

**Illuminating the Dharma:
Buddhist Studies in Honour of
Venerable Professor KL Dhammajoti**

EDITOR
Toshiichi ENDO

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

GUANG Xing
Georgios T. HALKIAS
Y. KARUNADASA
G.A. SOMARATNE
Charles WILLEMEN

Centre of Buddhist Studies
The University of Hong Kong
2021

Published in Hong Kong by
Centre of Buddhist Studies
The University of Hong Kong
2021

© Centre of Buddhist Studies,
The University of Hong Kong
All Rights Reserved

ISBN: 978-988-16843-7-0 (Hardcover)
ISBN: 978-988-16843-8-7 (Ebook)

CONTENTS

Contributors	xi
Foreword	xv
Four Decades of <i>Kalyāṇa-mittatā</i> : Reminiscences and Best Wishes	xvii
Introductory Essay	xxi
<i>Dhammavinaya</i> and <i>Dhamma</i> and <i>Vinaya</i>	
A Clarification	1
Kapila ABHAYAWANSA	
How the Steps of Mindfulness of Breathing Decreased from Sixteen to Two	11
Bhikkhu ANĀLAYO	
Transformation and Abhidhamma in Three Theravāda Meditation Traditions	29
Kate CROSBY and Pyi Phyo KYAW	
The Ordination of Bhaddā Kuṇḍalakesā and the <i>ehibhikkhunī</i> in the Theravāda Textual Tradition	51
Bhikkhunī DHAMMADINNĀ	
A Note on Śāṅkarananda's <i>Sambandhaparīkṣānusāriṇī</i>	99
Vincent ELTSCHINGER	
Other Aspects of the Buddha's Knowledge (2): The Buddha's Eye (<i>Cakkhu/Cakṣu</i>)	121
Toshiichi ENDO	
Yamāri on the Relationship between Absolute and Relative Means of Knowledge	131
Eli FRANCO	
The Place of <i>Bhakti</i> in Buddhism	151
Pradeep P. GOKHALE	
A Study of Repaying the Four Kinds of Compassion	167
GUANG Xing	
Śrī Siṃha's Ultimate <i>Upadeśa</i> Seven Nails that Strike the Essence of Awakening	181
Georgios T. HALKIAS	

The Buddhist Psychology of Philosophy: How Buddhism Looks at Philosophical Views and Theories Y. KARUNADASA	195
Jingying Huiyuan on <i>Aśubhabhāvanā</i> Robert KRITZER	209
Evolving Portrayals of Sāriputta and Moggallāna: Psychic Potency vis-à-vis Wisdom and Concentration Tse-fu KUAN	269
An Introduction to Sthiramati's <i>Tattvārthā</i> Chapter I Nobuchiyo ODANI (Tr. Shoba Rani DASH)	295
Review Article: <i>Setting Out on the Great Way: Essays on Early Mahāyāna Buddhism</i> Bhikkhu PĀSĀDIKA	307
Revisiting the <i>Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish</i> SAERJI	321
<i>Svakāyadṛṣṭi</i> Reconsidered Akira SAITO	337
Some Remarks on Chapter VIII (Against Meat Eating) of the <i>Laṅkāvatārasūtra</i> Lambert SCHMITHAUSEN	347
The Concept of Abhidharma in Buddhism: Some Observation Lalji 'SHRAVAK'	357
<i>Sarvalokavipratyanīkaṃ:</i> Dharma Teachings Contrary to the Whole World Peter SKILLING (Bhadra RUJIRATHAT)	367
Conjoining Meditative Appeasing and Meditative Watching for the Attainment of Arahatsip G.A. SOMARATNE	397
Three 'Endangered Species' in Theravāda Buddhist Studies Asanga TILAKARATNE	421
The Influence of Daṇḍin's <i>Mirror of Poetry (Kāvyadarśa)</i> on Mongolian Buddhist Poetics Vesna A. WALLACE	441

About the Early History of the <i>Heart Sūtra</i> Charles WILLEMEN	457
The Position of Conceptualization in the Context of the Yogācāra <i>Bīja</i> Theory Nobuyoshi YAMABE	467
Mental Consciousness and Physical Objects Zihua YAO	487

Svakāyadr̥ṣṭi Reconsidered

Akira SAITO

Preamble

Today, there still remains an enigma surrounding the well-known concept *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*¹ which was traditionally regarded in the Sarvāstivāda's system of defilements (*kleśa*) as one of the five false views (*dr̥ṣṭi*). What I call “enigma” here concerns the etymological meaning of the word *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* in relation to the traditional explanation of this view, i.e., twenty-alternatives view* of the self (*ātman*) or those belonging to the self (*ātmīya*). The analysis of this view into twenty alternatives was widely shared by both Sarvāstivāda and Theravāda Buddhist circles, as shown in the following table:

* *viṃśati-koṭikā satkāya-dr̥ṣṭiḥ* or “the view of *satkāya* with twenty alternatives”:

<i>satkāyadr̥ṣṭi</i>	I. <i>ātmadr̥ṣṭi</i>	<i>rūpam ātmeti samanupaśyati</i>
	II. <i>ātmīyadr̥ṣṭi</i>	-1. <i>rūpavantam ātmānam</i>
		-2. <i>ātmīyaṇi rūpam / ātmani rūpam</i>
		-3. <i>rūpe ātmeti</i>

In this table, *rūpa* or “body/matter” can alternatively be *vedanā* or “sensation”, *saṃjñā* or “representation”, *saṃskāra* or “formative forces”, or *viññāna* or “consciousness”, which amounts to $4 \times 5 = 20$ alternatives in total. The above table is explained typically by Yaśomitra (c. 6–7 CE) in the following way:

The view of *satkāya* is [traditionally] spoken of as having twenty alternatives [in the following way]: “One regards body as the self, self as possessed of body (*rūpa*), body as belonging to the self, or self as being in body. The explanation of the same type should be applied up to consciousness (*viññāna*).”

viṃśati-koṭikā hi satkāya-dr̥ṣṭiḥ paṭhyate. rūpam ātmeti samanupaśyati. rūpavantam ātmānam. ātmīyaṇi rūpam. rūpe ātmety evaṇi yāvad viññānaṇi vaktavyam. (AKVy 705.20–22.)

A similar expression of twenty alternatives is also found in the Pāli *tipiṭaka*, e.g., as follows:

Herein, Monks, the unlearned ordinary men regard body as the self, self as possessed of body, body as being in the self, or self as being in body. [They regard likewise as to] sensation, representation, formative forces, and consciousness.

Idha bhikkhave assutavā puthujjano ... rūpam attato samanupassati // rūpavantam vā attānam attani vā rūpam rūpasmim vā attānam // Vedanam /// Saññam /// Saṅkhāre // Viññānam....// (SN III, p. 46)

Concerning the etymological interpretation of *satkāya*, Childers and Nakamura² take this word as deriving originally from Pāli *sakāya* (Skt. *svakāya*) or “one’s own body/aggregation” instead of *sakkāya* (Skt. *satkāya*). On the other hand,

Edgerton understands the word *satkāya* as meaning “real, existent, body; individuality, personality” and *satkāya-dr̥ṣṭi* as “the heretical belief in a real personality, belief in the self and what belongs to the self”.³

Despite Childers and Nakamura’s suggestion, it seems that the Pāli form *sakāyaditt̥hi* (= Skt. *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi*) is not attested in the current editions of the Pāli *tipiṭaka*. However, in this regard, it is interesting to note that, as far as my present knowledge goes, the term *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* is found only in a few texts of the Mahāyāna tradition such as Nāgārjuna’s *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*, (hereafter, MMK), the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitāsūtra* (hereafter, *Aṣṭa*), and Haribhadra’s *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (hereafter, AAA) on the *Aṣṭa*’s above usage.⁴

The present paper deals with the following three points: First, which usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* is earlier, that of MMK or *Aṣṭa*? Second, in what sense did the *Aṣṭa* use the term? In view of discussing this question, let me refer to Haribhadra’s AAA. Third, did Nāgārjuna use the term *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* in the same sense as *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*? If such is the case, why is it so? Is it due only to his preference for *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* over *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*? Or is it because he understood that the original form of the Pāli term is *sakāyaditt̥hi* (= Skt. *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi*) but not *sakkāyaditt̥hi* (= Skt. *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*) as Childers and Nakamura suggested? For inquiring into this question, let me consult with the commentators’ explanations of Nāgārjuna’s usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* as found only in the MMK 23.5.

I. *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitāsūtra*

First, let me turn to the only usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* found in the *Aṣṭa*. While we find two examples of *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* in this *sūtra*⁵, *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* is used only in Chapter 1 in the following way:

Venerable Śāriputra answered as follows: “He will teach the *dharma* for the purpose of eliminating those strong views such as the view of self, the view of sentient being, the view of living being, the view of person, the view of the state of existence, the view of the state of non-existence, the view of cessation, the view of eternity, the view of *svakāya*, and so forth. For this reason, *bodhisattva* is called *mahāsattva*.”
āyusmān Śāriputra āha: mahatyā ātmadr̥ṣṭyāḥ sattvadr̥ṣṭyāḥ jīvadṛṣṭyāḥ pudgaladr̥ṣṭyāḥ bhavadṛṣṭyāḥ vibhavadṛṣṭyāḥ ucchedadr̥ṣṭyāḥ śāśvatadr̥ṣṭyāḥ svakāyadr̥ṣṭyā etāsām evamādyānām dr̥ṣṭīnām prahāṇāya dharmam deśayīṣyatīti tenārthena bodhisattvo mahāsattva ity ucyate / (*Aṣṭa*, 9.32–10.2)

tshedang ldan pa śāri`i bus gsol pa / bdag tu lta ba dang sems can du lta ba dang / (P om.) srog tu lta ba dang / (P om.) gang zag tu lta ba dang `byung bar lta ba dang `jig par lta ba dang chad par lta ba dang rtag par lta ba dang rang gi lus la lta ba chen po `di lta bu la sogs pa`i lta ba de dag spang ba`i slad du chos bstan to snyam ste / (P om.) don des na byang chub sems dpa` sems dpa` chen po zhes bgyi`o // (*Aṣṭa*, Tib. D Tōhoku No. 12, Ka 10b7–11a2; P Ōtani No. 734, Mi 11a6–7)

As for the meaning of *svakāya*, it is probable from the context of the above usage and its Tibetan translation that the term means “one’s own [physical and mental] aggregation”. Before inquiring into this matter about the meaning of *svakāya*, let me here turn to another related question of when this term started to be used in the *Aṣṭa*. The following are Chinese translations of the *Aṣṭa* arranged in chronological order:

Dào xíng bō rě jīng 道行般若經, Zhī lóu jiā chèn 支婁迦讖 (*Lokakṣema) tr. (178 CE) (T No. 224)

摩訶薩者, 悉自了見, 悉自了知, 十方天下人十方所有. 悉曉了知, 知人壽命, 知有惡無惡, 樂不樂, 有志無志. 悉曉了知見, 爲說法, 如是無所著, 爾故字爲摩訶薩. (T vol.8, 427b18–21)

Mahāsattva by himself entirely sees and completely knows people and things in the ten directions. He completely understands them, knowing people’s lifetime, knowing evil and good ones, pleased and unpleased ones, and ambitious and unambitious ones. Completely understanding, knowing, and seeing them, he teaches the *dharma*. For this reason, having thus no attachment, he is called *mahāsattva*.

Dà míng dù jīng 大光度經, Zhī qiān 支謙 tr. (222–228 CE) (T No. 225)

秋露子曰. 吾亦樂其爲大士者, 於見, 身見, 性見, 命見, 人見, 丈夫見, 有見, 無見, 斷滅見. 常在爲斷大見. 何者爲說上法, 度諸見淵. 是故爲大士. (T vol.8, 480c7-10)

Śāriputra answered as follows: “I am also pleased to call him *mahāsattva*. Concerning views such as the view of body, the view of own-nature, the view of living being, the view of human being, the view of person, the view of existence, the view of non-existence, and the view of cessation, he at all times tries to eliminate these strong views. The reason for his teaching the above *dharma* is to save [people] from the depth of views. Therefore, he is called *mahāsattva*.”

Mó hē bō rě chāo jīng 摩訶般若鈔經, Zhú fó niàn 竺佛念 & Tán mó pí 曇摩婢 tr. (382 CE) (T No. 226)

摩訶薩者, 悉自了見, 悉了知一切人世間所有. 悉了知人壽命, 悉了知, 悉了知著斷之事. 便能隨人所樂爲說法, 以是故名爲摩訶薩. (T vol. 8, 510b10–13)

Mahāsattva by himself entirely sees and completely knows all people and things in the world. He completely knows people’s lifetime, completely knows such a thing as the view of cessation. That is, he can teach the *dharma* in accordance with people’s wish. For this reason, he is called *mahāsattva*.

Xiǎo pǐn bō rě jīng 小品般若經, Jiū mó luó shí 鳩摩羅什 (Kumārajīva) tr. (408 CE) (T No. 227)

舍利弗白佛言. 世尊, 菩薩爲斷我見, 衆生見, 壽者見, 人見, 有見, 無見, 斷見, 常見等, 而爲說法. 是名摩訶薩義. (T vol. 8, 538c21-23)

Śāriputra answered the Buddha as follows: “The *bodhisattva* teaches the *dharmā* for the purpose of eliminating the view of self, the view of sentient-being, the view of living being, the view of person, the view of existence, the view of non-existence, the view of cessation, the view of eternity and so forth. This is the reason why he is called *mahāsattva*.”

Dà bō rě jīng 大般若經, Xuán zàng 玄奘 tr. (660–663 CE) (T No.220)

舍利子言。以諸菩薩方便善巧，為諸有情宣說法要。令斷我見，有情見，命者見，補特伽羅見，有見，無有見，斷見，常見，薩迦耶見，及餘種種有所執見。依如是義，名摩訶薩。(T vol. 7, 766b13–16)

Śāriputra answered as follows: “Because *bodhisattvas* are skillful in means, they teach the essence of the *dharmā* to sentient beings for the purpose of eliminating the view of self, the view of sentient being, the view of living being, the view of person, the view of existence, the view of non-existence, the view of cessation, the view of eternity, the view of *svakāya* (*Isatkāya*), and other various attached views. For this reason, they are called *mahāsattva*.”

From the above translations of the *Aṣṭa*, it seems most probable that the view of *svakāya* was newly inserted into the text of *Aṣṭa* between *Xiǎo pǐn bō rě jīng* 小品般若經 and *Dà bō rě jīng* 大般若經, i.e., from 5th to the middle of 7th centuries.

II. Haribhadra’s explanation of the *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi*

On the above single usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* in the *Aṣṭa*, Chapter 1, Haribhadra (ca. –800) in his AAA comments as follows:

The view of *svakāya* “one’s own [physical and mental] aggregation” means regarding the five aggregates as the aspects of either the self or what belongs to the self (*ātmātmyā*).

ātmātmyākāreṇa pañca-skandha-darśanaṃ svakāyah (sic, read *svakāyadr̥ṣṭiḥ* as the above usage in the *Aṣṭa* as well as the following Tib.) (AAA, p. 81).

Tib.: *bdag dang bdag gi ba’i rnam pas phung po lngar lta ba ni rang gi lus su lta ba’o* // (AAA, Tib. D Tōhoku No. 3791, Cha 50a1; P Ōtani No. 5189, Cha 61b2)

It is worthy of note that Haribhadra in the above commentary regards *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* as almost having the same sense as *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* which is traditionally defined as the view of the self (*ātman*) or those belonging to the self (*ātmīya*)⁶.

III. Nāgārjuna’s usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*

Taking into consideration the above unique usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* in the *Aṣṭa*, Nāgārjuna (ca. 150–250) appears to be the first in India who used this term⁷, most probably, instead of *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*. His usage is found in the MMK 23.5 as follows:

As with the view of *svakāya* or “one’s own aggregation”, the defilements do not exist in a defiled one (= mind) in any of the five ways. As with the view of *svakāya*, a defiled one does not also exist in the defilements in any of the five ways.

svakāyadr̥ṣṭivat kleśāḥ kliṣṭe santi na pañcadhā |
svakāyadr̥ṣṭivat kliṣṭam kleśeṣv api na pañcadhā || (MMK 23.5)⁸

IV. Commentators’ understandings of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* as used by Nāgārjuna

On the above verse, Qīng mù 青目 (*Piṅgala)’s *Zhōng-lùn* 中論, *Akutobhayā*, which has almost the same text in Tibetan as that of Buddhapālita’s commentary regarding this and following chapters⁹, Bhāviveka’s (ca. 490–570) *Prajñāpradīpa*, and Candrakīrti’s (ca. 600–660) *Prasannapadā* make their comments as follows:

Zhōng-lùn 中論 (tr. by Kumārajīva in 409 CE)

“As the view of *svakāya* or ‘one’s own aggregation’ is not possible [in five aggregates] searched for in any of the five ways, the defilements are not possible in a defiled mind searched for in any of the five ways.”
 As the view of *svakāya* is not possible in five aggregates searched for in any of the five ways, the defilements are also not possible in a defiled mind searched for in any of the five ways and a defiled mind is not possible in the defilements searched for in any of the five ways.

如身見五種 求之不可得
 煩惱於垢心 五求亦不得 (MMK 23.5)
 如身見五陰中五種求不可得, 諸煩惱亦於垢心中五種求亦不可得。
 又垢心於煩惱中五種求亦不可得. (T No. 1564, vol. 30, 31b2–6)

Akutobhayā (ascribed traditionally to Nāgārjuna¹⁰ and tr. by Klu’i rgyal mtshan and Jñānagarbha in the early 9th century)

“As with the view of *svakāya* or ‘one’s own aggregation’, the defilements do not exist in a defiled one in any of the five ways. As with the view of *svakāya*, a defiled one does not also exist in the defilements in any of the five ways.”

As the view of *svakāya* is not possible in aggregates in any of the five ways, the defilements are also not possible in a defiled mind in any of the five ways. As the view of *svakāya* is not possible in aggregates in any of the five ways, a defiled mind is also not possible in the defilements searched for in any of the five ways

rang lus lta bzhin nyon mongs rnam || (P /) *nyon mongs can la rnam lngar med ||*
rang lus lta bzhin nyon mongs can|| nyon mongs pa la rnam lngar med || (MMK 23.5)

ji ltar rang gi lus la lta ba phung po rnam la rnam pa lngar yod pa ma yin pa de bzhin du | (P om. /) *nyon mongs pa rnam kyang* (P om. *kyang*) *nyon mongs pa can gyi sems la rnam pa lngar you pa ma yin no || ji ltar rang gi lus la lta ba phung po rnam la rnam pa lngar yod pa ma yin pa* (P om. *ma yin pa*) *de bzhin du | nyon mongs*

*pa can gyi sems (*kliṣṭaṃ cittaṃ) kyang nyon mongs pa rnam la rnam pa lngar yod pa ma yin no // (D na l) (D Tōhoku No. 3829, Tsa 85b7–86a2; P Ōtani No. 5229, Tsa 99a2–b1)*

Prajñāpradīpa (by Bhāviveka and tr. by Klu'i rgyal mtshan and Jñānagarbha in the early 9th century)

“As with the view of *svakāya* or ‘one’s own aggregation’, the defilements [do not exist in the defiled one in any of the five ways.]” “One’s own” (*sva*) means both the self (*ātman*) and those belonging to the self (*ātmīya*). “Aggregation” (*kāya*) is a synonym of the accumulation (**upacaya*) of name-and-form (*nāmarūpa*) [i.e., psycho-physical complex¹¹]. “The view of one’s own aggregation” (*svakāyadr̥ṣṭi*) means the view defiled by conceiving one’s own [physical and mental] aggregation [i.e., five aggregates].

rang lus lta bzhin nyon mongs rnam // (MMK 23.5a)
*rang zhes bya ba ni bdag dang bdag gi'o (*sva ity ātmātmīyāḥ) //*
lus zhes bya ba ni ming (P mi) dang / gzugs nye bar bsags pa'i rnam
*(D rnam) grangs so (*kāya iti nāmarūpocayaparyāyāḥ) // rang gi*
lus la lta ba zhes bya ba ni / rang gi lus la dmigs pa'i nyon mongs
pa can gyi lta ba'o // (D Tōhoku No. 3853, Tsha 221a1–2; P Ōtani
No. 5253, Tsha 277a7–8)

Prasannapadā (by Candrakīrti)

“As with the view of *svakāya* or ‘one’s own aggregation’, the defilements do not exist in a defiled one in any of the five ways. As with the view of *svakāya*, a defiled one does not also exist in the defilements in any of the five ways.” (MMK 23.5)

Svakāya, or “one’s own aggregation”, means a collection of the characteristics of body/matter (*rūpa*) and so forth. *Svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* is a view of one’s own aggregation, which works as an apprehension of the aspects of either the self (*ātman*) or what belongs to the self (*ātmīyā*). Just as this [view of one’s own aggregation], being examined in the five ways, does not exist in one’s own aggregation because of the following [Nāgārjuna’s statement]:

“The Tathāgata is not identical with the aggregates nor distinct from the aggregates; the aggregates are not in him nor is he in them; he is not possessed of the aggregates. What Tathāgata, then, is there?” (MMK 22.1)

so the defilements also do not exist in a defiled one, ...

svakāyadr̥ṣṭivat kleśāḥ kliṣṭe santī na pañcadhā /
svakāyadr̥ṣṭivat kliṣṭaṃ kleśeṣv api na pañcadhā // (MMK 23.5)
*svakāyo hi nāma rūpādīlakṣaṇasaṃhātāḥ / *svakāye dr̥ṣṭiḥ*
*svakāyadr̥ṣṭir ātmātmīyākāra-grahaṇapravṛttā^{*12} // yatheyaṃ*
pañcadhā vicāryamāṇā svakāye na sambhavati
skandhā na nānyaḥ skandhebhyo nāsmīn skandhā na teṣu saḥ /
tathāgataḥ skandhavān na katamo 'tra tathāgataḥ // (MMK
22.1) ity anena // evaṃ kliṣṭe 'pi kleśā... (PSP, p. 454.10–455.1).

The above are those commentaries on Nāgārjuna’s unique usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi*. The Tibetan and Chinese translations of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* for the above examples are *rang (gi) lus (la) lta (ba)* and 身見 (*Zhōng-lǐng* 中論 tr. by Kumārajīva)¹³.

The anonymous commentary on the PSP also glosses the above *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* as follows:

“The view of one’s own aggregation means the view of existing aggregation.”

svakāyadr̥ṣṭiḥ satkāyadr̥ṣṭiḥ (Yonezawa [2007: 229])

In this brief gloss, the anonymous author of **Lakṣaṇatīkā* shows his understanding of Nāgārjuna’s term *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* as corresponding to the referent of *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*.

Although whether Nāgārjuna intentionally changed the traditional term *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* to *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* is unclear, it seems certain that, as is confirmed by both Bhāviveka’s *Prajñāpradīpa* and Candrakīrti’s *Prasannapadā*, Nāgārjuna used the term *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* in the sense of *ātmadr̥ṣṭi* and *ātmīyadr̥ṣṭi*¹⁴ and what he meant by the term *pañcadhā* is, as Candrakīrti puts it, *pañcadhā vicāryamāṇa* (*jmṛgyamāṇa*¹⁵) or “being examined in the five ways”, i.e., A (e.g. *dr̥ṣṭi*) is identical with B (e.g. *svakāya* in the sense of five aggregates (*pañca skandhāḥ*)), A is different from B, A is not in B, B is not in A, and A is not possessed of B. This scheme of criticism accords well with that of *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* as set out in the Preamble of this paper.

Conclusion

From the above examination of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* as found in the *Aṣṭa*, Haribhadra’s commentary on it, and MMK, we can draw the following conclusions: First, as far as our present knowledge goes, Nāgārjuna appears to be the first who used *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* instead of *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*.

Second, as is confirmed by both Bhāviveka and Candrakīrti, Nāgārjuna used the term *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* in the sense of both *ātmadr̥ṣṭi* and *ātmīyadr̥ṣṭi*.

Third, for Nāgārjuna, *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* is to be examined in the five ways, i.e., A is identical with B, A is different from B, A is in B, B is in A, and A is possessed of B. In his unique usage of this term in MMK 23.5, “A” stands for *dr̥ṣṭi* and “B” for *svakāya*. *Svakāya* refers to “one’s own [five] aggregates (*[pañca] skandhāḥ*)” which is shared by all the above-mentioned commentators on MMK.

Forth, it seems most probable that the unique usage of *svakāyadr̥ṣṭi* was newly inserted into the text of *Aṣṭa* Chapter 1 between *Xiǎo pǎn bō rě jīng* 小品般若經 and *Dà bō rě jīng* 大般若經, i.e., from 5th to the middle of 7th centuries.

Abbreviations

- AAA: *Abhisamayālaṅkāralokā*. U. Wogihara ed., *Abhisamayālaṅkāralokā Prajñāpāramitāvyaḥyā: The Work of Haribhadra*, Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1932; repr. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1973.
- AKBh: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. P. Pradhan ed., *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*, Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.
- AKVy: *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*. U. Wogihara ed., *Sphutārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: The Work of Yaśomitra*, Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1936.
- Aṣṭa: *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitāsūtra*. P. L. Vaidya ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā*, Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 4, 1960.
- D: Tibetan tripiṭaka, sDe dge edition.
- MMK: *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* by Nāgārjuna. Ye Shaoyong ed., *Zhonglunsong (Mūlamadhyamakakārikā)*, Shanghai: Zhongxi Book Company, 2011.
- Mvy: *Mahāvvyūtpatti*. Y. Ishihama and Y. Fukuda ed., *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvvyūtpatti: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology*, Studia Tibetica 16, Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1989.
- P: Tibetan tripiṭaka, Peking edition.
- PSP: *Mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti-Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti. L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*, Bibliotheca Buddhica, IV. St. Pétersbourg: Académie impériale des sciences, 1903-1913.
- SN: *Samyuttanikāya*. M. Léon Feer ed., *Samyutta-nikāya of the Sutta-piṭaka*, London: Pali Text Society, 1884 ~ (vol. III 1890).

Brief References (in chronological order)

- Funahashi, Issai 舟橋一哉 [1952] “附記「是我・異我・相在」の解釈について—阿含經典の読み方に関する和辻博士の誤解—” [Appendix. On the interpretation of *shì wǒ* 是我, *yì wǒ* 異我, and *xiāng zài* 相在: Dr. Watsuji's misinterpretation of how to read the Āgama scriptures], 原始仏教思想の研究 [Studies in the Thought of Early Buddhism], Kyoto: Hōzōkan, pp. 249-255.
- Nakamura, Hajime 中村元 [1963] “インド思想一般から見た無我思想” [The tenet of No-self in the context of Indian Philosophy], 自我と無我 [Self and No-self], Kyoto: Heirakuji-shoten, pp. 1-142.
- Hirakawa, Akira 平川彰 [1963] “無我と主体” [No-self and Agent], 自我と無我 [Self and No-self], Kyoto: Heirakuji-shoten, pp. 381-421.
- Nakamura, Hajime 中村元 [1970] 原始仏教の思想・上 [The Philosophy of Early Buddhism, vol. 1], 中村元選集 13 (原始仏教 3) [Selected Works of Nakamura Hajime 13: Early Buddhism 3], Tokyo: Shunjūsha, esp. pp. 155-158.
- Tabata, Tetsuya 田端哲哉 [1977] “説一切有部の基本命題と *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*” [The basic proposition of Sarvāstivāda and *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*], *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 印度学仏教学研究 25-2, pp. 190-193.
- Saigusa, Mitsuyoshi 三枝充憲 [1978] 初期仏教の思想 [The Philosophy of Early Buddhism], Institute of Oriental Studies 東洋学術研究所.
- Wayman, Alex. [1979] “The Twenty Reifying Views (SAKKYADITṬHI)”, *Studies in Pali and Buddhism: Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap Memorial Volume*, Delhi: B. R. Publishing Co., 1979, pp. 375-380.

- Schmithausen, Lambert シュミットハウゼン, L. [1979] “我見に関する若干の考察—薩迦耶見、我慢、染汚意—” [Some Aspects of the Conception of an Ego in Buddhism — *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi*, *asmimāna* and *kliṣṭa-manas* —], *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 仏教学 7, pp. 1-18.
- Imanishi, Junkichi 今西順吉 [1986] “我と無我” [Self and No-self], *Hokkaido Journal of Indological and Buddhist Studies* 印度哲学仏教学1, pp. 28-43.
- Fuller, Paul. [2005] *The Notion of Ditthi in Theravāda Buddhism*, London: RoutledgeCurson, esp. pp. 26-28.
- Yonezawa, Yoshiyasu 米澤嘉康 [2007] “**Lakṣaṇaṭīkā: Sanskrit Notes on the Prasannapadā* (4)”, *Journal of Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies* 成田山仏教研究所紀要 30, pp. 203-235.
- Dhammajoti, Bhikkhu KL [2015] *Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma*, Hong Kong: The Buddha-Dharma Centre of Hong Kong.
- Imanishi, Junkichi 今西順吉 [2016] “仏教とウッダーラカの哲学” [The Buddha and Uddālaka’s Philosophy], *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 国際仏教学大学院大学紀要 20, pp. 225-242 (esp. 226-232).
- Kimura, Yukari 木村紫 [2016] “『俱舍論』を中心とした有身見の研究—刹那的な諸行を常住な一自体 (*piṇḍa*) と把握する想と聖者の諦—” [A study of *satkāyadr̥ṣṭi* with special reference to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: Misconception of momentary formative-forces as an eternal individual and Realities for the Nobles], unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Risshō University.

Notes

- 1 See, e.g., Nakamura [1963: 106-110], Hirakawa [1963: 404-408], Dhammajoti [2015: 374-375].
- 2 Childers, *A Dictionary of the Pali Language*, 1875, s.v. "sakkāyo"; Nakamura [1963: 107-108].
- 3 F Egerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, New Haven, 1953 (repr. India, 1977), s.v. "satkāya-dṛṣṭi".
- 4 As is well-known, Vasubandhu gives an etymological explanation to the same word as follows: "The view of *satkāya* is either the view of self or the view of those belonging to the self. Because it perishes (*sīdati*), it is [called] *sat*. *Kāya* means accumulation, collection, and aggregate. It is *satkāya* 'perishing body (*kāya*)' because it perishes and at the same time a body, viz. the five appropriate aggregates. It was so expressed for the purpose of eliminating both the [wrong] conception of eternity and that of a mass because adherence to the self in regard to those [five aggregates] is preceded by these [wrong conceptions]." *ātmadṛṣṭir ātmiyadṛṣṭir vā satkāyadṛṣṭiḥ / sīdatīti sat / cayaḥ kāyaḥ saṅghātaḥ skandha ity arthaḥ / sac cāyaṇi kāyaś ceti satkāyaḥ pañcopādānaskandhāḥ / nītyasañjñāṃ piṇḍasañjñāṃ ca tyājayitum evaṇi dyotitā / etatpūrvako hi teṣv ātmagrāhaḥ* / (AKBh, V, p. 281). The widely used Tib. tr. 'jig tshogs la lta ba (Mvy, nos. 1966, 4671) agrees with the above Vasubandhu's etymological explanation of *satkāyadṛṣṭi*.
- 5 *Aṣṭa* Chap. 25, p. 213.12-13: *tad yathāpi nāma Subhūte satkāyadṛṣṭau dvāṣaṣṭidṛṣṭigatāny antargatāni bhavati, evam eva...* "Subhuti, just as, for instance, those belonging to the sixty-two [wrong] views are [all] included in the view of *satkāya*, so...."; Chap. 31, p. 255.16: *... sarvasatkāyadṛṣṭipratīṣṭhitānāṃ sarvasaddṛṣṭyabhiniviṣṭānāṃ sattvānāṃ* // "...of sentient beings who are dependent on all views of *satkāya* and clinging to all wrong views."
- 6 See the above Preamble and Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā* cited in the following section.
- 7 *svakāyadṛṣṭi* is also found in a unique ms. of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* in its citation from *Daśabhūmikasūtra* whose reading, however, is therein *satkāyadṛṣṭi* and not *svakāyadṛṣṭi* in both Rahder's (p. 28.30) and Kondo's (p. 44.2) editions. See C. Bendall's edition of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bibliotheca Buddhica I, 1897-1902), p. 289.4, n. 4 and PSP p. 454, n. 1.
- 8 In MMK *svakāyadṛṣṭi* appears only in this verse, while *satkāyadṛṣṭi* is not used in this treatise.
- 9 See J. Fehér, "Identical Chapters in *Akutobhayā* and *Buddhapālita's* Commentary," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13, 1986, pp. 134-175.
- 10 See A. Saito, "『無畏論』の著者と成立をめぐる諸問題" [Remarks on the Authorship and Textual Development of the *Akutobhayā*], *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 51-2, 2003, pp.863-869; do., "『無畏論』とその成立年代—『般若経』の引用を手がかりとして—" [The *Akutobhayā* and Its Approximate Date of Formation: In view of a citation from *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra*], *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 仏教学45, 2003, pp. (1)-(29).
- 11 See Dhammajoti [2015: 601].
- 12 For the text of this sentence with asterisks, which accords with Tib.: *rang gi lus la lta ba ni rang lus lta ste / bdaq dang bdaq gi ba'i rnam par 'dzin par (P pa) zhugs so* // (D Tōhoku No. 3860, 'a 148b4; P Ōtani No. 5260, 'a 168b8), see PSP p. 454, n. 3.
- 13 Cf. *Dà shèng zhōng guān shì lùn* 大乘中觀釋論 (by Sthiramati and tr. by Wéi jìng et al. 惟淨等); 有身見 (卍字藏經26-1, 68右上); *Dà bō rě jīng* 大般若經 (tr. by Xuán zàng 玄奘); 薩迦耶見 (T vol. 7, 766b15-16).
- 14 See MMK 18, kk. 1-2.
- 15 PSP, pp. 284.5, 439.8, 590.1.