On a Paragraph in the *Dharma-viniścaya* Chapter of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*

Noriaki Hakamaya

I

It is a well known fact that there is a close relationship between Asaṅga's works and the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* (*SNS*)\(^1\).

Asaṅga uses two quotations from this *sūtra* (*SNS*) in his chief work, *Mahāyānasamgraha* (*MS*). One verse quoted from chapter VI of the *sūtra* (*SNS VI*) is in his chapter I of the *MS*\(^2\) (*MS I*, entitled *jnāya-āśraya*) in order to prove that the *ādāna-vijñāna* is a synonym of the *ālaya-vijñāna*. The other is a passage of considerable length, which is quoted from chapter VIII of the *SNS*\(^3\) (*SNS VIII*) in his chapter II of the *MS* (*MS II*, entitled *jnāya-lakṣaṇa*) as the trustworthy scripture (*āgama*) for the representation only (*vijñaptimātra*).

The *SMS* VIII from which the passage in the latter is quoted seems to have had the most important influence on Asaṅga. We can recognize this good example in the *dharma-viniścaya* chapter of his other work, *Abhidharmasamuccaya*\(^4\). In this chapter\(^5\) (*AS III*), the *dharma* means the twelve members

---

2) É. Lamotte, ed., *La Somme de Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga (Mahāyānasamgraha)* (Louvain, 1938), Tome I, p. 4.
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of Buddha's teaching (dvādaśaṅgavacogata) which is the meditative object\(^6\) (ālambana or gocara). Similarly, the dharma-prajñāpīti in the SNS VIII means the same.\(^7\) This suggests that both chapters treat essentially the same subject.

Furthermore, in the AS III, the meditative object is divided into four kinds, namely, the universal meditative object (vyāpya-ālambana), the meditative object for purification of addiction (carita-viśodhana-ālambana), the meditative object for skill (kausalya-ālambana) and the meditative object for purification of corruption (kleśa-viśodhana-ālambana).\(^8\) The first meditative object is further subdivided into four kinds, namely, the image attended with predication (sāvikalpa-pratibimba), the image devoid of predication (nirvikalpa-pratibimba), the limits of the entity (vastu-paryantata) which are of two sorts, the phenomenal one (yāvadbhāvika, 盛所有性) and the noumenal one (yathāvadbhāvika, 如所有性), and the fulfillment of the requirement (kārya-parinisṛpatti).\(^9\) The latter four kinds are the same as that which are enumerated in the SNS VIII\(^{10}\). Though the former

---

5) The dharmaviññācaya is the third of five chapters according to the Tibetan or the hypothetic Sanskrit original. But according to the Chinese translation, this chapter is the second of the four subdivisions which belong to the second division. We call this chapter the third following the former, because the Chinese seems to be arranged by Hsüan-tsang as P. Pradhan has pointed out (see ibid., Introduction, p. 10).

6) P. Pradhan, ed., op. cit. p. 78 or 80.

7) É. Lamotte, ed., op. cit. pp. 88-89. The commentary on the SNS, Hphags pa dgoṅs pa ʰes par ḥgreṅ paḥi mdoṅi rnam paṛ bṣad pa explains the outline of this chapter as follows: “de la leḥu bṛgyad pa ḥdiḥi bsdus paḥi don ni mdoṅ bsdu na chos ḡdag ḡem par bṣag pa ḡlas ḡrtsams nas/ ṛṇal ḡbyor gyi yoṅs su bsdus paḥi ɡnas daṅ lhag mthon gi lam gyi ṛab tu ṛhye baa bstan paṛ yin no// (ibid., P. ed., No. 5845, Co, 161b5-6)”.

8) P. Pradhan, ed., op. cit. p. 80. The four kinds of the meditative object are explained in the Śrāvakabhūmi whose authorship A. Wayman attributes to Asaṅga. See A. Wayman, Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961), p. 86. We borrow here the Sanskrit words from his text, and use his translation in order to facilitate the comparison with the Śrāvakabhūmi.

9) P. Pradhan, ed., op. cit. p. 85. These four kinds are also explained in the Śrāvakabhūmi. The Sanskrit words and their translations are according to the notice given in note 8.

---
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ones are not mentioned in the SNS VIII, the commentary on it refers to the former ones as well as to the latter ones\(^{11}\).

From this comparison of the AS III with the SNS VIII, we may suppose that Asaṅga was inspired by the latter especially when he wrote the former. But, we do not wish to go here into a general comparison of both, since our supposition will not be supported by it. Therefore, we shall show the paragraph in the AS III which strengthens our supposition, for it contains the passage which is almost the same as that which is stated in the SNS VIII. After making a comparison between the two passages, we shall consider the significance of the agreement.

II

We are going to show the paragraph in question from the AS III with its Tibetan and Chinese translations\(^{12}\).

Skt.

\[\text{vaipulye dharma-samādhi-kuśalo bodhisattvaḥ kathāṃ pratyaagantavyah| pancabhiḥ kāraṇaiḥ — pratikṣaṇaṃ sarva-daunśhūlyāśrayaṃ drāvayati, nānātvā-saṃjñā-vaigātāṃ*} \]
\[- \text{ca dharma-arāma-ratīṃ* pratilabhate, aparicchinna-ākāraṇ ca sarvato¹³} \]
\[- \text{pramanāṃ dharmāvabhāsaṃ saṃjñānātī*, viśuddha*-bhāgyāni cāsyāvikalpitaṃ nimitāni samudācaranti, dharma-kāya-paripāri-parinispattaye cōttarād uttaratarami hetu-samparīgra} \]
\[- \text{ham}¹⁴\] karotī||

\(^{10}\) É. Lamotte, ed., p. 88. The Sanskrit words in this part reconstructed by him should be corrected according to the Śrāvakabhūmi.

\(^{11}\) Ḵphags pa dgon s pa ṇes par ḷgrel poḥi ṃdoḥi ṛṇam par bṣad pa, op. cit., 165a\(^8\)--b\(^8\).

\(^{12}\) It is by good luck that we can find the Sanskrit original in the fragment F (see V. V. Gokhale, ed., op. cit. p. 35). The paragraph contains the same passage with that in the prose section of the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra, to which we shall refer below. There are few differences between the two. Only four words signed by asterisk differ from the words in the latter, namely *vigatiṃ, *raith, saṃjānte, avikalpitaṃ cāsyā viśddhi-bhāgyāyānī respectively.

\(^{13}\) This word cannot be found in the fragment, but is supplemented according to its Tibetan and Chinese translations.
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tatra pañca vidhāyām bhāvanāyām phalaṁ pañca vidhāṁ nirvartitam iti darśayati/
pancavidhā bhāvanā — sambhinna-bhāvanā, animitta-bhāvanā, anābhoga-bhāvanā,
uttapta-bhāvanā, parivṛtti-nibhā (sic. nimitta?)-bhāvanā yathākramam||

Tib.

śin tu rgyas pa la byañ chub 'sens dpal chos la tiñ ne hdsn du mkhas par ji/
ltar khoñ du chud par bya se na/ rnam pa līna stel skad cig re re la gnas 'nan/
len gyi gnas thams cad hjig par byed pa dañ/ sna tshogs kyi hdu šes pa dañ bral/
tel/ chos kyi dgah ba la dgah ba hthob pa dañ/ chos kyi snañ ba rnam pa yoñs su/
ma chad pa thams cad du tshad med pa yañ dag par šes pa dañ/ de la rnam pa/
dag pañi cha dañ mthun pa rnam par mi rtogs pañi mtshan ma rnam ma kun tu hbyun/
ba dañ/ chos kyi sku yoñs su rdsogs par bya ba dañ yoñs su bsgrub pañi phiyir goñ/
ma bas kyañ ches goñ mañi rgyu yoñs su hdsn par byed paño15)||

Chin.

反复，方廣分中，於法三摩地善巧菩薩相，云何可知。謂，由五種因故。一，刹那刹那
消除一切麁重所依。二，出離種種想，得樂法樂。三，了知無量無分別相。四，順清淨分
無分別相恒現在前。五，能攝受轉上轉勝圓滿成就佛法身因。

聲聞藏法菩薩藏法等從如來法身所流16)。

Each underlining indicates the passage which is almost the same as the
one underlined in the paragraph that we shall quote later from the SNS
VIII, and which is completely the same as that which explained in the run-
ning prose commentary on the Mahāyānasūtraālaṁkāra (MSA), verse XX-XXI
3117) and in the MS V, § 418).

There is much room for inquiry on the passage following the word ‘tatra’.
The passage is neither found in its Tibetan nor in its Chinese. But, as P.
Pradhan has pointed out19), the corresponding passage is found in its com-
mentary, the Abhidharmasamuccayabhasya (ASBh)20) and the Chinese trans-

14) V. V. Gokhale reads ‘hetu-saparigraha’ in his edition. Here we follow S. Lévi’s
reading in his edition of the Mahāyānasūtraālaṁkāra.
16) Taisho., XXXI, p. 688a. The last sentence is neither found in the Sanskrit nor
the Tibetan, to which we do not intend to refer in this paper.
lation of it\textsuperscript{21}). Though there is nothing corresponding with the passage in the Tibetan translation of it, we can find the parallel passage in the \textit{Mñon chos kun nas btus paḥi rnam par bṣad pa ṣes bya ba}\textsuperscript{22}) (*Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyakhyā-nāma). However, concerning the appellations to the five kinds of \textit{bhāvanās} there are differences between the basic text in Sanskrit and the three versions of its commentary. As the commentaries nearly agree with each other, we might be able to guess that the passage was wrongly inserted into the basic text from its commentary in a latter period. Though the Tibetan and Chinese versions of the basic text seem to support this guess, we do not admit it for another reason.

Because, in the \textit{MS V}, § 4, Asaṅga gives the same appellations to the five kinds of \textit{bhāvanās}, before showing the passage quoted in note No. 18. He introduces these appellations as follows:

\begin{quote}
\textit{sa ḥdi dag gi bṣog pa ji ltar ṣe na/ ḥdi la byaṅ chub sems dpah sa daṅ}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{19} P. Pradhan, ed., \textit{op. cit.}, Introduction, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{20} We regret that the edition of the \textit{ASBh} has not yet been published. But we can read the passage in question in Pradhan’s introduction or note of the edition of the \textit{AS} (p. 15 or p. 85, n. 5). The passage runs as follows: “\textit{tad etat p\textsc{c}a\textsc{v}a\textsc{i}d\textsc{h}a\textsc{y}ā bh\textsc{ā}v\textsc{a}n\textsc{ā}yāḥ phalām p\textsc{c}a\textsc{v}a\textsc{i}d\textsc{h}aṃ nir\textsc{v}ar\textsc{t}tātā iti sa\textsc{m}d\textsc{a}rs\textsc{i}tatā/ p\textsc{c}a\textsc{v}a\textsc{i}d\textsc{h}ā bh\textsc{ā}v\textsc{a}n\textsc{ā}-katamā/ pra\textsc{s}r\textsc{a}b\textsc{d}hi-nimitta-bh\textsc{ā}v\textsc{a}nā sam\textsc{b}h\textsc{i}n\textsc{a}-bh\textsc{ā}v\textsc{a}nā an\textsc{i}mit\textsc{t}a-bh\textsc{ā}v\textsc{a}nā an\textsc{a}bh\textsc{h}oga-bh\textsc{ā}v\textsc{a}nā p\textsc{a}r\textsc{i}v\textsc{r}t\textsc{t}i-nimitta-bh\textsc{ā}v\textsc{a}nā ca/}”

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Taisho.}, XXXI, p. 752c. “彼因如是五種，即顯五修能得果。何等為五。謂，息相修，和合修，無相修，無功用修，轉相修”

\textsuperscript{22} P. ed., No. 5555, Śi, 309a. “\textit{de daṅ de dag gaṅ gis rnam par bṣogs pa na/ ḥbras bu rnam pa līṇa ḥgrub par ḥgyur ṣes yaṅ dag par bstan to/} bṣog pa rnam pa līṇa gaṅ ṣe na/ śiṅ tu sbyaṅs paḥi mtshan ma bṣog pa daṅ/ tha ni daṅ pa bṣog pa daṅ/ mtshan ma med pa bṣog pa daṅ/ spyod pa med pa bṣog pa daṅ/ yoṅs su mya ṣaṅ nas ḥdas pa bṣog paḥo/”
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Comparing these appellations in the Tibetan translation of the MS V, § 4 with the ones in the Sanskrit of the AS III, we can recognize that the first four appellations completely agree with each other, but the last appellation in the former 'chog par mi hdzin par bsgom pa' which is Sanskritized into 'asamtuṣṭa-bhāvāna' by É. Lamotte disagrees with the one in the latter 'parivṛtti-nimitta (sic. nimitta ?)-bhāvāna'. However, consulting the oldest Chinese translation corresponding with the former, we can recognize that the last appellation of bhāvāna 轉轉修 is more approximate to the word 'parivṛtti-nimitta-bhāvāna' than to the word 'asamtuṣṭa-bhāvāna'24). If the original form of 轉轉修 were 轉相修, it would completely agree with 'parivṛtti-nimitta-bhāvāna'. Therefore, it is more possible to suppose that the passage which is found only in the Sanskrit of the AS III was written by Asaṅga himself than to suppose that it was inserted in a latter period.

By the way, concerning the passage in question P. Pradhan interprets that the word 'tatra' “refers to the Vaipulya as appears from the Bhāṣya (AS Bh)25)”. But, if we understand this passage based upon the passage quoted above from the MS V, § 4, we should take this word to indicate the foregoing passage. So we read this passage as follows:

Hereinbefore (tatra) it is shown that the five kinds of fruits are grown out of the five kinds of bhāvanās. The five kinds of bhāvanās are ...... respectively.

We believe that our reading may be supported by the sentence ‘tad etat ......’ in the AS Bh26).

---

23) É. Lamotte, ed., op. cit., p. 66.
24) The oldest Chinese translation of the MS, namely Buddhāśānta’s employs the word 轉轉修 (Taisho., XXXI, 107a), while Paramārtha’s, Dharmagupta’s or Hsüan-tsang’s employs 不知足修 (ibid., 126b), 無厭足修 (ibid., 303b), or 悅足修 (ibid., 146a) respectively which is each equivalent to ‘asamtuṣṭa-bhāvāna’.
On a Paragraph in the Dharmaviniścaya (N. Hakamaya) (46)

III

Now returning to the whole paragraph quoted from the AS III in the first part, we shall compare it with one from the SNS VIII which runs as quoted below with both the Chinese translations.

becom ldan ḩdas byaṅ chub sems ḩpaḥi ḩi tsam gyis ḩna ḩdres ḩpaḥi ḩchos ḩla dmigs ḩpaḥi ḩi ḩgnas ḩdaṅ ḩlag mthoṅ ḩthob ḩpar ḩḥgyur ḩlags/ ḩbyams ḩpa ḩde ḩni ḩrgyu ḩlnas ḩthob ḩpar ḩḥgyur ḩbar ḩrig ḩpar ḩbya ḩste/ ḩḥdi ḩlta ḩste ḩyid ḩla ḩbyed ḩpaḥi ḩtshe ḩskad ḩcig ḩskad ḩcig ḩla ḩgnas ḩnaṅ ḩlen ḩgyi ḩrten ḩthams ᩆcad ᩆhjig ᩆpar ᩆbyed ᩆpa ᩆdaṅ/ ᩆḥdu ᩆšes* ᩆsna ᩆtsghogs ᩆrnam ᩆpar ᩆspaṅs ᩆte/ ᩆchos ᩆkyi ᩆkun ᩆdgah ᩆla ᩆdgah ᩆba ᩆḥthob ᩆpa ᩆdaṅ/ ᩆchos ᩆnaṅ ᩆba ᩆphyogs ᩆbcuṛ ᩆtshed ᩆmedi ᩆcin ᩆrnam ᩆpa ᩆyoṅs ᩆsu ᩆma ᩆchaḥ ᩆpa ᩆyaṅ ᩆdag ᩆpar ᩆśes ᩆpa ᩆdaṅ/ ᩆdgos ᩆpa ᩆyoṅs ᩆsu ᩆgrub ᩆpa ᩆdaṅ ᩆpa ᩆrnam ᩆpar ᩆdag ᩆpaḥi ᩆcha ᩆdaṅ ᩆḥthun ᩆpaḥi ᩆmtshan ᩆma ᩆrnam ᩆpar ᩆma ᩆbrtags ᩆpa ᩆrnamṣ ᩆde ᩆla ᩆkun ᩆḥhyuṅ ᩆba ᩆdaṅ/ ᩆchos ᩆkyi ᩆsku ᩆḥthob ᩆpa ᩆdaṅ/ ᩆyoṅs ᩆsu ᩆrdsogs ᩆpa ᩆdaṅ ᩆyoṅs ᩆsu ᩆḥgrub ᩆpar ᩆbyaḥi ᩆ PHYIR/ ᩆrgyu ᩆgoṅ ᩆma ᩆbas ᩆches ᩆgoṅ ᩆma/ ᩆbzaṅ ᩆpo ᩆbas ᩆches ᩆbzaṅ ᩆpo ᩆyaṅ ᩆdag ᩆpar ᩆyoṅs ᩆsu ᩆḥdsin ᩆpar ᩆbyed ᩆpaho27)!!

Hsiian-tsang’s translation

世尊，菩薩齊何名得緣總法奢摩他毘鉾舍那。佛告慈氏菩薩曰。善男子，由五緣故，當知名得。一者，於思惟時剎那剎那剎那消一切業重所依。二者，離種種想，得樂法樂。三者，解了十方無差別相無量法光。四者，所作成滿相應淨分無分別相恆現在前。五者，為令法身得成滿故，攝受後後轉勝妙因28)。

Bodhiruci’s translation

彌勒菩薩言。世尊，云何菩薩證得差別觀奢摩他毘婆舍那法。佛言，彌勒，有五種觀，觀彼法。何等五種。所謂，思惟奢摩他毘婆舍那，念念滅一切煩悩身。離種種相，得法樂樂。如實知十方無量無辮齊，知無量法光明。所作成就相應清净分無分別相現前。為得成就法身，證上上勝勝因29)。

The passage underlined is almost the same as the one in the AS III, and some differences between both passages are not those of the original but those of translations, except for four places which are double-underlined.

27) É. Lamotte, ed., op. cit., pp. 95–96. *ḥdu šes’ is ḩdu byed in all editions.
28) Taisho., XVI, 699a.
29) Ibid., 675c.
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The first, the word 'phyogs bcur' in the SNS VIII is 'thams cad du (sarvatas)' in the AS III corresponding with the former place. As the word '十方' in both the Chinese translations of the SNS VIII agrees with 'phyogs bcur', the original Sanskrit of it seems to have been 'daśadiśas' and differed from 'sarvatas' in the AS III. But, in this case, 'sarvatas' means 'daśadiśas' according to Asvabhava’s commentary on the same passage in the MSA. Therefore, there is no wide difference in the meaning of these two words.

The words of the last three places in the Tibetan have nothing corresponding with them in the AS III. But, as seen above in the comparison of the Tibetan with both of the Chinese translations of the SNS VIII, these three words agree with the ones in the two Chinese translations, that is to say, 'dgos pa yoṅs su grub pa daṅ ldan pa' with '所作成滿相應' or '所作成就相應', 'ḥṭhob pa' with '得', 'bzaṅ po bas ches bzaṅ po' with '後後轉……妙' or '勝勝'. From the agreement in these versions, we can assume that in the original corresponding with them there had been the Sanskrit words which are not found in the AS III. However, among these words, there still remains the question whether the word 'ḥṭhob pa' is equivalent to '得'. Because, in the context of the Tibetan, the phrase 'chos kyi sku ḍṭhob pa daṅ yoṅs su rdoṅs pa daṅ yoṅs su ḍgrub par bya baḥi phyir' is read 'in order to obtain, to complete and to accomplish the law-body and is comprehended to show the three stages concerning the law-body as both of the commentaries on the SNS VIII admit', while the phrase '為令法身得成就故' or '為得成就法身' in the Chinese translations cannot be understood as clearly as the Tibetan. Because of the vagueness of the Chinese language on this particular sentence, it is better to follow the Tibetan for the time being.

30) Theg pa chen poḥi mdo sdeḥi rgyan gi rgya cher bṣad pa, P. ed., No. 5530, Bi, 188b6-7. “yaṅ na thams cad du rnam pa yoṅs su ma chad pa ṣes bya ba ni/ phyogs beḥur rnam pa yoṅs su ma chad paḥi chos kyi snaṅ ba yaṅ dag par ṣes so[|”

31) ‘To obtain’ it is in the third bhāmi, ‘to complete’ in the tenth bhāmi, ‘to accomplish’ in the tathāgatabhāmi. Ḥphags pa dgoṅs pa ṣes par ḍgreḥ paḥi mdo las ḍphags pa byams paḥi leḥu ni tsheḥi bṣad pa, P. ed., No. 5535, Tshi, 181b8. Ḥphags pa dgoṅs pa ṣes par ḍgreḥ paḥi rnam par bṣad pa, op. cit., 205b6-206a1.
As the result of our comparison of both passages, we acknowledge that there are few differences between them, and that they bear a close resemblance to each other. And so we can conjecture that the agreement between them cannot be mere chance.

IV

Let us consider the reason and significance of the agreement between the two passages.

It might be possible to suppose that the agreement had happened, because Asaṅga had quoted the passage from the SNS VIII. But then, it is open to doubt why he did not indicate the name of this sūtra. He names the sūtra in the two places of his MS to which we refered in the introductory part of this paper. Therefore, if the passage had been the quotation from the SNS VIII, Asaṅga should had indicated the source.

Then, is not the passage quoted from the SNS VIII, but from another source? However, the fact that in this case he does not show any quotation marks such as ‘yathoktam (bhagavata) ...... iti’ or ‘yad uktam (bhagavata) ...... iti’ etc. seems to indicate that the passage is not even a quotation. If the passage is not quoted from any source, how can we explain that it bears a close resemblance to the passage in the SNS VIII?

As we have already known, there is the passage in the MS II, § 33[32) which we can trace to the extant literatures[33)], though no quotation marks are clearly shown[34)]. In this case, as the paragraph treats the subject concerning the exgetics of scripture, we can suppose by its content that the passage is based on some source, which is not necessarily limited to a specific scripture and which was well known at the time of Asaṅga and now still is enumerated in the Mahāvyutpatti[35)].

---

32) É. Lamotte, ed., op. cit., p. 43.
34) ‘ḥdi lta ste’ in the Tibetan, ‘所說説 (Taisho., XXXI, 103c)’, ‘廣説 (ibid., 121c)’, ‘如説 (ibid., 293a)’ and ‘謂説 (ibid., 141b)’ in the Chinese translations seem to be a quotation mark.
Following this example, we might be able to explain the reason for the close resemblance between the passage in the *AS III* and that in the *SNS VIII*. The passage common to both was well known at the time of Asaṅga and was stated in the other scriptures as well as the *SNS VIII*. Consequently Asaṅga did not feel the necessity to show the name choosing only one from among several scriptures, though he would, with clear consciousness, recognize the passage as the quotation from a certain source. This assumption may be approved to a great extent, if we consider it in the light of the fact that Asaṅga seems, in his works, to have based on some scriptures and taken portions of others and pieced them together with his own passages in order to organize the *vijñaptimātra* system\(^{36}\).

However, we must admit at once that the character of the passage in the *AS III* differs from that of the passage in the *MS II*, § 33. The latter passage is a well known stereotyped expression like that found in the two sorts of extant scriptures\(^{37}\), while the former has not such a character, and is found only in the *SNS VIII* which is one of the extant scriptures that precedes Asaṅga. Furthermore, the passage in question is neither a mere paraphrase nor an original sentence as known from the result of comparison with the passage in the *SNS VIII*. So it is still impossible to explain the reason why Asaṅga did not show any quotation marks. If we could, under these circumstances, regard the passage as plagiarism from the *SNS VIII*, our questions concerning the passage would be almost resolved. But this is only a easy means of resolution. Because, if so, it is the inner performance of plagiarism itself that must be discussed.

We are very far indeed from being able to say anything conclusive, for our material is still inadequate. But we will try to explain this problem psychologically\(^{38}\). The passage might have been a plagiarism from the *SNS VIII*.
VIII. Nevertheless, the fact that we judge it by appearance to be a plagiarism would have appeared to Asaṅga’s mind as an original creation. He therefore did not show not only the name of scripture but also any quotation marks. The term ‘cryptomnesia\(^{39}\)’ employed in psychology well explains Asaṅga’s inner mind. In the phenomenon of cryptomnesia, it is said that an automatic creative force causes lost memories to reappear in sizeable fragments and with photographic fidelity\(^{40}\). The peculiarities of this phenomenon C. G. Jung points out as follows:

A quite unimportant detail which only deserves to be forgotten as quickly as possible is suddenly reproduced with almost literal fidelity, while the main point of the story is, one cannot modified, but re-created in an individual manner\(^{41}\).

The passage in the AS III differs from that in the MS I or II where the source, namely the SNS, is indicated. The former must have been more unimportant for Asaṅga than the latter which is quoted as the trustworthy scripture for his organization of the vijñaptimātra system. Asaṅga, of course, would have read the passage in question in the SNS. But it was not so important for his organization that it slipped into his dark background of consciousness, namely the unconscious. Later on when he wrote his works, it was reproduced word by word, except for the four places which we have pointed out before.

We must here notice the fact that the passage in question completely agrees with that in his chief work, MS, while it differs slightly from that in the SNS VIII in the four places. The fact suggests that the passage seems to Asaṅga to be his own original creation. It is natural that the passage which he once admitted as his own consciously through cryptomnesia with a few differences is written down in his other work without a bit of difference. If


39) This term literally means ‘hidden memory’.

40) C. G. Jung, ibid., p. 106.

41) C. G. Jung, ibid., p. 83.
our assumption that the passage is a sort of his own original creation is
approved, it will give us a clue to the inference of the authorship of the
running prose commentary on the *MSA*\(^{42}\). Because the passage exactly com-
mon to the *AS III* and the *MS V* also complely agrees with that in the com-
mentary on the *MSA* as mentioned above\(^{43}\), it seems to us that the prose
section in the *MSA* was written by Asaṅga.

We have tried to give a tentative explanation on the agreement between
the passage in the *AS III* and the *SNS VIII*, though we do not know whether
it is right or not to apply the phenomenon of cryptomnesia to Asaṅga, one
of the philosophers in ancient India. However, the legend of Asaṅga, ac-
cording to which he heard the doctrine of the *Mahāyāna* from Maitreya comming
down to Jambudvīpa, seems to tell the phenomenon of cryptomnesia: his
own consciousness approches the unconscious, and his creative works are in-
termediated by the unconscious, that is Maitreya. The more unconsciously the
passage in quesion is reproduced, the more clearly it seems to show the direct
relationship between Asaṅga's works and the *SNS*.

---

\(^{42}\) I have presented some doubt about the opinion which attributes the authorship
of the prose section of the *MSA* to Vasubandhu. See my article: "Asvabhāva's
467–470.

\(^{43}\) See note 12.

\(^{44}\) J. Takakusu, "The life of Vasu-bandhu by Paramārtha (A. D. 499–569)", *Ts'oung