

JIABS

Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies

Volume 26 Number 2 2003

<i>General Introduction</i> by Robert KRITZER	201
Nobuyoshi YAMABE <i>On the School Affiliation of Āśvaghoṣa: “Sautrāntika” or “Yogā- cāra”?</i>	225
Takumi FUKUDA <i>Bhadanta Rāma: A Sautrāntika before Vasubandhu</i>	255
Bart DESSEIN <i>Sautrāntika and the Hṛdaya Treatises</i>	287
Yoshifumi HONJŌ <i>Sautrāntika</i>	321
Robert KRITZER <i>Sautrāntika in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i>	331
Oskar VON HINÜBER <i>Report on the XIIIth Conference of the IABS</i>	385
Cristina SCHERRER-SCHAUB <i>IABS Treasurer Final Financial Report</i>	391
Notes on the Contributors	395
JIABS volume 26 Number 1 2003 • <i>Errata</i>	397

THE WORD SAUTRĀNTIKA

YOSHIFUMI HONJŌ

As Katō Junshō points out in his epoch-making work on Sautrāntika (*Kyōryōbu no kenkyū* 91), both Vasubandhu and Śrīlāta seem to have referred to themselves as “Sautrāntika” in spite of their obvious doctrinal differences.¹ There are those students of Buddhism, however, who refuse to admit that Śrīlāta was a Sautrāntika, but they underestimate the importance of, or completely ignore the occurrence of, one passage in the *Nyāyānusāra* (T. 1562: 332a24), where the author Saṅghabhadra accuses the Dārṣṭāntikas, including Śrīlāta, of not accepting what is taught in the *sūtra* but still calling themselves “Sautrāntikas.”² Thus the question arises as to why such thinkers who are doctrinally different could be called by the same appellation.

De la Vallée Poussin’s explanation is as follows:

The philosophers of the Little Vehicle were divided into two schools: on the one hand, the Vaibhāṣikas, who accepted the Abhidharma books of the Sarvāstivādins (the seven Abhidharmas) as “revealed” scripture (ipsissima verba), and the commentary on them, Vibhāṣā, as the oldest and the most authoritative “treatise” (śāstra); on the other hand, the Sautrāntikas, who considered the seven books simply as “treatises” (śāstra) of human inspiration and therefore liable to error, who maintained that Buddha had not composed treatises dealing with Abhidharma or given indications for the composition of such treatises under his authority (a working hypothesis in Pāli scholasticism), but had taught Abhidharma doctrines in certain Sūtras (or Sūtrāntas). According to them, these Sūtras, the Arthaviniśchaya, etc., constitute “the

¹ As we discuss later in this paper, the Sautrāntika theories of Vasubandhu in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* have their origin in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Therefore, it is highly probable that Vasubandhu was a Mahāyānist already at the time of writing the *Abhidharmakośa*. Śrīlāta and others, on the other hand, seem to have been “Hīnayānists.”

² See de la Vallée Poussin’s Introduction: “Le Dārṣṭāntika rejette certains Sūtras: comment pretend-il au nom de Sautrāntika?” (*L’Abhidharmakośa* 1: liii n. 1). See also Katō (99). Harada insists that the first person to refer to himself as “Sautrāntika” was Vasubandhu (138). Harada does not seem to take this passage into consideration.

Basket of Abhidharma.” Hence their name Sautrāntikas, the philosophers who recognize the authority of the Sūtrāntas alone. (de la Vallée Poussin “Sautrāntika” 214)

Katō suggests that, to both Śrīlāta and Vasubandhu, the word “Sautrāntika” might have meant “opponents of Sarvāstivāda theory,” “rational,” or “new-fashioned” (ii).

Before commenting on these explanations, I would like to take a look at Yaśomitra’s definition of that school, upon which de la Vallée Poussin obviously depended.

I. Yaśomitra

Yaśomitra’s definition of the word Sautrāntika appears in the first chapter of the *Vyākhyā*, where he comments on a passage of the *Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya*, which states with the word *kīla* that *Abhidharmaśāstras* were first expounded by the Buddha (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 2.17-3.4).

The word *kīla* indicates the statement of others. It means, “This is what is understood by the Ābhidhārmikas, not by us Sautrāntikas”, since the authors [other than the Buddha] of the *Abhidharmaśāstras* are handed down to us; i.e., the author of the *Jñānaprasthāna* is Ārya Kātyāyanīputra, the author of the *Prakaraṇapāda* is Sthavira Vasumitra, [the author] of the *Vijñānakāya* is Sthavira Devaśarman, [the author] of the *Dharmaskandha* is Ārya Śāriputra, [the author] of the *Prajñaptiśāstra* is Ārya Maudgalyāyana, [the author] of the *Dhātukāya* is Pūrṇa, [the author] of the *Sanḡītiparyāya* is Mahākauṣṭhila. What is the meaning of [the word] “Sautrāntika”? Those who recognize the authority of *sūtrānta* and do not recognize the authority of *śāstras* are Sautrāntikas.³

The first thing I would like to mention here is that the second half of the definition, *na śāstra-prāmāṇikāḥ*, is far more important than the first half, *sūtrānta-prāmāṇikāḥ*, since no one can imagine any Buddhists who do NOT recognize the authority of sūtrāntas.

³ *kīla-śabdaḥ parābhiprāyaṃ dyotayati / Ābhidhārmikāṇām etan matam / na tv asmākaṃ Sautrāntikāṇām iti bhavaḥ / śrūyante hy Abhidharma-śāstrāṇām kartāraḥ / tadyathā Jñānaprasthānasya ārya-Kātyāyanīputraḥ kartā / Prakaraṇapādasya sthavira-Vasumitraḥ / Vijñānakāyasya sthavira-Devaśarmā / Dharmaskandhasya ārya-Śāriputraḥ / Prajñapti-śāstrasya ārya-Maudgalyāyanaḥ / Dhātukāyasya Pūrṇaḥ / Sanḡītiparyāyasya Mahākauṣṭhilaḥ / kaḥ Sautrāntikārthaḥ / ye sūtra-prāmāṇikāḥ na śāstra-prāmāṇikāḥ, te Sautrāntikāḥ (Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: 11.25-30).*

Second, only the seven *Abhidharmaśāstras* of the Sarvāstivādins are meant here by the word *śāstra*. Therefore, it seems clear that the Sautrāntikas belong to the Sarvāstivāda sect. This does not contradict the views of Sakurabe Hajime (“Kyōryōbu no keitai” 115) and Katō (7).

Third, when discussing the meaning of the word “Sautrāntika,” of utmost importance is the Sautrāntikas’ attitude toward the *tripiṭaka*, especially toward the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* (*Abhidharmaśāstras*), not their individual theories, since the name of this school comes from the position it takes toward the scripture (or the text) on which it depends most, as in the cases of Vaibhāṣika, Yogācāra, and Mādhyamika, not from its doctrinal standpoint, as in the cases of Sarvāstivādin and Vijñānavādin (Mukai “Yōgāchāra-ha no gakuha-meī no yurai”; Saito “On Bhavya’s Interpretation of ‘Madhyamaka’ as Found in the Tarkajvālā”).

II. The Sautrāntika attitude toward the *tripiṭaka*

What, then, is the Sautrāntika attitude toward the *tripiṭaka*, especially toward the *Abhidharmaśāstras*? As is evident from Yaśomitra’s statement, they did not accept the view of the Sarvāstivāda orthodoxy that the Abhidharma was expounded by the Buddha. Hence the expression, *na śāstra-prāmāṇikāḥ* (Lamotte *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien* 199).

As Katō points out (19, 105, 208), Yaśomitra’s definition of Sautrāntika is closely linked to a passage quoted by Vasubandhu in the third chapter of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

We recognize the authority of the *sūtras*, but we do not recognize the authority of the *śāstras*, for the Blessed One said, “ You should rely on *sūtrāntas*, [not on other scriptures].”⁴

This statement is ascribed to Śrīlāta (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: 307.17; *Tattvārthā*: Tho 74b3; Katō 105), and, as Saṅghabhadra reports, the phrase from *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*: *sūtrānta-pratiśaraṇair bhavitavyam* is one of the grounds on which Sautrāntikas claim that the Abhidharma is not the words of the Buddha (T. 1562: 329c21; Katō 106; Waldschmidt 238).

⁴ *sūtra-prāmāṇakā vyaṃ, na śāstra-prāmāṇakāḥ. uktaṃ hi Bhagavatā, sūtrānta-pratiśaraṇair bhavitavyam iti* (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 146.3-4).

Another passage that apparently has a close connection with this definition of Yaśomitra's is in Chapter VIII of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. It reads as follows: "Disagreement with *śāstra* is better than disagreement with *sūtras*."⁵ This statement is ascribed by Saṅghabhadra to Vasubandhu,⁶ and Yaśomitra comments on it: "The import [of the passage] is: *Abhidharmaśāstra* was not expounded by the Buddha."⁷

What about the Vinaya? In a controversy between the Sautrāntikas and Saṅghabhadra about whether the Abhidharma is the word of the Buddha or not, Saṅghabhadra states:

If [the Abhidharma] is not words of the Buddha, because [the Blessed one] did not tell the disciples to rely on Abhidharma, then the Vinaya also is not the word of the Buddha, because [the Blessed One], just before his *parinirvāṇa*, did not advise the disciples to rely on [it].⁸

It follows, therefore, that Sautrāntika admitted that the Vinaya, like *sūtra*, is the word of the Buddha.

Thus we can conclude that the Sautrāntikas are those scholars who belong to the Sarvāstivādin sect, and who claim that Abhidharma was not expounded by the Buddha.⁹

III. The Vaibhāṣika attitude toward the *tripiṭaka*

The characteristic attitude of Sautrāntika toward the *tripiṭaka* can be understood more clearly in comparison with that of the Vaibhāṣikas. At the beginning of the *Vibhāṣā*, a vast commentary on the *Jñānaprasthāna* (T. 1544), one of the seven Abhidharma treatises of Sarvāstivāda, it is claimed that the *Jñānaprasthāna* was expounded by the Buddha; after this, there is a discussion of the difference among the three baskets, i.e., Sūtra, Vinaya, and Abhidharma.

First, the *Vibhāṣā* introduces an opinion of some scholars who deny the differences, saying that all the teachings of the Buddha are the product

⁵ varam śāstra-virodho, na sūtra-virodhaḥ (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 397.16; Katō 19).

⁶ Not to the Pāścātyas, as Katō once understood (Katō 19; Fukuda "Shohyō, Katō Junshō cho, Kyōryōbu no kenkyū" 48-49).

⁷ abuddhoktam Abhidharmaśāstram ity abhiprāyah (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: 621.19-20).

⁸ 若不說依 非佛語者 毘奈耶應非佛說 臨涅槃時 不勸依故 (T. 1562: 329 c26-27).

⁹ This conclusion is almost identical to Katō's (19, 105).

of one and the same ocean of knowledge [of the Buddha], one and the same pond of enlightenment [of the Buddha], etc.¹⁰ Then it discusses the differences in the name (名), the base (依處), that which is clarified (所顯), the origin (等流), that which is taught (所說), the object (所爲), the level (分位) [of the followers], and the progress (進趣) [of the practitioners] of each basket (T. 1545: 1c1-2a11). To summarize the last three discussions on the object, etc., the *Sūtra-piṭaka* is for beginners, the *Vinaya-piṭaka* is for intermediate followers, and the *Abhidharma-piṭaka* is for the most advanced practitioners, whose object is to obtain salvation (T. 1545: 2a1-11).

In the *Vibhāṣā*, therefore, the *Abhidharma-piṭaka* is not only regarded as the words of the Buddha, but it is counted as the most important teaching of the Buddha, which leads practitioners to enlightenment.¹¹ We can see how sharply in contrast are the attitudes of the two schools, Sautrāntika and Vaibhāṣika, toward the three baskets.

IV. Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika

In the *Vibhāṣā*, Dārṣṭāntika theories are cited and attacked no less than 80 times (Akanuma Chizen *Indo Bukkyō koyū meishi jiten* 145-148). The two occurrences of Ching pu 經部 in Hsüan-tsang's translation do not seem to indicate occurrences of Sautrāntika in the original Sanskrit, but are the interpolations of the translator (Katō 113-119).

Most of the other extant Indian sources, with the exception of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*,¹² do not distinguish Dārṣṭāntika from Sautrāntika. For example:

¹⁰ 如是三藏有何差別。或有說者無有差別。所以者何。一切佛教徒一智海之所生故。隨一覺池之所出故。等力無畏所攝受故。同一悲所等起故 (T. 1545: 1b27-29).

¹¹ This reminds us of the interpretation of the word *abhidharma* in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, where this word is explained as *amalā* (= *anāsravā*) *prajñā*, which stands face to face (*abhimukha*) with *nirvāṇa* (*nirvāṇaṃ prati*). *Abhidharma* treatises are so called because they give rise to *sāsravā prajñā*, which is the base of *anāsravā prajñā* (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 2.2-10). Also, it is interesting to note that there is a passage in the *Śroṇakoṭīkarṇāvadāna* that states the following: "When he was living an ordinary life, he attained *śrotaāpatti-phala*. After he studied the four *āgamas*, he gained *sakṛdāgāmi-phala*. In the course of learning *māṭṛkā* as a *śrāmaṇera*, he became an *anāgāmin*. And as a *bhikṣu* who received the *upasampadā*, he became an *arhat* after acquiring knowledge of the three baskets" (*Divyāvadāna*: 17 ff.).

¹² Vasubandhu refers to Sautrāntika theories when he agrees and to Dārṣṭāntika ones when he does not agree (Katō 84).

- (1) Saṅghabhadra calls Śrīlāta and his followers by both of the names, “Dārṣṭāntika” and “Sautrāntika.”¹³
- (2) Sthiramati comments on the word “Dārṣṭāntika” as follows: “[What is the meaning of] ‘the Dārṣṭāntikas’ [?] Those who make [vocal] expressions [using] examples (*drṣṭānta*), i.e., **kalpanā* are Dārṣṭāntikas, namely, Sautrāntikas.”¹⁴
- (3) Yaśomitra repeatedly insists that the Dārṣṭāntikas are no other than the Sautrāntikas (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: 392.21; 400.17; Katō 99).
- (4) The author of the *Abhidharmadīpa* cites a “Sautrāntika” theory referred to in the *Abhidharmakośa* as a “Dārṣṭāntika” theory in his work.¹⁵

In the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, however, the author Vasubandhu agrees with “Sautrāntika” theories but never with “Dārṣṭāntika” ones (Katō 74-85).

The best way to explain this situation is to accept the idea of Przyluski, who argues that *drṣṭānta* has a comparatively pejorative nuance and *sūtrānta* an honorific one.¹⁶

V. The Rise of the Sautrāntikas

Since the earliest occurrence found so far of the word “Sautrāntika” belongs to a lost work of Śrīlāta, Katō conservatively concludes that Śrīlāta was the first to call himself “Sautrāntika” (88). However, there is evidence to believe that the name “Sautrāntika” dates back to the pre-*Vibhāṣā* period.

¹³ See note 1.

¹⁴ dpeṣ ston pa mams žes bya ba ni / gañ dag dpeṣ te rtog gis tha sñad byed pa, de dag ni dpeṣ ston pa ste mdo sde pa mams so (*Tattvārthā* ad *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 230.8 [The 175 b6]. A Sanskrit restoration would be: Dārṣṭāntikā iti, ye drṣṭāntena kalpanayā vyavahāraṃ kurvanti, te Dārṣṭāntikāḥ Sautrāntikāḥ. I propose restoring *rtog pa* as *kalpanā*, since there is a correspondence between *drṣṭānta* and *kalpanā* in the title(s) of a work by Kumāralāta: the *Drṣṭāntapañkti* and the *Kalpanāmañḍitikā* (see Lüders *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmañḍitikā des Kumāralāta* 17-19).

¹⁵ The corresponding passages are as follows: evaṃ tu sādhu yathā Sautrāntikānām (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 278.17); evaṃ tu sādhu yathā Dārṣṭāntikānām iti Kośakārah (*Abhidharmadīpa*: 222.3).

¹⁶ “The word dārṣṭāntika could only have been applied to them by their opponents. In the same way, the deprecatory expression Hīnayāna was probably used only in the Mahāyāna school” (Przyluski “Dārṣṭāntika, Sautrāntika and Sarvāstivādin” 250; de la Vallée Poussin *L’Abhidharmakośa* 1: lii; Kato 69). Przyluski’s view on Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika is of course not as simple as the passage cited here suggests.

- (1) Saṅghabhadra, Sthiramati, Yaśomitra, and the Dīpakāra do not distinguish Sautrāntika from Dārṣṭāntika.
- (2) If we are to accept Przulski's view, it is unnatural that the Dārṣṭāntikas in the *Vibhāṣā* should have had only a pejorative name.
- (3) It is true that no schools are attested in the *Vibhāṣā* that refused explicitly to recognize the authority of Abhidharma, but the Dārṣṭāntikas' attack on the Vaibhāṣika orthodoxy is so severe that they substantially claim that Abhidharma is not the word of the Buddha.
- (4) Shiratate Kaiun points out that there is a passage in the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* stating that a certain theory of a Sautrāntika master is cited in the *Vibhāṣā*.¹⁷ In addition, another similar example can be found in the same text.¹⁸ Unfortunately, no parallel passage is found in the extant Chinese translations of the *Vibhāṣā*, but these quotations from the *Vyākhyā* are worthy of consideration.

VI. Vasubandhu

Recently more and more evidence has come to light suggesting that many "Sautrāntika" theories of Vasubandhu presented in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* have their origin in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (see Kritzer *A Comparison of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (Chapters I-III) and the Yogācārabhūmi*). This has led an increasing number of scholars to believe that Vasubandhu already belonged to the Yogācāra school at the time of writing the *Abhidharmakośa* and that he did not undergo any substantial changes in his doctrinal standpoint.¹⁹ If this is the case, which is highly probable, Vasubandhu was a Sautrāntika and a Yogācāra at the same time.

Setting aside the question of Vasubandhu's acceptance of Yogācāra, let us see in what sense Vasubandhu was a Sautrāntika. First of all, when he quotes "Hīnayāna" canonical sources without any citation, these sources

¹⁷ Vibhāṣāyāṃ Bhadantena Sautrāntikenoktam (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: 673.9-10; see Shiratate "Kenkyū zakkān").

¹⁸ Sautrāntikadarśanāvalambī cāyaṃ Bhadanto Vibhāṣāyāṃ likhitaḥ (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: 44.19-20).

¹⁹ This view has developed so gradually that it is difficult to say who was the first to propose it.

belong to the Sarvāstivādin sect.²⁰ Furthermore, when he uses the word *Nikāyāntarīya*, it means “one who belongs to a sect other than the Sarvāstivādins.”²¹ Finally, he does not believe that the *Abhidharmaśāstras* are the word of the Buddha.²²

Thus, Vasubandhu belongs to the Sarvāstivāda sect but does not recognize the authority of Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharmaśāstras*. This seems to be the basic definition of “Sautrāntika.”

References

Primary Sources

- Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*. Edited by P.S. Jaini. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series IV. Second edition. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1973.
- Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Edited by P.L. Pradhan. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series XIII. First edition. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.
- Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*. Edited by U. Wogihara. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1990. Reprint (First edition: Tokyo: The Publishing Association of the Abhidharma-kośa-vyākhyā, 1932-1936).
- Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkā Tattvārthā nāma* (= Tattvārthā). Sthiramati. Peking Bstan 'gyur 5875 (mdo 'grel to, tho).
- Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā* (A-p'i-ta-mo ta p'i-p'o-sha lun 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論). T. 1545.
- Divyāvadāna*. Edited by E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886.
- Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. Edited by E. Waldschmidt. Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins,

²⁰ In the last *kārikā* of Chapter Eight of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the author Vasubandhu declares that the theories of the *Abhidharmakośa* are mainly (*prāyeṇa*) based on the Kashmir Vaibhāṣika standpoint. Reading through the entire text of the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā* of Śamathadeva, I have never come across any evidence that the *Āgama* passages cited in both the *Abhidharmakośa* and the do not belong to the Sarvāstivāda sect (Honjō *A Table of Āgama-citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*).

²¹ For occurrences of the term, see Hirakawa *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* 424.

²² See *Abhidharmakośa* I 3 (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 2.19-22); *Pratītyasamutpādāvibhaṅgabhāṣya*: Chi 62b2-63a2; Matsuda “Abhidharmasamuccaya ni okeru jūnishi engi no kaishaku” 33ff.

auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften hrsg. und bearbeitet. Teil I-III. Berlin 1950-1951.

Nyāyānusāra (A-p'i-ta-mo shun cheng-li lun 阿毘達磨順正理論). T. 1562.

Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅgabhāṣya (Rten ciñ 'brel bar 'byuñ ba dañ po dañ rnam par dbye ba bśad pa), Peking Bstan 'gyur 5496 (mdo 'grel chi)

Modern Works

Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. *Indo Bukkyō koyū meishi jiten* 印度佛教固有名詞辞典.

Kyoto: Hozokan, 1979. Reprint (First edition: Tokyo: 破塵閣書房, 1931).

de la Vallée Poussin, Louis. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. New edition.

Mélanges chinois et bouddhique 16. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes

Études Chinoises, 1971. Reprint (First edition: Louvain: J.B. Istas, 1923-31).

—. "Sautrāntikas." *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Ed. James Hastings.

13 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-1926. 11: 214-215.

Fukuda Takumi 福田琢. "Shohyō, Katō Junshō cho, Kyōryōbu no kenkyū" 書評,

加藤純章著, 經量部の研究. Buddhist Seminar 佛教學セミナー 50 (1990): 46-52.

Harada Waso 原田和宗. "Kyōryōbu no 'tansō no' shiki no nagare' to iu gainen

e no gimon [I]" <經量部の「単層の」識の流れ>という概念への疑問 *Jour-*

nal of Indian and Tibetan Studies インド学チベット学研究 1 (1996): 134-193.

Hirakawa Akira. *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Part one. Tokyo: Daizō

Shuppan Kabushikikaisha, 1973.

Honjō Yoshifumi 本庄良文. *A Table of Āgama-citations in the Abhidharmakośa*

and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā. Part I. Kyoto: privately printed, 1984.

Shirata Kaiun 白館戒雲. "Kenkyū zakkān." Buddhist Seminar 佛教學セミナー

49 (1989): 66-67.

Katō Junshō 加藤純章. *Kyōryōbu no kenkyū* 經量部の研究 (Etudes sur les Sautrān-

tika). Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1989.

Kritzer, Robert. A Comparison of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (Chapters I-III) and

the Yogācārabhūmi. (Japanese Ministry of Education Grant-in-Aid for Scientific

Research C. Project Number 11610024.) Kyoto: privately printed, 2001.

Lamotte, Étienne. *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*. Publication de l'Institut Ori-

entaliste de Louvain, 14, Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, Lou-

vain-La-Neuve, 1976 (Reproduction anastatique de l'édition originale, parue

en 1958 dans la "Bibliothèque du Muséon" no 43).

Lüders, Heinrich. *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā des Kumāralāta*. Mono-

graphien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie; Bd. 1. Kleinere

Sanskrittexte; Heft 1-2. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1979. (Reprint of the 1926

ed. published by the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Leipzig.)

Matsuda Kazunobu. "Abhidharmasamuccaya ni okeru jūnishi engi no kaishaku"

Abhidharmasamuccaya における十二支縁起の解釈. *Otani Daigaku Shinshū*

sōgō kenkyū-jo Kenkyūjo-kiyō 1 (1983): 29-50.

- Mukai Akira 向井亮. “Yōgāchāra-ha no gakuha-mei no yurai” ヨーガーチャーラ派の学派名の由来. *Sanzōshū* 4 三蔵集 4. Tokyo: Daito shuppan-sha, 1978. 267-273.
- Przyluski, Jean. “Dārṣāntika, Sautrāntika and Sarvāstivādin”, *Indian Historical Quarterly* 16 (1940): 246-254.
- Saito Akira. “On Bhavya’s Interpretation of ‘Madhyamaka’ as Found in the Tarkajvālā.” *Abhidharma bukkyō to Indo shisō: Katō Junshō hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* アビダルマ仏教とインド思想：加藤純障博士還暦記念論集 (Abhidharma and Indian Thought: Essays in Honor of Professor Doctor Junshō Katō on His Sixtieth Birthday). Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2000. 267-279.
- Sakurabe Hajime. “Kyōryōbu no keitai” 経量部の形態. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 2.1 (1953): 115-116.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Robert Kritzer for help with my English.