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The Editor-in-Chief wishes to express thanks to Roger Jackson
and Rena Crispin for their assistance in the production of this issue.
What is to follow constitutes one portion of a larger study of the path towards arhattha as described in Abhidharma works that now survive only in Chinese, one that does, however, take into account the Sanskrit (Abhidharmakośa and śvyākhyā) and, to a lesser extent, Pāli work on the subject. The study directly preceding this one had to do with the four 'aids to penetration' (catvāri nirvedhabhāgīyāṇi). The present study, like the one just preceding it, is based on a work bearing he title A-p'i-t'an hsìn lun 阿毘達心論, ascribed to one Fa-sheng 法勝. In 1975 there appeared in Brussels a complete English translation of the work by Mr. Charles Willemen. In view of this, one might wish to know how the work that follows can defend itself against the charge of superfluity. ¹

The work in question survives in three Chinese translations, by Saṃghadeva (assisted by Hui-yüan of Lu-shan 龍山慧嚴), by Narendrayaśas and by Saṃghbhadra. Though the third named, the longest by far of the three, is clearly swollen by commentary, no commentator is named, while the second identifies its commentator as Upaśānta. Mr. Willemen seldom indicates how the versions differ, nor does he paraphrase them, contenting himself with a translation so literal as to be not infrequently puzzling. On the other hand, within the limits of possibility he meticulously restores the technical terms to Sanskrit. Since the methods here pursued differ radically from his, one ventures to say that there is room for what follows. Where Mr. Willemen's findings have been of help, they shall be gratefully acknowledged.

As indicated, the 'aids to penetration' are followed by sixteen degrees of comprehension (abhisamaya), bearing on the Four Noble Truths. For each truth there are four steps, viz., (a) acceptance on faith (ksanti), (b) understanding (jnana), both for the Sphere of Desire (kāmadhātu), then (c) acceptance on faith of an analogue (anvayaksanti)
and (d) understanding of the analogue (anvayajñāna), the latter two having to do with the Spheres of Form (rupa) and of Formlessness (ārupyadhātu). For information, cf. LVP 6.179-83, where much will be found that does not appear below but which does not conflict with it. As Mr. Willemen says on p. 231, n. 56, of his work, the Noble Path (aryamārga) is divided into two, one of the learners (saikṣa, yu hsüeh tao 学道), i.e., of those below arhattva, and one of the ‘non-learners’ (asaiksamārga, wu 学道), of the arhantah, who have nothing more to learn. The former, in turn, is subdivided into a ‘path of vision’ (darśanamārga, chien tao 学道) and one of ‘realization’ (bhavānāmārga, hsiu 学道). All eight acts of acquiescence, of acceptance on faith (ksānti) and the first seven of the eight acts of understanding (jñāna) belong to ‘vision’, the last jñāna alone to ‘realization’. (The same note has a chart giving a birds’-eye view of the issue.) The approach to be followed will be to restate what Samghadeva and Narendrayasas have to say, which happens to be nearly the same, then to reserve for Comment the remarks of Samghadeva, which, to my knowledge, have no precise analogue. The presentation begins with verses, which deal only with categories (a) and (b) regarding the first of the Four Noble Truths.

The supreme worldly dharmas next in order
Invariably raise up (another form of) dharma-acquiescence.
The acquiescence in its own turn produces gnosis, and
Both together regard the lowest woe. 2

This ‘acquiescence’ is qualitatively different from the ‘patience’ just dealt with in the passage preceding what is being dealt with here, i.e., the four aids to penetration (catvāri nirvedahāgīyāni), the difference being that the present one is without outflows or, in other words, does not conduce to rebirth in the world. It indicates a willingness, even an eagerness, to see a truth that one has never seen before. 3

Finally, to the question as to the object of these acquiescences and gnoses, the answer is the Truth of Woe as it affects the Kāmadhātu.

Comment

Samghavarman comments that the supreme worldly dharmas, without moving, 4 shake off wrong deeds (hsieh yeh 学业, duskarman?), bad destinies (hsieh ch'ü 学命, durgati) and wrong views (hsieh chien 学道, 8
mithyādrsti). By ‘wrong deeds’ are meant the five enormous offenses (pañcānantaryakarmāṇi), viz., a. matricide (mātrghata), b. parricide (pitṛghata), c. murder of an arhat (arhadghata), d. introduction of disunity into the councils of the Order (saṁghabheda), e. striking a Buddha with malicious intent and with such force as to draw blood (tathāgatasyāntike duṣṭacittarudhiropādanam). By ‘wrong views’ are meant the five wrong views, (cf. n. 3, a.-e.).

Also, the supreme worldly dharmā divides acquiescence in the dharmā of the Truth of Woe in such a way as to produce five certainties. These are, namely, the certainties of a. ground, b. aspects (?), c. object, d. kṣaṇa (moment of time), e. immediate condition. These are then explained. a. The ground (tiṣṭha, bhumi?) on which a person attained the supreme worldly dharmā is the same as that on which he attains to acquiescence in the dharmā of woe. b. The same is true for aspects (kṣaṇa, akāra?) and objects, as also for kṣaṇa, the last named in the sense that the moment that he turns his back on the one is the moment in which the other is produced. e. Finally, the immediate (pre)condition of the acquiescence in question is the supreme worldly dharmā, without which the said acquiescence would not come into being.5

The fifth of Saṁghabhadrā’s five ‘equalities’ is treated in Mahāvibhāṣā 5 (T27.22ab). Here too the meaning is that laukika-gradharma is a samanantarapratyaya to duḥkhadharma-kṣanti, that nothing can obstruct or hinder the passage from the one to the other. Interestingly enough, at the end of the paragraph in question (22b) is a sentence that reads, ‘In the moment immediately following the supreme worldly dharmā (shih ti yi fa wu chien ch’ia-na 世第一法義開別, laukikāgradharmānantarakṣane?), acquiescence in the knowledge of the dharmā of woe (k’u fa chih jen 世第一法義開別, duḥkkhudharma-jñānakṣanti) invariably and evidently comes to the fore. For this reason this dharmā is a certainty, never turning back. (shih ku tz’u fa chüeh ting pu t’ui 是故此法決定不退, ata evaśa dharmo niyatāvinivartaniyāh?).

In the two systems, in other words, a. and e. are shared, while ākāra (b.c.) and ālambana (c.d.), present in both, occupy respectively different positions. Each, finally, has one that is missing in the other, viz., kṣaṇa (d. in Saṁghadeva’s system) and indriya (if indeed that is the meaning of ken, b. in the catalogue given in the Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā). All the same, the Mahāvibhāṣā presentation mentions kṣaṇa specifically, which may well mean that the notion of an uninterrupted moment of time is included there in that of an immediate and necessary precondition.
There follows a puzzling statement: ‘Inferior patience’ (hsia jen ṭ, mrduksánti) applies to the Truth of Suffering and its four aspects with respect to all three spheres. ‘Middle patience’ (chung ṭ jen, madhyaksánti) applies only to the Sphere of Desire, namely, the same Truth of Suffering and its four aspects. ‘Superior patience’ (shang ṭ jen, iikṣṇaksánti) consists of looking at each and every one of the Four Noble Truths, then narrowing one’s view to the ‘continuity of woe’ in the Sphere of Desire (yu chieh k’u hsiang hsü, kāmāptadukhas-amāna?), finally reducing even that to the thought of a single moment of woe in the same sphere (yu chieh k’u yi ch’a-na ssu wei, kāmāptadukhaikakṣanacetanā?). From there one proceeds to the supreme worldly dharma, from there to acquiescence in the truth of woe, from that to knowledge of the same truth.

Willemen 72 reads as follows:

After the highest worldly dharma (laukikāgradharma) one is certain to produce a patient acceptance of dharma (dharmaksánti): after the highest worldly dharma one produces a pure (anāsrava) patient acceptance of dharma, called patient acceptance of dharma in relation to suffering (duhkhe dharmaksántih). Because that which has not yet been realized is patiently accepted when now realized, they call it patient acceptance. It is, namely, the first pure (anāsrava) immediate path (ānantaryamaṅga).

After patient acceptance one produces knowledge: after that, one produces the knowledge of dharma in relation to suffering (duhkhe dharmajñānam), the path of deliverance (vimuktimārāga), in the same range (visāya) experiencing true nature.

Question: What is the object (ālambana) of that patient acceptance and of knowledge?

Answer: Both realize lower suffering.

Lower suffering: the suffering of the realm of desire is taken as object by both.

All three versions now have a quatrain saying virtually the same thing, in addition to which the wording itself in the versions of Narendrayaśas and of Samghavarman is almost identical. Samghadeva’s verses say that ‘upper woe’ (shang k’u ṭ ū), i.e., the contemplation of the first of the Four Noble Truths with regard to the spheres of Form and of Formlessness, may be described, mutatis mutandis, in the same terms as for the Sphere of Desire, and that the same may be said for the three other truths as well; that, finally, this ‘proper’ view of the dharmas (cheng kuan chu fa, dharmasamyagdarśana?...
dharmasamyagdrst ✓) is called the ‘sixteen pure (states of) mind’ (shih liu ching hsin + for shoda-abhisamayāḥ?). To this, the other two identify this process with the ‘uninterrupted’ (ānantaryamārga; the wording, in both cases, is tz’u fa we chien teng st. lit. etaddharmasamanantaram).

The prose commentary also says the same thing, with some variation. Samghadeva, whose treatment is, as usual, the tersest, identifies the sixteen abhisamayas by specifying that each of the Four Noble Truths becomes the object first of acquiescence, then of understanding, both with regard to the Sphere of Desire, then of acquiescence and of understanding by analogy, both for the two upper spheres. The ‘acquiescence’ (jen §, kṣānti) he identifies with the ‘uninterrupted path’ (wu ai tao , the wording, in both cases, tsufa we chien teng st. lit. etaddharmasamanantaram). The ‘understanding’ (chih jnana) with the ‘path of deliverance’ (chieh t’o tao vimuktimārga). Finally, he identifies these sixteen with ‘viewing the dharmas’ (chien fa kṣānti, i.e., darśanamārga, although, strictly speaking, it is only the first fifteen of which this may be said).

Narendrayasas says the same thing, except that he does specify that darśanamārga applies only to the first fifteen of the abhisamayas, while the last of them belongs to bhāvanāmārga. The latter extends from that point up to and including the ‘concentration likened to diamond’ (chin kang yü ting , from which point on the practitioner is known as one who has ‘already done what was to be done’ (so tso yi pantf krtakaraniya). The stages of practice are grouped collectively under three headings, those of the ‘ground of view’ (chien ti , i.e., darśanamārga), the ‘ground of cultivation’ (hsiu ti, i.e., bhāvanāmārga) and the ‘ground (of them who have) nothing (left to) learn’ (wu hsiieh ti, i.e., aśaiksamārga). Narendrayasas concludes by saying that, now that he has described the ‘grounds’, he will go on to describe the persons (jen pudgala) who occupy them.

Comment

Abhidharmakosa 6.28 reads as follows:

ksāntijñānāny anantaryamuktimārgā yathākramam/
adṛṣṭadrṣṭer drṇmārgas tatra pañcadaśa kṣanāḥ//28//

(Note anantaryā° for ānantaryā°.) LVP 6.190 sq. renders this as follows: ‘Kṣāntis et jñānas sont, dans l’ordre, ānantaryamārga et vimuktimārga.
Parce qu’ils se produisent chez quelqu’un qui voit ce qui n’a pas été vu, quinze moments sont chemin de la vue.’ The basic text is Kôsa 6.28b, accompanied by the commentaries (Dwarikadas 930 ff., LVP 6.191 sqq.).

One will now attempt to explain as much of the commentary to the above verses as is relevant to the matter at hand. First, however, one must review three sets of categories.

a. Each of the Four Noble Truths has four aspects. Thus, 1) woe (duhkha) has a) anitya (‘impermanent’), b) duhkha (‘douloureux’), c) śūnya (‘vide’), d) anātmaka (‘impersonnel’); 2) the origin of woe (samudaya) has e) hetu (‘cause’), f) samudaya (‘origine’), g) prabhava (‘causation successive’), h) pratyaya (‘en tant que réalisant un effet en causation conjuguée, abhinispādanayogena); 3) the suppression of woe (niruddha) has i) niruddha (‘destruction’), j) śānta (‘calme’), k) pranīta (‘excellent’), l) niḥṣarana (‘salvifique’); 4) the Path that leads to the suppression of woe (pratipad, marga) has m) mārga (‘chemin’), n) nuyā (‘raisonnable ou pratique’), o) pratipad (‘obtention’), p) nairyāṇika (‘sortie définitive’).

b. At each stage of his development, the practitioner rids himself of his defilements in nine stages, the defilements being of three degrees of intensity, viz., extreme (adhimātra), middling (madhya) and slight (mrdu), each of which is similarly divided into extreme, middling and slight. Each act of self-liberation consists of two steps, ānataiyāmarga, or ‘path of immediacy’, and vimuktimārga, or ‘path of deliverance’. LVP 6.278 says this about them: ’Le . . . chemin qui ne peut être empêché . . . est le chemin par lequel est abandonné un obstacle . . . Le . . . chemin de délivrance . . . est le premier chemin qui naiss de l’obstacle abandonné au moyen de l’ānantaryāmarga.’

There follow a quatrain and a brief commentary that are virtually the same in all versions: Anyone who, during the first fifteen moments of the sixteen abhisamayas, was of comparatively dull faculties is called one who ‘acts in accordance with faith’ (sui hsin hsing, i.e., śraddhānusārin), because he has gained his insight in keeping with the predications of a person whom he trusted, while the person of sharp faculties is called one who ‘acts in accordance with the Dharma’ (sui fa & hsin, i.e., dharmānusārin), because his understanding is based on a direct intuition of the Doctrine.

It will be recalled that the ‘path of deliverance’ (vimuktimārga, chieh t’o tao) has nine stages. Samghadeva’s next quatrain says that a person who has not yet separated himself from the passions of the Sphere of the Desire is moving in the direction of the First Fruit
(srota'āpattiphala), while the one who has separated himself from the six lowest ones is moving towards the Second (sakrđāgāmiphala); he who has freed himself from all, towards the Third (anāgāmiphala). Narendrayaśas’s quatrain says the same in only slightly different language. Samghadeva’s prose commentary specifies the nine categories and the words srota’āpanna and sakrđāgāmin, both in transcription, but does not add anything significant. Narendrayaśas’s commentary is somewhat more specific. It identifies the person still in the Sphere of Desire as one ‘totally bound by all bonds’ (chü yi ch’i fo - vi sakalabandhana). It goes on to say that, when such a person ‘reaches a fixed portion’ (chih chüeh ting fen, niyāmabhāgam prāpya?), then he faces the fruit of the srota’āpanna (srota’āpattiphalapratipannako bhavati?). As in the case of Samghadeva, so here too the commentary specifies the nine degrees, going on to say that, once the lowest six have been abandoned, the person ‘enters certainty’ (ju chüeh ting niyāmam avakrāmati?), which means that he now faces the fruit of the sakrđāgāmin (sakrđāgāmiphalapratipannako bhavati?). One who has abandoned all nine, finally, again ‘enters certainty’ in the sense that he faces the fruit of the anāgāmin (anāgāmithalapratipannako bhavati?).

Samghavarman has two quatrains where the other two have only one, and his commentary is, correspondingly, longer (11 Taishō lines as against 6 for Samghadeva and 17 1/2 for Narendrayaśas). He specifies that, if the śraddhānusārin or dharmānusārin has not yet freed himself from the Kāmadhātu, or even if he has, but only of one of the first five categories of bonds, then he is a srota’āpattiphalapratipannaka, a candidate for the First Fruit. A person who has not freed himself at all from the bonds of the Sphere of Desire is a sakalabandhana, while one who has freed himself from the lowest of them is an asakalabandhana (po chü fo 不等師). Samghavarman proceeds to say something of whose meaning I am not quite certain. To the extent that I have understood it, it is as follows: Once a person has freed himself of the five lowest categories of bonds, in one jump he escapes rebirth (? ch’ao sheng li sheng 超昇離生). One who, with respect to the ‘view of woe to be cut off in the Sphere of Desire’, severs the five lowest categories of bonds attains the dharma-gnosis touching the dharma of woe and bears direct witness to deliverance. The same applies, mutatis mutandis, all along the line up to and including the same with respect to the ‘view of the Path’. Finally, when one has severed the five lowest categories of bonds to be severed on the ‘path of cultivation’, one attains the fruit of the sakrđāgāmin and bears direct witness to deliverance.
The second quatrain says that anyone who severs from six through eight of the bonds just mentioned 'faces the second fruit' (i.e., is a sakrdagamiphalapratipannaka), while one who leaves the 'eighth ground' is one 'facing the third (fruit', i.e., an anagamiphalapratipannaka). The prose commentary simply says the same thing in different words, but it is worthy of note that the second couplet is interpreted to mean that anyone from the Sphere of Desire up to and including the top of the Sphere of Formlessness is—under these circumstances, presumably—headed for the fruit of the anagāmin (i.e., an anagamiphalapratipannaka).

The next quatrain, as well as the prose commentary accompanying it, is, except for differences in wording, virtually the same in all three versions. It says that, upon attainment of the sixteenth abhisamaya, the candidate is a firm occupant of the Fruit in question, the one of 'soft views' (juan chien 祈, mrdudṛṣṭi?) being called 'liberated by faith' (hsin chieh 造 業, śraddhāvimukta), the one of 'sharp views' (li chien 勘, so Samghadeva and Samghavarman), or of 'pure views' (ching chien 持, so Narendrayaśas, but both standing, presumably, for tūkṣṇadṛṣṭi or tūkṣṇadārśana) being called ‘arrived at insight’ (chien tao 罹, drśtiprapta).

The commentary, specifically, says that the sixteenth abhisamaya corresponds to mārgānvayajñāna, that one who has not left the Sphere of Desire becomes a srotāpañca, one who has abandoned the sixth category of bonds a sakṛdāgāmin, one who has abandoned all nine an anagāmin. It goes on to say that one of 'dull faculties' (tun ken 端, i.e., mṛdvindriya), the hitherto sraddhanusārin, is now a Śraddhāvimukta, while the one of 'sharp faculties' (li ken 勘, tūkṣṇendriya), is now a drśtiprapta.

Comment

The above statement is based principally on Samghadeva. Beyond saying that 'pure view' means 'sharp view', Narendrayaśas says the same thing in words only slightly different. Samghavarman begins virtually the same way, but ends quite differently. He says that one of slight insight who enters the dārsanamārga is called a śraddhānusārin and that, when he comes to rest in the Third Fruit, he is known as a śraddhāvimukta, while the one of sharp insight, called dharmānusārin upon entry into the dārsanamārga, is now known as a drśtiprapta. Samghavarman concludes by saying that the drśtiprapta, whose faith (hsin 業, śraddhā) is actually stronger than that of the śraddhāvimukta, has a faith 'perfumed by wisdom' (hui so hsin 純 私, prajñāvāsita?), which accounts for his name.
Two points seem to merit comment. First, the 'passions to be abandoned by meditation' are the ten samyojanas (the five mentioned in n. 10 as well as rûparāga, attachment to the Sphere of Form; ārûpyarāga, attachment to the Sphere of Formlessness; audhatya, agitation; māna, pride; moha, delusion); all deeds that, while not unwholesome, do not conduce to leaving the world (kusālasāsrava) and those that, while placing no obstacle in the path of salvation, are morally neutral (anivrtāvyākṛta); impure avijñāti. The second point worthy of comment is that arhattva is not achieved by the 16 abhisamayas, that arhattvaaphalapratipatti is as high as one can go. Cf. LVP 6.196.

Samghavarman has another quatrain peculiar to his version, followed by rather an extensive prose commentary. The whole passage, in sum, makes a statement so surprising, in the light of what I know from elsewhere in the Abhidharma, that I am not certain of having understood it correctly. Since, moreover, this particular text is peculiar to Samghavarman, I have no analogue against which to verify the accuracy of my interpretation. For what it is worth, I present it here.

By severing the eighty-eight 'bonds' (chieh *$ , samyojana) applicable to the path of vision (chien tao g, darśanamārga), the practitioner achieves srotā'apattiphala. And so on up to the person on anāgamya, who dwells in the Fruit of the srotā'āpanna. A person who, by some means or other (fang pien i, representing upāyena?), overcomes the strongest (shang shang t, i.e., ūkṣṇatikṣṇa or adhimātradbhimātra) of the obstacles to deliverance is called a sakrādgāmiphalapratipannaka. Here Samghavarman says something that reminds one a bit of what he said above. From the point just specified up to that of the person who, having severed the five lowest categories of bonds and escaped rebirth, produces mārgānvayajñāna, one has to do with a srotā'āpanna. He is not a sakrādgāmiphalapratipannaka, since the path of the latter has not presented itself to him for a single moment (yasmāt tatphalapratipannakamārga ekaksāṇam aty asmai na pratiṃpannas tasmāt? na sāksādabhiṣvā tasmāt?).

Q. There are many bonds to sever. Why did the Blessed One speak only of three?

A. The ten anusayas are basic, namely, the five views in addition to doubt, lust, anger, pride and inclarity. On the path of view (chien tao g, darśanamārga) one severs six of these, namely, the five views and doubt. When this has been done, then they are severed permanently. Three of the anusayas are prime movers, three secondary.
In the absence of any definition of 'mental cognition to be abandoned by realization' (bhāvanāprahātavyam manovijñānam iii. above), I conclude that the reference is to mental cognition having to do with passions to be banished by realization/meditation. 'Pure thought' is thought having nirvāṇa as its object. That is, the view of a substantial person (shen shien 延, satkāyadrṣṭi) is a prime mover (pravartaka), while the extreme views of eternity and of absolute finality (pien chien 鐵, antagrāhadrṣṭi) are secondary movers (anuvartaka); the willful choice of one's own style of religious life (śilavrataparāmarśa) is a prime mover, while the willful choice of views (drṣṭiparāmarśa) is a secondary mover; doubt (vicikitsā) is a prime mover, while false views (mithyādrṣṭi, specifically the denial of the truth of dependent origination, pratityasamutpāda) are secondary movers.

What Samghadeva treats next in a single sloka, and with less than 7 lines of commentary (in the Taishō edition), Narendrayasas enunciates in the same amount of verse and about twice as much prose (15 lines), while Samghavarman has about twice as much material as Narendrayasas, viz., two slokas and 31 lines of commentary. What we shall do here is, for our immediate purposes, reproduce Samghadeva’s version, then use Samghavarman’s as Comment, followed by the Abhidharmakosā and the afhibhasa in the same sense. Since Narendrayasas falls somewhere between the other two, there shall be no mention of his version.

Samghadeva’s sloka, more or less literally translated, would be about as follows:

One by whom cogitation has not yet been completely severed
Is limited to birth in birth-and-death seven (times).
The house-to-house (wanderer), having had three, is finished.
Both are situated in the Fruit of the Path.

Making no attempt at versification, one might venture the following restoration: //acchinnabhāvanāheyaḥ saptakṛtparamo jāyate kulamkulas tu triskṛtyaparamah| ubhau ca mārgaphale vartetel// 'Cogitation' renders ssu wei .bel., which here clearly stands for bhāvanā, 'realization', about which more below. Samghadeva’s commentary might be summarized as follows: The first ardhaśloka means that the sadhāvimukta and the drṣṭprāta, not yet free of the kleśas to be abandoned by bhāvanā (wei li yü chieh ssu wei so tuan fan nao 未離欲界思惟所蔽煩悩, going back to a presumable acchinnakāmāvatarabhāvanāheyakleśāḥ), shall be reborn and die seven
times, i.e., seven times each (?) among gods and men, but no more. The third pāda means that a kulamkula is one who has eliminated the three grossest klesas, i.e., adhimātrādhimātra, adhimātramadhya and adhimātramrdi (shang wei shang chung shang shang shang 十 十 十 十). He shall be reborn into two clans (kula) or three, among gods and men, then achieve parinirvāṇa. The last pāda means that saptakṛtparāma and kulaṃkula shall both dwell in srota'āpatti(phala?).

Comment

One who has not exhausted the seeds (?) varieties? chung 植 of the path of cultivation (hsiu tao 行道) Receives birth among those who are born and die seven times. It is to be known that what is meant by that Is that, when the term is full (chi man 充满, the person in question is a) srota'āpanna.

Samghavarman’s prose:

When the srota'āpanna has not yet exhausted the varieties of the path of cultivation (hsiu tao chung, representing a probable bhāvanā- mārgavaṇḍhayah) know that his absolute term is seven existences, that is, seven births each among manusyas (jen chien 人 生), in antarābhava (chung yin 十陰), in upapattibhava (sheng yin 生 陰) and among kāmadhatudevas (yū chieh t’ien 禪 天). ‘Seven’ means, in every case, no more than seven, as, for example, in the case of the ‘seven-leaved tree’ (ch’i yeh shu 七葉樹, saptaparṇavṛksa).

Q. Why just seven, neither more nor less?
A. It is like one bitten by a ‘seven-step serpent’: the victim’s mahābhūtas (physical elements) let him take seven steps, but the poison will not let him take an eighth. In the same way, the force of deeds makes for seven rebirths, but no more than that is possible, thanks to the might of the Path (tao li 行道, mārgabalena? mārgavāsenan?). When the practitioner dwells in mārgānayākṣānti (if anvayākṣānti is indeed the meaning of tseng shang jen 十 生, lit. ‘super-tolerance’ or ‘acquiescence’), except for seven rebirths in the Sphere of Desire, apratisamkhyaṇirodha keeps him from being reborn.

In view of the external evidence, the next statement must mean that one born among men is reborn there seven times, as is, mutatis
mutandis, one born among gods. The difficulty is the wording, for the latter certainly seems to refer to transcending both groups, the words used being *ch'ao* 超, 'to outpass', and *li* 留, 'to leave'. They mean that, in order to get beyond the manusyaloka and devaloka, respectively, the being must be reborn seven times in the sphere in question. At any rate, if in the course of either the Holy Path (*sheng tao* 圣道, representing a presumable *āryamārga*) makes it appearance, then, thanks to the ‘hold of the power of deeds’ (*yeh li ch'ih* 良其, *karmabaladhṛtyā?*), the practitioner in question does not experience *parinivāna*.

Q. If at the end of seven rebirths there appears no Buddha in the world, then how does the practitioner get *arhattva*?

A. There are two views. 1. He gets it as a layman, but, once having got it, does not retain his secular status (representing a possible *grhausthaḥ* sann evārhatvam prāpruti prāpya tu na grhe tiṣṭhate?). 2. He leaves the household without undergoing any change in form. This seems to represent *rūpaṃ na vikāryaiva pravrjayate*, possibly in the sense that he becomes a *religieux* by nature without having to assume the outward appearance of one. The reasons given number eight. a. The practitioner in question achieves unassailable purity. b. His hopes have been fulfilled. c. He sees the errors in misconduct. For these three reasons he does not fall from *srota'āpatti* into *durgati*. Also, d. he is not born into the Buddhakula, e. the fire of his gnosis (*chih huo* 岐火, representing *jñānāgni?*) is bright and pure, f. he sees the deceptions (*kuo* 觊, lit. ‘transgressions’) in *viṣaya* and *dhātu*, g. his acquiescence and insight are perfect (representing a possible *yataḥ śamathavipaśyane asya parinispanne tataḥ*), h. he has been ‘perfumed’ by the medicinal herbs of the Noble Path (*āryamārgaūṣadhyā vāsatātvena?*). He is like a crown prince, like a man whose inner fire is enhanced (*ju nei huo tseng jen* 生內火增淫), like an agile fish (*ju ch'iao pien yü* 生尖身魚). This is why the *srota'āpanna* does not fall into *durgati*. (Neither do some *prthagjanas*, to be sure, but their number is small, and the escape is not certain; hence no mention of them here. The *srota'āpanna*, on the other hand, is a member of a destined group—*niyatavarga?*—, destined, that is, for *nirvāṇa*, for perfect enlightened intuition—*chü cheng chüeh* 圣成聖, *samyaksambodhitāka?*). . . . Not all *srota'āpannas* must necessarily go through seven rebirths.

Samghavarman goes on to the *kulamkula*.

If one severs three or four varieties (of bonds),
Achieving their counteragents,
Leaving only two rebirths or three,
One is called (a wanderer from) family to family (chia chia 家 家, kulamkula).

There are three reasons for positing the kulamkula, viz., 1. his 'severance of the agonies' (yan nao tuan 顛斷, i.e., his abandonment of the defilements, kleśaprahāṇa, 2. his perfection of his faculties (ch'eng chiu kén 承此能, indriyasiddhi Siddhiendriyatva?), 3. his 'receipt of birth' (shou sheng 聖, representing jātyādāna or upapattiyādāna?). 1. refers to those defilements on the plain of the Sphere of Desire that are to be removed by realization (bhāvanā, as opposed to 'view', darsana, of which more below, i.e., to kāmadhātuklesabhāvanāprahāṇa) or, to be specific, to three or four varieties thereof, for beyond that the kulamkula ends, the abandonment of the fifth leading automatically to the sixth and to sakṛdāgāmipāla, the step immediately following srota'āpatti. 2. means that the practitioner gets the counteragents and faculties free of outflows (if that indeed is the meaning of pi te tui chih su lou chu kēn 彼得對治無漏諸種, which may represent something such as tatpratipakṣāvatā-sravendriya-prāptyā). 3. means that in some cases there are more rebirths in the Sphere of Desire, at times two, at times three. Unless all three conditions are met, one is not a kulamkula. There are two kinds of kulamkula, viz., 1. deva°, which means two or three rebirths as a god in the Sphere of Desire, whether in one devaloka or in two or three; 2. manusya-kulamkula, which may mean in one world (? t'ien hsia 萬, or two or three, or in one clan (chia, for kula?), or two or three.

Q. What does kulamkula mean?
A. Proceeding from clan to clan, then on to parinirvāṇa, it is the highest rank of srota'āpanna (cf. Willemen, 74 f.).

Before going on to consider what is said in the Kota and the Mahāvibhāṣā it would be well to mention that the 88 anusayas mentioned above are all to be eliminated by 'view' (darsanapratyāhārya, darsanahelya, drggheyay). To them are added 10 that are to be eliminated by 'realization' (meditation, 'development', bhāvanā-pratitya, bhāvanāheya), viz., rāga, dveṣa, moha and māna on the level of the Sphere of Desire, these four less dveṣa on the level of the two upper spheres. The Mahāvibhāṣā deals with the saptakṛtparama in T27.240b-241b. A summary now follows.

The number 7 does not refer to a total of seven births, but rather to a maximum of seven births (upapattibhava) in each of two spheres, devaloka and manusyaloka, as well as in the intermediate existences (antarābhava) preceding them. Several reasons are given for the
maximal number 7, not all of which are understood to me, but which I reproduce here for what they are worth, at times in my own words, at others in those of M. Louis de La Vallée-Poussin.

1. Si plus (de sept), si moins, on produirait doute; qu’il naisse dans sept existences ne contredit pas le dharmalaksana, c’est-à-dire la nature des choses, et n’est pas critiquable.

2. The vipākahetu has the power of generating only so many vipākaphalāni, no more.

3. En outre, par la force de l’acte, il prend sept existences; par la force du Chemin il n’en prend pas une huitième. De même que l’homme mordu par le serpent-des-sept-pas fait sept pas par la force des grands éléments et, par la force du poison, n’en fait pas un huitième. En outre, s’il prenait huit existences, il ne posséderait pas le Chemin dans sa huitième naissance, car la nature du Chemin est qu’il ne peut s’appuyer sur un huitième corps du Kāmadhātu. If there were no āryadharma from this putative eighth rebirth onwards, then there would be no satyadarśana (beyond the first?), nor any āryaphalaprāpti or abhisamayā, and after the achievement of āryatva one would revert to prthagjanatā. Since none of this is true, there is no eighth rebirth.

4. If there were an eighth rebirth, one would outpass the trailokya, gain arhatasamyaksam buddhadharmavinaya (?) exceeding the number of Ganges’s sands and no longer be of the Buddha’s company, just as beyond the seventh degree of kinship there are no relations.

5. At the time of tseng shang jen (duhkhanirrodhaṁ gāmṁyāṁ pratipadi dharmāṇvayākṣāntiḥ?), apart from seven rebirths as deva and manusya in the Sphere of Desire and one rebirth in each of the two upper spheres, one can gain apratisamkhyānirrodha in any rebirth. A dharma subjected to apratisamkhyānirrodha no longer makes its appearance, hence only seven rebirths.

6. There are only seven sthānas (ch’u ) in the Sphere of Desire, viz., that of humans (manusyaloka) and six of gods (devaloka), hence ‘seven births’ means one in each.

7. There are limits to the force of the nine classes of kleśa, hence only seven rebirths. (?)

8. In the course of seven rebirths one perfects the seven sambodhyangas (limbs of enlightenment); no more than seven are required.18

9. In the course of seven rebirths one perfects seven āśrayaniyāmas and seven āryamārgas.19

10. In the course of seven rebirths, one thoroughly counter­acts seven anusāyas.20
The number 7 is a maximal number; there may be seven each among gods and men, or there may be uneven numbers, i.e., one less in one sphere than in the other, anywhere from 6:7 or 7:6 to 1:2 or 2:1.

Q. Where does the paripūrṇasrotāʾapattika (? yüan man yü liù) fulfill his seven rebirths? Is it among gods or men that he completes his seventh rebirth and experiences parinivāna?
A. There is a conflict of theories.

1. The birth in the course of which one attains srotāʾāpattiphala counts as one of the seven. In other words, if it is birth as a god, one still has to go through seven as a human, and vice versa.
2. The birth in question is not reckoned into the total. A god must come back for seven rebirths as a god, a man as a man.

The first view is mistaken. (This is followed by arguments in refutation.)

Q. If one fulfills the seven rebirths in a Buddha-less age, does one attain arhattva as a (lay) householder (grhastha)?
A. Again, there is a conflict of two views.

1. It is impossible to attain to arhattva as a householder.
2. One may attain arhattva as a householder, then go on to join the Order, for one may be a disciple of the Buddha in terms of the Dharma (fa erh Fo ti tzu dharmato Buddhasisyah?)

The case is like that of the five hundred rsis who cultivated the Path on Mount Rṣigili, at bottom śrāvakas in a Buddha-less age, who later imitated an ape that had appeared before them in the guise of a disciple of the Buddha. By imitating the ape, they attained to pratyekabodhi, because, being adepts, they were not the recipients of the signs of non-believers. (This is followed by some discussion of transmigration under the term liù chuan wang lai.)

There is more on the kulamkula in Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā 53 (T27.274b-277a). It is paraphrased below.

There are cases in which the fetters (of sensation, notion, constituents and cognition, vedanāsamskārāvijñānānabandhanāni) are 'not unsevered', i.e., those of the kulamkula, of the sakrddgāmin and of the ekavīcin. Between the one who severs the sharp-middle defilements among those which, belonging to the Sphere of Desire, are to be eliminated by realization and the one who severs the slight defilements of sensation, etc., on the same level is found the kulamkula, who has severed the first three or four on the level of the Sphere of Desire, as
well as the sensations, notions, constituents and cognition that go with them. In other words, the *kulamkula* remains subject to the remaining five or six. The *sakrdagamin* severs six, is left with three. The *ekavicin* severs seven or eight, is left with one or two. This is the meaning of 'not unsevered'.

As to visible matter, the *anagamin* already free of attachment thereto, free of its fetters on the fifth *bhumi* (i.e., on the lowest of the *arûpyas*), is also free of attachment to the third *dhyâna*, but not to the fourth. So it goes down to the third *bhumi* (the third *dhyâna*), where the *anagamin* is free of attachment to the first *dhyâna*, but not to the second. One free of the fetters of visible matter on the second *bhumi* (the second *dhyâna*) is not yet free of the taints (*janâ*, meaning the obstacles, *nivarana*) of the first *dhyâna*.

Q. If the sensations, etc., are severed, have the fetters thereof thereby been removed?
A. Both are true of the *arhant* with respect to sensations, etc., removable whether by view or by realization in all three spheres (those of Desire, of Form and of Formlessness).

2. The *anagamin* free of attachment to *âkimcanyâyatana* (second-highest stage in the Sphere of Formlessness) is free of the fetters of sensation, etc., on all levels. And so on down to the one not yet free of attachment to the first *dhyâna*, who is free of the fetters of sensation, etc., to be eliminated by view in all three spheres and by realization on the first *bhumi* (i.e., the first *dhyâna*).

3. The one free of attachment to *vijñânânantyâyatana* (the second stage in the Sphere of Formlessness) but not to *âkimcanyâyatana* is free also of the fetters of sensation, etc., to be eliminated by view in all three spheres and by realization on the first seven *bhûmis* (i.e., everything from the first *dhyâna* up to and including *naivasamjñânâsamjñâyatana* or *bhavagra*).

4. And so on down to the one who has not severed his attachment to the first *dhyâna* but who has severed the fetters of sensation, etc., to be eliminated by view of all three spheres and by realization on the lowest *bhumi* (i.e., the first *dhyâna*).

5. The *srota'âpanna* and the *sakrdagamin* have severed the fetters of sensation, etc., to be eliminated by view in all three spheres.

6. There are some who have severed the fetters of sensation, etc., but who still have not rid themselves of their fetters, viz., *a. kulamkula*, *b. sakrdagamin*, *c. ekavicin*. (The above is repeated about their respective levels.) This is what is meant by 'having severed the fetters but being
not yet rid of them' (yi tuan fei li hsi 乙 断非 非 聳, chinnāvitasamyojana?).

Q. We are dealing with one who rids himself of one degree or two of defilements and of the sensations, etc., that go with them. Why is he not listed under srota'pañña? Why single out the kulamkula, sakṛdāgāmin and ekāvīcika who are not yet rid of their fetters, whether they have severed them or not?

A. Where the srota'pañña is concerned, the statement does not apply to the sakalabandhāṇa ('le saint qui n’a pas coupé une des passions à couper par le chemin mondain'), but it does apply to all the other three, since the former is not necessarily destined for destruction of the said passions (aniyatavināśābhimukhya?), while the latter are destined not to destroy them (niyatavināśābhimukhya?).

Also, the srota'pañña, in the case of the severance of one or two classes of klēśa (defilement, affliction), experiences no interruption by death and rebirth (cyutuypapatti). One who has severed five classes of defilements is called a yogācārya; once he has attained to srota'pañṭīphala, he makes a great effort to eliminate his defilements on the level of the Sphere of Desire, that are to be eliminated by realization, for he can have no cyutuypapatti before eliminating the major (?) class of defilements. If he has severed five classes of defilements, there can be absolutely no cyutuypapatti for him until he has severed the sixth class as well. Since the three types, beginning with the kulamkula, invariably have cyutuypapatti, they are mentioned apart from the srota'pañña. . . .

The kulamkula is one kind of srota'pañña, the ekāvīcika one kind of sakṛdāgāmin. There are two kinds of kulamkula, those born into two kulas and those born into three. The former has severed the first four classes of defilements in the Sphere of Desire, and has the seeds of only two left; the latter, having severed the first three, has three left.

Q. Why is there no kulamkula who has severed five classes of defilements?

A. Anyone who has severed five has automatically severed six, and is thereby a sakṛdāgāmin. The sixth class is weak and cannot resist the sakṛdāgāmin, just as a thin thread is not enough to pull an elephant. The ekāvīcika is one who has severed seven or eight . . .

For the Kośa’s position, cf. LVP 6.200,206.

Samghadeva’s next sloka reads as follows:

When six are complete, he is the one who once goes and comes, While one separated from eight is said to be of One Seed. When all nine have been annihilated, he is a non-returner, For he has already left the cesspool of desire.
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The commentary is as follows: The first foot means that upon exhaustion of six varieties of defilements, to wit, the three sharp ones and the three middling ones, he is a sakramagamin. To him are left one birth above the heavens and one birth among men. When he has once gone and come back, he shall achieve parinirvana. This is why he is called sakramagamin. The second foot means that upon the exhaustion of eight varieties he is an ekabijn. To him is left but one birth, which is why he is called ekabijn (‘of one seed’). The third foot means that upon the exhaustion of all nine he is called anagamin. He is called that because he does not come back to the Sphere of Desire. The reason is that he is finally out of the cesspool (quagmire) of desire.

Narendrayasas has verses that say in effect the same thing as those of Samghadeva, as well as a commentary that begins and ends virtually the same way. His commentary to the second foot, however, is different enough to merit separate treatment. ‘One separated from eight is of one seed’ he explains by saying that ‘one seed’ (ekam bijam) means the seed of one birth (yi sheng chung tzu – 生種子, ekasyā jāter bijam?). ‘Such a man has but one remaining birth, whether among gods or among men.’

The last expression (jo jen jo t’ien 當人若天, representing manusyesu và devesu vā?) is followed by the expression yi chung yi chung tzu 一種一種子, which, if not a copyist’s error, is tautological. The first yi has the variant reading erh = , ‘two’, which may simply be a clumsy way of saying that there are two kinds of rebirth, one among gods, one among men, erh chung = 種 standing for something such as dvayor vidhyoh. If that is the reading then the yi chung tzu that follows begins the next sentence, which reads, ‘“One seed” means one seed among men, one seed among gods.’ The next sentence is also a bit opaque, for it reads huo fan nao ch’a piēh ming yi chung tzu 或煑煑別名一種子, which I take to be a literal translation of something such as atha vā klesavisesa ekabijam ity ucya, signifying, possibly, that there is one particular kind of defilement—or, rather, residue of defilement—called ‘one seed’. That is followed by something even more opaque: tang chih ssu-t’o-han kuo chang sheng tao she 填如斯等會中聖道, which may represent the following: srota’āpatti-phalenāryamārgah samgrhyata iti jñātavyam. Again, if I am right, the text is saying what there seems to be no need to say, namely, that the srota’āpanna belongs to the āryamārga, i.e., that he is no longer of the world. As already stated, the remainder of Narendrayasas’s commentary is more or less the same as Samghadeva’s.

Samghavarman, as already indicated, expresses the same idea in three slokas, each followed by its own commentary. The first reads thus:
One who has severed six classes of defilements
And who, on the path of view, has severed all
Is called a sakrdāgāmin,
Which means that he has not yet gone forward (?).

The commentary says, in effect, the following: If one has severed, on the plane of the Sphere of Desire, the ‘upper three and the middle three’ (i.e., adhimātra and madhya) among the defilements to be eliminated by realization, as well as all of the defilements to be eliminated by view, if one resides in the Fruit in question without going forward (?), one is called a sakrdāgāmin.

Q. What does that word mean?
A. It means that, when his life has come to an end, he is born as a god in the Sphere of Desire, then returns once to the world of men, after which he experiences parinirvāna.

The next sloka reads as follows:

If, having severed seven or eight classes,
One achieves faculties that counteract them,
Then, for the rest, one shall experience but one rebirth,
And shall be called a person of ‘one seed’.

Commentary: Anyone who has severed, within the Sphere of Desire, seven or eight classes of those defilements to be eliminated through realization, as well as all of those to be eliminated through view, thereby gains the faculties free of outflows (sraddhā, virya, smṛti, samādhi, prajñā, anājñātam ājñāsyāmi, ājñā, ājñātāvi, known collectively as anāsravendriyāni wu lou ken 萬有盡)) that counteract them. Anyone destined for a single rebirth is called a person of ‘one seed’ (yi chung-tzu 一種子, ekābijin).

There are three contributing causes, no one of which may be missing if a person is to be an ekābijin.23 A devaikābijin is born once as a god and then achieves parinirvāna. The same is true, mutatis mutandis, of a manusyaikābijin. He is called ekābijin because he bears the seed of but one birth more.

Q. Why is a person an ekābijin for severing eight classes of defilements while one who has severed five is not a kulamkula?
A. Even if one who severed six classes of defilements were a kulamkula, he would still be reborn in the Sphere of Desire, which means that the karmakleśas of that sphere are no obstacle (to the achievement within that sphere of the status of a kulamkula).24 The ekābijin, on the other hand, an ekābijin who had eliminated all nine classes of defilements,
would be born in the Sphere of Form, which means that the karmakleśas of the Sphere of Desire would definitely be an obstacle (to rebirth in that sphere). The ekābijin is a superior sakṛdāgāmin.

The third śloka reads as follows:

One who has eliminated nine classes is a non-returner.
It is to be known that there are many kinds,
Whether five, or seven, or eight,
While some say that they are more numerous yet.

This leads to the topic of the anāgāmin proper, a subject to which a separate study has been devoted.

NOTES:
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2. Willemen 71 (104) translates as follows: ‘After the highest worldly dharma one is certain to produce a patient acceptance of dharma. After the patient acceptance one produces the knowledge. Both realize the lower suffering.' While Mr. Willemen’s interpretation, at the beginning, makes more sense, my own is, I believe, defended by the three commentaries, all of which gloss tz’u ْx with tz’u ti ْx.

3. Narendrayāsas and Saṅghavarman mention that, by seeing the supreme worldly dharmas in the Sphere of Desire, one severs ten defilements (anusaya), to wit, a. the false view of a substantial personality (satkayadrsti), b. the views of the two extremes (antagrāhadrsti, viz., those of the impossibility of self-extrication from the worldly round, śāsvatavāda, and of the denial of reincarnation, uchedavāda), c. the false view that one’s deeds have no bearing on one’s destiny (mithyadrsti), d. the equally false view that one may pick and choose one’s beliefs at will (dntiparamārśa), e. the no less false view that one may attain to deliverance by the religious practices and rituals of one’s own choice (vilavataparāmāri), f. lust (for the unwholesome, rāga), g. malice (towards the wholesome, pratigha), h. delusion (as to the object of f. and g. moha), i. pride (as to one’s own imagined religious attainment, māna), j. doubt (as to the validity of the Buddha’s teachings, vucikṣa). In this context, shih ْx, usually kleśa, here represents, rather, anusaya.

4. If this, indeed, is the meaning of pu tso pu hsing pu hsing 不作 不向 不行.

5. The word ‘certainties’ in the first sentence renders ting ْx, which is, without much doubt, niyama or nityāma. What this seems to mean is that, given a certain condition in the laukikāgradharma, a certain fixed condition must also obtain with respect to duhkhadharmakśānti, and that there is no room for uncertainty or for any alternative.
The only analogue I can find is in *Abhidharmamahāvibhasa* 3 (T27.13c), whose contents might be paraphrased as follows: *Laukikāgradharma* and *duḥkhadharmakṣaṇī* have four points at which they coincide (*su shih teng* 殊勝* tatasrah samatāḥ*), namely,

a. Equality of ground (*ti teng* 提* bhūmisamatāḥ*). By this is meant that, whatever the ground on which one attains *duḥkhadharmakṣaṇī* that is also the ground on which one attained *laukikāgradharma*.

b. Equality of base (*ken ik teng* 興* āśrayasamatāḥ*). Whatever the base(s) connected (*hsiang yingt* 光* samprayukta) with *duḥkhadharmakṣaṇī*, they are also the ones connected with *laukikāgradharma*. (If one wonders what is the difference between *bhūmi* and *āśraya*, it is more than possible that *ken*, here as elsewhere, represents *indriya* after all, but in the broader, rather than in the narrower, sense.)

c. *Hsing i* = *teng*. Here, however, as in the case of Samghabhadra, the context does not indicate the meaning of the first syllable, a many-faceted word. The difficulty is compounded by the commentary, in which *hsing hsiang* 聲 is used as a verb. *Hsing hsiang* is, to be sure, used in Hsüan-tsang’s translations, but it seldom is an exact equivalent for a Sanskrit term. The cases that I have been able to verify use the word to represent *prakāra* and *ākāra*, respectively. The meaning appears to be the manner in which ——— behaves or appears to behave. Here, however, it is being used as a verb, which makes it difficult to construe. May it possibly represent *ākārayati*, used in the sense of marking or of characterizing an aspect?

d. ‘Equality of object’ (*so yuan f* 其* alambanasamatāḥ*) seems to mean that what was the object (*ching* 其* viṣaya) of one’s attention in the one case if likewise so in the other.

6. I am not certain of having fully understood what has been rephrased above. The ‘puzzling’ statement is endorsed by the *Abhidharma-Kośa*. Cf. LVP 6.166.

7. Mr. Willemen refers to p. 84 of his own work, where one reads, ‘These three knowledges (*dharmajnāna, anvaya*, *samvṛtijnāna*) comprise all knowledges. Among them, knowledge of dharma is called the pure knowledge that takes as its range suffering, origination, cessation and the path within the realm of desire. Because in its range one experiences for the first time the characteristics of dharma, it is called knowledge of dharma.’ I have taken some liberties with Mr. Willemen’s English, which is occasionally less than it should be.

8. *Chüeh ting* 舊 almost certainly stands for *niyama* or *niyāma*. Cf. LVP 6.180. If I have understood correctly, *niyama* is *nirvāṇa*, while *niyāma* is the quality of having *nirvāṇa* as one’s sole object. LVP has, in the notes to 6.180-3, a great deal of additional information including material on *niyama niyāma niyāma*, a word of obviously uncertain etymology that has given rise to much fanciful speculation.

9. The *avarabhāgiyasamyojanāṇī* are the mistaken view of a substantial personality (*saktāyadrṣṭī*), the mistaken view that the religious observances of one’s own choice (Brahmanical ones are meant) will conduce to salvation (*śīlavrataparāmarśa*), doubt as to the validity of the Buddha’s Doctrine (*vivikṣā*), lustful attachment to the Sphere of Desire (specifically sexual desire, *kāmacchanda*) and malice (*vyāpāda*).

10. The chief difficulty is that one is here dealing with the sixteenth *abhisamaya*, by which time the *darśanamārga* has presumably been left behind. That, at least, is the position of the *Kośa*, a position with which the present text appears to disagree. The nine categories of bonds, mentioned above on all levels, that of the Sphere of Desire, of the four *dhyānas* and of the four *ārūpyas*. 27
11. Best explained in LVP 4.3 sq., no. 2: "Lorsqu’un homme ordonne un assassinat, il n’accomplit pas le geste par lequel le meurtre est perpétré; l’ordre qu’il donne est seulement un préparatif de meurtre; il n’est pas coupable de "l’information corporelle de meurtre". Mais, (4) au moment où meurt l’assassiné, une "non-information" de meurtre naît en lui: il est, de ce fait, coupable de meurtre." ‘Non-information’ is LVP’s equivalent for avīñāpti.

12. This refers to a distribution of the ten basic anusayas among the Three Spheres. The ten are a) satkāyadrṣṭi, the view either that the death of the body is all-final, i.e., a denial of reincarnation, or that a termination of reincarnation is impossible, i.e., a denial of nirvāṇa, c) mithyādṛṣṭi, ‘false view’ specifically the view that the moral (or immoral) quality of one’s acts will have no effect on one’s next incarnation, d) drṣṭiparāmarśa, the notion that one may have what views one pleases, with no significant effects, d) śīlāvataprāmarśa, arbitrary choice of disciplinary codes and of vows, specifically of Brahmanical vows and practices, with a mistaken belief in their efficacy, f) rāga, desire for the unwholesome, g) dvesa, abhorrence of the wholesome, h) moha, inability to distinguish between the two, i) māna, pride, specifically the false ascription to oneself of specific degrees of enlightenment and/or sainthood, j) vicikitsā, doubt as to the truth of the Buddha’s teachings. In the Sphere of Desire, all alike have to do with the First Noble Truth (10); all but a), b) and d) with the Second (7) and Third (7); all but a) and b) with the Fourth (8). In the two upper spheres the situation is the same, except for the total absence of g). Thus, in the Sphere of Desire one has 32, in the Sphere of Form 28 and in the Sphere of Formlessness 28, yielding a total of 88.

13. Anāgāmya, as already indicated, is the stage preparatory to the First Dhyāna. In the context, srotaāpattiphala can refer only to pratipatti, while ‘dwell...’ refers to the phala itself. Anāgāmya is my rendition of wei chi hsing 菩提心, meaningless on the face of it, but where I read chin 前 for chi, on the basis both of the verse and of a variant reading. If I have understood this correctly, it means that a srotaāpattiphala pratipannaka is one who has rid himself of all eighty-eight anusāṇamarga, while srotaāpanna is one who has reached anāgāmya. This is possible, of course, only if one assumes that there is a hsien (7) missing before hsü-t'o-huan kuo 惹誘願果.

14. Ch. san chieh 弥陀. I do not know the basis of this question, but see below.

15. The Chinese word used here is shih 世, whose literal meaning, in the present context, is ‘something that sends one about on errands’, in this case fruitless, even harmful, ones.

16. ‘Inclarity’ renders wu ming 无明, usually the equivalent of avidyā, but here plainly standing for moha, ‘delusion’, specifically the inability to distinguish the wholesome from the unwholesome. The ‘five views’ are the first five anusayas. ‘Lust’ here renders ai 色, the usual equivalent of trṣṇā, lit. ‘thirst’, but here standing for rāga. ‘Anger’ renders yi 炎 one of the equivalents of dvesa. Although the Skt. word and unmistakably means ‘hatred’, all Ch. versions, without exception, render it with ‘anger’. Plainly, there is something at work here that we do not fully understand.

17. ‘Prime mover’ renders chuan 人, representing pravartaka, while ‘secondary mover’ renders sui chuan 人, which, in turn, represents anvartaka. Cf. LVP 4.35-40.

18. The seven are those of a. mindfulness (smṛti, nien chüeh chih 明妙), b. dharma selection (i.e., the sorting out of the wholesome and of the unwholesome, dharmaprajñāya, tse fa 智法), c. exertion (virya, ching chin 努力), d. zest (prītis, hsi 激), e. relaxedness
It is impossible to say whether ch'iyi ting 七 俠 represents saptasrayaniyamāḥ or sapta dhyanasrayah. In either case, I do not know what is meant. As for āryamārga, I presume it to refer to seven members of the Noble Eightfold Path, but I do not know which.

Again, which seven?
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(āma)', interpreting niyāma as if it were nirāma, i.e., ni + rāma. For more on this somewhat puzzling word, cf. n. 8 and the literature cited there. The same comment applies to the paragraph bestriding pp. 17 and 18. N. 8 mentions chūeh ting, a more rational equivalent of niyama (niyāma, nyāma). It is unlikely that, at the time these translations were made, the Chinese knew, or even suspected, that chüeh ting and li sheng represented the same original. The whole expression refers to the attainment of certainty.