



# Yogācāra Influence on the Northern School of Chan Buddhism

---

Nobuyoshi Yamabe  
Tokyo University of Agriculture

## Abstract

In East Asian contexts, Yogācāra Buddhism is often seen as a theoretical system rather than a collection of practical instructions. In particular, many people seem to have the stereotypic image that the Faxiang 法相 tradition (based on the Yogācāra texts brought to China by Xuanzang 玄奘) was a highly scholastic system, while Chan (Zen) 禪 Buddhism emphasized intuitive penetration into the essence of Buddhism. Thus, these two traditions are thought to have stood at the opposite ends of a spectrum. If one actually looks into early Chan texts belonging to the Northern School 北宗 (or its forerunner, East Mountain Teaching 東山法門), however, one realizes that the matter is not so simple. *Yuanming lun* 圓明論 and *Dasheng kaixin xianxing dunwu zhenzong lun* 大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論, for example, clearly display traces of the strong influence of Xuanzang's Yogācāra texts. *Daofan qusheng xinjue* 導凡趣聖心決 indicates that even the meditative practice of Chan Buddhism was influenced by Xuanzang's Yogācāra. Apparently the relationship between Faxiang and Chan was much closer than is commonly believed

---

## Keywords

Yogācāra; Xuanzang; Faxiang tradition; Northern School; East Mountain Teaching; asallakṣaṇānupraveśopāyalakṣaṇa

## I. Introduction

In this paper I would like to discuss Chan 禪 in conjunction with Yogācāra, especially the Faxiang 法相 tradition. Needless to say, Chan is a tradition very closely associated with meditation. In contrast, the Faxiang tradition, the version of Yogācāra Buddhism brought to China by Xuanzang 玄奘 (602-64), is commonly seen as a very scholastic tradition. The textbook view of this tradition is something like the following (Kenneth Ch'en 1972, 325):<sup>1</sup>

For a time during the middle of the T'ang Dynasty the [Faxiang/Fa-hsiang] school flourished in China, but after Hsüan-tsang and K'uei-chi had gone, the school rapidly declined. . . . Moreover, the philosophy of the school, with its hairsplitting analysis and abstruse terminology, was too difficult and abstract for the practical-minded Chinese, who preferred the direct and simple teachings of the Ch'an and Pure Land Schools. Hence these schools flourished while the Wei-shih declined.<sup>2</sup>

According to this view, the system of the Faxiang School was cumbersome and scholastic, while the Chan tradition emphasized

---

\* An earlier version of this paper was read at an international symposium entitled, "Yogācāra Buddhism in China," held at Leiden, June 8-9, 2000, organized by Lin Chen-kuo 林鎮國 (on this symposium, see Yamabe 2001). After that, I published a Japanese version of this paper as Yamabe 2006. The original English paper remains still unpublished. The present paper is an updated and revised version of that English paper. I thank Shih Huimin 釋惠敏, Peter Zieme, Yoshimura Makoto 吉村誠, Robert Kritzer, Wang Ding 王丁, Harada Wasō 原田和宗, Ōtake Susumu 大竹晋一 and Kitsudō Kōichi 橘堂晃一 for their kind assistance in preparing this paper. I also owe much information to the anonymous reviewer of this paper.

1 Throughout this paper, I use the word "Faxiang" when I refer to the Chinese tradition based on the *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論 (T No. 1585) translated by Xuanzang. When I refer to Yogācāra traditions in a wider sense in India and China, I use the word "Yogācāra."

2 Similar views are expressed by such Japanese authorities of Sino-Japanese Faxiang/Hossō Buddhism as Fukihara Shōshin (1944, 125) and Fukaura Seibun (1972, 269-70).

intuitive penetration into the essence of Buddhism. Thus these two traditions stood at the opposite ends of the spectrum. The Chinese religious mentality favored the more practical approach of Chan, and thus Xuanzang's school lost its influence after a short period of prosperity.

However, in the light of more recent research, this understanding seems highly questionable. First, Chan was not simply a practical movement entirely divorced from doctrinal elements. Specialists of Chan Buddhism, such as Tanaka Ryōshō (1980, 229-30; 1983, 397), Tanaka and Okimoto Katsumi (1989, 464), Okabe Kazuo (1980, 346), Yanagida Seizan (1999, 48), John R. McRae (1986, 209-10, 245), and Robert Buswell (1989, 8-9), have noted ties between early Chan and the doctrinal traditions of Chinese Buddhism.

On the Faxiang side, the textbook view is questionable with regard to two points. First, it is not entirely correct to say that the Faxiang School was a purely scholastic tradition. Second, the Faxiang School apparently exerted wider-ranging and longer-lasting influences over Chinese Buddhism than was formerly believed.

On the first point, since Paul Demiéville's epoch-making work, "*La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa*" (1954), it has been suggested that the Yogācāra School in India was preceded by practical traditions of meditators.<sup>3</sup> It has also been argued that even the doctrinal system of the full-fledged Yogācāra School emerged from a systematic reflection on meditative experiences.<sup>4</sup> It is true that, in India, the Yogācāra School eventually developed a complex doctrinal system, something that might give the impression of being less practical. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that, as an offshoot of the Indian Yogācāra School in China, the Faxiang tradition would have completely lost its practical elements.

If we take into consideration the prehistory of Yogācāra described above, we notice that the Indian meditative traditions, which may

---

3 For a more recent discussion of this matter, see Florin Deleanu 2006, 1:147ff.

4 Most notably, see Lambert Schmithausen 1973; 1976.

well have paved the way for the later Yogācāra School, had a strong influence on the practice of Chinese Buddhism from its very early stages. For example, elsewhere I have argued that An Shigao (second century), who first translated Buddhist scriptures (including meditation texts) into Chinese, may have been close to the early precursors of the Yogācāra School (Yamabe 1997). In addition, Kumārajīva's 鳩摩羅什 (350?-409?) *Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經 (T No. 614), which had a lasting influence on the subsequent Chinese Buddhist practice, was partly based on Aśvagoṣa's *Saundarananda*. The *Saundarananda*, if I am correct, shares many similar elements with the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, probably the oldest portion of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (Yamabe, Fujitani Takayuki, Harada Yasunori 2002; Yamabe 2003).

Even the doctrines of the Yogācāra School were not irrelevant to the practice of Chinese Buddhists. This point will immediately become clear if we think of the two texts that are most closely associated with the early Chan tradition, namely the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* (*Lengqie abaduoluo bao jing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經, T No.670)<sup>5</sup> and the *Awakening of Faith* (*Dasheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論, T No.1666).<sup>6</sup> Both of these texts have many elements deriving from Yogācāra, so it would not be too controversial to claim that Yogācāra concepts heavily influenced early Chan through these two texts. If we look into some texts of the Northern School (Beizong 北宗),<sup>7</sup> as we will see below, we notice that even Xuanzang's Faxiang tradition had a strong influence not only on

5 Though there are two other Chinese versions of this sūtra (T Nos. 672, 673), only the four-fascicle version of Guṇabhadra (Qiuna batuoluo 求那跋陀羅) is directly relevant for the present purpose. As we shall see below, in spite of the traditional association of early Chan with the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, the actual significance of this sūtra for the early Chan tradition is questioned by scholars. Nevertheless, at the stage of the *Yuanming lun* 圓明論, a significant Northern School text to be discussed later, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* was definitely one of the important sources. See below.

6 T No. 1666 is attributed to Paramārtha. The other version attributed to Śikṣānanda (T No. 1667) is not directly relevant for the purpose of this paper.

7 There are some problems with this term, but I follow the general scholarly convention and call the lineage of Shenxiu "the Northern School." See McRae 1986, 8-9.

its theory, but also on its practice.

This leads us to the second point mentioned above. It seems to me that Faxiang Buddhism exerted influence over Chinese Buddhism more widely and for a longer period than was previously believed. On this matter, Tsukamoto Zenryū (1975, 129-58) points out the existence of numerous Faxiang texts in the Jin 金 edition of Buddhist Canon kept in the Guangshengsi 廣勝寺 (Shanxi 山西 Province) and thus demonstrates that the Faxiang tradition was active in north China through the Liao 遼 and Jin periods (10th-13th cent.). Chikusa Masaaki (2000, 3-57) makes it clear that Faxiang Buddhism continued to be studied until the Song 宋 and Yuan 元 periods (10th-14th cent.), not only in northern China but also in some parts of the south.

Furthermore, we should note that many texts belonging to the Faxiang Tradition are found in the Dunhuang 敦煌 manuscripts. According to Ueyama Daishun (1990, 39-74), in addition to the cardinal treatise of this school, the *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論 (CWSL, T No. 1585), numerous texts of this tradition (especially those composed by masters of the Ximingsi 西明寺 lineage, see *ibid.*, 70) are found in Dunhuang manuscripts.

Ueyama (*ibid.*) further points out that an eminent scholar-monk Tankuang 曇曠 (latter eighth century), who studied at Ximingsi in Chang'an 長安 and was active in Dunhuang, composed texts based on the Faxiang doctrine, including the *Dasheng baifa mingmenlun kaizong yiji* 大乘百法明門論開宗義記, the *Dasheng baifa mingmenlun kaizong yijue* 大乘百法明門論開宗義決, the *Dasheng rudao cidi kaijue* 大乘入道次第開決, and the *Weishi sanshilun yaoshi* 唯識三十論要釋.

Another significant scholar-monk, Facheng 法成 (ninth century), also active in Dunhuang (and Ganzhou 甘州), translated Woncheuk's 圓測 (613-96) commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, *Jie shenmi jing shu* 解深密經疏 into Tibetan (*ibid.*, 117-19). He also gave extensive lectures on the *Yogācārabhūmi*, which are recorded in numerous notes entitled, *Yuqielun shouji* 瑜伽論手記, or *Yuqielun fenmenji* 瑜伽論分門記 (*ibid.*, 219-46).

Thus, monks in Dunhuang did not just passively accept Faxiang texts

from central China, but actively composed their own texts. Some more Faxiang texts not included in the standard Chinese Buddhist Canons are also found in Dunhuang mingmen lun, namely, an anonymous commentary on the *Dasheng baifa mingmen lun* 大乘百法明門論 (T No. 1614); the *Dasheng baifalun yizhang* 大乘百法論義章 by a certain “Venerable Yan” 晏法師; and an anonymous commentary on Xuanzang’s *Bian zhongbian lun* 辯中邊論 (T No. 1600; see Ueyama 1990, 378-401).

It is also significant that many manuscripts of Ci’en’s 慈恩 (632-82) commentary on the *Lotus Sūtra* (*Miaofa lianhua jing* 妙法蓮華經, T No.262), *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanzan* 妙法蓮華經玄贊 (T No. 1723), are found in Dunhuang (Ueyama 1990, 366-71). According to Ueyama (1990, 369), from the mid-eighth century onwards, this is virtually the only commentary on the *Lotus Sūtra* seen in the Dunhuang manuscripts. Hirano Kenshō (1984, 322-24) points out that the *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanzan* influenced popular lectures on the *Lotus Sūtra* in Dunhuang, as we can observe in the *Miaofa lianhua jing jiangjing wen* 妙法蓮華經講經文 (Pelliot chinois 2305). He further points out that other commentaries by Ci’en, the *Guan Mile shangsheng doushuaitian jing zan* 觀彌勒上生兜率天經贊 (T No. 1772), the *Amituo jing shu* 阿彌陀經疏 (T No. 1757), the *Shuo wugoucheng jing shu* 說無垢稱經疏 (T No. 1782), and the *Jin’gang bore jing zanshu* 金剛般若經贊述 (T No. 1700) were also influential on local lectures on the respective sūtras (Hirano 1984, 325-31). Ci’en’s commentaries thus seem to have exerted a strong influence on Buddhism in Dunhuang.

Numerous Faxiang manuscripts are found also in Turfan, such as the fundamental text of this school, the *CWSL* and its standard commentary by Ci’en, the *Cheng weishi lun shuji* 成唯識論述記 (T No. 1830); other classical Yogācāra texts, like the *Yuqieshi di lun* 瑜伽師地論 and the *Bian zhongbian lun*; sūtra commentaries, including the *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanzan*, its subcommentary by Quanming 詮明 (a Faxiang monk of the Liao Dynasty, 10th-11th cent.),<sup>8</sup> *Fahua jing*

8 For Quanming, see Tsukamoto 1975, 142-53; Nishiwaki Tsuneki 2009, 116-17 (I owe the reference to Nishiwaki 2009 to Yoshimura Makoto).

*xuanzan huigu tongjin xinchao* 法華經玄贊會古通今新抄, *Quanming's Shangsheng jing shu kewen* 上生經疏科文 and *Mile shangsheng jing shu huigu tongjin xinchao* 彌勒上生經疏會古通今新抄, an otherwise unknown commentary on the *Jie shenmi jing* 解深密經, and the *Yuzhu jin'gang bore jing shu xuanyan* 御注金剛般若經疏宣演.<sup>9</sup> We also find Faxiang treatises by Chinese masters like Zhizhou's 智周 (668-723) *Dasheng rudao cidi* 大乘入道次第 (T No. 1864), and Tankuang's *Dasheng baifa mingmen lun kaizong yiji* and *Dasheng baifa mingmen lun kaizong yijue*. Manuscripts of these texts are all found in Turfan. Thus, Faxiang scholarship appears to have reached this remote oasis city via Dunhuang.<sup>10</sup> In addition, significantly the existence of exchanges between the Liao state and Turfan is suggested by the discovery of the works of the Liao scholar, Quanming, in Turfan.

Still more noteworthy is that many of these Faxiang texts were translated into Old Uighur (Old Turkish). Peter Zieme (2012, 149ff.) mentions Uighur translations of Ci'en's *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanzan*,<sup>11</sup> "Unknown Commentary of the Vijnaptimātra School,"<sup>12</sup> and Zhizhou's *Dasheng rudao cidi*. In addition, Ci'en's *Dasheng fayuan yilinzhang* 大乘法苑義林章 (T No. 1861),<sup>13</sup> and several other Faxiang texts were also translated into Uighur or at least known to Uighur Buddhists.<sup>14</sup> It is highly suggestive of his eminence in Uighur Buddhism that in a colophon to the Old Uighur translation of the *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanzan*, Ci'en is even called "God" (Zieme

9 This is a subcommentary on the commentary by the Tang Emperor, Xuanzong 玄宗 (685-762), on the *Diamond Sūtra*, the *Yuzhu jin'gang bore jing shu* 御注金剛般若經疏 composed by Daoyin 道胤 from the Faxiang point of view. See Nishiwaki 2009, 214.

10 See Wang 2007, 147-48; 156-58 (I thank him for a copy of this paper); Nishiwaki 2009, 203-31.

11 Zieme here refers to Kudara's work. See Kudara 1980; 1983; 1990. See also Johan Elverskog 1997, 82-84.

12 On this text, see Elverskog 1997, 84-85.

13 See Shōgaito Masahiro 2003, 144-54. I thank Kitsudō Kōichi for the reference.

14 Kitsudō is undertaking a comprehensive study of Uighur translations of Faxiang texts. I await his results.



2012, 150). Zieme (*ibid.*, 151) further mentions a commentary on the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*, which, according to Kasai Yukiyo (2012, 106), was translated from Chinese<sup>15</sup> and has significant Faxiang elements. We shall come back to this text later.

Considering these points, we have good reasons to reconsider the distance between Yogācāra (especially Faxiang) and Chan. It is not at all unlikely that such a widely spread tradition as Faxiang exerted some influence over the emerging Chan tradition. This is the point I would like to establish in this paper.

Research in the West on the Northern School has been greatly facilitated by McRae's important contribution, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism* (1986). In this book he edits, translates, and analyzes two important early Chan texts, namely, the *Fanqu shengwu jietuo zong Xiuxin yao lun* 凡趣聖悟解脫宗修心要論 (hereafter *Xiuxin yao lun*),<sup>16</sup> attributed to the "fifth patriarch" Hongren (601-74),<sup>17</sup> and the *Yuanming lun* 圓明論.<sup>18</sup> The former text preserves the doctrine of the East Mountain Teaching (Dongshan Famen 東山法門),<sup>19</sup> and the latter, that of the Northern School.

15 According to Kasai (*ibid.*), we cannot identify a single source for this Old Uighur text, but the closest available Chinese text is the *Jingming jing jijie guanzhong shu* 淨名經集解關中疏 (T. No. 2777) by Daoye 道液 (Tang period). For this commentary, see Ueyama 1990, 342-62, which points out that Daoye belonged to the Tiantai 天台 tradition.

16 Also known as the *Zuishangsheng lun* 最上乘論 (T No.2011). This text comes down to us in several printed versions and Dunhuang manuscripts. See McRae 1986, pp. 309-12, n. 36. In this paper, I use the edition contained in *ibid.*, appendix, pp.1-16. See also Tanaka and Cheng 2009, 285-91.

17 On this attribution, see McRae 1986, 120. Ibuki Atsushi (2001, 24-26) believes that this text was transmitted in the lineage of Hongren's disciple, Faru 法如 (638-89). Ibuki also thinks that this text faithfully represents the doctrine of the East Mountain Teaching.

18 Available in Dunhuang manuscripts. See McRae 1986, pp. 325-27, n. 160. See also n. 27 of this paper.

19 It was named after the Pingmao Shan 憑茂山, where Hongren resided. It is to the east of the Twin Peak (Shuangfeng Shan) 雙峰山, where the "Fourth Master" Daoxin 道信 (580-651) resided. Both mountains are in present-day Hubei 湖北 province. See Ibuki 2001, 20.

For the present purpose, what is directly relevant is the latter text, which contains many Yogācāra elements. McRae (1986, 210) is, of course, aware that the *Yuanming lun* contains Yogācāra elements. However, since his main interest lies in clarifying the background of the famous “mind verses” attributed to Shenxiu 神秀<sup>20</sup> (?-706) and Huineng 慧能<sup>21</sup> (638-713) in the *Platform Sūtra (Nanzong dunjiao zuishang dasheng mohe bore boluomi jing liuzu Huineng dashi yu Shaozhou Dafansi shifa tan jing* 南宗頓教最上乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經六祖惠能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經, T No. 2007),<sup>22</sup> he does not exhaustively identify the Yogācāra elements in the *Yuanming lun*, nor does he trace those elements to their sources. Yogācāra influence on this text from various sources is far more extensive than McRae seems to believe. In this regard, the *Yuanming lun* is in contrast to the other text that McRae studies, the *Xiuxin yao lun*, which contains few unambiguous Yogācāra elements.<sup>23</sup> Apparently, the early Chan tradition received a great deal of Yogācāra influence in the period between the *Xiuxin yao lun* and the *Yuanming lun*. Therefore, a careful study of the Yogācāra elements of the *Yuanming lun* may well shed new light on an important aspect of early Chan history.

20 身是菩提樹 心如明鏡臺  
時時勤拂拭 莫使有塵埃 (T48:337c1-2)  
The body is the *bodhi* tree.  
The mind is like a bright mirror’s stand.  
At all times we must strive to polish it.  
and must not let dust collect. (McRae 1986, 1-2)

21 菩提本無樹 明鏡亦無臺  
佛性常清淨 何處有塵埃 (T48:338a7-8).  
*Bodhi* originally has no tree.  
The mirror also has no stand.  
The Buddha Nature is always clear and pure.  
Where is there room for dust? (McRae 1986, 2)

22 As is well known, there are versions of this text available in the Dunhuang manuscripts that contain significant differences. Since this text is not the main topic of this paper, I do not go into detail.

23 Ibuki (2011, 111) points out that the meditative experience described in this text is very similar to the meditative system of the *Daofan qusheng xin jue* 導凡趣聖心訣. He probably refers to the meditation on the external objects and the inner mind (T48:378b23-24; McRae ed., §[P], p.10). However, the parallelism between these two texts may require further examination.

Another significant text for my present purpose is the *Dasheng kaixin xianxing dunwu zhenzong lun* 大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論 (T No.2835, hereafter *Zhenzong lun*), which is attributed to Master Dazhao 大照禪師 and a lay practitioner Huiguang 居士慧光 and contains extensive discussions of the fourfold wisdom of the Yogācāra tradition.<sup>24</sup>

Even more important are the instructions on meditation found in the *Daofan qusheng xinjue* 導凡趣聖心決, a copy of which is found just after the *Xiuxin yao lun*<sup>25</sup> in an anthology of East Mountain/Northern School materials (Pelliot chinois 2657, 3018, 3559, 3664).<sup>26</sup> The meditation method described here has a structure typical of the Yogācāra School, and this suggests that Yogācāra Buddhism affected not only the theory but also the practice of the Northern School.

If we can establish these points, it will significantly change our view of the role that Yogācāra Buddhism played in China. It was not just an impractical scholasticism. Thus, studying Yogācāra elements in early Chan texts can be important for both Yogācāra and Chan studies. With this possibility in mind, in this paper I shall reexamine a few of the early Chan texts mentioned above.

24 See also McRae 1986, p.324, n.157.

25 This portion of the manuscript is translated in McRae 1986, 215-17. Ibuki 1991(110-11) believes that this text belonged to the lineage of Faru 法如, who first introduced the East Mountain Teaching to Chang'an 長安 and Luoyang 洛陽. See also Shinohara Hisao 1980, 176-77. For recent researches concerning this text, see Tanaka and Cheng 2011, 268-70. Cheng 2005, 31 points out that D̄x00649 also preserves the last portion of this text.

26 According to Ueyama 1990, 403-4, this anthology was originally one manuscript that was cut into four. In Gallica, the online database of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Pelliot chinois 3559 and 3664 are shown together under the heading of "3664 (+3559)." I thank Nathalie Monnet (BnF) for her assistance with Gallica.

## II. The *Yuanming lun*

The *Yuanming lun* is a text available in several Dunhuang manuscripts.<sup>27</sup> One manuscript attributes the authorship to Aśvaghōṣa,<sup>28</sup> but McRae considers this text to be a record of a lecture or lectures given by an eminent Northern School master, possibly Shenxiu (?-706) himself (1986, 149; 210-11). Its date of composition is uncertain, but based on the date of the secular document written on the recto of the Pelliot chinois 3559 and 3664 (c.751), Ueyama (1990, 403-4) considers the Chan manuscripts in question to have been copied around 760-70.<sup>29</sup> Tanaka (1983, 398) argues that it must have been composed in the latter half of the eighth century.

This text abounds in doctrinal elements traceable to various Buddhist doctrinal traditions. Yanagida (1963, 47) and Tanaka (1983, 397) maintain that the *Yuanming lun* was composed under the influence of Tathāgatagarbha thought as found in the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra* and the *Awakening of Faith*. On the other hand, Okabe (1980, 346) notes Huayan 華嚴 and Faxiang terms in this text, though he also emphasizes its close ties to the *Awakening of Faith*. McRae (1986, 210), too, observes “traces of Hua-yen, Mādhyamika, and Yogācāra doctrines” there. None of them, however, attempts to identify the sources of individual Yogācāra elements in this text. This is what I would like to do here. We can observe many Yogācāra elements from a few different groups of texts in the *Yuanming lun*. Here I examine three groups of Yogācāra texts (the *Lankāvatāra-sūtra*, Paramārtha’s text, and Xuanzang’s texts) that influenced the *Yuanming lun*.

27 Beijing 7254 (*fū* 服-6, see Huang Yongwu 1986, 582); Pelliot chinois 3559, 3664; Stein 6184; the manuscript that used to be in the possession of Ishii Mitsuo 石井光雄; Dx00696. See Yanagida 1963, 47-48, Tanaka 1969, 204-7; 1983, 389-400; Okabe Kazuo 1980, 345. For Dx00696, see Cheng 2005, 40-41.

28 Beijing 7254. In this manuscript, excerpts from the *Awakening of Faith* are embedded in the *Yuanming lun*, and that confusion may well have been the reason for this attribution. See Tanaka 1969, 206-7; 1983, 389-98.

29 Buddhist texts were often copied on the verso of recycled administrative documents (Ueyama 1990, 404). Concerning the date of the *Yuanming lun*, see also Tanaka 1969, 207, and McRae 1986, 326.

## II.1 *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*

Early Chan was traditionally associated with the four-fascicle version of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* (*LAS*), as shown in such texts as the *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳 (T No. 2060) and the *Lengqie shizi ji* 楞伽師資記 (T No. 2837).<sup>30</sup> Therefore, it might seem to be a matter of course that the *LAS* is one of the major sources of the *Yuanming lun* (*YML*). In fact, the historicity of the legend that Bodhidharma 菩提達摩 bestowed this sūtra on Huike 慧可 is quite dubious (McRae 1986, 27-28), and very few quotations from the *LAS* have been found in early Chan texts (Suzuki Daisetz 2000, 304; see also Ui Hakuju 1939, 370-73). Therefore, clear examples of the influence of the *LAS* on the *YML* are well worth pointing out. Though not necessarily a mainstream Yogācāra text, the *LAS* has many Yogācāra elements. Thus, the close ties between the *LAS* and the *YML* are significant for the purpose of this paper.

One example of a statement that seems directly traceable to the *LAS* is the following line from the *YML* (p.19):<sup>31</sup>

一者從無始妄想熏習而生，二者即從現在香味因緣□□□從熏習而生。

[The image of the body] arises first from the beginningless impregnation of false thoughts, and second from the conditions<sup>32</sup> of present scent and taste. . . . [Aided by these conditions, the body?] arises from the impregnation.

30 See Sekiguchi Shindai 1964, 52-74; 1967, 176-80, 271-81. On the other hand, Ibuki is suspicious about the identification of the “Laṅkāvatāra School (Lengqie Zong 楞伽宗)” with the Chan tradition. See Ibuki 2001, 17.

31 All the quotations from the *YML* in this paper are from the edition included in McRae 1986, appendix, pp.18-44. The *YML* is translated in full in *ibid.*, pp.149-71. When translating this text, I referred to his translation, but the translations in this paper are my own.

32 Literally, “causes and conditions.” This compound as a whole can also be a technical term meaning, “primary cause.” In this context, however, it seems to be used rather loosely in the sense of “conditions.”

Though this might seem to be a rather commonplace statement in Yogācāra texts, the phrase *wushi wangxiang xunxi* 無始妄想熏習, “the beginningless impregnation of false thoughts,” is reminiscent of the following line from the *LAS* (T16:483a20-21):

大慧, 取種種塵及無始妄想薰是分別事識因

Mahāmāti, grasping various objects and the beginningless impregnation of false thoughts are the causes of the consciousness that discriminates objects.

Further, see the following passage from the *YML* (p.33).

賴耶本性無有形質, 及諸根身是有形質。今時凡夫不見賴耶爲本, 謂言父母能生。是以浪作色身之觀。推至微塵, 乃至虛空, 妄取羅漢之果。若知身本來依賴耶而起者, 卽無眼耳鼻舌。

[*Ā*]laya is essentially without substance, but the body consisting of various sense organs has substance. Deluded people nowadays do not understand that *ālaya* is the root [of human body] and think [rather] that it is parents who give birth to [the body of their child]. For this reason, they wrongly practice meditation on the physical body. They analyze it into motes of dust, up to [the point they look like] space (*ākāśa*), and [thereby] erroneously attain the fruit of arhatship. If one [simply] knows that the body has originally arisen depending on *ālaya*, then [one knows that] there is no eye, ear, nose, or tongue [that constitute the body].

The topic here is the meditative analysis of matter into atoms (*paramāṇu*), found in Yogācāra sources (for example, the *CWSL*, T31:4b29-c4). The word *laiye* 賴耶 (abbreviated phonetic transcription of *ālaya*) is clearly Xuanzang’s terminology,<sup>33</sup> so the main source here must have been Xuanzang’s texts. Nevertheless, the word *weichen* 微塵 as an equivalent of *paramāṇu* catches our eyes. This word is clear-

33 Paramārtha uses *aliye* 阿黎耶 or *aliye* 阿梨耶.

ly different from Xuanzang's *jiwei* 極微 or Paramārtha's *linxu* 隣虛,<sup>34</sup> and suggests a tie to the following line of the *LAS* (T16:508c17-18):

竟者分析乃至微塵，觀察壞四大及造色。

“The end” means that, analyzing [the four elements and their composite matter] into notes of dust,<sup>35</sup> [the practitioner] observes the destruction of the four elements and their composite matter.

In the last chapter of the *YML* (p. 40), the text explicitly quotes from the *LAS*:

依楞伽經，自覺聖智宗立一切諸法<sup>36</sup>皆是自心現量義。若解者，山川大地，及以己身，並是自心，非是謬(?)也。

According to the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, the teaching of self-realizing noble wisdom presents the thesis that all dharmas are manifestations of one's own mind. If one understands [this principle, the statement that] mountains, rivers, ground, and one's own body are all [manifestations of] one's mind is not false.

The key concepts of this chapter, namely *zijue shengzhi* 自覺聖智 and *zixin xianliang* 自心現量, appear frequently in the *LAS*, and so obviously the content of this chapter is closely linked to the *LAS*. See, for example, the following passage from the *LAS* (T16:491b14-24):

如來地自覺聖智，修行者不應於彼作性非性想。… 譬如水中有樹影現，彼非影非非影，非樹形非非樹形。如是外道見習所熏妄想計著，依於一異俱不俱有無非有非無常無常想，而不能知自心現量。

34 See Hirakawa Akira, et al, 1973, s.v. “*paramāṇu*” (pp. 224-25).

35 Corresponding Sanskrit is: *paramāṇu*, “atom” (Nanjio Bunyiu ed., 207.13)

36 McRae's edition has *fo* 佛 here, but the Pelliot chinois 3664 has *fa* 法. McRae himself translates it as “dharmas” (1986, 167). Therefore, *fo* 佛 must be a simple misprint.

[Concerning] the self-realizing noble wisdom<sup>37</sup> at the stage of Tathāgata, practitioners should not consider it to be either substantial or insubstantial. . . . When a reflected image of a tree appears on water, it is not an image, nor is it not an image; it is not the form of a tree, nor is it not the form of a tree. In the same way, non-Buddhists are attached to erroneous thoughts impregnated with [wrong] habitual views<sup>38</sup> and, relying on the notions of “one,” “other,” “together,” “separate,” “existing,” “not existing,” “non-existent,” “not non-existent,” “not impermanent,” and “impermanent,” cannot understand the manifestations of their own minds.<sup>39</sup>

Thus, the discussion in the seventh chapter of the *YML* seems to have been very closely linked to the *LAS*.<sup>40</sup> Let us look at one more example. See the following passage from the *YML* (p.40):

釋曰，實是自心所現，非是謬也。所以得知，自心所現。且論身四大者，為內有四種妄想，感得四大以為身。是以無五大。何以故。內有沈重妄想故，感得地大以為身。內有津潤妄想故，感得水大以為身。內有忿熱妄想故，感得火大為身。內有飄動妄想故，感得風大以為身。是以得知，皆是自心現量。

Commentary: Indeed, [the four elements] are manifestations of our own mind; [this] is not wrong. Therefore, we know that [the four elements] are manifestations of our mind. Regarding the four elements of the body, because there are

37 The underlying Sanskrit in the *LAS* is: *āryajñānapratyātmādhigamyam*, “to be known by oneself with noble wisdom” (Nanjio ed., 92.18-93.1). Here I simply translate the Chinese.

38 The corresponding Sanskrit is: *tīrthyadr̥ṣṭivāsanāvāsitaikalpā*, “discriminating thought impregnated with the *vāsanās* of the views of non-Buddhists” (Nanjio ed., 93.15-16).

39 The corresponding Sanskrit is *svacittadr̥ṣyamātra*, “to be perceived only by one’s own mind” (Nanjio ed., 93.17).

40 It is also possible that the simile of a tree reflected on water in the above passage from the *LAS* may have been the source of inspiration of the story of the faces reflected on pure wine in the *YML* (p.42).



four types of wrong thoughts inside, we acquire the four elements constituting the body. For this reason, there are no five elements [beyond these four].” Why [not]? Since there is a false thought of heaviness inside, we acquire the earth element constituting the body. Since there is a false thought of moisture inside, we acquire the water element constituting the body. Since there is a false thought of heated anger inside, we acquire the fire element constituting the body. Since we have a false thought of movement inside, we acquire the wind element constituting the body. For these reasons, we know that everything is a manifestation of our own mind.

This argument is clearly tied to the following portion of the *LAS* (T16:495c18-22).

大慧，彼四大種云何生造色。謂津潤妄想大種生內外水界。堪能妄想大種生內外火界。飄動妄想大種生內外風界。斷截色妄想大種生內外地界。

Mahāmāti, how do those four elements create composite matter? I say that the element of the false thought of moisture creates the water element inside and outside. The element of the false thought of agility creates the fire element inside and outside. The element of the false thought of movement creates the wind element inside and outside. The element of the false thought of cutting matter (?) creates the earth element inside and outside.

Though the agreement is not perfect, the Chinese expressions for “the false thought of moisture” (for the water element) and “false thought of movement” (for the wind element) agree exactly.<sup>41</sup> There thus seems to be a clear connection between the *YML* and the *LAS*. Since,

41 Concerning the disagreements between these two texts, one might consider McRae’s argument that the *YML* was a record of lectures (1986, 149; 210-11). If the lecturer relied on his memory rather than referring to the source text in front of him, some deviations from his source are to be expected.

as we have seen, scholars have rarely observed any actual influence of the *LAS* on early Chan, this close relationship is quite significant.

## II.2 Paramārtha's Text

At one place in the text, the *YML* is clearly based on Paramārtha's translation. See the following passage from the *YML* (pp.33-34):

何以得知識元無有形質，唯有四似。何者名為四似。似根，似塵，似我，似識。此是四似。一一似中，推覓元無有識根等，並是賴耶之中影像也。

How can one know that consciousness originally has no substance and only has four semblances? What are the four semblances? The semblances of sense organs, external objects, Self, and consciousness. These are the four semblances. Even if one searches in each semblance, [one finds that] there is originally no consciousness, sense organ, and so forth; they are just images in the *ālaya*.

Here again, the word *laiye* 賴耶 suggests a connection to Xuanzang's texts. On the basis of the overall wording and the content, however, the main source here must have been Paramārtha's translation of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* (*Zhongbian fenbie lun* 中邊分別論, T31:451b7-13 [No.1599], corresponding to verse I.3 and its commentary in the Sanskrit text).

塵根我及識 本識生似彼  
但識有無彼 彼無故識無

似塵者，謂本識顯現相似色等。似根者，謂識似五根於自他相續中顯現。似我者，謂意識與我見無明等相應故。似識者，謂六種識。本識者謂阿黎耶識。生似彼者，謂似塵等四物。但識有者，謂但有亂識。無彼者，謂無四物。

External objects, sense organs, Self, and consciousness; the fundamental consciousness arises and resembles these [four].

Only the consciousness exists, while these [semblances] do not. Since they do not exist, the consciousness does not exist [either].

“The semblance of external objects” means that the fundamental consciousness appears like matter and so forth. “The semblance of sense organs” means that the consciousness appears like the five sense organs in the [personal] continuities of oneself and others. “The semblance of Self” means that the consciousness of *manas* is associated with the view of Self, ignorance, and so forth. “The semblance of consciousness” means the six types of consciousness. “The fundamental consciousness” means *ālayavijñāna*. “Arises and resembles these [four]” means that it resembles the four items such as external objects. “Only the consciousness exists” means that only disturbed consciousness exists. “They do not exist” means that the four items do not exist.

The agreement of the four characteristic terms, *sigen* 似根, “the semblance of sense organs,” *sichen* 似塵, “the semblance of external objects,” *siwo* 似我, “the semblance of Self,” and *sishi* 似識, “the semblance of consciousness,” clearly indicates that Paramārtha’s, not Xuanzang’s, version of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* was the source of the *YML*. Further, the *YML* states that these four items are images of *ālayavijñāna*, an understanding that agrees with Paramārtha’s version, but not with Xuanzang’s.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, in spite of the use of Xuanzang’s [*a*]laiye [阿]賴耶 instead of Paramārtha’s *aliye* 阿黎耶, it is clear that here the *YML* was drawing from Paramārtha’s *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*.

42 Xuanzang’s disciple, Ci’en’s *Bian zhongbian lun shuji* 辯中邊論述記 (ZZ 1-75-1-19v) criticizes Paramārtha’s translation, which states that the four “semblances” are all manifestations of the “fundamental consciousness” (*benshi* 本識). According to Ci’en’s interpretation, “Self” and “consciousness” are not manifestations of *ālayavijñāna*.

### II.3 Xuanzang's Texts

The foregoing arguments notwithstanding, the main source of Yogācāra elements in the *YML* is no doubt Xuanzang's texts. I hope this point is clear from the many correspondences shown in the table in the appendix. Here, I discuss only a few examples.

In Chapter 4 of the *YML*, entitled *Bianming sansheng nishun guan* 辨明三乘逆順觀, "Explanation of the Meditation in Forward and Reverse Order of the Three Vehicles," the text discusses the conversion of *śrāvakas* to the bodhisattva path. See, for example, the following line (p.31):

聲聞人廻心入菩薩道, 望 (?) 八識習氣藏而得. 而生菩薩道, 并行六波羅蜜.

Conversion of *śrāvaka* people to the bodhisattva path becomes possible based on the eighth consciousness, which contains *vāsanās*. Thus, [they] can give rise to the bodhisattva path and also practice the six *pāramitās*.

According to the Faxiang doctrine, certain people have undetermined *gotra* in their *ālayavijñāna*, and thus they can convert from one vehicle to another. The passage quoted above seems to presuppose such a system. See, for example, the following passage from the *CWSL* (T31:55c1-3):

又說彼無無餘依者, 依不定性二乘而說. 彼纔證得有餘涅槃決定廻心求無上覺.

The statement that they have no [nirvāṇa] without remainder was made with regard to [the practitioners of] the two vehicles who have undetermined *gotras*. The moment they attain nirvāṇa with remainder, they definitely convert and seek the unsurpassed awakening.

Further, see the following line from the *YML* (p.33):

今見眼耳鼻舌並是賴耶[識]<sup>43</sup>之氣。

The eye, ear, nose, and tongue that we see now<sup>44</sup> are all *vāsanās* in the *[ā]layavijñāna*.

Here *qi* 氣 must be an abbreviated form of *xiqi* 習氣, namely, *vāsanā*. This line is actually a little ambiguous. Considering the preceding passage,<sup>45</sup> we might read this line as simply meaning that *vāsanās* held in the *ālayavijñāna* give rise to the sense organs. However, if we consider another line that appears a little after this line in the *YML* (p. 34, quoted below), it seems also possible that the sense organs themselves were equated with *vāsanās* in the *ālayavijñāna*.<sup>46</sup> If we accept the latter interpretation, this line may presuppose the following argument in the *CWSL* (T31:19c21-24):

識上色功能 名五根應理  
功能與境色 無始互為因

彼頌意言。異熟識上能生眼等色識種子名色功能，說為五根。無別根等。

It is reasonable to call the potential of matter in the consciousness “five sense organs.” Potential and material objects have caused each other from time immemorial.

The meaning of this verse is as follows: “Potential of matter” refers to the *bījas* in the *vipākavijñāna* that can give rise to

43 This character is added by McRae.

44 Strictly speaking, from the point of view of orthodox Faxiang theory, this statement is questionable, because *indriyas* are not considered visible in this system. See *CWSL*, T31:4a29.

45 賴耶識猶如大地，眼耳鼻舌身意等猶如百草萌芽。若無大地，草木叢林依何而得生長。草木叢林種子，皆是地之所持，不失種子。（*YML*, p. 33）  
*[Ā]layavijñāna* is like the ground, and the eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and mind are like a hundred sprouting grasses. If there were no ground, on what basis can grasses, trees, bushes, and woods grow? The seeds of grasses, trees, bushes, and woods are all held by the ground without being lost.

46 The *YML* is not a doctrinally coherent text, so some inconsistencies are not unexpected.

the consciousness [appearing as] matter, such as the eye, and [these *bījas*] are called the five sense organs. There are no sense organs and so forth apart from [the *bījas*].

This is a variant theory based on the *Viṃśikā Vijñaptimātratāsiddhiḥ* (*Weishi ershi lun* 唯識二十論, T31:75b17-23 [No. 1590], corresponding to verse 9 and its commentary in the Sanskrit text) but not adopted by the *CWSL*. Here the “potential” is synonymous with *bīja* and *vāsanā*, so the position of this passage agrees with that of the *YML* quoted above. It seems highly possible that the *YML* presupposed this argument.

In the same context, the *YML* further states as follows (p.34):

但見賴耶本性無有生滅，即捨諸根之見。何以故。元無諸根故，並是本識種子相分故。本識之相分者，即無眼耳鼻舌之根。

If one merely sees that [*ālaya*] essentially has no arising and perishing, one abandons the view that the sense organs [indeed exist]. Why? It is because there originally are no sense organs, and all [the sense organs] are *bījas* that are the image-portion of the fundamental consciousness. “The image-portion of the fundamental consciousness” indicates that there are no sense organs of eye, ear, nose, or tongue.

The first line (of the original Chinese text), which states that the *ālaya* has no arising and perishing, seems alien to the Faxiang doctrine.<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, we should note that this quotation contains the distinctive Faxiang term “image-portion” (*xiangfen* 相分). In fact, the argument here would be unintelligible without referring to the Faxiang doctrine that subsumes *bījas* under the image-portion of *ālayavijñāna*. See the following (*CWSL*, T31:10a17-23):

阿賴耶識，因緣力故，自體生時，內變為種及有根身，外變為器。即以所變為自所緣。…似所緣相說名相分。

<sup>47</sup> In the Faxiang doctrine, *ālayavijñāna* is impermanent, so it constantly arises and perishes. See *CWSL* T31:12c2-3.

Owing to the power of causes and conditions, when the main portion of *ālayavijñāna* arises, it creates *bījas* and the body with sense organs inside and the receptacle[-world] outside. Namely, the cognitive objects [of *ālayavijñāna*] are its own creations. . . . The images that resemble cognitive objects are called the “image-portion.”

Judging from these examples, it is nearly certain that the author of the *YML* referred to Xuanzang’s Yogācāra texts. Though the *YML*’s Yogācāra elements are an amalgamation of at least three different traditions (the *LAS*, Paramārtha, Xuanzang), Xuanzang’s texts seem to have been the most important source among these three.

### III. The *Zhenzong lun*

The *Zhenzong lun* is another text in which we can observe conspicuous Faxiang influence. A transcription of Pelliot chinois 2162 is included in the Taishō Canon, vol. 85 (No. 2835). In addition, Stein 4286 preserves the first part of this text (about 1/3 of the entire text). An edition (together with a Japanese translation), based on these two manuscripts and prior editions, has been published by Tanaka (1989, hereafter “Tanaka ed.”). I primarily use this edition in this paper.

As already mentioned, this text presents itself as a record of questions and answers between a lay practitioner, Huiguang, and Chan Master Dazhao. One strange point here is that, according to the preface to this text, Dazhao is the Dharma name of Huiguang. If this is the case, it follows that this text is a monologue: the questioner and answerer are the same person. On the other hand, Ibuki (1992a, 302) points out that this preface was concocted based on the *Dunwu zhenzong jin’gang bore xiuxing dabi’an famen yaojue* 頓悟真宗金剛般若修行達彼岸法門要決 (*Yaojue*). If he is correct, this preface does not have any independent value.

On the basis of a line in the preface that suggests that Dazhao was a

disciple of Shenhui 神會 (684-758<sup>48</sup>; Tanaka ed., 182; T85:1278a29), this text had long been considered to be a Southern-School text.<sup>49</sup> Tanaka (1980, 233-41; 1983, 246-56), however, argued that the *Zhenzong lun* was closely linked to the *Guanxin lun* 觀心論 of Shenzhou 神秀 and thus belonged to the Northern School. I follow his arguments and treat the *Zhenzong lun* as a Northern School text.<sup>50</sup>

Scholars have noted that the *Zhenzong lun* was based on the *Yaojue* and other prior sources (Ibuki 1992a; 1992b; Nishiguchi Yoshio 2000; see also Ueyama 1976). Cheng 2011 argues that the source the *Zhenzong lun* most heavily relied on was the *Dasheng qishi lun* 大乘起世論. Therefore, these earlier sources need to be investigated also. However, if we follow Cheng (2011, 128), no earlier Chan source is known for most of the portions of the *Zhenzong lun* that discuss Yogācāra theories.<sup>51</sup> Thus, for the present purpose, I think we should focus our attention on the *Zhenzong lun* itself.

It should be obvious from the table found at the end of this paper that the extensive discussion of the eight types of consciousness and their transformation into the four types of wisdom in the *Zhenzong lun* are based on the Faxiang doctrine. Therefore, I do not compare individual

48 For his dates, I follow Ibuki 1992, 306.

49 See Ui 1939, 238-55, *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解說大辭典, s.v. “*Daijō kaishin kenshō tongo shinshū ron*” 大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論 (7:281d), and Suzuki 2000, 41-42. This text is edited in *ibid.*, 318-30.

50 Tanaka considers the *Yaojue* (which mentions Shenzhou) to have been based on the *Zhenzong lun* (which mentions Shenhui). However, if we follow Ibuki, this relationship should be reversed. The background of these two texts requires further investigation. On the other hand, Ibuki (2001, 51) also seems to accept the identification of the *Zhenzong lun* as a Northern School text. See also Cheng (2002, 179), who, on the basis of its preface, believes that the *Zhenzong lun* was composed a little before 733.

51 Yogācāra elements are not particularly visible in the *Dasheng qishi lun* transcribed by Fang Guangchang (1997, 54-69) from Pelliot chinois 2039v. The *Dasheng qishi lun* was, according to Cheng 2011, the most important source of the *Zhenzong lun*. If we follow Ibuki (1992b, 97-98) and Cheng (2011, 128), the description of the fourfold wisdom in the *Zhenzong lun* is partly based on the *Dasheng wusheng fangbian men* 大乘無生方便門 (T No. 2834). In this case also, the dependence on Yogācāra sources is much more explicit in the *Zhenzong lun* than in the *Dasheng wusheng fangbian lun*.



points concerning this text with their possible Faxiang sources.

We should note here that the *Zhenzong lun* at times deviates from the Faxiang orthodoxy. I would like to discuss two cases of such originality (or deviation) below.

First, see the following statement of the *Zhenzong lun* (Tanaka ed., pp. 199-200; T85:1280a5-9):

所言識者，以了別爲義。如人眼與色相應之時，意識於中分別。或時計好，或時計惡。隨彼所計便有相生，卽薰於第七末那之識。承此薰故遂卽執取，轉薰於第八識。

What is called “consciousness” has the meaning of “cognition.” For example, when the eye and color are associated, the *manovijñāna* makes a judgment about [the object], sometimes as desirable, sometimes as undesirable. Following its judgment, an image appears and impregnates the seventh consciousness of *manas*. Due to this impregnation, [the *manas*] grasps onto [the object] and in turn impregnates the eighth consciousness [*ālayavijñāna*].

Clearly the passage presupposes Faxiang doctrine. Here, the understanding that when a sense perceives<sup>52</sup> its object, *manovijñāna* makes a judgment about the object is a standard Yogācāra doctrine confirmed in such texts as the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* (*Jie shenmi jing*, T16:692b20-22 [No. 679]), the *Yogācārabhūmi* (*Yuqieshi di lun* 瑜伽師地論, T30:280a22-27 [No. 1579]), and the *CWSL* (T31:21a13-15). Therefore, the first half of the passage is not a problem. The second half, on the other hand, clearly disagrees with the Faxiang position. The *CWSL* makes it clear that only *ālayavijñāna* can receive impregnation. See below (T31:9c18-19):

52 The original expression is *xiangying* 相應, “to be associated with” (*sam-pra-yuj*). Strictly speaking, this is an expression used to refer to the relationship between consciousness (*shi* 識, *vijñāna*) and its functions (*xinsuo* 心所, *caitta*). The statement that the eye and color are “associated” is not exactly accurate from a doctrinal point of view, but I do not discuss this point here.

唯異熟識具此四義可是所熏。非心所。

Only *vipākavijñāna* (= *ālayavijñāna*) satisfies these four conditions [necessary for being impregnated: solidity, neutrality, capacity to be impregnated, and coexistence with what impregnates] and can be impregnated. It is not the case that mental functions and so forth can be [impregnated].

Further, a standard commentary on the *CWSL*, the *Cheng weishi lun shuji* (T43:313b25-27), expressly states that the seventh consciousness cannot be impregnated, as follows:

其無性人此第七識四義具足。何不受熏。以染無記違善惡品。今言無記唯無覆無記。

The seventh consciousness of the *gotra*-less people satisfies these four conditions [for being impregnated]. Why does it not receive impregnation? Since it is defiled-neutral, it is not consistent with good and bad elements. The word “neutral” that appears here [in the four conditions] only refers to undefiled-neutral.

In the Faxiang doctrine, the seventh consciousness does not transmit the impregnation from the six types of active consciousness to the eighth consciousness. The six kinds of active consciousness directly deposit their *bījas* into *ālayavijñāna*, and so does the seventh.<sup>53</sup> Therefore, this point clearly disagrees with the Faxiang position.

53 現行者謂七轉識及彼相應所變相見性界地等。除佛果善極劣無記，餘熏本識生自類種。此唯望彼是因緣性。(CWSL, T31:40a25-28)

“Active elements” refer to the [three] natures, [three] *dhātus*, and [nine] *bhūmis*, which are the image and cognizer portions of the seven types of active consciousness and [the functions] associated with them. Except for the good [elements] at the Buddha stage and extremely impotent neutral [elements], other elements impregnate the fundamental consciousness (= *ālayavijñāna*) and create their own seeds. These [active elements] are the primary causes only of their [own seeds].

Another problem is the correspondence between the threefold bodies of the Buddha and his four types of wisdom. See the following statement in the *Zhenzong lun* (Tanaka ed., p.204; T85:1280b15-23).

問曰. 四智既爾. 云何三身.

答曰. 大圓鏡智以爲法身. 平等性智以爲報身. 成所作智及妙觀察智以爲化身.

又問曰. 以何知之而作是說.

答曰. 據今時現在而言. 具定一切無漏功德圓滿義足, 猶如世間明鏡現衆面像而無分別. 故說此智以爲法身. 妄心既盡, 平等性成萬行成就. 以爲報身. 六根無染廣度衆生. 自離離他, 令他同解而修因. 故以化身.

Question: The four types of wisdom are already thus [understood]. What are the three bodies?

Answer: Great Mirror Wisdom is the Dharma Body. Equality Wisdom is the Body of Recompense. Action Wisdom and Observation Wisdom are the Body of Transformation.

Another Question: How do you know that and make the above statement?

Answer: We say this based on what exists now(?). [Great Mirror Wisdom] is complete with all undefiled merits like a clear mirror that we use in our daily life, which reflects many images but does not make judgments about them. For this reason, this wisdom is the Dharma Body. Deluded mind has already been exhausted, equality has been established, and a myriad practices have been accomplished. For this reason, it is the Body of Recompense. [Action Wisdom:] The six sense organs have no defilements and widely save sentient beings. [Observation Wisdom:] It equally detaches oneself and others, and makes others equally understand the cause of practice. Therefore, [these two types of wisdom are] the Body of Transformation.

Therefore, according to this model, the correspondences between the fourfold wisdom and the three bodies are as follows:

Great Mirror Wisdom	The Dharma Body
Equality Wisdom	The Body of Recompense
Action Wisdom Observation Wisdom	The Body of Transformation

On the other hand, the *CWSL* gives two theories about this issue. The first theory is as follows (T31:58a6-13):<sup>54</sup>

Tathatā Great Mirror Wisdom ( <i>ādarśa-jñāna</i> )	The Body of the Essence ( <i>svabhāva-kāya</i> =Dharma Body)
Equality Wisdom ( <i>samatā-jñāna</i> ) Observation Wisdom ( <i>pratyavekṣaṇā-jñāna</i> )	The Body of Recompense ( <i>sambhoga-kāya</i> )
Action Wisdom ( <i>krtyānuṣṭhāna-jñāna</i> )	The Body of Transformation ( <i>nirmāṇa-kāya</i> )

The second theory is as shown in the table below (T31:58a15-25):

Tathatā	The Body of the Essence
Great Mirror Wisdom	The Body of Recompense for Oneself ( <i>svasambhoga-kāya</i> )
Equality Wisdom	The Body of Recompense for Others ( <i>parasambhoga-kāya</i> )
Action Wisdom	The Body of Transformation

Thus the model of the *Zhenzong lun* does not agree with either theory of the *CWSL*. Sakuma Hidenori (1987, 387-403; 2012, 46) lists these

54 The same theory is found in the \**Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra* (*Fodi jing lun* 佛地經論, T26:325c27-28).

and other models found in Yogācāra texts, but none of them agrees with the model in the *Zhenzong lun*. This theory may have been an invention within the Chan tradition.<sup>55</sup> A notable point here is that, according to Kasai (2012, 108-9), an Old Turkish (Old Uighur) commentary on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* has a combination of the fourfold wisdom and the three bodies that exactly agrees with the theory in the *Zhenzong lun*. See the following comparative table.

Fourfold Wisdom	<i>CWSL</i> 1 (T31: 58a6-13) = <i>BBhVy</i> (Nishio ed., §III.5.1.[1]); <i>BBhSŚ</i> (T26: 325c27-28)	<i>CWSL</i> 2 (T31:59a15-25)	<i>SAVBh</i> (Chibetto Buntan Kenkyūkai ed., Tib. Text, 117.7-118.10)	<i>MSA</i> , Ch (Prabhākara -mitra, T31:606a3-607b20 [No. 1604])	<i>Zhenzong lun</i>	Old Uighur Commentary
Tathatā/ Dharma- dhātu	Svabhāva (=Dharma)	Svabhāva (=Dharma)	--	--	--	--
Great Mirror Wisdom	Svabhāva (=Dharma)	Svasaṃ- bhoga	Svabhāva = Dharma (Svasaṃ- bhoga)	Dharma	Dharma	Dharma
Equality Wisdom	Sam̐bhoga	Parasaṃ- bhoga	Sam̐bhoga	Dharma	Sam̐bhoga	Sam̐bhoga
Observation Wisdom	Sam̐bhoga	?	Sam̐bhoga	Sam̐bhoga	Nirmāṇa	Nirmāṇa
Action Wisdom	Nirmāṇa	Nirmāṇa	Nirmāṇa	Nirmāṇa	Nirmāṇa	Nirmāṇa

55 Kitsudō 2012 points out that the same combinations of the fourfold wisdom and the threefold bodies are found in several other Chinese Chan texts. This might have been a standard view shared by Chinese Chan masters. I thank Kitsudō for allowing me to refer to his forthcoming paper.

It is difficult to explain this agreement between the *Zhenzong lun* and the Old Uighur commentary. Kasai (2012, 106-7) points out that this Uighur commentary is on the whole close to the *Jingming jing jijie guanzhong shu* 淨名經集解關中疏 (T No. 2777), but that this particular discussion is not found in the Chinese commentary and was probably added by the Uighur translator. If so, perhaps the Uighur translator was familiar with the Chan interpretation of this matter. Further investigation is needed regarding the agreement between the *Zhenzong lun* and the Old Uighur commentary.

Concerning the *\*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* (*Jin'gang sanmei jing* 金剛三昧經, T No. 273), Buswell observes as follows (1989, 9):

The relationship the author [Buswell] draws between Ch'an praxis and the seminal doctrinal concepts of the wider sinic tradition will show that, while Ch'an may "not," as it claims, "rely on words and letters," it nevertheless has drawn creatively, and with little real reticence, on the scriptural teachings of the larger Buddhist tradition.<sup>56</sup>

Here the keyword should be "creatively." In fact, when we look at the *YML* and the *Zhenzong lun*, we get similar impressions. They certainly draw heavily on doctrinal texts, in this case Yogācāra, but they do not hesitate to depart from the orthodox doctrines found in their source texts, often without stating clear reason. Thus, their way of argument looks quite different from that found in the doctrinal Yogācāra (especially Faxiang) texts. When diverging opinions are presented in the Faxiang texts, their proponents try to justify their views on a textual or doctrinal basis. Such justification is often missing in the relevant Chan texts, and they frequently state their

---

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Tanaka, Okimoto Katsumi 1989, 465.

views without presenting a clear theoretical basis.<sup>57</sup> In some cases, the departures might have been simply the result of misunderstanding. But more importantly, I think those Chan authors were fundamentally practitioners and not textual scholars. Their primary interest, I suspect, was to express their own spiritual attainments making use of words found in mainstream Buddhist texts rather than to convey faithfully the doctrines found in those texts.<sup>58</sup> That is probably also the reason why they do not hesitate to mix up elements found in different strains of texts. However heavily dependent on doctrinal texts they may appear, after all, I think, they were Chan practitioners.<sup>59</sup>

#### IV. *Daofan qusheng xinjue*

In the foregoing examination, we have observed that the Northern School was influenced by Faxiang doctrine. In this section, I would like to point out that early Chan was also influenced by Yogācāra practices.

The aforementioned *Daofan qusheng xinjue*, a set of instructions on meditation of the East Mountain Teaching/Northern School,<sup>60</sup> is

---

57 In the particular case of the fourfold wisdom and the three bodies, some reasoning is given in the *Zhenzong lun*, but this is not the norm in the relevant Chan texts. For example, when the *Zhenzong lun* says that *manovijñāna* first impregnates *manas*, and then *manas* impregnates *ālayavijñāna* (see above), this is a serious deviation from the system of the *CWSL*, but the reason for deviation is not explained in the *Zhenzong lun*.

58 Cf. McRae (1986, 198): “Since their message was in many ways at variance with the letter and spirit of Indian Buddhism, the members of the early Ch’an School often had not only to cite the scriptures, but also to reinterpret them to fit their own purposes.”

59 Cf. the following observation by McRae (1986, 245): “Although the members of the Northern School were not scholastics, they focused their attention on explaining themselves in conventional Buddhist jargon to the highly literate members of imperial court society.” See also Cheng 2011, 134-35.

60 See n. 25.

highly significant in this regard. Therefore, though it is rather long, I quote a large portion of this text:<sup>61</sup>

若欲脩觀，要須從外觀。所以須者，以諸外境，是生心因緣，起煩惱處。又來凡夫志力麁淺。若令卽入深深勝處，恐難進趣。所以先從外觀者，須知諸法本來體性平等无差別相。今所有諸法，但是无始薰習因緣幻起，無有實體。此法平等因緣幻起理。本非是有无生滅是非長短。只爲无始无明迷或，<sup>62</sup>不了此理，無人法處，妄見人法。无生滅非有无處，妄見有无，妄生取着。執人執法，造種種業，流轉六道。今人法生滅有无等，但只是妄心謂此心外，更无一法可得。既知此理，但心所緣，皆須一一隨逐，如前觀察，知唯是心无外境界。

作此觀察純熟已，常令此心緣妄理。住心得久。得久已卽須卻觀此妄心。爲當是有，爲復是无，又是滅。種種推求，畢竟不可得。若過去，過去心已滅。若未來，未來心未至。若現在，現在心不住。又來兩心不並。覺心生時，不覺心已滅。夫論心生，必須假因籍緣。因緣若積聚，心卽有所從生。因緣先自不積聚。生何可生。生既无生，滅亦无滅。又須觀卻觀此心。

問。此心既是智心覺心。何須更觀。

答。此心雖是智心覺心，猶是心家流類。仍有生滅境相未亡。

問。既須此觀上有能觀所觀在耶。

答曰。今言卻觀者只是嘗念觀心自卻觀，更無能所(?)。凡刀不自割，指不自指，心不自觀心。意在无觀之時，卽有能觀所觀。正卻觀之時，既无能所觀。此時離言絕相。言語道斷，心行處滅。

If one wishes to practice meditation, one should definitely begin with the meditation on the external. The reason why this is necessary is that external objects are the causes and conditions for giving rise to the mind and they are the locus where defilements arise. Further, ordinary people

61 The first part (up to 又須觀卻觀此心) is transcribed in Yanagida 1963, 49. This quotation is my own partial transcription of Pelliot chinois 3664 (+3559) available at Gallica (see n. 26), but I made full use of Yanagida's transcription. Дх00649 (n. 25) does not include the relevant portion. These instructions are translated in McRae 1986, 215-17, but the translation here is my own.

62 Sic. Read 惑.



have shallow aspirations. So, if they are immediately made to enter the profound and unfathomable realm, they will probably have difficulty in progressing. Therefore, one who first meditates on the external should know that dharmas are originally equal in their essence and have no distinct characteristics. Now all dharmas merely arise like illusion, caused by beginningless impregnation, and they have no substance. These dharmas equally [follow] the principle of arising like illusion by causes and conditions. [The dharmas] originally neither exist nor do not exist, neither arise nor perish; nor are they long or short. Simply deluded by the beginningless ignorance and delusion, one does not realize this principle, and one wrongly sees persons and dharmas where there is no person or dharma. One [further] wrongly sees existence and non-existence and wrongly develops attachment to them, where there is no arising or perishing, and no existence or non-existence. One [thus] comes to be attached to persons and dharmas, performs various karmas, and transmigrates through the six destinies. Now persons and dharmas, arising and perishing, existence and non-existence, and so forth are merely what the deluded mind considers to be outside the mind, [but in reality] there is nothing to be apprehended [outside]. Understanding this principle, one merely needs to follow individual objects of mind, observe them as stated above, and know that they are no other than the mind without any external objects.

After one has become proficient in this observation, one should [then] always make one's mind focus on the principle of the falsity [of external dharmas]. One keeps one's mind [on this principle] for a long time. After [doing so], one should reflectively observe the deluded mind [itself, in the following way]: "Does [this mind] exist or not? Does it perish?" [If one thus] examines [the mind] in various ways, in the end no [mind] is to be apprehended. If [one searches for] the past mind, the past mind has already perished. If [one searches

for] the future mind, the future mind has not come yet. If [one searches for] the present mind, the present mind does not abide. Further, two minds do not coexist. When awakened mind arises, unawakened mind has already perished.<sup>63</sup> [If one] talks of the arising of mind, it must depend on causes and conditions. If causes and conditions were accumulated, mind would have the means by which to arise. [In reality,] causes and conditions themselves have not been accumulated before. [So] how can there be arising? If there is no arising, there is no perishing. Also, one needs to reflectively observe this mind.

Question: This mind is already the mind of wisdom and awakening. Why need one further observe it?

Answer: Though this mind is the mind of wisdom and awakening, it is still a member of the mind-family. Accordingly, it has arising and perishing, and the images of objects have not been eradicated.

Question: When one practices this observation, are there subject and object of observation?

Answer: What we call “reflective observation” here is just that one is mindful of the observing mind that is reflectively observing itself. There is no subject or object. A knife cannot cut itself, a finger cannot point at itself, and the mind cannot observe itself. When the mind is at [the stage of] the observation of nothingness, there are subject and object of observation. At the stage of reflective observation, there

63 Here the argument of the *Daofan qusheng xinjue* might have been influenced by the following line in the *Prajñāpāramitā* corpus (I thank Harada Wasō for his suggestion on this point):

是心於心理不應有隨喜迴向。以無二心俱時起故，心亦不可隨喜迴向心性故 (*Da bore boluomiduo jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經, T7:791c8-10 [No. 791]; Cf. *Xiaopin bore boluomiduo jing* 小品般若波羅蜜多經, T8:548a11-15 [No. 227]).

This mind, in its principle, should not have joy or transference, because no two minds arise simultaneously, and because the mind cannot have the nature of the minds of joy and transference.

is no subject or object of observation. At that time, [the practice] transcends words and eradicates images. [It is now] completely inexpressible, and the locus of mental activity perishes.

The basic message here is as follows: Since it is difficult for beginners to meditate on the profound principle, one should proceed step by step. Thus, one should first meditate on the insubstantiality of external objects and understand that there are no objects outside the mind. Then one should conversely observe the mind itself and realize that the mind also cannot be apprehended.

The general structure of the observations described here (first external objects, then internal mind) is none other than the sequence of standard Yogācāra meditation, usually referred to as *asallakṣaṇānupraveśopāyala-kṣaṇa*, “the aspect of the means of entering the aspect of non-existence,” an expression found in the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya*.

Below is Xuanzang’s translation of the relevant portion of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* (*Bian zhongbian lun*, T31:465a3-9, corresponding to verse I.6 and its commentary of the Sanskrit text):

當說即於虛妄分別入無相方便相。頌曰。

依識有所得 境無所得生  
依境無所得 識無所得生

論曰。依止唯識有所得故，先有於境無所得生。復依於境無所得故，後有於識無所得生。由是方便得入所取能取無相。

Now the author should explain the aspect of the means of entering the aspect of non-existence of the false discrimination. The verse says:

Owing to the apprehension of consciousness, the non-apprehension of its objects arises. Owing to the non-apprehension of its objects, the non-apprehension of consciousness arises.

Commentary: “Owing to the apprehension of” only “consciousness,” first “the non-apprehension of its objects arises.” Further, “owing to the non-apprehension of its

objects, the non-apprehension of the consciousness arises” afterwards. By this method, one can enter the aspect of non-existence of the object and subject of apprehension.

As an example of the same structure, see the following verses quoted in the *CWSL* (T31:49b29-c3):<sup>64</sup>

菩薩於定位 觀影唯是心 義想既滅除 審觀唯自想  
如是住內心 知所取非有 次能取亦無 後觸無所得

In concentration, a bodhisattva observes that [cognitive] images are just mind. When thoughts of objects are removed, he closely observes only his own thoughts.

Thus, he resides in the inner mind and knows that the objects of apprehension do not exist. Then the subject of apprehension does not exist either. After that, he attains non-apprehension.

Judging from the presence of some typical Yogācāra expressions in the quoted portion of the *Daofan qusheng xinjue*,<sup>65</sup> the similarities with the Yogācāra methods of meditation do not seem coincidental.<sup>66</sup> Also noteworthy is the following line found in the last part of the quotation:

64 These verses are said to be from the \**Yogavibhāga* (*Fenbie yuqie lun* 分別瑜伽論), which is quoted in the *Mahāyānasamgraha* (*She dasheng lun ben* 攝大乘論本, T31:143c6-9 [No.1594]), §III.17.

65 所有諸法但是无始薰習因緣幻起, “All dharmas merely arise like illusion caused by beginningless impregnation and have no substance”; 唯是心无外境界, “they are no other than the mind, and there are no external objects”. (quoted above)

66 Cf. a similar structure of meditation is observed in the \**Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* also. See below:

識生於未時 境不是時生 於境生未時 是時識亦滅  
彼即本俱無 亦不有無有 無生識亦無 云何境從有 (T9:373b1-4)  
When consciousness has not yet been produced,  
Objects then are not produced either.  
When objects have not yet been produced,  
Consciousness is then also extinguished.  
These are both originally nonexistent,

凡刀不自割, 指不自指, 心不自觀心.

A knife cannot cut itself, a finger cannot point at itself, and the mind cannot observe itself.

This is a characteristic expression found in discussions in the Abhidharma and Yogācāra literature concerning whether or not mind can perceive itself. Considering the general affinity of these meditative instructions with Yogācāra literature, the source of this line may have been the following passage from the *\*Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra (Fodi jing lun 佛地經論, T26:303a26-b1 [No. 1530])*:

集量論說. 諸心心法皆證自體, 名爲現量. 若不爾者, 如不曾見不應憶念. 是故四智相應心品, 一一亦能照知自體. 云何不與世法相違, 刀不自割, 指端不能觸指端故. 不見燈等能自照耶.

The *Pramāṇasamuccaya* says:<sup>67</sup> All types of mind and mental functions perceive themselves, and [this perception] is called “direct perception” (*pratyakṣa*). Otherwise, as if one cannot recall what one has not experienced[, one would not recall one’s own mental experiences]. Therefore, each of the groups of mental elements associated with the fourfold wisdom can perceive itself. How does it not contradict our daily experiences, because a knife does not cut itself, and the tip of a finger cannot touch itself? Do you not see that lamps and so forth can illuminate themselves?

---

They neither exist nor do not exist.

Consciousness that is unproduced is also nonexistent,

So how is it that objects exist on account of it? (Buswell 1989, 243-44)

一切境空. 一切身空. 一切識空. 覺亦應空. (T9:368b24-25)

If all sense realms are void, all bodies are void, and all consciousnesses are void, then enlightenment too must be void. (Buswell 1989, 204)

67 According to Harada (personal communication), the real source of this quotation is the *Nyāyabindu*, 1.10 (F. I. Shcherbatskoi ed., *Bibliotheca Buddhica* 7:11.4): *sarvacittacaittānām ātmasaṃvedanaṃ* “All the minds and mental functions perceive themselves.”

The positions of the *Daofan qusheng xinjue* and the *\*Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra* are not exactly the same, and thus one might also consider an Abhidharma text like the *\*Abhidharma-Mahāvibhāṣā (Apidamo dapiposha lun 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 [No. 1545])* to be a possible source. See the following passage (T27:43a26-28).<sup>68</sup>

有說。世間現見，指端不自觸，刀刃不自割，瞳子不自見，壯士不自負。是故自性不知自性。

Someone maintains: In the world, one experiences that the tip of a finger cannot touch itself, the edge of a sword cannot cut itself, the pupil cannot see itself, or a fighter cannot beat himself. Therefore, something cannot cognize itself.

On the other hand, we should recall here that these early Chan texts not infrequently deviate from their conclusions when referring to Yogācāra texts. Therefore, some difference in the arguments does not necessarily exclude the possibility that the *Daofan qusheng xinjue* was referring to the *\*Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra* here.

In any case, it is beyond doubt that the expression in question was based on Indian Abhidharma/Yogācāra literature. Therefore, it is highly likely that the meditative method described above was not the original contribution of the Northern School but was based on an Indian Buddhist (probably Yogācāra) tradition.

Somewhat problematic in the *Daofan qusheng xinjue* is the following line:

若過去，過去心已滅。若未來，未來心未至。若現在，現在心不住。

68 Cf. the *\*Tattvasiddhi (Chengshi lun 成實論, T32:278b26-c1 [No. 1646])*:

若心是一，以何障故，不取一切。故知多心。又可取法異故，能取亦異。如人或自知心，云何自體自知。如眼不自見，刀不自割，指不自觸，故心不一。(T32:278b26-c1)

If the mind is one, what prevents it from perceiving all? Therefore we know that there are many minds. Also, since the cognized dharmas are different, the cognizing [minds] are also different. In the case in which one happens to cognize one's own mind, how can something cognize itself? It is just as the eye cannot see itself, a sword cannot cut itself, or a finger cannot touch itself. Therefore, the mind is not one.

If [one searches for] the past mind, the past mind has already perished. If [one searches for] the future mind, the future mind has not come yet. If [one searches for] the present mind, the present mind does not abide.

This line resonates with the famous passage from the *Diamond Sūtra* (*Jin'gang bore boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經 [T No. 235]).<sup>69</sup> However, we should note that an even closer parallel is found in Zhiyi's 智顓 (538-98) *Lüeming kaimeng chuxue zuochan zhiguan yaomen* 略明開矇初學坐禪止觀要門 (hereafter *Kaimeng chuxue*, Sekiguchi 1974, 340):<sup>70</sup>

若謂心是有者，爲在是過去，未來，現在耶。若在過去，過去已滅。何得有心。若在未來，未來未至，何得有心。若是現在，現在不住。則不可得。

If one thinks that the mind exists, does one believe it to be in the past, future, or present? If in the past, the past [mind] has already perished. How can there be mind? If in the future, the future [mind] has not yet come. How can there be mind? If it is the present [mind], the present does not abide. Therefore it cannot be apprehended.

Although similar expressions are found in other texts as well,<sup>71</sup> the *Lüeming kaimeng chuxue zuochan zhiguan yaomen* contains a closest

69 如來說諸心皆爲非心是名爲心。所以者何。須菩提，過去心不可得，現在心不可得，未來心不可得。(T8:751b26-28)

The Tathāgata says that minds are not minds, and [therefore] they are called minds. For what reason? Subhūti, [it is because] past mind cannot be apprehended, [because] present mind cannot be apprehended, [and because] future mind cannot be apprehended.

70 On this text, see n. 74.

71 *Dasheng ru zhufu jingjie zhiguangming zhuangyan jing* 大乘入諸佛境界智光明莊嚴經 (T12:262a10-12 [No. 359]), *Sheng siwei fantian suowen jing* 勝思惟梵天所問經 (T15:91a21-22 [No. 587]), *Wenshu zhili puchao sanmei jing* 文殊支利普超三昧經 (T15:422a24-25 [No. 627]), *Jin'gangxian lun* 金剛仙論 (T25:853c6-8 [No. 1512]), etc.

parallel to the *Daofan qusheng xiujue* on this matter.<sup>72</sup> Thus we have to consider the possibility that the *Daofan qusheng xiujue* was partly dependent on a pre-Faxiang meditation text as well.<sup>73</sup> Nevertheless, both from the overall structure and from the characteristic expressions, it is clear that the *Daofan qusheng xiujue* was heavily dependent on the Yogācāra and Abhidharma texts brought to China by Xuanzang.

72 Although this would be later than the *Daofan qusheng xiujue*, the *Dasheng bensheng xindiguan jing* 大乘本生心地觀經 (T3:327b4-5 [No. 159], 8th cent.) is another text that has very similar expressions.

73 I thank the anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this possibility. He points out that in the *Xiuxi zhiguan zuochan fayao* 修習止觀坐禪法要 (hereafter *Xiuxi zhiguan*, T46:467a16-b6), commonly known as the *Tiantai xiao zhiguan* 天台小止觀 (hereafter *Xiao zhiguan*), there is a discussion of the mind in the three periods (quoted above) similar to the one in the *Daofan qusheng xiujue*. The reviewer also says that after this portion, the *Xiuxi zhiguan* quotes the *Awakening of Faith* and propounds a meditative method very similar to the one in the *Daofan qusheng xiujue*. Thus, he suggests that this method (first external objects, then internal mind) goes back to Zhiyi.

This is certainly a significant suggestion that deserves consideration. We should, however, also note that there are serious textual problems on the *Xiao zhiguan*. According to Sekiguchi (1974), *Xiuxi zhiguan* is a highly corrupt version of the *Xiao zhiguan*, and a more authentic and older form of the text is found in the *Kaimeng chuxue*. Significantly, in the *Kaimeng chuxue*, the quotation from the *Awakening of Faith* is missing. This quotation is most likely a later interpolation (ibid., 302-3). The discussion of the external objects and the internal mind is not clearly stated in the *Keimeng chuxue* either. Thus, the *Xiao zhiguan* is a rather unlikely source of this meditative method in the *Daofan qusheng xiujue*.

On the other hand, even though its quotation in the *Kaimeng chuxue* cannot be attested, the *Awakening of Faith* itself is noteworthy. See the following line (T32:582a22-23):

是正念者，當知唯心無外境界。既復此心亦無自相，念念不可得。

Regarding correct mindfulness, one should know that there is only the mind and no external objects. Since this mind does not have its own characteristics either, it cannot be apprehended at any moment.

As Hotori Rishō (1992, 55) points out, this line resonates with the Yogācāra method of *asallaṅkaṣaṇānupraveśopāyalaṅkaṣaṇa*. Thus, we should consider the possibility that the *asallaṅkaṣaṇānupraveśopāyalaṅkaṣaṇa* was already accepted by Chinese Buddhists at the stage of the *Awakening of Faith*. On the other hand, we should note that the structure of the *asallaṅkaṣaṇānupraveśopāyalaṅkaṣaṇa* is not entirely clear in the *Awakening of Faith* (in the *asallaṅkaṣaṇānupraveśopāyalaṅkaṣaṇa*, the second meditation presupposes the



## V. Conclusion

We have observed numerous Yogācāra elements in the Northern School texts. Concerning the elements borrowed from mainstream Buddhist texts in Northern Chan texts, McRae observes as follows (1986, 198):

...much of the energy of early Ch'an seems to have been directed at convincing other Buddhists (or at least those with some knowledge of Buddhism) that the Northern School approach to the religion was the most, or even the only, authentic one. This task required that the Northern School trace its doctrine back to the scriptures and prove that it was the highest teaching of the Buddha.

In short, according to McRae, the Northern School made use of doctrinal elements found in mainstream Buddhist texts to justify the claims of the Chan tradition. This was probably part of the story, but the extent of Yogācāra influence seems to be too extensive to be only a means of justification. We should note that even the meditative method of the Yogācāra School, the *asallakṣaṇānupraveśopāyalakṣaṇa*, exerted an influence on the Northern School. Although the meditative method described in the *Daofan qusheng xinjue* may have been partly influenced by pre-Faxiang texts, the main sources on this matter are definitely Xuanzang's Yogācāra and Abhidharma texts.

Whether or not the *asallakṣaṇānupraveśopāyalakṣaṇa* was accepted in China before Xuanzang is a problem that requires further examination, but it seems certain that Xuanzang's Yogācāra texts

---

first, but that dependency is not explicitly stated in this text). In addition, even if we notice the structure of the *asallakṣaṇānupraveśopāyalakṣaṇa* here, it is probably because the *Awakening of Faith* was under the influence of a Yogācāra tradition (see Hotori, *op cit.*, and Takemura Makio 1990). This matter requires more extensive investigation, which is beyond the scope of the present paper. (I thank Ōtake Susumu for the reference to Hotori 1992 and Takemura 1990, as well as for his advice on the *Awakening of Faith*).

reintroduced this important Yogācāra method to the Chinese Buddhist world, and at that time it did catch the attention of Chinese Buddhists. Admittedly in this paper I have presented only one clear example of such influence, and I certainly do not claim that the entirety of the practice of the Northern School was under the influence of the Faxiang School.<sup>74</sup> Nevertheless, given the stereotypic image of Faxiang as a dry and impractical scholasticism, it is quite significant that not only the theory but also the practice of one of the supposedly most practical Buddhist traditions in China, Chan, were influenced by the Faxiang School. This suggests, I believe, that the highly developed Yogācāra doctrine brought back to China by Xuanzang was accepted not only as theory but also, at least to some extent, as practical guidance by Chinese Buddhist practitioners.

An examination of Yogācāra elements in these Northern School texts is also important for the study of early Chan history. The Northern School was a direct descendent of Daoxin and Hunren's "East Mountain Teaching." The *Xiuxin yao lun*, which propounds the East Mountain Teaching, has hardly any distinctively Yogācāra elements.<sup>75</sup> It is noteworthy that not even the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, which is supposed to have been the most important sūtra for the early Chan tradition, is expressly mentioned. For either chronological or geographical reasons, the early Chan tradition does not seem to have been exposed to the Yogācāra Buddhism at this stage.<sup>76</sup> In the *\*Vajrasamādhi-sūtra*, on the other hand, we can observe the clear

74 There is also a Faxiang text that shows a hostile attitude to Chan. See Saitō Tomohiro 2012.

75 We can observe a few idealist elements and some quotations from the *Daśabhūmikā-sūtra* (*Da fangguang fo huayan jing Shidi pin* 大方廣佛華嚴經十地品, T9:558c10 [No. 278]) and the *Awakening of Faith* (T32:576c11-15) in the *Xiuxin yao lun*, but no distinctly Yogācāra element.

76 See the tentative chronology below:

443	Guṇabhadra's <i>Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra</i> (four-fascicle version)
499-569	Paramārtha
548	Paramārtha came to Jiankang 建康

influence of both the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra* and Xuanzang's Yogācāra (including the *asallakṣaṇānupraveśopāyalakṣaṇa*, see n. 66). It is also noteworthy that in the late seventh century, the Northern School advanced to Chinese metropolitan areas in the Central Plains and probably had easier access to Xuanzang's Yogācāra texts.

Ueyama (1990, 428-30) points out that, later in Dunhuang, the Northern School was even identified with the Faxiang School. See the following threefold classification of Mahāyāna Buddhism found in Dunhuang manuscripts (after *ibid.*, 429).<sup>77</sup>

勝義皆空宗 The Teaching That Maintains That Everything is Empty in the Supreme Truth	應理圓實宗 The Round Teaching That Accords with the Principle	法性円融宗 The Teaching of the Harmony with the Dharma-Nature
破相宗 The Teaching of Removing Characteristics	法相宗 The Teaching of Dharma-Characteristics (Faxiang School)	法性宗 The Teaching of Dharma-Nature

- 
- 580-651 Daoxin  
 601-74 Hongren (*Xiuxin yao lun?*)  
 602-64 Xuanzang  
 645 Xuanzang returned to Chang'an  
 638-89 Faru  
 c.686 Faru came to Shaolin-si 少林寺 near Luoyang. (Ogawa 2007, 41) (*Xiuxin yao lun?*, *Daofan qusheng xinjue?*)  
 ?-706 Shenxiu (*YML?*)  
 668-85 Composition of the *Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* according to Buswell (1989, 71)  
 700 Shenxiu meets Empress Wu at Luoyang

77 This table is an amalgamation by Ueyama of Stein 2583; 4459; and Pelliot chinois 2258v.

經中宗 <sup>78</sup> The Middle Teaching [Based on] Sūtras	唯識宗 <sup>79</sup> The Teaching of Consciousness-Only	論中宗 <sup>80</sup> The Middle Teaching [Based on] Treatises
南能頓宗 The Sudden Teaching of [Hui]-neng in the South	漸宗 The Gradual Teaching	
	北秀宗 The Teaching of [Shen] xiu in the North	

According to Ueyama (*ibid.*, 428), Stein 2583 is a sub-commentary on the *Baifalun shu* 百法論疏 of Tankuang (the latter half of the eighth century [*ibid.*, 17]), copied on the verso of a document written around 866-71. “The Round Teaching That Accords with the Principle”<sup>81</sup> and “The Teaching of Consciousness-Only” are epithets of the Faxiang School, so this model clearly identifies the Faxiang School with the

78 In Facheng’s commentary on the *Śālistambha-sūtra* (*Dasheng daogan jing suitingshu* 大乘稻竿經隨聽疏, T No. 2782), there is a similar discussion although “The Sudden Teaching of [Hui]neng in the South” is not mentioned. There, we can find the expression 依經中宗, “The Middle Teaching Based on Sūtras,” and a detailed explanation of this term. According to this explanation, this teaching refers to the Mādhyamika Tradition of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. See T85:544b6-22. I thank Shih Huimin for kindly drawing my attention to this commentary. See also Ueyama 1990, 430.

79 In the same commentary (T No. 2782), this is called 唯識中宗, “The Middle Teaching of Consciousness-Only.” According to its explanation, the term refers to the tradition of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. See T85:544b22-c21.

80 In the same commentary (T No. 2782), this is called 依論中宗, “The Middle Teaching Based on Treatises.” According to its explanation, the term refers to the teaching of Śāntarakṣita (?Naduo luoshiduo 那多落尸多) who composed the *Madhyamakālaṅkāra* (*Zhongzong zhuangyan lun* 中宗莊嚴論). See T85:544b3-545a2.

81 The words 勝義皆空 and 應理圓實 may come from the *Miaofa lianhua jing xuanzan* (T34:657b4-5).

Northern School.<sup>82</sup> In the face of the heavy Yogācāra influence observed in Northern School texts, this identification does not seem entirely groundless.

This paper is obviously not the place to draw an overall picture of early Chan history. Nevertheless, I think that consideration of Yogācāra elements in these early Chan texts does help clarify a very important aspect of early Chan.

---

82 Here I quote only the most relevant line of Stein 2583 from Ueyama's transcription (1990, 428):

二應理圓實宗。亦云法相宗，亦云唯識宗，亦漸宗，亦呼北秀宗。

Second: "The Round Teaching That Accords with the Principle" is also called "The Teaching of Dharma-Characteristics" (Faxiang School), "The Teaching of Consciousness-Only," "The Gradual Teaching," and also "The Teaching of [Shen]-xiu in the North."

## Abbreviations and Short Titles

<i>AF</i>	See <i>Awakening of Faith</i> .
<i>AKBh</i>	<i>Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya</i> ( <i>Apidamo jushe lun</i> 阿毘達磨俱舍論), T No. 1958.
<i>AMV</i>	* <i>Abhidharma-Mahāvibhāṣā</i> ( <i>Apidamo dapiposha lun</i> 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論), T No. 1545.
<i>ASBh</i>	<i>Abhidharmasamuccaya-bhāṣya</i> ( <i>Dasheng apidamo zaji lun</i> 大乘阿毘達磨雜集論), T No. 1606.
<i>Awakening of Faith</i>	<i>Dasheng qixin lun</i> 大乘起信論, T No. 1666.
<i>BBhVy</i>	<i>Buddhabhūmi-vyākhyā</i> .
<i>BBhSŚ</i>	* <i>Buddhabhūmisūtra-sāstra</i> ( <i>Fodi jing lun</i> 佛地經論), T No. 1530.
<i>CWSL</i>	<i>Cheng weishi lun</i> 成唯識論, T No, 1585.
<i>Kaimeng chuxue</i>	<i>Lüeming kaimeng chuxue zuochan zhiguan yaomen</i> 略明開蒙初學坐禪止觀要門.
<i>LAS</i>	<i>Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra</i> ( <i>Lengqie abaduoluo bao jing</i> 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經), T No. 670.
<i>MAVBh</i>	<i>Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya</i> ( <i>Zhongbian fenbie lun</i> 中邊分別論), T No.1599.
<i>MSA</i>	<i>Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra</i> ( <i>Dasheng zhuangyanjing lun</i> 大乘莊嚴經論), T No. 1604.
<i>MSgBh</i>	<i>Mahāyānasamgraha-bhāṣya</i> ( <i>She dasheng lun shi</i> 攝大乘論釋), T No. 1597.
<i>MSgUp</i>	<i>Mahāyānasamgrahopanibandhana</i> ( <i>She dasheng lun shi</i> 攝大乘論釋), T No. 1598.
<i>Platform Sūtra</i>	<i>Nanzong dunjiao zuishang dasheng mohe bore boluomi jing liuzu Huineng dashi yu Shaozhou Dafansi shifa tan jing</i> 南宗頓教最上大乘摩訶般若波羅蜜經六祖惠能大師於韶州大梵寺施法壇經, T No. 2007.
<i>SAVBh</i>	<i>Sūtrālaṅkāravṛttibhāṣya</i> .
<i>Shuji</i>	<i>Cheng weishi lun shuji</i> 成唯識論述記, T No. 1830.

<i>SNS</i>	<i>Samdhanirmocana-sūtra</i> ( <i>Jie shenmi jing</i> 解深密經), T No. 676.
Tanaka ed.	See Tanaka 1989.
<i>Vajrasamādhi</i>	* <i>Vajrasamādhi-sūtra</i> ( <i>Jin'gang sanmei jing</i> 金剛三昧經), T No. 273.
<i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśa</i>	<i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra</i> ( <i>Weimojie suoshuo jing</i> 維摩詰所說經), T No. 475.
<i>Vimś</i>	<i>Vimśikā Vijñaptimātratāsiddhiḥ</i> ( <i>Weishi ershi lun</i> 唯識二十論), T No. 1590.
<i>Xiao zhiguan</i>	<i>Tiantai xiao zhiguan</i> 天台小止觀.
<i>Xiuxi zhiguan</i>	<i>Xiuxi zhiguan zuochan fayao</i> 修習止觀坐禪法要, T No. 1915.
<i>Xiuxin yao lun</i>	<i>Fanqu shengwu jietuo zong Xiuxin yao lun</i> 凡趣聖悟解脫宗修心要論.
<i>YML</i>	<i>Yuanming lun</i> 圓明論.
<i>YBh</i>	<i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> ( <i>Yuqieshi di lun</i> 瑜伽師地論), T No. 1597.
<i>Yaojue</i>	<i>Dunwu zhenzong jin'gang bore xiuxing da bi'an famen yaojue</i> 頓悟真宗金剛般若修行達彼岸法門要決.
<i>Zhenzong lun</i>	<i>Dasheng kaixin xianxing dunwu zhenzong lun</i> 大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論, T No. 2835.
<i>ZZ</i>	<i>Dainihon zokuzōkyō</i> 大日本續藏經.

## References

- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1989. *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The "Vajrasamādhī-Sūtra," a Buddhist Apocryphon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ch'en, Kenneth K. S. 1972. *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (1964)
- Cheng Zheng 程正. 2002. *Tongo shinshū kongō hannya shugyō tatsuhigan hōmon yōketsu to Daijō kaishin kenshō tongo shinshūron* 『頓悟真宗金剛般若修行達彼岸法門要訣』と『大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論』 (*Dunwu zhen zong jin gang panruo xiu xing da bianfamen yaojue and Da cheng kai xin xian xing dunwu zhen zonglun*). *Komazawa Daigaku Daigakuin Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūkai nempō* 駒沢大学大学院仏教学研究會年報 (Annual of Graduate Research in Buddhist Studies) 35:171-80.
- . 2005. *Gazō Tonkō bunkenchū ni hakken sareta zenseki ni tsuite* 俄藏敦煌文獻中に發見された禪籍について (Chan Texts found in Dunhuang Manuscripts of the Russian Collections). *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 (Studies in Zen Buddhism) 83:17-45.
- . 2011. *Daijō kaishin kenshō tongo shinshūron no eko bunken ni tsuite: Tokuni Daijō kiseron tonon kanren o chūshin ni* 『大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論』の依據文獻について：特に『大乘起世論』との關連を中心に (The Documents on Which the *Dasheng kaixin xianxing dunwu zhenzong lun* Was Based). *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 (Journal of the Faculty of Buddhism of Komazawa University) 69:121-41.
- Chibetto Bunten Kenkyūkai 西藏文典研究會, ed. and trans. 1981. *Chibetto bunkenn ni yoru Bukkyō shisō kenkyū* 西藏文獻による佛教思想研究 (\*Studies in Buddhist Thought by Tibetan Materials), vol. 2, *Anne zō "Daijō shōgon kyōron shakusho" Bodaibon* 安慧造『大乘莊嚴經論積疏』：菩提品 (\*Sthiramati's *Sūtrālamkāravṛttibhāṣya: Bodhyadhikāra*), part. 2. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林.
- Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅章. 2000. *Sō-Gen Bukkyō bunkashi kenkyū* 宋元佛教文化史研究 (\*Study in the History of Buddhist Culture in the Song-Yuan Periods). Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin 汲古書院.



- Deleanu Florin. 2006. *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the “Śrāvabhūmi”: A Trilingual Edition (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese), Annotated Translation, and Introductory Study*. 2 vols. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series, 20. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Demiéville Paul. 1954. La *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 44(2): 339-436.
- Elverskog, Johan. 1997. *Uygur Buddhist Literature*. Silk Road Studies I. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Fang Guangchang 方廣鎬. 1997. *Zangwai Fojiao wenxian 藏外佛教文獻* (\*Extra-Canonical Buddhist Texts), vol. 3. Beijing: Zongjiao Wenhua Chubanshe 宗教文化出版社.
- Fukaura Seibun 深浦正文. 1972. *Yuishikigaku kenkyū 唯識学研究* (\*Study in Yogācāra), vol. 1. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō. (1954)
- Fukihara Shōshin 富貴原章信. 1944. *Nihon Yuishiki shisōshi 日本唯識思想史* (\*History of Yogācāra Thought in Japan). Kyoto: Taigadō 大雅堂.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰, et al. 1973. *Kusharon sakuin 俱舍論索引* (Index to the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* [P. Pradhan Edition]), pt. 1, *Sansukuritto go, Chibetto go, Kanyaku taishō* サンスクリット語, チベット語, 漢譯對照 (Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Hirano Kenshō 平野顕照. 1984. *Kōkyōmon no soshiki naiyō 講經文の組織内容* (\*The Structures and Content of Popular Lectures on Sūtras in Dunhuang). In *Kōza Tonkō 講座敦煌* (\*Seminar on Dunhuang), vol. 7, *Tonkō to Chūgoku Bukkyō 敦煌と中国仏教* (\*Dunhuang and Chinese Buddhism), 321-58. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Hotori Rishō 阿理生. 1992. Indo shoki yuishiki to *Daijō kishin ron* インド初期唯識と『大乘起信論』(The Early *Vijñaptimātravāda* in India and the *Mahāyānādhimuktyutpāda*). *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究* (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) 40(2): 53-57.
- Huang Yongwu 黃永武, ed. 1986. *Dunhuang yishu zuixin mulu 敦煌遺書最新目錄* (\*A Latest Catalogue of Dunhuang Manuscripts). Taipei: Xinwenfeng 新文豐.
- Ibuki Atsushi 伊吹敦. 1991. Hōnyo-ha ni tsuite 法如派について (On Faru and His Followers). *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究* (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) 40(1): 110-13.

- 1992a. *Tongo shinshū kongō hannya shugyō tatsuhigan hōmon yōketsu* to Katakū Jinne 『頓悟真宗金剛般若修行達彼岸法門要決』と荷沢神会 (\**Dunwu zhenzong jin'gang bore xiuxing dabi'an famen yaofue* and Heze Shenhui). In *Nihon, Chūgoku Bukkyō shisō to sono tenkai* 日本・中国仏教思想とその展開 (\**Buddhist Thought in Japan and China and Its Development*), 291-325. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林.
- 1992b. *Daijō kaishin kenshō tongo shinshūron no eyō bunken ni tsuite* 『大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論』の依用文献について (The Works on Which the *Dasheng kaixin xianxing dunwu zhenzong lun* Was Based). *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) 41(1): 97-100.
- 2001. *Zen no rekishi* 禪の歴史 (\**History of Chan*). Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館.
- Kasai Yukiyo 笠井幸代. 2012. The Outline of the Old Turkish Commentary on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa Sūtra*. In *Dunhuang Studies: Prospects and Problems for the Coming Second Century of Research*, 106-111. St. Petersburg: Slavia.
- Kitsudō Kōichi 橘堂晃一. 2012. The *Four Kinds of Wisdom* in Old Uyghur Buddhist Terminology. Conference paper presented at Xiyu-Zhongya yu wenxue guoji xueshu yantaohui 西域中亚与文学国际学术研讨会 (International Symposium on Central Asian Philology). Zhongguo Zhongyang Minzu Daxue 中国中央民族大学 (Minzu University of China). November 23-25, 2012. Retitled as "A Chan School Text in Old Uyghur: Mainz 340" and is forthcoming in the proceedings of the same conference.
- Kudara Kōgi 百濟康義. 1980. Uiguru yaku *Myōhō rengo kyō gengan* ウイグル訳『妙法蓮華經玄贊』(Uigur Translation of the *Miao-fa-lian-hua-jing Xuan-zan*), part 1. *Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 佛教學研究 (The Studies in Buddhism) 36:49-65.
- 1983. *Myōhō rengo kyō gengan no Uiguru yaku danpen* 妙法蓮華經玄贊のウイグル訳断片 (\**Fragments of a Uighur Translation of the Miaofo lianhua jing xuanzan*). In *Nairiku Ajia, Nishi Ajia no shakai to bunka* 内陸アジア・西アジアの社会と文化 (\**Societies and Cultures of Inner and West Asia*), 185-207. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha 山川出版社.

- 1990. Gime Bijutsukan shozō *Myōhō rengekyō gengan* Uiguru yaku danpen ギメ美術館所蔵『妙法蓮華經玄贊』ウイグル訳断片 (Uigur Fragments of the *Miao-fa-lian-hua-jing Xuan-zan* Preserved in the Musée Guimet). *Ryūkoku kiyō* 『龍谷紀要』 (The Ryukoku Journal of Humanities and Sciences) 12(1): 1-30.
- McRae, John R. 1986. *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*. Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no.3. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Nishiguchi Yoshio 西口芳男. 2000. Shanto 138V Bukkyō mondō to *Tongo shinshūron* 上図一三八V 仏教問答と『頓悟真宗論』 (A Study of the *Dunwu zhenzong lun* and the Shanghai Library Ms. 138 verso). *Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 禅文化研究所紀要 (Annual Report of the Institute for Zen Studies) 25:57-105.
- Nishiwaki Tsuneki 西脇常記. 2009. *Chūgoku koten shakai ni okeru Bukkyō no shosō* 中國古典社會における佛教の諸相 (\*Various Aspects of Buddhism in the Classical Chinese Society). Tokyo: Chisen Shokan 知泉書館.
- Ogawa Takashi 小川隆. 2007. *Jinne: Tonkō bunken to shoki no zenshūshi* 神会: 敦煌文献と初期の禅宗史 (\*Shenhui: Dunhuang Manuscripts and Early Chan History). *Tōdai no zensō* 唐代の禅僧 (\*Chan Monks of the Tang Period), vol. 2. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten 臨川書店.
- Okabe Kazuo 岡部和雄. 1980. *Zensō no chūshō to gigi kyōten* 禅僧の注抄と疑偽經典 (\*Commentaries by Zen Monks and Apocryphal Sūtras). In *Kōza Tonkō* 講座敦煌 (\*Seminar on Dunhuang), vol. 8, *Tonkō Butten to Zen* 敦煌仏典と禅 (\*Dunhuang Buddhist Texts and Chan), 335-76. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Saitō Tomohiro 齋藤智寛. 2012. *Hossōshū no Zenshū hihan to Shindai sanzō*: Tonkō monjo Sustain 2546 *Myōhō rengekyō gengan shō* (gi) to *Shindai shamon gyōki* 法相宗の禅宗批判と真諦三藏: 敦煌文書スライン二五四六『妙法蓮華經玄贊鈔(擬)』と『真諦沙門行記』 (The Trepitaka Paramārtha and Faxiang Criticism of the Chan School: The *Miaofa lianhua jing xuan zan chao* (Dunhuang, Stein no. 2546) and the *Zhendi shamen xing ji*. In *Shindai sanzō kenkyū ronshū* 真諦三藏研究論集 (Studies of the Works and Influence of Paramārtha), 303-44. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo 京都大学人文科学研究所.

- Sakuma Hidenori 佐久間秀範. 1987. “Sanshin” to “gohō”: Ryōsha no ketsugō kankei to sono seiritsu katei <三身>と<五法>—両者の結合関係とその成立過程 (\*The ‘Three Bodies’ and the ‘Five Elements’: Their Correspondences and Formative Process). In *Indogaku bukkyōgaku ronshū: Takasaki Jikidō hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū* インド学仏教学論集：高崎直道博士還暦記念論集 (\*Papers on Indian and Buddhist Studies: Festschrift for Dr. Takasaki Jikidō on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- 2002. Chūgoku, Nihon Hossō kyōgaku ni okeru shiki to chi no ketsugō kankei: Fūin saretai dairokusiki → jōshosachi, go genshiki → myōkanzacchi no seitōsei 中国・日本法相教学における識と智の結合関係：封印された第六識→成所作智，五現識→妙觀察智の正当性 (\*The Correspondences between the Consciousness and Wisdom in Sino-Japanese Faxiang Scholarship: The Legitimacy of the Concealed Model of *manovijñāna* > *krtyānuṣṭhānājñāna*, *pañcavijñāna* > *pratyaśaṅgajñāna*). In *Kimura Kiyotaka hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū Higashi Ajia Bukkyō: Sono seiritsu to tenkai* 木村清孝博士還暦記念論集 東アジア仏教：その成立と展開 (\*Festschrift for Dr. Kimura Kiyotaka on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday, East Asian Buddhism: Its Establishment and Developments), 65-86.
- 2012. Yugagyō Yuishiki shisō towa nanika 瑜伽行唯識思想とは何か (\*What is Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda Thought?). In *Shirīzu Daijō Bukkyō* シリーズ大乘仏教, vol. 7, *Yuishiki to yugagyō* 唯識と瑜伽行 (\*Vijñānavāda and Yogācāra), 19-72. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Schmithausen, Lambert. 1973. Spirituelle Praxis und philosophische Theorie im Buddhismus. *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 3 (73): 161-86.
- 1976. On the Problem of the Relation of Spiritual Practice and Philosophical Theory in Buddhism. In *German Scholars on India*, 235-50. Bombay: Nachiketa Publications.
- Sekiguchi Shindai 関口真大. 1974. *Tendai shōshikan no kenkyū* 天台小止観の研究 (A Study of the *T'ient'ai Siao-Chihkuan*). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林. (1954)
- 1964. *Zenshū shisōshi* 禪宗思想史 (A History of Thoughts of the Zen Sect). Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林.

- 1967. *Daruma no kenkyū* 達摩の研究 (A Study on Daruma). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.
- Shinohara Hisao 篠原壽雄. 1980. Hokushū-zen to Nanshū-zen 北宗禪と南宗禪 (\*The Northern School and the Southern School). In *Kōza Tonkō* 講座敦煌 (\*Seminar on Dunhuang), vol. 8, *Tonkō Butten to Zen* 敦煌仏典と禪 (\*Dunhuang Buddhist Texts and Chan), 165-98. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- Shōgaito Masahiro 庄垣内正弘. 2003. *Roshia shozō Uigurugo bunken no kenkyū: Uiguru moji hyōki kanbun to Uigurugo butten tekisuto* ロシア所蔵ウイグル語文献の研究:ウイグル文字表記漢文とウイグル語仏典テキスト (Uighur Manuscripts in St. Petersburg: Chinese Texts in Uighur Script and Buddhist Uighur Texts). Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku Kenkyūka 京都大学大学院文学研究科 (Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University).
- Suzuki Daisetz 鈴木大拙. 2000. Zen shisōshi kenkyū 禪思想史研究 (\*Study in the History of Chan Thought), no.3. In *Suzuki Daisetz zenshū* 鈴木大拙全集 3:1-335. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店. (1968)
- Tanaka Ryōshō 田中良昭. 1969. Tonkōbon *Enmyōron ni tsuite* 敦煌本「圓明論」について (The *Yūan-ming-lun* from Tun-huang). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究 (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) 18(1): 204-7.
- 1980. Nenbutsu-zen to kōki Hokushū-zen 念仏禪と後期北宗禪 (\*Nianfo Chan and the Late Northern School of Chan). In *Kōza Tonkō* 講座敦煌 (\*Seminar on Dunhuang), vol. 8, *Tonkō Butten to Zen* 敦煌仏典と禪 (\*Dunhuang Buddhist Texts and Chan), 221-42. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- 1983. *Tonkō Zenshū bunken no kenkyū* 敦煌禪宗文献の研究 (A Study of Tun-huang Zen Manuscripts). Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.
- 1989. Kōchū wayaku *Daijō kaishin kenshō tongo shinshūron* 校注和訳『大乘開心顯性頓悟眞宗論』 (A Revision with Note and Translation of the *Ta-ch'êng K'ai-sin hsien-sing tun-wu chên-tsung lun* into Japanese). *Zaidan hōjin Matsugaoka Bunko kenkyū nenpō* 財団法人松ヶ岡文庫研究年報 (The Annual Report of Researches of Matsugaoka Bunko) 3:173-215.

- Tanaka Ryōshō and Cheng Zheng 程正. 2009. *Tonkō Zenshū bunken bunrui mokuroku* 敦煌禪宗文獻分類目錄:II Goroku rui 語錄類 (The Classified Catalogue of Dunhuang Chan Manuscripts: II “Recorded Sayings” of Chan), pt. 1. *Komazawa Daigaku Zen Kenkyūjo nenpō* 駒澤大學禪研究所年報 (Annual Report of the Zen Institute) 21:280-304.
- 2010. *Tonkō Zenshū bunken bunrui mokuroku* 敦煌禪宗文獻分類目錄:II. Goroku rui 語錄類 (The Classified Catalogue of Dunhuang Chan Manuscripts: II. “Recorded Sayings” of Chan), pt. 2. *Komazawa Daigaku Zen Kenkyūjo nenpō* 駒澤大學禪研究所年報 (Annual Report of the Zen Institute) 22:350-16.
- 2011. *Tonkō Zenshū bunken bunrui mokuroku* 敦煌禪宗文獻分類目錄:II. Goroku rui 語錄類 (The Classified Catalogue of Dunhuang Chan Manuscripts: II. “Recorded Sayings” of Chan), pt. 3. *Komazawa Daigaku Zen Kenkyūjo nenpō* 駒澤大學禪研究所年報 (Annual Report of the Zen Institute) 23:252-74.
- Tanaka Ryōshō, and Okimoto Katsumi 沖本克己, trans. 1989. *Daijō butten, Chūgoku Nihon hen* 大乘仏典中国・日本篇 (\*Mahāyāna Texts from China and Japan), vol. 11. *Tonkō* 敦煌 (\*Dunhuang), pt.2. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha 中央公論社.
- Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆. 1975. *Bukkyō shiryō to shitenō Kinkoku Daizōkyō: Tokuni Hokusō Shakkyō mokuroku to Tō, Ryō no Yuishiki-shū kankei shōsho ni tsuite* 仏教史料としての金刻大藏經：特に北宋釈教目録と唐・遼の唯識宗関係章疏について (\*The Jin Edition of Buddhist Canon as Buddhist Historical Material: Focusing on the Catalogues of Buddhist Texts from the Northern Song and Yogācāra-Related Commentaries from the Tang and Liao Periods). Reprint in *Tsukamoto Zenryū chosakushū* 塚本善隆著作集 (\*Collected Works of Tsukamoto Zenryū) 5:93-164. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社. (1936)
- Ueyama Daishun 上山大峻. 1976. *Chibetto yaku Tongo shinshū yōketsu no kenkyū* チベット訳『頓悟真宗要決』の研究 (A Study on the Tibetan Version of *Tunwu chên tsung yao chüeh*). *Zen Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 禪文化研究所紀要 (Annual Report from the Institute for Zen Studies) 8:33-103.
- 1990. *Tonkō Bukkyō no kenkyū* 敦煌佛教の研究 (\*Study in Dunhuang Buddhism). Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館.

- Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. 1939. *Zenshūshi kenkyū* 禪宗史研究 (\*Study in the History of Chan Traditions). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Wang Ding 王丁. 2007. Tulufan chutu de Tangdai weishixue wenxian xiaokao 吐魯番出土的唐代唯識學文獻小考 (\*An Examination of the Yogācāra Texts from the Tang Period Excavated in Turfan). *Tonkō shahon kenkyū nenpō* 敦煌寫本研究年報 (\*Annual Memoir of Dunhuang Manuscript Studies) 1: 145-63.
- Yamabe Nobuyoshi 山部能宜. 1997. An Shigao as a Precursor of the Yogācāra Tradition: A Preliminary Study. In *Watanabe Takao kyōju kanreki kinen Bukkyō shisō bunkashi ronsō* 渡邊隆生教授還曆記念佛教思想文化史論叢 (Buddhist Thought and History of Buddhist Culture: A Collection of Papers in Honor of Professor Watanabe Takao on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday), 785-826. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂.
- . 2001. Gakkai hōkoku: “Chūgoku ni okeru Yuishiki Bukkyō” shinpōjiumu ni sankā shite 学会報告・「中国における唯識仏教」シンポジウムに参加して (Conference Report: Yogācāra Buddhism in China, Leiden, June 8-9, 2000). *Bukkyō bunka* 佛教文化 (Buddhist Culture) 11: 67-73.
- . 2003. On the School Affiliation of Aśvaghōṣa: “Sautrāntika” or “Yogācāra”? *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 26(2): 225-54.
- . 2006. Hokushū Zen bunken ni mirareru Yuishiki kyōgi no eikyō 北宗禪文献にみられる唯識教義の影響 (\*Yogācāra Elements Found in Some Texts of the Northern School of Chan Buddhism). In *Chūgokugaku no jūjūiro: Kaji Nobuyuki hakushi koki kinen ronshū* 中国学の十字路: 加地伸行博士古稀記念論集 (\*Crossroads of Chinese Studies: Festschrift for Dr. Kaji Nobuyuki on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday), 571-91. Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan 研文出版.
- Yamabe Nobuyoshi, Fujitani Takayuki 藤谷隆之, Harada Yasunori 原田泰教. 2002. Memyō no gakuha shozoku ni tsuite: *Saundarananda* to *Shōmonji* no hikaku kenkyū 馬鳴の学派所属について: *Saundarananda*と『声聞地』の比較研究 (On the School-Affiliation of Aśvaghōṣa: A Comparative Study of the *Saundarananda* and the *Śrāvabhūmi*), part 1. *Bukkyō bunka* 佛教文化 (Buddhist Culture) 12: 1-65.

- Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山. 1963. *Den hōbo ki to sono sakusha: Perio 3559 gō monjo o meguru Hokushū Zen kenkyū shiryō no sakkī, sono ichi* 傳法寶紀とその作者：ペリオ三五五九號文書をめぐる北宗禪研究資料の札記，その一 (On the *Ch'uan-fa-Pao-chi* and Its Compiler: One of the Earliest of the So-Called “Transmission of the Lamp” Histories of Chiense Zen School). *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 (Studies in Zen Buddhism) 53:45-71.
- 1999. *Zen Bukkyō no kenkyū* 禪仏教の研究 (\*Study in Chan Buddhism). Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館.
- Zieme, Peter. 2012. Some Notes on Old Uigur Translations of Buddhist Commentaries. *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo nenpō* 創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報 (Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University) 15:147-60.



## Appendix

Comparative Tables of Relevant Texts

(Note that these tables only indicate that the passages in the right column are somehow relevant to those in the left. I do not necessarily mean that those in the right are the sources of the corresponding items in the left. Nor do I mean that the content of the corresponding items always match exactly.)

## 圓明論 明心色因果品第一

一者從無始妄想熏習而生。二者即從現在香味因緣□□□從熏習而生。熏習則是因，身則是果。熏習(?)是色相(?)□□□ (p. 19)	大慧，取種種塵及無始妄想薰是分別事識因。( <i>LAS</i> , T16:483a20-21) 無始時來虛妄熏習內因力故恒與身俱。 ( <i>CWSL</i> , T31:2a10-11) 謂此要待自眾緣合功能殊勝方成種子。 ( <i>CWSL</i> , T31:9b22-23)
若從因緣習氣起者，即知是虛。[因]既是空，果亦是空。(p. 19)	一因緣。謂有為法親辦自果。此體有二。一種子。二現行。( <i>CWSL</i> , T31:40a21-22) 眾緣生故。如幻事等非有似有誑惑愚夫。 ( <i>CWSL</i> , T31:46c8-9)

## 要門方便品第二

空花所誑眼○○○。(p. 22)	畢竟非有如空華。( <i>CWSL</i> , T31:48a10-11) 如有眩瞽見髮蠅等。( <i>Vimś</i> , T31:74b29-c1)
大眾生是太世界，小眾生是[小]世界。勢分各別。(p. 25)	復次阿賴耶識，當言於欲界中緣狹小執受境。於色界中緣廣大執受境。於無色界空無邊處識無邊處緣無量執受境。( <i>YBh</i> , T30:580a18-21)

## 辨明修釋因果品第三

明知無始習氣，熏資其身具足。煩惱未除，習氣未盡。(p. 28)	煩惱障中見所斷種於極喜地見道初斷。彼障現起地前已伏。修所斷種金剛喻定現在前時，一切頓斷。彼障現起地前漸伏。初地以上能頓伏盡，令永不行。( <i>CWSL</i> , T31:54a6-9)
如是行行常在禪定，經於三大阿僧祇。(p. 29)	由三大劫阿僧企耶修集無邊難行勝行。( <i>CWSL</i> , T31:54c13-14)

<p>如斯行行，無始習氣自然滅盡。唯有空行。所以為空行，習氣俱盡，不住彼我。(p. 29)</p>	<p>然阿羅漢斷此識中煩惱龜重，究竟盡故，不復執藏阿賴耶識為自內我。(CWSL, T31:13c3-5) 此中二空二障頓證頓斷。(CWSL, T31:50a10)</p>
<p>猶如水上波。波元依水起。波還即是水水既不異波。化身亦如是。(p. 30)</p>	<p>如大海水因風波動，水相風相不相捨離。(AF, T32:576c11-12)</p>
<p>若習氣未盡，名為因果。習氣既盡，豈得名為因果。(p. 30)</p>	<p>一因緣。謂有為法親辦自果。此體有二。一種子。二現行。種子者謂本識中善，染，無記，諸界，地等功能差別。能引次後自類功能，及起同時自類現果。此唯望彼是因緣性。(CWSL, T31L40a21-25) 種子既是習氣異名。(CWSL, T31:8b8)</p>

#### 辨明三乘逆順觀品第四

<p>聲聞人迴心入菩薩道，望(?)八識習氣藏而得，而生菩薩道，并行六波羅蜜。(p. 31) 上來聲聞迴心，及凡人入道者，先說因，然後說果。(p. 31)</p>	<p>或說二乘無涅槃者，依無住處，不依前三。又說彼無無餘依者，依不定性二乘而說彼纔證得有餘涅槃，決定迴心求無上覺。(CWSL, T31:55b29-c3)</p>
<p>一眾生是一世界。大眾生是大世界。小眾生是小世界也。(p. 32)</p>	<p>復次阿賴耶識，當言於欲界中緣狹小執受境。於色界中緣廣大執受境。於無色界空無邊處識無邊處緣無量執受境。(YBh, T30:580a18-21)</p>

#### 簡異外道緣生得根本品第五

<p>若利根凡夫逆觀者，不然。從聲香味觸次第觀之，亦非微塵，並是自心妄想現。(pp. 32-33)</p>	<p>竟者分析乃至微塵，觀察壞四大及造色。(LAS, T16:508c17-18) 諸瑜伽師以假想慧於色相漸次除析至不可析。假說極微。雖此極微猶有方分，而不可析。若更析之便似空現。不名為色。故說極微是色邊際。(CWSL, T31:4b29-c4)</p>
---	---

一切衆生具有六根。何以有之。皆八識。眼耳鼻舌身意等根何處得來。(p. 33)	有根身者，謂異熟識不共相種成熟力故，變似色根及根依處。即內大種及所造色。(CWSL, T31:11a8-10)
亦非是自然，並有來處。比從賴耶識中來。賴耶識猶如大地。眼耳鼻舌身意等，猶如百草萌芽。若無大地，草木叢林，依何而得生長。草木叢林種子，皆是地之所持，不失種子。(p. 33)	或名種子識。能遍任持世出世間諸種子故...或名阿賴耶。攝藏一切雜染品法令不失故。(CWSL, T31:13c12-14)
今見眼耳鼻舌並是賴耶[識]之氣。(p. 33)	眼等五根即種子故。(CWSL, T31:19c14) 識上色功能 名五根應理 功能與境色 無始互爲因 彼頌意言。異熟識上能生眼等色識種子名色功能。說爲五根。無別根等。(CWSL, T31:19c21-24)
賴耶本性無有形質。及諸根身是有形質。今時凡夫不見賴耶爲本，謂言父母能生。是以浪作色身之觀。推至微塵，乃至虛空，妄取羅漢之果。若知身本來依賴耶而起者，即無眼耳鼻舌。(p. 33)	若諸色處亦識爲體，何緣乃似色相顯現，一類堅住相續而轉。名言熏習勢力起故。(CWSL, T31:39b20-22) 竟者分析乃至微塵，觀察壞四大及造色。(LAS, T16:508c17-18)
何以得知識元無有形質，唯有四似。何者名爲四似。似根，似塵，似我，似識，此是四似。一一似中，推覓元無有識根等，並是賴耶之中影像也。(pp. 33-34)	似塵者，謂本識顯現相似色等。似根者，謂識似五根於自他相續中顯現。似我者，謂意識與我見無明等相應故，似識者，謂六種識。本識者謂阿黎耶識。生似彼者，謂似塵等四物。但識有者，謂但有亂識。無彼者，謂無四物。(Paramārtha, MAVBh, T31:451b9-13)

<p>但見賴耶，本性無有生滅。即捨諸根之見。何以故。元無諸根故。並是本識種子相分故。本識之相分者，即無眼耳鼻舌之根。本識中先無根識之質，唯有似也。其似即體是空。推趁即無，但為不見本識。謂言眼耳鼻舌自然生。(p. 34)</p>	<p>阿賴耶識，因緣力故，自體生時，內變為種及有根身，外變為器。即以所變為自所緣。...似所緣相說名相分。(CWSL, T31:10a17-23)</p>
<p>今本識體者。唯有似，無有質。以質無故，名為自心影像，既是自心影像者，何有我也。既無有我，誰取果也。以不取果故，不同鈍根凡夫。推於四大，至於虛空取其果。(p. 34)</p>	<p>由彼影像唯是識故。善男子。我說識所緣唯識所現故。世尊。若彼所行影像即與此心無有異者，云何此心還見此心。...善男子。如依善瑩清淨鏡面，以質為緣還見本質，而謂我今見於影像。及謂離質別有所行影像顯現。(SNS, T16:698b1-8)</p>
<p>取果有我之過。若羅漢入定，猶如死人，復如死灰。經於千劫，更復出定。出定以後，還同凡夫。分別既同。分別者，何處更得識來。既有識生，明知本識所持。是以得出其定，為此無來未斷一分煩惱。有此過故，既有此患，只為不見身是本識影像。(p. 34)</p>	<p>如世尊說，離身行外有身住因。所謂飲食命根識等。由此雖無入息出息，而身安住。意即不爾。離意行外更無別因持心令住。由此應至無意識故名無心定。異熟果識此中有故。世尊說識不離於身。即從此識一切種子後出定時轉識還生。故知定有阿賴耶識。(Xuanzang, MSgBh, T31:335b25-c2)</p> <p>得諸三昧身 乃至劫不覺 譬如昏醉人 酒消然後覺 彼覺法亦然 得佛無上身</p> <p>(LAS, T16:497c7-9)</p>

#### 入道邪正五門辨因果品第六

<p>若為心本，本有二種。一者真實心。二者妄想心。凡夫生滅都由妄想。不關真實。(p. 36)</p>	<p>依一心法有二種門。云何為二。一者心真如門。二者心生滅門。(AF, T32:576a5-6)</p>
<p>先觀外四大，山川大地，萬物所依。.....即此微塵未叢以前，元本是空。從虛空眾業力所感，始有微塵。若眾生元無業力者，微塵亦空，... (p. 38)</p>	<p>所言處者，謂異熟識，由共相種成熟力故，變似色等器世間相。即外大種及所造色，雖諸有情所變各別，而相相似處所無異。如眾燈明各遍似一。(CWSL, T31:10c12-16)</p> <p>引發增上者，謂一切有情共業於器世間故。(ASBh, T31:715c13-14)</p>

<p>爲凡夫無始已來，煩惱熏習積累非今，不可一時頓盡。亦復依今解悟，常覺現前，勿令無明煩惱重起，是名因行。習氣煩惱都盡，更不得與色塵，境界重合，始名斷。(p. 39)</p>	<p>謂無始來數數現行熏習而有。(T31:8b28-29)</p>
---	-----------------------------------

## 自心現量品第七

<p>依『楞伽經』，自覺聖智宗，立一切諸佛皆是自心現量義。若解者，山川大地，及以己身，並是自心，非是謬(?)也。(p. 40)</p>	<p>如來地自覺聖智，修行者不應於彼作性非性想。...而不能知自心現量。譬如明鏡隨緣顯現一切色像而無妄想。(LAS, T16:491b14-25)</p> <p>不爲得自覺聖智處。大慧，於一切法無所有，覺自心現量離二妄想。(LAS, T16:506c13-14)<sup>1</sup></p> <p>菩薩入五法淨。心即無妄。若無有妄，即入如來自覺聖智之地。(Vajrasamādhi, T9:366c24-25)</p>
<p>實是自心所現，非是謬也。所以得知，自心所現。且論身四大者，爲內有四種妄想。感得四大以爲身，是以無五大。何以故。內有沈重妄想故，感得地大以爲身。內有津潤妄想故，感得水大以爲身。內有忿熱妄想故，感得火大爲身。內有飄動妄想故，感得風大以爲身。是以得知，皆是自心現量。(p. 40)</p>	<p>大慧，彼四大種云何生造色。謂津潤妄想大種生內外水界。堪能妄想大種生內外火界。飄動妄想大種生內外風界。斷截色妄想大種生內外地界。(LAS, T16:495c18-22)</p>

1 Cf. The definition of 自覺現量 (T16:505a9-10).

<p>問曰。其身信知不惑，山川大地，若為得知自心。 答曰。亦由內心。何以故。已有高下妄想故，感得山川大地不平。(p. 40)</p>	<p>舍利弗言。我見此土，丘陵坑坎荆棘沙礫，土石諸山穢惡充滿。螺髻梵言。仁者心有高下，不依佛慧故，見此土為不淨耳。(Kumārajīva, <i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśa</i>, T14:539c15-18)</p>
<p>其地下厚三百六十萬里，名為地輪。其地下有水，得深三百六十萬里，名為水輪。已承大地。其水輪下，復有火，復深三百六十萬里，以上衝承其水輪。其大火下，復有風輪，復深三百六十萬里。上下四輪，次第相承，大地得存，名為世界。(pp. 40-41)</p>	<p>今此大地深十六萬八千由旬。其邊無際。地止於水。水深三千三十由旬。其邊無際。水止於風。風深六千四十由旬。其邊無際。 (<i>Shiji jing</i> 世記經, T1:114c8-11) 安立器世間 風輪最居下 其量廣無數 厚十六洛叉 次上水輪深 十一億二萬 下八洛叉水 餘凝結成金 是水金輪廣 徑十二洛叉 三千四百半 周圍此三倍 (<i>AKBh</i>, T29:57a8-13)</p>
<p>只有四輪，而無五六者，為衆生內心有四種妄想。還為內有沈重妄想故，感得地輪。為內津潤妄想故，感得水輪。為內有忿熱妄想故，感得火輪。為內有飄動妄想故，感得風輪。以相成也。作此思惟，皆是自心所現。除心以外，更無一法。(p. 41)</p>	<p>大慧，彼四大種云何生造色。謂津潤妄想大種生內外水界。堪能妄想大種生內外火界。飄動妄想大種生內外風界。斷截色妄想大種生内外地界。(LAS, T16:495c18-22)</p>
<p>問曰。山川大地是無情，人是有情。云何忽言無情之境是其心也。若為得信，實難可信。 答曰。譬如夫妻二無智愚癡，相共平章，作酒欲沾。酒既醞已，其夫往看其酒，酒已澄清。乃見自影，即以成瞋，打其婦，</p>	<p>譬如水中有樹影現。彼非影非非影。非樹形非非樹形。如是外道見習所熏妄想計著，依於一異俱不俱有無非有非非常無常想。而不能知自心現量。譬如明鏡隨緣顯現一切色像，而無妄想。彼非像非非像，而見像非像。妄想愚夫而作像想，如是外道惡見，自心像現妄想計著。(LAS, T16:491b20-27)</p>

<p>婦分疏。"我有何事。"其夫即言。"你何故將一男人，藏着瓮中。"其婦不信，即看瓮中，乃見自影，還復大瞋即語夫言。"你何故將一婦女藏着瓮中，不語我知。"爾時夫婦相打，各不識自影。相打至死。... 凡夫亦爾，山川大地日月參辰，並是自心業所現，盡是自心影像。何以凡夫不名心作，決定不信。亦如夫妻二人諍影像相似，決定不信是自影也。瓮中實影者，喻山川大地亦是自心現量。若非自心現量者，既見雷車，震其虛空得作聲，明知，此聲是其空也。又見乘車在地，雖震其地以作聲，若無虛空，終不出聲。明知，此聲亦是空也。作此解時，一切諸法盡是虛空。(pp. 42-43)</p>	<p>由彼影像唯是識故。善男子。我說識所緣唯識所現故。世尊。若彼所行影像即與此心無有異者，云何此心還見此心。善男子。此中無有少法能見少法。然即此心如是生時，即有如是影像顯現。善男子。如依善瑩清淨鏡面，以質為緣還見本質，而謂我今見於影像。及謂離質別有所行影像顯現。如是此心生時相似有異。三摩地所行影像顯現。世尊。若諸有情自性而住，綠色等心所行影像。彼與此心亦無異耶。善男子。亦無有異。而諸愚夫由顛倒覺。於諸影像不能如實知唯是識。(SNS, T16:698b1-12)</p>
--	--

大乘開心顯性頓悟真宗論（沙門大照，居士慧光集釋）T85:1278a-87c (No.2835)

<p>悟者三界唯心，不悟隨眠邪正 (p. 181; T85:1278a15)</p>	<p>安立大乘三界唯識。以契經說三界唯心。(Vims, T31:74b27) 三界虛偽，唯心所作。(AF, T32:577b16-17)</p>
<p>若見如是理者，即名見性是也。即於分別中得無分別智。(p. 191; 1279a20-21)</p>	<p>一真見道。謂即所說無分別智，實證二空所顯真理，實斷二障分別隨眠。(CWSL, T31:50a6-7)</p>
<p>問曰。一切衆生皆以八識而轉，不得自在。云何是八識。答曰。所為眼耳鼻舌身意末那賴耶是也。(p. 199; 1280a3-5)</p>	<p>一謂異熟。即第八識。...二謂思量。即第七識。...三謂了境。即前六識。(CWSL, T31:7b27-28)</p>

所言識者，以了別為義。如人眼與色相應之時，意識於中分別。或時計好，或時計惡。(p. 199-200; 1280a5-7)	謂於六境了別名識。(CWSL, T31:26a22) 此中有識。眼及色為緣生眼識，與眼識俱隨行，同時同境有分別意識轉。(SNS, T16:692b20-22)
隨彼所計便有相生，即薰於第七末那之識。承此薰故，遂即執取，轉薰於第八識。(p. 200; 1280a7-9)	deviation 唯異熟識具此四義可是所熏。非心所等。(CWSL, T31:9c18-19) 其無性人此第七識四義具足。何不受熏。以染無記違善，惡品。今言無記唯無覆無記。(Shuji, T43:313b25-27)
所已積聚諸業種子，得名為藏。眼識既然，諸識亦爾。(p. 200; 1280a9-10)	謂或名心。由種種法熏習種子所積集故。(CWSL, T31:13c8-9)
一切眾生，業受報者，先將藏識，展轉成因，作未來之業。(p. 200; 1280a10-11)	聖說轉識與阿賴耶展轉相望為因緣故。(CWSL, T31:40b5-6)
所言此八識者，謂本有，以云為因，籀現在緣，而起造作。因緣和合，還欲生未來之因。(p. 200; 1280a13-15)	五待眾緣。謂此要待自眾緣合功能殊勝方成種子。(CWSL, T31:9b22-23)
今欲斷除不令生者，當正觀之時，了眼識從何而得。為從色得，為從眼得，為從心得。若從心得，盲人有眼，云何不能生於眼識。若從眼得，死人有眼，云何不能分別於色。若從色得，色即頑礙無知，如此眾緣不能獨辨。(p. 200; 1280a15-20)	汝言現見，為眼見，為識見。若眼見者，死人有眼，亦應見。若識見者，盲人有識，亦應見。若根識一一別不見，和合亦不見，喻如一盲不能見，眾盲亦不見。(Baizi lun 百字論, T30:251b24-27) <sup>2</sup>

2 The same passage is quoted in the *Zongjing lun* 宗鏡論 (T48:779c11-16).



<p>八識藏中，更無薰習雜染種子。以無種子，更不受生死，湛然常住，不為生之所生，滅之所滅。(p. 201; 1280a23-25)</p>	<p>由此如來第八淨識，唯帶舊種，非新受熏。(CWSL, T31:9c12-13) 佛果圓滿不增不減盡未來際。但從種生不熏成種。勿前佛德勝後佛故。(CWSL, T31:56c2-4)</p>
<p>問曰。佛有三身，從何而得。答曰。佛三身者，從八識而得。由轉八識得成四智。就此四智，速成三身。此乃從因至果，有此三身差別。(p. 202; 1280a25-28)</p>	<p>以五法性攝三身者·有義[第一師]初二[真如，大圓鏡智]攝自性身。...中二智品[平等，妙觀]攝受用身。...後一智品[成所作智]攝變化身。...(CWSL, T31:58a6-12)</p>
<p>因眼識耳識鼻識舌識身識，此五識以為妙觀察智。第六意識為成所作智。第七末那識為平等性智，第八阿賴耶為大圓鏡智。(p. 202; 1280a28-b2)</p>	<p>云何四智相應心品。一大圓鏡智相應心品。... 二平等性智相應心品 ... 三妙觀察智相應心品 ... 四成所作智相應心品 ... 此轉有漏八，七，六，五識相應品如次而得。(CWSL, T31:56a12-b3) 轉第八識得鏡智。轉第七識得平等智。轉五識<sup>3</sup>得觀智。轉第六識<sup>4</sup>得作事智。(MSA, T31:606c29-7a2) 當知此中轉阿賴耶識故得大圓鏡智。...轉染污末那故得平等性智。...轉五現識<sup>5</sup>故得妙觀察智。...轉意識<sup>6</sup>故得成所作智。(MSgUp, T31:438a14-24) 轉第八識得大圓鏡智相應心 ... 轉第七識得平等性智相應心 ... 轉第六識得妙觀察智相應心 ... 轉五現識得成所作智相應心 ... 復有義者，轉第六識得成所作。轉五現識得妙觀察。此不應爾。非次第故。(BBSŚ, T26:302c1-9)</p>

3 Text, 第六識, but I follow the variant given in the footnote of the Taishō canon. Concerning this and the following variants, see Sakuma 2002, 67.

4 Text, 前五識, but I follow the variant given in the Taishō canon.

5 Text, 意識, but I follow the variant shown in the footnote of the Taishō canon.

6 Text, 五識, but I follow the variant shown in the footnote of the Taishō canon.

<p>問曰。此四智者有何義故而作是說。 答曰。用前五識，亦云五根。其五根者，即惠門。照觸前境，而無妄染。所以將此五識，以為妙觀察智。(p. 202; 1280b3-6)<sup>7</sup></p>	<p>三妙觀察智相應心品。謂此心品善觀諸法自相，共相。無礙而轉。攝觀無量總持定門<sup>8</sup>，及所發生功德珍寶。於大眾會能現無邊作用差別皆得自在。兩大法雨斷一切疑。令諸有情皆獲得利樂。(CWSL, T31:56a21-25)</p>
<p>第六意識者，亦云意根。是智門，當須勲覺。覺之依淨。與法相應，真俗齊觀，成就智慧。轉意成惠，惠照能明。識無分別，轉智成□。是名成所作智。(pp. 202-3; 1280b6-9)<sup>9</sup></p>	<p>四成所作智相應心品。謂此心品為欲利樂諸有情故，普於十方示現種種變化三業。成本願力所應作事。(CWSL, T31:56a25-28)</p>
<p>第七末那識者，更無執取，自然無憎無愛。以無憎愛故，一切法悉皆平等。故云平等性智。(p. 203; 1280b9-11)</p>	<p>二平等性智相應心品。謂此心品觀一切法，自他有情悉皆平等。大慈悲等恒共相應。隨諸有情所樂。示現受用身土影像差別。妙觀察智不共所依。無住涅槃之所建立。一味相續窮未來際。(T31:56a16-21)</p>
<p>第八阿賴耶識藏中即空，雜染種子，悉皆清淨。猶如明鏡懸在於空，一切萬像，悉皆中現。而此明鏡，終不作念言。我能現像。像亦不言。我從鏡生。無能無所。故說此智名為大圓鏡智。(p. 203; 1280b11-15)</p>	<p>一大圓鏡智相應心品。謂此心品離諸分別所緣，行相微細難知。不忘不愚一切境相。性相清淨離諸雜染。純淨圓德，現種依持。能現能生身土智影。無間無斷窮未來際。如大圓鏡現眾色像。(CWSL, T31:56a12-16) 譬如明鏡隨緣顯現一切色像而無妄想彼非像非非像而見像非像。妄想愚夫而作像想。(LAS, T16:491b24-26)</p>
<p>問曰。四智既爾。云何三身。 答曰。大圓鏡智以為法身。平等性智以為報身。成所作智及妙觀察智以為化身。(p. 204; 1280b15-18)</p>	<p>以五法性攝三身者。有義[第一師]初二[真如，大圓鏡智]攝自性身。...中二智品[平等，妙觀]攝受用身。...後一智品[成所作智]攝變化身。... (CWSL, T31:58a6-12)</p>

7 This passage is based on the *Dasheng wusheng fangbian men* 大乘無生方便門. See Ibuki 1992b, 97; Cheng 2011, 128.

8 Text, 總持之門. I follow the variant shown in the footnote of the Taishō canon.

9 This passage is also based on the *Dasheng wusheng fangbian men*. See Ibuki 1992b, 97-98; Cheng 2011, 128.

法鼓佛教學院特叢 2

佛教禪修傳統：起源與發展  
2012 國際研討會論文集

主 編／莊國彬

執行編輯／羅佩心

封面與內頁設計／劉秋筑

發行人 高本釗  
出版者 新文豐出版股份有限公司  
地 址 臺北市中正區羅斯福路一段20號8樓  
電 話 (02) 2341-5293  
傳 真 (02) 2356-8076  
電子郵件 swfc@swfc.com.tw  
網 址 <http://www.swfc.com.tw>  
出版日期 2014 (民103) 年4月 初版  
I S B N 978-957-17-2203-0  
基 價 平裝 11.6 元

版權所有·翻印必究(Printed in Taiwan)

凡有缺頁或破損者，請寄回更換

22935002(平)

Dharma Drum Buddhist College Special Series 2

**Buddhist Meditative Traditions: Their Origin and Development**

Editor-in-Chief: Kuo-pin Chuang

Executive Editor: Pei-shin Lo

Typesetter: Liu Gaga

Publisher: Shin Wen Feng Print Co.

Address: 8th Fl. No. 20, Sec.1, Roosevelt Rd.,  
Taipei, Taiwan

Tel: (+886-2) 2341-5293

Fax: (+886-2) 2356-8076

E-mail: swfc@swfc.com.tw

URL: <http://www.swfc.com.tw>

Date of Issue: April 2014

ISBN: 978-957-17-2203-0

國家圖書館出版品預行編目(CIP)資料

佛教禪修傳統：起源與發展：國際研討會論文集. 2012 / 莊國彬主編. -- 初版. -- [臺北市]: 新文豐, 民 103.04  
面; 公分. -- (法鼓佛教學院特叢; 2)  
部分內容為英文  
ISBN 978-957-17-2203-0 (平裝)

1. 佛教修持 2. 禪定 3. 文集

225.7207

103004230