Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 77 (2023)

Heft: 1

Artikel: Where did Kamalala compose his works, and does it even matter? : Reflections on the activities of Indian scholars in imperial Tibet

Autor: Kellner, Birgit

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1055082

Birgit Kellner*

Where Did Kamalaśīla Compose His Works, and Does It Even Matter? Reflections on the Activities of Indian Scholars in Imperial Tibet

https://doi.org/10.1515/asia-2023-0003
Received January 16, 2023; accepted August 4, 2023

Abstract: This article reflects on the activities of the Indian Buddhist scholar-monk Kamalaśīla (c. 740–795) in imperial Tibet. Following accounts offered by Tibetan historians of later periods, these activities have so far been understood as more or less limited to Kamalaśīla's victorious participation in the historically momentous "Great Debate" at Bsam yas monastery against the Chinese Chan master Heshang Moheyan. This article suggests that he also composed altogether seven of his works – and possibly more – while residing in Tibet, and sketches aspects of his intellectual profile on this basis. While remaining focused on Kamalaśīla, the article also raises wider-ranging questions regarding the activities of Indian Buddhist scholars in imperial Tibet against the backdrop of interconnected histories across South, Central and East Asia.

Keywords: Bsam yas debate; Buddhist philosophy; Kamalaśīla; Tibetan intellectual history

Research for this article was conducted within the research project "Rationality, Meditation and Liberation in Indian Buddhism – Kamalaśīla's Scriptural Commentaries in Context," supported by the Austrian Science Fund (project no. FWF P32617-G) and hosted by the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Chizuko Yoshimizu offered important comments at the Vienna symposium "Kamalaśīla's Significance in the Intellectual History of Buddhism" (4–6 March 2022) where this paper was first presented, which led to several revisions and improvements. Unfortunately, owing to practical limitations, not all of her valuable suggestions could be followed. I would also like to thank Pei-Lin Chiou, Hiroko Matsuka and Margherita Serena Saccone for helpful comments and corrections. Cynthia Peck-Kubaczek kindly improved and corrected my English.

***Corresponding author: Birgit Kellner**, Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Wien, Austria, E-mail: birgit.kellner@oeaw.ac.at. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6076-5182

1 Introduction

Kamalaśīla (c. 740–795)[1] and his teacher Śāntarakṣita (c. 725–788) rank as major intellectual figures in late medieval Indian Buddhism. Both have a voluminous oeuvre to their credit, testifying to wide-ranging erudition over the entire spectrum of Indian religio-philosophical traditions, Buddhist and non-Buddhist alike. Their significance for the intellectual history of Buddhism in South Asia is due to their articulation, justification and defense of a distinctive philosophical-soteriological program that synthesizes the analyses of reality and consciousness of Yogācāra and Madhyamaka, the two thought systems of the Mahāyāna that dominated the philosophical discourse of their time. At the core of this synthesis is a hierarchical arrangement of the main principles defining these systems, this premised on the traditional Buddhist distinction between the conventional and the ultimate as two different levels of analysis. The Yogācāra principle of "mere-cognition" (*vijñaptimātra<tā>*) or "mere-mind" (*cittamātra*) claiming that all objects of experience have no existence independent of the consciousness displaying them represents the highest conventional analysis of reality. The Madhyamaka principle of universal emptiness represents the ultimate analysis. In addition, these two thinkers avail themselves of theories and methods from within the field of Buddhist logic and epistemology (*pramāṇa*) centering around the works of Dignāga (c. 480–540) and Dharmakīrti (between mid-sixth and mix-seventh centuries CE), and actively contribute to their further development.

Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla were also instrumental in the establishment of Buddhist doctrines, practices and institutions in the Tibetan empire, which reached its largest territorial expansion in Kamalaśīla's later years. Both were invited to Central Tibet by emperor Khri srong lde btsan (r. 755–795/8), Śāntarakṣita for a first time around 763, and Kamalaśīla shortly after Śāntarakṣita's death. It is in fact only because of these invitations and the following activities of the two in the Tibetan empire that we can place them in history, since practically all of the extant biographical information is provided by Tibetan sources. Next to nothing is known about the lives of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla before they traveled to Tibet. Śāntarakṣita is linked to the celebrated monastic center of Nālandā and likely received his earlier formation in local monasteries of the region.[2] Kamalaśīla was most

1 The life-dates have been proposed in Frauwallner 1961: 141–144; they essentially depend upon a set of Tibetan historiographies. In the case of Kamalaśīla, in particular, there is some leeway on both ends. A recent overview of Kamalaśīla's life and works is given in Marks/Eltschinger 2019. Sørensen (1994: 400 and n. 1362) dates Śāntarakṣita's passing to 797 (cf. also Scherrer-Schaub 2014: 121, n. 12).

2 Scherrer-Schaub specifically points to monastic centers in the present-day Rajshahi division of Bangladesh (Scherrer-Schaub 2014: 121–122, n. 13).

probably connected with Nālandā as well; he was closely related to his teacher and composed two extensive and historically influential commentaries on the latter's main philosophical works, these commentaries being the *Madhyamakālaṅkāra-pañjikā* (henceforth MAP) and the *Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā* (henceforth TSP). Nearly all of Kamalaśīla's works are preserved only in Tibetan translation; thirteen translations are recorded in the *Lhan dkar ma* catalogue and can therefore be presumed to have been completed by 812, at most seventeen years after his death.[3]

Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla resided in Tibet in a period when Tibetan state support for Buddhism solidified and expanded, in connection with an overall "internationalization" in the wake of political and military expansion. The construction and founding of Bsam yas monastery in South Central Tibet around 779 – supervised by Śāntarakṣita – marks the inception of an expansive monastic infrastructure. Since Tibetans had been in contact with surrounding regions with longer Buddhist histories for some time already, Buddhist strands shaped in different geographical and cultural contexts came in touch with each other in Central Tibet. Chinese Buddhist masters found a receptive audience for their teachings among the Tibetan nobility; their arrival would have been precipitated by the Tibetan conquest of Dunhuang, probably in 787. Judging from the depiction of this period in Tibetan Buddhist historiographies, all dating to at least three hundred years after the events, the support among the Tibetan nobility of Indian and/or Chinese Buddhist teachings led to doctrinal disagreements, as well as some social unrest. One of the key episodes in the narrative complex of how Buddhism arrived in Tibet is the "Great Debate" at Bsam yas. In this public debate, Kamalaśīla, whom Khri srong lde btsan had invited to pacify the situation following a prophecy of inner-Buddhist discord by Śāntarakṣita, proved victorious against the Chinese Chan master Moheyan. This victory is taken to mark the imperial authority's definitive decision to henceforth favor Indian Buddhism.[4]

Based on this episode, Kamalaśīla's activities in Tibet have thus far been largely understood as limited to his participation in the "Great Debate." From among his works, the third of his altogether three treatises entitled *Bhāvanākrama* (henceforth BhK 3) is most directly linked to the debate and generally held to have been composed in connection with it; approximately two thirds of BhK 3 are devoted to a polemical refutation of an unnamed opponent who can readily be identified as Moheyan.[5] However, there are first of all good reasons to believe that the debate did not take

3 For discussions of Kamalaśīla's oeuvre, see Schoening 1992: 221, n. 3, and Keira 2004: 3 (as well as Marks/Eltschinger 2019). For the dating of the *Lhan dkar ma*, see Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: xviii–xxii.

4 Cf. the thorough discussion of early – that is, pre-Bu ston – historiographies in Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 63–92. Biondo 2021 now offers a detailed and illuminating comparison of the debate narrative in the "Testimony of Ba" (cf. below), specifically in the *Dba' bzhed* and in the different *Sba bzhed* versions.

5 BhK 3 13,16–30,13.

place in the way Tibetan historiographies commonly depict it: as a single event in which Kamalaśīla, Moheyan and their respective supporters among Tibetan nobility exchanged positions, and where Khri srong lde btsan's final expression of support for the Indian side marked a clear and decisive victory. Ever since Demiéville's pioneering study "Le Concile de Lhasa" (Demiéville 1952), it has been frequently pointed out that Dunhuang documents closer in time to the reported events paint a rather different picture of their course as well as of their outcome. The most significant document in this regard, a Chinese-language compilation entitled *Dunwu dasheng zhengli jue* (henceforth ZLJ), contains three exchanges of questions and records the Chinese side as victorious. When evidence from Central Tibet and Dunhuang is pieced together and put in historical perspective, it becomes far more likely that the "debate" was a more complicated, drawn-out and open-ended process of controversial exchange than the dramatized accounts in Tibetan historiographies would suggest – a process that may have involved personal encounters among a larger group of persons, as well as the exchange of written treatises.[6] The very depiction of the controversy as a scholarly debate in the style practiced in Indian Buddhist monastic centers – and a particularly dramatic one at that – may well be a rational reconstruction,[7] for it seems doubtful that Moheyan, a Chinese Chan master from Dunhuang, could have quickly familiarized himself with such an intricate intellectual practice stemming from an Indian context. As far as the course of the controversy is concerned, it remains worth noting that texts associated with Moheyan's position continued to be propagated in the Dunhuang area after his demise; methods that are significantly similar to his became part of Rdzogs chen and Mahāmudrā teachings and impacted later Tibetan religious history.[8]

But if the "Great Debate" was a controversy that unfolded over a longer period of time, it may also be worthwhile to consider whether Kamalaśīla's activities in Tibet might not have been wider-ranging. Focusing on his works, which are the most evident and long-lasting traces of his activities, one may wonder whether other works over and above BhK 3 might similarly have been composed in response to the intellectual environment in which this controversy unfolded, or whether they, too, might have in fact been intended as contributions within the context of this controversy. And moving beyond the context of the "Bsam yas controversy" – for want of a better expression – we should not exclude from the outset that he might have

6 On this point, see also Van Schaik 2015: 115.

7 Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 82.

8 On this aspect, see especially the various studies by David Higgins (among others, Higgins 2006, Higgins 2013), Van Schaik 2015, as well as the special section on "The Tibetan Samyé Debate: Challenges and Responses" in the *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 39 (2016–17).

composed works while in Tibet for reasons other than the desire to refute Moheyan's position.

In what follows, I will argue that at least six works in addition to the third *Bhāvanākrama* merit being considered as constituting a "Tibetan" corpus within Kamalaśīla's oeuvre, a Tibetan corpus that thus comes to a total of seven works:

1. the first *Bhāvanākrama* (henceforth BhK 1),
2. the second *Bhāvanākrama* (henceforth BhK 2),
3. the third *Bhāvanākrama,*
4. the *Madhyamakāloka* (henceforth MĀ), which is Kamalaśīla's major independent Madhyamaka treatise,
5. the **Vajracchedikāṭīkā* (henceforth VChṬ),
6. the **Avikalpa-* or **Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭīkā* (henceforth APDhṬ),
7. the **Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayaṭīkā* (henceforth HṬ).[9]

The last three works are *sūtra* commentaries, of which Kamalaśīla authored altogether five; this is by far the least studied part of his oeuvre.[10] Of all seven works, only BhK 1 and 3 are extant in Sanskrit, in pioneering editions produced by Giuseppe Tucci.[11] For BhK 1, there is only one undated Sanskrit manuscript on palm-leaf (lacking the first folio), found by Tucci in Spos khang monastery in West Central Tibet in 1939.[12] A composite palm-leaf manuscript from the Tibetan Autonomous Region recently discussed by Matsuda indicates that shorter extracts from BhK 1 circulated independently.[13] For BhK 3, there is also only one undated Sanskrit manuscript, on

---

9 On the title of No. 7, see Horiuchi 2021: 54, n. 3. The titles of Nos.5–7 are not attested in Sanskrit and have been retranslated from the Classical Tibetan. For the sake of simplicity, the asterisk indicating the retranslated nature of the title is only used in the following when the full titles are mentioned, not for the abbreviations. Also for the sake of simplicity, the abbreviation APDhṬ is used for the **Avikalpa-* or **Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭīkā,* and only the full title **Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭīkā* is used in the following.

10 In addition to the three listed here, Kamalaśīla is also credited with a commentary on the *Śālistambasūtra* (D4001, P5502; Schoening 1995) and one on the *Saptaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā* (D3815, P5215).

11 Revised critical editions of BhK 1 and 3 are currently being produced by Francesco Sferra (BhK 1) and myself (BhK 3).

12 Tucci 1958: 6. Judging from the colophon and the first missing folio, this appears to be the same manuscript that Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana saw in Zha lu in 1936 (Sāṅkṛtyāyana 1937: 39, no. 267), even though Tucci's and Sāṅkṛtyāyana's overall folio count differs. The beginning portion has been edited in Kimura et al. 1998.

13 Matsuda 2019; the composite manuscript contains: (1) a *prajñāpāramitābhāvanākrama* corresponding to BhK 1 210,10–212,10 (fols. 60v–61v), an explanation of the process of reflective meditation fashioned as a commentary on *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* X.256–258; (2) a short *prajñāpāramitopadeśabhāvanākrama* ascribed to Kamalaśīla in the colophon (fols. 62r–62v), corresponding to BhK 1 208,3–23, which discusses the six defects (*doṣa*) of meditative practice and their counteragents.

paper and complete, but damaged; it is kept in the collection of the Asiatic Museum of the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg.[14] Moreover, two leaves of a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Madhyamakāloka* have also been recently identified by Ye, Li and Kanō.[15] All these Sanskrit manuscript materials date to the eleventh century or later, while the Tibetan translations of all seven works were completed before the early ninth.

Like much of Indian Buddhist doctrinal literature, none of these works in and of themselves offer clues to the specific historical conditions and circumstances of their composition. Arguments in favor of or against a particular production context involve examining character, style and contents of these and related texts, together with (scarce) external evidence. They also require reflecting on just how these works might constitute responses to the environment that Kamalaśīla encountered in Tibet, and how they relate to his intellectual pursuits as known from other works of his.

2 Historical, Conceptual and Methodological Preliminaries

The idea that an Indian paṇḍita in Tibet in the late eighth century composes works in Sanskrit aimed at a Tibetan-speaking audience might sound *prima facie* eccentric. However, once we consider the sociolinguistic and cultural conditions of the time, this scenario acquires some plausibility. Some Tibetan translation colophons indicate that this in fact happened, including that of the canonical translation of Kamalaśīla's own first *Bhāvanākrama.* It would be worthwhile investigating translation colophons for such references on a larger scale.[16] During Kamalaśīla's time in Tibet, first Tibetan generations of scholar-monks were trained in Sanskrit, since they were collaborating with Indian masters to produce translations in a more or less organized manner. The process of translation eventually became institutionalized in special translator colleges, colleges which may have already existed during Kamalaśīla's lifetime.[17] Translation also became highly regulated. Members of the Tibetan Buddhist scholarly élite in this period were thus schooled in Sanskrit.

---

14 Photographs are published in Obermiller 1963 (posthumously). For the history of this manuscript, see Kanō 2016. Note that it is part of the same bundle that includes a manuscript of the *Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* (used in the edition Matsuda 1996).

15 See below, p. 19.

16 For the translation colophon of BhK 1, see below p. 22, for the related issue of the colophon of Vimalamitra's Heart Sūtra commentary, see p. 35.

17 Mention is made of such colleges in the Tabo version of the *Sgra sbyor bam po gnis pa*, a royal decree with a lexicographical commentary regulating translation. This version can be dated to 783 or

Conversely, I am not aware of any Indian paṇḍita having learned Tibetan as a written language, which at this time was very much still under formation, in part precisely due to translation projects from Sanskrit as well as Chinese. Some paṇḍitas might well have acquired perfunctory knowledge of the spoken idiom. Bilingual scholars from border regions, such as Śāntarakṣita's personal translator, the Kashmiri brahmin Ananta,[18] can be assumed to have played an important role as mediators and cultural brokers. Translation from Sanskrit in any case loomed large as a cultural practice in Buddhist circles. In such an environment, Indian teachings and texts must have been rendered into Tibetan rather quickly, especially when they were regarded as important for pressing controversies such as the one behind the "Great Debate". By the same token, Indian scholars that were present could well have readily composed works – in Sanskrit – for a Tibetan audience when they saw the need to deal with certain issues, or were approached to do so.

When addressing the "composition" of Kamalaśīla's works in Tibet, moreover, we must be careful regarding what kind of process we understand by this notion. Certainly it would be ahistorical to understand "composition" on the model of an individual author's silent, private production of a text in writing, a model that is tacitly presumed for the modern period, albeit not without problems even there. Scholarly practices in late medieval India were embedded in situations of teaching, of oral instruction and transmission, and of more or less regulated disputation. To "compose" a work in such a context would have meant that a text gradually became fixed orally, perhaps in instalments, through more or less repeated instruction and/or debate. Instruction would have included elements of disputation; in any case, the boundaries between these two activities should not be assumed as particularly rigid. At some point a text must have been written down by the author or by others in their proximity – disciples, scribes or persons operating in both functions – with, presumably, some kind of authorial approval of the final product. In imperial Tibet, translation into Tibetan was an additional factor that may have already intervened at the stage when Sanskrit texts were being fixed in writing. The overall situation would have been quite similar. As the hypotheticals in this rendition indicate, the extant historical record does not generally permit us to grasp these steps in detail, and further complexities – for instance, the circulation of different versions of a work already from the outset – must also be taken into consideration. Still, it remains preferable to refer to such a process as "composition" when it comes to single-authored treatises and commentaries of the kind that constitute Kamalaśīla's oeuvre – if only to preserve a clear and necessary distinction between such works and texts that formed as compilations over a longer period of time, such as the *Yogācārabhūmi*, as is

795 (Panglung 1994). A thorough analysis of the *Sgra sbyor* is given in Scherrer-Schaub 2002, together with a more general discussion of translation regulation.

18 Scherrer-Schaub 2002: 275.

well established by Schmithausen's analysis. Kamalaśīla's works were arguably governed by a single person's intentionality and agency that led to a final written product which is accessible to us, even if this "access" involves much philological reconstruction owing to the vagaries of textual transmission. Helmut Krasser's hypothesis notwithstanding that certain Indian Buddhist philosophical works were the product of students' lecture notes, it would be quite excessive to use such cases as justification for deconstructing historical authorship completely.[19]

An important methodological problem is raised by the overall enterprise of writing an intellectual history of Buddhism; it is related to how historical Buddhist intellectuals "responded" to an environment. To write such a history involves reconstructing how ideas and theories are both products of and responses to specific intellectual, social (in this case primarily socio-religious) and even political environments in the broader sense of the term. In the case of Kamalaśīla, we are dealing with a set of doctrinal conceptions, soteriological and philosophical in nature, presented in texts of an expository, argumentative and/or exegetical nature. For a Buddhist intellectual to "respond" to aspects of their environment can, however, mean a number of things. Polemical engagement of the kind encountered in the third *Bhāvanākrama* is a straightforward and overt "response". As marked intentional acts with the potential of effecting historical change, such overt responses play a prominent role in writing intellectual history. However, Buddhist intellectuals may have also responded to their environment in other historically significant ways. Kamalaśīla's first *Bhāvanākrama*, for instance, is an exposition of a particular conception of what the Mahāyāna is, and has the character of a textbook or manual of Mahāyāna Buddhism. The text expounds the bodhisattva ideal and lays out bodhisattvic practice as grounded in great compassion and requiring the development of both insight and expedient means (*prajñā* and *upāya*) with the goal of the unfixed *nirvāṇa*, the *apratiṣṭhitanirvāṇa*, as a kind of in-between state where the bodhisattva is neither entrapped in *saṃsāra* nor completely removed from it. Composing a work with such a general orientation may in and of itself constitute a response to an environment like late eighth-century Tibet, in which alternative and conflicting views on fundamental issues are being propagated, even if this environment is not explicitly addressed in the text. Besides, composing such manuals would also meet the didactic needs of a nascent monastic community, in this case, again, in Tibet.

Arguments such as these, however, raise the question whether a composition in an Indian environment would not be equally plausible, or even more likely. In the

19 Krasser 2011; note also Lopez' suggestion in Lopez 1996: 80–81 that Kamalaśīla's HṬ might have been noted down by students, since it seems to have been written in a more hurried style than Kamalaśīla's philosophical treatises. Such suppositions would however have to be examined through more detailed textual studies and in light of the style of Kamalaśīla's other *sūtra* commentaries. However, since these are only accessible in Tibetan translation, it remains questionable how far one could get with this line of research in the case of Kamalaśīla.

case of Kamalaśīla, this boils down to asking whether a work was composed before his journey to Tibet or after, if we follow the division, as suggested by Tibetan historiographies, of his life into an earlier "Indian" period and a (shorter) later one spent in Tibet. I am going to follow this division, if only because there is no evidence that would suggest otherwise, and furthermore assume that Kamalaśīla's "Indian" period was primarily spent in the Pāla realm in Eastern India, possibly also to some extent in Nepal.[20] In this connection, it is worth noting that we are dealing with two regions – Eastern India and the Tibetan plateau – that underwent remarkably parallel developments in the period under consideration. These two regions, as well as these developments, were also interconnected. Both were at this time subject to political and military expansionism; the early Pāla rulers Gopāla (c. 750–775) and Dharmapāla (ca. 775–812)[21] extended their sway westward from Bengal, while the Tibetan empire under the reign of Khri srong lde btsan attained its largest geographical expansion after the fall of Dunhuang, probably in 787. In both domains, political expansion was coupled with an increasing support of Buddhism and its monastic infrastructure on the part of the respective ruling houses. Pāla inscriptions document grants of villages to Buddhist monasteries, as well as new monastic foundations, as part of a policy of extending generous support to several religious groups.[22] In Tibet the pillar edict of Bsam yas monastery from 780 made imperial support for Buddhism definitive.[23]

This parallelism is significant because it means that quite similar conditions prevailed within these otherwise different domains. Buddhist learning was actively supported by rulers in both realms, and as a consequence it can be presumed that there was a general need for didactic and exegetical literature in both regions. An appeal to a didactic motivation in general will therefore not be sufficient to place a particular work of Kamalaśīla in either of these environments. As a matter of fact, considering the commonalities between the two realms, one may well ask provocatively whether it even matters where Kamalaśīla composed his works, considering that the conditions to which he would have been responding were quite similar. However, as I shall try to demonstrate, there are additional factors that tip the balance in favor of composition in Tibet in some cases, and that also render certain features of the works in question more intelligible.

---

20 In Śāntarakṣita's prophecy before his death, related in the *Dba' bzhed*, Kamalaśīla dwells in Nepal (*Dba' bzhed* 19v2; translation Wangdu/Diemberger 2000: 78; text and translation Gonkatsang/Willis 2021: 136–137).

21 For Pāla chronology, see Sanderson 2009: 87–96, especially p. 87 and n. 154.

22 Sanderson 2009, Scherrer-Schaub 2014, and more recently Furui 2020.

23 For the Tibetan text of the pillar inscription, see Richardson 1985: 28. The edict of Bsam yas is alluded to in contemporary (or quasi-contemporary) documents of Dunhuang and recorded in the *Mkhas pa'i dga' ston* (short KhG); see Scherrer-Schaub 2002: 266–268. The KhG describes the inscription as a summary of two documents, an edict (*bka' gtsigs*), and an authoritative account (*bka' mchid*).

3 On the Composition of the *Madhyamakāloka* and the First Two *Bhāvanākramas* in Tibet

A Tibetan tradition whose narrative of the imperial period dates to the 11th or 12th century claims that the MĀ as well as the three BhKs were composed in Tibet. This claim is found in certain versions of the "Testimony of Ba", an early Tibetan tradition of how Buddhism was brought to Tibet that survives in several versions. Their complex relationships have most recently been revisited by Doney.[24] Rather than being a single text, the "Testimony" is perhaps better viewed as a "bundle of closely allied texts",[25] with noticeable differences and a complex transmission history. The passage in question is found in the *Sba' bzhed* version as edited by Stein,[26] but not in the *Dba' bzhed* manuscript first edited by Wangdu and Diemberger;[27] it is cited in Dpa' bo gtsug lag phreng ba's *Mkhas pa'i dga' ston*, a 16th-century history of Tibetan Buddhism that incorporates numerous passages from older works, both chronicles and edicts:

> KhG Ja 119b2–5: *de nas slob dpon ka ma la shi la la btsan pos chos thams cad thos bsam sgom gsum gyis bdag med par gtan la phab pa'i chos de ji ltar lags pa yi ger dgod par zhus pas sgom rim dang po brtsams nas gnang*[28] */ rjes gzigs pas don dgongs te da de'i don stan thog gcig du sgom na ji ltar sgom zhus pas sgom rim bar pa brtsams nas gnang / de la 'bras bu ji ltar mchi zhus pas sgom rim tha ma 'bras bu bstan pa brtsams nas gnang / 'bras bu bstan pa'i zhar la hva shang gi lta ba nor ba de sun phyung nas gnang /de la shin tu dgyes pas de'i don 'grel du bo dhi sa tva'i dgongs pa la rgol ba byung gis dogs pa don du lung dang rigs pa 'brel bar dbu ma snang ba brtsams nas brtsan po la gnang ngo [zhes rba bzhed khungs thub las byung ba'i lta ba bkod pa'o]/.*
>
> Then, the emperor [i.e., Khri srong lde btsan] asked the master, Kamalaśīla, to write down the teaching by which one determines, through hearing, reflection and meditation, that all *dharmas* are selfless. [Kamalaśīla] therefore wrote the first *Bhāvanākrama* and gave it [to him]. The emperor read it and thought about [its] meaning, and then asked [Kamalaśīla] how he [should] meditate upon the meaning of that [doctrine] in a systematic manner. So [Kamalaśīla] wrote the middle *Bhāvanākrama* and gave it [to him]. [And] since [he] asked [Kamalaśīla] what the result [of meditation] would be like in this case, [Kamalaśīla] wrote the last *Bhāvanākrama* which explains the result and gave it [to him]. In the course of explaining the result, [Kamalaśīla] refuted the mistaken views of Hva shang and gave [that to the emperor]. [The emperor] was very pleased with it. So then, by way of a commentary on the meaning of that [last BhK?], and

24 See his chapter 1 in Doney 2021.

25 Doney 2021: 4.

26 Houston 1980: 62,29–63,2.

27 Wangdu/Diemberger 2000. The text has also been edited and translated into English by Tsering Gonkatsang and Michael Willis in Doney 2021: 101–157.

28 The reading *gnang* in the *Sba' bzhed* is preferable over *snang* in the KhG; the same variation occurs twice in this passage.

> because he was concerned that the thought of the Bodhisattva [i.e., Śāntarakṣita] might be criticized, [Kamalaśīla] wrote the *Madhyamakāloka*, linking scripture and reason, and then gave it to the emperor.[29]

The "Testimony" is an assemblage of texts showing clear signs of redaction. The compilers and redactors drew on various other historiographical sources as well as doctrinal literature; the narrative of the Bsam yas debate, for instance, incorporates passages from (a version of) Kamalaśīla's third *Bhāvanākrama*.[30] This particular account is thus best treated as a kind of rational reconstruction. It responds to the question as to how four of Kamalaśīla's works are related to each other, and offers a rationale for his composition of three *Bhāvanākrama*s by assigning them different topics: the teaching that is apprehended through insight (born from hearing, reflection and meditation), the method of meditative cultivation, and the result. At the same time, the passage arguably effects a special connection of these works with Tibet by linking them with requests on the part of the emperor. Yet, despite the possibility that this particular rationale might have been fashioned at some fairly late stage in the transmission of the "Testimony of Ba", this does not rule out that it might still be based on a cultural memory of actual events. In short, it deserves to be taken seriously, but not literally.

Setting aside the third *Bhāvanākrama*, which we can safely assume as having been composed in Tibet, how does the assertion fare that the other two BhKs and the MĀ were also composed there if this assertion is considered against the background of other evidence? And what would the composition of these works in Tibet tell us about the nature and scope of Kamalaśīla's intellectual activities in Tibet at large? These are the questions to which I will turn first. After that I will address some of Kamalaśīla's *sūtra* commentaries and discuss them in light of the same questions.

The evidence for settling where the MĀ, BhK 1 and BhK 2 were composed consists of text-external, historical evidence about the reception of these works, as well as text-internal evidence from their contents. As regards the latter, it is relevant to determine whether – and if so, how – these works in any way respond to the situation Kamalaśīla encountered in Tibet. Since at least a part of his response is constituted by the polemical engagement with Moheyan reflected in BhK 3, it will be helpful to briefly recall the position that Kamalaśīla defended against Moheyan, and how he thought Moheyan's position was wrong.[31]

---

29 KhG Ja 119b2-5 (also translated in Keira 2004: 7), text also in Houston 1980: 22, with translation (different from Keira's) on pp. 40–41.

30 Biondo 2021: 77–78.

31 The following short summary is based on the more extensive treatment of Kamalaśīla's approach to non-conceptual gnosis (*nirvikalpajñāna*) in Kellner 2020. Note that it also relies on BhK 1, but only

In Tibetan sources approximately from the 11th century onward, the Bsam yas controversy has been framed as a confrontation between "instantaneism" and "gradualism". These categories form part of inner-Buddhist polemics in Tibet that are historically also related to a rich and variegated earlier religio-cultural discourse in China.[32] Kamalaśīla's gradualist (Tib. *rim gyis pa*) idea that awakening and liberation are the result of a progressive, step-by-step process of moral and mental cultivation is pitted against Moheyan's instantaneist (Tib. *[g]cig c[h]ar ba*) conception of awakening as the result of a single meditative practice geared to overcome discursive thought and conceptualization. Both parties concur that conceptualization needs to be eliminated, since it distorts reality and generates attachment. However, they disagree on the methods that are suitable for accomplishing this. For Kamalaśīla, a bodhisattva must develop insight and expedient means in gradations. In developing insight, the bodhisattva must successively cultivate three kinds, respectively, insight born from audition (i.e., scriptural study), reflection (i.e., rational inquiry), and meditative cultivation (*śruta-/cintā-/bhāvanāmayī prajñā*). Each subsequent type of insight presupposes the development of the previous one. Within the cultivation of insight, a conceptual understanding of emptiness that is produced by scriptural study followed by rational inquiry is a precondition for meditative cultivation (*bhāvanā*). Meditative cultivation itself comprises, as two complementary practices, tranquility meditation (*śamatha*) and reflective meditation (*vipaśyanā*). Reflective meditation, for its part, consists of various reasonings leading the bodhisattva to gradually realize that certain classes of entities – first, material entities, second, consciousness itself – do not ultimately exist. Meditative cultivation serves to transform a conceptual understanding of emptiness into a direct and immediate awareness of it, marked by the attainment of the state called "non-conceptual gnosis" (*nirvikalpajñāna*). In BhK 3, Kamalaśīla accuses Moheyan of denying insight and means as foundations of the Mahāyāna; he effectively accuses Moheyan of destroying the Mahāyāna.[33] Kamalaśīla insists that not conceptualizing entities does not simply mean ceasing to think about them, but means having come to a direct awareness of their emptiness subsequent to having understood them to be empty by conceptual means, that is, with the help of scriptural study and reasoning. Kamalaśīla's emphasis on the necessity of wholesome conduct – involving, among

---

for points that are coherent with BhK 3. Here BhK 1 only differs in its more expository mode of presentation, which contrasts with the polemical format that dominates in BhK 3.

32 The use of these categories is not homogeneous, owing to the diversity of historical and doctrinal contexts in which they were formed and used; important methodological observations in this regard can be found in Foulk 1993. On the background of Tibetan categories in broader Chinese cultural themes, see Gómez 1987: 69. On the semantics of the Tibetan terms *rim gyis pa* and *[g]cig c[h]ar ba* and corresponding expressions, see Stein 1987; Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 98.

33 BhK 3 14,7–15,9.

other things, generous giving (*dāna*) – as part of the bodhisattva path may also be viewed as part of the transferring of Indic conceptions of rulers as bodhisattvas to Tibet, even though this connection is not made explicit in the text. Khri srong lde btsan was conceived as on the path to awakening during his lifetime – in the Bsam yas bell inscription – and memorialized as a **mahābodhisattva* in the 'Phyong ras inscription dating to 800 CE.[34]

3.1 On the Composition of the *Madhyamakāloka*

As far as external evidence for where the *Madhyamakāloka* was composed is concerned, we can largely rely on the results of Keira's study of how Kamalaśīla proves universal emptiness therein – with some updates due to new manuscript discoveries that, however, do not alter the situation substantially.[35] To summarize, Keira argues that the work's composition in Tibet would help explain why there are no traces of a reception of the MĀ in India prior to the early 12th century, notably in the *Munimatālaṅkāra* by Abhayākaragupta; Abhayākaragupta appears to have had a penchant for Kamalaśīla, as he also incorporated material from BhK 1 into his *Abhayapaddhatī*.[36]

According to Mchims mam mkha' grags' (1210–1285) biography of the Indian master *Adhīśa Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna[37] (982–1054), the *Rnam thar yongs grags*, *Adhīśa found a Sanskrit manuscript of the MĀ when he visited Bsam yas monastery, copied it and sent it back to India[38] – an episode that indicates that at the time the MĀ was not known there.[39] Ye, Li and Kanō more recently reported on two palm leaves of a Śāradā manuscript of the MĀ's Sanskrit text, as well as on five palm leaves of an undated and anonymous Indian commentary on the MĀ in the China Ethnic Library in Beijing. These findings are consistent with a late reception of the MĀ in India, since the leaves can be tentatively dated to the 12th or 13th centuries; reference to this commentary is made in the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*

34 Doney 2011, esp. 108–112 for these two inscriptions.

35 Keira 2004.

36 A photocopy of a Sanskrit (palm-leaf) manuscript of the *Munimatālaṅkāra* preserved in Tibet has in the meantime become accessible; a critical edition is being prepared by Li and Kanō. This also permits us to recover Sanskrit portions of the MĀ. See Li and Kano 2014, Li and Kano 2017, Kano and Li 2017, Kano and Li 2018, Kano and Li 2021, as well as the summary in Kano and Li 2020: 51. For the *Abhayapaddhatī*, see AP 32,12–33,14 (*idam eva ca tattva … … utkīlyeti niścayaḥ*), based on BhK 1 211, 22–212,20.

37 For a discussion of the name of this master, often referred to as Atiśa, see Isaacson/Sferra 2014: 70–71, n. 51.

38 Keira 2004: 8, as well as Kanō 2016: 91.

39 Keira 2004: 8.

commentary by Jñānavajra (11th –12th c.).[40] The colophon of the canonical translation of the MĀ (D244r7, P275r3–4) does not mention that it was composed in Tibet.

What, now, would it *mean* for Kamalaśīla to have composed the MĀ in the particular environment of late 8th-century Tibet? Extant research on the MĀ, while not yet comprehensive, offers some clues in this regard. In general, the MĀ is in continuity with the MAP, Kamalaśīla's commentary on Śāntarakṣita's *Madhyamakālaṅkāra* and *-vṛtti* (henceforth MA(V)). Both the MĀ and the MAP are chiefly concerned with proving emptiness through scripture (*āgama*) and rational inquiry (*yukti*). The MĀ contains many parallels to passages in the MAP. On some theoretical issues, the MĀ shows a more developed approach, for instance on how to avoid the logical fallacy of the "unestablished basis" (*āśrayāsiddha*) in connection with proving emptiness. The problem that generates the need to avoid this fallacy is that the proof targets all putatively existing entities, which precisely because of the proof, however, are not established as existent.[41]

As regards the direct realization of emptiness in meditative states, a central topic in the BhKs' discussion of non-conceptual gnosis, no clear development is discernible. In the MĀ, Kamalaśīla quotes a passage from the *Dharmasaṅgīti* to the effect that the seeing of ultimate reality is a "non-seeing" (*adarśana*) and interprets non-conceptual gnosis (*nirvikalpajñāna*) as a meditation-induced "non-apprehension" (*anupalabdhi*) of an intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*) in all phenomena on an ultimate level; this characterization coheres with the BhKs, where Kamalaśīla also picked up the terminology of "non-apprehension" and "non-seeing", but did not probe into the matter any further.[42] As Keira has shown, Kamalaśīla further analyzes this non-apprehension by relying on specific features of the elaboration of non-apprehension as a logical reason on the part of Dharmakīrti. However, the manner in which this issue is treated in the MAP, in BhK 1 and 3, as well as in the MĀ does not indicate any process of development in Kamalaśīla's thinking on the matter.[43] It seems rather that the theoretical elaboration of non-conceptual gnosis with the help of Dharmakīrtian theories was an ongoing concern in Kamalaśīla's more technical Madhyamaka works, with some problems remaining unaddressed. That Kamalaśīla picks up the relevant terminology in the BhKs but does not deepen his analysis there can be

---

40 Ye et al. 2013 (Wang Catalogue Nos. 15 and 17); the reference in Jñānavajra's commentary has been pointed out in Van der Kuijp 2014.

41 Keira 2004: 14, n. 34 (referring to earlier studies by Mamoru Kobayashi).

42 BhK 1 211,2–212,4, with the *Dharmasaṅgīti* quotation (not mentioning the source) at 212,2–3, as well as BhK 1 214,12–22 (translation Kellner 2020: 47; parallel BhK 3 8,2–11, as well as in a passage in the *Sarvadharmaniḥsvabhāvasiddhi*, see Moriyama 1985: 65). The term *anupalambha* is used at BhK 1 212, 13, and, similarly, at BhK 3 6,8–11; a more technically Dharmakīrtian reference to *anupalabdhi* is found at BhK 1 213,1.

43 See the analysis in Keira 2004, Chapter 3.

readily explained by the overall orientation of the BhKs; they present main elements of Mahāyāna doctrine and practice, but do not enter more technical discussions of philosophical points or logical aspects of proofs.

In addition, Kamalaśīla appears to have been the first to distinguish five kinds of reasons by which the Madhyamaka proves emptiness. His precise arrangement is not found in Indian Madhyamaka literature until a later period, but similar arrangements found in other late 8th- and early 9th-century works indicate a general trend in this period towards codifying Madhyamaka reasoning from a larger perspective, beyond the neither-one-nor-many-argument that is central to Śāntarakṣita's MA(V).[44] That such a systematized presentation is given in the MĀ but absent from the MAP can be taken to further support that the MĀ is the later of these two works.

In sum, if the MĀ was indeed composed in Tibet, this would show that Kamalaśīla continued to be preoccupied there with the same overall problems of Madhyamaka philosophy that he already treated in the MAP. If this were the case, his range of activities would not have been limited to straightforwardly contributing to the Bsam yas controversy; he would also have continued to pursue his philosophical interests.

3.2 On the Composition of *Bhāvanākrama* 1 and 2

Both Tucci and Frauwallner place all three *Bhāvanākrama*s in Tibet, without offering any arguments.[45] Since the second BhK has numerous parallels in the third and also often quotes from the same *sūtra*s, it can be assigned to the same setting and was most probably composed in rather close temporal proximity. In general, there seems to be no attested reception of the second and third BhKs in later Indian works; it remains open whether they were known in India at all. Two hitherto undiscovered references to Kamalaśīla's *Bhāvanākrama*s in Prajñākaramati's (c. 950–1000) *Bodhicāryāvatārapañjikā* were recently identified by Funayama (private communication), but upon closer examination these turn out to refer to BhK 1, which was already known to have been used in earlier sources, as specified below.[46]

BhK 1 presents us with a more difficult case. The colophon of its canonical Tibetan translation states explicitly that the work was composed at the request of the divine ruler, Khri srong lde btsan, but this information is absent from a Dunhuang translation of BhK 1 and may thus be a later insertion, possibly even on the basis of

44 Keira 2004: 9–14.

45 Tucci 1958: 6; Frauwallner 1961.

46 BCAP 77r4 (fourth chapter, *bodhicittāpramāda*) refers to BhK 1 194,20–21 *prajñā tu tasyaiva copāyasyāviparītasvabhāvaparicchedahetuḥ*. BCAP 184r5–185r2 (at the very end of the eighth chapter, *dhyānapāramitā*) is a redacted quotation of a part of Kamalaśīla's explanation of tranquility meditation (*śamatha*) in BhK 1 205,14–207,9.

the tradition recorded in the "Testimony of Ba".[47] No such information is given in the colophons of the canonical translations of the second and third BhKs.

In a 1992 article, Taniguchi concluded that the first BhK was composed in India prior to Kamalaśīla's journey to Tibet. This conclusion was based on the observation that two late 8th- or early 9th-century Sanskrit works incorporate material from the first BhK: Jñānakīrti's *Pha rol tu phyin pa'i theg pa'i sgom pa'i rim pa'i man ngag* and Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā* (henceforth AAA). Jñānakīrti is listed by Tāranātha alongside other Indian paṇḍitas involved in imperial period translation activities, but his dates remain unknown.[48] Haribhadra must have been a close contemporary of Kamalaśīla. He was personally acquainted with the second Pāla ruler Dharmapāla, who ruled from 775–812.[49] Still, it is not inconceivable that a manuscript of the first BhK could have made its way from Tibet to the Pāla realm fairly quickly. Its character as a general manual, composed by a renowned scholar, might well have made it appear relevant for fast circulation. It is worth noting, however, that Haribhadra's AAA does not seem to contain any quotations from the MĀ or the second and third BhKs.[50]

As noted above, when compared with the third BhK, the first has the character of a "manual" of the Mahāyāna; it is more expository in its mode of presentation and does not contain any sections that are explicitly polemical and engage with an opponent's position. In terms of ideas that are relevant to the Bsam yas controversy, the first BhK gives a fuller presentation of the same points that are presented in a more sharply accentuated polemical form in the third. As I suggested above, as a Mahāyāna textbook, the first BhK would also meet the didactic needs of a nascent monastic culture, but this is not sufficient to place it either in the Pāla realm or in imperial Tibet. On the other hand, the first BhK also buttresses Kamalaśīla's position of a gradual bodhisattva path as defended in BhK 3. It does so both generally and particularly through its account of reflective meditation as a progressive understanding of, first, a Yogācāra and, second, a Madhyamaka analysis of the nature of reality.[51] Considering the contents and character of the first and third BhKs, and

---

47 BhK_t 1 D41vb6: *sa'i mnga' bdag dpal lha btsan pos bka' stsal nas ka ma la sh'ī las bsgom pa'i rim pa mdor bsdus pa 'di bgyis so*/The Dunhuang manuscript is IOL Tib J 648. It has no translation colophon, but includes the final portion with a verse in D41v3–6 that is missing from Tucci's Sanskrit, where the work proper ends with BhK 1 229,1 *etāvat tu saṅkṣepeṇa vaktuṃ śakyate.*

48 *Rgya gar chos 'byung* 172,6–9.

49 Note also that Haribhadra's *'Grel chung* is listed in the *Lhan dkar ma* catalogue. Since Taniguchi's paper was published, further references to the TSP and the MAP have been identified in the AAA (Keira 2004: 8, n. 22).

50 Keira 2004: 8, n. 22.

51 For this, the passage BhK 1 210,16–212,5 – fashioned as a commentary on *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* X.256–257 – is central; it is translated in Kellner 2020: 71–73.

placing BhK 1 in Tibet, we might surmise that Kamalaśīla's first reaction to Moheyan's position was to address this position through a general exposition in BhK 1, aimed (also) at an audience of Tibetan monks. Later he would have adopted a more polemical tone in BhK 3, perhaps because Moheyan and his Tibetan followers persisted in their arguments. While it remains uncertain whether BhK 2 was composed before or after BhK 3, a chronological sequence BhK 1 → BhK 3 would suggest itself.

These arguments make a composition in Tibet rather plausible. In more concrete terms, a brief, yet important passage in the first BhK tips the balance further towards its composition in Tibet.

> BhK 1 212,11–12: *yat punar uktam avikalpapraveśadhāraṇyām amanasikārato rūpādinimittaṃ varjayatīti. tatrāpi prajñayā nirūpayato yo 'nupalambhaḥ sa tatrāmanasikāro 'bhipreto na manasikārābhāvamātraṃ.*
> The *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* says: "[The bodhisattva] eliminates the mental appearances of matter [and the other four aggregates], etc., through non-mentation (*amanasikāra*)." There, too, non-mentation is intended to refer to the non-apprehension [of the bodhisattva] when they determine with insight, not to the mere absence of mentation.

Kamalaśīla here picks up a phrase that occurs repeatedly in the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*,[52] a *sūtra* on which he also authored a commentary: the bodhisattva completely eliminates (*parivarjayati*) conceptually produced appearances, including so-called "ordinary" appearances that represent the body and the other four aggregates (*skandha*).[53] These appearances refer to putatively existing external, material entities, as well as to the mind that conceives of them. They include also the higher attainments on the advanced bodhisattva stages, right up to the state of omniscience. By abandoning such appearances through a practice designated as "non-mentation" (*amanasikāra*), the bodhisattva eradicates attachment or clinging (*abhiniveśa*) even to the beneficial aspects of practice and the higher attainments, and enters the non-conceptual realm (*avikalpadhātu*). The term "mentation" (*manas(i)kāra*) in this case refers to an attentive mental engagement; specific practices of mental *dis*engagement (*amanasikāra*) – where practitioners are advised not to mentally engage with certain phenomena – have a long history in Indian Buddhism reaching back to *sutta*s in the Pāli canon. They also feature in earlier Yogācāra literature, including several chapters of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.[54]

---

52 The *sūtra* is also known under the synonymous title *Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*; the Sanskrit text is edited in Matsuda 1996.

53 NPDh (Matsuda's paragraph separations in Matsuda 1996) §4, §5, §6, §7, §8: … *sa tāny api ….vikalpanimittāni amanasikārataḥ parivarjayati* … (repeated for four different classes of *vikalpanimitta*s).

54 See Mathes 2009 for a brief survey, as well as the survey and broader discussion in Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 192–205.

In the first BhK, Kamalaśīla's reference to the APDh for the purpose of clarifying the practice of *amanasikāra* appears unmotivated within the specific context. The practice itself does not feature centrally in BhK 1, so that one wonders why Kamalaśīla felt prompted to clarify his understanding of it, and why he chose to do so with a reference to the APDh. This conspicuous reference can however be explained once we consider that in BhK 3, Kamalaśīla accuses Moheyan of having maintained a false interpretation of *amanasikāra*. There he attributes to his opponent the idea that the bodhisattva's mind enters the state of non-conceptuality (*nirvikalpatā*) through the methods of *asmṛti* and *amanasikāra*, "non-minding" and "non-mentation", applied to all *dharmas*.[55] Kamalaśīla rejects these practices based on the assumption that the opponent takes the negative compounds to refer to a mere absence. If a mere absence of attentive mental engagement were to lead to attaining non-conceptuality, then somebody who is unconscious (*saṃmūrchita*) would also have to be considered as having entered this state, something that is absurd. Besides, a mere absence cannot be a cause of anything. Kamalaśīla stresses that non-conceptuality cannot be attained without *bhūtapratyavekṣā*, a difficult term I propose translating as "consideration of what is real".[56] The "consideration of what is real" is Kamalaśīla's specific way of explaining reflective meditation (*vipaśyanā*), supported by a quotation from the *Ratnameghasūtra*;[57] it is key to Kamalaśīla's rationalistic approach to meditative practice.

In the above-quoted *amanasikāra* passage from the first BhK, Kamalaśīla explains that *amanasikāra* refers to a state of non-apprehension (*anupalambha*) which the bodhisattva attains when determining the true nature of reality with insight (*prajñayā nirūpayataḥ*) – a notion that we have seen is explained in more technical terms with the help of Dharmakīrtian logic in the MĀ. This non-apprehension is nothing other than the direct realization of emptiness in non-conceptual gnosis. Kamalaśīla's interpretation of *amanasikāra* in the first BhK is consistent with his

---

55 BhK 3 15,11–12 [opponent]: *sarvadharmeṣv asmṛtyamanasikāreṇa praviśatīti cet* (sc. *cittaṃ nirvikalpatāṃ*). Dunhuang texts that relate to Moheyan's view record a variety of negative terms to designate the practice that Moheyan recommends (Demiéville 1952: 78–79, n. 3). As Tillemans has argued, Kamalaśīla might have used *asmṛti* and *amanasikāra* to translate *wu nian* 無念 and *wu xin* 無心, which are recorded in the ZLJ (Tillemans 2013: 292).

56 BhK 3 15,17–17,18. For a discussion of the term *bhūtapratyavekṣā*, see Kellner 2020: 50–51; an analysis as a *tatpuruṣa* compound is found at BhK 3 5,17, where *bhūta* is explained as *pudgaladharmanairātmya*, i.e., emptiness. The standard Tibetan translation is adverbial (*yang dar par so sor rtog pa*), "correct consideration", and can be regarded as an attempt to square Kamalaśīla's own grammatical analysis with the actual content of the concept. Strictly speaking the term does not refer to a consideration of real entities, but to a consideration of certain classes of entities in terms of whether they are real.

57 BhK 3 3,1–4; the same quotation also occurs in BhK 2 21,11–12. See *Ratnameghasūtra* P897 Dzu 98r6 (identified in Goshima 1983: 30).

more technical grammatical analysis of the term in the APDhṬ. There Kamalaśīla refutes the interpretation of the negative compound *amanasikāra* as denoting (1) "mere absence" (**abhāvamātra*) and (2) "otherness" (**anyatva*). His own view is that it should be understood in terms of "opposition" or "counterpart" (**virodha/vipakṣa/pratidvandva,* Tib. *mi mthun pa*). "Non-mentation" refers to the consideration of what is real (*bhūtapratyavekṣā*), which is the opposite of (false) mentation. This is compared to the use of words like "non-friend" (*amitra*) or "non-true" (*anṛta*) that mean, respectively, "enemy" or "false."[58] Kamalaśīla further adds that *amanasikāra* can alternatively be taken to refer to the result of the consideration of what is real, and this is precisely the non-apprehension of all *dharma*s as expressed in BhK 1 212,11–12.

The conspicuous reference to *amanasikāra* in BhK 1 can thus be best explained if we place the composition of the text in the environment of the Bsam yas controversy. Conversely, there is no evidence of any Indian controversy surrounding *amanasikāra* in this period that could offer a similar explanation. As Mathes has demonstrated, it is only with later *siddha*s like Saraha and Maitrīpa (986–1063),[59] who propagate *amanasikāra* as a practice, that the notion becomes disputed.[60]

A closer look at Kamalaśīla's treatment of *asmṛti* and *amanasikāra* in the third BhK, contextualized in the doctrinal history of Indian Buddhism, further allows us to put the nature of his response to Moheyan into sharper relief. As I have suggested elsewhere, Kamalaśīla's characterization of Moheyan's practice with these terms can be understood as a construal of them against the backdrop of Yogācāra spiritual practices prescribing that a practitioner should not mind or mentally engage with certain appearances (*nimitta*) that present themselves in meditative practice, but instead turn their attention to or mentally engage with other ones.[61] Several Yogācāra compendia caution against interpreting these practices as a full and general lack of attentive mental engagement (or minding). In a list of five ways of how *nirvikalpajñāna* should *not* be understood, we also read that it should not be understood as a mere absence of *manas(i)kāra*. If *nirvikalpajñāna* were understood as a mere lack of mentation, persons who are unconscious because they are asleep or intoxicated would also have to be understood as having entered non-conceptual gnosis.[62] This is essentially the same as Kamalaśīla's argument from BhK 3 16,1–2 discussed

58 APDhṬ D131r6–131v2=P156v8–157r3. For the examples see also AKBh 141,1–5: *tasmāt: vidyāvipakṣo dharmo 'nyo 'vidyā 'mitrānṛtādivat//*(= AK 3.28cd). These analyses of the negative prefix are discussed further in Mejor 2002.

59 For the dating, cf. Mathes 2015: 4.

60 Mathes 2009.

61 Kellner 2020: 53–54.

62 The relevant passages have been collected in Hakamaya 1985; see also Kramer 2018, as well as Kellner 2020.

above. Against this background, Kamalaśīla's response to Moheyan amounts to his identifying the latter's view with a misinterpretation that he considered to already have been conclusively refuted within the Indian tradition. He assimilates Moheyan's view to a cliché, a stereotype, of a false view from Indian scholastic discourse that anyone familiar with this discourse would readily have been able to recognize; there is consequently no need to engage with such misconceptions in greater detail. The third BhK contains further examples of this kind of rhetorical maneuver; the view ascribed to Moheyan that the bodhisattva should avoid all action – even wholesome action – in order not to generate further conceptualizations that lead to entrapment in *saṃsāra* is, for instance, likened to the Ājīvika's view that liberation results from the mere destruction of *karma*, already rejected by the Buddha.[63]

Even the polemical response to Moheyan in BhK 3 can thus be understood as part of an overall doctrinal program. This response is not simply an articulation of new arguments prompted by an unexpected encounter with a problematic position. It is rather to be seen as an attempt to bring this position in relationship to a preexisting authoritative body of knowledge by assimilating it to a cliché of an already refuted false view. Kamalaśīla's intellectual background determines his response to Moheyan to a high degree; he mobilizes this background both in his reception of Moheyan's position, as well as in his endeavors to neutralize it.

3.3 The **Vajracchedikāṭīkā* and the **Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭīkā*

As mentioned above, altogether five *sūtra* commentaries are attributed to Kamalaśīla; none of them survive in full in Sanskrit. Among these, the **Vajracchedikāṭīkā* and the **Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭīkā* are currently being studied by Hiroko Matsuoka and Pei-Lin Chiou within the context of the Vienna research project on Kamalaśīla's *sūtra* commentaries. Given the preliminary state of research on these commentaries as a whole, I must here confine myself to general deliberations on their possible composition in Tibet. As far as I can tell, Tibetan historiographical literature remains silent on these works and their possible place and context of composition.

First, one may ask in general why an Indian Buddhist scholar would have felt motivated to compose commentaries on *sūtra*s in the early Pāla period. In this period of a well-developed Buddhist culture of scriptural interpretation and hermeneutics,

63 BhK 3 20,14–17. The Ājīvikas are usually invoked as advocates of strong determinism (*niyativāda*), but the view that Kamalaśīla ascribes to them is also occasionally found (Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 142, especially n. 271). For the canonical critique of doctrines of liberation that are purely based on *karman* (as advocated by Jainas), see Seyfort Ruegg 1989: 142–144.

scholarship could already rely upon well-established doctrinal models expounded in long-standing traditions of *śāstric* exegesis. Commentaries on individual *sūtra*s could however have been motivated by external factors, in this case the ascent of the Pāla dynasty that increased political attention to Buddhism. As the most prestigious and authoritative form of Buddhist literature, *sūtra*s could in such a constellation have become the focus of attention, as rulers sponsored new centers for study, catalyzing the production of new manuscripts, as well as the composition of new commentaries. The Tibetan historian Tāranātha accordingly attributes altogether fifty Buddhist religious foundations to Dharmapāla, of which as many as thirty-five were designated specifically for the purpose of the study of Prajñāpāramitā texts.[64] An increased patronage of Prajñāpāramitā literature under Dharmapāla, possibly helped along the way by Haribhadra's personal influence on the ruler, could well constitute a background for Kamalaśīla's composition of Prajñāpāramitā commentaries. In his study of the Heart Sūtra and its Indian commentaries, Lopez similarly points to twenty-one Indian commentaries on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* from the period of Kamalaśīla, although he does not indicate specific dates. That said, in an Indian environment, Kamalaśīla's commentary on the Heart Sūtra, the HṬ, would, again in Lopez' words, constitute "little more than an exercise in exegesis";[65] the same applies by extension also to his other *sūtra* commentaries.

It is not altogether impossible that such an "exercise" might account for why Kamalaśīla composed commentaries on *sūtra*s. However, the Bsam yas controversy offers more specific support for placing at least some of them in imperial Tibet. I am not the first to come up with this idea. Luis Gómez has implied that the APDhṬ was composed in Tibet.[66] Jan Nattier once suggested the same for the HṬ, on which Lopez also offered more specific deliberations, without, however, drawing a conclusion.[67]

These commentaries do not directly respond to Moheyan's views in the polemical fashion known from the third BhK. But the *Vajracchedikā* (henceforth VCh), the Heart Sūtra, and the *Saptaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā,* on which Kamalaśīla composed commentaries, held special significance within Chan Buddhism and this significance may already have been known in Tibet while Kamalaśīla stayed there. A survey of sources relating to both sides in the Bsam yas controversy shows that the interpretation of several of the *sūtra*s in question was contentious in this setting. Both sides rely upon these interpretations to support their respective positions. In

---

64 Sanderson 2009: 92; Tāranātha's *Rgya gar chos 'byung* 165,14–17 (passage cited by Sanderson 2009, n. 168).

65 Lopez 1996: 80.

66 Gómez 1983: 397.

67 Nattier 1992: 218, n. 102; Lopez 1996: 80–82. Lopez hesitates to conclude in favor of the work's composition in Tibet due to uncertainties as to whether the longer version of the Heart Sūtra, on which Kamalaśīla commented, was already translated into Tibetan at the time (*op. cit.*, p. 81, n. 1).

the ZLJ, Moheyan uses the VCh extensively.[68] The ZLJ also reports that Moheyan's "brahmin" opponent – i.e., Kamalaśīla – used the VCh to support his position (ZLJ 819a). The VCh also features prominently in a compilation of *sūtra* quotations in question-and-answer format entitled the "Treatise on the Single Method of Non-apprehension" (*Dmyigs su myed pa tshul gcig pa'i gzhung*). Six manuscript versions of this treatise survive in Dunhuang (none complete), including PT 116, the longest Tibetan Chan or Zen manuscript compilation.[69] In the same context of PT 116, we also find a quotation from the APDh in support of instantaneism/subitism.[70] The significance of the APDh in the Dunhuang area is further underscored by the existence of one Chinese and two Tibetan translations of potentially different Sanskrit versions of the *sūtra*, even though the dating of these translations is not yet on certain footing.[71] An important, although highly problematic further source in connection with the Bsam yas debate is the *Cig car 'jug pa'i rnam par mi rtog pa'i bsgom don* (henceforth *Cig car*) ascribed to one Vimalamitra. The *Cig car* combines materials from various sources, including all three of Kamalaśīla's BhKs.[72] Its authorship is uncertain, as is the process of its compilation. Regardless, for our purpose it is sufficient to note that this work, too, quotes from the APDh, the VCh, the *Saptaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā* and the Heart Sūtra in support of an instantaneist position.[73] As far as I can tell, all these sources postdate Kamalaśīla. They therefore do not prove that the *sūtra*s were already contested during his lifetime. Still, they indicate that these *sūtra*s were within the horizon of the Bsam yas controversy, which makes it plausible to presume that Kamalaśīla might already have been confronted with uses and readings of them that were, from his point of view, mistaken.

---

68 ZLJ 816a, 817a, 818a, 819a, 820a, 821a, 823a, 823b.

69 On PT 116, see Van Schaik 2016; for a discussion of the "Treatise on the Single Method" and an English translation, see Van Schaik 2015, Chapter 1. Earlier analyses of PT 116 include Faber 1985; Gómez 1983.

70 In Faber's analysis, this part of the text still belongs to the "Treatise on the Single Method" (Faber 1985: 66, section VIa; cf. also Ueyama et al. 1983), but it is not included in Van Schaik's translation of the "Treatise" in chapter 1 of Van Schaik 2015. The quotation comes from NPDh §4.

71 The Chinese translation, Dunhuang document *jiang* 23, as described in Ueyama et al. 1983: 32–42, is dated by Ueyama to the second half of the 9th century (German translation Meinert 2004: 112–124) and is close to the Tibetan canonical translation (Meinert 2003: 179). The Tibetan translations IOL TIB J 51 and 52 have, to my knowledge, not yet been dated (Meinert 2004: 105); they were not used in Matsuda's 1996 edition of the Sanskrit text of the NPDh.

72 For a complete list, see Harada 1976; Gómez (1983: 430, n. 21) does not agree with Harada's assessment that these interpolations prove the *Cig car* is not criticizing gradualists.

73 A brief summary of the *Cig car* is given in Tucci 1958: 115–120; for a further discussion, see Gómez 1983: 397, esp. the lengthy note 21, pp. 430–432; Gómez 1987: 96. Gruber (2016) argues on the basis of an examination of Vimalamitra's commentaries on the Heart Sūtra and the *Saptaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā* (ascribed to him already in the *Lhan dkar* catalogue) that this Vimalamitra had nothing to do with the author of the *Cig car* (to whom, by the way, is also ascribed a *Rim gis 'jug pa'i bsgom don*).

In general, it is not difficult to understand why the APDh, the VCh and the Heart Sūtra would have become relevant in the larger environment of the Bsam yas controversy, considering the overall message that these *sūtra*s convey. Regardless of their otherwise divergent doctrinal orientations, they have in common that they caution bodhisattvas against conceptualizing or reifying their own practice and thus developing attachment to it. The APDh does so in connection with the practice of "non-mentation" (*amanasikāra*) as discussed above. In the VCh, this overall theme is pursued under the general topic that a bodhisattva is to abandon all notions (*sañjñā*) of a self (*ātman*), a living being (*sattva*), a soul (*jīva*) or a person (*pudgala*), as well as all notions related to mental appearances (*nimitta*); the VCh pervasively employs a rhetoric of negation and non-reification.[74] This is also the case in the Heart Sūtra, which does not address issues of the path at all; this is perhaps precisely a reason for it becoming easily used to support different construals of the path.

For these reasons we may suppose that Kamalaśīla composed the VChṬ, the APDhṬ as well as the HṬ in Tibet. For the HṬ, Lopez has already drawn attention to Kamalaśīla's emphasis on the necessity of an inferential understanding of emptiness prior to the yogin's direct realization of it. Moreover, Kamalaśīla here strives aims to interpret a *sūtra* that does not explicitly deal with the path in terms of the fivefold path and related categories from the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*,[75] an emphasis that can also be well explained through the Bsam yas controversy. For the VChṬ and the APDhṬ, it remains to be seen whether they can be made intelligible as responses within the context of the Bsam yas controversy in more specific ways.

Stylistic aspects also merit consideration in this regard, at least to the extent that these can be gleaned from the Tibetan translations. For the HṬ, Lopez has observed that the tone of the work indicates that it was rather hurriedly written, that it might have been dictated or perhaps even reconstructed from the memory of a student.[76] In comparison to the TSP and the MAP, the VChṬ, the APDhṬ and the HṬ – as well as the *Bhāvanākrama*s – are certainly less methodically rigorous when they offer arguments, and not as thoroughly technical in their philosophical style. This could, of course, simply be a matter of design. But it might also indicate that the less rigorous and technical works were composed in an environment where Kamalaśīla wrote more from memory, removed from an institutional context – and library support. A setting like Nālandā would have facilitated greater technicality. That said, the MĀ does not quite fit into this pattern if we assume it was composed in Tibet, since it is in these respects closer to the TSP and the MAP, than to the BhKs and the *sūtra*

74 Nattier 2003: 135, n. 62.

75 Lopez 1996: 80–81; the central passage dealing with the bodhisattva's inferential understanding is translated on pp. 107–108.

76 Lopez 1996: 80–81.

commentaries just mentioned.[77] On the other hand, this can also be explained through Kamalaśīla's training in composing philosophical treatises – and Madhyamaka treatises in particular. In composing the MĀ, he could rely on his personal memory stemming from having composed the TSP and MAP – indeed, he might have brought manuscripts of these works along with him to Tibet – and was thus in a position to compose this kind of work with greater rigor, even in a Tibetan setting.

In addition to the Bsam yas controversy, however, there are other aspects meriting consideration. While they lead into murkier territory, they do open up interesting further questions. The missionary setting in Tibet brought together Indian paṇḍitas from different regions and backgrounds, for instance, from Kaśmir in the West and the Pāla realm in the East, as well as Nepal to the South, possibly also as a transit region for Eastern Indian paṇḍitas. It is likely that such encounters would have brought to light regional divergences in interpretation and approaches within the broader Indian tradition. Against this background, Kamalaśīla's *sūtra* commentaries should also be considered in relationship to commentaries composed by other Indian Buddhist scholars in Tibet, which opens up an entirely new line of investigation. This investigation might also acquire further special significance in considerations on the relationship between tantric and non-tantric approaches to liberation. The Heart Sūtra, in particular, was also subject to tantric (or mantric) construals, visible in a commentary composed according to the colophon of the Tibetan translation by Śrīsiṃha and offered to Khri srong lde btsan and the latter's son by Vairocana, an Indian master who is also listed among supporters of the Indian side in the Bsam yas debate.[78] A further commentary on the Heart Sūtra is ascribed to one Vimalamitra; according to the colophon, it is based on Vimalamitra's explanations in the temple of Tshangs pa'i 'byung gnas (in Bsam yas monastery).[79] This is not a tantric commentary, but a rather "traditional" scholastic one. Painstaking philological studies of these two commentaries by Horiuchi have shown that the Śrīsiṃha-Vairocana commentary was composed in Tibetan, while Vimalamitra's is a translation from the Sanskrit.[80]

It would in any case be conceivable that Kamalaśīla composed this commentary in particular in Tibet in order to counter tantric tendencies, as Lopez has suggested. However, it seems that Kamalaśīla's Heart Sūtra commentary does not explicitly engage with any tantric concepts, such as the distinction between inner, outer, and secret that Śrīsiṃha employs in his commentary. At this stage of research it would

77 Lopez (1996: 80–81) also groups the MĀ together with the TSP and MAP as Kamalaśīla's works with methodical style, logical structure, clarity of expression and a presence of supporting quotations from a wide range of *sūtra*s and *śāstra*s; however, he also places the BhKs in this group.

78 D4353, P4850; Lopez 1996: 82–83.

79 D3818 ma 280r5–6, P5217 ma 302r7–v1.

80 Horiuchi 2021.

appear that the presence of Tantra in Tibet might at most have served as a "background noise", motivating perhaps a clearer articulation of non-tantric readings of particular *sūtra*s, but not calling for explicit scholarly engagement in terms of content. In any case, one should resist a-historically projecting the tensions between sūtric and tantric strands within Indian (and Tibetan) Buddhism from later periods into the time of Kamalaśīla.

For the same reasons that it seems plausible to presume that the APDhṬ, the VChṬ and the Heart Sūtra commentary were written in Tibet, one can also hypothesize that the commentary on the *Saptaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā* could have also been composed there. The overall purpose of Kamalaśīla's "Tibetan" *sūtra* commentaries would then have been to provide patterns of interpretation for *sūtra*s that were contested, or that could present problems for Kamalaśīla's own position in the Bsam yas controversy. A relationship to other elements of the socio-religious and intellectual environment in Tibet – notably, Tantra – cannot be entirely excluded and merits further investigation.

4 Conclusions

A reconsideration of Kamalaśīla's oeuvre in relationship to his activities in Tibet suggests that these activities in Tibet extended beyond the participation in a single public debate, as Tibetan historiographies describe it. Those Tibetan historians that mention Kamalaśīla only in connection with this episode would be exhibiting a rather narrow perspective of his activities, owing to the great significance held by the Bsam yas debate for their own agenda. In other words, their specific way of treating Kamalaśīla can be provided with a rationale. Expanding the range of Kamalaśīla's activities does not mean that the Tibetan sources simply got their history wrong; it only means that certain of his activities were not relevant to their agenda.

Against this narrow perspective, the above deliberations suggest that Kamalaśīla's final period of life in Tibet included a variety of pursuits, a picture that is more consistent with how the Bsam yas controversy is presented in Dunhuang documents such as the ZLJ – and with the "Testimony of Ba" tradition discussed above – than how it is depicted in other Tibetan narratives. This picture would look more or less as follows: Philosophically, he persisted in developing the proof of emptiness in the MĀ in continuity with Śāntarakṣita's MA(V) and his own commentary on it, the MAP.[81] He engaged with the views of Moheyan and his supporters, and did so in a lengthier process that might have involved interactions with a larger group of persons,

81 Some further Madhyamaka works by Kamalaśīla still remain to be aligned with the MAP and the MĀ, notably his *Tattvāloka* (D3888, P5288) and *Sarvadharmaniḥsvabhāvasiddhi* (D3889, P5289).

including followers of Moheyan among ordained Tibetan nobility. This engagement resulted in the composition of the three BhKs, as well as of some of his *sūtra* commentaries, notably the APDhṬ, the VChṬ, and the commentary on the Heart Sūtra. In the same period of activity, Kamalaśīla also served the didactic needs of an emerging monastic culture. On the one hand, he provided this community with an overall manual of the Mahāyāna (the first BhK) and a doctrinal explanation and justification of meditative techniques (the second BhK). Into these contexts he also partly inserted his distinctive Yogācāra-Madhyamaka synthesis and his emphasis on rational inquiry and analysis as necessary prerequisites for attaining awakening, already shaped by an awareness of Moheyan's position. His response to Moheyan was governed by his overall doctrinal and philosophical agenda and strongly determined by his intellectual background. In hermeneutical and exegetical terms, on the other hand, the reliance of Moheyan and others on specific *sūtras* such as the APDh or the VCh motivated clarifications that Kamalaśīla had not been prompted to undertake in an Indian context. With respect to *sūtras* that had become contentious in the Bsam yas controversy, he strove to establish patterns of interpretation more generally, by composing commentaries. Apologetic, didactic and polemical motives combine in all the works that I have addressed; they do not exclude each other, but are rather combined in different ways, and are present in the different texts to different degrees. In such a scenario, on the whole Kamalaśīla kept pursuing his philosophical interests and doctrinal agenda in the new and foreign cultural environment of imperial Tibet.

With respect to Kamalaśīla's works, in particular the *sūtra* commentaries, this scenario at present remains a general hypothesis, to be tested and refined through more detailed and in-depth studies. These will also have to reconsider Dunhuang documents and other sources pertaining to Moheyan's position.[82] In addition, the relative chronology of some of the works within the "Tibetan" corpus of Kamalaśīla's works – and how other, as yet unstudied works fit within it – also remains to be established through more fine-grained textual investigations. Such open issues notwithstanding, an exploration of Kamalaśīla's activities in Tibet not only allows us to gain a better understanding of his intellectual profile, but also raises new questions regarding the activities of Indian paṇḍitas in Tibet in a period in which Tibetan history was intimately connected with developments in South, Central and East Asia.

---

82 Ding has recently argued that the question-and-answer-sections in the ZLJ exhibit linguistic features that can best be explained if one considers the questions as translated from the Tibetan; he also argues that both sides managed to understand each other well (Ding 2022: 6–26). This is similar to Tillemans 2013, where he also argues, but on different grounds, that Moheyan understood the Indian side rather well, despite infelicities involved in the translation process, thus departing from Demiéville's erstwhile account of the debate as a case of cross-cultural miscommunication. See also Ding's article in this issue.

Bibliography

Abbreviations and Primary Sources

AK	*Abhidharmakośa* (Vasubandhu). See AKBh.
AKBh	*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Vasubandhu); Pradhan, P. (1967), ed.: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
AP	*Abhayapaddhatī* (Abhayākaragupta); Luo, H. (2010), ed.: *Abhayākaragupta's Abhayapaddhatī: Critically edited and translated by Luo Hong with a preface by Harunaga Isaacson and Alexis Sanderson*. Hamburg/Beijing: Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg and China Tibetology Research Center.
APDhṬ	**Avikalpa-* or **Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭīkā* (Kamalaśīla). Tibetan translation. *'Phags pa rnam par mi rtog par 'jug pa'i gzungs kyi rgya cher 'grel pa*, translated by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Dpal brtsegs rakṣi ta. D4000 Ji 123r3–145v5, P5501 Ji 146v6–174v1.
BCAP	*Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* (Prajñākaramati). Byang chub kyi spyod pa la 'jug pa'i dka' 'grel, translated by Gnyan Dharma grags with and Sumatikīrti, revised by Yon tan rgya mtsho. D3872 La 41r7–288r7.
BhK 1	Bhāvanākrama 1 (Kamalaśīla). See Tucci 1958.
BhK 2	Bhāvanākrama 2 (Kamalaśīla). Goshima 1983.
BhK 3	Bhāvanākrama 3 (Kamalaśīla). Tucci, Giuseppe (1971), ed.: *Minor Buddhist texts, Part III: third Bhāvanākrama*. Roma: IsMEO.
BhK_t 1	Bhāvanākrama 1 (Kamalaśīla). Tibetan translation. *Bsgom pa'i rim pa (dang po)*, translated by Prajñāvarman (Tib. Shes rab go cha) and Ye shes sde. D3915 Ki 22r1–41v7, P5310 A 22r3–45r8.
Cig car	*Cig car 'jug pa'i rnam par mi rtog pa'i bsgom don*, ascribed to Vimalamitra.
HṬ	*Prajñāpāramitāhṛdyayaṭīkā* (Kamalaśīla). Tibetan translation. Shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i snying po'i 'grel pa, translated by Kumāraśrībhadra and 'Phags pa shes rab. P5221 Ma 330b6–333a6.
KhG	*Mkhas pa'i dga' ston* (Dpa' bo gtsug lag phreng ba). Lokesh Chandra (1962), ed.: *Mkhas pa'i dga' ston of Dpa' bo gtsug lag (also known as Lho brag chos 'byung) part 4*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
MĀ	*Madhyamakāloka* (Kamalaśīla). Tibetan translation. *Dbu ma snang ba*, translated by Śīlendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs [rakṣita]. D3887 Sa 133v4–244r7, P5287 Sa 143r2–275v4.
MA(V)	*Madhyamakālaṅkāra(vṛtti)* (Śāntarakṣita). Tibetan translation edited in Ichigō 1985.
MAP	*Madhyamakālaṅkārapañjikā* (Kamalaśīla). Tibetan translation edited in Ichigō 1985.
NPDh	*Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*, edition in Matsuda 1996.
Rgya gar chos 'byung	Rgya gar chos 'byung of Tāranātha. Anton Schiefner (1868), ed.: *Târanâthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione Narratio. Contextum tibeticum e codicibus petropolitanis edidit Antonius Schiefner*. St. Petersburg: Academia Scientiarum Petropolitana.
TSP	*Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā* (Kamalaśīla).
VCh	*Vajracchedikā*
VChṬ	**Vajracchedikāṭīkā* (Kamalaśīla). Tibetan translation. *'Phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa rdo rje gcod pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa*, translated by Mañjuśrī, Jinamitra and Ye shes sde. D3817 Ma 204r1–267r7, P5216 Ma 209v4–285v5.
ZLJ	Rao, Zongyi (1983), ed.: "Wang Xi 'Dunwu dasheng zhengli jue" xushuo bing xiaoji {*Preface and Notes to Wang Xi's "Ratification of the true principle of the Mahāyāna teachings of sudden awakening'}". In: Lan, Jifu (ed.): *Supplement to Chinese Tripiṭaka*, vol. 35. Taipei: Huayu chubanshe, 797a–854a.

Secondary Sources

Biondo, Serena (2021): "Narrative Sources of the Great Debate: History and Narrative in the Dba' bzhed Manuscript". In: *Bringing Buddhism to Tibet*. Edited by Lewis Doney. Berlin, etc.: De Gruyter, 75–87.

Demiéville, Paul (1952): *Le concile de Lhasa. Une controverse sur le quiétisme entre bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIIIe siècle de l'ère chrétienne*. Paris: Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises.

Ding, Yi (2022): "Telling Infelicities and Hidden Intelligibility: The 'Interlingual Questions' from the 'Samyé Debate' in Tibet (792–794)". *BuddhistRoad Paper* 1: 3–47.

Doney, Lewis (2011): "Transforming Tibetan Kingship: The portrayal of Khri Srong lde brtsan in the early Buddhist histories". London (School of African and Oriental Studies, University of London). (Dissertation).

Doney, Lewis, ed. (2021): *Bringing Buddhism to Tibet: History and Narrative in the Dba' bzhed Manuscript*. Berlin, etc.: De Gruyter.

Faber, Fleming (1985): "A Tibetan Dunhuang Treatise on Simultaneous Enlightenment: The dMyigs su myed pa tshul gcig pa'i gzhung". *Acta Orientalia* 46: 47–77.

Foulk, T. Griffith (1993): "Issues in the Field of East Asian Buddhist Studies: An Extended Review of Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought (Ed. Peter N. Gregory)". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 16/1, 93–180.

Frauwallner, Erich (1961): "Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5: 125–148.

Furui, Ryosuke (2020): *Land and Society in Early South Asia: Eastern India 400-1250 AD*. Oxon, etc.: Routledge.

Gómez, Luis O. (1983): "The Direct and the Gradual Approaches of Zen Master Mahayana: Fragments of the Teaching of Mo-Ho-Yen". In: *Studies in Ch'an and Hua-Yen*. Edited by Robert M. Gimello/ Peter M. Gregory. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 69–167.

Gómez, Luis O. (1987): "Purifying Gold: The Metaphor of Effort and Intuition in Buddhist Thought and Practice". In: *Sudden and Gradual. Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*. Edited by Peter N. Gregory. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 67–165.

Gonkatsang, Tsering/Willis, Michael (2021): "Text and Translation: History and Narrative in the Dba' bzhed Manuscript". In: *Bringing Buddhism to Tibet*. Edited by Lewis Doney. Berlin, etc.: De Gruyter, 102–157.

Goshima, Kiyotaka (1983): "The Tibetan text of the second Bhāvanākrama". n.a.: 1–92.

Gruber, Joel (2016): "The sudden and gradual sūtric (and tantric?) approaches of the *Rim gyis 'jug pa'i bsgom don* and *Cig car 'jug pa rnam par mi rtog pa'i bsgom don*". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*: 405–427.

Hakamaya, Noriaki (1985): "Yūishiki-bunken ni okeru mufunbetsuchi {*On *nirvikalpajñāna* in Yogācāra literature}". *Komazawadaigaku Bukkyōgakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 43: 41–78.

Harada, Satoru (1976): "bSam-yas no shūron igo ni okeru tonmon-pa no ronsho {*The literature of the Tonmon-pa after the debate of *bsam yas*}". *Nihon Seizō Gakkai Kaihō* 22: 8–10.

Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid (2008): *Die lHan kar ma. Ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte. Kritische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Higgins, David (2006): "On the development of the non-mentation (amanasikāra) doctrine in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 29/2: 255–303.

Higgins, David (2013): *The philosophical foundations of classical rdzogs chen in Tibet: Investigating the distinction between dualistic mind (sems) and primordial knowing (ye shes)*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

Horiuchi, Toshio (2021): "Revisiting the 'Indian' Commentaries on the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya*: Vimalamitra's Interpretation of the 'Eight Aspects'". *Acta Asiatica* 121: 53–81.

Houston, Garry W. (1980): *Sources for a History of the bSam yas Debate*. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Isaacson, Harunaga/Sferra, Francesco (2014): *The Sekanirdeśa of Maitreyanātha (Advayavajra) with the Sekanirdeśapañjikā of Rāmapāla: critical edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts with English translation and reproductions of the MSS*. Napoli: Università degli Studi die Napoli "L'Orientale".

Kanō, Kazuo (2016): "The Transmission of Sanskrit Manuscripts from India to Tibet: The Case of a Manuscript Collection in the Possession of Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (980–1054)". In: *Transfer of Buddhism Across Central Asian Networks (7th to 13th Centuries)*. Edited by Carmen Meinert. Leiden: Brill, 82–117.

Kano, Kazuo/Li, Xuezhu (2017): "Bonbun kōtei muniishusōgon daiisshō (fols. 59v4–61r5): chūgankōmyō sezoku no teigikasho itsubun (Critical Edition of the Sanskrit text of the Munimatālaṃkāra Chapter 1, fols. 59v4–61r5: Excerpts from Definitions of *Saṃvṛtisatya* in Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka*)". *Mikkyō bunka* 239: 7–26.

Kano, Kazuo/Li, Xuezhu (2018): "Bonbun kōtei muniishusōgon daiisshō (fols. 61r5–64r2): chūgankōmyō sezoku to gensetsu oyobi yuishinsetsu hihankasho itsubun (Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text of the *Munimatālaṃkāra* Chapter 1, fols. 61r5–64r2: Excerpts from the *Saṃvṛti-Vyavahāra* Part and Critics to *Cittamātratā* in Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka*). *Mikkyō bunka* 241: 31–56.

Kano, Kazuo/Li, Xuezhu (2020): "A survey of passages from rare Buddhist works found in the *Munimatālaṃkāra*". In: *Sanskrit manuscripts in China III. Proceedings of a panel at the 2016 Beijing International Seminar on Tibetan Studies, August 1 to 4*. Edited by Birgit Kellner/Jowita Kramer/Xuezhu Li. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House, 45–78.

Kano, Kazuo/Li, Xuezhu (2021): "Bonbun kōtei muniishusōgon daiisshō (fols. 62r2–67v2): chūgankōmyō yugagyōsha no chi to issaihō mujishō ronshō kasho itsubun (Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text of the *Munimatālaṃkāra* Chapter 1, fols. 64r2–67v2: Excerpts from the Yogin's Perception and Establishment of *Sarvadharmaniḥsvabhāvatā* in Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka*)". *Mikkyō bunka* 246: 5–39.

Keira, Ryūsei (2004): *Mādhyamika and Epistemology: A Study of Kamalaśīla's Method for Proving the Voidness of all Dharmas. Introduction, Annotated Translations and Tibetan Texts of Selected Sections of the Second Chapter of the Madhyamakāloka*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

Kellner, Birgit (2020): "Using concepts to eliminate conceptualization: Kamalaśīla on non-conceptual gnosis (*nirvikalpajñāna*)". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 43: 39–80.

Kimura, Takayasu et al. (1998): "Taishōdaigaku chibetto chōsa hōkoku 1: Sha lu shahon 'Shūjūshidai' shohen ni tsuite {*Reports on the Study of Tibet from Taishō University 1: On a Sanskrit Manuscript of the First Bhāvanākrama from Zhalu}". *Taishōdaigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō (Annual of The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism Taisho University)* 20: 106–116.

Kramer, Jowita (2018): "Conceptuality and Non-conceptuality in Yogācāra Sources". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 46: 321–338.

Krasser, Helmut (2011): "How to teach a Buddhist Monk to Refute the Outsiders: Text-critical Remarks on some Works by Bhaviveka". *Dhīḥ* 51: 49–76.

Li, Xuezhu/Kano, Kazuo (2014): "Bonbun muniishusōgon daiishō matsubi bubun no kōtei to wayaku: chūgankōmyō ichijōronshōdan no bonbun-danpen no kaishū (Critical Edition and Japanese Translation of Sanskrit Text of the Munimatālaṃkāra Chapter 1, Ekayāna Portion, fols. 67v2–70r4: Parallel Passages in the Madhyamakāloka)". *Mikkyō bunka* 232: 7–42.

Li, Xuezhu/Kano, Kazuo (2017): "Bonbun kōtei muniishusōgon daiisshō (fols. 58r5–59v4): chūgankōmyō shitaisetsu sanshōsetsu kasho itsubun (Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text of the Munimatālaṃkāra Chapter 1, fols. 58r5–59v4: Passages on the Caturāryasatya and Trisvabhāva Borrowed from Kamalaśīla's Madhyamakāloka)". *Mikkyō bunka* 238: 7–27.

Lopez, Donald S. (1996): *Elaborations on Emptiness: Uses of the Heart Sūtra*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Marks, James/Eltschinger, Vincent (2019): "Kamalaśīla". In: *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism. Volume II: Lives*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 272–278.

Mathes, Klaus-Dieter (2009): "Maitrīpa's Amanasikārādhāra ('A Justification of Becoming Mentally Disengaged')". *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* 13: 3–30.

Mathes, Klaus-Dieter (2015): *A fine blend of mahāmudrā and Madhyamaka: Maitrīpa's collection of texts on non-conceptual realization (amanasikāra)*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Matsuda, Kazunobu (1996): "Nirvikalpapraveśadhāraṇī: Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation". *Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyo University* 3: 89–113.

Matsuda, Kazunobu (2019): *Ratonākarashānti no han'nya haramitsu shūshū shidai* {*Sanskrit Text of the *Prajñāpāramitābhāvanākrama* by Ratnākaraśānti]. *The Bulletin of the Association of Buddhist Studies, Bukkyo University* XXIV: 21–32.

Meinert, Carmen (2003): "Structural Analysis of the *bSam gtan mig sgron*. A Comparison of the Fourfold Correct Practice in the *Āryāvikalpapraveśanāmadhāraṇī* and the Contents of the four Main Chapters of the *bSam gtan mig sgron*". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 26: 175–195.

Meinert, Carmen (2004): "Chinesische Chan- und tibetische rDzogs chen-Lehre: eine komparatistische Untersuchung im Lichte des philosophischen Heilskonzeptes ‚Nicht-Vorstellen' anhand der Dunhuang-Dokumente des chinesischen Chan-Meister Wolun und des Werkes bSam gtan mig sgron des tibetischen Gelehrten gNubs chen Sangs rgyas ye shes". Bonn: Universität Bonn. (Dissertation).

Mejor, Marek (2002): "On the sevenfold classification of the negative particle (*nañ*). (Grammatical explanation of *a-vidyā* in Vasubandhu's *Pratītyasamutpāda-vyākhyā*)". In: *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought. In Honor of Doctor Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday*. Kyōto: Heirakuji Shoten, 87–100.

Moriyama, Seitetsu (1985): "An annotated translation of Kamalaśīla's Sarvadharmaniḥsvabhāvasiddhi Part IV". *Bukkyōdaigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 69, 36–86.

Nattier, Jan (1992): "The Heart Sūtra: A Chinese Apocryphal Text?". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 15/2: 153–223.

Nattier, Jan (2003): *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path According to the Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Obermiller, Eugène (1963): *Kamalašila Bhavanakrama: Traktat o Sozercanii: Faksimile s Predicloviem*. Moskva: Izdat. Vost. Lit.

Panglung, Jampa L. (1994): "New Fragments of the sGra-sbyor bam-po gñis-pa". *East and West* 44: 161–172.

Richardson, Hugh E. (1985): *A Corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.

Sanderson, Alexis (2009): "The Śaiva Age – The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period". In: *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Edited by Shingo Einoo. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, 41–439.

Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Rāhula (1937): "Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Mss. in Tibet". *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 23/1: 1–57.

Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina (2002): "Enacting Words: A Diplomatic Analysis of the Imperial Decrees (*bkas bcad*) and their Application in the sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa Tradition". *Journal of the International Association for Buddhist Studies* 25: 263–340.

Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina (2014): "A Perusal of Early Tibetan Inscriptions in Light of the Buddhist World of the 7th to 9th Centuries A.D.: Proceedings of the Eponymous Conference Held in Vienna, 14-15 Oct. 2011". In: *Epigraphic Evidence in the Pre-Modern Buddhist World*. Edited by Kurt Tropper. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 117–165.

Schoening, Jeffrey David (1992): "The Ārya-śālistambasya-ṭīkā: Kamalaśīla's Commentary on the Śālistamba-sūtra". In: *Tibetan Studies, Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies NARITA 1989. Volume 1: Buddhist Philosophy and Literature*. Edited by Shōren Ihara/ Zuihō Yamaguchi. Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji, 221–235.

Schoening, Jeffrey (1995): *The Śālistamba Sūtra and its Indian Commentaries*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

Seyfort Ruegg, David (1989): *Buddha-nature, Mind and the Problem of Gradualism in a Comparative Perspective: On the Transmission and Reception of Buddhism in India and Tibet*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Stein, Rolf A. (1987): "Sudden Illumination or Simultaneous Comprehension: Remarks on Chinese and Tibetan Terminology". In: *Sudden and Gradual. Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*. Edited by Peter N. Gregory. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 41–65.

Sørensen, Per K. (1994): Tibetan Buddhist Historiography: The Mirror Illuminating the Royal Genealogies. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Taniguchi, Fujio (1992): "Quotations from the first *Bhāvanākrama* of Kamalaśīla found in some Indian texts". In: *Tibetan studies: proceedings of the 5th seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies NARITA 1989. Volume 1: Buddhist philosophy and literature.* Edited by Ihara, Shōren/ Yamaguchi, Zuihō. Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji, 303–307.

Tillemans, Tom J. F. (2013): "Yogic Perception, Meditation, and Enlightenment: The Epistemological Issues in a Key Debate". In: *A companion to Buddhist philosophy*. Edited by Steven M. Emmanuel. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 290–306.

Tucci, Giuseppe (1958): *Minor Buddhist Texts, Part II. First Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla. Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts with Introduction and English Summary*. Rom: IsMEO.

Ueyama, Daishun, Kenneth W. Eastman/Jeffrey L. Broughton (1983): "The Avikalpapraveśa-dhāraṇī: The Dhāraṇī of Entering Non-Discrimination". *Bukkyō Bunken Kenkyūsho Kiyō*: 32–42.

Van der Kuijp, Leonard (2014): "The **Madhyamakālokabhāṣyatattvapradīpa*: An Indic Commentary on Kamalaśīla's *Madhyamakāloka (Dbu ma snang ba)*". *China Tibetology* 1: 1–3.

Van Schaik, Sam (2015): *Tibetan Zen: Discovering a Lost Tradition*. Boston: Snow Lion.

Van Schaik, Sam (2016): "Manuscripts and Practices: Investigating the Tibetan Chan Compendium (P.Tib.116)". In: *One-Volume Libraries: Composite and Multiple-Text Manuscripts*. Edited by Michael Friedrich and Cosima Schwarke. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 287–304.

Wangdu, Pasang/Diemberger, Hildegard (2000): *dBa' bzhed; the royal narrative concerning the bringing of the Buddha's doctrine to Tibet*.

Ye, Shaoyong/Li, Xuezhu/Kanō, Kazuo (2013): "Further Folios from the Set of Miscellaneous Texts in Śāradā Palm-leaves from Zha lu Ri phug". *China Tibetology* 1: 30–47.