

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

GENERAL INTRODUCTION¹

ROBERT KRITZER

A. Sautrāntika Reconsidered

Although the term “Sautrāntika” appears in virtually every general study of Indian Buddhism, there is little reliable information about who the Sautrāntikas really were and exactly what positions they maintained. Until recently, scholars confidently referred to Sautrāntika ideas without critically examining the basis on which these ideas were identified as such. As a result, there was a body of common “knowledge” about Sautrāntika, most of it ultimately drawn from a handful of sources that are often not even cited. Since about 1980, however, Japan has been the center of a renewed interest in Sautrāntika, and studies have questioned the assumptions that have been current for so long. The title of the panel of the Thirteenth Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (Bangkok, 2002) at which the papers in this issue were originally read was “Sautrāntika Reconsidered,” and it is largely thanks to recent Japanese scholarship that it is now both necessary and possible to reconsider Sautrāntika.

The word “Sautrāntika” means a follower of the *sūtras*, and when we think of Sautrāntika, we generally think of a group that came into existence around the beginning of the Common Era and that, as its name suggests, considered *sūtra* rather than *śāstra* to be authoritative. Sautrāntika is frequently included in a list of four major schools of Indian Buddhism familiar to all students of Buddhism (the other three being Sarvāstivāda, Mādhyamika, and Yogācāra). Here it should perhaps be emphasized that Sautrāntika is not a sect. Although the terms “sect” and “school” are often used loosely or interchangeably, Bechert points out that what Frauwallner refers to as “Vinaya sects” are different from the doctrinal schools, or *nikāyas* (9-10). As for the term Sarvāstivāda, it is used to designate

¹ I am indebted to Professors Elizabeth Kenney and Yamabe Nobuyoshi for their helpful comments and suggestions.

both a Vinaya sect and the dominant school within that sect. Hence the doctrinal school referred to as Sarvāstivāda (or Vaibhāṣika) is actually one of a number of schools that rely on the Sarvāstivāda *vinaya*. Although Sautrāntika is generally considered to be another school that developed within the Sarvāstivāda sect, Cox suggests that the term may be better understood as referring to a variety of ideas that deviate from mainstream Sarvāstivāda, not to a consistent and formal school (Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 40-41). In this introduction, as in the papers in this issue (and in the literature on Sautrāntika, in general), the term Sarvāstivāda is generally used to refer to the orthodox school of the Sarvāstivāda sect, namely the Kāśmīra Vaibhāṣikas.

Although there is, to my knowledge, only one full-length monograph (in Japanese) on the subject of Sautrāntika (Katō *Kyōryōbu*), western scholars have written numerous brief descriptions of Sautrāntika history and doctrine.² Most of the accounts of the early history of the school are ultimately based on: 1) Vasumitra's *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* (especially Hsüan-tsang's translation [*I pu-tsung lun lun* 異部宗輪論, T. 2031]); 2) Hsüan-tsang's disciple, K'uei-chi's, commentary on the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*, the *I pu-tsung lun lun shu chi* 異部宗輪述記 (*Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 844); 3) K'uei-chi's commentary on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun shu chi* 成唯識論述記 (T. 1830); 4) K'uei-chi's commentary on the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the *Yü-ch'ieh-shi ti lun lüeh tsuan* 瑜伽師地論略纂 (T. 1829).

Closely associated with Sautrāntika is Dārṣṭāntika. This name is derived from the word *darṣṭānta* ("example"), and it appears to refer to the group's propensity for using examples or similes from the ordinary world to justify its doctrinal positions. It is not clear whether the terms Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika are, respectively, positive and negative designations for the same group, different names for the same group at different periods, or terms for two different groups. However, as we shall see, the commentators on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* tend to view Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika as essentially synonymous (Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 37-41).

According to Hsüan-tsang's translation of the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*, Sautrāntika arose as an offshoot of Sarvāstivāda four hundred

² A recent example is the entry on Sautrāntika in the *Encyclopedia of Religion* (Skorupski), which contains a summary of the traditional history of the school and an account of the major doctrinal positions attributed to it.

years after the Buddha's death. Sautrāntika was also called Saṃkrānti-vāda, and it paid special reverence to Ānanda (T. 2031: 15b19-20; Masuda 17). On the other hand, K'uei-chi says that one hundred years after the Buddha's death there lived a teacher named Kumāralāta who was called the Dārṣṭāntika. He was the founding teacher of the Sautrāntikas, although at that time, Sautrāntika did not exist as a school; it did not appear until four hundred years after the Buddha's death (T. 1830: 274a8-15). Elsewhere, K'uei-chi says that there were three Sautrāntika teachers: the *mūlācārya*, Kumāralāta; Śrīlāta, who wrote a Sautrāntika *Vibhāṣā*; and "one who is only called Sautrāntika" (T. 1830: 358a10-12).³

Most descriptions of early Sautrāntika doctrines, on the other hand, are based on the Sanskrit and Chinese commentaries on the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, which will be discussed in more detail in the next section. However, it may be useful to note here that in many cases western scholars, who rely to a fairly large extent on La Vallée Poussin's translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* for their information on *abhidharma*, may not be aware of the sources of attributions to Sautrāntika. Although his work is a masterpiece that must always be consulted, La Vallée Poussin often inserts, without comment, explanations from the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*. Furthermore, he sometimes attributes a statement to, for example, Sautrāntika, even when neither the Chinese nor Tibetan translation (the Sanskrit text was not available to him) does so. As I mention below, the attributions are usually actually those of the seventh-century Chinese commentators, and they continue to circulate, unidentified, in the scholarly literature. Other sources, including Tibetan doxographical texts (*grub mtha'*, *siddhānta*) and non-Buddhist Indian texts, are mentioned by La Vallée Poussin ("Sautrāntikas").

Recently, however, some scholars have begun to examine more critically these traditional accounts of Sautrāntika. For example, Katō shows that Kumāralāta was, in fact, later than the **Vibhāṣā* and thus could not be the founder of Dārṣṭāntika/Sautrāntika ("Notes"). Katō also argues that, although Hsüan-tsang uses the expression *Ching-liang pu* 經量部 (Sautrāntika) in his translation of the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*, the

³ According to La Vallée Poussin (*Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* 221-222) and Lamotte (*Traité* 163-164), this third teacher is Vasubandhu. La Vallée Poussin, on whom Lamotte relies, provides a great deal of information about what K'uei-chi says on this subject. However, his references to K'uei-chi's commentary on Vasumitra are very puzzling since they do not seem to correspond to K'uei-chi's actual text.

other Chinese and Tibetan translations of the text indicate that the original Sanskrit was probably “Sūtravāda” or “Sūtrāntavāda.” Furthermore, only Hsüan-tsang’s translation mentions Ānanda here; the others mention Uttara or Dharmottara. Katō argues that the original text of the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* was not referring to the group later known as Sautrāntika but to an earlier and different group, one that predated the **Vibhāṣā* (*Kyōryōbu* 101-109). Thus, according to Katō, Hsüan-tsang and K’uei-chi have made it *appear* as though Vasumitra were familiar with a group that we know as Sautrāntika, a group founded by Kumāralāta, which did not accept the *abhidharma* as authoritative and which subscribed to a doctrine of *bījas* (*I pu-tsung lun lun shu chi*: 577b15-23). Since Vasumitra’s work was first translated into Chinese between 385 and 413 (Lamotte *History* 275), his knowledge of such a group would suggest that the name Sautrāntika was current before Vasubandhu was active. However, Katō’s argument strongly undermines any evidence to that effect.

Thus, it is time to reconsider the questions of who the Sautrāntikas were, what they believed, and how they fit into Buddhist history during a period of intense doctrinal debate and development. In the remainder of this introduction, I will attempt to provide background information for the papers that follow, all of which represent new approaches to these questions.

B. Major Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika Theories⁴

Many theories have been attributed to either Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika or, by different authors, to both. Katō’s list of the Dārṣṭāntika opinions in the **Vibhāṣā* provides a fairly good idea of what these theories are like. He divides them into nine different categories:⁵ 1) the denial of the existence of certain *dharmas* accepted by Sarvāstivāda; 2) the assertion that consciousness can arise without an object; 3) denial of the existence of mental *dharmas* (*caittas*); 4) the assertion of the presence of a subtle consciousness in “unconscious” *samādhis*; 5) the denial of the Sarvāstivādin theory of the real existence of the past, present, and future; 6) theories related to *karma*; 7) theories related to *kleśas* and their destruction; 8) theories related to *dhyāna*; 9) other theories (Katō *Kyōryōbu* 70-72).

⁴ Mizuno’s is the pioneering work on this subject, and he identifies most of the passages mentioned below.

⁵ Mizuno and Tokoro divide them into nine and eight slightly different groups, respectively.

However, there are, in addition, several important ideas, appearing in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* under the name “Sautrāntika,” that are not associated with Dārṣṭāntika. Below, I list some of the more important individual Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika theories.

1. Theories Attributed only to Dārṣṭāntika⁶
 - a. There is no derived matter (*upādāyarūpa*) that is different from the great elements (*mahābhūtāni*).⁷
 - b. There are no mental *dharmas* (*caitta*) different from mind (*citta*).⁸
 - c. Contact (*sparśa*) is merely the coming together of organ, object, and consciousness; it is not a separate *dharma*.⁹
 - d. There is no pleasurable feeling (*sukhavedanā*); all feeling is suffering (*duḥkha*).¹⁰
 - e. All action is reversible (*nivartya*).¹¹

⁶ These theories are not attributed to Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

⁷ This opinion is attributed to Dārṣṭāntika by Saṃghabhadra (T. 1562: 356b21 ff.). The **Vibhāṣā* attributes it to Buddhadeva, who, it says, belongs to the same school as Dharmatrāta (T. 1545: 661c16-19, also 730b26-29; La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa* 1: 64 n. 2). Vasubandhu also attributes this position to Buddhadeva; he does not mention Sautrāntika, and he does not accept this opinion (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 24.1-13; La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa* 1: 64-66).

⁸ This opinion is attributed to “some Dārṣṭāntikas” by Saṃghabhadra (T. 1562: 395a2-15). The **Vibhāṣā* attributes it to Buddhadeva (T. 1545: 8c8-9, also 730b26-29; La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa* 1: 64 n. 2, 150 n. 2). Vasubandhu does not mention this opinion and, in fact, accepts the existence of at least some of the *caittas*. See La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa* 1: 150-152 n. 2.

⁹ This opinion is attributed to Dārṣṭāntika in the **Vibhāṣā* (T. 1545: 760a28-b2). Vasubandhu does not mention Sautrāntika here, attributing the position to “some,” and he sides with the Vaibhāṣikas. He concludes his discussion by seeming to accept *sparśa* as a separate *dharma* (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 143.5-21; La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa* 2: 96-98). For more details, see Kritzer *Rebirth* 110-120.

¹⁰ I can find no attribution of this position to Dārṣṭāntika. The **Vibhāṣā* on three occasions attributes this to “some people” (T. 1545: 402c16-17, 402c23-27, 714c2-3; see Katō *Kyōryōbu* 191). Vasubandhu also attributes this position to “some people,” and he concludes that the Ābhidharmikas are correct that *sukhavedanā* actually exists (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 330.9-20; La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa* 4: 129-130). Saṃghabhadra attributes this to the Sthavira (T. 1562: 663b7). For a detailed discussion, see Katō *Kyōryōbu* 183-197; Kritzer *Rebirth* 130-136.

Thus, whether one calls this a Dārṣṭāntika or a Sautrāntika position depends on whether one considers Śrīlāta to be Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika. In any case, this position is refuted by Vasubandhu.

¹¹ The **Vibhāṣā* attributes this position to Dārṣṭāntika in three places (T. 1545: 359b20-21, 593b10-11, 773c29-a1). Vasubandhu seems to accept the Vaibhāṣika position that certain *karma* is irreversible (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 125.12-15, 229.12-230.13).

2. Theories Attributed to Both Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika¹²
 - a. The *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* are not real *dharmas*.
 - b. The *asaṃskṛtas* are not real *dharmas*.
 - c. *Samsthānarūpa* is merely provisional (*prajñapti*).
 - d. *Vijñapti* does not really exist.
 - e. *Avijñapti* does not really exist.
 - f. Only the present is real. The past and future do not exist.¹³
3. Theories Attributed to Sautrāntika but not to Dārṣṭāntika¹⁴
 - a. Merit increases due to a subtle, gradual transformation of the stream of personality (*saṃtati/saṃtāna*) of the donor.
 - b. *Anuśayas* are *kleśas* in the state of seeds, not separate *dharmas*.
 - c. A result does not directly arise from a past action; instead, it arises due to a transformation of the stream of personality, based on a past action.

Very broadly, one can identify several tendencies in the opinions of Dārṣṭāntika/Sautrāntika. Many of the entities that are said by Sarvāstivāda to be real are reduced in status to mere designations (*prajñapti*). Mind, which has always been very important in Buddhism, becomes even more so. Consciousness as an organ of perception is asserted to have

¹² For references, see my article, “Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*,” in which these items are discussed in detail.

¹³ At the beginning of its major discussion of the three times, the **Vibhāṣā* mentions the Dārṣṭāntikas as saying that time is permanent while the *saṃskāras* are impermanent (T. 1545: 393a10-15; La Vallée Poussin “La Controverse” 8). Otherwise, the Dārṣṭāntikas are not identified as those who deny the existence of past and future. However, since the *Tattvasiddhi* clearly denies the reality of past and future, it is probably safe to say that this position was held by Dārṣṭāntika.

In the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, although Vasubandhu clearly agrees with those who deny past and future, he mentions neither Dārṣṭāntika nor Sautrāntika until near the end of the long discussion (298.4-301.10). But there, he is actually introducing a new, if related, issue, of how past actions produce results (see my article in this issue).

¹⁴ This group reflects the related theories of *bīja* and *saṃtati-pariṇāmanaviśeṣa*. In addition to the three items mentioned here, Vasubandhu also appeals to these ideas in order to explain his positions on other subjects. For example, regarding the question of whether *arhats* are subject to retrogression, Vasubandhu supports the unorthodox position that they are not, and he justifies himself by explaining that the *arhat* has destroyed the seeds of his *kleśas* and that they therefore cannot arise again.

For references, again see my article, “Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.”

unreal objects. *Bīja* replaces the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras*, *prāpti* and *aprāpti*, as the explanation for how a good *dharma* can arise in an individual immediately after a bad *dharma*, or a bad *dharma* after a good *dharma* (Jaini “Sautrāntika Theory” 238-239). The notion of momentariness is taken to greater extremes (see Rospatt 40-66; Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 94-95), and related to this, as Cox points out, is a special emphasis on the operation of cause and effect (*Disputed Dharmas* 94).

Similarities between Dārṣṭāntika/Sautrāntika ideas, particularly Vasubandhu’s Sautrāntika positions in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and Yogācāra philosophy, have long been noted. Sautrāntika has often been described as intermediate between Hīnayāna Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna Yogācāra: Sautrāntika posits *bījas* but not *ālayavijñāna*;¹⁵ the reality of *dharmas* other than *citta* is downgraded but not denied completely, etc. Recently, however, the relationship between Sautrāntika and Yogācāra is being reconsidered, especially in Japan.¹⁶

C. Sources for Dārṣṭāntika/Sautrāntika Theories

In this section, I discuss the main sources of information about early Dārṣṭāntika/Sautrāntika theories. Three of these sources predate the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, while the others are commentaries on it. Thanks to printed indices and to the electronic versions of almost all of the Chinese texts, it is possible to know exactly how frequently each of the terms Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika appears in most of these texts. The vast majority of occurrences are in connection with a doctrinal position, e.g.: “Furthermore, there is a view that the state of being an ordinary person (*prthagjanatvam*) is not a real entity, as the Dārṣṭāntikas maintain”;¹⁷ “For the Sautrāntikas, the future also does not really exist.”¹⁸ Knowing the distribution of the terms is significant since we can see that, at first, only

¹⁵ Or, in the case of other texts by Vasubandhu that do mention *ālayavijñāna* (e.g., the *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa* and the *Pratītyasamutpādayākhyā*), the *ālayavijñāna* is seen as being different from that of Yogācāra.

¹⁶ See Hakamaya; Harada “Dignāga”; Harada “Kyōryōbu”; Kritzer *Rebirth*; Kritzer *Comparison*; Miyashita; Yamabe “*Bīja* Theory”; Yamabe “Yugashichiron.” The contributions of Kritzer and Yamabe in this issue are also relevant.

¹⁷ **Vibhāṣā* (T. 1545: 231b26-27).

¹⁸ *Chū-she lun chi* (T. 1821: 170b17).

Dārṣṭāntika was used, while Sautrāntika appeared more and more often with the passage of time. Vasubandhu clearly distinguishes between the two terms, but his commentators use them increasingly interchangeably. The total number of references multiplies drastically in the Chinese commentaries. This perhaps indicates that the concept of a Sautrāntika school with characteristic doctrines has become more and more fixed: ideas that were not previously identified with Sautrāntika may be labelled as such because they seem consistent with other positions that *were* so designated.

In order to understand more precisely the meaning of Sautrāntika, it would be useful to study each of the hundreds of references to Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika found in these texts. That, however, is a large-scale project for the future. I hope that my article in this issue, in which I examine all the references to Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, will be a further step, after the works of Miyamoto, Mizuno, and Katō (see Section E of this introduction), in this direction.

1. **Vibhāṣā*

The earliest¹⁹ source for doctrines attributed to the Dārṣṭāntikas is the **Vibhāṣā*²⁰ (Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 37), the date of which is unknown (Sakurabe ventures an estimate of 150-200 C.E. [68]). Katō counts 86 references to Dārṣṭāntika theories, which the **Vibhāṣā* refutes as contradicting Sarvāstivāda doctrine (*Kyōryōbu* 70).²¹ Many of these theories are very similar, if not identical, to opinions attributed to Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and its commentaries, as well as to opinions in the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* of Harivarman (Mizuno).

As for the term Sautrāntika, it appears in connection with only two discussions in the **Vibhāṣā*. Katō shows convincingly that the first example

¹⁹ It is well known that the dates of Indian Buddhist texts are generally almost impossible to establish. However, there is some general consensus about the *relative* dates of certain texts, including the ones mentioned in this section.

²⁰ Commonly referred to as the *Mahāvibhāṣā* on the basis of the title of Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation, *A-p'i-ta-mo ta p'i-p'o-sha lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 (T. 1545). For information on this and other texts entitled *Vibhāṣā*, see Cox's discussion in Willemen et al. 229-239.

²¹ In the *A-p'i-t'an p'i-p'o-sha lun* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論 (T. 1546), however, the term Dārṣṭāntika (*p'i yü che* 譬喻者) appears only 46 times.

does not refer to what is commonly known as the Sautrāntika school and that the second example represents Hsüan-tsang's alteration of the original text (*Kyōryōbu* 113-119; Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 38). One of Katō's strongest pieces of evidence is the fact that the older version of the **Vibhāṣā* does not include the term Sautrāntika at all.

2. **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya*

The **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya*, a text generally considered later than the **Vibhāṣā* but earlier than the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, does not mention Sautrāntika. However, it contains three references to Dārṣṭāntika opinions,²² two of which correspond to opinions attributed to Dārṣṭāntika by the **Vibhāṣā*. Two earlier texts entitled **Abhidharmahṛdaya*, one by Dharmasrī (T. 1550) and the other by Upāśānta (T. 1551), mention neither Dārṣṭāntika nor Sautrāntika.

3. **Tattvasiddhiśāstra*

Harivarman's **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* is, after the **Vibhāṣā*, the richest source for Dārṣṭāntika although it refers to neither Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika by name. Mizuno has identified in the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* passages that agree with a large majority of the Dārṣṭāntika positions described in the **Vibhāṣā*. The sect to which Harivarman belongs has been a matter of debate (see Katsura). However, Mizuno's work shows convincingly that Harivarman belongs to the same doctrinal tradition as Dārṣṭāntika, despite the fact that the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* also contains ideas that have been

²² The three opinions are: 1) *Karma* is reversible (T. 1552: 895c22-29; Dessein 1: 207-208; *Vibhāṣā* 593b10 ff.). According to Mizuno, the **Tattvasiddhi* (T. 1646: 291b6 ff., 297c6 ff.) implies that *karma* is reversible.

2) *Samyojanas* (fetters) are real, but *puḍgala* (person) and *vastu* (substance) are not (T. 1552: 903b7-9; Dessein 1: 269-270; *Kokuyaku Issaikyō* bidon-bu 20: 202 n. 167; *Vibhāṣā* 288b16 ff.) According to Mizuno, the **Tattvasiddhi* does not mention this argument; however, Mizuno refers to Harivarman's refutation of the *puḍgala* (T. 1646: 259a ff.), which is somewhat related.

3) Space is neither *rūpa* (matter) nor not-*rūpa* (T. 1552: 944a8-9; Dessein 1: 604). According to Mizuno, a similar view, that space is not a real entity, is attributed to Dārṣṭāntika by Fa-pao (T. 1822: 494a ff.). According to Bareau, this is the standpoint of the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* (T. 1646: 343b ff., especially 343b12-14). This opinion does not seem to be found in the **Vibhāṣā*.

characterized as Mahāyāna. Katō accepts the Chinese tradition that Hari-varman was the disciple of Kumāralāta, who is considered the founder of Dārṣṭāntika (*Kyōryōbu* 58; Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 40), and gives Hari-varman's dates as 310-390 C.E. (*Kyōryōbu* 64).²³

4. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*

The earliest text in which the word Sautrāntika appears is the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* of Vasubandhu, which is, therefore, central to the study of the subject. Vasubandhu's dates have been a matter of great controversy; Cox settles on a date of the late fourth or early fifth century (*Disputed Dharmas* 53). Vasubandhu uses the term Sautrāntika about twenty times, while he mentions Dārṣṭāntika only three times. Katō shows that, in all three cases, Vasubandhu disagrees with these positions, unlike those he labels Sautrāntika, with which he agrees (*Kyōryōbu* 81-84; Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 39). Although Vasubandhu's Sautrāntika positions generally correspond to Dārṣṭāntika positions in the **Vibhāṣā*, in a few cases they do not. More often, Vasubandhu's arguments contain important elements not traceable to the Dārṣṭāntika of the **Vibhāṣā* or to Harivarman.²⁴

5. **Nyāyānusāra*

The **Nyāyānusāra* is Saṃghabhadra's long, fiercely critical work, in which he attacks many of Vasubandhu's statements in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Saṃghabhadra, probably a contemporary of Vasubandhu (Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 53-55), uses both Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika, seemingly without making any distinction between them (Katō *Kyōryōbu* 99; Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 39).²⁵ Saṃghabhadra also very frequently (250 times) identifies Vasubandhu as "the Sūtra-master" (*ching-chu* 經主)

²³ Katsura suggests approximate dates of 250-350 C.E. for Harivarman (196).

²⁴ For a detailed treatment of Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, see my paper in this issue.

²⁵ A computer search of the Chinese text indicates that Saṃghabhadra uses the terms with almost exactly the same frequency: Sautrāntika (*ching pu* 經部) 32 times; Dārṣṭāntika 33 times (*pi yü che* 譬喻者 25 times; *pi yü shih* 譬喻師 8 times). In Saṃghabhadra's shorter text, the *Abhidharmapiṭakaprakaraṇaśāsanāśāstra* (T. 1563), Sautrāntika (*ching pu*) appears only once, while Dārṣṭāntika (*pi yü che*) appears three times.

when criticizing him for views that disagree with orthodox Sarvāstivāda.²⁶ It is by no means certain that this term, the original of which seems to have been *sūtrakāra* (Katō *Kyōryōbu* 268 n. 39), has anything to do with Sautrāntika (Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 56). However, since it is used by Saṃghabhadra in association with almost all of the opinions in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* that are attributed to Sautrāntika, the possibility remains that Saṃghabhadra does, in fact, use the term *ching-chu* to identify Vasubandhu as a Sautrāntika.²⁷

6. *Abhidharmadīpa*

The *Abhidharmadīpa*, together with its auto-commentary, *Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*, is another text that is critical of Vasubandhu's unorthodox views. This text is not, strictly speaking, a commentary, although, as Jaini notes (2), it closely follows the organization of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. The name of its author, commonly referred to as the Dīpakāra, is unknown. Jaini believes that the *Abhidharmadīpa* must have been written no more than about a hundred years after Vasubandhu (135).²⁸ Unfortunately, the Sanskrit text is only partially extant, and no translation, Tibetan or Chinese, has been found. Nor is the text available for electronic searching. However, Jaini, in his index, identifies eight occurrences of Dārṣṭāntika and three of Sautrāntika. According to Jaini, the two terms are used almost synonymously in the *Abhidharmadīpa* (70). Supporting this statement is the fact that the Dīpakāra ascribes to Dārṣṭāntika two theories that are found in neither the **Vibhāṣā* nor the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra*: the theory of *bīja*²⁹ and a passage that resembles the theory of *saṃtatipariṇāmaśeṣa*.³⁰

²⁶ In the *Abhidharmapiṭakaprakaraṇaśāsanāśāstra*, *ching-chu* is found 26 times.

²⁷ In my ongoing work of comparing the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*, I am identifying all of the occurrences of *ching-chu* in the **Nyāyānusāra* (see *Kritzer Comparison* for occurrences in the first three chapters).

²⁸ However, Yoshimoto Shingyō believes that it may be somewhat later (Willems et al. 253).

²⁹ *evaṃ tu sādhu yathā dārṣṭāntikānām iti kośakāraḥ / kathaṃ ca dārṣṭāntikānām / kāmarāgasyānuśayaḥ kāmarāgānuśayaḥ* etc. (*Abhidharmadīpa*: 222.3-4). The original passage mentions Sautrāntika, not Dārṣṭāntika (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*: 278.17 ff.).

³⁰ *dārṣṭāntikaḥ khalu brūte kāraṇaśaktiṣu nirātmakajanikartrupacāraḥ pravartate* (*Abhidharmadīpa*: 274.26-27). I am indebted to Fukuda Takumi for pointing out the similarity between this passage and the idea of *saṃtatipariṇāmaśeṣa*.

7. *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*³¹

The *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* of Yaśomitra (perhaps early seventh century) is the only actual commentary on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* that is extant in Sanskrit. Yaśomitra is sometimes described as a Sautrāntika (e.g., Willemen et al. 110), and unlike Saṃghabhadra or the Dīpakāra, he does not use the terms Sautrāntika or Dārṣṭāntika disapprovingly. As Cox indicates, Yaśomitra twice says that the Dārṣṭāntikas are Sautrāntikas (*Disputed Dharmas* 39), while on another occasion, he seems to say that a Sautrāntika is a Dārṣṭāntika (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: 44.14-23; La Vallée Poussin *L'Abhidharmakośa* 1: 36 n. 2).

Altogether, Yaśomitra uses the term Dārṣṭāntika six times, while Sautrāntika appears 43 times. He does not describe as Dārṣṭāntika any of the positions that Vasubandhu attributes to Sautrāntika. However, a careful analysis of all the references to Sautrāntika is necessary to determine the extent to which Yaśomitra distinguishes the two.

Of particular interest is Yaśomitra's explanation of the meaning of the term Sautrāntika (*Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*: 11.24-12.1). This passage is mentioned in several of the articles in this issue.

8. Indian Commentaries Extant only in Tibetan

Additional sources of information include a number of other commentaries on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, originally written in Sanskrit but now extant only in Tibetan translations (see Mejer). Unfortunately, these texts are neither indexed nor available in electronic form, so I have been unable to survey the occurrences in them of the terms Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika. However, Marek Mejer has been kind enough to look through portions of two of the most important of these commentaries, Sthiramati's *Tattvārtha* and Pūrṇavardhana's *Lakṣaṇānusārinī*, and his inspection indicates that these texts, like the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, use the term Dārṣṭāntika more frequently than does Vasubandhu himself. Therefore, a detailed analysis of the references to Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika in these texts, too, would be valuable.

³¹ The full title is *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*.

9. Chinese Commentaries

Willemen et al. mention twelve Chinese commentators on the *Abhidharmakośa* (277), of whom three, Shen-t'ai 神泰, P'u-kuang 普光, and Fa-pao 法寶, are considered the most important (Nishi 337). These three were all students of Hsüan-tsang, the second Chinese translator of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and they were active from the middle of the seventh century until the very beginning of the eighth (Nishi 338-339). While Shen-t'ai's commentary is not included in the Taishō Tripiṭaka and, as far as I know, is not available in a digital version, P'u-kuang and Fa-pao's commentaries are (T. 1821, T. 1822).

The occurrences of the terms *Dārṣṭāntika* and *Sautrāntika* are markedly more numerous in these two texts. P'u-kuang mentions *Dārṣṭāntika* 23 times and *Sautrāntika* 565, while Fa-pao mentions *Dārṣṭāntika* 31 times and *Sautrāntika* 411. Part of this increase is simply due to the fact that both commentaries expand greatly on the original text; however, the two commentators also seem to attribute more opinions to *Dārṣṭāntika* and *Sautrāntika* than did their Indian predecessors. Cox suggests that Shen-t'ai, P'u-kuang, and Fa-pao may have all reflected Hsüan-tsang's own interpretations, perhaps including ones that he brought back from India (*Disputed Dharmas* 60).

Saeki Kyokuga's nineteenth-century Japanese edition and commentary of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *Kandō Abidatsumakusharon*, frequently refers to P'u-kuang and Fa-pao's attributions. As Cox remarks, La Vallée Poussin often relies on Saeki for information that he includes in the notes of his French translation (*Disputed Dharmas* 180), usually without acknowledgment. In fact, many of the school attributions in the French translation are actually those of P'u-kuang or Fa-pao.

D. *Dārṣṭāntika* and *Sautrāntika* Teachers

A number of personages, many of them rather shadowy, have been associated with the development of *Dārṣṭāntika*/*Sautrāntika* thought. The **Vibhāṣā*, for example, mentions teachings of several teachers linked to *Dārṣṭāntika* teachings: Buddhadeva, Dharmatrāta, and someone identified simply as Bhadanta (Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 41).

However, the figure traditionally credited with founding the Dārṣṭāntika school is Kumāralāta, for whom Katō proposes the dates 280-360 C.E.,³² that is to say, later than the **Vibhāṣā* (*Kyōryōbu* 38). The famous poet Aśvaghōṣa, who lived at approximately the same time, is sometimes associated with Dārṣṭāntika or Sautrāntika (see Yamabe's paper in this issue). Slightly later is Harivarman (310-390 C.E.), who is identified in the *Ch'u san-tsang chi chi* 出三藏記集 and the *San lun hsüan-i* 三論玄義 as Kumāralāta's disciple (Katō *Kyōryōbu* 58).

According to Katō, Śrīlāta (330-410 C.E.) was another disciple of Kumāralāta and was Harivarman's contemporary, as well as being the "Sthavira" whom Saṃghabhadra (370-410 C.E.) attacks in the **Nyāyānusāra* (Katō *Kyōryōbu* 52-53). Katō thinks that Śrīlāta was Vasubandhu's teacher (Katō *Kyōryōbu* 62), but Cox, following Fukuda, seems skeptical (*Disputed Dharmas* 51-52 n. 114). Katō refers to Hsüan-tsang's *Ta T'ang hsi-yü chi*, in which Śrīlāta is said to be the author of a Sautrāntika *Vibhāṣā*. However, I know of no reference earlier than Hsüan-tsang's to a text of this name. My own opinion is that these teachers, who all precede Vasubandhu, would be better described as Dārṣṭāntika than Sautrāntika since, as I have mentioned, the term Sautrāntika cannot be attested before Vasubandhu. According to Lamotte (*Traité* 164),³³ K'uei-chi calls Vasubandhu "the Sautrāntika easy to know," and it may be this fact to which K'uei-chi is referring.

Vasubandhu, of course, is one of the most important figures in the history of Buddhism. According to the traditional account, he began his career as a Sarvāstivādin, wrote the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* under the influence of Sautrāntika ideas, and was converted to Mahāyāna by his brother, Asaṅga, with whom he founded the Yogācāra school. However, little is certain about Vasubandhu: his dates, as I have mentioned, are a matter of contention,³⁴ as is the question of whether there was one Vasubandhu or two.³⁵ It is clear, in any case, that when later Buddhist thinkers refer to "Sautrāntika" positions, they are usually talking about

³² For all the dates of Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika teachers in this section, I follow Katō's tentative suggestions (*Kyōryōbu* 64).

³³ See note 2 above.

³⁴ According to Katō, 350-430 C.E. (*Kyōryōbu* 64).

³⁵ For a clear, brief summary of the controversy, see Cox *Disputed Dharmas* 53.

the unorthodox opinions that Vasubandhu espouses in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, whether or not the same opinions are described as Dārṣṭāntika in the **Vibhāṣā*.

One more teacher who should be mentioned is Bhadanta Rāma, who is criticized by Saṃghabhadra in the **Nyāyānusāra*. According to Fukuda, Bhadanta Rāma was probably later than Śrīlāta but earlier than Vasubandhu. From the same tradition as Dārṣṭāntika and Śrīlāta, Bhadanta Rāma was even more radically unorthodox, and Fukuda suggests that he may have been strongly influenced by Yogācāra thought.

E. Important Studies of Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika

Modern studies of Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika started in the late 1920s, prompted by the publication of La Vallée Poussin's translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, which began to appear in 1923. In 1926, Lüders published the Sanskrit fragments, together with a study, of the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, attributed to Kumāralāta. This was followed in 1927 by the article, "La *Dṛṣṭānta-pankti* et son auteur," in which Lévi asserts that *Dṛṣṭāntapankti* is the proper title for the work designated *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* by Lüders. Lévi goes into some detail concerning the identity of Kumāralāta, and he presents an example of a simile in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* that Yaśomitra attributes to Kumāralāta, as well as several examples attributed to Dārṣṭāntika in the **Vibhāṣā*.³⁶

In 1928, Miyamoto published a long article entitled "Hiyusha, Daitoku Hoggu, Dōju, *Yumanron* no Kenkyū" (Study of Dārṣṭāntika, Bhadanta Dharmatrāta, Kumāralāta, and the *Dṛṣṭāntapankti*), in which he identifies and analyzes passages in the **Vibhāṣā* containing opinions of a number of non-orthodox teachers. In the same year, Takai included in his *Shōjō Bukkyō gairon* (An Outline of Hīnayāna Buddhism) what Katō characterizes as the most detailed study of the Sthavira (prior to Katō's own work).³⁷ Finally, La Vallée Poussin inserted into his translation of the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* a several-page note, in which he summarizes the

³⁶ For a summary in Japanese of research on the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*, see Okano.

³⁷ The relevant chapter (Takai 264-369) is entitled "Kyōryōbu no kyōgi" (The Doctrine of Sautrāntika).

information from several of K'uei-chi's works concerning Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika (221-224).

Probably the most important and most useful of all of these early studies is Mizuno's "Hiyushi to *Jōjitsuron*" (Dārṣṭāntika and **Tattvasiddhiśāstra* 1930). Mizuno notices similarities between the Dārṣṭāntika positions in the **Vibhāṣā* and Harivarman's in the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra*, and he methodically arranges all of the Dārṣṭāntika passages (as well as some Sautrāntika passages from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*) into nine groups. For almost every passage, he locates a corresponding opinion in the **Tattvasiddhiśāstra*, thus proving that Harivarman, regardless of his sect affiliation, was doctrinally very close to Dārṣṭāntika.

The last of these important early studies was Przyluski's "Sautrāntika et Dārṣṭāntika" (1931-32). Przyluski argues that there was originally a group designated "Dārṣṭāntika," which could be considered to be the Mūlasautrāntika. Later, this group divided into two, the followers of Śrīlāta and Sautrāntika properly speaking. In 1940, Przyluski published a revised, English version of the same paper, entitled "Dārṣṭāntika, Sautrāntika, and Sarvāstivādin." There he adds the observation that Dārṣṭāntika is a pejorative term, assigned by its opponents, and he speculates that Kumāralāta's pupils adopted the name Sautrāntika in reaction. Later, when Kumāralāta's school divided, "the practice was made of describing as Mūlasautrāntika those who claimed to follow Kumāralāta, the other factions being called by the name of Śrīlāta, or described as Sautrāntika without any more precision" ("Dārṣṭāntika" 251).³⁸

In 1935-1936, Lamotte published the text of Vasubandhu's *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, together with a French translation and introduction. In this text, Vasubandhu is generally considered to have further developed his Sautrāntika positions, while not yet having converted to Mahāyāna Yogācāra. Lamotte analyzes these positions in some detail (*Traité* 163-171). Yamaguchi Susumu's Japanese translation of the same work, which appeared shortly afterwards in 1951, is particularly influential in Japan.³⁹

The next scholar to study Sautrāntika in depth was Jaini, whose introduction to his edition of the *Abhidharmadīpa* (1959) contains discussions

³⁸ This article is also available online: <http://sino-sv3.sino.uni-heidelberg.de/FULLTEXT/JR-ENG/prz-1.htm>.

³⁹ Muroji published a revised edition of the Tibetan text in 1985.

of all the points concerning which the Vaibhāṣika Dīpakāra attacks Vasubandhu's "Sautrāntika" positions. In the same year, Jaini published several articles based on this material, two of which are particularly relevant: "The Sautrāntika Theory of *bīja*" and "Origin and Development of the Theory of *viprayukta-saṃskāras*." Jaini notices the similarity between Vasubandhu's positions and Yogācāra ideas, and he adduces it as support for the "traditional account" of a single Vasubandhu, who was the author of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and who later became a Vijñānāvādin (*Abhidharmadīpa* introduction 128).

Whereas Jaini finds nascent Yogācāra concepts in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Schmithausen, in his "Sautrāntika-voraussetzungen in *Viṃśatikā* und *Triṃśika*" (1967), sees remnants of Sautrāntika ideas in two post-conversion works of Vasubandhu, particularly the *Viṃśatikā*. He characterized Vasubandhu's use of the terms *viññānasaṃtāna* (instead of *ālayaviññāna*) and *saṃtānapariṇāma*, as being based on "the 'one-layered' mental series of the Sautrāntikas" (136).⁴⁰

Katsura's Ph.D. thesis, *A Study of Harivarman's Tattvasiddhi* (University of Toronto 1974), includes an outline of the text, a discussion of the author, his ideas and school affiliation, along with translations of selected passages. Katsura's is the only substantial work in a western language on the *Tattvasiddhi*. Although it is not published and is not available from University Microfilms, there are several copies in circulation.

An interesting example of how Buddhists of a much later period described Sautrāntika doctrine can be found in the fourteenth-century Tibetan doxographical text, the *Blo gsal grub mtha'*. Mimaki published an edition, with an introduction, of the relevant portion of this work (1979), as well as a French translation (1980), both extensively annotated. Relying on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and on other texts, including a number of Buddhist epistemological works, the *Blo gsal grub mtha'* illustrates how ideas like the self-awareness (*svasaṃvedana*) of consciousness, which do not appear in the **Vibhāṣā* or the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* but may have been implied by early Dārṣāntika/Sautrāntika theories, were labelled as Sautrāntika by later authors.

⁴⁰ Although Schmithausen's article is in German, it includes a brief English abstract, on which my summary is based.

Kajiyama's study of Buddhist theories of cognition, *Bukkyō ni okeru sonzai to chishiki* (Being and Cognition in Buddhism),⁴¹ includes a good general introduction to Sautrāntika, its main doctrines, and the sources of information about them, as well as a detailed explanation of the Sautrāntika (or Dārṣāntika) viewpoint regarding cognition (v-xi, 31-59). Much of his discussion is based on later works, mainly epistemological texts.

In 1980, Katō published an article, "Notes sur les deux maîtres bouddhiques Kumāralāta et Śrīlāta," in which he critically reviews the Chinese sources regarding the lives of these two teachers and establishes more reliable dates than those suggested by the most commonly quoted source, K'uei-chi. Katō's *Kyōryōbu no kenkyū* (Study of Sautrāntika), which appeared in 1989, remains by far the most important work on the subject of Sautrāntika and Dārṣāntika. Centered largely on Saṃghabhadra's account and criticism of the Sthavira (Śrīlāta) in the **Nyāyānusāra*, Katō's book is divided into two parts dealing with Sautrāntika history and thought. Although the study is in Japanese, a useful abstract in French can be found at the end of the volume.

Another very important contribution concerning Vasubandhu's Sautrāntika positions and the Sthavira is Cox's *Disputed Dharmas: Early Buddhist Theories on Existence*. Published in 1995, this book is a revised version of her 1983 Ph.D. thesis, *Controversies in Dharma Theory*. Cox provides an extensively annotated translation of the section of the **Nyāyānusāra* in which Saṃghabhadra attacks both Vasubandhu's and the Sthavira's denial of the reality of the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras*.

It is probably fair to say that Katō's work has been a catalyst for further studies of Sautrāntika, particularly in Japan. Since 1980, so many articles have been published that it is impossible for me to summarize them adequately here. Still, since most, if not all, are in Japanese, it may be useful at least to mention some of their titles:⁴² "Sarvāstivādin and Sautrāntika theories of *vipāka* as seen in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*" (Hyōdō 1980);

⁴¹ I am grateful to Yamabe Nobuyoshi for this reference.

⁴² If the original titles are in Japanese, I give my own English translations here. Although many of the journals in which these articles are published supply their own (or the author's own) English translations, these are typically found at the end of each issue or on the back cover. In most cases, I possess only offprints, which do not include an English title.

The full Japanese titles can be found in the list of works cited.

“The relationship of Dārṣṭāntika and Sautrāntika — doctrine of Sautrāntika in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and *Tattvasiddhiśāstra* — [1]” (Tokoro 1989); “Sautrāntika” (Honjō 1992); “Dignāga’s *Hastavālaprakaraṇavṛtti*: a Japanese translation of the *Hastavālaprakaraṇavṛtti* with a Sanskrit reconstruction” (Harada “Dignāga” 1993);⁴³ “The Dārṣṭāntika position on the difference between *citta* and *caitta* as seen in the *Mahāvibhāṣā*” (Fukuda “*Daibibasharon*” 1997); “The Sautrāntika Bhadanta Rāma” (Fukuda “*Kyōryōbu*” 1998).

Other studies are concerned more specifically with the relationship between Sautrāntika and Yogācāra: “*Ādi-viśeṣa-vibhāga-sūtra*: Vasubandhu the Sautrāntika’s theory of praṭītya-samutpāda” (Matsuda “*Funbetsu*” 1982); “The definition of *ālayavijñāna* in Vasubandhu’s *Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā*” (Matsuda “Seshin” 1982); “Research note concerning Vasubandhu [1]” (Matsuda “Vasubandhu” 1984); “The theory of two truths in the *Vyākhyāyukti* — Research note concerning Vasubandhu [2]” (Matsuda “*Vyākhyāyukti*” 1986); “The background of the theory of *abhūtvā bhavati* in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*” (Miyashita 1986); “Research on Pūrvācārya [in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*]” (Hakamaya 1986); “*Bīja* theory in *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*” (Yamabe 1990); “Vasubandhu on *saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānam*” (Kritzer 1993); “Questions concerning the concept of a ‘Sautrāntika single-layered stream of *vijñāna*’ [I]” (Harada “*Kyōryōbu* I” 1996); “Questions concerning the concept of a ‘Sautrāntika single-layered stream of *vijñāna*’ [II]” (Harada “*Kyōryōbu* II” 1997); “Questions concerning the concept of a ‘Sautrāntika single-layered stream of *vijñāna*’ [III]” (Harada “*Kyōryōbu* III” 1998); *Rebirth and Causation in the Yogācāra Abhidharma* (Kritzer 1999); “One side of the theory of causation of good and evil in the *Yogācārabhūmi*: the so-called theory of ‘mutual impregnation of *rūpa* and *citta*’” (Yamabe “*Yugashichiron*” 2000); *A Comparison of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (Chapters I-III) and the Yogācārabhūmi* (Kritzer 2001).

⁴³ A discussion of Sautrāntika is included in an appendix to Harada’s article.

References

Primary Sources

- Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāṛtti*. Ed. P.S. Jaini. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 4. Second edition. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1973.
- **Abhidharmahṛdaya (A-p'i-t'an hsin lun 阿毘曇心論)*. Dharmasīrī (or Dharmasreṣṭhin). T. 1550.
- **Abhidharmahṛdaya (A-p'i-t'an hsin lun ching 阿毘曇心論經)*. Upaśānta. T. 1551.
- Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Ed. P. Pradhan. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series VIII. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.
- Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*. Ed. U. Wogihara. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Bookstore, 1990. Reprint (First edition: Tokyo: The Publishing Association of the *Abhidharma-kośa-vyākhyā*, 1932-1936).
- Ch'eng wei-shih lun shu chi 成唯識論述記*. K'uei-chi 窺基. T. 1830.
- Chü-she lun chi 俱舍論記*. P'u-kuang 普光. T. 1821.
- Chü-she lun shu 俱舍論述*. Fa-pao 法寶. T. 1822.
- I pu-tsung lun lun shu chi 異部宗輪論述記*. K'uei-chi 窺基. *Dai Nihon zokuzōkyō* 844
- **Nyāyānusāra (A-p'i-ta-mo shun cheng-li lun 阿毘達磨順正理論)*. Saṃghabhadra. T. 1562.
- Samayabhedoparacanacakra (I pu-tsung lun lun 異部宗輪論)*. Vasumitra. Trans. Hsüan-tsang. T. 2031.
- **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya (Tsa a-p'i-t'an hsin lun 雜阿毘曇心論)*. Dharmatrāta. T. 1552.
- **Tattvasiddhiśāstra (Ch'eng shih lun 成實論)*. Harivarman. T. 1646.
- **Vibhāṣā (A-p'i-ta-mo ta p'i-p'o-sha lun 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論)*. Trans. Hsüan-tsang. T. 1545.
- **Vibhāṣā (A-p'i-t'an p'i-p'o-sha lun 阿毘曇毘婆沙論)*. Trans. Buddhavarman. T. 1546.
- Yü-ch'ieh-shi ti lun lüeh tsuan 瑜伽師地論略纂*. K'uei-chi 窺基. T. 1829.

Modern Works

- Bechert, Heinz. "Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna." *German Scholars on India: Contributions to Indian Studies*. Ed. Cultural Department of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, New Delhi. Vol. 1. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 6-18.
- Cox, Collett. *Controversies in Dharma Theory*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University. 1983.
- . *Disputed Dharmas: Early Buddhist Theories on Existence*. *Studia Philologica Buddhica: Monograph Series 11*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1995.

- Dessein, Bart. *Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya: Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions*. Buddhist Tradition Series 33. Vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.
- Fukuda Takumi 福田琢. “Daibibasharon ni mieru hiyusha no shinshinsho bettai setsu” 『大毘婆沙論』に見える譬喩者の心心所別体説. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 45/2 (1997): 913-910.
- , “Kyōryōbu no Daitoku Rāma” 經量部の大徳ラーム. *Bukkyōshigaku Kenkyū* 41/1 (1998): 1-36.
- Hakamaya Noriaki 袴谷憲昭. “Pūrvācārya kō” Pūrvācārya 考. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 34/2 (1986): 93-100.
- Harada Wasō 原田和宗. “Dignāga no Hastavālaprakarāṇa & Vṛtti.” *Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūshitsu Nenpō* 6 (1993): 92-110.
- , “Kyōryōbu no ‘tansō no’ shiki no nagare to iu gainen e no gimon [I]” <經量部の「単層の」識の流れ>という概念への疑問 (I). *Indogaku Chibettogaku Kenkyū* 1 (1996): 135-193.
- , “Kyōryōbu no ‘tansō no’ shiki no nagare to iu gainen e no gimon [II]” <經量部の「単層の」識の流れ>という概念への疑問 (II). *Indogaku Chibettogaku Kenkyū* 2 (1997): 22-59.
- , “Kyōryōbu no ‘tansō no’ shiki no nagare to iu gainen e no gimon [III]” <經量部の「単層の」識の流れ>という概念への疑問 (III). *Indogaku Chibettogaku Kenkyū* 3 (1998): 92-110.
- Honjō Yoshifumi 本庄良文. “Sautrāntika.” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 40/2 (1992): 148-154.
- Hyōdō Kazuo 兵藤一夫. “Kusharon ni mieru setsuissaiubu to kyōryōbu no ijuku setsu” 『俱舍論』に見える説一切有部と經量部の異熟説. *Bukkyō Shisō Shi* 3 (1980): 57-88.
- Jaini, P.S. Introduction. *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*. Ed. P.S. Jaini. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 4. Second edition. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, 1973. 1-136.
- , “Origin and Development of the Theory of viprayukta-saṃskāras.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 22/3 (1959): 531-547.
- , “The Sautrāntika Theory of bīja.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 22/2 (1959): 236-249.
- Kajiyama Yūichi 梶山雄一. *Bukkyō ni okeru sonzai to chishiki* 佛教における存在と知識. Tokyo: Kinokuniya Shoten, 1983.
- Katō Junshō 加藤純章. *Kyōryōbu no kenkyū* 經量部の研究 (*Étude sur les Sautrāntika*). Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1989.
- , “Notes sur les Deux Maitres Bouddhiques: Kumāralāta et Śrīlāta,” in *Indianness et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 23. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1980.
- Katsura, Shoryu. *A Study of Harivarman’s Tattvasiddhi*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1974.

- Kritzer, Robert. *A Comparison of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (Chapters I-III) and the Yogācārabhūmi*. (Japanese Ministry of Education Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research C. Project Number 11610024.) Kyoto: privately printed, 2001.
- , *Rebirth and Causation in the Yogācāra Abhidharma*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 44. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1999.
- , “Vasubandhu on *saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānam*.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 16/1 (1993): 24-55.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de, trans. *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. 6 vols. New edition. *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 16. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1971. Reprint (First edition: Louvain: J.B. Istaș, 1923-1931).
- , “Documents d’Abhidharma: la controverse du temps.” *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 15 (1936-1937): 7-158.
- , “Sautrāntikas.” *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Ed. James Hastings. 13 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908-1926.
- , trans. *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: La Siddhi de Hiuan-tsang* (French translation of *Ch’eng wei shih lun*). 2 vols. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1928-1929.
- Lamotte, Étienne. *History of Indian Buddhism*. Trans. Sara Webb-Boin. Publications of l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain: 36. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1988.
- , trans. *Traité de la démonstration de l’acte de Vasubandhu: Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*. *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 4 (1935-36).
- Lévi, Sylvain. “La *Dr̥ṣṭāntapañkti* et son auteur.” *Journal asiatique* 211 (1927): 95-127.
- Lüders, Heinrich. *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā des Kumāralāta*. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie; Bd. 1. Kleinere Sanskrittexte; Heft 1-2. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1979. (Reprint of the 1926 ed. published by the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Leipzig.)
- Matsuda Kazunobu 松田和信. “*Funbetsuengishoshōhōmongyō (ĀVVS): kyōryōbu seshin no engisetsu*” 『分別縁起初勝法門經 (ĀVVS) 一經量部世親の縁起説一. *Bukkyōgaku Seminā* 36 (1982): 40-70.
- , “*Seshin engikyōyaku (PSVy) ni okeru arayashiki no teigi*” 世親 『縁起経訳 (PSVy)』におけるアラヤ識の定義. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 31/1 (1982): 63-66.
- , “*Vasubandhu kenkyū nōto (1)*” Vasubandhu 研究ノート(1). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 32/ 2 (1984): 82-85.
- , “*Vyākhyāyukti no nitai setsu – Vasubandhu kenkyū nōto (2)*” Vyākhyāyukti 二諦説 – Vasubandhu 研究ノート(2). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 33/2 (1985): 114-120.
- Mejor, Marek. *Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa and the Commentaries Preserved in the Tanjur*. Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an

- der Universität Hamburg, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 42. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1991.
- Mimaki Katsumi 御牧克己. “Le chapitre du *Blo gsal grub mtha*’ sur les Sautrāntika: Un essai de traduction.” *Zinbun: Memoirs of the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies, Kyoto University* 16 (1980): 143-172.
- . “Le chapitre du *Blo gsal grub mtha*’ sur les Sautrāntika: Présentation et édition.” *Zinbun: Memoirs of the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies, Kyoto University* 15 (1979): 175-210.
- Miyamoto Shōson 宮本正尊. “Hiyusha, Daitoku Hoggu, Dōju, *Yumanron* no Kenkyū” 譬喩者大徳法救、童受、喩鬘論の研究. *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai Nenpo* 1 (1928): 115-192.
- Miyashita Seiki 宮下晴輝. “*Kusharon* ni okeru hon mu kon u ron no haikai” 『俱舍論』における本無今有の背景. *Bukkyōgaku Seminā* 44 (1986): 7-37.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. “Hiyushi to *Jōjitsuron*” 譬喩師と成實論. *Komazawa-daigaku Bukkyō Gakkai Nenpo* 1 (1930): 134-156.
- Muroji Gijin 室寺義仁. *Jōgōron chibetto yaku kōtei hon 成業論 チベット訳校訂本*. Kyoto: privately printed, 1985.
- Nishi Giyū 西義雄, trans. *Kusharonki* 俱舍論記. Kokuyaku issaikyō wakan senjutsubu. Ronsobu 5. Revised edition. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1981.
- Okano Kiyoshi 岡野潔. “Indobukkyōbungaku kenkyū shi 6: Jaatakamaalaa bungaku no kenkyū shi: Kumaaralaata no Kalpanaama.n.ditikaa D.r.s.taantapa.nkti” 『インド仏教文学研究史: Jaatakamaalaa 文学の研究史』 Kumaaralaata の Kalpanaama.n.ditikaa D.r.s.taantapa.nkti. *Kyūshū Indo Bukkyōgaku* 九州印度仏教学. 22 Feb. 2002. 24 Feb. 2003 <<http://member.nifty.ne.jp/OKANOKIYOSHI/kumaralata.html>>
- Przyluski, Jean. “Dārṣāntika, Sautrāntika, and Sarvāstivādin.” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 16 (1940): 246-254.
- . “Sautrāntika et Dārṣāntika.” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 8 (1931-1932): 14-24.
- Rospatt, Alexander von. *The Buddhist Doctrine of Momentariness*. Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 47. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995.
- Saeki Kyokuga 佐伯旭雅. *Kandō Abidatsumakusharon* 冠導阿毘達磨俱舍論. 3 vols. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1978.
- Sakurabe, Hajime. “Abhidharma.” *Buddhist Spirituality: Indian, Southeast Asian, Tibetan, and Early Chinese*. Ed. Takeuchi Yoshinori. New York: Crossroad, 1993. 67-78.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. “Sautrāntika-voraussetzungen in *Viṃśatikā* und *Triṃśika*.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 11 (1967): 109-136.
- Skorupski, Tadeusz. “Sautrāntika.” *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Ed. Mircea Eliade. New York: Macmillan, 1987. 16 vols.
- Takai Kankai 高井観海. *Shōjō Bukkyō Gairon*. Kyoto: Fujii Bunseido, 1928.
- Tokoro Rie 所理恵. “*Jōjitsuron Kusharon* to hiyusha, kyōryōbu to no kakawari ni tsuite [1]” 『成實論』『俱舍論』と譬喩者・經量部との関わりについて (-) *Bunka* 170 (1989): 48-69.

- Willems, Charles et al. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Zweite Abteilung. Indien. 11 Bd. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Yamabe Nobuyoshi 山部能宜. "Bīja Theory in *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 38/2 (1990): 13-15.
- . "Yugashichiron ni okeru zenaku inka setsu no ichisokumen: iwayuru 'shiki-shingokun' setsu o chūshin toshite" 『瑜伽師地論』における善悪因果説の一側面 — いわゆる「色心互熏」説を中心として. *Nihon Bukkyōgakkai Nenpō* 65 (2000): 127-146.
- Yamaguchi Susumu 山口進益. *Seshin no Jōgyōron* 世親の成業論. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1975. (Reprint. First edition: Kyoto 1951).