

Wonhyo's View of the *Ālayavijñāna*: Centered on His Understanding of the Three Subtle Marks of the *Ālayavijñāna**

KIM Seong-cheol

KIM Seong-cheol received his Ph.D. from Dongguk University, majoring in Indian Buddhism. He is a professor at the Geumgang Center for Buddhist Studies, Guemgang University. His translations and publications include *Chogi Bulgyo ui inyeom gwa myeongsang* (*The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism* [2010]), *Yusik gwa Yugabaeng* (*Yuishiki to Yugagyō* [2014]), and *Yeoraegang gwa bulseong* (*Nyōraizō to bussō* [2015]). Also he has published many papers such as “Chogi Yugahaengpa ui yeoraegang gaenyeom haeseok” (On the Interpretation of the Term “Tathāgatagarbha” in the early Yogācāra School) in *Indo Cheolhak* 27 (2009), “Jongseong ui bonjil e daehan Yugahaengpa wa yeoraegang sasang ui haeseok” (On the Interpretation of the Nature of Gotra by Yogācāra and Tathāgatagarbha School) in *Bulgyohak Ribyu* 10 (2011). KIM is widely recognized as one of the premier specialists on Yogācāra School in Korea and East Asia.
E-mail: icchantika@me.com

* This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (KRF-2007-361-AM0046).

International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture Vol. 26, No. 2 (December 2016): 85–115.
© 2016 Academy of Buddhist Studies, Dongguk University, Korea

<http://dx.doi.org/10.16893/IJBTC26.2.04>

The day of submission: 2016.10.15.

Completion of review: 2016.12.10.

Final decision for acceptance: 2016.12.21.

Abstract

East Asian exegetes typically understood the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna (AFM) in terms of the Yogācāra framework of the eight consciousnesses. For instance, Wonhyo 元曉 (617–686) considered the three subtle marks (sanxi 三細), elements of the secondary non-enlightenment, to be aspects of the ālayavijñāna.

Although Wonhyo based his arguments on passages from the Chinese translations of the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra (LAS), his identification of the three subtle marks with aspects of the ālayavijñāna should be re-examined. In his commentaries on the AFM, Wonhyo correlated the mark of subjective perceiving (nengjian xiang 能見相), second of the three subtle marks, with the evolving consciousness (zhuanshi 轉識), second of the five types of thought (wuyi 五意). He then states that the evolving consciousness is situated in the ālayavijñāna. But in the Sanskrit text of the LAS, the “forthcoming consciousness” (pravṛttivijñāna) just indicates all of the seven consciousnesses. In Wonhyo’s commentaries, the mark of the objective world (jingjie xiang 境界相), the third subtle mark, is identified with the manifesting consciousness (xianshi 現識), which appears in the LAS. But this scripture does not clearly define the manifesting consciousness (khyātivijñāna) as an aspect of the ālayavijñāna. Therefore, Wonhyo’s identification of these two consciousnesses with the ālayavijñāna is not supported by the text of the LAS.

Nevertheless, Wonhyo plausibly could have drawn upon the Xianshi lun 顯識論, purportedly translated by Parmārtha (499–569). Because the Xianshi lun is considered part of the Wuxiang lun 無相論 and Wonhyo makes a citation from the latter, he could have been aware of the former in which the manifesting consciousness is identified with the ālayavijñāna. This could be evidence that Wonhyo’s thesis is of Indian origins.

Key words: *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna, Wonhyo, Three Subtle Marks, ālayavijñāna, Evolving Consciousness, Manifesting Consciousness, Xianshi lun*

Introduction

The *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* (*Dasheng qixin lun* 大乘起信論; hereafter referred to as *AFM*) has unique theories of mind, which are often called the threefold theories of *citta*, *manas*, and *vijñāna*. In addition to the definition of the *ālayavijñāna*, introduced at the beginning of the *AFM*'s "Mind in Terms of Arising and Cessation" (*xin shengmie men* 心生滅門) section, these theories consist of the three subtle and six coarse marks (*sanxi liucu* 三細六麤), explained in the part that deals with secondary non-enlightenment; the five types of thought (*wuyi* 五意), appearing in the section "Causes and Conditions of Arising and Cessation" (*shengmie yinyuan* 生滅因緣); and the six defiled states of mind, appearing in the section "Marks of Arising and Cessation" (*shengmie xiang* 生滅相). Of these, the theory of five types of thought has central status in the *AFM*'s theory of mind. Intimate correlations between these three categories are also found throughout the text of the *AFM*.¹

Although the *AFM* does not explicitly expound on the theory of the eight consciousnesses, exegetes of the text tried to understand the abovementioned three categories in terms of Yogācāra's theory of eight consciousnesses. For instance, Wonhyo 元曉 (617–686) regarded the three subtle marks as belonging to the realm of the *ālayavijñāna* and Fazang 法藏 (643–712) also accepted his viewpoint. Later on, the theory that posits the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna* dominated the way in which the three subtle and six coarse marks are understood.

We should note, however, that prior to Wonhyo other commentators did not necessarily consider the three subtle marks to be aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. Because Wonhyo made such a correlation for the first time, it has become an influential theory and this is enough to show his uniqueness and excellence in scholasticism.

Rather than delving into Wonhyo's theory of the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*, this paper will focus on how he tried to corroborate that theory. Of the scriptures from which he made citations in order to justify his position, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* (hereafter referred to as *LAS*) will be carefully analyzed and the validity of his arguments will be re-examined. By analyzing the text and re-examining the arguments I will clarify that those scriptural passages do not necessarily serve to support his position. If the passages Wonhyo quotes from the *LAS* do not corroborate his position, then, does he

have other evidence supporting that theory? This paper will provide tentative answers to this question.

The Theory of the Three Subtle Marks as Aspects of the *Ālayavijñāna*

Wonhyo's explanations in the *Daeseung gisil-lon byeolgi* and the *Daeseung gisillon-so*

In his two commentaries on the *AFM*, that is the *Daeseung gisil-lon byeolgi* 大乘起信論別記 (hereafter referred to as *Byeolgi*) and *Daeseung gisillon-so* 大乘起信論疏 (hereafter referred to as *So*), Wonhyo correlates the three subtle marks with the *ālayavijñāna* six times in total as follows.²

- (a) Explanation of a passage from the *LAS*, related to the definition of the *ālayavijñāna*, which appears in the beginning part of the section “Mind in Terms of Arising and Cessation”: *Byeolgi* (T 44, 229a4–7), *So* (T 44, 208c2–6)
- (b) Identification of the mark of arising (*shengxiang* 生相) with an aspect of the *ālayavijñāna*: *Byeolgi* (T 44, 231a20–21), *So* (T 44, 209b19–20)
- (c) Identification of the three subtle marks with aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*: *Byeolgi* (T 44, 234a6–19), *So* (T 44, 212b7–25)
- (d) Explanation of the manifesting consciousness (*xianshi* 現識): *Byeolgi* (T 44, 235b13–25), *So* (T 44, 213c25–214a8)
- (e) Analysis of the six defiled states of mind into coarse and subtle ones: *Byeolgi* (T 44, 238a20–22), *So* (T 44, 216a20–22)
- (f) Explanation of the permeation of the deluded mind (*wangxin xunxi* 妄心熏習): *Byeolgi* (T 44, 239b7–8), *So* (T 44, 217b23–25; but the relevant passage in the *Byeolgi* is curtailed in the *So*.)

Of these, passages (e) and (f) are not directly concerned with the theory of the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*, but they are based on that theory. In the following section, I examine the theory in question by focusing on passages (a) through (d).

Wonhyo's theory of the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*

In relation to passage (a), Wonhyo makes a citation from the four-fascicle *LAS* in order to explain the expression “neither identical nor different” (*fēiyi fēiyi* 非一非異) appearing in the *AFM*'s definition of the *ālayavijñāna*. Here the *LAS* states that just as a lump of earth (*nituan* 泥團, Skt. *mṛtpiṇḍa*) is neither identical with nor different from an atom of earth (*weichen* 微塵, Skt. *mṛtparamānu*), the forthcoming consciousness (*zhuanshi* 轉識, Skt. *pravṛttivijñāna*) is neither identical with nor different from the true mark of the storehouse consciousness or *ālayavijñāna* (*zangshi zhenxiang* 藏識真相, Skt. *ālayavijñāna-jātilakṣaṇa*).³ Commenting on the *AFM*'s passage, Wonhyo's *Byeolgi* identifies the forthcoming consciousness, mentioned in the *LAS*, with the mark of perceiving (*jianxiang* 見相), which is arising and ceasing in the *ālayavijñāna*. Wonhyo then considers the *ālayavijñāna* as a whole to be its self-witnessing aspect (*[zi]ti [fen]* [自]體[分]).⁴ Besides the forthcoming consciousness, his later commentary *So* puts the activating consciousness (*yeshi* 業識), which he identifies with the mark of karma (*yexiang* 業相, Skt. *karmalakṣaṇa*) appearing in the four-fascicle *LAS*, within the realm of the *ālayavijñāna*.⁵

Passage (b) clarifies for the first time that the three subtle marks as a whole belong to the *ālayavijñāna*. Here the *AFM* explains the soteriological process, in which one attains ultimate enlightenment from non-enlightenment by going through the stages of apparent enlightenment and approximate enlightenment, in the reverse order of the four phenomenal states of arising, abiding, changing, and extinguishing. Before providing a detailed exposition on the process of enlightenment that is composed of the four stages, Wonhyo correlates the four phenomenal states with the three subtle and six coarse marks. He thus says that the state of arising has the three marks: that of karma (*yexiang* 業相), that of evolution (*zhuaxiang* 轉相), and that of manifestation (*xianxiang* 現相). He further considers all these three marks to be aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*.⁶ But more detailed explanations appear later in his commentary.

In passage (c) Wonhyo fully explains the thesis that the three subtle marks are aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. Here in the *Byeolgi* and the *So*, he gives an explanation of the mark of karma produced by ignorance, first of the three subtle marks. According to him, this mark is characterized by arising and ceasing but the two aspects of cognition, namely subject and object, have not been discriminated at this stage. In order to corroborate his thesis of non-

discrimination of the two aspects, he quotes a passage from the *Wuxiang lun* 無想(/相)論 or the *Zhuanshi lun* 轉識論, the translation of which is attributed to Paramārtha (Zhendi 真諦, 499–569).⁷ He then declares that *Wuxiang lun*'s passage reveals the characteristics of the fundamental consciousness (i.e., *ālayavijñāna*) on the basis of the mark of karma.⁸

Regarding the mark of the subjective perceiving and that of the objective world, the *Byeolgi* just briefly defines the former as the subjective aspect of perceiving (*jianfen* 見分) and the latter as the objective aspect of being perceived (*xiangfen* 相分), both of which are aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. In order to justify his thesis, Wonhyo makes a citation from the *LAS* and also maintains that the *Yogācārabhūmi* has the same explanation. He then says that all the three marks of karma, subjective perceiving, and objective world are the aspects of the maturing consciousness (*yishou shi* 異熟識, Skt. *vipāka-vijñāna*).

By contrast, the *So* just defines the mark of the subjective perceiving and that of the objective world as the mark of evolution and that of manifestation respectively without correlating them with the two aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. Instead, the *So* has a detailed explanation of these two subtle marks. It is noteworthy that in the *So* Wonhyo attributes a cognitive function to the mark of evolution with the limitation of its not being able to make the object manifest.⁹ This is distinguished from the *Byeolgi*'s structural formulation of the three marks in terms of the three aspects of mind. Despite the change in understanding the three subtle marks, Wonhyo still maintains that they are within the realm of the *ālayavijñāna*. Having explained the mark of the objective world, he states that this explanation serves to reveal the fundamental consciousness on the basis of that mark.¹⁰ Here he makes a strong case for the thesis that since the mark of manifestation (i.e., the mark of the objective world) already exists in the fundamental consciousness (i.e., the eighth consciousness), subtler marks of evolution and karma cannot be correlated with the sixth or seventh consciousness.

Passage (d) make a statement almost similar to passage (c). Regarding the activating consciousness, first of the five types of thought, the *Byeolgi* identifies it with the mark of karma produced by ignorance, first of the three subtle marks. The *So* also has an identical explanation.

Here his explanation of the evolving consciousness of the *AFM* is noteworthy. In the *Byeolgi* Wonhyo classifies this consciousness into three types: first, if the mark of subjective perceiving aroused by ignorance is called

the evolving consciousness, it exists in the *ālayavijñāna*; second, if the same mark aroused by a cognitive object is called the evolving consciousness, it exists in the seven consciousnesses preceding the *ālayavijñāna*; third, if all the subjective marks of perceiving are referred to as the evolving consciousness, it exists in all the eight consciousnesses. Of these, the first type corresponds to the mark of evolution (*zhuanxiang* 轉相) in the five types of thought, that is the evolving consciousness.¹¹ Wonhyo's explanation in the *So* is almost identical with the exception of lack of the third type of the evolving consciousness. The second type of the evolving consciousness seems to correspond to the Yogācāra school's general notion of the forthcoming consciousness. Thus, it is clear that Wonhyo is not only versed in the Yogācāra concept of the forthcoming consciousness, but also aware of the peculiarity of the *AFM*'s notion of the evolving consciousness.

When it comes to the explanation of the manifesting consciousness, third of the five types of thought, in the *Byeolgi* Wonhyo quotes the same passage from the *LAS*, which he also uses for the explication of the mark of objective world in the *So*. Here he emphasizes that the manifesting consciousness cannot be situated in the seven consciousnesses, too.

As seen above, it is clear that Wonhyo consistently puts the three subtle marks within the realm of the *ālayavijñāna* both in the *Byeolgi* and the *So*.¹²

Interpretations of the Three Subtle Marks Prior to Wonhyo

If we examine the commentaries on the *AFM* prior to Wonhyo's works, however, we find that they do not necessarily consider the three subtle marks to be aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. The oldest extant commentary on the *AFM*, the work of Tanyan 曇延 (516–588), for instance, clearly puts the six coarse marks under the sixth consciousness (i.e., thinking consciousness; *yishi* 意識, Skt. *mano-vijñāna*).¹³ But it is not certain how he correlates the three subtle marks with the other layers of consciousness. Regarding this issue, Yoshizu (1976, 160, n. 33) and Park Tae-won (1993, 38) surmise that Tanyan associates the three subtle marks with the seven consciousnesses. Although Tanyan's *Dasheng qixin lun yiji* 大乘起信論義記 does not offer an explicit definition of the seventh consciousness, it puts the six coarse marks within the realm of the sixth consciousness. However, as Tanyan does not deal with the seventh

consciousness separately but regards all the seven consciousnesses as functions of the fundamental consciousness,¹⁴ he does not seem to consider all of the eight consciousnesses to be distinct from each other, which distinguishes his position from that of Xuanzang's 玄奘 (ca. 602–664) Yogācāra.

But Huiyuan 慧遠 (523–592) regards all the three subtle marks as well as the mark of discriminating knowledge and that of continuity, which belong to the six coarse marks, as the realm of the seventh consciousness. He then considers the remaining four marks to be modes of the sixth consciousness.¹⁵ These associations are due to the fact that he correlates mind, thought, and consciousness respectively with the eight, seventh, and sixth consciousnesses¹⁶ and that he regards all the five types of thought as modes of the seventh consciousness.

The *Dasheng qixin lun shu* 大乘起信論疏 (羽333V) stored in Kyoū shooku 杏雨書屋, Ikeda (2012) reports to be the oldest commentary on the *AFM* and predate Tanyan's text, has a completely different understanding of the structure of mind. In this text we do not find precise correlations of the three subtle and six coarse marks with the five types of thought and six defiled states of mind, which characterize the commentaries on the *AFM* appearing after Tanyan's text.¹⁷ We see, however, that it associates each of the five types of thought with the eight consciousnesses. Here the activating consciousness is regarded as the *ādānavijñāna* or the *ālayavijñāna*, the evolving consciousness as the sixth consciousness, the manifesting consciousness as the five sense consciousnesses, the discriminating consciousness as the sixth consciousness, and the continuing consciousness as the *ālayavijñāna*.¹⁸ If we apply to these associations the threefold correlations established after Tanyan, it can be said that of the three subtle marks the mark of karma produced by ignorance is related to the *ādānavijñāna* or the *ālayavijñāna*, the mark of the subjective perceiving to the sixth consciousness, and the mark of the objective world to the five sense consciousnesses. In the case of the six coarse marks, it can be said that the mark of discriminating knowledge is related to the sixth consciousness and the mark of continuity to the *ālayavijñāna*. Such correlations are quite different from the way in which all marks, including the mark of karma produced by ignorance through the mark of suffering produced by karma, are understood as processes of the unfolding of secondary non-enlightenment. The following table illustrates the correlations of the three subtle and six coarse marks with the eight consciousnesses, explained in the commentaries on the *AFM*.¹⁹

Table 1 Correlations of the three subtle and six coarse marks with the eight consciousnesses made by the exegetes of the *AFM*

three subtle and six coarse marks	Kyōū shōoku Text	Tanyan's commentary	Huiyan's commentary	Wonhyo's commentary	Fazang's commentary
mark of karma produced by ignorance	7(8)	7	7	8	8
mark of subjective perceiving	6	7	7	8	8
mark of objective world	5	7	7	8	8
mark of discriminating knowledge	6	6	7	7 ²⁰	6
mark of continuity	8	6	7	6	6
mark of attachment	-	6	6	6	6
mark of the conceptualizing names	-	6	6	6	6
mark of producing karma	-	6	6	6	6
mark of suffering produced by karma	-	6	6	6	6

Why Wonhyo Proposes the Thesis of the Three Subtle Marks as Aspects of *Ālayavijñāna*

On what basis, then, did Wonhyo regard the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*? Concerning this issue, Eun Jeong-hui (2002, 124–127) maintains the validity of Wonhyo's argument on the basis of the *AFM*'s text.

According to Eun, when the *AFM* deals with original enlightenment in relation to the defiled state (*suiran benjue* 隨染本覺), it introduces the aspect of pure wisdom (*zhibijing xiang* 智淨相) and defines this aspect as opposing to the aspect of compound consciousness (*hebe shixiang* 和合識相).²¹ When the *AFM* explains ultimate enlightenment (*jiujing jue* 究竟覺), which is the final stage of actualized enlightenment (*shijue* 始覺), it defines the stage as devoid of minute

thoughts (*weixi nian* 微細念).²² Since both compound consciousness and minute thoughts should be eliminated in the ultimate stage of enlightenment, Eun identifies the former with the latter. Furthermore, she identifies the marks of subtle arising and cessation (*xi shengmie xiang* 細生滅相),²³ which is a subcategory of the marks of arising and cessation, with minute thoughts. Finally, she thinks that as the marks of subtle arising and cessation to correspond to the three subtle marks and also to the three defiled states of mind disunited from mental activities (*bu xiangying ran* 不相應染), all the three concepts indicate one and the same entity. Thus, we have an equation “the aspect of compound consciousness = minute thoughts = the marks of subtle arising and cessation = the three defiled states of mind disunited from the mental activities.” Of these “compound consciousness” is found in the *AFM*’s definition of the *ālayavijñāna*.²⁴ Therefore, the activating consciousness, the evolving consciousness, and the manifesting consciousness, all of which correspond respectively to each of the three defiled states of mind disunited from the mental activities, are within the realm of the *ālayavijñāna*.²⁵

Regarding textual evidence for the above thesis, Eun Jeong-hui (2002, 127) says that the *LAS*’s passages that Wonhyo cites provide a definition of the manifesting consciousness, which is identical to the one given in the *AFM*. Thus, she maintains that we can identify the activating consciousness, the evolving consciousness, and the manifesting consciousness—which are none other than the marks of subtle arising and cessation—with the minute thoughts without doubt.

Although there is a possibility that the *AFM*’s notion of “minute thoughts” can be understood differently,²⁶ Eun Jeong-hui’s foregoing thesis, which is based on the text of the *AFM*, is acceptable. But the *LAS*’s passages Wonhyo quotes from are open to different interpretations and we will re-examine this issue in the following.

Re-examination of Wonhyo’s Thesis of the Three Subtle Marks as Aspects of the *Ālayavijñāna*: Centered on Passages from the *LAS*

Wonhyo cites passages from diverse scriptures and treatises such as the *LAS*, the *Wuxiang lun* (i.e., *Zhuanshi lun*), and the *She dasheng lun shi* 攝大乘論釋 (**Mahāyāna-saṃgraha-bhāṣya*) attributed to Paramārtha’s translation, in order

to corroborate his thesis that the three subtle marks are aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. Of these texts he frequently resorts to the *LAS* and makes the scripture a fundamental textual evidence for the thesis.²⁷ Now, the six passages from the *LAS*, which are quoted for the justification of the thesis, will be analyzed and the validity of Wonhyo's thesis will be re-examined.

Re-examination of the notion of the evolving consciousness based on the *LAS*'s passage

As mentioned above, in the statement (a) Wonhyo quotes a passage from the four-fascicle *LAS*. The passage in question states that just as an atom of earth is neither identical with nor different from a lump of earth, the forthcoming consciousness and the true mark of the storehouse consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*) is neither identical nor different. We will not go into details of this simile but analyze the scripture's statement concerning the relationship of the forthcoming consciousness and the storehouse consciousness. The following is a passage from the *Byeolgi*.

It is the same as what is said in the four-fascicle *LAS*. . . . If the forthcoming consciousness (*zhuanshi* 轉識, Skt. *pravṛttivijñāna*) is different from the true mark (*zhenxiang* 真相, Skt. *jātilakṣaṇa*) of the *ālayavijñāna*, the *ālayavijñāna* cannot be a cause [for the former]. If the two are not different, the extinction of the former will entail that of the latter. But it is not the case that [the *ālayavijñāna*'s] own true mark is extinguished. Therefore there is no extinction of the consciousness with its own true mark; only the mark of karma (*yexiang* 業相, *karmalakṣaṇa*) is extinguished.²⁸

Wonhyo interprets the forthcoming consciousness, appearing in the above passage from the *Byeolgi*, as the mark of perceiving, which is arising and ceasing in the *ālayavijñāna*. He then considers the *ālayavijñāna* as a whole to be its self-witnessing aspect.²⁹ In the *So*, he comments that since the *ālayavijñāna* can transform itself and arouse the function of subjective perceiving (*nengjian* 能見) on the basis of the mind that moves (*dongxin* 動心), it is called the evolving consciousness.³⁰ In the *So* he also identifies the mark of karma (*yexiang* 業相, Skt. *karmalakṣaṇa*) with the activating consciousness (*yesbi* 業識) and considers both of the activating consciousness and the evolving consciousness to be aspects of

the *ālayavijñāna*.³¹ Thus, it is evident that Wonhyo identifies the terms such as the forthcoming consciousness and the mark of karma, appearing in the *LAS*, respectively with the evolving consciousness and the mark of karma appearing in the text of the *AFM*.

But we should note that Wonhyo's interpretation of the text does not necessarily correspond to the original context in which the above quotation occurs. In particular, the term "forthcoming consciousness" (*zhuanshi* 轉識, *pravṛttivijñāna*) just means the consciousness that evolves at a surface level as opposed to the latent *ālayavijñāna*, which can be ascertained from its Sanskrit equivalent. Therefore, it should not be understood as the mark of perceiving or the function of subjective perceiving inherent in the *ālayavijñāna* as Wonhyo thinks.³² Fazang, however, interprets the forthcoming consciousness, appearing in the passage from the *LAS*, as the seven consciousnesses as a whole and this shows that his understanding is more faithful to the original context of the *LAS*.³³

In order to support his thesis that the evolving consciousness of the *AFM* belongs to the realm of the *ālayavijñāna*, Wonhyo quotes a passage from the ten-fascicle *LAS* just after the above citation as follows.

It is just like what is said in the ten-fascicle scripture (i.e., *LAS*). When the *tathāgatagarbha*, namely the *ālayavijñāna*, arises with the seven consciousnesses, it is called the mark of evolution and cessation (*zhuanshi xiang* 轉識相).³⁴

According to the above passage, the mark of evolution and cessation indicates the arising of the seven consciousnesses together with the *ālayavijñāna*, which is identified with the *tathāgatagarbha*. But this term includes the word "cessation" (*mie* 滅), which makes it hard to understand and open to question whether it can be identified with the mark of evolution.³⁵ Furthermore, the extant Sanskrit text of the *LAS* does not have a term that corresponds to the mark of evolution and cessation.³⁶ The four-fascicle *LAS*,³⁷ the Chinese translation of its Sanskrit original and the text supposed to be Wonhyo's reference, as well as the Tibetan version of the scripture,³⁸ does not have the term, either. Wonhyo thus understands the evolving consciousness of the *AFM*, namely the mark of evolution, on the basis of the term only occurring in Bodhiruci's translation of the *LAS*.³⁹ In his commentary on the *AFM*, Fazang, however, does not cite this passage from the *LAS*.⁴⁰

In the *LAS*, the consciousness is classified into three types as follows, and this classification is not noted by Wonhyo.

Mahāmāti!⁴¹ The consciousness has three types: [the consciousness with] the forthcoming mark (Skt. *pravṛttīlakṣaṇam*), that with the mark of karma (Skt. *karmalakṣaṇam*), that with the true mark (Skt. *jātilakṣaṇam*).⁴²

Regarding these three marks, the Indian exegete Jñānaśrībhadrā (fl. 11th century) comments as follows.

The [three types of] consciousness is [like this]. When the eye-consciousness and so on occurs with respect to a visual object such a material form, it is called the forthcoming consciousness. When the consciousness recognizes that object immediately thereafter, it is called the mark of karma. The *ālayavijñāna* itself, which is pervasive, is called the true mark. . . .⁴³

This passage makes it clear that the *ālayavijñāna* is the true mark and that the consciousness occurring with respect its object is the forthcoming consciousness. Therefore, we can identify the forthcoming mark with the characteristic of giving rise to something, which is attributed to the forthcoming consciousness. Here the mark of karma is understood as the consciousness's function of recognizing its object after the consciousness occurs. Again, this comment by Jñānaśrībhadrā makes it clear that the forthcoming consciousness referred to in the *LAS* is none other than our ordinary consciousness, which is distinguished from the latent consciousness called the *ālayavijñāna*. And this fact can be ascertained from the four-fascicle *LAS* and the ten-fascicle *LAS*.⁴⁴ In other words, we do not have textual evidence that supports the thesis that identifies the *LAS*'s concept of the forthcoming consciousness with part of the *ālayavijñāna* from the original text of the *LAS* and its Indian commentary, as well as the Chinese translations of the *LAS*.

Re-examination of the manifesting consciousness occurring in the passage from the *LAS*

Since Wonhyo does not provide a corresponding scriptural passage from the *LAS* in the abovementioned statement (b), I will just examine his statement

(c) and a passage quoted from the *LAS*. As mentioned before, here Wonhyo presents a full-fledged thesis that puts the three subtle marks within the realm of the *ālayavijñāna*.

Wonhyo's statement in the *So* is as follows and here a passage from the *LAS* is quoted. In the *Byeolgi* he quotes this passage in order to explain the manifesting consciousness which is one of the five types of thought.

It is like what is said in the four-fascicle scripture (i.e., *LAS*). "Mahāmati! Briefly speaking, there are three consciousnesses; concretely speaking, there are eight marks. What are the three [consciousnesses]? They are the true consciousness (*zbenshi* 眞識), the manifesting consciousness (*xianshi* 現識), and the discriminating consciousness (*fenbie shishi* 分別事識). Mahāmati! Just as a clear mirror has images of many objects, so the manifesting consciousness is revealed in this way."⁴⁵

In the *So*, Wonhyo does not provide a detailed comment on the above quotation from the *LAS*. Here Wonhyo might have considered the passage in question to be self-evident and need no further explications.⁴⁶ He then quotes a passage from the *AFM* where the manifesting consciousness is explained, and says that all of these passages reveal the fundamental consciousness (i.e., *ālayavijñāna*) on the basis of the mark of manifestation (i.e., manifesting consciousness). In sum, he makes a strong case for the thesis that since the manifesting consciousness exists in the fundamental consciousness, the subtler marks of karma and evolution cannot be situated in the sixth or seventh consciousness.⁴⁷

In the *Byeolgi*, Wonhyo makes previous statement (d) by quoting the same passage from the *LAS* in order to explain the manifesting consciousness. Here he makes quotation just in order to explicate the simile of a clear mirror, which occurs within the context of introducing the manifesting consciousness. Again, however, he emphatically maintains that the manifesting consciousness as well as the activating consciousness does exist in the eighth consciousness, or the *ālayavijñāna* just as he does in the *So*.⁴⁸

Wonhyo's understanding of the manifesting consciousness can be discerned in other passages he quotes from the *LAS*. In statement (e), Wonhyo explains the six defiled states of mind, which comes under the heading "Marks of Arising and Cessation," and here the six defiled states of mind are divided into two types, namely coarse and subtle ones. The *AFM* comments that the two

types of arising and cessation are caused by the causes and conditions. Having commented on the causes and conditions of arising and cessation, Wonhyo makes a citation from the *LAS* as follows.

It is like what is said in the four-fascicle scripture (i.e., *LAS*). “Mahāmati! Inconceivable permeation and inconceivable transformation are the causes of the manifesting consciousness. Mahāmati! The appropriation of varied objects and the beginningless permeation of deluded thought are the causes of the discriminating consciousness.”⁴⁹

Having explained on the inconceivable permeation and the inconceivable transformation, which are regarded as the causes of the manifesting consciousness, Wonhyo makes the following comment.

[Inconceivable] permeation and [inconceivable] transformation are so subtle and inscrutable that the marks of the manifesting consciousness, which are caused [by these two], are also extremely subtle. The evolving consciousness and the activating consciousness are also [caused by them]. But just because the coarse one is represented and the subtler ones are implied, only the manifesting consciousness is mentioned.⁵⁰

Again, Wonhyo states that the manifesting consciousness, which is the coarsest of the three subtle marks, are just referred to as a representative and that the activating consciousness and the evolving consciousness are also caused by the inconceivable permeation and transformation. Although he does not make an explicit statement, it is easy to see that he bases his thesis on the premise that all the three subtle marks belong to the *ālayavijñāna*.

As noted above, Wonhyo's identification of the three subtle marks with the aspects of the *ālayavijñāna* seems to be fundamentally based on the concept of the manifesting consciousness referred to in the two passages from the *LAS*. In other words, he first identifies the manifesting consciousness mentioned in the quotations with the manifesting consciousness referred to in the *AFM*. He then thinks that since the manifesting consciousness occurring in the *LAS* indicates the eighth consciousness, the consciousness with the same name occurring in the *AFM* also indicates the eighth consciousness. Here Wonhyo's reasoning is that if the manifesting consciousness corresponds to

the eighth consciousness, then the subtler consciousness such as the activating consciousness and the transforming consciousness should correspond to the eighth consciousness. In this respect the way in which Wonhyo understands the manifesting consciousness seems to have the most crucial role in his thesis of the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*.

Does the manifesting consciousness (Skt. *khyātivijñāna*) referred to in the *LAS* really indicate the *ālayavijñāna*? This issue is so subtle that the modern scholars who study the *LAS* dissent upon its interpretation, which is quite different from the issue of how to understand the forthcoming consciousness. It is because the *LAS* does not present a clear definition of the manifesting consciousness. In order to understand the manifesting consciousness of the *LAS*, the later commentaries on the scripture will be helpful. Concerning the relationship between the manifesting consciousness and the discriminating consciousness, the *LAS* explains as follows.

Mahāmati! The two consciousnesses of the manifesting consciousness and the discriminating consciousness do not have a distinct characteristic. The two causes each other.⁵¹

The *LAS* classifies the eight consciousnesses into two types without assigning different characteristics to them. It further states that the two causes each other. Regarding these two consciousnesses, Jñānaśrībhadrā makes the following comments:

The expression “Mahāmati! The two consciousnesses of the manifesting consciousness and the discriminating consciousness” means that [the two consciousnesses] do recognize their objects. The former belongs to the [five consciousnesses] such as the eye-consciousness; the latter indicates the [sixth] consciousness. The expression “causes each other” means that the [sixth] consciousness is an immediately antecedent condition (Skt. *samanantara-pratyaya*) for such consciousnesses as the eye-consciousness and that such consciousnesses as the eye-consciousness is also an immediately antecedent condition for the sixth consciousness.⁵²

Here Jñānaśrībhadrā attributes the function of recognizing objects to the two consciousnesses, and then identifies the manifesting consciousness

with the five sense consciousnesses such as the eye-consciousness and the discriminating consciousness with the sixth consciousness. Commenting on the expression “causes each other,” once again he confirms that the manifesting consciousness is none other than the five sense consciousnesses preceding the sixth consciousness, such as the eye-consciousness. Following Jñānaśrībhadrā's lead, several modern scholars regard the manifesting consciousness as the five sense consciousnesses.⁵³

His comment, however, is not necessarily easy to understand. It is because that although the text of the *LAS* classifies the eight consciousnesses into two types, these two types of consciousness are just explained in terms of the six consciousnesses. In this regard, the statement made in the four-fascicle *LAS*, which classifies the eight consciousnesses into three types, its true mark included, is more intelligible. If we consider the true mark of consciousness or the true consciousness to be the *ālayavijñāna* identified with the *tathāgatagarbha*, we may say that all the eight consciousnesses are classified into three types in the *LAS*.⁵⁴ Moreover, because Jñānaśrībhadrā was active during the 11th century, we could doubt that his interpretation does precisely reflect how the concept of the manifesting consciousness was understood during the time in which the *LAS* was compiled. Nevertheless, it is evident that in the Indian commentarial tradition there existed a view positing the manifesting consciousness within the realm of the five sense consciousnesses, not that of the *ālayavijñāna*.

Here the Kyoū shooku text of the *Dasheng qixin lun shu* is noteworthy. This text identifies the manifesting consciousness with the five sense consciousnesses just as the Indian commentary on the *LAS* does.⁵⁵ Although the Kyoū shooku text of the *Dasheng qixin lun shu* does not have evidence that it was influenced by the *LAS*, it takes note of the *AFM*'s text itself⁵⁶ and regards the manifesting consciousness as the five sense consciousnesses.⁵⁷ This shows that if we base ourselves only on the *AFM*'s text, we cannot necessarily consider the manifesting consciousness to be the eighth consciousness.

If so, does an East Asian commentarial tradition on the *LAS*, which was probably available to Wonhyo, have a precedent that understood the manifesting consciousness and the forthcoming consciousness just as he does? The answer seems to be negative at this moment in which no relevant textual evidence has been found.

Zhiyan's 智儼 (602–668) commentary on the four-fascicle *LAS*, which

Wonhyo might have drawn upon, does not expound upon the three passages [(c), (d), and (e)] Wonhyo quotes from the *LAS*.⁵⁸ Except for Zhiyan's exegesis, all the commentaries on the four-fascicle *LAS* are produced after Wonhyo's works.⁵⁹

Although the oldest extant commentary on the ten-fascicle *LAS* has been recently reported,⁶⁰ the passage in question is not left and we cannot ascertain the influence this commentary had upon Wonhyo's exegesis. While Wonhyo himself left a commentary on the *LAS*,⁶¹ the text is not extant and we cannot ascertain its content.

Finally, it is possible that the *Ru lengqie jing shu* 楞伽經疏 by Bodhiruci (Putiliuzhi 菩提流支, fl. 508–527), who also translated the *LAS*, influenced Wonhyo's understanding of the two consciousnesses referred to in the *AFM*. Although the whole text of Bodhiruci's commentary is not left, his comments on the manifesting consciousness (*xianshi* 現識 = *liaobie shi* 了別識) and the discriminating consciousness (*fenbie shishi* 分別事識) is partially available. According to them, the discriminating consciousness is not the sixth consciousness but the six consciousnesses as a whole.⁶² But we cannot find his explanation on the manifesting consciousness. Although the commentary has some explanations on the three marks (i.e., the forthcoming mark, the mark of karma, and the true mark) and identifies the mark of karma with the seventh consciousness, its explanations on the remaining two marks are not available.⁶³

As noted above, we cannot find any link that associates the evolving consciousness and the manifesting consciousness with the *ālayavijñāna* in the East Asian commentarial tradition prior to Wonhyo's time.

If so, where did Wonhyo find the textual ground that supports his association of the evolving consciousness and the manifesting consciousness, in particular, with the *ālayavijñāna*? The answer to this question remains tentative because we do not have explicit philological evidence.

The *Xianshi lun*'s Concept of the Manifesting Consciousness (*Xianshi* 顯識, Skt. **kbyātivijñāna*)

Concerning the issue of how to justify Wonhyo's thesis regarding the three subtle marks, we may refer to the text of the *AFM* itself just as Eun Jeong-hui (2002, 124–127) does. According to Eun, the *AFM* attributes the three

subtle marks, the manifesting consciousness (i.e., mark of the objective world) in particular, to be aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. As mentioned before, Eun's formulation is acceptable with the exception of a possibility that the "minute thoughts" can be understood differently. But it would not be fruitful to find textual evidence for the thesis from the text of the *LAS* in which the theory of mind is presented. It is because it is hard to find an interpretation that attributes the manifesting consciousness to the *ālayavijñāna* from the *LAS* itself as well as Indian and East Asian commentarial traditions on this scripture.⁶⁴

If so, how could Wonhyo make a strong case for his thesis? Here the treatise entitled *Xianshi lun* 顯識論, of which translation is attributed to Paramārtha, merits a special attention.⁶⁵ This treatise is understood as part of the *Wuxiang lun* 無相論. When Wonhyo comments on the mark of karma produced by ignorance, appearing in the *AFM*, he quotes a passage from the *Wuxiang lun*.⁶⁶ Therefore, it is highly plausible that Wonhyo was aware of the *Xianshi lun*, which is part of the *Wuxiang lun* despite the fact that he does not make a direct citation from the *Xianshi lun*.

In the beginning part of the *Xianshi lun*, it is declared that the triple world is consciousness-only. The treatise goes on to say that there exist two kinds of consciousness in the triple world and defines the two consciousnesses as follows.

The manifesting consciousness is none other than the fundamental consciousness. . . . What is the discriminating consciousness? It is the sixth consciousness. . . . Just as an image of a thing occurs by relying on a mirror, the discriminating consciousness occurs with the manifesting consciousness as its condition.⁶⁷

The *Xianshi lun* defines the manifesting consciousness and the discriminating consciousness as the fundamental consciousness and the sixth consciousness respectively. By resorting to the simile of mirror, it then explains the relationship between the manifesting consciousness and the discriminating consciousness. This explanation as well as the simile precisely corresponds to the structure of the two consciousnesses as represented in the *LAS*.⁶⁸ This means that either the theory of mind as represented in the *Xianshi lun* explicitly relies on the *LAS*⁶⁹ or the *Xianshi lun*'s theory has at least a common

origin with that of the *LAS*.⁷⁰

The *Xianshi lun* then explains the two consciousnesses in terms of the eleven consciousnesses, which are referred to in the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. Although the *Xianshi lun*'s exposition of the discriminating consciousness is rather confusing, the treatise still clarifies that the manifesting consciousness is of nine kinds and that the discriminating consciousness corresponds to the seventh *ādānavijñāna* and the sixth *mano-vijñāna*.⁷¹

Therefore, if we follow the *Xianshi lun*'s explanation, we should say that the manifesting consciousness indicates the five sense consciousnesses and the eighth consciousness in particular. And the discriminating consciousness should be identified with the sixth and seventh consciousnesses. If the *Xianshi lun* was derived from the *LAS*, it is quite possible that there existed an Indian commentarial tradition that considers the manifesting consciousness to be the eighth consciousness and the five sense consciousnesses. But such an alternative tradition should be distinguished from the commentarial tradition that follows Jñānaśrībhadrā. We may assume that this alternative tradition was transmitted in East Asia through the works of Paramārtha. If this assumption is justified, we may say that Wonhyo's thesis of the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna* was formed by making a detour through that alternative commentarial tradition of the *LAS* which is attributed to Paramārtha. Furthermore, if this conjecture is correct, Wonhyo's understanding of the manifesting consciousness can be considered to have been derived from one of the diverse commentarial traditions of the *LAS*, especially that of Indian origins.

Conclusion

In this essay, we have re-examined Wonhyo's thesis of the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna* and the plausibility of the thesis. Unlike the previous commentaries on the *AFM*, Wonhyo's text defines the three subtle marks, which belong to the category of the secondary non-enlightenment, as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*. Wonhyo's thesis was later followed by Fazang and made a standard for the interpretation of the three subtle and six coarse marks. For the most part, Wonhyo justifies his thesis by making citations from the *LAS*.

Our re-examination of the passages Wonhyo quotes from the *LAS*, however, shows that his interpretation is not necessarily faithful to the original text of the *LAS*. The original Sanskrit text of the *LAS* and the later Indian commentarial tradition make it clear that the concept of the forthcoming consciousness, appearing in the *LAS*, corresponds to the seventh consciousness, which is distinguished from the *ālayavijñāna*. Regarding the *AFM*'s theory of mind, Fazang, who was contemporary with Wonhyo, had an idea similar to that of Wonhyo, but their understanding of the evolving consciousness as an aspect of the *ālayavijñāna* lacks textual evidence even if only the Chinese translations were available to them.

The concept of the manifesting consciousness, occurring in the *LAS* and adopted by Wonhyo, seems to have exerted a definitive influence on his identification of that consciousness with the *ālayavijñāna*. But the text of the *LAS* does not provide an explicit definition of the manifesting consciousness. Moreover, we see that the later Indian commentaries on the *LAS* identified the manifesting consciousness with the five sense consciousnesses. And the positive textual evidence that supports Wonhyo's thesis is hard to find even from the commentaries on the *LAS* which were composed in East Asia and thought to have been available to him.

In this respect, I have paid attention to the concept of the manifesting consciousness appearing in the *Xianshi lun* of which translation is attributed to Paramārtha. This treatise distinguishes the manifesting consciousness and the discriminating consciousness just as the *LAS* does, and explains the relationship between the two consciousnesses with a simile of mirror again just as the *LAS* does. Thus, it seems clear that the concept of the manifesting consciousness appearing in the *Xianshi lun* was derived from the *LAS* or that the treatise had a common textual origin with the *LAS*. If so, we may be justified in considering the *Xianshi lun*'s concept of the manifesting consciousness Paramārtha transmitted to be an interpretation of the consciousness with the same name, which appears in the *LAS*. It is thus possible that Wonhyo identified the concept of the manifesting consciousness, appearing both in the *LAS* and the *AFM*, on the basis of the *Xianshi lun* purportedly translated by Paramārtha. Wonhyo's theory of mind can then be considered to have reflected an alternative interpretation of the *LAS*, which is different from Jñānaśrībhadrā's view. And this could show that Wonhyo's thesis of the three subtle marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna* is of Indian origins.

Notes

¹ Generally speaking, the correlations between the three subtle and six coarse marks, the five types of thought, and the six defiled states of mind can be illustrated as follows.

Table 1 Correlations between the three subtle and six coarse marks, five types of thought, and six defiled states of mind

three subtle and six coarse marks	five types of thought	six defiled states of mind
mark of karma produced by ignorance (<i>wumingye xiang</i> 無明業相)	activating consciousness (<i>yeshi</i> 業識 = <i>yexiang</i> 業相)	defilement disunited from the fundamental karma (<i>genben ye bu xiangying ran</i> 根本業不相應染)
mark of the subjective perceiving (<i>nengjian xiang</i> 能見相)	evolving consciousness (<i>zhuanshi</i> 轉識 = <i>zhuanshi</i> 轉相)	defilement disunited from the perceiving mind (<i>nengjian xin bu xiangying ran</i> 能見心不相應染)
mark of the objective world (<i>jingjie xiang</i> 境界相)	manifesting consciousness (<i>xianshi</i> 現識 = <i>xianxiang</i> 現相)	defilement disunited from the manifested forms (<i>xianse bu xiangying ran</i> 現色不相應染)
mark of discriminating knowledge (<i>zhixiang</i> 智相)	discriminating consciousness (<i>zhishi</i> 智識)	defilement united from the discriminating knowledge (<i>fenbie zhi xiangying ran</i> 分別智相應染)
mark of continuity (<i>xiangxu xiang</i> 相續相)	continuing consciousness (<i>xiangxu shi</i> 相續識)	defilement united with the continuing consciousness (<i>buduan xiangying ran</i> 不斷相應染)
mark of attachment (<i>zhiqu xiang</i> 執取相) mark of the conceptualizing names (<i>ji mingzi xiang</i> 計名字相)		defilement united with attachment (<i>zhi xiangying ran</i> 執相應染)
mark of producing karma (<i>qiye xiang</i> 起業相)		
mark of suffering produced by karma (<i>yexi kuxiang</i> 業繫苦相)		

The above three categories serve different explanations. The category of the three subtle and six coarse marks explains the aspect of non-enlightenment inherent in the *ālayavijñāna* in terms of the fundamental ignorance; that of the five types of thought

- explains the process in which the *ālayavijñāna* and ignorance give rise to the arising and cessation of mind; and that of the six defiled states of mind explains the way in which ignorance comes to an end in a detailed fashion. See Yoshizu (1976, 160).
- 2 Eun Jeong-hui (2002, 122 n. 29) locates fourteen passages from the *Daeseung gisil-lon so gi boebon*. The passages indicated in this paper are basically identical with those Eun locates.
 - 3 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 228c26–229a5); *So* (T 44, 202b26–c3); *Lengqie abatuoluo baojing* 楞伽阿跋多羅寶經 (T 16, 483a26–b3), “譬如 ... 如是轉識 藏識 真相 若異者 藏識非異 若不異者 轉識滅藏識亦應滅 而自真相實不滅 是故非真識滅 但業相滅。”
 - 4 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 229a4–5), “此言轉識者 梨耶識內生滅見相 名為轉識 於中體名為藏識。”
 - 5 *So* (T 44, 208c4–6), “此中業識者 因無明力不覺心動 故名業識 又依動心轉成能見 故名轉識 此二皆在梨耶識位。”
 - 6 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 231a13–21); *So* (T 44.209b12–c20), “生相三者 一名業相 ... 二者轉相 ... 三者現相 ... 此三者是阿梨耶識位所有差別。”
 - 7 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 233c28ff); *So* (T 44.212b1ff), “如無想論云 問此識何相何境 答相及境不可分別 一體無異..”
 - 8 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 234a6), “如是等文 正約業相 而說也”; *So* (T 44.212b7), “此等文意 正約業相 顯本識也。”
 - 9 *So* (T 44, 212b10–11), “如是轉相雖有能緣 而未能顯所緣境相。”
 - 10 *So* (T 44, 212b23–24), “如是等文 約於現相以顯本識。”
 - 11 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 235b15–19), “然轉識有二 若說無明所動能見 名為轉識者 是在阿梨耶識 如其境界 所動能見 名轉識者 是謂七識 二義不同 不可相濫 又有處說 諸是能見 通名轉識 則通八識 今此中轉相 是緣初義也。”
 - 12 For the above explanation of the three marks as aspects of the *ālayavijñāna*, see Eun Jeong-hui (2002, 120–123); Ryu Seung-ju (2003).
 - 13 *Dasheng qixin lun yishu* (Z 1, 71.3.274c3–5), “復生六種相者 謂是分別妄相差別也 此之六種 前五明因 後一顯果 俱是意識功能也。”
 - 14 *Dasheng qixin lun yishu* (Z 1, 71.3.275b13–15), “但今此所明 為欲攝末就本 六七等識皆是 本識上用 故合皆約本識 釋此三名 顯因緣義。”
 - 15 *Dasheng qixin lun yishu* (T 44, 186a10–11), “此中隨義辯者 七識中有六 六識之中有四也。” Here Huiyuan adds the three subtle and six coarse marks to the element of ignorance, thus making ten marks in total. He then considers the first six items to correspond to the seventh consciousness. Accordingly, he identifies all of the three subtle marks and the mark of discriminating knowledge and the mark of continuity, which are included in the six coarse marks, with the seventh consciousness. See Yoshizu (1976, 160); Park Tae-won (1993, 48).
 - 16 *Dasheng qixin lun yishu* (T 44, 186c5–6), “所謂衆生依心者 是第八識也 意意識轉故 七六識也。” See Yoshizu (1976, 160); Park Tae-won (1993, 48).
 - 17 Concerning the two commentaries on the *AFM*, namely Tanyan's text and the Kyoū shooku text, Ikeda (2012, 79, n.51) discusses which comes first on the basis of the

- correlations between the three subtle and six coarse marks, five types of thought, and the six defiled states of mind.
- 18 See Ikeda (2012, 153f).
- 19 For the table that shows the correlations between the three subtle and six coarse marks and the eight consciousnesses which can be gleaned from the three representative commentaries on the *AFM* in addition to Tanyan's commentary, see Yoshizu (1976, 160) and Lee Pyeong-rae (1996, 280–281).
- 20 For Wonhyo's identification of the mark of discriminating knowledge with the seventh consciousness, especially manas which is discussed by Xuanzang's Yogācāra school, see Kim Seong-cheol (2015).
- 21 *Dasheng qixin lun* (T 32, 576c7–9), “智淨相者 謂依法力熏習 如實修行 滿足方便故 破和合識相 滅相續心相 顯現法身智淨故。”
- 22 *Dasheng qixin lun* (T 32, 576b23–26), “如菩薩地盡 滿足方便 一念相應 覺心初起 心無初相 以遠離微細念故 得見心性 心即常住 名究竟覺。”
- 23 *Dasheng qixin lun* (T 32, 576b7–9), “復次 分別生滅相者 有二種。云何爲二 一者 僮與心相應故 二者 細與心不相應故。”
- 24 *Dasheng qixin lun* (T 32, 576b7–9), “心生滅者 依如來藏故 有生滅心 所謂 不生不滅與生滅和合 非一非異 名爲阿梨耶識。”
- 25 See Park Tae-won (1993, 121ff); Ryu Seung-ju (2002; 2003).
- 26 It is not clear whether the term “minute thoughts” (*weixi nian* 微細念) refers to all of the three subtle marks or to the mark of karma, first of the secondary non-enlightenment. Wonhyo's commentary seems to assign the minute thoughts to the mark of karma only. See *Byeolgi* (T 44, 232a21–22); So (T 44, 210b16), “業相動念 念中最細 名微細念。” Wonhyo's view is also accepted by Fazang. See *Dasheng qixin lun yiji* (T 44, 258c8–9), “業識動念 念中最細 名微細念 謂生相也。”
- 27 In the *Byeolgi*, Wonhyo quotes passages from the *LAS* thirty-four times in total. Of these, thirty-one passages are related to the section “Mind in Terms of Arising and Cessation,” which includes subsections entitled “Arising and Cessation of Mind” (18 passages from the *LAS*), “Causes and Conditions of Arising and Cessation” (6 passages), and “Marks of Arising and Cessation” (7 passages). In the *So* a similar emphasis on the section “Mind in Terms of Arising and Cessation” can be discerned. Here of the twenty-one passages from the *LAS*, sixteen passages are concerned with this section, which also includes the abovementioned subsections such as “Arising and Cessation of Mind” (9 passages), “Causes and Conditions of Arising and Cessation” (2 passages), and “Marks of Arising and Cessation” (5 passages). This shows that Wonhyo puts heavy emphasis on the *LAS* when he comments on the *AFM*'s theory of mind. The following table shows the passages Wonhyo quotes from the *LAS* in the *Byeolgi* and the *So*. The contents of the *AFM* in the table follow Kashiwagi's (2005, 370–371) formulation.

Table 3 Passages quoted from the *LAS* in the commentaries on the *AFM*

Contents of the <i>AFM</i>				<i>Byeolgi</i>	<i>So</i>	
I. The Reasons for Writing				-	-	
II. Outline				-	-	
III. Interpretation	1. Revelation of True Meaning	0) One Mind and Its Two Approaches		2	2	
		1) Mind in Terms of Suchness		-	-	
		2) Mind in Terms of Arising and Cessation	① Arising and Cessation of Mind	(a) <i>Ālayavijñāna</i>	11	5
				(b) Enlightenment	3	1
				(c) Non-enlightenment	4	3
			② Causes and Conditions of Arising and Cessation	(a) Mind	1	-
				(b) Thought	4	1
				(c) Consciousness	1	1
		③ Marks of Arising and Cessation		7	5	
		④ Permeation		-	-	
	⑤ Three Types of Greatness		-	-		
	3) Entry into Suchness		-	-		
2. Correction of Evil Attachments		-	-			
3. Analysis of the Types of Aspiration		1	2			
IV. On Faith and Practice				-	1	
Sum (repeated passages included)		(passages from the four-fascicle <i>LAS</i>)		34	21	
		(passages from the ten-fascicle <i>LAS</i>)				(17)

28 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 228c26–229a3); *So* (T 44, 208b26–c3), “如四卷經云 ... 如是轉識 藏識真相 若異者 藏識非因 若不異者 轉識滅 藏識亦應滅 而自真相 實不滅 是故非自真相識滅 但業相滅”; *Lengqie abatuoluo baojing* (T 16, 483a26–b3); *LAS* 38.8–18, “evam eva mahāmate pravṛttivijñānāny ālayavijñānajātīlakṣaṇād anyāni syur anālayavijñānahetukāni syuḥ / athānanyāni pravṛttivijñānanirodha ālayavijñānanirodhaḥ syāt sa ca na bhavati svajātilakṣaṇanirodhaḥ / tasmān mahāmate na svajātilakṣaṇanirodho vijñānānām kiṃtu karmalakṣaṇanirodhaḥ.” See Yasui (1976, 36); Eun Jeong-hu (1991, 125); Takasaki (2015, 103); Ōtake (2003, 68).

29 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 229a4–5), “此言轉識者 梨耶識內生滅見相 名為轉識 於中體名為藏識。”

30 *So* (T 44, 208c5), “又依動心轉成能見 故名轉識。” Here Wonhyo's interpretation is based

- on the *AFM*'s definition of the evolving consciousness. *Dasheng qixin lun* (T 32, 585c27), “二名轉識 謂依動心能見境相。”
- 31 *So* (T 44, 208c4–6), “此中業識者 因無明力不覺心動 故名業識 又依動心轉成能見 故名轉識 此二皆在梨耶識位。”
- 32 Ōtake (2003, 70f) introduces the following sentence from the *LAS* as a passage that corresponds to the *AFM*'s concept of the evolving consciousness and only occurs in Bodhiruci's Chinese rendering. *Ru lengqie jing* 入楞伽經 (T 16.538c2–3), “大慧 以依彼念觀有故 轉識滅七識亦滅。”
- 33 *Dasheng qixin lun yiji* (T 44, 256b26–27), “解云 此中真相是如來藏 轉識是七識 藏識是梨耶。”
- 34 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 229a5–7); *So* (T 44, 208c6–7), “如十卷經言 如來藏阿梨耶識 共七種識生 名轉滅相*”; *Ru lengqie jing* (T 16, 557a6–8). * In the *Byeolgi* “名轉相” is written instead of “名轉滅相。”
- 35 In the *Byeolgi* occurs “轉相” (the forthcoming mark) without the character “滅” (cessation). Therefore, if the *Byeolgi*'s passage is precise, then we cannot exclude the possibility that the passage in question from the *LAS* Wonhyo refers to has “轉相” only. See note 34.
- 36 *LAS* 223.1–3, “etad eva mahāmate mayā śrīmālāṃ devīm adhiḥṛtya deśanāpāṭhe 'nyāṃś ca sūkṣmanipuṇaviśuddhabuddhīn bodhisattvān adhiṣṭhāya tathāgatarbha ālayavijñānasamśabditaḥ saptabhir vijñānair saha pravṛtṭy (pravartate?) abhiniviṣṭānāṃ śrāvakānāṃ. . .” See Yasui (1976, 202–203). The passage Wonhyo quotes from the Chinese translation of the *LAS* corresponds to the underlined sentence. In the extant Sanskrit text of the *LAS* the word “pravṛtṭyabhiniviṣṭānāṃ” is written as a compound. The Chinese rendering of the word appearing in the four-fascicle *LAS* corresponds to the Sanskrit word *pravartate*, not *pravṛtti*. But the text of the Tibetan translation corresponds to the word appearing in the extant Sanskrit edition. See notes 37 and 38.
- 37 *Lengqie abatuoluo baojing* (T 16, 510c4–7), “大慧 我於此義以神力建立 令勝鬘夫人及利智 滿足諸菩薩等 宣揚演說 如來藏及識藏名 與七識俱生 聲聞計著 . . .”
- 38 *LAS_T(1)* P Mdo Ngu 157b2–4, “blo gros chen po de nyid lha mo dpal gyi phreng ba'i phyir bstan pa brjod pa dang / blo rnam par dag cing zhib mo yangs pa bkhas pa'i byang chub sems pa' gzhan rnam kyī ched du de bzhin shegs pa'i snying po kun gzhi rnam par shes par bsgrags pa rnam par shes pa bdun dang bcas pa / 'jug pa la mngon par chags pa'i nyan thos rnam la . . .”
- 39 For the close relationship between the *AFM*'s theory of mind, especially that of the evolving consciousness, and Bodhiruci's translation of the *LAS*, see Ōtake (2003, 70–72).
- 40 *Dasheng qixin lun yiji* (T 44, 255b27f).
- 41 In accordance with *LAS_T(1)* (P. Mdo Ngu 75b6) and the ten-fascicle *LAS* (T 16, 529c29), the word “Mahāmāti” is inserted.
- 42 *LAS* 37.12–14, “trividhaṃ vijñānaṃ pravṛttilakṣaṇaṃ karmalakṣaṇaṃ jātilakṣaṇaṃ ca.” See Yasui (1976, 35); *Lengqie abatuoluo baojing* (T 16, 483a14–15), “諸識有三種相 謂轉相業相真相”; *Ru lengqie jing* (T 44, 521c29–522a1), “大慧 識有三種 何等三種

- 一者轉相識 二者業相識 三者智相識。”
- 43 *LASV* (D Ni 67b1–3); Hadano (1993, 135b1–3), “de dag ni gzugs la sogs pa'i yul du snang ba rnam la mig la sogs pa'i rnam par shes pa gang 'jug pa de dag 'jug pa'i rnam par shes pa rnam so // gang de ma thag pa'i shes pa bya ba'i nan tan pa de ni las kyi mtshan nyid pa'o // gang khyab pa po kun gzhi rnam par shes pa ni rigs kyi mtshan nyid de / ...” See Ōtake (2001, 42).
- 44 Takasaki (1980, 136; 2015, 309) says that the true mark indicates the *ālayavijñāna* itself and that the mark of evolution refers to the consciousness's activity of recognizing its object. He considers the mark of karma to be a link that associates the true mark and the mark of evolution. In other words, he understands the mark of karma as habit energy or functions of seeds inherent in the *ālayavijñāna* that causes the evolving consciousness which arises and ceases momentarily.
- 45 *So* (T 44, 212b17–20), “大慧 略說有三種識 廣說有八相 何等爲三 謂真識現識 及分別事識 大慧 譬如明鏡持諸色像 現識處現* 亦復如是”; *Lengqie abatuoluo baojing* (T 16, 483a15–18). For a translation of the passage, see Takasaki and Horiuchi (2015, 102) and Eun Jeong-hui (1991). * The character “現” is added in the four-fascicle *LAS* and the *Byeolgi* (T 44, 235b5). The above translation is based on text that has this character.
- 46 Wonhyo seems to understand the true consciousness, the manifesting consciousness, and the discriminating consciousness, all of which occur in the *LAS*, as the *tathāgatagarbha*, the *ālayavijñāna*, and the sixth consciousness respectively.
- 47 *So* (T 44, 212b23–25), “如是等文 約於現相 以顯本識 如是現相既在本識 何況其本轉相業相反在六七識中說乎。”
- 48 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 235b26–28), “當知 現識定在第八 其業識等 與此作本 其相彌細 如何強將置七識中, 甚可乎。”
- 49 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 283b3–5); *So* (T 44.216a29–b2), “如四卷經云 大慧 不思議熏 及不思議變 是現識因 取種種塵 及無始妄想熏 是分別事識因”; *Lengqie abatuoluo baojing* (T 16, 483a19–21). See Takasaki and Horiuchi (2015, 309).
- 50 *So* (T 44, 216b6–8), “此熏及變甚微且隱 故所起現識行相微細 於中亦有轉識業識 然舉羸兼細 故但名現識也。” See Eun Jeong-hui (1991, 263f).
- 51 *LAS* 37.17–18, “khyātivijñānaṃ ca mahāmate vastuprativikalpavijñānaṃ ca dve 'py ete 'bhinnalakṣaṇe 'nyonyahetuke.” See Yasui (1976, 35).
- 52 *LASV* (D Ni 67b6–68a2); Hadano (1993, 135b6–137a2), “blo gros chen po snang ba'i rnam par shes pa“ dang dngos po so sor rnam par rtog pa'i rnam par shes pa de nyid ni zhes bya ba yul gyi rnam par chud pa'i rnam par shes pa dag go // snang ba'i rnam par shes pa ni mig la sogs pa'i rnam par shes pa'i bar du'o // dngos po so sor rnam par rtog pa'i rnam par shes pa ni/ yid kyi rnam par shes pa'o // ... gcig gi rgyu gcig go zhes bya ba ni yid kyi rnam par shes pa mig la sogs pa'i rnam par shes pa rnam kyi de ma thag pa'i rkyen byed pa dang / mig la sogs pa'i shes pa de dag kyang yid kyi rnam par shes pa'i de ma thag pa'i rkyen du nye bar 'gro ba'i phyir ro.” See Ōtake (2001, 44).
- 53 See Yasui (1972, 5); Takasaki (1980, 136); Takasaki and Horiuchi (2015, 309). For

- a summary of the concept of the manifesting consciousness made by contemporary scholars in Buddhist studies, see Jeong (forthcoming).
- 54 See Takasaki (1980, 136); Takasaki and Horiuchi (2015, 309).
- 55 See Ikeda (2012, 153), “三名現識者 即是五識。”
- 56 *Dasheng qixin lun* (T 32, 577b8–11), “三者名爲現識 所謂能現一切境界 猶如明鏡現於色像 現識亦爾 隨其五塵 對至即現 無有前後 以一切時 任運而起 常在前故。”
- 57 See Ikeda (2012, 153), “此以何義復名現識 以此識緣現在五塵 不見別法 自分別一分 成境界相 還自見也。”
- 58 *Lengqie jing zhu* (Z 1, 91.2); *Lengqie jing shu* (Z 1, 91.2).
- 59 For commentaries on the *LAS*, see Takasaki (1980, 416–419).
- 60 See Lee Sang-min (2013; 2014).
- 61 *So* (T 44, 208c14–15), “翻名釋義 是如楞伽宗要中說。”
- 62 See Takemura (1985, 279); Ōtake (2001, 44).
- 63 See Ōtake (2001, 42f).
- 64 Concerning this issue, Takemura (1985, 272ff) says that the *AFM*'s theory of mind is based on the structure of the two consciousnesses such as the manifesting consciousness and the discriminating consciousness. He also says that the *AFM*'s theory corresponds to the *LAS*'s theory of mind that includes the simile of mirror and the explanation of the two consciousnesses.
- 65 According to Funayama (2012, 19), the *Xianshi lun* has a characteristic of a commentary work on the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. He further says that the *Xianshi lun* can be considered a lecture note on the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*. The *Xianshi lun* is also known as part of the *Wuxiang lun* together with the *Shiba kong lun* 十八空論 and the *San wuxing lun* 三無性論. The *Zhuanshi lun* is said to be part of the *Wuxiang lun*, too. See Radich (2012, 58, n. 62).
- 66 *Byeolgi* (T 44, 233c29–234a5); *So* (T 44, 212b1–7), “如無想論云 問 此識何相何境 答 相及境不可分別 一體無異 ... 本識亦爾。” This passage appears in the *Zhuanshi lun* (T 31, 61c13–62a2), which is now understood as part of the *Wuxiang lun*.
- 67 *Xianshi lun* (T 31, 878c5–10), “顯識者 即是本識 ... 何者分別識 即是意識 ... 譬如依鏡色 影色得起 如是緣顯識 分別識得起。”
- 68 The same simile of mirror occurs in the *AFM* where the manifesting consciousness is explained. See note 56.
- 69 Takemura (1985, 274ff) maintains that the *Xianshi lun*'s theory of mind is derived from the *LAS* and that there existed the theory of eight consciousnesses and that of two consciousnesses in the Indian commentarial tradition.
- 70 For the concept of the manifesting consciousness appearing in the *LAS* and the *Xianshi lun*, see Jeong (forthcoming).
- 71 *Xianshi lun* (T 31, 879b14–16), “顯識有九種 如上顯識 唯是梨耶 若是分別識 則是陀那及意識。”

Abbreviations

- LAS* *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Edited by Bunyiu Nanjio. Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1923.
- LAS_T(1)* 'phags pa Lang kar gshegs pa chen po'i mdo. P No. 775, D No. 107.
- LAS_T(2)* 'phags pa Lang kar gshegs pa rin po che'i mdo las Sangs rgyas thams cad kyi gsung po zhes bya ba'i le'u. P No. 776, D No.108 (Translated into Tibetan from the four-fascicle Chinese version of the LAS)
- LASV* *Laṅkāvatārasūtra-vṛtti*. P No. 5519; D No. 4018.

References

Primary Sources

- Daeseung gisil-lon byeolgi* 大乘起信論別記. By Wonhyo 元曉. T 44, no. 1845.
- Dasheng qixin lun yiji* 大乘起信論義記. By Fazang 法藏. T 44, no. 1846.
- Dasheng qixin lun yi shu* 大乘起信論義疏. By Tanyan 曇延, X 71.582–560 (Z 1.71.3)
- Gisillon-so* 起信論疏. By Wonhyo. T 44, no. 1844.
- Xinashi lun* 顯識論. Translated by Paramārtha. T 31, no. 1618.
- Zhuanshi lun* 轉識論. Translated by Paramārtha. T 31, no. 1587.

Secondary Sources

- Eun, Jeong-hui *Wonhyo ui Daeseung gisil-lon so byeolgi* [원효의 대승기신론소 별기].
은정희 Seoul: Iljisa.
1991
- 2002 [1983; 1987] “Wonhyo ui samse ariyasik seol ui chang’an” [원효의 삼세아리아식설의 창안]. In *Han'guk ui sasangga sibir Wonhyo* [한국의 사상가 10인 원효], ed. Go Yeongseop 고영섭, 112–139. Seoul: Yemun Seowon.
- Funayama, Tōru “Shindai no katsudō to chosaku no kihonteki tokuchō” [真諦
般山徹 の活動と著作の基本的特徴]. In *Shindai sanzō kenkyū ronshū* [真諦
2012 三藏研究論集], ed. Funayama Tōru 般山徹, 1–86. Kyoto: Kyōto
Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo.
- Hadano, Hakuyu *Shō Nyū ryōga kyō chū Chibetto Butten kenkyū sōsho dai yon shū*
羽田野伯猷 [聖入楞伽經註 ちベット佛典研究叢書(第4輯)]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
1993
- Ikeda, Masanori Kyoū shooku shozō *Donkō hon Daijō kishin ron shō gidai hane*
池田將則 sansansan bi ni tsuite [行雨書屋所藏敦煌本「大乘起信論疏」(擬題,
2012 羽333V)について]. *Bulgyohak ribyu* 12:45–167.

- Jeong, Ju-hee (forthcoming) “The Relationship between the *Lankāvatārasūtra* and Paramārtha’s Extant Corpus: On the Concepts of the *Khyātivijñāna* and the (*Vastu*)*prativikalpavijñāna*.”
- Kashiwagi, Hiroo 2005 “Shindai yaku *Daijō kishin ron*” [(真諦譯)大乘起信論]. *Shin kokuyaku daizōkyō Butsusei ron Daijō kishinron* [新國譯大藏經 佛性論·大乘起信論]. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
- 伯木弘雄 1980
- Kim, Seong-cheol 2015 “Wonhyo ui je chil mallasik gwan” [원효의 제7말나식관]. *Bulgyobak yeon’gu* 42:1–28.
- 김성철 2015
- Lee, Pyeong-rae 1996 *Silla Bulgyo yeoraejang sasang yeon’gu* [신라불교여래장사상연구]. Seoul: Minjoksa.
- 이평래 1996
- Lee, Sang-min 2013 “*Daeseung sipji-ron uigi u chiriryuk al*” [大乘十地論義記(羽726R)]. In *Jangoe Jironjong munheon jipsoeng sokjip* [藏外地論宗文獻集成續集], comp. Geumgang Daehakgyo Bulgyo Munhwa Yeon’guso, 515–542. Seoul: Ssiaial.
- 이상민 2013
- 2014 “*Ip neungga-gyeong juseokseo e natanan chogi Jironhakpa ui teukjing*” [“입능가경” 주석서에 나타난 초기 지론학파의 특징]. *Seon munhwa yeon’gu* 16:139–172.
- 2014
- Ōtaka, Susumu 2001 “Bodairushi no ushinawareta san chosaku” [菩提留支の失われた三著作]. *Tōhōgaku* 102:34–48.
- 大竹晋 2001
- 2003 “*Nyu ryōga kyō no yuishikisetsu to Daijō kishin ron*” [入楞伽經の唯識説と大乘起信論]. *Tetsugaku shisō ronsō* 21:67–80.
- 2003
- Park, Tae-won 1994 *Daeseung gisil-lon sasang yeon’gu* [대승기신론사상연구]. Seoul: Minjoksa.
- 박태원 1994
- Radich, Michael 2012 “External Evidence Relating to Works Ascribed to Paramārtha, with a focus on Traditional Chinese Catalogues.” In *Shindai sanzō kenkyū ronshū* [真諦三藏研究論集], ed. Funayama Tōru 般山徹, 39(R)–102(R). Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo.

- Ryu, Seung-ju “Ilsim yeoraegang ariyasik e daehan Wonhyo ui haeseok” [一心 · 如來藏 · 阿梨耶識에 대한 元曉의 해석]. *Bulgyo hakbo* 39:197–225.
류승주
2002
- 2003 “Samsesang gwa je palsik e daehan Wonhyo ui haeseok” [三細相과 第八識에 대한 元曉의 해석]. *Han'guk Bulgyohak* 33:145–163.
- Takasaki, Jikidō *Ryōga kyō* [楞伽經]. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan
高崎直道
1980
- Takasaki, Jikido *Ryōga kyō* [楞伽經]. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan.
高崎直道
and Horiuchi, Toshio
堀内俊郎
2015
- Takemura, Makio *Daijō kishin ron tokushaku* [大乘起信論讀釋]. Tokyo: Sankibō shorin.
竹村牧男
1985
- Yasui, Kōsai “*Nyū ryōga kyō* ni arawareru shiki no gakusetsu ni tsuite” [入楞伽
安井廣濟 經にあらわれる識の學說について]. *Ōtani gakubō* 52(2):1–15.
1972
- 1976 *Nyū ryōga kyō* [入楞伽經]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Yoshizu, Yoshihide “Egon *Daijō kishin ron gishō* no kenkyū” [慧遠 『大乘起信論義疏』
吉津直英 の研究]. *Komazawa daigaku Bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 34:151–173
1976