

BOOK REVIEWS

THE ESSENCE OF METAPHYSICS. Abhidharmahṛdaya. Translated and annotated by Charles Willemen. Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Bouddhiques, Série "Études et textes" No. 4. Bruxelles, 1975. xxvii, 366 pp. et 25 pp. de texte chinois.

LE COEUR DE LA LOI SUPRÊME. Traité de Fa-cheng. *Abhidharmahṛdayaśāstra* de Dharmaśrī. Traduit et annoté par I. Armelin. Paris, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1978. 388 pp.

THE PUBLICATION of two translations of the Abhidharmahṛdaya (T. no. 1550) testifies to the growing interest in Abhidharma studies in recent years. In 1977 José van den Broeck published a French translation of Ghoṣaka's Amṛtarasa (T. no. 1553) and Marcel van Velthem a French translation of Skandhila's Abhidharmāvatāraśāstra (T. no. 1554).¹ Mrs. Armelin's translation was already finished in 1963. Since then she has added a long introduction (pp. 3-48) in which she makes much use of Yamada Ryūjō's *Daijō bukkyō seiritsuron josetsu* (Kyōto, 1959). In her preface she announces a translation of Dharmatrāta's Saṃyukta-abhidharmasāra (T. no. 1552) and a book on the importance of the Abhidharma in Indian thought (*L'importance de l'Abhidharma dans la pensée indienne*).

Willemen's introduction (pp. v-xxvii) is divided into two parts. The first deals with the three texts called (Saṃyukta) abhidharmahṛdaya (T. nos. 1550, 1551 and 1552), their authors and the Chinese translations (pp. v-xxvii). The name of the author of I (T. no. 1550) is Fa-shêng. Western scholars assume that his Sanskrit name is Dharmaśrī but several Japanese scholars prefer Dharmaśreṣṭhin. In his *L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi* (Paris, 1949, p. 51, n. 1) Lin Li-kouang pointed out that Dharmatrāta in his Ch'u-yao ching (T. no. 212, p. 643a) quotes the opinion of T'an-mo-shih-li on the importance of the

¹ *La saveur de l'immortel (A-p'i-t'an Kan Lu Wei Lun)*. La version chinoise de l'Amṛtarasa de Ghoṣaka (T. 1553). Traduite et annotée par José van den Broeck. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1977. *Le traité de la descente dans la profonde loi (Abhidharmāvatāraśāstra) de l'Arhat Skandhila*. Traduit et annoté par Marcel van Velthem. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1977. Reviews of both works will be published in the *T'oung Pao*.

practice of *kāyānusmṛti*. According to Lin this transcription confirms the reconstruction Dharmaśrī proposed by Pelliot in 1930 (*JA*, 1930, II, p. 267 ff.). Willemen adds that it is most probable that this T'an-mo-shih-li is the author of the Abhidharmahṛdaya. It is necessary to point out that the *kāyānusmṛti* is not mentioned in the Abhidharmahṛdaya (cf. Lin, p. 330). Dharmatrāta quotes also two verses by Dharmaśrī (T'an-mo-shih-li) which obviously belong to a different work (T. no. 212, p. 626a17-21). In both instances Dharmaśrī is called 尊者 (*sthavira*, *ārya* or *bhadanta*). It is therefore doubtful that the Dharmaśrī quoted by Dharmatrāta is the author of the Abhidharmahṛdaya. Willemen accepts Lin Li-kouang's theory according to which the author of the Ch'u-yao-ching is identical with the Dharmatrāta or Bhadanta mentioned in the Mahāvibhāṣā. If Dharmatrāta in his Ch'u-yao-ching quotes Dharmaśrī, then he must have lived before the masters of the Mahāvibhāṣā (second century A.D. according to Willemen). Willemen believes that it is possible to go back further because he accepts Frauwallner's theory that the Abhidharmahṛdaya is older than the Jñānaprasthāna. Frauwallner mentions in this connection Tao-yen's preface to Buddhavarman's translation of the Abhidharmavibhāṣā (T. no. 1546, p. 1b11-12). However, it does not seem likely that Tao-yen's testimony is more reliable than the other often conflicting statements on the date of Dharmaśrī in Chinese sources (cf. Lin, p. 51 and Willemen, pp. VII-VIII). As to the relation of the Abhidharmahṛdaya to the Jñānaprasthāna and the Mahāvibhāṣā the opinions of scholars vary greatly. Willemen, who knows well the works of Japanese scholars, quotes those of Fukuhara (cf. p. VIII), Yamada and Sakurabe (p. XXII; read Sakurabe H., instead of Sakurabe T.). It is interesting to note that Willemen and Mrs. Armelin attribute different opinions to Yamada. Willemen writes: "R. Yamada thinks that the Abhidharmahṛdaya is a little earlier than the Jñānaprasthāna, but that there is no direct relation between the two texts, and he goes on to say that the Abhidharmahṛdaya was probably written at the same time as the Mahāvibhāṣā." Mrs. Armelin writes: "Selon le Professeur Yamada, le Hṛdayaśāstra composé de dix sections (*daśa-varga*) est postérieur au Jñānaprasthāna parce que son style est plus prolixe que celui des Aṣṭaskandha" (p. 12). Willemen refers to p. 113 of Yamada's book. Yamada indicates here as his provisional conclusion that the Abhidharmahṛdaya is later than the Jñānaprasthāna and roughly contemporary with the Mahāvibhāṣā. However, on p. 428 of his book Yamada declares positively that the Abhidharmahṛdaya is earlier than the Mahāvibhāṣā.

In his introduction Willemen carefully examines the problems connected with the Chinese translations of the three Abhidharmahṛdaya texts. He has also consulted a Tun-huang manuscript, probably written in the beginning of the fifth century, of Saṃghadeva's translation of Dharmaśrī's Abhidharmahṛdaya, and has been able to show that this text contains exactly 250

BOOK REVIEWS

stanzas. In the Taishō text several stanzas have not been distinguished as such. Willemen reproduces the Taishō text adding a continuous numbering of the 250 stanzas. Moreover, in a concordance he indicates the corresponding stanzas in the works by Upasānta and Dharmatrāta (pp. 304–313). According to him Upasānta was a *bahirdeśaka*, a master of Gāndhāra, and lived probably in the third century. Dharmatrāta lived also in Gāndhāra but he relied heavily on the *vaibhāṣika* views as expressed in the Mahāvibhāṣā. Willemen lists a number of doctrinal differences between Dharmasrī and Dharmatrāta (pp. xxiii–xxiv). He concludes that Dharmasrī probably represents the early *bahirdeśakas*. Upasānta almost always agrees with Dharmasrī but his work shows traces of *vaibhāṣika* influence. Finally Willemen shows that Dharmasrī's Abhidharmahrdaya and Dharmatrāta's Saṃyuktābhidharmahrdaya were very important in China until the publication of Hsüan-tsang's translations of the Kośa and the Mahāvibhāṣā.

Mrs. Armelin's introduction deals with the following topics: i. L'Abhidharma des Sarvāstivādin, p. 3. ii. La date de composition de l'Abhidharmahrdayaśāstra, p. 7. iii. Plan du Hrdayaśāstra, p. 12. iv. Comparaison des chapitres des deux traités, p. 15. v. Le titre de l'ouvrage de Dharmasrī, p. 19. vi. Positions doctrinales du Hrdayaśāstra, p. 20. vii. Dharmasrī et l'école des Sarvāstivādin, p. 34. viii. Dharmasrī, arhat ou bodhisattva? p. 45. Résumé, p. 47.

Whereas Willemen in his introduction pays much attention to the history of the Chinese translations, Mrs. Armelin is more interested in the doctrinal problems. As mentioned above, she has made much use of Yamada's work but does not mention at all the important abhidharma studies by Erich Frauwallner (*WZKS* 7, 8, 15, 16, 17). As to the relation between the Jñānaprasthāna and Dharmasrī's Abhidharmahrdaya she disagrees with Yamada and believes that Dharmasrī was probably a contemporary of the author of the Jñānaprasthāna. Both Willemen and Mrs. Armelin prefer the title Abhidharmahrdaya to that Abhidharmasāra used by de La Vallée Poussin and other scholars. Willemen does not explain his preference. According to Mrs. Armelin *hrdaya* is to be preferred because Dharmasrī wanted to reveal the *hrdaya*, the most important part of Buddha's doctrine. He did not want to extract the *sāra*, the essence, from the abhidharma doctrines. Mrs. Armelin adds that the word *abhidharmasāra* would imply that Dharmasrī tried to extract the essence from the Abhidharma and especially from the Śaṭpādaśāstra which, from a doctrinal point, is not very likely. Her arguments are not entirely convincing. It is quite well possible that Dharmasrī in his relatively short work wanted to present the essence of the abhidharma doctrines known to him.

Mrs. Armelin compares the way of salvation as presented by Dharmasrī with the brahmanical way of salvation as found in the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad. She writes: "Dharmasrī ne cite pas les théories des Upaniṣad. Toutefois, son

oeuvre trahit ses connaissances, et peut-être même ses origines brahmaniques" (p. 27). On p. 29 she remarks: "Dharmaśrī confronte l'enseignement du Buddha à celui des penseurs brahmaniques partisans de la Bṛhadāraṇyaka-upaniṣad." It is of course always possible to oppose Buddhist doctrines to Brahmanical doctrines but it is difficult to discover in Dharmaśrī's work such a specific reaction to Brahmanical doctrines as maintained by Mrs. Armelin. However, the comparisons made by Mrs. Armelin are instructive insofar as they help to bring out more clearly the nature of the Buddhist doctrines taught by Dharmaśrī.

In a chapter on Dharmaśrī and the school of the Sarvāstivādins (pp. 34-46) Mrs. Armelin examines the doctrinal systems of Dharmaśrī, Upaśānta, and Dharmatrāta. She remarks that although Vasubandhu has been influenced by the Sautrāntikas and the Pāścātyas, his doctrinal position is closer to that of the Kashmirians than to that of other Abhidharmikas. On several points he rectifies opinions expressed by Dharmaśrī and defends vaibhāṣika doctrines. As example, she mentions that according to Dharmaśrī the *kāyaviññapti* is a movement (*gati*) but according to the Vaibhāṣikas a figure (*saṃsthāna*). She adds that this is a doctrine of the Vātsīputriyas but without drawing attention to the fact that this is not said in the Kośabhāṣya but in Yaśomitra's Vyākhyā (p. 345. 16).

With regard to the different Abhidharma schools of the Sarvāstivādins much is still obscure. Of the great mass of texts only very few have yet been translated into Western languages and it is at present not possible to arrive at any definitive results. In a long and learned introduction to his translation of Ghoṣaka's Amṛtarasa José van den Broeck has pointed out the contradictions found in the sources. It will be a very delicate task to distinguish the different Sarvāstivāda schools to which the texts refer. The three works by Dharmaśrī, Upaśānta and Dharmatrāta and Vasubandhu's Kośa constitute an important stream in the development of abhidharma doctrines. The translation of Dharmaśrī's work by Willemen and Mrs. Armelin makes it possible to compare in detail his work with that of Vasubandhu. Mrs. Armelin has already announced a translation of Dharmatrāta's work. It is to be hoped that Upaśānta's work will also be translated in order to make it possible to compare in detail the three Abhidharmahṛdayas and Vasubandhu's Kośa.

The Abhidharmahṛdaya is a difficult text to translate. The verses especially create problems and a correct interpretation is often only possible with the help of the prose commentary and by comparing the renderings of the verses in the works by Upaśānta and Dharmatrāta. Willemen stresses his great debt to the Japanese version by Watanabe, Mizuno and Ōishi in the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō, Bidon-bu xxxi* (Tōkyō, 1932). It is a pity that Mrs. Armelin does not seem to have made any use of this excellent translation which contains also many helpful notes. Willemen seems to have made more use also of the other two Abhidharmahṛdaya texts than Mrs. Armelin. He translates technical terms,

BOOK REVIEWS

and gives the Sanskrit equivalents only in his notes. Both in Mrs. Armelin's book and in that of Willemen the notes are printed after the translation, which makes the study of their works more difficult. Mrs. Armelin often refers to de La Vallée Poussin's translation of the Kośa. This work is rarely mentioned in Willemen's notes although it is obvious that he has studied it very carefully. De La Vallée Poussin's translation of the Kośa is accompanied by a detailed commentary in which he quotes extensively from Yaśomitra's Vyākhyā, the only Sanskrit text available to him. Since the publication of the Sanskrit text of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya in 1967 it has become even more necessary to refer to the Kośa in translating abhidharma texts, and especially a text such as Dharmasūtri's Abhidharmahrdaya which has been an important source for Vasubandhu, if not directly, at least indirectly through the later adaptations by Upaśānta and Dharmatrāta. If for technical reasons it is not possible to add extensive notes at the bottom of the page, the best solution would probably be to publish the translation on the left-hand page and to reserve the opposite page for a detailed commentary.

Two brief passages of Dharmasūtri's Abhidharmahrdaya were translated by de La Vallée Poussin in the introductory volume of his translation of the Kośa (Paris-Louvain, 1931), pp. LXV and LXVI-LXVII. The first deals with the three obstacles (*āvaraṇa*): Bhagavat dit qu'il y a trois *āvaraṇas*, *karman*, *kleśa* et *vipāka*. Quelle est leur définition?

"Les actes d'*ānantarya* qui sont sans remède, les passions développées, l'acte mauvais senti dans les mauvaises destinées, ce sont là les *āvaraṇas*."

Ces trois font obstacle au Dharma; ils empêchent de prendre les dharmas d'Ārya (T. 1550, p. 815a23-27). Willemen translates this passage as follows:

Question: What about the characteristics of the three obstructions, as explained by the World-Honoured One: the obstruction of action, the obstruction of affliction, and the obstruction of retribution?

Answer: (63) Let it also be known that the immediate and irredeemable actions, the afflictions one produces on a large scale, and the unwholesome retributions experienced in the woeful courses, are obstructions.

With these three dharmas, the so-called obstructions, one surely will not experience the dharmas of the noble (Willemen, p. 46).

Willemen's translation is more literal than that of de La Vallée Poussin. However, de La Vallée Poussin's interpretation of 此三法障礙者. 必不受聖法 is to be preferred: "These three obstacles to the dharma make it impossible to receive the dharmas of the noble."² It would have been helpful if Willemen

² The Kokuyaku issaikyō translation has: "This obstacle to the three dharmas. . ."(!): *kono sanbō no shōge wa kanarazu shōbō o jusezu*.

THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

had quoted the first half of Kośa iv. 96: *ānantaryāṇi karmāṇi tivrakleśo 'tha durgatīh*, and had referred to de La Vallée Poussin, Kośa, iv, p. 201 ff.

Mrs. Armelin's translation is as follows: *Question*: "Le Bienheureux a parlé de trois empêchements (*nīvaraṇa*): l'empêchement des actes (*karmāvaraṇa*), l'empêchement des passions (*kleśāvaraṇa*) et l'empêchement de la rétribution (*vipākāvaraṇa*). Quels en sont les caractères?" *Réponse*: (III-31) "Les actes à rétribution immédiate (*ānantarya*), irrémissibles, peuvent produire des passions. Dans les mauvaises destinées (*durgati*) on ressent la mauvaise rétribution. Tels sont les empêchements, sachez-le." Ces trois essences (*dharma*) sont empêchements: parce qu'elles rendent impossible la réception des essences saintes (*āryadharmā*), on les appelle empêchements (p. 95).

Probably *nīvaraṇa* is an error for *āvaraṇa*. Mrs. Armelin translates 此三法障礙者 in the same way as Willemen. Her translation of the first half of the stanza does not bring out the fact that it deals with the first two obstacles and has to be rectified accordingly.

The second passage translated by de La Vallée Poussin explains *vijñapti* and *avijñapti*: Pour l'*avijñapti*: quand on fait un acte d'une manière ferme, la pensée peut changer, le germe demeure. Si, par exemple, un homme prend les engagements de moralité, sa pensée peut ensuite être mauvaise ou non-définie: la moralité continue cependant (T. 1550, p. 812c3-4: 無教者. 若作業牢固. 轉異心中此種子生. 如善受戒人. 不善無記心中. 彼猶相隨. Willemen has: "Non-information: when the actions one performs are firm. This element arises even though it takes place among thoughts which are different, e.g. even among unwholesome and indeterminate thoughts someone who is well ordained follows (the precepts)" (p. 28). Mrs. Armelin translates: "La 'non-information,' c'est, lorsque l'acte accompli est ferme, ce qui continue à fonctionner dans d'autres pensées où naissent des germes [d'essences mentales]. Ainsi, dans les pensées mauvaises et indéfinies d'un homme vertueux, qui pratique les règles de discipline (*śīla*), celles-ci continuent, les unes et les autres, à guider sa conduite" (p. 75). Both translations are not entirely satisfactory. It seems to me that this passage has to be rendered as follows: "As to non-information, if one has firmly performed an act, a seed of it is produced [and continues to exist] while his thought changes. Just as when a man has well taken upon himself the discipline, it continues to exist while his thought is bad or non-defined." De La Vallée Poussin's translation is excellent although it is somewhat free.

Stanza 151 (T. 1550, p. 813b20-21) describes the first trance. Willemen's translation of the stanza is as follows:

The one with five members, with adjusted and discursive thinking, and also with three feelings, different classes and four thoughts, they call it the first trance.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mrs. Armelin's translation of the first pāda (Celle qui possède cinq membres comprend le "raisonnement" et la "réflexion," p. 158) is not correct because the commentary distinguishes between a trance with five members and a trance with *vitarka* and *vicāra*. The commentary explains first the five members (*aṅga*). Then the following question is put: "Since we know the five members, what need is there for adjusted and discursive thoughts now?" (Willemen, p. 107). The answer is: 枝者謂善. 是於五枝中. 說穢汚及無記. 亦有覺有觀而不是善. (p. 823b29-c1). Willemen translates: "As for the members, the so-called wholesome ones are among the five members. They say that a defiled (trance) and an indeterminate one also have adjusted thoughts and discursive thoughts, but not the wholesome ones." Willemen explains in a note that the five *aṅgas* are *kuśala* in the *kuśala* first *dhyāna*. When *kliṣṭa* or *avyākṛta*, *vitarka* and *vicāra* are not among the *aṅgas*. Willemen's explanation is correct but I believe that his translation has to be rectified as follows: "The members are said to be wholesome. They [*vitarka* and *vicāra*] are included in the five members. [With *vitarka* and *vicāra*] refers to a defiled and an indeterminate trance. They also comprise *vitarka* and *vicāra* but are not wholesome." Mrs. Armelin states in a note (547): "Toute cette réponse à la question ainsi posée est fort obscure. Vasubandhu n'est guère plus explicite." Indeed Vasubandhu does not deal with this problem but in the *Mahāvibhāṣā* there is a long discussion on the problem of constituent elements of defiled *dhyānas* which do not possess the characteristics of *aṅgas* (T. 1545, ch. 161, p. 814ab).

In the Chinese translation of Dharmaśrī's *Abhidharmahrdaya* 味 is used to render *vyañjana* as explained in Dharmatrāta's *Abhidharmahrdaya*, T. 1552, p. 943a (cf. Willemen, p. vii, note 225). This has been overlooked by Mrs. Armelin who translates 味 (p. 825c16 and c24) with 'savour' (cf. n. 612). *Vyañjana* is defined as follows: 味者句會事. 廣說如偈及契經. (p. 831a3). Willemen translates: "Vyañjanas: the elements of a combination of sentences, etc. such as *gāthās* and scriptural texts" (p. 158). Mrs. Armelin translates: "Les syllabes (*vyañjanakāya*): l'ensemble des phonèmes dont la réunion forme un mot qui désigne un objet; comme, par exemple, 'stance,' 'aphorisme,' etc." (p. 216). This definition of *vyañjana* has been studied also by José van den Broeck who writes: "Dharmaśrī et Ghoṣaka interprètent le terme *vyañjana* comme signifiant "un discours": le *vyañjanakāya* est "une substance (*dravya*), consistant dans l'ensemble des phrases (*pada*)" (*Abhidharmasāra*, T. 1550, ch. 4, p. 831a3); c'est "l'ensemble des énoncés développés" (*Amṛta*)" (*op. cit.*, p. 61; cf. also pp. 232 and 260). The Kokuyaku issaikyō translation does not follow the punctuation of the Taishō edition and puts a dot after 廣說: "*Vyañjana*, i.e., a detailed statement of a fact by a combination of *padas*, such as a *gāthā* and a *sūtra*." In a note the translators explain that 味 here has the meaning 文章 (*bunshō*) "literary composition." It seems to me that the interpretation of

THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

this definition in the Kokuyaku issaikyō translation is the correct one but it is difficult to understand how *vyañjana* came to be interpreted in this way by Dharmaśrī and Ghoṣaka.

There are many more problems in Dharmaśrī's Abhidharmahrdaya which ought to be examined but this would far exceed the limits of a review. Thanks to the conscientious efforts of Willemen and Mrs. Armelin this text has become now much more accessible. Their translations as well as the Kokuyaku issaikyō translation will be of great help in the study of this important and difficult text. Very welcome also are the glossaries compiled by the translators. Mrs. Armelin's book contains a Sanskrit-Chinese glossary (pp. 327-352) and a Chinese-Sanskrit glossary (pp. 353-371). Willemen has added an index of Sanskrit terms (pp. 314-331), a Chinese-Sanskrit-English glossary (pp. 332-351) and an English-Sanskrit glossary (pp. 352-366).

J. W. DE JONG