

要 旨

The criticism of few hypothesis related to Dārṣṭāntika's theory of 'the aggregation sees (和合見)'

KWON Oh-min

Traditionally Dārṣṭāntika is known as a pioneer of Sautrāntika, but recently Harada Waso and Robert Kritzer posed a hypothesis that Sautrāntika on *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is the fictitious name for hiding Yogācāra, or reflected Vasubandhu's Yogācāra beliefs. To them, it is clear that Dārṣṭāntika's theory of 'the aggregation sees' on *Mahāvibhāṣāsāstra* and Sautrāntika's theory of 'the non-function of organs and consciousness' on *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* are completely separate one.

Harada Waso posed major bases of an argument that (1) Kato Junsho's hypothesis that Vasubandhu (i.e. Sautrāntika) admitted 'simultaneous arising of mind and mental condition' of Sarvāstivādin differently to Dārṣṭāntika, (2) Miyashita Seiki's hypothesis that the background of Sautrāntika's theory of 'coming into existence from non-existence (*abhūtva bhāva*)' is *Yogācārabhūmi*. And he argued that (3) Sthavira Śrīlāta maintained the theory of 'one-eye sees (一眼見)' according to the quotation of *Nyāyānusārasāstra*, not the theory of 'the aggregation sees'. Also, Robert Kritzer understood (4) Dārṣṭāntika's position on *Abhidharmadīpa* as the theory of 'consciousness sees (識見)' as to Harivarman took the theory.

This paper criticized four hypotheses above based on *Nyāyānusārasāstra* by Saṃghabhadra. The theory of 'the non-function of organs and consciousness' which is referred as Sautrāntika's on *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and as Dārṣṭāntika's on *Nyāyānusārasāstra* is an argument of a group (*ekiyas*) of Dārṣṭāntika which belongs to Sthavira Śrīlāta, call themselves as Sautrāntika under the motto that "we only take the sūtra which is preached by the Buddha himself as a base of knowledge (*pramāṇa*)".

The theory of 'the aggregation sees' of the Sthavira sect (a group of Dārṣṭāntika)

which takes 'coming into existence from non-existence and going back to non-existence (本無今有 有已還無)'--'real dharma of kṣaṇa (刹那実法)' as the first principle, does not take simultaneous arising of mind and mental conditions as a premise. And their theory of 'one-eye sees' is just a discussion on relationship between consciousness and its base (*āśraya*), but not on cognitive agent (*dr̥ṣṭr*). Furthermore, Dipakāra did not mention about Dārṣṭāntika as the one who argued the theory of 'consciousness sees'. Also in *Abhidharmadīpa*, a series of articles are about sequential arising of mind and mental conditions and theories of knowledge (i.e. *sākārajñānavāda*) accordingly, and they are all confirmed in Sthavira Śrīlāta/ his Dārṣṭāntika's argument and Saṃghabhadra's criticism about their argument.