that Buddhism too has a parallel concept of the attainment of companionship with Brahma. But this, however, does not mean that Buddhism, like Vedic literature or Brahmanism, admits the possibility of eternal companionship with Brahma.

Jñānic attainments signify the experiencing of a very high level of mental development through the process of jñānic practices. The teaching on the four Brahmas-Vihāras (four Sublime States) is another instance which explains how the Buddha adopted another important aspect of the pre-Buddhist Brahma concept. It is obvious that many scholars are of the opinion that the teaching on Brahmas-Vihāra is purely Buddhist. Perhaps this is more likely to be an adaptation of a pre-Buddhist concept to suit the Buddhist standpoint. This becomes apparent from Venerable Buddhaghosa’s explanation of Brahmas-vihāra. According to him, they are called Brahmas-vihāras as they are supreme and faultless. These states constitute the best mode of conduct towards others. The Brahmas live with their minds freed of the five hindrances.

As the parental love is imbued with these mental attitudes towards their children, they too can be called Brahmas. The comparison of parents with the Brahmas, has added a new dimension to the Brahma concept. The Buddhist path leading to Nibbāna is called the “Brahma-faring” (Brahmacarīya). The Buddha addressing the first disciples who grasped his teaching said, “Come O monk, the doctrine is well taught. Practice this Brahmacarīya for the perfect ending of suffering.” The five ascetics who were the first disciples of the Buddha were already following some kind of a restrained noble life. By inviting them to lead “Brahmacarīya” Buddha seems to have made clear that his interpretation of the Brahmacarīya meant something different from what they were already engaged in. Brahmacarīya in Buddhism, which developed from a pre-Buddhist idea, was identified as the path leading to the ending of defilement resulting in the attainment of Nibbāna.

Conclusion

It is obvious that Gautama Buddha has not been described in the sense of Brahma yet the term Brahma occurs in the discourses in the meaning of Supreme, Noble, Highest, Holy and so on. For instance, the terms such as Brahmacakka, Dharmacakka, Brahmbhāta, Dharmabhāta, Brahmacāya and Dharmacāya, signify this and the ascription of qualities of Brahma to the Buddha also denotes this fact. Hence, what is obvious is that Buddha has used the pre-Buddhist Brahma concept to give a new dimension to certain important Buddhist concepts. Nonetheless, glorification of the concept of Buddha is a natural outcome of this equation of the two concepts, i.e., Buddha and Brahma, but the Buddha remained a supplan human being in the early Buddhist literature without undergoing significant change as found in the Mahāyāna School of Buddhist thought.

Haribhadra’s Commentary (Abhisamayālaṅkārāloka) on the Story of Sadāprudita
(Ch. 30-31 of Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā) — Sources and Construction of a Mahāyāna Soteriology

Bill M. Mak

Introduction

The convoluted story of Sadāprudita, presented as the final chapters of Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā (AP), has been the bane of modern philologists who considered the devotional narrative embedded in an otherwise largely metaphysical text as unaccountably incongruous.1 For the traditional Mahāyāna commentators, however, the authenticity of these materials as buddhavacana being taken for granted, their concerns were purely exegetical, that is, to interpret and explain the text to the intended audience in the most coherent and learned manner. Haribhadra’s important but understudied Abhisamayālaṅkārāloka (AAA), commentary to AP, was one of such works in a long tradition which tried to make the best sense out of the baffling texts of Prajñāpāramitā (PP). Thus taking the plot of the story as an illustration of a spiritual journey, Haribhadra presented to his readers his vision of a Mahāyāna soteriology.

In this paper, my focus will be on the sources of this scheme presented by the commentator and how he tried to fit it into the story. By examining such sources together with the commentator’s interpretation, I hope to reveal the challenges the commentator confronted and some of the goals Haribhadra tried to achieve and had achieved in this work.

1 Described as “turgid devotionalism” serving the purposes of “propaganda and edification” by Conze, the story of Sadāprudita was considered as an accretion to an Ur-Prajñāpāramitā no longer extant (Conze 1952:252). Conze (1952), Hiktala (1958) and Schmithausen (1977) favored this view in support to their different developmental models of PP. For a survey of modern scholarship as well as traditional treatment on the problem of multiple PP texts, see my forthcoming paper, “The traditional vs. modern accounts on the structure and formation Prajñāpāramitā texts — An examination of assumptions, methodologies and their implications”.

2 The general consensus is that Haribhadra was active in East India in the Pilla Kingdom during the late 8th century (Amano 1983: 194). According to Haribhadra himself, the work was composed in Trīkūṭāla Vihāra under the patronage of Dharmapāla (W 994.6-7). Although Tīrāṇītha the building of Trīkūṭāla to Devapāla, as Sanderson pointed out, this account appeared to be confused and Dharmapāla was indeed associated with Tīrāṇītha as well as Haribhadra (HBI 266-75; Sanderson 2009: 90-92). Furthermore, according to Tīrāṇītha, Haribhadra was well known for his exegesis of Aṣṭasāhasrikā, referring most likely to AAA (HBI 277).
In my reading I have largely followed Wogihara’s edition (W), referring to Tuccia’s edition (T) and the NGMPP manuscript A 37/7 (N) whenever necessary.³

1. Basic assumptions concerning the mûla

A few remarks concerning Haribhadra’s position on the texts of PP should be made before examining the scheme found in the final chapters of AAA. These ideas were presented at the beginning of his work:

Others say that the Lord [demonstrated the Noble 100,000[-PP] to bring benefit to those beings who are devoted to words and delight in details, demonstrated the Noble 25,000[-PP], through gathering all the subject-matters (artha) together, out of affection for those beings who delight in moderation and understand from selective elaboration, and furthermore, taught the Noble 8,000[-PP], through summarizing its subject-matters, for the benefit of the beings who are captured by headings and delight in the abbreviated.]⁴

Immediately after this “other’s view”, Haribhadra quoted a verse from Dignâga’s Prajñâpâramitā-piñḍârtha (PPP) to support his view:

Hence we assert that this 8000[-PP] is a condensed version of PP, not short of any of the topics. It proclaims the very same topics that [the longer sūtras] have proclaimed.⁵

Thus for Haribhadra, as with Dignâga, AP was an abridged version (samskypita) of PP while Pañcavijnâati-PP (PPvP) and Śatasahasrikâ-PP (SP) the medium (madhyâ) and the most extensive (vistara) respectively. A more fundamental assumption revealed here is that all PP texts were considered prima facie buddhavacana

³ While W in most cases is more reliable than T as the former was intended to be (see Preface of W), a new revised edition with emendations is highly desirable (Slik 2001:149). My experience with the text suggested that in some cases T’s reading is preferable and W showed too strong a reliance on Tibetan translation which should not be taken as authoritative. As a large part of T was not critically edited despite of having used one of the best manuscripts available (N, described by Tuccia as “extremely correct” and apparently not used in W), a revision based on N should be a major improvement on both W and T. For materials in the first abhidhamga, I have used Spaurham’s English translation with some modifications of mine.


⁵ itihãm asãsãsãsãryam anyãdãrthah yathaditham]]] 1 grantha-sâmskâpa itio ‘tra, ta evârthâ yathadithã // ii (W12= PPP 7)
Also in Fomu boro boloan niunji yunji lun 布恰參雜及羅最高表義論 (T25.912c).

and that the different versions were simply a portion of a greater meta-text.⁶ While this assumption might seem harmless at the first sight, the structural incongruities as we shall see below will eventually need to be addressed.

2. Abhisamayālankāra and its commentarial tradition

Abhisamayālankāra[śāstra] (AA), a work of 273 slokas attributed to Maitreya, was composed to systematize the contents of PP into eight abhisamayâs and seventy topics.⁷ Subsequently, AA became the basis of a lineage of commentaries to which AA belonged.⁸ Haribhadra’s mission was simple — to apply the scheme of AA to AP, which Haribhadra described as sphiṣṭârata (very clear). The idea behind this was logical — if an excellent work like AA had managed to bring out the true structure and meaning of PP it should do the same for all other PP texts as well, including AP; if after all both AP and PPvP had the same origin. Commenting on the concept of citotpâda, Haribhadra explained:

The passages in the text from the 25000[-PP] that teach the subdivisions (prabheda-) of the various production of the thought of enlightenment are not written out here [in AP] due to the fear of proximity (prâcâya-). They are not given here [ie. in AP] because it is a demonstration for living beings

⁶ In both the Chinese and Tibetan traditions, there was the notion that meta-text was kept somewhere in a non-human realm and whatever we have in this world is only a portion of it.

⁷ The structural incongruities of PP texts come in a variety of forms. First of all, there exist two main systems of PP texts: the Larger PP and the Lesser PP, of which the PPvP belongs to the former and AP the latter. Then within these two systems there is a variety of parallel versions varying in size and to a lesser extent, content as well, each of which has apparently its own lineage of development. For a survey of PP texts, see Conze 1978. For comparative tables of the overlapping texts and their corresponding Chinese and Tibetan translations, together with a developmental schema of PP, see Hikata 1958: Appendices.

⁸ Little is known concerning the circumstances where AA was created despite its fundamental importance in expressing what were later to become the fundamentals of Mādhyamika (Obermiller 1933:ii). The idea of reformulating prose into verses was however an ancient one in India, as in the works of Vasubandhu (6th century C.E.): prâjñâna sârîreṇa vîpûṣyât [sârîreṇa vîpûṣyât is recited with an oath, I recite for the vîpûṣyât of the great prajñâna in conformity with the sârîreṇa (Vasubandhu 103). Though Buddha himself seemed to be against the idea of one turning his teaching into chadhau (Sanskrit verses, cf. Câlavagge V.33), the proximity and the rambling style of PP texts were most likely deemed undesirable by the learned Indian Buddhists during the early centuries of the common era. Amongst the versified PP texts, besides the watertight AA of PPvP there were also Râjaviññâna-saṃgâthikã and PPP of Dignâga (n. 3), both of AP.

⁹ Thus as explained by Haribhadra himself at the beginning of AAA, AA was commented by four predecessors of his Asanga, Vasubandhu, Arjya-vinakṣesana and [Bhadanta]-Vinakṣesana. bhâyan kamadbhâya-cakrâcârd-prajñânâm evârthâ bhujaâditya-grahena, sa sarvârthopasññhena, bhâvanâkramyândrâtâ-sriññha-pùrpa-nâma-jñâyinâmâdhyadhyeyovâsama-pavante prajñâna-puññha-piññhi-sâsàhâsàhãtaḥ asâtya vasantârah arthe-kathâvâ prajñâpado phâdati, vâyādhâya-paṭhâhâvata-natrali-mahâsâli lokottara-jñânâh jñâta v arya-vinakṣesana-saṅghya yato mahâ mahâ vâritthah, ekta-sri-vipâka-driśtyāmanãm sâtrãmaññadha bhâditam na loke sa vinakṣesana-saṃsâkaḥ [paro vâritthah], (W1).
who are captured by headings and delight in brief explanation. Still you
definitely have to assume the presence of the aforementioned subdivisions
because as I explained before, according to the master Dignāga this jewel-
like sūtra is a digest of the subject matters in the 25000[-PP].

The jewel-like sūtra, viz., AP, did not however correspond to AA exactly.
As AA had not taken the story of Sadāprudita cycle into consideration,
the last three chapters of AP in fact fell outside the AA scheme. The
commentator thus had to find a way to justify this discrepancy and to
furthermore explain what was going on in this additional text in terms of
its contents.

| Abhisamaya in AA | Corresponding AP Ch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>according to recast PvP</th>
<th>according to AAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - sarvākārajñātā</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - mārgajñātā</td>
<td>2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - sarvajñātā</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - sarvākārabhisambodha</td>
<td>9-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - mūrdhan</td>
<td>20-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - anupūrva</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - ekākṣaṇa</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - chārmakāya</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Absent in Skt PvP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9 - epilogue)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Haribhadra suggested here that not only was the story not extraneous to the
main body of PP, it was in fact an embodiment of PP, a practical illustration of the kinds
of practices required to attain enlightenment starting from the very beginning.
Furthermore, it should be noted that after the Sadāprudita cycle, in parīndanā-
parivarta, the last chapter of AAA, Haribhadrā quoted the closing verses of
AA, thereby embedding the Sadāprudita cycle into the overall structure of AA.

But how could an avadāna type of story serve to enlighten our understanding
of PP in practice? Given “progression” (krama) was a constant theme in AAA, it
is therefore not unexpected to see Haribhadra trying to superimpose another
scheme to the story. Since the AA scheme cannot be reused here, he had to look
elsewhere. It turns out that there is no shortage of such ideas in both sutras
and commentaries. Throughout AAA in various occasions, Haribhadra had
already alluded to the reader a bewildering array of various analyses of
Mahāyāna soteriology, summarized here as follows:

10 sarva-prākāra-bodhicitiopāda-prabheda-pratipāda-gruntha-paścāvijñātāsahasrikāto
jītāpākaraveha prācarya-bhāya na likhyate, etāra tadhiṣṭhīتا-saṃskṛta-ruci-
sattva-nivṛtiḥ pravṛti-vadā desanday iti śrava nātaka, yathoktārtha-prabheda vasyam eva
pratipatvayoh, yatho paścāvijñātāsahasrikāto pratipāda-pratipāda-gruntha ca
pravṛti tām adāna-pravṛti-ratnam iti prāga eva pratipāda-lakṣaṇād. (W27).

11 We can only speculate why AA did not include the stories of Sadāprudita, which is found
in the Chinese translations of PP texts, including all AP PvP and Śāraśāhārīki-PP, with the
exception of Xuanzang’s AP (T220[4]). The extant Sanskrit PvP however did not contain the
story of Sadāprudita and was arranged under the AA scheme and interpolated with AA
topics as subdivisions. This led Conze to believe that the extant Sanskrit PvP was a later recast
of the original of possibly the 5th century (Conze 1978: 36-39).


13 The three parivartas beginning with Sadāprudita were found in certain versions, but missing
in others. Among the Sanskrit PvP and SP extant, these three parivartas had not yet been found.
Rather curiously, the three parivartas were missing in Xuanzang’s translation of AP
(T220[4]).

14 yathākārtābhāsīsāmaya-svabhāva-prajāpāramārtadhigamam prati pārva-yoga-kathā-
mukhenāśaṁkarikāvāśīṁ ārabhyo parśyeṇa-kramam āveśayā adāraś
aparaṁ iṣyādhi, sadāprūdita-saṃādi-śaṅkā-śaṃcayavān gṛhośiṇāvāvād
upalambha-praśadarśikāvāc ca. (W928)


16 Beside the term yathākārama and krama which occurred 191 and 75 times in the work,
krima as part of a compound or an isolated word occurred 22 times.
Two observations may be made with regard to the array of materials presented by Haribhadra. First of all, Haribhadra did not claim to be exhaustive and suggested the readers to consult the sources directly should that be necessary. Secondly, the author who considered himself to be in the lineage of Vasubandhu (320-400 C.E.), was naturally inclined to adopt the position expressed in Vasubandh's works such as his auto-commentarial Abhidharmakosaśāstra and his commentary to Daśabhūmikasūtra.

4. Haribhadra's solution

As Haribhadra set out to interpret this final episode of AP as a grand finale and summary of his work, it turns out to be a convenient place for the author to consolidate the various schemes of Buddhist spiritual development into a comprehensive scheme of Mahāyāna soteriology — the fourfold scheme of sambhāra-adhimukti-caryā-bodhisattva-tathāgata. The scheme was once alluded earlier in the analysis of AAs twenty-two objects of citotpāda (W25) but was not treated separately. Hence the author took the opportunity to reiterate the scheme in a clearer manner. In the preface to his commentary to the story of Sādāpratidhita, Haribhadra thus explained,

It is implied that, at that time, situated at the Bhūmi of Accumulation, he was intent on the quest for the teachings of penetrative insight and so on which are successively higher than that. As for now, he is in fact the Lord of Ten Bhūmis.27

The career of Sādāpratidhita was thus marked clearly as starting from sambhāra-bhūmi and ending, at least for the moment, at the tenth bhūmi. This system adopted

---

21 For development of the system presented in AKBh, see Lamotte 1958: 679-684.
22 This set of five mārga-s was never mentioned as a group though it was widely adopted in various Abhidharma and Yogacara texts. From AAs description of the "group of 22", we can see that some of the items from the five mārga-s have been interpolated into some of the AA commentaries prior to AAA.
23 In AAA, the four dhvāna-s were associated with attainments by which beings were reborn as devas in various worlds of kāmadhātu and rūpadhātu (see also W25).
24 Thus, ātva-avasākha rūpadhātu-nirvāṇakāya-avatāra-parākṣa-parāsākhyasūtra (W928).
25 sambhāra-bhūmiku sātiṣṭa udātattāna-paramākṣa parāsākhyasūtra (AKBh).
by Haribhadra suggested thus a hybrid between the five-mārga system of AKbhi and the ten-bhūmi system of Daśabāhūmika.²⁸ By claiming that Sadāpradūta, who had accumulated abundant merits in his past life, and that he has “now” reached the highest bhūmi as a Bodhisattva, Haribhadra reinforced to the mind of the readers the idea that the story was illustrative in nature and opened up for himself the task to reveal doctrinally what transpired in between.

Haribhadra’s strategy is as follows: by looking for signposts within the story which suggested some form of development, he tried to show such development corresponded to the soteriological scheme he had in mind and at the same time, prove that the avadāna was not just some random story with obscure unknown characters. During the course of Sadāpradūta’s quest for PP in the mātā, the protagonists had three major spiritual experiences: i) hearing of a voice from the sky; ii) entrance into sixty-two samādhis after the encounter with the image of Tathāgata (tathāgata-vigraha); iii) entrance into ten thousand samādhis²⁹ after the encounter with Dharomgata. Haribhadra thus associated each of these events with Sadāpradūta’s ascension within the bhūmi system he proposed, namely the thresholds for sambhāra-bhūmi, adhimukti-cārī-bhūmi and pramudita-bhūmi respectively.

An example of how Haribhadra tried to make connection to every possible details he could find in the mātā, would be the case of sixty-two samādhis enumerated in Ch. 30 which the author explained as the manifestation of adhimukti-cārī-bhūmi:

All understanding is manifested by the insubstantiality of dharmas. Thus it was said: “He had many [forms of concentration]...”. The concentration known as “All-dharma-nature-viewing” is that in which one sees the nature of all dharmas being illusion-like and so on. In such a way, the concentration known as “all-dharma-nature-non-perception” and other concentrations should be explained. Amongst these, due to the distinction of understanding the mild, medium and superior fourfold penetration of insight (catur-nirvedhabhāga), there are twelve concentrations such as the “All-dharma-nature-viewing” and so on. Fifty concentrations such as “Illusion-abandoned” and so on should be understood as the ones evolved out of these [twelve concentrations] in the Bhūmi of Resolute Conduct alone.³⁰

Given the proximity and the textual varieties found in PP texts, it is not unexpected that not all the materials in AP, in particular, in the story of Sadāpradūta fit nicely into Haribhadra’s numerically-minded scheme. As with other incompatible elements such as the śrāvaka dhyāna system mentioned in the text,³¹ Haribhadra overrode them with a scheme whose structure seemed well substantiated by sūtras and commentaries.

As far as the plot of the avadāna is concerned, it turned out to be rather unsatisfactory in the sense that it ended abruptly at the last experience, namely, with Sadāpradūta entering into ten thousand samādhis, leaving the reader without a conclusion as to what eventually happened to the protagonist and what his spiritual attainment actually was. Haribhadra’s claim that Sadāpradūta had become the Lord of Ten Bhūmis earlier could be interpreted as a way to preempt the doubt concerning the fate of the Sadāpradūta, a loose-end on the part of the mātā.

At the end of the story, Haribhadra presented once again as a summary the reconciled soteriological scheme, together with the number of eons required to attain each bhūmis (W988).³²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major bhūmis</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Eons required (total of 33)</th>
<th>Landmark events in Sadāpradūta Cycle according to AAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sambhāra-bhūmi</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Beginning of Sadāpradūta’s quest in Ch.30. Meditation on threefold Emptiness of Sadāpradūta to gain merits (puñja).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³¹ The spiritual experience of Sadāpradūta was in fact described in Śrāvaka terms in AP: tadyaḥ/’pi nāma prathama-dhyāna-saṁgānaḥ bhūṣkā ekāreṇa maṇitāreṇa (W954, also similarly W959, 983). Rather curiously, the Chinese translations seemed to show some form of (de)evolution of Sadāpradūta’s attainment, starting with description of immense joy in the earliest translations of AP (T224, T225), the fourth dhyāna in Mokṣaśāla translation of Larger PP (T222) and subsequently, the third dhyāna for all subsequent translations of PP where the story of Sadāpradūta is present (Mak 2010: 66).

³² According to Haribhadra, this calculation of eons are based on Vasubandhu. The work Haribhadra referred to is most likely to Mahāyāna-saṅgara-bhāya-tika, Vasubandhu’s commentary to his brother Asanga’s work, both of which survived in Chinese translations. It appears that Vasubandhu was simply discussing the various calculations without deciding on a specific one based on a specific scheme to be a definite one. Hence, he stated in his text with many verses and pithy examples. (1977: 350-354). For discussion of this hybrid system, see Isoda 1977: 350-354.

²⁸ The Chinese translations of AP (T224, T225, T228) as well as parallel passages in T221, T227 read however sixty thousands.


³⁰ According to Haribhadra, this calculation of eons are based on Vasubandhu. The work Haribhadra referred to is most likely to Mahāyāna-saṅgara-bhāya-tika, Vasubandhu’s commentary to his brother Asanga’s work, both of which survived in Chinese translations. It appears that Vasubandhu was simply discussing the various calculations without deciding on a specific one based on a specific scheme to be a definite one. Hence, he stated in his text with many verses and pithy examples. (1977: 350-354). For discussion of this hybrid system, see Isoda 1977: 350-354.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major bhūmis</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Eons required (total of 33)</th>
<th>Landmark events in Sadaprārūḍīta Cycle according to AAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adhimukticāryā-bhūmi</td>
<td>prayoga-mārga</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Accumulation of knowledge (jītāna), manifesting in various intermediate samādhīs in the middle of Ch.30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>darśana-mārga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodhisattva-bhūmi</td>
<td>triphala-bhūmi:</td>
<td>Thirty (3 X 10)</td>
<td>At the end of Ch.31, Sadaprārūḍīta enters into hundred samādhīmuhkha-bhūmi, sign of pramudita-bhūmi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pramudita vimalā prabhākāri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sapta-prayoga-bhūmi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sadaprārūḍīta is “now” dasabhūmīsvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arciṣmati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sudurjayā abhimukhi dūrāngamā acalā sādhunātī dharmamegheśā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tathāgatha-bhūmi</td>
<td>samanta-prabhā-bhūmi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum, Haribhadra’s vision of Mahāyāna soteriology might be presented as follows. A prthagjana first engages himself to accumulate punya in sambhāra-bhūmi and then jītāna in the adhimukticāryā-bhūmi. After three eons of continuous practice, a transformation would result and his career as a saṅgata (ārya) commences in the bodhisattva-bhūmi. Twenty nine eons, with three eons per one of the nine bodhisattva bhūmi-s, one would reach the final bhūmi of dharmanemga and become the Lord of Ten Bhūmis. Three more eons will pass before one finally becomes a completely enlightened Tathāgata.

5. Characteristics of Haribhadra’s scheme

The scheme Haribhadra applied to the story of Sadāprārūḍīta is therefore a consolidation of various schemes presented earlier in AAA, derived ultimately from various sources. Broadly speaking, the scheme is a distilled version of a much larger amalgamation of materials from three main sources: 1) PP; 2) AKBh/ Yogacāra, 3) Daśabhūmika.

In the case of PP, we can identify two basic schemes, firstly the more general composition of beings in various bhūmis in AP, viz. prthagjana-srāvakā-

pratyekabuddha-buddha, secondly, the more specific list of ten bhūmis in the Larger PP, which shared some common features with the bhūmis of the Avatāmśaka system. The notable point here is that only in the second system was bodhisattva-bhūmi introduced as a separate item. When the two systems are to be merged together, the basic pattern of prthagjana-srāvaka-pratyekabuddha-bodhisattva-buddha emerges. As AAA was conceived as a comprehensive commentary on PP, it is reasonable to see such scheme to form the basis of Haribhadra’s system. As for the AKBh/Yogacāra system, only the first bhūmi, sambhāra, remains intact in Haribhadra’s system. The second and third were subsumed under adhimukticāryā, while the fourth and fifth, being paths for śrāvaka-s, held little importance in Haribhadra’s system, which boldly subsumed everything of adhimukticāryā-bhūmi and tathāgata-bhūmi under the category of bodhisattva. Furthermore, the bodhisattva-bhūmi adopted dasabhūmika of Avatāmśaka system, which Haribhadra had likely modeled upon as other earlier PP commentaries.

With respect to the way the scheme applies to the story of Sadāprārūḍīta, a few observations may be made in addition. First of all, as noted earlier, the description of Sadāprārūḍīta’s meditative experience in terms śrāvaka dhyāna was not commented on and according to Haribhadra’s scheme, such experience would belong to that of a prthagjana. Moreover, the threshold from one bhūmi to another was always marked by some form of miraculous experience. The higher the bhūmi is, the grander such experience would be, such as by an ever increasing varieties of samādhi-s — a characteristic of PP as well as other Mahāyāna texts which will require further investigation.

Conclusion

In the foregoing discussion we have seen how Haribhadra handled the structural incongruities of PP texts, exemplified by his treatment of Ch. 30-31 of AP. The commentator consolidated a variety of materials pertaining to Mahāyāna soteriology into a four-bhūmi scheme which all other systems could somehow fit in. Furthermore, rather ingeniously, the scheme was shown to be illustrated by the story of Sadāprārūḍīta, a story originally outside the overarching scheme of AA and would normally be considered incongruous to the main body of AP as far as its content is concerned.

To fully appreciate why Haribhadra took such effort in harmonizing and thus taming the text, beside the erudition of the author as a scholarly monastic, one should consider the role of commentaries play within the broader domain

33 Subsumption of the Avatāmśakā/Daśabhūmika ten bhūmis under the Larger PP ten bhūmis may be seen also in Daizhikudara (*Mahāyānasūtraśāristamareagadālakacāra*), T49.411a.
of Indian hermeneutical tradition. Traditionally, Sanskrit commentaries in the form of prose unravel the meanings of the māla-s, conceived in terse, versified “sūtras” for mnemonic purposes, by providing glosses, grammatical analyses and other vital information which render the text more “meaningful” to the intended readers. PP, despite being called sūtra, with its prolixity and meandering style, behaved nothing like a sūtra in its conventional sense. AA remedied the problem by placing PP back into its proper form as conceived by the learned Indian audience, as well as in the subsequent commentarial trajectory where AAA could be seen as a final goal. In such a way, the rather obscure and baffling text of PP were not only given its badly needed structure and clarity, but also a kind of internal cohesion which enriches the doctrinal profundity of the text.

Haribhadra’s scheme of fourfold bhūmis and its relation with other schemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAA</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AKBh</th>
<th>Daśabhūmiṇa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. sambhāra</td>
<td>1. pṛthagjana</td>
<td>1. sambhāra</td>
<td>1. pramuditā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. adhimukticaryā</td>
<td>2. prayoga</td>
<td>2. sīvalā</td>
<td>2. vimalā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bodhisattva</td>
<td>3. darśana</td>
<td>3. prabhākārī</td>
<td>3. prabhākārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. śrāvaka</td>
<td>4. bhāvanā (= śrōtādāpana...)</td>
<td>4. arcaṃatī</td>
<td>4. arciṣmatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. pratyekabuddha</td>
<td>5. sudurjāya</td>
<td>5. sudurjavī</td>
<td>5. sudurjavī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. tathāgata</td>
<td>5. abhimukhī (= arhat)</td>
<td>6. abhimukhī</td>
<td>6. abhimukhī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. buddha</td>
<td>8. dūraṃgāma</td>
<td>7. dūraṃgāma</td>
<td>7. dūraṃgāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. acalā</td>
<td>8. acalā</td>
<td>8. acalā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. sādhunatī</td>
<td>9. sādhunatī</td>
<td>9. sādhunatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. dharmameghā</td>
<td>10. dharmameghā</td>
<td>10. dharmameghā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Abhisamayālankāra (Editions T, W, N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>NGMPP A 377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prajñāpāramitā (See AP, PrP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠP</td>
<td>Šatasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Empiricism and the Buddhist View of the Role of Mind in Sensory Knowledge

Soorakkulame Pemarathana

Introduction

Early Buddhist discourses deal extensively with the elucidation of the process of sensory knowledge. Early Buddhism is interested in the discussion of the process of sensory knowledge due to three main concerns. Firstly, early Buddhism which denies any existence of a soul has a theoretical need to provide an alternative and adequate explanation on how sensory knowledge occurs without such a notion. Secondly, early Buddhism describes one's personality as largely a product of his or her sensory process. Thirdly, the origin of human suffering and its cessation as explained in early Buddhism are directly related with sensory process. Various accounts of early Buddhist analysis of sensory knowledge are critically studied and interpreted by various scholars. K.N. Jayatilaka's treatment of early Buddhist analysis of knowledge seems to be the most outstanding study of the subject. He has presented a fresh view to evaluate early Buddhist accounts in the light of modern philosophical discussions of epistemology. He has also interpreted the early Buddhist account of knowledge as a form of empiricism. A few critiques have been leveled against Jayatilake's interpretation. Those critiques are basically concerned with alleged invalid usage of Western philosophical categories in interpreting early Buddhist. In this paper I will attempt to highlight the role of mind in sensory knowledge, which has not been adequately addressed in Jayatilaka's treatment and in the above critiques as well. I will argue that the recognizing the mind's role in sensory knowledge as presented in early Buddhist discourses is central to understand and to appreciate the early Buddhist position in epistemology.

Empiricism

K.N. Jayatilaka shows that the early Buddhist critique of "traditional authority (anussaya)" and "mere reasoning (apakka)" as valid ground of knowledge exemplifies the primacy of sensory experience that is evident in the early Buddhist accounts of knowledge. Based on this explicit emphasis on sensory experience in giving rise to knowledge, Jayatilaka considers the early Buddhist theory of knowledge as akin to empiricism.  

1 Buddhist discourses preserved in Pali Nikaya literature are referred here.
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