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1. The Closing and Reopening of the Sarvāstivādin List

Our earliest source for a list of viprayuktas is Pañcavastuka. Imanishi has arrived at a text with a list consisting of fifteen items (Imanishi 1969:8). Furthermore, although Imanishi's text does not indicate it, both Chinese translations, as well as the text of Prakaraṇapāda, include references to other, similar dhammas that are also cittaviprayukta (T.1557:998c; T.1556:995c; T.1542:692c). Therefore, we can probably add ye 'py evanijātiyakā to the Sanskrit on the basis of Abhidharmakośavyākhyā, which quotes from a śāstra identified by Wogihara as Prakaraṇapāda (AKVy:142). Other early sources for cittaviprayuktas that refer to additional dhammas include Dharmaśāla (T.1537:501b) and Abhidharmāmṛta (T.1553:970a). This last contains our earliest reference to prthagjanatva as a viprayukta.

The Abhidharmahṛdayas of both Dharmaśri and Upāsānta, as well as Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya, contain fourteen dhammas, the number associated with the seventy-five-dharma system; however, they preserve the earlier term prthagjanatva instead of replacing it with aprāpti. Moreover, none of these three texts contains any reference to “other viprayuktas” (T.1550:830c; T.1551:866a; T.1552:943a). While the Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya, in its explanation of samghabheda, describes it as a viprayukta, it does not mention samghabheda in its discussion of viprayuktas. Nor, unlike Mahāvibhāṣā, does it specify that it belongs to a category of other, similar ones (T.1552:898c). Therefore, the Abhidharmahṛdaya seems to have closed the list of viprayuktas at fourteen, the number, according to P'u Kuang, accepted by orthodox Sarvāstivāda. Our last pre-Abhidharmakośa text, the
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Abhidharmāvatāra, likewise contains fourteen viprayuktas, but it replaces prthagjanatva with aprāti (T.1554:982a).

However, the question arises as to whether Vasubandhu re-opens the list with the phrase ādayaś ceti in the verse of the Abhidharmakośa. In verse thirty-five and the first pāda of verse thirty-six of Chapter II, Vasubandandhu enumerates the viprayuktasamskāras from prāpti through nāmakāya and adds the word “etc”. It seems likely that “etc.” here simply refers to padakāya and vyāñjanakāya. In fact, before criticizing the Vaibhāṣika position, Vasubahdhu explains in the Bhāṣya that the word ādi refers to pāda- and vyāñjanakāya, thus accounting for the word ādi without allowing for the possibility of more than fourteen viprayuktas. As for the words ca and iti, they seem to have no special meaning other than to fill out the verse and indicate the end of the list. Therefore, although Vasubandhu, like the Samyuktabhidharmahrdaya, elsewhere states that samghabheda is a viprayukta, he limits his actual list to fourteeh and does not admit any other similar dharmas.

According to Yasomitra, however, Vasubandhu intends to include other similar viprayuktas, for example, samghabheda (which has the nature of asāmagri), that have not been mentioned but that are really cittaviprayuktas; Yasomitra justifies this by referring to the phrase in śāstra, ye ’py evamjātiyakā (AKVv:142).

According to samghabhadrā, ādi includes padakāya and vyāñjanakāya, as well as a fifteenth viprayukta, sāmagrī, while ca refers to dharmas mistakenly introduced by other masters that are really nothing more than varieties of the fifteen (T.1562:396c).

The terms asāmagri and sāmagrī are of interest to us since they appear among the additional group of ten viprayuktas found at the end of the Yogācāra list. In the case of sāmagrī, we can find a very complete definition in the first passage of Viniścayasaṅgrahāṇi. Unfortunately, Samghabhadra nowhere defines the term so we cannot compare his sāmagrī with that of the Yogācāra. A passage in P’u Kuang’s commentary on AK suggests that it refers to monastic concord, but this cannot be verified.
In the case of asāmagṛi, although the basic definitions of sāmagṛi (T.1579:587b-c;YBh:Zi26b3-4), and of asāmagṛi, its opposite, are very broad, it is possible that the Yogācāra viprayukta can include the specific case of saṃghabheda, mentioned in the abhidharma texts, since one of the six subtypes of sāmagṛi is defined as harmony among beings (T.1579: 687c;YBh:Zi26b7-8). It seems likely to me that the terms sāmagṛi and asāmagṛi originally referred to monastic concord and discord, and that the Viṃścayasaṃgrahaṇī expanded their meaning to include the cooperation of causes and conditions or its absence.

2. The Relationship between the Sarvāstivādin and the Yogācāra Lists

There are two discussions of cittaviprayuktasamśkāras in Viṃścayasaṃgrahaṇī on Pañcaviṃśatikāyaṃpravṛtyaḥbhūmimanobhūmi. Of these, the first passage (T.1579:585c-588c), although incomplete, appears to be the oldest Yogācāra discussion, and it is to this passage that I shall devote the most attention. However, I shall also refer to the second passage, which contains the twenty-four viprayuktas most frequently associated with the Yogācāra (T.1579:607).

One should notice first of all that the first fourteen dharmas in this list correspond most closely to the list of the Abhidharmahrdaya: notably, both texts include prthagjanatva rather than aprāpti. The first passage, although it omits asamijñasamapatti, nirodhasamapatti, and asamijñika, likewise contains prthagjanatva. In fact, all other Yogācāra enumerations of the first fourteen viprayuktas contain the same dharmas as Abhidharmahrdaya.

Another feature of all the lists found in the Yogācārabhūmi, as well as that of Ta ch'eng pai fa ming men lun, is that they do not contain any reference to “other” viprayuktas. Although the Chinese translation of Abhidharmasamuccaya includes such a reference, neither the Sanskrit text nor the Tibetan translation does, thus leading me to believe that it is another of Hsüan Tsang’s additions, and the appearance of a reference to other dharmas in the Chinese translation of Hsien yang shêng chiao lun
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is therefore also suspect. The Pañcaskandhaka, on the other hand, which contains only the first fourteen dharmas, undeniably contains such a reference. (T.1612:849b-c) P'u Kuang, in his commentary on T'cpfmmnl explains the final phrase in Pañcaskandhaka as referring to the last ten dharmas beginning with pravṛtti. (T.1837:60a)

On the basis of the above, I think that the Yogācārabhūmi tradition regarding the cittaviprayuktas must have diverged from the Sarvāstivāda tradition between the time of Abhidharmahrdaya and Abhidharmāvatāra. Perhaps, at the time of the composition of Abhidharmahrdaya, the early Yogācāras, already reconsidering both the constituents and the ontological status of the viprayuktas, added to the Sarvāstivādin list, using a phrase such as ye 'py evamjātiyakā as justification. Perhaps it was in reaction to this that the Abhidharmahrdaya and its successors omitted such phrases and limited the category to fourteen dharmas.

3. The Criticism of the Reality of Jāti in the Vinīścayasaṃgrahāṇī

All of the passages in Yogācārabhūmi at least mention that the viprayuktas are prajñaptidharmas; however, the first passage of Vinīścayasaṃgrahāṇī deals with this most extensively. Of particular interest are the discussions of jāti and prāpti, both of which employ arguments that seem to be related to Vasubandhu's criticism in the AKBh, and both of which involve bija. However, due to space limitations, I shall only discuss jāti here.

The text makes a number of arguments against the ultimate existence of jāti, several of which I shall mention briefly. The first of these is based on an immediately preceding denial of the real existence of the three times as merely names for the bijasantati (T.1579:585c; YBh:Zi21b2-3). This argument foreshadows one of Vasubandhu's criticisms of the Sarvāstivādin position in the AKBh (AKBh:78). Another argument is that all dharmas are caused by their own bijas; hence, there is no need for an entity called jāti to produce them (T.1579:585c; YBh:Zi2b6-7). Finally, the
text asks whether jāti is the actualization of the saṃskṛtadharma or the cause of their actualization and shows that the alternatives are equally illogical (T.1579:585c; YBh:Zi21b7-22a1). The argument against their being the cause of actualization seems to resemble the argument of infinite regress raised by Vasubandhu against the upalakṣaṇas, jātijāti, etc. (AKBh: 76).

After stating that the other lakṣaṇas can be similarly criticized, the text concludes that they are, therefore, all designations for the saṃskṛtadharma, themselves (T.1579:585c; YBh:Zi22a2-4); the same conclusion was arrived at earlier in the Bodhisattvabhūmi (BoBh:279; T.1579:544b).

In the Viniścayasaṃgrahani’s arguments against the real existence of the saṃskṛtalakṣaṇas, one can recognize a number of general ideas that are expressed much more fully by Vasubandhu in the AKBh. Furthermore, its explanation that they are designations for the saṃskṛtadharma is clearly reflected in Vasubandhu’s statement of his own position, particularly in the second of three verses that he composes to support his argument. (AKBh:77)

Katō Junshō (1987:308) suggests that Harivarman, the “Sthavira” of Nyāyānusāra, and Vasubandhu all rely on the Darṣṭāntika of the Mahāvibhāṣa in their criticisms of the saṃskṛtalakṣaṇas; furthermore, the four texts examined by Katō share the same conclusion as the YBh, namely that the saṃskṛtalakṣaṇas are designations for the saṃskṛtadharma at different points in their careers. They all suggest that the principle of conditioned origination is sufficient to explain the progression of the saṃskṛtas from their initial production to their final destruction without the intervention of other dhāmas. However, only the first passage of the Viniścayasaṃgrahani refers to bija in its criticism of the Sarvāstivādin dharma, jāti.

Therefore, even though the Dārṣṭāntika is assumed to be earlier than YBh, the possibility must be considered that for certain of his arguments Vasubandhu relies more directly on the YBh, which, although it sometimes coincides with the Dārṣṭāntika, on other occasions contains ideas that
cannot be traced to him, and on still other occasions radically disagrees with him.

4. The Yogācāra Viprayuktas and the Exposition of Pratityasamutpāda and the Ten Hetus

In its exposition of conditioned origination, the Abhidharmasamāsāntaka, following Savatrīkasavārābhūmi enumerates under the category of artha a number of features of the relationship between cause and result, and the ASBḥ reiterates the importance of these features in the immediately following section, relating them to the fivefold profundity (gāmbhirya) of pratityasamutpāda. Several of these arthas call to mind the definitions of certain of the Yogācāra cittaviprayuktasāmskāras in AS: hetuphala-prabandhānupacchedārtha (ASBḥ:33-34) and pravṛtti (AS:11; ASBḥ:10) both designate the phenomenon of the non-interruption of the series of cause and result. Vicītrahetupatalārtha and pratiniyatahetupatalārtha (ASBḥ:34) seem to be related to pratiniyama (AS:11; ASBḥ:10). Finally, anurūpahetupatalārtha (ASBḥ:34) and yoga (AS:11; ASBḥ:10) both refer to the correspondence between the cause and the result.

Lastly, I shall point out two connections between the causal viprayuktas and the system of ten hetus. The seventh hetu, pratiniyamahetu, is defined in the Bodhisattvabhūmi as the fact that different types of things have different causes. (BoBḥ:98) This corresponds with the definition of pratiniyama as a viprayukta.

Finally, the eighth hetu, sahakārihetu, is related to the viprayukta sāmagri. According to the first passage in Viniscayasamgrahāṇi, all the causes and conditions that can produce dharmas are referred to by the single term sāmagri, which is also called sahakārihetu. (T.1579:587b-c; YBḥ:Zi26b3-4) This association of the terms sāmagri and sahakārihetu can likewise be traced to the exposition of the ten hetus in the Bodhisattvabhūmi, where all the hetus that are involved in production, namely from apeksāhetu through pratiniyamahetu, are designated as sahakārihetu (BoBḥ:98): in the botanical context, if any of these causes is lacking, the grain will not mature, and,
therefore, the totality (sāmagrī) of all these causes is called sahakārihetu (BoBh:100).

The system of ten hetus and the Yogācāra expositions of pratityasamutpāda are attempts to explain the evolution of phenomenal existence, as well as its reversal or purification, in terms of seed causality. The Yogācāra criticism of the reality of the Sarvāstivādin cittaviprayuktas is likewise based on the belief that the explanation of causality renders these “forces” superfluous. However, the Yogācāras recognize that, despite the validity of their explanation, the functioning of cause and result remains difficult to understand. For this reason, they refer back to their earlier expositions in introducing as new viprayuktas their ten designations for the state of cause and result. In doing so, having appropriated a Sarvāstivādin category, they have altered it for their own purposes and to fit together with other features of their own system.

Bibliography:
Imanishi J.
Katō Junshō
1989 経量部の研究 (Étude sur les Sautrāntika). Tokyo; Shunjūsha.
I have not included the passages that I have referred to due to lack of space. However, I shall be happy to supply them to anyone who needs them. Please contact me directly.

(Key Words) abhidharma, cittaviprayuktasamskāras, Yogācāra

(Part-time Lecturer, Bukkyō Daigaku)