

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE *ĀŚRAYAPARIVṚTTI* THEORY¹

Hidenori SAKUMA

1. Under the name of “Vijñānavāda,” the Yogācāra school was criticized, especially in later Indian intellectual society, as a school of thought that negated the existence of external objects.² But it is common knowledge that, particularly in its early stages, the Yogācāra school was, as is indicated by its name, a community of keen practitioners of yoga. The reason that they practised yoga was to become liberated, and thus they did not differ from other Buddhists insofar that the goal of their practices was *nirvāṇa*. It was out of these practices aimed at the attainment of *nirvāṇa* that the theories of *ālayavijñāna*, *trīsvabhāva*, etc.,³ peculiar to this school, were born.

However, these theories of the Yogācāra school were initially not mere theories. They were practical theories that gradually evolved in a process of trial and error as their exponents explored ways in which the ordinary unenlightened practitioner could be liberated and attain *nirvāṇa*, and it is possible to trace the stages in their development in the early treatises of this school. Subsequently, especially after the

¹ This article, based on my previous studies of *āśrayaparivṛtti* (see References) and subsequent research, presents a survey of the historical development of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory. The research for this paper was funded by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research [C] (2009-2011) from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences. I also wish to thank my friend Rolf Giebel for translating this paper.

² An overview of criticism of the Yogācāra school by the Brahmanical schools can be found in Kher 1992, and it should not be necessary to mention the criticism by the Madhyamaka school (Bhāviveka, etc.). But fortunately there have recently appeared some studies that point out that Vijñānavāda is different from the solipsism or idealism of other idealist schools in both the East and the West, even though there are many similarities between them. See, for example, Wood [1991], especially his introduction. In this article I use “Yogācāra school” and “Vijñānavāda school” as the designations of a school or group. This reflects my practice of referring to the theories that evolved on the basis of the experiences of early *yogācārins* as “practical theories” or “theories of practice” and referring to the theories that were further scholastically refined once these “practical theories” had achieved a certain degree of systemization as “doctrinal theories.”

³ On the theory of *ālayavijñāna* and its development, see Schmithausen [1987a]. On the *trīsvabhāva* theory, concerning how the practitioner can become liberated in accordance with his physical and mental stage, see, for instance, Hakamaya [1994].

Mahāyānization of these theories and on the basis of the idea that the defiled practitioner becomes a Buddha by being purified in his defiled state, there eventually occurred a shift to the view that the practitioner was purified only because pure seeds had been planted within him from the very outset through the compassion of the pure Buddha. Thereafter the theories of this school changed, developed, and were eventually systematized on the basis of this view.⁴

To illustrate this process, I shall here take up the theory of *āśrayaparivṛtti*, one of the practical theories distinctive of this school, as it is developed in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and I shall show how it was born as a practical theory directed at liberation and then developed to become one of the elements, along with *nirvāṇa* and *tathatā*, that characterize a Buddha. In doing so, I hope to delineate at least one aspect of this school's path to liberation.⁵

The theory of *āśrayaparivṛtti* or *āśrayaparāvṛtti* attempts to describe the fundamental change that spiritual practice or the path to salvation brings about in the person who practises it, above all in its final stage. This theory is accordingly one of the most important teachings of the Yogācāra school. It would in fact seem that it was this school that invented this theory as well as the term itself (at least in this sense).

Most Yogācāra texts deal with the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory, but the *Yogācārabhūmi* is the basic work of the Yogācāra school and, according to our present state of knowledge, contains the oldest textual materials that may be assigned to this school (in the narrow sense). This is confirmed also in the case of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory: here, too, the *Yogācārabhūmi* represents by and large an earlier stage of development than other texts. Within the *Yogācārabhūmi* this theory is dealt with in the *Maulī Bhūmi*, *Viniścaya-saṃgrahaṇī* and *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī*; within the *Maulī Bhūmi*, in the *Manobhūmi*, *Śrāvakabhūmi*, *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and *Nirupadhikābhūmi*, to which one may add a short reference in the *Śrutamayī Bhūmi*, probably based on the *Śrāvakabhūmi*.

In the following I shall sketch the process whereby the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory developed, text by text, the sequence being determined by what I consider to be the intrinsically most plausible

⁴ I have traced the development of several of these practical theories from the viewpoint of Mahāyānization in Sakuma [1997].

⁵ A detailed consideration can be found in Sakuma [1990].

historical development of the theory in the *Yogācārabhūmi* materials. A proviso should, however, be made: namely, that it is not always easy to decide on what is in fact most plausible; further, the inevitably linear sequence of presentation should not be misunderstood as intending to exclude the possibility that the actual development was sometimes multilinear, so to speak, and that some steps may occurred side by side rather than successively.

2.1. The *Śrāvakahūmi* uses the concept *āśrayaparivṛtti* in connection with the practice of concentration based on training in “calm abiding” (*śamatha*) and “clear insight” (*vipaśyanā*), where it is in fact used in the meaning of a transformation or purification of the psychophysical “base” (*āśraya*), by which the latter is freed from “badness” (*dauṣṭhulya*) and filled with “ease” (*praśrabdhi*). This process can also be described alternatively as the replacing of a “base” afflicted with “badness” by a new base endowed with “ease” in such a way that the old base afflicted (*-sahagata*) with “badness” (*dauṣṭhulya*) comes to an end or disappears through the spiritual practice of the *yogin*, not in a single moment but step by step or gradually (*anupūruveṇa*), and that at the same time a new base endowed with “ease” gradually comes to replace it, that is, comes to take its place. In the *Śrāvakahūmi*, the result of this transformation or replacement of the base of existence is the supranormal direct perception of the object of meditation. The idea of the gradual replacement of “badness” by “ease” stems in fact from the context of meditative concentration, where this idea can be ascertained already in Abhidharma texts and incipiently even in canonical sermons. As far as I have hitherto been able to determine, its connection with the concept of *āśrayaparivṛtti* is, however, found for the first time in the *Śrāvakahūmi*. This term is used later above all in the teaching relating to liberation. A certain anticipation of this shift in usage can be observed already in the *Śrāvakahūmi*, where a *sūtra* quotation concerned with “purification of the base” (*āśrayapariśuddhi*) connects with later moral-spiritual (*rāga-virāga*) and gnoseological (*avidyā-virāga*) consequences. In the *Śrāvakahūmi* itself such a connection is, however, not to be found. It has also to be taken into consideration that on the supramundane path the elimination of “badness” associated with “defilement” (*kleśa*) is not a prerequisite for the supranormal perception of what is to be perceived (viz. the four noble truths, or *tathatā*), but is rather its effect.

It may therefore be established that the term *āśrayaparivṛtti* is not yet used in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, at least not explicitly, in connection with the doctrine of liberation or the “supramundane path.”⁶ It is only in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* that this occurs for the first time.

2.2. In the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* one does find the terms *āśrayapariśuddhi* and *āśrayaparivṛtti*; but the difference between the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* and *Śrāvakabhūmi* is that the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* mentions only the elimination of “badness” but not its replacement by the positive element of “ease.” Furthermore, “badness” is used here not as a counterconcept to “ease” but in the sense of moral badness, namely, *kleśapakṣya dauṣṭhulya*. It is rather “power” or “control” (*vaśitā*) that appears as a positive counterpart. As has already been indicated, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* places the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the context of the teachings relating to liberation, first the traditional doctrine of liberation, and then also the doctrine of salvation in the Mahāyāna.⁷

2.3. The *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī* does not correspond to the stage of development testified to by the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, and already shows the use of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the traditional teaching of liberation (elimination of *kleśas*), which we have also found in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of the *Maulī Bhūmi*; a positive substitute for the eliminated (*kleśapakṣya-*) *dauṣṭhulya* is either missing or somewhat different (viz. the natural tendency towards wisdom, *vidyādhātu*). The *āśraya* is the six senses (*ṣaḍāyatana*), as in the other older parts of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.⁸

2.4. Similar to the concept of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the *Vastusaṃgrahaṇī*, the concept of “purification of the base” (*āśrayapariśuddhi*) is applied in the *Śrutamayī Bhūmi* of the *Maulī Bhūmi* to the traditional process of liberation (elimination of *kleśas*), as is also the concept of the termination or disappearance of the old base and that of its replacement by a new one (*āśrayanirodha* and *āśrayaparivarta*).⁹

2.5. The *Manobhūmi* of the *Maulī Bhūmi* uses, on the one hand, the concept of *āśrayaparivṛtti* within the framework of the traditional teaching of liberation (elimination of *kleśas*), as does the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. In fact, the *Manobhūmi* uses it in the sense of *āśrayaviśuddhi*

6 Cf. Sakuma [1990: 15-58].

7 Cf. Sakuma [1990: 59-70].

8 Cf. Sakuma 1990: 151-156].

9 Cf. Sakuma [1990: 71].

in the *Śrutamayī Bhūmi*, viz. for the purpose of denoting the existential aspect of the spiritual culmination of the path to liberation, that is, the attainment of Arhatship. But it seems that the expression *parivṛttāśraya* can also denote earlier stages of spiritual perfection in the process leading to this culmination. Above all, it is of interest that the *Manobhūmi*, like the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, mentions the attainment of power or control (*vaśitā*) as a positive complement of *āśraya-parivṛtti*, although, in contrast to the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, the power attained does not exhibit any aspects peculiar to the Mahāyāna but fits completely into the framework of the traditional doctrines of liberation.¹⁰

2.6. In the *Manobhūmi*, *āśrayaparivṛtti* seems to be understood above all as a process leading to the moment of entry into extinction-with-remainder (*sopadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*), that is, to the attainment of Arhatship, and it is therefore defined as the complete elimination of the seeds of defiled *dharmas* as well as the attainment of control over internal conditions, which probably means control over life forces. In the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi* of the *Maulī Bhūmi*, on the other hand, the concept of *āśrayaparivṛtti* clearly appears in the context of extinction-without-remainder (*nirupadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*). It might be that the compound *āśrayaparivṛtti* had in the meantime already become a fixed term that was used to designate a decisive phase of spiritual achievement, especially the attainment of Arhatship or Buddhahood. In the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi*, *āśrayaparivṛtti* is defined as occurring through or consisting in the purification of *tathatā*, imperishable and unchangeable ultimate reality (*tathatā-viśuddhi-prabhāvita*). If the individual components of the parallel expressions *āśraya-parivṛtti-prabhāvita* and *tathatā-viśuddhi-prabhāvita* also correspond to one another, this would mean that the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi* had replaced the old conception of *āśraya* as the body possessing the faculty of consciousness, or *śaḍāyatana*, with a completely new idea, namely, *āśraya* in the sense of *tathatā*, and understood the process of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as the purification of this *āśraya*. But the text is not clear on this point.

The *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi* does not give any explicit information about the motive for its new interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti*. It should not, however, be particularly difficult to guess the reason. The old *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory was orientated towards the spiritual

¹⁰ Cf. Sakuma [1990: 72-80].

achievements of the śrāvaka or bodhisattva. The base of existence in which this process takes place is the body possessing the faculty of consciousness, or *ṣaḍāyatana*. Yet reflection on extinction-without-remainder showed that this base could not continue to exist after the death of the liberated person. An immortal *āśraya* became necessary, and the only imperishable element was *tathatā*. This introduction of *tathatā* into the context of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* doctrine is in the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi* conceived of completely from the point of view of the traditional doctrine of liberation.¹¹

2.7. In the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, the term *āśrayaparivṛtti* and related forms (e.g., *parivṛttāśraya*) appear remarkably more frequently than in the *Maulī Bhūmi*. As regards the content of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, we may say in general that most aspects existing already in the *Maulī Bhūmi* are also found in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*. Moreover, we can also observe a further development. On the one hand, the new interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as the purification of *tathatā*, which had already appeared in the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi* of the *Maulī Bhūmi*, is taken up, explained and further developed in various passages. On the other hand, in some passages — by way of contrast to the *Maulī Bhūmi* — *ālayavijñāna* is introduced in the context of *āśrayaparivṛtti* and defined in its relation to *āśrayaparivṛtti*.¹²

Furthermore, in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* we find a peculiar usage of the term *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the sense of sexual transformation in the context of problems relating to the precepts. It is true that, when investigating the origins of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory, some modern scholars previously thought that this theory may have originated in the current of women's enlightenment on the grounds that evidence of sexual transformation, i.e., women being transformed into men and men into women, is found in the *Abhidharmakośa*. But as I have pointed out in Sakuma [1991], sexual transformation or hermaphroditism should be treated as issues concerning the Vinaya and are not related to the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory.

Among the passages in the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* that consider or at least refer to *ālayavijñāna* within the framework of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory, that on *ālayavijñāna* at the beginning of the

¹¹ Cf. Sakuma [1990: 82-88].

¹² Cf. Sakuma [1990: 89-104].

Viniścayasamgrahaṇī (Sakuma [1990: TEXT VinSg 1, 2, 3 & 4]¹³) is of special significance. If one sets aside Sakuma [1990: TEXT VinSg 3],¹⁴ which deals with *āśrayaparivṛtti* on a different level, as has been analyzed by Schmithausen [1987a: n. 1337] and Sakuma [1990: 104-108]), then the following picture results: since *ālayavijñāna* is the root or basis of all spiritual pollution (*saṃkleśa*), the *yogin* can concentrate this, so to speak, within *ālayavijñāna*; with the help of both the insight that has ultimate reality (*tathatā*) as its object and the repeated practice of this insight, he transforms his base of existence (here probably still meaning the body endowed with consciousness or the six senses); as soon as the base has been transformed, *ālayavijñāna* is eliminated, and with the elimination of *ālayavijñāna* spiritual pollution (*saṃkleśa*) can also be considered to have been eliminated.

In the above passage at the beginning of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, *āśrayaparivṛtti* is understood as the process that constitutes the attainment of Arhatship, that is, extinction-with-remainder. The state of the Arhat after death, extinction-without-remainder, is not considered in this part of the text, which is consequently either “conservative” on this point or older than the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi*, where the concept of *āśrayaparivṛtti* was applied to extinction-without-remainder and was accordingly interpreted completely anew, namely, as “purification of *tathatā*.” This new interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* conceived of from the point of view of extinction-without-remainder is in fact taken up, explained and further developed in other parts of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*.

In some paragraphs of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*¹⁵ and in the Nirvāṇa Chapter¹⁶ of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, *āśrayaparivṛtti* is defined as “purification of ultimate reality” (*tathatā*- or *dharmadhātu*-*viśuddhi*). In the Nirvāṇa Chapter the traditional division of *nirvāṇa* into two phases — namely, extinction-with-remainder (*sopadhiśeṣa*) and extinction-without-remainder (*nirupadhiśeṣa*) — is strictly maintained, in contrast to parts of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, where both phases seem to merge into one another. The Nirvāṇa Chapter also stands out on account of its endeavours to find

13 Shè juézé fēn 攝決撮分, T1579.30.581b22-c22 = Juédìngzàng lùn 決定藏論, T1584.30.1020a28-b24)

14 Shè juézé fēn, T30.581c8-17 = Juédìngzàng lùn, T30.1020b11-19.

15 Cf. Sakuma [1990: 109-114].

16 Cf. Sakuma [1990: 114-124].

firm ground for its standpoint. Of special interest is that it attributes the motivation for the new *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory expressly to the difficulties that result from the older teaching — *āśrayaparivṛtti* as a transformation of the six senses (*ṣaḍāyatana*) or a replacement of the old ones by new ones — and that it attempts to determine the relationship of *āśrayaparivṛtti* conceived of as *tathatāvisuddhi* and the liberated person to the six senses.

While the Nirvāṇa Chapter does not see any incompatibility between *ālayavijñāna* and *āśrayaparivṛtti* understood as purified ultimate reality (*tathatā*), such a contrast is explicitly stated in other parts of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*. One of these (Sakuma [1990: TEXT VinSg 5]) expressly regards *ālayavijñāna* as the seed of worldly, polluting factors only, whereas the seed of pure factors is *tathatā*, which constitutes *āśrayaparivṛtti*. It is thus plausible that this text describes *āśrayaparivṛtti* as the “opponent” (*pratipakṣa*) of *ālayavijñāna*.¹⁷

The sharp contrast between *āśrayaparivṛtti* and *ālayavijñāna* is expressed just as clearly but explained in more detail in the paragraph on the treatment of *ālayavijñāna* at the start of the *Viniścaya-samgrahaṇī* that was left out of consideration above (Sakuma [1990: TEXT VinSg 3]). Here too *āśrayaparivṛtti* is described as the “opponent” (*pratipakṣa*) of *ālayavijñāna*, and it is made clear that *pratipakṣa* is to be understood not in the usual sense of “counterforce” or actual spiritual means leading to elimination (this function being fulfilled by insight), but rather in the sense of “opponent” or “enemy” on the existential level of the fundamental source from which actual *dharmas* emerge. This paragraph goes beyond the one discussed before (viz. Sakuma [1990: TEXT VinSg 5]) also in that it endeavours to demonstrate concretely the contrast between *ālayavijñāna* and *āśrayaparivṛtti* by listing their differences.¹⁸

Several parts of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* formulate the *āśraya-parivṛtti* theory with regard to the state of liberation of the Buddha, that is, from the point of view of the Mahāyāna.

One part of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* (Sakuma [1990: TEXT VinSg 15]) asserts a fundamental difference between the *nirvāṇa* of the Buddha and that of śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas and also in the *āśrayaparivṛtti* that constitutes them.

¹⁷ Cf. Sakuma [1990: 127-129].

¹⁸ Cf. Sakuma [1990: 129-135].

This passage stands in direct contrast to the Nirvāṇa Chapter in that the *āśrayaparivṛtti* constituting the liberation of the Buddha (*mahā-bodhi*) is, in its view, superior (*viśiṣṭa*) to the *āśrayaparivṛtti* of śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas.¹⁹

The *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* (chapter X) also expressly teaches the superiority of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* of the Tathāgata over that of the śrāvaka-arhat and pratyekabuddha. The *āśrayaparivṛtti* of the Tathāgata is identified with his *dharmakāya*, while that of the śrāvaka and pratyekabuddha can be described only as *vimuktikāya*. It is nevertheless difficult to pinpoint the essential difference between these two *kāyas*, for both have uncaused ultimate reality as their essence. The difference lies above all in their effectiveness or operation. The *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, which is orientated towards the Mahāyāna, emphasizes, however, by using different terms, the difference between the two forms of liberation and also the superiority of the Mahāyāna over the Śrāvakayāna.²⁰

2.8. These interpretations of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* may be summarized by arranging them in the form of the following five patterns.²¹

- (1) The notion of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* and *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, the oldest parts in the *Maulī Bhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, where it refers to a psychophysical transformation in the practitioner brought about by the practice of meditation. In the *Śrāvakabhūmi* it is a transformation that occurs in the psychophysical base (*āśraya*) of the yoga practitioner, consisting primarily of an exchange of inertia (*dauṣṭhulya*) for lightness (*praśrabdhi*). The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* mentions only the elimination of inertia or badness (*dauṣṭhulya*) (in a decidedly more ethical sense) connected with defilement (*kleśa*), with the consequent aim of gaining the positive element of power or control (*vaśitā*). But the original simple form of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory found in the *Śrāvakabhūmi* had already disappeared from around the stage of the *Viniścayasamgrahānī*

¹⁹ Cf. Sakuma [1990: 144-146].

²⁰ Cf. Sakuma [1990: 146-150].

²¹ In Sakuma [1989a: 21-22] [2000: 146-147], I summarized the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theories found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* in terms of five patterns. Here I have added the results of subsequent research.

and seldom appears in later times.

- (2) The view found from the time of the *Maulī Bhūmi* onwards, again presented as a transformation occurring in the psychophysical “base” of the practitioner, although not as the result of an exchange of elements but as a transformation involving the entire basis of the practitioner’s existence. This idea is found, for example, in the section of questions in the “Nirvāṇa Chapter” of the *Viniścayasamgrahanī*. Even after the Mahāyāna theory of *āśrayaparivṛtti* came to occupy the mainstream, this way of thinking was constantly present below the surface in the Yogācāra school, and consequently in the *Chéng wéishì lùn* 成唯識論 this early interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* is found alongside the newer Mahāyāna interpretation.
- (3) A new interpretation, signs of which can be found in the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi* in the *Maulī Bhūmi*, in which the concept of *āśrayaparivṛtti* is absolutized as *tathatā*, which remains even after the physical death of the practitioner. This new interpretation is found, for instance, in the section of questions in the “Nirvāṇa Chapter” of the *Viniścayasamgrahanī*. The defiled practitioner attains Buddhahood not through purification but by gradually incorporating the seeds that issue forth from the originally pure realm of the Buddha. It is for this reason that *āśrayaparivṛtti* as an outcome can survive even after death without being subject to the physical constraints of the practitioner. I provisionally characterize this pattern as “Mahāyānization.” Of course, at the stage of the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi* there is to be found only a leaning towards this Mahāyānization. But subsequently this tendency becomes more pronounced in the *Viniścayasamgrahanī*, and thereafter it becomes in all respects the main current of *āśrayaparivṛtti* thought.
- (4) The final stage in the absolutization of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as *tathatā*, in which *āśrayaparivṛtti* stands in sharp contrast to *ālayavijñāna*. This appears in the *Viniścayasamgrahanī* and is a radical interpretation that subsequently shows up in various works.
- (5) Once the Mahāyānization of *āśrayaparivṛtti*, equating it with *tathatā*, had been completed and had taken root in the realm of practice, the Yogācāra school as a school of Mahāyānists began to assert the superiority of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* of the Mahāyāna over that of the Śrāvakayāna by means of the distinction between the

dharmakāya, reserved for bodhisattvas, and the *vimuktikāya*, with which the *dharmakāya* is contrasted in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, quoted in the *Viniścayasamgrahanī*. This is similar to the relationship between *mahābodhi* and *dharmadhātu-viśuddhi* in the *Viniścayasamgrahanī*. People belonging to this group began to utilize *āśrayaparivṛtti* as a theory of practice leading to enlightenment. The connection between *āśrayaparivṛtti* and the *dharmakāya* presented in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* came to be expressed formulaically as “the *dharmakāya* is characterized by *āśrayaparivṛtti*,” and this notion became firmly established in later times. This is an idea that would be inconceivable in terms of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in its older form or as part of the process of practice. Furthermore, the idea linking *dharmadhātu-viśuddhi* with *āśrayaparivṛtti* gives the impression that this group of Mahāyānists was at the stage of utilizing this theory after its theoretical formulation had been completed.

On the basis of these patterns I now wish to survey the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in other texts. But before doing so, I shall briefly consider the terminology of this theory. It is well-known that there are two terms used for delineating this theory, i.e., *āśraya-pari-√vṛt* and *āśraya-parā-√vṛt*. As far as we can see, the *Yogācārabhūmi* appears to have used only the term *āśraya-pari-√vṛt*, and the *Xiǎnyáng shèngjiào lùn* 顯揚聖教論, *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya*, which derive from the *Yogācārabhūmi*, as well as the *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga*, have only the term *āśraya-pari-√vṛt* too. By way of contrast, the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, which draws on the thought of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* in the *Maulī Bhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, uses both terms, and they are used in different meanings.²² But any such differences between them would probably have disappeared by the time of the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, and we can no longer find any differences in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra-ṭīkā* and *Sūtrālaṅkāra-vṛtti-bhāṣya*, both commentaries on the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, nor of course in later texts such as the *Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā* (Sthiramati’s commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga*) and *Triṃśikā-Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi-bhāṣya* (Sthiramati’s commentary on the *Triṃśikā-Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*).

²² Cf. Sakuma [1996].

3. The *Xiǎnyáng shèngjiào lùn* and *Abhidharmasamuccaya* are both considered to be summarizations of the content of the *Yogācārabhūmi* compiled by Asaṅga,²³ and whereas the former was composed in accordance with the views of its author Asaṅga, the latter is arranged in the form of a dictionary or glossary of important items. As regards the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti*, both include all the interpretations of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, but these interpretations have been skilfully melded together to provide an interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in which it signifies a state in the resultant stage of spiritual practice, and there is no evidence of the simpler interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as incorporating the process of spiritual practice.

An interpretation not found in the *Yogācārabhūmi* is that linking the *trīsvabhāva* theory with *āśrayaparivṛtti*, which appears in the *Xiǎnyáng shèngjiào lùn*.²⁴ This interpretation is not made explicit in the verses of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, but it is clearly enunciated in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra-bhāṣya* (known as Vasubandhu's commentary) on the same.

Whereas the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* gives an interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* that restricts it to the final stage of spiritual practice, its commentary, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya*, gives an interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* that incorporates the process of spiritual practice, although it is explained in a more systematic form than in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. For example, its differentiation of *citta-āśrayaparivṛtti*, *mārga-āśrayaparivṛtti* and *daṣṭhūlya-āśrayaparivṛtti*²⁵ clearly hints at the process of spiritual practice.

4. As regards the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, the term is here used on the basis of a semantic distinction between *pari√vṛt* ('to enter, interchange') and *parā√vṛt* ('to exclude').²⁶ Furthermore, in addition to the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, a major distinctive feature is the introduction of the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* based on the *trīsvabhāva* theory, although it is only in the so-called

²³ Tsukamoto et. al. [1990: 348ff.] also provides information on other works attributed to Asaṅga.

²⁴ For example, T31.559c6ff.

²⁵ For a detailed explanation on these three types of *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory, see, for instance, Hakamaya [1976: 46-76].

²⁶ For a detailed explanation, see Sakuma [1996: 557-568].

Vasubandhu's commentary (*Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra-bhāṣya*) that the *trīsvabhāva* theory and *āśrayaparivṛtti* are actually linked.²⁷ While based on the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in the *Yogācāra-bhūmi*, the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* is centred on Pattern 5 noted above, and the simpler interpretations of Pattern 1, etc., would seem to have receded into the background. This clearly reflects the fact that by its very character the chief aim of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* was to promote the Mahāyāna.

5. The interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the *Mahāyānasamgraha* is one that gives clear expression to its Mahāyānist standpoint, and it has been formulated on the basis of the interpretation to be found in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*, etc. An especially distinctive interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in the *Mahāyānasamgraha* is that which links it to the *trīsvabhāva* theory. To be precise, it interprets *āśrayaparivṛtti* on the basis of a "twofold *paratantra-svabhāva*," differentiating between defiled *paratantra-svabhāva* and pure *paratantra-svabhāva*.²⁸ In other words, it is considered that during the course of spiritual practice the practitioner is gradually purified so that he moves from a state of defilement to one of purity. This parallels the notion that defiled *tathatā* becomes pure *tathatā* by being freed of pollution. In the process whereby the practitioner attains enlightenment, the transformation at a cognitive level, in which *tathatā* as an object of cognition changes from a state of defilement to one freed of defilement, is expressed as the "transformation of *tathatā*,"²⁹ and this is given as the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti*.

6. Generally speaking, the theories of the Yogācāra school that developed at the time of Asaṅga were brought to completion by Vasubandhu, and this also applies to the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory. We know that the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory appears for the first time in

²⁷ We can find the combination of the *trīsvabhāva* theory with *āśrayaparivṛtti* in, for instance, the commentary on *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* XI.13ff. (especially XI.17-18) and XIX.50ff. (especially XIX.53-54)

²⁸ The twofold *paratantra-svabhāva* linked with the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory appears in MS X-3-1.

²⁹ This means that the new interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* probably originated in the *Nirupadhikā Bhūmi*. See §2.6.

Abhidharma traditions in the *Abhidharmakośa*,³⁰ where the term *āśraya* is used together with the two verb forms *pari√vṛt* and *parā√vṛt* in the stages of the *darśana-mārga* and *bhāvanā-mārga*. In the *Abhidharmakośa* it is not possible to determine any difference in nuance between the two verb forms, and the overall meaning of the relevant passages is merely that the base (*āśraya*) is transformed through the complete elimination of negative elements (i.e., *kleśa*). Furthermore, this *āśrayaparivṛtti* represents the final stage of enlightenment as a Buddha, which means that *āśrayaparivṛtti* is already quite close in its connotations to *tathatā*. When these points are taken into consideration, it would seem that the *Abhidharmakośa* incorporated the idea of *āśrayaparivṛtti* only after the difference in nuance between the two verb forms had disappeared. If we accept that the Kośakāra Vasubandhu was familiar with Pattern 5 of the interpretation of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, it is hardly surprising in terms of the development of this theory that he used its terminology³¹ in the *Vyākhyāyukti*,³² *Pratītyasamutpādayākhyā*,³³ and *Triṃśikā*³⁴ and that his formulation was a somewhat

30 AKbh, p. 63.20-21: *āśrayaviśeṣād etat sidhyati/ āśrayo hi sa āryānām darśana-bhāvanā-mārga-sāmarthyāt tathā parāvṛtto bhavati yathā na punas tatpraheyānām kleśānām prarohasamartho bhavati*; AKbh, p. 232.25-233.2: *darśana-mārga-vyutthitasāyāśeṣa-darśana-prahātavya-prahānāt pratyagrāśrayaparivṛtti-nirmalā saṃtatir vartate/ arhat-phala-vyutthitasāyā-śeṣa-bhāvanā-prahātavya-prahānāt pratyagrāśrayaparivṛtti-śuddhā saṃtatir vartate/ ... / śeṣasya tu bhāvanāmārgasyāparipūrṇa-svabhāva-phalatvāc ca tadvyutthitanām na tathā pratyagrāśrayaparivṛtti-śuddhā* saṃtatir vartate(e) ... / (*See Sakuma [1990: 43, n. 141].)*

31 The fact that the Kośakāra Vasubandhu used the terminology of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the *Abhidharmakośa*, *Vyākhyāyukti*, *Pratītyasamutpādayākhyā* and *Triṃśikā* precludes the possibility that he was not familiar with this theory even if he did not use its terminology in the *Karmasiddhi* and *Vimtikā*. (I follow Kano [2008: 343-358]). A similar phenomenon can be observed in the case of terms like *ālayavijñāna* and *vijñaptimātratā*. It may be safely assumed that the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theories appearing in the *Abhidharmakośa*, *Vyākhyāyukti*, *Pratītyasamutpādayākhyā* and *Triṃśikā* belong to roughly the same stage of development.

32 Lee [2001: 241.24-26]: *nyon mongs pa dang shes bya'i sgrib pa thams cad spangs pa'i phyir gnas gyur pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa brnyes pa dang!*. Translations of this passage can be found in Honjō [1992: 111], and Horiuchi [2005: 47]. *Āśrayaparivṛtti* is mentioned in response to a question about the *svabhāvakāya*. This text seems to regard it as the realization of a state in which the base has been completely transformed (*āśraya-pari/parāvṛtti*) after the elimination of the two hindrances (*kleśa* and *jñeya*). The term *āśraya-pari/parāvṛtti* used here is presumably a full-fledged compound, and therefore, since it appears in connection with the *svabhāvakāya*, it is reasonable in terms of the development of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory to interpret it as referring only to the state of Buddhahood in which the base (*āśraya*) has been completely transformed as a result of yoga practices. The connection between the *dharmakāya* or *svabhāvakāya* and *āśrayaparivṛtti* came to be expressed in later times in the form of a stock formula. The fact that the *Vyākhyāyukti* uses this stock formula without any explanation shows that this text must have been composed after this interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* had already become firmly established.

33 Muroji [1993: 108]: *btsun pa Sa ston pa rnam srid pa'i yan lag gi rnam par shes pa yang de yin te/ de gnas yongs su ma gyur na srid pa rgyun mi 'chad pa'i phyir rol/*. Muroji [1993:

advanced form of the *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory.

Later, during the time of Sthiramati, interest was directed chiefly at fine-tuning this already completed *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory. Next, I wish to consider this point.

7. In order to consider the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* at the time of Sthiramati, I shall deal collectively with Sthiramati's commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga* (*Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā*), his commentary on the *Triṃśikā-Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* (*Triṃśikā-Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi-bhāṣya*), Asvabhāva's commentary on the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* (*Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra-ṭīkā*), Sthiramati's commentary on the same (*Sūtrālamkāra-vṛtti-bhāṣya*), and also the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*, which should be treated on the same level as these other works with regard to its content.

7.1. A distinctive feature of the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* at the time of Sthiramati is that the transformation of the religious practitioner was identified with *āśrayaparivṛtti*. In other words, the transformation of *sūnyatā*, equated with *tathatā*, from a state of defilement to a state of purity was projected onto the transition from a state in which the base of existence has not changed (*āśraya-aparāvṛtti*) to one in which it has changed (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*).³⁵ One may safely say that this scheme takes into account cognitive changes in the practitioner.

It would appear that a characteristic feature of Sthiramati's interpretation is that he understands *āśrayaparivṛtti* — that is, the series of changes taking place in the practitioner and incorporating the process of spiritual practice — as a form of *āśrayaparivṛtti* distinctive of Mahāyāna Buddhism. This is apparent in his interpretation of *bodhi*, according to which Hīnayānist *bodhi* is subject to the limitations of

187] reconstructs the underlined phrase as **tad-āśrayaparivṛttau*. As I have shown in Sakuma [2001], the compound form *āśraya-aparāvṛtti* can be confirmed among Yogācāra texts in the *Madhyānta-vibhāga-ṭīkā* attributed to Sthiramati, as I discuss in §7.1. If we reconstruct the verbal form of this phrase as **āśrayo na parivartate*, this calls to mind *āśrayaḥ parivartate* in the *Śrāvākabhūmi* (Sakuma [1990: A.1.5]). However, in the *Śrāvākabhūmi* this *āśraya*, i.e., base, has to be a purified positive element. In the *Pratītyasamutpāda-vyākhyā*, on the other hand, the base is regarded as *ālayavijñāna*, and it is therefore a negative element that has to be transformed through yoga practices, as in the *Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā*. This indicates that it already belongs to a stage beyond that of the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra-kārikā* and its commentary.

³⁴ TVbh, p. 43.22-23: *acitto 'nupalambho 'sau jñānaṃ lokottaraṃ ca tat/ āśrayasya parāvṛttir dvidhā dauṣṭhulya-hānitah//* (29). According to Sthiramati's commentary, *dvidhā* refers to *kleśāvaraṇa* and *jñeyāvaraṇa*, in which case there is no difference between this interpretation and that of the *Vyākhyāyukti*.

³⁵ MAVT, I-16b, p. 51.19-20.

the practitioner's life, whereas Sthiramati was strongly conscious of the fact that Mahāyānist *bodhi* is not subject to these limitation.³⁶ Furthermore, Sthiramati places side by side the schema of innately pure *tathatā* being freed of adventitious mental afflictions and the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as incorporating the process of spiritual practice. This would indicate that earlier interpretations of *āśrayaparivṛtti* had by this time been more clearly delineated and systematized.

Thus, a distinctive feature of not only the theory of *āśraya-parivṛtti*, but also other theories being propounded at the time of Sthiramati,³⁷ is that they represent the systematization of the various theories brought to completion during the time of Vasubandhu. This can also be said about *āśrayaparivṛtti*. For example, according to a theory that had been established by this time, the mind of an ordinary person and the knowledge of a Buddha are correlated, corresponding to the stages before and after the transformation due to spiritual practice. The mind of the ordinary person represents the eight consciousnesses starting with *ālaya-vijñāna*, while the knowledge of the Buddha represents the four knowledges starting with *ādarśa-jñāna*, and both are interrelated.³⁸ In addition, a correspondence was also recognized between these four knowledges and the three bodies.³⁹ At any rate, because *āśrayaparivṛtti* had become firmly established as an important factor in the attainment of Buddhahood and was placed at the centre of the mechanism of enlightenment, various correspondences were posited between existing doctrinal elements. In such circumstances it was only natural that there should have arisen a desire to systematize and classify these various elements.

7.2. If these attempts at classification may be described as systematization, then the best organized pattern of systematization is presented by the doctrines of the Chinese Fāxiàng school based on the *Chéng wéishì lùn* translated by Xuánzàng. But it is also true that, because the doctrines of the Fāxiàng school were overly concerned with systematization, they tended to lose sight of the practitioner and *āśrayaparivṛtti* in its original sense of "transformation of the base of existence" or "state in which the base of existence has been

³⁶ Ibid., II-10, p. 84.21-22, p. 85.6-7; III-11, p. 125.19-20.

³⁷ Cf. Sakuma [1998].

³⁸ Cf. Sakuma [1984].

³⁹ Cf. Sakuma [1987].

transformed.”⁴⁰

7.3. Before considering the salient trends in Xuánzàng’s thought, I wish to touch on the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in the *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga*.⁴¹ Whereas Sthiramati’s interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* was one that incorporated the process of spiritual practice and treated it separately from innately pure *tathatā*, the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga* focuses on *āśrayaparivṛtti* in terms of the purification of *tathatā*. In other words, in its orthodox interpretation *āśrayaparivṛtti* is considered to refer to a state in which *tathatā* has been transformed and which does not incorporate the process of spiritual practice, as was the case with Sthiramati, whose interpretation is relegated to a secondary position and receives little attention.

Stated in another way, the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in the *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga* represents an extension of the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in terms of *tathatā*, corresponding to Pattern 3 noted earlier, and it does not, moreover, incorporate the process of spiritual practice. Thus, it is diametrically opposite in its understanding to Sthiramati’s interpretation. However, since the *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga* also mentions a form of *āśrayaparivṛtti* that incorporates the process of spiritual practice, the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in terms of the purification of *tathatā* has been chosen after having taken due account of the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as incorporating the process of spiritual practice.

8. The theoretical systematization to be seen in the doctrines of the Chinese Fǎxiàng school deriving from Xuánzàng is also clearly evident in its interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti*. It is necessary to bear in mind that in the *Buddhabhūmivyākhyā* translated by Xuánzàng prior to his translation of the *Chéng wéishì lùn* there are still signs of trial and error with respect to doctrinal systematization, but these problems have all been admirably resolved in the *Chéng wéishì lùn*. Its interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* starts off from the old and new interpretations found in the “Nirvāṇa Chapter” and presents side by side both of the interpretations that had been systematized by the time of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā* and *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga*, that is,

⁴⁰ For a detailed consideration of Xuánzàng’s treatment of these theories, see Sakuma [1989a] [1989b] [1989c].

⁴¹ For a detailed explanation, see Sakuma [1998].

the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as incorporating the process of spiritual practice and the interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* in terms of *tathatā*. In other words, on the one hand the term *āśrayaparivṛtti* signifies, as in the case of the *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga*, the manifestation of the innately pure *tathatā* after the removal of adventitious mental afflictions, while the interpretation involving the process of spiritual practice is incorporated not in the form of the term *āśrayaparivṛtti*, but in the form of expressions such as “transformatively abandoning” the consciousness of the ordinary person to “transformatively obtain” the knowledge of the Buddha. Furthermore, as regards the categories of the constituent elements of existence, because it was held that “consciousness,” associated with the “mind,” was “transformatively abandoned,” it was considered with regard to “knowledge,” belonging to the “mental attributes,” that a “consciousness or mind associated with knowledge” was “transformatively obtained.” In this manner efforts were made to devise appropriate modes of expression to ensure that both interpretations of *āśrayaparivṛtti* could coexist without there being any inconsistencies.⁴²

9. In the above we have reviewed the historical development of *āśrayaparivṛtti* thought by tracing the course followed by some of the more distinctive interpretations of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in various Yogācāra texts. The interpretation of *āśrayaparivṛtti* as the “transformation of the base of existence,” stemming from the psychophysical changes undergone by the meditating *yogin*, underwent a process of Mahāyānization during its subsequent development, and ultimately the various interpretations were systematized in such a way that the earlier interpretation and the new Mahāyānized interpretation were able to coexist as Abhidharmic categories without any inconsistencies whatsoever. It is only by considering the history of this current of *āśrayaparivṛtti* thought that one is able to correctly understand the interpretations of *āśrayaparivṛtti* found in works such as the *Ratnagotravibhāga* and *Lankāvarāra-sūtra*, and I hope to deal with these on another occasion.

⁴² Cf. Sakuma [1989a] and related articles.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AKbh *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, ed. by P. Pradhan, Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967 (1st ed.), 1975 (2nd ed.).
- MAVT *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā, exposition systématique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda, édition d'après un manuscrit rapporté du Népal par M. Sylvain Lévi*, Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1966.
- MS *La Somme du grand véhicule d'Asaṅga (Mahāyānasamgraha)*, par Étienne Lamotte, Tome I, Louvain-la-Neuve: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1973.
- TVbh Sylvain Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, deux traités de Vasubandhu, Viṃśatikā accompagnée d'une explication en prose et Triṃśikā avec le commentaire de Sthiramati*, Paris: Champion, 1925.

REFERENCES

- Hakamaya, Noriaki 袴谷憲昭
1994 *Yuishiki no kaishakugaku: "Gejinmikyō" o yomu* (唯識の解釈学『解深密経』を読む [The hermeneutics of the Vijñānavāda: Reading the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*]), Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
1976 "Sanshu tenne kō" (三種転依考 [On the triple āśraya-parivṛtti/parāvṛtti]), *Bukkyō-gaku* 2: 46-76.
- Honjō, Yoshifumi 本庄良文
1990 "Shakkiron daiyonshō — Seshin no Daijō bussetsuron" (『釈軌論』第四章 — 世親の大乗仏説論 [Vyākhyāyukti, chap. IV: Vasubandhu's thesis that the Mahāyāna was expounded by the Buddha]), pt. 1, *Kōbe Joshi Daigaku Kiyō: Bungakubuhēn* 23(1): 57-70.
1992 "Shakkiron daiyonshō — Seshin no Daijō bussetsuron," pt. 2, *Kōbe Joshi Daigaku Kiyō: Bungakubuhēn* 25(1): 103-118.
- Horiuchi, Toshio 堀内俊郎
2005 "Shakkiron no busshin ron — hengeshin to shite no Shakuson" (『釈軌論』の仏身論 — 変化身としての釈尊 [Buddhākāya theory in the Vyākhyāyukti: Śākyamuni as a *nirmāṇakāya*]), *Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyū Ronshū* 9: 45-61.
- Kano, Hazuo 加納和雄
2008 "Two Short Glosses on Yogācāra Texts by Vairocanaṅkṣita: *Viṃśikāṭīkāvivṛtti* and **Dharmadharmatāvibhāgavivṛtti*", *Manuscripta Buddhica* 1, Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection Part I, edited by Francesco Sferra, Serie Orientale Roma 104: 343-380.
- Kher, Chitrarekha V.
1992 *Buddhism as Presented by the Brahmanical Systems*, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 91, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Lee, Jong Cheol 李 鐘徹
2001 *The Tibetan Text of the Vyākhyāyukti of Vasubandhu, Critically Edited from the Cone, Derge, Narthang and Peking Editions*, Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Muroji, Yoshihito G. 室寺義仁
1993 *Vasubandhus Interpretation des Praṭītyasamutpāda: Eine kritische Bearbeitung der Praṭītyasamutpādavyākhyā (Samskāra- und Vijñānavibhaṅga)*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, Bd. 43, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Sakuma, Hidenori 佐久間秀範
1984 "'Chi' to 'shiki' — ryōsha no ketsugō kankei to sono seiritsu katei" (<智>と<識> — 両者の結合関係とその成立過程 [Jñāna and Vijñāna: On the development of their interconnection]), *Buzan Gakuho* 28/29: 125-141.
1987 "'Sanshin' to 'gohō' — ryōsha no ketsugō kankei to sono seiritsu katei" (<三身>と<五法> — 両者の結合関係とその成立過程 ["Three bodies" and "five elements": On the development of their interconnection]), In *Takasaki Jikidō hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū: Indogaku Bukkyōgaku ronshū* (高崎直道博士還暦記念論集・インド学仏

- 教学論集 [Essays on Indology and Buddhism in honour of Dr. Jikido Takasaki on his 60th birthday], pp. 387-411, Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- 1989a “Genjō no ito suru ‘tenne’ shisō” (玄奘の意図する<転依>思想 [The aims of Xuanzang’s *āśrayaparivṛtti* thought]), *Bukkyōgaku* 26: 21-47.
- 1989b “Genjō ni okeru ‘shiki’ no atsukaikata” (玄奘における<識>の扱い方 [Some aspects of Xuanzang’s treatment of *vijñāna* and *jñāna*]), *Tohogaku* 78: 55-67.
- 1989c “Genjō ni okeru busshin no atsukaikata” (玄奘における<仏身>の扱い方 [Some aspects of Xuanzang’s treatment of “Buddha-bodies”]), *Bukkyō Bunka* 25: 94-108.
- 1990 *Die Āśrayaparivṛtti-Theorie in der Yogācārabhūmi*, 2 vols., Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, Bd. 40. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- 1991 “Yugagyōha ni okeru ‘seitenkan’ no ronri” (瑜伽行派における<性転換>の論理 [The logic of “sexual transformation” in the Yogācāra school]), in *Maeda Sengaku hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū: “ga” no shisō* (前田専學博士還暦記念論集・<我>の思想 [Ātmajñāna: Felicitation volume for Professor Sengaku Mayeda on the occasion of his 60th birthday]), pp. 629-641, Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- 1996 “*Daijō shōgonkyōron* ni okeru tenne shisō — parāvṛtti no shiyō patān ni tsuite” (『大乘莊嚴經論』における転依思想 — parāvṛtti の使用パターンについて [The *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra: A parāvṛttau B labhyate*]), in *Imanishi Junkichi kyōju kanreki kinen ronshū: Indo shisō to Bukkyō bunka* (今西順吉教授還暦記念論集・インド思想と仏教文化 [Indian thought and Buddhist Culture: Essays in honour of Professor Imanishi Junkichi on his 60th birthday]), pp. 568-557, Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- 1997 “Shoki Yugagyōha no takyō to no tairon no pointo” (初期瑜伽行派の他教との対論のポイント [Points at issue in debates between the Yogācāra school and other schools]), *Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai Nenpō* 62: 27-47.
- 1998a “Yuishiki shoriron kazuawase no haikai ni aru mono” (唯識諸理論教合わせの背景にあるもの [The background to combinations of numbered theories in the Vijñānavāda]), *Mikkyōgaku Kenkyū* 30: 33-44.
- 1998b “Dharmadharmatāvibhāga ni okeru tenne shisō” (Dharmadharmatāvibhāga における転依思想 [Āśrayaparivṛtti thought in the *Dharmadharmatāvibhāga*]), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 46(2): 975-967.
- 2000 “*Daijō Bukkyō Yugagyōha* ni okeru satori e no tenkan no ronri” (大乘仏教瑜伽行派における悟りへの転換の論理 [The doctrinal development of *āśrayaparivṛtti*]), in *Ejima Yasunori hakushi tsuitō ronshū: kū to jitsuzai* (江島恵教博士追悼論集 空と実在 [Collected essays in memoriam of Dr. Ejima Yasunori: Emptiness and reality]), pp. 143-150, Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- 2001 “Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭikā ni okeru tenne shisō” (Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭikā における転依思想 [The *āśrayaparivṛtti* theory in the *Madhyāntavibhāga*]), in *Ishigami Zen’ō kyōju koki kinen ronbunshū: Bukkyō bunka no kichō to tenkai* (石上善應教授古稀記念論文集・仏教文化の基調と展開 [Felicitation volume for Professor Ishigami Zen’ō on the occasion of his 70th birthday]), pp. 109-136, Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Schmithausen, Lambert
- 1969 *Der Nirvāṇa-Abschnitt in der Vinīścayasamgrahaṇī der Yogācārabhūmiḥ*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 264. Bd., 2. Abh. Wien: Kommissionsverlag.
- 1987a *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*, 2 vols., *Studia Philologica Buddhica*, Monograph Series IVab, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies. (Reprint, 2007.)
- Tsukamoto, Keishō 塚本啓祥, et. al.
- 1990 *Bongo butten no kenkyū III: ronsho hen* (梵語仏典の研究III 論書篇 [A descriptive bibliography of Sanskrit Buddhist literature, III: Abhidharma, Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, Buddhist epistemology and logic]), Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- Wood, Thomas E.
- 1991 *Mind Only: A Philosophical and Doctrinal Analysis of the Vijñānavāda*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Professor
Graduate School of Humanities and
Social Sciences, Institute of Philosophy
University of Thukuba
Tsukuba, Japan