

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 |

ON THE SCHOOL AFFILIATION OF AŚVAGHOṢA:
“SAUTRĀNTIKA” OR “YOGĀCĀRA”?*

NOBUYOSHI YAMABE

Introduction

Traditionally it was understood that Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika, and Yogācāra were three distinct traditions, but this framework has been seriously questioned in recent years.

Owing to the efforts of Paul Demiéville, Nishi Giyū (*Abidatsuma*, “Buha”), and other scholars, it is becoming clear that there were traditions of meditators called *yogācāras* within the Sarvāstivāda community before the establishment of the philosophical Yogācāra school. Further, Lambert Schmithausen has compared the magnum opus of the Yogācāra school, the *Yogācārabhūmi*, with the Sarvāstivāda/Mūlasarvāstivāda recensions of the Buddhist canon and has found that the *Yogācārabhūmi* was specifically based on the Mūlasarvāstivāda canon (“Beiträge,” “Zu dem Rezensionen”). Concerning the exact relationship between the appellations

* This paper was originally prepared to satisfy a pre-dissertation requirement at Yale University and was submitted to the graduate school in 1991 (unpublished). In the first half of the original version, entitled, “On the School Affiliation of Aśvaghōṣa: A Comparative Study of the *Saundarananda* and the *Śrāvakabhūmi*,” I discussed relevant meditative elements, while I concentrated on doctrinal elements in the second. Later, I organized a study group of the *Saundarananda* at the Institute of Buddhist Studies, Kyushu Ryukoku Junior College, with Fujitani Takayuki and Harada Yasunori, and, based on our discussion, we published a revised and enlarged Japanese version of the first half of the aforementioned paper in 2002. The present paper is a concise version originally meant for the IABS conference at Bangkok in 2002, where I selectively discussed both meditative and doctrinal elements. I thank Professors Stanley Weinstein, Lambert Schmithausen, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Lance Cousins, Robert Kritzer, Aramaki Noritoshi, Honjō Yoshifumi, Iwata Takashi, Miyashita Seiki, Muroji Yoshihito, and Harada Wasō for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. My particular thanks are due to Robert Kritzer for his organization of the panel at the IABS conference and for kindly editing my English. Professor Hokazono Kōichi has referred me to some of the relevant studies. I further thank my former collaborators Fujitani Takayuki and Harada Yasunori for their input during the period in which we read the relevant texts together.

“Sarvāstivāda” and “Mūlasarvāstivāda,” Enomoto Fumio has recently suggested that the word “Mūlasarvāstivāda” represents the Sarvāstivādin claim that Sarvāstivāda was the root (*mūla*) of the other sects; thus, according to him, “Mūlasarvāstivāda” does not refer to a subsect of the Sarvāstivāda tradition (“Konpon Setsu Issai Ubu,” “Mūlasarvāstivādin”).

Taken together, these points seem to suggest that the Yogācāra school did not exist as a distinct school separate from Sarvāstivāda. Rather, it appears that meditators practicing within the Sarvāstivāda community gradually systematized their views and eventually formed their own philosophical tradition.

Similarly, as early as 1953, Sakurabe Hajime doubted whether Sautrāntika was an independent school with its own canon.¹ Rather, according to him, Sautrāntika seems to have been a philosophical tradition that existed within the Sarvāstivāda community.² Further, several Japanese scholars, such as Mukai Akira, Matsuda Kazunobu, Hakamaya Noriaki, Miyashita Seiki (“*Kusharon*,” “*Genkanhenchitai*”), and myself (“*Pūrvācārya*,” “*Yugashijiron*”) have noted that many of the theories attributed to “Sautrāntika” or “*Pūrvācārya*” in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* can be traced back to the *Yogācārabhūmi*.³

A major breakthrough in Sautrāntika studies was brought about when Katō Junshō published his comprehensive study of Sautrāntika in 1989 (*Kyōryōbu*). In this important work, Katō demonstrates that a verifiable reference to the word “Sautrāntika” cannot be attested in any extant text older than the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (hereafter, *Kośa*). He further compared the Sautrāntika positions mentioned in the *Kośa* with the Dārṣṭāntika positions found in the **Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā* (hereafter, *Vibhāṣā*) and the **Tattvasiddhi*, and Śrīlāta’s views recorded in the **Nyāyānusāra*. Katō observes that, although Vasubandhu’s “Sautrāntika” positions are in many cases closely related to the earlier Dārṣṭāntika positions, Vasubandhu does not always agree with the Dārṣṭāntika views.

After these significant findings of Katō, the close relationship between the *Kośa* and the *Yogācārabhūmi* came to be seen as even more important than before. Recently, Robert Kritzer (“*Samṣkārapratyayaṃ vijñānam*,”

¹ See also Lamotte (*Histoire* 582).

² See also Schmithausen (“Zu den Rezensionen” 97), Katō (*Kyōryōbu*, 86-93).

³ See also Yamabe (“*Bīja*” 929; 931).

“*Rebirth and Causation*,” “Vasubandhu”) and Harada Wasō (“Dignāga,” “Kyōryōbu”) have been working very actively on this issue. In addition to the fact that Vasubandhu sometimes rejects the Dārṣṭāntika theories recorded in the earlier texts (such as the denial of the existence of a real *sukha* and of *caittas*), Harada notes that some of the Sautrāntika positions of Vasubandhu (especially the *bīja* theory) cannot be traced back to the Dārṣṭāntika tradition but are found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Thus, Harada speculates that when Vasubandhu discusses “Sautrāntika,” his real source is actually the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Kritzer, based on his own observations, also suspects that Vasubandhu was already Yogācāra when he composed the *Kośa*. This hypothesis will be discussed in detail by Kritzer himself in a separate paper in this issue.

Other noteworthy attempts are found in a series of papers of Honjō Yoshifumi (“Memyō no gakuha,” “Memyō saku,” “Memyō shi”). In these papers, Honjō points out that there are many Sautrāntika-like elements in the two major *kāvya*s of Aśvaghōṣa, namely the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda*, and argues that Aśvaghōṣa was close to the Sautrāntika tradition.⁴ Since the school-affiliation of this celebrated Buddhist poet has long been an unsolved problem among Buddhist scholars,⁵ Honjō’s study is an important contribution, not only in the context of Sautrāntika studies, but also as a study of Aśvaghōṣa himself.

Honjō’s arguments are based on his extensive knowledge of *abhidharma* literature and are very solid. From my own point of view, however, there still seem to be significant points concerning Aśvaghōṣa that are not adequately covered by Honjō. First, the methods of meditation practice described in the latter portion of the *Saundarananda* are closely related to those in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Second, as we might expect from the foregoing discussion, most of the Sautrāntika-like elements found in Aśvaghōṣa’s works are also found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Thus, Aśvaghōṣa’s works, especially the *Saundarananda*, seem to hold an important key for clarifying one aspect of the intricate relationship among Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika, and Yogācāra.

From this point of view, in this paper I would like to discuss Aśvaghōṣa’s works with regard to their practical and doctrinal aspects. For

⁴ See also Honjō, “Sautrāntika,” for his view of this tradition.

the reasons stated above, my main focus will be on the *Saundarananda*. Since I cannot cover all the relevant points in a single paper, I confine my discussion here to a few representative points.

1. Systems of Meditation

The latter half of the *Saundarananda* consists of the Buddha's exposition of the way of practice (Cantos 12-16), a description of Nanda's actual process of practice (Canto 17), and the approval of his achievement by the Buddha (Canto 18). Many elements of these portions have close parallels in the *Śrāvaka bhūmi*, as shown in tables 1-6 in the appendix.⁶

We should note here that not only at the level of general structure but also at the level of wording, the *Saundarananda* and the *Śrāvaka bhūmi* are closely related. I give a few examples of their correspondences, together with their possible Nikāya sources below. The first correspondence is from the section on *śīla* (in Table 1, item 2).⁷

Evam pabbajito samāno pātimokkha-saṃvara-saṃvuto viharati ācāra-gocara-saṃpanno aṇumattesu vajjesu bhaya-dassāvī... (*Sāmaññaphala-sutta* 63.13-15)

The one who has thus become a recluse stays restrained in the restraints of precepts, maintains a good realm of conduct, and sees fear in minor faults...

etāvac chīlam ity uktam ācāro 'yaṃ samāsataḥ /
asya nāśena naiva syāt pravrajyā na gṛhasthatā //
tasmāc cāritrasaṃpanno brahmacaryam idaṃ cara /
aṇumātreṣv avadyeṣu bhayadarśī dṛḍhavrataḥ // (*Saundarananda* 13.19-20)

⁵ I have summarized some of the representative arguments about Aśvaghōṣa's school affiliation in Yamabe, Fujitani, Harada (5-10). In addition to the works mentioned there, Dieter Schlingloff's paper, which points out that the pictorial representation of Nanda legend in Ajanta Cave 16 is based on the *Saundarananda*, is noteworthy, although it is not directly relevant to doctrinal issues. J.W. de Jong's review of Biswanath Bhattacharya's *Aśvaghōṣa* is also helpful.

⁶ I refer to the *Saundarananda* and the *Buddhacarita* by canto and verse numbers. Other Sanskrit and Pāli texts I refer to by page and line numbers. In order to save space, I have omitted some of the relatively unimportant details. Therefore, these tables are not complete; for more comprehensive tables, I refer the reader to the Japanese paper that I published with Fujitani and Harada.

⁷ In this paper, in principle I quote the original texts in the notes. Here, however, in order to facilitate the comparison of the original passages, I quote them in the main text.

This much is called morality, and in sum, this is good conduct. If this is lost, there would be no life as a recluse or as a householder.

Therefore, one who maintains good conduct should follow this pure practice. One who firmly adheres to one's vow sees fear in minor faults.

ācāragocarasaṃpannaḥ, aṇumātreṣv avadyeṣu bhayadarī (*Śrāvabhūmi*, ed. Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 16.18-19)

One who maintains a good realm of conduct sees fear in minor faults.

The next correspondence is from the section on “knowing the right amount when eating,” *bhojane mātraññaḥ* (Table 1, item 4).

paṭisaṅkhā yoniso āhāraṃ āhāriṣṣāma, n'eva davāya na madāya na maṇḍanāya na vibhūsanāya, yāvad eva imassa kāyassa ṭhitiyā yāpanāya, vihiṃsūparatiyā brahmacariyānuggahāya (*Mahāssapura-sutta* 273.23-26)

I shall take food circumspectly and properly. It is not for play, sensual pleasure, adornment, or beauty. It is just for the sustenance and support of this body, for the cessation of harm, and for the promotion of pure practice.

evam abhyavahartavyaṃ bhojanaṃ pratisaṃkhyayā /
na bhūṣārthaṃ na vapuṣe na madāya na dṛptaye //
dhāraṇārthaṃ śarīrasya bhojanaṃ hi vidhiyate /

....

yogācāras tathāhāraṃ śarīrāya prayacchati /
kevalaṃ ksudvighātarthaṃ na rāgeṇa na bhaktaye // (*Saundarananda*, 14.14-19)

Thus, food should be taken circumspectly. It is not for the sake of beauty, a nice-looking body, sensual pleasure, or arrogance, since food is provided for the maintenance of the body.

....

A *yogācāra* gives food to the body in this way. It is merely for the sake of removing hunger and not for the sake of lust or reverence.

sa tathā saṃvṛtendriyaḥ pratisaṃkhyāyāhāraṃ āharati, na darpārthaṃ na madārthaṃ na maṇḍanārthaṃ na vibhūṣanārthaṃ, yāvad evāsyā kāyasya sthitaye *yāpanāyai jighatsoparataye, brahmacariyānuggahāya*⁸ iti / (*Śrāvabhūmi*, ed. Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 18.8-11)

The [practitioner], having thus guarded the senses, takes food circumspectly. It is not for the sake of arrogance, sensual pleasure, adornment, or beauty. It is just for the sustenance and support of this body, for the cessation of hunger, and for the promotion of pure practice.

⁸ The part between asterisks is lost due to a damage of the manuscript and is reconstructed by the editors based on parallel passages. Saṃdhi is not observed between the last *-hāya* and the following *iti*, but I follow the text here.

Again, due to limited space I cannot give too many examples, but even these few examples suggest that the *Saundarananda* and the *Śrāvaka-bhūmi* are significantly related.⁹

Of course, as I myself have shown, we should keep in mind that these two texts seem to have had common sources in the Āgamic literature. Nevertheless, I think it is significant that almost all the items of the *Saundarananda* also appear in the *Śrāvaka-bhūmi* in a similar order. Thus, I think that the similarities are too extensive for us to assume that these two texts separately relied on common sources.

Rather, I suspect that there were efforts to systematize the various meditative methods found in Āgamic sources into a comprehensive system. The *Yogācārabhūmi* seems to represent a fairly developed stage of such systematization, while the *Saundarananda* appears to show a relatively early one. The meditation system recorded in the *Saundarananda* may well preserve an early form of the manuals of the *yogācāra* meditators that eventually culminated in the voluminous *Yogācārabhūmi*.¹⁰

On the other hand, although the correspondences are not as extensive as those between the *Saundarananda* and the *Śrāvaka-bhūmi*, we should note that there are some partial agreements between the **Tattvasiddhi* and the *Saundarananda* as well (Tables 1 and 2). Since the **Tattvasiddhi* is considered to be a Dārṣṭāntika work (Mizuno), this may suggest that these meditative methods were to some extent also shared by the Dārṣṭāntika tradition.¹¹

⁹ In the aforementioned paper (Yamabe, Fujitani, Harada), I have given the examples of correspondences more systematically and comprehensively. Therefore, interested readers are referred to that article.

¹⁰ Honjō (“Memyō shi” 390) regards the *Saundarananda* as a *Yogācārabhūmi* of the Sautrāntika tradition.

In this connection, we should perhaps also recall that the word *yogācāra* appears twice in the *Saundarananda* (14.19, 15.68), as has been already noted by Shastri (xi-xii). It is of course widely recognized that the word *yogācāra* is a common noun that appears in a wide range of Buddhist literature. Therefore, the mere occurrence of the word itself does not mean much for determining the school affiliation of a text. Nevertheless, taken together with the structural similarities between the *Saundarananda* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*, this word could appear once again as a symbolic word.

¹¹ *Saundarananda* 14.14-15cd are quoted as “verses composed by Aśvaghōṣa” in the **Tattvasiddhi* (T. 1646: 372a15-16). See Johnston xxxii, Fukuhara Ryōgon (51-52). Therefore, it is imaginable that the standpoints of the **Tattvasiddhi* and Aśvaghōṣa are rather close, though we should note that there are also significant differences between them. See

2. Doctrinal Elements

We now turn to the doctrinal side. In his study of Aśvaghōṣa, Honjō raises several points that appear to link Aśvaghōṣa to the Sautrāntika tradition (“Memyō shi”). However, since a comprehensive discussion of all these points would make this paper too long, let us here discuss just a couple of the most significant ones.

(1) The interpretation of *anuśaya* (Honjō, “Memyō shi” 394-95)

At the beginning of the Anuśayanirdeśa of the *Kośa*, there is a famous controversy over the interpretation of the compound *kāmarāgānuśaya*. This controversy is related to the extensive argument among various Buddhist schools over whether or not *anuśaya* is identical to *paryavasthāna*.¹² According to the available sources, Mahāsāṅghika, Mahīśāsaka, and Vibhājyavāda claim that *anuśaya* is the latent form of *paryavasthāna*.¹³

In contrast to these traditions, Sarvāstivāda does not accept the existence of such a latent form of *kleśa*. Thus, in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, orthodox Sarvāstivāda interprets the term *kāmarāgānuśaya* as an appositional compound (*karmadhāraya*) and says that *kāmarāga* is identical to *anuśaya*.¹⁴

Vasubandhu, however, does not accept this interpretation and supports the Sautrāntika view, which considers the compound *kāmarāga-anuśaya* to be a dependent compound (*tatpuruṣa*), meaning “the *anuśaya* (or evil potential) of *kāmarāga*”:

However, it is good [to understand the compound *kāmarāgānuśaya*] as the Sautrāntikas do. But how do the Sautrāntikas [understand this]? [They understand] that *kāmarāgānuśaya* means the *anuśaya* of *kāmarāga*. And the *anuśaya* is neither associated with nor dissociated from [the mind], because it [i.e., *anuśaya*] is not a distinct entity. [The reason why *anuśaya* is not a distinct entity is merely that] the dormant *kleśa* is called *anuśaya*, and the awakened one, *paryavasthāna*. Then what is the dormancy (*prasupti*) of that

Louis de la Vallée Poussin (“Notes” 264). For quotations from the *Saundarananda* in other Buddhist texts, see Jens-Uwe Hartmann (70-73).

¹² See Jaini (“The Sautrāntika” 239-44).

¹³ See Katō (“Zuimen” 10-20), and Fukuda (“*Jōjitsuron*” 152). A reference to the Vibhājyavādins in the *Vibhāṣā* will be discussed later in this paper.

¹⁴ *kāmarāga evānuśaya iti Vaibhāṣikāḥ* (278.6)

[*kleśa*]? The continuum of the latent [*kleśa*] in the state of seed (*bījabhāva*). What is the awakening (*prabodha*)? [The *kleśa*] in the manifest state. What is this state of seed? The capacity (*śakti*) of personal existence (*ātmabhāva*) that has arisen from [past] *kleśas* and that generates [future] *kleśas*, like the capacity that derives from [the past] perception and that generates [the future] memory, or like the capacity of sprouts and so forth that derive from [past] fruits of rice and that generate [future] fruits of rice. (278.18-24)¹⁵

According to this position, *paravasthāna* is the manifest *kleśa*, while *anuśaya* is the dormant *kleśa*, which, as a seed, generates future *kleśa*. As Honjō points out (“Memyō shi” 395), this theory is also quoted in the *Abhidharmadīpa* (as a Dārṣāntika theory)¹⁶ and in the * *N y ā y ā n u s ā r a* (as a theory of the *Sūtrakāra [Ching-chu 經主]).¹⁷

Honjō attempts to connect this theory to the following verses of the *Saundarananda*.

Their potential (*anuśaya*, i.e., the potential of the *kāmas*) remains, like a fire covered up with ashes. O friend, you should quench that [*anuśaya*] with practice, like fire with water. (15.5)

For those [*kāmas*] arise again from that [*anuśaya*], like sprouts from a seed (*bīja*). [But] those [*kāmas*] would not exist when that [*anuśaya*] is destroyed, as sprouts [do not exist] when the seed is destroyed. (15.6)¹⁸

These verses regard *anuśaya* as the latent form of *kāma* and equate the *anuśaya* with a seed from which the *kāmas* arise again in the future. Though “seed” (*bīja*) in the *Saundarananda* seems to be a figurative expression and not a well-established technical term, the similarity of

¹⁵ *evaṃ tu sādhu yathā Sautrāntikānām / katham ca Sautrāntikānām / kāmarāgasyānuśayaḥ kāmarāgānuśaya itī / na cānuśayaḥ samprayukto na viprayuktas tasyādravyāntaratvāt / prasupto hi kleśo ’nuśaya ucyate / prabuddhaḥ paravasthānam / kā ca tasya prasuptiḥ / asaṃmukhībhūtasya bījabhāvānubandhaḥ / kaḥ prabodhaḥ / saṃmukhībhāvāḥ / ko ’yaṃ bījabhāvo nāma / ātmabhāvasya kleśajā kleśotpādanaśaktiḥ / yathānubhavajñānājā smṛtyutpādanaśaktir yathā cāṅkurādīnām śālīphalajā śālīphalotpādanaśaktir itī /*

¹⁶ 222.3-223.1.

¹⁷ T. 1562: 596c24-597a2.

¹⁸ *tiṣṭhaty anuśayas teṣāṃ channo ’gnir iva bhasmanā / sa te bhāvanayā saumya praśāmyo ’gnir ivāmbunā // (15.5)*
te hi tasmāt pravartante bhūyo bījād ivāṅkurāḥ /
tasya nāśena te na syur bījanāśād ivāṅkurāḥ // (15.6)

the wording between the *Saundarananda* and the *Kośa* seems evident to me.

However, as has been pointed out by Harada (“Dignāga” 108, “Kyōryōbu” 153), the same theory also appears in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (Savitar-kasavicārādibhūmi in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*) in the following way:

There the active (*kun tu ’byuñ ba*, 現行, **samudācarita*) and manifest (*mñon du gyur pa*, 現起, **saṃmukhībhūta*) *kleśa* (*ñon moñs pa*, 煩惱) is called *pariyavasthāna* (*kun nas dkris pa*, 纏). Its *seed* (*sa bon*, 種子, **bīja*), which has not been abandoned (*ma spañs*, 未斷, **aprahīna*) or destroyed (*yañ dag par ma bcom pa*, 未害, **asamudghāita*), is called *anuśaya* (*bag la ñal*, 隨眠) and *dauṣṭhulya* (*gnas ñan len*, 麤重). Because it is [in the] dormant [state] (*ma sad pa*, 不覺位, **aprabuddha[-avasthā]*), it is *anuśaya*, and because it is in the awakened state (*sad pa’i gnas skabs*, 在覺位, **prabuddhāvasthā*), it is *pariyavasthāna*. (Pek. 5539: Zi 118b1-3; T. 1579:623a22-24)¹⁹

Needless to say, this system is exactly the same as the Sautrāntika theory in the *Kośa* quoted above. Considering the aforementioned studies that point out the close relationship between the *Kośa* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*, I think it is quite likely that Vasubandhu directly based his description of this Sautrāntika theory on this passage from the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

At this juncture, we should note that this theory, identified as a “Dārṣṭāntika” position in the *Abhidharmadīpa*, cannot be confirmed in the earlier Dārṣṭāntika sources (i.e., the Dārṣṭāntika theories recorded in the *Vibhāṣā* and the **Tattvasiddhi*). In the *Vibhāṣā*, a similar theory is not attributed to the Dārṣṭāntikas but to the Vibhajyavādins:

The Vibhajyavādins also say that *anuśaya* is the *seed* of *pariyavasthāna*. The essence of *anuśaya* is not associated with mind, [while] the essence of *pariyavasthāna* is associated with mind. *Pariyavasthāna* arises from *anuśaya*. Because *pariyavasthāna* manifests itself, *arhats* retrogress. [If] the *anuśaya* is already severed, *pariyavasthāna* does not arise; how can he retrogress? Therefore, they say that [*arhats*] do not retrogress. (T. 1545: 313a1-4)²⁰

¹⁹ de la ñon moñs pa kun tu ’byuñ ba mñon du gyur ba ni kun nas dkris pa zes bya’o // de ñid kyi sa bon ma spañs śiñ yañ dag par ma bcom pa ni bag la ñal zes bya ste / gnas ñan len kyañ de yin no // ma sad pa’i phyir ni bag la ñal yin la sad pa’i gnas skabs kyi phyir ni kun nas dkris pa yin no //

Harada presents a Sanskrit reconstruction of this passage in his “Kyōryōbu” (153).

²⁰ 分別論者又說隨眠是纏種子。隨眠自性心不相應，諸纏自性與心相應。纏從隨眠生。纏現前故退諸阿羅漢。已斷隨眠纏既不生彼如何退。故說無退。

Here, one might note that the words “Dārṣṭāntikas” and “Vibhajyavādins” appear together in compounds on three other occasions in the *Vibhāṣā*. So these traditions apparently shared a few same tenets,²¹ but we should not overemphasize this point.²² (We should note that the common tenets do not include the *anuśaya* or *bīja* theory.) Fukuda (156-58) claims that the denial of the retrogression of *arhats* in the **Tattvasiddhi* presupposes the theory of latent *anuśaya*, although *anuśaya* is not expressly equated with *bīja*.²³

Perhaps Dārṣṭāntikas were not completely ignorant of the theory of latent *anuśaya*, but this point is not at all certain at this stage.

(2) The Denial of the existence of a real *sukha* (Honjō, “Memyō shi” 392-94)

The Mārgapudgalaṅkirdeśa of the *Kośa* refers to a theory held by “some people” who negate the existence of real pleasant sensation (*sukha-vedanā*), as follows:

Some people say that there is no pleasant sensation at all and that all [sensation] is painful. How should this be understood? From scripture and from reason.... How [does one understand it] from reason? It is because [what is normally regarded as] the cause of pleasure is [actually] not fixed; for, if some drink, food, coolness, or warmth, and so forth, which are regarded as the causes of pleasure, are applied in excess or at an inappropriate time, the same things turn out to be the causes of pain. And it is not reasonable that pain arises because the causes of pleasure increase, or because the moderate [amount of the causes of pleasure are applied] at another [inappropriate] time. Therefore, they [i.e., what appeared to be the causes of pleasure] were, from the very beginning, the causes of pain and not of pleasure. But when that pain becomes great, it eventually becomes manifest [that they were

²¹ T. 1545: 393a11, 772c21-22, 774a14-15.

²² Yin Shun notes that, though Vibhajyavāda and Dārṣṭāntika were two distinct traditions, they shared certain common tendencies (*Shuo i-ch'ieh yu-pu* 410, 419-28). Concerning Vibhajyavāda, see also André Bareau 167-80; Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa* lv-lviii; and Kimura Taiken.

²³ I find Fukuda's argument on this point reasonably plausible, but there are certain things that still need to be considered. First, in one of the passages Fukuda quotes from the **Tattvasiddhi* in this connection (T 1646: 334a5-6), what is compared to a burnt seed is karma and not *kleśa*. Therefore, this passage is not directly relevant to *anuśaya*. Second, this sort of seed-image is not uncommon in Buddhist literature, and, though I cannot find the image of a “burnt seed” in the Orthodox Sarvāstivāda theories in the *Vibhāṣā*, the image of a “rotten seed” is found in T. 1545: 98c1-2.

the causes of pain]. Change in the positions of the body should be understood in the same way. [The second reason is that we] feel pleasure from the remedy for pain or from the modification of pain; for, as long as one has not been [previously] afflicted by another type of pain caused by hunger, thirst, cold, heat, fatigue, or lust (*kāmarāga*), nothing is felt to be pleasant. Therefore, ignorant people feel pleasure merely from the remedy [for pain] and not from [the real] pleasure. Also, foolish people feel pleasure from the modification of pain, such as moving the load from one shoulder to the other. Therefore, there is no pleasure. (330.10-22)²⁴

This theory is attributed to “Śrīlāta and so forth” (*Śrīlātādayaḥ*) by commentators (Yaśomitra²⁵ and Pūrṇavardhana²⁶) and is refuted by Vasubandhu. Honjō points out several verses of the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda* that convey similar ideas. Indeed, all the major points of the above discussion are found in these *kāvya*s, as is shown below.

[1] There is no pleasant sensation:

For [a man] who is dragging around an afflicted and unstable body, there is no pleasure whatsoever from the standpoint of the highest truth. One considers [something] to be pleasant when a remedy for pain is applied, or when there is [only] a small pain. (*Saundarananda* 9.40)²⁷

[2] The cause of pleasure is indefinite:

And because the objects of desire are not fixed [as the cause of pleasure], I do not think such objects enjoyable, for the very things that bring about pleasure also bring about pain. (*Buddhacarita* 11.41)²⁸

²⁴ *nāsty eva sukhā vedanety ekīyā duḥkhaiva tu sarvā / katham idaṃ gamyate / sūtrād yuktitaś ca /... / katham yuktitaḥ / sukhahetvavyavasthānāt / ya eva hi kecit pānabhojana-śītoṣṇādaya isyante sukhahetavas ta evātyupayuktā akālopayuktāś ca punar duḥkhaheṭavaḥ sampadyante / na ca yuktā sukhahetuvṛddhyā samena vā 'nyasmin kāle duḥkhotpattir ity ādita eva te duḥkhaheṭavo na sukhasya / ante tu tadduḥkhaṃ vṛddhim āpannaṃ vyaktim āpadyata iti / evaṃ tṛyāpathavikalpe 'pi vaktavyam / duḥkhapratikāre ca sukhabuddher duḥkhavikalpe ca / na hi tāvat sukhā ity vedyate kiñcid yāvan na duḥkhāntareṇopadruto bhavati kṣutpipāsāśītoṣṇāśramakāmarāgāprabhavaṇa / tasmāt pratikāra evāviduṣāṃ sukhabuddhir na sukhe duḥkhavikalpe ca bālāḥ sukhabuddhim utpādayanti yathāṃśād aṃśaṃ bhāraṃ saṃcārayantaḥ / tasmān nāsty eva sukhā ity /*

²⁵ *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* 518.21.

²⁶ Pek. 5594: Ņu 186b3. See Katō, *Kyōryōbu* 190.

²⁷ śārīram ārtam parikarṣataś calaṃ na cāsti kiṃcīt paramārthataḥ sukham / sukhaṃ hi duḥkhapratikāraṣevayā sthite ca duḥkhe tanuni vyavasyati //

²⁸ kāmeṣv anaikāntikatā ca yasmād ato 'pi me teṣu na bhogaśaṃjñā / ya eva bhāvā hi sukhāṃ dīśanti ta eva duḥkhaṃ punar āvahanti //

²⁹ gurūṇi vāsāṃsy agurūṇi caiva sukhāya śīte hy asukhāya gharṃ / candrāṃśavaś candanam eva coṣṇe sukhāya duḥkhāya bhavanti śīte //

Thick garments and fragrant aloe wood entail pleasure when it is cold, but pain when it is hot. The rays of the moon and sandalwood entail pleasure when it is hot, but pain when it is cold. (*Buddhacarita* 11.42)²⁹

[3] That which is in fact merely the remedy for pain is felt as pleasure:

If [you] think that the objects of desire are enjoyable, [you should understand that] none of these [objects of desire] is considered to be enjoyable. For in [this] world, things and qualities,³⁰ such as clothes [and warmth], should be considered to be the remedy for pain. (*Buddhacarita* 11.36)³¹

Therefore, people's [sense-]objects are the means of the remedy for pain and are not enjoyable things. What wise man applying the remedy [for pain] would think that he is enjoying something enjoyable? (*Buddhacarita* 11.39)³²

Someone [a foolish person], who is burning with bilious fever and would consider a cold treatment to be an enjoyable thing, would imagine that the objects of desire are enjoyable things[, when in fact he is merely] applying the remedy for pain. (*Buddhacarita* 11.40)³³

Because the exertion by a creature for the application of the remedy for pain, [which is] called pleasure, turns out to be the cause of bondage and destruction, he saw that [worldly] existence is painful. (*Saundarananda* 17.19)³⁴

Here again Honjō's argument is very persuasive, and the similarities between these verses and the theory quoted in the *Kośa* should be obvious.

In this case, this theory is well attested in a Dārṣṭāntika source, **Tattvasiddhi* (chapter 78, "The Chapter on the Characteristics of *Vedanā*," and

³⁰ I follow Honjō's interpretation of *dravyaguṇa* ("Memyō shi" 393).

³¹ *kāmās tu bhogā iti yan matiḥ syād bhogā na kecīṭ pariganyamānāḥ / vastrādayo dravyaguṇā hi loke duḥkhapratīkāra itī pradhāryāḥ //*

³² *duḥkhapratīkāranimittabhūtās tasmāt prajānām viṣayā na bhogāḥ / aśnāmi bhogān itī ko 'bhyupeyāt prājñāḥ pratīkāravidhau pravṛttaḥ //*

³³ *yaḥ pittadāhena vidāhyamānaḥ śītakriyām bhoga itī vyavasyet / duḥkhapratīkāravidhau pravṛttaḥ kāmeṣu kuryāt sa hi bhogasamjñām //*

³⁴ *yataḥ prasūtasya ca karmayogaḥ prasajyate bandhaviḡhātahe tuḥ / duḥkhapratīkāravidhau sukhākhye tato bhavaṃ duḥkham itī vyapaśyat //*

³⁵ T. 1646: 281c-282c. Honjō ("Memyōshi" 393) points out that similar arguments appear also in the *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā* (Pek. 5496: Chi 40a6ff). Further, Katō (*Kyōryōbu* 191) points out that similar arguments are found in the *Vibhāṣā* (without specifying who claimed them; T. 1545: 402c16-29; 714c2-3) and in the *Pañcavastukavibhāṣā* (T. 1555: 994c5-18).

³⁶ *Cintāmayībhūmi* of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* (Pek. 5539: Zi 220b4-221a6; T. 1579: 663b12-27), which states that from the standpoint of *saṃskāraduḥkhatā*, all *vedanā* is considered *duḥkha*. Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (329.22-330.2).

chapter 79, “The Chapter on *Samṣkāraduḥkha*”),³⁵ but not in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. *Samṣkāraduḥkhatā* is highly emphasized in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and somewhat similar arguments are also found there,³⁶ but a flat negation of *sukha-vedanā* is, as far as I can see, not found anywhere in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. The *Yogācārabhūmi* seems to subscribe to the traditional *tri-vedanā* theory,³⁷ and Harada (“Dignāga” 109-110) suspects that this is the reason why Vasubandhu rejects this Dārṣṭāntika theory in his *Kośa*.

On the other hand, it is worth noting that a very similar argument is also found in the *Tso-ch’an san-mei ching*, a Chinese meditation manual compiled by Kumārajīva based on several Indian meditation manuals. The passage in question runs as follows:

One should realize that in fact pleasant sensation cannot be recognized. How so? Owing to clothing and food, pleasure is brought about. Excessive pleasure, however, gives rise to pain,³⁸ because [what appears to be pleasure] is not truly pleasure. When the pain of a wound is stopped by applying medicine (i.e., a remedy), it is called comfort. Because of a great pain, a small pain is considered to be pleasant, but it is not real pleasure. Also, because of an old pain, a new pain is considered to be pleasant. When one carries a heavy load, and when one moves it from one shoulder to the other, the new weight is felt to be pleasant,³⁹ but it is not real, lasting pleasure. In the case of the nature of fire, it is always hot and does not cool down even for a moment. If these [examples] were truly pleasant, they should not become unpleasant.

...

[Another point is that] we [merely] regard a small pain in [the face of] a larger pain as pleasant. For example, when a person is facing execution, if he [manages to] keep his life and is [merely] whipped, he regards this [being whipped] as pleasure.⁴⁰... (T. 614: 278c12-25)⁴¹

According to the preface to this text by Kumārajīva’s disciple, Sêng-jui 僧叡, preserved in the *Ch’u san-tsang chi chi* (T. 2145: 65a19-b20),

³⁷ E.g., *Savitarkasavicārādibhūmi* (208.1-7).

³⁸ Cf. **Tattvasiddhi* (T. 1646: 282b2-4).

³⁹ Cf. **Tattvasiddhi* (T. 1646: 282b20).

⁴⁰ A very similar line is found in the **Tattvasiddhi* (T. 1646: 282b6-7).

⁴¹ 當觀樂痛實不可得。云何不得。因衣食故致樂。樂過則苦生。非實樂故。如患瘡苦以藥塗治痛止爲樂。以大苦故。謂小苦爲樂。非實樂也。復次以故苦爲苦。新苦爲樂。如擔重易肩而以新重爲樂。非實常樂也。如火性熱無暫冷時。若是實樂不應有不樂。... 於大苦中以小苦爲樂也。如人應死全命受鞭。以是爲樂。...

Kumārajīva's sources were the "teachings on the essence of meditation" (*ch'an-yao* 禪要) of "various masters" (*chung-chia* 衆家), such as Vasumitra, Saṅgharakṣa, Upagupta, Saṅghasena, Pārśva, Aśvaghōṣa, and Kumāralāta.⁴² Unfortunately Sêng-jui does not specify the source of this particular portion. Though not mentioned in his list, a relationship with Harivarman's **Tattvasiddhi* (T. 1646: 281c16-282c22) should perhaps be considered, for the relevant portions of these two texts share many similar elements. Since the **Tattvasiddhi* was also translated by Kumārajīva, he must have been familiar with its content. Katō (*Kyōryōbu* 46, 52) argues that Harivarman was a disciple of Kumāralāta. If so, we might also consider the possibility that the passage in question from the *Tso-ch'an san-mei ching* is derived from Kumāralāta's meditation manual.

In any case, this theory must have been included in the "teachings on the essence of meditation" of some master. Thus, although this theory was not admitted into the *Yogācārabhūmi*, it seems to have been propounded by some of the earlier meditators.

(3) *Parikalpa* (Honjō, "Memyō shi" 390, supplement)

The *Saundarananda* (13.49-53) states as follows:

Even if a sense faculty (*indriya*) is directed to an object (*viṣaya*), as long as no mental discrimination (*manasas parikalpa*) is directed there, it [i.e., *indriya*] does not adhere to it [i.e., *viṣaya*]. (13.49)

As fire blazes when there are firewood and wind, so the fire of *kleśa* arises from the object and from the discrimination. (13.50)

For a man is bound by the erroneous discrimination (*abhūtaparikalpa*) of an object. When he sees the same object as it is (*bhūtaṭaḥ*), he is liberated, (13.51)

⁴² Since the incorporation of Aśvaghōṣa's and Saṅgharakṣa's texts into the *Tso-ch'an san-mei ching* can be confirmed at the places where Sêng-jui specifies, this preface should be considered to be a reliable one. See Matsunami, *Memyō Tansai* 162-168; "Yugagyōha" 131-144; Yamabe, *The Sūtra* 78-79. It should be noted that "various masters" might include some other masters not expressly mentioned by Sêng-jui.

Having seen one visible thing (*rūpa*), one person is attached [to it] (*rajyate*), another is offended (*praduṣyati*), a third person stays neutral (*madhyastha*), yet another becomes compassionate (*ghṛṇāyate*) with regard to the same [object]. (13.52)

Therefore, the object is not the cause of bondage or liberation. Whether there is attachment or not depends on the type of discrimination (*parikalpaviśeṣa*). (13.53)⁴³

Honjō links these verses to the following passage from the **Nyāyānu-sāra* (Anuśayanirdeśa):

The Dārṣṭāntikas say as follows: Because pain and pleasure arise depending upon discrimination, we know that the nature of objects cannot be substantially established. As is said by the Buddha in the *Māgandīya Sūtra*:⁴⁴ “Lepers feel pleasant when they touch painful fire.” He also says, “A visible thing is regarded as a pleasing object by one sentient being, but not by another.”

Also, because the [distinction between] cleanliness and dirtiness, etc. cannot be substantially established[, the nature of objects cannot be substantially established]. This means that different types of sentient beings judge the cleanliness and the dirtiness of the same thing differently.⁴⁵ Because we recognize that the characteristics, clean and dirty, are relative, [the distinction between] clean objects and dirty objects cannot be substantially established. (T. 1562: 639b4-10)⁴⁶

⁴³ nendriyaṃ viśaye tāvat pravṛttam api sajjate /
yāvan na manasaś tatra parikalpaḥ pravartate // (13.49)
indhane sati vāyau ca yathā jvalati pāvakaḥ /
viśayāt parikalpāc ca kleśāgnir jāyate tathā // (13.50)
abhūtaparikalpena viśayasya hi badhyate /
tam eva viśayaṃ paśyan bhūtataḥ parimucyate // (13.51)
dṛṣṭvaikaṃ rūpaṃ anyo hi rajyate 'nyaḥ praduṣyati /
kaś cid bhavati madhyasthas tatraivānyo ghṛṇāyate // (13.52)
ato na viśayo hetur bandhāya na vimuktaye /
parikalpaviśeṣeṇa saṃgo bhavati vā na vā // (13.53)

⁴⁴ For the *Māgandīya Sūtra*, see the *Hsü-hsien-t'i ching* 鬚提提經 (*Madhyamāgama*, no. 153) T. 26: 670a-73a; the *Māgandīya-suttanta* (*Majjhima-nikāya*, no.75) 1: 501-13.

⁴⁵ This would mean that, for example, what is dirty for a human being can be clean for certain animals.

⁴⁶ 譬喻部師作如是說。由分別力苦樂生故，知諸境界體不成實。以佛於彼摩建地迦契經中說。諸癩病者，觸苦火時以為樂故。又說一色，於一有情名可意境，非於餘故。又如淨穢不成實故。謂別生趣同分有情，於一事中取淨穢異。既淨穢相非定可得，故無成實淨穢二境。

⁴⁷ It is well known that Saṅghabhadra (the author of the **Nyāyānu-sāra*), Yaśomitra, Sthiramati, and the *Abhidharmadīpa* do not distinguish Dārṣṭāntika from Sautrāntika (e.g., Katō *Kyōryōbu* 68-85, Honjō “Sautrāntika” 937, Tokoro 49: 62-63).

Here the theory is attributed to the Dārṣṭāntikas.⁴⁷ In this regard, we should note that a theory very similar to *Saundarananda* 13.52 is mentioned as a Dārṣṭāntika theory in the *Vibhāṣā* as follows:

The Dārṣṭāntikas say... since defiled and undefiled objects are indeterminate, one knows that objects are unreal. For example, [when] a colorfully adorned, beautiful woman enters an assembly, upon seeing her, some give rise to respect, others give rise to lust, yet others give rise to hatred, envy, disgust, compassion, or equanimity. One should know that among these people, [her] children see her and give rise to respect. Those who indulge in desire see her and give rise to lust. Enemies see her and give rise to hatred. Those who share the same husband see her and give rise to envy. Those who have practiced the meditation on impurity give rise to disgust. Detached sages see her and give rise to compassion, thinking thus: “These beautiful appearances will soon perish due to impermanence.” *Arhats* see her and give rise to equanimity. Therefore, one knows that objects have no reality. (T. 1545: 288b16-27)⁴⁸

⁴⁸ 譬喻者說。…有染與無染境不決定故知境非實。謂如有一端正女人種種莊嚴來入衆會。有見起敬。有見起貪。有見起瞋。有見起嫉。有見起厭。有見起悲。有見生捨。應知此中子見起敬。諸耽欲者見而起貪。諸怨憎者見而起瞋。諸同夫者見而起嫉。諸有修習不淨觀者見而起厭。諸離欲仙見起悲愍。作如是念。此妙色相不久當爲無常所滅。諸阿羅漢見而生捨。由此故知境無實體。

Further, a very similar theory appears in the **Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra* as well, where it is not attributed to any particular person or group. As Yin points out, judging from the close similarity to the Dārṣṭāntika theory in the *Vibhāṣā*, this theory should probably also be attributed to the Dārṣṭāntikas (*Dai chido ron* 52-53).

復次如一美色。姪人見之以爲淨妙心生染著。不淨觀人視之種種惡露無一淨處。等婦見之妬瞋憎惡目不欲見以爲不淨。姪人觀之爲樂。妬人觀之爲苦。行人觀之得道。無豫之人觀之無所適莫如見土木。若此美色實淨。四種人觀皆應見淨。若實不淨。四種人觀皆應不淨。以是故知。好醜在心外無定也。觀空亦如是。(T. 1509:148a13-20; Lamotte, *Le traité* 2: 732-33)

Next, in the case of the beautiful appearance [of a woman], a lustful person sees her, considers her to be wonderful, and is attached to her. One who practices the meditation on impurity sees her [and thinks that she is filled with] various filthy things and that not a single spot is clean. Fellow wives (**sapatnī*) see her and [are driven by] envy and hatred. They do not want to look at her and consider [her] to be impure. A lustful man looks at her and considers her to be pleasing. An envious person looks at her and considers her to be unpleasant. A practitioner looks at her and attains the way. One who has completed the way looks at her and is indifferent, as if he were looking at soil or wood. If this beautiful appearance were really pure, the four types of people should see it as pure. If really impure, the four types of people should all consider it as impure. Therefore, one should know that beauty and ugliness exist in one's mind; they are not fixed outside of the mind. One observes emptiness in the same way.

⁴⁹ Consider, for example, the famous verse 1.1 of the *Madhyāntavibhāga*. See also Matsunami (“Memyō saku” 127-28), who attempts to connect *Saundarananda* 13.41-53

However, these verses of the *Saundarananda* seem to me to be also closely linked to the Yogācāra tradition. First, we should consider that the expression (*abhūta*-)*parikalpa* ([erroneous] discrimination) is strongly reminiscent of the Yogācāra tradition.⁴⁹ Second, the whole line of the argument is quite similar to that of the Yogācāra tradition, and indeed an idea comparable to that of *Saundarananda* 13.52 appears in the **Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana* (Pek. 5552: Li 276a2-3; T. 1598: 402c26-27), as follows:

A mendicant, a lustful one, and a dog have three [different] concepts (*vikalpana*) regarding a beautiful woman's body; namely, [they see it] as a corpse, as a lovely woman, and as food.⁵⁰

Further, here again I would like to reiterate the importance of structural comparison. In Table 1, these verses of the *Saundarananda* fall in the section on *indriyasamvara* (no. 3). Then, obviously the first thing to do is to compare them with the corresponding part of the *Śrāvakahūmi*, where we find the following passage:

Visual consciousness (*caḥsurvijñāna*) arises dependent on the eye (*caḥsus*) and visible things (*rūpāṇi*). Following the visual consciousness, discriminating mental consciousness (*vikalpakaṃ manovijñānaṃ*) arises, and it is through this discriminating mental consciousness that one clings to (*saṃrajyate*) a

to the later *trivabhāva* theory. On the other hand, it is notable that the expression *abhūta-parikalpa* seems to be missing in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. See Schmithausen ("Zur Literaturgeschichte" 820).

We should also keep in mind that *abhūtaparikalpa* is found in some Mahāyāna sūtras, e.g., *Ugradataparipṛcchā* (quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 110.14-15), and *Vimalakīrtinīrdeśa* (ibid. 140.20). See also Aramaki Noritoshi ("Miroku ronjo"), who emphasizes the importance of the *Jñānālokālaṃkārasūtra* in the development of this concept.

I thank Professors Iwata Takashi and Harada Wasō for their suggestions and information on some of these points.

⁵⁰ Lamotte (*La somme* 2: 106; *Le traité* 2: 733) points out that the Sanskrit text of this verse is quoted in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (12.7-8) as follows:

parivrāṭkāmukaśunām ekasyāṃ pramadātanau /
kuṇapaḥ kāmīnī bhakṣya iti tisro vikalpanāḥ //

The similarity with the above passage from the **Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* is also noted by Lamotte (*Le traité*).

⁵¹ caḥsuḥ pratītya rūpāṇi cotpadyate caḥsurvijñānaṃ, caḥsurvijñānānantaram utpadyate vikalpakaṃ manovijñānaṃ, yena vikalpakena manovijñānena priyarūpeṣu rūpeṣu saṃrajyate / apriyarūpeṣu rūpeṣu vyāpadyate /

This passage is found in *Śrāvakahūmi* (C) in the table.

visible thing of attractive appearance and hates (*vyāpadyate*) visible things of unattractive appearance. (Shōmonji Kenkyūkai ed. 102.2-5)⁵¹

This passage should be compared, in particular, with *Saundarananda* 13.49 quoted above. These two passages express fairly similar ideas using similar words.

In the *Saundarananda*, in the same section on *indriyaśaṃvara* just prior to the aforementioned verses, there appears another noteworthy verse:

Inevitably, here in this world, the sense faculties would function in their respective spheres. But there [in their spheres], the primary characteristics (*nimitta*) or the secondary characteristics (*anuvyañjana*) should not be grasped (*na grāhya*). (13.41)⁵²

This verse is reminiscent of the following passage from the *Śrāvakabhūmi*:

Having seen visible things with his eye, [the practitioner] does not grasp their primary or secondary characteristics. (Shōmonji Kenkyūkai ed. 16.22-23)⁵³

It should be noted that: (a) in both the *Saundarananda* and the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, grasping the *nimitta* and the *anuvyañjana* is discussed; (b) in both texts, the emphasis is on the discriminating *manas* or *manovijñāna* that works with or after sensory perception (see *Saundarananda* 13.49). The *Saundarananda* and the *Śrāvakabhūmi* seem to be closely related on these points.

Therefore, Aśvaghōṣa, Dārṣṭāntika, and Yogācāra seem to share the same position on this matter. It is clear that this view is not shared by the orthodox Sarvāstivāda, since it is expressly rejected in the *Vibhāṣā* (T. 1545: 288b27-c1).⁵⁴

⁵² *avaśyaṃ gocarē sve sve vartitavyam ihendriyaiḥ /
nimittam tatra na grāhyam anuvyañjanam eva ca //*

⁵³ *sa cakṣuṣā rūpāni dṛṣṭvā na nimittagrāhī bhavati, nānuvyamjanagrāhī.*

This line is in *Śrāvakabhūmi* (A) in Table 1. See Yamabe, Fujitani, and Harada (11, 16-17).

⁵⁴ It is noteworthy that a somewhat similar theory appears in the *Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā* (9.28-10.10; Mori 182) as a theory of the Vītaṅḍavādin. Concerning the identity of the Vītaṅḍavādin, see Mori and Silk. I thank Professor Lance Consins for bringing this point to my attention.

Provisional Conclusions

Thus far we have examined the relationship among Aśvaghōṣa, Sautrāntika, and Yogācāra from the meditative and theoretical points of view. Admittedly, we have only been able to discuss a few of the relevant points, but even this limited examination has revealed that these traditions were intricately intertwined.

On the one hand, it seems very likely that Aśvaghōṣa was close to the meditative tradition that later formed the Yogācāra school. On the other hand, Aśvaghōṣa's texts contain many points that are akin to the Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika tradition. Further, as I have mentioned, many of these Sautrāntika-like elements are also found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Considering these points, it appears that the Yogācāra tradition and the Sautrāntika-like elements were almost inseparably interconnected long before the compilation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

This, however, does not mean that we can trace a single line of development from Aśvaghōṣa via the *Yogācārabhūmi* to Vasubandhu. As we have seen, the matter is far more complex. See Table 7 in the appendix. One point of which Aśvaghōṣa approves (i.e., the denial of the existence of real *sukha*) is neither found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* nor accepted by Vasubandhu. Nevertheless, this point is attested in an early Dārṣṭāntika text (**Tattvasiddhi*) and a few other relevant sources. Another point Aśvaghōṣa propounds (i.e., *anuśaya* = *bīja* theory) is attested in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and is also accepted by Vasubandhu but is not (at least clearly) attested in the early Dārṣṭāntika sources. The same theory is attributed to the Vibhājyavādins in the *Vibhāṣā*. Things are very complicated, and we need to do much more research before we can paint a more reliable picture.

One point that seems relatively certain at this moment is that the Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika tradition was fairly closely linked to meditative traditions.⁵⁵ Therefore, my (admittedly very tentative) working hypothesis at this stage is that the critiques of the orthodox Sarvāstivāda theories transmitted to us as Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika views were perhaps the

⁵⁵ Cf. Yin Shun, who observes that the Dārṣṭāntikas emphasized the practice of meditation (*Shuo i-ch'ieh you-pu* 374-75).

opinions of more practice-oriented people who found the Sarvāstivāda system at times too artificial to follow. Of course, there would have been variant opinions even among these practice-oriented people, and so it is not surprising that scholars have noticed many different opinions within the Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika tradition. Needless to say, at this stage this is nothing but an untested hypothesis, and I would like to examine its validity in my future research.

Appendix

Table 1. Prerequisites to Meditation

Cf. *Mahāssapura-sutta*; *Cūḷahatthipadopama-sutta*, *Sāmaññaphala-sutta*.¹

| <i>Saundarananda</i> | * <i>Tattvasiddhi</i> (T. 1646) | <i>Śrāvakabhūmi</i> (A) (Shōmonji Ken- kyūkai ed.) (T. 1579) | <i>Śrāvakabhūmi</i> (C) (Shōmonji Ken- kyūkai ed.) (T. 1579) |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | ātmasampad (10.2-12.11) 自圓滿 (396b15-c9) | ātmasampad (62.8) 自圓滿 (402a19) |
| | | parasampad (12.13-16.2) 他圓滿 (396c9-397a7) | parasampad (62.8) 他圓滿 (402a19) |
| 1. śraddhā (12.30-43) dharmacchanda (12.31a) | | kuśalo dharmacchandaḥ (16.4-11) 善法欲 (397a7-14) Cf. śraddhā (16.5) 淨信 (397a9) | kuśalo dharmacchandaḥ (62.8) 善法欲 (402a19) |
| | | pravrajyā (16.13-15) 正出家 (397a14-16) | |
| 2. śīla (13.10-29) | 淨持戒 (351a23-b29) | śīlasamvara (16.17-19) 戒律儀 (397a16-19) | śīlasamvara (62.11-98.19) 戒律儀 (402a21-406b10) |
| | 善知識 (351b29-c20) | | |
| 3. indriyasam- vara (13.30-56) | 守護根門 (361c21-26) | indriyasamvara (16.21-18.6) 根律儀 (297a19-b1) | indriyasamvara (100.2-114.24) 根律儀 (406b20-408a14) |
| 4. bhojane mātrajñāḥ (14.1-19) | 飲食知量 (351c26-352a8) | bhojane mātrajñātā (18.8-13) 於食知量 (397b1-7) | bhojane mātrajñātā (116.2-148.7) 於食知量 (408a14-411b22) |
| 5. pūrvaṃ yāmaṃ triyāmāyāḥ prayogenāti- nāmya... (14.20-34) | 初夜後夜損睡眠 (352a18-28) | pūrvarātrāpararātram jāgarikānuyogaḥ (18.15-20.2) 初夜後夜常勤修習 覺悟瑜伽 (397b7-16) | pūrvarātrāpararātram jāgarikānuyuktatā (150.2-170.17) 初夜後夜常勤修習覺 悟瑜伽 (411b8-413c29) |
| 6. samprajānan... smṛtiṃ ādhātum (14.35-45) | | samprajānadvihāritā (20.4-8) 正知而住 (397b16-22) | samprajānadvihāritā (172.2-210.8) 正知而住 (413c29-417a17) |
| 7. kāyasya/ manaso vivekaḥ (14.46-52) | | prāvivekyā (20.10-13) 樂遠離 (397b22-26) | prāvivekyāntarāya (248.7-250.7) 遠離障 (420a15-420b5) |

Table 2. Abandoning the Six *Vitarkas*
Cf. *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, no. 3.100; *Samyuktāgama*, no. 1246

| <i>Saundarananda</i> <i>Tso-ch'an san-mei</i> <i>ching</i> ² (T. 614) | * <i>Tattvasiddhi</i> (T. 1646) | <i>Śrāvakahūmi</i> (Shukla ed.) (T. 1579) | <i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i> (Wogihara ed.) (T. 1579) |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 8. vitarkaprahāṇa (15.1-69) 治思覺法門 (273a12ff.) | 不善覺 (352b1-353a22) | vitarka (399.4) 尋思障 (457b11-12) | |
| 8.1. kāma (15.3-11) 欲覺 (273b8-12) | 欲覺 (352b5-7) | kāmavitarkādayaḥ (399.4-5) 欲尋思等染汚尋思 (457b12) | kāmavitarka (145.12) 欲尋思 (512c17) |
| 8.2. vyāpāda, vihimsā (15.12-17) 瞋恚覺, 惱 (273b22-c3) | 瞋覺, 惱覺 (352b7-9) | [vyāpāda, vihiṃsā] ³ | vyāpāda, vihiṃsā (145.14) 恚, 害 (512c18) |
| 8.3. akuśala (15.18-29) 不善覺 (273c4-8) | | | |
| 8.4. jñātijana (15.30-41) 親里覺 (274a5-20) | 親里覺 (352b16-c1) | jñāti[-vitarka] (400.4) 親屬 (457b27) | jñāti (145.14) 親里 (512c19) |
| 8.5. janapada (15.42-51) 國土覺 (274b3-15) | 國土覺 (352c2-13) | janapada[-vitarka] (400.4) 國土 (457b27) | janapada (145.14) 國土 (512c19) |
| 8.6. amaraṇa (15.52-63) 不死覺 (274b19-c3) | 不死覺 (352c13-353a5) | amaravitarka (400.4) 不死 (457b27) | amara (145.14) 不死 (512c19) |
| 8.7. pratipakṣa (15.64-69) (273a13, a27-b2) | | pratipakṣa (400.15) 修習對治 (457c6-7) | |

Table 3. Exposition of the Four Noble Truths

| <i>Saundarananda</i> | <i>Śrāvakahūmi</i> (Shukla ed.) (T. 1579) |
|--|---|
| 9. <i>āryasatyavyākhyāna</i> (16.1-98) | |
| 9.1. <i>āryasatya</i> (16.1-48) | (251.14-253.1) (424c10-17) |

Table 4. Timely Practice

Cf. *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, no. 3.100; *Samyuktāgama*, no. 1247

| <i>Saundarananda</i> <i>Tso-ch'an san-mei ching</i> (T. 614) | <i>Śrāvakabhūmi</i> (Shukla ed.) (T. 1579) |
|---|---|
| 9.2. <i>kāla</i> and <i>abhyupāya</i> of yoga (16.49-67) 時・方便 (285c1ff.) | <i>kālaprayogatā</i> (391.9?+394.1) 應時加行 (456a9-b14) |
| 9.2.1. <i>uddhanyamāne</i> : <i>śamāya nimittam</i> (16.53-54) 調動: 定 (285c9-12) | <i>uddhate citte uddhatavābhiśamkīni</i> : <i>śamathanimitta</i> (391.18-392.19) 心掉舉時, 或恐掉舉時: 止相 (456a16-b4) |
| 9.2.2. <i>līyamāne</i> : <i>pragrāhakaṃ nimittam</i> (16.55-56) 軟復懈怠: 精進勇猛心 (285c13-16) | <i>līnaṃ cittaṃ līnatvābhiśamkīni</i> : <i>pragrahanimitta</i> (392.20-393.5) 心沈下時, 或恐掉舉時: 舉相 (456b4-8) |
| 9.2.3. <i>sāmyam gate</i> : <i>aupekṣikaṃ nimittam</i> (16.57-58) 正等心: 捨想 (285c17-20) | <i>śamathavipaśyanāpakṣalayauddhatya-</i> <i>vinirmukte cetasi: upekṣānimitta</i> (393.6-394.1) 於奢摩他毘鉢舍那品所有[沈下]掉舉心 已解脫: 捨相 (456b8-11) |

Table 5. Practice Suitable for One's Temperament

Cf. *Mahāniddeśa* 2: 239, etc.

| <i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> of <i>Saṅgharakṣa</i> (T. 606) | <i>Saundarananda</i> <i>Tso-ch'an san-mei ching</i> (T. 614) | <i>Śrāvakabhūmi</i> (Shukla ed.) (T. 1579) |
|---|--|---|
| | | <i>anurūpe ālambane cittaṃ</i> <i>upanibadhnāti</i> (198.15) <i>anurūpaprayogatā</i> (389.14) 於相稱緣安住其心 (428a11) 相應加行 (455b27-28) |
| 情欲熾盛: 不淨之法 (191c17-20) | 9.2.4. <i>rāga: aśubhā</i> (16.59-60) 多淫欲: 觀不淨 (285c21-24) | <i>rāgacarita</i> (198.13; 207.2; 389.14): <i>aśubhā</i> (198.14; 202.6; 389.4-5) 貪行 (428a11-12; 429c1; 455b28): 不淨 (428a12; 428c20; 455b28) |
| 瞋怒而熾多: 慈心 (191c20-192a18) | 9.2.5. <i>vyāpāda: maitrī</i> (16.61-62) 多瞋恚: 行慈心 (285c25-28) | <i>dveṣacarita</i> (198.15; 209.14; 389.15): <i>maitrī</i> (198.16; 207.7; 389.15) 瞋行 (428a13; 429c25; 455b29): 慈愍 (428a13; 429c3; 455b29) |

| <i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> of Saṅgharakṣa (T. 606) | <i>Saundarananda</i> <i>Tso-ch'an san-mei ching</i> (T. 614) | <i>Śrāvakahūmi</i> (Shukla ed.) (T. 1579) |
|--|---|---|
| 多愚癡: 十二因緣 (192a19-25) | 9.2.6. moha: idampratyaya- tā (16.63-64) 多愚癡: 觀因緣 (285c29-286a3) | mohacarita (198.16; 210.9-10); idampratyayatāpratītyasa mutpāda (198.16; 210.3) 癡行 (428a14; 430a11; 455b29); (緣生)緣起 (428a14; 430a7; 455b29-c1) |
| 多憍慢: 骨鎖 (192b1-14) | | mānacarita (198.17; 218.9); *dhātuprabhedā (198.17; 211.1) (憍)慢行 (428a15; 430c1; 455c1-2); 界差別 (428a15; 430a14; 455c1-2) |
| 多想念: 出入數息 (192a26-29) | | vitarkacarita (198.18; 236.15; 389.16); ānāpānasmṛti (198.18; 219.1; 389.16) 尋思行 (428a16; 433b24; 455c2); 阿那般那念 (428a16; 430c5; 455c2-3) |
| | 9.2.7. Concluding remarks about <i>kāla</i> and <i>abhyupāya</i> (16.65-67) 非時方便 (286a4-9) | |
| | 9.3. Concluding remarks about abandoning the <i>vitarkas</i> (16.68-85) 應病與藥 (286a10-11) | |
| | 9.4. <i>vīrya</i> (16.86-98) | |

Table 6. Attainment of Arhatship

| * <i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> of Saṅgharakṣa (T. 606) | <i>Saundarananda</i> | <i>Śrāvakahūmi</i> (Shukla ed.) (T. 1579) |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| (217a3-223a14) | 10. <i>amṛtādhigama</i> (17.1-73) | (437.16-508.4) (465b15-477a13) |

Table 7

| Points | <i>Saundara- nanda</i> | <i>Vibhāṣā</i> (T. 1545) | * <i>Tattvasiddhi</i> (T. 1646) | <i>Yogācāra- bhūmi</i> | <i>Abhidharma- kośabhāṣya</i> , etc. |
|--|--|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <i>anuśaya</i> = <i>bija</i> | 15.5-6 | “Vibhajya- vādin” 313a1-4 | — (?) | Savitarka- savicārādi- bhūmi- Viniścaya Pek. 5539: Zi 118b1-3. | “Sautrāntika” 278.18-24 |
| denial of the existence of a real <i>sukha</i> | 9.40, 17.19 <i>Buddhacarita</i> 11.36-42 | 402c16-29; 714c2-3 (without specification of the proponent) | 282b-c | — | “Śrīlāta” 330.10-22 |
| <i>parikalpa</i> | 13.49-53 | “Dārṣṭāntika” 288b16-27 | — | Śrāvakahūmi Shōmonji Kenkyūkai ed. 102.2-5, etc. | “Dārṣṭāntika” (<i>Nyāyānusāra</i>) T. 1562: 639b4-10 |

¹ I thank Professor Miyashita Seiki for drawing my attention to the *Sāmaññaphala-sutta*. Tables 1-6 show the correspondences among the *Saundarananda*, *Śrāvakahūmi*, and other relevant texts. In these tables, when the breaks of the relevant sections are clear, I refer to the beginning and the end of each section. Otherwise, I refer to the line where each key word appears. In this respect, these tables are not entirely consistent. I omit minor annotations to the following tables. For more detailed annotations, the reader is referred to Yamabe, Fujitani, Harada (“Memyō” 44-65).

² Since this portion of the *Saundarananda* is incorporated into the *Tso-ch’an san-meī ching*, I also show the corresponding portions of that text in this table, as well as in Tables 4 and 5. However, it should be noted that not all the verses in the respective sections are incorporated into the *Tso-ch’an san-meī ching*. For more details, see Matsunami (“Yugagyōha” 131-44).

³ *Vyāpāda* and *vihīṃsā* are not mentioned here. However, comparisons with the list in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* shown in the right-most column and with similar lists elsewhere in the *Yogācārabhūmi* confirm that *kāma-vitarkādayah* implies *vyāpāda* and *vihīṃsā*.

⁴ The expression, “*kālaprayogātā*,” is missing here, but it is attested at the concluding line of this section (394.1).

References

Primary Sources

- **Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā (A-p'i-ta-mo Ta-p'i-o-sha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論). T. 1545.
- Abhidharmadīpa. Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti.* Ed. Padmanabh S. Jaini. 2nd. ed. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 4. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1977.
- Abhidharmakośabhāṣya.* Vasubandhu. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu.* Ed. P. Pradhan. 2nd. ed. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1975.
- Abhidharmakośavyākhyā.* Yaśomitra. *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā.* Ed. U. Wogihara. 1936. Reprint. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1990.
- Aṅguttara-nikāya.* PTS ed.
- Bodhisattvabhūmi. Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being Fifteenth Section of Yogācārabhūmi).* Ed. Unrai Wogihara. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1971.
- Buddhacarita. The Buddhacarita: Or, Acts of the Buddha.* Ed. and trans. E.H. Johnston. 1935-36. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.
- Ch'u san-tsang chi chi* 出三藏記集. Compiled by Sêng-yü 僧祐. T. 2145.
- Cūlahatthipadōpama-sutta. Majjhima-nikāya,* no. 27; *Hsiang-chi-yü ching* 象跡喻經 (*Madhyamāgama,* no. 146).
- Dīghanikāya,* PTS ed.
- Ekottarikāgama (Tsêng-i a-han ching* 增壹阿含經). T. 125.
- Hsü-hsien-t'i ching* 鬚閑提經. *Madhyamāgama,* No. 153.
- Madhyamāgama (Chung a-han ching* 中阿含經). T. 26.
- Madhyāntavibhāga. Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya.* Ed. Gadjin M. Nagao. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964.
- Māgandīya-suttanta. Majjhima-nikāya,* no. 75.
- Mahāniddeśa.* In *Niddeśa.* PTS ed.
- **Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra (Ta chih-tu lun* 大智度論). T. 1509.
- Mahāssapura-sutta. Majjhima-nikāya,* no. 39; *Ma-i ching* 馬邑經 (*Madhyamāgama,* no. 182); *Ekottarikāgama,* no. 49.8.
- **Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana.* Asvabhāva. Pek. 5552; T. 1598.
- Majjhima-nikāya.* PTS ed.
- **Nyāyānusāra (Shun chêng-li lun* 順正理論). Saṅghabhadra. T. 1562.
- Pañcavastukavibhāṣā (Wu-shih p'i-p'o-sha lun* 五事毘婆沙論). Dharmatrāta. T. 1555.
- Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā (Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅganirdeśa).* Vasubandhu. Pek. 5496.
- Sāmaññaphala-sutta. Dīghanikāya,* no. 2.
- Samyuktāgama (Tsa a-han ching* 雜阿含經). T. 99.

- Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. Ānandāśramasamskṛtagranthāvali, 51. Puṇyapattana: Ānandāśrama, 1977.
- Saundarananda. The Saundarananda of Aśvaghōṣa*. Ed. E.H. Johnston. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.
- Savitarkasavicārādibhūmi. *The Yogācārabhūmi of Ācārya Aśaṅga*. Ed. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1957.
- Savitarkasavicārādibhūmi in the Viniścayasamgrahaṇī. Pek. 5539; T. 1579.
- Śikṣāsamuccaya. Śikṣāsamuccaya of Śāntideva*. Ed. P.L. Vaidya. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 11. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1961.
- Śrāvakabhūmi. Śrāvakabhūmi of Ācārya Aśaṅga*. Ed. Karunesha Shukla. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 14. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1973; *Yugaron Shōmonji daiichi yugasho: Sansukuritto go tekisuto to wayaku* 瑜伽論声聞地 第一瑜伽処：サンスクリット語テキストと和訳 (*Śrāvakabhūmi: Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation, the First Chapter*). Ed. Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 声聞地研究会 (Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group). Tokyo: San-kibō Busshorin, 1998.
- **Tattvasiddhi (Ch'êng-shih lun 成實論)*. Harivarman. T. 1646.
- Tso-ch'an san-mei ching 坐禪三昧經*. Compiled by Kumārajīva. T. 614.
- Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā. Sammoha-vinodanī Abhidhamma-piṭake Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā*. PTS ed.
- Viniścayasamgrahaṇī. Part of the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Pek. 5539; T. 1579.
- Yogācārabhūmi*. See *Bodhisattvabhūmi*; Savitarkasavicārādibhūmi; Savitarkasavicārādibhūmi in the Viniścayasamgrahaṇī; *Śrāvakabhūmi*.
- **Yogācārabhūmi of Saṅgharākṣa (Hsiu-hsin tao-ti ching 修行道地經)*. T. 606.

Modern Works

- Aramaki Noritoshi 荒牧典俊. “Miroku ronjo ni okeru ‘komō funbetsu’ no kigen ni tsuite” 弥勒論書における「虚妄分別」の起源について. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 佛教學セミナー 75 (2002): 1-28.
- Bureau, André. *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule*. Saigon: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1955.
- de Jong, J.W. Review: Biswanath Bhattacharya, *Aśvaghōṣa*. Santiniketan, 1976. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 20.1/2 (1978): 124-27.
- Demiéville, Paul. “La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharākṣa.” *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 44.2 (1954): 339-436.
- Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄. “‘Konpon Setsu Issai Ubu’ to ‘Setsu issai ubu’” 「根本説一切有部」と「説一切有部」. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 47.1 (1998): 392-400.
- , “‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’ and ‘Sarvāstivādin.’” *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*. Ed. Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Volker M. Tschannerl. *Indica et Tibetica* 37. Swisttal-Odendorf, 2000. 239-250.

- Fukuda Takumi 福田琢. “Jōjitsuron no zuimen ron” 『成実論』の随眠論. *Katō Junshō Hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū: Abidaruma Bukkyō to Indo shisō*. 加藤純章博士還暦記念論集 アビダルマ仏教とインド思想. Ed. Katō Junshō Hakushi Kanreki Kinen Ronshū Kankōkai 加藤純章博士還暦記念論集刊行会. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2000. 151-65.
- Review: Katō Junshō cho, *Kyōryōbu no kenkyū* 加藤純章著 『経量部の研究』. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 佛教學セミナー 50: 46-52, 1989.
- Fukuhara Ryōgon 福原亮巖. *Bukkyō shoha no gakusetsu hihan Jōjitsuron no kenkyū* 仏教諸派の学説批判 成実論の研究. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 1969.
- Hakamaya Noriaki 袴谷憲昭. “Pūrvācārya kō” Pūrvācārya 考. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 34.2 (1986): 859-66.
- Harada Wasō 原田和宗. “Dignāga no Hastavālaprakarāṇa & Vṛtti: Wayaku to Skt. kangen’yaku no kokoromi,” Dignāga no Hastavālaprakarāṇa & Vṛtti: 和訳と Skt. 還元訳の試み. *Ryūkyō Daigaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūshitsu nenpō* 龍谷大学佛教学研究室年報 6 (1993): 92-110.
- “<Kyōryōbu no ‘tansō no’ shiki no nagare> to iu gainen eno gimon” <経量部の「単層の」識の流れ>という概念への疑問, part 1. *Indogaku Chibettogaku kenkyū* インド学チベット学研究 1 (1996): 135-93.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. “Neue Aśvaghōṣa- und Mātrcēta-Fragmente aus Ostturkistan.” *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1988.2: 53-92.
- Honjō Yoshifumi 本庄良文. “Memyō no gakuha ni kansuru senkō gakusetsu no ginmi: Jonsuton setsu” 馬鳴の學派に關する先行學説の吟味—ジョンストン説—. *Watanabe Fumimaro Hakushi tsuitō kinen ronshū Genshi Bukkyō to Daijō Bukkyō* 渡邊文鷹博士追悼記念論集 原始仏教と大乘仏教, vol. 2. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 1993.
- “Memyō saku Saundarananda dai 13 shō, 22-26” 馬鳴作『サウダラナダ』第13章, 22-26. *Bukkyō ronsō* 佛敎論叢 37 (1992): 19-22.
- “Memyō shi no naka no Kyōryōbu setsu” 馬鳴詩のなかの経量部説. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 36.1 (1987): 390-95.
- “Sautrāntika.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 40.2 (1992): 933-39.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. “The Sautrāntika Theory of Bīja.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 22.2 (1959): 236-49.
- Johnston, E.H. *The Buddhacarita: Or, Acts of the Buddha*. Reprint (3 pts. in 1) Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.
- Katō Junshō 加藤純章. *Kyōryōbu no kenkyū* 経量部の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1989.
- “Zuimen: anuśaya” 随眠: *anuśaya*. *Bukkyōgaku* 佛敎學 28 (1990): 1-32.
- Kimura Taiken 木村泰賢. “Funbetsu Ronja to buha no shozoku ni tsuite” 分別論者と部派の所屬に就て. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 n.s. 2.6 (1925): 25-56.
- Kritzer, Robert. “Saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānam in the Abhidharmakośa.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 41.1 (1992): 519-523.

- *Rebirth and Causation in the Yogācāra Abhidharma*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 44. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1999.
- “Vasubandhu on *saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānam*.” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 16.1 (1993): 24-55.
- Lamotte, Étienne. *Histoire du bouddhisme indien, des origines à l'ère Śāka*. Louvain: Bibliothèque du Muséon, 1958.
- *La somme du Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga (Mahāyānasaṃgraha)*. Tome 2. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 8. 1938. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1973.
- *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)*. Tome 2. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 26. 1949. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1981.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu: traduction et annotations*. Tome 1. Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 16. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1980.
- Notes de bibliographie bouddhique. *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 5 (1937): 243-304.
- Matsuda Kazunobu 松濤誠廉. “Vyākhyāyukti no nitai setsu: Vasubandhu kenkyū nōto (2)” *Vyākhyāyukti* の二諦説: Vasubandhu 研究ノート (2). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 33.2 (1985): 750-56.
- Matsunami Seiren 松濤誠廉. “Memyō saku *Tansei naru Nanda* to sono shisō” 馬鳴作『端正なる難陀』とその思想. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 n.s. 13.3 (1936): 115-29.
- *Memyō Tansei naru Nanda* 馬鳴 端正なる難陀. Ed. Matsunami Seiren Sensei Ikōshū Kankōkai 松濤誠廉先生遺稿集刊行会. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1981.
- “Yugagyōha no so to shite no Memyō” 瑜伽行派の祖としての馬鳴. *Taishō Daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 39 (1954). Reprint in Matsunami Seiren, *Bukkyō ni okeru shin to gyō* 仏教における信と行, 123-71. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1967.
- Miyamoto Shōson 宮本正尊. “Hiyusha, Daitoku Hokku, Dōju, Yumanron no kenkyū” 譬喩者, 大徳法救, 童受, 喩鬘論の研究. *Nippon Bukkyōgaku Kyōkai nenpō* 日本佛教學協會年報 1 (1929): 115-92.
- Miyashita Seiki 宮下晴輝. “Genkanhenchitai genkan” 現観辺智諦現観. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 佛教學セミナー 47 (1988): 47-56.
- “*Kusharon* ni okeru honmu kon'u ron no haikai: *Shōgi kūshōkyō* no kaishaku o megutte” 『俱舍論』における本無今有論の背景: 『勝義空性經』の解釈をめぐって. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 佛教學セミナー 44 (1986): 7-37.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. “Hiyushi to *Jōjitsuron*” 譬喩師と『成実論』. 1931. Reprint in *Mizuno Kōgen chosakushū* 水野弘元著作集 vol. 2. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1997. 279-300.

- Mori Sodō. “The Vitaṇḍavādins (Sophists) as seen in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās.” *Essays on the Pāli and Buddhist Civilization*. Ed. The Society for the Study of Pāli and Buddhist Civilization. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin. 171-88.
- Mukai Akira 向井亮. “Yugaron ni okeru kako mirai jitsuu ron ni tsuite” 『瑜伽論』に於ける過去未來実論に就いて. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 20.2 (1972): 140-41.
- Nishi Giyū 西義雄. *Abidatsuma Bukkyō no kenkyū* 阿毘達磨仏教の研究. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1975.
- . “Buha Bukkyō ni okeru yugashi to sono yakuwari” 部派佛教に於ける瑜伽師とその役割. *Bukkyō kenkyū* 佛敎研究 3.1 (1939): 1-48.
- Sakurabe Hajime 櫻部建. “Kyōryōbu no keitai” 經量部の形態. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛敎學研究 2.1 (1953): 115-16.
- Schlingloff, Dieter. “Aśvaghōṣas Saundarānanda in Ajanta.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 19 (1975): 85-102.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. “Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischer Materialien.” *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur*. Ed. Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987. 2: 304-406
- . “Zu dem Rezensionen des Udānavargaḥ.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 14 (1970): 47-124.
- . “Zur Literaturgeschichte der Älteren Yogācāra-Schule.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplementa 1.3 (1969): 811-23.
- Shastri, Haraprasad. *Saundarananda Kāvya of Ārya Bhadanta Aśvaghōṣa*. Bibliotheca Indica 192. Calcutta: The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1939.
- Silk, Jonathan A. *Cui bono? or Follow the Money: Identifying the Sophist in a Pāli Commentary*. *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodo Mori*. Ed. Publication Committee for Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Dr. Sodo Mori. Tokyo: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai, 2002. 129-83.
- Tokoro Rie 所理恵. “Jōjitsuron, Kusharon to Hiyusha, Kyōryōbu tonokakawari ni tsuite” 『成実論』『俱舍論』と譬喩者・經量部との関わりについて, part 1. *Mikkyō bunka* 密敎文化 170(1989): 48-69.
- Yamabe Nobuyoshi 山部能宜. “Bīja Theory in Viniścayasamgrahaṇī.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*. 印度學佛敎學研究 38.2 (1990): 929-31.
- . “Pūrvācārya no ichi yōrei ni tsuite”. Pūrvācārya の一用例について. *Kyūshū Ryūkoku Tanki Daigaku kiyō*. 九州龍谷短期大學紀要 45 (1999): 203-17.
- . *The Sūtra on the Ocean-Like Samādhi of the Visualization of the Buddha: The Interfusion of the Chinese and Indian Cultures in Central Asia as Reflected in a Fifth Century Apocryphal Sūtra*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Yale University. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services, 1999.
- . “Yugashijiron ni okeru zen’aku ingasetu no ichi sokumen: Iwayuru ‘shikishin gokun’ setu o chūshin to shite” 『瑜伽師地論』における善惡因果說の一側

- 面：いわゆる「色心互熏」説を中心として. *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai nenpō* 日本佛教學會年報. 66: 127-146, 2000.
- Yamabe Nobuyoshi 山部能宜, Fujitani Takayuki 藤谷隆之, Harada Yasunori 原田泰教. “Memyō no gakuha shozoku ni tsuite: *Saundarananda* to *Shōmonji* no hikaku kenkyū” 馬鳴の学派所属について: *Saundarananda* と『声聞地』の比較研究, part 1. *Bukkyō bunka* 佛教文化 12:1-65, 2002.
- Yin Shun 印順. “*Dai chido ron*” no sakusha to sono hon’yaku 『大智度論』の作者とその翻訳. Translated into Japanese by Iwaki Hidenori 岩城英規. Taiwan: Chêng-kuan Ch’u-pan Shê, 1993.
- , *Shuo I-ch’ieh yu-pu wei-chu tê lun-shu yü lun-shih chih yen-chiu* 說一切有部爲主的論書與論師之研究. 1968. Taipei: Chêng-wên Ch’u-pan Shê, 1992.