Aṣṭādaśāvenīka-buddhadharma in the Mahāvastu

Shin-ichi Takahara

I. Daśabala and aṣṭādaśāvenīka-buddhadharma.

We will make it a starting point of our paper to pay attention to such a classification in the Dai-chi-do-ron\(^1\) as to the relation between daśabala and aṣṭādaśāvenīka-buddhadharma as follows: ‘Answer. “……therefore the former eighteen\(^2\) are not called avenīka.”’ \(^3\) ……Question. “Well then, why does Katyāyanputra claim that daśabala, caturvaiśāradya, mahākaraṇa and tryāvenīka-smṛtyupasthāna are called aṣṭādaśāvenīka-buddhadharma? If your aṣṭādaśāvenīka-buddhadharma is a true view, why does Katyāyanputra make such a view?” Answer. “It is because this is called Katyāyanputra’s (view). If this is the case of Śākyaputra, He will not make such a view. What Śākyaputra tells is the true avenīka-dharma.”’\(^4\) Thus the Dai-chi-do-ron gives two views of aṣṭādaśāvenīka-buddhadharma: Katyāyanputra’s view and that of Śākyaputra. The former includes daśabala, while the latter excludes it. The Dai-bi-ba-sha-ron\(^5\) and the Abhidharmakośaśāstra\(^6\) stand

---

\(^1\) We owe this reference to the late Dr. H. Ui, Indo-tetsugaku-kenkyū, vol. 4, Tokyo 1922, pp. 72-73.

\(^2\) ‘The former eighteen’ means daśabala, caturvaiśāradya, mahākaraṇa, and tryāvenīkasmrtyupasthāna; and the latter eighteen the aṣṭādaśāvenīkadharmas excluding daśabala. Both together are called thirty-six dharmas.

\(^3\) Taisho 25 247 bc. (以是故前十八不名共)

\(^4\) Taisho 25 255 bc. (問曰。若爾迦旃延尼子。何以言十力四無所畏大悲三共意止名為十八不共法。若前説十八不共法是真義者。迦旃延尼子何以故如是説。答曰。以是故名迦旃延尼子。若釋子則不作是説。釋子説者是真不共法。)

\(^5\) Taisho 27 85 a. (三法身等。謂如一佛成就十力四無所畏大悲三念住。十八不共法等無邊功德。餘佛亦爾故名平等。) *Thirdly because dharma-kāya is equal. A Buddha accomplishes His daśabala, caturvaiśāradya, mahākaraṇa, trismṛtyupasthāna,*
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on the former view. The latter view is widely seen among the Prajñāpāramitā-literature and Mahāyāna-literature in general. (7)

How far can we trace back to the origin of aṣṭādaśāveṇika-buddhādharma? With a help of the index, vol. one to the Taisho Tripitaka, vols. 1 and 2, we come across only one instance of the eighteen dharmas in the Bon-ma-yu-kyō, which reads like this: "⋯⋯caturvaiśāradya, eight voices, daśabala, eighteen-āvenikadharma, thirty-two-lakṣana, eighty-anuvyāñjana. One who lacks any one of them is not a Buddha." (8) The Chinese translation corresponds to the Brahmāyusutta in Pali (M. ii. 133-146), where we find all of them except the eighteen dharmas. So this item does not seem to have existed in the original text.

The usage of āveṇika in this sense is not found in the Pali Tipiṭakaṁ Concordance. (9) The Nanden-Daizōkyō-Śōsakuin (General Index to the Japanese Translation of Pali Tipiṭaka, vol. I, pt. 1, p. 420) gives several instances of Aṭṭhārasa-buddhādhamma in the Milindapañha and in the Visuddhimagga as follows. Miln : Nanden. vol. 59 a, pp. 9, 238, 403 = vol. 59 b, p. 32, p. 122; Siamese ed. pp. 6, 153, 269=292, 360; Trenckner's ed. pp. 105, 216, 285(10);

astādaśāveṇikadharma and such unlimited qualities, and so do the other Buddhas. Therefore Buddhas are equal'.) This sentence does not tell clearly whether the eighteen includes daśabala or not. But the following portion clearly shows that it includes daśabala: Taisho 27 160 c (after explaining on daśabala, caturvaiśāradya, mahākaruṇā and trismṛtyupasthāna, it reads)⋯⋯

此十八種不共佛法⋯⋯‘These eighteen kinds of āveṇikabuddhādharma⋯⋯’


(7) We owe much to Dr. Kōgen Mizuno, who made a comprehensive and penetrating study on aṣṭādaśāveṇikabuddhādharma: ‘Jūhachi-fugu-buppō-no-bunrui’, (Classification of 18-āvenikadharma), one section of his contribution to Daijō-bukkyō-no-seirisushi- teki-kenkyū, compiled by Dr. Shōson Miyamoto, Tokyo 1954, pp. 292–302.

(8) Taisho 1 885 b, tr. by 支譔 (Shi-ken), ca. 223–253. AD.

(9) Ed. by E. M. Hare, part vi, London 1954, p. 346.

(10) Cf. PTSD (under Buddha-dhamma).
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The original portion of Miln is supposed to be the parts whose counterparts are found in the Chinese Nasen-biku-kyō A and B (Taisho. 32. 694a-703c, & 703c-719a), i.e. Trenckner’s edition up to page 89, and Siamese edition up to page 132. Among them, the parts of Siamese edition, where we do not find counterparts in Trenckner’s edition, are regarded as the later additions. Therefore, it can safely be said that the term aṭṭhārāsa-buddhadhamma of Miln does not belong to the original portion of the text. As the term aṭṭhārāsa-buddhadhamma is enumerated after dasabala and caturvesārajja in both texts, it seems that it excludes dasabala.

Dr. K. Mizuno suggested that the aṭṭhārāsa-buddhadhamma of Vism probably was the same with that of the Gedatsu-dō-ron. Dr. R. Hikata pointed out the fact that the eighteen-buddhadharma of the Gedatsu-dō-ron had the close relation with that of Mv, and further the relation was investigated in detail by Dr. K. Mizuno.

In Mv, we find the enumerations of 32-lakṣaṇa, 80-anuvyaṇjana, 18-āvenika, dasabala and 4-vaiśāradya several times (i. 38. 13–39. 1; 39. 11–14; 50. 2–5; 237. 8–11; 335. 11–16; 336. 6–8; iii. 64. 3–5; 138. 11–13; 407. 2–4, all in prose). As enumerated like this, the 18-āvenika in Mv seems not to include dasabala. In fact, among the five eyes of the Buddha, the fourth dharmacaksu is explained by dasabala and the fifth buddhacaksu by 18-āvenika (i. 158. 1–160. 16 in prose except dasabala). This portion is contained in the tenth Bhūmi which seems to be a rather later composition.

As mentioned above, we rarely find the 18-āvenika in Chinese āgamas,
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and as for Pali *Tipiṭaka* we find the term only in later canonical works as *Miln* and *Vism*. Putting all this together, we suppose that the aṣṭādaśāvenika-buddhadharma is a rather later composition.(15)


As mentioned in the first section, there are two kinds of 18-āvenika: one including daśabala and the other excluding it. The latter is often found in Mahāyāna texts. This is not limited only in these texts, but also found in later canonical texts in Pali: *Miln* and *Vism*; and the *Gedatsu-dō-ron* in Chinese (=G), and *Mv* in BHS. And further, we must pay a special attention to *Yasomitra*,(16) who introduces the latter āvenika as some persons’ opinion, while he himself keeps the same standpoint with Vasubandhu who maintains the former āvenika including daśabala.(17)

We see some diversity of order of the enumeration of the latter 18-āvenika among the texts mentioned above.(18) Now, our texts to be examined here will be G,(19) Vism-Gaṅṭhipada(20) and JinA(21), AKV(22), Mv(23), and Mvy.(24) The first twelve of 18-āvenika among G, VismG and JinA, and Mv are the same in their order, and their names are self-evident. These

(15) Dr. K. Mizuno suggested that the 18-buddhadharma came to be mentioned probably around the beginning of the Christian era. See note (7) op. cit., p. 302, n. 34.


(17) = (6)

(18) = (7)

(19) Taisho 32 427 c.

(20) = (7). I regret to say that I have not been able to avail myself of *Vimuttimagga and Visuddhi-magga* by Dr. P. V. Vapat, Poona 1937.
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twelve correspond to nos. 7 to 18 of AKV, and nos. 16–18, 13–15 and 7–12 of Mvy.

Well then, we have to focus our mind on Nos. 13–18, where both G and JinA have some brief commentary notes on each of them.

G. 13. 無可疑事（無可疑事者。無有威儀為於狡狯）

Parenthesis shows the commentary note, which may be put into English like this.

'There is nothing to be doubtful' means that there is no behavior to do cheating. The corresponding part in Pali is 13. natthi dvedhayitattam. JinA adds a note 'vedâyitattan-ti turitakiriyā.' Vedâyitattan- is a wrong script to be emended as dvedhā°. The word dvedhāyatatta seems to mean 'duality, doubt, deceit' by aid of a cognate Skt dvaidhya, nt. 'duplicity, falsehood', dvaidhībhāva, m. 'doubt, falsehood, deceit' (Monier Skt Dict). How should we understand the Chinese commentary '狡猾' or 'cheating'? The commentary in JinA seems to have a key. Turita means 'speedy action'. It is a synonym of catura, and the latter means secondarily 'clever, shrewd; cunning'. Then we may suppose that turita might also have implied 'cunning' sometime. On the supposition that turita means 'cunning', we may understand both commentaries in Chinese and in Pali are quite reasonable. Let the word belong to kāyakarma, then it is equivalent to 13. nāsti khalitaṁ in Mv, and 1. nāsti tathāgatasya skhalitaṁ in AKV and Mvy.

G. 14. 無詐師事（無詐師事者。無急速威儀）

'詐師, (fu-shi) probably means 'a diviner or one who makes a false statement' and the second half of the commentary means 'that there is no'

---

(25) The emendation is suggested by Dr. K. Mizuno, see (7), op. cit., p. 300.
(26) Cf. PTSD (under Dvejjha) advejjha, 'undivided, certain, doubtless; simple, sincere,-----'
(28) A negative 無 is dropped in the original.
(29) Morohashi's Dai-kanwa-jiten, vol. 4, p. 376 b; 訓師; cf. 訓, ibid., p. 375 b; and also 訓, ibid., vol. 10, pp. 478–480.
manner in a hurry’. ‘Manner in a hurry’ is equal to the Pali commentary ‘sahasā kiriyā’ and AKV comm. ‘sahasā kriyā.’

14. natthi ravā, text in Pali, is equal to nāsti ravitam in SK (14 in Mv, 2 in AKV and in Mvy). PTSD gives rava¹ for raya ‘speed’ and rava² ‘loud sound’. We suppose that the original for the Chinese translation might have been something like Pali rava and the translator probably took it for the second meaning. Leaving the propriety of the Chinese translation unsaid, G, JinA and AKV agree both in text and in commentary.

G. 15. 無不分明（無不分明者。以知無不觸）

‘There is nothing that is indistinct’ means that there is nothing untouched with knowledge.

JinA commentary reads ‘apphutan-ti ñañena aphantsitam’ (‘Not pervaded’ means ‘not touched by knowledge’). According to PTSD, apphuta is equal to Sk *āśphṛta for asphārita (fr. sphañ) meaning ‘untouched, unpervaded, not penetrated’. Chinese and Pali agree on the commentary level. As for the text, G seems to have wrongly taken apphuta (= Sk āśphṛta) for SK a-sphuṭa meaning ‘indistinct’, if we may suppose that the original of the Chinese had been written in Pali or in a similar Pkt.

It is a question to decide that to which item in Skt, among Mvy 3, 4 and 5, for instance, this is equivalent. What about supposing that this is equivalent to Skt nāsti nānātvasaṁjñā (AKV 4, Mv 18, and Mvy 5)? AKV commentary reads ‘nānātvasaṁjñā sukhadūḥkhāduḥkhāsukheṣu viṣayeṣu rāgadveṣamohato nānātvasaṁjñā.’

(30), Louis de la Vallée Poussin pointed out a precise coincidence of two glossaries between JinA and AKV. This is one of the two. Cf. (33).

(31) We find the same explanation on nānātvasaṁjñā in Nāgārjuna’s Ratnāvalī, v, 17 ab: tr. into Japanese by Ryūshin Uryūzu, Sekai-ken-son-bungaku-zenshū, vol. 6=Butten, vol. 1, Tokyo 1966, p. 368: Tib. Peking Ed. vol. 129, 181–4–2: Taisho 32 503 a（欲諫癡乱想 説明種種相）; cf. also Taisho 25 248 a (Dai-chido-ron), where we will see several explanations of nānātvasaṁjñā in detail, and one of them shows some approximation, but not the same. In Pali, Vbh 369 reads ‘kāmasaṁñā viyāpādaṁsaññā vihinsaṁsaññā: ayan vuccati nānattasaññā. Sabbā pi akusalasaññā nānattasaññā.’ As kāma, vyāpāda and vihinsā corre-
to नः (नः in Sk).\(^{(32)}\) Well then, we may find no contradiction between नःनेना अफ्हसितम and रागाद्वेशमोहतो नानात्वसामज्ञा.

G. 16. 無有急事 (無急事者。無威儀以急事)

'There is no hastiness' means that one's manners are not done in haste.

This is the only case where we can not find any correspondence of commentaries between G and JinA (=AKV). Was there not any corruption on the original manuscript of G? We have no means to ascertain the original. Pali text has 16. natthi dava—-dava ti khīḍā*dhīppāyena kiriya commented by JinA. Both the text and the commentary are precisely equal to AKV 3. nāsti dravatā—-dravatā krīḍā 'bhīpṛāyata'.\(^{(33)}\)

Pali dava or Sk drava means primarily 'quick motion', and secondly 'sporting, play'. According to the commentaries, the text must be understood in the secondary meaning. The original of G might have been natthi dava or the like, and the translator took it wrongly in the primary meaning. But it may also be possible to suppose that the text might have been natthi sahasā\(^{(34)}\) or the like. It is better to leave G unsettled.

Now, as a counterpart of Pali 16. natthi dravā=AKV 3. nāsti dravatā, which shall we take, nāsti muṣitasmṛta (Mv 15, Mvy 3) or nāsti asamāhitam cittaṁ (Mv 16; Mvy 4. "hitacitta")? We may take the latter. We can not say that we have a convincing reason. But we will find such passages where samāhitacitta takes such a modifier as vigatopakilesa in Pali as well as in Sk. (D. i. 76-84; Mv. i. 228-229; Lv. 344-345), and auddhatya, one of upaklesas, spond to राग, द्वेष and मोह respectively, this definition is almost equal to that in AKV and Ratnāvalī.

\(^{(32)}\) Cf. Netti 12 and 36: Ratto atthaṁ na jānati ratto dhammaṁ na passati, andhatamaṁ tadā hoti yaṁ rāgo sahate naran ti. (tr. by Bhikkhu ṇāṇamoli, The Guide, London PTS, 1962, pp. 23 and 59.) This verse is found in Mv i 244 3-4; and the similar verses in a series are found in It. 83-85=SnA 15-16, and partly in Sum i 54; cf. A iv 96-98: Taisho 1 618 ab, partly Sum i 52.

\(^{(33)}\)=\(^{(30)}\) This is another of the two. *Burnouf, Lotus, p. 649 reads kiccha°, but we follow the emendation by Poussin.

\(^{(34)}\) Cf. Buddhaghosa gives 16. n'atthi sahasā besides 13. n'atthi dava, in Sum iii 994 5-16.

—428—
Astadasavenika-buddhadharma in the *Mahāvastu* (S. Takahara) is explained in the *Vijñaptimatratāsiddhi* (p. 31) as follows, including the word *kṛṣṭita*. *(35)*

Auddhatyaṁ cittasyāvyūpaśamaḥ, vyūpaśamo hi śamatass-tadviruddho vyūpaśamaḥ sa punar eṣa *rāgānukūlapūrva-hasita-rasita-* kṛṣṭitādy-anusmaratas-*cetaso 'vyūpaśamahetūḥ śamatha-paripanṭhakarmakah. (‘The exaltation’ is untranquility of mind: tranquility is being tranquil and the contrary to this is untranquility. The cause of untranquility, which makes an obstacle to being tranquil, belongs to the mind of the man who is remembering what he had previously laughed, enjoyed, played, and so on, according to his passions.)

**G. 17.** 無隱覆處（[無](37)隱覆者。心行無有非不憶智）

‘There is nothing covered. It (‘covered’?) means that no activity of mind is never unconscious’.

The counterpart in Pali is 17. natthi avyāvaṭamano—avyāvaṭamano ti nīratthaka cittasamudācāro. (There is no mind that is careless.——‘Mind that is careless’ is that the activity of mind is meaningless.) Vyāvaṭa in Pali is equal to Sk vyāpṛta meaning ‘occupied, busy’ (fr. *pr*), and not in the sense of ‘covered, obstructed’ (wrongly fr. *vr*). *(38)* The Chinese translation seems to have wrongly derived the word from *vr*. It is a mere coincidence of the manuscripts of G and VismG that they have not the negative prefix *a*. AKV 5. nāsty avyākṛtaṁ manaḥ, -k- being emended to -p-, precisely agrees with Pali. The only counterpart remained for this is Mv 15 and Mvy 3, nāsti muṣṭasmṛtī (There is no consciousness obscured).

**G. 18.** 無不觀捨（無不觀捨者。無有不知捨）

‘There is no disinterestedness without seeing’, means that there is no disinterestedness without knowing.

Pali 18. natthi appaṭisaṅkhān’upekkhā—aṇāṇ’upekkhā natthīti. Both Chi-

(36) rasita, tr. by Lévi ‘chants’, is emended by Dr. K. Mizuno (op. cit.) to ramita (樂 ‘pleasure’), which agrees with Tib. ‘dgaḥ-dgaḥ-ba’ (Peking Ed. vol. 113, p. 307–3–7). *......* cf. also A iv 55: hasita-lapita-kīṭāni anussarati.
(37) If we omit the negative 無, the Chinese translation may be intelligible.
(38) PTSD (under Vyāvaṭa.)
inese and Pali agree exactly in text as well as in commentary. The other three also agree as follows. AKV 6. nāsti apratisamkhyāyōpeksā = Mv 17. nāsti apratisamkhyāya upeksā = Mvy 6. nāsti apratisamkhyāyōpeksā.

Our comparison shows that G remarkably agrees with JinA on the commentary level except no. 16. If we suppose that the original text of G has been written in Pali or in a similar Prakrit, a few errors of the Chinese translation we saw are quite possible ones. Now we have to admit that the two texts belong to the same group. Mv shows almost the same order of the list with the above two. This is one of the most characteristic points of Mv, which shows its relation near to the Pali group. But, on the other hand, Mv differs in vocabulary with Pali, and agrees with Mvy and Mahāyāna group. This shows that Mv has a close relation with Pali group, but the relation may be something in rivalry. Some people’s opinion, which is introduced by Yaśomitra, rather seems to tend to Mahāyāna group both in order and in vocabulary. But it contains two portions, as Poussin pointed out, which show a precise agreement with the Pali in text as well as in commentary.

(39) = (7)
(40) Senart, Commentaire, Mv i 506 (at the end of comm. on p. 160, l. 8).
(41) = (30) and (33).
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