

法相學會集刊

第一輯

VIJNAPTIMATRATASIDDHI SASTRA CH'ENG WEI-SHIH LUN

成唯識論

OR

THE TREATISE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF
CONSCIOUSNESS-ONLY

By

Dharmapala and Nine Other Sastra-Masters Compiled and Translated from Sanskrit

By

Hsuan Tsang (玄奘)

Tripitaka Master of the T'ang Dynasty Translated from the Chinese Version

By

Wei Tat (韋達), M. A., F.R.S.A.
Academiician (The China Academy)

本 頌

稽首唯識性，滿分清淨者，
我今釋彼說，利樂諸有情。

STANZA OF HOMACE

I pay homage to the Beings that are either completely or partially purified by Vijnaptimatrata.

For the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings I now explain what Vasubandhu has said in his Treatise in Thirty Stanzas on Vijnaptimatrata.

造論意旨

今造此論爲於二空有迷膠者生正解故^{1[1]}。

〔述記：安慧等欲顯論主爲令生解斷障得果所以造論。〕

生解爲斷二重障故^{2[2]}。

由我法執二障具生，若證二空，彼障隨斷^{3[3]}。

斷障爲得二勝果故。

由斷續生煩惱障故證真解脫，由斷礙解所知障故得大菩提^{4[4]}。

THE PURPOSE OF THE TREATISE

1. [According to Sthiramati.]—Vasubandhu wrote the Trimsika (Thirty Stanzas) for those who misunderstood or made nothing of the Doctrine of the two Sunyatas or Voids,^{5[1]} in order that they might acquire a correct understanding of it.^{6[2]} A correct understanding of this doctrine is essential if one is to cut off the two heavy *avaranas* or barriers [i. E., (a) *klesavarana*, the barrier of vexing passions which obstructs one's way to Nirvana or true deliverance, and (b) *jneyavarana*, which impedes Mahabodhi or Supreme Enlightenment].^{7[3]} Both these *avaranas* are due to a belief in the subjective existence of the Atman or individual ego (*atmagraha*, Atmanclinging) and to a belief in the objective existence of dharmas or external things (*dharmagraha*, dharmaclinging). If the two Sunyatas are realized, both barriers will be lifted.^{8[4]} The sundering of the two barriers has for excellent fruits the attainments of true deliverance or Nirvana and of Supreme Enlightenment or Mahabodhi.^{9[5]} The former is the result of cutting away the barrier of vexing passions which cause rebirth, while the latter is the result of cutting away the barrier which hinders Absolute Knowledge.^{10[6]}

[1] The two Sunyatas are: *pudgalasunyata*, voidness of Atman or ego, and *dharmasunyata*, voidness of all dharmas or external things.

[2] This corresponds to the first two of the five stages of the Path leading to Vijnaptimatrata, namely, the stage of moral provisioning (*sambharavastha*) and the stage of intensified effort (*prayogavastha*).

[3] This corresponds to the third stage of the Path, namely, the stage of unimpeded penetrating understanding (*pravedhavastha* or *darsanamarga*).

[4] This corresponds to the fourth stage of the Path, namely, the stage of exercising cultivation (*bhavanavastha* or *bhavanamarga*).

[5] This corresponds to the fifth (i. e., the last) stage of the Path, namely, the stage of final attainment or ultimate realization (*nisthavastha*). See Section on *The Path* in Book III.

[6] This corresponds to the moment of Vajropamasamadhi or diamond meditation, that of the last stage of the Bodhisattva, characterized by firm, indestructible knowledge, penetrating all reality, and attained after all remains of illusion have been cut off. See Section on *The Path* in Book III.

又爲開示謬執我法迷唯識者令達二空。

於唯識理如實知故。

〔述記：火辨等意明論主令達二空悟唯識性所以造論。〕

復有迷謬唯識理者。

〔述記：護法等明造本論破諸邪執顯唯識理。〕

或執外境如識非無。

〔述記：薩婆多等。〕

或執內識如境非有。

〔述記：即學中百清辨等師。〕

或執諸識用別體同。

〔述記：即大乘中一類菩薩。〕

或執離心無別心所。

〔述記：經部師說佛說五蘊，故離心外唯有三心所一受二想三思。〕

爲遮此等種種異執，

令於唯識深妙理中得如實解，故作斯論。

2. [According to Cittrabhanu and others]—The Trimsika was composed to instruct those who erroneously admitted the reality

of Atman and dharmas, misapprehended the Doctrine of Vijnaptimatra (Consciousness-Only), or could not assimilate the truth that “nothing exists apart from Consciousness” (Vijnana), and thus enable them to penetrate the two Voids and know the true principles of Vijnaptimatra.

3. [According to Dharmapala.]—The Trimsika was composed to refute the diverse false views held by various scholars about Vijnaptimatra, and to enable them to reach a true understanding of its profound and wonderful teaching. The following categories of scholars have misunderstood or are ignorant of its principles:

(1) Scholars who consider that external objects exist in the same way as consciousness exists,—in other words, that both outer objects and inner consciousness are co-existent [as do the Sarvastivadins];

(2) Those who consider that internal consciousness is non-existent in the same way as external objects are non-existent—in other words, that inner consciousness and outer objects are both non-existent (as do Master Bhavaviveka and others);

(3) Those who consider that the various consciousnesses are all of one and the same substance despite the variety of their activities [as do a certain class of Mahayana *Bodhisattvas*];

(4) Those who consider that, apart from mind (*vijnana citta* or and three of its mental properties, sensation, conception, and volition), there exist no other associated mental properties (*caittas*) [as do the Sautrantikas].

依教廣成 明唯識相 我執手法

若唯有識，云何世閒及諸聖教說有我法？

頌曰：

由假說我法，有種種相轉，
彼依識所變，此能變唯三，
謂異熟思量，及了別境識。

BELIEF IN THE EXISTENCE OF REAL ATMAN AND REAL DHARMAS ATMAGRAHA AND DHARMAGRAHA

If consciousness alone exists, and nothing apart from it, why is it that both the world and the sacred teachings state that Atman and dharmas exist?

The Stanza says:

1. Notions of Atman and Dharmas do not Imply a Real Atman and Real Dharmas, but are Mere Conventional Constructions [Produced by Numerous Causes] and, as Such, are False.

Because of This, all Kinds of phenomena are Evolved.

The Phenomena of Atman and Dharmas are [All Mental Representations] Based on the Evolution and Transformation Consciousness.

Consciousnesses Capable of Unfolding or Manifesting Themselves may be Grouped Under Three Main Categories:

2A. (1) The Consciousness Whose Fruits (Retribution) Mature at Varying Times (i. E., the Eighth Consciousness or Alayavijnana): (2) That of Cogitation or Deliberation (i. E., the Seventh Consciousness or Manasvijnana); and (3) That which Perceives and discriminates Spheres of Objects [i.e., the Sixth Consciousness or manovijnana (Thought Consciousness) and the Five Sense Consciousnesses].

論曰：

世閒聖教說有我法但由假立，非實有性。

我謂主宰，法謂軌持。

〔述記：軌謂軌範可生物解，持謂任持不捨自相。〕

彼二俱有種種相轉。

我種種相謂有情命者等，預流一來等。

法種種相謂實德業等，蘊處界等。

轉謂隨緣施設有異。

問徵

如是諸相若由假說，依何得成？

彼相皆依識所轉變而假施設。

別解識及變

識謂了別。

此中識言亦攝心所，定相應故。

變謂識體轉似二分。

〔述記：護法等云，謂諸識體即自證分，轉似相見二分而生。〕

相見俱依自證起故。

依斯二分施設我法，彼二離此無所依故。

The Treatise says,

1. Both the world and the Scriptures state that Atman and dharmas exist, but, in point of-fact, they have no reality of their own, being inere subjective constructions based on false ideas. “Atman” implies ownership or lordship or controlling power, while “dharma” implies norm-support (i.e., a model or something that clings to its nature as something particular.)

The idea of Atman and dharmas may assume many forms with specific characteristics. For example, Atman may assume the forms of *sattva* (sentient beings), of *jiva* (living things), etc., or of *srotaapanna* (disciples who have “entered the stream” of holy living), of *sakrdagamin* (those in their enultimate return to mortality), etc. On the other hand, dharmas may appear in the form of *dravya* (substance), *gunas* (qualities), *karman* (actions), etc., or *skandhas* (aggregates) *ayatanas* (sense-spheres), *dhatas* (planes of existence), etc.

(In the original Sanskrit stanza the word *pravartate* (arising) signifies that different structures assumed by Atman and dharmas

are produced in accordance with their causes and conditions.

2. Objection: Question and answer If such various phenomena of Atman and dharmas are mere subjective elaborations, what is their real foundation? What is their *raison d'etre*?

They are the result of the evolution and manifestation of consciousness (*vijnanaparinama*). As such they are subjective and conventional elaborations.

3. Consciousness defined

The word consciousness means perception and mental discrimination, i. e., of “external things”; in the present treatise it is understood as the mind and its associated activities (*citta* and *caittas*), as the latter are necessarily associated with consciousness.

4. Evolution of Consciousness

What is meant by “the evolution of consciousness”? There are two theories.

First answer: according to Dharmapala and Sthiramati

“Evolution” (*parinama*) indicates that what essentially constitutes consciousness (that is to say, its substance, the *samvittibhaga*), when it is born, manifests itself under two seeming aspects or divisions (*bhagas*), namely, the image-aspect and the perception aspect, i. e., the object perceived (or perceived division) and the perceiving faculty (or perceiving division) (*nimittabhaga* and *darsanabhaga*). These divisions arise out of a third division called the “self-constituting division” (*samvittibhaga*) which constitutes their “essential substance”. It is on the basis of these two functional divisions that Atman and

dharmas are established, for they have on other.

或復內識轉似外境。

我法分別熏習力故，諸識生時變似我法。

〔述記：即是難陀親勝等義。〕

此我法相雖在內識、而由分似外境現，諸有情類無始，緣此執為實我實法。

夢喻

如患夢者患夢力故心似種種外境相現。緣此執為實有外境。

世俗諦及勝義諦

愚夫所計實我實法都無所有。

但隨妄情而施設故說之為假。

內識所變似我似法雖有而非實我法性。

然似彼現故說為假。

外境隨情而施設故，非有如識。

〔述記：徧計所執心外實境由隨妄情施設為假，體實都無，非與依他內識相似。〕

內識必依因緣生故，非無如境。

〔述記：由內識體是依他故，必依種子因緣所生，非體是無如徧計境。〕

由此便遮增減二執。

〔述記：由此內識體性非無，心外我法體性非有，便遮外計離心之境實有增執，及遮邨見惡取空者撥識亦無損減空執，即離空有說唯識教。有心外法輪迴生死，覺知一心生死永棄可謂無上處中道理。〕

Second answer: according to Nanda, Bandhusri, etc.

Evolution of consciousness means also that the inner consciousness develops into what seems to be an external sphere of objects. By virtue of the “perfuming” energy (*vasana*) deposited in the mind by wrong concepts (*vikalpa*) of Atman-dharmas, the consciousness, on becoming active, develops into the similitude of Atman and dharmas. Although phenomena of Atman and dharmas lie within the consciousness, yet, because of wrong mental discrimination, they are taken to be external objects. That is why all sentient beings, since the beginningless past, have conceived them as real Atman and dharmas.

The Nightmare Analogy

The case is like that of a man in a dream, who, under the influence of this dream, in which his mind manifests what seem to be external objects of all sorts, believes that these images are real external objects.

The two truths: relative and absolute

What the ignorant imagine to be a “real” Atman and “real” dharmas are devoid of all objective existence. They are simply established in this way in accordance with their erroneous opinions and conceptions. Hence we say that they are false (i.e.,

relative truths).

Thus the seeming Atman and the seeming dharmas which evolve out of internal consciousness, although (in one way) they do exist, do not have the substance of a real Atman and real dharmas, despite their verisimilitude. This then, is the reason for calling them false.

In other words, what we take to be external objects are the result of our erroneous notions, and do not “exist” in the same way as consciousness does; [that is to say, external objects are illusory (*parikalpita*).]

On the other hand, internal consciousness, born by reason of causes and conditions, and responsible for the appearance of external objects, is not, in its essential nature, nonexistent in the same way as are external objects; (it is *paratantra*).^{11[7]} Thus we exclude the two heterodox doctrines, namely, that which clings to the additional reality of objects apart from the mind and that which, because it wrongly believes in “voidness”, sets aside consciousness itself as non-existent, thus reducing everything to voidness or emptiness.

Since external objects are mere conventional constructions arising from internal consciousness, they exist purely from a worldly point of view. On the other hand, inasmuch as consciousness is the essential basis out of which false appearances

[7] The five Skandhas or aggregates, i.e., the components of an intelligent being, especially a human being, are: (1) *rupa*, material form, the physical form related to the five organs of sense; (2) *vedana*, reception, sensation, feeling, the functioning of the mind or senses in connection with affairs and things; (3) *samjna*, conception or thought, the functioning of mind in distinguishing; (4) *samskara*, predisposition, the functioning of mind in its processes regarding like and dislike, good and evil etc.; (5) *vijnana*, consciousness, mental faculty in regard to perception and cognition, discrimination of affairs and things. The first is said to be physical, the other four mental qualities; (2), (3), and (4) are associated with mental functioning; (5) is associated with the faculty or nature of the mind.

of an external world arise, it is existent in real truth.

境依內識而假立唯世俗有，識是假境所依事故亦勝義有。

云何應知實無外境唯有內識似外境生？

實我實法不可得故。

我 執

如何實我不可得耶？

諸所執我略有三種。

一者執我體常周徧量同虛空。

〔述記：此謂數論勝論等計，即是僧法吠世史迦義。〕

隨處造業受苦樂故。

二者執我其體雖常而量不定。

隨身大小有卷舒故。

〔述記：如度牛皮日乾水漬，日炙便卷，水溼便舒。此即無慚之類計也。謂尼虔予，今言呢犍陀。〕

三者執我體常至細如一極微。

潛轉身中作事業故。

〔述記：謂有外道名播輸鉢多，翻爲獸主。復有外道名波利咀羅拘迦翻爲徧出，徧能出離諸俗世間，即是出家外道之類。〕

5. Objection answered How do we know that in reality there is no external sphere of objects, but only internal consciousness which brings forth what seem to be real external spheres of objects?

Because the existence of a real Atman or real dharmas cannot be real affirmed beyond doubt.

Let us now examine, in proper sequence, the different ways of conceiving Atman dharmas.

ATMAGRAHA (ATMAN-CLINCING) Belief in the Reality of the Atman

Why is it impossible to establish the existence of a real Atman?

1. Theories of the Atman held by various heterodox schools may be reduced to three kinds.

(1) The Samkhyas and the Vaisesikas hold that the substance of the Atman is eternal, unversal, and as extensive as empty space. It acts everywhere and, as a consequence, enjoyshap pines or suffers sorrow.

(2) The Nirgranthas, the Jains, etc., hold that, although the substance of the Atman is eternal, its extension is indeterminate, because it expands and contracts according as the body is large or small (just as a piece of leather stretches when it is wet and shrinks when dried in the sun).

(3) The Pasupatas (Animal-Lord worshippers), Parivrajakas (recluses), etc., hold that the substance of the Atman is eternal but infinitesimal like an atom, lying deep and moving around within the bady and performing actions of all kinds.

別破

初且非理。所以者何？

執我常徧量同虛空，應不隨身苦樂等。

又常徧故應無動轉，如何隨身能造諸業？

又所執我一切情爲同爲異？

若言同者，一作業時一切應作，一受果時一切應受，一得解脫時一切應解脫，便成大過。

若言異者，諸有情我更相徧故，體應相雜。

又一作業一受果時與一切我處無別故，應名一切所作所受。

若謂作受各有所屬無斯過者，理亦不然。

若果及身箕諸我合，屬此非彼不應理故。

一解脫時一切應解脫，所修證法一切我合故。

中亦非理。所以者何？

我體常住，不應隨身而有舒卷。

既有舒卷，如橐籥風，應非常住。

又我隨身應可分析，如何可執我體一耶？

故彼所言如童豎戲。

後亦非理。所以者何？

我量至小如一極微，如何能令大身徧動？

〔述記：如何小我一剎那中能令色究竟天萬六千由，大身動轉？〕

Refutation

The first theory is contrary to reason. Why?

If it is held that the so-called Atman is eternal and universal, and as extensive as empty space, it should not enjoy happiness or suffer sorrow along with the body.

Again, since it is eternal and universal, it should be motionless. Being motionless, how can it perform individual acts along with the body of an individual?

Furthermore, is the Atman so conceived common to all sentient beings or has each a separate Atman? If it is common,

then, when one individual being acts or receives the fruits of his action or attains emancipation, all individual beings should at the same time do the same. What a great mistake! If it is different and separate, the Atmans of all sentient beings would universally penetrate one another (since, being universal, all of them are omnipresent): then the substance of all Atmans would be mixed together. Besides, since all Atmans would abide in the same field, the acts of one individual being or the fruits of his action should likewise be the acts or fruits of all beings. To argue that actions and fruits belong to each being separately and that there would be no mistake such as that just described, would be no less contrary to reason, because actions, fruits and body are identified with all Atmans, and it is unreasonable for them to belong to one Atman and not to another.

From this it follows that when one being attains emancipation, all other beings should also attain it, for the Dharma (Truth) practiced and realized is identical with all Atmans.

The second theory is also contrary to reason. Why?

If the substance of the Atman is eternal and immutable, it cannot expand or contract with the size of the body in which it is. Were it to expand and contract like the air in a bag or pipe, it is never in the same state.

Furthermore, if the Atman follows the body in its expanding and contracting, it should be divisible. How, then, can it be held that the substance of the Atman is one?

What this school teaches is like child's play.

The last theory is also contrary to reason. Why?

Since the Atman is infinetesimal like an atom, how can it, at one moment, set in motion the whole big body [of the Deva that extends throughout the highest plane of the Rupa World and measures sixteen thousand yoginas]?

若謂雖小而速巡身如旋火輪，以偏動者，則所執我非一非常，諸有往來非常一故。

又所執我復有三種。

一者即蘊。

二者離蘊。

三者與蘊非即非離。

初即蘊我理且不然，我應如蘊非常一故。

又內諸色定非實我，如外諸色有質礙故。

心心所法亦非實我，不恆相續待眾緣故。

〔述記：前破心所即行蘊少分，行蘊少分中不相應行既與心所別，故應別破之。〕

If it is argued that, although small, it goes rapidly through the body, like a fire-brand of an *alatacakra* (whirling torch) so that the whole body seems to move, then the Atman so conceived is neither one nor eternal, for what comes and goes is neither eternal nor one.

2. Atman theory; from another point of view

From another point of view, that of the Buddhist doctrine of

Skandhas (aggregates),^{12[8]} the Atman may also be conceived in three ways:

The first theory holds that the Atman is identical with the Skandhas (aggregates), (namely, material form, sensation, conception, predisposition, and consciousness).

The second theory holds that it is separate from the Skandhas.

The third theory holds that it is neither identical with nor separate from the Skandhas.

Refutation

The first theory

(1) To say that the Atman is identical with the Skandhas is contrary to reason, for, if it were identical, it would, like the Skandhas, be neither eternal nor unique.

(2) Besides, internal matter (*rupa*), that is to say, the five sense organs, is surely not the Atman, for it is corporeal, having extension and resistance, like external matter. (This refers to the Rupaskandha^{13[9]} of the five Skandhas).

(3) Furthermore, the mind and its associated activities (*citta* and *daittas*: Vedanaskandha, sensation; Samjnaskandha, conception; Vijnanaskandha, consciousness; and part of Samskaraskandha, pre-disposition) are not the real Atman either, for they do not continue in an uninterrupted series; their manifestation depends on various causes and conditions (*hetupratyaya*).

[8] *Rupa* refers to form, colour, appearance, phenomenon, etc.

[9] Philosophers of the Samkhya School believe in an Atman which manifests itself as 23 charmas, the Mahat, the Ahamkara, etc., which are constituted by the union of the three yunas, namely, *sative*, *rojas*, *tamas*.

餘行餘色亦非實我，如虛空等，非覺性故。

〔述記：心所法外餘行外處及無表色亦非實我，非覺性故，如虛空等。〕

〔述記義演：外處者，即外五塵。如前破色塵但約內色，今破不相應行兼破外色及無表色，即法處所攝色也。〕

中離蘊我理亦不然，應知虛空無作受故。

〔述記：夏僧佉等計也。〕

後俱非我理亦不然。

〔述記：破犢子等也。〕

許依蘊立非即離蘊，應如瓶等非實我故。

又既不可說有爲無爲，亦應不可說是我非我故彼所執實我不成。

總破

又諸所執實有我體爲有思慮，爲無思慮？

若有思慮，應是無常，非一切時有思慮故。

若無思慮！應如虛空，不能作業亦不受果。

故所執我理俱不成。

又諸所執實有我體爲有作用，爲無作用？

若有作用，如手足等，應是無常。

若無作用，如兔角等，應非實我。故所執我二俱不成。

(4) The other “conditioned” Samskaras, that is to say, the *viprayuktasamakaras*, and the *rupa* of Avijnapti are not the real

Atmen either, for, like empty space, they are without intelligence.

The second theory

The second theory (held by the Samkhyas, etc.) that the Atman is separate from the Skandhas is no less illogical, for the Atman would then be like empty space, which neither acts nor receives fruits of action.

The third theory

The last theory (held by the Vatsiputriyas) that the Atman is neither identical with nor separate from the Skandhas is also contrary to reason. This theory admits that the Atman is established on the Skandhas but is neither identical with nor separate from them. In this case the Atman would not be a real Atman at all; it is merely “existence in name” like a vase [which, depending on clay for its construction, is neither clay nor separate from clay].

Further, since it is impossible to say whether the so-called Atman is produced by causes (i. e., “conditioned”, *samskrta*) or not so produced (i. e., “unconditioned”. *asamskrta*), it should also be impossible to say whether it is an Atman or not.

Therefore the real Atman conceived by this theory cannot be established.

3. General Refutation

(1) Against the heterodox schools Is the Atman, grasped as a real entity by the various heterodox schools, possessed of cogitation or not? If it is, it would not be eternal, because it does not cogitate all the time. If it is not, then it would be like empty space, which neither acts nor receives fruits of action. Therefore, on the basis of reason, the Atman so conceived cannot be

established.

Again, does this substance of the real Atman conceived by the various schools perform any function or nor? If it does, it would be like hands and feet and would not be eternal. If it does not, it would be like the illusory horns of a hare (things that exist in imagination only) and would not be a real Atman.

Therefore, in either case, the Atman which they conceive cannot be established.

又諸所執實有我體爲是我見所緣境不？
若非我見所緣境者，汝等云何知實有我？
若是我見所緣境者，應有我見非顛倒攝，如實知故。
若爾，如何執有我者所信之教皆毀我見稱讚無我？
言無我見能證涅槃，執著我見沈淪生死。
豈有邪見能證涅槃，正見翻令沈淪生死？

又諸我見不緣實我，有所緣故，如緣餘心。
我見所緣定非實我，是所緣故，如所餘法。
是故我見不緣實我，但緣內識變現諸蘊隨。
妄情種種計度。

我執伏斷位次

然諸我執略有二種。
一者俱生，二者分別。
俱生我執無始時來虛妄熏內因力故恆與身俱不待邪教及邪分別任運而轉故名俱生。
此後二種，一常相續，在第七識緣第八識起自心相執爲實我。

(2) Against the Vatsiputriyas

Is the substance of the real Atman conceived by the various schools an object of “Atmadrsti” (Self-belief or Self-view) or not? If it is not, how do the advocates of the theory know that an Atman exists? If it is, then there should be an “Atmadrsti” that does not involve any perversion, for that would be knowledge of what really is. In that case, how is it that the perfectly true doctrines believed in by those holding the theory of the Atman all denounce Atmadrsti and exalt its absence, declaring that he who is free from Atmadrsti will attain Nirvana while he who clings to it will be engulfed in the sea of birth and death (*samsara*, transmigration)? How can it be that an erroneous view (*mithyadrsti*) leads to Nirvana and a correct view (*samyagdrsti*), on the contrary, leads to wallowing in the sea of birth and death (transmigration)?

Furthermore, the various Atmanviews (Atmadrsti) actually do not take the real Atman as an object, because it has objects which are not itself, just , as the mind takes other things (such as external matter) as objects. The object of Atmadrsti is certainly not the real Atman, because it (Atmadrsti) is an object perceivable like other dharmas.

We consider therefore that “Atmadrsti” does not take the real Atman as an object; that it takes as objects only the Skandhas evolved by inner consciousness; and that, in accordance with the erroneous opinions of each individual, it interprets these Skandhas as the diverse forms of Atman.

4. Cessation of Atman-Clinging (Atmagrahavibhanga).

Atman-clingings are, generally speaking, of two kinds: (1) that which is innate (*sahaja*) and (2) that which results from mental discrimination (*vikalpita*).

(1) The innate Atman-clinging is perpetually present in the individual, owing to the internal causal influence of a false perfuming (*vasana*) which has been going on since the beginningless past. Thus, without depending on external false teachings or discriminations, it spontaneously operates. That is why it is called innate.

This Atman-clinging, however, is again subdivided into two kinds:

The first is constant and continuous, and pertains to the seventh consciousness or Manas, which, directing itself to the eighth consciousness or Alayavijnana, produces from this an individualized mental image to which it clings as a real Atman.

二有閒斷，在第六識緣所變五取蘊相或總或別起自心相執爲實我。

此二我執細故難斷，後修道中數數修習勝生空觀方能除滅。

分別我城亦由現在外細力故，非與身俱。

要待邪教及邪分別然後方起故名分別。

唯在第六意識中有。

此亦二種。

一緣邪教所說蘊相起自心相分別計度執爲實我。

二緣邪教所說我相起自心相分別計度執爲實我。

此二我執麤故易斷，初見道時觀一切法生空真如即能除滅。

如是所說一切我執，自心外蘊或有或無。自心內蘊一切皆有。

The second kind is at times interrupted and pertains to the sixth consciousness or Manovijnana which, directing itself to the five “tenacious aggregates” (*upadanaskandhas*) that are evolved from consciousness, sometimes *in toto*, sometimes eparately, produdes out of them an individualized mental image to which it clings as a real Atman.

These two kinds of innate Atman-clinging, being subtle, are difficult to cut off. It is only later, in the Path of Meditation and self-cultivation (Bhavanamarga), that a Bodhisattva, by practicing repeatedly the “eminent contemplation of the voidness of individuality” (*pudgalasunyata*), is able finally to annihilate them.

(2) As for the Atman-clinging which results from mental discrimination, it derives from the force of external factors and so is not innate in the individual. It must wait for false teachings or discriminations befor it can arise. That is why the term “mental discrimination” is applied to it. It pertains exclusively to the sixth consciousness or Manovijna.

This Atman-clinging is also of two kinds:

The first pertains to the sixth consciousness, Manovijnana, which, taking as its objects the aggregates spoken of in one school of false teaching, produces within itself an individualized image to which, as a result of discrimination and speculation, it clings as though it were some real Atman.

The second kind pertains also to the sixth consciousness, Manovijnana, which, taking as object the various Atman-concepts or characteristics as defined in one school of false teaching, produces within itself an individualized image to weich, through

discrimination and speculation, it clings as to some real Atman.

These two kinds of Atman-achinging are crude and, consequently, easy to rid of. When an ascetic attains tains the first stage of the Path of Insight into Transcendent Truth (*Darsancmsrga*), he can finally annihilate them by contemplating the “Bhutatahata (Suchness) of the voidness of all individualities and dharmas” (*sarvadharmapudgalasunyata-bdutatahata*).

General conclusion

In examining the various Atman-clingings and their objects, we find that, in certain cases but not in all, Atman-clinging has as its object “aggregates” external to the mind; while in all cases it is the “aggregates within the mind that form the point of support for Atman-clinging.

是故我執皆緹緣無常五取蘊相妄執爲我。
然諸蘊相從緣生故是如幻有，妄所執我橫計度故決定非有。
故契經說，苾芻當知世間沙門婆羅門等所有我見一切皆緣五取蘊起。

假設外徵釋諸妨難

實我若無，云何得有憶識誦習恩怨先事？
所執實我既常無變，後應如前，是事非有。
前應如後，是事非無，以後與前體無別故。
若謂我用前後變易非我體者，理亦不然。
用不離體應常有故，體不離用應非常故。

Let us therefore conclude that all Atman-clinging take as their object the impermanent five “tenacious aggregates”

(Upadanaskandhas) which are an internal image (*rimittabhaga*) of the mind, and falsely cling to it as a real Atman.

The sefive aggregate-images, arising as they do from causes and conditions (*pratyaya*), exist as illusory phenomena only. As for the Atman which is merely a false interpretation of the aggregates, (like the interpretation of magic), it certainly has no real existence whatsoever.

This is why the Sutra says: “Know ye, O Bhiksus, that all beliefs in the Atman (*satkayadrsti*) of the Brahminas and Sramanas are only produced because of the five Upadans-kandhas.”

5. Refutation of objections

(1) If a real Atman does not exist, how do you explain memory, perception of objects, reading of books, meditation on texts, favours, hatred, etc.?

Since the so-caled real Atman is eternal and immutable, its post-manifestation state should be the same as its pre-manifestation state; then memory, cognition, etc., which were non-existent in the latter, should be non-existent also in the former. Inversely, since its pre-manifestation state should be the same as its post-manifestation state memory, cognition, etc., which exist in the latter, should have existed also in the former. These are the two logical conclusions of your Atman-theory and neither of them explains memory, etc., satisfactorily since you hold that there is no difference between the two states in question.

If it is said, as a rejoinder, that the activity (*yung, karitra*) of the Atman is variable, but that its subetance (*t'i. svabhava*) is immutable, the reply is that this theory, too, is illogical. Since

the activity is not separable from the substance, it (the activity) should also be constant (i.e., unchangeable). Inversely, since the substance is not separable from the activity, it (the substance) should not be permanent.

然諸有情各有本識，一類相續任持種子，與一切法更互爲因，熏習力故得有如是憶識等事。故所設難於汝有失，非於我宗。若無實我，誰能造業，誰受果耶？

所執實我既無變易，猶如虛空，如何可能造業受果？若有變易，應是無常。

然諸有情心心所法因緣力故相續無斷，受業受果於理無違。

我若實無，誰於生死輪迴諸趣，誰復厭苦求趣涅槃？

所執實我既無生滅，如何可說生死輪迴？常如虛空非苦所惱，何爲厭捨求趣涅槃？故彼所言常爲自害。

然有情類身心續，煩惱業力輪迴諸趣，厭患苦故求趣涅槃。

Correct explanation of memory, etc.

The truth is that each sentient being has a fundamental consciousness [Mulavijnana, i.e., Alayavijnana], which evolves in a homogeneous and continuous series and which carries the “seeds” or “germs” (*bijas*) of all dharmas. This fundamental consciousness and the dharmas act as reciprocal causes of one another, and because the “perfuming” energy (*vasana*) of the dharmas imprints its essence permanently in the Alayavijnana in the form of “seeds” or *Bijas*, memory, cognition, etc., arise in manifestation, the *Bijas* evolving as actual dharmas which in turn produce *Bijas* in the Alaya. Hence, the point raised about

memory, etc., indicates that there are faults in your Atman theory, not in our doctrine of consciousness.

(2) If there is no real Atman, by whom is an act accomplished? By whom are the fruits of action received and tasted?

Since your Atman is, by definition, immutable, like space, how can it act and taste the fruits of action? If it acts and tastes, that is, if it varies, it is not permanent.

Correct explanation of action, etc.

The truth is that, by virtue of the force of causes and conditions, the mind and mental properties (*citta-caittas*) of each sentient being evolve in a continuous uninterrupted series, resulting in the accomplishment of acts and the tasting of their fruits. This explanation is logical.

If there is really no Atman, who goes from one state of existence (*gati*) to another in “cycles of birth and death” (*samsara*)? Again, who is it that is disgusted with suffering, and seeks to attain Nirvana?

Since your real Atman is free from birth and destruction, how can you speak of “cycles of birth and death”? Since your Atman is as eternal as space it cannot be tormented by suffering: how, then, can it be disgusted with suffering, expel suffering and seek the attainment of Nirvana?

Hence, all the objections you have raised turn against your own Atman theory.

Correct explanation of Samsara and Nirvana.

The truth is that each sentient being is a continuous physical and mental series which, by the force of vexing passions (*klesas*)

and impure acts, turns from one state of existence (*gati*) to another in cycles of transmigration. Tormented by suffering and disgusted with it, he seeks the attainment of Nirvana.

General Conclusion

由此故知定無實我，但有諸識無始時來前滅後生因果相續，由妄熏習似我相現，愚者於中妄執爲我。

Hence we conclude that positively there is no real atman; that there are only various consciousnesses which, from time without beginning, have followed one another, the subsequent arising with the disappearance of the antecedent, and thus a continuous series of causes and effects (karmic seeds — actual dharmas — karmic seeds) is formed; and that, by the perfuming energy (*vasana*) of false thinking, an image of a pseudo-Atman (of the likeness of an Atman) arises in consciousness, and it is this pseudo-Atman that the ignorant take to be a real Atman.

[1] The two Sunyatas are: *pudgalasunyata*, voidness of Atman or ego, and *dharma-sunyata*, voidness of all dharmas or external things.

[2] This corresponds to the first two of the five stages of the Path leading to Vijnaptimatratna, namely, the stage of moral provisioning (*sambharavastha*) and the stage of intensified effort (*prayogavastha*).

[3] This corresponds to the third stage of the Path, namely, the stage of unimpeded penetrating understanding (*pravedhavastha* or *darsanamarga*).

[4] This corresponds to the fourth stage of the Path, namely, the stage of exercising cultivation (*bhavanavastha* or *bhavanamarga*).

[5] This corresponds to the fifth (i. e., the last) stage of the Path, namely, the stage of final attainment or ultimate realization (*nisthavastha*). See Section on *The Path* in Book III.

[6] This corresponds to the moment of Vajropamasamadhi or diamond meditation, that of the last stage of the Bodhisattva, characterized by firm, indestructible knowledge, penetrating all reality, and attained after all remains of illusion have been out off. See Section on *The Path* in Book III.

[7] The five Skandhas or aggregates, i.e., the components of an intelligent being, especially a human being, are: (1) *rupa*, material form, the physical form related to the five organs of sense; (2) *vedana*, reception, sensation, feeling, the functioning of the mind or senses in connection with affairs and things; (3) *samjna*, conception or thought, the functioning of mind in distinguishing; (4) *samskara*, predisposition, the functioning of mind in its processes regarding like and dislike, good and evil etc.; (5) *vijnana*, consciousness, mental faculty in regard to perception and cognition,

discrimination of affairs and things. The first is said to be physical, the other four mental qualities; (2), (3), and (4) are associated with mental functioning; (5) is associated with the faculty or nature of the mind.

[8] *Rupa* refers to form, colour, appearance, phenomenon, etc.

[9] Philosophers of the Samkhya School believe in an Atman which manifests itself as 23 charmas, the Mahat, the Ahamkara, etc., which are constituted by the union of the three yunas, namely, *sative*, *rojas*, *tamas*.

[1] 述記：生正解故者，八見道前，資糧加行二位之時……此即第一加行位也。

[2] 述記：此即第二通達位也。

[3] 述記：此即第三入習位悖。

[4] 述記：顯金鋼心斷煩惱障證真解脫斷所知障得大菩提故，此即第四究竟位也。

VIJNAPTIMATRATASIDDHI SASTRA

CH'ENG WEI-SHIH LUN

成唯識論

OR

THE TREATISE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE DOCTRINE OF MERE-CONSCIOUSNESS

By

Dharmapala and Nine Other Sastra-Masters

Compiled and Translated from Sanskrit

By

Hsüan Tsang (玄奘)

Tripitaka-Master of the T'ang Dynasty

Translated from the Chinese Version

By

Wei Tat (韋達), M.A., F.R.S.A.

Academician (The China Academy)

VJNAPTIMATKASIDDHI SASTRA

CHENG WEI-SHIH JUN

唯識論

THE TREATISE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE DOCTRINE OF MERE-CONSCIOUSNESS

稽首唯識性， 滿分清淨者，
我今釋彼說， 利樂諸有情。

Dharmapala and His Other Expositions

Compiled and Translated from Sanskrit

Hsiao Tsung (玄奘)

Tripartite Edition of the Tung Dynasty

Translated from the Chinese Version

Wei Tan (韋廉士), M.A., F.R.S.A.

Academic Press (— 1 —)

THE BUDDHIST CONCEPT OF THE FIVE
STANZA OF HOMAGE

I pay homage to the Beings that are either completely or partially purified by Vijnaptimatrata.

For the welfare and happiness of all sentient beings I now explain what Vasubandhu has said in his Treatise in Thirty Stanzas on Vijnaptimatrata.

造論意旨

今造此論爲於二空有迷謬者生正解故。1

[述記：安慧等欲顯論主爲令生解斷障得果所以造論。]

生解爲斷二重障故。2

由我法執二障具生，若證二空，彼障隨斷。3

斷障爲得二勝果故。

由斷續生煩惱障故證真解脫，由斷礙解所知障故得大菩提。4

-
1. 述記：生正解故者，入見道前資糧加行二位之時……此即第一加行位也。
 2. 述記：此即第二通達位也。
 3. 述記：此即第三修習位也。
 4. 述記：斷障爲得二勝果故者，顯金剛心斷煩惱障證真解脫，斷所知障得菩提故，此即第四究竟位也。

THE PURPOSE OF THE TREATISE

1. [According to Sthiramati].--Vasubandhu wrote the Trimsika (Thirty Stanzas) for those who misunderstood or made nothing of the Doctrine of the two Sunyatas or Voids,¹ in order that they might acquire a correct understanding of it.² A correct understanding of this doctrine is essential if one is to cut off the two heavy *avaranas* or barriers [i.e., (1) *klesavarana*, the barrier of vexing passions which obstructs one's way to Nirvana or true deliverance, and (2) *jneyavarana*, which impedes Mahabodhi or Supreme Enlightenment].³ Both these *avaranas* are due to a belief in the subjective existence of the Atman or individual ego (*atmagraha*, Atman-clinging) and to a belief in the objective existence of dharmas or external things (*dharmagraha*, dharma-clinging). If the two Sunyatas are realized, both barriers will be lifted.⁴ The sundering of the two barriers has for excellent fruits the attainments of true deliverance or Nirvana and of Supreme Enlightenment or Mahabodhi.⁵ The former is the result of cutting away the barrier of vexing passions which cause rebirth, while the latter is the result of cutting away the barrier which hinders Absolute Knowledge.⁶

-
1. The two Sunyatas are: *pudgalasunyata*, voidness of Atman or ego, and *dharmasunyata*, voidness of all dharmas or external things.
 2. This corresponds to the first two of the five stages of the Path leading to Vijnapti-matrata, namely, the stage of moral provisioning (*sambharavastha*) and the stage of intensified effort (*prayogavastha*).
 3. This corresponds to the third stage of the Path, namely, the stage of unimpeded penetrating understanding (*prativedhavastha* or *darsanamarga*).
 4. This corresponds to the fourth stage of the Path, namely, the stage of exercising cultivation (*bhavanavastha* or *bhavanamarga*).
 5. This corresponds to the fifth (i.e., the last) stage of the Path, namely, the stage of final attainment or ultimate realization (*nisthavastha*).
 6. This corresponds to the moment of Vajropamasamadhi or diamond meditation, that of the Bodhisattva, characterized by firm, indestructible knowledge, penetrating all reality, and attained after all remains of illusion have been cut off.

又爲開示謬執我法迷唯識者令達二空。於唯識理如實知故。

〔述記：火辨等意明論主令達二空悟唯識性所以造論。〕

復有迷謬唯識理者。

〔述記：護法等明造本論破諸邪執顯唯識理。〕

或執外境如識非無。

〔述記：薩婆多等。〕

或執內識如境非有。

〔述記：即學中百清辨等師。〕

或執諸識用別體同。

〔述記：即大乘中一類菩薩。〕

或執離心無別心所。

〔述記：經部師說佛說五蘊，故離心外唯有三心所一受二想三思。〕

爲遮此等種種異執，

令於唯識深妙理中得如實解，故作斯論。

2. [According to Citrabhanu and others].— The Trimsika was composed to instruct those who erroneously admitted the reality of Atman and dharmas, misapprehended the Doctrine of Vijnaptimatra (Mere-Consciousness), or could not assimilate the truth that “nothing exists apart from Consciousness” (Vijnana), and thus enable them to penetrate the two Voids and know the true principles of Vijnaptimatra.

3. [According to Dharmapala]. — The Trimsika was composed to refute the diverse false views held by various scholars about Vijnaptimatra, and to enable them to reach a true understanding of its profound and wonderful teaching. The following categories of scholars have misunderstood or are ignorant of its principles:

(1) Scholars who consider that external objects exist in the same way as consciousness exists, — in other words, that both outer objects and inner consciousness are co-existent [as do the Sarvastivadins];

(2) Those who consider that internal consciousness is non-existent in the same way as external objects are non-existent — in other words, that inner consciousness and outer objects are both non-existent [as do Master Bhavaviveka and others];

(3) Those who consider that the various consciousnesses are all of one and the same substance despite the variety of their activities [as do a certain class of Mahayana Bodhisattvas];

(4) Those who consider that, apart from mind (*citta* or *vijnana* and three of its mental properties, sensation, conception, and volition), there exist no other associated mental properties (*caittas*) [as do the Sautrantikas].

依教廣成

明唯識相

我執法執

若唯有識云何世間及諸聖教說有我法？

頌曰：

由假說我法，有種種相轉， (1)

彼依識所變，此能變唯三，

謂異熟思量，及了別境識。 (2)

BELIEF IN THE EXISTENCE OF
REAL ATMAN AND REAL DHARMAS
ATMAGRAHA AND DHARMAGRAHA

If consciousness alone exists, and nothing apart from it, why is it that both the world and the sacred teachings state that Atman and dharmas exist?

The Stanza says:

1. NOTIONS OF ATMAN AND DHARMAS DO NOT IMPLY A REAL ATMAN AND REAL DHARMAS, BUT ARE MERE CONVENTIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS [PRODUCED BY NUMEROUS CAUSES] AND, AS SUCH, ARE FALSE AND IMAGINARY.

BECAUSE OF THIS, ALL KINDS OF PHENOMENA ARE EVOLVED.

THE PHENOMENA OF ATMAN AND DHARMAS ARE [ALL MENTAL REPRESENTATIONS] BASED ON THE EVOLUTION AND TRANSFORMATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

CONSCIOUSNESSES CAPABLE OF UNFOLDING OR MANIFESTING THEMSELVES MAY BE GROUPED UNDER THREE MAIN CATEGORIES:

- 2A. (1) THE CONSCIOUSNESS WHOSE FRUITS (RETRIBUTION) MATURE AT VARYING TIMES (i.e., THE EIGHTH CONSCIOUSNESS OR ALAYAVIJNANA; (2) THAT OF COGITATION OR DELIBERATION (i.e., THE SEVENTH CONSCIOUSNESS OR MANASVIJNANA); AND (3) THAT WHICH PERCEIVES AND DISCRIMINATES SPHERES OF OBJECTS [i.e., THE SIXTH CONSCIOUSNESS OR MANOVIJNANA (SENSE-CENTRE CONSCIOUSNESS) AND THE FIVE SENSE CONSCIOUSNESSES].

論曰：

世間聖教說有我法但由假立，非實有性。

我謂主宰，法謂軌持。

〔述記：軌謂軌範可生物解，持謂任持不捨自相。〕

彼二俱有種種相轉。

我種種相謂有情命者等，

預流一來等。

法種種相謂實德業等，蘊處界等。

轉謂隨緣施設有異。

問徵

如是諸相若由假說，依何得成？

彼相皆依識所轉變而假施設。

別解識及變二字

識謂了別。

此中識言亦攝心所。定相應故。

變謂識體轉似二分。

〔述記：護法等云，謂諸識體即自證分，轉似相見二分而生。〕

相見俱依自證起故。

依斯二分施設我法，彼二離此無所依故。

The Treatise says:

1. Both the world and the Scriptures state that Atman and dharmas exist, but, in point of fact, they have no reality of their own, being mere subjective constructions based on false ideas. "Atman" implies ownership or lordship or controlling power, while "dharma" implies norm-support (i.e., a model or something that clings to its nature as something particular.)

The idea of Atman and dharmas may assume many forms with specific characteristics. For example, Atman may assume the forms of *sattva* (sentient beings), of *jiva* (living things), etc., or of *srotaapanna* (disciples who have "entered the stream" of holy living), of *sakrdagamin* (those in their penultimate return to mortality), etc. On the other hand, dharmas may appear in the form of *dravya* (substance), *gunas* (qualities), *karman* (actions), etc., or *skandhas* (aggregates), *ayatanas* (sense-spheres), *dhatus* (planes of existence), etc.

(In the original Sanskrit stanza) the word *pravartate* (arising) signifies that different structures assumed by Atman and dharmas are produced in accordance with their causes and conditions.

2 Objection: Question and answer

If such various phenomena of Atman and dharmas are mere subjective elaborations, what is their real foundation? What is their *raison d'être*?

They are the result of the evolution and manifestation of consciousness (*vijnana-parinama*). As such they are subjective and conventional elaborations.

3. Consciousness defined

The word consciousness means perception and mental discrimination, i.e., of "external things"; in the present treatise it is understood as the mind and its associated activities (*citta* and *caittas*), as the latter are necessarily associated with consciousness.

4. Evolution of Consciousness

What is meant by "the evolution of consciousness"? There are two theories.

First answer: according to Dharmapala and Sthiramati "Evolution" (*parinama*) indicates that what essentially constitutes consciousness (that is to say, its substance, the *samvittibhaga*), when it is born, manifests itself under two seeming aspects or divisions (*bhagas*), namely, the image-aspect and the perception-aspect, i.e., the object perceived (or perceived division) and the perceiving faculty (or perceiving division) (*nimittabhaga* and *darsanabhaga*). These divisions arise out of a third

或復內識轉似外境。

我法分別熏習力故，諸識生時變似我法。

〔述記：即是難陀親勝等義。〕

此我法相雖在內識，而由分別似外境現。

諸有情類無始時來緣此執爲實我實法。

夢喻

如患夢者患夢力故心似種種外境相現。

緣此執爲實有外境。

世俗諦及勝義諦

愚夫所計實我實法都無所有。

但隨妄情而施設故說之爲假。

內識所變似我似法雖有而非實我法性。

然似彼現故說爲假。

外境隨情而施設故，非有如識。

〔述記：徧計所執心外實境由隨妄情施設爲假，體實都無，非與依他內識相似。〕

內識必依因緣生故，非無如境。

〔述記：由內識體是依他故，必依種子因緣所生，非體是無如徧計境。〕

由此便遮增減二執。

〔述記：由此內識體性非無，心外我法體性非有，便遮外計離心之境實有增執，及遮邪見惡取空者撥識亦無損減空執。即離空有說唯識教。有心外法輪迴生死，覺知一心生死永棄可謂無上處中道理。〕

division called the "self-corroboratory division" (*samvittibhaga*) which constitutes their "essential substance". It is on the basis of these two functional divisions that Atman and dharmas are established, for they have no other.

Second answer: according to Nanda, Bandhusri, etc.

Evolution of consciousness means also that the inner consciousness develops into what seems to be an external sphere of objects. By virtue of the "perfuming" energy (*vasana*) deposited in the mind by wrong concepts (*vikalpa*) of Atman-dharmas, the consciousnesses, on becoming active, develop into the similitude of Atman and dharmas. Although phenomena of Atman and dharmas lie within the consciousness, yet, because of wrong mental discrimination, they are taken to be external objects. That is why all sentient beings, since the beginningless past, have conceived them as real Atman and dharmas.

The Dream Analogy

The case is like that of a man in a dream, who, under the influence of this dream, in which his mind manifests what seem to be external objects of all sorts, believes that these images are real external objects.

The two truths: relative and absolute

What the ignorant imagine to be a "real" Atman and "real" dharmas are devoid of all objective existence. They are simply established in this way in accordance with their erroneous opinions and conceptions. Hence we say that they are false (i.e., relative truths).

Thus the seeming Atman and the seeming dharmas which evolve out of internal consciousness, although (in one way) they do exist, do not have the substance of a real Atman and real dharmas, despite their verisimilitude. This, then, is the reason for calling them false.

In other words, what we take to be external objects are the result of our erroneous notions, and do not "exist" in the same way as consciousness does; (that is to say, external objects are illusory (*parikalpita*)). On the other hand, internal consciousness, born by reason of causes and conditions, and responsible for the appearance of external objects, is not, in its essential nature, non-existent in the same way as are external objects; (it is *paratantra*). Thus we exclude the two heterodox doctrines, namely, that which clings to the additional reality of objects apart from the mind and that which, because it wrongly believes in "voidness", sets aside

境依內識而假立故唯世俗有，識是假境所依事故亦勝義有。

云何應知實無外境唯有內識似外境生？

實我實法不可得故。

我執

如何實我不可得耶？

諸所執我畧有三種。

一者執我體常周徧量同虛空。

〔述記：此謂數論勝論等計，即是僧佉吠世史迦義。〕

隨處造業受苦樂故。

二者執我其體雖常而量不定。

隨身大小有卷舒故。

〔述記：如一牛皮日乾水漬，日炙便卷，水濕便舒。此即無慚之類計也。謂尼虔子，今言呢犍陀。〕

三者執我體常至細如一極微。

潛轉身中作事業故。

〔述記：謂有外道名播輸鉢多，翻爲獸主。復有外道名波利咄囉拘迦，翻爲徧出，徧能出離諸俗世間，即是出家外道之類。〕

consciousness itself as non-existent, thus reducing everything to voidness or emptiness.

Since external objects are mere conventional constructions arising from internal consciousness, they exist purely from a worldly point of view. On the other hand, inasmuch as consciousness is the essential basis out of which false appearances of an external world arise, it is existent in real truth.

5. Objection answered

How do we know that in reality there is no external sphere of objects, but only internal consciousness which brings forth what seem to be real external spheres of objects?

Because the existence of a real Atman or real dharmas cannot be affirmed beyond doubt.

Let us now examine, in proper sequence, the different ways of conceiving Atman and dharmas.

ATMAGRAHA

(ATMAN-CLINGING)

Belief in the Reality of the Atman

Why is it impossible to establish the existence of a real Atman?

1. Theories of the Atman held by various heterodox schools may be reduced to three kinds.

(1) The Samkhyas and the Vaishesikas hold that the substance of the Atman is eternal, universal, and as extensive as empty space. It acts everywhere and, as a consequence, enjoys happiness or suffers sorrow.

(2) The Nirgranthas, the Jains, etc., hold that, although the substance of the Atman is eternal, its extension is indeterminate, because it expands and contracts according as the body is large or small (just as a piece of leather stretches when it is wet and shrinks when dried in the sun).

(3) The Pasupatas (Animal-Lord worshippers), Purivrajakas (recluses), etc., hold that the substance of the Atman is eternal but infinitesimal like an atom, lying deep and moving around within the body and performing acts of all kinds.

別破

初且非理。所以者何？

執我常徧量同虛空，應不隨身受苦樂等。

又常徧故應無動轉，如何隨身能造諸業？

又所執我一切有情爲同爲異？

若言同者，一作業時一切應作，一受果時一切應受，

一得解脫時一切應解脫，便成大過。

若言異者，諸有情我更相徧故，體應相雜。

又一作業一受果時與一切我處無別故，應名一切所作所受。

若謂作受各有所屬無斯過者，理亦不然。

業果及身與諸我合，屬此非彼不應理故。

一解脫時一切應解脫，所修證法一切我合故。

中亦非理。所以者何？

我體常住，不應隨身而有舒卷。

既有舒卷，如橐籥風，應非常住。

又我隨身應可分析，如何可執我體一耶？

故彼所言如童豎戲。

後亦非理。所以者何？

我量至小如一極微，如何能令大身徧動？

〔述記：如何小我一剎那中能令色究竟天萬六千由旬大身動轉？〕

The first theory is contrary to reason. Why?

If it is held that the so-called Atman is eternal and universal, and as extensive as empty space, it should not enjoy happiness or suffer sorrow along with the body.

Again, since it is eternal and universal, it should be motionless. Being motionless, how can it perform individual acts along with the body of an individual?

Furthermore, is the Atman so conceived common to all sentient beings or has each a separate Atman? If it is common, then, when one individual being acts or receives the fruits of action or attains emancipation, all individual beings should at the same time do the same. What a great mistake! If it is different and separate, the Atmans of all sentient beings would universally penetrate one another (since, being universal, all of them are omnipresent): then the substance of all Atmans would be mixed together. Besides, since all Atmans would abide in the same field, the acts of one individual being or the fruits of his action should likewise be the acts or fruits of all beings. To argue that actions and fruits belong to each being separately and that there would be no mistake such as that just described, would be no less contrary to reason, because actions, fruits and body are identified with all Atmans, and it is unreasonable for them to belong to one Atman and not to another.

From this it follows that when one being attains emancipation, all other beings should also attain it, for the Dharma (Truth) practised and realized is identical with all Atmans.

The second theory is also contrary to reason. Why?

If the substance of the Atman is eternal and immutable, it cannot expand or contract with the size of the body in which it is. Were it to expand and contract like the air in a bag or pipe, it is never in the same state.

Furthermore, if the Atman follows the body in its expanding and contracting, it should be divisible. How, then, can it be held that the substance of the Atman is one?

What this school teaches is like child's play.

The last theory is also contrary to reason. Why?

Since the Atman is infinitesimal like an atom, how can it, at one moment, set in motion the whole big body (of the Deva that extends throughout the highest

若謂雖小而速巡身如旋火輪，似徧動者。

則所執我非一非常，諸有往來非常一故。

又所執我復有三種。

一者即蘊。

二者離蘊。

三者與蘊非即非離。

初即蘊我理且不然，我應如蘊非常一故。

又內諸色定非實我，如外諸色有質礙故。

心心所法亦非實我，不恆相續待衆緣故。

〔述記：前破心所即行蘊少分，行蘊少分中不相應行既與心所別，故應別破之。〕

plane of the Rupa World and measures sixteen thousand yoginas)?

If it is argued that although small, it goes rapidly through the body, like a fire-brand of an *alatacakra* (whirling torch) so that the whole body seems to move, then the Atman so conceived is neither one nor eternal, for what comes and goes is neither eternal nor one.

2. Atman theory: from another point of view

From another point of view, that of the Buddhist doctrine of Skandhas (aggregates),¹ the Atman may also be conceived in three ways:

The first theory holds that the Atman is identical with the Skandhas (aggregates), (namely, material form, sensation, conception, predisposition, and consciousness).

The second theory holds that it is separate from the Skandhas.

The third theory holds that it is neither identical with nor separate from the Skandhas.

Refutation

The first theory

(1) To say that the Atman is identical with the Skandhas is contrary to reason, for, were it identical, it would, like the Skandhas, be neither eternal nor unique.

(2) Besides, internal matter (*rupa*), that is to say, the five sense organs, is surely not the Atman, for it is corporeal, having extension and resistance, like external matter. (This refers to the Rupaskandha² of the five Skandhas).

(3) Furthermore, the mind and its associated activities (*citta* and *caittas*: Vedanaskandha, sensation; Samjnaskandha, conception; Vijnanaskandha, consciousness; and part of Samskaraskandha, pre-disposition) are not the real Atman either, for they do not continue in an uninterrupted series; their manifestation depends on various causes and conditions (*hetupratyaya*).

1. The five Skandhas or aggregates, i.e., the components of an intelligent being, especially a human being, are: (1) *rupa*, material form, the physical form related to the five organs of sense; (2) *vedana*, reception, sensation, feeling, the functioning of the mind or senses in connection with affairs and things; (3) *samjna*, conception or thought, the functioning of mind in distinguishing; (4) *samskara*, predisposition, the functioning of mind in its processes regarding like and dislike, good and evil, etc.; (5) *vijnana*, consciousness, mental faculty in regard to perception and cognition, discrimination of affairs and things. The first is said to be physical, the other four mental qualities; (2), (3), and (4) are associated with mental functioning; (5) is associated with the faculty or nature of the mind.

2. *Rupa* refers to form, colour, appearance, phenomenon, etc.

餘行餘色亦非實我，如虛空等，非覺性故。

〔述記：心所法外餘行外處及無表色亦非實我，非覺性故，如虛空等。〕

〔述記義演：外處者，即外五塵。如前破色蘊但約內色，今破不相應行兼破外色及無表色，即法處所攝色也。〕

中離蘊我理亦不然，應如虛空無作受故。

〔述記：破僧佉等也。〕

後俱非我理亦不然，

許依蘊立非即離蘊，應如瓶等非實我故。

〔述記：破犢子等也。〕

又既不可說有爲無爲，亦應不可說是我非我。

故彼所執實我不成。

總破

又諸所執實有我體爲有思慮，爲無思慮？

若有思慮，應是無常，非一切時有思慮故。

若無思慮，應如虛空，不能作業亦不受果。

故所執我理俱不成。

又諸所執實有我體爲有作用，爲無作用？

若有作用，如手足等，應是無常。

若無作用，如兔角等，應非實我。故所執我二俱不成。

(4) The other "conditioned" Samskaras, that is to say, the *vi-prayuktasamskaras*, and the *rupa* of Avijnapti are not the real Atman either, for, like empty space, they are without intelligence.

The second theory

The second theory (held by the Samkhyas, etc.) that the Atman is separate from the Skandhas is no less illogical, for the Atman would then be like empty space, which neither acts nor receives fruits of action.

The third theory

The last theory (held by the Vatsiputriyas) that the Atman is neither identical with nor separate from the Skandhas is also contrary to reason. This theory admits that the Atman is established on the Skandhas but is neither identical with nor separate from them. In this case the Atman would not be a real Atman at all; it is merely "existence in name" like a vase (which, depending on clay for its construction, is neither clay nor separate from clay).

Further, since it is impossible to say whether the so-called Atman is produced by causes (i.e., "conditioned", *samskṛta*) or not so produced (i.e., "unconditioned", *asamskṛta*), it should also be impossible to say whether it is an Atman or not.

Therefore the real Atman conceived by this theory cannot be established.

3. General Refutation

(1) Against the heterodox schools

Is the Atman, grasped as a real entity by the various heterodox schools, possessed of cogitation or not? If it is, it would not be eternal, because it does not cogitate all the time. If it is not, then it would be like empty space, which neither acts nor receives fruits of action. Therefore, on the basis of reason, the Atman so conceived cannot be established.

Again, does this substance of the real Atman conceived by the various schools perform any function or not? If it does, it would be like hands and feet and would not be eternal. If it does not, it would be like the illusory horns of a hare (things that exist in imagination only) and would not be a real Atman.

Therefore, in either case, the Atman which they conceive cannot be established.

又諸所執實有我體爲是我見所緣境不？

若非我見所緣境者，汝等云何知實有我？

若是我見所緣境者，應有我見非顛倒攝，如實知故。

若爾，如何執有我者所信之教皆毀我見稱讚無我？

言無我見能證涅槃，執著我見沈淪生死。

豈有邪見能證涅槃，正見翻令沈淪生死？

又諸我見不緣實我，有所緣故，如緣餘心。

我見所緣定非實我，是所緣故，如所餘法。

是故我見不緣實我，但緣內識變現諸蘊隨自妄情種種計度。

我執伏斷位次

然諸我執畧有二種。

一者俱生，二者分別。

俱生我執無始時來虛妄熏習內因力故恆與身俱，

不待邪教及邪分別任運而轉故名俱生。

此復二種。

一常相續，在第七識緣第八識起自心相執爲實我。

(2) Against the the Vatsiputriyas

Is the substance of the real Atman conceived by the various schools an object of "Atmadrsti" (Self-belief or Atman-view) or not? If it is not, how do the advocates of the theory know that an Atman really exists? If it is, then there should be an "Atmadrsti" that does not involve any perversion, for that would be knowledge of what really is. In that case, how is it that the perfectly true doctrines believed in by those holding the theory of the Atman all denounce Atmadrsti and exalt its absence, declaring that he who is free from Atmadrsti will attain Nirvana while he who clings to it will be engulfed in the sea of birth and death (*samsara*, transmigration)? How can it be that an erroneous view (*mithyadrsti*) leads to Nirvana and a correct view (*samyagdrsti*), on the contrary, leads to wallowing in the sea of birth and death (transmigration)?

Furthermore, the various Atman-views (Atmadrsti) actually do not take the real Atman as an object, because it has objects which are not itself, just as the mind takes other things (such as external matter) as objects. The object of Atmadrsti is certainly not the real Atman, because it (Atmadrsti) is an object perceivable like other dharmas.

We consider therefore that "Atmadrsti" does not take the real Atman as an object; that it takes as objects only the Skandhas evolved by inner consciousness; and that, in accordance with the erroneous opinions of each individual, it interprets these Skandhas as the diverse forms of Atman.

4. Cessation of Atman-Clinging (Atmagrahavibhanga)

Atman-clinging are, generally speaking, of two kinds:—(1) that which is innate (*sahaja*) and (2) that which results from mental discrimination (*vikalpita*).

(1) The innate Atman-clinging is perpetually present in the individual, owing to the internal causal influence of a false perfuming (*vasana*) which has been going on since the beginningless past. Thus, without depending on external false teachings or discriminations, it spontaneously operates. That is why it is called innate.

This Atman-clinging, however, is again subdivided into two kinds:

The first is constant and continuous, and pertains to the seventh consciousness or Manas, which, directing itself to the eighth consciousness or Alayavijnana, produces from this an individualized mental image to which it clings as a real Atman.

二有閒斷，在第六識緣識所變五取蘊相或總或別起自心相執爲

實我。

此二我執細故難斷，後修道中數數修習勝生空觀方能除滅。

分別我執亦由現在外緣力故，非與身俱。

要待邪教及邪分別然後方起故名分別。

唯在第六意識中有。

此亦二種。

一緣邪教所說蘊相起自心相分別計度執爲實我。

二緣邪教所說我相起自心相分別計度執爲實我。

此二我執麤故易斷，初見道時觀一切法生空眞如卽能除滅。

如是所說一切我執，自心外蘊或有或無。

自心內蘊一切皆有。

The second kind is at times interrupted and pertains to the sixth consciousness or Manovijnana which, directing itself to the five "tenacious aggregates" (*upadana-skandhas*) that are evolved from consciousness, sometimes *in toto*, sometime separately, produces out of them an individualized mental image to which it clings as a real Atman.

These two kinds of innate Atman-clinging, being subtle, are difficult to cut off. It is only later, in the Path of Meditation and Self-cultivation (*Bhavanamarga*), that a Bodhisattva, by practising repeatedly the "eminent contemplation of the voidness of individuality" (*pudgalasunyata*), is able finally to annihilate them.

(2) As for the Atman-clinging which results from mental discrimination, it derives from the force of external factors and so is not innate in the individual. It must wait for false teachings or discriminations before it can arise. That is why the term "mental discrimination" is applied to it. It pertains exclusively to the sixth consciousness or Manovijnana.

This Atman-clinging is also of two kinds:

The first pertains to the sixth consciousness, Manovijnana, which, taking as its object the aggregates spoken of in one school of false teaching, produces within itself an individualized image to which, as a result of discrimination and speculation, it clings as though it were some real Atman.

The second kind pertains also to the sixth consciousness, Manovijnana, which, taking as object the various Atman-concepts or characteristics as defined in one school of false teaching, produces within itself an individualized image to which, through discrimination and speculation, it clings as to some real Atman.

These two kinds of Atman-clinging are crude and, consequently, easy to get rid of. When an ascetic attains the first stage of the Path of Insight into Transcendent Truth (*Darsanamarga*), he can finally annihilate them by contemplating the "Bhutatahata (Suchness) of the voidness of all individualities and dharmas" (*sarvadharmapudgalasunyatabhutatahata*).

General conclusion

In examining the various Atman-clings and their objects, we find that, in certain cases but not in all, Atman-clinging has as its object "aggregates" external to the mind; while in all cases it is the "aggregates" within the mind that form the point of support for Atman-clinging.

是故我執皆緣無常五取蘊相妄執爲我。

然諸蘊相從緣生故是如幻有，妄所執我橫計度故決定非有。

故契經說，苾芻當知世間沙門婆羅門等所有我見一切皆緣五取

蘊起。

假設外徵釋諸妨難

實我若無，如何得有意識誦習恩怨等事？

所執實我既常無變，後應如前，是事非有。

前應如後，是事非無，以後與前體無別故。

若謂我用前後變易非我體者，理亦不然。

用不離體應常有故，體不離用應非常故。

Let us therefore conclude that all Atman-clingings take as their object the impermanent five "tenacious aggregates" (*Upadanaskandhas*) which are an internal image (*nimittabhaga*) of the mind, and falsely cling to it as a real Atman.

These five aggregate-images, arising as they do from causes and conditions (*pratyaya*), exist as illusory phenomena only. As for the Atman which is merely a false interpretation of the aggregates, (like the interpretation of magic), it certainly has no real existence whatsoever.

This is why the Sutra says: "Know ye, O Bhiksus, that all beliefs in the Atman (*sakayadrsti*) of the Brahmins and Sramanas are only produced because of the five Upadanaskandhas."

5 Refutation of objections

(1) If a real Atman does not exist, how do you explain memory, perception of objects, reading of books, meditation on texts, favours, hatred, etc.?

Since the so-called real Atman is eternal and immutable, its post-manifestation state should be the same as its pre-manifestation state;¹ then memory, cognition, etc., which were non-existent in the latter, should be non-existent also in the former. Inversely, since its pre-manifestation state should be the same as its post-manifestation state, memory, cognition, etc., which exist in the latter, should have existed also in the former. These are the two logical conclusions of your Atman-theory and neither of them explains memory, etc., satisfactorily since you hold that there is no difference between the two states in question.

If it is said, as a rejoinder, that the activity (*yung, karitra*) of the Atman is variable, but that its substance (*t'i, svabhava*) is immutable, the reply is that this theory is just as illogical. Since the activity is not separable from the substance, it (the activity) should also be constant (i.e., unchangeable), Inversely, since the substance is not separable from the activity, it (the substance) should not be permanent.

1. Philosophers of the Samkhya School believe in an Atman which manifests itself as 23 dharmas, the Mahat, the Ahankara, etc., which are constituted by the union of the three Gunas, namely, *sattva, rajas, tamas*.

然諸有情各有本識，一類相續任持種子，與一切法更互爲因，

熏習力故得有如是憶識等事。故所設難於汝有失，非於我宗。

若無實我，誰能造業，誰受果耶？

所執實我既無變易，猶如虛空，如何可能造業受果？若有

變易，應是無常。

然諸有情心心所法因緣力故相續無斷，受果於理無違。

我若實無，誰於生死輪迴諸趣？誰復厭苦求趣涅槃？

所執實我既無生滅，如何可說生死輪迴？常如虛空非苦所惱，

何爲厭捨求趣涅槃，故彼所言常爲自害。

然有情類身心相續，煩惱業力輪迴諸趣，厭患苦故求趣涅槃。

Correct explanation of memory, etc.

The truth is that each sentient being has a fundamental consciousness (Mulavi-jnana), which evolves in a homogeneous and continuous series and which carries the "seeds" or "germs" (*bijas*) of all dharmas. This fundamental consciousness and the dharmas act as reciprocal causes on one another, and because the "perfuming" energy (*vasana*) of the dharmas imprints its essence permanently in the Alayavijnana in the form of "seeds" or *Bijas*, memory, cognition, etc., arise in manifestation, the *Bijas* evolving as actual dharmas which in turn produce *Bijas* in the Alaya. Hence, the point raised about memory, etc., indicates that there are faults in your Atman theory, not in our doctrine of consciousness.

(2) If there is no real Atman, by whom is an act accomplished? By whom are the fruits of action received and tasted?

Since your Atman is, by definition, immutable, like space, how can it act and taste the fruits of action? If it acts and tastes, that is, if it varies, it is not permanent.

Correct explanation of action, etc.

The truth is that, by virtue of the force of causes and conditions, the mind and mental properties (*citta-caittas*) of each sentient being flow in a continuous uninterrupted series, resulting in the accomplishment of acts and the tasting of their fruits. This explanation is logical.

If there is really no Atman, who is going from one state of existence (*gati*) to another in "cycles of birth and death" (*samsara*)? Again, who is it that is disgusted with suffering and seeks to attain Nirvana?

Since your real Atman is free from birth and destruction, how can you speak of "cycles of birth and death"? Since your Atman is as eternal as space, it cannot be tormented by suffering: how, then, can it be disgusted with suffering, expel suffering and seek the attainment of Nirvana?

Hence, all the objections you have raised turn against your own Atman theory.

Correct explanation of Samsara and Nirvana

The truth is that each sentient being is a continuous physical and mental series which, by the force of vexing passions (*klesas*) and impure acts, turns from one state of existence (*gati*) to another in cycles of transmigration. Tormented by suffering and disgusted with it, he seeks the attainment of Nirvana.

由此故知定無實我，但有諸識無始時來前滅後生因果相續，由

妄熏習似我相現，愚者於中妄執爲我。

(破我章竟)

General conclusion

Hence we conclude that positively there is no real Atman; that there are only various consciousnesses which, from time without beginning, have followed one another, the subsequent arising with the disappearance of the antecedent, and thus a continuous series of causes and effects (karmic seeds — actual dharmas — karmic seeds) is formed; and that, by the perfuming energy (*vasana*) of false thinking, an image of a pseudo-Atman (of the likeness of an Atman) arises in consciousness, and it is this pseudo-Atman that the ignorant take to be a real Atman.

(Chapter on Atman-clinging concluded)