

Preface

Although this is the first volume to this work, in time sequence almost all of the work constituting the forthcoming volumes was completed before that of present volume. This is because I realized only after a great deal of work on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* that the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*, a work mentioned by Mī pham as the source of some teaching found in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*, was in fact the work quoted by the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* in its unique citation of an unnamed *sūtra*. Since the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* is certainly the source of some teaching of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*, it appears to be a precursor for Maitreyan Yogācāra, and is interesting in its own right, particularly when considered with its excellent commentary of Kamalaśīla, as a document bearing on the debate concerning sudden and gradual enlightenment in which Kamalaśīla was supposedly a participant advocating the gradualist position.¹ Moreover, Kamalaśīla's commentary is extremely important for the light it sheds on his Madhyamaka position, which perhaps

¹ This famous Indian scholar came to Tibet, and official sources claim he did so to uphold the Indian side of gradual enlightenment against the Chinese side of sudden enlightenment in the famous bSam yas debate held before the Tibetan king. On the important controversy between advocates of sudden and gradual enlightenment, the bSam yas debate, and the role of Kamalaśīla in both the general controversy and the famous debate see the following introduction to the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* where these topics are presented in detail. It seems likely that Kamalaśīla wrote the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇīfīkā* in the context of the gradual-sudden controversy; indeed, he probably wrote it in Tibet after he wrote the threefold Bhāvanākrama that deals with the necessity of a gradual approach and the impossibility of a sudden approach and that cites the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*.

represents the pentacle of the Indian Madhyamaka tradition. I decided, therefore, to translate the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*, with some annotation from Kamalaśīla's commentary by the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇīṭīkā*, as well as some important sections of the latter.

That is why there is included in this work, which is otherwise devoted to the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*, a great deal of material concerning the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*. The original plan was to publish my work on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* accumulated since the late 1970s when I completed a translation of Mi pham's commentary to that work. This was closely followed by a translation of Vasubandhu's commentary. More recently having become aware of Rong ston's commentary, and noting that it had served as the model for Mi pham, I decided to translate it and continue work on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*. I then discovered the commentary by Blo bzang rta dbyangs, which explicitly states that it was written following Rong ston's commentary but according to the teachings of Tsong kha pa and his immediate disciples, and I decided to translate it also, because then this work on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* and its commentaries would contain the original text of Maitreya, the classical commentary of Vasubandhu, the commentary by the Sa skya pa Rong ston, the commentary by the rNying ma pa Mi pham, and the commentary by the dGe lugs pa Blo bzang rta dbyangs, thus giving a good look at the contrast between different approaches to the same text. At that point I had not yet discovered that the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* was the *sūtra* quoted in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*. Following Mi pham's identification of the quoted source as the *Kāśyapaparivartananāmamahāyānasūtra*, I had located the quoted passage in that work but had not bothered to consult the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*, mentioned by Mi pham only as the

source of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*'s teaching on the abandonment of marks. Still, however, I was cognizant that continuously from Vasubandhu to the present a tradition seeking teaching in the Maitreyan tradition was present. This realization of the continuity and viability of the ideas of the Maitreyan tradition was given a concrete focus when I was contacted by Dr. Henry Shiu and learned about Master Tam Shek-wing (rDo rje 'jigs 'dral)'s interest in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* and wish to write a commentary on it. I sent him my translation of Vasubandhu's commentary and he wrote a commentary on Vasubandhu's commentary that is included in the second volume of this work, thus making the range of focus of work on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* it presents extend well over fifteen hundred years, since generally Vasubandhu is considered to have lived in the fourth century.²

This idea of presenting the history of over fifteen hundred years of thought focused on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* was giving a significant boost by the discovery of a text, the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*, that is certainly the source of some significant teachings of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*, that is the sole text quoted by the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*, and that appears to be a precursor for such Maitreyan doctrines as the three constitutive principles and that reality is always present but cloaked in a shroud of obscuring conceptualization.³ The discovery that the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* was in fact the unnamed scripture quoted in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* and that it was the source for significant features of the

² See the General Introduction in this volume for more information on the work of Tam Shek-wing that is fully presented in the second volume.

³ Moreover the path-structure presented in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*, central to which is that contact with reality takes place on the path of seeing after intense cultivation, is the subject of the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*'s central metaphor of digging to obtain the present but obscured treasure.

Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga's structure establishes a reference point near the origin of what would come to be called the Maitreyan tradition.

This discovery came about toward the end of the above mentioned work on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*, when on a return trip to Berkeley, I decided to utilize the university's Tibetan collection to check Mi pham's report that the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* was the source of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*'s teaching of the fourfold abandoning of marks. Indeed that proved to be the case: the teaching of the fourfold abandoning of marks is the central element of the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*. Furthermore, it turns out, despite Mi pham's claim that the source of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga*'s sole scriptural citation was the *Kāśyapaparivartananāmamahāyānasūtra*, that in fact the actual source is the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*. The quoted passage does appear in the *Kāśyapaparivartananāmamahāyānasūtra* but only the passage without the attendant context that is present in the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī*. Therefore, in order to present a picture of the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* from its source to twentieth century commentaries I decided to include a translation of this fairly short *dhāraṇī*. That possibly could have proceed fairly quickly, but as there is a fascinating and excellent commentary to the *Avikalpapraveśadhāraṇī* by Kamalaśīla, I considered it desirable not only to utilize Kamalaśīla's commentary in explicating the *dhāraṇī* but also to translate large portions of this commentary because of its significance not just to the *Dharmadharmatāvibhaṅga* project but to the history of Buddhist thought, since it can be argued that Kamalaśīla's thought represents the highest development of Madhyamaka thought in India. Moreover, his coming to Tibet was a significant event in the introduction of Buddhism into that country.