

Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien

Herausgegeben vom
Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens an der Universität Hamburg

- 15 Eine Digambara-Dogmatik. Das fünfte Kapitel von Vattakeras Mūlācāra, hrsg. übersetzt u. kommentiert von Kiyooki Okuda. 1975. IV, 164 S., 18,— DM
ISBN 3-515-02139-6
 - 16 Tapan Kumar Das Gupta: Der Vajra — eine vedische Waffe. 1975. VI, 119 S., m. 39 Abb. u. 5 Anhängen, 16,— DM
ISBN 3-515-02174-4
 - 17 Klaus Rüping: Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Vedānta-Philosophie
Teil. 1: Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Brahmasūtra-Kommentaren des Śāṅkara und des Bhāskara. 1977. VI, 75 S., 28,— DM
ISBN 3-515-02409-3
 - 18 Claus Oetke: Die aus dem Chinesischen übersetzten tibetischen Versionen des Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra. Philologische und linguistische Beiträge zur klassifizierenden Charakterisierung übersetzter Texte. 1977. VI, 462 S., 28,— DM
ISBN 3-515-02600-2
 - 19 Horst Brinkhaus: Die altindischen Mischkastensysteme. 1978. VI, 232 S., 24,— DM
ISBN 3-515-02759-9
 - 20 Axel Michaels: Beweisverfahren in der vedischen Sakralgeometrie. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Wissenschaft. 1978. XIV, 209 S., 18,— DM
ISBN 3-515-02978-8
 - 21 Catharina Kiehnle: Vedisch *ukṣ* und *ukṣ/vakṣ*. Wortgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchungen. 1979. V, 241 S., 27,— DM
ISBN 3-515-03149-9
 - 22 Egon Brucker: Die spätvedische Kulturepoche nach den Quellen der Śrauta-, Grhya- und Dharmasūtras. 1. Der Siedlungsraum. 1980. IV, 160 S., 4 Ktn.; 20,— DM
ISBN 3-515-02999-0
-

FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH WIESBADEN

it can also be attained in any of the four *dhyānas* as well as in the so-called “state between [the First and the Second] Dhyāna” (*dhyānāntara*¹⁵⁸)¹⁵⁹. Texts which only state its acquisition in the Fourth Dhyāna (as does the *Ster.Det.Descr.*) can be explained as referring to the Enlightenment of the Buddha which actually took place in the Fourth Dhyāna¹⁶⁰. The opinion of texts like the *Mahāmāluṅkyasutta* (ch. J) that Liberating Insight is also possible in the first three Spheres beyond Visible Matter is referred to the Path of (repeated) Practice (*bhāvanāmārga*)¹⁶¹. Even the view that Nirvāṇa is the content of Liberating Insight could easily be integrated into the theory of Liberation through Insight into the four Noble Truths by understanding the Insight into the Truth of Cessation as a comprehension of Nirvāṇa similar to that of the *Mahāmāluṅkyasutta*¹⁶², Nirvāṇa, however, being conceived in Sarvāstivāda as an unconditioned entity called Cessation by Comprehension (*pratisaṅkhyānirodha*) (or better as a class of such entities)¹⁶³. There is, in Sarvāstivāda, no final Liberation by a mystical ecstasy into a supramundane sphere, no liberating function of the attainment of *saṃjñāvedayitanirodha* (cp. ch. H), which is regarded by the Sarvāstivādins to be an entity that is only similar to Nirvāṇa¹⁶⁴ and to be attained in a state of absorption completely devoid of any kind of consciousness or mental factors whatsoever^{164a}. Yet even the principle of gradual detachment from spheres of mundane existence by means of the meditative realization of the next higher sphere has found its place in the Sarvāstivāda system in the form of the “Mundane Path of Practice” (*laukiko bhāvanāmārgaḥ*)¹⁶⁵ which, however, is only an intramundane process which cannot go beyond the Sphere of Neither-Consciousness-nor-Non-consciousness¹⁶⁶ because there is no further mundane sphere and because Nirvāṇa and *saṃjñāvedayitanirodha* have no longer any cosmological value, not even in an analogous sense.

2.

As for the (later) Pālī school (Theravāda), the main sources on which its theory of Liberating Insight is based appear to be Suttas like AN 10.6 discussed in ch. J.

158 Cp. AK(Bh) 448,7 ff.; AKp VIII 180 f.; FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* IV (1972), p. 96; *dhyānāntara* or *dhyānāntarikā* (AKBh 68,19), which is defined as a variety of the First Dhyāna without *vitarka*, was introduced in order to integrate the *saṃādhi* which has no *vitarka* but only *vicāra*, of passages like DN III 219 and SN IV 360.

159 FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* III, p. 100.

160 Cp. AK(Bh) 451,18–452,2 (ms. reads *caturtha* instead of *caturbhya*).

161 Cp., e.g., AK(Bh) 368,4 f. (AKp VI 238); the non-occurrence of (supramundane) Liberating Insight in *naivasamjñānāsamjñāyatana* is stated, e.g., in AKBh 386,10 f.; AKVy 570,9 f.; Vi 433 c 11 ff.

162 Cp. the *ākāras* of *nirodhasatya* which include *śānta* and *praṇīta* (cp. AKBh 400,6 and 11; 401,5 f.; FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* III, p.82).

163 Cp. AKBh 327,12 f.: “*pratisaṅkhyānirodho yo viśaṃyoga*” (AK I,6a) *iti nirodhasatyam*. As for *pratisaṅkhyānirodha*, see, e.g., AK(Bh) 3,24 ff.; FRAUWALLNER, *Ph.B.* 129 f.

164 Cp., e.g., AKBh 363,13 f.; Abhidharmadīpa(vṛtti) 93,5 f.; Vi 782 c 18 ff.; Abhidharmasāra (T 1552) 932 c 8.

164a AKBh 69,24 ff.; 73,3 f.

165 Cp., e.g., AK(Bh) 368,7 ff. (AKp VI 238 f.).

166 Cp., e.g., AK(Bh) 366,14 ff. (AKp VI 233); FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* III, p. 96.

5 and the Mahāmālūṅkyasutta (see esp. ch. J.4). The Theravādins seem to have interpreted the latter as treating of not only Liberating Insight proper but also the decisive preparatory phase. To this phase belong, according to them, the entrance into the four *dhyānas* and the first three States Beyond Visible Matter¹⁶⁷ (which they understand as alternative but not necessary¹⁶⁸ starting-points¹⁶⁹) and insight into the negative nature^{169a} – essentially impermanence, disagreeableness, and Not-having-or-being-a-Self¹⁷⁰ – of the *dhammas* that constitute those meditative states (a comprehension which they consider to be the result of a long process of analytical observation or contemplation that only takes place after one has re-emerged from meditative concentration¹⁷¹). Liberating Insight proper has Nirvāṇa for its sole object¹⁷². Thus it corresponds only to the last element of the description of Liberating Insight in the Mahāmālūṅkyasutta, to the element which corresponds to Suttas like AN 10.6, viz. the comprehension of Nirvāṇa as peaceful and excellent. Yet, the Nirvāṇa-experience of later Theravādins seems to be less intellectual¹⁷³. Nevertheless, it is not a mystico-existential anticipation of Nirvāṇa as in the “*saṃjñāvedayitanirodha*-Liberation theory” – in Theravāda too, *saṃjñāvedayitanirodha* has come to be regarded as a completely non-conscious state, altogether dissociated from Liberating Insight – but a mystical cognition (*nāṇa*) or intuition (*nāṇadassana*)¹⁷⁴ taking place in one of the four, or the five¹⁷⁵,

167 They are considered to be special applications of the Fourth Dhyāna: FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* IV (1972), p. 105; NYANATILOKA, *B. Wb.*, p. 92.

168 There are followers of a Path of pure or mere analytical insight (*sukkhavipassaka* or *suddhavipassanāyānika*, cp. VisM XVIII.5; VIII.237; NYANATILOKA, *B. Wb.*, p. 216) who do not enter into the *dhyānas* before attaining Liberating Insight proper (cp. VisM XXI.112).

169 VisM XVIII.3; cp. also XXI.112–114.

169a As for insight into the negative nature of *dhammas* as a (merely) preparatory stage which does not necessarily include finding pleasure in Nirvāṇa, cp. SN III 134 (. . . *mayham pi kho etam evam hoti – ‘rūpaṃ aniccaṃ, . . . anattā, . . .’ ti; atha ca pana me . . . nibbāne cittaṃ na pakkhandati nappasīdati. . .*). This Sutta, by the way, seems to have had considerable influence on the Śrāvakabhūmi (ŚrBh 496 ff.), according to which, nevertheless, Liberating Insight consists in a vision not of Nirvāṇa alone but of all the four Noble Truths (ŚrBh 500, 15 ff.).

170 Cp. Ps III 146,8 f.: *nissattaṭṭhena suññato, na attatṭhena anattato*.

171 VisM XVIII.3; cp. also the explanation of the phrase (of the Mahāmālūṅkyasutta) *so tattha tṭhito* (MN I 436,3) as *tāya tilakkhaṇārammaṇāya vipassanāya tṭhito* (Ps III 146,25 f. ≈ Mp IV 196,23 f. [ad AN 9.36, see ch. K]) instead of the more natural explanation *tasmim pathamajjhāne tṭhito* (Mp IV 196,6 f.).

172 See n. 178.

173 Cp. Ps III 146,18 ff. (= Mp IV 196,16 ff.) which refers the respective portion of the Mahāmālūṅkyasutta both to preparatory insight and to Liberating Insight proper (i.e. to the *maggacitta*) and makes it clear that [in the case of Liberating Insight proper] one does not verbalize [its contents] in the form “this is peaceful, this is excellent” but only focusses one’s mind on [Nibbāna] while penetrating into it in such a form (*iminā . . . ākārena taṃ paṭivijjhanto*).

174 Cp. VisM XXII.2.

175 In the pattern of five *dhyānas*, an additional *dhyāna* has been inserted in which there is only *vicāra* but no *vitarka* and which thus corresponds to the *dhyānāntara* of the Sarvastivādins (see n. 158); cp. FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* IV (1972), p. 96.

*dhyānas*¹⁷⁶. It is only the principle that Craving for mundane things or existence can be extirpated only by a realization of the Supramundane, i. e. Nirvāṇa, that the Theravādins, seemingly on lines of Suttas like AN 10.6, have taken over from the “*saṃjñāvedayitānirodha*-Liberation theory”.

However, the statements on Liberating Insight in some Theravāda sources, especially the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*¹⁷⁷ and the *Visuddhimagga*, present additional difficulties. The text of the *Visuddhimagga*, it is true, is quite unambiguous in declaring that only Nirvāṇa is the object (*ārammaṇa*) of the moment of Liberating Insight (i. e. the *magga-kkhaṇa*)¹⁷⁸. On the other hand, the text asserts the doctrine that this very same Liberating Insight (*maggañāṇa*) fulfils a fourfold function (*kicca*) and that in this one moment all the four Noble Truths are “attained” (*abhisam-i*)¹⁷⁹. But the term “attainment” (*abhisamaya*) does not seem to be used in a univocal sense in this context; for the text specifies that the Truth of Suffering (*dukkhasacca*) is “attained” in the sense of “knowing completely” (*pariññā*), the Truth of Origination (*samudayasacca*) in the sense of “elimination” (*pahāna*), the Truth of Cessation (*nirodhasacca*), i.e. Nirvāṇa, in the sense of “realization” (*sacchikiriya*), and the Truth of the Path (*maggasacca*) in the sense of “practising” (*bhāvanā*)¹⁸⁰. It seems that, in the case of the Truth of Origination and the Truth of the Path, “attainment” (*abhisamaya*) does not mean a gnoseological act. The same ought to be true also of the Truth of Suffering, and there seems to be an effort to interpret the term *pariññā* accordingly, viz. as *pahānapariññā*¹⁸¹, provided that this term is intended to mean “*pariññā* [consisting in] elimination”¹⁸². But such an interpretation of *pariññā* is rather strange; it would be far easier to interpret not *pariññā* but *sacchikiriya* in a non-gnoseological sense (viz. as realization = Verwirklichung [of the cessation of the respective Causes of Suffering]), and to retain the gnoseological value of *pariññā*. Such an interpretation, however, would not fit the basic position of the *Visuddhimagga*, but it is actually found in an explanation of “comprehension or attainment [of all the four Noble Truths] by one [single moment of Insight]” (*ekābhisamaya*) referred to in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*¹⁸³.

176 Cp. VisM XXI.112–114; FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* IV (1972), p. 106 f.

177 According to FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* IV (1972), p. 124 f., this text was the latest of all Abhidharma works to be incorporated in the Theravāda canon.

178 Cp., e.g., VisM VIII.236; XXI.71; 124; XXII.13; 40; 127; Ps III 146,21 (= Mp IV 196,19); cp. also Paṭis I 116 f.

179 VisM XXII.92 ff.

180 Ibid.; cp. also Paṭis I 118.

181 VisM XXII.108; cp. also XX.3 f.

182 Cp. VisM XXII.96: *yathā nāvā orimaṃ tīraṃ pajahati, evaṃ maggañāṇaṃ dukkhaṃ pari-jānāti*. – Of course, grammatically it would be equally possible to explain the compound *pahāna-pariññā* in the sense of “complete knowledge [leading to] elimination”; if this is the right interpretation, my presumption that the term *pahānapariññā* aims at avoiding or veiling the gnoseological meaning inherent in the term *pariññā* would seem to be not to the point.

183 AKBh 352,2 f.; cp. also 351,14 f.

The pattern looks like an attempt at *h a r m o n i z i n g* the old doctrine of Liberating Insight as comprehension of the four Noble Truths with doctrines according to which its actual content is only *o n e* of these Truths: the Truth of Suffering (*dukkhasatya*, cp. ch. I), or the Truth of Cessation (*nirodhasatya*), i. e. Nirvāṇa, as in the Visuddhimagga.

Yet, the situation in the Visuddhimagga (and already in the Paṭisambhidāmagga) is still more complex, because there are passages which give a *g n o s e o l o g i c a l* meaning to the term *abhisamaya* in the case of *a l l* the four Noble Truths. It seems that in the one moment of Liberating Insight (*maggakkhaṇa*), although it realizes Nibbāna as its sole object, yet the other Truths, too, are somehow *s e e n* or *u n d e r s t o o d*¹⁸⁴. The question is which kind of “understanding” (*paṭivedha*) is intended. The Paramatthamañjūsā uses the *n e g a t i v e* term *asammoha* (*-paṭivedha*)¹⁸⁵ which may indicate that there is no actual cognition of the other Truths, as in the case of the Truth of Cessation which is said to be manifested distinctly (*paccakkhakaraṇa*)¹⁸⁶, but only some *i m p l i c i t* or *v i r t u a l* kind of “knowledge” on the basis of which *a f t e r w a r d s* a completely clear and adequate actual cognition of anyone of the Truths and their aspects can arise¹⁸⁷. This appears to be a different attempt at harmonizing, which, however, in the Visuddhimagga does not seem to be clearly distinguished from the first one.

3.

It is not possible to give in this paper a detailed exposition of the doctrine of Liberating Insight as set forth in Harivarman's *T a t t v a - o r S a t y a s i d d h i*¹⁸⁸, but a few provisional hints should be to the point.

184 VisM XXII.92 (*nirodham ārammaṇaṃ karitvā cattāri pi saccāni pāpuṇāti passati paṭivijjhati*) and 103; Paṭis I 119.

185 PMAñj, vol. III, p. 1634, l. 15: *asammohavasena paṭivijjhati* (referring to *dukkhasacca*); l. 16: *asammohato abhisameti* (referring to *samudayasacca*); l. 18 f.: *maggam asammohato paṭivijjhati*; l. 23 f.: *nirodhasaccam ekam ārammaṇapaṭivedhena, cattāri pi saccāni asammohapaṭivedhena maggañāṇaṃ* (subject!) *paṭivijjhati*; p. 1637, l. 10 ff.: *maggañāṇaṃ hi nirodham eva ārammaṇaṃ karontam pi yo so dukkhādisu . . . saccaṭṭho, tappaticchādaka-sammoha-viddhamśanena taṃ . . . paṭivijjhantaṃ . . . pavattati* (cp., however, also n. 186); p. 1640, l. 20 and 22 f.: *na hi dukkhapariññāsamudayappahānāni dukkhasamudaya-saccārammaṇena ñāṇena kātuṃ sakkuṇeyyāni. nibbānārammaṇena pana tattha itaradvaye ca* (i.e. with regard to Nibbāna as well as to the other two, viz. *dukkha-* and *samudayasacca*) *sammohaṃ viddhamśentena sakkā kātuṃ . . .*

186 PMAñj III, p. 1634, l. 20 f. (ad VisM XXII. 92): *‘nirodham’ ti nibbānaṃ. ‘sacchikiriyābhisamayaṇa’ ti paccakkhakaraṇasaṅkhātena paṭivijjhanena*. Cp., however, also p. 1637, l. 10 ff., where *paccakkham karontam eva* (or read *iva*?) refers to the *saccaṭṭha* of *a l l* Truths.

187 PMAñj III, p. 1637, l. 12 f.: *yato aparabhāge . . . soḷasa pi saccaṭṭhā ariyassa hatthāmalakam viya yāthāvato upaṭṭhahanti*.

188 FUKUHARA, Jōjitsuron no kenkyū (1969), was, unfortunately, not accessible to me. — I do not refer, in my notes, to N. AIYASWAMI SASTRI's retranslation of Harivarman's work into Sanskrit (Baroda 1975), which poses serious methodological problems.

Harivarman expressly rejects the opinion of the Vaibhāṣikas according to which Liberation is achieved by the full comprehension of the four Noble Truths¹⁸⁹; for according to him the usual canonical explanation shows that the four Noble Truths refer to Conventional Truth (*saṃvṛtisatya*) only¹⁹⁰. Thus, the doctrine of Liberating Insight propounded in the *Ster.Det.Descr.* (ch. C) is rejected or, more precisely, referred to another stage of the Path of Liberation¹⁹¹.

In some passages, a decisive role in the process of extirpating Defilements is accorded to the comprehension of Suffering¹⁹², i.e. the comprehension of the *skandhas* as impermanent (*anitya*) and disagreeable (*duḥkha*)¹⁹³, and especially as empty (*śūnya*) and essenceless (*anātman*)¹⁹⁴. Occasionally, Emptiness is defined as non-existence, in the five *skandhas*, of a substantial Living Being or Person, i. e. in the sense of *pudgalanairātmya*, whereas Essencelessness means non-existence of the *skandhas* themselves, i.e. *dharmanairātmya*¹⁹⁵.

Yet in other passages Harivarman emphasizes that insight into the negative nature of all mundane factors (in the sense of the canonical doctrine of ch. I) is not yet Liberating Insight proper¹⁹⁶. Strictly speaking, the Defilements are eliminated only by insight into the Truth of C e s s a t i o n (*nirodhasatya*)¹⁹⁷ which alone is Ultimate Truth (*paramārtha-satya*)¹⁹⁸. In this insight, which is closely related to, and obviously immediately provoked by¹⁹⁹, the insight into the Essencelessness of the *skandhas*, there is no longer any perception or notion of mundane factors, but mind has for its object Cessation only, which is unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*)²⁰⁰, because all *dharma*s, on account of their intrinsic Essencelessness, have ceased *ab aeterno*.

Harivarman's view that the decisive phase of Liberating Insight is insight into the Truth of Cessation (i. e. Nirvāṇa)²⁰¹ is in keeping with the principle that seems to underly the “*saṃjñāvedayitanirodha*-Liberation theory” (ch. H), viz. that detachment from all the mundane spheres can only be achieved by an experience of, or insight into, the supramundane sphere, i.e. Nirvāṇa. In fact, this principle is expressly stated by Harivarman when he says that the notion of disagreeableness with regard to all conditioned *dharma*s becomes definite only after insight into the

189 TSi 362 c 5 ff., esp. c 27 ff. and 363 a 16 f. and 19 ff.

190 TSi 363 a 19–23.

191 Cp. TSi 363 a 7 f.

192 Cp., e.g., TSi 372a 28 – b 1.

193 TSi 372 b 2; 362 b 2.

194 Ibid.

195 TSi 365 b 15 f.

196 Cp. TSi 362 b 2 f.; 332 c 20 ff.

197 Cp. TSi 323 c 12 f.; 324 c 3; cp. also 372 b 3; 363 a 28; b 13. Cp. also Sh. KATSURA, Harivarman on Satyadvaya, in: IBK 54/1979, p. 960.

198 Cp. TSi 365 b 25 ff.

199 Cp. TSi 372 b 2 f.; cp. also 370 b 28.

200 Cp. TSi 332 c 11 f.

201 Cp. also TSi 362 b 1; c 1 f.; 346 a 10 f.

Truth of Cessation, i.e. Nirvāṇa²⁰²; in the same way as, e.g., a person who has not yet attained to the bliss of the First Dhyāna cannot become detached from sensual pleasures (i. e. from *kāmadhātu*)²⁰³. Harivarman even accepts that *saṃjñāvedayitanirodha* implies complete extinction of Cankers or Defilements²⁰⁴, although only in the context of the eight Liberations (*vimokṣa*), not in the context of the nine Successive States (*anupūrvavīhāra*), where it only means (temporary) suppression of mind and mental states²⁰⁵. He explains *saṃjñāvedayita* as “mental states (*vedayita* = *citta*)²⁰⁶ having conditioned [factors] for their object (*saṃskṛtālabhāna*)”²⁰⁷. These, of course, are eliminated in Liberating Insight which, as stated before, has for its sole object or content Cessation which is unconditioned²⁰⁸. Yet according to Harivarman, Liberating Insight does not require a state of mystical ecstasy, not even entrance into one of the four *dhyānas*, but can be achieved also on the ordinary mental level of *kāmadhātu*)²⁰³. In this sense, Harivarman is even more “intellectualist” than the Sarvāstivādins who had admitted, as the lowest mental level in which Liberating Insight can take place, a state inserted in between the ordinary state of mind and the First Dhyāna²¹⁰. Therefore, Harivarman’s position seems to be most closely related to the canonical texts discussed in ch. J. 5, and at the same time to the Pali version of Mahāmālunkyaśutta (ch. J. 4) if the comprehension or contemplation of the negative nature of mundane factors it contains is interpreted as referring to the phase preparatory to Liberating Insight as was also done in the later Pali School (cp. ch. N. 2). On the whole, the similarity of Harivarman’s view on Liberating Insight with that of the Pali school is obvious; one of the most important differences is his more intellectualist conception of the Truth of Cessation and Insight into it; another is the fact that he interpretes *anātman* in the sense of *dharmanairātmya* and thereby obtains an organic link between contemplation of the negative nature of mundane existence and insight into the Truth of Cessation.

4.

In Mahāyāna Buddhism such a distinction between the comprehension of Essencelessness (as the true nature of mundane factors) and the comprehension of the truth of Cessation (as the Cessation of all mundane existence ontologically anticipated from time immemorial), a distinction which is at many

202 TSi 363 b 13–15 and 18 f.

203 TSi 363 b 16 f.

204 Cp. TSi 339 b 13.

205 Cp. TSi 344 c 29 ff.; 339 b 28 f.; 340 a 3.

206 TSi 345 a 16 f.

207 TSi 345 a 17 f.; but seemingly otherwise 339 c 8 f.

208 Cp. TSi 339 c 12.

209 TSi 339 a 2 ff.; cp. *Mus.* p. 203.

210 See ch. N. 1. — *anāgāmya* is expressly rejected by Harivarman (TSi 339 a 5 ff.; cp. *Mus.* p. 203 f.).

points palpable enough in Harivarman’s text²¹¹, is usually not made. This means that, from the point of view of content, the “positive” and the “negative” tradition came to be fused (the accent, it is true, varying from system to system). With regard to its formal aspect, however, the Mahāyāna descriptions or theories of Liberating Insight, as far as I can see, refer to a clearly mystical experience, which resembles *saṃjñāvedayitanirodha* or *nirodhasamāpatti* in its aspect of a mystico-existential anticipatory realization of Nirvāṇa, though it is usually²¹² clearly distinguished from it, probably because *nirodhasamāpatti* had come to be regarded as a completely non-conscious (or at least subconscious) state, whilst mystical experience is, of course, consciousness, though, in Mahāyāna, a transconceptual one.

**Abbreviations:*

(Abbreviations of titles of Pali texts not listed below correspond to those of the CPD!)

- AK(Bh) = Abhidharmakōśa (bhāṣya) of Vasubandhu, ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1967.
 AKp = L’Abhidharmakōśa de Vasubandhu, trad. et ann. par L. de la Vallée Poussin, Paris-Louvain 1923–1931.
 AKVy = Abhidharmakośavyākhyā of Yaśomitra, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo ² 1971.
 AN = Aṅguttaranikāya (PTS ed.).
 AS = Abhidharmasamuccaya of Asaṅga, ed. P. Pradhan, Santiniketan 1950.
 ASBh = Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya, ed. N. Tatia, Patna 1976.
 BAREAU, *Recherches* = A. Bareau, Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtra-pitaka et les Vinayapitaka anciens: de la quête de l’Éveil à la conversion de Śāriputra et de Maudgalyāyana. Paris 1963.
 BHSD = F. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, New Haven 1953.
 CPD = V. Trenckner et al., A Critical Pali Dictionary, Copenhagen 1924–.
 DhCPS = Dharmacakrapravartanasūtra (see ch. B).
 DN = Dīghanikāya (PTS ed.).
 EĀ_c = Ekottarāgama (T 125).
 EB = G. P. Malalasekera et al., Encyclopedia of Buddhism, Colombo 1961–.
 ERGARDT, *Faith* = Jan T. Ergardt, Faith and Knowledge in Early Buddhism, Leiden 1977.
 FRAUWALLNER, *A.St.* = E. Frauwallner, Abhidharma-Studien, in: WZKS(O) 7/1963 (= I); 8/1964 (= II); 15/1971, 69–102 (= III); 15/1971, 103–121 and 16/1972 (= IV); 17/1973 (= V).
 FRAUWALLNER, *G.i.Ph.* = E. Frauwallner, Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, I, Salzburg 1953.
 FRAUWALLNER, *Ph.B.* = E. Frauwallner, Die Philosophie des Buddhismus, Berlin ³ 1969.
 HACKER, *Kl. Schr.* = Paul Hacker, Kleine Schriften, ed. by L. Schmithausen, Wiesbaden 1978.
 Hôb = Hôbôgirin, dictionnaire encyclopédique du Bouddhisme, Tokyo 1929–.
 IBK = Indogaku Bukkyôgaku Kenkyû (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies).
 MĀ_c = Madhyamāgama (T 26).
 MN = Majjhimanikāya (PTS ed.).
 MPPU_L = É. Lamotte, Le Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse, tome I–IV, Louvain 1944–1976.

211 Cp., e.g., TSi 362 b 2. But cp. also passages like TSi 370 b 28 f. and c 10 ff., or 365 c 1 f., where the distinction seems doubtful.

212 An exception seems to be Kāśyapaparivarta (ed. Staël-Holstein) § 144; cp. *Mus.* p. 222.

- MSV = Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinayavastu, Vol. II, ed. S. Bagchi, Darbhanga 1970.
 NYANATILOKA, *B. Wb.* = Nyanatiloka, Buddhistisches Wörterbuch, Konstanz o.J.
 PMañj = Paramatthamañjūsā, in: Visuddhimaggo with Paramatthamañjūsāṭikā of Bhaddantācariya Dhammapāla, ed. by Rewatadhamma, 3 vols., Varanasi 1969–1972.
 PTC = F. L. Woodward, E. M. Hare, et al., Pāli Tripitakam Concordance, London 1952–.
 SĀ_C = Saṃyuktāgama (T 99).
 SN = Saṃyuttanikāya (PTS ed.).
 ŚrBh = Srāvakaśāstra, ed. K. Shukla, Patna 1973.
Ster. Det. Descr. see ch. C!
 SWTF = Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, hrsg. unter der Leitung von H. Bechert, Göttingen 1973–.
 T = Taishō edition of the Tripitaka in Chinese.
 TSi = *Tattva- (or Satya-)siddhi of Harivarman (T 1646).
 Vi = (Mahā-)Vibhāṣā(-śāstra) (T 1545).
 VisM = Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosaṭṭhi, ed. by H. C. Warren, rev. by Dh. Kosambi, Cambridge, Mass., 1950.
 VON HINÜBER, *Kasussyntax* = O. von Hinüber, Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pali, besonders des Vinaya-piṭaka. München 1968.
 Y_C = Chinese version of the Yogācārabhūmi (T 1579).
 Y_m = Sanskrit manuscript of the Yogācārabhūmi kept in the K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna.
 (In the case of AN, DN, MN, Paṭi, and SN, references are to PTS-ed., though, for practical reasons, the texts quoted are from Nālandā-ed.)

A d d e n d a:

ad ch. A. 1: One could, of course, contrast 'Liberating Insight' (*ājñā*) with '(Supreme) Perfect Enlightenment' (*(anuttarā) samyaksambodhiḥ*) (cp. T. TAGAMI, *Aññācitta* no imi to seikaku, in: Komazawa-Daigaku Bukkyōgaku-bu Ronshū 2/1971, pp. 75 ff., esp. 82 ff.); but apart from the question of its antiquity this opposition may seem to imply an emphasis on qualitative difference, whereas for some of the materials discussed in this paper exactly the opposite is true (cp., esp., ch. C).

ad n. 8: I should have added SH. MIYAMOTO, The Buddha's First Sermon and the Original Pattern of the Middle Way, in: IBK 26/1965, pp. 855–845, esp. 852, and particularly A. HIRAKAWA, Shitaisetsu no shujusō to hokkan, in: Bukkyō Kenkyū 5/1976, pp. 1 ff. Both scholars favour the authenticity of (at least the content of) the account of Enlightenment given in the DhCPS.

ad n. 11: An opinion on the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda version of the DhCPS similar to that of KUSAMA is given by A. HIRAKAWA, op. cit. (add. ad n. 8), p. 6 f.

ad n. 19: Of course, *kāmāsava* could also be understood as a Karmadhāraya if *kāma* is taken in the subjective sense (cp. also K. R. NORMAN, Elders' Verses I 134: "kāma etc. were . . . the means by which *karman* flowed in"), but I do not see how such an interpretation would be possible in the case of *bhavāsrava*.

ad n. 23: Cp. also AN II 198 where the *āsravas*, said to originate in *avidyā* (and other factors), do not themselves include *avidyā*, but are glossed by the expression

vighātapariḷāhā (cp. also MN I 9 ff.; 361 ff.; AN III 387 ff.; MVu III 338) which seems to mean “afflictions” in some passages, but evil emotions like annoyance/frustration and anguish/distress (or burning desire? cp. *abhijjhā-domanassa*!) in others, thus appearing to stand, somehow, half-way between Defilements and Suffering, or to comprise aspects of both. I am not certain whether this concept of *āsravas* may contribute to the interpretation of the *Ster.Det.Descr.*, but it should perhaps be considered in connection with its conjectural prefiguration (see n. 27).

ad n. 26: Cp. also Dhṛp 190–192 = Udānavarga XXVII.33–35.

ad n. 50: Cp. also L. HURVITZ, The Eight Deliverances, in: Studies in Pali and Buddhism, ed. A. K. Narain (Delhi 1979), p. 152. — In *Āyāraṅga* II.15 quoted by C. CAILLAT, Deux études de moyen-indien, JA 1960, p. 43, *kāeṇa phāsie pālie tīrie* . . . refers to the monastic vows (*mahāvṛaya*); but surely CAILLAT’s explanation of *kāeṇa* as an *upalakṣaṇa* for *kāya-vāṇ-manobhiḥ* (op. cit., p. 62, n. 12) is commentatorial and can hardly be accepted as the original meaning.

ad ch. H: The original meaning of *nirodhasamāpatti* (a term which, however, does not occur in the Pāli canon where we only find expressions like *saññāvedayitanirodham upasampajja viharati* or *samāpajjati*) has been discussed in a most stimulating article by H. NAGASAKI, Metsujinjō ni tsuite, in: Ōtani Gakuhō 39.2/1959, pp. 64 ff. According to NAGASAKI, *nirodhasamāpatti* originally was nothing but a (metaphorical) designation for Nirvāṇa in terms of meditative concentration (pp. 65 f.; 70 f.; 73 ff.), for in the context of the *anupūrvavihāras* Nirvāṇa is attained, NAGASAKI says (p. 70 f.), subsequent to the 8 meditative concentrations (*samāpatti*), and moreover it is, like meditative concentration, a state of tranquillity (p. 65 f.). Later on, the metaphoricality of the usage was forgotten and *nirodhasamāpatti* came to be understood as being realiter a certain type of meditative concentration, first considered to be accessible to released persons only, but later devaluated to a stage below Nirvāṇa and preceding it (pp. 72 f.; 75 f.). In my opinion, NAGASAKI is right in emphasizing the original identity of *saññāvedayitanirodha* and Nirvāṇa. But I think that the wording of the *vimokṣa* and *anupūrvavihāra* patterns, which after all describe attainment to *saññāvedayitanirodha* with exactly the same expressions as attainment to the preceding stages, should be taken seriously, its purport being that what is attained is a temporary meditative or mystical ascent to the level of Nirvāṇa (in the sense of final Nirvāṇa definitively attained by the Arhat after death, as a state where all ideations and feelings will have ceased), and that this mystical anticipation of final Nirvāṇa effectuates Nirvāṇa in the spiritual sense, i.e. the vanishing of the *āsravas*. As against this, to NAGASAKI, the attainment of *saññāvedayitanirodha* is to be identified with Nirvāṇa in the sense of the vanishing of the *āsravas* (p. 71), an assumption which forces him to interpret the term ‘*saññāvedayitanirodha*’ to mean “cessation of the ideations and feelings of a worldly person (*prthagjana*) and their commutation into the ideations and feelings of an *ārya*” (p. 72). Such an interpretation, though in fact also advocated by Harivarman in the context of the 8 *vimokṣas* (TSi 337 a 27 f.; b 11 f.; c 8 ff.; cp. ch. N.3), does not seem to be supported by any textual evidence in the canon. Moreover, it would imply an analogous artificial interpre-

tation of the *ārūpyas*; for only if the *ārūpyas* were regarded as a gradual emptying and diminution of worldly *saṃjñā* alone would it be understandable that they lead to elimination of worldly *saṃjñā* alone (which I grant may imply elimination of the *āsravas*). But in the canonical *vimokṣa* and *anupūrvavihāra* formulas, no such restriction to worldly *saṃjñā* is expressed or even hinted at.

ad n. 70: Different interpretations of the term *dharmacakkhu* and the sentence “*yaṃ kiñci samudayadhammaṃ . . .*” are given by K. MIZUNO, *Abhisamaya* (genkan) ni tsuite (Tōkai Bukkyō 7/1961), p. 54; idem, *Genshi-bukkyō ni okeru satori* (Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai Nempō 31/1966), pp. 8 f.; A. HIRAKAWA, op. cit. (add. ad n. 8), pp. 21 f.; idem, *Genshi-bukkyō ni okeru hō no imi* (Waseda-daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku-kenkyū-ka Kiyō 14/1968), p. 23. For my own view of the sentence “*yaṃ kiñci . . .*”, I should like to point out to SN 23.13–46, but I admit that the passage may need reconsideration.

ad n. 121 (p. 233): As for the problems of constructions like *taṃ santam idaṃ atthī ti pajānāti*, cp. VON HINÜBER, *Kasussyntax*, § 89. The passage may need reconsideration. — The word-order (*idaṃ atthi*, not *atthi idaṃ* as in Ps IV 152, 9) seems to imply emphasis on *idaṃ* (cp. ICKLER, op. cit. [n. 59], p. 92).

n. 147a: This seems to imply that what had been the decisive feature of the state of *saññāvedayitanirodha* for the old positive-mystical current, viz. its being an anticipatory mystical ascent to the sphere of Nirvāṇa, has been given up or has at least lost its functionality in the present Sutta in its received form — a fact which may perhaps also account for the choice of a different term (viz. *animitto cetosa-mādhī*).

ad n. 182: ENOMOTO, *Āsrava* (ro) no seiritsu . . . [see n. 22], p. 42, has shown that the notion of “abandoning” is closely associated to the word *pariññā* already in texts like Dhṣ and Sn, and that the term *pahānapariññā* has a Jainist equivalent in the form of *pratyākhyānaparijñā*.

Moreover: AKBh 322,6 f. (*dve hi pariññe - jñānaparijñā prahāṇaparijñā ca. . . . prahāṇaparijñā . . . prahāṇam eva.*) and the Sūtra quoted AKVy 503,29 ff. (*. . . pariññā katamā? yad atra cchandarāgaprahāṇam.*).