

## English summary

and the other as means of cognition, but ultimately the means of cognition came to be referred to as *pramāṇa* and the result of cognition as the result of *pramāṇa*. However, the result of *pramāṇa* is always established separately from *pramāṇa*, and so the result of *pramāṇa* is consciousness of what is to be abandoned and so on (*hānādibuddhi*) when *pramāṇa* is cognition of an object. Therefore, it is not specific to the Buddhist logico-epistemological school to use the word *pramāṇa* in the meaning of cognition, but we can acknowledge its distinctiveness in that, while regarding *pramāṇa* as cognition, they avoided establishing the result of *pramāṇa* separately from cognition through the metaphorical usage of the word *pramāṇa*.

## Dharmakīrti's Interpretation of *nigrahasthāna* (1): On *asāadhanāṅgavacana*

SASAKI Ryo

It is well known that Dharmakīrti (ca. 600-660) explains "the condition of defeat" (*nigrahasthāna*), which is the traditional concept of debate, in detail in the *Vādanyāya*. However, it had not been sufficiently clarified by preceding studies that the definition of "the condition of defeat" in the *Vādanyāya* is original and differs from that of the *Nyāya* school. Dharmakīrti divides "the condition of defeat" between the *asāadhanāṅgavacana*, which is the "the condition of defeat" for a disputant, and the *adoṣodbhāvana*, which is the "the condition of defeat" for an opponent. The purpose of this study was to analyze the *asāadhanāṅgavacana*.

On analysis, it becomes clear that Dharmakīrti interprets *asāadhanāṅgavacana* as having five meanings according to the following criteria: (i) a case relation between *sādhana* and *aṅga*, (ii) the meaning of the word *sādhana*, (iii) the meaning of the word *aṅga*, and (iv) the method of adding the prefix *a-*. To be specific, the findings are as follows. In the case of (i), in the first, second, third and fourth interpretations *sāadhanāṅga* is interpreted as a case-determined compound (*tatpuruṣa*) and in the fifth interpretation it is interpreted as a possessive compound (*bahuvrīhi*). (ii) In the first, fourth and fifth interpretations *sādhana* is interpreted as *siddhi* and in the second and third interpretations *sādhana* is interpreted as *karaṇasādhana*. (iii) In the first and fourth interpretations *aṅga* is interpreted as *kāraṇa* and in the second and third interpretations *aṅga* is interpreted as *avayava* and in the fifth interpretation *aṅga* is interpreted as *dharma*. (iv) In the first and second interpretations the prefix *a-* is added to *vacana* and in the third, fourth and fifth interpretations the prefix *a-* is added to *sāadhanāṅga*.

On the basis of these four sets of criteria, Dharmakīrti interprets *asāadhanāṅgavacana* as the

following five meanings. The first meaning of *asādhānāṅgavacana* is *iṣṭasyārthasya siddheḥ kāraṇasyāvacanam*. The second meaning is *trirūpāhetuvacanasamudāyasya avayavyāvacanam*. The third meaning is *trirūpāhetuvacanasamudāyasya anavayavyasya vacanam*. The fourth meaning is *iṣṭasyārthasya siddher akāraṇasya vacanam*. The fifth meaning is *asādhānāṅgasyāprastutasya vacanam*. Furthermore, these five meanings are explained in more detail by use of logical concepts, for example, *trividhaṃ liṅgam*, *trirūpāhetu*, *hetvābhāsa* and so forth. In this way, Dharmakīrti gives his own original definition to "the condition of defeat".

## An Inquiry into Kamalāśīla's Influence on the Definition of *bodhicitta*

SATŌ Akira

This paper inquires into Kamalāśīla's influence on the definition of the mind that aspires to enlightenment (*bodhicitta*) in late Mahāyāna Buddhism. It consists of two parts. In the first part, I reconfirm Kamalāśīla's understanding of *bodhicitta* in his *First Bhāvanākrama* (BhKr I). Then, in the second part, I consider Jñānakīrti's understanding in his *Pāramitāyānabhāvanākramopadeśa* (PBhU).

Kamalāśīla (ca. 740–795), a scholar representative of the Yogācāra-Madhyamaka school, shows in his BhKr-I the course for Bodhisattvas to realize enlightenment. This course consists of three stages, namely, compassion (*karuṇā*), the mind for enlightenment (*bodhicitta*), and practice (*pratipatti*). He classifies *bodhicitta* into two types, namely, *prañidhicitta* and *prasthānacitta*. The first (*prañidhicitta*) is the practitioner's will to realize enlightenment for the salvation of all beings. This *prañidhicitta* is connected with *karuṇā*. The second (*prasthānacitta*) is the mental foundation for practitioners who strive for self-control (*saṃvaragrahaṇa*) and to collect supplies for entering into practice (*pratipatti*). This *prasthānacitta* is connected with *pratipatti*. Kamalāśīla seems to systematize the course for Bodhisattvas (i.e., *karuṇā* ⇒ *prañidhicitta* — *prasthānacitta* ⇒ *pratipatti*) by defining *bodhicitta* in this way.

Jñānakīrti (ca. 9c.), who is presumed to have been a scholar of the Vajrayāna, wrote the PBhU on the basis of the BhKr I. However, his understanding of *bodhicitta* differs from that in the BhKr I. Jñānakīrti classifies *bodhicitta* into 22 types (i.e., three types of *prañidhicitta* and 19 types of *prasthānacitta*). Further, these 22 types are distinguished according to the practitioner's mental stages, including the final stage (*buddhabhūmi*). In this understanding, we can regard the completion of meditation on *bodhicitta* as the cause of attainment of the final stage. But Jñānakīrti states that the cause