





THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR WŎNHYO STUDIES'  
COLLECTED WORKS OF WŎNHYO • VOLUME II

# Wŏnhyo's Philosophy of Mind

*Edited by*

A. CHARLES MULLER AND  
CUONG T. NGUYEN



University of Hawai'i Press  
Honolulu



© 2012 University of Hawai'i Press  
All rights reserved  
Printed in the United States of America  
17 16 15 14 13 12      6 5 4 3 2 1

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Wonhyo, 617-686.

[Selections. English. 2012]

Wonhyo's philosophy of mind / edited by A. Charles Muller and Cuong T. Nguyen.  
p. cm.—(International Association for Wonhyo Studies' collected works of Wonhyo ;  
v. 2)

Annotated translations of seminal works by Wonhyo.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8248-3573-6 (hardcover : alk. paper)

I. Wonhyo, 617-686. 2. Philosophy of mind. 3. Buddhist philosophy. I. Muller, A.  
Charles. II. Nguyen, Cuong Tu. III. Title. IV. Series: International Association for  
Wonhyo Studies' collected works of Wonhyo ; v. 2.

BQ9219.W663E52 2012

294.3'361282—dc23

2011032950

**International Association for Wōnhyo Studies' Collected Works of Wōnhyo Series**

Sponsored by the International Association of Wōnhyo Studies,  
with generous financial support provided by Dongguk University, Seoul,  
and the State University of New York, Stony Brook.

SUNG-BAE PARK, SUNY Stony Brook, Executive Director,  
Stony Brook branch of the IAWS

YONG-PYO KIM, Dongguk University, Executive Director,  
Seoul branch of the IAWS

HONGKYUNG KIM, SUNY Stony Brook, Managing Director

**SERIES EDITORIAL BOARD**

ROBERT E. BUSWELL JR. (chair), University of California, Los Angeles

SUNGTAEK CHO, Korea University

ROBERT GIMELLO, Harvard University

PETER GREGORY, Smith College

YONG-PYO KIM, Dongguk University

LEWIS LANCASTER, University of California, Berkeley (emeritus)

CUONG TU NGUYEN, George Mason University

SUNG-BAE PARK, SUNY Stony Brook

WONCHEOL YUN, Seoul National University

University of Hawai'i Press books are printed on acid-free  
paper and meet the guidelines for permanence and  
durability of the Council on Library Resources.

Designed by Paul Herr  
Printed by Sheridan Books, Inc.

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
<i>General Introduction</i>	1
I. The System of the Two Hindrances ( <i>Yijang ūi</i> )	
A. CHARLES MULLER	45
II. Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies ( <i>Simmun hwajaeng non</i> )	
CUONG T. NGUYEN	161
III. Commentary on the <i>Discrimination between the Middle and     the Extremes</i> ( <i>Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so</i> ): Fascicle Three	
CUONG T. NGUYEN	177
IV. Critical Discussion on Inference ( <i>P'an piryang non</i> )	
DAN LUSTHAUS	263
<i>Notes</i>	299
<i>Glossary</i>	379
<i>Bibliography</i>	387
<i>Index</i>	395



## Acknowledgments

It is probably not that unusual for a multiauthor-translator volume in a translation series to go through a number of twists and turns and starts and stops before finally coming out into print. This one certainly did. First commissioned in 1997, this volume went through a continuous series of changes in contributors and editors, to the extent that there were times of doubt (at least in the minds of one or two) as to whether it would ever see the light of day. But here it is—a collection of some of Wŏnhyo’s most challenging and philosophically stimulating works in one volume, well-translated and well-annotated.

We would like to take this opportunity to offer our thanks and congratulations to Sung Bae Park, for whom the translation of Wŏnhyo’s extant works into English has been a lifelong dream, a dream that is gradually moving toward its fruition. It was Sung Bae who put the initial parties and funding together and who organized the groundwork for the production of this watershed project for Wŏnhyo studies. We would also like to extend our deep thanks to Robert Siegel and Sungtaek Cho, who expended enormous energy in the early days of the project to put the initial teams together and who handled numerous managerial and editorial tasks while under other pressing responsibilities. Their task was subsequently taken over by Hongkyung Kim, who has also worked tirelessly to keep things on track.

Our thanks also to the two readers for the University of Hawai‘i Press, Robert Kritzer and Dan Lusthaus, whose valuable comments resulted in a significant improvement in the overall quality of the volume. As it turned out, when we, as dilettantes in Buddhist logic, were frustrated with having to tackle an impenetrable fragment of Wŏnhyo’s attempt at *hetuvidyā*, we enlisted Lusthaus to become one of our contributors. It was a good decision, because Dan ended up producing a translation and introduction that, to our knowledge, virtually no one else in the field of East Asian Buddhist studies is presently capable of doing to this level. Another important later contributor to the volume is William Waldron. We were struggling with the first half of the general introduction (on Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha, in their symbiotic relationship) and had reached a bit of an impasse in the process of trying to blend the two rather different essays written by Nguyen and Muller. Bill rewrought the whole thing into a single essay that I think we can safely say is now one of the best single introductions to Yogācāra/Tathāgatagarbha presently available.



Last, but furthest from the least: All of the participants in this volume project owe profound thanks to Robert Buswell, who jump-started the entire project at a critical juncture, arranging the publication agreement with the University of Hawai'i Press and pushing the volumes in this series through the stage of production. In particular, he worked to get this volume on track again at a point when it had been in limbo for a couple of years. Without Robert's rare combination of scholarly, editorial, and managerial talents, this volume would probably never have seen the light of day. We are immeasurably grateful.

A. CHARLES MULLER  
CUONG T. NGUYEN

## Abbreviations

<i>A</i>	<i>Aṅguttara-Nikāya</i>
<i>AMF</i>	<i>Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith</i>
BDK	Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai
CBETA	Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association
Ch.	Chinese
<i>CWSL</i>	<i>Cheng weishi lun</i>
<i>D</i>	<i>Dighā-Nikāya</i>
<i>FDJL</i>	<i>Fodijing lun</i>
HPC	Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō
K.	Korean
KT	Korean Tripiṭaka
MN	Majjhima-Nikāya
R	Reprint Xu Zangjing (Xin wenfeng reprint; Taipei: Xin wenfeng chu-ban-she)
<i>SHN</i>	<i>Simmun hwajaeng non</i> (Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies)
Skt.	Sanskrit
<i>Sṃdh</i>	<i>Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra</i>
SN	Samyutta-Nikāya
<i>SPE</i>	<i>Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment (Yuanjue jing)</i>
T	Taishō shinshū daizōkyō
<i>Vbh</i>	<i>Vibhaṅga</i>
WSC	Wōnhyo sōngsa chōnsō (Collected Works of the Sagely Teacher Wōnhyo)
XZJ	Xu Zangjing (The Shinsan Dainihon Zokuzōkyō; Tokyo: Kokusho Kankokai)
<i>YBh</i>	<i>Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra</i>
Z	Zokuzōkyō (The Dainihon Zokuzōkyō; Kyoto: Zokuzōkyō Shoin)



# General Introduction

## Contents

1.	BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHY OF MIND IN EAST ASIA	3
	1.1. Grounding in Basic Buddhist Philosophical and Soteriological Approaches	3
	1.2. Madhyamaka: Dependent Arising and Emptiness	7
	1.3. Problems with Transmission of Karma and Abhidharmic Solutions	9
	1.4. The Need for a More Detailed Map of Consciousness	10
	1.5. Yogācāra: The Middle Path and Mind-Only	11
	1.6. Liberation in Yogācāra	14
	1.7. Tathāgatagarbha	14
	1.8. Intermixture	16
	1.9. The Base Consciousness: Pure, Defiled, Neither, or Both	17
	1.10. The Xuanzang Effect	18
	1.11. The Fate of East Asian Yogācāra	19
	1.12. Yogācāra Influences on Wŏnhyo	20
	1.13. Buddhist Logic	23
2.	WŌNHYO AS “HARMONIZER”	24
	2.1. The Meaning of <i>Hwajaeng</i>	24
	2.2. Not Doing <i>P’angyo</i>	25
	2.3. Approaches to the Study of <i>Hwajaeng</i>	26
	2.4. Wŏnhyo’s Writings, Logic, and Modes of Inquiry	28
	2.5. Philological Analysis: Terminological Bases for <i>Hwajaeng</i>	30

---

2.6. Paradigmatic Bases for Wŏnhyo's Perspective of Harmonization	34
2.6.1. The One Mind	34
2.6.2. Two Truths	36
2.7. Harmonization, Faith, and Distance from Language	38
2.7.1. Linguistic <i>Hwajaeng</i> and Nonlinguistic <i>Hwajaeng</i>	38
2.7.2. Nonconceptual Faith as the Final Destination	40
3. THE TEXTS	42

## I. Buddhist Philosophy of Mind in East Asia

Modern scholars have come to distinguish two major streams of early East Asian Mahāyāna Buddhist philosophy. Both of these were based on Indian antecedents, and both conducted thorough examinations of the constitution and transformative potential of human consciousness, particularly the potential for sentient beings to be liberated from the suffering of cyclic existence. These are the doctrinal streams of Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha. Although these two currents of Buddhist thought held differing views on such matters as the basic moral quality of the human mind and the possibility of universal enlightenment, they did share extensively in the content of their doctrines and practices, as well as their technical terminology. These were the two most significant philosophies of mind to be received, studied, and interpreted by Wōnhyo (617–686), and they provided the basic framework for his own philosophical perspectives.<sup>1</sup> We will pay special attention to Wōnhyo’s treatment of these two doctrinal streams below, but first we will briefly review their general course of development, paying special attention to their symbiotic relationship.

### I.1. Grounding in Basic Buddhist Philosophical and Soteriological Approaches

The Buddhist philosophies of mind received by Wōnhyo were the product of many centuries of reflection on psychological, epistemological, and soteriological questions, whose origins lay as far back as the first couple of centuries after the passing of Śākyamuni Buddha. As Buddhism developed in the philosophically sophisticated and religiously variegated milieu of India, there arose the need to provide rational explanations for those aspects of its doctrines that contradicted the general tenets of the non-Buddhist Indian religious worldview, which are generally subsumed under the rubric of Brahmanism. Such basic Buddhist teachings as *anātman* (no-self) and *pratītya-samutpāda* (dependent arising), for example, were formulated as critiques of various Indian theories of causation, both Vedic and non-Vedic. These schools countered Buddhist paradigms with their own sophisticated arguments, making it necessary for Buddhists to explain and defend their positions.

Like most of his contemporaries in the ancient Indian philosophical world, Śākyamuni Buddha was interested in attaining spiritual liberation (*mokṣa*) from the cyclic flow of conditioned existence (*saṃsāra*) characterized by suffering and unsatisfactoriness (*duḥkha*). And like most of his contemporaries, the Buddha emphasized that this liberation could be realized only by means of an accurate insight into the true nature of the world—that is, through a direct and correct apprehension of reality.<sup>2</sup> Yet while Śākyamuni shared the aim of spiritual

liberation—and the indispensable role of insight in attaining it—with most of his Brahmanical contemporaries, his explanations of these processes attempted to avoid the “essentialist” views endemic to Brahmanism.<sup>3</sup> In other words, the Brahmanical philosophers thought that liberation could be attained through a realization of the ontological identity between one’s true self (*ātman*) and the cosmic self (Brahman), both of which are characterized as immutable, changeless, and independent.<sup>4</sup>

The Buddhist view, further elaborated by later Abhidharmic schools, analyzed our experience of the world into sets of evanescent events referred to as dharmas, which are not fixed entities but physical and mental processes in a continual state of flux. As identified in a relatively early stratum of Buddhist literature, these dharmas are subsumed within the dynamic relationship between the six internal sense bases (*āyatana*), their six types of respective objects, and the six types of consciousness that arise when these two come into contact.<sup>5</sup> These three sets of six added up to eighteen fundamental factors (*dhātu*) constituting our basic cognitive processes.

The standard Buddhist analysis of cognition focuses on the relations between, on the one hand, what we perceive through our sensory and mental faculties—i.e., the six classes of objects—and, on the other hand, a sheer awareness (*viññāna*) of those objects that is accompanied by various mental factors (*caitta*), such as feelings (*vedanā*), perceptions (*saṃjñā*), and volitions (*saṃskāra*). These mental factors can be either wholesome or unwholesome in moral quality, depending on the motivations associated with them. Buddhist analysis of bondage and liberation, its soteriology, is thus grounded on the recognition that we engage the world both cognitively and affectively.

At the individual level, the human personality is analyzed both in terms of the twelve sense bases and the five psychophysical aggregates (*pañca-skandha*). These five aggregates include both the person and world—insofar as we perceive and experience it. There is, in the Buddhist view, no other immutable and substantial essence above, beyond, within, or below this. According to Śākyamuni, the arising of *duḥkha* and its eventual cessation, the whole drama of bondage and liberation, takes place within the five skandhas. As the Buddha remarks: “In this fathom-long body with its perceptions and thoughts there is the world, the origin of the world, the cessation of the world and the path to the cessation of the world.”<sup>6</sup> Since both bondage/delusion and liberation/awakening occur in terms of the five skandhas,<sup>7</sup> it would be superfluous to posit another “self,” an immutable, eternal essence such as the Hindu *ātman*.<sup>8</sup>

One of the key differences between these two worldviews is that, for the Brahmanical thinkers, all change is illusory once one discovers the immutable Brahman, the ultimate cause and reality of the universe. For the Buddhists, however, it is exactly the opposite. Such immutability is nothing but the superimposition of deluded ideas onto a constantly flowing reality. And it is precisely our attachment to the superimposed concepts of a permanent self and its correlative, a permanent universe, that invites all kinds of cognitive and behavioral faults

(*doṣa*). These wrong views and the attachments they elicit are “unskillful” (*akuśala*) because they bind sentient beings to *samsāra*. To see the human personality (*pudgala*) as a form of eternal self (*ātman*) is itself nothing but an illusion constructed out of a particular configuration of dharmas, which are, in fact, constantly changing from one moment to the next.<sup>9</sup>

The classification of our experience of the world into its irreducible events or “facts” is not unique to Buddhism—this philosophical approach is shared by other ancient Indian thinkers as well.<sup>10</sup> But what sets the Buddha apart from his Indian predecessors and contemporaries is his focus on causality, described in terms of *pratītya-samutpāda*, or dependent arising. According to this view, even the most basic factors of existence are impermanent—they too arise and cease from moment to moment. And it is precisely *because* of this constant flux that causation is possible.

In early Buddhist texts the principle of dependent arising is stated as follows:

When this is, that is (*Imasmim sati idam hoti*);  
 This arising, that arises (*Imassuppādā idam uppajjati*);  
 When this is not, that is not (*Imasmim asati idam na hoti*);  
 This ceasing, that ceases (*Imassa nirodhā idam nirujjhati*).<sup>11</sup>

Several important notions follow from this.

First, this principle of causality (*idam-pratyayatā*) is explained as the functional dependence of any specific element of experience upon a variety of other elements. “Real things” are not produced from causes and conditions that exist completely independently of them; nor is it possible to isolate a single principle as their ultimate cause. Nonetheless, even though Śākyamuni Buddha rejected the Brahmanical view that reduced everything in the universe to a single, ultimate, permanent cause, he also vehemently rejected the view of the materialists/nihilists, who denied causation altogether and thought that everything occurred just by chance. In response to both, he affirmed the reality of causal interaction.

Second, dependent arising is therefore characterized as the middle path that is free from two extreme views, namely, the annihilationist view (*uccheda-vāda*)—that the effects of actions cease as soon as they are over—and the eternalistic view (*śāśvata-vāda*)—that the true nature of all phenomena is an unchanging, eternal essence.<sup>12</sup> From Śākyamuni Buddha’s perspective, annihilationism cannot account for continuity, rebirth, and the working of karma, whereas eternalism leaves no possibility for change. Both of these extreme views prevent an adequate understanding of causation: *uccheda-vāda* leads to the extreme of non-being, while *śāśvata-vāda* constitutes the extreme of being. In an early scripture, Śākyamuni declared to one of his disciples:

Kātyāyana, everyday experience relies on the duality of “it is” and “it is not.” But for one who relies on the Dharma and on wisdom, and



thereby directly perceives how the things of the world arise and pass away, for him, there is no “it is” and no “it is not.” “Everything exists” is simply one extreme, Kātyāyana, and “nothing exists” is the other extreme. The Tathāgata relies on neither of these two extremes, Kātyāyana; he teaches the Dharma as a Middle Way.<sup>13</sup>

Śākyamuni Buddha’s understanding of causation, indeed his teaching as a whole, is thus designated the middle path (*madhyamā-pratipad*).<sup>14</sup>

Third, dependent arising depicts the cessation as well as the arising of conditioned phenomena (*saṃskṛta-dharma*—phenomena that arise depending on causes and conditions). And it is this possibility of cessation—of *nirvāṇa*—that provides the foundation for the Buddhist path to liberation.

In short, dependent arising refers to the basic principle of causality that makes change and transformation possible, particularly as it applies to the arising and the cessation of cyclic existence. The specific causal patterns depicting this are typically described in terms of the formula of twelve-limbed (*nidāna*) dependent arising.<sup>15</sup>

The twelve-limbed model of dependent arising serves two purposes: it reveals the causal patterns that perpetuate cyclic existence, and it shows how liberation from cyclic existence is achieved, first by understanding these causal patterns and then by reversing them. In Buddhist parlance, dependent arising describes both the perpetuation (*pravṛtti*) of cyclic existence as well as its reversal (*nivṛtti*). An understanding of how cyclic existence comes about from these causal patterns is necessary for realizing how they can be reversed through a process of pacification. In later soteriological language, this is to realize the original quiescence of things, or *nirvāṇa*. As the Buddha himself remarks:

There is, monks, an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned. If, monks, there were no unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned, no escape would be discerned from what is born, become, made, conditioned. But because there is an unborn, unbecome, unmade, unconditioned, therefore an escape is discerned from what is born, become, made, conditioned.<sup>16</sup>

This soteriological model—that the attainment of an aboriginal quiescence is achieved through the realization that phenomena are conditioned—is first articulated in the Prajñāpāramitā texts<sup>17</sup> and was subsequently accepted by both the Madhyamaka and Yogācāra schools. This model also provides the foundation for the nondualistic philosophies of both these schools.

The contrast between the mistaken or “unskillful” way of seeing oneself and phenomena (i.e., as inherently existent, delimited entities) and the correct or “skillful” way of seeing them (i.e., as momentary and dependently arisen) clearly shows that the basic cause of human suffering is the mistaken way we understand the world. At bottom, Buddhists see the human problem as an epistemological

one, a problem with our modes of understanding. Thus, although Buddhist meditators clearly recognized and sought to remedy our emotional afflictions through such means as cultivating mental focus and observing moral precepts, they prioritized being able to identify and correct our *cognitive* errors through rational analysis and suprarational, direct observation.

## 1.2. Madhyamaka: Dependent Arising and Emptiness

Between the first and fifth centuries of the Common Era, the ideas and practices of Indian Buddhism underwent significant development. Philosophically, this period witnessed the emergence of the two principal Mahāyāna schools: Madhyamaka and Yogācāra. Both claimed to faithfully elaborate the philosophical positions enunciated by Śākyamuni, such as no-self, dependent arising, the middle path, and so forth, although they differed, sometimes radically, in their respective emphases and interpretations. These two schools made an indelible impact on the development of Buddhist philosophy throughout Asia.

The major contribution of the Madhyamaka school was, no doubt, the notion of “emptiness” (*śūnyatā*) as expounded by Nāgārjuna (ca. second century CE),<sup>18</sup> its legendary founder, in his seminal work, the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāh*:

Whatever is dependent arising, we declare to be emptiness.  
It is also a provisional designation, it is indeed the middle path.  
Any phenomenon that is not dependently arisen cannot obtain.  
Therefore any phenomenon that is not empty does not exist.<sup>19</sup>

Briefly, in Nāgārjuna’s view Śākyamuni Buddha taught dependent arising, not to show that phenomena are truly produced by a truly existent set of causes and conditions, but to show that dependently arisen phenomena are “empty” of any inherent nature or essence (*svabhāva*). It is because phenomena lack such an inherent nature that dependent arising is possible. As Nāgārjuna points out in the next verse, if phenomena were not “empty” in this sense—that is, if they were not dependently arisen (*pratītya-samutpanna*)—then nothing would be possible, since phenomena would neither arise nor cease.<sup>20</sup> Nāgārjuna thus concludes:

All things are possible for someone for whom emptiness is possible;  
All things are not possible for someone for whom emptiness is not possible.<sup>21</sup>

Nāgārjuna then proceeds to apply the deconstructive logic of emptiness to the principal concepts of Buddhism such as the Four Truths, *nirvāṇa*, the skandhas, *dhātu*, and even to causality itself, each time demonstrating that none of these could function if they actually possessed an inherent, unchanging nature.

At first reading, it may seem that Nāgārjuna is engaging in a destructive logic that is tantamount to nihilism.<sup>22</sup> Nāgārjuna's true target, however, is the tendency in some major Abhidharmic schools—particularly the Sarvāstivāda school—to reinstate a substantialist view of reality and dependent arising.<sup>23</sup> Nāgārjuna is pointing out that if phenomena were not empty of inherent nature, then there would be no causal interaction—and this would render Buddhist teachings effectively vacuous, for it is precisely because things are empty of inherent nature that change and transformation are possible. As the Buddha declared in his very first sermon, whatever is subject to origination is all subject to cessation.

This bears repeating: in Nāgārjuna's view, for things to exist *with* an inherent nature means that they exist independently, by their own power, without being supported by other causes and conditions—they would *not* be dependently arisen. To say that things are empty, however, does not imply that they are absolutely nonexistent. To the contrary, it is precisely because phenomena are dependently produced that they interact and function. Therefore Nāgārjuna claims that it is exactly because phenomena are empty of essence that both the mundane (*laukika*—i.e., *saṃsāra*, or bondage) and the transmundane (*lokōttara*—i.e., *nirvāṇa*, or liberation) are possible. It is because things are empty that the entire Buddhist tradition—whose philosophy, ethics, and soteriology are all predicated on the possibility of transformation—is plausible in the first place.<sup>24</sup>

In order to counter the charge of nihilism—that if emptiness were ultimately true, then conventional causality could not obtain, and religious practice would therefore be futile—Nāgārjuna introduces the notion of the two truths:

The true teaching of the Buddha is based on the two truths:  
 Conventional truth and ultimate truth.  
 Those who do not know the distinction between the two truths  
 Do not understand the profound reality of the Buddha's teaching.  
 Without relying on conventional reality, the ultimate truth cannot  
 be expressed;  
 Without realizing the ultimate truth, *nirvāṇa* cannot be  
 attained.<sup>25</sup>

As a Buddhist, Nāgārjuna considers attaining *nirvāṇa* to be the final goal of the path. This, in turn, cannot be achieved without realizing the ultimate truth—that in the final analysis all phenomena are empty of inherent existence. However, ultimate truth can be revealed only by means of conventional truth, for ultimately reality itself is beyond predication by words, symbols, or doctrines. Although Buddhist teachings such as dependent arising and so forth are not considered accurate depictions of reality in an ultimate sense (*paramārthatas*)—that is, they do not possess a one-to-one correspondence with reality—at the conventional or relative level (*samvṛtitas*) such teachings are perfectly capable of performing

their purported function: that is, they help dispel the two extreme views of being (eternalism) and nonbeing (annihilationism). As will be explained below, a proper understanding of the two truths is crucial for Wōnhyo as well, and understanding the fluid relationship between them is basic to his larger project of reconciling an array of doctrinal disagreements (*hwaŋjaeng*).

From the soteriological perspective, Mahāyāna Buddhism teaches dependent arising or emptiness, not in order to establish an absolute view about causality (which the Buddha rejects), but to prevent beings from seeing either the person (*puḍgala*) or the elements (dharma) that constitute its reality as inherently existent, and thereby to lead them to a realization of the aboriginally quiescent and peaceful nature of all phenomena. In the opening verse to his *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ*, Nāgārjuna praises the Buddha for teaching dependent arising, which is characterized by “noncessation, nonarising, nonannihilation, noneternality, nonidentity, nondifference, noncoming, nongoing, which is the blissful pacification of all conceptual proliferations [*prapañca*].”<sup>26</sup> This amplifies a similar statement in the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*: “All things are without inherent nature, nonoriginated, nonannihilated, quiescent from the beginning, and peaceful by nature.”<sup>27</sup>

### I.3. Problems with Transmission of Karma and Abhidharmic Solutions

The logical problems between the ideas of no-self and dependent arising and the core Indian models of karma and transmigration—problems that even early Buddhists had to address—were only exacerbated by the Mādhyamika ideas of the emptiness of self and things. In the Buddhist view, all our intentional actions, words, and thoughts set into motion energies that eventually engender pleasant, unpleasant, or neutral effects. The moral qualities of one’s activities in the present moment, in other words, bring about effects that are bound to arise in succeeding seconds, minutes, years, or, in the Buddhist view, lifetimes. Buddhist moral theory largely rests on this law of karma, which claims that actions done in the past are justly connected to their consequences in the future, and to the *same being* who performed them.

But this raises a host of questions, for what ensures that every single intentional deed, word, and thought will in fact result in its just effect? If it is indeed the case that beings are reborn with specific potentialities and in circumstances determined by the quality of their prior actions, and yet that there is no real “I” connecting the past actor to the present or future consequence, how can the process of rebirth be explained? Exactly who, or what, is being reborn? And if karma is indeed accurately transmitted, if we will indeed experience the results of our previous actions, right and wrong, and in-between, then by what mechanism can this unfathomable process be explained? How is individual karma actually transmitted between lifetimes?

#### 1.4. The Need for a More Detailed Map of Consciousness

Contemporaneous Buddhist thinkers devoted considerable effort and ingenuity to formulating systematic responses to these vexing questions. Indeed, constructing theories that could adequately explain our incessant coursing through cyclic existence, as well as the possibility of escape therefrom, became a large and diverse scholarly project.

To accomplish this, Abhidharma scholars developed earlier Buddhist models of mind into ever more elaborate schemata for analyzing mind and mental processes, along with an expanding technical terminology. They classified human cognition into six types, according to their specific cognitive functions based upon contact between the respective cognitive faculties and their correlative cognitive objects. This is readily intelligible today since it corresponds quite well with the basic model understood by modern psychology: the first five modes of cognition are none other than our five senses, while the sixth is “mind,” broadly interpreted. The principal activity of mind is *thought*, which is conducted chiefly through concepts—linguistic constructs and mental images. The faculty of mind, as understood by Abhidharmists, has three principal objects: (1) perceptions associated with the five sense consciousnesses, (2) linguistic constructs and concepts, and (3) images and other symbols generated through memory.

While this simple model of five sense consciousnesses along with a sixth, thinking consciousness, may suffice for understanding everyday cognition during a single lifetime, its inherent limitations become apparent when addressing the processes of death and rebirth in connection with the accumulation of karmic potential. When the body passes away, the sense faculties lose their material bases and mental consciousness loses its objects. Thus all six forms of consciousnesses effectively cease at the time of death. So how does consciousness continue from one life to the next if there is no transcendent, enduring self, or *ātman*? And even during our present lifetime, there are occasions when thinking consciousness is completely interrupted, such as during deep sleep or meditative absorption. How is it that our entire being does not disintegrate during these times?

Leaving these questions aside for the moment, one could even ask how it is that we are able to maintain awareness of anything at all? Even in everyday life we do not experience completely continuous awareness—conscious and uninterrupted—of all the thoughts we have ever produced and all the experiences we have ever undergone. This is impossible; it would create an unmanageable burden on all our faculties almost immediately. Yet, after a thought or a sensory experience ceases, we are able to remember it in the future, even though it has long since passed from our conscious awareness. And not only can we recall things that we are no longer conscious of, but we are also able to accumulate and build upon distinctive forms of knowledge and specific mental and physical skills,

such as learning tennis or a foreign language or algebra. Where do all these bodies of information and sets of skill persist? And how is it we are able to retrieve them when the need arises?

### 1.5. Yogācāra: The Middle Path and Mind-Only

It was precisely within this milieu, informed by Abhidharmic inquiries yet moderated by Mādhyamika analyses, that Yogācāra began to take form in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Common Era. On the one hand, it absorbed the deconstructive analytic of the Madhyamaka school, with its well-articulated notion of emptiness, while on the other hand it attempted to refine the psychological analyses of the Abhidharmists, especially concerning the continuity of consciousness.

The term “Yogācāra” is composed of two components, *yoga* and *ācāra*. *Yoga* in this context refers to meditative analysis, while *ācāra* means “practice.”<sup>28</sup> In short, this school arose as a system of meditative practices aimed toward liberation from ignorance and suffering. To this end, the Yogācāra masters sought to formulate a comprehensive and rational account of the psychological/spiritual processes involved in human experience, including a thoroughgoing deconstruction of our tendencies to reify experience in terms of selves and things.

The principal founders of the Yogācāra school are traditionally considered to be Maitreyanātha, Asaṅga, and Vasubandhu. While concrete biographical details on the first figure are vague at best,<sup>29</sup> the latter two—half-brothers who lived in India during the late fourth and early fifth centuries<sup>30</sup>—are the authors of the most important formative texts of the tradition. The Yogācāra school was subsequently developed by such figures as Dignāga (ca. 480–540)<sup>31</sup> and Sthiramati (470–550)<sup>32</sup> before it declined in India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The school’s doctrines were exported to Tibet and East Asia, where they had significant influence.

If Madhyamaka’s main thrust is a recasting of the Buddha’s teaching of dependent arising and the middle path in terms of the theory of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), then Yogācāra arises as a reinterpretation of Madhyamaka’s teaching of emptiness—in the continuing context of the dependent arising of mind—in terms of Yogācāra theories of mind-only (*citta-mātra*) or representation-only (*viññapti-mātra*). By refocusing on consciousness (*citta/manas/vijñāna*),<sup>33</sup> the Yogācāra school reasserts the fundamental Buddhist concern with direct human experience. The experience of suffering (*duḥkha*) and freedom from suffering (*mokṣa*), also called the “arising and cessation of the world (*loka*),” is considered a “transformation of mind” (*viññāna-pariṇāma*); that is, it occurs in terms of the complex of mind (*citta*) and its associated mental factors (*caitta*). This is the sense of mind-only or representation-only. It is only within our mental experience that the perpetuation (*pravṛtti*) of the world as well as its reversal (*nivṛtti*) occurs.<sup>34</sup> The perpetuation of the world is brought about by reifying the ongoing flux of experience into the static categories of persons (*pudgalas*) and phenomena (*dharmas*).

Reversing this process (*nivṛtti*) is liberating and is brought about by realizing that the reifications of persons and phenomena are merely modes of mental representation, merely transformations of consciousness. They do not reflect reality as it is (*yathābhūtam*). Rather, they reflect the way we mistakenly construe that reality—that is, in terms of the reified entities of selves and things.

Sthiramati succinctly summarizes this philosophical outlook in the opening statement to his commentary on Vasubandhu’s *Triṃśikā*, one of the key Yogācāra texts:

This treatise [the *Triṃśikā*] has been composed for those who are attached [to the view that] persons and phenomena [intrinsically exist] and do not correctly understand mind-only, [to help them] to gradually realize [the true meaning of] representation-only, together with its results, by showing the absence of self in persons and in phenomena.

Again, some think that, like consciousness, objects of consciousness are also real; others think that, like its objects, consciousness exists only conventionally but not ultimately. It is to refute these two extreme views that [the Master] composed this treatise.<sup>35</sup>

In these remarks, in addition to pronouncing on mind-only, Sthiramati enunciates the Yogācāra interpretation of the middle path (*madhyamā-pratīpad*) between the extreme views of naïve realism (or essentialism) and annihilationism. Naïve realism takes both the subject (*pudgala*, or person) and its objects (*viññeya*) as ultimately real—or, more precisely, it takes the elements that constitute the *pudgala* and its objects as ultimately real. The view of annihilationism is the opposite extreme in Sthiramati’s interpretation, since it denies that anything is ultimately real, even consciousness. For Yogācārins, though, consciousness (*viññāna*)—a general label for the mind complex and its mental factors—must exist in some ultimate (*paramārthatas*) or irreducible (*dravyatas*) sense insofar as it serves as the basis for both the continuation and the reversal of cyclic existence. It is *experientially* ultimate or irreducible in the sense that conscious experience, awakened or otherwise, is something we never get outside of.

The Madhyamakas object to this formulation on the grounds that the mind complex and its objects<sup>36</sup> are also empty of inherent existence and that the ultimate truth of emptiness cannot be predicated by any of the four logical possibilities (*catuṣkoṭi*) of existence, nonexistence, both, and neither.<sup>37</sup> In their view, to apply the predicate “exists,” even to something as seemingly self-evident as experience, is misguided if not actually mistaken. For Yogācārins, however, the Madhyamakas’ relentless deconstruction tends toward annihilationism<sup>38</sup> inasmuch as it denies the obvious fact that we experience the world through mind or consciousness, which is the basis of both *samsāra* and *nirvāṇa*. Moreover, in the post-Mādhyamika context the Yogācārins were operating in, to say that



something exists ultimately was not to say that it exists with an inherent nature (*svabhāva*) but to say that it was irreducible.

Nor do the Yogācārins deny that there is some kind of real world. For them, the main problem is how we perceive reality, not what the “world” might be like in and of itself, independent of our engagement with it. It is necessary to know reality as it actually is (*yathābhūtam*), since this leads to liberation, but for this we must see reality directly, unmediated by the representations (*vijñapti*) and rifications constructed by our deluded minds.

The problem, then, is that our deluded or unawakened minds imagine that there are real *pudgalas* and real dharmas. In order to eliminate these tendencies, Yogācārins analyze how they occur, classifying these processes into three modes or transformations of consciousness: *viśaya-vijñapti* (representation of objects), *manana* (reflection), and *vipāka* (ripening).<sup>39</sup> Each of these three modes fulfills a specific function in constructing and sustaining the apparent reality of *pudgalas* and dharmas. The first refers to the six forms of active consciousness (*pravṛtti-vijñāna*)—that is, the five forms of sensory consciousness and conceptual or mental consciousness, which arise in relation to their respective objects. The second is called *manas* (intellect) because mind is constantly reflecting; and insofar as it is constantly conceiving an enduring (yet illusory) self, toward which four basic afflictions continuously arise, it is also referred to as afflicted mind (*kliṣṭa-manas*). The third mode refers to the store consciousness, or *ālaya-vijñāna*.<sup>40</sup> This level of consciousness is called *ālaya*, or “store,” because it retains and records the results of the activities of the other consciousnesses in the form of seeds (*bīja*) and habitual tendencies (*vāsanā*). When conditions are appropriate, the store consciousness provides the seeds, the causes, for the arising of new forms of active consciousness. This is why the store consciousness is called *sarvabījakaṃ* (containing all seeds).<sup>41</sup>

The notion of the store consciousness is an important contribution to Buddhist thought because it resolves both the problems of continuity of mind and the preservation of the effects from past actions, problems that other Abhidharmic models had failed to adequately explain. Since the first seven forms of consciousness are constantly changing from moment to moment and therefore cannot “contain” the karmic seeds, it became necessary to conceptualize the dimension of consciousness that actually did persist, relatively unchangingly, throughout our present lives as well as across multiple lifetimes.<sup>42</sup> The Yogācārins claimed that Śākyamuni Buddha himself taught the idea of store consciousness but that he refrained from teaching it to Hīnayānists lest they mistake it as a self. As the Buddha purportedly taught in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*:

The appropriating consciousness [*ādāna-vijñāna*—a synonym  
for *ālaya-vijñāna*] is profound and subtle,  
Flowing like a torrent with all the seeds.  
I do not reveal it to the spiritually immature,  
Lest they imagine it as a self.<sup>43</sup>



### 1.6. Liberation in Yogācāra

The ultimate goal of the Mahāyāna Buddhist path has always been awakening (*bodhi*). For the Yogācārin as well as other Mahāyānists, to “be awakened” means to realize Buddhahood, with all its salvific implications. Philosophically, this is seen as a process of correcting or eliminating unwholesome mental processes, both affective and cognitive, and replacing them with wholesome emotions and accurate cognitions. This is accomplished through an intricate course of contemplative practice wherein one cultivates ways of seeing oneself and one’s environment as they actually are, not as we imagine them. After all, the elaborate Yogācārin analyses of cognitive processes were developed not to create a better theory of mind but to attain liberation. To this end, the Yogācārin devised a bodhisattva path consisting of forty-one stages (a better-known path consisting of fifty-two stages appears in Tathāgatagarbha, Tiantai, and Huayan works). In the final stages of the Yogācāra path, four classes of consciousness (the five sensory consciousnesses; the sixth, thinking consciousness; the seventh, afflicted-with-self consciousness; and the eighth, store consciousness) are said to be thoroughly purified and their mode of functioning radically transformed. Liberation is thus explained in terms of four transformations: (1) the five sense consciousnesses become able to transcend their normal physical limitations; (2) the sixth, thinking consciousness, is able to discern phenomena with perfect accuracy; (3) the seventh, afflicted-with-self consciousness, is stripped of its self-centeredness and able to perceive the equality of all phenomena; and (4) the store consciousness perfectly reflects all phenomena like a clear mirror, constituting what Mahāyāna Buddhists call omniscience (*sarvajña*). The perfect accomplishment of these four purifications is called transformation of the basis (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*).<sup>44</sup>

### 1.7. Tathāgatagarbha

With its vast array of paths and stages, its obstructions of the afflictions and obstructions to liberation, the diverse proclivities of disparate practitioners, the multiple wisdoms of buddhas and bodhisattvas, and so on, Yogācāra is arguably the most complex and expansive soteriological system in all of Buddhism. Yet it is also clear that for many Mahāyānists, both in India and East Asia, Yogācāra was not just overly theoretical—it also failed to provide an unambiguously positive statement affirming the possibility of universal Buddhahood.

The Yogācārin *did* posit within the store consciousness the presence of “pure seeds” representing the potential for all sentient beings to attain liberation. And since the fundamental character of the store consciousness is karmically indeterminate, sentient beings could always improve themselves through meditative practice and self-reflection. But the doctrine of merely potential liberation, requiring an incalculable number of eons, did not satisfy every Mahāyāna thinker and practitioner, even those working within the same Abhidharma and Yogācāra

milieus. Some needed—or perhaps discerned—a more definitive foundation for the possibility of enlightenment. They thus argued that all sentient beings are already endowed with an intrinsic Buddha mind, whose presence provided not only the impetus toward, but also the assurance of, attaining perfect enlightenment.<sup>45</sup> They called this fundamental Buddha mind *tathāgata-garbha*, the womb or embryo of the Tathāgata.

The Tathāgatagarbha theorists worked in the same milieu as the Yogācāra thinkers and shared many of their basic concepts. Their discourse included the same categorizations of consciousness, the same contemplative practices such as calm abiding (*śamatha*) and insight (*vipaśyanā*), the same paths and stages of practice for attaining liberation, similar analyses of afflictive and cognitive hindrances, the same emphasis on emptiness and compassion for bodhisattva practice, and so forth.

But despite sharing these basic Mahāyāna tropes, the exponents of Tathāgatagarbha sharply diverged from the Yogācāra system, particularly regarding their central tenet, which became increasingly prominent as their tradition developed: the idea that the human mind is, without equivocation, already perfect and pure in its very essence. The Tathāgatagarbha texts clearly state that the basic condition of all sentient beings is effectively equivalent to that of the Tathāgata (Thus-Come One)—except that the original purity at the core of our being is covered over, hidden by affliction and ignorance, thus making its intrinsically pure wisdom-nature unrecognizable and nonfunctional.

Hence, the actual condition of sentient beings is likened to that of an embryo (*garbha*) in a womb. The term *garbha* connotes “covering” and “hiding,” as well as “matrix,” suggesting that the defiled mental and physical container of this originally pure mind also protects and nurtures it as it advances toward manifest perfection. The Tathāgatagarbha scriptures commonly compare this process to that of purifying gold ore, which must be melted down and the dross removed before the underlying, untarnished gold is fully revealed. The *Ratnagotravibhāga*, a seminal Tathāgatagarbha text,<sup>46</sup> presents nine different metaphors illustrating how the essence of the Buddha (i.e., his merits, or *guṇa*) exists amidst the afflictions of *saṃsāra* (i.e., faults, or *doṣa*).<sup>47</sup>

The earliest scripture associated with Tathāgatagarbha is traditionally considered to be the *Śrīmālādevī-sūtra*.<sup>48</sup> The first three-quarters of the sutra are devoted to various Mahāyāna themes, the most important of which is distinguishing bodhisattvas from practitioners of the two lesser vehicles—that is, the direct disciples (*śrāvakas*) and the solitary realizers (*pratyekabuddhas*). The last portion of the sutra introduces the notion of innate enlightenment and finally, close to the end, introduces the term *tathāgatagarbha*.<sup>49</sup> This tradition evolved to such an extent that later Indian texts, such as the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, assert *tathāgatagarbha* right from the beginning and elaborate it throughout the text.

It is their stress on the idea of innate enlightenment that most distinguishes these texts from the definitive works of the Yogācāra school, such as the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, and the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. And although the

Tathāgatagarbha texts do mention the eight modes of consciousness as explained in Yogācāra, they discuss them in much simpler terms and without attending to the entire catalogue of consciousness. Also absent are the detailed investigations of cognition and causation found in many Yogācāra texts. Rather, almost all discussions directly concern soteriology and Buddhist practice.

As the Tathāgatagarbha tradition develops, we see an increasing emphasis on the notion of innate enlightenment, increasingly sophisticated arguments to defend it, and multiplying metaphors to illustrate it. Yet, at the same time, we also see the tradition increasingly borrowing Yogācāra discourse, including its complex technical terminology. Moreover, although this is rarely noted, if we look carefully we can discern influences going in the other direction as well.<sup>50</sup>

### 1.8. Intermixture

As these two systems of thought reached their apex in India and began to profoundly influence East Asian Buddhism, the confluence of their ideas becomes increasingly apparent. Of course, the two had greatly differing soteriological discourses: while the Tathāgatagarbha movement prioritized original purity, or a positive assessment of mind's potential, the Yogācārins emphasized the morally neutral quality of the store consciousness. And while Yogācāra did posit "originally pure seeds"—which is somewhat comparable to the notion of innate Tathāgatahood—it also posited a category of beings called *icchantikas*, who were considered incapable of ever attaining liberation.<sup>51</sup> In East Asia, this was seen as irreconcilable with the view of universal, innate Buddhahood propounded in the Tathāgatagarbha texts, as well as in such profoundly influential Mahāyāna works as the *Lotus Sutra* and the *Nirvana Sutra*—all of which asserted that all living beings will eventually become buddhas, the position that eventually predominated in all of East Asian Mahāyāna.

Moreover, the influence of East Asian Yogācāra would later decline at both a popular and an institutional level, a development historians have generally attributed at least in part to displeasure with the *icchantika* doctrine. Historians of East Asian Buddhism have also pointed out that Yogācāra explorations into the nature of consciousness were too complex and arcane for the common people, who were largely illiterate.<sup>52</sup>

Despite all these differences, however, we can see within the development of the Tathāgatagarbha texts an increasing confluence with, and sometimes outright inclusion of, Yogācāra doctrines that explain both the existence of this originally pure mind and its gradual path to liberation. While earlier Tathāgatagarbha works do not present fully fleshed-out theories of eight consciousnesses and so forth, it is not unusual to see a mention of the *ālaya-vijñāna*, sometimes directly identified with the *tathāgatagarbha*, as for example, in the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*:

Mahāmati, if there were no Tathāgatagarbha referred to as *ālayavijñāna*, then, in the absence of the Tathāgatagarbha referred to

as *ālayavijñāna*, no evolution, no deterioration would take place. But evolution and deterioration belong to both the immature and the noble ones. Also, while abiding in a pleasant state during the present life and future noble destiny due to their inner consciousness, the yogins do not cast off their burden and are hard to deflect. Mahāmāti, this domain of Tathāgatagarbha *ālayavijñāna* is intrinsically pure, but is impure because it has been defiled by the adventitious defilements going with the discursive views of all the Disciples, Self-Enlightened ones, and heretics. Not so the Tathāgatas! They have direct perception of that domain, like a myrobalan fruit [manifesting (itself)] on the palm of the hand. This, Mahāmāti, I revealed in connection with Queen Śrīmālā and I empowered other Bodhisattvas of subtle, wise, and pure discrimination [to know] that there is the Tathāgatagarbha referred to as *ālayavijñāna*, along with seven perceptions (*vijñāna*), for the sake of revealing the egolessness of dharmas to the Disciples attached to its evolution. The Tathāgata realm that was revealed when I empowered Queen Śrīmālā is not a realm accessible to the Disciples, Self-Enlightened ones, heretics, and logicians.<sup>53</sup>

The *Ratnagotravibhāga* occasionally mentions what are, in effect, the equivalents of the eight consciousnesses.<sup>54</sup> And the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, in particular, not only utilizes such specific Yogācāra terms as *ālaya-vijñāna*, *manas*, and *mano-vijñāna* (conceptualizing consciousness) and concepts as seeds, perfuming, and so on but also, as the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* does, identifies *ālaya-vijñāna* with the innate *tathāgatagarbha*. These developments in the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, and the *Ratnagotravibhāga* are followed, both historically and doctrinally, by the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*,<sup>55</sup> which assembles the most important concepts from both the Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha traditions in a single, tightly argued fascicle.

### 1.9. The Base Consciousness: Pure, Defiled, Neither, or Both

Later developments of Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha thought in both India and China evince other forms of confluence—as well as a wealth of complications, as the schools, lineages, and authors identified with one tradition are often credited with works produced in the other. This confusing situation is especially evident in sixth-century China, when both the Dilun school<sup>56</sup>—which soon broke into two lineages—and the Shelun school emerged. The southern branch of Dilun was based on the views of Ratnamati (fifth–sixth centuries), who was followed by the eminent scholars Fashang (495–580) and Huiyuan (523–592), while the northern branch adhered to the interpretations of Bodhiruci (?–527). The Shelun school was formed around the doctrine articulated in the translation by

Paramārtha (499–569) of the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, a seminal Yogācāra treatise composed by Asaṅga.

The major doctrinal differences between these schools derived from their distinctive schemes for analyzing consciousness. Some scholars posited seven consciousnesses, others posited eight, and scholars such as Paramārtha posited nine—the ninth being an undefiled (*amala*) consciousness. Even among those groups who held an eight-consciousness model there were various interpretations concerning the nature and composition of the store consciousness, its relationship to the defilements, the objects of the world, thusness (*tathatā*), and so forth. For some, the eighth consciousness was wholly grounded in worldly conditions and therefore inherently defiled. For others, the eighth consciousness was equal to the pure ground of reality, and defilement was found only in the first seven. There were also thinkers who considered the eighth consciousness to be simultaneously defiled and pure, but they understood this dual modality in different ways. Differences could also be seen between the earlier and later writings of individual scholars (such as Huiyuan), as well as differences in their way of explaining consciousness, depending upon which text they were interpreting.<sup>57</sup> As we shall see, Wōnhyo could not but grapple with all of these differing perspectives.

### 1.10. The Xuanzang Effect

In this light, practically speaking, there was no sharp distinction to be seen between the Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha traditions in China prior to Xuanzang's return from India in 645 and that which could be gleaned from his subsequent translations of the major texts of Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, and other Yogācārin. Clear lines were drawn, however, with Xuanzang's publication of the *Cheng wei-shi lun*, where he set out a new understanding of the Yogācāra system gained from his extensive studies in India and the wide range of texts he had worked on, the most important of which was the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*. His retranslations of Yogācāra texts that Paramārtha had previously translated also helped delineate the clear differences in their respective understandings of key Yogācāra doctrines, particularly their philosophies of mind. Paramārtha, especially in the Tathāgatagarbha-oriented texts, tended to equate the deepest stratum of mind with an unsullied thusness, whereas Xuanzang, in the *Cheng wei-shi lun* as well as the *Yogācārabhūmi* and others, understood the most fundamental dimension of mind, *ālaya-vijñāna*, as neutral at best.<sup>58</sup>

Wōnhyo's appearance in East Asian Buddhist history at this particular time could hardly have been more auspicious, since his activities spanned the period from before Xuanzang's return to Tang-dynasty China until well after his imperially funded team provided so many valuable new translations. Over this entire period there was an unprecedented influx of new Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha texts, as well as other major Mahāyāna works (including the *Nirvana Sutra* and the *Lotus Sutra*, works on Madhyamaka, scriptures in the

traditions of esoteric Buddhism, Pure Land, and the like). Wōnhyo was one of the first major commentators to be able to take full advantage of this new knowledge. As explained in the introduction to “The System of the Two Hindrances” in this volume, the availability of Xuanzang’s new translations gave Wōnhyo a tremendous advantage over earlier commentators on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, such as Jingying Huiyuan (who worked almost a century earlier), for he was able to draw extensively upon Xuanzang’s translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, perhaps the single most important source for the systematization of the technical terminology for the mental processes involved in the production of affliction and nescience. His commentaries on other seminal texts, such the *Nirvana Sutra*, the Pure Land sutras, and so forth, also drew on the wide range of sources newly provided by Xuanzang’s work. Furthermore, unlike many of his contemporaries whose work was constrained by specific doctrinal affiliations (such as Huayan and Tiantai), Wōnhyo was free to evaluate texts and doctrines based on a much broader, effectively pan-Mahāyāna perspective.

### I.II. The Fate of East Asian Yogācāra

The Yogācāra school came to be defined in East Asian Buddhism in two different ways, reflected in its two names. The first name—“consciousness-only” (Ch. *weishi*; K. *yusik*)—refers to one of its central, yet most difficult, tenets: the epistemological point that nothing in the world is apprehended apart from one’s various cognitive processes. The name that eventually came to identify the school, however—“characteristics of phenomena” (Ch. *faxiang*; K. *pōpsang*)—was, interestingly enough, originally used by a rival school to disparage Yogācāra. Huayan Buddhism (K. Hwaōm), a school with strong Tathāgatagarbha roots, was one of the major rivals to Xuanzang’s Weishi circle in the early Tang period. Its proponents claimed that their own system focused on the true inner nature of phenomena (Ch. *faxing*; K. *pōpsōng*), unlike the Weishi school, which, they argued, was absorbed in the superficial manifestations of things—hence, they referred to it as the school that dwells on the “characteristics of things.” The name “Faxiang” ended up sticking, and so this tradition was transmitted as such to both Korea and Japan. In Korea, although Yogācāra thought in general made a deep and lasting impact, Pōpsang as a distinct school did not endure for more than a couple of centuries. In Japan, on the other hand, the equivalent school—Hossō—became one of the most powerful Buddhist institutions, throughout the Heian and early Kamakura periods. And though it was eventually relegated to a minor role in Japanese Buddhism following the ascendance of Tiantai, Zen, and Pure Land, the Hossō school still exists in Japan, with its headquarters at the Kōfukuji in Nara. Hossō continues as the formal name for this tradition, with no pejorative connotations.

In China, the Faxiang school itself would eventually die out, succumbing first to the native Chinese doctrinal systems of Tiantai and Huayan and finally to the

popular, more lay-oriented schools of Pure Land and Chan. Although “Tathāgatagarbha” never existed as a distinct sect, its basic premise of innate Buddhahood continued to form the doctrinal core of all other East Asian schools, particularly Tiantai, Huayan, Pure Land, and Chan. Similarly, although Weishi/Yusik disappeared as a distinct school, the surviving East Asian schools nonetheless continued to rely on the concepts and schemata developed by Yogācāra whenever they were called upon to provide doctrinal explanations of such phenomena as karma, rebirth, and the gradual course to liberation.

### I.12. Yogācāra Influences on Wōnhyo

An oft-cited narrative in Wōnhyo’s hagiography is that of his enlightenment experience, which is said to have occurred while he was attempting to travel to Tang China with his colleague Ŭisang (625–702), apparently to study the Yogācāra doctrine under Xuanzang.<sup>59</sup> According to the hagiographic accounts, what stopped Wōnhyo from pursuing this opportunity to go to the Tang was none other than a major awakening experience.

As the story goes, when Wōnhyo and Ŭisang arrived at their port of embarkation, their ship’s departure was delayed by inclement weather. Caught in the rain and without a place to stay, they took shelter for the night in a nearby cave, where they found gourds from which to drink and so were able to get a decent night’s sleep. In the light of the dawn, they realized that the cave in which they were staying was actually a tomb and that the “gourds” from which they had drunk were human skulls. The storm continued, delaying their departure for another day, and they were forced to spend another night in the same cave. During their second night in the cave they were unable to sleep, being plagued by ghosts and nightmares. As Wōnhyo reflected on this experience, he suddenly became deeply aware of the extent to which his perception of the world was based on the limits of his own mind. He experienced a great awakening to the principle of consciousness-only, after which he decided that there was, after all, no need to go to China in search of the Dharma. He explained his experience thus: “Because of the arising of thought, various phenomena arise; since thought ceases, a cave and a grave are not two.” (This is a reference to the verse in the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* that says, “When a thought arises, all dharmas arise, and when a thought ceases, all dharmas disappear.” T 1666:32.577b22.) And so he said: “Since there are no dharmas outside the mind, why should I seek them somewhere? I will not go to the Tang.”<sup>60</sup> Regardless of the historical accuracy of this story, it is significant for the way it has come to define the character of Wōnhyo’s religious views, his nonsectarianism, his independence, and the combined rational and nonrational character of his religious insights.

Wōnhyo’s oeuvre is permeated throughout by Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha discourse, and not only in his direct commentarial work on Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha texts. He relied on these two systems for explicating a wide



range of Mahāyāna texts from many other schools. Though it has rarely been emphasized in historical scholarship, it is hard to overstate the influence of Yogācāra thinking on Wŏnhyo's thought—notwithstanding the fact that Korean, as well as Japanese and Chinese, traditions have tended to associate him with the Hwaŏm (Huayan) school.

This association is no doubt due to a variety of factors. For one, Wŏnhyo was generally considered a “harmonizer,” and “harmonization” is more typically associated in East Asian Buddhist discourse with Hwaŏm than with other traditions. In the same vein, traditional histories tend to list Wŏnhyo as the “patriarch” of a “dharma-nature” (Pŏpsŏng) tradition, which has close associations with both Hwaŏm and Tathāgatagarbha textual lineages. Wŏnhyo's association with these systems may have also been accentuated by one of his greatest admirers in China, the renowned Huayan scholar Fazang (643–712). Fazang relied heavily on Wŏnhyo in writing his own commentary on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* and was keenly aware of Wŏnhyo's other writings, especially the *System of the Two Hindrances*. At the same time, since Fazang was critical of the Xuanzang-Kuji stream of East Asian Yogācāra—which, as noted above, he also pejoratively called *pŏpsang* (dharma-character)—he would not have been likely to emphasize that dimension of Wŏnhyo's work. Added to this is the fact that Wŏnhyo's commentaries on the major Yogācāra texts, such as the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*, the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, the *Cheng weishi lun*, and so forth, are either wholly lost or extant only in small fragments; thus most of his work directly connected with Yogācāra texts has had little historical influence.

Nonetheless, an analysis of the content and character of Wŏnhyo's writings, taking into account his favored hermeneutic framework, lends little support to the claim that his overall scholarly output exhibits a pervasive Hwaŏm orientation. If we look at the entire list of more than two hundred works attributed to him, the largest group by far belongs to the Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha traditions.

First are the Yogācāra commentaries in a fairly narrow sense, including the following:

- *Yuga ch'o* (Extracts of the *Yogācārabhūmi*; four fascicles, not extant)
- *Yugaron chungsil* (Marrow of the *Yogācārabhūmi*; five fascicles, not extant)
- *Sŏng yusik non chong'yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the *Cheng weishi lun*; four fascicles, not extant)
- *Yang sŏmnon so ch'o* (Exegetical Notes on the Liang Translation of the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*; one fascicle, not extant)
- *Sŏp taesūng non Sech'in sŏk non yakki* (Summary Notes on Vasubandhu's Commentary to the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*; four fascicles, not extant)



- *Sōp taesŭng non so* (Commentary on the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*; four fascicles, not extant)
- *Chungbyōn punbyōllon so* (Commentary on the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*; four fascicles, only third fascicle extant)
- *Apidalma chapchip non so* (Commentary on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*; twelve fascicles, not extant)
- *Hae simmil kyōng so* (Commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*; three fascicles, only fragments of the introduction extant)

There are an additional six commentaries and essays on Tathāgatagarbha texts:

- *Sŭngman kyōng so* (Commentary on the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*; two fascicles, not extant)
- *Pujŭng pulgam kyōng so* (Commentary on the *Sutra of Neither Reification nor Annihilation*; one fascicle, not extant)
- *Posal yōngnak pon'ōp kyōng so* (Commentary on the *Pusa yingluo benye jing*; three fascicles, only third fascicle extant)
- *Posōng non chong'yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the *Ratnagotravibhāga*; one fascicle, not extant)
- *Posōng non yogan* (Analysis of the *Ratnagotravibhāga*; one fascicle, not extant)
- *Kugyōng ilsŭng posōng non kwamun* (Analysis of the Ultimate Single Vehicle *Ratnagotravibhāga*; one fascicle, not extant)

He also commented on texts that can be categorized as composites of both streams:

- *Nŭngga kyōng so* (Commentary on the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*; seven fascicles, not extant)
- *Nŭng kyōng chong'yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*; one fascicle, not extant)
- *Taesŭng kisillon so* (Commentary on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*; two fascicles, extant)
- *Taesŭng kisillon pyōlgi* (Expository Notes on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*; one fascicle, extant)
- *Yijang ūi* (System of the Two Hindrances; one fascicle, extant)
- Six other *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*-related commentarial works, totaling six fascicles, not extant

Finally, there are the logic commentaries, which can be considered part of the Yogācāra system:

- *Inmyōng ip chōngni non ki* (Notes on the *Nyāyapraveśa*; not extant)
- *P'an piryang non* (Critical Discussion on Inference; fragment extant)

Merely tabulating the number of texts or their volume in fascicles, however, tells only a small part of the story. What is more significant is the overwhelming extent to which Wŏnhyo relied on Yogācāra texts—most frequently, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*—as a source for the doctrinal explanations in his commentaries. Indeed, although it may well be argued that he considered the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* or perhaps the \**Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* as the summum bonum of Mahāyāna Buddhist thought<sup>61</sup>—based on statements Wŏnhyo made in various places or on patterns discernible in his (hypothesized) career course—it is nevertheless clear that he relies far more on the *Yogācārabhūmi* throughout his exegetical writings than on any other work. This is true not only for his commentaries on Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha texts themselves but for almost everything else as well, including commentaries on Vinaya, logic, state protection, and Pure Land. Simply put, Wŏnhyo treated the *Yogācārabhūmi* as the master encyclopedia for all mind-related doctrines, a source where he could find almost anything he needed.

Instructive in this regard are Wŏnhyo's Pure Land commentaries.<sup>62</sup> One might expect, given developments in the later East Asian Pure Land tradition, to see an extensive explanation by Wŏnhyo on topics such as faith in other-power, or the attributes of Amitābha, based on references to other, Pure Land-related works. Instead, Wŏnhyo relies almost exclusively on the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* to resolve the potential breaches in the standard Buddhist commitment to the law of cause and effect that he sees in these scriptures. He asks, for example, how it could be possible, in the context of mainstream Buddhist karmic theory, that practitioners could attain a state of advanced liberation, such as that implied by rebirth in the Pure Land, by merely repeating the name of the Buddha; or how the mere existence of something like a Pure Land, with all its marvelous animals and vegetation, could be explained by that same system of cause and effect. In answering these questions, Wŏnhyo has no recourse but to rely on the categories of buddha-bodies, the different levels of practitioners and so forth, that are explained in the greatest detail in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and other Yogācāra texts.<sup>63</sup>

### 1.13. Buddhist Logic

In this introduction to the Yogācāra system, we have heretofore focused on Yogācārin explanations of the structure and function of human consciousness, paying specific attention to cognitive and soteriological problems. Another important component of the Yogācāra tradition, however, and one that contributed to the systematic way that Wŏnhyo presented his theoretical positions, is that of Buddhist logic (*hetuvidyā*). But since Dan Lusthaus has provided a thorough introduction to Buddhist logic attached to his translation in this volume, along with some comments about the way Wŏnhyo understood and used this logic, we ask the reader to see that section.

## 2. Wŏnhyo as “Harmonizer”

### 2.1. The Meaning of *Hwajaeng*

The term that has come down to modern times to characterize the distinctive style of Wŏnhyo’s commentarial work is the Sino-Korean *hwajaeng*, which has commonly been rendered into English as “harmonization” or “reconciliation.” The Sinitic term itself can be misleading, and its English renderings have the danger of leading us further astray from understanding the application of the concept in the context of Wŏnhyo’s project. The term *hwajaeng* is originally used in the Chinese translations of the scriptures and Vinaya primarily to refer to the resolution of a personal squabble among members of the sangha. In the context of Wŏnhyo’s writings, however, it should be defined as something like “the commensuration of divergent doctrinal positions based on a thoroughgoing inquiry into their underpinnings and the background and motivations of their proponents.”

Within Wŏnhyo’s writings, the term actually appears only twice: once in the title of his major essay, the *Simmun hwajaeng non* (Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies, hereafter *SHN*—but the term itself does not appear in the actual text of this work), and once in the *Yŏlban chong’yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the *Nirvana Sutra*). Thus it is natural, once one begins to dig into this topic, to ask how this particular term came to characterize Wŏnhyo’s project.<sup>64</sup> The first answer to this question lies in accepting the notion that the impact of the *Simmun hwajaeng non* on the Silla Buddhist world of Wŏnhyo’s day was extensive,<sup>65</sup> a position that is buttressed by Wŏnhyo’s posthumous title, which ended up being “National Master of the Harmonization of Disputes.”<sup>66</sup> Additionally, virtually no scholar denies that Wŏnhyo’s work demonstrates a strongly distinctive tendency toward the effort of proving a unity within the Mahāyāna system based on repeated demonstrations that apparent differences are grounded in the personal approaches and agendas of individual scholars and movements, rather than being the result of some kind of contradiction inherent in the content of the Buddha’s teaching.

The rendering of *hwajaeng* into English as “harmonization of disputes” or “reconciliation of doctrinal controversies” can be misleading without a sufficient explanation of background and content. Wŏnhyo may have indeed at times been dealing with live disputes, and he was clearly dealing with current doctrinal controversies. But what he was attempting to do more broadly in his writings was much the same in its underlying motivation as the work of rest of the great East Asian commentators of the sixth to eighth centuries in China and Korea: he was trying to make sense of the wide range of disparate strands of teaching that had been pouring into East Asia under the broad rubric of Mahāyāna Buddhism. The traditions associated with Prajñāpāramitā, the *Nirvana Sutra*, Satyasiddhi,<sup>67</sup> Yogācāra, the *Lotus Sutra*, Pure Land, the *Flower Ornament Sutra*, Madhyama, the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, state protection, logic, and so forth

each had their distinctive perspectives on the Buddhist teachings, and certain aspects of their doctrines were incommensurate with each other.

The leading figures of the East Asian exegetical community during the sixth through eighth centuries had settled down to a customary way of dealing with these complications—complications that tested the integrity of the Mahāyāna system and that also made it difficult for any single tradition to claim to be the possessor of the most complete or most effective form of the teaching. The method that became predominant was that of *p'angyo* (Ch. *panjiao*), or doctrinal classification, the primary hermeneutic strategy of East Asian Buddhist scholars for more than three centuries. Faced as they were with sorting out the range of doctrinal streams still coming into East Asia from India and Central Asia, along with newly developing indigenous doctrinal and practical traditions, and at the same time needing to preserve the meaning and power of scriptural authority across the spectrum of acknowledged canonical texts (i.e., they could not simply say that their favorite scripture was “right” and the other scriptures were “wrong”; in fact, they really could not even directly say that one scripture was “better” than another), they devised teleological categories of Buddhist scriptures and treatises that ranged from the primitive to the advanced (the advanced were usually called “complete,” “perfect,” “final,” etc.), from the narrow to the all-inclusive, from the incomplete to the fully revealed, and so forth. And of course, the most advanced, inclusive, or complete scripture would be the one prized by one’s own school or tradition, with all of the rest being relegated to the status of its propaedeutics. An unavoidable task, then, of most serious East Asian exegetes from roughly the fifth to eighth centuries was that of deciding to which compartment a particular text belonged and then making the argument for assigning it there.

## 2.2. Not Doing *P'angyo*

While not denying the historical development of the doctrines of the various Buddhist schools, Wōnhyo seems to have also seen the move toward compartmentalization as a way of avoiding the task of precisely identifying and articulating the reasons for the discrepancies.<sup>68</sup> He tended to go in the opposite direction: rather than creating a teleological edifice in which to pigeonhole texts and doctrines, he tried to dig into the assumptions, circumstances, and specific aims of the author of a given sutra or *śāstra*, to clearly discern the sources of the divergence.

While a significant portion of Wōnhyo’s exegetical analyses that worked toward providing an interface for mutual understanding between ostensibly incommensurate views took up differences between major traditions such as Madhyamaka and Yogācāra, he tended to pay even more attention to subtler disagreements between thinkers and scholars who were generally seen as members of the same tradition. Thus in his *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra,”* he treats the positions of six scholars who all basically accept the premise of

innate Buddhahood but who do so with various interpretations. And in the *System of the Two Hindrances* he compares the divergent positions taken within a group of Yogācāra scholars, all of whom assume the existence of the *ālaya-vijñāna* but differ in the way they define the details of its character and function.

*Hwajaeng* is the guiding force that penetrates Wŏnhyo's writings. We can see him again and again taking the differing positions of various schools or scholars, investigating them exhaustively until identifying their precise point of divergence, and then showing how differences in fundamental background, motivation, or sectarian bias on the part of the proponents of those particular doctrinal positions lead to the production of apparent conflicts. The end result of his inquiry is invariably that of seeing a way through the apparent contradictions inherent in two or more positions, to show how, when differences exist, it is usually for a clearly intelligible, logically explicable reason.

### 2.3. Approaches to the Study of *Hwajaeng*

Despite the centrality of *hwajaeng* in Wŏnhyo's thought and work, we do not as of yet have in a Western language a full-length study of this topic. Almost all of us who work seriously with Wŏnhyo have acknowledged the importance of *hwajaeng* in the introductions to our books and translations and sometimes in articles, including, at least, Sung Bae Park, Robert Buswell, Jörg Plassen, and myself.<sup>69</sup> But these discussions have been partial, dealing with *hwajaeng* from a specific angle, or in the specific context of the text under discussion, with only a minimal amount of attention paid to examples in other texts or to the overall methodology and underpinnings of this exegetical practice. There are numerous works on the topic in Korean, as well as several useful articles in Japanese. Treatments of *hwajaeng* have been done with different aims and approaches, which we can categorize briefly as follows:

1. Inquiries of textual origins and sources for influences that stimulated Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng* tendencies. An example is the work by Ishii Kōsei,<sup>70</sup> identifying influences on Wŏnhyo's harmonization in Jizang, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, and so forth. Jörg Plassen identifies the influence coming from Laozi, Wangbi, and Zhuangzi through Sengzhao.<sup>71</sup> Ishii's and Plassen's studies of the prior influences that contributed to the development of Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng* are well documented.
2. Discussions of thematic bases for his *hwajaeng* thought, typified by the argument for the grounding of Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng* tendencies in the One Mind doctrine, which is the main focus of Bhikṣuṇī Jeon Haeju and is also discussed to some extent by Sung Bae Park. In Haeju's establishment of the One Mind as the basis for Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng*, she includes an extensive argument attempting to

demonstrate that Hwaōm (Huayan) is the major influence on Wōnhyo's harmonizing tendencies.<sup>72</sup> Running close to this theme is the explanation made by Satō Shigeki of the grounding of *hwajaeng* in the “no duality yet no unity” framework of the \**Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*.<sup>73</sup>

3. Discussions of the mechanics of the discourse through which the work of *hwajaeng* is actually carried out, such as that of Park Chong Hong and Sung Bae Park. Fukushi Jinin also covers this approach from a historical perspective, while additionally reviewing works related to all categories (but not distinguishing them according to these present categories).<sup>74</sup>
4. Discussions of the *methodology* of Wōnhyo's *hwajaeng*—the kinds of tropes and literary techniques he uses to carry out his commensuration of disparate positions. One of the most prominent, which has been noted by many scholars, is that of *kae-hap*, or “opening and sealing,” which is closely related to his penchant for establishing and refuting the same notion in a single passage. We will address this below, along with some other rhetorical techniques.

One point that is readily acknowledged by scholars as a by-product or component of *hwajaeng* but actually can be seen as a causal factor, especially in comparison with the *p'angyo* inclinations of Wōnhyo's colleagues, is that he was not affiliated with any particular school. Much of the motivation and very structure of the *p'angyo* practice was the valorization of the school or tradition to which one belonged and, thus, the specific text or family of texts that that tradition held to be the consummation of the Buddhist teachings. Wōnhyo was the only major commentator who was not a founding patriarch or a member of the lineage of a distinct tradition, and thus he had no institutionally governed obligation to set a particular teaching on top and the others below. One might well raise the chicken-or-egg question as to whether it was his basic *hwajaeng* orientation that led him to be nonsectarian, or the other way around, but nonetheless he did not have this formal restriction in place when he went to work.

This is not to say that Wōnhyo did not have his own preferences as to what constituted a more profound or widely applicable interpretation of the Buddha Dharma or a more rigorously developed theory. It seems fairly clear that he personally preferred an innate-Buddhahood interpretation of Mahāyāna over a Consciousness-only position of overall moral karmic indeterminacy of the mind; but this does not lead to any systematic disparagement or relegation of the Yogācāra teachings. On the other hand, in terms of hermeneutic sources, Wōnhyo relies on Yogācāra texts more than on those of any other single tradition. This reliance attests to the strongly rational and systematic bent of his writing, as the doctrines of any distinguishable strain of discourse—whether they be from the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, *Amitābha-sūtra*, *Lotus Sutra*, or any other Mahāyāna scripture—must pass the tests of logical validity and of consistency

with Mahāyāna Buddhist principles of individuated cause and effect, which happen to be explained in the greatest detail in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and other Yogācāra works.<sup>75</sup> Wōnhyo makes his evaluations based more on his own learning and predilections than for the purpose of providing added weight to any certain doctrinal system. Therefore there is a distinctive level of fairness that he brings to his work.

There are modern-day scholars with affinities with certain traditions who tend to try to identify Wōnhyo with their own tradition—something that he probably would have found amusing. Of course, occasional references to Wōnhyo in East Asian commentarial works indicate him to be of Huayan lineage. But support for the position of Huayan association is difficult to establish based on a full and balanced reading of his extant corpus or the titles of his nonextant works.<sup>76</sup>

#### 2.4. Wōnhyo's Writings, Logic, and Modes of Inquiry

Wōnhyo was extremely prolific, having produced over two hundred fascicles in more than eighty works. Among these, twenty-two works are extant either in full or fragmentarily.<sup>77</sup> He composed commentaries on almost all of the most important texts from the major Mahāyāna traditions being studied in China at the time, with the exception of esoteric Buddhism. Doctrinal traditions covered in his works include the traditions of Prajñāpāramitā, Three-Treatise (Madhyamaka), Nirvāṇa, Tathāgatagarbha, Lotus, Tiantai, Vinaya, Pure Land, Yogācāra, state protection, Huayan, and Buddhist logic.

Wōnhyo's writing exhibits a few readily distinguishable modes of prose and poetic style. These are sometimes associated with a particular philosophical influence or a distinctive type of hermeneutic or discursive approach, of which several intertwining types can be identified. One of the first forms that can be discerned in the writings of Wōnhyo is a lyrical mode that emulates Daoist style, most notably the *Daode jing*.<sup>78</sup> This mode, especially seen in the prefatory sections of his works, serves mainly to elaborate and praise the attributes of the Dharma, the Great Vehicle (Mahāyāna), enlightenment, and so forth. It is powerful in its ability to describe something wondrous and inconceivable, but it is not applied in the development of any sort of specific doctrinal position. The verses that constitute the prolegomena to Wōnhyo's commentaries are invariably accompanied by or blended with an exercise in inconceivability, using examples of space, time, and so on, as can be seen, for example, in the prolegomenon to his commentary on the *Flower Ornament Sutra*.

Now, in the unhindered and unobstructed dharma-opening of the dharma-realm there is no dharma, and yet no nondharma; no opening, and yet no nonopening. Thus it is neither large nor small, neither in a hurry nor taking its time; neither moving nor still, neither one nor many. Not large, it can become an atom, leaving nothing behind. Not small, it can contain all of space with room left over. Unhurried,



it can include all the kalpas in the three time periods; not taking its time, it can enter fully into an instant. Neither moving nor still, *saṃsāra* is *nirvāṇa* and *nirvāṇa* is *saṃsāra*. Neither one nor many, one dharma is all dharmas and all dharmas are one dharma. (HPC 1.495a6–10)

This passage is also useful for introducing the rhetorical strategy of *kae-hap*—a literary practice that is somewhat reminiscent of the Chan trope of “rolling out and taking back up”—that is stressed by many modern scholars as one of Wŏnhyo’s strategies that works toward the disallowing of attachment to a given position. Park Chong Hong characterizes this as:

“Open” [*kae* 開] opens up to the reader the vast numbers of different ideas presented in a text, while “combine” [*hap* 合] provides a synthetic perspective that can reveal how those various ideas complement one another. When both the hermeneutics of opening and combining hermeneutics are applied simultaneously in the explication of a text, one is free to advocate certain positions and to critique others. One can open up for analysis different viewpoints without creating unnecessary complications, as well as combine those viewpoints into a single overriding perspective without creating untoward parochialism. Put another way, treating a text either analytically or synthetically neither adds anything to it nor takes anything away. Hence, one may advocate something without gaining anything, or critique something else without losing anything. (Park Chong Hong, *Han’guk sasang sa*, pp. 49–50; slightly modified from Robert Buswell’s translation as “Wŏnhyo’s Philosophical Thought” [Park Chong Hong 1991])

We can readily agree that this kind of *kae-hap* stylistic strategy is distinctive in, and used by, Wŏnhyo in his prolegomena and some places in his exegetical writings. Some caution is warranted, though, in asserting its role in Wŏnhyo’s writings to the extreme suggested by Park and those who follow him on this, in that so far the only examples that have been provided of its application have been like the above passage—from the short prefaces and prolegomena to Wŏnhyo’s commentarial writings. No doubt special attention should be paid to these prefaces, as they represent the essence of his thought and skills of literary expression. But it is much more difficult to demonstrate its consistent application in the exegetical portions of Wŏnhyo’s works, and a number of complicated things are going on there.<sup>79</sup>

Another prominent form of discourse utilized by Wŏnhyo is a paradoxical logic reminiscent of the Prajñāpāramitā texts, which goes something like this: “Since there is nothing that is shown, there is nothing that is not shown. Since there is nothing to attain, there is nothing that is not attained” (*Doctrinal Essentials of the “Great Perfection of Wisdom Sutra”*; HPC 1.480a16–17; T



1697:33.68c4–5). In this case, rather than taking a point to the limit of its logical extension, as in the Daoistic mode discussed above, Wŏnhyo makes a series of paradoxical statements that reflect an understanding of the logic of emptiness (*śūnyatā*). This mode often ends up being indistinguishable from another favorite approach, the “negation of negation” as seen in Mādhyamika logic and used throughout Wŏnhyo’s writings. At the same time it should be noted that this is, like his other rhetorical strategies, not something that he adheres to exclusively.

Mixed in with these borrowings from classical Chinese and Indian Buddhist modes of discourse are East Asian approaches, such as a reliance on the paradigm of essence-function (*ch’e-yong*). Wŏnhyo moves seamlessly among these modes, combining them to execute his detailed arguments that ultimately assert the integrity of the Mahāyāna system.

### **2.5. Philological Analysis: Terminological Bases for *Hwajaeng***

As noted earlier, aside from its appearance in the title of the *SHN*, the word *hwajaeng* appears only once in Wŏnhyo’s writings—in the *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra,”* in the section where he explains the four attributes of the eternal body of the Buddha (*dharmakāya*). There we read:

Sixth is the distinction of the four attributes, which are outlined into four approaches: (1) the approach of revealing their marks; (2) the approach of defining them; (3) the approach of distinguishing them, and (4) the approach of harmonizing [*hwajaeng*] them. (T 1769:38.245b24)

In the section on the fourth approach, that of harmonizing, we read:

Next is the fourth, the clarification of the harmonization of debates. As these debates proliferate, they show much promise; yet they go to extremes, giving rise to disagreements. The dharma body abides eternally, while the transformation body arises and ceases. Theories regarding these two bodies are not in agreement. Only in regard to the reward body do two attachments arise separately. These separately arisen disagreements do not go beyond two trajectories—namely, attachment to eternal abiding and attachment to impermanence. Within the position of attachment to the eternal there are also two camps. (T 1769:38.247c2–6)

From here Wŏnhyo will—as usual—go into an extensive discussion analyzing the two positions, showing the underpinnings and contextual framework leading to each position.

The two logographs composing the term *hwajaeng* (*hwa* and *chaeng*) are also

seen separated within phrases, with the same sort of implications, as in the *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra”*:

[This sutra] unifies the divisions of all the scriptures, returning the thousand streams to the single taste [of the ocean]. Revealing the perfect fairness of the Buddha’s intention, it *harmonizes* [hwa] the *dissension* [chaeng] among the hundred philosophers. (T 1769:38.239a25)

Another example comes from the *Expository Notes on the “Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith”*:

As the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* says: “The relationship between the three natures is one of neither difference nor nondifference. You should explain it like this: if you are able to understand the meaning of neither sameness nor difference among the three natures, none of the *disagreements* [chaeng] among the hundred philosophers will not be *harmonized* [hwa].” (T 1845:44.227c20)

The several examples of this sort represent the gamut of the actual usage of the term *hwajaeng* in Wŏnhyo’s texts. What is more important is that the notion is amply expressed throughout his writings with other terms and in the character of the content of the discourse itself.

An important synonym of *hwajaeng* that Wŏnhyo uses, and one that appears more often in Buddhist texts in general, is *huit’ong*, a term that has basic connotations very close to the implications of *hwajaeng* in Wŏnhyo’s context: the commensuration of variant doctrines and interpretations, as distinguished from *hwajaeng*’s original usage of referring to the settling of personal disputes within the *saṃgha*.<sup>80</sup> For example, we read in the *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra”*:

The meaning of Buddha nature is distinguished into six aspects: (1) showing the essence; (2) cause and effect; (3) seeing the nature; (4) existence and nonexistence; (5) in the three times; (6) *commensuration* [huit’ong]. (T 1769:38.249a5–6)

It should be noted that when Wŏnhyo arranges the structure of exegesis of a text or a certain doctrinal problem, the last section is typically going to be the one where the various incongruent positions on the matter are taken up for analysis, with the intent of arriving at a deeper understanding of the issues involved, if not a total commensuration among those positions. As another example, the prologue to the *Yijang ũi* reads:

The doctrine of the two hindrances will be explained in six aspects: (1) the definition of their terminology; (2) the presentation of their

essences and characteristics; (3) an explication of their functions; (4) a summary of their various categories; (5) a clarification of the processes of their subjugation and elimination; (6) the resolution of discrepancies. (HPC 1.789c4)

For Wōnhyo, the resolution of discrepancies is inevitably the ultimate task to be undertaken.

Wōnhyo's basic strategy is to identify the underlying assumptions, as well as the overriding aims and purposes of the disputants. When two scholars are in disagreement on a point of doctrine, it is rarely the case that one is adjudged right and the other wrong, unless one is clearly guilty of a fallacy. He starts off with the assumption that their argument has a specific intention or that their basic viewpoint regarding the issues has been informed by a special background. When the individual scholar's intent, background, and point have been fully grasped, Wōnhyo usually acknowledges that "he has a valid point," "his position makes sense," or it is "logical," and so on. The operative phrase here is *yu tori*, which is commonly seen in phrases such as *yi sa sosōl kae yu tori* (the theories of both scholars make sense, have a valid principle, etc.), or *yi sōl kae yu tori* (both theories make sense, have a valid principle, are logical, etc.).

This kind of phrase is also seen in the writings of other commentators of the period, but nowhere near to the extent and frequency that it is used by Wōnhyo. Again and again, he takes us through a detailed analysis of all the positions involved in a given argument, ending with this conclusion.<sup>81</sup>

First, let us look at some brief examples, and then we will take up a more detailed account of an argument with which some of us are familiar. From the *Commentary on the "Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith"*:

The theories of both scholars are valid, since they both rely on scriptural authority [*yi sa sosōl kae yu tori*]. The theory of the first scholar grasps the intent of the *Yogācārabhūmi*; the second grasps the intent of the *Awakening of [Mahāyāna] Faith*. (T 1844:44.217a16)

From the *Exposition of the "Vajrasamādhi-sūtra"* (*Geumgang sammae kyōng non*):

Question: In other places it is explained that there are three contemplations of naturelessness. How is that only two are explained here?

Answer: Marklessness and birthlessness combine to form one extreme, since the marks and the birth that are expelled are the same in being existent. Furthermore, these two contemplations both have discursive thought. Since when one expels naturelessness there is no discursive thought, whether you explain them from the perspective of unfolding or combining, both are valid [*kae yu tori*]. (T 1730:34.965b17–21; HPC 1.611b13–18)<sup>82</sup>

And from the *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra”*:

Question: Which, between the theories of these two scholars, is correct and [which is] mistaken?

Answer: According to one position, both are correct and both are mistaken. How so? If you are rigidly attached to one extreme, both are wrong. In this kind of unhindered explanation, both are valid [*ku yu tori*]. (T 1769:38.248b27)

It should be noted that these kinds of pronouncements usually constitute the summation of a long and detailed discussion, sometimes extending over several pages, including as many as six variant positions that are often being treated at multiple levels of interpretation. One should not think that Wōnhyo is simply pronouncing both positions to be valid based on a brief look.

In our translation of the *System of the Two Hindrances* in this volume, numerous well-developed examples of this kind of rhetorical pattern can be seen, one of the most prominent being Wōnhyo’s treatment of the classic Yogācāra issue of the extent and depth of the penetration of nescience and affliction within the eight consciousnesses, something that Wōnhyo was compelled to confront in the course of his detailed study of the two hindrances. This occurs in the context of his discussion of the three karmic moral qualities of wholesome, unwholesome, and indeterminate within the cognitive hindrances. Since this discussion occupies more than fifteen pages in English translation and can be read in full in this book, only the concluding paragraph is cited here.<sup>83</sup>

If we were to take the nescience of the attachment to dharmas in the specific interpretation and try to apply it throughout the situations of eight consciousnesses and three karmic moral qualities, it would not match the principle, and thus it would be incorrect. If, on the other hand, you take attachment to dharmas interpreted broadly and try to limit it to the two [*mano* and *manas*] consciousnesses, with it not operating in wholesome states, then not only will it not match the principle, but it will also be at odds with the scriptural sources. Since the theories of the two scholars are not [misapplied] like this, both theories make sense. (HPC 1.793a4–9)

We would like here to emphasize the balance taken in his approach, and the thoroughness of the investigation. Wōnhyo is *not* saying anything like “all these positions are ultimately the same” (as he is sometimes misconstrued to do). He is saying that each scholar is making a valid point, based on the sources being used and the perspective of his particular approach. In this example, Wōnhyo does not make any evaluative judgment between these positions. He does, however, make evaluative judgments in other places, one of the better-known ones being his

evaluation of the positions of the six scholars in the *Doctrinal Essentials of the "Nirvana Sutra."* But this is not because he is committed to supporting a certain lineage or doctrine. It is simply because he finds a particular line of argumentation to be more compelling.

There are occasionally instances where Wŏnhyo judges a given position to be invalid. In these cases, however, invalidity is usually demonstrated by applying a rule from Hetuvidyā or Mādhyamika principles of argumentation. Thus Wŏnhyo extensively utilized the logical traditions of Hetuvidyā and Madhyamaka in conducting his inquiries.

One of the most concentrated and sustained examples of this kind of approach can be seen in the *Simmun hwajaeng non*<sup>84</sup>—one of Wŏnhyo's few extant non-commentarial essays.<sup>85</sup> The *SHN* can be characterized as a methodological exercise that selectively utilizes Mādhyamika and Dignāgan logic, interwoven with the motifs of several major Mahāyāna scriptures, including the *Lotus Sutra*, the *Nirvana Sutra*, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, and so on. As in his other works, Wŏnhyo's point is to work through ostensibly conflicting doctrinal problems to clarify their content, reveal their underpinnings, and ultimately demonstrate the way that the variant doctrinal positions fit into the Mahāyāna Buddhist system as a whole.

## 2.6. Paradigmatic Bases for Wŏnhyo's Perspective of Harmonization

### 2.6.1. THE ONE MIND

As mentioned above, various paradigmatic structures are posited by scholars as providing the primary conceptual framework for Wŏnhyo's harmonization of doctrines in his integrated view of Mahāyāna Buddhism. One that is often seen taken up by Korean scholars as the basis for doctrinal harmonization is that of his understanding of the One Mind. In his discussions of Buddha nature/original enlightenment works, such as the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, the *\*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*, the *Nirvana Sutra*,<sup>86</sup> and so forth, the notion of One Mind plays a pivotal role.

In terms of representing Wŏnhyo's view of the One Mind as the mainspring that motivated his practical outlook, one of the direct and sustained discussions takes place in his *Exposition of the "Vajrasamādhi-sūtra,"*<sup>87</sup> presumed to have been written in his later years. The One Mind there is described as being bound to neither existence nor nonexistence: in its real and mundane aspects, it is neither one nor two, neither pure nor defiled. The harmonization that merges the real and the mundane is based on the One Mind.

In the *Exposition*, Wŏnhyo unfolds his view of the performance of practice through the logic of harmonization. In the prolegomenon of this sutra, we can see that in the course of clarifying the source of the One Mind and the ocean of the three kinds of emptiness, or of existence and nonexistence, the real and the

mundane are not two. At the same time, they are not one, as expressed in the phrase, “nondual, without sticking to unity” (*mui pul suil*).

The sutra says: At this juncture the Honored One spoke a verse [*gāthā*], saying: “The meaning of the production from causes and conditions is the meaning of extinction. The meaning of the nonproduction and extinction of all production and extinction means production and nonextinction.” The treatise says: This is the fourth explanation. The meaning of the four phrases has both specific and general aspects. From a specific standpoint, it clarifies the meaning of the two aspects. From a general standpoint, it expresses the dharma of the One Mind. All Buddha dharmas [are contained in] this One Mind in two aspects, and there are none that are not contained. What does this mean? The prior two phrases merge the conventional with the real, expressing the meaning of equality. The latter two phrases merge the real with the conventional, expressing the aspect of differentiation. Stated from the general perspective, while the real and conventional are not two, there is no clinging to oneness [thus nondifferentiation, monism, etc.]. Since there are not two, it is none other than this One Mind. Not sticking to oneness, the two fully and completely emerge. This is what is known as the One Mind in two aspects. (T 1730:34.995c26–996a3; HPC 1.658c9–16).

For Wōnhyo, the essential nature and characteristics are interfused; past and present are wrapped up in each other, and the diverse arguments of the one hundred philosophers are harmoniously reconciled with each other.<sup>88</sup>

This explanation of the One Mind as given in the *Exposition* is, as might be expected, closely related to the One Mind of the Tathāgatagarbha found in his *Commentary on the “Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith”* and the *Expository Notes on the “Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith.”* After all, the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* was for Wōnhyo “the text that posits and negates freely, being the patriarchal source of all treatises and the chief arbiter of all controversies” (HPC 1.678a18–19), and it took the theory of Tathāgatagarbha as the principle for the harmonization of Yogācāra and Madhyamaka.

Because the minds of thusness and arising-and-ceasing, which are two ways of seeing of the One Mind, have the appearance of being in conflict with each other, the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* reconciles them by explaining that they are actually only two aspects of the One Mind. Because there are two aspects to the One Mind, these two approaches combine to produce, through the reciprocal function of both aspects (positing and refuting), the three kinds of greatness of essence, aspects, and function.<sup>89</sup> Therefore it is argued that the One Mind is a major basis for Wōnhyo’s harmonization of disputes, and the One Mind that is the principle of the harmonization of disputes is the mind of the Tathāgatagarbha of the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*.<sup>90</sup>

The prior extract from the *Exposition* is helpful for demonstrating, in a short passage, a seminal characteristic of Wŏnhyo's approach to the Dharma, which basically cannot be separated from his hermeneutic method. However, while it does lend support to the positions of those scholars who take the One Mind/two aspects paradigm as being the basis for Wŏnhyo's approach, within it we can see contained a more pervasive and more basic principle functioning throughout Wŏnhyo's exegetical rhetoric, one that may be so obvious that it goes unnoticed. Or perhaps because it is something not especially distinctive within Buddhist discourse, some scholars may think Wŏnhyo would receive no special merit from recognition of its usage. We are referring here to the two truths. This is not to dispute the One-Mind-in-two-aspects approach as one viable way of trying to show a basis for Wŏnhyo's attempts at philosophical commensuration. It may be the case, however, that those who would like to argue for it as the most fundamental basis for Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng* argumentation are going beyond what is necessary in identifying the basic apparatus Wŏnhyo uses in making his arguments.

### 2.6.2. TWO TRUTHS

Specifically, it seems that everything that the One-Mind-in-two-aspects approach has to provide for the philosophical argumentation that Wŏnhyo would like to undertake is more fully encompassed by seeing it as a development, or an alternative expression, of his application of the two truths. We can find the two truths applied virtually everywhere in Wŏnhyo's writing. It is often stated that one scholar's position can be seen as holding true from an absolute (*chin*) perspective, while the other can be seen as holding true from a conventional (*sok*) perspective. Equally visible in this respect are the various analogs of the two truths, such as emptiness and existence, the conditioned and the unconditioned, et cetera.

In acknowledging the extent of his application of the two truths, one could say that Wŏnhyo is following a general Buddhist approach that is explicitly articulated in Madhyamaka and subsequently applied by numerous influential thinkers from various schools. What is perhaps slightly distinctive about Wŏnhyo is the extent of his unceasing emphasis on the mutual containment of the two truths—their not being two yet not being one. Furthermore, the two truths simultaneously play the role of hermeneutic tool with which one deals with the text as object, while at the same time serving as a type of personal (meditative) exercise for undoing the habituated proclivities of one's own consciousness—the tendencies to instantaneously and unconsciously move in the conceptual directions of reification or nihilation. For Wŏnhyo, the act of scriptural exegesis and one's engagement in one's own personal efforts toward breaking the habituation of constructing and maintaining dualisms are not two separate things. Thus he seems to believe these categories, applied flexibly and pushed to their limits, can go just about the whole way in explaining the contradictions to be seen in Buddhist discourse, without needing to take the step of placing texts, theories, and doctrines into pigeonholes.



Thus, lurking in the background of this entire discussion is the basic Buddhist problem of attachment (*abhiniveśa*) to any kind of rigid position, whether it be the conventional or the real, existence or emptiness, and so forth. Attachment, typically subsumed in the extremes of reification and nihilism, is the key object of criticism in Wōnhyo's Vinaya commentaries, where he argues repeatedly that the most critical point is not to reify the precepts in either direction but to be able to flexibly judge morality according to the proper context.<sup>91</sup> And while we still have this passage fresh in our minds, we should also take note of a couple of other key terms that appear there and are regularly employed hermeneutic categories for Wōnhyo, equally serving to maintain fluidity of interpretive perspective. These are the categories of specific (*pyōl*) and general (*ch'ong* or *t'ong*), as well as fine (*se*) and coarse (*ch'u*). Quite often a given theory is seen as being acceptable in a general sense but not in specific situations, and vice versa. We are going to return this important matter of nonattachment toward the end of this general introduction.

One of the best examples of Wōnhyo's usage of the two truths in an exercise of nonattachment to extremes is found in his preface to the *Exposition of the "Vajrasamādhi-sūtra"*:

Now, the fount of the One Mind is free from existence and nonexistence and is entirely pure. The ocean of the three [levels of apprehension of] emptiness<sup>92</sup> merges the absolute and conventional and is perfectly calm. While calmly fusing two, it is not one. Entirely pure, it is free from extremes but does not lie in the center. Not lying in the center, yet free from extremes, nonexistent dharmas do not abide in nonexistence, and marks that are not nonexistent do not abide in existence.

Since it is not one yet merges dualities, nonabsolute phenomena are not originally conventional, and the nonconventional principle is not originally absolute. Since it merges dualities and yet is not one, there is nothing that the natures of the absolute and the conventional do not establish, and there are no marks of purity and pollution not contained within. Since it is free from extremes, yet not in the center, there are no existent or nonexistent dharmas that are not created, and no positive or negative implications that are not subsumed.

Accordingly, without refutation, there is nothing not refuted; without positing, there is nothing not posited. We can call it the ultimate principle of no-principle, the great being-so of not being-so. This is the general message of this sutra. (HPC 1.604b7–20)

The principle of the two truths is probably the most fundamental and extensively used hermeneutic structure throughout Wōnhyo's works, applied in a way that emphasizes the importance of maintaining an attitude that allows the fluid



shifting back and forth between the truths, as well as their analogs, such as conditioned/unconditioned, existence/emptiness, and the One Mind that always includes both aspects without being two and without being one.

But lest we oversimplify: The matter of technique and approach in the application of this basic principle is not related simply to a skillful application of the paradigm of the One Mind in two aspects or the two truths alone. There are, in Wŏnhyo, many things involved in being able to reconcile doctrinal disagreements, not the least of which is a basic level of mastery of the doctrines that allows him to fully apprehend what the proponents of various positions are trying to say. Wŏnhyo possessed an unusual grasp of the major scriptures and *śāstras* from all of the Mahāyāna traditions represented in East Asia and was able to readily bring to mind and cite a passage from anywhere within the Mahāyāna canon to support or refute a certain position.

## 2.7. Harmonization, Faith, and Distance from Language

### 2.7.1. LINGUISTIC *hwajaeng* AND NONLINGUISTIC *HWAJAENG*

To see an example of the practice of *hwajaeng* as an exercise carried out through systematic logical argumentation based on a thorough grasp of and detailed citation of canonical sources, we can go just about anywhere in any of Wŏnhyo's works and, either in the prolegomena or in the conclusion of a discussion of a doctrinal problem, find an example of Wŏnhyo saying something like "Since scholar A's position is based on idea X, and since scholar B's position is based on idea Y, each argument is in itself valid." That is, as the conclusion of a series of logical arguments, plural, ostensibly disparate positions can be reconciled. We can label this as one general type of *hwajaeng*, which is conceptual, being based in the consummation of a rational exercise and grounded in doctrinal paradigms.

We can also identify another kind of *hwajaeng*, one that might be seen as having more affinity with Chan practice than with the logic of Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, or Huayan. This can be characterized as nonlinguistic *hwajaeng*, which consists of taking one further step in disclosing nonobstruction by saying that true resolution of a doctrinal disagreement resides neither in being able to accurately and subtly analyze the preconceptions held by a set of disputants and logically reconcile their positions, nor in seeing all doctrinal positions to be subsumed in the One Mind. It lies instead in the reader's ability to freely dissociate her or his *own* mind from the words—to be able to step out into, and observe from, a nonconceptualizing state. This is a dimension of Wŏnhyo's approach that sets him apart from his doctrinal contemporaries, as we have an exegete for whom the nonlinguistic domain is always just one step away and ultimately the only true point of perceiving things the way they are. This is the *hwajaeng* where all conflicts are resolved

in a nonconceptual experience. We might guess that the ability to do language-based *hwajaeng* is no doubt stimulated by having this kind of experience.

As one example of this kind of turning point in Wŏnhyo's writings, we can read this passage from the *Doctrinal Essentials of the "Lotus Sutra" (Pŏphwa chong'yo)*:

Resolution: This statement is not right. Why? Suppose one says that because "not three [vehicles] but only one [vehicle]" does not lie outside the four logical possibilities, that which is to be obtained is not final. If this is the case, then obtainability is wrong, and nonobtainability is right. Since this also falls within the four possibilities, then obtainability is also not a correct observation. If, relying on words, we say it is unobtainable, this is not the same as language attaching to nonobtainability. Therefore the unobtainable does not fall within the four logical possibilities. There are other cases where one also relies on words to provisionally explain the One Vehicle, but this is not the same as language grasping to the One Vehicle. This is because the One Vehicle also does not fall outside the four possibilities. Therefore we should know that in pursuing words, both are wrong. If we are not attached to the language, there is no difference between the two explanations. (HPC 1.491a7–14)

A more fully developed argument of this type can be found in the *SHN*:

Now, I will further cite from the scriptures an example of freedom from language. This is the example of empty space, which accommodates all sorts of material objects, whether they are long or short, and all sorts of actions, such as expansion and contraction. When you extract various forms and activities, nonmaterial space seems to appear. When you extract a ten-foot rod, ten feet of space appears. When you extract a one-foot rod, one foot of space appears. When you remove [the condition of] contraction, contraction becomes evident, and when you remove expansion, expansion becomes evident.<sup>93</sup> You should know that this space that becomes apparent [merely] *seems* long and short. *The situation of being free from language is like this situation of space, which adapts according to the size and shape previously occupied by various objects.* (HPC 1.838b11–17; emphasis added)

No matter what position one takes regarding the problems of existence and emptiness, the main thing the reader has to do is to learn how to apprehend the argument while maintaining a certain degree of distance from the words themselves—an admonition that can be found frequently in Wŏnhyo's writings.<sup>94</sup>

Again, the real source of all disputation for Wŏnhyo is none other than attachment. There are scores of examples throughout his extant writings where

the correctness or not of a certain position has nothing to do with its doctrinal or logical supports: rather, the key determinant is whether or not one is attached to the position. With yet another example from the *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra”*:

As the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra* says: Is the perfected cognition of the Tathāgatagarbha permanent or impermanent? The Buddha said: “It is neither permanent nor impermanent, since both extremes are wrong” and so forth. Now, even though these words have no permanence, they do not vanish in every moment. This kind of passage refutes this extreme attachment. Rigid attachment to one extreme is not the correct principle. If they are explained in a nonobstructive way, both interpretations are acceptable. (HPC 1.537b5–9; T 1769:38.248b28–c3)

We can also reinvoke the One Mind approach in a subjective sense as a mental way of being that emphasizes personal spiritual fluidity and nonattachment to conceptual structures—that is, the One Mind in two aspects seen not as an ontology or a hermeneutic framework but as a way of understanding Wōnhyo’s view of the psychological structure of his own mind and the state of mind from which one ideally should read the scriptures and apprehend doctrinal controversies. To say that the One Mind has two aspects is not merely a way of describing its character in an objective sense; it means that human beings who seek to truly understand themselves and their world in a holistic way must be personally able to fully experience both aspects of the mind and must furthermore be able to move fluidly between the two. This experiential dimension is also something that has been strongly emphasized in Wōnhyo’s biographical materials, most notably in the form of his consciousness-only realization experience in the skull-filled tomb on his aborted trip to China.

## 2.7.2. NONCONCEPTUAL FAITH AS THE FINAL DESTINATION

One may ask further: How does one get to this condition, where he or she, as reader or writer, is able to avoid these inevitable conceptual traps—the traps that catch all of the unenlightened? What is the subjective, personal perspective of *hwajaeng*, and how does one arrive to this state?

Our investigation into *hwajaeng* would be incomplete if did not take into account that Wōnhyo’s argumentation—along with its strong roots in precise philosophical argumentation through the principles in logic, grounded in an unusually broad and deep mastery of the canon—also has a distinctly religiomythical dimension. That is, while the defense of a specific doctrinal tradition or tenet is obviously not the be-all and end-all for Wōnhyo, it is further the case that in the end he is more than a philosopher, dialectician, or master of the doctrine. His ultimate purpose in resolving doctrinal disputes is a religious one—one aimed eventually at the arrival to the state of deep faith as described most completely in the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*.

That deepest form of faith is a state of mind that linguistic argumentation cannot lay hold of, a state where words cannot gain any traction. Yet, in line with the fluidity of the One Mind expressed continuously throughout Wŏnhyo's writings, that state of faith in which the attachment to language is broken off can allow the exegete to see beyond the differences in the positions of the various participants in doctrinal argumentation, to see their underpinnings. Thus the ability to be in a state wherein one is disconnected from words, while being its own end, can also serve as an exegetical standpoint from which reconciliation is far more readily undertaken.

While we can, from the perspective of logical argumentation, assert that the overriding goal of all the modes of Wŏnhyo's discourse described above is *hwajaeng*, we might still see *hwajaeng* as only the penultimate aim of Wŏnhyo's efforts. His final purpose, even as a scholarly commentator, is *religious*, not philosophical or doctrinal. Thus his intent in validating each of these texts through his exegesis is to allow each one of them to serve as the best guide possible to Buddhist salvation. As noted, he often admits, in the closing portions of his works or in the closing sections of arguments, the futility of approaching the truth through language and admonishes himself and his readers to recognize that the only real recourse is to enter the domain of the nonconceptual. As can be seen in his *Doctrinal Essentials of the "Sutra of Immeasurable Life"* (*Muryangsu kyŏng chong'yo*), this nonconceptual experience is none other than the experience of absolute faith.

The incomparable, unequaled, supreme cognitive faculty is established in order to overcome both these barriers—the doubt [about the possibility of omniscience] and the problem [of whether its attainment is sudden or gradual]. Therefore I want to clarify that this mirrorlike cognitive faculty surpasses the other three kinds of cognitive faculties—there is nothing like it. Outside the two truths one resides independently, in nonduality. Both barriers and their two external expressions transcend the barrierless. One should just have faith, because it cannot be apprehended through reason. Therefore it is called the incomparable, unequaled, supreme cognitive faculty. (HPC 1.562a6–10)

Or, from the same work:

Since there is nothing to be seen, there is nothing that [the incomparable, unequaled, supreme cognition] does not see. In this way it corrects the fourth doubt. If you are unable to grasp the point, it is like words grasping meanings—limited and limitless—none escape error. It is indeed precisely based on the approach that denies a limit that one provisionally posits limitlessness. If one is unable to resolve these four doubts, even if one manages to be born in that [pure] land, one resides only at its outer edges. If there is someone like this, even

if he or she is unable to understand the world of the prior four cognitive faculties but is able to humbly yield even though his or her mind's eye is not yet opened and, with faith, to think only of the Tathāgata with wholehearted submission, this kind of person, according to his or her level of practice, will be born in that land and not reside at its outer edges. (HPC 1.562a24–b8)

This same point is made in the citation from the *Doctrinal Essentials of the "Lotus Sutra"* above, and it appears frequently in various forms in Wōnhyo's commentaries on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* and the *\*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*.

In the closing passage of the *System of the Two Hindrances*, Wōnhyo says:

Yet these sentient beings, as well as all dharmas, are not really person or dharmas in the commonly understood sense of the word, nor are they nonexistent. I am offering this explanation, yet the truth of the two hindrances can be fathomed only by the enlightened ones. [We sentient beings] should consider it relying on pious faith. (HPC 1.814b18–20)

Finally, as Wōnhyo says in his oft-cited preface to his *Commentary on the "Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith"*:

Who, besides Vimalakīrti or the One-Glance Gentleman,<sup>95</sup> can discuss the Great Vehicle without language and produce profound faith in the state of severance of thought? (HPC 1.698b13–14)

### 3. The Texts

The four texts contained herein constitute a highly influential response to the state of intellectual flux in East Asian Buddhism during the seventh century. They provide a glimpse of how Wōnhyo navigated the polarizing differences between Xuanzang's brand of Yogācāra and earlier versions based on the translations of Paramārtha and the like. He tends to take the interpretations of the latter more seriously, having nevertheless fully absorbed the materials produced by the former. Two of the texts included here are essays, one of which is incomplete; another text is a commentary; and the last is an experimental text, in which Wōnhyo uses a new rhetorical tool, the Buddhist three-part logic, to debate contentious questions of his day—such as whether the existence of something like the Pure Land could pass the standards of logical proof. All four texts are united by their interest in Yogācāra. Two, the *Simmun hwajaeng non* and the logic text, show Wōnhyo mounting arguments against Xuanzang's new interpretation of Yogācāra, even while employing materials from Xuanzang's own school. The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* commentary, though incomplete, is a good example of his careful study of Yogācāra texts.

The first work, the *Yijang ūi* (translated by Charles Muller under the title “The System of the Two Hindrances”) is the only surviving full-length treatise by Wŏnhyo that is not an outright commentary. We qualify this because the *System of the Two Hindrances* does have an exegetical origin: it began as a long digression in the midst of Wŏnhyo’s commentaries on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*. Apparently, it ended up being thorough enough to stand alone as an independent treatise, so he decided to publish it separately. It represents precisely the Yogācāra-Tathāgatagarbha synthesis described above, since it addresses their respective understandings of the two hindrances with a thoroughness and completeness unique in the entire field of Buddhism. It is also the most complete representation of Wŏnhyo’s philosophy available to the modern student of Buddhism.

Although only fragments of the beginning portion of the second text, *Simmun hwajaeng non* (Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies, translated by Cuong Nguyen), survive, it is considered by many Wŏnhyo scholars as his magnum opus. It, too, is one of his few works that is not a commentary, but unlike the *System of the Two Hindrances*, it is not intended to resolve a particular doctrinal problem. Rather, it is a methodological exercise rigorously using a combination of Mādhyamika and Dignāgan logic, seamlessly interwoven with themes from the major Mahāyāna scriptures, such the *Lotus Sutra*, the *Nirvana Sutra*, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, the *Prajñāpāramitā-sutra*, and so on. As usual, the point is to show how ostensibly conflicting doctrinal problems—especially those concerned with innate Buddhahood—could be reconciled if analyzed thoroughly enough. The loss of so many of Wŏnhyo’s works is certainly lamentable, but this is likely the one that students of Wŏnhyo would most like to see recovered someday.

Wŏnhyo’s commentary on the *Madhyānta-vibhāga* (*Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so*, or “Commentary on the *Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes*,” translated in this volume by Cuong Nguyen) is also fragmentary—only the third fascicle is extant. Based on the frequency of his citations of the *Madhyānta-vibhāga* in his other commentaries, we know how greatly Wŏnhyo valued this seminal Yogācāra work. Unfortunately, the only fascicle that is extant comes from the middle part of the commentary, which merely lists and explains technical terminology, so it lacks the rich interpretive prose that invariably bookends his commentarial works.

Our final inclusion, the *P’an piryang non* (Critical Discussion on Inference, translated by Dan Lusthaus), though fragmentary, constitutes Wŏnhyo’s only extant writing on Buddhist logic. Because it contains a standard Wŏnhyo conclusion, it must be either the end of a major section or the end of the work itself. Since we as readers enter into a discussion that it is already well under way, it is difficult to fathom Wŏnhyo’s motives for writing the text or to fully appreciate his final conclusions. It is clear, in any case, that it constitutes an exercise in Buddhist logic, applying its newly enumerated fallacies and newly formulated criteria for valid argumentation to well-known problems in Yogācāra and Mahāyāna doctrine.





**The System of the Two Hindrances**  
*(Yijang ũi)*

Translation and Introduction by

A. CHARLES MULLER





## Contents

Acknowledgments	51
Introduction	53
1. THE TWO HINDRANCES	53
1.1. Development of the Hindrances	53
1.2. Defining the Hindrances in Detail	56
2. PROCESS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF TWO HINDRANCES SYSTEMS	58
2.1. The Tathāgatagarbha System of the Hindrances as Explained by Huiyuan	59
2.2. The Yogācāra System of the Hindrances	62
2.3. Completing the Yogācāra Hindrances System: The <i>Fodijing lun</i> and <i>Cheng weishi lun</i>	63
2.4. The <i>Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith</i> and the Composition of the <i>Yijang ūi</i> : The Indirect Approach to the Hindrances	65
3. THE LEGACY OF THE HINDRANCES IN EAST ASIA	67
4. CONTENT ANALYSIS	69
4.1. A Brief Introductory First Chapter	69
4.2. The Essence of the Hindrances	69
4.3. The Function of the Hindrances	70
4.4. The Categories of the Hindrances	71
4.5. Counteracting and Eliminating the Hindrances	72
4.6. Resolution of Discrepancies	72

5. TEXTUAL HISTORY AND NOTES ON THE TRANSLATION	73
Translation	74
1. PROLOGUE AND DEFINITION OF TERMINOLOGY	74
1.1. Prologue	74
1.2. Definition of Terminology	74
2. THE ESSENCE OF THE HINDRANCES	76
2.1. The Direct Approach	76
2.1.1. Showing the Essence of the Hindrances from the Point of View of Their Nature	76
2.1.2. Examining the Essence of the Hindrances from the Perspective of the Eight Consciousnesses and the Three [Karmic Moral] Qualities	76
2.1.2.1. The Afflictive Hindrances	76
2.1.2.1.1. Within the Eight Consciousnesses	76
2.1.2.1.2. Within the Three [Karmic Moral] Qualities	78
2.1.2.2. The Cognitive Hindrances	80
2.1.2.2.1. In the Eight Consciousnesses	80
2.1.2.2.2. The Three Qualities	83
2.1.3. The Essences of the Two Hindrances from the Perspectives of Active Binding and Latency	86
2.1.4. The Essences of the Hindrances in Terms of the Afflictions Proper and Their Habit Energies	89
2.1.4.1. Habit Energies That Function in Specific Situations	89
2.1.4.2. Pervasive Habit Energies	90
2.1.5. The Essences of the Hindrances from the Perspective of the Five Categories of Dharmas	92
2.1.6. The Essence of the Two Hindrances from the Indirect Perspective	93
3. THE FUNCTION OF THE HINDRANCES	94
3.1. The Direct Interpretation	94
3.1.1. The Afflictive Hindrances	94
3.1.1.1. The Function of Producing Karma	94

3.1.1.2.	The Momentum of the Continuity of Rebirth	96
3.1.2.	The Cognitive Hindrances	101
3.2.	The Function of the Two Hindrances according to the Indirect Perspective	101
3.2.1.	Generation of Karma	101
3.2.2.	Momentum of Rebirth	103
4.	THE CATEGORIES OF THE HINDRANCES	104
4.1.	The 128 Afflictions	104
4.2.	The 104 Afflictions	107
4.3.	The Ninety-eight Declivities	108
4.4.	The Eight Kinds of Deluded Conceptualization	110
4.5.	The Three Categories of Affliction	113
4.6.	The Two Categories of Affliction	114
5.	COUNTERACTING AND ELIMINATING THE HINDRANCES	118
5.1.	The Antidotes	118
5.1.1.	The Definition Based on Scriptural Authority	119
5.1.2.	The Definition Based on the Inner Realization of the Supreme Truth	121
5.1.2.1.	The Relationship of the <i>Manas</i> with the <i>Mano-vijñāna</i> and <i>Ālaya-vijñāna</i>	121
5.1.2.2.	Elimination of the Hindrances in the Two Kinds of Cognition and the Five Paths	125
5.1.2.2.1.	The Five Paths	125
5.1.2.2.2.	The Two Kinds of Cognition	128
5.2.	Identification of That Which Is Eliminated	129
5.2.1.	The Identification of That Which Is Eliminated in Terms of Primary and Secondary	130
5.2.2.	The Identification of That Which Is Eliminated from the Perspective of Activity and Quelling	131
5.2.3.	The Identification of That Which Is Eliminated from the Standpoint of General and Specific	131
5.2.4.	The Identification of That Which Is Eliminated according to the Time	131
5.3.	Distinctions in Quelling and Eliminating	134
5.3.1.	The Distinctions between Quelling and Eliminating	134

5.3.2.	The Distinctions in the Elimination of the Fetters	135
5.3.3.	The Distinctions in Release from the Bondages	136
5.4.	Correction and Elimination in the Various Levels [of Practitioners]	137
5.4.1.	From the Approach of the Non-Sameness of Purity and Impurity	137
5.4.1.1.	Correction and Elimination at the Stage of Worldling	137
5.4.1.2.	Antidotes in the Level of the Two Vehicles	138
5.4.1.2.1.	The Direct Perspective	138
5.4.1.2.2.	The Indirect Perspective	142
5.4.1.3.	The Stages of Elimination in the Bodhisattva Path	143
5.4.1.3.1.	Direct and Indirect Perspectives	143
5.4.1.3.2.	Arisen Afflictions	144
5.4.1.3.3.	Entrenched Afflictions	147
5.4.2.	From the Perspective of Nonobstruction between Purity and Impurity	148
6.	RESOLUTION OF DISCREPANCIES	149
6.1.	Question 1: Relationship between Counteracting the Afflictions of the Desire Realm and Attaining the Realization of Nonreturner	149
6.2.	Question 2: Relationship between the Liberation Attained in the Realms of Form and Formlessness	150
6.3.	Question 3: Relationship of Sentient Beings to the Three Realms	150
6.4.	Question 4: Placement of the Adherents of the Two Vehicles in the Framework of the Mahāyāna Path	152
6.5.	Question 5: How Can the <i>Manas</i> Cognize All Dharmas?	154
6.5.1.	Proof through Inference	154
6.5.1.1.	Proof of Valid Claims	154
6.5.1.2.	Refutation of Error	154
6.5.2.	The Argument Based on Scriptural Authority	155
6.6.	Coarseness and Subtlety in the Nescience Entrenchment	155

## Acknowledgments

My earliest exposure to the notion of the two hindrances was in a readings course with Paul Groner at the University of Virginia, where we encountered the notion in Gyōnen's summary of the Hossō school in the *Hasshū kōyō*. I met this pair again when I began my involvement in the *Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yuanjue jing*), as well as in the course of my initial occasional dabbings in Yogācāra literature. So I had been interested in the topic of the two hindrances from a fairly early period in my studies.

The section in the fifth chapter of the *Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment*<sup>1</sup> that describes the two hindrances consists of just a few paragraphs, thus providing only the barest outline of the topic. Further, the hindrances are discussed in that text with a Chan orientation that leaves a lot of room for ambiguity and tends to place far greater emphasis on their cognitive dimension than is seen in earlier Indian sources. I had noticed these ambiguities during the time I was working with this text, and put it in my mind to do some further investigation of the topic at a future time. Later on, I was introduced to Wōnhyo's *Yijang ũi* (System of the Two Hindrances) by my adviser at SUNY Stony Brook, Sung Bae Park, in conjunction with a study in our seminar on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*. At that time I briefly reviewed the content of the *Yijang ũi*, and being intrigued by it, put it on my mental list of texts for eventual study. Thus, when I was asked by the Wōnhyo translation project to help out by translating one of Wōnhyo's works, I requested the *Yijang ũi*.

Once I actually began to work with the text, however, I was concerned that I had bitten off a bit more than I could chew. The inherent difficulty of unpacking the arguments of the text was compounded by its being by far the most corrupted of Wōnhyo's extant works contained in the Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō (The Collected Works of Korean Buddhism).<sup>2</sup> Luckily, over time I was able to deal with these difficulties. Concerning the textual errors, I was greatly aided by the availability of a more accurate edition of the text in Ch'o Myōnggi's *Wōnhyo taesa chōnjip*, where much advantage had been taken of the careful editing done previously on the text by Ōchō Enichi. I was also lucky to have embarked on this task at a time when the Taishō canon was fully available in digital format.<sup>3</sup> The identification of textual errors, as well as the location of citations that I was able to do over a period of months, would have probably taken more than a decade otherwise, and as has happened in the case of treatments of this text by earlier scholars, many citations would have simply remained unlocated. The ready availability of these source texts was an indispensable aid in understanding the context of the discussions.

The effort required to unravel and properly communicate these seminal issues in Buddhist philosophies of mind led me through extensive research of the Yogācāra/Tathāgatagarbha texts and doctrines involved, so I have come out of this project a rather different scholar from the one who entered into it—to the extent that working on the *Yijang ũi* ended up changing the entire course of my research career. In this regard, I owe much credit to my coeditor of this volume, Cuong Nguyen, without whose help in the early stages this translation would have ended up being wholly inadequate. Cuong’s deep grasp of both Indian philosophy and literary Chinese allowed him to make extensive revisions and suggestions on earlier drafts, and I am deeply indebted to him for whatever degree of success this work is ultimately judged to achieve. I am also indebted to the many learned and patient scholars of Yogācāra who spent time helping a relative late-comer to this field to catch up. They include Dan Lusthaus, Bill Waldron, Leslie Kawamura, Tao Jiang, Mario D’Amato, John Dunne, John Keenan, Jeffrey Hopkins, Makoto Yoshimura, Shigeki Moro, Tomoaki Kitsukawa, and Hidenori Sakuma.

I would also like to offer special thanks and congratulations to my longtime mentor at Stony Brook, Sung Bae Park, whose lifelong dream of a complete translation of Wŏnhyo’s extant works is now being realized largely because of his vision and unstinting efforts toward seeing it through to the end. Finally, all of the participants in this project also owe our deep thanks to Robert Buswell, who jump-started the project at a critical juncture, at the same time arranging the publication agreement with University of Hawai’i Press and getting the volumes through the stages of production. Without his rare combination of scholarly, editorial, and managerial talents, this project may have never reached fruition.

A. CHARLES MULLER

# Introduction

## I. The Two Hindrances

### I.1. Development of the Hindrances

The two hindrances as articulated in Mahāyāna Buddhist texts are the afflictive hindrances (*kleśa-āvaraṇa*) and the cognitive hindrances (*jñeya-āvaraṇa*), which together constitute a characteristic Buddhist way of categorizing the broad range of phenomena that engender suffering, impel continuity of the cycle of re-birth, impede the attainment of liberation, and obstruct the ability to see things as they really are. These hindrances include all psychological functions associated with nescience, delusion, affliction, suffering, anxiety, and so forth. The systematization of the individual factors that constitute the mind and its functions, and along with them, the hindrances, was begun in the Abhidharmic texts with the establishment of the seventy-five dharmas. Late Abhidharma had begun the project of taking up the negative mental functions and categorizing them according to their general afflictive or cognitive character. The clear and formal classification into these two broad categories followed in the course of the composition of the Yogācāra texts, including early works such as the *Samādhinirmocana-sūtra*, and starting at roughly the same time, an analogous categorization of mental disturbances into the two categories of cognitive and affective began to be established in early Tathāgatagarbha texts such as the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, and other works. The basic rationale for the division of hindrances into the two types of afflictive and cognitive is fairly straightforward and is reflective of the Buddhist view of the fundamental causes of the human condition of suffering.

Early Buddhism lists eight kinds of suffering. These include the four basic forms of suffering (birth, aging, sickness, and death), along with the four psychological forms of suffering: separation from the attractive, association with the repugnant, inability to fulfill our desires, and the suffering from the nebulous character of the self constructed from the five skandhas—in other words, our inability to know exactly who or what we are at any given time. The first three of the four psychological forms can be associated with the latter two of the three



poisons: attraction (desire, craving) and dislike (ill will, antipathy). This pair arises from the first of the three poisons—nescience (*avidyā*). Nescience, however, is a composite rubric, having various forms and interpretations, and while it is usually seen as the conditioning agent for the negative emotive factors, it is also in turn conditioned by them.

In early Indian Buddhism, the quintessential form of nescience that leads to the eight forms of suffering is the errant mental function of imputing the existence of a singular and enduring self, or ego (*ātman*). This self is believed in and attached to. It develops the conceit “I am” (*asmi-māna*) and thus desires to accumulate things, create stability for itself, and compare itself with other selves. These other selves end up being judged—through this self’s own colored view—as superior, inferior, or mistakenly equal. Name, profit, and comparative evaluation become automatic preoccupations of this self, and thus it cannot but continually suffer from egoistic competitiveness, pride, jealousy, ill will, resentment, and a whole gamut of afflicted thoughts and emotions. These are known as afflictions because they prevent sentient beings from experiencing mental freedom and balance. They constrict the scope of our activities, bring pain, and are the factors that prevent us from experiencing the blissful state known as *nirvāna*—the end goal of practice as understood in early Indian Buddhism.

Śākyamuni taught that the afflictions could be removed by practicing his middle way of the eightfold path, summed up in the three approaches of morality, concentration, and wisdom, with the wisdom aspect (*prajñā*) referring primarily to the deconstruction of this above-mentioned imputed self and its concomitant attachment. A moral life that includes close observance of one’s thoughts, words, and deeds is seen here as essential to creating the proper environment for the destruction of self-centered tendencies, and the focus on deconstructive mental exercises such as dependent origination could not be conducted with any significant effect unless concentration is cultivated. This, in a nutshell, is what later Great Vehicle (Mahāyāna) thinkers called the approach of Lesser Vehicle Buddhism—a form of practice that is aimed at the removal of one’s afflictions through these three general approaches.

Mahayanists, when describing this prior model for the sake of using it as a foil, labeled two related types of practitioners who were exemplary in their practice of this path: the *śrāvakas*, proximate disciples of an enlightened teacher who could develop themselves based upon hearing his teachings (translated with terms such as “voice hearers” and “disciples”), and *pratyekabuddhas*, religious practitioners who had developed an advanced degree of self-sufficiency that allowed them to carry this practice out on their own (translated with terms such as “solitary realizers” and “individual illuminates”). The content of the realization of this early Indian path to arhatship was articulated by the various branches of Indian scholastic (Abhidharma) Buddhism.

Although the attachment to an imputed self was identified at an early stage in Indian Buddhism as the source of all suffering, the earliest texts do not seek to establish a clear distinction in types of impediments to liberation as either

cognitive and afflictive. But such a distinction can readily be inferred, for example, by setting apart the mental action of imputation of a self and attachment thereto as a cognitive error, and all the resultant troubles as afflictive errors. It is clear from the start that, even in the eightfold path, many of the objects of contemplation are markedly cognitive in character (for example, meditation on the twelve-link process of dependent arising).

As speculation regarding the precise functions of consciousness developed in the Abhidharma texts, concrete signs of this kind of bifurcation began to appear, such as in the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, where we see for the first time the technical terminology of “two hindrances,” designating a pair called afflictive hindrances (*pōnnoe chang*) and hindrances to liberation (*haet’al chang*). In this case the afflictive hindrances refer to the manifestly active afflictions that serve to obstruct the emergence of undefiled wisdom and thus obstruct attainment of liberation through wisdom (*hye haet’al*). However, even if one overcomes these hindrances and is able to attain liberation through wisdom, one may still be obstructed by the subtler hindrances to liberation, which impede the attainment of the concentration of total cessation (*myōlchin chōng*). Thus the latter type (also known as the cessation hindrances, *chōngjang*) is said to impede both types of liberation. The afflictive hindrances are seen as being constituted by defiled nescience (*yōm’o muji*), and the hindrances to liberation by undefiled nescience (*puryōm’o muji*).<sup>4</sup>

The shift from the doctrines of early Indian scholasticism to the Mahāyāna-based Yogācāra is well reflected in the development of this two-hindrance framework. The inclinations and character of the bodhisattva as Mahāyāna hero are spelled out in extensive detail, with focus being placed on three intertwined concepts: emptiness (*śūnyatā*), compassion (*karuṇā*), and enlightenment (*bodhi*), which supersede the prior set of no-self (*anātman*), indifference (*apekṣā*), and cessation (*nirvāṇa*). In defining the course of the bodhisattva’s practice through the five paths, the Yogācāras took great pains to include the two Lesser Vehicle practitioners, in part so that fine and detailed distinctions could be made between their practices and progress and those of the bodhisattvas. The key element utilized in making this distinction is the categorization of all mental disturbances (*kleśa; doṣa*) into two types: (1) the afflictive hindrances (*kleśa-āvaraṇa*), which include most of the emotive, intellectual, and sensory defilements that had been identified by the Abhidharma scholars, and (2) a newly defined category called the cognitive hindrances (*jñeya-āvaraṇa*).<sup>5</sup>

The general outline given to these two kinds of hindrances in basic Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha texts formulaically explains the afflictive hindrances as being the sole object of the religious practice of the adherents of the two vehicles. As Wōnhyo will show us, however, this hard definition does not hold up under close scrutiny, since the imputation of and attachment to a self, along with a lack of thorough recognition of such things as dependent arising and impermanence, clearly have a cognitive dimension. Of course, the bodhisattvas must also overcome the afflictive hindrances, but they must also be prepared, at a fairly early

junction, to cope with the correction of obstructions to insight, which lie outside the purview of the awareness and practice of the Lesser Vehicle adherents. What exactly are these cognitive hindrances?

The establishment of the cognitive hindrances in the Yogācāra framework is directly related to the appearance of the Great Vehicle emptiness doctrine. The Mahāyāna teaching of emptiness took the original doctrine of no-self to a new level by arguing that it was not only the individual personality that lacked an intrinsic and defining nature but also all the objective “things” (dharmas) that we perceive, whether these be physical objects, mental images, or linguistic constructs. It was understood by Mahayanists that the uncritical acceptance of the reality of the elements of our existence was a far subtler and pervasive stumbling block than the imputation of the existence of an enduring self, and without overcoming the former, the tendency to reify a concept of self would be all the more difficult to eradicate. Thus, they said, to eradicate only the notion of a self in the way of a Lesser Vehicle arhat was a stage far removed from that of Buddhahood, which implied the attainment of *bodhi*, “enlightenment.” The cognitive hindrances, then, were seen to be operating at a subtler level of mental function than the afflictive hindrances. Also, while the karmic moral quality of the afflictive hindrances was understood to be of negative value, the cognitive hindrances were for the most part understood as being karmically indeterminate or neutral (*avyākṛta*)—a characteristic that would also tend to make them more difficult to identify and treat.

In the introduction to this volume we outlined the intertwined development of the Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha streams of philosophy in India and East Asia. In that discussion it was pointed out that as time passed, the degree of confluence of discourse and technical terminology between these two streams steadily grew. Interestingly, it is the terminology of the two hindrances that is among the first to be shared between the two. For instance, the two hindrances begin to figure prominently in such texts as the *Ratnagotravibhāga*<sup>6</sup> before the Tathāgatagarbha texts incorporate any real discussion of detailed Yogācāric delineations of regions of consciousness, seeds, habit energies, and so forth. And although, as Wōnhyo shows in his treatise, the precise technical definitions of the hindrances differ in interesting ways between these two streams of discourse, their general point and meaning are the same. Thus the discussion of the hindrances provides a unique standpoint for comparing the Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha doctrines, a point that was obviously not lost on Wōnhyo.

## 1.2. Defining the Hindrances in Detail

In their standard Yogācāra interpretation, the afflictive hindrances include all the various forms of affliction enumerated in the Yogācāra scriptures and treatises. Out of the reification of an imagined self, there arise the six primary afflictions. From these six afflictions are derived the twenty secondary afflictions, as well as the ninety-eight, 104, 128, and further sets of afflictions. These manifest themselves in “actively entangling” form, “latent” form, “debilitating” form, and

“seed” form; as habit energies; and in a range of subvarieties of strength and weakness, coarseness and subtlety, and intermixture. Generally speaking, they are karmic—that is, in addition to being the direct causes and manifestations of suffering, they create bonds to cyclic existence, enmeshing sentient beings in perpetual rebirth. Thus, by definition, they obstruct the attainment of liberation—*nirvāṇa*. This means that the afflictive hindrances receive their name primarily because of their role as the *agents*, rather than objects, of obstruction.

The cognitive hindrances are subtler obstructions of awareness that are grounded in discrimination and attachment by cognitive functions. In the basic Yogācāra explanation, all cognitive hindrances are ultimately derived from the reification of imaginary dharmas (objective phenomena). The Sanskrit *jñeya*, which can be interpreted in English as “the knowable(s)” or “all that can be known,” was translated into Chinese (here, provided with the Korean reading) as *soji*—“that which is known” or “objects of cognition.” To a certain degree, the initial orientation for the naming of these hindrances is opposite from that of the afflictive hindrances, since, in the case of the cognitive hindrances, it is the things that should be known (reality, thusness, the noble truths, correctly apprehended dharmas, and so forth) that are *subject to* obstruction, rather than being the obstructing agents. But there is also a sense in which those things that are cognized end up being taken as the obstructions, and thus the definition of the cognitive hindrances is more complicated. In any case, whereas it is the afflictive hindrances that directly bring about karmic suffering and rebirth in the three realms, it is the cognitive hindrances that keep sentient beings in a state of misapprehension of reality, such that they continue making the errors that allow for, at best, the nonelimination of the afflictive hindrances and, at worst, the creation of new afflictions. At the beginning of his explanation of the “essence of the hindrances” in the *Yijang ūi*, Wŏnhyo provides a basic definition as follows:

Led by the attachment to person, the [six] fundamental afflictions and the [twenty] derivative afflictions, such as anger, resentment, conceal-  
ing, and so forth constitute the nature of the afflictive hindrances. If we take into account the other dharmas that are associated with these afflictions, including attendant factors, the karma they produce, as well as the karmic retribution that is experienced, all can be seen as playing a role in constituting the afflictive hindrances.

What constitutes the cognitive hindrances? Led by attachment to dharmas, they have as their substance deluded conceptualization and discrimination, along with attachment to teachings, pride, nescience, and so forth. Taking into account the secondary dharmas that can be included as cognitive afflictions, there are also the attendant factors and their marks that are attached to. (HPC 1.790a17–21)

The relationship between the two kinds of hindrances in their basic Yogācāra

definition has a rational and clearly defined roots-to-branches structure. The cognitive hindrances, which represent subtler errors that are mistaken functions of awareness, serve as the basis of the afflictive hindrances. The cognitive hindrances usually do not in themselves produce negative karma, since in most cases they do not have moral retribution associated with their function. The afflictive hindrances are behavioral habits that are always contaminated to some degree and, in the majority of cases, bring about undesirable moral retribution. When the two hindrances are discussed in the context of the Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha stages in which they are removed (such as the paths of seeing and cultivation or the ten bodhisattva grounds), the afflictive hindrances are removed earlier by both bodhisattvas and adherents of the two vehicles (who rely on self-salvifically oriented practices) and the cognitive hindrances are removed later, by bodhisattvas only, through practices that are empowered by emptiness and compassion.<sup>7</sup>

## 2. Process of the Development of Two Hindrances Systems

Throughout the Mahāyāna texts where the hindrances are invoked, their most common function is to serve as a means of distinguishing the content of the Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna paths. The general characterization is made that the practices of the adherents of the two vehicles (*śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*) are limited in their focus and application of contemplation to the afflictive hindrances, while the practices of the bodhisattvas can be applied to both. In Yogācāra, this means that the two-vehicle practitioners are limited in their degree of enlightenment to their realization of selflessness to the recognition of *anātman* and thus attain only the Hīnayāna *nirvāṇa*, whereas the bodhisattvas penetrate further, to the realization of *śūnyatā*, and can hence attain *bodhi* equal to that of the buddhas. While the Tathāgatagarbha texts do not define the causes of the hindrances directly in terms of attachment to selfhood of persons and dharmas, their descriptions of the hindrances agree in their making of this Hīnayāna/Mahāyāna distinction in terms of level of enlightenment attained.

The development of a comprehensive systematic description of the hindrances in both of the systems of Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha occurs rather late in comparison with the timing of the finalization of other facets of their respective doctrines, appearing at first only rarely, then with gradually increasing frequency in a broad range of texts over a period of a couple of centuries. At the earliest stages, the hindrances are mentioned with almost no explanation, usually as simple markers to indicate the completion of a certain set of practices or the attainment of a certain stage.<sup>8</sup>

Although most scholars tend to associate the two hindrances with the Yogācāra system, in fact the earliest effort in East Asia to thoroughly define and systematize the hindrances, done by Jingying Huiyuan (523–592) in his commentary on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (hereafter *AMF*),<sup>9</sup> is based solely on Tathāgatagarbha texts. This discussion, occupying three full pages in the Taishō canon (T 1843:44.188b29–191a1), arises as a long digression within the

commentary. In the *AMF* itself, the hindrances are invoked in a cryptic manner, barely explained at all. Not long after this, compilers of the works of Zhiyi (538–597) published a much shorter but nonetheless valuable analysis of the hindrances in the *Mohe zhiguan* (Great Calming and Contemplation)—one that shows a close relationship to Huiyuan’s model.<sup>10</sup> Essays that aim to fully define and systematize the hindrances reach their peak in the middle of the seventh century, when, during roughly the same period, the *Fodijing lun* (hereafter *FDJL*) and the *Cheng weishi lun* (hereafter *CWSL*) summarize the system of the hindrances in a way that generally represents the understanding of the Weishi school, while Wōnhyo composes the “magnum opus” of two-hindrances theory, the *Yijang ũi*. Wōnhyo’s full-length monograph is, like Huiyuan’s work, a digression written in the process of the composition of a commentary to the *AMF*, which grew to such a magnitude that Wōnhyo apparently decided to publish it separately. The *Yijang ũi* is of critical importance, not just for hindrances discourse but also for its thorough, nonsectarian analysis of East Asian Buddhist philosophy of mind at that point in history, in that Wōnhyo is the first to identify two distinct streams of hindrances discourse—what we now call the Yogācāra tradition (as understood in the East Asian Weishi/Faxiang lineage, derived from such works as the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, and the *FDJL*), and the Tathāgatagarbha tradition (derived from texts such as the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, and *AMF*).

### 2.1. The Tathāgatagarbha System of the Hindrances as Explained by Huiyuan

Huiyuan’s explanation of the content of the hindrances relies primarily on the doctrine of the four afflictive entrenchments (*sa chuji*) and the nescience entrenchment (*mumyōng chuji*) as first articulated in the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* and later invoked in the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (*Posōng non*), the *Foxing lun* (*Pulsōng non*), and so forth. The four entrenchments<sup>11</sup> as taught in these Tathāgatagarbha texts can be understood as four underlying bases from which manifestly active afflictions are generated—and that retain the afflictions when they are in a dormant state. In other words, they are the latent aspects of the hindrances—comparable in connotation to the concept of *bīja* (seeds) in Yogācāra. In the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* they are contrasted with active or “arisen” afflictions (*ki pōnnoe*—analogous to the Yogācāra active afflictions, *ch’u* or *hyōnhaeng pōnnoe*). The four entrenchments are as follows:

1. Entrenchment of the view of identity (*kyōn ilch’ō chuji*)
2. Entrenchment of emotion toward objects in the desire realm (*yog’ae chuji*)
3. Entrenchment of emotion toward objects in the form realm (*saeg’ae chuji*)
4. Entrenchment of emotion toward objects in the formless realm (*yuae chuji*)

The fifth entrenchment is entrenched nescience (*mumyōng chuji*; Skt. *avidyā-vāśabhūmi*), referring to nescience in its latent aspect as something innate and deeply embedded in the mind, extremely difficult to remove, and serving as the basis for the other four entrenchments and thus as the ultimate basis for the production of afflictions. When entrenched nescience is added to the previous four, they are spoken of as the five entrenchments (*o chuji*).<sup>12</sup>

Utilizing this structure, Huiyuan sees the application of the hindrances as having three levels of possible interpretation, which are distinguished on a sliding scale of differentiation between what kinds of mental functions are regarded as *afflictive* and what kinds are regarded as *cognitive*. The three levels of interpretation are explained through the framework of the four/five entrenchments:

1. The first level, which is the most straightforward, is the one that takes the four afflictive entrenchments (*sa chu pōnnoe*) to be directly equivalent to the afflictive hindrances, and the nescience entrenchments to be directly equivalent to the cognitive hindrances.
2. In the second approach, the intrinsic natures of all five entrenchments are collectively understood to constitute the afflictive hindrances, while the inability to properly cognize distinct phenomena (*sajung muji*) constitutes the cognitive hindrances. In this approach, nescience is distinguished into two types: confusion in regard to principle, and confusion in regard to distinct phenomena. Huiyuan identifies this interpretation as equivalent to the understanding of the hindrances in the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*.
3. In the third approach, the essences of the five entrenchments, as well as obscuration of cognition in regard to both principle and phenomena, are taken to be the afflictive hindrances, leaving only the function of discriminating cognition itself as the cognitive hindrances.<sup>13</sup>

These levels of interpretation may be rendered schematically:

	<i>Afflictive hindrances</i>	<i>Cognitive hindrances</i>
1.	Four entrenchments of afflictions	Nescience entrenchments
2.	Natures of the five entrenchments, plus delusion in regard to principle	Delusion in regard to distinct phenomena
3.	Natures of the five entrenchments, plus delusion in regard to principle and phenomena	Discriminating cognition

At the first level, cognitive problems are clearly distinguished from afflictive problems. The narrowness of focus on the cognitive increases in the second and



third levels, as cognitive error is defined first as *delusive* discriminating cognition and then further as discriminating cognition *itself*.

The straightforward afflictive/cognitive distinction provided in the first level, which separates the nescience entrenchments from the four entrenchments of desire and aversion toward the world, can be mapped in a general way to the basic Yogācāra explanation.<sup>14</sup> As for the second level, Huiyuan states that this is the one that corresponds to the description of the hindrances in the *AMF*. Hence, this is the category that Wōnhyo will later label as “indirect” (*ūnmil*), mainly because it shows awareness of a specific type of cognitive problem not treated in the first level—the implication of bodhisattvas lingering in meditative absorptions in thusness.

Interesting here is the third category, since it is one that, as far as I can tell, is not acknowledged by Wōnhyo. In this definition, all five of the entrenchments, plus obscuration of both principle and phenomena, constitute the afflictive hindrances, with the cognitive hindrances consist only of dependently arisen cognition (i.e., discriminating cognition). The bar is again raised, such that the cognitive hindrances are identified in their impedimentary effect to an even narrower range of mental function, one that in itself carries no inherent negative connotations at all. One could argue, however, that it is not incommensurate with the basic view in the *AMF* that any movement whatsoever of the mind is impedimentary to enlightenment. In terms of textual sources for these three types of interpretations, it is not that one interpretation refers to a reading given in any particular text or even a particular group of texts. It is a matter of Huiyuan picking up a certain way of explaining the relationship between various forms of defilement and cognitive distortion from different sections in what is sometimes even the same text.<sup>15</sup>

What is most important about this is that Huiyuan’s analysis ends up becoming, until the mid-seventh-century appearance of the *FDJL* and Wōnhyo’s *Yijang ūi*, the definitive systematic discussion of the two hindrances in East Asia, since, as noted, none of the sutras or *śāstras* available at that time, in either Tathāgatagarbha or Yogācāra, contain any systematic discussion comparable to this. Thus, from the East Asian perspective, the fully developed Yogācāra/Weishi definition of the hindrances (in the *FDJL*, the *CWSL*, and so on) actually appears almost a full century *after* that of the crystallization of the Tathāgatagarbha version in the form of Huiyuan’s commentary.

An interesting question comes to mind regarding the rather abrupt leap in detail and precision to be seen in the Yogācāra/Weishi articulation of the hindrances, going from the vague and sketchy passages in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* (hereafter *Smdh*), the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* (hereafter *YBh*), and the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* (Compendium of the Great Vehicle) to the highly systematic articulation in the *FDJL* and the *CWSL*, in that there is no pure, extant Yogācāra text containing an intermediate-level development of a hindrances system that would readily serve as a bridge between these two stages. Yet during this interim period, the model of the hindrances in the Tathāgatagarbha texts undergoes significant development in such works as the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, the *Benye jing* (Primary Activities Sutra), the *AMF*, and, most importantly, the



analyses of Huiyuan and Zhiyi. Given this fact, it may be quite possible that even if the masters of the Yogācāra/Weishi school did not seek to directly *apply* the Tathāgatagarbha structure to their own articulation of the hindrances, they may well have felt pressure to flesh out their own argument to demonstrate an equivalent level of sophistication on the matter.

## 2.2. The Yogācāra System of the Hindrances

As articulated in Yogācāra works, the term “afflictive hindrances” refers primarily to all the mental factors (*simso*; *caitta*) that are of unwholesome (*pulsōn*; *akuśala*) quality—that bring suffering and anxiety to sentient beings. Included here are the factors enumerated in such categories as the six fundamental afflictions (*kūnbon pōnnoe*) and twenty derivative afflictions (*su pōnnoe*), along with their further derivatives. In the most standard Yogācāra definition (as one will find in the *FDJL* and *CWSL*), the afflictive hindrances are said to originate in the view of the selfhood of persons (*ajip*, *agyōn*; *ātma-grāha*, *ātma-drṣṭi*, and so on). They are said to be eliminated by the practices of the *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*, as well as those of the bodhisattvas. The cognitive hindrances are said to be derived from the fundamental error of understanding phenomena (dharmas) to have intrinsic reality (*pōpchip*; *dharma-grāha*). They are noetic errors, the most subtle of which can be permanently eliminated only by bodhisattvas who have a thoroughgoing awakening to emptiness. They serve as the basis for the afflictive hindrances. The five paths of Yogācāra practice are distinguished in terms of the bodhisattvas’ ability to quell and eliminate the active manifest forms, seed forms, and karmic impressions of these two kinds of hindrances.

The earliest mention of the hindrances in the Yogācāra tradition is seen in the *Sṃdh*, after which they appear to one extent or another in most texts, but none of the major definitive Yogācāra *śāstras*, including the *YBh*, the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, and the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*,<sup>16</sup> contain a unified and thorough systematic discussion.

The diverse character of the discussions of the hindrances in the *YBh* reflects the composite nature of that text, in that these discussions are rather unsystematic and address varying types of problems. One frequent type of invocation is identical to that seen in the *Sṃdh*, where the hindrances are invoked merely to summarize all the types of hindrances removed in the practices of the ten *bhūmis* (bodhisattva stages) or some other set of stages—as the final achievement of practice.<sup>17</sup> The second type of recurrent mention of the hindrances in the *YBh*—and especially of the afflictive hindrances—is one that still shows admixture from the older Abhidharmic scheme. In this case, one or both of the two hindrances are mentioned together with the hindrances to cessation (*chōngjang*) or hindrances to liberation (*haet’al chang*)—one more piece of evidence of the stratified character of the *YBh* in terms of stages of development.<sup>18</sup> On the whole, in the *YBh* the notion of the two hindrances as a set pair is not yet firmly established, and therefore the afflictive hindrances can be seen mentioned in a

wide variety of situations with a wide range of other hindrances, such as karmic hindrances (*ōpchang; karmāvaraṇa*) and retribution hindrances (*isuk chang; vipākāvaraṇa*).<sup>19</sup> There are a number of other passages where the bodhisattvas and practitioners of the two vehicles are compared in terms of purity, wisdom achieved, compassion, and so forth, but not in connection with anything that directly links the deliverance from the hindrances to the later-standardized definition of realization of selflessness of persons and selflessness of dharmas. This does not happen until the invocation of the two hindrances in the “Tattvārtha Chapter,” which establishes four increasingly profound levels of apprehension of reality. Among these four, numbers 3 and 4 are defined as levels of awareness reflecting the removal of the hindrances.<sup>20</sup>

### 2.3. Completing the Yogācāra Hindrances System: The *Fodijing lun* and *Cheng weishi lun*

The mature form of two-hindrances theory within Yogācāra proper is best seen in the *FDJL*, which has a couple of fairly long sections that treat the hindrances in detail from the most important perspectives, including their content, function, and removal. It is quite clear that the summary of the hindrances in the *CWSL* is derived directly from the *FDJL* or from a common source—one that was also apparently accessible to Wōnhyo, as many of the lines found in the *FDJL* also appear unreferenced in the *Yijang ūi*.<sup>21</sup>

We can identify the *FDJL* as the primary source of the systematization of the hindrances in the form that will be taken as orthodox for Weishi Buddhism. But since the crux of these arguments is presented in more compact form in the *CWSL*, and since the *CWSL* further includes important supplementary material, here the basic definition will be cited as it is presented in the *CWSL*.<sup>22</sup> The *CWSL* starts as follows:

With the view of selfhood of attachment to the pervasive attachment to the reality of a self at their head [they include] the 128 fundamental afflictions,<sup>23</sup> as well as all the derivative afflictions that flow out from them. Since they all bring discomfort to the bodies and minds of sentient beings and are able to obstruct *nirvāṇa*, they are called the afflictive hindrances. (T 1585:31.48c6–9)

What are the cognitive hindrances? With the view of selfhood of pervasive discrimination of and attachment to the reality of dharmas at their head, *views, doubt, nescience, attachment, anger, pride*, and so forth obscure the undistorted nature of objects of cognition and are able to obstruct *bodhi*. Therefore they are called the cognitive hindrances. (T 1585:31.48c10–12; emphasis added)

We pause here to note that there is already a problem of ambiguity to be seen in

this passage, in that in listing “views, doubt, nescience, attachment, anger, pride, and so forth,” the author has included a set of mental factors from the same set of fundamental afflictions in both the afflictive and cognitive categories of mental disturbances.<sup>24</sup> But the author of this passage (Xuanzang, we assume) is himself aware of the ambiguity and feels compelled to defend it below. What is especially interesting about Xuanzang’s explanation is that, in his most basic definition of the hindrances, he makes an unusual and surprising reference to the Tathāgatarbha system identified by Huiyuan.

If the cognitive hindrances include views, doubt, and so forth, how could *those* scriptures [i.e., the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Benye jing*, and so forth, which are the sources of Huiyuan’s chart of the hindrances] explain them to be part of the nescience entrenchments [in other words, not to be strictly categorized as afflictive, but also as cognitive problems]? As the effects of nescience expand, [these too] are generally termed nescience, and views and so forth are not excluded. In the case of hindrances of the afflictive type constituting the four entrenchments of identity-view, and attachment to desire, form, and formlessness, how could they lack pride or nescience [which are understood in the *Cheng weishi lun* as cognitive hindrances]? (T 1585:31.48c23–26)

This is a fascinating and instructive case within the corpus of Weishi literature, as Xuanzang is here actually trying to rely on Tathāgatarbha works to buttress his own claims. The entrenchments are concepts strictly associated with the Tathāgatarbha system, mentioned in the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, the *Treatise on Buddha Nature*, and so forth. They do not appear anywhere else in the Yogācāra works associated with Xuanzang’s Weishi school (as we can readily confirm with a digital search of the canon). And furthermore, nowhere in the Tathāgatarbha sutras and *śāstras* where the entrenchments are discussed are they ever directly linked to the two hindrances the way they have been described in the above passage. They are only mapped like this in Huiyuan’s commentary. This means that the author of the *CWSL* was drawing directly upon Huiyuan’s two-hindrances scheme, which obviously had been read in Weishi circles. Since the corresponding passages in the *FDJL*, which seem to be the source of this material in the *CWSL*, contain everything else except this statement, this is no doubt a comment made by Xuanzang or one of his assistants at the time of the composition of the *CWSL*, in response to this specific concern.

It is of some significance that we have between Huiyuan’s analysis of the hindrances, based on Tathāgatarbha texts, and the *CWSL*’s analysis, based on Yogācāra texts, a clear disparity in understanding of the meaning of, and relationship between, afflictive and cognitive obstructions. But since this is a matter that Wōnhyo deals with thoroughly in his treatise (and in fact its treatment is one of his primary motivations for writing), it will not be elaborated in detail here. The point here is to show the extent to which the scholars of the Weishi school

were aware of the system of hindrances discourse that had been developing in the text associated with the Tathāgatagarbha movement, as well as their need to come to terms with it.

#### **2.4. The Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith and the Composition of the *Yijang ūi*: The Indirect Approach to the Hindrances**

A century after Huiyuan, Wōnhyo wrote his own commentaries to the *AMF* and, in the process, came across the same the same terse and cryptic passage that introduces the hindrances—the passage that had pushed Huiyuan into a fairly extensive exploration of the system of the hindrances that was identifiable to him in the literature available at that time. But when Wōnhyo’s turn came, the situation was vastly more complicated, since an entirely new, significantly different, and far more systematic system of the hindrances had emerged in the form of the new Yogācāra translations of Xuanzang, in such works as the *Sṃdh*, the *YBh*, the *FDJL*, the *CWSL*, and so forth. Wōnhyo had been immersed in the study of the *YBh*, the *FDJL*, and all the other new Yogācāra works being translated by Xuanzang, which is obvious in his extensive citation of these texts in his explication of the hindrances. Since the *AMF* is concerned, more than anything else, with issues related to the origins and removal of affliction and nescience in the effort of attaining enlightenment, it is not surprising that the two hindrances make their appearance within it. But the definition that the author of the *AMF* attaches to the hindrances constitutes a radical departure from the generic Yogācāra system that was introduced above—and that, in fact, has no true precedent in the Tathāgatagarbha texts either. The passage in the *AMF* that introduces the hindrances states:

Furthermore, the aspect of defiled mind is called the afflictive obstruction, because it is able to obstruct the intrinsic intelligence that cognizes thusness. The aspect of nescience is called the cognitive obstruction, as it is able to obstruct conventional spontaneously karmic cognition. (T 1666:32.577c20–22)

The phrase “the aspect of defiled mind is called the afflictive obstruction” is not problematic in the context of the generic Yogācāra or first-tier interpretation of Huiyuan. But in the next part of the passage, the afflictive obstructions, rather than being presented in the standard manner as obstructing *liberation*, are said to obstruct the *intrinsic intelligence that cognizes thusness*—nothing less than the most fundamental manifestation of enlightened awareness. This kind of obstruction, in the context of the canonical Weishi texts, would clearly be seen as cognitive in character. Furthermore, the first part of this phrase, while not seeming problematic at first glance, does present difficulties in terms of the way it is further explained in the *AMF*. Rather than being constituted by the six primary and twenty derivative afflictions, with the reification of a self at their head, or in

terms of the four/five entrenchments, the afflictive obstructions are identified as the six kinds of defiled mental states—the first six movements of mind away from the pure condition of thusness. This description of a sequential degradation of the pristine mind has connotations unique (at least up to that point in time) to the *AMF* and cannot readily be correlated to the way that the afflictive hindrances are described in any other text.

In the second sentence, we find the *cognitive obstructions* defined as “nescience.” This would not in and of itself be problematic, except that the nescience being introduced here does not obstruct the fundamental apprehension of *tathatā* (thusness). Instead, it obscures the functioning of the karmic, phenomenal, discriminating wisdom that one uses for everyday worldly activities. While this impediment *does* fall under the purview of cognitive functioning and thus no doubt belongs in this category, it would seem to be, at least on the basis of the brief description provided here, a relatively secondary problem. This means that the structure of the relationship between the two kinds of hindrances in the *AMF* is quite different from the clearly defined roots-to-branches structure that is apparent in the original Yogācāra model, as well as from the first-tier interpretation of the four/five entrenchments of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*.

In fact, it even seems as if the positions on these two approaches to the hindrances are actually *reversed* in terms of fundamental and derivative, since the *AMF*'s afflictive obstructions obscure the cognition of *tathatā*, and the cognitive obstructions impede a relatively external phenomena-oriented form of awareness. The author of the *AMF*—no doubt well aware of the differences between his account of the hindrances and the more standard versions—was moved to clarify:

What does this mean? Since, depending upon the defiled mind, one is able to see, manifest, and deludedly grasp objects, one's mental function is contrary to the equal nature of thusness. Taking all dharmas to be eternally quiescent and devoid of the characteristics of arising, nonenlightenment manifests nescience and thus one deludedly misapprehends dharmas. Thus one has no access to the cognition of particular phenomena that is applied to all objects of the container world. (T 1666:32.577c23–25)

Beyond this problem of the relative depth of the awareness being obstructed, there is also the difference to be seen in the description of the afflictive obstructions in the *AMF* as being basically *cognitive* in character. There is no mention of the traditional six primary or twenty derivative afflictions, nor even the traditionally named origin of these—the reification of the views of “I,” “mine,” and so on. Instead, the afflictive hindrances are seen as residing in an inability to perceive the fundamental equality of things. According to the teaching of the *AMF*, this results in the first movement of the mind, and that movement leads to a series of attachments and, eventually, every form of discomfort.

The *AMF*'s cognitive obstructions, on the other hand, arise from the error of

seeing *only* unity/equality, which makes one unable to function in the world. We can interpret a bit here and say that while both kinds of obstructions can be seen as being extremely subtle in their function, the cognitive obstructions would more likely be seen in their activity in the minds of those who have already had some experience with correct awareness. Thus they affect advanced practitioners who need to be active in the world—bodhisattvas. We can also observe that the afflictive obstructions would have their primary effect on the person practicing calm abiding meditation (*śamatha*), whereas the cognitive obstructions would thwart the meditator doing contemplative analysis (*vipaśyanā*).

Thus what the reader is going to see in the translation below is exactly how Wŏnhyo ends up handling these complications, as the *Yijang ūi* was indeed the result of his research to this end. In his earlier commentary, *Expository Notes (Pyŏlgi)*, Wŏnhyo writes a brief note indicating that there is a problem and that the reader needs to be aware that there is more than one system of the hindrances. Then, during the interim before his next, most famous commentary on the *AMF*, he conducts an exhaustive inquiry into the matter, obviously reading Huiyuan's commentary, along with the texts cited therein as well as the main texts of the Weishi tradition, to develop a full understanding of the issues. His investigation also extends beyond these two basic sets of texts, to a broad range of Mahāyāna works, investigating the basic Mahāyāna approaches to delusion and its riddance in general. Then, sometime after the completion of that project, he returns to the *AMF* to write one more commentary, which would end up establishing him as one of the premier scholars in all of East Asian Buddhist history.

Wŏnhyo's investigation of the hindrances is nothing but a tour de force, covering their meanings, their composition, their effects, and their removal from every conceivable angle, taking into account all the detailed nuances and differences between textual families, as well as between the theories of various masters ostensibly representing the same traditions. His major broad contribution is the distinguishing of hindrances discourse into two general streams, which we can label, generally speaking, as Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha. The Yogācāra system is taken as the "evident" (K. *hyŏllyo*; "exoteric," "direct") and the Tathāgatagarbha system is labeled as "indirect" (K. *ŭnmil*; "esoteric," "hidden"). The main discussions of the hindrances in the *Yijang ūi* are broken down according to these two main categories. At the same time, Wŏnhyo provides an explanation of these systems internally that is far more thorough than anything ever written by a scholar identified with either tradition.

### 3. The Legacy of the Hindrances in East Asia

In East Asia the Tathāgatagarbha approach to the hindrances predominated at first, based on the influence of the works of Paramārtha, Huiyuan, and their colleagues (along with Tathāgatagarbha-influenced views of Yogācāra concepts), with the competing "orthodox" Yogācāra explanation taking firm hold only after the publication of Xuanzang's translations of the *FDJL* and the *CWSL*. In discussions of the

hindrances in East Asia subsequent to the demise of the Chinese Weishi school, Buddhist commentators and essayists in China and Korea tend to present the hindrances with an apparent lack of awareness of the distinction between the two systems. On the other hand, within the Hossō school in Japan, which maintained a distinct Faxiang doctrinal identity, the Xuanzang/Kuiji view of the hindrances becomes the standard model, no doubt based on the powerful influence of the *CWSL* and Japanese derivative texts such as the *Kanjin kakumu shō*.<sup>25</sup>

We do not see in the subsequent Buddhist scholarship of any cultural tradition a treatment of the hindrances comparable in thoroughness or magnitude to that by Wōnhyo. As mentioned earlier, the hindrances do resurface in the East Asian apocryphon *Yuanjue jing* (Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment, T 842, hereafter *SPE*), in its fifth chapter, that of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī.<sup>26</sup> The usage of the hindrances in that scripture makes for an interesting study, as it is apparent from the content of the discussion that the author of that text was aware of the connotations of the hindrances in both their original Yogācāra (“direct”) meaning, as well as that of the “indirect” *Awakening of Faith*. In constructing a new set of hindrances, the author borrows a bit from both perspectives, at the same time incorporating new elements derived from nascent indigenous East Asian Buddhist teachings, including both Huayan and Chan. The Huayan influence is seen in the *SPE*’s framing of the hindrances within the *yi-sa* (Ch. *li-shi*; principle-phenomena) structure. The Chan influence is seen in the inclusion of the perspective of sudden enlightenment and in the practice-oriented reinterpretation of the cognitive hindrances into mistakenly reified “*kenshō*”<sup>27</sup> experiences.

The Chinese scholiast Zongmi (780–841), in his major commentary on the *SPE*, also devotes a couple of pages to explaining the hindrances, showing how the hindrances of the *SPE* are to be correlated with those of Yogācāra and the *AMF*. In a relatively brief summary, he distinguishes the hindrances into interpretive categories that are analogous to Wōnhyo’s Direct/Indirect arrangement, but it is not clear from the language he uses whether or not he was familiar with Wōnhyo’s work.<sup>28</sup>

The only other separate treatment of the hindrances that I have come across is, interestingly enough, also done by a Korean. This is the *Sippon kyōngnon yijang ch’esōl* (Analysis of the Constitution of the Two Hindrances through Ten Scriptures and Treatises), by the Chosōn monk Ch’oenul (1717–1790).<sup>29</sup> Ch’oenul selects passages from a number of texts, nine of which are Tathāgatagarbha/*AMF*/Huayan works, with the only Weishi source being the *CWSL*, and no citations whatsoever from Indian sources. He analyzes the types of hindrances and compares them from four perspectives: (1) the broad perspective, wherein a single hindrance is seen as obstructing many forms of virtue; (2) the specific perspective, wherein each hindrance obstructs a single, specific virtue; (3) the perspective of commensurate relationships, wherein a subtle hindrance obstructs a subtle virtue, and a coarse hindrance obstructs a coarse virtue; and (4) the perspective of disjunctive relationships, wherein the coarse obstructs the subtle and the subtle obstructs the coarse.<sup>30</sup>



## 4. Content Analysis

The *Yijang ũi* is structured into six chapters, as follows.

### 4.1. A Brief Introductory First Chapter

In the initial chapter, the basic definitions of the hindrances are provided.

### 4.2. The Essence of the Hindrances

The second chapter gives an analysis of how the various canonical texts explain the hindrances as being constituted, especially in terms of such Yogācāra categories as retributive moral quality; the degree of permeation of the hindrances throughout the eight consciousnesses; their conditions of manifest activity and latency; their function in the situation of seeds, habit energies, and perfuming;<sup>31</sup> their categorization in terms of Yogācāra dharma theory; and so forth. The earlier part of the discussion focuses on the depth to which the afflictions are understood to exist in the various regions of consciousness. Do they reside only as deep as the seventh (*manas*) consciousness, or can they be found in the eighth (*ālaya-vijñāna*) as well? The Yogācāra masters had divergent views on this issue. In explaining the range of positions, Wōnhyo analyzes the various afflictions in terms of the three types of moral qualities of wholesome, unwholesome, and indeterminate, with the latter category of indeterminate having the two aspects of defiled and undefiled. The presence of afflictions with these qualities is also determined by the meditative realm in which they are discussed, be it the realm of desire, form, or formlessness.

A similar analysis is repeated with the cognitive hindrances, which are investigated in terms of their retributive moral quality, their presence in various consciousnesses and mental realms, as well as their presence in the characters of two-vehicle adherents and bodhisattvas, and at various stages of advancement on both kinds of paths. This section also goes into greater depth in the discussion of perfuming and habit energies. In relation to the cognitive hindrances, we are shown the importance of understanding the various interpretations of the meaning of the notion of “nescience,” in terms of delusion in regard to the real existence of dharmas and self, attachment to linguistic constructs, and so forth.

In clarifying the constitution of the various hindrances, Wōnhyo begins to explain some of the more important categorical distinctions. The first of these is that of latency of the afflictions as contrasted with their manifest activity, with latency in turn being distinguished into the two aspects of seeds and debilitating tendencies (tendencies that, while not actively entangling, nonetheless hamper certain mental functions). The cognitive hindrances are distinguished along analogous lines.

The next broad distinction, found in both the afflictive and the cognitive hindrances, is that between the hindrances proper and their habit energies (*vāsanās*).



In the end, Wõnhyo relegates the habit energies into a separate category of hindrance, because their extreme subtlety makes them by far the most difficult sort of obstruction to eliminate. The final set of categories that Wõnhyo uses to identify the hindrances is that of the five Yogācāra categories of dharmas: (1) mind, (2) mental factors, (3) form, (4) dharmas not directly associated with mind, and (5) unconditioned dharmas. While the hindrances, properly speaking, are normally seen as being included in the second category, they can, by extension, be seen as affecting all of the other categories of dharmas except for the unconditioned. Wõnhyo concludes this section by placing the above-mentioned categories of latent/active, actual/impressions, and the various capacities of sentient beings in the framework of this final classification of the five categories of dharmas. Having finished this explanation, Wõnhyo introduces an entirely new interpretive approach to the hindrances, which he calls the Indirect approach, the origins of which have been explained above.

### 4.3. The Function of the Hindrances

In the third chapter, Wõnhyo analyzes in painstaking detail the kinds of power the hindrances have to keep sentient beings enmeshed in nescience and cyclic existence (*saṃsāra*). Now framing each discussion with a clear distinction between the Direct and Indirect explanations, the greater portion of this chapter treats the afflictive hindrances in their direct aspect. It is, after all, the predominating role of the afflictions to keep sentient beings bound in cyclic existence. In this context, Wõnhyo separates the functions of the afflictions into two main types: the function of producing karma and the function of bringing rebirth. The function of producing karma is twofold, with the first aspect being the function of producing *directive karma* (karma that, based on nescience, determines general traits, such as one's species) and the second being the function of producing *particularizing karma* (karma that, based on attraction/aversion, determines the precise conditions of one's rebirth). These functions are analyzed through the various categories of moral quality, latency/activity, their relation to the Four Truths, and the location of their activity in the five sense consciousnesses, as well as the sixth, seventh, and eighth consciousnesses. The function of bringing rebirth is also discussed through these categories, with special attention to the role of attachment to a reified self.

The cognitive hindrances do not function deludedly in regard to the Four Noble Truths or to selflessness of persons and thus do not produce karma or rebirth. But they have subtler functions, such as those of discrimination of self-nature/dharmas along with discrimination of distinctions of self and other, the disagreeable and agreeable, and so forth. They are also directly involved with the problems incurred by perfuming from linguistic events. With the main portion of this explanation finished, a brief section follows, this time explaining the production of karma and rebirth from the perspective of habituation, and the role of the entrenchment of nescience and attraction/aversion taught in the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*.

#### 4.4. The Categories of the Hindrances

The fourth chapter provides a detailed explanation of the rationale behind the various types of arrangements of the hindrances. The first three groupings, those of the 128, 104, and ninety-eight afflictions, represent three different interpretations that are derived from the same basic Yogācāra model. These first three large-number groups are found in Yogācāra texts such as the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya*,<sup>32</sup> and the *Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā*<sup>33</sup> and thus are typical of the Direct perspective. All three schemes are derived from interpretations of the ten afflictions<sup>34</sup> seen in terms of their ability to continue to function in the various contexts of the Four Truths and three realms of existence. Thus, arrival at the totals of 128, 104, and so on is based on how these ten afflictions are seen to linger, depending on various circumstances.

The next three groupings are smaller in number but more complex. These are (1) the eight kinds of deluded conceptualization, (2) the three kinds of hindrances, and (3) the two categories of arisen and entrenched (i.e., the Indirect perspective). Whereas the three arrangements introduced in the paragraph above deal exclusively with the afflictive hindrances, the eight kinds of deluded conceptualization deal with eight stages of coarsening delusion, starting with the mistaken perception of intrinsic natures, leading to the discrimination of “I” and “mine,” and ending up in the discrimination of the appealing and unappealing. The first three of the eight are seen as cognitive hindrances, while the remaining five are categorized as afflictive hindrances.

The next categorization of the hindrances into three groups is done according to the level of practice, or “path,” in which they are removed. There are hindrances eliminated in the Path of Seeing, hindrances eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, and hindrances that are not eliminated in either path. This analysis is further placed in the perspective of the distinctions between what occurs in the practices of the adherents of the two vehicles and the practices of the bodhisattvas. These are further sifted through the perspective of the layer of consciousness in which they are contained, as well as whether they are latent or active and whether they are afflictions proper or habit energies.

The last section of this chapter, entitled “The Two Categories of Affliction,” is a detailed inquiry into the connotations of the entrenched and arisen hindrances taught in the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* and the *Benye jing*, and it is here that we can see Wōnhyo’s reliance on Huiyuan. Thus it is an interpretation from the Indirect perspective. Wōnhyo explains the two general categories of the entrenchments: (1) nescience and (2) afflictive emotions toward phenomena in the three realms. These entrenchments are examined from their aspect as four distinct types and then from the aspect of what they generally have in common. A major point of this section is the clarification of the meaning of intrinsic nescience and its unmatched subtlety that gives it its power to bring about delusion.

#### 4.5. Counteracting and Eliminating the Hindrances

The main organizing structure for the fifth chapter is that of the five Yogācāra paths, and this turns out to be one of the most complete accounts of Yogācāra path theory available anywhere. While all five paths are discussed, the primary focus is placed on what exactly occurs within the two important supramundane paths of Seeing and Cultivation. Tied into this discussion are the matters of virulence and subtlety of afflictions, how the paths are actually applied in the circumstances of the two lesser vehicles and the bodhisattva vehicles, and so on. Combined into this analysis of Yogācāra five-path theory are the four realizations of the path of *śrāvakas*, as well as the forty-one-stage bodhisattva path. Once again, the matter of the extent of penetration of the various types of hindrances into the layers of consciousness is seminal in this discussion, as well as the timing involved in the counteracting of the hindrances. All of this is done from the perspective of the various degrees of release from the grip of the hindrances, defined by the distinction between “quelling,” which means to subjugate the negative effects of the hindrances but not to be totally rid of them, and “elimination,” which refers to their permanent annihilation.

#### 4.6. Resolution of Discrepancies

This final chapter treats problematic issues, especially those concerned with trying to correlate the path schema adhered to by different texts and traditions. Wōnhyo works through a long list of questions: Do all those who completely and permanently eliminate the afflictions of the desire realm attain the realization of the nonreturner? Do all those who attain the realization of the nonreturner completely and permanently eliminate the afflictions of the desire realm? Do all those who are permanently free from the desire of the form realm definitely enter into the formless concentrations? And do all those who enter into the formless liberating concentrations free themselves from the desire of the form realm? Beyond the three realms, are there sentient beings or not? How should *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* who have reached the stage of no-more-learning be evaluated in terms of the stages of the Mahāyāna path? And so on.

Included within these questions are unresolved issues regarding the complicated position of the *manas* in the various forms of path theory, as well as problems related to the correlation of the Direct and Indirect approaches to the hindrances. It is in this section where Wōnhyo most fully demonstrates his extraordinary abhorrence of loose ends. As in many of his other works, Wōnhyo concludes that the full understanding of the matter is beyond the ordinary consciousness of sentient beings and can be fathomed only by enlightened beings.

## 5. Textual History and Notes on the Translation

The primary source for this translation is the edition of the *Yijang ūi* contained in volume 1 of the Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō (hereafter HPC). It should be noted, however, that although the text has been transmitted in the modern era with the title *Yijang ūi* (System [or “Meaning” or “Doctrine”] of the Two Hindrances), in his own works (such as his later commentary on the *AMF* and his commentary on the \**Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*), Wōnhyo refers to the text with the title *Yijang chang* (Essay on the Two Hindrances), and that is the way it is listed in later Faxiang and Huayan catalogues.<sup>35</sup> The most extensive real citation and usage of the text that can be identified within the Taishō are found in the commentaries on the *Huayan wujiao zhang* (Essay on the Five Teachings of Huayan), by the Japanese Kegon monks Gyōnen (1240–1321) and Shinjō (thirteenth–fourteenth centuries) (T 2339 and T 2340). In both of these works, the title is given as *Yijang ūi*. Presumably, this is the version of the text that ended up in the Ōtani University library, which received the invaluable editorial treatment from Ōchō Enichi.

In Korean works collected in the HPC, I have not come across any mention of the *Yijang ūi* in the writings of the Koryō or Chosōn period. Even Ch'oenu's essay on the two hindrances noted above makes no mention whatsoever of the text. There is one hint of possible awareness of the *Yijang ūi* in Ch'oenu's usage of the hermeneutic strategy of analyzing the hindrances in terms of “the positive function being obstructed,” for this phrase does appear in the *Yijang ūi* (1.790a9). But no other real correspondence between the two works can be made beyond this, and almost no correlation can be made between the source texts that Ch'oenu uses and those used in the *Yijang ūi*, leaving us with little evidence of Ch'oenu's knowledge of Wōnhyo's text.

The HPC version of the text has such an extremely high frequency of errors that it is virtually unreadable as is. Thus, like other modern students of the text, I have relied extensively on the version of the Ōtani text edited by Ōchō Enichi, and the edition contained in the *Wōnhyo sōngsa chōnsō* (Collected Works of the Sagely Teacher Wōnhyo; hereafter WSC), both of which are significantly improved, allowing the reader to gain a foothold on the text. But even the editors of these versions were understandably unable to track down the large number of citations Wōnhyo made from the *YBh* and fifty other texts—and they also misidentified a number of textual references. Therefore I was fortunate in having been able to study this text at a time when digital versions of the canon had become available, enabling me to identify and correct a large number of previously unreported errors and obtain the contexts for many abbreviated citations. I was also able to work with an array of digitized lexical tools that allowed me to identify probable Sanskrit originals of translated Chinese compound words, as well as probable Tibetan equivalents, which allowed me to bring a degree of precision to the translation that would have been impossible otherwise. It is clear that the tools available in the digital age are going to be a big help when it comes to this kind of work.

Unfortunately, due to printing costs, we were not able to include Chinese in the main text of this edition. This limitation turned out to be especially problematic in the case of the *Yijang ũi*, in view of the unusually high number of errors in the text, as well as disagreements in cited passages between what is provided in the *Yijang ũi* and what appears in source texts in our possession, such as the *YBh*. The sheer number of these errors, along with the difficulties to be seen in attempting to effectively discuss them through Sino-Korean romanization, led me to the conclusion that it would not be worthwhile to annotate all of these numerous points in the present study, given that a critical edition can be easily placed on the Web. I have therefore placed a revised and heavily annotated edition of the source text on my website at <http://www.acmuller.net/twohindrances/ijangui-cjk.html> for those who wish to study the text along with its Sino-Korean source. In the event of the future relocation of the Web resource, please search for the keywords “*Yijang ũi*,” “*Ijang ũi*,” or “two hindrances.” Also, during the course of the translation, virtually every term was added to the online *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (<http://buddhism-dict.net/ddb>) and can thus be checked using the online source text that I have prepared.

## Translation

### THE SYSTEM OF THE TWO HINDRANCES

*Composed by Wŏnhyo*

*Translated by A. Charles Muller*

## I. Prologue and Definition of Terminology

### I.1. Prologue

[789c] The doctrine of the two hindrances will be explained in six sections: (1) the definition of their terminology, (2) the presentation of their essences and characteristics, (3) an explication of their functions, (4) a summary of their various categories, (5) a clarification of the processes of their subjugation and elimination, (6) the resolution of discrepancies.

### I.2. Definition of Terminology

The two hindrances are (1) the afflictive hindrances, also called the mentally disturbing<sup>36</sup> hindrances, and (2) the cognitive hindrances [K. *soji chang*], also written with the Sino[-Korean] term *chijang*.<sup>37</sup> There is also another interpretation of the hindrances, in which they are termed the afflictive obstructions [K. *pŏnnoe ae*] and cognitive obstructions [K. *chi ae*].<sup>38</sup> The afflictive hindrances include mental disturbances such as craving, anger and so forth, which have pain and suffering as their nature.

They manifest themselves according to the circumstance and afflict the body and mind—therefore they are called afflictions. In this case the subject derives its name from its function. These hindrances furthermore function to disturb those still in the world of cyclic existence.<sup>39</sup> The effects of affliction vex sentient beings, causing them to lose their tranquility. Therefore they are called afflictions. This approach explains the name of the effect from the perspective of cause.

“Hindrances” [*āvaraṇa*] has the meaning of impeding and also has the function of obscuration. The afflictions impede sentient beings from escaping from cyclic existence. They obscure the intrinsic nature so that it cannot manifest *nirvāṇa*. It is with these two connotations in mind that they are called [afflictive] hindrances. They are named based on their function.

What are the cognitive hindrances? Because the nature of the multiplicity of things and the nature of the thusness of things<sup>40</sup> are illumined [respectively] by the two kinds of cognition,<sup>41</sup> they are called “the knowables.” The mental disturbances of attachment to dharmas<sup>42</sup> and so forth obstruct the nature of cognition so that it cannot carry out clear observation. They obscure the nature of the objects such that one cannot clearly observe the mind. Due to these connotations, they are called the cognitive hindrances. [These hindrances] derive their name from that which is obscured, as well as from their function.<sup>43</sup>

However, the mental disturbances such as attachment to person also partially hinder the cognition of objects. Yet they do not impede perfect enlightenment and do not obscure the perfect cognition of every single kind of object.<sup>44</sup> And even if one eliminates these hindrances, one does not necessarily attain enlightenment; therefore they are not defined as cognitive hindrances. Mental disturbances such as attachment to dharmas are also partially responsible for bringing about cyclic existence.<sup>45</sup> Yet they do not obstruct the attainment of *nirvāṇa* by the adherents of the two vehicles and do not trap people in delimited cyclic existence. Even though one has not severed this [cyclic existence], one may still realize the principle.<sup>46</sup> Therefore they are not called afflictive hindrances. Indeed, the practice of offering a proposition and then immediately refuting it can be seen here.<sup>47</sup> The terms “afflictions” and “cognition” can be understood according to their common usage.

**[790a]** They have also been referred to as the afflictive and cognitive “obstructions” [*ae*].<sup>48</sup> When the six kinds of defiled mind<sup>49</sup> arouse thoughts and attach to characteristics, they act counter to the nature of equality, which is free from characteristics and motionless. Because they upset one’s serenity, they are called the “afflictive obstructions” [*pōnnoe ae*]. *Fundamental nescience* [*kūnbon mummyōng*] directly obscures the unobtainable nature of all dharmas, and there is nowhere that it does not obstruct conventional cognition. Because they bring about incomplete comprehension, they are called “obstructions to cognition.” In this interpretation, “affliction” is named as an error that acts to obstruct. “Cognition” is named as the positive [function] that is being obstructed. The meaning of denying and affirming can be understood the same way as in the prior passage.<sup>50</sup>

## 2. The Essence of the Hindrances

There are two basic approaches to the explanation of the essence of the hindrances: the Direct approach and the Indirect<sup>51</sup> approach.

### 2.1. The Direct Approach

The Direct [K. *hyōllyo*—i.e., plain, obvious, fully revealed] approach to the hindrances is explained from five perspectives: (1) showing their essence and characteristics from the point of view of their basic nature, (2) examining their essence from the perspective of the eight consciousnesses and the three [karmic moral] qualities, (3) discerning their essence from the perspectives of manifest activity and latency, (4) clarifying their essence from the perspective of the afflictions proper and their habit energies,<sup>52</sup> (5) determining their essence from the point of view of the five [categories] of dharmas.<sup>53</sup>

#### 2.1.1. SHOWING THE ESSENCE OF THE HINDRANCES FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THEIR NATURE

Led by the attachment to person, the [six] primary afflictions<sup>54</sup> and the derivative afflictions, such as anger, resentment, concealing, and so forth constitute the nature of the afflictive hindrances.<sup>55</sup> If we take into account the other phenomena that are associated with these afflictions, including concomitant factors, the acts they produce, as well as the retribution that is experienced, all help to constitute the essence of the afflictive hindrances.

The cognitive hindrances, led by attachment to dharmas, have as their essence delusive discrimination, along with the attachment to teachings, pride, nescience, and so forth. They are buttressed by concomitant [mental] functions and the marks that they adhere to, which also conjoin to form their essence.<sup>56</sup>

#### 2.1.2. EXAMINING THE ESSENCE OF THE HINDRANCES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE EIGHT CONSCIOUSNESSES AND THE THREE [KARMIC MORAL] QUALITIES

##### 2.1.2.1. The Afflictive Hindrances

###### 2.1.2.1.1. *Within the Eight Consciousnesses*

The afflictive hindrances are in essence not associated with the *ālaya-vijñāna*<sup>57</sup>—they arise only in conjunction with the seven forthcoming consciousnesses.<sup>58</sup> Among these, attraction and nescience permeate all seven of these consciousnesses. Pride functions in the two consciousnesses [*mano-vijñāna* (thinking consciousness) and *manas* (self-absorbed consciousness)]. Only anger does not operate in the



*manas*.<sup>59</sup> Doubt and the four views [besides the view of self] reside only in the *mano-vijñāna* [i.e., operate at the level of waking consciousness],<sup>60</sup> while the view of self<sup>61</sup> is contained in both the *mano* and *manas* consciousnesses<sup>62</sup> [thus operating at both conscious and subconscious levels]. The view of self has two functions: one is [to produce] the view of “I,” and the other is [to produce] the view of “mine.”

[790b] These two functions of the view of self operate in both [the *mano* and *manas*] consciousnesses. The reason why both function within the *mano-vijñāna* is obvious.<sup>63</sup> As for the function of these two aspects [of the view of self] in association with the *manas*, it creates the activity of “I” by directly apprehending the *ālaya-vijñāna* as an essence. At the same time,<sup>64</sup> apprehending the various marks on the surface of this essence of consciousness, [the *manas*] creates the feeling of “mine.” “Various marks” refers to the five categories of [the hundred] dharmas together with all the signs of the eighteen cognitive factors.<sup>65</sup> All of these various marks are produced from the seeds of this [*ālaya*] consciousness—all appear as the reflections of the clear mirror of this consciousness. Therefore the *manas* consciousness also takes these as its object.

It is as when the visual consciousness apprehends a clear mirror—there are also various aspects of what is perceived. On one hand, the visual consciousness perceives the reflective character of the mirror. On the other hand, it perceives the images reflected in the mirror, yet it is unable to imagine the existence of objects outside the mirror. The situation of the two kinds of perception of self carried out by the *manas* is like this—the *manas* cannot imagine that there are phenomena outside the *ālaya-vijñāna*. Therefore generally speaking, the *manas* perceives that [*ālaya*] consciousness. It is as when simply saying that the visual consciousness perceives the mirror: one should also understand that the consciousness perceives the images reflected in the mirror. That images are also being perceived does not require a special explanation. When it is merely said that the *manas* perceives the storehouse consciousness, one should understand without a special explanation that this also includes the perception of what is manifested within that consciousness. Therefore we should not be troubled about its being directly explained.

As the *Xianyang lun*<sup>66</sup> says: “The *manas* is said to arise from the seeds in the *ālaya-vijñāna* and then, perceiving that consciousness, makes the associations of self-delusion, self-love, ‘I,’ ‘mine,’ and the conceit ‘I am’ [K. *aman*; Skt. *asmimāna*].<sup>67</sup> Thus, within the view of a self there are two kinds of cognition: the first depends on cognition of self, and the second depends on cognition of others. That which is produced by the *manas* only contains the first kind of cognition, while the *mano-vijñāna* includes both kinds of cognition. There are two kinds of activity depending on the self-cognizing view of a self. These are the so-called “activity produced by discrimination” and “innately active.”<sup>68</sup> The *manas* contains [only] the latter, and the *mano-vijñāna* includes both.”

As the *Yogācārabhūmi*<sup>69</sup> says: [790c]

Based on the four kinds of self-view, there is the production of the conceit “I am.” These are (1) the discriminated self-view, which is



said to be entertained by non-Buddhists; (2) the innate self-view, which is said to be produced even by lower beings, such as birds and beasts; (3) the self-dependent self-view, which is produced within each individual; (4) the other-dependent self-view—the view of self that is produced in relation to other persons. [T 1579:31.779c10–14]

All the derivative afflictions abide in the seven kinds of forthcoming consciousness appropriate to [the mental condition]. Based on this explanation, this point can be understood in detail.

#### 2.1.2.1.2. *Within the Three [Karmic Moral] Qualities*

What are the three [karmic moral] qualities [in their relation to affliction]? Since there are a number of interpretations, for the time being we will discuss the matter from the perspective of [the possession by afflictions of] a definitive nature. All the afflictions of the form and formless realms,<sup>70</sup> as well as the four afflictions of the *manas* in the desire realm,<sup>71</sup> are impedimentary, but indeterminate in their moral quality. The greed, hatred, delusion, and so forth that are arisen from the five consciousnesses<sup>72</sup> are all of unwholesome quality. This is because they are effects that are the same in type as the unwholesome states of the *mano-vijñāna*. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

It is only subsequent to the mental state of ascertainment<sup>73</sup> that there is defilement and purity, and after this, effects of the same type produced. The visual consciousness functions in wholesome and unwholesome states, but this is not due to its own discriminative power [T 1579:30.280a24–25]. [The *Yogācārabhūmi* also says, in an earlier passage:] The activity [of all of the consciousnesses] from the visual consciousness to the [other four] sense consciousnesses should be understood as operating according to the same rule [T 1579:30.280a21].

Therefore all afflictions produced by discrimination within the *mano-vijñāna* when it is operating in the desire realm are unwholesome. The two inherent views of the existence of a self and extreme views are of indeterminate karmic quality.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

Furthermore, the inherently produced view of the reality of the self is only of indeterminate quality. This is because it repeatedly manifests<sup>74</sup> and does not bring extreme pain to either oneself or others. Since the view of self that is produced by discrimination is rigidly attached to, it differs from the former. When it functions within the desire realm, it is only of unwholesome quality. [T 1579:30.622a26–28]

Unwholesome activities that are to be eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, which are produced from thirst, pride, and nescience, are of unwholesome quality. Those that are subtly active at the time of birth are of indeterminate quality. As the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says: “The nine kinds of near-death mind are essentially associated with thirst” [T 1606:714b.27]. This is because this thirst is only of impedimentary indeterminate quality. Hatred is exclusively of unwholesome quality, even though it can be active in the midst of wholesome mental states.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

[791a] [Good and evil karmas] are also posited from the standpoint of their own nature, as can be seen in the case of concurrent negative and positive activity. It is like the situation where, in the context of a certain situation, an act might be acknowledged as being beneficial, while the same act in another situation may be seen as harmful. For example, the case where a person in a state of rage commits an evil act and experiences anger, but the thoughts that accompany this anger take no joy in the commission of this evil. It should be understood that this [positive] thought and [negative] anger are concurrent, so therefore, even while acting in conjunction with the negative aspect of the action, there is no joy experienced in the action. But since this evil is concurrent [with the not-taking of joy], it also acts in conjunction with a positive aspect. Therefore this karmic activity is called [a blend of] negative and positive. The other cases should be understood in the same way. [T 1579:30.665a27–b4]

Within the derivative afflictions, discursive thought, investigation, recognition of evil actions, and drowsiness function within all three moral qualities. Yet when they function in wholesome states of mind, they do not necessarily have the nature of derivative afflictions.<sup>75</sup> It is like [someone] cultivating the uncontaminated path in the midst of a dream—in this case the mental factor of sleepiness does not have an afflictive nature. The other three [indeterminate] mental factors can be understood in the same way.

The [first] ten [of the derivative afflictions] starting with indolence and including flattery, deceit, and conceit are all of unwholesome quality and impedimentary indeterminate [*nivṛta-avyākṛta*] quality. The remaining nine [afflictions of] wrath, enmity, hypocrisy, anxiety, parsimony, jealousy, injury, lack of conscience, and shamelessness are of exclusively unwholesome quality. In terms of their nature, lack of conscience and shamelessness permeate all types of unwholesome states of mind. As they expand in their activity, shame is active in all [qualitative] states, while conscience is not necessarily active. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says: “Lack of conscience and shamelessness are associated with all unwholesome states” [T 1579:30.604a25–6].

As an above passage says: “When conscience manifests, shame cannot but also be present. But the presence of shame does not necessarily imply the presence of

conscience. It is like the four formless aggregates,<sup>76</sup> which, although by nature must operate concurrently, from the perspective of their developing function they appear in sequence.”<sup>77</sup> It is also said [in the *Commentary on the “Mahāyāna-saṃgraha”*]: “After the arising of this first mental [aggregate] the other three arise” [T 1595:31.167b2]. The principle for the arising of these two [mental states of shame and conscience] is the same as this. The principle for the arising of the remaining derivative afflictions is as explained in detail in the [*Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*].

[The *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*] says:

The derivative afflictions are generally distinguished in terms of four characteristics [ . . . ].<sup>78</sup> This means that lack of conscience and shamelessness arise in concert with all unwholesome states of mind. Indolence, restlessness, torpor, faithlessness, [791b] laziness, illicit sexual desire, [mistaken] resolve, forgetting, distraction, and incorrect knowledge—these ten arise in tandem with all defiled states of mind, and all serve as tethers to the three realms.<sup>79</sup> Each of the [ten derivative afflictions] of anger, enmity, hypocrisy, vexation, jealousy, parsimony, deceit, guile, conceit, and hostility arises separately in unwholesome states of mind. Once one arises, no others arise. Except for deceit, guile, and conceit, these ten are all limited in their function to the desire realm.

Since deceit and guile persist up to the first meditation,<sup>80</sup> and conceit is experienced in all three realms, it is put together with the prior two. When it appears at more advanced stages of practice, it is only of indeterminate quality. Discursive thought, investigation, recognition of evil actions, and drowsiness—these four operate in all three moral modes of mentation, but not in all places and not at all times. If discursive thought and investigation are carried out for an extremely long time, they cause physical exhaustion, loss of mindfulness, and mental fatigue, and thus discursive thought and investigation can be called derivative afflictions. These two [also] function up to the first meditation. Remorse and drowsiness exist only in the desire realm. [T 1589:30.622b23–622c9]

This summarizes the characteristics of the afflictive hindrances.

### 2.1.2.2. The Cognitive Hindrances

#### 2.1.2.2.1. In the Eight Consciousnesses

What are the characteristics of the composition of the cognitive hindrances? Some say that the nescience of attachment to dharmas exists only in the sixth and seventh consciousnesses and does not extend to the other consciousnesses.<sup>81</sup>

Strictly speaking, attachment to dharma, malice, and so forth are not included in the category of views [*dr̥ṣṭi*].<sup>82</sup> But if we interpret in a looser sense, then they can also be said to operate in the five [sense] consciousnesses. As the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* says: “Subjective pervasive discrimination [K. *p’yōngye*; Skt. *parikal-pita*] is done only by the *mano-vijñāna*” [T 1594:31.139b12, paraphrased].<sup>83</sup> None whatsoever occurs in the *ālaya-vijñāna*. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says: “The *ālaya-vijñāna* does not contain afflictions, even if it is associated with them” [T 1579:30.651c15]. If there were attachment to dharmas within this [*ālaya*] consciousness, it would construct views of the inherent existence of dharmas. If this were the case, then the existence of nescience and so forth would not be limited in its association to only the five [pervasively functioning] mental factors.<sup>84</sup> “Furthermore, if this consciousness had attachment to dharmas, it could not undergo perfuming and therefore would disappear in every moment. If one did not employ corrective practices, everything would go awry.”<sup>85</sup>

Furthermore, at the time prior to the initial insight into the selflessness of dharmas, this [*ālaya*] consciousness would be cut off. This is because the [activity of the] hindrances and their correction conflict with each other and hence cannot function concurrently. If this were the case, the remaining contaminated seeds<sup>86</sup> would have no support, and the merit that is cultivated would not perfume anything. Since there would be nothing to perfume, one cannot even speak of “perfuming.” Since the mirror cognition<sup>87</sup> is not of indeterminate moral quality,<sup>88</sup> and it has not yet been attained, we know that attachment to dharmas does not occur in this consciousness. Among the three qualities, [attachment to dharmas] is only of unwholesome and impedimentary indeterminate quality.<sup>89</sup>

**[791c]** Even though [this attachment to dharmas] does not contaminate the holy paths of the two vehicles,<sup>90</sup> it *does* infect and obstruct the path of the bodhisattvas. Because of this, it is said to be both impedimentary and nonimpedimentary. Since its essence is characterized in two ways according to the situation, this attachment does not [necessarily] extend its influence into the four kinds of exclusively nonimpedimentary, morally indeterminate mental states.<sup>91</sup> This is because (1) the results of ripening<sup>92</sup> that appear within the forthcoming consciousnesses have the same nature as the differentially ripening consciousness itself [i.e., the *ālaya-vijñāna*]; (2) their power of discrimination is weak and unable to attach; (3) the mental states of deportment and so forth do not adhere firmly; and (4) their attachment does not function everywhere. Furthermore, [attachment to dharmas] does not pervade all wholesome mental states. This is because [these states] act in opposition to the nature of nescience and so forth and because these [wholesome mental states] must act concurrently with the wholesome root<sup>93</sup> of absence of folly.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says: “There are two kinds of nescience: the first is unwholesome, and the second is of indeterminate quality. There are also two further kinds: the first is defiled, and the second is undefiled. Nescience cannot be said to be ‘wholesome.’”<sup>94</sup> If you say that during the Path of Skillful Means prior to the contemplation of the selflessness of dharmas<sup>95</sup> there is attachment to

dharmas, then during the Path of Skillful Means prior to contemplation of the selflessness of person<sup>96</sup> there should also be attachment to person. Yet since the latter is not the case, we know that in the former situation there is also no attachment to dharmas.

Some maintain that discrimination and attachment to dharmas function throughout the eight consciousnesses. This is because when one has not realized the selflessness of dharmas, one grasps discriminated characteristics. As the *Samḍhinirmocana-sūtra* says: “From the eighth [bodhisattva] ground up, the extremely subtle latent afflictions are removed. After this, none of the afflictions will ever again be active. From here only the cognitive hindrances exist to serve as the basis [for mental disturbance]” [T 676:16.707c17–18]. This shows that subsequent to the eighth [bodhisattva] ground only the cognitive hindrances are active, and one cannot say that the hindrances are produced by the forthcoming consciousnesses, since they do not serve as a basis for the latent afflictions. One should understand that this means that the extremely subtle cognitive hindrances in the *ālaya-vijñāna* continue their activity unabated.

Furthermore, the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*<sup>97</sup> says:

Objects, faculties, self, and [the six kinds of manifest]  
consciousness,  
The root consciousness<sup>98</sup> arises appearing like these.  
When this confused consciousness exists, those [four] do not  
exist;  
If they do not exist, neither does consciousness.<sup>99</sup>

“Confused consciousness exists” means that it is only the confused consciousness that exists. “Those do not exist” means that those four things do not exist.<sup>100</sup>

[The meaning of the nonexistence of these four] is explained as follows: “Why is this deluded consciousness said to be false? Because its objects are not real, and because its essence is dispersed [among the objects, faculties, etc.]” [T 1599:31.451b22–23].

**[792a]** The principal activity of this [confused] consciousness is conceptualization. It discriminates and adheres to marks, not comprehending markless thusness. Hence it is called attachment to dharmas; it is also called nescience. Failing to fully investigate their nature, one imagines [those marks] to really exist, and based on this, there appear mental factors such as delusion. Furthermore, this deluded conceptualization is so extremely subtle in its function that it [can be known only as delusion] when it is contrasted with the mirrorlike cognitive faculty. Therefore [this kind of subtle discrimination] does not obstruct the intelligence of the forthcoming consciousnesses. This being the case, it can also be perfumed. This is because it is of indeterminate moral quality and because it is not marked by its own distinctive powerful “odor.” Take, for example, the case of a person’s clothes or the like. In the case of a [Daoist] immortal we would smell the odor, and he could also be perfumed by an odor, because [his own] smell is

not extremely powerful. It is the same with this consciousness. As the [*Commentary on the*] *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* says: “‘Indeterminate quality’ means that it cannot be identified by [its own] powerful odor” [T 1597:31.329c17–18].<sup>101</sup>

Furthermore, even if this consciousness does not undergo perfuming, before and after continuously produce each other, and without undergoing correction, it will never be cut off. Since there is neither interruption nor cessation, how can it be perfumed? That which does not receive habituation will disappear. If the seeds<sup>102</sup> are not [re]perfumed, they should be disappearing in every thought-moment. Yet these seeds, even though not being habituated, have continuity between before and after without break or interruption. So even though there is cessation at each thought-moment, there is not loss at each thought-moment. Attachment by this consciousness to dharmas should be understood in the same way. Based on this principle, there is no error. However, since there are no afflictive hindrances in this situation, it is said that it is not concomitant with the afflictions. It is *not* said that it is not concomitant with the cognitive hindrances. Therefore this passage is also not contradictory.

If even the *ālaya-vijñāna* is subject to deluded conceptualization, how could the five [sense] consciousnesses be completely free from attachment to dharmas? As the *Nirvana Sutra*<sup>103</sup> says:

Even though these five consciousnesses do not generate a single thought, they are still contaminated.<sup>104</sup> Because distorted perception stimulates their contaminating activity, they are said to be contaminated. Since essences are not real and they are attached to marks, the [five consciousnesses] perceive mistakenly. [T 374:12.587a12–14]

From this we know that the five consciousnesses also have distorted attachment. Yet these five consciousnesses attach only to the five objects. They are not able to engage in calculating everything [*parikalpanā*], and they do not attach to language. Therefore [the activity of] calculating everything is said to be limited to the *mano-vijñāna*. **[792b]** If, based on these passages, one affirms that the five consciousnesses lack attachment to dharmas, then it would follow that the *manas* also lacks attachment to dharmas. Therefore we can confirm that this text does not corroborate [the position taken by the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*].

#### 2.1.2.2.2. *The Three Qualities*

The cognitive hindrances are also imbued with the three qualities, up to the level of uncontaminated selflessness of person realized by the adherents of the two vehicles, who have still not succeeded in freeing themselves from discriminated attachment to dharmas. Why so? In their Path of Seeing,<sup>105</sup> [the adherents of the two vehicles] are freed from all the mental chatter [*mano-jalpa*] that was present in the Path of Skillful Means.<sup>106</sup> They are free from all linguistic apparatus associated with the truths of suffering and so forth; they transcend all projected

images and experience direct perception. Therefore they realize the thusness of selflessness of person.

Yet at this point, even though they do not adhere to names, when they experience suffering and so forth, they still adhere to its marks. [Captivated by] this extreme [of attainment of insight into selflessness of person], but not yet attaining the thusness of the selflessness of dharmas, they become confused in regard to the nature of the virtues of the dharma, self, permanence, and bliss.<sup>107</sup> It is like the case of the five sense consciousnesses: even though they entirely lack the capacity to discriminate words, in their direct cognition of objects such as form they function at odds with marklessness and adhere to marks, and thus they deliver distorted cognitions. The principle being explained here should be understood in the same way.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

The intelligence and practices in the Path of Seeing are far removed from all marks. When one is practicing that path, although one's holy awareness perceives suffering, one refrains from discriminating suffering as a distinct phenomenon. This means that the consciousness functions while apprehending the marks of suffering. It is the same with the other truths. One is liberated from all of the marks and conceptions of the truths that were previously contemplated through conventional cognition, and cuts off knowing through conceptual proliferation. Still, in this form of knowing, [this consciousness] apprehends the principle of thusness and functions free from marks. [T 1579:30.625a1–6, with some abridgments]

This passage clarifies the point that it is through nonattachment to language that one attains the principle of the thusness of the selflessness of person.

The *Ratnagotravibhāga*<sup>108</sup> says:

For the purpose of correcting these four kinds of distortions,<sup>109</sup> there are four kinds of undistorted teaching. This means that with regard to impermanent phenomena such as form [one should generate] thoughts of impermanence, and so forth.<sup>110</sup> In this way you can correct the four distortions. If one relies on the dharma-body, this is also a distortion. [T 1611:31.829b20–24]<sup>111</sup>

This passage shows that even though one may be freed from distortions by realizing the selflessness of person, if one remains deluded in regard to the selflessness of dharmas, one still ends up being confused.

Furthermore, there is also attachment to dharmas in the Path of Skillful Means prior to the insight into the selflessness of dharmas. This means that expedient awareness [*upāya-jñā*], which does not realize the selflessness of dharmas, continues to discriminate and adhere to characteristics. This is called nescience;



it is also called attachment to dharmas. It is only the mental factor of wisdom that has the potential to be either liberated or attached. At this stage [of Skillful Means] there are no separate factors, such as nescience, that are not in the same way uniformly deluded in terms of attachment to dharmas. [792c] Therefore, lacking the wholesome root of nondelusion, and cognizing in tandem with mental factors such as delusion, one makes mistakes. As the \**Abhidharma-samuccaya* says:

“Being deluded” implies subjective and objective grasping. [ . . . ]  
 “Nondelusion” implies supramundane [nondiscriminating] cognition and subsequently attained [discriminating] cognition. “Delusion-and-then-nondelusion” refers to the wholesome roots, such as the knowledge derived from learning, that are consonant with supramundane cognition. This is because one discriminates knowable objects [thus, confusion] and attunes oneself with nondiscriminating cognition awareness [thus, nonconfusion]. [T 1606:31.764a8–13]<sup>112</sup>

The *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Relying on the practice of contemplation of the emptiness of dharmas, the bodhisattvas are, in brief, said to bring about mental liberation within the six kinds of bondage in deluded conceptions. What are the six? When one gives rise to internal conceptions regarding the self and dharmas, this is the first conceptual bondage. When one at this point gives rise to external conceptions, it is the second conceptual bondage. The arising of internal and external conceptions [together] is the third conceptual bondage. If one, in regard to all the realms of sentient beings of the ten directions, resolves to bring about liberation by cultivating the foundations of mindfulness, the conceptions arisen within this state constitute the fourth conceptual bondage. If, based on this, one cultivates the contemplation on physical and mental objects and lingers [in these states], the concepts that arise in this state are the fifth conceptual bondage. Thenceforth, if one lingers in the cultivation of the contemplation on body and mind, the conceptions produced here are the sixth conceptual bondage. [T 1579:30.713a4–11]

Based on this passage, we should understand that these practitioners have not yet entered into the authentic contemplation. From this level down, there is no state of mind that is free from false conceptualization—all have delusion. How could delusion and false conceptualization not include attachment to dharmas?

If you say that since there is no attachment to person in the preparatory path prior to the meditation on the selflessness of person, then there is also no attachment to dharmas in the preparatory path prior to the meditation on the selflessness of dharmas. You could also say that since, in the preparatory path



prior to the contemplation on [no-]self, there is no apprehension of a self, in the preparatory path prior to the [contemplation of] signlessness, there is no apprehension of signs. The former position is not the same [as the prior example], nor is the latter. Since there is a principle to this, there is no fallacy.

Some say that the views presented by both masters are equally valid. How so? If you hold strictly to a loose interpretation of the matter, then the theory of the first scholar also makes sense. [793a] If you take a broader approach that includes both broad and narrower interpretations, then the theory of the second master also makes sense. If one recognizes that each approach is based on its own valid logic, the apparent contradictions in the texts can be well reconciled.

If we were to take the nescience of the attachment to dharmas in the specific interpretation and try to apply it throughout the situations of the eight consciousnesses and three karmic moral qualities, it would not match the principle, and thus it would be incorrect. If, on the other hand, you take attachment to dharmas interpreted broadly and try to limit it to the two [*mano* and *manas*] consciousnesses, with it not operating in wholesome states, then not only will it not match the principle, but it will also be at odds with the scriptural sources. Since the theories of the two scholars are not [misapplied] like this, both theories make sense.

### 2.1.3. THE ESSENCES OF THE TWO HINDRANCES FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF ACTIVE BINDING AND LATENCY

When the fundamental and derivative afflictions are in a state of activity, they have strong connotations of bondage; hence they are called *actively binding* [*pariyavasthāna*]. There is also a type of afflictions that are generated as a result of perfuming by the binding afflictions and that follow along in a concealed and subliminal state; these are called *latent* [*anuśaya*]. The actively binding and the latent afflictions taken together are the essence of the hindrances. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

The fundamental and derivative afflictions have two main kinds of states in which they defile and torment sentient beings. The first are the actively binding afflictions, and the second are the latent afflictions. Manifestly active afflictions are called *binding*. When their seeds are not yet eliminated or subjugated, they are said to be *latent*; they are also called *debilitating* [Skt. *dauṣṭhulya*; K. *ch'ujung*]. Also, when they are functioning subliminally, they are said to be *latent*. When they are functioning at the level of conscious awareness, they are called *actively binding*. [T 1579:30.623a23–26]

The latent aspect of affliction can also be distinguished into two kinds: the first are the *seeds*, and the second are the *debilitating*. These two occur as the result of perfuming from the single type of actively binding afflictions. What are

their characteristics? [The first type is] that which is perfumed by defilement and both produces and does not produce adaptivity. Tendencies toward incapacity stick in the ripening consciousness [*vipāka-vijñāna*]<sup>113</sup> but are unable to actively bind. These afflictions are said to be debilitating and are not considered to be *seeds*. [The second type includes] those that are perfumed by defilement in this consciousness and create further tendencies of the same type. Since these are able to give rise to manifest activity, they are called seeds. This is *inflexibility* [K. *pu choyu*; Skt. *adānta*] and is also called *debilitating* [K. *ch'ujung*].

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

What are the characteristics of the debilitating type? [793b] Basically, they bring about an inadaptability and incapability to respond to things—this is the characteristic of the debilitating [type of latency]. They have five aspects: (1) manifest heaviness, (2) rigidity, (3) obstruction, (4) weakness, and (5) limitation, which devolves into incapability. Due to these aspects, they gravitate to impure properties and resist pure properties. [T 1579:30.657a19–23, with abridgments and differences]

Thus they are called *debilitating latencies* and not *seed latencies*. That treatise [the *Yogācārabhūmi*] also says:

Among the seeds contained in the basis of personal existence [the *ālaya-vijñāna*], those that have afflictive properties are called debilitating. They are also called latent [i.e., *anuśaya*—not actively manifest, but nonetheless having potential for further new reproduction]. If they are contained in the category of the ripened [*vipāka*] or other categories of morally neutral factors, then they are only called debilitating—they are not said to be latent. The seeds of wholesome mental factors such as faith and so forth are neither debilitating nor latent. [T 1579:30.284c3–7]

This explains how the seeds have the meaning of latency yet at the same time contain the implications of debilitation.

That treatise also says: “Conventional forms of meditation are able only to gradually remove debilitating latencies—they do not extricate seeds. Uncontaminated forms of meditation remove both kinds together” [T 1579:30.331b7–9]. These passages explain both kinds of latent afflictions. When the two combine, they are able to create obstructions. Therefore these two together constitute the hindrances [of affliction].

Within the seeds there are also two types: kernels [*dhātu*] of original nature<sup>114</sup> and seeds formed by habituation.<sup>115</sup> Combining with each other, the two are able to bring about active entanglement. Therefore both types constitute the [afflictive] hindrances. As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

[. . .] Then, within the subsequently existent [thinking] consciousness are found the seeds of nescience and kernels of nescience.<sup>116</sup> The *mano* consciousness that these two types of seeds adhere to and the objective realm upon which they are contingent combine to form the present world, based on the discriminated view of entities brought about in previous lives by the practitioner’s reliance on incorrect explanations of the Dharma and the Vinaya. [When that view, developed in prior lives,] is compounded in the present world, one produces the innately arisen view of entities. Even though they may now have access to reliable explanations of the Dharma and the Vinaya, these [wrong views] remanifest and act as hindrances. [T 1579:30.788a24–29]

In the same way that the afflictive hindrances have the two aspects of active binding and latency, the cognitive hindrances also have two kinds of seeds [i.e., latent aspects]—the dependently originated and the discriminated; therefore these also constitute the cognitive hindrances. As the *Xianyang lun* says: “Furthermore, within the essence of the other-dependent nature, two kinds of pervasively conceptualized essences are distinguished; namely, [793c] the awareness that arises dependently and that of latent habituation—the latency of habit energies” [T 1602:31.508b4–5].

The *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* says:<sup>117</sup>

Thought and language share in perfuming appearances,  
Names and their meanings manifest each other.  
Since these are discriminated and not real,  
They are called *discriminated characteristics*.

The commentary says:<sup>118</sup>

[. . .] This verse explains the [discriminated] character to be threefold, consisting of (1) the discursive discriminated character, (2) the nondiscursive discriminated character, and (3) the mutually caused discriminated character. “Thought and language” refers to the conceptualization of meanings; “meanings” are the objects that are conceptualized, and conceptualization [*saṃjñā*] is a mental factor. Based on the conceptualization of meanings, there arise understandings of this or that according to thought and language. This is the discursively discriminated character. What are “perfumed appearances”? “Perfuming” refers to the seeds of thought and language. “Appearances” means that seeds directly give rise to the appearance of meanings. When one is not able to give rise to understandings of this or that according to thought and language, this is the nondiscursive discriminated character. “Names and their meanings manifest

each other” means that, based on words, meanings are illuminated, and based on meanings, words are illuminated. The objective realm is not real but only of discriminated character [the world consists only of such-and-such names and objects]. This is the mutually caused discriminated character. [T 1604:31.613c14–24, abridged]

Based on these passages, we can understand that all active seeds are discriminatory and thus [help] constitute the cognitive hindrances. The remaining distinctions in interpretation can be understood according to the above model.

#### 2.1.4. THE ESSENCES OF THE HINDRANCES IN TERMS OF THE AFFLICTIONS PROPER AND THEIR HABIT ENERGIES

As explained above, since the essences of the two hindrances directly obstruct the holy paths, they are called the hindrances proper. When the previously ingrained habits are extinguished, energies remain bearing their imprint; therefore they are called habit energies [*avāsanā*]. These habit energies can be classified into two general types: habit energies that function in specific situations and habit energies that function pervasively.

##### 2.1.4.1. Habit Energies That Function in Specific Situations

The habit energies that function in specific situations appear only within the afflictive hindrances and not within the cognitive hindrances. These habit energies also have the two aspects of manifest activity and seeds. What are their characteristics? Take, for example, the case of someone born into a family of high social rank, who has passed through a great number of lifetimes in this status and has been long habituated by arrogance. In the mental state of arrogance, he has become accustomed to the use of deprecatory language toward his servants and, in this condition, apprehends marks and discriminates. The seeds that are perfumed from this are of two kinds: those that engender the proclivity toward arrogance and those that produce adherence to marks [of status and so forth]. [794a] If this person cultivates the Way and attains sagehood, the seeds that produce the proclivity toward arrogance are destroyed. But the seeds that create the adherence to marks are not destroyed. Therefore these seeds can be activated, and the person, even though not in the mental state of arrogance, may still suddenly use deprecatory speech toward servants. This kind of thing is called the habit energy of the proclivity for arrogance. Habit energies derived from other afflictions operate in the same way.

These habit energies of afflictive character are not included among the afflictive hindrances proper. This is because they are not able to hinder the practices of the two vehicles. Since the discriminations that adhere to marks obfuscate the principle of the selflessness of dharmas, they are properly regarded as part of the essence of the cognitive hindrances. As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says: “Some

arhats,<sup>119</sup> because of the habit energies in their undefiled mind, will break into a smile when they meet someone with protruding lips and buck teeth.”<sup>120</sup> The \**Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* says: “Such acts as rising to dance [reveal the existence of] habit energies of desire. The rude speech to Varuṇa is [a result of] habit energies of pride” [T 1509:25.649c15–16].<sup>121</sup> These passages show the connotations of the habit energies that function in specific situations.

#### 2.1.4.2. Pervasive Habit Energies

“Pervasive habit energies” refers to the case where both kinds of hindrances contain trace energies that are neither actively manifest nor in seed form. Since these energies are strictly of the nature of incapacitation, they are simply called debilitating. What are their characteristics?

They are like the debilitating hindrances that are afflictive in character, in that as long as they are not counteracted, their energy increases. When the uncontaminated path is practiced and the seeds are extinguished, then the debilitating become insignificant, and they can no longer be categorized as afflictions. Because they adhere to the ripening consciousness [the *ālaya-vijñāna*], they are called the debilitating [habit energies] of the ripening consciousness. Also, these debilitating [energies] are like the trace energies of dripping water, which are not dripping water itself. Therefore they are also called the defiled debilitating. It is just like the case of a son reflecting on his deceased father’s remains. He thinks of this only as his father—not as the father’s remains.<sup>122</sup> This concept should be understood in the same way.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Question: The debilitating hindrances of afflictive character are permanently eliminated without remainder by the arhats. After this, what kind of debilitating hindrances still remain to be eliminated, and which, once eliminated, allow one to be called “a *tathāgata* who has permanently eliminated all habit energies”?

Answer: The debilitating hindrances that are of the ripening type [i.e., contained in the *ālaya-vijñāna*] are the ones that the arhats have not been able to eliminate. Only the *tathāgatas* are said to completely extinguish them. [T 1579:30.619b23–26]

Again, in a passage below, it says:

**[794b]** Again, there are two general types of debilitating [hindrances]. The first are the debilitating of simple contamination; the second are the debilitating caused by residual contamination. The debilitating of simple contamination are completely extinguished by arhats when they extinguish afflictions. This means that when

someone still has latent hindrances, there is unease and incapacitation in mind and body. The debilitating [hindrances] caused by residual contamination are produced by the perfuming from contamination born of [remaining] impurity at the time the latencies are eliminated. Their basic nature is that of discomfort and adherence to suffering. They are all thinned out, together with the closely resembling incapacitating hindrances. Furthermore, these residually contaminated debilitations are called the habit energies of the afflictions, and they cannot be extirpated by *śrāvakas*<sup>123</sup> and *pratyekabuddhas*.<sup>124</sup> Only the *tathāgatas* are able to completely extinguish them. [T 1579:30.625b16–23]

The nature and characteristics of the cognitive habit energies can be understood to be the same as that which was explained for the habit energies of the afflictions. Hence, these habit energies are common to both kinds of hindrances.

As the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says: “The *tathāgatas* permanently eliminate the afflictive hindrances, the cognitive hindrances, and their habit energies” [T 1606:31.694c9–10]. The *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* says:

[Because they are perceived by the fully penetrating wisdom of the *tathāgata*’s wisdom-eye, which lacks distinctions,] they are impure. Because all worldlings possess the afflictive hindrances, they are defined. Because all *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* are affected by the cognitive hindrances, they have specks [of obscurity]. Because all bodhisattva-*mahāsattvas* are affected by the habit energies of the two hindrances, [they are spurred into activity]. [T 1611:31.823b8–11]<sup>125</sup>

Based on these passages, we should understand that both kinds of hindrances have habit energies. Since they are something that the bodhisattvas are unable to extinguish, these habit energies are not subsumed under the two hindrances proper and thus are separately designated with a third name, as the “habit energy hindrances.”

If we look at them from the perspective of their similarity in nature, we can also call them the most extremely subtle two hindrances. As the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* explains in its section on the eleven hindrances: “At the stage of *Tathāgata* [the practitioner] corrects the extremely subtle and most extremely subtle of the afflictive hindrances and cognitive hindrances” [T 676:16.702a10–11].

Furthermore, at the time of the elimination of the seeds and habit energies of the two kinds of hindrances, there are still habit energies. Since during the time prior to this elimination there were no residual traces, [then] when the seeds are eliminated, the residual traces instantly appear. Therefore they are called instantaneously arisen habit energies. In the case of the previously explained habit energies that function in specific situations, [794c] during the time when the seeds of affliction are not yet eliminated, there are already habit energies. Therefore they

are called previously generated habit energies. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says: “There are two kinds of latencies: the harmful and the harmless. There are also two kinds of habit energies: instantaneously generated habit energies and previously generated habit energies” [T 1579:30.627a22 and 656a27–b1].

### 2.1.5. THE ESSENCES OF THE HINDRANCES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FIVE CATEGORIES OF DHARMAS

The fifth section ascertains the essences of the hindrances from the point of view of the five categories of dharmas. What are the five categories? They are (1) mind, (2) mental factors, (3) form, (4) dharmas not concomitant with mind, and (5) unconditioned dharmas. In the case of the active states of the two kinds of hindrances that were explained above, the hindrances are, strictly speaking, understood as being contained within the category of mental factors.<sup>126</sup> But if we discuss the matter in terms of the kinds of dharmas with which the hindrances can be associated by extension, then the dharmas of mind, those of form, and those not directly associated with mind can also be included—as well as dharmas functioning concomitantly [with mind].

Among the two kinds of latencies, the manifest activities of the seed latencies are included in the two categories [of mind and mental factors]. Since they are of the nature of dependent origination and discrimination, previously arisen habit energies, manifestly active factors, and seeds are also included in the two categories of mind and mental factors. All debilitating types of latencies, as well as instantaneously produced habit energies, are included exclusively in the categories of dharmas not concomitant with mind; this is because they are not by nature concomitant. Those that are contained within the twenty-four dharmas not concomitant with mind are those possessed by unenlightened sentient beings, because they are not able to maintain noble behavior.

However, the natures of unenlightened beings are distinguished into coarse and subtle. The unenlightened beings of coarse nature are those whose debilitations, at the time when the afflictions removable in the Path of Seeing have not yet been eliminated, are unable to accord with the holy standard. At this time they are designated as unenlightened sentient beings. Who are the unenlightened beings of subtle nature? They are the ones whose debilitations, up to the attainment of the adamant concentration,<sup>127</sup> according to particular obstructions, make them unable to accord with the holy standard. Therefore both are said to have the nature of unenlightened sentient beings. Although there are these two kinds, the treatises deal only with the coarse aspect of the nature of unenlightened sentient beings. It is like the case of the four marks [of existence], which have both coarse and subtle. Since the subtle is momentary and the coarse is continuous, the treatises base their discussions only on the coarse aspect.

As the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says: “You should understand that the notion of unenlightened sentient beings<sup>128</sup> and so forth is established based on continuity and not on momentariness” [T 1606:31.700b29]. Therefore it is the same with

the coarse and the subtle<sup>129</sup> within the nature of unenlightened sentient beings, and so we can understand that both coarse and subtle are found in the natures of unenlightened sentient beings.

[795a] This marks the conclusion of the above five sections, which constitute the first interpretation—the Direct explanation of the essence of the hindrances.

#### 2.1.6. THE ESSENCE OF THE TWO HINDRANCES FROM THE INDIRECT PERSPECTIVE

The afflictive obstructions have the six defiled mental states as their essence, while the cognitive obstructions have fundamental nescience as their essence. The six defiled mental states are (1) defilement concomitant with attachment, (2) defilement concomitant with noninterruption, (3) defilement concomitant with discriminatory cognition, (4) defilement not concomitant with manifest form, (5) defilement not concomitant with the subjectively viewing mind, and (6) defilement not concomitant with fundamental karma. Among these, the first two reside in the sixth consciousness, the third defilement resides in the seventh consciousness, and the last three defilements reside in the eighth consciousness. Since the content of this is explained in detail in my *Expository Notes [on the “Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith”]*,<sup>130</sup> I will not repeat it here. This interpretation of the afflictive obstructions in terms of these six kinds of defiled mental states fully covers the content of both hindrances as explained above.

Fundamental nescience, which is the basis of the six defiled mental states, is the most extremely subtle form of darkness and nonawareness. Confused in regard to the oneness and equality of the nature [of living beings] within, one is also unable to apprehend the distinctions in characteristics without. Therefore one is capable neither of apprehending objective distinctions nor of illuminating reality. Since the characteristic [of thussness] is great and close at hand, this nescience is the most distant thing from it. It is like the nearness of the lowest acolyte to the head monk [which might allow the acolyte to not properly appreciate the wisdom of his teacher]. Within all of cyclic existence there is not a single thing that is more subtle than the nescience that serves as a basis. Only with this as a source [does thought] suddenly appear. Therefore it is called *beginningless nescience*.

As the *Sutra of Primary Activities*<sup>131</sup> says: “Before this entrenchment, no dharma has appeared; therefore it is called the entrenchment of beginningless nescience” [T 1485:24.1022a7–8]. The *AMF* says: “Because one has not apprehended the single dharma realm, the mind is not aware [of its total unity with thussness]. At that moment suddenly a thought arises. This is called nescience” [T 1666:32.577c5–7].

The characterization of nescience in these passages as “unprecedented” and “suddenly arising” is not done from the standpoint of the temporal divisions of before and after. It is only a provisional explanation of subtlety and coarseness in dependent arising. Even though this nescience is not concomitant with the



ripening consciousness, it creates a fundamental and insoluble fusion. Therefore we provisionally explain its characteristics based on this consciousness. [795b] It is based on this reasoning that [nescience] is said to exist at such a fundamental level of consciousness as the *ālaya-vijñāna*. As the *Treatise [on the Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith]* says: “It is said that nescience arises without awareness depending on the *ālaya-vijñāna*” [T 1666:32.577b4–5]. The above is called the Indirect explanation of the essence of the cognitive obstructions.

The section on the explanation of the essence of the hindrances ends here.

### 3. The Function of the Hindrances

This section, as above, will be explained in the framework of the two perspectives [of Direct and Indirect]. From the Direct perspective, the functions of the afflictive hindrances are basically two: the function of producing karma, and the function of bringing rebirth. The function of producing karma is again twofold: the first is the function of producing *directive karma*,<sup>132</sup> and the second is the function of producing *particularizing karma*.<sup>133</sup>

#### 3.1. The Direct Interpretation

##### 3.1.1. THE AFFLICTIVE HINDRANCES

###### 3.1.1.1. The Function of Producing Karma

Generally speaking, all afflictions produce directive karma as well as particularizing karma. If, within these, we take them in terms of their most prominent characteristics, then nescience functions to produce directive karma, while thirst and grasping function to produce particularizing karma.<sup>134</sup> As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Among the twelve limbs [of dependent origination], there are two kinds of karma and three kinds of affliction. Of the two kinds of karma, the first is directive karma and the next is particularizing karma. Among the three afflictions, one [nescience] functions to produce directive karma, and the other two [thirst and grasping] function to produce particularizing karma. [T 1579:30.612b6–10]

Among these, the production of directive karma is equivalent to the production of manifestly active karma. The production of particularizing karma is equivalent to the production of seed karma. Based on the ability to perfume and generate the seeds of prior activities, it causes them to mature, to be able to come to life and come forth into visible existence.

Directive karma has two kinds of generative potentiality: (1) the ability to generate manifest binding when producing evil karma, and (2) the ability to generate

the latent aspects of virtuous and nonpropelling karma. When generating particularizing karma, all three karmas of evil, virtuous, and nonpropelling are active, and craving and grasping are able to arise. Furthermore, within the generation of directive karma, innate afflictions [afflictions carried over from previous lifetimes] produce karmas with specific results. Only the afflictions arisen from discrimination [manifest afflictions produced in the present lifetime] accord with that which they are associated, and are able to produce the three kinds [i.e., evil, virtuous and nonpropelling] of directive karma of general results.

Why is this so? If you fully realize that the three realms are nothing but suffering and you also understand the causes for the arising of suffering, you will naturally not behave in a way that would cause suffering. By the same token, if you do *not* fully understand the causes of suffering, the impetus of this nescience acts to produce directive karma. Again, if you understand no-self and the equality of self and other, what could compel you to create your own individual retributive karma? Hence, if you do not fully understand no-self, the impetus of this nescience can lead to the generation of the directive karma of general retribution.

[795c] For this reason, the afflictions [that arise] due to confusion regarding phenomena—and that are to be eliminated in the Path of Cultivation<sup>135</sup>—are able to produce the directive karma of general retribution. Following this argument, the nescience that is associated with the innately arisen view of self, which is confused in regard to selflessness and the equality of self and other, is actually able to generate both directive and particularizing karma. However, when one reaches the stages subsequent to the Path of Seeing, one is free from their concomitants, and since their power is weakened, these karmas are unable to come forth. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Question: What kinds of causes and conditions allow the nonbeneficial and nonpropelling karmas to be properly produced from the activity of thought? Can nescience also be a condition for this?

Answer: It is due to a lack of understanding of the ordinary causes of suffering that one engages in nonbeneficial actions. It is due to a lack of understanding of the supramundane causes of suffering that one creates beneficial and nonpropelling karmas. [T 1579:30.325a7–11, paraphrased]

This clarifies that it is due to delusion in regard to the causes and conditions for ordinary suffering in the evil destinies that nescience is able to bring about sinful activity. Therefore the text says that one does not understand the ordinary causes of suffering. And it is due to delusion in regard to the causes [and conditions] of the suffering induced by the changes that occur in conditioned existence in the good destinies that nescience is able to bring about virtuous activity. Therefore the text says that one does not understand the supramundane causes of suffering.

The *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says:

There are two kinds of confusion. The first is the confusion in regard to karmic ripening; the second is confusion in regard to ultimate reality. It is due to the confusion in regard to karmic ripening that one engages in unwholesome activity. It is due to confusion in regard to ultimate reality that one produces beneficial and nonpropelling activity. The first confusion occurs when defilement combines with nescience, and one lacks the capacity for the correct view of confidence in regard to the defining activities of karmic ripening. As for the second kind of confusion, “ultimate reality” refers to the Four Truths. Because of this confusion, one does not perceive the truths. Even if you create wholesome mental states, since these are still pulled about by latent afflictions, they are still said to be “confused.” Due to their influence on the suffering extending throughout the three realms, one fails to accurately cognize reality and hence generates the causal nature of beneficial and nonpropelling activity in a subsequent existence. One who has already apprehended the truths does not produce this karma, as he or she lacks confusion in regard to ultimate reality. Therefore that karma is said to be generated by these causes. [T 1606:31.728c9–18]

This is discussed in order to make it clear that the production of karma and [the production of] nescience are both involved with delusion in regard to the meaning of the Four Truths, as well as the failure to understand [the principle of] ripening of causes into effects. Yet when one engages in wholesome activity, it is because even though one has not fully comprehended the principle of the Four Truths, one is nonetheless able to have confidence in the ripening of causes into effects. At this point, under the influence of the latencies of nescience, one does not properly understand how causes ripen into effects. [796a] When one engages in immoral activities, it is not only due to a lack of comprehension of the principle of the Four Truths but also because of a lack of firm confidence in the fact that virtually every cause ripens into an effect. Therefore, at this time, nescience is specifically termed “confusion in regard to causal ripening.”

### 3.1.1.2. The Momentum of the Continuity of Rebirth

Next is the clarification of the momentum of continued rebirth. There are two types of births to which we are linked: regular birth and expedient birth. In terms of timing there are two kinds of regular birth: birth at a definite time during existence in the form realm, and birth at a definite time upon dying from a life in the formless realm. The second kind, expedient birth, occurs only in conjunction with dying. Yet, as one approaches death, the existent mind has three levels: the first is the level of the mind of the three [karmic moral] qualities; the next is the

level of defiled mind; the last is the level of the karmically ripening mind. The first two are the *mano* and *manas* consciousnesses. The last is the ripening consciousness [the *ālaya-vijñāna*]. The mind at the level of the three qualities does not appear at the moment of birth, but the latter two mental levels are present at the time of birth. Also, between the latter two, the first is the level of entering birth with actively binding [afflictions], and the second is the level of entering birth with latent [afflictions].

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

Furthermore, when one dies in the desire realm and is reborn into a higher level, the continuity of wholesome states of mind and qualitatively indeterminate states directly produces defiled states of mind in the higher existence. This is because continued incarnation can take place only through defiled states of mind. Furthermore, when one is reborn into a lower level from a higher level, it is because the uninterrupted continuity of the wholesome states of mind of the higher stage, defiled states of mind, and qualitatively indeterminate states of mind produce only defiled states of mind when one is reborn into a lower level. [T 1579:30.684b10–18, abridged]

Again, a later passage says:<sup>136</sup> “Since the final thought before the moment of death is necessarily a ripened mental state, the mind of the unbroken string of rebirths is also ripened [and thus neutral in quality]” [T 1579:30.664c19–20].

If in the *Yogācārabhūmi* there is a final mental moment, it is necessarily defiled. Before this, there is no definable stage. In short, the situation at the time of birth is explained like this.

Within this context, what kinds of afflictions are able to bring about rebirth? [796b] Broadly speaking, all the afflictions in one’s present stage are able to bring about rebirth. To be very specific however, it is only the morally indeterminate inborn attachment to self that brings about continuous rebirth. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Question: When people are reborn into various realms in various bodies, should it be said that all the afflictions of all the realms bring about rebirth? Or are there some that do not?

Answer: They all do, and there are none that do not. Why? It is only when one is not yet free from desire that one is reborn in these places—it does not happen if one is free from desire. Furthermore, when one is not free from desire, all debilitating tendencies of afflictive character will continue to adhere to one’s body and also serve as the causes for the birth of another body. Also, at the time of undergoing rebirth, on the surface of the self, sexual desire is activated. Love and hatred manifest one after another. [T 1579:30.629c9–16]

And so on. This passage explains the matter in its general aspect.

The [*Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*] also says: “Why is there birth? It occurs because of the incessant arising of attachment to self. [ . . . ] [It is because the seeds] from this life ripen without interruption that one attains birth” [T 1579:30.282a13–16, greatly abridged].

The \**Abhidharma-samuccaya* says:

The power of linking [of rebirth] includes the nine kinds of near-death states of mind. These are concomitant with attachment to the self-essence [*ātma-bhāva*] and enable the linking of lives in each of the three realms. This attachment to a self-essence is wholly innate. Even though one does not cognize the impedimentary indeterminate qualities that are found in the objective realm, one is able to distinguish “I”—a self-essence—and give rise to a separately distinguished objective realm. Because of this impetus, all worldlings are led into incessant continuation of their existence. [T 1606:31.714b27–c6, greatly abridged]

These passages explain [the matter of continuity of rebirth] from the perspective of a stricter interpretation [i.e., that which says that most of the momentum for rebirth comes specifically from the deep attachment to the notion of self].

There are two ways that we can understand how when afflictions are not abandoned at higher-level states they can produce rebirth in lower levels.

One is that if one abides in a higher state and the karma of the higher state is exhausted, at the end of one’s life the circumstances of rebirth are naturally determined. Since one has previously fallen away from the merit attained in that stage, at that time a lower rebirth is brought about. This is just like the case of the time of the approach of death after a birth in the no-thought heaven—one’s circumstances of rebirth are naturally determined. One’s life has come to an end after one has retrogressed from nonthought states. This is the same sort of case.

The second case is that where worldlings are reborn into a higher level but have not yet overcome the view of self. Because of their not overcoming the power of the view of self, they generate attachment to a self when they are reborn into a lower level of existence.

As [the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*] says:

From the mundane path up to the state of freedom from all desires in the stage of nothingness,<sup>137</sup> [796c] one is liberated from the craving and desire that lie within all the afflicted states of mind in the lower stages. Yet one is not free from the view of entities. Because of [attachment to] this view, in all of the activities engaged in within the lower and higher stages there is confusion regarding the self-essence, and one does not [correctly] discriminate, assuming all things to be either “I” or “mine.” Because of this, even though one might ascend

to the summit of material existence,<sup>138</sup> one still subsequently retrogresses. [T 1579:30.794c3–8]

According to these two implications, although one becomes free from the previously subjugated afflictions that are to be eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, at the time of death they are potent enough to reappear. Because of this we can say that the afflictions that bind us to rebirth in the three realms are primarily the afflictions that are to be extirpated in the Path of Cultivation. [Those afflictions] that produce general reward karma are primarily those eliminated in the Path of Seeing. Since these influence each other, they are said to share in the production [of karma] and the bringing about of rebirth.

As the *\*Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*-[*bhāṣya*]<sup>139</sup> says: “If there is no nescience within suffering, no practices will be initiated. [Even if practices are already initiated,] if there is no nescience in the Path of Cultivation, those practices will not have fruition” [T 1595:31.167b29–c1].<sup>140</sup> This clarifies that the nescience that is associated with the discrimination of the view of self is able to produce the general retribution/directive karma. Nescience that is concomitant with attachment to surrounding objects functions to support that [directive] karma and to bring about the formation of particularizing karma.

The *Treatise on Buddha Nature*<sup>141</sup> says: “Beneficial and nonpropelling karmas aid in enhancing the causes of being born in the Buddha’s family. Thought enables the formation of karma; [delusion in regard to] seeing the truths allows one to experience the effects [of karma]” [T 1610:31.806c29–7a1]. This clarifies that attachment to the objects around one [at the moment of death] augments directive karma and brings about the formation of particularizing karma. Therefore the text says “formation of karma.” Because it is not able to initiate the production of directive karma, the text does not say “is able to produce [directive] karma.” Based on the karmic power of attachment to self, one is able to experience effects. Therefore it says, “Delusion in regard to] seeing the truths allows one to experience the effects [of karma].”

According to that treatise, attachment to mental objects entails confusion regarding the five sense objects, and therefore this is called *thought*. Attachment to self runs contrary to the principle of selflessness; therefore it is called [*mental disturbance in regard to] seeing the truth*. Yet this attachment to self is not arisen from discrimination, and so therefore it is to be eliminated in the Path of Cultivation. With this kind of reasoning there is no contradiction.

Furthermore, if we distinguish according to the type of person, all of the actively binding and latent afflictions of worldlings bring about rebirth. However, in the case of bodhisattvas, neither the actively binding hindrances nor the latent hindrances bring rebirth. [797a] The sages of two vehicles are different. Why? From a broader perspective, all those at the level of sage are reborn only due to the possession of latent afflictions. This is because at the time the sages undergo rebirth, there is no sexual attraction or aversion. From a narrower perspective, in the first two realizations of [the four realizations<sup>142</sup> of the Lesser Vehicle]

sagehood, the innate attachment to self is also active. It is only at the level of the third realization [nonreturner]<sup>143</sup> that it does not produce rebirth. When one is reborn based solely on latencies, it is because birth with attachment to self muddles the sagely intention, and because of the gradual energizing of the uncontaminated path.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

There are, in general, seven kinds of continuous rebirth: (1) continuous rebirth from both active and latent hindrances—this involves all worldlings; (2) continuous rebirth from latent hindrances only—this refers to those who have seen the traces of the holy path; (3) entering the womb with correct awareness—this refers to the wheel-turning kings; (4) entering into abiding with correct awareness—this refers to the *pratyekabuddha*; (5) not losing correct mindfulness in any situation—this refers to the bodhisattvas; (6) rebirth induced by karma—this refers to the bodhisattvas; (7) rebirth based on wisdom-power—this refers to the bodhisattvas. [T 1579:30.629c20–26]

When it says here that rebirth from the latent hindrances refers to those who have seen the traces of the holy path, this is based on the perspective of the broader interpretation of the causes of rebirth.

The *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says:

All [sages] who have not yet eliminated desire are like this. And even up to the stage of not yet having fully clarified their conceptualization, within this state they are still able to generate this attachment [to self]. Yet when they are able to discriminate clearly, it is because the power of their corrective practices can subdue [desire]. Since the power of the corrective practices of [the sages] who have eliminated desire is strong, this attachment never reactivates, even though they have not permanently eliminated it. It is due to the power of the latent hindrances that they continue to undergo rebirth. [T 1606:31.714c7–11]

This is from the perspective of the narrower interpretation of binding to rebirth.

The above discussion of karma-induced rebirth explains the case of the afflictions generated by the sixth consciousness. As for the four afflictions associated with the *manas*, they are constantly active in all mental states and thus pervasively serve as the basis for the generation of karma and rebirth. This kind of interpretation of production of karma and rebirth is equivalent to the two aspects among the three kinds of conditioned arising:<sup>144</sup> of rebirth through like and dislike, and [of rebirth through] receiving the body for enjoyment. Among the three kinds of perfuming,<sup>145</sup> this doctrine reflects only perfuming by distinction of

one's state of existence and perfuming by the view of self. This completes the explanation of the functions of the afflictive hindrances.

### 3.1.2. THE COGNITIVE HINDRANCES

[797b] The cognitive hindrances do not have the function of producing karma or rebirth within the three realms. This is because [these hindrances] do not include delusion in regard to either the Four Truths or selflessness of person. Nonetheless, they have two distinctive kinds of functions. What are the two?

The first is the discrimination of distinct self-natures in all dharmas, which allows the ability to perfume and form the eighteen elements. Based on this, one discriminates and produces the essences of dharmas. This is the function of direct causation [from among the four kinds of causes] [*hetu-pratyaya*]. Between the two kinds of causes of rebirth, it is the cause of self-nature. Among the three kinds of perfuming, it is the perfuming by verbal expressions.<sup>146</sup>

The second is the cognitive hindrances' discrimination of the marks of distinctions between self and other, the disagreeable and agreeable, et cetera, which is able to produce views, pride, craving, anger, and so forth. This is the function of causation by contingent factors [*adhipati-pratyaya*].<sup>147</sup> This concludes the explanation of the functions of the hindrances from the Direct perspective.

## 3.2. The Function of the Two Hindrances according to the Indirect Perspective

The Indirect perspective of the functions of the two kinds of obstructions also includes the dimensions of generation of karma and continuation of rebirth.

### 3.2.1. GENERATION OF KARMA

In this context, "generation of karma" means that the uncontaminated karma produced by entrenched<sup>148</sup> nescience causes one to undergo miraculous birth-and-death<sup>149</sup> beyond the [three] realms. This is the principle of the Four Unconstructed Truths.<sup>150</sup> It is like the above explanation from the Direct perspective, which is done from the perspective of the Four Constructed Truths.

As the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says:

As it is by grasping the causes of contaminated karma that [sentient beings] are born in the three realms, [so it is that] the entrenchment of nescience, linking up with noncontaminated karma, produces the three kinds of mind-made bodies of the arhats, *pratyekabuddhas*, and powerful bodhisattvas.<sup>151</sup> [T 353:12.220a16–18]

Generally speaking, although they are differentiated in this context, the uncontaminated karmas produced here, being the roots of goodness of the supramundane



aspect of the Path of Skillful Means, are neither produced by nor nourished by the three kinds of contamination<sup>152</sup> and do not produce birth in the three realms. Therefore they are called uncontaminated.

It should be understood that the Truth of Arising has the two aspects of contaminated and uncontaminated. The Truth of Suffering that is produced also has two aspects: they are called the conditioned Truth of Suffering and the unconditioned Truth of Suffering. As the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* says:

[797c] Why is it called “mundane world”? Because the marks of the three realms resemble the visible phenomena reflected in a mirror. What does this clarify? Within the uncontaminated [dharma-]realm are the three kinds of mind-made bodies, and that which is called mundane world is something created based on uncontaminated wholesome roots. When there is freedom from states produced by contaminated afflictive activities, it is also called *nirvāṇa*. In the same vein, the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: “There is the conditioned mundane world, and there is unconditioned mundane world; there is conditioned *nirvāṇa*, and there is unconditioned *nirvāṇa*.”<sup>153</sup>

There are also two kinds of generation of karma. One is the generation of directive karma from the entrenchment of nescience. The second is the generation of particularizing karma from the habit energies of thirst and grasping. The reason that the entrenchment of nescience is able to produce directive-samsaric karma is that it implies a lack of awareness that the nature of the mind is originally quiescent and forever changeless. Based on this impetus, practitioners are capable of producing the arising-and-ceasing of mind-made bodies and the karma of miraculous birth-and-death.

Bodhisattvas in the Path of Seeing permanently free themselves from subjectivity and objectivity and, according to their abilities, actualize the original motionlessness [of the mind’s nature]. Therefore, even though they still have nescience, this nescience does not form the karma that leads to rebirth. Because of this power, in the subsequent Path of Skillful Means and so forth, they should not produce the karma that leads to generic retribution. It is like the case of the adherents of the two vehicles who have completed their Path of Seeing. Even though they still possess the nescience of the innate view of self, this does not result in the formation of the karma of generic retribution. You should understand the principle being expressed here in the same way.

Why is it that the habit energies of attachment to person and the discriminations of attachment to dharmas are not capable of producing uncontaminated karma? There is no case within the purview of the three vehicles where this does not hold true. However, when these bodhisattvas are in their Path of Skillful Means, they cultivate uncontaminated karma as an antidote. Since there is a *conflict between the hindrances and their correction*, this karma cannot be generated.<sup>154</sup> For example, it is like the case of a person in the desire realm who,

because of attachment to self and so forth, is not capable of producing nonpropelling karma, due to the conflict between the hindrances and their antidotes. It is the same here. Therefore the entrenchment of nescience is not something that can be subdued by karmically uncontaminated [practices], and thus [this nescience] is able to produce karma. Since this [entrenched] nescience pervasively produces the uncontaminated directive karma of the three vehicles, we simply say here that it generates karma.<sup>155</sup>

When particularizing karma is generated, its function is limited to the nourishment and appropriation of seeds, causing them to form and emerge. It does not produce manifestly active uncontaminated karma. [798a] Based on this interpretation, habit energies from thirst and grasping, as well as deluded conceptualization, are able to produce particularizing karma. As the \**Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra* says: “Due to the power of their habit energies, the nonretrogressive bodhisattvas are born with the body of the dharma-nature” [T 1509:25.371a28]. This illustrates the meaning of the production of particularizing karma.

The *Ratnagotravibhāga* says: “‘Marks of conditions’<sup>156</sup> means that the entrenchment of nescience creates conditions when it moves. It is the same as nescience serving as condition for impulse [as the first and second of the twelve links of dependent arising]” [T 1611:31.830b3–5]. This explains the meaning of directive karma. That treatise also says: “Conditioned by the entrenchment of nescience and conditioned by subtle forms of conceptual elaboration [*prapañca*], uncontaminated karma is produced in the mental aggregate” [T 1611:31.830b15–18, abridged<sup>157</sup>]. These passages fully explain the two branches of karma [i.e., particularizing and directive].

### 3.2.2. MOMENTUM OF REBIRTH

Next is the clarification of the momentum of rebirth. When arhats and *pratyekabuddhas* undergo birth, there are habit energies of attachment to self, and within these there is rebirth as well as the production of particularizing karma. These are [included in] the function of the afflictive obstructions, as they all abide within the six kinds of defiled [mind]. The production of directive karma comes from the influence of the cognitive obstructions, as the entrenchment of nescience is not one of the six kinds of defiled mind. Furthermore, these cognitive obstructions have two kinds of special functions:

(1) Nescience quickens thusness into cyclic existence. As the *Sutra [of Neither Increase nor Decrease]*<sup>158</sup> says: “This realm of existence is called sentient beings” [T 668:16.467c11–12]. The *Treatise [on the Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith]* says: “The essentially pure mind moves due to the wind of nescience” [T 1666:32.576c14].

(2) Nescience is able to impregnate thusness, generating all dharmas such as consciousness and so forth. As the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* says: “Inconceivable impregnation and inconceivable transformation are the causes of the manifest consciousness” [T 670:16.473a19–20]. The *Treatise [on the Awakening of Mahāyāna*

*Faith*] says: “The pure state of thusness essentially lacks defilement. It is only because of perfuming by nescience that it takes on the marks of defilement” [T 1666:32.578a19–20].

Due to these two kinds of forces, one creates two kinds of bases for cyclic existence. As the [*Śrīmālā*]-*sūtra* says: “The generation of these three stages—those three kinds of mind-made bodies—as well as uncontaminated karma, all depend on the entrenchment of nescience. They all are contingent upon it, and there are none that are not contingent upon it” [T 353:12.220a18–19]. Therefore you should know that the power of nescience is especially predominant. As a verse says: “Among all mental factors, wisdom is the most excellent. It attains the state of nonaccomplishment, yet there is nothing that it does not accomplish, because there is nothing that it cannot do. Within cyclic existence, it is the power of nescience that is the greatest. It is able to quicken the single realm of existence such that it pervasively gives rise to the three [realms of] birth-and-death.”<sup>159</sup>

[798b] The above two sections have explained the functions of the hindrances.

## 4. The Categories of the Hindrances

The next is the fourth section, which details the various categories of the mental disturbances—and there are indeed many. Here we will summarize them in six groups: (1) the 128 afflictions, (2) the 104 afflictions, (3) the ninety-eight declivities, (4) the eight kinds of deluded conceptualization, (5) the three kinds of afflictions, and (6) the two kinds of afflictions.

### 4.1. The 128 Afflictions

First, what are the 128 afflictions? This term refers to the 128 types of grasping throughout the three realms, based on the discriminations that arise due to delusion in regard to the Four Truths. As the “Original Section” of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

In connection with the Noble Truths of Suffering and Arising in the desire realm, as well as the Truths of Cessation and the Path of the desire realm that overcome the former, there are ten kinds of afflictions of deluded attachment. In connection with the noble truths of suffering and arising in the form realm, as well as the Truths of Cessation and the Path in the form realm that overcome the former, there is the same set of afflictions, excluding hatred. The case is the same in the formless realm as it is in the form realm. There are six kinds of confusions related to deluded attachment that are dealt with in the corrective practices in the desire realm—[which are the same set of ten,] minus wrong view, attachment to views, attachment to discipline, and doubt.<sup>160</sup> In the form and formless realms there are five

kinds of deluded attachment, which are the same as the prior six, excluding ill will.<sup>161</sup> [T 1579:30.313b21–28, abridged]

How are these ten afflictions distinguished within the realms of the Four Truths? The deluded attachments that arise are distinguished into four according to their origin. What does this mean? These ten afflictions have three general types, which are (1) confusion in regard to the fundament, (2) confusion of essentialism, and (3) confusion in regard to the continuity of sameness. Confusion in regard to the fundament refers to nescience. Confusion of essentialism refers to the view of a self, one aspect of extreme views (either nihilism or eternalism), the view of attachment to views, as well as attachment to discipline, and greed. The confusion in regard to the continuity of sameness accounts for the remaining afflictions.

Nescience as confusion in regard to the fundament also has two kinds, which are called *concomitant* and *independently functioning*.<sup>162</sup>

Independently functioning nescience is a form of nescience that is not bound to desire and the other afflictions. It is just that due to the influence of incorrect contemplation of the objects of the [Four] Truths of suffering and so forth, there are some persons of dull intelligence whose thinking is incorrect and who therefore draw mistaken conclusions, which obscure mental functioning. [798c] This is called independently functioning nescience. [T 1579:30.622a11–15, abridged]

If, within [this state], one investigates the Truth of Suffering with incorrect contemplation, then inaccurate awareness darkens and obscures [cognitive function]. Based on this nescience, one imagines a perceiver and so forth, and following this, one gives rise to the view of self, with its attendant delusions. In this way these ten [afflictions] are all confused in regard to the Truth of Suffering.

If one investigates but fails to accurately understand the Truth of Arising and, based on this [incorrect perception], imagines an actor and so forth, then these ten [afflictions] are all confused in regard to the Truth of Arising. Because these two are directly confused in regard to the basis of causation, one does not give rise to fear regarding the Truths of Cessation and the Path.

Again, suppose, based on incorrect contemplation, one investigates the Truth of Cessation and misunderstands it and then, based on this nescience, imagines a pure self. With this as a starting point, the other delusions arise in concert. In this case the ten [afflictions] all contain confusion in regard to the Truth of Cessation. If one investigates the Truth of the Path and misunderstands it and, based on this [nescience], imagines a knower and a seer, then these ten kinds [of affliction] all contain confusion in regard to the Truth of the Path.

The afflictions produced by these two kinds of nescience eventually generate thoughts of fear regarding the Truths of Cessation and the Path. This is because

one originally fails to investigate the principle of the [Four] Truths and directly imagines a self and so forth based on the five aggregates. In this way, all [these afflictions] are based in confusion in regard to the Truth of Suffering. Therefore each of the Four Truths has ten afflictions of mistaken attachment associated with it. As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

All of the mistakes in regard to the Truths of Suffering and Arising operate based on the mistakes in regard to the grounds of their causes and conditions. All the mistakes in regard to the Truths of Cessation and the Path operate due to the mistake of fearing them. [T 1579:30.627c5–7]

The \**Abhidharma-samuccaya* says:

Furthermore, the ten afflictions are all based in confusion regarding the Truths of Suffering and Arising and thus give rise to evil activities. This is because [suffering and the arising of suffering] are their causal ground. Why is this? The two Truths of Suffering and Arising are the causes and conditions of and are the grounds for the ten kinds of afflictions. Therefore all contain confusion in regard to their causal grounds and give rise to various evil actions. Furthermore, the ten afflictions all contain confusion in regard to the Truths of Cessation and the Path and thus give rise to various evil actions. Because of this, [sentient beings] have apprehension regarding these [two truths]. Why so? Due to the power of the afflictions, one enjoys and becomes attached to cyclic existence and generates great fear regarding pure states, as if he were standing at the edge of a precipice. Furthermore, all non-Buddhists deludedly give rise to all kinds of distorted notions in regard to the Truths of Cessation and the Path. Therefore these ten delusions all contain confusion in regard to the Truths of Cessation and the Path and give rise to all kinds of evil actions. [T 1606:31.736a1–8]

If confusion in regard to this [truth] gives rise to evil actions, then it is in seeing it that they will be eliminated.

[799a] Furthermore, one who investigates such principles as thusness, Buddha nature, and so forth based on incorrect contemplation, and thus wrongly apprehends them, denies the Great Vehicle. Such wrong views, produced from discrimination, cause incessant suffering, even though one does not directly err in regard to the established Four Truths. Yet you cannot say that the adherents of the two vehicles fail to stem the causes of falling into evil rebirths, since they eliminate these causes without remainder. They are able to eliminate these erroneous views because they use the discernment of the contemplation of the uncontaminated truths of the two vehicles, and they also contemplate the truths as

nonposited objects. Therefore these erroneous views are included together with the confusion in regard to the Four Truths. Since the principles of emptiness and selflessness contained within the Four Truths are not different from the Buddha nature, to entertain a view of a self is to deny the Great Vehicle.

Furthermore, the two views [view of self and extreme views] under discussion here are also innate. The [remaining] three views [evil view, view of attachment to views, and view of attachment to discipline], along with doubt, are arisen only through discrimination. Since the [first] two views internally impute a self-essence and constantly habituate this imputation, they also activate spontaneously. The [remaining] three views and doubt, inaccurate cognition in the investigation of reality, and incorrect imputations are not continuously habituated, and therefore they are not innate. And even though one may spontaneously give rise to doubts in various situations, these are not considered to be afflictive in nature, since they are not defiling. Therefore there are only six types of affliction eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, and these are all understood to be engendered by the six consciousnesses. If we discuss the four kinds of mental disturbances that are associated with the *manas*, then these are all included with the four that are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation. This concludes the explanation of the 128 afflictions.

#### 4.2. The 104 Afflictions

Next I will explain the 104 afflictions. Ninety-four of these are eliminated in the Path of Seeing, and the remaining ten are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, totaling 104. As the “Section on Ascertainment” in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

How do we distinguish types of confusion along with their elimination? The confusions in regard to the Truth of Suffering within the desire realm include the ten afflictions. The confusions in regard to the remaining three truths consist of eight kinds of affliction apiece, [that is, the ten basic afflictions] minus the view of entities and the view of attachment to extremes. The afflictions in the upper [two] realms [form realm and formless realm] are the same as those in the desire realm, with the exception of anger [T 1579:30.623a10–15]. [. . .] Eliminated in the Path of Cultivation are the anger of the desire realm and the three afflictions of greed, pride, and nescience in all three realms [T 1579:30.623c3–4].

[799b] The reason that the two views of [attachment to] extremes and view of entities are mistaken only in regard to the Truth of Suffering is that correction of them that is undertaken in this context is said to be mistaken. Why is it understood like this? Because these two views directly controvert the two defining activities of the Truth of Suffering—no-self and impermanence. When these two

views appear in the context of the remaining three truths, all give rise to unwholesome activities based on the delusions arisen in regard to the Truth of Suffering. Since the remaining afflictions do not operate in this way, they are said to be deluded in their apprehension of objects. The reason why these two views are not part of the afflictions that are removed in the Path of Cultivation is that once one has attained of the Path of Seeing, one rarely generates these views. Therefore I just mention them in passing here. Even though the three delusions in the *manas* consciousness have the same name, they are not included with the three that are removed in the Path of Cultivation. This concludes the explanation of the 104 afflictions.

### 4.3. The Ninety-eight Declivities

Third is the explanation of the ninety-eight declivities. Eighty-eight of these are eliminated in the Path of Seeing, and ten are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, totaling ninety-eight. Among the eighty-eight, within the desire realm there are ten included under the Truth of Suffering and eight under the Truth of the Path—that is, all except the two views. The remaining two truths each include seven—that is, all except the two views and the view of attachment to discipline. Within the two higher realms, each of these categories also lacks hatred, and the rest are the same as those in the desire realm. The ten that are removed in the Path of Cultivation do not differ from those in the prior explanation [of the 104 afflictions].

As the *Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā*<sup>163</sup> says:

Those that are included in the declivities are called “afflictions,” and those that are included in the tethers are called “impurities.” Included among the declivities are the ten basic afflictions. They are discriminations that are eliminated according to contemplative insight into the truths in the three realms—therefore they are called the ninety-eight declivities. Those that are not subsumed under the declivities are lack of faith and so forth. Also, included among the discriminations that are eliminated according to contemplative insight into the truths within the three realms there are 196 kinds of tethers and impurities. [T 1521:26.108b28–c6]

The afflictions explained in this category have the view of self as their basis. It is due to harboring the view of self that one persistently denies the Four Truths. Based upon the four mistaken views, one gives rise to the other afflictions according to the situation. Therefore, in connection with the Four Truths, one mistakenly attaches to distinctions.

As the *Guang lun* says:

Due to the view of the existence of the self, one denies the [Four]

Truths. When one says that the self lacks suffering, one denies the Truth of Suffering. When one says that the self is uncaused, one denies the Truth of Arising. [799c] When one says that the self has no cessation, one denies the Truth of Cessation. When one says that there are no antidotes to the [afflictions affecting the] self, one denies the Truth of the Path.<sup>164</sup>

The point of this approach is to explain that in all cases the view of a self occurs where one takes the five aggregates as a self-essence [*ātma-bhāva*]. Therefore there is no [case where the view of self] is not confused in regard to the Truth of Suffering. Extreme views depend on this reified self, imagining either its absolute nonexistence or its permanence. Hence, extreme views are also confused in regard to the Truth of Suffering. Therefore these two views do not pervade the [remaining] three truths.

The reason that attachment to [wrong] discipline<sup>165</sup> is deluded only in regard to the Truths of Suffering and the Path is that when it comes to attachment to [wrong] discipline, there are but two kinds. The first is the attachment to discipline as an independent means to liberation—which is the error of relying solely upon mistaken [non-Buddhist] discipline as the cause [for liberation]. The second is the attachment to perverted discipline, wherein one regards one's own erroneous views to be the path and so forth. The attachment to discipline as an independent means to liberation takes the Truths of Suffering and Arising as its referent. Yet in regard to the Truth of Arising it does not directly controvert its principles, since it at least understands causation as causation. But in terms of the Truth of Suffering, it directly controverts its principles, since it confuses causes with effects. Therefore this attachment is eliminated merely through insight into the Truth of Suffering. The attachment to perverted discipline takes as its referent only the Truth of the Path, as evil views that deny the path are misconstrued to be the path. The remaining evil views are not misconstrued to be the path.

Why is this so? It is based on the intention to attain enlightenment that one gives rise to views that deny the path.<sup>166</sup> When one seeks and has some attainment with these views, one further misconstrues them as the path. The denying of the remaining three truths is, on the other hand, not based on one's seeking of the path, and therefore those views are not construed to be the path. Hence the attachment to [wrong] discipline does not extend to the Truths of Arising and Cessation. The reason that the two innate views are not considered to be eliminated in the Path of Cultivation is that, in comparison with the faults of desire, ill will, and so forth, they are extremely subtle. Therefore they are not technically defined as afflictions [in the narrow sense]. Rather, they are considered to be part of the mistaken cognition that is eliminated in the Path of Cultivation. This concludes the explanation of the ninety-eight declivities.

The above three categories discuss the afflictive hindrances as they are understood from the Direct perspective. However, each of these three ways of categorizing treat the distinctions in mistaken activity and deluded attachment only



from a certain kind of approach. This is not a set formula that can be applied universally.

#### 4.4. The Eight Kinds of Deluded Conceptualization

Fourth is an explanation of the eight kinds of deluded conceptualization, which are also known as the eight kinds of discrimination. As the *Xianyang lun* says:

The verse says:

There are eight kinds of discrimination  
 That are able to produce the three circumstances.<sup>167</sup>  
**[800a]** You should understand that this discrimination  
 Is constituted by [. . .] the mind and mental factors of the three  
 worlds. [T 1602:31.558b11–13]

The commentary says:

The eight kinds of discrimination are:

- (1) The discrimination of intrinsic nature. This means that when one perceives phenomena such as form and so forth, one discriminates them as having inherent nature.
- (2) The discrimination of distinctions. This means that one discriminates notions of phenomena such as form and so forth, saying that this one has form, that this one is formless, that they are visible, invisible, et cetera. With the imputation of intrinsic nature as the basis, one discriminates a variety of distinctions.
- (3) The discrimination of conglomerations. This refers to the reifications of self, sentient being, life span, and being that are established based on the composite phenomena of form and so forth, designated through metaphorical verbal and conceptual discriminations. Based on the compounding of clusters of phenomena, one takes them as a basis and generates discriminations. Also, with regard to the notions of phenomena such as “house,” “army,” or “forest,” and so forth, “house” and so forth are elements of discursive thought derived from nominal designations.
- (4) The discrimination of an “I.” This refers to the situation where there is contamination and attachment to phenomena, which becomes habituated over a long period of time, such that “I” becomes a reified object of attachment. It is a false discrimination that takes as referent the entity seen through repeated habituation of the subjective view.

(5) The discrimination of “mine.” This discrimination arises based on appropriation of events as well as appropriation of the objects of self that are adhered to.

(6) The discrimination of that which is attractive. This is the discrimination that occurs through perception of substances that are pure and attractive.

(7) The discrimination of the unattractive.

(8) The discrimination of the mutual distinction between the attractive and the unattractive.

These [eight] discriminations can be arranged into three<sup>168</sup> broader categories, which are the discrimination of inherent essences, the discrimination of bases, and the discrimination of cognitive objects. The first three discriminations function to create bases and the referential phenomena for conceptual elaborations. The discriminations of “I” and “mine” function to produce the view of self that is the basis for the rest of the [mistaken] views, and the conceit “I am,” which is the basis for the other manifestations of pride. The [discrimination of] the attractive, the unattractive, and their contrast give rise to their derivatives of greed, hatred, and delusion. Therefore these eight kinds of discrimination are the source of these three kinds of circumstances. [T 1602:31.558b10–c13, abridged]

The commentary explains it thus. That the first three kinds of discrimination function to give rise to the phenomena of bases and referents clarifies the perfuming of the seeds of verbal expression. From this, the phenomena of the twelve sense fields are proliferated.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

[The discriminations] explained here can be summarized as two types. [800b] One is the discrimination of intrinsic natures. The second is the discrimination of bases and referential phenomena. These two kinds of phenomena have served as mutual causes since the beginningless past. This means that the past discriminations serve as the cause, giving rise to the present discriminations, bases, and referential phenomena. Once the bases and the referents in the present have arisen, they are in turn able to function as causes to produce the present world. Since the discriminations arisen by those bases and referents are not something of which the present discrimination is sufficiently aware, they again produce the circumstances that are the bases and referents of the future. As that future comes to

pass, those bases and referents again produce discriminations. [T 1579:30.490a23–b1, abridged]

Referred to here as “bases” are the six internal sense bases;<sup>169</sup> the “referents” are the six external bases.<sup>170</sup> This shows how all of the eighteen elements of cognition are the products of the perfuming of the [first] three kinds of discrimination. Among these, the characteristics of the first two kinds of discrimination are readily understandable. As for the discriminations of the third type [conglomerations], such as “I,” “sentient being,” and so on, these are not the same as the [commonly understood] situation where the view of a true self is imputed based on self-view. From this, one, with conceit, apprehends accepted conventional terminology and, appropriating clustered characteristics, discriminates variously. Therefore [this type of discrimination] is not included within the afflictive hindrances.

Furthermore, these [first] three kinds of discrimination include all of the cognitive hindrances. When internal discriminations are exhausted, it is because one is free from these three aspects of discrimination, so that there is no longer any external thing to discriminate. However, in order to further illustrate that the cognitive hindrances function as the contributory factors for the production of the afflictive hindrances, [the commentary] appropriately establishes the remaining five [kinds of discrimination] based on the three kinds of generic discrimination. It is like the case where the four kinds of self-view of the afflictive hindrances [ultimately end up being the contributory factors] that bring about all types of affliction, including both discriminated and innate. However, in order to further illustrate the meaning of the conceit “I am,” [the commentary] separately establishes the two contingent types of self-view—of self and other, from the perspective of these two types of self-view. One should know that the principle being explained here is the same.

What are the characteristics of the afflicted phenomena produced from the five [subsequent] kinds of discrimination? It is just like the auditory consciousness, which hears the sound of a self. Based upon this, the *mano-vijñāna* arises, seeking the name of this self. In the third moment of the mind, one conclusively determines the name of this self to be different from other things, and so it is at this third moment of the mind that there is discrimination of an “I.” Right after the third moment of mind, one produces the defiled thought that does further speculative discrimination, assuming “I” to be unitary or eternal, to be actor, desirer, et cetera. After this, this “I” generates conceit and so forth. [800c] This process occurs with the other sense consciousnesses the same way as it does with the auditory consciousness.

The discrimination of “mine” functions like the discrimination of “I.” This means that, depending on these two kinds of discrimination, one produces phenomena such as views and pride. The discrimination of the attractive can be seen in the case where the visual consciousness makes a connection with pure and beautiful form, and then the *mano-vijñāna* arises, seeking after the subtler

features. At the third mental moment, one has certain knowledge of this beauty and forthwith senses pleasure, but does not yet give rise to craving. This third mental moment is called the discrimination of the attractive. Only after the moment of ascertainment does one give rise to defiled attraction, and the two subsequent forms of discrimination produce hatred and delusion. From this, the function [regarding the other sense consciousnesses] can be understood.

This means that it is depending on these three levels of discrimination that greed and other mental states are generated. Among these, the first five discriminations are the products of the cognitive hindrances, and the [latter] two mental states [of attraction and aversion] are [produced from] afflictive hindrances. Strictly speaking, when the afflictions arise following the third mental moment, these five kinds of discrimination are already present. The nature of the cognitive hindrances creates the root of the afflictions. However, if we interpret in a more general manner, then we can simply say that prior and after produce each other. From this perspective, we can say that the eight kinds of discrimination are all direct confusion in regard to the fourth truth.<sup>171</sup>

As the Old Treatise [the *Bodhisattvabhūmi-śāstra*]<sup>172</sup> says, “All unenlightened fools, not knowing reality, give rise to the eight kinds of deluded conceptualization, and these subsequently give rise to the three phenomena” [T 1581:30.895b7–8]. In the New Treatise [the *Yogācārabhūmi*] it says: “Furthermore, all foolish worldlings do not cognize reality, and because of this, the eight kinds of discrimination arise, generating the three phenomena” [T 1579:30.489c9–10]. Thus these eight kinds of deluded conceptualization are included in the cognitive hindrances from the Direct perspective.

#### 4.5. The Three Categories of Affliction

Fifth is the explanation of the three kinds of affliction. These are the afflictions eliminated in the Path of Seeing, the afflictions eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, and those that are not eliminated in either path. In terms of their distribution, there are two levels[, that of the adherents of the two vehicles and that of the bodhisattvas].

If we elucidate the three kinds of affliction from the standpoint of the two vehicles, then the afflictions produced by discrimination are eliminated in the Path of Seeing, and the innate afflictions are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation. The cognitive hindrances are not eliminated in either path. If we explain the three types of affliction from the standpoint of the bodhisattva [vehicle], then everything within both hindrances that is arisen by discrimination is eliminated in the Path of Seeing. All innate afflictions, except for those in the eighth consciousness, are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation.

**[801a]** The previously removed extremely subtle cognitive hindrances, along with the previously eliminated habit energies of the two hindrances, along with the fundamental karmic afflictions explained in the Indirect obstructions of affliction, as well as with the entrenchment of nescience in the Indirect obstructions

to wisdom—none of these are eliminated in either of the two paths. This is because only the practices of the final path are able to eliminate them. This outlines the general framework of their categorization. The precise details of these distinctions [in the levels at which specific hindrances are removed] will be explained in a subsequent section [the section on the elimination of the hindrances].

#### 4.6. The Two Categories of Affliction

Sixth is the explanation of the two categories of afflictions: entrenched afflictions and arisen afflictions. The arisen afflictions include all of the actively binding and latent afflictions associated with mind, as explained through the Direct aspect of the two hindrances. All are able to manifest based on the entrenchments and are thus called arisen.<sup>173</sup>

The relation between these two can be understood in the way that grasses, trees, and their seeds all rely upon the earth. When the entrenched afflictions are discussed in a general sense, then there is nothing but the singular entrenchment of nescience. Its characteristics are as previously explained in the section on the essence of the hindrances. If we discuss them in terms of their distinctions, then there are basically two kinds. The first are the innate entrenchments, which are also known as the entrenchments of the identity-view. The second are the constructed entrenchments, which are also known as the entrenchments of emotion toward the three realms.

The reason they are called innate is that they arise spontaneously in the state of nonawareness of thusness. They are beginningless, and therefore they are said to be innate. Since the point in regard to which they are deluded is thusness, they are not the same as the constructed entrenchments. Blurring the space of the three realms, [the deluded] say, “Everything is one”: one location, one mark, perfect equality, with no distinction to be obtained between seer and seen. But since this person is not awakened, it is called a view. When one is awakened, then there are no views, and so therefore it is called the entrenchment of the identity-view.

What is the meaning of constructed entrenchments? This means that based upon innate entrenchments, one gives rise to the mental states of the three realms, not realizing that its objects are actually thusness. This enables the production of the afflictions of the three realms. Since these [innate entrenchments] give rise to those [constructed entrenchments], the mind does not apprehend its objects. Since these delusions are not innate, they are said to be constructed. Since the emotive attachments are the same in their obscuration of objects, they are all included in the category of emotive mental functions. Therefore they are also known as the entrenchments of the emotive category.

**[801b]** Furthermore, these constructed entrenchments give rise to emotion regarding the three realms,<sup>174</sup> and so they are divided into three kinds of entrenchments. These are the entrenchments of the desire realm, the entrenchments of the form realm, and the entrenchments of the formless realm. They are also called

the entrenchments of emotions in the desire [realm], and so forth, up to the entrenchments of emotions in regard to existence. When the innate entrenchment is added together with these three constructed entrenchments, there are in total four types of entrenchments.

Yet, in their character of being [manifestations of] nonenlightenment, these three constructed entrenchments and the innate entrenchment are equal, having no distinctions of coarse and subtle. Therefore the four types are collectively referred to as beginningless entrenchments of nescience. Furthermore, these four kinds are not concomitant with mind, and they are also not the same as the arisen afflictions, which are concomitant [only] momentarily. Therefore they are comprehensively called entrenchments of nescience not concomitant with mind. It is comparable to the evening darkness that spreads throughout the entire sky, below which are three kinds of pavilions. Since the darkness within each pavilion is the unique characteristic of that pavilion, each can be separately called the darkness of that pavilion. Yet the characteristics of the darkness of each of the three pavilions are not in fact different from the darkness of the sky itself, and so therefore they are all termed together as “evening darkness.” You should understand the principle being explained here in the same way.

As the *Benye jing* says:

The consciousnesses of all sentient beings first give rise to a single mark and abide in it as referent. Since this arises in opposition to the ultimate truth, it is called mental disturbance. This becomes an entrenchment called innate affliction. Based on this entrenchment, one gives rise to all afflictions. Following this, all dharmas are born from conditions, and these are called constructed afflictions. Those that give rise to the afflictions of the desire realm are called the entrenchments of the desire realm. Those that give rise to the afflictions of the form realm are called the entrenchments of the form realm. Those that give rise to [purely] conceptual afflictions are called the entrenchments of the formless realm. Since, through these four kinds of entrenchments, one gives rise to all afflictions, this constitutes the arising of the four entrenchments. Prior to these four entrenchments, there is no phenomenon that is arisen; therefore it is called the beginningless entrenchment of nescience. The person at the level of the adamant wisdom is aware that this initially arisen single mark has an end, but does not know whether or not there are phenomena prior to its initial arising. How can we [fully] fathom the single innate entrenchment and the three constructed entrenchments? Only the buddhas know from beginning to end. [T 1485:24.1021c28–1022a10]

[801c] The *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says:

There are two kinds of afflictions: entrenched afflictions and arisen

afflictions. There are four kinds of entrenched afflictions. What are the four? The first is the entrenchments of the view of oneness. The second are the entrenchments of emotions in the desire [realm]; the third are the entrenchments of emotions in the form [realm]; the fourth are the entrenchments of emotions in regard to existence itself. These four kinds of entrenched afflictions generate all of the arisen afflictions. The arisen afflictions are concomitant with momentariness of the mind. World Honored One, the mind is not concomitant with the beginningless entrenchment of nescience. [T 353:12.220a2–6]

It should be understood that from the point of view of their differences, there are four kinds of entrenchments. But from a broader perspective, there is only the singular entrenchment of nescience. Seeing it from the perspective that beyond these four there is no other entrenchment, we say that there are four kinds. But when these four are seen as one, it is called the entrenchment of nescience that is not concomitant with mind. If we add these general and specific aspects together, we then have a total of five types of entrenchments, which are nothing other than nescience.

Nescience can be interpreted generally or specifically. It is like the general and specific connotations of the term “scripture.” The twelve genre divisions of the Buddhist canon can be classified under the general rubric of “scripture.” This is the usage of the term in a general sense. Then again, the discourse containing the [Buddha’s] direct teaching of the aggregates, realms, fields, and so forth that is not contained in the remaining eleven divisions of the canon is also called “scripture.” Here the term is being interpreted more specifically. This conception of nescience can be understood in the same way. When the four kinds of entrenchments are termed together as “nescience,” this is the general interpretation of the entrenchment of nescience. It is as was explained in the two scriptural citations. That which is not included in the three kinds of habituated attachment to existence is the innate entrenchment of direct error of the view of unity, which is again termed “entrenchment of nescience.” This is a specific aspect of the entrenchment of nescience. As the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: “The power of the entrenchment of nescience is so extremely great that only the enlightened wisdom of the buddhas is able to eliminate it” [T 353:12.220a10–15].

Furthermore, from the perspective of the entrenchments of the afflictive emotions regarding existence, the general and specific tallied together comprise four kinds of entrenchment of nescience. This implies the three kinds of specific emotional afflictions regarding existence, plus the generic aspect of the entrenchment of nescience. As the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: “Only the *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* are able to eliminate the entrenchment of nescience” [T 353:12.221a24]. The [same text] also says: “Arhats and *pratyekabuddhas* eradicate the four kinds of entrenchments of the afflictions of emotion regarding existence” [T 353:12.220a23–24].

[802a] Why is it necessary to combine the general and specific interpretations? It is done to illustrate that even though the energy that is produced by each of the three kinds of emotional entrenchments is different, there is no [distinction of] coarseness and subtlety in their dulling effects. It should be understood that the four entrenchments explicitly taught in the sutras are only the four types of *specific* entrenchments. All of the entrenchments are included in these four, and you can again say that these four include the four entrenchments of emotive afflictions regarding existence. This is the reason for the combined explanation of the general and specific interpretations. The entrenchment of the view of oneness is not part of this set of four. The rationale for the two different sets of four should be understood in this way.

Another reason that two kinds of general and specific characteristics are posited within the entrenchment of nescience is to make clear that its power is by far the greatest. What does this mean? If we were to compare the most virulent of the seeds that are the ground of the mind that are included in each of the four kinds of entrenchment of nescience with the broadly interpreted entrenchment of nescience, then even though the seeds are great in number, their power is weak. [On the other hand,] even though nescience is only one, its power is exceedingly strong. This is because all of the seeds are able to generate only their own separate mental conditions and do not have influence on other states. But this single entrenchment fully supports all the most virulent seeds that affect the mind and is therefore especially strong. It is like comparing [the power of] the seeds of all kinds of vegetation with that of the earth. The [entrenchment of nescience] is like this.

As the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: “The power of these four entrenched afflictions is the basis for all virulent mental afflictions but cannot be compared in terms of number and metaphor to the entrenchment of nescience” [T 353:12.220a6–8]. Once again, from the standpoint of the power of the entrenchment of nescience in its broad interpretation, [the sutra] separately takes the four kinds of entrenched afflictions of emotion in regard to existence and compares them with the power of the entrenchment of nescience in its specific interpretation, which is not included in the entrenched afflictions of emotional states concerning existence. Even though they are the same in their not being concomitant with mind, the power of the entrenchment of nescience is vastly greater.

Why is it so? These four entrenched afflictions of emotions in regard to existence are all of the constructed type [rather than the innate type], and so the delusion that they bring about is limited in its extent. Therefore they can be eradicated by lesser forms of wisdom. The essence of the entrenchment of nescience is the innate confusion in regard to oneness, and so [its power is] vast and great without limit—something that all kinds of lesser wisdom are incapable of eradicating. It can be eliminated only after attaining the mirrorlike cognitive faculty. Therefore the power of this nescience is [said to be] extremely great. It is like the difference between the darkness in a house, which can be removed by a single lamp, while the darkness of the entire sky is something upon which the lamp will have virtually no effect. [802b] Only when the sun rises in the heavens will this



darkness disappear. You should understand the nescience being discussed here in the same way.

As the [*Śrīmālā-*]sūtra says: “The power of the entrenchment of nescience is vastly greater than that of the four entrenched afflictions of emotion in regard to existence, such that the wisdom of the arhats and *pratyekabuddhas* is unable to eradicate it. Only the enlightened wisdom of the buddha-*tathāgatas* is able to eradicate it” [T 353:12.220a13–15]. This concludes the discussion of the distinction of the two kinds affliction of entrenched and arisen.

Among these two, the arisen afflictions are included in category of both of the hindrances discussed in the Direct interpretation, as well as the afflictive obstructions discussed in the Indirect interpretation. The entrenched afflictions are not discussed in the Direct interpretation. There mental disturbances are considered to be included in the category of the obstructions to wisdom only in the Indirect aspect.

There are in total six categories that can be identified with the frameworks of the hindrances: (1) mental disturbances<sup>175</sup> that are subsumed only under the afflictive hindrances, (2) mental disturbances that are subsumed only under cognitive hindrances, (3) mental disturbances that are included in both kinds of hindrances (these three categories have been discussed above); (4) mental disturbances that are subsumed only under the Direct aspects of both hindrances, excluding habit energies (for example, the six kinds of debilitating afflictions that are eliminated in the three abodes, and so forth), (5) delusions that are subsumed under the two hindrances proper, as well as under the habit energies (for example, the eleven kinds of hindrances that are eliminated during the eleven stages, and so forth); and (6) delusions that are subsumed under the two hindrances proper, the habit energies, and the two obstructions [from the Indirect teaching] (for example, the twenty-two kinds of delusion, the eleven debilitating obstructions, and so forth).<sup>176</sup> All other categories of the afflictions and their derivative phenomena should be understood as included here. This covers the two kinds of hindrances and two kinds of obstructions and fully encompasses all the various aspects of the teaching regarding mental disturbances. This concludes the section on the summary of the various categories of affliction.

## 5. Counteracting and Eliminating the Hindrances

The fifth section treats the counteracting and elimination of the hindrances. It is explained from four basic perspectives: (1) the antidotes, (2) that which is to be eliminated, (3) the divisions of antidotes and elimination, and (4) the stages of antidotes and elimination.

### 5.1. The Antidotes

The antidotes for counteracting [the hindrances] are said to have two broad methodological aspects: the mundane path and the supramundane path. The content of the mundane path is readily understandable in the everyday sense. [802c] The

supramundane path has three<sup>177</sup> divisions: the Path of Seeing, the Path of Cultivation, and the Final Path. Within each of these three there are contained five, four, and three subpaths, respectively. Within the Path of Seeing there are five: (1) the Path of Preparation, (2) the Path of Skillful Means, (3) the Instantaneous Path, (4) the Path of Liberation, and (5) the Path of Excellent Advancement. The Path of Cultivation consists of four—the four besides the Path of Preparation. [The Path of Preparation can be eliminated] because the two provisions [of virtue and wisdom] have already been accumulated. In the Final Path there are three, which are the same as those from the Path of Cultivation, minus the Path of Excellent Advancement. This is because once one has achieved perfect enlightenment, there is no path on which to further advance.

The Path of Preparation in the first group of five refers to the abiding by worldlings in the practices of morality, restraint, and so forth up to effort, meditation, and wisdom.<sup>178</sup> All these kinds of wholesome roots that are the causes of liberation constitute the Path of Preparation. As for the Path of Skillful Means, the virtues cultivated in the Path of Preparation are all also considered to be skillful means, but there are aspects of the Path of Skillful Means that are not included in the Path of Preparation—for example, the wholesome roots conducive to right ascertainment. The Instantaneous Path is the very final moment of the Path of Skillful Means—the momentary positioning of the highest worldly meditative state.<sup>179</sup> Based on the power of this path, in this instant one is definitely able to permanently eliminate the seeds of affliction. The Path of Liberation is named as such because one penetrates precisely to the essence of the Path of Seeing. Due to the liberation brought about by this essence of the Path of Seeing, one realizes the liberation of the elimination of afflictions. The Path of Excellent Advancement is so called because the subsequently attained cognition<sup>180</sup> includes the knowledge of words and their meaning, and therefore it surpasses the prior cognition. It is also named as such because one advances to the next stage, giving rise to applied practices. Even though their general characteristics are as I have described here, there are also distinctions among the paths. The components of the remaining four paths are as I have explained in my *Essay on the Single Path*.<sup>181</sup>

Here I will focus on explaining only the fourth path. I will define the Path of Seeing based on two kinds of authorities. The first is defining the truth based on scriptural authority. The second is defining by the authority of the inner realization of the supreme truth.

### 5.1.1. THE DEFINITION BASED ON SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY

Within the first definition, there is first the explanation according to the teachings for the two vehicles and then the interpretation according to the teaching for the bodhisattvas. At the time the practitioner of the two vehicles enters the Path of Seeing, it is said that, according to the order of the sixteen mental states,<sup>182</sup> one gradually eliminates the lesser afflictions of the higher and lower eight truths.<sup>183</sup>

As it says in the “Section on Ascertaining the *Śrāvaka’s* Stages” [of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*]:

**[803a]** Using dharma-cognition in the Path of Seeing, one counteracts the afflictions of the desire realm. Using the cognition of types in the Path of Seeing, one counteracts the afflictions that are eliminated in the form realm and formless realm. [T 1579:30.683b15–16]

The reason that the sixteen mental states are posited is that the Path of Seeing is able to produce the conventional cognition that observes the distinctions in the sixteen defining activities [of the Four Truths]. Therefore this explains the effects from the perspective of their causes.

If we discuss the bodhisattvas’ entry into their Path of Seeing, there are three kinds of meditative states that are practiced in succession. The first is the contemplation of the selflessness of person, which counteracts the attachment to person. The second is the contemplation of the selflessness of dharmas, which overcomes the attachment to dharmas. In the third meditative state, the bodhisattvas comprehensively contemplate both kinds of selflessness and accomplish the elimination of both kinds of attachment. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

At the final extent of the wholesome roots conducive to right ascertainment, there is, without a moment’s lapse, the appearance of the first mental state—that which internally expels cognition of the provisional appearance of sentient beings. This [mental state] is able to remove the debilitating aspects of the hindrances of mild strength that are eliminated in the Path of Seeing. Immediately after this is the appearance of the second mental state, which internally expels cognition of the provisional appearance of all dharmas. This [mental state] is able to remove the debilitating aspects of the hindrances of medium strength that are eliminated in the Path of Seeing. Immediately after this, the third conditioned mental state arises, which pervasively expels the link to the provisional appearance of all sentient beings and dharmas and is able to remove all of the debilitating hindrances of the Path of Seeing. [T 1579:30.605c19–24]

The reason that these three mental states are posited is that they are practiced in distinct order in the Path of Skillful Means. From this applied practice, one can advance to the Path of Seeing. Therefore [it is called] the interpretation that explains the causes from the perspective of the effects. It is called the position based on scriptural authority, which establishes the distinctions in the characteristics within the Path of Seeing.

### 5.1.2. THE DEFINITION BASED ON THE INNER REALIZATION OF THE SUPREME TRUTH

#### 5.1.2.1. The Relationship of the *Manas* with the *Mano-vijñāna* and *Ālaya-vijñāna*

Next is the definition based on the inner realization of the supreme truth. When the sages of the three vehicles enter the Path of Seeing, there is only the one mind, which internally realizes thusness. There are no distinctions such as those of the sixteen mental states or the three mental states. When the term “one mind” is used, it means that once one enters into this contemplation, the mind has only one property. Prior and after are the same, without distinctions. Therefore it is said to be “one mind.” “One mind” is not invoked from the perspective of momentariness.

As the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: “When the *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* first contemplate on the holy truths, with one type of cognition they eliminate all entrenched afflictions. A single type of cognition eliminates all four” [T 353:12.221a20–21]. The *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* says: “All *śrāvakas*, *pratyekabuddhas*, and bodhisattvas share together in this single marvelous pure path. All are the same in this single absolute purity” [T 676:16.695a17–18]. Furthermore, the *Xianyang lun* says: “Removing the actively binding afflictions of attachment to sentient beinghood, one awakens to the true nature of dharmas. [803b] [Having awakened to the true nature of dharmas,] one permanently eliminates attachment to dharmas. It should be understood that when the attachment to dharmas is eliminated, one also eliminates the latent attachment to sentient beinghood” [T 1602:31.559c4–6]. The *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* also gives the same kind of explanation.

Based on these passages, it should be clear that the bodhisattvas suddenly realize the thusness of the two kinds of selflessness at the same time and suddenly eliminate the seeds and latent afflictions of both kinds of attachment. But if this one mind equally realizes thusness, what differences are there between the Paths of Seeing of the practitioners of the three different vehicles? The adherents of the two vehicles contemplate thusness only in its defined aspect. To see thusness as differentiated is like looking at the color of the sky through a bamboo tube. The bodhisattvas rely without discrimination on both the defined and undefined truths to simultaneously contemplate thusness as well as distinctions in own-nature. It is like the indiscriminating penetration of those who possess the pure divine eye, who fully view the colors of the sky from within and without.<sup>184</sup> Therefore, while seeing thusness, one also sees that things have distinctions.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

What is the practice of contemplation appropriate to adherents of the vehicle of the *śrāvakas*? Contemplating on the defined truth, they observe thusness as an object that is limited and has phenomenal

distinctions. What is the practice of contemplation appropriate to adherents of the Great Vehicle? Contemplating on both the defined and undefined truths, they observe thusness as an object that is without limit and lacks phenomenal distinctions. [T 1579:30.668c4–14, abridged]

And so on.

Further below it says:

The realm of existence can be explained as having two general [types of] characteristics. The first are the characteristics of distinction; the second are the characteristics of identity. The characteristics of distinction include the aspect of constancy and the aspect of quiescence. The aspect of constancy includes the originally unborn essential nature and the inexhaustible essential nature. The aspect of quiescence is the essential nature free from the bondages of affliction and suffering. “Characteristics of identity” refers to all the dharmas included in characteristics, name, discrimination, thusness, and corrective wisdom.<sup>185</sup> Since these are of the nature of pervasive discrimination [*parikalpita*], they are not of the selfless perfected nature [*pariniṣpanna*]. Here the *śrāvakas* comprehend the realm of existence based on distinctive characteristics, not by perceiving characteristics of identity. Why? [803c] Based on conceptions of continuity and security, they attain the conception of quiescence within the realm of existence, and they are unflinchingly disillusioned with all karmic formations. [T 1579:738a19–29]

If the bodhisattvas, based equally on both characteristics, penetrate the realm of existence and enter the condition of the bodhisattva’s correct nature of freedom from affliction [the Path of Seeing], then they should already be abiding in the contemplation that takes the characteristics of identity in the realm of existence as referent. Why? If they contemplate the realm of existence relying [only] on characteristics of distinction and thus proceed directly to *nirvāṇa*, this is not the correct skillful means of perfect enlightenment. [T 1579:738b6–11]

Herein lies the difference between the Paths of Seeing in the greater and lesser vehicles.

Furthermore, when the adherents of the three vehicles enter the Path of Seeing, they produce the cognitive faculty that apprehends equality, which is transmuted from the *manas*. It cognizes equality as it should, arisen by the same referents as the [purified] cognition of the *mano-vijñāna*. This is because the uncontaminated *mano-vijñāna* must have its own uncontaminated support.

As the *Xianyang lun* says:

The *manas* consciousness is born from the seeds in the *ālaya-vijñāna*. Then, taking that consciousness as its referent, the [errors of] self-delusion, self-love, “I,” “mine,” and the conceit “I am” [arise] concomitantly. Sometimes [the *manas*] resists its binding with the *ālaya* and continually seeks agitation. Sometimes it functions in equanimity together with [the *ālaya*]. Deliberation is its nature. As the Bhagavān says: “The inner mental base does not damage external mental objects. When [objects] are present, its attention is directly stimulated. According to this stimulation, the *mano* [sixth] consciousness arises” [T 1602:31.480c23–27]

The *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Question: The nature of the *manas* is that of perpetual deliberation; it is continually active without interruption. How can [such a thing as] a supramundane *manas*, as taught by the World Honored One, be posited?

Answer: This is a nominal designation, which need not be taken as the final truth. Nonetheless, if the *manas* is corrected, one can remove its distortions and can deliberate correctly. The *manas* supports the *mano* [sixth] consciousness, causing it to discriminate. Therefore the *manas* is said to be the basis for the *mano*. [T 1579:30.651b29–c4]

The meaning of this question can be stated like this: As is said in the above section that defines the characteristics of the *manas* consciousness, this *manas* exists continually bound to the four afflictions, [and] its nature is that of constant deliberation. In this interpretation, [it would seem that] a supramundane *manas* cannot be posited, since it is at all times deliberating on a self.

Answer: [804a] There are two kinds of *manas*. The first is that according to the conventional definition, which says that it is the nature of [the *manas*] to be continually assessing. From the absolute standpoint, however, it is not always deliberating on the self as its object. Therefore this is called a nominal designation. It is not necessary for every single explanation of the *manas* to be from the perspective of ultimate reality.

What is the second meaning of *manas*? When this *manas* is confused, it deliberates on the self as an object. When it is not confused, it deliberates on selflessness. It always operates sharing the same objects with the *mano-vijñāna*, and therefore it does not have the same supports as the *mano-vijñāna*. Hence, even though it is its nature to perpetually deliberate, this does not eliminate the possibility of positing a supramundane *manas*. For this reason the *manas* does not engage in practices of spiritual cultivation but directly relies on cultivation by other [consciousnesses].<sup>186</sup> When it suddenly becomes free from error, it is because of its not sharing its basis [with the *mano-vijñāna*] and because its fundamental nature is pure.

It is like the ripening consciousness [*vipāka-vijñāna*], which does not engage in practices of spiritual cultivation. But due to the power of the noble paths being cultivated through the *mano-vijñāna*, the ripening consciousness is suddenly freed from its seeds. This is because it is the basis for all the forthcoming consciousnesses. It is the same with the *manas*—even though it does not cultivate spiritual practices, through the power of the uncontaminated path of the *mano-vijñāna* it suddenly becomes freed from its binding with the four kinds of afflictions. This is because it does not share its basis with the *mano-vijñāna*. Furthermore, the basic nature of the *manas* is originally pure. It is only from its association [with the afflictions] that it becomes polluted. Hence, once freed from confusion, it deliberates correctly.

As a verse in the “Stage Consummated by Thought” section [of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*] says:

At all times in the defiled *manas*  
 All afflictions arise and cease together.  
 Once one is liberated from these afflictions,  
 There is neither before nor after.  
 It is not the case that first dharmas are born  
 And then afterwards become purified.  
 Dharmas are originally not defiled.  
 That is what is meant by freedom from all afflictions.  
 All, appearing to be polluted,  
 Are ultimately pure in nature. [T 1579:30.364a6–10]

[. . .] And so forth.

The explanation below this says:

Furthermore, concerning the characteristics of liberation that have been described, it should not be construed that they are purified only after the full arising [of dharmas]—that there is some kind of other purity. At the point where the *manas* arises, it originally lacks defilement, and therefore one is said to be liberated. [T 1579:30.365b28–c1]

[. . .] And so on.

Based on these passages, it should be understood that a supramundane *mano-vijñāna* must have a supramundane *manas*. [804b] Yet although this is generally true, there are also special cases. Since the bodhisattvas on the Path of Seeing realize both kinds of selflessness, the two kinds of attachment of the *manas* are not functioning. Thus it matches with the cognitive faculty that apprehends intrinsic equality perceiving the two kinds of selflessness. In their Path of Seeing, adherents of the two vehicles realize only the selflessness of person, the attachment to dharmas through the *manas* still functions, and their cognition of

intrinsic equality occurs only in reference to the selflessness of person. It is like when one, through the *mano-vijñāna*, on one hand, realizes the emptiness of person and ends up producing uncontaminated wisdom, yet, on the other hand, when grasping the marks of suffering, attaches to dharmas. A single cognitive factor functions as both wisdom and attachment, but they do not obstruct each other, since their referent is different. The cognition of intrinsic equality should be understood in the same way. The distinctions in the characteristics of their respective Paths of Seeing are to be understood like this.

#### 5.1.2.2. Elimination of the Hindrances in the Two Kinds of Cognition and the Five Paths

Among these two kinds of cognition and five kinds of paths, which are able to counteract the hindrances, and which hindrances are they unable to eliminate? These two kinds of cognition [of the bodhisattvas and the buddhas] are both able to counteract the debilitating afflictions. This is because they are contrary in nature, yet they have the same properties.

##### 5.1.2.2.1. The Five Paths

Furthermore, all of the five kinds of paths are also capable of counteracting these hindrances. This is because in the Path of Preparation one becomes disillusioned with the afflictions and works toward their subjugation, gradually weakening the strength of the seeds of affliction, up to the Path of Skillful Means, where one gradually removes their debilitating tendencies. Since, in the Instantaneous Path, one is, in an instant, able to permanently extinguish these seeds, the antidotes used in these two paths are those of elimination [as distinguished from the gradual weakening seen in the Path of Preparation]. Since the Path of Liberation is able to transmute affliction into liberation, its function is counteracting by transmutation. Since, in the Path of Excellent Advancement, one distances oneself from the maturation of affliction, the antidote in this path is that of distancing. As the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says: “The antidote of elimination is applied in the Path of Skillful Means and the Instantaneous Path. This is because it is in these paths that one is able to eliminate all afflictions [ . . . ]” [T 1606:31.738b3–4]. And so forth.

It is based on these five paths and two kinds of cognition and the coming together of myriad conditions that one is able to attain complete freedom from the latent view-based afflictions. Therefore it is said that all such conditions are antidotes. This is because, apart from myriad conditions, there is no antidote. However, if we search among the gamut of conditions to find [a certain] antidote, in the end there is no single factor that is responsible for the elimination of afflictions. Why? As with the first three paths, since one is not free from the clutches of the latent afflictions of attachment to the six objective realms, one is not able to eliminate them. Since the fourth path is in itself liberation, there is nothing to



be eliminated, and so it acts as an antidote. How, then, could there possibly be something to eliminate in the Path of Excellent Advancement? If one seeks elimination here, it will not be found, since all dharmas are inactive. [804c] If they do not even abide themselves, how can they extinguish something else? Even though there is no specific antidote, there is nothing that is not eliminated. This is because all conditions combine with each other before, in between, and after.

As the *Daśabhūmikasūtra-śāstra*<sup>187</sup> says: “In this cognitive extirpation of contamination, there is initial cognitive elimination, intermediate elimination, and subsequent elimination. There is also not initial elimination, nor intermediate or subsequent elimination. It is like a lamp’s flame not having prior, middle, or subsequent, [but nonetheless] prior, middle, and subsequent are reified” [T 1522:26.132a29–b1]. Even though the situation is actually like this, if we foreground the most effective factors in the task of eliminating afflictions, only that which occurs in the Path of Liberation can be called true elimination.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Question: Is the counteracting of the afflictions through elimination by these clear contemplations something that can be done only after the antidotes are fully activated, or can it occur before they are activated?

Answer: It does not occur when they have not yet been activated. But when we say they have become fully activated, this does not refer to a subsequent time. It should be understood that the elimination of afflictions and the activity of the antidotes are perfectly simultaneous. At this time, it is stated only as an approximation that all afflictions are eliminated subsequent to the activation of the corrective practices. [T 1579:30.691c13–17]

A later passage says: “If the uncontaminated paths that are included in the practice of clear realization are accompanied by the arising of the latent afflictions that are eliminated in the Path of Seeing, this cannot be called the essential nature of the antidotes” [T 1579:30.625a21–22]. This clarifies that the nature of the Path of Seeing is liberation and is the essence of true elimination and counteraction.

The characteristics of the four kinds of paths contained within the Path of Cultivation can generally be understood in the same way as those described above in the section on the Path of Seeing, but there are differences. For example, the Path of Skillful Means is easy to consummate, unlike in the prior stage of According to Ascertainment, where one can enter into correct contemplation only after a long period of assiduous cultivation. This is because one has already entered into the holy paths and rides on this momentum to advance and enter into the next level of path.

Furthermore, the Instantaneous Path and the Path of Liberation are not

necessarily as perfectly distinguished as they were before. Like the time when one is about to enter the contemplation of marklessness in the eighth bodhisattva ground, the prior mental state of the Instantaneous Path is not the Path of Liberation. Only the final meditative state of the tenth ground,<sup>188</sup> which is the adamant concentration, is considered to be the Path of Liberation and not the Instantaneous Path. All the various mental states between these two, when seen in terms of prior, are understood to be part of the Path of Liberation; when seen in terms of subsequent, they are understood as part of the Instantaneous Path. This kind of understanding is seen in the Path of Cultivation leading up to the seventh bodhisattva ground, where there is increasing subtlety in the distinctions of meditative states. [805a] As the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* says: “[The first of the five phenomena is] the phenomenon that is relied upon in the moment-to-moment ability to destroy the bases of the debilitating afflictions” [T 1593:31.126b13].

What about the case of the Path of Skillful Means within the Ultimate Path? Once one is in the advanced portion of the tenth bodhisattva ground and wants to eradicate fundamental nescience, one does not, in this case, leave meditation to resume the cultivation of skillful means, since skillful means have been completed. The final thought-moment is the Instantaneous Path. As the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says: “The Ultimate Path means the adamant concentration. This concentration has two kinds: that of the Path of Skillful Means and that of the Instantaneous Path” [T 1606:31.742b27–28].

It should be understood that the very final adamant concentration, if seen from the standpoint of that which is eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, is nothing but the Path of Liberation. If seen from the standpoint of those hindrances that are eliminated in neither of the paths, then it is nothing but the Instantaneous Path. Also, from the stage of the adamant concentration down to the first bodhisattva ground, all practices are included in the Path of Skillful Means in the Ultimate Path.

The wholesome roots contained within the stages of confidence in practice<sup>189</sup> are all the Path of Preparation within the Ultimate Path. For example, the gradient practices contained in the advanced part of the tenth dedication of merit are the skillful means that come close to special cultivation in the Path of Seeing. If it is explained fully, then from the stage of the highest worldly meditative state down to the first stage of the ten understandings, all can be considered as the Path of Skillful Means for the Seeing of the Truths. The wholesome roots that are cultivated in the ten stages of faith can also be seen as the Path of Preparation for the Seeing of the Truths. The content of the Ultimate Path should be understood according to this model.

As for the Path of Liberation in the Ultimate Path, the mirrorlike cognition attained at the Buddha stage is regarded as its essence. As the [*Prajñāpāramitā*-] *sūtra* says: “[The practitioner] who courses the unobstructed path is called a bodhisattva. [The practitioner] within the Path of Liberation who separates from all hindrances is called a *tathāgata*” [T 223:8.411b26]. What are the similarities and differences between these two paths? If we look from the perspective of the

afflictions eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, then at the stage of the adamant mind one has already attained liberation. Since this cognitive elimination cannot be surpassed even by the Buddha, it is called virtual enlightenment, or the immaculate stage. As the *Benye jing* says: “Once one passes beyond the ten grounds, one’s understanding is equal to [that of] the Buddha” [T 1485:24.1018b2].

From the perspective of the hindrances that are not eliminated in either of the paths, nescience has not yet been cast off at this point. [805b] It is merely [the level of] deep confidence, and one is not yet able to realize direct insight. Even though one has attained illuminated quiescence, this is not quiescent illumination. Therefore one is called only a bodhisattva and is not called an enlightened one. As the *Sutra [for Humane Kings]* says: “From the practice of the [first] tolerance up to the adamant absorption [ . . . ], [all are called] the [tolerances] of markless faith [that quell all afflictions]. With the illumination of the ultimate truth [one extinguishes all afflictions]. [ . . . ] [None of the insights possessed prior to the adamant concentration] are called seeing. What is called seeing is the omniscience [of the buddhas]” [T 246:8.246b26–29, abridged greatly and paraphrased]. It should be understood that the bodhisattva who has not yet attained Buddhahood must rely on the eighteen kinds of emptiness and the seven kinds of thusness.

#### 5.1.2.2.2. *The Two Kinds of Cognition*

Relying on this teaching alone, one is able to illuminate the ultimate truth but is not free from the quiescent illumination of exclusive emptiness; one does not escape the veil of nescience and penetrate unalloyed thusness. Only the mirrorlike cognition of the buddha-*tathāgatas* directly penetrates beyond exclusive emptiness and fully embodies the single realm of existence. One transcends the two truths, just abiding in nonduality. It is, for example, like the time prior to the attainment of the highest worldly meditative state, where one is unable to abandon marks and penetrate to the selflessness of dharmas. Therefore there are the two marks of grasper and that which is grasped. If one attains the nondiscriminating cognition of the Path of Seeing and fully apprehends both kinds of emptiness, he becomes permanently free from subject and object. Outside of the two marks, one abides exclusively in nonduality. Therefore it is called the Buddha’s pure insight.

It should be understood that [the two kinds of cognition of the bodhisattvas and buddhas] resemble each other to a certain extent. Expressing this resemblance, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Question: What are the differences in the states of stable abiding up through the final stage, in terms of the cognition of the bodhisattvas, the cognition of the Tathāgata, and so forth?

Answer: It is like a person with clear eyesight who sees various

colors and shapes while obstructed by a thin veil. The subtle wisdom in regard to the objective realm as experienced by bodhisattvas who have arrived at the final stage can be compared to this. It is like the case of a person with clear vision who sees various shapes and colors without any obstruction at all; this is like the subtle wisdom in regard to the objective realm as experienced by the Tathāgata. It can also be compared to the work of painting patterns on a round cloth. After the work is done, although there is marvelous coloration, there is a difference in the appearance of the work before and after its final rinse. The two kinds of cognition possessed by the bodhisattvas and the Tathāgata can be compared to this. Or, again, [it is like] the difference between a person with clear vision who sees colors in the condition of slightly dimmed light and the person who sees them in a condition completely free from obscuration. The two kinds of cognition are also comparable to this. Or, again, it is like the difference between seeing colors from afar and seeing them from up close, or the difference between seeing in a person with a slight cataract condition and [seeing in] one who has perfectly clear vision. The distinction in the two kinds of cognition can be understood in the same way. [T 1579:30.574b19–c3, abridged]

What are the differences among these five examples? That which is cognized by the nescience of extremely subtle mistaken conceptualization that is associated with the base consciousness obstructs the adamant eye. [805c] Therefore it is similar to being obstructed by a thin veil. The myriad practices have been cultivated, and one has attained the three kinds of cognition, lacking only the attainment of the mirrorlike cognition. The very final marvelous form purified by the *tathāgatas* is liberated from the two hindrances; therefore they attain the pure eye. When one is not yet free from the extremely subtle entrenchment of nescience, it is no different from seeing colors in slightly dimmed light. There are habit energies from the delusory hindrances, but they do not directly hinder the wisdom that observes the selflessness of dharmas. Therefore it is like seeing colors from afar. Even though the habit energies of the hindrances to wisdom are extremely subtle, they obstruct the wisdom-eye from a close range, which is in effect the same as having light cataracts. The distinctions in the five kinds of metaphors should be understood like this. The above section concludes the explanation of the antidotes.

## 5.2. Identification of That Which Is Eliminated

This topic is explained from four general perspectives: (1) in terms of primary and secondary, (2) from the perspective of activity and quelling, (3) from the standpoint of general and specific, and (4) according to the time.

### 5.2.1. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THAT WHICH IS ELIMINATED IN TERMS OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY

If we analyze their association from the standpoint of arising and ceasing, the mind and the mental factors are equally subject to elimination. This is because their bonding is never removed. It is as the *Treatise on Signlessness*<sup>190</sup> says: “If one sees the afflicted consciousnesses and mental factors contained in the [Four] Truths [and attains the supramundane paths], then at the time of the sixteen minds they are completely eliminated” [T 1587:31.62a19–21].<sup>191</sup>

Following this line of reasoning, once we eliminate the mind and mental factors of cyclic existence, we attain the mind and mental factors of the Buddha stage. In this process, there is no attainment of Buddhahood; there are only the five aggregates that first cease and then arise. Following the same kind of reasoning, the Buddhist scriptures say: “[One] rejects impermanent form and selects permanent form. Feeling, perception, volition, and consciousness [can be understood] in the same way.”<sup>192</sup>

If we investigate the nature of the mind from the standpoint of continuity, those aspects of the mind that are not afflicted do not undergo elimination. Although the mind undergoes contamination from external sources, its own nature is pure. It is like muddy water, the nature of which is pure. As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:

Question: When the defiled mind appears, is it because its own nature is defiled? Or because of its association [with external conditions]? Or because of latent tendencies?

Answer: It is because of its association [with external conditions] and because of latent tendencies. It is not due to its own nature. Since its own nature has no impurity, we say that when the mind arises, its own nature is pure. [T 1579:30.601b19–23]

Again, the question is asked:

Question: With which dharmas is it associated? And based upon what kind of reasoning is this association posited?

Answer: It is based on association with other natures and not on its own nature. Pervasive complete understanding is dependent upon the pure mind in its own nature. Based on the presence of defiled and undefiled dharmas, mental purity sometimes increases and sometimes decreases. Therefore this association is posited. [T 1579:30.608c29–609a2]

[806a] If we rely on this interpretation, then in impure stages the mind-kings<sup>193</sup>

of the eight consciousnesses separate from all kinds of impure factors and finally attain Buddhahood. Hereupon, these consciousnesses become associated with the four kinds of purified cognition. It is based on this kind of reasoning that the scriptures say: “Those who possess mind will attain enlightenment” [T 374:12.524c8–9].

#### 5.2.2. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THAT WHICH IS ELIMINATED FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ACTIVITY AND QUELLING

Generally speaking, both the actively binding afflictions and the latent afflictions are quelled and are also eliminated. But if we examine closely, the actively binding afflictions are quelled but are not truly eliminated. It is only the latent afflictions that are properly eliminated. As the *Xianyang lun* says: “The permanent disabling of the latent [afflictions] is called the elimination of afflictions” [T 1602:31.486a22].

#### 5.2.3. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THAT WHICH IS ELIMINATED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF GENERAL AND SPECIFIC

Broadly speaking, both the general and specific aspects of the two attachments are eliminated. Speaking more strictly, the afflictions of the specific aspects are properly eliminated but are also quelled. For example, eliminating the cause of a disease is also called *quelling the disease*. The attachments to dharmas in the general sense are only quelled and are not eliminated. This is because they are sometimes released, sometimes attached to, and they are not always afflictive. It is only through cultivation of corrective practices that they are purified. It is like polishing a corroded mirror and making it bright and shiny. This is only called *polishing the mirror*. It is not called *eliminating the mirror*.

#### 5.2.4. THE IDENTIFICATION OF THAT WHICH IS ELIMINATED ACCORDING TO THE TIME

I will first introduce the three times and then explain how these relate to what is eliminated. If we want to fully elaborate the characteristics of the three times, we can basically articulate their distinctions in nine units. The nine are (1) the past of the past, (2) the future of the past, (3) the present of the past, (4) the past of the future, (5) the present of the future, (6) the future of the future, (7) the future of the present, (8) the past of the present, and (9) the present of the present.

As the *Flower Ornament Sutra*<sup>194</sup> says:

Bodhisattvas have ten ways of explaining the three times. What are the ten? They are the past explaining the past, the past explaining the

future, the past explaining the present, the future explaining the past, the future explaining the present, the future explaining inexhaustible time, the present explaining the future, the present explaining the past, the present explaining equality, and the present explaining all three times as a single thought-moment. This is what is known as the bodhisattvas' explanation of the three times. [T 279:10.281b24–29]

Based on this analysis of the three times, we are able to universally explain all kinds of [relationships] of the three times.

[806b] Here, when the sixth is called [the future explaining] inexhaustible [time], it means the future of the future of all dharmas, implying no subsequent limit. Therefore it is called inexhaustible. In the ninth item, the term “equality” seeks to give expression to the meaning of “present of the present.” From the perspective of prior it is the present of the past, and from the perspective of after it is the present of the future. But at the time they are active, they are equal, without distinction. Since one, based on this present moment, cannot further add characteristics of the present, in relation to the present it is called *equal*. In the final part, the phrase that says “all [three] times as a single thought-moment” contains two basic kinds of meanings.

The first meaning is that even though a present dharma is said to have past and future, its past does not exist subsequent to the past of the present. Its future does not abide prior to the present of the future. It is only existent within this single thought-moment of the present. Looking forward is the future, and looking backward is the past. The explanation of its own characteristics as being the present is done to refute the present of the future as understood by the adherents of the Lesser Vehicle, who conflate the present of the future with the [simple] future. After the present disappears, quelling abides in the past. The past is the subsequent of the present moment, and the future is the prior of the present moment. Therefore it is said that the three times are only a single thought-moment.

The second meaning is like that of the three times in the original nine-part explanation, which comprehensively includes all unlimited [combinations of] the three times. In this meaning, the three times, which are limitlessly great in length, all enter into the single moment of the present. Some think that these three times are the same as this one moment, [806c] and therefore they say the three times are just one moment. Even if it is a vastly long eon, it is still [nothing but] this single moment; but this perspective does not consider its aspect of shortness as being contained in this single moment. Even though one moment is the same as innumerable eons, there is no momentariness in this long period. Therefore a verse [from the *Flower Ornament Sutra*] says: “Although innumerable and limitless eons are but one swift thought-moment, you cannot squeeze an eon into the most infinitesimal period of time” [T 278:9.610a12–14].

This interpretation is intended to refute the one-sided attachment by adherents of the Great Vehicle who say that the future does not yet exist, [that] the past is already gone,<sup>195</sup> that “all single moments are quickly cut off, and the eons of

the three times are long.” Therefore it is said that the three times are nothing but a single thought-moment. Even though ten categories of the three times were explained above, when we elaborate the distinctions in time, they actually do not exceed the above nine categories. Therefore I will explain the determination of what is eliminated in terms of these nine. Within these nine times, when are afflictions eliminated?

There is no elimination in the three times of the past. This is because once the corrective paths are activated, these [times] have already vanished. There is also no elimination in the three times of the present. This is because at the time the corrective paths are activated, there are no active afflictions. The future of the future also has nothing to be corrected, since once the paths of elimination have been activated, their characteristics are not renewed. The past of the future also has no elimination, since once the paths of elimination have been activated, their energy is not sufficient to the task. It is the present of the future in which elimination proper occurs.

Why is this the case? Let’s say that at this time the purifying paths were not activated. In this case, the latent afflictions will manifest at this time. “Will manifest” indicates the present of the future. In the moment that the purifying paths are directly manifested, the latent afflictions should be appearing in complete form. Yet they do not take complete form, and so they are said to be eliminated. Therefore it is the present of the future in which they actually undergo elimination. The remaining eight times are inapplicable for the undergoing of elimination. As the *Xianyang lun* says: “The afflictions can be eliminated in the present of the future. Permanent incapacitation of their latencies is called elimination of afflictions” [T 1602:31.496b26].

Even though based on this explanation they are eliminated in this way, if we fully investigate this elimination, it is also unattainable. Why? At the time the purifying paths are activated, from the perspective of the latent afflictions, in the present of the future they are both existent and nonexistent. [807a] If they are still existent, then they are not eliminated; if they are already nonexistent, then there is nothing to be eliminated. If in the present of the future they are subsequently nonexistent due to their elimination in accord with two reasons [explained above], then it means that before their elimination in the present of the future, they were existent. [To say that] only in this one moment of the present of the future they previously exist, and are subsequently nonexistent, does not make sense, since within the instant of time there is no before or after. [On the other hand,] to say that in this single moment of the present of the future they are both existent and nonexistent also does not make sense, because a single dharma cannot have two natures.

Based on this reasoning, there is nothing that to be eliminated, and therefore there is nothing eliminated throughout the three times. However, the purifying paths are liberative in their nature throughout the three times, constantly separating from the actively binding afflictions. Therefore it can be said that elimination occurs throughout all three times. As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says:



Question: Is the elimination of the latent hindrances done in the past, future, or present?

Answer: The elimination does not occur in the past, future, or present. Yet it is said that elimination occurs in the three times. [. . .]  
[T 1579:30.623b20–24, abridged]

And so forth. [. . .] The section on the identification of what is eliminated ends here.

### 5.3. Distinctions in Quelling and Eliminating

There are three main parts to this discussion: (1) the distinctions between quelling and eliminating, (2) the distinctions in elimination of fetters, and (3) the distinctions in release from the bondages.

#### 5.3.1. THE DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN QUELLING AND ELIMINATING

What is the meaning of “quelling”? Free from the conditions of the afflictions, one cultivates antidotes. At the level above the root of the afflictions, one stifles<sup>196</sup> the arising of their branches. The meaning of “stifling” should also be understood in this way. There are three kinds of stifling:

(1) Stifling in the sense of separation. This is like the case where one attentively maintains the prohibitions and precepts and thereby separates from unwholesome conditions. Based on this energy, one stifles the arising of evil.

(2) Stifling due to disillusionment. This means that through the two kinds of wisdom derived from learning and reflection, one is aware of excessive desire and becomes disgusted with these excesses. Based on this energy, one avoids creating attachments.

(3) Stifling [through the practice] of calming meditation. This means that the through the worldly wisdom gained by practice, one longs for the higher things and grows weary of the lower things and, according to distinctions in subtlety of the afflictions, cultivates provisional corrective practices. Accordingly, those that are eliminated do not become active.<sup>197</sup>

This can be understood in further detail through the explanation in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, which, in explaining the meaning of “elimination,” gives three types. [807b] “The first is quelling elimination, the second is permanent elimination,<sup>198</sup> and the third is the elimination of eradication without residue. The meaning of quelling elimination’ is like the case of grasses and roots that grow on a large rock. If you scrape off the roots with a sharp hoe, they will never be able to grow again. But since the stems outside of the rock have not been eradicated, it is called quelling. Yet because the roots have lost their connection [with the earth], they are also said to be eliminated.”

In the same way, when the person who has separated himself [or herself] from desire enters into the Path of Seeing, he [or she] eliminates afflictions in the desire realm, working toward the elimination of seeds. These kinds of practices are all called quelling elimination. Although the afflictions are not yet totally eradicated, they have been rendered impotent.

The meaning of permanent elimination is like that of grain being cooked in a kettle. Although grain that is taken out of the kettle does not lose its cereal characteristics, it can never again germinate, because of its having been cooked. This [kind of elimination] should be understood as being applicable to the [practices that] eliminate seeds from the stage of the adamant concentration down to those of the adherents of the two vehicles. Since one is separated from nescience, there is no loss of the characteristics in the ripening consciousness. Overcome by the energy of uncontaminated dharmas, they will never again be able to create seeds. Therefore this is called permanent elimination.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi* says: “There are two basic kinds of realization through elimination: one is the realization through the quelling elimination of seeds; the second is the realization through the permanent elimination of seeds” [T 1579:30.675b6–7]. Yet this permanent elimination, when seen from the perspective of elimination without residue, would actually only be permanent quelling, for [from that perspective] one has not yet [truly] accomplished permanent elimination.

The meaning of the elimination of eradication without residue is like that of the conflagration at the end of the universe, where [the great fire] blazes continuously for seven days, thoroughly consuming the heavens, the oceans, and the continents, annihilating them without a trace. In the end, even the tiniest particles are completely extinguished, with nothing whatsoever left over. Similarly, when the three great eons of practice are completed, the four kinds of purified cognitive faculties<sup>199</sup> simultaneously appear, perfectly reflecting the realm of existence, and the vast ocean of the *ālaya-vijñāna* and the continent of nescience are extinguished without a trace. In the end, even the most subtle habit energies of the two hindrances are completely extinguished, with nothing whatsoever left over. Therefore this is called the elimination of extinction without residue. This is how the three kinds of elimination are distinguished.

### 5.3.2. THE DISTINCTIONS IN THE ELIMINATION OF THE FETTERS

There are two kinds of fetters, which are called fettering by association [with the mind] and fettering by objects. They both act in tandem with a single affliction, binding the minds of sentient beings. What are they? When the afflictions are associated with the mind for a period of time, they are able to restrict it, preventing it from being free. [807c] Hence the term “fettering by association [with the mind].” Then, when these afflictions attach to the objects around them, they lead the mind to come under the control of the objects. This is called fettering by

objects. It is like taking a single rope and attaching it to an ox. Once the ox is thoroughly bound, it cannot free itself. Then the other end of the rope is tied to a post, resulting in the ox's binding to the post. The restriction of the mind by the two [kinds of] fetters should be understood in this way.

The elimination of these two fetters actually occurs simultaneously—in terms of order, there is neither prior nor subsequent. Why? If we ask the Mind King, “King, in what sort of conditions in regard to the surrounding objects may we gain freedom from attachments?” the Mind King would answer, saying: “There is the single Mental Factor of Wisdom, which is instantaneously able to sever the fetters that are associated with the self, and hence there is no longer attachment to the objects.” Yet one is not aware for oneself what was severed. If we ask the Factor of Wisdom, “Through what skill is the fettering through association severed?” the Factor of Wisdom explains, saying: “I have no special technique. It is merely my natural intelligence that obliterates the coarse marks and brings lasting freedom from the attachment to the marks [upon which the mind] is contingent. Based on this, I am able to cut off their associated dharmas.” According to the explanation by the Mental Factor of Wisdom, one first severs the fettering by objects and then severs the fettering of association [with mind].

It is based on this reasoning that the *Xianyang lun* says: “‘Elimination of that which is accompanying’ means to eliminate afflictions by [severing the binding to] objects. Once the afflictions of the objective realm are eliminated, all the associated factors are also accordingly eliminated” [T 1602:31.496b24–26].

According to the explanation of the Mind King, then, one first separates from the fettering of association [to mind] and then separates from the fetters to the objective realm. It is with this kind of reasoning that the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

It is [by severing the] association [with mind] and association with objects that the afflictions are to be eliminated. Why? Once the antidotes are applied, the afflictions do not arise, and one attains the realization of the nonarising of phenomena. Therefore it is called the severing of fettering by association [with mind]. Once the fettering by association [with mind] has been severed, one no longer perceives objects, and so the object-connecting fetters are also said to be severed. [T 1579:30.628c11–14]

The meaning of severing the two kinds of fetters should be understood like this.

### 5.3.3. THE DISTINCTIONS IN RELEASE FROM THE BONDAGES

Third is the clarification of the release from the bondages. There are two kinds of bondages. What are they? The first is the bondage according to type that is incurred from the two fetters. This is the same as explained just above. The second is the case where one can be subject to many categories of bondages. What does this mean? As when one is subjected to affliction, there are nine levels in all. The greatest-of-the-

greatest mind and mental factors can be fettered by conditioning from all nine categories. [808a] It is just like a single post being made the object of attachment by nine ropes. As the greatest-of-the-greatest are subject to nine kinds of binding, the other eight categories also undergo the same binding. This is because these nine categories are all capable of binding with each other and because, whenever they remain in their latent state, they tend to have an affinity for each other.

There are two kinds of release from the bondages. The first is the individual release from the binding of the two classes of bondage. The next is categorical release from the binding of one bondage.

What is categorical release from binding? Even though one severs the two kinds of fetters of the first category, one can still be subject to fettering by the other eight categories. And even if one has already severed the eight categories of the two fetters, the mind of these eight categories that is still bound receives the fettering of the one class. Therefore one has not been released from the fettering of the prior eight. Therefore you cannot call it complete severing. Once one completely severs the ninth class of the two fetters, one is released from the prior eight and this ninth simultaneously. Therefore it is called categorical escape from the bondage.

It is like the case of a single bundle of reeds that is tied up with nine strings. Even if you cut eight strings, it will still not come loose. Once you cut the ninth string, all will come loose at once. Categorical escape from the fetters should be understood just like this. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says: “You should understand that there are two kinds of escape from the fetters. The first is escaping individually from the fetters of the various classes of affliction. The second is categorically escaping from the bonds of affliction” [T 1579:30.675b7–9].

The section on the distinctions in the quelling and elimination of the afflictions ends here.

#### **5.4. Correction and Elimination in the Various Levels [of Practitioners]**

##### **5.4.1. FROM THE APPROACH OF THE NON-SAMENESS OF PURITY AND IMPURITY**

Fourth is the explanation of the levels of correction and elimination. There are three main contexts in which correction and elimination are explained: (1) within the [practices of] worldlings, (2) within [the practices of] the two vehicles, and (3) within [the practices of] the bodhisattvas.

##### **5.4.1.1. Correction and Elimination at the Stage of Worldling**

The mundane corrective practices in the stage of worldling only quell the afflictions eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, as well as treat their debilitating tendencies—from the level of the three levels of apprehending emptiness

downward. But these practices are not able to remove the seeds of these afflictions. Beyond this, there are no other hindrances that they are able to eliminate. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

If all worldlings would like to escape the desire of the desire realm or the desire of the form realm, they can rely only on the Path of Cultivation and not on the Path of Seeing. Once they attain freedom from the desire of the desire realm, [they also attain freedom from] craving, ill will, and the closely following factor of pride. If the nescience that is associated with all the afflictions does not manifest, all [these afflictions] are said to be eliminated. This is not like the case of the [afflictions] eliminated with the view of entities and so forth that happens in the Path of Seeing. Since these afflictions [still] abide in this body, they will eventually manifest, due to their predilection to activate, and as long as one has not passed beyond this life, they will rearise. In the same way, it should be understood that when these worldlings become free from the desire of the form realm, they will at the same time remove anger and the other afflictions. [T 1579:30.625b8–14]

**[808b]** As for the four afflictions that are associated with the *manas*, even though these are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, they are so extremely subtle that the mundane Path of Cultivation is not able to quell them.

#### 5.4.1.2. Antidotes in the Level of the Two Vehicles

##### 5.4.1.2.1. The Direct Perspective

###### (A) HINDRANCES PRODUCED BY THE SIX LIMINAL CONSCIOUSNESSES

Next is the explanation of the antidotes applied in the level of the two vehicles. There are two interpretations here. If we look at the matter from the perspective that the two attachments to person and to dharmas support the production of each other from beginning to end, then the adherents of the two vehicles only subdue the afflictive hindrances but do not permanently eliminate them.<sup>200</sup> This is because they lack a boundless mind and do not realize the selflessness of dharmas. Hence they do not remove the root of the afflictions.

If one approaches the matter directly from the perspective of mutual production of the active and latent hindrances derived from the attachment to person, then they are all permanently eliminated, rather than only quelled. Through the thusness that is manifested in the realization of the selflessness of person, one permanently disables the seeds of the category of attachment to person. As the *Mile suowen lun* (Treatise on the Sutra of the Questions Asked by Maitreya; Skt. \**Maitreya-paripṛcchôpadeśa*) says: “The *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* are

unable to truly cultivate the four kinds of immeasurable mind<sup>201</sup> and so are not able to completely eliminate all afflictions. They are able only to subdue all afflictions” [T 1525:26.265b18–21]. This explains the first interpretation.

Furthermore, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

If, based on the supramundane paths, the sagely *śrāvakas* free themselves from the desire of the desire realm and proceed to attain simultaneous emancipation from the desire of all three realms, then at that time all the seeds of defiled states are without exception permanently impaired. It is comparable to the case of the seeds of various types of grain kept in atmospheric suspension or in a dry container. Even if the seeds cannot germinate in this circumstance, they have nonetheless not lost their capacity to do so. But if they are scorched by fire, then they can no longer germinate. The interpretation of the notions of quelling and permanent impairment can be understood to be like this. [T 1579:30.584a2–10; abridged]

This clarifies the second interpretation.

Since these two teachings of quelling elimination and permanent elimination are not contradictory, I will now explain their gradations from the perspective of permanent elimination. There are three types of persons who eliminate the afflictions of views [in the Path of Seeing]. The first are those who enter into the Path of Seeing [directly] from the condition of being enmeshed in afflictions.<sup>202</sup> When they fully eliminate the afflictions in the Path of Seeing, they attain the realization of the stream-winner. Those who enter the Path of Seeing from a condition of greater freedom from desire simultaneously eliminate double the amount of afflictions [in the desire realm] and attain the realization of the once-returned. [808c] When those who have completely freed themselves from desire enter the Path of Seeing, they simultaneously eliminate the afflictions of the nine classes, attaining the realization of the nonreturner. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says: “There are three kinds [of practitioners] who enter the Path of Seeing and who, according to their own level, attain three realizations.”<sup>203</sup>

The elimination of afflictions generally happens according to the above-related model, but there are also further distinctions within these general categories. When one eliminates the conceptual afflictions [in the Path of Seeing], there are three kinds of sudden elimination: (1) the use of the one mind to suddenly eliminate the three realms, (2) the use of a single meditation to suddenly eliminate four kinds [of affliction], and (3) the use of one class [of affliction] to suddenly eliminate nine classes.

What is the meaning of using one mind to eliminate three [realms]? Although there are distinctions of coarse and subtle in the mental functioning within the three realms, minor and major errors in regard to the truth are not distinguished according to the realm. Therefore one mind is able to eliminate the [afflictions in] the three realms. What is the meaning of a single meditation suddenly

eliminating four [kinds of affliction]? It means that one breaks one's reliance on conventional truths and focuses one's mind to thoroughly contemplate the Four Truths and the principle of selflessness.<sup>204</sup> What is the meaning of using one class [of affliction] to suddenly eliminate nine classes? When the one mind in the Path of Seeing counters the ninth class and eliminates its light [afflictions], the heavy afflictions are consequently annihilated.

Once one is in the Path of Seeing, this is the first stage of uncontaminated practice. How does one suddenly counter the ninth class [of affliction]? Starting from the stage of warmth,<sup>205</sup> one cultivates the contemplation of the least of the least and continues up until the completion of the greatest-of-the-greatest in the Path of Seeing. In the Instantaneous Path, one has already countered the [lower] eight classes, and so it is no longer possible to eliminate the seeds of those classes. But if one is not able to eliminate the seeds of the [lower] eight classes, how can one produce the greatest-of-the-greatest practices? Gradually removing the debilitating afflictions of the eight classes, one is able to induce the greatest-of-the-greatest practices. But since none of these yet include the realization of the thusness of the selflessness of person, one is unable to remove the seeds of these categories.

It is from this perspective that the sages of the three vehicles simultaneously eliminate the nine classes of seeds when they first enter the holy paths. This is not to be interpreted as a path that treats the coarse classes [of afflictions]. And even though one eliminates the remaining subtle classes of afflictions, these are not only of a single class. Since their Path [of Seeing] is extremely powerful, one counters nine classes. In the stage of the Path of Cultivation, riding on the momentum [from the practices] of the prior path, one gradually cultivates skillful means and directly enters into the practices that remove higher classes [of afflictions]. Since it is not necessary to have, as earlier, the applied practices aimed at numerous classes, one gradually eliminates the innate afflictions [in the Path of Cultivation] according to their individual class. This does not mean that it is because the innate afflictions are tightly bound and difficult to eliminate that one does not suddenly eliminate all nine classes at one time.

**[809a]** How are the subsequent two types of practitioners able to eliminate the seeds of the innate afflictions [in the Path of Cultivation]? The practices in the Path of Seeing actually have no ability to counteract the innate afflictions. Therefore they are unable to permanently eliminate these seeds. However, these seeds have already been subdued to a certain degree, and now they once again are subject to the sharp hoe of the Path of Seeing. Therefore, in their correction, one attains realization, and based on this, one is able to cultivate antidotes appropriate to this class. One is not subject to rebirth into the realm of desire, which means that one has attained the prize of the stage of nonreturner. The cases of those who are at an advanced degree of freedom from desire can be understood in terms of this. The interpretation of [the application of] supramundane practices should be understood in this way.

I will next explain the stages of the elimination of innate afflictions [in the

Path of Cultivation]. There are two kinds of people who advance to the Path of Cultivation. The first are those who gradually attain freedom, in which case the process is according to the standard explanation. Those in the second group attain freedom suddenly. [In the first case] it means that based on the various dharmas of the three realms, one enters into the uncontaminated paths and gradually counters the nine classes of affliction. In the case of sudden elimination of [the afflictions of] the three realms, one gradually removes the nine classes of afflictions. Here one directly realizes arhatship. “Sudden elimination of the afflictions of the three realms” means that the previously explained categories of light and heavy do not stay aligned with the coarseness and subtlety of their manifest conditions. This being the case, how can there be gradual elimination? It is because the dharmas of the three realms are not suddenly conditioned.

As the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says:

Sudden liberation means that having entered into the contemplation of the truths, one depends on the practices prior to the attainment of the first concentration to bring oneself onto the holy paths that suddenly eliminate all the afflictions of the three realms. Separately eliminating the afflictions class by class results in the attainment of only two of the realizations of the *śrāvakas*: those of stream-winner and arhat. How is this doctrine verified? As the *Zhiduan jing* says: “All form, [and the other aggregates,] up to consciousness, whether past, future, or present, whether far or near, can without exception be summarized into a single part, a single group, a single heap, a single aggregate. Once we have done this, we should observe all without exception to be impermanent, and all without exception to be suffering.”<sup>206</sup> And so forth. It is based on the same idea that the Tathāgata, in the *Fenbie jing* (Sutra of Discriminations), says that the stream-winner instantaneously produces the fruit of the arhat. [T 1606:31.756b9–25, abridged]<sup>207</sup>

(B) AFFLICTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE *MANAS*

The above explanation of the distinctions in subjugation and elimination has all been carried out in the context of the afflictions that are produced by the sixth consciousness. [809b] If we discuss the functions of the four afflictions that are associated with the *manas*, they are the most extremely subtle in type, and they function equally without distinction throughout the three realms. Therefore it is only when one is free from nonconceptual desire that one suddenly eliminates them. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says: “The innate afflictions that are bound with the *manas* [T 1579:30.651c15] [. . .] are liberated only through freedom from desire in the state of neither-thought-nor-no-thought; hence they are suddenly eliminated in a single instant. They are not like the other afflictions, which are gradually eliminated” [T 1579:30.652a2–4].



The *Treatise on Signlessness* says:

The second appropriating consciousness [the *manas*] and its associated dharmas are completely annihilated upon attaining arhatship. If the seeing of the truths disables<sup>208</sup> the afflictions, then the consciousness and mental factors will attain the supramundane path. During the practices of the sixteen mental states<sup>209</sup> they are finally annihilated. The only hindrances that remain unextinguished are those under the category of thought [i.e., those eliminated in the Path of Cultivation]. [T 1587:31.62a14–20]

This is called the second appropriating consciousness. Here we have two interpretations of elimination. If they are the substantial afflictions within the sixth consciousness, then during the practices of the sixteen mental states all will be completely extinguished. Therefore they belong to the categories [to be eliminated by] seeing the truths. The remainder of the afflictions to be eliminated from this second consciousness are totally annihilated only in the attainment of arhatship. Therefore those [hindrances in] this consciousness are only in the category of thought [and thus eliminated in the Path of Cultivation].

Based on these passages, we know that the afflictions of the *manas* are not eliminated in the Path of Seeing. This shows that the adherents of the two vehicles do [fully] eliminate the afflictive hindrances.

When it comes to the cognitive hindrances, there are some that the two-vehicle practitioners eliminate and some that they do not eliminate. The arhats who are liberated through wisdom-only do not eliminate any. Those who are liberated through the combined practice [of meditation and wisdom] are able to remove some. This means that the undefiled nescience that hinders the eight kinds of liberation is to be countered by the cultivation of the eight kinds of verification. As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says: “Furthermore, liberation is manifested through the liberation from the cognitive hindrances. Based on this, the *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* attain liberation from the mental states of the cognitive hindrances” [T 1579:30.645c10–11].

#### 5.4.1.2.2. *The Indirect Perspective*

What has been explained up to this point is the interpretation of the active afflictions associated with mind that are eliminated from the Direct perspective. If we discuss the entrenched afflictions from the Indirect perspective, then the adherents of the two vehicles are able to only partially eliminate them. What does this mean? The entrenchments of the three realms and broadly interpreted nescience constitute four inherent afflictions of emotion toward existence. While in the stage of the Path of Seeing, one eliminates a small portion of these. That is, when one is at this stage, one is not yet capable of eliminating the range of objects of confusion in regard to phenomena. Therefore, at this point, one eliminates only a small portion.

[809c] As the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: “When the *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* first contemplate the holy truths, they eliminate all entrenchments with a single type of wisdom. With a single type of wisdom they eliminate four” [T 353:12.221a20–21]. Therefore, at the attainment of the level of arhat, the four entrenchments of emotion toward existence are completely eliminated. As that sutra says: “If one is not a *śrāvaka* or *pratyekabuddha*, one cannot eliminate the entrenchment of nescience. It is by means of the nondualistic cognition of the holy truths that all entrenchments are eliminated” [T 353:12.221a24–25].

#### 5.4.1.3. The Stages of Elimination in the Bodhisattva Path

##### 5.4.1.3.1. Direct and Indirect Perspectives

Third is the explanation of elimination from the standpoint of bodhisattvas. Here there are again two kinds of interpretations. If we follow the doctrine of mutual production of roots and branches as seen in the Indirect approach, then bodhisattvas from the level of the adamant concentration downward are able to perform only quelling elimination and not permanent elimination. Why? In regard to the single realm of existence, they only believe [the truths] but do not yet see them, and so they are unable to remove the roots of mental disturbances.

As the *Sutra for Humane Kings*<sup>210</sup> says: “From the practice of the tolerances up to the adamant concentration, one does quelling elimination of all afflictions, using markless faith. Annihilating all afflictions, one generates the wisdom of liberation and illuminates the ultimate truth—but this is not called seeing. [Here] the term ‘seeing’ means ‘omniscience’” [T 245:8.832b7–8].<sup>211</sup>

The *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: “If the entrenchment of nescience is not eliminated and not terminated, then dharmas more numerous than the grains of sand in the Ganges river that should be eliminated will be neither eliminated nor terminated” [T 353:12.220b12–13]. If we see it from the Direct perspective of the mutual production of active and latent afflictions, then from the first bodhisattva ground up to the stainless [second] ground, the seeds of the two hindrances are all permanently eliminated. Why? Even though one has not yet been able to perceive the implications of the single realm of existence, one has succeeded in actualizing the vision of the tenfold realm of existence.

Although this is generally the case, there are herein two types of bodhisattvas. If, from the time of the completion of the two-vehicle stage of no further application,<sup>212</sup> gradually enlightened bodhisattvas enter the first ground, they eliminate only cognitive hindrances and not afflictive hindrances. This is because [the afflictive hindrances] have already been eliminated.

As the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*<sup>213</sup> says: “[The elimination of the] hindrances to wisdom occurs through the excellent purity gained through the insight into the selflessness of dharmas. [The elimination of the] afflictive hindrances refers to the earlier cultivation of the view of selflessness of person, which is eliminated in the extinction of the seventh consciousness” [T 670:16.513a20–22]. If they are

suddenly enlightened bodhisattvas [who are still] in the three ranks of worthies,<sup>214</sup> they are able only to gradually subjugate the two hindrances in their active manifestations. They are also able to gradually remove the debilitating aspects of the two hindrances that are removed in the Path of Seeing. They have not yet removed their seeds.

As the *Benye jing* says: **[810a]** “In the prior three ranks of worthies [the bodhisattvas] subdue the nescience of the three realms yet utilize coarse karma. Why? At the time of rebirth, goodness becomes the children of conditions and attachment nourishes their karma” [T 1485:24.1016c14–15]. Therefore the *Flower Ornament Sutra* says:

The fourth are the disciples of the Buddha born with nobility.  
They are born from the correct teachings of the worthies and  
sages.  
They do not adhere to either existent or nonexistent dharmas.  
Casting off birth-and-death, they escape from the three realms.  
[T 278:9.448a10–11]

From this perspective, it is because they do not undergo the karmic binding of the three realms that they escape. Since this is not the elimination of seeds, it is called *escape*.

#### 5.4.1.3.2. Arisen Afflictions

When one enters the bodhisattva’s Path of Seeing, one suddenly eliminates the two hindrances that are produced from discrimination. Concerning this point, there are five general interpretations of suddenness. Three of these are the same as explained in reference to the Path of Seeing of the two vehicles. The fourth kind of sudden elimination of the two hindrances consists of the simultaneous actualization of the two kinds of selflessness. In the fifth, there is sudden elimination of the two kinds of afflictive hindrances that are removed in the Path of Seeing and the Path of Cultivation. This occurs because the bodhisattvas, during their Path of Skillful Means before entering the grounds, already subjugate the afflictions that are to be eliminated in the Path of Seeing that might obstruct their work in helping other sentient beings. So now, when they attain to this Path [of Seeing], they build upon these prior efforts, eliminating afflictions according to the appropriate type [for the Path of Seeing] and attaining realization. For this reason, it is called sudden elimination. Unless they are afflictions appropriate for treatment in the Path of Cultivation, they are eliminated permanently.

As the *Mile suowen lun* says:

Question: If *śrāvakas* first eliminate the afflictions that are eliminated in the Path of Seeing and then gradually eliminate the

afflictions that are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, how do the bodhisattvas differ from the *śrāvakas*?

Answer: The bodhisattvas have carried out practices for the benefit of sentient beings since countless ages in the past and have experienced the experiential realms of thusness and immortality. They contemplate the bodies of sentient beings and are aware that these beings in fact are not different from themselves in terms of what they seek. Therefore all the afflictions in the bodhisattvas' Paths of Seeing and Cultivation that can impede the practices that bring benefit to sentient beings are eliminated by the bodhisattvas at once in their Path of Seeing. [T 1525:26.239b19–c4, abridged]

Among the mental disturbances that are eliminated in the Path of Cultivation, it is said to be only those of the greatest and middling levels that are able to impede activities aimed at helping sentient beings. The reason the afflictions of lesser strength do not impede the bodhisattvas' practices is that they are active only from the level of the seventh bodhisattva ground and below. This is the case until one reaches the level of the adamant concentration, at which point all of the extremely subtle manifestations of the two hindrances are completely extinguished.

**[810b]** Herein there are two kinds of processes. First, if we interpret the binding conditions from the perspective of the three levels of the two hindrances, their removal occurs only in the sudden elimination of the two hindrances in the third bodhisattva ground. It is not yet possible to eliminate the hindrances in any stage below this. All one can do is cultivate the preparatory practices [that will eventually lead to their elimination]. Therefore this is the categorical removal of the bondages.

As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

[Only] after passing through three incalculably long eons can one eliminate the debilitating aspects of the two hindrances. More specifically, in the abode of perfect bliss, one permanently eliminates the debilitating afflictions of all evil destinies, completely and without exception. All of the greater and middling afflictions do not appear. In the markless abode with no applied practices and no exertion,<sup>215</sup> all hindrances are thoroughly purified. In the recognition of the birthlessness of dharmas, all classes of affliction are permanently eliminated, and no afflictions whatsoever appear. It should be understood that in the abode of the final consummation of bodhisattvahood<sup>216</sup> all of the habit energies, latent aspects, and other impediments related to the afflictions are completely and permanently eliminated, and one enters the stage of the Tathāgata.

There are also three kinds of cognitive hindrances. It should be understood that the externally resident debilitating [cognitive] hindrances are completely and permanently eliminated at the abode of perfect bliss.<sup>217</sup> The medially resident debilitating [cognitive] hindrances are completely and permanently eliminated at the markless abode with no applied practices and no exertion. The internally resident debilitating [cognitive] hindrances are completely and permanently eliminated at the abode of the Tathāgata. Here one attains the extremely pure omniscience. In these three stages, the two hindrances of affliction and cognition are permanently eliminated. In the rest of the [earlier] stages, one gradually cultivates the requisite conditions for elimination. [T 1579:30.562a28–b14]

Among these, the subtlest of the cognitive hindrances reside in the *ālaya-vijñāna*, and therefore they are removed only at the stage of the Tathāgata. The subtlest of the afflictive hindrances reside only in the forthcoming consciousnesses, and therefore they can be completely extinguished at the stage of the bodhisattva. [Hindrances that are] referred to as habit energies are those that are no longer active from the eighth bodhisattva ground up; therefore they are called habit energies. These are seed habit energies and not residual habit energies. This is the explanation of categorical release from bondage.

Next, if we analyze the elimination of fettering by association from the perspective of the ten levels of the two hindrances in terms of ten grounds, [810c] then there is elimination of both hindrances in every stage. This is the perspective of escaping bondage according to the class. As the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* says:

World Honored One: How many kinds of delusion and how many kinds of debilitating hindrances are corrected at each of the bodhisattva grounds?

Sons of Good Families, there are twenty-two kinds of delusion and eleven kinds of debilitating hindrances that are corrected. Namely, at the first bodhisattva ground there are two kinds of delusion. One is the delusion of attachment to person and dharmas. The second is the delusion of the stain of the evil destinies, along with their debilitating hindrances, which are here corrected. [ . . . ]

And so forth, up to [this passage:]

[ . . . ] Coming up to the stage of the Tathāgata there are two kinds of delusion. The first kind is the delusion of extremely subtle attachment to all knowable objects. The second kind is the most extremely subtle impedimentary delusions, as well as their associated

debilitating hindrances—which are here corrected. The [bodhisattva] grounds are established based on [the correction of] these twenty-two kinds of delusion and eleven kinds of debilitating hindrances. [T 676:16.704b4–c3]<sup>218</sup>

This clarifies the teaching of escape from the tethers according to class.

In the portion of the stage of the Path of Cultivation that occurs within the ten grounds, the main practice is that of contemplating thusness in itself; one does not practice the contemplation of the distinctions in thusness. Yet when [the bodhisattvas] enter into contemplation, they simultaneously realize the thusness that is manifested by the two kinds of selflessness. Therefore they simultaneously eliminate the seeds of the two hindrances. Since they do not specifically cultivate the antidotes to the attachment to person, they are unable to eliminate the latent [hindrances associated with] attachment to person.<sup>219</sup>

As the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Because of attachment to intrinsic nature and to dharmas  
The nature of [attachment to] self evolves.  
Being awakened to this through contemplation, cessation is  
attained. [T 1579:30.663a27–28]<sup>220</sup>

The *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says:

Furthermore, bodhisattvas at the stage of the Path of Cultivation in the ten bodhisattva grounds cultivate the corrective practices applicable only to cognitive hindrances and not to the afflictive hindrances. Upon the attainment of enlightenment, they suddenly eliminate both the afflictive hindrances and the cognitive hindrances, suddenly becoming arhats and *tathāgatas*. [T 1606:31.763c26–29]

This clarifies the sudden elimination of the two hindrances and the sudden attainment of the two realizations. Sudden elimination is not explained in terms of the nine classes [of afflictions].

#### 5.4.1.3.3. *Entrenched Afflictions*

##### (A) BROAD INTERPRETATION OF THE NESCIENCE ENTRENCHMENT

So far the explanation of the two hindrances that are eliminated in the Paths of Seeing and Cultivation has been limited to the category of the arisen aspect of the afflictions—we have not yet dealt with the entrenchments. If we explain the stages of subjugation and elimination from the perspective of the entrenched afflictions, the four entrenchments that are eliminated by the adherents of the two vehicles are corrected according to the situation. It is the same for the bodhisattvas.

[811a] As far as the elimination of the remaining hindrances is concerned, practitioners can further eliminate a small portion of the broadly interpreted entrenchment of nescience. As for delusion in regard to the objective realm conditioned by the eight kinds of deluded conceptualization, when deluded conceptualization is eliminated, this can also be eliminated. As the *Awakening of [Mahāyāna] Faith* says:

The nonrealization of the one realm of existence is eliminated by the investigation and contemplation in the stages that are associated with faith. Upon entering into the stage of the pure mind, freedom is also attained according to one's ability. Finally, one arrives to the stage of the Tathāgata, where one is able to attain final freedom. [T 1666:32.577c15–17]

This is the explanation from the perspective of [entrenched] nescience in its broad interpretation.

#### (B) SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE NESCIENCE ENTRENCHMENT

If we discuss the entrenchment of nescience in terms of its specific characteristics, then it is something that bodhisattvas cannot eliminate. It can be suddenly eliminated only by the buddhas' mirrorlike cognition. It is with this point in mind that the *Sutra for Humane Kings* says: "There are only suddenly enlightened *tathāgatas*. There are no gradually enlightened buddhas" [T 1485:24.1018c20].<sup>221</sup> The *Śrīmālā-sūtra* says: "The power of the entrenchment of nescience is extremely great. [ . . . ] It can be eliminated only by the enlightened wisdom of the buddhas" [T 353:12.220a10–15, abridged]. Furthermore, the ripening consciousness has extremely subtle attachments. Depending on the extremely subtle hindrances of nescience, the habit energies within the forthcoming consciousnesses make their appearance inseparably linked with the ripening consciousness. They are something from which the bodhisattvas are unable to free themselves—only the *tathāgatas* are able to eliminate them. These are the distinctions in what is eliminated in the Ultimate Path.

#### 5.4.2. FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF NONOBSTRUCTION BETWEEN PURITY AND IMPURITY

Since the above-explained distinctions in the subjugation of the hindrances have been made from the perspective of an interpretation that regards defilement and purity as being different, we say that the hindrances enable the seeking of enlightenment, and that enlightenment can remove the hindrances. But if we look at it from the perspective of nonobstruction between defilement and purity, then the hindrances do not impede enlightenment, and enlightenment is not an escape from the hindrances. What is hindering is not a separate hindrance. Since the

Tathāgata has already embodied this kind of principle, all the dharmas are none other than his own body. Since they are his own body, what is there to be eliminated? And what does the elimination? How can we go beyond the two truths and abide in illuminated independence?

As the *Yingluo jing* (Bodhisattva Diadem Sutra) says: “Cyclic existence is one with enlightenment; enlightenment is nothing other than cyclic existence” [T 656:16.127a5]. The *Mahāvānasūtrālamkāra* says: “No suffering, yet extreme suffering; no self, yet self-views” [T 1604:31.626a8]. You should know that all forms of the dharma and all of its interpretations lack hindrance and have no impediment. They are all thus, and all not thus. The buddhas are at one with this kind of nature, which is neither gathered nor dispersed. Since there is no attainment that is not attained, elimination and nonelimination are free from their marks, and one reaches the limit [of practice]. Thus we have the appellation “well-gone” [Skt. *sugata*]. [811b] Having ridden thus and completely returned, one is called thus-come [Skt. *tathāgata*]. As the *Benye jing* says: “All buddhas return for worldlings; therefore they are not empty. Since nothingness is nothingness, there is no existence of dharmas; since it is nondharma, it is not two; since there are not two dharmas, they are not one.”<sup>222</sup> For this reason elimination and nonelimination do not impede each other. This concludes the above four teachings, which constitute the explanation of the fifth chapter on the subjugation and elimination of the hindrances.

## 6. Resolution of Discrepancies

Next is the sixth major division of the text, the resolution of discrepancies.

### 6.1. Question 1: Relationship between Counteracting the Afflictions of the Desire Realm and Attaining the Realization of Nonreturner

Question: Do all those who completely and permanently eliminate the afflictions of the desire realm attain the realization of the nonreturner? And do all those who attain the realization of the nonreturner completely and permanently eliminate the afflictions of the desire realm?

Answer: There are four ways of answering this: (1) There are some who completely and permanently eliminate the afflictions of the desire realm but who have not yet attained the realization of the nonreturner. This happens because when they pass over the stage of nonreturner and advance to the elimination of the nine classes of affliction of the form realm, they simultaneously eliminate the seeds and so forth that were quelled in the desire realm. (2) There are some who have not yet permanently eliminated the seeds of the affliction of the desire realm but who nonetheless attain the realization of the nonreturner. This happens in the case of a person who enters the Path of Seeing free from the afflictions of the desire realm and who performs quelling elimination of the seeds and attains this



realization. (3) The third is the case where the person who attains gradual freedom realizes nonreturning. (4) The fourth covers all cases not included above.

### 6.2. Question 2: Relationship between the Liberation Attained in the Realms of Form and Formlessness

Question: Do all those who permanently free themselves from the desire of the form realm definitely enter into the formless concentrations? And do all those who enter into the formless liberating concentrations definitely free themselves from the desire of the form realm?

Answer: There are four ways of answering this: (1) There are some who have already freed themselves from the desire of the form realm but who have not yet entered the formless concentrations. This means that they have freed themselves from the desires of the form realm using the preparatory practices prior to the first concentration. (2) There are some who have already entered the formless concentrations and who have not yet freed themselves from the desire of the form realm. This is said in reference to sages who have already attained the level of the fourth meditation and do not seek birth in the form realm, yet who, due to a loss of intensity toward the practice of the fourth meditation, let go of the practices of elimination of affliction. Because of their attainment of the advanced stages of the path, they are gradually able to enter the concentrations of infinite space and so forth. (3) The third case is where one enters the concentration of infinite space depending on the practices of eliminating affliction. (4) The fourth covers the cases not included in the above.

It is based on this interpretation that it is said that the concentration of cessation is reactivated in the form realm. [811c] As the *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya* says: “The concentration of cessation must be experienced in a human rebirth. Sometimes it can manifest in the human existence, and sometimes in the form realm. Once it has been experienced, it subsequently remanifests” [T 1606:31.737b5–9, abridged]. This explanation is based on canonical sources prior to the introduction of the teaching of the *ālaya-vijñāna*. In actuality, it also remanifests in the formless realm. The faculty of life can continue to exist in the ripening consciousness and seed-generated form as its basis. This is similar to the explanation given in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*.

### 6.3. Question 3: Relationship of Sentient Beings to the Three Realms

Question: Do sentient beings exist apart from the three realms or not? Why is there uncertainty about this? Because whether you say they exist or they do not exist, you are at odds with scriptural authority.

Answer: There are two ways of interpreting this. If we follow the earlier teaching, then the origin of sentient beings lies within in the cave of consciousness, from which they flow out and enter into the three realms. This is the same

as the teaching given in the non-Buddhist texts. However, there is no such teaching in Buddhism. Therefore, if you seek the origin of sentient beings in terms of the past, they have, since beginningless time, transmigrated throughout the three realms. If you look from the perspective of subsequent cultivation of the Way, removal of the hindrances, and escape from the three realms, then there are distinctions to be made. Why? If we observe in terms of the direct experience, then there are many sentient beings who escape from the three realms but who are not yet free from cyclic existence. If we look at it in terms of those who by nature have transcended the three realms, then only at the Buddha stage is one free from transmigration.

When we say “in terms of the direct experience,” there are, specifically speaking, four types of cases.

The first is that of the adherents of the two vehicles who are aiming for extinction. Once they escape from the three realms, they take on the mind-made body. As the [*Śrīmālā*]-*sūtra* says: “Beyond the three realms, there are three kinds of mind-made bodies.”<sup>223</sup>

The second is the direct departure of the bodhisattvas, who in the fourth of the ten abodes have already escaped from the three realms and attained the unfettered body. As the *Flower Ornament Sutra* says: “In the fourth [abode], true and nobly born disciples of the Buddha abandon cyclic existence and escape from the three realms” [T 278:9.448a10–11].

The third is the case of the bodhisattvas in the third of the seven grounds,<sup>224</sup> who, due to the power of their vows, quell the afflictions, transcend the three realms, and attain the body of the Pure Land. If they do not rely on the power of their vows, they will not directly escape. [812a] It is like the case of unenlightened beings who subdue afflictions at lower stages and thus receive a superior rebirth. As a sutra says: “There are pure lands beyond the three realms where the bodhisattvas of the third bodhisattva ground are reborn due to the power of their vow. This is something that unenlightened worldlings or the adherents of the two vehicles are unable to accomplish.”<sup>225</sup>

The fourth case is that of the bodhisattvas who are at the seventh of the ten grounds. Due to the power of their practice, they quell and eliminate the seeds. Casting off this body, they attain a mind-made body. It is like the one who, because of the power of noncontamination possessed in the passing over of the stage of nonreturner, quells and eliminates the seeds and is not reborn into the desire realm. This is the same sort of thing. As the *Benye jing* says: “From the first bodhisattva ground to the seventh, the karmic effects of the three realms are completely subdued without remainder. In the eighth ground, they are extinguished” [T 1485:1016c17–18].

This has all been explained from the perspective of the direct experience of the three realms. It is by not experiencing them that one is able to escape. Yet in terms of the essence of the three realms, from these four stages up to the adamant concentration none have yet been able to escape. What is the meaning of “the essence of the three realms”? This refers to the dependently originated self-nature

permeated by karma from the eight kinds of discrimination in the three realms. Included here are the natures of the eighteen realms that are the karmic retributions of the afflictions in the three realms. When the practitioners of the three vehicles escape from the three realms, they permanently eliminate seeds of contingent causes in the three realms. Because of this, they do not directly experience the direct awareness of the three realms. Yet the three realms still exist in essence, since one has not yet eliminated their causes and conditions.

If we explain the liberation from the essence of the three realms from the perspective of the elimination of their causes, conditions, and seeds, then in the first bodhisattva ground one begins to eliminate the coarse class of the causes and conditions of the three realms. Thus one extricates oneself from the coarse class in the essence of the three realms. One gradually extricates oneself like this up until the stage of the adamant concentration, wherein one eliminates the subtlest class of the causes and conditions of the three realms and then extricates oneself from the subtlest class of the essence of the three realms. Yet since they have not yet freed themselves from the habit energies of the three realms, all sentient beings abide within the matrix of the essence of the three realms. Only the buddha-*tathāgatas* transcend the three realms.

As the *Sutra [for Humane Kings]* says:

None of the afflictions of sentient beings survive beyond the matrix of the three realms. [812b] The twenty-two faculties<sup>226</sup> of sentient beings' karmic retribution do not lie outside the three realms. All the buddha-bodies of response, transformation, and reality are also not outside the three realms. Beyond the three realms there are no sentient beings. Whom would the Buddha teach? Therefore I say that [the view that] beyond the three realms there is a realm-matrix of sentient beings is a teaching of the Vaiśeṣika.<sup>227</sup> It is not the teaching of the seven buddhas [of the past]. What I have always taught is that once sentient beings completely exhaust the karmic effects of the afflictions of the three realms, that is called buddha. [T 245:8.826c29–827a5]

#### 6.4. Question 4: Placement of the Adherents of the Two Vehicles in the Framework of the Mahāyāna Path

Question: How should *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* who have reached the stage of no further application be situated within the stages of the Mahāyāna path?

Answer: The practices appropriate to the two vehicles have higher and lower degrees. Therefore, in terms of their position [from the perspective of the Mahāyāna path], we could assign them to both advanced and retrograde stages. Why? Once [the adherents of the two vehicles] have reached the limits of the attainment of the body of liberation, they sit on the same seat of liberation with all buddhas.

As the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* says: “The *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* share the same taste of liberation with all buddha-*tathāgatas* in the elimination of the afflictive hindrances, but not in the elimination of the cognitive hindrances” [T 670:16.513a19–20]. Hence, if we discuss the matter in terms of the level of liberation, then [Lesser and Greater Vehicle] practitioners are equal in the very final thought-moment of the ten bodhisattva grounds in terms of the extent to which they experience the selflessness of person. Based on this doctrine, the *Nirvana Sutra*’s chapter on the four kinds of reliance says: “The arhats abide in the tenth bodhisattva ground” [T 374:12.397a22–23]. If we explain in terms of the doctrine of the reception of the final body, then the arhat is of the same rank as a bodhisattva of the seventh bodhisattva ground.

Based on this doctrine, the *Sutra for Humane Kings* says: “The advanced bodhisattvas subdue to extinction the gathering of karmic causes in the three realms. Abiding in a subsequent body, their place is the seventh ground, the level of the arhat” [T 245:8.832a18]. If we discuss the relationship between the two in terms of the usage of supernatural powers of external manifestation, then the arhats are placed at the level of the bodhisattva of the ten understandings and below. As the *Sutra for Humane Kings* says: “Within the cultivated pure lineage there are ten kinds of mind, which are superior to all the virtuous stages of the two vehicles” [T 245:8.826b29].

From the perspective of the breadth and narrowness, the length and shortness of the mental range of operation, the bodhisattvas in the ten levels of faith are also superior [to the adherents of the two vehicles]. As the *\*Tattvasiddhi-śāstra*<sup>228</sup> says: “When the arhat-monk is aware that his novice student has generated the bodhisattva’s mind, he sets him in the front [and carries his bowl for him]” [T 1646:32.291c25–27]. Because of this, the adherents of the two vehicles who are aiming for quiescence, according to the sharpness or dullness of their faculties, reach the level of perfect enlightenment only after passing through many eons. As the [*Nirvana*] *Sutra* says: “The stream-winners are of indefinite lineage. Since they are of indefinite lineage, after passing through eighty thousand eons, they are able to attain perfect enlightenment [ . . . ] and so forth, up to the *pratyekabuddhas*, who are able to attain perfect enlightenment after ten thousand eons” [T 374:12.494b1–4].

**[812c]** What doctrine does this clarify? It is like when stream-winners of the dullest faculties undergo seven rebirths before entering *nirvāṇa*, extinguishing mind and mental factors—like the entry into the concentration of extinction. Passing through eighty thousand eons, they attain the generation of the mind of enlightenment. When they generate this mind, they receive further instructions from the Buddha and thus generate the mind of perfect enlightenment. If, in this single lifetime, they attain the second realization [once-returner], then they undergo two rebirths and subsequently enter into *nirvāṇa*. Passing through sixty thousand eons, they are able to generate the mind [of enlightenment].

If in this single lifetime, they attain the realization of the nonreturner and, without returning to the desire realm, enter into *nirvāṇa*, they pass through forty

thousand eons and are then able to generate the mind of enlightenment. If, in this single lifetime, they are able to attain the fourth realization [arhat] and enter into *nirvāṇa* in the present body, they pass through twenty thousand eons and are then able to generate the mind of enlightenment. In the case of the *pratyekabuddhas* of the sharpest faculties, they are able to generate the mind of enlightenment after passing through ten thousand eons. This is the gist of what is taught in the [*Nirvana*] *Sutra* on this topic. Once these five practitioners generate the mind of enlightenment, they are equivalent to bodhisattvas at the stage of the ten faiths. Yet since they are not yet able to carry out the bodhisattva practices with fierce energy, their practice cannot match [that of] even the worldly bodhisattva practitioners who have the predilection for the Great Vehicle [and] who have just generated the mind of enlightenment. It is like a proverb says: “One who wants to go on a trip must first prepare provisions.”<sup>229</sup> Isn't this the same?

### 6.5. Question 5: How Can the *Manas* Cognize All Dharmas?

Question: Above it was said that the *manas* cognizes all dharmas. Through what forms of argumentation can this be proved?

Answer: There are two methods of argumentation through which this can be confirmed. The first is by logical argumentation.<sup>230</sup> The second is by scriptural authority. Within inference there are two approaches: (1) proof of valid claims [*sādhana*] and (2) refutation of invalid claims [*dūṣaṇa*].

#### 6.5.1. PROOF THROUGH INFERENCE

##### 6.5.1.1. Proof of Valid Claims

We will begin from the perspective of proof of valid claims. When the *manas* and *mano-vijñāna* arise, while they must share the same objects, they have distinct bases. Generally speaking, in all cases where there are distinct bases and dependents, they must share in the same objects [otherwise they would have nothing whatsoever to link them]. It is like the [opposite] case of the visual consciousness and the rest [of the five sense consciousnesses]. Though they do not necessarily share the same objects, we see that none fail to share in the same bases. It is like the sequential annihilation [of the *manas*] and so forth. Since this proposition includes three components [of a valid argument], it cannot be refuted, so it can be taken as proof.<sup>231</sup>

##### 6.5.1.2. Refutation of Error

[813a] What is the approach of refutation? It is as when someone makes an assertion, saying [that] since the *manas* does not necessarily share the same referents with the *mano* and is not concomitant with it, all nonconcomitant conscious functions that we observe do not necessarily have the same objective referents. It

is just like the visual consciousness and so forth. Or someone asserts that since the visual consciousness and the other sense faculties do not necessarily share the same objects with the *mano* and are not concomitant with it, it is the case that all nonconcomitant conscious functions we see may possibly not share the same objects—just like the *manas*. This is a fallacy [in Buddhist logic] wherein differing but individually valid reasons lead to the completion of contradictory propositions,<sup>232</sup> and so neither position constitutes a valid proof.

Why? If, based on the assumption that the bases and dependents of the *manas* are not concomitant, we allow that they do not share their objects, and we apply this reason to the visual faculty and so forth, we cannot disallow that their objects will be different. If, using this reason, we simultaneously acknowledge both positions, both of the positions of nonsharing of referents are confirmed.

Furthermore, if the position of lack of referents of the visual faculty and so forth serves as a proper example,<sup>233</sup> then one ends up asserting that the *manas* lacks referents. If the *manas* does *not* lack referents yet does not share the same objects with its dependent [the *mano*], then, lacking shared reasons, they cannot be posited. Therefore, from the perspective of proof and refutation, it is established that the *manas* and *mano-vijñāna* share the same objective realm. Since the *manas* shares the same objective realm with the *mano-vijñāna*, the fact that the *manas* perceives all objects is self-evident.

#### 6.5.2. THE ARGUMENT BASED ON SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY

As for the argument based on scriptural authority, it is like the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* says: “Moved by the winds of the objective realm, the waves of the seventh consciousness roll” [T 670:12.484b11–13]. The author of the *Awakening of [Mahāyāna] Faith* comments on this point: “Due to cognition of the objective realm, the six kinds of marks are newly produced. What are the six? The first is the mark of discriminating knowledge [ . . . ]” [T 1666:32.577a12–13]. And so forth. Here, the mark of discriminating knowledge is always concomitant with the mental factor of intelligence in the *manas*; therefore it is called the mark of discriminating knowledge. I have already discussed the details of this in my *Expository Notes*<sup>234</sup> on that treatise. Depending upon scriptural authority, you should know that the *manas* is also produced by the objects of the six fields and is not simply conditioned by the *ālaya-vijñāna*.

### 6.6. Coarseness and Subtlety in the Nescience Entrenchment

Question: The entrenchments of nescience, which were explained earlier, are, in their broad interpretation, also removed by the adherents of the two vehicles according to their abilities. But we still do not know whether or not these entrenchments of nescience have distinctions of coarse and subtle or light and heavy. If they do have [distinctions of] coarse and subtle, then there will be some afflictions that are eliminated and some that are not. If this is the case, then one would

assume that a portion of these overlap into association with the eighth consciousness. [813b] If [on the other hand] they are completely unassociated, there can be no distinctions of coarse and subtle, or light and heavy. How can we say that the adherents of the two vehicles have some hindrances that are eliminated and some that are not?

If we suppose that they share in delusions such as the view of self that are error in regard to principle, then even if these are not coarse, they are eliminated together. If this is the case, then the nescience that is concomitant with the *manas* is the same as the view-based error of confusion in regard to the principle of selflessness. Therefore they should be eliminated together in the Path of Seeing. But if, due to their subtlety, one is unable to eliminate them [in that path], how can the most extremely subtle of these possibly be eliminated simultaneously?

Answer: The entrenchments of nescience are so imperceptibly subtle that distinctions such as coarse and fine or light and heavy cannot be clearly articulated. Therefore they need to be explained in terms of all kinds of various types. Why? If afflictions are fully activated at a high level of strength and energy, then they can be described only as coarse and not as subtle. If the marks of their activity are not yet discernible, and they are not concomitant with mind, then they can be described only as being subtle and not as being coarse.

In terms of what they hinder, they hinder the greater and the lesser. Therefore they can be said to have both heavy and light aspects. The claim that there is neither light nor heavy can be made only in the case where their distinctive marks are one, without the slightest increase in subtlety. Above them there is nothing heavy, below them there is nothing light, and you also cannot say that they reside only in the intermediate level. However, because they are not light, lesser wisdom is able to remove them. And because they are not heavy, superior wisdom also eliminates them. When they are neither light nor heavy, middling wisdom can extinguish them! It is, for example, like the realm of existence coursing through the five destinies. The five destinies can be called coarse, but when they permanently sever the four positions,<sup>235</sup> then they can be called subtle.

In terms of what they penetrate, they penetrate below and penetrate above, and thus you can say that there are shallow and deep [afflictions]. If they have no distinguishing marks of order, then you can say only that they are neither shallow nor deep—below there is nothing shallow, above there is nothing deep, and you also cannot say that they abide in the space between. Nonetheless, since they are not deep, lesser wisdom is able to realize them. Since they are not shallow, superior wisdom is able to understand them. Since they are neither deep nor shallow, middling wisdom is also able to meet them.

You should understand the lightness and heaviness of [entrenched] nescience in the same way. The nescience in the *manas* consists of its concomitant afflictions. Its activities are defined; its lightness and heaviness have a limit. Therefore the antidotes are of only a single category. You cannot take the *manas*' defining activities as representative of the entrenchment of nescience. Therefore the essence and attributes of nescience can be thoroughly illuminated only by the



perfect wisdom of the Buddha. [813c] The bodhisattvas in their final lifetime who possess the wisdom of the Ultimate Path are able to see only the end of this nescience—they cannot see its origin. “Seeing its end” means that within the three existences produced from nescience, they apprehend nonexistence and also illuminate no nonexistence.

“Not seeing its origin” means that because of their mistaken perception, through nescience, of “emptiness-only,” they are able to believe, but they are not yet able to confirm it for themselves. It is as when, while understanding the existence and nonexistence of the three objective realms, one also observes the act of giving rise to nescience regarding emptiness and existence. But since one is still not yet able to discern the objectively mistaken marks of the single realm of existence, one is also not yet able to fully understand the defining activities of subjective delusion. Therefore the defining activities of nescience are extremely deep and profoundly subtle, such that only the Buddha is able to fathom it.

Objection: If you say that the truth of the two kinds of selflessness obscured by the two kinds of attachment is real and not nonexistent, and can be illuminated only by sagely wisdom, then we can also submit that the two entities of person and dharmas that are reified by the two kinds of delusions are false, nonexistent, and not illuminated by sagely wisdom. If we admit both of these positions, then there is no conventional wisdom to remove the great error of denying the relationship of cause and effect. If you take the position that even though reified dharmas are not real, there are provisional dharmas perceived by cognition, that means that even though the reified self is not real, there is a provisional self perceived by cognition. If we accept both of these positions, that which is illuminated by sagely wisdom does not go beyond the three phenomena [of the five aggregates, eighteen realms, and twelve bases]. Within the aggregates, realms, and bases, where is the self to be located? If you say that there really are provisional dharmas but not a provisional self, then this means that there is selflessness of person, but there is not selflessness of dharmas.

If both kinds of selflessness exist, then both person and dharmas are nonexistent. If you say that reified dharmas do not really exist and therefore there is selflessness of dharmas, and yet the reification of dharmas refers to dharmas that are born from perfuming by language—[that is,] they are not real but nonetheless exist; they exist but nonetheless are not real—then this does not refute the selflessness of dharmas. If this is so, then the attachment to person refers to the self that is born from perfuming by language, and so it is not real but nonetheless exists; it exists but nonetheless is not real. This perspective does not refute the selflessness of person. At the time of causation, all are equally perfumed, but the results are not equally generated. This does not make sense.

If we speak from the perspective of the principle of cause and conditions as expressed by the conventional truth, [814a] when the four kinds of causes are combined,<sup>236</sup> dharmas are produced. Also from the perspective of cause and conditions as expressed by the conventional truth, when the five aggregates combine, the person is produced. If, when the five aggregates are combined, there is



no person produced, and when the four conditions combine, there are no dharmas produced, [it would mean that] in both cases there are causal conditions in the form of perfuming and seeds, but effects are both produced and not produced. This also does not make sense.

Response: Each of the above objections has a valid reason. Since each has a valid reason, there are none that are not admissible. Since there are none that are not admissible, there is no point of disagreement. What does this mean? To counter the non-Buddhist attachments to oneness, to eternalism, or to the self, we admit that there are five aggregates, but no oneness and no self. This is because, outside the dharmas of the five aggregates, there is no such thing as a soul. As the *Vimalakīrti-sūtra*<sup>237</sup> says: “There is no self, no doer, no experiencer. All dharmas are born of causes and conditions” [T 475:14.14.537c15].<sup>238</sup> That text also says: “It is like a third hand or a second head. So it is with a self existing within the five aggregates.”<sup>239</sup>

To counter the attachment of the adherents of the two vehicles to the dharmas of the five aggregates throughout the three times, we admit the existence of a unitary self and deny the five aggregates. This is because even though there is a true self, beyond it there are no five dharmas. As a sutra says: “When this same dharma body transmigrates through the five destinies, it is called sentient being.”<sup>240</sup> It is also said: “All sentient beings possess Buddha nature” [T 374:12.404c4–5]. Thus the term “self” here refers to the *tathāgatagarbha*.

To counter the attachment to nihilistic tendencies by bodhisattvas who attach to the words that express the most profound teaching, we admit the existence of a self and dharmas. As the [*Yogācārabhūmi*]-*śāstra* says: “This provisional self does not have the character of permanence, existence, or stability. [It has the character of change and disintegration] . . .” [T 1579:30.307b22]. And so forth.

To counter the attachment to reification by bodhisattvas who attach to the words that express the teaching of the characteristics of dharmas, we admit that both person and dharmas are nonexistent. As a sutra says: “Even self, sentient being, and so forth up to cognition and views do not exist; how much more so with form, feeling, perception, volition, and consciousness.”<sup>241</sup> According to this principle of cause and conditions, whether it is person or dharmas, they are neither existent nor nonexistent. Since they are not nonexistent, we say that the person and dharmas exist as illuminated by discriminating wisdom. Since they are not existent, we say that the principle of the two kinds of selflessness of person and dharmas is that which is realized by the wisdom of principle. Since they are realized by the wisdom of principle, we do not deny the existence of person and dharmas. That which is illuminated by the wisdom of discrimination does not controvert the teaching of the two kinds of selflessness.<sup>242</sup>

As the *Flower Ornament Sutra* says: “One discriminates all dharmas without attaching to the marks of dharmas” [T 278:9.455a16] and “Skillfully discriminating sentient beings without the marks of sentient beings” [T 278:9.455c1]. The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* says: “Saying that there is a true self is the extreme of the reification of the person. Saying that there is no self is the extreme of denial of

the person. Saying that there are really dharmas is the extreme of the reification of dharmas. Saying that there are no dharmas is the extreme of the denial of dharmas” [T 1599:31.462c8–11]. Depending on this scriptural authority, one should understand that the existence and nonexistence of person and dharmas equally express the ultimate truth. The alternating explanations of existence and nonexistence are teachings that are given appropriate to the situation.

What kind of phenomenon is this self that is under discussion? If we take the self as realm of existence, sentient being, or Buddha nature, then it is neither identical with the aggregates, realms, or fields nor separate from the aggregates, realms, or fields. Yet it also can be said that it is something included in the realm of conceptualization and the field of conceptualization. This interpretation is found in the *\*Dvādaśanikāya-śāstra*,<sup>243</sup> which says that if you discuss the nominal self that is produced from perfuming by the view of self, then it should be included within the consciousness of the distinction of self and other among the eleven consciousnesses.<sup>244</sup> It is not the aggregates, realms, or fields and is not separate from the aggregates, realms, or fields. Yet it is also able to be embraced by the aggregate of volition, the realm of conceptualization, and the field of conceptualization.

As the [*Yogācārabhūmi*]-*śāstra* says: “This nominal self cannot be said to have a nature that is either the same as or different from all the dharmas” [T 1579:30.307b20]. What kind of dharmas are contained within the aggregate of volition? These are the twenty-four factors that are not associated [with mind], in the category of commonality, which is also called the species of sentient beings. Yet these sentient beings, as well as all dharmas, are not really person or dharmas in the commonly understood sense of the word, nor are they nonexistent.

I have offered this explanation, yet the truth of the two hindrances can be fathomed only by the buddhas. [We sentient beings] should consider it according to the situation, relying on pious faith.



**Treatise on the Ten Ways of  
Resolving Controversies**  
*(Simmun hwajaeng non)*

Translation by  
CUONG T. NGUYEN

Introduction by  
A. CHARLES MULLER



## Contents

Introduction	165
Translation	167
1. CAUSES OF CONTROVERSIES	167
2. BEING AND EMPTINESS	167
3. THE OPPONENT'S VIEW	168
4. WŎNHYO'S RESPONSE: WORDS AND REALITY	168
5. LANGUAGE AND EMPTINESS	169
6. THE THREE NATURES AND REALITY	169
7. CANONICAL SOURCES	169
8. NONDUALITY AND THE UNIVERSALITY OF BUDDHA NATURE	171
9. BUDDHA NATURE IS WITHOUT BEGINNING AND WITHOUT END	173
10. THE TWO KINDS OF SELFLESSNESS	174



## Introduction

As was discussed at some length in the general introduction to this volume, if there is one term that is used more than any other to describe Wŏnhyo's distinctive approach to scholarly commentarial work, it is *hwajaeng*, or “resolution of doctrinal disputes.” The implications of this concept in Wŏnhyo are seen in many ways, going from his strict logic-grounded methodology to his profound, faith-oriented form of discourse. In all of his modes of discourse, he shows a pronounced ecumenical attitude toward all schools of Mahāyāna Buddhism, as well as other religious and philosophical traditions.

As a methodological approach, *hwajaeng* refers to Wŏnhyo's basic practice of taking ostensibly variant or conflicting Buddhist doctrinal positions, investigating them exhaustively until identifying the precise point at which their variance occurs, and then showing how differences in fundamental background, motivation, or sectarian bias have led to the creation of such variances. Wŏnhyo carries out this process repeatedly, in every extant commentary, in every essay and treatise—to an extent, to our knowledge, not seen in any other East Asian scholar or exegete. Thus it is appropriate that he is known as a reconciler of doctrinal disputes. Since the general introduction to this volume discusses at considerable length the role of *hwajaeng* in Wŏnhyo's career, there is no need to repeat that discussion here.

The *Simmun hwajaeng non* (Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies, hereafter *SHN*), of which only fragments from the beginning portion are extant, is one of Wŏnhyo's very few works that is not actually a commentary and is not intended to resolve a particular doctrinal theme. It is, rather, a methodological exercise based in both Mādhyamika and Dignāgan logic, seamlessly interwoven with the themes of the major Mahāyāna scriptures, including the *Lotus Sutra*, the *Nirvana Sutra*, the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, and so on. As in his other works, his point is to show how ostensibly conflicting doctrinal problems—especially those concerned with innate Buddhahood—stand up under the scrutiny of a rigorous logical examination.

There is good reason to guess that Wŏnhyo's *SHN* may have been regarded by his contemporaries as his magnum opus. To begin with, the *Kosŏnsa Sōdang hwasang t'appi* (Stele Inscription to Master Sōdang [viz. Wŏnhyo] of Kosŏnsa)—the earliest extant account of Wŏnhyo's life, composed approximately one



hundred years after his death—mentions only two works of Wŏnhyo's: the *SHN* and the *Hwaŏm chong'yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the *Flower Ornament Sutra*; not extant).<sup>1</sup> This is a fact of some significance, given the extensive influence of some of his commentarial works, such as his commentaries on the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, the *Nirvana Sutra*, and the *\*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*.

In this essay he does not engage in the work of *hwajaeng* in regard to any particular text or single doctrinal problem but treats a series of fundamental Buddhist doctrinal and philosophical issues. In this sense the *SHN* is a unique document in his corpus, which we must assume to have been written at a stage of relative maturity in his scholarly career.

It is therefore extremely unfortunate that only the early portion of this work is available, with even this portion missing pieces here and there. The text that is available to us is the result of heroic efforts on the part of a number of Korean scholars toward its reconstruction, and some, such as Yi Chŏng-ik, have attempted to further reconstruct the arguments that may have characterized each of the ten approaches, even in the missing text.<sup>2</sup> The title of the *SHN* appears in almost all catalogues of Buddhist texts. In 1937, fragments of the text were discovered on four wooden printing blocks at Haein-sa, numbers 9, 10, 15, and 16; in 1943, block 31 was also discovered at Haein Temple.<sup>3</sup> The wooden printing blocks on which these fragments were found had been engraved by Sŏng Hŏn, who finished carving the blocks in 1098 CE.

Although the complete text of Wŏnhyo's *SHN* is not extant, there are extensive Chinese, Korean, and Japanese source materials that discuss this text, the most important of which are *Kosŏnsa Sŏdang hwasang t'appi* (mentioned above), Ŭich'ŏn's *Sinbyŏn chejong kyojang chongnok* (New Edition of the Complete Catalogue of the Sutras and Commentaries of All Sects), *Narachō genzai issai kyōso mokuroku* (Catalogue on the Commentaries and Entire Scriptures of the Present Nara Dynasty), edited by Ishida Mosaku, and the five extant fragments of the *SHN* on the printing blocks in Haein Temple. These Chinese, Korean, and Japanese source materials contain many quotations and commentaries on this text. Some documents even assert that when Wŏnhyo wrote the *SHN*, disciples of Dignāga (sixth century) came to Tang China and took the treatise back to India.<sup>4</sup> The two fascicles of the *SHN* were also transcribed in 751 CE in Ishida's Nara catalogue.<sup>5</sup> The two-volume transcription has been lost, however.

In the *Simmun hwajaeng non*, which by virtue of its title alone is taken to be most representative text for showing his methodological approach, Wŏnhyo takes up ten of the most important doctrinal issues under discussion in East Asian Mahāyāna at this time. Many of these discussions are taken up in his other works, so we know that these represent the most seminal doctrinal problems for him. Since the *Simmun hwajaeng non* exists only in fragments, we do not know the full list of ten topics that he treated. The table of contents has been reconstructed, however, based on various citations in other works. These works suggest that the items in the table of contents are (1) the various arguments about three vehicles and one vehicle, (2) various attachments to existence and

emptiness, (3) various attachments to self and phenomena, (4) various doctrines of the three natures and of the five natures, (5) becoming a buddha, (6) various doctrines of the two hindrances, (7) various doctrines on *nirvāṇa*, (8) various doctrines of buddha-bodies, (9) various doctrines of Buddha nature, and (10) various attachments to the real and the conventional.<sup>6</sup> There seem to be a fair number of scholars who believe that Wōnhyo chose to elaborate these problematic issues under ten topics as an acknowledgment of his appreciation for Huayan, as ten is considered in Huayan to be a perfect number containing limitless meanings. This may be the case, but before coming to any firm conclusions regarding this, we should note that there is nothing special within the extant portions of the *SHN* that indicates any association with Huayan philosophy.

This present translation from the Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō is derived from the partial preface of the *SHN* from the inscription discovered at Kyōngju, Korea, in 1914 and the fragments from the five wooden printing blocks discovered at Haein-sa in 1937.<sup>7</sup>

## Translation

### TREATISE ON THE TEN WAYS OF RESOLVING CONTROVERSIES

*Composed by Wōnhyo*  
*Translated by Cuong T. Nguyen*

## I. Causes of Controversies

[838a] When the Tathāgata was still in this world, [sentient beings could] still rely on his perfect voice [like] rain pouring down, and empty arguments [were rampant like] like clouds scattering. Some said that they are right [and] others are wrong, that they are correct while others are at fault, thereupon creating [confusion as extensive as] the Milky Way. Trees . . . mountains and returning to the valley.

Some detest being and love emptiness<sup>8</sup>—this is like doing away with trees in order to enter a forest. [Being and emptiness] are like blue and green sharing the same primary color, like ice and water sharing a common origin. The mirror makes room for the myriad forms. The water divides . . . [into the myriad streams and, in the ocean,] mingles together. This serves as [my] prefatory statement and I title it *Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies*.

## 2. Being and Emptiness

Being, as it is designated here, is not different from emptiness. Thus, although it is designated as being, it is not artificial reification [*samāropa*]. It is provisionally designated [*prajñapta*] as being, but in reality it does not fall into [a reified

concept of] something existing. Being, as it is designated here, cannot but fall into the category of existence. Thus, although it is not different from emptiness, it is not destructive negation [*apavāda*].<sup>9</sup>

What previously was described as really existent is not different from the existence of emptiness. What subsequently was described as not falling into [a reified concept of] something existing is being that does not fall into being different from emptiness. Therefore both can be posited without contradicting each other. Because neither is not so, both are posited. Yet because they are not so, neither is posited. This being not so is not different from being so<sup>10</sup>—just as being existent is not different from being empty. Therefore, though neither is posited, we do not lose the basic teaching of our school. Thus all four logical possibilities [*catuṣkoṭi*] are posited side by side, and we are free from error.<sup>11</sup>

### 3. The Opponent's View

Objection: Though you claim your words clarify the matter and avoid logical difficulties, the meaning of what you say is even more unclear to see. You say that being is not different from emptiness, but the examples you adduce actually do not explain this. How so? If something actually exists, then this is different from not existing. The horns of an ox[, which really exist,] are not the same as the horns of a rabbit[, which do not]. If something is not different from emptiness, then certainly it is not [838b] existent. For example, the horns of a rabbit are not different from emptiness.<sup>12</sup> Now, you assert that existence is not different from emptiness. Since there are no examples of this in the world, how can your position be established? If you put forth a similar example to establish that it is not different from emptiness, by the foregoing inference [*anumāna*] you are committing the error of indeterminacy.

### 4. Wōnhyo's Response: Words and Reality

Answer: Although you are quite clever in posing objections, the difficulties you raise do not contradict my point, and the examples you adduce do not work. Why not? The horns of an ox are not existent and the horns of a rabbit are not nonexistent. Thus what you cling to are only words. I make use of words to communicate, in order to express the truth that cuts off words.<sup>13</sup> It is like using the finger to point at the moon, which [of course] is separate from the pointing finger. All you are doing now is grasping at the literal meaning of the words. Using examples that can be expressed in words makes it difficult to detach from verbal truth. You are just looking at the finger and finding fault with it for not being the moon. That is why the more refined the objections you pose, the further you are from the inner truth.

## 5. Language and Emptiness

So now let me bring in comparisons from the holy teachings that are beyond language. It [emptiness] is like empty space that can take in all forms, no matter whether they are long or short, and all actions, whether they involve contraction or expansion.

If we temporarily banish all forms and all actions that have form, formless empty space seems to appear. As the saying goes, where you remove ten feet of a rod, then ten feet of empty space appears. If you remove one inch of wood, then one inch of empty space appears. If you remove a movement of contraction, a contracted bit of space appears. If you remove a movement of expansion, an expanded bit of space appears.

We must recognize that this empty space that appears, whether it seems long or short, is something apart from words. This empty space corresponds in size to the forms that it held before, but the forms that it contained are different from the emptiness.

## 6. The Three Natures and Reality

The misguided thinking of ordinary beings makes distinctions among things that they grasp at.<sup>14</sup> Therefore it is likened to the phenomena of the imagined [nature] [*parikalpita-svabhāva*]. Though these phenomena are nonexistent, they judge them as being different from emptiness [*śūnyatā*]. The things that it contains are not different from empty space—this is not something that ordinary beings can comprehend with their discriminating thoughts. These things are explained as phenomena that arise dependently [*paratantra-svabhāva*]. Although they are real, they are not different from emptiness. Thus their artificial imagined nature is not established independently by itself without a basis [*āśraya*]. The artificial imagined nature gets established only on the basis of the dependent nature.<sup>15</sup> It is likened to [838c] something empty and beyond words that accommodates all forms according to what it responds to.<sup>16</sup>

When a bodhisattva detaches from the distinctions of false thinking and dispenses with artificially constructed forms, then the truth beyond words immediately appears. At that time the quality that all phenomena have of being detached from words appears. It is like this: when all forms are cleared away, emptiness apart from forms appears in the place that is cleared.<sup>17</sup> According to the logic of this reasoning, you must recognize that all phenomena are equal to empty space.<sup>18</sup>

## 7. Canonical Sources

As the *Golden Light Sutra*<sup>19</sup> says:

If you say that [the realm of the five aggregates (*skandhas*) and the Realm of Reality (*dharmadhātu*)] are different, then all the characteristics and practices of

buddhas and bodhisattvas become objects of attachment. [As long as one has not attained freedom from the bondage of afflictions, one is not capable of attaining perfect awakening.] Why so? All the sages apply the conduct of wisdom in the same way to both conditioned [*saṃskṛta*] and unconditioned [*asaṃskṛta*] phenomena. Thus they do not consider them different. Thus [the realm of] the five aggregates does not exist [in the absolute sense], and is not born from causation. Nor is it non-existent. [The realm of] the five aggregates does not go beyond the realm of the sages. Thus this is not something that language can reach.

The [*Great*] *Perfection of Wisdom Sutra* says:

Though the road of sentient beings is long, and their natures are diverse, its extent is like space, and the extent of the natures of sentient beings is like space.<sup>20</sup>

The *Madhyamaka-śāstra* says:

The real ultimate extent of *nirvāṇa* and the ultimate extent of the world are no different at all.<sup>21</sup>

The *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* says:

Sentient beings do not understand the esoteric meaning of the profound scriptures propounded by the Buddha on the interactions of profound emptiness. In them the Buddha explains that all phenomena are without inherent nature [*niḥsvabhāvatāḥ*], telling them that phenomena are not real things [*nirvastukatāḥ*], without birth or extinction. The Buddha explains that all phenomena are equal to empty space—that they are all like illusions or dreams. When sentient beings hear this, their minds become fearful, and they reject these scriptures, saying that they are not what the Buddha said.

The bodhisattvas act on behalf of these sentient beings, so that they may comprehend in accord with the truth and understand in accord with the real facts. The bodhisattvas accommodate these sentient beings and explain for them that these scriptures do not say that all phenomena are entirely nonexistent, but say just that all phenomena are without any so-called inherent nature.

[839a] There are all the things that are described, but these descriptions operate depending on them [the sentient beings themselves, and their cognitive processes]. Nevertheless the inherent nature [in these things], which they talk about and which can be described, is not their true inherent nature, if we go by the absolute truth.

It is like<sup>22</sup> this: There is a multitude of forms and their activities in empty

space, which can contain all these forms. This means that in empty space there appear all sorts of [forms and their activities] that come and go, that expand and contract. But if at a given time all these forms and their activities were removed, then only purified space appears in the absence of forms.

Thus, right amidst this thing that is like empty space and is detached from words and descriptions, there are all kinds of discriminations of false thought created by words and descriptions, and following these false conceptualizations [*prapañca*], forms and activities seem to occur.

Furthermore, all these various discriminations of false thought created by words and descriptions, and all these forms and activities generated according to these false conceptualizations, are all contained within this thing that is like empty space and is detached from words and descriptions.

If at a given moment a bodhisattva uses the wondrous holy wisdom to clear away all these discriminations of false thought created by words and descriptions and [to clear away] the accompanying false conceptualizations, at that moment the bodhisattva, the superlative sage, realizes that all phenomena are detached from the business of words and descriptions, and [the bodhisattva] experiences the manifestation of the fact that the nature of words and descriptions is not real inherent nature. This is like the purity of empty space appearing. Beyond this, there is no other inherent nature that must be further considered.<sup>23</sup>

## 8. Nonduality and the Universality of Buddha Nature

Furthermore, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*<sup>24</sup> says: “Sentient beings and the Buddha nature are neither one nor two. All the buddhas are everywhere equal, like empty space, and all sentient beings share in this.”<sup>25</sup>

Further on, the text says:

All sentient beings have Buddha nature, and they all share in the One Vehicle, [and they all share in the same liberation], and they all share a single causal basis and [attain] a single result [i.e., awakening], and they all share in the sweet dew [of awakening]. All of them will attain the eternity, bliss, self, and purity [of awakening]. Therefore [sentient beings and Buddha nature] have one flavor, [the flavor of awakening].<sup>26</sup>

According to this passage from the scripture, if you posit anything at all without Buddha nature, then you are going against the Great Vehicle [teaching] of the everywhere-equal true nature of phenomena. Everything shares in the great compassion [of the buddhas], just as the ocean is all of one flavor.

Moreover, suppose you claim that there are definitely sentient beings without Buddha nature, because the distinctions between all elements obtain. For instance, the nature of water is not present in the nature of fire. Others will claim that **[839b]** all sentient beings definitely have Buddha nature, since it is the case

that the inherent nature that has one flavor is everywhere equal. For instance, in agglomerations of coarse matter, the nature of the gross elements is always present. Thus there is the fallacy of definite contradiction.

Again, some say that there are definitely [sentient beings] without Buddha nature, because of the way things are. There are others who claim that there are definitely no [sentient beings] without Buddha nature, because of the way things are. [These positions] definitely contradict each other.

Those who insist that there are definitely [sentient beings] without Buddha nature say that the scriptures say that sentient beings all have minds, which includes all sentient beings with or without Buddha nature, whether they have or have not attained [awakening], and that all with minds are bound to attain awakening, including those with minds who have Buddha nature but have not yet attained [awakening].

Supposing that all who have minds are bound to attain [awakening], are those who have already attained awakening also bound to attain it? Thus we know [the scriptures] are not saying that all who have minds are bound to attain [awakening].

When [the scriptures] say that [Buddha nature] is like empty space that pervades everything, this is at the level of inner truth, not the level of practice. Also, when [the scriptures] say that [all sentient beings] have a single causal basis and [attain] a single result [i.e., awakening] and that all of them are bound to attain eternity, bliss, self, and purity, this means a fraction of them all, not literally all of them. All these passages from the scriptures can be properly understood in this fashion.

As for those who claim that there are no [sentient beings] without Buddha nature, because of the way things are, this implies that there is a finite number of sentient beings, and this is a great error. The other theory that there are [sentient beings] without Buddha nature, because of the way things are, does not make this mistake. Thus we know that though these two positions seem to contradict each other, in reality they do not.

Some claim that in the nature of how things are, fire is not wet. Others claim that in the nature of how things are, fire is wet. This appears to be a definite contradiction, but actually there is no such fallacy. This is because the nature of fire is heat; it is really not wetness. The logic is the same for [the assertion that there are] sentient beings without [Buddha nature].

Question: If one accepts the latter teacher's idea, how can it be reasonable?

[Answer:] As the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* says:

How can it be true that there is no such thing as attaining final *nirvāṇa* only in the present lifetime? That would not be reasonable. Shouldn't one say that even if there is no such thing as final *nirvāṇa* in the present lifetime, [839c] in other lifetimes one can be transformed and attain final *nirvāṇa*? Why so? Because [otherwise] there would be no inherent potential for final *nirvāṇa*. Moreover, if in this

lifetime one has already accumulated wholesome roots conducive to liberation, why wouldn't this be called final? If in this lifetime one has never accumulated [wholesome roots conducive to liberation], how can one attain final *nirvāṇa* in a next life? Therefore there are definitely sentient beings without the potential to attain final *nirvāṇa*.<sup>27</sup>

The *Yogācārabhūmi* also agrees with this theory.

## 9. Buddha Nature Is without Beginning and without End

Moreover, if all sentient beings will become buddhas, then even though sentient beings are numerous, there would be an end of them, since [eventually] there would be none who do not become buddhas. In that case, there would also be an end to the buddhas' virtues of benefiting others.

Furthermore, if there were an end to sentient beings [because all become buddhas], the last one who becomes a buddha would not have anyone to convert. Since there would be no one to convert, the virtue of benefiting others would be absent, and it is not reasonable that one would attain Buddhahood without this virtue.

Again, if one says that all will eventually become a buddha, and at the same time says that there will never be an end of sentient beings, one commits the fallacy of contradicting one's own teaching. This is because if there is no end to sentient beings, [some of them] will never attain Buddhahood.

Moreover, one buddha in one assembly can save hundreds of millions of sentient beings. Now, when these sentient beings attain *nirvāṇa*, there will be a decrease to the realm of sentient beings. When there is a gradual reduction [in the number of sentient beings], there will ultimately be a final end [to them]. It is not logical to have reduction without an end.

If there is no decrease [in the number of sentient beings], there is no attainment of extinction and liberation. It is not logical for them to be liberating without their numbers decreasing [as they move from being sentient beings to being buddhas].

Ultimately we cannot posit this kind of increase and decrease, because they are not of the same kind. This idea is not proven [*asiddha*].

Those who hold to the view that all sentient beings [have Buddha nature] say that these new treatises reject the view that before [awakening], one is without Buddha nature, and after [awakening], one is transformed into someone with Buddha nature.

Such is what those texts say. That is, one should not say that although [one has not yet realized] *nirvāṇa* in the present life, in a future life one would be able to attain *nirvāṇa*.

Now the teaching posited is that [sentient beings] originally have Buddha nature. This does not mean that before [awakening] they do not have it and after



[awakening] they come to have it. Therefore this viewpoint avoids the objection of that treatise. Besides, the intent behind that scripture teaching that [some sentient beings] are without Buddha nature was to [840a] turn around those who do not seek the mind of the Great Vehicle. It gives this teaching based on an immeasurable period of time, and because of this hidden intention, it does not contradict the above viewpoint.

Some counter by saying that if all who have a mind will attain Buddhahood, buddhas also have a mind [and] they should also attain [Buddhahood], and that is not the case.

That scripture already analyzes this issue. It says, “Sentient beings are also this way: they all have a mind. Those who have a mind will attain awakening.” Buddhas are not sentient beings; these two should not be confused with one another.

Again, some counter, “If all sentient beings will become buddhas, then there will be an end to them.” This objection is extended to the viewpoint that [sentient beings] by nature do not have Buddha nature. Why so? According to your teaching about sentient beings without Buddha nature, they originally have the seeds of ultimate reality, and until the end of time the seeds are inexhaustible.

Now let me ask you a question—you can answer as you please. Should one say that these seeds will all bear fruit, or should one say that some of them will not bear fruit? If you say that there are seeds that will not bear fruit, then those that do not bear fruit are not seeds. If you say that all seeds will bear fruit, it means that seeds are numerous yet they will definitely become exhausted, because all of them will bear fruit. If you say that although all the seeds will bear fruit, they are endless, so they will never become exhausted, [and you agree that] this is not self-contradictory, then you should believe and accept the teaching that all sentient beings will become buddhas; yet, since sentient beings are countless, they are inexhaustible. Again, you object saying, “If there is extinction without [ . . .].”

## 10. The Two Kinds of Selflessness

[840c]<sup>28</sup> The truth of the two kinds of selflessness<sup>29</sup> is real and not nonexistent, as revealed by the wisdom of the saints. It can also [dispel] the two defilements.<sup>30</sup> The imagined persons and phenomena are erroneous and nonexistent. This does not belong to the realm of wisdom of the saints.

If both [self and phenomena] are accepted, this would not [even be] mundane wisdom, [since such acceptance entails] rejecting [actual] cause and effect. This is a great false view.

If one says that although the imagined phenomena are not real, there are provisional phenomena that are revealed by wisdom of the saints, then, if that is the case, although there is no imagined true self, the sages did reveal a provisional self.

If both [provisional phenomena and provisional self] are accepted, the wisdom of the saints is not beyond the three categories of aggregates [*skandhas*],

bases [*āyatana*], and elements [*dhātu*], in what factor is the internal self to be found?

If one says that the provisional phenomena truly exist while the provisional self truly does not exist, then in that case the selflessness of persons is real, whereas there is no selflessness of phenomena. If the two kinds of selflessness both exist, persons and phenomena are equally nonexistent. If one says that just as the imagined phenomena, because they truly lack existence, exist as empty phenomena, and yet based on the attachment to phenomena, they undergo impregnation of language, then although they are not real, they do exist; they exist but they are not real. Thus the selflessness of phenomena is not abandoned. The self that is produced by the impregnation of language exists although it is not real; it is not real although it exists. In this case the selflessness of persons is not abandoned. It is not reasonable that the cause relies on impregnation and the effect is not born of impregnation.

If one says that in the conventional reality, based on the principle of causation, phenomena arise due to the confluence of the four conditions, [then] likewise in the conventional reality, based on the principle causation, persons are produced due to the combination of the five aggregates.

If the five aggregates have been combined, there are no persons produced; and likewise when there is the confluence of the four conditions, there are no phenomena produced. [It would mean that] when impregnated seeds, causes, and conditions are all present, effects are either produced or not. This is not reasonable.

Therefore in general I say that all these objections are reasonable. Since they are reasonable, they can all be conceded. Since all can be conceded, all make sense. What does this mean? If—contrary to the non-Buddhists who imagine oneness, permanence, and self [as real]—we accept that the five aggregates exist but there is no single self, [then] this is because there is no self separated from the five aggregates. As it is stated in a scripture:

There is no self, no person that acts, and no person that suffers [the consequences of acts]. Phenomena are born based on causes and conditions.<sup>31</sup>

Another scripture states:

The [idea of a] self within the five aggregates  
Is like a third hand or a second head.<sup>32</sup>

If, contrary to the disciples [*śrāvakas*] and the self-realized buddhas [*pratyekabuddhas*] who imagine that the five aggregates [are real] in the past, present, and future,<sup>33</sup> we accept that there is one self but there are no five aggregates, this is because there are no five aggregates separated from the true self.<sup>34</sup>

As it is stated in a scripture:

It is this same Realm of Reality [*dharmadhātu*] circulating in the five migrations that is called sentient beings.<sup>35</sup>

It again states:

All sentient beings have Buddha nature. Buddha nature means self. The self is the embryo of Tathāgata [*tathāgatagarbha*].<sup>36</sup>

Thus, to counter the bodhisattvas who, with regard to the highly profound teaching [of the Buddha], entertain a literal understanding and become attached to the extreme of negation, both persons and phenomena can be posited as existent. As it is stated in a treatise:

Again, this provisional self has the characteristic of impermanence [*anityatā*], is without characteristics [*alakṣaṇa*], has the characteristic of abiding [*sthiti*], and has the characteristics of change [*vikāra*] and decay [*nāṣṭi*], and so forth.<sup>37</sup>

To counter the bodhisattvas who, with regard to [the Buddha's] teaching on the characteristics of phenomena, entertain a literal understanding and become attached to the extreme of reification, one says that the nonexistence of both persons and phenomena can be accepted.<sup>38</sup> As it is stated in a scripture: "If even the self of sentient beings up to the wise ones and the learned ones does not exist, how could form, feeling, perception, and volitional formations exist?"<sup>39</sup>

**Commentary on the *Discrimination  
between the Middle and the Extremes*  
(*Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so*): Fascicle Three**

Translation and Introduction by

CUONG T. NGUYEN



## Contents

Introduction	183
1. THE <i>MADHYĀNTAVIBHĀGA-BHĀṢYA</i>	183
2. THE CONTENT OF CHAPTER FOUR OF THE <i>MADHYĀNTAVIBHĀGA-BHĀṢYA</i>	184
3. THE MAHĀYĀNA APPROACH TO THE THIRTY-SEVEN CONSTITUENTS OF AWAKENING	185
4. AN OVERVIEW OF WŎNHYO'S COMMENTARY	186
5. WŎNHYO AND THE EAST ASIAN COMMENTARIAL STYLE	186
6. THE STYLE OF THE <i>CHUNGBYŎN PUNBYŎLLON SO</i>	187
7. WŎNHYO'S AUTHORITATIVE SOURCES	188
8. WŎNHYO'S COMMENTARIAL STRUCTURE	188
9. ON TRANSLATING THE <i>CHUNGBYŎN PUNBYŎLLON SO</i>	189
Translation	190
A. Chapter on the Antidotes	190
1. INTRODUCTION	190
2. COMMENTARY	190
2.1. Enumerating the Names of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening	190
2.2. Explaining the Meaning of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening	192
2.2.1. The Four Foundations of Mindfulness	192
2.2.2. The Four Right Eliminations	193
2.2.3. The Four Legs of Supernormal Powers	195
2.2.4. The Five Spiritual Faculties	197

2.2.5.	The Five Powers	197
2.2.6.	The Seven Awakening Limbs	197
2.2.7.	The Eight Limbs of the Noble Path	198
2.3.	Illustrating the Essence of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening	198
2.4.	Elucidating the Stages and Levels of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening	199
2.5.	Clarifying the Order of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening	201
2.6.	Discriminating the Divisions of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening	203
2.6.1.	The Five Divisions	203
2.6.1.1.	The Five Divisions of the Four Foundations of Mindfulness	203
2.6.1.2.	The Five Divisions of the Four Right Eliminations	208
2.6.1.3.	The Five Divisions of the Four Legs of Supernormal Powers	209
2.6.1.4.	The Five Divisions of the Five Spiritual Faculties	211
2.6.1.5.	The Five Divisions of the Five Powers	212
2.6.1.6.	The Five Divisions of the Seven Awakening Limbs	212
2.6.1.7.	The Five Divisions of the Eight Limbs of the Noble Path	215
3.	AN ANALYSIS OF THE WORDS OF THE CHAPTER	216
3.1.	The Four Foundations of Mindfulness	217
3.2.	The Four Right Endeavors	218
3.3.	The Four Wish-Granting Legs	219
3.4.	The Five Spiritual Faculties	228
3.5.	The Five Powers	231
3.6.	The Seven Awakening Limbs	235
3.7.	The Eight Limbs of the Noble Path	237
3.7.1.	The Antidotes and the Three Obstructions	240
3.7.2.	The Three Kinds of Antidote	242
3.7.3.	Distinctions [between the Vehicles]	243

B. The Stages of Cultivation	244
1. FOUR STAGES AND EIGHTEEN LEVELS	245
1.1. The Seven Levels of Cause in the Shared Stages	246
1.2. The Distinct Stages	247
1.3. The Successive Levels	247
1.4. The Simultaneous Levels	248
2. LEVEL OF THE REALM OF REALITY	248
C. On the Attainment of Fruits	250
1. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIVE FRUITS	250
2. THE ESSENCE OF THE FRUITS	251
3. THE DIVISIONS OF CAUSE	252
4. EXPLAINING THE WORDS	253
5. THE TEN FRUITS	254
6. A SUMMARY	257
7. THE MEANING OF THE LEVELS IN THE STAGES OF CULTIVATION OF THE ANTIDOTES	258
8. THE MEANING OF FRUITS	259
9. A CONCLUSION ON THE MEANING OF THE THREE CHAPTERS	260





## Introduction

The *Chungbyōn punbyōllon so* is another text of Wōnhyo's that is available only fragmentarily; all that remains is the commentary on the fourth chapter of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*. This is the "Chapter on the Antidotes, Its Cultivation, the Stages [of the Path], and the Attainment of Fruition" (Pratipakṣa-bhāvanāvasthā-phala-pariccheda), and as such it represents only a small aspect of Wōnhyo's scholarly interest. This introduction is therefore confined to a brief description of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, an analysis of the style and structure of Wōnhyo's commentary, and my approach to translating his commentary.

### I. The *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*

The *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* is one of the few foundational Yogācāra texts still extant in the original Sanskrit.<sup>1</sup> The text consists of the root verses traditionally attributed to Maitreya (or Maitreya-nātha) and a prose commentary by Vasubandhu. According to the Sanskrit text, the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* consists of five chapters. Chapter One, "Lakṣaṇa-pariccheda," discusses the characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of phenomenal reality (*abhūta-parikalpa*) and ultimate reality (*śūnyatā*), or the characteristics of defilement (*saṃkleśalakṣaṇa*) and purification (*vyavadānalakṣaṇa*). Chapter Two, "Āvaraṇa-pariccheda," gives a detailed exposition of the obstacles (*āvaraṇa*) on the path to awakening. Chapter Three, "Tattva-pariccheda," explains the various categories of realities (*tattva*), including the three *lakṣaṇas* (characteristics) or *svabhāvas* (natures) instrumental to the Yogācāra program of discerning all aspects of reality and realizing all-knowledge, or awakening. Chapter Four, "Pratipakṣa-bhāvanāvasthā-phala-pariccheda," focuses on the cultivation of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening (*bodhipakṣika*) as the practical path leading to realization, together with the stages of cultivation and the attainment of the fruits. Chapter Five, "Yānānuttarya-pariccheda," illustrates the excellence of the Yogācāra and Mahāyāna Buddhist path in general.<sup>2</sup>

The Indian commentator Sthiramati states that these five chapters aim at explaining seven subjects: characteristics, obstacles, realities, antidotes, stages of the path, the attainment of fruition, and the excellence of the Great Vehicle.<sup>3</sup> In

other words, these seven subjects encompass the Yogācāra's views on the perceptions of reality, the Path of Cultivation, the attainment of the fruits of cultivation, and the excellent benefits obtained through the path of the Great Vehicle.<sup>4</sup>

Two Chinese translations of the verses alongside Vasubandhu's commentary can be found in the Chinese Tripiṭaka: one by Paramārtha (*Zhongbian fenbie lun*) and another by Xuanzang (*Bian zhongbian lun*).<sup>5</sup> Xuanzang also produced a separate translation of the verses.<sup>6</sup> Wōnhyo's commentary is based on Paramārtha's version.

## 2. The Content of Chapter Four of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*

Wōnhyo's *Chungbyōn punbyōllon* so consists of a commentary on the chapter "Pratipakṣa-bhāvanāvasthā-phala-pariccheda" of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*.<sup>7</sup> In this chapter the antidotes (*pratipakṣa*) are identified as the thirty-seven constituents of awakening (*bodhipakṣikā-dharmā*). Because they counteract the obstructions (*āvaraṇa*) to awakening, the antidotes are also called the path (*mārga*).<sup>8</sup> That the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* presents the cultivation of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening as the practical path leading to awakening shows that the *bodhipakṣikā-dharmā* are considered in many Mahāyāna texts as the practical path shared by the adherents of all the three vehicles.<sup>9</sup>

In Buddhist literature the thirty-seven constituents of awakening are divided into seven groups: (1) the four foundations of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*), (2) the four right endeavors (*samyak-pradhāna*), (3) the four bases of supernormal powers (*rddhipāda*), (4) the five spiritual faculties (*indriya*), (5) the five powers (*bala*), (6) the seven awakening factors (*bodhyāṅga*), and (7) the eight limbs of the Noble Path (*mārgāṅga*). On closer analysis we see that although the thirty-seven constituents of awakening are called antidotes to the obstructions to awakening,<sup>10</sup> they function as more than just counteractions to the obstructions; they also produce various salvific qualities. This is an essential point in Mahāyāna Buddhist soteriology: the attainment of awakening is twofold; it consists of both the elimination of afflictions and the acquisition of positive qualities. Let us consider a brief analysis of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening from this standpoint.

Among the seven groups that make up the thirty-seven constituents of awakening, the group of the four foundations of mindfulness is principal, while the other six serve as complements. This is so because, by cultivating the four foundations of mindfulness, one realizes the Four Noble Truths, which are the foundation of Buddhism.

The four right endeavors represent moral practice, since by cultivating them, one knows all wholesome and unwholesome states. The four bases of supernormal powers, the five spiritual faculties, and the five powers represent the meditative aspect. Note in this connection that, in Mahāyāna Buddhism, *samādhi*

(meditative concentration) consists of various types accomplished through different qualities. These types of *samādhi* represent different aspects of salvific powers. The seven awakening factors signify the content and structure of the awakening experience. By cultivating these factors of awakening, one realizes salvific aims for oneself (*svārtha*). However, from the Mahāyāna standpoint, the complete awakening experience consists in realizing salvific aims for both oneself and others (*sva-parārtha*). The eight limbs of the Noble Path provide the means to achieve this.

### 3. The Mahāyāna Approach to the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening

Some of the authoritative texts Wōnhyo draws on to compose his commentary are key texts of Yogācāra Buddhism. These texts purport to present a deeper level of understanding and cultivation of the same Buddhist teachings shared by all three vehicles that lead to a more complete fruition. This is relevant to our understanding of the historical as well as doctrinal development of Mahāyāna Buddhism. In other words, Mahāyāna does not necessarily replace earlier Buddhism with a new set of teachings but mainly offers new approaches and techniques of mental cultivation that will lead to the full development of the potentials within the teachings. The Mahāyāna states that the Buddha's teaching is impartial. The levels of its realization, however, depend on the practitioners' resolution, aptitude, aspiration, and conditioning. To expound these, the Mahāyāna devises a systematic division of persons (who undertake the path), spiritual aptitude or lineages, and levels of attainments.

The author of the *Dazhidu lun* (\**Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*), one of Wōnhyo's oft-quoted canonical sources, addresses this issue more specifically: the thirty-seven constituents of awakening are commonly considered part of the path of the disciples (*śrāvakas*) and self-realized buddhas (*pratyekabuddhas*), whereas the six perfections (*pāramitās*) are considered part of the path of the bodhisattvas. Why is it that the disciples' method is discussed in the path of the bodhisattvas? The answer to this question is that the bodhisattva, in cultivating the perfection of wisdom, should study all methods and paths. This means that the bodhisattva should cultivate all of the ten grounds (*bhūmis*). However, the bodhisattva studies the first nine grounds but does not become attached to their attainment. As regards the tenth ground, or the stage of Buddhahood, the bodhisattva not only studies but also attains its fruition. Besides, it is not correct to say that the cultivation of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening belongs exclusively to the path of the disciples and self-realized buddhas. Mahāyāna scriptures also teach this.<sup>11</sup> In other words, the cultivation of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening is the universal path toward *nirvāṇa*. The particular fruits attained depend on the practitioner's resolution, aspiration, and conditioning.<sup>12</sup>

According to the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, eighteen kinds of fruit are attained through the cultivation of these thirty-seven constituents of awakening.

Wōnhyo divides these eighteen kinds of fruit into four stages: (1) the shared stage, which includes the first seven kinds of fruit attained by practitioners of all three vehicles; (2) the distinct stage, which consists of the fruits that are higher than those of the adherents to the two lesser vehicles and are attained only by bodhisattvas who have entered the lower bodhisattva grounds (*bhūmis*); (3) the gradual six stages, which encompass the fruits from the sixth bodhisattva ground up to, but not including, the supreme stage of Buddhahood; and (4) the supreme stage of Buddhahood, in which the practitioner attains the three buddha-bodies and their attendant salvific qualities. This stage and the previous one are attained only by those adherents of the Mahāyāna who generate the aspiration to realize the supreme goal.

#### 4. An Overview of Wōnhyo's Commentary

As mentioned above, Wōnhyo's commentary on the "Chapter on the Antidotes" is based on Paramārtha's translation of the text. We learn this through the title that he uses for the text: *Chungbyōn punbyōllon so*, not *Pyōn chungbyōllon so*. The numbers of the verses Wōnhyo refers to in his commentary also coincide with Paramārtha's version. These verses discuss the antidotes (to the obstructions to awakening), or the thirty-seven constituents of awakening, from the perspective of their cultivation, stages, and fruits. Wōnhyo's commentary is on both the root verses and Vasubandhu's commentary, and he mentions neither Sthiramati's nor Kuiji's work. We do not know whether Wōnhyo had the original Sanskrit at his disposal, but he seems to be aware of the divisional difference between the Chinese translations and the Sanskrit text. At the end of his commentary, he gives a brief explanation of how Vasubandhu combined these three chapters into one.

#### 5. Wōnhyo and the East Asian Commentarial Style

The *Chungbyōn punbyōllon so* is an East Asian commentary on an Indian Yogācāra Buddhist text based on its Chinese translation. Therefore an elaboration on both Wōnhyo's commentarial style and the implications of linguistic differences should be useful to our understanding of Wōnhyo's view. Although I am certain that the translators of other, more complete and more significant works of Wōnhyo's included in this project will discuss this issue in more detail in their introductory essays, it seems to me that Wōnhyo's contribution in the *Chungbyōn punbyōllon so* consists mainly in rearranging and condensing the hermeneutical framework already laid out in canonical texts, according to which the practitioner should understand the thirty-seven constituents of awakening as presented in the "Chapter on the Antidotes." Therefore I wish to offer in this connection only a few remarks that I hope will facilitate the reading of the text.

For East Asian Buddhist authors, to comment on a canonical text means to locate the text within the broad context of the Buddhist tenets from both historical and doctrinal perspectives and to interpret its meaning through an explanation of

words of the text. Very briefly, the task of the commentator is to read and elucidate the text both contextually and textually. Thus the purpose of commenting on a scriptural text goes beyond the task of merely explaining or elaborating on key terms and concepts it contains to include locating these in the interpretive structure and context of the totality of the Buddha Dharma. In other words, although each canonical text is an individual unit dealing with a specific topic, it can be thoroughly understood only if it is read against the background of and in connection with a nexus of interpretive concepts in which the Buddha Dharma is to be appreciated. In sum, a commentary on a scriptural text is not just an interpretation of that text as such—that is, as an independent doctrinal unit. Rather, it is a reading of the text as a constitutive element of the Buddha's doctrinal structure.

Most commentaries tend to read like handbooks on Buddhist thought and meditation aimed mainly at a scholastic audience. Normally, a commentator will indicate at the outset his interpretive framework or the basic hermeneutic principles according to which he contextualizes the ideas, terms, and concepts in the text from the perspectives of history, doctrinal development, sectarian outlook, levels on the Path of Cultivation, persons engaged in the path, and so on. Ideas, terms, and concepts again are subject to a more detailed analysis within an interpretive framework that includes subcategories upon subcategories ad nauseam. A modern reader cannot help having the impression that this practice adds confusion rather than clarity to the commentary. However, this is precisely the commentator's vision of doctrinal coherency. In other words, this is exactly how a text should be read and comprehended. As we will notice when we read Wŏnhyo's commentary, his only contribution is to impose an interpretive framework on concepts and ideas discussed in the canonical texts. Wŏnhyo does not even invent this interpretive framework. It implicitly exists as the natural hermeneutic structure of the text. His only task is to make the structure of the text clear to the reader or, in other words, to facilitate the reading of the text.

## 6. The Style of the *Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so*

The *Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so* in its present state is, unfortunately, not one of the more reader-friendly texts among Wŏnhyo's extant works. Although it is supposed to be a commentary on the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, Wŏnhyo's commentary itself is not much more than a jumbled patchwork of quotations from other canonical sources. The commentary also includes many syntactically obscure passages that would make the task of translating it daunting. Occasionally there may be a scribal error that initially appears to be a minor mistake, but because of the nature of this text and Wŏnhyo's commentary, for which every single technical term is essential in itself and relevant to the others, an erroneous term could easily derail the translator for a long time.

There are many instances where Wŏnhyo is not consistent in his use of terminology. For example, he alternates between *sa nyŏmju* and *sa nyŏmch'ŏ*; *ch'il gakkhi* and *ch'il kak pun*; *sa sinjok* and *sa yŏui chok*; and the like. This inconsistency

occurs because Wōnhyo quotes from other authors to comment on the text and he retains these authors' terminology when he appears to be quoting them either directly or indirectly.

When it comes to technical terms, Wōnhyo also has a tendency to alternate between Chinese translations and transliterations of the original Sanskrit. For example, to express the Sanskrit terminological set of *śamatha/vipaśyanā*, he will alternate between the translated *chi/kwan* and the transliterated *samat'a/pi-balsana*; or for the Sanskrit *samādhi*, he alternates between *chōng* and *sammaji*; and so forth.<sup>13</sup>

## 7. Wōnhyo's Authoritative Sources

Given that Wōnhyo's commentary is mostly a patchwork of quotations from canonical texts, a look into the texts that Wōnhyo frequently quotes as authoritative sources for his commentary will shed considerable light on our understanding of his commentarial style, his interpretive structure, and his contextualization of the main concepts of his commentary. Most of the numerous canonical texts from which Wōnhyo quotes are seminal Mahāyāna treatises, such as the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, the *Dazhidu lun*, the *Abhidharmakośa*, the *Mahāvibhāṣā*, the *Uttaratantra*, and the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. For this commentary, the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and the *Dazhidu lun* appear to be Wōnhyo's main references. As mentioned above, Wōnhyo does not really invent the interpretive concepts but simply draws on these authoritative texts, from which he extracts hermeneutic categories. Wōnhyo's task consists in weaving them together into what he visualizes as a coherent structure.

Wōnhyo thus distills his interpretive framework from a careful investigation of the understanding of different dimensions and functions of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening in various canonical scriptures. This knowledge of Wōnhyo's interpretive concepts will help facilitate the reading of his commentary considerably. Briefly, in contextualizing the thirty-seven constituents of awakening through six interpretive categories, Wōnhyo endeavors to illustrate not only the meaning of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening but also their relation to other concepts and their significance in the Buddhist worldview.

## 8. Wōnhyo's Commentarial Structure

Wōnhyo divides his commentary into two parts: an illustration of the meaning of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening; and a detailed analysis of the words of the root verses and Vasubandhu's prose commentary. In other words, in the first part Wōnhyo proceeds to exhaust the meaning of these constituents of awakening in the context of the Buddhist paths in general, according to canonical sources. In the second part, he analyzes the root verses (together with Vasubandhu's commentary) and elaborates on the meaning of the words within

the hermeneutic context laid out in these sources. Briefly, Wŏnhyo proposes to read the text from two interwoven perspectives: contextually and textually. Wŏnhyo's structuring of his commentary can be outlined as follows:

Part I: Illustrating the meanings (*myŏng ki ũi*) of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening, organized into six sections:

1. Enumerating the names (*yŏlmyŏng*) of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening
2. Explaining their meaning (*sŏk ũi*)
3. Illustrating their essence (*ch'ul ch'e sŏng*)
4. Elucidating their levels (*sŏn myŏng chi wi*)
5. Clarifying their order (*sŏl ch'a che*)
6. Discriminating their divisions (*pyŏn che mun*)

Part II: Analyzing the words of the text (*so mun*) in detail, including an interpretation of the words of the root verses and Vasubandhu's prose commentary in Chapters Four, Five, and Six

In the second part of his commentary, Wŏnhyo does not quote complete verses but simply refers to some key words of the verse on a particular item among the thirty-seven constituents of awakening and then again gives a very detailed and lengthy discussion of its meaning, mainly by quoting profusely from canonical sources. There is much overlap with the first part. However, it appears that Wŏnhyo's intention in the second part is to elucidate the meanings of the terms in addition to contextualizing them.

## 9. On Translating the *Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so*

The *Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so* is not an independent treatise in which Wŏnhyo presents and defends a specific philosophical position. Rather, it is essentially a fragmented commentary on a canonical text. The text reads like a series of lectures given directly to a group of advanced students. It seems that all of the students have a copy of Vasubandhu's commentary in front of them<sup>14</sup> while Wŏnhyo gives his commentaries, and they are written down by a scribe. That is why in this commentary Wŏnhyo never quotes the entire passage on which he comments but only indirectly refers to the terms and concepts to be explained or mentions—by way of emphasis—certain key terms or phrases in the root verses or in Vasubandhu's commentary. These fragmented quotations become mixed up with Wŏnhyo's own words, and so tend to make his commentary in general, and the second part in particular, appear confusing.

To remedy this situation, I felt it necessary to translate the root verses together with Vasubandhu's commentary and insert them into Wŏnhyo's commentary. In the following pages, the root verses and Vasubandhu's commentary are printed in boldface type.



As the reader will notice, my translation of the *Chungbyōn punbyōllon so* for the greater part involves translating a profusion of passages from canonical texts and very little of Wōnhyo's own words. These texts belong to different eras and have different translators. There is no consistency or standardization of technical terms, and different Chinese terms can be used to render the same Sanskrit word. The modern translator must therefore be able to go beyond the literal meaning of the Chinese characters to detect what Sanskrit terms they stand for. Even so, the translator still has to be flexible, since Wōnhyo comments on the technical terms in the way he understands them. Therefore, although it is necessary to be aware of the Sanskrit original, the translator must make sure that his translation of the root verses and Vasubandhu's commentary is compatible with Wōnhyo's own commentary.

## Translation

### COMMENTARY ON THE DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN THE MIDDLE AND THE EXTREMES (FASCICLE THREE)

*Composed by Wōnhyo of Silla*  
*Translated by Cuong T. Nguyen*

#### A. CHAPTER ON THE ANTIDOTES

### 1. Introduction

[817b] The “Chapter on the Antidotes”<sup>15</sup> studies the thirty-seven constituents of awakening.<sup>16</sup> Their meanings are illustrated by designating the counteractive expedients according to the objects to be counteracted. Therefore this chapter is called “Chapter on the Antidotes.” In this commentary, I will first illustrate their meanings; then I will analyze the words [of the text].

First, the [thirty-seven] constituents of awakening can be briefly explained in six categories: (1) enumerating their names, (2) explaining their meanings, (3) illustrating their essence, (4) elucidating their levels, (5) clarifying their order, and (6) discriminating their divisions.

### 2. Commentary

#### 2.1. Enumerating the Names of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening

What are the thirty-seven constituents of awakening [*bodhipakṣikā-dharmā*]? They are the four foundations of mindfulness [*smṛtyupasthāna*],<sup>17</sup> the four right eliminations [*samyak-prahāṇa*],<sup>18</sup> the four legs of supernormal powers [*ṛddhipāda*], the five spiritual faculties [*pañcēndriya*], the five powers [*pañca-bala*], the seven

awakening limbs [*sapta-saṃbodhyaṅga*], and the eight limbs of the Noble Path [*aṣṭa āryamārgāṅga*].

(1) The four foundations of mindfulness consist of (i) mindfulness of the body [*kāyānupaśyanā*], (ii) mindfulness of feelings [*vedānānupaśyanā*], (iii) mindfulness of mind [*cittānupaśyanā*], and (iv) mindfulness of factors of existence [*dharmānupaśyanā*].<sup>19</sup>

(2) The four right eliminations consist of (i) eliminating unwholesome states that have arisen, wherein one produces aspiration [*chandaṃ janayati*], strives [*vyāyacchate*], generates a vigorous effort [*vīryam ārabhate*], engages one's mind energetically [*cittam praḥṛhāti*], and exerts it [*pradadhāti*]; (ii) preventing [as yet] unarisen unwholesome states, wherein one produces will, strives, generates a vigorous effort, uses one's mind energetically, and exerts it; (iii) arousing [as yet] unarisen wholesome states, wherein one produces will, strives, generates a vigorous effort, uses one's mind energetically, and exerts it; and (iv) developing arisen wholesome states, wherein one does not forget, and brings them to perfection, cultivates them, increases them, and expands them; one produces will, strives, generates a vigorous effort, uses one's mind energetically, and exerts it.

(3) The four legs of supernormal powers include (i) the supernormal power accomplished by the right application of concentration through will [*chanda-samādhi*], (ii) the supernormal power accomplished by the right application of concentration through endeavor [*vīrya-samādhi*], (iii) the supernormal power accomplished by the right application of concentration through mind [*citta-samādhi*], and (iv) the supernormal power accomplished by the right application of concentration through investigation [*mīmāṃsā-samādhi*].<sup>20</sup>

(4) [817c] The five spiritual faculties are (i) the spiritual faculty of conviction [*śraddhēndriya*], (ii) the spiritual faculty of effort [*vīryēndriya*], (iii) the spiritual faculty of mindfulness [*smṛtīndriya*], (iv) the spiritual faculty of concentration [*samādhīndriya*], and (v) the spiritual faculty of wisdom [*prajñēndriya*].

(5) The five powers consist of (i) the power of conviction [*śraddhā-bala*], (ii) the power of effort (*vīrya-bala*), (iii) the power of mindfulness (*smṛti-bala*), (iv) the power of concentration (*samādhi-bala*), and (v) the power of wisdom [*prajñā-bala*].

(6) The seven awakening limbs are (i) the awakening limb of mindfulness [*smṛti-saṃbodhyaṅga*], (ii) the awakening limb of investigation of the teachings [*dharmapraṇicaya-saṃbodhyaṅga*], (iii) the awakening limb of effort [*vīrya-saṃbodhyaṅga*], (iv) the awakening limb of joy [*prīti-saṃbodhyaṅga*], (v) the awakening limb of pliancy [*prasābhi-saṃbodhyaṅga*], (vi) the awakening limb of concentration [*samādhi-saṃbodhyaṅga*], and (vii) the awakening limb of equanimity [*upekṣā-saṃbodhyaṅga*].

(7) The eight limbs of the Noble Path consist of (i) right view [*samyagdr̥ṣṭi*], (ii) right conception [*samyak-saṃkalpa*], (iii) right speech [*samyagvāca*], (iv) right action [*samyak-karmānta*], (v) right livelihood [*samyagājīva*], (vi) right effort [*samyagvyāyāma*], (vii) right mindfulness [*samyak-smṛti*], and (viii) right concentration [*samyak-samādhi*].

## 2.2. Explaining the Meaning of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening

### 2.2.1. THE FOUR FOUNDATIONS OF MINDFULNESS

“Mindfulness of the body” means contemplation with mindfulness with regard to the body. The same applies to [the mindfulness of feelings, the mindfulness of mind, and] the mindfulness of factors of existence. What is mindfulness? It means that, by [contemplation of] the body, one sustains the truth, contemplates the meaning of the teaching, cultivates until realization, and is not forgetful in regard to the meanings of the words or in cultivation of realization. What is contemplation [*anupaśyanā*]?<sup>21</sup> It means to correctly contemplate and to correctly investigate all bodies<sup>22</sup> and all characteristics by means of the wisdoms derived from hearing [*śrutamayī*], reflection [*cintāmayī*], and cultivation [*bhāvanāmayī*]<sup>23</sup> [acquired by] the [contemplation] with regard to the body. One contemplates with regard to them and attains knowledge accordingly.<sup>24</sup> What is the cultivation of contemplation? Some say it means “with regard to the body”; others say it means [contemplating] the body progressively.<sup>25</sup> “With regard to the body” means that, with regard to the natural image of the body [*prakṛtibimbakāya*], one contemplates the speculative counterimage of the body [*vikalpapratiimbakāya*]; this is called contemplation with regard to the body [*kāye kāyānupaśyanā*].

As the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states:

What does it mean to contemplate the body with regard to the body? It is to discern the speculative counterimage of the body as identical [to the natural image of the body]. To contemplate the body as object is to contemplate the similarity between the characteristics of the body and the nature of the body. This is called “to contemplate the body with regard to the body.” This is [so] because it is through the contemplation of the speculative counterimage of the body that one thoroughly contemplates and investigates the natural image of the body.<sup>26</sup>

As regards [contemplating] the body progressively, [818a] “progressively” has the meaning of “successively.”<sup>27</sup> It means that not only does one directly contemplate the characteristic body, but one also contemplates the thusness-body within this context. It is stated in the [chapter] “On Discerning the Bodhisattva Ground”: What is a bodhisattva’s practice of the mindfulness of the body by contemplating the body progressively? It is the contemplation of the thusness-body successively, following from [the contemplation] of the characteristic body.

What is the foundation of mindfulness? It means to guard one’s thoughts, not to be defiled by external objects, [and] to maintain one’s attention on the perceived object. “Guarding one’s thoughts” means that if one is constantly and smoothly mindful, one is not defiled by external objects. It is like what has been

explained. One guards one's thoughts in mental activities, maintains one's thoughts on stability, perceives characteristics rather than secondary aspects, and so on up to guarding the mental faculty in order to cultivate restraint with a view to abiding in perceived objects; this is like what has been explained. To maintain one's thoughts on the four objects,<sup>28</sup> one maintains one's thoughts well, due to the three characteristics; this is called the foundation of mindfulness. It is also called the base of mindfulness.<sup>29</sup> "Base" is synonymous with "foundation."

The *Dazhidu lun* states, "When mindfulness dwells on [*upatiṣṭhati*] objects of knowledge, it is called mindfulness."<sup>30</sup> To sum up, [whether we say] "by this mindfulness" or "through this mindfulness," both are referred to as mindfulness. "By this mindfulness" refers to mindfulness on perceived objects. "Through this mindfulness" means that when either mindfulness or wisdom is attained in concentration, there is essential mindfulness. The other mind and its associated mental factors are associated mindfulness. This is similar to what is explained in the [chapter] "The Ground Accomplished through Hearing" of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.<sup>31</sup> This has been a brief account of the meaning of the foundations of mindfulness.

### 2.2.2. THE FOUR RIGHT ELIMINATIONS

Next, I will illustrate the meaning of the four right eliminations. What are the arisen unwholesome states? They are called arisen [because they] can lead to unwholesome acts that consist of the primary afflictions [*kleśa*] and derivative afflictions [*upakleśa*] in the realm of desire subsumed in debilitating bondages.<sup>32</sup> In order to eliminate them, the practitioner cultivates their antidotes. In order to mitigate them, he produces will [*chadam janayati*]<sup>33</sup>—that is, the will to achieve their elimination. To strive [*vyāyacchate*] means not to tolerate unwholesome states and [instead] to turn toward the path of elimination. To generate a vigorous effort [*vyīyam ārabhate*] means to establish firmness in order to cultivate antidotes.

**[818b]** The above three statements show that the wisdom derived from hearing and the wisdom derived from reflection in the unstable realm<sup>33</sup> counteract the minor afflictions. To engage one's mind energetically [*cittam pragrhñāti*] is to resort to the wisdom derived from cultivation to counteract them. When one's mind becomes languid and defiled by afflictions, one engages one's mind energetically to pacify them. To exert [*pradadhāti*] one's mind means that when one is counteracting [these arisen unwholesome states] if the mind is floating and is defiled by afflictions, one should exert one's mind to suppress them.

What are the [as yet] unarisen unwholesome states? Since they are the causes of debilitating bondages subsumed by growing derivative afflictions, they are called unarisen. Not to let them arise means not to let debilitating bondages become active. To produce will means to [produce the will] to begin to realize [the elimination of] the [as yet] unarisen [unwholesome states]. To generate a vigorous effort means not to lose mindfulness and [instead] to skillfully maintain

mindfulness so that [the as yet unarisen unwholesome states] are prevented from arising. The following four statements are as explained above.

What are the [as yet] unarisen wholesome states? Because the three kinds of wisdom derived from hearing, reflection, and cultivation are free from faults, they are called wholesome states. They are called [as yet] unarisen because they have not been attained. To cause [these as yet unarisen wholesome qualities] to arise, one produces will—that is, the will to realize them. To strive means to search for correct means to acquire them. To generate vigorous effort<sup>34</sup> means to cultivate diligently for long periods of time. The above three statements illustrate the virtues subsumed in the wisdom derived from hearing and the wisdom derived from reflection in the unstable realm. To engage one's mind energetically and to exert it is to realize the wisdom derived from cultivation. The rest is similar to what has been explained above.

What are the arisen wholesome states? They are [the wholesome states] already attained. To maintain mindfulness [of them] is the wisdom derived from hearing, not forgetting them is the wisdom derived from reflection, and bringing them to perfection is the wisdom derived from cultivation. The above three statements illustrate mere preservation—that is, to multiply, to increase, and to expand wholesome states already attained. According to order, the practitioner should not be satisfied simply with the arisen [wholesome states] but has to produce will [to strive, to generate a vigorous effort, and to engage one's mind energetically and exert it to develop them], as has been explained above. This is roughly similar to what is said in the *Xiayang shengjiao lun*.<sup>35</sup>

Right elimination is also called right endeavor.<sup>36</sup> “Endeavor” refers to the essence; “elimination” signifies the function.<sup>37</sup> The *Dazhidu lun* states, “To destroy evil states and to course in the true path, [818c] this is called ‘to practice right endeavor.’”<sup>38</sup> According to the *Yogācārabhūmi*, [there are four kinds of] elimination. [The first two are] (1) elimination through restraint [*saṃvara-prahāṇa*] and (2) elimination through elimination [*prahāṇa-prahāṇa*]. As regards the [already] arisen unwholesome states, the practitioner should cultivate restraint to eliminate them, because he should not suffer them. This is called elimination through restraint [of the senses]. As regards the [as yet] unarisen unwholesome states, the practitioner should prevent them from arising. In order to prevent them from arising, he eliminates them, so they are eliminated. This is called elimination through elimination. [The other two kinds of elimination are] (3) elimination through cultivation [*bhāvanā-prahāṇa*] and (4) elimination through protecting [*anurakṣaṇa-prahāṇa*]. As regards wholesome states, the practitioner constantly cultivates and practices them so that he attains what previously has not been attained—[that is,] he is capable of eliminating what is to be eliminated. This is called elimination through cultivation. As regards the wholesome states already attained, the practitioner abstains from carelessness and cultivates to perfection, and so protection is generated, [and] he is capable of eliminating what is to be eliminated. This is called elimination through protecting.<sup>39</sup>

To sum up, in order to clarify the perfection of aspiration and the perfection of

applied practice regarding what is to be eliminated and what is to be obtained with regard to wholesome and unwholesome states, the four kinds of elimination are proclaimed. In this connection, due to the generation of will, the practitioner's aspiration is brought to perfection; due to striving up to exerting his mind, his applied practice is brought to perfection. What has been explained above comes from the *Yogācārabhūmi*.<sup>40</sup> This has been a brief exposition of the [four] right eliminations.

### 2.2.3. THE FOUR LEGS OF SUPERNORMAL POWERS

Now I will explain the four legs of supernormal powers. What are the four supernormal powers? Namely, (1) [the supernormal power accomplished by concentration through] will [*chanda*], (2) [the supernormal power accomplished by concentration through] endeavor [*vīrya*], (3) [the supernormal power accomplished by concentration through] mind [*citta*], and (4) [the supernormal power accomplished by concentration through] investigation [*mīmāṃsā*].<sup>41</sup>

There are two meanings. Either one practitioner is endowed with all these four powers or one practitioner focuses primarily on one among these four, as it is stated in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, fascicle ninety-eight.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, through four kinds of power, the practitioner keeps his mind in concentration. Therefore the four legs of supernormal powers are established. What are these four powers? They are (1) pure aspiration power, (2) diligent power, (3) mental joy power, and (4) right wisdom power.<sup>43</sup> Among these, through the first power, the practitioner generates aspiration for *samādhi*, and he cultivates diligently to attain it. Through the second power, the practitioner initially keeps his mind in concentration. Through the third [819a] power, the practitioner keeps his already concentrated mind from being distracted; he keeps it from wavering in himself. Through the fourth power, the practitioner contemplates on equipoise.<sup>44</sup> He correctly knows the afflictions to be countered and how to eliminate what has not been eliminated.

Then, in equipoise, the practitioner enters, abides, and exits characteristics and is able to well discern them. When he thus correctly knows the characteristics of *śamatha* and so forth, through tranquility and insight the practitioner contemplates the derivative afflictions [*upakleśa*] and their antidotes and correctly knows them. To delight in equipoise means to find one's activities only in equipoise. Except for this, there is neither fault nor excess. This passage clearly shows that a practitioner who is equipped with four kinds of power realizes equipoise; therefore the four legs of supernormal powers are established.

What does it mean by [the reference to] other practitioners primarily focusing on only one? As it is stated in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, the attainment of *samādhi* primarily through will is like the case of a practitioner who in his previous life cultivated advanced wholesome roots with an adept teacher or practiced virtues together with those who had wisdom. Generating conviction and will, he listened to the true teaching and became joyful according to his conviction. After

listening to the true teaching, he eventually realized one-pointedness of mind. Due to this will [to attain awakening], he accomplished *samādhi*. By “accomplishment” is meant the attainment of mastery regarding this.<sup>45</sup>

Second is the attainment of *samādhi* primarily through endeavor. A practitioner relying on teachers and precepts, either at leisure time or in such places as in the forest or at a quiet dwelling, generates a vigorous effort for long periods of time. Becoming mature and energetic, he realizes one-pointedness of mind. Due to correct exertion, he accomplishes *samādhi*.<sup>46</sup>

Third is the attainment of *samādhi* primarily through mind. This is like the case where a practitioner who has previously cultivated *śamatha*, because of this condition, contemplates internal objects and swiftly realizes one-pointedness of mind. By cultivating mind, he accomplishes *samādhi*.

Fourth is the attainment of *samādhi* primarily through investigation. As a practitioner who learns much and retains [819b] his learning, he accumulates his learning, dwelling alone in a joyful and pure place. Through wisdom he investigates these phenomena. He investigates them in a subtle manner; he perceives and examines them extensively. Because of that, he realizes one-pointedness of mind. Through contemplation he accomplishes *samādhi*.<sup>47</sup>

The above passage clearly shows the cases of four practitioners, in which each relies primarily [on a specific approach] to accomplish equipoise. Therefore the four legs of supernormal powers are established. All four involve the achievement of [concentration] through the practice of elimination. I will discuss the eight kinds of applied practice extensively later.<sup>48</sup>

The expression “legs of supernormal powers” is established metaphorically. The *Yogācārabhūmi* states:

It is like someone who has legs; he can come and go, he can vigorously jump and leap, he can realize the special objects of the world. The worldly special objects are called supernormal. [The legs of supernormal powers] can move from here to there, so they are called supernormal legs. If one is possessed of [supernormal] qualities accomplished by *samādhi* through will, [endeavor, mind, and investigation], [his mind becomes quiescent, fresh, and without stains; one is free from derivative afflictions and dwells in forthrightness]. One becomes capable by attaining immovability; one can come and go, one can vigorously jump and leap, one can realize and attain exceptional states. These latter are excellent and sovereign to the utmost degree, they are excellent to the utmost—that is, supernatural to the utmost. The legs can realize those states; therefore they are called legs of supernormal power.<sup>49</sup>

These are also called the four kinds of wish-granting legs. “Leg” means gratification, or gratification of one’s wish. Therefore they are called wish-granting legs. Besides, legs can carry one to one’s destination.



The *Dazhidu lun* states:

If, when the practitioner exercises the four right endeavors, his mind is slightly distracted, [then] he should use concentrations to collect his mind; therefore these concentrations are called wish-granting legs. It is like a gourmet dish that would lack taste with too little spice, while with sufficient spice its taste would be satisfying. It is like a man with two legs, who, in addition, also has a fast horse and a good chariot, and he can reach any destination he wishes. By [the four right endeavors] a practitioner attains the true wisdom of the four foundations of mindfulness; he makes right effort with regard to the four right endeavors. Through right effort, his wisdom increases. However, his concentration power is still feeble. But when he attains the four kinds of concentration and thus maintains his mind, the powers of wisdom and concentration become equal, and his wishes are achieved. Therefore [these four concentrations] are called the [four] wish-granting legs.<sup>50</sup>

This has been a brief exposition of the meaning of the legs of supernormal powers.

#### 2.2.4. THE FIVE SPIRITUAL FACULTIES

Now I will explain the five spiritual faculties [*indriya*].<sup>51</sup> “Faculty” means predominance. It means that conviction [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom] [819c] can serve as the predominant support for the arising of exceptional states. Besides, they mutually rely on each other to support the arising [of exceptional states]. The spiritual faculty of wisdom supports only exceptional states. This has been a brief exposition of the meaning of the five spiritual faculties.<sup>52</sup>

#### 2.2.5. THE FIVE POWERS

Now I will explain the five powers. “Power” has the meaning of “hard to subdue.” Neither celestial demons nor *śramaṇas* nor *brāhmaṇas*<sup>53</sup> nor other mundane beings can subvert someone equipped with these powers. Even when encountering afflictions, they cannot suppress him. Therefore the five powers are called hard to subdue. Because these powers are endowed with great momentum, [those who possess them can] subdue all the demons’ powers and can realize the complete extinction of influxes. Therefore they are called powers. This has been a brief exposition of the meaning of the five powers, following the *Yogācārabhūmi*.<sup>54</sup>

#### 2.2.6. THE SEVEN AWAKENING LIMBS

Now I will explain the seven awakening limbs. Those who have realized the true insight of the self [*pudgala*]<sup>55</sup> attain the awakened wisdom of true reality. The practitioner uses it as a limb; therefore these are called awakening limbs or



awakening factors.<sup>56</sup> “Factor” has the sense of a cause conducive to the attainment of the fruit of awakening; therefore they are called awakening. The *Dazhidu lun* states, “The practitioner can attain the true wisdom that is beyond learning through these seven [awakening] factors; therefore they are called factors.”<sup>57</sup> This has been a brief exposition of the meaning of the awakening limbs.

### 2.2.7. THE EIGHT LIMBS OF THE NOBLE PATH

Now I will explain the eight limbs of the Noble Path. The saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*] see the traces [of the noble truths]. Equipped with these eight limbs, which course the right path, they can completely annihilate all afflictions and ultimately attain liberation. Therefore these are called the eight limbs of the Noble Path<sup>58</sup> or the right [eightfold] path. The *Dazhidu lun* states, “[The practitioner] wishing to enter the unconditioned citadel of *nirvāṇa* practices these factors [of the eightfold path]; that moment is called the right path.”<sup>59</sup> This has been a brief exposition of the meaning of the right path.

Question: If among these seven categories [namely, the thirty-seven constituents of awakening], there is none that is not right, why is the path of endeavor alone referred to as right? Answer: As it is said in the *Dazhidu lun*, “Because these four kinds of effort of vigorous mind or endeavor [correct the practitioner’s] fear of faults, they are called right endeavors. Besides, when the practitioner courses the path, he is afraid of falling into the evil paths, [and so] it is called the right path.”<sup>60</sup> The differences in this [820a] matter will be discussed later. This has been a brief exposition of the meaning of the eight limbs of the Noble Path.

### 2.3. Illustrating the Essence of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening

Established as a set, [the constituents of awakening] consist of thirty-seven items. From the perspective of their essence, they are subsumed in ten categories—namely, precepts [*śīla*], conception [*saṃkalpa*], feeling [*vedanā*],<sup>61</sup> mindfulness [*smṛti*], concentration [*samādhi*], wisdom [*prajñā*], endeavor [*vīrya*], conviction [*śraddhā*], pliancy [*praśrabdhī*], and equanimity [*upekṣā*]. Among these, precepts are carried out in manifest and unmanifest modes.<sup>62</sup> The remaining nine are all subsumed by mental factors.<sup>63</sup> Among these, conception and feeling are two constant mental factors. Mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom are three object-specifying mental factors. Endeavor, conviction, pliancy, and equanimity belong to the great virtues. The thirty-seven [constituents of awakening] are established based on these ten elements.

The precepts are divided into three—namely, right speech, right actions, and right livelihood. Conception consists of one—namely, right conception. Feeling is also one—namely, the awakening limb of joy. Mindfulness is elaborated in four ways—namely, the spiritual faculty of mindfulness, the power of mindfulness, the awakening limb of mindfulness, and right mindfulness [in the

noble eightfold path]. Concentration is elaborated in eight ways—namely, the four wish-granting legs, the spiritual faculty of concentration, the power of concentration, the awakening limb of concentration, and right concentration [in the noble eightfold path]. Wisdom is also established as eight—namely, the four foundations of mindfulness, the spiritual faculty of wisdom, the power of wisdom, and the awakening limb of investigation of the teachings, together with right view [in the noble eightfold path]. Endeavor is also established as eight—namely, the four right endeavors, the spiritual faculty of effort, the power of effort, the awakening limb of effort, and right effort [in the noble eightfold path]. Conviction shows itself in two ways—namely, the faculty of conviction and the power of conviction. Pliancy and equanimity are each singular—namely, pliancy and equanimity within the seven awakening limbs.

To sum up, there are five categories: (1) there are three that are expressed in eight ways—namely, concentration, wisdom, and endeavor; (2) one that is expressed in four ways—namely, mindfulness; (3) one that is expressed in three ways—namely, precepts; (4) one that is expressed in two ways—namely, conviction; (5) four that are expressed in one way—namely, conception, feeling, pliancy, and equanimity. Within the first category there are twenty-four items; within the remaining four kinds, there are thirteen items in all. In total, there are thirty-seven items. Therefore there is unevenness in revealing and closing off. This is because concentration, wisdom, and endeavor are extensive in their cultivating power, [and so] they are expressed in eight ways. Because conception, feeling, pliancy, and equanimity are weak accessories of the path, they are each expressed in one way. Combining the power of conviction and so forth into this, four, three, and two are established successively. Therefore, in essence, there are only ten categories. [820b] The *Dazhidu lun* says: “The thirty-seven constituents of awakening are based on ten categories,” and so forth.<sup>64</sup>

#### 2.4. Elucidating the Stages and Levels of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening

From the perspective of practice, these universally apply to all levels. As it is stated in the *Yogācārabhūmi*: “Furthermore, the wholesomeness that is produced on both the ordinary and exceptional paths through [the contemplation of] body, feelings, mind, and factors of existence is called the foundations of mindfulness.”<sup>65</sup>

Also, a subsequent passage states:

Briefly, all the eight limbs of the Noble Path are subsumed by two planes—namely, the mundane and the supramundane. On the mundane plane, beings are tied down by the three influxes [*āsrava*] and the four kinds of clinging [*upadāna*],<sup>66</sup> [and so] they cannot annihilate their sufferings. Since [the limbs of the Noble Path] are wholesome, [they] can lead beings to a good transmigration. The

supramundane plane, however, is opposite to the mundane in that it can lead to the annihilation of all kinds of suffering.<sup>67</sup>

The first and last groups<sup>68</sup> [i.e., the four foundations of mindfulness and the eightfold Noble Path] have thus been explained.

The five middle groups [namely, the four right endeavors, the four legs of supernormal powers, the five spiritual faculties, the five powers, and the seven awakening limbs] are also the same. Although they are similar from the perspective of practice, they are established differently according to their levels. What does this mean? According to a rough division of its stages, there are two levels. The first five groups [namely, the four foundations of mindfulness, the four right eliminations, the four legs of supernormal powers, the five spiritual faculties, and the five powers] belong to the level of the ordinary people; the last two [namely, the seven awakening limbs and the eightfold Noble Path] are established in the levels of the saints. The five groups of the worldly level have two meanings. According to the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, the four foundations of mindfulness are contemplated before the heat level [*uṣma-gata*], [and] the four right endeavors simultaneously with it. The four wish-granting legs are at the summit level [*mūrdhan*], the five faculties are at the forbearance level [*kṣānti*], [and] the five powers are at the worldly ultimate level [*laukikāgra*].<sup>69</sup> According to this treatise [i.e., “Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes”], the third and fourth groups [i.e., the four legs of supernormal powers and the five spiritual faculties] are conducive to liberation, and the second and fifth groups [i.e., the four right eliminations and the five powers] are conducive to penetration [*nirvedhabhāgīya*]. Each exposition assumes its meaning according to its context.

The two stages of the saintly level have three meanings. One is as explained in the *Abhidharmakośa*; other meanings have been explained by other masters. Faithful to their order, the practitioner at the Path of Vision cultivates the [limbs] conducive to awakening, because on the Paths of Vision and Cultivation, the practitioner cultivates the limbs of the Noble Path. The second meaning is as stated in the *Dazhidu lun*: “Through the exercise of the Path of Cultivation it is called [parts of] awakening. Through the exercise of the Path of Vision it is called [parts of the] path.”<sup>70</sup> The Vaibhāṣikas give the same explanation. For instance, it is stated in their treatises that the Path of Vision is conducive to the path [and that] the Path of Cultivation is conducive to awakening. How so? [820c] “Path” has the sense of “knowledge” on the Path of Vision; knowledge becomes extremely swift. “Awakening” has the sense of “being awakened.”<sup>71</sup> On the Path of Cultivation there are nine kinds of awakening. Because there are numerous kinds of awakening, there are successively seven and eight, according to the order of their numbers.

The third meaning is like that explained in this treatise: the [seven] factors of awakening belong to the Path of Vision, and the [eight] limbs of the Noble Path belong to the Path of Cultivation. The *Dazhidu lun* contains the same teaching.<sup>72</sup> These three meanings all make sense. If the practitioner practices according to

these meanings, none is inappropriate. The *Yogācārabhūmi* discusses all of these three meanings. It is stated in fascicle sixty-two that the complete knowledge of the nature implies the eight limbs of the Noble Path, because they are the antidotes to the three defilements. The three aggregates [of precepts, concentration, and wisdom] are established as antidotes to the defilement of unwholesome acts, the defilement of desires, and the defilement of wrong views.<sup>73</sup>

These words are spoken by the first master. The practitioner counters wrong views on the Path of Vision and counters desires on the Path of Cultivation. As it is stated in fascicle eighteen, what is the meaning of forthrightness? When [the eight limbs of the Noble Path] arise, the reverse becomes straight. The eight limbs of the Noble Path can annihilate wrong views, and all afflictions due to following the reverse path become complaisant.<sup>74</sup> This passage should belong to the second meaning. It is stated in fascicle twenty-nine:

At that time, when the practitioner at first attains the seven awakening limbs, it is called inceptive awakening, because after seeing the traces of the noble truths, he completely annihilates all afflictions to be annihilated on the Path of Vision and cultivates the annihilation of all afflictions to be annihilated on the Path of Cultivation.<sup>75</sup>

This passage should be understood in the third meaning.

## 2.5. Clarifying the Order of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening

The *Dazhidu lun* states:

Question: The [noble] path should be explained first. Why so? Because only after practicing the path does one obtain wholesome states. It is like one traveling one's path first and reaching one's destination afterward. Now, why is it that [they are inverted like this, such that] the foundations of mindfulness are explained first and the Noble Path [consisting of eight limbs] is explained afterward?

Answer: They are not inverted. At the time one wishes to enter the path, the thirty-seven constituents are called cause. It is as when a practitioner [821a] comes to the place of the master to listen to the teaching, [and] he should first use mindfulness to retain this teaching; that moment is called foundation of mindfulness.

After that, seeking the fruit of that teaching, he practices diligently; that moment is called right endeavor. Because he generates much effort, his mind becomes distracted. He focuses his mind and arrives at a state of pliancy; this is called wish-granting leg. After his mind has

attained pliancy, he generates the five spiritual faculties: (1) The true characteristic of phenomena is extremely profound and hard to fathom, but by the faculty of conviction he has conviction in it; this is called the spiritual faculty of conviction. (2) He is indifferent in regard to his own life and searches for the truth of the path with all his heart; this is called the spiritual faculty of effort. (3) He is constantly mindful of this [the Buddha's] teaching and not of anything else; this is called the spiritual faculty of mindfulness. (4) He focuses his mind on the path; this is called the spiritual faculty of concentration. (5) He contemplates the [Four Noble] Truths and the true characteristic; this is called the spiritual faculty of wisdom.

When the five spiritual faculties are developed, they can block afflictions; [it is like the power of a big tree that can block water. When these five faculties are developed, they can gradually penetrate the profound states;] this is called power. After obtaining these powers, the practitioner can discern the truth of the Path [of Cultivation]. This consists of [three limbs]: (1) the second awakening limb is called discernment of phenomena; (2) the [third] awakening limb is called effort; (3) the [fourth] awakening limb is called joy. If the mind subsides at the moment when the practitioner practices the path, these three limbs pick it up. [There are three different limbs:] (1) the [fifth] awakening limb is called pliancy; (2) the [sixth] awakening limb is called concentration; (3) the [seventh] awakening limb is called equanimity.

If the mind is distracted at the moment when the practitioner practices the path, these three limbs seize it [so that it can concentrate.] [As for the remaining limb—namely, the first] awakening limb called mindfulness—it interferes in two circumstances [i.e., when the mind subsides or when the mind is distracted]. [It can unite wholesome states and halt unwholesome states.] It is like a gatekeeper [who allows in what is useful and discards what is useless.] When the mind subsides, mindfulness and three limbs pick it up. When the mind is distracted, mindfulness and three limbs seize it. [Because these seven things act, they are called] the seven awakening limbs. When the practitioner has attained these qualities [and his tranquility is perfected], he wishes to enter the citadel of uncreated *nirvāṇa*; that is why he practices these eight qualities [of the path]. This moment is called path.<sup>76</sup>

Again the *Yogācārabhūmi* states:

One should know that, at the level of the foundation of mindfulness,

at the outset the practitioner focuses his mind on the perceived objects. Then, while abiding in mindfulness of perceived objects, he diligently cultivates right elimination. Then, after obtaining concentration, in order to develop it to perfection, he diligently cultivates through the legs of supernormal powers. After bringing concentration to perfection, in order to render all characteristics and debilitating afflictions free from bondage, he engages in applied practice of faculties relying on the spiritual faculties of conviction, [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom]. In his cultivation, faculties belong to lower categories, [and] powers belong to higher categories. After engaging in the right applied practice, he attains the awakening limbs and gains insight into true reality. After this, he cultivates the eight limbs of the Noble Path gradually until he attains perfect awakening, being free from all obstructions.<sup>77</sup>

Both of these treatises use the ordering according to stages and levels.

## 2.6. Discriminating the Divisions of the Thirty-seven Constituents of Awakening

### 2.6.1. THE FIVE DIVISIONS

Each of these seven groups<sup>78</sup> has five categories. As stated in the [821b] *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, all [thirty-seven] constituents of awakening that lack distinction are established according to five categories—namely, (1) object [*ālambana*], (2) basic nature [*svabhāva*], (3) aids [*sahāya*], (4) cultivation [*bhāvanā*], and (5) the fruit of cultivation [*bhāvanāphala*].<sup>79</sup>

#### 2.6.1.1. The Five Divisions of the Four Foundations of Mindfulness

(1) The objects of the foundations of mindfulness consist of four things—namely, body, feelings, mind, and factors of existence.<sup>80</sup> These are the things that are the basis of the self [*ātmāśrayavastu*], things experienced by the self [*ātmopabhogavastu*], the essence of the self [*ātmavastu*], and qualities belonging to the defilement and purification of the self [*ātmasaṃkleśavyavadānavastu*].<sup>81</sup> Why are only these four objects established? Due to distorted perception, ignorant people entertain much discrimination positing the self. Depending on the basis of the body possessed of faculties, they experience pain and pleasure, they take perceived objects as characteristics, and they become defiled through greed and become purified through conviction. Therefore, in order to correctly contemplate the true characteristics at the outset, these four [foundations of mindfulness] are established as objects [of discrimination].<sup>82</sup>

The above is a general explanation, but if we discriminate among these four objects, each has three kinds: (i) internal, (ii) external, and (iii) internal and

external.<sup>83</sup> The *Yogācārabhūmi* briefly articulates six interpretations: (i) Internally there is sentient<sup>84</sup> form serving as object within the body. Externally there is nonsentient form serving as object without the body. The form of other sentient beings serves as object within and without the body. Perceiving this internal body, one generates the thought of love, and this is called internal feelings. Internal thought, internal objects, [and] external objects, together with internal and external objects are also explained in the same manner. (ii) Subsumed by the faculties, the appropriated form becomes the internal body. Not subsumed by the faculties, the nonappropriated form is the external body. Not subsumed by the faculties, the appropriated form is the internal and external body. Perceiving these three, one generates the mental factor of feeling. According to their objects, there are three kinds. (iii) Internally, concentration, together with pliancy and form, constitutes the internal body. Nonconcentration and debilitating afflictions, together with form, constitute the external body. Other pliant form and debilitating form become the internal and external body. Perceiving these three, one generates the mental factor of feeling. Therefore there are three. This is similar to the above explanation up to the sixth category regarding bodily [aspects] such as hair, bodily hair, nails, teeth, and so forth that constitute [821c] the internal body. Other bodies' forms such as hair, bodily hair, and so forth constitute the external body. Whether the internal body changes into the blue color of a corpse and so forth or not, and whether the external body changes into the blue color of a corpse [or not], they are similar to the true nature of universal equality. Perceiving these three categories, one contemplates the feelings, mind, and factors of existence. According to their objects, there are three.<sup>85</sup>

The *Dazhidu lun* also gives an explanation of the internal body from the perspective of these six meanings. It is basically similar to the above explanation, with some minor differences. According to these two explanations, the internal and external body entertains no discrimination of internal and external. The above two are not included. According to others' explanation, one generates this thought, [but] if internal contemplation is untenable, can there be external contemplation? If external contemplation is also untenable, one thinks one might have made mistake. Therefore, now one should contemplate internal and external altogether and contemplate internal and external as different characteristics. Contemplation of both simultaneously is the general characteristic. General contemplation and specific contemplation are unobtainable.<sup>86</sup> The object of contemplation has been explained.

Within the mental factor of feeling, there are also three categories—namely, internal, external, [and internal and external]. This is similar to the explanation found in the *Yogācārabhūmi*. There is also another explanation. According to this explanation, the feelings associated with mental consciousness are internal feelings, and so forth. The feelings associated with the five sense consciousnesses are external feelings. Concentrated mind is internal mind, distracted mind is external mind, and so forth. Except for feelings, other mental factors are internal phenomena. Conditioned phenomena that are not associated [with mind]



[*citta-viprayukta-saṃskāra*] and nonconditioned [*asaṃskṛta*] phenomena are external phenomena, and so forth. These are the objects of the foundations of mindfulness.

(2) The notion of the nature of the foundations of mindfulness has two connotations: With regard to the adverse states [that are to be corrected], it has the nature of wisdom, because wisdom is the correct antidote to the four defects.<sup>87</sup> With regard to perceived objects, it has the nature of wisdom and mindfulness, because both wisdom and mindfulness are stabilized on objects. The *Dazhidu lun* states, “The wisdom contemplating the body and the wisdom contemplating phenomena are the nature of the foundations of mindfulness.”<sup>88</sup> This is to reveal the nature through the adverse states to be countered. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*<sup>89</sup> states: “The nature of the foundations of mindfulness is wisdom and mindfulness. Because in Buddhist scriptures [822a] there are teachings on contemplation with regard to the body and on the foundations of mindfulness, following this order, we illustrate their nature with regard to their object.”<sup>90</sup>

(3) The aids to the foundations of mindfulness consist of the mind and mental factors associated with them [mindfulness and wisdom] with the fruits attained having them as the main elements.<sup>91</sup> As it is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, the aids to the foundations of mindfulness are the mind and mental factors associated with them.<sup>92</sup> [The word] “them” means mindfulness and wisdom. The *Dazhidu lun* states, “What is the foundation of mindfulness by connection [*samsarga*]? The path—whether ordinary or exceptional—produced in dependence on the contemplation primarily of the body is the foundation of mindfulness of the body.”<sup>93</sup> It is the same with regard to the contemplations [of feelings and mind] up to the factors of existence. Again, the following passage states that within the mindfulness by connection, the two karmic activities of body and speech belong to matter, [and] the rest [mental activities] do not.<sup>94</sup>

(4) The cultivation of the foundations of mindfulness.<sup>95</sup> Briefly, there are two categories—namely, shared cultivation and distinct cultivation. Shared cultivation signifies the cultivation of the body with regard to the body [*kāyēkāyabhāvanā*] based on the internal body and the cultivation of the contemplation of the body with regard to the body based on the external [body] and [the] internal and external body in common with the Lesser Vehicle. This includes the contemplation of impurities up to the contemplation of selflessness. Such<sup>96</sup> [cultivations] are called cultivations in common with the Lesser Vehicle. Distinct cultivation is limited to the bodhisattva’s contemplation. This means the bodhisattva eliminates internal and external thoughts concerning body, [feelings, mind, and factors of existence] and contemplates only the true characteristic free of extreme [views regarding] the body, [feelings, mind, and factors of existence]. As it is stated in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the bodhisattva truly understands the principle of the constituents of awakening of the path of the two vehicles—namely, of the Vehicle of Disciples and the Great Vehicle. What does it mean to say that the bodhisattva truly understands the principle of the constituents of awakening of the Great



Vehicle? This means the bodhisattva can cultivate progressive contemplation with regard to his own body and does not entertain the thought of existence or any kind of thought regarding his body. In addition, transcending words and letters, the bodhisattva truly understands self-nature and true nature with regard to his body, and so forth.

It is also stated that the bodhisattva who diligently cultivates the foundations of mindfulness in accordance with emptiness frees his mind from the six kinds of bondage. What [822b] are these six? To conceive internal characteristics with regard to the body up to factors of existence is the first bondage to characteristics.<sup>97</sup> To conceive external characteristics with regard to these is the second bondage. To conceive internal and external characteristics with regard to these is the third bondage. If one cultivates the foundations of mindfulness with a view to liberating countless sentient beings of the ten directions and conceives characteristics regarding them, this is the fourth bondage. If, because of that, one cultivates contemplation of objects such as the body, [feelings, mind, and factors of existence] and conceives characteristics regarding them, this is the fifth bondage. With regard to the body and so forth, one cultivates the contemplation and conceives the characteristics regarding them; this is the sixth bondage. And so forth.

The *Dazhidu lun* states:

The bodhisattva mahāsattva's contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness [is as follows]: He contemplates his internal body as impermanent, suffering, resembling an ulcer, a mass of decaying flesh, filled with impurities, oozing out from the nine orifices, like a mobile latrine,<sup>98</sup> [ . . . ] The characteristics of this body are not found either inside or outside or in the middle. The anterior, posterior, and middle limits are all unobtainable. This body is born of a confluence of causes and conditions. Yet the causes and conditions that create this body themselves also arise from delusion and defect. Within these causes and conditions, the characteristics of cause and condition cannot be found, and the birth of causes and conditions lacks the characteristic of birth. Thus reflecting, [the bodhisattva] realizes that this body, since the beginning, is without the characteristic of birth. Because it is not born, it is without characteristics, and because it is without characteristics, it is not born. Only the deluded sentient beings call it "body." When the bodhisattva thus contemplates the true characteristic of the body, he becomes free from defilements, he maintains his mindfulness on the body, [and he] persistently cultivates the contemplation of the body. This is called the bodhisattva's contemplation of the mindfulness of the body. It is the same with his contemplation of the external body and the internal and external body.<sup>99</sup>

The same principle is applied to the [contemplation of the foundations of

mindfulness] of feelings, mind, and factors of existence.

(5) The fruit of the cultivation of the foundations of mindfulness. As it is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, when one eliminates the four defects and enters into the Four Noble Truths, the body and so forth are free from bondage. This is called the cultivation of the fruit of elimination.<sup>100</sup> To eliminate the four defects is called the four foundations of mindfulness. Each of them successively can rid the practitioner of the four illusions of purity, joy, permanence, and [822c] self.<sup>101</sup>

Through the mindfulness of the body, the practitioner enters the truth of suffering. This is because [one realizes that] the physical body that one possesses is the manifestation of the debilitating tendencies of the characteristics of the suffering from volitional formations. Therefore, when the practitioner cultivates contemplation, he can experience this pliancy that counteracts [the suffering] caused by the discrimination of the body.

Through the mindfulness of feelings the practitioner enters the noble truth of the cause of suffering, realizing that feelings such as joy and so forth are the basis of the compounded [*sāmagrī*] feelings of love and the like. Through the mindfulness of mind the practitioner enters the noble truth of the extinction of suffering. Observing consciousness separated from the self, he is completely free from the fear of the extinction of the self and of *nirvāṇa*.<sup>102</sup> Through the mindfulness of factors of existence the practitioner enters the noble truth of the path [leading to the extinction of sufferings], in order to eliminate the adversaries [of the path] and to cultivate their antidotes. Besides, these four foundations of mindfulness can successively lead to the attainment of the fruit of liberation from the bondage of body, feelings, mind, and factors of existence. Due to this cultivation, the practitioner can gradually become free from the debilitating tendencies of the body and so forth.<sup>103</sup> This illustrates the freedom of the four kinds of bondage to debilitating hindrances.

The four kinds of bondage are (i) the bondage of grasping, (ii) the bondage of experience, (iii) the bondage of discrimination, and (iv) the bondage of attachment. These four kinds of bondage fetter the mind.<sup>104</sup> That is, the mind with regard to the body becomes bound by the bondage of grasping, grasping an internal body [and] sharing the same security and risk with it.<sup>105</sup> Because of this, it cannot become free from the perils of the body. The mind with regard to feelings, through the bondage of experience, becomes commensurate to feelings, sharing the same pain and joy. Because of this, it cannot become free from the perils of feelings. The mind with regard to objects, through the bondage of discrimination, perceives the six objects and is never stable. Because of this, it cannot become free from the perils of discrimination. The mind with regard to afflictions, through the bondage of attachment, becomes commensurate with delusions and becomes attached to factors of existence. Because of this, the mind cannot become free from the faults of afflictions.

As stated in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, one should know that the mind with regard to the body is bound by the bondage of grasping, with regard to feelings is bound

by the internal bondage of experience, and with regard to objects such as form is bound by the bondage of discrimination. [823a] This means that the phenomena such as body, [feelings, mind, and factors of existence] are bound by the bondage of grasping, such as the primary and derivative afflictions in the form of greed, hatred, and so forth. The four foundations of mindfulness are established as antidotes to these four kinds of bondage. This illustrates the fruit of the cultivation of the foundations of mindfulness. The five divisions of the foundations of mindfulness have been thus briefly explained.

#### 2.6.1.2. The Five Divisions of the Four Right Eliminations

(1) The object of right elimination<sup>106</sup> consists of the arisen [*utpanna*], the [as yet] unarisen [*anutpanna*], the adverse [*vipakṣa*], and the counteractive [*pratipakṣa*]. The first right elimination has as its object the arisen adverse. The second right elimination has as its object the [as yet] unarisen adverse. The third right elimination has as its object the unarisen counteractive. The fourth right elimination has as its object the arisen counteractive. One should interpret it in conformity with the words of the scriptures.<sup>107</sup>

(2) The nature of the [four] right eliminations is the effort generated regarding these four objects.<sup>108</sup>

(3) The aid to the [four] right eliminations includes the mind and its associated mental factors.<sup>109</sup>

(4) The cultivation of the [four] right eliminations is as stated in a scripture: “[The practitioner] produces will, strives, generates right endeavor, engages his mind energetically, and exerts it.”<sup>110</sup> These words illustrate the cultivation based on right endeavor as well as its basis. The base is will because, relying on will, one generates effort.<sup>111</sup> “Right endeavor” means to strive and so forth for tranquility [*śamatha*], for energetic activity [*pragraha*], [and] for equanimity [*upekṣā*] as the objects of one’s attention [*nimittamanasikāra*]. If the practitioner generates attention to the characteristics of tranquility and so forth, he intensely cultivates the antidotes by not being attached to the perceived objects. That moment is called striving. In order to eliminate lethargy and agitation, he generates right effort. Why so? When the derivative afflictions such as lethargy arise, the practitioner, in order to eliminate them, uses his mind energetically by resorting to pure attention. When the derivative afflictions such as agitation arise, the practitioner resorts to internal realization to control his mind; that moment is called the generation of right endeavor. This shows that [right endeavor] is the expedient means to eliminate lethargy and agitation; therefore the energetic application and exertion of the mind are subsequently explained.<sup>112</sup> There is a different meaning, as has been mentioned in the [823b] explanation of the meaning above.

(5) The fruit of the cultivation of right endeavor should be known as the complete discarding of all adversaries [of the path] and the successive acquisition and realization of the appropriate antidotes.<sup>113</sup> Thus the five divisions of the four right eliminations have been briefly explained.

## 2.6.1.3. The Five Divisions of the Four Legs of Supernormal Powers

(1) The object of the legs of supernormal powers is the work accomplished by thorough concentration. This also means through the power accomplished by thorough *samādhi* arises a variety of miraculous things. These are the objects [of the supernormal powers].<sup>114</sup>

(2) The nature of the legs of supernormal powers is *samādhi*.<sup>115</sup>

(3) The aids to the legs of supernatural powers include will, endeavor, mind, and contemplation together with mind and its associated mental factors.<sup>116</sup>

(4) The cultivation of the legs of supernormal powers implies the frequent cultivation of the eight kinds of applied practice—namely, will, effort, conviction, pliancy, right mindfulness, clear comprehension, volition, and equanimity. These eight kinds can be summarized as four—namely, vigorous effort [*vyāvasāyika*], benefiting [*anugrāhaka*], joining [*aupanibandhika*], and counteracting [*pratipakṣika*]. “Applied practice” means will, effort, and conviction. Will is the basis of effort; conviction is the cause of will. Why so? Because of the will to attain this goal, the practitioner generates effort. This will is not separated from conviction, because they are of the same nature. “Benefiting” means pliancy, because through this pliancy the practitioner benefits his body and mind.

“Joining” means right mindfulness and clear comprehension [*samprajanya*], because by not forgetting its perceived objects, the mind is focused on one object. If carelessness arises, the practitioner knows it exactly as it is. “Counteracting” means volition and equanimity, the two powers of applied practice of energetically engaging and exerting the mind through which the practitioner is able to become free from previously arisen lethargy and agitation. These two applied practices also generate states such as tranquility that remove and obstruct afflictions.

Furthermore, the cultivation of will, endeavor, mind, and contemplation is twofold: the cultivation of the elimination of the causes and conditions of [inward] contraction [*saṃkṣepa*] and [external] distraction [*vikṣepa*], and [the cultivation] based on both intrepidity [*alīnatva*] and nondistraction [*avikṣepa*].<sup>117</sup> In this connection, it shows the twofold cultivation of will, [endeavor, mind, and contemplation] as the causes and conditions of the elimination of contraction and distraction. The causes and conditions of contraction consist of lethargy arising from laziness due to the [823c] lack of *vipaśyanā*. The causes and conditions of distraction consist of elation arising from agitation because of the dissociation from the characteristics of impurity. “Contraction” [*saṃkṣepa*] means that, because of drowsiness and sleepiness, one becomes sluggish inward. Distraction [*vikṣepa*] occurs because compliance with [*anurodha*] the [perceived] pure and wonderful characteristics [of conditioned things causes] one’s mind [to] become scattered externally.<sup>118</sup>

To cultivate oneself against [*virodha*] contraction means that one contemplates the factors of existence while focusing on the characteristics to be contemplated. To cultivate oneself against distraction means to rely on the characteristic

of impurity; one contemplates hair, bodily hair, and so forth. The cultivation of conformity based on both is the cultivation of the basis of the characteristic of luminescence, following that order. The Bhagavān said: “There is neither dejection [*līna*] nor elation [*auddhatya*] in my will and joy. There is neither inward contraction nor external distraction. Generate the mind to be free from the bondage of thoughts of before and after or high and low. Cultivate the mind in accordance with luminescence, so there is no darkness and obscurations in your minds.”

The above explanations are contained in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*.<sup>119</sup>

What is referred to in this treatise as “contemplation of phenomena based on their characteristics to be contemplated” is meant to illustrate the scriptural saying of “expansion of the mind through thoughts of before and after.” “To contemplate hair and so forth based on the characteristics of impurity” is said to illustrate the scriptural message of “being free from the thoughts of high and low.” What is meant by “before, after, high, low”? It is stated in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, fascicle twenty-eight:

When the practitioner cultivates *śamatha*, he cultivates perception of the high and low in the division of tranquility.<sup>120</sup> When he cultivates *vipaśyanā*, he cultivates perception of before and after in the division of insight. “Perception of high and low” means to contemplate and examine this body in accordance with the practitioner’s state and wish, from head to toe, that it is filled with all kinds of impurities—namely, hair, bodily hair, nails, and teeth, as have been mentioned previously. “Perception of before and after” means being intensely focused on one’s object of contemplation, [such that] one preserves it, observes it, comprehends it, and attains it thoroughly.

[824a] It means [that,] when standing, one contemplates sitting, [and] when sitting, one contemplates reclining, or to contemplate what comes before from what comes after. [This shows that he uses the practice of *vipaśyanā* to observe the dependently arisen conditioned phenomena of past, present, and future.] The statement “When standing, one contemplates sitting” is [given] to illustrate the contemplation of future objects of knowledge by means of present attention. Why so? Because the state of present attention already arises, it is called standing. When the future object of knowledge does not yet arise, but it is about to arise, it is called sitting. To say that, when sitting, one contemplates reclining is to illustrate the contemplation of past objects of knowledge by means of present attention. Why so? Because the state of present attention is about to become extinct, it is called sitting. Because the state of the past object of knowledge is already extinct, it is called reclining. The statement “To contemplate

what comes before from what comes after” is [given] to illustrate the contemplation of the attention just made extinct by means of the present attention.

Why so? Because it already arises and is immediately extinct, the attention perceived is called what comes before. If this active attention that just arises grasps what was just vanished previously, this is called what comes after. One should know that in order to cultivate tranquility and insight, one cultivates two kinds of extremely luminous thought. This is called the cultivation of perception.<sup>121</sup>

The remaining paragraphs can be understood through inference. This is called the characteristic of the cultivation of the legs of supernormal powers.

(5) The fruits of the cultivation of the legs of supernormal powers. Because the practitioner has well-cultivated concentration, he witnesses objects of knowledge as he desires. This means he can know and manifest as he wishes. He also realizes mastery [*vaśitā*] over things at every single place. As he wishes, he can perform all kinds of supernatural powers. He can also generate special qualities. Thus the five divisions of the four legs of supernormal powers have been explained briefly.<sup>122</sup>

#### 2.6.1.4. The Five Divisions of the Five Spiritual Faculties

(1) The object of the five spiritual faculties: From the perspective of common aspects of [cultivation], the five spiritual faculties perceive the Four Noble Truths. From the perspective of distinctive aspects of [cultivation], they perceive ultimate **[824b]** truth.<sup>123</sup>

(2) The nature of the five spiritual faculties consists of conviction, endeavor, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom.<sup>124</sup>

(3) The aids to the five spiritual faculties are the mind and its associated mental factors.<sup>125</sup>

(4) The cultivation of the five spiritual faculties consists in (i) the cultivation of application [*prayogabhāvanā*] by means of the spiritual faculty of conviction [*śraddhēndriya*] with a view to arousing firm conviction with regard to the noble truths; (ii) the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of effort [*vīryēndriya*] with a view to arousing striving [*vyāyāma*] in order to attain awakening; (iii) the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of mindfulness [*smṛtīndriya*] with a view to arousing nonforgetfulness [*asaṃmoṣa*]; (iv) the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of concentration [*samādhīndriya*] with a view to arousing one-pointedness of mind; and (v) the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of wisdom [*prajñēndriya*] with a view to arousing investigation [*pravicaya*].<sup>126</sup>

The *Dazhidu lun* states:

[Through] the spiritual faculty of conviction the bodhisattva believes

that all factors of existence are produced by causes and conditions, by distorted and false views. They do not exist in the past, they do not exist in the future, and they do not exist in the present. He believes that all factors of existence are empty, without characteristics, are uncreated, unborn, and unvanishing. He believes in precepts, meditation, wisdom, liberation, knowledge of liberation, and so forth. [Through] the faculty of wisdom the bodhisattva penetrates without obstruction or difficulty the true characteristic of factors of existence. He experiences neither sorrow in cyclic existence nor joy in *nirvāṇa*. To be possessed of this sovereign wisdom is called the faculty of wisdom.<sup>127</sup>

The above is a brief illustration of the characteristic of the cultivation of the five faculties.

(5) The fruit of the cultivation of the five faculties is the ability to swiftly generate the clear comprehension of truth. Because of this sustaining power the practitioner soon generates the Path of Vision. He can also cultivate the stage of heat [*uṣma-gata*] and the stage of summit [*mūrdhan*] and produces the stage of forbearance [*kṣānti*] and the stage of worldly ultimate [*laukikāgra*]. He enters the stage conducive to discernment by this body.<sup>128</sup> This is a brief explanation of the five divisions of the five faculties.

#### 2.6.1.5. The Five Divisions of the Five Powers

The first four divisions [of the five powers] are similar to those of the five spiritual faculties. There is only some slight difference in the cultivation of fruit. The powers are far superior to the faculties in that they annihilate all unconquerable obstructions such as the lack of conviction, [endeavor, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom].<sup>129</sup> Thus the five divisions of the five faculties have been explained briefly.

#### 2.6.1.6. The Five Divisions of the Seven Awakening Limbs

(1) The object of the awakening limbs: From the perspective of the nonultimate truth of the two vehicles [of disciples and self-realized buddhas], only the selflessness of persons [*pudgala-nairātmya*] is illustrated. From the perspective of the nonultimate and ultimate truth of the Great Vehicle, the selflessness of both persons and phenomena [*pudgala-dharma-nairātmya*] is the object.<sup>130</sup> [824c]

(2) The nature of the awakening limbs: The seven factors—namely, mindfulness [*smṛti*], investigation of the teachings [*dharmavicaya*], effort [*vīrya*], joy [*prīti*], pliancy [*praśrabdhi*], concentration [*samādhi*], and equanimity [*upekṣā*—are the nature of the awakening limbs. These seven categories are subsumed in three divisions. As it is stated in the *Yogācārabhūmi*:



[These seven awakening limbs are subsumed in three categories—namely], three limbs are subsumed by *śamatha*, another three limbs are subsumed by *vipaśyanā*, and one limb is subsumed by both. Hence they are called the seven awakening limbs. The three awakening limbs called investigation of the teachings, effort, and joy are subsumed in the category of insight. The three awakening limbs called pliancy, concentration, and equanimity are subsumed in the category of tranquility. The one awakening limb called mindfulness is subsumed in both categories of *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*; hence it is called universal.<sup>131</sup>

The *Dazhidu lun* states:

The awakening limb of mindfulness is found in places where it can assemble wholesome states and block unwholesome states. Like a gatekeeper, it lets beneficial things enter and wards off that which is harmful. Because the mindfulness of three phenomena arises when the mind sinks, it is subsumed in the mindfulness of the three phenomena when tranquility is distracted.<sup>132</sup>

(3) The aids to the awakening limbs consist of the mind and mental factors associated with it.<sup>133</sup>

(4) The cultivation of the awakening limbs includes cultivation that exhibits shared and distinct characteristics. Shared cultivation is [defined as follows], as is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*:

[It is] the cultivation of the awakening limb of mindfulness [*smṛti-saṃbodhyaṅga*] up to the awakening limb of equanimity [*upekṣā-saṃbodhyaṅga*] dependent on dissociation [*visamyoga*], detachment [*virāga*], cessation [*nirodha*], and aiming for renunciation [*vyavasargaparīnata*]. These four items successively illustrate the cultivation of the awakening limbs having [the Four Noble] Truths as their object. Why so? When one perceives suffering as painful and one seeks freedom from the objects of suffering, it is called [the cultivation of the awakening limbs] dependent on dissociation. When one perceives attachment as the cause of suffering, one certainly seeks [detachment from] attachment. Therefore it is called [the cultivation of the awakening limbs] dependent on detachment. When one perceives the cessation of suffering as the cessation of suffering, one seeks to realize that objective. Therefore it is called [the cultivation of the awakening limbs] dependent on cessation. Renunciation means when one engages in the practice of the cessation of suffering and, because of this momentum, rids oneself of suffering. [Therefore, when one perceives this object,] one seeks to cultivate it. This is called aiming for renunciation.<sup>134</sup>



This is what is called shared cultivation.

As regards distinct cultivation, the *Dazhidu lun* states:

The bodhisattva neither recollects nor thinks of any phenomenon; this is the awakening limb of mindfulness [*smṛti-saṃbodhyaṅga*]. Searching among all phenomena—wholesome phenomena, [825a] unwholesome phenomena, and indifferent phenomena—the bodhisattva finds that they are unobtainable; this is the awakening limb of investigation of the teachings [*dharmapṛavicaya-saṃbodhyaṅga*]. Without entering the three realms [*traiḍhātuka*], the bodhisattva destroys the characteristics of all realms; this is the awakening limb of effort [*vīrya-saṃbodhyaṅga*]. As regards all conditioned phenomena [*saṃskāra*], the bodhisattva produces neither attachment [*abhiniveśa*] nor pleasure [*sukha*], and because of this all characteristics of sorrow and joy are destroyed;<sup>135</sup> this is the awakening limb of joy [*prīti-saṃbodhyaṅga*]. As regards all phenomena, the bodhisattva is not attached to the mental object of serenity; this is the awakening limb of serenity [or pliancy] [*praśrabdhi-saṃbodhyaṅga*].<sup>136</sup> The bodhisattva knows that all phenomena that have as their characteristic [their] being constantly concentrated are not now distracted, now concentrated; this is the awakening limb of concentration [*samādhi-saṃbodhyaṅga*]. As regards all phenomena, the bodhisattva is not attached to them, does not rely on them, and does not even see them. This mind of equanimity is the awakening limb of equanimity [*upekṣā-saṃbodhyaṅga*]. [ . . . ] [Furthermore, contemplating in such manner, the bodhisattva] generates joy in true wisdom; this is called true joy. Having obtained this true joy, the bodhisattva first removes bodily debilitation [*kāyadauṣṭhulya*], then he removes mental debilitation [*cittadauṣṭhulya*],<sup>137</sup> [and] finally he removes all characteristics of phenomena [*dharmalakṣaṇa*]. Therefore he obtains a happiness that pervades body and mind; this is the awakening limb of serenity.

Having obtained the practice of contemplation of joy, serenity, and equanimity, [the bodhisattva completely eliminates all conceptual proliferations [*prapañca*] such as contemplations of] what is called impermanence, suffering, emptiness, [not-self, birth and cessation, nonbirth and noncessation], being and nonbeing, neither being nor nonbeing, and so forth. Why so? Because [the absence of characteristics, of objects, of contrivance], of conceptual proliferation, is true reality[, which is perpetual quiescence]. If he fails to practice equanimity, he will fall into disputes. If one takes being as real, then one will take nonbeing as unreal. If one takes nonbeing as real, one will take being as unreal. If one takes nonbeing and non-nonbeing as real,

one will take being and nonbeing as unreal. Being enamored of and attached to [what one considers as] real, and hating and detesting [what one considers as] unreal, one has occasion for anxiety and joy. So why not practice elimination? When the bodhisattva has obtained true joy, relief, [and] equanimity, the whole gamut of the seven awakening limbs becomes complete.<sup>138</sup>

In the above passage, “serenity” means pliancy. Because it is capable of removing debilitating afflictions, it is called serenity. This has been a brief explanation of the cultivation of the awakening limbs.<sup>139</sup>

(5) The fruit of the cultivation of the awakening limbs is the complete annihilation of afflictions on the Path of Vision.<sup>140</sup> What is called the fruit of the distinct [cultivation] of the awakening limbs is the attainment of a birth in a Buddhist environment and freedom from the five fears [*vibhīṣaṇā*], the attainment of the knowledge of countless teachings,<sup>141</sup> and the appropriation of innumerable Buddhas’ realms. It is as has been extensively explained in the scriptures. This has been a brief explanation of the five divisions of the seven awakening limbs.

#### 2.6.1.7. The Five Divisions of the Eight Limbs of the Noble Path

(1) The object of the eight limbs of the Noble Path is **[825b]** the true nature of the Four Noble Truths together with [the knowledge] of all phenomena [*yāvadbhāvikatā*] and [the knowledge] of the true nature of all phenomena [*yathāvadbhāvikatā*].<sup>142</sup> These are all objects of the level of the Path of Cultivation.<sup>143</sup>

(2) The nature of the eight limbs of the Noble Path are right view, right conception, right speech, right actions, right livelihood, right efforts, right mindfulness, and right concentration. These eight factors are the essence of the [noble eightfold] path.<sup>144</sup> These eight factors are subsumed in the three aggregates [of precepts, concentration, and wisdom]. As the *Yogācārabhūmi* states:

Among these, right view, right conception, and right efforts are subsumed in the aggregate of wisdom [*prajñā-skandha*]. Right speech, right actions, and right livelihood are subsumed in the aggregate of precepts [*śīla-skandha*]. Right mindfulness and right concentration are subsumed in the aggregate of concentration [*samādhi-skandha*].<sup>145</sup>

Why are the [seven] awakening limbs subsumed in these three categories? To say that the limbs of the [noble eightfold] path are subsumed in the three aggregates is to illustrate that on the Path of Vision both tranquility and insight function, and it is not the same on the Path of Applied Practice.<sup>146</sup> It is to illustrate that on the Path of Cultivation, by cultivating these three aggregates [of precepts, concentration, and wisdom], the practitioner will be able to attain the aggregate

of liberation [*vimukti-skandha*] and the aggregate of the knowledge and vision of liberation [*vimukti-jñāna-darśana-skandha*] of the level of the saints beyond training [*aśaikṣa*].<sup>147</sup>

(3) The aids to the limbs of the [noble eightfold] path include the mind and the mental factors associated with it.<sup>148</sup>

(4) The cultivation of the limbs of the [noble eightfold] path: From the perspective of shared cultivation, it is similar to the explanation of the awakening limbs.<sup>149</sup>

From the perspective of distinct cultivation, the *Dazhidu lun* states:

The bodhisattva, positioning himself in the emptiness and unattainability of phenomena, contemplates, through right view, the characteristics of right conception. He knows that all conceptions are false, including conceptions of *nirvāṇa* and conceptions of buddhas. Why so? It is because the elimination of all varieties of conceptions is called right conceptions. All varieties of conceptions come from falsity, faults, and defects. That is why they differ. But the characteristics of conception are all unobtainable. The bodhisattva, positioning himself in this correct conception, sees neither correctness nor falsity—he transcends all varieties of conceptions; this is right conception. To him all varieties of conceptions are equal, and because they are equal, his mind does not become attached. These are called the bodhisattva’s right conception, and so forth.<sup>150</sup>

(5) The fruit of the cultivation of the limbs of the [noble eightfold] path means that one discriminates and explains them, causing [people to generate] conviction in them. It is because by purifying [primary] afflictive obstructions and derivative afflictive obstructions, and purifying obstructions to the most excellent qualities, that the practitioner attains immeasurable most excellent qualities.<sup>151</sup> This has been a brief explanation of the five divisions of the [noble eightfold] path. [825c] The meaning of the awakening limbs has been thus briefly explained.

### 3. An Analysis of the Words of the Chapter

**Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.458a15–16]: I will now explain the cultivation of the antidotes—that is, the cultivation of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening. This treatise starts with [the verse . . . ]**<sup>152</sup>

Next I will analyze the words [of the treatise]. [Vasubandhu’s] commentary first explains the beginning of the treatise. Concerning this there are two sentences. The first gives a general disclosure, the second a specific explanation. “**This treatise starts with . . .**”<sup>153</sup> means this chapter first discusses the four foundations of mindfulness.

There are in all twelve and a half verses [1–13ab].<sup>154</sup> These can be divided into two. The first eleven verses specifically explain the antidotes; the last one and a

half verses sum up the meaning of antidotes in general. The first eleven verses can also be divided into six: (1) The first verse illustrates the four foundations of mindfulness. (2) The next verse explains the four right endeavors. (3) Three and a half verses explain the wish-granting legs [3–6ab].<sup>155</sup> (4) Two verses explain both the [five spiritual] faculties and [the five] powers [6cd–8ab]. (5) One and a half verses explain the seven awakening limbs [8cd–9]. (6) Two verses explain the eight limbs of the Noble Path [10–11].

### 3.1. The Four Foundations of Mindfulness

Verse 1 [T 1599:31.485a17–18]:

**In order to attain the Four Noble Truths, one cultivates  
contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness,  
By [realizing] debilitating conditioned states [such as those  
through which the body is manifested, feelings as] the cause  
of craving, [mind as the] physical base [of a self], and non-  
delusion [with regard to the factors of existence].**<sup>156</sup>

In this first verse, which explains the four foundations of mindfulness, the first half gives a specific explanation while the second half gives a general illustration.<sup>157</sup> Briefly, the four foundations of mindfulness are established with three intentions: (1) to counteract the four defects, (2) to be free from the four bondages, and (3) to enter the Four Noble Truths. These three divisions have been explained earlier.<sup>158</sup> Here I explain only the third meaning. What is called debilitating conditioned states is [the subject of] the mindfulness of the body. The physical body is compliant with debilitating afflictions<sup>159</sup> and is separated from pliancy; this is the characteristic of suffering as conditioned states [*saṃskāra-duḥkhatā*].<sup>160</sup> Therefore one attains the truth of suffering by contemplating the body.

[The phrase] “**as the cause of craving**” [verse 1a] illustrates the mindfulness of feelings. Various kinds of feeling produce six kinds of craving and desire.<sup>161</sup> Craving and desire induce the myriad sufferings of the three realms.<sup>162</sup> Therefore, by contemplating these, the practitioner can attain the truth [of the cause of suffering]. [The term] “**physical base**”<sup>163</sup> [verse 1b] illustrates the mindfulness of mind. The mind preserves the seeds,<sup>164</sup> which are the basis of all phenomena.<sup>165</sup> The self is the root of all [imagined] phenomena, afraid of annihilation and extinction. Therefore, by correctly contemplating the mind, the practitioner realizes the truth of the extinction of suffering. [The expression] “**[by realizing] nondelusion**” [verse 1b] explains the mindfulness of factors of existence. There are many kinds of factors of existence that are different from one another in terms of purity and impurity. **[826a]**

Because ignorance becomes obstruction covering luminous wisdom, the practitioner, by not being deluded about the characteristics of the factors of

existence, attains the truth of the path [leading to the cessation of suffering]. The next half of the verse (1cd), stating “**in order to attain the Four Noble Truths,**” generally illustrates the object of cultivation; [and] “**one cultivates contemplation of the four foundations of mindfulness**” generally illustrates the act of cultivation.

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.458a 19–26]: **Debilitating conditioned states are manifested by the body. Because the body has the characteristic of gross conditioned states,**<sup>166</sup> by discerning them one enters the truth of suffering. [This characteristic of] gross [conditioned states] is suffering as conditioned states. The sages contemplate the truth of suffering with regard to all afflicted phenomena due to this suffering as conditioned states. Feelings are the basis of thirst. By discerning feelings, one enters the truth of the origin of suffering. Mind is the basis for the attachment to the self. By discerning mind, one enters the truth of the cessation of suffering because this leads to freedom from the fear of the extinction of self. There are two divisions of factors of existence: impurity and purity. By discerning the factors of existence, one becomes free from the ignorance concerning impurity and purity and enters the truth of the path [leading to the cessation of suffering]. Therefore, in the beginning, for the purpose of attaining the Four Noble Truths, the cultivation of the four foundations of mindfulness is established.<sup>167</sup>

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of two parts. In the first part he explains the first half [of the verse]; in the second half he explains the second half [of the verse]. In the first part, which is an explanation of debilitating obstructions, he first briefly glosses the words [of the verse]; then he offers a more detailed analysis. First, he remarks, “**Debilitating conditioned states are manifested by the body.**” As it is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, the physical body is characterized by suffering as conditioned states, because it is manifested by debilitation.<sup>168</sup> Therefore, in cultivating the contemplation of conditioned states, one can attain the pliancy that counters the varieties [of view of] the body. Now [Vasubandhu] states, “**Debilitating conditioned states are manifested [by the body],**” [which] means the debilitation that is suffering as conditioned states becomes manifest. [The statement] “**because the body [has the characteristic of gross conditioned states]**” explains further the above meaning. [Vasubandhu] remarks that “[**this characteristic of] gross [conditioned states] is suffering as conditioned states.**” “Gross” signifies “debilitating,” meaning that debilitation is the characteristic of suffering as conditioned states. This becomes clear in the remaining text. [The statement] “**Therefore, [in the beginning, for the purpose of attaining the Four Noble Truths, the cultivation of the four foundations of mindfulness is established]**” explains the second half of the verse.

### 3.2. The Four Right Endeavors

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.458a27–b5]: Next is the cultivation of the [four] right endeavors.

Verse 2:

**Having known the adversaries of the path and all kinds of antidotes,  
[For the annihilation and production, respectively, of] these two, one cultivates the four right endeavors.**<sup>169</sup>

**Vasubandhu's commentary:** Through the cultivation of the four foundations of mindfulness, the practitioner has known all forms of unwholesome states that are adversaries of the path and wholesome states that are accessories of the path. For the annihilation of the adversaries and for the production of the accessories, the practitioner generates the four kinds of right endeavor. First is the annihilation of unwholesome and evil states that have arisen, as is extensively discussed in the scriptures.<sup>170</sup>

Next is the cultivation of the right endeavors. First, [Vasubandhu] brings up the following text. The following is the second verse explaining the four right endeavors. The verse consists of two parts. The first half concludes the above to start what follows. The second half continues the above and explains the four right endeavors. As has been stated earlier in the section on the mindfulness of factors of existence, the practitioner already knows that impure states are the adversaries of the path. He also knows that pure states are the antidotes [to the adversaries of the path]. Therefore verse [2ab] says “**having known the adversaries of the path and all kinds of antidotes.**” As discussed previously, one should remove the arisen impure states, and one should not let the [as yet] unarisen ones arise. One should cause the [as yet] unarisen wholesome states to arise and develop the arisen wholesome states. Therefore verse [2cd] says, “**[For the annihilation and production, respectively, of] these two, one cultivates the four right endeavors.**”

[Vasubandhu's] commentary consists of two parts. First he explains the first half [verse 2ab]. [The paragraph] “**For the annihilation of the adversaries [and for the production of the accessories, the practitioner generates the four kinds of right endeavor]**” explains the second half [verse 2cd]. The text is self-explanatory.

### 3.3. The Four Wish-Granting Legs

Verse 3 [T 1599:31.458b6–14]:

**Stability in it according to objects, in order to accomplish all aims.  
[In order to] annihilate the five faults [and to] assiduously cultivate the eight provisions.**<sup>171</sup>

**Vasubandhu's commentary:** In order to annihilate unwholesome states and to attain wholesome states, after having cultivated the [four] right endeavors, the [practitioner's] mind is without obstructions because the

accessories [of the path] are present. [Therefore] stability [of mind] is attained. This stability of mind has four functions. One consists in relying on the teachings to reach attainment. Relying on the teachings to reach attainment is called the four wish-granting legs, because they are the causes and conditions for the accomplishment of all one's wishes. Here one should know that "stability" means the stability of mind, which is called *samādhi*. Therefore, after the four right endeavors, the four wish-granting legs are successively explained. One should know that stability [of mind] according to objects and teachings is done for the purpose of annihilating the five faults and cultivating the eight provisions. What are the five faults?<sup>172</sup>

The third verse explains the wish-granting legs.<sup>173</sup> There are three and a half verses [3–6ab], divided into three paragraphs. The first statement illustrates the nature; the second explains the name. Afterward there are three verses illustrating the characteristics of cultivation. First, [verse 3ab] says "**stability in it according to objects,**" meaning that having cultivated the [four] right endeavors, [826b] [thereby] annihilating unwholesome states and producing wholesome states, subsequently there is no obstruction, and there is the presence of accessories [to the path]. Therefore the practitioner attains one-pointedness of mind. The objects perceived by mind are of two kinds: distracting gross objects and objects of quiescent contemplation. The practitioner discards distracting gross objects and abides in objects of quiescent contemplation. Therefore verse [3a] says "**stability in it.**" This illustrates the mind abiding in one object. Tranquility is the nature of the four wish-granting legs, because depending on the four predominant [conditions], the practitioner attains concentration.

Next, verse [3b] says "**in order to accomplish all aims.**"<sup>174</sup> This is the second part, which explains the wish-granting legs. "Wish-granting" has the meaning of accomplishment. Aims are the objects of legs. There is nothing the practitioner wishes that he does not accomplish. This is the meaning of the six sovereign superknowledges.<sup>175</sup> These six superknowledges should be called the four legs [of supernormal powers]. It is like [the way,] in order to reach some destination, one needs two legs. Thus the meaning of "leg" is explained through its aim. Referring to the fruit to talk about the cause is called wish-granting legs. The following three verses [3cd–6ab] illustrate the characteristics of cultivation. They consist of two parts. The first two quarters [3cd] indicate generally the items by enumeration; the next two and a half verses [4–6ab] successively give specific explanation. The general indication is also twofold. The first quarter indicates the faults eliminated through cultivation; the next quarter indicates [ . . . ].<sup>176</sup>

[Vasubandhu's] commentary consists of two parts. In the first part he explains the first half of the verse [3ab]; in the second part he explains the second half of the verse [3cd]. The first part itself is twofold, consisting of a specific explanation and a general illustration. In the specific explanation, he first explains the first quarter. This is also twofold—namely, direct explanation and further explanation. In direct explanation, [Vasubandhu] says, "**In order to annihilate unwholesome states and to attain wholesome states, after having cultivated the**



**[four] right endeavors.**” He says “**according to objects**” to explain “objects.” Next he remarks [that] “**the [practitioner’s] mind is without obstructions because the accessories [of the path] are present,**”<sup>177</sup> to explain the mind that abides accordingly. Then he explains the word “according.” [The phrase] “**Therefore stability [of mind] is attained**” explains [verse 3a] “stability in it.” [The phrase] “**This mind**” and so forth explains further the above meaning. [Vasubandhu] says, “**This stability of mind has four functions,**” [which] means that the realization of the stability of mind has four excellent functions—namely, will, sustenance, endeavor, and mental contemplation. These four functions achieve stability of mind according to abiding in objects. Each one relies on the holy teachings of the master to attain one-pointedness of mind. Therefore [Vasubandhu] states, [826c] “**One consists in relying on the teachings to reach attainment.**”

As is stated in the ninety-eighth fascicle of the *Yogācārabhūmi*:

If a *bhikṣu* [monk], due to his pure aspiration and vigorous will, wishes to realize the most excellent penetrating wisdom, then showing earnest respect to the Tathāgatas and Buddhist masters, listening to the true teaching, and from constantly listening, he gradually attains supreme *samādhi*. This is called [supernormal power accomplished by] *samādhi* predominantly through will. Again, there may be a *bhikṣu* who, in accordance with the teaching he has learned and attained, generates great application and produces great effort, or proclaims and reveals the truth to others, or reads and chants it with pleasant words. By constantly doing this, he can, due to causes and conditions, gradually attain supreme *samādhi*. This is called [supernormal power accomplished by] *samādhi* primarily through endeavor. Again, a *bhikṣu* who, by means of wholesome *samādhi*, produces good conceptions contemplates the mottled blue color of a corpse up to the skeleton. By thus contemplating [on these objects], he successively generates supreme *samādhi*. This is called [supernormal power accomplished by] *samādhi* primarily through mind. Again, a *bhikṣu*, in accordance with the teaching he has learned and attained, dwells alone in a quiet place, contemplates and calculates, diligently investigates and examines. Because of this, he gradually generates excellent *samādhi*. This is called [supernormal power accomplished by] *samādhi* primarily through investigation, and so forth.<sup>178</sup>

These four persons all achieve excellent *samādhi* through hearing the teaching. Therefore [Vasubandhu] says, “**Relying on the teachings to reach attainment.**”

Next, he explains the second quarter of the verse [3b]. It consists of two parts. First, he says that “**relying on the teachings to reach attainment,**” [which]



refers to the four wish-granting legs. In order to explain the meaning, [Vasubandhu] refers to the actual substance to illustrate the name. [The statement] “[because they are the causes and conditions for the accomplishment of] all [one’s wishes]” explains the name. [The phrase] “for the accomplishment of all one’s wishes” explains the phrase “in order to accomplish [all aims]” in verse 3b. [The expression] “causes and conditions” explains [the word] “aims” [verse 3b]. The word “therefore” that follows [the statement] “Here one should know that ‘stability’ means the stability of mind, which is called *samādhi*” [is connected with] “one’s wishes.” It is the cause of the accomplishment of one’s aims. Therefore it is said that this [827a] concentration is called wish-granting legs.

Next is the specific explanation of the two quarters [3ab]. [The statement] “Here [one should know that ‘stability’ means the stability of mind, which is called *samādhi*]” is a general illustration of its meaning. Regarding this, there are two statements. The first one explains further the actual substance of the wish-granting legs. The next one gives a concluding illustration. “Successively” explains thought. First [Vasubandhu] says that “the stability of mind[, which] is called *samādhi*”; here it is called stability of mind, and it is with an intention to illustrate the stability of mind. Among the nine kinds, only the ninth—namely, equipoise—is taken to be the basic constituent of the wish-granting legs.

What are the nine kinds of stability of mind? [They are] (1) internal stability, (2) equal stability, (3) peaceful stability, (4) near stability, (5) regulation, (6) quiescence, (7) supreme quiescence, (8) stability on one path, and (9) equipoise.<sup>179</sup> This is because, due to numerous kinds of constant cultivation, the practitioner attains the stage of nonexertion and effortlessness, where he courses freely on the path; therefore it is called equipoise. Equipoise is the same as *samādhi*. I will explain the other first eight kinds later. [The statement] “Here one should know [that ‘stability’ means the stability of mind]” is to exhort the practitioner to know this equipoise. [The statement] “Therefore, [after the four right endeavors, the four wish-granting legs are successively explained]” is the second concluding illustration. By means of the above eight levels of stability of mind, based on the four right endeavors one cultivates assiduously, and then one attains the ninth foundation of *samādhi*. Therefore the four wish-granting legs are explained subsequent to the right endeavors. [The phrase] “according to objects” and so forth next explains the second half [of verse 3]. The phrase “according to objects and teachings” continues the above explanation of the nature of the wish-granting legs. Relying on internal effort and the external holy teachings as causes and conditions, one attains the stability of mind. Therefore [Vasubandhu] says “stability [of mind] according to objects and teachings.” The internal and external causes and conditions have been explained above.

By what means does the practitioner attain this stability? It is by the annihilation of the five faults through the cultivation of the eight virtues. By the provision of [these eight virtues], one attains the stability of mind. Therefore [Vasubandhu] says, “One should know that stability [of mind] according to objects and teachings is done for the purpose of annihilating the five faults

**and cultivating the eight provisions.”** This means that when the practitioner attains the four kinds of concentration, he has to rely on these eight kinds of provisions to attain those three *samādhis*. This is an explanation based on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*.<sup>180</sup> The *Yogācārabhūmi* [827b] gives a different explanation.

What is the cultivation of the wish-granting legs? There are two kinds. First, relying on the four predominating powers such as will, [endeavor, mind, and investigation], the practitioner accordingly attains *samādhi*. But he annihilates only the present bondages and does not yet eliminate the latent afflictions. Afterward, if the same practitioner wishes to eliminate the latent afflictions, he has to continue to cultivate the eight kinds of applied practice in order to attain supreme equipoise.<sup>181</sup> Here they are explained together as the successive two stages, establishing the essence of the four wish-granting legs. Thus [Vasubandhu’s] remark **“according to objects and the teachings”** explains the previous stage—namely, that of the four practitioners who attain concentration.

[Vasubandhu’s commentary]: **“For the purpose of annihilating [the five faults and cultivating the eight provisions]”**—this illustrates that these four practitioners afterward accordingly cultivate the eight kinds of applied practice. Generally speaking, these eight kinds of right application are also seen in the previous stage. Yet at that stage the practitioner subdues only the present bondages; therefore the term “elimination” is not established. At the last stage, the practitioner eliminates latent afflictions; therefore elimination is established here. As stated in that treatise [i.e., the *Yogācārabhūmi*]:

The [practitioner,] by means of the four powers accomplished through *samādhis*, is already free from bondages. Furthermore, in order to completely annihilate latent afflictions and to cultivate the counteractive wholesome qualities, he generates will and exertion. [This is, generally speaking, similar to the principle of the practice of the four right eliminations above.] When he thus cultivates correctly in order to completely annihilate latent afflictions and to attain perfect *samādhis*, the eight kinds of applied practice function variously.<sup>182</sup>

[and]

In this connection, “will” signifies will [among the eight right applications]; “exertion” means effort; “conviction” means conviction [among the eight right applications]; pliancy, mindfulness, right knowledge, volition, and equanimity are equivalent to the expedient means expressed there. Thus in this connection the previous four *samādhis* accomplished through will, [endeavor, mind, and investigation] and the eight eliminations currently mentioned for the purpose of completely annihilating latent afflictions and completely accomplishing *samādhis*, are altogether referred to as the leg of

supernormal power accomplished by the right application of *samādhi* through will, [the leg of supernormal power accomplished by the right application of *samādhi* through endeavor, the leg of supernormal power accomplished by the right application of *samādhi* through mind] up to the leg of supernormal power accomplished by the right application of *samādhi* through investigation, and so forth.<sup>183</sup>

The statement [above]: “**In this connection, ‘will’ signifies will [among the eight right applications]; ‘exertion’ means effort; ‘conviction’ means conviction [among the eight right applications]; [pliancy, mindfulness, right knowledge, volition, and equanimity are equivalent to] the expedient means**” [827c] is to illustrate that when the practitioner previously cultivates the four *samādhis*, he also becomes possessed of these eight applications.<sup>184</sup> When these four practitioners cultivate concentration, each and every one has to rely on will, effort, conviction, and expedient means to attain concentration. They are referred to together as four. The *Yogācārabhūmi* does not refer to it as the eight kinds of applied practice. Yet although the *Yogācārabhūmi* does not use the term “elimination,” there is no difference in terms of function between them. Therefore it is said that these are identical with those. Also, although all four practitioners have will [*chanda*], they are spoken of as four different practitioners, according to different degrees of progress. It does not mean that [the leg of supernormal power accomplished] through will lacks the practice of effort, [mind, and investigation], and [that the leg of supernormal power accomplished] through investigation lacks will, [effort, and mind].

**Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.458b14–23]: What are the [five] faults?**

Verse 4:

**Indolence, forgetting the teachings, lethargy and agitation,  
Nonapplication of thought, application of thought—one  
should know that these are the five faults.**<sup>185</sup>

Vasubandhu’s commentary: “Indolence” means languishing in evils. “Forgetting the teachings” means neither remembering nor implementing the names, sentences, and meanings of the teachings established by the teacher. “Lethargy and agitation” are the combination of the two obstructions that are derived from sorrow and joy. They are characterized by vacillation. At this stage, when these two are present, there is nonapplication of thought; this is the fourth fault. If the practitioner generates application of thought when these two are absent, this is the fifth fault. In order to annihilate these five faults, the eight kinds of provisions of meditative concentration are established. In order to annihilate indolence, there are four things—namely, will, right endeavor, conviction, and suppleness. Again, one should know the order of these four factors.<sup>186</sup>

Let us temporarily withdraw from this digression and return to the exegesis of the text. [Vasubandhu states,] “**What are [the five faults]?**” to introduce what follows. Following this there are two and a half verses [4–6ab]. Based on the above general indication, the order is illustrated specifically: the first verse [4] explains the five faults; the next one and a half verses [5–6ab] illustrate the eight kinds of applied practice. The first verse consists of two parts. The first three quarters [4abc] specifically illustrate, and [the last] quarter [4d] presents a general conclusion. The characteristics of the five faults are clearly explained in [Vasubandhu’s] commentary. His commentary successively explains the five kinds of fault. First, [Vasubandhu] says “**languishing in evils,**” meaning that one becomes caught in distraction and cannot generate effort. Second, [Vasubandhu] says “**neither remembering and nor implementing,**” which means not remembering the teachings and not implementing the instructions. Third, [Vasubandhu] says “**are derived from sorrow and joy as their nature.**” Lethargy is equivalent to sorrow. With sorrow, it is hard for the practitioner to make progress; its manifest function is sinking. Agitation is equivalent to joy. One becomes joyful with little gain; its manifest function is excitement. These two are opposites, yet both become obstructions. Therefore they are jointly referred to as a single fault. It is as when one refers to annihilationism [*uccheda-vāda*] and eternalism [*śāśvata-vāda*] together as extreme views.

Regarding the fourth fault, when one is lethargic, one should cultivate insight; when one is excited, one should cultivate tranquility; but if one fails to apply oneself to cultivate [the proper] antidotes at the appropriate moment, then nonapplication becomes a fault. As regards the fifth fault, when lethargy [828a] and agitation are annihilated, the practitioner should generate equanimity. If, after lethargy is annihilated, he still entertains the notion of dissociation, he is still excited. If, after excitement has ceased, he still generates attention to calm it, he again falls into lethargy. Therefore, when lethargy and excitement are absent and he still applies mental attention, it becomes an obstruction. [The statements “**In order to annihilate these five faults, the eight kinds of provision of meditative concentration are established**” and “**In order to annihilate indolence, there are four things—namely, will, right endeavor, conviction, and suppleness**”] illustrate the functions of the antidotes. They are also generated first. Among these three quarters [of the verse], the first generally enumerates the eight kinds of concentration. The next quarter specifically illustrates the first four ideas. [The statement] “**Again, [one should know the order of the four factors]**” serves to adumbrate the following text.

**Verse 5ab** [T 1599:31.458b24–c6]:

**The basis and that which is based on it; its cause, condition,  
and fruit.**<sup>187</sup>

**Vasubandhu’s commentary:** Will is the base of right endeavor. Right endeavor is that which is based on will. This base is called will, and its cause is

conviction. This is because when there is conviction, will arises. Suppleness is the fruit of right endeavor, which is based on will, because when the practitioner generates right endeavor, he attains the desired meditative concentration. The remaining four kinds of provisions—namely, mindfulness, wisdom, attention, and equanimity—respectively serve as antidotes to the remaining four faults. One should know that this is the order of these four foundations of mindfulness and so forth.<sup>188</sup>

Verses 5cd, 6ab [T 1599:31.458b24–c6]:

**Nondelusion of perceived objects; knowing the high and the low.**

**The mental application to annihilate them: equanimity in quiescence.**<sup>189</sup>

Vasubandhu’s commentary: “Mindfulness” means not being forgetful of objects. “Wisdom” means the awareness of lethargy and agitation when there is absence of forgetfulness of them. “Attention” is the mind generating efforts to annihilate [lethargy and agitation] after they have come to one’s awareness. “Equanimity” is to generate and release the tranquil mind flowingly and continuously after lethargy and agitation have been brought to quiescence.<sup>190</sup> The verse consists of two parts. The first two quarters illustrate the first four practices. The next verse explains the next four practices. The first four practices taken together are the antidote to one obstruction. This is because among the obstructions indolence is foremost and is hard to eliminate. Therefore the practitioner needs the combination of will and endeavor—as the basis and that which is based on the basis—and [needs] the combination of conviction and suppleness as cause and fruit. By relying on these four powers, he subdues [lethargy and agitation]. As for the next four faults, with the loss of their leader, their obstructive power is weakened, and so the practitioner can remove them one by one. “The basis” [verse 5a] is the first [power]—namely, will; “and that which is based on it” [verse 5a] is the second [power]—namely, right endeavor. First, one has to deepen one’s aspiration, quiescence, and merit, because, based on these, one generates endeavor and effort. [The phrase] “its cause, condition” [verse 5b] means that the third [power]—namely, conviction—is the cause of the basis, because decisive conviction produces will. [The expression] “and fruit” [verse 5c] means that the fruit of that which is based on the basis is the fourth [power]—namely, suppleness—because, based on right endeavor, one attains the fruit of suppleness.

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary successively explains these four kinds [of powers]. The fourth [statement] says, “Because when the practitioner generates right endeavor, he attains the desired meditative concentration.” When the practitioner attains meditative concentration, debilitating afflictions become extinct, and he subsequently attains pliancy of body and mind. Pliancy is called suppleness; it is characterized by delightfulness. Therefore, by attaining

concentration, the fruit of suppleness becomes manifest. [The statement] **“The remaining four [kinds of provisions—namely, mindfulness, wisdom, attention, and equanimity—respectively serve as antidotes to the remaining four faults]”** explains the next four practices and are brought up first. In this connection, first their numbers and names are indicated. [The phrase] **“to annihilate”** and so forth deals with the faults that have already been explained. The four quarters of the next verse accordingly explain the four characteristics.

The first quarter—**“nondelusion of perceived objects”** [5c]—means that right mindfulness [828b] is an antidote to forgetfulness of the teachings. The next quarter—**“knowing the high and the low”** [5d]<sup>191</sup>—means that right knowledge is an antidote to the third fault. “Knowing the high and the low” means that agitation is high, lethargy is low, and the practitioner accordingly knows them. [The phrase] **“the mental application to annihilate them”** [verse 6a] illustrates the application of mental attention. In order to annihilate lethargy and agitation, the practitioner resorts to the application of mental attention and accordingly generates antidotes. In this context, application of mental attention is the mental factor of volition [*cetanā*]. To generate tranquility and insight means the application of mental attention. This is not identical with the mental factor of attention in the constant mental factors. [The phrase] **“equanimity in quiescence”** [verse 6b], illustrates the characteristic of equanimity. When lethargy and agitation are annihilated, the practitioner freely generates equanimity.

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of four parts. The fourth part states, **“‘Equanimity’ is to generate and release the tranquil mind flowingly and continuously after lethargy and agitation have been brought to quiescence,”** with a view to clarifying that equanimity consists of beginning, middle, and end. As stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, equanimity is based on right endeavor and the absence of greed, hatred, and delusion and is the obverse of defilements. Its nature is the equality of mind, the forthrightness of mind, and the effortlessness of mind. Its function is not to become the basis for defilement. The equality, [forthrightness, and effortlessness of mind] are to distinguish equanimity into the beginning, middle, and end. Why so? Because equanimity and its associated mind are free from lethargy, which is inequality. First, the practitioner attains the equality of mind; because of this he is free from conscious effort and becomes spontaneous. Next, the practitioner attains the forthrightness of mind; because of this he has no fear of defilements. Finally, he attains the stage of the effortlessness of mind. Now, the phrase **“[‘Equanimity’ is] to generate and release . . .”** is the general statement. Next, [the phrase] **“[release the tranquil mind] flowingly [and continuously . . .]”** illustrates the equality of mind in the first stage. It is because the practitioner first releases and renounces inequality. Next, [the word] **“flowingly”** illustrates the forthrightness of mind at the second level, because the four kinds of forthrightness flow from equality. [The word] **“continuously”** explains effortlessness in the third stage, because it is through effortlessness that one attains abiding stability.

### 3.4. The Five Spiritual Faculties

Vasubandhu's commentary [T 1599:31.458c6–9]: **After the four wish-granting legs, [the Master] successively discusses the cultivation of the five spiritual faculties. How are these five spiritual faculties established?**

Verses 6cd, 7cd:

**Having planted the seeds of liberation; from the predominance of will;  
From nondelusion of perceived objects; nondistracted and investigation.  
Because the adversaries are being diminished by powers, the previous [factor] is the cause of the subsequent one.**<sup>192</sup>

After the four wish-granting legs, the fourth part is a general elaboration of the five spiritual faculties and the five powers. They are brought up first, [828c] and the words of the texts are self-explanatory.

The verses consist of two parts. The first one and a half verses illustrate the characteristics of practice. The last two quarters pertain to the levels and stages. The first consists of three parts. One verse explains the five spiritual faculties. One quarter explains the five powers. The last quarter explains the five orders. The first also consists of two parts. The first quarter explains the cause for the generation of the faculties; the last three quarters explain the characteristics of the faculties. The first quarter, [6c] “**having planted the seeds of liberation,**” means that the stage of the five faculties is included on the level of insight, so the seeds conducive to liberation are planted first. Because the practitioner expects the fruit of liberation, the cultivated wholesome roots are the initial seeds of the fruit of liberation. Therefore [verse 6c] says, “**having planted the seeds of liberation.**”

What are the wholesome states that are its nature? There are masters who teach that among the seven means the first three are conducive to liberation. Since the four minds of the heat level [*uṣma-gata*] belong to the level of insight, one knows that the first three belong to the level conducive to liberation.<sup>193</sup> Others teach that the three activities—namely, the two kinds of wisdom derived from hearing and reflection and the three activities of generosity, precepts, [and learning]—are conducive to liberation. According to the *Upāsikāpratimokṣa-sūtra*,<sup>194</sup> what is essential to liberation is the subjugation of the activities of body, speech, and mind. This is attained through expedient means. Expedient means are twofold—namely, hearing and reflection. They are also threefold—namely, generosity, precepts, and learning. The *Vibhāṣā* gives the same explanation concerning the [three activities of] body, speech, and mind. Among [the activities of] body, speech, and mind, the activities of mind are particularly numerous. They belong to the domain of the mental consciousness and are not found in the



other five consciousnesses. They are attained through means and through birth. They are the wisdom derived from hearing and the wisdom derived from reflection, and not the wisdom derived from cultivation. How is one to plant such wholesome roots? By means of generosity, precepts, and learning. One uses them to dedicate oneself to [the attainment of] liberation and *nirvāṇa*, which is complete freedom from birth and death. If the practitioner has such a powerful mind, he can plant the seeds [of liberation]; otherwise, even if he extensively practices generosity [829a] and precepts and cultivates learning his entire life, he still cannot plant the seeds [of liberation]. This is what this treatise teaches.

If one calls the first three expedient means conducive to liberation, and the mindfulness called the pacification of mind as common to all three wisdoms, why it is said that they do not fall under the category of the wisdom derived from cultivation? The *Vibhāṣā* also states that the virtues conducive to liberation are both distant and near. The near ones are the seeds [planted] in one's previous life and are perfected in this life, and one will attain liberation through them. The distant ones are seeds planted in innumerable<sup>195</sup> reincarnated bodies, not capable of producing far-reaching virtues. The *Upāsikāpratimokṣa-sūtra* gives the same explanation. Yet disciples, self-realized buddhas, and bodhisattvas of acute faculties all cultivate the seven expedient means in their final life and attain liberation. If the contemplation of the pacification of mind and the general and specific foundations of mindfulness are the wholesome roots conducive to liberation, then one should attain liberation by planting the seeds [of liberation] through one body. Why is it said that it spans three bodies? Therefore one should know that the virtues of the first three expedient means belong to the expedient means conducive to penetration. For example, the intermediate [body] is the means of the limb of consciousness; therefore it belongs to consciousness. It is the same here. Some explain that generosity, precepts, learning, and the two expedient means are all the essence of the wholesome roots conducive to liberation. Yet the virtues conducive to liberation have three divisions. The middling and low divisions have hearing and reflection as their essence and can be repelled. The first level has the wisdom derived from cultivation as its essence. It is conducive to the level of insight and cannot be repelled. The above-mentioned scriptures and treatises mention only the initial seeds [and] illustrate only the wholesome roots of the middling and lower divisions. As is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, "The virtues conducive to liberation at the lower and middling levels can be repelled. But they can be repelled only by manifest activity and not by karmic impressions."<sup>196</sup>

However, this treatise explains the planting of the seeds conducive to awakening from the perspective of the four right endeavors and the four wish-granting legs; therefore one knows that this level also occurs in common with the wisdom derived from cultivation.

[Question:] If this root of wholesome states is also common to the wisdom derived from cultivation, why does it assume the other two characteristics?

[Answer:] Because when conviction is predominant, it is conducive to



liberation; when wisdom is predominant, it is conducive to discernment. As is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, [829b] phenomena that sustain truth [and] that have the characteristics of pure conviction and liberation are conducive to liberation. Careful examination of the characteristics of forbearance<sup>197</sup> of these factors is conducive to discernment. Accordingly, because conviction is predominant, wisdom is predominant. Let us temporarily cease from this digression and return to explaining the text. The following three quarters [of the verse] specifically illustrate the five spiritual faculties. The predominant will is the characteristic of the faculty of conviction, because when conviction is predominant, there is also the joyous will. The predominant activity is the characteristic of the root of effort, because it is capable of annihilating evil and generating virtues. “**Nondelusion of perceived objects**” [*ālambane'saṃmoṣa*] [verse 7a] is the characteristic of the faculty of mindfulness, because when mindfulness predominates, the practitioner is not deluded. [The expression] “**nondistracted**” [verse 7b] is the characteristic of the faculty of concentration. [The expression] “**and investigation**” [verse 7b] illustrates the characteristic of the faculty of wisdom.

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.458c10–14]: **Here [the verse explains] the successive five kinds of predominance as the cultivation of the four endeavors. The mind has become stabilized according to the teachings. Thus this mind has planted the seeds of the wholesome roots conducive to liberation, (1) because of the predominance of will, (2) because of the predominance of the cultivation of exertion, (3) because of the predominance of the nondelusion of objects, (4) because of the predominance of nondistracted, and (5) because of the predominance of the investigation of the teaching. The five spiritual faculties of conviction, [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom] should be known according to their order.**<sup>198</sup>

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of three parts. First, he explains the meaning of the concept of “faculty.” Next, he explains the first quarter [6c]. Finally, he explains the last three quarters [6d–7ab]. First, he says, “**Here [the verse explains] the successive five kinds of predominance.**” The expression “**predominance**” in the second quarter [6d] is implied in all five places, as “predominance” means faculty. [The phrase] “**As the cultivation [of the four endeavors]**” explains the first quarter [of the verse]. [The phrase] “**as the cultivation of the four endeavors**” serves to bring attention to the right endeavors and to include the foundations of mindfulness at the same time. [The statement] “**The mind has become stabilized according to the teachings**” explains the four wish-granting legs. [The statement] “**Thus this mind has planted the seeds of the wholesome roots conducive to liberation**” refers to the mind of conviction. This illustrates that the three and the four are conducive to liberation. One can understand it through the words of the text. Thus these third and fourth levels are in front of the four wholesome roots. [The statement] “**Because of the predominance of will, [because of the predominance of the cultivation of exertion, because of the predominance of the nondelusion of objects, because of the predominance of nondistracted, and because of the predominance of the investigation of the**

teaching]” specifically explains the five spiritual faculties. The text is sufficiently clear as it is.

### 3.5. The Five Powers

Verse 7cd [T 1599:31.458c15–26]:

Because the afflictions<sup>199</sup> are being diminished by [the five] powers,  
the previous [factor] is the cause of the subsequent one.<sup>200</sup>

Vasubandhu’s commentary: The five factors of conviction, [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom,] as mentioned before, are possessed of special powers. Therefore they are called powers. What does it mean to call them special powers? It is because they are capable of eliminating the adverse delusions. If the five factors [of conviction, effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom] function as antidotes to the lack of conviction, [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom,] afflictions cannot obstruct them. Therefore it is said that [the five] powers and [the five] spiritual faculties have their order. Why are the five factors of conviction, [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom] explained in their order? These five factors successively serve as each other’s cause and fruit. Why so? Someone who has conviction in cause and fruit, wishing to attain this fruit, becomes determined to exert himself. Because of this exertion, he is focused on his objects. When calming mindfulness becomes stabilized, the mind attains to *samādhi*. When the mind has attained concentration, it contemplates and knows objects as they are. Because of this, the five factors are established in their order. If a practitioner has planted the seeds conducive to liberation, it is said that the five faculties are his stage. If a practitioner has planted the wholesome roots conducive to the stage of insight, he is at the level of the five spiritual faculties, which is the proper level.<sup>201</sup>

One quarter [7c] is the second illustration of [the five] powers. This is meant to explain [the five] powers from the perspective of the five factors. When one makes steady progress, one can eliminate delusions. Therefore [verse 7c] states, “Because the afflictions are being diminished [by the five powers].” The next quarter [7d] illustrates the order of the five powers: the previous factor becomes the cause of the next one in succession. Therefore conviction is mentioned first, and wisdom last. Thus the verse says that “the previous factor is the cause of the subsequent one.”

[829c] [Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of two parts. His commentary on the first quarter [7c] also consists of three statements. First, he explains the five spiritual faculties. Next, he explains the words [of the verse]. [The statement] “If the five [factors of conviction, effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom] function as antidotes to the lack of conviction, effort, mindfulness,

**concentration, and wisdom, afflictions cannot obstruct them]**” and so forth reiterates the idea that the five powers are explained after the five spiritual faculties. It means that when the five factors are first established, they still course between good and evil; they are not called powers yet. It is only when [they render] lack of conviction, [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom]—which are afflictions<sup>202</sup> adverse to the teaching—incapable of being obstructions that they are called the five powers. [The statements] **“Therefore it is said that [the five] powers and [the five spiritual] faculties have their order”** [and] **“Why so?”** and so forth are an explanation of the next quarter [7d]. This also consists of three parts. First, a clarifying question is asked, which is followed by an answer in verse. **“Why so?”** and so forth are a specific illustration of their order in answering the question. The words of [Vasubandhu’s commentary] are clear enough.

The above has been an illustration of their functions [*ākāra*]. [The statement] **“If a practitioner [has planted the seeds for the wholesome roots conducive to liberation, it is said that the five faculties are his stage. If a practitioner has planted the wholesome roots conducive to the stage of insight, he is at the level of the five spiritual faculties, which is the proper level]”** belongs to the levels and stages. It is also brought up first. Regarding this, there are two statements. The first discriminates the subsequent stages from the perspective of what comes first. This illustrates the five spiritual faculties after the factors conducive to liberation. The next questions the place from the perspective of what comes after. This question investigates the factors conducive to penetration concerning [the five] spiritual faculties and [the five] powers.

**Verse 8ab** [T 1599:31.458c27–459a1]:

**Two each [of the factors] conducive to penetration  
[Are] the five spiritual faculties and the five powers.**<sup>203</sup>

**Vasubandhu’s commentary: At the stages of heat and summit, the practice of the five spiritual faculties is established. At the stages of forbearance and worldly ultimate, the practice of the five powers is established. If the practitioner has planted the seeds of the wholesome roots conducive to liberation, these two and two stages are decisively conducive to penetration. If he has not, there would be no such powers.**<sup>204</sup>

The two quarters of the verse precisely answer this question. The four stages of heat, [summit, forbearance, and worldly ultimate] belong to the stage of insight. Among them, the first two establish [the five] spiritual faculties; the last two explain [the five] powers. Therefore [verse 8ab] says, **“Two each [of the factors] conducive to penetration are the five faculties and the five powers.”** Here is a brief explanation of the meaning of the four wholesome roots. There are four categories to elucidate it: (1) name, (2) nature, (3) characteristic, and (4) stages. First, the names are explained. The two names of heat and summit are derived from analogies. Regarding the next two, the names are established from the perspective of the factors.

When the practitioner first concentrates his mind, he carefully contemplates the noble truths; it vaguely resembles the true clear investigation. It is a bit like drilling to start a fire: first warm air is produced, which comes into contact with the heat of fire. At the beginning there is some similarity. Thus, based on this analogy, it is called heat stage. This is to exhort the practitioner to cultivate indefatigably. It is like drilling to make a fire; one cannot relax for a moment. As is stated in the *Dazhidu lun* [830a]:

If a practitioner thus contemplates the noble truth with conviction as the path of *nirvāṇa* with his mind abiding in joy, he will be as without influxes. This is called the heat stage. It is like a man drilling for fire: once warm air is produced, he can expect to have a fire. As for the summit stage, it has the meaning of “highest.” When a practitioner cultivates the five spiritual faculties to the highest degree, it is like the head, which is the highest part of a human’s body. Thus, from this analogy, it is called the summit state. To realize the truth by the highest degree of these five powers is called ultimate. Here the five faculties at their highest degree, and through this analogy, are called the summit stage. Although it can be looked at from the perspectives of intimacy and distance, they all illustrate the highest meaning.<sup>205</sup>

As is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*:

Through this summit stage, a practitioner gradually progresses and dwells on top. Besides, “summit” also means abiding within. Why is it that before [the cultivation of] the heat stage, vices increase and merits are thin, and it is difficult to cultivate, like climbing a mountain? After having cultivated forbearance, vices decrease and merits increase, and so cultivation is no longer difficult, as when one descends from a mountain. Between these two, when vices and merits cease, it is as if one has reached the mountaintop; one is there and has not come down. Thus, based on this analogy, it is called the summit state.<sup>206</sup>

As is stated in the *Dazhidu lun*:

The heat stage increases, [and] vices and merits cease: this is called the summit stage. It is as when one has reached the top of a mountain, [and] the paths on both sides are equally clear. Some say both forward and backward paths are clear. These meanings are common. The meaning of truthful forbearance and the ultimate stage are similar to the standard interpretations.<sup>207</sup>

One can investigate this for oneself.

Second, to illustrate their essence: The first two wholesome roots have the five spiritual faculties as their essence. The next two wholesome roots have the five powers as their essence. If they take the most supreme concentration and wisdom as their essence, their accessories are common to other mental factors. As is stated in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya*:

As regards the heat state, each has its own inner realization. They show, regarding the noble truths, their attainment of *samādhi* and *prajñā* and the associated factors, [ . . . ] up to the ultimate state. To say that each has its own inner realization means that, regarding the noble truths, they have attained uninterrupted *samādhi* and *prajñā* and other [830b] associated factors. [ . . . ] From this uninterrupted mind, one generates the initial exceptional path.<sup>208</sup>

Third, the discrimination of characteristics: This serves to discriminate the divisions of characteristics through the analogy of drilling fire. The *Yogācārabhūmi* states:

It is like a man who wishes to drill to ignite a fire, taking advantage of its potentiality. He strives [and] makes a vigorous effort [in] applying the drilling stick on a piece of dried wood being held down. First, a bit of heat comes from the wood. Then the heat increases and heat arises. Then the heat increases and smoke arises. Then a fire blazes up. Immediately after the fire blazes, it burns wildly. After burning wildly, a fire is capable of doing what it is supposed to do. Similar to the initial heat that comes from the piece of dried wood, it is the same with the warm wholesome roots that burn away the afflictions. The pure fire of truth produces the same characteristic. In the same way that the heat increases and heat arises, the summit wholesome roots also arise. In the same way that the subsequent smoke arises, truthful forbearance arises. In the same way that smokeless fire swiftly blazes, the ultimate state is attained. One should know that, as with the fire that constantly blazes wildly, it is the same with the pure exceptional holy states produced by the five powers subsumed in the absolute truth.<sup>209</sup>

Fourth is the articulation of the levels and stages. Since I have already fully explained this in my *Yildo jang* [Essay on the Single Path; not extant], I will not repeat it here. The four wholesome roots are thus briefly explained.

[Vasubandhu's] commentary consists of two parts. First, he explains the words [of the verse]. Next, he gives a detailed analysis. The detailed analysis consists of two statements. The first clarifies according to the [practitioners'] situation, and the second explains reflectively. **“If a practitioner has planted the seeds [for**

**the wholesome roots] conducive to liberation,**” he will attain the stage of discernment in the next four stages. If he has not planted the seeds conducive to liberation, then he has not realized the power of discernment. This is what is meant by illustrating accordingly and explaining reflectively.

### 3.6. The Seven Awakening Limbs

**Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.459a1–10]: Next, the Master discusses the awakening factors. How are these established?**

Verses 8cd, 9ab:

**Basis factor, nature factor; the third: liberation factor;  
The fourth: beneficial factor; the three kinds of affliction-  
annihilating factors.**<sup>210</sup>

**Vasubandhu’s commentary: The awakening factors are established based on the Path of Vision. What does “awakening” mean? The nonconceptual wisdom of thusness is called awakening. What does “factor” mean? The companions of truth that share the same function are called factors. Among these seven factors, the factor that is the basis of awakening is called mindfulness-awakening. The nature factor is called investigation-awakening. The liberation factor is called right endeavor-awakening. The beneficial factor is called joy-awakening. The undefiled and nonobstructing factor consists of three—namely, suppleness, concentration, and equanimity. Why are these three factors said to be the undefiled and nonobstructing factor?**<sup>211</sup>

Next, [Vasubandhu] initiates his explanation by saying: “**Next [the Master] discusses the seven awakening factors.**”<sup>212</sup> The six quarters<sup>213</sup> in the verse are spoken from the perspective of their five connotations. The expression “**basis factor**” [*āśrayāṅga*] signifies the initial factor of mindfulness, [830c] because it is the basis of awakening. The “**nature factor**” [*svabhāvaṅga*] means the awakening factor of investigation, because it is the nature of awakening. The “**liberation factor**” [*niryānāṅga*] is the awakening factor of effort, because it can enhance the wisdom of awakening and it causes one to be free from obstructions. The “**beneficial factor**” [*anuśamsāṅga*] means the awakening factor of joy, because by being awakened to the true characteristic, the practitioner generates joy. The “**three kinds of affliction-annihilating factor**” [*niḥkleśāṅga*] means suppleness, concentration, and equanimity, because they annihilate the obstructions of affliction and assist the attainment of awakening. The next two quarters<sup>214</sup> [of the verse] illustrate the three distinctions.

The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states that mindfulness is the basis limb,<sup>215</sup> because by maintaining mindfulness one does not forget wholesome states. Investigation is the nature limb, because it is the characteristic of awakening. Effort is the liberation limb, because by the momentum of effort one can reach one’s destination. Joy is the beneficial limb, because by the momentum of

joy the body is well regulated. Pliancy, concentration, and equanimity are the undefiled limbs, because by these one is free from defilement. Based on this nondefilement, the essence is not defiled. Following this order, because of pliancy one is free from defilement. Through this, one can remove the faults of debilitating afflictions. Through concentration, one is free from defilement, [and by] relying on concentration, basis transformation [*āśraya-parāvṛtti*] is attained. Equanimity is the nature of nondefilement; it completely annihilates greed and thirst, because its nature is the undefiled stage.<sup>216</sup>

[Vasubandhu's] commentary consists of four parts. First, he explains the stage of awakening. Second, he explains the meaning of the name. Third, he explains the words [of the verse]. Fourth, he raises a question. First, he explains the stage: because on the Path of Vision, the practitioner starts to be awakened to the truth of the path, the awakening factors are established. Second, he first explains the term "awakening" by the statement "**The nonconceptual wisdom of thusness is called awakening.**" From the perspective of the two vehicles [of disciples and self-realized buddhas], it is the wisdom of thusness devoid of the four defects. From the standpoint of the bodhisattva, it is the thoroughly nonconceptual wisdom [*nirvikalpa-jñāna*] of thusness. Next, he explains the meaning of "factor" by the statement: "**The companions of truth that share the same function [831a] are called factors.**"

This is because these factors mutually aid one another on the path of transforming the ordinary into the exceptional. [The statement] "**Among these seven [factors, the factor that is the basis of awakening is called mindfulness-awakening. The nature factor is called investigation-awakening. The liberation factor is called right endeavor-awakening. The beneficial factor is called joy-awakening. The undefiled and nonobstructing factor consists of three—namely, suppleness, concentration, and equanimity]**" explains the words of the verse. [The statement] "**Why [are these three factors said to be the undefiled and nonobstructing factor]**" is to raise the question.

Verse 9cd [T 1599:31.459a11–14]:

**Because of cause, basis, self-nature, thus it has been shown.**<sup>217</sup>

**Vasubandhu's commentary: The cause of nonobstruction and nondefilement is suppleness, because suppleness is the antidote to afflictive obstructions, which are the cause of debilitation. This suppleness, whose basis is meditative concentration, is counteractive to the cause of debilitation. Self-nature is the awakening limb called equanimity.**<sup>218</sup>

The two quarters of the verse [9cd] explain the three divisions. [The phrase] "**Because of cause**" means the cause that annihilates afflictions; this is the awakening factor of suppleness or pliancy, because it is the opposite of the cause that is debilitation. [The phrase] "**[because of] basis**" means that the basis of the annihilation of afflictions is the awakening factor of concentration,<sup>219</sup> because by relying on the principle of concentration, basis transformation is attained. [The



phrase] “[**because of**] **self-nature**” refers to the awakening factor of equanimity, because its nature is the elimination of afflictive obstructions. [The phrase] “**thus it has been shown**” means that by these three factors the meaning of the annihilation of afflictions is accomplished. Therefore it is said that these three factors are the annihilation-of-afflictions factor.

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary successively explains these three meanings. First, he says “[**the**] **afflictive obstructions, which are the cause of debilitation,**” to illustrate the cause of the objects to be counteracted. The seeds of debilitation are called the afflictive obstructions. Therefore it is said that the afflictive obstructions are debilitating. This debilitation becomes the cause of the active afflictions; therefore [Vasubandhu] remarks, “[**The cause of nonobstruction and nondefilement is suppleness, because suppleness is the antidote to the afflictive obstructions, which are**] **the cause of debilitation.**”<sup>220</sup> **This suppleness[, whose basis is meditative concentration,] is counteractive to the cause of debilitation.**” “Suppleness” means pliancy, which counters debilitation. Therefore it can be the cause of the annihilation of afflictions. The remainder of the text is self-explanatory.

### 3.7. The Eight Limbs of the Noble Path

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.459a14–20]: Next, the Master discusses the eight factors of the Noble Path. How are they established?

Verse 10:

**Determination, causing others to attain, causing others to  
have conviction—there are three kinds;  
The antidotes to adverse states: the path consisting of eight  
factors.**<sup>221</sup>

Vasubandhu’s commentary: On the Path of Cultivation the factors of the path are clearly established. The decisive factor conducive to seeing the path is right view. This view is the worldly right view [or wisdom]<sup>222</sup> attained subsequent to the exceptional one.<sup>223</sup> Through this wisdom one determines and discriminates one’s attainment of the path and its fruits. The factors that cause others to attain [the noble truths] are right conception and right speech, because by uttering words and language, one can cause others to know and to attain [the noble truths]. The factor that causes others to have conviction is threefold: right speech, right action, and right livelihood. These three factors [follow] this order.<sup>224</sup>

[Vasubandhu] says that in what follows [the Master] explains the eight limbs of the Noble Path.<sup>225</sup> They will be brought up first. The verse consists of two parts. The first half establishes the eight ideas from the perspective of the four meanings. The second half clarifies the six divisions from the perspective of the last two meanings. The term “**determination**” [*pariccheda*] in the first quarter



[10a] means right view. It means that the subsequently gained wisdom [*pr̥ṣṭha-labdha-jñāna*] thoroughly understands the obtained decisive factor. It also clearly discriminates what [the practitioner] realized earlier. [The expression] “**causing others to attain**” [verse 10a] signifies right conception and right speech. Conception is mental action; speech is verbal action. Through these two kinds of right action, one causes others to attain the right path. [831b] [The statement] “**causing others to have conviction—[there are] three kinds**” [verse 10b] also means right speech together with right action and right livelihood. “Right action” means physical action.<sup>226</sup> Physical and verbal actions are generally of two kinds. If they are not performed out of hatred and delusion, they are recognized to be right speech and right action. If they arise from the wholesome roots of nongreed, they are specifically called right livelihood. The opposite of this is evil livelihood.

The *Dazhidu lun* states:

Through pure wisdom, rejecting and eliminating the five kinds of evil livelihood is called right livelihood.

[Question:] What are the five kinds of evil livelihood? [Answer: They are the following:]

(1) For the sake of gaining support, the practitioner falsely displays various kinds of marvels. (2) For the sake of gaining support, he flaunts his excellent qualities. (3) For the sake of gaining support, he practices fortune-telling. (4) For the sake of gaining support, he raises his voice and shows his power to incite fear and respect in people. (5) For the sake of gaining support, he speaks of gifts already obtained to move other people’s hearts [to give more gifts]. To live by evil means is called evil livelihood.<sup>227</sup>

The antidotes to the adverse states are right endeavor, right mindfulness, and right concentration, because these three counteract the three obstructions. The eight factors of the Noble Path are established through these four meanings; therefore [verse 10d] says “**the path consisting of eight factors.**” Among these eight, right speech has two functions; therefore it is thus explained there. The rest are not like this, so they are explained individually.

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of two parts. First, he clarifies the stages. [The statement] “On the Path of Cultivation the factors of the path are clearly established” means that on the Path of Cultivation the practitioner attains the subsequently gained wisdom, which is the worldly right view; this is the meaning of “determination factor.” In his commentary on the words of the verse, [Vasubandhu] explains the first three meanings. First, his explanation consists of four statements. First, he states, “**The decisive factor conducive to seeing the path is right view.**” This explains the content of the verse. The subsequently

gained right view, based on its own seeing, determines and discriminates, and knows its divisions. Therefore he says **“the decisive factor conducive to seeing the path.”** The second statement, **“This view is the worldly right view,”** illustrates its nature. The third statement, **“which is the worldly right view attained subsequent to the exceptional one,”** discriminates the cause. [831c]

**“Through this [wisdom]”** and so forth is the fourth statement that explains the determination factor. [The phrase] **“one determines and discriminates one’s attainment of the path”** explains the path seen and known. [The phrase] **“and its fruits”** means the nonconditioned state attained through the elimination of cognitive obstructions. The practitioner discriminates and thoroughly understands the decisive factor, relying on the fruits attained; therefore right view is called determination. [The statement] **“[the factors that cause others to attain]”** and so forth explains the meaning of **“causing to reach.”** [The statement] **“one can cause others to know and to attain [the noble truths]”** means to generate right speech from internal right conception. Therefore the practitioner can cause others to recognize the path and also can cause them to practice accordingly and attain the path. Therefore these two are said to “cause others to attain.” [The statement] **“[The factor] that causes others to have conviction [is threefold: right speech, right action, and right livelihood]”** explains the third meaning. To enumerate numbers and to show the names, the following verse is introduced.

**Verse 11ab** [T 1599:31.459a21–28]:

**Seeing precepts, and moderation; know that [these factors]  
produce conviction in others.<sup>228</sup>**

Vasubandhu’s commentary: The [Noble Path] factors that produce conviction in others are of three kinds: [To produce conviction in others by right speech means that,] through right speech, one discusses and discerns meanings with others; thus one produces conviction in others. [He is already possessed of profound wisdom.] To produce conviction in others by right actions means that, through keeping precepts, one does not do what is not in accord with truth. [He is already possessed of pure precepts.] To produce conviction in others by right livelihood means that, through disregarding possessions and being moderate, he behaves according to principle and quantity and sees the four necessities such as clothes only as means to sustain life. Therefore he produces conviction in others by disregarding possessions and being moderate. [He is already possessed of profound liberation.]<sup>229</sup> The [Noble Path] factors that serve as antidotes to afflictions are also of three kinds—namely, right endeavor, right mindfulness, and right concentration. These three factors function accordingly.<sup>230</sup>

The two quarters of the verse [11ab] explain the three different views. Right speech<sup>231</sup> reveals the internal right view; therefore right view derives its name from what one expresses. And right action is also known as right livelihood.

Because of these three qualities, one produces conviction in others. Therefore [verse 11b] says, “**Know that [these factors] produce conviction in others.**” According to the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, right speech, right action, and right livelihood are the factors that produce conviction in others. They successively cause others to realize the teaching, to generate decisive conviction, and to see the purity of right livelihood. Why so? Through right speech, by means of one’s realization, the practitioner can answer questions, discuss, and investigate [the teaching]. From this others know that he possesses pure views. Through right actions, the practitioner is equipped with right deportment in all his movements. From this others know that he possesses pure precepts. Through right livelihood, he lives according to the truth and prepares his bowl, robe, and other utensils according to the Buddha’s teachings. From this others know that he has pure livelihood.<sup>232</sup>

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of two parts. First, he states, “**The [Noble Path] factors that produce conviction in others are of three kinds.**” This is an explanation of the second quarter [11b]. [The phrase] “**through right [speech]**” and so on explains the first three items [verse 11a]. The first statement includes the word “**wisdom,**” [832a] which is intended precisely to explain the implication of the verse. [The statement] “**by right actions**” and so on explains the meaning of precepts. [The statement] “**by right livelihood**” and so on explains moderation.

Among the three statements, the first, “**[he produces conviction in] others by disregarding possessions and being moderate,**” conveys the general idea that disregard for possessions means one does not treasure unrighteous possessions. “Moderation” means that, regarding rightful things, one does not indulge too much. The second sentence explains further the above items. [The statement] “**he behaves according to principle and sees the four necessities such as clothes**” and so forth is an explanation of disregard for possessions. [The statement] “**[he behaves] according to quantity and sees the four necessities such as clothes**” and so on is an explanation of moderation. “Four” and “two” denote the conditions of life—namely, clothes, food and drink, cushion, and medications. [The statement] “**Therefore he produces [conviction in others by disregarding possessions and being moderate]**” is the third concluding statement. [The statement] “**[The Noble Path factors that serve as antidotes to] afflictions [are also of three kinds—namely, right endeavor, right mindfulness, and right concentration]**” illustrates the fourth item. Its numbers and names are enumerated to adumbrate the following verse.

### 3.7.1. THE ANTIDOTES AND THE THREE OBSTRUCTIONS

Verse 11cd [T 1599:31.459b1–10]:

**The great afflictions and the small afflictions; obstructions to  
mastery, and their antidotes.**<sup>233</sup>

Vasubandhu's commentary: There are three kinds of adverse afflictions: (1) Afflictions that are to be eliminated through the Path of Cultivation; these are called great afflictions. (2) Afflictions that cause mental lethargy and agitation; these are called small afflictions. (3) Obstructions to mastery are those that can obstruct the manifestation of excellent merits. The antidote to the first kind of afflictions is right endeavor. Why so? Because through right endeavor, one cultivates the path and attains it. When the path is attained, afflictive thoughts are annihilated. The antidote to the second kind of afflictions is right mindfulness. The practitioner dwells in a quiet place, because when he dwells in a quiet place with right mindfulness, lethargy and agitation are annihilated. The antidote to the third kind of afflictions is right concentration. Relying on meditative concentration,<sup>234</sup> one can manifest the qualities of the six supernormal powers.<sup>235</sup>

Verse 11cd clarifies the three divisions. [The expression] “**great afflictions**” signifies the primary afflictions [*kleśa*], whose antidote is right endeavor. [The expression] “**small afflictions**” means derivative afflictions [*upakleśa*], whose antidote is right mindfulness. [The expression] “**obstructions to mastery**” [*vaibhūtvā-vipakṣa*] means obstructions to the six supernormal powers; right concentration is the antidote to these obstructions. The word “**antidotes**” [*pratipakṣa*] mentioned at the end [of verse 11cd] are antidotes to the above three obstructions. To illustrate the three antidotes jointly, the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states that right effort is the [Noble Path] factor that removes afflictive obstructions, because by means of right effort the bondages are completely eliminated. Right mindfulness is the [Noble Path] factor that removes the derivative afflictive obstructions, because by means of mindfulness the practitioner does not forget the true characteristics of tranquility [*śamatha*] and energetic activity [*pragraha*], and he absolutely does not tolerate derivative afflictive obstructions such as lethargy and agitation. Right concentration is the [Noble Path] factor that removes the obstructions to the most special qualities, because it leads to the production of immeasurable, most special qualities such as supernormal powers.

[Vasubandhu's] commentary consists of two parts. By [the statement] “[**The antidote to the** first [kind of afflictions is right endeavor]” he explains the antidotes from the perspective of the obstructions. First, he states, “**There are three kinds of adverse afflictions,**” to show that these three are the afflictions obstructing [special qualities] such as the six supernormal powers. The *Vibhāṣā-śāstra* records the teachings of three masters. One teaches nescience, another teaches unattainability, and yet another teaches [832b] the failure to attain mastery in concentration. All three of these teachings make sense. Now, this treatise explains the first meaning only—namely, nescience, which is also called affliction. The afflictions that are removed in the Path of Cultivation are called great afflictions. The afflictions that are removed in the Path of Vision are also called great afflictions. Here [Vasubandhu] in explaining adverse states countered by the [Noble Path] factors mentions only the [afflictions] to be removed on the Path of Cultivation, such as greed, hatred, and so forth. Phrases such as “[**the antidote**

to] the second [kind of afflictions is right mindfulness]” and “[the antidote to] the third [kind of afflictions is right concentration]” and so forth are self-explanatory. “[The antidote to] the first kind of afflictions [is right endeavor]” is the second statement in which [Vasubandhu] illustrates the antidotes from the perspective of the obstructions. He then successively discusses all three. You can see the text [of his commentary] for yourself.

### 3.7.2. THE THREE KINDS OF ANTIDOTE

**Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.459b9–10]: One should know that, briefly, this cultivation of these antidotes consists of three kinds.**

Verse 12:

**With defect followed by nondefect;  
Without defect but susceptible to defect.  
Without defect and not susceptible to defect:  
three kinds of cultivation of the antidotes.**<sup>236</sup>

**Vasubandhu’s commentary:** There are three kinds of cultivation of the antidotes. What are these three? First, with defect followed by nondefect. Second, without defect but susceptible to defect. Third, without defect and not susceptible to defect. These three correspond respectively to the level of ordinary sentient beings, the level of saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*], and the level of saints beyond training [*aśaikṣa*].<sup>237</sup>

Within this section there are two paragraphs specifically explaining the antidotes that were elaborated above. [The statement] “[**One should know that, briefly,**] this [cultivation of these antidotes consists of three kinds]” is the second part that generally discusses the antidotes. This consists of two parts. The first verse discriminates in terms of levels; the next two quarters discriminate in terms of people.

First, [the statement] “[**this cultivation [of these antidotes consists of three kinds]**]” introduces the following verse. The verse consists of two parts. The first three quarters [12abc] specifically distinguish the three levels. The last quarter [12d] sums up by enumeration. First, the verse [12a] says “[**with defect followed by nondefect,**]” referring to the level of worldly sentient beings. From the standpoint of the two vehicles [of disciples and self-realized buddhas], the connection extends from the meditation of mental cessation to the ultimate level. From the standpoint of the bodhisattva[’s vehicle], it is from the ten convictions up to the ten dedications,<sup>238</sup> conforming to the Path of Vision; therefore [Vasubandhu says] “[**followed by nondefect**]” [*aviparyāsānukūlā*]. Since one is not yet free from cognitive afflictions, therefore it is called defect [*viparyastā*]. “[**Without defect but susceptible to defect**]” [verse 12b] signifies the level of the saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*]. From the standpoint of the two vehicles, the forbearance of suffering is accomplished up to the adamant concentration.

From the standpoint of the bodhisattva[’s vehicle], from the first ground up to perfect enlightenment the seeds of affliction are not yet annihilated; thus it is called “susceptible to defect” [*viparyāsānubandhā*]; since they attain nonconceptual wisdom [*nirvikalpa-jñāna*], it is called “without defect” [*aviparyāsa*]. “**Without defect and not susceptible to defect**” [verse 12c] refers to arhatship and Tathāgata ground. Because [at these levels] the cognitive afflictions [*jñeya-āvaraṇa*] are annihilated, it is called “**not susceptible to defect**” [*viparyāsa-niranubandhā*]. Because [at these levels] the affective afflictions [*kleśa-āvaraṇa*] are completely annihilated, it is called “**not susceptible to defect.**” The next quarter [12d] sums up. The words are self-explanatory.

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of two parts. First, he explains the last quarter [12d]. [The statement] “**What [are these three?]**” [832c] explains the first three quarters [12abc]. [The statement] “**These three correspond respectively to the level of ordinary sentient beings, the level of saints in higher training, and the level of saints beyond training]**” explains the three levels. This can be understood according to the words [of the commentary].

### 3.7.3. DISTINCTIONS [BETWEEN THE VEHICLES]

**Vasubandhu’s commentary** [T 1599:31.459b16–26]: **There is difference in the bodhisattva’s cultivation of the antidotes. What is the difference?**

Verse 13ab:

**There is a distinction as regards objects, attention, and attainment.**<sup>239</sup>

**Vasubandhu’s commentary:** The disciples and the self-realized buddhas have as objects the mindfulness of their own mental streams, bodies, and so forth. The bodhisattvas have as their objects the mindfulness of mental streams, bodies, and so forth of [both] self and other. The disciples and the self-realized buddhas, through the characteristics of impermanence and so forth, contemplate phenomena such as the body. The bodhisattvas contemplate and investigate according to the principle of nonapprehension.<sup>240</sup> The disciples and the self-realized buddhas cultivate qualities such as the four foundations of mindfulness with a view to annihilate phenomena such as the body. The bodhisattvas cultivate these phenomena neither with a view to annihilating—nor with a view not to annihilate—the body but with a view to attaining *nirvāṇa* without abode. The cultivation of the antidotes has been explained. What are the states of cultivation?<sup>241</sup>

[The statement] “[**There is difference in**] the bodhisattvas’ [**cultivation of the antidotes**]” is intended to distinguish with regard to persons. It also aims to introduce the two quarters in the verse that explain the three divisions. [The term] “**objects**” means perceived objects [*ālambana*]. [The term] “**attention**” [*manaskāra*] means the object of cultivation. [The term] “**attainment**” [*prāpti*]

means the fruit attained. Among the [cultivations of] the three [disciples—namely, bodhisattvas, disciples, and self-realized buddhas—]there are some minor differences. That is why the verse says “**there is a distinction**” [*tad-viśiṣṭatā*].

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of three parts. First he states, “[**The disciples and the self-realized buddhas**] **have as objects the mindfulness of their own mental streams, bodies, and so forth.**” The realists of the two vehicles also eliminate internal body and internal and external body. But they can perceive only their own world and are not capable of perceiving all other worlds. To show their narrowness, [Vasubandhu] says “**their own [mental streams,] bodies,**” and so forth. Next, he remarks that “**the bodhisattvas contemplate and investigate according to the principle of nonapprehension**” [*anupalambha*], because by not grasping the characteristics of birth and extinction they attain the principle. Therefore it is said that “they attain the truth.”<sup>242</sup> He then says “**with a view to annihilate phenomena such as the body,**” meaning annihilating the body to attain quiescence. This shows that the adherents of the two vehicles [of disciples and self-realized buddhas], for their own benefit, dwell in quiescence. They consider this the highest attainment. The bodhisattvas do not cultivate for the purpose of attaining annihilation. They differ from the two vehicles in that they constantly remain in cyclic existence to liberate all sentient beings. Nor do the bodhisattvas not cultivate for the purpose of attaining extinction, because, unlike worldly sentient beings, in their minds the bodhisattvas are free from obstructions. Yet, in order to attain the *nirvāṇa* without abode [*apratiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*], the bodhisattvas separate themselves from the attachments of the worldly sentient beings—they do not linger in transmigration. The bodhisattvas are also different from the adherents of the two vehicles [of disciples and self-realized buddhas] in that they do not linger in quiescence. That is why [the bodhisattvas’ attainment] is called *nirvāṇa* without abode. [The statement] “**The cultivation [of the antidotes has been explained]**” is provided to conclude the above and to introduce what follows.

## B. THE STAGES OF CULTIVATION

Cultivation is, as explained above, the stages of practice in the chapter on the path. These stages are established by practice and are the levels where practitioners abide [for a time]. Therefore they are called stages. [833a] In this section [the Master] precisely shows how the stages are established, based on the levels of cultivation. That is why it is called the section on the stages of cultivation.

In this section there are three and a half verses. They consist of two parts. The first three verses specifically explain the characteristics of the stages. The last two quarters sum up from the perspective of persons. The first part is also two-fold. Two verses and one quarter establish four divisions of stages based on cultivation. The next three quarters illustrate three different stages from the perspective of the Realm of Reality [*dharmadhātu*].



## I. Four Stages and Eighteen Levels

Verses 13cd, 14, and 15a [T 1599:31.459b28–c17]:

There are four stages of cultivation: cause, entry, applied practice, and attainment.

Attention and nonattention; nonsupreme and supreme.

The stages of conviction, entering, going forth and receiving prophecy,

Instructing, initiation, attainment, merits,

Task-accomplishing, have been explained.<sup>243</sup>

Vasubandhu's commentary: There are eighteen levels in the stages of cultivation. What are these eighteen? (1) The level of cause [*hetvavasthā*]: This signifies people who already abide in their lineages. (2) The level of entry [*avatārāvasthā*]: This includes people who have generated the mind of awakening.<sup>244</sup> (3) The level of applied practice [*prayogāvasthā*]: This includes people who have generated the mind of awakening but have not attained fruition. (4) The level of fruition [*phalāvasthā*]: This signifies the attainment of fruition. (5) The level of effort [*sakaraṇīyāvasthā*]: This is [the level of the disciples] in higher training. (6) The level of effortlessness [*akaraṇīyāvasthā*]: This is [the level of] the saints beyond training [*aśaikṣa*]. (7) The level of special qualities [*viśeṣāvasthā*]: This includes those who have attained the six superknowledges according to their wish. (8) The nonsupreme level [*uttarāvasthā*]: This denotes the practitioners who have surpassed the levels of the disciples and other disciples who have not yet entered the first bodhisattva ground. (9) The supreme level [*anuttarāvasthā*]: This is the level of buddha-*tathāgatas*; there is no other level beyond this one. (10) The level of conviction [*adhimuktyāvasthā*]: This signifies the level of the practice of all resolute convictions [of the bodhisattvas]. (11) The level of entering [*praveśāvasthā*]: This is the first of the bodhisattva grounds. (12) The level of going forth [*niryāṇāvasthā*]: This includes the six stages after the first [of the bodhisattva grounds]. (13) The level of receiving prophecy [*vyākaraṇāvasthā*]: This is the eighth [bodhisattva] ground. (14) The level of the instructor [*kathikatvāvasthā*]: This is the ninth [bodhisattva] ground. (15) The level of initiation [*abhiṣekāvasthā*]: This is the tenth [bodhisattva] ground. (16) The level of attainment [*prāptyāvasthā*]: This is the truth-body of buddhas. (17) The level of merits [*anuśāmsāvasthā*]:<sup>245</sup> This is the beatitude body of buddhas. (18) The level of accomplishing tasks [*krtyānuṣṭhānāvasthā*]: This is the emanation body of buddhas. One should know that the stages are countless. Here I am giving only a brief account of them.<sup>246</sup>

The first part is threefold. The first quarter [13c] enumerates the sections to establish a general outline. The next seven quarters [13d–14 and three words



clearly distinguish the four levels. The last two words (已說) [“**have been explained**”] are the conclusion. [The verse 13c] first shows the general framework, saying that “**there are four stages of cultivation,**” which include what is referred to afterward [in Vasubandhu’s commentary] as the eighteen levels. The intention [of the Master] is to establish four categories. Therefore [he] says “**there are four.**” What are these four? (1) The first seven kinds establish the shared stages, because they are common to all three vehicles. (2) The next two kinds establish the distinct stages, because they are distinct at two points. (3) The next six kinds establish the successive stages, because these successively consist of six. (4) The last three kinds establish the simultaneous stages, because these are threefold. To show that the cultivation of the [thirty-seven] constituents of awakening<sup>247</sup> consists of shared and distinct stages, the former two are established. To show that the cause, practice, fruition, and merits are both gradual and sudden,<sup>248</sup> the next two are established. This is what is meant by the [Master’s] intention to establish four stages. The verses consist of four parts. The first two quarters establish the shared stages. The next quarter establishes the distinct stages. The next three quarters articulate the successive stages. The remaining quarter posits the simultaneous stages.

### 1.1. The Seven Levels of Cause in the Shared Stages

First, the shared stages include the seven stages of cause. (1) [The term] “**cause**” [*hetu*] signifies the first level of cultivation, called cause, which includes the lineage [*gotra*] of the three vehicles, from the beginning up to the generation of the mind of awakening. In the middle there is only cause—the fruition of practice is not attained yet—[and] that is why it is called the level of cause. (2) [The term] “**entry**” [*avatāra*] signifies the second level of cultivation, called entering, which includes the adherents of the three vehicles who, depending on their lineages, have already entered the initial stage of the generation the mind [of awakening]. (3) [The expression] “**applied practice**” [*prayoga*] signifies the third level of cultivation, called applied practice, [833b] which includes the adherents of the three vehicles who from the generation of the mind [of awakening] up to the ultimate level, according to their expedients, engage in applied practices. (4) [The term] “**attainment**” [*prāpti*] signifies the fourth level of cultivation, called fruition, which includes the adherents of the three vehicles who only start to attain exceptional fruition after entering the Path of Vision. (5) [The expression] “**with effort**” [*sakaraṇīya*] signifies the fifth level of cultivation, called effort, where the adherents of the three vehicles at the Path of Cultivation, having not attained their desired goal, still generate contrived efforts. (6) [The expression] “**without effort**” [*akaraṇīya*] signifies the sixth level of cultivation, called effortless, where the adherents of the three vehicles, having arrived at the stage beyond training, have already attained their goal and thus cease to generate contrived efforts. (7) [The term] “**attention**” [*manaskāra*] signifies the seventh level of cultivation, called the special qualities, where the practitioner attains sovereignty within the

six transmigrations. This level is common to the [disciples] in higher training and [those] beyond training.

### I.2. The Distinct Stages

The second paragraph briefly establishes two levels. [The expression] “**nonsupreme**” [*uttara*] means that a bodhisattva before entering the [bodhisattva] grounds relies on distinct practices, having coursed all the levels and stages of the two vehicles [of disciples and self-realized buddhas], there are no more benefits [within these two vehicles] for him to strive for. This shows that such a bodhisattva still has a higher practice [to strive for]; therefore [his level] is called nonsupreme. But this higher practice is not yet the ultimate, [for] there is still a higher state to be cultivated; therefore it is called nonsupreme. Based on these two meanings, the nonsupreme level is established. Why is it that only the level before [a bodhisattva enters the bodhisattva’s grounds] is established? This is to show that a bodhisattva, even when he is at the worldly level, already surpasses the holy fruitions of the other two vehicles. [The term] “**supreme**” [*anuttara*] signifies the stage of Tathāgatahood. Although the bodhisattvas surpass [the adherents of] the two vehicles [of disciples and self-realized buddhas], they have not attained the ultimate goal; there is something higher to be cultivated. Therefore the stage of Tathāgatahood is established as the supreme level. It is supreme because it is ultimate and perfect. Also, because this Buddhahood is the most supreme level and can completely annihilate the latent tendencies of self-pride, there is no level superior to it. Therefore it is called the supreme level. As is stated in the scripture, since there is nothing superior to it, it is called supreme. Based on these two meanings it is called the supreme level. The nonsupreme level is established to differentiate [the bodhisattvas] from [the adherents of] the other two vehicles. The supreme level is established to distinguish the stage of bodhisattvas. Based on these two meanings, the distinct stage is established.

### I.3. The Successive Levels

[833c] The third paragraph establishes the six levels, such as the level of conviction. This means that, at the level of forty minds<sup>249</sup> prior to entering the bodhisattva’s grounds, the practitioner, generating conviction to realize the one path, diligently cultivates various practices. [The expression] “**the level of entry**” [*avatārāvasthā*] includes the bodhisattvas of the first ground who have entered the Path of Vision and have become part of the Buddha’s community. [The phrase] “**the level of going forth**” [*niryāṇāvasthā*] means that during the next six grounds the [bodhisattva] gradually increases his cultivation of the path; he becomes free from the obstructions. [The expression] “**the level of receiving prophecy**” [*vyākaraṇāvasthā*] denotes the eighth [bodhisattva] ground from which [the bodhisattva] definitely does not retrogress, because he has received prophecy from the Buddha. “**The level of the instructor**” [*kathikatvāvasthā*] is

the ninth [bodhisattva] ground, where the bodhisattva realizes eloquence and can well expound the teaching. “**The level of initiation**” [*abhiṣekāvasthā*] is the tenth [bodhisattva] ground, where the bodhisattva completes his practices and is initiated into the level of Buddhahood. The bodhisattva receives Buddhahood by accepting with his head the luminescence generated from buddhas of the ten directions. It is similar to the enthronement of a king, in which waters taken from the four oceans are poured on his head.<sup>250</sup> These six levels show the order of the levels.

#### I.4. The Simultaneous Levels

The fourth paragraph posits three levels. [The expression] “**the level of attainment**” [*prāptyāvasthā*] denotes the truth-body [*dharmakāya*] of the stage of fruition, because the practitioner reaches his final destination after undertaking the journey. “**The level of merits**” [*anuśamsāvasthā*] is the beatitude body [*saṃbhoga-kāya*], because the practitioner enjoys countless merits based on countless exploits. “**The level of accomplishing tasks**” [*krtyānuṣṭhānāvasthā*] is the emanation body [*nirmāṇa-kāya*], because this body pervades all the worlds in the ten directions and transforms into eight forms. These three levels show the different varieties of fruition, yet they do not follow successive order. [The phrase] “**have been explained**” is the third part of concluding remark.

### 2. Level of the Realm of Reality

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of three parts. First is an enumeration of the sections of the outline. Next, he continues with a specific articulation, wherein he successively explains the eighteen levels. The seventh, “**the level of special qualities**” [*viśeṣāvasthā*], is an explanation of the word “**attention**” in verse [14a], because, based on special qualities, the practitioner attains [the four] wish-granting legs. [The commentary on] the eighth level mentions “[**the practitioners who] have surpassed the levels of the disciples**” and so forth. This is an explanation of the meaning of the expression “**nonsupreme**,” because there is a higher level. [The statement] “**have not yet entered the first bodhisattva ground**,” because there are higher levels to be reached, constitutes an explanation of the term “**nonsupreme**.” [834a] The explanation of the term “**supreme**” is from the perspective of only one meaning. The rest of the commentary can be understood from the explanations given earlier. [The statement] “[**One should know that] all [the stages are countless. Here I am giving only a brief account of them]**”<sup>251</sup> is the third general conclusion, clarifying the words “**have been explained**” in the verse.

Verse 15bcd [T 1599:31.459c18–22]:

**The Realm of Reality is threefold: impure, impure and pure,  
[and] utterly pure successively.**<sup>252</sup>

**Vasubandhu's commentary:** Briefly speaking, this level is threefold: (1) **The impure level:** This is from the level of cause up to the level of applied practices. (2) **The impure and pure level:** This is the level of the saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*]. (3) **The utterly pure level:** This is the level of the saints beyond training [*aśaikṣa*].<sup>253</sup>

What follows is the second part illustrating the level of the Realm of Reality [*dharmadhātu*]. The first quarter [15b] is a general outline; the next provides a detailed explanation. Thusness, or the Realm of Reality, is undefiled in nature yet, because of adventitious afflictions [*āgantuka-kleśa*], manifests three levels [of relative purity].<sup>254</sup> Therefore verse [15b] says, “**The Realm of Reality is threefold.**” [The term] “**impure**” means that the seeds of affliction have not been eliminated at the level of worldly sentient beings. [The expression] “**impure and pure**” signifies the level of [the disciples] in higher training,<sup>255</sup> where the affective afflictions have not been annihilated. But because the cognitive afflictions have been annihilated, it is said to be pure. At the level of [the disciples] beyond training, both cognitive and affective afflictions have been completely annihilated. [The term] “**successively**” indicates the general conclusion.

[Vasubandhu's] commentary consists of two parts. First, he explains the first quarter [15b]. “**Impure**” and so forth explains the next two quarters [15cd]. The first four levels [are explained] from the perspective of the first shared level. The explanation of the three divisions is intended to illustrate the Realm of Reality. Because it is common to the three vehicles, he does not explain it from the perspective of other teachings.

**Verse 16ab** [T 1599:31.459c23–26]:

**Here persons are established; one should know that it conforms to reason.**<sup>256</sup>

**Vasubandhu's commentary:** One should know that the distinctions of this level conform to reason. The ordinary sentient beings and the disciples are distinctively established. This person dwells in his lineage, or this person has entered the levels. Thus the stages of cultivation have been explained. What is the meaning of attaining fruition?<sup>257</sup>

In this section there are two paragraphs that come first that specifically explain the characteristics of the levels. The first quarter of the verse [16a]—namely, “**here [persons are established]**” summarizes the perspective of persons. [The phrase] “**here persons are established**” establishes the divisions of persons based on the divisions of levels. [The statement] “**one should know that it conforms to reason**” is an exhortation to establish persons conforming to reason. [Vasubandhu's] commentary consists of two parts. First he gives a general explanation. [The phrase] “**here [persons are established]**” specifically explains the characteristics of levels. [The phrase] “**dwells in his lineage**” explains the first person based on the first level. [The statement] “**this person has entered the levels**” establishes persons by illustrating the second level. [The statement]

“Thus [the stages of cultivation have been explained]” successively shows the last levels for the remaining persons. [The statement] “[Thus] the stages of cultivation<sup>258</sup> have been explained. What is the meaning of attaining fruition?” concludes the above and introduces what follows.

### C. ON THE ATTAINMENT OF FRUITS

This chapter is called “[On] the Attainment of Fruits” because, based on the previous stages of cultivation, the attainment of fruit becomes manifest. [834b] This chapter consists of two and a half verses [16cd–18] and is divided into two paragraphs. The first two verses and one quarter [16cd–18c] specifically explain the characteristics of fruits. The last quarter [18d] gives a general conclusion. The first paragraph also consists of two parts. The first verse [16cd–17ab] illustrates that the five fruits are not the same from the perspective of cause. The next one verse and one quarter [17–18a] illustrates the ten divisions of fruit from the perspective of stage. Here its meaning is briefly explained first; the meaning of the five fruits is discriminated by the three quarters. First, the author enumerates their names; next, he illustrates their nature.

Verse 16cd, 17ab [T 1599:31.459c28–560a6]:

**Receptacle fruit and resultant fruit; these are predominant fruits.**

**Delighting and growing, pure—these, successively, are fruits.**<sup>259</sup>

Vasubandhu’s commentary: Receptacle fruit [*bhājanatva-phala*] refers to the correspondence between fruits and the wholesome roots. The receptacle fruit is predominant because it is the highest degree of the wholesome roots. The delighting fruit [*ruci-phala*] means that because one constantly cultivated in previous existences, in this life one loves and delights in virtues. Growth fruit [*vyddhi-phala*] means that in the present life one constantly cultivates the wholesome roots until they become perfect. Pure fruit [*viśuddhi-phala*] means the annihilation of obstructions. One should know that this level of fruits consists of five successive kinds: (1) resultant fruit<sup>260</sup> [*vipāka-phala*], (2) predominant fruit [*adhipati-phala*], (3) causally conforming fruits [*niṣyanda-phala*], (4) human effort–caused fruit [*puruṣakāra-phala*], and (5) dissociation fruit [*viśaṃyoga-phala*].<sup>261</sup>

### I. The Characteristics of the Five Fruits

The third part discriminates according to the cause—namely, it enumerates the names. According to the *Yogācārabhūmi*, these are (1) fully ripened fruit, (2) causally concordant fruit, (3) cessational fruit, (4) human effort–caused fruit, and (5) predominant fruit. This is to explain from the perspective of both

defilement and purification. Now, according to this treatise, (1) the resultant fruit is identical with the fully ripened fruit [in the *Yogācārabhūmi*]; (2) in terms of naming, the predominant fruit here is not different from that [in the *Yogācārabhūmi*]; (3) the causally conforming fruit is equivalent to the causally concordant fruit [in the *Yogācārabhūmi*]; (4) the human effort–caused fruit is equivalent to the human effort–caused fruit [in the *Yogācārabhūmi*];<sup>262</sup> and (5) the liberation fruit is equivalent to the cessational fruit [in the *Yogācārabhūmi*]. This is a specific explanation, wherein only virtuous fruits are mentioned. They are explained in succession in terms of their arising from virtues. Why so? Because through the fully ripened fruits produced by wholesome deeds in previous existences, one becomes ready<sup>263</sup> for wholesome states. Thus it is said initially that, based on the predominant power of these fully ripened fruits, one generates the wholesome roots. After the arising of predominant fruit, because of the cultivation of delighting in excellent good in one’s previous lives, one attains causally concordant fruit. Because of the present devotion to making effort, one’s wholesome roots become perfect; this is human effort–caused fruit. Because, by perfecting one’s cultivation, one can be free from obstructions, therefore the fifth is established as the dissociation fruit.

## 2. The Essence of the Fruits

Second, to illustrate the essence of fruits, it is stated in the “Chapter on the Power of the Lineages” in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* that, because of unwholesome deeds, one suffers fully ripened fruit in bad transmigrations. Because one performs wholesome yet impure deeds, one enjoys fully ripened fruits in good transmigrations. This is called fully ripened fruits. Because one is accustomed to evil, one likes to dwell in unwholesome states. When unwholesome states increase, one should cultivate wholesome states, so that one will enjoy dwelling in wholesome states. When wholesome [834c] states increase, subsequent fruits arise commensurate to one’s previous deeds. This is called causally concordant fruit.

The eight limbs of the Noble Path annihilate afflictions, and thus they are called cessational fruit. Other sentient beings rely on the worldly path to annihilate afflictions, but because this is not ultimate, there is no cessational fruit. There is one kind of sentient beings who are concerned with the conventional truth [and] who rely on a certain type of skill to generate human accomplishments such as agriculture, commerce, learning, mathematics, divination, and so forth. Due to this, they achieve the fruits of harvest, profits, and so forth. This is called the fruit of human effort. As visual and other consciousnesses are the predominant fruits of the eye and other faculties, likewise sentient beings’ achievements are called human effort–caused fruit. As visual and other consciousnesses are the indestructible and indissoluble parts of the eye and other faculties, they are the predominant fruits of the life principle.

Each of the twenty-two faculties<sup>264</sup> is capable of generating its own predominant fruits, and thus they are all called predominant fruits. In this connection, it

is said that subsequent fruits arise commensurate to one's previous deeds. For instance, due to the cause of having committed murder, after reaping the fully ripened fruits of birth in evil transmigrations, [then] although afterward one may attain rebirth in the human realm, one experiences a short life span. Because of having committed theft, after falling into bad transmigrations, [then] although afterward one may attain rebirth as a human being, one suffers from the retribution of poverty. These [fruits] are subsumed in the category of causally concordant fruit. The remaining text is clear; one can understand it if one investigates it. The essence of the five fruits has thus been briefly illustrated.

### 3. The Divisions of Cause

The third part discriminates the divisions of cause. This is to illustrate the divisions with regard to the ten causes. Fully ripened fruit depends on the originating cause. Predominant fruit based on mind and mental factors depends on the combined cause. The attainment of wholesome or unwholesome states depends on the originating cause. Causally concordant fruit depends on generative cause. The attainment of human effort-caused fruit depends on the originating cause. The attainment of cessational fruit depends on the originating cause. The remaining fruits attained by other causes are mostly subsumed in the division of predominant fruit, as has been stated in the section "Investigation through Reflection" in the *Yogācārabhūmi*.<sup>265</sup> Previous afflictive actions become ripened as fully ripened fruits in the three realms. [835a] Because these fully ripened fruits are generated through afflictive actions as the cause, they are called causal phenomena. Also, the six consciousnesses from visual consciousness to mental consciousness have forms up to factors of existence as predominant conditions. They are combined cause; they are called causal phenomena. Also, unwholesome states [arise] due to originating causes such as associating with bad friends, listening to false teachings, and wrong conceptions; they are called causal phenomena. The three originating causes—the opposites of these—which give rise to all wholesome states, are to be understood in the same way.

These causes all correspond to their successive predominant fruits; they are called ripened phenomena. As all the seeds of wholesome, unwholesome, [and] indeterminate phenomena that have not been damaged are capable of being causes giving rise [to fruits], they are therefore called causal phenomena. These causes that give rise [to fruits] are all seen from the perspective of their successive causally concordant fruits and so are called ripened phenomena. Those who dwell in defilements generating evil efforts that bear no fruit give rise to worry and unhappiness. Those who do not dwell in defilements generating good efforts that bear fruits give rise to joy and happiness. These arise due to originating causes, and so they are called causal phenomena. Because these causal phenomena are all seen from the perspective of human effort-caused fruits, they are called ripened phenomena.

Also, [those of] the worldly path who follow the elimination of desires and the



exceptional states are subsumed in the saintly path [and] can attain *nirvāṇa*. This is due to the originating cause, and it is called causal phenomena. Because the exceptional path will give rise to cessational fruit, it is called ripened phenomena. It is said that because [the exceptional path leads to] the ultimate cessational fruit, the worldly path does not ultimately lead to cessational fruit. These cited passages pick up the meanings at random; they do not necessarily follow closely the order of the text. The characteristics of the five fruits have been thus briefly explained.

#### 4. Explaining the Words

Next, I will explain the words [of the verse]. First, [verse 16c] says “**receptacle fruit**.” This means fully ripened fruit. It is the fully ripened fruit attained by the cultivation of wholesome roots in previous existences. In accordance with the cultivation of wholesome actions, one becomes a receptacle of the teaching. Therefore it is called receptacle fruit. This fully ripened fruit is found in both good and evil transmigrations. Now [835b] I am illustrating the favorable fruit, so I will focus on the good transmigration. “**Resultant fruit**” means predominant fruit. In other words, the extremely wholesome faculty, on the strength of the receptacle fruit, decisively arises. It is called resultant fruit, deriving its name from its cause. Next, when [verse 16d] says “**these are predominant fruits**,” it might be an overlapping with the first fruit, and it is designated according to its root. This predominant fruit is common to all phenomena. Now, this fruit is established from the perspective of wholesome states that arise based only on the receptacle fruit.

“**Delighting fruit**” means causally conforming fruit. Because in previous existences one persistently cultivated the wholesome roots, [then] afterward conforming to them, one loves and delights in wholesome states. This causally conforming fruit is common to all three lineages. Now I will explain the fruit of cultivation only from the perspective of wholesome phenomena. “**Growth [fruit]**” means the fruits of human effort. It is because in the present lifetime one exerts assiduous efforts to develop the wholesome roots to perfection. “**Pure fruit**” is the dissociation fruit, because when one’s cultivation is complete, one is free from obstructions. “**Successively**” means to establish the order of the five fruits called receptacle[, resultant, predominant, delighting, and growth]. The order of the five fruits derives from their mutual dependence.

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of two parts: First, he explains the five fruits. [The statement] “[**One should know that**] this level<sup>266</sup> of fruits [consists of five successive kinds: (1) resultant fruit, (2) predominant fruit, (3) causally conforming fruits, (4) human effort–caused fruit, and (5) dissociation fruit]” explains the order. In his explanation of the receptacle fruit, he mentions resultant fruit<sup>267</sup> to illustrate the essence of receptacle fruit. [The phrase] “**the correspondence [between fruits and] the wholesome roots**”<sup>268</sup> illustrates the meaning of receptacle. Next, [Vasubandhu] says “**receptacle fruit is**



predominant,” pointing out that productive condition is resultant. [The phrase] “the highest degree of the wholesome roots” shows the good produced. This explains the essence of fruit. Third, [Vasubandhu] says “one constantly cultivated in previous existences” in order to refer to the previous cause. [The statement that] “one loves and delights in virtues” explains the essence of the fruit. In the fourth and fifth parts, the words are self-explanatory. [The phrase] “this level” and so forth explains the expression “[five] successive [kinds].” This is also clear.

## 5. The Ten Fruits

Verse 17cd, 18ab [T 1599:31.460a7–20]:

Successive [fruit] and initial fruit; continued-practice [fruit],  
completion fruit.  
Conforming [fruit] and antidote [fruit]; dissociation [fruit]  
and special [fruit].  
Nonsupreme and supreme [fruits]; the fruits have thus been  
briefly explained.<sup>269</sup>

Vasubandhu’s commentary: Briefly, there are ten kinds of fruit: (1) Successive fruit [*uttarottara-phala*]; from the generation of the mind of awakening from one’s lineage up to cultivation, one should know its succession. (2) Initial fruit [*ādi-phala*] means the initial attainment of the exceptional states. (3) Continued-practice fruit [*abhyāsa-phala*] means the level of [the disciples] in higher training beyond the initial fruit. (4) Completion fruit [*samāpti-phala*] consists of the stages [of the disciples] that are beyond training. (5) Conforming fruit [*ānukūlya-phala*], being causes and conditions of further fruits; one should know that it is subsumed by the successive fruit.<sup>270</sup> (6) Antidote fruit [*vipakṣa-phala*] is the path of cessation, because through it the practitioner attains the initial fruit. Here the initial path is called antidote fruit. (7) Dissociation fruit [*viśaṃyoga-phala*] is the continued-practice fruit and completion fruit because they lead to freedom from afflictive obstructions, respectively belonging to the fruits [attained] by the saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*] and those beyond training [*aśaikṣa*]. (8) Excellent fruit [*viśeṣa-phala*] means virtues such as supernormal powers. (9) Superior (but nonsupreme) fruit [*uttara-phala*] is the stage of the bodhisattvas, because this is superior to other vehicles. (10) Supreme fruit [*anuttara-phala*] is the stage of the Tathāgatas. These four fruits are mentioned to discriminate the completion fruits. [They are] briefly explained [because] there are [already] so many. If one were to give an extensive elaboration, they are countless.<sup>271</sup>

The second part of [Vasubandhu’s commentary] illustrates the ten [divisions of fruit] from the perspective of levels. Among these, the first four explain the

fruits briefly; the last six explain the fruits extensively. The first four fruits [835c] can be divided into six divisions. Besides, the first four fruits are successive fruits; previous fruits depend on subsequent causes. The last six fruits are conforming fruits. Each pair conforms to one another. This results in three pairs.

The first quarter [17c] mentions “**successive fruit**,” which is the first fruit. In fact, the name is common. Yet the verse first establishes the common name; the next three quarters [17d–18ab] then establish distinctive divisions. This first fruit is attained at the level of entry into practice. Entering comes before cause, practice comes before entering, and the fruit comes after. Thus it is called the successive fruit. At the stage of cultivation of the cause level, [the practitioner still exists at the level of] lineage and has not engaged in cultivation. Therefore fruit is not established.

The expression “**initial fruit**” is the second fruit. It is only at the ultimate level that the practitioner attains the exceptional stages; therefore it is called initial fruit. The expression “**continued-practice fruit**” is the third fruit. At the level of making effort, the practitioner exerts himself in applied practice; therefore it is called continued-practice fruit. [The expression] “**completion fruit**” is the fourth fruit. It is the fruit [attained by the disciples] beyond training at the nonabiding level. Therefore it is called ultimate.

The following three statements explain the last six fruits. The expression “**conforming [fruit]**” denotes the first four fruits, called successive fruit. This fruit is exactly the expedient means to attain the Path of Vision. Because it conforms to it, it is called conforming fruit. Here the three pairs are all conforming. Yet their common name derives from the initial [fruit]. “**Antidote [fruit]**” is the second initial fruit among the first four [fruits]. Only by conforming to expedient means does the practitioner attain the Path of Vision, completely eliminating the seeds of afflictions subdued previously. Therefore it is called antidote fruit. “**Dissociation [fruit]**” includes the last two fruits among the first four [fruits]. [The disciples] in higher training [and the disciples] beyond training, in order to dissociate themselves from the obstructions, should generate extraordinary virtues. Therefore it is called dissociation. “**Excellent fruit**” includes the six supernormal powers belonging to this level. When one correctly cultivates according to them, one attains freedom from obstructions and achieves these extraordinary virtues. Therefore these two also conform. So far the fruits have been established from the perspective of shared levels. The following two fruits will be established from the perspective of the distinct [836a] levels. “**Superior (but nonsupreme) [fruit]**” denotes those bodhisattva’s grounds after the first three levels. “**Supreme [fruit]**” refers to the ground of the Tathāgatas. This is explained from the perspective of the simultaneous fourth stage. Nonsupreme and supreme conform to one another. These three pairs are called conforming fruit. The following one statement is the second part—a general conclusion.

[Vasubandhu’s] commentary consists of two parts. First, he explains the words [of the verse]. Next, he sums up the distinctions. The first part again is twofold. First, he raises the general point. Next, he gives an explanation based on the

words [of the verse]. This again is twofold. First, he explains the ten fruits. Next, he explains the concluding quarter [18b]. The first part is twofold. First, he explains the words [of the verse]. Next, he discerns the meaning.

In explaining the words [of the verse, Vasubandhu] says, “**From the generation of the mind of awakening from one’s lineage up to cultivation, [one should know its succession].**” From one’s lineage one generates the mind [of awakening] until one engages in cultivation. From generating the mind [of awakening] until engaging in cultivation explains the essence of the successive fruit. [The statement] “**one should know its succession,**” in this connection, means here the previous is explained according to the subsequent. This means that the level of generation of the mind [of awakening] comes after lineage, and the cultivation level comes after the generation of the mind [of awakening]. Based on the subsequent factors, the previous fruits are established. Lineage does not come after, so it is not established as fruit.

[Vasubandhu’s] explanation of the next three fruits is self-explanatory. In explaining conforming [fruit], he says “[**conforming fruit,**] **being causes and conditions [of further fruits]**”—this is an explanation of the meaning of conformity. This means that since the first cause functions as cause and condition to the second fruit, it is called conforming. [The statement] “**one should know [that it is subsumed by] the successive fruit**” illustrates its essence. In explaining the antidote [fruit], he states [that it] “**is the path of cessation**” to illustrate its essence. Because it is the path of elimination and extinction [of afflictions], it is called the path of extinction. [The statement] “**through it the practitioner attains the initial fruit**” means that through this conformity one attains the fruit of the Path of Vision. This is an illustration of the meaning of conformity through the previous fruit. [The statement] “**Here the initial path is called the antidote fruit**” is to point to the essence of fruit to justify its name. In explaining the dissociation [fruit], he says “**dissociation fruit**” to elaborate its name. [The statement] “**the continued-practice fruit and completion fruit**” illustrates its essence. It means that, among the first four, the last two are essence. [836b] “Completion” has the meaning of “ultimate.” [The statement] “**because they lead to freedom from afflictive obstructions**” explains the meaning of dissociation [fruit]. [The statement] “**respectively belonging to the fruits [attained] by the saints in higher training and those beyond training**” is used to illustrate their fruits from the perspective of persons. [Vasubandhu’s] explanation of the next three fruits is self-explanatory.

[The statement] “**These [four fruits are mentioned to discriminate the completion fruits]**” again discriminates divisions. [The phrase] “**these four fruits**” means [the following]: (1) The fourth is called completion fruit. (2) The seventh is called dissociation fruit. (3) The eighth is called excellent fruit. (4) The tenth is called supreme fruit. These four fruits all show the divisions of the complete level of fruit. Therefore it is said, “[These four fruits] **are mentioned to discriminate the completion fruits.**” From this one can infer the meaning of the remaining six fruits. In order to discriminate the cause, the fruits are not

mentioned. This is not to render them equal. Not rendering them equal, the four fruits show the fruit of one level. The six fruits accordingly illustrate the cause in different levels. [The statement] “[**They are**] **briefly explained because there are already so many**]” explains the conclusion of the verse. [The statement] “**briefly explained [because] there are [already] so many**” is an explanation of the words in the verse, that there are either five or ten [fruits]. Therefore he says “**so many.**” [The statement] “**If one were to give an extensive elaboration, they are countless**” illustrates the concluding idea. The phrase “**briefly explained**” in the concluding quarter [18b] is to show that if one were to give an extensive elaboration they would be innumerable.

## 6. A Summary

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.460a20–24]: Here is a summary of the meanings of the cultivation of the antidotes: (1) comprehensive cultivation [*vyutpatti-bhāvanā*]; (2) mitigating cultivation [*nirlekha-bhāvanā*]; (3) penetrating cultivation [*parikramma-bhāvanā*]; (4) successive-undertaking cultivation [*uttara-samārambha-bhāvanā*]; (5) persevering cultivation [*śliṣṭa-bhāvanā*], because wisdom perceives its objects thoroughly; (6) engaging cultivation [*praviṣṭa-bhāvanā*]; (7) elevated cultivation [*utkrṣṭa-bhāvanā*]; (8) inceptive cultivation [*ādi-bhāvanā*]; (9) intermediate cultivation [*madhya-bhāvanā*]; (10) culminating cultivation [*paryavasāna-bhāvanā*]; (11) nonsupreme cultivation [*sottara-bhāvanā*]; and (12) supreme cultivation [*niruttara-bhāvanā*], where objects are exalted, mental attentions are without contrivance, and attainments are distinctive.<sup>272</sup>

Above, the first part—the explanation of the words [of the text] has been completed. Below is the second part, summing up and discriminating. This is twofold. First, I will summarize the meaning. Then I will make a definitive conclusion. The first part is threefold. First, I will explain the antidotes. Second, I will summarize the levels of cultivation. Finally, I will explain the attainment of fruits. The first part is also twofold: a general indication and a specific explanation. As regards the specific explanation, concerning the above chapter, twelve kinds of cultivation are enumerated.

“**Comprehensive cultivation**” consists of the four foundations of mindfulness. Its essence is wisdom because it removes ignorance. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* states that this is called revealing cultivation, because it dispels the darkness of ignorance and reveals objects of knowledge. “**Mitigating cultivation**” consists of the four right endeavors, because, by assiduously cultivating the two kinds of goodness, the two kinds of evil are diminished. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* refers to this as the detracting cultivation. “**Penetrating cultivation**” consists of the four [836c] wish-granting legs. Its essence is quiet contemplation because it realizes the path of the antidotes. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* refers to this as the “realizing-antidotes cultivation.” “**Successive-undertaking cultivation**” consists of the five spiritual faculties; to start the high stage is

within the capacity of the five powers. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* calls this “posterior cultivation.” **“Persevering cultivation”** is the five powers, because in engaging practice and principle, the practitioner can subdue afflictions. The words **“wisdom perceives its objects thoroughly”** explains the meaning of persevering. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* calls this “associating cultivation.” **“Engaging cultivation”** refers to the seven awakening factors, because here the practitioner starts entering the exceptional path and is superior to the ordinary world. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* calls this “excellent wisdom cultivation.” **“Elevated cultivation”** refers to the noble eightfold path. Here the practitioner enters the Path of Cultivation, which is superior to the engaging stage. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* calls this “ever-increasing cultivation.”

**“Inceptive cultivation”** occurs at the level of ordinary sentient beings. It is like what is stated in the previous verse [12], “with defect followed by nondefect” [12a]. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* calls this “initial stage cultivation.” **“Intermediate cultivation”** refers to the level of the saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*]. It is like what is stated in the previous verse, “without defect but susceptible to defect” [12b]. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* calls this “intermediate stage cultivation.” **“Culminating cultivation”** belongs to the stage of the saints beyond training. It is like what is stated in the previous verse, “without defect and not susceptible to defect” [12c]. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* calls this “final stage cultivation.”<sup>273</sup>

**“Nonsupreme cultivation”** is the cultivation of the adherents of the two vehicles. **“Supreme cultivation”** is the cultivation of the bodhisattvas. It is like what is stated in the previous verse: **“There is a distinction [between the bodhisattvas and those of the two vehicles] as regards perceived objects, attention, and attainment.”** [The phrase] **“exalted objects”** and so forth explains supremacy by referring to those three meanings. **“Without contrivance”** means that the bodhisattva contemplates deeply into the unattainability of the conditioned factors of existence. Thus it is called without contrivance in contrast to the adherents of the two vehicles’ contemplation within the context of the characteristics of suffering, impermanence, and so forth.

## 7. The Meaning of the Levels in the Stages of Cultivation of the Antidotes

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.460a24–27]: Next is a summary of the meanings of the stages of cultivation to establish their attainability: “Stages” refers to the stage of the practitioner who dwells in his lineage, the stage of undertaking the stages of cultivation—namely, from the generation of the mind [of awakening] to the levels of cultivation. [These include] the impure stage, the impure and pure stage, and the utterly pure stage; the stage accompanied by adornment; the all-pervasive stage—since it pervades all of the ten [bodhisattva] grounds; and the supreme stage.<sup>274</sup>

The following is the second part, which explains the meaning of the stages of cultivation. It also consists of two parts: a general indication and a specific

explanation. [Vasubandhu] briefly refers to the five levels to explain the stages of cultivation. First, he states, [837a] “[Next is a summary of the meanings of the stages of cultivation] to establish their attainability” to clarify its name. [The statement] “the practitioner who dwells in his lineage” locates a person in his level, referring to the above-mentioned name. Because he dwells in the level of cause, [then] although he has not attained realization, he is capable of it; therefore [Vasubandhu] says “attainability.” Second, he says “the stage of undertaking the stages of cultivation” to clarify its name. [The levels from] the generation of the mind [of awakening] [*bodhi-cittôtpāda*] up to the actual cultivation belong to this level. This is what was previously referred to as “entering the level, practicing the level.” Third, Vasubandhu says “the utterly pure stage” to first explain the previous level. This means that the previous fourth level is called the ultimate level. This expression “ultimate” is synonymous with truth-body [*dharmakāya*]. Therefore it is called the utterly pure level.

Next, he says “the utterly pure stage” to establish its name. This is articulated with the desire to illustrate that this level is not simply called utterly pure in essence; it is [in actuality] utterly pure. Therefore it is called the utterly pure stage. In the fourth sentence, he says “the stage accompanied by adornment” to establish its name. [The statement] “since it pervades all the ten [bodhisattva] grounds” illustrates the meaning of adornment. In the ten [bodhisattva] grounds there are ten kinds of Realm of Reality,<sup>275</sup> ten perfections [*pāramitās*],<sup>276</sup> [and] conditioned and nonconditioned virtues universally pervading. Therefore it is called the level with adornment. Concerning the fifth level, he says “the supreme level” to establish its name. Its meaning is already clear, so I will not reiterate it. As these five levels subsume the eighteen above-mentioned levels and the three levels of the Realm of Reality explained after that, one should know that they mutually subsume according to their mutual association.

## 8. The Meaning of Fruits

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.460a27–b3]: Next is a summary of the meanings of fruits. [These are] (1) conglomeration fruit [*saṃgraha-phala*], (2) most excellent fruit [*viśeṣa-phala*], (3) previous-practice fruit [*pūrvābhyaśa-phala*], (4) successive-accomplishment fruit [*uttarottara-nirhāra-phala*], (5) enunciation fruit [*uddeśa-phala*], and (6) explanation fruit [*nirdeśa-phala*]. Among these, the conglomeration fruit consists of five kinds; the remaining fruits are the five divisions of fruits. The previous-practice fruit is called resultant fruit. The successive-accomplishment fruit includes the four other kinds of fruit. Briefly speaking, the successive-accomplishment fruit consists of four kinds. Broadly speaking, the conforming fruit has six kinds, which are an extensive elaboration of the four kinds of fruit.<sup>277</sup>

The following is the third part of the explanation of meaning of fruits. This also consists of two parts: a general indication and a specific explanation. In the specific explanation, [Vasubandhu] explains six kinds of fruits. First, he lists



their names, and then he discriminates their characteristics. (1) “**Conglomeration fruit**” explains the first five fruits. It is the resultant fruit within the five fruits. It encompasses all fruits without remainder. It is also encompassed in the five receptacle fruits. Next, he explains the ten kinds of fruit. Based on these two meanings, they are called conglomeration fruit. (2) “**Most excellent fruit**” explains the ten fruits. From within those fruits encompassed in those five fruits, he selects the most special one [837b] to establish these ten fruits. Therefore they are called most excellent fruits.

The next two fruits again illustrate the five fruits. The last two fruits again explain the ten fruits. (3) “**Continued-practice fruit**”<sup>278</sup> illustrates the first resultant fruit among the five fruits, because by constantly cultivating the wholesome roots, one attains the results. (4) “**Successive-accomplishment fruit**” explains the last four among the five fruits and the appearance of predominant fruit upon the resultant fruit up to the production of dissociation fruit on the human effort-caused fruit. (5) “**Enunciation fruit**” explains the first four among the ten fruits. (6) “**Explanation fruit**” explains the last six among the ten fruits. The meaning of enunciation [*uddeśā*] and explanation [*nirdeśā*] has been discussed above. In what follows I will successively illustrate their characteristics. [The expression] “**conglomeration fruit**” means the five kinds of fruit. It also illustrates the meaning of the first fruit as has been explained above. [The expression] “**the remaining fruits**” signifies the division of the five kinds of fruit. In order to illustrate the most excellent fruits, he subsequently explains the ten fruits. They are called remaining fruits because they are the most excellent among the five fruits. This is called “**the five divisions of fruits.**”<sup>279</sup>

[The statement] “**The previous-practice fruit is called resultant fruit**” is intended to illustrate that the continued-practice fruit is the first among the five fruits. [The statement] “**The successive-accomplishment fruit includes the four other kinds of fruit**” means that the gradually removing fruit is the last four among the five fruits. [The statement] “**Briefly speaking, the successive-accomplishment fruit consists of four kinds**” briefly illustrates the fruits—namely, the first four among the ten fruits. In the same vein, [Vasubandhu] says, “**The successive-accomplishment fruit consists of four kinds.**” He states, “**Broadly speaking, the conforming fruit has six kinds,**” to illustrate explanation fruit—namely, the six kinds among the ten fruits. Also, in the same vein, [Vasubandhu] states, “**The conforming fruit has six kinds.**” This is an extensive discrimination of the four kinds of fruit. In explaining the designation “**explanation fruit,**” he discriminates it into six from the perspective of the previous four fruits. Therefore the last six kinds are called explanation fruit.

## 9. A Conclusion on the Meaning of the Three Chapters

Vasubandhu’s commentary [T 1599:31.460b3–5]: This section of the *Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes* consists of four [parts], three chapters: (1) Chapter on the Antidotes, (2) Chapter on the Stages of

Cultivation, and (3) Chapter on the Attainment of Fruits. They have been explained extensively and thoroughly.<sup>280</sup>

[The statement] “**This section of the *Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes*”** and so forth is a conclusion. [Vasubandhu] says, “**This section of [the *Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes*] consists of four [parts],” [837c]** speaking from the perspective of general characteristics. The three chapters on the antidotes, the stages of cultivation, and the attainment of fruits are combined into one section.<sup>281</sup> This is to establish levels [of cultivation] based on practice and to establish fruits based on levels. The lively flow of the Master’s<sup>282</sup> words continues without gap. Therefore the commentator [Vasubandhu] combines these three chapters into one section to explain their meaning.<sup>283</sup> Due to this meaning, up to here there are four parts: (1) characteristics, (2) obstructions, (3) realities, (4) practice, stages, and fruits. Therefore it is said that this part has four parts. The fourth part includes three objects. Based on these, chapters are divided. Hence there are three chapters.

Commentary on the *Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes*, fascicle three.





**Critical Discussion on Inference**  
*(P'an piryang non)*

Translation and Introduction by

DAN LUSTHAUS



## Contents

Introduction	267
1. AN INCOMPLETE MANUSCRIPT	268
2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF BUDDHIST <i>HETUVIDYĀ</i>	269
3. BUDDHIST LOGIC COMES TO CHINA AND KOREA: LÜ CAI AND THE FIASCO OVER THE <i>NYĀYAMUKHA</i>	270
4. HOW A DIGNĀGAN PROOF WORKS	272
5. THE <i>NYĀYAMUKHA</i> AND WŎNHYO	277
6. <i>CRITICAL DISCUSSION ON INFERENCE</i>	283
7. EDITIONS CONSULTED	285
Translation	286



## Introduction

*Critical Discussion on Inference* (K. *P'an piryang non*, Ch. *Pan biliang lun*; hereafter *Critical Inference*) is one of the most unusual texts written by Wōnhyo (617–686). While his other extant writings consist primarily of commentaries and doctrinal apologetics, *Critical Inference* is not a commentary on any specific text (though it does comment on a variety of texts), nor is it simply a work of apologetics (though Wōnhyo does manage to include some of his favorite doctrinal controversies in the discussion). In *Critical Inference* he not only discusses and evaluates the new tools of Buddhist logic but also adopts them to test them out, taking them for a test drive, as it were.

It may be hard for readers today to imagine how exciting and intriguing Buddhists in China and Korea in the second half of the seventh century found Dignāga's recently introduced logic system.<sup>1</sup> Many today tend to think of logic as dry and abstract. And while there were revivals of interest in Buddhist logic during the Ming dynasty and the early twentieth century in China and Japan, scholars rarely pay much attention to it in their studies of East Asian Buddhism. Nonetheless, the Dignāgan system, with its implicit promise to provide a sound method for reaching valid conclusions about contentious topics and claims, attracted attention not only because the seventh and eighth centuries were a period in which Buddhists hotly debated conflicting interpretations along the entire spectrum of Buddhist teachings and thus found any tool that might help sort out and resolve the controversies attractive. East Asian Buddhists also found logic fascinating because nothing like it had appeared in East Asia before, giving the logical system an air of arcane, exotic mystery. To them it was a deep and tantalizing puzzle to be worked out and mastered, as one might master a complicated game like chess. More than a pastime with which to amuse oneself, logic promised to help clarify abstruse doctrines and help determine true doctrines from the false. After all, the purpose of an inference is to show whether a claim is valid, invalid, or inconclusive.

Buddhist logic<sup>2</sup> (Skt. *hetuvidyā*; K. *inmyōng*) was introduced to East Asians by Xuanzang (600–664) through his translation of two fundamental logic texts: (1) Śāṅkarasvāmin's *Nyāyapraveśa* (Ch. *Yinming ruzhengli lun*, T 1630, translation completed September 10, 647), an introductory overview of Dignāga's system; and (2) Dignāga's *Nyāyamukha* (Ch. *Yinming zhengli men lun*, T 1628,

translation completed February 1, 650), Dignāga's own introduction (*mukha*) to his system. Both titles—*Nyāyapraveśa* and *Nyāyamukha*—could be translated as *Introduction to Logic*.<sup>3</sup> Both provide a basic overview of how to construct and evaluate a valid inference, and that was no doubt the purpose to which Xuanzang hoped they would be applied. Some of Xuanzang's students and assistants wrote commentaries on them, the most important being the commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa* by Kuiji (632–682), Xuanzang's disciple and successor, titled *Yinming ruzhengli lun shu* (T 1840) and often called *The Great (Logic) Commentary* (Ch. *Yinming dashu*). In the *Great Commentary*, Kuiji also discusses ten other commentators who wrote commentaries on the *Nyāyapraveśa* or the *Nyāyamukha*, but most of these are no longer extant.<sup>4</sup> Wōnhyo also refers to some of these commentaries in his *Critical Inference*.

## I. An Incomplete Manuscript

The manuscript on which the following translation and all published versions of *Critical Inference* are based was rediscovered in Japan in modern times, or, more accurately, most of the second half was recovered. The text remains incomplete.

Typically Wōnhyo devotes the introductory part of his texts to providing a rich contextual orientation for what is to follow. Such an explanation is lacking in this case. The text we have numbers its sections, ending with section 14; but the manuscript begins somewhere toward the end of section 7, so it is clear that at least half the text is missing. It was not uncommon for authors in this period to devote greater attention and more verbiage to the earlier sections of their works, when their energy and enthusiasm for the new project were at their height. If that was the case for Wōnhyo in this text, then more than half of what he wrote is missing, and some of the missing portions might have provided crucial context for what has survived. I suspect that he roughly followed the sequence of the *Nyāyamukha*—that is, dealing with each structural part of an inference in its turn. If so, then whatever discussion he might have provided of the definitions of important key terms and components of an inference is not currently available to us. It is also clear that there are missing portions in the half of the text that is extant, the lacunae ranging from characters that have been lost or obscured by wormholes in the single surviving manuscript to entire passages containing arguments that we know about only because Wōnhyo refers to them in the surviving portions.

At least six passages from *Critical Inference* that are not found in the received version are quoted by others, but they are short and, aside from the presumption that they occurred in the first half of the text, are insufficient for attempting to reconstruct the missing portions.<sup>5</sup>

The colophon tells us this text was written in 671, when Wōnhyo was fifty-five, seven years after Xuanzang died but while Kuiji was still active. The craze over Buddhist logic was at its peak.

Even in its incomplete form, and with many passages a challenge to decipher, it is a fascinating text that may afford some insights, directly and indirectly, into

the now largely forgotten stir this new method of debate and analysis created in East Asia. Wōnhyo's treatment of the *hetuvidyā* materials is particularly revealing since, unlike the other known commentators who studied this logic with Xuanzang and his circle, Wōnhyo remained in Korea, and therefore he either figured out the system on his own solely through his study of the Chinese texts (no mean feat, as anyone today who has tackled a text like the *Nyāyamukha* can tell you—since it is available only in Chinese translation, without a Sanskrit or Tibetan version to consult or guide the reader), or he may have learned something of the system through contact with the people who brought the texts to Korea and may also have brought instructions on how to use them. In either case, his command of the material, though possibly imperfect, is impressive.

## 2. Brief Overview of the Early Development of Buddhist *Hetuvidyā*

Like most Indian religio-philosophical traditions, Buddhism from early on was deeply steeped in debate. The Pali canon frequently depicts Buddha or his disciples debating with non-Buddhists or each other, though debating that elevated egotism fanned by aggressive competition was frowned upon. Traditionally the so-called Third Council consisted of a debate under the aegis of King Aśoka between Theravādins and their rivals; the *Kathāvatthu* (Points of Controversy), a volume in the Pali Abhidhamma canon, purports to be an account of those debates and consists of arguments given in point and counterpoint. It is a treasure trove of the diversity of views among early Buddhist schools but also a reminder that debate, especially in front of a noted authority such as a king, was the established way of promoting the views of one's school while vanquishing one's foes.

Debates could be fierce and even deadly. The stakes for losing could range from personal humiliation, to closing one's school, to leaving the district with all of one's disciples and colleagues, to becoming the slave of the victor, to even killing oneself as the price of defeat. While personal reputation might increase for a particularly successful or clever debater, more important was that the prestige of one's entire tradition often hinged on how successfully the tradition's positions were debated in public.

As with any sport, when winning becomes the prime objective, cheating enters the picture. Sophistries and other quasi-logical tricks could win the day, so a good debater had to be able to quickly detect a flaw or chicanery in the opponent's argument, expose the trickery in a way that the audience and especially the judges could appreciate, and thereby dispatch the opponent quickly. Also, as in any sport, rules of engagement and criteria for determining who wins or loses were proposed and set. Violating the rules, such as by cheating, resulted in disqualification; that is, one lost.

While many imagine Abhidharma to consist of little more than endless laundry lists of enumerated models piled one on top of another, in reality the Abhidharma tradition was a vigorous and rigorous debating tradition, and many



of the techniques, categories, and concerns better known from their use by the later so-called Pramāṇavādins (Epistemologists) were forged, hewn, and refined by the Ābhidharmikas. The ponderous two-hundred-fascicle *Mahāvibhāṣā* (T 1545; K. *Abidam pibasa ron*), an encyclopedic compendium of the positions and arguments of the Vaibhāṣikas and their opponents, is a testament to the vitality and prolific argumentation of the various Buddhist schools.

One already finds discussions in the Abhidharma texts on topics such as the means of valid knowledge (*pramāṇas*) such as perception (*pratyakṣa*) and types of inference (*anumāna*), but the first Buddhist to discuss these in the way the Buddhist *hetuvidyā* tradition was to develop them was Asaṅga, who offered detailed expositions on the *pramāṇas*, devised an early form of the *trairūpya* (three requirements of a valid inference),<sup>6</sup> along with many related issues that would later occupy the Pramāṇavādins. Asaṅga lays this out in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (in the *Śrutamayī-bhūmī*) and also in a related but slightly more developed form in the concluding section of his *Abhidharma-samuccaya* (Compendium of Abhidharma).<sup>7</sup> His half-brother Vasubandhu wrote several texts on *vāda* (debate), only fragments of which are extant; based on the discussion of these texts in later works, they were innovative and influential.

The Buddhist *hetuvidyā* successor to Vasubandhu was Dignāga. He tightened the rules, streamlined the steps necessary for a sound inference, and established ground rules that were sufficiently ecumenical that debaters from very different presuppositional bases and forms of ideological commitment could debate each other on neutral ground. He also provided clear rubrics for detecting fallacious arguments and pseudo-proofs.

For a century or more other Buddhists were not fully clear on the difference between an Abhidharmic approach to argument and the more rigorous (and in some ways more restricted) form of argumentation introduced by Dignāga, and the extant sources that shed light on how his works were appropriated and understood in the period prior to Dharmakīrti<sup>8</sup> suggest that many labored unaware of the implications, logical and methodological, his system introduced. It is probably safe to say that Dignāga himself did not foresee all the consequences that adhering to a rigorous logic would entail.

Dilemmas arose in the system, logical entailments that required a more sophisticated and detailed analytic approach. That was provided by Dharmakīrti. His work was never translated into Chinese, however, and thus remained unknown in East Asia, so the *hetuvidyā* found in China, Korea, and Japan, until modern times, was strictly Dignāgan.

### 3. Buddhist Logic Comes to China and Korea: Lü Cai and the Fiasco over the *Nyāyamukha*

One reminder of the fuss that Buddhist logic created in China when introduced by Xuanzang's translations is the controversy over a commentary on the *Nyāyamukha* written by a court Daoist named Lü Cai. Those events had such an

impact on the Buddhists of the day that the entire eighth fascicle (out of ten) of Xuanzang's biography by Huili and Yang Cong (*Daciensi Sanzang fashi zhuan*, T 2053:50.262b2; hereafter *Biography*), is devoted to recounting them in detail.

In brief, the records relate that after Xuanzang translated the *Nyāyamukha*, ten monks who had assisted in the translation and were apparently also receiving some instruction in its intricacies each wrote a commentary, competing with each other. None quite understood the technicalities of the system, and the results were so incommensurate that it became evident to everyone involved that none had a handle on how the system worked. Jokingly, the *Nyāyamukha* received the reputation among Xuanzang's circle of being the most inscrutable text in China. One of the monks, Xixuan, was a friend of a prominent Daoist at court, Lü Cai, who considered himself, with no hint of modesty, talented and expert at everything he tried, claiming to have mastered chess in two weeks and boasting there was no text, no matter how abstruse, that he could not master quickly. Perhaps tired of Lü's boasting, or maybe still in the competitive spirit of the monk commentators, Xixuan challenged Lü to compose a commentary on the inscrutable text, in effect saying, "If you're so smart, let's see you handle this!"

Lü did not duck the challenge and earnestly devoted himself to cracking the text. Recognizing that it was built on a binary opposition of affirmation and negation, he apparently treated it as a quasi-cosmological treatise on the order of the schema in the classic text the *Yijing* (Book of Changes), which treats the universe as permutations of the binary pair yin and yang, and wrote a commentary that included charts, tracing out all the binary oppositions. The preface to his work is preserved in the *Biography*, and it is drenched in the purple prose of the day. Unfortunately, his actual charts and analysis, which filled two fascicles, have not survived. When he triumphantly showed his completed work to Xixuan, Xi informed him that he had missed the point. Indignantly Lü insisted he had not, that clearly the monks who could not agree on anything in their commentaries did not understand the text, and thus they were in no position to challenge his understanding, which, he assured them, was perfect and deep.

What had begun as a friendly challenge soon grew into a major diplomatic brouhaha, with court-affiliated persons taking sides and Buddhists and Daoists throughout the country at each other's throats, at least rhetorically. Memorials to the emperor, asking him to censor Lü, were sent (some appear verbatim in the *Biography*). Things intensified, until the emperor, in no position to evaluate Lü's work himself, asked Xuanzang to pass judgment on it. Xuanzang, probably cautious due to the potential political fallout and the growing animosity between Buddhists and Daoists at court and elsewhere, was at first hesitant to declare one way or the other. Finally, under increasing pressure from the emperor to render a verdict, he admitted that Lü's work had no merit and did not properly understand the system. Crestfallen and having lost face, Lü withdrew, and even though the animosities between Daoists and Buddhists subsided, Xuanzang translated no more logic texts after that.

Kuiji speaks on several occasions about Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and

even laments in one place that there is no Chinese translation for this important text. I suspect that Xuanzang spoke of it often and considered it an important text and that, had the Lü Cai incident not occurred, he would have translated it.

#### 4. How a Dignāgan Proof Works

To help the reader follow Wōnhyo's use of the Buddhist inference structure, the following brief overview has been provided. This should give the reader a clearer appreciation for the technical aspects of what Wōnhyo has undertaken, as well as providing readers with some tools for evaluating by themselves Wōnhyo's understanding and use of the Dignāgan inference. The following is adapted from an entry on *sādhana*, "inferential proof," that I wrote for the *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*.<sup>9</sup>

A *sādhana* is an inferential proof, that is, a properly constructed argument that establishes the claim one is trying to assert. Dignāga revolutionized the Indian theories on how to properly construct an argument. While the structure of Buddhist arguments continued to develop after Dignāga (notably with Dharmakīrti and his followers, and later in Tibet), and non-Buddhist Indian schools dramatically revised their own *pramāṇa* theories in reaction to Dignāga's innovations, only Dignāga's system was introduced to East Asia (in the translations of Xuanzang and Yijing), so those later developments remained unknown in East Asia until the modern era.

Sāṃkhyaans proposed an inference structure that required ten members (or statements); the Nyāya inference had five members. Dignāga proposed to streamline this to only three members (three *avayava*), since, by his analysis, the other members were not logically necessary for a sound proof.

A standard Nyāya five-part argument (*parārthānumāna*, or inference for the sake of [convincing] others), consisting of five members, is illustrated in the following example.

One looks at a mountain and sees smoke there. Fire is not observable, but one can infer its presence in the following manner:

1. Thesis (Skt. *pratijñā*; K. *ipchong*): "This mountain is fire-possessing."
2. Reason (Skt. *hetu*; K. *in*): "Because it is smoke-possessing."
3. Principle and Examples (Skt. *udāharaṇa*; K. *piyu, yu*): "Whatever is smoke-possessing is fire-possessing, like kitchen stove, unlike lake."
4. Application (Skt. *upanaya*; K. *hap*): "This mountain, since it possesses smoke, possesses fire."
5. Conclusion (Skt. *nigamana*; K. *kyōl*): "This mountain is fire-possessing."

Analysis: The first statement consists of two items. The thing or substrate in which the property-to-be-proven resides is called the *pakṣa* (K. *chong*). The

*pakṣa* is also called the subject of the inference. In the above argument, the *pakṣa* is “this mountain,” since that is the thing in which the property-to-be-proven—that is, fire—would reside. The property-to-be-proven is called the *sādhya* (K. *so sōṅnip*); in the above argument, that would be “fire-possessing.” The *sādhya* is what is to be inferred, since—unlike the mountain and the smoke, which are being perceived—the fire is not seen; therefore one has to infer its existence. Arguments, in other words, are inferences (Skt. *anumāna*; K. *piryang*) for “proving” something that is not presently being perceived or that is at present unknown (or uncertain).

The second statement gives the *Reason* (Skt. *hetu*), a property that is accepted as residing in the *pakṣa*. For the inference to be valid, this property must reside in the *pakṣa* and also be invariably connected with the *sādhya*. In the above example, the Reason that fire can be inferred is because smoke is seen on the mountain, and where there is smoke, there is fire.

The third statement makes explicit the *basis* of the invariant connection between smoke and fire (“Whatever is smoke-possessing is fire-possessing . . .”) and then offers two examples. The first is an *example of a similar case* (Skt. *sapakṣa*; K. *tongp’um*) that illustrates the concomitance between the inferred property (“fire-possessing”) and the established property (“smoke-possessing”); the second is an *example of an exclusionary case* (Skt. *vipakṣa*; K. *yip’um*) in which those properties are absent. “Kitchen stove” serves as a *similar example* because, back in the day when everyone cooked on fuel-burning stoves, the concomitance between fire and smoke was an unimpeachable common, everyday observation, thus “establishing” that the concomitance has been previously perceived. The *dissimilar example*, “lake,” implies additional arguments: Obviously fires do not typically occur in lakes, since lakes are composed of water; but more importantly, the negative example is designed to help rule out mistaken or dubious or ambiguous cases that might undermine the concomitance. Mist and fog—which look similar to smoke—may be seen on a lake, but they are not smoke, despite the pseudo-similarity. Hence fog on a lake does not indicate the presence of fire.

Note that the “basis” portion of the third statement still *implies* the locus of both properties while focusing on the properties’ concomitance by phrasing the concomitance as a co-occurrence in or of some locus (“Whatever is smoke-possessing is fire-possessing . . .”). The word “whatever” indicates the mountain, the stove, and so on—that is, any locus in which both properties invariantly co-occur.

The fourth statement *applies* or *reiterates* the basic proof, putting the *pakṣa* together with both properties (the *hetu* and the *sādhya*) that are being attributed to it: the accepted property (“smoke-possessing”) and the inferred property (“fire-possessing”). The inference paraphrased asserts: There is smoke on the mountain; wherever there is smoke, there must be fire, since smoke occurs only in a locus containing fire, such as the mountain. Since the mountain possesses smoke, it must also possess fire.

Finally, the fifth statement brings the argument to a close, repeating the original hypothesis (*pratijñā*), this time as a proven inference.

*Dignāga's innovation:* Dignāga considered the fourth and fifth parts of the Nyāya argument structure unnecessary and redundant, and, in addition, he tightened the stipulations of the first three statements as to how they should be properly formed so that the interrelation of the various parts of the argument would validly support the inference. According to Dignāga, a proper three-part inference consists of (1) a Thesis, (2) a Reason, and (3) an Example. The following is an example of the three-member inference:

1. Thesis (Skt. *pakṣa*): Sound is impermanent (*śabdaḥ anityam*)
2. Reason (Skt. *hetu*; or Skt. *līṅga*, K. *sang*, mark): because [it is] produced (*kṛtakatvāt*).
3. Example (Skt. *dr̥ṣṭānta*; K. *yu*):
  - a. Whatever is produced, that is known to be impermanent, like a pot, etc. (*yat kṛtakam tad anityam dr̥ṣṭam yathā ghaṭādir*);
  - b. Whatever is permanent, that is known to be unproduced, like *ākāśa*, etc. (*yan nityam tad akṛtakam dr̥ṣṭam yathākāśam*)

Analysis: Dignāga's nomenclature for the components of the argument is similar to the terms used by Nyāya, with some differences. The entire Thesis is called the *pakṣa* rather than *pratijñā* (though the *Nyāyapraveśa* uses both terms). The *sādhya* (i.e., the property-to-be-proven) is "impermanent." Sometimes *sādhya* indicates the entire thesis statement (since it is the *sādhya* of that specific *pakṣa*). As in the Nyāya argument, the *hetu* (or *līṅga*) must be a property of the *pakṣa* ("sound") and concomitant with the *sādhya* ("impermanent"). Since whatever is produced is impermanent, and sound is produced, sound must be impermanent. That is, while the *sādhya* is an alleged property of the *pakṣa* still awaiting proof, the *hetu* is an accepted property of the *pakṣa* ("sound").

The *pakṣa* can also be differentiated into a *qualifier* (Skt. *viśeṣaṇa*; K. *nūṅbyōl*) and a *qualified* (Skt. *viśeṣya*; K. *sobyōl*). In the *pakṣa* "Sound is impermanent," the qualifier is "impermanent," which qualifies, or indicates, the highlighted quality of "sound," which is thus the qualified.

The *dr̥ṣṭānta* (Example) consists of a *similar example* (*sapakṣa*) and a *dissimilar example* (*vipakṣa*). "Similar example" means an example that is similar to, of the same class or type, or sharing the same property (Skt. *sadharmā*; K. *tongbōp*), and "dissimilar example" means an example that is dissimilar to, of an opposed class or type, or containing dissimilar properties (Skt. *vaidharmā*; K. *yibōp*). More importantly, the property (Skt. *dharma*; K. *pōp*) that one is trying to prove concerning the *pakṣa* must reside in the positive example and must be absent in the negative example.

A property-of-the-*pakṣa* is called a *pakṣadharmā* (K. *chongbōp*). In this example, the *pakṣadharmā* is "impermanence," which is the property (*dharma*) being attributed to the *pakṣa* "sound." A property (*dharma*) resides in a *dharmin*

(K. *yubōp*, literally, property possessor), which is its substrate or, better, its locus. That impermanence is a property of the locus sound is what needs to be proven. For a *sādhana* (a well-formed argument) to be valid, the property indicated by the *hetu* (“is produced”) (1) must be concomitant with the *pakṣa*, (2) must be present in the *sapakṣa* (similar example, “like pot, etc.”), and (3) must be absent from the *vipakṣa* (negative example, “unlike *ākāśa*, etc.”). These three criteria, which are indispensable and necessary, according to Dignāga, are called *trairūpya*. The *hetu* (Reason), then, is the logical linchpin between the *pakṣa*, *sapakṣa*, and *vipakṣa*, which validates the *sādhya* as a legitimate *pakṣadharmā*. Dignāga’s preference for using the term *pakṣa* in place of *pratijñā* to indicate the Thesis may have been due, at least in part, to the cognate relation between *pakṣa* and the two examples (*sa-pakṣa* and *vi-pakṣa*)—that is, an overt reinforcement of the necessity for satisfying the *trairūpya* requirement.

Notice that in the “full” form of the argument the Examples portion includes “principial” statements—“Whatever is produced, that is known to be impermanent, like a pot, etc.” (*sapakṣa*) and “Whatever is permanent, that is known to be unproduced, like *ākāśa*, etc.” (*vipakṣa*)—as did the Nyāya version. Since these principial statements are already implicit in the syntax of the argument’s structure, they may be omitted in practice (though one must be ready to recite them should that be necessary). In streamlined form, a three-part Dignāga argument would be:

1. Thesis: Sound is impermanent
2. Reason: because [it is] produced
3. Example(s): like a pot; unlike *ākāśa*.

Most of the inferences in *Critical Inference* are in this streamlined form. Additionally, it is not uncommon that in practice the *vipakṣa* may also be omitted from the Examples (in the above example, “unlike *ākāśa*” may be omitted). The *vipakṣa* remains a tacit part of the inference, however, and must be provided if a disputant requests it.

Dignāga also provides detailed rules and tests for detecting fallacies in the various statements and the relations between them. Each of the three parts can suffer a variety of fallacies specific to that part. A fallacious *pakṣa* or pseudo-*pakṣa* (Skt. *pakṣābhāsa*; K. *sa ipchong*) is one that is contradicted (Skt. *viruddha*; K. *sangwi*) by some established form of knowledge or that contains an axiom that either of the disputants considers unacceptable (Skt. *aprasiddha*; K. *pul kūksōng*). *Prasiddha* (K. *kūksōng*) means something that is considered to be established, common knowledge, or an unproblematic premise that both disputants agree to accept; *aprasiddha* is its opposite. Dignāga placed great stress on the two disputants finding axioms that both considered *prasiddha*, in order to allow cross-sectarian debate to be open and fruitful.

Śāṅkaravāmin’s *Nyāyapraveśa* lists nine types of pseudo-*pakṣas*. A pseudo-*pakṣa* would be a *pakṣa* (1) contradicted by perception (*pratyakṣa-viruddhaḥ*); (2)



contradicted by inference (*anumāna-viruddhaḥ*); (3) contradicted by the teachings of one's own tradition (which would make one inconsistent) (*āgama-viruddhaḥ*); (4) contradicted by worldly consensus (*loka-viruddhaḥ*); (5) contradicted by one's own [prior] statements (i.e., self-contradiction) (*sva-vacana-viruddhaḥ*); (6) in which the qualifier is not accepted by one of the disputants (*aprasiddha-viśeṣaṇaḥ*); (7) in which the qualified is not accepted by one of the opponents (*aprasiddha-viśeṣyaḥ*); (8) in which both the qualifier and the qualified are not accepted (*aprasiddhobhayaḥ*); or (9) in which the relation between the qualifier and the qualified is too well known to require additional proof (*prasiddha-sambandhaś ceti*).

The first five should be rather obvious, but the remaining four might require additional comment. The example given in *Nyāyapraveśa* of a *pakṣa* that is fallacious because “the qualifier is not accepted by one of the disputants” is when a Buddhist tries to propose to a Sāṃkhyan that “sound is destructible.” This is unacceptable to the Sāṃkhyan because he holds that sound is eternal and indestructible. This would be a case of the disputants not sharing the same premise, which renders the *pakṣa* unusable even though the Buddhist would certainly hold that particular claim to be true. It would appear that the *pakṣa* “sound is impermanent” would nonetheless be an acceptable *pakṣa* for a Buddhist debating a Sāṃkhyan, even though the Sāṃkhyan holds that sound is permanent, since that is a more basic tenet that can be questioned. To characterize sound as destructible, on the other hand, already presupposes that sound cannot be permanent and thus prejudices and biases any subsequent discussion. Similarly, the example given for “the qualified is not accepted by one of the opponents” is a Sāṃkhyan proposing to a Buddhist that “the self [*ātman*] is conscious,” since the qualified in that statement—that is, the *ātman*—is not accepted by Buddhists as a legitimate locus for properties.

“Both the qualifier and the qualified are not accepted” is illustrated by the example of a Vaiśeṣika proposing to a Buddhist that the self is the *inherent cause* (Skt. *samavāyi-kāraṇam*; K. *hwahap inyōn*) of happiness, etc. (*vaiśeṣikasya bauddhaṃ prati sukhādi-samavāyi-kāraṇam ātmeti*). As above, the Buddhist does not accept the self as a legitimate locus, much less an actual cause of anything. In addition, however, Buddhists also reject the Vaiśeṣika theory of inherence. Vaiśeṣikas propose a number of ultimately real metaphysical categories that they call *padārthas* (K. *ku'ūi*). Inherence (*samavāyi*) is the sixth *padārtha*. It refers to an eternal relation (*nitya-sambandha*) of perpetual co-inherence, inner or intimate relation, constant and intimate union, or inseparable concomitance, such as the relation that Vaiśeṣikas posit to exist between a substance and its qualities, between a whole and its parts (e.g., between a cloth and the yarn composing it), between a genus and its individuals, and so on. Such relations, for Buddhists, are conceptual (Skt. *kalpanā*; K. *punbyōl*), not metaphysical, and certainly not eternal. Hence, discussing a Vaiśeṣika postulate that presumes that the self exhibits inherence would make no more sense to a Buddhist than discussing the color of the hair possessed by the son of a barren woman.

The example given for a “relation between the qualifier and the qualified is

too well known to require additional proof” is “sound is audible.” This would be a pseudo-*pakṣa* for a couple of reasons: first, sound, by definition, is what is audible, so this is tautological and in need of no additional “proof”; second, audibility is not a matter that inference can resolve, but something affirmed or denied only by perception.

Similarly detailed lists of types of fallacies concerning the Reason (Skt. *hetvābhāsa*, K. *sa'in*, fallacious reason) and the Example (Skt. *drṣṭāntābhāsa*, K. *sayu*, fallacious example) are given in the *Nyāyamukha*, the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, and the *Nyāyapraveśa*. Dignāga may have written an entire work devoted to identifying such fallacies, but it has not survived. His extant works, fortunately, retain the details. Śāṅkarasvāmin added a few fallacies to Dignāga’s list; Kuiji’s *Great Commentary on Nyāyapraveśa* became the definitive account of the fallacies in East Asia, sparking some discussion and debate during that period in which Wōnhyo’s *Critical Inference* participates.

## 5. The *Nyāyamukha* and Wōnhyo

Wōnhyo devotes some attention to an important section of Dignāga’s *Nyāyamukha* that discusses what sort of relation between the Thesis and the Reason yields a valid proof, what sort yields a contradictory (i.e., invalid) proof, and what sort remains inconclusive. In all, there are nine possible permutations, of which two entail validity, two are contradictory, and the remaining five are inconclusive. This ninefold model, which Dignāga also made the subject of an independent text that was not translated into Chinese, is called the *hetucakra*, or wheel of reasons.

Many of the inferences that Wōnhyo presents in the surviving part of *Critical Discussion on Inference* are, he concludes, inconclusive. Some he declares outright contradictory (hence false), and some he accepts as valid. But the majority of inferences that he considers he judges to be inconclusive. Without the earlier part of the text, it is difficult to determine whether Wōnhyo has a general tendency to find inferences inconclusive or whether the missing portion of his text would redress the seeming imbalance. One must also consider that the odds of an inference’s being inconclusive, if one follows Dignāga’s examples, are 5 to 9—that is, greater than 50 percent. Whether the large number of inconclusive inferences in Wōnhyo’s text are intended to mirror Dignāga or, as Wōnhyo seems to suggest in his conclusion, such reasoning itself is inconclusive for the deepest questions is something that, aside from recovering the missing portions of the text (Wōnhyo’s introduction in particular might have shed some light on this), the readers will have to decide for themselves. However, one cannot resist entertaining the thought that the preponderance of inconclusive arguments may be a result of his penchant—clearly observable in his other texts—to generate dialectical dilemmas and conundrums, which he can then transcend in order to claim a position above them. He does that here as well and concludes his text with a strong reiteration of that attitude.



The commentators, recognizing the importance of this section of the *Nyāyamukha*, apparently discussed—and disputed—its details at length. Wōnhyo joins that conversation, referring to the ideas of some of the other commentators, some of whose comments would otherwise be unknown to us.

Below is a translation of that section of the *Nyāyamukha*. This should help orient the reader to the issues Wōnhyo is alluding to when he takes up his discussion of this text and the commentators' theories on it. It might also serve as an illustration of the style of Dignāga's text, which is terse, so that the reader might appreciate the challenge Buddhists such as Wōnhyo faced when trying to understand the system and its implications.

We pick up the passage at Dignāga's discussion of the *pakṣadharmā*—that is, the property of the Thesis that also must reside in the Reason. The *Nyāyamukha* is systematic in the sense that it begins by discussing and explaining the Thesis (*pakṣa*) and its components, then moves on to the Reason, and then turns to how the Thesis and Reason relate to each other. The Example is brought into the discussion at verse 7.

Dignāga takes as his stock example the claims that “sound is eternal” and “sound is not eternal [i.e., impermanent],” which he has borrowed from the Vaiśeṣikas, who themselves had challenged Hindu orthodoxy by arguing against the notion that sound is eternal. The Sanskrit term *śabda* has a variety of meanings. Here it is treated as “sound,” but *śabda* also means “word” and can imply the Scriptural Word—that is, *the* Scriptures, which for Hindus means the Vedas. When the Vaiśeṣikas, already in their earliest scripture, the *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra*, advance arguments against the notion that sound is eternal, they are not merely debating the metaphysics or physics of acoustical phenomena but challenging a notion of eternally valid Scripture embraced by various Hindu schools, such as Sāṃkhya and Mīmāṃsā, as well. Dignāga, as a Buddhist, brings that attitude about scripture into Buddhism, which eventually shifted Buddhists' reliance on reason and scripture (*yukti* and *āgama*) as providers of valid knowledge to reliance on the two valid means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) that the Vaiśeṣikas had accepted: perception (*pratyakṣa*) and inference (*anumāna*). It is sometimes overlooked that Dignāga adopted this from the Vaiśeṣikas and did not devise this idea himself.<sup>10</sup> Wōnhyo is concerned in *Critical Inference* with understanding that second *pramāṇa*, inference.

Just before the passage below begins, Dignāga has described the *hetu* (Reason), pointing out, among other things, that it is given in the fifth grammatical case—that is, the ablative (“because of,” “from”).<sup>11</sup> In the passage below he presents nine Theses with their Reasons. The term *liṅga* (sign, mark) is used as a synonym for *hetu* (Reason), since the Reason is what is supposed to *signal* the validity of the proof. Note that, in what follows, Dignāga plays with reversing the Thesis and Reason statements (e.g., compare items 3 and 8).<sup>12</sup>

In this way there are nine types of *pakṣadharmā*. Briefly, in order, their marks [\**liṅga*]:

- (1) Sound is eternal, because of its knowability [*prameya*];<sup>13</sup> or
- (2) It is not eternal, because a product; or
- (3) It is directly produced by human effort, because not eternal; or
- (4) It is eternal, because a product; or
- (5) It is eternal, because of its audibility; or
- (6) It is eternal, because it is directly produced by human effort (*prayatnanantarīyakatvaṃ*); or
- (7) It is not produced directly by human effort (*aprayatnānantarīyaka*), because it is not eternal; or
- (8) It is not eternal, because directly produced by human effort; or
- (9) It is eternal, because intangible.

As Dignāga will point out shortly, statements 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 are inconclusive, statements 2 and 8 are valid, and 4 and 6 are contradictory. He continues:

The nine types are [respectively parsed and] gathered into two verses [the first verse listing the properties-to-be-proven and the second providing their respective Reasons]:

5. [Sound is] (1) eternal, (2) not eternal, (3) [produced by] human effort, (4) perpetually abiding, (5) firm, (6) stable, (7) not produced by effort, (8) variable, or (9) invariant; these are the nine [*pakṣas*] from which [claims as to whether or not sound is] knowable, and so on [are made].<sup>14</sup>
6. [Because it is] (1) something known, (2) a product, (3) non-eternal, (4) a product, (5) audible, (6) arising from human effort, (7) non-eternal, (8) human effort, or (9) intangible, are the nine [*hetus*] [on which claims for] eternity [and non-eternity] are based.

These are differentiated into [valid] Reason, contradictory, and inconclusive. Hence a verse states:

7. A [Reason in which the *pakṣadharmā*] is present in the positive example, in two (possible) ways and absent from the negative example is a (valid) Reason. Otherwise [the inference] is contradictory or else inconclusive.

Among these [nine], only two are [valid] Reasons—that is, [when the *pakṣadharmā* is] present in all positive examples and absent in all negative examples and when it is present in some positive examples and absent in (all) negative examples. These are the items in the middle of the first three and of the last three [that is, the second and eighth items].

Further, only two types are contradictory, since they oppose what is being posited [by the Thesis]. These are

- (1) [when the *pakṣadharmā*] is present (i) in all or (ii) in some dissimilar examples [*vipakṣas*], and
- (2) [when] it is fully absent in all similar examples (*sapakṣas*).

In the second three, these two are the first and last [i.e., statements 4 and 6].

As to the remaining five [i.e., statements 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9], there is no way to determine whether they are [valid] reasons or contradictory; so they are doubtful reasons [*saṁśaya-hetu*].<sup>15</sup>

However, if in all [three parts of the inference] the property is in the Reason, etc., then they are all said to have a single property of the same type [i.e., the *pakṣadharmā* is shared in common by the *hetu*, the *pakṣa*, and the *sapakṣa*]. If two [parts] have properties that contradict each other, then they cannot be predicated as sharing the same locus and still be considered a [valid] reason, etc. Or, when the reason only partially permeates [the other parts of the inference when they should be] identical, [then it is also considered inconclusive].<sup>16</sup>

Thus the Reason is the linchpin for determining whether an inference is valid, since it expresses the property that the Thesis and Example have in common with it—namely, the *pakṣadharmā*.

Dignāga now addresses some alternate theories proposed by rivals:

[Some contend that] logically [only] four types should be called inconclusive Reasons, since the two [occur] in both ways.

This requires some unpacking. The “four types” would be the following cases: (1) when the *pakṣadharmā* is present in the similar example and present in some dissimilar examples; (2) when it is present in some similar examples but absent in the dissimilar example; (3) when it is not present in some similar examples and is absent in the dissimilar example; and (4) when it is absent in some similar examples but present in some dissimilar examples.

The following terse comment by Dignāga will receive extended consideration by Wōnhyo:

How can “audibility” [be considered inconclusive]? Because it is a property that is not shared [*asādhāraṇa*] [between the three parts of the inference].

Again, some unpacking is called for. This is referring to the fifth statement above: “[Sound] is eternal, because of its audibility.” The property “audibility” applies only to sound, nothing else, so when it is cited as the Reason, it is a property that

cannot be shared with anything else and thus cannot be shared with the Thesis or similar examples. No items or examples of “audibility” other than sound are available for the similar examples or the dissimilar examples.

This observation carries further implications and insights into Dignāga’s proposals on inference, which may be why the commentators hovered over this nearly elliptical statement. In terms of the two *pramāṇas*—perception and inference—Dignāga informs us that perception deals exclusively with singular particulars (*sva-lakṣaṇa*), whereas inference, since it involves language and concepts, deals in general classes (*sāmānya-lakṣaṇa*), which are invariably conceptual (*kalpanā*). This becomes a fundamental tenet of Buddhist epistemology. Since, for a variety of reasons, Buddhists considered singular particulars to be real, actual things while conceptualizations were at best abstract approximations of what obtains concerning particulars viewed through general categories, Buddhists did not consider universal classes to hold ontological status. Hence the sort of universals accepted as ontological foundations by their opponents were rejected by Buddhists. Yet inference, which they did accept as valid, deals exclusively in classes, which are the correlates of universals. How could Buddhists accept inference while rejecting universals? In Dignāga’s terse comment we get a hint.

While perception deals exclusively with singularities, particulars, inference always deals only with general classes. Dignāga is insisting here that in order for an inference to have validity beyond a distinct particular—which would have to be addressed by perception rather than inference—the inference must show that a common property is shared between at least two distinct classes, that it is shared in common between them. One cannot generalize what is not general, and one must demonstrate generality by indicating that more than one class shares that property—that is, that it is not exclusive to only one thing or even one class. This affords some insight into the way that Dignāga’s *sāmānya-lakṣaṇa* is “general” while not becoming the sort of metaphysical “universal” entertained in many other systems.

Since “audibility” applies only to sound, it is not sufficiently general to serve as a Reason from which one could draw any additional conclusions from a *pakṣadharmā* concerning “sound.” The *pakṣadharmā* would have to apply to other classes of things or properties in order to constitute a viable inference. Hence, unlike “directly produced by human effort,” “audibility” is not a characteristic that applies to any other thing and thus is too narrow or restricted to serve as a Reason concerning the eternality or non-eternality of sound.

Audibility is not an axiomatic property of eternality or of its opposite. One might argue that sounds are heard to arise and cease, and thus, since they appear only temporarily in a temporal sequence, they must be non-eternal; one might also argue conversely that sound is always available, though that available sound is not always heard, and “audibility” refers to that availability and not to any actual auditory event. Hence, again, this remains inconclusive.

Dignāga continues:

If the property of the thing-to-be-proven [*pakṣadharmā*]<sup>17</sup>—that is, the quality [*viśeṣa*] [of the *pakṣa*] that [must] permeate all the [parts of the proof]—is not shared [by all of the parts], then it is a dubitable Reason, since it only applies to what has that [specific] nature, which (in the case of “audibility”) is utterly unique (and not share-able with other types of things, as would be required by the positive example, etc.). All parts should share the (property of the) Reason without exception.

In the inference “Sound is eternal, because of audibility,” the Reason is considered “doubtful,” not “contradictory,” because the statement itself (e.g., “sound is audible”) seems to be true, and yet even though the Reason in itself is in some sense true, it fails to connect with the Thesis statement (sound is eternal) or to support either contention as to whether sound is or is not eternal, since neither “eternal” nor “non-eternal” shares a decisive *pakṣadharmā* with “audibility.”

During his discussion of what he includes among the inconclusive types of Reasons, Dignāga mentions another issue that also caught Wōnhyo’s attention. In the interest of brevity I will forgo translating and unpacking Dignāga’s discussion of it and try instead to explain this in simpler terms. The issue is the status of what Dignāga called *viruddha-avyabhicārin*. *Viruddha* means “contradictory,” and so the question is, why is this sort of contradiction classified as inconclusive instead of as contradictory? *Avyabhicārin* means “not to wander, stray, or go errant.” An inference that properly follows its logical path through the requisite steps, inerrantly reaching its conclusion, would be one that is logically valid. A *viruddha-avyabhicārin* is a case in which two inferences are both technically sound and therefore valid, but nonetheless each reaches a conclusion that contradicts the conclusion reached by the other inference. The contradiction is not within either of the inferences—both are sound inferences. It is the conclusions reached by each that are contradictory. In other words, the contradiction lies in the implications of the conclusions that each entails, when taken in conjunction; neither is internally contradictory. Thus, for Dignāga, this becomes a case of being inconclusive, not technically contradictory, since one or the other might be true, or both may be false, and so on.<sup>18</sup> Thus their conclusions being contradictory produces an impasse and renders both inconclusive.

That Dignāga allows it is possible for there to be two fully valid inferences such that each reaches a conclusion that contradicts the conclusion reached by the other valid inference—rendering both inconclusive despite their logical validity—indicates that he was not a strict rationalist. Rationalists believe that reason itself is a guarantor of truth, such that a logically valid proof built on sound premises must necessarily be true. Dignāga is allowing that that is *not* the case. It is noteworthy that Dharmakīrti, in his *Nyāyabindu*,<sup>19</sup> emphatically rejects the possibility that any actual *viruddha-avyabhicārin* can exist. He recognizes that it threatens the presumptive edifice on which reason as arbiter of truth is built.

Wōnhyo is intrigued by the potential for undermining positions that can be

caused by juxtaposing two seemingly sound inferences against each other. It is a device he himself uses repeatedly to render arguments for a variety of positions “inconclusive.” It is noteworthy that Sungyǒng, another Korean monk of the time who wrote on Buddhist logic, became known for establishing a method of *viruddha-avyabhicārin*—that is, inconclusiveness based on contradiction between valid proofs (K. *kyōlchǒng sangwi pujǒng yang*) that turns pairs of logical proofs into dialectical counterbalances.

## 6. Critical Discussion on Inference

Turning now to Wǒnhyo and *Critical Discussion on Inference*, it is again worth noting how striking it is that Dignāga’s logic system, through Xuanzang’s translations and the commentaries that were being written on them, experienced such a rapid spread that we find it being discussed so quickly in Korea in such a sophisticated way.

Wǒnhyo was not the only Korean at this time engaged in writing about the logic texts. One of the commentators discussed by Kuiji in his *Great Commentary* is Sǔngjang, who also served for a while as one of Xuanzang’s translation assistants. Most of his writings, including those on logic, are no longer extant.

Even more germane is the previously mentioned Korean monk Sungyǒng, who earned a reputation in China for his writings on the *hetuvidyā* texts, though according to some accounts he never left Silla (others claim he went to China to study with Xuanzang). A short biography is given in the fourth fascicle of the *Song Dynasty Compilation of Lives of Eminent Monks* (*Song gaoseng zhuan*, T 2061:50.728a4–b10), by Zanning (920–1001). This biography, which suggests that Sungyǒng never left Silla, tells us that the Chinese monks were critical of him, complaining that if even they, who had studied directly with Xuanzang, were unable to fully comprehend the “lustrous gem” of the teachings on logic, how could he do so from afar? Nonetheless this illustrates that Koreans were engaged in the project of working out the implications of the new logic system and that Kuiji and the rest in China were familiar with Sungyǒng’s writings. This also shows that the logic materials were circulating and being studied in Korea during Xuanzang’s lifetime and for some time afterward and that some Koreans—Sǔngjang, Sungyǒng, and Wǒnhyo—were producing their own commentaries that were being read back in China and, even when criticized, were nonetheless being taken seriously. The flow of information traveled in both directions.

Wǒnhyo understood that the inference system is a set of tools by which conflicting sides can try to resolve differences or by which a true idea can overcome a falsehood, and he knew these tools were especially applicable to working out doctrinal differences. Some of the other East Asian commentaries on *hetuvidyā* texts scrutinize the lists of fallacies, pseudo-reasons, and so on, while rehearsing positions held by Sāṃkhyaans, Vaiśeṣikas, etc., back in India that the Indian texts offer up as examples to illustrate the types of arguments one would encounter in debate. Since there were no Sāṃkhyaans, Vaiśeṣikas, etc., in China or Korea, their

positions and associated arguments were largely irrelevant to the situation in East Asia—in other words, those East Asian commentaries discuss and debate “museum” positions. One of the striking things about Wōnhyo’s *Critical Inference* is that, unlike in those commentaries, attention is entirely devoted to the controversial issues of his day. For Wōnhyo the logical tool kit needs to be tested on things that were then hot items of contention in East Asia, such as whether a Pure Land exists or not, or whether to accept a fourth component (*svasaṃvitti saṃvitti*) to the parts of a perceptual act, something introduced in the *Buddhabhūmyupadeśa* (Ch. *Fodijing lun*) and *Cheng weishi lun*.

Xuanzang’s Yogācāra had become a challenge to the older forms of Yogācāra that had developed from the translations and teachings of Bodhiruci, Paramārtha, and their followers. While Xuanzang was alive, under the emperor’s patronage and with unimpeachable credentials based on his time in India and his unprecedented (for a Chinese) command of Sanskrit and Buddhist literature, he and his Indian-style Yogācāra prevailed. Once he died, the “old schools” reasserted themselves and began to increasingly challenge what were perceived as key elements in Xuanzang’s teachings, such as the five *gotras*,<sup>20</sup> the four components of perception, and so on. Fazang, later deemed a Huayan patriarch, became one of the major opponents of what he dubbed as the Weishi (Consciousness-only) school in China, and Wōnhyo was engaged in something similar, if less directly polemical, in Korea. Both seized the *Awakening of Faith* as a key weapon in their arsenals. *Critical Inference* is, among other things, an artifact of that project.

Another striking feature of *Critical Inference* is the effective way it takes statements from other texts that there appeared in the typical prose of a Buddhist treatise and recasts the doctrinal positions as tight threefold inferences. Whether all or some of this reformulation was performed by Wōnhyo himself or whether some of the Chinese *hetuvidyā* commentaries no longer extant had done some of this for him is impossible to determine.

There are several major impediments to gaining a clear understanding of *Critical Inference*. The first and most important is that, as mentioned, at least half the text is missing, and the first half at that. Often, even with a relatively complete text, reconstructing context when the contextual materials are no longer available can be challenging. With a text that is also incomplete that problem is compounded, since one often gets the sense that Wōnhyo is arguing with his sources, but we have to guess on our own what they might have said. Some sections are easier to reconstruct than others, but several portions of my translation remain tentative at best.

One issue that Wōnhyo delves into may require some comment. The *Buddhabhūmyupadeśa* and the *Cheng weishi lun* discuss a theory by which perception is distinguished into four distinct components: (1) an objective component (Skt. *nimitta*; K. *sang*); (2) a “seeing” or perceiving part (Skt. *darśana*; K. *kyōn*); (3) a self-aware part (Skt. *svasaṃvitti*; K. *chajūng*), which witnesses the “seeing” part as it “sees”; and (4) a part that is aware of the self-aware part (Skt.



\**svasaṃvitti-saṃvitti*; K. *chŭng chajŭng*). While the *Buddhabhūmyupadeśa* insists that all four components are necessary in order to provide a full account of what is involved in an act of perception, the *Cheng weishi lun* suggests that all four ultimately reduce to the second, being simply various versions of “seeing.”<sup>21</sup> Wŏnhyo is clearly not comfortable with the fourth component, and possibly the third as well.

The question of how well Wŏnhyo actually understood all the rigorous requirements of the Dignāga system—given that he was getting it largely from texts that themselves were known to be contradictory (vide the Lü Cai fiasco)—is unclear. Sometimes he makes very shrewd and insightful observations, but at other times—perhaps due to obscurities in the surviving text that prevent us from appreciating his argument fully—he seems to misconstrue some fundamental aspects of the inferential method. I leave this for the readers to sort out for themselves.

## 7. Editions Consulted

Although only a partial manuscript of *Critical Inference* is extant, several attempts have been made to produce a readable, cogent edition of the half that remains. As mentioned previously, there are sufficient ambiguities—ranging from characters and phrases obscured by physical damage to graphically readable but semantically incoherent statements that are probably copyist errors in need of correction—that such efforts have been necessary and bring us several helpful steps beyond the raw manuscript.

I initially received the Han’guk Pulgyo chŏnsŏ (HPC) edition along with a draft translation by Professors Cuong Nguyen and Charles Muller. Before long, it became clear that both the draft translation and the HPC edition were in need of substantial revision. With Charles Muller’s assistance I acquired additional editions of *P’an piryang non*, including the version in HPC as well as the Kugyŏk (a Korean vernacular translation that included edited source Sino-Korean) in the Wŏnhyo sŏngsa chŏnsŏ (Collected Works of the Sagely Teacher Wŏnhyo). I also consulted the version on CBETA (XZJ 860.951a5–953b20) with its annotations. Not surprisingly, at almost every possibly ambiguous location in the text, each of these versions offered different solutions. Although I had no access to the original manuscript on which these editions were based, nor to photos of it, I did manage to carefully compare each of their solutions. In the end I primarily followed the reading in the CBETA version, as it seemed the soundest, and its annotations discuss the condition of the manuscript at various points while noting the variant readings proposed by others, notably Kim Chigyŏn, Choe Pŏmsul, and Fukihara Shōshin. As the task before me was to produce an English translation, and not another attempt at a critical edition (which would have been awkward to present in a format that consigns Chinese characters to a glossary), I have commented in the notes only on the most significant philological and graphical issues.



## Translation

### CRITICAL DISCUSSION ON INFERENCE

*Composed by Wōnhyo*

*Translated by Dan Lusthaus*

[7] . . . definitely fallacious, so one can refute that as well, since this elicits the same objections [Skt. *codanā*; K. *nan*] [as the previous proof].

Moreover, to be certain, one ought to ask:

You [claim], in words, that “Words do not reveal the Pure Land.” [Does what you say] convey knowledge [Skt. *jñāna*; K. *hye*] about the Pure Land? Or [do you mean that words] do not convey the Pure Land itself? If you say [words] do convey [some knowledge], then that contradicts your own thesis, because this teaches something about the Pure Land, and so is able to reveal [knowledge about] the Pure Land. If you say they do not convey [the Pure Land itself], that was not the other’s thesis, since [the other would agree that the Pure Land itself] is not revealed in words; so this does not refute the Pure Land [itself].

You ought to keep an open mind when debating that. If you intended the first [option—namely, that no knowledge is conveyed by words—] you are committing the fault of contradicting your own statement [since you are claiming, in words, that words do not convey knowledge, which is self-contradictory.] If [you intended the second option] and modify [your claim to be that] words [about] this Pure Land are insufficient to convey the Pure Land itself, I would ask: Are they [i.e., words] insufficient to enter the *teaching* about the Pure Land? Since this would not be committing the fault of contradicting your own statement, then it would seem you *do* take [some] knowledge [from the words], and thus your claim is inconclusive. In this way [we could go] go back and forth, with none of this being logically [decisive as to the existence of the Pure Land].<sup>22</sup>

(Two Inferences<sup>23</sup>)

8. Those who hold that [an act of perception consists of] four components,<sup>24</sup> attempting to refute the [idea that there are only] three [or two<sup>25</sup>] components, set up the following inference that states:

[*Thesis*] A self-aware [i.e., third component] mental [act] exists,  
which itself is what is aware.<sup>26</sup>

[*Reason*] Because it is included among the mental components.

[*Example*] Just as the image component [*nimitta*] [is included].<sup>27</sup>

[An opponent counters:]

- [*Thesis*] The self-aware should not be included among the mental components,  
 [*Reason*] Because no such capacity to be aware of itself exists.  
 [*Example*] Like the horns of a hare.

Critique: These two inferences are fallacious [*ābhāsa*], not true. They both (suffer) the flaw of being inconclusive, since neither is able to [definitively] exclude the other.<sup>28</sup>

That is, if one considers the “being self-aware” [K. *chajñg pun*; Skt. *svasaṃvitti*] to be included among the mental components, like the Images component [K. *sangbun*; Skt. *nimitta*], then it exists, and it itself would be capable of being aware.<sup>29</sup> If[, on the other hand,] one considers it to be included among the mental components, just like the image [*nimitta*] that arises in visual consciousness[, which is how the *nimitta* comes to be included within a mental act], then it does not exist as that which is capable of being aware [since the *nimitta* is not capable of being aware; rather, it is what one is aware of]. Like the previous Reason, this [argument] has the fault of being inconclusive.

Then again, a self-aware component [*svasaṃvitti*] that is considered [nonexistent] like the horns of a rabbit, because it would not be something capable of being aware (or of verifying cognitions<sup>30</sup>), would not be included among the mental components.

[The third self-aware component is then said to be the image perceived by the fourth component, the one aware of the self-aware component. The first is the image component that is perceived by the “seeing” component, which becomes an image component for the third component, the self-aware component. The third, in turn, becomes an image component for the fourth. Since the second and third components become image components, they, along with the first component, yield three image components in total. Such is the theory of the four components.]

If [the third component] is considered to be [one of the] three [types of] images, like the image component for auditory consciousness, since [the image component for auditory consciousness consists of sounds, which are insentient, then even though sounds] are something incapable of being aware (or of verifying cognitions), they would [nonetheless] be included among the mental components.

In this way these latter Reasons are also inconclusive.

If one counters that because the three [types] of *nimittas* are essentially inseparable from the five consciousnesses,<sup>31</sup> they are the object-support [*ālambana-viṣaya*] for the self-aware [component], that is also logically impossible, since, as images, the three [types] of *nimittas* are inseparable from the images component [and thus insentient], and also since it is the “seeing” component of the five consciousnesses that apprehends object-supports.<sup>32</sup>

If they do not admit this, how could that be possible? If one accepts what the other previously claimed, then this must not be accepted. The five consciousnesses and their object-supports in the experiential realm [*dharmadhātu*] and sense-spheres [*āyatana*] [must be properly parsed]; to mix up and confuse the

characteristics of the factors of experience [*dharmas*] contradicts logic and the teachings.

But knowing that those two [opposing] Reasons [can be asserted of] the three [types] of *nimittas* makes both claims inconclusive.

If [in order to avoid that difficulty] one counters that, saying: “The three [types] of *nimittas* are *not* included among the mental components,” then this would entail the flaw of the fallacy of an inference involving self-contradiction [*anumāna-viruddha*].<sup>33</sup> So you should know that talk about the fourth component is just meaningless chatter.

(Two Inferences)

9. Asvabhāva’s *Commentary on the “Compendium of the Great Vehicle,”*<sup>34</sup> in order to prove [the legitimacy] of the eighth consciousness against the [rejection of it by proponents] of the Lesser Vehicle [who argue that it is not included in their scriptures<sup>35</sup>], offers two inferences, stating:

[*Thesis*] The teaching of the eight consciousnesses is included in [the Buddha’s] Sacred Speech [*ārya-bhāṣā*].

[*Reason*] Because it is similar to [the teaching of] no-self.

[*Example*] Like [the teachings in] the four Āgamas.<sup>36</sup>

And again,

[*Thesis*] The teachings on the eight consciousnesses must accord with reason.

[*Reason*] Because they are the Sacred [*āryan*] Teachings.<sup>37</sup>

[*Example*] Like the teachings [= scriptures] on the six consciousnesses.

In this way this is developed into a proof for the eight consciousnesses.<sup>38</sup>

Now, in order to impartially mediate between [these conflicting claims about] what is expressed [in the scriptures], an inference is offered:

[*Thesis*] Proving [. . .<sup>39</sup>] consciousness.

That is, just as the gustatory, tactile, and mental consciousnesses [*mano-vijñāna*] are not included among the three consciousnesses with six gates—that is, the visual, auditory, and olfactory consciousnesses<sup>40</sup>—but are additional, distinct consciousnesses,

[*Thesis*] [The *ālaya-vijñāna*] is not among the three six-gate [consciousnesses].

[Reason] Because it is included among the three consciousnesses.<sup>41</sup>

[Example] Just as the gustatory, tactile, and mental consciousnesses [are not included among the three “sixes” either].<sup>42</sup>

Here, the six consciousnesses are accepted as axiomatic by both sides [prāsiddha].<sup>43</sup> For the opponent the [ālaya-vijñāna] serves as the exclusionary example [vipakṣa],<sup>44</sup> and for we who accept eight consciousnesses, that is our exclusionary example [as well].<sup>45</sup> The Reason “included among the three consciousnesses” does not change that. Therefore this Reason is definitively proven.

If one takes “Because included in the Fluctuating Consciousnesses [pravṛtti-vijñāna]”<sup>46</sup> as a Reason, then the opponent [will insist that the ālaya-vijñāna] is different from the Fluctuating Consciousnesses. If a claim takes as the Reason “That is the nature of consciousness,” that too is our exclusionary example. Neither [side] can avoid the fallacy of being inconclusive.<sup>47</sup>

(Three Inferences)

10. The *Cheng weishi lun* posits the following inference, stating:

[Thesis] The eighth consciousness necessarily has a simultaneous support [sahabhū-āśraya].<sup>48</sup>

[Reason] Because that is the definition [= nature] of consciousness.

[Example] Like the six consciousnesses, etc.

This Reason has difficulties that render it inconclusive; namely, some assert that

[Thesis] The eighth consciousness does not have a simultaneous support.

[Reason] Because it is the root [i.e., not derivative].

[Example] Like suchness.

[But the opponent replies:] If that is what you say, then you commit the fallacy of proving the opposite of a property of the *dharmin* [dharmi-viśeṣa-viparīta-sādhana],<sup>49</sup> because that would establish that the eighth consciousness is unconditioned [since it would depend on nothing other than itself, which is not an accepted property of the ālaya-vijñāna, since it is *saṃskṛta*, conditioned, par excellence]. The previous Reason [viz., that the eighth does have *sahabhū-āśraya*] as well is fallacious, since that would be a proof [sādhana] that the eighth [consciousness] is [the same as] the *pravṛtti-vijñānas*.

If someone states this, he refutes himself, thus entailing the objection of failing to prove [asiddha] [his contention]. The other [alternative] also contradicts itself and so entails the objection of not being the case.

Now [*Cheng weishi lun*] posits a separate thesis:<sup>50</sup>

[*Thesis*] Neither *ālaya* nor *manas* has the sense faculties [*indriya*] as a simultaneous basis.

[*Reason*] Because they are not included in what defines the six consciousnesses [i.e., cognizing the objects of the five senses].

[*Example*] Like the visual faculty [i.e., eye], etc.<sup>51</sup>

If one objects that this Reason commits the fallacy of contradiction, what one would need to prove [*sādhya*] is that the seventh and eighth consciousnesses are not perceivers of object-supports,<sup>52</sup> as is the case for the eye faculty and other sense organs.<sup>53</sup> But this too is impossible, since [the fact that they do take] the mental factors [*caitta dharmas*] [as object-supports] makes this proof inconclusive.

If you say that my previous Reason is also inconclusive—the fallacy [*ābhāsa*] being that the mental factors [*caittas*], even though they are not of the nature of the six consciousnesses, nonetheless do have a basis[, proving that having a basis is not confined to the six consciousnesses, thus rendering the Reason inadequate]—my [Reason] is not inconclusive, since the root basis is said to be in the mind [i.e., the *ālaya*].

If one retorts that it is only the mental factors [*caittas*] that are the bases [for the seventh and eighth consciousnesses], while the sense faculties are not bases for them, since [the seventh and eighth consciousnesses, and their mental factors,] are included in the [category of] *dharmāyatana*,<sup>54</sup> which does not rely on the sense faculties, then although that one's thesis knows to differentiate between dependence and basis,<sup>55</sup> it still does not understand that there is a difference between a basis and the sense-faculty.<sup>56</sup>

If one argues that while there are bases [*āśraya*] related to the eight consciousnesses and mental factors, the sense-faculty bases [*indriyāśrita*] are not related to the mental factors, nor to the seventh and eighth consciousnesses [since the sense-faculty bases are exclusively related to the physical senses], then some would refute that thesis by positing an inference that states:

[*Thesis*] *Mano-vijñāna* definitely is incapable of cognizing objects simultaneously [*sahabhū*] with the [five] sense faculties.

[*Reason*] Because the sixth consciousness is not included among the *citta* and *caittas*.

[. . .]<sup>57</sup>

[*Thesis*] The sense faculties are simultaneous conditions for the sixth consciousness.

[*Reason*] Because [the sixth's perception may] include any of them.

[*Example*] Like the eye faculty and the other [sensory faculties, which serve as bases for their respective consciousnesses].

An opposing thesis counters [by saying that] the *rūpa* and *dharmas* included

in the *dharmāyatana*s are considered mental [and not material]—thus raising an objection.<sup>58</sup> Even though this refutation is fully consistent with the tenets of Mahāyāna, nonetheless it gives rise to the fallacy of two valid inferences contradicting each other [*viruddha-avyabhicārin*].<sup>59</sup> It posits that:

[*Thesis*] A mental faculty [*manas-indriya*] must not be composed of a material nature.

[*Reason*] Because the basis of the conceptual consciousness<sup>60</sup> is restricted [to the nonmaterial].

[*Example*] Like the sixth consciousness, which has attention [*manaskāra*] as a simultaneous [condition].<sup>61</sup>

Due to difficulties such as these, those Reasons are inconclusive.

(Four Inferences)

11. The Śabdavāda<sup>62</sup> masters posit:

[*Thesis*] Sound is permanent.

[*Reason*] Because of audibility.

The Vaiśeṣika<sup>63</sup> rejects that [argument] as being inconclusive insofar as it allows contradictory conclusions to be drawn [*viruddha-avyabhicārin*].<sup>64</sup> Buddhists reject it for being inconclusive because [it is] too restricted [*asādhāraṇa-anaikāntika*], because [audibility is exclusively a property of sound and so] lacks a property that can be shared with a similar example [*sapakṣa*].<sup>65</sup> Some point out a problem with this Reason [i.e., “audibility”] by positing an inference that states:

[*Thesis*] The Reason “audibility” should not be considered a dubious reason.<sup>66</sup>

[*Reason*] Because it is absent from any similar example.

[*Example*] [Which, instead, makes it] like a contradictory reason.<sup>67</sup>

Then again,<sup>68</sup> another posits:

[*Thesis*] This reason should not be inconclusive.

[*Reason*] Because it is absent from the exclusionary example.

[*Example*] Just as with a valid reason.

Dharma-master Munbi<sup>69</sup> says: “The *Nyāyamukha* says that because [a Reason] is utterly unique to a single [type of thing, and thus incapable of obtaining any Examples,] it is subject to objections.” That means that a Thesis that posits

“audibility” as the Reason is classified as inconclusive, since that is utterly unique [to sound and nothing else]. As such, it is inconclusive. The term “utterly unique” means [it applies to only] one [thing].<sup>70</sup>

Critique: This Reason has the fault of being inconclusive. [To give an absurd example,] taking “visibility” [as a Reason, i.e., “Because (sound has) visibility”], even though one of the three marks is missing [literally, it is deficient in one mark], [that is not the determinative fault;] it still would not be inconclusive, because [more importantly] it would be considered an unacceptable assertion [*aprasiddha*].<sup>71</sup> That is, regarding the claim

[*Thesis*] Sound is impermanent.

[*Reason*] Because it is visible.

[if somehow] this Reason would [manage to] be present in a similar example and absent from an exclusionary example, it would be deficient only as to the first mark [i.e., the property-to-be-proven is *not* shared between the Thesis and the Reason]. It is therefore considered to be deficient in one mark.

If one is trying to avoid the fault of being inconclusive, one might posit a Reason stating:

[*Reason*] Because it is deficient in one of the two latter marks.

[*Example*] Just like the four types of inconclusive reasons,<sup>72</sup> such as [the pseudo-reason in which the property-to-be-proven is] shared [with its opposite].<sup>73</sup>

This Reason has other faults and is also inconclusive. For instance, according to the Emptiness school [i.e., Madhyamaka], because of conditional co-arising, even if a Reason is deficient in one of the two latter marks, it is nevertheless a true reason, since it is not inconclusive. Thus it cannot be made into a case of two valid proofs contradicting each other [*viruddha-avyabhicārin*].<sup>74</sup>

Then again, [one might argue that the property-to-be-proven] in the prior Thesis is absent from the exclusionary example [as it is supposed to be], so even though the Reason itself is not dubious, [the proposition as a whole] is still inconclusive. It is like the [valid] Reasons in valid proofs that reach opposing conclusions [*viruddha-avyabhicārin*] because even though [the property-to-be-proven] is absent from the exclusionary Example [as it supposed to be], it is still a dubious Reason. Only if a Reason is absent from the similar example would it not be indeterminate and not a dubious Reason, since it would then be a full-fledged contradictory inference. That is,

[*Thesis*] “Audibility” etc. are inconclusive Reasons.

[*Reason*] Because they contradict the Thesis.

[*Example*] Like inconclusive Reasons, such as [the pseudo-reason in which the property-to-be-proven is] shared [with its opposite].

For example, the *Nyāyamukha* [verse 7—commentary] illustrates this Reason, saying: “If the property of the thing-to-be-proven [*sādhyā-dharma*]<sup>75</sup>—that is, the quality [*viśeṣa*] [of the *pakṣa*] that [must] permeate all the [parts of the proof]—is not shared [by all of the parts], then the Reason is dubitable,<sup>75</sup> since it applies only to what has that [specific] nature, which [in the case of ‘audibility’] is utterly unique [and not shareable with other types of things, as would be required by the similar Example, etc.]”<sup>76</sup>

To settle this, we say: The thing-to-be-proven [*sādhyā*] is too restrictive.<sup>77</sup> For example, someone posits:

[*Thesis*] Sound is eternal.

[*Reason*] Because of audibility.

Or someone posits:

[*Thesis*] [Sound] is impermanent.

[*Reason*] Because of audibility.

In this way, since [the Reason “Because of audibility” can be used to justify anything,] there is nothing that cannot be posited, all is equal; by logic such statements pervade and include everything.<sup>78</sup>

In all these cases the reason “audibility” is a dubious reason, since it is an utterly unique [property]. The objective accomplished by positing those theses is the same in that the theses are all identical in being “too restricted.” “All identical” means “unique.” “Too restricted” means “separated from.”<sup>79</sup> Because they are utterly unique [= all the same in being too restricted], positing [audibility] has the same [result] for those theses. Since those theses are contradictory, their reasons are inconclusive.

(Five Inferences)

12. Positing two [valid] inferences whose conclusions contradict each other [*viruddha avyabhicarin*].

Dharma-master Wengui<sup>80</sup> composed the following question and answer.

Question: [An inference] that fulfills [the requirements] of the *trairūpya* should be a valid reason. Why, then, in comparing [two inferences in which each fulfills the *trairūpya* but they result in contradictory conclusions], are they called inconclusive?

Answer: The doubt is because one cannot reach a final determination [as to which inference is true], so one dare not propound [either of] them [as conclusively true].

There is an interpretation<sup>81</sup> of the intent of this question, expressed as an inference:



[*Thesis*] The Reasons in the contradictory-conclusion [inferences] [*viruddha-avyabhicārin*] should be [considered] valid reasons.  
 [*Reason*] Because they fulfill the *trairūpya*.  
 [*Example*] Just like other true reasons.

Now [the answer] can be expressed:

[*Thesis*] The Reasons in contradictory-conclusions are not true reasons.  
 [*Reason*] Because they are equally problematic.  
 [*Example*] Like a contradictory reason.

From this we have demonstrated that they have the fault of being inconclusive.

Then again,

[*Thesis*] These two Reasons are not classified as unproven [*asiddha*].  
 [*Reason*] Because [separately] they are accepted [as valid inferences] by both parties.  
 [*Example*] Like the “too restricted.”

Due to this,

[*Thesis*] The two Reasons are classified as inconclusive reasons.  
 [*Reason*] Because they are not true, not contradictory, and not unproven.  
 [*Example*] Like the other five types of inconclusive reasons.<sup>82</sup>

(Six Inferences)

13. Some raise an objection concerning the five kinds of lineages,<sup>83</sup> positing an inference that states:

[*Thesis*] [Even] sentient beings lacking [Buddha] nature<sup>84</sup> will become buddhas.  
 [*Reason*] Because they have a mind.  
 [*Example*] Like those who have [Buddha] nature.

This Reason is inconclusive, so the objection is not established.

On the one hand, even though buddhas have a mind, they do not become buddhas [since they already are buddhas]. On the other hand, bodhisattvas, because they possess a mind [that aspires for enlightenment], necessarily will

become buddhas.<sup>85</sup>

An opponent might respond by reiterating the previous Thesis, replacing the Reason with [this one]:

[Reason] Because sentient beings have not yet become buddhas.

This Reason as well has the fault of being inconclusive [since whether all sentient beings will become buddhas is precisely the thing that needs to be proven, not presupposed]. On the one hand, bodhisattvas [by definition possess the requisite] seed nature [to become buddhas]. On the other hand, [is this true of beings in] the two vehicles[—viz., hearers and *pratyekabuddhas*—as well]?

One trying to avoid this [objection] can posit a Thesis that states:

[Thesis] All sentient beings lacking [Buddha-] nature [who are] determined [to follow] the two vehicles will become buddhas.

[Reason] Because these sentient beings are included among those not buddhas yet.

[Example] Like bodhisattvas.

One can find objections to this; thus this proof is inconclusive. For example:

[Thesis] Three types of people will not become buddhas.

[Reason] Because they are not in the Mahāyāna [vehicle], lack [the requisite] uncontaminated seeds, or are not included among those with the seed nature of a bodhisattva.

[Example] Like wood, stone, etc. and other insentient things.

Then again, their inferences have the fault of being contradictory, such as saying:

[Thesis] Among the five seed natures, the other four [aside from bodhisattvas destined to become buddhas] should have the four qualities,<sup>86</sup> even when they fall into the hells

[Reason] Because we claim they will be buddhas [someday].

[Example] Just like those in the bodhisattva family.

Such a claim contradicts the [basic Mahāyāna] teachings.<sup>87</sup> To not claim it contradicts the [Mahāyāna] principle [of universal Buddhahood].<sup>88</sup> [In either case] this inference has the fault of being self-contradictory; that is, one contradicts one's own statements.<sup>89</sup>

(Five Inferences)

14. The *Cheng weishi lun*, in order to refute selfhood [*ātman*] and *dharmas*,<sup>90</sup> posits inferences stating:

[*Thesis*] Generally, the object-support [*ālambana*]<sup>91</sup> for those who hold the view of selfhood [*ātma-dṛṣṭi*] is not a real self.

[*Reason*] Because it is an object-support [*ālambana*].<sup>92</sup>

[*Example*] Like [any] other mental object.

[*Thesis*] The object-support for those who hold the view of selfhood is definitely not a real self.

[*Reason*] Because it is an object-support.

[*Example*] Like other *dharmas*.<sup>93</sup>

Then again, it also states:

[*Thesis*] The *dharmas* held by non-Buddhists and the other vehicles as different from the mind and mental associates [*citta* and *caittas*] are not real [*dravya*].

[*Reason*] Because they are [mentally] grasped [objects] [*grāhya*].

[*Example*] Just like the mind and mental associates.

[*Thesis*] The grasper [*grāhaka*] perceiving them [*dharmas*] also is not [itself] an object-support [*ālambana*].

[*Reason*] Because it is a grasper [*grāhaka*].

[*Example*] [That would be] just like taking this perceiving [itself] as a object-support [i.e., perceiving subjectivity as an object].<sup>94</sup>

Critique: Here we have four inferences that are valid refutations,<sup>95</sup> since they [successfully] refute self and *dharmas*, and do so without engendering any logical flaws.

Some, employing the Reasons from these negations, may try to negate Mahāyāna [teachings], stating:

[*Thesis*] The cognitive objects [*ālambana*] that the eighth consciousness perceives [*darśana*] are not images [*nimitta*] of the *ālaya-vijñāna*.<sup>96</sup>

[*Reason*] Because it has an object-support.

[*Example*] Like taking for an object-support[. . . ]<sup>97</sup>

[. . .] How can it be said that things of the same class are different from each other? “Same” and “different” have two [different] referents. They disagree with and contradict each other, and yet each says that essentially they are saying the same thing. That definitely is not logical.

Critique: Here there are nine inferences. The first six refuted the original contention, while the latter three refuted Saṅghabhadra’s objections, that is:

[*Thesis*] When conjoined, it should not be the eye, etc.

[*Reason*] Because [the sense faculties] are different from the previous eye, etc.

[*Example*] Like color, sound, etc.<sup>98</sup>

Then again,

[*Thesis*] [Items in] a class should not be identical.

[*Reason*] Because they are different from [the other items] that share the same essence.

[*Example*] Like different images.

[*Thesis*] Images, as well, are not different.

[*Reason*] Because they are identical in that they share the same essence [*qua* being images].

[*Example*] Like<sup>99</sup> things in the same class.

These inferences are self-contradictory and thus are illogical.

Here again there may be some who want to refute Mahāyāna [teachings], saying:

[*Thesis*] Mahāyāna should not [include] “nominal form” in the sphere of form.<sup>100</sup>

[*Reason*] Because it is knowable [K. *soji*; Skt. *jñeya*].

[*Example*] Like the auditory sphere, etc.

The same applies to the other sensory spheres [smell, taste, touch] as well.

If the Mahāyāna school admitted the existence of “nominal form,” then it would be unable to avoid such fallacies. However, True Mahāyāna neither admits the existence of any such thing as “nominal form,” nor does it propound “substantial form” [*dravya-rūpa*].

Therefore what these inferences have proven is that all the *dharma*s, such as the *skandhas*, *dhātus*, and *āyatanas*, all of them are beyond language because they are nominal constructs [K. *ka sisōl*; Skt. *prajñapti*].

(Ten Inferences<sup>101</sup>)

Logical proofs are extremely difficult to comprehend,

So I laugh; what seemed so abstruse is easy to understand!

Now, relying on the sacred teaching, I raise one corner [of the whole],<sup>102</sup>

May Buddha Dharma circulate through this world and the next.

*Critical Discussion on Inference*, one fascicle, composed by Wōnhyo.



# Notes

## General Introduction

1. In addition to these two Indian-derived systems, Wōnhyo's writings were heavily influenced by Madhyamaka (to some extent by way of Jizang), as well as by the indigenous traditions of Daoism and Confucianism. See the discussion in Plassen, "Entering the Dharma-gate of Repeated Darkening."

2. Since its beginning, Buddhism has predicated the possibility of spiritual liberation (soteriology) on a correct knowledge of reality (epistemology)—a theme that is elaborated expansively and variously in Mahāyāna Buddhism.

3. Richard F. Gombrich remarks: "The brahmanical scriptures of the Buddha's day, the Brāhmaṇas and the early Upaniṣads, were mainly concerned with a search for the essences of things: of man, of sacrifice, of the universe. Indeed, brahmanical philosophy continued in this essentialist mode down the centuries" (*How Buddhism Began*, pp. 3–4).

4. This realization is enunciated in the Upaniṣads in the famous statement *tat tvam asi*. See, for instance, Roebuck, *Upaniṣads*, pp. 178–179.

5. Śākyamuni Buddha remarks: "Bhikkhus, I will teach you the all. . . . And what, bhikkhus is the all? The eye and forms, the ear and sounds, the nose and odors, the tongue and tastes, the body and tactile objects, the mind and mental phenomena. . . . In dependence on the eye and forms, eye consciousness arises. The meeting of the three is contact. With contact as condition, feeling [comes to be]. . . . In dependence on the ear and sounds. . . . In dependence on the mind and mental phenomena, mind-consciousness arises. The meeting of the three is contact. With contact as condition, feeling [comes to be]" (SN XXXV.23 and 60). See Bodhi, *Connected Discourses of the Buddha*, pp. 1140, 1148.

6. See A 4:45, quoted in Nyanaponika, *Karma and Its Fruit*, pp. 93–94. For a brief description of the detailed content of the five skandhas, see, for instance, Rahula, *What the Buddha Taught*, pp. 20–23.

7. See Bodhi, *Connected Discourses of the Buddha*, pp. 1136–1143.

8. In this sense, the Buddhist no-self (*anātman*) is best understood as a critique of the Hindu (or more precisely, the Upaniṣadic) notion of *ātman*, an immutable divine essence above and beyond the mind-body complex. The respective views of Buddhism and Hinduism regarding the self (*ātman*) are also correlated with their theories of causation.

9. In order to generate insight into the ever-changing elements of the human personality, Śākyamuni Buddha taught a meditative technique called the four foundations of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*). These include contemplations on the body, on feeling, on the mind, and on our physical and mental processes (dharma). For a detailed study of the four foundations of mindfulness, see, for instance, Silananda, *Four Foundations of Mindfulness*. This meditation technique is included in the path leading to spiritual realization in such key principal Yogācāra texts as the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*—on which Wōnhyo wrote a commentary, fragments of which are translated in this volume.

10. For instance, the Sāṃkhya school classifies reality into twenty-five basic principles. See Hiriyanna, *Essentials of Indian Philosophy*, pp. 106–128; and Hiriyanna, *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, pp. 267–297.

11. MN iii.63; SN V.387, quoted in Rahula, *What the Buddha Taught*, 53.

12. For an extensive study of this issue, see Kalupahana, *Causality*.

13. SN 3, 134.30–135.19, and SN 2, 17.8–30, quoted in Huntington, *Emptiness of Emptiness*, p. 37.

14. Both of the major Mahāyāna schools, Madhyamaka and Yogācāra, considered the middle path to be the central teaching of Śākyamuni, though their interpretations of this general concept differed.

15. The twelve limbs are as follows: “Conditioned by (1) ignorance are (2) volitional formations, conditioned by volitional formations is (3) consciousness, conditioned by consciousness is (4) mind-and-body, conditioned by mind-and-body are (5) the six senses, conditioned by the six senses is (6) sense-contact, conditioned by sense-contact is (7) feeling, conditioned by feeling is (8) craving, conditioned by craving is (9) grasping, conditioned by grasping is (10) becoming, conditioned by becoming is (11) birth, conditioned by birth is (12) old age and death.” For a detailed analysis of this twelve-link model, see, for instance, Gethin, *Foundations of Buddhism*, pp. 157–158. Note that the numbers of the links of dependent arising were recorded variously in the early texts (*āgama*) as five, nine, ten, and twelve. For a brief survey of this issue, see, for instance, Yinshun, *Weishixue tanyuan*, pp. 10–23.

16. *Udāna* 8:3, 80–81, quoted in Bodhi, *In the Buddha’s Words*, p. 336. The Buddha also remarks: “The cessation of Continuity and becoming (*Bhavanirodha*) is Nibbāna” (SN II). See Rahula, *What the Buddha Taught*, p. 37.

17. Note a statement of the Buddha in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* that all phenomena (dharmas) are “absent of inherent nature, unborn, unannihilated, originally quiescent, and of the nature of *nirvāṇa*” (*niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvadharmā anutpannāḥ sarvadharmā aniruddhā ādiśāntāḥ prakṛtiparinirvṛtāḥ*). Quoted in Lamotte, *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*, p. 193.

18. For a brief survey on Nāgārjuna’s life and ideas, see Frauwallner, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 170–178. For a more detailed discussion, see Chr. Lindtner, “Nāgārjuna,” in Carr and Mahalingam, *Companion Encyclopedia of Asian Philosophy*, pp. 349–370.

19. *Yāḥ pratiṅgyasamutpādāḥ śūnyatāṃ tām pracakṣmahe/ sa prajñaptir upādāya pratipat saiva madhyamā// apratītya samutpanno dharmāḥ kaścīn na vidyate/ yasmāt tasmād aśūnyo hi dharmāḥ kaścīn na vidyate// Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ XXIV:18–19.* Sanskrit text edited by de Jong, *Nāgārjuna Vīgrahavyāvartanī*, Sanskrit text in Bhattacharya, *Dialectical Method of Nāgārjuna*, p. 53.

20. *yady aśūnyam idaṃ sarvam udayo nāsti na vyayaḥ/ cartuṅām āryasatyānām abhāvas te prasajyate// Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ XXIV.19.* See de Jong, *Nāgārjuna*, 35.

21. *sarvaṃ ca yujyate tasya śūnyatā yasya yujyate/ sarvaṃ na yujyate tasya śūnyam yasya na yujyate// Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ XXIV.14.* See de Jong, *Nāgārjuna*, 35. See also verse 70 of the *Vīgrahavyāvartanī*: “All things prevail for him for whom this emptiness prevails. Nothing prevails for him for whom emptiness does not prevail” (*prabhavati ca śūnyateyam yasya prabhavanti tasya sarvārthāḥ/ prabhavati na tasya kiṃcīnna prabhavati śūnyatā yasya//*). Sanskrit text edited by E. H. Johnston and Arnold Kunst in Bhattacharya, *Dialectical Method of Nāgārjuna*, 52. Note that in his own commentary to the verse, Nāgārjuna takes dependent arising as synonymous with emptiness.

22. This is how both his contemporary opponents and many modern Buddhist scholars interpret his positions.

23. On Nāgārjuna’s approach, see Lindtner, *Nāgārjuniana*. On Sarvāstivāda, see the short but useful discussion in Williams, *Buddhist Thought*, pp. 112–117.

24. Nāgārjuna illustrates this point most forcefully in his *Vigrahavyāvartanī*. See Bhattacharya, *Dialectical Method of Nāgārjuna*, pp. 47–48.

25. *dve satye samupāsṛitya buddhānām dharmadeśanā/ lokasaṃvṛitisatyam ca satyam ca paramārthataḥ// ye'nayor na vijānanti vibhāgam satyayor dvayoh/ te tattavaṃ na vijānanti gambhīram buddhaśāsane// vyavahāram anāśṛitya paramārtho na deśyate/ paramārtham anāgamyā nirvāṇam nādhigamyate// Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ XXIV.8–10. See de Jong, *Nāgārjuna*, 34.*

26. *Anirodhamanutpādamānucchedamaśāsvatām/ anekārthamanānārthamanāgam amanirgamam// yaḥ pratīyasamūtpadam prapañcopaśamaṃ śivam/ deśayāmāsa sambuddhastam vande vadatām varam//* Sanskrit text from Inada, *Nāgārjuna*, p. 38. De Jong's *Nāgārjuna* does not contain this praise-verse.

27. *niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvadharmā anutpannāḥ sarvadharmā aniruddhā ādisāntāḥ prakṛtiparinirvṛtāḥ. Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, quoted in Lamotte, *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*, p. 193. This passage is also quoted by the principal Yogācāra texts as an ontological foundation of soteriology.

28. Monier-Williams (*Sanskrit English Dictionary*) defines *ācāra* as “conduct, manner of action, behaviour, good behaviour, good conduct . . . (with Buddhists) agreeing with what is taught by the teacher.”

29. Both Buddhist traditions and modern scholars hold various opinions regarding the historicity of Maitreya the Yogācārin. According to the Indo-Tibetan tradition, Maitreya is the author of the five principal Yogācāra texts: the *Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra)*, the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*, the *Dharmadharmatā-vibhāga*, and the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra*. For a discussion of Maitreya, see Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. x–xi; Ui, “Maitreya as a Historical Personage,” p. 101; Tucci, *Some Aspects of the Doctrines*; Lamotte, *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*, p. 25; and Frauwallner, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 296–308.

30. For a brief but useful discussion on Asaṅga and his dates, see Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. ix–xiv. According to Rahula, Asaṅga lived around fourth century in northwestern India. See also Frauwallner, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 326–335.

31. See, for instance, Frauwallner, *Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 390–393.

32. Modern scholars propose different dates for Sthiramati. We accept Ui Hakuju's argument (*Indo tetsugaku kenkyū*, p. 136) for dating Sthiramati at 470–550, which places him as an older contemporary of Dharmapāla and seems to agree with Xuanzang's records.

33. In Buddhist literature the three terms *citta*, *manas*, and *viññāna* are often considered synonyms that denote mind or consciousness.

34. Sthiramati, for instance, defines *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* as follows: “The onward course [*pravṛtti*] of cyclic existence means being bound by repetitive birth, sharing the lot of living beings [*nikāyasabhāga*]. The cessation [*nivṛtti*] of cyclic existence refers to the realm of *nirvāṇa* with remainder and the realm of *nirvāṇa* without remainder” (*tatra saṃsāra pravṛttir nikāyasabhāgāntareṣu pratisamdhibandhaḥ/ nivṛtīḥ sopadhiśeṣo nirupadhiśeṣaśca nirvāṇadhātūḥ*). *Trimśikāviññaptibhāṣyam*. Sanskrit text edited by Lévi in *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 37.

35. *atha vā dharmapudgalābhiniṣṭāścittamātram yathābhūtam na jānantīyato dharmapudgalanairāmyapradarśanena saphale vijñaptimātre 'nupūrveṇa praveśārtham prakaraṇārambhyah/ atha vā vijñānavadvijñeyamapi dravyata eveti kecinmanyante/ vijñeyavad vijñānamapi samvṛtita eva na paramārthata ityasyadviprakārasyāpyekānta*



*vādasya pratiṣedhārthaḥ prakaraṇārambhaḥ/ Trīṣikāvijñaptibhāṣyam.* Sanskrit text in *ibid.*, p. 15.

36. Namely, the six internal sense bases and the six external sense bases.

37. Wōnhyo touches upon the idea of *catuṣkoṭi* in his *Simmun hwajaeng non* (translated in this volume), giving it a Yogācāra interpretation.

38. Note that the Yogācāra philosophers oppose only what they consider to be nihilistic in Mādhyamika thought. They do not reject the entire *sūnyatā* doctrine. Indeed, aspects of Nāgārjuna's critique of causes and conditions are palpable throughout Yogācāra philosophy.

39. *pariṇāmaḥ sa ca tridhā/ vipāko mananākhyāśca vijñaptirviṣayasya ca//* Sanskrit text in Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 13.

40. For a detailed study of the development of the notion of the *ālaya-vijñāna* in response to the problems inherent in the Abhidharma model, see Waldron, *Buddhist Unconscious*. For an influential hypothesis on the development of the concept of *ālaya-vijñāna* in Buddhist literature from a textual/historical point of view, see Schmithausen, *Ālayavijñāna*.

41. “What is called store consciousness is a resultant [consciousness] containing all seeds” (*tatrālayākhyam vijñānam vipākaḥ sarvabījakam*). Sanskrit text in Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 18.

42. Sthiramati provides a detailed explanation of the function of the store consciousness in the process of rebirth in his commentary on verse 19 of the *Trīṣikā*. See *ibid.*, pp. 35–38.

43. See Lamotte, *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*, pp. 186–187; T 676:16.692c22–23. This verse is also quoted by Sthiramati in his commentary on the *Trīṣikā*: *ādānavijñānagabhārasūksmo ogho yathā vartati sarvabījo/ bālā eṣāmapī na prakāśate mohaiva ātmā parikalpayeyuh//*. Sanskrit text in Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 34.

44. For an explanation of the transformation of the basis, see, for instance, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* IX.12–17. For the Sanskrit original, see Lévi, *Asaṅga*, pp. 35–37. Wōnhyo also has an excellent explication of the process of transformation of the basis, in, of all places, his *Doctrinal Essentials of the Sūtra of Immeasurable Life*. This is discussed in Muller, “Faith and the Resolution of the Four Doubts.”

45. For instance, it is stated in the *Uttaratantra* of Maitreya: “Were there no Buddha essence, there would be no discontent with suffering, nor wish, nor effort, and no aspiration for peace” (*buddhadhātuḥ sacenna syānnirvidduḥkhe'pi no bhavet/ necchā na prārthanā nāpi praṇidhīrṇvṛtau bhavet//*). Sanskrit text in Prasad, *Uttaratantra of Maitreya*, 103.

46. The authorship of some of the foundational Tathāgatagarbha texts has not been definitively established. For instance, the Tibetan tradition considers Maitreya the author of the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, also known as the *Uttaratantra*, whereas the Chinese tradition attributes the authorship of this text to Ratnamati or Sāramati. It also attributes the Chinese translation of this text (T 1611:31.813–848) to Ratnamati in the year 511 CE. On the Chinese tradition concerning the author of the *Uttaratantra*, see Takasaki, *Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga*, pp. 6–9. Frauwallner (*Philosophie des Buddhismus*, pp. 255–258) also considers Sāramati as the author of the *Uttaratantra*. The text explicates the theory that all sentient beings, no matter how horrible their crimes (such as *icchāntikas*, beings considered incapable of attaining liberation), possess the potential to attain Buddhahood. The great power possessed by the buddhas is able to erase the karma of these crimes.

47. These nine metaphors are (1) a buddha sitting in a decaying lotus, (2) honey

abiding amidst bees, (3) grains covered by their husks, (4) gold covered by corrosion, (5) treasure buried beneath the earth, (6) seeds embedded in fruit, (7) a Buddha image wrapped in tattered rags, (8) a future king in the womb of a wretched woman, and (9) a golden statue abiding within a clay mold. For the Sanskrit text, see Prasad, *Uttaratantra of Maitreya*, pp. 127–134. In the Taishō, see T 1611:31.814c.

48. The *Śrīmālādevi-siṃha-nāda-sūtra* (T 353) was translated into Chinese in 436 CE by Guṇabhadra (394–468). Through the mouth of the Indian queen Śrīmālā, this early Mahāyāna text teaches (1) innate enlightenment in the form of the *tathāgatagarbha* as well as (2) the One Vehicle. For English translations, see Wayman and Wayman, *Lion's Roar*; and Paul, *Sūtra of Queen Śrīmālā*.

49. T 353:12.222b5.

50. As is explained in the introduction to the translation of the *System of the Two Hindrances* in this volume, the development of the mature East Asian Yogācāric theory of two hindrances exhibited considerable influence from the Tathāgatagarbha tradition.

51. Though the notion of *icchantikas* has a long history in Buddhist traditions, we are using the relatively narrow definition found in the Yogācāra system. For a more detailed article on the history and meaning of the term *icchantika*, please see the entry in the *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (search for “ilch'onje”). Also see Seishi Karashima, “Who Were the *Ichchantikas*?”

52. One could argue, however, that Yogācāra continued to have wide influence insofar as its basic explanations of the processes of cognition of karmic continuity and its mapping of the mind were appropriated, albeit in bits and pieces and to different degrees, by most other schools of East Asian Buddhism.

53. Wayman and Wayman, *Lion's Roar*, pp. 52–53. Interpolations are in the original.

54. See, for example, T 1611:31.824a13.

55. In rendering the title of the *Dasheng qixin lun* as *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, as opposed to Hakeda's “Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna,” I am following the position put forth by Sung Bae Park in Chapter Four of his book *Buddhist Faith and Sudden Enlightenment*. There he argues that the inner discourse of the text itself, along with the basic understanding of the meaning of *mahāyāna* in the East Asian Buddhist tradition, works not according to a Western theological “faith in . . .” subject-object construction but according to an indigenous East Asian essence-function model. Thus *mahāyāna* should be interpreted not as a noun-object but as a modifier that characterizes the *type* of faith.

56. The Dilun philosophical movement was inspired by Vasubandhu's commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-śāstra* (*Sipchi kyōng non*; also included in the *Yogācārabhūmi*), which also forms the commentary on one the chapters of the *Flower Ornament Sutra*, a strongly Tathāgatagarbha-oriented text.

57. Diana Paul's *Philosophy of Mind in Sixth-Century China* examines the various schools, texts, and thinkers in the interwoven stream of Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha thought at the time, based on her appended translation of a seminal work by Paramārtha.

58. Dan Lusthaus' *Buddhist Phenomenology* thoroughly examines the relationship between Xuanzang's newer system of Yogācāra and the older, more Tathāgatagarbha-influenced systems established by Huiyuan, Paramārtha, and others.

59. The reference to this specific interest in studying Yogācāra is found in Wōnhyo's biography contained in the *Song gaoseng zhuan* at T 2061:50.730a6.

60. This story is related in Ūisang's biography contained in the *Song gaoseng zhuan*, starting on T 2061:50.729a03.

61. Wŏnhyo called the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* the “patriarchal source of all treatises” and called its author “the chief arbiter of all controversies” (T 1845:44.226b5–12). On the other hand, as Robert Buswell (*Formation of Ch’an Ideology*, chap. 4) points out, it was quite possibly Wŏnhyo’s high evaluation of the \**Vajrasamādhi* that brought him out of retirement to compose his final commentary.

62. That is, his commentarial works on the Smaller and Larger Pure Land sutras (*Amit’agyoṅg so* and *Muryangsuḡyoṅg chong’yo*). Translations of both are scheduled to appear in a forthcoming volume in this Wŏnhyo series. Charles Muller’s translation of the latter work will also appear in the first volume of the forthcoming Jogye Jong translation project.

63. For a more detailed discussion of this kind of exegetical strategy in Wŏnhyo, see Muller, “Faith and the Resolution of the Four Doubts.”

64. The problem of the appropriateness of applying this label to Wŏnhyo’s oeuvre is the point of departure for Fukushi Jinin’s “Gangyō no shisō wo wasō shisō to toraeru koto ni taishite.”

65. Some scholars think that there is good reason to guess that Wŏnhyo’s *SHN* may have been regarded by his contemporaries as his magnum opus. For details, see the introduction to the second translation in this book, *Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies*.

66. From the *Koryō sa*, fasc. 11, sixth year of Sukchong, eighth month, Kyesajo. At this time, Wŏnhyo was awarded the posthumous title of “National Preceptor of the Harmonization of Disputes” and Ŭisang was given the title “National Preceptor of the Perfect Teaching.” It is thought that these two monks were conferred with these titles based on a petition to the emperor made by Ŭich’ōn (1055–1101). (See Kim Sanghyōn, *Wŏnhyo yōn’gu*, pp. 290–291.) Note that in the *Koryō sa*, the reference to Wŏnhyo as National Master of the Harmonization of Disputes is written as *Hwajōng kuksa* rather than *Hwajaeng kuksa*. This notation is also seen in the subsequent *Tongsa yōlchōn*, which lists Wŏnhyo with the same title (HPC 10.996c16). Kim Pusik (1075–1151) of the Koryō period also referred to Wŏnhyo by this name in his Stele for the National Preceptor of the Harmonization of Disputes at Punhwangsa (now kept in Dongguk University Museum).

67. A late Indian “Hīnayāna” school, established primarily on the teachings of the *Satyasiddhi-sāstra*, among other works by Harivarman; one of the thirteen Chinese schools.

68. There is, in fact, a *p’angyo* system ascribed to Wŏnhyo in Fazang’s *Huayanjing tanxuan ji* (T 1733:35.111a23–27), but we should be careful not to take this as an indication that Wŏnhyo was seriously involved in the work of doctrinal classification, for (1) nowhere else in his extant corpus do we find anything indicating his having created or emphasized a doctrinal classification system; (2) if we read his works extensively, it would seem that his entire approach is antithetical to the work of compartmentalization; and, most important, (3) in the final lines of his *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra,”* he says: “Yet, if you use the scheme of four teachings to categorize the scriptures, or use five time periods to delimit the Buddha’s intention, this is just like using a snail shell to scoop out the ocean or looking at the sky through a tube!” (T 1769:38.255c5–7). Implicit here is a criticism of Zhiyi (538–597), who has been associated with the practice of doctrinal classification in the *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra.”*

69. See Sung Bae Park, “Silla Buddhist Spirituality”; Buswell, *Cultivating Original Enlightenment*; Plassen, “Entering the Dharma-gate”; and Muller, “Explanation of the Essence of the Two Hindrances.” See also the introduction to my online translation of the *SHN* at [http://www.acmuller.net/kor-bud/simimun\\_hwajaeng\\_non.html](http://www.acmuller.net/kor-bud/simimun_hwajaeng_non.html).

70. Ishii discusses the extent of the influence of Confucian and Daoist thought on Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng* in Ishii, "Gangyō to Chūgoku shisō," and the influence from the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* in Ishii, "Gangyō no wasō shisō no genryū."

71. See Plassen, "Entering the Dharma-gate."

72. See Jeon, "Gangyō no wasō genri." For discussions in English, see the 1966 essay by Park Chong Hong entitled "Wŏnhyo ūi chōrhak sasang." This first appeared in the volume *Han'guk pulgyo sasang* (Seoul: Ilsinsa, pp. 59–88) and has been made available to the English-speaking audience through the translation by Robert Buswell (see Park Chong Hong, "Wŏnhyo's Philosophical Thought"). Sung Bae Park discussed *hwajaeng* in his 1979 dissertation, "Wŏnhyo's Commentaries on the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*," and we can assume that this discussion will be updated and included in his forthcoming translation of these commentaries in this Wŏnhyo English translation series from the University of Hawai'i Press. See also Park, "Silla Buddhist Spirituality."

73. See Satō, "Gangyō no Kongō zammai kyō ni okeru ronri kōzō no tokushoku."

74. For a more comprehensive listing of recent Korean works on *hwajaeng*, see Fukushi, "Gangyō no shisō wo wasō shisō to toraeru koto ni taishite," n. 2.

75. See the discussion of Wŏnhyo's usage of Yogācāra texts in his exegetical works in Muller, "Explanation of the Essence of the Two Hindrances"; and Muller, "Wonhyo on the *Lotus Sūtra*."

76. In his *Yijang ūi*, Wŏnhyo distinguishes discourse regarding the two hindrances into two main categories, one being a Tathāgatagarbha category, derived primarily from the interpretations provided by the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* (hereafter *AMF*) and *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, and the other being a Yogācāric category, derived from explanations of the hindrances found in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, *Fodijing lun*, and other texts of the Weishi orthodoxy. Wŏnhyo labels the *AMF*'s interpretation of the hindrances as the "indirect interpretation" (*ūnmil mun*), and the Yogācāra explanation as the "direct interpretation" (*hyōllyo mun*; my rationale for rendering with these English terms is explained below in the translation). Haeju, in her introduction to the Korean version of volume 1 of the forthcoming Jogye Jong translation series (*Han'guk chōnt'ong sasang ch'ong sō*, *Pulgyo p'yōn*, *Chōngsŏn Wŏnhyo*), citing previous work by Yi P'yeongnae, asserts that Wŏnhyo's classification of the Yogācāra hindrances as *hyōllyo* and the Tathāgatagarbha hindrances as *ūnmil* constitutes a kind of *p'angyo* value judgment on his part, indicating a preference for the Tathāgatagarbha tradition. But if one takes full account of the discussion in the *Yijang ūi* itself, it is hard to see where the support would come from. Leaving aside for the moment that his oeuvre as a whole—his entire career-long project of *hwajaeng*—tends to work against the practice of doctrinal classification that was used for this kind of privileging of certain doctrines, there is no other language in the *Yijang ūi* that lends itself toward indicating any kind of value judgment, except for this distinction made between "direct" and "indirect." I think it is fine to simply take these labels of "direct" and "indirect" at face value: The Yogācāra system of the hindrances as articulated by Wŏnhyo in the *Yijang ūi* fits into a neat roots-to-branches structure and is thus *nītārtha*. The *AMF*'s system, on the other hand, is convoluted, paradoxical, and relatively difficult to digest and is thus *neyārtha*.

77. For a listing of Wŏnhyo's extant works, see Muller, "Wonhyo on the *Lotus Sūtra*," available online at [http://www.acmuller.net/articles/2009intetsu\\_wonhyo\\_lotus.html](http://www.acmuller.net/articles/2009intetsu_wonhyo_lotus.html). This list is also included in the entry on Wŏnhyo in Muller, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*.

78. Although primarily focusing on Mādhyamika influences, Plassen, in "Entering

the Dharma-gate,” has identified a much broader range of Daoist sources for this style of Wŏnhyo’s writing.

79. In a forthcoming article on *hwajaeng* to be published in the *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research*, I discuss in more detail the problems with the overly broad and as yet not fully substantiated characterization of *kae-hap* as Wŏnhyo’s primary hermeneutic principle.

80. The term *huit’ong* appears in every major Buddhist dictionary, whereas *hwajaeng* appears in none. We find 1,697 appearances of the former in the Taishō, and only 76 for the latter. I would like to acknowledge being alerted to Wŏnhyo’s more extensive usage of this term by Fukushi Jinin, who identifies seven appearances of the term at critical junctures in Wŏnhyo’s works. A digital search for the term through Wŏnhyo’s extant corpus yields sixteen occurrences.

81. The exact phrase *yu tori* appears in Wŏnhyo’s extant corpus more than fifty times, but other related usages of *tori* occur more than three hundred times. Fukushi, “Gangyō no shisō wo wasō shisō to toraeru koto ni taishite,” cites about twenty instructive cases.

82. See Buswell 2007, p. 73.

83. See the section 2.1.2.2, “The Cognitive Hindrances,” in “The System of the Two Hindrances” in this volume.

84. HPC 1.838a–840c. Translated by Cuong Nguyen in part II of this volume.

85. Wŏnhyo also wrote a couple of hortatory tracts for practitioners, which are translated in volume 1 of the forthcoming Jogye Jong series.

86. In the *Doctrinal Essentials of the “Nirvana Sutra,”* the ground for the logic of harmonization is that of the single taste (*ilmi*), which is explained from the perspective of the aspect of *nirvāṇa* and the aspect of Buddha nature. This “single taste” can be seen as another expression for the One Mind, referring to the nonunitary yet nondual nature of reality.

87. Translated in Buswell, *Cultivating Original Enlightenment*.

88. See Taegak Kuksa, “Che Punhwangsa hyosōng mun” (HPC 4.555a18). See also Jeon, “Wŏnhyo ūi hwajaeng kwa Hwaōm sasang,” pp. 157–159; and Satō, “Gangyō no Kongō zammai kyō ni okeru ronri kōzō no tokushoku.”

89. See Ko, “Wŏnhyo ūi Hwaōm sasang,” pp. 55–63; and Sung Bae Park, “Wŏnhyo ūi nollu kujo,” p. 45.

90. See Ch’oe Yujin, “Wŏnhyo ūi hwajaeng sasang yŏn’gu”; and Ishii, “Shiragi bukkyō ni okeru Daijō kishinron no igi,” p. 546.

91. See, for example, in the *Posal kyebon chibōm yogi*, T 1907:45.919b3 ff. (translated by Jin Y. Park as *Essentials of Observing and Transgressing the Code of Bodhisattva Precepts* in the forthcoming volume on Wŏnhyo in the Jogye Jong translation series).

92. As described in the *\*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*: “emptiness of marks, emptiness of emptiness, emptiness of that which is empty.” See T 273.9.369b5.

93. In other words, expansion and contraction become evident only after their activity stops.

94. This can be confirmed by doing a search for such terms as “free from words” (*yi’ōn*) and “severing thought” (*chōllyō*) in the digital version of Wŏnhyo’s corpus (contained in volume 1 of the digitized HPC at [http://ebti.dongguk.ac.kr/ebti\\_en/main.html](http://ebti.dongguk.ac.kr/ebti_en/main.html)).

95. This is a reference to Confucius and Wenbo Xuezi, who, according to the *Zhuangzi*, did not say anything to each other when they met, even though Confucius had

wanted to meet Wenbo for a long time. When Confucius was asked the reason by his disciple Zilu, he replied: “With that kind of man, once glance tells you that the Way is there before you. What room does that leave for the possibility of speech?” This discussion occurs in Chapter Twenty-one, “Tian Zi-fang.” See Watson, *Complete Works of Chuang-tzu*, p. 223.

## I. The System of the Two Hindrances

1. Muller, *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*, pp. 144–148.
2. In my work on the *Yijang ũi*, I have identified more than two hundred problematic points in twenty-five HPC pages.
3. For this, I am indebted to the invaluable contributions of Tripiṭaka Koreana, SAT, and CBETA projects for their work in digitizing the Chinese and Korean canons.
4. See T 1559:29.282c21. In the *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā-śāstra* these two associations are replaced, respectively, by the afflictive hindrances, which are equivalent to *defiled nescience*, and the cognitive hindrances, which are equivalent to *undefiled nescience*. See T 1545:27.724b29.
5. I would like to clarify that my choice of rendering of the term *chang* (Ch. *zhang*) with the English word “hindrance” has specific reasons. One often sees this term rendered in scholarly works and in translations (especially from Tibetan, it seems) as “two veils,” “two obscurations,” and so on, apparently as an attempt to provide an appropriate English equivalent for the Sanskrit *āvaraṇa*, which literally has these connotations. However, the actual application of the term in Yogācāra, as well as other soteriological systems, extends far beyond the cognitive connotations indicated by such words as “veil” and “obscuration.” Especially in the case of afflictive hindrances, what is being indicated most of the time is the notion of “binding” (*bandhana*, *samyojana*; K. *pak*, *kye*) or debilitation or rigidity (*daṣṭhulya*; K. *ch’ujung*). In the case of the afflictions, we are dealing only tangentially with problems of cognitive distortion that might be interpreted by “veil” and the like. And in the case of the cognitive hindrances, although the meaning of “veil” can more readily be applied, even these hindrances include the aspect of debilitation, and so the applicability of such a rendering even in the case of the cognitive hindrances can be misleading. These hindrances are not merely “sky-flowers” or a distorting prism—they represent the whole gamut of negative emotions, concepts, and habits that keep us bound in cyclic existence. Of course, rather than “hindrance,” one might well choose from other synonyms that broadly express the same meaning, such as “impediment,” “obstruction,” et cetera. But in my work on this topic, especially when comparing the Yogācāra hindrances with those from other systems, it is helpful to have a couple of other synonyms available for cases where one is dealing in a comparative manner with analogous concepts. Thus I have kept “obstruction” aside for that purpose and used “hindrance” as my primary translation term.
6. See, for example, T 1611:31.818a14.
7. However, as Wŏnhyo explains at considerable length in the *Yijang ũi*, this is true only in a general sense, as certain types of cognitive hindrances can actually be removed by *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*, and there are situations (such as that where the salvation of other sentient beings is at stake) where the bodhisattvas are more proficient than the adherents of the two vehicles at the removal of the afflictive hindrances.
8. I discuss the process of the development of the hindrances system within the



major Yogācāra works in my forthcoming chapter “The Contribution of the Yogācārabhūmi to the Development of the System of the Two Hindrances” (to be published in a volume tentatively entitled *The “Yogācārabhūmi” and the Yogācāras*, from Harvard University Press). I will briefly summarize that discussion here.

9. In 1972 Yoshizu Yoshihide (in his “Eon no Kishinron-shū o meguru sho mon-dai”) questioned the accuracy of the attribution of Huiyuan’s authorship and was later supported by Hirakawa Akira (in his *Daijō kishinron*, p. 399). The argument presented there is sufficient to concede that this commentary was probably composed after Huiyuan’s time. Nonetheless, no one disputes the probability that it was written by a person or persons intimate with Huiyuan’s thought, quite possibly one of more of his students, and thus represents his essential teachings. For the sake of simplicity, we will refer to this text as “Huiyuan’s commentary.”

10. See T 1911:46.85b22–c22. The content of this discussion by Zhiyi has been treated in Swanson, “Chih-I’s Interpretation of *Jñeyāvaraṇa*.”

11. My rendering of *chujī* as “entrenchment” follows that used by Alex Wayman in his translation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*. However, Wayman used the term “entrenchment” only in conjunction with nescience, referring to the four afflictive types as “static defilements.” It seems to me that the meaning of “entrenchment” can be well applied in both cases, thus my present rendering. See Wayman and Wayman, *Lion’s Roar*, p. 84 n. 56. Diana Paul’s rendering as “stages” in her translation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* for the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai (*Sūtra of Queen Śrīmālā*, p. 32) does not seem to reflect a useful understanding of the meaning of this concept.

12. The locus classicus for this structure is the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, T 353:12.220a1–8. Please note that all of the technical terms contained in the *Yijing ūi* have been added to Muller, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, and are usually explained there in considerable detail.

13. See T 1843:44.188c3–9.

14. The explanation given to this category, found both in the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* and in Huiyuan’s commentary, locates the two-vehicle practitioners and the bodhisattvas in positions analogous to that found in the Yogācāra explanation, in terms of their ability to deal with the hindrances. See T 353:12.220a13–15.

15. My own guess as to why Wōnhyo did not include this third category is that, in comparison with the other two, its textual sources are drawn from isolated phrases and passages that do not in themselves form cohesive arguments, and so he may not have been convinced that this should be established as a separate category.

16. The second chapter of the *Madhyānta-vibhāga* (*Pyōn chungbyōllon*) is often cited as a source for hindrances discourse. But while the two hindrances are invoked at the beginning and end of the chapter, the discussion that takes place in between does not lend itself to any systematic development of hindrance theory that can be readily mapped to the standardized format of the hindrances being explained here. The *YBh* contains extensive discussions on the topics of both affliction and cognitive distortion, but not in a single place, in an organized fashion, under the heading of the two hindrances.

17. See, for example, T 1579:30.495c5–8, 496c5, 562b26, 727c11–16.

18. For example, at T 1579:30.354a13 ff., we have liberation from the afflictive hindrances (*pōnnoe chang haet’al*) juxtaposed with liberation from the cessation hindrances (*chōngjang haet’al*), along with simultaneous liberation from both (*kujang haet’al*). In such contexts, we never see the afflictive hindrances defined as originating in the view of person—it is just a reference to the phenomenon of affliction in general. Similar examples

can be seen at T 1579:30.425b18 ff. and 427a16 ff. Beyond this, there are a number of places where the hindrances are named as obstacles to be overcome, with no special explanation of their content or implications. At T 1579:30.656a12–21 the afflictive hindrances and cognitive hindrances are included in a list of twelve items, with the afflictive hindrances listed at number ten (their removal constituting the wisdom liberation, or *hye haet'al*) and the cognitive hindrances as number twelve (their removal constituting the Tathāgata's liberation, or *yōrae sim tūk haet'al*), with the cessation hindrances in between at number eleven (their removal constituting the dual liberation, or *kubun haet'al*).

19. See, for example, T 1579:30.446a18 ff.

20. See T 1579:30.486b16 ff.

21. In his *Yijang ūi*, Wōnhyo is very diligent about citing his scriptural sources. Whenever he cites the *Yogācārabhūmi*, *AMF*, or some other scriptural source, he clearly indicates the title. This is no doubt because these are considered to be scriptural authority. On the other hand, when citing the opinions of other scholars, he usually does not provide a source. However, in the *Yijang ūi* there are many lines that are identical to lines in the *FDJL* but are not cited as such. So why did Wōnhyo use lines from this text without citing its name? Perhaps portions of this text were circulating in East Asia prior to its publication, and he considered these to be the opinions of a contemporary scholar? It is an interesting question.

22. For the sources of these passages in the *FDJL*, see T 1530:26.323b–c.

23. This labeling of the 128 afflictions as “fundamental,” as seen in the *FDJL* and *CWSL*, is unusual, as the term *kūnbon pōnnoe* in these and other Yogācāra texts almost always refers to the six fundamental afflictions, which are followed by the twenty-odd derivative afflictions. The number 128 is arrived to by manipulating the list of ten afflictions (*sipsa*) in various relationships with the four truths and three realms. These ten are divided into two groups. The first five, which are characteristic of those of keen religious sensitivity, are view of self (*singyōn*), extreme view (*pyōngyōn*), evil view (*sagyōn*), attachment to views (*kyōnch'wi kyōn*), and view of attachment to the precepts (*kyegūm ch'wigyōn*). The second five, which are characteristic of those of undeveloped religious sensitivity, are desire (*yok*), hatred (*chin*), delusion (*ch'i*), pride (*man*), and doubt (*ūi*). Wōnhyo explains how these numbers are generated in the *Yijang ūi* at HPC 1.798b6–14.

24. This was noticed right away by commentators such as Kuiji, who defends this definition by explaining that although these afflictions are listed in both places, we should understand that there is a difference in their subtlety, intensity, and amount in each situation. See T 1830:43.560c1–4.

25. *Observing the Mind, Awakening from the Dream*, by the Japanese Hossō monk Ryōhen (1194–1252) around 1244 (3 fasc., T 2312:71.61–89). Written to provide a short summary of Yogācāra doctrines, based primarily on the *Cheng weishi lun*.

26. For this discussion, see T 842:916b20–c7; HPC 7.146a; and Muller, *Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment*, pp. 144–146.

27. The term *kenshō* (seeing the nature) does not appear in the *SPE*. But its author is giving a clear warning to those who practitioners who, based on their meditative efforts, have some experience of insight into their inner nature and assume they have become enlightened.

28. Please see Muller, “Yogācāra Two Hindrances,” for a discussion of this further development of the hindrances. I have also translated this portion of Zongmi's *Yuanjue jing dashu* at <http://www.acmuller.net/twohindrances/zongmi.html>.

29. HPC 10.46–47.



30. I have discussed and translated this work in “Explanation of the Essence of the Two Hindrances,” available both in print and online (<http://www.acmuller.net/articles/sipbongyeongnon.html>).

31. (K. *hunsŭp*). The literal meaning is that of being permeated with an odor, and this metaphor is used to describe the how karma works in the form of various undefiled and defiled phenomena, whereby activities, without fail, leave impressions on our consciousness, thus altering it. Included here is the meaning of receiving an impression, or one thing having an effect on another thing, especially by habituation, or the function of one thing gradually being conditioned by another. As clothes that have been exposed to perfume gradually come to take on that same smell, our own activities of word, thought, and deed leave an influence on our mind. It is a distinctive Buddhist explanation for how karmic influence is transmitted through the consciousnesses of living beings.

32. The *\*Abhidharma-samuccaya*, by Asaṅga, was translated into Chinese in seven rolls by Xuanzang in 652 as *Dasheng abitama ji lun* (T 1605). It is a later Abhidharma work that treats certain aspects of Yogācāra doctrine and is closely related in content to the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*. There is a French translation from the Sanskrit by Rāhula, which is further translated into English by Boin-Webb.

33. The *Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā* is a commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* attributed to Nāgārjuna, translated by Kumārajīva around 405 CE in seventeen rolls (T 1521). It consists primarily of an explanation of the bodhisattva stages contained in the *Huayan jing* and also contains one of the early expositions regarding Amitābha Buddha.

34. The ten afflictions (K. *sipchong pŏnnoe*) are (1) the view of the existence of body-as-self, (2) extreme views, (3) evil views, (4) view of attachment to views, (5) attachment to the precepts, (6) desire, (7) anger, (8) pride, (9) nescience, and (10) doubt. The first four of these are often separately categorized as the four attached views.

35. For example, in T 2177 and T 2180.

36. The Sino-Korean *hok* most commonly translates the Sanskrit *doṣa*. This term is commonly used as a direct synonym for “affliction,” referring especially to desire and grasping, but in the *Yijang ūi* and most of the Yogācāra texts treated in this work, it is used with at least equal frequency in a more general sense to refer to any kind conceptual or emotional obstruction to enlightenment or *nirvāṇa*, including the cognitive hindrances as well. Therefore it may often be taken simply as a synonym for the concept of “hindrance” itself.

37. The Sino-Korean *soji chang* is the translation of the term provided by Xuanzang in his translations of Yogācāra works such as the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and it is used in the texts of the subsequent Faxiang/Pōpsang/Hossō tradition, most importantly in the *Cheng weishi lun*. The rendering of *chijang* is predominant in pre-Xuanzang works, whether they be of Yogācāra or Tathāgatagarbha pedigree.

38. This is the rendering introduced by the *Awakening of Faith*. Wŏnhyo will analyze these at length in this treatise.

39. The world of unenlightened sentient beings, as distinguished from the world of saints, bodhisattvas, and the like.

40. The terms “multiplicity of things” and “thusness of things” are defined in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* at T 1579:30.427c1–7.

41. Different texts name different pairs of cognition, but as a general rule they are divided along the lines of the type of cognition that operates through pure, nondiscriminating awareness and the type that operates through the discrimination of differences. The latter is interpreted either negatively or positively, according to the context, since the

discriminating thought that is carried out by unenlightened sentient beings is delusive, while, on the other hand, adept practitioners such as bodhisattvas need to use discriminating awareness to function in the world of language and teach fellow practitioners. In the context of Yogācāra and the *Awakening of Faith* tradition, one sees the pair “intrinsic awareness” (*kūnbon chi*) and “subsequently attained awareness” (*hudūk chi*), as well as “cognition of totality” (*ilch’e chi*) and “cognition of the particulars” (*ilch’e chong chi*). This point—that cognitive obstructions can be categorized into the two main types: (1) obstruction of the insight into underlying reality, and (2) obstruction of the proper function of the discriminating mind—can be seen in the discussions of the hindrances by both Huiyuan and Zhiyi, expressed as cognitive obstruction in regard to principle and cognitive obstruction in regard to phenomena.

42. Or “attachment to objective phenomena” (K. *pōpchip*). Yogācāra teaches that the adherents of the two vehicles are capable of eliminating attachment to the notion of an inherent, enduring self but remain unaware of their unconscious attachment to the reality of objective phenomena. The bodhisattvas, seeing objective constructs to be empty of an enduring nature, eliminate the cognitive hindrances. This is taught in the Weishi system but not explicitly in Tathāgatagarbha texts.

43. In other words, it is a problem with the function of cognition itself, as well as the cognized objects, that constitutes the meaning of this hindrance. As Paul Swanson has shown in his article “Chih-I’s Interpretation of *Jñeyāvaraṇa*,” the question of the subjective/objective character of the hindrances is one that was pursued by Zhiyi, in an insightful and instructive manner. For Zhiyi’s discussion of this point, see T 1911:46.85b22–c26. The ensuing section in our present text shows how the clear-cut distinctions made in the standard definition do not necessarily hold up under closer scrutiny.

44. I.e., they do not obscure the cognition of advanced bodhisattvas and buddhas, whose minds reflect all objects like a clear mirror.

45. HPC offers the alternative of *ch’a* (this) for *kam* (incur), but the latter seems right.

46. Following WSC’s *yi* (principle) instead of HPC’s *yi* (separate).

47. Soon after explaining the basic way of categorizing the hindrances, Wōnhyo has shown that these basic categories do not really hold true.

48. This is the nomenclature that appears for the first time in the *AMF* and continues to be used only in direct connection with commentaries on that text. This section briefly summarizes the explanation of the hindrances derived from the *AMF* (T 1666:32.577c20–25), which will later be identified as the “indirect” understanding of the hindrances.

49. Six progressively coarser stages of affliction taught in the *AMF*.

50. As in the prior passage, although the differences between the two are clearly defined, under close analysis there is really no border between the two, and the cognitive obstructions are to some degree afflictive, and vice versa. This point—that in actuality both kinds of hindrances include to a certain degree the functions of the other—is one that is made in all significant other summaries of the hindrances, including those by Huiyuan and Zhiyi and the *Cheng weishi lun*.

51. Over the course of the dozen or so years that passed since my embarking on this project until I was able to finally see the manuscript go to print, I changed my way of translating the terms *hyōllyo mun* (Skt. *nīrārtha*) and *ūnmil mun* (Skt. *neyārtha*) a few times, experimenting with such pairs as exoteric/esoteric, revealed/hidden, evident/abstruse, and so forth. The more I read the text, however, the more I became convinced that Wōnhyo’s intention was not to make any special distinction in value between the two approaches but to merely make a distinction in the plainness of the logic involved in each of

the systems. I noticed “direct/indirect” as one of the ways Ian Harris rendered this distinction in the context of the texts of early Buddhism, before systematic valorization became part of the baggage of their usage, and I think this pair works better here than the alternatives I have mentioned. As explained at some length in note 76 in the section “Wōnhyo as ‘Harmonizer’” in the general introduction to this volume, some scholars take these categories to be value-laden, with *p’angyo* motivations favoring the Tathāgatagarbha system. I disagree with this, preferring to take the labeling at face value. The Yogācāra system is rationally systematic, having a readily apprehensible structure. The Tathāgatagarbha system, represented by that of the *AMF*, is convoluted and somewhat nonrational. Thus these labels.

52. Habit energies (K. *sūpki*; Skt. *vāsanā*) are created from all of the words, thoughts, actions, and external influences experienced by sentient beings. *Vāsanās* are distinguished from seeds (*bīja*) by virtue of their being the traces that remain even after destroying the seeds existent in the *ālaya-vijñāna*. According to Yogācāra, the seeds and the habit energies are removed during the period from the first *bhūmi* until the tenth. These tendencies are fully eliminated only upon the final attainment of Buddhahood.

53. According to Yogācāra, all experiential phenomena are divided into five categories: mind, mental factors, form, factors (dharmas) not directly associated with mind, and unconditioned dharmas. In the mind group there are eight. Within mental factors there are fifty-one: the five that function pervasively, the five that function only in regard to specific objects, the eleven good factors, the six primary afflictions, the twenty derivative afflictions, and the four indeterminate factors. In the group of form there are ten; in the group that are not necessarily associated with mind there are twenty-four; and in the unconditioned there are six. Together these total one hundred. A concise list of these factors is contained in the *Dasheng baifa mingmen lun*.

54. The six primary afflictions (K. *yuk pōnnoe*) are the basic forms of affliction from which all of the derivative afflictions are derived. They are nescience, desire (greed, craving), anger, pride, doubt, and false views.

55. The derivative afflictions (K. *su pōnnoe*; Skt. *upakleśa*) are hybrid afflictions that are derived from various admixtures of the six primary afflictions. In later East Asian Yogācāra works such as the *Cheng weishi lun*, there is a standardized list of twenty, but in the *Yijang ūi*, based mostly on the *YBh*, Wōnhyo presents a less clearly defined version of this set, which can include between twenty-two and twenty-four mental factors. The standard set provided in the *Cheng weishi lun* includes anger, enmity, vexation, concealing, deceit, flattery, haughtiness, harming, jealousy, stinginess, lack of conscience, shamelessness, lack of faith, laziness, indolence, depression, flightiness, forgetting, incorrect knowledge, and distraction.

56. This description of the hindrances bears a strong resemblance to that given in the *FDJL* at T 1530:26.323a29–b8, as well as that given in the *CWSL* at T 1585:31.48c5. There are some instructive differences, however. One is that Wōnhyo, instead of saying “128 fundamental afflictions as well as derivative afflictions” (which is clearly odd, since it does not reflect the standard Yogācāra/Weishi chart of the six fundamental afflictions and twenty derivative afflictions), simply says “primary afflictions and derivative afflictions,” which makes more sense. For the cognitive hindrances, he adds in the term “delusive discrimination” (K. *mangsang punbyōl*), which is far more commonly seen used in the Tathāgatagarbha texts than in the Yogācāra texts.

57. *Ālaya-vijñāna* is usually translated as “store consciousness.” This is a distinctive concept of the Yogācāra school of Buddhism, originating in India in the third to fifth

centuries CE, and refers to the mental processes that underlie each and every moment of the traditional six forms of manifest cognitive awareness (*pravṛtti-vijñāna*). The *ālaya-vijñāna* is said to dependently arise based, on the one hand, on both the material sense faculties and the cognitive and affective formations (*samskāra*) that constitute one's sentient existence and, on the other hand, on its own specific object, an indistinct (*asamvidita*) apprehension of an external world. It serves as the central locus of accumulated karmic potential and latent afflictions, effectively constituting one's samsaric existence and serving as the virtual "subject" of *samsāra*. It is considered to be the eighth and most fundamental of the eight consciousnesses established in the doctrine of the Yogācāra school. The *ālaya-vijñāna* accumulates all potential energy for the mental and physical manifestation of one's existence and supplies the substance to all existences. It also receives impressions from all functions of the other consciousnesses and retains them as potential energy for their further manifestations and activities. Since it serves as the basis for the production of the other seven consciousnesses (called the forthcoming consciousnesses), it is also known as the base consciousness (*mūla-vijñāna*) or the causal consciousness. Since it serves as the container for all experiential impressions (termed metaphorically as "seeds"), it is also called the seed consciousness. The eighth consciousness provides a sense of eternity, unity, subjectivity, and mastery, resembling an eternal *ātman*, thus causing the seventh consciousness to mistakenly perceive and attach to a self. For a more extensive explanation of the history of the formation of the notion of the *ālaya-vijñāna*, see William Waldron's essay on the topic in Muller, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*.

58. The forthcoming consciousnesses—also rendered as "evolving consciousnesses" and "activity consciousnesses" (K. *chōnsik*; Skt. *pravṛtti-vijñāna*)—are the seven manifestly functioning consciousnesses that arise based on the *ālaya-vijñāna*. These are the *manas* (mental) consciousness, the *mano* (thinking) consciousness, and the five sense consciousnesses. As Wōnhyo will explain, some Yogācāra scholars considered the existence of the afflictions to be limited to these seven, while others theorized afflictive activity in the *ālaya* as well.

59. Because anger arises based on conscious thought, and the *manas* is a subconscious region of the mind.

60. The *mano-vijñāna* (K. *ūsik*) is the thinking consciousness, which is the sixth among the eight consciousnesses taught in Yogācāra Buddhism. This consciousness is understood to arise based on the organ of thought, the *manas* consciousness. It is able to gather and discriminate the sense data derived from the five sense consciousnesses, thus discriminating all the aspects of the environment. It also works with past and future objects, recalling the past and planning for the future. Being based on the *manas*, it naturally shares some of the *manas*' afflictions, but it also has its own distinctive afflictions—those kinds of mental function that can occur only in a conscious state.

61. The view of self (Skt. *ātma-dṛṣṭi*) is the view of attachment to self that cannot be extricated from the notions of "I" and "mine"—the view of the real existence of the person. This is one of the four attached views associated with the *manas* consciousness.

62. This means that the view of the real existence of a person is something that occurs both liminally and subliminally. The *manas* consciousness (K. *manasik*) is the seventh of the eight consciousnesses. It is the consciousness that localizes experience through thinking. One of its primary functions is to perceive the subjective position of the *ālaya* consciousness and erroneously regard it as one's own ego, thereby creating ego attachment. The *manas* is characterized in the *Cheng weishi lun* as "continually examining and

assessing.” In this function, it is similar to the sixth (*mano*) consciousness, but whereas the function of the *mano* is periodically interrupted (by deep sleep and other unconscious states), the function of the *manas* is continuous. While not consciously controllable, the *manas* is said to motivate conscious decisions in regard to individual survival and incessant self-concern.

63. I.e., because they are conscious activities that we are aware of.

64. Using *kyōm*, following the WSC, rather than *mu* (none), as given in the HPC.

65. The *sipp’algye* (*astādaśa-dhātavaḥ*) are the eighteen factors of cognitive experience: the six sense faculties, their six objects, and the six consciousnesses.

66. *Hyōnyang sōnggyo non* (abbreviated as *Sōnggyo non*; Skt. \**Prakaranāryavācaśāstra*, Acclamation of the scriptural teaching; T 1602). One of the major Yogācāra treatises, it is a combination of verse by Asaṅga and comments by Vasubandhu and is considered to be an offshoot of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*. This text contains discussions of all the major Yogācāra topics, such as the eight consciousnesses, three natures, and theories of mental factors. It was translated into Chinese by Xuanzang in 645–646 CE.

67. Pride in the belief that the aggregates are self and are possessed by self. While the term is later commonly understood in the negative sense of pride or conceit, Schmithausen (*Ālayavijñāna*, pp. 149–150) understands *asmi-māna* as simply a “feeling of identity” of self—a sense of ego. T 1602:31.480c16–17.

68. There are afflictions, karma, views, and so forth that are activity from discrimination (K. *punbyōl ki*) and those that are innately active. The former are produced subsequent to birth in this world, depending upon the mistaken thoughts that one generates based on inaccurate conceptions. These afflictions are eliminated in the Path of Seeing. The innately active (K. *kusaeng*; Skt. *sama-utpatti*) afflictions—karma, attached views, and so on—have been carried over from previous lifetimes and are therefore more deeply embedded. These are removed during the Path of Cultivation.

69. *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* (K. *Yuga saji ron*; Discourse on the stages of concentration practice). The definitive text of the Yogācāra school of Buddhism, it consists of one hundred rolls composed in India between 300 and 350 CE and translated into Chinese by Xuanzang. In the process of explaining the spiritual states, practices, and fruits incurred in the course of the seventeen stages leading to Buddhahood, the text delves deeply into discussions of fundamental Yogācāra concepts such as the *ālaya-vijñāna*, three natures, three nonnatures, seeds, perfuming, the two hindrances, and consciousness-only.

70. The form realm (K. *saekkye*; Skt. *rūpa-dhātu*), which is the second of the three realms, is existence constituted of pure materiality, free from the afflictions of the desire realm. Although the desires have subsided, one still possesses a body. This realm is the locus of the four meditation heavens. The formless realm (K. *musae kye*; Skt. *ārūpya-dhātu*), which is the third of the three realms, is the realm of pure mind, in which materiality (one’s body) is transcended. This realm is characterized by the function of four types of awareness: (1) the awareness of the limitlessness of emptiness, (2) the awareness of limitless consciousness, (3) the awareness of the limitlessness of nothingness, and (4) the awareness of neither thoughtlessness nor nonthoughtlessness.

71. The desire realm (K. *yokkye*; Skt. *kāma-dhātu*) is the second of the three realms of existence, within which one’s consciousness is subject to the desires for food, sex, and sleep. The four afflictions of the *manas* are the four most fundamental afflictions that come about based on the *manas* consciousness’ perception of the *ālaya-vijñāna* to be a self (*ātman*). Their arising in the *manas* indicates that they are functioning below the level of normal conscious awareness and are thus not consciously controllable. The four are

self-nescience (K. *ach'i*; Skt. *ātma-moha*), self-view (K. *agyōn*; Skt. *ātma-drṣṭi*), the conceit “I am” (K. *aman*; Skt. *asmi-māna*), and self-love (K. *a'ae*; Skt. *ātma-tṛṣṇā*).

72. The five consciousnesses (K. *osik*; Skt. *pañca-vijñāna*) are the five sense consciousnesses, which are considered to be the first five of the eight consciousnesses. They are produced in connection with the five sense organs (eyes, ears, nose, tongue, and skin), which take as their objects the five physical categories of form, sound, smell, taste, and tactile objects. In terms of the three realms, those in the desire realm are said to have six consciousnesses; those in the first meditation heaven of the form realm lack the olfactory and gustatory consciousnesses, while those in the second meditation heaven and above maintain only the sixth (thinking) consciousness.

73. In this passage of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, this “mental state of ascertainment” (K. *kyōlchōng sim*) is the third of three successive stages of mind, preceded by (1) the mental state “as it is” and (2) the “mental state of inquiry,” which correspond to the initial action of one of the sense consciousnesses and subsequent abiding in the *mano-vijñāna*.

74. As Wōnhyo explains below, once an affliction is in its manifest phase, it does not retain its evil quality; this is the meaning of the moral neutrality of “karmic ripening.”

75. According to standard Yogācāra presentations of mental functions, *sim* (discursive thought), *sa* (investigation), *akchak* (recognition of one’s evil), and *sumyōn* (sleepiness) are categorized as being of “indeterminate” moral quality, which means that they have no predisposition to engender either good or evil activity. For Wōnhyo to include them here among the derivative afflictions might seem surprising, but we need to be aware that he is probably writing this at a time when the *CWSL* has not yet been written and thus the presently accepted chart of Yogācāra mental functions has not yet been firmly established. In fact, he is probably following the *YBh*, in which at least one passage (cited below), this same arrangement is given.

76. I.e., the four of the five skandhas (K. *o'on*) except for form: feeling, perception, impulse, and consciousness.

77. Citation not identified.

78. Here Wōnhyo skips over some text in the *YBh* that says: “The first is the arising that permeates all unwholesome states of mind; the second is the arising that permeates all defiled states of mind; the third is the arising that occurs with separately distinguished states of mind; the fourth is the arising that occurs with wholesome, unwholesome, and neutral states of mind.”

79. The derivative afflictions in Yogācāra are generally numbered at twenty—at least after the publication of the *Cheng weishi lun*. But here in this citation from the *YBh*, the additional two mental factors of illicit sexual desire and mistaken resolve are included. In addition, the text below further indicates that in certain situations discursive thought and investigation can be called derivative afflictions.

80. The first of the four stages of meditation that enable one to remove the delusions attached to in the realm of desire, to make way for the bliss of the form realm.

81. According to Kuiji, this distinction in the two positions as to whether or not discrimination is limited to the sixth and seventh consciousnesses or extends to the eighth consciousness can be correlated to disagreements between Sthiramati and Dharmapāla, with Sthiramati stating that it pervades all eight consciousnesses and Dharmapāla maintaining that it is limited to the sixth and seventh. See Kuiji’s commentary to the *Madhyānta-vibhāga* (*Bian zhongbianlun shuji*), T 1835:44.4b14–19 and 35a11–18.

82. This same argument is made in the *Fodijing lun* at T 1530:26.323c8.

83. The *Mahāyānasamgraha-śāstra* (K. *Sōp taesūng non*) is ascribed to Asaṅga.



This work gives an overview of most of the important categories in the Yogācāra system, including the eight consciousnesses, the three natures, affliction, two hindrances, bud-dha-bodies, and meditative practices that lead to liberation. Three Chinese translations were done.

84. The five mental factors (K. *o p'yōnhaeng*) are those that are understood to be functioning in all instances of consciousness. They are contact (Skt. *sparśa*), focusing of attention (Skt. *manaskāra*), sensation (Skt. *vedanā*), perception (Skt. *saṃjñā*), and volitional impulse (Skt. *cetanā*).

85. This passage is not referenced by Wōnhyo, but it appears, almost verbatim, in the *Fodijing lun* at T 1530:26.323b24–27.

86. (K. *yuru chongja*). These are the seeds in the *ālaya-vijñāna* that produce all mental and physical phenomena in the conditioned world of cyclic existence, as distinguished from uncontaminated seeds.

87. (K. *kyōngji*). In Yogācāra theory, the mirror cognition is one of the four undefiled cognitive faculties that is the result of the transmutation, upon becoming a buddha, of the various forms of previously defiled consciousness. In this case it is the pure cognition experienced at Buddhahood by a qualitative transmutation of the eighth consciousness. The mirror cognition reflects all objects without distortion or interference.

88. (K. *mugi*). Karmic moral indeterminacy (or “neutrality”) constitutes one of the three qualities of all activities (karma)—with the other two being “good” and “bad” (or “wholesome” and “unwholesome”). While the latter two states bring about definite, concomitant karmic effects, indeterminate states do not have a determinable good or evil consequence. Karmic moral indeterminacy is distinguished into two kinds: obstructing indeterminacy and nonobstructing indeterminacy.

89. Defiled indeterminate quality (K. *yubu mugī*; Skt. *nivṛta-avyākṛta*). One of the subdivisions of the class of moral indeterminacy among the hindrances to enlightenment, this quality is the complement of *nonimpedimentary moral indeterminacy*. It is a mental function that, although not determinable as good or evil, has the contaminated aspect of impeding pure perception of reality. It is seen, for example, in the four manifestations of the view of self that are associated with the *manas* consciousness.

90. The two vehicles (K. *isūng*) are the two kinds of practitioners, *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*. These two kinds of practitioners are regularly introduced in Mahāyāna Buddhist literature, where they are cast in a negative light in contradistinction to the bodhisattva as representatives of the so-called Lesser Vehicle tradition. They are understood to be practitioners who are engaged in a view toward practice and enlightenment that will permit them to reach the level of arhatship and not Buddhahood. This means that they are able to permanently sever the multitude of afflictions resultant of the three poisons, but they are unable to progress further along the path in the manner of the bodhisattva due to a lack in the development of their compassion and their insight into the absence of self-nature in all dharmas.

91. Nonobstructed morally indeterminate mental states, or undefiled moral neutrality (K. *mubu mugī*; Skt. *anivṛta-avyākṛta* or *akliṣṭa-avyākṛta*), are one of the two kinds of morally neutral categories of mental functioning, the other being obstructed moral indeterminacy. These are mental functions of neutral quality that do not hinder enlightenment. They were originally posited by the Sarvāstivādins, who distinguished four kinds of nonimpedimentary moral indeterminacy. The *four kinds of exclusively nonobstructed morally indeterminate mental states* (K. *sa mugī*) are morally indeterminate mental functions that also do not create any cognitive obstructions and therefore cannot act as

impediments. These are (1) karmic results that differ from their causes; (2) mode of deportment, referring to the neutral quality of the thoughts that arise in connection with moving into certain physical positions; (3) the arts and crafts; and (4) the indeterminacy/ neutrality of the occurrences that arise through the action of supernatural transformations.

92. The concept of “ripening” or “differential ripening” (K. *isuk*; Skt. *vipāka*) is a pivotal one in Yogācāra theories of individuated causality. It describes an important characteristic of the ripening of karma into results, or new phenomena, in that when one thing produces another, the next thing that is produced, while having a direct and close relation to its cause, must also be something different from its cause. Common metaphors include the ripening of fruit or the baking of a loaf of bread, in which case the final products are quite different in character from their causal stages and have exhausted their potential for further development. Once good or evil karmas bear their fruit, they lose their positive and negative potentiality and thus become morally indeterminate. In Yogācāra usage, the term refers especially to the natural fruition of the latent power of good and evil activities (karma) and is used especially in reference to the *ālaya-vijñāna*.

93. Wholesome roots (K. *sōn’gūn*; Skt. *kuśala-mūla*) are virtuous causal actions that bring good rewards. There are generally considered to be three of these: absence of covetousness, absence of antipathy, and absence of folly.

94. This passage is not contained in the *YBh* as Wōnhyo indicates, but is found in the *Fodijŏng lun* at T 1530:26.323b13–14.

95. Selflessness of dharmas, or emptiness of dharmas (K. *pōpkong*; Skt. *dharmasūnyatā*), is the seminal Mahāyāna Buddhist position that says that not only do individual beings lack inherent existence, but the compositional elements of the world from which beings are composed also lack inherent existence. This is considered by Mahāyānists to be a level of insight that distinguishes them from the two-vehicle practitioners, who are able to perceive only the emptiness of person. In terms of the two hindrances, the insight of emptiness of dharmas is important for the removal of cognitive hindrances.

96. Selflessness of person (K. *ingong* or *in mua*; Skt. *puḍgala-nairātmya*) is the lack of the inherent existence of a changeless definitive self, or personality, within the person. In Mahāyāna Buddhism this is viewed as the first and not-quite-thoroughgoing level of insight into emptiness, with the next level being selflessness of dharmas.

97. The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* (K. *Chunghyōn punbyōllon*; Discrimination between the middle and the extremes) is a seminal Yogācāra text that is considered to have been completed through the joint efforts of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. The special focus of this text is on the Yogācāra articulation of the meaning of mistaken discrimination versus the meaning of emptiness of inherent nature, with the aim of breaking attachment to extreme notions of emptiness and existence.

98. Root consciousness (K. *ponsik*; Skt. *mūla-vijñāna*) can generally be understood as a synonym for *ālaya-vijñāna*. This is a translation of the term used by Paramārtha, possibly influenced by the original Sarvāstivāda understanding of a root consciousness.

99. Intentional or not, Wōnhyo has collapsed two verses together. The source text has *tan* (only) instead of *nan* (disturbed), but as we see, ultimately the same thing is being discussed—i.e., an originary, amorphous, undefined state of consciousness that appears as objects, faculties, a self, and the six consciousnesses. See T 1599.31.451b7–23.

100. From T 1599:31.451b7–14, fragmentarily. The first twenty words in this citation are four stanzas of a terse verse, which is explained in full in a commentary just afterwards.



101. The portion of this text following this citation contains a detailed explanation of the application of the metaphor of perfuming in regard to moral indeterminacy, the *ālaya-vijñāna*, and the forthcoming consciousnesses. One might also want to look at the related discussion in the *Cheng weishi lun* at T 1585:31.12a24 ff.

102. The term “seeds” (K. *chongja*; Skt. *bīja*) is used in Yogācāra as a metaphor to explain the mechanism of individuated cause and effect. “Seeds” are one phase of the latent potentialities of all mental and physical phenomena that are stored in the *ālaya-vijñāna*. They come into existence by receiving the influence of (being “perfumed” by) the result of present activities and conditions, and they result in new potentialities, giving rise to continued existence. The *ālaya-vijñāna* is in fact made of nothing but countless seeds being created and disappearing in every moment.

103. The *Nirvana Sutra* (K. *Yōlban kyōng*) is one of the most influential sutras in East Asian Mahāyāna Buddhism. This sutra, which is supposed to be the account of the Buddha’s final sermon prior to his passing away, stresses that all sentient beings possess the Buddha nature and that all beings, even *icchantikas*, will become buddhas.

104. “Contaminated” here is a translation of *yuru* (*āsrava*). Literally translated into Chinese as “having outflow,” in Buddhism it refers to the fact that if a mental function, whether it be of wholesome, unwholesome, or indeterminate moral quality, is goal-oriented—thus conditioned—it will tend to further one’s enmeshment in cyclic existence. This occurrence of contamination is directly associated with the condition of nescience, which allows the consciousnesses to be tricked by the illusions of subject and object, like and dislike. The enlightened mind is able to operate without contamination (K. *murū*; Skt. *anāsrava*), and thus the distinction between “contaminated” and “uncontaminated” is analogous to that between mundane and holy, or unenlightened and enlightened.

105. The Path of Seeing (K. *kyōndo*; Skt. *darśana-mārga*) is the third of the five stages of attainment in the Yogācāra school. It is the stage of the observation of the Four Truths and also the stage at which one enters the level of the uncontaminated supramundane wisdom. It is after entry into this stage that one is considered to be enlightened. In Abhidharma doctrine it is equivalent to the stage of *stream-winner*, and in Mahāyāna to the stage of the first *bhūmi*. After the consummation of this stage, one moves on to the Path of Cultivation, where the correct views attained in the Path of Seeing are thoroughly and repeatedly practiced. The practices of the Path of Seeing are capable of eliminating the afflictions produced by discriminations in this lifetime, but in order to eliminate the afflictions carried over from prior lifetimes, one must enter the Path of Cultivation.

106. The term “Path of Skillful Means” (K. *pangp’yōn to*; Skt. *prayoga-mārga* or *upāya-mārga*) is used somewhat flexibly within various path descriptions to indicate a relatively early stage of practice, wherein one is not yet exercising undefiled wisdom. According to some texts, it is equivalent to the second of the five paths, which are stages of religious cultivation in Yogācāra (the second stage is more commonly termed “stage of applied practices,” or *kahaeng to*). According to the scheme explained in the *Yijang ūi*, the Path of Skillful Means is one of the five subpaths contained within the Path of Seeing.

107. Mahāyāna Buddhism contains a teaching regarding four positive attributes of Buddhist religious experience (permanence, joy, self, and purity) that are taught as an antidote to the negativity of teachings such as that of emptiness. It would seem that it is this set of four that is being referred to here, except that instead of “purity” (K. *chōng*), we have “dharma” (K. *pōp*). Since these two characters look similar when written in cursive script, it is not inconceivable that there is a corruption here. The likelihood of this is supported by the fact that this sequence of characters (dharma-self-permanence-joy) does not

appear anywhere in the known East Asian canon. The best known locus classicus for the four virtues is the *Nirvana Sutra*. See, for example, T 374:12.377b19 ff.

108. The *Ratnagotravibhāga-śāstra* (K. *Posŏng non*; Jewel-nature treatise) is a mixture of verse and prose, a basic text in the articulation of Tathāgatagarbha thought in Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism. The treatise explains in detail the theory that all sentient beings, no matter how horrible their crimes, possess the potential to attain Buddhahood. The great power possessed by the buddhas is able to erase the karma of the crimes of such evil persons as *icchāntikas*.

109. In the source text, these are the four errors of (1) seeing enjoyment instead of suffering, (2) seeing self where one should see no-self, (3) seeing permanence where one should see impermanence, and (4) seeing impurity where one should see purity.

110. “And so forth” means that the same application should be made toward thoughts of no-self, suffering, and impurity.

111. The inclusion of this last line in the citation may not be especially relevant, as, from an examination of the original text, it seems to be the start of the explanation of a new theme rather than a summation of the prior one.

112. The quoted text differs significantly from that in Taishō. Please see my online version of the Sino-Korean version of the *Yijang ūi* with attached notes at <http://www.acmuller.net/twohindrances/ijangui-cjk.html>.

113. The consciousness that is resultant of maturation—i.e., consciousness that appears as the maturation of prior causes (or seeds), or the consciousness that handles the fruitional economy. The fruition of prior karma is itself karmically neutral—were it not, karma would become hard determinism, since, for instance, bad karma would perpetuate itself endlessly. During the course of the development of the notion of *ālaya-vijñāna*, it became necessary to posit this aspect of the consciousness of sentient beings, and thus *vipāka-vijñāna* becomes an important connotation of the *ālaya-vijñāna*. Since the matured effects of prior causes must by nature be indeterminate in terms of their moral quality, this consciousness is said as well be morally indeterminate. It is understood later to also contain the seeds and other latent karmic factors that produce effects within the seven forthcoming consciousnesses.

114. Kernels of original nature (K. *ponsŏng kye chŏngja*; Skt. *prakṛti-stham gotram*) are seeds in the *ālaya-vijñāna* that are already present at birth as the result of the activities of prior lifetimes. This term is commonly used in reference to the seeds that would determine one’s spiritual proclivities, such as the distinction between potential for becoming a *śrāvaka*, bodhisattva, and so forth. These kernels are far subtler than the seeds that are created from habituation in the present lifetime. In one passage in the *YBh* that is clearly related, the eighteen realms (*dhātu*) are classified into the six types of kernels: dharma *dhātu*, pure *dhātu*, *dhātu* of original nature, habituated *dhātu*, *dhātu* where the effect is already experienced, and *dhātu* where the effect is not yet experienced. In this passage, the third and fourth types are being cited. See T 1579:30.610a8 ff.

115. Seeds formed by habituation (K. *sŭpsŏng chongja*) are proclivities (seeds) that are cultivated in the present lifetime, which are more coarse and superficial than the inherent seeds with which one is born.

116. The former are recently habituated, and the latter are originary.

117. *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* (K. *Chang’ŏm non*, full title *Taesŭng chang’ŏm kyŏng non*; Treatise on the scripture of adorning the Great Vehicle). This work is attributed to Asaṅga, but according to some traditions, the verses were written by Maitreya and were expanded into prose form by Asaṅga or Vasubandhu. It is an important text for the

Yogācāra school, being one of the eleven treatises that formed the basis for the *Cheng weishi lun*. It consists of twenty-four chapters, the content of which is almost exactly the same as that of the “Chapter of the Bodhisattva Stages” in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, with most of the important discussions being in regard to the bodhisattva seeds, arousal of the intention to save sentient beings, faith and understanding, six perfections, and the merits of practice. This citation from the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* occurs in the midst of an explanation of objective marks (which are the five categories of the one hundred dharmas) and subjective marks. The sentence prior to this says, “We will now discuss the various subjective marks.” T 1604:31.613c13.

118. Wōnhyo has here omitted the introductory portion of this passage, which says: “There are, in general, three kinds of subjective marks. These are called the marks of discrimination, the marks of dependent origination, and the marks of true reality.”

119. (K. *arahan*). In early Indian texts the stage of arhat is the final goal of Buddhist practice—the attainment of *nirvāṇa*, which means the complete elimination of affliction, and the end of rebirth into the world of suffering. In Mahāyāna texts the arhat (or the *śrāvaka* or *pratyekabuddha* who is practicing toward arhatship) is placed in the position of foil for the Mahāyāna hero, the bodhisattva, and thus these practitioners of the two vehicles are disparaged as adherents of the Lesser Vehicle and are said to be engaged in practices that are self-centered and incomplete in the wisdom of emptiness.

120. This passage in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* describes various forms of bad behavior seen in arhats even though they have eradicated all afflictions. The text cited here is an abbreviation of the source passage at T 1579:30.738b29–c1.

121. This is a story that appears in a number of Buddhist scriptures about an arhat named Pilinda-vatsa. He was said to be a master of tantric spells but gave these up upon becoming a disciple of the Buddha. He had lived many lifetimes as an upper-class Brahman and thus had long cultivated upper-class airs and still tended to address others as if they were *sūdras* (the lowest of the four Indian castes, equivalent to slaves). Once while passing along the Ganges River, he ordered the god of the rivers, Varuṇa, to make the Ganges stop flowing. Varuṇa was infuriated by this and complained to Śākyamuni, who ordered Pilinda-vatsa to repent.

122. The HPC and WSC versions have disagreement regarding the usage of *ru* (contamination) and *yōm* (defilement, pollution). While there are cases in Abhidharma and Yogācāra texts where these might be seen as synonymous, I read *ru* here as being used for its original, concrete connotations of “leaking” or “dripping,” as is indicated by the term *rusu*. There may also be a double meaning in the usage of the term *rusu* here, which is also listed in dictionaries as a method for the running of ancient clocks. Hence the energy from “leaking water” would have a positive effect. Therefore I do not agree with the WSC’s change from *ru* to *yōm*.

123. (K. *sōngmun*). The Skt. *śrāvaka* here originally refers to a direct disciple of the Buddha (who heard his voice). In later Mahāyāna texts this is a technical term with somewhat negative connotations. While *śrāvakas* are disciplined monk-practitioners who contemplate the principle of the Four Truths for the purpose of attaining arhatship and thus eventually *nirvāṇa*, they are also considered, along with the *pratyekabuddhas* (solitary realizers), to be practitioners of the two lesser vehicles, inferior in insight and compassion to the bodhisattvas. This is because their practice is said to be self-centered, focusing on their own salvation, a selfishness that is made possible by their lack of recognition of the emptiness of all objective dharmas.

124. (K. *pyōkchi pul, yōngak, tokgak*). The Skt. *pratyekabuddha* is translated as

“enlightened by contemplation on dependent origination.” *Pratyekabuddhas* are one of two kinds of Lesser Vehicle sages (the other being the *śrāvakas*), whose practice, according to the Mahāyāna scriptures, is aimed toward the “lesser” goal of arhatship rather than toward complete Buddhahood. The first Chinese rendering of the term emphasizes the method by which the practitioner attains the goal, which is by analyzing the principle of the twelve-part conditioned origination. The second rendering refers to the fact that this practitioner attains liberation through his or her own study and effort, not relying on the sermons of a teacher, and by staying alone, absorbed in contemplation.

125. The line here as cited by Wōnhyo has significant differences (mainly omissions) from the source text, which make it difficult to translate without looking at the source. Please see my online version of the Sino-Korean source text of the *Yijang ūi* for clarification (<http://www.acmuller.net/twohindrances/ijangui-cjk.html>).

126. In the Yogācāra system there are fifty-one dharmas allotted to the category of mental factors. See note 51 above.

127. The adamant concentration (K. *kūmgang yujōng*; Skt. *vajra-upama-samādhi*), also rendered by translators as “diamondlike *samādhi*” or “adamantine absorption,” is a state of deep meditative trance where all of the subtlest defilements are destroyed, and it is the final stage of bodhisattva practice. Mahāyāna schools state that this is the highest meditative state attainable in Lesser Vehicle practices—the highest attainment of the arhat—and that in their own system it is considered to be the same as “equal enlightenment.” In Yogācāra this state of concentration occurs in the consummating stage of practice.

128. Using *yi* (differ) from the Taishō source text, rather than *ip* (establish) as in the HPC.

129. In view of the context, it seems that the character *ch’u* (heavy) may have been mistakenly inserted for *xi* (subtle).

130. HPC 1.693c21–23; T 1845:44.237c20–29. The *Expository Notes* will be translated in this series by Sung Bae Park.

131. The (*Posal yōngnak*) *Pon’ōp kyōng* (T 1485:24.1010b–1023a). Like the *Flower Ornament Sutra*, the *Sutra for Humane Kings*, the *Sutra of Brahma’s Net*, and others, this scripture discusses the course of the bodhisattva’s practice through the fifty-two stages, the pure precepts, the ten *pāramitās*, and so on. The only known commentary that deals with this sutra exclusively is that done by Wōnhyo, of which only the second fascicle remains.

132. Directive karma (K. *in’ōp*), also called *ch’ongpo* (general reward karma), draws one into overarching conditions, such as that of the species of which one is a member. This is contrasted to *particularizing karma*, which determines the precise characteristics of one’s rebirth.

133. Particularizing karma (K. *saeng’ōp*) determines precise conditions in one’s rebirth, such as one’s personality, level of intelligence, social status, and so forth. This karma contrasts with *directive karma*, which determines more general conditions, such as the species into which one is born.

134. Nescience is the first of the twelve limbs of dependent arising, thirst is the eighth, and grasping is the ninth.

135. The Path of Cultivation (K. *sudo*; Skt. *bhāvanā-mārga*) is the fourth of the five stages of Yogācāra practice, the second of the three supramundane paths. After the experience of the Path of Seeing (K. *kyōndo*), the practitioner renews his or her efforts based on this new insight, seeking further accordance with reality. The afflictions that are

eliminated in this path are the more deeply embedded innate afflictions, whereas the practices of the prior Path of Seeing is able to eliminate the less deeply embedded afflictions produced by discrimination.

136. In terms of the present arrangement of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* in the Korean and Taishō canons, this would actually be an earlier, rather than later, sentence.

137. The stage of nothingness (K. *musoyu ch'ō*; Skt. *ākīṃcanya-āyatana*) is a meditative state in which nothing exists whatsoever. It is the third of the four loci of the formless realm—the third of the four formless concentrations.

138. The summit of material existence (K. *yujōng*; Skt. *bhava-agra*) is the fourth and highest heaven of the form realm.

139. (K. *Sōp taesūng non sōk*). This is Asaṅga's commentary on the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, by his brother Vasubandhu, and translated into Chinese by Paramārtha. Following the text to which it is a commentary, this work gives extensive treatment to all of the major Yogācāra theories regarding consciousness-only, including the *ālaya-vijñāna*, affliction, seeds, perfuming, and so on.

140. The cited text is abbreviated and cannot properly be read without seeing the source text.

141. The *Treatise on Buddha Nature* (K. *Pulsōng non*) is attributed to Vasubandhu (but this attribution is not taken seriously), translated by Paramārtha. This treatise discusses the theory of Buddha nature, in great detail in sixteen chapters. In the course of explaining how it is that all sentient beings have the Buddha nature, the mistaken views of non-Buddhists and Lesser Vehicle practitioners are refuted. The author cites extensively from the *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, the *Lotus Sutra*, and the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*.

142. The four realizations (K. *sagwa*; Skt. *catvāri-phalāni*) are the four attainments (literally, fruits) of the *śrāvaka* path: (1) stream-winner, (2) once-returner, (3) nonreturner, and (4) arhat. The stream-winner succeeds in eradicating conceptual disturbances of the three realms (also called the eighty-eight afflictions), experiences the fifteen minds of the Path of Seeing, and, finishing this task, enters the Path of Cultivation, thus consummating this stage. Entering into the stage of once-returner, the practitioner removes the first six of the nine qualities of afflictions of the Path of Cultivation and thus consummates this stage. The practitioner then proceeds to enter the level of nonreturner and eliminates the remaining three afflictions to consummate this stage. In arhat, the final stage, all afflictions have been permanently eradicated, and the practitioner is capable of entry into *nirvāna*.

143. A nonreturner (K. *purhwan*; Skt. *anāgāmin*) is a practitioner of the path of the *śrāvaka* who has attained the third of the four stages, which is that of freedom from rebirth in the desire realm.

144. The three kinds of causes/conditions for rebirth (K. *samjong yōnsaeng*) are (1) that from reaching the limits of birth-and-death (*kung saengsa yōnsaeng*), that from the path of attachment and nonattachment (*ae piae to yōnsaeng*), and that of receiving [a body] for enjoyment (*suyong yōnsaeng*).

145. The three kinds of perfuming (*samjong hunsūp*) are (1) perfuming by linguistic expressions, (2) perfuming by self-view, and (3) perfuming according to one's existence (i.e., in one of the three realms or six destinies). See T 1593:31.117c2.

146. The two kinds of causes of rebirth are taught in the *Compendium of the Great Vehicle* at T 1593:31.115b10–12. The three kinds of habituation are taught in the same text at T 1593:31.117c2.

147. Overwhelming contingencies (K. *chūngsang yōn*) constitute one of the four

kinds of causation in Yogācāra causal theory. The term refers to conditions related to the absence or presence of empowerment, meaning all the causes that aid the main causes of the production of existences, plus the conditions that, though not directly contributing to the cause, do not impede. For all occasions, when one thing is produced, there are various influencing and controlling factors.

148. Following Alex Wayman in his translation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* (Wayman and Wayman, *Lion's Roar*), I have used the term “entrenched” here to indicate the new dimension of nescience and affliction that Wōnhyo now brings to our attention through the designation of the Indirect interpretation—*mumyōng chuji* (nescience entrenchment). The implications here are primarily those of “latency” as distinguished from manifest activity. It would make sense to simply render this in English as “latent,” if the latent afflictions were not already a significant and distinct technical category in the previously described Direct interpretation of the hindrances, and so it would probably be clearer if another term is used, for the sake of consistency in indicating latency in this new context. Also, the term “entrenched” conveys a connotation of embedment that is clearly appropriate. When this term is used, the reader should understand that it is referring specifically to the Indirect aspect of the latent hindrances as derived from the discourse of the *Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, *Śrīmālā-sūtra*, *Bodhisattvabhūmi-sūtra*, and *Benye jing*.

149. Miraculous birth-and-death (K. *pyōnyōk saengsa*; Skt. *parinamiki-jarā-marāṇa*) is the cyclical existence experienced by enlightened bodhisattvas, as opposed to the fragmentary birth-and-death experienced by unenlightened people.

150. The term “Four Unconstructed Truths” (K. *mujak saje*) refers to an understanding of the principle of the Four Truths in the sense of reality as it is, without relying on the explanation of the law of cause and effect. In contrast, the Four Constructed Truths are the Four Truths explained in their ordinary sense, in the context of the law of cause and effect.

151. According to the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*, bodhisattvas have three kinds of mind-made bodies: (1) the body mentally produced from enjoyment of meditative absorption (these are produced by bodhisattvas in the third to fifth grounds); (2) the body mentally produced from the nature of enlightenment (these are produced by bodhisattvas in the eighth ground); and (3) the body mentally produced by various types of beings together functioning without effort or obstruction (these are produced by bodhisattvas in the ninth and tenth grounds). See T 670.16.497c26 ff.

152. The three kinds of contamination (K. *samnu*; Skt. *traya-āsravāḥ*) are the contamination of desire, the contamination of existence, and the contamination of nescience. In other words, the contaminations of the three levels of existence: the realms of desire, form, and no-form.

153. The citation from the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* is from T 1611:31.834b25–c1, and the citation from the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* is from T 353:12.221b25–26. This citation of the *Śrīmālā-sūtra* is contained in this form within the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, and apparently that is the way Wōnhyo is citing it.

154. The term “conflict between the hindrances and their correction” is defined in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* on T 1579:30.501b6, as a situation where one is trying to conduct a pure religious practice in the midst of an impure, afflicted condition, and thus there is conflict.

155. It must be understood from this that the entrenchment of nescience is being clearly distinguished from the mistake of discriminating objective dharmas.

156. The marks of conditions are the first of the four kinds of hindrances listed at this



point in the *Ratnagotravibhāga*. The remaining three are the hindrance of the marks of causes, the hindrance of the marks of arising, and the hindrance of the marks of destruction.

157. Wōnhyo skips over a considerable amount of text here.

158. The *Sutra of Neither Increase nor Decrease* (K. *Pujŕng pulgam kyōng*) is a short *tathāgatagarbha* text that discusses the relationship between sentient beings and the *dharmakāya* (or *dharmadhātu*) as being one of equivalence within the medium of the *tathāgatagarbha*.

159. Citation not located.

160. Remaining, then, would be the view of the existence of a self, extreme views, desire, ill will, pride, and nescience.

161. The ten kinds of afflictions have been defined in the prior paragraph of the *YBh*, where it has also been explained that these ten are multiplied by twelve variations of the Four Truths within the three realms to produce a total of 120 afflictions.

162. To explain this point, Wōnhyo uses an unreferenced passage from the *YBh*. He leaves out the first sentence of this passage, which says: “It is not without nescience that afflictions come into being; therefore the nescience that accompanies the production of all afflictions such as greed and so forth is called associated nescience” (T 1579:30.622a13). The next line in the text follows on this.

163. 17 fasc., T 1521:26.20–123. The *Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā-śāstra* (K. *Sipchu pibasa ron*) is a commentary on the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* attributed to Nāgārjuna, translated by Kumārajīva around 405 CE. Consists primarily of an explanation of the fifty-two bodhisattva stages; also contains one of the early expositions regarding Amitābha.

164. This passage is found not in the *Guang lun*, as Wōnhyo has indicated, but in the *Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra* (T 1546:28.30b26–29). One possible explanation for this confusion may be that both texts are originally one hundred fascicles in length.

165. Attachment to [wrong] discipline (K. *kyegūm ch’wi*; Skt. *śīla-vrata-parāmarśa*) is the mistaken view of misunderstanding the path of discipline and considering it to be the true cause of cessation of suffering when it is not, and holding to it as the true path, though it is not. It also includes the mistaken view that the austerities, moral practices, and vows of non-Buddhist sects can lead one to the truth—that is, trying to seek salvation by means of the austerities of the non-Buddhist Indian schools of philosophy. This general type of attachment is also distinguished into two types: precepts-only attachment and upside down (i.e., inverted) attachment. In the Yogācāra system, it is counted as one of the five mistaken views.

166. For understanding exactly how it is that the views that deny the path are generated by devout practitioners, it is helpful to read Wōnhyo’s explication of the precept against slandering the Dharma, contained in his *Pōmmanggyōng posal kyebon sagi*. See HPC 1.603a, and the translation by Eun-su Cho, titled *Personal Exposition on the “Bodhisattva Precepts Chapter” in the Sutra of Brahma’s Net*, in the International Association of Wōnhyo Studies’ Collected Works of Wōnhyo series.

167. In the line of this text just prior to where Wōnhyo begins his citation, the “three circumstances” are defined as (1) the circumstances that are the perceptual referents for conceptual elaborations, (2) the circumstances of self-view and pride, and (3) the circumstances of greed and so forth.

168. “Two,” as found in the HPC and the WSC, is changed to “three” to agree with both the source text and the thread of the current discussion.

169. The five sense faculties and the thinking consciousness.

170. The six objects of the sense faculties.

171. Wōnhyo is probably referring here to the fourth of the four levels of apprehension of reality (*S. tattvārtha*; *K. chinsil ūi*) taught in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* and other texts. These are, briefly, (1) the expression of truth in everyday speech (i.e., generally shared linguistic convention), wherein sentient beings, when seeing the earth, call it earth, and when seeing fire, call it fire, without confusion; (2) reality as formulated by accurate reasoning (i.e., the reality accepted by the intelligent based on direct perception, inference, authoritative validity, and other forms of accepted logical reasoning); (3) reality as formulated by the cognition purified of the afflictive hindrances (*śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* are able, based on untainted expedient cognition, accurate cognition, and subsequently obtained cognition, to eradicate the afflictive hindrances, obtaining pure cognition and unimpeded cognition); and (4) reality as formulated by the cognition purified of the cognitive hindrances (bodhisattvas are able to free themselves from the cognitive hindrances and actualize the truth of the middle way, experiencing the world through true cognition). See T 1579:30.486b8.

172. (*K. Posal chiji kyōng*). 10 fasc., T 1581:30.888–959. Translated into Chinese by Dharmakṣema, it is said to be the teaching of Maitreya as recorded by Asaṅga. It explains in detail the practices of the Mahāyāna Bodhisattva, especially the Mahāyāna disciplines. It was also translated by Guṇabhadra into the nine-fascicle *Pusa shanjie jing* (T 1582) and by Xuanzang as part of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*. Sanskrit and Tibetan versions are also extant.

173. Wōnhyo is now establishing a new level of internality/externality or latency/manifestation. In the first section on the essence of the hindrances, he distinguished the standard forms of affliction into actively binding forms, and latent forms. The distinction he is making here is somewhat different, in the sense that this new category of “arisen” includes afflictions in both their actively binding form and their latent form. This means that he sees the level of “entrenchment” as being something deeper than the notion of “latent” as a translation of the Sanskrit *anuśaya*. “Entrenchments” in this case seems to be something more like a vague, undifferentiated fertile ground. In the commentarial works of specialists of comparative Yogācāra/Tathāgatagarbha doctrine, the notion of entrenchments is usually associated with that of Yogācāra seeds (*bīja*), which are indeed a different category than *anuśaya*.

174. In this case, the term *ae* (love, attachment) is used as a general term to refer to the five gross afflictions—i.e., attraction, hatred, pride, etc.

175. Given that the logograph *hok* is used in the subsequent five items, it should probably also be here, instead of *pōnnoe*.

176. Taught in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* at T 1579:30.730a9.

177. In view of the context, no doubt “two,” as given in the HPC, should be “three.”

178. I.e., the six perfections.

179. In Abhidharma Buddhism, the highest worldly meditative state (*K. se cheil pōp*) is the fourth rank of the four wholesome roots, which is the last that contains contamination. Occurring at the end of the stage of applied practices, the practitioner subsequently enters the Path of Seeing. In Yogācāra this occurs during the first *bhūmi*, whereupon one enters the Path of Seeing.

180. The subsequently attained cognition (*K. hudūk chi*; *Skt. pṛṣṭha-labdha-jñāna*), in contrast to innate cognition, is the knowledge attained as a result of enlightenment that the bodhisattvas use for the task of liberating other sentient beings. Buddhas and bodhisattvas are able to utilize their discriminating capacities after attaining enlightenment,



but without reifying and appropriating notions regarding their own selfhood or the intrinsic reality of objects. The existence of this clear function means that they understand and take advantage of conventional “realities” and are thus not “disconnected” from the world.

181. Wōnhyo’s *Yildo chang* is not extant.

182. The sixteen mental states (K. *sibyuk sim*) are composed of the eight kinds of tolerance and the eight kinds of wisdom.

183. Of the higher and lower eight truths (K. *sangha palch’ē*), the higher are those of the form realm and formless realm, and the lower are those of the desire realm.

184. Possession of the divine eye implies a vision not obstructed by physical matter.

185. These five characteristics are also introduced and explained in the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* at T 671.16.558a6–20.

186. Therefore Buddhist practices of self-cultivation cannot be carried out by the *manas* (nor by the *ālaya-vijñāna*, as we will see just below) and must be carried out by the *mano*, which is directly involved in the world at the conscious level. For a detailed explanation of this, see *Living Yogācāra: An Introduction to Consciousness-only*, esp. chaps. 5–7.

187. The *Treatise on the “Sutra of the Ten Stages”* (K. *Sipchi kyōng non*; Skt. *Daśabhūmikāsūtra-śāstra* or *Daśabhūmikabhāṣya*), by Vasubandhu, is an explanation of the “Ten Stages” chapter of the *Huayan jing*, which covers many seminal topics, such as the eight consciousnesses, nescience, the three bodies of the Buddha, the three cumulative rules of discipline, and the cause and effect aspects of Buddhahood. The Chinese Dilun school was established based on this treatise, and the Huayan school used the treatise to explain many of its teachings.

188. The ten bodhisattva grounds (K. *sipchi*; Skt. *daśabhūmi*) are the forty-first through the fiftieth stages in the path of the bodhisattva, which are usually referred to as one through ten. Each of the stages is associated with the subjugation or elimination of a certain type of obstruction to enlightenment.

189. (Skt. *adhimukti-caryā-bhūmi*). A reference to the Stage of Preparation and the Stage of Application, which are undertaken before the Stage of Seeing.

190. Paramārtha’s *Wuxiang lun* is not extant as a single work, but some of the portions that originally combined to form it are available in the *San wuxing lun* (T 1617), the *Zhuanshi lun* (T 1587), and *Xianshi lun* (T 1618). See Paul, *Philosophy of Mind*, 94. This passage was located in the *Zhuanshi lun*, T 1587:31.62a18.

191. The original text in Taishō differs significantly from what is contained in the *Yijang ūi*. Please see Taishō or my online edition of the text at <http://www.acmuller.net/twohindrances/ijangui-cjk.html>.

192. This line is cited in the same way in several other treatises, but the original source is unclear.

193. “Mind-king” (K. *simwang*) is an East Asian term (i.e., it is not found in the Indian Yogācāra documents) for the mind proper, consisting of the eight consciousnesses, as distinguished from mental factors, states, or functions.

194. The *Flower Ornament Sutra* (K. *Hwaōm kyōng*; Skt. *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*) is one of the most influential texts in East Asian Buddhism. It describes a cosmos of infinite realms upon realms, mutually containing each other. The vision expressed in this work was the foundation for the creation of the Huayan school of Buddhism, which was characterized by a philosophy of interpenetration. The sutra is also known for its detailed description of the course of the bodhisattva’s practice through fifty-two stages.

195. The only place where I have been able to find this phrase, or something close to

it, is in the *Zhengshi lun* (\**Tattvasiddhi-śāstra*) at T 1646:32.289b4, but this would not, strictly speaking, be considered a Mahāyāna work.

196. Here the terms “stifling” and “quelling” can be understood as being basically synonymous, just being written with a different combination of Sino-Korean logographs. I would have translated both as “quell,” but there is a point below in the text where the two terms are distinguished, and thus I am forced to render them with some kind of differentiation.

197. This elaboration of these three kinds of stifling is a summary of a longer discussion in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* at T 1579:30.583c16.

198. T 1579:30.675b6–7, paraphrased. Either Wōnhyo had access to a version of the *Yogācārabhūmi* different from that in our possession, or the rest of this passage is his own interpolation, as it is not contained in the *Yogācārabhūmi*, nor have I been able to locate it in another text.

199. In *Yogācāra* the four kinds of purified cognition (Skt. *catvāri-jñāni*), first introduced in Aśaṅga’s *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, *Yogācāra* are those attained upon the full enlightenment of the Buddha. These are (1) great mirror cognition (Skt. *ādarśa-jñāna*), the purified form of the eighth consciousness, the *ālaya-vijñāna*; (2) cognition of equality in nature (Skt. *samatā-jñāna*), a purified form of the seventh consciousness, the *manas*; (3) wondrous observing cognition (Skt. *pratyavekṣa-jñāna*), the purified form of the sixth consciousness, the *mano-vijñāna*; and (4) cognition with unrestricted activity (Skt. *kṛtya-anuśṭhāna-jñāna*), the purified form of the five sense consciousnesses.

200. This interpretation would then be a new wrinkle in the standard characterization of the relationship of adherents of the two vehicles with the afflictive hindrances, wherein these hindrances are usually defined as that which can be eliminated by those practitioners.

201. The *sa muryang sim* (Skt. *catvāri-apramāṇā*) are four mental states of immeasurable concern for others, cultivated by bodhisattvas and not necessarily by practitioners of the two vehicles: (1) immeasurable mind of kindness (*maītrī*), (2) immeasurable mind of pity (*karuṇā*), (3) immeasurable mind of joy (*muditā*) on seeing others freed from suffering, and (4) immeasurable mind of impartiality (*upekṣā*)—i.e., rising above these emotions or giving up all things, such as distinctions of friend and enemy, love and hate, etc.

202. In the section of the *YBh* that Wōnhyo is alluding to here, this first kind of practitioner is defined by the technical term “not yet free from desire.”

203. Based on T 1579:30.436b14.

204. See T 1579:30.628c16–17 and 539c1–20.

205. (K. *nanwi*; Skt. *uṣma-gata*). In the way that the presence of heat is an omen for fire, when one approaches the fire of the undefiled wisdom of the Path of Seeing that scorches the afflictions, one feels the “heat” upon reaching the immediately prior (still defiled) stage of wholesome roots—i.e., the stage of warmth. This is described as a level of understanding that is close to the realization of the principle of the Four Truths.

206. While this line is indeed cited in T 1606 (*Mahāyāna-abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*), I have not been able to identify the *Zhiduan jing*.

207. This entire citation is from the \**Abhidharma-samuccaya*. There are a few texts that use *Fenbie jing* as an abbreviated title, such as the *Enan fenbie jing* (T 495), but since I have not been able to locate this passage in the canon, it is not clear whether this comes from any of them.

208. Various texts provide three different viable alternatives for *hae* (disable) here. For discussion, see the online version of the Sino-Korean text at <http://www.acmuller.net/twohindrances/ijangui-cjk.html>.

209. The sixteen mental states (Skt. *ṣoḍaśa-citta*) comprise the eight kinds of tolerance and the eight kinds of wisdom.

210. The *Sutra for Humane Kings* (K. *Inwang kyōng*) is a Prajñāpāramitā sutra about a humane king who protects his country. It may have been originally composed in East Asia and includes an explanation of the thirteen aspects of emptiness, the fourteen kinds of tolerances, the two truths, and so on. It has been translated into English by Charles Orzech with the title *Politics and Transcendent Wisdom: The Scripture for Humane Kings in the Creation of Chinese Buddhism*.

211. In order to allow this passage to be apprehensible, I have included the large amount of missing text from the original source.

212. The stage of no further application (K. *muhak*; Skt. *aśaikṣa*) is a level of practice where one no longer needs religious training; the term is also used as another name for an arhat who has completed the course of practice. One who has attained the state of arhat has already abandoned all defilement, so there remains nothing to learn and practice. It is the last of the four stages of the *śrāvaka* path.

213. The *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* (K. *Ip nūngga kyōng*; Sutra on [the Buddha's] entering [the country of] Lanka) is a relatively late Mahāyāna sutra that combines discussion of Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha concepts. This mixture allowed it to be used in East Asia as a basic canonical text by both the Faxiang and Chan sects in presenting their distinctive approaches to practice and enlightenment.

214. In the Mahāyāna path scheme, the three ranks are the thirty stages categorized as the ten abodes, ten practices, and ten dedications of merit.

215. The markless abode with no applied practices and no exertion (K. *mu kahaeng mu kongyong musang chu*) is the tenth of the twelve abodes of the bodhisattvas taught in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*.

216. This is the last of the twelve bodhisattva abodes, as taught in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*.

217. The abode of perfect bliss (K. *kūghwanhūi chu*) is the third of the twelve abodes of bodhisattvas taught in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, wherein the bodhisattva abides in pure unimpeded mental bliss.

218. In the source text, this discussion goes through each of the ten bodhisattva grounds, most of which Wōnhyo has skipped over here.

219. It would seem that the double negative in the source text is incorrect. If we eliminate either *fei* or *bu*, the line makes sense the way it is translated here.

220. The source text, which is in verse format, is different enough to warrant some attention. Please see Taishō or my online version at <http://www.acmuller.net/twohindrances/ijangui-cjk.html>.

221. This line is not found in the *Sutra for Humane Kings*, but it does appear in the *Benye jing*.

222. Wōnhyo severely abbreviates the source text, which is part of long passage that conducts a cryptic exercise of *reductio ad absurdum* via the two truths (T 1485:24.1018b28–c2).

223. This is a summary of T 353:12.220a16–20.

224. The seven grounds are seven stages of practices taught in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* that are defined in terms of their relation to the twelve abodes.

225. This text, though somewhat altered, is basically the same as in the *YBh* at T 1579:30.736c27.

226. The twenty-two faculties (Skt. *dvāvīṣaṭīndriyāni*) are the six organs of eye, ear,

nose, tongue, body, and mind; the three faculties of male, female, and life; the five sensations of joy, suffering, pleasure, anxiety, and detachment; the five wholesome roots of faith, effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom; and the three undefiled faculties of that which is to be known, that which is already known, and endowed wisdom.

227. Vaiśeṣika is a school of Indian philosophy that is the oldest of the so-called six non-Buddhist schools of Indian philosophy. The Sanskrit *vaiśeṣika* literally means “referring to the distinctions (*viśeṣa*).” The Vaiśeṣikas, like the disciples of the orthodox Nyāya philosophy, chiefly occupied themselves with the theory of knowledge.

228. The *\*Tattvasiddhi-śāstra* (or *Satyasiddhi-śāstra*; Ch. *Chengshi lun*); 16 fasc., T 1646; attributed to Harivarman (c. 250–350), translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva. A scholastic text that analyzes all factors of cognitive experience into eighty-four types while giving extensive treatment to the concept of emptiness, asserting that all existence is nominal in a way close to that of Mahāyāna. The doctrine of this work is to be regarded as the pinnacle of philosophical development attained by the Hīnayāna schools, marking a transitional stage between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna.

229. An adage in Chapter One of the *Zhuangzi* says: “If you are going a thousand *li*, you need three months to gather provisions.”

230. Wōnhyo is referring here to the two major approaches defined in Buddhist debate, most seminally represented in the East Asian Buddhist tradition of his time by Xuanzang’s translation of Dignāga’s *Nyāyamukha* (K. *Inmyōng chōngni mun non pon*; Introduction to logic), which is organized according to the two categories of proof and refutation.

231. The importance of this discussion for Wōnhyo is evident, as he takes it up in at least two other places besides here. One of these is contained in his *Critical Discussion on Inference*, translated in this volume. It can also be seen in Wōnhyo’s *Commentary on the Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith (Kisillon so)* at T 1844:44.212c12–20, which goes like this: “Question: How can we know that the seventh *manas* not only takes the *ālaya-vijñāna* as referent but also takes the six objects as referent? Answer: There are two kinds of proofs. The first is through logical argumentation, and the second is by citing scriptural authority. There are two kinds of inference: (1) the proof of valid claims and (2) the refutation of invalid claims. From the approach of logical argumentation, this mental faculty [*manas*] necessarily shares the same objects with the thinking consciousness [*mano*]. This is the positing of the tenet. Since they do not necessarily share the same bases [i.e., there may be the case where the *manas* has a different base from that of the *mano*], this is the articulation of the cause. Thus, while having their own special bases, their dependents must be the same objects [otherwise they would have nothing in common whatsoever]. It is like the visual faculty [and other sense faculties]. Although they are discussed as being of the same general type, there are times when they do not share the same objects, yet they definitely cannot have their own distinct bases [because the five sense consciousnesses take the same underlying consciousness as their base. This proof from the perspective of the five sense consciousnesses is being made in the opposite direction from that of the prior case of *manas* and *mano* in terms of bases and objects.] As in the sequential extinction of the mental faculty and so forth, this is an explanation based on a contrasting situation [since the relation between bases and objects between the *manas* and *mano*, and the relation among the five sense consciousnesses, are opposite.] This kind of argument based on example is without error. Therefore you should know that the mental faculty [*manas*] also takes the six sense objects as referent.”

232. The completion of contradictory propositions (Skt. *viruddha-avyabhicārin*,

*anaikāntika-viruddha-avyabhicārin*) is the sixth of six errors of indeterminacy in the reason. It can be translated as “being counterbalanced”—i.e., two syllogisms yield mutually opposite conclusions, or the case where two reasons (offered by the proponent and the opponent) are established to support two separate and mutually conflicting theses. In such a case, each of the reasons satisfies the three requirements of a reason. Even though the reasons are sufficient for their own individual positions, they are insufficient for refuting the opponent’s assertion; therefore a conclusion to one’s own proposition cannot be claimed. Thus these reasons have brought about the conclusion of mutually contradictory arguments. For example, the syllogism “Sound is impermanent/because it is created/like pottery” and the syllogism “Sound is eternal/because it is audible/like the essence of sound” are proposed even though they are mutually contradictory, and neither of the discussants can refute the other’s position. See Muller, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (search for *viruddha-avyabhicārin*).

233. In Buddhist logic, a proper example (K. *tongbōp yu*; Skt. *sādharmya-dr̥ṣṭānta*) is one that is the same in type as the thesis to be proved, and it includes the meaning of the reason. This and related concepts are explained in greater detail in Wōnhyo’s *Critical Discussion on Inference*, translated in this volume.

234. Wōnhyo’s *Expository Notes on the “Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith”* is part of the combined commentary on that text that is being translated by Sung Bae Park for the present series.

235. The reference for use of the term *sagu* (four positions) is not supplied. The most common application of this term seen in Wōnhyo’s texts is the four logical possibilities of Madhyamaka (Skt. *catuṣkoṭi*), or the four terms of differentiation—e.g., the differentiation of all things into A, not-A, both A and not-A, and neither A nor not-A.

236. In Yogācāra the causes that produce all phenomena are divided into four types, which are explained in such texts as the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Cheng weishi lun*. The four causes are (1) direct internal causes that produce a result, or *hetu-pratyaya* (this refers to a directly produced effect within a person—seeds and their manifestations, i.e., the production by the seeds in the *ālaya* consciousness of the world cognized through the seven consciousnesses); (2) similar and immediately antecedent conditions, or *saṃanantara-pratyaya* (since the prior instant of mind/mental functioning gives rise directly to the succeeding instant of mind, there is no gap in their leading into one another); (3) “referent as condition,” or *ālambana-pratyaya* (for the mind to arise, its object must be present, so every object becomes a cause for the mind); and (4) “overwhelming causes” (i.e., contributory factors as causes), or *adhipati-pratyaya* (this group includes all kinds of indirect peripheral causes and contingences that lie outside of the three prior, relatively direct types of causation; it includes not only those things that contribute to the production of results but also factors that aid merely by their not serving to impede or hinder).

237. The *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra* (Ch. *Weimo jing*) is considered one of the most profound, as well as literarily excellent, of the Indian Mahāyāna sutras. It expounds the deeper principle of Mahāyāna as opposed to Lesser Vehicle teachings, focusing on the explication of the meaning of nonduality. A significant aspect of the scripture is that it is a teaching addressed to high-ranking Buddhist disciples through the mouth of the layman bodhisattva Vimalakīrti, who expounds the doctrine of emptiness in depth, eventually resorting to silence. There are three extant translations: the *Weimojie suoshuo jing* (T 475; trans. Kumārajīva), the *Shuo wugoucheng jing* (6 fasc., T 476; trans. Xuanzang), and the *Weimojie jing* (2 fasc., T 474; trans. Zhi Qian).

238. These lines are reversed in the source text in Taishō.

239. The first part of this citation about the heads and hands is found in many texts, such as the *Satyasiddhi-sāstra* (T 1646:32.315b14), but I have not yet found the full line in one piece.

240. This phrase is cited secondarily in many places with the same introduction, “a sutra says,” but I have not yet found it in a sutra.

241. Found in T 1509:25.700c7–8 (*Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra*), which is not a sutra.

242. This discussion on the differences in application of anti-reifying discourse to counter reified positions of non-Buddhists and of two-vehicle and bodhisattva practitioners is also contained, almost verbatim, in Wōnhyo’s *Simmun hwajaeng non*. See HPC 1.840a.

243. 1 fasc., T 1568; attributed to Nāgārjuna and translated by Kumārajīva. One of the three main treatises that formed the basis for the Sanlun school. The doctrine of emptiness is explained in twelve aspects.

244. This is not a direct quote but a summary of the point of a passage, not from the *Dvādaśanikāya-sāstra* but from the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* (T 1593:31.118a21–29).

## II. Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies

1. *Kosōnsa Sōdang hwasang t’appi*, in Ch’o, *Wōnhyo Taesa chōnjip*, p. 661, lines 10, 13.

2. Yi Chōng-ik, *Wōnhyo ūi kunbon sasang*.

3. Yi Man-yōng, *Wōnhyo ūi sasang*, p. 77.

4. This account is given in Park Chong Hong, *Han’guk sasang sa*, p. 105.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

6. Sources for these hypothetical restorations of the ten topic headings include “Wōnhyo ūi Simmun hwajaeng non sasang yōn’gu” (Tongbang sasang, vol. 1: *Wōnhyo yōn’gu non sōnjip*, no. 9, Chung-ang Sūngga Taehak, Pulgyo Sahak Yōngu so, 1993, pp. 283ff.); Kim Unhak, “Wōnhyo ūi hwajaeng sasang,” *Pulgyo hakpo* 15 (1988): 177 (Dongguk Taehakkyo Pulgyo Munhwa Yōn’guwōn); Yi Man-yōng, *Wōnhyo ūi sasang: Wōnhyo Daesa ūi Simmun hwajaeng non*, p. 177; (4) O Pōb’an, *Wōnhyo ūi hwajaeng sasang yōn’gu*, pp. 83–108.

7. This preface was found in the *Kosōnsa Sōdang Hwasang t’appi*. The biographer was Kogūm, a high-ranking military officer, and his name was written on the inscription. See Takayasu, “Shiragi so Gangyō denkō,” pp. 64–65.

8. While the text of this introductory section is significantly corrupted, it still seems clear that Wōnhyo establishes the main theme of his treatise by touching upon what the Buddha considers to be the main ill of the worldly attitude: attachment to the extremes of existence and nonexistence. In the *Saṃyutta-Nikāya* of the Pali canon, the Buddha addresses Kaccāna, saying: “This world, Kaccāna, for the most part depends upon a duality—upon the notion of existence and the notion of non-existence” and “‘All exists’: Kaccāna, this is one extreme. ‘All does not exist’: this is the second extreme. Without veering towards either of these extremes, the Tathāgata teaches the Dhamma by the middle” (Bodhi, *Connected Discourses of the Buddha*, p. 544). Nāgārjuna refers to this issue in his *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ* XV.7: “In his instructions to Kātyāyana, both concepts of existence and nonexistence are rejected by the Lord, who understands well being and nonbeing” (*kātyāyanāvavāde cāstīti nāstīti cobhayam/ pratiśiddham*



*bhavadatā bhāvābhāvavibhāvinā//*) (Sanskrit text edited by J. W. de Jong, *Nāgārjuna*, p. 19). Note that in his treatise Wōnhyo tends to use “emptiness” and “nonexistence” interchangeably. These two terms have different connotations, which are evident in the contexts of Wōnhyo’s arguments.

9. The two categories of artificial reification (*samāropa*) and destructive negation (*apavāda*) are instrumental in Yogācāra ontology. They represent the two extreme views of eternalism (*śāśvata-vāda*) and annihilationism (*uccheda-vāda*). In other words, *samāropa* is the belief that things inherently exist, which is identical with *śāśvata-vāda*. *Apavāda* refers to the view that things are absolutely nonexistent, which is the same as *uccheda-vāda*. To steer clear of both of them is to avoid these two extreme views and at the same time to achieve the middle path, which is identical with the Realm of Reality (*dharmadhātu*). See, for instance, Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, 75–77. Wōnhyo’s argument is clearly along this line of thinking.

10. Compare *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.3: “Therefore, everything is said to be neither empty nor non-empty. Because it is existent, because it is non-existent and because it is existent” (*na śūnyam na’pi ca’śūnyam tasmāt sarvaṃ vidhiyate/ sattvādasattvāt sattvācca madhyamā paratīpatcca sām//*). See Pandeya, *Madhyānta-vibhāga-śāstra*, p. 13. Chinese translations of this verse can be found in T 1601:31.477c9–10 and T 1599:31.451a22–23. Wōnhyo’s view is also comparable to that of Piṅgala, the commentator to *Madhyamakāśāstra*. See T 1564:30.25a15–b2. See also Robinson, *Early Mādhyamika*, pp. 55–58.

11. It is essential to grasp Wōnhyo’s view on *catuṣkoṭi*, since it is one of the keys to his arguments in this text. For him the four logical possibilities included in *catuṣkoṭi* exhaust all ontological modes of being and nonbeing of things. In sum, *catuṣkoṭi* is used to establish the middle path. *Catuṣkoṭi* is also used to establish dependent origination (*pratītya-samutpāda*) by rejecting the four extreme views that a phenomenon is created by itself, by something else, or by both or is without a cause. See, for instance, *Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ* I.1: *na svato nāpi parato na dvābhyāṃ nāpy ahetutaḥ/ utpannā jātu vidyante bhāvāḥ kva cana ke cana//*. See de Jong, *Nāgārjuna*, p. 1. See also verses VII, 20; VIII, 18; *Lokāūtastava* 21: *svayaṃkrtaṃ parakṛtaṃ dvābhyāṃ kṛtaṃ ahetukam/ tārkikair iṣyate duḥkham tvayā tūktam pratītyajam//* (Sanskrit text from Lindtner, *Nāgārjuniana*, p. 134). For a modern study of *catuṣkoṭi*, see Ruegg, “Uses of the Four Positions.”

12. It is obvious that the opponent is adhering to the reified views regarding existence and emptiness. Particularly, he takes emptiness as an absolute nonexistence. This is clearly seen in Wōnhyo’s reply.

13. For the connection between *catuṣkoṭi* and the notion that the true nature of phenomena is beyond the sphere of word, see, for instance, *Acintyastava* 23: “Therefore, you have said that phenomena are beyond the four logical possibilities. They are not objects of consciousness, much less within the sphere of words” (*catuṣkoṭivīnirmuktās tena dharmās tvayoditāḥ/ vijñānasyāpy avijñeyā vācām kim uta gocarāḥ//*). See Lindtner, *Nāgārjuniana*, p. 149. This is because, according to Buddhism, words, verbal expressions, or linguistic conventions are essentially linked to conceptual proliferations (*prapañca*).

14. The text has *pōmbu sasang punbyōl soch’wi*, which I think should be amended to *pōmbu sasang punbyōl nūngch’wi soch’wi*: “The misguided thinking of ordinary beings imagines subject [*grāhaka*; *nūngch’wi*] and object [*grāhya*; *soch’wi*].” This would add more clarity to Wōnhyo’s argument. According to Yogācāra philosophy, it is the imagined nature that constructs the duality of *grāhaka* and *grāhya*, the putative inherent nature of consciousness and objects of consciousness. However, although the duality of

*grāhaka* and *grāhya* does not exist in the ultimate sense (nonexistence), it is established on the basis of the dependent nature (existence), which itself is not different from the perfected nature, or emptiness (neither existence nor nonexistence). This is because the perfected nature is simply the dependent nature being free from the superimposition of the duality of *grāhaka* and *grāhya* conceptually constructed by the imagined nature. On this issue the *Madhyāntavibhāga* I.2 says: *abhūtaparikalpo'sti dvyaṃ tatra na vidyate/ śūnyā vidyate tvatra tasyāpī sa vidyate//* (False construct exists; duality is not found in it. Emptiness, however, exists in it; in it [emptiness] too, that [false construct] is found). Sanskrit text from Pandeya, *Madhyānta-vibhāga-śāstra*, p. 9. Wōnhyo's subsequent arguments are exactly along this line.

15. This paragraph appears to be a paraphrase of a passage in the *Yogācārabhūmi*: “It is because the dependent nature and the perfected nature exist that the imagined nature gets established. The one who sees the dependent nature and the perfected nature as nonexistent also rejects the imagined nature. Thus he is said to reject the three natures” (T 1579:30.721b23–26). If one rejects the three natures, one fails to see the *catuṣkoṭi* and the middle path.

16. Here Wōnhyo resorts to the Yogācāra *trīsvabhāva* (three natures) ontology to prove his point. Things that are grasped by ordinary people as nonexistent belong to *parikalpita-svabhāva* (the imagined nature) while those that are considered existent belong to *paratantra-svabhāva* (the dependent nature). The former is established on the basis of the latter. Both of them are not different from emptiness (*śūnyatā*) or *pariṇiṣpanna-svabhāva* (the perfected nature). On the relationship among the three natures see, for instance, Tola and Dragonetti, “*Trīsvabhāvakārikā* of Vasubandhu,” p. 249; Lamotte, *Somme du grand véhicule d'Asaṅga*, pp. 110–111; and *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣyam*, in Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, pp. 39–41.

17. Wōnhyo is obviously alluding to the notion that when the reified phenomena imagined by *parikalpita-svabhāva* are removed from *paratantra-svabhāva*, pure emptiness (i.e., *pariṇiṣpanna-svabhāva*) appears: *pariṇiṣpannastasya pūrveṇa sadā rahitatā tu yā// ata eva sa naivānyo nānanyaḥ paratantraḥ/* (The perfected nature is the perpetual separation of that [the dependent nature] from the former [i.e., imagined nature]. Therefore the perfected nature is neither different from nor identical to the dependent nature). See *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣyam*, in Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 14.

18. Here “all phenomena” refers to phenomena of both *parikalpita-svabhāva* and *paratantra-svabhāva*, whereas empty space symbolically denotes emptiness, or *pariṇiṣpanna-svabhāva*.

19. Wōnhyo cites the *Golden Drum Sutra*, but it is obvious that this passage is from the *Golden Light Sutra* (*Suvarṇa-prabhāsōttama-sūtra*). See T 664:16.380b18–23. Here again Wōnhyo touches upon the essential issue of the middle path (*madhyamā-pratīpad*).

20. This is an abridged quotation from the *Dazhidu lun*. See T 1509:25.590c6–8.

21. See *Mūlamadhyamakārikāḥ* XXV.20: *nirvāṇasya ca yā koṭiḥ koṭiḥ saṃsāraṇasya ca/ na tayor antaraṃ kiṃcit susūksmam api vidyate//* (There is not the slightest difference between the limit of cyclic existence and the limit of *nirvāṇa*). The nonduality between cyclic existence (phenomenal reality) and *nirvāṇa* (ultimate reality), which characterizes awakening, has been stated in many Mahāyāna texts. See, for instance, Vasubandhu's commentary to *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, verse VI.5: *na cāsti saṃsāranirvāṇayo kiṃcinnānākaraṇaṃ paramārthavṛtyā nairātmyasya samatayā* (There is no difference between cyclic existence and *nirvāṇa* because they are equally



without self in the ultimate sense). See *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, in Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 23.

22. The text at HPC 1.839a3 has *chi* (know), which should be emended to *yō* (like).

23. See T 1579:30.541a12–b12. Wōnhyo’s quotation is slightly different from the text.

24. Wōnhyo simply says “that sutra.”

25. See T 374:12.539a7–11.

26. *Ibid.*, 559a21–23. On the description of awakening or Buddhahood or *tathāgatagarbha* as eternity, bliss, self and purity see also Prasad, *Uttaratantra of Maîtresya*, p. 143. Here Asaṅga asks some monks who focus on impermanence, suffering, no-self, and impurity to reinterpret them as eternity, bliss, self, and purity. The *Uttaratantra* also refers to the association of the concept of *tathāgatagarbha* with the four perfections (*pāramitā*)—namely, the perfection of eternity, the perfection of bliss, the perfection of self, and the perfection of purity (*tathāgatadharmakāya eva bhagavan nityapāramitā sukhapāramitā ātmapāramitā subhāpāramitā*). *Ibid.*, p. 99.

27. See T 1602:31.581a27–b4.

28. From here the translation is based on the reconstructed text by Ch’oe Pōmsul, found in the note at the bottom of HPC 1.840.

29. The two kinds of selflessness includes selflessness of persons (*pudgalanairātmya*) and selflessness of phenomena (*dharma-nairātmya*). In Yogācāra philosophy the realization of thusness (*tathatā*), emptiness (*śūnyatā*), or selflessness (*anātman*) is identical with the realization of these two forms of selflessness. See, for instance, Sthiramati’s commentary to verses IX.23 and 37 of the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*.

30. The text has *hok* (*kleśa*), or “defilements,” but it is obvious that in this context it is identical with *chang* (*āvaraṇa*), or “obscurations.” These two obscurations are defined as afflictive obscurations (*kleśa-āvaraṇa*) and cognitive obscurations (*jñeya-āvaraṇa*). In Yogācāra philosophy awakening, or Buddhahood, is attained by the removal of these two obscurations through the realization of the two forms of selflessness: the selflessness of persons (*pudgalanairātmya*) and the selflessness of phenomena (*dharma-nairātmya*). See, for instance, Sthiramati’s *Triṃśikāvijñaptibhāṣyam*, in Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 15.

31. See T 475:14.537c15–16. See also Thurman, *Holy Teaching of Vimalakīrti*, p. 13: “All these things arise dependently, from causes, yet they are neither existent nor non-existent. Therein there is neither ego, nor experiencer, nor doer, yet no action, good or evil, loses its effect.”

32. This appears to be a reference to a well-known metaphor. See, for instance, T 1509:25b23–24.

33. Wōnhyo no doubt is referring to the view of the Sarvāstivādins.

34. It is significant that Wōnhyo uses the expression “true self” in this connection. He is obviously referring to the self that is identical with *tathāgatagarbha* in the *Uttaratantra* and the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, and so forth.

35. The scriptural source closest to this passage that I am able to identify is T 1627:31.895c2–5. On the relationship between the Realm of Reality (*dharmadhātu*) and the realm of sentient beings, see \**Mahāyānadharmadhātunirviśeṣa-sāstra*, T 1626:31.892a13–894b10; T 1627:31.894b12–896b20.

36. See \**Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, T 374:12.407b9–11: “Self means *tathāgatagarbha* [embryo of Tathāgata]. All sentient beings have Buddha nature, which means [true] self. This [true] self since time immemorial has been obscured by countless afflictions.

Therefore sentient beings cannot see it.” On the identity of Buddha nature and [true] self, see also *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* IX.23: “In pure emptiness buddhas attain the supreme self of selflessness and become the great self by realizing the pure self” (*śūnyatāyāṃ viśuddhāyāṃ nairātmyātmārgalābhataḥ/ buddhāḥ śuddhātmalābhivāt gatā ātmamahātmatām//*). In his commentary to this verse, Vasubandhu remarks: “This shows the supreme self of buddhas in the uncontaminated realm. Why so? Because [a buddha’s true self] is the self of supreme selflessness. Supreme selflessness is pure thusness, and that is the [true] self of buddhas, in the sense of self-nature. When this is pure, buddhas attain pure supreme selflessness. Therefore, by attaining a pure self, buddhas realize the spiritual greatness of self. Thus it is with this intention that buddhas are proclaimed to have a supreme self in the uncontaminated realm” (*tatra cānasrave dhātau buddhānāṃ paramātmā nirdīśyate/ kiṃ kāraṇaṃ/ agranairātmyātmakatvāt/ agraṃ nairātmyaṃ viśuddhā tathatā sā ca buddhānāmātmā svabhāvārthena tasyāṃ viśuddhāyāmagraṃ nairātmyamātmānaṃ buddhā labhante śuddhaṃ/ ataḥ śuddhātmalābhivāt buddhā ātmamāhātmyaṃ prāptā ityānenābhisaṃdhinā buddhānāmanāsrave dhātau paramātmā vyavasthāpyate//*). I followed L. Jamspal et al. (*Universal Vehicle Discourse Literature*, p. 82 n. 35) and amended *nairātmyānmārgalābhataḥ* to *nairātmyātmārgalābhataḥ* in the verse.

37. This is from the *Yogācārabhūmi*. See T 1579:30.307b22–23, which incorrectly has *pi anbo sang* instead of *si anju sang*. It is obvious that *anju* in this context simply means *sthiti* (abiding). The provisional self is something designated (*prajñapta*). Therefore it has the typical four marks that characterize all conditioned phenomena (*saṃskṛta-dharma*): arising (*utpatti*), abiding (*sthiti*), change (*vikāra*), and decay (*nāṣṭi*). Besides, the expression *pi anbo* does not seem to have any meaning.

38. Up to this point, and reading this treatise with Wönhyo’s view on *catuṣkoṭi* in mind, we should understand that “nonexistent” here does not at all involve destructive negation (*apavāda*). It is only an antidote (*pratipakṣa*) to the extreme of artificial reification (*samāropa*). In his commentary on verse IX.22 of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* (“Although not different before and after, it is unstained by all obscurations. Neither pure nor impure, Buddha[hood] is defined as thusness” [*snga ma phyi mar khyad med kyang// sgrib pa thams cad dri ma med// dag pa ma yin ma dag min// sangs rgyas de bzhin nyid du ’dod//*]), Sthiramati states: “Purity [conventionally] means that having the nature of defilement beforehand, and then afterward by cultivating the path, one becomes pure. [In other words,] before, one was a sentient being. Afterward, one becomes perfectly awakened. [However,] the truth-body [*dharmakāya*] of Buddha is defined as thusness [*tathatā*—namely, emptiness [*śūnyatā*]. Emptiness means that even when one is at the level of ordinary sentient beings, one has the nature of emptiness and luminescence [*prakṛtiprabhāsvara*]. Afterward, when one becomes perfectly awakened, one still has the nature of emptiness and luminescence. There is no difference in the pure nature. In this connection, because one does not become pure, [Buddhahood] does not become pure [from a former state of impurity]. Nevertheless, when perfect awakening is attained, on the strength of the cultivation of the path, one becomes free from the adventitious defilements [*āgantukleśa*] of the afflictive and cognitive obscurations. Since one does become pure afterward, [Buddhahood] is not impure” (*sngon kun nas nyon mongs pa’i rang bzhin yin pa las physis lam bsgoms te dri ma med par gyur pa ni dag pa zhes byao// snga ma ni so so’i skye po’i dus so// phyi ma ni mngon par sangs rgyas pai dus la bya te/ sang rgyas kyi chos kyu sku ni de bzhin nyid stong pa nyid kyi rang bzhin yin par ’dod de/ stong pa nyid ni so so’i skye bo’i dus na yang stong pa dang rang bzhin kyis ’dod gsal ba’i*

*rang bzhin yin/ phyi ma ste mngon par sangs rgyas pa'i dus na yang stong pa dang rang bzhin gyis 'od gsal ba'i rang bzhin yin pas dag pa'i rang bzhin du khyad par me de de la sbyang du med pas na dag pa med pa yin no// 'on kyang mngon par dzogs par sangs gyas pa'i dus na lam bsgoms pa'i mthus nyon mongs pa'i grib pa dang/ shes bya'i sgrib pa slo bur gyi dri ma med pa med par gyur te/ phyis dag par 'gyur bas na dag par yang ma yin no zhes bya ba'i don to//). Tibetan text is from Chibetto Buntan Kenkyūkai, *Chibetto bunken ni yoru Bukkyō shisō kenkyū*, pp. 51–52. For a similar argument on the existence and nonexistence of Buddha, see *ibid.*, pp. 54–55. It is obvious that the expression “im-pure” in the above passage cannot be literally interpreted as “truth-body,” because it is really not pure. Here Wōnhyo clearly applies the fourth of the *catuṣkoṭi*, the neither-nor alternative, to interpret ultimate reality, or emptiness, or Buddhahood.*

39. This passage is from the \**Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*. See T 1509:25.700c7–8. Wōnhyo refers to this statement to warn his reader against the extreme of reification (*samāropa*). The quotation in our treatise seems broken, and having the full passage would definitely help make Wōnhyo's argument clearer: “Whether buddhas appear or not, the true nature of phenomena constantly remains without change. [If] in this true nature there is even no self, no sentient beings up to no wise ones, [and] no learned ones, how could form, feeling, perception, and volitional formations exist?” *Ibid.*, c6–9.

### III. Commentary on the Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes

1. At the present time two Sanskrit editions of the text are available.
2. Chinese translations by both Paramārtha and Xuanzang contain seven chapters, dividing the three topics discussed in Chapter Four of the Sanskrit version into three chapters.
3. See Pandeya, *Madhyānta-vibhāga-śāstra*, pp. 7–8.
4. This internal structure appears to be the approach of most Yogācāra philosophical compendia: discernment of reality (that is, discrimination between different modes of perception of reality according to persons, from ordinary sentient beings to various sages such as disciples, self-realized buddhas, bodhisattvas, and fully awakened buddhas); description of a path of cultivation that basically consists in transforming deluded perception to wisdom; and the fruits attained according to persons.
5. For Paramārtha's translation, see T 1599:451–464a23; for Xuanzang's translation, see T 1600:464b1–477b22.
6. See T 1601.
7. This chapter is Chapter Four in the Sanskrit version and is Chapters Four, Five, and Six in both Chinese translations by Paramārtha and Xuanzang.
8. (*sa mārgaḥ*). Pandeya, *Madhyānta-vibhāga-śāstra*, p. 7.
9. From this structure of ground, path, and goal, we realize that a comprehensive investigation of Yogācāra philosophy should cover these three. So far most modern studies of Yogācāra have focused mostly on its “idealistic” outlook and its alleged rejection of the external world. Not much attention has been paid to the soteriological nature of the goal or fruit of the path of cultivation of Yogācāra and other sectarian schools of Buddhism in general.
10. “Constituents” (*pakṣa*) means antidotes (*pratipakṣa*)—that is, the removal of hostile dispositions (*vipakṣa*). Pandeya, *Madhyānta-vibhāga-śāstra*, p. 7.

11. See *Dazhidu lun*, T 1509:25.197b18–c8.

12. The *Dazhidu lun* gives the example that it is like the dragon king who causes rain. The rain falls everywhere without any distinction; the large trees and large herbs, because their roots are big, absorb a lot of rain; the small trees and small herbs, because their roots are small, absorb little rain. See T 1509:25.197c6–8; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1139.

13. In my translation I chose to give English translations for the Chinese technical terms but retain the Sanskrit.

14. Wōnhyo will simply refer to the first and the last words of a specific verse or passage he is commenting on. Also, he often instructs his students to look at the text.

15. The “Chapter on the Antidotes” is Chapter Four of the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*. For Sanskrit text, see Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 50–59; for Paramārtha’s Chinese translation, see T 1599:31.458a11–460b7.

16. For a useful discussion of the meaning and canonical sources of the *bodhipakṣika*, see Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1119–1137. For a detailed study of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening (*bodhipakṣikā-dharmā*) from the Pali literature, see, for instance, Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*.

17. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.439c22–23. The four foundations of mindfulness are the main topics of the *Satipaṭṭhāna sutta*. There are three versions of this sutra in the Pali canon: the *Mahāsatiṭṭhāna sutta* (sutta 22 in the *Dighā-Nikāya*); the *Satipaṭṭhāna sutta* (sutta 10 in the *Majjhima-Nikāya*; the same as *Dighā* sutta 22 but without the detailed explanation of the Four Noble Truths); and the *Satipaṭṭhāna* (sutta 47 in the *Samyutta-Nikāya*). For modern studies of the four foundations of mindfulness, see, for instance, Silananda, *Four Foundations of Mindfulness*; Anālayo, *Satipaṭṭhāna*; Thanissaro, *Wings to Awakening*; Shaw, *Buddhist Meditation*, pp. 76–85; and Soma and Pereira, *Way of Mindfulness*.

18. *Chōngdan*. The Pali has *samma-ppadhāna* (right endeavor), while the Sanskrit has *samyak-prahāna* (right elimination) and *samyak-pradhāna* (right endeavor). In this context I accept Gethin’s argument that “right endeavors” would “fit better for a general description of the formula than ‘four right eliminations,’ since all four parts of the formula speak of one who endeavors (*padahati/pradadhāti*) while only the second part explicitly mentions abandoning (*pahānaya/prahānaya*).” Gethin also shows that the Sanskrit passage on this formula even says “rightly endeavors” (*samyak-pradadhāti/prañidadhāti*). See Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*, pp. 69–70.

19. The term “dharma” in this case should be more correctly translated as “factors of existence” and not as “mental objects,” as some authors do. To contemplate these factors of existence is to discriminate between factors that cause bondage and those that bring liberation.

20. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.440a2–5. For the typical definition of the four legs of supernormal powers (*ṛddhipāda*) in the Pali canon, see Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*, p. 81.

21. For a discussion on the meaning of this term, see Anālayo, *Satipaṭṭhāna*, p. 32.

22. As we can see in the following paragraphs, contemplation of the body is not confined to contemplation of the physical body but also includes contemplation of other forms of the body as the object of meditation. The goal is to attain the thusness-body by means of the cultivation of contemplation of the body.

23. In Buddhism the ultimate goal of the path is to attain wisdom of reality as it is. This attainment consists of three steps: first one attains wisdom through hearing or

learning (*śrutamayī*), then one reflects on what one has learned (*cintāmayī*), and finally one cultivates it to perfection (*bhāvanāmayī*). For a Mahāyāna interpretation of this threefold wisdom, see Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 63; Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, p. 158; and T 1599:31.461a13–22. Wōnhyo skillfully employs this in the context of Buddhist practice—for instance, in his commentary on the section on the four right endeavors.

24. Wōnhyo’s definition of mindfulness in this connection appears to draw heavily on the *Yogācārabhūmi*. See T 1579:30.440a22–26.

25. In the *Dazhidu lun* and the Chinese versions of the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and the \**Mahāyāna-abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, we find *sunsin* and occasionally *susin*. They are both used to translate the Sanskrit *kāyānupaśyanā* (contemplation of the body). Note that the Chinese *sun* and *su* (both meaning “follow”) are used to translate the prefix *anu* in the expression *anupaśyanā*, which simply means contemplation. Wōnhyo, however, discriminates between *susin* (with regard to the body) and *sunsin* ([contemplating] the body progressively). He does have a point, since the sequence of the foundations of mindfulness leads progressively from grosser to more subtle levels. On this progressive pattern, see Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*, p. 47; Guenther, *Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma*, p. 219; and King, *Theravāda Meditation*, p. 67.

26. See T 1606:31.739a17–20. The HPC text is somewhat different from the \**Mahāyāna-abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*; in the HPC the expression *sunsin* is replaced by *susin*.

27. According to the *Satipaṭṭhāna sutta*, the contemplation of body consists of a progressive process, beginning with the basic aspects of the body and continuing toward a more detailed analysis of the nature of the body. See Anālayo, *Satipaṭṭhāna*, p. 117.

28. *So yōn*, or *ālambana*, is a difficult term to translate. Depending on particular contexts it can mean “objective basis,” “object of meditation,” “perceptual object,” “perceived object,” etc. In this context, the body, feelings, mind, and factors of existence are objects of meditative contemplation.

29. The Pali has *paṭṭhana* (Skt. *upasthāna*). The Sino-Korean makes a distinction between *ch’ō* (place) and *chu* (abode). For a detailed discussion of the meaning of the term *paṭṭhana* in the *Satipaṭṭhāna sutta* and its commentarial literature in the Pali source, see Anālayo, *Satipaṭṭhāna*, pp. 29–30.

30. The wording is a little different from that in the Taishō. See T 1509:25.198b14–15; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1147.

31. See T 1579:30.345a17.

32. *Ch’ujōn*. *Chōn* (*paryusthāna*) literally means “bondage” and is a reference to the afflictions. This is because afflictions can bind sentient beings to cyclic existence.

33. *Pujōng chi* signifies the realm of desire (*kāma-dhātu*), because this realm is unstable for the lack of the cultivation of meditative concentration.

34. Here Wōnhyo uses *pal chōnggi kūn* instead of *pal kūnjōng chin*, which he used in the section on enumerating the names of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening above.

35. Wōnhyo’s commentary on this item is not merely “roughly similar” to what is said in the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* as he mentioned—rather, it is almost identical to it. In my translation I had to rely on the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* to clarify some cryptic sentences in Wōnhyo’s commentary. See T 1602:31.488b14–c13.

36. Here Wōnhyo is aware of the interchangeability between elimination (*tan*) and endeavor (*kūn*).

37. Wōnhyo employs the typical Sinitic hermeneutic that involves essence (*ch'e*) and function (*yong*), but he uses *ōp* (activity) instead of *yong*.

38. See T 1509:25.198b15; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1147.

39. See T 99:2.221a10–11. See also Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*, p. 73.

40. See T 1579:30.443a21–b8.

41. *Iddhi-pādas* (Pali) or *ṛddhi-pādas* (Skt.) means bases of success. For a discussion of this term from the Pali sources, see Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*, pp. 80–103; and Sayadaw, *Constituents of Awakening*, p. 75. The Chinese text has *sinjok* for *ṛddhi-pādas*. Although the Sanskrit word *pāda* does mean “foot,” in this context “base” is certainly more accurate. However, in this translation the word “leg” would fit Wōnhyo’s interpretation better. The HPC text (1.818c16) has *chijok sajong*, which should be amended to *sinjok sajong*.

42. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.862b26–c10.

43. This appears to be an abbreviation of T 1579:30.862c11–17.

44. This seems to be a paraphrase of T 1579:30.862c18–21.

45. See *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, T 1602:31.488c14–17.

46. See *ibid.*, T 1602:31.489a11–15.

47. Wōnhyo’s explanation of the types of *samādhi* accomplished primarily through mind and investigation draws heavily on the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*. See T 1602:31.489a15–22.

48. Wōnhyo elaborates on the eight kinds of abandoning later when he comments on Vasubandhu’s commentary on verse 3.

49. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.444b1–8. See also Asaṅga’s *Śrāvakabhūmi: kena kāraṇena ṛddhipāda ity ucyate/ āha/ tadyathā/ yasya pādaḥ saṃvidyate/ so 'bhikrama-pratikrama-parākrama-samartho bhavati/ evam eva yasyaite dharmāḥ saṃvidyante/ eṣa ca samādhiḥ saṃvidyate/ paripūrṇaḥ sa evam pariśuddhe citte paryavadāte ana(ñ)gaṇe vigatopakleṣe ṛjubhūte karmanyasthite āni(ñ)jya-prāpte abhikrama-pratikrama-[parākrama]-samartho bahavati/ lokottāraṇām dharmāṇām prāptaye sparśanāyai/ eṣā hi parā ṛddhiḥ parā saṃṛddhiḥ/ yad uta lokōttara dharmās tenocyante ṛddhipāda iti/*

(Why is it called the base of supernormal powers? The master explains as follows: Because someone who has a base is capable of approaching, returning, and advancing. Likewise, because someone who is possessed of these qualities, who has complete concentration when his mind has been thoroughly purified, thoroughly cleansed, is without blemish, free from derivative afflictions, straight, beneficial, motionless, [and] he is capable of approaching, returning, and advancing in order to attain and touch the transcendent qualities. That is the supreme supernormal power, the supreme prosperity; that is, the transcendent qualities are therefore called the base of supernormal powers). Sanskrit text is in Wayman, *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript*, p. 100; English translations have been modified by the present translator.

50. See T 1509:25.202c6–9; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1177–1178. In the HPC text (1.819b16) the character *mun* should be amended to *haeng*.

51. I use the expression “spiritual faculties” to distinguish them from the six faculties. For a brief discussion on *indriya*, see Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*, pp. 104–106.

52. This passage is obviously based on *Yogācārabhūmi* T 1579:30.444b13–17. However, the HPC text appears to be a bit corrupted. I had to rely on the *Yogācārabhūmi* to give it a clearer reading.



53. That is, various types of religious ascetics and mendicants.

54. This is a summarized quotation from *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.444b20–26. The character *kyōng* in the HPC text (1.819c6) should be corrected as *chōn*.

55. *Chōngsōng yisaeng* is a synonym of the Path of Vision (*kyōndo*). When one enters the Path of Vision, one realizes the true nature of *nirvāṇa* (*chōngsōng*) and is free from the birth (*yisaeng*) of afflictions.

56. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.444c29–445a1.

57. See T 1509:25.198c8; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1149.

58. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:31.445a13–15.

59. The complete passage reads: “Having realized these things and that his security is complete, [the practitioner] wishes to enter the uncreated citadel of *nirvāṇa*, [and] he practices these parts [of the Noble Path]; that moment is called path” (T 1509:25.198c8–10). See also Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1149–1150.

60. This is an indirect quotation from the *Dazhidu lun*. The complete passage reads: “Question: Why is it that among the seven categories of [the thirty-seven constituents of awakening] these four are called *right* endeavors and the latter eight *right* paths, while the rest are not referred to as *right*? Answer: Because when these four efforts of spiritual vigor are generated, they are afraid of errors, [and] therefore they are called *right* endeavors. Because the practice of the [eightfold] path follows the truth and is afraid of the evil paths, it is called the *right* path” (T 1509:25.202b29–c4). See also Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1177.

61. According to the *Dazhidu lun*, it should be *prīti* (joy) instead of *vedanā* (feeling). See T 1509:25.198b8–9; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1146.

62. See T 1509:25.198b9; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1145–1146.

63. Yogācāra Buddhism classifies mental states and mental activities into two categories: mind, or *citta* (*sinwang*); and mental factors, or *caitta* (*sinso*). For a detailed discussion of this issue, see, for instance, *Xiayang shengjiao lun*, T 1602:31.480c29–483a23.

64. The *Dazhidu lun* reads: “The thirty-seven constituents are based on ten categories. What are these ten? (1) Conviction, (2) precepts, (3) conception, (4) effort, (5) mindfulness, (6) concentration, (7) wisdom, (8) pliancy, (9) joy, and (10) equanimity. (1) Conviction consists of the spiritual faculty of conviction and the power of conviction. (2) Precepts consist of right speech, right actions, and right livelihood. (3) Conception consists of right conception. (4) Effort consists of the four correct endeavors, the spiritual faculty of effort, the power of effort, the awakening limb of effort, and right effort. (5) Mindfulness consists of the spiritual faculty of mindfulness, the power of mindfulness, the awakening limb of mindfulness, and right mindfulness. (6) Concentration consists of the four wish-granting legs, the spiritual faculty of concentration, the power of concentration, the awakening limb of concentration, and right concentration. (7) Wisdom consists of the four foundations of mindfulness, the spiritual faculty of wisdom, the power of wisdom, the awakening limb of investigation of the teachings, and right view. (8) Pliancy consists of the awakening limb of pliancy. (9) Joy consists of the awakening limb of joy. (10) Equanimity consists of the awakening limb of equanimity” (T 1509:25.198b8–13). Items 8, 9, and 10 are missing in the Taishō text and are completed by Lamotte following the *Kośa*. See Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1145–1147.

65. See T 1579:30.442a14–15. The two expressions *yuru to* (*sāsravamārga*) and *murū to* (*anāsramārga*) literally mean “the path with influxes” (the impure path) and “the path without influxes” (the pure path). In this passage they simply mean “the

ordinary (or worldly) path” (*segan to [laukikamārga]*) and “the exceptional path” (*ch’ul segan to [lokōtaramārga]*). The cultivation of “impure” (*sāsrava*) wholesome states can lead to fruitions within the three realms, whereas the cultivation of “pure” (*anāsrava*) wholesome states can lead to the annihilation of all afflictions and to the attainment of *nirvāṇa*. This quoted passage squares well with the subsequent one. In both passages, Wōnhyo is discussing the “levels” of the thirty-seven constituents of awakening.

66. *Samnu (trayāsravā)*, “three influxes,” denotes the three kinds of affliction—*yongnu (kāmasrava)*; the affliction of desire), *yuru (bhavāsrava)*; the affliction of existence and becoming), and *mumyōngnu (avidyāsrava)*; the affliction of ignorance)—that tie sentient beings to the three realms. *Sach’wi (catvāryupādanāni)* signifies the four afflictions of clinging or attachment: *yok ch’wi (kāmōpādāna)*; attachment to desire), *kyōnch’wi (dr̥ṣṭyupādāna)*; attachment to false views), *kyegūm ch’wi (śīlavratōpādāna)*; attachment to precepts and rituals), and *aō ch’wi (ātmavādōpādāna)*; attachment to the self and what belongs to the self).

67. See T 1579:30.865c5–8.

68. Wōnhyo uses the term *pōp*, which in this context designates the groups, seven in all, in which the thirty-seven constituents of awakening are subsumed.

69. For a discussion regarding this issue, see Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. 118–124.

70. See T 1509:25.198b17–18; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1147.

71. The original Chinese has *kak si kak üi*.

72. See T 1509:25.198b16–17; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1147.

73. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.647c5–9.

74. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.375a14–16.

75. See T 1579:30.445a8–9.

76. Wōnhyo’s quotation is fragmentary; I have provided complete passages from the *Dazhidu lun*. See T 1509:25.198b18–c10; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1147–1150.

77. See T 1579:30.712c16–22.

78. That is, the thirty-seven constituents of awakening.

79. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.738c1921; *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684b5–6; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 118.

80. The term “dharma” in the four foundations of mindfulness has been translated as “mental objects” or “mental objects and qualities.” It is obvious, however, that the objects of meditation mentioned in this connection belong to both the mental and the physical categories. I chose to translate it as “factors of existence.”

81. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684b7–8; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 118.

82. Wōnhyo appears to quote the paragraph starting with “Why are only these four objects . . .” almost verbatim from the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*. See T 1606:31.738c23–739a3.

83. There are different interpretations of this issue. Gethin (*Buddhist Path to Awakening*, pp. 53–55), for instance, makes an insightful contemplation that as a practitioner “watches body, feelings, mind, and *dhammas* within, without, within and without, rather than seeing a world made up of distinct ‘persons’ or ‘selves,’ he becomes progressively aware of a world of *dhamma* made up entirely of *dhammas* all of which are not-self.”



84. The term used here, *yujōng su*, signifies all things that belong to the category of being sentient.

85. I have not been able to locate this reference in the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

86. This seems to be an indirect reference to T 1509:25.202a18–24. See also Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1173.

87. The four defects consist of considering what is impermanent as permanent, what is suffering as happiness, what is impure as pure, and what is not the self as the self. See *Kośa*, chap. V, p. 21.

88. See Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*.

89. The HPC text (1.821c22) has *taech'i yun*, which is obviously a mistake for *taebōp non* (in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*).

90. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* reads: “The nature of the foundations of mindfulness is wisdom and mindfulness, because there is a teaching in the Buddhist scriptures regarding the contemplation of the body and a teaching on the foundations of mindfulness successively” (T 1606:31.739a4–5). Note that the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* has *sungwan*, which obviously means *anupaśyanā*, whereas the HPC text has *sugwan*.

91. A character, *sim* (mind), appears to be missing from the HPC text (1.822a3). My emendation is according to the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739a4–5.

92. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684b9; Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 118; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739a6–7.

93. See T 1509:25.201a4–7; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1170.

94. See T 1509:25.201a27–28.

95. Wōnhyo’s commentary on this item draws on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, the *Yogācārabhūmi*, and the *Dazhidu lun*. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* reads: “The cultivation of the foundations of mindfulness is the contemplation [*anupaśyanā*] of the body, [feelings, mind, and factors of existence] with regard to the internal body, [feelings, mind, and factors of existence]. As it is with the internal body, it is so with the external body and the internal-external. The internal body is made up of the internal physical bases subsumed by the internal bases of the faculties of eye, ear, nose, tongue, [and] body within one’s body. It falls within the category of the sentient; therefore it is called internal. The external body is made up of the external physical bases subsumed by the external bases of external form, sound, odor, taste, and tangibles. It does not fall within the category of the sentient; therefore it is called external. The internal-external body is made up of the external bases that are the seats of the faculties and are linked to the internal bases. There are external bases such as form, et cetera, based on the faculties connected to the five internal bases of eye, ear, [and so on,] which also fall within the category of the sentient and are subsumed by the external bases; they are called internal-external. They are also the internal physical bases belonging to others. When it is established with regard to bases and with regard to body, it is called internal-external. What is contemplation with regard to the body? It is contemplation of the identity of the natural image of the body with the speculative counterimage of the body. It is contemplation of the body, contemplation of the characteristic of the body as similar to the nature of the body. This is called contemplation of the body with regard to the body. Through contemplation of the speculative counterimage of the body, one truly contemplates the natural image of the body. Internal feelings are feelings produced by reason of one’s own body perceiving bases of eye and so forth as objects. [This type of feeling] is produced

dependent on one's own body; therefore it is called internal. External feelings are feelings produced by reason of the external body, perceiving bases such as form and so forth as objects. [This type of feeling] is produced dependent on the body of others; therefore it is called external. Internal-external feelings are feelings produced by reason of the internal-external body, perceiving the bases external to one's body as objects, [and] perceiving internal bases in the body of others as objects; therefore [this type of feeling] is called internal-external. As it is with feelings, it is so with the mind and factors of existence. As with contemplation with regard to the body, so should one understand contemplation with regard to feelings, [mind, and factors of existence,] respectively. Furthermore, cultivation concerns will, endeavor, vigor, perseverance, energetic action, nonstalling, right mindfulness, clear comprehension, and diligence. The cultivation of will is accomplished by counteracting the derivative affliction of lack of attention. The cultivation of endeavor is accomplished by counteracting the derivative affliction of idleness. The cultivation of vigor is accomplished by counteracting the derivative afflictions of lethargy and agitation. The cultivation of perseverance is accomplished by counteracting the derivative affliction of mental apathy. 'Mental apathy' is to become mentally discouraged because of low esteem of oneself with regard to special qualities to be acquired. The cultivation of energetic action is accomplished by counteracting the derivative afflictions of discouragement, difficulty, and fatigue. 'Discouragement, difficulty, and fatigue' means that one is bothered by mosquitoes and flies, et cetera. The cultivation of nonstalling is accomplished by counteracting the derivative affliction of satisfaction in the acquisition of a small quantity of the wholesome. The cultivation of [right] mindfulness is accomplished by counteracting the derivative affliction of forgetfulness with regard to teaching of the Blessed One. The cultivation of clear comprehension is accomplished by counteracting the derivative affliction of remorse concerning transgression. To be remorseful concerning transgression is to act without full knowledge of events of the past and the present; first transgressing what one has learned, one becomes remorseful afterward. The cultivation of diligence is accomplished by counteracting the derivative affliction of the shirking of duties with regard to the wholesome. The shirking of the wholesome occurs due to the fault of nondiligence, giving up vigorous means, and not being capable of attaining the special qualities to be cultivated" (T 1606:31.739a8–b15). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684b10–29; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. 118–120.

96. The character *chi* (know), used here (822a13), should be amended to *yō* (thus). Confusion between these two characters is seen quite frequently in the HPC text.

97. See *Dazhidu lun*, T 1509:25.203b10–12; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1187.

98. See T. 1509:25.203b10–12; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1187.

99. This is a summarized quotation from the *Dazhidu lun*. See T 1509:25.203b23–c9; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1189.

100. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684b29–c1; Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 120; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739b15–29.

101. This means to take the illusory self, which is characterized by impurity, suffering, impermanence, and not-self, as purity, joy, permanence, and self. For an interpretation of the four foundations of mindfulness as the antidotes of the four defects, see also Asaṅga's *Śrāvakabhūmi: tatra caturnāṃ viparyāsānāṃ pratipakṣeṇa bhagavatā catvāri smṛtyupasthānāni vyavasthāpitāni/ tatrāśucau śucīti viparyāsa-pratipakṣeṇa*

*kayāsmṛtyupasthānaṃ vyavasthāpitam/ tatra duḥkhe sukham iti/ viparyāsa-pratipakṣeṇa vedanāsmṛtyupasthānaṃ vyavasthāpitam/ [tatra] anitye nityam iti viparyāsa-pratipakṣeṇa [citta-]smṛtyupasthānaṃ vyavasthāpitam/ tatrānātmāny ātmeti viparyāsa-pratipakṣeṇa dharmasmṛtyupasthānaṃ vyavasthāpitam/* (Here the Lord establishes the four foundations of mindfulness as the antidotes to the four confusions. Among these, the foundation of mindfulness of the body is established as an antidote to the confusion of the impure as pure. Among these, the foundation of mindfulness of feelings is established as an antidote to the confusion of suffering as happiness. Among these, the foundation of mindfulness of mind is established as an antidote to the confusion of impermanence as permanence. Among these, the foundation of mindfulness of the factors of existence is established as an antidote to the confusion of the not-self as self). Sanskrit text from Wayman, *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript*, p. 98.

102. This reads like a paraphrase of Vasubandhu's commentary to the first verse of Chapter Four.

103. This section is a quotation from the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*. See T 1606:31.739b15–29.

104. The original text has *simwang* here.

105. Although the word *ālaya-vijñāna* (store consciousness) is not specifically mentioned, this is obviously the main characteristic of the store consciousness.

106. In this paragraph the term “right endeavor” (*chōnggūn*) seems more appropriate than “right elimination” (*chōngdan*). However, the Chinese term used here is *tan*, and, as mentioned above, given that Wōnhyo uses both *tan* and *kūn*, I prefer to follow him as closely as possible.

107. This is an exact quotation from the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*. See T 1606:31.739c1–5. See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c2; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 121.

108. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c2; Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 120; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739c6.

109. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c3; Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 120; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739c7.

110. *chandam janeti vāyamati viriyaṃ ārabhati cittaṃ paggaṅhāti padahati* (D III, p. 221; A II, p. 15; S V, p. 269; *Vbh*, p. 216). Quoted in Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 120 n. 3; T 5:220.299c22–23.

111. Here Wōnhyo alternates between *chōnggūn* (right endeavor) and *chōngjin* (effort).

112. Wōnhyo quotes this section (4) on the cultivation of the four right eliminations verbatim from the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*. See T 1606:31.739c8–18. See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c4–8; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 120.

113. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c8–9; Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 120; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739c24–26.

114. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c10; Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 120; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739c27.

115. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c10–11; Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 121; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739c27.

116. Wōnhyo is curiously brief about this item. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* reads: “The aid to the bases of supernormal powers consists of will, endeavor, mind, investigation, and the mind and its associated mental factors. Concentration through will is

the one-pointedness of mind attained by abundant means. “Eliminate” means to attain concentration by means of intense zeal and intense reverence. Concentration through endeavor is one-pointedness of mind attained by continuous means. “Endeavor” means constant effort without respite. Concentration through mind is one-pointedness of mind attained due to the power of concentration cultivated formerly. Why so? Due to the repeated cultivation of the power of concentration in previous lives, the seeds of its power increase. Due to the power of the seeds, the mind freely courses in concentration; therefore one swiftly attains one-pointedness of mind. Concentration through investigation is one-pointedness of mind attained due to hearing the teaching and to internal reflection. Furthermore, concentration through will is one-pointedness of mind attained by generating will. Concentration through endeavor is one-pointedness of mind attained by ardently generating right endeavor. Concentration through mind is one-pointedness of mind attained by exerting the mind. Concentration through investigation is one-pointedness of mind attained by applying the mind assiduously. In order to illustrate the production of the cause of the bases of supernormal powers, in the cultivation of the right elimination one produces qualities such as will, vigor, and so forth by exerting the mind and applying the mind energetically. According to this order, concentration through mind is the concentrated mind attained by exerting the mind; because of the internal quiescence, one swiftly attains concentration. Concentration through investigation is the concentration attained by applying the mind. One swiftly attains concentration by applying the mind according to the investigation of the teaching” (T 1606:31739c28–740a16). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c11–20; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 121.

117. See T 1605:31.684c22–23.

118. Anālayo (*Satipaṭṭhāna*, p. 178) remarks that, according to some Pali texts, inward contraction is the result of sloth and torpor, whereas external distraction is the outcome of pursuing sensual pleasures.

119. The entire section (4) is from *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.740a17–b12. See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c21–24; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. 121–122.

120. The HPC text (1.823c17) has *simp’um*, which should be amended to *chip’um* according to the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

121. See T 1579:30.439b27–c18. Some missing lines in the HPC text have been provided as a sentence in brackets.

122. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.740b12–15; *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c24–28; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 122.

123. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* reads: “The object of the five spiritual faculties is the Four Noble Truths, because this practice is subsumed by the vigorous practice of the clear comprehension of the [Four Noble] Truths” (T 1606:31.740b16–17). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c28; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 122.

124. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.740b18; *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c28–29; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 122.

125. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T.31.1606.740b19; *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.684c29–685a1; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 122.

126. The HPC text seems to be corrupted. Wōnhyo’s commentary appears to be an incomplete quotation from the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, which reads: “The

cultivation of the five spiritual faculties consists of the cultivation of application by means of the spiritual faculty of conviction with a view to arousing firm conviction with regard to the noble truths; the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of effort with a view to arousing effort for the attainment of awakening in one who already has firm conviction; the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of mindfulness with a view to arousing nondelusion [*asammoṣa*] in one who makes effort with regard to the noble truths; the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of concentration with a view to arousing one-pointedness of mind in one who has maintained mindfulness with regard to the noble truths; [and] the cultivation by means of the spiritual faculty of wisdom with a view to arousing investigation in one whose mind is concentrated on the noble truths” (T 1606:31.740b20–24). Sthiramati’s commentary is almost identical to Asaṅga’s text; see *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a1–6. See also Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 122.

127. This is a summarized quotation from the *Dazhidu lun*. See T 1509:25.204a28c10; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1195–1198.

128. Here Wōnhyo quotes verbatim from the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*. See T 1606:31.740b25–27. See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 122.

129. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* reads: “The five powers are the same as the five spiritual faculties. The difference consists in that they are called powers because they are capable of annihilating the unconquerable adverse obstructions. Why is it said that the object of the five powers is similar to that of the five spiritual faculties but there is difference in their fruits? When it is said that the fruit [of the five powers] consists in the annihilation of the obstructions such as the lack of conviction, [endeavor, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom], [it means that the powers] are superior to [the five spiritual faculties]. Although the nature of their objects is the similar, there is difference in that the obstructions [to be annihilated] are unconquerable; that is why the group of five powers is separately established” (T. 1606:31.740b28–c4). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a8–9; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. 122–123.

130. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya* simply states: “What is the object of the seven awakening limbs? It is the true nature of the Four Noble Truths.” See also Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 123. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* reads: “The object of the seven awakening limbs is the true nature of the Four Noble Truths. True nature is the pure object of ultimate truth” (T 1606:31.740c5–6).

131. See T 1597:30.445a1–7. The HPC text (1.824c7) has *sohaeng*, which should be amended to *pyōnhaeng*.

132. See Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1200. Wōnhyo’s commentary on this item appears to be a combination of ideas from the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the *Dazhidu lun*, and the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*. With regard to the nature of the seven awakening limbs, the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states: “The object of the awakening limbs consists of mindfulness, investigation of the teachings, effort, joy, pliancy, concentration, and equanimity. Mindfulness is the basic limb, because due to the application of mindfulness one does not forget the wholesome states. Investigation of the teachings is the nature limb, because it is the self-nature of awakening. Effort is the release limb, because through its momentum one can reach one’s destination. Joy is the beneficial limb, because by its momentum the body is regulated. Pliancy, concentration, and equanimity are the limbs of nondefilement because through them there is

nondefilement; based on them there is nondefilement, because they are by nature without defilement. Successively, through pliancy one can eliminate the fault of debilitation; based on concentration there is the absence of defilement, because based on concentration one attains basis transformation; [and] equanimity is the nature of nondefilement—it permanently annihilates greed and attachment, because its nature is the level of nondefilement” (T 1606:31.740c7–16).

133. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.740c17; *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a14; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 123.

134. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.740c18–27. I have provided missing words in square brackets and corrected the character *ki* in the HPC text (1.824c20) to *ch’wi*. See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a15–18; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 123.

135. The HPC text (1.825a4) has *chŭng*, which should be amended to *koe*.

136. The Chinese texts use several terms to translate the Sanskrit *praśrabdhi* (pliancy)—for example, *an*, *kyōngan*, *che* (remove), and *ūi*. See also Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1146 n. 1. Here Wōnhyo uses *che*. The Chinese text on this item seems obscure.

137. The HPC text (1.825a9) has *sinhŭi* and *simhŭi*, which should be amended to *sinch’u* and *simch’u*, according to the *Dazhidu lun*. See T 1509:25.205a18–20; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1202.

138. This appears to be a paraphrase of the *Dazhidu lun*. I have provided some of the omitted portions in brackets. See T 1509:25.205a2–29; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1200–1203.

139. Wōnhyo’s commentary on this item is derived from his reading of the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* and the *Dazhidu lun*. Regarding the cultivation of the awakening limbs, the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states: “The cultivation of the awakening limbs means the cultivation of the awakening limb of mindfulness [and other awakening limbs] dependent on dissociation, detachment, cessation, and aiming for renunciation. These four items successively illustrate the cultivation of the awakening limbs based on the Four Noble Truths. Why so? When one perceives the nature of suffering as suffering, one definitely seeks liberation from the objects of suffering. This is called [the cultivation of the awakening limbs] dependent on dissociation. When one perceives attachment as the cause of suffering, one certainly seeks freedom from attachment. This is called [the cultivation of the awakening limbs] dependent on detachment. When one perceives the cessation of suffering as the cessation of suffering, one definitely aspires for the realization of that object. This is called [the cultivation of the awakening limbs] dependent on cessation. ‘Renunciation’ means to course the path of the cessation of suffering, because by this momentum one renounces suffering. Therefore, when one perceives this object, at that position one definitely aspires to cultivation; thus it is called aiming at renunciation” (T 1606:31.740c18–27). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a15–18; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 123.

140. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* says: “The fruit of the cultivation of the awakening limbs is the complete elimination of afflictions on the Path of Vision, because the seven awakening limbs is the nature of the Path of Vision” (T 1606:31.740c28–29). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a18; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 123.

141. *Paekpōp myōngmun* in Sino-Korean.

142. (*Chin soyu sōng* or *yāvadbhāvikatā*; and *yō soyu sōng* or *yathāvadbhāvikatā*). In



Mahāyāna Buddhism in general and in Yogācāra Buddhism in particular, discerning reality (*tattvārtha*), or knowing things as they are, is the essential step toward awakening. This discernment of reality consists of *yathāvadbhāvikatā*, or knowing the true nature of the factors of existence, and *yāvadbhāvikatā*, or knowing the factors of existence in their totality. Briefly, it can be characterized as knowing both the absolute and phenomenal aspects of reality. A concise definition of *tattvārtha* can be found in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi: tattvārthaḥ katamaḥ/ samāsato dvividhā/ yathāvadbhāvikatāñca dharmāṇāmārabhya yā dharmāṇām bhūtatā yāvadbhāvikatāñcārabhya dharmāṇām sarvatā/ iti bhūtatā sarvata ca dharmāṇām samāstastattvārtho veditavyaḥ/* (What is the knowledge of reality? Briefly, there are two kinds: that which consists in knowing the true nature of the factors of existence as they are in themselves, and that which consists in knowing the phenomenal aspect of the factors of existence in their totality. In brief, knowledge of reality should be known as knowledge of the factors of existence as they are and in their totality). See Dutt, *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, p. 25.

143. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states: “The object of the eight limbs of the Noble Path is the subsequent nature of the Four Noble Truths, because the object of the Path of Vision has as its nature the previous true knowledge of the other truths” (T 1606:31.741a1–3). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a19–20; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 123.

144. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states: “The nature of the eight limbs of the Noble Path is right view, right conception, right speech, right actions, right livelihood, right efforts, right mindfulness, and right concentration. These eight items are called the nature of the Noble Path. Right view is the limb of discernment, as the initial realization of true investigation. Right conception is the limb of instructing others, because it utters pronouncements according to the realized expedients. Right speech, right actions, and right livelihood are the limbs producing conviction in others. They successively produce in others the strong conviction that there is the luminescent nature of view, precepts, and right livelihood through their realization of the truth. Why so? Through right speech one is skilled in dialogue, discussion, and investigation. Therefore one knows that there is the luminescent view. Through right actions one is equipped with the right deportment of coming and going, moving and stopping. Therefore one knows that there is the luminescent view of precepts. Through right livelihood one requests robe, bowl, and utensils, approved by the Buddha and according to the truth. Therefore one knows that there is luminescent livelihood. Right effort is the limb that dispels the obstructions of afflictions. Through this, one completely eliminates all defilements. Right mindfulness is the limb that dispels the obstructions of derivative afflictions. Through this, one is not forgetful of the true characteristic of tranquility and so forth, because one no longer ever suffers derivative afflictions such as lethargy and agitation. Right concentration is the limb that dispels the obstructions to the special qualities, because it generates immeasurable qualities such as the supernormal powers” (T 1606:31.741a4–18). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a20–24; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. 123–124.

145. This is the typical classification of the eight limbs of the Noble Path into the three learnings—namely, precepts, concentration, and wisdom. See also *Dazhidu lun*, T 1509:25.203a23–24; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1183–1184.

146. *Pangp’yōn to* is synonymous with *kahaeng to*.

147. The aggregate of liberation and the aggregate of the knowledge of liberation together with aggregate of precepts, the aggregate of concentration, and the aggregate of wisdom are the five qualities possessed by the disciples at the level of beyond training.

148. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.741a19; *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a25; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 124.

149. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states: “The cultivation of the eight limbs of the Noble Path is similar to the explanation of the awakening limbs. It means the cultivation of right view up to [right concentration] dependent on liberation, on detachment, [and] on cessation, aiming at renunciation. One should understand these words according to the principle explained previously” (T 1606:31.741a20–22). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a25; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 124.

150. This is a summarized quotation from the *Dazhidu lun*. See T 1509:25.204b1–9; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, p. 1203.

151. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, T 1605:31.685a26–27; and Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 124. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* states: “The fruit of the cultivation of the eightfold path consists of discernment, instructing others, producing conviction in others, dispelling the obstructions of afflictions, dispelling the obstructions of derivative afflictions, and dispelling the obstructions to the special qualities” (T 1606:31.741a23–24).

152. *pratipakṣa-bhāvanā bodhipakṣya-bhāvanā sedānīm vaktavyā*/ (Now the cultivation of the antidotes—that is, the cultivation of the constituents [of awakening] will be explained). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 50.

153. Wōnhyo obviously uses Paramārtha’s translation. The Sanskrit simply has *tatra tāvad ādau* (First of all). See *ibid.*

154. The Sanskrit has twelve verses. See *ibid.*, pp. 50–55.

155. Here Wōnhyo suddenly switches to *yōūi chok* instead of *sinjok*.

156. *dauṣṭhulyāt tarṣahetuvāt vastutvād avimohataḥ/ catuḥ-satyāvatārāya smṛty-upasthāna-bhāvanā*// (By [realizing] debilitation, the cause of craving, the physical base, [and] nondelusion/In order to enter the four noble truths, one cultivates the foundations of mindfulness). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 50.

157. For the sake of fluency, in my translation the second half comes first.

158. See section 2.6.1.1 on the divisions of the four foundations of mindfulness.

159. In his commentary Wōnhyo uses *ch’uhaeng* and *ch’ujung*, which I successively translate as “debilitating conditioned states” and “debilitating afflictions” in order to be compatible with his interpretation of the four kinds of suffering.

160. There are three aspects of *duḥkha*: *duḥkha-duḥkha* (*duḥkha* as ordinary suffering), *vipariṇāma-duḥkha* (*duḥkha* as produced by change), and *samskāra-duḥkha* (*duḥkha* as conditioned states). For a brief discussion of the aspects of *duḥkha*, see Rahula, *What the Buddha Taught*, pp. 19–20.

161. *Yuk t’amae* or *yuk aesin* (*ṣaṭ trṣṇākāyāḥ*). This means that based on the six objects of the six senses arise the six kinds of craving or thirst (*trṣṇā*) with regard to the body as the basis of the concept of self.

162. The three realms are the realm of desire (*kāma-dhātu*), the realm of form (*rūpa-dhātu*), and the formless realm (*arūpya-dhātu*) encompassing the entire Buddhist universe. In this universe dwell multiple sentient beings with different destinies depending on their minds.

163. The Sino-Korean has *chong*. The Sanskrit has *vastu*, which means “substance” or “thing.” The mind is the physical base of a reified self. Here again, this alludes to the Yogācāra doctrine that the self (*pudgala*) is constructed or reified based on the seeds (*bīja*) or latent imprints (*vāsanā*) stored in the store consciousness (*ālaya-vijñāna*).

164. Wōnhyo uses *chongja* (seeds). As has been noted, the Sanskrit has *vastu*.



165. Two characters are missing in the Chinese text. They should be amended as *pōppon*.

166. Here Paramārtha uses the expression *ch'udae*.

167. *kāyena hi dauṣṭhulyam prabhāvvyate/ tat parīkṣayā duḥkhatā-satyam avatarati/ tasya sa-dauṣṭhulya-saṃskāra-lakṣaṇatvāt/ dauṣṭhulyam hi saṃskāra-duḥkhatā/ tayā sarvvam sārsravam vastv āryā duḥkhatāḥ paśyantīti/ tṛṣṇā-hetur vedanā tat parīkṣayā samudaya-satyam avatarati/ ātmābhīniveśa-vastu cittam tat-parīkṣayā nirodha-satyam avataraty ātmoccheda-bhayāpagamāt/ dharmma-parīkṣayā-saṃkleśika-vaiyavadānika-dharmmasammohāt/ mārgga-satyam avataraty ataḥ ādau catuḥ-satyāvatarāyā smṛty-upasthāna-bhāvanā vyavasthāpyate/* (Debilitation is manifested by the body. Because it has the characteristic of being rigidly compounded, by contemplation on it one enters the truth of suffering. Debilitation is suffering due to being compounded, through which the sages see that all things are impure because of suffering. The cause of thirst is feeling, [and so] by contemplation on it one enters the truth of the origin of suffering. Mind is the ground for the attachment to the self. By contemplation on it, one enters the truth of the cessation of suffering because there is no longer any fear of the extinction of self. Through the contemplation on factors of existence, one enters the truth of the path due to nonconfusion with regard to factors that defile and factors that purify. Therefore, in the beginning, the cultivation of the [four] foundations of mindfulness is established in order to enter the Four Noble Truths.) Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 50.

168. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.739b21–22.

169. *parijñāte vipakṣe ca pratipakṣe ca sarvvathā/ tad-apāyāya-vīryam hi caturdhā sampravarattate//* (Having known thoroughly the adversaries and their antidotes, one undertakes the fourfold efforts to remove them). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 50.

170. *smṛty-upasthāna-bhāvanāyā vipakṣe pratipakṣe ca sarvva-prakāraṃ parijñāte vipakṣāpagamāya pratipakṣāpagamāya ca vīryaṃ caturddhā sampravarattate/ utpannānāṃ pāpakānāṃ akuśalānāṃ dharmmānāṃ prahāṇyēti vistaraḥ/* (Having cultivated the foundations of mindfulness, one knows all forms of the adversaries [of the path] and their antidotes; in order to annihilate the adversaries and to produce the antidotes, one engages in the fourfold efforts, to eliminate the evil unwholesome states that have arisen, and so forth.) *Ibid.*

171. *karmmanyatā sthites sarvvārthānāṃ samṛddhaye/ pañca-doṣa prahāṇāṣṭa-saṃskārāsevanānvayā//* (Steadfast in flexibility for the achieving of all aims/following the elimination of the five faults and the assiduous practice of the eight applications). *Ibid.*, p. 51.

172. *tasyām tad-apāyāya-vīrya-bhāvanāyām citta-sthiteḥ karmmanyatā catvāra rddhi-pādāḥ sarvvārtha-samṛddhi-hetutvāt sthitir atra citta-sthitiḥ samādhir veditavyaḥ/ ataḥ samyakprahāṇānataram rddhipādāḥ/ sa punaḥ karmmanyatā pañca-doṣa-prahāṇāyāṣṭa-prahāṇa-saṃskāra-bhāvanānvayā veditavyā/* (In this cultivation of the efforts to remove [and to produce the two factors] the flexibility in the steadfastness of mind is the four bases of supernormal powers, because they are the cause of the achieving of all aims. “Steadfastness” here should be known as steadfastness of mind—that is, concentration. Thus the bases of supernormal powers come right after the right eliminations. This should be known as following the elimination of the five faults and the cultivation of the eight applications). *Ibid.* Note that Wōnhyo’s commentary on this verse is mainly based on Paramārtha’s translation, which does not appear to be close to the Sanskrit version. For instance, Paramārtha renders the term *karmanyatā* (flexibility) in the verse as *susa*. In his commentary Wōnhyo takes it to mean something like “according to objects” and comments

on both terms separately. Besides, the phrase *su kyo chōk sōngch'wi* in Paramārtha's translation does not have any equivalent in either the Sanskrit version or Xuanzang's translation. Note that Xuanzang's translation of this verse and its commentary is much closer to the Sanskrit than Paramārtha's. For Xuanzang's translation, see T 31:471b28–c5.

173. Two characters are missing in the text. They should be amended as *haje*.

174. The HPC text (1.826b6) has *wi sōngch'wi so sōl*, which should be amended to *wi sōngch'wi so su*, according to Vasubandhu's commentary.

175. The six forms of superknowledge (*abhijñā*) are (1) the superknowledge of super-normal powers (*rddhyabhijñā*), (2) the superknowledge of the divine ear (*divyaśrotrābhijñā*), (3) the superknowledge with regard to the thoughts of others (*cetaḥparyāyābhijñā*), (4) the superknowledge of the recollection of previous lives (*pūrvanivāsānusrītyabhijñā*), (5) the superknowledge of death and birth (*cyutyupapādābhijñā*), and (6) the superknowledge of the destruction of the influxes (*āsravakṣayābhijñā*). For a detailed description, see *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.759c17–760a12.

176. The text is obviously corrupted here.

177. The HPC text (1.826b19) has *sim cha mu ch'ang yu cho*. The character *ch'ang* should be corrected to *chang*.

178. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.826b26–c10.

179. The *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* mentions nine kinds of stability of mind with some differences: (1) stabilizing the mind (*anju sim; cittaṃ sthāpayati*), (2) restraining the mind (*sōpchu sim; cittaṃ samthāpayati*), (3) stopping the mind (*haeju sim; cittaṃ avasthāpayati*), (4) focusing the mind (*chōnju sim; cittaṃ upasthāpayati*), (5) taming the mind (*pokchu sim; cittaṃ damayati*), (6) calming the mind (*sikchu sim; cittaṃ śamayati*), (7) utterly calming the mind (*myōlchu sim; cittaṃ vyupaśamayati*), (8) unifying the mind (*sōngju sim; cittaṃ ekotīkaroti*), and (9) perfectly concentrating the mind (*chiju sim; cittaṃ samādadhāti*). See T 1604:31.624b20–22.

180. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.740a17–27.

181. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.444a420.

182. See *ibid.*, T 1579:30.443c29–444a5.

183. See *ibid.*, T 1597:30.444a22–29.

184. Here Wōnhyo follows the *Yogācārabhūmi* and uses *haengsang* rather than *charyang*, to be consistent with Paramārtha's translation. This is another example of Wōnhyo's conveniently adopting the terminology of the texts he refers to without demonstrating any effort toward being consistent.

185. *kausīdyam avavādasya saṃmoṣo laya uddhataḥ/ asaṃskāro'stha saṃskāraḥ pañca doṣā ime matāḥ//* (Indolence, forgetting the teachings, slackness, agitation, nonattention, attention—these are considered to be the five faults). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 51.

186. *tatra layāuddhatyam eko doṣaḥ kriyate/ anabhisamskāro layāuddhatya-praśamana-kāle doṣaḥ/ abhisamskāraḥ praśāntau/ eśāṃ prahāṇāya katham aṣṭau prahāṇa-saṃskāra vyavasthāpyante/ catvāraḥ kausīdyam-prahāṇāya cchanda-vyāyamaśraddhā-prasrabdhayaḥ te punar yathā-kramaṃ vedītavyaḥ//* (Here slackness and agitation are made into one fault; lack of attention is a fault when slackness and agitation are being pacified. How are eight eliminations of functioning toward their elimination to be determined? The four that are conducive to the elimination of slackness are will, endeavor, conviction, and pliancy). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 51.

187. *āśarayo' thāśritas tasya nimittaṃ phalam eva ca//* (The basis and that which is based on it; its cause and its fruit). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 51.

188. *āśrayaś chando vyāyāmasya/ āśrito vyāyāmas tasyāśyāraysya cchandhasya nimittam śraddhā sampratyaeye saty abhilāṣāt tasyāśritasya vyāyāmasya phalam prasrab-dhir ārabdha-vīryayasya samādhi-viśeśādhigamāc cheṣāś catvārah prahāna-samskārah smṛti-samprajanya-cetanōpekṣāś caturññām doṣāññām yathāsaṃkhyam pratipakṣāś/* (Will is the basis of endeavor. Endeavor is that which based on will. The cause of this basis, will, is conviction because its longing is in firm conviction. The fruit of endeavor, which is based [on will,] is pliancy, because special concentrations are attained after endeavor has been undertaken. The remaining four factors of elimination—mindfulness, clear comprehension, volition, and equanimity—are the four antidotes to the four faults in the order in which they are enumerated). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 51–52.

189. *ālambane' sammoṣo layāuddhatyānubuddhyanā/ tad-apāyābhisamskārah śāntau praśaṭha-vāhitā//* (Not losing the perceived objects, being aware of slackness and agitation; coursing flowingly in peace when the momentum has been brought to quiescence). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 52.

190. *smṛtir ālambane 'saṃpramoṣaḥ/ samprajanyaṃ smṛty-asampramoṣe sati layāuddhityānubodhaḥ/ anubuddhya tad-apagamāyābhisamskāras cetanā/ tasya layāuddhatyasyōpaśāntau satyam praśaṭha-vāhitā cittasyōpekṣā/* (Mindfulness is not losing the perceived objects. Clear comprehension means the recollection of slackness and agitation when there is absence of forgetfulness of mindfulness [of them]. Volition is the effort to remove [slackness and agitation] after there has been awareness of them. Equanimity of mind is to course flowingly in peace after slackness and agitation have been brought to quiescence). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 52.

191. The Chinese translation has *ko ha* (high and low), whereas the Sanskrit has *layāuddhatya* (slackness and agitation).

192. *ropite mokṣa-bhāgīye cchanda-yogādhipatyataḥ/ ālambane 'sammoṣā visāra-vicayasya ca//* (Having planted the elements conducive to liberation, from the predominance of the application of will; from not losing the perceived objects, nondiffusion, and investigation). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 52.

193. The heat level (*uṣma-gata*) is one of the four levels of the wholesome roots. The other three are the summit level (*mūrdhāna*), the forbearance level (*kṣānti*), and the level of the worldly ultimate (*laukikāgra-dharma*).

194. See T 1488:24.

195. *Nayut'a* (Skt. *nayuta*) means “innumerable.”

196. Wōnhyo's rendering is a bit different from the text in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, which reads: “Among the low and middling divisions of the [factors], the [factors] conducive to the discernment [of the teaching] can be repelled. But they can be repelled by only manifest [afflictions] and not by karmic impressions” (T 1605:31.689a8–9). See also *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.754a14–15.

197. *Pōb'in* (*dharma-kṣānti*), the forbearance of the birthlessness of phenomena.

198. *ādhipatyata iti varttate/ ṛddhipādaiḥ karmaṇya-cittasyāropite mokṣa-bhāgīye kuśala-mulecchandādhipatyataḥ prayogādhipatyataḥ/ālambanāsampramoṣādhipatyataḥ/ avisārādhipatyataḥ/ pravīcayādhipatyataś ca/ yathā-kramam pañca śraddhādīndriyāṇi veditavyāni/* (By their predominance. When the wholesome roots conducive to liberation have been planted in an unobstructed mind with the bases of success such as by the predominance of will, by the predominance of application, by the predominance of not losing the perceived objects, by the predominance of the nondiffusion [of mind], and by the predominance of investigation. The five faculties of conviction and so forth should be known according to their order). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 52.

199. The Sino-Korean has *hok*, which is synonymous with *pōnnoe* (affliction).

200. *vipakṣya hi samlekhād/ pūrvvasya phalam uttaram//* (Because the adversaries are diminished, the subsequent is the fruit of the previous). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 52–53.

201. *tāny eva śraddhādīni balavanti balanīty ucyante/ teṣām punar balavatvaṃ vipakṣasya hi samlekhād/yadā tāny āsraddhādībhīr vipakṣair na vyavakīryante/ kasmāc chraddhādīnām purvvōttara-nirdeśaḥ/ yasmāt pūrvvasya phalam uttaram/ śraddhadhāno hi hetu-phalam vīryam ārabhate/ ārabdha-vīryasya smṛtir upatiṣṭhate/ upasthita-smrteṣ cittaṃ samādhīyate/ samāhita-citto yathā-bhūtaṃ prajānāti/ avaropita-mokṣabhāgīyasyendriyāny uktāny atha nirvedha-bhāgīyāni kim indriyāvasthāyām veditavyāny āhosvid balāvasthāyām/* (Because these faculties such as conviction and so forth are powerful, they are called powers. Again, they are powers because of the adversaries being diminished when these powers are not scattered by adversaries such as lack of conviction and so forth. Why are conviction, [effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom] enumerated successively? Because the subsequent is the fruit of the previous. Being possessed of conviction, one undertakes the fruit of this cause, effort. Having undertaken effort, mindfulness occurs; mindfulness having occurred, the mind is concentrated. When the mind is concentrated, one knows [reality] as it is. If he has planted the factors conducive to liberation, he is said to have the faculties. Are the factors conducive to penetration to be known as the stage of faculties or the stage of powers?) Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 52–53.

202. The HPC text (1.829c) has *hok* (who), which should be amended to *hok* (affliction).

203. *dvau dvau nirvedha-bhāgīyav indriyāni balāni ca//* (Two each of the elements conducive to penetration are faculties and powers). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 53.

204. *uṣmagataṃ mūrddhānaś cēndriyāni/ kṣāntayo laukikaś cāgra-dharmā balāni/* (At the levels of heat and summit are the faculties; at the levels of forbearance and ultimate are the powers). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 53.

205. I have not been able to locate this passage in the *Dazhidu lun*.

206. I have not been able to locate this passage in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*.

207. I have not been able to locate this passage in the *Dazhidu lun*.

208. This appears to be an incomplete quotation from T 1605:31.682b29–c10.

209. See *Yogācārabhūmi*, T 1579:30.444c14–28.

210. *āśrayāṅgaṃ svabhāvāṅgaṃ niryāṅgaṃ trītyakaṃ/ caturthaṃ anuśamsāṅgaṃ niḥkleśāṅgaṃ tridhā mataṃ//* (Basis limb, self-nature limb; going-forth limb as the third. The fourth limb is conducive to merit; the affliction-removal limb is threefold). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 53.

211. *darśana-mārgge bodhāv aṅgāni bodhy-aṅgāni/ tatra bodher āśrayāṅgaṃ smṛtiḥ/ svabhāvāṅgaṃ dharmma-vicayaḥ/ niryāṅgaṃ vīryam/ anuśamsāṅgaṃ prītiḥ/ asaṃkleśāṅgaṃ tridhā prasrabdhi-samādhy-upekṣāḥ/ kim-arthaṃ punar asaṃkleśāṅgaṃ tridhā deśitam/* (The awakening limbs are limbs conducive to awakening on the Path of Vision. Among these the limb that is the basis of awakening is mindfulness; the self-nature limb is the investigation of the teachings; the limb of going forth is effort; the limb that is conducive to merit is joy; the limb that causes freedom from afflictions is threefold—namely, pliancy, concentration, and equanimity. Why is it that the limb that causes freedom from afflictions is proclaimed to be threefold?). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 53.

212. Paramārtha's Chinese translation reads: "Next the Master explains the awakening factors" (T 1599:31.459a1).

213. The HPC text (1.830b24) has *yuk ku* (six quarters). There are actually only four (8cd–9ab).

214. Wōnhyo’s commentary appears a bit confusing here. It seems to include verse 9cd, which is obviously the topic of the next section.

215. Here Wōnhyo switches to *chi* (limb).

216. See Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, p. 123; and *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.740c7–16.

217. *nidānenāśrayeṇēha svabhāvena ca deśitaṃ/* (Because of cause, basis, self-nature, thus it has been shown). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 54.

218. *asaṃkleśasya nidānaṃ prasarabdhir dauṣṭhulya-hetuvāt saṃkleśasya/ tasyās ca tat-pratipakṣatvād āśrayaḥ samādhiḥ/ svabhāva upekṣā/* (The cause of nondefilement is pliancy, because [pliancy is the antidote to] afflictions caused by debilitation, and because the basis of [pliancy] as its antidote is concentration. Self-nature is equanimity). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 54.

219. The HPC text (1.831a6) has *chi* (of), which should be amended to *chōng*.

220. The HPC text (1.831a12 and 14) has *wi haengju in*, which should be corrected to *wi chung haeng chak in* according to Vasubandhu’s commentary. Here Wōnhyo adds a textual comment that appears confusing: “Here the word *wi* should come after the word *chung* [heavy].”

221. *paricchedo 'tha saṃprāptiḥ para-sambhāvanā tridhā/ vipakṣa-pratipakṣās ca mārggasyāṅgam tad aṣṭadhā/* (Determination, attainment, causing others to cultivate—threefold, and antidotes to adverse states: the limb of the path is eightfold). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 54.

222. In this context “right view” (*chōng kyōn*) is synonymous with “wisdom” (*chi*).

223. *Prṣṭha-labdha-jñāna*, or the wisdom gained subsequent to nonconceptual wisdom (*nirvikalpa-jñāna*), is salvific wisdom. This wisdom mainly knows all the specific characteristics of the mundane world. Due to this, an enlightened being can put to practice various expedient means to benefit sentient beings.

224. *bhāvanā-mārgge 'sya paricchedāṅgam samyag-dṛṣṭir laukikī lokōttara-prṣṭha-labdhā yayā svādhigamaṃ paricchinati/ para-saṃprāpaṇāṅgam samyak-saṃkalpaḥ samyag-vāk ca sa-samutthānayā vācā tat-prāpaṇāt/ para-sambhāvanāṅgam tridhā samyag-vāk karmāntājivas tair hi yathākramaṃ/* (On the Path of Cultivation, right view is its discriminating limb by which one discerns one’s own attainment of the worldly exceptional subsequently gained [wisdom]. The limbs that cause others to attain are right conception and right speech, because by uttering words, one causes others to attain. The limb that causes others to cultivate is threefold: right speech, right action, and right livelihood. These three follow this order). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 54.

225. This phrase is not found in Paramārtha’s translation.

226. The meaning of Wōnhyo’s remark, *ōn chōng’ōp cha chūksi sin’ōp* (1.831b2) is a bit obscure, since action is considered to be threefold.

227. See T 1509:25.203b16–23; and Lamotte, *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, pp. 1182–1183.

228. *drṣṭau śīle 'tha saṃlekhe para-vijñaptir iṣyate/* (It is maintained that the perception [of truth] by others is due to one’s precepts and moderation). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 54.

229. Paramārtha’s translation of this passage is a bit obscure. My translation incorporates some elements from Xuanzang’s version. See T 1600:31.472b17–21.

230. *tasya samyag-vācā kathā-sāmkathya-viniścayena prajñāyām sambhāvanā*

*bhavati/samyak-karmmântena śīle 'krtyākaraṇāt/samyag-ājīvena saṃlekhe dharmmeṇa mātrayā ca cīvarādy-anveṣaṇāt/vipakṣa-pratipakṣāṅgam tridhāiva samyag-vyāyāma-smṛti-samadhāyah/eṣām hi yathākramam/* (It is one's right speech, the ascertainment of discourses, and suggestions that cause others to cultivate wisdom. It is through one's right action that one is established in precepts because one does not commit acts that should not be done. It is through right livelihood that one is established in moderation; one seeks clothes and other necessities only in accord with the Dharma. The limb that serves as an antidote to adverse states is threefold: right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration. These three function accordingly). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 54.

231. The HPC text (1.831c10) has *chōngsōl*, which should be amended to *chōng'ō*.

232. See *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā*, T 1606:31.741a4–18.

233. *kleśopakṣeṣa-vaibhūtvavipakṣa-pratipakṣatā/* (Antidotes to afflictions and derivative afflictions; and adverse states to mastery). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 54.

234. *Sōnjōng* in the original Sino-Korean.

235. *trividho hi vipakṣaḥ kleśo bhāvanā-heyah/upakṣeṣo layāuddhatyam vibhūtvavipakṣas ca vaiśeṣika-guṇābhinirhāra-vibandhaḥ/tatra prathamasya samyag-vyāyāmaḥ pratipakṣas tena mārgga-bhāvanāt/dvītīyasya samyak-smṛtiḥ śamathādi-nimitteṣu sūpasthita-smṛiteḥ layāuddhatyābhāvāt/trtīyasya samyak-samādhiḥ dhyāna-sannīrayeṇābhijñādi-guṇābhinirhārāt/* (Adverse states are of three kinds: afflictions that are to be eliminated by cultivation; derivative afflictions—namely, slackness and agitation; [and] adverse states to sovereignty and obstructions to the manifestation of supernormal qualities. Among these, right effort is the antidote to the first, because by it the path is cultivated. Right mindfulness is the antidote to the second, because there is an absence of slackness and agitation in mindfulness that is well established in the cause for tranquility. Right concentration is the antidote to the third, because by abiding in meditation the qualities of supernatural powers are manifested). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 54–55. Note that Paramārtha's Chinese translation uses two terms for "afflictions"—*hok* and *pōnnoe*—whereas the Sanskrit has only *kleśa*.

236. *anukūlā viparyastā sānubandhā viparyayā/aviparyastā-viparyāsā-nānubandhā ca bhāvanā/* (Being defective with conforming [nondefect], [being nondefective] with conforming defect, and being nondefective without conforming defect: the cultivation [of the antidotes]). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 55.

237. *viparyastāpi aviparyāsānukūlā 'viparyastā viparyāsānubandhā/aviparyastā viparyāsā-niranubandhā ca yathākramam prthagjana-śaikṣāśaikṣavathāsu/* (Being defective but conforming to nondefect, being without defect but is connected to defect, and being without defect and is not connected to defect, respectively in the levels of ordinary sentient beings, saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*], and saints beyond training [*śaikṣa*]). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 55. Kuiji's commentary on this verse (based on Xuanzang's translation) gives the following interpretation: 'Being defective but conforming to nondefect' means that ordinary sentient beings are all possessed of defect or afflictions. Since the nature of what is to be counteracted is impure, it is called 'with defect.' Being able to produce purity is called 'conforming to nondefect.' Put differently, from the perspective of the basis, it is called 'with defect,' [and] looking from the standpoint of counteracting, it is called 'conforming to nondefect.' 'Being without defect but is connected to defect' means that the essence of the cultivation of the level [of the disciples] in higher training is pure; it is called 'nondefect.' However, the body, which is the basis, still has affliction; it is called 'with conforming defect.' 'Being without defect and is not connected to defect': The nature of the cultivation of the level [of the disciples]



beyond training is pure; it is called ‘without defect.’ The impurities of the body, which is the basis, are thoroughly annihilated; it is called ‘without conforming defect.’ See T 1835:44.25c15–26a1.

238. There are fifty-two stages on the path of a bodhisattva’s practice. The ten convictions constitute the first ten stages; the ten dedications make up the thirty-first to fortieth stages.

239. *ālambana-manaskāra-prāptitas tad-viśiṣṭatā//* (There is a distinction with regard to perceived objects, mental attention, and attainment). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 55.

240. Paramārtha’s Chinese translation (T 1599:31.459b22) has *musaeng tūk tori*, which should be amended to *mu tūk tori*. This would agree with the Sanskrit *anupalambha yogena* and Xuanzang’s translation. For Xuanzang’s translation, see T 1600:31.472c13–14: “The bodhisattvas cultivate antidotes to objects such as body and so forth through the contemplation of nonapprehension.”

241. *śrāvaka-pratyekabuddhānām hi svāsantānikāḥ kāyādayaḥ ālambanam/ bodhisatvānām sva-para-sāntānikāḥ śrāvaka-pratyekabuddhā anityādbhir ākāraiḥ kāyādīnmanasikurvanti/ bodhisatvās tvanupalambhayogena/ śrāvaka-pratyekabuddhāḥ smṛty-upasthānādīni bhāvayanti yāvad eva kāyādīnām viśaṃyogāya/ bodhisatvā na viśaṃyogāya/ nāviśaṃyogāya/ yāvad evāpratiṣṭhita-nirvāṇāya/* (The disciples and the self-realized buddhas have as objects of meditation their own mental streams, bodies, and so forth. The bodhisattvas have their own and others’ mental streams. The disciples and the self-realized buddhas are mentally attentive to their bodies and so forth in their aspects of impermanence and so forth; the bodhisattvas, however, do so with the method of nonapprehension. The disciples and the self-realized buddhas cultivate the foundations of mindfulness and so forth in order to be free from their bodies, et cetera. The bodhisattvas do so neither to be free nor not to be free [from their bodies, etc.] but to attain *nirvāṇa* without abode). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 55.

242. Wōnhyo failed to notice that the phrase *musaeng tūk tori* is a mistake for *mu tūk tori*. In his commentary, he took it to mean that the bodhisattvas “attain the truth” (*tūk tori*) by contemplating the principle of “birthlessness” (*musaeng*). See note 240.

243. *hetv-avasthāvatārākyā prayoga-phala-saṃjñitā/ kāryākārya-viśiṣṭā ca uttarānuttarā ca sāl/ adhimuktau praveśe ca niryāṇe vyākṛtāv api/ kathikatve 'abhiṣeke ca saṃprāptāv anuśasane// kṛtyānusthā uddiṣṭā/* (They are called the levels of cause, entering, applied practice, and fruition; [the levels where there is] something to be done and [where] there is nothing to be done, the supernormal level, and the higher and the supreme, [the levels] of confidence, entering, going forth, reception of prophecy, instructing, consecration, attainment, being beneficial, and accomplishing all tasks). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 56.

244. Generating the mind of awakening, or *bodhicittōtpāda*, is to produce the mind of wisdom aspiring toward the attainment of awakening. This is the first step on the path of realizing the ultimate goal of Buddhahood in Mahāyāna Buddhism.

245. The Chinese has *kongdōk*; the Sanskrit, *anuśamsa*.

246. *tatra hetvavasthā ya gotra-sthasya pudgalasyāvasthā utpādita-bodhicittasya prayogāvasthā cittōpādād ūrdhham aprāpte phale/ phalāvasthā prāpte/ sakaraṇīyāvasthā śaikṣasya/ akaraṇīyāvasthā aśaikṣasya/ viśeṣāvasthā 'bhijñādi-guṇa-viśeṣa-samanv-āgatasya/ uttarāvasthā śrāvakādhibhyo bhūmi-praviṣṭasya bodhisatvasya/ anuttarāvasthā buddhasya tata ūrdhham avasthābhāvād adhimuktyāvasthā bodhistvānām sarvvasyām adhimukti-caryā-bhumau/ praveśāvasthā prathamāyām*

*bhūmau niryāṇāvasthā tad-uttarāsu ṣaṣṭu bhūmiṣu/vyākaraṇāvasthā aṣṭamyām bhūmau kathikatvāvasthā navamyām abhiṣekāvasthā daśamyām/ prāptiyavasthā buddhānān dharmma-kāyaḥ/ anūsamsāvasthā sāmhogikaḥ kāyaḥ/ kṛtyānuṣṭhānāvasthā nirmāṇa-kāyaḥ/ sarvvāpy eṣā bahuvividhāvasthābhisamasya veditavyā/* (Among these the level of cause is the level of one who abides in his lineage. The level of entering is the level of one who has generated the mind of enlightenment. The level of applied practice is the level of one who has generated the mind of enlightenment but has not attained fruition. The level of fruition is the level [of ones who] have attained [fruition]. The level of having something to be accomplished is the level [of ones] in training. The level of not having anything to be accomplished is the level [of ones] beyond training. The supernormal level is the level of one who is possessed of supernormal qualities such as the supernatural powers. The high level is the level of a bodhisattva who has entered a ground higher than that of the disciples and so forth. The supreme level is the level of a buddha because beyond that there is no other level. The level of confidence is the level of all bodhisattvas where confidence is cultivated. The level of entering is on the first [of the bodhisattva's] grounds. The level of going forth includes the six grounds after that. The level of reception of prophecy is the eighth [bodhisattva] ground. The level of being capable of instructing is the ninth [bodhisattva] ground. The level of consecration is the tenth [bodhisattva] ground. The level of attainment is the truth-body of buddhas. The level of being beneficial [to others] is the enjoyment body. The level of accomplishing tasks is the emanation body. All these states are numerous that are known here only briefly). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 56.

247. The Chinese (1.833a13) has *to p'um*, which is an abbreviation for *samsip ch'il to p'um*, the thirty-seven constituents of awakening, or *nirvāṇa*.

248. The two interpretive concepts of “gradual” and “sudden” seem out of place here.

249. The forty minds consist of the ten convictions (*śin*), the ten grounds (*chu*), the ten practices (*haeng*), and the ten dedications (*hoehyang*). They are the levels on the path of practice of a bodhisattva.

250. The Sanskrit term *abhiṣeka* means “sprinkling of water.”

251. Wōnhyo replaces the whole statement with the word “all,” which is not found in Vasubandhu's commentary.

252. *dharmma-dhātau tridhā punaḥ/ aśuddhāśuddha-śuddhā ca viśuddhā ca yathārhatā//* (Again in the Realm of Reality they are threefold respectively: pure, impure and pure, and utterly pure). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 56.

253. *tatrāśuddhāvasthā hetv-avasthām upādāya yāvat prayogād aśuddha-śuddhāvasthā śaikṣāṇām/ visuddhāvasthā aśaikṣāṇām/* (Here the impure level starts with the level of cause up to the level of applied practice. The impure and pure level is the level of the saints in higher training [*śaikṣa*]. The utterly pure level is the level of the saints beyond training [*aśaikṣa*]). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 57.

254. This is a fundamental theme in Mahāyāna Buddhism—that thusness (*tathatā*), the Realm of Reality (*dharmadhātu*; i.e., ultimate reality) is essentially pure and is originally quiescent. Although from a conventional standpoint ultimate reality is realized through the purification of adventitious defilements that cloud it, from the ultimate standpoint it is not a conditioned state; that is, it is not actually created or produced by anything. See, for instance, Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, 67–68; and T 1599:31.462b1–5.

255. In this paragraph the term *yugak* (in 1.834a8 and 834a9) should be amended to *yuhak*.



256. *pudgalānām yavavasthānam yathā-yogam ato matam/* (Thus it should be known that the [distinction] of persons has been established accordingly). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 57.

257. *ato 'vasthā-prabhedād yathā-yogaṃ pudgalānām yavavasthānam veditavyam ayaṃ gotra-stho 'yaṃ avatīrṇṇa ity evam-ādi/ uktāvasthā/* (Thus one should know that from the division of levels persons are established accordingly. One can know whether a person abides in his lineage or whether a person has entered [the levels]. The levels have been explained). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 57.

258. The HPC text (1.834a22) has *wi*, which should be amended to *chu*.

259. *bhājanatvaṃ vipākākhyam balan tasyādhipatyataḥ// rucir vṛddhir viśuddhiś ca phalam etad yathā-kramaṃ/* (Receptacle is called maturation because its power is predominant. Pleasure, growing, and utterly pure; these successively are fruits). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 57.

260. Paramārtha uses *po kwa*, whereas the *Yogācārabhūmi* has *visuk kwa*. They are both used to render the Sanskrit *vipāka-phala*.

261. *bhājanatvaṃ yaḥ kuśalānukūlo vipākaḥ/ balaṃ yā bhājanatvādhipatyāt kuśalasyādhimātratā/ rucir ya pūrvvābhyāsāt kuśala ruciḥ/ vṛddhir yā pratyutpanne kuśala-dharmābhyāsāt kuśala-mūla-paripuṣṭiḥ/ viśuddhir yad āvaraṇa-prahāṇam/ etad yathā-kramaṃ phalaṃ pañca-vidhaṃ veditavyam/ vipāka-phalam adhipati-phalan niṣyanda-phalam puruṣa-kāra-phalam viśamyoga-phalaṃ ca/* (Receptacle is maturation conforming to wholesome states. Power is the predominance of wholesome states because of the predominance of receptacle. Delight is the delight in wholesome states coming from practicing [in previous existences]. Growing is the nourishing of the wholesome roots through the cultivation of the wholesome states when they have come into being. Utterly pure is the removal of the obstacles. Thus should the five kinds of fruit be known in their order: maturation fruit, predominant fruit, causally concordant fruit, human effort-caused fruit, and dissociation fruit). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 57.

262. The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* has *kongyong kwa*, whereas the *Yogācārabhūmi* has *sayong kwa*.

263. *Pōpki* in Sino-Korean literally means “dharma receptacle” or “dharma instrument.” Idiomatically, it means being ready for the Dharma or certain wholesome states.

264. Twenty-two faculties (*dvāvimśatīndriyāni*) signify the twenty-two phenomena that are beneficial to the existence of things: the six faculties of eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and consciousness; the three faculties of male, female, and life; the five affective faculties of suffering, happiness, joy, sadness, and indifference; the five wholesome faculties of conviction, endeavor, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom; and the three pure faculties of knowledge of what is as yet unknown, knowledge of what is known, and complete knowledge. See Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 46–47; and T 1599:31.457b9–19. For a list of these twenty-two faculties and their sources in early Buddhist literature, see Gethin, *Buddhist Path to Awakening*, p. 105.

265. See T 1579:31.658c9–668b19. Wōnhyo seems to be referring to pages 664b5–665c17.

266. Throughout this paragraph (835b15–22) the character *ip* should be amended to *wei*.

267. The HPC text (1.835b16) has *kwa po*, which should be amended to *po kwa*.

268. The HPC text (1.835b16) has *yō sōn*, which should be amended to *yō sōngūn*.

269. *uttarōttaram ādyaṃ ca tad-abhyāsāt samāptitaḥ// ānukūlyād vipakṣāc ca viśamyogād viśeṣataḥ/ uttarānuttaratvāc ca phalam anyat samāsataḥ//* (Successive

[fruit] and initial [fruit]; [fruits attained through] practice and attainment. [Fruits attained] through conforming, through dissociation from adverse states, and through extraordinary. [Fruits attained through] nonsupreme and supreme, and another briefly). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 57.

270. Because the Chinese of Paramārtha's translation is a bit obscure, I have modified my translation according to Xuanzang's translation (T 1600:31.473b19–20).

271. *uttarōttara-phalaṃ gotrāc cittōtpāda ity evam-ādi paramparayā vedītavayā/ ādi-phalaṃ prathamato lokōttara-dharma-pratilambhaḥ/ abhyāsa-phalaṃ tasmāt pareṇa śaikṣāvasthāyām/ samāpti-phalaṃ āśaikṣa-dharmāḥ/ ānukūlya-phalaṃ upaniṣad-bhāvenōttarottara-phalaṃ eva vedītavayā/ vipakṣa-phalaṃ prahāṇa-mārggo ytaḍ evādi-phalaṃ/ pratipakṣo 'bhipretaḥ/ viśaṃyoga-phalaṃ nirodha-sākṣāt-kriyā abhyāsa-phalaṃ samāpti-phalaṃ ca kleśa-viśaṃyogaḥ śaikṣāśaikṣānām yathā-kramam/ viśeṣa-phalaṃ abhijñādiko guṇa-viśeṣaḥ/ uttara-phalaṃ bodhistva-bhūmayas tad-anya-yānōttaratvād anuttara-phalaṃ buddha-bhūmiḥ/ etāni catvāri abhyāsa-samāpti-phala-prabheda eva etad anayat phalaṃ samāsa-nirdeśato vyāsatas tv aparimāṇam/* (Successive fruit should be known by the succession from the generation of the mind of enlightenment from one's lineage, and so forth. Initial fruit is the first attainment of exceptional states. Fruit of practice is the level of [the disciples] in higher training by going beyond that [initial fruit]. Completion fruit consists of the states [of the disciples] beyond training. Conforming fruit should be known as successive fruit because it is the cause of further fruits. Initial fruit is the path of elimination of adverse fruits, which can be considered as the antidotes. Dissociation fruit is the fruit of practice and completion fruit, which are the realization of cessation and respectively the levels of the [disciples] in higher training and the saints beyond training, where one is separated from afflictions. Excellent fruit means excellent qualities such as the supernormal powers. Superior fruit is the bodhisattva's grounds because they are superior to other vehicles. Supreme fruit is the stage of buddhas. These four levels are the divisions of fruit of practice and completion fruit. Thus the other fruits are indicated in brief; in full elaboration they are immeasurable). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 57–58.

272. *tatra pratipakṣa-bhāvanāyāḥ piṇḍārthaḥ/ vyutpatti-bhāvanā nirlekha-bhāvanā parikramma-bhāvanā uttara-samārambha-bhāvanā śliṣṭa-bhāvanā darśana-mārgga-śleṣāt/ praviṣṭa-bhāvanā utkṣṭa-bhāvanā ādi-bhāvanā madhya-bhāvanā paryavasāna-bhāvanā sōttara bhāvanā niruttarā ca bhāvanā yālabhāna-manaskāra-prāpti-viśiṣṭā/* (Here is a summary of the meanings of the cultivation of the antidotes. Comprehensive cultivation, mitigating cultivation, penetrating cultivation, successive-undertaking cultivation, adhering cultivation because it is adhered to the Path of Vision, engaging cultivation, eminent cultivation, inceptive cultivation, middling cultivation, culminating cultivation, nonsupreme cultivation, and supreme cultivation, where perceived objects, mental attention, and attainment are distinctive). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 58.

273. For a discussion of the divisions of cultivation, see *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, T 1594:31.146a4–7; and Lamotte, *Somme du grand véhicule d'Asaṅga*, pp. 204–205.

274. *avasthānām piṇḍārtha/ bhavyatāvasthā gotra-sthasya/ ārambhāvasthā yāvat prayogāt/ aśuddhāvasthā aśuddha-śuddhāvasthā viśuddhāvasthā/ sālakārāvasthā/ vyāpty-avasthā daśa-bhūmi-vyāpanāt/ anuttarāvasthā ca//* (A summary of the meaning of levels: the level of being able to dwell in a lineage; the level of undertaking up to the path of application; the impure level, the impure and pure level, the utterly pure level; the level with adornment; the all-pervasive level because it pervades all ten [bodhisattva] grounds; and the supreme level). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 58.

275. For a discussion of the ten forms of *dharmadhātu*, see *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, T 1594:31.145b21–b4; and Lamotte, *Somme du grand véhicule d’Asaṅga*, pp. 197–199.

276. The ten perfections are qualities to be successively cultivated on the ten grounds by the bodhisattva. They consist of (1) generosity (*dāna*), (2) precepts (*śīla*), (3) forbearance (*kṣānti*), (4) effort (*vīrya*), (5) meditation (*dhyāna*), (6) knowledge (*prajñā*), (7) expedient means (*upāya*), (8) aspiration (*praṇidhāna*), (9) power (*bala*), and (10) wisdom (*jñāna*). The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* gives the explanation that the bodhisattva favors sentient beings through generosity. Because of the perfection of precepts, he does no harm to others. Because of the perfection of forbearance, he forgives harm done to him by others. He increases virtues through the perfection of effort. Through the perfection of meditation, he delivers [others from evil] and leads [them to good] by supernatural powers. Through the perfection of knowledge, he liberates others by giving them the right teachings. Through the perfection of expedient means, he makes his [virtues], such as giving and so forth, inexhaustible by the great awakening he attains through transformation. Through the perfection of aspiration, because he embraces all occurrences concordant to the perfections, he constantly engages in generosity and so on, causing the arising of Buddhahood in all sentient beings. Through the perfection of power—that is, discernment and cultivation—he always engages in generosity and so on because these do not allow adverse states to overpower. Through the perfection of wisdom, because of the removal of the confusion regarding the phenomena as heard, he experiences the enjoyment of all things that are conducive to generosity and so on, and he brings sentient beings to maturity. (*dānena hi bodhisatvaḥ satvān anuḡrḥṇāti/ śilenōpaghātaṃ pareśāṃ na karoti/ kṣāntyā paraiḥ kṛtam upaghātaṃ marṣayati/ vīryeṇa guṇān varddhayati/ dhyānena ṛddhyādhībhīr āvarjyāvatarāyati/ prajñayā samyag-avavāda-dānād vimocayati/ upāya-kausalya-pāramitayā mahābodhi-pariṇāmanād dānādīn akṣayān karoti/ praṇidhāna-pāramitayānukūlōpapatti-parigrahāt/ sarvva-janmasu buddhōtpādārāganato dānādiṣu sadā pravarttate bala-pāramitayā pratisaṃkhyāna-bhāvanā-balābhyaṃ niyataṃ dānādiṣu pravarttate/ vipakṣānabibhavāt/ jñāna-pāramitayā yathārūta-dharmma-sammohāpagamād dānādy-ādhipateya-dharmma-sambhogaṃ ca pratyanubhavati/ satvāmś ca paripācayati/ Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, p. 62. See also T 1599:31.460c20–461a9. The Chinese translation is slightly different.*

277. *phalānāṃ piṇḍārtaḥ saṃgrahataḥ tad-viśeṣataḥ purvvyābhyāsataḥ uttarōttara-nirhārataḥ/ uddeśato nirdeśataḥ ca/ tatra saṃgrahataḥ pañca phalāni/ tad-viśeṣataḥ śeṣāni/ pūrvvābhyāsataḥ vipāka-phalāṃ/ uttarōttara-nirhārataḥ tad-anyāni catvāri/ uddeśataḥ uttarōttara-phalādīni catvāri nirdeśataḥ ānukūlya-phalādīni ṣaṭ/ teṣāṃ eva caturṇṇāṃ nirdeśāt//* (A summary of the meanings of fruit: Fruits [derived from] protecting [others], from extraordinary qualities, from previous cultivation, from successively removing [afflictions], from ascertaining, and from instructing. Among these, the fruits derived from protecting others are the five fruits. The fruits derived from supernatural qualities are others. The fruit derived from previous practice is the fruit of maturation. The fruits derived from successive accomplishment are the other four. The fruit derived from enunciations include the four fruits such as successive fruit and the like. The fruit derived from explanations includes fruits such as conforming fruit and so forth because four of them have been instructed). Nagao, *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, pp. 58–59.

278. The HPC text (1.837b3) has *susūp kwa* (continued-practice fruit), which I believe should be *suksūp kwa* (previous-practice fruit), to be consistent with Vasubandhu’s commentary. However, Wōnhyo appears to gloss “continued-practice fruit” instead of “previous-practice fruit.”

279. The HPC text (1.837c13) has *o kwa chi pyōl kwa*, which should be amended to *o kwa chi pyōl i*.

280. Nagao's Sanskrit edition does not contain this paragraph.

281. In the Sanskrit text these make up three sections of Chapter Four.

282. The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* is attributed to Maitreya or Maitreyaṅātha. The Buddhist traditions and modern scholars hold various opinions about the historicity of this figure. For a discussion of Maitreyaṅātha, see Rahula, *Compendium de la super-doctrine*, pp. x–xi; Uī, “Maitreya as a Historical Personage,” p. 101; Tucci, *Some Aspects of the Doctrines*; and Lamotte, *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*, p. 25.

283. The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* in its Sanskrit version consists of five chapters discussing seven topics. The seven topics are characteristics (Chapter One); the obscurations (Chapter Two); realities (Chapter Three); the cultivation of the antidotes, and their stages and fruition (Chapter Four); and the supremacy of the [Great] Vehicle (Chapter Five). Thus Chapter Four includes three topics. The Chinese translations divide the text into seven chapters, with each discussing a topic.

#### IV. Critical Discussion on Inference

1. Dignāga, or Diñnāga (Ch. Chénnà; K. Chinna), lived during the fifth century. For a list of his extant works in Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan, see Hattori, *Dignāga*, pp. 1–11. To that list must now be added the Sanskrit portions of his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* embedded in Jinendrabuddhi's commentary that is being published by E. Steinkellner et al. through the University of Vienna, starting with *Jinendrabuddhi's Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā, Chapter 1, Part 1: Critical Edition; Part 2: Diplomatic Edition* (Vienna: Institut für Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, 2005).

2. Scholars have argued for many years whether Indian and Buddhist logic should technically be considered “logic” or rather should be taken only as debate rules, and whether the three-part inferences (or five-part inferences) they use can properly be called “syllogisms” or require another label. We need not resolve those issues here. While I also have reservations as to the appropriateness of applying the terms “logic” and “syllogism” to this stage in the development of *hetuvidyā* (literally, the science of reasoning), for convenience I will use those terms here.

3. *Nyāya* is one of several Sanskrit terms for logical reasoning, as well as the name of a Hindu school that specialized in its own form of logic. *Praveśa* means “entrance,” and *mukha* literally means “face” but also implies initially coming face-to-face with something—that is, being *introduced* to it. Both *praveśa* and *mukha* are commonly found in the titles of introductory texts.

4. The ten are Jingyan, Shentai, Wenbei, Jingmai, Lingui, Sūngjang, Bigong, Wengui, Shunjing, and Xuanfan. Among the works still extant are *Yinming ruzhengli lun shu*, by Wengui (XZJ 848.680b6–694c6), and two versions of Shentai's *Limen lun shu ji* (T 1839 and XZJ 847.663c–680a17).

5. The eighth-century Silla monk T'aehyōn (also called Taehyōn), in his *Sōng yusingnon hakki* (Ch. *Chengweishilun xueji*), quotes a passage from *Critical Inference* at XZJ 818.56c20–22 that is found in the received version, but this is immediately followed by another passage at XZJ 818.56c22–57a1 that is not found in the received manuscript of *Critical Inference*. Additional passages he cites that are not found in the surviving version occur at XZJ 818.34b1–5, 97c21–23, and 125b18–21. Huizhao (K. Hyeso; 648–714), one of

the Chinese Faxiang patriarchs, in his *Cheng weishi lun liaoyi deng*, provides two quotes, one after the other, that are not found in the surviving manuscript, at T 1832:43.731c28–732a19.

6. As will be explained shortly, these three stipulations regarding the property to be established (*pakṣadharmā*) are that it (1) be found in the Reason (*hetu*) and the Thesis (*pakṣa*), (2) be found in the similar example (*sapakṣa*), and (3) be fully excluded from the dissimilar example (*vipakṣa*). Dignāga is often credited with devising this threefold scheme, but as Tucci noted in “Buddhist Logic before Dīnnāga (Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Tarka-śāstras),” esp. p. 479, it predates Dignāga and can be found in Asaṅga, though entangled there in additional details; Dignāga hewed it into a leaner form.

7. One key difference is that *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, since it focuses on debate, says almost nothing about perception, whereas the *Yogācārabhūmi* discussion includes an intriguing, and unique, analysis of perception. Alex Wayman translated the *Yogācārabhūmi* section relying on the Tibetan and a Sanskrit manuscript, with a critical edition of the latter accompanying his translation, in *A Millennium of Buddhist Logic*, pp. 3–41; he did not consult Xuanzang’s Chinese translation, whose corresponding section is found at T 1579:30.356a11–360c21. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya* has been translated into French by Walpola Rahula (*Compendium de la super-doctrine*) from Gokhale’s partial Sanskrit version (“Fragments from the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* of Asaṅga”) supplemented by Pradhan’s back-translation into Sanskrit from the Chinese and Tibetan (Pradhan, *Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asaṅga*). Since then, Tatia published the Sanskrit of Sthiramati’s commentary on the *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, which contains much of Asaṅga’s root text (Tatia, *Abhidharmasamuccaya-Bhāṣyam*); it should therefore be consulted, since it gives a better version of the Sanskrit than what Rahula used. The section on debate and the *pramāṇas* forms the climactic final chapter of the text—showing the inseparability of Abhidharma and logical debate for Asaṅga. An English translation from Rahula’s French version was published by Sara Boin-Webb as *Abhidharma-samuccaya: The Compendium of the Higher Teaching (Philosophy) by Asaṅga*. The chapter on debate (pp. 242–256) corresponds to Xuanzang’s *Dasheng apidamo jilun*, T 1605:31.693a8–694b9. In “Buddhist Logic before Dīnnāga,” Tucci compares Asaṅga’s treatment in the two texts, but he did so before any of the Sanskrit versions were recovered, so his speculative reconstruction of the Sanskrit terminology, though sometimes correct, should not be trusted.

8. Dharmakīrti (600–666) was the most important theoretician and systematizer of Buddhist logic in India; his innovations set the foundation for everything that was to follow in India and later Tibet. The development of Buddhist logic can be roughly divided into the following periods (with some overlaps): (1) Early (fifth century BCE to second century CE), (2) Abhidharma and Madhyamaka Debating Styles (third century BCE–fourth century CE), (3) from Asaṅga and Vasubandhu to Dignāga (fourth–fifth century CE), (4) from Dignāga to Dharmakīrti (fifth–seventh century CE), and (5) post-Dharmakīrti (eighth century–present). Most scholars who work on “Buddhist logic” deal almost exclusively with the fifth period, especially as preserved in the Tibetan tradition. Materials from Dharmakīrti and from that last period did not reach East Asia until the twentieth century. On the other hand, Chinese translations preserve materials from the earlier periods not available elsewhere.

9. The original article on *sādhana* is accessible at [http://buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?80.xml+id\('b80fd-7acb'\)](http://buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?80.xml+id('b80fd-7acb')).

10. As mentioned previously, when one compares Asaṅga’s discussion of *pramāṇa*

in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, Aśaṅga seems to demonstrate that this notion was already in flux, since in the *Yogācārabhūmi* he treats all three *pramāṇas*—perception, inference, and scriptural authority—as equally valid, whereas in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* he adds the stipulation that scriptural authority is valid only if “it is not contradictory to the other two *pramāṇas*.” Cf. Tucci, “Buddhist Logic before Dīnāga,” p. 467.

11. Sanskrit grammar uses numbers to indicate the nominal cases: the nominative is the first case, accusative is second, instrumental is third, and so on. Commentators indicate the case by its number. The ablative (“from, because of”) is the fifth case.

12. All the quotes from *Nyāyamukha* that are translated here are given in the order in which they appear, without omission, from Dignāga’s *Nyāyamukha* (Ch. *Yinming zhengli men lun*), translated by Xuanzang, T 1628:32.2a19–b24.

13. The implied argument seems to be that it is “always” available for perception, so it is always a knowable object, and hence it must be eternal. This argument conflates actual sounds with the concept of sound, since what one hears is actually “always” different and anew, or, as the musician Eric Dolphy remarked, “[Sound,] after it’s over, it’s gone, in the air, you can never recapture it again.”

14. One very interesting feature of Dignāga’s restatement of the *pakṣas* in this verse is that he unpacks differing senses of “eternal” by offering nuanced synonyms for it, such as “perpetually abiding,” “firm,” “stable,” and so on, each tailored to the specific claim being asserted. Analyzing the implications of his differentiating these connotative options is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

15. Cf. *Nyāyapraveśa* 3.2.2. For the Sanskrit with English translation, see Tachikawa, “Sixth-Century Manual of Indian Logic.” I am using his numbering here. Xuanzang’s Chinese translation of this section begins at T 1630:32.11c17.

16. For examples, see *Nyāyapraveśa* 3.2.2.3 and T 1630:32.11c24–12a3.

17. In the inference “Sound is eternal, because of audibility,” the Reason is considered “doubtful,” not “contradictory,” because the statement itself (e.g., “sound is audible”) seems to be true, but even while the Reason in itself is true, it fails to connect with the *sādhya* (sound is eternal) or support either contention as to whether sound is or is not eternal, since neither “eternal” nor “not-eternal” share a decisive *pakṣadharma* with “audibility.” Wōnhyo’s discussion will explore this in depth.

18. *Nyāyapraveśa* 3.2.2.6 offers the following example of *viruddha-avyabhicārin*: “An example of ‘contradictory [conclusions] from [two] inerrant [proofs]’ is: ‘Sound is impermanent, because it is produced, like a jar.’ ‘Sound is permanent, because audible, like sound-ness.’ Both, taken together, make the *hetu* dubious [*saṃśaya-hetuvād*], since the two only combine into a single uncertainty [*eko ‘naikāntikaḥ*].”

19. *Nyāyabindu* 3.109ff., in Malvania, *Ācārya-Dharmakīrti-kṛta-Nyāyabindor ācārya-Dharmottara-kṛta-ṭīkāyā aṇuṭīkārūpaḥ pañḍita-Durvekamiśra-kṛto Dharmottara-pradīpaḥ*; i.e., verses 115–121 in the numbering used by Stecherbatsky in *Buddhist Logic*, vol. 2, pp. 223–229.

20. The five *gotras* are five types of persons whose capacity for advancement in Buddhism is based on the karmic “seeds” they’ve inherited from previous lives. The five are *śrāvaka*, *pratyekabuddha*, bodhisattva, buddha, and *icchantika*. The first type represents practitioners of Hīnayāna, and the second those who achieve enlightenment without learning from or having had contact (in their present life) with a buddha or Buddhism. The third type is Mahāyāna practitioners. The fifth was the problematic category. *Ichchantikas* are incorrigible beings said to be incapable of attaining Buddhahood, the universal



goal of all Mahāyāna practitioners. East Asian Buddhists embraced the notion of universal Buddha nature in all sentient beings, an idea that seems to be directly contradicted by the category of *icchantika*. Hence attacks against Xuanzang’s style of Yogācāra, and in Japan against Hossō, frequently raised the problem of the *icchantika*, which, the opponents believed, should be rejected. It should also be noted that the Chinese term for *gotra* (family or clan) is a homonym and graphically similar to the character for “nature” (as in “Buddha nature”). *Sōng/gotra* (family) and *sōng/nature* are sometimes used interchangeably, and redactors sometimes systematically converted one to the other. Discourse about becoming a cleric by “leaving home” in order to join the “family of the buddhas” (Buddha *gotra*)—that is, becoming a Buddhist without other caste affiliation—elided into notions of “Buddha nature” in East Asia.

21. “Seeing” is a metonymy for perception, including hearing, smelling, tasting, touching, and mental perception of mental objects (i.e., thoughts, concepts). For a thorough discussion and translation of the relevant portions of these two texts, see Lusthaus, “Pre-Dharmakīrti Indian Discussion of Dignāga”; and Lusthaus, “Yogācāra Theories of the Components of Perception.”

22. Since the beginning of this “debate” is missing, my estimation of its context is somewhat tentative, but it seems that the opponent is supposed to be claiming that words about the Pure Land do not prove that the Pure Land exists; and Wōnhyo wants to render that criticism ineffective. He does so by proposing two different meanings that the statement could intend. He turns the first possibility into a version of the Liar’s Paradox (“Everything I say is a lie!”) and declares that self-contradictory. The second option differentiates between “teachings” (i.e., words) *about* the Pure Land, and the Pure Land itself, arguing that words do provide some sort of knowledge or cognition about the Pure Land, while conceding that the Pure Land itself is not conveyed through words—pointing out that the one who holds that the Pure Land does exist readily concedes the limitations of words and teachings. The second option is, then, “inconclusive” because it is insufficient to disprove the existence of the Pure Land itself.

23. At the conclusion of each numbered section of *Critical Inference* there is, in parentheses, a number followed by the word (Ch.) *liang* (K. *ryang*), which literally means “measure,” and is the standard equivalent for *pramāṇa*. These are enigmatic, and it is not clear to me whether they are original to Wōnhyo or tabulations added by a later copyist. Since we have only one manuscript of the text, there is no way to tell. I have not found a viable theory to explain what these tabulations signify. I suspect that at some point they counted how many inferences were given in that section, since, for instance, some transmissions of Chinese texts would tabulate the precise number of Chinese characters used in a preceding section to help assure quality control with a complete and accurate copy. The “two inferences,” etc., might have originally been a comparable tabulation. However, the numbers provided in the extant manuscript do not tally with the actual number of inferences found in several of the sections, which may indicate that the manuscript is in a more corrupt condition than we might otherwise have surmised. As discussed elsewhere, there are several indications that we are missing important arguments even within the extant portions, including what were probably important inferences late in the text. While conceding that these closing tabulations make little sense given the current condition of the text, I include them without modification in the translation.

24. Asaṅga, in *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* (K. *Sōp taesūng non*; Ch. *She dasheng lun*), discusses two components, the image component (*nimitta*) and the perceiving component (*darśana*). Dignāga, in *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, introduces a third component, *sva-saṃvitti*,

“self-aware” or “self-witnessing.” The *Cheng weishi lun* and the *Commentary on the “Buddha Lands Sutra”* (Ch. *Fodijing lun*) add a fourth component: “being aware of being self-aware” (\**svasaṃvitti-saṃvitti*). In East Asia the fourth component gets directly associated with Xuanzang and his “new” Yogācāra, since his translations introduced it to East Asian audiences. Whether Wōnhyo’s resistance to the third and fourth components is purely philosophical or doctrinal, on the one hand, or a sectarian rejection of Xuanzang’s school, on the other, I leave to the reader to ponder.

25. Insect damage makes it hard to see whether the manuscript said “3” or “2.” “Three” seems to fit better with the context and subsequent arguments. Fortunately, Taehyōn (Ch. Taixuan) quotes this line in his *Cheng weishilun xueji* (XZJ 818.56c20–57a1) and thus confirms that the number here is “3.” There are other minor variations between the Taehyōn version and our manuscript, but the most significant difference is that Taehyōn provides a different “Critique” from that in the current manuscript. It is arguably a paraphrase of what our manuscript says, though it cannot be ruled out that he may be quoting something no longer contained in our incomplete manuscript: “Critique: These two are both inconclusive. The image arises in eye consciousness. Although included in the mental component, yet [the image component] itself is devoid of the capacity to be aware. When the discerning consciousnesses become image components—that is, the three images—although as images they lack the ability to be aware, nonetheless they are included as mental components” (ibid.). Taehyōn adds a comment noting that he disagrees with Wōnhyo’s analysis on this point. As for the argument as presented in our manuscript, note that, by undermining the third component, Wōnhyo has dispensed with the need to challenge the fourth. If the third is disallowed, the fourth, which is based on it, becomes moot.

26. “Which itself is what is aware” (Ch. *ji ti nengzheng*) might also be rendered “which itself is what verifies,” since the Korean *chūng* (Ch. *zheng*) has several meanings, including “to realize,” “to become aware of,” “to prove,” and “to verify.” Sometimes Wōnhyo seems to play off the two main senses—to be aware and to verify—but in the current usage I render it “what is aware” in anticipation of Wōnhyo’s follow-up arguments, which will be based on whether this component is or is not sentient, aware, a cognizer.

27. A proof very similar to this is found in Taehyōn’s *Sōng yusingnon hakki* (XZJ 80.30d6–7), fasc. 2, which he attributes to Wōnch’uk, not Wōnhyo: “Wōnch’uk said: [Thesis] The third, the self-aware [component], definitely exists, possessing the capacity to be aware. [Reason] Because it is a mental component. [Example] Like the perceiving component (*darśana* [*bhāga*])” (XZJ 818.56c18–20 // Z 1:80, p. 30d6–8 // R 80, p. 60b6–8).

28. Wōnhyo emphasizes that the two inferences reach different conclusions and thus cancel each other out, making both inconclusive, a category of logical fallacy Dignāga called *viruddha-avyabhicārin* (K. *sangwi kyōlchōng*), which Wōnhyo will discuss directly later. Technically a *viruddha-avyabhicārin* should involve two *valid* inferences that point to opposing conclusions; if either inference is invalid, then that is simply a false proof, and no *viruddha-avyabhicārin* status obtains for it in relation to another proof. In the present case, from the point of view of soundness of argument according to Dignāga’s principles, the first inference is simply invalid due to an improper example (absence of the disputed property in the positive example), while the second is not formally invalid, but by dealing with the existence or non-existence of something—citing a doctrinal authority as proof—it is also questionable. So these technically are not “inclusive”—the first is fallacious on its face, and the second is questionable. Wōnhyo, who in his other



writings displays a penchant for, even a love of, dialectical impasses leading to a transcending resolution, arranges his treatment of logic in the same vein.

29. A sound inference should not have more than one *pakṣa*—i.e., a thesis-to-be-proven. Wōnhyo here informs us that the inference has a compounded *pakṣa* with two distinct parts. The first is that “it exists because it is included among the doctrinal components of perception, like the Image component,” which would be a matter of *prasiddha*, something to settle by agreement between the disputants before entering into debate and not by inferences during debate. The second is that it is capable of perceiving, of being aware.

30. *Chūng* can mean “to experience or realize” or “to prove or verify.”

31. The five consciousnesses are the five sensory consciousnesses: visual-, auditory-, olfactory-, gustatory-, and tactile-kinetic-consciousnesses.

32. The argument seems to be as follows: if one claims that the various objects of the *nimitta* component are perceivable by the self-aware component because the *nimittas* are inseparable from the consciousnesses that perceive them, this would be impossible because (1) the *nimittas* are strictly *nimittas*, not to be confused with the three perceiving components, and (2) since the regular Perceiving component (*darśana*) is already perceiving the *nimittas*, assigning that task to the self-aware component would be superfluous.

33. An inference that contradicts itself (K. *piryang sangwi kwa*; Skt. *anumāna-viruddha*) is the second of the nine errors in the Thesis (*pakṣābhāsa*). The *Nyāyapraveśa* gives the following example of an inference that contradicts itself: “permanent, like a jar.” To make Wōnhyo’s point clearer, this is a matter of doctrinal classification. The first component, the *nimitta*, is one of the four *mental components* of a perceptual act, but *not* one of the three *Perceiving components* among those four. The other three are all classified as perceivers (*darśana*). His critique is that the arguments that are trying to prove the existence of a fourth component (and even a third) blur necessary lines of distinction between the various components and their functions. In defense of the theory itself, however, it should be pointed out that the “confusions” concerning the “characteristics of *dharmas*” hinge on details Wōnhyo himself has imposed on the theory, and not the explanations found in either the *Buddhabhūmyupadeśa* or *Cheng weishi lun*. If Wōnhyo is responding to an actual opponent who made these arguments in the name of this theory, rather than creating his own straw man, that opponent’s work is no longer available to us.

34. This commentary by Asvabhāva is a subcommentary on Vasubandhu’s commentary (*bhāṣya*) on Asaṅga’s *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. It was translated into Chinese by Xuanzang in ten fascicles (T 1598).

35. The Korean word *kyo* (Ch. *jiao*) means “teachings” and also means “scriptures” containing the teachings—in other words, the authoritative words and teachings of the tradition in written and oral form. The argument here will be about whether the *ālaya-vijñāna*, the eighth consciousness, should be accepted as an authentic teaching of the Buddha even though it is absent from the Hīnayāna scriptures.

36. The Āgamas are the non-Pali counterparts—in Prakrits or Sanskrit—to the Pali Nikāyas, which contain the sutras accepted by non-Mahāyāna Buddhists as the authentic words of the Buddha.

37. On “teachings” = “scriptures,” see note 35.

38. These actual inferences are not found in Asvabhāva’s text. Wōnhyo’s text is taking points that were made there in standard commentarial prose and has recast them into the threefold structure of an inferential proof. Whether these paraphrases are Wōnhyo’s

own, or something he adopted from one of the lost commentaries on the logic texts, is unclear. As a side note, perhaps it is important to keep in mind that, for Asaṅga and Vasubandhu (and Asvabhāva, at least while commenting on their texts), there are three valid means of knowledge: perception, inference, and scriptural authority. For Dignāga, only the first two are valid. Scripture requires validation by inference and perception, he claims, which is an idea already acknowledged by Asaṅga in his *Abhidharma-samuccaya*.

39. The manuscript is damaged here; almost the entire proof appears to be missing.

40. The six gates are the two eyes, two ears, and two nostrils.

41. The three consciousnesses are the sixth, seventh, and eighth (*mano-vijñāna*, *manas*, and *ālaya-vijñāna*), which are treated as distinct from the five sense consciousnesses. Hence the *ālaya-vijñāna* would not be included “among the three six-gate [consciousnesses].”

42. The point of the argument is to show that there are a variety of ways to classify and group different types of consciousness. Even within its own classificatory schema Hīnayāna can exclude some of the consciousnesses it accepts from certain formulations. Hence, the implication seems to be that simply because the eighth consciousness appears to be excluded from certain formulations of subsets of consciousness doesn’t mean it is not a consciousness. Since the prior inference to which this is responding is missing, exactly how this argument is meant to interact with that is unclear.

43. (Skt. *prasiddha*; K. *kūksōng*). In Dignāga’s system, in order to create an ecumenical level playing field in which opposing schools and traditions can debate, certain items within a proof must be accepted by both sides beforehand or else the inference itself is rendered fallacious. For instance, a Sāṃkhyan who accepts that there is an eternal self cannot use that *ātman* in a proof against a Buddhist, since Buddhists reject the idea of an *ātman* and would not consider anything argued on its basis valid. Conversely, a Sāṃkhyan would not accept “impermanent” as a property of sound in an inference proffered by a Buddhist. The *Nyāyapraveśa* includes four fallacies related to problems with *prasiddha* among the nine types of fallacious theses. The basis of disagreement might be either something conflicting with the doctrinal system of one of the disputants or something contrary to what is normally accepted as common sense. In this case, the existence of six consciousness is taken as doctrinally axiomatic by all Buddhists.

44. (Skt. *vipakṣa*; K. *yip’um*). When a proof is given in full, the Example portion includes both an inclusive, or positive, example (as we have seen so far in all the proofs above) that shares with the Thesis and the Reason the property-to-be-proven, and an exclusionary, or negative, Example, in which the property in dispute must be absent. Since Wōnhyo has so far provided only the bare-bones version of the three-part proof, which includes a positive example but omits the exclusionary example, it is not clear what he is referring to here (assuming the missing proof was not a full-blown proof with both examples, which is unlikely). For that matter, it is not clear what Wōnhyo understands an exclusionary example to be, since his usage here seems odd.

45. In its present form, this makes little sense and possibly is referring to the part of the proof missing from the manuscript. Wōnhyo may be alluding to the fact that the last proof “excluded” the *ālaya-vijñāna* from the “six gates,” but that exclusion occurs in the Thesis statement, not within an exclusionary example statement, since, as noted, Wōnhyo has been dealing with the streamlined version of proofs, which omits providing exclusionary examples.

46. (Skt. *pravṛtti-vijñāna*; K. *chōnsik*). Some texts define these as the seven

consciousnesses other than the *ālaya-vijñāna*; others define it as only the first six consciousnesses. Unlike the *ālaya-vijñāna*, which is always operating even during deep sleep and while one is unconscious and so on, the others operate sporadically and, at times, not at all—hence “fluctuating.” That he brings up this term here suggests it may have been included in the missing part of the proof.

47. This makes little sense in its present form. Wōnhyo may be confused concerning what an exclusionary example is, confusing it in the case of the opponent’s position with *aprasiddha* (nonagreement between disputants on an axiomatic issue), perhaps taking it to mean “what an opponent does not accept.” This may stem from his not having read Huizhao’s *Yinming yiduan* (T 1841:44.149b28–c14) carefully, assuming this was not written after Wōnhyo’s work. Huizhao (648–714) outlived Wōnhyo (617–686) by nearly thirty years.

48. Consciousnesses have various sorts of supportive conditions, one type being simultaneous support (Skt. *sahabhū-āśraya*; K. *kuyu ūi*)—that is, something occurring at the same time, in parallel, that influences that consciousness. This is a synchronic condition. While Wōnhyo here attributes the position that the eighth consciousness has such a simultaneous support to the *Cheng weishi lun* (see, e.g., T 1585:31.20c17–26), the argument is already found in the first chapter of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (see T 1579:30.279a25–280a18) and its *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* (see 651c2–14) and was already an important topic among Ābhidharmikas.

49. A *dharmīn* is that part of the Thesis which is the possessor of the property in dispute. The property possessed by the *dharmīn* is called the *dharma*. A *dharma* would be the disputed property. The *dharmīn* is the locus for the *dharma*. As for the fallacy Wōnhyo evokes (K. *yubōp ch’abyōl sangwi in*), this is the fourth of four types of contradictory Reasons listed in the *Nyāyapraveśa*. What he seems to be suggesting by applying this fallacy is the idea that in order to prove the existence of the *ālaya-vijñāna*, this consciousness would have to satisfy the definition of a consciousness, a definition that includes having a simultaneous support. If one denies it has this support, that is tantamount to saying it either does not exist or is something other than a consciousness. Wōnhyo will bypass somewhat the issue of simultaneity, instead focusing on a more general implication, namely what would it mean for something to not require *any* basis outside of itself. Such a thing would be so thoroughly independent of external influence that it would have to be unconditioned, something no consciousness can be, since consciousnesses are produced, moment by moment, by conditions. In other words, Wōnhyo focuses on the Reason (“Because it is the root [i.e., not derivative]”), taking that as if referring to any and all “bases,” not just a simultaneous basis, and thus sidestepping the issue of simultaneity.

50. It should be noted that the *Cheng weishi lun* discusses this topic in normal prose (T 1585:31.19c–22a) and in much more detail. Wōnhyo (or a source he used that is no longer available to us) has converted that discussion into a technical inference.

51. Assuming I am reading this correctly, it is at best an awkwardly worded proof, and Wōnhyo is about to exploit its awkwardness. The *paśadharma* (“having a sense-faculty as a simultaneous support”) is *not* present in the *sapakṣa* (“like the eye, etc.”), since the eye itself *is* the sense-faculty, and, according to Buddhist theories of perception, it does not take the other four sense-faculties as simultaneous supports (each sense cognizes its own sphere, not the spheres of the other senses). Additionally, the Reason (“because they are not included in what defines the six consciousnesses”) is ambiguous and misleading, since it is the exclusive property of the sixth consciousness to take the objects of the other five as its own objects as well, making it alone a candidate for both being a

sense-faculty and taking other sense-faculties as simultaneous supports. However, while *mano-vijñāna* is treated in Yogācāra as a sense-faculty, (1) it is only a consciousness, not a faculty, in standard non-Mahāyāna theory, and (2) what *mano-vijñāna* cognizes from the other senses are the perceptual objects (*viśaya*) cognized by the other five consciousnesses (*pañca-vijñāna*), so, technically, it is the other five consciousnesses—and not the other sense-faculties—that are serving as its simultaneous support.

52. (K. *nūngyōn*; Skt. *ālambaka*). This is the perceiver of an *ālambana*, an object that causes a cognition. The argument Wōnhyo is suggesting is that to insist that the eighth and seventh consciousnesses are unlike the other six, the aspect of the six that one would still have to specifically deny is their ability to cognize objects, especially sense objects. The *Cheng weishi lun* does claim that neither the *ālaya-vijñāna* nor *manas* has direct access to sense objects; they receive information about sense objects indirectly from the *mano-vijñāna*, which has more direct access to the objects experienced by the five senses. At issue here is also the claim by some Buddhists of a distinction between the sense organ (*indriya*), which is not the perceiver, and the corresponding consciousness, which is. That is, the eye organ does not perceive visibles; perception requires visual consciousness, for which the eye serves as a medium.

53. One would have to prove that these consciousnesses lack the nature of being perceivers, because the analogy was to the sense faculties—that is, the physical organs of sensation. According to some Buddhists, because these organs are matter rather than mental, they do not perceive but act as mediums for conscious perception.

54. Each of the six senses has its own sphere (*āyatana*) of operation, so that the visual faculty (eye) and visible objects are one sphere, the auditory faculty (ear) and sounds are another, and so on. The *āyatanas* of the five senses are *rūpic*—that is, constituted of physical materiality—while the *āyatana* of the mental sphere consists of a mental faculty (*manas*) whose objects are also mental, these mental factors being called *dharmā-āyatana*. The objector is claiming that since the *caittas* are mental, their objects are also exclusively mental (*dharmā-āyatana*), not physical.

55. “Dependence” (K. *yī*; Ch. *yī*) and “bases” (K. *suī*; Ch. *suōyī*) are worded similarly in Chinese, prefixed. Technically, despite Wōnhyo’s contention here that some important difference is to be recognized between *yī* and *suoyī*, both terms are often used interchangeably in Chinese for the same Sanskrit terms, such as *āśraya*, *āśrita*, *niśraya*, etc.

56. With all due respect to Wōnhyo’s distinctions, *āśraya* (basis) when used of consciousness, including the sixth, seventh, and eighth consciousnesses, often *does* imply their function as sense-faculties, though there can be other bases as well. Wōnhyo’s distinctions are unclear. Differentiating between dependence and basis perhaps is Wōnhyo’s way of implying that there are more types of dependencies than “relying on a basis.” The difference between a basis and a sense-faculty—given that the terms are often used synonymously in this literature—would seem to suggest that there are more types of bases than just the sense-faculties.

57. The Example is missing from this proof, and the Reason given is doctrinally problematic, suggesting the text is corrupt here (and, possibly, that Wōnhyo is setting up a straw man). Since this argument is attempting to make detailed distinctions between technical terms, I have left some key technical terms in Sanskrit, since English equivalents might obscure rather than capture the specific technicalities at issue. Even so, this argument remains unclear. The lack of an Example suggests a lacuna and/or textual corruption, as does the awkward phrasing (Ch. *zhi suo bu she gu* instead of the more correct Ch. *zhi bu suoshe gu*). The issue this and the following inference seem to be tackling is

whether or not the sixth consciousness operates simultaneously with the sense faculties, a matter that was disputed in Abhidharma and Yogācāra literature. Generally Ābhidharmikas such as Sarvāstivāda would insist that the *mano-vijñāna* receives the impression of the sense object a moment or so *after* the sense faculty contacted and cognized it, so that the object being cognized by the sixth consciousness is at a time delay, the actual sensation and its corresponding momentary object already in the past. Hence the moment of cognition for the sixth consciousness and the moment when the sense faculty came into contact with its object are not simultaneous, the latter having become nonexistent by the time the cognition registers in the *mano-vijñāna*. At stake for Wōnhyo is the question of the ways in which the eight consciousnesses, their respective types of objects, and so on are related and the ways in which they differ. What meaningful distinction obtains between the sense faculties and the *caittas*, or between the five senses and the three other consciousnesses? Are any of them unique? What, as consciousnesses, do they all have in common? However, the Reason “Because the sixth consciousness is not included among the *citta* and *caittas*” is simply doctrinally erroneous. A possible alternate reading—“Because the six consciousnesses are not included among the *citta* and *caittas*”—is equally problematic doctrinally. *Citta*, when used in its narrowest sense as the eighth consciousness, would by definition exclude the sixth consciousness, but when used in its more general sense—as it would be in the phrase “*citta* and *caittas*”—it would stand for any of the eight consciousnesses.

58. The *dharmāyatana* (= *dharmā* + *āyatana*) is the cognitive sphere of the sixth consciousness, consisting of the mental sense-organ, mental sense-objects, and the mental consciousness produced by their contact. *Rūpa* is generally taken to mean “physical matter” and also means “color.” See note 54 above. The question Wōnhyo is raising here is the following. Unlike the other five consciousnesses, which only cognize objects of their own sphere (*āyatana*)—vision sees only visibles, not sounds; hearing hears only sounds, not colors, and so on—the sixth consciousness has the unique ability to cognize the objects perceived by the other five senses. *Mano-vijñāna* does not have direct access to the external object but receives an image of it from the sense-consciousness. The red apple seen by the eye is *rūpa*, a material entity, but what is the status of the “red apple” that appears as a cognitive object to the *mano-vijñāna* by way of the visual consciousness? Is that also “material,” or has the apple become “mental”? The dominant opinion among most Buddhists, not just Yogācāra, would be that since the *dharmā-āyatana* itself is mental, not physical (*rūpa*), therefore its “objects” must also be mental, and thus mental representations of material entities, i.e., material entities converted into conceptualized versions, mental “replicas” (*sādrśya*).

59. (K. *sangwi kyōlchōng kwa*; Skt. *viruddha-avyabhicārin, anaikāntika-viruddhāvyabhicārin*). The sixth of six errors of indeterminacy in the Reason where two valid inferences (offered by the proponent and the opponent, respectively) are established to support two separate and mutually conflicting theses. Since both inferences are valid and satisfy the three requirements of an inference, they cancel each other, rendering the point under dispute inconclusive, despite the inferential validity of each proof. The *Nyāyapraveśa* gives this example: “‘Sound is impermanent, because it is produced, like a jar.’ And ‘Sound is permanent, because audible, like sound-ness.’ Both, taken together, make the Reason dubious [Skt. *saṃśaya-hetuvād*; K. *yuyō in*], since the two only combine into a single uncertainty [Skt. *eko 'naikāntikah*]” (*anityaḥ śabdaḥ kṛtakatvād ghaṭavad*|*nityaḥ śabdaḥ śrāvaṇatvāt śabdatvavad iti*|*ubhayoḥ saṃśaya-hetuvād dvāv apy etāv eko 'naikāntikah samuditāv eva*||). See the introduction to the translation.

60. “Conceptual consciousness” (K. *punbyōl sik*; Skt.  $\sqrt{klp}$ —*vijñāna*) is another name for the sixth consciousness, one that highlights its distinctness from the five senses in that it introduces concepts, *kalpanā*, to perception.

61. Attention (Skt. *manaskāra*; K. *chag’ūi*) is one of the “always operating” *caittas*.

62. Śabdavāda masters are those who hold that the Word (*śabda*) of the Vedas is eternal. *Śabda* means both “sound” and “word.” Debates in India on the question of the eternity or impermanence of *śabda* usually play on the double sense of *śabda*, on the one hand, arguing about the nature of sound and, on the other, keeping in mind that the subtext is the eternity, and thus validity, of the words of the Vedas, or “scripture.” During this period, Śabdavāda included most Hindu Grammarians (another meaning of *śabda-vāda*), such as Bhartṛhari; the Mīmāṃsīkās, whose entire orientation centered on the Vedas as a foundation for the religious life and performance of Vedic rituals for which they developed sophisticated theories of language and hermeneutic epistemologies (*śabda-pramāṇa*) in order to extract the full and correct meanings of the eternally true word of the Vedas; and especially the Sāṃkhyaans, who were the main targets of Dignāga’s critique of Śabdavāda. The Vaiśeṣikas, like the Buddhists, argued that sound is impermanent, and devoted a substantial portion of the second chapter of the *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra* (2.2.19–42) to refuting the eternity of sound (*śabda*), fully cognizant of the challenge to Vedic authority implicit in that refutation. The *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra* is probably the first Indian text to make the logical argument “Sound is impermanent.” Dignāga adopted his critique from the Vaiśeṣikas while refining the means for establishing the validity of the refutation of sound’s “eternity.” Nyāya also held that sound is impermanent (*Nyāya-sūtra* 2.2.13–57). Cf. *Nyāyapraveśa* T 32:1630.11c3–4, which attributes the Śabdavāda position to Sāṃkhya.

63. The founder of the Vaiśeṣika school of Indian philosophy is said to have been Kaṇāda (also known as Ulūka), to whom their foundational text, the *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra*, is ascribed. That text devotes a long section to refuting the claim that sound is eternal. See previous note.

64. As Dignāga explains in the *Nyāyamukha* (see introduction to the translation), a proof yields one of three results: it is either a valid proof, contradictory (and hence false), or inconclusive. Both the Vaiśeṣika and Buddhists find the Śabdavāda proof inconclusive, but for different reasons. The issue Wōnhyo will raise here is what sort of fallacy is committed by the Śabdavāda Thesis. Dignāga identifies several types of “inconclusive” (*anaikāntika*) Reasons: (1) too restricted (*asādhāraṇa*), (2) too inclusive (*sādhāraṇa*), and (3) inconclusive insofar as it allows contradictory conclusions to be drawn (*viruddha-avyabhicārin*). An example of an overly restricted Reason would be a property that belongs only to the item-to-be-proven (*sādhya*), such as “audibility,” since nothing other than sound is audible. Since it is a property exclusive to sound, it fails as a Reason, because no similar example (*sapakṣa*)—something different that shares the same property as the item-to-be-proven and the Reason—could share that property. This is a fallacy of being too restricted, because it permits no similar example. An overly broad Reason would be “sound is permanent, because intangible,” since intangibility is a property of many things, such as mental states, that are not permanent. “Audibility” as a Reason might be considered *viruddha-avyabhicārin*, since one could argue either that audibility entails that sound is permanent (since it is always available to be heard or made audible) or that sound is impermanent (since audible sounds occur only in a momentary way and then are terminated; cf. *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra* 2.2.29, which labels this transiency of sound *apavarga*, “comes to an end”). These are inconclusive Reasons, rather than simply false ones,



since the Reason itself (e.g., audibility, intangibility) is indeed true of the *dharmin* (sound) but is nonprobative for establishing the *dharma* (property; e.g., permanence, impermanence) of the *sādhyā*.

65. A similar Example (*sapakṣa*) is something that shares the disputed property with the *sādhyā* and the Reason and yet is a different type of thing than the *dharmin*. For instance, in the proof: “There is fire on the mountain, because there is smoke, like a kitchen stove,” the *dharmin* is the mountain, the Reason is smoke, the thing to be inferred is fire, and the similar example is a kitchen stove. “Kitchen stove” and “mountain” are different classes of things; what they share is being loci where the properties “smoke” and “fire” display concomitance. Hence, seeing smoke on a mountain, one validly infers that fire is also present.

66. A “dubious Reason” or “doubtful Reason” (K. *ūi’in*) is one in which the property-to-be-proven either is not found in the similar example or is not excluded from the dissimilar example, resulting in an inference being either “inconclusive” (K. *pujōng*) or “contradictory” (K. *sangwi*). This is defined in Dignāga’s *Nyāyamukha* at T 1628:32.2b6–11.

67. In a valid inference, the property-to-be-proven (*sādhyā*) must be present in the Reason and in the similar example and must be absent from the exclusionary example. If that property is instead absent from the similar example, then the proof is considered contradictory, since the three criteria of a valid proof (*trairūpya*) require that the property-in-dispute be found in all *sapakṣa* and absent from all *vipakṣa*. If the property is absent from the *sapakṣa*, one has contradicted one’s own proof. Since “audibility” cannot be posited of anything other than sound, no *sapakṣa* can be available, which is the same as saying the *pakṣa*’s property is absent from *any* possible *sapakṣa*. Therefore a proof in which the property-to-be-proven is absent from the *sapakṣa* is considered contradictory.

68. This discussion draws on verse 7 of Dignāga’s *Nyāyamukha*, T 1628:32.2b4–5 with his autocommentary, but actually beginning earlier. Dignāga explains that the *pakṣadharmā* is the property of the Thesis that, in order to make a valid inference, must also be shared by the Reason and the similar Example, while excluded from the exclusionary Example. To illustrate this, he uses the example of a debate over whether sound is eternal, introducing it by asking: When a Vaiśeṣika proposes the Thesis “Sound is not eternal” and yet offers no dissimilar Example, or he offers one not accepted by the opponent, can the inference still be valid? Dignāga replies that if no dissimilar Example can be given, that confirms that the *pakṣadharmā* does not reside in it, so no fallacy is incurred. Dignāga then offers his famous *hetucakra*, or wheel of Reasons, using the Thesis “Sound is/is not eternal” to illustrate the nine types of statements involving a Thesis and a Reason, showing which are valid, which are contradictory, and which inconclusive. Verse 7 then says: “A [*pakṣadharmā*] present in the positive example, in two (possible) ways, and absent from the negative example is a (valid) Reason. If otherwise, then [the inference] is contradictory or else inconclusive.” See the introduction to the translation for a translation and discussion of this section of the *Nyāyamukha*.

69. Dharma-master Munbi (K.) is Wenbei (Ch.; Tang dynasty, n.d.), one of the eleven commentators on Buddhist logic cited in Kuiji’s and Huizhao’s texts (e.g., in T 1840, 1841, and so on), but his commentaries are not extant. A biography of a Wenbei who came from Silla to Tang China, studied the major Mahāyāna sutras, and practiced Chan is given in *Shimen zhengtong* (The orthodox transmission of Buddhism), by the Song Tiantai monk Zongjian (XZJ 1513.318c10–319a7 // Z 2B:3, p. 416b13–c16 // R 130, pp. 831b13–832a16), but this biography makes no mention of *hetuvidyā*. He is listed in the *Bussho kaisetsu*

*daijiten* (1–203c) as the author of a nonextant work entitled *Inmyōng non so* (Ch. *Yinming lun shu*)—a commentary on Dignāga’s *Nyāyamukha*. We are able to establish the limit of the quotation, as this passage from Wōnhyo’s text is cited in *Immyō ronsho myōtō shō*, by Zenju (727–797), at T 2270:68.357b4—an indication that Japanese Hossō scholars were reading Wōnhyo. The passage from the *Nyāyamukha* that Munbi is discussing is at T 1628:32.2b17.

70. The three criteria (K. *in samsang*; Skt. *liṅgasya trairūpyam*) are (1) the property-to-be-proven is shared by the Thesis and the Reason; (2) it is found in the similar Example; and (3) it is absent from the exclusionary Example. Audibility, being “utterly unique,” fulfills only the first of these three criteria.

71. As explained in the introduction, the items included in a proof must be commonly accepted (*prasiddha*) by the disputants. The Reason “Because [sound has] visibility” violates common sense and thus is *aprasiddha*.

72. The four types of inconclusive Reasons are given in the *Nyāyamukha*. Generally, the subsequent East Asian tradition follows the *Nyāyapraveśa* and Kuiji’s *Great Commentary* in listing six types. Śāṅkarasvāmin calls the first of the four (or six) “inconclusive because it is shared both by the thing-to-be-proven [*sādhyā*] of the thesis [*pakṣa*] and by its opposite.” The *Nyāyapraveśa* offers this example: “[The pseudo-reason that is inconclusive because it is] shared: Such as saying, ‘Sound is permanent because it is a *prameya* [a valid object of knowledge],’ which is inconclusive because [being a *prameya* is a property that is] shared by permanent and impermanent *pakṣas*. Is sound impermanent because it is a *prameya*, like a jar? Or is it permanent because it is a *prameya*, like spatiality (*ākāśa*)?” The six types of inconclusive [*anaikāntika*] pseudo-reasons [*hetvābhāsa*] given by the *Nyāyapraveśa* 3.2.2 are (1) when the property of the Reason is shared (*sādhāraṇa*; K. *kong*) both by the property-to-be-proven (*sādhyā*) of the thesis and by its opposite; (2) when the property of the Reason is not shared (*asādhāraṇa*; K. *pulgong*) by either the *sādhyā* of the thesis or its opposite; (3) when the property of the Reason occurs in some of the similar examples while fully permeating the exclusionary example (*sapakṣaikadeśa-vṛttir vipakṣa-vyāpī*; K. *tongp’um ilbun chōn ip’um pyōnjōn*); (4) when the property of the Reason occurs in some of the exclusionary examples while fully permeating the similar example (*vipakṣaikadeśa-vṛtṭiḥ sapakṣa-vyāpī*; K. *ip’um ilbun chōn tongp’um*); (5) when the property of the Reason occurs in part of both examples (*ubhaya-pakṣaikadeśa-vṛtti*; K. *kup’um ilbun chōn*); and (6) when two valid inferences lead to opposite conclusions (*viruddha-avyabhicārī*; K. *sangwi kyōlchōng*).

73. See note 72.

74. This is the sixth type of inconclusive Reason listed in the *Nyāyapraveśa*. *Viruddha-avyabhicārīn* (K. *sangwi kyōlchōng*; Ch. *xiangwei jueding*) occurs when two inferential proofs, despite each being logically valid, nonetheless result in contradictory conclusions. On their own, each would be considered a valid inference, but combined they render each other inconclusive. The *Nyāyapraveśa* states: “An example of *viruddha-avyabhicārīn* is [the following]: ‘Sound is impermanent, because it is produced, like a jar.’ ‘Sound is permanent, because audible, like sound-ness.’ Both, taken together, make the Reason dubious [*samśaya-hetutvād*], since the two combine only into a single uncertainty.” Why Wōnhyo attributes to Madhyamaka the claim that an inference can lack the latter two marks—meaning that it fails to satisfy the requirements that the disputed property is present in the *sapakṣa* and absent in the *vipakṣa*, and satisfies only the first mark; i.e., the *pakṣadharmā* is present in the *hetu* and the *pakṣa*—and still be true, because of conditioned co-arising, is puzzling. I know of no Madhyamaka source making any such claim.



75. “Dubitable Reason” (Skt. *saṃśaya-hetu*; K. *ūi'in*; Ch. *yi'in*).

76. T 1628:32.2b15–17. The *Nyāyamukha* next says: “All [three] parts [of the inference] should share the [property of the] Reason without exception. If this [property] is only in that [one type of thing], even if both [that type of thing and the predicate being attributed to it] are not contradictory, it is a dubitable Reason.”

77. On “too restrictive” see note 64. Note that the Chinese rendering, *bugong* (K. *pulgong*), literally means “not shared,” so it is natural in Chinese to discuss this sense of “too restrictive” very concretely in terms of a property that is “not shared” by the parts of the proof. See note 67 on the *trairūpya* criteria.

78. This is perhaps Wōnhyo’s clearest statement about what he takes logic to be. This agenda helps clarify why he would find the *viruddha-avyabhicārin* dilemmas so intriguing.

79. Wōnhyo is performing a kind of etymological analysis on the Chinese phrase *yixiang li*, which I have been translating as “utterly unique,” based on how it is used in the *Nyāyamukha*. He splits the term into two parts—a common East Asian exegetical strategy, even when Chinese terms are equivalents for a single underlying Sanskrit word, as is likely the case here. *Yixiang* is often used to render *ekānta*, which means “alone,” “exclusive,” “single,” or “by itself.” The Chinese term can mean “exclusively,” “fully,” or “completely.” *Li* means “separate from” or “detached from.”

80. (Ch. Wengui [n.d.]). A Tang monk, specialist in Yogācāra and Buddhist logic; author of *Yinming ruzhengli lun shu* (Commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa*) (XZJ 848.694b4 // Z 1:86, p. 343d16 // R 86, p. 686b16) and numerous nonextant works listed in the *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten*. He is cited extensively in works on Hetuvidyā by Kuiji, Huizhao, and others. See T 1840, 1841.

81. The Japanese Hossō [= Yogācāra] monk Zenju (727–797) includes this passage in his *Immyō ronsho myōtō shō* (Bright lamp of annotations to (Kuiji’s) commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa*) at T 2270:68.362c12–14, with critical differences in his text that suggest corruption in our manuscript version. This explanation of this particular fallacy accords with that given in the *Nyāyapraveśa* and other basic logic texts.

82. The six types of inconclusive Reasons (Skt. *anekāntika-hetu*; K. *yuk pujōng*) are listed in the *Nyāyapraveśa*. See note 72.

83. The five *gotras* (families or lineages) are hearers, *pratyekabuddhas*, bodhisattvas, the undecided, and *icchantikas*. Hearers are followers of Hīnayāna; *pratyekabuddhas* attain awakening without association with Buddhism; bodhisattvas practice Mahāyāna to become buddhas; the undecided are ordinary people who have not committed to Buddhism; and *icchantikas* are incorrigible beings who lack the requisite qualities to become a buddha. These “lineages” are determined by which “seeds” one embodies. Bodhisattvas contain the uncontaminated seeds of Buddhahood and simply need to cultivate them and bring them to maturity to become a buddha. Although, according to one of the orthodox theories, the other *gotras* lack these buddha seeds, they may have the requisite seeds to attain enlightenment and *nirvāṇa* through one of the two vehicles (hearers and *pratyekabuddhas*). The undecided can always decide to follow one of the three vehicles and may have all the requisite seeds for Buddhahood. Only the *icchantikas* are said to be bereft of seeds needed for enlightenment or to attain *nirvāṇa*, much less Buddhahood. One Yogācāra theory, however, sees the *icchantikas* only as currently incorrigible in this present life, without ruling out that the requisite seeds might be acquired during some subsequent life.

84. “Lacking Buddha nature” = “lacking Buddha *gotra*”—that is, the seeds of

Buddhahood that would make one a member of the family of buddhas. Sentient beings who lack these seeds are called *icchāntikas*, “incorrigible ones.”

85. Wōnhyo appears to be playing on a double sense of the word “mind.” The Chinese *xin* (K. *sim*) renders the Sanskrit *citta*. The Sanskrit and the Chinese both mean “mind,” but, in some contexts, *citta* or *xin* may mean “desire, aspiration,” and this latter meaning occurs most importantly in the Buddhist doctrine of *bodhicitta*, generating the “aspiration for enlightenment.” This is also called *cittotpāda*, literally “the arising of the aspiration [for enlightenment].” Understood in the sense of “aspiration” rather than “mind” (though Wōnhyo is conjuring both senses), the argument would be that one becomes a buddha due to having an aspiration for enlightenment. Since buddhas are already enlightened, they don’t “aspire” for *bodhi* (enlightenment) since they already possess a *bodhi*-mind, an “enlightened mind.” Bodhisattvas, on the other hand, become buddhas because of their aspiration for enlightenment. However, if the word *xin* is taken only in this narrow sense of “aspiration [for enlightenment]” such that the *xin* in the Reason is understood as “aspiration” rather than “mind,” then the initial statement of the Thesis and Reason (“Even sentient beings lacking [Buddha] nature will become buddhas, Because they have the *aspiration*”) would become doctrinally impossible, since the defining characteristic of those bereft of such seeds, especially those who are labeled *icchāntika*, is precisely the absence of such an aspiration. And, according to the five-*gotra* theory, those who aspire for enlightenment but lack the seeds of Buddhahood can become arhats (Hīnayāna enlightened ones) or *pratyekabuddhas*, but not buddhas, regardless of their aspiration. It is this theory that Wōnhyo is trying to complicate.

86. It is unclear which list of four qualities (*guṇas*) Wōnhyo has in mind. There are thousands of occurrences of the term “four qualities” in the Chinese canon, and many in Yogācāra texts, that expound entirely different lists of four. One candidate that might fit Wōnhyo’s implied point here comes from the Tathāgatagarbha literature, which usually assigns four qualities to the *tathāgatagarbha*: permanence, purity, self, and pleasure.

87. Contradicting the teachings of one’s own school or tradition (K. *chagyō sangwi*; Skt. *āgama-viruddha*) is the third of the nine possible fallacies of the Thesis (K. *chong kugwa*): Since it is unclear what the four qualities are, it is difficult to specify which Mahāyāna tenets are being violated. The most obvious tenet would be collapsing the other vehicles into Mahāyāna, so that it loses its unique soteriological status. Wōnhyo will also cast this as an ambivalent contradiction in the doctrines concerning universal Buddhahood.

88. Also a case of K. *chagyō sangwi* (Skt. *āgama-viruddha*). See note 87.

89. Contradicting one’s own statements (K. *chagyō sangwi*; Skt. *svavacana-viruddha*) is the fifth of the nine possible fallacies of the Thesis.

90. The *Thirty Verses* (K. *Yusik samsip song*; Skt. *Triṃśikā*), by Vasubandhu, on which the *Cheng weishi lun* is an extended commentary, begins by stating that self (*ātman*) and *dharma*s are figurative expressions (*upacāra*) for mental fluctuations. The Mahāyāna tenet that both self and *dharma*s are devoid of selfhood is at stake.

91. (K. *soyōn*). The object-support is a contributing condition to perception. According to the *Cheng weishi lun*, an *ālambana* must be causal (i.e., be part of a causal chain that produces the perception), and it must be cognitive (i.e., involve mental processes). According to Dignāga in the *Ālambana-parīkṣā* (Investigation of the *Ālambana*), an *ālambana* must satisfy two criteria: (1) it must cause the perception, and (2) it must convey its own image to the mind of the perceiver. Since for Buddhism something is real to the extent that it is causal, an *ālambana* must be an image of something real and actual. An *ālambana* causes its own image to arise in one’s mind.

92. To make the Thesis and the Reason clearer, we might paraphrase them thus: What those who hold the view of self see is not a real self, because it is an *ālambana*, which means it has to be caused by something real. What one “sees” with the “view” of selfhood is not caused by what does not exist, so the *ālambana* cannot be a real self. Obviously this type of argument is tautological.

93. These two inferences are verbatim quotes from the *Cheng weishi lun*: T 1585:31.2a6–8.

94. This verbatim quote from the *Cheng weishi lun* comes from T 1585:31.6c21–22.

95. (K. *chin nūngp'a*; Skt. *dūṣāna*).

96. According to many texts, perception involves at minimum a component that sees or perceives (*darśana*) and an image (*nimitta*) that is perceived. The Chinese texts distinguish these as the seeing component (K. *kyōnbun*) and image component (K. *sangbun*), respectively. Scholars typically Sanskritize the *fen* (component) as *bhāga*, but neither that nor a comparable term is attested in any Sanskrit source in this context, suggesting that the *fen* was added by translators into Chinese for semantic clarity, not to reproduce an original Sanskrit term. At issue in the Thesis Wōnhyo presents is whether the images (*nimitta*) that the *ālaya-vijñāna* perceives (*darśana*) are of the *ālaya-vijñāna* itself (one common interpretation) or something other than the *ālaya-vijñāna*, the latter position apparently something that Wōnhyo finds to be contrary to Mahāyāna teachings. To problematize this Thesis, he reduces the problem to whether the *ālaya-vijñāna* can act as both subject and object of its perceptions. The exact nature of the argument and how he unpacks it are unknown, since it appears that a sizeable portion of the section of his text that carried that discussion is not available.

97. The manuscript is damaged here; what immediately follows is missing, and the CBETA version gives the closing verse here and a colophon. It then presents what follows as newly discovered, followed again by the same closing verse. When the text resumes here with the additional section, we are told that nine inferences had just been given, and the discussion has entered into issues of perception generally found in Abhidharma literature, taking up Saṅghabhadra—best known for his *Nyāyānusāra* (*Apīdamo shun zhengli lun*, T 1562, a detailed criticism of Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, both translated into Chinese by Xuanzang)—and mentioning multiple refutations; thus the amount of Wōnhyo’s text that is missing here appears to be significant. Although this additional portion is treated in the various printed editions as the conclusion of section 14 of the text—conceivable on the grounds that the issue of perception and of same versus different are continuations from the *ālaya-vijñāna* inference that begins section 14—we do not know with certainty whether this really is a continuation of this section or possibly part of another section, potentially extending what was originally the full text beyond the present 14 sections.

98. Without the discussion that contextualizes the terse statements of this inference, determining their meaning is difficult. I have rendered literally what the Chinese says. The Reason would seem to be referring to the notion of momentariness in which, at each moment, the causes of the previous moment have produced anew what exists, so that the eye, ear, nose, and so on are not the same from moment to moment but are in some important sense new and different each moment, even if what is caused to arise closely resembles what preceded, as it should since the antecedent causes played a role in its coming into momentary existence.

99. The text has an extra “because” (K. *ko*; Ch. *gù*) here, which, since that violates the syntax of inferences, should be considered extraneous.

100. Sphere of form (K. *saekcheo*; Skt. *rūpa-āyatana*). “Nominal form” (Ch. *jiase*; K. *kasæk*) is another name for *avijñapti-rūpa*, “nonindicative form,” an abhidharmic category that Vasubandhu eventually abandoned, and was thus also rejected by subsequent Yogācāra thinkers. Most types of *rūpa* are tangible, meaning they offer physical resistance (*pratigha*) and are usually visible (*nidarśana*, which also means “evident, displayed”). *Avijñapti-rūpa* is karmic and is considered “nonindicative” (meaning others do not recognize the intent it embodies, it doesn’t “communicate” or “show itself,” *avijñapti*); it is intangible (*apratigha*) and invisible (*anidarśana*). *Avijñapti-rūpa* basically refers to a supposed material residue resulting from a karmic act, whether positive (such as taking a vow) or negative (such as concealing a malicious intent), in which the intention was not revealed to others by bodily, verbal, or mental gestures, and which perdures until reaching karmic fruition. Many, such as Vasubandhu, questioned whether such a thing exists, and especially why this seemingly intangible, immaterial thing should be classified as a type of *rūpa*.

101. In its present form this section contains nine inferences, not ten. Within the section, Wōnhyo mentions “nine inferences.” If the tabulation “ten inferences” is meant to be complete, then only one inference (and possibly its attendant discussion) is missing. Since the tabulations at the end of many of the sections have been incongruous with the actual number of inferences found in those sections, contemplating these incongruities further in the absence of a fuller manuscript remains inconclusive speculation.

102. “Raise one corner” (K. *kō iru*) comes from the *Lunyu* (Analects of Confucius) 7–8, in which Confucius said: “If a student is not eager, I won’t teach him; if he is not struggling with the truth, I won’t reveal it to him. If I raise up one corner and he can’t come back with the other three, I won’t do it again.”



# Glossary

## Terms

*a'ae* 我愛  
*ach'i* 我癡  
*ae* (love, attachment) 愛  
*ae* (obstruction) 碍 (var. 礙)  
*ae piae to yönsaeng* 愛非愛道緣生  
*agyön* 我見  
*ajip* 我執  
*akchak* 惡作  
*aman* 我慢  
*an* 安  
*anju* 安住  
*anju sim* 安住心  
*aõ ch'wi* 我語取  
*arahan* 阿羅漢  
*arayasik* 阿賴耶識  
*ch'a* 此  
*cha õ sangwi (kwa)* 自語相違(過)  
*cha piryang* 自比量  
*chagyo sangwi (kwa)* 自教相(違)  
*chajǔng* 自證  
*chajǔng pun* 自證分  
*chang (hindrance)* 障  
*ch'ang* 彰  
*charyang (provisions)* 資糧  
*che* 除  
*ch'e* 體  
*chi (branch)* 支  
*chi (cognition; discrimination)* 智  
*chi (know)* 知  
*chi (of)* 之  
*ch'i* 癡  
*chi ae* 智礙  
*chi chang* 智障  
*chiae* 智碍  
*chijok sajong* 知足四種  
*chiju sim* 持住心  
*ch'ilsik* 七識  
*chin (anger)* 瞋

*chin (true)* 眞  
*chin nǔngp'a* 眞能破  
*chin soyu sǒng* 盡所有性  
*chinsil üi* 眞實義  
*chip* 執  
*chipchi sik* 執持識  
*chipch'wi* 執取  
*chip'um* 止品  
*ch'õ* 處  
*ch'oesang sǒngman posal chu* 最上成  
滿菩薩住  
*chõllyõ* 絕慮  
*chõn* 纏  
*chong* 種  
*chõng (concentration)* 定  
*chõng (purity)* 淨  
*ch'ong* 總  
*chõng chajõng pun* 證自證分  
*chong kugwa* 宗九過  
*ch'ongbo* 總報  
*chongbõp* 宗法  
*chõngdan* 正斷  
*chõnggũn* 正勤  
*chõnggyõn* 正見  
*chongja* 種子  
*chõngjang* 定障  
*chõngjang haet'al* 定障解脫  
*chõngjin* 精進  
*chõng'õ* 正語  
*chõngsõl* 正說  
*chõngsõng* 正性  
*chõngsõng yisaeng* 正性離生  
*chõnju sim* 轉住心  
*chõnsik* 轉識  
*chu* 住  
*ch'u (coarse)* 麤  
*ch'udae* 麤大  
*ch'uhaeng* 麤行

- chujj* 住地  
*ch'ujŏn* 羸纏  
*ch'ujung (debilitation)* 羸重  
*ch'ul segan to* 出世間道  
*chung* 重  
*chŭng (confirm)* 證  
*chŭng (increase)* 增  
*chŭng chajŭng* 證自證  
*chŭngsangyŏn* 增上緣  
*ch'wi* 趣  
*dokgak* 獨覺  
*hae (harm)* 害  
*haeju sim* 解住心  
*haeng* 行  
*haengsang* 行相  
*haet'al chang* 解脫障  
*haje* 下第  
*hap* 合  
*hoehyang* 回向  
*hok (mental disturbance, affliction)* 惑  
*hok (who)* 或  
*hudŭk chi* 後得智  
*hui'ong* 會通  
*hunsŭp* 薰習  
*hwahap inyŏn* 和合因緣  
*hwajaeng* 和諍  
*Hwajaeng Kuksa* 和諍國師  
*Hwajŏng Kuksa* 和靜國師  
*hye haet'al* 慧解脫  
*hyŏllyo mun* 顯了門  
*hyŏnhaeng pŏnnoe* 現行煩惱  
*ilch'e chi* 一切智  
*ilch'e chong chi* 一切種智  
*ilch'onje* 一闡提  
*ilmi* 一味  
*in* 因  
*in mua* 人無我  
*in samsang* 因三相  
*ingong* 人空  
*injip* 人執  
*inmyŏng p'almu* 因明八門  
*in'ŏp* 引業  
*ip* 立  
*ipchong* 立宗  
*ip'um ilbun chŏn tongp'um pyŏnjŏn*  
 異品一分轉同品遍轉  
*ip'um pyŏnmu sŏng* 異品遍無性  
*isuk* 異熟  
*isuk chang* 異熟障  
*isŭng* 二乘  
*ka sisŏl* 假施設  
*kae yu tori* 皆有道理  
*kae-hap* 開合  
*kahaeng to* 加行道  
*kak si kak ūi* 覺是覺義  
*kam* 感  
*ki* 起  
*ki pŏnnoe* 起煩惱  
*kiŏp* 起業  
*ko ha* 高下  
*kŏ iru* 舉一隅  
*koe* 壞  
*kong pujŏng (kwa)* 共不定(過)  
*kongdŏk* 功德  
*kongyong kwa* 功用果  
*ku yu tori* 俱有道理  
*kubun haet'al* 俱分解脫  
*kŭghwanhŭi chu* 極歡喜住  
*kugu in* 九句因  
*kujang haet'al* 俱障解脫  
*kŭksŏng* 極成  
*kŭmgang yujŏng* 金剛喻定  
*kŭn* 勤  
*kŭnbon chi* 根本智  
*kŭnbon mumyŏng* 根本無明  
*kung saengsa yŏnsaeng* 窮生死緣生  
*kup'um ilbun chŏn* 俱品一分轉  
*kusaeng* 俱生  
*ku'ŭi* 句義  
*kuyu ūi* 俱有依  
*kwabo* 果報  
*kye (tether)* 繫  
*kye myŏngja* 計名字  
*kyegŭm ch'wi* 戒禁取  
*kyegŭm ch'wigyŏn* 戒禁取見  
*kyŏl* 結  
*kyŏlchŏng sangwi pujŏng yang* 決定相  
 違不定量  
*kyŏlchŏng sim* 決定心  
*kyŏm* 兼  
*kyŏn* 見  
*kyŏn ilch'ŏ chujj* 見一處住地  
*kyŏn pun* 見分  
*kyŏnch'wi* 見取  
*kyŏnch'wi kyŏn* 見取見  
*kyŏndo* 見道

- kyǒng 經  
 kyǒngan 輕安  
 kyǒnggye 境界  
 kyǒngji 鏡智  
 man 慢  
 manasik 末那識  
 mangsang punbyǒl 妄想分別  
 mu (none) 無  
 mu kahaeng mu kongyong musang  
     chu 無加行無功用無相住  
 mu ru 無漏  
 mu tūk tori 無得道理  
 mubu mugi 無覆無記  
 mugando 無間道  
 mugi 無記  
 muhak 無學  
 mui pul suil 無二不守一  
 mujak saje 無作四諦  
 mumyǒng chuji 無明住地  
 mumyǒng ǒp 無明業  
 mumyǒng ru 無明漏  
 mun 問  
 muru to 無漏道  
 musaek kye 無色界  
 musaeng 無生  
 musaeng tūk tori 無生得道理  
 musoyu ch'ǒ 無所有處  
 myǒlchin chǒng 滅盡定  
 myǒlchu sim 滅住心  
 nan 亂  
 nanwi 煖位, 煖位  
 nayut'a 那由他  
 nūngbyǒl 能別  
 nūngch'wi 能取  
 nūnggyōn 能見  
 nūngnip 能立  
 o chu 五住  
 o chuji 五住地  
 o kwa chi pyǒl i 五果之別異  
 o kwa chi pyǒl kwa 五果之別果  
 o kyōn 五見  
 o p'yǒnhaeng 五遍行  
 o sik 五識  
 ǒn chǒng'ǒp cha chūksi sin'ǒp 言正業  
     者卽是身業  
 o'on 五蘊  
 ǒp 業  
 ǒpchang 業障  
 ǒpkye ko 業繫苦  
 pak (binding) 縛  
 pal chǒnggi kūn 發正起懃  
 pal kūnjǒng chin 發勤精進  
 pangp'yōn to 方便道  
 p'angyo 判教  
 panjiao 判教  
 pi anbo 菲安保  
 pi anbo sang 菲安保相  
 piryang 比量  
 piryang sangwi (kwa) 比量相違(過)  
 piyu 譬喻  
 po kwa 報果  
 pōb'in 法忍  
 pokchu sim 伏住心  
 pōmbu sasang punbyǒl nūngch'wi  
     soch'wi 凡夫邪想分別能取所取  
 pōmbu sasang punbyǒl soch'wi 凡夫邪  
     想分別所取  
 pongak 本覺  
 pōnnoe 煩惱  
 pōnnoe ae 煩惱礙  
 pōnnoe chang 煩惱障  
 pōnnoe chang haet'al 煩惱障解脫  
 ponsik 本識  
 ponsǒng kye 本性界  
 ponsǒng kye chǒngja 本性界種子  
 pōp (dharma) 法  
 pōpchip 法執  
 pōpki 法器  
 pōpkong 法空  
 pōppon 法本  
 pōpsang 法相  
 pōpsǒng 法性  
 pu chǒng kwa 不定過  
 pu choyu 不調柔  
 pujǒng 不定  
 pujǒng chi 不定地  
 pul kūksǒng 不極成  
 pulgong 不共  
 pulgong pujǒng 不共不定  
 pulgong pujǒng (kwa) 不共不定(過)  
 pulsōn 不善  
 pulsǒng 不成  
 punbyǒl 分別  
 punbyǒl ki 分別起  
 purhwan 不還  
 puryōm'o muji 不染污無知



*pyōkchi pul* 辟支佛  
*pyōl* 別  
*pyōn sijong pōpsōng* 遍是宗法性  
*p'yōngye* 遍計  
*pyōngyōn* 邊見  
*pyōnyōk saengsa* 變易生死  
*ru* 漏  
*sa (investigate)* 伺  
*sa chu pōnnoe* 四住煩惱  
*sa chuji* 四住地  
*sa ipchong* 似立宗  
*sa mugi* 四無記  
*sa muryang sim* 四無量心  
*sa sangwi kwa* 四相違(過)  
*sach'wi* 四取  
*saeg'ae chuji* 色愛住地  
*saekchō* 色處  
*saekkye* 色界  
*saeng (birth)* 生  
*saeng'ōp* 生業  
*sagwa* 四果  
*sagyōn* 邪見  
*sagyōn (four views)* 四見  
*sa'in* 似因  
*saji (cognition of phenomena)* 事智  
*saji (four kinds of cognition)* 四智  
*sajung muji* 事中無知  
*salgaya kyōn* 薩迦耶見  
*sam piryang* 三比量  
*samgye* 三界  
*samji chakpōp* 三支作法  
*samjong hunsūp* 三種熏習  
*samjong yōnsaeng* 三種緣生  
*samnu* 三漏  
*samsip ch'il to p'um* 三十七道品  
*sang (characteristic, mark)* 相  
*sang (concept)* 想  
*sangbun* 相分  
*sangha palch'e* 上下八諦  
*sangsok* 相續  
*sangwi* 相違  
*sangwi in* 相違因  
*sangwi kyōlchōng (kwa)* 相違決定(過)  
*sangwi kyōlchōng (pūjōng) (kwa)* 相違決定(不定)(過)  
*sayong kwa* 土用果  
*sayu* 似喻  
*se (subtle)* 細

*se cheil pōp* 世第一法  
*segan chayōnōp chi* 世間自然業智  
*segan to* 世間道  
*si anju sang* 是安住相  
*sibyuk sim* 十六心  
*sigak* 始覺  
*sikchu sim* 息住心  
*sim (investigate)* 尋  
*sim (mind)* 心  
*sim cha mu ch'ang yu cho* 心者無彰  
 有助  
*sim soyu pōp* 心所有法  
*simch'u* 心羸  
*simhūi* 心喜  
*simp'um* 心品  
*simso* 心所  
*simwang* 心王  
*sin* 信  
*sinch'u* 身羸  
*singyōn* 身見  
*sinhūi* 身喜  
*sinjok* 神足  
*sinjok sajong* 神足四種  
*sipchi* 十地  
*sipchong pōnnoe* 十種煩惱  
*sipp'algye* 十八界  
*sipsa* 十使  
*so ip* 所立  
*so sōngnip* 所成立  
*sobyōl* 所別  
*soch'wi* 所取  
*soji* 所知  
*soji chang* 所知障  
*sok* 俗  
*sōng (voice, sound)* 聲  
*sōng kyo* 聖教  
*sōng pōp p'aljong* 成法八種  
*sōngju sim* 性住心  
*sōngmun* 聲聞  
*sōngnon sa* 聲論師  
*sōn'gūn* 善根  
*sōnjōng* 禪定  
*sōpchu sim* 攝住心  
*soyōn* 所緣  
*su (follow, accord with)* 隨  
*su kyo chōk sōngch'wi* 隨教的成就  
*su pōnnoe* 隨煩惱  
*sudo* 修道

*sugwan* 隨觀  
*suksŭp kwa* 宿習果  
*sumyŏn* 睡眠  
*sun* 循  
*sungwan* 循觀  
*sunsin* 循身  
*sŭpki* 習氣  
*sŭpsŏng chongja* 習成種子  
*susa* 隨事  
*susin* 隨身  
*susŭp kwa* 數習果  
*suyong yŏnsaeng* 受用緣生  
*taebŏp non* 對法論  
*taech'i yun* 對治論  
*tan (abandonment)* 斷  
*tan (only)* 但  
*to p'um* 道品  
*t'ong* 通  
*tongbŏp* 同法  
*tongbŏp yu* 同法喻  
*tongp'um* 同品  
*tongp'um chŏngyu sŏng* 同品定有性  
*tongp'um ilbun chŏn ip'um pyŏnjŏn*  
 同品一分轉異品遍轉  
*tori* 道理  
*tŭk tori* 得道理  
*ŭi (doubt)* 疑  
*ŭi (pliancy)* 猗  
*ŭi'in* 疑因  
*ŭisik* 意識  
*ŭnmil mun* 隱密門  
*wi (for)* 爲  
*wi (rank)* 位  
*wi chung haeng chak in* 爲重行作因  
*wi haengju in* 爲行住因  
*wi sŏngch'wi so sŏl* 爲成就所說  
*wi sŏngch'wi so su* 爲成就所須  
*yeryu* 預流  
*yi (differ)* 異  
*yi (principle)* 理  
*yi (separate)* 離  
*yi sa sosŏl kae yu tori* 二師所說皆有道理  
*yi sŏl kae yu tori* 二說皆有道理  
*yibŏp* 異法  
*yijang* 二障  
*yiji* 理智  
*yi'ŏn* 離言  
*yip'um* 異品

*yisaeng* 離生  
*yisuk kwa* 異熟果  
*yŏ* 如  
*yŏ sŏn* 與善  
*yŏ sŏngŭn* 與善根  
*yog'ae chuji* 欲愛住地  
*yok* 欲  
*yok ch'wi* 欲取  
*yok ru* 欲漏  
*yokkye* 欲界  
*yŏm* 染  
*yŏm'o muji* 染污無知  
*yong* 用  
*yŏngak* 緣覺  
*yŏrae sim tŭk haet'al* 如來心得解脫  
*yŏsoyusŏng* 如所有性  
*yŏŭi chok* 如意足  
*yu* 喻  
*yu ru* 有漏  
*yu tori* 有道理  
*yuae chuji* 有愛住地  
*yubŏp* 有法  
*yubŏp ch'abyŏl sangwi in* 有法差別  
 相違因  
*yubu mugi* 有覆無記  
*yugak* 有覺  
*yuhak* 有學  
*yujak saje* 有作四諦  
*yujŏng* 有頂  
*yujŏng su* 有情數  
*yuk aesin* 六愛身  
*yuk ku* 六句  
*yuk kŭnbon pŏnnoe* 六根本煩惱  
*yuk pŏnnoe* 六煩惱  
*yuk pujŏng (kwa)* 六不定(過)  
*yuk t'amae* 六貪愛  
*yuk yŏmsim* 六染心  
*yuru chongja* 有漏種子  
*yuru to* 有漏道  
*yusik* 唯識  
*yusim* 唯心

## Persons

*Bi Pŏpsa (Bei Fa-shi)* 備法師  
*Choe Pŏmsul* 崔凡述  
*Ch'oenu* 最訥  
*Fazang* 法藏

*Fukihara Shōshin* 富貴原章信  
*Fukushi Jinin* 福士慈稔  
*Gyōnen* 凝然  
*Huiyuan (sixth century)* 慧遠  
*Huiyuan (seventh century)* 慧苑  
*Huizhao (Hyeso)* 慧沼  
*Ishii Kosei* 石井公成  
*Jeon Haeju* 全海住  
*Kim Chigyōn* 金知見  
*Kim Pusik* 金富軾  
*Ko Kum* 高金  
*Sanggallaju* 商羯羅主  
*Satō Shigeki* 佐藤繁樹  
*Shentai* 神泰  
*Shinjō* 審乘  
*Sōng Hōn* 成軒  
*Sūngjang* 勝莊  
*Sungyōng* 順璟(順憬)  
*Taehyōn* 大賢  
*Toryun* 道倫  
*Tullyun* 遁倫  
*Wenbei* 文備  
*Wengui* 文軌  
*Zenju* 善珠  
*Zhiyi* 智顛

## Texts and Collections

*Abidam pibasa ron* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論  
*Apitalma chapchip non so* 阿毘達磨雜  
 集論疏  
*Chang'ōm non* 莊嚴論  
*Che Punhwangsa hyosōng mun* 祭芬皇  
 寺曉聖文  
*Cheng weishi lun (Sōng yusingnon)* 成  
 唯識論  
*Cheng weishi lun liaoyi deng (Sōng  
 yusingnon yoŭi tūng)* 成唯識論  
 了義燈  
*Chidan kyōng* 指端經  
*Chōnsik non* 轉識論  
*Chungbyōn punbyōllon* 中邊分別論  
*Chungbyōn punbyōllon so* 中邊分別  
 論疏  
*Daciensi Sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩  
 寺三藏法師傳  
*Dasheng apidamo jilun* 大乘阿毘達  
 磨集論

*Fodijing lun* 佛地經論  
*Haesimmil kyōng* 解深密經  
*Haesimmil kyōng so* 解深密經疏  
*Huajanjing tanxuan ji* 華嚴經探玄記  
*Hwaōm kyōng* 華嚴經  
*Hyōnsik non* 顯識論  
*Hyōnyang sōnggyo non* 顯揚聖教論  
*Immyō ronsho myōtō shō* 因明論疏明  
 燈抄  
*Imun non* 理門論  
*Inmyōng chōngni mun non* 因明正理  
 門論  
*Inmyōng chōngni mun non pon* 因明正  
 理門論本  
*Inmyōng ip chōngni mun* 因明入正  
 理論  
*Inmyōng ip chōngni non ki* 因明入正  
 理論記  
*Inmyōng non so* 因明論疏  
*Inwang kyōng* 仁王經  
*Ip nūngga kyōng* 入楞伽經  
*Kandŏng ji* 刊定記  
*Kosōnsa Sōdang Hwasang Tapbi* 高仙  
 寺誓幢和尚塔碑  
*Kugyōng ilsūng posōng non kwa-  
 mun* 究竟一乘寶性論科文  
*Limen lun shu ji* 理門論述記  
*Muryangsu kyōng chong'yo;* 無量壽  
 經宗要  
*Musōngsōp non (Ch. Wūxìngshè  
 lùn)* 無性攝論  
*Narachō Genzai Issai kyōso Moku-  
 roku* 奈良朝現在一切經疏目錄  
*Nūng kyōng chong'yo* 楞經宗要  
*Nūngga kyōng so* 楞伽經疏  
*Paekpōp myōngmun* 百法明門  
*P'an piryang non* 判比量論  
*Pon'ōp kyōng* 本業經  
*Pōphwa chong'yo;* 法華宗要  
*Posal chiji kyōng* 菩薩地持經  
*Posal kyebon chibōm yogi* 菩薩戒本  
 持犯要記  
*Posal yōngnak pon'ōp kyōng so* 菩薩  
 瓔珞本業經疏  
*Posōng non* 寶性論  
*Posōng non chong'yo* 寶性論宗要  
*Posōng non yogan* 寶性論料簡  
*Puin kyōng* 夫人經

- Pujŭng pulgam kyōng* 不增不減經  
*Pujŭng pulgam kyōng so* 不增不減經疏  
*Pulchigyōng non* 佛地經論  
*Pulsōng non* 佛性論  
*Pyōn chungbyōllon* 辯中邊論  
*San musōng non* 三無性論  
*Shiragi so Gangyō denkō* 新羅信元曉傳考  
*Sinpyōn chejong kyojang chongnok* 新編諸宗教藏總錄  
*Sipbon kyōngnon yijang ch'esōl* 十本經論二障諦說  
*Sipchi kyōng non* 十地經論  
*Sipchu pibasa ron* 十住毘婆沙論  
*Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳  
*Sōng yusingnon chong'yo* 成唯識論宗要  
*Sōng yusingnon hakki* 成唯識論學記  
*Sōnggyo non* 顯揚論  
*Sōp taesūng non* 攝大乘論  
*Sōp taesūng non sech'in sōngnon yakki* 攝大乘論世親釋論略記  
*Sōp taesūng non so* 攝大乘論疏  
*Sōp taesūng non sōk* 攝大乘論釋  
*Sūngman kyōng* 勝鬘經  
*Sūngman kyōng so* 勝鬘經疏  
*Taebōp non* 對法論  
*Taesūng abidalma chapchimnon* 大乘阿毘達磨雜集論  
*Tongsa yōlchōn* 東師列傳  
*Wōn'gak kyōng* 圓覺經  
*Yang sōmnon soch'o* 梁攝論疏抄  
*Yijang ūi* 二障義  
*Yinming ruzhengli lun* 因明入正理論  
*Yinming ruzhengli lun shu* 因明入正理論疏  
*Yinming yiduan* 因明義斷  
*Yinming zhengli men lun* 因明正理門論  
*Yōlban chong'yo* 涅槃宗要  
*Yōlban kyōng* 涅槃經  
*Yuga ch'o* 瑜伽抄  
*Yuga saji ron* 瑜伽師地論  
*Yugaron chungsil* 瑜伽論中實  
*Yugaron ki* 瑜伽論記  
*Yuishiki gitōsō myō ki* 唯識義燈增明記



# Bibliography

## East Asian Canonical Collections

- Han'guk Pulgyo chōnsō 韓國佛教全書 (The collected works of Korean Buddhism). Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1979.
- Taishō shinshū daizōkyō 大正新脩大藏經 (Revised Tripiṭaka compiled during the Taishō period). Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭, eds. Tokyo: Daizō kyōkai, 1924–1935.
- Wōnhyo sōngsa chōnsō 元曉聖師全書 (Collected works of the sagely teacher Wōnhyo). Seoul: Cheil munhwa sa, 1989.
- Xu Zangjing (Xin wenfeng reprint). Taipei: Xin wenfeng chu-ban-she. (CBETA digital text used for most locations.)

## East Asian Canonical Sources

- Abidan pibosha lun* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論. By Kātyāyanīputra 迦多衍尼子. 60 fasc. T 1546:28.1–416. (Trans. Futuo Bamo 浮陀跋摩 and Daotai 道泰 et al.)
- Bian zhongbianlun shuji* 辯中邊論述記. By Kuiji 窺基. 3 fasc. T 1835:44.1a–46a.
- Bore denglun shi* 般若燈論釋. Trans. Prabhākaramitra 波羅頗蜜多羅. 15 fasc. T 1566:30.50c–135c.
- Buzeng bujian jing* 不增不減經. Trans. Bodhiruci 菩提流支. 1 fasc. T 668:16.466–468.
- Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論. By Xuanzang 玄奘. 10 fasc. T 1585:31.1a–59a.
- Chengshi lun* (\**Satyasiddhi-śāstra*). Attributed to Harivarman. T 1646:32.239–375.
- Da ban niepan jing* 大般涅槃大般涅槃經 (*Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*). Trans. Dharmakṣema 曇無讖. 40 fasc. T 374:12.365c–603c.
- Dafanguang yuanjue xiuduluo liaoyi jing* 大方廣圓覺修多羅了義大般涅槃經 (Sūtra of perfect enlightenment). 1 fasc. T 842:17.913a–922a.
- Dasheng baifa mingmen lun* 大乘百法明門論. By Vasubandhu; trans. Xuanzang. 1 fasc. T 1614:31.855b–c.
- Dasheng qixinlun yiji* 大乘起信論義記. By Fazang 法藏. 3 or 5 fasc. T 1846:44.240–287.
- Dazhi du lun* 大智度論 (*Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*). Attributed to Nāgārjuna 龍樹. Trans. Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什. 100 fasc. T 1509:25.57c–756b.
- Fodijing lun* 佛地經論. By Bandhuprabha 親光. 7 fasc. T 1530:26.291–328.
- Gokyōsho tsūro ki* 五教章通路記. By Gyōnen 凝然. 52 fasc. T 2339:72.295a–615a.
- Huayan jing* 華嚴經. *Avatamsaka-sūtra*. Trans. Buddhahadra 佛跋跋陀. 60 fasc. T 278:9.395a–788b.
- Huayan jing* 華嚴經. *Avatamsaka-sūtra*. Trans. Śikṣānanda 實叉難陀. 80 fasc. T 279:10.1b–444c.
- Jie shenmi jing* 解深密大般涅槃經 (*Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*). Trans. Xuanzang 玄奘. 5 fasc. T 676:16.688b–711b.
- Kegon gokyōsho mondō shō* 華嚴五教章問答抄. By Shinjō 審乘. 15 fasc. T 2340:72.617a–767c.

- Langqie abaduoluo baojing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經 (*Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*). Trans. Guṇabhadra 求那跋陀羅. 4 fasc. T 670:16.479–513.
- Mile pusa suowen jinglun* 彌勒菩薩所問經論. Trans. Bodhiruci 菩提留支. 9 fasc. T 1525:26.233–273.
- Nanzan nishōgi shō* 南山二障章. By Gyōnen 凝然. 1 fasc. Contained in the *Shoshū shōso roku* 諸宗章疏錄 (compiled by Murakami Susumu et al. in 1790).
- Nishōtai dōji* 二障体同事. By Fuiichi Chōrō 普一長老. Hōshūin 寶壽院 edition.
- Pusa dichí jīng* 菩薩地持經 (*Bodhisattvabhūmi-sūtra*). Trans. Dharmakṣema 曇無讖. 10 fasc. T 1581:30.888–959.
- Pusa yingluo benye jīng* 菩薩瓔珞本業經. 2 fasc. T 1485:24.1010b–1023a.
- Renwang huguo bore boluomi jīng* 仁王護國般若波羅蜜經. Trans. Fugong 不空. 2 fasc. T 246:8.825a–846a.
- She dasheng lun* 攝大乘論 (*Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra*). Attributed to Asaṅga 無著. 3 fasc. T 1593:31.112b–132c.
- She dasheng lun shi* 攝大乘論釋. Trans. Paramārtha 真諦. 15 fasc. T 1595:31.152–271.
- Shengman shizi hu yisheng da fangbian fangguang jīng* 勝鬘師子吼一乘大方便廣經 (*Śrīmālādevī-siṃha-nāda-sūtra*). Trans. Guṇabhadra 求那跋陀羅. 1 fasc. T 353:12.217a–223b.
- Shidi jinglun* 十地經論 (*Daśabhūmikasūtra-sāstra; Daśabhūmikabhāṣya*). By Vasubandhu. Trans. Bodhiruci 菩提流支 et al. 12 fasc. T 1522:26.123b–203b.
- Shier men lun* 十二門論. Attributed to Nāgārjuna. Trans. Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什. 1 fasc. T 1568:30.159c–167c.
- Shizhu piposhalun* 十住毘婆沙論 (*Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā*). Attributed to Nāgārjuna 龍樹. Trans. Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什. 17 fasc. T 1521:26.20–123.
- Shou lengyan jīng* 首楞嚴大般涅槃經 (*Śūraṅgama-sūtra*). Trans. attributed to Pramiti 般刺蜜帝, but probably apocryphal. 10 fasc. T 945:19.106b–155b.
- Shuo wugoucheng jīng* 說無垢稱大般涅槃經 (*Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*). Trans. Xuanzang 玄奘. 6 fasc. T 476:14.557–587.
- Sippon kyōngnon yijang ch'esōl* 十本經論二障體說 (Explanation of the constitution of the two hindrances through the texts of ten scriptures and treatises). By Ch'oenuil 最訥. HPC 10.46–47.
- Sōk hwaōm kyobungi wōnt'ong ch'o* 釋華嚴教分記圓通鈔. By Kyunyō 均如. 10 fasc. HPC 4.239–510.
- Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (Song biographies of eminent monks). By Zanning 贊寧 et al. 30 fasc. T 50:2061.709a–900a.
- Surūng'ōm kyōng hwanhae sanbogi* 首楞嚴經環解刪補記. By Pohwan 普幻. 2 fasc. HPC 6.418–479.
- Taesūng kisillon pyōlgi* 大乘起信論別記. By Wōnhyo. 2 fasc. HPC 1.677–697; T 44:1845.226a–240c.
- Xianyang shengjiao lun* 顯揚聖教論. 20 fasc. T 1602:31.480b–583b.
- Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 (*Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*). Trans. Xuanzang 玄奘. 100 fasc. T 1579:30.279–882.
- Yuqie shidi lun lüezuan* 瑜伽師地論略纂. By Kuiji. 16 fasc. T 1829:43.1a1–228b5.
- Zhuanshi lun* 轉識論. Attributed to Vasubandhu 世親. Trans. Paramārtha 真諦. 1 fasc. T 1587:31.61c–63c.

## Modern Works

- Anacker, Stefan. *Seven Works of Vasubandhu*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.
- Anālayo. *Satipaṭṭhāna: The Direct Path to Realization*. Birmingham, UK: Windhorse, 2003.
- Arnold, Dan. *Buddhists, Brahmins, and Belief: Epistemology in South Asian Philosophy of Religion*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Bhattacharya, Kamaleswar. *The Dialectical Method of Nāgārjuna: Vīgrahavyāvartanī*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. Vol. 2. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2000.
- . *In the Buddha's Words: An Anthology of Discourses from the Pāli Canon*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2005.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. *Cultivating Original Enlightenment: Wōnhyo's Exposition of the Vajrasamādhi-sūtra (Kūmgang Sammaegyōng Non)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.
- . *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Carr, Brian, and Indira Mahalingam, eds. *Companion Encyclopedia of Asian Philosophy*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Chibetto Buntten Kenkyūkai. *Chibetto bunken ni yoru Bukkyō shisō kenkyū* 西藏文献による仏教思想研究. Tokyo: Chibetto buntten kenkyūkai, 1979.
- Ch'ŏ Myōng-gi 趙明基. *Wōnhyo taesa chōnjip* (Edited version of the collected works of Wōnhyo). Seoul: Poryōn-gak, 1978.
- Ch'oe Namsōn. "Chosōn Pulgyo: Tongbang munhwasa sang ae iu nūn kŭ chiwi" (Chosōn Buddhism and its place in Oriental cultural history). *Pulgyo* 74 (1931).
- Ch'oe Yujin. "Wōnhyo ūi hwajaeng sasang yōn'gu" (Study of Wōnhyo's harmonization thought). Ph.D. diss., Seoul National University, 1988.
- Choong, Mun-keat. *The Notion of Emptiness in Early Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.
- de Jong, Jan Willem. *Nāgārjuna: Mūlamadhyamakakārikāḥ*. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1977.
- Dutt, Nalinakhsa, ed. *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. Patna, India: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1978.
- Frauwallner, Erich. *Die Philosophie des Buddhismus*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969.
- Fukushi Jinin 福土慈稔. "Gangyō no shisō wo wasō shisō to toraeru koto ni taishite" 元曉の思想を和諍思想と捉えることに対して (Concerning the applicability of *Hwajaeng* for characterizing Wōnhyo's thought). *Bukkyōgaku* 佛教學 64 (2004): 25–42.
- Gethin, Rupert. *The Buddhist Path to Awakening: A Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiya Dhamma*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- . *The Foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Gokhale V. V., ed. "Fragments from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* of Asaṅga." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Bombay Branch), n.s., 32 (1947): 13–38.
- Gombrich, Richard F. *How Buddhism Began: The Conditioned Genesis of the Early Teachings*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1996.
- Guenther, H. V. *Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1959.
- Harris, Ian Charles. *The Continuity of Madhyamaka and Yogācāra in Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 1991.



- Hattori Masaaki. *Dignāga: On Perception*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Hirakawa Akira. *Daijō kishinron*. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1973.
- Hiriyanna, Mysore. *The Essentials of Indian Philosophy*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1951.
- . *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994.
- Huntington, C. W., Jr. *The Emptiness of Emptiness: An Introduction to Early Indian Madhyamika*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1989.
- Inada, Kenneth K. *Nāgārjuna: A Translation of His Mūlamadhyamakakārikā with an Introductory Essay*. Tokyo: Hokuseidō Press, 1970.
- Ishida Mosaku, ed. *Narachō genzai issai kyōso mokuroku* (Catalogue on the commentaries and entire scriptures of the present Nara dynasty). Tokyo: 1930.
- Ishii Kōsei 石井公成. “Gangyō no wasō shisō no genryū: Ryogakyō to no kanren wo chūshin to shite” 元曉の和諍思想の源流—『楞伽經』との関連を中心として—。 *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 51, no. 1 (2002).
- . “Gangyō to Chūgoku shisō” 元曉と中国思想。 *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 31, no. 2 (1983).
- . “Shiragi bukkyō ni okeru Daijō kishinron no igi: Gangyō no kaishaku wo chūshin to shite” 新羅仏教における『大乘起信論』の意義—元曉の解釈を中心として—。 Hirakawa Akira, ed. In *Nyoraizō to Daijō kishinron* 如来蔵と大乘起信論, 545–583. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1990.
- Jamspal, Lozang, et al. *The Universal Vehicle Discourse Literature*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies, 2004.
- Jeon Horyeon (Haeju 海住). “Gangyō no wasō genri: kegon issin ni tsuite” 元曉の和諍原理—華嚴一心について—。 *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 48, no. 1 (1999).
- . “Wōnhyo ui hwaajaeng kwa Hwaōm sasang” (Wōnhyo’s harmonization of disputes and Huayan thought). *Hanguk bulgyo hak* 43 (1998). Seoul: Korean Association of Buddhist Studies.
- Kalupahana, David J. *Causality: The Central Philosophy of Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1975.
- Karashima, Seishi. “Who Were the *icchantikas*?” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* (March 2007): 67–80.
- Keenan, John, trans. *The Summary of the Great Vehicle*. Berkeley, CA: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1992.
- Kim Sanghyōn. *Wōnhyo yōn'gu* (Study of Wōnhyo). Seoul: Minjoksa, 2000.
- Kim Yong-pyo. “Wōnhyo’s Essentials of the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*.” *International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture* 6 (February 2006).
- King, Winston L. *Theravāda Meditation: The Buddhist Transformation of Yoga*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980.
- Ko Ikchin 高翊晉. “Wōnhyo ūi Hwaōm sasang” (Wōnhyo’s Huayan thought). *Han'guk hwaōm sasang yōn'gu*. Seoul: Buddhist Cultural Research Institute, Dongguk University, 1997.
- Lamotte, Étienne. *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra—L'explication des mystères*. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1935.
- . *La somme du grand véhicule d'Asaṅga (Mahāyānasamgraha)*. Louvain: Museon, 1938.
- , trans. *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*. 5 vols. Louvain: Institut orientaliste, Bibliothèque de l'Université de Louvain, 1944.

- Lancaster, Lewis R., and Chai-shin Yu, eds. *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty*. Vol. 8. Berkeley, CA: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.
- Lévi, Sylvain. *Asaṅga: Mahāyāna-sūtrāḷaṃkāra; Exposé de la doctrine du grand véhicule selon le système Yogācāra*. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1907.
- . *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: Deux traités de Vasubandhu*. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1925.
- Lindtner, Christian. *Nāgārjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987. First published 1982 by Institute for Indisk Filologi, Copenhagen.
- Lusthaus, Dan. *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogācāra Buddhism and the Ch'eng Wei-shih Lun*. London: Routledge-Curzon, 2002.
- . “A Pre-Dharmakīrti Indian Discussion of Dignāga Preserved in Chinese Translation: The *Buddhabhūmy-upadeśa*.” *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 6 (2009): 19–81.
- . “Yogācāra Theories of the Components of Perception: The *Buddhabhūmyupadeśa*.” In *Readings in Buddhist Philosophy*, ed. Jay Garfield and William Edelglass, 205–217. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Malvania, Dalsukh Bhai, ed. *Ācārya-Dharmakīrti-kṛta-Nyāyabindor ācārya-Dharmottara-kṛta-ṭīkāyā aṇuṭīkārūpaḥ paṇḍita-Durvekamīśra-kṛto Dharmottara-pradīpaḥ*. Rev. ed. Patna, India: Bhoṭadeśīya-Saṃskṛta-granthamālā, 1971.
- Monier-Williams, Monier, Sir. *A Sanskrit English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged, with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960.
- Muller, A. Charles. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*. <http://buddhism-dict.net/ddb/>.
- . “Explanation of the Essence of the Two Hindrances through Ten Canonical Texts.” In *Korean Buddhism in East Asian Perspectives*, 191–213. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2007.
- . “Faith and the Resolution of the Four Doubts in Wonhyo’s *Doctrinal Essentials of the Sūtra of Immeasurable Life (Muryangsu gyeong jong’yo)*.” *Bulletin of Tōyō Gakuen University* 15 (March 2007): 1–15.
- . “*Hwajaeng* 和諍: The Bases, Methods, and Manifestations of Wonhyo’s Resolution of Doctrinal Discrepancies.” *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research*. Forthcoming.
- . *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment: Korean Buddhism’s Guide to Meditation (with Commentary by the Sōn Monk Kihwa)*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1999.
- . “Wonhyo on the *Lotus Sūtra*.” *Studies in Indian Philosophy and Buddhism* 印度哲学仏教学研究 (March 2009): 25–38. Tokyo University: Department of Indian Philosophy and Buddhist Studies.
- . “Wonhyo’s Reliance on Huiyuan in His Exposition of the Two Hindrances.” *Bulletin of Tōyō Gakuen University* 14 (March 2006): 1–16.
- . “The Yogācāra Two Hindrances and Their Reinterpretations in East Asia.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 27, no. 1 (2004): 207–235.
- , trans. *Zhuangzi*. <http://www.acmuller.net/con-dao/zhuangzi.html>.
- Nagao, Gadjin. *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya: A Buddhist Philosophical Treatise Edited for the First Time from a Sanskrit Manuscript*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964.
- Nyanaponika, Thera, ed. *Karma and Its Fruit: Selected Essays*. The Wheel Publication no. 221/224. Kandy, Sri Lanka: Buddhist Publication Society, 1990.
- O Pōb’an. *Wōnhyo ūi hwajaeng sasang yōn’gu* (Wōnhyo’s theory of harmonization). Seoul: Hongdōbwōn, 1988.

- Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日. “Gangyō no nishōgi ni tsuite” (On the meaning of the two hindrances of Wōnhyo). *Tōhō gakuho* 11 (1940).
- . *Nishōgi: Kenkyū hen*. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1979.
- Ono Gemmyō 小野玄妙. *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1933–1935.
- Orzech, Charles D. *Politics and Transcendent Wisdom: The Scripture for Humane Kings in the Creation of Chinese Buddhism*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.
- Pandeya, Ram Chandra, ed. *Madhyānta-vibhāga-sāstra: Containing the Karikas of Maitreya, Bhyasya of Vasubandhu and Tika by Sthiramati*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.
- Park Chong Hong. *Han’guk sasang sa* (History of Korean thought). Seoul: 1972.
- . “Wōnhyo’s Philosophical Thought.” Trans. Robert E. Buswell Jr. In *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea: Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla Dynasty*, ed. Lewis R. Lancaster and C. S. Yu, 47–103. Berkeley, CA: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.
- Park, Sung Bae. *Buddhist Faith and Sudden Enlightenment*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1983.
- . “Silla Buddhist Spirituality.” Takeuchi Yoshinori, ed. In *Buddhist Spirituality II: Later China, Korea, Japan and the Modern World*, 57–78. Crossroad Publishing Co., 1999.
- . “Wōnhyo ūi nollu kujo” (The structure of Wōnhyo’s logic). In *Wōnhyo ūi sasang ch’egye wa Wōnhyo chōnsō yōngyōk sang ūi che munje* (Wōnhyo’s thought system and various problems in the English translation of the complete works of Wōnhyo). Seoul: Dongguk University Press, 1997.
- . “Wōnhyo’s Commentaries on the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna*.” Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1979.
- Paul, Diana Y. *Philosophy of Mind in Sixth-Century China: Paramārtha’s “Evolution of Consciousness.”* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1984.
- . *The Sūtra of Queen Śrīmālā of the Lion’s Roar*. Berkeley, CA: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2004.
- Plassen, Jörg. “Entering the Dharma-gate of Repeated Darkening: Towards a Reassessment of Hwajaeng in Its Chinese Context.” In *Korean Buddhism in East Asian Perspective*, ed. Geumgang Center for Buddhist Studies, Geumgang University, 213–241. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2007.
- Powers, John. *Wisdom of Buddha: The Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra*. Berkeley: Dharma Publishing, 1994.
- Pradhan, Prahlad, ed. *Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asaṅga*. Santiniketan, India: Visva-Bharati, 1950.
- Prasad, Hari Shankar, ed. *The Uttaratantra of Maitreya*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1991.
- Rahula, Walpola, trans. *Le compendium de la super-doctrine (philosophie) (Abhidharma-samuccaya) d’Asaṅga*. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1980.
- . *What the Buddha Taught*. New York: Grove Books, 1959.
- Rāhula, Walpola (Sara Boin-Webb), ed. *Abhidharmasamuccaya: The Compendium of the Higher Teaching (Philosophy) by Asaṅga*. Fremont, CA: Asian Humanities Press, 2001.
- Robinson, Richard H. *Early Mādhyamika in India and China*. Madison: University of

- Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Roebuck, Valerie J., trans. *The Upaniṣads*. London and New York: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. “The Uses of the Four Positions of the Catuskoṭi and the Problem of the Description of Reality in Mahāyāna Buddhism.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 5, no. 1 (1977): 1–71.
- Satō Shigeki 佐藤繁樹. “Gangyō no Kongō zammai kyō ni okeru ronri kōzō no tokushoku: Muni ji fu shu ichi shisō” 元曉の『金剛三昧經論』に於ける論理構造の特色—無二而不守一思想. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 42, no. 2 (1994): 226–228.
- . *Wōnhyo ūi hwajaeng nollī: Mui pulsuil sasang* (Wōnhyo’s logic of doctrinal reconciliation: “Nondual without guarding the one” thought). Seoul: Minjoksa, 1996.
- Sayadaw, Ledi. *The Constituents of Awakening*. Kandy, Sri Lanka: Buddhist Publication Society, 1983.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*. 2 vols. *Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series*, no. 4. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1987.
- Shaw, Sarah. *Buddhist Meditation: An Anthology of Texts from the Pali Canon*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Silananda, U. *The Four Foundations of Mindfulness*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1990.
- Soma, Bhikkhu, and Cassius A. Pereira. *The Way of Mindfulness: The Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: Ajirārāma, 1949.
- Stcherbatsky, Theodore. *Buddhist Logic*. Vol. 2. 1930; reprint, New York: Dover, 1962.
- Swanson, Paul L. “Chih-I’s Interpretation of *Jñeyāvaraṇa*: An Application of the Three-fold Truth Concept.” *Annual Memoirs of the Ōtani University Shin Buddhist Comprehensive Research Institute* 1 (1983): 51–72.
- Tachikawa, Musashi. “A Sixth-Century Manual of Indian Logic.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 1 (1971): 111–145.
- Tagawa, Shun’ei. *Living Yogācāra: An Introduction to Consciousness-Only Buddhism*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2009.
- Takasaki, Jikidō. *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra): Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. *Serie Orientale Roma*, no. 33. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1966.
- . trans. *Bushhōron, Daijōkishinron*. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan kabushiki kaisha, 2005. Shin kokuyaku daizōkyō.
- Takayasu Yaotani. “Shiragi so Gangyō denkō” (A study of the life of the Silla monk Wōnhyo). *Taishō Daigaku hō* 38 (1952).
- Tatia, Nathmal, ed. *Abhidharmasamuccaya-Bhāṣyam*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 17. Patna, India: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1976.
- Thanissaro, Bhikkhu. *The Wings to Awakening*. Barre, MA: Dhamma Dana Publications, 1966.
- Thurman, Robert A. F., trans. *The Holy Teaching of Vimalakīrti: A Mahāyāna Scripture*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976.
- Tola, Fernando, and Carmen Dragonetti, eds. “The *Trisvabhāvakārikā* of Vasubandhu.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 11 (1983): 225–266.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. “Buddhist Logic before Dīnāga (Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Tarkasāstras),” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1929): 451–488.
- . *Minor Buddhist Texts: Part II*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio et Estremo Oriente, 1958.

- . *On Some Aspects of the Doctrines of Maitreya(nātha) and Asaṅga*. Calcutta: 1930.
- Ui Hakuju. *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū*. Vol. 5. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 1929.
- . “Maitreya as a Historical Personage.” In *Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Ūn, Chōng-hūi, trans. *Yijang ūi*. Seoul: So myōng ch’ulp’an, 2004.
- Waldron, William S. *The Buddhist Unconscious: The Ālaya-vijñāna in the Context of Indian Buddhist Thought*. London: Routledge-Curzon, 2003.
- Watson, Burton, trans. *The Complete Works of Chuang-tzu*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
- Wayman, Alex. *Analysis of the Śrāvaka bhūmi Manuscript*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961.
- . *A Millennium of Buddhist Logic*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.
- Wayman, Alex, and Hideko Wayman, trans. *The Lion’s Roar of Queen Śrīmālā*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Williams, Paul. *Buddhist Thought: A Complete Introduction to the Indian Tradition*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Yi Chōng-ik. *Wōnhyo ūi kunbon sasang: Simmun hwajaeng non yōn’gu* (Wōnhyo’s fundamental thought: Research on the Ten Approaches to the Reconciliation of Doctrinal Controversy). Seoul: Tongbang Sasang Yōn’gu wōn, 1977.
- Yi Man-yōng. *Wōnhyo ūi sasang: Hwajaeng sasang ūl chungsim ūro*. Seoul: Chōnmangsa, 1983.
- . *Wōnhyo ūi sasang: Wōnhyo Daesa ūi Simmun hwajaeng non*. Seoul: Chōnmangsa, 1983.
- Yinshun. *Kong zhi tanjiu*. Taipei: Zhengwen chubanshe, 1986.
- . *Weishixue tanyuan*. Taipei: 1988.
- Yoshizu Yoshihide. “Eon no Kishinron-shū o meguru sho mondai.” *Komazawa daigaku bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 3 (December 1972): 82–97.

## Index

- Abhidharma, 8, 53–55, 269, 270,  
302n.40, 370n.57, 376n.97; analysis  
of mind, 9–11; and debate, 362n.7;  
developing hindrance theory, 53; and  
logic, 269, 270; and Yogācāra, 14
- Abhidharma-samuccaya*, 270, 310n.32;  
afflictions discussed in, 71
- adamantine concentration, 92, 127,  
128, 135, 143, 145, 151, 152, 242,  
321n.127 (defined)
- ādāna-vijñāna*, 13
- adānta*, 87
- afflictions, 104, 107, 128; actively bind-  
ing, 86, 97, 99, 121, 131, 133, 143;  
afflictive hindrances, 104–108; in  
the *ālaya-vijñāna*, 81; arisen, 115–  
118, 142, 147; arising and ceasing  
together, 124; associated with at-  
tachment to person, 75; based on the  
view of self, 108; basic definition,  
54, 57, 75; bound to nescience, 138;  
causing rebirth, 70, 97, 99; cogni-  
tive in character, 57; conceptual,  
139; counteracted by faith, 128;  
counteracted in the Instantaneous  
Path, 125; counteracted in the Path  
of Cultivation, 79, 95, 99, 108, 109,  
113, 137, 144, 145; counteracted in  
the Path of Liberation, 125; coun-  
teracted in the Path of Preparation,  
125; counteracted in the Path of  
Seeing, 108, 113, 120, 139, 140,  
144; counteracted in the Path of  
Skillful Means, 125; debilitating,  
87, 90, 92, 118, 125, 127, 140, 145;  
declivities, 108; derivative, 65, 66,  
78, 79, 80, 86 (*see also* derivative  
afflictions); in the desire realm, 78;  
distinctions between quelling and  
eliminating, 134; distinctions in  
strength, subtlety, etc., 155, 156;  
eliminated by arhats, 90; eliminated  
by awareness of association, 136;  
eliminated in the desire realm, 149;  
eliminated in the twelve abodes,  
151; eliminated without effort, 145;  
elimination of, 90, 119, 125, 126,  
128, 133, 135, 136, 137, 141, 143;  
entrenched, 114–118, 121, 142, 147;  
in the form and formless realm, 78;  
fundamental, 113; generated by  
the sixth consciousness, 100; habit  
energies, 89, 91; increasing in the  
desire realm, 139; innate, 95, 98,  
115, 140, 141; latent, 69, 82, 87, 92,  
96, 99, 121, 125, 126, 133, 143; of  
the *manas*, 107, 123, 124, 141, 142,  
156; manifestly active, 55; medita-  
tion for eliminating in three realms,  
139; moment of arising, 113;  
ninety-eight, 71; non-elimination of  
essences, 152; non-removal of root,  
138, 139; not lying beyond the three  
realms, 152; obstructing the mind,  
135; originally non-existent, 124;  
primary, 66; primary six, 56, 65, 76,  
312n.54; primary six, produced by  
discrimination, 78, 113; produced  
by sixth consciousness, 141; pro-  
duced by two kinds of nescience,  
105; producing karma, 94; relative  
strength, subtlety, etc., 69, 71, 72,  
76, 81, 92, 131, 134, 140, 142, 145;  
sudden elimination, 147; ten, 104,  
105, 106, 310n.54; three, 94, 107;  
time of elimination, 133; two, 114
- afflictive hindrances, 53, 66, 74–76, 80,  
83, 88, 89, 91, 94, 101, 109–118,  
138, 142–144, 146, 147; elimination  
of, 153

- Ālambana-parīkṣā*, 375n.91  
*ālambana-pratyaya*, 330n.236  
*ālaya-vijñāna*, 13, 16, 17, 26, 69, 76,  
 77, 81–83, 87, 90, 94, 97, 123, 135,  
 146, 150, 155, 302n.40, 312n.57  
 (defined), 367n.41; as base of the  
*manas* and *mano-vijñāna*, 155; mis-  
 construed as a self, 314n.67; as neu-  
 tral in moral quality, 18; relationship  
 to images of perception, 376n.96;  
 and *vipāka-vijñāna*, 319n.113  
*Analects of Confucius*, 377n.102  
*anāsrava*. See uncontaminated  
*anātman*, 55, 299n.8  
 antidotes, 190, 193, 195, 201, 207, 208,  
 216, 219, 225–227, 232, 237–243,  
 257, 261, 336n.38  
*anumāna*, 168, 270, 273, 278  
*anumāna-viruddha*, 276, 288, 366n.33  
*anuśaya*, 86, 87, 325n.173  
*apavāda*, 332n.9, 335n.38  
 arhat, 56, 141, 143, 153, 154, 320n.119  
 (defined)  
 Asaṅga, 11, 18, 270, 301n.30, 317n.97,  
 362n.6, 363n.10, 367n.38; and  
 logic, 270  
*asmi-māna*, 315n.71  
*āsrava*. See contamination  
*āśraya-parāvṛtti*, 14  
*ātma-bhāva*, 98, 109  
*ātman*, 54  
 attachment: to dharmas, 57, 75, 76,  
 80–86, 102, 110, 124; to person,  
 57, 75, 76, 82, 85, 102, 138, 146,  
 147, 157  
 attachment to discipline, 104–109,  
 324n.165 (defined)  
*āvāraṇa*. See hindrances  
*Avatamsaka-sūtra*, 326n.194  
*avidyā-vāśabhūmi*. See entrenchments  
*avijñapti-rūpa*, 377n.100  
*avyākṛta*, 56  
*Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith*, 27, 65,  
 66, 68, 73, 93, 94, 148; afflictive  
 hindrances in, 65; hindrances in, 66;  
 as valued by Wōnhyo, 23  
*āyatana*, 4, 175, 287, 370n.58  
*bhāvanā-mārga*. See Path of Cultivation  
*bija*. See seeds  
*bodhi*, 55, 56  
*bodhicitta*, 375n.85  
*Bodhisattvabhūmi-śāstra*, 113, 325n.172  
 bodhisattvas, 81, 85, 91, 101–103, 128,  
 143; attachment to doctrine, 158;  
 compared with adherents of two  
 vehicles, 55, 58, 67, 69, 71, 99, 113,  
 119, 121, 125, 137, 143, 145, 147,  
 153, 154; compared with buddhas,  
 128, 129; in the fourth abode, 151;  
 nescience entrenchment, 148; Path  
 of Cultivation, 147; Path of Seeing,  
 120, 122; Path of Skillful Means,  
 144; realize two kinds of selfless-  
 ness, 124, 147, 158; in the seventh  
 ground, 151, 153; in their final life-  
 time, 157; in the third ground, 151;  
 in the three ranks of worthies, 144  
 Buddha nature, 106, 107, 158, 159, 167,  
 171–174, 176, 318n.103, 322n.141,  
 335n.36, 364n.20, 374n.84  
 Buddhist logic, 267, 268, 270–284,  
 330n.233; in China, 270, 271; com-  
 ponents of argumentation, 272–282;  
 five-part argument, 274; function of  
 proofs, 272–274; origins, 269; place  
 in Wōnhyo's oeuvre, 23; three-part  
 argument, 275  
 Buswell, Robert, 26, 304n.61  
*caitta*, 4, 11, 290, 340n.63  
*cauṣkoṭi*, 302n.37, 330n.235, 332n.11  
 Chan, 51  
*Cheng weishi lun*, 18, 21, 59, 63, 64, 68,  
 284, 309n.23, 320n.117, 330n.236,  
 368n.50, 369n.52, 375n.91  
 Ch'oenu, 68  
 Ch'o Myōnggi, 51  
*citta-mātra*, 11  
 cognitive hindrances, 53, 55, 58, 67–70, 74–  
 76, 80, 82, 83, 88, 89, 91, 94, 101, 103,  
 112, 113, 118, 142–147, 153, 307n.7  
 compassion, 55, 327n.201  
 Confucius, 307n.95, 377n.102  
 contamination: 318n.100 (defined); three  
 kinds, 323n.147



- Daode jing*, 28
- Daoism, 30
- darśana-mārga. *See* Path of Seeing
- Daśabhūmikāsūtra-sāstra*, 326n.187
- Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā*, 310n.33; afflictions discussed in, 71
- Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā-sāstra*, 324n.163
- dauṣṭhulya*, 86
- debate. *See* Buddhist logic
- delusion, 53, 69, 71, 77, 78, 82, 85, 95, 96, 99, 101, 104, 111, 113, 117, 118, 123, 146–148, 157
- dependent arising, 3–11, 55, 93, 103; twelve limbs, 300n.15
- derivative afflictions, 57, 62, 63, 65, 66, 76, 78–80, 86, 193, 195, 196, 208, 241, 309n.23, 312n.53 (defined), 315n.79
- desire realm, 59, 72, 78, 80, 97, 102, 104, 107, 108, 114, 115, 120, 135, 138, 139, 149, 151, 153; afflictions of, 72, 78, 80, 108, 115, 120, 135, 139, 149, 314n.71 (defined); desire in, 138, 139; dying within, 97; entrenchment of, 59, 114; four truths and, 104, 107; karma in, 102; rebirth in, 151, 153; view of self and, 78
- dharma body, 158
- dharmadhātu*, 334n.35
- dharmakāya*, 30
- Dharmakīrti, 362n.8
- dharma-nature, 21
- Dharmapāla, 315n.81
- dharmas: according to time, 132; associated with *manas*, 142; attachment to, 83, 110, 131, 138, 143, 146, 147, 157, 158, 159; categories of, 70, 76, 77, 92; cognitive hindrances and, 70; confusion regarding, 75, 95, 101; correctly apprehended, 57; defiled and undefiled, 130; as devoid of marks, 66; discriminating without attaching, 158; that engender suffering, 53; existent and non-existent, 144, 158; in the *manas*, 154; nonarising of, 93; non-production of, 124, 145; produced from conditions, 115; provisionally existent, 157; reification of, 57, 69; selflessness of, 84, 85, 91, 92, 120, 121, 157, 158; seventy-five, 53; uncontaminated, 135
- dharmin*, 368n.49, 372n.65
- Dignāga, 267–285, 372n.68
- Direct Interpretation, 94, 118, 305n.76
- doctrinal classification. *See* *p'angyo*
- Doctrinal Essentials of the "Flower Ornament Sutra,"* 166
- Doctrinal Essentials of the "Great Perfection of Wisdom Sutra,"* 29
- Doctrinal Essentials of the "Lotus Sutra,"* 39
- Doctrinal Essentials of the "Nirvana Sutra,"* 24, 25, 30, 31, 33, 34, 40, 306n.86
- Doctrinal Essentials of the "Sutra of Immeasurable Life,"* 302n.44
- Dolphy, Eric, 363n.13
- doṣa*, 55
- dr̥ṣṭānta*, 274
- dr̥ṣṭāntābhāsa*, 277
- dūṣana*, 154
- elimination, 118, 345n.116; activation of antidotes and, 126; by adherents of the Two Vehicles, 153; of affliction, according to time, 133, 134; of afflictions, 143, 149; cases of non-occurrence, 130; as a category of countering, 126; of cognitive hindrances, 143, 153; conceptual, 139; of confusion, 107; cultivation of preparation for, 146; by disabling latencies, 131; of entrenchments, 147, 148; by faith, 143; of fetters, 136, 146; innate, 140; in the *manas*, 142; not in the Path of Excellent Advancement, 125, 126; in the Path of Cultivation, 128, 142; in the Path of Liberation, 126; in the Path of Seeing, 119, 120, 126, 139; in the Path of Skillful Means, 125; permanent, 134, 135, 139, 143; quelling, 72, 74, 134, 139, 143; realization through, 135; same as non-elimination, 149; of seeds, 91, 135, 144, 149, 152; subjugation and, 141; sudden, 141, 144, 145, 147; of the



- view of self, 138; by wisdom, 126;  
without residue, 135
- emptiness, 7–12, 15, 30–36, 55, 169,  
302n.38, 317n.95, 333n.16, 335n.38.  
*See also* selflessness: of dharmas;  
selflessness: of person
- entrenchments, 147; affliction, 114;  
nescience, 60, 101, 102, 103, 104,  
113–118, 129, 143, 148, 155, 156;  
as used by Wayman, 323n.148
- essence-function, 30, 303n.55
- Exposition of the Vajrasamādhī-sūtra*,  
32, 37
- faith, 23, 38, 40, 41, 42, 87, 108, 143,  
148, 159, 303n.55
- Faxiang, 68, 73
- five aggregates, 80, 106, 109, 116, 130,  
141, 157, 158, 159
- five consciousnesses, 315n.72
- Flower Ornament Sutra*, 326n.194
- Fodijing lun*, 59–68, 284, 305n.76,  
365n.24; as source of hindrance  
theory, 309n.21, 312n.56
- formless realm, 78, 96, 104, 107, 114,  
115, 120, 150, 314n.70 (defined),  
322n.137; afflictions of, 78, 104,  
107, 120; concentration of cessation  
in, 150; death within, 96; entrench-  
ment of, 59, 114, 115
- form realm, 72, 96, 104, 107, 114, 115,  
120, 138, 149, 150, 314n.70 (defined);  
afflictions of, 107, 115, 120, 149; con-  
centration in, 150; desire in, 72, 138,  
150; entrenchments of, 59, 114; four  
truths and, 104; rebirth into, 96
- forthcoming consciousnesses, 76, 81, 82,  
124, 146, 148, 313n.57 (defined),  
318n.101, 319n.113, 367n.46
- foundations of mindfulness, 205–208,  
216–218, 226, 230, 243, 257
- four realizations (of the Lesser Vehicle),  
72, 99, 322n.142 (defined)
- Fukushi Jinin, 27
- Gethin, Rupert, 337n.18
- grounds (*bhūmis*), 58, 127, 143, 145–147,  
151–153; seventh, 127, 145, 153
- habit energies, 76, 88–92, 102, 103,  
113, 118, 129, 135, 145, 148, 152,  
312n.52 (defined)
- Haecin-sa, 166
- Hakeda Yoshito, 303n.55
- Harivarman, 329n.228
- harmonization of doctrines. *See hwa-*  
*jaeng*
- Harris, Ian, 312n.51
- hetu*, 272, 274, 275
- hetucakra*, 372n.68
- hetu-pratyaya*, 330n.236
- hetuvidyā*. *See* Buddhist logic
- highest worldly meditative state, 119,  
127, 128
- hindrances, 51, 71–74, 307n.5 (defined);  
in Abhidharma, 55; in the *Awaken-*  
*ing of Faith*, 65, 66, 67; detailed  
definition, 56; development of, 53;  
interpreted by Huiyuan, 59, 60,  
61; interpreted by Xuanzang, 64;  
interpreted by Zongmi, 68; in the  
*Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment*,  
68; in Tathāgatagarbha, 58, 59; in  
Yogācāra, 55, 56, 57, 58, 62, 63,  
64. *See also* afflictive hindrances;  
cognitive hindrances; thirty-seven  
constituents of awakening
- Hirakawa Akira, 308n.9
- Hossō, 364n.20, 373n.69
- Huayan, 14, 68, 73
- Huiyuan, 68, 71, 308n.9, 311n.41
- Huizhao, 368n.47, 372n.69, 374n.80
- hwajaeng*, 27, 30, 165, 166, 305n.70,  
306n.79, 331n.6
- Hwaōm, 21, 27
- Hwaōm chong'yo*, 166
- icchāntika*, 16, 302n.46, 303n.51,  
363n.20, 364n.20, 374n.83, 375n.85
- Indirect Interpretation, 118, 305n.76
- Instantaneous Path, 119, 125–127, 140
- Ishii Kōsei, 26
- Jeon Haeju, 26
- jñeya-āvaraṇa*. *See* cognitive hindrances
- kae-hap*, 29, 306n.79

- kāma-dhātu*. See desire realm  
 Kaṇāda, 371n.63  
*Kanjin kakumu shō*, 68  
 karma, 57, 58, 70, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98,  
 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 144,  
 152; directive, 94, 99, 321n.133;  
 formation of, 99; particularizing, 94,  
 321n.133  
 karmic moral indeterminacy, 316n.88  
*karuṇā*. See compassion  
*Kathāvattu*, 269  
*kenshō*, 309n.27  
 Kim Pusik, 304n.66  
*kleśa*. See afflictions  
*kleśa-āvaraṇa*. See afflictive hindrances  
*Kosōnsa Sōdang hwasang t'appi*, 166  
 Kuiji, 21, 68, 186, 268, 271, 277, 283,  
 309n.24, 315n.81, 355n.237,  
 372n.69; and logic, 268, 271  
*Kūmgang sammæ kyōng non*, 32
- language, 39, 40, 41, 42  
*Lankavatāra-sūtra*, 17, 22, 143, 328n.213  
 liberation: attained by cultivating the  
 foundations of mindfulness, 85; at-  
 tained by elimination of afflictions,  
 57; attained by the Two Vehicles,  
 142, 152, 153; attained through wis-  
 dom, 55; through combined practice  
 of meditation and wisdom, 142;  
 from the essence of the three realms,  
 152; impeded by afflictive hindrance-  
 es, 53, 55, 65; impeded cognitively  
 and by affliction, 54; intrinsic, 124;  
 Path of Cultivation, 128; Path of  
 Liberation, 125; Path of Preparation,  
 119; Path of Seeing, 119, 126; from  
 six kinds of bondage, 85; sudden,  
 141; wisdom of, 143
- li-shi*, 68  
*loka-viruddhaḥ*, 276  
*Lotus Sutra*, 27  
 Lü Cai, 270–272, 285
- Madhyamaka**, 7, 9, 11, 18, 24, 25, 28,  
 34, 35, 36, 38, 165, 292, 302n.38,  
 305n.78, 330n.235, 373n.74; and  
 debate, 362n.8
- Madhyānta-vibhāga*, 43, 308n.16,  
 317n.97  
*Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*, 183–187,  
 332n.9  
*Mahāyānasamgraha*, 18, 257, 258,  
 315n.83, 327n.199, 366n.34; as de-  
 finitive Yogācāra text, 15  
*Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, 319n.117  
*manas*, 69, 72, 76, 77, 78, 83, 86, 97,  
 100, 107, 108, 122, 123, 124, 138,  
 141, 142, 154, 155, 156, 313n.62  
 (defined), 329n.231, 367n.41; af-  
 flictions concomitant with, 76;  
 always defiled, 124; in AMF, 155;  
 attachment to dharmas, 124; as base  
 of *mano-vijñāna*, 123; character-  
 ized as incessant deliberation, 123;  
 cognizing self, 77; corrected, 123;  
 as deepest layer of affliction, 69;  
 differences from *mano-vijñāna*,  
 77; difficulty in categorizing, 72;  
 distinct from *mano-vijñāna*, 77, 83,  
 124, 154, 155; entrenched nescience  
 and, 156; four afflictions of, 78, 100,  
 107, 108, 122, 123, 124, 138, 141;  
 mistaken imputation of self, 156;  
 nature of incessant deliberation,  
 123; not cured in Path of Seeing,  
 142; objects of, 77; originally pure,  
 124; production from seeds, 77, 123;  
 purification upon arhatship, 142;  
 purified of afflictions, 124; sharing  
 with *mano-vijñāna*, 77, 86, 97, 154,  
 155; supramundane aspect, 124; tak-  
 ing the self as object, 123
- manaskāra*, 371n.61  
*mano-vijñāna*, 76–88, 97, 112, 122, 123,  
 124, 125, 154, 155, 313n.60 (de-  
 fined), 329n.231, 367n.41, 370n.57;  
 afflictions of, 78; continued exis-  
 tence in the second meditation heav-  
 en, 78; distinguished from *manas*,  
 76, 77, 154; as faculty of corrective  
 practices, 124, 125; nescience and,  
 88; as organ of pervasive calcula-  
 tion, 83; as organ of pervasive  
 discrimination, 81; point of arising,  
 112; sharing with *manas*, 76, 77, 86,

- 97, 122, 123, 154, 155; supramundane aspect, 124; taking the *manas* as its base, 123
- meditation heaven, 80
- mental disturbances, 53, 55, 75, 98, 107, 118, 143; counteracted in the Path of Cultivation, 145
- mind-king, 136, 326n.193 (defined)
- mirror cognition, 316n.83 (defined)
- mūla-vijñāna*. *See* root consciousness
- Munbi, 372n.69
- Nāgārjuna, 7, 8, 9, 300n.18
- nescience, 53–57, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 76; attachment to dharmas, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86; beginningless, 93; bound to afflictions, 138; as cause of practice, 99; as cause of transmigration, 101; compared to wisdom, 118; confusion regarding causation, 96; confusion regarding the fundament, 105; counteracted, 81; entrenchment of, 101, 102, 103, 104, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 129, 143, 148, 155, 156; extinguished after three great eons, 135; fundamental, 75, 93, 127; habituation thusness, 103; imputing a self, 105; independently functioning, 105; permeating the forthcoming consciousnesses, 76; producing afflictions, 79; producing karma, 94, 95; producing the three realms, 157; regarding existence and emptiness, 157; seeds of, 88; separation from, 135; subdued by bodhisattvas, 144; subtlety of, 93, 128, 129, 157; among the three poisons, 54; unde-filed, 142
- nescience entrenchment. *See* entrenchments
- neyārtha*, 305n.76
- nirvāṇa*, 54, 55, 57, 75, 102, 122, 153, 154; entry from the desire realm, 153
- Nirvana Sutra*, 83, 153, 318n.103; cited, 153
- nītārtha*, 305n.76
- nivṛta-avyākṛta*, 79
- nonreturner, 72, 100, 139, 140, 149, 151, 153, 322n.142 (defined)
- Nyāyamukha*, 267–278, 291, 293, 329n.230, 363n.12, 371n.64, 372n.66, 373n.69, 374n.76
- Nyāyapraveśa*, 267, 268, 274–277, 366n.33, 367n.43, 368n.49, 370n.59, 373n.72
- obstructions, 184; afflictive, 65, 66, 67, 74, 75, 87, 93, 103, 113, 118; cognitive, 56, 57, 66; two kinds, 101, 118
- Ōchō Enichi, 51
- omniscience, 14
- One Mind, 26, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 306n.86
- padārtha*, 276
- paśa*, 272–275, 336n.10
- paśābhāsa*, 275
- paśadharmā*, 274, 278
- p'angyo*, 25–28, 312n.51
- Paramārtha, 18, 42, 68, 284, 317n.98, 350n.172; compared to Xuanzang as translator, 18
- paratantra-svabhāva*, 333n.16
- parikalpanā*, 83
- parikalpita*, 81, 122
- parikalpita-svabhāva*, 333n.16
- pariniṣpanna*, 122
- pariniṣpanna-svabhāva*, 333n.17
- Park Chong Hong, 27
- Park, Sung Bae, 26, 27, 303n.55
- Path of Cultivation, 79, 99, 107, 108, 109, 113, 119, 126, 127, 128, 137–147, 321n.135 (defined); afflictions counteracted in, 95, 109, 113; afflictions removed in, 79, 99, 107, 108, 113; compared to other paths, 119, 113; elimination of attachment to self in, 99; hindrances eliminated in, 71; nescience in, 99
- Path of Liberation, 119, 125, 126, 127
- Path of Seeing, 71, 84, 127, 318n.105 (defined), 340n.55; bodhisattvas, 102, 122, 124, 144; compared to other paths, 119, 138; limitations of, 156; non-discriminating wisdom

- and, 128; producing mundane wisdom, 120; removal of afflictions in, 95, 99, 107, 108, 113, 119, 120, 126, 135, 139, 140, 142, 144, 149; removal of debilitation in, 144; Three Vehicles, 121; two vehicles, 83
- Path of Skillful Means, 81, 83, 84, 102, 119, 120, 125, 126, 127, 144, 318n.106
- Path of Vision. *See* Path of Seeing
- Paul, Diana, 308n.11
- perfuming, 17, 69, 70, 81, 83, 86, 91, 100, 101, 111, 112, 157, 158, 159, 310n.31 (defined); three kinds, 322n.145
- person: attachment to, 138, 157, 158; discrimination of, 99; selflessness of, 83, 84, 101, 120, 140, 153, 157, 158, 159
- Pilinda-vatsa, 320n.121
- Plassen, Jörg, 26
- prajñāpta*, 167, 335n.37
- Prakaranāryavāca-śāstra*, 314n.66
- pramāṇa*, 270, 272, 278, 362n.10, 364n.23
- prapañca*, 103, 332n.13
- prasiddha*, 367n.43
- pratigha*, 377n.100
- pratīpakṣa*. *See* antidotes
- prāṭhya-samutpāda*. *See* dependent arising
- pratyakṣa*, 270
- pratyakṣa-viruddhaḥ*, 275
- pratyekabuddha*, 15, 54, 72, 91, 100, 101, 103, 116, 118, 121, 138, 142, 143, 152, 153, 154, 374n.83, 375n.85
- pravṛtti-vijñāna*. *See* forthcoming consciousnesses
- principle-phenomena, 68
- pudgala*, 5, 9, 11, 12, 197, 349n.163
- Pure Land, 23
- quelling**, 72, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135, 137, 139, 143, 149, 151
- Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, 15, 17, 64, 302n.46, 319n.108; cited, 102, 103; as Tathāgatarbha text, 56
- rebirth, 53, 57, 70, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 140, 144, 150, 151
- ripening, 317n.91 (defined)
- ripening consciousness (*vipāka-vijñāna*), 81, 87, 90, 94, 97, 124, 135, 148, 150
- root consciousness, 313n.57. *See also* *ālaya-vijñāna*
- rūpa-āyatana*, 377n.100
- rūpa-dhātu*. *See* form realm
- śabda-pramāṇa*, 371n.62
- sādhana*, 154, 272, 275, 362n.9
- sādharmya-dṛṣṭānta*, 330n.233
- sādhya*, 273–275, 290, 293, 371n.64, 372n.65, 373n.72
- saṃanantara-pratyaya*, 330n.236
- samāropa*, 167, 332n.9, 335n.38, 336n.39
- śamatha*, 15, 67
- Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, 13; cited, 121, 146; as definitive Yogācāra text, 15; mentioned, 53, 82; opposed to *Nirvana Sutra*, 83
- saṃjñā*, 88
- Sāṃkhya, 283, 299n.10, 371n.62
- saṃśaya-hetu*, 374n.75
- sapakṣa*, 273–275, 280, 291, 362n.6, 368n.51, 371n.64
- Sarvāstivāda, 300n.23
- sāsrava*, 341n.65
- śāśvata-vāda*, 332n.9
- satkāya-dṛṣṭi*, 56
- Satō Shigeki, 27
- Satyasiddhi, 24, 304n.67
- Satyasiddhi-śāstra*, 329n.228
- seeds, 13, 318n.102; as basic Yogācāra category, 56, 69; cause of rebirth, 98; compared to entrenchments, 117; constituting the *ālaya-vijñāna*, 77; contaminated, 81; and debilitations, 86, 87; of defiled states, permanently impaired, 139; dependently originated and discriminated, 88; destruction of, 89; disabled, of attachment to person, 138; discriminatory, 89; distinguished from debilitations, 69; eliminated in bodhisattva path, 143, 151, 152; eliminated in the Path of Seeing,

- 119, 121, 144, 149; elimination in the Path of Cultivation, 138, 140, 147; elimination of, 91, 135, 144, 152; elimination of nine classes simultaneously, 140; elimination of those cultivated in the desire realm, 149; extinguishment of, 90; formed by habituation, 117; and four causes, 158; as habit energies, 89; kernels and habituated, 87; of linguistic constructs, 88; of nescience, 88; not removable by mundane meditations, 87; as one of two kinds of latencies, 92; particularizing karma and, 94, 103; in the Path of Preparation, 125; producing cognitive experience, 77; producing the *manas*, 123; removal in the Instantaneous Path, 140; of verbal expression, 111
- selflessness, 70, 83, 84, 86, 95, 99, 101, 107, 120, 123, 124, 128, 140, 153, 156, 157; of dharmas, 81, 82, 89, 121, 129, 138, 143, 144, 147, 157, 158, 317n.95; of person, 82, 84, 121, 124, 143, 144, 147, 157, 158, 317n.95
- self-witnessing, 365n.24
- Simmun hwajaeng non*, 165, 166, 302n.37, 331n.242; seen as Wŏnhyo's magnum opus, 24
- Sinbyŏn chejong kyojang chongnok*, 166
- six primary afflictions, 312n.54
- Sōng Hŏn, 166
- śrāvaka*, 15, 54, 72, 91, 116, 121, 122, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 152, 153, 320n.123 (defined)
- Śrīmālā-sūtra*, 15, 17, 59, 64, 303n.48, 308n.11; cited, 118; early Tathāgatagarbha text, 53
- stage of nothingness, 98, 322n.137 (defined)
- Sthiramati, 11, 12, 183, 186, 301n.32, 315n.81
- store consciousness. See *ālaya-vijñāna*
- subsequently attained cognition, 119, 311n.41, 325n.180
- suffering: caused by affliction, 57, 74, 96; caused by nescience, 95, 99; caused by wrong views, 106; debilitating hindrances and, 91; essential nature is free from, 122; four and eight kinds, 53, 54; grasping its marks, 84, 125; as nature of the three realms, 95; in the Path of Seeing, 84; Truth of, 83, 104, 105, 106, 109, 141
- Sūngjang, 283, 361n.4
- Sungyōng, 283
- śūnyatā*. See emptiness
- Sutra for Humane Kings*, 143, 148, 153, 328n.210
- Sutra of Neither Increase nor Decrease*, 324n.158
- Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment*, 68
- svasaṃvitti-saṃvitti*, 365n.24
- Swanson, Paul, 311n.43
- Taehyŏn, 361n.5, 365n.25
- Tathāgata, 127
- Tathāgatagarbha, 15–28, 35, 40, 43, 52, 53, 55, 56–68, 158, 302nn.46–47, 312n.51, 319n.108, 334n.26, 375n.86; formation of school of thought, 14, 15; metaphors of, 303n.47; and Yogācāra, 3, 14–18
- tathatā*, 66
- ten afflictions, 310n.34
- thirty-seven constituents of awakening, 190, 192, 198, 199, 201, 203, 216, 337n.16
- three natures, 169
- three poisons, 54
- three realms, 57, 71, 72, 80, 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 107, 108, 114, 139, 141, 142, 144, 150, 151, 152, 153
- Tiantai, 14
- transformation of the basis, 302n.44. See also *āśraya-parāvṛtti*
- Treatise on Buddha Nature*, 322n.141
- Trīṃśikā*, 12
- twenty-two faculties, 358n.264
- two vehicles, 316n.83 (defined); adherents of, 75, 135; and afflictive hindrances, 55, 58, 89, 138, 142; attachment to dharmas, 81, 158; and cognitive hindrances, 142; compared to bodhisattvas, 151; distinguished

- from bodhisattvas, 71, 99, 113, 119, 121, 124, 125, 137, 152, 153; entrenched afflictions, 142, 147; entrenchment of nescience, 155; Path of Seeing, 102, 144; realization of selflessness of person, 83; and rebirth, 106, 151
- Ultimate Path, 127, 148, 157  
 uncontaminated, 318n.104, 341n.65  
 unenlightened sentient beings, 92, 93, 310n.39; discriminating thought in, 311n.41  
*upakleśa*. See derivative afflictions  
*upāya-jñā*, 84
- Vaibhāṣika, 270  
 Vaiśeṣika, 152, 276, 278, 283, 329n.227, 371n.62  
*Vaiśeṣika-sūtra*, 371n.62  
*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*, 27; as valued by Wōnhyo, 23  
 Varuṇa, 320n.121  
*vāsanā*. See habit energies  
 Vasubandhu, 11, 18, 189, 317n.97, 335n.36, 362n.6; on logic, 270  
 Vedas, 371n.62  
*vijñāna-pariṇāma*, 11  
*vijñapti-mātra*, 11  
*Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*, 330n.237  
*vipāka*, 13, 87. See also ripening  
*vipāka-vijñāna*, 319n.113. See also ripening consciousness  
*vipakṣa*, 208, 273–275, 289, 362n.6, 367n.44  
*vipaśyanā*, 15, 67  
*viruddha-avyabhicārin*, 282, 283, 291, 292, 294, 329n.232, 365n.28, 370n.59, 371n.64, 373n.74, 374n.78
- Wayman, Alex, 308n.11, 323n.148  
 Wenbei, 361n.4, 372n.69  
 Wenbo Xuezi, 306n.95  
 Wengui, 374n.80  
 wisdom: arhats, 142; bodhisattvas, 129; as cause of rebirth, 100; corrective, 122; derived from learning, 134; derived from reflection, 134; of dharma, 120; discriminating, 158; eliminating afflictions, 156; eliminating both attachments, 157; eliminating entrenchments, 121, 143; eliminating nescience, 157; as greatest of mental factors, 104; indestructible, 115; intrinsic, 65; lesser forms of, 117; liberating, 143; meditation and, 119; as mental factor, 136; non-discriminating, 91; obstructions to, 66; as one of the three disciplines, 54; overcomes nescience, 116; in the Path of Seeing, 84; at the stage of virtual enlightenment, 128; subsequently gained, 119; two vehicles, 118; undefiled, 55, 125; unrecognized by students, 93; and virtue, 119
- Wōnch'uk, 365n.27  
 Wōnhyo, 3, 18, 20–43, 165, 268, 284; as harmonizer of disputes, 21–35; on logic, 268, 269, 277, 278, 283  
*Wuxiang lun*, 326n.190
- Xuanzang, 18, 19, 21, 68, 268–272, 283, 284, 303n.58, 310n.32, 364n.20, 365n.24; on logic, 267, 268, 271
- Yi Chōng-ik, 166  
*Yildo chang*, 326n.181  
 Yogācāra, 12–23, 43, 55, 56, 57, 66–72; and Abhidharma, 11; categories of dharmas, 70; liberation in, 14; and Madhyamaka, 11; and Tathāgatagarbha, 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18  
*Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, 314n.69; afflictions discussed in, 71; cognitive hindrances in, 65; as definitive Yogācāra text, 15, 28; as Wōnhyo's primary scriptural source, 23; Xuanzang's translation of, 18  
*Yōlban chong'yo*, 24, 25, 26, 27  
 Yoshizu Yoshihide, 308n.9
- Zenju, 373n.69, 374n.81  
 Zhiyi, 311n.41  
 Zhuangzi, 26, 306n.95, 329n.229  
 Zongjian, 372n.69  
 Zongmi, 68, 309n.28



## Wŏnhyo's Philosophy of Mind

Edited by A. Charles Muller and Cuong T. Nguyen

Leading East Asian Buddhist thinkers of the seventh century compared, analyzed, and finalized seminal epistemological and soteriological issues that had been under discussion in India and East Asia for centuries. Among the many doctrinal issues that came to the fore was the relationship between the Tathāgatagarbha (or “Buddha-nature”) understanding of the human psyche and the view of basic karmic indeterminacy articulated by the new stream of Indian Yogācāra introduced through the translations and writings of Xuanzang and his disciples. The great Silla scholiast Wŏnhyo (617–686), although geographically located on the periphery in the Korean peninsula, was very much at the center of the intense discussion and debate that occurred on these topics. Through the force of his writings, he became one of the most influential figures in resolving doctrinal discrepancies for East Asian Buddhism.

Although many of Wŏnhyo's writings are lost, through his extant work we are able to get a solid glimpse of his profound and learned insights on the nature and function of the human mind. We can also clearly see his hermeneutical approaches and methods of argumentation, which are derived from apophatic Mādhyamika analysis, the newly introduced Buddhist logic, as well as various indigenous East Asian approaches. This volume includes four of Wŏnhyo's works that are especially revelatory of his treatment of the complex flow of ideas in his generation: *System of the Two Hindrances (Yijang ūi)*, *Treatise on the Ten Ways of Resolving Controversies (Simmun hwajaeng non)*, *Commentary on the Discrimination between the Middle and the Extremes (Chungbyŏn punbyŏllon so)*, and the *Critical Discussion on Inference (P'an piryang non)*.

Charles Muller is Project Professor in the Center for Evolving Humanities at the University of Tokyo. His main work lies in the areas of Korean Buddhism, East Asian Yogācāra, East Asian lexicography, and online scholarly resource development. He has published *The Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment: Korean Buddhism's Guide to Meditation* (SUNY Press, 1999), and, in addition to the present volume, has several other studies and translations of the works of Wŏnhyo in preparation. He is also founder and managing editor of the online *Digital Dictionary of*



*Buddhism*, as well as founder and managing editor of the *H-Buddhism* Buddhist Scholars Information Network.

Cuong Tu Nguyen holds a Ph.D. in the study of religion from Harvard University, specializing in Indian Buddhism. He is currently associate professor in the Department of Religious Studies, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia. His major publications include *Zen in Medieval Vietnam: A Study and Translation of the Thiền Uyển Tập Anh*, also published by the University of Hawai'i Press. His research interest is in Buddhist philosophy and history of Vietnamese Buddhism.

Dan Lusthaus has taught at the University of California, Los Angeles, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Boston University, and is currently a research associate at Harvard University. His primary research deals with the religions and philosophies of India and East Asia, specializing in Yogācāra Buddhism. His publications include *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogācāra Buddhism and the Ch'eng wei-shih lun* (RoutledgeCurzon, 2002); a collaborative translation with Heng-Ching Shih of *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Heart Sutra (Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra)* by K'uei-chi (BDK, 2001). He is currently working on Yogācāra's role in the development of Buddhist epistemology and logic.