājāgrī* [D18a5–, P21b2–]³²
 3. *Niṣpannakrama* [D27b6–, P31a4–]
 1. *Kāyaviveka* [D27b6–, P31a4–]
 2. *Vāgviveka/Vajrajāpa* [D28b4–, P32b7–]
 3. *Cittaviveka* [D34b6–, P42a1–]

nas || *snags kyi thegs pa khyad par 'phags* ||* *zes 'byuñ ño* || (**Nayatrāyapradīpa*, D16b3–4, P17b5–6; Skt. quoted in the *Tatvaramāvalī* [ed. U. 1963: 8]: *ekārthatve śaṃmohād bahūpāyād aduṣkarāt | tīkṣṇendriyādhikārāc ca mantrasāstraṃ viśiṣyate* ||).

³¹ PUAP, D ki 61b2–63a5, P a 73a2–74b5.

³² In the Peking edition, the part corresponding to D22a3–23a5 (*phyir thabs dan śes rab kyi ... spro ba dan bsdu ba'i rim pas*) is misplaced and found in P35b1–36b6.

4. *Svādhiṣṭhānakrama* [D36a3–, P44a3–]
5. *Abhisambodhikrama* [D37b3–, P45a5–]
6. *Yuganaddhakrama* [D42a4–, P50a7–]
3. On the purpose of composition of the *Pradīpoddyotana* [D43b4–, P52a3–]
 1. The act (*bya ba*, **kriyā*) of composition, its effect (*bya ba*'i 'bras bu, **kriyāphala*) and the effect's effect (*bya ba*'i 'bras bu' i 'bras bu, **kriyāphalasya phala*) [D43b4–, P52a3–]
 2. Elements of textual composition [D44a1–, P52a8–]
 1. Title of the work (*abhidhāna*) [D44a1–, P52a8–]
 2. Subject matter (*abhidheya*) [D44a3–, P52b3–]
 3. Connection (*sambandha*) [D44a5–, P52b4–]
 4. Purpose of the work (*prayojana*) and the purpose of the purpose (*prayojanaprayojana*) [D46a5–, P55a3–]
 3. Target audience [D46b3–, P55b2–]
 1. Five types of persons (*candana*, *utpala*, *puṇḍarīka*, *padma* and *ratna*) [D46b3–, P55b2–]
 2. Four categories of audience [D47a1–, P55b7–]
 1. Ignorant (*mi śes pa*) [D47a1–, P55b8–]
 1. Following *pramāṇa* (*tshad ma*'i rjes su 'braṅ ba)
 2. Following non-*pramāṇa* (*tshad ma ma yin pa*'i rjes su 'braṅ ba)
 2. Doubting (*the tshom za ba*) [D47a3–, P56a2–]
 1. Following *pramāṇa* (*tshad ma*'i rjes su 'braṅ ba)
 2. Following non-*pramāṇa* (*tshad ma ma yin pa*'i rjes su 'braṅ ba)
 3. Wrong-minded (*phyin ci log pa*'i blo) [D47a5, P56a4–]
 1. Doubting and wrong-minded (*the tshom za ba la phyin ci log pa*) [D47a5–, P56a5–]
 2. Ignorant and wrong-minded (*mi śes pa la phyin ci log pa*) [D47a6–, P56a6–]
 3. **Knowing and wrong-minded** (*śes pa la phyin ci log pa*) [D47a6–, P56a7–]
 1. Not following *pramāṇa* (*tshad ma*'i rjes su 'braṅ ba ma yin pa) [D47a7–b1, P56a7]
 2. **Following *pramāṇa*** (*tshad ma*'i rjes su 'braṅ ba) [D47b1–, P56a8–]
 1. **Sāṅkhya** [D47b1–, P56b1–]
 2. **Naiyāyika-Vaiśeṣika** [D50a1–, P59a5–]
 3. **Lokāyata** [D50b7–, P60a7–]
 4. **Jaina** [D52a6–, P62a1–]

5. Śaiva [D52b6–, P62b2–]
6. Mīmāṃsaka [D54a6–, P64a7–]
4. Sure-minded (*ñes pa can gyi blo can*) [D58b6–, P69b3–]
 1. Śrāvaka [D58b6–, P69b4–]
 2. Sautrāntika [D59a3–, P70a1–]
 3. Yogācāra [D59a5–, P70a3–]
 4. Mādhyamika [D60a2–, P71a3–]
4. Superiority of Vajrayāna [D61b1–, P72b6–]
 1. No confusion (*asammoha*) [D61b3–, P73a1–]
 2. Multiplicity of methods (*bahūpāya*) [D62a1, P73a7–]
 3. No asceticism (*aduṣkara*) [D62a4–, P73b3–]
 4. For those with superior capacity (*tikṣṇendriyādhikāra*) [D62a7–, P73b7–]
5. Practitioners of Vajrayāna [D63a6–, P74b8–]
 1. Practitioners of *utpattikrama* [D64a3–, P75b6–]
 2. Practitioners of *niṣpannakrama* [D64b2–, P76a7–]
6. Examination of the *pramāṇa* for yogic practice [D69a1–, P81b4–]
7. Classification of the *Guhyasamāja* cycle within Buddhist Scripture [D71a2–75a6, P84a4–89a4]

Bibliography

ARÈNE 1998

Pierre ARÈNE, “Herméneutique des *tantra*: étude de quelques usages du « sens caché »,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 21–2, pp. 173–226.

BROIDO 1988

Michael M. BROIDO, “Killing, Lying, Stealing, and Adultery: A Problem of Interpretation in the Tantras,” in Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (ed.), *Buddhist Hermeneutics*, Reprint 1993, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, pp. 71–118.

CHAKRAVARTI 1984

Chintaharan CHAKRAVARTI (ed.), *Guhyasamājatantra Pradīpodyotanaṭīkā Ṣaṅkoṭivṃyākhyā*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 25, Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

CHATTERJI 1916

J. C. CHATTERJI (ed.), *The Spandakārikās with the Vṛtti by Kallaṭa*, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies IV, Srinagar.

CHATTOPADHYAYA 1980

Deviprasad CHATTOPADHYAYA (ed.), *Tāranāthās History of Buddhism in India. Translated from the Tibetan by Lama Chimpa Alaka Chattopadhyaya*, Calcutta: K. P. Bagchi & Company.

FUNAYAMA 1995

Toru FUNAYAMA, “Arcaṭa, Śāntarakṣita, Jinendrabuddhi, and Kamalaśīla on the Aim of a Treatise (*prayojana*),” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasians* 39, pp. 181–201.

ICHIGŌ 1980

Masamichi ICHIGŌ [一郷正道], *Chūganshōgonron no Kenkyū* [中觀莊嚴論の研究], Kyoto: Buneidō.

MIMAKI 1976

Katsumi MIMAKI, *La réfutation bouddhique de la permanence des choses (sthirasiddhidūṣaṇa) et la preuve de la momentanéité des choses (kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi)*, Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne.

MIMAKI 1986

Katsumi MIMAKI (ed.), “The Tattvaratnāvalī of Advayavajra (Tibetan Text),” in Yūichi Kajiyama and Katsumi Mimaki (eds.), *Kyōryōbu (Sautrāntika) Kenkyū* [経量部研究], Kyoto, pp. 3–20.

MIMAKI 2000

Katsumi MIMAKI, “*Jñānasārasamuccaya* kk°20–28,” in Jonathan Silk (ed.), *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 233–244.

MIMAKI and TOMABECHI 1994

Katsumi MIMAKI and Toru TOMABECHI (eds.), *Pañcakrama. Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts Critically Edited with Verse Index and Facsimile Edition of the Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 8, Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco.

NEWMAN 1992

John NEWMAN, “Buddhist Siddhānta in the Kālacakra Tantra,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasians* 36, pp. 227–234.

SANDERSON 2009

Alexis SANDERSON, “The Śaiva Age. The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period,” in Einoo Shingo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 41–349.

SCHIEFNER 1868

Anton SCHIEFNER, *Tāranāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione*, St. Petersburg.

SHASTRI 1927

Haraprasad SHASTRI (ed.), *Advayavajrasaṅgraha*, Gaekwad's Oriental Series 40, Baroda: Oriental Institute.

SHIZUKA 2015

Haruki SHIZUKA [静春樹], *Gaṇacakra to Kongōjō. Kōki Indo Bukkyōron*

no Saikōchiku wo Mezashite [ガナチャクラと金剛乗・後期インド仏教論の再構築を目指して], Urayasu: Kishin Shobō.

SNELGROVE 1959

David L. SNELGROVE, *The Hevajra Tantra. A Critical Study*. 2 vols. London Oriental Series 6, London: Oxford University Press.

STEINKELLNER 1978

Ernst STEINKELLNER, “Remarks on Tantric Hermeneutics,” in Louis Legeti (ed.), *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium*, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 23, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 121–134.

SZÁNTÓ 2012

Péter-Dániel SZÁNTÓ, *Selected Chapters from the Catuṣpīṭhatantra*, 2 vols., Doctoral Dissertation, Oxford: Balliol College, University of Oxford.

TANEMURA 2008

Ryugen TANEMURA [種村隆元], “Mikkyō ha Naze Kengyō yori Sugurete Irunoka. Jñānaśrī saku Kongōjō ni Kansuru Futatsu no Kyokutan no Haijo ni tsuite” [密教はなぜ顕教より優れているのか—ジュニャーナシュリー作『金剛乗に関する二つの極端の排除』について—], *Gendai Mikkyō* [現代密教] 19, pp. 145–155.

UI 1963

Hakuju UI [宇井伯壽], “Advayavajra, Tattvaratnāvalī,” in *Daijō Butten no Kenkyū* [大乘佛典の研究], Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, pp. 1–52.

UPADHYAYA 1986

Jagannatha UPADHYAYA, *Vimalaprabhā of Kalki Śrī Puṇḍarīka on Śrī Laghukālacakratantrarāja*, vol. 1, Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica Series 11, Saranath-Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.

YAMAGUCHI 1944

Susumu YAMAGUCHI [山口益], *Chūgan Bukkyō Ronkō* [中觀佛教論攷], Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

YAMAMOTO 2003

Shōichirō YAMAMOTO [山本匠一郎], “Buddhaguhya no Ronsho Jobun ni Mirareru Teikeiteki Hyōgen ni Tsuite” [ブツダグヒヤの論書序文に見られる定型的表現について], *Chisan Gakuhō* [智文学報] 52, pp. 107–125.