THE JOURNAL

OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Roger Jackson
Dept. of Religion
Carleton College
Northfield, MN 55057

EDITORS

Peter N. Gregory
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA

Alexander W. Macdonald
Université de Paris X
Nanterre, France

Steven Collins
Concordia University
Montréal, Canada

Ernst Steinkellner
University of Vienna
Wien, Austria

Jikidō Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Robert Thurman
Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts, USA

Volume 12 *1989* *Number 1*

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

II. SHORT PAPERS

III. BOOK REVIEWS

The Categories of *T'i, Hsiang*, and *Yung*: Evidence that Paramārtha Composed the *Awakening of Faith*

by William H. Grosnick

Introduction

The question of whether Paramārtha's version of the *Awakening of Faith in Mahāyāna (AFM)*[1] may really be a Chinese composition has long intrigued scholars of Buddhism. Because no original Sanskrit manuscript of the *AFM* has ever been found nor any reference to the *AFM* discovered in any Buddhist text composed in India, scholars have long suspected that the *AFM* might not be a Chinese translation of an Indian work. The traditional attribution of the text to Aśvaghoṣa is even more suspect—as Paul Demiéville pointed out, it is almost impossible to believe that the Aśvaghoṣa whom one associates with the *Buddhacarita*, the *Mahāvibhāṣā*, and the Sarvāstivādins could have composed any Mahāyāna text, much less a sophisticated Mahāyāna treatise like the *AFM*.[2] And the discovery at the beginning of this century of Japanese references to the seventh century Buddhist figure Hui-chün,[a] who is quoted as saying that the *AFM* was composed not by Aśvaghoṣa, but by a "prisoner of war" who belonged to the *T'i lun* School,[3] prompted many distinguished scholars, including Shinko Mochizuki and Walter Liebenthal, to argue that the work was a Chinese fabrication by a person affiliated with the native Chinese *T'i lun* School, which devoted itself to the study of Vasubandhu's *Daśabhūmivyākhyā*.[4] Indeed, as recently as 1958, Liebenthal went so far as to say that one could take it as "established" that a member of the *T'i lun* School composed the *AFM*.[5] Few would go so far as actually to name the member of the *T'i lun* School who wrote the *AFM*, as Liebenthal did

(indeed, as Liebenthal himself remarked, it is difficult to believe that any member of the *T'i lun* School could have written the *AFM*, given that the author of the *AFM* does not even seem to know the ten *bodhisattvabhūmis* described in the *Daśabhūmivyākhyā*),[6] but for a long time scholarly opinion has leaned in the direction of assigning authorship of the *AFM* to the Chinese. Just recently Professor Whalen Lai has brought forward some cogent new reasons for regarding the *AFM* as a Chinese composition.[7]

In light of all this, it might seem rather daring to suggest that an Indian actually composed the *AFM*, but that is what I propose to argue. I do not intend to suggest that the Sarvāstivādin Aśvaghoṣa, or even a "Mahāyāna Aśvaghoṣa" composed the *AFM*. The first place that any Aśvaghoṣa is listed as the author of the text is in Hui-yüan's *Ta-ch'êng i chang*,[b] a work composed about a half century after Paramārtha was said to have translated the *AFM*, so the attribution of the text to Aśvaghoṣa probably postdated its composition. But there are a couple of pieces of important philological evidence, heretofore largely overlooked, that seem to point strongly to an Indian Buddhist, most likely Paramārtha himself, as the real author of the text, or at least of major parts of it.[8] The first piece of evidence is the use in the *AFM* of the three categories of *t'i*,[c] *hsiang*,[d] and *yung*,[e] categories which I will try to show were derived by the author of the *AFM* from Sanskrit categories used in the *Ratnagotravibhāgamahāyānottaratantraśāstra (RGV)* and which could not have been formulated by anyone who did not possess a knowledge of Sanskrit. The second piece of evidence is Paramārtha's interpolation of passages from the *RGV* into the *Mahāyānasaṃgrahabhāṣya (MSbh)*, which seems to show not only that Paramārtha was intimately familiar with the *RGV* and its categories, but also that he was personally concerned about issues central to the *AFM*. When examined together with some interesting biographical details from accounts of Paramārtha's life, this evidence seems to suggest the very real possibility that Paramārtha was the author of the *AFM*.

I. Indian Origins of the Categories of T'i, Hsiang, *and* Yung

In the early "outline" (*li-i*)[f] section of the *AFM*, the author makes use of the three categories of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung* to analyze what is meant by the "greatness" of the Great Vehicle (Mahāyāna):

> The mind's aspect as thusness (*tathatā*) designates the essence (*t'i*) of Mahāyāna, and the aspect of mind which participates in the causes and conditions of birth and death designates the attributes (*hsiang*) and function (*yung*) of the essence of Mahāyāna. There are three meanings of the term. The first is the greatness of essence (*t'i*), which means that all *dharmas* form an undifferentiated whole with thusness, to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be taken away. The second is the greatness of attributes (*hsiang*), which means that the *tathāgatagarbha* is endowed with limitless virtues. The third is the greatness of function (*yung*), so called because it can give rise to good causes and results, both in this world and in others.[9]

These three categories are again employed—this time at greater length—in the "commentarial section" (*chieh-shih fen*)[g] of the text to analyze thusness (*chen-ju*,[h] *tathatā*), the central concept of the *AFM*.

For a long time scholars have suspected that this pattern of analysis pointed to the Chinese composition of the *AFM*, for later Chinese and Japanese Buddhist commentaries like Hui-yüan's *Ta-ch'êng i chang* and Kūkai's *Sokushin-jōbutsu-gi*[i] make abundant use of the triad of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung*, as do Sung Dynasty Neo-Confucian texts. And even though research has shown that this mode of analysis only became popular after Hui-yüan employed it in his *Ta-ch'êng i chang*—and Hui-yüan derived it directly from the *AFM* itself—the sheer popularity of the triad in China, together with its apparent absence in known Indian compositions, has suggested that this mode of analysis reflects a native Chinese way of thinking.

What seems particularly Chinese about the triad is the use of the term *yung*, which some scholars think is of Taoist origin. The Neo-Taoist Wang-pi[j] used the distinction between *t'i* and *yung* to analyze the *tao* and its virtues, and Yoshito Hakeda, following Zenryū Tsukamoto, has suggested that the early Bud-

dhist commentator Seng-chao[k] used this pattern of analysis in his *Pan-jo wu-chih lun.*[109] Walter Liebenthal has hinted that the *AFM* triad of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung* represents a grafting of this Neo-Taoist distinction between *t'i* and *yung* onto the traditional Buddhist distinction between the nature of a thing (its *svabhāva*, or *t'i*), and its attributes (*lakṣaṇa*, *hsiang*).[111] This may make some philosophical sense, since the Neo-Taoists used the term *t'i* to refer to the original, undifferentiated *tao* which lies beyond the distinctions of *yin* and *yang*, and contrasted this with *yung*, the process by which the *tao* unfolds to reveal its many virtues, while the *AFM* seems to make a parallel contrast between undifferentiated thusness and its many distinct virtues. But from a philological perspective it makes no sense whatsoever. In the first place, the *AFM* discusses the apparent paradox between undifferentiated thusness and its many clearly distinguishable virtues under the categories of *t'i* and *hsiang*, not *t'i* and *yung*. In the second place, what is discussed in the *AFM* commentary on the "function" (*yung*) of thusness are the Buddhist notions of the three Buddha-bodies and the indivisibility of all beings from thusness, topics which have nothing whatsoever to do with Taoism. Moreover, since no one has yet discovered a native Chinese composition predating the *AFM* which employs these three categories together, it seems more reasonable to credit the author of the *AFM* for the popularity of this mode of analysis in China.

Rather than engage in vague speculation about native Chinese "ways of thinking" it would make more sense to search for the origins of the three categories in those Indian Buddhist texts which might have directly influenced the *AFM*. Much research in this area has recently been done by Japanese scholars like Professor Hirowo Kashiwagi, whose recent book, *Daijōkishinron no kenkyū* gathers together much of the current Japanese scholarship relating to the Indian Buddhist origins of these categories.

Kashiwagi first examines the *AFM* reference to the three categories as "greatnesses" (*ta*,[m] *mahattva*). The *AFM* itself, of course, claims to be explaining what is meant by the "greatness" of the "Great Vehicle" (the "*mahā*" of "Mahāyāna"). It was a common practice in Indian Buddhist literature to explicate the meaning of "greatness" in this way; many texts, like the

Bodhisattvabhūmika and the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, give a traditional list of seven *mahattvas*.[12] But there also seems to have been room for free speculation on this theme—different chapters of the *Daśabhūmivyākhyā* speak of all sorts of greatnesses, from the greatness of the *bodhisattva*'s vow to the greatness of his wisdom.[13] However, nowhere in any of these lists of greatnesses has anyone yet found a list similar to the *AFM* list of the three greatnesses of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung*. The conceptual original of the categories themselves seems to have derived from a different source.

Following an idea first suggested by Professor Jikidō Takasaki, Kashiwagi suggests that the prototype of the *AFM* triad of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung* may have been a pattern used in Indian Yogācāra literature for the analysis of faith (*hsin*,[n] Skt. *adhimukti*). Two Indian Yogācāra works, the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi (VijS)* and the *MSbh*, both speak of three types of faith or confidence to be cultivated by a Mahāyāna practitioner: faith in the ultimate reality (*hsin shih yu*[o]), faith in its virtues (*hsin yu tê*[p]), and faith in its capacity to produce future results (*hsin yu nêng*[q]).[14] This triad is not precisely identical with the *AFM* triad, but there are some striking conceptual parallels. Both *t'i* and *shih yu* refer to the quintessential reality of something, and both *hsiang* and *tê* refer to properties. And the idea of capacity (*nêng*) is implicit in what the *AFM* initially says about the greatness of *yung*, when the text says that the Great Vehicle "has the capacity to give rise to good causes and results, both in this world and in others."[15] It is also worth noting that categories for the analysis of faith would undoubtedly be important for a treatise like the *AFM* which claims as its purpose the "awakening" or "arousal" of faith.

Since the author of the *AFM* was familiar with many Yogācārin ideas, it is certainly possible that he had read either the *MSbh* or the *VijS* and based his three categories in part on the three classifications of faith found in these texts. But as Professor Takasaki has shown, these three ways of classifying faith are also found in the *RGV*, the central commentary of the Mahāyāna *tathāgatagarbha* tradition and a text with which we can be quite sure the author of the *AFM* was familiar.[16] Two verses on the merits of faith from the final section of the *RGV* refer directly to these three classifications:

> The basis of Buddhahood, its transformation,

> Its properties and the performance of welfare—
> In these four aspects of the sphere of the Buddha's Wisdom,
> Which have been explained above,
> The wise one has become full of faith
> With regard to its existence (*astitva*), power (*śaktatva*),
> and virtue (*guṇattva*),
> Therefore, he quickly attains the potentiality
> Of acquiring the state of the Tathāgata (Takasaki translation).[17]

With a slight change of order, the pattern of "existence" (*astitva*), "power" (*śaktatva*), and "virtue" (*guṇattva*) corresponds exactly to the pattern of "reality," "virtue," and "capacity" found in the *MSbh* and *VijS*.

Of these three categories for the analysis of faith, only the category of *guṇa* seems to have been left unchanged by the author of the *AFM*. For it seems clear that the author of the *AFM* had the idea of *guṇas*, or virtues, in mind when he chose the category of *hsiang*. In the initial outline section of the text the author says that the "greatness of attributes (*hsiang ta*^{r}) means that the *tathāgatagarbha* is endowed with limitless virtues."[18] This emphasis on the numberless virtues of the Tathāgata (and *tathāgatagarbha*) is a central theme of the *RGV*. One of the seven main headings (or *vajrapadas*) of the *RGV* is the topic of the *guṇas* of the Buddha, and under the heading of *guṇa* in the opening section of the text, the *RGV* quotes the following verse from the *Śrīmālādevīsūtra*:

> O Śāriputra, that which is called the Absolute Body, preached by the Tathāgata, is of indivisible nature, of qualities inseparable from wisdom, that is to say, indivisible from the properties of the Buddha which far surpass the particles of sand in the Ganges River in number (Takasaki tr.).[19]

Elsewhere, the *RGV* insists (as does the *AFM*),[20] that the proper understanding of emptiness requires that one understand that the *tathāgatagarbha* is "not empty" of the *buddhaguṇas*.[21]

The influence of the *RGV* theory of the virtues of the Buddha is even clearer in the commentarial section of the *AFM*, where one finds the following passage on the attributes (*hsiang*) of the essence (*t'i*) of thusness:

> From the outset it is naturally replete with all virtues. . . . It is by nature endowed with the light of great wisdom. . . . It is mind that is pure by nature. It is eternal, blissful, true self, and pure. It is quiescent, unchanging, and self-abiding. It is endowed with the inconceivable *buddhadharmas*, which are inseparable, indivisible, and indistinguishable from its essence, and whose numbers are greater than the sands of the Ganges River.[22]

Almost all of the virtues listed in this passage are discussed in the opening chapter of the *RGV*. "Mind that is pure by nature" (*cittaprakṛtivaimalyadhātu*) is discussed there under the heading of "all-pervasiveness" (*sarvatraga*).[23] The four *guṇapāramitās* of eternality, bliss, true self, and purity are discussed under the heading of "result" (*phala*).[24] The terms "quiescent" (*ch'ing-liang*[s]) and "unchanging" (*pu-pien*[t]), which correspond to the Sanskrit terms *śiva* and *śāśvata*, respectively, are used on two separate occasions in the *RGV* under the heading of "changelessness" (*avikāra*).[25] And the idea that thusness is endowed with all of the innumerable *buddhadharmas* is discussed throughout the *RGV*.[26]

Judging by content alone, it is clear that this commentary on the attributes (*hsiang*) of thusness derives directly from the *RGV*. And that the author of the *AFM* speaks of attributes (*hsiang*) as "virtues" (*kung-tê*[u]) seems to confirm that the author of the *AFM* had the Sanskrit category of *guṇa* in mind when he chose the term *hsiang*, for the term *guṇa*, as used in reference to the Buddha, invariably refers to virtues. But it is worth noting that the term *guṇa* also frequently has the wider meaning of "attribute, characteristic, or property," a meaning very close to the Chinese *hsiang*.[27]

The connection of the other two *AFM* categories of *t'i* and *yung* to the *RGV* is a bit more complicated, however, and requires that one understand the structure of the latter text.

The *RGV* actually uses two different sets of categories to conduct its analysis. The first set of categories consists of the seven *vajrapadas*, or major topics addressed by the text. These seven topics are: 1) the Buddha, 2) the Dharma, 3) the Saṇgha (the traditional "three jewels"), 4) the *Dhātu* (the *buddhadhātu* or "Buddha-nature," which is synonymous with the *tathāgata-garbha*), and 5) enlightenment (*bodhi*), 6) virtues (*guṇa*), and 7)

the actions (*karman*) of the Buddha. Both Professors Takasaki and Kashiwagi have noted that the last three of these seven topics have at least a superficial resemblance to the *AFM* triad of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung*.[28] The second set of categories is a set of ten categories used to analyze the *tathāgatagarbha* in Chapter One and a closely related set of eight categories used to analyze *nirmalā tathatā* in Chapter Two. This second set of categories is a simple expansion of a traditional set of six categories that Professor Takasaki has shown is also used in several Yogācāra texts like the Mahāyāna-*sūtrālaṃkāra* and the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*.[29] The six categories are: 1) *svabhāva* (essence), 2) *hetu* (cause), 3) *phala* (result), 4) *karman* (activity), 5) *yoga* (union), and 6) *vṛtti* (function, mode of appearance). The six categories were used to analyze the ultimate object of knowledge in Mahāyāna Buddhism, referred to variously as *dharmadhātu*, *anāśravadhātu*, and *tathatā*. The *RGV* uses this set of six categories to analyze the two ways in which *tathatā* appears, first in ordinary beings (as the *tathāgatagarbha* or *samalā tathatā*), and second in the Buddha (as *nirmalā tathatā*). And though at first glance the *AFM* seems only to share the first category of *svabhāva (t'i)* with the list of six, that it uses the triad of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung* to analyze *tathatā* means that its three categories are being used for the same purpose that the six categories were traditionally used.

There seems little doubt that the author of the *AFM* had in mind *svabhāva*, the first of these six categories, when he formulated his category of *t'i*. Next to *tzu-hsing*[v], *t'i* is perhaps the most frequently used Chinese term used in Buddhist texts to translate *svabhāva* and its meaning is certainly much closer to svabhāva than it is to *bodhi* (the *vajrapada* which precedes *guṇa* in the *RGV*), or to *astitva* (the first of the three categories for the analysis of faith). More important, when one looks at what is said under the category of *svabhāva* in Chapter Two of the *RGV*, one notes a great similarity to what is said of the attributes of the essence (*t'i*) of *tathatā* in the *AFM*. This is what the *RGV* says of the *svabhāva* of *nirmalā tathatā*:

> Buddhahood has been spoken of as being radiant by nature . . .
> This Buddhahood is now eternal, everlasting, and constant,
> Being endowed with all the pure properties of the Buddha,

> And is attained when the elements of existence take resort
> To nondiscriminative and analytical wisdom. . . .
> It is endowed with all the properties of the Buddha
> Which are beyond the sands of the Ganges in number,
> And are radiant and of uncreated nature,
> And whose manifestations (*vṛtti*) are indivisible from itself (Takasaki translation).[30]

This is what the *AFM* has to say about the attributes of the essence (*t'i*) of thusness:

> From the outset it is naturally replete with all virtues. . . . It is by nature endowed with the light of great wisdom. . . . It is mind that is pure by nature. It is eternal, blissful, true self, and pure. It is quiescent, unchanging, and self-abiding. It is endowed with all the inconceivable *buddhadharmas*, which are inseparable, indivisible, and indistinguishable from its essence, and whose number is greater than the sands of the Ganges River.

Both of these passages speak of the *svabhāva* (or *t'i*) of thusness as being eternal, radiant, pure, endowed with wisdom, and replete with innumerable virtues.

It might be noted here that the author of the *AFM* is very careful in the above passage to state that he is speaking of the attributes (*hsiang*) of the essence (*t'i*) of thusness. He apparently thought that an important distinction needed to be made between *tathatā* itself (its *svabhāva*, or *t'i*), and the various attributes or virtues with which *tathatā* is said to be endowed. As described in an early passage of the *AFM*, *tathatā* is said to really "have no attributes." It is called "the limit of what can be verbalized" and "an expression used to transcend expressions."[32] By contrast, the various virtues of the Buddha are attributes *par excellence*; they are verbalizations intended to characterize Buddhahood.

The author of the *RGV* does not seem to have been particularly aware of this apparent contradiction, either because he did not understand thusness in the same way or because he was content simply to make his point that thusness was not empty of innumerable virtues. But the author of the *AFM*, though he clearly accepted the idea that thusness was replete with innumerable virtues, felt that a lengthy explanation was needed. At the end of his commentary on the greatness of the attributes

of thusness he appends the following question and answer:

> Question: Above you said that thusness in its essence (*t'i*) is undifferentiated and free from all attributes. How can you now say that it is endowed with these various virtues?
>
> Answer: Although it really has these virtues it is still without any attributes by which distinctions are made. . . . It is free from discrimination and discriminated characteristics; it is nondual. What is explainable in terms of distinctions is only what can be shown from the perspective of "activating consciousness," which is characterized by birth and death. What does this mean? Because all things are ultimately only mind, they really are not to be found in thoughts. Yet because there is the deluded mind which in its nonenlightenment gives rise to thoughts and perceives objects, it is explained as being ignorant. The nature of the mind does not arise; it itself is the light of great wisdom. (But) if the mind gives rise to "seeing" (the perceiving subject), then there comes into being an "unseeing" attribute (the perceived object). The freedom of the mental nature from a "subject side" is the universal *dharma*-realm. If the mind is stirred it is not true cognition and it loses its original nature. It is not eternal, blissful, true self, or pure. It is distressed, anxious, degenerate, and changeable, and so out of control that it possesses more faults than there are sands in the Ganges River. It is by contrast to this that one can say that the unmoved mental nature has the attribute (*hsiang*) of having more virtues than there are sands in the Ganges River. . . . Thus all those pure virtues are of the one mind and are not objects of thought.[33]

The point that the author is making is that it is by contrast to nonenlightenment that thusness is seen to be endowed with innumerable virtues. Thusness in its own nature is free from all forms of conceptualization; it is only from the perspective of *saṃsāra* that it can be seen to have attributes.

It is apparent from the detailed argumentation of the foregoing passage that the author of the *AFM* devoted a great deal of thought to reconciling the innumerable attributes (*guṇas*) of the Buddha with the undifferentiated nature (*svabhāva*) of thusness. That he was even able to perceive that this problem existed, much less come up with such an elegant solution,

suggests that he was someone well schooled in the Indian *tathāgatagarbha* tradition, and seriously concerned about its central issues. As brilliant as the native Chinese thinkers might have been, it seems unlikely that one of them would have both been able to identify and to resolve such a problem. What makes it even more unlikely is that part of the above answer is apparently phrased in classical Yogācāra terms. The expression "seeing" (*chien*[w]) and "attribute" (*hsiang*[x]) spoken of in the above passage seem to be early attempts to translate the Yogācārin terms *darśana-bhāga (chien-fen*[y]*)* and *nimitta-bhāga (hsiang-fen*[z]*)*. Since Yogācāra texts were only beginning to be introduced into China at the time, it seems unlikely that anyone but an Indian would have employed Indian Yogācāra ideas to analyze a problem which arose in the first place in Indian Buddhist literature.

The question of the Sanskrit origin of the third *AFM* category of *yung* is a more intriguing problem. Looking through the two sets of categories employed by the *RGV* one can find two Sanskrit terms which, like the Chinese *yung*, can mean something like "function." The first of these is *karman*, the seventh of the *vajrapadas* and the fourth of the six traditional Yogācāra categories of analysis. The second of these is *vṛtti*, the sixth of the Yogācāra categories. *Karman* is generally translated as "work" or "activity," which is close in meaning to *yung*. *Vṛtti* often means something like "manifestation" or "mode of appearance," though Monier-Williams lists a wide range of possible meanings of the term, including "function" and "activity."[34] That Hsüan-tsang used *yung* on several occasions to translate *vṛtti* in his translation of the *Abhidharmakośa* shows that eminent Chinese translators of the period regarded *yung* and *vṛtti* to be similar in meaning.[35]

As the seventh *vajrapadu*, *karman* is also the third term in the triad of *bodhi*, *guṇa*, and *karman*, so from the point of view of formal structure, *karman* would seem to be a likelier origin for the category of *yung* than *vṛtti*. But when one examines what the *RGV* says under the category of *karman*, one finds little that parallels what the *AFM* says under the category of *yung*. When speaking, for example, of the *karman*, or activity, of the Buddha, the *RGV* emphasizes that the Buddha's acts are effortless, continuous, and free from false discrimination,[36] whereas the *AFM* says nothing like this under the category of *yung*.

By contrast, what the *AFM* does talk about under the category of *yung* is remarkably similar to what the *RGV* says under the category of *vṛtti*, for both texts use these headings to discuss the theory of the Buddha-bodies. In Chapter Two of the *RGV* the subject of Buddhahood is analyzed in the following manner under the category of *vṛtti*:

> Now again it should be known that this Buddhahood, due to its possession of properties uncommon to others, manifests itself, though by means of a manifestation (*vṛtti*) which is inseparable from its immutable qualities like space, still in the forms of three immaculate bodies, viz. "the Body of Absolute Essence (*svabhāvika*)," "the Body of Enjoyment (*sāmbhogya*)," and "the Apparitional Body (*nairmānika*)," with various inconceivable activities like great skillful means, great compassion, and wisdom, in order to be the support and welfare and happiness of all sentient beings (Takasaki translation).[37]

In the commentarial section of the *AFM* we find the following commentary on the function (*yung*) of thusness:

> This function (*yung*) occurs in two different forms. The first is what is seen by the minds of ordinary beings, *srāvakas*, and *pratyekabuddhas* based on their "object-discriminating consciousness." This is called the "transformation body" (*nirmāṇakāya*). . . . The second is what is seen by the minds of *bodhisattvas* between the initial and final stages based on "activating consciousness." This is called the "reward body" (*saṃbhogakāya*).[38]

The author of the *AFM* goes on to explain that both of these Buddha-bodies are perceived because of incorrect thinking—ordinary beings cannot perceive the *saṃbhogakāya* because of their attachment to corporeal form and *bodhisattvas* who have not completed the stages cannot perceive the *dharmakāya* because they are not yet free from dualistic thinking. If beings could overcome these coarse and subtle illlusions they would perceive the only true body, the *dharmakāya*. This thinking accords with analysis found in the *vṛtti* section of the *RGV*, which also subordinates the *nirmāṇakāya* and the *saṃbhogakāya* to the *dharmakāya*,[39] and which suggests that the appearance of the former two bodies is conditioned by illusions.[40]

It was apparently a fairly common practice in Indian Yogācāra Buddhism to discuss the Buddha-bodies under the category of *vṛtti*, for this use of *vṛtti* is also found in a verse from the *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra*. The last verse in a series of six which describe the highest reality (*anāśravadhātu*) in terms of the same six Yogācāra categories used by the *RGV* says that the highest reality "manifests itself variously by the body of its own essence, by that of enjoyment of the doctrine, and by that of incarnation" (*svabhāvadharmasaṃbhoganirmair bhinnavṛttikaḥ*).[41] If it was a common practice to discuss the *trikāya* theory under the category of *vṛtti* then there were probably any number of sources besides the *RGV* from which the author of the *AFM* might have derived his category of *yung*.

There is another subject discussed under the *vṛtti* category of the *RGV* that parallels what is discussed under the category of *yung* in the *AFM*. This is the manifestation (*vṛtti*) of thusness in beings of different levels of spiritual awareness, namely ordinary beings, *āryas*, and Buddhas. Although other sections of the *RGV* distinguish among the understandings that these three types of beings have of thusness, the *vṛtti* section of Chapter One of the *RGV* affirms that all three are identical with thusness. *Kārikā* 10 reads:

> Those who have seen the truth say that
> Ordinary being, *ārya*, or Buddha—
> All are indivisible from thusness.
> Thus all beings possess the *tathāgatagarbha*.[42]

Our purpose of discussing *tathatā* under the heading of *vṛtti* was apparently to make clear that thusness is manifested in all beings. The author of the *AFM* also seems to have been aware of this second use of the category of *vṛtti*. In his commentary on the function (*yung*) of thusness he explains that all *buddhas* and *tathāgatas* regard all beings as their own bodies, because "they perceive truly that their own bodies and those of all beings form a single, undifferentiated whole with thusness and are not distinct from one another."[43] This is another indication that the author of the *AFM* was thinking of the Sanskirt *vṛtti* when he used the term *yung*.

What all of this means is that the three *AFM* categories of

t'i, *hsiang*, and *yung* seem to be related to traditional Indian Buddhist categories in a very complex and intricate way. It seems clear that the author of the *AFM* was familiar with several different sets of categories used in the *RGV* and elsewhere in the Indian Buddhist philosophical tradition, including: 1) the three categories for the analysis of faith (*astitva*, *guṇattva*, and *śaktatva*) spoken of in the *MSbh*, *VijS*, and *RGV*; 2) the *RGV* *vajrapadas*, and most especially the sixth *vajrapada* of *guṇa*; and 3) the six Yogācāra categories, which include the categories of *svabhāva* and *vṛtti*, found in the *RGV* and several other texts. Enough direct connections can be drawn between these Indian categories and the categories of the *AFM* that there is no reason to think that the three *AFM* categories represent native Chinese ways of thinking. Indeed, the author of the *AFM* so skillfully incorporates the subject matter traditionally discussed under the various Indian categories into his own unique analysis that it seems almost as if the use of those Indian categories was second nature to him. This suggests very strongly that the author of the text was an Indian.

Linguistic evidence also suggests that the author of the *AFM* must have been an Indian, for it seems very unlikely that a native Chinese working from the translations available to him at the time could have conceived of the categories of *hsiang* and *yung*. Neither Ratnamati's translation of the *RGV* (the *Pao-hsing lun*,[aa] *PHL*), nor Paramārtha's *Fo-hsing lun*[ab] *(FHL)*, a text which incorporates large sections of the *RGV*, use the *AFM* term *hsiang* to translate *guṇa* (both use *kung-tê*),[44] nor does either text use *yung* to translate *vṛtti* (the *PHL* uses *hsing*,[ac] "activity,"[45] and the *FHL* uses *fen-pien*,[ad] "distinctions"[46]). So it is difficult to imagine how any native Chinese, no matter how familiar he was with translations of the *RGV*, could have discovered the categories of *hsiang* and *yung*. Unless he knew that *guṇa* meant both "attribute" and "virtue," why would he substitute *hsiang* for *kung-tê*? And unless he knew that the Buddha-bodies were traditionally discussed under the category of *vṛtti*, why would he have used the term *yung* instead of *hsing* or *fen-pien*? It seems clear that the categories of *hsiang* and *yung* could only have been formulated by someone who was doing his thinking in Sanskrit.

II. Paramārtha's Mahāyānasaṃgrahabhāṣya *Interpolations*

If the author of the *AFM* needs to have known Sanskrit and to have been familiar with the *RGV*, the most likely person to have composed the text would be Paramārtha, who is traditionally credited with being its translator. Paramārtha is of course best known for being the Indian who first introduced Yogācāra ideas in any number into China, and he is credited with the translation of such important Yogācāra works as the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, and the *Viṃśatikāvijñaptimātratāsiddhi*. But his other translations also show that he was intimately familiar with the *RGV*. In fact, it is probably no exaggeration to say that Paramārtha knew the *RGV* better than any other Indian translator who came to China. Not only has he traditionally been considered the translator (and perhaps may be the author) of the *Fo-hsing lun*, a text so heavily influenced by the *RGV* that Professor Hattori thought it to be a second version of that text,[47] but Jikidō Takasaki has also argued convincingly that Paramārtha employed the *RGV* to compose the *Wu-shang i ching*[ae] (**Anuttarāśrayasūtra*).[48] And a comparison of Paramārtha's translation of Vasubandhu's *Mahāyānasaṃgrahabhāṣya* (*MSbh*) with the other versions of the text (one Tibetan, two Chinese), shows clearly that Paramārtha interpolated an additional half-dozen passages based on the *RGV* into the *MSbh* without acknowledging their true source. (There is little doubt that Paramārtha himself was responsible for these interpolations, since one particular passage—a direct quotation from the *RGV* giving the author's supposed reasons for writing his commentary—omits a line which is found exclusively in the Chinese translation of the *RGV*, which almost certainly rules out the possibility of a native Chinese having added the passages).[49] So there is little doubt that Paramārtha knew and esteemed the *RGV*.

But what would be more important for determining whether Paramārtha is likely to have written the *AFM* would be knowing what specific ideas from the *RGV* Paramārtha personally considered to be significant. The passages from the *RGV* which Paramārtha inserted into the *MSbh* give some indication of this, for he obviously considered them important enough to sneak them into another text. Interestingly enough, the ideas in these passages seem to show a very close connection to the

central ideas of the *AFM*.

Perhaps the most significant of the passages inserted by Paramārtha into the *MSbh* is the first one, a famous passage from the *Mahāyānabhidharmasūtra (AbhidhS)* that is quoted in the *RGV*:

> The beginningless *dhātu* is the foundation of all *dharmas*;
> Because of its existence, there exists the *gatis* and the acquisition of *nirvāṇa*.[50]

Since the *AbhidhS* is no longer extant, there is no way of knowing exactly what the author of this passage originally intended, but because the passage referred to the beginningless *dhātu* as the source of the six *gatis*, the realms of transmigration within *saṃsāra*, it was interpreted by Yogācāras as referring to the *ālayavijñāna*, the consciousness that is the basis of all defiled states of mind. At the same time, because the passage also says that the existence of this beginningless *dhātu* is the basis of the attainment of *nirvāṇa*, it was interpreted by the author of the *RGV* as referring to the *buddhadhātu* (Buddha-nature) and *tathāgatagarbha*. The *AbhidhS* passage itself suggests that these interpretations do not necessarily contradict one another—they can be harmonized. And anyone familiar with the *AFM* knows that this is essentially what the text sets out to accomplish, even though it does not refer to this passage directly. Not only does the *AFM* speak of the *tathāgatagarbha* and the *ālaya* in virtually the same breath, it also attempts to show how these two aspects of the human mind are related. When the *AFM* speaks of the pure, unevolved nature of the mind as identical with thusness, it is explaining how the "beginningless *dhātu*" can be responsible for the attainment of *nirvāṇa*. And when it describes how the human mind gives rise to deluded thoughts (*nien*[af]), it is explaining how that same *dhātu* can be responsible for the existence of *saṃsāra*. It is entirely possible that one intent of the author of the *AFM* was to clarify this enigmatic passage from the *AbhidhS*.

The *AFM* does not quote the whole *AbhidhS* passage, but there are clear echoes of it found in the text. In the section of the *AFM* which is aimed at correcting misunderstandings, for example, the fifth error listed is the following:

> Hearing the *sūtras* explain that, based on the *tathāgatagarbha*, *saṃsāra* exists and that based on the *tathāgatagarbha*, there is the attainment of *nirvāṇa*, they misunderstand and say that sentient beings must have a beginning.[51]

The *AFM* corrects this error by saying that just as the *tathāgatagarbha* is "beginningless," so is ignorance,[52] so it seems that the author of the *AFM* had the beginningless *dhātu* of the *AbhidhS* in mind both when he described the error and when he explained how to correct it.

Paramārtha follows his insertion of this quotation into the *MSbh* with the interpolation of a couple of passages derived from the *RGV* which comment on the "beginningless *dhātu*." The first explains how this *dhātu* is the basis of "all of the *buddhadharmas*, which are eternally joined together, inseparable from wisdom, unconditioned, and more numerous than the sands of the Ganges River."[53] As we have seen, the *AFM* discusses this idea of the innumerable *buddhadharmas* under the heading of the attributes (*hsiang*) of thusness. The second interpolation explains that "if the *tathāgatagarbha* did not exist, there would not be the hatred of suffering nor the desire, wish, and longing for *nirvāṇa*."[54] This passage is also echoed in the *AFM*, which twice says that the "permeation of thusness" (*chen-ju hsün-hsi*[ag]), is what "enables beings to hate the sufferings of *saṃsāra* and seek *nirvāṇa*."[55]

This insertion into the *MSbh* of the *AbhidhS* quote and the *RGV* commentaries to it would itself be sufficient to establish that Paramārtha was personally concerned with ideas that the author of the *AFM* thought important. But there are a couple of other interpolations that also show his interest in issues central to the *AFM*. Another passage taken from the *RGV* that Paramārtha interpolates into the *MSbh* compares the omnipresence of the *dharmakāya* to the omnipresence of space: "Just as there is no physical form outside of the realm (*dhātu*) of space/ So there is no being in the realm of *sattvas* who is outside of the *dharmakāya*."[56] This analogy of the *dharmakāya* to space is also found in the *AFM*:

> The freedom of the mind from thoughts is analogous to space,

> for there is no place that it does not penetrate. The one mark (*hsiang*) of the *dharmadhātu* is this universal *dharmakāya* of the Tathāgata.[57]

This *AFM* passage actually seems to derive from another verse in the *RGV* which compares pure mind and space: "Just as space pervades all without discrimination/ so the mind which is by nature free from defilement/ pervades all without discrimination."[58] As I have shown elsewhere, this analogy between pure mind and space is only part of the much more extensive *hsin-nien*[ah] complex that the author of the *AFM* seems to have derived from the *RGV* notions of *cittaprakṛti* and *ayoniśomanaskāra*.[59] But what is important to note here is that Paramārtha's interpolation shows that, like the author of the *AFM*, he too had a fondness for the *RGV*'s comparisons of pure mind and the *dharmakāya* to the all-pervading character of space.

There is a third passage that Paramārtha interpolates into the *MSbh* which also seems connected to the *AFM* in a significant way. This is a passage found in a commentary under the heading of *vṛtti* (*sheng-ch'i*[ai]), which explains that of the three Buddha-bodies, the *dharmakāya* is the most difficult to see:

> Of the three bodies, the *saṃbhoga* and *nirmānakāyas* are easily seen, but the *dharmakāya* is only seen with difficulty. The *dharmakāya* is easily seen by *buddhas* and *bodhisattvas* who are advanced in their practice, but there are four types of beings who have difficulty seeing it: ordinary beings, *śrāvakas*, *pratyekabuddhas*, and *bodhisattvas* who are beginning their practice.[60]

This passage shows that Paramārtha was aware of a second text in addition to the *RGV* which discussed the theory of the three Buddha-bodies under the category of *vṛtti*, and so makes it all the more likely that he would have chosen this model to follow if he had written the *AFM*. The content of this passage and its accompanying commentary also resembles the Buddha-body discussion of the *AFM*. As in the *AFM*, the other two bodies are subordinated to the *dharmakāya*. And in the commentary which immediately follows the above passage, Paramārtha's interpolation explains that the appearance of the *nirmāna* and *saṃbhogakayas* is due to the varying kinds of obstacles that obscure

the minds of different beings—a very similar explanation to the one found in the *AFM*.[61]

These various passages that Paramārtha interpolated into the *MSbh* do not, of course, prove without a shadow of a doubt that Paramārtha composed the *AFM*. Nothing—not even the sworn testimony of his contemporaries—could really do that. But they do give an impression of what Paramārtha, as an individual, was concerned about. Taken together, they seem to be solid evidence that he was concerned about the very same issues as the author of the *AFM*.

III. The Evidence from Paramārtha's Biographies

What do the early catalogues and biographies tell us about the possibility that Paramārtha composed rather than translated the *AFM*? About all that one can say with certainty is that they show that the early cataloguers and biographers were confused enough about the circumstances of the translation of the *AFM* that anything is possible, including Paramārtha's personal authorship of the text.

The earliest catalogue that mentions the *AFM* is the *Chung ching mou lu*[aj] *(CCML)*, compiled by Fa-ching[ak] and others in 594. Under the heading of "doubts about commentaries," the *CCML* lists the *AFM* with a note saying that "it is said that this treatise was *commented on (shih*[al]*)* by Paramārtha, but we do not find it listed in the catalogue of his works, which is why we list it as doubtful" (italics mine).[62] Demiéville suggests that this is not really an allegation that the treatise was fabricated in China, since the *CCML* has another heading for texts of that sort.[63] But it is interesting to note that there may have been some confusion at the time as to whether Paramārtha translated the *AFM* or else wrote something in connection with it, since some editions of the *CCML* have Fa-ching using the character *shih* ("comment on"), rather than *i*[am] ("translate"). In any case, Fa-ching does not seem to have known much about Paramārtha's works, since he attributes only 26 texts to him and, contrary to his usual practice, includes few specifics concerning the place or date of translation.

The most reliable of the early accounts seems to be the

Li-tai san-pao chi[an] *(LTSPC)* of Fei Chang-fang,[ao] which appeared in 597. This text attributes some 64 works to Paramārtha, including the translation of the *AFM*, so Fei must have had access to information not available to Fa-ching. Quite possibly this information came from a biography of Paramārtha composed by Ts'ao-pi,[ap] the nephew of Hui-k'ai,[aq] one of Paramārtha's most famous disciples, since the *LTSPC* refers to this biography on three occasions. According to the *LTSPC*, Paramārtha translated the *AFM* in 550 at the estate of Lu Yüan-che,[ar] the governor of Fu-ch'un,[as] and wrote a two-chapter commentary on it.[64] Paramārtha had fled to Lu's estate after the rebel Hou-ching[at] had deposed his first patron, Emperor Wu of Liang, shortly after Paramārtha's arrival in the capital.

This account is interesting for several reasons. First of all, like the *CCML*, the *LTSPC* indicates that Paramārtha wrote a commentary on the *AFM*, which shows that the early biographers were aware of a tradition that held that Paramārtha composed something in connection with the *AFM*. Whatever that commentary was (unless it was the *AFM* itself), it no longer exists. Could confusion over whether Paramārtha translated or composed the *AFM* have led them to infer that he must have composed such a commentary?

The *LTSPC* account is also interesting because it assigns a very early date (550) to the translation of the *AFM*. If this date is correct it means that Paramārtha translated (or composed) the *AFM* within four years of his arrival in China and, depending on whether he went to Liang-an in 558 or 563, at least 8, and perhaps as many as 13 years before he met Hui-k'ai and the other distinguished monks with whom he translated the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* and *Abhidharmakośa*. This means that Hui-k'ai, who presumably was an important source for his nephew's biography, could not possibly have known the precise circumstances of the translation (or composition) of the *AFM*. Perhaps all he really knew was that the text had been finished prior to his period of affiliation with Paramārtha.

Of course, 550 is not the only date given in the early biographies. The *K'ai yüan lu*,[au] which was not written until 730 and which is not generally regarded as very reliable, gives 552 for the date of translation of the *AFM*.[65] But whichever date one accepts, if either, it is clear that early Chinese tradition assigned

the *AFM* to the first stages of Paramārtha's activity in China. It is only speculation, but if in fact he wrote the *AFM*, it is in a way logical for Paramārtha to have composed it early in his career. Since the *AFM* is a compact introduction to the essentials of Mahāyāna Buddhism, it seems like a kind of text a missionary would have composed as part of his initial efforts. And given the terrible political situation at the time (Paramārtha's first patron, Emperor Wu of Liang, had just been forced to starve himself to death by a rebel), Paramārtha might have feared for his own life—an ample motive to set down in summary form everything that he considered essential to Mahāyāna Buddhism.

In any case, if Paramārtha composed the *AFM* in the early 550's, there was plenty of time for this fact to have been lost to his later disciples. The twenty monks who were said to have been with Paramārtha at the estate of Lu Yüan-che were no longer with him in 563 (or 558) when he met Hui-k'ai, Fa-t'ai,[av] and the other monks who formed his last group of disciples. Indeed, in his extensive travels to avoid the political turmoil of the times, Paramārtha had joined up with and separated from many other Chinese monks in the interim (which also serves to explain why the Chinese in Paramārtha's different translations varies so much).[66] Moreover, since the *AFM* was not a focal point of interest in Paramārtha's lifetime (it did not really become important until Fa-tsang took an interest in it over a century later), it is possible that Paramārtha's later disciples did not even care who wrote it. The avid interest aroused by the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* may have driven the *AFM* so far into the background that the text and its authorship were simply forgotten.

On the other hand, about the time of Paramārtha's death in 569, there occurred an event that could have caused Paramārtha's last disciples to hide the fact of his authorship of the *AFM*, had they known about it. This was the suppression of Paramartha's new translations of Yogācāra texts, brought about by the monks of Nanking, who were perhaps jealous of their reputations, and who, in any case, had been schooled more along Mādhyamika lines, studying the *Pañcavimśatikaprajñā-pāramitāsūtra* and the treatises of Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. It is at least plausible that one of Paramārtha's disciples might have attributed the *AFM* to a venerable Indian monk like Aśva-

ghoṣa in an effort to win sympathy for the new texts. This too is speculation, but since the earliest attribution of the *AFM* to Aśvaghoṣa appears in Hui-yüan's *Ta-ch'êng i chang*, which may not have been composed until 590 or so,[67] the tradition of Aśvaghoṣa's authorship may have developed rather late.

Still, Paramārtha himself was not above falsely assigning authors to Indian Buddhist texts, especially when those texts bore some connection to the *RGV*. He may have been responsible for attributing the authorship of the *Fo-hsing lun* to Vasubandhu, though his disciples may also have had a hand in that.[68] But he most definitely was responsible for inserting passages from the *RGV* into the *MSbh*, thus implying that Vasubandhu wrote them. And whether or not, as Takasaki suggests, he composed the *Wu-shang-i ching* on the basis of the *RGV*, he had to have known that he was presenting a commentarial work as if it were an authentic *sūtra* preached by the Buddha. So Paramārtha was anything but scrupulous when it came to identifying the true sources of texts, especially when the *RGV* was involved in any way. If he had composed the *AFM* and then ascribed it to Aśvaghoṣa, it would at least have been consistent with his previous practice.

Taken as a whole, the biographical information available regarding Paramārtha's life and work does not seem to point as strongly to his authorship of the *AFM* as the other evidence. (This is hardly surprising, considering that tradition holds him to be the translator and not the author of the text). But it is significant that the information that can be gleaned from the catalogues and biographies allows plenty of scope for the possibility that he wrote the *AFM*. The other very substantial evidence: 1) that the author of the *AFM* must have had intimate knowledge of the traditional Indian Buddhist philosophical categories found in the *RGV* in order to have used the triad of *t'i*, *hsiang*, and *yung* (and Paramārtha had such knowledge); 2) that the author of the *AFM* had to have known Sanskrit in order to translate *guṇa* as *hsiang* and to discuss the Buddha-bodies under the category of *yung (vṛtti)* (and Paramārtha knew both the language and this use of *vṛtti*); 3) that the author of the *AFM* tried to harmonize Yogācāra and *tathāgatagarbha* ideas (and Paramārtha was intimately familiar with both); 4) that the author

of the *AFM* knew and used many of the same quotations and analogies that Paramārtha used in his *MSbh* interpolations; and 5) that whenever the *RGV* was involved, Paramārtha was inclined to falsify the true authorship of a text (and the influence of the *RGV* on the *AFM* is clear)—all this points strongly enough to Paramārtha's authorship of the *AFM*.

IV. Implications

These various arguments for Paramārtha's authorship of the *AFM* will undoubtedly appear more convincing to some scholars than to others. At issue, however, is a great deal more than the authorship of a single text. Chinese Buddhism has often come under fire for substantially altering Indian Buddhist ideas, and the *AFM* is frequently held up as an example of the early sinification of the Buddhist tradition. If Paramārtha did write the *AFM*, then there is a great deal more that is authentically Indian in Chinese Buddhist thought (both in the *AFM* itself and in the many works that it influenced), than scholars have heretofore been willing to believe. And both those who dismiss Chinese Buddhist thought and those who revel in native Chinese contributions will have to rethink their positions.

Moreover, if Paramārtha wrote the *AFM*, this would also alter our picture of Indian Buddhism, particularly our picture of Yogācāra Buddhism as it developed in the late fifth and early sixth centuries following Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. Scholars have had a tendency to dismiss some of the Yogācāra ideas in the *AFM* as Chinese creations, and to attribute the *AFM*'s linking of the *tathāgatagarbha* and *ālayavijñāna* to some sort of Chinese passion for harmony. They have often treated Indian Yogācāra as something wholly distinct from the *tathāgatagarbha* tradition—this in spite of Takasaki's arguments that the *RGV* was written by a Yogācāra.[69] But it is quite clear even from Paramārtha's interpolations in the *MSbh*, not to mention his translations of both *tathāgatagarbha* and Yogācāra texts, that some Indian Yogācāras were well acquainted with the *tathāgatagarbha* literature. If Paramārtha wrote it, the *AFM* would serve as a classic example of Yogācāra-*tathāgatagarbha* syncretism, providing a

clear model of how Indian Yogācāras of the time harmonized the teaching of the *tathāgatagarbha* with other, more "classically" Yogācāra conceptions.

NOTES

1. The *Ta-ch'êng ch'i hsin lun*, *T* 1666.32.575–583. There also exists, of course, the translation of Śikṣānanda (*T* 1667), but since this other translation is probably a redaction of Paramārtha's version, and since it carries with it a plethora of scholarly problems of its own, all references will be to Paramārtha's version.

2. Paul Demiéville, "*Sur L'Authenticité du Ta Tch'eng K'i Sin Louen*," in *Choix D'Études Bouddhiques (1929–1970)* (Leyden: E.J. Brill, 1973), p. 63.

3. In ch. 5 of his *Sanron gensho mongiyō*[aw] (*T* 2299.70.228c), Chinkai,[ax] a twelfth century Japanese monk, quotes Hui-chün's *Ta-ch'êng ssu-lun hsüan i* as saying this. Tan'ei,[ay] a fourteenth century monk, also cites this passage in his *Kishin ketsugishō*.[az] Demiéville, p. 66.

4. Mochizuki maintains that the *AFM* was composed by T'an tsun (*504–*588), a member of the southern faction of the *T'i lun* School, in collaboration with his disciple T'an-ch'ien[ba] (542–607). Liebenthal believes that Tao-chung[bb] (dates unknown), a member of the northern faction of the school, was the author. Liebenthal, "New Light on the *Mahāyāna-Śraddhotpāda Śāstra*," *T'oung Pao*, 46 (1958), pp. 160, 210.

5. Liebenthal, p. 158.

6. Liebenthal, pp. 177–78.

7. See his "A Clue to the Authorship of the *Awakening of Faith*: Śikṣānanda's Redaction of the Word *'Nien*,'" *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (JIABS)*, 3, No. 1 (1980), pp. 34–53 and "*Hu-Jan Nien-Ch'i* (Suddenly a Thought Rose): Chinese Understanding of Mind and Consciousness," *JIABS*, 3, No. 2 (1980), pp. 42–59.

8. Liebenthal lists 17 possible emendations to the *AFM*, many of which he attributes to a "worshipper of Amitābha" (pp. 195–97). It is difficult to judge whether all of these passages are by another hand (or hands), but the references to Pure Land Buddhist ideas do seem inconsistent with the rest of the text. It is also possible that a disciple of Paramārtha's might have added occasional explanations (prefaced by the term *yu*[bc]), to the original text.

9. *T* 1666.32.575c.23–28.

10. Yoshito S. Hakeda, *The Awakening of Faith Attributed to Aśvaghoṣa* (New York: Columbia U. Press, 1967), p. 112. In my opinion, nothing in Seng-chao's use of the terms *t'i* and *yung* even remotely resembles the *AFM*'s use of these terms. It isn't even clear that Seng-chao uses the terms in contrast to one another. For example, in one passage Seng-chao writes, "activity (*yung*) is quiescence (*chi*[bd]) and quiescence is activity. Activity and quiescence are of

one nature (*t'i*)." *Chao-lun*, *T* 1858.45.154c.16–17. Clearly, *yung* is being understood in reference to *chi*, not *t'i*.

11. Liebenthal, p. 166.

12. The seven *mahattvas* listed in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* are 1) *dharma-mahattva*, 2) *cittotpāda-m.*, 3) *adhimukti-m.*, 4) *adhyāśaya-m.*, 5) *saṃbhāra-m.*, 6) *kāla-m.*, and 7) *samudāgama-m.* Hirowo Kashiwagi, *Daijōkishinron no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Shunjūsha, 1981), p. 482.

13. Kashiwagi, p. 483.

14. *T* 1585.31.29b.23–27, *T* 1595.31.200c.21–27. Kashiwagi, p. 484.

15. *T* 1666.32.575c.28.

16. Jikidō Takasaki, "*Nyoraizō-setsu ni okeru shin no kōzō*," *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Kiyō*, 22 (1964).

17. *Chiu-ching i-ch'êng pao-hsing lun (PHL)* 4, *T* 1611.31.847a.16–20. Jikidō Takasaki, *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra)* (Rome: Is.M.E.O., 1966), p. 382.

18. *T* 1666.32.575c.26–27.

19. *PHL* 1, *T* 1611.31.821b.1–3. Takasaki, *Study*, p. 144.

20. *T* 1666.32.576a.25–26.

21. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.835b.28–29.

22. *T* 1666.32.579a.14–20.

23. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.832b.8. Takasaki, *Study*, p. 233.

24. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.829b.9. Takasaki, *Study*, p. 207.

25. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.835a.20. Takasaki, *Study*, p. 257.

26. Takasaki, *Study*, pp. 228–29 (*yoga*). This passage is missing in the Chinese. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.835b.23ff. and Takasaki, *Study*, p. 259 (*asaṃbheda*). *PHL* 4, *T* 1611.31.841b.11 and Takasaki, *Study*, p. 315 (*svabhāva*).

27. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), p. 357.

28. Kashiwagi, p. 485.

29. Jikidō Takasaki, "Description of the Ultimate Reality by Means of Six Categories in Mahāyāna Buddhism," *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū (IBK)*, 9 (1961), pp. 731–40.

30. Takasaki, *Study*, pp. 314–15. *PHL* 4, *T*1611.31.841b.2–12.

31. *T* 1666.32.579a.14–18.

32. *T* 1666.32.576a.14–15.

33. *T* 1666.32.579a.21–b8.

34. Monier-Williams, p. 1010.

35. Hirakawa, *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhaṣya* (Tōkyō: Daizō Shuppan Kabushikikaisha, 1977), 2, p.474.

36. See, for example, *PHL* 1, *T* 1611.31.821b.8–9 (Takasaki, *Study*, p. 145) or *PHL* 4, *T* 1611.31.846a.21–23 (Takasaki, *Study*, p. 355).

37. *PHL* 4, *T* 1611.31.842c.2–7. Takasaki, *Study*, p. 324.

38. *T* 1666.32.579b.20–25.

39. *PHL* 4, *T* 1611.31.843b.16–18. Takasaki, *Study*, p. 331.

40. *PHL* 4, *T* 1611.31.842c.27–843b.12. Takasaki, *Study*, p. 328–29.

41. Takasaki, "Description," p. 737.

42. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.831c.21–22.

43. *T* 1666.32.579b.13–14.

44. *PHL* 1, *T* 1611.31.820c.24, 821a.7. *Fo-hsing lun (FHL)* 2, *T* 1610.31.798c.19 or *FHL* 4, *T* 1610.31.812c.9–813a.2.

45. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.828b.19.

46. *FHL* 2, *T* 1610.31.796b.3.

47. Masaaki Hattori, "*Busshōron no ikkōsatsu*," *Bukkyōshigaku* 4 (1955), p. 160ff.

48. Takasaki, *Study*, pp. 49–53.

49. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku Shōdaijōron-Seshin-shaku ni okeru nyoraizōsetsu*," in *Yūki-kyōju shōju kinen bukkyōshi shisōshi ronshū* (Tōkyō: Daizō Shuppan, 1964), p. 256.

50. *MSbh* 1, *T* 1595.31.156c.12–13. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku*," p. 243.

51. *T* 1666.32.580a.26–28.

52. *T* 1666.32.580a.29–b.1.

53. *T MSbh* 1, *T* 1595.31.156c.28–157a.1. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku*," p. 243.

54. *MSbh* 1, *T* 1595.31.157a.4–5. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku*," p. 244.

55. *T* 1666.32.578b.8, 22–23.

56. *MSbh* 13, *T* 1595.31.252b.17–18. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku*," p. 244.

57. *T* 1666.32.576b.12–13.

58. *PHL* 3, *T* 1611.31.832b.8–9.

59. See my article entitled "*Cittaprakṛti* and *Ayoniśomanaskāra* in the *Ratnagotravibhāga*: A Precedent for the *Hsin-Nien* Distinction of the *Awakening of Faith*," *JIABS*, 6, No. 2 (1983), pp. 35–47.

60. *MSbh* 14, *T* 1595.31.258b.22–25. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku*," p. 247. The *MSbh* uses all six of the traditional categories in this section.

61. *MSbh* 14, *T* 1595.31.258b.25–c.12. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku*," pp. 248–50.

62. *CCML* 5, *T* 2146.55.142a.16. Demiéville, p. 4.

63. Demiéville, p. 6.

64. *LTSPC* 11, *T* 2034.49.99a.5,11.

65. *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* 6, *T* 2154.55.538b.6–7. Demiéville, p. 10.

66. Some scholars who believe that the *AFM* was fabricated in China have argued that the terminology of the *AFM* differs from that ordinarily employed by Paramārtha—that whereas, for example, Paramārtha usually translates *tathatā* as *ju-ju*[be] and *avaraṇa* as *chang*,[bf] the *AFM* uses *chen-ju*[bg] and *ai*.[bh] Demiéville points out quite aptly that Paramārtha never really translated anything directly into Chinese himself, but instead worked with whole teams of translators, and those translation teams changed frequently. So any stylistic or terminological variations in his translations are more likely to be evidence of a change in his staff than to be evidence that he did or did not translate a given text (Demiéville, pp. 68–70).

67. Demiéville, p. 62.

68. Takasaki, "*Shindai-yaku*," p. 261.

Glossary of Chinese Characters

a 慧均
b 大乘義章
c 體
d 相
e 用
f 立義
g 解釋分
h 真如
i 即身成佛義
j 王弼
k 僧肇
l 般若無知論
m 大
n 信
o 信實有
p 信有德
q 信有能
r 相大
s 清涼
t 不變
u 功德
v 自性
w 見
x 相
y 見分
z 相分
aa 實性論
ab 佛性論
ac 行
ad 分別
ae 無上依經
af 念
ag 真如熏習
ah 心
ai 生起
aj 衆經目錄
ak 法經
al 釋
am 譯
an 歷代三寶紀
ao 費長房
ap 曹毗
aq 慧愷
ar 陸元哲
as 富春
at 侯景
au 開元錄
av 法泰
aw 三論玄疏文義要
ax 珍海
ay 湛睿
az 起信決疑鈔
ba 曇遷
bb 道寵
bc 又
bd 寂
be 如如
bf 障
bg 真如
bh 礙

Sources

Demiéville, Paul. "*Sur L'Authenticité du Ta Tch'eng K'i Sin Louen.* In *Choix D'Études Bouddhiques (1929–1970).* Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1973, pp. 1–79.

Grosnick, William. "*Cittaprakṛti* and *Ayonisomanaskāra* in the *Ratnagotravibhāga*: A Precedent for the *Hsin-Nien* Distinction of the *Awakening of Faith.*" *JIABS*, 6, No. 2 (1983), pp. 35–47.

Hakeda, Yoshito S., tr. *The Awakening of Faith Attributed to Asvaghoṣa.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Hattori Masaaki. "*Busshōron no ikkōsatsu*" (佛性論の一考察) *Bukkyōshigaku* (佛教史学), 4 (1955), pp. 160–74.

Kashiwagi Hirowo. *Daijōkishinron no kenkyū*(大乗起信論の研究) Tōkyō: Shunjūsha, 1981).

Lai, Whalen. "A Clue to the Authorship of the *Awakening of Faith*: Śikṣānanda's Redaction of the Word *'Nien.'*" *JIABS*, 3, No. 1 (1980), pp. 34–53.

_____. "*Hu-Jan Nien-Ch'i* (Suddenly a Thought Rose): Chinese Understanding of Mind and Consciousness." *JIABS*, 3, No. 2 (1980), pp. 42–59.

Liebenthal, Walter. "New Light on the *Mahāyāna-Śraddhotpāda Śāstra.*" *T'oung Pao*, 46 (1958), pp. 155–216.

Takasaki Jikidō. *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra).* Rome: Is.M.E.O., 1966.

Takasaki Jikidō. "Description of the Ultimate Reality by Means of Six Categories in Mahāyāna Buddhism," *IBK*, 9 (1961), pp. 731–40.

_____. "*Shindai-yaku Shōdaijōron-Seshin-shaku ni okeru nyoraizō setsu*" (真諦譯・攝大乘論世親釋における如来藏説). In *Yūkikyōju shōju kinen bukkyōshi shisōshi ronshū* (結城教授頌寿記念佛教史思想史論集). Tōkyō: Daizō Shuppan, 1964, pp. 241–64.