

The Classifications of Defilements (*Kleśa*) in Indian Buddhist Texts

Asst. Prof. Dr. Sung doo AHN (Geumgang Univ.)

Defilements are regarded in Buddhism, along with Karman, as the main cause of the saṃsāric transmigration of living beings, and they are usually dealt with under the category of the “factors associated with the mind” (*citta-samprayukta saṃskāra*). In the Nikāyas Defilements are, most broadly, grouped in the category of *Anuśaya* (evil disposition), which, as the synonym of *Kleśa*, is classified into seven factors. But, from the beginning of the Abhidharma period, it was subdivided and systematized further in accordance with the principles of the Realms (*dhātu*) and Four Noble Truths (*satya*). This is clear from the enumeration of Defilements in the Dharmasangitiparyāya, where the total number of Defilements to be abandoned through the Path of Insight (*darśanamārga*) amounts to 88 in their types. If we recognize the fact that this text belongs to one of the earliest ones ever compiled by the Sarvāstivāda School in India, then we can conclude rather safely that this kind of taxonomy reflects the peculiar doctrinal viewpoint of the corresponding school. Further, we should not forget that this subdivision is closely related with the theories of the system of practice (*mārga*) as its counterpart: in other word, the theories of the subdivision of Defilements are rooted in the core of doctrinal systematization.

The history of Buddhism has witnessed diverging theories on the issue of the classification of Defilements among the various schools or texts. The most well-known theory is that of the Sarvāstivāda, according to which the list of Defilements amounts to 108 kind. The way of calculating the Savāstivāda-list was clearly explained by Hajime Sakurabe in his article (1955) “On the Theories of 98 kind of Anuśayas” (in Japanese), and E. Frauwallner (1971) “Abhidharma-Studien III. Der Abhisamayavāda”. There also exist other types of classifications: for example, the 128 kind of Defilements in the Yogācārabhūmi and 122 kind in the *Tattvasiddhi can be pointed out. But, unfortunately, the reasons and the motives of these different formulations were neither explicitly elucidated in the source texts, nor sufficiently explained in the ensuing commentaries and second literature.

In the present paper, I will try to show on what ground these different classifications are based. The passages of the following texts will be examined: Dharmasangītiparyāya, *Abhidharmasāra, Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, Yogācārabhūmi, Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya and *Tattvasiddhi etc.