

I. Introduction

Traditionally, Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika, and Yogācāra are considered to be three clearly separated Buddhist schools. Sarvāstivāda is seen as highly conservative, Hīnayānist, and obsessed with its detailed analysis of existence and experience. Sautrāntika is supposedly more progressive and more concerned with the Buddha's spiritual message and is said to have Mahāyānist tendencies. Finally, Yogācāra is firmly on the side of Mahāyāna, having absorbed the basic Mahāyāna teaching of *dharmasūnyatā* (the emptiness of all the entities comprising existence), which informs its characteristic doctrine of idealism.

Fortunately, it would be difficult to find a contemporary scholar of Buddhism who subscribes to such a simplistic scheme. Today, we no longer take for granted that Mahāyāna Buddhism is more advanced than or superior to Hīnayāna, an appellation that has been largely superseded by non-derogatory ones such as "Śrāvakayāna," and the very definition of Mahāyāna is coming under scrutiny (see Silk 2002). The occurrence of the term Sautrāntika before Vasubandhu has been questioned (Katō 1989: 101-109), as has the existence of Sautrāntika as an actual school (Kritzer 2003a). Moreover, early Yogācāra texts have been shown to rely on the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Āgama* tradition (Schmithausen 1970), and a connection between meditators such as An Shih-kao, who were perhaps forerunners of Yogācāra, and Sarvāstivāda has been suggested (Deleanu 1993: 17; Yamabe 1997).

Still, traces of the traditional rigid classifications linger in our minds, especially since the sources for historical information about Buddhist schools and their founders (for example Vasumitra's *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* and Paramārtha's biography of Vasubandhu) accept these classifications so completely. Preconceptions regarding Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika, and Yogācāra are a particular obstacle in the study of Vasubandhu, the renowned fifth century philosopher (or was it the fourth century? or were there two Vasubandhus, one in each century?), because his name is associated with all three schools.

This book is a study of one of Vasubandhu's works, the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, which he is said to have written after he had become disillusioned with Sarvāstivāda and while he favored Sautrāntika, but before he converted to Mahāyāna and became a Yogācāra. Beginning with Hakamaya's seminal article (1986), Japanese scholars have been finding evidence that Vasubandhu sometimes relies on the *Yogācārabhūmi*, supposedly a Mahāyāna text, in his criticisms of Sarvāstivāda. These discoveries raise doubts about the actual course of Vasubandhu's career.

My systematic comparison of these two texts shows for the first time the extent of Vasubandhu's dependence on the *Yogācārabhūmi*. In order to complete this project, I have extensively referred to the **Nyāyānusāra*, Saṃghabhadra's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Below, I introduce the relevant texts and explain the significance of my results.

The *Yogācārabhūmi*

General Description of the Text

Although the *Yogācārabhūmi* is one of the most prominent early texts associated with the Yogācāra school, there is nothing even approaching a complete translation in a western language,¹ nor is there a comprehensive monograph on the text. There are several reasons for this, one of which is the sheer length of the work: the Chinese translation is about six hundred Taishō pages. Furthermore, although virtually the entire *Yogācārabhūmi* also exists in Tibetan translation, the Sanskrit text is only partially extant. Perhaps most daunting is the fact that the structure of the *Yogācārabhūmi* is extremely complicated, and even the individual sections appear to consist of various chronological layers. In what follows, I can hope to give only a very general description of the structure and contents of the text and show its place in Yogācāra literature.

It is often assumed that two *sūtras*, the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* and the *Mahāyānābhidharmasūtra*, constitute the earliest Yogācāra texts. However, Schmithausen argues that at least some portions of the *Yogācārabhūmi* predate both of these *sūtras* (1987: 11-12) as well as the three *śāstras* associated with Maitreya (*Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, *Madhyāntavibhāga*, and *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*) and the three *śāstras* by Asaṅga (*Hsien-yang sheng-chiao lun*, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, and *Mahāyānasamgraha*) (1969a: 819-822). A final group of early Yogācāra texts includes six *śāstras* by Vasubandhu (*Vyākhyāyukti*, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, *Pratītya-samutpādavyākhyā*, *Pañcaskandhaka*, *Viṃśatikā*, and *Triṃśikā*).

The influence of the *Yogācārabhūmi* is particularly evident in the *Hsien-yang*

¹ An English translation of Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation is planned in the BDK Tripitaka translation series but has not yet appeared.

sheng-chiao lun and the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, both of which on occasion quote from or closely paraphrase it. In the *Mahāyānasamgraha* and the *Triṃśikā*, concepts from the *Yogācārabhūmi* are developed more systematically. In contrast to these works by Asaṅga, the Maitreya texts contain terms such as *abhūtaparikalpa* that do not appear in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (Schmithausen 1987: 98-99), while they do not mention *ālayavijñāna*. Furthermore, they were influenced by Tathāgatagarbha ideas (Keenan 1993: 204). Nevertheless, Schmithausen asserts that the Maitreya texts "presuppose some elements" from portions of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (1987: 260-261 n. 98).

As the title indicates, the *Yogācārabhūmi* deals with the stages (*bhūmi*) of Buddhist practice. The first section of the text, the *Maulī Bhūmi*,² includes seventeen stages, and essentially the entire section exists in manuscript form. However, the Sanskrit texts of only some of these stages have been edited. In Table 1, I list only the editions of complete *bhūmis*. A complete account of published versions of all portions of the Sanskrit text can be found in Silk 2001: 153-158.

Hattori aptly characterizes the contents of the *Maulī Bhūmi*: "The *Yogācārabhūmi* enumerates, classifies, and explains all elements that relate to the practice of each of the seventeen stages in the same manner as that of the Abhidharma treatises" (1987: 525).³ However, the organization according to stages is not typical of the extant *abhidharma* texts, and it leads to a good deal of repetition, since similar topics often pertain to more than one stage.

An examination of the Chinese translation shows that the individual chapters vary considerably in length. The two longest are the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, both of which seem to have also existed as separate texts. At eighty-three Taishō pages, the shorter of these two, the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, is considerably more than twice as long as the combined third, fourth, and fifth chapters (the *Savitarkādi-bhūmi*),⁴ which comprise the third longest section. Several other *bhūmis* are only one or two Taishō pages long.

The second section, the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, is not extant in Sanskrit,

² Until recently, the Sanskrit title of the first section of the text was unclear (see Schmithausen 1969: 17-18 n. 4). However, Matsuda has discovered a reference to *maulyāṃ bhūmau* in a Sanskrit fragment of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* (1988: 18), leading Schmithausen to adopt *Maulī Bhūmi* as the best way of referring to this section (2000: 245).

³ Among others who make similar observations regarding the *abhidharma*-like nature of the *Yogācārabhūmi* are Wayman (1961: 45) and Rahula (1980: xiv).

⁴ For convenience, I use the designation *Savitarkādi-bhūmi* to refer to the *Savitarkā Savicārā Bhūmi*, *Avitarkā Vicāramātrā Bhūmi*, and *Avitarkāvicārā Bhūmi*.

although a few manuscript fragments exist.⁵ In addition to the Tibetan and Hsüan-tsang's

⁵The St. Petersburg fragments contain a portion corresponding to *Yogācārabhūmi*; zi 31a5-59b2; T. 1579: 589b19-600c10 (Matsuda 1988). Furthermore, Matsuda has edited a folio of a manuscript in Kathmandu containing a portion of the *Samādhinirmocanasūtra* as quoted in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, corresponding to T. 1579: 728c16-730c21 (1995).

Table 1⁶

Stage	Edition(s)
1. <i>Pañcavijñānakāyasamprayuktā Bhūmi</i>	<i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> : ⁷ 3-10
2. <i>Manobhūmi</i>	<i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> : 11-72
3. <i>Savitarkā Savicārā Bhūmi</i>	<i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> : 73-232
4. <i>Avitarkā Vicāramātrā Bhūmi</i>	<i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> : 73-232
5. <i>Avitarkāvicārā Bhūmi</i>	<i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> : 73-232
6. <i>Samāhitā Bhūmi</i>	
7. <i>Asamāhitā Bhūmi</i>	
8. <i>Sacittikā Bhūmi</i>	Wayman 1960, 1984 (Schmithausen 1987: 220-222)
9. <i>Acittikā Bhūmi</i>	Wayman 1960, 1984 (Schmithausen 1987: 220-222)
10. <i>Śrutamayī Bhūmi</i>	
11. <i>Cintāmayī Bhūmi</i>	
12. <i>Bhāvanāmayī Bhūmi</i>	
13. <i>Śrāvakahūmi</i>	<i>Śrāvakahūmi</i> ⁸
14. <i>Pratyekabuddhabhūmi</i>	Wayman 1960
15. <i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i>	<i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i> (Dutt); <i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i> (Wogihara)
16. <i>Sopadhikā Bhūmi</i>	Schmithausen 1991
17. <i>Nirupadhikā Bhūmi</i>	Schmithausen 1991

⁶ I have followed Wayman (1961: 43) in listing the names of the *Bhūmis* as they appear in Bhattacharya's text (*Yogācārabhūmi*: 3.7-12). Note that the third, fourth, and fifth *bhūmis* are not divided in the text. Below, I refer to them as *Savitarkādi-bhūmi*. Also, in the Tibetan translation, the *Śrāvakahūmi* and *Bodhisattvabhūmi* are contained in separate volumes from the remainder of the *Maulī Bhūmi*.

⁷ Bhattacharya's edition of the first five *bhūmis*.

⁸ Shukla's edition. A partial edition is found in Wayman 1961. The *Śrāvakahūmi* study group at Taishō University (Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 大正大学総合佛教研究所声聞地研究会) has started publishing a new edition with a Japanese translation. In addition to some portions published in periodicals (see Silk 2001: 156), the first chapter of the text has appeared in book form (Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Shōmonji Kenkyūkai 1998).

Chinese translation, there is also a partial translation by Paramārtha entitled *Chüeh-ting tsang lun* 決定藏論 (T. 1584).⁹ Wayman describes the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* as “a commentary on the seventeen *bhūmis* in their order” (1961: 43); in fact, as is noted in both the Chinese (T. 1579: 694c16) and the Tibetan translations (*Yogācārabhūmi*; zi 300a6), the *Pratyekabuddhabhūmi* is not commented on in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*. Wayman’s description essentially agrees with that of Ui, who, relying on the commentary of Jinaputra (Tsui-sheng-tzu 最勝子),¹⁰ says that in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* various obscure but important points from the *Maulī Bhūmi* are examined and authoritative explanations are given, hence the word *viniścaya* in the title (1958: 10).

The order of the remaining three sections differs between the Chinese (**Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī*, *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī*, *Vastusamgrahaṇī*) and the Tibetan editions (*Vastusamgrahaṇī*, *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī*, **Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī*).¹¹ These sections, too, are not extant in Sanskrit.¹² The **Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī* and *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī* are both very short, ten and twelve Taishō pages. Again relying on Jinaputra, Ui summarizes the contents of these sections: the **Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī*

⁹ The contents of this text correspond to the first part of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* (*Yogācārabhūmi*; zi 1a1-60b7; T. 1579: 579a8-601a25).

¹⁰ *Yü-ch’ieh shih-ti lun shih* 瑜伽師地論釋 (T. 1580).

¹¹ The Tibetan translation actually contains a sixth section, **Vinayasamgrahaṇī*, between the *Vastusamgrahaṇī* and the *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī*. In the Chinese translation, most of this section is included in the *Vastusamgrahaṇī*, although, as far as I can tell, the first several folios of the Tibetan **Vinayasamgrahaṇī* (*Yogācārabhūmi*; yi 1a1-5a8) do not correspond to anything in the Chinese. The corresponding portion in the Chinese begins at T. 1579: 868c6. The end of the **Vinayasamgrahaṇī* (*Yogācārabhūmi*; yi 27a2) coincides with T. 1579: 877c2. The Tibetan text abbreviates a list of definitions of five types of powers after the second item (*bsam pa’i stobs*, *i lē li* 意樂力), while the Chinese goes on to define all five items (through T. 1579: 877c17).

The Sanskrit titles of the **Vinayasamgrahaṇī* and the **Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī* are not attested. Hakamaya proposes **Vyākhyasamgrahaṇī* instead of **Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī* (2001: 89). For the remaining titles, see Schmithausen 1969: 18 ns. 5-8.

¹² Matsuda has identified and edited a one-folio fragment of the *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī* that is kept in Kathmandu (1994). In the same article, he also reconstructs a portion of the text, identifies the *sūtras* from which the words under discussion in the text are drawn, and shows the significance of this little-studied section of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

describes in detail the principles for interpreting scripture; the *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī* collects, classifies, and explains synonyms found in the *sūtras*; the *Vastusamgrahaṇī* explains all the significant contents of the *tripitaka* (1958: 9).

The *Vastusamgrahaṇī* is by far the longest and most important of these last three sections. In the Chinese translation, it consists of three main parts, concerning *sūtra* (*ch’i-ching shih* 契經事 = **Sūtravastu*),¹³ *vinaya* (*tiao-fu shih* 調伏事 = **Vinayavastu*),¹⁴ and *abhidharma* (*pên-mu shih* 本母事 = **Māṭṛkāvastu*).¹⁵ The first and longest part is to a large extent a commentary on the *Samyuktāgama* (Mukai 1985).

Composition and Authorship

Traditionally, the *Yogācārabhūmi* is considered to be the work of a single author: Maitreya, according to the Chinese translation; Asaṅga, according to Tibetan sources. However, Chinese sources say that Maitreya descended from heaven to transmit the *Yogācārabhūmi* to Asaṅga, so in both traditions the text is closely associated with Asaṅga. Some modern scholars, notably Wayman (1989: 201-202) and Mukai (see Schmithausen 1987: 183), insist that Asaṅga was the sole author of the entire *Yogācārabhūmi*. Others, like Hakamaya, maintain that Asaṅga was at least the compiler of the text (see Schmithausen 1987: 183). However, Schmithausen thinks that the text is a compilation of material that varies considerably in age and that the authors and compilers cannot be identified (most recently, 1987: 13-14, 184-185). Many scholars today agree with Schmithausen on this point, including me (see Kritzer 1999: 13-17 for a more detailed discussion of this issue).

Among both those who insist that Asaṅga alone composed the *Yogācārabhūmi* and those who believe that it is a compilation, there is some disagreement about the chronological order of the various sections. Wayman states that Asaṅga composed the text as follows: 1) the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and the *Samāhitā Bhūmi* when he was very young; 2) the *Paryāyasamgrahaṇī*, the *Vastusamgrahaṇī*, the *Śrutamayī Bhūmi*, the *Cintāmayī Bhūmi*, and the *Bhāvanāmayī Bhūmi* before being converted to Mahāyāna; 3) the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, the remainder of the *Maulī Bhūmi*, and the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* after his conversion (Wayman 1989: 203). According to Schmithausen, there are three main layers in the following chronological order: 1) parts of the *Maulī Bhūmi*, including the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, and the *Vastusamgrahaṇī*; 2) the remainder of the *Maulī Bhūmi*; 3) the *Viniścaya-*

¹³ T. 1579: 772b16-868b22. This corresponds to the entire Tibetan *Vastusamgrahaṇī* (*Yogācārabhūmi*; i 143a1-381b6).

¹⁴ T. 1579: 868c6-878a24. As mentioned in note 11, the first portion (through T. 1579: 877c22) corresponds to the majority of the Tibetan **Vinayasamgrahaṇī* (*Yogācārabhūmi*; yi 5a8-27a2).

¹⁵ T. 1579: 878a25-881c2. This part is entirely lacking in the Tibetan.

saṃgrahaṇī (1987: 14). Aramaki, on the other hand, mentions seven layers of the *Yogācārabhūmi* in a list of fourteen strata of early Yogācāra texts: 1) the *Śrāvakabhūmi*; 2) the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī*; 3) the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*; 4) the Maitreya, Viśālamati, Paramārthasaṃbhava, and Guṇākara chapters of the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*; 5) what Schmithausen refers to as the Proof, Pravṛtti, and Nivṛtti portions of the exposition of *ālayavijñāna* in the *Viniścaya-samgrahaṇī*; 6) the *Sacittikā Bhūmi* of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*; 7) the *Maulī Bhūmi* excluding the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (2000: 39 n. 2).

While Wayman believes that Asaṅga composed the *Yogācārabhūmi* section by section, both Schmithausen and Aramaki see the development of the text as a gradual accretion of material from various sources. Thus they do not simply identify sections that are earlier or later; rather they see different strata even within the same section. If one accepts their premises, then hardly any characteristic can be attributed to the *Yogācārabhūmi* as a whole. However, the heterogeneous contents of the text suggest that the Schmithausen-Aramaki approach is correct, even though the exact stratification remains uncertain.

Nobody presumes to give an exact date for the *Yogācārabhūmi* or for its various strata. Those who attribute the text to Asaṅga naturally place the text during Asaṅga's lifetime, usually thought to span the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century. However, if the text is a compilation assembled over a period of time, it seems likely that the oldest portions of the text might have been composed somewhat earlier than the end of the fourth century.

Doctrinal Content

The *Yogācārabhūmi* is one of the oldest texts, if not the oldest, associated with the Yogācāra school, and it contains some of the philosophical concepts distinctive to that school. Schmithausen has shown that the *Yogācārabhūmi* does not contain all of the doctrines characteristic of later Yogācāra texts.¹⁶ Nor does it maintain a consistent doctrinal position. Furthermore, the same terms can have somewhat different meanings in different sections of the text. Nevertheless, certain characteristically Yogācāra terms and doctrines appear, sometimes for the first time, in the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

The most striking of these doctrines is *ālayavijñāna*, "the container or storehouse of the latent residues or Impressions of previous actions (*karman*) and mind process, or...the basic layer of mind processes or even the very basic constituent of the whole living being" (Schmithausen 1987: 1). The term *ālayavijñāna* is completely

¹⁶ In addition to *abhūtaparikalpa*, Schmithausen mentions the term *vijñaptimātra*, which appears, but only once, in a quotation from the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* (1987: 32, 297 n. 221).

lacking in much of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, but it is explained in great detail in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi*, which includes a logical "proof" of its existence. The development of the concept of *ālayavijñāna* is explored thoroughly in Schmithausen 1987, and studies of *ālayavijñāna* will probably rely greatly on his work for some time to come.¹⁷

Another term important for the Yogācāra school that is found frequently in the *Yogācārabhūmi* is *bīja* (seed). Although the term *bīja* is used metaphorically in the *Āgamas*, it is first seen as a technical term in the early Yogācāra literature, where *bījas* comprise or are contained in the *ālayavijñāna*. Yamabe identifies seven different senses in which the term appears in the *Yogācārabhūmi*: seeds of the future life; seeds of *kleśas*; seeds of karma; seeds of good *dharmas*; seeds of the future *pravṛttivijñānas*; seeds of *rūpa*; seeds of all *dharmas* (1989). These seeds are not considered to be real *dharmas*; rather, they are designations for the potential of beings to produce good or bad results.

Other distinctive Yogācāra concepts found in the text include *kliṣṭamanas* (defiled mind) and *āśrayaparāvṛtti* (transformation of the basis of existence), as well as the three natures, i.e., *parikalpitasvabhāva* (imaginary nature), *paratantra-svabhāva* (dependent nature), and *pariniṣpannasvabhāva* (ultimate nature). But it must be emphasized that these terms appear only sporadically. Unlike in later Yogācāra texts, most of them are not systematically presented.

In addition, certain Sarvāstivādin positions are refuted in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Most important is the doctrine of *sarvāstivāda* itself, namely the idea that past, present, and future *dharmas* all really exist. The real existence, accepted by Sarvāstivāda, of various other items, such as the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* and *avijñaptirūpa*, is denied in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, which frequently appeals to the operation of *bījas* to explain phenomena that according to Sarvāstivāda result from real *dharmas*.

Finally, much of the contents of the *Yogācārabhūmi* is not specifically Yogācāra at all. As I have mentioned above, a large percentage of the text is non-Mahāyāna *abhidharma*. Wayman argues strenuously that Asaṅga was a Mahīśāsaka before converting to Mahāyāna and that his *abhidharma* is Mahīśāsaka *abhidharma* (1961: 26-29; 1989), but his arguments are convincingly criticized by Schmithausen (1970: 94-95, 115-119).¹⁸ Certainly, in many cases the *Yogācārabhūmi* is in essential

¹⁷ An example of a recent study is the psychological discussion in Waldron 2003.

¹⁸ However, Wayman receives some support from Bareau, who points out the similarity between the list of eight *asaṃskṛtadharmas* in texts attributed to Asaṅga, including the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and a list of nine *asaṃskṛtas* attributed to the Mahīśāsakas in Vasumitra's *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*. Bareau thinks that this proves conclusively that Asaṅga was a Mahīśāsaka before he converted to Mahāyāna (1993). Hakamaya also points out the reliance of the *Yogācārabhūmi* on Mahīśāsaka here (1990: 254). On the other hand, Schmithausen reasonably maintains that the

agreement with Sarvāstivāda, and it appears that, although it disagrees with Sarvāstivāda on some extremely important points, the *Yogācārabhūmi* is closely connected to the Sarvāstivāda tradition.

The Abhidharmakośabhāṣya

General Description of the Text

Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is best known as a compendium of Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma*, but it is also famous for its criticisms of certain points of Sarvāstivādin doctrine. In contrast to the *Yogācārabhūmi*, it is completely extant in Sanskrit and is available in two editions.¹⁹ There are two Chinese translations, Hsüan-tsang's (T. 1558) and Paramārtha's (T. 1559), as well as a Tibetan translation (Tohoku 4090, Peking 5591). Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation has been completely translated into French by La Vallée Poussin (1971),²⁰ and this French translation has in turn been translated into English by Pruden (1988-1990). Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation has also been completely translated into Japanese by Nishi in the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō* series (Bidon-bu 25-26). In addition, several chapters have been translated separately into Japanese from the Sanskrit (Funahashi 1987; Sakurabe and Odani 1991; Sakurabe, Odani, and Honjō 2004) and the Tibetan (Yamaguchi and Funahashi 1955). Some important resources for the study of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* include Saeki's annotated edition of the Chinese translation (1978), Hirakawa's index to the Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan (1973-1978), and Fukuhara's study of the *kārikas* (1973, 1986).

The Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma* literature can be divided into several general groups.²¹ First are the seven canonical texts, listed here in the chronological order suggested by Cox (Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998: 177 ff.): *Sanḡītiparyāya*, *Dharmaskandha*, *Prajñaptiśāstra*, *Vijñānakāya*, *Dhātukāya*, *Prakaraṇapāda*, and

fact that the *Yogācārabhūmi* contains some Mahīśāsaka teachings, including this list of *asaṃskṛtas*, is not enough to prove that the text is largely based on Mahīśāsaka (1970: 119).

¹⁹ *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, edited by P. Pradhan (1967), and *Abhidharmakośa and Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, edited by Swami Dwarkidas Shastri (1973). The Pradhan edition is more widely used by scholars.

²⁰ In an earlier publication (1914-1918), La Vallée Poussin also translated Chapter Three from the Tibetan translation.

²¹ The following discussion is not intended to be exhaustive, and not all *abhidharma* texts will be mentioned.

Jñānaprasthāna.²² Next are three texts entitled *Vibhāṣā*, nominally commentaries on the *Jñānaprasthāna*, among which the one commonly known as the **Mahāvibhāṣā* (T. 1545)²³ is the longest and most famous. These texts contain discussions of various positions on doctrinal points, and the **Mahāvibhāṣā* establishes the orthodox position for the branch of the Sarvāstivāda school known as the Kāśmīra Vaibhāṣika (Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998: 237-238). The name Vaibhāṣika, which is frequently used more or less synonymously with Sarvāstivāda, is derived from the title of this text. The *Vibhāṣās* are followed by three texts known as **Abhidharmahṛdaya*: the **Abhidharmahṛdayaśāstra* of Dharmaśrī or Dharmaśreṣṭhin, the **Abhidharmahṛdayaśāstra* of Upaśānta, and the **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*. According to Dessein, these texts are for the most part organized according to the four noble truths, with various topics discussed in an appropriate order (Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998: 255-269).

The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* closely follows the structure of the **Abhidharmahṛdaya* texts (Frauwallner 1995: 137-140; Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998: 269-274). It purports to give an account of the *abhidharma* of the Kāśmīra Vaibhāṣika school but frequently adopts unorthodox positions, especially those associated with Sautrāntika. (More will be said about this later.) There are several reasons for the enduring fame of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. First of all, despite the deviations from orthodoxy, the text gives the clearest and most complete account of the Sarvāstivādin system. Furthermore, the arguments for different points of view, orthodox and unorthodox, are skillfully presented so that they reveal the issues that are really at stake. It is also possible that the fact that Vasubandhu's name is associated with Mahāyāna as well as Sarvāstivāda added to the prestige of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* in China, Tibet, Mongolia, and Japan. Finally, among modern scholars, its availability in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese, not to mention the excellent French translation, make it uniquely accessible among *abhidharma* works.

The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* inspired some critical reaction from the defenders of Sarvāstivāda, notably Saṃghabhadra's **Nyāyānusāra* (extant only in Chinese)²⁴ and the *Abhidharmadīpa* (author unknown, extant only in Sanskrit). In addition, eight commentaries, originally in Sanskrit, are found in the Tibetan Bstan-'gyur, of

²² For complete titles, Taishō text numbers, and detailed discussions of authorship, contents, etc., see Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998: 177-229.

²³ The term **Mahāvibhāṣā* is not attested in Sanskrit, and I use it here only because it is the most common designation for this text. Elsewhere, I refer to T. 1545 as "the *Vibhāṣā*."

²⁴ *A-p'i-ta-mo shun cheng-li lun* 阿毘達磨順正理論 (T. 1562).

which Yaśomitra's *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*²⁵ (available in Sanskrit, as well) and Sthiramati's *Tattvārtha*²⁶ are particularly noteworthy.²⁷ In China, three of Hsüan-tsang's disciples, Shen-t'ai 神泰, P'u-kuang 普光, and Fa-pao 法寶, also wrote extensive commentaries.²⁸

The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* contains nine chapters (see Table 2). The first eight chapters consist of verses, which generally are consistent with Sarvāstivāda, and commentary on each verse, in which Vasubandhu often discusses and sometimes accepts positions that disagree with Sarvāstivāda. The ninth chapter, often characterized as an appendix, is entirely prose. Although many commentaries cover all nine chapters, Saṃghabhadra's **Nyāyānusāra* ends with chapter eight. Dessein refers to chapters three and nine as "additional chapters," since they do not fit into a division of the entire text according to the four truths, a division that he traces back to the **Abhidharmahṛdaya* texts (Willemen, Dessein, and Cox 1998: 255-274).

Vasubandhu's Career

The traditional account of Vasubandhu's career is found in Paramārtha's *P'o-su-p'an-tou fa-shih chuan* 婆蘇槃豆法師傳 (T. 2049; translated in Takakusu 1904):²⁹ Vasubandhu was originally a Sarvāstivādin, and he composed the verses (*karikās*) of the *Abhidharmakośa* from the Sarvāstivādin point of view, in accordance with the teaching of the *Vibhāṣā*. However, when he wrote his own commentary on his verses (the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*), he frequently rejected orthodox Sarvāstivāda in favor of Sautrāntika positions. Saṃghabhadra, an orthodox Sarvāstivādin from Kashmir, then wrote two works, one of which was extremely critical of Vasubandhu. Later, Vasubandhu converted to Mahāyāna under the influence of his older brother, Asaṅga, and he wrote a number of commentaries on Mahāyāna *sūtras* and *śāstras*, as well as some Yogācāra *śāstras* of his own.

Like most dates in the history of Indian Buddhism, the date of Vasubandhu is

²⁵ Tohoku 4092; Peking 5593.

²⁶ Tohoku 4421; Peking 5875.

²⁷ Regarding Indian commentaries in Tibetan translation, see Mejer 1991.

²⁸ Respectively, *Chü-she lun shu* 俱舍論疏 (*Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 1.8.3-4), *Chü-she lun chi* 俱舍論記 (T. 1821), and *Chü-she lun shu* 俱舍論疏 (T. 1822). The last two of these are frequently referred to in Saeki 1978, on which La Vallée Poussin (1971) often seems to rely in turn.

²⁹ Other accounts are found in the works of Hsüan-tsang and of Tibetan historians, particularly Bu-ston. Cox summarizes the differences among these accounts (1995: 53-55).

Table 2

Title ³⁰	Subject-matter
1. <i>Dhātunirdeśa</i>	Elements of existence
2. <i>Indriyanirdeśa</i>	Sense faculties
3. <i>Lokanirdeśa</i>	Cosmology
4. <i>Karmanirdeśa</i>	Action and its results
5. <i>Anuśayanirdeśa</i>	Defilements
6. <i>Mārgapudgalanirdeśa</i>	The path and the noble ones (<i>āryapudgala</i>)
7. <i>Jñānanirdeśa</i>	Knowledge
8. <i>Samāpattinirdeśa</i>	Meditation
9. <i>Pudgalanirdeśa</i>	Refutation of a self or soul

³⁰ For the titles of the first eight chapters, I follow Pradhan's Sanskrit text. For the ninth chapter, I follow common usage, although I have not found any textual attestation of *Pudgalanirdeśa*.

not known exactly. Since different dates appear in Chinese sources, and since the number of works attributed to Vasubandhu is very large, his date has been a matter of considerable controversy among scholars. In what follows, I give a simplified account of the complex debate about Vasubandhu's career.³¹

The source of the problem is that Paramārtha gives (or is reported to give) two different dates, one in the fourth century and one in the fifth. The later date appears in his biography of Vasubandhu, while the earlier date is attributed by K'uei-chi 窺基 and Hui-hsiang 慧祥 to works of Paramārtha that are no longer extant (Frauwallner 1951: 3-5). In order to make sense of this discrepancy, Frauwallner, in a well-known monograph, *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu*, proposes his theory of two Vasubandhus. According to Frauwallner, Vasubandhu the elder was the younger brother of Asaṅga. Frauwallner identifies this Vasubandhu the elder with the Vṛddhācārya Vasubandhu and the Sthavira Vasubandhu mentioned in the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (1951: 21-22). This elder Vasubandhu became a believer in Mahāyāna, and he was the author of many Mahāyāna works, including the *Śataśāstra*, *Madhyāntavibhāga*, *Daśabhūmikaśāstra*, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkopadeśa*, *Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, and *Bodhicittotpādanaśāstra* (1951: 55). Vasubandhu the younger, on the other hand, was a Sarvāstivādin who moved in the direction of Sautrāntika but never converted to Mahāyāna. He was the author of the *Abhidharmakośa* and *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. The only other work that Frauwallner attributes to Vasubandhu the younger at this point is the *Paramārthasaptatikā*, and he withholds judgement concerning the *Viṃśatikā* and *Triṃśikā*, saying, "We must therefore employ other means in order to determine the author of these works; we must gain the necessary basis from their contents and the doctrines upheld in them" (1951: 56). He does not mention by name the *Vyākhyāyukti*, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, *Pratītyasamutpādayākhyā*, *Pañcaskandhaka*, and *Trisvabhāvanirdeśa*, or the commentaries on the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, *Mahāyānasamgraha*, and *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*.³²

Schmithausen, following the principle stated by Frauwallner, has examined the doctrinal features of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the various Yogācāra texts attributed to Vasubandhu. In his first publication concerning this issue, he basically agrees with Frauwallner's theory but added the *Viṃśatikā* and *Triṃśikā* to the list of works by the author of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (1967: 136), an

³¹ Perhaps the clearest account of this controversy is Kajiyama's (Nagao, Kajiyama, and Aramaki 1976: 419-422). A concise English summary can be found in Griffiths 1986: 164-165 n. 9. Other, more detailed accounts include: Jaini 1958b; Wayman 1961: 19-24; Hirakawa 1973-1978 v. 1: ii-x; Kochumuttom 1982: xi-xiv; and Mejer 1991: 3-13.

³² This is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all the works that have ever been attributed to Vasubandhu.

addition later accepted by Frauwallner (1969: 425). In his most recent statement on this subject, Schmithausen designates the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *Vyākhyāyukti*, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, *Pratītyasamutpādayākhyā*, *Pañcaskandhaka*, *Viṃśatikā*, and *Triṃśikā* as "works of Vasubandhu the Kośakāra." Although he indicates that the texts he attributes to the Kośakāra contain certain terms and ideas, particularly *saṃtatipariṇāmaviśeṣa*, that are not found in the "Vasubandhu commentaries" (on the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, etc.) and the *Trisvabhāvanirdeśa*, Schmithausen now refuses to commit himself regarding the authorship of the latter group of texts or the question of two Vasubandhus (1987: 262-263 n. 101).

Frauwallner's theory has been attacked by various scholars since shortly after it was published, beginning with a very critical article by Sakurabe (1952), who, like Frauwallner, refers to a wide range of Chinese sources. Addressing the issue from a more doctrinal point of view, Jaini argues that criticisms in the *Abhidharmadīpa* of Vasubandhu's "Sautrāntika" views show how close these views are to Mahāyāna. Therefore, Jaini thinks that the account of Vasubandhu's career in Paramārtha's biography is reliable and that after writing the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Vasubandhu went on to compose Mahāyāna works. Regarding Vasubandhu's date and his relation to Asaṅga, Jaini is noncommittal. He does not deny the existence of an older Vasubandhu (the Vṛddhācārya mentioned in the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*), but, unlike Frauwallner, he does not think that Paramārtha conflated two Vasubandhus in his biography (Jaini 1958b).³³ Hirakawa challenges Frauwallner's interpretation of his Chinese sources and arrives at conclusions similar to Jaini's (1973-1978). In general, Japanese scholars do not accept Frauwallner's theory;³⁴ instead, they account for differences among the various texts in terms of Vasubandhu's doctrinal development (Nagao, Kajiyama, and Aramaki 1976: 421).³⁵ Most recently, Skilling sharply questions Frauwallner's methodology and attempts to establish the works of the Kośakāra on the basis of either cross-references in Vasubandhu's texts (or references by Vasubandhu's commentators) or "the evidence of style, sources used, methodology, and development of ideas" (2000: 299). Skilling includes as works by the Kośakāra the same texts as Schmithausen, as well as the *Gāthāsamgraha* texts³⁶ and the *Trisvabhāvanirdeśa*. The authorship of the commen-

³³ Wayman, Kochumuttom, and Griffiths generally agree with Jaini, while Mejer is somewhat ambiguous (1991: 111).

³⁴ Hakamaya (2001: 107) cites works of Harada (1996, 1997, 1998) and Fukuda (1998b) as representative examples.

³⁵ Hakamaya (2001: 107) has assembled an extensive bibliography of recent Japanese studies along this line, including those of Matsuda (1982a, 1982b, 1984, 1985) and Muroji (1993). Another recent contribution is Iwamoto 2000.

³⁶ These include three texts only extant in Tibetan: *Gāthāsamgrahaśāstra*, *Gāthārtha-*

taries on the Mahāyāna *sūtras* or the Maitreya texts remains a matter about which scholars are reluctant to say anything definite.

It is probably fair to say that most scholars today, while admitting the existence of other figures named Vasubandhu, agree on the single authorship of at least the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *Vyākhyāyukti*, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, *Pratītyasamutpādayākyā*, *Pañcaskandhaka*, *Viṃśatikā*, and *Triṃśikā*. My comparison of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi* provides further evidence of Vasubandhu the Kośakāra's affinity for Yogācāra and thus supports Jaini's arguments against Frauwallner's theory. However, I do not directly address the issue of the authorship of the works attributed to Vasubandhu.

The Question of Sautrāntika

Writers about Buddhism confidently use the term "Sautrāntika" to refer to one of the four representative schools of Indian Buddhism (along with Sarvāstivāda, Mādhyamika, and Yogācāra). In fact, little is known about who the Sautrāntikas were and what they believed. In the last twenty years, however, a number of studies, mainly originating in Japan, have begun to question old assumptions about Sautrāntika, and a 2003 issue of the *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* is dedicated to this topic. The brief discussion in the present book is based on my introduction to the *JIAS* issue, "Sautrāntika Reconsidered" (Kritzer 2003a).

As the name suggests, a Sautrāntika is one who follows the *sūtras*, and Sautrāntikas are generally considered to be people who disagreed with the Sarvāstivādin reliance on *śāstra*, that is to say, on the Vaibhāṣika *abhidharma* texts. What little we know of the history of the school comes from Vasumitra's *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*, specifically in Hsüan-tsang's translation (*I-pu-tsung lun lun* 異部宗輪論 [T. 2031]), and from several works of Hsüan-tsang's disciple, K'uei-chi. In the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun shu chi* 成唯識論述記, K'uei-chi gives the names of two early Sautrāntika teachers, Kumāralāta, whom he also calls "Dārṣṭāntika" (T. 1830: 274a8-13), and Śrīlāta (T. 1830: 358a10-12). The term Dārṣṭāntika is also used to refer to a dissident group within Sarvāstivāda, and there are various opinions concerning the relationship between Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika. In the commentaries on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the terms are very close to being synonymous, but it has also been suggested that Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika are, respectively, positive and negative designations for the same group or that there were two distinct groups with these names (Cox 1995: 37-41).

saṃgrahaśāstra, and *Eka-gāthābhāṣya*. Despite the fact that the *Gāthāsaṃgrahaśāstra* was translated into both German and English in the nineteenth century (Skilling 2000: 306 n. 22), these texts are rarely referred to, and I am grateful to Skilling for bringing them to my attention.

Our main source of information about early Dārṣṭāntika/Sautrāntika doctrine is the *Vibhāṣā*, where there are some eighty-six references to Dārṣṭāntika ideas (Katō 1989: 70). The term Sautrāntika, on the other hand, does not appear to have been used in the original text of the *Vibhāṣā* (Katō 1989: 113-119). Nor is Sautrāntika found in the **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya*, although three opinions are attributed there to Dārṣṭāntika. Harivarman's **Tattvasiddhiśāstra*, although it does not mention either Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika by name, frequently agrees with the Dārṣṭāntika positions in the *Vibhāṣā* (Mizuno 1930).

Thus, it seems as though the earliest occurrence of the word Sautrāntika is in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, where nineteen positions are attributed to "the Sautrāntikas" (Kritzer 2003b); Vasubandhu agrees with these positions. Only two positions are attributed to the Dārṣṭāntikas,³⁷ on the other hand, and Vasubandhu disagrees with these positions (Katō 1989: 81-84; Cox 1995: 39). This suggests that Vasubandhu does not consider Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika to be identical. Among the Sautrāntika opinions of which Vasubandhu approves are rejections of the reality of various *dharmas* accepted as real by Sarvāstivāda, including the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* (forces not associated with mind), the *asaṃskṛtadharmas* (unconditioned *dharmas*), the *anuśayas* (latent defilements), and *vijñaptirūpa* (manifested matter) and *avijñaptirūpa* (unmanifested matter). Vasubandhu also agrees with the Sautrāntika rejection of the reality of past and future, the insistence that one cannot fall from arhatship, and the theory of seeds (*bīja*) that appears in many Sautrāntika explanations.

Many of these positions are also found in Yogācāra texts, especially the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and scholars have characterized Sautrāntika as a kind of bridge between Hīnayāna Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna Yogācāra. This explanation fits well with the story of Vasubandhu's career as told by Paramārtha: Vasubandhu was on his way to accepting Mahāyāna when he wrote the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

However, some suggest an even closer affinity between Vasubandhu's Sautrāntika positions and Yogācāra. For example, Jaini points out that the author of the *Abhidharmadīpa* reviles Vasubandhu as a *vaitulika*, a believer in Mahāyāna, and he stresses the similarity between some of Vasubandhu's statements and Yogācāra doctrine (1959: 247-248). Hakamaya has shown that the term *pūrvācāryaḥ* (former teachers) in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* refers to Yogācāra teachers, with whose explanations Vasubandhu often agrees (1986). Yamabe has identified the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* as Vasubandhu's source for his *bīja* theory (1990) as well as for his idea of the mutual perfuming of *nāma* and *rūpa* (2000a). In addition, Yamabe has identified the *Manobhūmi* as the source of a statement, attributed to the *pūrvācāryas*, concerning the transition from the *antarābhava* to birth in the hells (1999). Miyashita (1986) and Harada (1993, 1996) have also noted similarities between the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

³⁷ Vasubandhu mentions the term three times, but two of his references are to the same Dārṣṭāntika opinion.

In 1993, on the basis of very limited evidence, I argued that Vasubandhu's so-called Sautrāntika definition of consciousness as a member of the formula of conditioned origination actually reflected Yogācāra beliefs, in other words, that Vasubandhu was inserting Yogācāra ideas into the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* under the guise of Sautrāntika. In a number of publications since then, I have identified a variety of correspondences between the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi* (1994a, 1994b, 1996, 1998, 1999). Most recently, I have examined all the occurrences of the term Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and identified correspondences for a large majority in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (2003b).³⁸

It seems as though these corresponding positions in the *Yogācārabhūmi* can be categorized in two groups. One group consists of ideas that cannot be traced to the Dārṣṭāntikas of the *Vibhāṣā* and are in fact not found in texts earlier than the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Some examples include the theory of mutual perfuming, mentioned above, and the idea of *saṃtatipariṇāma*. The other group includes ideas (for example, the denial of the reality of the *cittaviprayuktasamskāras*) that are also found, frequently in a less developed form, in the *Vibhāṣā*, where they are attributed to Dārṣṭāntika. It is Vasubandhu who first calls positions belonging to both of these groups "Sautrāntika."

However, not all of the Dārṣṭāntika positions are found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and it seems as though Vasubandhu accepts and labels as Sautrāntika only ones that are. Furthermore, Vasubandhu also criticizes, without using the term Dārṣṭāntika, a number of positions attributed to individual Dārṣṭāntika teachers, such as Śrīlāta. As Harada points out, in the case of many of these positions, Vasubandhu agrees with the *Yogācārabhūmi* in favoring the Sarvāstivāda opinion over the Dārṣṭāntika (1993: 109-110). It must also be noted that Vasubandhu does not accept all the Dārṣṭāntika opinions contained in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. The two positions attributed to Dārṣṭāntika by Vasubandhu in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* can both be found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. But in each case, the *Yogācārabhūmi* elsewhere also contains the Sarvāstivādin position, with which Vasubandhu in these cases agrees.³⁹

It is clear that there is a close relation between Vasubandhu's Sautrāntika

³⁸ In the same article, I examine a number of positions in the *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* characterized by Lamotte as Sautrāntika and identify definite or probable correspondences in the *Yogācārabhūmi* for all of these positions.

³⁹ Position 1: The Dārṣṭāntikas say that there are four possibilities regarding the experience of the results of karma. This statement implies eight types of karma, three of which are determined according to the lifetime in which their results will be experienced but undetermined as to whether they will be experienced at all. Vasubandhu rejects this, saying that if karma is determined according to the lifetime in which it comes to fruition, then its result definitely must be experienced (Pradhan: 230: 10-13; La Vallée Poussin 1971, v. 3: 116-117).

ideas and the *Yogācārabhūmi*, but the precise nature of that relation is difficult to understand. Yamabe remarks that the passages in the *Yogācārabhūmi* to which the Sautrāntika positions in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* correspond do not appear to presuppose the idea of *ālayavijñāna* (2000b: 68). Furthermore, one idea that appears in several of the passages common to the two texts is *saṃtatipariṇāma*, which may be a concept that is superseded by the theory of *ālayavijñāna*. If one accepts Schmithausen's general line of reasoning, one might say that these passages were composed before the idea of *ālayavijñāna* was formulated. The notion of *saṃtatipariṇāma* (transformation of the life-stream)⁴⁰ is also found in Vasubandhu's *Viṃśatikā*, where Schmithausen characterizes it as a "trace" of Sautrāntika (1967); presumably, he considers it to be a Sautrāntika element in the *Yogācārabhūmi* as well.

Thus, one explanation for the correspondences between Vasubandhu's Sautrāntika positions and passages in the *Yogācārabhūmi* is that the authors of both texts rely on a common source that represented an intermediate stage between Sarvāstivāda and fully developed Yogācāra, based on the concept of *ālayavijñāna*. But we search in vain for any text earlier than the *Yogācārabhūmi* containing ideas

The *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Savitarkādi-bhūmi* gives the same four possibilities as the Dārṣṭāntikas (*Yogācārabhūmi*: zi 152a3-4; T. 1579: 635c5-6). The *Yü-chieh-lun chi* (T. 1828: 362b10-22) discusses this passage and mentions that Sautrāntika and Sauryodayika accept the Mahāyāna interpretation concerning this issue and arrive at eight types of karma (I am indebted to Yamabe Nobuyoshi for this reference).

The *Savitarkādi-bhūmi*, on the other hand, gives the traditional explanation, which Vasubandhu accepts: karma can be determined or undetermined regarding whether its result will be experienced, and there are three possibilities regarding the lifetime in which it comes to fruition: in the present life; in the immediately following life; in a later life (*Yogācārabhūmi*: 189.15-16, 189.19-190.1; *Yogācārabhūmi*: dzi 110a5, 110a8; T. 1579: 319b3, 319b7-9).

Position 2: The Dārṣṭāntikas say that *abhidhyā*, *vyāpāda*, and *mithyādrṣṭi* are mental karma. Vasubandhu disagrees and accepts the Sarvāstivādin view that they are *karmapatha* but not karma (Pradhan 237.15-20, 248.2-12; La Vallée Poussin 1971, v. 3: 136, 168-170; see Katō 1989: 81-84 for detailed analyses of these passages).

The *Savitarkādi-bhūmi* defines the three as mental karma (*Yogācārabhūmi*: 182.9-14; *Yogācārabhūmi*: dzi 105b5-8; T. 1579: 317b22-29).

The *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Savitarkādi-bhūmi* says that they are *karmapatha* but not karma (*Yogācārabhūmi*: zi 153b3; T. 1579: 636a29).

Schmithausen discusses these passages (1970: 117). Again, I thank Yamabe Nobuyoshi for the reference.

⁴⁰ Cox's translation (1995: 95).

such as *saṃtatipariṇāmaśiṣa* or the mutual seeding of body and mind, according to which mind contains the seeds of the physical sense organs, and vice versa. And as we have seen, the term Sautrāntika is not attested before the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

My own conclusion is that in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* Vasubandhu uses the term Sautrāntika to designate positions in the *Yogācārabhūmi* that he prefers to those of orthodox Sarvāstivāda. As I argue elsewhere (1999: 203-204; 2003b), Vasubandhu in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* adjusts the traditional Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma* so that it no longer conflicts with the central theories of Yogācāra. Unlike in the Yogācāra texts attributed to him, his purpose in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is not to propound or defend these theories. Therefore, he does not mention *ālayavijñāna*, which would be glaringly out of place in a work that is described by its author as being largely based on Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma*, specifically that of the Kāśmīra Vaibhāṣikas.⁴¹ Instead, he borrows from the *Yogācārabhūmi* ideas like *bīja*, which do not represent such a radical departure from tradition. Attributing an opinion to Sautrāntika may simply be Vasubandhu's way of claiming that it is based on a more valid interpretation of *sūtra* than its Sarvāstivādin counterpart.

⁴¹ *prāyeṇa hi kāśmīravaibhāṣikāṅgāṃ nītyādisiddha eṣo 'smābhir abhidharma ākhyātaḥ* (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 450.1-2; La Vallée Poussin 1971, v. 5: 223).

II. Methodology and Results

Methodology

Although previous studies have identified a number of passages in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* that seem to be based on the *Yogācārabhūmi*, no systematic comparative study of these two texts had appeared before the private publication of my results for the first three chapters of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Kritzer 2001). The present work consists of the results for all eight main chapters of the text.⁴²

This project was made feasible by the fact that we have Chinese translations by Hsüan-tsang of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the **Nyāyānusāra*, and the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Although these texts were translated over an eight-year period,⁴³ they contain similar translations of most technical terms. Since the three texts are now available electronically,⁴⁴ they can be searched in a way that was impossible ten years ago.

The first step was to identify passages in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* that do not concur with Sarvāstivāda. In order to do this, I referred to Saṃghabhadra's **Nyāyānusāra*, in which many of Vasubandhu's statements are criticized for their deviations from orthodoxy. Conveniently, Saṃghabhadra uses the appellation *ching-chu* 經主 to refer to Vasubandhu in these cases. The meaning of *ching-chu* is not completely clear, and Cox summarizes what other scholars have said about the

⁴² In Kritzer 2001, I included the Chinese text of all relevant passages of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, together with the Sanskrit if edited text was available. Here, I add the Tibetan text of all passages, except for the handful for which no Tibetan translation exists.

⁴³ The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* was translated between 651 and 654 (Lancaster 1979: 346, 343), the **Nyāyānusāra* between 653 and 654 (Lancaster 1979: 343), and the *Yogācārabhūmi* between 646 and 648 (Lancaster 1979: 187).

⁴⁴ All three texts are now available from both the Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Tekisuto Dētabēsu 大正新脩大藏經テキストデータベース at Tokyo University (<http://www.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~sat/japan/>) and the Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (Chung-hwa tien-tzu fo-tien hsieh-hui 中華電子佛典協會) at Taiwan National University (<http://www.cbeta.org/cd/index.htm>). However, when I started this project, the only available text of the *Yogācārabhūmi* was from the Yūgyō Shisō Kenkyūkai 瑜伽行思想研究会 at Nagasaki University.

term: "Some have suggested that this reflects Saṃghabhadra's identification of Vasubandhu as a Sautrāntika. However, a quotation from the *Nyāyānusāra in Sthiramati's commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* suggests that the Sanskrit equivalent is *sūtrakāra*. This could refer to Vasubandhu's role as author of the *sūtra*, in this case the *kārikā* of the *Abhidharmakośa*, or it could be used with sarcasm suggesting Vasubandhu's lack of familiarity with Buddhist scripture" (1995: 56). This issue is far from settled. Given the fact that the vast majority of Vasubandhu's departures from Sarvāstivāda are found in the *bhāṣya*, not in the *kārikās*, it would seem strange for Saṃghabhadra to preface his criticisms of what Vasubandhu says in the *bhāṣya* with the epithet *sūtrakāra*. In any case, there is no doubt that in the approximately 250 places where Saṃghabhadra uses the term *ching-chu* he is always criticizing Vasubandhu.

Next, I located the passage in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* on which Saṃghabhadra was commenting. Saṃghabhadra usually follows the order of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, but not always, so it was sometimes necessary to search rather far afield to find the corresponding passage. This task was made easier by the notes to the *Kokuyaku Issaikyō* Japanese translation of the *Nyāyānusāra, which give the location of quoted passages in the *Kandō Abidatsumakusharon* (Saeki 1978), the Japanese edition of Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

The final step was to search for a corresponding opinion in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. This was made difficult by the fact that the two texts are organized in completely different ways, as we have seen above. Sometimes one can find phrases or sentences identical to those of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, used in similar contexts, to make the same argument, but these cases are inconveniently few. Despite the fact that both texts were translated by Hsüan-tsang, translations of Sanskrit words can vary, and sometimes different Sanskrit words are used to convey the same idea. Frequently, Vasubandhu makes a statement to which Saṃghabhadra takes exception that has no obvious parallel in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, but the possibility remains that Vasubandhu's argument relies on a statement in the *Yogācārabhūmi* that appears in a totally different, perhaps seemingly unrelated context. The correspondences I have found are therefore not all equally convincing. Nevertheless, I have included even the more dubious ones, usually in parentheses. Finally, Saṃghabhadra attacks many of Vasubandhu's statements that do not appear to be related to anything in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. Sometimes Saṃghabhadra finds fault with Vasubandhu's presentation of Sarvāstivādin positions; on other occasions, Vasubandhu may be expressing an idiosyncratic idea of his own that cannot be characterized as Sautrāntika or Yogācāra. However, even some of these cases may upon further investigation reveal a connection to the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

Distribution and General Characterization of Results

Distribution within the *Yogācārabhūmi*

The corresponding passages that I have found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* are distributed approximately as follows:

<u>Maulī Bhūmi</u>	number of passages
<i>Pañcavijñānakāyasamprayuktā Bhūmi</i>	1
<i>Manobhūmi</i>	8
<i>Savitarkādi-bhūmi</i>	25
<i>Samāhitā Bhūmi</i>	2
<i>Asamāhitā Bhūmi</i>	1
<i>Śrutamayī Bhūmi</i>	1
<i>Cintāmayī Bhūmi</i>	3
<i>Śrāvakahūmi</i>	10
<i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i>	5
<u>Viniścayasamgrahaṇī</u>	
<i>Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi</i>	55
<i>Savitarkādi-bhūmi</i>	8
<i>Samāhitā Bhūmi</i>	1
<i>Sacittikā Bhūmi</i>	1
<i>Cintāmayīprajñā Bhūmi</i>	9
<i>Śrāvakahūmi</i>	4
<i>Bodhisattvabhūmi (Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra)</i>	2
<u>*Vivaraṇasamgrahaṇī</u>	3
<u>Paryāyasamgrahaṇī</u>	2
<u>Vastusamgrahaṇī</u>	16

As can be seen from this chart, Vasubandhu relies most heavily on portions of the *Yogācārabhūmi* that have no specifically Mahāyāna content and, as I have mentioned, that do not expound the doctrine of *ālayavijñāna*. Furthermore, I have found relatively few correspondences to what Schmithausen and Aramaki consider to be the oldest sections of the text, namely, the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of the *Maulī Bhūmi* and the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī*.

General Classification According to Theme⁴⁵

Many of the correspondences between the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi* can be classified according to a few general themes. In most cases, these involve rejections of major Sarvāstivādin doctrines.

sarvāstivāda

In Chapter Five of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Vasubandhu criticizes at length the basic Sarvāstivādin principle that past, present, and future *dharma*s all really exist. Many of his arguments are similar to those found in refutations of *sarvāstivāda* in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* and the *Savitarkādi-bhūmi* (items 5.12-18 and 5.21-27 in Chapter Three of this book).

prajñapti

A number of points concern *dharma*s that the Vaibhāṣikas consider to be real entities but that both Vasubandhu and the *Yogācārabhūmi* classify as provisional (*prajñapti*). In Chapter One, Vasubandhu indicates his disagreement with the Vaibhāṣika definition of *avijñaptirūpa*, and Saṃghabhadra, looking forward to Chapter Four, states that Vasubandhu does not accept *avijñaptirūpa* as being real. Similarly, the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* defines both **saṃvararūpa* and **asaṃvararūpa*, equivalent to *avijñapti*, as provisional, while the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Cintāmayīprajñā Bhūmi* includes *avijñapti* in a long list of *prajñaptis* (item 1.2).

In Chapter Two, Vasubandhu criticizes at great length the Vaibhāṣika definitions of the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* (*dharma*s associated with neither matter nor mind), calling them all *prajñaptis*. Again, the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* also denies the reality of these *dharma*s, and some of its arguments are reflected in Vasubandhu's discussion (items 2.7, 2.13, 2.15-28).⁴⁶ Vasubandhu's well-known theory of *bīja* is found in his discussion of the *viprayukta, prāpti*, and Yamabe

⁴⁵ Much of this section appears in a slightly different form in Kritzer 2000b.

⁴⁶ For more details, see Kritzer 1999: 225-248.

has shown Vasubandhu's reliance here on the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* (1990).

Also in Chapter Two, Vasubandhu indicates that he does not accept the reality of the unconditioned *dharma*s (*asaṃskṛtadharmas*). Statements in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* and the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī* similarly question the status of the individual *asaṃskṛtadharmas* (items 2.37-40).

In Chapter Four, Vasubandhu declares that *saṃsthānarūpa* (shape) is merely a *prajñapti*. The definition of *saṃsthānarūpa* in the *Pañcavijñānakāyasaṃprayuktā Bhūmi* is similar to Vasubandhu's, and the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* explicitly says that *saṃsthānarūpa* is a *prajñapti* (items 4.3-4.6).

There is, moreover, another possible correspondence regarding *prajñapti*. In Chapter One, Vasubandhu maintains that the *skandhas*, being collections (*rāśi*), do not have independent reality, and to support his position, he refers back to a *sūtra* that he has quoted earlier. Although the *Yogācārabhūmi* does not directly state that the *skandhas* are *prajñapti*, the idea that collections are *prajñapti* can be found in the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī*. The *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* quotes the same *sūtra* as Vasubandhu to show that the meaning of *skandha* is *rāśi*. This may imply that the *skandhas* are *prajñapti* (items 1.5-6).

bīja

In Chapter Two, Vasubandhu relies on the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and on the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* for his statement that *bījas* are nothing other than *nāmarūpa* or the *āśraya* (item 2.11; see Yamabe 1990). He explains many of the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* in terms of *bījas*, and in almost every case, a similar explanation can be found in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* (items 2.7-2.16).

Outside of the context of the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras*, other statements by Vasubandhu explicitly or implicitly rely on the idea of *bīja* in giving explanations that deviate from Vaibhāṣika orthodoxy. For example, Vasubandhu offers an opinion to the effect that the unperceived *mahābhūtas* in a composite object exist as seeds. A closely related statement is found in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Cintāmayīprajñā Bhūmi* (item 2.4).

In Chapter Five, Vasubandhu refutes the orthodox Vaibhāṣika idea that *pariyavasthāna* (active defilement) and *anuśaya* (latent defilement) are synonymous, and he insists that *anuśayas* are defilements in the state of seeds. This idea appears in several different sections of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, including the *Savitarkādi-bhūmi*, the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Savitarkādi-bhūmi* and the *Cintāmayīprajñā Bhūmi*, and the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī* (items 5.3-5.4).

The Coming Together of Causes and Conditions

On a number of occasions, Vasubandhu offers the coming together of causes and conditions to account for events explained otherwise by the Vaibhāṣikas. For example, regarding the Vaibhāṣika opinion that it is the eye that sees *rūpa*, Vasubandhu says that, according to the Sautrāntikas, perception is nothing more than cause and effect: there is nothing that sees or is seen. The *Yogācārabhūmi* contains a number of similar statements, for example, in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* and in the *Paramārthagāthās* and their commentary in the *Cintāmayī Bhūmi* (item 1.14).

Another example is Vasubandhu's denial of the reality of the reflected image, which, he says, appears due to the power of the coming together of causes and conditions. Although the *Yogācārabhūmi* does not explicitly state that the reflected image is unreal, a number of statements seem to imply its relative unreality. For example, in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Sacittikā Bhūmi*, the *pravṛttivijñānas* are said to depend on *ālayavijñāna* as the reflected image depends on the mirror. In the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (*Samdhinirmocanasūtra*), the meditative image is said to be no different from the consciousness in which it is perceived, just as the reflected image depends on the mirror, with the object acting as a condition (item 3.6).

Special People and Their Powers

Finally, Vasubandhu makes a number of statements regarding the powers of special people that correspond to similar statements in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. For example, he says that one cannot fall from arhatship because an arhat has completely destroyed the defilements, including their seeds. The *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* makes the same argument (item 6.9).

In his discussion of the *cittaviprayuktasamskāras*, Vasubandhu states that *jīvitendriya* is not the result of karma in the case of the arhat, who can prolong his life by the power of his meditation. According to the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi*, arhats, Tathāgatas, and bodhisattvas have a special type of *jīvitendriya* that gives them the power to extend their *āyusamskāras*. This *jīvitendriya* is defined as "proceeding due to own-force." All other types are defined as "not proceeding due to own-force." This seems to be equivalent to the distinction made in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* between *jīvitendriya* that is not *vipāka* (that of the arhat) and ordinary *jīvitendriya*, which is *vipāka*. Furthermore, in the *Cintāmayī Bhūmi*, the Buddha is said to obtain mastery of *samādhi* (*samādhivaśitā*), which he uses to discard his former *āyusamskāras* and to produce a new body (item 2.3).

A related example occurs in a discussion of why the Buddha chose a womb-birth over an apparitional one. One Vaibhāṣika answer is that it was in order to leave a

a relic. Vasubandhu objects that this explanation will not satisfy those who believe that the Buddha has *ādhiṣṭhānikī ṛddhi*, by means of which he can prolong his life. This is reminiscent of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, according to which the Buddhas and bodhisattvas can use their magical power to continue to exist after death (item 3.4).

With the exception of *bīja*, one can find none of the characteristic terms of the *Yogācāra* among the above correspondences: words such as *ālayavijñāna*, *vijñapti*, *trivākyā*, and *trivabhāva* simply do not appear. Nor is there any explicit statement of *śūnyāna* themes, such as the emptiness of *dharma*s or the three bodies of the Buddha. However, the disagreements regarding these *abhidharma* issues between Vasubandhu and the *Sarvāstivāda* are far from insignificant. As Saṃghabhadra and the *Dīpakāra* often point out, Vasubandhu's criticism of the Vaibhāṣika *abhidharma* system reflects a very different view of the world, one that we can now see is provocatively similar to that of the authors of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.