

THE JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

A.K. Narain
University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

EDITORS

†L.M. Joshi
Punjabi University
Patiala, India

Ernst Steinkellner
University of Vienna
Wien, Austria

Alexander W. Macdonald
Université de Paris X
Nanterre, France

Jikidō Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Bardwell Smith
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota, USA

Robert Thurman
Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Roger Jackson
Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut, USA

Volume 9

1986

Number 1

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. The Meaning of *Vijñapti* in Vasubandhu's Concept of Mind, by Bruce Cameron Hall 7
2. "Signless" Meditations in Pāli Buddhism, by Peter Harvey 25
3. Dōgen Casts Off "What": An Analysis of *Shinjin Datsuraku*, by Steven Heine 53
4. Buddhism and the Caste System, by Y. Krishan 71
5. The Early Chinese Buddhist Understanding of the Psyche: Chen Hui's Commentary on the *Yin Chih Ju Ching*, by Whalen Lai 85
6. The Special Theory of *Pratītyasamutpāda*: The Cycle of Dependent Origination, by Geshe Lhundub Sopa 105

II. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Chinese Religions in Western Languages: A Comprehensive and Classified Bibliography of Publications in English, French and German through 1980*, by Laurence G. Thompson (Yves Hervouet) 121
2. *The Cycle of Day and Night*, by Namkhai Norbu (A.W. Hanson-Barber) 122
3. *Dharma and Gospel: Two Ways of Seeing*, edited by Rev. G.W. Houston (Christopher Chapple) 123
4. *Meditation on Emptiness*, by Jeffrey Hopkins (J.W. de Jong) 124

5.	<i>Philosophy of Mind in Sixth Century China, Paramārtha's 'Evolution of Consciousness,'</i> by Diana Y. Paul (J.W. de Jong)	129
	Diana Paul Replies	133
	J.W. de Jong Replies	135
6.	<i>Seven Works of Vasubandhu: The Buddhist Psychological Doctor,</i> by Stefan Anacker (A.W. Hanson-Barber)	136
7.	<i>Tsong Khapa's Speech of Gold in the Essence of True Eloquence: Reason and Enlightenment in the Central Philosophy of Tibet,</i> translated by Robert A.F. Thurman (Janet Gyatso)	138

III. NOTES AND NEWS

1.	Election Results, IABS	143
2.	Conference Announcements	144
	8th Conference, IABS	144
	32nd ICANAS	145
	7th World Sanskrit Conference	145
3.	AAR Buddhism Group	146

OBITUARIES	147
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	156

Philosophy of Mind in Sixth Century China. Paramārtha's 'Evolution of Consciousness,' by Diana Y. Paul. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984, vii + 266 pages.

Paramārtha (499–569) is considered to be one of the four great translators of Indian texts into Chinese, the other three being Kumārajīva, Hsüan-tsang and Amoghavajra. He arrived in China in 546, but did not meet with favourable conditions and was forced to wander from one place to another. Nevertheless, he was able to translate many texts, most of which belong to the Vijñānavāda school. He was interested in particular in the Mahāyānasamgraha, and he founded the She-lun school. His interpretations of the Vijñānavāda texts were disseminated by his disciples. After the foundation of the Fa-hsiang school by Hsüan-tsang's chief disciple, Chi (632–682), the She-lun school disappeared from the scene.

Diana Paul's book is the first monograph in a Western language on Paramārtha. The bibliography comprises many Sanskrit, Chinese and Japanese sources, and among the secondary sources a number of publications by Japanese scholars are mentioned. Her work seems to be the result of many years of study during which the author discussed her ideas with colleagues both in Japan and America. The first two chapters deal with the life and times of Paramārtha and the spreading of his ideas by his disciples. Paramārtha's views on language and on the philosophy of mind are discussed in the following two chapters. His *Chuan shih lun* is analysed in the last chapter, which is followed by the translation of the text.

The reader of this book cannot but be impressed by the wide range of sources both primary and secondary. However, when one takes the trouble to check the information the author gives, one soon discovers that her study and interpretation of the sources leaves much to be desired. For instance, she writes that all biographical data presented on the figure of Paramārtha are based upon his biography in the *Hsü kao seng chuan*. The single most important secondary source in the analysis of the HSKC is Ui Hakuju's study, *Indo tetsugaku kenkyū*, vol. 6, 1930, pp. 5–130 (cp. 187, note 31). On p. 35 Paul writes that after Hui-k'ai's death in 568 Paramārtha continued to translate the *Abhidharma-kośa*. On p. 194 (note 25) she repeats the same information, referring to Paramārtha's biography, and she wonders how Hui-k'ai could have written an introduction to the *Kośa* in 567 as stated by Ui on p. 6 of his book. In the same note Paul

writes that the *Kośa* was translated in the fifth year of T'ien-chia, or 564, which clearly contradicts her previous statement that Paramārtha continued to translate the *Kośa* after the death of Hui-k'ai. Ui discusses the dates of the translation of the *Kośa* and points out that this text must have been translated in 564 and not in 563 as stated in Hui-k'ai's introduction (Ui, pp. 36–37). Subsequently the translation was carefully revised and the revision completed in 567. Ui quotes a passage from Hui-k'ai's biography which says that Hui-k'ai lectured on the *Kośa* until his death and that after his death Paramārtha continued to lecture on the same text (cf. Ui, p. 37; HSKC, p. 431b9–24.)¹

Probably the first text translated by Paramārtha was the *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun* in five *chüan* (Paul, p. 25). The text is now lost, but it is certainly an incomplete translation of the first part of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (cf. Ui, pp. 55–58). In a note Paul writes that "*The Treatise on the seventeen Bodhisattva Stages (Shih-ch'i ti lun)* was a commentary on a *sūtra* by the same name consisting of part of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*" (p. 188, note 43)!

In her analysis of the *Chuan shih lun*, Paul discusses in detail the problem of the *amalavijñāna* and translates several passages of Paramārtha's works in which this term occurs. On p. 142 she translates one passage of the *San wu-hsing-lun* (T. 1617, p. 873c23–24) and adds "This is the only instance of *amala-vijñāna* in the SWHL". However, a much more important passage relating to *amalavijñāna* occurs in the same text (871c28–872a15; Ui, pp. 244–245). This passage is discussed by Katsumata Shunkyo and is also partially translated by Paul Demiéville, to mention only two publications listed in the bibliography of Paul's book.²

On p. 143 Paul translates a passage of the *Chüeh ting tsang lun* relating to the *amalavijñāna* (T. 1584, 1020b12–19; 23–24; Ui, pp. 563–565). The translation contains the most amazing errors. For instance, the text has: "The *ālayavijñāna* is followed by the effects of *dausthulya*. In the *amalavijñāna* the entire *dausthulya* is absent." Paul translates: "The *ālaya-vijñāna* is the consequent of subtle evil. The *amala-vijñāna* is followed by subtle evil." In the corresponding passage of Hsüang-tsang's translation *dausthulya* is rendered by *ts'u-chung*. Paramārtha uses the term *ts'u-o-ku*.³ The same passage was translated correctly in 1929 by Paul Demiéville.⁴ In the remaining part of this passage as in other passages relating to *amalavijñāna*, the translation is often far from correct.

The translation of the *Chuan shih lun* also contains some very strange renderings. On page 155 Paul translates: "[Verse

VII:] This consciousness and its associated [mental] states are eliminated in the Arhat stage, being ultimately eliminated upon entering cessation-meditation (*nirodha-samāpatti*).” This is exactly the opposite of that what is found in the text: “This consciousness and its associated dharmas are finally destroyed upon arrival in the Arhat stage and are also all destroyed upon entering the meditation of cessation.” As Ui explains, the destruction is definitive in the Arhat stage but only temporary during the meditation of cessation, because upon arising from this meditation consciousness returns (Ui, p. 447). This is of course a well-known doctrine and found, for instance, also in the *Ch’eng wei-shih lun*: “Dans l’état d’Arhat, le Manas souillé (*kliṣṭam manas*), tant actuel que Bijas, est absolument coupé. On dit donc qu’il n’existe pas (*na*). Quant aux Śaikṣas, dans l’état de “recueillement de cessation” (*Nirodhasamāpatti*) et lorsqu’ils pratiquent le Chemin, le Manas souillé est provisoirement “dompté” (incapable de s’actualiser). On dit donc qu’il n’existe pas” (*La Siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang* traduite et annotée par Louis de La Vallée Poussin, I, Paris, 1928, p. 267).

According to verse 16 of the *Triṃśikā*, the *mano-vijñāna* is absent in five states: *manovijñānasambhūtiḥ sarvadāsaṃjñikād r̥te / samāpattidvayān middhān murchanād apy acittakāt*. La Vallée Poussin translates: “Le Manovijñāna se produit toujours excepté dans l’état de dieu inconscient, et dans les deux recueils, la torpeur et la défaillance exempts de pensée” (*La Siddhi*, p. 398). Paramārtha mentions six states: *asaṃjñīsamāpatti*, *asaṃjñīdevas*, sound sleep without dreams (*middha*), drunkenness, stupor (*murchana*) and temporary death of the mind, omitting *nirodhasamāpatti* and adding drunkenness and temporary death of the mind (cf. Ui, p. 452). In her translation Paul manages to smuggle into the text the two *samāpattis*: “[cessation] meditation without conceptualization (*nirodha-samāpatti*), [meditation associated with the third level or *dhyāna* in] heavens without conceptualization (*asaṃjñī-samāpatti*), dreamless sleep, drunken stupor, unconsciousness, or a coma” (p. 158). No note accompanies her translation, which clearly was made without understanding the Chinese text and without consulting Ui’s commentary.

Diana Paul is not more successful in her interpretation of Sanskrit texts. She translates verse 17 of the *Triṃśikā* as follows: “Evolution of consciousness is discrimination that is falsely discriminated; therefore, it does not exist. Thus, all is Consciousness-Only” (p. 239, note 42). The Sanskrit text is: *vijñānapariṇāmo ’yaṃ vikalpo yad vikalpyate / tena tan nāsti tenedaṃ sarvaṃ vijñāptimātrakam*. Paul’s translation (“discrimination is falsely discrimi-

nated") sins both against Sanskrit grammar and the meaning of the verse. The interesting fact is that this verse is interpreted in two different ways by Hsüan-tsang and Sthiramati. This is clearly explained by La Vallée Poussin, who points out that Hsüan-tsang understands: "Ce développement du Vijñāna est la pensée et le "pensé", ce qui pense (cogitat) et la chose qui est pensée (cogitatur). Par conséquent (*tena*) cela (*tad* = Ātman et Dharmas) n'existe pas. Par conséquent tout cela est Vijñapti-sans-plus." Sthiramati makes a break after *vikalpaḥ*: "Le développement du Vijñāna est le Vikalpa, imagination; ce qui est imaginé par cette imagination (*tena* [*vikalpena*]), cela n'existe pas; par conséquent . . ." (*La Siddhi de Hsuan-tsang*, p. 416).

In other instances Paul advances new interpretations which are completely unacceptable. On p. 134 she refers to the following passage of Sthiramati's commentary on verse 1 of the *Triṃśikā*: *vijñānaṃ punaḥ pratītyasamutpannatvād dravyato 'stīty abhyupeyam* / (ed. Sylvain Lévi, p. 16.16–17). Paul suggests that *vijñānasya* may modify *pariṇāma*, although she concedes that "the more common reading by Buddhologists" connects it with *pratītyasamutpanna* (cf. p. 225, note 94). One wonders whether there is one reputable Buddhologist who accepts this interpretation. We have not taken the trouble to consult all the existing translations of the *Triṃśikā*, but Sylvain Lévi, Jacobi and Ui all connect *vijñānasya* with *pratītyasamutpanna*. Another new interpretation is given on p. 138 for the following sentence: *tena grāhyagrāhakeṇa paratantrasya sadā sarvakālaṃ atyantarahitatā yā sa pariṇiṣpannasvabhāvaḥ* (*Triṃśikā*, ed. Sylvain Lévi, p. 40.4–5). Paul writes: "Grammatically, this phrase . . . could be translated in the following manner . . . : 'Because always and in all times what is separate from the dependent nature through the agency of the perceiver and the perceived is called the absolute nature.'" Paul adds that "from the context of the *bhāṣya* this reading is unlikely," but even to suggest the possibility of such an interpretation is unwarranted.

The above remarks are the result of an examination of only a few passages taken more or less at random from Paul's book; other examples could be adduced. Paramārtha is a very important figure and it is to be hoped that he will receive due attention from Western scholars. In the first place it will be necessary to give a complete translation of his biography and those of his main disciples. In translating his works it would be highly desirable to translate also the corresponding passages in Hsüan-tsang's translations. In his book, Ui has presented parallel texts followed by a detailed commentary which is extremely useful. Ui's book,

although published in 1930, is still the most important publication on Paramārtha and is indispensable for any further study of his life and ideas.

J.W. de Jong.

NOTES

1. See also Paul Demiéville, "Sur l'authenticité du *Ta tch'eng k'i sin louen*", *BMFJ*, II, 2 (Tokyo, 1929), p. 21.

2. Katsumata Shunkyō, *Bukkyō ni okeru shinshikisetsu no kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1961), p. 704; Demiéville, *op.cit.*, p. 41.

3. On the meaning of *dausthulya*, see Unrai Wogihara, *Asaṅga's Bodhisattvabhūmi* (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 27–28; Sylvain Lévi, *Asaṅga, Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra*, Tome II (Paris, 1911), p. 51, note 2; Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *La Siddhi de Hiuan-tsang*, I–II (Paris, 1928–1929), pp. 331 and 608.

4. *Op.cit.*, p. 42.

Diana Paul Replies:

I always enjoy taking the time to reply to reviews of my books that have grappled with the content and basis of the analysis. A well-thought-out review always leaves the reader with a clearer idea of the author's purport and intent for writing the book. It gives a clear exposition of the substance and thesis of the book. I am sorry to say that the reader who looks at de Jong's review will not be able to grasp the nature of my project at all. The burden on any conscientious reviewer is to pay attention to what the author *does* write about rather than being preoccupied with issues that the reviewer *wants* to raise because he or she thinks those issues are more important. It is one thing to meet on the issues and substance and to disagree or to criticize. It is quite another to read a protracted discourse that, in fact, does not acknowledge what does appear in the work. This discourse by de Jong is such a protracted one. First, the reader should note that de Jong makes note of only Chapter One (two references) and Chapter Five (three references), without discussing Chapter Two, "The Dissemination of Paramārtha's Ideas," Chapter Three, "Theory of Language in Yogācāra," and Chapter Four, "Philosophy of Mind."

My major intent was to show in simpler, readable language