

## A Study of the Third Volume of the *Bhāvanākrama* of Kamalaśīla

ICHIGŌ Masamichi

This monograph contains a Japanese annotated translation of the third volume of the *Bhāvanākrama* of Kamalaśīla and presents my three views resulted from its translation work. Among them here in this summary I give the gist of my hypothesis of the order of writing the three volumes by analyzing their contents.

When Kamalaśīla was invited to Tibet and asked to teach the tenet of Indian Buddhism, he tried to teach its philosophy and practice. In his mind the philosophy was already established by his teacher Śāntarakṣita, the advocate of the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika school, in his *Madhyamakālaṃkāra*, on which Kamalaśīla wrote the subcommentary, the *pañjikā*.

The philosophy consists of the so-called *vipaśyanā contemplation*, that is, external entities are attributed to mind-only (*viññapti-mātratā*) from the standpoint of conventional truth and even mind-only is without intrinsic nature or self (*anātman*) from the standpoint of ultimate truth. On the other hand, Kamalaśīla himself found lacking a theory of practice in Śāntarakṣita's view. So he was being pressed to systematize the way to realize the truth (*bodhi*). Just at that time in the academic society of Tibetan Buddhism, there were some scholars who maintained that it was possible for practitioners to obtain liberation from transmigration without the practice of discernment and giving etc. But this was equivalent to the negation of Mahāyāna Buddhism for Kamalaśīla. Thus he criticized their views by expressing the Mahāyānist system of practice based on the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*.

A practitioner meditates gradually on the four kinds of objects: (a) *nirvikalpa-ālambana*, (b) *savikalpa-ālambana*, (c) *paryantatā*, and (d) *kārya-*

*niṣpatti*. (a) is realized by *śamatha*, (b) by *vipaśyanā*, (c) at the first stage (*bhūmi*) by both *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā* and (d) at the Buddhahood stage through the second and subsequent other stages by both as well. The four *ālambanas* themselves appear in the Maitreya chapter of the *Samdhinirmocanasūta* and can be traced back to the *Śrāvakabhūmi*. This is a summary of the third volume of the *Bhāvanākrama*. This volume starts without preamble with an explanation of *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā* which are nothing but the traditional method of Buddhist meditation. Kamalaśīla felt the necessity of describing the reason why the Mahāyānist also have to practise the *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*. This he presented at the beginning of the second volume, though it is missing from the third volume.

Kamalaśīla states that it is necessary for practitioners to practise *karuṇā*, *bodhicitta*, and *upāya* to obtain omniscience. The thought of enlightenment (*bodhicitta*) for supreme enlightenment comes by itself from the vow to rescue all creatures by cultivating compassion (*karuṇā*). The completion of the thought of enlightenment is made by practising both *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā* sincerely for a long time. This sketches the relationship between *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā* and the three factors mentioned above: *karuṇā*, *bodhicitta*, and *upāya*. Then, the second volume proceeds to explain the acquisition of the equipment (*saṃbhāra*) of *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*, a concrete description of their practices, etc. The second volume of the *Bhāvanākrama* is mostly devoted to an explanation of the *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*, and does not much describe the practical system of the four *ālambanas* which appear in the third volume.

Kamalaśīla's theory of practice can be said to be almost completed by the explanation found both in the second and the third volume. But Kamalaśīla himself might be dissatisfied with his explanation in the following aspects: 1) there is much overlapped explanation in both volumes. 2) the description of the *vipaśyanā contemplation* of the philosophical development from the mind-only theory to the non-self could be expanded more. 3) the originality of the view of *vipaśyanā* by the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika school is

insufficient. 4) the mind-only theory which he evaluates highly should be explained more not only on the basis of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* but also through more developed *vijñāna-vāda* texts such as the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* and the *Mahāyānasamgraha*.

These concerns seem to have pressed him to write the first volume. In this sense, the first was made as a synthesis of the second and the third, adopting from both volumes the necessary contents as they are on one hand, and making up for a deficiency on the other hand. So the first volume is thicker in quantity and higher in the degree of completion of the contents than the others.

In conclusion I tentatively understand the order of writing as follows : the third volume → the second → the first. This hypothesis is different from the tradition in Tibet, which was the other as, the first volume → the second → the third. The first volume most completely explains how to practice and the fruits of that practice. I think it is obvious that there would have been no need to write the two less complete texts later than the more complete one. According to my opinion, all three texts were written not in India but in Tibet.