A Study for the Germination of *Ālaya-vijñāna* Thought: From the Perspective of *Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa*

HIBI Yuka

0. Introduction

The question “how did *ālaya-vijñāna* thought become?” has already yielded vast theories in previous studies. In this paper, I will summarize these studies and point out some problems.

1. The Previous Studies of the Germination of *Ālaya-vijñāna* Thought

Asaṅga taught *gongneng* 功能 instead of *zuoyong* 作用 in order to explain *bīja* which indicates the mind of individuals (*ālaya-vijñāna*) in *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. Afterwards, Vasubandhu taught that “twelve *nidānas* depend on a consciousness” in *Ārya-daśabhūmi-vyākhyāna* (Sakamoto 1981: 252). From this method, it would correct the thought of “emptiness” branched from *śūnyatā* thought of Mādhyamika. Therefore, the thought which denies all works between whole things became precarious. It seems this is one of the way that the sect of Yogācāra brings there opinion to more physical and common way of thought.

Sarvāstivāda taught the reality of the past *karma*, the theory which supports “real existence” and *ārambhavāda*’s standpoint. On the other hand, Sautrāntika taught the conceptualism and *pariṇāmanavāda* theory. After these sects became common, Nāgārjuna denied the “real existence” of both sense organs and sense objects.¹⁾

As a result, Sarvāstivāda interpreted *pratyaya* based on *kriyā* while Mādhyamika denied them on the logic of the doctrine of the emptiness.²⁾ Thereafter, Asaṅga created the thought of *bīja* and *ālaya-vijñāna*.

2. When Did Vasubandhu Change His View?

According to Kusumoto (2007: 11), it was not a gradual change but he already had three standpoints when Vasubandhu wrote *AKBh*: Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika and Yogācāra.

Kritzer (2005), Harada (1996; 1997; 1998), Park (2007) clarified that *Yogācārabhūmi* had also directly influenced the Sautrāntika theory in *AKBh*. For example, there was an expression such as “the *bīja* of virtue has not burned” in the chapter of Indriya in *AKBh*,³⁾ which may indicate the *tathāgata-garbha* thought of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Thus, it is said that Vasubandhu already stood on Mahāyāna’s point of view when he wrote *AKBh*.

Lammote (1936) insisted Vasubandhu still stood on the Sautrāntika’s point of view although his thought was close to Yogācāra sects indeed. On the other hand, Lee (2001) argued that Vasubandhu strongly had the Sautrāntika’s viewpoint when he was writing *AKBh* and he changed his opinion to Yogācāra in the writing *Vyākhyāyukti*. Moreover, Satō (1978: 18) evaluated the Vasubandhu’s standpoint that taught the reality of outside of our mind and objective reality in *KS* of Sautrāntika. It seems to be a relevant material to confirm the transformation from Abhidharma of Hīnayāna Sarvāstivāda to Mahāyāna Yogācāra thoughts.

According to Schmithausen (1987), *Viṃśatikā-vijñaptimātratā-siddhi* (*Viṃś*) insists that there exists only a *vijñaptimātratā* (i.e., *vijñapti*) in this world. That is to say, nothing would exist except this kind of consciousness. This view point is clearly stands on the Yogācāra’s point of view. However, *ālaya-vijñāna* theory did not appear in *Viṃś*, he said. Thus, the thought of *vijñaptimātratā* appeared, even though there preached the “real existence” of *rūpa* in *KS*. Hence, it is difficult to classify *KS* to the *vijñaptimātratā* thought but the *vijñaptimātratā* thought in *KS* meant only to solve the question of a body of *saṃsāra*, which remained immature theory in *AKBh*.

3. Comparison of the Origin of the Transmigration in *AKBh* and *KS*

Considering about consciousness, the question “what are its characteristics?” may also arouse our curiosity. In the pre-Buddhist religion in ancient India, they believed that the existence of primordial materiality, which is apart from our body (*āśraya*). As an example, the early Sāṃkhya theory of primordial materiality (*prakṛti*), which describes the origins of the cosmos and life within it as an expression of an underlying absolute substratum, influenced Vasubandhu’s “*pariṇā mavāda*” theory (Yokoyama 1982: 119; Katō 2012: 134); Moreover, Sautrāntika *bīja* theory supported “real existence” and “*pariṇā mavāda*.”

On the other hand, Sarvāstivāda taught the *phalaṃ pratigṛhītāṃ*, *phalaṃ prayacchati* theory of past and present *karma* to explain about the transmigration caused by *hetu-phalaṃ*

of *karma*.⁴⁾ Against this theory, Sautrāntika and Yogācāra sects strictly constructed *kṣaṇa-nirodha* thoughts and denied the “real existence” of the past and the future. They brought the teaching of *bīja*, *saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa* and the conception of *ālaya-vijñāna*.

Furthermore, the sects of Kāśyapīya insisted that the result which became present had destroyed at that moment and corrected the interpretation of Sarvāstivāda in *Da piposha lun* 大毘婆沙論. The question “does the past *karma* also remain after reaching *nirvāṇa*?” still remains.

Considering this problem, Vasubandhu suggested the *ālaya-vijñāna* thought. The term of *ālaya-vijñāna* did not appear in *AKBh* but in *KS*.⁵⁾ However, Lamotte and Yamaguchi insisted that Vasubandhu taught his theory based on the Sautrāntika’s standpoint because they confirmed the “real existence” of *rūpa*. The pioneering thoughts of *ālaya-vijñāna* or *vipāka-vijñāna* is nothing but *bīja* and *saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa* thought in *AKBh*.

In *Da piposha lun*, *bīja* indicates nothing but the example of “germinate of the seeds,” a metaphor for the phenomenon of cause and effect. The *bīja* theory in *AKBh*, however, indicates the *nāma-rūpa*, which have the function of the “work,”⁶⁾ and made of *pañca-skandha*.

As stated above, although there were some theories that Vasubandhu were to be stand on Sautrāntika’s viewpoint in *AKBh* and *KS*, it became clearer that there was a distinctly difference of the insistence of the identity of *saṃtāna* in *AKBh* and *KS*. In *KS*, it is defined to be the *vijñāna* while *vijñaptimātratā* thought had not germinated yet, which means it has not been more than “*vijñāna* of a monolayer” thought of Sautrāntika. Therefore, *KS* taught nothing but a *vipāka-vijñāna*, that gathers the subjects of *saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa* or a kind of *bīja*.

4. Concluding Remarks

The outline of the germination of *ālaya-vijñāna*, became clearer beyond previous studies as the following. First of all, the conception of *pariṇāma* originated from Sāṃkhya which had brought into Buddhism by Sarvāstivāda as “*saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa*.” Then, Vasubandhu had turn into “*pariṇāma-vāda*” theory. In this process, *Samdhi-nirmocana-sūtra* taught that the Mādhyamika’s emptiness thought influenced the development of *ālaya-vijñāna* thought.⁷⁾

Regarding the descriptions about *bīja* in *AKBh* and *KS*, it became clearer why did Vasubandhu, who stood on Sautrāntika’s “*saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa*” theory, changed his view

for Yogācāra's "*ālaya-vijñāna*" theory.

As a result, the *nāma-rūpa* (*bīja*), which has *kriyā* of making result, is made of *pañca-skandha* and has the similar definition with "*vipāka-hetu*" and "*vipāka-phala*" at the point of the character of "*saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa*." It was clear to consider these thoughts have a common definition. Furthermore, the teaching of the "real existence" of the past *karma*, either the *karma* which had already made a result or not, might be the teaching on the basis of *saṃsāra* (rebirth of *karma*) thought within Sarvāstivāda.

However, these *vipāka-hetu*, *phalaṃ pratigrhītaṃ* or *bīja* is not the only one thing for one body of *saṃsāra*. In *AKBh*, it is taught that one *saṃsāra* has numerous *bīja*. Vasubandhu challenged to summarize these *bīja* theories to one *āyatana*. This is the beginning of *ālaya-vijñāna* of Vasubandhu. So, the question of a body of *saṃsāra* explained with past *karma* in *AKBh* and *ālaya-vijñāna* in *KS*.

The biggest difference between the teaching of *AKBh* and *KS* was a definition of where to define a body of *saṃsāra* itself. *KS* stressed the answer in *ālaya-vijñāna* which was what Vasubandhu wanted to insist the most. Moreover, *AKBh* and *KS*, written in the Sautrāntika's stand point, emphasized the necessity of identification of individuals, so there was an establishment of *bīja*, *prāpti* and *vipāka-vijñāna*.

Notes:

- 1) *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ* (MMK) Cakṣurādindriyaparikṣā Chapter 6g. 2) MMK Kar-makārakaparikṣā Chapter 2g. 3) *AKBh* pp.63–64; *AKV* p.147. 4) *AKBh* p.97; *AKV* p.230. 5) *KS* pp.164–165. 6) *AKV* pp.147–148. 7) Only to harmonize the six-*vijñānas*, the *vipāka-vijñāna* was stood there. According to *Samdhi-nirmocana-sūtra*, the teaching of *Prajñā-pāramitā*, which became the base of Nāgārjuna's thought lately, denied the view that stuck on the thought of "Absolute existence" of Abhidharma Buddhism. However, in order to indicate the characteristics of *a-svabhāva* of whole things (*śūnyatā*), people became to stuck on the *śūnyatā* thought. It was an excessive interpretation. Afterwards, it became necessary to sublimate these two attachments of "Absolute existence" and "*śūnyatā*," the "*vijñaptimātratā*" thought had occurred. (Cf. Kudō 1982)

Abbreviations:

AKBh *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*, Ed. P. Pradhan, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, vol. VIII, Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.

AKV *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: The Work of Yaśomitra*, Ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1971.

(170) A Study for the Germination of *Ālaya-vijñāna* Thought (Y. HIBI)

KS *Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa* (*Las grub-paḥi rab-tu-byed-pa*). Der. No. 4062. A Complete Catalogue of The Tibetan Buddhist Canons. Published by Tōhoku Imperial University.

References:

- Harada Wasō 原田和宗. 1996. “Kyōryōbu no ‘tansō no’ shiki no nagare’ to iu gainen e no gimon (1)” 〈経量部の「単層の」識の流れ〉という概念への疑問 (1). *Indogaku Chibettogaku kenkyū* インド学チベット学研究 1:134–193.
- . 1997. “Kyōryōbu no ‘tansō no’ shiki no nagare’ to iu gainen e no gimon (2)” 〈経量部の「単層の」識の流れ〉という概念への疑問 (2). *Indogaku Chibettogaku kenkyū* インド学チベット学研究 2:22–59.
- . 1998. “Kyōryōbu no ‘tansō no’ shiki no nagare’ to iu gainen e no gimon (3)” 〈経量部の「単層の」識の流れ〉という概念への疑問 (3). *Indogaku Chibettogaku kenkyū* インド学チベット学研究 3:92–110.
- Katō Junshō 加藤純章. 2012. “*Kusharon ni okeru ‘sōzoku no tokushu na henka’* (saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa sōzoku tenpen shabetsu): Shakujū-setsu kara tenpen-setsu e (oboegaki)” 『俱舍論』における「相続の特殊な変化」(saṃtati-pariṇāma-viśeṣa 相続転変差別): 積集説から転変説へ(覚え書). *Buzan gakuhō* 豊山学報 55:136–122.
- Kritzer, Robert. 2005. *Vasubandhu and the Yogācārabhūmi: Yogācāra Elements in the Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 18. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Kudō Shigeki 工藤成樹. 1982. “Chūgan to Yuishiki: Kū, Ichijō/Sanjō, Nitaisetsu o megutte” 中観と唯識: 空, 一乗・三乗, 二諦説をめぐって. In *Yuishiki shisō* 唯識思想, Kōza Daijō Bukkyō 講座大乘仏教 8. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Kusumoto Nobumichi 楠本信道. 2007. *Kusharon ni okeru Seshin no Engi-kan* 『俱舍論』における世親の縁起観. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- Lamotte, E. 1936. “Le Traité de l’acte de Vasubandhu: *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*.” *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 4:151–236.
- Lee, Jong Cheol 李鐘徹. 2001. *Seshin shisō no kenkyū: Shakkiron o chūshin to shite* 世親思想の研究: 『釈軌論』を中心として. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Park Changhwan. 2007. “The Sautrāntika Theory of Seeds (*bīja*) Revisited.” PhD diss., University of California.
- Sakamoto Yukio 坂本幸男. 1981. *Abidatsuma no kenkyū* 阿毘達磨の研究. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.
- Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄. 1978. *Daijō jōgōron* 大乘成業論. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1987. *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.
- Yokoyama Kōitsu 横山紘一. 1982. “Seshin no Shiki-tenpen” 世親の識転変. In *Yuishiki shisō* 唯識思想, Kōza Daijō Bukkyō 講座大乘仏教 8. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

〈Key words〉 *Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa*, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, consciousness, *ālaya-vijñāna*
(Graduate Student, Risho University)