

'Verità e bellezza'  
Essays in Honour of Raffaele Torella

*Series Minor*

XCVII.1–2

*Direttore*

Francesco Sferra

*Comitato di redazione*

Riccardo Contini, Martin Orwin, Junichi Oue,  
Roberto Tottoli, Giovanni Vitiello

*Comitato scientifico*

Anne Bayard-Sakai (INALCO), Stanisław Bazyliński (Facoltà teologica  
S. Bonaventura, Roma), Henrietta Harrison (University of Oxford),  
Harunaga Isaacson (Universität Hamburg), Barbara Pizziconi (SOAS,  
University of London), Lucas van Rompay (Duke University),  
Raffaele Torella (Sapienza, Università di Roma),  
Judith T. Zeitlin (The University of Chicago)

Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo  
Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”

UniorPress  
Napoli  
2022

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI “L’ORIENTALE”  
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

*Series Minor*

XCVII.2

‘Verità e bellezza’  
Essays in Honour of Raffaele Torella

Edited by  
Francesco Sferra and Vincenzo Vergiani



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE



European Research Council  
Established by the European Commission

UniorPress  
Napoli 2022

Volume pubblicato con contributi

- del Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo (Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”),
- della Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies (University of Cambridge),
- e del Progetto ERC n. 803624: «Translocal Identities. The Śivadharmā and the Making of Regional Religious Traditions in Premodern South Asia».



UniorPress

UniorPress - Via Nuova Marina 59, 80133 Napoli

ISBN 978-88-6719-209-0

Tutti i diritti riservati

Stampato in Italia

Finito di stampare nel mese di settembre 2022

Officine Grafiche Francesco Giannini & Figli S.p.A.

Via Cisterna dell’Olio 6B, 80134 Napoli

Tutti gli articoli pubblicati in questo volume sono stati sottoposti al vaglio di due revisori anonimi.

# Table of Contents

## Volume I

Preface.....	13
Foreword.....	19
Main Publications of Raffaele Torella.....	25
Andrea Acri <i>From Isolation to Union: Pātañjala vis-à-vis Śaiva Understandings of the Meaning and Goal of Yoga.....</i>	35
Lyne Bansat-Boudon <i>The Surprise of Spanda: An Aesthetic Approach to a Phenomenology of Transcendence (Rāmakaṇṭha ad Spandakārikā 2.6 [1.22/22]).....</i>	73
Bettina Sharada Bäumer <i>Kṣemarāja's Poetic Non-Dualism: Examples from his Netratantroddyota.....</i>	103
Giuliano Boccali <i>Lectio difficilior e creazione poetica: esempi dal Kumārasambhava..</i>	115

Johannes Bronkhorst <i>The Sarvadarśanasamgraha: One Text or Two? One Author or Two?.....</i>	129
Maria Piera Candotti and Tiziana Pontillo <i>The dikṣita's Language. Vedic Homologies and rūpakas in Jaiminīya-Brahmaṇa 2.60–64.....</i>	153
Daniele Cuneo and Elisa Ganser <i>The Emotional and Aesthetic Experience of the Actor. Diderot's Paradoxe sur le comédien in Sanskrit Dramaturgy.....</i>	193
Marzenna Czerniak-Drożdżowicz <i>Viṣṇu in his Three Abodes. Some Observations about Three-storey and Triple-shrined Viṣṇu Temples in South India.....</i>	273
Florinda De Simini <i>Rules of Conduct for the Śaivas. The Intersection of Dharmasāstra and Śaiva Devotion in the Śivadharmottara.....</i>	291
Vincent Eltschinger <i>Politics and/in the End of Times. On the Buddhist Reception of the Arthaśāstra.....</i>	337
Marco Ferrante <i>The Pratyabhijñā on Consciousness and Self-consciousness: A Comparative Perspective.....</i>	375
Giuseppe Ferraro <i>'Own-nature' (svabhāva) in the Abhidharma Tradition and in Nāgārjuna's Interpretation.....</i>	391
Marco Franceschini <i>The Printing History of Sargas 9 to 17 of the Kumārasambhava....</i>	411
Eli Franco <i>Prajñākaragupta on Pramāṇavārttika 2.1 in the Light of Yamāri's Interpretation.....</i>	433

Table of Contents

Elisa Freschi <i>Reconstructing an Episode in the History of Sanskrit Philosophy: Arthāpatti in Kumāriḷa's Commentators.....</i>	457
Paolo Giunta <i>Il rapporto di Śāntaraksita con Bhartḷhari. Edizione critica della Śabdabrahmaḷparikṣā e dello Sphoṭavāḷakhaṇḷana.....</i>	487
Dominic Goodall <i>A Glimpse of Classical Saiddhāntika Theology in a Cambodian Epigraph: A Fresh Edition and Translation of the Sanskrit Śaiva Hymn K. 570 of Banteay Srei.....</i>	543
Alessandro Graheli <i>Predestination of Freedom in Rūpa Gosvāmin's Theology of Devotion.....</i>	577
Kengo Harimoto <i>A Few Notes on a Newly Discovered Manuscript of the Śivadharmā Corpus 1.....</i>	595
Harunaga Isaacson <i>Vasiṣṭha's Ashram: A Translation of Sarga 1 of Kālidāsa's Raghuvamṣā into English Verse.....</i>	627
Volume II	
Mrinal Kaul <i>A Preliminary Note on the Manuscripts of the Tantrālokaḷviveka....</i>	679
Yohei Kawajiri <i>A Report on the Newly Found Manuscript of the Īśvaraḷpratyabhijñāḷvivṛti.....</i>	751
Chiara Neri <i>A Phenomenology of Dreams in Theravāḷa Buddhism: An Annotated Translation of the Tenth Chapter of the Sārasaṅgaha by Siddhattha Thera.....</i>	773

Cristina Pecchia <i>With the Eye of a Scholar and the Insight of a Physician: Gangadhar Ray Kaviraj and the Carakasamhitā.....</i>	797
Gianni Pellegrini <i>On prahasann iva. Bhagavadgītā 2.10 in the Light of Traditional Commentaries.....</i>	841
Stefano Piano <i>Qualche riflessione sui diversi tipi di śaḍaṅgayoga.....</i>	901
Cinzia Pieruccini <i>Transition and Transformation: On the Roles of Parks and Gardens in Early India.....</i>	913
Isabelle Ratié <i>Some Hitherto Unknown Fragments of Utpaladeva's Vivṛti (IV): On Non-being and Imperceptible Demons.....</i>	929
Antonio Rigopoulos <i>Prahasann iva. On Kṛṣṇa's Hint of Laughter in Bhagavadgītā 2.10.....</i>	965
Margherita Serena Saccone and Péter-Dániel Szántó <i>A Fragment of Pramāṇa from Gilgit.....</i>	1011
Małgorzata Sacha <i>Imagine the world... Abhinavagupta vis-à-vis the Psychoanalytic Mystic.....</i>	1025
Alexis Sanderson <i>The Meaning of the Term Trairūpyam in the Buddhist Pramāṇa Literature.....</i>	1049
Cristina Scherrer-Schaub <i>D'impronte e ombre tra India e Grecia. Questioni e visioni di storia del pensiero politico e filosofico tra il V e il II secolo a.C.....</i>	1063

Table of Contents

Francesco Sferra <i>The Second Chapter of the Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā</i> by Saṅghatrāta.....	1145
Federico Squarcini <i>Ecce yoga. Il miraggio del nome, il fantasma della salute</i> <i>e la concomitanza delle ‘cose’ qualsiasi.....</i>	1167
Ernst Steinkellner <i>Śāntarakṣita on the Induction Problem. A Translation</i> <i>of Vādanyāyaṭikā 14,12–16,29.....</i>	1223
Lidia Sudyka <i>Imagined Landscapes or Through the Year: The Descriptions of All</i> <i>Seasons and All Seasons’ Gardens in Indian Literature.....</i>	1237
Vincenzo Vergiani <i>Vivakṣā and the Formation of Meaning According to Bhartṛhari....</i>	1253
Alex Watson <i>Pratyabhijñā: Recognition’s Nature, Cause and Object.</i> <i>Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of a Portion</i> <i>of the Nyāyamañjarī.....</i>	1325



# *The Second Chapter of the Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā by Saṅghatrāta*

FRANCESCO SFERRA  
(Università di Napoli “L’Orientale”)

## *1. Introductory remarks*

The core of this paper is the *editio princeps* of the Dhātusamuccaya (§ 3), namely the second chapter of the *Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā*, a compendium of the Abhidharma modelled on Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa*, authored by an otherwise unknown Saṃmitīya teacher called Saṅghatrāta. For some details on his work and style, as well as on the *codex unicus* that contains his work, on the story of its discovery, and on its paleographic and codicological features, I refer the reader to another paper of mine, which also contains the edition and a tentative annotated translation of the first chapter, the Āyatanasamuccaya (Sferra 2020).

Displaying a typically cryptic wording, the thirty-five *anuṣṭubh* stanzas of the Dhātusamuccaya<sup>1</sup> deal with the following topics: general subdivision of the 18 *dhātus* (st. 1); the number of *mano-dhātus* (st. 2); the number of *dhātus* in each of the spheres of ex-

<sup>1</sup> As expected, the *pathyā* or ‘regular form’ is prevalent, but it is worth noting the relatively frequent use of regular extensions: stt. 1c and 12a are *na-viṣṭulā*; stt. 10c, 19a, 27a, 31c and 34c are *ma-viṣṭulā*.

istence (st. 3); the *dhātus* in each of the spheres of existence (st. 4); the locations of *vijñāna* and the explanation of the compound *vijñānasthiti* (stt. 5–6); the seven abodes of beings and their destinies (stt. 7–8); the intermediate existence (*antarābhava*) (st. 9); the four descents of the foetus into the womb (*garbhāvakrānti*) (st. 10); the four ways of being born/sources (*yoni*) (stt. 11–12ab); *kaṛmabhava* (stt. 12cd–13); the (intermediate) existence (st. 14); the spheres of existence and the aggregates (st. 15); the dependent origination (stt. 16–18); *avidyā* (st. 19); *saṃskāra*; (st. 20); *nāma-rūpa* (stt. 21–23); *sparsā* (st. 24); *vedanā*, *tyśṇā*, *upādāna* (st. 25); *jāti* (st. 26); the 22 *indriyas* (stt. 27–29); their subdivisions (stt. 30–32); the four nourishments (*āhāra*) (stt. 33–34); the death and its causes (st. 35).

In the notes to the text (§ 4) and to the translation, relevant parallels with other Abhidharmic works, and in particular with the third chapter of the *Abhidharmakośa*, are quoted and in some cases briefly discussed.

For the most part, as is generally the case with the *Abhidharma-samuccayakārikā*, the Dhātusamuccaya presents classifications and definitions that match quite well those of the *Abhidharmakośa*, but sometimes differences from Vasubandhu's treatment of the same topics are evident. For instance, in st. 24 Saṅghatrāta defines contact (*sparsā*) as the union of three things (*trayasya saṃghātaḥ*). Even though the text is silent about the items of the triad, these are certainly to be identified with the sense faculty, its object and the relative primary awareness. This viewpoint, shared also by the Sautrāntikas,<sup>2</sup> is implicitly criticised in the *Abhidharmakośa*, which states that the six kinds of contact *arise* from the meeting (of the three) (*sparsāḥ saṭ saṃnipātajāḥ*). In the *Bhāṣya*, Saṅghatrāta's opinion is overtly criticised.<sup>3</sup> Sometimes we find details that are not found in Vasubandhu's work or differences that cannot be easily explained. In st. 4 of the Dhātusamuccaya, for example, it is said that the states of existence in the Rūpadhātu are 15, while according to the *Abhidharmakośa* (3.2ab) they are 17.<sup>4</sup> At present I

<sup>2</sup> See Tripāthī 1990: 218.

<sup>3</sup> See *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad 3.30b*. For further references, see also de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 2: 95, n. 2, and pp. 96–98.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also Thích Thiên Châu 1999: 209–211.

am unable to explain the meaning of this difference and cannot exclude that it may depend on a simple transmissional mistake — although paleographically distinct, *paṃcadaśa* and *saptadaśa* are at least metrically equivalent. In this case, and in many others found in the *Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā*, the absence of other manuscripts (the only available manuscript does not even show any signs of corrections!), of any commentary and of a Tibetan or Chinese translation, makes it hard to correct the text or to confirm emendations and conjectures, or even simply to explain all details and provide plausible interpretations in every case.

Most of the transmitted text of the Dhātusamuccaya makes sense, but there are some stanzas of uncertain interpretation. The second quarter of stanza 14 is defective (three *akṣaras* are missing) and *pāda* 33b shows serious metrical problems and is almost certainly corrupt. It can be emended in a metrically satisfactory way only by making a rather big change. When I am unable to fully understand the text or propose sufficiently meaningful corrections, the translation is underlined or suspended. In the latter case three dots within square brackets point out the gap. Unfortunately, this happens especially towards the end of the chapter, where the parallels with the *Abhidharmakośa* are less evident or totally absent.

I had the opportunity to read this chapter on two occasions with a small group of colleagues and friends: once in Mahidol, at the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (Mahidol University, Salaya Campus, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand, February 2015), and once in Paris, at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (PSL, November 2021). I express my sincere gratitude to the organizers of those seminars and to the participants, who offered useful insights and suggestions, in particular (in alphabetical order): Nalini Balbir, Vincent Eltschinger, Torsten Gerloff, Kengo Harimoto, Harunaga Isaacson, Kei Kataoka, Mattia Salvini, Gregory Max Seton, Peter Skilling, Judit Törzsök, and Vincent Tournier.

I owe special thanks to H. Isaacson and V. Vergiani who have kindly read the last draft of this paper and provided me with useful suggestions and corrections.

## 2. Editorial policy

The text presented here retains some peculiarities of the manuscript. In particular, the sandhi, both internal and external, and the orthography have not been standardized, and the dot (•) inserted by the copyist between *pādas* c and d of stanza 8 has been faithfully reproduced. Apart from this, the text has been arranged in metrical form, the numbers of the stanzas and the foliation have been inserted between parentheses,<sup>5</sup> and the line-fillers have not been reproduced.

For this edition, the following sigla and symbols have been used:

[...]	enclose the foliation of the MS
]	separates the accepted reading, emendations or conjectures from other readings
(...)	enclose the numbers of the stanzas
<...>	enclose <i>akṣaras</i> and <i>avagrahas</i> that are absent in the MS
{...}	enclose <i>akṣaras</i> that should be cancelled
⊗	fleuron/wheel
<i>r</i>	<i>recto</i>
<i>v</i>	<i>verso</i>

## 3. Text

[2*v*<sub>2</sub>] ṣoḍhā vyavasthitāḥ sarvva āśrayālaṃbanāśritāḥ |  
 dhātavo 'ṣṭādaśa<sup>α</sup> manorūpasam̐mohanaṣṭaye || (1 [35])  
 ekaṃ viṣayibhāvena mana āyataneṣv iha |  
 āśrayadvayajtvāt tu dhātavaḥ sapta ṣaḍ manaḥ || (2 [36])  
 kāmādhātāvādiṣu tv ete caturṣv eva hy ato <'>khilāḥ |  
 caturddaśa trayo [2*v*<sub>3</sub>] <'>ṣṭau ca<sup>β</sup> kāmāragādīdūṣaṇāt || (3 [37])  
 kāmādhātur<sup>6</sup> ddaśāvastho<sup>γ</sup> rūpī paṃcadaśātmaḥ<sup>δ</sup> |

<sup>5</sup> The stanzas are not numbered in the manuscript. The copyist limited himself to indicating the overall number of stanzas by means of the figure numerals *laru* (= 35, see Sferra 2020: 707, fig. 16). In the text below, the second set of numbers, between brackets, indicates the number of the stanza starting from the beginning of the work.

<sup>6</sup> °dhātur em. ] °dhātor MS; see also below, n. 26.

catuḥsvabhāva ārūpyo<sup>ε</sup> nirmmalo 'nāsravas tridhā || (4 [38])  
 vijñānasthitayaḥ sapta<sup>ζ</sup> cittābhiratīyogataḥ |  
 pariḡgrāhakabhāvena catasraś cittavarjītaḥ ||<sup>η</sup> (5 [39])  
 rūpe hi veditāsvādāt saṃjñābhiḥ saṃpralo[2v<sub>4</sub>]bhitam |  
 upastabdham ca saṃskārair vjñānam avatiṣṭhate || (6 [40])  
 saptāsaṃjñībhavāggre ca sannivāsābhinandanāt |  
 satvāvāsā na nirddiṣṭā apāyā duḥkhopādānāt ||<sup>θ</sup> (7 [41])  
 te nārakāḥ satiryyaṃcaḥ pretā devanaraiḥ saha |  
 gatayo <'>vyākṛtāḥ kecit<sup>ι</sup> • sāsravāḥ skandhasaṃjñitāḥ || (8 [42])  
 tāsāṃ prāpaka ity uktaḥ paṃca[2v<sub>5</sub>]dhaivāntarābhavaḥ<sup>7</sup> |  
 gantavyagamanābhāvān nārūpyeṣūpapadyate || (9 [43])  
 saṃprajānan viśaty āste niryāti ca nireti na |  
 āste ca mūḍhas sarvvaṇi garbhāvakrāntayas trayāt ||<sup>κ</sup> (10 [44])  
 catasro<sup>8</sup> yonayo devā nārakāś caupapādukāḥ |  
 pretā jarāyujāś cāpi nṛtiryaṃcaś caturvidhāḥ ||<sup>λ</sup> (11 [45])  
 avasthābhedanīyatam sāsra[2v<sub>6</sub>]vaṃ skandhapāṃcakam |  
 kamma nāsāntarotpatti bhavākhyam<sup>μ</sup> kṣaṇikam dvayam || (12 [46])  
 sadhātau vā sabhāgasya kliṣṭāt kliṣṭasya sambhavaḥ |  
 akliṣṭasya tathākliṣṭād bhavānām pratisandhiṣu || (13 [47])  
 paṃcāṃgaś caturaṃgo vā <+++>bhava iṣyate<sup>9</sup> |  
 ekāṃgaś cāpare nāsti yathāyogam bhavatrāye || (14 [48])  
 kāmarūpabhavau paṃcaskandhakau rūpadūṣa[2v<sub>7</sub>]ṇāt |  
 catuskandhaka ārūpyaḥ kamma vā trividham bhavaḥ || (15 [49])  
 yaḥ kleśakarmmavastūnām<sup>ν</sup> mohādibhyaḥ samudbhavaḥ |  
 sa pratīyasamutpādaḥ pratīyotpattilakṣaṇaḥ || (16 [50])  
 ākṣepo yadbalād yena yathā yasya yad atra ca |  
 yadbalād yena nirvṛttir yyathāsyāntaś ca yo yathā ||<sup>ξ</sup> (17 [51])  
 triparvvaīṣa dvisandhiś ca dvādaśāṃ[2v<sub>8</sub>]gaḥ pravarttakaḥ |  
 kāryyakāraṇasaṃbandhaḥ sthitaś ca paripūriṇaḥ ||<sup>ο</sup> (18 [52])  
 dharmmo vipakṣo<sup>10</sup> vidyāyā avidyānye <'>khilā malāḥ |<sup>π, ρ</sup>  
 saṃsṛṣṭatvān na saṃkleśād dhiyo <'>prakhyātilakṣaṇā || (19 [53])  
 kāyavākcittasaṃskārās sāsravam kamma dṛṣṭayaḥ |  
 skandhaś caturttha āhārāḥ saṃskārāḥ kṛtakam ca yat || (20 [54])

<sup>7</sup> paṃcadhaivā<sup>o</sup> em. ] paṃcathāivā<sup>o</sup> MS

<sup>8</sup> catasro em. ] catusro MS

<sup>9</sup> Pāda b is hypometrical. In the manuscript there is no gap between vā and bhava. See below, n. 45.

<sup>10</sup> vipakṣo em. ] vimokṣo MS

yāvanto 'rū[3r<sub>1</sub>]piṇo dharmmās tan nāma namanāt kila |<sup>5</sup>  
 anyan nāmākṣaracchedaḥ saṃjñākarmmasamāśrayaḥ || (21 [55])  
 rūpaṃ tu varṇasaṃsthānaṃ kvacid dṛṣṭyā nirūpaṇāt |<sup>τ</sup>  
 rūpadhātuḥ kvacid rūpaṃ śreṣṭharūpasamāśrayāt || (22 [56])  
 asmin manasikārāntāḥ pañca nāma vidādayaḥ |  
 rūpaṃ tu rūpaṇād uktaṃ yat kiṃcit bhūtabhautikaṃ || (23 [57])  
 sparśas tra[3r<sub>2</sub>]yasya saṃghātaḥ so <'>dhivākpratighāśrayaḥ<sup>11</sup> |<sup>υ</sup>  
 vidyāvidyādvayāc<sup>12</sup> ϕ caikaḥ<sup>13</sup> pañcaikaikaṣaḍātmakāḥ || (24 [58])  
 veditatrayajā tredhā tṛṣṇā pañcavidhā tataḥ |  
 rāgaḥ kāmādyupādānam evaṃ karmabhavīkṛtaṃ || (25 [59])  
 bhūjalāggnyanilavyomnāṃ<sup>14</sup> sāsravasya ca cetasaḥ |  
 dhātutvaṃ rūpacaittādijanmasaṃdhāraṇād iti || (26 [60])  
 ādhyātmikāni [3r<sub>3</sub>] strīpumaṣṭve jīvitaṃ pañca vedanāḥ |  
 śraddhādīny amalāny evā'jñāsyāmītyādikaṃ trayam ||<sup>χ</sup> (27 [61])  
 viṣayaggrahaṇārththena saṃdhastrīnarabhedataḥ<sup>15</sup> |  
 saṃtānadhāraṇād āyur<sup>ψ</sup> vvedanāḥ kleśapakṣataḥ<sup>16</sup> || (28 [62])  
 vimokṣapakṣataḥ pañca trayam bhūmiviśeṣataḥ |  
 iṃdriyāṇi matis trīṇi vā kāyāt strīpumindriye<sup>ω</sup> || (29 [63])  
 ṣaṭ tri[3r<sub>4</sub>]dhā kuśalāny aṣṭāv aṣṭāv avyākṛtāni tu |  
 caturddaśa daśa trīṇi trayodaśa ca dhātuṣu || (30 [64])  
 aṣṭau na caitasāny eva caitasāni trayodaśa |  
 ekaṃ tu cittaṃ rūpīṇi sapta<sup>αα</sup> karmākṣhilāni na || (31 [65])  
 vā sapta karmmajāny āhur aṣṭau bhāvyaṇi sarvathā |  
 naikam aṣṭa pradeśaś ca ṣaṭ ca labhyaṇi naiva hi || (32 [66])  
 gaṃdhādīḥ kabaḍī[3r<sub>5</sub>]kāraḥ<sup>αβ</sup> sāsravaḥ sparśa eva ca<sup>17</sup> |  
 manaḥsaṃcetanā cittaṃ<sup>αγ</sup> ādhārāharaṇād iti || (33 [67])  
 sarve kāme trayo rūpe yāvād eke sukhodayam<sup>18</sup> |  
 ekaḥ parastāt pratyekaṃ vikalpo narakādiṣu || (34 [68])

<sup>11</sup> °pratighā° em. Tucci ] °pratiṣā° MS

<sup>12</sup> vidyāvidyā° em. Tucci ] vidyāvidvā° MS

<sup>13</sup> caikaḥ em. ] caika° MS

<sup>14</sup> °anila° em. ] °atila° MS

<sup>15</sup> saṃdha° em. Tucci ] ṣaḍve° MS

<sup>16</sup> °pakṣataḥ em. ] °pakṣavaḥ MS

<sup>17</sup> sāsravaḥ sparśa eva ca (or sparśas ca sāsravas tathā) corr. Isaacson ] sāsravaḥ sparśas tathā MS (contra metrum)

<sup>18</sup> sukhodayam em. ] sukhodayaḥ MS

āyuhkṣayād dhi satvānām cyutiḥ puṇyakṣayād<sup>19</sup> api |  
dvayakṣayāt tathānyeṣām anyeṣām nobhayakṣayāt || ❁ || (35 [69])

dhātusamucca[3r<sub>6</sub>]yaḥ samāptaḥ || Iaru || ❁ ||

4. Notes on the text

- α Cf. *Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana* p. 92<sub>2-4</sub>: [...] *bhagavatā āśrayāśritā lambanaṣaṭkabhedād aṣṭādaśa dhātavo nirdiṣṭāḥ | ta-trāśrayaṣaṭkaṃ cakṣurdhātur yāvan manodhātuh | āśritaṣaṭkaṃ cakṣurvijñānadhātur yāvan manovijñānadhātuh | ālambanaṣaṭkaṃ rūpadhātur yāvad dharmadhātur iti |*.
- β Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 1.30–31: [...] *kāmadhātuvāptāḥ sarve rūpe caturdaśa | vinā gandharasaghrāṇajihvāvijñānadhātubhiḥ || ā-rūpyāptā manodharmamanovijñānadhātavaḥ | sāsravānāsravā ete trayāḥ śeṣās tu sāsravāḥ ||*; *Abhidharmadīpa* 1.18: [...] *iha sarve 'pi rūpadhātāu caturdaśa | rasagandhau savijñānau dhātū hitvā trayo 'ntimāḥ ||*.
- γ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.1ac: *narakapretatiryāṅco manuṣyāḥ ṣaḍ divaukaṣaḥ | kāmadhātuh [...]*.
- δ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.2ab: *ūrdhvaṃ saptadaśasthāno rūpadhātuh [...]*.
- ε Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.3ab: *ārūpyadhātur asthāna upapattyā caturvidhaḥ |*.
- ζ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.5–6a: *nānātvakāyasaṃjñās ca nānākāyāikasaṃjñīnaḥ | viparyayāc caikakāyasaṃjñās cārūpiṇas trayāḥ || vijñānasthitayāḥ sapta.*
- η Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.7b–8a: *catasraḥ sthitayāḥ punaḥ | catvāraḥ sāsravāḥ skandhāḥ svabhūmāv eva kevalam || vijñānaṃ na sthitih proktaṃ.*
- θ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.6cd–7a: *bhavāgrāsaṃjñīsattvās ca sattvāvāsā nava smṛtāḥ || anicchāvasanān nānye.*
- ι Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.4ac: *narakādisvanāmoktā gatayāḥ pañca teṣu tāḥ | akliṣṭāvyaḅṛtā eva.*
- κ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.16–17ab: *saṃprajānan viśaty ekas tiṣṭhaty apy aparō 'paraḥ | niṣkrāmaty api sarvāṇi mūḍho 'nyo nityam aṇḍajāḥ || garbhāvakraṅtayas tīrasā cakravarttisvayambhuvām |*.

<sup>19</sup> *puṇya*<sup>o</sup> em. ] *puṇye* MS

- λ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.8cd–9: *catasro yonayas tatra sattvānām aṇḍajādayaḥ || caturdhā naratiryāñcaḥ nārakā upapādukāḥ | antarābhavadevās ca pretā api jarāyujāḥ ||*.
- μ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.24ab: *sa bhaviṣyadbhavaphalaṃ kurute karma tad bhavaḥ |*; and *Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana* p. 146<sub>3-4</sub>: [...] *bhaviṣyattraidhātukabhavaphalaṃ karma bhavaśābdenoktam | bhavaty anenāntaraṃ punarbhava iti bhavaḥ | yathā vahaty aneneti vahaḥ |*.
- ν Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.26ab: *kleśās trīṇi dvayaṃ karma sapta vastu phalaṃ tathā |*.
- ξ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.19ab: *yathākṣepaṃ kramād vṛddhaḥ santānaḥ [...]*.
- ο Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.20: *sa pratīyasamutpādo dvādaśāṅgas trikāṇḍakaḥ | pūrvāparāntayor dve dve madhye ṣṭau pariṇīṇaḥ ||*.
- π Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.28cd: *vidyā vipakṣo dharmo ṅyo ṅvidyāṅmītrāṅṅtādivat ||*.
- ρ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.21a: *pūrvakleśadaśāṅvidyā*.
- ς Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.30a: *nāma tv arūṇiṇaḥ skandhāḥ*. See also *Bhāṣya ad loc.*: *nāmendriyārthavaśēnārtheṣu namatīti nāma | [...] iha nikṣīpīte kāya upapattiyantare namanān nāmarūṇiṇaḥ skandhā ity apare* (p. 142); and *Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana* p. 120<sub>3-5</sub>: *kasmāc catvāraḥ skandhā nāmety ucyante? tṣṇābhīṣyānditakarmakleśavaśēna namanāt, upa{pa}pattiyantare<sup>20</sup> gamanād ity arthaḥ | rūpādiṣu artheṣu namatīti vā nāma | ālambanākāragrahaṇād iti yo ṛthaḥ |*.
- τ Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad* 1.10a<sub>1</sub>: *rūpaṃ dvidhā — varṇaḥ saṃsthānaṃ ca | tatra varṇaś caturvidho nīlādīḥ | tadbhedā anye | saṃsthānam aṣṭavidhaṃ dīrghādīḥ visātāntam |*; and *Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana* p. 95<sub>9</sub>: *rūpaṃ dvidhā | varṇātmaṃ saṃsthānātmaṃ ceti |*.
- υ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.30bd: *sparsāḥ ṣaṭ saṃnipātajāḥ | pañca pratighasaṃsparsāḥ ṣaṣṭho ḍhivacanāhvayaḥ ||*.
- φ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 3.31ab: *vidyāvīdyetarasparśāḥ amalakīṣṭaśeṣitāḥ |*.

<sup>20</sup> The correction °antare for the reading °antaraṃ of the printed edition has been suggested me by H. Isaacson, both because a primary derivative like *gamana* cannot govern the 2<sup>nd</sup> case (accusative), and because of parallels, for instance in Yaśomitra's *Sphuṭārthā* (*marāṇakāle nikṣīpīte kāye upapattiyantare namanād gamanād arūṇiṇo vedanādayaḥ skandhā nāmety ucyante*, p. 468).

- χ Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 2.3cd–4ab: *jīvitam vedanāḥ pañca śraddhādyās cendriyaṃ matāḥ || ajñāsyāmyākhyam ajñākhyam ajñātāvīndriyaṃ tathā |*.
- ψ Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad* 2.45ab: [...] *ya uṣmaṇo vijñānasya cādhārahūto dharmah sthitihetuḥ tad āyuh |*.
- ω Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 2.2cd: *strīvapumstvādhipatyāt tu kāyāt strīpuruṣendriye ||*.
- αα See *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad* 2.9cd (p. 42): *rūpīṇi punaḥ sapta cakṣuḥśrotraghrāṇajihvākāyastriṣpuruṣendriyaṇi rūpaskaṇḍhasaṃgrahāt |*.
- αβ Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad* 3.39ab: *kavaḍḍikāra āhārah kāme, na rūpārūpyadhātvoḥ tadvītarāgasya tatropapatteḥ | sa ca tryāya-tnātmakah | kāmāvacarāṇi gandharasaspraṣṭavyāyatanāni sarvāṇy va kavaḍḍikāra āhārah |*.
- αγ Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad* 3.40ab: *sparsāsanañcetanāvijñā āhārāḥ sāsravās triṣu | sparsās trikasaṃnipātajah, cetanā manaskarma vijñānaṃ ca sāsravāṇy evāhārāḥ triṣu api dhātuṣu saṃvidyante |*.

### 5. Tentative translation

1–2. All the eighteen elements (*dhātu*), which are ‘supporting basis’ (*āśraya*), ‘objects’ (*ālambana*) and ‘that which resorts to’ (*āśrita*), are arranged in six ways.<sup>21</sup> In order to destroy delusion with respect to *manas* (‘mind’) and *rūpa*, among the *āyatanas*, the mind is one in as much as it is the [only] *viśayin*.<sup>22</sup> Here [among the *dhātus*], since it arises from two bases [that is to say, the six *indriyas* and their objects], the mind corresponds to seven [or] six *dhātus*.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> In other words, the three groups contain six items each: six *dhātus* are the ‘supporting basis’ (*āśraya*) [= six *indriyas* = six sense faculties/internal *dhātus*], six are ‘objects’ (*ālambana*) [= six *rūpādīdhātus* = six corresponding elements/external *dhātus*], and six are ‘that which resorts to’ (*āśrita*) [= six *vijñānas*]. See above, n. α and the passage from the \**Mahāvibhāṣaśāstra* quoted in Dhammajoti 2007: 38.

<sup>22</sup> See *Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā* 1.6cd: *manasaḥ sarvaṃ ekasya svakalāpam apāsyā vā ||* ‘Everything [i.e., the twelve *āyatanas*] is [the object] of the mind alone, or [everything] apart from its own totality.’ On this line, see Sferra 2020: 679, nn. 115–116.

<sup>23</sup> That is to say, it is seven in case we count 1 *manas* + 6 *vijñānas*, or it is six if we count only the *vijñānas*.

3–4. Therefore,<sup>24</sup> in the four [spheres], that is in Kāmadhātu, etc. [up to the Anāsravadhātu] there are [respectively] all (*akhila*) [*dhātus*, that is, eighteen in Kāmadhātu], fourteen [in Rūpadhātu], three [in Ārūpyadhātu] and eight [in Anāsravadhātu]. Due to the corruption of attachment to desire-objects and so on,<sup>25</sup> the Kāmadhātu is endowed with ten states (*avasthā*).<sup>26</sup> The Rūpin [= Rūpadhātu] is made of fifteen.<sup>27</sup> The Ārūpya[dhātu] is fourfold.<sup>28</sup> The Anāsrava[dhātu] is pure in three ways.<sup>29</sup>

5. The locations of *viññāna* (*viññānasthiti*) are [properly speaking only] seven,<sup>30</sup> since [in them] there is mental delight (*cittābhirati*).<sup>31</sup> There are four [further locations], apart from the mind,<sup>32</sup> since [in them] there is the perceiver (*parigrāhaka*).

<sup>24</sup> I take the particle *hi* as a filler to avoid the sandhi between *eva* and *atah*.

<sup>25</sup> See above, n. β. Assuming that the explanation of the *Abhidharmakośa* can be applied here, we have the following scheme: in Kāmadhātu all 18 *dhātus*; in Rūpadhātu 14 *dhātus* (*gandhadhātu* / *rasa*° / *ghrāṇavijñāna*° / *jihvāvijñāna*° are absent); in Ārūpyadhātu only 3 *dhātus*, namely *manodhātu* / *dharmā*° / *manovijñāna*°. The reference to the 8 *dhātus* of the uncontaminated realm (*anāsravadhātu*) is not clear to me. Does it mean that there there are only the 6 pure *indriyas* + *manodhātu* and *dharmadhātu*?

<sup>26</sup> See above, n. γ. This number coincides with the taxonomy of the Sarvāstivādins and of some Theravāda sources (e.g. *Kathāvatthu* 8.1, ed. pp. 360–361); in other words, also for the Saṃmitīyas — or at least for some of them — the *asuras* are not counted as a separate destiny, pace Thích Thiên Châu 1999: 203. L. de La Vallée Poussin (1971 vol. 2: 1) refers to a passage of the *Atthasālinī* (62) where indeed the *asuras* are counted as a separate destiny.

The emendation *kāmadhātur* instead of *kāmadhātor* is the easiest; another possible emendation might be *kāmadhātor ddaśāvasthā[h]* ('There are ten states of the Kāmadhātu'). However, even though this is grammatically and metrically possible, it is stylistically less probable given that here the other phrases in the sentence are all nominative clauses where each of the realms is qualified by a *bahuvrīhi*.

<sup>27</sup> See above, § 1 and n. δ.

<sup>28</sup> See above, n. ε. The Ārūpyadhātu contains: 1) *ākāśānāntyāyatana*, 2) *viññānānāntyāyatana*, 3) *ākīṃcanyāyatana*, and 4) *naivasaṃjñānāsāṃjñāyatana* (a.k.a. *bhavāgra*); see de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 2: 5.

<sup>29</sup> Perhaps this refers to the three categories of unconditioned *dharmas*: *pratisaṃkhyānirodha*, *apratisaṃkhyānirodha*, and *ākāśa*.

<sup>30</sup> See above, n. ζ. The list usually includes: 1) *nānātvakāyasamjñāh*, 2) *nānākāyaikasamjñīnah*, 3) *ekakāyanānāsāṃjñīnah*, 4) *ekakāyasamjñāh*, 5–7) *arūpiṇas trayah*.

<sup>31</sup> In the *narakas* there is no delight, and this is the reason why they are not properly called locations. See also below, st. 7cd.

<sup>32</sup> See above, n. η and, e.g., *Saṅgītisuttanta* 1.11.18 (= *Dīgha Nikāya* vol. 3, p. 228). For further references, see de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 2: 23–25. Yaśomitra in the *Sphuṭārthā* points out that form/colour and feelings correspond to

6. [These are called *viññānasthiti*] since *viññāna* abides (*viññānam avatiṣṭhate*) in *rūpa* due to the tasting of feelings, allured by notions and supported by the *saṃskāras*.

7. The seven abodes of beings (*sattvāvāsa*)[, namely the five destinies] and the [further two, i.e.] unconscious beings and the *bhavāgra*, are [called abodes] since [in them] there is a real delight for the abode. The bad [destinies] (*apāya*) are not described [as abodes] since [in them] there is the affliction of pain.<sup>33</sup>

8. These, i.e. 1) the beings who live in the hells, together with 2) the animals, 3) the *pretas*, together with 4) gods and 5) men are the destinies (*gati*) that are non-defined (*avyākṛta*).<sup>34</sup> Some [believe that the destinies that are] endowed with *āsravas* are called [*upādāna*] *skandhas*.<sup>35</sup>

9. The intermediate existence (*antarābhava*) is said to be that which in five ways<sup>36</sup> makes these [destinies] to be attained (*prāpaka*). [The *antarābhava*] is not admitted with regard to those who belong to the Ārūpya[dhātu] since [in that sphere] there is neither something that should be reached (*gantavya*) [= the future aggregates] nor going (*gamana*) [= no *saṃkrānti* of the past aggregates].<sup>37</sup>

10. [The first being] enters [the womb] while being fully aware (*saṃprajānan viśati*), [the second] enters and lives [being fully aware] (*saṃprajānan viśaty āste*), [the third] enters, lives and dies [being fully aware] (*saṃprajānan viśaty āste nirvāti ca*), whereas [the fourth] enters, does not go out [of transmigration] and persists [in it] (*na nireti, āste ca*) [performing] all [these actions] while

Kāmadhātu, *viññāna*[*skandha*] and notions to Rūpadhātu, and the *saṃskāras* to Ārūpyadhātu: *catasro viññānasthītayah rūpōpagā viññānasthītiḥ kāmadhātuḥ vedanōpagā catvāri dhyānāni sañjñōpagā traya ārūpyāḥ saṃskāropagā bhavāgram tāsu catasṛṣu viññānasthītiṣu pratiṣṭhītaṃ viññānaṃ* (p. 69).

<sup>33</sup> See above, n. 0.

<sup>34</sup> See above, n. 1.

<sup>35</sup> It is not clear to me who the text refers to here.

<sup>36</sup> This reference is not completely clear to me. Are the five ways a reference to the five aggregates? Or perhaps this means simply that there are five *antarābhavas*, one for each *gati*?

<sup>37</sup> See also Thích Thiên Châu 1999: 207.

being confused.<sup>38</sup> The [four] descents of the foetus into the womb (*garbhāvākṛānti*) are from three [conditions].<sup>39</sup>

11–12ab. Four are the ways of being born (*yonī*): deities and beings who live in the hells are self-produced; the *pretas* are viviparous; human beings and animals, in their turn, are fourfold.<sup>40</sup> The five aggregates (*skandha*) endowed with impurities (*sāsrava*) are limited by the distinction of the states.<sup>41</sup>

12cd–13. [The] action (*karman*) by means of which there is an intermediate (*antarā*) origination [after] the destruction [= *marāṇa*] is called ‘becoming’ (*bhava*);<sup>42</sup> [this action] is instantaneous [and] twofold: [namely, it occurs in a different sphere of existence] or in the same sphere of existence.<sup>43</sup> At the junctures

<sup>38</sup> The reference here is probably to the Cakravartin, the Pratyekabuddha, the Sambuddha, and the Pṛthagjana (see above, n. κ and *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad st. 3.17b*, p. 128: *tatra prathamā cakravartināḥ | sa hi praviśaty eva saṃprajānan na tiṣṭhati nāpi niṣkrāmati | pratyekabuddhas tiṣṭhaty api | buddho niṣkrāmaty api |*). The four descents of the foetus into the womb (*garbhāvākṛānti*) can be summarized in this way: 1) *saṃprajānan viśati = cakravartin*; 2) *saṃprajānan viśaty āste = pratyekabuddha*; 3) *saṃprajānan viśaty āste niryāti ca = sambuddha*; 4) *mūḍho viśati na nireti āste ca = pṛthagjana*. See also *Saṃpāsādanīyasuttanta 5* (= *Dīgha Nikāya vol. 3*, p. 103) and *Saṅgītisuttanta 1.11.37* (= *Dīgha Nikāya vol. 3*, p. 231). In this sentence, the word *sarvāṇi* is rendered ‘all [these actions]’ on the basis of *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad st. 3.16cd*, p. 128: *kaścit punaḥ sarvāṇy evāsaṃprajānan karoti, praviśaty asaṃprajānan tiṣṭhati niṣkrāmaty api |*.

<sup>39</sup> That is, a healthy and fertile mother, the union of the father and the mother, and the presence of a *gandharva* (= an *antarābhava* being). See the quote at the beginning of *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad st. 3.12c* (p. 121): *trayaṅgām śthānānām saṃmukhībhāvāt mātuh kuṅsau garbhasyāvākṛāntir bhavati | mātā kalyāpi bhavati ṛtumati ca | mātāpitarau raktau bhavataḥ saṃnipatitau ca | gandharvas ca pratyupasthito bhavati |*. See also Kritzer 2014, in particular pp. 39–40. For further references, see de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 2: 37.

<sup>40</sup> In other words, human beings and animals can be self-produced (*upapāduka*, *aupapāduka*), viviparous (*jarāyuja*), oviparous (*aṇḍaja*), or born from sweat (*svedaja*) (see above, n. λ). Some instances of the four originations for human beings are given in *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad 3.9a* (p. 119); see also de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 2: 28. The basic classification expressed in this verse is common also in non-Buddhist sources (e.g., *Suśrutasamhitā 1.1.30* [ed. p. 5], *Manusmṛti 1.42–45* [ed. p. 38], *Śivadharmottara 8.2–5* [ed. p. 246]).

<sup>41</sup> This statement is not completely clear to me. I assume that here the states correspond to the destinies, but I am not sure.

<sup>42</sup> See above, n. μ. On *karmabhava* and *antarābhava*, see also *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad 3.4cd*.

<sup>43</sup> Here the text is probably correct, but I am not sure if my translation catches the point.

between one life and another<sup>44</sup> there is the arising [of *dharmas*] of the same kind (*sabhāga*) [as those of the previous existence]: (the arising) of defiled [*dharmas*] derives from defiled [*dharmas*] as well as [the arising] of undefiled [*dharmas*] derives from undefiled [*dharmas*].

14. It is admitted that (the intermediate) existence (*bhava*) possesses five limbs or four limbs and that it has one limb in due order. Others [believe that] there is no [(intermediate) existence] in the three [spheres] of existence.<sup>45</sup>

15. The two states of existence of Kāma and Rūpa have five aggregates.<sup>46</sup> The Ārūpya [state of existence] has only four aggregates

<sup>44</sup> In other words, when one takes rebirth.

<sup>45</sup> The text is quite cryptic, and my interpretation, which among other things takes *yathāyogaṃ* as *bhinnakrama*, is very tentative. In the manuscript, *pāda* b is hypometrical. At present I am unable to find parallels for this verse that might help us to fill the gap. Of course, the three missing syllables could be restored in many ways. In his unpublished transliteration of the work, Tucci corrected the text into *tridvyaṃgo bhava* (for information on Tucci's copy, see Sferra 2020: 650–652). Other metrically acceptable possibilities could be words like *keṣāṃcid* (Isaacson's suggestion) or phrases such as *ihaiva* or *atraiva*. It is also possible that, after the description of the destinies (st. 8) and of the *karmabhava* (st. 12cd) that is their first cause, the text deals again with the *antarābhava* (already described in st. 9), the second cause of the destinies, in a way that is obscure to me. In fact, according to a scriptural passage quoted and commented on in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad 3.4cd*, which does not contradict the viewpoints of the Saṃmitīyas, the 'states of existence' (*bhava*) are, *lato sensu*, seven: five destinies and two causes: *sapta bhavā narakabhavas tiryagbhavaḥ pretabhavo devabhavo manusyabhavaḥ karmabhavo 'ntarābhava iti | atra hi pañca gatayah sahetukāḥ sahāgamanāś cokitāḥ |* (p. 114, see also p. 121). This interpretation, which assumes that the gap should be filled with *antarā*<sup>o</sup> (giving rise to the hiatus *vā antarābhava*), is reflected in the translation by the use of the word 'intermediate' between parentheses. This interpretation would fit the statement that others do not accept the existence of the *antarābhava* in any of the spheres of existence, a position that was held by several Buddhist (and non-Buddhist) traditions (for some references, see de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 2: 32, n. 1). However, it should be noted that the hiatus between the odd and even *pādas*, albeit not impossible, is quite rare in the *Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā* (in 547 *anuṣṭubhs* it occurs only three times: st. 159cd, 191cd, 539cd).

<sup>46</sup> Note that the spelling *catuskandha* for the expected *catuḥskandha* is attested in Abhidharmic literature (see, e.g., *Abhidharmakośa* 8.2c, *Abhidharmadīpavṛtti*, pp. 93, 139, 218).

since the *rūpa*[*skandha*] is negated [there]. Alternatively, the state of existence means the threefold action.<sup>47</sup>

16. The production of defilements (*kleśa*), actions (*karman*) and things (*vastu*)<sup>48</sup> due to delusion (*moha* = *avidyā*) and so on is the dependent origination, which is characterized by the arising of elements in causal succession.

17–18. The one by force of which, through which, in accordance with which, of which [...],<sup>49</sup> there is the projection [i.e. the projecting cause] (*ākṣepa*) [of the series in regular order (*anuloma*)];<sup>50</sup> the one by force of which, through which, in accordance with which, and of which there is the cessation (*nirvytti*)<sup>51</sup> [of the series in reverse order (*pratiloma*)] and that, accordingly (*yathā*), is the end [of suffering], this (*eśa*) is [the *pratītyasamutpāda*, which is] endowed with three divisions (*triparvan*),<sup>52</sup> two conjunctions (*dviśandhi*),<sup>53</sup> [and] twelve limbs, which is the active force (*pravarttaka*), in which there is the connection between effect and cause and which is [fully] established for the one who accomplishes [the whole series] (*paripūrīn*).<sup>54</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Again, the text is unclear to me. Perhaps this is an alternative definition of *karmabhava*. The threefoldness might refer to several sets of three items: e.g. *kliṣṭa/akliṣṭa/avyākṛta*, *kāya/vāk/citta*, *dṛṣṭadharmavedanīya/upapadyavedanīya/aparaparyāyavedanīya* (cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad 4.50a–c: niyatānīyatam tac ca niyatam trividham punaḥ | dṛṣṭadharmādivedyatvāt*).

<sup>48</sup> The threefold division of the twelve limbs of the *pratītyasamutpāda* is also mentioned in the *Abhidharmakośa* (see above, n. v) and is described in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (*ad 3.26ab*, p. 134), where it is explained that three limbs belong to *kleśa* (*avidyā, tṛṣṇā, upādāna*), two to *karma* (*saṃskāra, bhava*), and seven to *vastu* (*viññāna, nāmarūpa, ṣaḍāyatana, sparśa, vedanā, jāti, jarāmaraṇa*).

<sup>49</sup> The words *yad atra ca* (lit. ‘and that which is here’) are obscure and probably corrupt.

<sup>50</sup> See above, n. ξ.

<sup>51</sup> Here the reading *nirvyttir* (lit. ‘production, development,’ etc.) is possibly *metri causa* for *nirvyttir* or *nirvytir*.

<sup>52</sup> Saṅghatrāta is probably referring to the same division mentioned in *Abhidharmakośa 3.20* (see above, n. o) and briefly explained in the *Bhāṣya* therein (*avidyā saṃskārās ca pūrvānte jātir jarāmarāṇam cāparānte | śeṣāṇy aṣṭau madhye |*, p. 131). In other words, two limbs belong to the past time (*avidyā, saṃskāra*), two to the future time (*jāti, jarāmarāṇa*), and eight to the present time (*nāmarūpa, sparśa, tṛṣṇā, vedanā, ṣaḍāyatana, viññāna, upādāna, bhava*).

<sup>53</sup> Namely, those between past and present and between present and future.

<sup>54</sup> See *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya avataraṇikā* of 3.20d2: *kiṃ punar etāny aṣṭāṅgāni sarvasyām jātāu bhavanti | nety āha | kasya tarhi — paripūrīṇaḥ ||*.

19. Nescience is a *dharmā* that is the antagonist of wisdom (*vidyā*).<sup>55</sup> [It is] all the other impurities [of the previous lives].<sup>56</sup> [*Avidyā*] is characterized by a lack of knowledge (*aprakhyāti*) that does not derive [only] by defilements (*saṃkleśa*), since the mind is joined [also with *vastu*].<sup>57</sup>

20. The *saṃskāras* of body, speech and mind,<sup>58</sup> the defiled action, the [wrong] view-points (*dṛṣṭi*), the fourth *skandha*, the [four] ‘nourishments’ (*āhāra*)<sup>59</sup> and what[ever] is conditioned (*kytaka*): [these] are the conditioning factors.

21. The immaterial *dharmas*, as many as they are, are generally held to be (*kila*)<sup>60</sup> *nāma*, due to [their] bowing (*namanāt*) [to-

<sup>55</sup> See above, n. π.

<sup>56</sup> See above, n. ρ. Alternatively, ‘Others [believe that *avidyā* is] all the [past] impurities [collectively considered].’

<sup>57</sup> Namely, with *viññāna*, *nāmarūpa*, etc. (see above, n. 48). Cf. also *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* ad 3.27: *yasmād eṣa nayo vyavasthito bhavāṅgānām tasmād avidyāpi kleśasvabhāvā vastunaḥ kleśād veti jñāpitam bhavati* | (p. 135). Alternatively, but less likely, ‘All the other impurities, since they are produced [by *avidyā*], are not due to a defilement of the mind. [*Avidyā*] is a lack of knowledge.’

<sup>58</sup> See *Arthaviniścayasūtra* (pp. 7–8): *avidyāpratyaḥ saṃskāra itī | saṃskārah katame? trayah saṃskārah — kāyasamskārah vāksamskārah manasamskāraś ca | tatra kāyasamskārah katamaḥ? āsvāsaḥ praśvāsaḥ | kāyiko hy eṣa dharmah, kāyaniśrītaḥ kāyapratibaddhaḥ, kāyam niśrītya vartate | tasmād āsvāsapraśvāsaḥ kāyasamskāra ity ucyate || vāksamskārah katamaḥ? vītarkayitvā vicārayitvā vācam bhāṣate, nāvītarkayitvā, nāvīcārya | tasmād vītarkavicāro vāksamskāra ity ucyate || manasamskārah katamaḥ? raktasya yā cetanā, cīttasya ca, tenāsya yā cetanā | caitasiko hy eṣa dharmah, cīttaniśrītaḥ cīttapratibaddhaḥ | cīttam niśrītya pravartate | tasmāc cetanā manasamskāra ity ucyate ||*

<sup>59</sup> That is to say, usual food (*khadīkārāhāra*), contact (*sparsā*), mental volition (*manasāñcetanā*), and consciousness (*viññāna*) (see also below, st. 33). On the four nourishments, see, e.g., *Abhidharmakośa* 3.38d–40ab, *Saṅgītisuttanta* 1.11.17 (= *Dīgha Nikāya* vol. 3, p. 228) and the *Āhāravagga* of the *Samyuttanikāya* (vol. 2, pp. 11–27). For further references and some information, see Verpoorten 2011.

<sup>60</sup> It seems that here the particle *kila* is used in order to mark a preliminary, more general interpretation of *nāma* (st. 21) and *rūpa* (st. 22), later followed by a specific explanation of both (st. 23). The use of *kila* to refer to something generally or traditionally accepted, which is duly recorded in Emeneau (1969: 244–248) but does not fully matches any of the categories detected for this particle by van Daalen 1988 (it could only be partially associated with his category A), diverges from the prevalent way this word is used by Vasubandhu in the *Abhidharmakośa* and its *Bhāṣya*. There seems to be only one place in the *Bhāṣya* (*vālāgramātraṃ kila* [...], ad 1.44ab) where, according to Yaśomitra, *kila* could be interpreted in a similar way (*āgamasūcanārthaḥ kilaśabdaḥ*, p. 124). In all the other

wards the objects].<sup>61</sup> The other *nāma* [i.e. the one in the list of the *cittaviṣṭayuktasamskāras*] is the distinction of syllables[, etc.], i.e. the basis for the functioning of notion (*saṃjñā*).

22. In its turn, *rūpa* is colour and configuration (*varṇasamsthāna*)<sup>62</sup> in some context [= when it is referred to as an *āyatana*], for the examination (*nirūpaṇa*) [of the object] is performed by the sight (*dyṣṭi*); in another context *rūpa* is the *rūpadhātu*, since it is the support of a higher [type of] *rūpa* [= pure forms].

23. In this (*asmin*) [case, that is to say, in the series of the *pratīyasamutpāda*] *nāma* is the five<sup>63</sup> [*skandhas*] beginning with feeling (*vid*) and ending with primary awareness (*manasikāra*).<sup>64</sup> In its turn, *rūpa*, which is called [in this way] because of its becoming broken (*rūpaṇāt*),<sup>65</sup> is whatever is *bhūta* and *bhautika*.<sup>66</sup>

cases, Yaśomitra points out that by means of *kila* Vasubandhu introduces others' viewpoints (just to quote a couple of instances, see *kilaśabdah paramatadyotanārthaḥ*, *Sphuṭārthā ad* 1.28b, p. 77; *kilaśabdo vaibhāṣikavyākhyānapradarśanārthaḥ svamataṃ tu yat tat paścād ucyate*, *ibid.*), viewpoints that he does not accept uncritically but rather regards with some mental reservation or dislike (*kilaśabdena aru-ciṃ sūcayati*, *Sphuṭārthā p.* 124) (see also de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 1: 94, n. 2). The latter use is not uncommon in śāstric literature (see, e.g., Kamalaśīla's commentary on *Tattvasaṃgraha* 2351d: *kilaśabdo 'rucisūcakah*, and, as V. Vergiani kindly pointed out to me, Helārāja's gloss on *Vākyapadīya* 3.7.70: *kila ity asmin pakṣe 'ru-ciṃ sūcayati*, ed. p. 287<sub>4-5</sub>).

<sup>61</sup> See above, n. ζ. See also de La Vallée Poussin 1971 vol. 2: 94–95.

<sup>62</sup> See above, n. τ.

<sup>63</sup> The word *pañca* is certainly corrupt. Instead of 'five,' one would expect 'four' or a word expressing the number four, referring only to the four immaterial aggregates (see *Arthaviniścayasūtra* pp. 8–9: *kataman nāma? catvāro rūpiṇaḥ skandhāḥ | katame catvāraḥ? vedānāskandhaḥ, saṃjñāskandhaḥ, saṃskāraskandhaḥ, vijñānaskandhaḥ | idaṃ nāma |*). A word that could match the context and would also be suitable for the metre is *skandhā[h]* / *skandhā[h]*. From the paleographic point of view, though, it would still be hard to explain the scribal error.

<sup>64</sup> I assume that in this context *manasikāra* and *vijñāna* are synonyms. This is unusual, however, since *manasikāra* is sometimes described as one of the five conditions for the arising of *vijñāna*. See, for instance *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (p. 225): [...]  
*pañcabhiḥ kāraṇaiś cakṣurvijñānam utpadyate | katamaiḥ pañcabhiḥ | cakṣuś ca pratī-tya rūpaṃ cālokaṃ cākāśaṃ tajjaṃ ca manasikāraṃ ca pratīyotpadyate cakṣurvijñānam | [...]* *evaṃ śeṣāṇām indriyāṇām yathāyogaṃ kartavyam ||*

<sup>65</sup> Saṅghatrāta refers here to a relatively common etymology of the word *rūpa*. See, e.g., *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad* 1.13d: *kasmāt punar ayam avijñaptiṣṭyānto rūpaskandha ity ucyate | rūpaṇāt | uktam bhagavatā — rūpyate rūpyata iti bhikṣavas ta-smād rūpōpādānaskandha ity ucyate | kena rūpyate | pāṇiṣparśenāpi sprṣto rūpyata iti vistaraḥ | rūpyate bādhyata ity arthaḥ | [...]* (p. 9). Cf. also *Sphuṭārthā avataraṇikā ad* 4.4ab: *rūpyata iti rūpalakṣaṇam* (p. 579); *Guṇabharaṇī* (p. 87): *rūpyate bādhyate iti*

24. Contact (*sparsā*) is the coming together of the three[, namely of *indriya*, *viṣaya* and *vijñāna*];<sup>67</sup> it is the basis for denomination [i.e. mental contact] (*adhivāc* = *adhivacana*) and for the [five] ‘oppositions’ (*pratigha*)[, namely, *caḅṣuḥsparsā* and so on]. Due to *vidyā*, due to *avidyā* and due to the absence of the two [i.e. neither *vidyā* nor *avidyā*],<sup>68</sup> it becomes one, made of five, one, one, six.<sup>69</sup>

25. Born from the three feelings,<sup>70</sup> thirst is threefold.<sup>71</sup> From that, attachment derives in five ways,<sup>72</sup> that is to say, clinging to the objects of desire, etc. (*kāmādyupādāna*),<sup>73</sup> which in this way becomes action (*karmabhava*).

26. Earth, water, fire, wind, and space, as well as the defiled mind are elements (*dhātu*), since they support (*saṃ-dhṛ-*) the birth (*janman* = *jāti*) of *rūpa* and of the mental factors, etc.

27. The internal [*indriyas* are:] Strīndriya, Pūmindriya, Jīvite-ndriya, the five feelings [i.e. *duḥkhendriya*, etc.],<sup>74</sup> Amal[en-]

*rūpaṃ; Pramāṇavārttikavyṛtti ad Pratyakṣapariccheda 215: viṣayatayā kiñcin nīrdi-  
śyate yathā rūpyata iti kṛtvā rūpaṃ.*

<sup>66</sup> See *Arthaviniścayasūtra* p. 9: *rūpaṃ katamat | yat kiñcid rūpaṃ, sarvaṃ tac  
catvāri mahābhūtāni catvāri ca mahābhūtāny upādāya | katamāni catvāri ? tad yathā —  
pṛthivīdhātuḥ, abdhātuḥ, tejodhātuḥ, vāyudhātuś ca |* (the same words occur in Vasu-  
bandhu’s *Pañcaskandhaka* p. 1).

<sup>67</sup> See above, n. v and § 1.

<sup>68</sup> See above, n. φ.

<sup>69</sup> Here the text is most probably corrupt. In this context, i.e. considering *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad 3.31a (vidyāvīdyetarasparsāḥ — vidyāsaṃsparśo ‘vidyā-  
saṃsparśaḥ, tābhyāṃ cānyo naivavidyānāvīdyāsaṃsparśa iti |*, p. 144) and *ad 3.32ab (tajjāḥ ṣaḍ vedanāḥ — caḅṣuḥsaṃsparśajā vedanā śrotagrahrāṇajihvākāyamaṇaḥ saṃ-  
sparśajā vedanāḥ | tāsāṃ pūnaḥ pañca kāyikī caitasī parā — caḅṣuḥśrotagrahrāṇaji-  
hvākāyasaṃsparśajāḥ pañca vedanāḥ kāyikī vedanety ucyate, rūpīndriyāśrītatvāt | ma-  
naḥsaṃsparśajā pūnar vedanā caitasikīty ucyate, cittamātrāśrītatvāt |*, pp. 144–145), we  
would have expected a reading such as *vidyāvīdyetarāt tredhā pañcaivaikā ṣaḍā-  
tmakāḥ*, ‘Due to wisdom, ignorance and the other, [contact becomes] in three  
ways[, i.e. *vidyāsaṃsparśa*, etc.] [Born from contact,] there are six [feelings  
(*vedanā*): five [bodily and] one [mental].’

<sup>70</sup> Namely, pleasant, unpleasant, and neither-pleasant-nor-unpleasant. See *Arthaviniścayasūtra* p. 10: *vedanā katamā [...] sukhā, duḥkhā, aduḥkhāsukhā ca.*

<sup>71</sup> That is, probably, *kāmatṣṇā*, *bhavatṣṇā*, and *vibhavatṣṇā*.

<sup>72</sup> Possibly because it is connected with the five objects of desire.

<sup>73</sup> Namely, *kāma*, *dṛṣṭi*, *śīlavrata* and *ātmavāda*. See *Arthaviniścayasūtra* p. 10: *tṣṇāpratrayam upādānam | upādānam katamat ? catvāri upādānāni | katamāni catvā-  
ri ? kāmopādānam, dṛṣṭyupādānam, śīlavratoḥ upādānam, ātmavādoḥ upādānam |*

<sup>74</sup> Cf. de La Vallée Poussin 1071: vol. 1, p. 105.

y]as,<sup>75</sup> that is to say *śraddh[endriya]*, etc., and the triad starting with *ajñāsyāmīndriya*.<sup>76</sup>

28. [The external *indriyas*, i.e. *caḥsus*, etc.] are [*indriyas*] due to the perception of the objects; [the internal *indriyas* are *indriyas* due to] the distinction between *ṣaṇḍha*, *strī* and *puṃs* [in the case of *strīndriya*, etc.]; *āyur* [= *jīvitendriya*] is [an *indriya*] due to maintaining the continuum (*santāna*);<sup>77</sup> the feelings are [*indriyas*] because they are on the side of the defilements;

29. the five [*śraddhendriya*, etc. are *indriyas*], because they are on the side of liberation (*vimokṣa*); the three [*ajñāsyāmīndriya*, etc.] are [*indriyas*] due to specific levels; alternatively the three *indriyas* [= *ajñāsyāmīndriya*, etc.] are the mind (*matī*). [Since they are sovereign with respect to femininity and masculinity,] the two sexual organs, female and male ones, [are *indriyas* distinct] from Touch.<sup>78</sup>

30. [Of these 22 *indriyas*,]<sup>79</sup> six are in three ways, eight are *kuśala*, while eight are *avyākṛta*.<sup>80</sup> Fourteen, ten, three and thirteen are in the *dhātus*.<sup>81</sup>

31. [Of these 22 *indriyas*,] eight are not-mental factors; thirteen are mental factors. One is the mind, seven are material (*rūpin*);<sup>82</sup> none is *karman*.

32. Alternatively, it has been said that seven arise from the *karman*; eight have to be meditated upon in every way. [...]

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *Abhidharmakośa* 2.9b.

<sup>76</sup> See above, n. χ.

<sup>77</sup> See above, n. ψ.

<sup>78</sup> See above, n. ω.

<sup>79</sup> The 22 *indriyas* are listed in *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya ad 1.48* (p. 37). They can be divided in five groups: 1) *caḥsurindriya*, *śrotrendriya*, *ghrāṇendriya*, *jihvendriya*, *kāyendriya*, *mana-indriya*, 2) *strīndriya*, *puṃsindriya*, *jīvitendriya*, 3) *sukhendriya*, *duḥkhendriya*, *saumanasyendriya*, *daurmanasyendriya*, *upekṣendriya*, 4) *śraddhendriya*, *vīryendriya*, *smṛtīndriya*, *samādhīndriya*, *prajñendriya*, 5) *anājñātamājñāsyāmīndriya*, *ājñendriya*, *ājñātāvīndriya*.

<sup>80</sup> This probably means that the six external *indriyas* (*caḥsurindriya*, etc.) are *kuśala*, *akuśala* and *avyākṛta*; that *strīndriya*, etc. and the feelings are *avyākṛta*; and that *śraddhendriya*, etc. and *anājñātamājñāsyāmīndriya*, etc. are *kuśala*.

<sup>81</sup> These numbers do not match those given in *Abhidharmakośa* 2.12.

<sup>82</sup> See above, n. αα.

33. Usual food, which is endowed with smell,<sup>83</sup> etc., defiled contact, as well as [defiled] mental volition, and [defiled]<sup>84</sup> consciousness (*citta* = *viññāna*) [all are nourishment (*āhāra*)] since they provide (*āharaṇāt*) a basis [for the maintenance of life].<sup>85</sup>

34. Some (*eke*) [believe that] all [four nourishments] are in Kāma[dhātu], [but only] three in the Rūpa[dhātu]<sup>86</sup> until there is the arising of happiness [i.e. the attainment of *nirvāṇa* (?)]. One is afterwards for every single one. Conceptualization is in the hells, etc.

35. Indeed, for beings, death (*cyuti* = *maraṇa*) results [only] from the destruction of life-force [or] from also the destruction of merit. For other [beings, death] results from the destruction of both, and for others, [it] does not result from the destruction of both.<sup>87</sup>

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* by Vasubandhu

*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* of Vasubandhu. Deciphered & Edited by Prahlad Pradhan, Revised with Introduction & Indices by Aruna

<sup>83</sup> See above, n. αβ.

<sup>84</sup> See above, n. αγ. The qualification ‘defiled’ is because the last three nourishments could also be undefiled as Yaśomitra points out: *kavaḍḍikārāhāras tryāyatanātmakatvāt sāsrava iti siddhaḥ | trayas tu sparsādayaḥ sāsravā anāsravāś ca sambhavanṭīty atas ta eva viśeṣitāḥ* (p. 494).

<sup>85</sup> With regard to the last three nourishments, Vasubandhu clarifies that *yāny api tu nabhyavahriyante, sthitiṃ cāharanti, tāny api sūkṣma āhāraḥ* | (p. 152).

<sup>86</sup> According to *Abhidharmakośa* 3.39ab, 40ab, the usual food is only in the Kamadhātu, whereas the other three nourishments are in all three *dhātus*. See the following words of the *Bhāṣya*: *na rūpārūpyadhātvoś tadvitarāgasya tatropapattēḥ | [...] cetanā manaskarma viññānaṃ ca sāsravāny evāhāras triṣv api dhātuṣu samvidyante* | (pp. 152, 153).

<sup>87</sup> Here, the reference is most probably to the four alternatives mentioned in a passage from the *Prajñāpti[sāstra]* quoted in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* ad 2.45ab or to a similar list: *atha kim āyuhkṣayād eva maraṇaṃ bhavaty āhosvid anyathāpi | prajñāptāv uktam — āyuhkṣayān maraṇaṃ, na puṇyakṣayād iti | catuṣkoṭiḥ — prathamā koṭir āyurvīpākasya karmaṇaḥ paryādānāt | dvitīyā bhogavīpākasya | tṛtīyobhayoḥ | caturthī viśamāparihāreṇa* | (p. 74). The same passage is quoted in Saṅghabhadra’s *\*Nyāyānusāra* (see Cox 1995: 293) and in *Abhidharmadīpavṛtti* ad st. 138 (p. 102).

Haldar, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series VIII, Patna 1975: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* by Yaśomitra

*Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Ācārya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, ed. by Dvārikādās Śāstrī, Bauddha Bharati Series 5–7, 9, Varanasi 1987: Bauddha Bharati.

*Abhidharmadīpa* by (Ārya/Ācārya) Īśvara

*Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣaṭprabhāṛitti* [sic]. Critically edited with notes and introduction by Padmanabh S. Jaini, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series iv, Patna 1959: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

*Abhidharmadīpavytti*

See *Abhidharmadīpa*.

*Arthaviniścayasūtra*

See *Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana*.

*Arthaviniścayasūtranibandhana* by Vīryaśrīdatta

*Arthaviniścayasūtra and Its Commentary (Nibandhana)*, ed. by N.H. Samtani, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series xiii, Patna 1971: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

*Kathāvatthu*

*Kathāvatthu*, 2 vols. Edited by Arnold C. Taylor, Pali Text Society, Text Series 48–49, London 1894, 1897 [reprint 1979].

*Guṇabharanī* by Raviśrījñāna

*The Śaḍaṅgayoga by Anupamarakṣita with Raviśrījñāna's Guṇabharanī nāma Śaḍaṅgayogaṭīppanī*. Text and Annotated Translation, ed. by F. Sferra, Serie Orientale Roma 85, IsIAO, Roma 2000.

*Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* by Kamalaśīla

*The Tattvasaṃgraha of Ācārya Śāntarakṣita with the 'Pañjikā' Commentary of Ācārya Kamalaśīla*, ed. by Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī, Bauddha Bharati Series 1, 2 vols., Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi 1968.

*Dīgha Nikāya*

*The Dīgha Nikāya*. Vols. I–II ed. by Thomas William Rhys Davids and Joseph Estlin Carpenter, Vol. III (Text Series No. 35) ed. by J. Estlin Carpenter. Pali Text Society. London 1890, 1903: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., Oxford 1911: The Pali Text Society.

*Pañcaskandhaka* by Vasubandhu

*Vasubandhu's Pañcaskandhaka*, Critically edited by Li Xuezhong and Ernst Steinkellner with a contribution by Toru Tomabechi, Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 4, China Tibetology Research Center / Austrian Academy of Sciences, Beijing — Vienna, 2008: China Tibetology Publishing House / Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

*The Second Chapter of the Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā by Saṅghatrāta*

*Pramāṇavārttikavyṭti* by Manorathanandin

*Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇavārttika with a Commentary by Manorathanandin.*  
Edited by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana. Patna 1938–1940.

*Manusmṛti* by Manu

*Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra.* Ed. by Patrick Olivelle. New York 2005: Oxford University Press.

*Vākyapadīya* by Bhartṛhari

*Vākyapadīya by Bhartṛhari with the Commentary of Helārāja. Kāṇḍa III, Part 1.* Edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer, Poona 1963.

*Śikṣāsamuccaya* by Śāntideva

*Śikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching Compiled by Śāntideva Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras.* Bibliotheca Buddhica 1. St. Petersburg: The Russian Academy of Sciences, 1897–1902 [Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1992].

*Śivadharmottara*

In *Paśūpatimatam. Śivadharmamahāśāstram. Paśūpatināthadarśanam.*  
Edited by Yogin Naraharinath, Kathmandu samvat 2055 (= 1998 ce) 1988, pp. 183–322.

*Samyutta Nikāya*

*The Samyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka,* ed. by Léon Feer, 5 vols., Oxford 1884, 1888, 1890, 1894, 1898: Pali Text Society.

*Suśrutasaṃhitā* by Suśruta

*The Suśrutasaṃhitā of Suśruta. With Various Readings, Notes and Appendix etc.* Edited with the co-operation of Jādvaji Trikamji Āchārya by Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya, Satyabhāmābhāi Paṇḍurang, 'Nirṇaya Sāgar' Press, Bombay 1945.

*Sphuṭārthā* by Yaśomitra

See *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā.*

Secondary sources

Cox, Collett

1995 *Disputed Dharmas. Early Buddhist Theories on Existence. An Annotated Translation of the Section on Factors Dissociated from Thought from Saṅghabhadra's Nyāyanusāra.* Studia Philologica Buddhica. Monograph Series XI, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

van Daalen, Leendert A.

1988 'The Particle *kila/kira* in Sanskrit, Prakrit and the Pāli Jātakas.' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31: 111–137.

- Dhammajoti, K.L. Bhikkhu (法光)  
2007 *Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma*. 3<sup>rd</sup> revised edition. Hong Kong: Centre of Buddhist Studies, The University of Hong Kong [2002<sup>1</sup>, Colombo].
- Emeneau, M. B.  
1969 'Sanskrit Syntactic Particles — *kila, khalu, nūnam*.' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 11: 241–268.
- Kritzer, Robert  
2014 *Garbhāvākraṅtisūtra. The Sūtra on Entry into the Womb*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 31. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de  
1971 *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu. Traduction et annotations*. Nouvelle édition anastatique présentée par Étienne Lamotte, 6 vols. Brussels: Institut belge des hautes études chinoises [1923–1931<sup>1</sup>].
- Sferra, Francesco  
2020 'Pudgalo 'vācyah. Apropos of a Recently Rediscovered Sanskrit Manuscript of the Saṃmitīyas. Critical Edition of the First Chapter of the *Abhidharmasamuccayakārikā* by Saṅghatrāta.' In Vincent Tournier, Vincent Eltschinger, and Marta Sernesi (eds.) *Archaeologies of the Written: Indian, Tibetan, and Buddhist Studies in Honour of Cristina Scherrer-Schaub*. Series Minor 89, pp. 647–710, Dipartimento Asia, Africa e Mediterraneo. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale."
- Thích Thiên Châu, Bhikshu  
1999 *The Literature of the Personalists of Early Buddhism*, Buddhist Tradition Series 39. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [1<sup>st</sup> English ed.: Ho Chi Minh City 1996]
- Tripāthī, Rām Śhaṅkara [sic]  
1990 *Sautrāntikadarśanam*, Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica 17. Sarnath – Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies.
- Verpoorten, Jean Marie  
2011 'The theory of the four nourishments according to the Buddhist doctrinal literature.' In A. Agud, A. Cantera, A. Falero, R. El Hour, M. Á. Manzano, R. Muñoz and E. Yildiz (eds.), *Séptimo Centenario de los estudios orientales en Salamanca*, pp. 687–694. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad Salamanca.