

A Source-Critical Analysis of the Sautrāntika Refutation of Non-manifest Action (*avijñapti*) in the AKBh 4-4

Changhwan Park

Research Professor of Geumgang University, Korea

The portion of the Sautrāntika disproof of the reality of non-manifest action (*avijñapti*) in the AKBh 4-4 (197:03-199:11) provides a rare specimen to test Vasubandhu's use of the terms of varying doctrinal denominations. The portion as a whole is posed as a Sautrāntika critique of the Vaibhāṣika conception of non-manifest action, but in the meantime, Vasubandhu skillfully intersperses it with an array of the doctrinal positions of such denominations as Yogācārās (Meditators), Apāra (Dārṣṭāntika), Pūrvācāryās, Vaibhāṣikas, and so on. This portion is therefore a unique occasion in which we can gauge how Vasubandhu made use of these terms and understood the mutual relationships among them.

Given the uniqueness of this portion, it is no wonder that much scholarly attention has already been paid to it, with some serious issues raised. Not much can be added to Funahasi Issai's (1954/1987) thorough analysis and translation of it. Hakamaya Noriaki (1986) already pondered on the possibility of the Pūrvācāryās as early Yogācāra masters such as Asaṅga and subsequently translated the whole portion (Hakamaya 1995).

More importantly, Robert Kritzer (1999) and Wasō Harada (1996) have recently called into question the authenticity of the uses of the term "Sautrāntikāḥ" in the AKBh, pondering the Yogācārabhūmi as the genuine, if covert, background of them. Robert Kritzer (2005 *Vasubandhu and the Yogācārabhūmi*) in particular has attempted to provide the corresponding Yogācārabhūmi passages for the Sautrāntika ones in the portion in an effort to prove his controversial thesis that Vasubandhu's Sautrāntika positions are, in reality, Yogācāra in disguise.

In a reaction to this claim, what I aim to do in this paper is to trace each doctrinal position in this Sautrāntika portion back to their earlier textual sources by using all the available pre/post-ACBh textual materials, Sanskrit, Tibetan, or Chinese. This source-critical approach can be justified because no serious attempt has been made to dig into the real textual sources of the varying doctrinal positions in this portion by using the Nyāyānusāra, which is a great mine of information for the tracing of the Dārṣṭāntika/Śrīlāta background of the Sautrāntika-leaning positions in the AKBh.

I will show that the majority of the Sautrāntika portion can be traced back to Dārṣṭāntika/Śrīlāta sources, which proves the authenticity of Vasubandhu's encapsulation of the entire disproof portion in the title of the Sautrāntikas and that Kritzer's claim on the correspondences of it with the Yogācārabhūmi are rather partial or superficial.