

**Zeitschrift:** Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft  
**Band:** 53 (1999)  
**Heft:** 4  
  
**Artikel:** Ghosaka further resonates  
**Autor:** Dessein, Bart  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147482>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 02.08.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## GHOṢAKA FURTHER RESONATES\*

Bart Dessein, Ghent National University

As we have outlined elsewhere<sup>1</sup>, Ghōṣaka is mentioned in the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā* (T.1545; = AMV), in Dharmaśreṣṭhin's \**Abhidharmahr̥daya* (T.1550; = AH), Dharmatrāta's \**Samyuktābhidharmahr̥daya* (T.1552; = SAH), Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* (T.1558/1559; = AK), and Saṃghabhadra's \**Nyāyānusāra* (T.1562; = NAS) and \**Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā* (T.1563; = ASP). There further is the \**Abhidharmāmr̥tarasa* (T.1553; = AAR) that is attributed to Ghōṣaka.

Of these works, the AMV, NAS and ASP are Kāśmīra works, while the AH, SAH, AK and AAR belong to the Gandhāra philosophical current of Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma*.<sup>2</sup> The AH and the AAR are syntheses of Gandhāran Sarvāstivāda philosophy. The AH is preserved in a Chinese translation of A.D. 391.<sup>3</sup> In the *Ch'u San-tsang Chi Chi* 出三藏記集, we can read that the original Indian version of the text was written between the Ch'in 秦 and the Han 漢 Dynasties (i.e. between 221 B.C.–A.D. 220).<sup>4</sup> This makes the work older than the AMV.<sup>5</sup> The AAR is only preserved in

\* This article is the result of some reflections after a lecture on 'Ghōṣaka' presented at the University of Washington, Seattle, on the 8th. of December 1998. It can be read as complementary to my previous "The Resonance of Ghōṣaka", AS 1998.

1 See Dessein (1998).

2 For a brief description of the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā*: see Ichimura, Kawamura, Buswell, and Cox (1996): 511-568 and Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 229-239; of the \**Nyāyānusāra* and \**Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*: Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 240-249; of the \**Abhidharmahr̥daya*: Willemen (1996): 451-470 and Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 255-269; of the \**Samyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*: Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 255-269 and Dessein (1999a): 314-319; of the *Abhidharmakośa*: Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 269-278; of the \**Abhidharmāmr̥tarasa*: Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 278-282 and Kritzer (1996): 489-509.

3 Willemen (1975): xxxii.

4 T.2145: 74b23-24.

5 See Lin (1949): 51; Fukuhara (1965): 395; Frauwallner (1971): 86; Willemen (1975): ii-iii; Ryose (1986): 4.

a Chinese translation by an anonymous translator of the Ts'ao Wei 曹魏 (220-265).<sup>6</sup> As an analysis of the factors associated with awarenesses (*cittasamprayukta dharma*) places the AAR in between the \**Aṣṭagrantha* and the AMV<sup>7</sup>, it is likely that the original Indian work has to be placed around the second century A.D. This makes the work somewhat contemporary to the AH. As to textual format, the most obvious difference between the two works is that the AH consists of stanzas (*kārikā*) that are commented and illustrated in prose, while the AAR is a full prose work. With this, the textual format of the AAR equals the one of the *Vibhāṣā* commentaries.

Since the AMV is the most extensive sourcebook for *Abhidharma* research, it is logical to start an investigation of Ghoṣaka from the data this work reveals. Only a few of the 148 references to Ghoṣaka in the AMV enable us to make clear the position of the AAR and to determine the philosophical position of Ghoṣaka within Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma* development. In what follows, we will enumerate the most important statements attributed to this Sarvāstivāda master.

(1) Consciousness (*viññāna*) arises because of two conditions: an object-field (*viṣaya*) and a faculty (*indriya*).<sup>8</sup> The importance of this passage lies in the fact that Ghoṣaka is connected to Buddhadeva and to a 'scriptural text' (*sūtra*). It has been argued<sup>9</sup> that Buddhadeva has to be associated with the Dārṣāntika-Sautrāntika sub-group of Sarvāstivādins.<sup>10</sup>

(2) It is wisdom (*prajñā*) associated with consciousness of the eye (*cakṣurvijñāna*) that sees matter (*rūpa*).<sup>11</sup> According to the \**Aṣṭagrantha*, is it so that "When the eye (*cakṣus*) takes matter as supporting object

6 Van Den Broeck (1977): 8, suggests that the present version of the work does not belong to the third century, but was (partly) revised, probably under supervision of Saṃghadeva in Ch'ang-an 長安 in the fourth century. This argumentation is based on the similarities in vocabulary between AH and AAR, especially in chapters 9, 10 and 11.

7 Dessein (1996): 647; Sakurabe (1969): 57-58.

8 T.1545: 984a6-8.

9 Cox (1995): 41.

10 On the relationship between *Sūtra* literature and the Dārṣāntika-Sautrāntikas: see Przyluski (1940) and Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 106-110.

11 T.1545: 61c7-10.

(*ālambana*), consciousness of the eye arises”.<sup>12</sup> This also is the Vaibhāṣika viewpoint.<sup>13</sup> Ghōṣaka here deviates from the \**Aṣṭaśāstra* and the Vai-  
bhāṣikas. Related to this problem, Ghōṣaka further states that “All factors  
(*dharma*) (i.e. including molecules) are subject to vision, because they are  
the object of the eye of wisdom (*prajñācakṣus*)”. This position is con-  
tradicted in the AMV.<sup>14</sup>

(3) In Sarvāstivāda psychological classification, the state of being a  
worldling, ordinariness (*prthagjanatva*), figures in the list of formations  
dissociated from awarenesses (*cittaviprayukta saṃskāra*). Different schools  
of Buddhism have different lists (*mātrkā*) of such factors.<sup>15</sup> The AAR lists  
seventeen formations dissociated from awarenesses<sup>16</sup>, while the Vaibhāṣi-  
kas differentiate fourteen of them.<sup>17</sup>

(4) Four characteristic marks (*lakṣaṇa*) that make something con-  
ditioned (*saṃskṛta*) are differentiated: birth (*jāti*), duration (*sthiti*), decay  
(*jarā*) and impermanence (*anityatā*).<sup>18</sup> Also in the AAR four characteristic  
marks are differentiated.<sup>19</sup> The AAR further differentiates four secondary  
characteristic marks (*anulakṣaṇa*): birth of birth (*jātijāti*), duration of  
duration (*sthitisthiti*), decay of decay (*jarājarā*) and impermanence of  
impermanence (*anityatānityatā*).<sup>20</sup> With this, it follows the AH.<sup>21</sup> This  
points to a relatively late date for the AAR, and, consequently, for its  
probable author Ghōṣaka<sup>22</sup>, supporting our claim that the AAR is to be  
dated around the second century A.D.

(5) According to the AMV, the Vibhajyavādins—term that we can  
freely translate as ‘heterodox’—propose a distinction between a latent and a

12 T.1543: 774c27.

13 Imanishi (1969): 25; Kajiyama (1977): 115.

14 T.1545: 390b8-9, 684a18-19.

15 See Cox (1995): 79-81 and Dessein (1998): note #51.

16 T.1553: 979b28-c3.

17 See Dessein (1999b): Vol.2, 453-454, note #67 and # 68.

18 T.1545: 615b11-15.

19 T.1553: 970a5-9.

20 T.1553: 970a13-16.

21 T.1550: 811b17-28.

22 See Dessein (1998a): note #58.

passive phase of defilements (*kleśa*).<sup>23</sup> This division of defilements belongs to an earlier phase of *Abhidharma* development than the *Vibhāṣā* belongs to. The AMV attributes the following position to Ghōṣaka: “Although [the contaminants] do not have the function of taking an object (*viśaya*), it is so that there is a possibility to be a bond (*saṃyojana*) in the present”.<sup>24</sup> This implies that Ghōṣaka here accepts the difference between ‘contaminants’ (*anuśaya*) and ‘manifestly active defilements’ (*paryavasthāna*), the latent and the passive phase of defilements respectively. This places the doctrinal position of Ghōṣaka before the Vaibhāṣika-period. Also the AAR implicitly supports the distinction between contaminants and manifestly active defilements.<sup>25</sup> Contrary to what was suggested before, this would justify an earlier date for the AAR.

(6) Of the bad paths of action (*akuśala karmapatha*), taking life (*prāṇātipāta*) is manifesting (*viññapti*).<sup>26</sup> This is also the opinion attributed to Ghōṣaka in the AK<sup>27</sup> and in the NAS.<sup>28</sup> A special form of good action (*kuśala karman*) is fasting (*upavāsa*). The statement attributed to Ghōṣaka in the AMV is also attributed to Saṃghavasū.<sup>29</sup> The importance of the person of Saṃghavasū here, is that the theory concerning the successive-ness of awarenesses (*citta*) that is attributed to Ghōṣaka in the SAH<sup>30</sup> is attributed to Saṃghavasū in the AMV.<sup>31</sup> This gives evidence that the Ghōṣaka mentioned in the SAH is the same person as the Ghōṣaka mentioned in the AMV.

(7) Ghōṣaka’s definition of meditative attainment without conceptual identification (*asamjñīsamāpatti*)<sup>32</sup> is not the Vaibhāṣika opinion of the AMV<sup>33</sup>, however, it is the opinion attributed to Ghōṣaka in the AK<sup>34</sup>.

23 T.1545: 313a1ff..

24 T.1545: 113a28-b4.

25 T.1553: 968c24ff..

26 T.1545: 617b23-25, 619c8, 619c11-12.

27 T.1558: 94a12-13; T.1559: 248b12.

28 T.1562: 588c23-25.

29 T.1545: 747b16-19.

30 T.1552: 955b2.

31 T.1545: 816a5-10.

32 T.1545: 541c13-15.

33 T.1545: 784b24-c1.

(8) The analysis of the twelve-membered chain of dependent origination (*dvādaśāṅga pratītyasamutpāda*)—the interpretation as to the three periods of time—that is attributed to Ghōṣaka in the AMV<sup>35</sup> is also found in the AAR.<sup>36</sup>

(9) Of the four theories the AMV<sup>37</sup> mentions to explain the existence of the three periods of time, the theory that it are the characteristic marks that are different (*lakṣaṇānyathātva*) is attributed to Ghōṣaka.<sup>38</sup> Ghōṣaka is attributed with the same theory, also in the AK<sup>39</sup>, the NAS<sup>40</sup>, and the ASP.<sup>41</sup>

(10) Related to the cause-fruit series, is the succession of different awarenesses of the different realms.<sup>42</sup> The same theory is attributed to Ghōṣaka in the SAH<sup>43</sup>, in the NAS<sup>44</sup> and in the ASP.<sup>45</sup> Ghōṣaka is familiar with both the four conditions (*pratyaya*) and the six causes (*hetu*) to explain causality.<sup>46</sup> As the AMV, also the AAR has notion of the six causes and the four conditions.<sup>47</sup> This again points to a relatively late date of the person Ghōṣaka.

(11) There are two kinds of aids to penetration (*nirvedhabhāgīya*). The first two of these—warmth (*ūṣman*) and summit (*mūrdhan*)—are bound to the realm of sexual passion (*kāmadhātu*); the last two—patience (*kṣānti*) and the highest worldly factor (*laukikāgradharma*)—are bound to the realm

---

34 T.1558: 25c28-26a6; T.1559: 184b5-10.

35 T.1545: 118b12-15, 124c17-24, 980b15-17.

36 T.1553: 970c25-971a2. See in this respect: Dessein (1999c): 53-83.

37 T.1545: 396a13-b23: Dharmatrāta: *bhāvānyathātva*; Ghōṣaka: *lakṣaṇānyathātva*; Vasumitra: *avasthānyathātva*; Buddhadeva: *anyonyathātva*.

38 T.1545: 396a13-b23.

39 T.1558: 104c8-13; T.1559: 258a7-12.

40 T.1562: 631a21-26.

41 T.1563: 901c18-23.

42 T.1545: 373b6-10, 960a7-10, 961c13-16.

43 T.1552: 955b2-4.

44 T.1562: 453a26-27.

45 T.1563: 826c11-12.

46 T.1545: 81a28-b3, 97b5-9, 105b16-22, 283b17-22, 680c16-20.

47 T.1553: 970a16-b3.

of form (*rūpadhātu*). The AMV does not agree with this opinion: all roots of merit (*kuśalamūla*) belong to the realm of form.<sup>48</sup> This opinion of the AMV also is the opinion of the AAR<sup>49</sup>. In the SAH<sup>50</sup>, AK<sup>51</sup>, NAS<sup>52</sup>, and ASP<sup>53</sup> Ghoṣaka is attributed with the theory that divides the roots of merit to the realm of sexual passion and the realm of form. The importance of the above is that the Ghoṣaka of the AMV and the AAR do not share the same opinion. For the application of mindfulness on feelings (*vedanā-smṛtyupasthāna*), Ghoṣaka is quoted by a reference to some undefined scriptural text.<sup>54</sup> In his definition of mindfulness (*smṛti*) produced by attention through resolve (*adhimuktimanaskāra*), Ghoṣaka contradicts Kātyāyanīputra.<sup>55</sup>

(12) The path of vision is described as “the wheel of the doctrine”<sup>56</sup>. Also the Ghoṣaka of the SAH<sup>57</sup>, AK<sup>58</sup>, NAS<sup>59</sup>, and ASP<sup>60</sup> explains the path of vision as the turning of the wheel of the doctrine.

(13) In explaining the process of abandoning defilements<sup>61</sup>, ‘scriptural texts’<sup>62</sup> and the «*Sheng-chih Lun*» (*Jñānotthāpanaśāstra*) are referred to.<sup>63</sup> The AMV and the \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1546) connect the «*Sheng-chih Lun*» with Ghoṣaka.<sup>64</sup> The AMV explains that for abandoning

48 T.1545: 1545: 25c14-18.

49 T.1553: 973a19-21.

50 T.1552: 910a26-27.

51 T.1558: 120b3-4; T.1559: 272b1-3.

52 T.1562: 681b29-c1.

53 T.1563: 922b24-26.

54 T.1545: 518b13-15.

55 T.1545: 205a28-b2.

56 T.1545: 912b1-4.

57 T.1552: 950b22-23.

58 T.1558: 128c2-6; T.1559: 280a5-8.

59 T.1562: 709a24-27.

60 T.1563: 934b21-24.

61 T.1545: 186a8-9, 253a4-10, 254a23-25, 268b1-2, 444c28-445a1, 487a24-27, 497b17-23, 534a18-22, 540c8-10, 556b21-26, 627a20-24.

62 T.1545: 316b6-12, 497b17-23.

63 T.1545: 397b13-22, 507a28-b11.

64 T.1545: 5c9, 38b10, 397b19 and 507b4; T.1546: 245b9.



defilements, there are two kinds of antidote (*pratipakṣa*): the antidote that is abandoning (*prahāṇapratipakṣa*) and the antidote that is detraction (*vidūṣaṇāpratipakṣa*). The pre-trance (*anāgamyadhyāna*) is with both kinds of antidote, and the higher five stages<sup>65</sup> are without the antidote that is abandoning.<sup>66</sup> To this, the venerable Ghōṣaka is reported to have objected that all six stages of the realm of form<sup>67</sup> all have the two kinds of antidote.<sup>68</sup> The opinion of Ghōṣaka here equals the one of the *Prakaraṇapāda*<sup>69</sup>, one of the oldest Sarvāstivāda texts. The same opinion is attributed to Ghōṣaka in the AK<sup>70</sup> and in the ASP.<sup>71</sup> These texts contradict the ‘orthodox’ Vaibhāṣika viewpoint.

(14) Eight full overcoming comprehensions (*parijñā*) in the fundamental trances (*mauladhyāna*) are differentiated.<sup>72</sup> This is also the opinion of Ghōṣaka in the SAH<sup>73</sup> and in the NAS.<sup>74</sup> This contradicts the Vaibhāṣika idea that there are only five full overcoming comprehensions in this case. The AAR<sup>75</sup> lists a completely different set of nine full overcoming comprehensions, i.e. a combination of the full overcoming comprehensions as we find them in the AH<sup>76</sup> and in the *\*Aṣṭagrantha*.<sup>77</sup> This set of nine is the same as in the AK<sup>78</sup>.

(15) The knowledge of birth and death (*cyutyupapādajñāna*) is included in four knowledges (*jñāna*), and the knowledge of the former

65 The intermediate trance and the four fundamental trances.

66 T.1545: 15a7-10.

67 The pre-trance, intermediate trance and four fundamental trances.

68 T.1545: 15a11-21. See also T.1545: 411c8-18.

69 T.1541: 637a8ff.; T.1542: 697b6ff., 716c11ff., 718a4ff., 758a4ff., 760c21ff., 764a1ff.. Notice that the *\*Abhidharmāvatāra* is conceived as a commentary on the *Prakaraṇapāda*.

70 T.1558: 112c3-4; T.1559: 265b2-5.

71 T.1563: 912b12-13.

72 T.1545: 324c20-21.

73 T.1552: 906b17-19.

74 T.1562: 654c27-28.

75 T.1553: 972b28-c4.

76 T.1550: 817c19-27.

77 T.1543: 790a17. See also Van Den Broeck (1977): 66-67.

78 T.1558: 112aff..



existences (*pūrvanivāsānusmṛtijñāna*) is included in six knowledges.<sup>79</sup> Also the SAH attributes this opinion to Ghoṣaka.<sup>80</sup>

(16) The interpretation of the diamond-like *samādhi* (*vajropama-samādhi*)<sup>81</sup> is the same as the opinion attributed to Ghoṣaka in the SAH<sup>82</sup>, in the NAS<sup>83</sup>, and in the ASP<sup>84</sup>.

(17) The opinion concerning the *arhat* who is able to prolong his own life (*āyuhṣaṃskāra*) depending on the fourth trance<sup>85</sup>, is the same opinion as the one attributed to Ghoṣaka in the AK.<sup>86</sup>

This brings us to the following scheme, in which the Abhidharma texts are listed in chronological order:

79 T.1545: 547a11-12, a16. Four knowledges: knowledge of the doctrine (*dharma-jñāna*), subsequent knowledge (*anvaya-jñāna*), conventional knowledge (*saṃvṛti-jñāna*) and knowledge of frustration (*dukkhajñāna*). Six knowledges: no knowledge of the awareness of another (*paracittajñāna*) and no knowledge of cessation (*nirodhajñāna*). See Dessein (1999b): Vol.1, p.414 and Vol.2, p.328, note #453.

80 T.1552: 920c23-25. The \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasa* equals *pūrvanivāsānusmṛtijñāna* to the conventional knowledge (*saṃvṛtijñāna*). This is seen as the opinion of the Ābhidhārmikas of Kaśmīra in Upaśānta's \**Abhidharmahr̥daya* (T.1551: 855a18-b1). Also the *Abhidharmakośa* (T.1558: 142c29-143a1) equals *pūrvanivāsānusmṛtijñāna* to *saṃvṛtijñāna*.

81 T.1545: 143c20-26.

82 T.1552: 957c27-958a3.

83 T.1562: 700b25-28.

84 T.1563: 930c25-28.

85 T.1545: 657a27-b1.

86 T.1558: 15b23-27; T.1559: 174c28-175a2.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Prakaraṇapāda (T.1541/1542)													=				
*Aṣṭagrantha (T.1543)		≠												≠			
Jñānaprasthāna (T.1544)																	
*Abhidharmahr̥daya (T.1550)				=													
*Abhidharmāmṛtarasa (T.1553)			≠	=	=			=		=	≠			≠			
*Mahāvibhāṣā (T.1545)		≠		=	≠		≠		≠	=	≠		≠	≠			
*Saṃyuktābhidharma- hr̥daya (T.1552)						⊕				⊕	⊕	⊕		⊕	⊕	⊕	
Abhidharmakośa (T.1558/1559)						⊕	⊕		⊕		⊕	⊕	⊕				⊕
*Nyāyānusāra (T.1562)						⊕			⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕		⊕		⊕	
*Abhidharmasamaya- pradīpikā (T.1563)									⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕			⊕	
Buddhadeva	=																
Kātyāyanīputra											≠						
Samghavasu						=											

= : agrees with the Ghoṣaka of AMV

≠ : disagrees with the Ghoṣaka of AMV

⊕ : attributes the same theory to Ghoṣaka as the AMV does.

While some of the above elements suggest an early philosophical position for Ghoṣaka (e.g., position 5), other elements force us to see in Ghoṣaka a later philosopher (e.g., positions 4, 8, 10). The similarities between the AAR and the Ghoṣaka of the AMV in 4 and 10 explain the attribution of the AAR to Ghoṣaka by many eminent scholars.<sup>87</sup> There are, however, positions that oppose such an identity (e.g., 3 and 11).

87 Lin (1949): 47-48; Bareau in Śānti Bhikṣu Śāstri (1953): ii; Mochizuki (1960-63): Vol.V, 4780, Vol.VI, 4292; Frauwallner (1963): 27; Fukuhara (1965): 390; de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.1, xlvi; Akanuma (1979): 203-205; Warder (1991): 347; Buswell and Jaini (1996): 102; Kritzer (1996): 489.

The tradition knows Ghoṣaka as a Tokharian, settled in Gandhāra, who after the synod of Kaniṣka (second century A.D.<sup>88</sup>) went to the West of Kaśmīra and near Tukhara.<sup>89</sup> This Gandhāran affiliation of Ghoṣaka explains why he is criticized in the AMV, and why some of his philosophical positions have to be dated relatively early and/or are non-Vaibhāṣika (e.g., position 15). It further explains that Ghoṣaka, although disagreeing with the *\*Aṣṭagrantha*, is familiar with the philosophical concepts of that work (e.g., position 14), and that he agrees with other Gandhāran philosophers, i.c. Buddhadeva (position 1) and Saṃghavasū (position 6), while disagreeing with Kātyāyanīputra (position 11). We know that Kātyāyanīputra has to be connected to the Kāśmīri Sarvāstivādins. The association of Ghoṣaka with *sūtras* is also to be noted in this respect (positions 1, 11 and 13).

Vaibhāṣika positions in the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasa* (positions 4, 8 and 10) can be explained by the same historical fact: as Ghoṣaka moved to the West of Kaśmīra and near Tukhara (and became known as a Tokharian), he undoubtedly was influenced by Vaibhāṣika ideas. Vaibhāṣika influence was general in this period and is also visible in Upaśānta's *\*Abhidharmahr̥daya* and in the SAH. Vaibhāṣika influence is, further, also seen in, e.g., the enumeration of the same ten envelopers (*paryavasthāna*) as in Dharmatrāta's work.<sup>90</sup> The treatment of the moments for leaving non-restraint (*asaṃvara*)<sup>91</sup>, the treatment of factors arising with awarenesses<sup>92</sup>, the enumeration of seventeen heavens in the realm of form<sup>93</sup>, and the treatment of preparatory exercises for the path<sup>94</sup> fit in the tradition after Dharmaśreṣṭhin. Hence, José Van Den Broeck concluded that the AAR is an adaptation of Dharmaśreṣṭhin's *\*Abhidharmahr̥daya*.<sup>95</sup>

88 For the dates of Kaniṣka: see Basham (1968); Simonetta (1978): 168 and 176; Fussman (1980a): 29-31 and 41, (1980b): 46; Posch (1995): 101.

89 See Bareau in Śānti Bhikṣu Śāstri (1953): ii; Malalasekera (1961-present): 84; Schiefner (1965): 49; de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.1, xlvi.

90 T.1553: 972b16-27.

91 T.1553: 968b20-21.

92 T.1553: 970b20-c17. See Dessein (1996): 634-635.

93 T.1553: 966c14-19.

94 T.1553: 972a25-b10.

95 Van Den Broeck (1977): 83.

This is not necessarily so. As mentioned, the AAR is a full prose work. This is the style that is predominant in Kāśmīra texts. As Ghōṣaka is reported to have moved near Tukhara, it is not unlikely that he chose the textual type that was predominant in that region to compose a text (the AAR) that had the same purpose as the AH. A logical consequence of this is that the AAR is not—as José Van Den Broeck claimed—a first adaptation of the AR, but is an independent work. This would account for its peculiar positions (e.g., positions 3 and 14). The style of prose works was not exclusively Kāśmīra: we know that *vibhāṣās* were also written in Gandhāra (e.g., Sitapāṇi's *\*Vibhāṣā[śāstra]* T.1547).<sup>96</sup> However, the textual type peculiar to the Gandhāra region is the type the AH belongs to: *sūtra*-like treatises. It is very likely that starting from the second century A.D.—the heydays of Kāśmīra philosophy—the Gandhāran Sarvāstivādins developed this peculiar type of texts, to the disadvantage of the full prose works. The first of these developments was the *\*Abhidharmahrdaya* by Upaśānta (around the third century A.D.)<sup>97</sup> This development resulted in it that the AAR, a text that as to textual format was reminiscent of the Kāśmīra works, was neglected and the name of its author was lost.

After Kāśmīra dominance, the AAR was reclaimed by the Gandhāra philosophers and attributed to Ghōṣaka.<sup>98</sup> This attribution explains the different opinions between the AAR and the AMV. In this respect, we have to remark that all post-*Vibhāṣā* works refer to the same Ghōṣaka as the AMV does (positions 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17), and that, e.g., the SAH only refers to one other philosopher: Ghōṣaka (positions 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16).

A similar scheme can, further, be drawn for Skandhila, a fifth century author, who wrote the *\*Abhidharmāvatāra* (T.1554).<sup>99</sup> Also this work is a full prose work that is reported to have been written in a place 'close' to Kāśmīra. The work is conceived as a commentary on the Gandhāra version of the *Prakaraṇapāda* and serves as a handbook for *Abhidharma*.<sup>100</sup> Its

96 See Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 125 and 156-159.

97 Kimura (1974): 230.

98 See Dessein (1998).

99 Van Velthem (1977): x. Van Velthem (1977): xi, describes Skandhila as a rival of Saṃghabhadra.

100 See Van Velthem (1977): ix; Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 76-77 and 283.

dependence upon the *Prakaraṇapāda*, a work even prior to the *\*Aṣṭa-grantha*, may just be one reason why the work was not as influential as, in the past, the AH had been, and, now, the AK was beginning to be. Also its textual format was not advantageous for such a development. As the AAR, the *\*Abhidharmāvatāra* at the one hand shows positions which are peculiar of Gandhāra *Abhidharma*, and others which are clearly Vaibhāṣika influenced.

One more question to be answered is why Skandhila would conceive his work as a commentary on the *Prakaraṇapāda*. Skandhila lived in the fifth century, the same period Vasubandhu lived in Gandhāra. That Vasubandhu compiles his AK gives evidence of it that the Vaibhāṣika dominance had already declined. That Skandhila returns to the *Prakaraṇapāda* may be the result of it that the AMV had been conceived as a commentary on the *Jñānaprasthāna*, the Kāśmīra interpretation of the Gandhāran *\*Aṣṭa-grantha*. As a consequence, Skandhila turned to that other work of which a Kāśmīra adaptation had been made: the *Prakaraṇapāda*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1. Primary Sources

#### T. Vol.26

No.1541: Vasumitra, [*Abhidharma*] *prakaraṇapāda[sāstra]* 衆事分阿毘曇論 «*Chung-shih-fen A-p'i-t'an Lun*», Guṇabhadra and Bodhiyaśas.

No.1542: Vasumitra, [*Abhidharma*] *prakaraṇapāda[sāstra]* 阿毘達磨品類足論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo P'in-lei Tsu-lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

No.1543: Kātyāyanīputra, *\*Abhidharmāṣṭa-grantha[sāstra]* 阿毘曇八犍度論 «*A-p'i-t'an Pa-chien-tu lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

No.1544: Kātyāyanīputra, [*Abhidharma*] *jñānaprasthāna[sāstra]* 阿毘達磨發智論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Fa-chih Lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

#### T. Vol.27

No.1545: 500 *arhats*, [*Abhidharma*] *mahāvibhāṣā[sāstra]* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Ta-p'i-p'o-sha Lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

## T. Vol.28

No. 1546: Kātyāyanīputra and 500 *arhats*, \*[*Abhidharma*]/*vibhāṣā*[*śāstra*] 阿毘曇毘婆沙論 «*A-p'i-t'an P'i-p'o-sha Lun*», Buddhavarman, Tao-t'ai 道泰 and others.

No.1547: Sitapāṇi, \**Vibhāṣā*[*śāstra*] 鞞婆沙論 «*P'i-p'o-sha Lun*», Saṃghabhadra.

No.1550: \*Dharmaśreṣṭhin, \**Abhidharmahr̥daya*[*śāstra*] 阿毘曇心論 «*A-p'i-t'an Hsin Lun*», Saṃghadeva.

No.1551: \*Upāśānta, \**Abhidharmahr̥daya* 阿毘曇心論經 «*A-p'i-t'an Hsin Lun Ching*», Narendrayaśas.

No.1552: Dharmatrāta, \**Samyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*[*śāstra*] 雜阿毘曇心論 «*Tsa A-p'i-t'an Hsin Lun*», Saṃghavarman.

No.1553: Ghōṣaka, \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasa* 阿毘曇甘露味論 «*A-p'i-t'an Kan-lu-wei Lun*».

No.1554: \*Skandhila, *Prakaraṇābhidharmāvatāra* 入阿毘達磨論 «*Ju A-p'i-ta-mo Lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

## T. Vol.29

No.1558: Vasubandhu, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* 阿毘達磨俱舍論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Chü-she Lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

No.1559: Vasubandhu, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* 阿毘達磨俱舍釋論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Chü-she Shih Lun*», Paramārtha.

No.1562: Saṃghabhadra, \*[*Abhidharma*]/*Nyāyānusāraśāstra* 阿毘達磨順正理論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Shun Cheng-li Lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

No.1563: Saṃghabhadra, \**Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā* 阿毘達磨藏顯宗論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Tsang Hsien Tsung Lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

## T. Vol.55

No.2145: Seng-yu 僧祐, 出三藏記集 «*Ch'u San-tsang Chi Chi*».

## 2. Secondary Sources

AKANUMA, Ch., ([1931] 1979<sup>3</sup>), *Indo Bukkyō Koyū Meishi Jiten*, Kyoto: Hōshōkan.

BASHAM, A.L., (Ed.), (1968), *Papers on the Date of Kaniṣka – Submitted to the Conference on the Date of Kaniṣka, London, 20-22 April, 1960*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.



BUSWELL, R.E. Jr. and JAINI, P.S., (1996), "The Development of Abhidharma Philosophy", in POTTER, K., (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol.VII: Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp.73-119.

COX, C., (1995), *Disputed Dharmas – Early Buddhist Theories on Existence – An Annotated Translation of the Section on Factors Dissociated from Thought from Saṅghabhadra's Nyāyānusāra*, Tokyo: Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XI.

DESSEIN, B., (1996), "Dharmas associated with Awarenesses and the Dating of the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma Works", *Études Asiatiques* L.3, pp.623-651.

DESSEIN, B., (1998), "The Resonance of Ghoṣaka", *Études Asiatiques* LII.4, pp.1001-1057.

DESSEIN, B., (1999a), "Dharmatrāta: Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥dayaśāstra", in POTTER, K., (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol.VIII, Buddhist Philosophy from 100 to 350 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp.314-319.

DESSEIN, B., (trans.) (1999b), *Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions*, 3 Vols., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

DESSEIN, B., (1999c): "Self, Dependent Origination and Action in Bactrian and Gandhāran Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma Texts", *Communication and Cognition*, vol.32 1/2, pp.53-83.

FRAUWALLNER, E., (1963), "Abhidharma-Studien I, Pañcaskandhakam und Pañcavastukam", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* VII, pp.20-36.

FRAUWALLNER, E., (1971), "Abhidharma-Studien III, Der Abhisamayavādaḥ", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ost-Asiens* XV, pp.69-121.

FUKUHARA, R., (1965), *Ubu Abhidatsumaron no Hattatsu*, Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō.

FUSSMAN, G., (1980a), "Nouvelles inscriptions Saka: ère d'Eucratides, ère d'Azès, ère Vikrama, ère de Kaniska", *Bulletin de l'École-française d'Extrême-Orient* 68, pp.1-43.



FUSSMAN, G., (1980b), “Documents épigraphiques kouchans (II)”, *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* 68, pp.45-58.

ICHIMURA, Sh., KAWAMURA, K., BUSWELL, R.E. Jr. and COX, C., (1996), “Mahāvībhāṣā” in POTTER, K., (Ed.), (1996), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VII, Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp.511-568.

IMANISHI, J., (1969), *Das Pañcavastukam und die Pañcavastukavibhāṣā (Abhidharma-texte in Sanskrit aus den Turfanfunden I)*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1. Philologisch-historische Klasse 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

KAJIYAMA, Y., (1977), “Realism of the Sarvāstivāda School”, in *Buddhist Thought and Civilization – Essays in Honor of Herbert, V. Guenther on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Kawamura, S. and Scott, K., (Eds.), Emeryville: Dharma Publishing.

KIMURA, T., (1974), *Kimura Taiken Zenshu IV: Abidatsumaron no Kenkyū*, Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku.

KRITZER, R., (1996), “Ghoṣaka, Abhidharmāmṛta”, in POTTER, K., (Ed.), (1996), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VII, Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp.489-509.

LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, L., de (trans.) ([1923-1931] 1971), *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, 6 Vols., Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, (6 Vols.).

LIN, L.-k., (1949), *L’aide-mémoire de la vraie loi (Saddharma-smṛtyupasthānasūtra) – Introduction au compendium de la loi*, Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient.

MALALASEKARA, G.P. (1961-present), *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Colombo: Government of Sri Lanka.

MOCHIZUKI, Sh., (1960-63), 10 Vols., *Bukkyō Daijiten*, Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.

POSCH, W., (1995), *Baktrien zwischen Griechen und Kuschan – Untersuchungen zu kulturellen und historischen Problemen einer Übergangsphase – Mit einem textkritischen Exkurs zum Shiji 123*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

PRZYLUSKI, J., (1940), “Dārṣāntika, Sautrāntika and Sarvāstivāda”, *Indian Historical Quarterly* 16, pp.246-254.

RYOSE, W.R., (1986), “The Position of the Abhidharmahrdaya in the Historical Development of Sarvāstivāda Thought”, *Abhidharma Research Institute*, Kyoto, No.5, pp.1-16.

SAKURABE, H., (1969), *Kusharon no Kenkyū*, Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

ŚĀNTI BHIKṢU ŚĀSTRĪ, (1953), “Abhidharmāmṛta of Ghoṣaka”, *Visvabharati Annals* 5, pp. 1-153.

SCHIEFNER, A., (1965), (Ed.), *Taranātha, čhos 'byun = Tāranāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione Narratio. Contextum Tibeticum*, Tokyo. Reprint of: Petropoli: E Codicibus Petropolitanis, 1968.

SIMONETTA, A., (1978), “The Chronology of the Gondopharean Dynasty”, *East and West* 28, pp. 155-187.

VAN DEN BROECK, J., (trans.) (1977), *La saveur de l'immortel (A-p'i-t'an Kan Lu Wei Lun) – La version chinoise de l'Amṛtarasa de Ghoṣaka (T.1553)*, Louvain: Institut Orientaliste de l'Université Catholique de Louvain.

VAN VELTHEM, M., (trans.) (1977), *Le traité de la descente dans la profonde loi (Abhidharmāvatāraśāstra) de l'arhat Skandhila*, Louvain-la-neuve: Institut Orientaliste.

WARDER, A.K., ([1970] 1991<sup>2</sup>), *Indian Buddhism*, Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass.

WILLEMEN, C., (trans.), (1975), *The Essence of Metaphysics. Abhidharmahrdaya*, Brussel: Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Bouddhiques, Série Études et Textes 4.

WILLEMEN, C., (1996) “(Bhadanta) Dharmaśrī, Abhidharmahṛdaya or Abhidharma-sāra”, in Potter, K., (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VII, Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp.451-470.

WILLEMEN, C., Dessein, B., Cox, C., (1998), *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Zweite Abteilung Indien, Leiden: E.J.Brill.

