

Eastern Buddhism to Zen: a Postscript,” and deals mainly with the well-known role D. T. Suzuki played in the propagation of Zen Buddhism to the West, and with the transition, in the discourse on the East-West encounter, from the construction of “Eastern Buddhism” propounded by the Japanese delegation at the World’s Parliament of Religions and Zen Buddhism as ‘constructed’ by him. Snodgrass in this chapter also mentions other authors responsible for such a construction of the Orient, and of the image of Japan in particular, as presented to the West, such as Okakura Kakuzō’s English writings (see also Chapter One), and Nukariya Kaiten’s *Religion of the Samurai* (1913).

In conclusion, a few remarks are needed to be given on the organizational structure of the book under review. *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West* is written in an agreeable style which has to be appreciated, though in some parts it suffers a little from repetitiveness and a lack of homogeneity so breaking the flow of the discourse, both of which could have perhaps been avoided. One point of criticism which this reviewer wishes to raise, concerns the spelling of Max Müller’s surname which is always written with an umlaut, though this cannot be found anywhere in this book. One last minor complaint regards the organization of the table of contents, which includes only the titles of the chapters and not those of the sections, making it difficult when searching for a specific topic.

Overall, however, *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism, Occidentalism and the Columbian Exposition* is a valuable study on the representations of Japanese Buddhism during the modern period and on the attempts Japan made at constructing an image which enabled her to face the challenges of the West, and be recognized as a ‘civilized’ nation with a highly developed spiritual culture. Judith Snodgrass’ book, therefore, provides an important contribution to the contemporary scholarship on Japanese Buddhism and to the debate on questions related to power struggles in their orientalist and occidentalist manifestations, which are relevant to the understanding not only of Japanese Buddhism of the Meiji period, but also of the recent situation of Buddhism as a whole both within and outside Japan.

Vasubandhu and the Yogācārabhūmi: Yogācāra Elements in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya. Robert Kritzer. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series XVIII. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2005. ¥1700 paper, xxxvii + 417 pages. ISBN 4-906267-51-3.

TAKAHASHI KŌICHI

What is the Sautrāntika? How was Vasubandhu converted to Mahāyāna Buddhism? The relationship between Vasubandhu and the Yogācāra has been repeatedly exam-

ined from various viewpoints since E. Frauwallner published a well-known book entitled *On the Date of the Buddhist Master of the Law Vasubandhu*, Serie Orientale Rome, vol. 3, 1951. So far the following two facts have been widely accepted: the appellation “Sautrāntika” occurs for the first time in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and some notions attributed to this can be traced to the *Yogācārabhūmi*. We may safely hypothesize that some of the doctrines in the *Yogācārabhūmi* were later introduced into Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, more or less in disguise as those of the Sautrāntika’s. Relying on this hypothesis, the author, Dr. Robert Kritzer, who has been investigating the doctrinal relationship between the Abhidharma and the Yogācāra for a long time, attempts to show in this publication Vasubandhu’s reliance on the *Yogācārabhūmi* by providing vast comparative lists of relevant passages of both the texts mentioned above.

The present study is composed of three chapters: Chapter I, “Introduction” (pp. xi–xxx), II, “Methodology and Results” (pp. xxxi–xxxvii), and III, “Passages from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and Related Passages from the *Yogācārabhūmi*” (pp. 1–389). The main body of this work is followed by a “Concordance of Passages from the *Yogācārabhūmi*” (pp. 391–396), Bibliography (pp. 397–405), and Index (pp. 407–417).

In Chapter I, relying upon previous scholars’ research, the author gives outlines of both the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. As for the compilation of the former, which is a complex problem in itself, he agrees with Schmithausen that it is a compilation of material that varies considerably in age with the authors and compilers not being identified (p. xvii). Referring to its doctrinal contents, he emphasizes that the *Yogācārabhūmi* seems closely connected to the Sarvāstivāda tradition (p. xx). With respect to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, after the general description of the text, the author summarizes the controversies over Vasubandhu’s biography. As generally accepted, he agrees with Vasubandhu’s authorship of at least the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *Vyākhyāyukti*, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, *Pratītya-samutpādavyākhyā*, *Pañcaskandhaka*, *Viṃśatikā*, and *Triṃśikā* (p. xxvi). Finally, the author delineates the association between the views attributed to the Sautrāntika and the Yogācāra’s doctrine. In his opinion, there is a variety of correspondences between the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi* and these corresponding positions can be categorized into two groups: (1) ideas that cannot be traced to the Dārṣṭāntika of the *Vibhāṣā* and are not found in texts earlier than the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and (2) ideas that are found in the *Vibhāṣā*, and attributed to the Dārṣṭāntika (p. xxviii). The author states that it is Vasubandhu who first calls the positions belonging to both of these groups “Sautrāntika” (p. xxviii), and concludes that Vasubandhu uses this term in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* in order to designate positions in the *Yogācārabhūmi* that he prefers to those of orthodox Sarvāstivāda (p. xxx).

In Chapter II, the author explains the methodology and the results of the present study. In order to extract the Sautrāntika's opinions from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, its commentary by Saṅgabhadra, the **Nyāyānusāra*, is utilized. It is said that Saṅgabhadra mentions Vasubandhu as *jīn-zhū* 經主, when criticizing his statements concerning their deviations from orthodoxy. The author located the passages in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, which are criticized for having views of *jīn-zhū* in the **Nyāyānusāra*, and searched for corresponding ideas in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. As a result, he provides a table of distribution of the corresponding passages within the *Yogācārabhūmi* (p. xxxiii). It shows that Vasubandhu relied mostly on the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* of the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* with fifty-five corresponding passages, and secondly on the *Savitarkādibhūmi* in the *Maulī Bhūmi* with twenty-five. The author concludes that Vasubandhu relies most heavily on portions of the *Yogācārabhūmi* that have no specific Mahāyāna content like the *ālayavijñāna*, pointing out that there are relatively few correspondences to the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of the *Maulī Bhūmi* and the *Vastusamgrahaṇī*, both of which are considered to be the oldest strata by Schmithausen and Aramaki (p. xxxiv). At the end of this chapter, he gives a brief explanation of some important notions common to both the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*; for example, *prajñapti*, *bija* and the like.

In Chapter III, the author provides an immense list comprising approximately of 170 items, which contrasts the passages from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* with those from the *Yogācārabhūmi*, although about a third of these have not yet been traced to the latter. It is notable that this list includes some parts of the Sanskrit texts of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, which are reconstructed by K. Matsuda from a manuscript fragment preserved in St. Petersburg (cf. items 1.2, 4.8, 4.9). Regrettably, there are occasional typographical errors in the texts cited from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*, for example; p. 13. 23: ···積聚義是蘊義 (Taisho no. 1579: 593c18–20) → ···積聚義是蘊義。又由諸蘊唯有種種名性諸行。當知爲顯無我性義建立諸蘊 (Taisho no. 1579: 593c18–22), p. 48. 8: *copekṣata* → *cāpekṣata*, p. 72. 8: *yaśya* → *tasya*, p. 74. 7: *trīṇīmāni saṃskṛtalakṣaṇāni* → *trīṇīmāni saṃskṛtasya saṃskṛtalakṣaṇāni*, p. 149. 6: *drṣṭiparāmarśo rāgaś* → *drṣṭiparāmarśah śīlavrataparāmarśo rāgaś*, p. 180. 3: *pratighaṃ* → *sapratighaṃ*, p. 187. 13: *rdzas su yod pa yin no* → *rdzas su yod pa yin no// sdom pa dang sdom pa ma yin par gtogs pa ni btags pa'i yod pa yin no//*, p. 214. 15: *saddharmopagamaṇaṃ sma* → *saddharmopa-gamaṇaṃ darśayanti sma*, p. 218. 16: *na gacchanti* → *necchanti*, p. 254. 1: *drṣtvā iti kṛtvā* → *drṣtā iti vā kṛtvā*, p. 266. 4: *niṣyandaphalam* → *niṣyandaphalaṃ bhavati*, p. 373. 6: *g.yeng ba 'i* → *rnam par g.yeng ba 'i*. Also, the following two articles, which are referred to in the present monograph, are not listed in the bibliography:

Mukai Akira 向井亮. “Yugaron ni okeru kako-mirai-jitu-u-ron ni tsuite” 『瑜伽論』に於ける過去未来実論について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 20, no. 2 (1972), pp. 140–141 (635–636). (See p. 299, n. 246; p. 305, n. 250; p. 309, n. 252; p. 317, n. 257.)

Schmithausen, Lambert. “On Three *Yogācārabhūmi* Passages Mentioning the Three *Svabhāvas* or *Lakṣaṇas*.” In *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*, ed. by Jonathan A. Silk, pp. 245–263. Hawai‘i, 2000. (See p. xiii, n. 2.)

The author attempts to analyze the doctrinal background of Vasubandhu by his meticulous comparison of passages between the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*. His careful study has succeeded in clarifying how and to what extent Vasubandhu relied on the *Yogācārabhūmi* when he showed, in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, his own understandings as opposed to the Sarvāstivāda tradition. With no intention to diminish the value of the present work, the reviewer here wishes to make a few remarks on the author’s methodological principle.

Firstly, there exist some materials other than the **Nyāyānusāra*, which can also indicate the Sautrāntika and/or the Yogācāra opinions in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. For example, with regard to the explanation of *citta*, *manas* and *viññāna*, Vasubandhu refers to another idea (the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* [hereafter AKBh], ed. by Pradhan, Patna, 1967, p. 61, 21 – p. 62, 1), and Yaśomitra implies that it belongs to the Sautrāntika or the Yogācāra (*Sphutārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* [hereafter AKVy], ed. by U. Wogihara, Tokyo, 1936, p. 141, 20). Also, the following passages are likewise attributed to either the Sautrāntika or the Yogācāra by Yaśomitra: AKBh p. 13, 12f. (AKVy p. 44, 14f.), p. 17, 8 (p. 52, 10), p. 39, 3 (p. 96, 16), p. 44, 12 (p. 105, 20), p. 53, 13 (p. 125, 5f.), p. 54, 23 (p. 128, 3f.), p. 61, 4f. (p. 139, 9), p. 78, 5f. (p. 177, 5), p. 98, 15 (p. 232, 28), p. 117, 19 (p. 263f.), p. 127, 18 (p. 281, 27), p. 138, 5 (p. 294, 25f.), p. 166, 17 (p. 328, 6), p. 195, 24 (p. 351, 23f.), p. 218, 1 (p. 379, 11f.), p. 230, 8 (p. 400, 17), p. 310, 9 (p. 492, 1) etc . . . (The page and line numbers in parentheses indicate locations of the AKVy). Moreover, Vasubandhu occasionally introduces some opinions in the name of Sautrāntika (for example AKBh p. 91, 14f.; p. 99, 9–10, and so on). However, these references of this kind are unfortunately not included in the author’s list.

Secondly, some of the passages criticized by Saṅghabhadra can be traced to some preceding texts other than the *Yogācārabhūmi*. For instance, as for item 1. 3 (*sāpi vijñaptirūpaṇād rūpitā bhavati/ vrksapracalane cchāyāpracalanavat/ . . .*), the author states that the analogy between *avijñapti* and the shadow of a tree cannot be found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. However, the underlined sentence can be identified with the following passage in Dharmatrāta’s **Samyuktābhidharmahr̥dya* (雜阿毘曇

心論); 無作雖不礙, 以作色是礙故, 彼亦礙。如樹動影亦動 (Taisho no. 1552, 871c2–4. Cf. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* of Vasubandhu, Chapter I: *Dhātunirdeśa*, ed. by Y. Ejima [hereafter *AKBh* ed. by Ejima], Tokyo, 1989, p. 14, n. 11). This correspondence shows that passages criticized by Saṅghabhadra are not always connected with the *Yogācārabhūmi*, as the author recognizes (p. xxxii).

Finally, on occasions, passages from the *Yogācārabhūmi* do not seem to be appropriately contrasted with those of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. For example, concerning item 1. 5, the author refers to Vasubandhu's claim that the *skandhas* are merely *prajñapti*, however the passages cited from the *Yogācārabhūmi* do not deal with that issue at all. Those from the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* in items 1. 5 and 1. 6 can be seen in the explication of verse I, 20ab, where Vasubandhu argues over the meanings of *skandha*, *āyatana* and *dhātu*. Before starting his argument concerning *skandha* existing as *prajñapti*, he introduces etymological explanations of *skandha* and so on, where it is defined as “collection” in accordance with the *Sūtra* (雜阿含 55, Taisho no. 99, 13b15–17, *Samyuttanikāya* 22. 48, vol. 3, p. 47, 11–14, cf. Y. Honjō, *A Table of Agama-Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, part I, Kyoto, 1984). After a brief explanation of the meaning of *āyatana* and *dhātu*, the opponent of Vasubandhu states:

“If *skandha* means “collection,” the *skandhas* result in a nominal existence (*prajñapti*), since [collections are] an assemblage of many substances, for example a heap [of wheat] or the *pudgala*.”
*yadi rāṣyārthaḥ skandhārthaḥ prajñaptisantaḥ skandhāḥ prāpnuvanti/
 anekadravyasamūhatvāt rāṣipudgalavat* (*AKBh* p. 13, 21–22).

This passage is given as item 1. 5. The opponent points out the incoherence of the *skandha*'s definition, and provisionally concludes that it should not be explained as a “collection.” However, the other two explanations of *skandha* (i.e., *kārya-bhārodvāhana* and *praccheda*) are also refuted because of their deviation from the *Sūtra*. Vasubandhu concludes that *skandha* means “collection of [various] kinds of *rūpa*, i.e., past [*rūpa*], future [*rūpa*] and present [*rūpa*] and so on,” which strictly conforms to the *Sūtra*'s content (item 1. 6 [*AKBh* p. 13, 23–26]: *kārya-bhārodvāhanārthaḥ skandhārtha ity apare/ pracchedārtho vā/ tathā hi vaktāro bhavanti tribhiḥ skandhair deyaṃ dāsyāma iti/ tad etad utsūtram/ sūtraṃ hi rāṣyartham eva bravīti yat kiṃcid rūpam atītānāgatapratyutpannam iti vistaraḥ/*). In conclusion, *skandha* has only a nominal existence since it means “collection,” which strictly accords with the statement of the *Sūtra*.

The author cites three passages from the *Yogācārabhūmi* as items 1. 5 and 1. 6, explaining their contents as follows:

1. 5) there are a number of statements in the *Yogācārabhūmi* to the effect that the meaning of *skandha* is “collection,”

1. 6) the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Pañcavijñānakāyamanobhūmi* quotes the same or a similar *sūtra* in defining *skandha* as “collection.”

These passages indeed characterize *skandha* as “collection,” but none of them mentions it as “nominal existence” (*prajñaptisat*). The first passage from the *Vastusamgrahaṇī* is a commentary on the same *sūtra* as Vasubandhu quotes in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* in order to explain the meaning of *skandha*. However, this does not refer to the *skandha* as “nominal existence.” The second and third ones from the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* do not directly treat this issue as well as the first passage. In addition, such an interpretation of the term *skandha* as “collection” is quite common to the Sarvāstivāda tradition (for example, *Mahāvibhāṣā*, Taisho no. 1545, 383c15f., cf. AKBh ed. by Ejima, p. 20, n. 4). Accordingly, these three passages do not allow us to ascertain the relationship between Vasubandhu and the *Yogācārabhūmi* over the meaning of *skandha*.

The author remarks that the *Yogācārabhūmi* does not directly state that *skandhas* are *prajñapti* (p. xxxv). However, a statement that *skandha* is *prajñaptisat* can be found in a paragraph of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* on the *Cintāmayī Bhūmi*, providing the *Yogācārāra*’s view of *dravya* “substance” and *prajñapti* (*Yogācārabhūmi*, Peking zi 207b3–208a8; Derge zhi 199a5–200a1; Taisho no. 1579, 658c27–659a18. A part of this paragraph is cited as item 1. 8). This paragraph gives categories of existence; (1) that which has been born (*skyes pa*), that which has risen (*byung ba*), and that which exists at present (*da ltar yod pa*), and (2) those which have become real as a substance (*rdzas*, **dravya*), an entity (*dnegos po*, **vastu*), or an object (*don*, **artha*). The *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* deals with the second category in detail, defining *dravyasat* “substantial existence” as that which has its own characteristic without depending on other things and *prajñaptisat* “nominal existence” as that which obtains its own characteristic by depending on other things. They respectively correspond to **vastu* named **skandha* and so on, and metaphorical appellations such as “**ātman*,” “**sattva*” and so on. It states as follows:

“The metaphorical appellations such as “**skandha*” and so on are [given] to **vastu* named “**rūpa*” as well as a metaphorical appellation “**ātman*” and so on is [given] to **vastu* named “**rūpaskandha*” and so on.”

gzugs la sogs pa 'i phun po 'i ming can gi dngos po la¹ bdag la sogs pa nye bar 'dogs pa bzhin du/ gzugs la sogs pa 'i ming can gvi dngos po kho na la phung po la sogs pa² nye bar 'dogs pa dang/ . . . de dang 'dra'o// (the *Yogācārabhūmi*, Peking zi 208a2f., Derge zhi 199b3f.)

1) Peking *la*; Derge *las*. 2) Derge *pa*; Peking *pa 'i*.

After this statement, the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* explains that there is no *ātman* apart from *skandha*. That context appears to harmonize with the contents of the third passage of the *Yogācārabhūmi* quoted in item 1. 5 as follows:

“Furthermore, these *skandhas are nothing but conditioned things since they have various and many kinds of essence. It should be comprehended that “*skandhas” are established [by Buddha] in order to show that there is no *ātman apart from them.”

*yang phung po de dag ni bdag nyid sna tshogs mang po yin pa'i phyir 'du byed tsam ste!*¹ *de las don gzhan pa'i bdag med par yongs su bstan pa'i phyir phung po rnam par* (²*gzhag par*²) *rig par bya'o//* (the *Yogācārabhūmi*, Peking zi 41a5–6; Derge zhi 39a1–2. The two Chinese translations are slightly different from the Tibetan rendering. Cf. Taisho no. 1579, 593c20–22; no. 1584, 1029c7–8.)

1) Derge /; Peking omits. 2) Derge *gzhag par*; Peking omits.

Therefore, this third passage can legitimately be recognized as referring to *skandha* as *prajñapti*, as the author considers on p. xxxv. However, the meaning of *skandha* deduced from the *Sūtra* does not function here as the reason why *skandha* should exist as *prajñapti*, unlike in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.

The author's conclusion as mentioned above is thus based on his statistical analysis of the corresponding passages between Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*. His meticulous research, no doubt a welcome and great contribution to the field of Buddhist studies, has succeeded in clarifying how and to what extent Vasubandhu relied on the *Yogācārabhūmi* when showing his own understandings as opposed to the Sarvāstivāda tradition. At the same time, it should be also noted that the author's conclusions need further investigation since, as slightly discussed above, some of the materials used in this monograph are still not enough to draw such a decisive opinion.

There seems to be a great obstacle in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, when it is investigated in the way the author has attempted. As he himself accepts, it is most probable that the *Yogācārabhūmi* was gradually composed by the hands of different authors or compilers. This explains very well why it contains heterogeneous strata throughout its whole contents. However, this difficulty in approaching the *Yogācārabhūmi* does not devalue the contribution of this work. The result of the author's research no doubt offers a useful tool for future inquiry into both Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and the *Yogācārabhūmi*. It also provides a number of clues to our understanding of the background to Vasubandhu's thought. Despite its methodological flaws, the present reviewer has no hesitation in recommending this book to anybody who is studying the Ābhidhārmika and/or Yogācāra doctrines.

(An asterisk, which is added to several Sanskrit words throughout this text, denotes that those words were reconstructed from the Tibetan and Chinese translations.)