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 *asādhanāṅgavacana*

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 Vāḍanyāya is original and differs from that of the Nyāya school. Dharmakīrti divides "the condition of defeat" between the *asādhanāṅgavacana*, which is the "the condition of defeat" for a disputant, and the *adosodbhāvana*, which is the "the condition of defeat" for an opponent. The purpose of this study was to analyze the *asādhanāṅgavacana*.

On analysis, it becomes clear that Dharmakīrti interprets *asādhanāṅgavacana* 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 *sādhanaṅga* is interpreted as a case-determined compound (*tatpurūṣa*) and in the fifth interpretation it is interpreted as a possessive compound (*bahuvrīhi*). (ii) In the first and fourth and fifth interpretations *sādhana* is interpreted as *siddhi* and in the second and third interpretations *sādhana* is interpreted as *karanasādhana*. (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 *sādhanāṅga*.

On the basis of these four sets of criteria, Dharmakīrti interprets *asādhanāṅgavacana* as the
following five meanings. The first meaning of \textit{asādhanāṅgavacana} is \textit{iṣṭasyārthasya siddhe kāraṇasyāvacanam}. The second meaning is \textit{trirūpahetuvacanasamudāyasya avayavasyāvacanam}. The third meaning is \textit{trirūpahetuvacanasamudāyasya anavayavasya vacanam}. The fourth meaning is \textit{iṣṭasyārthasya siddher akāraṇasya vacanam}. The fifth meaning is \textit{asādhanāṅgasyāprastutasya vacanam}. Furthermore, these five meanings are explained in more detail by use of logical concepts, for example, \textit{trividham lingam}, \textit{trirūpahetu}, \textit{hetvābhāsa} and so forth. In this way, Dharmakīrti gives his own original definition to "the condition of defeat".

\textbf{An Inquiry into Kamalāśīla’s Influence on the Definition of \textit{bodhicitta}}

\textsc{Satō Akira}

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

Kamalaśīla (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 (\textit{karunā}), the mind for enlightenment (\textit{bodhicitta}), and practice (\textit{pratipatti}). He classifies \textit{bodhicitta} into two types, namely, \textit{pranidhicitta} and \textit{prasthānacitta}. The first (\textit{pranidhicitta}) is the practitioner’s will to realize enlightenment for the salvation of all beings. This \textit{pranidhicitta} is connected with \textit{karunā}. The second (\textit{prasthānacitta}) is the mental foundation for practitioners who strive for self-control (\textit{saṃvaragrahaṇa}) and to collect supplies for entering into practice (\textit{pratipatti}). This \textit{prasthānacitta} is connected with \textit{pratipatti}. Kamalaśīla seems to systematize the course for Bodhisattvas (i.e., \textit{karunā} \rightarrow \textit{pranidhicitta} \rightarrow \textit{prasthānacitta} \rightarrow \textit{pratipatti}) by defining \textit{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 \textit{bodhicitta} differs from that in the BhKr I. Jñānakīrti classifies \textit{bodhicitta} into 22 types (i.e., three types of \textit{pranidhicitta} and 19 types of \textit{prasthānacitta}). Further, these 22 types are distinguished according to the practitioner’s mental stages, including the final stage (\textit{buddhabhūmi}). In this understanding, we can regard the completion of meditation on \textit{bodhicitta} as the cause of attainment of the final stage. But Jñānakīrti states that the cause