

## The Investigation of Vijñānapariṇāma in *Trimśikāvijñapti-prakarāṇa*

— The different concepts between Sthiramati and Dharmapāla —

By Shi Ruyuan

In the Chinese Buddhist tradition, the theory of Hsüan-Tsang's (玄奘) *Cheng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) has been considered to be legitimate in regard to *Yogācāra* philosophy. *Cheng-wei-shih-lun* is a commentary on Vāsubandhu's *Trimśikāvijñapti-prakarāṇa* and was translated into Chinese around the seventh century CE by Hsüan-Tsang. Even though he claimed that *Cheng-wei-shih-lun* was not a commentary of a single person, and instead, that it was a combination of ten people's commentaries, Hsüan-Tsang admitted that among those commentaries, Dharmapāla's concept was adopted as authoritative.

Recently, the original Sanskrit text of Sthiramati's *Trimśikāvijñaptibhāṣya*, one of the ten commentaries, was found and translated into different modern languages such as French, English, Chinese and Japanese. This discovery provides more access to study Vāsubandhu's *Trimśikāvijñapti*. However, following this remarkable discovery, problems appear due to the fact that there are many conceptual differences between these two commentaries, i.e. Sthiramati's commentary and *Cheng-wei-shih-lun*. One of the differences which is worth further investigation is the different theories regarding the idea of *pariṇāma* (transformation) in *vijñānapariṇāma*. The question is whose explanation is closer to Vāsubandhu's original meaning. After careful investigation, this paper will prove that in fact, Sthiramati's concept is more precise in interpreting Vāsubandhu's philosophy.

The methodology for this paper is a textual comparative study. This paper will directly explore the scriptural contents through the analysis of Sanskrit and Chinese since Sthiramati's commentary has a Sanskrit version and Dharmapāla's work exists only in Chinese. After the analysis of the two texts, this paper will trace the theory of *Vijñānapariṇāma* back to the theory of *bīja* in the early Sautrāntika school, *Abhidharmakośa* and *Karmasiddhi* to see the relationship

between the theory of *bīja* and *Vijñānapariṇāma*. Finally, through the inter-comparative study of Sthiramati's commentary, Dharmapāla's commentary, and the theory of *bīja*, the thesis of this paper that Sthiramati's interpretation of *pariṇāma* is closer to Vāsubandhu's original concept can be approached.

In the field of *Yogācāra* study, in regard to this topic, there is ample scholarship which can provide secondary sources to develop this paper. Some of the important scholarship includes “*Triṃśikāvijñaptiprakaraṇa*” in *the Lecture of Buddhist Scripture* by Yuki-reimon, *Dharmapāla and Sthiramati's Commentaries of Triṃśikāvijñapti-prakaraṇa* by Ui-hakuju, *The Lecture of Triṃśikāvijñapti prakaraṇa* by Inoue-genshin. Moreover, Fujimoto Akira wrote a article “Vāsubandhu's *pariṇāma* theory in *Triṃśikā*” focusing on *Sthiramati's* commentary. The clarification between the different concepts of *pariṇāma* and *vivartta* by Kochumuttom is a helpful resource for this paper. Furthermore, some parts of Hsüan-Tsang's (玄奘) *Cheng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) have been translated into English by Swati Ganguly. This translation provides a great convenience for studying *Dharmapāla*.

The first verses of *Triṃśikā* in *Cheng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) is as follows:

|       |       |
|-------|-------|
| 由假說我法 | 有種種相轉 |
| 彼依識所變 | 此能變爲三 |

Because the idea of self and the elements are false, the phenomenal appearances of all kind arise. These appearances are dependent upon the development of consciousness. This development is of three kinds.<sup>1</sup>

The same verses in Sthiramati's Sanskrit commentary are:

*ātmadharmopacāro hi vividho yaḥ pravartate /*  
*lokaśāstrayoriti vākyaśeṣaḥ /*  
*vijñānapariṇāme'sau /*

---

<sup>1</sup> From Ganguly's English translation (p.75).

That the figurative expressions of the self and of elements arise in both the world and treaties is in the transformation of conscious process.<sup>2</sup>

In the above Chinese and Sanskrit versions, the Chinese term corresponding to Sanskrit term *pariṇāma* is 變 (bian). Ganguly translates it as “development”. However, the word “development” does not quiet correspondent to the meaning of the Chinese term “變 (bian)”. That is because “development” emphasizes more the process of the transformation, and in contrast, the direct translation for “變” (bian) is “becoming” or “changing” which is more in the sense of focusing on the appearance of the consequence. The other translator, Wei- Tat, uses manifestation to interpret “變” (bian). The term manifestation which possesses the sense of making something suddenly appear is a good term to translate “變” (bian).<sup>3</sup>

In Williams’ *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, there are dozens of English translations for *pariṇāma* such as change, alternation, transformation, development, evolution, ripeness, maturity, growing etc.<sup>4</sup> Yuki concludes that the possible translations can be grouped into three concepts which are transformation, development and consequence. “Transformation” indicates the changing of the whole into another certain state. “Development” indicates the changing process. “Consequence” indicates the final state of the change.<sup>5</sup> Among these three understanding of *pariṇāma*, from terminological analysis, the meaning of “變 (bian)” is closer to the third concept for “變” (bian) emphasizing more the final state of the change. In contrast, the other Chinese word “轉 (Zhuan)” which corresponds to *pravartate* tends to possess the sense of transformation and development rather than “變 (bian)”. For this reason, instead of “變” (bian), Hua, the scholar who translated *Sthiramati’s* commentary into modern Chinese, uses “轉化” (Zhuan-hua) to translate *pariṇāma* in his work *The Sanskrit-Chinese translation of Sthiramati’s commentary*.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The English translation is by Akira (p.86).

<sup>3</sup> Wei Tat. *Chen Wei-Shih Lun: Doction of Mere-Consciouses*, p.9.

<sup>4</sup> Monier-Williams, M. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. p.594.

<sup>5</sup> Yuki, Reimon. “*Triṃśikāvijñapti-prakarāṇa*” *The Lecture of Buddhist Scripture*, p.87.

<sup>6</sup> Hua, T. H. *The Translation and Commentary of Sthiramati’s Triṃśikāvijñaptiprakarāṇa*. p.18.

Kochumuttom provides another direction for understanding the concept of *pariṇāma*. In order to show the different concepts of transformation in Indian background, he clarifies the difference between *pariṇāma* and *vivartta* by claiming, “*pariṇāma* implies transformation of a substratum into different modes of existence, while *vivartta* implies making some illusions appear.”<sup>7</sup> Evidence for this distinction can also be obtained from the *Yogocāramubhumi*. In the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, it says that Buddhas and Bodhisattvas have two kinds of magical powers which are transformation (*pariṇāma*) and manifestation (*nirṇāma*). On the one hand, transformation means that they are able to transform things into other different things. On the other hand, manifestation means they are able to cause something which has never existed before to appear. In Chinese translation, again, Hsüan-Tsang uses “變” (bian) to translate *pariṇāma* and uses “化” (Hua) to translate *nirṇāma*.<sup>8</sup> From the content of the text, *pariṇāma*, here, possesses the sense of suddenly transforming from one appearance to another totally different appearance. Therefore, Hsüan-Tsang’s employment of “變” (bian) for interpreting *pariṇāma* may indicate a kind of transformations which emphasizing on a sudden changing of a state to another state.

Through terminological analysis, in regard to the term “*pariṇāma*”, for *Stīramati*’s commentary, modern scholars tend to adopt “transformation” to interpret “*pariṇāma*” according to the content of his commentary. On the contrary, instead of “轉化” (Zhuan-hua) whose meaning is closer to “transformation” or “development”, Hsüan-Tsang (玄奘) preferred to use “變” (bian) to interpret *Dharmapāla*’s concept of “*pariṇāma*”. The different choices of terminologies for translating “*pariṇāma*” indicate the different concepts between *Stīramati* and *Dharmapāla*. One focuses on the process of a gradual transfor-

<sup>7</sup> Kochumuttom, T. A. *A Buddhist Doctrine of Experience*. p. 133.

<sup>8</sup> 由此神通能轉所餘有自性物，令成餘物，故名能變神境智通。云何能化神境智通品類差別？謂若略說，無事而有是名為化。能以化心隨其所欲，造作種種未曾有事，故名能化神境智通。By means of this magic power, (one) is able to transform all things which possess natures to other different things. Hence, it is called the magic power of transformation (*pariṇāma*). What are the various kinds of the magic power of manifestation? In summary, it is called manifestation (*nirṇāma*) because (one is able to make) things which never exist appear. One is able to create various things which never exist before in terms of one’s own will. Therefore, it is called the magic power of manifestation. (T30,493a15).

mation, while another emphasizes on the consequence of a sudden transformation.

Before investigating the different concepts between Sthiramati and Dharmapāla, it is necessary to understand the idea of *Bīja* (seed) in the *Yogocāra* school. That is because, the idea of the transformation of consciousness (*vijñānapariṇāma*) corresponds to the idea of the development or manifestation of seed. The reason that “consciousness” (*vijñāna*) is able to transform to various phenomenal existences is the function of seeds. Consciousness consists of a great deal of accumulation of seeds. For example, Hsüan-Tsang’s (玄奘) interpreted *ālayavijñāna* as something which is able to store, able to be stored, and attached to storing.<sup>9</sup> The first two interpretations of the three are due to the functions of seeds. That is, *ālayavijñāna* is like a storehouse which can contain seeds, and on the contrary, seeds are like stocks which can be amassed in a warehouse.

Furthermore, in order to emphasize the close relationship between consciousnesses and seeds, *ālayavijñāna* is also called the consciousness of all seeds.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, the consciousness and seeds are neither the same things nor different things. From the perspective of the whole accumulation of seeds, it is called consciousness. From the perspective of the function which is able to develop into phenomenal existences, it is called seeds. The relationship between consciousness and seeds can also be described as the relationship between nature and function. Therefore, the transformation of consciousness is exactly the transformation of seeds.

In his commentary, Sthiramati explains his idea of *pariṇāma* with the words:

*ko'yaṃ pariṇāmo nāma /anyathātvām / kāraṅkṣaṇanirodhasam-  
akālah kāraṅkṣaṇavilaṣaṇaḥ kāryasyātmalābhaḥ pariṇāmaḥ!*<sup>11</sup>

[Question]: what is this called “transformation” (*pariṇāma*).

[Answer]: It is “becoming different” (*anyathātvam*). “Transformation” means the acquisition of its own essence (*ātma-lābha*) by

<sup>9</sup> “Cheng-wei-shih-lun” (成唯識論). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 31. p.8a.

<sup>10</sup> “Wei-shih-san-si-son” (唯識三十頌). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 31. p.60b.

<sup>11</sup> Hua, T. H. *The Translation and Commentary of Sthiramati's Triṃśikāvijñaptiprakarāṇa*, p.154.

an effect (*karya*) which is different in nature from the moment of the cause (*kāraṇ-kṣaṇa-vilakṣaṇa*) and which takes place with the extinction of the moment of the cause.<sup>12</sup>

“Becoming different” is the characteristic or nature of transformation (*pariṇāma*). While the cause is becoming extinct, at that moment, the cause establishes an effect which possesses the different characteristic from its cause. *Sthiramati*’s illustration can be concluded into two ideas which are “becoming different” (變異爲性) and “the cause and effect at the different moments” (異時因果). To become different indicates the different characteristics or natures between cause and effect. The different moments of cause and effect indicates that the cause and effect cannot exist at the same time. It is just as *Sthiramati*’s view that the effect does not appear until the extinction of the cause (this concept is very different from the theory of Dharmapāla). The two ideas, “becoming different” (變異爲性) and “the cause and effect at the different moments” (異時因果), also indicates that *Sthiramati*’s concept of *pariṇāma* focuses more on the process of transformation.

According to *Cheng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論), for Dharmapāla, the interpretation of the transformation of consciousness is as follows:

Transformation means that the substance of consciousness manifests itself into two divisions, (namely, the object perceived and perceiving faculty). Both of the object perceived and perceiving faculty arise by means of the self- witness. It is on the basis of these two divisions that Atman and dharmas are established. Without these (two divisions), those two (i.e. Atman and dharmas) have no other basis.<sup>13</sup>

According to *Cheng-wei-shih-lun-su-ji* (成唯識論述記), the above commentary referred to both *Sthiramati* and Dharmapāla. However, this

---

<sup>12</sup> The English is translated by L. Kawamura and unpublished.

<sup>13</sup> Wei-tat 11.

interpretation cannot be found in Sthiramati's *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣyam*. Hence, the above commentary can only be considered to be Dharmapāla's interpretation. In this interpretation, Dharmapāla does not provide a clear explanation to the characteristic of transformation, and instead he merely focuses on the situation when seeds have transformed and become a fruit. However, due to the different emphases, there is no doubt that Dharmapāla has a different viewpoint from Sthiramati regarding the theory of transformation.

In the second chapter of *Cheng-wei-shih-lun*, Dharmapāla divides the concept of *pariñāma* in to two different kinds which are *pariñāma* in the state of cause (因能變) and in the state of effect (果能變). *Pariñāma* in the state of cause (因能變) refers to the relationship among the bīja (seeds) in the different moments. A certain seed of a dharma which has not received enough conditions to development (*samudācāra* 現行) continuously exists in the state of cause through the method that the seeds in the previous moment causes the arising of the seed in the latter moment. Since the previous seed as the cause and the latter seed as effect exist in the different moment, it is called "the cause and effect at the different moments" (異時因果). Thus, this concept is similar to that of Sthiramati.

The second type, *pariñāma* in the state of effect (果能變), refers to the relationship between a seed and its fruit (*samudācāra* 現行). When a seed is supported by sufficient conditions, it will transfer into a fruit or reversely, a fruit also can cause the existence of a seed through the theory of experientially initiated potentialities of experience (*vasanā* 熏習). Since the seed and its fruit are able to mutually effect each other, it is called *pariñāma* in the state of effect (果能變). Regarding this concept, Dharmapāla adopts a theory from the *Mahayana-saṃgraha* which is that the seed and its fruit must exist in the same moment. Thus, it is also called "the cause and effect in the same moment" (同時因果).

"The cause and effect in the same moment" (同時因果) is one of the six characteristics of seeds in the *Mahayanasamgraha*. Those six characteristics of seeds are the momentary vanishment, the togetherness, the continuity, the determination, the necessity of conditions and the causing of self-result. Among them, the togetherness means that the seeds must exist together with its fruit in the same moment. Only under this condition, the seed is able to operate and become

its fruit. In discussing of *Vijñānapariṇāma*, Dharmapāla tends to focus on the second type of *pariṇāma*. That is to say in regard to the concept of *pariṇāma*, Dharmapāla emphasizes more the consequence of *pariṇāma* and insists that the cause and effect must exist at the same moment.

In his commentary, Sthiramati also proposes the different kinds of *pariṇāma*, i.e. *pariṇāma* in the state of cause (因能變) and in the state of effect (果能變). However, in regard to the *pariṇāma* in the state of effect, Sthiramati does not mention the togetherness of the seed and its fruit since just like the above analysis, for Sthiramati, the cause must appear at the moment when the cause has gone. Therefore, in Sthiramati's theory of *pariṇāma*, the cause and effect can never be together at the same moment.

In order to solve the conflict between Sthiramati and Dharmapāla, an understanding of the early theory of the transformation of seeds in the *Sautrāntika* school is a good place to begin. The theory of seeds was generated from sectarian Buddhism and was properly completed during the time between the *Abhidharmamahāvibhāśāsāstra* and the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. The most important school that established the theory of seed is the *Sautrāntika* school. The *Sautrāntika* school originated from the *Sarvāstivāda* school, and comparing to other sects, its formation was very late. According to *I Bu Jong Lun Lun* (異部宗輪論), the *Sautrāntika* separated from the *Sarvāstivāda* four hundred years after Buddha's nirvana.<sup>14</sup> Because the day of Buddha's nirvana has not been verified, this assertion is not helpful for dating the formation of *Sautrāntika*. However, many different sources indicate that Kumāralāta was the founder of the *Sautrāntika*.<sup>15</sup> In *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*, Tāranātha indicated that Kumāralāta was a contemporary of *Nāgājuna*. In the *Mahāvaiśvika*, the

<sup>14</sup> 「至第四百年初，從說一切有部復出一部，名經量部，亦名說轉部。」(“At the beginning of the fourth-hundred year after Buddha's nirvana, a sect separated from *Sarvāstivāda*. It was known as *Sautrāntika* and was also called *Samkrāntika*.”) *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 49. p.15b.

<sup>15</sup> 俱舍論記：「鳩摩邏多...是經部祖師」(T41,35c)。Ju She Lun Ji, “Kumāralāta [...] was the founder of *Sautrāntika*”. 大唐西域記：「鳩摩邏多...是經部祖師」(T51,942a)。Da Tang Xi Yu Ji, “Kumāralāta [...] was the founder of *Sautrāntika*”. 成唯識論述記：「鳩摩邏多...名譬喻師，經部之種族，經部以此說為宗」(T43, 274a)。Cheng Wei Shi Lung Shu Ji, “Kumāralāta was a *dārṣṭāntika* and belonged to *Sautrāntika*. *Sautrāntika* considered his teaching as their main doctrine”.

authors only mention *dārṣṭāntika* and not *Sautrāntika*. According to Chinese resources such as *Chu San Zhang Ji Ji* (出三藏記集), *Da Tang Xi Yu Ji* (大唐西域記), *Kumāralāta* and Nagajuna were in the same contemporary.<sup>16</sup> Nāgārjuna lived around 150~250 C.E. Thus, the formation of *Sautrāntika* was probably within the second century C.E.

Kumāralāta was considered as the founder of the *Sautrāntika* school, and since he was adept at using *dr̥ṣṭānta* (parable or comparison) to promote Buddhism, he was called *dr̥ṣṭāntaka*. The *Sautrāntika* sect he founded was also called *dārṣṭāntika*.<sup>17</sup> According to *Abhidharma-nyāyānusāra*, Kumāralāta established the theory of *bīja* to explain the potential power of karma:

*Dārṣṭāntika* claim that just as the theory of a seed (of a plant) causing its fruits, it should be known that the theory of karma causing its fruit is the same. Just as the seed, the (previous) fruit which caused its existence have perished, is the main cause from which the different dharma (factors) such root, shoot, stem, branch, leaf and so on raise in order after possessing enough conditions. Although the main body of the stream is not stable, it is inheriting and proceeding. At the last state, while encountering another condition, the seed can raise its own fruit. Similarly, karma is the main cause in the continuing stream after the vanishment of the previous fruit which raises the karma. From the next state, there are different features of dharmas (factors) rising in every state of the continuing stream. Although the main body of the stream is not stable, it is inheriting (its feature from the previous state) and proceeding. At the last state, while it possesses another condition, it can cause its own fruit. Hence, karma is not the direct causes of its fruit but the power of anyonya (mutual operation) is.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> 出三藏記集 *Chu San Zhang Ji Ji*(T55,89a~c), 大唐西域記 *Da Tang Xi Yu Ji* (T51,942a).

<sup>17</sup> 「經部此有三種：一、根本，即鳩摩羅多。二、室利邏多，造經部毘婆沙，正理所言上座是。三、但名經部。以根本師造結鬘論，廣說譬喻，名譬喻師，從所說為名也。其實，總是一種經部」(續藏經 *Xu Zang* 83, 215)。

<sup>18</sup> 「譬喻宗說：如外種果感赴理成，如是應知業果感赴。謂如外種由遇別緣，為親傳因，感果已滅，由此後位，遂起根、芽、莖、枝、葉等諸異相法，體雖不住而相續轉。於最後位，復遇別緣，方能為因生於自果。如是諸業於相續中，為親傳因，感果已滅，由此於後自相續中，有分位別異相法起，體雖不住而相續轉。於最後位，復遇別緣，方能為因生於自

Kumāralāta used a simile, seed (*bīja*), to explain how karma continues to function and eventually causes its own fruit. The function of karma is similar to a seed of a plant. After a seed is sowed, the root, shoot, stem, branch, and leaf of the newly developing plant owes its form and growth to the seed. Finally, the fruit appears and matures. The function of karma is like this simile. All deeds and thoughts have gone at the moment when they are completed. How can karma cause its fruit, reward or retribution? This simile illustrates that certain qualities come from the previous state, even when the original cause of the state is gone. Finally, under certain circumstances, the fruit will occur. Thus, karma is the main cause of its fruit but it is not the direct cause. The direct cause to the fruit is the power of the inheriting and proceeding.

In this simile, Kumāralāta used the visible theory of a seed as an example to illustrate the invisible karma theory. Thus, this theory is known as the theory of *bīja* (seed). Based on this influential theory, other interpreters such as *ṅsanga* or Vāsubandhu continued to develop *bīja* theory in more detail. However, the main characteristics of *bīja* theory have been possessed in Kumāralāta's *bīja* theory. These special features are: 1) Inheriting-continuity, 2) transformation, 3) the function of fruit- rising.

In Kumāralāta's theory, the seed is not stable, instead it is continuously developing. At every moment, a seed is transforming into another state different from its previous state. It is just like the growing process of a plant. Each state such as such root, shoot, stem, branch, leaf and so on is different from another state. At the final state, a seed has transformed into a totally different state from its first state. It is the latest state of this transformation which is called fruit. Thus, the cause and effect cannot be in the same moment (i.e. the seed and its fruit cannot exist at the same moment), and the seed cannot suddenly transfer to fruit.

Vāsubandhu inheriting Kumāralāta's theory has given a more detailed explanation of the three features of a seed in his work the *Abhidharma-kośabhāṣya*:

What dharma (theory) is known as *bīja*? The *nāman* (thought) and *rupa*

---

果。……如是諸業，亦非親爲因，令自果生，然由展轉力」(T29,535a)。

(deeds) can cause their own fruits through *anyonya* (mutual operation). That mutual operation is the operation of *saṃtati* (continuity), *pariṇāma* (transformation), and *viśeṣa* (superiority).

What is the *pariṇāma* (transformation)? The *pariṇāma* means that the previous one different from the later one. What is the *saṃtati* (continuity)? The *saṃtati* (continuity) is that the actions in present, past, and future are mutual causes and effects. What is the *viśeṣa* (superiority)? The *viśeṣa* is the function of raising fruit.<sup>19</sup>

Inheriting Kumāralāta's idea, Vāsubandhu directly defined *bīja* as the function of raising fruit through mutual operation. That is, all deeds and thoughts have the function to cause their fruits. However, they do not directly cause their fruit. They have to follow a certain process of continuity, transformation, and superiority. The continuity means that when all deeds and thoughts suddenly vanish, there is something continuing. In this continuing stream, each state is the effect of its previous state and is the cause of its later state. The transformation means that in the continuing stream, each state inherits a feature from its previous state and is also distinct from its previous state. The superiority means that in the final state of this continuing stream, the power is stronger than any previous state and can raise the fruit.

From the above illustration, it is known that Vāsubandhu's concept of seed in the period of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* still maintained the idea from the *Sautrāntika* school. That is, the transformation of a seed to its fruit must proceed through a series of process. In this process, it is impossible for the cause and effect to stay at the same moment. Furthermore, it is also impossible for the seed to suddenly transform to its fruit. What he provides to the theory of seed is to give a clear definition to the seed and in detail, divided the process of transformation of the seed into three steps.

Someone may argue that the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is Vāsubandhu's early work and considered to be the work belonging to Sectarian Buddhism. After

---

<sup>19</sup> T29,22c.

Vāsubandhu was converted into Mahayana Buddhism by Asaṅga, his ideas might have changed. In order to deal with this argument, it is a good method to investigate the theory of seed in *Vāsubandhu's* later work *Karmasiddhi*. *Karmasiddhi* was considered to be a Mahayana text in the Chinese tradition. Even though the term “Mahayana” is not addressed in the title in its Sanskrit version, in the Chinese version, the translator put “Da-Cheng” (Mahayana) in front of *Karmasiddhi*. The reason that the Chinese tradition considers it to be a Mahayana text is that it has already mentioned *ālayavijñāna* and considered it as the carrier of seeds. Vāsubandhu divided human mind into different kinds in *Karmasiddhi*:

There are two kinds of mind. The first kind is called Accumulating-mind for it is the place in which all seeds are accumulated. The second kind is called various-mind for it operates differently due to the different perceived objects.<sup>20</sup>

Later, in the same chapter, Vāsubandhu uses *ādānavijñāna* adopted from *saṃdhi-nirmocanasūtra* to define the first mind, Accumulating-mind. He cites the verses from *saṃdhinirmocanasūtra*:

Because *ādānavijñāna* is extremely profound, and subtle and all of the seeds (in it) are just like the stream of waterfall, I (i.e. Buddha) do not demonstrate to the comment people. I worries that they might distinguish and consider it as ātman.<sup>21</sup>

In his commentary for this verse, Vāsubandhu refers to three terms, *ālayavijñāna*, *ādānavijñāna* and *vipākaphalavijñāna* as the same object. Due to the function of maintaining the physical body, it is called *ādānavijñāna*; from the perspective of storing all seeds, it is called *ālayavijñāna*; in terms of being the mature fruit caused by the karma in previous life, it is also called *vipākaphalavijñāna*.

---

<sup>20</sup> 「心有二種：一集起心，無量種子集起處故；二種種心，所緣行相差別故。」(T31, 784)。

<sup>21</sup> 「阿陀那識甚深細，一切種子如暴流，我於凡愚不開演，恐彼分別執爲我」(T31, 784c)。

Accordingly the above evidence shows there is no doubt the *Karmasiddhi* is a Mahayana text.

In *Karmasiddhi*, Vāsubandhu intends to establish a theory to explain why the karmas continue maintaining until they obtain rewards after the deeds of body, speed and mind have completed. Vāsubandhu concludes that the natures of the three karmas are *cetanā-viśeṣa*. Furthermore, Vāsubandhu tries to combine the theories of *ālayavijñāna*, *cetanā-viśeṣa* and seeds in order to make his theory more perfect. Here, the three features of the seed, *saṃtati* (continuity), *pariṇāma* (transformation), and *viśeṣa* (superiority), in *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* is again mentioned in establishing his karma theory.

(The seeds) were the impression of *cetanāviśeṣa*. Meanwhile, *ālayavijñāna* causes the seeds to continue, transform, and become superior. Due to this process, (the seeds) are able to cause the pleasing or unpleasing fruits in the future.<sup>22</sup>

The three features of seeds are mentioned again and again in this text. Hence, the three features can be considered to be the special characteristics of Vāsubandhu's theory of seeds. Through the series of analysis from the *Sautrāntika* school, the period of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* to the *Karmasiddhi*, it is clear that Vāsubandhu's theory of seed is inherited from the *Sautrāntika* school and maintained the same idea even in the *Karmasiddhi*. The transformation of a seed to its fruit must go through a series of process. In this process, each state is different from another state. Every state serves as an effect for its previous state and also serves as a cause for its coming state. Therefore, two states cannot exist together at the same moment. That is, cause and effect cannot stay at the same moment. Again, in this transformation process, it is impossible for the seed to suddenly transform to its fruit.

After the analysis of Vāsubandhu's theory regarding the transformation of seeds, it can be said that Sthiramati's theory is very close to what Vāsubandhu has illustrated. The main features of Sthiramati's theory of transformation are

---

<sup>22</sup> 「但思差別熏習，同時阿賴耶識令其相續、轉變、差別，能引當來愛非愛果」(T31, 785c)。

“becoming different” (變異爲性) and “the cause and effect exist at the different moments” (異時因果). These two features are exactly the features of Vāsubandhu’s theory of transformation of seeds. Sthiramati’s first concept “becoming different” (變異爲性) indicates Vāsubandhu’s concept that the transformation of a seed to its fruit have to proceed through a series of process and in this process, the seed is becoming different at each moment. That is what Vāsubandhu says, “What is the *pariṇāma* (transformation)? The *pariṇāma* means that the previous one is different from the later one.” Sthiramati’s second concept “the cause and effect exist at the different moments” indicates Vāsubandhu’s concept that in the process of transformation, two different states of the a seed cannot exist together at the same moment for every state serves as an effect for its previous state and also serves as a cause for its coming state. Therefore, it can be said that Sthiramati’s concept of transformation of seeds inherits and keeps the traditional concept from the *Sautrāntika* school to Vāsubandhu.

Dharmapāla’s theory requires careful analysis in terms of Vāsubandhu’s three features of seeds. Just like the above illustration, Dharmapāla divides the concept of *pariṇāma* into *pariṇāma* in the state of cause (因能變) and *pariṇāma* in the state of effect (果能變). *Pariṇāma* in the state of cause refers to a seed which has not obtained enough conditions to transform to a fruit. *Pariṇāma* in the state of effect refers to a seed which is becoming a fruit. Vāsubandhu’s three features of transformation are continuity, transformation and superiority. Among these three, the idea of transformation refers to a seed which will continue existing before becoming a fruit; one the contrary, the idea of superiority refers the becoming of a seed into a fruit. Therefore, it is obvious that Dharmapāla’s idea of *pariṇāma* in the state of cause (因能變) corresponds to Vāsubandhu’s idea of transformation of the three features, and that Dharmapāla’s idea of *pariṇāma* in the state of effect accords with Vāsubandhu’s idea of superiority.

Although Dharmapāla divides *pariṇāma* into two different kinds, in regard to the idea of transformation of consciousness, he emphasizes the latter one, i.e. *pariṇāma* in the state of effect (果能變). That is why he illustrates, “Transformation means that the substance of consciousness manifests itself into two divisions, (namely, the object perceived and perceiving faculty).” This

citation indicates that when the seeds of consciousness transform to fruit, they will manifest into two divisions. That is to say, Dharmapāla merely focuses on the moment when a seed transforms to its fruit. In other words, he focuses on Vāsubandhu's idea of superiority instead of the whole process.

In conclusion, through the above comparative study of both terminological and doctrinal analysis, the differences between Sthiramati's and Dharmapāla's concept of *pariṇāma* are clear. Sthiramati's theory inheriting the traditional theory of seed from *Sautrāntika* school to Vāsubandhu emphasizes the whole process of a gradual transformation. On the contrary, Dharmapāla's theory influenced by ṅsanga has given up the idea of gradual transformation and emphasizes the idea of sudden transformation or the consequence, i.e. Vāsubandhu's idea of superiority (*viśeṣa*). That is why Hsüan-Tsang's (玄奘) in *Cheng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) interprets *pariṇāma* as 變 (*bian*) instead of 轉化 (*Zhuan-hua*) since 變 (*bian*) possessing the meaning of sudden changing from one state to another state is more suitable to interpret Dharmapāla's theory than 轉化 (*Zhuan-hua*). Therefore, it can be said that Sthiramati's concept of *pariṇāma* is closer to that of both *Sautrāntika* and Vāsubandhu.

## Works cited

### Primary sources

- Bian Ji. "Da Tang Xi Yu Ji" (大唐西域記). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 51. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- Dharmapāla. "Cheng-wei-shih-lun" (成唯識論). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 31. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- Kuiji. "Cheng-wei-shih-lun-su-ji" (成唯識論述記). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 43. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- Lévi, Sylvain. "Trīṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣya" *Vijñaptimātrātrātāsiddhi*. Paris: ? , 1925.
- Shong Yo "Chu San Zhang Ji Ji" (出三藏記集). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 55.

- ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- Vāsubandhu*. “Abidamojushelun” (阿毘達磨俱舍論). Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo. vol 29. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- Vāsubandhu*. “Da-Cheng-Cheng-Ye-Lun” (大乘成業論) *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 31. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- Vāsubandhu*. “Sa-Da-Cheng-Lun-Shi” (攝大乘論釋) Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo. vol 31. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- “Xian Shi Lun” (顯識論). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 31. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.
- Zhi Zhou. “Cheng-wei-shih-lun” (成唯識論演秘). *Taisho Shinshu Daizokyo*. vol 43. ed. Takakusu Junjiro et al. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppansha, 1924.

## Secondary sources

- Fujimoto, Akira. “Vāsubandhu’s *Pariṇāma* Theory in *Trimśikā* ”. *Microfiches*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1993.
- Ganguly, Swati. *Treatise in Thirty Verses on Mere-consciousness*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1992.
- Inoue, Genshin. *The Lecture of Trimśikāvijñapti-prakarāṇa*. Taipei: Shi Hua, 1993.
- Kochumuttom, T. A. *A Buddhist Doctrine of Experience*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.
- McInerney, P. K. *Introduction to Philosophy*. New York: Harper-Collins, 1990.
- Monier-Williams, M. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University, 1988.
- Nagao, G. M. *The Japanese Translation and Commentary of Mahāyānasamgraha*. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1999.
- Nagao, G. M. *Mādhyamika and Yogācāra*. Trans. Leslie S. Kawamura. New York: State University of New York, 1991.
- Nakamura, H. *Way of Thinking of Eastern Peoples*. Honolulu: Hawaii University Press, 1964.
- Tat, Wei. *Cheng Wei-Shih Lun: Doctrin of Mere-Cinsciousness*. Hong Kong: Dai Nippon Printing Co., (H.K.) Ltd, 1973. \_
- Ui, Hakuju. *Dharmapāla and Sthiramati’s Commentaries of Trimśikāvijñapti-*

prakaraṇa. Tokyo: Iwa Nami Sho Ten, 1978.

Yuki, Reimon. “*Trimśikāvijñapti-prakaraṇa*” *The Lecture of Buddhist Scripture*,  
Tokyo: Taisho, 1917.

