

# The resonance of Ghosaka

Autor(en): **Dessein, Bart**

Objektyp: **Article**

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

Band (Jahr): **52 (1998)**

Heft 4

PDF erstellt am: **25.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147436>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## THE RESONANCE OF GHOṢAKA

Bart Dessein, Ghent National University

Such major works as Louis de La Vallée Poussin's French translation of the 'Abhidharmakośa,' or the French translation of the \*Abhidharmā-mṛtarasa by José Van Den Broeck<sup>1</sup> have made the person(s) called Ghoṣaka appear as very familiar. However, related to the dubious attribution of the \*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra to Ghoṣaka<sup>2</sup>, an exact outline of Ghoṣaka's philosophy as well as a general accepted theory on exactly which Ghoṣaka is to be linked to which Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma*<sup>3</sup> text fail to the present day.

The purpose of this article, consequently, is threefold. Our first aim is to give an outline of Ghoṣaka's philosophical position; secondly, to—throughout this description—provide an overview and comparison of the various philosophical positions attributed to Ghoṣaka in the different Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma* works, and thirdly, to make an attempt to clear to problem of the identity of Ghoṣaka and of the doctrinal position of the \*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra.

- 1 La Vallée Poussin, L. de (trans.) ([1923-1931] 1971), *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, 6 Vols., Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises; 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.
- 2 See note 13.
- 3 'Sarvāstivāda' here refers to the 'Sarvāstivādins' in their most encompassing meaning: i.e. as including the original Sarvāstivādins, originating from Mathurā; the Kāśmīri Vaibhāśikas, the Western Masters of Gandhāra and Bactria (the Dārṣāntika-Sautrāntikas) who are also referred to as Bahirdeśaka, Aparāntaka and Pāścattya, and the Mūlasarvāstivādins. See Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 19.

P'u-kuang 普光, in his seventh century commentary to the *Abhidharma-kośa* «*Chü-she Lun Chi*» 俱舍論記, gives the following explanation of the name 'Ghoṣaka'<sup>4</sup>:

“The venerable Ghoṣaka 妙音 is the second master of the Sarvāstivādins. Since his voice was superb, he was called ‘Good’ (妙) ‘Sound’ (音). In Sanskrit, this is Ghoṣa (懼沙 Chü-sha)<sup>5</sup>. However, one said 瞿沙 Ch'ü-sha<sup>6</sup>, which is a mistake.”

Indeed, all Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma* texts that refer to Ghoṣaka, refer to this person as 尊者瞿沙<sup>7</sup>, as 大德瞿沙<sup>8</sup>, as 尊者妙音<sup>9</sup>, or as 大德妙音<sup>10</sup>, whereby most texts use only one rendering into Chinese of the name Ghoṣaka. Exception to this is the \**Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā* (T.1563) that refers to Ghoṣaka as 尊者瞿沙 once, and five times as 尊者妙音. In view of the fact that Seng-yu 僧祐, in his list of Sarvāstivāda patriarchs in the «*Ch'u San-tsang Chi Chi*» 出三藏記集 (dated 515 A.D.), lists a 'bodhisattva' Ghoṣaka at number 14 and a second time at number 10; and an 'arhat' Ghoṣaka at number 20 and a second time at number 15<sup>11</sup>, one may ask whether it is possible that 妙音 and 瞿沙 refer to a different Ghoṣaka. This assumption seems justified as José Van Den Broeck concluded that:

4 T.1821: 310c12-14. For the dates of P'u-kuang: see Demiéville (1978): 248.

5 Early Middle Chinese: [ky` - ṣa] (Pulleyblank (1991): 165, 273). Sir Monier-Williams (1990): 378: ghoṣa: > √ghuṣ: to sound, to cry or proclaim aloud; ghoṣa: a proclamation; ghoṣaka: ifc. crier, proclaimer.

6 Early Middle Chinese: [k<sup>h</sup>y` - ṣa] (Pulleyblank (1991): 260, 273).

7 T.1546, T.1552 and T.1563.

8 T.1559.

9 T.1545, T.1558, T.1562 and T.1563.

10 T.1555.

11 T.2145: 89a26 and 89c8 (瞿沙); 89a29 (瞿沙) and 89c12 (巨沙 [Chü-sha], Early Middle Chinese: [ky` - ṣa] (Pulleyblank (1991): 164, 273)). With this, Ghoṣaka is placed before the Dharmatrāta of the \**Mahāvibhāṣā* (T.1545) and the one of the \**Samyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra* (T.1552).

“Il semble logique de conclure que l'*Amṛta* doit être l'œuvre d'un autre Ghoṣaka, puisque non seulement les thèses du Bhadanta Ghoṣaka n'y sont pas mentionnées, mais que le texte les contredit dans certains cas et semble enfin appartenir à une époque plus tardive que celle du Bhadanta Ghoṣaka cité dans la *Vibhāṣā*”.<sup>12</sup>

As the attribution of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* to Ghoṣaka seems to be based solely on the colophon to the work<sup>13</sup>—it is hereby remarkable that while Ghoṣaka is only referred to in post-*Vibhāṣā* works, in none of the Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma* works posterior to the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*, there is an attribution of this work to Ghoṣaka—it is, consequently, especially the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1545), commentary on Kātyāyanīputra's *Jñānaprasthāna*<sup>14</sup> and massive source-book of the Sarvāstivāda doctrine<sup>15</sup> that gives us evidence for Ghoṣaka's philosophical position. In this *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, Ghoṣaka appears as one of four masters of the *Abhidharma*, i.e. on equal level with Bhadanta Dharmatrāta, Vasumitra and Buddhadeva.<sup>16</sup> These four masters are

12 Van Den Broeck (1977): 21.

13 In the «*Ch'u San-tsang Chi Chi*» (T.2145: 32b6), the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* is mentioned among the works of anonymous translators. This is also the case in Fa-ching's 法經 «*Chung Ching Mu-lu*» 衆經目錄 (T.2146: 142c3), in Yents'ung's 彥琮 «*Chung Ching Mu-lu*» 衆經目錄 (T.2147: 156a16), and in Ching-t'ai's 靜泰 «*Chung Ching Mu-lu*» 衆經目錄 (T.2148: 188c17). Fei Ch'ang-fang's 費長房 «*Li-tai San-pao Chi*» 歷代三寶記 (T.2034: 60b20), dated 597 A.D., states that it is a work by an anonymous translator of between the Wei and the Wu (220-280). This is also the information of Tao-hsüan's 道宣 «*Ta T'ang Nei-tien Lu*» 大唐內典錄 (T.2149: 231a18), catalogue which is dated 664 A.D. The work is attributed to Ghoṣaka in Chih-sheng's 智昇 «*K'ai-yüan Shih Chiao Lu*» 開元釋教錄 (T.2154: 491c6), dated 730 A.D., and «*K'ai-yüan Shih Chiao Lu Lüeh Ch'u*» 開元釋教錄略出 (T.2155: 743b26). See also Van Den Broeck (1977): 4 and 12 where it is remarked that the last words of the Chinese translation of the text (T.1553: 980b17-18) may equally be a falsification.

14 T.1545: 1a18-19.

15 Buswell and Jaini (1996): 110, 112.

16 See Bareau in Śānti Bhikṣu Śāstrī (1953): i.

reported to have collaborated in the compilation of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* at the synod under Kaniṣka, in the second century A.D.<sup>17</sup>

Apart from the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, Ghoṣaka is also referred to in the *\*[Abhidharma]vibhāṣā[śāstra]*, translation of the *Vibhāṣā* by Buddhavarman, Tao-t'ai 道泰 and others (T.1546)<sup>18</sup>, in Dharmatrāta's *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥dayaśāstra* (T.1552), in Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* (T.1558 and T.1559), in Saṃghabhadra's *\*[Abhidharma]Nyāyānusāraśāstra* (T.1562) and *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā* (T.1563), and in Dharmatrāta's *\*Pañcavastukavibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1555).

According to the Taishō Index-volume No.15 (毘曇部[中]), p.218, also the *Samgītiparyāya*, T.1536, p.367a28 mentions Ghoṣaka (as 妙音). To our opinion, this passage does not refer to Ghoṣaka, but should be read as: "The disciples [...] further proclaimed in nice wordings (妙音) the manifold differences in retribution of giving (*dāna*) to the Mallas."<sup>19</sup>

Complementary to all this, the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* connects the «*Sheng-chih Lun*» 生智論<sup>20</sup>, work which is now lost, to Ghoṣaka. Also the *\*Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra* mentions the «*Sheng-chih Lun*».<sup>21</sup>

\* \* \*

In the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, Ghoṣaka is mentioned 148 times (as 妙音). With this, the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* gives the most extensive description of Ghoṣaka's philosophy. In the *\*Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstrā* (T.1546), Ghoṣaka is mentioned 69 times (as 瞿沙).

As the philosophical position attributed to Ghoṣaka in these two works is the same, this gives evidence for the fact that (1) Chū-sha and Miao-yin

17 See Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 116-121.

18 See Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 232-233.

19 See also Stache-Rosen (1968): 42.

20 T.1545: 5c9, 38b10, 397b19 and 507b4. *\*Jñānotthāpanaśāstra*: see de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.6, 113.

21 T.1546: 245b9. Louis de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.6, 113, also links the «*Wen Fan-kang Ching*» 問梵綱經 (*\*Prašnanirṇaya*) to Ghoṣaka. See T.1545: 38a19.

refer to the same person and that (2) the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* (T.1545) and the *\*Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1546) go back to the same recension.<sup>22</sup>

The quotations of and references to Ghoṣaka are scattered all over the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*. In order to outline Ghoṣaka's philosophy, there consequently, is need to organize these quotations and references in a structuralized system. Dharmasreṣṭhin's *\*Abhidharmahr̥daya* (T.1550) provides an excellent model for this aim.<sup>23</sup> This Bactrian (Bahirdeśaka) work for the first time presented the Sarvāstivāda path to salvation in a logically worked-out system, and served as model for the later Gandhāra philosophical works of Sarvāstivāda tendency. The fundamental thesis of the work is that the contaminants (*anuśaya*) are the cause of transmigration (*saṃsāra*) and that one can be released from these contaminants by developing the path of salvation. The path of salvation is to be summarized as follows:<sup>24</sup>

- 22 There are three extant *Vibhāṣā* compendia, all commentaries on the *\*Aṣṭaśāstra* / *Jñānaprasthāna* and all preserved in their Chinese translation: the earliest is the *\*Vibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1547) in fourteen fascicles, attributed to Sitapāṇi (Śītapāṇi), translated in 383 A.D. by Saṃghabhadra, Dharmānandin, Buddhārakṣa and Minchih 敏智; the second *Vibhāṣā* to be translated into Chinese is the *\*Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1546) in sixty fascicles, translated by Buddhavarman between 437 and 439 A.D.; the last Chinese translation is the *\*Mahāvibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1545), translated in two hundred fascicles by Hsüan-tsang's team from 656 to 659 A.D. The last two works go back to the same recension. See Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 232-234.
- 23 See Frauwallner (1971): 102. On the discussion of the author's name Dharmasreṣṭhin as opposed to Dharmasrī: see my "Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions", 3 Vols., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, forthcoming. See also Yamada (1959): 40-136. For the dating of the *\*Abhidharmahr̥dayaśāstra* prior to the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and contemporaneous with the *Jñānaprasthāna*: see Yamada (1959): 111ff.; Frauwallner (1971): 71-72; Willemen (1975): iii-iv. For the provenance of the text: see Watanabe (1954): 123ff.
- 24 See Frauwallner (1971): 73-75 and 82-85; Willemen (1996): 451-470; Dessein, B., Dharmatrāta: *\*Samyuktābhidharmahr̥dayaśāstra*, in Potter, K., (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VIII, Buddhist Philosophy from 100 to 350 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, forthcoming.

1. The phenomenal world is divided into three realms: the realm of sexual passion (*kāmadhātu*), the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*), and the realm of formlessness (*ārūpyadhātu*). The realm of sexual passion includes beings in hell (*naraka*), animals (*tiryagyoni*), humans (*manuṣya*), gods (*deva*) and hungry ghosts (*preta*). The realm of form consists of four fundamental trance (*dhyāna*) states, simply counted from one to four. These trance states are inhabited by different categories of gods. In between the realm of sexual passion and the first trance state, there is the pre-trance (*anāgamyadhyaṇa*); in between the first and the second trance state, there is the intermediate trance (*dhyānāntara*)<sup>25</sup>. The realm of formlessness consists of four states of meditative attainment (*samāpatti*): the sphere of unlimited space (*ākāśānantyāyatana*), the sphere of consciousness (*viññānānantyāyatana*), the sphere of nothingness (*ākīṃcanyāyatana*), and the sphere of neither identification-nor-nonidentification (*naivasamjñānāsamjñāyatana*). These realms consist of aggregates (all five in the first two realms, four in the realm of formlessness), sense(-field)s (all twelve in the realm of sexual passion, ten in the one of form, and two in the one of formlessness) and elements (all eighteen in the realm of sexual passion, fourteen in the one of form and three in the one of formlessness).<sup>26</sup>

In the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*, Ghoṣaka is reported to have defined the sense(-field)s as either “a collection (*rāśi*) of atoms (*paramāṇu*),” or as with “the nature of ‘the length of something having color’ (*varṇarūpa*),” or as with “the nature of successive resonance,” whereby

“All these are characterized by resistance (*sapratigha*), and what is contrary to this, is characterized by non-resistance (*apratigha*). The nature of ‘a collection of atoms’ among these, is explained to concern the eight material sense(-field)s<sup>27</sup>; the nature of ‘the length of something having color’ is explained to

25 According to the Kāśmīra Vaibhāṣika opinion, also the intermediate trance is inhabited by a special type of gods: the *brahmapurohitas*. See de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.2, 3, note #1.

26 Cp. T.1550: 810a1-10; T.1551: 835c18-836a3; T.1552: 875b13-c2; T.1553: 969b17-c13 and T.1558: 7b23-8a8. See also Stcherbatsky (1970): 62-64

27 I.e. the five faculties, smell, taste and the tangible (Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.10, 296).

concern the sense-field matter (*rūpāyatana*); the nature of ‘successive resonance’ is explained to concern the sense-field sound (*gandhāyatana*).”<sup>28</sup>

Equally with respect to the sense(-field)s, Ghoṣaka is reported to have stated that:

“When a factor has already arisen and has not disappeared yet and is relating to beings, it is resisting (*sapratigha*) and, when [in this case] it does not concern what is heard, it is explained to be subject to sensation (*upādi*). Already arisen, it looks into the future. Not disappeared yet, it conceals the past. Relating to beings it conceals what is not relating to beings. Being what is resisting, it conceals the sense mind (*manaāyatana*) and the sense-field of factors (*dharmāyatana*). Not being what is heard, it conceals the sense-field sound. What is contrary to this, is explained to be without sensation.”<sup>29</sup>

The aggregate of factors (*dharmadhātu*), further, is said to consist of 505,550 stanzas.<sup>30</sup>

As there is contact of the faculties (*indriya*) with their respective objects (*viṣaya*), consciousness (*viññāna*) arises. This consciousness leads to craving (*trṣṇā*), i.e. to bonds to existence. It is therefore, according to Ghoṣaka, that the eye (*cakṣurindriya*), the ear (*śrotrendriya*), the nose (*ghrāṇendriya*), the tongue (*jihvendriya*), the body (*kāyendriya*), the male (*puruṣendriya*), the female (*strīndriya*), and life (*jīvitendriya*) as eight faculties are the fundament of existence (*bhava*) and are, therefore, the superior faculties<sup>31</sup>, whereas the other fourteen are also said to be faculties

28 T.1545: 391b9-13 = T.1546: 293b2-6. Notice that factors (*dharmā*) are not mentioned explicitly here; ‘what is characterized by non-resistance’ refers to ‘factors’: cp. T.1546: 293b5-6.

29 T.1545: 712c11-15.

30 T.1545: 385c22-24 = T.1546: 289a28-29. The *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* (T.1545: 385c27-28) denies this: the correct number should be 80,000 as there are 80,000 antidotes (*pratipakṣa*) for 80,000 kinds of behavior of beings. Also the *Tattvasiddhiśāstra*, T.1646: 314a21-23 adheres to the latter opinion. See also Lamotte (1967): 163.

31 T.1545: 732b7-8.



because they constitute the seed for such eight as life.<sup>32</sup> In the higher two realms, there is no male or female faculty, no nose and no tongue.<sup>33</sup>

Consciousness, according to a scriptural text quoted by Buddhadeva and explained by Ghoṣaka<sup>34</sup>, arises because of two conditions: an object-field and a faculty. It is because a faculty, an object-field and consciousness do the same thing, that they are said to be combined.<sup>35</sup> This is the reason Ghoṣaka states that “When this scriptural text first mentioned six senses of contact, this has the deeper meaning that faculties do not neglect [their sense-fields]; and when later saying that ‘it is because of what is made,’ this has the deeper meaning that the faculties may neglect [their sense-fields].”<sup>36</sup> The objects of sensation are called *kāmaguṇas*<sup>37</sup>: The Chinese rendering of this term as 妙欲 is explained as that: “fools produce subtle conceptual identifications [regarding these *kāmaguṇas*], and that they are therefore said to be subtle (妙)”.<sup>38</sup>

Among the faculties, the faculty of sight (*cakṣurindriya*) implies some specific problems: (1) what happens with the eye when the divine eye arises; (2) is it really the eye that sees matter (*rūpa*)<sup>39</sup> or is it conscious-

32 T.1545: 732b9-11.

33 T.1545: 463c21-22.

34 Both the fact that Ghoṣaka is related to Buddhadeva and to a ‘scriptural text’ are to be kept in mind here. On Buddhadeva, Cox (1995): 41 remarks: “Other masters [...] would possibly be associated with a Dārṣāntika or Sautrāntika perspective: a Buddhadeva and a Dharmatrāta mentioned in the *Vibhāṣā* compendia.” See also Shizutani (1978): 136, 140 ff.

35 T.1545: 984a6-8.

36 T.1545: 662a23-26. See in this respect: Cox (1995): 267, 285 note #70, 270, and 286 note #82.

37 See de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.1, 43; Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.15, 393, note #2.

38 T.1545: 870a1-2; cp. T.1558: 870a1.

39 The ‘orthodox’ Sarvāstivāda viewpoint of the *Jñānaprasthāna*, which is also the Vaibhāṣika viewpoint. See Kajiyama, (1977): 115; Imanishi (1969): 25.

ness of the eye<sup>40</sup>, wisdom associated with consciousness of the eye, or a combination of these<sup>41</sup> that see matter; and, related to this last problem, (3) does one eye or do two eyes see matter. The first problem is solved as follows: the eye obtained at birth is not abandoned when the divine eye (*divyacakṣus*) is present, but, when there are the four elements of the realm of form regarding this sense, [the eye] is present together with the divine eye that is formed.<sup>42</sup> Ghoṣaka's statement that: "All factors [i.e. including molecules] are subject to vision, because they are the object of the eye of wisdom (*prajñācakṣus*)"<sup>43</sup> is contradicted in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*. Ghoṣaka is further reported to be an advocator of the idea that it is wisdom associated with consciousness of the eye that sees matter<sup>44</sup>:

"Should it be stated that one eye sees matter or that two eyes see matter, and so [for the faculty nose]? Question: 'Why this discussion?' Answer: 'In order to stop other schools and to proclaim the own opinion. It is namely so that some [masters] hold to it that it is consciousness of the eye that sees matter: such [masters] as Dharmatrāta. Some further hold to it that it is wisdom associated with consciousness of the eye that sees matter: such [masters] as Ghoṣaka'."<sup>45</sup>

The *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* claims that it is in order to stop such heresies<sup>46</sup> and to advocate the own opinion, viz., it are the two eyes that see matter, that it is appropriate to have this discussion.<sup>47</sup>

40 According to T.1545: 61c19: the opinion of Dharmatrāta; according to de La Vallée Poussin, (1971): Vol.1, 81-86: the opinion of the Vijñānavādins, Vātsīputrīyas and Dharmaguptakas. See also Imanishi (1969): 25.

41 The Dārṣṭāntikas: see de la Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.1, 82, note #1.

42 T.1545: 764b3-6.

43 T.1545: 390b8-9 = T.1546: 292b9-11; T.1545: 684a18-19.

44 T.1545: 61c7-10.

45 See de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.1, xlvi. See also Ichimura, Kawamura, Buswell, Cox (1996): 521.

46 T.1545: 61c12-13.

47 This discussion also in the *\*Pañcavastukavibhāṣā*, T.1555: 991b20-c13, the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*, T.1552: 876b12-877a3, and the *Abhidharmakośa*, T.1558: 10c6-11b8; T.1559: 170b25-171b12. See also Wogihara (1971): 80-82;

It is, finally, so that, according to the venerable Ghoṣaka<sup>48</sup>, “One obtains to enter the womb (*kukṣi*) from six elements<sup>49</sup>.” In the *\*Pañcavastukavibhāṣāśāstra*, the following interpretation of space as great element (*mahābhūta*) is attributed to Ghoṣaka:

“Why is space (*ākāśa*) not said to be a great element (*mahābhūta*)? Answer: ‘Because space does not have the characteristic marks of a great element: namely the great space is great but is not an element, since permanently abiding factors are not made. The venerable Ghoṣaka also made this explanation.’”<sup>50</sup>

Worldlings (*prthagjana*) are subject to craving and, as a result, to formations. This state of being a worldling, ordinariness (*prthagjanatva*), is on itself a formation dissociated from awarenesses (*cittaviprayukta saṃskāra*)<sup>51</sup> and is characterized by defilement. In the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*,

---

de La Vallée Poussin (1971), Vol.1, 81-86; Cox (1988): 34. The different opinions on this point are not attributed in T.1552 and T.1555. On this last point, “The venerable Ghoṣaka therefore said that when the object (*viṣaya*) of two eyes is what consciousness of the eye takes as supporting object, this [object] is only to be established as the sense-field matter” (T.1545: 387c10-12).

48 T.1545: 387c10-12.

49 *prthivī*, *ap*, *tejas*, *vāyu*, *ākāśa* and *viññāna*.

50 T.1555: 990a10-12. Imanishi, (1969): 6-7: “(rūpaṃ kata)rac=catvāri mahābhūtāni catvā(ri) [ca] ma(hā)bhūtāny=upādāya(.) catvāri mahābhūtā (ni katarāṇi. prthivī-) 0 dhātur=ab-dhātus=tejodhātur=vāyudhātuś=c=e [ti].” and (1969): 8: “[...] ākāśaṃ (ka)tarat\*(.) yad=ākāśa[m\*] + + + [t].m=(a)sph(a)[r](aṇaṃ) (r)ū-(pa) + + + +”.

51 Different schools of Buddhism have different lists (*mātrkā*) of factors dissociated from awarenesses. Of the *Śatpādābhidharma* works, the *Dharmaskandha* (1537: 500c17-25 and 501b16-23), and the *Prakaraṇapāda* (1541: 627a18-22, 628c13-24, 634c17-20; T.1542: 692c5-9, 694a19-29, 699b20-24), as well as the *\*Pañcavastuka* (1556: 995c20-24, 997c18-29; 1557: 998c23-26, 1000a16-b1 (See Imanishi (1969):8), had sixteen such elements. Only the *Jñānaprasthāna* lists *prthagjanatva* as a factor dissociated from awarenesses (1544: 928c5-929a4). This *prthagjanatva* is later (in the *Abhidharmakośa*) replaced by ‘*aprāpti*’. The *Vaiśiṣṭika* list has fourteen such elements: *asaṃjñika*, *asaṃjñisamāpatti*, *niro-*

Ghoṣaka describes ordinariness as “the nature of ordinariness,”<sup>52</sup> whereby “The nature of ordinariness exactly is the likeness of beings (*sattvasa-bhāgatā*)<sup>53</sup>—as a cow or a sheep are all with the likeness of beings and exactly are said to be with the nature of a cow or of a sheep.”<sup>54</sup> This ordinariness is not influenced by ‘acquisition’ (*prāpti*) which acts as a glue to connect a given defilement to a given life-stream, regardless of whether or not that defilement is actively functioning—that it, regardless of whether that defilement is present, past or future<sup>55</sup>:

“as it are other actions that have influenced acquisition and the likeness of beings, [this] acquisition can also influence the maturation (*vipāka*) of the

---

*dhasamāpatti*, *sabhāgatā*, *padakāya*, *vyañjanakāya*, *nāmakāya*, *jīvitendriya*, *prāpti*, *prthagjanatva*, *jāti*, *stḥiti*, *jarā* and *anityatā*. *Prthagjanatva* is lost with the acquisition of the path. See Jaini (1959a): 536, Lamotte (1967): 662-663, Van Den Broeck (1977): 56-62. The \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* lists seventeen such factors: i.e. the above list of fourteen, plus three forms of acquisition: *sthāna-prāpti*, *vastuprāpti* and *āyatanaprāpti*. According to Jaini (1959a): 536, this list is “undoubtedly the oldest, as he represents the period of the Mahā-vibhāṣā”. See also Cox (1995): 71 who notices that “Ghoṣaka includes accompaniment (*samanvāgama*), rather than possession (*prāpti*),” to which it is remarked that (Cox (1995): 79) “in early Buddhist *sūtras*, the term ‘possession’ (*prāpti*) is not used with the technical meaning that it acquires in later Abhidharma texts [...] it refers to the simple act of obtaining or acquiring [...]. The sense of continued possession or non-possession is conveyed by the terms ‘accompaniment’ (*samanvāgama*) or ‘non-accompaniment’ (*asamanvāgama*) [...]”. The fact that the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasa* uses both *prāpti* (得) and *samanvāgama* (成就) places the text in a special position, on which more further. See also Cox (1995): 79-81 and T.1553: 979b28-c3.

52 T.1545: 231c22-23 = T.1546: 179b28-29.

53 See Cox (1995): 207 and 227 note #129.

54 T.1545: 235a4-7 = T.1546: 179b28-c1.

55 Cox (1992a): 87: “As a distinct factor that is dissociated from thought, possession can connect a life-stream to any defilement, which then arises or becomes active due to other causes”. See also Cox (1992a): 73. Van Den Broeck (1977): 58: “La *prāpti* est une substance et peut donc être passée, présente ou future”.

appearance with respect to the sense eye up to [with respect to] the sense mind. Birth, duration, old age and impermanence of these factors are also included in this, since these are not self-willed and depend on the vicinity of these factors.”<sup>56</sup>

It is these four characteristic marks that make something conditioned (*samskr̥ta*).<sup>57</sup> It is to be remarked that the Ghōṣaka of the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*, as well as the one of the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* differentiate four characteristic marks.<sup>58</sup> The latter work even knows the secondary characteristic marks (*anulakṣaṇa*), hereby following the \**Abhidharmahr̥dayaśāstra*.<sup>59</sup>

2. Humans are exposed to ten contaminants (*anuśaya*): attachment (*rāga*), repugnance (*pratigha*), perplexity (*vicikitsā*), pride (*māna*), ignorance (*avidyā*); and a series of five views: belief in a self (*satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*), extreme view (*antagrāhadr̥ṣṭi*), false view (*mithyādr̥ṣṭi*), adherence to particular views (*dr̥ṣṭiparāmarśa*) and adherence to moral precepts and vows (*śīlavrataparāmarśa*). These ten are generated from a basic set of seven

56 T.1545: 615b11-15. See also Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.13, 47, note #60. See also Pradhan (1975): 54.6ff. and Wogihara (1971): 127.7ff.

57 T.1545: 393a7-8.

58 AN I:152 has three characteristic marks: *utpāda*, *vyaya* and *sthityanyathātva*. While some early Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma* works, e.g., *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra* (T.1548: 526c6, 663a17ff.), the *Āryavasumitrabodhisattvasaṅgītiśāstra* (T.1549: 796a22 ff.) and the \**Aṣṭagrantha* (T.1543: 780b17ff.) and the \**Vibhāṣāśāstra* (T.1547: 458a18) only have three characteristic marks (omitting *sthiti*). This has suggested some scholars that the *Āryavasumitrabodhisattvasaṅgītiśāstra*, *Aṣṭagrantha* and *Vibhāṣā* represent the non-Kāśmīra Sarvāstivāda lineage (Watanabe (1954): 140, 245 ff.; Sakurabe (1969): 87 ff.). The Vaibhāṣika *Abhidharma* has four characteristic marks: *jāti*, *sthiti*, *jarā* and *anityatā*. Hereby, *jāti* equals *utpāda* and *anityatā* equals *vyaya*. (Cox (1995):147). The term *sthityanyathātva* is interpreted differently in the various Buddhist schools. For the Vaibhāṣikas, it represents both *sthiti* and *jarā*. See Jaini (1959a): 534-544. See also Kalupahana (1974): 186; Cox (1995): 146-151.

59 T.1550: 811b17-28; T.1553: p.970a5-9, 13-16.

contaminants, for which we find evidence in *Sūtra* literature.<sup>60</sup> Separated as to the three realms (*dhātu*) and as to the five modes of abandoning (*prahāna*) (to be abandoned through the vision of frustration (*duḥkha-darśanaheya*), through the one of the origin (*samudayadarśanaheya*), through the one of cessation (*nirodhadarśanaheya*) and through the one of the path (*mārgadarśanaheya*), and to be abandoned through spiritual practice (*bhāvanāheya*) these ten form ninety-eight contaminants.<sup>61</sup> This scheme of ninety-eight contaminants is not attested in *Sūtra* literature, but is in accordance with the Sarvāstivāda path of salvation and the gradual process through which contaminants are to be abandoned for salvation. It is further so that while the early *Abhidharma* texts differentiated the defilements (*kleśa*) into a variety of categories with different intrinsic values<sup>62</sup>—in the *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, the Vibhajyavādins, e.g.,

60 By combining two varieties of attachment (attachment to sensual pleasure (*kāmarāga*) and attachment to existence (*bhavarāga*)) and dividing ‘views’ into five views, ten contaminants were attained. For the seven contaminants: see *EA* 34, T.125: 738c23 ff.; *AN* 7.8: *Samyojanasutta* 4:7, *AN* 7.11-12 *Anusayasutta* (1-2) 4:9; T.1536: 439a18ff (Stache-Rosen (1968): 184); T.1542: 693b28ff.; T.1545: 257a18ff.; T.1546: 200a10ff.; T.1547: 436a22f. In the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, the seven contaminants are divided to ninety-eight. See further: Frauwallner (1971): 75-76; Sasaki (1975):129-149; Cox (1992a):98, note #48.

61 See de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.4, 9, note #2; Van Den Broeck (1977): 62-65; Cox (1992a): 70.

62 The *Jñānaprasthāna* (T.1544: 929b13 ff.), e.g., lists sixteen categories: three fetters (*saṃyojana*), three roots of demerit (*akuśalamūla*), three impure influences (*āsrava*), four floods (*ogha*), four entanglements (*yoga*), four attachments (*grahaṇa*), four ties to the body (*kāyagrantha*), five obstructions (*nivarāṇa*), five fetters (*saṃyojana*), five fetters belonging to the lower realms (*avarabhāgīyasamyojana*), five fetters belonging to the upper realms (*ūrdhvaabhāgīyasamyojana*), five views (*dr̥ṣṭi*), the group of six desires (*kāmakāya*), seven contaminants (*anuśaya*), nine fetters (*saṃyojana*), and ninety-eight contaminants (*anuśaya*). The *\*Aṣṭagrantha* (T.1543: 784c11 ff.) has the same categories of the *Jñānaprasthāna*, with the exception of the five fetters belonging to the upper realms. This category is not listed in the *\*Aṣṭagrantha*. The five fetters are cited first in the *Jñānaprasthāna* (T.1544: 929b20 ff.); the ninety-eight contaminants are implied in sections of the *Dharmaskandha* (T.1537: 464c25 ff.) and first

propose a distinction between a latent and a passive phase of defilements, represented by the terms “contaminants” (*anuśaya*) and “manifestly active defilements” (*paryavasthāna*)<sup>63</sup>—these categories as they appear in post-*Vibhāṣā Abhidharma* texts, merely serve as lists of synonyms, following the Vaibhāṣika position that the contaminants and the manifestly active defilements are identical.<sup>64</sup> This list of synonyms includes entanglements (*yoga*), seizures (*upādāna*), floods (*ogha*) and impure influences (*āsrava*).<sup>65</sup> In Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa*, nine varieties are differentiated: entanglements, seizures, floods, impure influences, fetters (*saṃyojana*), bonds (*bandhana*), contaminants (*kleśa*), secondary afflictions (*upakleśa*) and manifestly active defilements (*paryavasthāna*).<sup>66</sup>

---

explicitly mentioned in the *Prakaraṇapāda* (T.1542: 698b6 ff. and 702a8 ff.). See Cox (1992a): 96, note #26. For the Sautrāntikas, ‘*anuśaya*’ is the state when a defilement is asleep, and is called ‘*paryavasthāna*’ when awakened. See Hirakawa (1973): xxxvii; Jaini (1959a): 239-240; Sakamoto (1981): 380-381.

63 T.1545: 313a1ff. Cox (1992a): 70: “the distinction [...] is further intimated by Upaśānta’s \**Abhidharmahrdayaśāstra* [...]”. that the \**Mahāvibhāṣā* describes this distinction as ‘vibhajyavādin’ implies that it is not the Vaibhāṣika viewpoint.

64 Hirakawa (1973): xxxvii: “In the Sarvāstivāda, it is considered that the ‘*anuśaya*,’ the ‘*kleśa*,’ the ‘*paryavasthāna*’ have the same meaning”.

65 See T.1550: 817a13 ff.; T.1551: 847a3 ff.; T.1552: 903b17 ff. See also Cox (1992a): 98, note #47.

66 There are four entanglements: the entanglement sensual pleasure (*kāmayoga*), the entanglement existence (*bhavayoga*), the entanglement views (*drṣṭiyoga*) and the entanglement ignorance (*avidyāyoga*); four seizures: the seizure of sensual pleasure (*kāmopādāna*), the seizure of the theory that there is a self (*ātmavādo-pādāna*), the seizure of views (*drṣṭyupādāna*) and the seizure of moral precepts and vows (*śīlavratopādāna*); four floods: the flood sensual pleasure (*kāmaugha*), the flood existence (*bhavaugha*), the flood views (*drṣṭyogha*) and the flood ignorance (*avidyaugha*); three impure influences: the impure influence sensual pleasure (*kāmāsrava*), the impure influence existence (*bhavāsrava*) and the impure influence ignorance (*avidyāsrava*); nine fetters: attraction (*anunaya*), repugnance (*pratigha*), pride (*māna*), ignorance (*avidyā*), views (*drṣṭi*), adherences (*parāmarśa*), perplexity (*vicikitsā*), envy (*īrṣyā*) and selfishness (*mātsarya*); three bonds: attachment (*rāga*), hatred (*dveṣa*) and delusion (*moha*); ten contaminants:

As Dharmasreṣṭhin, Upaśānta and Dharmatrāta<sup>67</sup>, in the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*, Ghoṣaka differentiates the contaminants as to ‘those developed by association’ (*saṃprayogato nuśerate*) and ‘those developed by the supporting object’ (*ālambanato nuśerate*). Hereby, Ghoṣaka states that: “Those developed by association let associated awarenesses produce defilement—as smoke acquired by flames—and obstruct the noble fruits,” and that “Those developed by the supporting object are without such thing regarding awarenesses that are developed by the supporting object”.<sup>68</sup> In connection with this, it is so that defilement that does not proceed in one’s own person is explained to be abandoned. This does not mean that it does

---

attachment (*rāga*), repugnance (*pratigha*), pride (*māna*), perplexity (*vicikitsā*), ignorance (*avidyā*), and the five views; and eight (or ten) secondary afflictions which are manifestly active defilements: shamelessness (*āhrīkya*), disregard (*anapatrāpya*), envy (*īrṣyā*), selfishness (*mātsarya*), excitedness (*auddhatya*), regret (*kaukr̥tya*), lethargy (*styāna*) and sleepiness (*middha*). There further is the category of impurities of defilement (*kleśamala*), consisting of violence (*vihimsā*), vengefulness (*upanāha*), craftiness (*śāṭhya*), deceit (*māyā*), arrogance (*mada*) and spite (*pradāśa*).

67 T.1550: 816b3-20; T.1551: 845c23-846a26; T.1552: 902a14-b2.

68 T.1545: 112a27-29. Ichimura, Kawamura, Buswell, Cox (1996): 528: “There are five major groups of contaminants: (1) those causing delusion about the four noble truths, (2) those causing delusion, i.e. attachment, hatred and pride in the three realms; (3) generally permeating contaminants; (4) generally permeating bad forces, and (5) limited permeating bad forces. They have a nature capable of increasing force within an awareness affected by similar contaminants. Theories of Bhadanta Kātyāyanīputra, Ghoṣaka and Buddhadeva are reviewed relating to the state of being afflicted by contaminants respecting the supporting object. Contaminants grow in two ways: (1) with regard to their supporting object, (2) with regard to their connected factors. Even past and future contaminants grow, though only present ones exert activity.” Cox, (1992a): 80: “Contaminants adhere or grow in two ways: either with regard to the object-support (*ālambanataḥ*) of a given moment of thought, or with regard to the factors with which that moment of thought is associated (*saṃprayuktataḥ*)” See *Jñānaprasthāna* (T.1544: 921a19ff.).



not exist at all. Because of the former existence, it is so that when a condition for falling back is met with, this defilement is a cause, and, therefore, future defilement is induced.<sup>69</sup> This relates the contaminants further to the three periods of time:

“Question: ‘Since past and future have no activity (*kāritra*)<sup>70</sup>, how then can one say that the contaminants increase successively?’ Answer: ‘Because they can be produced and attain the present: as when a fire that is not present can produce smoke.’ The venerable Ghoṣaka made such a statement: ‘Although they do not have the function of taking an object (*viṣaya*), it is so that there is a possibility to be a bond in the present in relation to what is taken as supporting object and [in relation to] the associated factors. That is why these contaminants have the meaning of successively increasing’.”<sup>71</sup>

This implies that Ghoṣaka here accepts the difference between ‘contaminants’ and ‘manifestly active defilements’<sup>72</sup>, and places this doctrinal position before the Vaibhāṣika-period. Apart from the contaminants and manifestly active defilements, we find the appearance of fetters, floods and impurities of defilement in the doctrinal positions attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and *\*Abhidharmavibhāṣā*-

69 T.1545: 312c17-20 = T.1546: 235c22-25.

70 On ‘*kāritra*’ see de La Vallée Poussin (1936-37):131.

71 T.1545: 113a28-b4. Ichimura, Kawamura, Buswell, Cox (1996): 529: “Past as well as future contaminants can increase their influence”.

72 Cox (1992a): 80: “For the Sarvāstivādins, even past and future contaminants are considered defiling in the sense that they adhere or grow [...] However, this adherence or growth of past or future contaminants must somehow be distinguished from their present activity (*kāritra*). Some Abhidharma masters suggested that past contaminants act to condition the arising of the present possession of contaminants, just as an extinguished fire is able to give rise to smoke. The Abhidharma master Ghoṣaka proposed that, even though a past contaminant does not exert the present activity (*kāritra*) of grasping an object-field, it still has the capacity (*sāmarthya*), like a present contaminant, of binding one to an object-support or to other associated factors”.

*śāstra*.<sup>73</sup> Also Ghoṣaka's \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasasāstra* implicitly supports the distinction between contaminants and manifestly active defilements as the work divides a maximum possible total of 108 defilements (*kleśa*) into two groups, including both the ten contaminants divided to ninety-eight, and the manifestly active defilements.<sup>74</sup> The above theory also implies a notion of activity (*kāritra*) on which more further.

Ghoṣaka generally characterizes the fetters as binding beings to existence<sup>75</sup>, i.e., they make bad actions which lead to an unwholesome rebirth state arise.<sup>76</sup> With respect to action, the 'paths of action' (*karma-patha*) are differentiated.<sup>77</sup> Of the bad paths of action, injuring life is described in more detail, viz., as to its being manifesting (*viññapti*): "The venerable Ghoṣaka said that [injuring life] obtains two forms of being manifesting. Why? Action that is bodily manifesting (*kāyaviññapti*) is established by molecularity. When harming the mother or someone else, this each concerns different molecules".<sup>78</sup> Ghoṣaka is also attributed with the idea that one application (*prayoga*) obtains manifold [forms of] being manifesting. Parallel statements attributed to Ghoṣaka are found in the *Abhidharmakośa*: "The venerable Ghoṣaka said that there are two kinds of being manifesting, since being manifesting concerns an accumulation of atoms;"<sup>79</sup> and in the \**Nyāyānusārasāstra*: "The venerable Ghoṣaka explained it in this way: 'in this position, there are also two kinds of being manifesting: because being manifesting concerns agglomerated atoms'."<sup>80</sup>

73 T.1545: 138c12-15; T.1545: 238b14-16 = T.1546: 184a11-13; T.1545: 241c25-27 = T.1546: 187a22-25; T.1545: 245a25-28 = T.1546: 190b25-27; T.1545: 248a4-6; T.1545: 249a3-5, cp. T.1546: 194a18-20; T.1545: 252a10-11; T.1545: 995b24-26.

74 T.1553: 968c24ff.

75 See T.1550: 815b15ff.; T.1551: 843c24 ff.; T.1552: 899c20ff.

76 T.1545: 272b11-12.

77 T.1545: 587c25-588a2.

78 T.1545: 617b23-25. See also T.1545: 619c8 and 619c11-12.

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

80 T.1562: 588c23-25.

Doing bad actions implies abiding in non-restraint (*asamvarastha*) which is defined by Ghoṣaka.<sup>81</sup> Although temporarily making existence increase, pure factors do not eventually do so: in the end, they oppose existence, and “therefore, they are not said to be nutriment. It is what in the end can [make existence] increase that is explained to be nutriment.”<sup>82</sup> Accordingly, when not doing bad actions, one abides in restraint which leads to the cessation of births. Related to this, the aspect without strife (*araṇa*) is described.<sup>83</sup> A special form of good action is fasting. The statement attributed to Ghoṣaka is also attributed to Saṃghavasū.<sup>84</sup> It should be remarked here that the theory concerning the successiveness of awarenesses that is attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharma-hṛdaya*<sup>85</sup> is, in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*<sup>86</sup>, attributed to Saṃghavasū. Also the roots of merit and of demerit are defined by Ghoṣaka.<sup>87</sup>

Two manifestly active defilements (*pariyavasthāna*) are described in detail by Ghoṣaka: shamelessness (*āhrīkyā*) and disregard (*anapatrāpyā*). Ghoṣaka’s opinion here parallels the one of Vasumitra: “The venerable Vasumitra made such a statement: [...] Also the venerable Ghoṣaka made this statement: ‘Although the power of shamelessness and of disregard is excessive regarding the bad action that is done, it is so that the meaning of ‘obstruction’ (*nivaraṇa*) is not comprehended yet, and, therefore, no obstruction is established’.”<sup>88</sup> As the *\*Aṣṭaśāstra* and the *Jñānapra-*

81 T.1545: 607b12-14.

82 T.1545: 674b17-21.

83 T.1545: 898b3-6.

84 T.1545: 647b16-19.

85 T.1552: 955b2.

86 T.1545: 816a5-10.

87 T.1545: 183a27-29; T.1545: 184a22-28 = T.1546: 138c19-21; T.1545: 582c5-9; T.1545: 607b12-14; T.1545: 626a4-7; T.1545: 674b17-21; T.1545: 898b3-6. Roots of merit: *alobha*, *adveṣa*, *amoha* and *alobha*. See Stache-Rosen (1968): 65; T.1536: 367c21-368a25. Roots of demerit: *lobha*, *dveṣa* and *moha*. See Stache-Rosen (1968):64; T.1536: 367b12-c20.

88 T.1545: 251b10-14.

*sthāna*<sup>89</sup>, Ghoṣaka knows the category of ‘obstructions,’ whereby the contaminants are interpreted in terms of ‘obstruction’.<sup>90</sup>

Also the floods are described<sup>91</sup>; of the impurities of defilement, craftiness (*śāṭhya*) is described.<sup>92</sup>

For liberation, there is the path of salvation. Precondition for the path of salvation is abiding in moral restraint.<sup>93</sup> In the process of the path to liberation, a special form of meditative attainment: meditative attainment without conceptual identification (*asaṃjñīsamāpatti*) is differentiated.<sup>94</sup> Ghoṣaka states that this form of meditative attainment is included in the *samādhi* of emptiness<sup>95</sup>, and that the person who acquires this meditative attainment has the ability to arise free from beings (*niyāma*).<sup>96</sup> There is no

89 T.1543: 778c6ff.; 780a10ff.; 787b3ff.; 796b11ff.; 806a20ff. 900a14ff. See also note 63.

90 For definitions and interpretations of the obstructions: see T.1545: 249c16-18, cp. T.1546: 195a8-10; T.1545: 249c27-29; T.1545: 251b1-5; T.1546, p.196a14-16. Hereby, ‘scriptural texts’ are referred to (T.1545: 251b1-5).

91 T.1545: 247a24-b1, cp. T.1546: 192b25-27.

92 T.1545: 251b26-29.

93 T.1545: 230b15-17 = T.1546, p.177b13-15.

94 Cox (1995): 114-115 remarks that “While the northern Indian Abhidharma schools generally accepted the possibility of meditative states without thought and shared the enumeration of their specific qualities, they disagreed concerning the character and functioning of such states [...] The primary participants in these arguments can be divided into two groups: on the one hand, the Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣikas, represented by Saṅghabhadra and, in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, by Ghoṣaka; on the other hand, the Dārṣṭāntikas, who share the view of Vasumitra cited (p.115) in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the ancient masters, whom Yaśomitra identifies as the Sautrāntikas, and finally Vasubandhu”. See also Wogihara (1971): 167.16 ff. See also de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.1, 200-201.

95 T.1545: 541c13-15.

96 de La Vallée Poussin (1971): Vol.1, 201, note #1: “...par l’entrée dans le *niyāma*, on obtient l’*apratīsamkhyānirodha* ou disparition définitive des mauvaises destinées”. Nakamura (1985): 1416: 離生: 正性離生 = *niyāma*: the path of vision: being free from the views of the eighty-eight contaminants.

more consciousness in this state.<sup>97</sup> This last opinion is not the Vaibhāṣika opinion of the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*<sup>98</sup>, but is the opinion attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *Abhidharmakośa*: “The venerable Ghoṣaka said that this is not right. Why? When there were still consciousness in this concentration, the combination of three should therefore result in contact. Contact would be the reason why there are feeling (*vedanā*) and conceptual identification (*saṃjñā*).”<sup>99</sup>

As defilements constitute the fundament of action (*karman*), they are—because of the principle of retribution (*vipāka*)—responsible for a future rebirth.<sup>100</sup> This theory of causality is the fundamental thesis of Buddhism. As the Sarvāstivādins assert that the past and the future are real, because the present has its root in the past and its consequence in the future, this implies that the three periods of time ought to exist separately; if not, the notions of past and future would not occur in us.<sup>101</sup> This creation continues in a time series of past, present and future, like in a chain. This chain is divided into twelve members, and is called ‘the chain of dependent origination’ (*pratītyasamutpāda*). The Sarvāstivādins interpret these twelve members in terms of the three periods of time: two members are past: ignorance (*avidyā*) and conditioning factors (*saṃskāra*); two members are future: birth (*jāti*) and decay and dying (*jarāmaraṇa*); the other eight members are intermediate: consciousness (*viññāna*), the psychophysical complex (*nāmarūpa*), the six senses (*ṣaḍāyatana*), contact (*sparśa*), feeling (*vedanā*), craving (*trṣṇā*), grasping (*upādāna*) and existence (*bhava*)<sup>102</sup>. The twelve members of the chain of dependent origination are further interpreted in terms of defilement (*kleśa*), action (*karman*) and actual entities (*vastu*), which, in their turn, are interpreted in terms of cause

97 T.1545: 773b23-26, 784b24-c1.

98 T.1545: 784b24-c1.

99 T.1558: 25c28-26a6; T.1559: 184b5-10. Bareau in Śānti Bhikṣu Śāstrī (1959): iii, remarks that here Ghoṣaka is in some agreement with the Sautrāntikas who believe that there is complete cessation of *citta* in the *samāpatti*.

100 See Sasaki (1975): 78-83 and 98-104. See also Cox (1992a): 100, note #66.

101 See Willems, Dessein, Cox (1998): 19-21.

102 See T.1552: 935b15-c2; Stcherbatsky (1996): Vol.1, 137.

(*hetu*) and fruition (*phala*).<sup>103</sup> In the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*, Ghōṣaka analyses some of the members of dependent origination in more detail: it is because “All beings are blinded by ignorance (*avidyā*) and are bound by craving (*trṣṇā*), that they make bad factors increase in the long cycle of transmigration (*samsāra*).”<sup>104</sup> In response to the Ābhidhārmika position that ‘conditioning factors’ refers to the five appropriating aggregates (*upādānaskandha*)<sup>105</sup>, the venerable Ghōṣaka is reported to have said that “‘conditioning factors’ only refers to action.”<sup>106</sup> “The function of birth (*jāti*),” further, is stated to be “superior and only does one thing. Therefore, it is established as a single member. The function of decay and dying (*jarāmaraṇa*) is weak, and they together do one thing. Therefore, they together establish a member: as a powerful person does a thing alone, and this is not true for a weak person.”<sup>107</sup> “The two members of the past are only called factors that produce by conditions; the two members of the future are only called factors that are already produced by conditions. The eight members of the present are both called factors that produce by conditions and factors already produced by conditions.”<sup>108</sup> Also the differentiation of the members of the chain of dependent origination as to defilements, actions and actual entities is known by Ghōṣaka: “[...] when investigating where awarenesses are induced from, it namely is from actions. When further investigating what these actions are emitted by, it namely is by defilements. When further examining what these defilements depend on to be produced, it namely are actual entities. Further examining what these actual entities have as fundament, it are awarenesses that make bonds arise [...].”<sup>109</sup> Hereby, “The venerable Ghōṣaka made such a statement: ‘this scriptural texts says that [...] all members of existence are taken as supporting object by knowledge and are therefore said to be actual

103 See Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 27. T.1552: 935b15-c25; T.1558: 48a21-49b17.

104 T.1545: 195b7-8 = T.1546, p.146a9-11.

105 T.1545: 127a6-8.

106 T.1545: 127a8-9.

107 T.1545: 121b26-29.

108 T.1545: 118b12-15.

109 T.1545: 124c17-24.

entities’.”<sup>110</sup> This analysis of the chain of dependent origination is also found in the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*.<sup>111</sup>

Through the chain of dependent origination, one can be reborn in different forms, and birth itself can be in different ways: one can be born from the womb (*kukṣi*), be egg-born (*aṇḍaja*), be moisture-born (*saṃsvedaja*), or be magically born (*upapāduka*).<sup>112</sup> It is denying *nirvāṇa* and the noble path (*āryamārga*) that makes one arise in woeful courses (*durgati*) at death.<sup>113</sup> Various reflections are made on these issues.<sup>114</sup>

Major tenet in the Sarvāstivāda philosophical works is the reason why the three periods of time exist. In the \**Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, four theories are mentioned<sup>115</sup>:

“There are four great masters of Sarvāstivāda who each establish the three periods of time (*adhvan*) in a different way. According to the venerable Dharmatrāta, the mode is different (*bhāvānyathātva*); the venerable Ghoṣaka holds to it that it are the characteristic marks that are different (*lakṣaṇānyathātva*); the venerable Vasumitra says that the state is different (*avasthānyathātva*); the venerable Buddhadeva says that [the factors] are mutually different (*anyonyathātva*).

Those who say that the mode is different say that when factors proceed in the periods of time, it is their mode that is different, not their substance (*dravya*) that is different: as when golden vessels are broken and other things are made, it

110 T.1545: 980b15-17.

111 T.1553: 970c25-971a2.

112 T.1545: 203b11-14.

113 T.1545: 784a23-24.

114 T.1545: 193c11-12; T.1545, 204a18-21; T.1545: 309b14-15, cp. T.1546: 233a19-25; T.1545: 960b14-15.

115 T.1545: 396a13-b23. These theories are discussed in T.1546: 295c6-296a2; T.1547: 466b7-28; T.1552: 961c27-962a18; T.1558: 104b27-105a5; T.1559: 258a7-12; T.1562: 631a13-b5; T.1563: 901c18-23. See also de La Vallée Poussin (1936-37): 22-25, 89-92; Takakusu (1956): 64-65; Fukuhara (1965): 9; Lamotte (1967): 667-668; Stcherbatsky (1970): 38-39; Frauwallner (1973): 99; Kawamura (1974): 42-48; Cox (1995): 139-141; Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 21-23.

is so that although the shape is different, the color (*varṇarūpa*) is not different, or, further, as when such things as milk change to koumiss, the power of the taste is abandoned, but its color is not abandoned. When, in this way, factors reach the present period of time from the future period of time, it is so that although their future mode is abandoned and their present mode is acquired, the substance of these factors is without attainment or abandonment. When, further, the past period of time is reached from the present period of time, it is so that although their present mode is abandoned and their past mode is acquired, the substance of these factors also is without attainment or abandonment.

Those who say that the characteristic marks are different say that when factors proceed through the periods of time, their characteristic marks are different, but not their substance is different. Factors in all periods of time have the characteristic marks of the three periods of time. With one kind of characteristic marks they are exactly combined, and they are not free from two kinds of characteristic marks. As when a person is attracted to one woman he is not said to be free from other women. When, in this way, factors abide in the past period of time, they are exactly together with the characteristic marks of the past, and they are not said to be free from the characteristic marks of [the] two [other] periods of time; when abiding in the future period of time, they are exactly combined with the characteristic marks of the future, and they are not said to be free from the characteristic marks of [the] two [other] periods of time. When abiding in the present period of time, they are exactly combined with the characteristic marks of the present, and they are not said to be free from the characteristic marks of [the] two [other] periods of time.

Those who say that the state is different say that when factors proceed through the periods of time, it is their state that is different and not their substance that is different. As when placing a token in the units, it is said to be 'one;' when placing it in the tens, it is said to be 'ten;' when placing it in the hundreds, it is said to be 'one hundred'. Although its position is different, the substance of the token is not different. When, in this way, all factors go through the three periods of time, it is so that although three names are acquired [because of] their position, their substance does not change. What these masters have established as to the periods of time is not confused.

When one depends on the function (*kāritra*) to establish the difference in the three periods of time, it is so that conditioned factors that have had no function yet, are said to be in the future period of time; exactly when having function,



they are said to be in the present period of time; when their function is already extinguished, they are said to be in the past period of time.<sup>116</sup>

Those who say that there is mutual adherence, say that when the factors proceed through the periods of time, it is so that their name is different as they are mutually established. As when one woman is said to be a daughter because of depending on the mother, and is said to be a mother depending on the daughter. Although their substance is not different, they are mutually different and in this way acquire the names of 'daughter' and of 'mother'. In this way, it is said that factors are said to be 'past' depending on what is later, are said to be 'future' depending on what is former, and are said to be 'present' depending on both.

What these masters have established as to the periods of time is confused. Why? Because mutual dependence has the three periods of time in all periods of time. Also a previous and a later *kṣaṇa* of the past period of time are said to be 'past' and 'future;' what is intermediate is said to be 'present'. The same is true for the three periods of time of the future. Although factors of the present period of time depend on what is later and on what is former and on both, and therefore have to establish the three periods of time [even] in one *kṣaṇa*, how then could this be said to be a right principle.

Also what is established as to the three periods of time by those of the difference of characteristic marks, is confused. Because factors in all periods of time should have the characteristic marks of three periods of time.

Those who say that the mode is different separate themselves from the specific nature of factors. Therefore, also the [theory of the] mode is without principle. When all conditioned factors reach the present from the future, the previous mode has to be extinguished; when reaching the past from the present, the later mode has to arise. [In this way,] the past has birth and the future has extinguishing. How could this be a right principle?

Only the third establishment of the periods of time is right. Because all formations include action."

Concerning this part of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, Erich Frauwallner<sup>117</sup> remarked that:

116 See Kajiyama (1977): 120.

117 Frauwallner (1973): 100.

“In der Vibhāṣā steht dieser Text am Schluss, gewissermassen als Anhang. [...] stellt der Hauptteil in der Darstellung der Vibhāṣā bereits eine über diesen Text hinausgehende Entwicklungsstufe der Lehre dar. Das heisst aber, dass dieser Text inhaltlich einen älteren Zeit angehört und dass ihn die Vibhāṣā nur gewissermassen als doxographischen Anhang aufgenommen hat.”<sup>118</sup>

The same theory of difference of characteristic marks is attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *Abhidharmakośa*<sup>119</sup>, the *\*Nyāyānusārasāstra*<sup>120</sup>, and the *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*.<sup>121</sup> Dharmatrāta, outlining the four theories in his *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*, does not attribute any of the four theories.

As we have shown that, in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, also Ghoṣaka shows to be familiar with the theory of activity<sup>122</sup>, this not only gives further evidence for Frauwallner’s assumption, but also gives evidence of it that philosophical theories were attributed to former masters. The importance of this with respect to the person of Ghoṣaka may not be underestimated. We find further evidence for the *kāritra*-notion of Ghoṣaka in the following

118 There are references in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, to the “former king, Kaniṣka, of Gandhāra,” which suggests that at least part of this text was composed after his reign. See T.1545: 593a15; Kimura, T., (1937): 215.

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

120 T.1562: 631a21-26.

121 T.1563: 901c18-23.

122 See the section on contaminants and manifestly active defilements. At this point, we have to contradict Van Den Broeck (1977): 20, who states that: “La thèse du Bhadanta Ghoṣaka qui fonde la distinction entre les trois époques sur l’affirmation que les *dharma* sont munis des caractères appartenant à une époque déterminée, sans toutefois être démunis des caractères des deux autres époques, n’est mentionnée à aucun moment. Par contre, l’auteur du traité [= *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasāstra*] avait connaissance de la doctrine de l’effectivité”. For the *kāritra*-notion of Ghoṣaka in the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasāstra*: see T.1553: 980a26-28. See also Van Den Broeck (1977): 20-21 and *Prakaraṇapāda*, T.1542: 716a6-7. Cox (1995): 139, remarks: “The master Ghoṣaka appeals to a change in characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*), whereby a factor is said to be present if marked by the characteristic of the present—that is, of having reached the state of functioning activity.”

passages of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*: “Although [these contaminants] do not have the function of taking an object (*viṣaya*), it is so that in relation to what is taken as supporting object and [in relation to] the associated factors, there is a possibility to be a bond in the present, and, therefore, they have the meaning of successively increasing;”<sup>123</sup> and “Since birth and death are mutually opposed, how can they exist together? The venerable Ghoṣaka made such a statement: ‘At the moment all factors arise, they did not have a function yet. Why then should they disappear? At the moment all factors disappear, they have already had a function. So, what should they further arise for’.”<sup>124</sup> This last statement implies the following:

“In the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, two solutions are suggested for the problem that when factors are momentary, the characteristic marks should all apply on this factor at the same moment.<sup>125</sup> Either birth functions when birth itself and the characterized factor are about to be produced; i.e. when future, while the other three characteristic marks function when they as well as the characterized factor are about to be destroyed, i.e. when present. The second solution, to which Ghoṣaka appears to adhere to, is that birth and decay do not belong to one single moment, while every moment contains all characteristic marks. This means that birth functions in the future, i.e. when the factor is about to arise; the other three characteristic marks function in the present, i.e. when the factor is about to be destroyed. This implies that each moment contains three marks (*sthiti*, *jarā* and *antiyatā*) of one factor together with one mark (*jāti*) of a subsequent factor”.<sup>126</sup>

Buddhism does not believe that all things came from one cause, but holds that everything is, inevitably, created out of more than two causes. In Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma*, all things are explained to come into existence by means of a set of six (main) causes (*hetu*) and a set of four sub-causes or conditions (*pratyaya*). The six causes are the efficient cause (*kāraṇa-hetu*), the simultaneous cause (*sahabhūhetu*), the homogeneous cause

123 T.1545: 113a28-b4.

124 T.1545: 105b16-22. See Cox (1995): 149, and 157 note #75.

125 See T.1545, p.200a4 ff.

126 Cox (1995): 149.

(*sabhāgahetu*), the pervasive cause (*sarvatragahetu*), the associated cause (*saṃprayuktakahetu*) and the cause of retribution (*vipākahetu*). The four conditions are the condition as direct antecedent (*samanantarapratyaya*), the condition as supporting object (*ālambanapratyaya*), the dominant condition (*adhipatipratyaya*) and the condition as cause (*hetupratyaya*). Hereby, the list of six causes seems to be a later doctrine.<sup>127</sup>

In the description of the six causes and the four conditions in the \**Mahāvibhāṣāsāstra*, Ghoṣaka is quoted concerning the associated cause, the cause referring to mental elements, viz. to the fact that the elements of pure consciousness, although a separate element, never appear alone, but always in company of other mental elements, feelings, ideas and volitions<sup>128</sup>; concerning the cause of retribution, referring to every deed having an either good or bad moral character<sup>129</sup>; and concerning the efficient cause, the leading factor in the production of a fruit<sup>130</sup>. It is in the description of the efficient cause that a reference to the *kāritra*-theory is found.<sup>131</sup> Ghoṣaka is also attributed with some definitions concerning the conditions.<sup>132</sup> As the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*, also the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* has notion of the six causes and the four conditions.<sup>133</sup>

In the following instances, the notion of the three periods of time with respect to causes and fruition is seen: “Is there somehow action with fruition in the present that has its cause in the past and its fruition in the present? Or, with its cause in the present and its fruition in the future? When depending on one person in the present, and asked [hereafter], the

127 See de La Vallée Poussin (1913): 54-55; Fukuhara (1965): 196-219; Stcherbatsky (1996): Vol.1, 138-141; Buswell and Jaini (1996): 110. The four conditions are primarily defined with respect to the forms of consciousness in the *Vijñānakāya* (T.1539: 547b22-24). Six causes are defined in the \**Aṣṭagrantha / Jñānaprasthāna* (T.1543: 773a13-21; 774b23-775a9; T.1544: 920c5-921a10).

128 T.1545: 81a28-b3 = T.1546: 666b11-15. See also Ichimura, Kawamura, Buswell, Cox (1996): 525.

129 T.1545: 97b5-9.

130 T.1545: 105b16-22.

131 T.1545: 105b16-22.

132 T.1545: 283b17-22 = T.1546: 219a3-6; T.1545: 680c16-20.

133 T.1553: 970a16-b3.

answer should be 'no'. The venerable Ghoṣaka said 'yes;'"<sup>134</sup> and: "Therefore, the venerable Ghoṣaka said that when a liked or disliked fruit is already produced in the present, that action is at that moment said to be the specific action. It is not at the moment that action is not produced yet or is being produced that there is the possibility to receive the fruit of maturation in the present. There is need that action is already extinguished to let its fruition be produced."<sup>135</sup>

Related to the cause-fruition series, is the succession of different awarenesses of the different realms. Concerning this point, the following theory is attributed to Ghoṣaka: good awarenesses of the realm of sexual passion are without intervals succeeded by those of the pre-trance, the first trance, the intermediate trance, or the second trance; and these four are without intervals succeeded by good awarenesses of the realm of sexual passion. This is explained by a comparison with the transgressing trance (*vyutkrāntakasamāpatti*): also here, it is possible to transgress the second trance from the first trance, whereby the third trance is present without intervals.<sup>136</sup> The same theory as attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *\*Samyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*: "In succession to good awarenesses of the realm of sexual passion, nine awarenesses arise: four of the realm of sexual passion [...] good awarenesses of the realm of form [...] This is a general saying: not everything of the realm of form is concerned. Some say that only the pre-trance is included. Moreover, it is said that it concerns the pre-trance and the first trance. Moreover, it is further said that it concerns the intermediate trance. The venerable Ghoṣaka said that it is up to the second trance".<sup>137</sup> This opinion is also attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *\*Nyāyānusāraśāstra*<sup>138</sup> and in the *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*.<sup>139</sup>

134 T.1545: 614a14-17.

135 T.1545: 649b15-18.

136 T.1545: 373b6-10 = T.1546: 283a9-13; T.1545: 960a7-10; T.1545: 961c13-16.

137 T.1552: 955b2-4. In the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* (T.1545: 816a5-10), this idea is also attributed to Saṃghavasū.

138 T.1562: 453a26-27.

139 T.1563: 826c11-12

3a. The preparation of the path of salvation consists of—eventually—three preparatory exercises: contemplation of the repulsive (*aśubhabhāvanā*), mindfulness on breathing in and breathing out (*ānāpānasmṛti*), and development of the analysis of the elements (*dhātuvyavasthā*)<sup>140</sup>; four applications of mindfulness: on the body (*kāyasmṛtyupasthāna*), on feelings (*vedanāsmṛtyupasthāna*), on awarenesses (*cittasmṛtyupasthāna*) and on factors (*dharmasmṛtyupasthāna*)<sup>141</sup>; and four aids to penetration (*nirvedhabhāgīya*): warmth (*ūṣman*), summit (*mūrdhan*), patience (*kṣānti*) and the highest worldly factor (*laukikāgradharma*). Hereby, it is to be noticed that the \**Aṣṭaśāstra* and the *Jñānaprasthāna* only have three (no patience), while the \**Mahāvibhāṣā* has four roots of merit.<sup>142</sup>

In the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*, Ghōṣaka describes these preparatory steps as follows:

“When the qualities (*guṇa*) are spoken of according to their succession, then one first has to mention the contemplation of the repulsive (*aśubhabhāvanā*), or such things as mindfulness on breathing in and breathing out (*ānāpānasmṛti*)<sup>143</sup>, next the applications of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*) should be mentioned,

140 T.1550: 818a15-23: applications of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*); T.1551: 848c1-11 and T.1552: 908a20-909b15 add contemplation of the repulsive (*aśubhabhāvanā*), mindfulness on breathing in and breathing out (*ānāpānasmṛti*) and the development of the analysis of the elements (*dhātuvyavasthā*). In Upaśānta’s \**Abhidharmahrdayaśāstra* (T.1551: 848c4-5) contemplation of the repulsive, mindfulness on breathing in and breathing out, and development of the analysis of the elements are shortly mentioned in connection to the application of mindfulness on the body (*kāyasmṛtyupasthāna*); in Dharmatrāta’s \**Samyuktābhidharmahrdaya*, the development of the analysis of the elements (T.1552: 908b5-21) and contemplation of the repulsive and mindfulness on breathing in and breathing out (T.1552: 933b24-934b26) are exhaustively treated.

141 On the four applications of mindfulness: MN #10 *Satipaṭṭhānasutta* 1:55 ff.; MA 24 #98 T.1: 582b9 ff. and DN #22 *Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasutta* 2:290-315. See also Schmithausen (1976): 241-246; Hurvitz (1978): 207-208; Cox (1992b): 73-74, 90 note #4 and #6.

142 See 1543: 772b4 ff.; 1544: 918a7ff.; 1545: 23c15 ff.

143 Notice: no development of the analysis of the elements (*dhātuvyavasthā*).

next the observations of three meanings<sup>144</sup> should be mentioned, next the seven good abodes<sup>145</sup> should be mentioned, next warmth (*ūṣman*) should be mentioned, next summit (*mūrdhan*) should be mentioned, next patience (*kṣānti*) should be mentioned, and next the highest worldly factor (*laukikāgradharma*) should be mentioned.”<sup>146</sup>

For the succession of the aids to penetration (warmth up to the highest worldly factor), the «*Sheng-chih Lun*» 生智論 is referred to: “What is warmth, what is summit, what is patience, what is the highest worldly factor?”<sup>147</sup> These aids to penetration are further differentiated as follows:

“The venerable Ghoṣaka made such a statement: ‘In total, there are two kinds of aids to penetration.<sup>148</sup> The first are bound to the realm of sexual passion; the second are bound to the realm of form. Of those bound to the realm of sexual passion, the lower one is called ‘warmth’ and the higher one is called ‘summit’. Of those bound to the realm of form, the lower one is called ‘patience’ and the higher one is called ‘highest worldly factor’. Because it is the superior one

144 I.e. *skandha*, *āyatana* and *dhātu*: See Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.7, 25, note #4.

145 I.e. *duḥkha*, *samudaya*, *nirodha*, *mārga*, *rāga*, *ādīnava* and *nairyāṇika*: see Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.7, 25, note #4. Further information: T.1545: 560c2-7.

146 T.1545: 5c1-4. The text further runs: “When the qualities are spoken of not according to their succession, then the fruit of *arhat*-ship (*arhattvaphala*) should be mentioned first, next the nonreturner (*anāgāmin*) should be mentioned, next the once-returner (*sakṛdāgāmin*) should be mentioned, next the stream-enterer (*srotaāpanna*) should be mentioned, next the path of vision (*darśanamārga*) should be mentioned, and next the highest worldly factor should be mentioned. When spoken of according to the succession of the aids to penetration (*nirvedhabhāgīyāni kuśalamūlāni*), then warmth should be spoken of first, next summit, next patience, and as last the highest worldly factor should be mentioned.” (T.1545: 5c4-9).

147 T.1545: 5c9-10 = T.1546: 4a15-26.

148 Notice that the term ‘*nirvedhabhāgīya*’ is not used in the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasa-śāstra*. See Van Den Broeck (1977): 15,71 or in T.1550, while it is in T.1551.

among the aids to penetration bound to the realm of sexual passion, is said to be the ‘summit’.”<sup>149</sup>

The *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* does not agree with this opinion: all roots of merit belong to the realm of form. With this, the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* agrees with the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*, where the four aids to penetration are all situated in the six stages of the realm of form.<sup>150</sup> Also the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*<sup>151</sup>, *Abhidharmakośa*<sup>152</sup>, *\*Nyāyānusāraśāstra*<sup>153</sup>, and *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*<sup>154</sup> attribute the above theory to Ghoṣaka.

The roots of merit are further differentiated in three classes and are explained in terms of the applications of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*).<sup>155</sup> The *\*Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra* does not agree with some of Ghoṣaka’s opinions. For the application of mindfulness on feelings, Ghoṣaka is quoted by a reference to some undefined scriptural text.<sup>156</sup> For mindfulness (*smṛti*) produced by attention through resolve (*adhimuktimanaskāra*), Ghoṣaka is reported to have stated that: “All mindfulness produced

149 T.1545: 25c14-18 = T.1546: 18a29-b4 and T.1546: p.21b1-2. Frauwallner (1971): 83: “Die *laukikāgradharma* gehören 6 Sphärenstufen an, dem *anāgamayam dhyānāntaram* und den 4 *mauladhyanāni*; weder dem *kāmadhātuḥ*, weil es in ihm keine Versenkung gibt, noch dem *ārūpyadhātuḥ*, weil dort der *darśanamārgaḥ* fehlt. Das gleiche gilt von der *kṣāntiḥ*. Dagegen können *ūsmāṇaḥ* und *mūrdhānaḥ* auch dem *kāmadhātuḥ* angehören, wenn man nämlich die Begierde noch nicht überwunden hat; sonst gehören sie dem *rūpadhātuḥ* an”. As far as the specific nature of these four aids to penetration is concerned, Ghoṣaka gives some definitions: see T.1545: 28a11; 29c6-13. See also Van Den Broeck (1977): 14.

150 T.1553: 973a19-21.

151 T.1552: 910a26-27.

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

153 T.1562: 681b29-c1.

154 T.1563: 922b24-26.

155 T.1545: 30a4-14 = T.1546: 21b13-18; T.1545: 31b23-26; T.1545, p.497b3-14; T.1545: 944c4-15. See also Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.16, 283-284, note #62.

156 T.1545: 518b13-15.



by attention through resolve is all said to be mindfulness that is opposing, [this is] not only [true for] the contemplation of the repulsive (*aśubha-bhāvanā*). With this, Ghōṣaka contradicts Kātyāyanīputra.<sup>157</sup>

3b. From the highest worldly factor, a form of patience (*kṣānti*) that is aimed at the truth of frustration, ‘patience regarding the law in relation to frustration’ (*duḥkhe dharmakṣānti*), arises. This is the first pure moment, i.e., the first moment of the noble path that consists of the path of vision (*darśanamārga*) comprising sixteen moments, and the spiritual path (*bhāvanāmārga*).<sup>158</sup> This first pure moment is a proximate path (*ānantaryamārga*) that abandons the possession of a certain form of defilement. This patience is followed by a knowledge (*jñāna*) with the same object, i.e., ‘knowledge of the law in relation to frustration’ (*duḥkhe dharmajñāna*). This is a path of liberation (*vimuktimārga*) that ascertains the disconnection from that defilement. These two forms are aimed at frustration of the realm of sexual passion (*kāmadhātu*). Aimed at frustration of the higher two realms are the ‘subsequent patience in relation to frustration’ (*duḥkhe ‘nvayakṣānti*) and the ‘subsequent knowledge in relation to frustration’ (*duḥkhe ‘nvayajñāna*), that again constitute a proximate path and a path of liberation.<sup>159</sup> With this fourfold track, the truth of frustration (*duḥkhasatya*) is fully understood. The other three noble truths are understood in the same way. This explains the sixteen moments for climbing up in the process of nobility and understanding the noble truths.

157 T.1545: 205a28-b2 = T.1546: 254a15-16.

158 On precedents for this distinction between the path of vision and the spiritual path as they appear in the earliest northern Abhidharma texts in a threefold categorization of all factors in terms of their abandonment: *darśanaheya*, *bhāvanāheya* and *aheya*: see *Samgītiparyāya* (T.1536: 401c24 ff.), *Dharmaskandha* (T.1537: 472a7 ff.) and *Prakaranapāda* (T.1542: 697b3 ff., 702a8 ff., 719c14 ff., 741c18 ff.). See also Cox (1992a): 75.

159 This pair of knowledge of the law and subsequent knowledge is listed in early Sarvāstivāda texts with the knowledge of the awareness of another (*paracitta-jñāna*) and conventional knowledge (*saṃvṛtijñāna*). See *Samgītiparyāya* (T.1536: 393c14 ff.); Stache-Rosen (1968): 100. For the relation between *kṣānti* and *jñāna*: see T.1545: 756c20ff.

Climbing up, one develops all kinds of spiritual states in the four trance states (*dhyāna*): concentrations (*samādhi*), full overcoming comprehensions (*parijñā*), unlimited ones (*apramāṇa*), spheres of totality (*krtsnāyatana*), spheres of mastery (*abhibhvāyatana*), knowledges (*jñāna*) and liberations (*vimokṣa*). Depending on these concentrations, knowledges proceed.<sup>160</sup>

In the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*, Ghōṣaka outlines a ten-stage scheme of spiritual development:

“At the moment the one who strives for liberation practices the path, he can discern what he could not discern yet: namely, this is frustration (*duḥkha*), this is the truth of the origin of frustration (*samudaya*), this is cessation (*nirodha*), this is the path leading to cessation (*mārga*), this is the path of preparation (*prayogamārga*), this is the proximate path (*ānantaryamārga*), this is the path of liberation (*vimuktimārga*), this is the superior path (*viśeṣamārga*), this is the path tending toward [a fruit] (*pratipannakamārga*), this is the acquisition of a fruit (*phalaprāpti*). Because of being able to differentiate such meanings, ‘*Abhidharma*’ is spoken of.”<sup>161</sup>

Ghōṣaka explains the path of vision as “the abandonment of defilement”<sup>162</sup> and as “the wheel of the doctrine”<sup>163</sup>. Also in the \**Samyuktābhidharmahrdaya*<sup>164</sup>, *Abhidharmakośa*<sup>165</sup>, \**Nyāyānusāraśāstra*<sup>166</sup>, and \**Abhi-*

160 Cox (1992a): 64: “An examination of the path-structure in Abhidharma texts suggests [...] a final goal that subsumes knowledge and concentration as equally cooperative means”. On the tension between knowledge and concentration: see Schmithausen (1981): 150-199.

161 T.1545: 4b7-12. See Buswell and Jaini (1996): 117-118. On Ghōṣaka’s scheme: see Fukuhara (1965): 278-280.

162 T.1545: 13a9-b1.

163 T.1545: 912b1-4.

164 T.1552: 950b22-23.

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

166 T.1562: 709a24-27.

*dharmasamayapradīpikā*<sup>167</sup>, the path of vision is explained as the turning of the wheel of the doctrine.

In explaining the process of abandoning defilements<sup>168</sup>, ‘scriptural texts’<sup>169</sup> and the «*Sheng-chih Lun*» are referred to. According to the «*Sheng-chih Lun*», views are investigated in two ways: “The first [way] is by means of the specific nature (*svabhāva*); the second [way] is by means of the antidote (*pratipakṣa*). By means of the specific nature concerns the specific nature of these views; by means of the antidote concerns what these views are cured by.”<sup>170</sup>

To the objection that: “The highest worldly factor can only be in the pre-trance (*anāgamyadhyāna*) because only the pre-trance can break all defilements of the realm of sexual passion (*kāmadhātu*), whereas this is not true for higher stages,”<sup>171</sup> the \**Mahāvibhāṣā* replies that:

“There are two kinds of antidote (*pratipakṣa*). The first is the antidote that is abandoning (*prahāṇapratipakṣa*); the second is the antidote that is detraction (*vidūṣaṇāpratipakṣa*). The pre-trance is with both kinds of antidote regarding the realm of sexual passion. Although the higher five stages<sup>172</sup> are without the antidote that is abandoning regarding the realm of sexual passion, they have the antidote that is detraction. Therefore, also these have the highest worldly factor”.<sup>173</sup>

To this, the venerable Ghosaka is reported to have objected:

“The six stages of the realm of form<sup>174</sup> all have the two kinds of antidote regarding defilement of the realm of sexual passion. It is not so that the path of the higher five stages cannot abandon [defilement] because there already was

167 T.1563: 934b21-24.

168 T.1545: 186a8-9; 253a4-10; 254a23-25; 268b1-2; 444c28-445a1; 487a24-27; 497b17-23; 534a18-22; 540c8-10; 556b21-26 (= T.1546: 395a25-28); 627a20-24.

169 T.1545: 316b6-12; 497b17-23.

170 T.1545: 397b13-22; 507a28-b11.

171 T.1545: 15a6-7.

172 *dhyānāntara* and the four fundamental trances.

173 T.1545: 15a7-10.

174 *anāgamyadhyāna*, *dhyānāntara* and the four *mauladhyānas*.

abandonment in the pre-trance. Although there is the power (*bala*) to abandon [defilement], there is no ability to abandon [defilement]. It is to be compared with six people who have a common opponent and who discuss about where to grasp and hurt this opponent. When one person of them grasps and hurts [this opponent] as first, the other five people may have the power to hurt him, but they cannot do so. It is further as when six people each grasp one torch and enter a dark room one after the other. When the first torch enters, all darkness is broken. Although the other [torches] have the ability [to break darkness], there is no more darkness to be destroyed. It is further as when the sunlight first comes out: there is not one of the later periods [of the day] that is not contrary to the darkness of night, [but] when the sun first came out, all darkness was broken. Although the other [periods of the day] have the ability [to break darkness], there is no more darkness to be broken. In this way, although all six stages can break the defilement of the realm of sexual passion, it is elaborately as explained before.”<sup>175</sup>

The same opinion is attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *Abhidharmakośa*<sup>176</sup> and in the *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*<sup>177</sup>, whereby these texts contradict the ‘orthodox’ Vaibhāṣika viewpoint.

In the process of abandoning defilement, it is so that:

“When first being free from the defilement of the [realm] of sexual passion<sup>178</sup> up to [from the defilement] of the sphere of nothingness (*ākimṇcanyāyatana*), one enters the ‘true nature of being free from beings’ (*samyaktvaniyāma*), and this equals the realization of the acquisition of being free from bonds regarding pure factors to be abandoned through vision of the eight lower stages with respect to the path of vision. It is therefore that it is said that ‘eighty-eight are to be abandoned through vision and ten are to be abandoned through spiritual practice’. Also the venerable Ghoṣaka made such a statement: ‘What is said in this discussion, depends on the principle of being certain. In the

175 T.1545: 15a11-21 = T.1546: 9c26-10a11. See also T.1545: 411c8-18 (cp. T.1546: 9c26 and 10a11).

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

177 T.1563: 912b12-13.

178 Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.9, 197.

«*Prakaraṇapāda*»<sup>179</sup>, it is said that the eighty-eight to be abandoned through vision are explained depending on the realization of being liberated from what is pure, or, are explained [depending] on the gradual acquisition of fruits’.<sup>180</sup>

Of the concentration stages, the pre-trance and the first trance are characterized by having initial thought, of which various forms are differentiated.<sup>181</sup> When entering the fourth trance, breathing does no more proceed.<sup>182</sup>

Depending on concentrations, knowledges arise. Knowledge is defined by Ghoṣaka.<sup>183</sup> After having given a definition of ‘full overcoming comprehension’ (*parijñā*)<sup>184</sup>, Ghoṣaka states that “There are eight [full overcoming comprehensions in the fundamental trances].”<sup>185</sup> This is also the opinion of Ghoṣaka in the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*<sup>186</sup> and in the *\*Nyāyānusārasāstra*<sup>187</sup>: “Those who say that there are eight [as fruit of the fundamental trances] are as the venerable Ghoṣaka who said that the fundamental trances are also the antidote for the one of sexual passion.” With this, the Vaibhāṣika idea that only differentiates five full overcoming comprehensions in this case is contradicted. It is further to be remarked that in the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasāstra*<sup>188</sup>, we find a completely different set of nine full overcoming comprehensions, i.e. a combination of the full overcoming comprehensions as we find them in the *\*Abhidharmahr̥daya-*

179 T.1541: 637a8 ff.; T.1542: 697b6 ff.; 716c11 ff.; 718a4 ff.; 758a4 ff.; 760c21 ff.; 764a1 ff.

180 T.1545: 266c29-267a6.

181 T.1545: 227c13-16; 228a12-15; 228b5-6.

182 T.1545: 132b27-c6.

183 T.1545: 161a3-4; 558b6-8.

184 T.1545: 175b23-25 = T.1546: 133a20-21; T.1545: 321b1-3, cp. T.1546: 242a25-26.

185 T.1545: 324c20-21 = T.1546, p.244b28-29.

186 T.1552: 906b17-19

187 T.1562: 654c27-28.

188 T.1553: 972b28-c4.

*śāstra*<sup>189</sup> and in the \**Aṣṭaḡrantha*.<sup>190</sup> This set of nine is the same as in the *Abhidharmakośa*.<sup>191</sup>

Of the knowledges that proceed depending on the concentrations, the knowledge of birth and death (*cyutyupapādayñāna*) is included in four knowledges: knowledge of the law, subsequent knowledge, conventional knowledge and knowledge of cessation,<sup>192</sup> and the knowledge of the former existences (*pūrvanivāsajñāna*) is included in six knowledges: the eight knowledges minus the knowledge of the awareness of another—because of taking past factors as supporting object; and minus the knowledge of cessation—because of taking conditioned factors as supporting object.<sup>193</sup> This opinion is also found in the \**Samyuktābhidharmahrdaya*.<sup>194</sup> A statement attributed to Ghoṣaka and only found in the \**Samyuktābhidharmahrdaya*<sup>195</sup> concerns the succession of the higher faculties (*abhijñā*): “The venerable Ghoṣaka said that the higher faculties produced with the realm of sexual passion as residence arise as has been spoken of. When in the realm of form, it is different from this: [...] the divine eye (*divyacakṣus*) [...], the footing of supernatural power (*ṛddhipāda*) [...], the divine ear (*divyaśrotra*) [...], knowledge of the mental make-up of others (*cetaḥparyāyajñāna*) [...], knowledge of the former existences (*pūrvanivāsānusmṛtijñāna*).”

In the stages of trances, also unlimited ones (*apramāṇa*) are developed. Also with respect to these and with respect to the knowledge resulting from resolve (*praṇidhijñāna*), Ghoṣaka is quoted.<sup>196</sup>

3c. Each of the nine stages (realm of sexual passion plus two times four stages for the higher two realms), has nine kinds of contaminants to be

189 T.1550: 817c19-27.

190 T.1543: 790a17.

191 T.1558: 112a20ff. See also Van Den Broeck (1977): 66-68.

192 T.1545: 547a11-12.

193 T.1545: 547a16.

194 T.1552: 920c23-25.

195 T.1552: 921a11-18.

196 *Apramāṇa*: T.1545: 425b7-9; 425c10-12; 431b1-3. *Praṇidhijñāna*: T.1545: 547a20-21.

abandoned by vision: minor-minor, minor-middle, minor-excessive, middle-minor, middle-middle, middle-excessive, excessive-minor, excessive-middle and excessive-excessive. In the first fifteen moments of the path of vision, the practitioner either is a doctrine-follower (*dharmānusārin*) when with keen faculties (*tīkṣṇendriya*) or a faith-follower (*śraddhānusārin*) when with minor faculties (*mṛdvindriya*). When the practitioner, whether he is a doctrine-follower or a faith-follower, has not abandoned defilements yet, he is one going to (*pratipannaka*) the fruit of the stream-enterer (*srotaāpanna*). Up to the moment that he has abandoned six kinds of contaminants, he is one going to the fruit of the once-returner (*sakṛdāgāmin*). Up to the moment that he has abandoned all nine kinds, he is going to the fruit of the nonreturner (*anāgāmin*).<sup>197</sup> It is in the sixteenth moment of the path of vision that the practitioner possesses these respective fruits. In these instances, he no longer is a doctrine-follower or a faith-follower, but, respectively, a view-attainer (*drṣṭiprāpta*) or one liberated through faith (*śraddhādhimukta*).

Climbing up in the path of vision, there are eight persons: “The venerable Ghoṣaka made such a statement: there are eight *pudgalas* both as to essence and as to name”. This is explained as follows: all stream-enterers (*srotaāpanna*) who have not produced the path superior to this fruit yet, accomplish the fruit of the stream-enterer. Therefore, the stream-enterer is spoken of. When producing the path that is superior to this fruit, they let the fruit of the stream-enterer loose and, therefore, the one who goes to the fruit of the once-returner (*sakṛdāgāmipratipannaka*) is spoken of, no longer the stream-enterer. All once-returners who have not produced the path superior to this fruit yet, accomplish the fruit of the once-returner, and are therefore called ‘once-returner’. When producing the path that is superior to this fruit, they let the fruit of the once-returner loose and, therefore, the one who goes to the fruit of the nonreturner (*anāgāmipratipannaka*) is spoken of, no longer the once-returner. All who do not return who have not produced the path superior to this fruit yet, accomplish the fruit of the nonreturner, and are therefore called ‘nonreturner’. When producing the path that is superior to this fruit, they

197 See *Dharmaskandha* (T.1537: 463c7 ff.); *Samgūtiparyāya* (T.1536: 392c23 ff. - Stache-Rosen (1968): 98).

let the fruit of the nonreturner loose and, therefore, the one who goes to the fruit of *arhat*-ship (*arhattvapratipannaka*) is spoken of, no longer the nonreturner. Because one depends on faculties to establish the *pudgalas*, one cannot say that there are two kinds of one.<sup>198</sup> The stream-enterer and the once-returner are defined separately.<sup>199</sup>

3d. When the view-attainer or the one liberated through faith have not yet abandoned those contaminants of the realm of sexual passion that are to be abandoned through vision, they at the most are reborn seven times with humans or with gods: they are a *saptakṛtvahparama*. When having abandoned three kinds of contaminants (excessive-minor, excessive-middle and excessive-excessive), they are destined to be reborn in the same kind of family (*kulamkula*). This means that, before entering *nirvāṇa*, they are reborn with humans or with gods with at the most two or three families. Both the one born seven more times and the one destined to be reborn in the same kind of family are stream-enterers. When the practitioner has abandoned six kinds of contaminants (all excessive and all middle ones), he is a once-returner. This means that, before entering *nirvāṇa*, he is reborn once with gods and once with humans. When he has abandoned eight kinds, he is a single-seeker (*ekavīcika*) and is to be reborn only once before entering *nirvāṇa*. When he has abandoned all nine kinds, he is a nonreturner. This implies that he does no more return to the realm of sexual passion. As in the realm of sexual passion, there are also nine kinds of contaminants in the higher two realms, i.e., in eight stages. Also these contaminants are to be abandoned by the proximate path and by the path of liberation.

4. Actually, there are two kinds of observation: a worldly one (*laukika*) and a pure one (*anāsrava*). In eight stages (realm of sexual passion, realm of form and the first three stages of the realm of formlessness) one can be liberated in the two ways. This is related to the idea that, for the Vai-bhāṣikas, ordinary persons can abandon certain defilements by practicing the spiritual path (*bhāvanāmārga*) which is, in their case, referred to as the

198 T.1545: 325c22-326a3 = T.1546: 245a1, with reference to the «*Sheng-chih Lun*». See also Ichimura, Kawamura, Buswell, Cox (1996): 546.

199 T.1545: 239a2-4; 879b5-7 resp.



worldly path. When an ordinary person has abandoned defilements by means of the worldly path, there is no more need to abandon them once again as a noble person by means of the path of vision. The spiritual path can also be practiced by a noble one after completing the path of vision.<sup>200</sup> The ninth proximate path that is aimed at the ninth stage, the stage of neither-identification-nor-nonidentification (*naivasamjñānāsamjñāyatana*) is called ‘diamond-like *samādhi*’ (*vajropamasamādhi*). This is the last awareness of the seeker (*śaikṣa citta*) and is said to be ‘diamond-like’ since, at that moment, all contaminants are abandoned completely and eternally and with it, the path of the practitioner is completed: hereafter, one attains the first knowledge of the adept (*aśaikṣa jñāna*): the knowledge of destruction (*kṣayajñāna*), which Ghoṣaka defines as the only knowledge with the meaning of superiority.<sup>201</sup> This knowledge of destruction is followed by the knowledge of nonorigination (*anutpādayajñāna*), the state of which is also described by Ghoṣaka.<sup>202</sup>

There are different opinions concerning the exact interpretation of the diamond-like *samādhi*. An exhaustive description is given in the \**Mahāvibhāṣāsāstra*.<sup>203</sup> The diamond-like *samādhi* is explained as follows by Ghoṣaka:

“Depending on the pre-trance, there are thirteen diamond-like concentrations: in the path of vision, there are four forms of patience; free from the defilement to be abandoned through spiritual practice of the stage of neither-identification-nor-nonidentification, there are nine proximate paths in the spiritual path. These are the thirteen diamond-like concentrations. As for depending on the concentration of the pre-trance, the same is true up to depending on the fourth trance. Depending on the stage of unlimited space (*ākāśānantyāyatana*) up to the stage of nothingness, there are only nine diamond-like concentrations in total: namely exception made for four patiences. The rest is as is explained for depending on the stage of the pre-trance.”<sup>204</sup>

200 See Cox (1992a): 85.

201 T.1545: 529c29-530a2.

202 T.1545: 958a23-28.

203 T.1545: 142c20-145b4.

204 T.1545: 143c20-26 = T.1546: 112c7-9.

The same opinion is found in the \**Samyuktābhīdharmahr̥daya*<sup>205</sup>, in the \**Nyāyānusārasāstra*<sup>206</sup>, and in the \**Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*<sup>207</sup>.

“With the knowledge of destruction (*kṣayajñāna*) and the one of nonorigination (*anutpādajñāna*),” according to Ghōṣaka, “everything is done and there is no other—superior—thing that can follow. Therefore, these [two] are not explained as ‘vision’.”<sup>208</sup> With these two knowledges, the practitioner is a saint (*arhat*), the fruit of which is obtained with neutral awarenesses<sup>209</sup> and from calculated cessation.<sup>210</sup> A saint, accordingly: “does not have a later existence.”<sup>211</sup> The *arhat* is able to prolong his own life (*āyuhṣamskāra*) depending on the fourth trance: he induces the four elements of the realm of form and lets them be present in the body.<sup>212</sup> The same opinion is attributed to Ghōṣaka in the *Abhidharmakośa*.<sup>213</sup> Liberation is the prerogative of the adept.<sup>214</sup> With respect to liberation, three elements are defined: “The venerable Ghōṣaka made such a statement: the breaking of the essence<sup>215</sup> of defilement is called: ‘the element abandoning’ (*prahāṇadhātu*); being free from fetters regarding an object (*viṣaya*) is called ‘the element nonattachment’ (*vairāgyadhātu*); being free from all big burdens (*bhāranirhāra*), is called ‘the element cessation’ (*nirodhadhātu*).”<sup>216</sup> These definitions are different from the ones in the \**Aṣṭagrantha / Jñānaprasthāna*<sup>217</sup> and in the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasa*<sup>218</sup>,

205 T.1552: 957c27-958a3.

206 T.1562: 700b25-28.

207 T.1563: 930c25-28.

208 T.1545: 490c18-20.

209 T.1545: 954a8-10; 955b24-27.

210 T.1545: 163c2-6, cp. T.1546: 123b16-17. See *Prakaraṇapāda* (T.1542: 719a5 ff.) and T.1545: 337c2ff. See also Cox (1992a): 95.

211 T.1545: 528b11-14.

212 T.1545: 657a27-b1.

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

214 T.1545: 141c11-12 = T.1546: 110b22-24; 146a28-29 = T.1546: 110b22-24 and 113a22-23; 147b27-28.

215 = essential nature: cp. Kimura, Nishi, Sakamoto (1978): Vol.8, 119, note #26.

216 T.1545: 149b18-19.

217 T.1543: 777a15-18; T.1544: 922c24-27.

where *prahāṇadhātu* is defined as the abandonment of all fetters, with the exception of *anunaya*; *virāgadhātu* as the abandonment of *anunaya*, and *nirodhadhātu* as the abandonment of all other factors.

The “Buddha accomplishes all qualities and acquires to be self-dependent in respect to all objects of knowledge (*jñeya jñāna*). At the moment of being on the point of *parinirvāṇa*, He can still produce all trances (*dhyāna*), liberations (*vimokṣa*), concentrations (*samādhi*) and meditative attainments (*samāpatti*).”<sup>219</sup> “Buddha,” further, “wanted to proclaim the truth after which he had made an investigation himself;”<sup>220</sup> and, according to Ghoṣaka: “At the moment Buddha primarily obtained *bodhi* without higher, He had great respect for the doctrine and, therefore, He reflected for many days and did not even come to thinking about eating and drinking. How then could he produce awarenesses to proclaim the doctrine to others?”<sup>221</sup>

## Conclusion

Throughout the description of Ghoṣaka’s path to salvation in the \**Mahāvibhāṣa* (and \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*), we come across several *sūtra*-references<sup>222</sup>; some ‘*sūtras*’ and ‘*śāstras*’<sup>223</sup> are even mentioned by name. The most important work mentioned may be the \**Jñānotthāpanaśāstra*<sup>224</sup> as this work is linked to Ghoṣaka. An *Abhidharma* work

---

218 T.1553: 979b6-8.

219 T.1545: 956b12-15.

220 T.1545: 931a17-18.

221 T.1545: 914a9-11.

222 T.1545: 251b1-5, 316b6-12, 497b17-23, 518b13, 980b15-17, 984a6-8.

223 Fujieda (1969): 17-39 remarks that the designation of the Buddhist texts of that time differed in that of later times in distinguishing *sūtra*, *vinaya* and *śāstra* or *upadeśa*.

224 T.1545: 5c9, 397b19, 507b4. The appellation ‘*śāstra*’ here, may be a later addition. See also note #20.

referred to is a *Ṣatpādābhidharma* work: the *Prakaranapāda*.<sup>225</sup> Ghoṣaka's dependence on *sūtra* literature is also seen in the following:

“The venerable Ghoṣaka made such a statement: ‘the *Abhidharma* is meant to explain the scriptural texts. Since it is depending on the scriptural texts that treatises are made, it is so that everything that is not in the scriptural texts should be excluded’;”<sup>226</sup>

and:

“When holding to ‘*āgama*’ well, this is the doctrine; not holding to ‘*āgama*’ well is a false doctrine. Who holds to it well still has to overcome [birth, old age, sickness and death]; how much more is this so for the one who does not hold to it well [and who thinks that these] do not have to be abandoned?”<sup>227</sup>

The fact that Ghoṣaka, who in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* is linked to Saṃghavaṣu, Vasumitra and Buddhadeva<sup>228</sup>, of whom the last one is connected to the Dārṣāntikas and Sautrāntikas<sup>229</sup>, is often contradicted in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* may be due to this dependence on *sūtra* literature: we know that the Vai-bhāṣika movement of Sarvāstivāda philosophy was a later movement<sup>230</sup> that laid great emphasis on the *Abhidharma*.

An early (Sautrāntika) position for Ghoṣaka is doctrinally attested. Of the doctrinal positions attributed to Ghoṣaka, the fact that, in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and in the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasāśāstra*, the difference between contaminants and manifestly active defilements—a Sautrāntika difference

225 T.1545: 266c29-267a6.

226 T.1545: 236b24-27 = T.1546: 182a10-12.

227 T.1545: 503c10-13 = T.1546: 369c28-370a1. The *āgama* (the scriptures handed down through oral tradition) and the *adhigama* (the religious practice) are the two links of the *dharma* (doctrine) preached by the Buddha. The purpose of the *āgama* is to expound the subject matter of the *adhigama* in all its aspects. See Śānti Bhikṣu Śāstrī (1953): 1. On ‘*adhigama*’: see T.1545: 437a13-27 = T.1546: 330a13-27. See also note #58.

228 T.1545: 647b16-19; T.1545: 251b10-14; T.1545: 984a6-8 resp.

229 See note #34.

230 See Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 79.

that in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* is rejected as a vibhajyavādin doctrine, is present, is important in this respect. The Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* have the same interpretation of the chain of dependent origination and both have notion of the theory of four conditions and six causes, with—related to this—the theory of successiveness of awarenesses that is attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya* and to Ghoṣaka and Saṃghavasū in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*. Both the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* differentiate four characteristic marks. Such similarities explain the attribution of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* to the Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* (*\*Abhidharmāvibhāṣāśāstra*) by many eminent scholars.<sup>231</sup>

However, there are elements that force us to oppose such an identity: the interpretation of the aids to penetration attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*, *Abhidharmakośa*, *\*Nyāyānusāraśāstra* and *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā* is opposed to the theory of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*.<sup>232</sup> An equally puzzling situation is seen with respect to the notions of ‘*samanvāgama*’ and ‘*prāpti*’<sup>233</sup>, or in the list of full overcoming comprehensions of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*. As, in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, Vasumitra<sup>234</sup> is attributed with the theory of activity (*kāritra*), José Van Den Broeck claimed that the Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* does not have this notion, while the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* clearly shows such a notion. This made him conclude that the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* is the work of another Ghoṣaka than the one of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*. To this, we have to object the following: it has been noted by Erich Frauwallner that this part of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* is simply

231 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.

232 Notice that the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* even does not have the term ‘*nirvedhabhāgīya*’. See note #148.

233 Both ‘*samanvāgama*’ and ‘*prāpti*’ in its later meaning are present in the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*, while the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* has ‘*prāpti*’. See also note #51.

234 See Frauwallner (1973): 100-104, 115.

added as a doxographic appendix. The passage is, consequently, of little value for dating the philosophical position of Vasumitra / Ghoṣaka. Moreover, we have shown that a *kāritra*-notion is implicitly inherent in Ghoṣaka's doctrine of contaminants and manifestly active defilements, what—again—seems to plead for an identity of the Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and the author of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*. Attributing the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* to another Ghoṣaka than the one of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* does further not explain why the «*Ch'u San-tsang Chi Chi*», while mentioning two Ghoṣakas, does not attribute the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* to Ghoṣaka, but to an anonymous author.

There further are ideas that are shared by the Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and post-*Vibhāṣā* Gandhāra *Abhidharma* works. The *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and the Sautrāntika *Abhidharmakośa* attribute the same interpretation of meditative attainment without conceptual identification to Ghoṣaka. These two works also have the same opinion on prolonging life of an *arhat*. These two works and the *\*Nyāyānusāraśāstra* also hold to the same idea that taking life is twofold as to being bodily manifesting. The theory of the wheel of the doctrine as it is attributed to Ghoṣaka in the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, is also found in the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*, *Abhidharmakośa*, *\*Nyāyānusāraśāstra* and *Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*. The theory on the number of full overcoming comprehensions (*parijñā*) of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* is the same as in the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya* and the *\*Nyāyānusāraśāstra*. The *Abhidharmakośa* and the *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā* share the same opinion concerning the presence of antidotes in the realms with the Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*. The interpretation of diamond-like *samādhi* is shared by the Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā*, the *\*Saṃyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*, the *\*Nyāyānusāraśāstra* and the *\*Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*.

As we have shown elsewhere<sup>235</sup>, many doctrinal positions of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* are posterior to the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* and date from a period in which the Vaibhāṣikas of Kaśmīra influenced the original

235 Dessein: *Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions*, 3 Vols., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (forthcoming). See also Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 281-282.

Sautrāntikas of Gandhāra and Bactria.<sup>236</sup> If the present version of the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* is a Vaibhāṣika-influenced work, how then can we account for the many references to the *Āgamas*<sup>237</sup> and the similarities with the *Ṣaṭpādābhidharma*?<sup>238</sup>

The tradition knows Ghoṣaka as a Tokharian, settled in Gandhāra, who after the synod of Kaniṣka went to the west of Kaśmīra and near Tukhara.<sup>239</sup> An analysis of the factors associated with awarenesses places the work in between the \**Aṣṭagrantha* and the \**Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*.<sup>240</sup>

All similarities and dissimilarities between the various opinions attributed to Ghoṣaka in the different Sarvastivada *Abhidharma* works can be perfectly explained by the following: as we have shown elsewhere<sup>241</sup>, the development of the philosophical-dogmatic Sarvāstivāda school took two directions: one was situated in Kaśmīra, where the seven *Abhidharma* works (i.e. including the *Jñānaprasthāna*) were put together. According to the accounts of the synod of Kaśmīra, a commentary to the summarizing work of the *Ṣaṭpādābhidharma*—the *Jñānaprasthāna*—was written in Kaśmīra: the \**Mahāvibhāṣā*. With the support of the Kuṣāṇas, these Vai-bhāṣikas became the predominant Sarvāstivāda sub-group and the Vai-bhāṣika viewpoints came to be considered as the orthodox ones. The

236 See in this respect: Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 79.

237 E.g.: the work has the nine types of *arhat* of the *Madhyamāgama*. See Van Den Broeck (1977): 164-167.

238 E.g. the higher knowledges enumerated in the \**Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* are a combination of those of the \**Abhidharmahr̥daya* and the *Aṣṭagrantha*. This contradicts the \**Mahāvibhāṣā* which is a commentary on the *Jñānaprasthāna*. Notice also Van Den Broeck (1977): 79: “Sur le plan doctrinal, nous avons noté que Ghoṣaka s’écarte assez souvent de Dharmaśrī, en se rapprochant du *Ṣaṭpādābhidharma*, notamment du *Dharmaskandha*, du *Prakaraṇa* et du *Jñānaprasthāna*. Il est donc manifeste que notre auteur a voulu ‘corriger’ certaines thèses de son modèle.”

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

240 See Dessein (1996): 647. See also Sakurabe (1969): 57-58.

241 Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 123-125.

second direction was situated in places such as Bactria and Gandhāra where, modeled on a Bactrian compendium of Sarvāstivāda philosophy—the *\*Abhidharmahr̥daya*—a series of *Hr̥daya* works was compiled. From Kaśmīra, the orthodox Vaibhāṣika doctrine spread to the bordering regions. This explains the Vaibhāṣika theories in Bactrian and Gandhāran works, including in the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*. This growing influence led to a reaction of those Sarvāstivādins who had remained loyal to the original doctrine and who referred to themselves as Sautrāntikas. When the Vaibhāṣika doctrinal supremacy disappeared because of the wane of Kuṣāṇa power, the original non-Kāśmīri Sarvāstivādins renamed themselves as Mūlasarvāstivādins and became the dominant group in the 7th. to 9th. centuries. This not only explains the late (8th. century) attribution of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* to Ghoṣaka—up to that moment, the work had undoubtedly been overshadowed by Vaibhāṣika works and by the other, more elaborate philosophical summaries of Gandhāra philosophy such as the *\*Samyuktābhidharmahr̥daya*, but it also explains the doctrinal variation in the work: at the one hand we see opinions which are clearly post-*Vibhāṣā* (explained by the fact that the Vaibhāṣika theories influenced Bactria and Gandhāra), our assumption also explains the doctrinal positions that predate the Vaibhāṣikas (we can—again—refer to the *\*Aṣṭagrantha* (the non-Kāśmīra *Jñānaprasthāna*) and to the *Prakarāṇapāda*: also of this work there is a probably Gandhāra and Kāśmīra version.<sup>242</sup> It is not unlikely that the Sautrāntikas, after the wane of Vaibhāṣika power wanted to bring homage to one of their former masters. This explains—as Van Den Broeck noticed—the fact that there possibly was a revised translation of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*.<sup>243</sup> Our assumption further explains why (1) Ghoṣaka is only referred to in Gandhāra (Sautrāntika) works and why (2) the Ghoṣaka referred to is always the one of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* (*\*Abhidharmavibhāṣāśāstra*), never the one of the

242 Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 76-77.

243 Van Den Broeck (1977): 8-11.



*\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra*: the latter work was not Ghoṣaka's work<sup>244</sup>. That the Sautrāntika works that quote Ghoṣaka contradict this master, may be explained by the following (1) the Sautrāntikas were not a monolithic bloc and (2) all works posterior to Upaśānta's *\*Abhidharmahr̥daya* show Vaibhāṣika influence.<sup>245</sup>

In short, it is—to our opinion—very likely that there only is one Ghoṣaka of whom we can with relative security state that he was a living person, and who is known by his positions in the *Vibhāṣā* literature. All later—Gandhāra—works refer to that same Ghoṣaka. The eighth century attribution of the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* to Ghoṣaka can only be explained as a Mūlasarvāstivāda homage to a Sautrāntika master, criticized by the Vaibhāṣikas.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 1. Primary Sources

#### T. Vol.1

No.26: *Madhyamāgama* 中阿含經 «*Chung A-han Ching*», Saṃghadeva.

#### T. Vol.2

No. 125: *Ekottarāgama* 增一阿含經 «*Tseng-i A-han Ching*», Saṃghadeva.

#### T. Vol.26

No.1536: Mahākauṣṭhila (Skt.), Śāriputra (Ch.), [*Abhidharma*]saṃgītiparyāya[*pādaśāstra*] 阿毘達磨集異門足論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Chi-i-men Tsu-lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

244 That the three elements related to liberation are explained differently in the *\*Abhidharmāmṛtarasaśāstra* than by the Ghoṣaka of the *\*Mahāvibhāṣā* may be a proof for this.

245 See Dessein: *Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions*, 3 Vols., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (forthcoming). See also Willemen, Dessein, Cox (1998): 281-282.

No.1537: Śāriputra (Skt.), Mahāmaudgalyāyana (Ch.), [*Abhidharma*]dharmaśāstra [*pādaśāstra*] 阿毘達磨法蘊足論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Fa-yün Tsu-lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

No.1539: Devaśarman, [*Abhidharma*]vijñānakāya[*pādaśāstra*] 阿毘達磨識身足論 «*A-p'i-ta-mo Shih-shen Tsu-lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

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

No.1542: Vasumitra, [*Abhidharma*]prakaraṇapāda[*śāstra*] 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, \**Abhidharmāṣṭaḥgrantha[śāstra]* 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[*śāstra*] 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[śāstra]* 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]* 毘婆沙論 «*P'i-p'o-sha Lun*», Saṃghabhadra.

No.1548: Śāriputrābhidharma[*śāstra*] 舍利弗阿毘曇論 «*She-li-fu A-p'i-t'an Lun*», Dharmayaśas and Dharmagupta.

T.1549: Vasumitra, Āryavasumitrabodhisattvasaṅgītiśāstra 尊婆須蜜菩薩所集論 «*Tsun P'o-hsü-mi P'u-sa So Chi Lun*», Saṃghabhadra, Dharmanandin, Saṃghadeva and Chu Fo-nien 竺佛念.

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

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

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

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

No.1555: Dharmatrāta, \**Pañcavastukavibhāṣāsāstra* 五事毘婆沙論 «*Wu-shih P'i-p'o-sha Lun*», Hsüan-tsang 玄奘.

T.1556: \**Pañcavastuka* 薩婆多宗五事論 «*Sa-p'o-to Tsung Wu Shih Lun*», Fa-ch'eng 法成.

T.1557: \**Pañcavastuka* 阿毘曇五法行經 «*A-p'i-t'an Wu Fa-hsing Ching*», An Shih-kao 安世高.

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.32

No.1646: Harivarman, \**Tattvasiddhiśāstra* 成實論 «*Ch'eng Shih Lun*», Kumārajīva.

T. Vol.41

No. T.1821: P'u-kuang 普光, 俱舍論記 «*Chü-she Lun Chi*».

## T. Vol.49

No.2034: Fei Ch'ang-fang 費長房, 歷代三寶記 «*Li-tai San-pao Chi*».

## T. Vol.55

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

No.2146: Fa-ching 法經, 衆經目錄 «*Chung Ching Mu-lu*».

No.2147: Yen-ts'ung 彥琮, 衆經目錄 «*Chung Ching Mu-lu*».

No.2148: Ching-t'ai 靜泰, 衆經目錄 «*Chung Ching Mu-lu*».

No.2149: Tao-hsüan 道宣, 大唐內典錄 «*Ta T'ang Nei-tien Lu*».

No.2154: Chih-sheng 智昇, 開元釋教錄 «*K'ai-yüan Shih Chiao Lu*».

No.2155: Chih-sheng 智昇, 開元釋教錄略出 «*K'ai-yüan Shih Chiao Lu Lüeh Ch'u*».

Taishō Index Volume No.15: 毘曇部 [中].

*Aṅguttaranikāya*: Morris, R. and Hardy, E., (Eds.), *The Aṅguttaranikāya*, 5 Vols., 1885-1900. Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1961-1979.

*Dīghanikāya*: Rhys Davids, T.W. and Carpenter, J.E., (Eds.), *The Dīghanikāya*, 3 Vols., 1889-1910. Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1982-1992.

*Majjhimanikāya*: Trenckner, V., Chalmers, R. and Rhys Davids, C.A.F., (Eds.), *The Majjhima-Nikāya*, 4 Vols., 1888-1925. Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1977-1993.

## 2. Secondary Sources

AKANUMA, Ch., ([1967] 1979), *Indo Bukkyō Koyū Meishi Jiten*, Kyoto: Hōshōkan.

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., (1988), 'On the Possibility of a nonexistent Object of Consciousness: Sarvāstivādin and Dārṣṭāntika Theories', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol.11, No.1, pp.31-87.

COX, C., (1992a), 'Attainment through Abandonment: the Sarvāstivādin Path of Removing Defilements', in *Studies in East Asian Buddhism, 7, Paths to Liberation – The Mārga and its Transformations in Buddhist Thought*, Buswell, R.E. Jr. and Gimello, R.M., (Eds.), Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp.63-105.

COX, C., (1992b), 'Mindfulness and Memory: The Scope of *Smṛti* from Early Buddhism to the Sarvāstivādin Abhidharma', in *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*, Gyatso, J., (Ed.), Albany: State University of New York Press, pp.67-108.

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.

DEMIÉVILLE, P., (1978), *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais – fascicule annexe du Hōbōgin*, L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris: Institut de France.

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

DESSEIN, B., (forthcoming), 'Dharmatrāta: Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra', in Potter, K., (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol.VIII, Buddhist Philosophy from 100 to 350 A.D.*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

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

FRAUWALLNER, E., (1963), 'Abhidharma-Studien I, Pañcaskandhakam und Pañcavastukam', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ost-Asiens*, 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.

FRAUWALLNER, E., (1973), 'Abhidharma-Studien, V, Der Sarvāstivādaḥ', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ost-Asiens*, XVII, pp.97-121.

FUJIEDA, A., (1969), 'The Tunhuang Manuscripts II - Dating of the Manuscripts and the Copying Offices', *Zinbun*, X, pp.17-39.

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

HIRAKAWA, A., (1973), *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, part 1, Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese*, Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan Kabushikikaisha.

HURVITZ, L., (1978), 'Fa-sheng's Observations on the Four Stations to Mindfulness' in *Mahāyāna Buddhist Meditation, Theory and Practice*, Minoru Kiyota (Ed.), Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, pp.207-248.

ICHIMURA, Sh., Kawamura, K., Buswell, R.E. Jr. and Cox, C., (1996), 'Mahāvibhāṣā' 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.

JAINI, P.S. (1959a), 'Origin and Development of the Theory of Viprayuktasamskāras', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol.XXIII - 3, pp.531-547.

JAINI, P.S., (1959b), 'The Sautrāntika Theory of bija', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. pp.236-249.

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, pp.114-131.

KALUPAHANA, D.J., (1974), 'The Buddhist Conception of Time and Temporality', in *Philosophy East and West*, 24, pp.181-190.

KAWAMURA, K., (1974), *Abidatsumaronsho no Shiryōteki Kenkyū*, Kyoto: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai.

KIMURA, T., (1937), *Abidatsumaron no Kenkyū*, Vol.6 of Kimura Taiken Zenshū, Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

KIMURA, T., Nishi, G., Sakamoto, Y., (trans.) (1978), *Abidatsuma Daibibosha Ron*, Kokuyaku Issaikyō, Bidonbu, Vols. 7-17.

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, (1913), *Théorie des douze Causes – Bouddhisme, Études et Matériaux*, London: Luzac & Co.

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

LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, L., de (1936-1937), 'Documents d'Abhidharma – la Controverse du Temps; les deux, les quatre, les trois Vérités', *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, V, pp.1-187.

LAMOTTE, E., ([1958] 1967), *Histoire du bouddhisme indien des origines à l'ère Śaka*, Louvain: Bibliothèque du Muséon, No.43.

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.

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

MOCHIZUKI, Sh., (1960-1963), *Bukkyō Daijiten*, 10 Vols., Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai.

MONIER-WILLIAMS, Sir, M., ([1899] 1990), *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

NAKAMURA, H., ([1981] 1985), *Bukkyō Daijiten*, Tokyo: Shojaku Kabushikikaisha.

POTTER, K., (Ed.), (1996), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VII, Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

PRADHAN, P., (Ed.), (1975), *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8, Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

PULLEYBLANK, E.G., (1991), *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Śānti Bhikṣu Śāstrī, (1953), 'Abhidharmāmṛta of Ghoṣaka', *Viśva Bharati Annals*, 5, pp.1-153.

SAKAMOTO, Y., (1981), *Abidatsuma no Kenkyū*, Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

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

SASAKI, G., (1975), (Ed.), *Bonnō no Honshitsu*, in *Bonnō no Kenkyū*, Tokyo: Shimizu Kōbundō Shobō, pp.72-128.

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



SCHMITHAUSEN, L., (1976), 'Die Vier Konzentrationen der Aufmerksamkeit: Zur geschichtlichen Entwicklung einer spirituellen Praxis des Buddhismus', *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaften und Religionswissenschaft*, LX, pp.241-266.

SCHMITHAUSEN, L., (1981), 'On Some Aspects of Descriptions or Theories of 'Liberating Insight' and 'Enlightenment' in Early Buddhism', in *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus. Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, Klaus Bruhn and Albrecht Wezler, Eds., Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 23, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp.155-199.

SHIZUTANI, M., (1978), *Shōjō Bukkyō Shi no Kenkyū*, Kyoto: Hyakkaen.

STACHE-ROSEN, V., (trans.), (1968), *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus II- Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgītiparyāya*, 2 Vols., Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

STCHERBATSKY, Th., ([1923] 1970), *The Central Conception of Buddhism and the Meaning of the word 'Dharma'*, Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

STCHERBATSKY, Th., (1996), *Buddhist Logic*, 2 Vols., Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt (reprint of 1958).

TAKAKUSU, J., (1956), *The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

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.

WARDER, A. ([1970] 1991), *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

WATANABE, B., (1954), *Ubu Abidatsumaron no Kenkyū*, Tokyo; Heibonsha.

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, Abhidharmahr̥daya 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.

WOGIHARA, U., (1971), (Ed.), *Sphuṭārthābhidharmakośavyākhyā of Yaśomitra*, 2 Vols., Tokyo: Sankibō Buddhist Book Store.

YAMADA, R., (1959), *Daijō Bukkyō Seiritsuron Josetsu*, Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.

