

## Dharmakīrti's criticism of *anityatva* in the Sāṃkhya theory

Toshikazu Watanabe

Between the Buddhist *kṣaṇikatvavādin* and the Sāṃkhya *satkāryavādin* there is a fundamental disagreement about the meaning of the word "*anityatva*". The aim of this paper is to examine Dharmakīrti's criticism of the Sāṃkhya's *anityatva* in the third chapter of his *Pramāṇaviniścaya* and to consider the historical background of the criticism.

Dharmakīrti introduces the following argument, which is attributed to the Sāṃkhya: The intellect (*buddhi*) does not have a consciousness (*acaitaniya*) because of its impermanence (*anityatva*). He points out that the reason "impermanence" is a *asiddhahetu* because destruction (*vināśa*), which is regarded as the meaning of "impermanence" by Buddhists, cannot be accepted in the Sāṃkhya's *satkāryavāda*. In response to this, the Sāṃkhya proposes two interpretations of the meaning of "impermanence," that is, (1) "disappearance" (*tirodhāna*) and (2) being changed into "a different state" (*avasthāntara*). According to Dharmottara, these two interpretations are offered by the two different Sāṃkhyas, i.e., *abhivyaktivādin* and *avasthāntaravādin*. The former explains the impermanence of things as the manifestation and disappearance of the persisting power (*śakti*). In contrast, the latter explains it as a change of the state of the things. These two theories are derived from the Sāṃkhya's two different descriptions of phenomena of the world, i.e., *vyaktivāda* and *pariṇāmapavāda*, respectively.

Dharmakīrti criticizes these theories as follows: (1) "disappearance" means "being imperceptible" (*adrśyatva*). However, *puruṣa* and *pradhāna* also have this property. Therefore, "disappearance" is not acceptable, as otherwise these two would be impermanent; (2) the *arthakriyā* of things is performed by their "state" (*avasthā*) and nothing exists other than that "state." Therefore, "different state" means "different thing."

Commenting on the latter, Dharmottara indicates that this Dharmakīrti's second criticism includes the criticism of Vaibhāsika's *traikālyā* theory, i.e. *avasthānyathika* propounded by Vasumitra of Sarvāstivādin to explain the difference of the present *dharma* from the past and future *dharma*. Vasumitra's theory has already been criticized by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati. By comparing their criticism with that of Dharmakīrti above mentioned, parallel arguments are found. This suggests that Dharmakīrti's criticism has been influenced by these predecessors' description.