

国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要
第 28 号 (令和 6 年)

Journal of the International College
for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies
Vol. XXVIII, 2024

Definitions of *Sāsrava* in the Sarvāstivāda
Hṛdaya Treatises: Part 1

Yosuke Fujimoto

Definitions of *Sāsrava* in the Sarvāstivāda *Hṛdaya* Treatises: Part 1*

Yosuke Fujimoto

1.1. Introduction

Sāsrava and *anāsrava* are two key religious concepts in Buddhism.¹ Generally, *sāsrava* refers to anything entangled in *saṃsāra*, the cycle of birth and death, while *anāsrava* refers to supra-mundane things such as *nirvāṇa* and the special abilities or virtues that enable one to attain it. Although the two terms were not commonly used as a pair in early Buddhism, a later Abhidharmic trend, notably the Sarvāstivāda's ontology of *dharmas*, introduced and emphasized the dichotomy of these two categories. The Sarvāstivādins hold that all phenomena consist of certain combinations of basic factors (*dharma*), and all the factors are, without exception, classified

* This paper is a revised version of part of chapter 3 of my doctoral dissertation, “Setsuissaiubu ni okeru urohō to murohō no teigi to sono tenkai” 説一切有部における有漏法と無漏法の定義とその展開 [Definitions of *Sāsrava* and *Anāsrava* Factors in the Sarvāstivāda School and their Development], submitted to Waseda University in November 2021, and is partly based on a draft presented at the XIXth Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (IABS), held at Seoul National University on August 16, 2022. I am grateful to Dr. Meghan Howard Masang for correcting my English and for many helpful comments and suggestions. Of course, all remaining errors are my responsibility.

This paper was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP23KJ2058.

¹ Grammatically, *sāsrava* is an adjective formed by combining the prefix *sa-* (“with”) and the noun *āsrava* (“outflow”) and literally means “with outflows,” while *anāsrava*, which is derived from the prefix *an-* (“-less”) and the noun *āsrava*, is always taken as a *bahuvrīhi*-compound meaning “without outflows.” These Sanskrit terms could perhaps be more appropriately rendered as “impure” and “pure” or “tainted” and “untainted,” but in this paper I will leave the terms untranslated for the sake of clarity and simplicity.

as either *sāsrava* or *anāsrava*.

From the time of the *Prakaraṇapāda* (circa 2nd century BCE) onward, the Sarvāstivādins treated the concepts of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* factors as major doctrinal terms. The *Samyuktāgama* (hereafter SĀ) nos. 56 and 229, which are the only two known texts that explain these two terms in the *Āgamas*, were most probably created in this context.² As suggested by SĀ no. 56, the earlier Sarvāstivādins are thought to have defined *sāsrava* factors as factors concerning which mental afflictions (*kleśa*) arise, i.e., those that become the object of mental afflictions, and *anāsrava* factors as the opposite.³ This traditional view of the two concepts was inherited in the **Mahāvibhāṣā* (*Āpīdāmó dà pípóshā lùn* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論, circa 2nd century CE, hereafter MV) but was modified in a rather complicated way. The Sarvāstivādins developed their view of *sāsrava* in the course of disputes over the nature of the Buddha's body on the one hand, and they put forward various definitions of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* factors on the other. Defining these two concepts remained one of the major doctrinal issues in later Abhidharma compendia, such as Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (circa 4th–5th century CE, hereafter AKBh).

In this series of papers, I will examine how *sāsrava* is defined in the Sarvāstivāda *hṛdaya* treatises, an important series of texts that preceded AKBh, and attempt to locate their definitions properly in the history of Sarvāstivāda thought by comparing them with those found in MV and other related texts.⁴

² These two texts have no counterpart in the Pāli canon.

³ The earlier Sarvāstivādins may not have preserved SĀ no. 56 as a physical medium, but they undoubtedly held the idea as presented in this *sūtra*. For more information on the textual formation and interpretation of SĀ no. 56 in the Sarvāstivāda tradition, see Fujimoto 2022a.

⁴ In his small article (Katō 1973, partly included in Katō 1987, 252–255; 1989, 228–232), Katō Junshō first examined the definitions of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* in the Sarvāstivāda literature. He briefly outlines their development from the Āgamic sources to AKBh. However, he does not address SĀ nos. 56 and 229. Furthermore,

1.2. The *Hṛdaya* Treatises

The Abhidharma texts of the Sarvāstivāda school have survived almost exclusively in the Chinese translation made by Xuánzàng (玄奘, 602–664), and they generally represent the views of the Kāśmīra Sarvāstivāda. However, there is a group of three texts in the Chinese Buddhist canon that were translated before Xuánzàng. These texts are:

1. **Abhidharmahṛdaya* (*Āpítán xīn lùn* 阿毘曇心論, hereafter AH), in 4 fascicles, composed by *Dharmaśrī/Dharmaśreṣṭhin (法勝) in circa 200 CE and translated by *Saṅghadeva (僧伽提婆) and Huiyüān 慧遠 in 391.⁵
2. **Abhidharmahṛdayasūtra*⁶ (*Āpítán xīn lùn jīng* 阿毘曇心論經, hereafter AHS), in 6 fascicles, composed by *Upaśānta (優波扇多) in circa 300 CE and translated by *Narendrayaśas (那連提耶舍) in 563.⁷
3. **Mīśrakābhīdharmahṛdaya* (*Zā āpítán xīn lùn* 雜阿毘曇心論, hereafter MAH), in 11 fascicles, composed by *Dharmatrāta (法救) between roughly 300 and 400 CE and translated by *Saṅghavarman (僧伽跋摩) in 434.⁸

his analysis of the definitions of *sāsrava* factors in MV and in the *hṛdaya* treatises is far from satisfactory.

⁵ See Watanabe *et al.* 1976b, 121–122, and Willemen *et al.* 1998, 255–257. The date of composition of AH remains open to discussion. For a survey of the opinions about the dating of this text, see Xuan 2015, especially 286–289.

⁶ The Chinese title includes the word *jīng* 經, but it is unlikely that the original title included the word *sūtra* or any similar equivalents, because the text is not written in the conventional Buddhist *sūtra* style. However, I will use the title **Abhidharmahṛdayasūtra* and its abbreviation AHS in this paper expediently to distinguish it from AH.

⁷ See Watanabe *et al.* 1976b, 125–126, and Willemen *et al.* 1998, 259.

⁸ See Watanabe *et al.* 1976a, 22–25, and Willemen *et al.* 1998, 260–263. On the

AH is a concise compendium of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma. It is the earliest known Abhidharma texts that was written in the form of verse and commentary and is systematically structured into several core chapters. The other two texts, AHS and MAH, are commentaries on *Dharmaśrī's verses but introduce a certain number of modifications and additions to them. These works are collectively referred to as the "*hṛdaya* treatises" due to the presence of the word "*hṛdaya*" (心, lit. "heart") in their titles. Among these, MAH holds particular significance as it provided the compositional basis for AKBh.

The *hṛdaya* treatises have not received much scholarly attention to date, but they are just as significant as Xuánzàng's translations. These treatises are believed to have been composed in Gandhāra or its adjoining areas and are expected to provide valuable information about the non-Kāśmīra Sarvāstivāda doctrines. From this standpoint, this study uncovers the unique characteristics of the definitions of *sāsrava* in the *hṛdaya* treatises as well as their similarities with the Sarvāstivāda orthodoxy. The present publication, part 1 of the full paper, will address *Dharmaśrī's definition of *sāsrava* factors in AH from both philological and philosophical perspectives. A future part 2 will examine the definitions by *Upaśānta and *Dharamtrāta found in AHS and MAH, respectively.

2. The Definitions of *Sāsrava* in the **Mahāvibhāṣā*

Before discussing the definitions of *sāsrava* in the *hṛdaya* treatises, let us briefly review how the concept is defined in MV to establish a basis for comparison. As noted earlier, the text presents two main contexts that suggest or imply how the Sarvāstivādins define *sāsrava*.

reconstructed Sanskrit title **Miśrakābhīdharmahṛdaya*, see also Harada 1993, 107, n. (1), and Fukuda 2003, 261–262, n. 14.

The first context is a series of controversies over the nature of the Buddha's body, where the Sarvāstivādin proponent argues that the Buddha's body is *sāsrava*, while the opposing schools such as the Mahāsāṅghikas claim that it is *anāsrava*. The Sarvāstivādins formulate their arguments in a logical manner, presupposing their own definition of *sāsrava* in each proof. MV includes three such controversies in different parts of the text (T 1545, 229a15–b21; 391c21–392b17; 871c1–872b2), that have a common structure. However, as the text progresses from the first to the third, the number of arguments presented by both sides increases, and the technical terms used are slightly altered. This implies that the first controversy developed into the second and then further into the third over time, and that the Sarvāstivādin definition of *sāsrava*, which is presupposed in their proof, was also modified over the course of these controversies. On an earlier occasion, I analyzed the proponent's proofs that the Buddha's body is *sāsrava* and derived the following three definitions of *sāsrava* as presupposed by the Sarvāstivādin proponent:⁹

Definition [1]: Anything that produces mental afflictions (*kleśa*) in others (i.e., anything that becomes the object of mental afflictions of others) is *sāsrava*.

Definition [2]: Anything that produces *āsravas* in others (i.e., anything that becomes the object of *āsravas* of others) and is produced by *āsravas* is *sāsrava*.

Definition [3]: Anything that increases *āsravas* in others and is produced by *āsravas* is *sāsrava*.

Revisions from definitions [1] to [3] can be explained as a line of development. In the first controversy, the Sarvāstivādin defined *sāsrava* as

⁹ See Fujimoto 2022b.

in definition [1], which is in accordance with SĀ no. 56. Later, in the second controversy, they defined *sāsrava* as in definition [2] by adopting the term *āsrava* (漏) for individual mental afflictions and adding a new characteristic of being produced by *āsravas*. Finally, in the third controversy, they defined *sāsrava* as in definition [3] by introducing the verb “to increase” (增) instead of “to produce” (生).

On the other hand, in another context, MV provides a list of eight definitions of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* factors. Since the list is introduced immediately after the second controversy over the nature of the Buddha’s body, the definitions in the list are closely related to definitions [1] to [3] used in the controversies. Recently, I have shown that the eight definitions were developed gradually, partly in line with or under the influence of the development of definitions [1] to [3].¹⁰

Thus, although MV contains various definitions of *sāsrava*, definitions [1] to [3] can be regarded as the most orthodox for the Sarvāstivādins, since they are adopted in the proofs for the *sāsrava* nature of the body of the Buddha, the most authoritative figure of Buddhism. Therefore, I believe it is appropriate to choose definitions [1] to [3] as the basis for our comparison with those proposed in the *hṛdaya* treatises.

3.1. *Dharmaśrī’s Definition of *Sāsrava*

Next, let us investigate how *Dharmaśrī defines *sāsrava*. His definition of *sāsrava* factors is found in Chapter 1, verse 4, as follows:

¹⁰ See Fujimoto 2024. Katō Junshō already pointed out the possibility that the Sarvāstivādin argument claiming that the Buddha’s body is *sāsrava* was closely related to the list of definitions of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* factors in MV (Katō 1987, 255–256 and 265; 1989, 232 and 240). Lambert Schmithausen also mentions these two contexts in his discussion of the term *sāsrava* (Schmithausen 2014, §184.2.1 and §184.2.2).

AH T 1550, 809b8–15: 問. 云何是有漏法. 答.

若生諸煩惱，是聖說有漏. (1.4ab)

若於法生身見等諸煩惱，如使品說，是法說有漏. 問. 何故. 答.

所謂煩惱漏，慧者之假名. (1.4cd)

煩惱者說漏. 漏諸入故，心漏連注故，留住生死故，如非人所持故，是故說有漏.

Question: What are the *sāsrava* factors? Answer:

Anything in/concerning which mental afflictions arise is called *sāsrava* by the Noble. (1.4ab)

If mental afflictions, such as the view of the [five] aggregates [as being the self] (身見, **satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*), and so on, as explained in the chapter on obsession (使, **amanuṣya*), arise in/concerning any factor, that factor is called *sāsrava*. Question: Why? Answer:

[Because] what are called mental afflictions are *āsravas*, and [this is] a provisional designation used by the wise. (1.4cd)

Mental afflictions are called *āsravas*. Because [mental afflictions] leak from the sense bases (入, **āyatana*), because [they] diffuse the mind incessantly,¹¹ because [they] keep [sentient beings] within birth and death, and because [they cause sentient beings to act] as if they were controlled by the unhuman (非人, **amanuṣya*),¹² [these mental afflictions are] therefore called *āsravas*.¹³

Here I have tentatively translated the conjunction *ruò* 若 in verse

¹¹ The phrase *xīn lòu liánzhù* 心漏連注 is syntactically uncertain. I interpret this phrase tentatively based on the similar passage from AS (= Li 2019, 54): *cittavisārasrutikaraṇārthena*; AS(Ch.) T 1605, 678a6–7: 令心連注流散不絕故名爲漏; cf. ASBh 59, 17: *cittavisāraṃ srutaṃ kurvāntīy āsravāḥ*.

¹² Cf. MV T 1545, 244b10–13; AV T 1546, 189c16–19; V T 1547, 425b17–20.

¹³ I take the word *yōulòu* 有漏 here to mean *āsrava* (see also footnote 39). My translation of this passage is partly based on Willemen 2006, 24. A French translation is found in Armelin 1978, 53.

1.4a and its commentary in two different ways (“in/concerning”) based on an assumed Sanskrit text. As will be demonstrated in the following sections, verse 1.4ab in Sanskrit exhibits a relative-correlative structure, with the relative element in the locative case, to which *ruò* 若 corresponds. Moreover, there are two possible interpretations of this Sanskrit locative, which is crucial to determining the meaning of the verse. This information is difficult to deduce from the Chinese translation alone. Therefore, to understand the verse accurately, we need to base our analysis on the Sanskrit original. In what follows, I will attempt to reconstruct the underlying Sanskrit of verse 1.4ab, at least at the syntactic level.

3.2. The Sanskrit Reconstruction of Verse 1.4ab

Regarding verse 1.4ab, there are several pieces of textual evidence that can be used to determine its exact wording in Sanskrit. First, the Chinese conjunction *ruò* 若 is often used to translate the Sanskrit relative pronoun *yad* (or its equivalent element), and in this case the Chinese demonstrative *shì* 是 corresponds to its correlative *tad*. Based on this usage, we can tentatively postulate a relative-correlative structure in verse 1.4ab. Secondly, *Dharmaśī himself glosses the conjunction *ruò* 若 as *ruò yú fǎ* 若於法 in his auto-commentary. The Chinese preposition *yú* 於 is typically used to express the Sanskrit locative case, so the gloss *yú fǎ* 於法 is generally traced to the Sanskrit locative noun *dharme*. This indicates the presence of a locative for the conjunction *ruò* 若, which is glossed by *yú fǎ* 於法 (**dharme*). Additionally, as will be addressed in Part 2, AHS translates the same verse as 若處生煩惱.¹⁴ As the Chinese word *chū* 處 means “place,” *ruò chū* 若處 supports the assumption of the Sanskrit locative.¹⁵ Based on

¹⁴ AHS T 1551, 834b14–15: 若處生煩惱, 是聖說有漏。以彼漏名故, 慧者說煩惱。(1.4)

¹⁵ Hirakawa *et al.* 1997, 1010, gives *yatra* under 若處.

these Chinese renderings, the conjunction *ruò* 若 here can be considered as translating a Sanskrit relative element in the locative case, specifically *yatra* or *yasmin*. If this is the case, the Chinese verb *shēng* 生 here likely translates an intransitive verb such as *ut-√pad-* (“to arise”) in Sanskrit.

This assumption is further supported by the following passage from Sthiramati’s **Tattvārthā* (hereafter TA), where he quotes two definitions of *sāsrava* factors by two masters who are seemingly **Dharmaśrī* and **Dharmatrāta*:

TA D 26b3–4/P 32a8–b1 (ad AKBh 3, 12): *slob dpon gzhan dag na re gang la nyon mongs pa skye bar ’gyur ba de zag pa dang bcas pa yin te / gang la nyon mongs <pa> ’phel ’gyur ba // de ni zag <pa> dang bcas par brjod / ces zer ba de dgag pa’i phyir (D; phyir / P) ’gog pa dang lam gyi bden pa la dmigs pas kyang zag pa skye bar ni ’dod mod kyi zhe bya ba la sogs pa gzungs te /*

Other masters state that anything in/concerning¹⁶ which (*gang la*, **yatra*) mental afflictions arise is *sāsrava*. [Yet other masters] argue that anything in/concerning which mental afflictions increase (*’phel ’gyur ba*, **√ṛdh-*) is *sāsrava*. To negate these claims, [Vasubandhu] says that **it is true that āsravas arise also having as their object the truth of cessation and [the truth of] the path**, and so on.¹⁷

Although no specific attribution is provided, the first definition agrees well with **Dharmaśrī*’s verse 1.4ab.¹⁸ Specifically, the Tibetan *gang la*

¹⁶ Just as in the case of verse 1.4a of AH, I have translated the locative expression *gang la* in two different ways because there are two possible interpretations for it. See section 3.4.

¹⁷ AKBh 3, 12 (ad AK 1.4ab): *kāmaṃ nirodhamārgasatyālambanā apy āsravā upajāyante ...*

¹⁸ In his **Lakṣaṇānusāriṇī* (hereafter LA), a commentary to AKBh,

corresponds to the Chinese *ruò* 若, *nyon mongs pa* to *fānnǎo* 煩惱, *skye bar 'gyur ba* to *shēng* 生, *de* to *shì* 是, and *zag pa dang bcas pa* to *yǒulòu* 有漏, respectively. The Japanese translation of the Sanskrit manuscript of TA attributes the former master to Dharmatrāta,¹⁹ but, as will be discussed at length in Part 2, the second definition agrees well with Dharmatrāta's verse.²⁰ In light of the correspondence between the Chinese and Tibetan texts, it is reasonable to ascribe the first view to *Dharmaśrī and the second view to *Dharmatrāta. Therefore, based on the corresponding Tibetan text, we can reconstruct with higher certainty the Sanskrit wording of *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4ab as follows:

Table 1

Ch.	若	生	諸煩惱	是	(聖說)有漏
Tib.	<i>gang la</i>	<i>skye bar 'gyur ba</i>	<i>nyon mongs pa</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>zag pa dang bcas pa</i>
Skt.	* <i>yad</i> (loc.)	* <i>ut-</i> √ <i>pad-</i> or * <i>upa-</i> √ <i>jan-</i>	* <i>kleśa</i> (nom.)	* <i>tad</i>	* <i>sāsrava</i>

Thus, verse 1.4a can be confidently handled as a locative relative

Pūrṇavardhana quotes the same definition and ascribes it to the older Sautrāntikas. LA D 17a4–5/P 20b8–21a1 (ad AKBh 3, 12): *mdo sde pa snga rabs rnam gang du nyon mongs pa skye bar 'gyur ba de ni zag pa dang bcas pa 'o zhe 'o // de dgag pa 'i phyir / 'gog pa dang lam gyi bden pa la dmigs pas kyang zhes bya ba la sogs pa smos te /* (The older Sautrāntikas argue that anything in/concerning which mental afflictions arise is *sāsrava*. To negate this [view], [Vasubandhu] states that **it is true that āsravas arise also having as their object the truth of cessation and [the truth of] the path**, and so on).

¹⁹ Odani *et al.* 2012, 5: 『雑阿毘曇心論』の著者は言う。「煩惱が生ずる場所、それが有漏である」と。しかし他の者は言う。「諸規範師たちは、煩惱が増長する場所、それが有漏であると述べる」と。

²⁰ MAH T 1552, 871a15–16: 若増諸煩惱，是聖說有漏。以彼漏名故，惠者説煩惱。(1.4)

clause, which consists of a locative relative element (*yatra* or *yasmin*), an intransitive verb meaning “to arise” (such as *ut-√pad-* or *upa-√jan-*), and a noun *kleśa* in the nominative case. Accordingly, verse 1.4b can be understood as its correlative clause, including at least a correlative pronoun *tad* and an adjective *sāsrava*. Here we can assume a basic construction like, for example, **yatra kleśā utpadyate saḥ sāsravaḥ* in Sanskrit, without addressing the question of metre.²¹

3.3. The Background of Verse 1.4ab

If the above reconstruction of *Dharmaśrī’s verse 1.4ab is accurate, an important point comes to the fore: There is a syntactical similarity with SĀ no. 56. Fortunately, the full text of this *sūtra* is quoted in *Śamathadeva’s **Abhidharmakośopāyikā* (hereafter AKUp) as follows:

AKUp D 6a4–7/P 6b7–7a4: *de nas bcom ldan ’das kyis dge slong rnams la bos nas bka’ stsal pa / dge slong dag legs par rab tu nyon la yid la zung shig dang / zag pa dang bcas pa dang zag pa med pa ’i chos rnams bshad par bya’o // zag pa dang bcas pa ’i chos rnams gang zhe na / gzugs gang ’das pa dang ma ’ongs pa dang (P; dang / D) da ltar byung ba la rjes su chags pa dang khong khro ba skye ba dang / ji srid du tshor ba dang / ’du shes dang / ’du byed dang / rnam par shes pa ’das pa dang (D; dang / P) ma ’ongs pa dang da ltar byung ba la rjes su chags pa dang khong khro ba skye ba ’di ni zag pa dang bcas pa zhes bya’o // gzugs gang ’das pa dang ma ’ongs pa dang da ltar byung ba la rjes su chags pa dang khong khro ba mi skye ba dang / ji srid du tshor ba dang / ’du shes dang / ’du byed dang / rnam par shes pa ’das pa dang / ma ’ongs*

²¹ Armelin 1978, 53 reconstructs verse 1.4ab to *yat kim cit kleśasambhavam tat sāsravam iti ucyate budhaiḥ*, but this inaccurately assumes a nominative relative clause.

pa dang (P; *dang* / D) *da ltar byung ba la rjes su chags pa dang khong khro ba mi skye ba 'di ni zag pa med pa zhes bya'o //*

Then the Blessed One said to the monks: “Monks, listen carefully and bear in mind [what I shall expound to you]. I will now teach [you] *sāsrava* and *anāsrava dharmas*.²² What are *sāsrava dharmas*? If affection or hostility arises in/concerning²³ any form, be it past, future, or present, and likewise if affection or hostility arises in/concerning [any] feeling ... perception ... formations ... consciousness, be it past, future, or present, these are called *sāsrava dharmas*. If neither affection nor anger arises in/concerning any form, be it past, future, or present, and likewise if neither affection nor anger arises in/concerning [any] feeling ... perception ... formations ... consciousness, be it past, future, or present, these are called *anāsrava dharmas*.²⁴

The definition of *sāsrava dharmas* is relatively similar in content to *Dharmaśrī’s verse 1.4ab, and this is more so when viewed from the Sanskrit perspective. The Sanskrit text for the *anāsrava dharma* portion is available in AKBh 196, 10–12:

Skt.: *anāsravā*²⁵ *dharmāḥ katame. yasmin rūpe 'ūtānāgata-*

²² Here I leave the word *dharma* (Tib. *chos*) untranslated because it is polysemantic and does not have the meaning of “factor” in the *Āgamas*.

²³ See footnote 16.

²⁴ My translation is partly based on Dhammadinnā 2014, 102–103. For a Japanese translation of the entire text, see Honjō 2014, 63. Cf. SĀ T 99, 13b25–c3: 爾時，世尊告諸比丘。我今當說有漏無漏法。若色有漏是取，彼色能生愛恚。如是，受想行識有漏是取，彼識能生愛恚，是名有漏法。云何無漏法。諸所有色無漏非受，彼色若過去未來現在，彼色不生愛恚，如是受想行識無漏非受，彼識若過去未來現在，不生貪恚，是名無漏法。For an English translation of this Chinese text, see Anālayo 2014, 52–53.

²⁵ *anāsravāḥ* ed.

*pratyutpanne*²⁶ *notpadyate 'nunayo vā pratigho vā yāvad yasmin vijñāne, ima ucyante 'nāsravā dharmā iti.*

This Sanskrit text perfectly matches the Tibetan translation. As the explanation of *anāsrava dharmas* stands in structural contrast with that of *sāsrava dharmas*, converting the above Sanskrit text from negative to affirmative allows for an almost complete reconstruction of the Sanskrit text of the *sāsrava dharma* portion as follows:

Skt.: **sāsravā dharmāḥ katame. yasmin rūpe 'tūtānāgatapratyutpanna utpadyate 'nunayo vā pratigho vā yāvad yasmin vijñāne, ima ucyante sāsravā dharmāḥ.*

This reconstructed Sanskrit text agrees with *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4ab from the point of view of syntax. If individual aggregates such as form are removed, and affection (*anunaya*) and hostility (*pratigha*) are generalized into mental afflictions (*kleśa*), the two texts will be virtually identical. Given that the idea of SĀ no. 56 is clearly adopted in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma canon,²⁷ it is reasonable to suppose that this *sūtra* served as the scriptural basis for *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4ab.

The hypothesis that *Dharmaśrī relied on some scriptural sources here is also backed up by the Chinese phrase *shèng shuō* 聖說 ("taught by the Noble") in verse 1.4b. As the term *shèng* 聖 (**ārya*, "noble") typically refers to the Buddha and his disciples,²⁸ *shèng shuō* 聖說 serves to show

²⁶ *-pratyutpanne* em. [AKBh(Tib.) D 169a5/P 194a2: *gzugs 'das pa dang ma 'ongs pa dang da ltar byung ba gang dang rnam par shes pa 'i bar gang la*; AKBh(X) T 1558, 69a5–6: 於過去未來現在諸所有色; AKBh(Z) T 1559, 226c12–13: 若色過去現世未來, 於中]: *-pratyutpanno* ed.

²⁷ See footnote 3.

²⁸ Cf. DhSk T 1537, 464c11–12: 佛及弟子名爲聖 (The Buddha and [his] disciples are called the noble).

that what is stated in verse 1.4ab is authorized by them, i.e., it has a scriptural basis. Additionally, *Dharmaśrī's separate composition of verse 1.4cd, where he equates mental afflictions (*kleśa*) with *āsravas*, can also imply his dependence on some scriptural sources. From verse 1.4 in its entirety, it is evident that *Dharmaśrī aims to provide a derivational definition of *sāsrava* by using the term *āsrava*. For this purpose, he could have used the term *āsrava* instead of *kleśa* in verse 1.4a, as in **yatrāsravā utpadyate saḥ sāsravaḥ*, but he did not. Rather, he created verse 1.4cd separately and proposed the explicit equation of mental afflictions (*kleśa*) and *āsravas* as a teaching of the wise. This separate composition is understandable only if we suppose that *Dharmaśrī derived verse 1.4ab from SĀ no. 56. Since this *sūtra* does not mention *āsravas*, *Dharmaśrī could not have used the term *āsrava* in verse 1.4a as a teaching of the Noble.

Thus, judging from the syntactical similarity between *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4ab and SĀ no. 56 and from his implication of the scriptural background in verse 1.4b, it is safe to conclude that SĀ no. 56 is the most probable candidate that underlies verse 1.4ab.

3.4. The Interpretation of the Locative in SĀ no. 56

If SĀ no. 56 served as the scriptural basis for *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4ab, how he interpreted the locative in the verse needs to be investigated. According to Saṅghabhadra's **Nyāyāmusārīṇī* (hereafter NA), there were historically at least two different interpretations of the locative expression in the above *sūtra* passage.²⁹

²⁹ I have already analyzed the two interpretations in a previous Japanese publication (Fujimoto 2022a, 49–53). However, it is useful to do so again here in English to highlight the context of the present discussion. Cf. Katō 1987, 262–263; 1989, 238–239.

NA T 1562, 331a26–b8: 無法自制，譬喻論師，違理背經，妄作是說。非有情數，離過身中所有色等，名無漏法。此必不然，違契經故。如契經言。謂，於過去未來現在諸所有色生長現貪或瞋或癡，乃至廣說。非有情數，離過身中所有色等，既能生長有情貪等。云何無漏。所以者何。無比指鬘烏盧頻螺迦葉波等，緣世尊身，生長貪瞋癡等漏故。彼計，於言非境第七，是依第七。如油於麻，爲漏所依，故名有漏。此不應理。以於去來說起現故。未曾依去來起現在貪等。是故，彼計決定非善。

Unable to control themselves at all, the Dārṣṭāntika masters go against reason, deviate from scripture, and make the following erroneous statement: “Whatever form, and so on, that does not pertain to sentient beings (非有情數, **asattvākhya*) and that belongs to the body of one who has become free from faults (離過, i.e., *arhat*) is an *anāsrava* factor.” This is certainly not the case, because it goes against the scriptures. As is stated in the scripture (SĀ no. 56), “Whatever form there is that is past, future, or present, in/concerning which there arises lust, anger, or delusion of the present, [is a *sāsrava* factor,] and so on—as is stated in detail.” Since those forms, and so on, that do not pertain to sentient beings and that belong to the body of one who has become free from faults, are able to give rise to lust, and so on, within sentient beings, how could they be *anāsrava*? Why is that? Because Anupamā, Aṅgulimāla, Uruvilvākāśyapa, and so on, [are said to have] taken the body of the Blessed One as their object and, [with regard to him,] given rise to *āsravas*, such as lust, anger, delusion, and so on. According to them (i.e., the Dārṣṭāntikas), the locative case ending (於言, lit. the preposition *yú* 於) [in the *sūtra* passage] is not a locative denoting the scope (境第七, **viśayasaptamī*) but a locative denoting the locus (依第七, **adhikaraṇasaptamī*). [Form, feeling, and so on,] are called *sāsrava* because [they] are the locus of *āsravas*, just as sesame seeds (麻, **tila*)

are [the locus] of [sesame] oil (油, **taila*).³⁰ [However,] this is untenable because the present [factors] are said to arise concerning the past and the future [factors]. Present lust, and so on, has never before arisen having the past or the future [factor] as its basis. Therefore, their opinion is definitively far from supreme.

The Dārṣṭāntikas, who seemingly proclaim themselves Sautrāntikas,³¹ argue that both external objects, such as form, that are insentient, and the body of an arhat are *anāsrava* factors. They derive this view from SĀ no. 56 by construing the locative of the expression 於過去未來現在諸所有色 (**yasmin rūpe 'ūtānāgatapratyutpanne*) as a locative denoting the locus (*adhikaraṇasaptamī*). In this interpretation, the five aggregates such as form are, insofar as mental afflictions arise therein, *sāsrava* factors, and those in which mental afflictions do not arise are *anāsrava* factors. According to such a view, the Dārṣṭāntika definitions of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* would be derived as follows:

Anything in which mental afflictions arise is *sāsrava*.

Anything in which mental afflictions do not arise is *anāsrava*.

Thus, for the Dārṣṭāntikas, the body of an ordinary person who has not yet completely abandoned mental afflictions is *sāsrava*, while external objects that do not pertain to sentient beings and the body of an arhat, who has

³⁰ There is another layer of meaning here. The seed is the locus (所依) for what flows out of it (漏), because when one presses a seed, the oil will flow out of it. I owe this to a suggestion by Dr. Meghan Howard Masang. According to Ogawa 2021, 30–31, Patañjali gives the same simile (*tileṣu tailam*) for illustrating *vyāpaka adhikaraṇa* in his *Mahābhāṣya*.

³¹ NA T 1562, 332a23–24: 彼不以一切契經皆爲定量。豈名經部 (Further, they do not take all scriptures as authority. How can they proclaim [themselves] as Sautrāntikas?). See also Fukuda 2003, 265, n. 3.

completely abandoned mental afflictions, are *anāsrava*.

On the other hand, the Sarvāstivādins, or Saṅghabhadra, reject this view, holding that all forms, including the body of an arhat and external insentient things, are exclusively *sāsrava*. They interpret the locative in the same passage from SĀ no. 56 as a locative denoting the scope (*viśayasaptamī*). In this interpretation, the five aggregates concerning which mental afflictions arise are *sāsrava* factors, and those concerning which mental afflictions do not arise are *anāsrava* factors. Their definitions of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* can be simply rephrased as follows:

Anything concerning which mental afflictions arise is *sāsrava*.

Anything concerning which mental afflictions do not arise is *anāsrava*.

This means that factors that can become the object of mental afflictions are *sāsrava*, while factors that cannot become their object are *anāsrava*. Following this definition, the Sarvāstivādins adduce Anupamā and others who famously gave rise to mental afflictions toward the Buddha, thus proving that the body of an arhat is *sāsrava*.³²

Considering these two strands of interpretation of the locative expression in SĀ no. 56, it is quite natural that the locative in *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4a, which is likely based on this *sūtra*, can also be construed in the same two ways. As *Dharmaśrī was a Sarvāstivādin, he may well have interpreted the locative in the Sarvāstivādin manner, i.e., as a *viśayasaptamī*. However, *Dharmaśrī himself does not specify which interpretation to take for verse 1.4a in the text. This interpretation issue can be solved by referring to another context in AH.

³² This argument is originally found in MV, see Fujimoto 2022b.

3.5. The Classification of Eighteen Elements into *Sāsrava* or *Anāsrava*

In verse 1.11 and its auto-commentary, *Dharmaśrī classifies eighteen elements (*dhātu*) into *sāsrava* and *anāsrava*. His commentary reads:

AH T 1550, 810a3–5: 有漏有十五者，五內界，五外界，五識界，漏止住故。餘二者，意界，意識界，法界。此或有漏，或無漏。若漏止住，是有漏。異則無漏。

As for “**fifteen are *sāsrava***” (verse 1.11a), it refers to the [first] five internal elements (i.e., five sense faculties), the [first] five external elements (i.e., five sense objects), and the [first] five [sense] consciousnesses because *āsravas* dwell (止住) in them. As for “**the others are two**” (verse 1.11b), it refers to the mental faculty element, the mind-consciousness element, and the mental object element. They are either *sāsrava* or *anāsrava*. If *āsravas* dwell in them, they are *sāsrava*; otherwise, they are *anāsrava*.³³

If *Dharmaśrī uses the *adhikaraṇasaptamī* interpretation for the locative in verse 1.4a, insentient objects and the body of an arhat will fall into the *anāsrava* category since mental afflictions cannot arise therein. However, the above passage clearly shows that form (*rūpa*) in a broad sense, namely the five sense faculties and the five sense objects, is exclusively *sāsrava*.³⁴ This means that insentient objects and the body of an arhat are grouped into the *sāsrava* category. Therefore, *Dharmaśrī does not adopt the *adhikaraṇasaptamī* interpretation in verse 1.4a. To prove that all forms are *sāsrava*, the *viśayasaptamī* interpretation must be taken in verse 1.4a because

³³ My translation is partly based on Willemen 2006, 29. A French translation is found in Armelin 1978, 56–57.

³⁴ In the Sarvāstivāda system, the unmanifested (*avijñapti*) that is *anāsrava* is exceptional in that it is classified within the form-aggregate (*rūpaskandha*) and is categorized under the mental object element (*dharmadhātu*).

all forms can serve as the objective support for mental afflictions in the Sarvāstivāda system.³⁵ Thus, it can be concluded that *Dharmaśrī himself interprets the locative in verse 1.4a as *viṣayasaptamī*.³⁶

3.6. The Meaning of Verse 1.4 and Its Comparison with MV

Based on the *viṣayasaptamī* interpretation, verse 1.4ab can be rendered as “anything concerning which mental afflictions arise is called *sāsrava* by the Noble”. This means that the object of mental afflictions is *sāsrava*. Furthermore, as noted earlier, *Dharmaśrī shows in verse 1.4cd that mental afflictions are nothing but *āsravas*. In light of this, what *Dharmaśrī intends in verse 1.4 can be simply restated as follows:

Anything that can become the object of *āsravas* is *sāsrava*. [A]

Definition [A] is almost identical to definition [1] in MV (see section 2

³⁵ In his commentary to verse 1.11ab, *Dharmaśrī argues that fifteen elements are *sāsrava* because *āsravas* dwell in them. This argument rests upon the premise that anything in which *āsravas* dwell is *sāsrava*. This can also be regarded as *Dharmaśrī’s definition of *sāsrava*. Theoretically, this definition should be identical in content with verse 1.4ab. They resemble each other in defining the “place” of mental afflictions or *āsravas* as *sāsrava*, but they are worded somewhat differently in this text, and AHS and MAH seem to distinguish between them. I will not address this issue anymore at this juncture.

³⁶ This is also confirmed by Sthiramati’s explanation. As already shown in section 3.2, he mentions the two definitions of *sāsrava* factors by two masters who are seemingly *Dharmaśrī and *Dharmatrāta and states that Vasubandhu negated their views by saying, “It is true that *āsravas* arise also having as their object the truth of cessation and [the truth of] the path” (*kāmaṃ nirodhamārgasatyālabhanāpy āsravā upajāyante ...*), and so on. This indicates that Sthiramati associates *Dharmaśrī’s definition with the idea negated by Vasubandhu. If *Dharmaśrī’s definition is identical to this idea, which seems to define the cognitive object of *āsravas* as *sāsrava*, the *viṣayasaptamī* interpretation must be taken for the locative in *Dharmaśrī’s verse 1.4ab. Therefore, we can take Sthiramati to have understood the locative in *Dharmaśrī’s definition as a *viṣayasaptamī*.

above) as both consider the object of mental afflictions (or *āsravas*) to be *sāsrava*. However, considering that all the later Sarvāstivādins tended to define *sāsrava* by using the term *āsrava*, the use of the term *āsrava* to define *sāsrava* can serve as an important measure for determining the developmental stage of the definition, and definition [A] is considered to come after definition [1]. It is concordant with definitions [2] and [3] in this regard, but it is simpler in content and comes before them. Therefore, definition [A] can be placed between definitions [1] and [2] in terms of development.

4. The Relationship with *Ghoṣaka's **Abhidharmāmṛtarasa*

Here it is worth noting that *Ghoṣaka's (瞿沙) **Abhidharmāmṛtarasa* (*Āpítán gānlūwèi lùn* 阿毘曇甘露味論, circa 2nd century CE, hereafter AAR), which is said to be closely related to AH, is quite similar to AH in its treatment of *sāsrava* factors. *Ghoṣaka explains this concept in the opening section of Chapter 5 as follows:

AAR T 1553, 968c23–25: 煩惱諸漏。何以故。趣一切生處，心漏連注，墮³⁷世界故，是謂有漏。三界有百八煩惱，九十八結十纏。是煩惱何處生，是說有漏法。

Mental afflictions are *āsravas*. [Question:] Why? [Answer:] Because [mental afflictions] lead [sentient beings] to all places of birth, diffuse the mind incessantly,³⁸ and cause [sentient beings] to fall into the world, these [mental afflictions] are called *āsravas*.³⁹ There are one hundred

³⁷ 墮 em. : 隨 ed. I follow a footnote to the Taishō canon.

³⁸ See footnote 11.

³⁹ The term *yōulòu* 有漏 here seems to translate *āsrava* or *bhavāsrava*, not *sāsrava*. The rendering of *āsrava* as *yōulòu* 有漏 is occasionally found in other Chinese translations of Buddhist texts (see Katō 1973, 635; 1987, 252–253; 1989, 229–230). Cf. V T 1547, 425b7ff.

and eight [types of] mental afflictions in the three realms, namely ninety-eight fetters (結, *saṃyojana* or *anuśaya*?) and ten envelopments (纏, **paryavasthāna*). [Question:] Where do these mental afflictions arise? Answer: [They arise in] *sāsrava* factors.

In this passage, *Ghoṣaka clearly explains that mental afflictions are nothing but *āsravas* and then states that *sāsrava* factors are the place in which mental afflictions arise. In this context, he introduces the term *āsrava* to explain *sāsrava* factors, which aligns with verse 1.4cd of AH. Furthermore, the Chinese interrogative *héchù* 何處 indicates the presence of a locative.⁴⁰ Given that *Ghoṣaka is faithful to the Sarvāstivādin doctrine that all forms are wholly *sāsrava*,⁴¹ the locative can be better understood as a *viṣayasaptamī*, as in the case of *Dharmaśrī. In other words, *Ghoṣaka also seems to regard the object of mental afflictions (i.e., *āsravas*) as *sāsrava*. This aligns with verse 1.4ab of AH. These points combined suggest that *Ghoṣaka's position closely resembles verse 1.4 of AH and can therefore be similarly placed between definitions [1] and [2] in MV in terms of

⁴⁰ I tentatively understand the Chinese *héchù* 何處 as interrogative (“where”) and translate the last part of the passage in a question-and-answer format, but the answering part appears to be awkward. As Mizuno *et al.* 1977, 21, n. 152, have noted, *héchù* 何處 here may well be an indefinite relative (“wherever”). This interpretation is not impossible because the indefinite usage of *hé* 何 is sometimes found in the Chinese Buddhist canon (see Wu 2008). If we take *héchù* 何處 to mean an indefinite relative, the last part would mean: “Anything in/concerning which these mental afflictions arise is called a *sāsrava* factor.”

⁴¹ AAR T 1553, 969b17–18: 問. 十八持幾有漏幾無漏. 答. 十八持十五持有漏. 三當分別. 云何三. 意持, 法持, 意識持 (Question: Among the eighteen elements (持, **dhātu*), how many are *sāsrava*? How many are *anāsrava*? Answer: Among the eighteen elements, fifteen elements (namely the five sense faculties, the five sense objects, and the five sense consciousnesses) are *sāsrava*. the [remaining] three [elements] should be distinguished. [Question:] What are the three? [Answer:] the mental faculty element, the mental object element, and the mind-consciousness element). See also section 3.5.

development.⁴²

5. Conclusion

As a starting point for our examination of the definitions of *sāsrava* in the Sarvāstivāda *hṛdaya* treatises, we have discussed *Dharmaśrī's definition of *sāsrava* from both philological and philosophical perspectives. He defines *sāsrava* factors in verse 1.4 of AH in the following way:

Anything in/concerning which mental afflictions arise is called *sāsrava* by the Noble (1.4ab) [because] what are called mental afflictions are *āsravas*, and [this is] a provisional designation used by the wise (1.4cd).

A careful examination of his auto-commentary in Chinese and Sthiramati's **Tattvārthā* in Tibetan makes it clear that verse 1.4ab originally had a relative-correlative structure with the relative element in the locative case in Sanskrit, for which a basic construction **yatra kleśā utpadyante saḥ sāsravaḥ* can be assumed.

From the point of view of syntax and content, *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4ab is identical to SĀ no. 56, which defines *sāsravadharmas* as the five aggregates such as form in/concerning which affection or hostility arise, and *anāsravadharmas* as the opposite. This suggests that this *sūtra* could have served as the scriptural basis for verse 1.4ab. *Dharmaśrī's separate identifications of verse 1.4ab as a teaching of the Noble and of verse 1.4cd as a teaching of the wise also support this hypothesis.

⁴² Here, I would also like to point out the similarity between definition [A] and *Buddhadeva's definition of *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* factors found in MV T 1545, 392c4–6, and AV T 1546, 293b27–28. Although the issue of which one was the earlier is uncertain, *Buddhadeva's definition can also be placed between definitions [1] and [2] in MV. For the analysis of his definition, see Fujimoto 2024, 72–74.

According to Saṅghabhadra, the Dārṣṭāntikas interpret the locative in the passage from SĀ no. 56 as a locative denoting the locus, i.e., *adhikaraṇasaptamī*, thereby arguing that factors in which mental afflictions arise are *sāsrava* and that factors in which mental afflictions do not arise are *anāsrava*. Here, both the body of an arhat, who has completely abandoned mental afflictions, and insentient objects are reckoned as being *anāsrava*. On the other hand, the Sarvāstivādins interpret the same locative as a locative denoting the scope, i.e., *viśayasaptamī*, and define *sāsrava* factors as factors concerning which mental afflictions arise, and *anāsrava* factors as the other way around. In other words, for the Sarvāstivādins, factors that can become the objects of mental afflictions are *sāsrava*, whereas factors that cannot become the object of mental afflictions are *anāsrava*. These two interpretations of the locative in the *sūtra* passage can also be applied to the locative in *Dharmaśrī's verse 1.4a.

In verse 1.11ab and its commentary, *Dharmaśrī explicitly states that all forms, including the body of an arhat and insentient objects, are exclusively *sāsrava*. This fact suggests that *Dharmaśrī himself takes the *viśayasaptamī* interpretation of the locative in his verse 1.4a so that any form is reckoned as being *sāsrava* inasmuch as mental afflictions can take it as their objective-support.

In light of verse 1.4cd, which equates mental afflictions with *āsravas*, what *Dharmaśrī intends in verse 1.4 is that anything that can become the object of *āsravas* is *sāsrava*. This definition is quite similar to the earliest definition of *sāsrava* (definition [1]) in MV in that both consider the object of mental afflictions to be *sāsrava*, but we can determine that the former comes after the latter due to the use of the term *āsrava* to define *sāsrava*. In this regard, *Dharmaśrī's definition is also in line with the revised definitions of *sāsrava* (definitions [2] and [3]) in MV but comes before them due to its simplicity of content.

*Ghoṣaka's treatment of *sāsrava* factors shows a high similarity with

verse 1.4 of AH. This indicates that his explanation also comes after definition [1] but before definition [2] in MV in terms of development.

Abbreviations

- cf. indication relevant to the reading of the text
Ch. Chinese text
conj. conjecture
D Derge edition
em. emendation
P Peking edition
Skt. Sanskrit text
T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經 [*Buddhist Canon Compiled in the Taishō Era (1912–1926)*]. 100 vols. Eds. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–1932.
Tib. Tibetan text

Primary Sources

- AAR **Abhidharmāmṛtarasa* (*Ghoṣaka): *Āpítán gānlùwèi lùn* 阿毘曇甘露味論. T 1553.28.
AH **Abhidharmahṛdaya* (*Dharmaśrī): *Āpítán xīn lùn* 阿毘曇心論. T 1550.28.
AHS **Abhidharmahṛdayasūtra* (*Upasānta): *Āpítán xīn lùn jīng* 阿毘曇心論經. T 1551.28.
AK *Abhidharmakośa* (Vasubandhu): see AKBh.
AKBh *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Vasubandhu): *Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Ed. P. Pradhan. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute 1967.

- AKBh(Tib.) Tibetan Translation of AKBh: *Chos mngon pa'i mdzod kyi bshad pa*. D 4090/P 5591.
- AKBh(X) Xuánzàng's 玄奘 Chinese translation of AKBh: *Āpidámó jùshě lùn* 阿毘達磨俱舍論. T 1558.29.
- AKBh(Z) Zhēndī's 真諦 Chinese translation of AKBh: *Āpidámó jùshě shì lùn* 阿毘達磨俱舍釋論. T 1559.29.
- AKUp **Abhidharmakośaṭīkopāyikā* (*Śamathadeva): *Chos mngon pa'i mdzod kyi 'grel bshad nye bar mkho ba zhe bya ba*. D 4094/P 5595.
- AS *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (Asaṅga): see Li 2019.
- AS(X) Xuánzàng's 玄奘 Chinese Translation of AS: *Dàshèng āpidámó jí lùn* 大乘阿毘達磨集論. T 1605.31.
- ASBh *Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya* (*Buddhasiṃha or *Jinaputra): *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣyam*. Ed. Nathmal Tatia. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute 1976.
- AV **Abhidharmavibhāṣā: Āpítán pípóshā lùn* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論. T 1546.28.
- DhSk *Dharmaskandha: Āpidámó fǎyùn zú lùn* 阿毘達磨法蘊足論. T 1537.26.
- LA **Lakṣanānusāriṇī* (*Pūrṇavardhana): *Chos mngon pa'i mdzod kyi 'grel bshad mtshan nyid kyi rjes su 'brang ba zhes bya ba*. D 4093/P 5594.
- NA **Nyāyānusāriṇī* (Saṅghabhadra): *Āpidámó shùn zhènglǐ lùn* 阿毘達磨順正理論. T 1562.29.
- MAH **Misrakābhidharmahṛdaya* (*Dharmatrāta): *Zá āpítán xīn lùn* 雜阿毘曇心論. T 1552.28.
- MV **Mahāvibhāṣā: Āpidámó dà pípóshā lùn* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論. T 1545.27.
- TA **Tattvārthā* (Sthiramati): *Chos mngon pa'i mdzod kyi bshad pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa don gyi de kho na nyid ces bya ba*. D 4421/P 5875.
- V **Vibhāṣā* (*Sītapāṇi): *Pípóshā lùn* 鞞婆沙論. T 1547.28.

Secondary Sources

Anālayo, Bhikkhu

- 2014 “On the Five Aggregates (4): A Translation of *Samyukta-āgama* Discourses 33 to 58.” *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies* 14: 1–71.

Armelin I[ndumati]

- 1978 *Le Coeur de la Loi Suprême traité de Fa-cheng. Abhidharma-hṛdayśāstra de Dharmasrī*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Dhammadinnā, Sāmaṇerī

- 2014 “A Translation of a Discourse Quotation in the Tibetan Translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* Parallel to Chinese *Samyukta-āgama* Discourse 36 and of the Discourse Quotations in Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā* Parallel to the Chinese *Samyukta-āgama* Discourses 39, 42, 45, 46, 55, 56, 57, and 58.” *Dharma Drum Journal of Buddhist Studies* 14: 73–128.

Fujimoto Yōsuke 藤本庸裕

- 2022a “*Zō agon kyō dai gojūroku kyō ni okeru urohō to murohō: Setsuissaiubu no kaishaku ni chakumoku shite*” 『雑阿含経』「第56 経」における有漏法と無漏法: 説一切有部の解釈に着目して [Sāsrava and Anāsrava Factors in *Sūtra* 56 of the *Samyuktāgama*: With a Special Focus on the Sarvāstivādin Interpretation]. *Tagen bunka 多元文化 [Transcultural Studies]* 11: 38–63.
- 2022b “Budda no Shintai wa naze uro ka: Setsuissaiubu ni yoru busshin urosetsu ronshō no ronriteki bunseki” ブッダの身體はなぜ有漏か: 説一切有部による佛身有漏説論證の論理的な分析 [Why is the Buddha’s Body impure (sāsrava)? A Logical Analysis of the Sarvāstivādin Argument for the Impurity of the Buddha’s Body].

Tōyō no shisō to shūkyō 東洋の思想と宗教 [*Thought and Religions of Asia*] 39: 22–46.

- 2024 “*Abhidatsuma daibibasha ron ni okeru urohō to murohō no teigi*” 『阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論』における有漏法と無漏法の定義 [Definitions of *Sāsra* and *Anāsra* Factors in the *Mahāvibhāṣā*]. *Komazawa daigaku bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 [*Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism*] 82: 61–78.

Fukuda Takumi 福田琢

- 2003 “Bhadanta Rāma: A Sautrāntika before Vasubandhu.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 26.2: 255–287.

Harada Wasō 原田和宗

- 1993 “Dignāga no *Hastavālaprakaraṇa* & *Vṛtti*: Wayaku to Skt. kangen yaku no kokoromi” Dignāga の *Hastavālaprakaraṇa* & *Vṛtti*: 和訳と Skt. 還元訳の試み [The Japanese Translation of *Hastavālaprakaraṇa* & *Vṛtti*: with Sanskrit Reconstruction]. *Ryūkoku daigaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyūshitsu nenpō* 龍谷大学佛教学研究室年報 [*Bulletin of Buddhist Studies Ryukoku University*] 6: 92–110.

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 *et al.*

- 1997 *A Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Tokyo: Reiyukai.

Honjō Yoshifumi 本庄良文

- 2014 *Kusharon chū Upāikā no kenkyū: Yakuchū hen (ge)* 俱舍論註ウパーイカーの研究：訳注篇 下 [**A Study of the Abhidharmakośopāyikā: Annotated Translation (part II)*]. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.

Katō Junshō 加藤純章

- 1973 “Uro muro no kitei” 有漏・無漏の規定 [Definition of ‘*sāsra*’ and ‘*anāsra*’]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [*Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 21.2: 635–639.

- 1987 “Abidaruma no nikutai kan: *Kusharon* o chūshi ni shite” アビダ
ルマの肉体観: 『俱舍論』を中心にして [**Abhidharma View*
of the Body: Focusing on the *Abhidharmakośa*]. In *Tōyō ni okeru*
ningen kan: Indo shisō to bukkō o chūshin to shite 東洋におけ
る人間観: インド思想と仏教を中心として [**The Oriental*
View of Man: Focusing on Indian Thought and Buddhism], ed.
Maeda Sengaku 前田専学, 251–286. Tokyo: Tōkyōdaigaku
shuppankai 東京大学出版会.
- 1989 *Kyōryōbu no Kenkyū* 経量部の研究 [**Study on the*
Sautrāntikas]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.

Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元 *et al.*

- 1977 *Kokuyaku issaikyō. Indo senjutsu-bu: Ronshū-bu* 國譯一切經 印
度撰述部: 論集部 [**Japanese Translation of the Chinese*
Canon: India. Miscellaneous Treatises], vol. 2. Tokyo: Daitō
shuppan 大東出版.

Li Xuezhu 李学竹

- 2019 “*Abidatsumajūron* bonbun kesson bu no kaishū: dai 17, 21 yō”
『阿毘達磨集論』梵文欠損部の回収: 第 17, 21 葉
[Restoration of the Sanskrit Text in Two Missing Leaves (fols. 17,
21) of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* Manuscript on the Basis of the
Abhidharmasamuccayavyākhyā Manuscript]. *Indogaku*
bukkyōgaku kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究 [*Journal of Indian and*
Buddhist Studies] 67.2: 50–55.

Odani Nobuchiyo 小谷信千代 *et al.*

- 2012 “Shinshutsu bonpon *Kusha ron anne sho* shiyaku (2)” 新出梵本
『俱舍論安慧疏』試訳(2) [A Tentative Translation of the Newly
Discovered Sanskrit Manuscript of Sthiramati’s *Abhidharma-*
kośabhāṣyaṭīkā Tattvārthā (Dhātunirdeśa), Part 2]. *Shinshū sōgō*
kenkyūjo kenkyū kiyō 真宗総合研究所研究紀要 [*Annual*
Memoirs of the Otani University Shin Buddhist Comprehensive

Research Institute] 29: 1–32.

Ogawa Hideyo 小川英世

2021 “Two Interpretations of *gurau vasati* in the Dharmaśāstra Literature: ‘He Dwells near His Teacher’ and ‘He Dwells with His Teacher’.” *Tetsugaku* 哲學 [*The Journal of Hiroshima Philosophical Society*] 73: 29–44.

Schmithausen, Lambert

2014 *The Genesis of Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda: Responses and Reflections*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Watanabe Baiyū 渡邊棹雄 *et al.*

1976a *Kokuyaku issaikyō. Indo senjutsu-bu: Bidon-bu* 國譯一切經 印度撰述部 毘曇部 [**Japanese Translation of the Chinese Canon: India. Abhidharma*], vol. 20. Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版.

1976b *Kokuyaku issaikyō. Indo senjutsu-bu: Bidon-bu* 國譯一切經 印度撰述部 毘曇部 [**Japanese Translation of the Chinese Canon: India. Abhidharma*], vol. 21. Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版.

Willems, Charles

2006 *The Essence of Scholasticism Abhidharmahṛdaya*. T1550. Revised edition with a completely new introduction. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.

Willems, Charles *et al.*

1998 *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Leiden: Brill.

Wu Juan 吳娟

2008 “Hānyī fódiǎn zhōng yíwèn dàicí hé de rènzhǐ yòngfǎ” 漢譯佛典中疑問代詞「何」的任指用法 [The Indefinite Use of the Interrogative *hé* in Chinese Buddhist Translations]. *Zhōngwénxué kān* 中文學刊 [*The Chinese Academic Journal*] 5: 141–157.

Xuan Fang 宣方

2015 “Tenkei wa shukuseki ni ari: Yin Shun to Lu Cheng no *Abidon shin ron* ni taisuru kenkai no sōi ni tsuite” 典型は夙昔に在り: 印順

と呂澂の『阿毘曇心論』に対する見解の相違について [On the Different Discourses about *Abhidharmahṛdaya* between Lü Cheng and Ven. Yinshun]. *Higashi ajia bukkuyō gakujutsu ronshū* 東アジア仏教学術論集 [Proceedings of the International Conference on East Asian Buddhism] 3: 283–327.

Keywords: *sāsrava*; 有漏; *anāsrava*; 無漏; *Abhidharmahṛdaya*; 阿毘曇心論; *Dharmaśrī*; 法勝

*Postdoctoral Research Fellow,
Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
Contract Researcher,
International College
for the Postgraduate Buddhist Studies*