The Ninety-Eight Proclivities (*anuśaya*) in the *Madhyamakapañcaskandhaka*:
Further Evidence for Candrakīrti's Authorship

YOKOYAMA Takeshi

Introduction　　The **Madhyamakapañcaskandhaka* (MPSk), preserved only in the Tibetan version and traditionally ascribed to Candrakīrti (c. 7th century), is a compact treatise that expounds the essence of the Sarvāstivāda system of elements (*dharma*s) for Buddhist beginners as the basis for understanding the theory of non-self. In this article, I investigate various issues connected to the section on proclivities (*anuśaya*). The article focusses on the ninety-eight proclivities. First, a comparison with the proclivities in the Sarvāstivāda tradition reveals the particular features of the treatment in the MPSk. Next, I describe some features of the MPSk that are similar to other works of Candrakīrti. Previous researchers insisted that only the section on insight (*prajñā*), which occupies about 20 percent of the MPSk, should be ascribed to Candrakīrti.[1] However, on the basis of the related passages on proclivities, I present new evidence that supports his authorship of the entire work. Lastly, I discuss Candrakīrti's understanding of Sarvāstivāda theories concerning the two truths in light of Candrakīrti's authorship of the MPSk.[2]

1. The Ninety-eight Proclivities in the *Madhyamakapañcaskandhaka　　The MPSk examines proclivity as the thirtieth element in the aggregate of conditioning factors (*saṃskāra-skandha*).[3] The section on proclivity consists of the following: (1) a presentation of the fundamental proclivities; (2) an explanation of the three realms; (3) an explanation of the five classes (*prakāra*); (4) an explanation of the ninety-eight proclivities; (5) an explanation of the four candidate stages (*pratipannaka*) and the four fruits (*phala*); (6) the etymology of *anuśaya*; (7) the order of the arising of the fundamental proclivities; (8) their causes.[4] This paper focuses on the explanation of the ninety-eight proclivities. For want of space, the translation of only the portion concerning twenty-eight proclivities that are abandoned by insight into suffering is presented below:

> Among them, when [one] pays attention to the truth of suffering in the realm of desire as impermanence, suffering, emptiness, and non-self, [elements] called "receptivity to the

knowledge of the doctrine with regard to suffering" (*duḥkhe dharmajñānakṣānti*) and "knowledge of the doctrine [with regard to suffering]" (*duḥkhe dharmajñāna*) arise. These ten proclivities of the realm of desire are abandoned by them. By paying attention similarly to the truth of suffering in the realm of form and in the formless realm, receptivity to subsequent knowledge with regard to suffering (*duḥkhe anvayajñānakṣānti*) and subsequent knowledge with regard to suffering (*duḥkhe anvayajñāna*) arise. Eighteen [proclivities], i.e., the nine proclivities of the realm of form and the nine proclivities of the formless realm [which are the same as the nine proclivities of the realm of desire], with the exception of enmity (*pratigha*), are abandoned. Thus, the twenty-eight proclivities that are abandoned by insight into suffering are abandoned by the four [path] moments, [namely, receptivity to the knowledge of] the doctrine, receptivity to the subsequent knowledge, [knowledge of the doctrine,] and [subsequent] knowledge, which constitute the comprehensive observation of the truth of suffering in the three realms.[5]

Here, the author of the MPSk presents the ninety-eight proclivities not only by classifying the ten fundamental proclivities in terms of the three realms and the five classes, but also by embedding the theory of their abandonment by knowledge and receptivity in the path that consists of the four candidate stages and the four fruits. In general, Sarvāstivāda texts systematically expound the components of proclivity and their abandonment in the path individually as for example, in the 5th and 6th chapters of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. The explanation in the MPSk includes elements of this Sarvāstivāda material.

2. Comparison with the *Abhidharmāvatāra*   Next, we consider an example of the presentation of the ninety-eight proclivities in a Sarvāstivāda text. The *Abhidharmāvatāra* (AA) of *Skandhila (c. 5th century), which forms part of the doctrinal background of the MPSk, explains as follows:

Thus, there are seven [fundamental] proclivities, but, distinguished according to differences in their realms, modes (*ākāra*), and classes, they become ninety-eight. There are ten that are abandoned in the realm of desire by insight into suffering: the wrong view of an existent body (*satkāyadṛṣṭi*), extreme views (*antagrāhadṛṣṭi*), false views (*mithyādṛṣṭi*), attachment to wrong views (*dṛṣṭiparāmarśa*), attachment to faulty disciplinary codes and modes of conduct (*śīlavrataparāmarśa*), doubt (*vicikitsā*), lust (*rāga*), enmity, conceit (*māna*), and ignorance (*avidyā*). There are seven that are abandoned by insight into origination, i.e., those [ten mentiones above], excluding the wrong view of an existent body, extreme views, and attachment to faulty disciplinary codes and modes of conduct. The same seven are abandoned by insight into suppression. There are eight that are abandoned by insight into the path, i.e., those seven as well as attachment to faulty disciplinary codes and modes of conduct. There are

four that are abandoned by cultivation （*bhāvanā*）, i.e., those [ten mentioned above], excluding the five false views and doubt. Thus, there are thirty-six proclivities in the realm of desire. In the realm of form, the five enmities [pertaining to the four insights into the truths and to *bhāvanāmārga*] are excluded [from those thirty-six proclivities]. In the formless realm, [the case is] the same as [in the realm of form]. Thus, there are ninety-eight [in total].[6]

Unlike the explanation of the MPSk, the AA here does not include the theory of the abandonment of proclivities by knowledge and receptivity in the path but presents the ninety-eight proclivities simply in relation to the realms and classes. In addition to the difference in the way the two texts explain the proclivities, we must also note that the theory of the path is expounded in different places in the text. In the MPSk, the discussion is found immediately after the presentation of the ninety-eight proclivities,[7] while the AA places it just after the definitions of knowledge and receptivity, which are the last two items on the list of conditioning factors associated with mind.[8] The textual structure of the MPSk also indicates the author's tendency to understand the theory of proclivities in association with the path and to expound them as a set.

3. Relationship to *Prasannapadā* ad 24.3–5ab   There are some features in Chapter 24 of the *Prasannapadā* （PP）, "Investigation into the Truths of the Noble Ones" （*āryasatya-parīkṣā*） that are similar to the presentation of the ninety-eight proclivities in the MPSk. Here the opponents' criticism is presented in the first six verses. Verses 1–2 argue that the emptiness of all elements leads to the negation of the comprehension of suffering and the abandonment of its origination. Verses 3–5ab insist that emptiness further leads to the negation of the four candidate stages and the four fruits and that it eventually results into the negation of the three jewels. The commentary on verses 3–5ab gives an explanation of the theory of the four candidate stages and the four fruits that includes the system of the abandonment of proclivities at those stages. Passages related to the MPSk are found in the commentary. A translation of the introductory remarks and description of the abandonment of the proclivities by insight into suffering is presented below:

> Here, indeed, before the sixteenth [moment of] subsequent knowledge with regard to the path （*mārge anvayajñāna*）, there are the following fifteen moments of receptivity and knowledge. [In the first set,] there are four moments of receptivity and knowledge that have suffering as their object in the comprehensive observation （*abhisamaya*） of suffering in the three realms. Here, what are the four moments of receptivity and knowledge in the comprehensive observation of suffering in the three realms? The first is the moment of receptivity to the

knowledge of the doctrine with regard to suffering that is a counteragent to the ten proclivities that are of the realm of desire and are abandoned by insight into suffering, i.e., the wrong view of an existent body, extreme views, false views, attachment to wrong views, attachment to faulty disciplinary codes and modes of conduct, doubt, lust, enmity, conceit, and ignorance, which arises in the form of impermanence, suffering, emptiness, and non-self, which has the truth of suffering in the realm of desire as its object, and which has the characteristic of the path of immediate succession （*ānantaryamārga*）. The second is the moment of knowledge of the doctrine with regard to suffering, which has the same object and form and which has the characteristic of the path of liberation （*vimuktimārga*）. Similarly, the third is the moment of receptivity to the subsequent knowledge with regard to suffering, which has the truth of suffering in the realm of form and the formless realm as its object, which is a counteragent to the eighteen proclivities [which are the same as the twenty proclivities] mentioned above with the exception of enmity, which arises in the form of suffering, etc., and which has the characteristic of the path of immediate succession. The fourth is the moment of subsequent knowledge with regard to suffering, which has the same object and form and which has the characteristic of the path of liberation.[9]

The doctrinal contents of these passages suggest that Candrakīrti takes Sarvāstivāda as his opponent. Here he expounds the Sarvāstivāda theory of the path, into which he embeds the ninety-eight proclivities. Although the contexts differ, there are similarities between the passages in the MPSk and the PP, particularly in the author's intention to expound the ninety-eight proclivities and the path as a set. The fact that the section on proclivities includes passages related to Candrakīrti's other work is evidence of his authorship of portions of the MPSk in addition to the section on insight. I have provided some evidence in support of Candrakīrti's authorship of the entire MPSk.[10] My analysis in this article of the section on the ninety-eight proclivities is further evidence for Candrakīrti's authorship.

4. Candrakīrti's Understanding of Sarvāstivāda Theory   In previous publications, I have pointed out that the MPSk expounds the Sarvāstivāda theory of elements as the basis for understanding the theory of non-self.[11] Candrakīrti's similar understanding of that theory can be seen in subsequent arguments in Chapter 24 of the PP. After verse 7, Candrakīrti responds to the opponents' criticism. He demonstrates their theory of emptiness by contradicting his opponents' assertion that emptiness invalidates the truths of suffering and origination. He says, on the contrary, that logically speaking the four truths cannot be established without accepting the emptiness of all elements. Verses 8–10 and

their comments are devoted to an explanation of the two truths (*satya-dvaya*). To the opponents who question the merit of teachings such as aggregates (*skandha*), elements (*dhātu*), sense-fields (*āyatana*), the truths of the noble ones (*āryasatya*), and dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) etc., which are not ultimate truth (*paramārtha-satya*), verse 10 answers that ultimate truth cannot be shown without depending on linguistic convention (*vyavahāra*) and that Nirvana cannot be attained without the attainment of the ultimate truth. In his comments on this, Candrakīrti says that conventional truth (*saṃvṛti-satya*) must surely be accepted at the very beginning because it is a means for attaining of Nirvana.[12] If the aim of the MPSk and its authorship are taken into consideration, it is possible that the teachings of aggregates, etc., questioned here include Sarvāstivāda theories and that Candrakīrti accepts them as being included in conventional truth. However, it must be noted that, as in the MPSk, Candrakīrti consistently denies the existence of the intrinsic nature of elements.

Conclusion In summary, the author of the MPSk first presents ninety-eight proclivities in association with the theory of their abandonment on the path consisting of the four candidate stages and the four fruits. This contrasts with the Sarvastivāda tradition, which expounds them separately according to the topics. Next, PP ad 24.3–5ab places an explanation similar to the presentation of proclivities in the MPSk within the context of explaining the Sarvāstivāda theory of the path. The fact that there are passages related to the PP outside of the section on insight in the MPSk is evidence for Candrakīrti's authorship of the entire text. Assuming that Candrakīrti is the author of the MPSk, which regards Sarvāstivāda theories as necessary for an understanding of the theory of non-self, I suggest that Candrakīrti conventionally accepts these theories on the level of conventional truth according to the two-truth theory expounded in PP ad 8–10.

Notes

1) See Ikeda (1985) and Kishine (2001, 18–19, 39–41).   2) It must be stated in advance that the MPSk does not present an unknown theory of proclivity that differs from Sarvāstivāda theories. Nor are there completely parallel passages between the MPSk and Candrakīrti's other works. The subject of this article is the style of presentation of ninety-eight proclivities in the MPSk and the PP. 3) For a synopsis of the MPSk, see Yokoyama (2021a, 45–50).   4) The locations of the Tibetan versions are as follows: (1) D 259a4–6, P 297a7–b1, (2) D 259a6–b6, P 297b2–298a2, (3) D 259b6–260a2, P 298a2–5, (4) D 260a2–261a1, P 298a5–299a5, (5) D 261a1–5, P 299a5–b2, (6) D 261a5–6, P 299b3, (7) D 261a6–b4, P 299b4–300a2, (8) D 261b4, P 300a2–3.   5) MPSk, D

260a2-5, P 298a5-b1.　　6）AA, D 310a1-6, P 402a3-7.　　　7）See item 5 in the section on proclivity in the MPSk. The textual structure of the MPSk seems out of order: knowledge and receptivity appear in the section on proclivity before they are introduced at the end of the section on conditioning factors associated with mind. This is because the MPSk embeds the theory of the path into the presentation of the proclivities.　　　8）AA, D 315b6-316b3, P 408b6-409b4. For a detailed comparison of the complete textual structures of the MPSk and the AA, see Yokoyama（2018）.　　　9）PP ad 24.3-5ab: 481.10-482.7.　　　10）See Yokoyama（2016b）and（2021b）. 11）See Yokoyama（2015）,（2016a）and（2021a, 20-23）.　　　12）PP ad 24.9-10: 494.2-15.

Abbreviations and Primary Sources

AA　　*Rab tu byed pa chos mṅon pa la ʼjug pa*（*Prakaraṇābhidharmāvatāra*）. D no. 4098 *ñu* 302a7-323a7, P no. 5599 *thu* 393a3-417a8.

MPSk　*Phuṅ po lṅaʼi rab tu byed pa*（*Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*）. D no. 3866 *ya* 239b1-266b7, P no. 5267 *ya* 273b6-305b5.

PP　　*Mūlamadhyamakakārikās*（*Mādhyamikasūtra*）*de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Ed. Louis de La Vallée Poussin. St. Pétersbourg: Commission-naires de lʼAcadémie impériale des sciences, 1903-1913.

Secondary Sources

Ikeda Rentarō 池田練太郎. 1985. “Candrakīrti *Goun-ron* ni okeru shomondai” Candrakīrti『五蘊論』における諸問題. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu ronshū* 駒澤大學佛教學部論集16: 23-45. Kishine Yoshiyuki 岸根敏幸. 2001. *Chandorakīruti no chūgan shisō* チャンドラキールティの中観思想. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.　　　Yokoyama Takeshi 横山剛. 2015. “*Chūgan Goun-ron* ni okeru shohō kaisetsu no seikaku”『中観五蘊論』における諸法解説の性格. *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 235: 89-114.　　　―――. 2016a. “An Analysis of the Textual Purpose of the *Madhyamaka-pañcaskandhaka*.” *IBK* 64（3）: 164-168.　　　―――. 2016b. “*Chūgan Goun-ron* no chosha ni tsuite”『中観五蘊論』の著者について. *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 237: 71-100.　　　―――. 2018. “Ron no kōsei kara mita *Chūgan Goun-ron* to *Nyūabidatsumaron* no kankei” 論の構成からみた『中観五蘊論』と『入阿毘達磨論』の関係. *Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Daigakuin Daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 22: 21-62.　　　―――. 2021a. *Zenyaku Chandorakīruti Chūgan Goun-ron* 全訳 チャンドラキールティ 中観五蘊論. Chiba: Kishin Shobō.　　　―――. 2021b. “*Sūtra* Citations in the *Madhyamakapañcaskandhaka*: Evidence for Candrakīrtiʼs Authorship.” *IBK* 69（3）: 115-120.

Key words　　Candrakīrti, チャンドラキールティ, *Madhyamakapañcaskandhaka*, 中観五蘊論, *anuśaya*, 随眠, authorship, 著者問題

（Project Assistant Professor, Gifu University, PhD）