

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Michael RADICH

1. Introduction¹

Like other ideas in his corpus, Paramārtha's² (Ch. Zhendi 真諦, 499-569) notion of *amoluoshi* 阿摩羅識, or **amalavijñāna*, “taintless consciousness”, occupies an

¹ Acknowledgements: I have been most fortunate in that I was able to use unpublished research materials circulated in the research seminar “Shintai sanzō to sono jidai 真諦三藏とその時代” [“Paramārtha and His Times”] (April 2005-March 2010), coordinated by Prof. FUNAYAMA Tōru 船山徹, Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University. Especially helpful were collected fragments of the *Jiushi zhang* cited in extant texts collected in ŌTAKE 2007(b), and studied by YOSHIMURA Makoto. I am also grateful for the invaluable opportunity to participate in this seminar. Its members have helped me tremendously. Above all I must thank Prof. FUNAYAMA for kindnesses too numerous to list. I also owe special thanks to Dr. ŌTAKE Susumu 大竹晋 for much valuable help. Prof. MUROJI Yoshihito 室寺義仁, Prof. YOSHIMURA Makoto 吉村誠, Dr. IKEDA Masanori 池田将則 and Ching KENG 耿晴 saved me from a number of errors, and pointed me in helpful directions. I am grateful for funding from the Kyōto University Institute for Research in Humanities, which made it possible for me to travel to Japan and present a lecture summarising the present research, “Shintai ni okeru amarashiki to sono igi 真諦における阿摩羅識とその意義,” on October 18 2008. I thank Richard STANLEY for permission to cite his unpublished ANU doctoral dissertation. Finally, I thank Eunsu CHO for helping me to find a useful article at the eleventh hour. Naturally, responsibility for any remaining errors is entirely my own.

Conventions: In citing the Taishō (T) and *Xuzangjing* (X) Chinese canons, I give the number of the text, followed by the volume, page, register and line nos., thus: T1616:31.863b05. Throughout, I regularly repunctuate citations from Chinese canonical texts without notice. I have aimed for this repunctuation to show clearly my interpretation of each passage.

² For purposes of argument, I will throughout this paper use “Paramārtha” (abbreviation: P) to refer indifferently to the historical person and also to the corpus attributed to him. In so doing, I am eliding important problems in determining authorship of these texts. I have in preparation a study in which I attempt to use methods of computer-assisted statistical analysis to examine this problem of authorship.

important place in the common understanding of the development of East Asian Buddhist thought. In particular, it is frequently linked to claims about the “sinification”,³ or “making Chinese”, of Buddhist ideas. It has also often been interpreted as an attempt to forge links between Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha thought, that is, to bring about a synthesis between two major strands of Mahāyāna Buddhist doctrine. For these reasons, an accurate understanding of **amalavijñāna* is important to our understanding of Buddhist doctrinal history. Towards this end, this paper studies primary sources for the doctrine of **amalavijñāna* in detail, first in Paramārtha’s extant corpus, and then in other sources to the close of the eighth century.

In Sections 2 and 3, I present a full analysis and translation of all passages in Paramārtha’s extant corpus mentioning **amalavijñāna*, containing in total approximately twenty instances of the concept.⁴ I interpret each passage in relation to its context, and with full reference to available Chinese, Sanskrit and Tibetan parallels. I also present an analysis of the generally neglected *Abhidharmakośa* passage in which the word *amalavijñāna* occurs for the only known time in Sanskrit, and its relation to Paramārtha’s concept.

In Section 4, I present an analysis of what is said by more than twenty-five authors, in several dozen texts, in about the first two and a half centuries after Paramārtha, comparing this evidence carefully with what is learnt about **amalavijñāna* from examination of Paramārtha’s extant works. I proceed in three main steps, examining in turn: (1) claims about **amalavijñāna* that are found only in later authors, and are not matched in Paramārtha’s works; (2) areas of overlap between later authors and Paramārtha; and (3) aspects of Paramārtha’s doctrine that are never repeated in later works.

Finally, in Section 5, I summarise the conclusions of this study. My main contentions will be as follows. (1) The neglected *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* passage surrounding the mention of the word *amalavijñāna* does have some clear relations with Paramārtha’s idea of **amalavijñāna*, especially as found in the *Jueding zang lun*. (2) In Paramārtha’s own works, we find not one but two largely distinct doctrines of **amalavijñāna*; one featuring in *Jueding zang lun* alone, and the other in the remaining

³ See n. 490.

⁴ This count is approximate because there are, in one or two places, textual problems and variant terms that may or may not constitute separate instances.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

works where the concept occurs. Of these two versions of the doctrine, it is likely that the *Jueding zang lun* is closer to the original doctrine. (3) There is relatively little overlap between Paramārtha’s own attested doctrine(s) of **amalavijñāna*, and characterisations of the doctrine in later authors — even when those authors purport to be describing the doctrine as Paramārtha taught it. (4) This suggests that Paramārtha’s ideas may sometimes have been misunderstood and misrepresented by the tradition. Later authors may thus not be very reliable sources of information about Paramārtha’s thought, and due to over-reliance upon them, our understanding of Paramārtha’s thought may not be entirely accurate.

2. Paramārtha’s concept of **amalavijñāna* in the primary sources

To my knowledge, there exists no complete study of Paramārtha’s concept of **amalavijñāna*.⁵ In this section of this study, I will analyse all the instances of the term in Paramārtha’s corpus. We will first examine the passages in which the concept occurs one by one. I will then attempt to summarise the doctrine of **amalavijñāna* as it appears in these sources into a synthetic, general picture.

⁵ There is certainly no such study in any Western language. By “complete study”, I mean a study that takes full account of all the instances of this term in P’s corpus. Some Japanese and Chinese studies do survey nearly all of the sources I will treat below, but typically do not sufficiently put passages in context; and I believe every scholar except YOSHIMURA misses at least some instances of the term. Few scholars have studied P’s texts against their parallels in reference to this question. Perhaps the closest study of primary passages is IWATA (1972[a]), which presents nearly all of the primary passages in which the term *amalavijñāna* appears in P’s extant corpus, and identifies parallel terms in Indic texts. However, IWATA does not mention the four instances of the term in SWXL. Further, his work is largely restricted to translating single sentences and identifying Sanskrit parallels, and he pays far too little attention to the larger conceptual contexts. IWATA has further studied **amalavijñāna* extensively, and often redundantly, in a long series of other articles, listed in my bibliography. These articles typically do not add anything not already said in this 1972 article. YOSHIMURA (2007a) surveys all pertinent passages, but only briefly, in preparation for consideration of later Shelun doctrines. Other important studies include relevant portions of KATSUMATA; Yinshun; Lu Cheng’s essay on **amalavijñāna* collected in *Lü Cheng foxue lunzhu xuanji*; and comments by Shengkai in his *Shelun xuepai yanjiu*. See also U₁ 6, 486-488, 539, 753-754; MOU 350-351, 355; FUKAURA 1, 338, 341-344; YE 15, 247, 253-255, 474; HAKAMAYA 10-13, 17. The most important Western language studies of **amalavijñāna* to date are undoubtedly FRAUWALLNER; and GIMELLO, 277 ff. (“The Early Chinese Appropriation of Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha Buddhism”). See also LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1928-1929), 109-113; DEMIÉVILLE (1952), 56 ff.; LIEBENTHAL 369 ff.; RUEGG 439-444 (“L’*Amalavijñāna*”); BUSWELL (1995), 77, 92-104; LUSTHAUS 369 ff; p. 379-380 n. 46; LAI, 76; PAUL 108, 145, 149; several pieces by YOSHIMURA (2002, 2007a, forthcoming).

The term 阿摩羅識 **amalavijñāna* is not found in any parallels to the Paramārtha texts in which it appears. However, there are extant Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese parallels to passages in which the term appears, which sometimes even make it possible to identify terms to which it corresponds. These provide valuable clues to the meaning of the term and its context, and I have attempted to make full use of them.⁶

2.1 *Amalavijñāna* in AKBh

It has seldom been observed in secondary literature on **amalavijñāna*⁷ that the term *amalavijñāna*⁸ is in fact attested in Sanskrit — though not in the sense Paramārtha famously gives to it; and not in parallels to any of the passages where he expounds his

6 In utilising parallels to interpret P's Chinese, I have tried to bear in mind two principles, which pull in opposite directions. (1) P most likely usually had before him a Sanskrit text that said something very similar to other versions of the text, and was trying to convey at least one plausible meaning of that text. Where possible, then, his Chinese must therefore be interpreted in a sense reconcilable with parallels. (2) As we shall see, it is also clear that P did at times depart from his source text in various ways, and this is corroborated by a general examination of his entire corpus. Therefore, where P's text cannot plausibly be reconciled with parallels without doing violence to it, we must translate P, and not the parallels.

7 See, however, HAKAMAYA 13, 23 n. 51.

8 Throughout this paper, I use the asterisk that denotes reconstruction in referring to the term **amalavijñāna* as the presumed equivalent of P's *amoluoshi* etc. By contrast, in reference to this sole attested Sanskrit instance of the term in AKBh, the asterisk is obviously unnecessary. I am grateful to MUROJI Yoshihito and ŌTAKE Susumu for reminding me that it is also necessary consider the possibility that the term P had in mind in coining *amoluoshi* was not **amalavijñāna*, but **nirmalajñāna*, as has been argued by IWATA (see esp. 1971) (see also n. 17). There are some good grounds for this argument. First, it is odd that a purified *jñāna*, proper to the Buddhas, would be called *vi-jñāna* rather than simply *jñāna*. Second, as IWATA points out, there are passages in which a *nirmalaṃ jñānam* is discussed, where that concept seems to correspond quite well with what we see of **amalavijñāna* in P. See e.g. BBh: *asaktam anāvaran am. suvisuddham nirmalaṃ jñānam*, WOGIHARA 405; XZ 無滯無障最極清淨無垢智, T1579:30.574b13; like **amalavijñāna*, this *nirmalaṃ jñānam* is associated with *āśrayaparāvṛtti*. So too MSA 14.28: 出世間無上 / 無分別離垢 / 此智 etc., T1604:31.625b08-09, *lokottaram anuttaram/ nirvikalpaṃ malapētam jñānam*, LÉVI (1907, 1911) 1, 93 and 2, 167; this *jñāna* is also associated with *āśrayaparāvṛtti* (14.29, T1604:31.625b14, LÉVI 1, 94 and 2, 168), is *visuddha* (14.32, T1604:31.625c05, LÉVI 1, 942, 168) etc. I will examine this possibility further in future work on the background of P's concept (see n. 490). For the present, though I am sure this idea of *nirmalaṃ jñānam* is certainly part of the background to the concept, I will assume that since the present AKBh passage provides us with a form that corresponds more exactly to the Chinese transcription *amoluo*, and because *shi* for *jñāna* would be unusual, **amalavijñāna* is the most likely reconstruction.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

amoluoshi 阿摩羅識.

The term occurs in *Abhidharmakośa* (AKBh) 5.28 ff. and the accompanying *Bhāṣya* (AKBh).⁹ The context is a discussion of when “latent tendencies” (*anusāya*) attach to *dharma*s, how many attach to each *dharma*, of what kind they are, etc. AK here distinguishes between sixteen kinds of consciousness. The first fifteen kinds are associated with the three “realms” (*dhātu: kama, rūpa, arūpya*); the sixteenth, however, is “pure”, or “free of outflows” (*anāsrava*). Paramārtha uses several translations for this last “pure consciousness”.

The centre of gravity in this passage as a whole is this concept of “consciousness without outflows” (i.e. **anāsravavijñāna*).¹⁰ Only in verses does Vasubandhu refer to this concept by the term *amalavijñāna*, and also by the epithet *amala* (twice, with *vijñāna* elided). In the prose Bh, by contrast, he consistently uses *anāsrava*. It is thus likely that he uses *amala* etc. *metri causa*. For Vasubandhu, the rare term *amalavijñāna* was thus most likely a nonce coinage, a mere poetic equivalent to **anāsravavijñāna*.

Thus, the term *amalavijñāna* itself occurs only once in Vasubandhu’s Sanskrit:

*duḥkhaḥhetudṛgabhyaśapraheyaḥ kāmadhātujāḥ /
svakatrayaikarūpāptāmalavijñānagocarāḥ.* (5.29)

“The [*dharma*s] produced in the *kāmadhātu* that are to be abandoned by insight into [the Truths of] Suffering and the Origin [of Suffering]/ are the objects (*gocara*) of three [kinds of consciousness proper to] their own realm; of one [kind of consciousness] obtained in the *rūpadhātu*; and of pure consciousness (*amalavijñāna*).”¹¹

Paramārtha translates: 見苦集修滅 / 是欲相應法 / 自界三一色 / 無垢識境界。¹²

⁹ PRADHAN 301-303; LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (hereafter VP) 4, 67-69. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1980) 4, 67 n. 3, points out that the discussion here follows **Mahāvibhāṣā* T1545: 27. 449a23 ff.

¹⁰ This emphasis is exceptionally clear when we note that the discussion in the **Mahāvibhāṣā*, upon which this AKBh passage is based, speaks *only* of **anāsravavijñāna* (無漏識 in Xuanzang’s [XZ] translation). See e.g. T1545:27.449a29, 449b08, 449b14, 449b20, 449c01, 449c10, 449c18 etc. The idea of **anāsravavijñāna* was thus, presumably, a firmly established piece of Vaibhāṣika doctrine by the time of AKBh.

¹¹ PRADHAN 302; VP 4, 67.

¹² T1559:29.260a12-13.

Strikingly, Paramārtha does *not* translate *amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識, although it is the presumed underlying term for his own notion of **amalavijñāna*. The term he does use, *wugoushi* 無垢識, only ever appears this once in Paramārtha’s corpus.¹³

In 30ab, this “pure consciousness” is identified merely by the epithet *amala* (with *vijñāna* elided); Paramārtha translates *jingshi* 淨識.¹⁴ Paramārtha uses this term twice in SWXL<1> and SBKL<2> to discuss **amalavijñāna*. He also uses a closely related locution¹⁵ in JDZL<4>.

In a summary verse that concludes the discussion, the “pure consciousness” is again called *amala*; here, Paramārtha translates *wuliu* 無流, more usually his translation for *anāsrava*.¹⁶ This translation is far from arbitrary, but rather reflects the real centre of gravity of the concept at issue. Aside from the exceptional (probably *metri causa*) instances of *amala* etc., Skt. too usually calls the same “pure consciousness” *anāsrava* (with “consciousness” elided but comprehensible from context). In one instance, Paramārtha translates *wuliushi* 無流識.¹⁷ Elsewhere, Paramārtha translates several times 無流心, for which we might expect Skt. **anāsravacitta*.¹⁸

13 This suggests that *wugoushi* and **amalavijñāna* may have been distinct for P himself. Yet *wugoushi* was taken quite regularly as an unproblematic equivalent for P’s **amalavijñāna* by later scholastics in East Asia; see n. 191.

The combination 無垢識 does appear once before P, in the 無盡意菩薩品 *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* T397(12) by the Liu Song 劉宋 translators from Liangzhou 涼州, Zhiyan 智嚴 and Baoyun 寶雲 (active c. 427 C.E.): 是淨戒中心淨無垢識不止住思不親近, T397:13.190b19. However, this is properly to be punctuated 是淨戒中、心淨無垢、識不止住 . . . as is clear from comparison with BRAARVIG’s Skt. reconstruction, *yā vimalacittatā vijñānānīśritatā manasikārāsaṃsṛṣṭis tac chilam*, and Tib. *sems dri ma med pa . . . rnam par shes pa la . . . mi gnas pa dang . . . yid la byed pa dang ma ’dres pa*; BRAARVIG 1, 140.

14 *svakādhara trayordhvaikāmalānām rūpadhātujāḥ*; 自界下界三、上一淨識境, T1559:29.260a17-18, PRADHAN 32, VP 4, 68.

15 相心極清淨。識清淨. . . T1584:30.1031a08-09; see the end of JDZL<4> below.

16 T1559:29.260b07, PRADHAN 303, VP 4, 69. (T1559:29.175c25, 176a04, 209c03, 226c09; HIRAKAWA 2, 463.) P also uses *wuliu* for *amala* elsewhere in AKBh, and also for *nirmala*; T1559:29.284c21, HIRAKAWA 2, 463.

17 The very term *wuliu* for *anāsrava* itself is one of the most striking hallmarks of P’s translation style; it occurs approximately 430 times in his corpus, and otherwise only once each in two texts (T398, T659) before or contemporaneous with him. It is unsurprising, therefore, that *wuliushi* is extremely rare, occurring, outside the present passage, only ever in a single passage of P’s MSgBh (where it appears four times): T1595:31.168c24-169a12.

18 T1559:29.260a17, 260a20, 260a23, 260b03, 260b05, 260b17. P had also translated 無流心 for

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

In this AKBh passage, then, the single instance of *amalavijñāna* clearly does not mean precisely what **amalavijñāna* = *amoluoshi* comes to mean in other passages in Paramārtha. Neither is the concept of “consciousness without outflows”, whose discussion forms the larger context, identical to Paramārtha’s **amalavijñāna*. This may be why scholars have tended to disregard this passage when studying Paramārtha’s concept of **amalavijñāna*. Yet this passage may provide us with clues to part of the background of Paramārtha’s concept. Certainly, we can at least be sure from this passage that Paramārtha knew Vasubandhu’s use of *amalavijñāna*. It is therefore likely that when he elaborated his own notion, he was picking up on Vasubandhu’s term and infusing it with new content.¹⁹

Neither is the meaning of *amalavijñāna* in AKBh entirely unrelated to Paramārtha’s **amalavijñāna*. As we will see below, two key parts of Paramārtha’s doctrine of **amalavijñāna* are: (1) that it is free of defilements (*kleśa*), a claim which is related to freedom from “outflows” (*āsrava*);²⁰ and (2) that the realisation of **amalavijñāna* brings freedom from the attachments that condition future rebirth, which also seems to be a consideration at play in the present AKBh passage’s consideration of *anusāya*. These factors also make it likely this AKBh passage formed part of the background to Paramārtha’s coinage of his own **amalavijñāna*.

To conclude, it is likely that: (1) Vasubandhu coined *amalavijñāna* as a nonce equivalent, *metri causa*, for **anāsravavijñāna*; and (2) Paramārtha picked this rare term up as a label for his own ideas, and bent it flexibly to that use.

We now turn to the consideration of “**amalavijñāna* proper”, that is, the term **amalavijñāna* as it is used to articulate the distinctively Paramārthian notion of a “pure consciousness” in the context of the Yogācāra system, usually represented by the transcription *amoluoshi* 阿摩羅識. The term appears in four texts: *Jueding zang lun*, *Shiba*

PRADHAN 302 *samāsata ime śoḍaśa dharmāḥ kamarūparūpyavacarah pañcaprakarah anāsravās ca*, T1559:29.260a09; but I think, as VP’s translation suggests (“*dharmas pur*” VP 4, 67), that this is in error for *anāsravāḥ dharmāḥ*.

- 19 This seems to be a time-honoured technique — a thinker picks up a rare or unusual (and therefore suitably ill-defined) term from some nook or cranny, and reshapes it to fit the new concept. Examples might include the standard concept(s) of *dharmakāya*; Zhiyi’s 一念三千; Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha uses of *praktiprabhāsvaracitta*; and even Mahāyāna *śanyata*.
- 20 In fact, the last paragraph of the passage I call JDZL<4> below, following the final mention of **amalavijñāna* in the text, explicitly mentions *anāsravavijñāna*.

kong lun, Zhuanshi lun, and San wuxing lun.

2.2 *Jueding zang lun*

The term **amalavijñāna* occurs most frequently in four passages in the *Jueding zang lun* 決定藏論 (JDZL), T1584.²¹

2.2.1 JDZL <1>

**Amalavijñāna* occurs, most importantly, eight times in one short passage in JDZL. This passage is thus the most important source for information about what Paramārtha meant by the term. Significantly, the context is a discussion of the “revolutionary transformation of the basis” (*āśrayaparāvṛtti*) of Yogācāra theory, and the relationship between it and the “storehouse” or “base” consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*).²²

“All that is included under [the head of] defilements (煩惱, **kleśa*)²³ in the category (? 種)²⁴ of *karmic* conditioning [i.e. ‘volition’, *saṃskāra* (*-skandha*), 行]²⁵ is gathered together in the fundamental consciousness (*alayavijñāna*); [thus, when,] because of intensive and repeated cultiva-

21 JDZL is a freestanding translation of a portion of YBh corresponding to the first portion of the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* (XZ *She jueze fen* 攝決擇分). For Tib, I have referred to the Tokyo University reprint of the Derge version (Tōkyō daigaku . . . ed). Important secondary studies, which were helpful to me in preparing the present article, are HAKAMAYA; U1 6, 541-790 (“Kettei zō ron no kenkyū”). MATSUDA Kazunobu has identified parallels to nearly half this text in a set of Sanskrit fragments in Nepal (see MATSUDA). According to MATSUDA’s account of the manuscript, it corresponds to JDZL 1025c26-1035a18 (extrapolating from equivalences MATSUDA gives to portions of the XZ YBh). This should mean that it contains a parallel to one instance of the term *amalavijñāna*, that at 1031a02-04, though MATSUDA also notes that the manuscript is damaged and it will not be possible to reconstruct a complete text on its basis, 18. However, it seems unfortunately that these Sanskrit fragments have not yet been published.

22 Parts of this passage are translated in DEMIÉVILLE (1929), 42.

23 Note that Tib. here reads *rnam par spros pa*, **viprapañca*. XZ agrees.

24 I presume this 種 is the basis for SAKUMA’s suggestion that there may have been an underlying *-gata*: “das Ālayavijñāna die [gesamten] Element(e) aller dieser Arten von (? : °gata?) bedingten [Faktoren] . . .”, Sakuma (1990) 2, 156; I cannot see any basis for this reconstruction in either XZ or Tib.

25 This phrase is somewhat difficult of interpretation. Tib. and XZ are somewhat more expansive. Tib. reads, “[Because] the *alayavijñāna* is the element/domain of all that is included as (‘habitual’, Hakamaya) conceptual proliferation of (= resulting from?) *saṃskāra*,” *kun gzhi rnam par shes pa ni ’du byed kyi rnam par spros par bsdus pa de dag thams cad kyi khams pa yin pa* [’i *phyir*]. XZ reads similarly “The *alayavijñāna* is the element/domain of *saṃskāras* that are included in all *prapañca*” 阿賴耶識是一切戲論所攝諸行界.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

tion (*asevita-bhavita*)²⁶ on the part of the wisdom that takes Thusness as its objective support (*tathatālambanajñāna*),²⁷ the fundamental consciousness is abandoned, which is to say that a revolutionary transformation (**parāvṛtti*) is brought about in the nature of the ordinary worldling (凡夫性, **prthagjanatva*),²⁸ such that all the qualities of the ordinary worldling (凡夫法, **prthagjanadharmā*) are discarded, then the fundamental consciousness is extinguished.²⁹ Because this consciousness is extinguished, all defilements are extinguished, and by means of [the] counteragent[s] (對治, *pratīpakṣa*) to the fundamental consciousness, the **amalavijñāna* is realised (cf. Tib./XZ: “the basis undergoes a revolutionary transformation”, *āśrayah pravartate*).³⁰

“The fundamental consciousness is impermanent (*anitya*), and is something attended by ‘outflows’ (有漏法, **sāsravadharma*);³¹ [whereas] **amalavijñāna*³² is permanent (*nitya*), and is something devoid of ‘outflows’ (無漏法, **anasravadharma*).³³ [This is because] **amalavijñāna* is

26 Tib. *kun tu brten cing goms par byas*, Skt. following HAKAMAYA 66.

27 真如境智, Tib. *de bzhin la dmigs pa'i shes paś*.

28 For **prthagjanatva* for *fanfuxing* 凡夫性 in P, see e.g. HIRAKAWA 1, 241, which shows it is the only Skt. term so translated by P in the context of AKBh. Within JDZL itself, *fanfuxing* (XZ *yish-engxing* 異生性) corresponds to Tib. *so so'i skye bo nyid* = **prthagjanatva* at T1584:30.1024c11-15 = T1579:30.587b25-29, D 23b4-5. (I am grateful to Ching KENG for pointing out the latter parallel to me.) It is thus implausible to reconstruct **prthagjanagotra* with GIMELLO 326.

29 The latter half of this sentence differs in its detailed wording, though not in its general import, from Tib, which reads merely, “A revolutionary transformation is brought about in the basis (*gnas 'gyur bar byed, āśrayah parivartate*) because of intensive and repeated cultivation on the part of the wisdom that takes Thusness as its objective support. The limitless revolutionary transformation of the basis should be considered to be the abandonment of the fundamental consciousness;” *de bzhin nyid la dmigs pa'i shes pas kun tu brten cing goms par byas pa'i rgyus gnas 'gyur bar byed do// gnas 'gyur ma thag tu kun gzhi rnam par shes pa spangs par brjod par bya ste*. XZ agrees. Such interpolated expansive glosses are typical of P's translation methodology.

30 Tib. reads, “The basis (*āśraya*) of this fundamental consciousness should be considered as something to be [obtained by being] transformed by [means of, in virtue of] the antidote and counterpart [of that fundamental consciousness],” *kun gzhi rnam par shes pa de'i gnas ni/ gnyen po dang/ dgra bos bsgyur bar rig par bya'o*. XZ is somewhat different again: “We should consider that the *āśrayaparāvṛtti*, because it is opposite [to it,] can act as a permanent counteragent to the *alayavijñāna*,” 當知轉依由相違故、能永對治阿賴耶識。

31 Tib. here reads rather *len pa dang bcas pa*, Skt. *sōpadāna*, “attended by clinging/grasping”. XZ approximately agrees: 有取受性。

32 Tib./XZ **āśrayaparāvṛtti, gnas 'gyur pa*, 轉依; so throughout.

33 Once more, Tib. differs slightly, reading *len pa med pa, anupadāna*. XZ agrees.

MICHAEL RADICH

realised 證 by means of the attainment of the path that takes Thusness as its objective support (真如境道, *de bzhin nyid la dmigs pa'i lam*, **tathatālambanamārga*).³⁴

“The fundamental consciousness is accompanied by ‘badness’ (*dauṣṭhulyasamanvāgama*),³⁵ [that is,] suffering as an effect [of *karma*] 苦果;³⁶ **amalavijñāna* is free of all ‘badness’ [i.e.] suffering as an effect [of *karma*].

“The fundamental consciousness is the basis 根本 for all the defilements 煩惱, but does not act as a basis for 根本 the noble path (聖道, **āryamārga*).³⁷ **Amalavijñāna*, on the other hand, is not the basis for the defilements, but only 但 acts as a basis for the noble path and the attainment of the path. The **amalavijñāna* acts as a ‘cause for the perdurance’ (**pratiṣṭhā-hetu*) of the noble path, but does not act as a ‘cause for the generation’ (*janma-hetu*) [of it].³⁸

“The fundamental consciousness does not exert controlling power (自在, *vibhūtvā*) over good and neutral [*dharmas*; 善無記, *kuśala*, (*kuśalākūśala*-) *avyākṛta*].³⁹

-
- 34 Tib. reads, “. . . because it *transforms by* [means of] the path that takes Thusness as its objective support”, *de bzhin nyid la dmigs pa'i lam gyis bsgyur ba'i phyr ro. XZ*: “. . . because it is only possible for the basis to undergo revolutionary transformation on the basis of the noble path that takes Thusness as its objective support”, 緣真如境聖道、方能轉依故。
- 35 There placement of “badness” (*dauṣṭhulya*) by “ease” (*praśrabdhi*) has been traced by SAKUMA as the oldest layer of meaning of the notion of the revolutionary transformation of the basis *āśrayaparavṛtti* in YBh. See SAKUMA (1990), esp. 164-165; also SAKUMA (1991), 440-439.
- 36 Nothing corresponds to this phrase in Tib. or XZ, and it thus seems to be an interpolated gloss on the part of P.
- 37 Tib. reads, “The *alayavijñāna* is the cause of the activation (*pravṛtti*) of the defilements, and yet is not the cause of the activation (*pravṛtti*) of the path,” etc.; *kun gzhi rnam par shes pa ni nyon mongs pa rnams kyi 'jug pa'i rgyu dang lam gyi 'jug pa'i rgyu ma yin la . . . XZ* agrees: 是煩惱轉因 etc.
- 38 I follow HAKAMAYA in identifying these two types of cause: Tib. *gnas pa'i rgyu*, *skyed pa'i rgyu* respectively; HAKAMAYA bases himself upon AKBh; 78 n. 78. Note that Tib. clearly says that it is because the revolutionary transformation of the basis (= P's **amalavijñāna*) is this kind of cause that it acts as a cause for the path: *gnas gyur pa ni nyon mongs pa rnams kyi 'jug pa'i rgyu ma yin pa dang/ lam du 'jug pa'i rgyu yin te/ gnas pa'i rgyu nyid yin pa dang/ skyed pa'i rgyu nyid ma yin pa'i phyr ro*. SAKUMA translates “die Ursache für sein Fortbestehen” and “die Ursache für seine Erzeugung” respectively; SAKUMA (1990) 2, 159. See also SCHMITHAUSEN (1987) 2, 369 n. 570, who translates respectively “the cause which supports [. . . continuance]” and “the cause which generates . . . [for the first time]”.
- 39 P seems to be missing a phrase here. Tib. reads, “The *alayavijñāna* does not exercise controlling power over good *dharmas* or *dharmas* unspecified [as good or bad, i.e. neutral *dharmas*],

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

“When the fundamental consciousness is extinguished, then things appear different.⁴⁰ That is to say, the causes of bad [*dharmas*] and defilements in future existences have been extinguished, and because these causes have been extinguished, the suffering of the five ‘rampant *skandhas*’ 五盛陰苦⁴¹ will therefore not arise again in future existences. In this present existence, the bad causes of all defilements are extinguished, and thus the aggregates of the ordinary worldling (凡夫陰, **prthagjanaskandha*)⁴² are extinguished. [The practitioner obtains] controlling power (**vibhūtvā*) [with regard to] the body of this [present existence] 此身自在,⁴³ [it] being therefore

whereas *āśrayaparāvṛtti* does exert controlling power over all good *dharmas* and *dharmas* unspecified,” *kun gzhi rnam par shes pa ni dge ba dang lung du ma bstan pa'i chos rnams la dbang mi byed la/ gnas gyur pa ni dge ba dang lung du ma bstan pa'i chos thams cad la dbang byed pa'o*. XZ agrees.

- 40 阿羅耶識滅時、有異相貌。There is nothing corresponding to this sentence in Tib. or XZ. 相貌 also strikes me as somewhat colloquial. I therefore suspect that this might be a record of an explanatory lecture comment (see n. 98).
- 41 The term *wu shengyin ku* 五盛陰苦 is relatively rare. This is the only attestation of the term in the extant P corpus. The term first ever appears in the North in Narendrayaśas (under the Sui), T397:13.262b25; prior to that is confined to the South.
- 42 The term *fanfuyin* is very rare in the canon (only five instances), and other than here, never occurs in a translation text. Other instances are in Huisi 慧思 (515-577), *Jingying Huiyuan*, and Zhanran. Tib. and XZ parallels (see below n. 47) do not discuss the *skandhas* in this context. However, the *skandhas* are linked to *āśrayaparāvṛtti* (for which P is consistently substituting **amalavijñāna* throughout the present passage) in MSg, which was arguably the most important of all Mahāyāna treatises for P. See RADICH §5.2.10, pp. 1159-1162. It is further notable that in MSg, the *parāvṛtti* (“revolutionary transformation”) of each of the *skandhas* in turn is described as leading to various special kinds of “controlling power” (*vibhūtvā*) proper to the *Buddhas*. Voluntary control over lifespan is not included among these powers, but there may be a connection between P’s incorporation of the *skandhas* here, MSg’s similar connection of *skandhas* to *āśrayaparāvṛtti*, and the fact that P, uniquely among our versions of the text, also talks here about controlling power (*vibhūtvā*) over lifespan (see n. 43 following).
- 43 Ordinarily, *zizai* 自在 would be for Skt. *vibhūtvā*, and I have translated accordingly. The logic, as I understand it, is that one who has attained liberation is understood to have power over his own life and death, especially in the case of the Buddha; see LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, “Notes” (1928-1929), 803, referring to AKBh to VII.34, VP V, 83; AK II.10a and Bh, VP I, 120-121. Further, AKBh 2.10, VP I, 120-124 holds at length that the power of prolonging or abandoning life at will is one of the *ṛddhipāda*; this later became part of the standard (expanded) list of ten “masteryes” (*vaśītatva*) of the *bodhisattva*, EDGERTON s.v. *vaśīta*; DBh, RAHDER 70, *so evaṃ kāyajñānābhīnīrharāprāpto vaśavartī bhavati sarvasatveṣu/ āyurvaśītām ca pratilabhate 'nābhīlāpyanābhīlāpyakālayuhpramāṇādhiṣṭhānataya/* etc.; *Mahāvastu*, “Ten powers are declared by the Buddha . . . to be the attributes of the Bodhisattvas . . . power over his own life, and the power of intelligence . . .” etc., JONES I, 234. We can thus perhaps understand that the passage is claiming that the body becomes “like a magical creation” in the sense that it is en-

MICHAEL RADICH

like a magical creation 如化 (*nirmāṇa*).⁴⁴ This is because [the practitioner] has abandoned all bad karmic consequences, and attained the cause and conditions of the **amalavijñāna*; [he] thereby attains controlling power over the life force (*jīvita*) of the present body, [whereby he] can extinguish the causes and conditions of the life force (*jīvitapratyaya*)⁴⁵ in the body, and can also sever [his] lifespan [so that it is] completely extinguished with no remainder (**nirupadhiśeṣa*). [By this same process,] all sensations (*vedanā*) are rendered pure,⁴⁶ and so forth, as a *sūtra* explains in detail.⁴⁷

tirely under the voluntary power of its possessor. In this connection, it is most likely significant that elsewhere in YBh itself (in the final chapter of BBh), voluntary power over lifespan is connected precisely with *āśrayaṣarāvṛtti*, for which P is here substituting **amalavijñāna*; see SAKUMA (1990) 2, 150-151; WOGIHARA 384; RADICH §5.2.6, pp. 1134-1135.

Parallel texts say nothing about voluntary power over lifespan here. Tib. has only, “The body that is like a magical creation continues to exist,” *sprul ba lta bu'i lus kun tu gnas pa*; and XZ similarly has “Although the body remains, it is like a magical creation” 其身雖住猶如變化. This would seem to be an interpretation of the passage closer to the notion of “Nirvāṇa with remainder” (*sōpadhiśeṣanirvaṇadhātu*) than P’s. It is thus remotely possible that P’s text is intended to convey a similar meaning, in which case we could also read *zizai*, unusually, as meaning something like “the body [of the present existence] continues to exist under its own [momentum]”.

44 In giving *nirmāṇa* I follow SAKUMA (1990) 2, 160.

45 Cf. the reference to *jīvitapratyaya* that appears immediately preceding this locus in XZ and Tib. parallels: 命緣, *srog gi rkyen*.

46 Note that this concern with sensation (*vedanā*) is a component of YBh’s doctrine of *āśrayaṣarāvṛtti* in portions of the text outside JDZL. For example, the text proposes that the “basis” that undergoes revolutionary transformation is to be identified with the six (internal) sense-bases (*ṣaḍāyatana*); see such passages as T1579:30.839a25-b04, SAKUMA (1990) 2, 206-208; SCHMITHAUSEN (1969), 43-53, 42, 43 = T1579:30.747c17-21; these passages analysed in RADICH §5.2.5, pp. 1130-1134. The problem here seems to be that sensation is ordinarily defiled, and yet it seems clear that *arhats* and Buddhas continue to function in the ordinary phenomenal world after their liberation: in what sense, then, can we say that they are liberated, when they continue to have (usually defiled) experience?

47 This entire paragraph departs in many details, but not in its gist, from parallels. Tib: “The characteristic of the abandonment (*brahāṇalakṣaṇa*) of the fundamental consciousness is this: immediately after (*samanantaram*) this abandonment, [there occurs a further] abandonment of the twofold clinging (*dvividhōpadana*), and [only] the body, which is like a magical creation (*nirmāṇōpamasya kayasya*), continues to exist. Because the causes that bring about the regeneration (*punarbhava*) of defilements in future existences have been abandoned, attachments that [might] bring about regeneration [of existence itself] are [also] discarded; and because all causes of defilements in the present existence have [also] been abandoned, all ‘badness’ (*dauṣṭhulya*) of [= related to] defilements in the present existence is also abandoned; and only the conditions of the life force (*jīvita*) itself persist, free of connection with all ‘badness’. Be-

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

“Thus, we should know that it is (1) by means of thorough comprehension and analysis; (2) by means of the cultivation of wholesome thoughts; and (3) by means of the realisation of the *amalavijñāna⁴⁸ that the fundamental consciousness and defilements together are extinguished.”⁴⁹

We may summarise the doctrine of *amalavijñāna in this rich passage as follows.

cause [these conditions still] exist, [the person] continues to experience sensation (*vedanā*) up to the limits of his body and lifespan (*kayaparyanta*, *jīvitaparyanta*). This is why it is says in words such as these in the *sūtras*, ‘These various [ongoing] sensations in this existence are only experienced for so long as [this existence lasts],’ and so forth;” *kun gzhi rnam par shes pa de'i spangs pa'i mtshan nyid ni de spangs ma thag tu len pa rnam pa gnyis spong ba dang/ sprul ba lta bu'i lus kun tu gnas pa ste/ phyi ma la sdug bsngal yang 'byung bar byed pa'i rgyu spangs pa'i phyir/ phyi ma la yang 'byung bar byed pa'i len pa song ba dang/ tshe 'di la kun nas nyon mongs pa'i rgyu thams cad spangs pa'i phyir/ tshe 'di kun nas nyon mongs pa'i gnas ngan len thams cad spong ba dang/ gnas ngan len thams cad dang bral shing srog gi rkyen du gyur pa tsam kun tu gnas so// de yod na lus kyi mtha' pa dang/ srog gi mtha' pa'i tshor ba myong bar byed de/ de'i phyir mdo sde las kyang 'di na de'i tshor ba thams cad de tsam gyis na yongs su gtugs par 'gyur ro shes rgya cher ji skad du gsungs pa lta bu'o// XZ agrees almost perfectly.*

It looks as though two new factors have been introduced in P: (1) P has introduced the old doctrine of voluntary control over lifespan for the liberated person in the present existence (cf. n. 43); (2) P is paraphrasing the ideas of the paragraph, rather than translating closely; in this process, as we have seen (see e.g. n. 42, 43, 46), part of his concern may be to fill in his audience on doctrines (especially those pertaining to *āsrayaṣāparavṛtti*) which he knew to be contained elsewhere in YBh, but to which they had no access.

⁴⁸ This sentence is a summary of a large section of the preceding exposition. The first two categories hark back to parts of the text we have not examined. Relevant for us is the fact that “the realisation of the *amalavijñāna” is the category under which the text summarises the entire section quoted.

⁴⁹ 「一切行種煩惱攝」者、聚在阿羅耶識中。得真如境智、增上行故、修習行故、斷阿羅耶識、即轉凡夫性捨凡夫法、阿羅耶識滅。此識滅故、一切煩惱滅、阿羅耶識對治故、證阿摩羅識。阿羅耶識是無常、是有漏法；阿摩羅識是常、是無漏法。得真如境道故、證阿摩羅識。阿羅耶識為龜惡苦果之所追逐；阿摩羅識無有一切龜惡苦果。阿羅耶識而是一切煩惱根本、不為聖道而作根本；阿摩羅識亦復不為煩惱根本、但為聖道得道得作根本。阿摩羅識作聖道依因、不作生因。阿羅耶識於善無記不得自在。阿羅耶識滅時、有異相貌、謂來世煩惱不善因滅。以因滅故、則於來世五盛陰苦不復得生、現在世中一切煩惱惡因滅故。則凡夫陰滅、此身自在、即便如化、捨離一切龜惡果報、得阿摩羅識之因緣故。此身壽命便得自在、壽命因緣能滅於身、亦能斷命盡滅無餘。一切諸受皆得清淨、乃至如經廣說。一切煩惱相故、入通達分故、修善思惟故、證阿摩羅識。故知阿羅耶識與煩惱俱滅，T1584:30.1020b08-28. For Tib. and XZ parallels, as quoted or referred to in fns immediately above, see D zhi 8a2-8b4, T1579:30.581c08-24. See also HAKAMAYA 40-42, 65-67; SAKUMA (1990) 2, 155-161; part of the passage is also translated in GIMELLO 326.

**Amalavijñāna* is realised when *alayavijñāna* is abandoned through the operation of its counteragents. The process whereby these counteragents operate is equivalent to intensive and repeated cultivation on the part of the wisdom that takes Thusness (*tathatā*) as its objective support (*ālambana*); it is also spoken of as the attainment of the path that takes Thusness as its objective support. The abandonment and extinction of the *alayavijñāna* amounts to a radical transformation in the being of the practitioner, which is identified as “revolutionary transformation [of the basis]” (*[āśraya-] parāvṛtti*).⁵⁰ The resultant state, in which **amalavijñāna* is realised, is diametrically opposed to the state of the ordinary worldling: it is free of defilements; it is also free of all the qualities (*dharmāḥ*), the *skandhas*, and the very nature (*xing* 性) of the worldling (*prthagjana*). In this state, all causes of future suffering have been brought to an end. By contrast to the ordinary states of consciousness grounded in *alayavijñāna*, this state is permanent; free of “outflows” (*anāsrava*); free of karmic conditioning (*saṃskāras*); free of “badness” (*dauṣṭhulya*); acts as a basis for the noble path; and exerts control over good and neutral *dharmas*.⁵¹ The state brought about by the realisation of **amalavijñāna* is also characterised by power of control over the body and over lifespan.

Comparison with the parallels in Chinese and Tibetan allow us to add, more certainly than on the basis of Paramārtha’s text alone, that **amalavijñāna* is clearly a functional equivalent of *āśrayaparāvṛtti*.⁵² This is confirmed by the fact that even in Paramārtha’s text, which does not specifically mention *āśrayaparāvṛtti*, **amalavijñāna* is characterised as “free from ‘badness’ (*dauṣṭhulya*)” — an old characterisation of *āśrayaparāvṛtti* itself.⁵³ It is also confirmed by the fact that quasi-commentarial paraphrases in Paramārtha’s text highlight other ideas known to be connected to *āśrayaparāvṛtti* doctrine in Yogācāra lore, despite the fact that parallel texts do not mention those ideas — the transformed relationship to the *skandhas*,⁵⁴ power over the body

50 However, in P, this *parāvṛtti* is not explicitly identified as of the *āśraya*.

51 Assuming the phrase that seems to be missing from P as noted above, n. 39; this contrast is arguably implied, in any case, by what does remain in P’s text.

52 Parallel texts have *āśrayaparāvṛtti* where P has **amalavijñāna* throughout. It is clear, even from this first passage, that P’s “translation” practice was different from that of the Tib. translators and XZ, and included unmarked periphrastic glosses. This feature of P’s method has already been very effectively described by FUNAYAMA (2005), 97-122. The substitution of **amalavijñāna* for *āśrayaparāvṛtti* could be read as part of this practice.

53 See n. 35.

54 See n. 42.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

and lifespan,⁵⁵ and the transformation of sensation (*vedanā*).⁵⁶

2.2.2 JDZL <2>

JDZL next mentions **amalavijñāna* at the end of a discussion about the different kinds of seeds (*bīja*) possessed by three different classes of persons — those still in bondage (*bandhana*), those on the path but requiring further training (*śaikṣa*), and those beyond further training (*aśaikṣa*).⁵⁷ The end of this discussion notes that it has been based upon the fundamental consciousness that is “not established” (*rnam par ma gzhaḡ pa*, **avyavasthita*). The text then considers the alternative perspective, in which seeds are considered on the basis of the “established” (*vyavasthita*)⁵⁸ fundamental consciousness. The discussion in this latter connection is very brief, but Paramārtha differs significantly from parallel texts. Tib. and XZ merely say:

“On the basis of the ‘established’ fundamental consciousness, in brief, it should be known that the seeds of all *dharmas* exist (*yod*) in/upon the basis of that [fundamental consciousness⁵⁹], and they are to be known respectively as either seeds that have not yet been abandoned and seeds that ought not be abandoned [at all].⁶⁰”

Thus, the discussion here is only phrased in terms of distinguishing between bad seeds and good seeds. One set needs to be abandoned but has not been yet, whereas the other set must be retained in order to attain to the liberated state.

Paramārtha puts the same point this way:

⁵⁵ See n. 43.

⁵⁶ See n. 46.

⁵⁷ T1584:30.1022a08-17, corresponding to D 15a1-15b1, T1579:30.584a15-b02.

⁵⁸ It is not entirely clear to me exactly what distinction the text is positing between these two modes of considering the *alayavijñāna*. One possibility is that it is thinking of a difference between the *alayavijñāna* as it should be considered for most provisional purposes of discussion, and a truly definitive view. Another possibility, especially given the way P interprets, is that the pertinent difference is between the *alayavijñāna* as it is “given” in the pre-liberation state, and *alayavijñāna* when it is considered in a “distinctive” perspective that contrasts it with the state succeeding upon revolutionary transformation.

⁵⁹ Tib. has only *de la*, “in that”, but XZ spells it out, saying rather that the seeds of all *dharmas* are based upon or grounded in *alayavijñāna*: 諸法種子一切皆依阿賴耶識.

⁶⁰ *rnam par gzhaḡ pa la ni mdor bsdu na de la chos thams cad kyi sa bon yod par rig par bya ste/ sa bon de dag ni ma spangs pa dang/ spang bar bya ba ma yin pa'i chos de dag dang ci rigs su ldan par rig par bya'o//* XZ differs in no significant respect.

“[In the perspective of] the established exposition [of the fundamental consciousness, we would rather say]: All worldly *dharmas* take the fundamental consciousness as their basis, whereas all transcendent *dharmas* (一切諸法出世間者, **sarvadharmāḥ lokōttarāḥ*) and *dharmas of the path not to be abandoned* (? 無斷道法 **aprahāṇīyamārgadharmāḥ*?) have **amalavijñāna* as their basis.”⁶¹

In other words, Tib. and XZ’s YBh merely distinguish between different types of seeds, and specifically locate them in one and the same *ālayavijñāna*. Paramārtha, by contrast, speaks rather of two different types of *vijñāna*, one the basis for worldly and defiled *dharmas*, and the other the basis of transcendent (*lokōttara*) *dharmas*. Paramārtha substitutes this point for the original text’s assertion that it is important to distinguish between the two types of seeds; and he inserts this distinction in a place that seems to be speaking of *ālayavijñāna* from a kind of “ultimate” or “definitive” (*vyavasthāna*) perspective.

This passage thus adds to our picture of **amalavijñāna* the detail that **amalavijñāna* is the separate basis for transcendent *dharmas* (*lokōttaradharmāḥ*), whereas worldly *dharmas* (*laukikadharmāḥ*) are based on *ālayavijñāna*. Further, it is perhaps implied that **amalavijñāna* so defined is consciousness as it appears in the perspective of definitive truth.

2.2.3 JDZL <3>

JDZL next mentions **amalavijñāna* in another discussion of “seeds” (*bīja*).⁶² The basic question at issue is a possible contradiction between the claim that all seeds are universally pervaded by “badness” (*dauṣṭhulya*), and the claim that there is a class of “transcendent” qualities (*lokōttaradharmas*) which lead to liberation. What seeds give rise to these *lokōttaradharmas*?⁶³ The basic answer is that *lokōttaradharmas* are produced from a different class of seeds, which are based upon (*ālambana*) Thusness itself as their necessary condition, and thus circumvent entirely the order of “impregnated” (*vāsanā*) seeds and their attendant “badness”. The text then explains the difference be-

61 有處說者、諸世俗法、阿羅耶識悉為根本。一切諸法出世間者、無斷道法阿摩羅識以為種本，T1584:30.1022a15-17.

62 The passage as a whole runs T1584:30.1025c12-26, corresponding to XZ T1579:30.589a13-b02, D28b3-29a3. Cf. SAKUMA (1990) 2, 161-165, particularly the passage SAKUMA numbers “(4)”. For some reason that is unclear to me, SAKUMA here omits the JDZL parallel.

63 P: 諸出世法、何者為本而得生耶? ; Tib. . . . *de ltar na 'jig rten las 'das pa'i chos rnams skye ba'i sa bon gang yin/ de dag skye ba'i sa bon gyi dngos po . . .*

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

tween four classes of beings (those who have not attained *nirvāṇa*, Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas and Buddhas/Tathāgatas) on the basis of the relationship in each between these seeds of *lokōttaradharmas* based upon Thusness and the two “obstructions” (*āvaraṇa*). The text summarises the difference between the two orders of seeds thus (Tib. and XZ):

“It should be understood that the continuance (*rjes su 'jug pa*, **anuvṛtti*) of *lokōttaradharmas* [once they have] arisen is due to the increased strength of the revolutionary transformation of the basis (*gnas gyur pa'i stobs bskyed pa las*, **āśrayaparāvṛttibalādhanā*⁶⁴). This [fundamental transformation of the basis] is the counteragent (*gnyen po*, *pratipakṣa*, ‘antidote’) to the fundamental consciousness (*alayavijñāna*), is [itself] without fundament (*kun gzhi ma yin pa*, **anālaya*), is a realm/element without ‘outflows’ (*zag pa med pa'i dbyings*, *anāśravadhātu*), and is free of conceptual elaboration (*spros pa med pa*, **niḥprapañca*).”⁶⁵

By comparison, Paramārtha reads:

“The continuum (相續, **saṃtāna*) produced by the *lokōttaradharmas* can only be established 住 on the basis of the **amalavijñāna*, since 以 this continuum acts as the counteragent to the fundamental consciousness (*alayavijñāna*); [this continuum is otherwise] itself⁶⁶ without fundament (無住處, more literally ‘without a place wherein it is established’), a realm/element without ‘outflows’ (*anāśravadhātu*), with no deleterious function 無惡作務, and free of all defilements (煩惱, *kleśas*).”⁶⁷

Once more, the contrast between *alayavijñāna* and *āśrayaparāvṛtti* is at stake, and

64 See SAKUMA (1990) 2, 165 and n. 872. I am grateful to ŌTAKE Susumu for help with this term.

65 *'jig rten las 'das pa'i chos skyes pa rnams kyi rjes su 'jug pa ni gnas gyur pa'i stobs bskyed pa las rig par bya ste/ de yang kun gzhi nam par shes pa'i gnyen por gyur pa dang/ kun gzhi ma yin pa dang/ zag pa med pa'i dbyings dang/ spros pa med pa zhes bya'o// XZ agrees.*

66 There is an obvious difficulty in P's text here. The parallel texts clearly make *āśrayaparāvṛtti* the subject of the following string of predicates. In P, however, it is difficult to construe the equivalent **amalavijñāna* as the subject. It is most rather most natural to interpret these predicates as modifying “continuum” (*xiangxu*); but the resulting sense is puzzling, most particularly because the text thus says that the continuum has “no fundament” 無住處, where it has just said that it is “founded” 住 on **amalavijñāna*. The suspicion that the text is here meant to say, with XZ and Tib, that **amalavijñāna* itself has no basis, etc., is strengthened by the fact that it *does* assert that **amalavijñāna* is without basis below; see n. 96.

67 出世法所生相續、依阿摩羅識而能得住、以此相續與阿羅耶識而為對治。自無住處、是無漏界、無惡作務、離諸煩惱, T1584:30.1025c23-26.

as in JDZL<1> above, **amalavijñāna* is substituted for *āsrayaaparāvṛtti*. New is the idea that the counteragent of *alayavijñāna* is a continuum produced by transcendent *dharmas* (*lokottaradharmāḥ*), and that this continuum is based upon **amalavijñāna*.

2.2.4 JDZL <4>

Finally, JDZL mentions **amalavijñāna* once more within the context of another discussion of the groundless counteragent to the *alayavijñāna*.⁶⁸ Significantly, it is clear from all three versions that the original text is indeed discussing a category of pure consciousness.⁶⁹ Although the term **amalavijñāna* only occurs once, it is necessary to take into account the fairly long passage that comprises the context in which the term is used to fully appreciate what is at stake.

The passage first asks how “the wise” (*mkhas pa*, **pandita*) [i.e. the Buddhas] can free themselves not only from the immediate passions of attachment and aversion, but even from the underlying latent bondage to the basic conditions of existence, which gives rise to *karma* and therefore to future existences.⁷⁰ In answer, the text explains how

⁶⁸ The passage in full runs from T1584:30.1030c21-1031a15, corresponding to XZ T1579:30.595b06-c06, D 43a6-44a4. See also on this passage U1 6, 785; and HAKAMAYA 10-17.

⁶⁹ For this reason, U1 thought that this passage provided us with evidence that the term **amalavijñāna* was originally found in Skt. YBh, and had been replaced by *āsrayaaparāvṛtti* in the lineage that led to XZ’s translations. HAKAMAYA discusses and refutes this interpretation. Against it, he reasonably proposes, on the basis of XZ and Tib, that the original text most likely had *āsrayaaparāvṛtti*; HAKAMAYA 10-12.

⁷⁰ So we can understand the general thrust, at least, of a question which poses difficulties in all the versions available to us. P: 智人從一切色、乃至行陰、愛等諸結暫伏故、無能生業結。有智慧故、根本永盡。何以知之？；XZ: 若聰慧者於諸色愛、乃至行愛所攝貪纏、能永斷離。於煩惱分所攝發業四身繫纏、亦能永斷。所以者何？；Tib: *gang gi phyir mkhas pa ni gzugs rnam pa thams cad nas 'du byed kyi bar la sred pas bsdus pa'i 'dod chags kyi kun nas dkris pa spong ba las bral bar 'gyur gyi bag la nyal las ni ma yin no// de'i mdud pa nyon mongs pa'i char gtogs pa las kun nas slong bar byed pa dag kyang kun nas dkris pa kho na las spong bar 'gyur ro//* Even the usually consonant XZ and Tib versions seem to part company here — a sign, perhaps, that the original text may itself have posed difficulties to its translators. The first four aggregates (*skandhas*) are here conceived of as the basic conditions of future re-existence; these four, as a group, are taken as the “basis” for a worldly and defiled consciousness, presumably understood as the fifth aggregate (*vijñāna*); and the bondage of this defiled *vijñāna* to the fourfold condition of future re-existence comprised by the other *skandhas* is understood in terms of the technical Abhidharmic category of “latent tendency” (*anusaya*). My interpretation is based upon the following observations about the question itself and subsequent discussion in the passage as a whole. (1) All three versions agree that it is the first four *skandhas* at issue (P: 色乃至行陰; XZ: 色乃至行; Tib: *gzugs rnam pa thams cad nas 'du byed kyi bar*). These four

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

full liberation of the wise differs from the state of the householder (*grhin*) or the monastic (*pravrajita*) who is not liberated. Householders are bound to future re-existences by the twofold fetter of desire and aversion (malice, ill-will), in addition to acts by which they harm sentient beings.⁷¹ Unliberated monastics are bound to future re-existence by excessive attachment to precepts and rules, which they mistake for the truth.⁷²

These two conditions comprise the foil against which the attainment of full liberation by “the wise” is explained. This is where **amalavijñāna* comes into play. XZ and Tib. explain as follows:

“By means of plentiful cultivation of the [‘supreme’ XZ only] counteragent, these twofold desirous latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) are abandoned, and because of this abandonment, one is freed from taking the four *skandhas* [such as] objective form, sensation etc. as the objective support (*alambana*) because of defilement; the continuum is thereby eternally (*gtan du*, **nityam*) severed. The cessation of consciousness attended by latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) [brought about] by this severing of the continuum is not grounded (based, *gnas*, **āśritya*) upon the bases of consciousnesses associated with form, sensation etc., because of the completely purified conscious-

skandhas are presumably the same set referred to later in the passage as “material form, sensation etc.” (P: 色等; XZ: 色受等; Tib. *gzugs dang tshor ba la sogs pa*). (2) Tib. speaks clearly throughout of bondage to these *skandhas* in terms of *anuśaya* (*bag la nyal*); XZ agrees in places (二種隨眠, 595b15; 有隨眠識, 595b17). (3) It is clear later in the passage that these four *skandhas*, as a set, are understood as a “basis” (P: [四]住處; XZ: 住, 安住; Tib. *gnas pa* = **āśraya*, **sthāna* etc.). (XZ also speaks unusually of the fourfold set as a fourfold *embodiment* 四身, 595b07, b13; for *skandhas* as “bodies” in earlier Chinese tradition, see RADICH n. 1617, and more generally §4.3.6 and p. 556 ff.)

⁷¹ *di ltar khyim pa'i phyogs la brten pa dag ni brnab sems dang/ gnod sems kyi mdud pa dag gis yul la rjes su 'dzin pa'i rgyu las byung ba dang/ sems can la gnod pa byed pa'i rgyu las byung ba'i las kun nas slong bar byed do//*

⁷² *rab tu byung ba'i phyogs la brten pa dag ni tshul khrims dang/ brtul zhugs mchog tu 'dzin pa dang/ 'di bden no snyam du mngon par zhen pa mchog tu 'dzin pa'i mdud pa dag gis las kun nas slong bar byed do//* The text goes on to specify the ways that such attachment to rules and precepts functions as an analogy to the cruder twofold defilements of the householder, inasmuch as excessive valuation of the rules is functionally analogous to desire, and the corresponding disregard (*āpavāda*, “degradation, deprecation”) of *nirvāna* is functionally analogous to aversion. Both of these errors are said (in Tib.) to be mere mental constructs (*gid kyiis rnam par rtogs pa*) and therefore to function, as their householder analogues do, to bring about further karmically conditioned existence. (XZ here says somewhat cryptically that only the attachment to the fourfold “embodiment” comprising the first four *skandhas* remains, because it is a product of imaginative construction belonging to the *manobhūmi* 當知四身繫唯在意地分別所生.)

ness (*rnam par shes pa rnam par dag pa*) that comprises the counteragent (*pratīpakṣa*) of that [basis]. Thus, this [transformation] is known as ‘the complete pacification (*upāsanti*) of the cause of the basis’. Because of the cessation of the cause, there will in future never occur any [initial] apprehension or ‘[coming to] fulfilment’ (*yongs su rdzogs pa*, **paripūrṇa*) of a body, nor any activation (*jug pa*, **vr̥tti*) of a continuum; thus is it called ‘the complete pacification of the basis’.

“That purified consciousness (*rnam par shes pa rnam par dag pa*) which is attained as ‘the counteragent of that [basis]’ is [itself] said not to be a basis (*gnas pa ma yin pa*, **anāśraya?*).⁷³ From it as cause, therefore, it is not possible [for further re-existence] to develop (*mngon par rgyas pa*).⁷⁴ Because of the intensive cultivation (*bhāvanā*) of the ‘Liberation Gate (*vimokṣamukha*)’⁷⁵ of Emptiness (*śūnyata*), [this state] is deemed to be ‘unconditioned’ (**asaṃskāra*, **anabhisamkāra*).⁷⁶ Because of the intensive cultivation of the ‘Liberation Gate of No Desire (*smon pa med pa*, **apraṇihita*)’, it is deemed to be ‘completely satisfied’ (*samtuṣṭa*). Because of the intensive cultivation of the ‘Liberation Gate of No Marks (*mtshan ma med pa*, **animitta*)’, it is a ‘basis’ (*gnas pa*).⁷⁷ Thus, for the reasons given, from ‘there being no further development [of future re-existence]’ to ‘its being a basis’, it is liberation (*rnam par grol ba*, *vimokṣa*).”⁷⁸

73 HAKAMAYA has suggested the following Skt. reconstruction of this sentence, on the basis primarily of XZ and Tib: **tat-pratīpakṣāptam yad viśuddham vijñānam tad apratiṣṭhitam ity ucyate*, HAKAMAYA 12. The reconstruction *apratīṣṭhitam* seems to me to be closest to XZ’s 無所住, but Tib, which I am trying to follow first in my translation here, seems rather to say “is not a basis” (*gnas pa ma yin pa*) rather than “does not have a basis” (**gnas pa med pa*).

74 *de yang rgyu las mngon par rgyas par mi ’gyur ba yin no*// This sentence on its own strikes me as somewhat cryptic, and I am interpreting partly on the basis of parallels (XZ: 不生長, P: 不能生業) and partly on the basis of the overall sense of the passage.

75 The three “liberation gates” (*tr̥ṇi vimokṣamukhāni*) named here are common, and also known under the name of the “three absorptions” (*samādhitraya* etc.), i.e. *śūnyatāsamādhi*, *apraṇihitāḥ samādhiḥ*, *animittāḥ samādhiḥ*. They appear elsewhere in YBh under this title, for which see YOKOYAMA s.v. the name of each respectively.

76 Parallels here lead me to take Tib. *’dus ma* as **anabhisamkāra*, more usually *mngon par ’du byed pa med pa*.

77 Note that this is of course in direct contradiction to the statement with which the paragraph begins. The purified consciousness *qua* counteragent of the ordinary defiled basis, it seems, is a kind of paradoxical “basis that is not a basis”, or a “groundless ground”.

78 *de’i ’og tu gnyen po shas cher bsten pas ’dod chags dang mdud pa de gnyis kyi bag la nyal spong bar ’gyur te/ de spangs pa’i phyir nyon mongs pa gang gis gzugs dang tshor ba la sogs pa la dmigs par byed pa’i dmigs pa de gtan du bral bas rgyun ’chad par ’gyur ro// de rgyun chad pas bag la nyal dang bcas pa’i rnam par shes pa ’gags pa de gzugs dang tshor ba la sogs pa rnam par shes pa gnas pa de dag la mi gnas te/ de’i gnyen po’i rnam par shes pa rnam par dag pa’i phyir ro// de*

“The Doctrine of *Amalaviñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Paramārtha reads (in a somewhat more abbreviated presentation):

“Due to the cessation that comprises the counteragent to these defilements, the desire to take material form etc. [i.e. the first four *skandhas*] as an objective support (境, *ālambana*) ceases; and due to this cessation, the defiled consciousnesses that take the [first] four [*skandhas*] as a basis no longer [find] a basis (諸識有惑於四住處則不復住). Because these consciousnesses that comprise the counteragents [plural in original, 諸對治識] are truly purified, we know that the basis is pacified (**upāsanta*); [and] because the cause (緣, **rgyu*) ceases, there will in future never be any re-arising of apprehension or bringing to completion (具足 *paripūrṇa*) of a continuum. Thus is it called the ‘pacification (*upāsanti*) of the basis and reason for [re-]existence’ 有緣住靜.

“The **amalaviñāna*, which is the counteragent (*pratipakṣa*) of temporal consciousness 世識,⁷⁹

ltar na de ni gnas pa'i rgyu nye bar zhi ba yin par rig par bya'o// rgyu 'gags pa'i phyir phyi ma la lus yongs su 'dzin pa dang/ yongs su rdzogs par byed pa dang/ rgyun 'jug pa rnams 'byung bar mi 'gyur te/ de ltar na de ni gnas pa nye bar zhi ba yin no// de'i gnyen por gtogs pa rnam par shes pa rnam par dag pa gang yin pa de ni gnas pa ma yin pa zhes bya'o// de yang rgyu las mngon par rgyas par mi 'gyur ba yin no// rnam par thar pa'i sgo stong pa nyid yongs su bsgoms pa'i phyir mngon par 'dus ma byas pa yin no// rnam par thar pa'i sgo smon pa med pa yongs su bsgoms pa'i phyir chog shes pa yin no// rnam par thar pa'i sgo mtshan ma med pa yongs su bsgoms pa'i phyir gnas pa yin no// de ltar mngon par rgyas pa med pa nas gnas pa'i bar gyi phyir shin tu rnam par grol ba yin no// 從此以後、由多修習勝對治故、復能永斷貪愛身繫二種隨眠。由此斷故、煩惱所緣色受等境亦不相續、以究竟離繫故、由此所緣不相續故。有隨眠識究竟寂滅、於色受等諸識住中不復安住、由對治識永清淨故。是名「識住因緣寂止」。又由當來、因緣滅故、於內身分不取不滿、決定無有流轉相續。是名「識住寂止」。又復對治所攝淨識名「無所住」。由彼因緣故、名「不生長」。由善修習空解脫門故、名「無所為」。由善修習無願解脫門故、名「為知足」。由善修習無相解脫門故、名「為安住」。如是不生長故、乃至安住故、名「極解脫」。

⁷⁹ *Shishi* 世識 as it is used here is a very unusual term. Excluding false analogies (e.g. across punctuation marks, across line breaks in verse, as part of longer compounds in other senses, etc. — including the only other instance within JDZL itself, where it is part of the term *weilai-shi-shi* 未來世識), the term does not to my knowledge occur before P.

The same term is very rare even in P's other works. In P's MSg and Bh the same compound occurs, but in the apparently somewhat different sense of one of the eleven *viñaptis*. These are analogous to the Kantian “categories”, as basic ideas or constructs that enter into consciousness of the world: (1) body/self 身, (2) the embodied subject (**dehin*), (3) sense [organ], (4) sense-datum, (5) consciousness of present sensation [pertaining to each of the senses respectively], (6) time 世, (7) number, (8) place, (9) language, (10) difference between self and other, and (11) *samsāra* comprising good and bad rebirth destinies 身識、身者識、受者識、應受識、正受識世識、數識、處識、言說識、自他差別識、善惡兩道生死識,

is utterly pure, and is said not to be a basis (不住, *anāśraya*), and thus this consciousness cannot

T1593:31.118a24-27. In this context, *shishi* refers to the necessary condition of the unbroken continuity of the “continuum” *saṃtāna/saṃtati* of the sentient being through all its lifetimes or incarnations; 世識謂生死相續不斷識, T1595:31.181c12; 為明眾生果報無始以來三世生死相續不斷故、須立世識, T1595:31.184a17-19.

Similarly, the term occurs in this sense in the *Xianshi lun* (顯識論, **Khyativijñāna-śāstra*, XSL). XSL is a puzzling text for various reasons, but seems to expound a category of consciousness (“manifesting consciousness”, *khyativijñāna* = 顯識) otherwise primarily known from LAS. Here, the term also appears as part of the same list of *vijñapti*. Here, however, we have the added twist that nine *vijñapti* are identified as types of **khyativijñānani*, as in the text’s title (nos. 1 and 4-11). Against this, the remaining two types of *vijñapti* are identified as two kinds of *vastupratikalpavijñāna* (“consciousness imagining differentiation between phenomenal things” = 分別識, a category also deriving from the same LAS contexts), i.e. (2) the embodied subject; and (3) sense [organ]; 「顯識」者有九種：一身識、二塵識、三用識、四世識、五器識、六數識、七四種言說識、八自他異識、九善惡生死識。其次「分別識」有二種：一有身者識、二受者識, T1618:31.878c27-879a02. In other words, it seems that for XSL, **khyativijñāna* are the categories (識, *vijñapti*) in which consciousness 識 manifests itself (顯, */khyā*) as apparent *objects* of experience, whereas *vastupratikalpavijñāna* are the categories in which consciousness appears as a pseudo-*subject*, which therefore is conceived of as the agent of false imagining (*parikalpa*, */kalp*, cf. *vastupratikalpa*) of phenomena as existent “things” (*vastu*).

Finally, the term also appears in P’s translation of *Ratnāvalī* 1.97: “Such temporal [Tib. *’gro < loka*, thus **laukikadharmāḥ?*] *dharmas*/ Are the fuel for the burning of consciousness/ With its due portion of the light of discrimination/ This fuel of temporal consciousness blazes, and then fades away;” 如是等世法 / 是然識火薪 / 由實量火光 / 世識薪燒盡, T1656:32.495b21-22, corresponding to Tib, *rnam shes me yi bud shing ni/ ’gro chos ’di kun yin par ’dod/ de dag ji bzhin rab ’byed pa’i/ ’od dang ldan pas bsregs nas zhi*, HAHN 39. This is the only other instance in which the word is used in anything like the sense here in JDZL, i.e. as referring simply to consciousness rather than *vijñapti*.

Returning to JDZL, *shishi* seems is intended here to convey two implications about the ordinary defiled consciousness to which **amalavijñāna* is the counteragent: (1) it points to consciousness as it is related to the continuum (*rgyun*, **saṃtāna*, **saṃtati*: see also the immediate sequence of the present JDZL locus) of existence bound to the ordinary “world” *samsāra*; (2) it connects to *shishi* in the *vijñapti* list, where *shi* refers specifically to time (the “three times” 三世 of past, present and future), indicating that there is not only something “worldly” about this consciousness, but that its worldliness is intimately related to the very stuff of time. My translation as “temporal consciousness” (more literally “world consciousness”) is intended to convey some of this ambiguity: “worldly” and “bound to time”. (There may even be an implication that the “counteragent”, i.e. **amalavijñāna* or the “purified consciousness” is atemporal in the sense that it is *timeless*, i.e. eternal.) This concept of “temporal consciousness” may be an echo of the old notion that consciousness is the origin (*samudaya*) of the suffering world (*loka*) (see below n. 175), connected to the Yogācāra idea of the *bhājanaloka* 器世 (“container world”) etc.

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

function as the cause of further existence. Because of the thorough cultivation of the ‘Liberation Gate (*vimokṣasamukha*) of Emptiness’, it cannot give rise to *karma* 不能生業. Because of the thorough cultivation of the ‘Liberation Gate of No Desire’, it ‘knows contentment’. Because of the thorough cultivation of the ‘Liberation Gate of No Marks’, it is based in the immovable 住於不動. For these foregoing four reasons, [it is equivalent to] the attainment of full liberation.”⁸⁰

“[A consciousness that is pure in this manner, even when it] sees the metamorphoses in phenomenal things 觀行於塵, does not have any attachments to [notions of] ‘I’ and ‘mine’ (*aham iti*, *mamēti*, *ātmātmya*, etc.), and thus, even when visible form (*rūpa*), etc. [i.e. phenomenal *dharma*s] are destroyed and pass out of existence 滅壞, the mind does not [feel] any hunger 渴愛 [for them; for more of the same]. In these respects 此諸相, the mind is utterly pure 心極清淨. Because consciousness is pure 識清淨, [it] does not pass out of existence of its own accord 不自滅壞, nor is it destroyed by other conditions [external to it] 亦復不為他緣所滅.⁸¹ Because there is [thus] no [longer any] continuum (相續, *santāna*), it is not reborn again into the places of the ten directions, and it does not hanker after life and death; thus it is called ‘desireless’ (P. *nicchata*, “without cravings”).⁸² [If] we liken the mind to a tree, and sensation (受,

⁸⁰ 此諸煩惱對治滅故、欲取色等以為境者即得永滅。以此滅故、諸識有惑於四住處則不復住。諸對治識實清淨故、如是得知、住處寂靜。以緣滅故、於未來世當生具足應得相續、不復更生。是名「有緣住靜」。阿摩羅識對治世識甚深清淨、說名「不住」。復次此識不為緣生。空解脫門善修習故、不能生業。無願解脫門善修習故、則能知足。無相解脫門善修習故、住於不動。如前四義、得正解脫, T1584:30.1030c27-1031a07.

⁸¹ This sentence says the polar opposite of XZ and Tib: 又由彼識永清淨故、不待餘因、任運自然入於寂滅、此識相續究竟斷故; *rnam par shes pa de ni rnam par dag pa nyid kyi phyir bdag nyid rgyu gzhan la mi ltos par rang gi ngang kho nas 'gag par 'gyur ro// rnam par shes pa de'i rgyun rgyun chad pa'i phyir . . .* (For translation, see n. 92).

⁸² For *nicchata*, the PTS *Pali-English Dictionary* gives Skt. **niḥṣata* < *nis+chāta*; cf. also, in connection with the notion of “cooling”, *niṣparidaha*, s.v. EDGERTON, citing *Samādhirāja sūtra*, *śtāto niṣparidahaḥ*. Here and in the sequence, the passage harks back to an old formula describing the state of a liberated being: “dwells in this life without craving, released, cool, enjoying bliss, become as Brahmā”, *diṭṭhe va dhamenicchato nibbuto sṭi-bhuto sukhaṇṇisaṃvedī brahma-bhūtena attana viharati*; *Dīghanikāya* 33 *Saṅgīti-sutta*, D (CARPENTER, PTS) 3, 233.1-2, WALSHE 494. (The two Chinese translations of the *Saṅgīti sūtra* in the *Dirghāgama* [T1, T12] seem not to contain any equivalent to this formula. The long *Saṅgītiparyāya* passage corresponding to the fourfold rubric expounded where D33 features this formula, i.e. four kinds of individual who torment themselves, others etc., also does not seem to contain any equivalent; T1536:26.406a07-407b17; STACHE-ROSEN 1, 122-125.) The present passage is partly structured around the relation of the state of pure consciousness to the epithets “without craving, released, cool, become as Brahmā” (as WALSHE translates them) respectively; note also the use of “in the here-and-now” (*diṭṭheva dhamma* = *dr̥ṣṭe dharme*).

vedanā)⁸³ to its shadow (*chāyā*),⁸⁴ then at this time, neither exists [any longer]; [for] where the tree no longer exists, so, too, its shadow no longer exists 是故無樹是故無影。⁸⁵ Because the temporal mind (世心, **laukikacitta*)⁸⁶ has been extinguished 滅, [this state] is called ‘complete cessation’ 盡滅⁸⁷ in the here and now [現; *dr̥ṣṭe dharme/ihaiva*]. With reference to 故 the gradual (次第, *kramena*) liberation of undefiled mind (mind ‘without outflows’, 無漏心, *anasravacitta*) in which residual practice is necessary (學... 解脫, **saikṣavinirmukti*), [this state] is said to have been ‘made peaceful’ (得寂靜, **sānta*).⁸⁸ With reference to liberation in which no further practice is necessary (無學解脫, **asaikṣavinirmukti*)⁸⁹ it is said to have been ‘purified’ 得清淨。⁹⁰

- 83 The mention of the cessation of *vedanā* in close proximity to talk of liberation “in the here-and-now”, “becoming cool”, etc., also recalls to mind the classic formula “all that is sensed right here, being not rejoiced in, will become cold”, *idheva . . . sabbavedayitāni anabhinanditāni sītibhavissanti*, as e.g. at *Itivuttaka* 44, WINDISCH 38; MASEFIELD 35. Thus, we see, running in order through the passage: “does not rejoice in” (Tib. only, *mngon par dga’ ba med pa*, cf. P. *anabhinanditāni*) [life and death]; “in the here and now” (cf. P. *idheva*); the cessation of the sensations (*vedanā*, cf. P. *sabbavedayitāni*); and the notion of coolness (*śīta* etc., cf. P. *sītibhavissanti*). In its *locus classicus* in It 44, this formula is associated with the distinction between *nirupadhiṣeṣanirvāṇadhātu* and *sōpadhiṣeṣanirvāṇadhātu*, “Nirvāṇa with/without a remainder of attachment”, and it likely that this distinction is in the back of the YBh author’s (“Asanga’s”) mind here, too, given that (1) the text lays out a graduated schema of several types of liberation; and (2) it is discussing liberation as a process whereby consciousness frees itself from grasping at (other) *skandhas*, where *nir/sa-upadhi* was often interpreted precise as having/not having (a remnant of) grasping at *skandhas* = *upadanaskandha*.
- 84 I suspect here a *nirukti* (etymological gloss) in the original text, playing on the homophony between *chāyā* “shadow” and *chanda* “desire” (or some cognate thereof).
- 85 Obviously, strictly speaking, 是故無樹是故無影 means “therefore there is no tree; therefore there is no shadow.” However, to say that the tree and shadow no longer exist because both [tree and shadow] no longer exist is tautological nonsense, and I suspect a better interpretation of this phrase is to see in it a clumsy “translationese” equivalent of a Sanskrit *yavad . . . tavad* construction, or something analogous.
- 86 Cf. “temporal consciousness” 世識 in the preceding paragraph of this same passage, JDZL<4>, and n. 79 above. Comparison with XZ and Tib. strongly suggests that the Skt. had here *sāsravacitta/sāsravavijñāna*, “consciousness/mind with outflows”.
- 87 This epithet should correspond to P. *nibbuta*, Skt. *nirvr̥ta/nirvr̥ta*, in the underlying DN 33 formula (see n. 82).
- 88 This epithet has no equivalent in the DN 33 formula (see n. 82).
- 89 The strange word order 是無漏心學解脫故前次第說得寂靜 would literally lead to a translation like “with reference to the liberation of the mind without outflows, in which no further practice is necessary, it is gradually said to be . . .” This makes little sense to me, and I suspect we are looking at an artefact of awkward and somewhat literal translation. I have therefore in part following the lead of the parallels in translating here. I do not know what to make of 前.
- 90 Note that Tib. and XZ here both have “cooled”, “coolness”, i.e. **śīti*, **śīta*; this would make

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Because the four remaining [*skandhas*] have been extinguished, [it is a state that has] attained the power of Brahman (得梵自在, for **brahmabhūta*?⁹¹”⁹²

better sense in light of the allusion to the *Sangti sutta* running through the passage (see n. 82). It is difficult, then, to see what might have led P to translate “purified” here, since it dampens the resonance of the allusions the passage is based upon. See discussion below.

91 For *brahmabhūta* here, see parallels, and the Nikāya/Āgama passage cited n. 82.

92 觀行於塵、於我我所無所取著、是故、色等諸塵滅壞、心無渴愛。如此諸相、心極清淨。識清淨故、不自滅壞、亦復不為他緣所滅。無相續故、於十方處不更入生、於命於死無貪欲。故說「無求欲」。心譬如樹、受喻如影、於時二無、是故無樹、是故無影。世心滅故、說「現盡滅」。是無漏心學解脫故前次第、說「得寂靜」。無學解脫故、得清淨。四餘滅故、得梵自在, T1584:30.1031a07-15. Comparison shows that the P translation is slightly scrambled and terse (whether this is because he was working from a different version of the text, or due to the translation process), especially towards its end; without the parallels, it would not be entirely possible to determine accurately the intent of some wording. XZ and Tib. here differ from one another in minor details, but the gist of both is the same. The following is a translation of XZ, noting key differences in Tib: “[Such a consciousness] does not grasp at ‘I’ and ‘mine’ (*aham iti, mamēti; ātmātmīya*, etc.) with regard to any [of the things subject to] metamorphosis (行, *rgyu bar gyur pa*); thus, it does not feel fear (恐怖, Tib. ‘distress’, *yi chad pa*), even when visible form, etc. [i.e. the *dharmas* of the phenomenal world] undergo destruction (壞, Tib. ‘change, transformation’, *gyur*). In virtue of this feature (相貌, *rtags*), it is manifest that that [consciousness] has been purified in its very essence (自體已得清淨, Tib. ‘is an essence that is pure[-ified]’, *rnam par dag pa’i bdag nyid du snang ngo*). Moreover, because this consciousness has been permanently purified (又由彼識永清淨故, Tib. because of the purity of this consciousness *rnam par shes pa de ni rnam par dag pa nyid kyi phyin*), it enters spontaneously into [the state of] tranquility (任運自然入於寂滅, Tib. ‘into cessation’ *rang gi ngang kho nas ’gag par ’gyur*), without any dependence upon other causes. Because the continuum of consciousness (識相續, *rnam par shes pa de’i rgyun, tasya vijñānasya saṃtānam*) is thus cut off once and for all, it never again will tumble through (流轉, Tib. ‘enter’, ‘fall into’, *’jug pa*) the worlds of the ten directions, and does not hanker after (希求, Tib. ‘finds no delight in’ . . . *la mngon par dga’ ba med pa*) life or death; it is therefore said to have left behind desire. Further, because all sensation (*vedanā*) is like a shadow to the tree of consciousness, and because that [consciousness], from that time on, will never again exist, it is said to have left behind its ‘shadow’. The extinction of defiled consciousnesses (諸無漏識, *zag pa dang bcas pa gang yin pa, yat sāsravaṃ [vijñānam, XZ]*) once and for all in the here and now (於現法中, *tshe ’di la, *dr̥ṣṭe dharme/ihaiva*), it is called ‘cessation’ (寂滅, *mya ngan las ’das pa, nirodha*). The gradual, step-wise (隨其次第, *rim gyis, kramena*) liberation of undefiled consciousnesses (consciousnesses without ‘outflow’, 諸無漏識, *zag pa med pa gang yin pa, yad anāsravaṃ [vijñānam]*) in which residual practice is still necessary (隨其次第有學解脫 **śaikṣavinirmukti*) is called ‘peace’ (寂靜, *zhi ba, śanta*). The liberation in which practice is no longer necessary (**śaikṣavinirmukti*) is called ‘cooled’ (清涼, *bsil ba, śita*); because the basis [for it, viz. consciousness] in the other (餘依) [*skandhas*; Tib. *phung po*] has been permanently extinguished, [this consciousness] is called ‘purified’ (清淨, *tshangs pa gyur pa, brahmabhūta*).” 又於行等都不執著我及我所、由此

This passage is very instructive. Looking just at XZ and Tib, YBh clearly does understand that: (1) ordinary consciousness, when associated with the other *skandhas*, is the base for ordinary defiled existence that is entangled in *samsāra*; (2) the counteragent to this base is a kind of purified consciousness (**viśuddham vijñānam*); (3) the liberation brought about by the operation of this counteragent is indeed a cessation of defiled consciousness; (4) this realisation equals the severing of the continuum (*saṃtāna*); (5) the realisation of this state guarantees that the realised being will never take incarnation, i.e. will never again in future apprehend a body, and thus will not suffer; (6) the purified consciousness is itself not a basis (for future existence in suffering); (7) this purified consciousness is identical with liberation. In these features, the doctrine of YBh echoes the following features of Paramārtha's **amalavijñāna* doctrine: it posits a kind of pure consciousness which comprises the counteragent to a kind of defiled consciousness, which is the basis for ordinary, defiled existence; liberation entails the cessation of the defiled consciousness and the severing of the continuum;⁹³ it involves the cessation of future suffering; and the cessation of future suffering is connected to the complete ending of embodiment.⁹⁴ Paramārtha's translation of this passage seems quite faithful, and adds little except that it names the purified consciousness **amalavijñāna*.

The passage adds the following to our picture of **amalavijñāna*. (1) **Amalavijñāna*

因緣、色等壞時亦不恐怖。由此相貌、顯彼自體已得清淨。又由彼識永清淨故、不待餘因、任運自然入於寂滅。此識相續究竟斷故、於十方界不復流轉。於命及死不希求故、名「永離欲」。又所有受是識樹影、彼於爾時不復有故、名「永離影」。諸有漏識於現法中畢竟滅盡故、名「寂滅」。諸無漏識隨其次第有學解脫、名「為寂靜」。無學解脫、名曰「清涼」。餘依永滅故、說「清淨」T1579:30.595b26-c06; *rgyu bar gyur pa na yang bdag dang bdag gir cung zad kyang mi 'dzin to// des na de gzugs la sogs par gyur kyang yongs su yi chad par yang mi 'gyur ro// rtags des na de rnam par dag pa'i bdag nyid du snang ngo// rnam par shes pa de ni rnam par dag pa nyid kyi phyir bdag nyid rgyu gzhan la mi ltos par rang gi ngang kho nas 'gag par 'gyur ro// rnam par shes pa de'i rgyun rgyun chad pa'i phyir phyogs bcur 'jug pa yang med do// 'tsho ba dang 'chi ba la mngon par dga' ba med pa ni grib ma med pa zhes bya'o// yang na tshor ba rnams ni rnam par shes pa shing ljon pa lta bu de'i grib ma lta bu yin te/ de dag de'i tshe na mi 'byung bas/ de'i phyir yang de ni grib ma med pa zhes bya'o// zag pa dang bcas pa gang yin pa de ni tshe 'di la mya ngan las 'das pa yin no// zag pa med pa gang yin pa de ni rim gyis slob pa'i rnam par grol bas zhi ba yin no// mi slob pa'i rnam par grol bas ni bsil bar gyur pa yin no// phung po 'gag pa'i phyir tshangs par gyur pa zhes bya'o. In Tib, the presentation of the conceit: "consciousness = 'tree', sensation = 'shadow'," and the following epithets of the liberated state differ, but not in any way that affects the gist for our purposes here. I am grateful to ŌTAKE Susumu for saving me from some errors in the attempted reconstruction of Skt. equivalents here.*

⁹³ Cf. JDZL<3> above.

⁹⁴ Cf. JDZL<1>, p. 55 above.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

is explicitly said to *be* the counteragent of defiled consciousness.⁹⁵ (2) **Amalavijñāna* *qua* the counteragent is overtly said itself not to have (or be) a basis.⁹⁶ (3) The passage makes explicit an association between the “consciousness” in question and the *vijñānaskandha*, and thus seems to clarify somewhat the connections between **amalavijñāna* and the cessation of the *skandhas* already touched on in earlier passages.

The final paragraph is especially important, even though it does not overtly mention **amalavijñāna*.

Most strikingly, Paramārtha says the polar opposite to parallel texts.⁹⁷ In XZ and Tib, the pure consciousness does not have to depend upon any other causes *in order to cease*, but rather *enters into cessation* of its own accord. At the moment of liberation, consciousness ceases to “exist”, and liberation consists in this cessation. In Paramārtha, pure consciousness “*does not* pass out of existence of its own accord, *nor* is it destroyed by other conditions [external to it].” In other words, the liberated, purified consciousness — **amalavijñāna* — is *permanent*, as we already saw at JDZL<1>. However, it is difficult to be sure what to make of this reversal in meaning. Given the sometimes slightly garbled state of the remainder of the text, which apparently betrays problems in translation, the reversal may result from simple error. This impression might be reinforced by the fact that even Paramārtha goes on immediately to say, “... there is no longer any continuum (*saṃtāna/saṃtati*).” (At least so long as “continuum” refers to consciousness, this would appear to be in direct contradiction to the assertion that purified consciousness “does not pass out of existence”.) However, Paramārtha’s text nowhere else really departs from the gist of the original as seen through parallel texts. Why, then, only at such a crucial juncture? This divergence from the underlying text thus may be deliberate, and for this reason, a significant component of Paramārtha’s

⁹⁵ I.e. rather than (as at JDZL<1>) that which is realised through the operation of the counteragent(s), or (as at JDZL<3>) the basis for a counteragent otherwise identified (e.g. as a continuum produced by the *lokōttaradharmas*).

⁹⁶ Recall that in JDZL<3> above, the text was unclear, but seemed to say that the continuum based upon **amalavijñāna*, rather than **amalavijñāna* itself, was without a basis — in direct contradiction both of its own statement that the continuum *does* have a basis, and also of parallel versions of the text. These textual problems might have led us to expect that JDZL is there, too, like XZ and Tib, meant to say that **amalavijñāna* is without a basis, but the present passage is thus the first place where JDZL has unambiguously made that statement.

⁹⁷ See n. 81.

doctrine of **amalavijñāna* — one that sounds rather close to “eternalism” (*śāsvatadr̥ṣṭi*, *nityadr̥ṣṭi*).

In this final paragraph (in parallels as well as Paramārtha), the passage also explicitly connects the liberating realisation of pure consciousness to *anāsravavijñāna/anāsravacitta*, which was a dominant theme in the AKBh *amalavijñāna* passage. This may show that there is indeed a conceptual link between the AKBh passage and Paramārtha’s use of **amalavijñāna*.

Finally, this last paragraph reinforces the idea that the purified consciousness is the *vijñānaskandha*. Liberation is the process whereby that consciousness is freed from attachment to the other four *skandhas* (aggregates). Here we hear echoes of a very old model, in which consciousness is the apparent subject of both transmigration and liberation. I take this model to be extremely pertinent to the doctrine of **amalavijñāna*. We will return to this point below.

2.3 *Shiba kong lun*

The *Shiba kong lun* 十八空論 (T1616, hereafter SKBL), or “Treatise on Eighteen [Modes of] Emptiness”, is a text of a type that has been referred to as a “lecture text”.⁹⁸ SBKL is clearly based upon two sections of the *Madhyāntavibhāga* (MAV), from Chapters 1 and 3 respectively. It intersperses apparent citations from or paraphrases of that text with comment and expansion.⁹⁹ Beyond its discussion of **amalavijñāna*, the text is of great interest because it makes use of a number of apparently Chinese categories.¹⁰⁰ Since Paramārtha separately translated the “root text”, MAV (中邊分別論, T1599), for at least one of the instances of **amalavijñāna*, we are in the unusual position of being able to see how Paramārtha himself alternately interpreted the passage into which he inserts

⁹⁸ Following FUNAYAMA (2002). This denomination identifies texts that are thought to result from P’s explanations to his team of Chinese collaborators about the texts he translated, given as they translated; there are reasons to think that some of these expositions were written down, and have come down to us among the P corpus.

⁹⁹ For details, see U1 6, 131-204 (“*Jūhachi kū ron no kenkyū* 十八空論の研究”), esp. 175-204. U1 argues persuasively that the current text is a fragmentary remnant of some longer original, and that the title, which is clearly based upon the first portion only (corresponding to MAV Ch. 1) was also applied to the text later.

¹⁰⁰ See, for instance, such categories as *li* and *shi* 理事, T1616:31.863b05; or the use of the term *ziran* 自然 in the discussion of the ninth mode of emptiness (emptiness of “[salvation] unto the final limit” (畢竟空, *atyanta-sānyata*), T1616:31.861c12-17; etc. I have in preparation a full annotated translation and study of SBKL, in which I intend to explore these dynamics in detail.

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

the term. We are also fortunate to have a sub-commentary (*ṭkā*) on Vasubandhu’s MAV *Bhāṣya* by Paramārtha’s close contemporary Sthiramati.¹⁰¹ The term **amalavijñāna* appears twice in SBKL.

2.3.1 SBKL <1>

**Amalavijñāna* first appears in SBKL corresponding to comment upon MAV 1.21-22. The text is discussing the category of *prabheda-sūnyatā*, “emptiness differentiated” [i.e. into different aspects or characteristics], before moving on to *piṇḍārtha-sūnyatā*, “emptiness in general”, i.e. a general summation of things that can be said of all the modes of emptiness collectively. In MAV, this corresponds to a section in which emptiness is “proven” as a doctrinal tenet.¹⁰² SBKL reads:

“Here begins part four,¹⁰³ proofs (道理, **sādhana*?) that emptiness is differentiated. There are three.

“(1) [The proof that emptiness can be differentiated according to its] purity and impurity. (i) If we were to say that emptiness (*sūnyatā*) were absolutely 定 impure, then it would be impossible for all sentient beings to attain liberation, because, [emptiness] being absolutely impure, it could not be made pure. (ii) [On the other hand,] if we were to say that [emptiness] is absolutely pure, then there would be no point in cultivating the path (**mārgabhavana*),¹⁰⁴ because even before one had attained liberation at [the stage of] the path without taints, emptiness would already be aboriginally 本 and innately 自然 pure of its very substance 體.¹⁰⁵ There would therefore be no

¹⁰¹ Obviously, Sthiramati (Sth) never went to China, and so there can be no question of any Chinese influence on his thought. The detailed comparison of P’s and Sth’s ideas, from the point of view of the implications for supposed sinification in P, is an important avenue for future research.

¹⁰² Corresponding to MAV and Bh 1.21, NAGAO 26, P T1599:31.463a21 ff.

¹⁰³ The fact that the text here announces a “part four” is one of the grounds upon which U₁ argues that our present text is incomplete.

¹⁰⁴ At roughly this same juncture, Sth, too, speaks of “meditative development of the path” (*mārgabhavana*); YAMAGUCHI 1, 59, STANLEY 77.

¹⁰⁵ P’s exposition only loosely follows his MAV model. He reverses the order of the two propositions comprising the proof (numbered i and ii respectively above and in the following, in order to facilitate comparison): “(ii) If it [emptiness] were not defiled, then all embodied beings would be liberated [already]/ (i) If it were not pure, then effort [towards salvation] would be fruitless;” *saṃkliṣṭa ced bhaven nāsau [,] muktāḥ syuḥ sarva-dehinaḥ/ viśuddha ced bhaven nāsau [,] vyayamo niṣphalo bhavet*. He also paraphrases the basic idea of these two propositions quite loosely and expansively, especially (ii).

MICHAEL RADICH

defilements to obstruct wisdom, nor anything that could extirpate [them], and all sentient beings would automatically attain liberation without relying on effort;¹⁰⁶ [however,] it is evident that sentient beings do not [in fact] attain liberation without effort, and thus, emptiness is not absolutely pure. On the other hand, it is also the case that liberation is [in fact] attained by dint of effort, and thus we know that emptiness is not absolutely impure.¹⁰⁷ This is the proof of purity-cum-impurity and impurity-cum-purity 淨不淨不淨淨.¹⁰⁸

“Additional comment: If we say that the principle (*li* 理) of emptiness is absolutely impure, then all efforts would be inefficacious 無果報, because the essential nature (自性, **svabhāva*) of the element of emptiness (空界, **sūnyatadhātu*) itself would be impure; and therefore, even when the path had arisen 生道, one would remain incorrigibly worldly/profane 俗不可除, so that the path would be useless. Because it is not thus 無此義故, we know that emptiness is not impure by nature.

“Question: If this is the case, then given that there is no impurity by essential nature 自性不淨, there should also be no purity by essential nature 自性淨. How can it be ascertained 分判 that the *dharma*-realm (法界, **dharmadhātu*) is neither pure nor impure?

“Answer: **Amalavijñāna* is the aboriginally pure [Skt. ‘luminous’] mind (自性清淨心, *praktipra-*

¹⁰⁶ According to the sequence of the text, this should correspond to MAV: “If *dharmas* were not defiled by adventitious defilements when the counteragent [of defilement] had not yet arisen, then because there was no defilement, all sentient beings would be liberated even without effort;” *yadi dharmmāṇaṃ śanyatā agantukair upakleśair anuṭpanne ’pi pratīpakṣe na saṃkliṣṭa bhavet [,] saṃkleśābhāvad ayatnata eva muktaḥ sarva-satvā bhavyuḥ*. P would correspond quite closely to this if it read 若無煩惱為能障智慧 . . . 則不依功力一切眾生自得解脫. As the text stands, however, it seems that the logical relation among the various clauses is quite different to Skt.

¹⁰⁷ MAV here reads: “On the other hand, if [emptiness] were not pure even when the counteragent *had* arisen, then efforts for the purpose of liberation would be fruitless;” *athōṭpanne ’pi pratīpakṣe na viśuddha bhavet mokṣārtham arambho niṣphalo bhavet*.

¹⁰⁸ It seems that this sentence corresponds to MAV 1.22ab, “It [*viz.* emptiness] is neither defiled nor undefiled, neither pure nor impure;” *na kliṣṭa nāpi vākliṣṭa suddhā ’suddhā na cāive sa*. 淨不淨不淨淨 could be read as a (somewhat muddy) attempt to convey the idea of being “neither defiled nor undefiled, neither pure nor impure”.

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

bhāsvāracitta).¹⁰⁹ It is only because it is tainted 汚 by adventitious dirt 客塵¹¹⁰ that we speak of it as ‘impure’; because of adventitious dirt, [that is,] we establish that it is [also] impure.”¹¹¹

This passage adds to our growing picture of **amalavijñāna* as follows. **Amalavijñāna* is now identified with *prakṛtiprabhāsvāracitta*, i.e. the aboriginal “innate purity of mind”. It accounts for the pure aspect of emptiness, whereas the impure aspect is accounted for by adventitious defilements. Moreover, both the association with *prakṛtiprabhāsvāracitta*, and the association between **amalavijñāna* and the dichotomy of intrinsic purity and innate defilements, link **amalavijñāna* to the pure Thusness of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (RGV), and via RGV to *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine (and its Chinese offshoot, the doctrine of “Buddha Nature”, *foxing* 佛性). Further, the pure aspect of emptiness with which **amalavijñāna* is identified here is also identified in turn with the *dharmadhātu*;¹¹² this is the beginning of a process that links **amalavijñāna* into a chain of identifications for (aspects of) the Mahāyāna “absolute”.¹¹³

109 IWATA (1972[a]) claims that *prabhāsvāra . . . cittasya*, i.e. something like *prakṛtiprabhāsvāracitta*, is the Skt. “original” for **amalavijñāna* here, but it is clear from the fact that SBKL also gives a term clearly corresponding to *prabhāsvāracitta* that **amalavijñāna* does not translate that term, but that rather, a *correspondence* is being explicitly asserted between the two terms. Further evidence that P does know the difference is that in the corresponding locus in his translation of MAV itself, he simply gives 心本自性清淨故 for this line (*prabhāsvāratvac cittasya*), T1599:31.453b01.

110 This line, following on from the correspondence to MAV 1.22ab above, seems to correspond roughly to MAV 1.22cd, “. . . because of the luminosity of mind, and because of the adventitiousness of defilement;” *prabhāsvāratvac cittasya kleśasyāgantukatvatah*. However, it can be seen that P has done very much with the bare bones provided by the MAV verse here, making it into the occasion of a whole dialogue of objection and rebuttal.

111 此下第四、分別空道理。有三：一、淨不淨。若言空定是不淨、則一切眾生不得解脫。何以故？以定不淨、不可令淨故也。若言定是淨、則修道無用。何以故？未得解脫無漏道時、空體本已自然清淨故、則無煩惱為能障智慧、又能除、則不依功力、一切眾生自得解脫。現見離功力眾生不得解脫、知此空非是定淨。復由功用而得解脫、故知此空非定不淨。是名「淨不淨、不淨淨」道理也。又釋：若言空理定是不淨、一切功力則無果報。何以故？以空界自性是不淨、雖復生道、俗不可除、道則無用。無此義故、故知此空非性不淨。問：若爾、既無自性不淨、亦應無有自性淨。云何分判法界非淨非不淨？答：阿摩羅識是自性清淨心、但為客塵所污、故名「不淨」、為客塵盡、故立為淨, T1616:31.863b06-21. For MAV, see NAGAO 26-27; ANACKER 221. For MAVT (including a translation of MAV), see YAMAGUCHI 1, 59-61, STANLEY 76-78; also FRIEDMANN 81-82, STCHERBATSKY 99-102.

112 Note that the association between **amalavijñāna*’s alter ego, *āśrayaparavṛtti*, and the *dharmadhātu* is already by this point old, for example in the “Nirvāna Chapter” of YBh. See RADICH §5.2.8, 1138-1152, esp. 1139; and ns. 2558, 2560.

113 Similarly, the passage also speaks of *li* 理, which was eventually to become so important in

The passage translated here comprises only part of a longer section. In the sequence, it becomes clear from the wording of the argument that, as above, emptiness is being identified with the *dharmadhātu* (cf. the unusual use of **sūnyatādhatu* above, probably as a kind of intermediate term to this identification),¹¹⁴ and with Thusness.¹¹⁵ All three are therefore implicitly also identified with **amalavijñāna qua* the “innate purity/luminosity of mind” (*praktiprabhāsvaracitta*). The identification of more than one of these terms as the topic or locus of absolute purity thus implies an identification of the truest pure substance of mind with the truest substance of all things.

2.3.2 SBKL <2>

Strictly speaking, the second passage in SBKL may not in fact mention **amalavijñāna*, but rather a “pure/luminous consciousness” (清淨心, *prabhāsvaracitta*), which is then *qualified* as **amala*. The passage in question corresponds to MAV 3.14 and Bh. MAV Ch. 3 treats various kinds of reality (*tattva*, also “truth”, “real” etc.). The ninth category under which it does so is *prabheda-tattva*, or “reality as it is differentiated”.¹¹⁶ This category in turn is divided into seven different aspects under which reality may be known, approached or apprehended.¹¹⁷ The third of these aspects is “the reality of representation only” (*vijñaptitattva*),¹¹⁸ which refers to the fact that in reality, all *dhar-*

China, especially in Huayan contexts.

¹¹⁴ 863b24, b27 etc.

¹¹⁵ These sections are not matched by anything in MAV. As it has for emptiness, the text expounds purity and impurity for the *dharmadhātu*, 863b22-c05; and Thusness (*tathatā*), 863c05-c24 (note in this connection that Sth also brings in Thusness in his exposition of the passage in MAVT: *tathatayam agantukair malaiḥ samkliṣṭatabhyuḥpagantavyeti* etc., YAMAGUCHI 1, 59.22-60.1). In each case, the basic proposition that the topic is “pure-impure” is expounded in different ways: in the case of the *dharmadhātu*, that it is “pure in some respects, and pure in others” 或淨或不淨; in the case of Thusness, that it is “both pure and impure” 淨不淨. The implicit identification effected by this argument between emptiness, the *dharmadhātu*, and Thusness is important; that **amalavijñāna* is also identified with the pure substance or essence of emptiness implies a further identification between **amalavijñāna* and all three of these instances. The use of 自性淨 to describe the *dharmadhātu*, e.g. 863b28-29, echoes the predication of 自性清淨 of mind/**amalavijñāna*.

¹¹⁶ Note the parallel with the treatment of “emptiness differentiated” in SBKL<1> above.

¹¹⁷ These seven types of *tattva* are also found in other early Yogācāra texts in addition to MAV, including SdhN, as Sth’s MAVT notes; see SdhN 8.20.2, LAMOTTE (1935) 99, 219; and MSA 19.44 and Bh, LÉVI (1907, 1911) 1, 167-168; 2, 275; JAMPSAL et al., 304.

¹¹⁸ I here provide the equivalent found in MAV (where the orthography is in fact –*tatva*), which is certainly the more relevant here, in that MAV is the text upon which SBKL is based. Note, however, that in other sources (see n. 117), the category may also be called *vijñaptitathatā* (as

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

mas are merely representations (*vijñaptimatra*). We will see below that Paramārtha also connected **amalavijñāna* to this category of the third *tattva* in SWXL<1>. ¹¹⁹

“Third, we explain the reality of representation only 唯識真實 (**vijñapti[-mātra]-tattva*). [This consists in] discerning that all *dharmas* are only pure consciousness 淨識, such that there is no subject of ignorance, and also no object of ignorance 無有能疑亦無所疑, ¹²⁰ as is explained in detail in the *Treatise on Representation Only* 唯識論. ¹²¹ There are two senses in which it is proposed that there is only representation.

“(i) First, [in the perspective/stage of] practice (*prayoga*, 方便), ¹²² [the doctrine of representa-

the other items in this sevenfold rubric are – *tathatā*); see e.g. LÉVI (1907, 1911) 1, 168; and cf. the term in SWXL, for which see below n. 144. I am grateful to ŌTAKE Susumu for pointing out this variant.

¹¹⁹ Further on P’s interpretation of *vijñapti[-mātra]-tattva*, see SBKL T1616:31.864c29-865a03, and GIMELLO 322.

¹²⁰ The distinction between *nengyi* 能疑 and *suoyi* 所疑 is unique to the present passage and a citation of it in the *Zong jing lu* (which erroneously attributes it to Kumārajīva’s 十二門論), T2016:48.609c03-09. (Chengguan, T1736:36.212b03-05, seemingly uses the two terms in a different sense.)

¹²¹ This should refer to Vasubandhu’s *Vimsatīkā*, which P translated as the 大乘唯識論, T1589.

¹²² The terminological distinction between *fangbian weishi* 方便唯識 and *zhengguan weishi* 正觀唯識 seems to be unique to the present passage in the entire Chinese canon. The general perspective on *vijñaptimātrata* expounded under this head, however, is a feature of P’s writings; see GIMELLO 320-323.

The term *abhisamaya*, “true understanding”, is defined in AKBh to 6.2 as follows: *abhisamaya iti ko ’rthah. abhisambodhah. iṅo bodhanārthatvāt. kasmād anāsrava eva na śasravaḥ. sa hi nirvanābhīmukhaḥ samyak bodhaḥ. samyag iti tattvena*; PRADHAN 328.11, VP 4, 122; 「對正觀」者、此句何義？趣向正覺為義。云何此唯無流、非有流？由此趣向於涅槃、緣真實境起、故名「正」。P then adds a comment that is not paralleled in Skt: “It is called *bodhi* (awakening) because [one] comes to know what was not known before, and because one penetrates to the purified object in accordance with reality” 未曾知知、故名「覺」、如實能通清淨境故, 266b22-25. (*Abhisamaya* is also discussed at AK 6.27a and Bh, PRADHAN 351.7 ff., VP 6, 185 ff., where P however translates simply 觀, T1559:29.273c11 ff.) In this AKBh definition, P translates *abhisamaya* as *duizhengguan* 對正觀, but in the immediate context also as 觀 alone, T1559:29.266b21; at T1559:219.284c15-16, he also translates *zhengguan*, for *ataś catvāry api satyāny abhisamayato dharmavetyaprasadalabhah* VP 4, 292, PRADHAN 387.3 It is thus clear that the translation is (as is typical of P) adaptable to circumstance, and also that *zhengguan* does correspond to *abhisamaya*, and further, in a sense that fits the use of the term here.

In places in AKBh, P translates *prayoga* “practice” as *fangbian*. Once in the same AKBh Ch. 6, *fangbian* is used in translating *prayogamārga*: 方便道, T1559:29.282b23, PRADHAN 379.1-2. (Note,

MICHAEL RADICH

tion only] refers to the perception that there is only *alayavijñāna*, and no other objects beyond it 無餘境界. This results in the realisation of the dual emptiness of object and mind 境智兩空, and the complete extirpation of deluded consciousness. This is what is termed ‘representation only [in the perspective/stage] of practice’.

“(ii) Second, representation only [in the perspective/stage] of perfect insight (正觀, **abhisamaya*).¹²³ [In this perspective,] we dispose of 遣蕩¹²⁴ both the deluded consciousness and mind of *samsara*, and of its object, [such that] both are completely purified, and there is only the taintless (阿摩羅, **amala*) pure/luminous mind (清淨心, **prabhasvaracitta*).”¹²⁵

however, that the translation of *prayoga* and even *prayogamārga* is, once more typically for P, variable even within this chapter; the more regular translation of *prayoga* throughout the chapter is *jiāxíng* 加行.) This may be compared to P’s Bh to MSg 3.3: 一切法、謂有為無為、有流無流、及四界、三乘道果等。如此等法、實唯有識。何以故？一切法以識為相、真如為體故。若方便道、以識為相。若入見道、以真如為體, T1595:31.200a19-22. Here, too, the contrast is between (the path of) practice (方便道, *prayogamārga*) and (the path of) insight (見道, *darsanamārga*); further, (the path of) practice is related to the realisation that the characteristic of all *dharmas* is consciousness/representation (*śī*), while (the path of) insight is related to the realisation that their substance (*tī*) is Thusness. Thus, it is likely that in correlation with *zhengguan* “perfect insight”, “true understanding”, *fangbian* is intended to refer to *prayoga*, “practice”. I am grateful to ŌTAKE Susumu for pointing me to this background.

¹²³ See n. 122.

¹²⁴ This compound is extremely rare. As far as I can ascertain, it never occurs in the Chinese canon before P. It occurs three times in his corpus, in AKBh T1559:29.279c23; here; and in the 四諦論, T1647:32.391a25. The AKBh instance is not indexed by HIRAKAWA, but occurs at Bh to 6.54a, where it corresponds to *vāhana* in PRADHAN’s Skt, which I read in the causative sense given by Monier Williams in the variant orthography *vāhana* “drawing off, carrying off”, PRADHAN 370, MW s.v.; LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1980) reads *bahana* and translates “expulse”, 4, 244, to which he cites a Yaśomitra gloss fn. 3. My translation here remains tentative, due to this relative paucity of information.

¹²⁵ 第三、明唯識真實：辨一切諸法、唯有淨識、無有能疑、亦無所疑。廣釋如唯識論。但唯識義有兩：一者、方便、謂先觀唯有阿梨耶識、無餘境界、現得境智兩空、除妄識已盡、名為「方便唯識」也。二、明正觀唯識、遣蕩生死虛妄識心及以境界、一皆淨盡、唯有阿摩羅清淨心也, T1616:31.864a22-28. For another translation of the last two paragraphs in my English, see GIMELLO 325. I am not as confident as GIMELLO that we can take *amoluo* here as an abbreviated reference to the **amalavijñāna*, but rather think it possible that *amala* is merely being used as a modifier for *qingjingxin*; I have reflected this slight difference in reading in my translation. For MAV, see NAGAO 43, O’BRIEN 236-238, ANACKER 238-239. For MAVT, see YAMAGUCHI 1, 133-135; STANLEY 176-179. Sth, following Vasubandhu’s gloss of the root text to the effect that *vijñaptitattva* (and three other kinds of *tattva*) are to be identified with the “perfected nature” (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*) (3.14, *ekaṃ lakṣaṇa-vijñapti-suddhi-samyakprapannatā*, Bh: *lakṣaṇatattvādīni catvāry ekaṃ mūla-tattvaṃ pariniṣpanna-lakṣaṇam*) further says that this is because it

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

This passage is the first time we have seen **amalavijñāna* associated with the doctrine that there is representation only. In Sanskrit, there is a distinction, however tricky, between “representation(s) (*vijñapti*) and “consciousness” (*vijñāna*). However, in this Chinese there is none — both are *shi* 識. It seems clear that the present passage plays on this polysemy, and is predicated on thinking in Chinese: there is only *shi*, and that is of two kinds, *alayavijñāna* (at the intermediate stage of practice) and **amalavijñāna* (at the stage of insight). This exposition situates **amalavijñāna* in relation to an interpretation of *vijñaptimātra/weishi* typical of the Paramārtha corpus (see e.g. ZSL below), here articulated in terms of the distinction between *fangbian weishi* and *zhengguan weishi*. As opposed to a halfway-house understanding of *vijñaptimātra* that hypostasises *alayavijñāna* and imagines it to be all there is,¹²⁶ **amalavijñāna* is associated with an ultimate understanding in which *alayavijñāna* is gotten rid of altogether (as above, e.g. in JDZL<1> and <3>, where **amalavijñāna* is associated in various ways with its counteragents). This final perspective is also associated with a non-dualism that transcends the subject-object dichotomy (here, of subject and object of ignorance). Finally, it is also worth noting that the overall context of this passage associates **amalavijñāna* with reality or Thusness (*tattva, tathatā*), thus rendering direct a link that was only indirect in SKBL<1> above, where it was made via emptiness as middle term.

2.4 *Zhuanshi lun* (ZSL)

The *Zhuanshi lun* (轉識論, **Pravrttivijñāna śāstra*?¹²⁷ T1587, hereafter ZSL) com-

is “perfected in [the sense of] being free of erroneous inversion” (*aviparyasapariniṣpattyā*); YAMAGUCHI 1 135.9, STANLEY 179.

¹²⁶ An interpretation which incidentally corresponds quite accurately to characterisations of Vijñaptimātra thought as “idealist”, frequently found in the secondary literature; a Vijñaptimātra response to charges of “idealism” might thus be that the term only characterises an imperfect or incomplete Vijñaptimātra.

¹²⁷ The title of this text poses interesting problems. The term *zhuanshi* 轉識 does not actually appear anywhere in ZSL except the title; the *vijñānaparināma* that is the topic of the text is rather called (more logically) *shizhuan* 識轉. Aside from this, *zhuanshi* only appears in two places in P’s extant corpus: once in the possibly problematic *Yijiao jing lun*, T1529:26.285c13-14; and once in a passage in M_SG and B_H, where it is part of a verb-object construction meaning “to transform the aggregate of consciousness”, 轉識陰依故, Tib. *rnam par shes pa’i phung po [gnas su] gyur pa’i phyir* (**vijñānaskandhāśraye parāvrtti[-tvāt]?*); T1593:31.130a22, T1595:31.253b27-28, LAMOTTE (1973) 1, 86.

On the other hand, although it is elsewhere also quite rare, the term *zhuanshi* does appear in the following series of texts. Beginning with Guṇabhadra, all three Ch. versions of LAS use the term for *pravrttivijñāna*, *pravrtti* or *vrtti*, Tib. *’jug pa’i rnam par shes pa* etc. (443 C.E.): in Guṇabhadra, T670:16.483a29-b3, 484a13-14, corresponding respectively to NANJIO 38.13-15,

prises a translation of Vasubandhu's *Trīṃśikā*, with commentary seamlessly interwoven with the root text.¹²⁸ In this sense, ZSL too may answer to the description of "lecture text". As for SBKL, we have the possibility here of some direct comparison with Sthiramati's interpretation, as his commentary on the *Trīṃśikā* is also extant.¹²⁹ Sthiramati also comments in detail upon the verse, sometimes to similar effect,¹³⁰ but

44.8; in Bodhiruci (513 C.E.), in addition to passages corresponding to these Guṇabhadra passages at T671:16.522a16-20 and 523a19-23, also at 515a06-08=NANJIO 2.13, 523.c10-16=NANJIO 47.3-8, 538c02-04=NANJIO 126.18, 540b25-27=NANJIO 136.12, 559c01-04=NANJIO 235.17, 571c12-13=NANJIO 300.11; and in corresponding loci in Śikṣānanda's translation (700-704); see also SUZUKI (2000) 120, 412. A large number of these loci feature the conceit of the arising of the *pravṛttivijñāna* as "waves" upon the "ocean" of the *alayavijñāna*: e.g. *ebhir mahāmate caturbhih kāraṇair oghāntarajalasthanyad alayavijñānat pravṛttivijñānataranga utpadyate*, NANJIO 44.8 etc. The only other place it appears before P is in Bodhiruci's *Dasabhamika sutra śāstra* T1522:26.172b17, where it corresponds to Tib. 'jug pa'i rnam par shes pa (= **pravṛttivijñāna*), ŌTAKE (2005) 2, 488, 489 n. 10. Thereafter, the most important place where the term also appears is AF, where it is clearly derived from LAS in at least some instances (being associated, for instance, with 業識 *karma[-lakṣaṇa-]vijñāna*, 分別事識 *vastupratikalpavijñāna*, 現識 *khyativijñāna* etc.; see T1666:32.577b06-12, HAKEDA ("evolving consciousness") 48; 579b20-23, HAKEDA 69; 581a26-29, HAKEDA 87.

As ŌTAKE Susumu has pointed out (personal communication), in P's own texts, the more usual term for *pravṛttivijñāna* is by contrast *shengqishi* 生起識: see MSg T1593:31.115c17, 116a03, (119c22, not in Tib.), 121b29-c03 = 'jug pa'i rnam par shes pa, LAMOTTE (1973) 1, 12-13, 42; MAVBh to 3.22, T1599:31.457c16-17, = *pravṛttivijñāna*, NAGAO 48. (The term *shengqishi*, further, is not found before P, and only a few times in XZ after him in translation works, and so is a strong marker of his genuine style.)

Thus, while the evidence is only circumstantial, it seems a term derived from LAS, but never certainly found in P's own corpus, has been applied as the title of this P text. The same term is further associated with AF, i.e. the most famous instance of the interpolation of non-P ideas into the P corpus, which is itself associated with LAS-derived ideas. Rather than reading the title in terms of the content of ZSL itself, then, and reconstructing **Vijñānaparīṇāma śāstra*, it seems more consistent with this scenario to read the title in terms of the LAS provenance of the term *zhuanshi*, and to reconstruct **Pravṛttivijñāna śāstra*. This reflects a presumed intent of whoever applied the title to align the text with ideas derived from LAS and possibly AF.

Note, finally, that Daoji, who quotes ZSL by name, must have seen the text in whatever modified form it assumed when this title was applied to it; conversely, we can conclude that the text must have acquired the title at least before his citations (in 633-637); see below p. 131.

¹²⁸ A full translation of ZSL is the centre of the only book-length study of P's works in English, PAUL; see 153-167. For apt criticisms of PAUL's translation, see reviews by DE JONG and COX.

¹²⁹ See LÉVI (1925) and LÉVI (1932), 61-123.

¹³⁰ LÉVI (1925), 36. Sth agrees with P that the first *vijñānam* refers specifically to *alayavijñāna*; and that various particular sense-consciousnesses are produced in the process of *parīṇāma*

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

the two commentaries differ in important respects.¹³¹ There is nothing in Sthiramati that sounds like the **amalavijñāna* passage translated here.¹³²

**Amalavijñāna* occurs twice in one passage, at the end of a long comment on *Triṃśikā* 18.¹³³ That verse proclaims:

“[This] consciousness (i.e. *alayavijñāna*)¹³⁴ is [possessed of/identical to] all seeds; due to the mutual influence [of consciousnesses one upon the other],¹³⁵ [its] phenomenal transformation (*pariṇāma*) goes from one form to another, and thereby each figment of the imagination comes into being [in turn].”¹³⁶

(though P specifies a wider range of evolutes).

¹³¹ In particular, P’s translation and interpretation of *tathā tathā/ yaty anyonyavaśād* is strange and difficult to account for. At this point, P’s text also adds comments on the distinction between subject and object of discrimination, and equivalences between these categories and *parikalpitasvabhāva* and *paratantrasvabhāva*, none of which are matched in Sth’s text. P’s emphasis on the disproof of external objects alone is also not paralleled in Sth.

¹³² That is to say, no caveat that the kind of *vijñaptimātra* here expounded is limited or provisional, no concern with a “pure” aspect of *vijñaptimātra* system or practice, and no mention of any concept that might answer to **amalavijñāna* itself. For a French translation of Sth’s comments here, see LÉVI (1932), 107-108.

¹³³ The passage as a whole runs from T1587:31.62b25-c20. For a translation (not always accurate) see PAUL 159-160.

¹³⁴ The root text has already adverted to this consciousness, i.e. *alayavijñāna*, in the preceding verse. Both P and Sth agree that it is *alayavijñāna* that is meant here. Sth is at pains to point out that it is specified by the epithet *sarvabijam*, which is necessary to distinguish *alayavijñāna* from other kinds of consciousness that are not comprised of seeds (i.e. the “operative” *pravṛtti* sense-consciousnesses etc.), and therefore that no fault accrues to Vasubandhu for omitting the qualifier *ālaya-* in speaking of it here; LÉVI (1925), 36. YUKI has argued that because talk of **amalavijñāna* arises here in the context of a discussion of *alayavijñāna*, it is unlikely that the reference in ZSL to the “Chapter on the Doctrine of ‘Nine Consciousnesses’” is, as it has been taken by the tradition, reference to a freestanding text (like the rumoured *Jiushi zhang*) that expounded **amalavijñāna* as a “ninth consciousness”; see p. 106 below.

¹³⁵ So at least Sth understands this notion of mutual influence: *anyonyavaśād iti/ tathā hi cakṣurādivijñānaṃ svasaktiparipoṣe vartamaṇaṃ śaktiviśiṣṭasyalayavijñānapariṇāmasya nimittaṃ so ’pi alayavijñānapariṇāmaḥ cakṣurādivijñānasya nimittaṃ bhavati/ evam anyonyavaśād yasmād ubhayaṃ pravartate/ tasmād alayavijñānād anyenanadhiṣṭitād anekapṛakaro vikalpaḥ sa sa jāyate*, LÉVI (1925), 36. P’s gloss here is very peculiar and would simply lead us away from the issue at hand; see T1587:31.62c06-10.

¹³⁶ *sarvabijam hi vijñānaṃ pariṇāmas tathā tathā/ yaty anyonyavaśād yena vikalpaḥ sa sa jāyate.*

This verse explains how apparent phenomenal experience originates from the mind as a product of the interactions of karmic forces (seeds, *btja*). The apparent objects of phenomenal experience are mere figments of false imagination (*vikalpa*), and the endlessly transforming stream of such experience is a series of transformations (*pariṇāma*) of consciousness itself.

Paramārtha's ZSL then comments in detail on this verse, foot by foot. These comments basically treat the verse as showing the falsehood, i.e. the non-existence in the ultimate perspective of truth, of external phenomenal objects only. On this reading, the verse disproves the independent status of external things, but not of consciousness itself.¹³⁷ In a move clearly related, in content if not in name, to the doctrine of two perspectives on *viññaptimātra* we saw above in SBKL <2>, the text characterises this aspect of *viññaptimātra* as the “impure aspect” (不淨品) — a clear parallel to “representation only in the perspective of practice” (方便唯識).¹³⁸ This leads the text directly to the notion of **amalaviññāna*. It seems clear (though implicit) that this exposition is intended to present **amalaviññāna* as the “pure aspect” of *viññaptimātra* (both as practice and object of realisation), by contrast to the “impure aspect” just examined:

“Question: If we do away with the phenomenal object, but allow consciousness (*viññāna*) to remain 遣境在識, then we can call this principle ‘consciousness only’ (唯識, *viññaptimātra*, ‘representation only’). But once both object and consciousness have been done away with, what ‘consciousness’ is there to be demonstrated/realised (成, /*siddh*) [in order that we can call the resulting state ‘consciousness only’]?”

“Answer: In establishing ‘consciousness only’, it is in the final analysis only for the purposes of argument (卒終為論)¹³⁹ that one [proposes] merely doing away with the object and retaining the mind. In fact, the true purport [of ‘consciousness only’] is that one does away with the object because one wants to render mind empty (遣境為欲空心), and for this reason, the principle [of ‘consciousness only’] is only truly realised (是其義成) when both object and consciousness dis-

¹³⁷ 離識之外諸事不成... 但遣前境未無識, T1587:31.62b27-28.

¹³⁸ 此即不淨品, T1587:31.62b28; 但唯有識義成。既未明遣識。惑亂未除。故名不淨品也, 62c14-15.

¹³⁹ This phrase, which occurs twice in close succession, is a mysterious *hapax* (apart from its duplication here). Even the phrase 卒終 is only found here and in an isolated instance in Zhiyi (T1718:34.49c25) down to this period. As we shall see immediately below (n. 140), it is also, in its second occurrence, implicated in the textual problem that also besets the second instance of the term **amalaviññāna*. My translation here is therefore tentative.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

appear at once. This simultaneous disappearance of both object and consciousness is precisely the perfected nature (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*); and the perfected nature is precisely the **amalavijñāna*.”¹⁴⁰

As in SKBL<2> above, we here see **amalavijñāna* related to a more perfect aspect or version of *vijñaptimātra/weishi* doctrine. Again, this “higher *weishi*” is superior, and ultimately true, because it not only disposes of external objects, but also of ordinary consciousness. The most significant new aspect of the doctrine here is the identification between the perfected nature (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*) and **amalavijñāna*; once more, this is associated with a non-dualism that obviates the subject-object dichotomy.

2.5 *San wuxing lun*

The *San wuxing lun* (三無性論 T1617, **Niḥsvabhāvatatraya-śāstra*, “Treatise on the Threefold Absence of Essential Nature”, hereafter SWXL) corresponds to the *Cheng wuxing* Chapter (成無性品, “Proof of the Absence[s] of Essential Nature”) of the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* (顯揚聖教論, T1602, hereafter XYSJL).¹⁴¹ The term **amalavijñāna*

¹⁴⁰ 問：遣境在識、乃可稱「唯識」義、既境識俱遣、何識可成？答：立唯識、乃一往遣境留心、卒終為論。遣境為欲空心、是其正意。是故境識俱泯、是其義成。此境識俱泯、即是實性、實性即是阿摩羅識, T1587:31.62c15-20. My translation differs significantly from PAUL’s. The second instance of the term **amalavijñāna* occurs in the phrase immediately following, 亦可卒終為論是摩羅識也. There are reasons to believe there is a textual problem here. (1) **Amalavijñāna* is uniquely here represented by 摩羅識 alone, whereas in all other instances of the term it always has a preceding syllable for Skt. *a-* (阿摩羅識, 庵摩羅識, etc.); note, however, that Song, Yuan, Ming and Palace editions of the canon have *a* here. (2) As we noted in the preceding fn. 139, the odd phrase 卒終為論 is unique, in the entire canon, to the present passage. Its repetition at such close proximity may be a sign of a scribal error. (3) It is very difficult to extract any sense from this sentence. (PAUL’s translation here, “Additionally, we can say in the final analysis that this is Pure Consciousness,” is a guess at best, and does not acknowledge the strangeness of the Chinese syntax.) In support of this conjecture, we might note that the text seems also to be corrupt in other places; at the very beginning of the passage discussed here, for example, we see an apparently meaningless repetition of the phrase 及所餘七識種子 thus: 為諸法種子及所餘七識種子 及所餘七識種子, T1587:31.62b29-c02, where it seems clear the copyist’s eye has been drawn back to the first instance of *zhongzi* and he has redundantly reduplicated its sequence. These possibly corrupt passages are the same in all editions of the text available to me (including the southern Qisha and two derivatives of the Kaibao canon, namely the Koryō and Jin versions). U1 silently corrects the latter passage, U1 6, 416. In any case, whether or not the sentence is indeed corrupt, it is difficult enough to make sense of it that it adds nothing to our analysis of the overall meaning of the term **amalavijñāna*.

¹⁴¹ XZ’s translation of the text. The title of this text is variously reconstructed

appears in two passages in this text.¹⁴²

2.5.1 SWXL <1>

**Amalavijñāna* occurs three times in a passage expounding the third of the seven *tattvas*, i.e. “the reality of representation only” (*vijñaptitattva*, *vijñaptitathatā*). As we saw above, **amalavijñāna* is expounded in the same connection in SBKL <2>.¹⁴³

“(3) The reality (Thusness) of representation only (識如如, **vijñapti* [-*matra*]-*tattva*).¹⁴⁴ By this is meant that all conditioned phenomena (一切諸行, **sarvasamskāra*) are nothing more than representation/consciousness (識, **vijñapti*, **vijñāna*). This ‘consciousness’ is called ‘reality’ (如如, *tattva*) in two senses: (i) it is a comprehension free from error (攝無倒, **aviparyāsamgraha*?¹⁴⁵); (ii) it is immutable (無變異, **avikāra*).¹⁴⁶

“(i) In saying it is ‘a comprehension free from error’, we mean that all *dharmas*, i.e. the twelve sense bases (入, *ayatana*) etc., are nothing more than representation/consciousness, and that beyond [this] deluded consciousness 亂識,¹⁴⁷ there are no other *dharmas*. Thus, all *dharmas* are comprised by consciousness and nothing more.¹⁴⁸ The discernment of this principle is called

**Āryadeśanavikhyāpana*, *Āryaśāsanaprakaraṇa*, *Śāsanōdbhavana* etc. The chapter in question begins at 557b04. Parts of XYSJL and therefore of SWXL also correspond in some measure to portions of YBh, and I will refer to relevant parallels below. On the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*, see SCHMITHAUSEN (1987) 2, 261-262 n. 99.

¹⁴² PAUL incorrectly asserts that it only appears in SWXL <2>; PAUL 142.

¹⁴³ This passage is translated in its entirety in GIMELLO 317-319, and I have benefited greatly from consulting this translation and annotations in the process of making my own. A partial translation is also given in DEMIÉVILLE (1929), 41-42. GIMELLO also comments extensively on this passage, 320 ff.

¹⁴⁴ The reader is referred to comments introducing SBKL<2> above p. 76, for the meaning of this concept and its place within larger rubrics. Note that the translation terminology varies: for 識如如 here SBKL has 唯識真實; see n. 118.

¹⁴⁵ Following GIMELLO’s suggested Skt. and explanation, 318 n. 206.

¹⁴⁶ See GIMELLO 318 n. 207, esp. the illuminating reference to MAV 3.11, NAGAO 41.

¹⁴⁷ P uses 亂識 to translate both *bhrānti* “error, delusion” and *abhūtaparikalpa* “imagination of that which does not really exist” in his MAV. See GIMELLO 318 n. 208. This term is a fingerprint of P’s style; see n. 337.

¹⁴⁸ Note that here, in being associated with *luanshi*, *weishi* 唯識 takes on a stronger sense of “consciousness only” than would be suggested by Skt. *vijñaptimatra* “representation only”. This same dynamic is noticeable at other places in P’s expositions of *weishi* also.

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

‘comprehension free from error’,¹⁴⁹ and it is because it is free from error that it is ‘reality’¹⁵⁰ (如如, ‘Thusness’¹⁵¹). However, this ‘reality free from error’ is not yet the [higher] Thusness free of characteristics (無相如如, **alakṣanatattva*).¹⁵²

“(ii) In saying ‘it is immutable’, we show that this deluded consciousness 亂識 is in fact 即 manifested in consciousness of the pseudo-objects 似塵¹⁵³識¹⁵⁴ proper to the imagined and interdependent [essential natures] (分別依他, **parikalpita[-svabhāva]*, **paratantra[-svabhāva]*).¹⁵⁵ Be-

149 I have differed from GIMELLO (who translates “comprises”, “comprisal” etc.) in translating *saṃgraha* as “comprehension”. I am attempting to convey what I take to be a play on words. On the one hand, *vijñaptimātra* is said to “comprehend” what is free from error in the sense that it *includes* it or *encompasses* it. On the other hand, the discernment with which *vijñaptimātra* is realised is itself a “comprehension” in the sense that it consists in arriving at an *understanding* of or insight into this basic fact of the reality of existence. It is this “comprehension” (understanding), I believe, that is “freed from error” (*aviparyāsa*). At least in Skt., the verbal root / *grah* admits of a similar polysemy to English “comprehend” in this regard, though it is a stretch to naturally interpret Chinese *she* in the cognitive sense.

150 GIMELLO 318 n. 209 refers us to the third of the ten *tattvas* in MAV Ch. 3. This third category is *aviparyasatattva*, “reality free of error”, which is the reality that is discerned when we understand that existence is characterised by impermanence, suffering, absence of self, and impurity. (It may help to recall that *prabhedatattva*, or “reality as it is differentiated”, is the ninth of this tenfold list; and is the master rubric under whose sevenfold head the present *vijñaptitattva* is discussed as the third item).

151 Recall that *vijñaptitathata* is a variant name for this third “reality”; see n. 118.

152 GIMELLO 318 n. 210 refers us to MAV 3.7.

153 The term 似塵 is also a unique hallmark of P’s style, never found in any other translator, and only in native Chinese scholiasts after him, beginning with Huisi, Jizang, Jingying Huiyuan and Tanyan 曇延 (516-588).

154 I take this to mean, in line with standard Yogācāra doctrine, that the apparently dualistic experience of objective phenomena by a perceiving subject is merely a manifestation of the underlying defiled consciousness (*alayavijñāna* = *luanshi*), which is in fact all that there is.

155 It is more accurate, though cumbersome, to translate the names of the three natures as “the essential nature of all things whereby they are figments of the imagination” (*parikalpitasvabhāva*), “the essential nature of all things whereby they are products of mutual interdependence” (*paratantrasvabhāva*), and “the essential nature of all things as they are when brought to perfection” (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*). Note that the identification of this deluded experience with both *parikalpitasvabhāva* and *paratantrasvabhāva* is in line with P’s usual doctrine of the three natures, which holds that *paratantra*, also, is dispensed with, transcended or sublated in the liberated state, and all that remains is *pariniṣpannasvabhāva*. This understanding of the three natures differs from that found in XZ, from the apparent doctrine of MSg (and perhaps therefore the interpretation of this doctrine by Asaṅga), and from many modern characterisations of three natures doctrine in the secondary literature.

MICHAEL RADICH

cause the imagined essential nature never exists, the interdependent essential nature also does not exist; and the inexistence of these two [essential natures] is *amalavijñāna (阿摩羅識).¹⁵⁶ Uniquely, this consciousness alone is ‘immutable’, and for this reason it is [fit to be] called ‘reality’ (‘Thusness’).

“[Now,] the former ‘reality’ [i.e. (i) ‘Thusness/reality free from error’] only dispenses with the twelve sense bases (*āyatana*) [and] all [such] *dharmas* distinguished in the Lesser Vehicle.¹⁵⁷ [This discernment or comprehension] merely frees the [understanding of the] twelve sense bases [etc.] from [predicative?] error¹⁵⁸ 唯十二入非是顛倒。Here, however, the tenets of the Greater Vehicle demolish 破 the twelve sense bases [etc.], such that they are [seen to be] completely non-existent 並皆是無, and only the figments of deluded consciousness 亂識。Thus, [in this perspective,] the twelve sense bases [etc.] themselves *are* in fact errors 則為顛倒, but there is still no [predicative?] error 非顛倒 with regard to the deluded consciousness that is in fact all that exists. Thus it is called ‘reality’ (‘Thusness’).

“However, the substance 體 of this [deluded] consciousness is still mutable 猶變異。Next, [therefore,] in consideration of [its inexistence in terms of] imagined and interdependent natures, we do away with 遣 this consciousness. [In this perspective,] only the *amalavijñāna is free of [the] error [even of positing bare existence *per se*, 唯阿摩羅識是無顛倒],¹⁵⁹ [only

¹⁵⁶ This effectively identifies **amalavijñāna* with *parinīṣpannasvabhāva*.

¹⁵⁷ 但遣十二入小乘所辨一切諸法。My translation here differs from GIMELLO’S.

¹⁵⁸ I have tried to reflect in my translation of this paragraph and the next a distinction that the text may be making between two kinds of negation, and two corresponding kinds of “freedom from error”. *Fei* 非, which in classical Chinese is usually used to negate predication, and *wu* 無, which negates existence, are perhaps deliberately used in a distinct manner throughout. In what the text calls the perspective of the Lesser Vehicle, one refutes or negates (*fei*) certain mistaken understandings of the Abhidharmic reals (*dharmas*) as represented by the synecdoche of the twelve *āyatanas*, but one accepts their fundamental existence. In the perspective of the Greater Vehicle, one comes to the more profound insight that *dharmas* themselves fundamentally do not exist, and therefore negates (*wu*) their very existence itself. The former perspective is a kind of freedom from predicative error 非顛倒, but not from the error of assuming sheer existence 無顛倒。We might alternatively express the two types of error as the error “that [a given] X is Y” and “that *there is* X”. Thus, P immediately trumps the ordinary perspective of the Greater Vehicle with one even more sublime, in which the deluded consciousness is perceived in a manner free not only of predicative error, but also of the error of positing its existence — i.e. the perspective he elsewhere calls “*vijñaptimatra* in the perspective of truth” (SKBL <2>), “the perfected nature” (ZSL) etc.

¹⁵⁹ Reading 無顛倒 in the sense contrasting with “predicative error” 非顛倒 laid out in n. 158 above.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

**amalavijñāna* is immutable, and is therefore the true ‘reality’ (Thusness) 真如如。

“Even in [interpreting] the former theory of consciousness only, we should adopt this interpretation of ‘consciousness’. Thus, we first do away with external objects by means of [the posit that] there is only deluded consciousness; next, through disposing of the deluded consciousness by means of **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識, [we realise that] there is ultimately only pure consciousness 究竟唯一淨識。”¹⁶⁰

As in ZSL above, **amalavijñāna* is here identified with *pariniṣpannasvabhāva* (“perfected nature”). As in both ZSL and SBKL<2>, it is also associated with the superior interpretation of *vijñaptimātra/weishi* doctrine, which does away with ordinary consciousness as well as its objects, and so obviates the subject/object dualism. Once more, **amalavijñāna* is identified with a kind of reality or Thusness (*tattva, tathatā*), as in SBKL above (especially SBKL<2>, where the link was direct). The text adds to our understanding of **amalavijñāna* by further specifying a further sense in which the “reality” with which it is identified is said to be real: it is free from change (*avikāra*; echoing JDZL<1>, “**amalavijñāna* is permanent”). The text also aligns the “lesser” understanding of *vijñaptimātra/weishi* doctrine with “*hīnayāna*”, and asserts that only the superior understanding that perceives **amalavijñāna* is worthy of the name “Mahāyāna”.

2.5.2 SWXL <2>

The last passage in which **amalavijñāna* is mentioned is also found in SWXL. The root text is discussing the relationship between two groups of “characteristics” or

¹⁶⁰ 三、識如如者。謂一切諸行、但唯是識。此識二義故稱如如。一攝無倒、二無變異。「攝無倒」者：謂十二入等一切諸法、但唯是識、離亂識外、無別餘法、故一切諸法、皆為識攝。此義決定故、稱「攝無倒」、「無倒」故如如。無倒如如、未是無相如如也。「無變異」者：明此亂識、即是分別依他似塵識所顯。由分別性永無故、依他性亦不有。此二無所有、即是阿摩羅識。唯有此識、獨無變異、故稱「如如」。前稱如如、但遺十二入、小乘所辨一切諸法、唯十二入非是顛倒。今大乘義、破諸入並皆是無、唯是亂識所作故、十二入則為顛倒、唯一亂識則非顛倒、故稱「如如」。此識體猶變異、次以分別、依他、遣此亂識、唯阿摩羅識是無顛倒、是無變異、是真如如也。前唯識義中、亦應作此識說。先以唯一亂識遣於外境、次阿摩羅識遣於亂識、故究竟唯一淨識也，T1617:31.871c27-872a15. The corresponding passage in XYSJL is extremely brief. It explains that all *dharmas* are, in their true nature, only comprised of consciousness/representation, but then goes on, in an interesting echo of P’s preoccupations here, to say that “sentient beings are defiled because the mind, which is all that exists, is defiled; when the mind that is all that exists is purified, [so] sentient beings [too] become purified.” 三、唯識真如作意、謂如前說、乃至於染淨法所依思惟、諸法唯識之性。既思惟已如實了知、唯心染故眾生染、唯心淨故眾生淨，T1602:31.493b17-20.

“marks” (*lakṣaṇa*):

- (1) one group of five characteristics, namely
 - (i) signifier (名言, **abhilāpa*);
 - (ii) signified (所言, **abhilāpya*);
 - (iii) meaning (義, **artha?*);
 - (iv) attachment/hypostatisation (執著 **abhiniveśa*);
 - (v) non-attachment (非執著, **anabhiniveśa*);¹⁶¹

- (2) “three characteristics” corresponding to the three essential natures of Yogācāra, namely:
 - (i) the characteristic of [all things as] imaginary constructs (*parikalpitalakṣaṇa*);
 - (ii) the characteristic of [all things as products of] mutual interdependence (*paratantralakṣaṇa*);
 - (iii) the characteristic of [all things as they appear when brought to] perfection (*pariniṣpannalakṣaṇa*).

¹⁶¹ These five characteristics are expounded elsewhere in XYSJL, at T1602:31.536c21-537a06, corresponding to YBh T1579:30.751a21-b07. They seem otherwise to be rare. For the five categories concerned, XZ YBh reads as follows: (1) “referents” (所詮, *brjod par bya ba*, **abhilāpya*); (2) “speech” or “language” (能詮, *brjod ba*, **abhilāpa*); (3) “the conjunction of these two [referent and speech]”, i.e. reference (此二相應, **taddvayasamyoga?*); (4) “attachment”, i.e. hypostatisation of the construction of the world according to the categories of language (執著, *mngon par zhen pa*, **abhiniviṣṭa*, **abhiniveśa*); (5) “detachment, non-attachment” (不執著, *mngon par ma zhen pa*, **anabhiniveśa*), i.e. the undoing, deconstruction or transcendence of hypostatisation. This paragraph corresponds to nothing in the extant Tib. YBh (we would expect it to fall at Derge 1 50b1, following . . . *bsams pa las byung ba'i sar ji skad bstan pa de bzhin du blta bar bya'o*). It is therefore impossible to provide precise Tib. equivalents for the terms used. However, we can tentatively reconstruct the equivalents given, in part on the basis of Tib. equivalents provided in YOKOYAMA for other instances of the same translation terms. The order in which the first two characteristics are given is reversed in P's SWXL. Useful comments on a selection of these categories state: (1) The first of these categories refers in turn to a complex analysis of categories under which all reals can be understood, for which see T1602:31.507a17-b01, T1579:30.696a01-21. (2) “Speech/language”, upon which the texts comment in the most detail, is identified with other technical categories including *parikalpitasvabhava*, hypostatisation or reification (*samaropa*), etc. (4) “Attachment” is explained rather technically as “the *parikalpitasvabhava* of the benighted (**bala*), continuously operative from beginningless time, and its attendant tendencies (**anusaya*)” 諸愚夫無始時來相續流轉遍計所執自性執及彼隨眠.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

The text then considers whether the five encompass or comprise (攝, **sam/grah*) the three, or vice versa. It answers that of the fivefold rubric, categories (1) signifier and (2) signified are comprised in all three members of the threefold rubric; (3) “meaning” is comprised of the imagined characteristic (*parikalpītalakṣaṇa*) alone;¹⁶² (4) “attachment/hypostatisation” is comprised of the interdependent characteristic (*paratantralakṣaṇa*) alone; and (5) freedom from attachment is comprised of the perfected characteristic (*pariniṣpannalakṣaṇa*) alone.¹⁶³

In SWXL alone, a comment follows, bringing **amalavijñāna* to bear:

“The reason the first two characteristics [of the fivefold rubric] are comprised of all three characteristics [in the threefold rubric] is as follows.

“(1) The characteristic [called] ‘the signifier’ is the names of all things (*dharma*) and language. This signifier is a product of consciousness. (i) Consciousness arises in the apparent guise of the signifier, and for this reason it is of the nature of what is imagined (*parikalpītasvabhāva*). (ii) The subject [or ‘agent’] of [this] imagination, viz. consciousness 能分別識, is of the nature of what is produced by interdependence (*paratantrasvabhāva*). (iii) Since the signifier constituting the imagined object 所分別名言 does not exist, the consciousness constituting the agent of imagination also does not exist, and [the discernment of] this [very fact] is the nature of [things as they are when brought to] perfection (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*). For this reason, this first [category] is comprised of all three natures 三性攝.¹⁶⁴

“(2) The second characteristic is also comprised of all three natures. The characteristic called ‘the signified’ is the meaning/referent (**artha*) intended by the signifier 所目義, that is to say, all things 一切諸物,¹⁶⁵ which are also products of consciousness. (i) Where only consciousness

¹⁶² Recall that **artha*, if it is what underlies *yi* 義, can also mean “object”, “referent”.

¹⁶³ T1617:31.873c02-08, T1602:31.559b19-27.

¹⁶⁴ Note the way P’s comment here slips from talk of *parikalpīta*, *paratantra* and *pariniṣpanna* as “characteristics” to talk of them as “natures”.

¹⁶⁵ Is relatively unusual in a Buddhist translation context, but very common otherwise in Chinese philosophical discourse, to refer to all “things” as *wu* 物; translation texts, P’s included, would probably more often talk of all *dharmas*, or sometimes of *shi* (事, **vastu*). This seems to be the only instance of 一切諸物 in P, though we do quite frequently find 一切物: in JDZL T1584:30.1027b28; in MSgBh T1595:31.250c27-251a01; especially numerous in *Rushi lun* 如實論, T1633:32.30c14, 31b04-12, 31b28-29, 32c18-19; **Lakṣaṇānusāra-śāstra* 隨相論 T1641:32.159b14; 佛說立世阿毘曇論, T1644:32.225b15-16; *Ratnāvalī* T1656:32.500b27.

MICHAEL RADICH

exists, it is of the nature of what is imagined (*parikalpitasvabhāva*) that there arise the apparent characteristics of things 似物相起. (ii) The agent of imagination, viz. consciousness, is of the nature of what is produced by interdependence (*paratantrasvabhāva*). (iii) That these two, as above, do not exist, is of the nature of [things as they appear when they have been brought to] perfection (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*).

“(3) The third characteristic [‘meaning’, i.e. reference] is only comprised of the nature of what is imagined (*parikalpitasvabhāva*) for the following reason. This ‘characteristic [of things] whereby word and meaning correspond to one another’ 名義相應相 refers to [the fact that] a word is designated for a thing. We make [the word] correspond to the thing, [so that,] by means of the word, it is possible to represent the thing 因名得顯物. However, this meaning of the word in fact does not exist, and because of the fact that it is so characterised by inexistence 無相義故,¹⁶⁶ [we know that] it is only of the nature of what is imagined (*parikalpitasvabhāva*).

“(4) The fourth characteristic [‘attachment’, i.e. hypostatisation] is only comprised of the nature of [what is produced by] interdependence (*paratantrasvabhāva*) for the following reason. In this ‘characteristic of attachment to both word and meaning’, we distinguish the agent of this attachment, and thus [determine that] it is only of the nature of interdependence. Because [this category] does not explicitly [address] the object of attachment, it is not comprised of the nature of what is imagined. The preceding [category], however, only brings out the object of imagination, and not the agent of imagination; and thus it is not of the nature of interdependence.

“(5) The reason the fifth characteristic is comprised only of the nature of [things as they appear when they have been brought to] perfection is as follows. This state ‘characterised by freedom of attachment to both word and meaning’ is the **amalavijñāna*, in which there is no distinction between object and wisdom/intuition 境智無差別阿摩羅識. The third and fourth [characteristics, i.e. the apparent object and subject of deluded knowing comprised by imagined and interdependent natures] are in fact no different from this perfected nature; [the] only [difference is that] each of them establishes [a category that] manifests precisely one partial aspect [of the truth].”¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁶ The phrase 無相義故 is obscure. It might also be read, at a stretch, “because there is nothing corresponding to the meaning”.

¹⁶⁷ 釋曰：初二相所以通為三相所攝者、初名言相、即是諸法名字及說。此名言是識所作。識似名言相起、即是分別性、能分別識、即依他性。所分別名言既無所有、能分別識亦無所有、即是真實性。是故、初相即三性攝。第二相亦三性攝者、所言相、即是名言所目義、謂一切諸物、亦是識所作。但識有、似物相起、即是分別性。能分別識、即是依他性。亦二俱無所有、即是真實性。第三相但為分別性所攝者、此名義相應相、謂為物立名、令與物相應、因

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

In this passage, as previously in ZSL and SWXL<1>, **amalavijñāna* is once more identified with *pariniṣpannasvabhāva*. This passage adds to our picture of **amalavijñāna* a new dimension of non-dualism. Where previously the non-dualism was defined in negative terms, as the obviation of a false dualism between subject and object of delusory thinking, here, its content is defined positively as a relation of indistinction between perfected gnosis (wisdom, *jñāna*) and its object. In the emphasis in its exposition of the earlier members of the fivefold rubric, the passage also exposes a certain dimension of the relationship between **amalavijñāna* and language. Previously, in SWXL<1>, we were already told that **amalavijñāna* is identical with “reality” in part because it is beyond error (*aviparyāsa*); given the frequent connection between *viparyāsa* and language, we could perhaps have inferred that this meant it was free of ordinary language also. Here, however, this aspect of **amalavijñāna* is made explicit. All aspects of the operation of language and its referential function are associated with the imperfect *parikalpita*- and *paratantrasvabhāva*. **Amalavijñāna*, by contrast, is associated exclusively with *pariniṣpannasvabhāva*, in large part because it is “free of attachment to word and meaning”.

3. Summary and analysis: Two doctrines of **amalavijñāna*

Let us now review the picture of **amalavijñāna* that emerges from the primary texts taken in the aggregate. For the purposes of this summary analysis, it will be convenient to divide the primary texts (excluding *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*) into two groups: (1) *Jueding zang lun* (JDZL); (2) other texts. There are several reasons for this division.

First, the JDZL passages in which **amalavijñāna* appears have counterparts in parallel versions of the text in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Xuanzang’s Chinese. By contrast, in SBKL, ZSL and SWXL, there is uniformly little or nothing in parallel texts that corresponds to passages expounding **amalavijñāna*. This suggests strongly that in SBKL, ZSL and SWXL, we are dealing with sub-commentarial or “lecture” passages (whether by Paramārtha and his team at the point of translation, or by some later hand).

Second, JDZL is traditionally supposed to have been translated (or composed) earli-

名得顯物。此名義實無所有、無相義故、但是分別性。第四相但為依他性攝者、此執著名義二相、辨其能執故、但是依他性、不明所執、故非分別。前但出所分別、不出能分別、故非依他。第五相唯為真性所攝者、此不執著名義二相、即是境智無差別阿摩羅識故。第四第三亦不離真實性、但其所立、正為偏顯一義耳, T1617:31.873c09-26. My translation of the last sentence is tentative.

est of all the texts under consideration here, during the Liang (before 557). The facts here are complex and tenuous;¹⁶⁸ but in the absence of firm evidence to the contrary, we

¹⁶⁸ JDZL is first mentioned in the catalogues in the *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定眾經目錄, composed by Mingquan 明佺 under Empress Wu (r. 690-705). Here, it is ascribed to P and the Liang in the Song, Ming and Yuan versions of the text, 梁天竺三藏真諦譯, T2153:55.407c15; in the Korean version, however, this line is missing, so that JDZL ends up appearing to be ascribed to Gautama Prajñaruci (active c. 516-543?), alongside his 迴諍論 *Vigrahavyāvartīnī* T1631. JDZL is not more precisely dated until the next catalogue of the canon, Zhisheng's (智昇, 669-740) *Kaiyuan lu* 開元釋教錄 (which dates to 730). Even then, Zhisheng only dates the text on the basis of the fact that it contains an interlinear note glossing a transliteration term by saying "in Liang, this is said . . ." 梁言; T2154:55.538b05; relevant JDZL passage at T1584:30.1018c09. So it is not until 120-160 years after P's death that JDZL turns up, under that title, in the catalogues, and then the dating is based upon one very slender piece of evidence. Note that this means that the first recorded references to the title *Jueding zang lun* are actually found outside catalogues; e.g. the reference in Wōnch'uk (see below, p. 107-108, 145) predates Mingquan.

The situation is further complicated, however, by the fact that older catalogues, beginning with Fei Changfang's (費長房, d.u.) somewhat unreliable *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 in 597 (T2034:49.99a04), list a lost *Shiqi di lun* 十七地論 among P's works, which seems to have been a partial translation of YBh (see further also n. 283). It is possible that our present JDZL is a surviving remnant of that text; for example, we will see below that there is at least one clear instance in which T2807 refers to contents included in JDZL by the title *Shiqi di lun* (see n. 283). If JDZL is a remnant of the *Shiqi di lun*, it may be relevant that that text too is supposed to date to early in P's translation career, dating from the fourth year of the Taiqing era 太清四年 (approx. 550).

Judging from its title, we might well expect that *Shiqi di lun* ("Treatise on the Seventeen Stages") should have been a translation of the *Maulibhāmi* portions alone of YBh. However, this seems not to have been the case. T2807 cites a portion of the text corresponding to the present JDZL, i.e. the *Vinīscayasamgrahaṇī* (see once more n. 283). Bhikkhu Huimin has further pointed out that one of three *Shiqi di lun* passages referred to in P's MSgBh is also from the *Vinīscayasamgrahaṇī*: 十種法正行、如『十七地論』說, T1595:31.224b18-19 (Huimin has a19, in error), corresponding to T1579:30.706c22 (in *juan* 74 of XZ); Huimin [1994], 6 (I am grateful to ŌTAKE Susumu for pointing out this reference to me). In unpublished work, ŌTAKE has also found passages quoted from the *Shiqi di lun* that correspond to sections of the *Maulibhāmi* ranging from XZ *juan* 4 to *juan* 48. It therefore seems that whether or not it was a full translation or, as seems more likely, merely a set of excerpts, *Shiqi di lun* covered passages corresponding to a very wide range in the present YBh, including parts outside the *Maulibhāmi*. Thus, while it is possible that JDZL is a remnant of *Shiqi di lun*, *Shiqi di lun* cannot have been identical to our present extant JDZL. We should also note that when Huijun summarises the seventeen stages as laid out in the text (which he calls *Shiqi jing* 十七經), stages nine to fourteen comprise five sets of ten stages, totalling fifty stages, known to be unique to Chinese Buddhism, i.e. (1) ten "faiths" 十信, (2) ten "abodes" 十住, (3) ten

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

should still follow the traditional bibliographers. If JDZL was thus the first text in which **amalavijñāna* was mentioned, and followed only at a distance of perhaps a decade by the other texts under consideration, the concept may have undergone considerable development between JDZL and the other texts. For this reason, we should be alert to possible differences in **amalavijñāna* doctrine as it is expounded in JDZL, against the doctrine of the other texts.

Third, close study of the style of these texts suggests that SWXL, SBKL and ZSL may be part of a reasonably close sub-group in Paramārtha’s corpus, but differ in important respects from JDZL. These stylistic considerations reinforce the hints from the bibliographic tradition that the circumstances, and indeed collective authorship, of our texts may have differed in important respects.¹⁶⁹

“practices” 十行, (4) ten “dedications of merit” (here broken up into two sets, for the *hīnayāna* and *Mahayāna*) 捨[十]小乘迴向大乘, 大乘十迴向地, and (5) ten “grounds” 十地 (X784:46.569c11-13; ŌTAKE, personal communication). This would seem to make it unlikely that the text was simply a straight translation of any Indic version of YBh.

SWXL, by contrast, is attested as early as the *Zhong jing mulu* 眾經目錄 by Fajing (法經, d.u.) of 594 (T2146:55.141b10) (much more reliable than the *Lidai fabao ji*); here it is already assigned to the Chen. It is also found in the *Gu jin yijing tu ji* 古今譯經圖紀 by Jingmai (靖邁, d.u.), dating to 664-665, where it is assigned even more firmly to a period in which P was supposed to have been in residence at Zhizhi si 制旨寺, which various sources place either “for some time” after 562 or between 563 and 567; T2151:55.365a01, 364c20. Given that ZSL is supposed originally to have been part of the same larger text as SWXL, viz. the *Wuxiang lun* 無相論, this information may apply to it also. Mention of an independent ZSL, however, is first seen in the *Da Zhou lu*, where it is ascribed to P and assigned to the Chen dynasty, T2153:55.408a01; Zhisheng concurs, adding the detail that assignment to the Chen was confirmed by another catalogue, the *Chulun ti danben* 出論題單本, T2154:55.609a20-21. Finally, SBKL, like SWXL, is attested quite early, in the *Zhong jing mulu* 眾經目錄 by Yancong (顏琮) of 602, where it is ascribed to the Chen, T2147:55.153c16; as with SXWL, Jingmai ascribes it to the Zhizhi si period. In the cases of what I am here calling the “other” texts (SWXL, ZSL and SBKL), then, our most concrete information is also late, dating to a century after P’s time.

Uncertain though it may be, this information suggests that JDZL may be ten years or more older than the other three texts, and thus date to a significantly different period of P’s career, when his team was of very different composition, etc.

¹⁶⁹ I will address the complex issue of authorship and style in a study currently in preparation. To give only one example, JDZL calls *alayavijñāna* 阿羅耶識 — 71 times! — but the term is previously entirely unknown (and is only attested three times in one text even thereafter). JDZL’s frequent use of this term is thus unique in the P corpus in this regard.

Fourth, we find that there are important differences between the **amalavijñāna* doctrine of JDZL and that of the other three texts, but the other three texts present a relatively uniform version of the doctrine.

3.1 **Amalavijñāna* in JDZL

We can summarise the most important points of the rich doctrine of **amalavijñāna* in JDZL as follows. **Amalavijñāna* corresponds closely to *āśrayaparāvṛtti*. The term corresponds to *āśrayaparāvṛtti* in textual parallels; it is also spoken of as *parāvṛtti* in JDZL itself, where context shows clearly that *āśrayaparāvṛtti* is meant; and it is free of “badness” (*dauṣṭhulya*). The text (especially in Paramārtha) equivocates paradoxically over the exact status of this *āśrayaparāvṛtti* — in places it is said not itself to have, or be, a basis; but elsewhere it is said to be the basis for this or that (e.g. the path, *lokōttara-dharmas*). The identity with *āśrayaparāvṛtti* is doubtless also connected to the interesting doctrine, propounded with special emphasis in JDZL<4>, that **amalavijñāna*, identified with a purified *vijñānaskandha*, stands in a radically transformed relationship to the other four *skandhas*. The other four *skandhas*, when the object of grasping or attachment, are clearly spoken of as the “basis” (*āśraya*) for further rebirth, because clinging to them leads to appropriation of a new body (incarnation) after the end of one lifespan.

There seems to be a number of respects in which JDZL’s **amalavijñāna-cum-āśrayaparāvṛtti* warrants the epithet “pure”. It is the counteragent, or the result of the operation of counteragents, to *alayavijñāna* and other features of the defiled state. It is associated with (a separate basis for) the “transcendent *dharmas*” (*lokōttaradharmāḥ*). It is also pure because it is diametrically opposed to the ordinary defiled state in many specific respects: most importantly, it is free of defilements (*kleśa*, 煩惱) and “outflows” (*āsrava*), and their causes; it is also free of all other qualities associated with the ordinary worldling (*prthagjana*). The purity of **amalavijñāna* is also reflected in the fact that in it, the sensations (*vedanā*) are rendered pure. Its purity is also reflected in its association with Thusness. **Amalavijñāna* is realised by intensive cultivation of the wisdom that knows Thusness (*tathatā*), and the very notion of “taintlessness” (*amala*, *nirmala*) may well be intended to recall expositions of “purified Thusness” in RGV, other parts of YBh, etc.

**Amalavijñāna* is also permanent (*nitya*), and this is emphasised by Paramārtha’s assertion, against parallel texts, that *amalavijñāna-cum-āśrayaparāvṛtti* does *not* cease of its own accord.

Apart from the naming of the liberated state (*āśrayaparāvṛtti* etc.) as

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

**amalavijñāna*, Paramārtha adds little to ideas already found in YBh. In effect, he has just given a clear name to an already-present configuration of ideas about the implications of liberation for consciousness. The name, moreover, is not inappropriate. The parallel passages also discuss liberation as a liberation of consciousness from defilements, in a manner that amply justifies the epithet “pure”; and the phrase “pure consciousness”, in some form, even appears in one place in parallel versions of the text.

It is impossible to miss, throughout these passages, the ring of the Yogācāra “Mahāyāna Abhidharma” — much of the talk is of seeds (*bīja*), defilements (*kleśa*), “outflows” (*āsrava*), aggregates (*skandha*), gradualist models of paths of practice and realisation (including *śaikṣa* and *aśaikṣa*), etc.

Some of this doctrine echoes the AKBh *amalavijñāna* passage, not only in the general “Abhidharma” language, but in specifics. In both contexts, at issue is a consciousness pure specifically in that it is free of “outflows” (*āsrava*), and of defilements under other names. This purity matters so much because it enables us to attain freedom from eventual rebirth, or more precisely (especially in AKBh) freedom from the “latent tendencies” (*anuśaya*) that constitute the most subtle level of grasping after the *bases* of future rebirth. If Paramārtha picked up the term *amalavijñāna* from AKBh 5.29 ff. and used it to name the doctrine of pure consciousness elaborated in these YBh passages, it was thus an artful move.

We see echoes here of an old doctrine of consciousness as the subject of transmigration and liberation.¹⁷⁰ These echoes have not been noted by previous **amalavijñāna* scholarship. In brief, this old doctrine is as follows.

In some texts, such as the *Mahānidāna sutta* (DN 15), *viññāna* is presented as the *sine qua non* for embryonic development; as “descending” into the mother’s womb, “leaving” in cases of miscarriage, etc.¹⁷¹ *Viññāna* is also presented as a “surviving” factor, called in the *Majjhima nikāya* the “consciousness that evolves [into the next life]” (*saṃvattanikaviññāna*).¹⁷² In both these connections, the understanding of *viññāna* is closely related to the place it assumed in the standard twelvefold chain of dependent

¹⁷⁰ See esp. WIJESKERA (1964): 254-259; WIJESKERA (1945): 73-107; WALDRON 9-45.

¹⁷¹ See e.g. WIJESKERA (1945): 92, referring to D 2.63.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 93; WIJESKERA (1964): 259; referring to *Aneñjasappaya sutta* (M 106), i.e. M 2.262 ff.

origination (*patīccasamuppāda*).¹⁷³ Another related idea is that consciousness arising from moment-to-moment sense experience is the “origin of the world” (*lokassa samudayam*)¹⁷⁴ with all its suffering, and that the suffering world ceases when consciousness ceases.¹⁷⁵ Wijesekera has further shown that *viññāna* so understood is connected to the notion of the *gandharva/gandhabba*, as the “being that enters into the womb” on conception, a “being of the intermediate state” (*antarabhavasattvam*);¹⁷⁶ this notion in turn is linked with *manas*, mind or “soul”,¹⁷⁷ and, ultimately, with an ancient and sprawling network of various mythemes reaching back to the Vedas and apparently beyond.¹⁷⁸ The resonances between these ideas and JDZL are strengthened by other key details. Even in the earliest texts, as in JDZL, *viññāna* is continually drawn back into rebirth precisely because it is still associated with *anusaya (anusāya)*.¹⁷⁹ Further, *viññāna* is spoken of in the *Sampasādanīya sutta* (DN 28) as a “stream” (*viññānasotaṃ*), in a manner that clearly recalls the “continuum” or “flow” (*santāna*) at issue in JDZL.¹⁸⁰

In the early texts, this same consciousness is sometimes understood as continuing

¹⁷³ In this formula, *viññāna* is pivotally placed as the key link in the process leading to rebirth. On the emergence of the twelvefold model, problems of internal consistency in it, and its possible basis in more than one earlier model, see the still seminal LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1913).

¹⁷⁴ This might make us think of P’s notion of “temporal consciousness” (more literally, “world consciousness”) 世識 in JDZL<4>, for which see n. 79.

¹⁷⁵ SN. 44.4 “The World”, S 2.73-74, BODHI 581-582.; WALDRON 31-32.

¹⁷⁶ WIJESKERA (1945): 88-89; note especially the *Assalayana sutta* (M 93) passage discussed here: “We know how the descent of an embryo comes about. Here, there is the union of the mother and father, and the mother is in season, and the *gandhabba* is present . . . Then, sirs, do you know for sure whether that *gandhabba* is a noble, or a brahmin, or a merchant, or a worker?”, *Jānāma mayāṃ bho yathā gabbhassa avakkanti hoti. Idha mātapitaroca sannipatitā honti. Māta ca utunī hoti, gandhabbo ca paccupaṭṭhito hoti. . . . Jānanti pana bhonto yagge so gandhabbo khattiyō vā brāhmaṇo vā vesso vā suddo vāti?* M 2.156-157, ÑĀNAMOLI and BODHI 769; WALDRON 14; here, the status of the *gandhabba* as a personal entity from previous lives is very clear.

¹⁷⁷ WIJESKERA (1945): 84.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, *infra*; note discussion of Avestan and possibly Greek parallels, 73-75.

¹⁷⁹ On this dimension of the early doctrine of *viññāna*, see e.g. WALDRON 33 ff.

¹⁸⁰ E.g. “the unbroken stream of consciousness that is established in this world and the next”, *viññānasotaṃ . . . ubhayato abbochinnaṃ idha loke paṭiṭṭhitaṃ ca paraloke paṭiṭṭhitaṃ ca*, D 3.105, WALSH 420. This is part of the key distinction between the doctrine of transmigrating *viññāna* in these early texts and related, more outright ontological concepts current in Upaniṣadic and other contexts, as is shown particularly by the Buddha’s refutation of “Sāti’s thesis” that “it is this same consciousness that runs and wanders through the round of rebirths, not another;” see M 1.258 ff., ÑĀNAMOLI and BODHI 349 ff., WALDRON 195 n. 44.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

even into rarefied meditative states as far as *nevasaññānāsaññāyatana*,¹⁸¹ and there are indications that it, or perhaps “mind” construed more generally, was in some sources regarded as the quasi-“subject”¹⁸² of the process and state of liberation itself.¹⁸³ Such a consciousness is said to be “unestablished” (*apatiṭṭhita-viññāna*): a representative statement says that when lust (*rāga*) has been abandoned with regard to each of the five *khandhas* in turn, “there is no basis (*ārammaṇam*) for the establishing of consciousness (*patiṭṭhā viññāna*ssa na hoti);” such a consciousness is liberated (*vimuttam*), steady (*ṭhitam*) and satisfied (*santusitam*), and has attained *nirvāṇa* (*parinibbāyati*).¹⁸⁴ It seems clear that in such a state, consciousness is still undergoing experiences of some kind, which are free of suffering, and that it is such experience that comprises liberation. (However, we must also note other passages that depict liberation as a “cessation” of *viññāna* altogether.¹⁸⁵) It is also noteworthy that this state is already spoken of in terms of there being no “basis” (*ārammaṇam* = Skt. *ālambanam*) for consciousness (although the term is not *āśraya*, JDZL clearly echoes these ideas). In “Volition”, SN 40.10.3, the attainment of this “unestablished” state without a basis is further clearly linked to the absence of “latent tendencies” (*anusaya* = *anuśaya*).¹⁸⁶

These and related ideas find resonances in the JDZL doctrine of the ordinary *vijñānaskandha*, attached to the other four *skandhas* as “base” and therefore undergoing repeated rebirth and suffering; and of **amalavijñāna* as a metamorphosed or purified transmutation of this *vijñāna*, which is freed from suffering, the subject of a pure kind of experience, and eternal.

Modern scholars have often taken **amalavijñāna* as a kind of bridgehead, intended to enable annexation of *tathagatagarbha* doctrine into Yogācāra. Perhaps the doctrine

181 WIJESEKERA (1945): 93, M 2.263-264.

182 As always in discussing Buddhist doctrines, any such term must be handled with caution and due provisos; but at the same time, if we are to discuss the problem, we must say *something*.

183 For aspects of this notion, see HARVEY; ALBAHARI; THANISSARO; LINDTNER. I am grateful to my student Benno BLASCHKE for bringing my attention to several of these studies.

184 E.g. S 3.58, BODHI 894; *apatiṭṭhitam viññānam* also features e.g. at S 3.53-54, BODHI 891; D 3.105, WALSH 420; as a description of the liberated state of one Godhika, S 1.122, BODHI 214; S 2.66, BODHI 577, where it is associated with the cessation of the whole mass of suffering; etc.

185 D3.103, S1.122, S2.66, 2.103, 3.61 etc.

186 *Yato ca kho bhikkhave, no ceva ceteti, no ca pakappeti, no ca anuseti, ārammaṇametam na hoti viññāna*ssaṭṭhitiya. *Arammaṇe asati patiṭṭhā viññāna*ssa na hoti etc., S 2.67, BODHI 577-578; so too S 2.66, BODHI 577; S 2.103, BODHI 600-601.

did lend itself to that use, and perhaps Paramārtha was at pains, elsewhere in his work, to bring about such a *rapprochement*. However, very little in JDZL calls to mind *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine — only, faintly, that **amalavijñāna-cum-āśrayaparāvṛtti* is associated with “pure Thusness”; that it is permanent (*nitya*); and that it somehow pre-exists the liberatory state (thus resembling *tathāgatagarbha* as a ground for potential realisation). Moreover, this is all also present in parallel texts, and therefore was presumably in Paramārtha’s source. The connection between *tathāgatagarbha* and **amalavijñāna* in JDZL may thus be weaker than scholars have thought.

3.2 **Amalavijñāna* in SWXL, ZSL and SBKL

In SXWL, ZSL and SBKL, **amalavijñāna* is identified with a “higher” or complete understanding of *vijñaptimātra/weishi* (“consciousness/representation only”), in which the practitioner realises the unreality not only of objects, but also of ordinary defiled consciousness itself (of *alayavijñāna*). A state is thus attained that transcends the usual epistemological dualism of subject and object. Further, in explicit connection with this “higher *weishi*”, **amalavijñāna* is identified with the *pariṇiṣpannasvabhāva* (“perfected nature”) (ZSL, SWXL). This status of **amalavijñāna* as the “perfected nature” hinges on the obviation of the delusory dualism of subject and object that pertains in ordinary consciousness.¹⁸⁷ It is also said to be also expressed in the non-dualism of perfected gnosis and its object in the liberated state (SWXL). **Amalavijñāna* is further associated with (the pure aspect of) Thusness or reality, particularly in the context of the exposition of the seven kinds of *tattva* (SBKL, SWXL).

The concept of **amalavijñāna* in these texts is thus relatively consistent and uniform. However, some claims are unique to a single text. Most importantly, only in SBKL is **amalavijñāna* identified as “aboriginally luminous mind” (*prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta*), which is tainted by adventitious defilements (*āgantukakleśa*). This aboriginally luminous mind is further identified with the fundamentally pure aspect of Thusness (*tathatā*), and also of the related domains of emptiness (*śūnyatā*) and the *dharmadhatu*. SWXL<1> alone claims that the aspect of Thusness constituted by **amalavijñāna* is real (or “thus”) because it is immutable, i.e. not subject to metamorphosis (*avikāra*). SWXL<2> alone claims that it is real, also, because it is beyond ordinary language. On the whole, however, divergences between the texts are minor, and the coherence in their doctrine of

¹⁸⁷ Note, in this connection, the way that the application of the notion of *pariṇiṣpannasvabhāva* in parts (1) and (2) of SWXL<2> also hinges on the obviation of a dualistic relation, in which it is vital that an apparent subject be involved.

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

**amalavijñāna* is more striking.

There is still relatively little, in this version of **amalavijñāna* doctrine, that recalls *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine. The strongest echoes of *tathāgatagarbha* ideas are found in SBKL, where **amalavijñāna* is identified with *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta* as obscured by “adventitious dust 塵”.

The relatively uniform **amalavijñāna* doctrine of these three texts is strikingly different from that of JDZL. JDZL does not associate **amalavijñāna* with *vijñaptimātra/weishi* doctrine in any form. It unsurprisingly, therefore, never breathes a word of transcendence of the subject-object dualism. Neither does it identify **amalavijñāna* with the “perfected nature” (*pariṇiṣpannasvabhāva*). Despite its clear concern with the purity of consciousness and mind, it also does *not* link **amalavijñāna* and *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta*. Nor does it link **amalavijñāna* to emptiness or the *dharmadhātu*; nor claim that it is beyond ordinary language.

By contrast, these three texts do not associate **amalavijñāna* with *āśrayaparāvṛtti* as JDZL does. They do not treat **amalavijñāna* as the *vijñānaskandha*, nor consider its relationship to other *skandhas*. They do not associate **amalavijñāna* with the problematic of rebirth or its escape. There is, correspondingly, no discussion of defilements or “outflows” (*āsrava*). **Amalavijñāna* is never said to be the “counteragent” (*pratipakṣa*) to anything. These texts never broach the question of the relationship between **amalavijñāna* and the path, or various kinds of *dharma*s (e.g. *lokōttaradharmas*, *prthagjanadharmas*), or the stages of *śaikṣa* or *āśaikṣa*. They never speak of the purification of *vedanā*. Nothing in these texts echoes the AKBh passage in which the term *amalavijñāna* is attested in Sanskrit. There is also nothing, in these texts, of the echoes with the old doctrine of consciousness as the subject of transmigration and liberation.

More generally, in JDZL we observed a close entanglement of **amalavijñāna* doctrine with the Yogācāra “Mahāyāna Abhidharma”. Here we see, rather, attempts to connect **amalavijñāna* more directly with core elements of innovative doctrines more particular to Yogācāra itself — that there is “only consciousness” (*vijñaptimātra*); three natures (*trisvabhāva*); theory of language; the non-dualist nature of true gnosis; and the relationship between that gnosis and the reality or Thusness it knows. In fact, SWXL<1> even seems to scorn an Abhidharmic understanding of reality (twelve *āyatana* etc.) as “*hīnayāna*”.

In contrast to these stark differences, there are only minimal areas of overlap be-

tween the presentation of **amalavijñāna* in JDZL and the other three texts. In both sets of material, **amalavijñāna* is associated in some regard with Thusness; and in both, the permanence of **amalavijñāna* is stressed.¹⁸⁸

What, then, are we to make of these differences? We cannot be sure what they mean, but some possibilities suggest themselves. The traditional bibliographies assert that JDZL is much earlier than other texts featuring **amalavijñāna*. There also seems to be a closer fit between its **amalavijñāna* and *amalavijñāna* in AKBh. These are also the only passages in which **amalavijñāna* features in a “translation” rather than a “lecture” or “sub-commentarial” context. JDZL<1> is also the only passage that expounds **amalavijñāna* at length, whereas it is elsewhere often merely mentioned. Finally, stylistic differences¹⁸⁹ and other structural considerations¹⁹⁰ make it possible that **amalavijñāna* passages in the other texts may have been added by a later hand. JDZL is thus far more likely than the other texts to preserve for us the first known exposition of **amalavijñāna*.

It is possible that the differences between the “Yogācāra Abhidharma” of JDZL and the “core Yogācāra” of the other three texts is merely a function of the different topics at issue. The two versions of **amalavijñāna* doctrine, while different, do not directly contradict one another, and so may be mutually consistent developments, in different directions, of the same doctrine by the same hand. It is also possible that both sets of materials are equally the work of Paramārtha(s group), but that the doctrine was further developed between JDZL and the other texts, and that the composition of the authorial team shifted in the interim as well. SWXL, SBKL and ZSL may therefore show us a later version of **amalavijñāna*. Alternatively, **amalavijñāna* passages may have been interpolated later into SWXL, ZSL and SBKL, perhaps as subcommentary. Such a later hand might still be quite closely related to Paramārtha’s group.

Whatever the reasons, within Paramārtha’s corpus we thus find not one but two relatively distinct doctrines of **amalavijñāna*. We now turn to the question of how accurately either of these versions of the doctrine was communicated to the later tradition.

¹⁸⁸ JDZL<1>, <4>, “immutable” SWXL<1>.

¹⁸⁹ See n. 169.

¹⁹⁰ For example, the fact that ZSL seems clearly to contain different layers of commentary on the root text (*Triṃśikā*), whereby the second layer may be the addition of a later hand (see further n. 243). In SBKL<1>, too, as we saw, mention of **amalavijñāna* occurs in what is clearly labelled as an “additional comment”.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

4. **Amalavijñāna* in later sources

There are relatively few sources for Paramārtha’s doctrine of **amalavijñāna*. It is natural, then, to turn for further information to the testimony of later scholastics. Such scholastics report aspects of **amalavijñāna* doctrine never found in Paramārtha’s extant corpus, and this may be because they had access to additional facts. Such authors may have seen texts since lost; sometimes they refer to such texts (or at least claim to). They were also closer in time and space to Paramārtha, and may have learnt things by hearsay that were never written down.

However, we cannot always be sure that later reports are accurate. These authors may have quoted from memory, or at second-hand. They may not have had access to Paramārtha’s texts, but could be relying upon hearsay. Ideas might have been ascribed to Paramārtha to lend them authority, even if actually elaborated by someone else — much as was the case with the entire *Awakening of Faith*. Some portrayals of Paramārtha’s ideas may have been coloured by sectarian polemics.

For these reasons, we must determine the extent to which later authors concur with or diverge from Paramārtha, as a way of judging their reliability. To this end, I will here summarise reports about **amalavijñāna* to 800 C.E. under three heads: (1) what later authors report that we do not find in Paramārtha; (2) agreement between Paramārtha and later authorities; and (3) what we find in Paramārtha that is not reported by later authorities.

4.1 What later sources say that Paramārtha does not

In later reports of **amalavijñāna*, we find much that is never found in Paramārtha’s extant corpus. First, later authors use various terms never found in Paramārtha; second, the specific content they attribute to the doctrine of **amalavijñāna* is extremely various. In what follows, I consider this material in approximate chronological order.

4.1.1 A proliferation of various terms

Turning first to terms, we find that later sources frequently refer to **amalavijñāna* by various names that Paramārtha’s texts do not use.

I have already mentioned above the fact that later sources sometimes use the term

MICHAEL RADICH

wugoushi 無垢識 to refer to **amalavijñāna*.¹⁹¹ *Wugoushi* is identified with “ninth consciousness”, and therefore with **amalavijñāna*, already in Huijun (慧均, d.u., fl. 574-580s?)¹⁹² and in Daoji (道基, 577-637);¹⁹³ by Kuiji (窺基, 632-682);¹⁹⁴ by Wōnch’uk (圓測, 613-696);¹⁹⁵ by Wōnhyo (元曉, 617-686);¹⁹⁶ by Taehyōn (大賢, 太賢, d.u., active c. 742-765);¹⁹⁷ by Chengguan (澄觀, 738-839);¹⁹⁸ and by Zongmi (宗密, 780-841).¹⁹⁹ Tunnyun (遁倫, d.u., Silla monk of the eighth century) also knows this term.²⁰⁰

We also find **amalavijñāna* called *jingshi* 淨識, e.g. by Zhiyi (智顛, 538-597),²⁰¹ Huijun²⁰² and Daoji.²⁰³

We also find that there are many variants of the transcription term that never appear in Paramārtha: (1) **Amalavijñāna* is called *anmoluoshi* 菴摩羅[識] by Zhiyi;²⁰⁴ by

¹⁹¹ The term *wugoushi* is already mentioned in connection with Yogācāra doctrine by Jingying Huiyuan 淨影慧遠 (523-592), but he thinks that it is a term for *alayavijñāna* (T1851:44.524c25-26). This is similar to the meaning the term has in the *Cheng weishi lun*, T1585:31.13c19-27; Huizhao (惠沼, d. 714) understands the term in a similar manner, as one of the eighteen names of *alayavijñāna* mentioned in the *Cheng weishi lun* (成唯識論了義燈 T1832:43.729c03).

¹⁹² X784:46.601c24; 603a13.

¹⁹³ As quoted by Gyōnen, DBZ 122, 364a-b. See also below, §4.1.3.7.

¹⁹⁴ E.g. T1782:38.1001c28-1002a01, T1830:43.344c07-13.

¹⁹⁵ T1708:33.400b27-28; Wōnch’uk glosses it, in terms highly redolent of *tathagatagarbha*, as “the *dharmakāya* when it is free of bonds”.

¹⁹⁶ 金剛三昧經論, T1730:34.961b03-04, 980c14, BUSWELL [2007], 49, 157. Wōnhyo also uses this term, in addition to 庵摩羅識 (金剛三昧經論 T1730:34.978a20, 980c10 [citing the root text], BUSWELL [2007], 142, 157) and 阿摩羅識 (涅槃宗要 T1769:38.249b08). By contrast, VSS uses only 庵摩羅識 T273:9.368c28-29.

¹⁹⁷ 成唯識論學記, X818:50.64c02-04.

¹⁹⁸ E.g. T1735:35.821b02-03.

¹⁹⁹ T1795:39.542c04.

²⁰⁰ Three instances, T1828:42.318a17-22.

²⁰¹ T1716:33.744b22, b29, c03; X356:20.48c21.

²⁰² X784:46.599c21-2.

²⁰³ DBZ 12, 370b.

²⁰⁴ T1716:33.744b19, c07-08; T1783:39.4a12-13, 7c27; X907:55.645b18-19; X356:20.48c11, c12, c18, c20 (the byline of this text says it is the text of a lecture that was given by Zhiyi, recorded by Guanding, and *shu* 述 by Zhili of the Song; a very similar text at T1784 is only ascribed to Zhili; here I give it the benefit of the doubt). This is also the term under which **amalavijñāna* appears in the apocryphal 大佛頂如來密因修證了義諸菩薩萬行首楞嚴經, T945:19.123c14-16.

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Kuiji;²⁰⁵ by Zhanran (湛然, 711-782), perhaps following Kuiji;²⁰⁶ and once by Tunnyun, citing Kuiji.²⁰⁷ (2) In the *Vajrasamādhi sūtra* T273 alone (prior to the Song), **amalavijñāna* is referred to by the variant *anmoluooshi* 庵摩羅[識].²⁰⁸ (3) It is called *anmoluooshi* 庵摩羅[識] by Wōnhyo;²⁰⁹ in Amoghavajra’s (不空金剛, 705-774) T1177A;²¹⁰ by the anonymous (perhaps late eighth century) *Shi moheyan lun* T1668;²¹¹ by Amoghavajra’s disciple Huilin (慧琳, d. 820);²¹² and in a sub-commentary on T1668.²¹³ (4) The transcription *amoluooshi* 阿末羅[識] was used by Kuiji,²¹⁴ by Wōnch’uk (圓測, 613-696);²¹⁵ by Tunnyun, citing Kuiji;²¹⁶ by Taehyōn citing Kuiji;²¹⁷ and by Tankuang (曇曠, c. 700-788).²¹⁸ (5) **Amalavijñāna* is called *anmoluooshi* 菴末羅識 by Kuiji,²¹⁹ and, citing him, by Tunnyun.²²⁰ (6) The transcription *amoluooshi* 阿磨羅識 is used by Li Shizheng (李師政, d.u., fl. 627-649);²²¹ and by Tankuang.²²²

205 T1829:43.179a01-05.

206 T1912:46.221c02-12; the contents of Zhanran’s comment also support the suspicion that he was getting his information from Kuiji.

207 T1828:42.605b19-23.

208 T273:9.368c28-29 (twice); see n. 209, 211.

209 T1730:34.978a01-28 (several times including quotes from the root text), 980b10, 980c07, c10-11, 981a24, 981a26; note that these instances include quotes from the root text, in which Wōnhyo follows his own orthography rather than that of (our extant) VSS.

210 This text is the 大乘瑜伽金剛性海曼殊室利千臂千鉢大教王經: T1177a:20.757c14-15.

211 T1668:32.611c23-27; this text is also citing VSS, and it is perhaps significant that both Wōnhyo and T1668 have the same variant orthography; it is possible that 庵摩羅 crept into the VSS itself as a scribal variant sometime during its transmission, and that the original had 庵摩羅.

212 T2128:54.604c20.

213 X771:45.800c18-801a03. The byline ascribes this text to the Tang monk Famin 法敏 (579-640), but this is a chronological impossibility (see n. 482).

214 T1830:43.344c10 (Kuiji here notes that this is a variant, and in the same passage also gives 阿摩羅識); T1861:45.261b22 (this is the only transcription appearing in this passage). Kuiji ascribes the doctrine of *amalavijñāna* to the *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing* in the passage in T1861. See n. 431.

215 X369:21.247a01; Wōnch’uk cites the same *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing* that Kuiji is discussing when he also uses this transcription.

216 T1828:42.318a22, citing T1861:45.261b22.

217 X818:50.64c01-02, citing T1830:43.344c10.

218 T2810:85.1051b09-10.

219 T1829:43.179a04-05.

220 T1828:42.605b22-23.

221 T2124:54.195b11-23.

222 T2812:85.1075a19-23. Some of these transcription terms (阿末羅, 菴末羅) were also used for

Of course, orthography was sometimes a matter of some indifference. For example, when Wōnhyo quotes the *Vajrasamādhi sūtra* in his *Vajrasamādhi sūtra lun*, he uses a variant orthography from the one we find in the extant text of the VSS itself.²²³ However, the majority of sources *do* still use the standard Paramārthian transcription *amoluo* 阿摩羅. Where transcriptions in later authors depart from this standard, variant transcriptions are also retained by later authors who quote those authors in turn (e.g. Tunnyun or Taehyōn’s quoting Kuiji). Thus, it seems authors did stick with a given transcription, and departures from the usual transcription may indicate, for example, that an author had heard the term but not read it; or that his knowledge of it came from a source other than the texts of Paramārtha himself.

4.1.2 “Ninth consciousness/nine consciousnesses”

Perhaps the most significant variant term we encounter for **amalavijñāna* is “ninth consciousness” (*jiushi* 九識). Numerous later sources frequently say that Paramārtha expounded **amalavijñāna* as such a “ninth consciousness” over and above the “standard” eightfold model of consciousness of normative Yogācāra. However, Paramārtha’s extant texts never say that **amalavijñāna* is a “ninth consciousness”.²²⁴

4.1.2.1 Reference to **amalavijñāna* as “ninth consciousness”

The claim that **amalavijñāna* is a ninth consciousness is found as early as Zhiyi,²²⁵ Jingying Huiyuan (淨影慧遠, 523-592),²²⁶ Huijun,²²⁷ and Jizang (吉藏, 549-623);²²⁸ in the anonymous Dunhuang text *She dasheng lun zhang* 攝大乘論章 T2807;²²⁹ in the *She*

the *amalaka* (myrobalan) tree, fruit etc. P himself, by contrast, uses *amoluo* 阿摩羅 even for *amalaka*: e.g. T669:16.468b15, 469a23-24.

²²³ See n. 209.

²²⁴ We must be careful to distinguish cases where P uses the phrase *jiushi*, but to refer to the ninth of the eleven *vijñapti*, e.g. T1595:31.181c14-15. See p. 106, and n. 245, 79.

²²⁵ T1716:33.742b01-10, 744b22; T1783:39.4a12-13; T1778:38.686a06-11; X356:20.42b08-09.

²²⁶ T1843:44.176a08-13, 179a20-29, 179c13-17.

²²⁷ See below n. 272.

²²⁸ T1824:42.104c08-09.

²²⁹ T2807:85.1016c10-11. The date of the group of Dunhuang texts including T2807 is uncertain, but the best estimates of modern scholars, including ODA Akihiro, KATSUMATA Shunkyō, Shengkai and Ching KENG, tend to place each sometime between 590-640. For a recent summary of research on this subject see Shengkai, *Shelun xuepai yanjiu* 1, 47-59; see also, especially on T2805, the forthcoming Harvard PhD dissertation of Ching KENG. I am grateful to KENG for pointing me to this information (personal communication, September 2008).

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

dasheng yi zhang 攝大乘義章 T2809 (probably by Daoji),²³⁰ in other writings of Daoji,²³¹ in Zhiyan (智儼, 602-668),²³² in Li Tongxuan (李通玄, 635-730),²³³ in Kuiji,²³⁴ in the *Vajrasamādhi sūtra*,²³⁵ in Wōnhyo (based on the VSS),²³⁶ in Zhizhou (智周, 668-723),²³⁷ in Tankuang,²³⁸ and in Zhanran.²³⁹

4.1.2.2 A supposed special text on “ninth consciousness”

In addition to the reports of the authors just cited, there is a complicated body of further evidence that similar ideas may have been contained in a lost text attributed to Paramārtha, apparently primarily on this subject.²⁴⁰ The text in question is given a wide variety of titles containing the phrase “nine consciousnesses/ninth consciousness” (*jiushi* 九識).²⁴¹

230 T2809:85.1036b28. On Daoji’s probable authorship of this text, see n. 382.

231 See below §4.1.3.7.

232 T1869:45.522c24-25; T1870:45.543a20.

233 T1739:36.722b15; 722c22; 723a06-07; 723b09-11; 736a20-b03; 741b29-c01. Li Tongxuan is notable because, in discussing **amalavijñāna*, he never uses *any* transcription term (he rather calls it *adanavijñāna*!); his understanding of the doctrine is also highly peculiar; see n. 482.

234 T1829:43.179a05; T1830:43.239a11-19; T1861:45.282c24-25.

235 T273:9.370b22-c01; 371b14-16.

236 T1730:34.961b03-04; 961b20-22; 978a07-08; 989b07-11; 989b23-26; 994c22-27; 995a17-19; 1003b20-26. Some of these loci include quotes from the root text VSS.

237 T1833:43.819b16-17.

238 T2810:85.1050b21. It is uncertain that this passage really means **amalavijñāna* by *jiushi*, since Tankuang refers rather to the *Lankāvatāra sūtra*, but the doctrine sounds compatible with what was thought about **amalavijñāna* by Tankuang’s time: 『楞伽經』等、開阿賴耶染淨二位、說有九識。

239 T1717:33.942c23-24 (implicitly); T1912:46.221c02-12.

240 On this problem, see also YUKI 37-42.

241 In translating all the various versions of the title of this text in English, we necessarily confront the problem of whether it was supposed to be about a system of nine consciousnesses, or about a ninth consciousness specifically; in English, we cannot preserve the ambiguity of the Chinese. On the one hand, if we presume that the passages about **amalavijñāna* in the present JDZL were what was referred to as the “ninth consciousness section/chapter” of JDZL, then it is clear that those passages do not focus on expounding a ninefold system of consciousness, but rather, just on expounding **amalavijñāna* itself, so that we should translate “ninth consciousness”. On the other hand, if we suppose that an entirely separate text existed and was lost, it seems possible, from comments that are made about its supposed content by authors who refer to it, that it did expound a ninefold system of consciousnesses and not just the ninth consciousness alone, so that we should translate “nine consciousnesses”. In this paper, I have varied the translation as fits what seems the most likely interpretation of each

1) ZSL contains the phrase “as it says in chapter on the doctrine of ‘Nine Consciousnesses’ 如九識義品說”.²⁴² However, this is not conclusive proof that Paramārtha himself knew of such a text, let alone that he wrote one. ZSL apparently contains a sub-commentarial layer, perhaps by a later hand,²⁴³ and this comment may belong to that layer.²⁴⁴ Further, YŪKI Reimon has argued the possibility that this comment refers to a text like the *Xianshi lun* (XSL), which expounds not a ninefold system of “consciousnesses” (識, *vijñāna*) but the first nine out of eleven “categories” or “ideas” (識, *vijñapti*) (the *xianshi* = *khyātivijñāna* of XSL’s title).²⁴⁵ Further, the comment falls in the course of a discussion which is in fact on *alayavijñāna*, i.e. eighth consciousness.²⁴⁶ The ZSL comment may thus refer to a text entirely separate from the issue of **amalavijñāna* as “ninth consciousness”.

2) The preface to *Awakening of Faith* (AF) claims that a *Jiushi yi zhang* 九識義章 was translated by Paramārtha, and gives quite specific circumstances and dates.²⁴⁷ However, this is a preface to a text whose own attribution to Paramārtha is generally regarded as spurious; and the preface is also considered inauthentic.²⁴⁸

3) Bibliographic sources report that Paramārtha was the author of a text called the *Jiushi yiji* 九識義記. However, the first report of this text is in the often unreliable *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀, among a crop of texts dated to Paramārtha’s period of activity under the Liang dynasty, to which Fei Changfang (費長房, d.u., fl. under the Sui) attaches

passage; but I stress that all these translations are provisional.

²⁴² T1587:31.62a04.

²⁴³ See FUKAURA 1, 315 ff.

²⁴⁴ ZSL is not mentioned in the catalogues until the *Da Zhou kanding mulu*, composed under Empress Wu (r. 690-705). However, we can be certain that the text already existed (though not precisely by this name), and that it already contained this reference to a “chapter on the doctrine of nine consciousnesses”, from the fact that it is quoted by Daoji, writing at the latest in 637; see n. 375 below.

²⁴⁵ YŪKI, 41-42. See also n. 224 above. On the set of categories at issue here, see n. 79.

²⁴⁶ YŪKI 42.

²⁴⁷ T1666:32.575a28-b01.

²⁴⁸ See DEMIÉVILLE (1929) 11-15. CHEN Yinque, however, has pointed out that some historical details in this preface could only have been known by someone very close to the original context in which P and his group worked, so that we cannot dismiss all of its contents out of hand. Prof. FUNAYAMA has rightly stressed that we must take this into consideration in weighing the testimony of the preface about the *Jiushi yi zhang* (personal communication, October 2008).

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

a suspicious precision about dates and places of translation.²⁴⁹ The *Da Tang neidian lu* repeats this report verbatim;²⁵⁰ other Buddhist bibliographers through to Zhisheng (730) do not pick it up.²⁵¹

4) Gyōnen says that Daoji’s *Shelun zhang* is a commentary on the *Jiushi zhang* 九識章.²⁵² From context, it is clear that Gyōnen probably understands the *Jiushi zhang* to be the source of doctrines Daoji has just attributed to Paramārtha in a passage Gyōnen has quoted.²⁵³ Gyōnen seems to have had Daoji’s *Shelun zhang* before him as he wrote (he quotes it extensively). If Gyōnen has this information direct from Daoji, this is probably our strongest piece of evidence that a *Jiushi zhang* existed and was already attributed to Paramārtha in the Shelun school of Daoji’s time. However, Gyōnen does not say that the *Jiushi zhang* was in fact by Paramārtha, and it is possible that Daoji was reading a *Jiushi zhang* by another author (for instance, his teacher Jingsong; see below) which described Paramārtha’s doctrines at second hand. It is also possible that Gyōnen knows of a supposed erstwhile *Jiushi zhang* by Paramārtha, and has merely inferred that Daoji is commenting upon it.

5) Wōnhyo also refers to what seems most likely to be a similar text (a *zhang*), but without specifying its title.²⁵⁴

6) Wōnch’uk cites a *Jiushi zhang* 九識章,²⁵⁵ and even says specifically, in his commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana sūtra*, that the text was quoting a “Ninth Conscious-

249 T2034:49.99a12. YUKI also points out, following earlier scholars, that there is an inconsistency in Fei’s account: P was not where he is said to have translated the text in the year he is supposed to have translated it; YUKI 38.

250 T2149:55.266b06. YUKI points out that neither Fei nor Jingmai ever actually saw the text, 38.

251 On the *Jiushi yiji*, see also SU (1937): 28. I am grateful to Prof. FUNAYAMA Tōru for pointing out this reference to me.

252 已上彼章第一、彼章九識章釋、互三卷, DBZ 12, 364b.

253 真諦三藏不引經論 etc., DBZ 12, 364a-b.

254 真諦三藏九識之義、依是文起。如彼章說, T1730:34.978a07-08. However, at the same locus, Wōnhyo also asserts point blank that P expounded his theory on the basis of the VSS passage under discussion, which is chronologically impossible, so we must take what he says with a grain of salt.

255 T1708:33.400b26-29; X369:21.240c06-07, 271b11-12. Ūich’ōn (義天, 1055-1101) reports that a text of this title was included in the canon, but perhaps he was just relying on Wōnch’uk and other reports? T2184:55.1177c06.

ness' Chapter" of JDZL.²⁵⁶ This is the first time we see the claim that JDZL contains such a special chapter, here found *in tandem with* the notion of a freestanding text on the same topic. The most impressive thing about Wōnch'uk's evidence is that he cites the *Jiushi zhang* as a source for ideas that are not directly connected to the doctrine of **amalavijñāna* or ninth consciousness.²⁵⁷ Here, it is difficult to imagine any motivation for Wōnch'uk (or any intermediate source, if the citation is indirect²⁵⁸) to ascribe the passage to the *Jiushi zhang*, except that such a text indeed existed and contained it.²⁵⁹ This evidence cannot reassure us that the *Jiushi zhang* these scholars cite was correctly ascribed to Paramārtha, but it strongly suggests that some text of that name certainly did exist.

7) In a Vinaya text by Dajue 大覺 (712),²⁶⁰ we also see the claim that JDZL contains a "Ninth Consciousness Chapter" 九識品, referring to **amalavijñāna*.²⁶¹

8) Tunnyun reports that according to Huijing 惠景, Paramārtha "established the doctrine of nine consciousnesses 九識義 on the basis of a citation from the 'Ninth Consciousness Chapter' 九識品 of JDZL." Tunnyun is sceptical, and notes that there "never was" any such chapter in the corresponding part of YBh.²⁶² Tunnyun notably tells us explicitly that he only has this information by hearsay.

9) Tankuang reports that the theory of ninth consciousness is found in "the 'Treatise on Nine Consciousnesses' (*Jiushi lun* 九識論), translated by Paramārtha".²⁶³

²⁵⁶ 具如『九識章』引『決定藏論』『九識品』中說; once more at X369:21.240c06-07.

²⁵⁷ 真諦三藏『九識章』云、「問：『大本』云、「緣覺十千劫到」、到何位、是何宗？答：此是客、宗意除三界或(惑?)、迴心學大乘、入十信、信法如如。」准知真諦亦說十信為所到處, X369:21.271b11-14.

²⁵⁸ YOKI does not believe Wōnch'uk ever saw the text; 39.

²⁵⁹ The same is true of a much later reference in Chinkai (珍海, 1092-1152). 真諦三藏『九識章』云、「天親造論百部」云云, T2299:70.228c, cited in ŌTAKE 2007 (b).

²⁶⁰ On the date of this text, see n. 457.

²⁶¹ 『決定藏論』有『九識品』、第九名「阿摩羅識」, X736:42.876b19-20.

²⁶² Tunnyun also goes on to express scepticism about the claim that the notion of **amalavijñāna* really derives from WXL, on the grounds that corresponding parts of XYSJL do not feature the concept; T1828:42.318a11-15.

²⁶³ T2812:85.1075a19-23. Note that Tankuang may well, like Tunnyun, have been getting his information via Kuiji; he too was trained in the Faxiang school.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñana* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

10) In a statement either paraphrasing Dajue or quoting a third common source, Chengguan 澄觀 (738-839) also refers to a “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” of JDZL 決定藏論九識品.²⁶⁴

11) A *Jiushi lun* 九識論 in two *juan* is attributed to Paramārtha in a catalogue of manuscripts from Japan dating to 753.²⁶⁵ However, the entry in question is included in a list of manuscripts “yet to be copied” (*misha* 未写), so there is no guarantee that the compiler of the catalogue actually sighted the text in question.

We should also note the ambiguous case of Huijun, who refers at one point to doctrines expounded in MSg and a “*jiushi yi*” 九□²⁶⁶ 義并『攝論』. *Jiushi yi* here could simply mean “[in expounding] the tenet of ninth consciousness”, but given that later reports held that Paramārtha wrote a text entitled the *Jiushi yiji* 九識義章 etc. (AF preface, Fei Changfang), we must also recognise the possibility that this is an abbreviated reference to the title of a text.²⁶⁷

Against these sources, we must weigh another set of references, which sometimes purports to trace the idea of “ninth consciousness” or “nine consciousnesses” to similar source texts, but *without* referring to a special text or chapter with “ninth consciousness/nine consciousnesses” in the title. Such authors are largely early.

1) Huijun (conceivably our earliest witness²⁶⁸) says:

²⁶⁴ T1736:36.323c10, 336b20.

²⁶⁵ 『九識論』二卷, *Misha kyōritsuron shū mokuroku* 未寫經律論集目錄 (Shōsōin bunsho 正倉院文書), *Dai Nippon komonjo jāni (tsuika roku)* 大日本古文書十二(追加六), 553; cited in YOSHIMURA (unpublished 2007b), 3, on the basis of ŌTAKE 2007 (b).

²⁶⁶ The context makes it clear here that the illegible character must be *shi* 識.

²⁶⁷ However, elsewhere, Huijun also ascribes the doctrine of ninth consciousness rather to the *Shiqi jing* (see p. 109 below). Huijun also immediately cites a verse that appears in MSg (see n. 335), so that either this verse should have appeared in the putative *Jiushi yi* as well, or the phrase merely means “in his [teachings on the] tenet of the ninth consciousness and the *Mahāyanasamgraha*”. Matters are further complicated by the fact that in the series of three quotations that follow (the second and third introduced by 又云), there is material that is not found in the present MSg or MSgBh, including a phrase that *can*, rather, be traced to FXL and SBKL, i.e. 非淨非不淨 X784:46.645c06; see n. 334. This may indeed indicate that material included in these apparent quotes not found in MSg and Bh was found in a separate text, available to Huijun, called the *Jiushi yi*.

²⁶⁸ See n. 330.

“What is the practice in seventeen stages? It is as laid out in the *Sūtra of Seventeen [Stages]* 十七經,²⁶⁹ which is cited by the Trepitaka Paramārtha to prove the tenet that there is a ninth consciousness 有九矧. His treatise 彼論²⁷⁰ says, “nine kinds of mind 九品心”, and thus there exists a ninth consciousness 有第九矧. However, that *sūtra* [i.e. *Shiqi jing*] has not been translated here [in China 此間²⁷¹], and [Paramārtha’s claim] is thus difficult to believe.”²⁷²

It is key that Huijun does not say the “*Shiqi jing*” contained a *chapter* 品 specially on “ninth consciousness” (i.e. a *Jiushi pin* 九識品). Rather, he says that the text speaks of *jiu pin xin* 九品心, most naturally read “nine kinds/categories of mind”. This claim fits better with our extant JDZL (if we grant the identification between **amalavijñāna* and “ninth consciousness”) than any claim that any partial YBh translation by Paramārtha contained an entire special section devoted to “ninth consciousness”. This is also the earliest reference in our extant record to the exposition of ninefold mind in JDZL. We might thus suspect that the idea of a “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” arose later by a reversal of Huijun’s word order (九品心 → 九心品), combined with the idea that Paramārtha wrote a special text on this topic.

2) The anonymous Shelun School Dunhuang text, *She dasheng lun shu* 攝大乘論疏 T2805,²⁷³ mentions a passage in which JDZL “expounds ninth consciousness”²⁷⁴ 『決定藏

²⁶⁹ Certainly, given the context, to be identified with what the tradition has more usually called the *Shiqi di lun*, for which see n. 168.

²⁷⁰ This might also refer to the *Shiqi di lun*, even though it was referred to as a *jing* 經 in the previous sentence. However, given that the text is here discussing P’s citation of the so-called *Shiqi di lun* to prove the existence of ninth consciousness, it is more likely that it refers to a *lun* by P in which he gives the citation. That the two sources are separate in Huijun’s mind is made still more likely by the fact that Huijun reverts to calling the *Shiqi jing* a *jing* in the sentence immediately following.

²⁷¹ CH’OE argues, at least for some instances, that *cijian* and similar expressions refer to Paekche, where he holds the *Si lun xuan yi* was composed, in opposition to Wu 吳 and Lu 魯 as appellations for parts of China; see e.g. 18-23. However, CH’OE’s theory seems to me to still be speculative; and it would be odd, in this instance, for Huijun to have the expectation that any text would be translated “here” if “here” means in Paekche.

²⁷² 問十七地行者。答：真諦三藏師、如牽『十七經』證有九詞義。彼論云、「九品心」、故有第九詞。而此間不出此經、故難信, X784:46.569b24-c02. The text then goes on to enumerate the seventeen stages.

²⁷³ Ching KENG dates T2805 between 590 and 600; see his forthcoming Harvard PhD dissertation.

²⁷⁴ See n. 241 on this translation.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

論』釋九識中。²⁷⁵ This passage is of particular interest because T2805 is here *not* itself expounding **amalavijñāna* or “ninth consciousness”, so this characterisation of the text is clearly not motivated by T2805’s doctrinal agenda. The quote following this introduction is not a verbatim citation, but perhaps rather a paraphrase.²⁷⁶ However, the author clearly knew Paramārtha’s text.²⁷⁷ The cited passage falls just before JDZL<1>.²⁷⁸

This passage, comments by Huijun, comments in T2807,²⁷⁹ and comments by Daoji (who cites parts of XWL)²⁸⁰ are the only instances where a later reference to “ninth consciousness” can clearly be shown to have in mind an extant Paramārtha text. T2805 is also the earliest text to say that “ninth consciousness” derives from JDZL, and the only text that actually recognisably cites JDZL in the process. T2805 also shows no special interest in “ninth consciousness” or **amalavijñāna*, but rather merely mentions it here, in passing. It is thus early, accurate, and has no special interest in presenting any version of “ninth consciousness” doctrine. If T2805 also does not say that JDZL contains a special “chapter” on “ninth consciousness”, we may be glimpsing another intermediate stage in the elaboration of a legend of a special chapter on ninth consciousness in JDZL.

3) Another anonymous Shelun School Dunhuang text, the *She dasheng lun zhang* 攝大乘論章 T2807, says “it is said abroad” 外國傳云 that the “Bodhisattva Chapter’ of the ‘Treatise on Seventeen Stages’²⁸¹ [*Shiqi di lun* 十七地論菩薩品] goes into detail to distin-

²⁷⁵ T2805:85.985b19.

²⁷⁶ Referring to JDZL T1584:30.1019b16-19. ŌTAKE 2007(b) points out that there are places in which this version of the text of JDZL is closer to the text of YBh as reflected in XZ and Tib. than the extant JDZL. He suggests that this may indicate that the author of T2805 is citing from the so-called *Jiushi yi* (which he takes to have been a separate text), in which P, rather than citing his own earlier translation of JDZL verbatim, retranslated from the original Sanskrit. One difficulty this inference must confront is the question of why T2805 calls this text “*Jueding zang lun*”, if it was citing a different text to our extant JDZL.

²⁷⁷ Other than via P, we know of no other way that an author in China at the time of T2805 could know the content of this part of YBh.

²⁷⁸ JDZL<1> begins a full Taishō page later, T1584:30.1020b08. Note too that JDZL itself says, at the end of JDZL<1>, that the whole section has been about “the realisation of the **amalavijñāna*”; see n. 48. That the citation falls outside our JDZL passages suggests that the author of T2805 considered a larger portion of JDZL to be centrally engaged in “expounding ninth consciousness” than only the passages that actually mention **amalavijñāna*.

²⁷⁹ See §4.1.3.5 below.

²⁸⁰ See §4.1.3.7 below.

²⁸¹ Does this statement in T2807 mean that the author had heard of some foreign text or authority

guish an **amalavijñāna*, and counts it as a ninth consciousness 廣辨阿摩羅識以為九識。²⁸² Now, *Shiqi di lun* is the title of a lost partial translation of YBh by Paramārtha, and the present JDZL may be a remnant of it.²⁸³ The present JDZL does not contain a “Bodhisattva Chapter”,²⁸⁴ but the passage that concentrates most on **amalavijñāna*, JDZL<1>, does open with an indication that it is discussing the entry of the *bodhisattvas* into the “stage of non-regression” (不退地, *avaivartikabhūmi*). Thus, the title “Bodhisattva Chapter” may be no less appropriate than “Ninth Consciousness Chapter”.²⁸⁵

T2807 thus traces **amalavijñāna* to the exposition in JDZL, but refers to it by *another* alternate chapter name, also unattested in our extant text. This suggests that: (1) reference to texts by title was loose; (2) the tradition that JDZL contained a “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” was either not yet established, or at least not yet universal.

4) The wording of Huijun’s report ((1) above) is echoed by Daoji 道基. Daoji says that Paramārtha cited the “definitive exposition (? 決定說) of nine kinds of mind 九品心 in the *Shiqi di lun*” to prove a theory of ninth consciousness/nine consciousnesses.²⁸⁶ However, Daoji does not seem to have very concrete information about his sources. He claims, for example, that Paramārtha quotes LAS in expounding his theory, which is not supported by any extant evidence.²⁸⁷ Further, Daoji shows himself wary of the *Shiqi di*

who said that *Shiqi di lun* corroborated the doctrine of **amalavijñāna* found in JDZL? Or does it simply indicate that the author presumed it was a “foreign tradition 外國傳” because the text is presented as a translation? Does the use of the title *Shiqi di lun* mean that the author had actually seen a text circulating under that title that expounded **amalavijñāna* — and as a ninth consciousness, to boot — or that he was just attempting to put two and two together from various pieces of hearsay?

282 T2807:85.1016c21-23.

283 See n. 168.

284 The **amalavijñāna* passages appear in a chapter entitled “The Stage/Ground of the Mind” 心地品.

285 諸菩薩入不退地 T1584:30.1020b05

286 又引『十七地論』決定說九品心、以為證驗, DBZ 22, 370a, 370b, 388b.

287 如真諦三藏、引『楞伽經』「八九種種心」... DBZ 22, 370a, 370b, 388b. ŌTAKE Susumu points out that the wording of this quotation matches no Chinese translation of LAS, and suggests that this is because the quote genuinely dates back to P, who translated himself and directly from his knowledge of Skt. LAS; he regards this as supporting evidence for the likelihood that a special text on ninth consciousness by P really did exist (ŌTAKE 2007d). However, given the confusion that Daoji seems to evince in this very same passage about his other source, the *Shiqi di lun* (in which case he is possibly referring to or “citing” a text he himself never even saw, and thus basing himself on hearsay), it does not seem that we have strong grounds for confi-

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

lun. He rejects it as a proof-text on the grounds that “has never circulated in this country [i.e. China] 此國未行”.²⁸⁸ Daoji himself thus never saw the *Shiqi di lun*, and any information he gives us about it is based on hearsay.²⁸⁹

Once again, Daoji does *not* say that the *Shiqi di lun* contained a special section whose title had anything to do with “ninth consciousness”. Daoji was a Shelun scholar in a direct line from Paramārtha himself. His teacher, Jingsong (one remove from Paramārtha), may have written a text entitled *Jiushi yi zhang* (see below), which we would expect his disciple Daoji to have known. If even Daoji does not say that Paramārtha’s *Shiqi di lun* (or JDZL) contained a special chapter on “ninth consciousness”, and if he nonetheless refers to *Shiqi di lun* (and LAS!) for his textual support, rather than a dedicated text by Paramārtha on ninth consciousness, then it seems unlikely such a text existed by the 630s.

In addition, Daoxuan (道宣, 596-667) reports that two other texts with similar titles were written by important Shelun figures. (1) Tanqian 曇遷 (542-607) is supposed to have written a *Jiushi zhang* 九識章.²⁹⁰ Tanqian was extremely influential in spreading Shelun School thought to the North, and a prominent figure under the Sui.²⁹¹ (2) Jingsong (靖嵩, 537-614) is supposed to have written a *Jiushi xuan yi* 九識玄義.²⁹² Jingsong was a disciple of Fatai 法泰 and so a “dharma grandson” of Paramārtha himself; he was also, like Tanqian, an important figure in the transfer of the Shelun school to the North.²⁹³ Jingsong was also pivotal because he was the master of Daoji, an important Shelun-school witness to later **amalavijñāna* doctrine (see below). It is thus not impos-

dence that Daoji certainly quoted word-for-word from texts on paper, rather than roughly, from memory or hearsay. The slight difference in wording here might therefore only be evidence that Daoji’s “quotation” is actually simply a “near-enough” paraphrase.

²⁸⁸ DBZ 12, 370b; in fact, as we will see below, Daoji goes to some lengths to find alternative proof-texts for the notion of ninth consciousness, precisely because he is so suspicious of the *Shiqi di lun*.

²⁸⁹ This ignorance about the text is mirrored by the fact that details of Daoji’s reference to the text also seem confused; his mention of 決定說 is perhaps a vague echo of the title of *Jueding zang lun*, and it is possible that he knows that these two titles have something to do with one another, but is not sure what.

²⁹⁰ *Xu gaoseng zhuan* 續高僧傳, T2060:50.574b04. It is important to remember, in assessing this report, that Daoxuan’s information is never repeated in any other source.

²⁹¹ See CHEN Jinhua.

²⁹² *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T2060:50.502a02.

²⁹³ See n. 366.

sible that one of these texts became associated in the tradition with Paramārtha, leading to the reports we have seen above of a similar text in Paramārtha's name.²⁹⁴

Finally, we should also consider that the earliest mention of a ninth consciousness, or nine consciousnesses, is found not in Paramārtha or his successors, but in the *Laṃkāvatāra sūtra* (LAS), as early as the translation of Bodhiruci.²⁹⁵ The verse in question reads: "The various consciousnesses, eight or nine in kind/ Are like waves on water."²⁹⁶ This passage, or its doctrine, was frequently referred to as later scholastics discussed the concept of **amalavijñāna* and ninth consciousness: for example, by Jingying Huiyuan,²⁹⁷ T2807,²⁹⁸ Li Tongxuan,²⁹⁹ Kuiji,³⁰⁰ Tunnyun,³⁰¹ and Tankuang.³⁰² This shows that later authors were interested in using LAS to furnish a scriptural warrant for **amalavijñāna*; or using the notion of **amalavijñāna* to interpret this cryptic passage in LAS; or using LAS to account for the errors perceived as inhering in the notion of **amalavijñāna*; etc. Whatever tack the various later scholars took, these passages suggest that LAS is one possible alternative source of the enumeration of **amalavijñāna* as a ninth consciousness.

Surveying this tangled body of evidence, we can discern several main points.

First, there seems to be considerable confusion about the title of the text(s) ascribed to Paramārtha (九識義品, 十七地論菩薩品, 九識義章, 九識品, 九識義記, 九識章, 九識品, 決定藏論有九識品, 九識論), which we find alongside a number of other locu-

²⁹⁴ In this connection, YOSHIMURA points out that Tanqian is said in his biography to have read AF before he encountered MSg. Thus, if later characterisations of "ninth consciousness" (e.g. Wōnch'uk) present it as if through an AF filter, and at the same time cite a *Jiushi zhang* as the source of the doctrine, this would be consistent with Tanqian being the actual author of the *Jiushi zhang* in question; YOSHIMURA (2007a), 181.

²⁹⁵ Yuki, in particular, has seen great significance in this connection with LAS; see n. 307.

²⁹⁶ 八九種種識 / 如水中諸波; T671:16.565b24. Skt. *aṣṭadhā navadhā citram tarangāṇi mahodadhau/* 10.13cd, NANJIO 265; "The Vijñāna[-system] rises; severally as eightfold, as ninefold, like waves on the great ocean;" SUZUKI (1999), 227. The entire surrounding section is missing from the earlier Guṇabhadra translation of the text.

²⁹⁷ T1851:44.530c04-26.

²⁹⁸ T2807:85.1016c08-1017a09.

²⁹⁹ T1739:36.723a06-16.

³⁰⁰ T1830:43.239a11-19, 344c09-13; T1861:45.261b13-23.

³⁰¹ T1828:42.318a11-27.

³⁰² T2812:85.1075a19-23.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

tions which may or may not even refer to a freestanding text (九品心, 九識義, 釋九識中). We also see much confusion about whether it this was a freestanding text or a chapter in a larger text (usually specified as in JDZL), or (perhaps) both. This confusion does not inspire confidence that many authors had actually seen such a text.

There is a clear association in some quarters between this supposed text and JDZL (or *Shiqi di lun*). If “ninth consciousness” refers to **amalavijñāna*, this association is partly justified; however, extant JDZL **amalavijñāna* doctrine does *not* call it a “ninth consciousness”. Further, as we will see, the actual ideas about **amalavijñāna* that *are* expounded in JDZL almost never appear again in the record.

We can further sort the above materials into three main groups:

(1) the idea that JDZL or *Shiqi di lun* expounded the *idea* of ninth consciousness, without any claim about a section with a related title: Huijun, T2805 and T2807, and Daoji.

(2) the idea that there existed a separate text on the same topic: beginning (possibly) with ZSL, or Fei Changfang and the AF preface; the root-text of Daoji’s *Shelun zhang* (only as reported by the much later Gyōnen); the *Da Tang neidian lu*; the Faxiang authors Wōnch’uk and Tankuang; possibly Wōnhyo; and the Japanese catalogue of 735. In Wōnch’uk we find the unusual hybrid assertion that such a freestanding text (*Jiushi zhang*) cited a special chapter of JDZL.

(3) The idea that JDZL contained a text with a title to do with ninth consciousness, expounding the same.³⁰³ This idea is first seen in Wōnch’uk, then in Dajue, Tunnyun and Chengguan. In Wōnch’uk, moreover, we find the unusual hybrid idea that this chapter was the source for a separate text called the *Jiushi zhang*.

Thus, the broad pattern seems to be as follows. Our earliest evidence contains two conflicting accounts. In the first century after Paramārtha, one line of evidence holds that the doctrine of ninth consciousness is grounded in JDZL (among other texts; WXL, MSgBh etc. are also cited). This line of evidence is found in our best informed, most scrupulous early sources: Huijun and texts closely associated with the Shelun school, which go into detail about doctrines and accurately cite Paramārtha’s real texts. Along-

³⁰³ See also YOSHIMURA (2007a), 180-182.

side this, we have texts which, especially in the early period, only touch very fleetingly on the whole problem, and never show themselves to be well informed about the concrete contents of Paramārtha's texts. These texts hold that the doctrine of ninth consciousness is found in a separate text by Paramārtha containing the term "ninth consciousness/nine consciousnesses" in the title, but cannot agree on what that title is. At the same time, we also have accounts that inform us that two important Shelun School authors in the late sixth century, Tanqian and Jingsong, wrote texts with "ninth consciousness/nine consciousnesses" in the title. There is thus a possibility that the freestanding text of that title ascribed to Paramārtha might, like AF, have been incorrectly attributed to him, and actually authored by someone else.³⁰⁴

When we arrive at the Faxiang authors, the characterisation of the textual basis for the theory of ninth consciousness changes. Wōnch'uk seems to be pivotal. In him, we see an assertion, never repeated, that there exists a freestanding text, *and* that it cites a section of JDZL also named for the doctrine of ninth consciousness. Perhaps Wōnch'uk was attempting to reconcile the two contradictory traditions that had preceded him, i.e. that there was a text with *jiushi* in the title, and that the doctrine was expounded primarily in JDZL.³⁰⁵ After Wōnch'uk, all authors but one take to saying that ninth consciousness doctrine is expounded in a chapter of JDZL named for that doctrine. The idea that there existed a separate text only recurs in catalogues and in Tankuang.

While we cannot be sure, it thus seems likely that neither JDZL nor *Shiqi di lun* ever contained a section with the term "ninth consciousness" in the title. The idea that such a text existed seems rather to emerge over a century after Paramārtha's death, as an attempt to reconcile conflicting traditions, and then to be repeated in a way that shows the extent of the authority of Wōnch'uk (which he shared with Kuiji; see below).

It is even more difficult to know whether or not Paramārtha did indeed compose a freestanding text with *jiushi* in the title. On the one hand, the texts that do say Paramārtha wrote such a text are less clearly reliable. On the other hand, the portion of Fei Changfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* about Paramārtha's translations may have been based on a list drawn up by Cao Bi; CHEN Yinquē has shown that the apocryphal AF preface still contains considerable accurate historical information; and Wōnch'uk and Chinkai cite the *jiushi zhang* on topics *other* than ninth consciousness. These facts and others

³⁰⁴ YOSHIMURA argues this was the case; YOSHIMURA (2007a), 181.

³⁰⁵ YUKI suggests this possibility; 40.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

discussed above seem to me to suggest that at least one text with a title like *Jiushi zhang* certainly existed, and that it was almost certainly ascribed to Paramārtha as early as 590. However, perhaps that attribution, and indeed the text itself, was not widely known for quite some time beyond that (otherwise why would Daoji not cite it?). Beyond this, however, it seems to me impossible to exclude either of two mutually contradictory possibilities: (a) the text was by Paramārtha, or (b) that it was by another author, and the attribution was apocryphal.

4.1.2.3 Did Paramārtha propound a ninth consciousness?

The idea that there are nine consciousnesses, and the identification of **amalavijñāna* with the ninth consciousness, was certainly current and well-known in the scholastic Buddhism of North China from the early Sui (by the late 580s or 590).³⁰⁶ All our most reliable witnesses for this early period relay to us this idea. We have no evidence that is closer to Paramārtha and his circle than these witnesses, that might give us grounds to doubt this testimony. We must recognise the possibility that these ideas were genuinely propounded by members of the group (including perhaps Paramārtha himself), but were lost from the extant record of their texts.

On the other hand, these ideas *are* absent from the extant Paramārtha corpus. Further, as we will see, even our earliest witnesses were not very well-informed about Paramārtha’s actual doctrines of **amalavijñāna*; many of the aspects of the doctrine we have seen above are entirely absent from their accounts, and each of them appears ignorant of the bare existence of at least some key texts, let alone their contents. We have also seen that the notion of nine kinds of consciousnesses could have been derived from LAS, and **amalavijñāna* labelled a ninth consciousness in order to make sense of the LAS passage and furnish the Shelun school theory of mind with more textual support.³⁰⁷ It is also possible, then, that a nine-consciousness model grew up in the early Shelun school, to reconcile earlier convictions that the ground of mind was pure Thusness with the idea that *alayavijñāna* was the repository of all defiled seeds.³⁰⁸ Given that our present evidence gives us no firm testimony of the existence of the idea of ninth con-

³⁰⁶ Indeed, YOSHIMURA makes the valid point that if Jingying Huiyuan, who himself espoused an eight-consciousness theory, nonetheless felt obliged to make room for a ninth consciousness theory and **amalavijñāna* understood as such, it is a sign that this position was already strong in his time; YOSHIMURA (2002), 229.

³⁰⁷ YUKI in particular argues that P did not expound nine consciousnesses, but that the doctrine developed under the influence of the LAS; see esp. YUKI 21-44.

³⁰⁸ Something like this is the conclusion argued by YOSHIMURA (2002); see esp. 240, 241 n. 28.

sciousness until perhaps as late as 590, we cannot exclude the possibility that the doctrine of ninth consciousness/nine consciousnesses was an early post-Paramārtha development, which was then ascribed to him as founder of the Shelun school.

It therefore seems impossible to determine for sure whether or not Paramārtha or his group expounded ninth consciousness, or nine consciousnesses.

4.1.3 Later reports of concrete contents of the doctrine of **amalavijñāna*

In tracing the later development of **amalavijñāna* doctrine, we must treat the reports of several individuals separately, since there is relatively little agreement between them.³⁰⁹ This lack of consensus alone suggests that there was a lot of creative interpretation mixed in with these reports.

4.1.3.1 Jingying Huiyuan

Jingying Huiyuan (淨影慧遠, 523-592)³¹⁰ places **amalavijñāna* under a broader rubric of “true” 真 consciousness, which is twofold, including also *alayavijñāna*. He says that *amala* means “taintless” in Chinese 此云無垢, and also “originally pure” 本淨. He says further that it is referred to as “taintless” in the sense that the substance 體 of what is true (or Thusness) is permanent and pure 真體常淨故曰無垢. He equates it with the “Thusness aspect of mind” 心真如門, a term clearly derived from AF;³¹¹ he quotes AF as a proof-text in the next line, so connecting **amalavijñāna* to *tathagatagarbha*.³¹² Elsewhere, Huiyuan again associates “ninth consciousness” with the “Thusness aspect of mind” 心真如相, and *alayavijñāna* with “the aspect of mind [that is subject to] arising, cessation and conditions” 心生滅因緣相. The ninth consciousness is the “substance of all *dharmas*” 諸法體. Both **amalavijñāna* and *alayavijñāna* are part of the same mind, but the difference is that ninth consciousness is the state in which language is cut off and conditionality is transcended, whereas eighth consciousness is the state in which [mind] conforms to the metamorphoses brought about by conditions.³¹³

³⁰⁹ The most thorough discussions of later witnesses, to my knowledge, are YOKI and YOSHIMURA (2002) (2007a).

³¹⁰ We have already seen that Jingying Huiyuan refers to **amalavijñāna* as a “ninth consciousness”. To my knowledge, the only transcription of the term found in his works is the standard *amoluoshi* 阿摩羅識.

³¹¹ T1666:32.576a06.

³¹² T1851:44.530b06-11.

³¹³ 於一心中絕言離緣、為第九識。隨緣變轉、是第八識, T1843:44.179a20-29. See also T1843:44.179c13-17.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Already, the concept of **amalavijñāna* is clearly being interpreted in part through the lens of AF. As a result, the relationship posited here between **amalavijñāna* and *ālayavijñāna* differs from that found in Paramārtha’s works. Paramārtha understood **amalavijñāna* to be the counteragent to *ālayavijñāna*, and the two to be in a temporal relationship to one another, whereby *ālayavijñāna* existed only until liberation, and was then succeeded by fully realised **amalavijñāna*.³¹⁴ For Huiyuan’s post-AF analysis, by contrast, the two are different facets of the same “true” consciousness, **amalavijñāna* in its pure, eternal, self-contained and transcendent purity, and *ālayavijñāna* as it is engaged with and even immanent in *samsāra*.³¹⁵

Huiyuan also links **amalavijñāna* as “ninth consciousness” to the LAS passage mentioned above.³¹⁶ Here again, he says that within the rubric of a ninefold analysis of consciousness, there are two possible analyses, depending upon whether one understands “true” and “false” 真妄 as (1) distinct 分別 or (2) as dialectically “analysed and then synthesised” 離合. (1) In the former perspective, the “true” aspect is twofold, and comprises **amalavijñāna* on the one hand and *ālayavijñāna* on the other. (2) On the latter analysis, only “the fundamentally pure **amalavijñāna*” 本淨阿摩羅識 is “true”, and *ālayavijñāna* is included among eight consciousnesses that are an “amalgam of true and false” 真妄和合.³¹⁷ This approach is again redolent of AF. However, these are only two among a longer list of various modes of analysis consciousness admits of, which also include tenfold and elevenfold analyses.

It seems, then, that Huiyuan is wielding the concept of **amalavijñāna* and related concepts in the pursuit of his own hermeneutic projects,³¹⁸ and is not simply concerned with giving us accurate doxographic reports of Paramārtha’s own doctrine. Huiyuan also shows little sign of direct acquaintance with Paramārtha’s own pertinent texts.³¹⁹

³¹⁴ As we saw, this relationship is complicated by the fact that P also, in some passages, considers that **amalavijñāna* pre-exists liberation in some form, e.g. as the basis for the path, etc.

³¹⁵ 阿梨耶識... 隨妄流轉、體無失壞... 與生滅合, T1851:44.530b09-11.

³¹⁶ See n. 296.

³¹⁷ T1851:44.530c08-16.

³¹⁸ On this same point, see YOKI 29, YOSHIMURA (2002), 226-227.

³¹⁹ See also YOSHIMURA (2007a), 179.

4.1.3.2 Zhiyi

The bulk of Zhiyi's (智顓, 538-597)³²⁰ discussion of **amalavijñāna*³²¹ is found in his *Fahua xuanyi* 法華玄義, most likely dating to around 593.³²² Zhiyi maps the different levels of consciousness, in which he includes **amalavijñāna*, onto his unique doctrine of “three *dharma*s” 三法 or “three rules” 三軌: **amalavijñāna* is the “rule of Thusness [itself]” 真性軌; *alayavijñāna* corresponds to the “rule of contemplation of Thusness” 觀照軌; and *adānavijñāna* 阿陀那識 corresponds to “the rule of extending this understanding to the workings of Thusness” 資成軌.³²³ Zhiyi also says explicitly that the difference between **amalavijñāna* and *alayavijñāna* is just that **amalavijñāna* is *alayavijñāna* in which the seeds of wisdom exist and in which the “perfumation (*vāsanā*) of hearing” has grown, so that it undergoes a “revolutionary transformation of the basis” (*āśrayaparavṛtti*) and is transformed into “Thusness after the path” (道後真如).³²⁴ He identifies **amalavijñāna* with something he rather idiosyncratically calls “the light of *nirvikalpakajñāna*” 無分別智光.³²⁵ Elsewhere, Zhiyi also says that **amalavijñāna* is the “consciousness” of a Buddha, whereas *alayavijñāna* is the consciousness of the *bodhisattva*, and *adānavijñāna*, which he calls the “seventh” consciousness and identifies with **prativikalpavijñāna* 分別識, is proper to the two lesser vehicles.³²⁶

As this brief overview shows,³²⁷ much of what Zhiyi has to say about **amalavijñāna*

³²⁰ We have already seen above that Zhiyi uses the otherwise unusual transcription 菴摩羅[識] for **amalavijñāna*, and also understands it as a “ninth consciousness”.

³²¹ On Zhiyi's understanding of “ninth consciousness”, see YOSHIMURA (forthcoming).

³²² 妙法蓮華經玄義, T1716. Lectures upon which this text is based are traditionally said to have been given in 593 during Zhiyi's stay in Jingzhou 荊州; however, doubts remain about the exact date and place of these lectures, and it is possible they took place slightly later. See SATO, 58-59. Moreover, because many of Zhiyi's texts were revised in light of other information (e.g. the work of Jizang) by Zhiyi's disciple Guanding 灌頂 (561-632), it is difficult to be sure which details in those texts date back to Zhiyi himself.

³²³ T1716:33.744b18-20. The doctrine of the “three *dharma*s/rules” as a whole is expounded from T1716:33.741b07.

³²⁴ 若阿黎耶中、有智慧種子、聞熏習增長、即轉依成道後真如、名為「淨識」, T1716:33.744b28-29.

³²⁵ T1716:33.744c08.

³²⁶ T1783:39.4a12-13. SATO concludes that it is impossible to be sure if the present 金光明經玄義 is genuinely by Zhiyi, or if so, when the lectures upon which it is based might have been given. Zhiyi is thought to have preached on the *Suvarṇaprabhā* around 581, but Guanding could not have heard these teachings; SATO 452-453. He is also thought to have preached on (part of) it between 588 and 592, but the circumstances make it unlikely that these sermons were the basis of the extant commentarial texts; SATO 454-455.

³²⁷ Further comments about **amalavijñāna* are found in two other works ascribed to Zhiyi in the

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

is unique to him, and looks like the result of creative attempts to coordinate what he knows of **amalavijñāna* from other sources with other doctrines and his own original system.³²⁸

4.1.3.3 Huijun/Hyegyun

Important evidence about the image of Paramārtha's doctrine in late sixth-century China is preserved in Huijun's (慧均, d.u., fl. 574-590s?)³²⁹ *Si lun xuan yi* 四論玄義 X784. It is difficult to know exactly when Huijun was writing,³³⁰ but the Shelun school already

canon, but it is difficult to be sure of their authenticity and date. Even if these two texts are not actually by Zhiyi, however, we should not automatically exclude their evidence. They may both nonetheless contain information as early as the period immediately after Zhiyi's death, and thus still comprise some of our earliest evidence. (1) The 金光明經玄義拾遺記 X356 is a collection of fragments made in 1023 by Zhili 知禮 (960-1028) of the Shanjia 山家 faction, intended to disprove accusations from representatives of the Shanwai 山外 faction that parts of the *Jin guangming xuan yi* were apocryphal. It may contain sub-commentarial layers, and these are further of uncertain date; SATO 451. This text says **amalavijñāna* is an “unmoving consciousness” (不動識), and says it is another name for *prajñā* and awakening 覺了; X356:20.42b08-09. It further identifies **amalavijñāna* with the attainment of a sophisticated insight 觀 into the nature of mind, which has both empty and non-empty aspects; this insight does not hypostasise either the empty or the provisional, but understands their dialectical interrelationship; 60b10-13. It also maps this schema onto the analogy to gold, earth and impurities from MSg; **amalavijñāna* equates with the gold, and is all that is left when full buddhahood is attained; 48c15-18. (2) The *Chan men zhang* 禪門章 X907 is probably not actually by Zhiyi, but is rather a commentary on Zhiyi's 次第禪門. SATO thinks it probably dates after Zhiyi's death (in 597), but otherwise is unable to speculate about its date; SATO 125, 276. This text includes **amalavijñāna* in a string of different names which variously identify the absolute, all of which have in common that they strike the happy medium (*madhyamapratipad*) between the extremes of various false dualisms like conditioned/unconditioned, bondage/liberation, worldly/transcendent, defiled/pure etc. In this context, **amalavijñāna* is identified with ultimate truth (*paramārthasatya*), Buddha nature (*foxing* 佛性), Thusness, the “limit of what exists” (*bhūtakoti*), non-abiding, non-production etc; X907:55.645b17-22.

³²⁸ See YOSHIMURA (forthcoming), 2.

³²⁹ We have already seen above that Huijun says that P propounded a ninth consciousness, and that he said he did so in a “treatise” that cited the so-called “*Shiqi jing*”; see above p. 48. The only transcription he uses for **amala [vijñāna]* is 阿摩羅. He also calls it *wugoushi* 無垢識 and *jingshi* 淨識. Huijun attributes the doctrine of “ninth consciousness” 第九識 to the “Shelun masters”; X784:46.635b09.

³³⁰ Huijun/Hyegyun, also known as Junzheng 均正, was a Sanlun scholar-monk, and like Jizang was a disciple of Falang 法朗 (507-581). This fact is known from several passages in the recovered fragment of his *Si lun xuan yi* entitled “*Chu zhang zhong jia yi*” 初章中假義; in particular: 興皇師 [i.e. Falang]、大建六年 [574 C.E.] 五月、房內亦開六章, which informs us

had some identity that it presented to outsiders,³³¹ and thus Huijun's knowledge of the concepts that concern us was filtered through a Shelun lens. The only **amalavijñāna* text he mentions by name, he apparently misnames (*Shiqi jing* for *Shiqi di lun*), and he makes it clear that he has not seen the text himself.³³² Huijun's attitude to ideas he identifies as belonging to Paramārtha is also probably coloured by his polemical hostility towards the Shelun school.³³³

that he most likely heard Falang lecture in person in 574, thus providing our most precise clue as to the dates of his activity. Other clues seem to indicate that he was a student of Falang from relatively early; that he was close to Falang over an extended period; and that he was slightly senior to Jizang; see MITSUGIRI 223-225, KANNO (2002) 87. It was long thought that the partial version of the *Si lun xuan yi* collected in the canon was his only surviving work, but modern scholars have discovered other parts of that text in Japan; see e.g. ŌCHO, and works listed in KANNO (2008) n. 1. Further, ITO has argued that the *Mile jing you yi* 彌勒經遊意 T1771, traditionally ascribed to Jizang, is also his (see ITO [1977] 847-848 for a summary of the reasons for this claim; also ITO 1973). It has also been proposed that the *Dapin jing you yi* 大品經遊意 T1696, also ascribed to Jizang, is by Huijun (CH'OE 26). Recently, CH'OE (infra) has proposed that Huijun may have been from Paekche 百濟, and also that the *Si lun xuan yi* may even have been composed in Paekche. (I will nonetheless refer to him as "Huijun", not "Hyegyun", because CH'OE's theory is still new and speculative, and because Huijun was active in China and wrote in Chinese.) In the current state of our knowledge, it is not possible to know definitively the chronological relations between Huijun and Jizang (or their works), nor the exact date of the *Si lun xuan yi*. The full text of the *Si lun xuan yi* is thought to date at least to after Falang's death in 581 (MITSUGIRI 225); it mentions events of the Sui, and figures like Huijue 慧覺 (554-606) and Huichong 慧衝, which would seem to indicate that the text was completed after Huijun was active in Chang'an 長安 under the Sui (*Foguang dacidian* 6029). As we saw, Huijun is thought to have been senior to Jizang; on the other hand, he also refers to Jizang (藏公, X784:46.599b02; KANNO [2008] 6). Despite this uncertainty in their chronological relations, I have placed Huijun before Jizang because he is thought to have been slightly senior; because the only firm date I know for his activities is his reference to hearing Falang lecture in 574; and because, to my knowledge, there is no firm evidence for his activity much beyond the time shortly after the death of Falang, whereas Jizang lived for several more decades. It is also possible that Huijun is *the* earliest among our sources after P. Both Jingying Huiyuan and Zhiyi were active into the 590s, and Zhiyi's texts, further, were in many cases revised and expanded by his disciple Guanding, who lived until 632. Given that Huijun was active before the 580s, this may mean that some information in his text(s) about P predates these other sources.

³³¹ The Shelun masters represent one of four positions comprising Huijun's main foils in *Si lun xuan yi*, the others being Dilun, *Satyasiddhi* and Abhidharma; KANNO (2008).

³³² See above p. 109.

³³³ See, for example, his critiques of both Dilun and Shelun positions touched upon in n. 347 below.

“The Doctrine of **Amalaviññāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Against this, however, we should also weigh the following factors. Huijun is potentially a particularly reliable witness not only because he is close in time to Paramārtha, but because he knows Paramārtha’s works better than many of our other witnesses. He quotes SBKL verbatim;³³⁴ he also accurately quotes MSg³³⁵ and unique parts of Paramārtha’s MSgBh.³³⁶ This puts Huijun among a very small number of later witnesses to **amalaviññāna* / “ninth consciousness” doctrine who quote Paramārtha verbatim, or even cite texts and loci in which **amalaviññāna* is in fact expounded. Huijun also knows at least one term that is found very rarely outside the writings of Paramārtha himself.³³⁷ In addition, Huijun is unlikely to himself be consciously applying AF concepts to the interpretation of Paramārtha’s ideas (though the ideas may have already passed through

334 非淨非不淨, X784:46.599c18, 645c06; quoting SBKL 非淨非不淨 T1616:31.863a27-28, 非淨非不淨 863b19; in the second passage, particularly, this phrase is associated immediately with **amalaviññāna* and *praktiprabhāsvaracitta*, for which see SBKL<1> above. See also FXL T1610:31.795c02.

335 此師九□義并『攝論』云：「此[界?]無始時、一切此[for 法?]依止」X784:46.645b24, probably citing MSg: 此界無始時 / 一切法依止 T1593:31.114a01, cf. *anādikaliko dhatuh sarvadharmasamāśrayah* | *tasmin sati gatih sarvā nirvānadhigamo 'pi ca*, TrBh 37, 12-13.

336 彼『論』三種佛性中「自性住佛」X784:46.599c20-21, and again in greater length at 602a02-06, referring to MSgBh T1595:31.200c23.

337 The term in question is *luanshi* 亂識, for which see also n. 147. This term is only found twice, in one location, before P’s translations, in the “Second [? Part of the?] Annotated Preface to the *Dasabhamika sūtra*” 十住經含注序第二 by Sengwei 僧衛 (fl. 410-420?) preserved in Sengyou’s *Chu sanzang ji ji*, T2145:55.61b02-05. (Sengwei may be approximately dated by the fact that he appears in the biography of Tanyi 曇翼 [時長沙寺復有僧衛沙門, T2059:50.356a12-13], who is known to have been a student of Lushan Huiyuan 廬山慧遠 [334-416]; by the fact that he is said in Baochang’s [寶唱, d.u., active under the Liang] 名僧傳抄 to have been from Changsha 長沙寺 in Jiangling 江陵 under the [Eastern] Jin 晉 [317-420] [X1523:77.347b16]; and by this preface itself, which is to a text translated by Kumārajīva in 410.) Given that the preface is cited by Sengyou and therefore must date at the latest before approx. 515, when the *Chu sanzang ji ji* was completed, only two explanations are possible for the appearance of the term *luanshi* there, well before P: either it is coincidence; or P’s team took the term from Sengwei. *Luanshi* appears 52 times in P’s corpus: in MAV, *Ālambanaparīkṣā*, *Hastāvalaprakaraṇa*, MSgBh (but not MSg), FXL and SWXL. Thereafter it appears occasionally (and interestingly enough) in a few translation works by XZ (part of a wider pattern where special P terms are peppered through XZ’s works, seemingly indicating either that some of XZ’s terminology was still influenced by hangovers from P, or perhaps that he even occasionally based translations of certain passages on P’s translations); and in the works of some Tang scholiasts. The only other places where it appears to my knowledge before XZ are in the Shelun texts 攝大乘論章卷第一 (T2807:85.1014a09) and 攝大乘義章卷第四 (T2809:85.1044a24, 1044b26). Thus, the fact that Huijun cites this term, otherwise so rare, shows he must have had direct and exceptionally good knowledge of the concrete contents of (some of) P’s texts.

some AF filter before they reached him). This is because Huijun knew AF, but was suspicious of it, believing it a Chinese apocryphon.³³⁸ On the whole, then, Huijun is a seemingly reliable witness - early, well-informed and scrupulous.

Huijun says, more than once, that **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness is beyond language and conception or thought (想, possibly meaning **saṃjñā[-skandha]*), and even, quite specifically, that it cannot be known by consciousness itself.³³⁹ He further associates “pure consciousness” 淨識 with *praktiprabhasvaracitta* 自性清淨心, citing in the process SBKL<1>, in which **amalavijñāna* is indeed associated with that concept.³⁴⁰ He links these doctrines to *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine, but only indirectly, insofar as he ascribes to *both* the Dilun and Shelun schools the notion that an “aboriginal storehouse (or *garbha*) consciousness 本有藏識 is the substance of the essence of mind 心性之體”, which is prevented from being manifest by adventitious defilements; on this view, he says, the process of becoming a Buddha is identical with the removal of these defilements.³⁴¹ This view is associated clearly with the idea that

“we do not speak of ‘Buddha nature’ only upon the attainment of buddhahood, but rather, it is precisely by means of the present manifestation of an original, hidden/latent mind that buddhahood is achieved; the original nature is neither changed nor lost, and thus we speak of ‘Buddha nature that always indwells’.”³⁴²

In the context of describing a varied set of views about what comprises the substance 體 of Buddha Nature, Huijun also alludes to “ninth taintless (*wugou*) consciousness” 第九無垢識 (ascribed to the Shelun school, not to Paramārtha himself).³⁴³ The ninth and tenth positions he discusses are those of the Dilun and Shelun

338 He says (in a comment that survives only in a quoted fragment): 『起信』是虜(=吳?)魯人作、借馬鳴菩薩名; quoted in CH’OE 16.

339 『攝論』師云：「第九識、名言所不及、故言語道斷。想所不及、故心行處哉。故第九識不可識。」X784:46.635b09-10 (it is difficult to know where the quote ends here, and it may end after *zai* 哉); 「阿摩羅」者、正番[翻]「無垢」、無垢有二種 二者、名言想識所不及, 635b14-16; this seems to be connected to the ascription of the same attribute of ineffability to Buddha nature.

340 X784:46.599c20-22; see n. 334.

341 X784.611b04-09.

342 不以成佛時方名「佛性」。正以本有藏心今顯成佛。其本性不改不失、故名「常住佛性」也 X784:46.611b06-08; referring once more to MSgBh, for which see n. 336.

343 X784:46.601b01 ff.

“The Doctrine of **Amalayijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

schools. He says that the Dilun masters hold *alayavijñāna*, counted as an eighth consciousness 第八無沒識,³⁴⁴ to be the substance *qua* ontological cause (正因體, where 正因 is probably for *kāraṇahetu*³⁴⁵); the Shelun masters hold “ninth, taintless consciousness” to be the same.³⁴⁶ Huijun is critical of both views.³⁴⁷ In the course of this

³⁴⁴ The term 無沒識 is very unusual. So far as I can determine, it never appears in a translation text, and the earliest texts in which it appears seem to be the present text by Huijun, and texts by Zhiyi (T1716:33.699c15, 744b22; T1777:38.552a10; T1783:39.4a13-14), Jingying Huiyuan (X753:45.107c14-15) and Jizang (T1824:42.119a23-24); the term also appears early in the Dunhuang Shelun text 攝大乘論章卷第一 (T2807:85.1013a27). Jingying Huiyuan also says that *wumo* is the “proper translation” of *ālaya*, e.g. 「阿梨耶」者、此方正翻名為「無沒」, T1851:44.524c18, also 530b09-10. This leaves open the mysterious question of where this term for *alayavijñāna* comes from. I have been unable to find even the epithet *wumo* alone, clearly applied to any kind of consciousness, in any translation texts earlier than the texts cited here.

³⁴⁵ *Shengyin* 生因 (*kāraṇahetu*) means a cause due to which something comes into existence, i.e. an ontological cause; *liaoyin* 了因 (*jñāpakahetu*) means a cause due to which an act of perception or knowledge takes place, i.e. an epistemological cause; see OGIHARA s.v. *shōin*, *ryōin*. The distinction is explained in MPNS, T374:12.530a16-26 = T375:12.774c23-775a03, T374:12.593a11-19 = T375:12.841a01-10; and also in Kuiji’s commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa* 因明入正理論疏 T1840:44.101b29-c28. *Kāraṇahetu* is variously compared to the seed from which a plant grows, the clay from which a pot is made, etc., while *jñāpakahetu* is commonly compared to lamplight that illuminates objects. The terms were known to P: see FXL T1610:31.798a07-10 (explaining different phases of the realisation of Buddha-nature); *Rushi lun* T1633:32.32c28-33a01 (the reason argued does not ontologically produce the ineternity of sound, but only brings about realisation of that ineternity, i.e. it is a *jñāpakahetu* for that ineternity, not a *kāraṇahetu*). I am grateful to Prof. FUNAYAMA Tōru for pointing out these references. For *zhengyin* opposed to *liaoyin*, in roughly the same sense as *shengyin* = *kāraṇahetu*, see MPNS: 有二種因：一者正因、二者了因。尼拘陀子以地水糞作了因、故令細得麤, T374:12..532b14-16.

³⁴⁶ 第九、『地論』師云、第八無沒識為正因體。第十、『攝論』師云、第九無垢識為正因體, etc.; X784.601c23-602a02.

³⁴⁷ Huijun’s criticisms are difficult to understand exactly, but he says, “[Whether] one takes the *alayavijñāna* as the ground upon which liberation from delusion is possible, [or whether holds that] the taintless [consciousness] is manifest upon the extinction of *vajracitta* and *alayavijñāna*, [one is] surely still beholden to a dualistic view” 彼義宗、無沒識為解或之本、至金心無沒盡顯無垢、豈非二見之徒, X784:64.602a20-22. He further seems to charge them with distinguishing in a dualistic manner between what is “mind” and what is not: 豈開心非心？乃至八九識亦然, 602b01-02; and with failing to avoid the errors of nihilistic and eternalist thinking: 第九、十兩家、執正因、差前諸師、而不離斷常過, 603a06-07. He also applies Madhyamaka dialectic to prove the absurdity of the claim, which he attributes to both schools, that all kinds of mind lower than *vajracitta* on the path are conditioned (*samskrta*), whereas “taintless consciousness” (*wugoushi*) is unconditioned (*asamskrta*) (though once more the finer details of his argument escape me): 彼地、攝兩論意、金心以下是有為、無垢識是無為、故虛實兩識故被破也 etc., X784.603a13-14 ff. The claim that taintless consciousness is *asamskrta*

exposition, Huijun mentions an understanding of “taintless consciousness” that seems accurate to what we have seen of it in Paramārtha, namely that it succeeds upon the cessation of *alayavijñāna* 無沒盡顯無垢.³⁴⁸

To summarise, then: Huijun calls **amalavijñāna* a “ninth consciousness”, and uses the term *wugoushi* for the same; he seems indifferently to identify the views of Paramārtha and those of the Shelun school; he understands that **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness is beyond language and conception, and even unknowable; he connects the doctrine of this consciousness to *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta*; and he seems to report loose associations between this consciousness and Buddha nature/*tathāgatagarbha* (as part of a position indifferently ascribed to both Dilun and Shelun schools).

4.1.3.4 Jizang (writing c. 599-608)³⁴⁹

Jizang (吉藏, 549-623)³⁵⁰ lists **amalavijñāna* among a set of terms that are identified by different schools or figures as what is “non-dual” (*advaya*, 不二).³⁵¹ Jizang also

does seem to correspond to the understanding that it is *asamskara*, seen in Tib. and XZ parallels to JDZL<4> above.

³⁴⁸ X784:64.602a21; note, however, that this comment falls in the middle of a passage that is difficult of interpretation.

³⁴⁹ The Jizang works in which **amalavijñāna* is discussed seem all to date between about 599 and 608. (1) HIRAI considers 淨名玄論 T1780 to probably be the first thing Jizang wrote during his residence at Riyan si 日嚴寺 in Chang’an 長安, i.e. between his move to Chang’an in 599 and the end of the Kaihuang 開皇 era (581-600) (HIRAI 374; citing Jizang’s own words in his 維摩經義疏 T1781:38.908c17-19); the text was thus written in 599-600. (2) Because the exposition of the category of 八不義 in 大乘玄論 T1853 is extremely close to that of Huijun, scholars have long been doubtful whether the text is actually by Jizang, or perhaps rather by Huijun; HIRAI, however, concludes that whatever may be the provenance of passages concerning this category, the text as a whole is representative of Jizang’s thought, and cannot be excluded with certainty from the list of his authentic works; HIRAI 256. HIRAI seems to believe that this text was at least written after T1780; 595. (3) Tradition has held that 中觀論疏 T1824 was completed in 608; HIRAI 375. However, HIRAI notes that the group of texts to which it belongs were the work of several years, and other complications surround the dating of the text; 608 is only the date of completion; 375-377. The text could thus contain elements older by a few years. (4) 維摩經略疏 X343 was probably written in 604; HIRAI 375.

³⁵⁰ We have already seen that Jizang speaks of **amalavijñāna* as a ninth consciousness. To my knowledge, the only transcription of the term found in his works is the standard *amoluoshi* 阿摩羅識.

³⁵¹ Others are: the principle of the [Four Noble] Truth(s) 真諦理; *prajñā* that carries the mark of reality 實相般若; *alayavijñāna*, identified with Nirvāṇa that is pure in its essence 性淨涅槃阿梨耶識. In T1853, these are identified as the positions respectively of the *Satyasiddhi* masters; the

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

refers to the notion of *amalavijñāna in another doxographic passage discussing views of various schools on the “real/true” 實, saying that “scholars of the *Mahāyānasamgraha*” hold that the principle 理 of the twofold absence of self (*nairātmyadvaya* 二無我), the principle of the threefold absence of essence (**niḥsvabhāvatraya* 三無性), and the *amalavijñāna can rightly be called “true/real”, but all else is false.³⁵² In another passage, in his “Exposition of the Profundities of [the] *Vimalakīrti [sūtra]*” (淨名玄論, T1780), Jizang returns to this characterisation. According to him,

“Adherents of the *Mahāyānasamgraha* and the **Vijñaptimatratā śāstra* [唯識論 i.e. the *Vimśatikā*]³⁵³ take non-attachment to the three natures as the principle 理 of the threefold absence of essence; this principle of the threefold absence of essence is *amalavijñāna, which is also the principle of the twofold absence of self. The ‘three natures’ are the interdependent nature (*paratantrasvabhāva*), the imaginary nature (*parikalpitasvabhāva*), and the perfected nature (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*). . . The perfected nature is Nirvāṇa.”³⁵⁴

Elsewhere, Jizang also recalls a similar classification to distinguish the ultimate, as it is characterised in all these schools, from the “Nirvāṇa of the true doctrine” (正法涅槃, **saddharmanirvāṇa*) taught by his own position. In all these other cases, including that of *amalavijñāna as taught by the Shelun masters, he says that the instance in question is manifest upon the attainment of buddhahood, and this resultant state is called

Mahāprajñāpāramitōpadeśa masters; and the Dilun school; where identifying the nondual as *amalavijñāna is the position of “the Shelun masters and Trepiṭaka Paramārtha” [攝論] 師、真諦三藏。See T1780:38.856c11-17, 912b09-18; T1853:45.66c02-06;

³⁵² T1824:42.123c22-124a02. Jizang also mentions this same doxographic characterisation at 126c04-07. The other positions are: for adherents of the Abhidharma 阿毘曇人 (i.e. *Satyasiddhi* specialists) it is the principle of the Four Noble Truths, and most specifically of the third truth of cessation (*nirodhasatya*); for the [adherents of the] “Mahāyāna of the south” (?南土大乘; this is the only time this phrase ever occurs in the canon) it is the “principle of the truth of refutation” (?破諦之理); for “those in the North” (i.e. *Mahāprajñāpāramitōpadeśa* exponents) it is *prajñā* that carries the mark of reality 實相波若。

³⁵³ Given that these are referred to as a separate group of scholars, Jizang may be referring to exponents of the text in Gautama Prajñāruci’s translation, T1588, translated around 540. For example, Tanqian’s biography reports that he studied this text before he went to the south, and so presumably before he had access to P’s texts (it is known that he only encountered the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, for instance, after he fled Zhou Wudi’s 577 persecution of Buddhism); CHEN Jinhua 14-15 n. 12.

³⁵⁴ T1780:38.897b06-16.

dharmakāya because these schools maintain that certain *dharmas* definitively exist.³⁵⁵ Finally, Jizang also briefly mentions a difference of opinion between the Dilun position, in which the “six consciousnesses” are eradicated to leave *alayavijñāna*, and that of a certain Trepitaka and certain “masters” 三藏師 (presumably Paramārtha and the Shelun masters) who say that “the eighth consciousness is also eradicated, since it too is not pure; [only] the ninth, **amalavijñāna*, is entirely pure”. Jizang again differs with these positions because they still posit a dualism of pure and impure.³⁵⁶

Jizang’s explanation of the doctrine is rare in linking **amalavijñāna* to three natures doctrine, and more specifically to the perfected nature. The general silence on this matter contrasts with the fact that it was so central to **amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha. However, other members of the string of identifications Jizang ascribes to the doctrine are new: **amalavijñāna* is also identified with the nondual in a new sense, with the two-fold absence of self, and with Nirvāṇa; the identification with *dharmakāya* in T1853 is also new. Jizang also ascribes the positions he describes either to the Shelun school and Paramārtha indiscriminately, or else only to the Shelun masters, on occasion not even mentioning Paramārtha. Even if Jizang reports everything with fidelity, we apparently see here a version of the doctrine already filtered through the early Shelun school.

On the whole, Jizang’s presentation of **amalavijñāna*, like those of Zhiyi and Huiyuan, is also clearly bound up with his own intellectual agendas, and his attempts to fit the material into his own doctrinal system.

4.1.3.5 *She dasheng lun zhang*³⁵⁷

The anonymous Dunhuang Shelun text *She dasheng lun zhang* 攝大乘論章 T2807 argues that the same consciousness can either be called eighth or ninth, and cites LAS in support.³⁵⁸ Like Huiyuan, it adduces the AF categories of a “Thusness aspect” 真如門

³⁵⁵ T1853:45.46c24-47a03. By contrast, in the position he expounds, it is in fact the “middle path” that is Buddha nature (*madhyamaṃpratipad*) 中道為佛性, and in this middle path, there can be no question of Buddha nature being either latent or manifest. The other positions are here characterised as the “essentially pure Nirvāṇa” 性淨涅槃 or *alayavijñāna* of the Dilun masters, and the original Nirvāṇa 本有涅槃 or attainment of Buddhahood of the *Satyasiddhi* masters.

³⁵⁶ 又有三藏師云、亦除八識、此識亦不淨、第九阿摩羅識、番 (f o r 翻) 此乃淨, X343:19.166a24-b08. Jizang reports the dispute in very similar terms, and attempts to bring LAS and AF to bear to adjudicate it, at T1824:42.104c07-13.

³⁵⁷ On the dates of this text, see n. 230.

³⁵⁸ See 296.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

and “*samsāric* aspect” 生滅門 of mind to negotiate the apparent contradiction between eightfold and ninefold analyses, identifying “ninth consciousness” with the Thusness aspect. It then cites what it calls the “Chapter on Marklessness” (*wuxiang pin* 無相品, actually citing our extant SXWL) from the *Wuxiang lun*: “Because the imagined essential nature never exists, the interdependent essential nature also does not exist; and the inexistence of these two [essential natures] is **amalavijñāna* (阿摩羅識).”³⁵⁹ It then says that this consciousness is “the ultimate, unique pure consciousness” 究竟唯一淨識. The text then says that a tradition from outside China reports that the *Shiqi di lun* contains a “Bodhisattva Chapter”, which gave an extensive exposition of **amalavijñāna* as ninth consciousness.³⁶⁰

This passage from T2807 probably conforms more closely to what we see in our extant Paramārtha corpus than any other later account of **amalavijñāna*. Even here, however, we see a certain admixture of AF concepts.

4.1.3.6 Prabhākaramitra’s *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* (tr. 630-633)

Prabhākaramitra’s (波羅頗蜜多羅, 564-633) translation of the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* T1604 famously mentions **amalavijñāna*.³⁶¹ The mention features as part of commentary on the verse corresponding to Skt. 13.19.³⁶² This verse is part of a set dealing, in significant part, with “aboriginally luminous mind” (*prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta*), which, we saw above, is connected with **amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha’s SBKL. These verses assert that defilement (*niḥsaṃkleśa*) and purification (*viśuddhi*) do not really exist, but are illusory, like a magic trick or “space” (*ākāśa*) (3.16). This is likened to the way a flat picture, skilfully executed, appears to contain height and depth; similarly, there is in fact no dualism (*dvaya*) in the imagination of what is unreal (*abhūtakalpa*), but it appears as if dual (3.17). Water is intrinsically clear, even when tainted by mud, and when the mud is removed, the water is not changed, but rather, its original true nature simply becomes manifest (3.18). 3.19 spells out the parallel to this conceit in the case of the mind:

³⁵⁹ This citation actually appears in SXWL T1617:31.872a05-06; see SWXL<1> above. There is a slight difference in wording, but the quote is nearly verbatim: SXWL: 由分別性永無故、依他性亦不有、此二無所有、即是阿摩羅識; T2807: 分別性永無、依他性亦不有、此二無所有、即是阿摩羅識.

³⁶⁰ T2807:85.1016c08-23; already noted above, p. 111.

³⁶¹ The word **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識 itself occurs at T1604:31.623a09.

³⁶² This passage occurs in Chapter 14 of Prabhākaramitra.

“I have explained that the mind is pure in essence 心性淨
 But is defiled by adventitious dirt 客塵;
 There is no essential purity of mind
 Apart from the Thusness³⁶³ of the mind 心真如.”³⁶⁴

In other words, like water, the mind is pure all along and by its very nature; it is not the case that, when it is purified, some new, pure mind is produced in the process.

In the *Bhāṣya* to this verse, Chinese features an extra sentence that does not correspond to anything found in the Sanskrit. “It is this mind[, equated with Thusness,] that is expounded as aboriginally pure 自性清淨. This mind is **amalavijñāna* 此心即是阿摩羅識.”³⁶⁵ This reinforces the association of **amalavijñāna* with *praktiprabhāsvacitta*. This association, made in SBKL, Huijun, and Daoji, appears again in Wōnhyo and Chengguan.

4.1.3.7 Daoji (writing c. 633-637)

One of the most important moments in the history of **amalavijñāna* doctrine after Paramārtha is found in Daoji’s (道基, 577-637)³⁶⁶ lost *Shelun zhang* 攝論章,³⁶⁷ which is

³⁶³ Corresponding to *dharmatā* in Skt; Bh gives “Thusness”, *tasmāc cittatathatāivam cittam veditavyam*, LÉVI (1907, 1911) 1, 88.

³⁶⁴ 已說心性淨 / 而為客塵染 / 不離心真如 / 別有心性淨, T1604:31.623a03-04. I translate Prabhākaramitra’s Ch., which agrees only in its gist with Skt. Skt. reads: “It is understood that while the mind is ever aboriginally pure, it is always poisoned by adventitious poisons;/ Apart from this aboriginal mind, there is no other essential mind characterised by purity (luminosity);” *matam ca cittam praktiprabhāsvaram sada tadāgantukadoṣaduṣitam/ na dharmatacittam rte ’nyacetasaḥ prabhāsvaratvam praktau vidhīyate//* (3.19), LÉVI (1907, 1911) 1, 88; 2, 158; JAMPSAL et al., 171.

³⁶⁵ T1604:31.623a08-09.

³⁶⁶ Daoji was a disciple of Jingsong 靖嵩 (537-614). Jingsong was originally from the North, but fled the N. Zhou persecution of Buddhism in 577, and while in Jinling 金陵 (mod. Nanjing) met Fatai 法泰 (d. after 577), a prominent disciple of P. Fatai introduced him to MSg, and Jingsong took the text back to the north when he moved to Pengcheng 彭城 in 590. See CHEN Jinhua 31 n. 56, 32, 199-200 n. 60; *Xu gaoseng zhuan* T2060:50.501b06-502a25. This means that Daoji was a “dharma great-grandson” of P, in a direct line. Daoji was in turn a teacher of XZ, and his testimony is thus particularly important because it is possible that Kuiji, Wōnch’uk and their successors had their information about P’s supposed “ninth consciousness” via him, rather than directly from P’s texts. On Kuiji’s apparent relation to Daoji, see further below, n. 433.

³⁶⁷ Daoji cites the MSA, which enables us to date his comments quite closely between 630-633, when MSA was translated, and his death in 637.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

quoted by Gyōnen 凝然 (1240-1321) in the *Kegon kōmokushō hatsugo ki* 華嚴孔目章發悟記 15. Daoji’s³⁶⁸ most important comments about **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness are contained in a single extended passage.

“Question: Upon what *sūtras* and *śāstras* do Trepitaka Paramārtha and the Dharma Master Daoji base themselves, in proving the tenet of ninth consciousness?

“Answer: In the first [*juan?*] of [Daoji’s] *She lun zhang* [“Treatise on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*”], it says.³⁶⁹

There are Dharma Masters who expound nine consciousnesses. For example, Trepitaka Paramārtha cites [the line], “Various kinds of mind, eight- or ninefold” from the *Laṃkāvatāra sūtra*;³⁷⁰ [he] also cites the definitive exposition 決定說 of nine kinds of mind 九品心 from the *Shiqi di lun* [“Treatise on the Seventeen Stages”] as proof. From then, right down to the present, the controversy has not ceased, so that later generations have no way of deciding [what is correct].

‘Here, we will determine that it is correct to hold that: the *sūtras* expound six [kinds of consciousness]; some, however, say there are seven; the *Laṃkāvatāra* expounds eight; and the *Wuxiang lun* has nine. Among these various theories, the *Laṃkāvatāra* etc. expound only eight consciousnesses because they are expounding an abridged [version of the doctrine] (?據略但說八識).

‘On the other hand 或復說云, the doctrines of the *Wuxiang [lun]* lay out the nine in full (?義具通陳其九). The “Chapter on **Pravṛttivijñāna* 轉識品”³⁷¹ in the *Wuxiang lun* says, “The [consciousness that is the] subject of perception is of three kinds: (1) Consciousness [arising] as a result [of *karma*] 果報識 (*vipākavijñāna*), that is, *alayavijñāna* 黎耶,³⁷² (2) Con-

³⁶⁸ We have already seen above that Daoji refers to **amalavijñāna* as *wugoushi*. He also refers to it as *jingshi* 淨識. Like Huijun, Daoji says that P cited a discussion of “nine kinds of mind” 九品心 in *Shiqi di lun* to prove a theory of ninth consciousness.

³⁶⁹ These introductory passages are the words of Gyōnen.

³⁷⁰ See n. 296. ŌTAKE points out (2007d) that the precise wording of this quote does not match any transmitted Chinese translation of the text; see n. 287.

³⁷¹ On this reconstruction for the term *zhuanshi* in this context, see n. 127.

³⁷² The transcription of *alayavijñāna* with the character 黎 is unusual, and is only ever found in the *Xu zang jing*, never in the Taishō. However, it is clearly a scribal variant of the transcription 阿黎耶, which is a distinguishing feature of P’s style (it is only found a few times in Bodhiruci

MICHAEL RADICH

sciousness that ‘grasps’ [or ‘is attached’] 執識, that is, *adanavijñāna* 阿陀那; (3) Sense consciousness [literally ‘consciousness of sense objects’] 塵識, that is, the six consciousnesses [of eye, ear etc.].³⁷³ When it has finished explaining thus, the text goes on to expound **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識. Thus, the [same *Wuxiang*] *lun* says, “The simultaneous disappearance of both object and consciousness is precisely the perfected nature (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*); and the perfected nature is precisely the **amalavijñāna*.”³⁷⁴ The [*Wuxiang*]*lun* also says, “*Ālayavijñāna* 阿黎耶識 is of eight different kinds, as is explained in the ‘Chapter on Nine Consciousnesses’.”³⁷⁵ This treatise, having expounded eight consciousnesses, in addition expounds separately a pure consciousness 淨識 called **amala* 阿摩羅, and further says “as is explained in the ‘Chapter on Nine Consciousnesses’”. It is clear that the principle of the nine consciousnesses we are expounding here is paramount in it [? 勝焉: i.e. in that text?].

‘In addition, the *Mahāyānasātrālamkāra* says, “By the transformation 轉 (**paravṛtti*) of eighth consciousness, ‘mirror-like wisdom’ 鏡智 (*adarsajñāna*) is obtained; by the transformation of seventh consciousness, ‘the wisdom [that recognises the] equality [of all things]’ 平等智 (*samatajñāna*) is obtained; by the transformation of the five [external sense] consciousnesses [*sic*], ‘wisdom of [perfect] cognition’ 觀智 (*pratyavekṣajñāna*) is obtained; and by the transformation of the *manovijñāna* [*sic*], ‘wisdom that achieves its tasks’ 作事智 (*anusthanajñāna*) is obtained.”³⁷⁶ This sentence [refers to] eight consciousnesses. However, the same treatise also says, “It is this mind[, equated with Thusness,] that is expounded as aboriginally pure 自性清淨. This mind is *amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識.”³⁷⁷ When we add this mind to the previous eight, are there not nine [altogether]?

‘Trepiṭaka Paramārtha may cite [the line], “Various kinds of mind, eight- or ninefold” from the *Laṃkāvatāra sūtra*; and also the definitive exposition 決定說 of nine kinds of mind 九品心 from the *Shiqi di lun*. However, even though the *Laṃkāvatāra* does indeed say “eight-

before P, and also almost never after him in translation texts).

373 ZSL: 能緣有三種: 一、果報識、即是阿梨耶識。二、執識、即阿陀那識。三、塵識、即是六識, T1587:31.61c08-09.

374 ZSL: 境識俱泯、即是實性、實性即是阿摩羅識, T1587:31.62c18-19; see §2.4 above.

375 ZSL: 就此識中、具有八種異、謂依止處等。具如『九識義品』說, T1587:31.62a03-04.

376 M S A : 轉第八識得鏡智、轉第七識得平等智、轉第六識得觀智、轉前五識得作事智, T1604:31.606c29-607a02. This text appears in Bh to the verse correspond to Skt. 9.67, Lévi (1907, 1911) 1, 46; 2, 88; however, nothing in the Sanskrit corresponds to this Chinese.

377 MSA: 心真如、名之為「心」、即說此心為自性清淨。此心即是阿摩羅識, T1604:31.623a08-09; see n. 365 above and corresponding text.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

or ninefold”, it does not lay out the names [of the types of consciousnesses concerned]; and the *Shiqi di lun* was transmitted throughout (?攝傳?) India, but has never circulated in this country 此國未行. Thus, these two modes of exposition can hardly constitute proof [of the doctrine]. Here, we have taken up passages from the *Wuxiang lun* and the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* to explain that there are nine consciousnesses, taking them as reliable [proof-texts].

‘Question: If nine consciousnesses are expounded, then why does the *Lamkāvatāra* only expound eight consciousnesses? Answer: In the *Lamkāvatāra*, only eight consciousnesses are expounded because [the text] only bases [itself on a view that] takes the objects (*alambana*) as consciousness (?) 但據緣境為識. [However,] in the *Wuxiang lun* and the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*, both mind and object are taken as consciousness, and so it explains in full [all] nine(?) 以心境俱識、通說九乎. Or again, the *Lamkāvatāra* only bases itself on [the point of view of] *samsāra* 生滅, [and so] expounds only eight consciousnesses; but in *Wuxiang lun* etc., the doctrine encompasses [both] true and deluded 真妄³⁷⁸ [aspects].”³⁷⁹

Elsewhere, Daoji states that Paramārtha holds the substance of “pure consciousness” 淨識體 to be Thusness and the wisdom that takes Thusness as its object 如如及如

³⁷⁸ The contrast between 生滅 and 真妄 is obviously reminiscent of AF.

³⁷⁹ 問：真諦三藏、并道基法師、依何經論、建九識義？答：『攝論章』第一云、「或有法師、具說九識、如真諦三藏、引『楞伽經』「八九種種心」、又引『十七地論』決定說九品心、以為證驗。自後諍論于今不息、遂另後代取決莫由。今者、正判諸經說六、或復云七、『楞伽』說八、『無相』具九。多說之中、『楞伽』等、據略但說八識。或復說云、『無相』義具通陳其九。『無相論』中『轉識品』云：「能緣有三。一、果報識、即黎耶。二者、執識、即阿陀那。三者、塵識、即是六識。」如是說已、復說阿摩羅識。故彼『論』云：「境識俱泯、即是實性、其實性者、即阿摩羅識也。」彼『論』復云：「阿黎耶識、有八種異、如『九識品』說。」論既說八識之外、別說淨識名「阿摩羅」、復云「如『九識品』中說」、明知、今者所說九識、其理勝焉。復次『大莊嚴論』云：「轉八識得鏡智、轉第七識得平等智、轉五識得觀智、轉意識得作事智。」蓋八識文也。彼『論』復云：「心真如、名之為心、即說此心為自性清淨。此心即是阿摩羅識。」前八及此心、豈無九也？真諦三藏、雖引『楞伽經』「八九種種心」、復引『十七地論』決定說九品心、其『楞伽經』雖云「八九」、不引列名、『十七地論』攝傳天竺、此國未行。故此二說亦難為證。今取『無相論』文并『大莊嚴論』說有九識、用為可依。問曰：若說九識、何故『楞伽』但說八識？答曰：『楞伽經』中、但據緣境為識、唯說八種。『無相論』中及『大莊嚴論』中、以心境俱識、通說九乎。又『楞伽』唯據生滅、但說八識。『無相論』等中、義含真妄、通說九識也，DBZ 22, 370a-371a; see also YOSHIMURA (2002), 237-239. In the case of this quote we are very fortunate that Gyōnen (unlike many later authors) makes it clear precisely where the quote ends by saying 已上, and by adding 此一段文、道基先舉真諦三藏所立義門、次出自義。

如智³⁸⁰ (Daoji disagrees with this doctrine, as we will see below). The *She dasheng yi zhang* (攝大乘義章, T2809), which was preserved in an ancient manuscript in Japan³⁸¹ and is probably by Daoji,³⁸² also briefly mentions the “ninth consciousness”.³⁸³

Daoji’s citations, from texts like ZSL, MSA, SWXL, AF and the *Mahāyānābhisamaya*,³⁸⁴ are exceptionally accurate,³⁸⁵ and show that he is a scrupulous scholar. Daoji’s testimony is also particularly valuable because of his critical attitude towards Paramārtha (perhaps surprising, in a member of the Shelun school towards its ostensible founder). This shows him a cautious commentator, not ready to simply believe anything. For example, he says that Paramārtha lists six alternative names for the “pure consciousness” (阿摩羅, 無垢, 淨識). These names are found together in no

³⁸⁰ DZB 22, 371b. Cf. T226265:440c-441a.

³⁸¹ It is sometimes mistakenly said to be a text from Dunhuang. I am grateful to IKEDA Masanori for allowing me to see unpublished work in which he traces some of the history of this manuscript.

³⁸² On Daoji’s probable authorship of this text, see KATSUMATA 795. I am grateful to both Ching KENG and IKEDA Masanori for pointing out KATSUMATA’s arguments.

³⁸³ T2809:85.1036b28-c05. This passage is difficult to interpret. It apparently identifies **amalavijñāna* with an ultimate (*paramārtha*) pure consciousness identical with the truth 第一淨識, whose substance is Thusness 體是如如 (which, as we have seen, Daoji consistently holds elsewhere). The true essence of this consciousness is supposed to exist aboriginally 真性本有, and is identified with a gnosis (*jñāna*) that has no inception and cannot be cultivated 非始修智.

³⁸⁴ The **Mahāyānābhisamaya sūtra* (*Tongxing jing*, 大乘同性經, T673) was translated by Jñānayaśas (fl. 564-572). The passage that Daoji cites (DBZ 12, 372a) in support of ninth consciousness doctrine is an abridged version of T673:16.642c15-643a08 (the actual phrases cited are found at 642c15-19, 643a06-08). In this passage, the Tathagata is discussing the process of rebirth with the King of Lamka 楞伽王, and asserts that the “spirit-consciousness of the sentient being” 眾生神識 (that undergoes transmigration) is limitless in size, without visible form (*arūpya*), without characteristics (*alaksana*) etc.; it then states, in what is probably the key link to **amalavijñāna* doctrine, that this consciousness is pure, and only obscured by adventitious defilements, just as the pure element of empty space (*akāśadhātu*) is obscured by the “adventitious defilement” of the four elements. For links between Daoji’s use of *Mahāyānābhisamaya* (and WXL) and Kuiji’s testimony, see below n. 433. Note that this is the only echo in all the later literature of the connection (here very tangential) between **amalavijñāna* and the old doctrine of consciousness as subject of transmigration and liberation (see above p. 95).

³⁸⁵ Daoji cites SWXL (calling it, like ZSL, “*Wuxiang lun*”) twice at 372a, citing T1617:31.872a05-07 and 872a11-12. Daoji also cites, in the course of this same long comment, AF and the *Mahāyānābhisamaya* (for the latter, see n. 384 preceding).

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

extant Paramārtha text.³⁸⁶ Daoji repeats twice that Paramārtha cites the authority of no *sūtra* or *śāstra* for these names, and concludes, “My suspicions have not been allayed, and I cannot rely upon [this doctrine as Paramārtha expounds it]” 疑信未決、未可即依。³⁸⁷ This critical attitude towards Paramārtha is also evidenced in an explicit disagreement Gyōnen reports that Daoji expresses with Paramārtha’s understanding of what comprises the “substance” 體 of consciousness.³⁸⁸

Here, then, we see a Shelun scholar and direct “*dharma* descendant” of Paramārtha himself, who is yet sceptical of the standard proof-texts used to support the doctrine of ninth consciousness and keen to find alternative, less vulnerable proofs. Nonetheless, Daoji apparently cannot find anything better than ZSL and the hot-off-the-press MSA. Moreover, he also does not seem to know any additional Paramārtha texts since lost, except the *Shiqi di lun*, which he knows only by hearsay and is sceptical of.

4.1.3.8 The **Vajrasamādhi sūtra* and Wōnhyo’s commentary (approx. 649-686)

The **Vajrasamādhi sūtra* (VSS) T273³⁸⁹ and Wōnhyo’s (元曉, 617-686) commentary on it, the *Kūmgang sammaegyōng non* (**Vajrasamādhi sūtra lun*, T1730), contain extensive new developments in the doctrine of **amalavijñāna*. Here, **amalavijñāna* is given outright (apocryphal) warrant as *buddavācana*, and a creative synthesis is attempted between **amalavijñāna* and other concepts important to East Asian Buddhism.

³⁸⁶ These six alternate names of **amalavijñāna* are highly specific, however, and ŌTAKE has shown that at least some of them seem to have connections to P’s ideas; see ŌTAKE (2007d).

³⁸⁷ 道基『章』云、「阿摩羅」者、是天竺語、此翻「無垢」。明此淨識、一自性清淨、二無垢清淨、具二清淨、故言「無垢」、所無得名。亦名「淨識」、第一識體、皎然離染、名目「淨識」、當體受稱。依『無相論』說此兩名。眞諦三藏、不引經論、別說六名。一曰(曰?)「藏識」、二云「宅識」、三名「眞識」、四無「失識」、五無「濁識」、六無「量功德識」。雖復數此六種異名、不云經論來處、疑信未決、未可即依, DBZ22,364a-b. In this passage, as above, **amalavijñāna* is identified with *praktiprabhāsvācitta* 自性清淨; and once again, Daoji relies upon WXL as his authority.

³⁸⁸ Daoji accepts, with P, that the “principle of Thusness” 如如, 如如理 is the “substance” of consciousness, but not that “wisdom of Thusness” 如如智 is also part of that substance: 三藏所說第一淨識如如為體、頗有此理。言如如智、理亦不然 etc., DBZ 22, 371b. For Daoji’s enumeration of consciousnesses from **amalavijñāna* as *first*, see Gyōnen’s interlinear note here, and also the *Shelun zhang* passage cited at Gyōnen 364a.

³⁸⁹ On evidence studied by Robert BUSWELL, we can surmise that VSS was composed sometime between 649, when XZ translated the *Prajñāparamitahrdaya sūtra* (BUSWELL [2007], 369-370 n. 284) and Wōnhyo’s commentary, which can have been written no later than his death in 686. We saw that VSS uses the transcription 庵摩羅識, which would seem to place it in some connection with Zhiyi.

The VSS first mentions **amalavijñāna* twice each in the following two passages:

(VSS<1>): “At that time, the Bodhisattva Non-Abiding asked the Buddha: ‘Lord! Through revolutionary transformation (轉 **para/vrt*) by what inspiration 利³⁹⁰ do all the affective consciousnesses 一切情識 of sentient beings undergo a revolutionary transformation 轉³⁹¹ so that they enter into the **amala[-vijñāna]*?’ The Buddha replied: ‘All the Buddhas, the Tathāgatas,³⁹² constantly employ the one awakening 以一覺 to [effect a] revolutionary transformation in all consciousnesses, so that they will enter into the **amala[-vijñāna]*. This is because the original awakening 本覺 of all sentient beings [works,] by means of the one awakening, to awaken those sentient beings, and [thus] to make the sentient beings all regain their original awakening, viz. to awaken them to the fact that all affective consciousnesses are empty, tranquil and unproduced. That is because it is an established fact 決定 that the original essence is originally without motion.’³⁹³

(VSS<2>): “[The Buddha said:] ‘One who is enlightened need not abide in *nirvāna* 不住涅槃. Why is this? One who awakens to 覺 original nonproduction 本無生 remains far removed from the maculations (*mala*, 垢) of sentient beings. One who awakens to the original lack of tranquility 本無寂 remains far removed from the activity of *nirvāna* 離涅槃動. For one who abides 住 at such a stage, the mind abides nowhere. Free from both egress and access 無有出入, it accesses the *amala* consciousness 庵摩羅識.³⁹⁴ The Bodhisattva Non-Abiding 無住菩薩 asked: ‘If the *amala*-consciousness 庵摩羅識 has some place where it can be accessed, [does this mean it is] something that is attained (得, *upalabdhī*) — that is, an attained dharma (處有所得是得法)?’ The Buddha replied: ‘No, it does not.’³⁹⁵

The VSS goes on to relate a parable of a prodigal son (VSS<3>), who carries gold coins in his hands, but does not know it. For fifty years he roams in poverty and destitu-

³⁹⁰ I here follow BUSWELL’s translation. To my knowledge, he does not explain how he arrived at it, but equally, I cannot fully understand the sense of the Chinese, and defer to his judgement.

³⁹¹ I use the admittedly awkward translation “revolutionary transformation” because 轉 here recalls the doctrine of *aśrayaparāvṛtti*, which, as we have seen, is absolutely central to P’s original doctrine of **amalavijñāna*.

³⁹² Translation modified.

³⁹³ T273:9.368b13-18; BUSWELL (2007), 141, translation modified.

³⁹⁴ The text here recalls the old *prajñāparamitā* idea that the ultimate, the *tathagata* etc. “does not come or go”.

³⁹⁵ T273:9.368c26-369a01. I modify the translation in BUSWELL (2007), 155-157, which incorporates in full his earlier translation of the root text of VSS published in his *Formation of Ch’an Ideology*.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

tion, before his father finally tells him he has been in possession of gold all along. The moral of the story is spelt out thus:

“It is just the same with the **amala*[-*vijñāna*]. It is not something from which you have departed 出, and now, it is not ‘accessed’ 入. Just because you were deluded in the past, does not mean you did not have it; and just because you have realised now [that you have it], does not mean you have ‘gained access’ to it 入.”³⁹⁶

VSS also mentions “ninth consciousness” twice:

(VSS<4>): “The Buddha [said:] “Those who recite the Prātimokṣa precepts do so because of their unwholesome haughtiness, which is [like] waves and swells on the sea. If the sea, i.e. the ground of their mind in the eighth consciousness, is limpid, then the ‘[out-]flow’ (流, *asrava*/*ogha*)³⁹⁷ will be purified from the ninth consciousness. Where no wind moves, waves cannot arise. The precepts are by nature uniform and empty (*sūnya*) 等空; [those who] hold fast to them are deluded and confused.”³⁹⁸

(VSS<5>): “[The Buddha said:] Thusness is empty (*sūnya*) in its essence 真如空性. The fire of the gnosis [that knows] this emptiness of essence 性空智火 completely burns up all fetters (結, *samyojana*). All is utterly uniform 平等平等, and the three stages of equivalent enlightenment 等覺三地³⁹⁹ and the three bodies of sublime awakening 妙覺三身 are radiant, clear and pure within the ninth consciousness 於九識中皎然明淨, [so that] there are no shadows.”⁴⁰⁰

³⁹⁶ T273:9.369a01-09; BUSWELL (2007), 157-159, translation modified. This parable is full of word-play key to conveying its lesson: on the notion of “attaining” (得, *upalabdhi*), which is the same word used for the son finally “getting” or “finding” the gold; on the notions of “coming to” and “going from” 出入, which BUSWELL translated “egress and access” above, which refer back to the old Prajñāpāramitā notion of “coming or going”, and which are used to refer to gold and good fortune apparently *deserting* and then *returning to* the son. BUSWELL’s translation obscures these word plays somewhat.

³⁹⁷ A play on words: 流 (often *asrava*) is also used for *ogha*, “flood”, “flow”, thus likening the *asrava* to the waves.

³⁹⁸ T273:9.370b22-24; BUSWELL (2007), 204, translation modified.

³⁹⁹ Like the following concept of “sublime awakening”, this concept derives from the Chinese apocryphon the *Pusa yingluo benye jing*; BUSWELL (2007), 12. BUSWELL translates “virtual enlightenment”, but I cannot understand what he intends by this translation. My alternative here is also tentative, but I hope, closer to the literal sense of the Chinese.

⁴⁰⁰ T273:9.371b14-16; BUSWELL (2007), 234.

There is much that is new here. Astonishingly, the VSS is the first time after Zhiyi⁴⁰¹ in the later evidence that we see even the faintest allusion to *āśrayaparāvṛtti*, despite the centrality of it to Paramārtha’s doctrine of **amalavijñāna*.⁴⁰² We also see here a connection of **amalavijñāna* to a kind of “other-power” doctrine, in which access to it is explained by the good works of the Tathāgatas (VSS<1>). This is also the first time we have seen **amalavijñāna* associated with the doctrines of “non-abiding *nirvāna*” (無住涅槃, *apratiṣṭhitanirvāna*), “non-production” (*anutpāda*), and “neither coming nor going” (BUSWELL’s “free from both egress and access”). It is also the first time we have seen **amalavijñāna* associated with “non-abiding” (VSS<2>). The parable (VSS<3>) is clearly modelled on the basic conceit of some of the nine parables of the *Tathāgatagarbha sūtra*, even though it matches none of those parables exactly⁴⁰³ — by this means, the association between **amalavijñāna* and *tathāgatagarbha* is clearly further strengthened. The metaphor of the “waves and the sea” (VSS<4>) derives from LAS,⁴⁰⁴ and is, of course, by this stage in Chinese Buddhist history, famously associated with AF.⁴⁰⁵ This is the first time we have seen it used in direct connection with **amalavijñāna*. VSS<5> also draws an implicit connection between **amalavijñāna* and the “taintless stage” (*wugou di* 無垢地 = **amalabhūmi*) of the path to buddhahood, as it was expounded in the Chinese apocryphon the *Pusa yingluo benye jing* (菩薩瓔珞本業經, T1485).⁴⁰⁶

Wōnhyo develops these rich ideas even further in his commentary. As BUSWELL shows in his translation and study of Wōnhyo’s commentary, Wōnhyo picks up on these hints in the root text and elaborates them into a theory whereby **amalavijñāna* be-

401 Note that the transcriptions used for **amalavijñāna* in VSS also seem to suggest a connection with Zhiyi.

402 Even later, this connection is only hinted at a few times, by Dingbin, Dajue and Chengguan (see below).

403 Several of the parables involved hidden gold (4, “gold in a cesspit”; 7, “dead traveller’s gold”; 9, “dirty gold statue”). In addition, Parable 5, of the poor family that, unbeknownst to themselves, lives on top of a treasure-trove for years, shares a basic similarity of plot conceit with this present parable. For these parables, see *Rulaizang jing* 如來藏經 (*Tathāgatagarbha sūtra*) T666, and for an exhaustive study, see ZIMMERMAN.

404 E.g. T671:16.515a06-08, 523b25-c03, 523 c12-19.

405 T1666:32.576c11-15.

406 The “equivalent” 等覺 awakening alluded to here is said in that text to belong to a “taintless (or ‘immaculate’) stage” (*wugoudi*), while “sublime” awakening 妙覺 belongs to a stage called “sublime training” (*miaoxuedi* 妙學地). It is easy to see how the author of the VSS could have associated this *amala* stage of practice with **amalavijñāna*.

comes the key to a scheme of practice, by means of which the practitioner can progress from the ordinary to the awakened state. The key innovation and doctrinal goal in Wōnhyo’s commentary is the attempt to bring out an “active” dimension of *tathāgatagarbha*, using a framework derived from AF (“original enlightenment” *benjue* 本覺, “acquired enlightenment” *shijue* 始覺, etc.).⁴⁰⁷ The main way Wōnhyo achieves this is to map **amalavijñāna* onto the path structure of the *Pusa yingluo benye jing*. Thus, “as Wōnhyo interprets [the VSS], the enlightenment that is immanent in the mundane world . . . could actually be viewed as a practical catalyst to religious training.”⁴⁰⁸ Wōnhyo constructs “a comprehensive system of meditative practice, focusing on the six divisions of contemplation practice⁴⁰⁹ that lead to the experience of ‘the contemplation practice that has but a single taste,’” which constitutes “a practical way of actually cultivating original enlightenment, rather than just passively acquiescing to it”.⁴¹⁰ On this reading, “the *Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* provides a practical soteriology of original enlightenment by shifting the *Awakening of Faith*’s accounts of mind and enlightenment from ontology into the realm of actual practice.”⁴¹¹

The most important points in Wōnhyo’s exposition of **amalavijñāna* are as follows.⁴¹² In his introduction, Wōnhyo says that as the result of the six practices⁴¹³ advocated by the *sūtra*, the “ninth consciousness” appears by a revolutionary transformation 轉 (*parā/vrt*).⁴¹⁴ He calls this resulting ninth consciousness *wugoushi* 無垢識, and identifies it with the *dharmadhātu*.⁴¹⁵ This is the first time we have seen **amalavijñāna* associated with the *dharmadhātu* since SBKL<1>.⁴¹⁶ The process of realisation continues with the revolutionary transformation (轉 once more) of the eight consciousnesses into the

407 BUSWELL (2007), 5-6.

408 BUSWELL (2007), 13.

409 BUSWELL summarises the six divisions of this practice, which are the focus of Ch. 2-7 of Wōnhyo’s text respectively, 14.

410 BUSWELL (2007), 14.

411 BUSWELL (2007), 15.

412 Remaining passages where Wōnhyo treats **amalavijñāna* (excluding citations from the root text), not discussed individually in the following, are: T1730:34.995a17-19, BUSWELL (2007), 236-237; 1003b20-26, BUSWELL 284. See also n. 254 above.

413 See n. 409.

414 BUSWELL (2007) mistranslates this word as “in turn”, 49.

415 T1730:34.961b03-04; BUSWELL (2007), 48-49.

416 It is possible that this might be a clue indicating that Wōnhyo had direct access to SBKL, since we know of no other earlier source from which he might have derived this idea. It is also possible, however, that he arrived at the identification independently.

four wisdoms (*adarsajñāna*, *samatajñāna*, *pratyavekṣajñāna*, *anusthānajñāna*), and the attainment of the three bodies (*trikyāya*) of the Buddha. We have not seen the idea of the attainment of all three bodies connected to **amalavijñāna* before; the only place we have previously seen **amalavijñāna* connected with the four wisdoms is in Daoji's use of MSA.⁴¹⁷ Wōnhyo further says that in this state, gnosis and its object are nondual 境智無二.⁴¹⁸

Later, Wōnhyo states explicitly that “original enlightenment” is identical to **amalavijñāna* 本覺正是唵摩羅識; he therefore glosses the notion of “accessing **amalavijñāna*” seen in VSS<1> as “attaining *benjue*” 得本覺.⁴¹⁹ The ground for this move was obviously prepared for Wōnhyo by the author of VSS in passage <1> above; Wōnhyo is merely spelling out what is already there implicit. In glossing VSS<2>, Wōnhyo explains that “accessing **amala[-vijñāna]* means “leaving behind the two extremes” 離二邊, and he identifies the attainment of **amalavijñāna* with “returning to the fountainhead of the mind” 歸此心源.⁴²⁰ These claims reinforce the ties between **amalavijñāna* and the AF framework.

In commenting on the parable of the foolish son, Wōnhyo comments that the gold has the four qualities of permanence, bliss, self-identity and purity 常樂我淨. The use of these four well-known epithets of *tathāgatagarbha* strengthens still further the association between *tathāgatagarbha* and **amalavijñāna*. He also assigns these epithets to *benjue*.⁴²¹ He goes on to employ the LAS/AF figure of wind, waves and water, associating the underlying tranquil substratum (the sea) with *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta* 自性清淨心.⁴²² Mention of this concept puts Wōnhyo in a line that includes Huijun, MSA and Daoji before him, and Chengguan after.

Finally, in one other text, the *Niepan zong yao* 涅槃宗要, Wōnhyo explicitly identi-

⁴¹⁷ See p. 132. Note, however, that Kuiji's verse from the *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing* also makes this same connection (see p. 143), and we cannot be sure of the chronological relationship between Kuiji's and Wōnhyo's pertinent works here.

⁴¹⁸ T1730:34.961b03-06. He later repeats the assertion that *benjue* and “ninth consciousness” are identical: 本覺正是第九識 989b25, BUSWELL (2007), 205.

⁴¹⁹ T1730:34.978a20-22

⁴²⁰ T1730:34.980c08, BUSWELL (2007), 157. He also identifies the attainment of **amalavijñāna* with “returning to the fountainhead of the mind” at 994c24-27.

⁴²¹ T1730:34.981a28-29.

⁴²² T1730:34.981b20.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

fies **amalavijñāna* with Thusness, the substance of Buddha-nature 佛性體, and, most interestingly, *jiexing* 解性.⁴²³ This last notion derives from Paramārtha’s MSg,⁴²⁴ and seems itself to have been the centre of a process of reinterpretation in line with *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine as mediated by AF ideas.⁴²⁵ This is the first time we have seen this idea associated with **amalavijñāna*.

In sum, in the VSS and Wōnhyo, **amalavijñāna* is an important concept, and it undergoes a number of striking new developments. It is elaborated into a basis for practice; it is associated with the path structure from the *Pusa yingluo benye jing*; it is linked to the four wisdoms and the three bodies; it is tied much more closely to *tathāgatagarbha*, Buddha nature, and their four epithets of permanence, bliss, self-identity and purity; and it is associated still more with AF rubrics and concepts. These texts also seem to revert to some old and, from what the extant texts show us, authentic dimensions of Paramārtha’s doctrines, including the link to *āśrayaparāvṛtti*, and the identification with the *dharmadhātu*, and the nonduality of perfect gnosis and its object.

From this point in our analysis,⁴²⁶ as we venture into periods more distant from Paramārtha himself, the testimony of authors who mention **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness tends only to become more uniform, more removed from anything Paramārtha himself said, and more derivate of intervening accounts. For these reasons, we will not treat individual the remaining authors to 800 so exhaustively, but rather, will

⁴²³ T1769:38.249b08.

⁴²⁴ T1595:31.175a25-26.

⁴²⁵ This concept has traditionally been understood as meaning something like “inherent nature [disposing the sentient being] to liberation/gnosis”. However, Ching KENG argues persuasively that this is not an accurate reflection of the term as it was used by P and the early Shelun school. See KENG’s forthcoming Harvard PhD dissertation.

⁴²⁶ Remaining sources in the period down to the Faxiang authors, whose comments are too slight to treat in detail, are: (1) A brief comment in Fali’s (法礪, 569-635) *Sifen lü shu* (四分律疏, composed between 618 and 626), which occurs in the context of a discussion of the Buddha’s bodies, speaks of the “ninth pure consciousness [that is] Thusness, the *dharmadhātu*” 真如法界第九淨識. Upon the attainment of buddhahood, this instance, “originally hidden, is made manifest” 本隱今顯 and “comprises the *dharmakāya*” 以為法身; X731:41.541b06-09. (2) Li Shizheng (李師政, d.u., fl. 626-649) mentions **amalavijñāna* in his *Famen ming yi ji* 法門名義集 T2124. He uses the very unusual transcription 阿磨羅識. Li, unusually, echoes Huijun in discussing **amalavijñāna* in terms of the distinction between ontological cause 生因 (*karanahetu*) and epistemological cause 了因 (*jñāpakahetu*); T2124:54.195b11-23; see n. 345. (3) Zhiyan very briefly mentions **amalavijñāna* twice, T1870:45.543a18-21; T1869:45.522c18-26.

only pick out the main trends in their accounts. There are two main groups of ideas we need to look at: those of the Faxiang school; and the beginning of a reaction against those ideas, as seen in the Vinaya authors Dingbin and Dajue, and in Chengguan.

4.1.3.9 Faxiang authors

We turn first to Xuanzang's Faxiang school. During roughly the same few decades when the VSS and Wōnhyo's commentary were composed, Xuanzang and his team would have been busy on their massive translation projects, and his disciples would have been producing the first of their significant body of commentarial literature. In this literature, they occasionally commented on Paramārtha's doctrines, including **amalavijñāna*. The three most important Faxiang authors to comment on **amalavijñāna* and ninth consciousness are Kuiji, Wōnch'uk and Tunnyun. We will here take them as representative, noting additional information supplied by other authors as necessary.⁴²⁷

The battle against the notion of the so-called "ninth consciousness" was a key part of the struggle of the Faxiang school to roll back the ongoing synthesis of Yogācāra and *tathāgatagarbha* thought, which it saw as heterodox. This polemical setting exerts a significant distorting influence over their presentation of the doctrine. This bias notwithstanding, the massive historical influence of the Faxiang position in the interpretation of Yogācāra/Vijñaptimātra doctrine in East Asia has arguably exerted an excessive influence over our understanding of **amalavijñāna*, right down to modern scholarship.

⁴²⁷ Zhizhou (智周, 668-723) comments very briefly in his 成唯識論演祕疏, but merely echoes standard Faxiang opinion, T1833:43.819b16-17. The other pertinent Faxiang authors, both late, are Taehyōn (大賢, 太賢, fl. c. 742-765) and Tankuang (曇曠, c. 700-788). Taehyōn discusses the doctrine in his "Study Notes" 學記 on the *Cheng weishi lun*, discussing the same passage that occasions Kuiji's first comment. He is entirely reliant on his Faxiang predecessors for any information about the doctrine, and does not add any fresh information to our picture; X818:50.64c01-07. Tankuang's account is also entirely derivative. He uses only the transcriptions 阿末羅識, found only Faxiang writers, and 阿磨羅識, otherwise only in Li Shizheng. **Amalavijñāna* is supposed to be a ninth consciousness, and derive from a *Jiushi lun* 九識論 by P, and also LAS. His account is resonant of AF; T2810:85.1050b21, 1051b09-14; T2812:85.1075a19-23.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Kuiji⁴²⁸ discusses **amalavijñāna* in the context of a larger discussion of various rubrics numbering consciousness various ways. He begins by citing the LAS passage saying consciousness can be eightfold or ninefold. He then says:

“On the basis of the *Wuxiang lun* and the *Mahāyānābhisamaya sūtra*, this [verse, i.e. from LAS⁴²⁹ is interpreted to] [mis-]take 取⁴³⁰ Thusness for a ninth consciousness, because it expounds the combination of two aspects, one true [consciousness] and eight worldly [consciousnesses]. Thus, [this interpretation] [mis-]takes 取 the eighth, fundamental consciousness 本識, when it is in a state of purity, for a ninth, expounding a distinction between the defiled and pure 染淨 fundamental consciousness. The “*Sūtra of the Adornment of the Tathāgata by Merits*” 如來功德莊嚴經 says:

The taintless consciousness 無垢識 of the Tathāgata
Is the pure 淨 element/realm without ‘outflows’ (*anāsravadhātu* 無漏界);
It is liberated from all obstructions (*sarvāvaraṇa* 一切障);
It is conjoined with (**samyukta* 相應) the cognition that is like a perfect mirror (圓鏡智,
adarśajñāna).⁴³¹

“Since, here, the text speaks of “taintless consciousness” 無垢識 and “cognition that is like a perfect mirror” together, and since, further, the ninth is called **amalavijñāna* 阿末羅識, we [therefore] know that [the text] is expounding a distinction between the defiled and pure [aspects of

428 As we have already seen above, Kuiji (窺基, 632-682) uses a variety of transcriptions for **amalavijñāna*: 菴摩羅識, 菴末羅識, and 阿末羅識 (this last seen for the first time here and in Wōnch'uk). He also calls it *wugoushi* 無垢識. Kuiji also refers to **amalavijñāna* as a “ninth consciousness” — indeed, for him, the fact that it is counted as a ninth is a major bone of contention.

429 Kuiji cites the verse on “eight or nine consciousnesses” from LAS (see n. 296; Kuiji cites the Bodhiruci translation, T671:16.565b24) immediately before the passage Tunnyun quotes here.

430 “Mistakes for” in the sense that it “apprehends” it as such, but this apprehension is a kind of ignorant clinging 取.

431 如來無垢識 / 是淨無漏界 / 解脫一切障 / 圓鏡智相應. This verse is quoted (from “a *sūtra*”) in the third *juan* of *Cheng weishi lun* T1585:31.13c23-24. The provenance of the verse is identified in Kuiji’s commentary, T1830:43.344c21-22. The text seems only to have been known in the East Asian tradition for this one verse. In CWSL itself, this verse is only identified as from “a *sūtra*”; commentators from Kuiji on seem to follow Kuiji here in identifying the source text, e.g. Huiyuan (慧苑, 673-743?): X221:3.833b21-23 ; Chengguan: T1735:35.878a17-18; Yanshou (延壽, Song dynasty): T2016:48.584c08-10; etc. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN (1928-1929) 1, 167, reconstructs the title of the *sūtra* as *Tathāgataguṇālamkāra*, but does not give any information about the text.

the] eighth consciousness, and taking [the latter] 以為 for the ninth.”⁴³²

This passage was the key point of reference for later Faxiang writers discussing **amalavijñāna*. We see here a number of hints that suggest Kuiji’s understanding is based quite closely on Daoji.⁴³³ Kuiji also adduces a new proof text for the concept, coming to him via none other than the (for his school) immensely authoritative *Cheng weishi lun* (the only source for the *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing* verses).

In keeping with the Faxiang attempt to assert their orthodoxy over Paramārtha, we see here for the first time the outright assertion that there is something wrong with the concept of ninth consciousness: it is based upon (grasping) misapprehension 取. Kuiji was elsewhere even more forthright about criticising this notion: “A former master set up [*wugoushi*] as a ninth consciousness. This is an error 古師立為第九識者非也.”⁴³⁴ In his commentary on the *Cheng weishi lun* (the *Shuji* 述記), he again cites the LAS verse, and then explains the nature of the error:

“To say there is a ninth consciousness is superfluous 增數. It is manifest that the other-dependent consciousness (**paratantra-vijñāna*, 依他識) includes three types [of consciousness], when considered in general 略, and only 唯 eight, when considered in detail 廣. It is beyond increase and decrease 離於增減, and that is why we use the word ‘only’ 唯.”⁴³⁵ The *Laṃkāvatāra*

⁴³² 大乘法苑義林章, T1861:45.261b16-23.

⁴³³ It is significant that both WXL and the *Mahāyānābhisamaya* are used by Daoji as key proof-texts for the discussion of **amalavijñāna*. For Daoji’s use of WXL, see §4.1.3.7 above; for his use of the *Mahāyānābhisamaya*, see n. 384. The fact that Kuiji mentions these two texts in tandem, in addition to the fact that Daoji was a teacher of XZ, suggests that the *Mahāyānābhisamaya* passage Kuiji is thinking of here is most likely the one quoted by Daoji. Further, Daoji’s citation of MSA passages about the transformation of various kinds of consciousness by *parāvṛtti* (see p. 132) is also the main precedent to the link Kuiji makes (via the *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing* citation) between **amalavijñāna* and *adarsajñāna*. The fact that the present passage alludes to these source texts is a strong indication that the Faxiang school’s understanding of the doctrine was derived via Daoji’s *Shelun zhang*, or at any rate, from Daoji. In this connection, it is perhaps significant that Kuiji also mentions WXL and *Mahāyānābhisamaya* once more, where he also ascribes to them certain ideas about “taintless consciousness” — namely that it is “consciousness or mind in its essence, viz. the principle of Thusness” 無垢識、是自性識心、則真如理, T1831:43.634c08-09. (The only other places this phrase occurs are when later authors cite Kuiji.) This, too, is a clear echo of ideas from Daoji’s *Shelun zhang*, for which see n. 388.

⁴³⁴ T1830:43.344c09-13.

⁴³⁵ Note that this is the “only” of *weishi*, Chinese for *vijñaptimātra*, “consciousness only”, the

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

doubles up in its exposition[, saying] that if we take the eighth as defiled, and separate out its pure [aspect], we can speak of a ‘ninth consciousness’. This does not mean that there are nine [consciousnesses] in the substance 體 of the other-dependent consciousness 依他識, and it also does not mean that in terms of substantial kinds 體類, there is a separate ninth consciousness.⁴³⁶

Apart from these passages, Kuiji only comments briefly and inconsequentially on **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness.⁴³⁷

In his famous commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana sūtra*, Wōnch’uk⁴³⁸ also uses the term *wugoushi* in a manner that clearly attempts to recuperate the term as merely another name for *ālayavijñāna*.

“The Trepitaka Paramārtha asserted a doctrine of nine consciousnesses on the basis of the *Jueding zang lun*. “Nine consciousnesses” refers to: six consciousnesses (of the eye, etc.) . . . the seventh *adāna* . . . and the eighth, *ālayavijñāna*, which is of three kinds . . . The ninth is **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識, which here [in China] is called ‘taintless consciousness’ 無垢識. It takes Thusness for its substance 體, such that, in the same Thusness, there are two aspects 義: (1) the object [of gnosis] (‘noema’, 所緣境), which is termed Thusness, or the ‘limit of reality’ (*bhūtakoti*); (2) the subject [of gnosis] (能緣, ‘noesis’), which is termed ‘taintless consciousness’ 無垢識, and is also termed ‘original awakening’ (*benjue*, 本覺). This is as is explained by the *Jiushi zhang*, citing the “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” of the *Jueding zang lun* 具如九識章引決定藏論九識品中說.⁴³⁹

Later, Wōnch’uk returns to the topic, arguing that *wugoushi* is correctly just another name for *ālayavijñāna*:

subject of the eponymous *Cheng weishi lun*.

⁴³⁶ T1830:43.239a12-16.

⁴³⁷ In one brief passage, Kuiji says that **amalavijñāna* is only found at the stage of “the fruition of buddhahood” 唯在佛果; T1829:43.179a04-05. Other passages in which Kuiji comments are T1782:38.1001c26-29 and T1861:45.282c19-25.

⁴³⁸ We have seen that Wōnch’uk (圓測, 613-696) (who is Kuiji’s senior in years, but as we shall see, depends upon him in the explication of **amalavijñāna*), uses the transcription 阿末羅識 (seen for the first time here and in Kuiji), as well as the standard 阿摩羅識. He also uses the term *wugoushi* to refer to **amalavijñāna*. We also saw already that he refers to a specific text by P on the “nine consciousnesses”, which he calls “Essay on Nine Consciousnesses” (*Jiushi zhang* 九識章), saying it quotes the “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” of JDZL.

⁴³⁹ X369:21.240b20-c07.

“[*Ālayavijñāna*] is also called ‘taintless consciousness’ (*wugoushi*), because it is utterly pure, and the basis for all *dharmas* ‘without outflow’ (*anasravadharmas*, 諸無漏法). To explain: the Sanskrit word [for this term] is **amalavijñāna* 阿末羅識, which here [in China] means ‘taintless consciousness’ (*wugoushi*). This is the state of [*ālayavijñāna* in?] sublime awakening 妙覺位. The substance of mind when it is conjoined 相應 with wisdom that is like a mirror (*adarsajñāna*) is called *wugoushi*. It is utterly pure; all the *dharmas* of the path that are without ‘outflow’ (**anasravamargadharma*),⁴⁴⁰ [such as] wisdoms (*jñāna*), states of absorption (*samādhi*) etc., take it as their basis. Thus the ‘Sūtra of the Adornment of the Tathāgata by Merits’ (*Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing*) says: ‘The taintless consciousness of the Tathāgata/ Is the pure element without ‘outflows’;/ It is liberated from all obstructions;/ It is conjoined with the cognition that is like a perfect mirror.’⁴⁴¹ This is explained in detail in the third *juan* of the commentary on the [*Cheng*] *weishi lun* 唯識疏.⁴⁴²

This explanation applies purely to the *alayavijñāna*, even though it accepts (or speculates) that **amalavijñāna* was the original term for *wugoushi* as cited in the *Cheng weishi lun*.

In one other brief comment in his commentary on the *Sūtra of Humane Kings* 仁王經疏 Wōnch’uk overtly addresses a doctrine he ascribes to Paramārtha:

“Further, Trepitaka Paramārtha propounded a total of nine consciousnesses, adding **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識, which has as its essence Thusness-cum-original awakening 真如本覺. While it is in [a state of] bondage, it is called *tathāgatagarbha*; when it escapes bondage, it is called the *dharmakaya* 在纏名如來藏出纏名法身. Here [in China,] we call it ‘taintless consciousness’ 此云無垢識. This is as [it is expounded] in the *Jiushi zhang* 九識章. The remaining eight consciousnesses are roughly the same as in all the masters.”⁴⁴³

The distinction here adduced between “in bondage” and “free from bondage” derives from a new proof-text in the history of **amalavijñāna* doctrine, the seminal *tathāgatagarbha* scripture, the *Śrīmālādevīsīmaṇāda sūtra*,⁴⁴⁴ though the exact wording

440 This is one of the very few times we have seen **amalavijñāna* associated with what is “without ‘outflows’” (*anasrava*) since P himself.

441 This verse was already cited by Kuiji, above p. 143.

442 X369:21.246c24-247a05. The reference at the end of this citation is to Kuiji; see n. 431.

443 T1708:33.400b26-29.

444 In *Guṇabhadra*: 若於無量煩惱藏所纏如來藏不疑惑者、於出無量煩惱藏法身亦無疑惑, T353:12.221b17-18; in *Bodhiruci* almost identical, T310(48):11.676c26-28; Skt. is known be-

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

used by Wōnch’uk appears in no Chinese *sūtras*, but rather, first in the writings of this Faxiang generation and their successors. This is a new link between **amalavijñāna* and *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine. Unfortunately, it does not seem there is any way of knowing whether Wōnch’uk had it from some earlier text, and if so, what; or whether he perhaps added this flourish himself.

In his *Yuqie lun ji* 瑜伽論記, Tunnyun⁴⁴⁵ provides us more new information:

“Here, [Hui-]Jing [惠]景⁴⁴⁶ follows 擬 Master Paramārtha in establishing the doctrine of nine consciousnesses 九識義 on the basis of a citation from the ‘Ninth Consciousness Chapter’ 九識品 of the *Jueding zang lun*. However, in the portion of the *Jueding zang lun* corresponding 即到 the second part 分 of the present *śāstra*, there never was any ‘Ninth Consciousness Chapter’. Further, Master [Wen-]Bei [文]備⁴⁴⁷ says that an old tradition 昔傳 cites the [notion of] **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識 from the *Wuxiang lun* 無相論 to prove that there are nine consciousnesses.⁴⁴⁸ The *Wuxiang lun* corresponds to the ‘Chapter on Absence of Essence (*niḥsvabhāvatā*) 無性品’ from the *Xianyang [shengjiao] lun* 顯揚論, but in that chapter, the term **amalavijñāna* does not feature. Now, based upon the doctrine that there are nine consciousnesses from the *Laṃkāvatāra sūtra* etc., [we can say that] the ninth is called **amalavijñāna*, which here [in China] would be said, ‘taintless’ 此云無垢. Master Ji 基 [i.e. Kuiji] says [of this]:

[Tunnyun here quotes in full the long Kuiji passage translated above, p. 143.]

“Divākara (地婆訶羅, fl. 676-688) says that there is also an interpretation 解, in Western lands 西方, that holds that a separate aspect of the sixth consciousness 六識 [i.e. *manovijñāna*] is called **amala* 阿摩羅, because it has the excellent function 勝用 of eradicating ignorance and realising

cause it is cited in RGV: *yo bhagavan sarvakleśa-kośakoṭi-gūḍhe tathāgatagarbhe niṣkāṅṣaḥ sarvakleśa-kośa-vinirmuktes tathāgatagarbhakāye ‘pi sa niṣkāṅṣa iti*, JOHNSTON 79, 147; WAYMAN and WAYMAN 96.

⁴⁴⁵ We have already seen that Tunnyun (遁倫, d.u., Silla monk of the eighth century) uses the transcriptions 菴摩羅識, 阿末羅識 (citing Kuiji), and 菴末羅識 (citing Kuiji) as well as the ordinary 阿摩羅. We also saw that he reports that Huijing 惠景 traced the doctrine back to a “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” of JDZL.

⁴⁴⁶ Wenbei and Huijing were apparently late Shelun school figures; YOSHIMURA (2002), 234.

⁴⁴⁷ See n. 446.

⁴⁴⁸ Given that Wenbei was a Shelun school figure, we can speculate, on the basis of the evidence to hand, that this is most likely a reference to Daoji.

MICHAEL RADICH

cessation 斷惑證滅.⁴⁴⁹ Dharma Master [Wōn-]Hyo of Silla says that *praktiprabhasvaracitta* 自性清淨心 is called **amala* 阿摩羅,⁴⁵⁰ and that it is of one substance with the eighth [consciousness], *alayavijñāna*, but different in aspect 義別. Here, I follow (‘retain’, 存) this interpretation, which accords well 善順 with the *sūtra* [quoted] above.”

Tunnyun’s comments⁴⁵¹ here stand out for the scholarly care with which he reports and evaluates various positions and traditions. He has also clearly taken pains to gather all the relevant information he could; but he is still entirely reliant upon relatively late, second-hand information. It also seems he could only base his assessment on parallels to Paramārtha’s texts in translations by Xuanzang; he apparently did not refer to Paramārtha’s own works on the topic.

Perhaps the most significant thing about the treatment of **amalavijñāna* and ninth consciousness/nine consciousnesses in these Faxiang authors is the overtly critical tone they adopt. Where early Sanlun authors (Jizang and Huijun) were also critical of Paramārtha, this was in a context in which they were critical of a number of schools, and for reasons somewhat tangential to Yogācāra concepts. Here, however, we encounter a head-on attack precisely on the concept of ninth consciousness itself, and the discussion is almost entirely governed by this polemic; such authors mention only those aspects of the doctrine that are necessary to refute it. In this polemical context, we should be alert for possible distortions of the doctrine, to make of it a straw man or a sitting duck.

Faxiang authors adduce a new proof text, the otherwise entirely unknown “*Sūtra of Adornment of the Tathāgata by Merits*”. Moreover, Faxiang authors implicitly also use *Cheng weishi lun* as a proof text (since their comments are often occasioned by pertinent passages in that text); the conjunction of the *Mahāyānābhīsamaya* and WXL as proof-

449 It is difficult to know what to make of this tantalising comment. Divākara may have made some remark in connection with his translation of the *Ghanavyūha sūtra*, which Dingbin and Chengguan cite (see below) as a proof text for the notion that mind can be eightfold or ninefold, and that the pure *garbha* of the Tathāgata is called **amalajñāna*; see n. 459, 473. On *manovijñāna* as the only consciousness to which the elimination of desire (corresponding here to *huo*, “confusion, ignorance”) pertains, see AKBh 3.42a-c, *vairāgya . . . manovijñāna eva iṣṭā*; VP 2, 131, PRADHAN 155.19-20, P T1559:29.213b07-08. My thanks to ŌTAKE Susumu for pointing this passage out to me.

450 Presumably referring to the passage cited above n. 422.

451 One other mention of **amalavijñāna* in Tunnyun’s corpus is also a simple quote from Kuiji, T1828:42.605b22-23.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

texts imply they are probably reliant upon Daoji,⁴⁵² and authors after Kuiji refer to Kuiji himself as an authority on the question. In addition, Faxiang authors refer to the following texts already referred to by their predecessors: LAS, WXL, and the *Mahāyānābhisamaya*. The transcriptions they use seem to indicate that they have encountered the idea of **amalavijñāna* in part through the writings of Tiantai Zhiyi.

By contrast, Faxiang authors make very little reference to Paramārtha’s own works: they only refer to the supposed *Jiushi zhang*, and to JDZL (with no signs that they had actually read JDZL itself). Given the reasons for caution in believing the traditional ascription of a *Jiushi zhang* to Paramārtha, there is very little to give us confidence that the Faxiang authors were engaging with a textually grounded version of **amalavijñāna*, traceable to Paramārtha himself.

This paucity of firm information is reflected in the contents of the doctrine the Faxiang authors describe. They are more concerned to tell us what it is *not*, i.e. the “correct” understanding that in their view should be substituted for its mistakes; and what is wrong with it by contrast. They have very little to say about the actual content of Paramārtha’s doctrine: only that it counts **amalavijñāna* as a ninth consciousness; that it associates **amalavijñāna* with Thusness; (in Wōnch’uk only) that it has two aspects, as object (Thusness etc.) and subject (*benjue* etc.); that it is the basis for *anāsravadharmas*; and that it has two states, after the manner of *tathāgatagarbha*, i.e. in and out of bondage.

Now, it seems highly likely from his citation of WXL and the *Mahāyānābhisamaya*, and perhaps the reference to *ādarsajñāna*, that Kuiji is deriving his information about **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness from Daoji.⁴⁵³ It is also apparent that Wōnch’uk, already, is in part following Kuiji in his interpretation of the problem.⁴⁵⁴ We recall that Daoji was a teacher of Xuanzang,⁴⁵⁵ and also a student of Jingsong, to whom is ascribed a *Jiushi xuan yi*.⁴⁵⁶ These facts in combination make it possible that a Jingsong-Daoji version of the doctrine was the proximate source of Faxiang information about it, and the most immediate target of the Faxiang polemic.

⁴⁵² See n. 433.

⁴⁵³ See n. See n. 433.

⁴⁵⁴ See his reference to Kuiji at the end of the second passage translated above, p. 146, and n. 442.

⁴⁵⁵ See n. 366.

⁴⁵⁶ See p. 113.

Further, we have seen that an almost riotous variety of various ideas about **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness was current in the century between Paramārtha and the Faxiang authors. By contrast, looking ahead towards the eighth century, we see that after Kuiji and Wōnch'uk, the range of ideas we encounter is significantly impoverished, and very often dependent on the Faxiang authors themselves.

It thus seems that we encounter here a bottleneck in the transmission of “ninth consciousness” lore: ideas possibly acquired via Daoji’s Shelun-school lineage are recast in a form most suitable for their treatment as the targets of a polemic, and this then becomes the dominant guise in which the lore is known to later generations.

4.1.3.10 Two Dharmaguptaka Vinaya authors in the early eighth century

We turn next to Dingbin’s (定賓) *Sifen lü shu shi zong yiji* 四分律疏飾宗義記 (c. 703-705)⁴⁵⁷ and Dajue’s 大覺 *Sifen lü xingshi chaopi* 四分律行事抄批 (712),⁴⁵⁸ both in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya 四分律 lineage. The main significance of these two authors is that they disagree with Faxiang authors and side with Paramārtha. In so doing, however, they show that even scholars after the Faxiang authors but outside that school were heavily influenced by them in their understanding of the doctrine.

Dingbin cites a new proof text, translated only after the time of Kuiji and Wōnch'uk: the *Ghanavyūha-sūtra* (*Dasheng miyan jing* 大乘密嚴經, T681), which held, in a manner reminiscent of LAS, that mind could either be of eight or nine kinds.⁴⁵⁹ He then cites an explanation of the ninefold system of consciousnesses, ostensibly from Paramārtha but most likely at best derived second-hand from the Wōnch'uk passage above.⁴⁶⁰ This description begins with the six Abhidharmic consciousnesses, and then goes through sev-

⁴⁵⁷ AS FUNAYAMA Tōru points out, this text is ascribed to the later Kaiyuan period (713-741) in the *Song gao seng zhuan*, but passages in the text make reference to “the present third year of the Chang’an era of the great Zhou (dynasty) 大周長安三年 (703 C.E.)” (X733:42.36c15-21), on the one hand, and to the ascension to the throne of the Tang Emperor Zhongzong 中宗 in 705 C.E. In addition, the text is cited by Dajue writing in 712 (on the date of Dajue’s text, see n. 458 following). These facts allow us to date the present text more precisely. See FUNAYAMA (2000), 352 n. 11.

⁴⁵⁸ This text is dated from its colophon, which dates it to the first year of the Daji/Taiji era of the Tang 唐大極元年, i.e. 712 C.E., and says that it was written at Dazhuangyan si 大莊嚴寺 in Xi’jing 西京 (mod. Hangzhou), X736:42.1063c07.

⁴⁵⁹ 心有八種、或復有九, citing T681:16.734a24; *rnam brgyad rnam pa dgu yi sems* etc., P. Cu 31b3, cited in ŌTAKE (2007b), 3. The *Ghanavyūha* was translated by Divākara between 676 and 688.

⁴⁶⁰ See p. 145.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

enth *ādanavijñāna* and eighth *alayavijñāna*. It then comes to the ninth:

“The ninth is called **amalavijñāna*. The Tang Trepitaka says that here [in China], this is translated ‘taintless’ (*wugou*). This is also another name for the eighth consciousness. When one becomes a Buddha, the eighth consciousness undergoes a revolutionary transformation (轉, *para/vrt*), and becomes taintless. There is [thus according to Xuanzang] no separate ninth consciousness. [This is explained] in detail in the **Vijñaptimatra* (唯識, prob. *Cheng weishi lun*), the *Mahayanasamgraha* etc.”⁴⁶¹

Dingbin goes on elaborate further on how Xuanzang and his schoolmen disagreed with this doctrine. However, he then refers to the *Ghanavyūha* again, as proof that it is in fact the Faxiang understanding that is incorrect: “The ninth here is what is described in the last *juan* of the *Ghanavyūha* as follows: ‘The pure *garbha* of the Tathāgata/ Is also called **amalajñāna* 無垢智.’⁴⁶² Thus we can see that [Paramārtha’s understanding] is not in error 不謬.”⁴⁶³ He then goes on to describe the concrete contents of the doctrine of ninth consciousness thus:

“Trepitaka Paramārtha says that there are two kinds of **amalavijñāna*: (1) as object of gnosis (noema, 所緣), meaning Thusness; (2) “original awakening” 本覺, i.e. **tathatājñāna*, 真如智. [This] subject of gnosis (noesis, 能緣) is identical with the “non-empty” (*aśūnya*) [facet of the] matrix ([*tathagata*-] *garbha*); the object (noema) is identical with the “empty” (*sūnya*) [facet of the] matrix ([*tathagata*-] *garbha*).⁴⁶⁴ According to the same (?通? for 同) treatise, both facets take Thusness as their substance 體.”⁴⁶⁵

This characterisation of **amalavijñāna* as of two kinds is clearly derived from simi-

⁴⁶¹ X733:42.44a18-21.

⁴⁶² Citing T681:16.747a15. I am grateful to ŌTAKE Susumu for pointing out that where Divākara has 無垢智, Tib. *Ghanavyūha* has *sprul pa'i ye shes*, **nirmāṇajñāna*; see Peking no. 778, Cu 62a8. By contrast, Divākara’s Chinese would seem to correspond to an underlying **nirmalajñāna* (personal communication, November 2008).

⁴⁶³ 其第九識、如『密嚴經』下卷云、「如來清淨藏、亦名無垢智」故知不謬也, X733:42.44a22-24. Dingbin here may be responding directly to a comment by Wōnch’uk, cited by Taehyōn but to my knowledge unattested elsewhere: “This [interpretation found in the] *Wuxiang lun* is Paramārtha’s error” 其『無相論』真諦謬, X818:50.64c04 (my emphasis).

⁴⁶⁴ Referring to the *Śrīmāladevi sūtra*, T353:12.221c16-18; *sānyas tathāgatagarbho vinirbhāgair muktajñāih sarvakleśakośaih/ aśūnyo gaṅganadvālikavyativṛttair avinirbhāgair amuktajñair acintyair buddhadharmair iti*, JOHNSTON 76, 144; TAKASAKI 301; WAYMAN and WAYMAN 99.

⁴⁶⁵ X733:42.44b03-06.

lar comments made by Wōnch'uk,⁴⁶⁶ or from the same source Wōnch'uk relied upon. However, it is not entirely derivative; it is the first time we have seen **amalavijñāna* associated with the concept of what is “non-empty”, another epithet of the *tathāgatagarbha*. In implicitly adducing the *Śrīmālādevī* as a proof-text, however, Dingbin may also be taking his cue from Wōnch'uk, who we saw above refers to other concepts from the same text.⁴⁶⁷

Dajue explicitly says he gets his information from “the Tang Trepiṭaka” (唐三藏, i.e. Xuanzang). He links **amalavijñāna* to *ādarsajñāna* (like Kuiji's *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing*, probably following Daoji's use of MSA), and says that ninth consciousness is called **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識 in the “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” of JDZL (thus following Wōnch'uk). Echoing Dingbin and Wōnch'uk, he then says,

“Paramārtha explains: ‘This [**amalavijñāna*] is of two kinds: (1) as object of gnosis (noema, 所緣), meaning Thusness; (2) what is termed ‘original awakening’ (*benjue*), which is the gnosis itself (*jñāna*) qua subject of gnosis (能緣, noesis). The *manovijñāna* 意識⁴⁶⁸ and this [*amala*] consciousness unite noema and noesis, which thus, in their unity, comprise the substance of this consciousness 合為此識體。”⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁶ See above p. 145.

⁴⁶⁷ See above p. 146. Dingbin also refers to **amalavijñāna* in one other passage of marginal interest. “Trepiṭaka Paramārtha says that all sentient beings have an originally awakened nature (*benjue xing* 本覺性), which is the ninth [consciousness, viz.], **amalavijñāna*, and practice is only an expedient. The Buddha Jewel functions to make this original awakening (*benjue*), which was originally hidden, become manifest. The Dharma Jewel is intended to provide guidelines allowing one to conform to this original awakening (?即本覺上可軌則義以為法寶). The Saṃgha Jewel is intended to prevent discord and strife 無違諍義為僧寶. The Tang Trepiṭaka said that the essence of the Three Jewels is nothing other than Thusness;” X733:42.191a14-18.

⁴⁶⁸ I cannot understand exactly what Dajue is saying here. It may be relevant that in places P seems to understand that at least at one stage in the process of the realisation of *vijñaptimātrata/weishi*, *manovijñāna* can be taken as the subject of something like *fangbian weishi*, but is understood to itself be obviated in *zhengguan weishi*; cf. FXL T1610:31.809b26-c06, SBKL T1616:31.864a24-28, and discussion in ŌTAKE (2007a), 390-394. Further, as we saw above, according to Tunnyun, Divākara associated *manovijñāna* with *amalavijñāna* in some capacity; Divākara's doctrine may have been connected to the Abhidharma identification of *manovijñāna* as the consciousness that undergoes the elimination of defilement/ignorance/desire; see n. 449. There, too, we see possible parallels with this passage. I thank ŌTAKE Susumu for help with this difficult point (personal communication).

⁴⁶⁹ 真諦所翻『決定藏論』有『九識品』、第九名「阿摩羅識」。真諦譯云：「此有二種。一者、所

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

The last (very cryptic) sentence here is new, but otherwise, Dingbin’s comments are entirely derivative of either the Faxiang authors or Dingbin’s use of Faxiang characterisations. Elsewhere, Dajue repeats verbatim a lengthy passage from Dingbin, showing that he was certainly aware of what Dingbin had to say about **amalavijñāna*.⁴⁷⁰ It is thus difficult to be sure to what extent Dajue worked directly from Wōnch’uk and Kuiji, and to what extent he had even their ideas indirectly via Dingbin.

The most important of these two scholars is clearly Dingbin, whose comments are more detailed, and earlier. Although Dingbin disagrees with the Faxiang position, he clearly has much of his information from Faxiang scholars, and reads Paramārtha’s doctrine through the lens of Faxiang views. It is also noteworthy that he has to fall back, for a proof text, on the *Ghanavyūha*, a new text translated even after Xuanzang’s era. Neither Dingbin nor Dajue seem to have direct access to Paramārtha’s texts.

4.1.3.11 Chengguan

Later comments by Chengguan (澄觀, 738-839) echo Dingbin and Dajue closely. Chengguan also sides quite openly with Paramārtha (as he perceives him) against Xuanzang.

In a first extended discussion,⁴⁷¹ Chengguan says that Paramārtha called the pure aspect of eighth consciousness, which Chengguan refers to as “the pure consciousness of the Buddha” 佛淨識,⁴⁷² a ninth consciousness, and named it **amalavijñāna* 阿摩羅識. Xuanzang said that this term should be translated *wugou*, and that it results from the revolutionary transformation (轉, *parā/vrt*) of the eighth consciousness into a taintless consciousness (*wugoushi*) upon the attainment of buddhahood; but that it is not a ninth consciousness. Chengguan then gives the two *Ghanavyūha-sūtra* citations first seen in Dingbin,⁴⁷³ saying they support Paramārtha in establishing a ninth consciousness. Chengguan then repeats verbatim Dingbin’s assertion, which says that **amalavijñāna* is of two kinds, corresponding to the “non-empty” and “empty” aspects of

緣、即是真如。二名「本覺」、即能緣智。意識、此識、通能所緣、合為此識體也。」
X736:42.876b19-22.

⁴⁷⁰ X736:42.1019b20-23; passage discussed n. 22.

⁴⁷¹ T1736:36.323c03-17.

⁴⁷² This rare term would seem to derive from XZ’s translation of the **Buddhabhāmi sūtra śāstra*: T1530:26.293a29, 311b01, 327c24-25. (Perhaps Chengguan is trying to hoist XZ with his own petard . . .)

⁴⁷³ See above n. 459, n. 463.

tathāgatagarbha.⁴⁷⁴ Chengguan relates this doctrine to the two aspects 門 of mind from AF, i.e. the Thusness aspect 真如門 and the *samsaric* aspect 生滅門,⁴⁷⁵ quoting as a proof-text a section of AF saying that mind is only one, and is Thusness.⁴⁷⁶ He then says that whatever we call the mind in this liberated state, there are important differences between it and ordinary consciousness 凡識, namely that pure consciousness 淨識 creates the four wisdoms and the three bodies (probably following Wōnhyo).⁴⁷⁷

Later in the same text,⁴⁷⁸ Chengguan returns to the topic, in the course of glossing the notion of *rushi xin* (如實心, **yathābhūtacitta*, “mind that is adequate to reality”, apparently a close relative of *yathābhūtajñāna*, 如實智).⁴⁷⁹ He identifies this concept with *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta* (自性清淨心, “aboriginally luminous mind”), for which he refers again to the *Śrīmālādevīsīmhanāda sūtra* and AF, and also cites a passage from MSA comparing *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta* with pure water that has been tainted by mud and dirt, which returns to its original purity when the taints are removed.⁴⁸⁰ He then argues that there can be no essence of mind separate from the Thusness of mind, and therefore, that purity of mind is merely a matter of removing adventitious defilements. Thus, mind is identical with Thusness, and *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta* is identical with *tathāgatagarbha*, and also with original pure consciousness 本來淨識. Having thus prepared the ground, he introduces Paramārtha’s notion of **amalavijñāna*, which he calls a ninth consciousness. The remainder of this passage repeats much of the argument he already laid out in the first passage cited above.⁴⁸¹

⁴⁷⁴ See above p. 151.

⁴⁷⁵ T1666:32.576a06,

⁴⁷⁶ Citing T1666:32.576a12-13.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. VSS and Wōnhyo’s commentary, which are the only other places we have seen the four wisdoms and the three bodies linked with **amalavijñāna* (see p. 140).

⁴⁷⁸ T1736:36.336b04-26.

⁴⁷⁹ 如實心 is a rare enough concept, but found once in Śikṣānanda’s *Avatamsaka sūtra* T279:10.105b01-02, which is certainly enough to account for Chengguan’s interest in it.

⁴⁸⁰ Chengguan is apparently citing from memory: his citation differs in details from MSA itself, but corresponds to scattered portions of Ch. 14 of the Chinese, T1604:31.622c14-623a04, i.e. immediately preceding 623a09, where Prabhākaramitra’s text uses the term **amalavijñāna*; corresponding to Skt. 13.17-13.19 and Bh, where the text is already discussing *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta*; Lévi (1907, 1911) 1, 88; 2, 157-158; JAMPSAL et al. 171-172.

⁴⁸¹ Specifically, he repeats that XZ says the term is translated as *wugou*, but it is not a separate ninth consciousness, rather what results from the revolutionary transformation of eighth consciousness on attainment of buddhahood; he then repeats the two citations from the *Ghanavyāha*; the assertion that **amalavijñāna* was expounded in a special chapter of JDZL;

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

There is much that is new in Chengguan’s discussion here. We have not seen **amalavijñāna* related to “the pure consciousness of the Buddha”. We have seldom since Paramārtha seen such a close association between **amalavijñāna* and *prakṛtiprabhāsvaracitta*, though the link does appear in Huijun, MSA and Daoji, and again in Wōnhyo. It is also, to my knowledge, the first time since Paramārtha that anyone has said so directly that **amalavijñāna* is obscured by adventitious defilements. In some respects, then, it is as if Chengguan is returning to aspects of Paramārtha’s original doctrines; and yet, despite the meticulous way he specifies his sources, we have no indication that he has direct knowledge of Paramārtha’s works.

In Chengguan, then, it seems we see a strengthening of an initial reaction against the Faxiang rejection of Paramārtha’s ideas seen first in Dingbin and Dajue. However, Chengguan elaborates this understanding in a creative way that is most reminiscent, if anything, of the mode of doctrinal development that we see begun in VSS and built upon by Wōnhyo in his commentary. The **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness as articulated in these texts has little to do with Paramārtha’s own doctrine. If **amalavijñāna*, now firmly identified with a ninth consciousness, is by the time of Chengguan on the verge of winning for itself a secure place in East Asian Buddhism, it is in a form that has declared almost complete independence from its original author.

The Faxiang authors articulated a very influential vision of **amalavijñāna* doctrine, as we have seen. At the same time, they made the conflict with Paramārtha so sharp it was almost a matter of “you’re either with us or against us”. In the long run, this may ironically have hastened the demise of the doctrine they opposed to Paramārtha’s. Apparently scholastics began to decide that they were “against them” — the ideas ascribed to Paramārtha, even as Kuiji and Wōnch’uk (inaccurately) described them, proved too attractive to reject entirely, and too well supported in a range of proof texts (none of them, by this stage, Paramārtha’s own!). Perhaps, then, we hear here one stroke of the death knell of Xuanzang’s “orthodox” Faxiang line against the “sinified” line represented by the *Yogācāra-tathāgatagarbha*-Buddha nature-AF synthesis that eventually won out in mainstream East Asian Buddhism.⁴⁸²

the passage shared with Dingbin on the two kinds of **amalavijñāna*, relating to the non-empty and empty aspects of *tathāgatagarbha*; and the reference to AF’s two aspects of mind.

⁴⁸² For the sake of completeness, we should note that this survey has omitted the following later evidence of relatively marginal importance: (1) The *Da foding rulai miyin siuzheng liaoyi zhupusa wanxing shoulengyan jing* 大佛頂如來密因修證了義諸菩薩萬行首楞嚴經 T945, translated by Pāramiti/Pramiti (? 般刺蜜帝), who arrived in Canton in 705 (DEMIÉVILLE [1952], 43 n. 2),

4.1.4 Summary

Before we compare **amalavijñāna* doctrine in later witnesses with that of Paramārtha himself, it will be helpful to identify some general trends in this later material.

First, the materials seem to fall into two main periods. A first period lasts from approximately the 580s, or the early Sui, to the formation of Xuanzang's Faxiang school. In this period, we see quite various impressions of **amalavijñāna* doctrine, with little apparent centre of gravity. A second period lasts from approximately the middle of the seventh century, when Xuanzang's school became active, until around the end of the eighth century, when we ended our survey. Understanding of **amalavijñāna* from this period is dominated by the Faxiang authors, and their preoccupation with proving that eight, not nine, is the correct count for kinds of consciousness. In this same period, however, we see a second strand of material, represented mainly by VSS, Wōnhyo, Dingbin and Chengguan, in which the gathering tendencies are to accept **amalavijñāna*, sometimes by overtly rejecting the Faxiang position; to associate **amalavijñāna* more and more overtly with *tathāgatagarbha*; and to creatively connect **amalavijñāna* to a range of other ideas and texts.

contains one very brief reference to **amalavijñāna* 菴摩羅識; T945:19.123c15. This is primarily of interest only because it is another instance of the term finding its way into a *sātra* (cf. VSS) or Indic text (cf. also MSA). (2) Li Tongxuan (李通玄, 635-730) apparently mentions **amalavijñāna* in his *Xin Huayan jing lun* 新華嚴經論 T1739, but his comments are notable mostly for their outlandishness. Li mistakenly refers to this consciousness as *āḍānavijñāna* or “ninth consciousness”. According to Li, this doctrine is taught in the *Samdhinirmocana sātra!* 解深密經 (T676:16.692c02-04, referring to XZ T676), but the actual content of this doctrine sounds more like a cross between LAS and rumours of P; T1739:36.722c22-23, 723a06-14, 723a23, 723b05-09, 723b12, 736a20-b02, 741b29-c01. (3) The *Shi moheyan lun* 釋摩訶衍論 (a commentary on AF, probably written sometime in the late seventh or eighth centuries; see YAMAMOTO Kazuhiko 山本和彦, “*Shaku makaen ron*”, s.v. *Daizōkyō zen kaisetsu daijiten*) mentions **amalavijñāna* 唵摩羅識 in discussing a ninth consciousness, and quotes part of the passage I called “VSS<1>” above; T1668:32.611c22-27. (4) The *She Moheyan lun shu* 釋摩訶衍論疏 (said to have been compiled 集 by 法敏 Famin [579-645], but this seems a clear anachronism), a sub-commentary on T1668, quotes T1668 quoting the same VSS passage; X771:45.800c18-22. (5) We see brief mentions in Śubhākarasiṃha (善無畏, 637-735, arrived in China 716), Amoghavajra (不空金剛, 705-774) and Amoghavajra's disciple Huilin (慧琳, d. 820); T906:18.913c07, T1177a:20.757c14-18, T2128:54.604c20. (6) Zhanran (湛然, 711-782) discusses *alayavijñāna* as 了因 (*jñāpakaḥetu*) and “**amala* 菴摩羅” as direct cause 正因 (*karanaḥetu?*) (see n. 345), thus echoing Huijun and Li Shizheng (see n. 426).

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

Moreover, as we move further away from Paramārtha, the trail runs cold in the hunt for genuine new information. In the earliest references to Paramārtha, it is difficult to be sure whether we are seeing the result of accurate doxography, creative endeavour, or inaccurate hearsay. Later, however, we find authors clearly repeating their predecessor’s views. This suggests strongly that over time, **amalavijñāna* lore became increasingly like a chamber of echoes or a game of “Chinese whispers”.

Throughout the period we have surveyed, our authors very seldom refer to any works from the extant Paramārtha corpus as evidence for their characterisation of **amalavijñāna*/ninth consciousness: only Huijun, T2805 (whose direct knowledge of JDZL is established by its quote therefrom),⁴⁸³ T2807, Daoji, Kuiji (whose reference however seems possibly second-hand via Daoji), Wōnch’uk as reported by Taehyōn,⁴⁸⁴ and Wenbei as reported by Tunnyun. Verbatim citation of a known Paramārtha text in the discussion of this doctrine is even rarer, only occurring in Huijun, T2807 and Daoji.

Otherwise, where authors purport to refer to works by Paramārtha, they refer mostly to the mysterious special work on nine consciousnesses he is supposed to have composed. However, as we have seen, confusion seems to reign supreme over the exact title, location, nature and contents of this work, and there is little sign that any of the authors who refer to this work had themselves seen or read it. Apart from the supposed treatise or chapter on nine consciousnesses/ninth consciousness, the other main supposedly Paramārthian source authors refer to is the apocryphal AF.

Instead of making reference to Paramārtha’s works, extant or otherwise, authors reach for many other sources to piece together a picture of the doctrine, and **amalavijñāna* gradually gets woven into a fabric of allusions to an ever-shifting range of new proof-texts. Thus, authors claim to find the origins of the doctrine in MSg, the *Vimśatika*, LAS, the *Mahāyānābhisamaya*, the elusive *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing*, the *Cheng weishi lun*, the *Pusa yingluo benye jing*, the *Tathāgatarabha sūtra*, MSA, the *Śrīmālādevī*, the *Ghanavyūha*, and even, in the singular case of Li Tongxuan, the *Samdhinirmocana sūtra*. Of course, it is the usual task of exegetes to find or forge links like these between texts and doctrines they interpret and doctrines in other texts. At the same time, we are certainly justified in wondering why such diligent textual scholars would almost uniformly turn to such sources, and almost entirely overlook Paramārtha

⁴⁸³ See n. 276.

⁴⁸⁴ Taehyōn has Wōnch’uk refer to WXL; see n. 463.

himself, if they had the choice of consulting Paramārtha’s own works directly.⁴⁸⁵

Parallel to this process of weaving **amalavijñāna* into a larger intertextual fabric, the doctrine also progressively becomes associated with more and more concepts. These include: *dharmakāya*; the “Thusness aspect of mind” of AF; Buddha nature; “neither increase nor decrease”; “not coming or going”; “original awakening” (*benjue*); *jiexing*; “non-abiding Nirvāṇa” (*apraṭiṣṭhitanirvāna*); the LAS/AF figure of the wind, the waves and the water; the epithets of *tathāgatagarbha* “eternal, blissful, self-identical, pure”; the *dharmadhātu*; *wugoushi* 無垢識; the “gnosis that is like a mirror” (*ādarśajñāna*); the *tathāgatagarbha* idea of “in bondage” and “free from bondage”; the non-empty and empty aspects of *tathāgatagarbha*; “Buddha consciousness”; various technical doctrines of causation as it relates to liberation; the “pure Buddha consciousness”; the “pure *garbha* consciousness of the Tathāgata”; and, of course, *tathāgatagarbha* itself.

This lengthy survey (§4.1) has thus shown that there is very much about **amalavijñāna* in later sources that is never found in Paramārtha’s extant works. On the other hand, then, how much overlap is there with Paramārtha’s documented doctrine of **amalavijñāna*?

4.2 What later sources say that agrees with Paramārtha

We saw above (§3) that there seem to be two quite distinct doctrines of **amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha’s corpus. Here, however, I will treat all these text as a single unit, for purposes of comparison with later texts.

We find that there really is very little overlap between **amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha and in later authors. This is in part a function of the wide variation of later authors among themselves. However, even if we take all the later sources as a unit for the purposes of comparison, it is remarkable how seldom they concur with our extant evidence about the doctrine they were ostensibly discussing. The only areas of frequent overlap are:

1) The term **amalavijñāna* itself. However, some later sources only use the term “ninth consciousness”, or *wugoushi*, both terms that are not used in association with

⁴⁸⁵ YOSHIMURA also observes the great fluctuation of proof texts adduced in support of the doctrine; (2007a), 180; so too YUKI 32-35.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

**amalavijñāna* doctrine in Paramārtha himself; and transcriptions widely diverge from Paramārtha.

2) Discussion is at least about some kind of “pure” consciousness, as the term would lead us to expect.

3) **Amalavijñāna* is a state of consciousness that attends liberation, and is attained through some transformation or purification of *alayavijñāna*.

4) The connection between **amalavijñāna* and Thusness.⁴⁸⁶ However, Thusness also features prominently in AF, whose categories loom so large in the attempts of later authors to come to grips with **amalavijñāna*. It is difficult to determine, therefore, whether this agreement is a function of accurate reporting of Paramārtha’s ideas from the later authors, or of the application of the AF lens.

5) The identification between **amalavijñāna* and *praktiprabhāsvacitta* is touched upon in Huijun (actually citing SBKL), MSA, Daoji, Wōnhyo (also reported second-hand by Tunnyun) and Chengguan. This link is thus the specific component of Paramārtha’s actual doctrine that most frequently recurs in later authors. It suggests that to the extent that the later tradition did base itself upon accurate information, it was working not from (reports of) JDZL, but SBKL. It is interesting to note that no Faxiang author notices this aspect of the doctrine.

There is also some reference in the later tradition to the following dimensions of Paramārtha’s doctrine, but it is slender. In many cases, we find ourselves in a grey zone, where agreement could be a result of coincidence:

1) The idea that **amalavijñāna* is related to *āśrayaparāvṛtti* is only mentioned explicitly by Zhiyi. It is also hinted at slightly in some authors.⁴⁸⁷

2) The association between the attainment of **amalavijñāna* and the realisation of a state “without ‘outflows’” (*anāsrava*), or the association between **amalavijñāna* and *anāsravadharmas*, features briefly in the *Rulai gongde zhuangyan jing* verse cited by Kuiji, Wōnch’uk and Tankuang.

3) The statement that **amalavijñāna* is “permanent” appears only in Jingying Huiyuan, and does not then reappear in later sources until the loose association of

⁴⁸⁶ **Amalavijñāna* is associated implicitly with Thusness in SBKL<1>, and explicitly in SKBL<2>. This theme is found, in one form or another, in Zhiyi, Jingying Huiyuan, Daoji, T2807, VSS, Wōnhyo, Kuiji (where the identification is criticised as a misapprehension), Dajue, Dingbin and Chengguan.

⁴⁸⁷ By the use of the word *zhuan* 轉 to refer to the transformation in consciousness that brings it about: VSS, Wōnhyo, Dingbin, Chengguan.

**amalavijñāna* with the four epithets of *tathagatagarbha* in Wōnhyo. (The related Paramārthian notion that **amalavijñāna* is “true” because free from change [SWXL<1>] is never found later.)

4) The association between the attainment of **amalavijñāna* and the attainment of power over body and lifespan is only weakly echoed in the identification of **amalavijñāna* and *dharmakāya* in Jizang, Fali, Li Shizheng and Wōnch’uk; and in the association between the attainment of **amalavijñāna* and the three bodies (*trikāya*) in VSS<5>, Wōnhyo, and Chengguan.

5) The identification of **amalavijñāna* and the “perfected nature” (*pariniṣpannasvabhāva*) is only weakly hinted at in Jizang.

6) The idea that **amalavijñāna* is obscured by adventitious defilements is only found in Huijun; by association in MSA; and in Chengguan.

7) Very little is made of the notion that **amalavijñāna* is characterised by a nondualism of subject and object. We find this notion reflected directly only in Wōnhyo. In Jizang, Dajue and Dingbin, the nondual also seems to feature, but it has a curiously different emphasis.

8) The relationship between delusion and language, or the relationship between the attainment of **amalavijñāna* and the escape from language, is only reflected in Huijun and Jingying Huiyuan. (We also do not find much emphasis on Paramārtha’s related assertion that **amalavijñāna* is free from error.)

4.3 What Paramārtha says that later sources do not

Comparing Paramārtha’s extant corpus our later sources, we find that the following aspects of Paramārtha’s doctrine are never mentioned at all:

1) The association or identification of **amalavijñāna* with the counteragents (*pratipakṣa*) of *alayavijñāna*.

2) The idea that attainment of the **amalavijñāna* entails a transformation of the relationship to the *skandhas*.

3) The association between the problematic of the attainment of **amalavijñāna*, and liberation specifically understood as a process of evading rebirth, and thereby escaping future suffering.

4) The related overtones, found in Paramārtha, of the old Nikāya/Āgama doctrine of consciousness as the subject of transmigration and liberation; and indeed, any sign of a relationship between **amalavijñāna* and the *vijñānaskandha*.

5) The identification of **amalavijñāna* with a “higher” stage of Vijñaptimātrata/*weishi* (*weishi* as the object of “perfect insight”, *zhengguan weishi* etc.), beyond the *weishi* “in practice” (*fangbian weishi*) that obviates only external objects but not the ordinary

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

perceiving consciousness.

6) The notion that **amalavijñāna* is free of “badness” (*dauṣṭhulya*), which, as we saw, is connected to its close association with *āśrayaparāvṛtti*.

7) The idea that **amalavijñāna* is a basis for transcendent (*lokōttara*) *dharma*s.

8) Any association whatsoever between **amalavijñāna* and the idea of the “continuum” (*saṃtāna*), either the ordinary continuum of the *prthagjana* before liberation, or the “continuum produced by *lokōttaradharmas*” of JDZL<3>.

9) The idea that **amalavijñāna* is without a basis (依, *āśraya*), or even the very question of its relationship to a basis.

10) The “Mahāyāna Abhidharma” framework that is so key to the exposition of **amalavijñāna* in JDZL.

11) The identification of **amalavijñāna* with emptiness (SBKL).

I argued (§3) that there are two separable **amalavijñāna* doctrines in Paramārtha, and that JDZL probably preserves the version closest to the original. We see here that some details of the version of the doctrine reflected in the other group of texts (SWXL, SBKL, ZSL) are reflected, if weakly, in later texts. However, the JDZL doctrine sinks almost without a trace.

This almost total silence on the actual content of JDZL forms a striking contrast to the fact that so many of the later sources claim to trace the notion of **amalavijñāna* back to a putative “Ninth Consciousness Chapter” found precisely in JDZL.

5. Conclusions

There are very few areas of real overlap between **amalavijñāna* doctrine in extant Paramārtha texts and in later sources. Of course, traditional bibliographies report that Paramārtha wrote many more texts than we have received. At least on the evidence of the extant texts, however, it seems that the tradition inherited from Paramārtha only a very basic idea of a pure, post-liberatory consciousness, in some relationship of contrast to *ālayavijñāna*, which had a close relationship or identity with Thusness.

Recognising the virtual certainty that some of Paramārtha’s texts and ideas have indeed been lost to our record, the possibility cannot be ruled out that some of what the tradition reports was in fact part of the doctrine of Paramārtha or his group. In particular:

1) We saw (§4.1.2.2, §4.1.2.3) that we cannot be sure that Paramārtha did not author a text especially on “ninth consciousness” (*Jiushi zhang* etc.), or that he did not teach a

ninth consciousness or a system of ninefold consciousness.

2) We cannot be sure that he never associated **amalavijñāna* with *tathāgatagarbha*, and may indeed therefore have been attempting thereby to effect some kind of *rapprochement* between Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha thought.⁴⁸⁸

Testimony that Paramārtha's teaching had these features is early and widespread. We have no contradictory evidence intervening between the earliest witnesses and Paramārtha's group, which might allow us to cast doubt on this testimony. Thus, it is entirely possible, if not certain, that Paramārtha taught that **amalavijñāna* was a separate, ninth kind of consciousness, associated with *tathāgatagarbha*. If such important aspects of Paramārtha's original doctrine may indeed have been lost, it reminds us that we must also be aware of the possibility that we have an incomplete picture when we attempt to study and characterise Paramārtha's thought more generally.

However, the fact remains that later authors only received a very vague and pared-down version of Paramārtha's doctrine. Subsequent authors then often took the concept as raw material for their own constructive projects, or, in the interests of attacking or defending the notion, wove it into complex new networks of proof texts and various concepts. The result, as we have seen, is that the bulk of what was said about **amalavijñāna* by later authors was new. We have little grounds for confidence that these authors were well acquainted with any works by Paramārtha, upon which they based their comments.

Despite some excellent studies, modern scholarship has still tended to accept too readily the image of **amalavijñāna* found in the later tradition, rather than to examine closely what Paramārtha's texts had to say about it. I hope that this study has shown that those sources reveals a surprising profile of Paramārtha's genuine attested doctrine of **amalavijñāna*.

To summarise, the major findings of this study were:

1) It is reasonable to think that Paramārtha coined the term *amoluoshi* at least in

⁴⁸⁸ We see **amalavijñāna* or "ninth consciousness" associated with *tathāgatagarbha* (or Buddha nature) in witnesses as early and apparently reliable as Huijun and Jingying Huiyuan. This association then recurs in Zhiyan, VSS, Wōnhyo, Wōnch'uk, Dingbin and Chengguan. Notably, however, no Shelun school witnesses are found in this list (Dunhuang texts, Daoji).

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

part on the basis of the term *amalavijñāna* in AK 5.29.

2) Paramārtha’s extant works contain not one but two separable doctrines of **amalavijñāna*: one in JDZL, and the other in ZSL, SWXL and SBKL. The JDZL doctrine is most likely earlier, and more likely to be authentic (though the other version of the doctrine may *also* be authentic).

3) The rich details of these original doctrines have been insufficiently known in modern scholarship. They were also almost unknown to later authors in the tradition.

4) Later authors propose a riot of extremely varied ideas about **amalavijñāna* and ninth consciousness, little of it traceable with any confidence to Paramārtha or his group.

6. Directions for future research

If we have tended to overlook the original content of Paramārtha’s own **amalavijñāna* doctrine, that implies at least three agendas for further research.

First, it is important to look for the sources of Paramārtha’s attested **amalavijñāna* doctrine.⁴⁸⁹

Second, what has proven true for **amalavijñāna* may prove true of Paramārtha’s thought more generally. Paramārtha’s actual ideas may have been buried under what was made of them by his successors — enthusiasts as much as enemies. Those ideas may therefore constitute a missed chapter the development of East Asian Buddhism. We may need to bracket out what we think we “know”, from the image of Paramārtha constructed by the later tradition, and study Paramārtha’s own texts more carefully.

Finally, Paramārtha’s ideas are significant in part because of the place they hold in our usual narratives of the so-called “sinification” of Buddhist concepts. If the general image of **amalavijñāna* has been inaccurate to date, then part of the general understanding of the process of sinification may have been built on sand. It will also be important, therefore, to reassess the place of **amalavijñāna* in relation to the problem of sini-

⁴⁸⁹ I am currently preparing a study in this direction entitled “Sources of Paramārtha’s **Amalavijñāna*”.

fication, in light of a more accurate picture of **amalavijñāna* and its actual sources.⁴⁹⁰

Abbreviations

| | |
|------|---|
| AKBh | <i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i> |
| BBh | <i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i> |
| Bh | <i>Bhāṣya</i> |
| Ch. | Chinese |
| D | Derge |
| D | <i>Dīgha nikāya</i> |
| DBZ | <i>Dai Nippon Bukkyō zensho</i> |
| DN | <i>Dīgha nikāya</i> |
| FXL | <i>Foxing lun</i> 佛性論 T1610 |
| IBK | <i>Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū</i> インド学仏教学研究 |
| It | <i>Itivuttaka</i> |
| JDZL | <i>Jueding zang lun</i> 決定藏論 T1584 |
| LAS | <i>Laṃkāvatāra-sūtra</i> |
| M | <i>Majjhima nikāya</i> |
| MAV | <i>Madhyāntavibhāga</i> |
| MAVT | <i>Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā</i> |
| MPNS | <i>Mahāparinirvāna sūtra</i> |
| MSA | <i>Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra</i> |

⁴⁹⁰ With reference to Buddhism, the term “sinification” may broadly be taken in two senses, “weak” and “strong”: “weak” sinification is any change that *results* in a Buddhism unique to China, regardless of the cause of that change (thus including changes resulting from chance vicissitudes of the translation process, translation errors, and a host of other factors); “strong” sinification refers to change resulting in aspects of Buddhism unique to China, *caused by* factors themselves already unique to China or characteristically Chinese (most typically, Chinese culture, thought or a Chinese “worldview”). To simplify, Paramārtha’s **amalavijñāna* has often been regarded as a part of an increasing emphasis on *tathāgatagarbha*/Buddha nature, culminating in its eventual ascent to centrality and orthodoxy, supposed to be typical of East Asian Buddhism. This process is regarded as sinification in the specific sense that it is thought, in a quasi-Weberian mode, to have been the product of “this-worldly” and “optimistic” tendencies fundamental to the Chinese tradition. I disagree with this interpretation of **amalavijñāna*. I am currently preparing a study of these problems entitled “Paramārtha’s **Amalavijñāna* as a Case Study in the So-called ‘Sinification’ of Buddhist Concepts”, in which I hope to demonstrate the relationship of important received interpretations of **amalavijñāna* and Paramārtha’s thought with “sinification” so understood, and argue that, for the case of **amalavijñāna*, it is a misinterpretation.

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

| | |
|-------|---|
| MSg | <i>Mahāyānasamgraha</i> |
| MSgBh | <i>Mahāyānasamgrahabhāṣya</i> |
| P | Paramārtha |
| PTS | Pāli Text Society |
| RGV | <i>Ratnagotravibhāga</i> |
| S | <i>Samyutta nikaya</i> |
| SBKL | <i>Shiba kong lun</i> 十八空論 T1616 |
| SdhN | <i>Samdhinirmocana sūtra</i> |
| Skt. | Sanskrit |
| Sth | Sthiramati |
| SWXL | <i>San wuxing lun</i> 三無性論 T1617 |
| T | <i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i> 大正新脩大藏經 (CBETA version) |
| Tib. | Tibetan |
| TrBh | <i>Trimsikabhāṣya</i> |
| VP | LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, trans., <i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i> |
| WXL | <i>Wuxiang lun</i> 無相論 |
| X | <i>Shinsan dai Nippon zokuzōkyō</i> 卅新纂大日本續藏經 (CBETA version) |
| XSL | <i>Xianshi lun</i> 顯識論 T1618 |
| XYSJL | <i>Xianyang sheng jiao lun</i> 顯揚聖教論 T1602 |
| XZ | Xuanzang 玄奘 |
| YBh | <i>Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra</i> |
| ZSL | <i>Zhuanshi lun</i> 轉識論 T1587 |

Bibliography

Note: In this bibliography, I have followed Chicago History style. However, at *Zin-bun*'s request, in the footnotes I have adopted name-date citation to save space. To ease cross-reference, I therefore list multiple items by a single author in chronological order. Where I am not using the first edition of an item, I have tried to give the original date of publication in square brackets, followed by the date of the edition or printing I used, thus: [1984] 1998. Citations in footnotes refer to the date of the version I used.

AHN, J. “Taehyōn.” *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, [http://buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?59.xml+id\('b5927-8ce2'\)](http://buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?59.xml+id('b5927-8ce2')). Accessed October 3 2008.

ALBAHARI, Miri. “Against No-*Ātman* Theories of *Annatta*.” *Asian Philosophy* 12, no. 1 (2002): 5-20.

ANACKER, Stefan. *Seven Works of Vasubandhu, the Buddhist Psychological Doctor*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, [1984] 1998.

- BODHI, Bhikkhu, trans. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Samyutta Nikaya*. Somerville MA: Wisdom Publications, 2000.
- BRAARVIG, Jens. *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra. Vol I: Edition of Extant Manuscripts with an Index; Vol II: The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought*. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1993.
- BUSWELL, Robert E. Jr. *The Formation of Ch'an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon*, Princeton Library of Asian Translations. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- trans. *Cultivating Original Enlightenment: Wōnhyo's Exposition of the Vajrasamādhi-sūtra* (Kūmgang Sammaegyōng Non). The International Association of Wōnhyo Studies' Collected Works of Wōnhyo, Volume 1. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.
- CARPENTER, J. Estlin, ed. *The Dīgha-nikāya* vol. III. Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2006.
- CHEN, Jinhua. *Monks and Monarchs, Kinship and Kingship: Tanqian in Sui Buddhism and Politics*. Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, 2002.
- CHEN Yinque 陳寅恪. "Liang yi Dasheng qi xin lun wei Zhikai xu zhong zhi zhen shiliao 梁譯大乘起信論偽智愷序中之真史料 [1948]." In *Chen Yinque wenji zhi san: Jinming guan cong gao er bian* 陳寅恪文集之三 金明館叢稿二編, 147-152. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980.
- CH'OE Yōnsik 崔鉉植. "Daijō shi ron gen gi ki to Kudara bukkyō 『大乘四論玄義』 と百濟仏教." *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 39 (2008): 13-28.
- Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association. *Shinsan dai Nippon zoku zōkyō* 卍新纂大日本續藏經. Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1975-1989. CBReader v. 3.7, 2008.
- *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Taishō shinshū daizōkyō kankōkai/ Daizō shuppan, 1924-1932. CBReader v. 3.7, 2008.
- DEMIÉVILLE, Paul. "Sur l'authenticité du *Ta tch'eng k'i sin luoen*." *Bulletin de la maison français-japonais* 2, no. 2 (1929): 1-78. Reprinted in *Choix d'études bouddhiques 1929-1970*, 1-79.
- *Le concile de Lhasa: une controverse sur le quiétisme entre bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIII. siècle de l'ère chrétienne*. Paris: Impr. nationale de France, 1952.
- EDGERTON, Franklin. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols [1953]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998.
- FRAUWALLNER, Erich. "Amalavijñānam und Ālayavijñānam." In *Beiträge zur indischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, Walter Schubring zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht*, 148-159. Hamburg 1951. "Amarashiki to araiyashiki 阿摩羅識と阿賴耶識." Translated by Kumoi Shōzen 雲井照善. *Otani gakuho* 大谷学報 32, no. 2 (1952): 54-71.
- FRIEDMANN, David Lasar. *Sthiramati Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā: Analysis of the Middle Path*

“The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

- and the Extremes* [Utrecht: 1937]. Oregon: Canon Publications Photographic Reprint, 1984.
- FUKAURA Masafumi 深浦正文. *Yuishikigaku kenkyū* 唯識学研究. 2 vols. Tokyo: Nagata Bunshodō, 1954, 1976.
- FUNAYAMA Tōru 船山徹. “Ryō no Sōyū sen *Satsubata shi shiden* to Tōdai bukkyō 梁の僧祐撰『薩婆多師資伝』と唐代仏教.” In *Tōdai no shūkyō* 唐代の宗教, ed. YOSHIKAWA Tadao 吉川忠夫, 325-354. Kyoto: Hōyū shoten, 2000.
- “‘Kanyaku’ to ‘Chūgoku senjutsu’ no aida — Kanbun butten ni tokuyū na keitai wo megutte 「漢訳」と「中国撰述」との間 — 漢文仏典に特有な形態をめぐって.” *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 45, no. 1 (2002): 11-28.
- “Shintai sanzō no chosaku no tokuchō — Chū-In bunka kōshō no rei toshite 真諦三蔵の著作の特徴 — 中印文化交渉の例として.” *Kansai daigaku tōsaigakujutsu kenkyūjo kiyō* 関西大学東西学術研究所紀要 38 (2005): 97-122. “The Work of Paramārtha: An Example of Sino-Indian Cross-cultural Exchange.” Translated by Benjamin Brose. Forthcoming in the proceedings volume of an April 2007 Vienna conference panel “Early Chinese Buddhist Texts”.
- GIMELLO, Robert M. “Chih-yen (602-668) and the Foundations of Hua-yen Buddhism.” Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1976.
- HAHN, Michael. *Nāgārjuna’s Ratnāvalī*. Bonn: Indica Et Tibetica Verlag, 1982.
- HAKAMAYA Noriaki 袴谷憲昭. “*Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* ni okeru ārayashiki no kitei *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī* におけるアーヤ識の規定.” *Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 79 (1979): 1-79.
- HAKEDA, Yoshito S. *The Awakening of Faith, Attributed to Āśvaghosha*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- HARVEY, Peter. “Consciousness Mysticism in the Discourses of the Buddha.” In *The Yogi and the Mystic*, ed. Karel Werner, 82-102. London: Curzon, 1989.
- HIRAI, Shun’ei 平井俊英. *Chūgoku hannya shisōshi kenkyū: Kichizō to Sanron gakuha* 中国般若思想史研究 — 吉蔵と三論学派. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1976.
- HIRAKAWA, Akira. *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1973.
- Huimin (Keibin), Bhikkhu 釋惠敏. *Shōmon ji ni okeru shoēn no kenkyū* 『声聞地』における所縁の研究. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin, 1994.
- ITŌ Takatoshi 伊藤隆寿. “*Miroku kyō yūi* no gimonten 『弥勒経遊意』の疑問点.” *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 4 (1973): 59-75.
- “Hōshōin zō *Miroku jōge kyō yūi jūjū* ni tsuite 宝生院蔵『弥勒上下経遊意十重』について.” *IBK* 25, no. 2 (1977): 323-326.

- IWATA Ryōzō 岩田良三.⁴⁹¹ “Shintai no amarashiki ni tsuite 真諦の阿摩羅識について.” *Ōsaki gakuho* 大崎学報 122 (1967): 176-177.
- “*Amala-jñāna* to amarashiki setsu ni tsuite / *Amala-jñāna* と阿摩羅識について.” IBK 19, no. 2 (1971): 136-137.
- “Shintai no amarashiki setsu ni tsuite 真諦の阿摩羅識説について.” *Suzuki gaku-jutsu zaidan nenpo* 鈴木学術財団年報 8 (1972[a]): 46-56.
- “Shintai no sanshō setsu ni tsuite 真諦の三性説について.” IBK 21, no. 1 (1972[b]): 355-58.
- “*Shō daijō ron* to kushiki setsu ni tsuite 撰大乘論と九識説について.” IBK 20, no. 2 (1972[c]): 302-305.
- “Shintai no sanshō setsu ni tsuite (zoku) 真諦の三性説について(続).” IBK 22, no. 1 (1973): 107-110.
- “Shintai no sanshō sanmushō setsu ni tsuite 真諦の三性三無性説について.” *Suzuki gaku-jutsu zaidan nenpo* 鈴木学術財団年報 10 (1974): 26-43.
- IWATA Taijō 岩田諦静.⁴⁹² *Shoki yuishiki shisō kenkyū* 初期唯識思想研究. Tokyo: Daito shuppansha, 1981.
- “Seshin zō *Shō daijō ron* no kan'yaku keitai ni tsuite 世親造『撰大乘論釈』の漢訳形態について.” IBK 33, no. 2 (1985[a]): 73-78.
- “Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru hen'i no yakugo ni tsuite 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』における変異の訳語について.” *Ōsaki gakuho* 大崎学報 140 (1985[b]): 17-34.
- “Shintai yaku no *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru sanshō setsu ni tsuite 真諦訳の『撰大乘論世親釈』における三性説について.” In two parts. 上, *Hokke bunka kenkyū* 法華文化研究 13 (1987): 25-48; 下 *Hokke bunka kenkyū* 法華文化研究 15 (1989): 27-52.
- “Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru ‘Shi kai mushiji’ ge to saiseijō hōkai ni tsuite 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』における此界無始時偈と最清浄法界について.” In *Suguro Shinjō hakushi kokei kinen ronbunshū* 呂信静博士古稀記念論文集, ed. Suguro Shinjō hakushi kokei kinen ronbunshū kankōkai 勝呂信静博士古稀記念論文集刊行会, 117-134. Tokyo: Sankibo busshorin, 1996.
- “Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru ariyashiki setsu ni tsuite 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』における阿黎耶識説について.” IBK 45, no. 2 (1997): 203-209.

491 IWATA Taijō/Ryōzō is a single author who has published under two names. I list his publications here in two groups, according to the name under which each was published.

492 See n. 491.

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

- “Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru kōzō bubun no kentō — ‘Shaku eshi shō sō hon Shochie shō’ 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』における増広部分の検討 釈依止勝相品所知依章.” *Minobu ronsō* 身延論叢 5 (2000): 97-118.
- “*Hokke gen gi* ni okeru anmarashiki setsu ni tsuite — Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* to no kanren 『法華玄義』における菴摩羅識説について 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』との関連.” *Hokke kyō kenkyū* 法華経研究 13 (2001[a]): 371-392.
- “Shintai no yuishiki setsu no tokushoku ni tsuite 真諦の唯識説の特色について.” *IBK* 50, no. 1 (2001[b]): 173-180(L).
- “Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru anmarashiki setsu ni tsuite 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』における菴摩羅識説について.” *IBK* 49, no. 1 (2001[c]): 58-64.
- “Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru shūji setsu ni tsuite 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』における種子説について.” In *Taga Ryūgen hakushi kokei kinen ronshū: Bukkyō shisō bukkuyōshi ronshū* 田賀龍彦博士古稀記念論集 — 仏教思想仏教史論集, ed. Taga Ryūgen hakushi kokei kinen ronshū kankōkai 田賀龍彦博士古稀記念論集刊行会, 107-124. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin, 2001(d).
- “Shintai yaku *Shō daijō ron Seshin shaku* ni okeru dōgo no shinnyo ni tsuite 真諦訳『撰大乘論世親釈』における道後の真如について.” In *Sasaki Kōken hakushi kokei kinen bukkuyōgaku bukkuyōshi ronshū* 佐々木孝憲博士古稀記念仏教学仏教史論集, ed. Sasaki Kōken hakushi kokei kinen bukkuyōgaku bukkuyōshi ronshū kankōkai 佐々木孝憲博士古稀記念仏教学仏教史論集刊行会, 3-18. Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin, 2002.
- *Shintai no yuishiki setsu no kenkyū* 真諦の唯識説の研究. Kyoto: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 2004.
- JAMPSAL, L., R. CLARK, J. WILSON, L. ZWILLING, M. SWEET and R. THURMAN, trans. *The Universal Vehicle Discourse Literature (Mahāyanasūtrālamkāra)*. Tanjur Translation Initiative Treasury of the Buddhist Sciences series. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies, Center for Buddhist Studies, Tibet House US, 2004.
- JOHNSTON E. H., ed. *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyanottaratantraśāstra* [1950]. In *The Uttaratantra of Maitreya*, ed. H. S. Prasad. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series No. 79. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1991.
- JONES, J. J., trans. *The Mahāvastu*. 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society and Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949-1956, 1978, 1987.
- KANNO Hiroshi 菅野博史. “Ekin *Daijō shi ron gen gi ki* no sanshu shakugi to Kichizō no yonshu shakugi 慧均『大乘四論玄義記』の三種釈義と吉蔵の四種釈義.” In *Kimura Kiyotaka hakushi kanreki kinen ronshū: Higashi Ajia bukkuyō — 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, 87-100. To-

- kyo: Shunjusha, 2002.
- “*Daijō shi ron gen gi ki no kisoteki kenkyū* 『大乘四論玄義記』の基礎的研究.” Unpublished conference paper delivered at the 59th annual conference of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies 印度学仏教学会, Aichi Gakuin Daigaku, September 2008.
- KATSUMATA Shunkyō 勝又俊教. *Bukkyō ni okeru shin-i-shiki setsu no kenkyū* 仏教における心意識説の研究 [A Study of the Citta-Vijñāna Thought in Buddhism]. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1961.
- KENG, Ching. PhD dissertation, Harvard University. Forthcoming, 2009.
- LAI, Whalen. “The Meaning of ‘Mind-Only’ (*wei-hsin*): An Analysis of a Sinitic Mahāyāna Phenomenon.” *Philosophy East and West* 27, no. 1 (1977): 65-83.
- LAMOTTE, Étienne, ed. and trans. *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra: Explication des mystères*. Louvain: Bureaux de Recueil, 1935.
- *La somme du grand véhicule d’Asanga* (Mahāyānasamgraha). Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste, Université de Louvain, 1973.
- LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, Louis de. *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux: Théorie des douze causes*. Gand [Ghent]: Librairie Scientifique E. van Goethem, 1913.
- *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: La siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang*. 2 vols. Paris: P. Geunther, 1928-29.
- *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* [1923-1926]. Brussels: Institut belge des hautes études chinoises, 1980.
- LÉVI, Sylvain, ed. *Mahāyāna-sūtrālamkāra*. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1907, 1911.
- *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: Deux traités de Vasubandhu: Viṃśatikā (La vingtaine) accompagnée d’une explication en prose, et Trīṃśikā (La trentaine) avec la commentaire de Sthiramati*. Paris: H. Champion, 1925.
- *Matériaux pour l’étude du système vijñaptimātra, un système de philosophie bouddhique*. Paris: H. Champion, 1932.
- LIEBENTHAL, Walter. “Notes on the *Vajrasamādhi*.” *T’oung Pao* 44 (1956): 347-386.
- LINDTNER, Christian. “From Brahmanism to Buddhism.” *Asian Philosophy* 9, no. 1 (1999): 5-37.
- LÜ Cheng 呂澂. *Lü Cheng foxue lunzhu xuanji* 呂澂佛學論著選集. Jinan: Jilu chubanshe, 1991.
- LUSTHAUS, Dan. *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogācāra Philosophy and the Ch’eng Wei-shih Lun*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2002.
- MASEFIELD, Peter, trans. *The Itivuttaka*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.
- MATSUDA Kazunobu. “Darai Rama 13 sei kizō no ichiren no nepāru kei shahon ni tsuite: *Yuga ron* ‘Shō kettaku bun’ bonbun danpen hakken ki ichi ぐライラマ13世寄贈の

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

- 一連のネパール系写本について — 『瑜伽論』撰決撰分梵文断簡発見記 —. *Nihon Chibetto gakkai kaihō* 日本チベット学会会報 34 (1988): 16-20.
- MITSUGIRI Jikai 三桐慈海. “Ekin no sanron gaku 慧均の三論学.” In *Sanron kyōgaku no kenkyū* 三論教学の研究, ed. HIRAI Shun’ei 平井俊栄, 223-236. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1990.
- MOU Zongsan 牟宗三. *Foxing yu bore* 佛性與般若 [1977]. Taipei: Xuesheng shuju 學生書局, 1997.
- MULLER, A. Charles, ed. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*. <<http://buddhism-dict.net/ddb>>. Edition of 30/09/2008.
- NAGAO, Gadjin M. *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya: A Buddhist Philosophical Treatise Edited for the First Time from a Sanskrit Manuscript*. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964.
- ÑĀNAMOLI, Bhikkhu, and Bhikkhu BODHI, trans. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995.
- NANJIO, Bunyiu, ed. *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1923.
- O’BRIEN, Paul Wilfred. “A Chapter on Reality from the *Madhyāntavibhagacāstra*.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 9, no. 1-2 (1953): 277-303.
- ŌCHO E’nichi 横超慧日. “Shinshutsu shiryō: *Shi ron gen gi* no ‘Sho shō chū ka gi’ 新出資料・四論玄義の初章中假義.” *IBK* 7, no. 1 (1958): 131-134.
- OGIHARA, Unrai 荻原雲来. *Kanyaku taishō bonwa daijiten* 漢訳対照梵和大辞典 [1964-1974]. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1986.
- [See also WOGIHARA.]
- ŌTAKE, Susumu 大竹晋. *Jūji kyō ron* 十地経論. Shin kokuyaku issaikyō 新国訳一切経, Shaku kyōron bu 釈経論部 16. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 2005.
- *Yuishiki setsu wo chūshin to shita shoki Kegon kyōgaku no kenkyū: Chigen, Gishō kara Hōzō e* 唯識説を中心とした初期華嚴教学の研究 智嚴・義湘から法蔵へ. Tokyo: Daizō-shuppan, 2007(a).
- “Shintai ‘Kushiki giki’ itsubun 真諦『九識義記』佚文.” Unpublished paper circulated in the seminar “Shintai sanzō to sono jidai 真諦三蔵とその時代,” Kyōto University, 2007 (b).
- “Kushiki shō’ kanjin senjutsu setsu ni taisuru jakkan no gimon (Chūgoku hen) 『九識章』 漢人撰述説に對する若干の疑問 (中国篇).” Unpublished paper circulated in the seminar “Shintai sanzō to sono jidai 真諦三蔵とその時代,” Kyōto University, 2007(c).
- “Kushiki shō’ kanjin senjutsu setsu ni taisuru jakkan no gimon (Indo hen) 『九識章』 漢人撰述説に對する若干の疑問 (インド篇).” Unpublished paper circulated in the seminar “Shintai sanzō to sono jidai 真諦三蔵とその時代,” Kyōto University,

- 2007(d).
- PAUL, Diana Y. *Philosophy of Mind in Sixth-Century China: Paramārtha's 'Evolution of Consciousness'*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984.
- PRADHAN, Prahlad, ed. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.
- RADICH, Michael. "The Somatics of Liberation: Ideas about Embodiment in Buddhism from Its Origins to the Fifth Century C.E." PhD dissertation, Harvard University, Nov. 2007.
- RAHDER, Johannes, ed. *Daśabhūmikasūtra*. Leuven: J.-B. Istaś, 1926.
- RUEGG, David Seyfort. *La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra*. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1969.
- SAKUMA, Hidenori. *Die Āsrayaparivṛtti-theorie in der Yogācārabhūmi*. 2 vols. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 40. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990.
- 佐久間秀範. "Yugashi-ji ron ni okeru tenne shisō 『瑜伽師地論』における転依思想." IBK 39, no. 1 (1991): 66-74.
- SATO Testuei 佐藤哲英. *Tendai daishi no kenkyū: Chigi no chosaku ni kansuru kisoteki kenkyū* 天台大師の研究 智顛の著作に関する基礎的研究. Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1961.
- SCHMITHAUSEN, Lambert. *Der Nirvāna-Abschitt in der Vinīścayasamgrahaṇī der Yogācārabhūmi*. Wien: Hermann Böhlau Machf., 1969.
- *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and Development of a Central Concept in Yogācāra Philosophy*. 2 vols. *Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series IVb*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1987.
- Shengkai 圣凯. *Shelun xuepai yanjiu* 摄论学派研究. Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2006.
- "Amoluoshi yu benjue: Shelun shi de 'amoluoshi' sixiang 阿摩罗识与本觉——摄论师的'阿摩罗识'思想." *Dunhuangxue jikan* 敦煌学辑刊 2007, no. 3: 106-118.
- STACHE-ROSEN, Valentina. *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus II: Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgitipāryāya*. 2 vols. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
- STANLEY, Richard. "A Study of the *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya-ṭīkā*." PhD dissertation, Australian National University, 1988.
- STCHERBATSKY, Th., trans. *Madhyānta-Vibhanga: Discourse on Discrimination Between Middle and Extremes, Ascribed to Bodhisattva Maitreya and Commented by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati*. [Bibliotheca Buddhica vol. 30, 1936;] New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1978.
- SU, Gongwang 蘇公望. "Zhendi liuhua nianpu 真諦留華年譜." Originally published in instalments in *Weimiao sheng* 微妙聲, 1936-1937. Republished as "Zhendi sanzang nianpu 真諦三藏年譜." In *Xiandai fojiao xueshu congkan* 現代佛教學術叢刊 13,

“The Doctrine of *Amalavijñāna in Paramārtha (499-569), and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.”

- Han Wei liang Jin Nanbeichao pian (xia)* 漢魏兩晉南北朝篇(下), ed. ZHANG Mantao 張曼濤. Taipei: Dasheng wenhua chubanshe, 1978.
- SUZUKI, Daisetz Teitaro, trans. *The Lankavatara Sūtra: A Mahāyāna Text* [1932]. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999.
- *An Index to the Lankavatara Sūtra* [1934]. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2000.
- TAKAKUSU Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 望月信亨, eds. *Dai Nippon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書. Tokyo: Yūseidō shuppanbu 有精堂出版部, 1934.
- TAKASAKI, Jikidō. *A Study on the Ratnagoṭravibhāga (Uttaratantra), Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. Rome: Serie Orientale Roma, 1966.
- THANISSARO Bhikkhu. *The Mind Like Fire Unbound*. Barre, MA: Dhamma Dana Publications, Barre Centre for Buddhist Studies, 1993.
- Tōkyō daigaku bungakubu Indo tetsugaku Indo bungaku kenkyūshitsu 東京大学文学部 インド哲学インド文学研究室, ed. *Deruge-ban Chibetto daizōkyō ronsho bu: Tōkyō daigaku bungakubu shozō: Yuishiki bu sems tsam* デルゲ版チベット大蔵経論疏部東京大学文学部所蔵：唯識部 SEMS TSAM, *sDe dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka bStan hgyur Preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo*. Tokyo: Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai, 1980.
- UI, Hakuju. *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū* 印度哲学研究. Tokyo: Kōshisha Shobō 甲子社書房, 1926-1932. Vol VI.
- WALDRON, William S. *The Buddhist Unconscious: The Ālaya-vijñāna in the Context of Indian Buddhist Thought*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- WALSHE, Maurice, trans. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Dīgha Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995.
- WAYMAN, Alex. “Notes on the Three Myrobalans.” *Phi Theta Annual* 5 (1954/55): 63-77.
- WAYMAN, Alex, and Hideko WAYMAN, trans. *The Lion’s Roar of Queen Śrīmālā: A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- WIJESEKERA, O. H. de A. “Vedic Gandharva and Pāli Gandhabba.” *University of Ceylon Review* 3, no. 1 (1945): 73-107.
- “The Concept of *Viññāna* in Theravāda Buddhism.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84, no. 3 (1964): 254-259.
- WINDISCH, Ernst, ed. *Iti-vuttaka*. London: Pali Text Society, 1975.
- WOGIHARA, Unrai, ed. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of Whole Course of the Bodhisattva, Being the Fifteenth Section of Yogācārabhūmi*. Tokyo: Sankibo, 1971.
- [See also OGIHARA.]
- YAMAGUCHI, Susumu 山口益, ed. *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā: Exposition Systématique du*

- Yogācāravijñaptivāda* 安慧阿遮梨耶造中邊分別論釈疏. Nagoya: Librairie Hajinkaku 破塵閣, 1934.
- YE, Ayue (Yō Agetsu) 葉阿月. *Yuishiki shisō no kenkyū — konpon shinjitsu toshite no sanshō setsu wo chūshin ni shite* 唯識思想の研究 — 根本真実としての三性説を中心にして. Tainan: Gaochang yinshuju, 1975.
- Yinshun 印順. “Lun Zhendi sanzang suochuan de amoluoshi 論真諦三藏所傳的阿摩羅識.” In *Yi fofa yanjiu fofa* 以佛法研究佛法, *Miao yin ji* 妙音記 vol. 3, part 4, 269-300. Taipei: Zhengwen chuban, 1972.
- YOKOYAMA, Koitsu and Takayuki HIROSAWA, eds. *Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology Based on Yogācārabhūmi : Sanscrit-Tibetan-Chinese & Tibetan-Sanscrit-Chinese / Bukkyōgo jiten : Yugashiji ron ni motozuku Bon-Zō-Kan taishō, Zō-Bon-Kan taishō*. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1997.
- YOSHIMURA, Makoto 吉村誠. “Shōron gakuha no shinshiki setsu ni tsuite 撰論学派の心識説について.” *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 34 (2002): 223-241.
- “Shintai no amarashiki setsu to Shōron gakuha no kushiki setsu 真諦の阿摩羅識説と撰論学派の九識説.” IBK 56, no. 1 (2007[a]): 177-183.
- “Den Shintai ‘Kushiki shō’ itsubun 傳真諦『九識章』佚文.” Unpublished materials circulated in the seminar “Shintai sanzō to sono jidai”, 2007(b).
- “Tendai bunken ni mirareru Jiron, Shōron gakuha no shinshiki setsu — Chigi to Tanzen no chosaku wo chūshin ni 天台文献に見られる地論・撰論学派の心識説 — 智顛と湛然の著作を中心に.” Forthcoming, IBK 57.
- YŪKI, Reimon 結城零聞. “Shina yuishikigaku shijō ni okeru Ryōgashi no chii 支那唯識学史上における楞伽師の地位.” *Shina bukyō shigaku* 支那仏教史学 1, no. 1 (1937): 21-44.
- ZIMMERMAN, Michael. *A Buddha Within: The Tathāgatagarbhasūtra, The Earliest Exposition of the Buddha-Nature Teaching in India*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VI. Tokyo: The International Research Association for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2002.