

Who were the *icchantikās*?*

Seishi KARASHIMA

(1) **Pā = BHS. *icchati*** : “fancies; maintains, holds, claims; accepts, admits, approves of (a theory)”

In the *Visuddhimagga* (ed. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, PTS), the verb *icchati* occurs several times with the meaning “maintains, claims, thinks of (a theory)” or “approves of, admits”¹ as follows:

310.20f. *akkharacintakā pana atthaṃ avicāretvā “nāmamattam etan” ti icchanti, ye pi atthaṃ vicārenti, te sattāyogena(v.l. satta°) “sattā”ti icchanti.*² (“However, [in the world] etymologists who do not consider meaning have it that it is a mere name, while those who do consider meaning have it that a ‘being’ [*satta*] is so called with reference to the ‘bright principle’ [*satta*].”) ³

338.30f. *ārammaṇātikkamato catasso pi bhavant’ imā / aṅgātikkamam etāsaṃ na icchanti vibhāvino* // (“While reckoned by surmounting of the object they are four, the

* This article is an enlarged and revised version of Seishi Karashima, “Miscellaneous notes on Middle Indic Words,” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2001*, March 2002, pp. 148-151. Soon after the publication of the former article, Prof. Lambert Schmithausen referred to it in a positive way in his article (“Zum Problem der Gewalt im Buddhismus,” *Krieg und Gewalt in den Weltreligionen: Fakten und Hintergründe*, ed. Adel Theodor Khoury *et al.*, Freiburg 2003: Herder-Verlag, p. 137, n. 45), which made me more confident in my theory. In this respect, I am grateful to him. I should also like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Kiyotaka Goshima, Yoshifumi Honjō, Shin’ichirō Miyake, Naomi Satō, Yoshiyasu Yonezawa, Daigo Sasaki, Peter Skilling, Prof. Oskar von Hinüber and Prof. Minoru Hara for their valuable suggestions in the process of writing this article. Thanks are due as well to Yasunori Harada and Kaie Mochizuki for providing me with otherwise unattainable sources on my request, and also to Peter Lait for correcting my English.

¹ This meaning of *icchati* is not recorded in dictionaries including CPD. DP (s.v. *icchati*¹ [2]) gives “approves, allows, prescribes” to this verb, but only as a grammatical technical term, quoting the *Paramatthajotikā* II and the *Saddanīti*. Cf. *Points of Controversy or Subjects of Discourse, Being a Translation of the Kathā-vatthu*, by Shwe Zan Aung and Mrs. Rhys Davids Oxford (PTS), p. xxxiv. MW (s.v. \sqrt{ic}) gives “to acknowledge, maintain, regard, think” also as a grammatical term, while PW give “anerkennen, ansehen für” for *icchati*; “gebilligt, anerkannt, angenommen, für etwas angesehen werden, gelten” for *īyate*, referring to a wide range of texts, including literary works (vol. 1, p. 823, right).

² = *Paṭisambhidāmagga-atthakathā* I 57.20f.

³ *Ñāṇamoli* 1956: 302-303.

wise do not admit surmounting of factors that one can recognize.”⁴

375.20f. *aṅgārammaṇavavattbhāpanam pi eke icchanti, aṭṭhakathāsu pana anāgatattā addhā tam bhāvanāmukhaṃ na hoti.* (“Some would also have ‘defining of factors and object’; but since that is not given in the commentaries it is certainly not a heading in the development.”)⁵

692.27f. *ye pana nānābhisamayam icchanti tesam uttaram Abbidhamme Kathāvattbusmiṃ vuttam eva* (“But about those who would have it that [the different truths] are penetrated to separately, more is said in the Abhidhamma in the Kathāvattu.”)⁶

A similar usage of this verb is also observed in the *Kathāvattbuppakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā*⁷ as follows:

37.2f. *Sammitiyā Vajjiputtakā Sabbatthivādino ekacce ca Mahāsaṅghikā arabato pi(v.l.-) paribāniṃ icchanti* (“The Saṃmitiyas, the Vajjiputtiyas, the Sabbatthivādins, and some of the Mahāsaṅghikas maintain that an arahān can fall away.”)⁸

41.5f. *tattha ye paranimmitavasavattideve upādāya tad upari devesu maggabhāvanam pi na icchanti seyyathāpi Sammitiyā* (“But some, for instance the Saṃmitiyas, do not believe in any Way-culture among the higher devas.”)⁹

85.15f. *tattha ye sabbasmimpi anāgate nānam icchanti, seyyathāpi Andhakā* (“But some, for instance the Andhakas, consider that insight into any part of the future is possible.”)¹⁰

etc. etc.

The word *icchati*, with the same meaning, namely “maintains, claims, thinks of (a theory),” as in the above-cited Pāli texts, is also found four times in Nāgārjuna’s *Madhyamakakārikā*:

II 10d. *gantur gamanam icchataḥ* // (“Because he maintains [there is] the movement of a mover.”)¹¹

VI 8cd. *sababhāvaprasiḍḍhyartham pṛthaktvam bhūya icchasi* // (“You maintain the diversity [of two entities] for the purpose of establishing co-existence.”)¹²

VI 9cd. *katamasmin pṛthagbhāve sababhāvam satīcchasi* // (“In which [of the two entities] do you maintain co-existence, when the diversity [of two entities] does exist?”)¹³

XII 1. *svayam kṛtam parakṛtam dvābhyām kṛtam abetukam* /

⁴ *op. cit.* p. 333.

⁵ *op. cit.* p. 371.

⁶ *op. cit.* p. 719.

⁷ Ed. N. A. Jayawicrama, London 1979: PTS.

⁸ Cf. *The Debates Commentary*, trans. by B. C. Law, Oxford ²1989 (PTS), p. 43, where *icchanti* translated as “incline to the belief”.

⁹ *op. cit.* p. 48.

¹⁰ *op. cit.* p. 106.

¹¹ Cf. Saigusa 1984, I, p. 131. 去る主体に〔さらに〕去るはたらき〔が有る〕、と主張しているからである; Kalupahana 1986: 123, “For him who entertains the view: ‘A mover moves,’ and who looks for the movement of a mover, it follows that there is a mover without movement.”; Inada 1970: 46, “If it is asserted that a passing entity comes to pass then a fallacy would result in that the entity could be separated from the coming to pass. (And yet) a passing entity requires the (condition of) passing away.”

duḥkham ity eka icchanti tac ca kāryaṃ na yujyate // (“Some assert that suffering arises by virtue of being self-caused, other-caused, both self and other-caused or non-causal. Such [an assertion which treats suffering as] an effect is not justifiable.”)¹⁴

Likewise, the word \sqrt{is} , meaning “fancies, maintains, claims, thinks of (a theory),” or “approves of, admits” (usually used with negatives, such as “does not approve of; does not accept”), is used frequently¹⁵ in the *Abhidharmakośabbāṣya*.¹⁶ For instance,

p. 72, l. 8. *caturthadhyānabbūmikām api nirodhasamāpattiṃ nikāyāntarīyā icchanti* (“Those, who belong to other schools, maintain that [there is] attainment of cessation [nirodhasamāpatti], which belongs to the fourth stage of meditation”)¹⁷

p. 72, l. 17 = 2nd edition, p. 72, l. 20. *atītaśyāpy astivāt isyate Vaibhāṣikāḥ samanantarapratyayatvam* (“The *Vaibhāṣikas* maintain that [there is] an immediately preceding situation [of the mind] due to the existence of the past [mind].”)

p. 85, l. 13 = 2nd edition, p. 85, l. 15. *ye tu rūpaṃ rūpasya nēcchanti sabhāgabetuṃ teṣāṃ eṣa granthaḥ icchā-vighātāya sampravarttate “atītāni mahābhūtāny anāgatānāṃ mahābhūtānāṃ hetur adhipatir” iti* (“However, the following text contradicts the assertion of those who do not accept [the idea] that *rūpa* is *rūpa*’s corresponding cause: “The great-elements in the past are a cause and a dominant factor of the great-elements in the future.”)¹⁸

p. 189, l. 4. *atra tu kecit tīrthaṅkarā icchanti* : “*paramāṇavo nityāste tadānīṃ śiṣyanta*” *iti* (“Concerning this, some heretics maintain that atoms are permanent and remain at the time [of the destruction of the world]”)¹⁹

p. 212, l. 23. *tad etat kasyacid apy aborātrād ūrdhvam adeśanān nēcchanti Vaibhāṣikāḥ*

¹² Cf. Saigusa 1984, I, p. 211. ところが、〔両者の〕結合を成立させるために、汝はさらに、〔両者が〕別異であることを主張しているのである; Kalupahana, p. 157: “You, again, look for discreteness for the purpose of establishing co-existence.”; Inada, p. 62: “On the other hand, while projecting the establishment of concomitance, once again, you are desirous of diversity.”

¹³ Saigusa 1984, I, p. 213. 〔両者が〕互いに別異であるということが存在するときに、汝は、そのどちらにおいて結合を主張するのであるか; Kalupahana, pp. 157-158: “In the presence of what kind of discreteness would you expect co-existence”; Inada, p. 62: “In what kind of diversity (of entities) are you desirous of establishing concomitance?”

¹⁴ Inada, p. 88 (The words in square brackets are added by the present author.). Cf. Kalupahana, p. 211: “Some assume that suffering is self-caused,”

¹⁵ Cf. Abhidh-k(Index), Part I, p. 92, s.v. *Iṣ*.

¹⁶ *Abhidharmakośabbāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1967, revised 2nd edition, Patna 1975.

¹⁷ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) I, p. 210: “D’après une autre école, le recueillement d’arrêt appartient aussi au quatrième *dhyāna* et n’est pas sujet à la chute.”

¹⁸ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) I, p. 256: “Le *Dārṣāntika* nie que la matière (*rūpa*) soit cause semblable de la matière; mais c’est contredire le *Mahāśāstra* (*Jñānaprasthāna*, 13, 14) : «Les grands éléments passés sont *hetu* et *adhipati* des grands éléments futurs.»”

¹⁹ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) II, p. 210: “Certains docteurs hétérodoxes - *Kaṇṇabhuj*, etc. - disent que les atomes sont éternels ; que, par conséquent, ils restent quand l’univers est dissous.”

- (“The *Vaibhāṣikas* do not approve of this [*i.e. saṃvarōtpāda* ‘production of the discipline’] because [this] is not prescribed [by the Buddha] concerning anyone beyond a day and night.”²⁰)
- p. 216, l. 8. *vināpi hi saṃvareṇōpāsakah prajñaptito na tu bhikṣusrāmaṇerāv iti te tv etan nēcchanti Kāśmīrāḥ* (“Even without discipline, an *upāsaka* is designated [as an *upāsaka*]. It is not so in the case of a monk or a novice. The Kashmirian [*Vaibhāṣikas*] do not accept this.”)²¹)
- p. 223, l. 6f. *dbanarṇavat tu Kāśmīrair āpannasyēṣyate dvayam //39// Kāśmīrās tu khalu Vaibhāṣikāḥ evam icchanti: “na maulīm adhyāpattim āpannasyāsti bhikṣusaṃvaretyāgaḥ. kiṃ kāraṇam? na hy ekadeśakṣobbhāt kṛtsnasamvaratyāgo yukta” iti ...* (“However, the Kashmiris maintain that an offender possesses two things such as wealth and debt. [39] The Kashmirian *Vaibhāṣikas*, however, maintain as follows: ‘[Even] if a [monk] commits grave offences, he does not lose the discipline of a monk. Why? It is not reasonable then that a slight misdeed leads to the lost of his entire discipline.’”)²²)
- p. 229, l. 24. *apare punaḥ pañcavidhaṃ karmēcchanti p. 230, l. 4. tad evaṃ nēcchanti Vaibhāṣikāḥ* (“However, other [people] maintain there are five sorts of Karma. ... The *Vaibhāṣikas* do not accept this.”)²³)
- p. 248, l. 10. *ye tarhi Dārṣṭāntikā abhidhyādīn eva manaskarmēcchanti teṣāṃ te kathaṃ karmapathāḥ* (“In this respect, how can these [*i.e. covetousness etc.*] be paths of action for the *Dārṣṭāntikas*, who maintain that covetousness *etc.* are acts of the mind?”)²⁴)
- p. 284, l. 8 = 2nd edition, p. 284, l. 9. *tad etan nēcchanti Vaibhāṣikāḥ* (“The *Vaibhāṣikas* do not accept this.”)
- p. 407, l. 1. *evaṃ (← eva) tu nēcchanti Vaibhāṣikāḥ* (“However, the *Vaibhāṣikas* do not accept thus.”)
- p. 440, l. 14. *yathēcchanti nikāyāntarīyāḥ dharmāntaram eva caitasikaṃ prītiḥ. saumanasyaṃ tu triṣv api dhyānesu sukham iti* (“... as those, who belong to other schools, maintain

²⁰ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) III, p. 63: “Comme Bhagavat ne parle pas de jeûne durant plus longtemps, les Vaibhāṣikas n’admettent pris cette manière de voir.”

²¹ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) III, p. 75-76: “Or le Maître parle d’Upāsakas ne possédant pas la discipline dans son entièreté; il ne parle pas de Bhikṣus ou de Srāmaṇeras de discipline incomplète. Le Vaibhāṣika du Kāśmīr n’admet pas cette opinion.”

²² Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) III, p. 95: “39 c-d. Le Kāśmīrien croit que le pécheur possède moralité et immoralité, comme un homme peut avoir des richesses et des dettes.

i. Les Vaibhāṣikas du Kāśmīr disent: Le moine coupable (*āpanna*) d’un péché grave (*maulī āpatti*), c’est-à-dire d’un *patanīya*, ne perd pas la discipline de Bhikṣu. Que, en détruisant une partie de la discipline (*ekadeśakṣobbha*), on perde la discipline toute entière, cela n’est pas admissible.”

²³ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) III, pp. 115-116: “50 c-d. D’après une opinion, l’acte est de cinq espèces. Les Vaibhāṣikas n’acceptent pas cette manière de voir.”

²⁴ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) III, p. 169: “Comment donc expliquent-ils que le Sūtra donne à la convoitise, etc., le nom de chemin-de-l’acte ?”

that *prīti* [“joy”] is a mental *dharmā* different [from *saumanasya* “pleasure”] and that *saumanasya* [“pleasure”] is delight in the three meditations.”²⁵

p. 461, l. 11 = 2nd edition, p. 461, l. 14. *yat tarhi Vātsīputriyāḥ pudgalaṃ santam icchanti vicāryaṃ tāvad etat* (“In this regard, the *Vātsīputriyas* maintain that *pudgala* exists. Let’s examine this now!”²⁶

Also, the word *icchati*, meaning “(does not) approve of; (does not) accept,” appears in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.

Bbh. 47.8f. *yaḥ kaścic chramaṇo vā brāhmaṇo vā tac ca nēcchati yena sūnyam, tad api nēcchati yat sūnyam* (“There is a certain ascetic or a Brahmana who does not accept that because of which something is empty, nor does he accept that which is empty.”)

In the *Hastikakṣyasūtra*, quoted in the first *Bhāvanākrama* of Kamalaśīla, we find a verse in which the word *icchati* is used to mean “fancies, assumes” or “maintains”:

*na kaścil labhyate bhāvo yasyōtpādasya sambhavaḥ /
asambhavesu dharmeṣu bālaḥ sambhavam icchati //*²⁷

(“No substance, whose generation exists, can be apprehended. Ignorant people fancy the existence within non-existent dharmas.”²⁸)

From these examples, it can be seen clearly that the word \sqrt{ic} , both in Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit, is used to mean “maintains, claims; fancies, assumes” or “approves of, admits” (usually with negatives), especially in the context where theories or doctrines of a certain school are concerned.

In the Chinese translations of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the word \sqrt{ic} with such meanings was correctly rendered as 許 (“admits”), 說 (“maintains”), 言 (“says”), 執 (“holds, clings, maintains”), 信 (“believes”), 信受 (“accepts and believes”) and so on, while the Tibetan translators uniformly rendered it as *’dod pa*²⁹ — apparently they translated \sqrt{ic} ,

²⁵ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) V, p. 159: “Nous suivons une autre école. D’après cette école, il existe un *dharmā* distinct du *saumanasya*, un *caitasika* (ou « mental ») nommé *prīti*. Le *sukha* des trois *dhyānas* est *saumanasya* ; donc la *prīti*, qui est distinguée du *sukha*, est distincte du *saumanasya*.”

²⁶ Cf. Abhidh-k(VP) V, p. 232: “Le *Vātsīputriya*, il est vrai, admet un *Pudgala* qui n’est ni identique aux éléments (*skandha*), ni autre que les éléments. — Nous devons examiner (si ce *Pudgala* existe comme entité [*dravyatas*] ou comme désignation [*prajñaptitas*], d’une existence nominale.)”

²⁷ Giuseppe Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part Two, Roma 1958 : Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (*Serie Orientale Roma* 9, 2), p. 200, ll. 5-6 (I should like to thank Mr. Yoshiyasu Yonezawa who pointed this occurrence out to me). Cf. *Taishō* 17, No. 814, 785b8f. 象腋經: “無有法可得 若生是有者 無有和合法 凡夫欲和合”; cf. also *Taishō* 17, No. 813, 779b21f.

²⁸ Cf. Parmandra Sharma, *Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla*, New Delhi 1997, p. 24, ll. 27-30: “Nothing exists whose generation or birth is possible. Ignorant people look for the possible from the impossible dharmas.”; Luis O. Gómez, “Primer tratado de cultivo graduado,” in: *Diálogos, Revista del Departamento de Filosofía*, Universidad de Puerto Rico, XII 29-30, 1977, p. 192, ll.11-13: “No se descubre existente alguno que tenga nacimiento en su origen. [Solo] el necio busca nacimiento entre principios sin nacimiento.”; Jose van den Broeck, *La Progression dans la Méditation*, Bruxelles, 1977, p. 16, ll. 11-13: “On ne trouve guère d’entité dont la production existe; à des choses inexistantes, le sot attribue une existence.” I am grateful to Prof. Kaie Mochizuki for providing me with the above-cited translations.

²⁹ Cf. Abhidh-k(Index), Part I, p. 90, s.v. *icchant-*, p. 92, s.v. *Iṣ*.

which generally means “desires, wants,” automatically as *'dod pa* (“desires, wants”), regardless of the context in which it appeared. In some Tibetan reference books, instances of *'dod pa* meaning “maintains, asserts, admits” in similar but slightly different contexts are recorded.³⁰ However, presumably, the Tibetan word had not originally had such a meaning,³¹ but later, as it was frequently used as a translation for the Sanskrit word \sqrt{is} with this meaning, the Tibetan one came finally to be used also in the meaning “maintains, asserts, admits,”³² though still in a limited context.

(2) *icchantika* : “one who claims; an opinionated one”

Several studies have been made and arguments formulated concerning the etymology as well as the definition of *icchantika* (一闍提 MC. ʔjet tshjān: diei).³³ The term *icchantika* has been defined in the following ways:

“A being who, according to some Mahāyāna texts, is lacking in Buddha-nature or the potential for enlightenment (bodhi).”³⁴

“One who has no goodness in his nature and, therefore, no possibility of becoming a buddha.”³⁵

“This (*i.e.* *icchantika*) is generally understood to have been derived from *icbhā* ‘desire.’ The *icchantika* are those devoted followers of hedonism either in its bad or good sense.”³⁶

“The notion of the *icchantika* (loosely rendered into English as “hedonist” or “dissipated”) is the closest Buddhism comes to a notion of damnation or perdition.

³⁰ Cf. Paul G. Hackett, *A Tibetan Verb Lexicon : Verbs, Classes, and Syntactic Frames*, Ithaca, N.Y. 2003: Snow Lion Publications, p. 109; Zuihō Yamaguchi (山口瑞鳳), *Tibetogo Bungo Bunpō* チベット語文語文法 (*A Grammar of Literary Tibetan*), Tokyo: Shunjūsha 1998, p. 293. Cf. also Heinrich August Jäschke, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, London, 1881; Reprint London ²1972: Routledge & Kegan Paul, *Boḍ rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*, 藏漢大辭典 (*A Comprehensive Tibetan-Chinese Dictionary*), ed. Zhang Yisun 張怡蓀 Beijing 1985, ²1993, Minzu Chubanshe 民族出版社 (Nationalities Publishing House), *The Rangjung Yeshe Tibetan-English Dictionary of Buddhist Culture*, CD ROM Version 3, 2003, Rangjung Yeshe Institute, s.v. *'dod pa*, *'dod don* (“assertion”), *'dod tshul* (“do.”), *'dod lugs* (“opinion, viewpoint, position, attitude”) etc.

³¹ To support this assumption, it may be pointed out that many of the Tibetan dictionaries, which I consulted, except for those cited in the preceding note, do not contain the meaning “maintains, admits.” They are: *Dictionnaire Tibétain-Latin-Français*, par les Missionnaires Catholiques du Thibet, Hong Kong 1899: Imprimerie de la Société des Missions Étrangères; *Tibetan-English Dictionary: With Supplement*, Stuart H. Buck, Washington 1969: Catholic University of America Press; Delhi ²1997: Sri Satguru Publications (Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series, No. 179); *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, by Sarat Chandra Das, revised and edited under the orders of the Government of Bengal by Graham Sandberg and A. William Heyde, Reprint: Delhi 1970: Motilal Banarsidass; George Roerich, *Tibetsko-Russko-Angliiskii Slovar s Sanskritskimi Paralleliami*, Moskva 1983-1993: Nauka; *The New Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan*, ed. Melvyn C. Goldstein et al., Berkeley 2001: University of California Press.

³² In the Tibetan translation of the *Abhidharmakośabbāṣya*, the word *mata* (“thought right, approved”), a synonym of the word \sqrt{is} in question, is rendered also as *'dod (pa)* (cf. *Abhidh-k[Index]*, Part 3, p. 133, s.v. *'dod*; p.135, s.v. *'dod pa*), which may indicate that this word had acquired the meaning “maintains, asserts, admits” by then and was, therefore, used as a translation not only for \sqrt{is} but also for *mata* in that particular text.

icchantika refers to a class, or "lineage" (Sanskrit, *gotra*), of beings who are beyond all redemption and lose forever the capacity to achieve *nirvāṇa* (Sanskrit, *aparinirvāṇagotraka*).³⁷

" The term *icchan* originally refers to someone who is in a continual state of craving. In India the term refers to an Epicurean or a secularist. In Buddhism it refers to someone who lacks the basic causes and conditions for becoming a Buddha."³⁸

The definitions of *icchantika*, given in the last three works — especially the third one which is apparently greatly influenced by those written by Japanese scholars³⁹ —, are problematic. First, this word occurs only in the relatively late Mahāyāna Buddhist texts of the *tathāgatagarbha* tradition, namely the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* — which is probably the first text to contain this word —, *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*, *Ratnagotravibhāga* etc., and in the *Mahāvīyūtpatti* — the first Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon composed in the ninth

³³ Cf. BHSD, s.v. *icchantika*; *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17(1975), p. 275. Also, it is to be noted that Unrai Wogihara, who was once an authority of Buddhist Sanskrit, assumed *icchantika* to be a Middle Indic form of **itthamvika* or **aitthamvika* ("being worldly") — both of which are derivatives of Skt. *itthamva* ("existence here") — based on the contexts of *icchantika* in the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Unrai Wogihara, *Bonkan Taiyaku Bukkyō Jiten: Hon'yaku Myōgi Taishū* 梵漢對譯佛教辭典：翻訳名義大集 [*The Sanskrit-Chinese Dictionary of Buddhist Technical Terms, based on the Mahāvīyūtpatti*], Tokyo 1927; Reprint: Tokyo 1959; Sankibō Busshorin, Notes, p. 23; cf. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*, London 1930: Routledge, p. 219, n. 1; BHSD, s.v. *icchantika*). Cf. Ruegg 1973: 12, n. 1; Shimoda 1993: 92; Ogawa 2004: 108f. When I read an earlier version of this paper at the 13th World Sanskrit Conference, held in Edinburgh, Scotland, July 2006, Prof. von Hinüber suggested to me the following derivation: *icchā + antika* ("ending in; belonging to, related to, connected with" [BHSD, s.v.]) > **icchāntika* > *icchantika*. Prof. Minoru Hara suggested also on the same occasion that the form *icchantika* could have been derived from **iccanta* (< **ityanta* < *iti + anta*), meaning "one, who adheres to what was told, namely a tradition." As Prof. Hara admitted, the development *-cc-* > *-cb-* is awkward.

³⁴ Damien Keown, *A Dictionary of Buddhism*, Oxford 2003: Oxford University Press, p. 117.

³⁵ Inagaki Hisao, *A Dictionary of Japanese Buddhist Terms: based on references in Japanese literature* 日英佛敎語辭典, 4th ed., Kyoto 1992: Nagata Bunshōdō, p. 126, s.v. *Issendai*.

³⁶ Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*, London 1930: Routledge, p. 219, n. 1.

³⁷ Robert E. Buswell et al., eds., *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, New York 2004-: Macmillan Reference, vol. 1, p. 351, s.v. *icchantika*.

³⁸ A. Charles Muller, *Dictionary of East Asian Buddhist Terms* (online), s.v. 一闍提 (*yīl chán* ti2).

³⁹ Most of the Buddhist dictionaries written by Japanese scholars define the term to mean "one who craves"; e.g. 「……字義どおりには、〈欲求する人〉という意味に解され、現世の欲望を追求する人びとをさすが、仏典の用例では、因果・業報・来世を信ぜず、仏の所説にしたがわず、正法を誹謗して成仏の縁を欠くものをいう。……」 (*Iwanami Bukkyōjiten* 岩波仏敎辭典, ed. Nakamura, Hajime 中村元 et al., Revised Edition: Tokyo 2002: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店) p. 49; 「……もとの意味は、〈欲求しつつある人〉であるが、断善根、信不具足、極欲などと訳して成仏する因をもたないものをいう。……」 (*Sōgō Bukkyō Daijiten* 総合佛敎大辭典, Kyoto 1987: Hōzōkan, vol. 1, p. 59); 「……通俗語源解釈によると、欲求しつつある人 (S. *icchan*) の意で、インドの快樂主義者や現世主義者をさすというが、仏教では仏敎の正しい法を信ぜず、さとりを求める心がなく、成仏の素質・縁を欠く者をいう。世俗的快樂だけを希求している人。また仏敎の教義を毀謗し、救われる望みのない人。……」 (*Hajime Nakamura* 中村元, *Kosetsu Bukkyō Daijiten* 広説佛敎語大辭典, Tokyo 2001: Tokyo Shoseki 東京書局, vol. 1, p. 74).

century — and is never found in any non-Buddhist literature. Also, apart from the aforementioned lexicon *Mahāvvyutpatti*,⁴⁰ in all instances, this word means *Ichchantika*, monks antagonistic towards followers of the *tathāgatagarbha* theory, and hence, there is no instance where an *icchantika* is referred to as being a “hedonist” or a “secularist” in India.

Having examined exhaustively the occurrences of this word in Buddhist texts in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese as well as previous research undertaken by others, Dr. Ryōkō Mochizuki concluded that an *icchantika* is “one who desires to profit and nourish himself”⁴¹ and that “*icchantikas* refer to people who were in some way closely related to the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* group; but due to their desire for profit and nourishment, the *icchantika* presented a threat to that group and were considered pseudo-Mahāyānist.”⁴² Mochizuki’s definition of this word as “one who desires to profit and nourish himself” is accepted and adhered to by other Japanese scholars.⁴³

However, among the sentences, containing this word, exhaustively compiled in Mochizuki’s book,⁴⁴ there are no instances of an *icchantika* being described as desiring gain (利養). According to the Tibetan translation of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, the object of the verb *’dod pa* (“desires; maintains, claims”) of a *’dod chen pa* (lit. “one who has strong desire” = *icchantika*) is Arhatship. That is to say, an *icchantika* (Tib. *’dod chen pa*) claims (or “fancies”; Tib. *’dod pa = icchati*) that he is an Arhat. Passages in this scripture concerning an *icchantika* read as follows:

⁴⁵An *icchantika* (*’dod chen pa*) — who is blind, solitary and claims to be an Arhat (*dgra bcom pa yin par ’dod pa*) — desires to go on the great, endless way. (He) claims to be a compassionate Arhat (*byams pa dang ldan pa’i dgra bcom pa yin par ’dod*), and desires (*’dod de*) to refute the *Vaipulya*. Claiming to be an Arhat (*dgra bcom pa yin par ’dod cing*), and having refuted the *Śrāvakayāna*, he gives (them) predictions to Buddhahood, saying: ⁴⁶“I am a Bodhisattva. I am a preacher of the *Vaipulya*. In all sentient beings, there are qualities of the *tathāgatagarbha*, there exists (the state of being) a Buddha.” He says: “You and I should crush various *kleśas* like a water vase. We should practise for enlightenment without doubting. The Sutra’s instruction is such.” For example, a king’s messenger, who is pure, loyal, eloquent and very majestic, states the message to the (enemy) king completely at the risk of his own life in the midst of the enemy. Likewise, a wise one, who cherishes the *Vaipulya* should give predictions to Buddhahood, at the risk of his own life in the midst of the ignorant, since all sentient beings

⁴⁰ Mvy, p. 164, No. 2210. *icchantikah*, Tib. *’dod chen*; p. 165, No. 2223. *icchantikah*, Tib. *’dod chen po*.

⁴¹ Mochizuki 1988: 12 (in the English part), 111 (in the Japanese part).

⁴² Mochizuki 1988: 16 (in the English part).

⁴³ Takasaki 1989: 256, n. 49; Shimoda 1997: 356-378, 27-29 (in the English summary); Hakamaya 2001: pp. 20-34.

⁴⁴ Mochizuki 1988: 377ff.

⁴⁵ 'dod chen pa long ba gcig bu dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod pa ni lam mi zad pa chen por 'gro 'dod do // byams pa dang ldan pa'i dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod la shin du (v.l. tu) rgyas pa sun dbyung bar 'dod de / dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod cing nyan thos kyi theg pa sun phyung nas nga ni byang chub sems dpa' ste / shin du (v.l. tu) rgyas pa ston pa yin no / sems can thams cad la de bzbin gshegs pa'i snying po'i yon tan rmams yod do / sangs rgyas yod do zbes zer zbing sangs rgyas su lung ston par byed de / nga dang khyed kyi nyon mongs pa'i rnam pa chu'i bum pa bzbin du gzbom par bya'o (v.l. bya'i) / the tsom med par byang chub bsgom par bya ste (v.l. 'o) / mdo sde'i man ngag ni de lta bu yin no zbes zer ro / dper na rgyal po'i pbo nya gtsang zbing snying nye la smra mkhas shing gzi byin che ba / dgra'i nang du rang gi srog dang bsnogs te rgyal po la tshig rdzogs par smra ba de bzbin du shes rab can shin du (v.l. tu) rgyas pa gees par 'dzin pa ni byis pa rmams kyi nang du rang gi srog dang bsnogs nas sems can thams cad la de bzbin gshegs pa'i snying po yod pas sangs rgyas su lung ston (v.l. bston) par byed do // dgon pa pa / mdo sde spong ba / byis pa blun po dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod pa gang yin pa de la dgra bcom pa dang 'dra bar blta (v.l. lta) zbing sems can chen po dang 'dra bar lta ste / 'dod chen pa dge slong sdig can de dgon pa na gnas shing bdag nyid dgra bcom pa dang 'dra bar rtsi bar byed de / dgon pa na gnas pa'i dge slong rmams gzhan gyis bos pa mi bzod la rkyen bzbi las shing du (v.l. tu) rgyas pa ni bDud kyi smras pa yin no // bcom ldan 'das ni mi rtag go / chos dang dge 'dun yang med par 'gyur ro // dam pa'i chos med par 'gyur ba'i ltas de lta bu dag kyang (v.l. -) snang ngo zbes bya ba 'di theg pa chen po las legs par bshad do zbes zer te / (The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition, vol. 31, No. 788, p. 199, 133b8-134a7). For the above-cited sentences, cf. Mochizuki 1988: 425-429; Shimoda 1997: 372. They incorrectly rendered *dgra bcom pa yin par 'dod pa* as "He wishes to be an Arhat" (阿羅漢たること願う), "He thinks that he may be an Arhat" (阿羅漢であろうと思つて), respectively. Such interpretations of this sentence are grammatically not possible. Cf. also the Chinese translations of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*: 有似阿羅漢一闍提而行惡業；似一闍提阿羅漢而行慈心。"有似阿羅漢一闍提"者，是諸衆生誹謗方等。"似一闍提阿羅漢"者，毀訾聲聞，廣說方等，語衆生言，"我與汝等俱是菩薩。所以者何？一切皆有如來性故。"然彼衆生謂："一闍提。"而言："如來授我等決。汝亦如是。我與汝等皆當俱離無量煩惱・衆魔惡業，如壞水瓶。於此契經必成菩提，勿復生疑。譬如烈士奉王使令，至他國中，稱歎王德，寧失身命，要不移易。我等今日亦復如是，如來記說：'一切衆生皆有佛性。'我等要當不惜身命，於凡愚中廣說此經。"是名"似一闍提摩訶薩"也。若阿練若愚癡無智，狀似阿羅漢，而誹謗方等。愚騃凡夫謂眞阿羅漢，謂是大士。是惡比丘示現空閑阿練若處，而自處置，似眞阿羅漢，於阿練若行，永不隨順，而作異說："起四因緣，言方等經"皆是魔說。言"摩訶衍"者，是諸點慧正法刺劍。諸佛世尊皆當無常，而說"常住。"當知是爲毀滅正法・破僧之相。"作是說者名"一闍提。" (T. 12, No. 376, 892c9-28); 一闍提者名爲無目，是故不見阿羅漢道。如阿羅漢不行生死險惡之道。以無目故誹謗方等，不欲修習。如阿羅漢勤修慈心。一闍提輩不修方等，亦復如是。若人說言："我今不信聲聞經典。信受大乘，讀誦，解說。是故我今即是菩薩。一切衆生悉有佛性。以佛性故，衆生身中即有十力・三十二相・八十種好。我之所說不異佛說。汝今與我俱破無量諸惡・煩惱如破水瓶。以破結故，即得見於阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。"是人雖作如是演說，其心實不信："有佛性"。爲利養故，隨文而說。如是說者名爲惡人。如是惡人不速受果，如乳成酪。譬如王使善能談論，巧於方便，奉命他國，寧喪身命終不匿王所說言教。智者亦爾，於凡夫中不惜身命，要必宣說大乘方等如來祕藏："一切衆生皆有佛性"。善男子！有一闍提，作羅漢像，住於空處，誹謗方等大乘經典。諸凡夫人見已，皆謂："眞阿羅漢"，"是大菩薩・摩訶薩"。是一闍提惡比丘輩住阿蘭若處，壞阿蘭若法，見他得利，心生嫉妬，作如是言："所有方等大乘經典悉是天魔波旬所說。"亦說："如來是無常法。毀滅正法，破壞衆僧"。復作是言："波旬所說非善順說"。作是宣說邪惡之法。是人作惡，不即受報，如乳成酪，灰覆火上，愚輕踏之。如是人者謂一闍提。是故當知大乘方等微妙經典必定清淨，如摩尼珠投之濁水，水即爲清。大乘經典亦復如是。 (T. 12, No. 374, 419a4-b1). As Mochizuki (1988: 98) pointed out, the latter part of the above-quoted sentences resembles verses 5-11 in the *Utsāha-parivarta* of the Lotus Sutra. I have demonstrated elsewhere that those verses show the antagonism of wilderness monks toward the village ones, who composed and held the Lotus Sutra (Karashima 2001). I have translated those verses in the Lotus Sutra as follows (*ibid.* 162-163):

Ignorant practitioners of austerities, who dwell in the wilderness and wear patched garments, will say of us as follows: (v. 5)

"They, greedily attached to tastes (*rāsa*), preach (*deśayī*) the *Dharma* to house-holders." (v. 6ab)

They (*i.e.* the wilderness monks) will be honoured as if they were those who possess the sixfold supernatural knowledge (*ṣaḍabbijñā*). (v. 6cd)

evident.’ — this is explained clearly in the (true) Mahāyāna (scriptures),”⁵⁰ we may assume that *icchāntikas* were monks who, following the traditional Mahāyāna teachings, did not approve (*icchāntī*) of the then emerging theory of the eternity of the *Tathāgata* — which is the main theme of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*.⁵¹

The word *icchāntika* is either formed from the present active participle *icchant-* with the suffix *-ka*, as Edgerton suggested,⁵² or derived from *icchā* + *anta*.⁵³ As we have seen above, the word *icchant-* (‘*dod pa*) has the meanings “fancying; claiming, maintaining; admitting, approving of” in addition to its usual definition “desiring.”⁵⁴ Accordingly, the noun *icchā* has the meaning “assertion, claim”⁵⁵ in addition to “desire.” What is meant by *icchāntika* is, then, probably “one who claims.” When a monk — who claimed (*icchati*) to be an “Arhat” also was revered as an “Arhat” or a “Mahāsattva” by his followers⁵⁶ and thus, was an authority and spiritual leader of the Buddhist community — did not recognise (*nēcchāntī*) new ideas such as the eternity of the *Tathāgata* and the *tathāgatagarbha* theory as the Buddha’s teachings, then the newly-risen, would-be “*Vaipulya* teachings” (probably the older stratum of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*⁵⁷) may have been branded as

⁴⁹ Cf. the Chinese translations of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*: 若阿練若愚癡無智，狀似阿羅漢，而誹謗方等。愚駿凡夫謂真阿羅漢，謂是大士 (T.12, No. 376, 892c20f.); 有一闍提作羅漢像，住於空處，誹謗方等大乘經典，諸凡夫人見已，皆謂：“真阿羅漢。是大菩薩摩訶薩” (T.12, No. 374, 419a19f.).

⁵⁰ Cf. also the Chinese translations of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*: 諸佛世尊皆當無常，而說：“常住”。當知是為毀滅正法破僧之相 (T.12, No. 376, 892c26); 亦說：“如來是無常法。毀滅正法，破壞衆僧”(T.12, No. 374, 419a24f.).

⁵¹ According to the *Chusanjangji ji* (T.55, No.2145), the original manuscripts of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* had been preserved with a lay family. It says that Faxian (法顯; 337–418 C.E.) obtained the Sanskrit manuscript from an *upāsaka*, called Qieluoxian (伽羅先 *Kālasena*?) in Pāṭaliputra (60b3f.), from which he made the first Chinese translation of the text, while Zhimeng (智猛) is said to have acquired another Indian manuscript from one of Qieluoxian’s descendants, named Luoyue (羅閱), from which Dharmakṣema (曇無讖; 385–433 C.E.) made the second Chinese translation of the text (113c4f. = 60b14f.). Therefore, these reports may indicate that the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* had not been accepted by Buddhist communities at least by the beginning of the fifth century. Cf. Shimoda 1993: xxv–xxvi; do. 1997: 157–158.

⁵² This explication is not without difficulties, as we may expect **icchāntaka* instead of *icchāntika*, to have derived from *icchant-* plus *-ka* (cf. BHSD, s.v. *tiṣṭhāntika*, BHSG § 22.29).

⁵³ *icchā* (“assertion, claim”) + *anta* (pleonastic; cf. DP, s.v. *anta*¹) + *ika* (suffix) > **icchāntika* > *icchāntika* (“someone who claims, maintains”). Cf. n. 33.

⁵⁴ There might be a word-play on the meanings of “claims” and “desires” of *icchati* (‘*dod pa*) in the above-quoted sentence from the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*: “An *icchāntika* — who is blind, solitary and claims to be an Arhat — desires to go on the great, endless way. (He) claims to be a compassionate Arhat, and desires to refute the *Vaipulya*.” (‘*dod chen pa long ba gcig bu dgra bcom pa yin par ’dod pa ni lam ni zad pa chen por ’gro ’dod do // byams pa dang ldan pa’i dgra bcom pa yin par ’dod la shin du (v.l. tu) rgyas pa sun dbyung bar ’dod de /*).

⁵⁵ Cf. the above-cited third example from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

⁵⁶ Cf. the above-quoted sentence: “(When) a wilderness dweller, ... claims to be an Arhat, he looks like an Arhat also looks like a Mahāsattva.” (*dgon pa pa ... dgra bcom pa yin par ’dod pa gang yin pa de la dgra bcom pa dang ’dra bar blta zhing sems can chen po dang ’dra bar lta ste*).

unorthodox. That is what was meant by the word “rejection” (*pratikṣepa*; Tib. *spang ba*, 誹謗). If a simple, common monk rejects a new theory, his voice may not reach anybody. Being rejected and condemned by none other than the authorities of the Buddhist communities, those who advocated new ideas and their followers must have faced a crisis. Then, they may have condemned the authoritative monks repeatedly as being “arrogant,” “evil” and “irredeemable,” as well as calling them, in a derogatory term, *icchāntika* (“one who claims [to be an authority]”) in the newly-added chapters of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*.⁵⁷ However, if one looks at the descriptions cited above from a different point of view, those monks, who were condemned as *icchāntikas* in the “Sutra,” might have been respected conservative monks who stayed with the traditional (Mahāyāna) Buddhist teachings, while opposing new ideas concerning Buddhahood. They might have been so-called “fundamentalists” but never “evil monks.”

Those, who composed the later stratum of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, were probably the first to label those monks, who did not approve of the eternity of the *Tathāgata* and the *tathāgatagarbha* theory, as *icchāntikas*. Following in the wake of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, the composers of later Buddhist texts, putting forth the same *tathāgatagarbha* theory, continued to condemn those who did not approve of their theory, regarding them as *icchāntika*.⁵⁸ Claiming that their texts were part of the “true Mahāyāna” tradition, the former condemned the latter as rejecters of the “Mahāyāna” teachings.

However, much later, the word *icchāntika* seems to have come to be interpreted, not as meaning “one who claims” but “one who desires (transmigration).” This is clearly seen in the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*⁶⁰:

p. 28, l. 14f. *ye nāpi saṃsāram icchanti yathēcchantikā* (“They are not seeking for the Phenomenal Life as the *Ichchantikas* do, ...”)⁶¹

p. 29, l. 1f. *tatra ye sattvā bhavābhilāṣiṇa icchantikās tanniyatipatitā ihadhārmikā evocyante mithyātvaniyataḥ sattvarāśir iti* (“And here, those people who cling to this worldly life, i.e. the *Ichchantikas* and those who, though belonging to this Our Religion, have definitely fallen into the former’s way are called the group of people who confirm in the wrong way.”)⁶²

p. 31, l. 8f. *tatra mahāyānadharmapratihatānām icchantikānām aśucisaṃsārābhirati-viparyayaṇa bodhisattvānāṃ mahāyānadharmādhimuktibhāvanāyāḥ subha-*

⁵⁷ Shimoda posits three stages (Group 1, Group 2-1 and Group 2-2) in the present Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Shimoda 1997: 13f. [in English]; 163f. [in Japanese]).

⁵⁸ According to Shimoda (1997: 27 [in English]; 363f. [in Japanese]), “The *icchāntika* may be assumed to be foreign to Group 1 and essential to Group 2, for the term appears only once in Group 1, [where it] must be a later addition, but more than fifty times in Group 2.”

⁵⁹ Cf. Mochizuki 1988: 465f., where the author quotes sentences containing *icchāntika* from the *Aṅgulimālīya-*, *Buddhanāma-sūtra* etc.

⁶⁰ *The Ratnagoṭravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*, ed. by E. H. Johnston, Patna 1950 : Bihar Research Society.

⁶¹ Cf. Takasaki 1966: 204.

⁶² *op. cit.*, p. 205.

pāramitādhigamaḥ phalaṃ draṣṭavyam (“Here, being opposite to the taking of delight in the ‘impure’ Phenomenal Life by the Icchantikas who have hatred against the Doctrine of Great Vehicle, it should be understood that the acquisition of the Supreme Purity is the result of ‘Practice of the Faith in the Doctrine of Great Vehicle’ by the Bodhisattvas.”)⁶³

The shift in meanings of the word *icchantika* from “one who claims” to “one who desires (transmigration),”⁶⁴ may indicate the actual disappearance of those, who had disapproved of the *tathāgatagarbha* theory, at least from the vicinity. It may further suggest that followers of the theory might have increased in number, making them much more self-confident of their theory; or that the theory itself might have come to be fully recognised as a genuine Mahāyāna teaching.

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924-48.

Abhidh-k(Index) = Akira Hirakawa *et al.*, *Index to the Abhidharmakośabbāṣya* 阿毘達磨俱舍論索引, 3 vols., Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan 大蔵出版, 1973-1978.

Abhidh-k(VP) = *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu : traduction et annotations*, Louis de Vallée Poussin: Paris 1923-1931; Nouv. éd. anastatique présentée par Étienne Lamotte, Bruxelles 1971: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 6 vols. (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* v. 16).

Bbh = *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, ed. Unrai Wogihara, Tokyo 1930-36; Reprint: Tokyo ²1971: Sankibō Buddhist Book Store.

BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

BHSD, G) = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols., New Haven 1953 : Yale University Press; repr. Delhi, ²1970 : Motilal Banarsidass.

CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen *et al.*, Copenhagen, 1924~.

DP = *A Dictionary of Pāli*, by Margaret Cone, Oxford 2001~ : The Pali Text Society.

Hakamaya, Noriaki 袴谷憲昭

2001 “*Ichantika* no imi to *lābha-satkāra*” *icchantika*(一闍提)の意味と *lābha-satkāra* (The Meaning of *Ichantika* and *lābha-satkāra*), in: *Bukkyōgaku Seminar* 仏教学セミナー 74(2001), pp. 20-34.

Inada, Kenneth K.

1970 *Nāgārjuna: A Translation of his Mūlamadhyamakakārikā with an Introductory Essay*, Tokyo: The Hokuseidō Press.

Kalupahana, David J.

1986 *Nāgārjuna: The Philosophy of the Middle Way*, Albany: SUNY Press.

⁶³ *op. cit.*, p. 210.

⁶⁴ This word, also in the following sentence from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, seems to mean “one who desires (transmigration)”: *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, ed. B. Nanjio, Kyoto 1923, p. 65, l. 17f. *tatrēcchantikānāṃ punar Mahāmāte amēcchantikatā mokṣaṃ kena pravartate? ... bodhisattvapīṭakanikṣepo 'bhyākhyānaṃ [←'nāṃ] ca nāṭe sūtrānta-vinaya-mokṣānukūlā iti bruvataḥ sarvakuśalamūlōtsargatvān na nirvāyati* (“How, Mahāmāte, is it that *icchantikas* do not have a desire for emancipation? ... One, who rejects and denounces the bodhisattva collection [of scriptures], saying that it is not in conformity with the Sutras, Vinaya, and emancipation, will not enter into Nirvāṇa, because he has forsaken all roots of merit [by such deeds].”).

As well as this, the Tibetan renderings '*dod chen pa* (lit. “one who desires much”) and *log sred can* (lit. “one who delights in evil”; cf. Ruegg 1973: 12, n. 1) were made, presumably based on this new interpretation of *icchantika*, meaning “one who desires (transmigration).”

Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志

- 2001 "Who Composed the Lotus Sutra? — Antagonism between wilderness and village monks," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2000*, March 2001, pp. 143-179.

Mochizuki, Ryōkō 望月良晃

- 1988 *Daijō Nehangyō no Kenkyū* 大乘涅槃經の研究——教団史的考察(*Studies on the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra. An Examination of Institutional History*), Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.

Mvy = *Hon'yaku Myōgi Daishū* 翻譯名義大集 (*Mahāvīyutpatti*), ed. Ryōzaburō Sakaki, 2 vols., Kyoto 1926; Reprint: Tokyo 1962: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木學術財団.

MW = Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899: The Clarendon Press.

Ñānamoli, Bhikkhu

- 1956 *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga)*, translated from the Pali by Bhikkhu Nanamoli, 1956 Colombo: A. Semage; 1991 Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

Ogawa, Ichijō 小川一乘

- 2004 *Ogawa Ichijō Bukkyō Sisō Ronjū* 小川一乗仏教思想論集, vol. 2, *Bussō Sisōron II* 仏性思想論 II, Kyoto: Hozōkan 法藏館.

Pā = Pāli

PTS = The Pali Text Society

PW = Otto Böhtlingk, Rudolph Roth, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, 7 vols, St. Petersburg 1855-1875.

Ruegg, David Seyfort

- 1969 *La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra : Études sur la Sotériologie et la Gnoséologie du Bouddhisme*, Paris : École française d'Extrême-Orient (Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. 70).

- 1973 *Le Traité du Tathāgatagarbha de Bu sTon Rin Chen Grub : Traduction du De bžin gšegs pai snin po gal žin mdzes par byed pai rgyan*, Paris : École française d'Extrême-Orient (Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. 88).

Saigusa, Mitsuyoshi 三枝充憲

- 1984 *Chūron* 中論 ([An Annotated Japanese Translation of] *Madhyamakārikā*), 3 vols., Tokyo, Daisanbunmeisha 第三文明社, (Regurusubunko レグルス文庫, vol. 158-160).

Shimoda, Masahiro 下田正弘

- 1993 *Zōbun Wayaku Daijō Nepangyō* 藏文和訳大乘涅槃經 (*An Annotated Japanese Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*), Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林.

- 1997 *Nehangyō no Kenkyū* — *Daijō Kyōten no Kenkyūbōhō Shiron* 涅槃經の研究——大乘經典の研究 研究方法試論 (*A Study of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra: with A Focus on the Methodology of the Study of Mahāyānasūtras*), Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu, Kaikyoku Watanabe, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924-1934.

Takasaki, Jikidō 高崎直道

- 1966 *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra) : Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1966 (*Serie Orientale Roma* 33).

- 1989 *Hōshōron* 宝性論 (*The Ratnagotravibhāga*) Tokyo 1989: Kōdansha 講談社 (*Indo Koten Sōsho* インド古典叢書)

Visuddhimagga = *The Visuddhi-magga of Buddhaghosa*, ed. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, 2 vols., London 1920-1921 (PTS)