

## The Theoretical Basis of the *bskyed rim* as Reflected in the *bskyed rim* Practice of the Ārya School

Chizuko Yoshimizu

### I.

The *bskyed ba'i rim pa* (*utpattikrama*) or stage of generation which, together with the *rdzogs pa'i rim pa* (*niṣpannakrama*) or stage of completion, constitutes the main practice of Annut-tarayogatantras, had been practically systematized by the end of the eighth century.<sup>(1)</sup> The *bsKyed rim gsal byed* (*dPal gsang ba 'dus pa'i sgrub thabs mdor byas kyi rgya cher bshad pa bsKyed rim gsal byed*) by Bu ston rin chen grub (1290–1364), which will be utilized in this paper, is a commentary on the *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* (*mdor byas*) attributed to Nāgārjuna.<sup>(2)</sup> The *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* first expounds systematically the *bskyed rim* practice of the Ārya school (*'Phags lugs*), one tradition of the *Guhyasamāja* rituals. Two works by Nāgārjuna, this *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* and the *Pañcakrama* on *rdzogs rim* practice, have been regarded as the most important texts of the Ārya school, and a critical edition of their Sanskrit originals had already been published under the title *Pañcakrama* by L. de la Vallée Poussin in 1896.<sup>(3)</sup> At the same time as such commentaries or instructional works on Tantric scriptures were figuring in history, incessant attempts were being made to give theoretical meanings based on Mahāyāna thought to the under-currents of the Tantric scriptures and their rituals. It goes without saying that these procedures were indispensable in order that Tantric texts might be ranked among the orthodox lineages of Buddhism. It was for this reason that the Ārya school played a very important role. Its tradition has, furthermore, been eagerly accepted by Tibetan Buddhists since the eleventh century. The *bsKyed rim gsal byed* was the first attempt at interpreting *bskyed rim* practice according to Mahāyāna thought, especially Śūnyavāda, in Tibet where, thereafter, so many commentaries were produced. In this work Bu ston aims to state that all Tantric practice should be done for the purpose of realizing the truth of *śūnyatā*, totally following the manner of the Ārya school, whose ascriptions of authorship, viz. Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva and Candrakīrti, etc., inform us that they declare themselves to be Mādhyamika. However, it will be noticed upon careful examination that not only Mādhyamika but all varieties of Mahāyāna thought are contained in their works.

Examining the *bskyed rim* system, I have reached two conclusions as follows:

1. Bu ston as well as authors of the Ārya school explain the *bskyed rim* practice on the basis of the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika theory that one should first contemplate the *śūnyatā* of all external objects, since external objects are mind-only (*cittamātra*), and that then one should contemplate this mind-only to be *śūnya* too.<sup>(4)</sup> This method of explanation, whereby Tantric practice is justified, is widely used among Tantric commentators and is not independent of the current of thought originating with Śāntarakṣita which asserts that the two major streams of Mahāyāna philosophy should be integrated but that Mādhyamika thought should be ranked highest. Under the strong influence of this idea, the Jñānapāda school was founded by Jñānapāda, a contemporary of Śāntarakṣita, in the latter half of the eighth century. In this school, the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika theory and the argument of “neither a singular nor a plural nature” (*ekānekaviyogahetu*) for *śūnyatā* are often employed.<sup>(5)</sup> In the Ārya school too *vijñaptimātra* or *cittamātra* theory is still adopted as a theoretical authority, although it is clear from the authors' names that this school persists in declaring its Mādhyamika position. But I would like to note here that the Ārya school never established itself on the basis of Mādhyamika-Prāsaṅgika theory.<sup>(6)</sup> This fact has already been indicated by L. de la Vallée Poussin,<sup>(7)</sup> H. Hadano,<sup>(8)</sup> who published a detailed study on the *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* relying on the *bsKyed rim gsal byed* in 1958, A. Wayman,<sup>(9)</sup> and S. Tsuda.<sup>(10)</sup> The Ārya school, to conclude, swam with the currents of thought which were most popular at the time for the purpose of giving authority to its Tantric methods.

2. Another reason why the Ārya school intentionally declared itself to be Śūnyavādin is that it was thus possible to continue avoiding the substantialism and monism into which Tantric Buddhism has a natural tendency to fall. Tantric Buddhism originally bears a close resemblance to Brahmanism as regards its advocacy of the identity of the Absolute and the individual and of the emanation of all phenomena from the Absolute. I think that all the practical systems of Tantric Buddhism were in essence established on the basis of such Brahmanistic concepts. However, in the final analysis, the Ārya school seems to have failed to transform itself into pure Śūnyavādin. Moreover it can be said that such Tantric concepts still remain in Bu ston's *bsKyed rim gsal byed*. In this connection, one should further consider the relationship between Tantric Buddhism and the Tathāgatagarbha theory, whose similarity to Upaniṣadic philosophy is generally recognised.<sup>(11)</sup> The term *prabhāsvara*, an ultimate truth set forth by Nāgārjuna, is the key to an elucidation of this question. As it will be examined later in this paper, suffice it to say here that Tantric Buddhism may be said to represent the most Brahmanistic development of Tathāgatagarbha theory.

In addition, I would like to point out two distinguishing characteristics of Tantric thought in connection with my two foregoing conclusions.

1) *Samādhi*, the way of contemplation, endowed with almighty power.

It is held to be possible for a Tantric yogin to control all phenomena by merely entering into *samādhi*. Visualization of a *maṇḍala* and recitation of *mantras* in *samādhi* make it possible for him to purify completely not only himself but also all other sentient beings, since each constituent of the *maṇḍala* is nothing other than each sentient being, the whole *maṇḍala* is nothing but the whole phenomenal world, and the yogin himself is the lord of the *maṇḍala*. Namely, there exist neither real objects of ordinary perception nor other beings outside of his mind. The external objects can be replaced by the yogin's internal imagination and be transformed into the absolutely pure world of Buddhas. Regarded from this point of view, it should be clear that Tantric theory had a tendency to link itself with the *viñaptimātra* or *cittamātra* theory of the Yogācāra school.

2) Immanence of the Absolute or the absolute truth.

This is the very fundamental principle which makes the yogin's visualization in *samādhi* effective and is connected with my second conclusion on the Ārya school of thought. The Absolute (Vajrasattva) or the absolute truth (*prabhāsvara*) is immanent by nature in an individual, so that a yogin can identify himself with the Absolute and make all phenomena emanate from within himself. The Ārya school stresses *prabhāsvara* as the immanent essence of an individual with which both he and the Absolute are endowed. As far as the *bskyed rim* practice is concerned, its aim is explained in general by commentators as follows:

One should dismiss his ordinary images (of the external world) (*tha mal ba'i snang ba*) and have special, extremely bright images (of Buddha) (*khyad par can gyi snang ba shin tu gsal ba*), i.e. the *maṇḍala*, instead. And one should dismiss his ordinary self-consciousness (*tha mal ba'i nga rgyal*) and have the self-consciousness of a Buddha (*lha'i nga rgyal*) instead. This means, namely, a self-awakening of one's own innate essence.

## II.

In the following I shall substantiate my foregoing conclusions through an investigation of the contents of the *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* and *bsKyed rim gsal byed*.

The process for achieving the goal is expounded in the *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* vv.17-50. For want of space, only vv.17-23 and vv.44-50 will be here presented with translation.

17. *abhāvabhāvanābhāvo bhāvanā naiva bhāvanā/  
iti bhāvo na bhāvaḥ syād bhāvanā nopalabhyate*/(<sup>12</sup>)

There is the contemplation of unreality. (This is, however, ultimately unreal since there is nothing to be contemplated.) The contemplation (of reality) is not a contemplation. Therefore (such) reality would be unreality. (In either case) the contemplation is not perceived.

18. *anayā gāthayā śūnyam dhyātvā sthiracarātmakam/  
anena vidhiyogena jñānabhūmir adhīsyate*(<sup>13</sup>)//

In accordance with this verse, meditating that (both) the (sentient) beings movable and the world immovable are *śūnya*, one should search for *jñānabhūmi* through the (following) practice of the rite.

19. *ākāśadhātumadhyasthaṃ bhāvayed vāyumaṇḍalam/  
dvihūṃyambījaṇiṣpannaṃ vajradvayasamāyuktam//*  
One should contemplate a circle of wind sprung up from the letters, two *hūms* and a *yaṃ*, in the center of the sky with two *vajras*.
20. *agnimaṇḍalakam cāpi tasyopari vibhāvayet/  
dvihūṃraṃbījaṇiṣpannaṃ vajradvayasamaṅkitam//*  
And thereon one should contemplate a circle of fire sprung up from the letters, two *hūms* and a *raṃ*, and marked with two *vajras*.
21. *vārimaṇḍalakam cāpi tasyopari vibhāvayet/  
dvihūṃvambījaṇiṣpannaṃ vajradvayasamāyuktam//*  
And thereon one should contemplate a circle of water with two *vajras*, sprung up from the letters, two *hūms* and a *vaṃ*.
22. *prthivīmaṇḍalakam cāpi tasyopari vibhāvayet/  
dvihūṃlaṃbījaṇiṣpannaṃ vajradvayasamanvītam//*  
Thereon, furthermore, one should contemplate a circle of earth with two *vajras*, sprung up from the letters, two *hūms* and a *laṃ*.
23. *caturmaṇḍalasamhāre vajrabhūbhāgamaṇḍalam/  
tatra bhrūṃkāraṇiṣpannaṃ kuṭāgāraṃ vibhāvayet//*  
On the accumulation of the four circles one should contemplate a *vajrabhūbhāgamaṇḍala* and thereon a pavilion sprung up from the letter *bhrūṃ*.
44. *sanirvānaṃ sarvaśūnyaṃ dharmakāyaś ca gadhyate/  
dṛḍhīkaraṇaḥetutvān mantraṃ etad udhāharet//*  
*Oṃ śūnyatājñānavajrasvabhāvātmaṃko'ham*<sup>(14)</sup>  
(*Prabhāsvara*) is said to be attended with *nirvāṇa*, to be *sarvaśūnya* as well as *dharmakāya*. One should pronounce this *mantra* since it makes him firm (in his belief and decision): *Oṃ*. I am the being which has the intrinsic nature of the diamond knowledge of *śūnyatā* as my own essence.
45. *paramārthamaṇḍalaṃ hy etan nirābhāsam alakṣaṇam/  
paramārthasatyānāmāpi sarvatathāgatālayaḥ//*  
This (*prabhāsvara*) is just a *maṇḍala* of the ultimate sense, has no appearance, has no characteristic, and is the abode of all Tathāgatas. It is called the ultimate truth.
46. *prabhāsvaṇapraṇiṣṭasya vyutthānaṃ ca pradarśyate/  
mantramūrtiprayogena devatāmbanaṃ prati//*  
It is expounded that one who has once entered into *prabhāsvara* arises from therein towards the (principal) image of the Buddha through the practice of *mantra*-body.
47. *ākāśadhātumadhyasthaṃ bhāvayet sūryamaṇḍalam/  
tasyopari punar mantrī candrabimbaṃ vibhāvayet//*  
A follower of the *mantra*-practice should contemplate a circle of the sun in the center of the sky and thereon an image of the moon.
48. *tatra cāṣṭadalaṃ padmaṃ raktavarṇaṃ vibhāvayet/  
padmopari mahāmantrī tryakṣaraṃ bhāvayet punaḥ//*  
And there the great follower of the *mantra*-practice should contemplate a red lotus flower with eight leaves and on that flower three letters (viz. *oṃ*, *āḥ* and *hūṃ*).
49. *mantraṃ padmaṃ tathā sūryaṃ praviṣṭaṃ candramaṇḍale/  
candramaṇḍalam āpūrṇaṃ bodhicittaṃ vibhāvayet//*  
He should contemplate that the circle of the full moon whereinto the *mantra* (= three letters), the lotus flower and the sun as well have entered is *bodhicitta*.
50. *sthāvaraṃ jaṅgamaṃ sarvaṃ tatraiva vibhāvayet/  
dṛḍhīkaraṇaḥetutvān mantraṃ etad udhāharet//*  
*Oṃ dharmadhātusvabhāvātmaṃko'ham*<sup>(15)</sup>  
He should contemplate all beings movable and immovable only therein (in the circle of the moon) and pronounce this *mantra* since it makes him firm:  
*Oṃ*. I am the being which has the intrinsic nature of the *dharmadhātu* as my own essence.

Dismissing ordinary images and self-consciousness is interpreted as realization of the *sūnyatā* of both subject and object. According to v. 17, a follower of the *bskyed rim* should contemplate that the external objects are *sūnya*, after which he is allowed to start the visualization of the pure *maṇḍala*. From v. 19 to v. 23, a *vajrabhūbhāgamaṇḍala*, the foundation of the whole *maṇḍala*, is contemplated. Thereafter images of the *kuṭāgāra* and thirty-two deities<sup>(16)</sup> are contemplated, all of which will be merged into the yogin's own body (vv. 24–43). When the deities have been merged into his body, their essence symbolized by the five Tathāgatas is contemplated as identical with yogin's five *skandhas*. Finally these five *skandhas* are merged one after another into *prabhāsvara*. There follows v. 44 in which it is declared that the yogin who has once entered into *prabhāsvara* arises from therein with the self-consciousness of a Buddha because all the deities of the *maṇḍala* have already been merged into his body. This self-consciousness of a Buddha is expressed as *bodhicitta* in v. 49.

Through these verses of the *Pinḍikṛtasādhana* one may discern two key points in the thought of the Ārya school:

- 1) the process of contemplating *sūnyatā*.
- 2) the meaning of *prabhāsvara*.

In order to investigate these points, Bu ston's commentary should be consulted.

- 1) To begin with, I will present here Bu ston's explanation of v. 17, whereby the process of contemplating *sūnyatā* is clarified. Bu ston first expounds the concrete images to be contemplated (which is in reverse order to the process of vv. 19–23) in the following manner:

de bzhin du bskyed rim pa sgom pa pos kyang / (13b4) dam pa'i don du bdag gzhan snod  
bcud kyi dngos po rnam thams cad sa chu la / chu me la / me rlung la / rlung sems snang  
ba dang po la / de sems byung snang ba mched pa la / de 'od gsal du thim pa'i tshul gyis  
srung ba'i 'khor lo dang bcas pa'i 'dod (13b5) pa dang gzugs dang gzugs med kyi srid gsum  
dngos po med pa 'od gsal gyi ngang du byang chub sems kyi tshigs bcaḍ 'dis gzhug cing  
bsgom ste / Āryadevas /  
sa ni chu la thim gyur te // chu ni me la thim par gyur // me ni phra ba'i kham su  
zhugs // (13b6) rlung yang sems (snang ba) la thim gyur te //  
sems ni sems las byung (mched) la 'jug // sems byung ma rig par zhugs nas //  
de yang 'od gsal bar 'gro ste // srid pa gsum po 'gog par 'gyur // zhes so //

In the same way (as the world comes to ruin during the period of cosmic destruction, *saṃvartakalpa*), a follower of the *bskyed rim*, keeping his mind on this verse of *bodhicitta*, should contemplate as the nature of *prabhāsvara* that the three worlds, viz. *kāmadhātu*, *rūpadhātu* and *ārūpyadhātu*, with a protective wheel are unreal through (the meditation of) the process that as an ultimate sense the earth embracing all things, i.e. oneself and others, the inanimate world and sentient beings, merges into mind (*citta*), which is the first *āloka*; this (mind) merges into the mentals (*caitta*), which are *ālokābhāsa*; these (mentals) merge into *prabhāsvara*.

It is also expounded by Āryadeva:<sup>(17)</sup>

Earth merges into water; water merges into fire; fire enters into subtle essence (= wind); wind, likewise, merges into mind (*āloka*);<sup>(18)</sup> mind enters into mentals (*ālokābhāsa*);<sup>(19)</sup> mentals enter into nescience; and this (nescience) further goes into *prabhāsvara*. Namely, the three worlds fall into ruin.

This process is very important for understanding the Ārya school of thought. It may be put into the following formula:

P-1. *sa*→*chu*→*me*→*rlung*→*sems byung*→*ma rig pa*→*'od gsal*  
(*āloka*→*ālokābhāsa*→*ālokopalabdhi*→*prabhāsvara*)

The three stages of the mind called *āloka*, *ālokābhāsa* and *ālokopalabdhi* should be briefly commented on first, for it is by these that the doctrine of the Ārya school is characterized. These terms did not appear in the *Pinḍikṛtasādhana* but appear in the *Pañcakrama*.<sup>(20)</sup> They also represent the stages which yogins should pass through in order to reach the final stage of *prabhāsvara*. In the following table some convertible terms (*paryāya*) associated with each stage in the second chapter of the *Pañcakrama* are given:<sup>(20)</sup>

<i>āloka</i>	<i>ālokābhāsa</i>	<i>ālokaṣaḍḍhi</i>
<i>śūnya</i>	<i>atisūnya</i>	<i>mahāśūnya</i>
<i>prajñā</i>	<i>upāya</i>	<i>upalabdha</i>
<i>citta</i>	<i>caitasika</i>	<i>avidyā</i>
<i>paratantra</i>	<i>parikalpita</i>	<i>pariniṣpanna</i>
(endowed with 33 <i>praktis</i> )	(endowed with 40 <i>praktis</i> )	(endowed with 7 <i>praktis</i> )
80 <i>praktis</i>		

One can see that many Yogācāra terms are employed here.<sup>(21)</sup> These three stages are also called three *viññānas* or *jñānas* (*Pañcakrama* II.6, 36). The eighty *praktis* (which I do not mention each by name) may be interpreted as various conditions of the mind. They arise both day and night (to total 160),<sup>(22)</sup> caused by wind-conveyance, and manifest themselves as external objects (*ibid.*, 27, 32, 33, 34). The cause called “wind-conveyance” is the false conception of the existence of *ātman*.

On the other hand, if one comes to realize that external objects arise in the *praktis* of his own mind through the contemplation of *bskyed rim* following the formula P-1, all the manifestations cease and then the three stages of the mind merge into *prabhāsvāra*, i.e. the stage of *sarvaśūnya*. In this way one may recognize in the *Pañcakrama* II the similarity of the *bskyed rim* method to that of Yogācāra-Mādhyaṃika. It will be found, moreover, in the following passage of Bu ston too.

Bu ston interprets *Pinḍikṛtasādhana* v.17 by means of the *caturvidhākhyāna* or “fourfold explanation” which is one of the *saptālaṃkāra* or “seven ornaments”, that is to say, a criterion for distinguishing real meaning from literal meaning in Tantric teachings.<sup>(23)</sup>

<Yi ge'i don> de la brtan pa dang g-yo ba'i dngos po thams cad kyi ngo (13b7) bo nyid ni / med pa yin pas na / bsgom pa med ste / bsgom par bya ba med pa'i phyir ro // 'dir / dngos po med pa bsgom pa'i dngos // zhes bsgyur pa ni / dgag pa'i sgra med pa'i dbang du byas pa dang / 'di'i skabs kyi 'grel pa la (14a1) / dgag sgra yod pa'i bshad pa byas so // gang yod par sgom pa de yang bsgom pa ma yin te / bsgom bya dang bral yang yod pa yin pa'i phyir ro // de lta dngos po dang / dngos po med pa dang ldan pa de ni dngos po med pa ste / phan tshun (14a2) 'gal ba'i phyir ro // de'i phyir bsgom bya dang sgom pa po dang bsgom pa dmigs su med pa'o //

<Literal meaning (*akṣarārtha*)>

Therein (in *prabhāsvāra*) since the reality of all beings movable and immovable is unreal, the contemplation is unreal, for there is nothing to be contemplated. Concerning this (line of the verse), the (Tibetan) translation reads the original passage without a negative particle, “*dngos po med pa(r) bsgom pa'i dngos.*” (On the other hand) the commentary reads this passage with a negative particle and explains accordingly.

Any contemplation of reality is not contemplation either since (if there were anything real) it would be real even if it were independent of any contemplation thereon. There is nothing either that has both reality and unreality since these are mutually exclusive. Therefore (in either case) objects of contemplation, the person who contemplates, and the contemplation do not exist as the objects of perception.

<sPyi'i don> steng 'og la sogs pa'i dbye bas chos thams cad rnam par gsal nas / 'dus byas dang 'dus ma byas kyi chos rnam stong pa'o // zhes gang bsgom (14a3) pa de ni / med de / stong pa nyid la zhen pas lta ba yin pa'i phyir / gang bsgom par bya ba rgyu dang 'bras bu'i rnam pa la mngon par zhen nas bsgom na / de nyid kyang bsgom par rigs pa ma yin rgyu dang 'bras bu gnyis su med pas mtshan ma med pa'i phyir ro // (14a4) de lta na / gang zhig phyi rol gyi rnam pa la smon pa'i 'bras bu de yang med de / smon lam la sogs pa nye bar ma dmigs pa'i phyir ro // de bas na / phyi rol gyi dngos po lta bur bsgom pa ni / dmigs su med pa ste / rig par bya ba ma yin te / sems kyi rang bzhin (14a5) yin pa'i phyir ro //

<General meaning (*samastāṅgārtha*)>

It is unreal to contemplate that every sort of being such as *saṃskṛta* and *asaṃskṛta* is *śūnya* after making (the nature of) all beings clear through the distinction between top and bottom, etc., since (such contemplation is) to see *śūnyatā* with attachment. And when one contemplates with attachment any objects which have the appearances of cause and effect, such a contemplation is not right to contemplate either since neither cause nor effect have any characteristics on account of their non-duality. Thus, there is no fruit of wishes for any appearances of external objects since any wish and the like are not perceived. Hence the contemplation of anything as if it were an external existence does not exist as an object of perception, namely, it cannot be known since (external objects) have an intrinsic nature identical with the mind.

<*sBas pa*> gang phung po la sogs pa de rnams ni / dngos po med ste / bsgom byar gyur pa'i sems tsam gang yin pa de ni dngos po med de / rnam par dag pa dang brtag tu med pa'i phyir\* (/) kun rdzob kyi bden pa bzlog pa'i phyir gsungs (14a6) pas / gang kun rdzob kyi bden pa'i bdag nyid sgyu ma lta bu'i lha sku bsgom pa de yang sgom par byed pa rigs pa min te / 'od gsal bas rnam par dag pa'i phyir ro // de ltar te / de bzhin du kun rdzob kyi bden pa tsam gyi dgos po ni / dngos por yod (14a7) pa ma yin te / bden pa gnyis dbyer med pa'i phyir ro // des na bden pa gnyis lta bur sgom par byed pa ni / dmigs su med pa ste / zad par mi dmigs pa yin pas so //

\* *Ratnāvalī*, 300a5: ma dag pa dang rtag tu med pa'i phyir ro //

*Pradīpodyotana*, 28b2: rnam par ma dag pa dang / brtag tu med pa yin pa'i phyir ro //

<Secret meaning (*garbhārtha*)>

These *skandhas* and so forth are unreal since the mind-only which has come to be contemplated is unreal, impure,\* and does not exist as anything being examined. Since it is taught (in *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* v. 17b) that *bsgom par bya ba sgom pa min* in order to eliminate conventional truth, the contemplation of the illusional image of a Buddha which has conventional truth as its intrinsic nature is not right as a contemplation either since it (the image of a Buddha) is (intrinsically) pure as *prabhāsvara*. Thus, the things (which exist) only as conventional truth in this way do not exist as real things since the two truths are not to be distinguished. Hence the perception of the truth as two does not exist as an object of perception since (the two truths) are not distinguished any more and are not to be perceived.

\* Based on the *Ratnāvalī* and the *Pradīpodyotana*.

<*mThar thug pa*> dngos po med pa don dam pa'i bden pa la / bsgom pa (14b1) med pa ste / gzod ma nas dag pa'i phyir ro // gang kun rdzob kyi bden pa'i bdag nyid du sgom par byed pa de yang bsgom bya yod pa ma yin te / mi bden pa nyid kyi phyir ro // de ltar te / rnam pa 'dis bden pa gnyis kyi bdag nyid kyi dngos po bsgom par bya bar mi (14b2) 'gyur te / bden pa gnyis gnyis su med par mthong ba tsam gyis grol bar 'gyur pa'i phyir ro // des na sgom pa po dang // bsgom pa dang / bsgom par bya ba'o // zhes 'di ltar mngon par zhen pa ni / zung 'jug gi rim pa rtogs pa rnams la dmigs su med (14b3) pa ste / rig bya ma yin no // zhes rDo rje 'chang chen pos gsungs te / mthar thug pa'o //

<Ultimate meaning (*kolikārtha*)>

There is no contemplation of the absolute truth which is unreal since (it is) intrinsically pure. To contemplate anything as if it had the essence of conventional truth has no object to be contemplated either since it cannot be a truth. Thus, the realities of the essence of the two truths cannot be contemplated in this manner since one can be liberated only through regarding the two truths as being non-dual. Therefore the attachment to (views) such as "(it is) a person who contemplates, (it is) a contemplation, (it is) an object of contemplation" is not found in those who realize the *yuganaddha-krama*,<sup>(24)</sup> namely, it is not to be known.

Thus Mahāvajrapāṇi teaches. This is the ultimate meaning.

One comes to understand the deeper meaning of v. 17 through this fourfold explanation, and at the same time he follows the path to the ultimate stage of *sarvaśūnya*. This process deepening into a realization of *sarvaśūnya* coincides with the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika method too. In summary, this verse 17 states that there is nothing to be contemplated: the general meaning teaches that there are no external objects to be contemplated since all objects of perception are identical with mind-only by nature; in the next step of the secret meaning, however, the mind-only cannot be contemplated either since it is unreal too; the last two meanings state that the two truths are not contemplated since they do not exist as two;<sup>(25)</sup> nothing is contemplated after all, i.e. everything is *śūnya*. The final ultimate meaning seems to be associated with the goal of *rdzogs rim*, *yuganaddha*.

In regard to the *caturvidhākhyāna*, I must note the fact that this fourfold explanation of v. 17 first appeared in the *Pradīpoddīyotana*, the most important commentary on the *Guhyasamāja-tantra* written by Candrakīrti. Candrakīrti gives the fourfold explanation for *Guhyasamāja* II.v.2 which has been identified with *Pinḍīkṛtasādhana* v.17.<sup>(26)</sup> Besides, Ratnākaraśānti (or Śānti-pa, who is thought to have lived in the eleventh century) also utilized it in the *Ratnāvalī*, his commentary on the *Pinḍīkṛtasādhana*.<sup>(27)</sup> That means, I suppose, that both Ratnākaraśānti and Bu ston followed Candrakīrti, since the *Pradīpoddīyotana* must have been the most authorized exegesis in the Ārya school in both India and Tibet. On the strong assumption that this fourfold explanation is original to Candrakīrti, it will be recognized that the Ārya school employed Yogācāra-Mādhyamika theory virtually from its starting point. Namely, the Ārya school followed the Jñānapāda school in a contemporary Mahāyāna current, which may have maintained its domination until the age of Bu ston in Tibet.<sup>(28)</sup>

We shall now continue in our examination of Bu ston's commentary. Bu ston explains the rise of phenomena from *prabhāsvāra* by the following process:<sup>(29)</sup>

P-2a. *prabhāsvāra* → (ālokapalabdhi → ālokābhāsa → āloka) → four *bhūtas* → five *skandhas*  
(three *viññānas*) (sattva)

In this manner, objects of ordinary perception appear to ordinary people, while to the yogin, once he has entered into *prabhāsvāra*, objects do not appear since he knows that they are only manifestations of his mind, and so he starts a contemplation of *bodhicitta* (*Pinḍīkṛtasādhana* vv.46–50). According to Bu ston, a circle of the sun, an image of the moon (v.47), and a red lotus flower (v.48) symbolize the three stages of the mind, and three letters on the flower (v.48) symbolize the wind-conveyance. The circle of the full moon whereinto all of them enter is *bodhicitta* (v.49). *Bodhicitta* should be contemplated as completely identical with the *dharmadhātu* (v.50). Bu ston gives the following explanation of the contemplation of *bodhicitta*.

*thams cad 'dus pa las zla ba'i dkyil 'khor cha shas kun yongs su rdzogs pas nya gang  
ba lta bur gyur te | byang chub sems kyi ngo bo sems tsam du rnam par bstag pa ste |  
gsam par (34a5) bya'o || de nas zla ba las 'od zer 'phros pas rgyu ba sems can gyi kham  
rnams dang | mi rgyu ba phyi gnod thams cad kyang ye shes kyi bdag nyid zla ba'i dkil  
'khor de nyid du bcug par rnam par bsam ste | thams cad sems tsam du shes shing bden  
(34a6) gnyis dbyer med par rtogs pa'i don du'o ||*

*brtan g-yo thams cad rang gi sems tsam du bsdud pa de yang skye 'jig gnas gsum dang  
bral ba'i chos kyi dbyings kyi rang bzhin can nga'o || (34b1)*

In consequence of all (the sun, the lotus flower, and the three letters) joining (in the circle of the moon), (when) the circle of the moon completely waxes and becomes like a full moon on the fifteenth night, the essence of *bodhicitta* is recognized, i.e. mediated on as mind-only. And then (one should) meditate that the light is emitted from the moon and that thereby all the sentient beings composing (the world) and the external world composed (of the sentient beings) are also put into the very circle of the moon, and so one should know that all beings are mind-only and realize the non-duality of the two truths.

All beings movable and immovable are joined in one's own mind-only, which is, in turn, the *dharmadhātu* separated from the three (stages) of birth, abiding and death, and its (the *dharmandhātu's*) intrinsic nature I have as my own nature.

P-2b. 'od gsal→(nyi ma→zla ba→padma)→zla ba (byang chub sems=sems tsam, ye shes)  
 ||  
 prabhāsvara→(ālokopalabdhi→ālokābhāsa→āloka)→bodhicitta

*Bodhicitta* is called *ye shes* (*jñāna*), which means that the three *viññānas* have been already purified. In other words, the three *viññānas* as the basis of phenomena have already changed into *jñāna* at this stage. This reminds us of the transformation of *ālayaviññāna* into *jñāna*, so-called *āśrayaparāvṛtti*, in the *Vijñānavāda*. A yogin arises from *prabhāsvara* with a converted mind upon the acquirement of *bodhi*.

What then is *prabhāsvara*? I shall take up this question for consideration in the next section.

2). Yogācāra-Mādhyamika theory seems to have been well suited to the Ārya school's objectives, since it made it possible for them not only to give authority to their yoga system but also to style themselves as Śūnyavādin. They set forth *prabhāsvara* as a stage of *sarvaśūnya*, whereby they intended to surpass the *Vijñānavāda* and convert themselves into Mādhyamika. Ratnākaraśānti comments on such *prabhāsvara* in his *Ratnāvalī*, stating that,<sup>(30)</sup> "*viññaptimātra* does not remain (at the stage of *prabhāsvara*) since the author (of the *Pinḍīkṛtasādhana*) belongs to the Mādhyamika school." Judging from its terminology, the Ārya school surely puts more stress on *śūnyatā* than does the *Jñānapāda* school. However, I repeat here that the advocate of Śūnyavāda called Nāgārjuna fails to rank himself among true Śūnyavādins. In my opinion, the main reason for this is that he attempted to apply Mahāyāna theory to Tantric concepts without strictly discerning the difference between the two. Most Tantric authors including Nāgārjuna seem to lack any concrete understanding of Mahāyāna philosophies. Whoever reads this paper or any Tantric works will notice that all sorts of Mahāyāna terms are employed and mechanically associated with Tantric concepts.<sup>(31)</sup> In fact, Tantric commentators wished to establish their own system on the basis of a synthesis of Mahāyāna philosophies. Nevertheless, they neglected to reflect upon the strict meanings of those Mahāyāna terms.

I will refer to various descriptions of *prabhāsvara* given in both the *Pinḍīkṛtasādhana* and *Pañcakrama*.

*sanirvāṇaṃ sarvaśūnyaṃ dharmakāyaś ca gadhyate/* (*Pinḍīkṛtasādhana* 44ab)  
*paramārthamaṇḍalaṃ hy etan nirābhāsaṃ alakṣaṇam/*  
*paramārthasatyanāmāpi sarvatathāgatālayaḥ//* (*Pinḍīkṛtasādhana* 45)

According to Bu ston, *nirābhāsa* means that *prabhāsvara* surpasses the three stages of the mind and *alakṣaṇa* means that *prabhāsvara* is not defiled by the eighty *prakṛtis*.<sup>(32)</sup>

*śūnyatrayaviśuddhir yā prabhāsvaram ihocyate/*  
*sarvaśūnyaṇipadaṃ tac ca jñānatrayaviśuddhir yo//* (*Pañcakrama* 11.53)  
*jñānaśuddhipadaṃ tattvaṃ sarvajñatvam anuttaram/*  
*nirvikāraṃ nirābhāsaṃ nirdvandvaṃ paramaṃ śivam//* (*Pañcakrama*)  
*astīti na ca nāstīti na ca tad vākhyagocaram/*  
*ataḥ prabhāsvarāc chūddhāj jñānatrayasamudbhavaḥ//* (*Pañcakrama* 11.55)

Although most of these appear to be stereotyped phrases used for the ultimate truth in many schools, it is not impossible to discern some characteristics of *prabhāsvara* among them. It should be noticed first that *prabhāsvara* is characterized as *śūnyatrayaviśuddhi* or *jñānatrayaviśuddhi*, i.e. the purity of the three stages of the mind. It is also stated that the three *jñānas* arise from *prabhāsvara*. This means that *prabhāsvara* is the stage in which our ordinary consciousness (*viññāna*) or mental activities are completely purified and from which pure consciousness or gnosis (*jñāna*) then arises as *bodhicitta*. In other words, *prabhāsvara* itself has no defilement and is unchangeable by nature, whereas our ordinary consciousness attended with defilements, i.e. the eighty *prakṛtis*, can be changed into pure consciousness by means of purification of the eighty *prakṛtis*. From this point of view, I interpret the term *sarvaśūnya* as follows: the compound *sarvaśūnya* may be analyzed into *sarvaṃ śūnyam* or *sarvena śūnyam*, the Tibetan translation of which reads *kun stong*<sup>(33)</sup> or *thams cad stong pa*,<sup>(34)</sup> glossed by Bu ston as *thams cad kyis stong pa*.<sup>(35)</sup> What does *sarvaṃ* mean? It means all defilements of the mind; therefore *prabhāsvara* is the stage (*pada*) void of all defilements, or *prabhāsvara* lacks all defilements. I think that the term *śūnya* is employed in this case as a close synonym of



*viśuddhi*. *Śūnyatraya*, viz. *śūnya*, *atīśūnya* and *mahāśūnya*, applied to the three stages of the mind, refers to the stages of the purification of defilements leading up to complete purity.

I will quote a passage from J. Takasaki on the *Ratnagotravibhāga* because of its similarity to the Tantric view:

"... the real meaning of *śūnyatā* is to know the *astitva* of the Germ having within itself both the *śūnya* of defilements and the *aśūnya* of the Buddha's Qualities (I, 154-5).<sup>(38)</sup> We may take this statement as an explanation of *śūnyam sarvam*, defining *sarvam* as *sarvakleśa* from which all phenomena arise and which excludes the Germ inseparably associated with the Buddha's Qualities, that is to say, identical with the Absolute; and hence the word *śūnya* implies *aśūnya* of the Germ."<sup>(37)</sup>

It may be certainly inferred in this way that the Tantric concepts of both *prabhāsvara* and *sarvaśūnya* are derived from the doctrine of *cittaprakṛti* and *āgantukakleśa* of Tathāgatagarbha theory. H. Hadano has already pointed out this close similarity between the *Ratnagotravibhāga* and Tantric Buddhism.<sup>(38)</sup> It is well-known that the term *prabhāsvara* has its origin in the Pāli canon and that therefrom Tathāgatagarbha theory is descended.<sup>(39)</sup> In scriptures or explanatory works of the Tathāgatagarbha theory, the expressions *prakṛti-prabhāsvara* and *prakṛti-viśuddhi* are employed to express the intrinsic purity of the mind.<sup>(40)</sup> Intrinsic purity implies, namely, the absence of all defilements.

Thus considered, *śūnyatā* as used by Nāgārjuna seems to lose its original meanings, i.e. *pratītyasamutpāda* (nothing can come to be existent independently) and *niḥsvabhāvatā* (nothing possesses any intrinsic nature). Nāgārjuna supposes that everything arises from a single unchangeable origin by cause of the unpurified mind, and this origin as the essence of the Absolute is immanent by nature in an individual, that is to say, all beings have an intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*) identical with the Absolute. The term *śūnyatā* is used by Nāgārjuna to signify the purity of our nature. Therefore it should be understood in this case that *śūnyatā* is a manifestation of *prabhāsvara* rather than that *prabhāsvara* be a manifestation of *śūnyatā*.

This is a very critical point in distinguishing the Ārya school of thought from original Mādhyamika philosophy. For this reason, I cannot agree that the Ārya school followed Mādhyamika-Prāsaṅgika and I suggest instead that it failed to change itself into Śūnyavādin.<sup>(41)</sup>

I will adduce another quotation of the *Pañcakrama* in support of my argument.

*evam prakṛtayaḥ sarvā ābhāsatrayahetukāḥ*// (II. 42cd)  
*nirviśya viśayān kṛtsnān praviśanti prabhāsvaram*/ (II. 43ab)

In this way (i.e., as if various clouds arised from the sky and thereinto disappeared) having entered into all objects (of sense), all the natures (of mind) which have the three lights (= three stages of mind) as their cause enter into *prabhāsvara*.

Now let us return to the *bskyed rim* practice. Based on the doctrine of *prabhāsvara*, it comes to assume more Brahmanistic characteristics. When the yogin enters into *prabhāsvara* through the process of formula P-1 in *samādhi*, the goal has already been guaranteed for him since he has just realized his intrinsic nature identical with the Absolute. Nothing remains necessary for him to do in order to reach the goal but to contemplate this identity concretely by using symbols, viz. *mudrā* and *mantra*, in *samādhi*. The ultimate goal is attained by him in the following manner:<sup>(42)</sup>

*yat kāyam sarvabuddhānām pañcaskandhaprapūritam*/  
*buddhakāyasvabhāvena mamāpi tādṛśam bhavet*// (*Pinḍikṛtasādhana* 77)  
*Om sarvatathāgatakāyavajrasvabhāvātma'ham*

As is the body of all Buddhas filled with the five *skandhas*, so would my (body) be.  
*Om*. I am the being which has the intrinsic nature of the diamond body of all Tathāgatas.  
*yad eva vajradharmasya vācā niruktisamṣadā*/  
*mamāpi tādṛśi vācā bhaved dharmadharopamā*// (*ibid.* 83)  
*Om sarvatathāgataavāgvajrasvabhāvātma'ham*

As is the diamond doctrine's speech accomplishing the teaching, so would my speech be similar to the supporter of the doctrine.

*Om*. I am the being which has the intrinsic nature of the diamond speech of all Tathāgatas.

*yac cittam samantabhadrasya guhyakendrasya dhimataḥ/  
mamāpi tādrśam cittam bhaved vajradharmopamam// (ibid. 89)  
Om sarvatathāgatacittavajrasvabhāvātmake'ham*

As is the mind of the wise *samantabhadra*, the secret lord, so would my mind be similar to the supporter of the diamond.

*Om*. I am the being which has the intrinsic nature of the diamond mind of all Tathāgatas.

The yogin who has in this manner gained a self-consciousness identical with that of a Buddha goes on contemplating this image of himself as being united with a sixteen year-old girl, i.e. *vidyā*; this represents the fulfillment of the *bskyed rim* practice.

To be precise, however, the yogin does immediately start another contemplation for the sake of all other sentient beings. Having taken up the seat of Dveṣavajra (=Akṣobhya), the lord of the *maṇḍala*, he contemplates that the thirty-two deities arise successively from their respective *mantras* and purify all sorts of suffering sentient beings (*Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* 107–197). He is able to relieve all beings from suffering and purify their defilements merely by contemplation of the *maṇḍala* in *samādhi* since they too have an intrinsic nature identical with that of a Buddha. All phenomena and beings merge into *prabhāsvara*, namely, their intrinsic nature, through the yogin's mind and therein change themselves into bright pure images which constitute the *maṇḍala*. "Clear light," the original meaning of *prabhāsava*, would awaken our imagination to this scene.<sup>(43)</sup> Thus Tantric yogins do actually nothing for the sake of others in their ordinary life, or rather, according to their theory, they need not do anything except contemplation in *samādhi*. Here lies the great difference between the Tantric ideal and the Mahāyāna ideal of the Bodhisattva forever saving others.

In conclusion, the *bskyed rim* practice was originally established on the basis of Tantric theory which is inconsistent with that of Mahāyāna, especially Śūnyavāda, and has on the contrary a close resemblance to Brahmanism. The absence of the *pratītyasamutpāda* doctrine as well as of activities for the benefit of others are positive proof of this conclusion. As to such incompatibility between Tantric theory and Mahāyāna, S. Tsuda has set forth many suggestive arguments through investigations of Tantric scriptures on several occasions, and I have also illustrated it by examining the Ārya school's exegesis from another viewpoint in this paper. Therefore, it should be possible for us to see through the real character of Tantric Buddhism, even if its advocates wore the masks of Śūnyavādins such as Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, and so on. Nevertheless, it is truly surprising that a number of scholars who work on Tantric Buddhism still believe that it has its theoretical basis in the Śūnyavāda. How can they demonstrate logically that the immanence of the Absolute in an individual or the identity between the two presupposes the Śūnyavāda? One could never accept any immanent existence or any intrinsic nature if he clearly understood the *nairātmya* of both *dharma* and *pudgala*. We should never swallow the statements of Tantric authors whole. In other words, we should pursue our studies of Tantric Buddhism ascertaining its dual structure, i.e. its real character and theoretical camouflage.<sup>(44)</sup>

(I wish to express my sincere thanks to Mr. R. W. Giebel and Mr. S. Okada, who kindly corrected my English in this paper.)

#### Notes

(1) I assume that the two stages (*dvikrama*) were first systematized by Jñānapāda in his *Dvikrama-tattvabhāvanā-mukhāgama* (cf. Yoshimizu, "Jñānapāda-ryū ni okeru Yugagyō-Chūgan setsu", "Tsong kha pa Himitsudōshidaidairon ni okeru kanjōron"). See Hadano, "Himitsushū-tantra ni okeru Jñānapāda-ryū ni tsuite," on the chronology of Jñānapāda.

(2) Nāgārjuna is presumed to have lived in the ninth or tenth century. Cf. Hadano, "Tāntric Buddhism ni okeru ningen sonzai."

(3) S. Sakai published a Japanese translation of these two works under the title *Chibetto mikkyō kyōri no kenkyū* in 1956.

(4) This process of meditation is originally based on the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* X. v. 256 and the *Madhyamikāiaṃkāra* v. 92. Cf. Yoshimizu, "Jñānapāda-ryū ni okeru Yugagyō-Chūgan setsu," pp. (87)–(88).

- (5) Cf. *ibid.*, p. (86).
- (6) I do not know the real reason why the Ārya school is regarded as having followed the Mādhyamika-Prāsaṅgika philosophy in general. It seems to be due to the Tibetan tradition.
- (7) De la Vallée Poussin, *Pañcakrama*, p. 10, 11.6–16. Poussin recognizes that the *Pañcakrama* adopts practical methods corresponding to the definition of the Yogācāras, although he considers its viewpoint to be Mādhyamika-Prāsaṅgika.
- (8) Hadano, *op. cit.*, p. 27, Note (12).
- (9) Wayman, *Yoga of the Guhyasamājantra*, pp. 91–93, p. 194. Wayman points out that the Yogācāra vocabulary is employed by Nāgārjuna.
- (10) Tsuda, “Mikkyō to Kū,” p. 633.
- (11) Cf. Takasaki, *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga*, p. 60, 1.35–p. 61, 1.3; *Nyoraizō shisō no keisei*, p. 762, 11.15–16.
- (12) This verse has been identified with the *Guhyasamājantra* II.2 and has many variants in its different recensions:
- GST.II.3 *abhāve bhāvanābhāvo bhāvanā naiva bhāvanā /  
iti bhāvo na bhāvaḥ syād bhāvanā nopalabhyate //*
- GST.P.No. 81 (100b2)  
*dnogs po med la sgom pa med // sgom pa sgom pa ma yin nyid //  
de ltar dnogs po dnogs med de // bsgom pa dmigs su med pa'o //*
- GST.Stein.No. 438 (8b4)  
*dnogs po med par bsgom pa'i dnogs // bsgom par bya ba bsgom pa min //  
de ltar dnogs po dnogs med pas // bsgom pa dmigs su med do zhes //*
- Pinḍīkṛtasādhana* P.No. 2661 (3a3)  
*dnogs po med la bsgom pa'i dnogs // bsgom par bya ba bsgom pa min //  
de ltar dnogs po dnogs med de // sgom pa dmigs su med pa'o //*
- Pinḍīkṛtasādhana* P.No. 4788 (2b2)  
*dnogs po med la sgom pa med // sgom pa sgom pa ma yin nyid //  
de ltar dnogs po dnogs med de // sgom pa dmigs su med pa'o //*
- Stein.No. 438 is the oldest version among them. P.No. 4788 seems to have been revised following P.No. 81, the new version of the *Guhyasamājantra*. Cf. Wayman, *op. cit.*, p. 280.
- (13) Poussin reads *adhiṣyate* in accordance with the manuscript. The Tibetan versions read *byin gyis bslab* (P. No. 2661, 3a4; P. No. 4788, 3a3).
- (14) This mantra derives from the *Guhyasamājantra* III. Cf. Wayman, *op. cit.*, p. 271.
- (15) Do. Cf. Wayman, *loc. cit.*
- (16) The Ārya school expounds a *maṇḍala* of thirty-two deities, whereas the Jñānapāda school expounds a *maṇḍala* of nineteen deities.
- (17) *Svādhiṣṭhānakrama-prabheda*, 128a6–7.
- (18) Parentheses by Bu ston.
- (19) These prototypes are found in the explanatory tantras of the *Guhyasamāja*, viz. the *Vajramālātantra* and *Vajrajñānasamuccayatantra*. Cf. Matsunaga, *Mikkyō kyōten seiritsushi ron*, pp. 274–315.
- (20) See *Pañcakrama* II.7–27.
- (21) Cf. Wayman, *op. cit.*, pp. 192–195.
- (22) This number 160 reminds us of the hundred and sixty minds expounded in the *Vairocanaśāmbodhisūtra*.
- (23) Cf. Matsunaga, *op. cit.*, pp. 279–286; Wayman, *op. cit.*, p. 116; and Steinkellner, “Remarks on Tantristic Hermeneutics.”
- (24) *Yuganaddha* is the last step of the *pañcakrama*.
- (25) Mind-only seems to be not considered in relation to conventional truth here.
- (26) I regret not having had the opportunity so far of referring to the original Sanskrit manuscript of the *Pradīpoddhyotana*.
- (27) *Ratnāvalī*, 299b6–300b2.
- (28) Bu ston seems to have succeeded to the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika philosophy transmitted in the Sa skya pa tradition. It is not clear how Bu ston estimates Vijñānavāda; however, I have sometimes encountered statements in his Tantric works which recognize mind-only as conventional truth (cf. *dPal gsang ba 'dus pa'i rdzogs rim rim lnga'i dmar khrid kyi man ngag yi*

*bzhin nor bu rin po che'i za ma tog*, 8a5-6). Ruegg also regards Bu ston as a Yogācāra-Svātantrika-Mādhyamika (*Le Traité du Tathāgatarbha de Bu ston*, pp. 56-57). In any case, it may well be said that Bu ston never eliminates Vijñānavāda by means of a rigid distinction between Mādhyamika and Yogācāra. On the other hand, Tsong kha pa interprets this fourfold explanation on the basis of only Mādhyamika theory (cf. Tsong kha pa, *gSang 'dus sgron gsal le'u bcu gcig pa yan gyi mchan 'grel*, 90b-93b6).

(29) See *bsKyed rim gsal byed*, 32b2-33a6.

(30) *Ratnāvalī*, 301b3-4.

(31) Tantric terminology often gives a strange impression, for there is no necessary connection between the various terms, such as *avidyā* and *pariniṣpanna* (see table).

(32) See *bsKyed rim gsal byed*, 32a1.

(33) *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana* (P. No. 2661), 4a4.

(34) *Pañcakrama* (P. No. 2667), 56a4.

(35) *bsKyed rim gsal byed*, 31a1.

(36) Johnston, *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*, p. 76.

(37) Takasaki, *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga*, p. 54, l. 27-p. 55, l. 5.

(38) Hadano, "Tāntric Buddhism ni okeru ningen sonzai," pp. 36-37.

(39) Takasaki, "Yuishin to Nyoraizō," pp. 58-59; *Nyoraizō shisō no keisei*, p. 397.

(40) *Id.*, "Yuishin to Nyoraizō," pp. 68-73.

(41) If the *Ratnagotravibhāga* describes *śūnyatā* in the same manner as the Ārya school, I cannot but doubt whether it is a real successor to Śūnyavāda (cf. Takasaki, *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga*, p. 54).

(42) It seems apparently to be descended from the five-stepped process of attaining enlightenment (五相成身觀) in the *Tattvasaṃgrahatantra*.

(43) An image of light is often used in Tantric practices.

(44) Another question still remains for investigation: how does Bu ston evaluate this Tantric character? I can hardly imagine that Bu ston, a scholar who criticized the *gZhan stong* theory of Jo nan pa,\* would recognize *prabhāsvara* in the same meaning as Nāgārjuna. Although I could not make a judgement on this point from the *bsKyed rim gsal byed* alone, Bu ston seems to interpret *prabhāsvara* as a synonym of the Mādhyamika *śūnyatā*.

\* Cf. Ruegg, *Le Traité du Tathāgatarbha de Bu ston*; Yamaguchi, "Jo nan pa no Nyoraizōsetsu to sono hihansetsu"; and Shimoda, "Bu ston no Nyoraizō kaishaku."

## Bibliography

Āryadeva: *Svādhiṣṭhānakrama-prabheda*, P. No. 2670.

Bu ston: *dPal gsang ba 'dus pa'i sgrub thabs mdor byas kyi rgya cher bshad pa bskyed rim gsal byed*, The Collected Works of Bu ston, Part 9 (Ta), Śatapiṭaka Series, New Delhi, 1967.  
*dPal gsang ba 'dus pa'i rdzogs rim rim lnga'i dmar khrid kyi man ngag yi bzhin gyi nor bu rin po che'i za ma tog*, The Collected Works of Bu ston, Part 10 (Tha), Śatapiṭaka Series, New Delhi, 1967.

Candrakīrti: *Pradīpoddyotana*, Sanskrit Ms. belonging to the Jayaswal Institute, Patna; P. No. 2650.

De la Vallée Poussin, L.: See Nāgārjuna.

Hadano Hakuyū: "Himitsushū-tantora ni okeru Jñānapāda-ryū ni tsuite" (「秘密集タントラにおけるジニヤナパーダ流について」), *Bunka (shin)* No. 5, 1950.

"Tāntric Buddhism ni okeru ningen sonzai" (「Tāntric Buddhism における人間存在」), *Tōhokudaigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Nenpō* No. 9, 1958.

Johnston, E. H. (ed.): *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra* Patna, 1950.

Matsunaga Yūkei: (ed.) *Guhyasamājatantra*, *Journal of Koyasan University*, No. 10, 1975.

*Mikkyō kyōten seiritsushi ron* (『密教経典成立史論』), Hōzōkan, 1980.

Nāgārjuna: *Piṇḍikṛtasādhana*, Études et Textes Tantriques, *Pañcakrama*, par L. de la Vallée Poussin, Gand, 1896; P. Nos. 2661, 4788.

*Pañcakrama*, do., P. No. 2667.

Ratnākaraśānti: *Piṇḍikṛtasādhanopāyikāvṛtti-ratnāvalī-nāma*, P. No. 2667.

Ruegg, D. Seyfort: *Le Traité du Tathāgatarbha de Bu ston*, Paris, 1973.

Sakai Shinten: *Chibetto Mikkyōkyōri no kenkyū* (『チベット密教教理の研究』), Kōyasan, 1956.

Shimoda Masahiro: "Bu ston no Nyoraizō kaishaku" (「ブトンの如来蔵解釈」), *Chibetto no Bukkyō*

- to *Shakai*, Shunjūsha, Tōkyō, 1986.
- Steinkellner, Ernst: "Remarks on Tantristic Hermeneutics," *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica*, Vol. XXIII, Budapest, 1978.
- Takasaki Jikidō: *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga*, Serie Orientale Roma, Vol. XXXIII, Roma, 1966.
- Nyoraizō shisō no keisei* (『如来蔵思想の形成』), Shunjūsha, Tōkyō, 1974.
- "Yuishin to Nyoraizō" (『唯心と如来蔵』), *Bukkyōgaku (Journal of Buddhist Studies)*, Nos. 9, 10, Tōkyō, 1980.
- Tsong kha pa: *gSang 'dus sgron gsal le'u bcu gcig pa yan gyi mchan 'grel*, The Collected Works of rJe Tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa, Vol. 6, G. S. M., New Delhi, 1978.
- Tsuda Shin'ichi: "A Critical Tantrism," *The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 36, Tōkyō, 1978.
- "Mikkyō to Kū" (『密教と空』), *Bukkyōshisō* Vol. 7, Heirakujishoten, 1982.
- Wayman, Alex: *Yoga of the Guhyasamājatantra*, Delhi, 1977.
- Yamaguchi Zuihō: "Jo nan pa no Nyoraizōsetsu to sono hihansetsu" (『チョナンパの如来蔵説とその批判説』), *Bukkyōkyōri no kenkyū*, Shunjūsha, Tōkyō, 1982.
- Yoshimizu Chizuko: "Jñānapāda-ryū ni okeru Yugagyō-Chūgan setsu" (『Jñānapāda 流における瑜伽行中観説』), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies)*, Vol. XXXIV No. 1, 1985.
- "Tsong kha pa Himitsudōshidaidairon ni okeru kanjōron" (『ツォンカパ『秘密道次第大論』における灌頂論』), *Chibetto no Bukkyō to Shakai*, Shunjūsha, Tōkyō, 1986.

○大会記事 第33回日本西藏学会大会は、昭和61年11月29日(土)、東洋文庫で開催され、次の研究発表が行なわれた。

奥山直司(東北大学) 万神の集い—ペーコル・ Cholテンに関する調査報告—

吉永千鶴子(東京大学) bskyed rim の思想的基盤—Bu ston 著 dskyed rim gsal byed による

木村誠司(駒沢大学) 論理学の目的と限界  
福田洋一(東洋文庫) チベット撰述文献における形象真実論と形象虚偽論の設定について

佐藤道郎(岩手大学) 他空説の根本問題

光島 督(國土館大学) 吐蕃時代のボン教学派について

大会当日の総会において次の事柄が報告承認された。

1) 新たに次の方々に委員を依頼する：頼富本宏(種知院大学)。

2) 会費を五年滞納した者は、会費が払い込

まれるまで一時学会報の送付を中止する。

3) 会報33号の編集委員を北村 甫(言語)、山口瑞鳳(歴史)、袴谷憲昭(宗教)の三氏に依頼する。

4) 昭和62年度大会(第34回)を国立民族学博物館で開催する。

5) 昭和60年度会計報告

収入：

前年度繰越金	348,599円
会 費	586,500円
バックナンバー	9,900円
利 息	7,334円
合 計	952,333円

支出：

会報32号印刷費	216,000円
発送費	49,130円
事務連絡費	48,730円
謝 金	90,000円

合 計 403,860円

昭和61年度への繰越金 548,473円