

Vasubandhu's relationship to the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkārahāṣya* and *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* based on citations in the *Vyākhyāyukti*

Toshio HORIUCHI

Introduction

In the study of Vasubandhu (ca. 4c), scholars cannot overlook the impact of the so-called two Vasubandhu theory advocated by E. Frauwallner in 1951, which insists that Vasubandhu the Kośakāra (author of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, AKBh) and Vasubandhu the brother of Asaṅga are different. Although most Japanese scholars have not accepted this theory, Frauwallner's thesis has nonetheless been provocative, adding to our understanding of the study of Vasubandhu. As the sobriquet “the author of thousands of treatises” implies, many treatises are attributed to Vasubandhu. To ascribe this large number of texts to one author is, of course, implausible. Therefore, the issue of what text to ascribe to what “Vasubandhu” has become an important task for scholars. In other words, scholars have had to reconsider their ascription of many texts which apparently have different line of thought to only one author, and have had to begin to scrutinize the differences found in those texts.

On the other hand, it has to be noted that Kazunobu Matsuda has ascribed the *Pratītyasamutpādayākyā* (PSVy) to the Kośakāra Vasubandhu, and based on the fact that AKBh and the *Karmasiddhi* (KS) are mentioned therein, he also proved that PSVy was posterior to AKBh and KS. As the *Vyākhyāyukti* is mentioned in KS, and the *Vimśatikā* and the *Triṃśikā* (Tr) are said to be Vasubandhu's final works, he assumed that the works of Kośakāra Vasubandhu are:

- Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*
- *Vyākhyāyukti*
- *Karmasiddhi*
- *Pratītyasamutpādayākyā*
- *Vimśatikā*
- *Triṃśikā*,

in this order. In this way, one theme in the study of Vasubandhu has become to examine texts of dubious authorship in light of the above texts and thus ascribe (or deny) authorship.

This paper does not aim to provide new evidence concerning the two Vasubandhu theory, nor does it examine his dates. Rather, this paper re-examines citations from two Mahāyāna texts – the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* (MSA) and *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* (LAS; specifically, verses in LAS) – found in VyY. First, this paper examines the meaning of the three parallel passages found in both VyY and MSA and tries to determine the relationship between the two texts. Second, this paper examines the verses, which correspond to LAS, cited in VyY and tries to seek a possible chronology of the two texts based on both recent studies about LAS and the examination of Vasubandhu's method of citation. An appendix examines some of the Mahāyānasūtras cited in VyY. Skilling (2000) is an informative study of the VyY and includes a list of this kind; the appendix to this paper is simply an addendum to Skilling's work¹.

1 MSA and VyY

Previous studies have reported that there are three parallel passages found both in MSA(Bh)² and in VyY³:

* I would like to express my gratitude to Professor José Cabezón and Mr. Nathan McGovern, a graduate student at the University of California, Santa Barbara, who kindly corrected my English.

The mistakes that still remain are my own.

¹ Part of this paper was presented at the meeting of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (2008) in Atlanta.

² On the relationship between MSABh and AKBh, see Hakamaya, Noriaki and Arai, Hiroaki (1993) *Daijōshōgonkyōron*, Shin Kokuyaku Daizōkyō, Yuga Yuishiki-Bu 12, Daizō Shuppan.

³ Lee (2001: 53) points out that although in Ch. V of VyY (VyY (L), 311), there is a citation from *mdo sde rgyan* (**Sūtrālamkāra*), this has no correspondence either to MSA or to Aśvagoṣa's

Case (1): It has been reported that the explanation of the sixty aspects of the Tathāgata's speech found in Ch. V of VyY (VyY(L), 262-268) has a parallel in MSABh (ad. MSA, XII.9, MSABh (N2), 178-192)⁴. Lee (2001: 55-60) cites and compares the explanations found in these texts and shows that they completely accord with one another.

Case (2): Fujita (1996) reported that a verse cited under the introductory phrase *byang chub sems dpa' legs par rnam par byang ba rtogs pas kyang* (**svyavadātasamayabodhisattvenāpi*) in Ch. IV of VyY (VyY(L), 215.11-14) corresponds to MSA, I.12 (MSABh (N1), 42-44)⁵.

Case (3): Lee (2001: 51-53) pointed out that Ch. IV of VyY (VyY(L), 233.1-4) cites a verse from MSA (XI.31, A verse on the investigation of the object) under the introductory phrase “*theg pa chen po las* (**mahāyāne*)”.

Of course, the mere existence of parallel passages does not indicate that these two texts were written by the same author. However, it is also true that it surely shows some relationship between the two texts. The question is, to what is the extent of this relationship? Here, I shall examine case (3) and try to determine the relationship between VyY and MSABh.

1.1 VyY

In VyY Ch. IV, Vasubandhu cites the following verse [VyY, D108b2ff, P126b3ff (VyY(L), 232ff.)]:

gzhan yang theg pa chen po las/
 yang dag min rtog⁶ yang dag min//
 yang dag min pa min⁷ mi rtog//
 rtog min mi rtog ma yin par//
 shes bya thams cad yin par bstan//
 zhes tshigs su bcad pa bstan pa yang yin no//
 de la yang dag min rtog ni gang zhig thar pa dang mi mthun pa'o// yang dag min yang dag min
 pa min ni zag pa dang bcas pa'i thar pa dang mthun pa ste/ brjod du med pa'i mtshan nyid mi
 rtogs⁸ pa'i phyir dang/ de rtogs⁹ pa dang mthun pa'i phyir ro// mi rtog ni 'jig rten las 'das pa'i
 lam dang/ chos nmams kyi de bzhin nyid de gang zag dang chos la bdag med pa nyid ni¹⁰ mnam
 par rtog pa'i mtshan nyid med pa'i phyir ro// rtog min mi¹¹ rtog ma yin pa ni 'phags pa nmams
 kyi 'jig rten las 'das pa'i rjes las thob pa dag pa 'jig rten pa'i ye shes yin te/ yang dag pa ji lta
 ba'i¹² yul yin pa'i phyir dang/ chos kyi mtshan nyid mnam par 'jog pa'i phyir ro//

Aside from the word order, a possible reconstruction of the original Sanskrit of the above text is as follows:

*(tatra (1) abhūtakaḥpo yo na mokṣānukūlah/ (2) na bhūto nābhūto yo sāsravamokṣānukūlo,
 anadhigamād anabhilāpyalākṣaṇasya tadadhigamānukūlāc ca/ (3) akalpas lokottaramārgo
 dharmānām ca tathatā, vikalpalākṣaṇābhāvāt pudgaladharmanairātmyasya/ (4) na kalpo nāpi
 cākālpō āryānām lokottaraprṣṭhalabdham jñānam, yathābhūtaviṣayāt
 dharmalākṣaṇavyavasthānāc ca/)

**Sūtrālamkāra*.

⁴ Khang dkar Tshul khriims sKal bzang: *Byams chos bskyar shib drang nges mdzes rgyan*, 1984, New Delhi; Hakamaya and Arai (1993, 56. n.42).

⁵ Tradition says that Vasubandhu first maligned the Mahāyāna but later was converted to the Mahāyāna by his brother Asaṅga. The legend says that he converted to the Mahāyāna upon hearing the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*. However, Vasubandhu's citations of MSA Ch.I in VyY seem to suggest another possibility: Vasubandhu converted to the Mahāyāna upon hearing MSA. And later in his VyY, he defends the authenticity of the Mahāyāna, citing MSA.

⁶ P rtogs

⁷ D pa min; P rtog na

⁸ D rtog; cf. VyYT(D) rtogs

⁹ D rtog; cf. VyYT(DP) rtogs

¹⁰ P kyi

¹¹ P min

¹² DP ba; cf. VyYT(DP) ba'i

1.2 MSA, XI.31 and MSABh

MSA, XI.31 and its commentary, on the other hand, run as follows¹³ [MSABh (N2), 79-81; cf. D Phi 170b3ff, P Phi 183bff.]

jñeyaparyeṣṭau ślokaḥ/

abhūtakalpo no bhūto nābhūto 'kalpa eva ca/
na kalpo nāpi cākalpaḥ sarvaṃ jñeyam nirucyate//
abhūtakalpo yo na lokottarajñānānukūlaḥ kalpaḥ/ na bhūto nābhūto yas tadanukūlo yāvan
nirvedhabhāgiyah/ akalpas tathatā lokottaram ca jñānam/ na kalpo nāpi cākalpo
lokottaraprṣṭhalabhdham laukikam jñānam/ etāvaca sarvaṃ jñeyam/

A verse on the investigation of the object:

The entire object (everything that is an object of knowledge) is taught to be [the object of]
(1) unreal imaginative construction, as (2) neither real nor unreal, as (3) nonconceptual,
and as (4) neither conceptual nor nonconceptual.

(1) “Unreal imaginative construction” is mental construction which does not conform to transcendental intuition. (2) “Neither real nor unreal” is that [conceptual construction] which does conform to [such intuition], up to¹⁴ the aids to penetrative insight. (3) “The nonconceptual” is suchness and transcendental intuition. (4) “Neither conceptual nor nonconceptual” is the mundane intuition attained in the aftermath of transcendental intuition. And that is the entire object.

1.3 Contextual examination

First, Vasubandhu cites this verse in VyY in the context of illustrating that “even an unreal imaginative construction (**abhūtaparikalpa*), some conforms to purification¹⁵”. In this context, he takes as an example a conception held by ordinary beings, namely ordinary beings' (**prthagjanas*) conception that “the dharmas are impermanent (**anitya*)”, and he states that it does not correspond to reality¹⁶. However, according to Vasubandhu, that conception is not discordant to attaining the understanding of the dharmas the way they are¹⁷. He seems to have cited the above MSA verse to

¹³ I have consulted Thurman et al (2004) to translate this part.

¹⁴ Although Thurman et al (2004) translates *yāvat* (tib, *bar*) as “such as”, judging from Sthiramati's commentary (SAVBh), it seems that this should rather be translated as “up to”, or “till”.

SAVBh, D Mi 182a2-3, P Mi 202a2-3:

so so'i skye bo'i dus na dam pa'i chos nyan pa dang sems pa la sogs pa nas brstams te mos pa spyod pa'i sa 'jig rten gyi chos mchog man chad gyi rtog pa la bya ste/
[*Na bhūto nābhūto* (Neither real nor unreal)] is the construction when one is an ordinary being (**prthagjana*) starting from hearing and thinking of the true doctrine (**saddharma*) up to (*man chad*) the stage of zealous conduct (**adhimukticyābhūmi*).

Here, *adhimukticyābhūmi* is the stage of an ordinary being that comes before *darśanamārga* (Cf. *Mahāyānasamgraha*, III.3). As is seen from this commentary, the *yāvat* in MSA is understood as designating “up to”, “till”.

This interpretation is also attested by the following doctrinal point of view: first, among the four *nirvedhabhāgiyas*, the stage *lokāgra* is just before (one *kṣaṇa* before) the *darśanamārga* [in which stage one attains] *lokottarajñāna*. Second, there is a stage named *mokṣabhāgiya* before *nirvedhabhāgiya*. Thus, *yāvat* seems to refer to everything from the beginning of *mokṣabhāgiya* to (/up to/till) the end of *nirvedhabhāgiya*, all of which conform to transcendental intuition.

¹⁵ VyY(L), 232.8-10: yan dag pa ji lta ba bzhin ma yin par kun ru rtog pa yang ...kha cig rnam par byang ba dang mthun pa yin te/.

On the broader context, see Cabezón (1992).

¹⁶ VyY(L), 232.18-20: so so'i skye bo nmams mi rtog pa la sogs pa'i rnam pa dag gis chos nmams la kun tu rtog pa na/ yang dag pa ji lta ba bzhin du rtog pa ma yin te/.

¹⁷ VyY(L), 232.24: mi mthun pa ma yin no//.

refer the second construction, which conforms to the **sāsravamokṣa*, to illustrate his argument¹⁸.

Second, let us consider the content of MSABh and VyY. The MSA verse divides construction (*kalpa=vikalpa*) into four categories. MSABh makes transcendental intuition (*lokottarajñāna*) a criterion of division. In this sense, this commentary is clear and simple. VyY also allots the latter two constructions ((3) and (4)) to the transcendental (**lokottara*); however, VyY commentary on these lines from MSA seems not to be as clear as MSABh's. The commentary in VyY seems to be adjusting to the context, because the term **anabhilāpyalakṣaṇa*, **pudgaladharmanairātmya* are important terms in VyY Ch. IV. Moreover, it is to be noted that in the passages before this, he argues that, although there is no teaching of the “essencelessness of all dharmas” in the Śrāvakayāna, the Buddha did not deceive Śrāvakas, because Śrāvakas attain liberation by way of understanding the essencelessness of person (**pudgala*)¹⁹. And, among the four constructions (**kaptas*), this second item which he elucidates as indicating “zag pa dang bcas pa'i thar pa dang mthun pa” is what Vasubandhu intended to show by citing the verse. In this way, the commentary given by VyY seems to be more flexible and ingenious.

A peculiar term establishing the relationship between the two commentaries seems to be “the [mundane] intuition attained in the aftermath of transcendental intuition (**lokottaraprṣṭhalabhdha-[-laukika]-jñāna*)”, because this is not seen anywhere else in the MSA verse. However, even this does not suggest a strong relationship between the two commentaries. Rather, what suggests the relationship is a stylistic similarity.

1.4 Stylistic examination

Let us therefore consider the above two commentaries from a stylistic point of view. First of all, the word-by-word style commentary of VyY is similar to that of MSABh cited above. However, what is noteworthy here is rather the fact that these commentaries are *different*. That is to say, if both the commentaries are the same (as in case (1) of the three parallel passages found both in MSA(Bh) and in VyY. See section “1 MSA and VyY” above), it is possible to assume that one was just citing from the other. And this would not suggest anything concerning the authorship of the two texts. The simple fact that VyY cites a verse from MSA (as in case (2)), on the other hand, shows nothing more than that VyY knew that verse.

However, here in case (3), the two commentaries are different. This fact at least shows that Vasubandhu, the author of VyY, himself wrote a comment on a MSA verse. Or, in other words, we can catch a glimpse in Vasubandhu the Kośakāra as a commentator on MSA. One of the hesitations of scholars to ascribe MSABh to Vasubandhu the Kośakāra seem to have been based on the following question: Would an author as creative as Vasubandhu write this kind of commentary? However, on the basis of the above investigation, one can at least say that the Kośakāra Vasubandhu commented on MSA in a manner similar to that found in MSABh. And it is only after this somewhat roundabout investigation that this parallel passage can be considered as an example showing the relationship between the author of VyY and MSABh to some extent²⁰.

2 LAS and VyY

Since Yamaguchi²¹ reported that two sets of verses found in Ch. IV of VyY (VyY(L), 225.18-227.3) correspond to LAS (vv.135-137, vv.150-155ab), the chronology of Vasubandhu and LAS has become a vexing question. On this topic, Schimthausen (1992) is convincing. He examined the parallel passages between Vasubandhu's *Trimsikā* (Tr.28.3, 20.5) and LAS (169.3ff, 163.10ff.

¹⁸ Lee (2001: 52) misunderstands this context and interprets this second item as referring to the construction of *ārya(s)*.

¹⁹ VyY(L), 230.10ff.

²⁰ If I admit that MSABh was written by the Kośakāra, which I think is highly possible, and have to place this text among the Vasubandhu works, I place MSABh immediately before (or immediately after) VyY. In any case MSABh would have to have been written after AKBh. The latter contains no Mahāyāna ideology of the type found in VyY.

²¹ Yamaguchi, Susumu *Bukkyōgakubunshū* (Ge), Shunjūsha, 1973.

prose portion) and concluded that LAS cited Tr. On the other hand, the fact that Vasubandhu used the introductory phrases *gzhan las kyang* (“in another [text]”) and *yang gsungs pa* (“further, it runs as follows”) when he cited the verses corresponding to LAS; in other words – the fact that he did not mention the name LAS – seems to have created a headache for scholars²².

As the *Sagāthaka* (verse portion) of LAS was not included in the earliest translation of the LAS (443 CE²³), its existence has generally been assumed to be later. However, Takasaki (1980: 345)²⁴ says, “It would be allowable to suppose that the *Sagāthakam* and the main body of the *Laṅkāvatāra* were different texts in the beginning - different texts from the same source materials” and further, “Those verses which are found in both the main body and the *Sagāthakam* can claim their antiquity as forming the original text of the *Laṅkāvatāra*” . Kubota (1989, etc), on the other hand, suggests the possibility that *Sagāthaka* was prior to LAS.

Here, I first examine the ways of citation in VyY because some scholars seem to be too nervous in their understanding of the “LAS introductory phrase” in VyY. After that, I try to seek a possible chronology of VyY and LAS based on recent studies and Vasubandhu's testimony.

2.1 First, the introductory phrases *gzhan las kyang* (“in another [text/ place]”) and *yang gsungs pa* (“further, it is taught”) found in VyY apparently shows that the passages immediately after these phrases are citations [from a text]:

1) As regards the Śrāvakayāna texts (scriptures), Vasubandhu often cites them without even mentioning that they are citations from scriptures: In Ch. I of VyY, he explains that a word has diverse meanings, citing many scriptures as illustrations²⁵. However, he does not even mention that they are citations from scriptures. Here, I just cite one case: he explains 9 meanings of **pada* by citing 9 examples. The second explanation runs as follows [VyY(L), 20: (b)]: *rkang pa la ni* “seems can gang dag rkang pa med pa 'am/ rkang gnyis sam/ rkang mangs sam” *zhes 'byung ba lta bu'o//*. As this phrase is undoubtedly found in the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, V.21.12-13 (*sattā apadā vā dipadā vā catuppadā vā bahupadā vā*), it is surely a citation from a scripture. However, Vasubandhu just says: *zhes 'byung ba lta bu'o//*.

2) As regards the Mahāyāna texts, on the other hand, it is true that he often cites them referring to their names. However, in Ch. IV of VyY [VyY(L), 213-214], Vasubandhu cites a *sūtra* as *mdo gzhan las* (“in another scripture (**sūtra*)”). The same text is further cited under the phrase *de nyid las* (“in the same [scripture]”) and *gzhan yang* (“furthermore”). These are citations from the *Brahmaviśeṣacintipariprcchāsūtra*.

²² Schimthausen (1992): “As regards the quotation of LAS verses in the *Vyākhyāyukti*, Takasaki has already pointed out that these verses are not expressly quoted as s t e m m i n g f r o m L A S. This means that at the time when the *Vyākhyāyukti* was written some materials now found in LAS were, to be sure, already in existence, but LAS as a composition or compilation of such materials need not have existed yet. And even if it did exist, it need not yet have existed in the form presupposed by Guṇabhadra” .

Kubota, Chikara (1989) (in *Bunka* (Tōhoku Daigaku Bungaku-kai)), Vol.52.3-4, 147-178) is an informative study which lists the citations of LAS in the later Buddhist treatises. This paper (p.43.n. 59), referring to Vasubandhu's way of citation of LAS, casts doubt on whether the *Sagāthaka* was originally intended to be a *sūtra* (or a part of a *sūtra*).

This is not about LAS, but Lee (2001: 54, and 53.n.105), on the other hand, supposes that the compilation of MSA had not been finished when Vasubandhu wrote VyY based on the fact that Vasubandhu did not mention the name MSA when he cited it in his VyY.

²³ The *Sagāthaka* is included in two Chinese translations made in 513 CE and 700-704 CE, respectively.

²⁴ Jikido Takasaki (1980) “Analysis of the *Laṅkāvatāra*: In search of its original form” , *Indianisme et Bouddhisme : Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain, 339-352.

²⁵ Cf. Skilling (2000: 338) “Thirteen words with diverse meanings” .

2.2 Second, the fact that Vasubandhu does not mention the names of texts never indicates that Vasubandhu did not know the names of the texts nor that the names of those texts were not given at that time²⁶:

1) Although the *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra* is cited in VyY [VyY(L), 238.4 ff.] as “a verse that occurs in the *Mahāyāna*” (*theg pa chen po las 'byung ba'i tshigs su bcad pa*), in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, which is supposed to be prior to VyY, the same text is cited under the title *Bhavasamkrāntisūtra*.

2) The *Brahmaviśeṣacintiparipṛcchā* which I mentioned above, was translated into Chinese as early as the third century CE, and has been cited in many treatises such as the **Mahāyānasamgraha* and MSABh.

2.3 Examination

In this way, the “LAS introductory phrase” in VyY is understood as shedding no light on the compilation of LAS. Vasubandhu may or may not have cited from the scripture called the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*.

It is rather the introductory phrase when he cites verses from the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* and LAS that shows the textual situation of LAS. He says [VyY(L), 225.6-8]:

de dag las tshigs su bcad pa tsam ni shas shig brjod par bya'o//

“I mention only the verses [and then] just a portion [of these verses] from those (i.e., from scriptures or passages of scriptures of definitive meaning) ” .

If we believe this testimony, not only verses but also some *prose* portions of LAS or Ur-LAS seem to have existed²⁷. However, based on Schmithausen's conclusion that LAS is posterior to Tr, the Ur-LAS which Vasubandhu may have consulted is not the one found in LAS. Therefore, a possible chronology based on the above examination is

Ur-LAS (prose and verses²⁸)

-VyY

-Tr

-LAS (as found in 443's Chinese translation)

The above chronology is what scholars have thought was the case on this topic²⁹ and is nothing new in itself. Moreover, close examination of the whole LAS and Vasubandhu texts is needed. However, I came to this conclusion by re-examining the “LAS introductory phrase” in VyY and the testimony by Vasubandhu.

3 Conclusion

This paper examined two citations of the Mahāyāna texts in VyY: MSA and LAS.

First, I examined the parallel passages between VyY and MSABh and pointed out that there are parallels that can serve as evidence in ascribing MSABh to Vasubandhu the Kośakāra.

Second, I examined the LAS citation in VyY, and, based on an examination of the citation of scriptures in VyY and Vasubandhu's testimony, I pointed out the possibility that Vasubandhu cited from the Ur-LAS, which included both verse and prose portions.

These conclusions are only preliminary and further investigation of MSA(Bh) and LAS is, of course, needed.

²⁶ As regards the Śrāvakayāna texts (*āgamas*), again, it is rather rare that VyY mentions their names. For example, as Skilling (2000) shows, Vasubandhu cites the *Udānavarga* as from **gāthā* in Ch. I of VyY.

²⁷ Vasubandhu surely cites the prose portions of the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* in his VyY (VyY(L), 239.22ff).

²⁸ The Ur (Proto)-LAS is not the same text available to us as LAS today. Some scholars argue that the *Sagāthaka* at least was in the form we have now. Note that the passages in LAS which Schimthausen claimed as citations from Tr were found in the prose portions of LAS.

²⁹ Schimthausen (1992) and the studies which accepted his article.

.....
Appendix

Here, I shall point out that there are citations of the *Brahmaviśeṣacintipariṣcchā*, *Lokottaraparivarta*, and *Tathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśasūtra* in VyY.

1. In the context of arguing that the Mahāyāna, esp., *sarvadharmaniḥsvabhāvatā* (essencelessness of all dharmas) theory is not to be taken literally, Vasubandhu cites three canonical passages without referring to their source by name. All three³⁰ are citations from the *Brahmaviśeṣacintipariṣcchāsūtra* (BVP³¹).

VyY(L), 213.4-9=BVP, D42b6(/5)-43a1, P44a8(/7)-44b2³²;

VyY(L), 213.17-214.3=BVP, D44a3-5, P45b6-46a1³³;

VyY(L), 214.8-18=BVP, D29b2-4, P30a7-30b1(/2)³⁴;

2. In the latter part of VyY Ch. IV, Vasubandhu argues that Śākyamuni Buddha is an emanation (**nirmāṇa*). In the course of his arguments, he mentions the names of several scriptures.

2.1 VyY(L), 246.4-7:

[Question] Then, what purpose is there in the teaching that **Uttara*³⁵ and so on are **nirmāṇa*?

[Answer] Determine [the purpose] suitably [as taught in the *sūtras*] such as the

**Upāyakaūśalyasūtra* and the **Lokottaraparivarta*.

The last part of the *Lokottaraparivarta* elucidates the acts of the bodhisattvas beginning from the staying in the Abode of *Tuṣīta* to the attainment of *parinirvāṇa* (D No.44 Ga 251b3-264a2). Cf. *Lokottaraparivarta*, D Ga 251b3, P Si 16b2-3.

2.2 In the last part of VyY Ch. IV [VyY(L), 248.22], Vasubandhu mentions the *De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba bstan pa'i mdo*. The *De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba 'byung ba bstan pa* (D Ga 123a6-123b1, P Śi 123a6-8) contains similar descriptions. Cf. *ibid.*, D Ga 123b2-3, P Śi, 123b8-124a1³⁶.

Abbreviations

BVP: *Āryabrahmaviśeṣacintipariṣcchā nāma mahāyānasūtra*. 'Phags pa tshangs pas byin gyis shus pa shes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo. D No.160, P No.827.

LAS: *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. Nanjyo, B. ed., Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1, Kyoto, 1923.

MSABh (N1): Nagao Gadjin, Daijōshōgonkyōron Wayaku to Chūkai Jyō, Kyoto, 2008.

MSABh (N2): Nagao Gadjin, Daijōshōgonkyōron Wayaku to Chūkai Ge, Kyoto, 2008.

SAVBh: Sthiramati, *Sūtrālamkāravṛttibhāṣya*. D No. 4034, P No. 5531.

³⁰ Otake, Susumu (in *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū*, 46-2, 2003) reported that the third part is from the *Brahmaviśeṣacintipariṣcchā* and gave the location of the Chinese translation. However, the previous two parts are also citations from this scripture.

³¹ There are three Chinese translations: Taisho (T) No.585, 586, 587 (all found in T Vol.15). I just mention the corresponding locations in the following footnotes.

³² T15.40b; T15.71a.

³³ T15.41a; T15.71c; T15.8c.

³⁴ T15.35b; T15.65a; T15.3b.

³⁵ This is the name of *Śākyamuni* in his previous life.

³⁶ One flaw of this assumption is the fact that the name of the *sūtra* cited in this part of the VyY is assumed not to be *Tathāgatopattisambhavanirdeśa* (*De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba 'byung ba bstan pa*) but rather **Tathāgatopattinirdeśasūtra* (*De bzhin gshegs pa skye ba bstan pa'i mdo*). However, it is to be noted that the *Sarvapūnyasamuccayasamādhisūtra* is cited as **Sarvapūnyasamuccayasūtra*, in VyY(L), 223. Since in both Chinese and Tibetan translation of the scripture, we find the translation corresponding to *samādhi*, this case can be considered an example of an instance in which Vasubandhu cited a *sūtra* in an abridged manner.

VyY: Vasubandhu, *Vyākhyāyukti*. D No.4061, P No.5562.

VyY(L): Lee, Jong Choel *The Tibetan Text of the Vyākhyāyukti of Vasubandhu* Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 8, Tokyo: The Sankibo Press, 2001.

VyYT: Guṇamati, *Vyākhyāyukti-tīkā*. D No.4069, P No.5570.

Bibliography

Cabezón 1992

Cabezón, José Ignacio “Vasubandhu’s *Vyākhyāyukti* on the Authenticity of the Mahāyāna Sūtras” (in J. Timm, ed., *Traditional Hermeneutics in South Asia*, Albany: SUNY Press, 1992, 221-243)

Fujita 1996

Fujita, Shōdō “Mitsuishu to daijō bussetsuron: betsuji ishu no kaimei ni mukete”, *Donran no sekai*, Nagatabunshōdō, 1996, 1-53.

Lee 2001

Lee, Jong Choel *Seshin shisō no kenkyū: Shakkiron wo chūshin to shite (A Study of Vasubandhu: With Special Reference to the Vyākhyāyukti)*, *Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica* 9 (Sankibō Busshorin, 2001).

Schmithausen 1992

Schmithausen, Lambert “A Note on Vasubandhu and the Lankāvatārasūtra”, *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques*, XLVI-1, 1992, 392-397.

Skilling 2000

Skilling, Peter “Vasubandhu and the *Vyākhyāyukti* Literature,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 23-2 [2000], 297-350.

Thurman et al 2004

The universal vehicle discourse literature : Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra / by Maitreyanātha/Āryāsaṅga ; together with its commentary (bhāṣya) by Vasubandhu ; translated from the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese by L. Jampal et al; editor-in-chief, Robert A.F Thurman

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI