

“*prabheda*” in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*(AS)

—in comparison with those in the *Yogācārabhūmi*(YBh)—

Shigeho OKADA

The AS, with its Abhidharmic characteristics as the title suggests¹⁾, presents us with clues for research on influences especially on the author of the text²⁾. This paper attempts to investigate an aspect of the relation of the AS with another and more comprehensive Abhidharmic work of this school, the YBh, through a comparison of corresponding parts dealing with *prabheda*³⁾, the categorical analysis of *dharma*s.

A listing of the criteria of *prabheda* reveals to us that the order of about the first one third of the categories in the AS is close to that of the *VinSg-C*: while the *VinSg-M* shows complete accordance with the list given in the YBh-Ś, from **rūpin/a*^o up to the ninth criterion **laukika/lokottara*, the AS and the *VinSg-C* correspond to each other from *sat* up to the eighth *gredhāśrita/naiṣkramya*^o.⁴⁾ Here the notable differences between these two texts are as follows: the *VinSg-C* mentions *sabhāga/tat*^o under *rūpin/a*^o; the order is reversed for *saṃskṛta/a*^o and *laukika/...*; the *VinSg-C* includes *ma gtoḥ pa* under *laukika/...* (a similar category can be found in YBh-Ś/*VinSg-M* with slightly different terminology); the AS divides *sat* into four, and adds *jñeya*, *vi*^o and *abhi*^o between *sat* and *rūpin/a*^o. In the latter part of the list, moreover, there exist criteria which are unique to these two texts, namely; *pratītyasamutpanna* (not expounded in the *VinSg-C*), the three *duḥkhatā* and *sottara/niruttara*.

Although the points above are noted from a purely nominal viewpoint, some do show genuine resemblances. For instance, the definition of *dravyasat* in the AS [56a⁸/667a¹⁵, Skt. missing] reads as follows:

... the object of sense organs which does not depend on language(**abhilāpa*) or anything other than [the object] itself.

The definition given in the *VinSg-C* [199a⁷/659a²] is:

That which evokes(*ḥdogs par byed pa*) an inherent characteristic(**svalakṣaṇa*) without depending or relying on anything other than itself

This passage is followed by the proposition that it is erroneous to conceive of an entity as genuinely existent through the means of language. The two definitions have in common the fact that neither denies the existence of things *sat* and that (the role and effects of) language is regarded as the basic criteria.

As for *tatsabhāga*, the *AS* [27³³/68a⁴/672a¹] gives this definition:

... the successive generating of the sense organ towards the object with absence of the cognitive function and resemblance to [the sense organ] itself (*viññānavira-hita-svasādrśyēndriyaviṣayaḥprabandhotpatti*)

In the *VinSg-C* [203a⁷/660c⁹f.], it is defined as follows:

Those [pure material substances(**prasādarāpa*)] which have absence of the cognitive function gradually resemble [their] own flow of existence(*rgyun*)

Here both the definitions are based on the absence of *viññāna*, and resemblance to itself (or *viññāna* for *sabhāga*), of *indriya*.⁵⁾

On the other hand, however, the close relation between the two texts is only partial: for the definition of *sapratigha*, the *AS* [20¹⁸f./57b⁸f./667c¹²f.] corresponds in two of its three criteria to that in the *VinSg-M* [74b³f./608a¹⁰f.]; *klista/a*^o ≡ 染汚/不^o is peculiar only to the *AS* [22¹⁹f./60b²f./668c²⁷f.] and the *VaSg* [Ch. 879c⁹f.], the definition of which does not show any notable resemblance; *indriya* is not dealt with in the *VinSg-C*, and contents parallel to the *AS* [28⁸f./68a⁴f./672a⁹f.] can be found in the **indriyakaūśalya* section of the *VinSg-C* [89b²f./614a¹⁷f.].⁶⁾

The forms of relation and the degree of resemblance of the *AS* to the *YBh* are, as we have cursorily seen in the case of *prabheda*, much varied. Nonetheless, the above may allow us to assert that the author of the *AS* referred to the relevant passages in the *YBh*, with his list of criteria possibly based on that in the *VinSg-C*, in composing the *prabheda* section.⁷⁾

Critical Apparatus: Loc. as [(Skt.)/Tib(Derge)./Ch(Taisho).]. *AS*: [Gokhale ed. 19²⁵-29¹/Ri 56a⁵-70a⁶/No. 1605 667a¹³-672c²⁰]; *YBh-Ś*: in the *Śrutamayī bh*^o

(14) “*prabheda*” in the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (S. Okada)

[Tshi 163b²-164a⁷/No. 1579 346a²⁷-346b²¹, listing only]; *VinSg*: *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*; *VinSg-M*: in its *Manobh*° [Shi 74b²-76b³/608a⁷-608c¹⁶, under **skandhakauśalya*] ⇐ 顯揚聖教論 [No. 1602 506a²⁸-507a⁴]; *VinSg-C*: in its *Cintāmayī bh*° [Shi 199a⁵-223a⁵/658c²⁷-668b¹³]; *VaSg*: *Vastusamgrahaṇī* [Tib. missing/879b²⁹-880a²⁵].

- 1) Unlike the 顯揚聖教論, which has the (greatly controversial) opening verses, the explanation given in the *AS* itself [120a^{5f}/694b^{8f}.] as to why the work is thus named neither gives nor suggests its source(s) for *samuccaya*. As for *abhidharmasātra* referred to in the relevant passage of the *AS-bhāṣya*, see Hakamaya, N.: **Mahāyānasamgraha* における心意識説 (『東京大学東洋文化研究所紀要』 No. 76, 1978, p. 245 fn. 27.).
- 2) The authorship of *Asaṅga* for the *AS* seems to be widely accepted. The following is based on the minimum assumption that *Asaṅga* wrote (not “edited” or “compiled”) the work. This assumption should hopefully contribute to the clarification of the possible relation and role(s) which *Asaṅga* had and played in the forming of the *YBh*.
- 3) See Uesugi, N.: 阿毘達磨集論の有色・無色説について (*IBK* No. 26 Vol. 1, 1977, pp. 332-335) for the structural peculiarities of *prabheda* in the *AS*. Also note that in the *YBh-Ś*, the term *rnam par hbyed pa*/思擇 is used.
- 4) The basis of Frauwallner’s argument for textual sources of influences on *Asaṅga* (“ABHIDHARMA-STUDIEN I” *WZKSO* Bd. 7, 1963, p. 33), that the *AS* and the *Jñānaprasthāna* share the same ten criteria in the same order, seems insufficient: all of the Frauwallner’s ten criteria are listed in the passages found in our critical apparatus except for the *VaSg*, and hence can better be regarded as common to the *Yogācāra* school.
- 5) In the *VinSg-M*, both *sat* and *sabhāga/tat*° are dealt with under the **dhatukauśalya* section: the former is only enumerated at 78a^{2f}/609b^{16f}., while the latter at 78b^{4f}/609c^{3f}., where only the first criterion is used.
- 6) Corresponding passages for some of the other criteria have been noted or studied. As for *atīta*/..., see Miyashita, S.: 『俱舍論』における本無今有論の背景 (『仏教学セミナー』 No. 44, 1986, p. 34, nt. 33); for *pratītyasamutpanna*, Matsuda, K.: *Abhidharmasamuccaya* における十二支縁起の解釈 (『大谷大学真宗総合研究所研究紀要』 Vol. 1, 1984, pp. 29-50); for *āhāra* and *pratītyasamutpanna*, Sasaki, Y.: アーラヤ識成立の一要因 (『東洋学術研究』 Vol. 21 No. 2, 1982, pp. 182-186).
- 7) According to Sasaki *loc. cit.*, the concept of *upādāna* in the *AS* is under the influence of the *VaSg*. See also Suguro, S.: 『初期唯識思想の研究』 (Tokyo, 1989, p. 138) for the hypothesis of the *YBh*’s chronological precedence to *Asaṅga*.

〈Key words〉 *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, *Yogācārabhūmi*, *prabheda*

(Graduate Student, University of Tokyo)