

The ‘Discourse on Accumulated Actions’ in Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā*

Giuliana Martini*

Introduction:

This article provides an annotated translation of a complete version of the ‘Discourse on accumulated actions’ found in Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, preceded by a brief presentation of Śamathadeva’s work as a primary source for the study of early Buddhist discourse material and a survey of the known parallel versions to the ‘Discourse on accumulated actions’.

Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā* as a primary source for the study of early Buddhist *āgamas*:

According to Skilling and Harrison (2005: 699) Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā* (hereafter: *Upāyikā*), the ‘Essential Companion to the Treasury of the Abhidharma’,¹ whose Sanskrit original is now lost, “may have been composed at any time between the 5th century and the as yet unknown date of its Tibetan translation”.²

* Dharma Drum Buddhist College, 2–6 Xishihu, Jinshan District 20842, New Taipei City, Taiwan.

¹ *Chos mngon pa’i mdzod kyi ’grel bshad nye bar mgo ba*, D 4094, Q 5595, Si 161+162, etc.

² Skilling and Harrison (2005: 699) further speculate that the text might have been translated into Tibetan (in Kashmir) in the eleventh century, but that “we really have no information to go on”.

This Tibetan translation, located in the Tanjur division of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, appears to be mentioned for the first time in Bu-ston's 'History of the Dharma' (composed in 1322 or 1323).³

The *Upāyikā* supplements brief *sūtra*-quotations found in the *Abhidarmakośabhāṣya* with the corresponding passage – in full or even with the whole discourse – from the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Āgamas*.⁴ The *raison d'être* of the *Upāyikā* is well captured by one of the stanzas that close this work, in which Śamathadeva poetically proclaims:

An exposition of the Treasury [of the Abhidharma] that is unadorned, bereft of the *āgamas*, such as the *sūtras* and other [scriptures],

even though it may be stainless, it does not capture the heart, like a moonless night.

And so by virtue of any goodness that there may arise by decorating with the *āgamas*, jewels by nature, such an exposition,

may the world be adorned with an unblemished intellect.⁵

³ The *Upāyikā* is listed under the "Hīnayāna treatises" (*theg chung gi bstan bcos*) section, and both the author and the Indian translator of this work are described as Nepalese (*bal po*), cf. Nishioka (1980: 59,6 §490) and *Chos 'byung* 230,2: *bal po zhi gnas lhas mdzad pa'i chos mngon pa'i mdzod la nye 'gyur* [reference from Skilling and Harrison (2005: 699 and 682 note 7)].

⁴ As explained by Skilling (2009: 424), in general "there is a complex intertextual relationship between Buddhist *sūtras* and their commentaries. In rare cases like Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośa-upāyikā-tīkā*, *sūtras* are cited in full as commentary—or as a source-book—on a *śāstra*, the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*".

⁵ Q 5595 thu 144a2 or Si 162 p. 980,21 (on AK 473,23): *mdo sogs lung dang bral zhing rgyan med gyur pa'i mdzod kyi rnam par bshad pa ni / gang phyir dri med gyur kyang zla bas stong pa'i mtshan bzhin yid 'phrog byed pa min / de phyir rin chen rang bzhin lung gis rnam par bshad pa rab tu brgyan byas las / dge ba gang yod de yis 'jig rten dri med blo yis rab tu brgyan* (N reads: *rgyan*, cf. Si 162 p. 995 note 981) *gyur cig*. In this article I take the Peking edition as my main text for the *Upāyikā* and I provide references to the Peking edition as well as the 'Sichuan' collated Tanjur published by the China Tibetology Research Center in Beijing. The 'Sichuan' edition (Si 161+162) is based on the Derge edition (D 4094), and it includes variant readings from the Cone and Narthang editions. For other texts I give reference to the Peking and Derge editions, with the exception

Honjō Yoshifumi, the Japanese scholar who has devoted most of his scholarly life to the study of the *Upāyikā*, has published an annotated Japanese translation in instalments over several decades, and has also made available a privately circulated complete revised draft translation of this work.⁶

In addition to the translation, Honjō (1984) has produced a valuable survey of the *āgama* quotations in the *Upāyikā*.⁷

As regards Western languages, several discourses found in this work have been translated into English.⁸

In view of the existence of multiple and diverse Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda communities with their own bodies of transmitted texts, the precise relationship between the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda or (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda textual traditions remains difficult to assess at the present stage of research.⁹

However, regarding the school affiliation of the *Upāyikā*, philological scrutiny has shown that the quotations found in this work correspond to texts that are reckoned to be Mūlasarvāstivāda.

The discourse quotations in the *Upāyikā* stem from a tradition very close to that of the Chinese *Samyukta-āgama* (T 99, *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經), generally assigned to the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, and to that of the *Vastusamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.¹⁰

of the Tibetan translation of the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, for which only the Peking and Narthang editions are available to me.

⁶ The complete list of Honjō’s translations of the *Upāyikā* quotations is too long to be given here. Fortunately, however, his revised *opus magnum* is due for publication in the foreseeable future.

⁷ A survey of parallels to the discourses in the *Majjhima-nikāya* is found in Anālayo (2011: 1037f).

⁸ Skilling (1978a), (1978b), (1978c), (1979), (1980), (1992), (1996), (1998), (forthcoming, 2012: 22), and Anālayo (2011b).

⁹ Recent discussions are found in Skilling (1997: 96f), Enomoto (1998), Enomoto (2000) reviewed by Skilling (2002: 374f) and with a critical response by Yao (2007) and Wynne (2008), and Chung (2008: 11f).

¹⁰ Mukai (1985). On the school affiliation of the Chinese *Samyukta-āgama* cf. Lü (1963: 242), Waldschmidt (1980: 136), Mayeda (1985: 99), Enomoto (1986: 23), Schmithausen (1987: 306), Choong (2000: 6 note 18), Hiraoka

Investigation of the relationship between the discourses of the *Madhyama-āgama* collection extant in Chinese translation (T 26, *Zhong ahan jing* 中阿含經), that is generally attributed to the Sarvāstivādins,¹¹ and the *Madhyama-āgama* quotations in the *Upāyikā* has highlighted some important divergences.¹² Moreover, structural differences between the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* and the *Madhyama-āgama* as known in the *Upāyikā* and in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* have been found.¹³

The *Vinaya* passages quoted by Śamathadeva can be safely traced back to the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.¹⁴

On the same line of research, an example of one of the indications of the Mūlasarvāstivāda affiliation of the *Upāyikā* is the agreement of its list of the thirty-two *mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas* with that of the Gilgit manuscript of the *Saṅghabhedavastu*, against for example the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* of the Sarvāstivādins and the corresponding lists transmitted by various other schools (Skilling 1997: 136 note 107).

Besides being a central resource for the study of the early Buddhist discourses, the *Upāyikā* also provides information for the study of the structure of the *Sūtrapiṭaka* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins – or, more precisely, of that transmitted by one of the (Mūla-) Sarvāstivādin textual lineages – through the summary stanzas (*uddānas*) it has preserved.

Moreover, the *Upāyikā* is also useful for the reconstruction of a relative chronology of the all important and still undated or inexactly dated (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma works extant in Chinese and Tibetan, in that comparative investigation of the discourse quotations featuring in the *Upāyikā* vis-à-vis those witnessed by these works can provide clues on the stage of

(2000), Harrison (2002: 1), Oberlies (2003: 64), Bucknell (2006: 685), Chung (2008: 11f), and Glass (2010).

¹¹ On the school affiliation of the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* cf. the references in Anālayo (2011: 7 note 64) and Bingenheimer (forthcoming, 2012). According to Chung and Fukita (2011: 13f) the current consensus on the Sarvāstivāda origin of the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* cannot be considered established, a position critically reviewed by Anālayo (forthcoming, 2012).

¹² Sakurabe (1969: 38f); cf. also Schmithausen (1987: 338).

¹³ Honjō (1985: 63f) and Enomoto (1984: 98 and 107 note 40; 1986: 22).

¹⁴ Honjō (1987); for an example, cf. also below note 45.

development of the discourse material in question as transmitted within the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma treatises.

The order of the canonical quotations given by Śamathadeva follows chapter by chapter that of Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, thus the *Samcetanīya-sūtra*, the discourse I study in this paper, quoted in the fourth chapter of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the ‘exposition on karma’ (*karma-nirdeśa*), is accordingly taken up by Śamathadeva in the fourth chapter of his *Upāyikā*.

The ‘Discourse on accumulated actions’ in the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā* and its Parallels:

The context of the passage of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* that takes up the discourse quotation in question is a discussion of the causes of actions. A deed, good or bad, can be “done and accumulated” (*kṛtaṃ copacitaṃ ca karmocyate*) or “done and not accumulated” (*ato ’nyathā karma kṛtaṃ bhavati, nopacitaṃ*).¹⁵

Besides this brief canonical quotation in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, an excerpt from the ‘Discourse on accumulated actions’, that provides its otherwise unattested Sanskrit title,¹⁶ is found in the relevant section of Yaśomitra’s commentary on the *bhāṣya*, the *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (hereafter: *Vyākhyā*).¹⁷

The known discourse parallels to the ‘Discourse on accumulated actions’ (*bsags pa’i las mdo*) quoted by Śamathadeva¹⁸ are:

- 1-3. The two ‘Discourse(s) on intentional [action]’ or ‘Discourse(s) on the intentional’ (*Sañcetanika-suttas*, AN

¹⁵ AK 271,18f, transl. of the Chinese version by Xuanzang 玄奘 in de la Vallée Poussin (1923–1931/III: 242f). On *karma kṛtaṃ nopacitaṃ*, cf. also *Karmavibhaṅga* ed. Lévi (1932: 47, 23 §23) or ed. Kudo (2004: 80,1), transl. Lévi (1932: 121) as “l’Acte qui, étant fait, n’est pas aggragé”.

¹⁶ AKBV 400,9: *Samcetanīya-sūtre vacanād iti*, and AKBV 400,21: *Samcetanīya-sūtraṃ*, with ms. reading: *°yaṃ*.

¹⁷ AK 237,17, transl. of the Chinese version in de la Vallée Poussin (1923–1931/III: 136), and AKBV 400,9.

¹⁸ Q 5595 tu 270a3 or Si 161 p. 577,2.

10.206 and AN 10.207) and the ‘Discourse on the body made of deeds’ (*Karajakāya-sutta*, AN 10.208), consecutively located in the *Karajakāya-vagga* of the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* of the Theravādins.¹⁹

4. The ‘Discourse on intention’ (*Si jing* 思經, MĀ 15), currently located in the first division of the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama*, a collection generally held to stem from a Sarvāstivāda line of transmission.²⁰ This version is abbreviated at the same point as the *Upāyikā* parallel: the section on the ten wholesome courses of action that in the two Pali *Sañcetanika-suttas* (AN 10.206 and AN 10.207) follows the section on the ten unwholesome courses of action is not given in full.²¹

Anālayo (2009a: 13) has shown that probably these three discourses “were interrelated during oral transmission”, for “in fact the Chinese and Tibetan versions are parallels to all three”, suggesting that “the way the *Karajakāya-sutta* and the *Sañcetanika-suttas* have been preserved in the Pāli canon could be the result of a garbling of what originally was a single discourse”.

The Titles of the Parallel Versions:

Notably, the different traditions of reciters have attached to the transmitted discourses titles that reflect conceptually related notions:

- 1) some titles speak of “intentionality” (AN 10.206 and AN 10.207, MĀ 15, *Vyākhyā*);
- 2) others of “accumulation of actions” (*Upāyikā*);
- 3) and still others of a “body of actions” that derives from one’s own deeds (AN 10.208).

¹⁹ Alternative title in Woodward (1936: 192): “The Brahma-moods”. The Pali versions have been translated by Woodward (1936: 189f) and by Nyanaponika and Bodhi (1999: 256f).

²⁰ MĀ 15 ad T I 437b28; on the the school affiliation of the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* cf. above note 11.

²¹ For a translation and comparative study of MĀ 15 cf. Anālayo (2009), republished in id. (forthcoming, 2012).

Thus Śamathadeva introduces his quotation as the ‘Discourse on accumulated actions’ (*bsags pa’i las mdo*).²² The underlying Sanskrit title could be reconstructed as **Upacitakarma-sūtra*, with *bsags pa* most likely rendering *upacita* or a closely equivalent term. The title takes its cue from the discourse’s presentation of the maturing of the fruits of actions that have been (done and) accumulated.

The canonical quotation in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* taken by Śamathadeva as his point of departure gives the title as *Samcetanīya-sūtra*, a title which is likewise supplied by the *Vyākhyā*.²³ This Sanskrit form in turn corresponds to the title of the two Pali *Sañcetanika-suttas* in the Burmese and Ceylonese editions.²⁴ The *Madhyama-āgama* parallel is the ‘Discourse on intention’ (*Si jing* 思經), equally emphasising the aspect of intentionality. Besides, the expression *sañcetanika kamma* appears in the opening statement of both Pali discourses in question, as well as in the identical passage of the closely related *Karajakāya-sutta*.²⁵

As shown by Anālayo (2009) on the basis of a comparative study of the extant discourse versions – and by taking into account the early Buddhist view on karma vis-à-vis the Jain position – the initial statement on the necessity of experiencing (each and every) fruit of karmic retribution in order to reach the end of *dukkha* found in the Pali parallels is probably the result of a transmission error.²⁶

²² Q 5595 tu 270a3 or Si 161 p. 577,2. Honjō (1984: 68) suggests to expunge *las* from the title of the discourse quotation as given by Śamathadeva, thereby reading it as *bsags pa’i mdo*.

²³ AKB 237,18; cf. Honjō (1984: 68–69 no.81), transl. of the Chinese version in de la Vallée Poussin (1923–1931/III: 136); AKBV 400,9 and 400,20, cf. also the Tibetan rendering in D 4092 ngu 51a6 and 51b1 or N 154 61a6 and 61b1: *ched du bsam par bya ba’i mdo*.

²⁴ AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,1 and AN 10.207 ad AN V 297,14 [title from B^c and C^c; E^c does not provide any title, cf. Anālayo (2009: 1 note 1)].

²⁵ AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,1, AN 10.207 ad AN V 297,14, and AN 10.208 ad AN V 299,11: *nāhaṃ bhikkhave sañcetanikānaṃ kammānaṃ katānaṃ upacitānaṃ appaṭisaṃviditvā vyantibhāvaṃ vadāmi*.

²⁶ The suggested emendation is the reading *appaṭisaṃviditvā* for *paṭisaṃviditvā* in *na tvevāhaṃ, bhikkhave, sañcetanikānaṃ kammānaṃ katānaṃ upacitānaṃ appaṭisaṃviditvā dukkhass’ antakiriyaṃ vadāmi*, ‘yet,

This initial passage is also discussed by Vetter (1988: 90), who considers the statement on the need to experience karmic retribution in order to make an end of *dukkha* as original, thereby interpreting the presence of the immeasurables (*appamānas*) in AN 10.208 as an intentional “attempt to react to this idea”, which would be “recommended as a means to overcome the power of former deeds”. However the restoration of the probably original textual situation made possible by the comparative study as well as by the taking into account the overall early Buddhist soteriological context make Vetter’s assessment unlikely (Anālayo 2009: 12 note 37). Elsewhere I have discussed how the proposed restoration of the initial statement is strongly supported by a close inspection of the doctrinal and meditative dynamics underpinning the discourse.²⁷

A detailed taxonomy of actions (*karma/las*) that are done and can be either accumulated (*bsags pa*) or not accumulated (*ma bsags pa*) is extensively engaged with in the context of the discourse quotation in the fourth chapter of the *Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya* itself, for which Śamathadeva provides the present canonical excerpt *in extenso*, and was to be amply developed in the Abhidharma works of the Sarvāstivādins. That is, the title given by Śamathadeva seems to somehow reflect the centrality of an Abhidharmic classificatory and explanatory interest, which may have led to singling out this particular theme as a key word chosen as a title identifying the discourse, but it has to be left open to conjecture whether the terminology may specifically be a reflection of the (by then) highly developed and influential Abhidharma thought of the Sarvāstivādins.

Closely related to the discrepancy in the titles, and probably accounting for the title given in the *Upāyikā*, is a major difference found between the discourse versions (Theravāda *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, AN 10.206, AN 10.207 and AN 10.208, and Sarvāstivāda

monks, I do not say that there is a making an end of *dukkha* without having experienced [the fruits of] intentional deeds that have been undertaken and accumulated”, AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,4, AN 10.207 ad AN V 297,17, and AN 10.208 ad AN V 299,14 [with variants in E^c and B^c reading throughout: *appaṭisaṃveditvā*, cf. Anālayo (2009: 1 note 2)].

²⁷ Martini (forthcoming, 2012), where I discuss the dynamics of the *apramānas* vis-à-vis purification of intention and *karma*, and Martini (in press), on doctrinal and meditative aspects of the early Buddhist immeasurables.

Madhyama-āgama, MĀ 15) as well as the discourse quotation in the *Vyākhyā* of the Sarvāstivādins versus the quotation in the *Upāyikā* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, in that only the former group of texts explicitly qualify actions as being intentional (or unintentional).²⁸

Judging from this difference, it would seem that the Mūlasarvāstivāda recension – as witnessed by the *Upāyikā* quotation in its Tibetan translation – is unique vis-à-vis both the Theravāda and the Sarvāstivāda transmission as far as the absence of this particular terminology is concerned.²⁹

In what follows I provide a translation of the whole discourse extract together with annotations.³⁰

Translation

Discourse on accumulated actions³¹

²⁸ Cf., e.g., AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,1, AN 10.207 ad AN V 297,14, and AN 10.208 ad AN V 299,11: *sañcetanikānaṃ kammānaṃ katānaṃ ...*, “intentional actions that have been undertaken ...”, and AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,6, AN 10.207 ad AN V 297,19 (passage missing in AN 10.208): *tividhā kāyakammantasandosavyāpatti akusalasañcetanikā ...*, “threefold is the defiling fault of intentional unwholesome bodily action ...”; MĀ 15 ad T I 437b26: 若有故作業 ..., “if [someone] does deeds intentionally ...” and MĀ 15 ad T I 437b28: 身故作三業. 不善 ..., “three are the [types] of intentionally done bodily deeds that are unwholesome ...”; AKBV 400,9: *saṃcetanīyaṃ karma kṛtvā ...* and AKBV 400,11: *saṃcintya* (ed. reads: *saṃcīṃtya*) *trividhaṃ karma kāyena karma karoti ...*, cf. also the Tibetan rendering *ched du bsams nas lus kyi las rnam pa gsum byed cing ...* (D 4092 ngu 51a7 and 51b5 or N 154 chu 61a7). Here and throughout translations of passages from MĀ 15 are with minor modifications after Anālayo (2009).

²⁹ For definitions of the terms *sañcetanika* and *upacita* in the *Manorathapūraṇī*, the commentary on the *Āṅguttara-nikāya*, cf. Mp V 76,9 and 76,11 respectively. On *saṃcetanīya-karma* in the context of the Sarvāstivāda doctrine of karma cf., e.g., Dhammajoti (2007: 539f §14.3 and 542f §14.4). On Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma in general, cf., e.g., the overview in Willemsen et al. (1998: 138f); for a study of Kumārajīva’s explanatory discourse about Abhidharmic literature cf. Willemsen (2008).

³⁰ Elsewhere I have focused in particular on the section on *apramāṇa* meditation, cf. Martini (forthcoming, 2012).

³¹ The translated quotation is found in the fourth chapter of the *Upāyikā*, Q 5595 tu 270a4–272b5, Si 161 pp. 577,2–582,10 (based on D 4094 ju 236b2–238b5, with variant readings noted *ibid.*: 737–738). After the title,

Then the Blessed One called the monks and said: ‘Monks, the results of actions that have been done and accumulated³² shall be experienced.³³ And these shall be experienced either in this very lifetime³⁴ or after taking rebirth or on some future occasion.³⁵

the discourse quotation is preceded by a reference to the Śrāvastī narrative introduction (*gleng gzhi*, Skt. *nidāna*) which would have been orally supplemented. The *Madhyama-āgama* parallel provides more detailed information on the location of the discourse, Jeta’s Grove, Anāthapiṇḍada’s Park in Śrāvastī, MĀ 15 ad T I 437b25, whereas the *Saṅcetanika-suttas* and the *Karajakāya-sutta*, AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,1, AN 10.207 ad AN V 297,14, and AN 10.208 ad AN V 299,11, start directly with the topic of karmic retribution, cf. Anālayo (2009: 5 note 21).

³² The Tibetan *nye bar bsags pa* renders Sanskrit *upacita* (cf. Pali *upacita*) ‘heaped’, ‘piled up’, ‘accumulated’, or a closely similar term. In MĀ 15 ad T I 437b26 the Buddha tells the monks: “if [someone] does deeds intentionally, I say that he will inevitably have to experience [their] fruits”, 若有故作業, 我說彼必受其報, and then goes on to present the different types of fruition according to present or future lifetimes.

³³ Here and throughout the discourse’s *so sor myong bar ’gyur* (and its negative formulation, *so sor myong bar mi gyur*) renders occurrences of an underlying Sanskrit *pratisamvedayati*, °te (and *apratīsamvedayati*, °te), cf. the corresponding conjugated forms *paṭīsamvedeti* (and *apaṭīsamvedeti*) and 受 in the Pali and Chinese parallels. *So sor* thus reproduces, as a *calque* translation, the preposition *prati-*, in the context of a discussion of karmic fruition. The Tibetan translation makes an apparent distinction between *so sor myong bar ’gyur* and *so sor myong bar mi ’gyur* (Q 5595 tu 270a4 and 270a6 or Si 161 p. 577,5 and 577,8), and the simple *myong bar ’gyur* and *mi ’gyur* (Q 5595 tu 270a5 or Si 161 p. 577,6) and *myong bar gyur cig* (Q 5595 tu 272b2 or Si 161 p. 581,21), where however the shorter forms appear in repetitions of previously introduced concepts.

³⁴ Here and below *mthong ba’i chos nyid* is the equivalent of Sanskrit *dr̥ṣṭadharmā*, cf., e.g., *Mahāvīyūtpatti* 1118, understood, idiomatically, as ‘here and now’, ‘during the same lifetime’, ‘in present life experience’, cf., e.g., *dr̥ṣṭadharmavedanīya karmeti* in an unsourced canonical quotation in AK 229,13, transl. of the Chinese version in de la Vallée Poussin (1923-1931/III: 113), and AKBV 392,12, cf. Honjō (1984: 64–65 no.67) and Pāsādika (1989: 83 no.310), and cf. also the Chinese rendering 或現世 ..., “either in this life ...”, MĀ 15 ad T I 437b27. The expression *diṭṭhadhamma vedanīya kamma* is found, e.g., in Mp V 78,3, the commentary on a passage in AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,10.

³⁵ Lit., “on some future occasion [in a lifetime subsequent to the next]”, *lan grangs gzhan na myong bar ’gyur ba*, rendering Sanskrit *aparaparyāya-vedanīya* or a closely similar expression. The mention of the three times for experiencing retribution is also found in AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,3, AN 10.207 ad AN V 297,16, and AN 10.208 ad AN V 299,13: *tañ ca kho diṭṭh’eva dhamme upapajje* (after S^c; E^s reads: *upapajjam*) *vā apare vā pariyāye*,

Monks, I say that the results of actions that have not been done and accumulated shall not be experienced.

Furthermore, monks, there are three types of evil, unwholesome bodily actions and four [evil, unwholesome] verbal [actions] and three [evil, unwholesome] mental [actions] that are done and accumulated, [which] will bring forth results that will be *duḥkha* and unwholesome. Monks, what are the three evil, unwholesome bodily actions that, when done and accumulated, will bring forth results that will be *duḥkha* and unwholesome?³⁶

(1) Some who take the life [of a living being] – these are those who have not abstained from taking the life [of a living being], are bloody-handed,³⁷ have no shame in destroying and totally annihilating [living beings], are ruthless, put all their minds on [taking] the life of any living beings, even as much as an ant.³⁸ [tu 270b]

whereas MĀ 15 ad T I 437b26 only speaks of the fruits having to be experienced in two time periods, i.e., “either in this life or in a later life”. On the three time periods cf. the discussion in von Hinüber (1978: 57), accepted by Norman (1997: 166), who prefers the readings *upapajjam* or *uppajjam*), and with a reply in Anālayo (2011: 779 note 118).

³⁶ The beginning of the quotation in AKBV 400,9 speaks of intentional actions that have been done and accumulated, which mature in birth in the hells, *Samcetanīya-sūtre vacanād iti: samcetanīyaṃ karma kṛtvopacītya narakeṣūpapadyate*, thus it does not parallel verbatim the beginning of any of the discourse versions, nor that of the *Upāyikā*’s quotation. The *Vyākhyā* quotation then continues by asking the question of what is an intentional action that is both done and accumulated, followed by an explanation of the types of intentional action. After that, the *Vyākhyā* moves on directly to discussing the three types of mental action that have been done and accumulated, *kathaṃ bhikṣavas trividhaṃ manasā samcetanīyaṃ karma kṛtaṃ bhavaty upacītaṃ?* At the same point both the *Upāyikā* discourse quotation and the discourse versions begin the exposition of the ten unwholesome courses of action. AN 10.206, AN 10.207 and MĀ 15 agree with the Tibetan in presenting a summary statement and a detailed exposition of the unwholesome actions, whereas AN 10.208 does not have either of them, cf. Anālayo (2009: 6 note 23).

³⁷ The phrase *lag pa khrag dang bcas pa* renders a Sanskrit equivalent to the Pali adjective *lohitapāṇī*, ‘sanguinary’, lit., ‘bloody-handed’, AN 10.206 ad AN V 292,14, whereas the Chinese, MĀ 15 ad T II 437c3 has 飲血, which literally means ‘drinking blood, presumably mistaking the second member of this compound to be related to *pāna* or *pāṇīya*, ‘drink’, cf. Anālayo (2009: 6 note 24).

³⁸ As already noted by Anālayo (2009: 6 note 25), AN 10.208 does not have a detailed treatment of the ten unwholesome actions, yet AN 10.206 ad AN V

(2) Some who have taken what has not been given – these are those who have not abstained from taking what had not been given and who are counted among those who by going to a village or to a monastery have stolen what is not given by others.

(3) Some who have committed sexual misconduct – these are those who have not abstained from sexual misconduct, that is,

292,15 (which does take up the ten unwholesome actions) only mentions living beings in general, *sabbapāṇabhūtesu* (AN 10.207 is abbreviated). For a similar difference in the description of abstention from killing observed between MN 27 and its Chinese parallel, MĀ 146, with the *Madhyama-āgama* version explicitly indicating that this also covers killing insects, cf. Anālayo (2011a: 190), and for references on killing ants/insects, cf. *ibid.* (note 244). With regard to the absence of small animals from the Theravāda version of the gradual path, Schmithausen and Maithrimurthi (2009: 53) – discussing the category of sentience, non-sentience, or a borderline status given in early Buddhism to plants and seeds – comment: “Are lay followers, too, expected to abstain from killing animals even down to ants or tiny creatures in the drinking water? As far as the canon of the Theravāda school is concerned, express statements to this extent seem to be rare ... a passage where the Buddha is reported to have chastised boys for beating a snake with sticks [Ud 11 ad Ud 2.3] being rather exceptional. In the formulation of the first precept with reference to lay followers, no explicit specification, comparable to its extension even down to ants as found in the Vinaya, is met with anywhere in the Theravāda canon. The fact that apart from pointing out the most flagrant violations ... there is little specification ... may indeed not be accidental ... may rather signal the conscious intention to keep the precepts practicable for the majority by marking only the ideal and the extreme opposite ...”. For a discussion of the unwholesome path of action of killing in the context of Theravāda Abhidharmic commentarial passages taking up the list of ten unwholesome paths of action and in commentaries on the *pārājika* rule no. 3 and *pācittiya* rule no. 61 cf. Gethin (2004). From the point of view of the Sarvāstivāda transmission, an aspect to be taken into account is an apparently growing emphasis on and sensitivity towards – in terms of karma and ethics – the spiritual status of sentient beings who may be harmed as a result of an evil action, to the point of including the smallest creatures even in the formulation of the precepts for the laity. For example, in a discussion on the higher or lesser gravity of the crime of destroying the eggs of ants or killing a human being who has already cut off the wholesome roots, the **Mahāvibhāṣa(-śāstra)* (*Apidamo da piposha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論) holds that the former act is more serious because in this case the eggs are endowed with a higher spiritual potential, T 1545 ad T XXVII 184c10, discussed in Dhammajoti (2007: 538f), who comments that it is “a very grave transgression indeed to interrupt the spiritual progress of any sentient being – be it as trifling as an ant!” (p. 539); the ethical subtleties implied by the formulation of the precept of not killing in the Sarvāstivāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda and Theravāda canonical texts have been discussed by Schmithausen (2000: 52f).

seducing [a woman] guarded by her mother or guarded by her father or guarded by her brother or guarded by her sister or guarded by her father-in-law or guarded by her mother-in-law or guarded by her relatives or guarded by her family or guarded by her clan or [a woman] who has been garlanded [in token of betrothal and is]³⁹ under [threat of] punishment⁴⁰ and veiled, because she has been [already] obtained by somebody else and is [thus] somebody else’s woman,⁴¹ or having sexual intercourse with her by overwhelming [her].⁴²

Monks, when these three types of evil, unwholesome bodily actions are done and accumulated, they will bring forth results that are *duḥkha* and unwholesome.

Monks, what are the four evil, unwholesome verbal actions that, once done and accumulated, will bring forth results that are *duḥkha* and unwholesome?

³⁹ On the meaning of garlanding as sexual invitation in ancient India cf. Silk (2007: 7); on similar expressions in the parallels, MĀ 15 ad T I 437c8 and AN 10.206 ad AN V 292, 20; cf. Anālayo (2009: 6 note 27).

⁴⁰ MĀ 15 ad T I 437c7 has: 有鞭罰恐怖, lit., “having whip-punishment fear”, cf. Anālayo (2009: 6 note 26), and AN 10.206 ad AN V 292, 20: *saparidaṇḍā*, lit., “with a stick around”, “surrounded by a stick”, an idiomatic expression used to indicate that the woman is protected by threat of corporal punishment, cf. MN 41 ad MN I 286,21 with Ps II 330,10, MN 140 ad MN III 46,30, Vin III 139,35 with Sp III 555,12, etc.; according to Woodward (1936: 177 note 4) “*daṇḍa* may be taken in the sense of penalty”.

⁴¹ Cf. AK 244,14: *paraparigrhītām*, transl. of the Chinese version in de la Vallée Poussin (1923–1931/IV: 157); *Daśakuśalakarmapatha* in Lévi (1929: 269,10): *parastrī*, with its Tibetan parallel in Q 5355 ki 357b2 (= Q 5396 gi 40a8) or D 3958 khi 307a7 quoted in Silk (2008: 371): *gzhan gyi bud med thams cad dang* and in the Chinese version in T 727 ad T XVII 457c25 in id.: 372: 他妻.

⁴² On stipulations on the categories of women whom one may not approach sexually, studied by Silk (2008), cf. AK 244.14-15, transl. of the Chinese version in de la Vallée Poussin (1923–1931/IV: 157); *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論, T 1509 ad T XXV 156c4, transl. Lamotte (1949/II: 799f, esp. 799 note 1); and the discussion in the section on misconduct (*duścarita*) found in the second chapter (on *akuśala*, the unwholesome) of the **Tridharmakaśāstra* (*Sanfadu lun* 三法度論) of the Puṅgalavādins/Vātsīputriyas, T 1506 ad T XXV 22a5, cf. Thiệu Châu (1996/1999: 64 note 267).

(1) [There are] some who speak falsehood – these are those who have not abstained from speaking falsehood, that is, those who for their own sake or for the sake of others or for the sake of just a small share of material gain,⁴³ knowingly speak falsehood, such as, be it in the king’s palace or in the minister’s hall or having gone in the midst of an assembly or having gone amidst an entourage, upon being questioned by the authority [like this]:⁴⁴ “Come, man, say what you do know! Don’t say what you don’t know! Say what you’ve seen! Don’t say what you haven’t seen!”, without giving wise consideration to what the authority has questioned [them] about, they answer in response: “I know!” although they do not know and “I have seen!” although they have not seen.

(2) [There are] some who slander and are divisive – these are those [tu 271a] who have not abstained from slandering speech, that is, having heard [something] from that [person] they report it to this [person], and having heard [something] from these [people] they report [it] to those [other people] and the community becomes [thus] divided, not in accord with [the principle of] trust, undisciplined, in conflict.

(3) [There are] some who speak harsh speech – these are those who have abandoned [types of] speech such as a speech that is sweet to the ear, that is pleasant and that delights the heart of others, illuminating, charming, worth hearing to, appealing to many beings, enchanting to many beings, that greatly gladdens many beings, that touches the heart of many beings, that is conducive to [mental] equipoise, and that brings about [the right

⁴³ Cf. AN 10.206 ad AN 293,7: *āmisakiñcikkhahetu vā*, “or for the sake of a small material (lit., ‘carnal’) thing”, and MĀ 15 at T I 437c13: 或為財物, “or for objects of wealth”.

⁴⁴ For *dbang bo* I adopt the reading of N and Q (cf. Si 161 p. 738 note 3): *dbang bos* (ergative). Literally, *dbang bo* refers to a “lord”, in the sense of the most important person of authority in a given context. Because the king (*rgyal po*) and minister (*blon po*) who would be the authorities presiding over the administration of justice have already been mentioned in this passage (*rgyal po’i pho bran*, “the king’s palace” and *blon po’i khang*, “the minister’s hall”), here and below I take *dbang bo* as designating in general the person in charge of the interrogation. The Pali parallel, AN 10.206 ad AN V 293,3, specifies that the wrongdoer is *sakhipuṭṭho*, “interrogated as a witness”, and, as MĀ 15, it does not mention the person who is conducting the interrogation.

mental conditions] for concentration.⁴⁵ [Those who speak harsh speech are then] those who have not abstained from harsh speech, such as a speech that is abusive and harsh, that wrenches the heart of others, that is not in harmony with others, that is disagreeable to many beings, that is repulsive to many beings, that is unpleasant to many beings, that upsets the minds of many beings, that is not conducive to [mental] equipoise, and that does not bring about [the right mental conditions] for meditation.

(4) [There are] some who speak frivolous talk – these are those who have not abstained from speaking frivolous talk, that is, they speak pointless words, they speak untruthful [words], they speak [words that are] not in accordance with reality, they speak [words that are] meaningless, they speak [words that are] not peaceful, they speak [words] that provoke agitation and are untimely, that are not leading to discernment and that are against the Dharma, that draw together what is not the [real] meaning.

Monks, when these four evil, unwholesome verbal actions are done and accumulated, this will bring forth results that are *duḥkha* and unwholesome.

Monks, what are the three evil, unwholesome mental actions that, once done and accumulated, will bring forth results that are *duḥkha* and unwholesome?

(1) [There are] some who are covetous – these are those who have not abstained from covetousness, [tu 271b] that is, have strong attachment to [things] that are the objects of desire, covetousness for the material goods of another, the wealth of another and the necessities of life of another, and [the wish:] “What if that which belongs to another would instead become mine?”

(2) [There are] some who have ill will – these are those who have not abstained from ill will, that is, with a poisonous mind they think such kind of thought: “May it be that all of you living beings experience failure, be defeated, encounter misfortune and loss!”

⁴⁵ The listing of the positive qualities that have been forsaken, opposite to the negative ones of someone on the wrong path of action, is not found in the parallel versions, AN 10.206 and MĀ 15. The Tibetan translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* is in this respect consistent with the treatment found in the present discourse quotation, cf., e.g., Q 1035 ne 196b7 or D 1 kha 69a5 and Q 1030 ge 64b1 or D 6 da 205b3; that is, this might constitute a pattern in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.

(3) [There are] some who have wrong view – these are those who have not abstained from wrong view, that is, holding a view that is a distorted view, they propound such statements: “There is no [efficacy in] giving, there are no [ritual] offerings and donations, there is no good conduct, there is no bad conduct, there is no ripening of the fruits of karma of good conduct nor of [those of] bad conduct, there is no this world, there is no other world, there is no father, there is no mother, there are no spontaneously arisen beings,⁴⁶ in the world there are no arhats that have rightly gone⁴⁷ who have by themselves gained direct knowledge of this

⁴⁶ The reference to the view of the non-existence of spontaneously arisen beings, *sems can rdzus te byung ba rnams med do*, is absent from the Chinese parallel, but found in AN 10.206 ad AN V 293,32: *n’ atthi sattā opapātikā*, cf. Anālayo (2009: 8 note 31) and id. (2011: 659) for other occurrences of this difference. Cf. also, e.g., MN 117 ad MN III 71,28 with a canonical quotation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda parallel, in the *Upāyikā*, Q 9035 ad thu 132b7 or Si 162 p. 958,7, quoting AKB 468,9; cf. also Anālayo (2010: 69 and 89 note 27).

⁴⁷ The phrase *yang dag par song* seems to render an underlying Sanskrit *samyaggatā*, “who have gone rightly”, cf. the more expanded AN 10.206 ad AN V 294,1: *sammāgatā sammāpaṭipannā*, “who have gone rightly [and] who have rightly practised”, and MĀ 15 ad T I 438a1: 善去. 善向, “who have well gone and have advanced well”. In the Tibetan version this quality is attributed to arhats, *dgra bcom pa*, whereas the Pali speaks of recluses and Brahmins, *samaṇa-brahmāṇā*, and the Chinese of true persons, 真人. According to Anālayo (2009: 8 note 32), though in its general usage 真人 can also render arhat, it would in this case render an Indic term equivalent to the Pali *sappurisa* “true person”, judging from its use elsewhere in the *Madhyama-āgama* (e.g., 真人經 in MĀ 85 ad T I 561a20, parallel to the Pali *Sappurisa-sutta*, MN 113 ad MN III 37). The Tibetan *dgra bcom pa* indicates unequivocally an arhat, with the standard equivalent to *sappurisa* (Skt. *satpuruṣa*) being *skyes bu dam pa*, cf., e.g., *Mahāvīyutpatti* 7358. The expression *sammag(g)ata* features in early Buddhist discourses as a quality of the arhat or of the *tathāgata*, e.g., Vin II 203,17 or It 89 ad It 87,1; of great seers who engage in allowable sacrifices free from violence, SN 3.9 ad SN 76,23; of the Dharma and Discipline taught by a fully awakened one, in which confidence is rightly directed, *sammag(g)ato/sammag(g)atā akkhāyati*, MN 11 ad MN I 67,7; etc. Cf. also the discussion in Horner (1936: 82f). It is open to question whether this might have led the reciters responsible for the transmission of the Mūlasarvāstivāda recension (or perhaps Śamathadeva or the team of Tibetan translators) to substitute an equivalent of the Pali *sappurisa* with *arhat/dgra bcom pa*. Apart from this inconsistency in the designation of the realised person in question, the three versions, with minor variations, agree in their description of the respective spiritual qualities. Notably, in the Tibetan version, the standard formula for the attainment of the highest goal of the holy life is found subsequently,

world and of the other world in their present lifetime and [thus] attained perfect realisation [being thereby able to proclaim:] ‘For me birth is destroyed, the holy life has been lived, what had to be done has been done, there is no more of this hereafter.’

Monks, when these three types of evil, unwholesome mental actions are done and accumulated, they will bring forth results that are unhappy and *duḥkha*.

Furthermore, monks, a noble disciple abandons unwholesome bodily factors and develops wholesome bodily factors; he abandons unwholesome verbal and mental factors [272a] and develops wholesome verbal and mental factors:⁴⁸

With a mind imbued with benevolence (*byams pa*, Skt. *maitrī*), free from enmity, unsurpassed, free from ill will, vast, all-pervasive, immeasurable, well-developed, he dwells pervading one direction, and likewise the second, likewise the third, likewise the fourth [direction], the quarters above and below, he dwells pervading the whole world with a mind imbued with benevolence, free from enmity, unsurpassed, free from ill will, vast, all-pervasive, immeasurable, well-developed.⁴⁹

[He should then] reflect in this way: ‘Formerly, my mind was not developed, it was small, [whereas] in this way now my mind has become immeasurable and well-developed.’ Monks, for the mind of a well-taught noble disciple [which has been cultivated in this way] it is impossible to be negligent, [the mind] does not

whereas it is absent in the Chinese and Pali parallels. This would lend support to the suggestion that the mention of the arhat in the Tibetan text might be influenced by the context, a context which, in turn, might be the result of the insertion of a standard formulation exemplifying the results of a rightly conducted holy life. A Sanskrit parallel to the statement of wrong view is found in a canonical quotation in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, AK 247, 20, cf. Pāsādika (1989: 88 no.335).

⁴⁸ Rather than of bodily, verbal and mental factors (*chos rnams*, Skt. *dharmas*), MĀ 15 ad T I 438a3 talks of bodily, verbal and mental deeds (業), a phrasing that is used elsewhere in the *Madhyama-āgama* discourse where the corresponding Tibetan version speaks of actions (*las*). On the ten wholesome and unwholesome actions and the five precepts cf. Nattier (2002).

⁴⁹ For a standard Tibetan rendering of the formula of pervasion with the four immeasurables cf., e.g., *Mahāvīyutpatti* 1508–1509.

fall [into negligence], it does not abide [in negligence], and becomes beyond measurement.⁵⁰

Monks, suppose there is a small boy or a small girl⁵¹ who has [since birth]⁵² developed the concentration of the mind of benevolence.⁵³ Would [later he or she] change into doing actions of

⁵⁰ This first part of the review phase of the benevolence radiation in the form of a monks' reflection suggested by the Buddha is found, with differences in wording and details, in the parallel versions: MĀ 15 ad T I 438a11 and AN 10.208 ad AN V 299,23. For other occurrences of *pamāṇakataṃ kammaṃ* cf., e.g., DN 13 ad DN I 251,7, MN 99 ad MN II 207,25, and SN 42.8 ad SN IV 322,13. In the first two cases the Chinese parallels, DĀ 26 ad T I 106c17 and MĀ 152 ad T I 669c10 do not have the reference to the effect of *appamāṇā* on limiting actions, whereas in the third case the parallels SĀ 916 ad T II 232b5 and SĀ² 131 ad T II 425b29 do refer to the effect of *appamāṇā*, cf. Anālayo (2009: 9 note 35). The commentary on the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* explains the implications of this statement in terms of rebirth, cf. Mp V 77,17, cf. also Spk III 105,27. That is, limiting actions that would lead to taking birth again in the sense realm are neutralised because the corresponding mental inclinations have been superseded, cf. also Anālayo (2009: 9 note 35). Spk III 105,25, commenting on SN 42.8 ad SN IV 322,12, explains that 'liberation of the mind' (*cetovimutti*) means absorption". In other words, the absorption attainment through benevolence will take precedence over sense-sphere karma and result in rebirth into a higher realm.

⁵¹ The Tibetan version's *khye'u dang bu mo*, agrees with the Chinese version in mentioning a boy and a girl, MĀ 15 ad T I 438a15: 童男, 童女, whereas the Pali version refers only to a boy, AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,2: *kumāro*. As pointed out by Anālayo (2009: 9) note 34, since all versions later on mention a man and a woman, the presence of a boy and a girl fits the context better.

⁵² Cf. AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,1: *dahara-t-agge* ..., "if from his youth (or: boyhood) onwards" (cf. also Mp V 77,22: *daharatagge ti daharakālato paṭṭhāya*) and MĀ 15 ad T I 438a15: 生, "since birth".

⁵³ Here and below the parallels employ the standard formulations "liberation of the mind through benevolence" (*mettācetovimutti*, AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,2 etc.; 慈心解脫, MĀ 15 ad T I 438a19 etc.) rather than "development of concentration of the mind of benevolence", *byams pa'i sems kyi ting nge 'dzin sgom par byed pa* etc. found in the Tibetan version, which does not seem to occur elsewhere in the *Upāyikā* and would seem to render a Sanskrit equivalent to Pali *cetosamādhi-bhāvanā*. On *appamāṇo cetosamādhi* cf. Maithrimurthi (1999: 28f). Dhammajoti (2010: 185 note 39) remarks: "[in the attainment of *mettācetovimutti*] ... *vimutti* seems to suggest the type of mental liberation/freedom similar to that obtaining in the case of the eight *vimokkhas* (Sanskrit *vimokṣa*)"; for references on the eight deliverances cf. Martini (2011a: 131 note 23). Another example of variation in final or defining terms are the different expressions used in the parallel

body, speech and mind that are evil and unwholesome actions? Or would [he or she] similarly display for a long time actions that are contrary to the Dharma, unbeneficial and [result in] *duḥkha* for others?” “It is not so, venerable sir.”⁵⁴

“Monks, it is well, it is well. Monks, a man or a woman, whether being a householder or one gone forth, should develop the concentration of the mind of benevolence. Why is that, monks? A man or woman, whether being a householder or one gone forth,⁵⁵ once [he or she] has abandoned this body and will be going to the other world, [272b] monks, [he or she] will enter [the next birth] based on a mind which is determined by the mind that depends on the mental quality that conforms to [that particular] mental state.⁵⁶

versions of the ‘Shorter discourse on emptiness’, which has the equivalent of the “signless element” in Tibetan [*mtshan ma med pa’i dbyings*, cf. Pali *animittadhātu*, ed. Skilling (1994: 172,5)], “signless concentration of the mind” in Pali (*animitta-cetosamādhī*, MN 121 ad MN III 107,28), and the equivalent of “signless concentration of the mind” in Chinese [無想定 at MĀ 190 ad T I 737c3, emended to *無想定 by Anālayo (2011: 686 note 15), based on the assumption that the reading at T I 737c3 results from a confusion in the original of 想 with 相, two characters often confused in Chinese texts, cf. also Anālayo (2011: 274 note 54) and Choong (1999: 71)]. Different choices of terminology are a redactional feature that runs through the *sūtra* literature, pointing to major editing practices which are still awaiting extensive examination.

⁵⁴ The parallels are formulated in a slightly different way: AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,2: ... *api nu kho pāpakammaṃ kareyyā ti ... akarontaṃ kho pana pāpakammaṃ api nu kho dukkhaṃ phuseyyā ti?*, “would he [i.e., the boy] do any evil action? ... and not doing any evil action, would he experience *duḥkha*?”; MĀ 15 ad T I 438a16: ... 而於後時. 彼身. 口. 意寧可復作不善業耶 ... 自不作惡業, 惡業何由生, “later on, would they [i.e., a small boy or a small girl] still do unwholesome deeds by body, speech or mind?” ... [Given that they] do not do evil deeds themselves, how could evil deeds arise?”.

⁵⁵ While MĀ 15 ad T I 438a18 agrees with the Tibetan, the Pali version speaks of “a man or a woman”, AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,8. The presentation in the Tibetan and Chinese versions from this point on shifts from rebirth for a practicing man or woman in general to progress prospects for monastics, as noted by Anālayo (2009: 9 note 35).

⁵⁶ Besides the difference noted above (no mention of monastics), compared to the other two versions AN 10.208 at this point features a significant variation in wording. The whole passage, AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,7, reads: *bhāvetabbā kho panāyaṃ ... mettāceto vimutti itthiyā vā purisena vā. itthiyā vā ... purisassa vā nāyaṃ kāyo ādāya gamanīyo. cittantaro ayaṃ ... macco. so evaṃ pajānāti: yaṃ kho me idha kiñci pubbe iminā karajakāyena pāpakammaṃ kataṃ, sabbaṃ taṃ idha vedanīyaṃ, na taṃ anugaṃ* (with

Monks, one says: ‘With this body of mine formerly I did evil, unwholesome actions, which have been accumulated. With regard to all that has become accumulated, let it be experienced [now] and not be experienced further at the time of birth.’⁵⁷

Monks, if at the present time one is [thus] endowed with the concentration of the mind of benevolence, one will directly know the state of non-retrogression⁵⁸ or the highest Dharma. Therefore a

various ms. variant readings recorded in E^c) *bhavissatī ti*, “indeed, monks, the liberation of mind by benevolence should be developed by a man or a woman. A man or a woman cannot take their body along with them and depart [from this world]. Monks, this mortal [life] is but an intermediate mental state. He knows thus: ‘whatever evil actions I did before with this physical body, their results shall be experienced here and shall not follow me.’” After this, all versions present a statement on the leading to the attainment either of non-return or of the highest. The interpretation of the Pali passage is particularly difficult due to the ambiguity of the phrase that I provisionally render with “this mortal [life/being] is an intermediate state of mind” [rendered by Nyanaponika and Bodhi (1999: 269) as “mortals have consciousness as the connecting link”], and it presents philosophical implications (interim existence or *antarabhāva*, rebirth consciousness and consciousness continuum or *bhavaṅga*, etc.) that go beyond the scope of what is feasible in annotation. Theravāda commentarial explanations of the expression *cittāntaro* are found in Mp V 77, 25. With different degrees of abridgement for the development of compassion, sympathetic joy and equanimity, the three versions display the same pattern of variation noted here and in the notes below.

⁵⁷ The aspiration to experience the fruits of unwholesome actions resulting from previous negligence entirely now and not in a later world is also found in MĀ 15 ad T I 438a21. The direct expression of any aspiration is completely absent from AN 10.208, probably due to a textual loss on the side of the Pali version, cf. also Anālayo (2009: 9 note 35). A comparable statement is, however, found later on in the Pali text, in the form of a further review phase of the practice of benevolence, worded indirectly as a post-meditative reflection, AN 10.208 ad AN V 300,10, cf. a similar statement found in Th 81 ad Th 12,21. After the aspiration (present only in the Tibetan and Chinese parallels and specifically addressed to monastics, cf. above note 55) all three versions continue with a statement of the certainty of non-return or of the highest goal (*bla na med pa’i chos*, 復上, *uttari vimutti*).

⁵⁸ The “directly knowing the state of not being subject to retrogression”, i.e., the attainment of irreversibility (*phyir mi ldog par gnas ... so sor rig par byur* [D reads: *gyur*]), stated to be the final outcome of the ethical and meditative instructions outlined by the ‘Discourse on accumulated actions’ is more commonly found as the Tibetan literal counterpart to Sanskrit *avaivartika* or *avinivartanīya*, whereas ‘non-returner’ (*anāgāmin*) is literally translated as *phyir mi ’ong ba*, e.g., *Mahāvīyūtpatti* 1014. In the concluding part of the discourse the Pali and Chinese versions have the leading to the

well-taught noble disciple has abandoned evil and unwholesome bodily [actions] and develops wholesome bodily actions, has abandoned evil and unwholesome verbal and mental [actions] and develops wholesome verbal and mental actions.

By [developing] in sequence one after the other⁵⁹ that which is called a ‘mind imbued with compassion, [a mind imbued with] sympathetic joy and [a mind imbued with] equanimity’, monks, one who having done so is endowed with the concentration of the mind of equanimity, will directly know the state of non-retrogression or the highest Dharma.”

Acknowledgements:

I am grateful to Peter Skilling for having passed on to me his notes on the *Upāyikā*, to Honjō Yoshifumi for having put at my disposal his Japanese translation of this work; and to Bhikkhu Anālayo, Seishi Karashima, Bhikkhu Ñāṇatusita, Giacomella Orofino, Alberto Todeschini, Vincent Tournier, Dorji Wangchuk and Wanloo Woon for comments and suggestions.

attainment of the state of non return (*anāgāmitāya samvattati*), and the certainty of attaining it (必得阿那含), respectively, cf. AN 10.208 ad AN V 300, 13 and 301,15 and MĀ 15 ad T I 438a23 and 438b9. An epithet related to the irreversibility of a non-returner spoken of in the Tibetan version occurs, e.g., in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, cf. ed. Waldschmidt 1950: 166, §9.12 (Sanskrit): *anāgāmy anāvrttidharmā*; DN 16 ad DN II 92,24 (Pali): *anāvattidhammo*; Waldschmidt 1950: 167, §9.12 (Tibetan): ‘*mi ’byung ba’i chos nyid ’gyur*. Non-returning qualified as an irreversible condition (*mi ldog pa’i chos can phyir mi ’ong ba zhes bya*), distinctive of those who have abandoned the five lower fetters, is found, e.g., in another discourse quotation in the *Upāyikā*, in a standard presentation of the four types of (noble) individuals, Q 5595 tu 20a2 or Si 161 p. 41,17, parallel to SĀ 61 ad T II 15c14), Q 5595 tu 21a5 or Si 161 p. 44,3. Thus compounds such as *anāvartika* or **anāvrttika* (underlying the rendering *phyir mi ldog par gnas*) and *anāvartikadharmā* or *anāvrtti(ka)dharmin* etc. (underlying the rendering *phyir mi ldog pa’i chos can*) adopted by Śamathadeva to designate a non-returner chiefly from the standpoint of irreversibility (*phyir mi ldog par gnas*, and especially *phyir mi ldog pa’i chos can*) are part of standard qualifications of an *anāgāmin* featuring across the different early Buddhist textual traditions. For an occurrence of *anāvartikadharmi(n)* in the *Abhidharmakośa*, in the context of a discussion of the meaning of *sarāga/vigatarāga*, cf. AK 398,11, transl. of the Chinese version in de la Vallée Poussin (1923–1931/V: 26); cf. also the gloss in AKBV 624,1.

⁵⁹ *Snga ma bzhin du* renders Sanskrit *anupūrveṇa* or an equivalent expression.

This article is based on research made while I was an ITLR (Indo-Tibetan Lexicographic Resource) fellow at the Khyentse Center for Tibetan Textual Scholarship at the University of Hamburg in the summer of 2011.

Abbreviations:

AK	<i>Abhidharmakośa</i> (ed. Pradhan)
AKB	<i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i> (ed. Pradhan)
AKBV	<i>Abhidharmakośavyākhyā</i> (ed. Wogihara)
AN	<i>Āṅguttara-nikāya</i>
B ^c	Burmese edition
CBETA	Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association
C ^c	Ceylonese edition
C	Cone edition
D	Derge edition (Tōhoku)
DĀ	<i>Dīrgha-āgama</i> (T 1)
DN	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i>
E ^c	European (PTS) edition
It	<i>Itivuttaka</i>
Jā	<i>Jātaka</i>
Jā-a	<i>Jātaka-atthavaṇṇanā</i>
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i> (T 26)
MN	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>
Mp	<i>Manorathapūranī</i>
N	Narthing edition
PTS	Pali Text Society
Q	Peking (Qianlong) edition (Ōtani)
SĀ	<i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (T 99)
SĀ ²	‘other’ <i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (T 100)
S ^c	Siamese edition
Si	Sichuan (Beijing) edition
SN	<i>Samyutta-nikāya</i>
Sp	<i>Samantapāsādikā</i>
Spk	<i>Sāratthapakāsinī</i>

T	Taishō <i>Tripīṭaka</i> (ed. CBETA, 2011)
Th	<i>Theragāthā</i>
Ud	<i>Udāna</i>
Vin	<i>Vinaya</i>

Note:

All references to Pali texts are to the Pali Text Society editions, unless otherwise indicated. For Sanskrit, Pali, Tibetan and Chinese, on occurrence, I have adjusted the *sandhi*, punctuation, capitalisations, etc.

Bibliography:

- Anālayo 2009. “Karma and Liberation – The Karajakāya-sutta (AN 10.208) in the Light of its Parallels”, *Pāsādikadānam: Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*, ed. Martin Straube et al., Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, pp. 1–24.
- Anālayo 2010. “The Mahācattārisaka-sutta in the Light of its Parallels – Tracing the Beginnings of Abhidharmic Thought”, *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 8: 59–93.
- Anālayo 2011a. *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya*, Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Anālayo 2011b. “*Chos sbyin gyi mdo* – Bhikṣuṇī Dharmadinnā Proves Her Wisdom”, *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 24: 3–33.
- Anālayo 2012 (forthcoming). *Madhyama-āgama Studies*, Hamburg: Hamburg University Press.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus 2012 (forthcoming). “Introduction”, in ed. id., Anālayo and Roderick Bucknell: *The Middle Length Discourses*, vol. 1, Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation & Research.
- Bollée, William 2002. *The Story of Paesi (Paesi-kahāṇayam): Soul and Body in Ancient India, A Dialogue on Materialism, Text, Translation, Notes and Glossary*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

- Bucknell, Roderick S. 2006. “Saṃyukta-āgama”, in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, ed. W.G. Weeraratne, Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs 7.4: 684–687.
- Choong, Mun-keat 1999. *The Notion of Emptiness in Early Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Choong, Mun-keat 2000. *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism: A Comparative Study based on the Sūtrāṅga Portion of the Pali Saṃyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Chos 'byung = Gangs ljongs shes rig gi nying bcud (ed.), 1988.
- Chung, Jin-il 2008. *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama* (雜阿含經相當. 梵文斷片一覽), Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Chung, Jin-il and Takamichi Fukita 2011. *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Madhyamāgama (Including References to Sanskrit Parallels, Citations, Numerical Categories of Doctrinal Concepts, and Stock Phrases)*, Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- de la Vallée Poussin, Louis 1923–1931. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, Paris: Geuthner, 6 vols.
- Dhammajoti KL 法光 2007. *Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma*, Hong Kong: Centre for Buddhist Studies, The University of Hong Kong (third revised ed.).
- Dhammajoti KL 法光 2010. “The Apramāṇa Meditation in the Sarvāstivāda with Special Reference to Maitrī-bhāvanā”, *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* 8: 165–186.
- Enomoto, Fumio 榎本 文雄 1984. *Agon kyōten no seiritsu* 阿含經典の成立 (The Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas), *Tōyō Gakujutsu Kenkyū* 東洋學術研究 / *The Journal of Oriental Studies* 23.1: 93–108.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1986. “On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas”, *Buddhist Studies Review* 3.1: 19–30.
- Enomoto, Fumio 榎本 文雄 1998. ‘Mūlasarvāstivāda’ and ‘Sarvāstivāda’, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 47.1: 400–392.

- Enomoto, Fumio 2000. “‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’ and ‘Sarvāstivādin’”, in *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette* (Indica et Tibetica Band 37), ed. Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Volker M. Tschannerl, Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, pp. 239–250.
- Gangs ljongs shes rig gi nying bcud (ed.) 1988: *Bu ston chos 'byung, Gangs ljongs shes rig gi nying bcud, pe cin*, Beijing: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang.
- Gethin Rupert 2004. “Can Killing a Living Being Ever Be an Act of Compassion? The analysis of the act of killing in the Abhidhamma and Pali Commentaries”, *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 11: 167–202.
- Glass, Andrew 2010. “Gunabhadra, Baoyún, and the Saṃyuktāgama”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31.1-2: 185–203.
- Harrison, Paul 2002: “Another Addition to the An Shigao Corpus? Preliminary Notes on an Early Chinese Saṃyuktāgama Translation”, in *Sakurabe Hajime Hakase Kiju Kinen Ronshū Shoki Bukkyō kara Abidaruma e* 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集初期仏教からアビダルマへ / *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought, In Honor of Doctor Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday*, ed. Sakurabe Hajime Hakase Kiju Kinen Ronshū kankōkai 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集刊行会 / Sakurabe Ronshu Committee, Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, pp. 1–32.
- Harvey, Peter 1995: “The Question of an Intermediary Existence”, in: id., *The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvāṇa in Early Buddhism*, London: Curzon, Richmond Surrey.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi 平岡 聡 2000. “The Sectarian Affiliation of Two Chinese Saṃyuktāgamas”, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 49.1: 506–500.
- Honjō, Yoshifumi 本庄 良文 1984. *A Table of Āgama Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, Kyoto.

Honjō, Yoshifumi 本庄 良文 1985. *Shamathadeva no tsutaeru chū-, Sōō-agon* シヤマタデーヴァの伝える中・相応阿含 (The Madhyama and Saṃyukta Āgama as Recorded by Śamathadeva), *Bukkyō Kenyū* 佛教大学 / *Buddhist Studies* 15: 63–80.

Honjō, Yoshifumi 本庄 良文 1987: *Shamathadeva no tsutaeru ritten* シヤマタデーヴァの伝える律典 (A Vinaya Text as Quoted by Śamathadeva), *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 仏教研究 / *Buddhist Studies* 16: 123–134.

Horner, Isaline Blew 1936. *The Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected: A Study of the Arahan Concept and of the Implications of the Aim to Perfection in Religious Life Traced in Early Canonical and Post-Canonical Pali Literature*, London: Williams & Norgate.

Kudo, Noriyuki 2004. *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscript from Nepal* (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VII), Tokyo: Soka University.

Lamotte, Étienne 1949: *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nagarjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*, vol. 2, Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.

Lévi, Sylvain 1929. “Autour d’Aśvaghōṣa”, *Journal Asiatique* 215.2: 255–285.

Lévi, Sylvain 1932. *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*, *Textes sanscrits rapportés du Népal, Édités et traduits avec les textes parallèles en Sanscrit, en Pali, en Tibétain, en Chinois et en Koutchéen*, Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Lü, Cheng 1963. “Āgama”, in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, ed. G.P. Malalasekera, Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, 1.2: 241–244.

Mahāvīyūtpatti = Sakaki 1926.

Maithrimurthi, Mudagamuwe 1999. *Wohllwollen, Mitleid, Freude und Gleichmut: Eine ideengeschichtliche Untersuchung der vier Apramāṇas in der Buddhistischen Ethik und*

Spiritualität von den Anfängen bis hin zum Frühen Yogācāra, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

- Martini, Giuliana 2011a. “*Mahāmaitrī* in a Mahāyāna Sūtra in Khotanese — Continuity and Innovation in Buddhist Meditation”, *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 24: 121–193.
- Martini, Giuliana (in press). “The Meditative Dynamics of the Early Buddhist *Appamāṇas*”, *Canadian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 7 (2011).
- Martini, Giuliana 2012 (forthcoming). “Transcending the Limiting Power of Karma — Early Buddhist *Appamāṇas*”, in *Buddhist Philosophy & Praxis: Papers Contributed to the 2nd International Association of Buddhist Universities Academic Conference 31 May-2 June, 2012*, ed. Dion Peoples, Wangnoi: Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University Press, 2012 (provisional title).
- Mayeda [=Maeda], Egaku 1985. “Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas”, in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Erster Teil*, ed. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 94–103.
- Mejor, Marek 1991. *Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa and the Commentaries Preserved in the Tanjur*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Mukai, Akira 向井亮 1985. “*Yogashijiron shōjibun to zaagonkyō*” 『瑜珈師地論』撰事分と『雜阿含經』 (The *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Samyuktāgama*), *Hokkaidō daigaku bungakukenyūka kiyō* 北海道大学文学研究科紀要 33.2:1–41.
- Nattier, Jan 2002. “The ‘Eleven Precepts’ for Laity in the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*”, in *Sakurabe Hajime Hakase Kiju Kinen Ronshū Shoki Bukkyō kara Abidaruma e* 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集初期仏教からアビダルマへ / *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought, In Honor of Doctor Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday*, ed. Sakurabe Hajime Hakase Kiju Kinen Ronshū kankōkai 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集刊行会 / Sakurabe Ronshu Committee, Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, pp. 33–44.

- Nishioka, Soshū 1980. “Index to the Catalogue Section of Buxton’s ‘History of Buddhism’ (II)”, *Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange, The University of Tōkyō* 4.
- Norman, K.R. 1997. *A Philological Approach to Buddhism* (The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994), London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Nyanaponika, Thera and Bhikkhu Bodhi 1999. *Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: An Anthology of Suttas from the Aṅguttara Nikāya*, Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
- Oberlies, Thomas 2003. “Ein bibliographischer Überblick über die kanonischen Texte der Śrāvakayāna-Schulen des Buddhismus (ausgenommen der des Mahāvihāra-Theravāda)”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 47: 37–84.
- Pāsādika, Bhikkhu 1989. *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya des Vasubandhu*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pradhan, P. 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Sakaki, Ryōzaburō 榊 亮三郎 1926. 翻譯名義大集 [*Mahāvvyutpatti*], Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- Sakurabe, Hajime 櫻部建 1969. *Kusharon no kenkyū: kai, konhon* 俱舍論の研究 : 界, 根品 (A Study of the Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya: The Chapters on Elements and Faculties), Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Schmithausen, Lambert 1987. “Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischer Materialien”, in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Zweiter Teil* (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,2), ed. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, vol. 2, pp. 304–406.
- Schmithausen, Lambert 2000. “Buddhism and the ethics of nature — Some remarks”, *The Eastern Buddhist* 32.2: 26–78.
- Schmithausen, Lambert and Mudagamuwe Maithrimurthi 2009. “Attitudes towards Animals in Indian Buddhism”, in *Penser, dire et représenter l’animal dans le monde Indien*

(Actes du colloque organisé par l'équipe LACMI en mars 2002, à paraître), ed. Nalini Balbir and Georges-Jean Pinault, Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, pp. 47–115.

- Silk, Jonathan A. 2007. "Garlanding as sexual invitation: Indian Buddhist evidence", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50: 5–10.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2008. "Forbidden women: a peculiar Buddhist reference", in *Aspects of Research into Central Asian Buddhism: In memoriam of Kōgi Kudara*, ed. Peter Zieme (Silk Road Studies XVI), Brepols: Turnhout, pp. 371–378.
- Skilling, Peter and Paul Harrison 2005. "What's in a Name? Sarvāstivādin Interpretations of the Epithets 'Buddha' and 'Bhagavat'", in *Buddhism and Jainism: Essays in Honour of Dr. Hojun Nagasaki on His Seventieth Birthday*, Kyoto: Committee for the Felicitation of Dr. Hojun Nagasaki's Seventieth Birthday, Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, pp. 700–675.
- Skilling, Peter 1978b. "Une édition critique de la version tibétaine d'un passage de *l'Abhidharma-kośaṭīkopāyikā* de Śamathadeva — tirée de l'ensemble le plus étendu des matériaux d'Āgama trouvables en tibétain: 'Les quatre sortes de karma'", *Linh-Son Publication d'Études Bouddhologiques* (Paris: Institut de Recherche Bouddhique Linh-Son) 3: 27–30.
- Skilling, Peter 1979. "Discourse on the Four Kinds of Karma", *The Journal of Religious Studies* (Patiala: Punjabi University) 7.1: 86–91.
- Skilling, Peter 1980. "The *Daśottara-sūtra*, the *Ṣaṭsūtraka-nipāta*, and the *Śīlaskandhikā*", *Linh-Son Publication d'Études Bouddhologiques* (Paris: Institut de Recherche Bouddhique Linh-Son) 10 (mars): 26–35.
- Skilling, Peter 1992. "Symbols on the Body, Feet, and Hands of a Buddha, Part I—Lists", *Journal of the Siam Society* 80.2: 67–79.
- Skilling, Peter 1994/I and 1997/II. *Mahāsūtras*, 2 vols., Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Skilling, Peter 1996. "Symbols on the Body, Feet, and Hands of a Buddha, Part II—Short Lists", *Journal of the Siam Society* 84.1: 5–28.

- Skilling, Peter 1998. “The Sūtra on the Four Conditions: A (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin Discourse on Causality”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 41: 139–149.
- Skilling, Peter 2002. Review of Enomoto 2000, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45:373–377.
- Skilling, Peter 2009. “Commentary at Nālandā in the Age of Dhammapāla, Vīryaśrīdatta’s Nibandhana on the Arthavinīścaya-dharmaparyāya”, in *Pāsādikadānaṃ: Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*, ed. M. Straube et al., Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, pp. 399–447.
- Skilling, Peter 2012 (forthcoming). “‘Discourse on the twenty-two faculties’, Translated from Śamathadeva’s Upāyikā-ṭīkā”, in *Dharmapracicaya: Aspects of Buddhist Studies, Essays in Honour of Professor Narayan Hemandas Samtani*, ed. Lalji ‘Shravak’ and C. Willemen, pp. 399–434. Delhi: Buddhist World Press.
- Skilling, Peter 1978a. “Un passage du Sūtra du Nuage de Joyaux (1)”, *Linh-Son Publication d’Études Bouddhologiques* (Paris: Institut de Recherche Bouddhique Linh-Son) 3 (mai): 20–26.
- Skilling, Peter 1978c. “Les Quatre Sortes de Karma”, *Linh-Son Publication d’Études Bouddhologiques* (Paris: Institut de Recherche Bouddhique Linh-Son) 44: 16–24.
- Thiền Châu, Thích (Bhikṣu) 1996/1999. *The Literature of the Personalists of Early Buddhism*, transl. Sara Boin-Webb, Ho Chi Minh City: Vietnam Buddhist Research. Institute, 1997 (reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999).
- Vetter, Tilmann 1988. *The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism*, Leiden: Brill.
- von Hinüber, Oskar 1978. “On the Tradition of Pāli Texts in India, Ceylon and Burma”, in *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 108), ed. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 48–57.

- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1950. *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, Verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins, Auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben und bearbeitet*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1980. “Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas”, in *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition* (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II), ed. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 136–174.
- Willemen, Charles 2008. “Kumārajīva’s ‘Explanatory Discourse’ about Abhidharmic Literature”, *Kokusai bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 / *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 12: 37–83 [= 156–110].
- Willemen, Charles, Bart Dessein and Collett Cox 1998. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 138–254.
- Wogihara, Unrai 1932–1936. *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, Tokyo.
- Woodward, F. L. 1936. *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Aṅguttara-Nikāya), or More-Numbered Suttas*, vol. 5 (The Book of the Tens and Elevens), London, The Pali Text Society: Luzac & Company.
- Wynne, Alexander 2008. “On the Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins”, *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 9: 243–266.
- Yao, Fumi 八尾 史 2007. “On the Name ‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’”, *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 / *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 5.2: 897–894.