

An English Translation
of the *Banya paramilda
simgyeong chan*:
Wonch'uk's Commentary
on the Heart Sūtra
(*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*)

B. Hyun Choo

This paper has attempted to present an English translation of Wonch'uk's Banya paramilda simgyeong chan (般若波羅蜜多心經贊) or Commentary on the Heart Sūtra which was written in classical Chinese in the 7th century. As an example of the intellectual analysis of a sūtra, Wonch'uk's Commentary is an important text that has exerted a significant influence on East Asian Buddhist thought. A prominent Korean Yogācāra scholar, Wonch'uk authored twenty-three works during his lifetime; unfortunately, all but three have been lost. The Commentary on the Heart Sūtra is the shortest among his extant writings, yet it clearly reflects his incomparable erudition. It is a unique commentarial work to examine the Buddhist meaning of emptiness (sūnyatā) as it reflects the Mādhyamika doctrine of Emptiness from the Yogācāra perspective.

B. Hyun Choo is a Lecturer of Department of Asian and Asian-American Studies at State University of New York at Stony Brook, U.S.A.

International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture February 2006, Vol.6, pp.121-205.

© 2006 International Association for Buddhist Thought & Culture

The English translation of Wonch'uk's original Chinese text may offer the contemporary readers in the West an opportunity to reveal the distinctive features of Wonch'uk's Commentary as well as an East Asian scriptural exegesis.

Key Words: Wonch'uk, *Banya paramilda simgyeong chan*, Essence, Doctrine, Three Wheels of Dharma, Three natures of existence, The nature of Emptiness.

I. Introduction

The *Banya paramilda simgyeong chan* (般若波羅蜜多心經贊)¹ is a commentary on the *Heart Sūtra* written in classical Chinese by the 7th century Buddhist exegete Wonch'uk. An excellent example of the intellectual analysis of a *sūtra*, it is an important text that has exerted a significant influence in the history of East Asian Buddhist thought.

Wonch'uk (圓測, 613-696 C.E.), also known as Reverend Moon-A of His-ming Monastery (西明寺) in China, was originally from Silla, Korea.² (Koh, 1999:13-14) An eminent disciple of Hsüan-tsang (玄奘),³ and an older contemporary of K'uei-chi (窺基) of the Chinese *Fa-hsiang* School (法相宗), he is considered one of the most prominent *Yogācāra* scholars.⁴ According to his biographical source, Wonch'uk authored

1 According to Dr. Nguyen, the Chinese term “chan (贊)” means “eulogy” rather than “commentary,” so this work should be titled as “*Eulogy on the Heart Sūtra*”; yet it in no way resembles the *sūtra* style in Indian Buddhist literature, but is rather merely a commentary. Nguyen notes that this has significant implications on how Wonch'uk views the status of the *Heart Sūtra* (Nguyen, 2001:24-25).

2 Wonch'uk moved to T'ang China at the age of fifteen and never returned to Korea (Kim & Wu, 1976:70).

3 Chang-geun Hwang, in his dissertation, investigates the relationship between Hsüan-tsang and Wonch'uk. According to Hwang, *The Encyclopedic Biographies of Hsüan-tsang and His Disciples* (玄奘三藏師資傳叢書) Wonch'uk is mentioned as the disciple of Hsüan-tsang, whereas other records state that Hsüan-tsang studied old *Yogācāra* from both Fa-ch'ang and Seng-pien as did Wonch'uk and, therefore, the relationship between the two could be defined as peers or fellow students of the two masters rather than as master and disciple (Hwang, 2000:41).

4 According to Sung-fu (宋復), Wonch'uk was highly respected by Empress Wu (測天武后, c.684-705) of T'ang China, so that even though the King of Silla, Korea, Sin Moon (神文王, c.681

twenty-three works, in 108 volumes, during his lifetime, though all but three have been lost. Chinese resistance to scholarship by a Korean monk-scholar may be to blame for this poor survival rate; there are indications that Wonch'uk's status as a non-Chinese disciple under Hsüan-tsang was somewhat unstable (Oh, 1991:120). The three extant works are: the *Commentary on the Heart Sūtra* (般若心經贊, *Banya paramilda simgyeong chan*), which is the first commentary on Hsüan-tsang's translation of the *Heart Sūtra*; the *Commentary on the Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra* (解深密經疏, *Hae sim-mil gyeong so*), which is the largest extant commentary on that *sūtra*—called “the Great Chinese Commentary” by the eminent Tibetan Buddhist scholars, Tsong kha pa; and the *Commentary on the Benevolent King Sūtra* (仁王般若經疏, *Inwang banya gyeong so*).⁵ (Powers, 1992:19) Although the *Commentary on the Heart Sūtra* is the shortest among his extant writings, Wonch'uk's encyclopedic knowledge of Buddhist literature is contained in it; it is, in Powers' words, “a massive compendium of Buddhist scholarship” (Powers, 1992:9). A close reading of his *Commentary* not only leads us to more deeply understand many essential teachings of the *Heart Sūtra*, but also reminds us that *sūtra* study and the engagement in *sūtra* exegesis are principal religious practices in Buddhism.

1. The *Heart Sūtra*

The *Heart Sūtra* (*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*) is undoubtedly one of the most important *Mahāyāna* scriptures, particularly in China, Korea

692) petitioned for his return to his homeland, the Empress would not allow it. In addition, when eminent Indian monks came to T'ang, Empress Wu allowed Wonch'uk not only to receive them but also to help them with their projects of *sūtra* translations (Sung-fu, No.150:91-92; Hwang, 2000:31).

5 According to Hwang, the list of non-extant Wonch'uk texts, which are mentioned in various bibliographies including the *Ui cheon mok-rok* (義天目錄), are: the *Seong yu sik ron so* (成唯識論疏), the *Seong yu sik ron byeol-jan* (成唯識論別章), the *I sip yu sik (ron) so* (二十唯識論疏), the *Baek-beop ron so* (百法論疏), the *Gwang baek ron so* (廣百論疏), the *Mu-ryang-ui gyeong so* (無量義經疏), the *Gwan so-yeon-yeon ron so* (觀所緣緣論疏), the *Yuk-sip igyeon jang* (六十二見章), the *In-myeong jeong-ri-mun ron so* (因明正理門論疏), the *A-mi-ta gyeong so* (阿彌陀經疏), the *Yu ga ron so* (瑜伽論疏), the *Gu sa ron seok song so* (舍舍論釋頌), the *Mu-ryang-su-gyeong so* (無量壽經疏), the *Seong yu-sik eun cho* (成唯識應鈔), the *Seong yu-sik gwang cho* (成唯識光鈔), the *Geumgang banya gyeong so* (金剛般若經) (Hwang, 2000:120-123).

and Japan. According to Edward Conze, it was composed around 350 C.E. and is considered the shortest version of the voluminous *Perfection of Wisdom sūtras* (*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtras*),⁶ comprising only two hundred and sixty two Chinese characters. Nevertheless, it contains not only the essence of the entire *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtras* but also the entire *Mahāyāna* teaching. The *Heart Sūtra* is especially emphasized in the Ch'an tradition, since it formulates the teaching of emptiness (*sūnyatā*) in a particularly clear and concise way.

Considered the word of the Buddha,⁷ the *Heart Sūtra* focuses on the concept of emptiness (*sūnyatā*); that all phenomena, including human suffering, are without self-nature (*svabhāva*) because they arise due to causes and conditions. The *sūtra* also discusses the realization of emptiness; that one is able to eradicate all attachment to the self and *dharmas*, and thus to liberate the self from suffering. In contrast to the early Buddhist scriptures of the *Nikāya* tradition, which focus on the existence of permanent selfhood, the *Heart Sūtra* proclaims the true meaning of the emptiness of existence as the spiritual breakthrough necessary to actualize enlightenment.

The core passage of the *Heart Sūtra* is “Form is not different from emptiness; emptiness is not different from form, and form is emptiness, emptiness is form.” As Lopez points out, it may be “at once the most celebrated and problematic passage in the text” (Lopez, 1988:8). Nevertheless, when understood, insight into the empty nature of all phenomena leads to the *Perfection of Wisdom* (*Prajñāpāramitā*) as the Middle Way. The *sūtra* addresses the major categories of Buddhist teaching, i.e., the five aggregates, dependent origination, the Four Noble Truths, and, through the series of negations, the essence of the doctrine of emptiness.

6 According to Conze, *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras*, also known as “*Perfection of Wisdom sūtras*,” originated in the first centuries B.C.E and C.E., and expanded from 8,000 lines, in the oldest text, to 100,000 lines. Later, along with the shorter versions of the two most famous *sūtras*, the *Diamond sūtra* (*Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*) and the *Heart sūtra* (*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*), under the influence of tantric modes of thought, the “*Perfection of Wisdom in a Few Words*,” which was designed as a counterpart to the *Heart Sūtra*, was also composed (Conze, 1978:11,15).

7 Although it was not preached directly by the Buddha but by Avalokiteśvara, who is a manifestation of the Buddha, the *Heart Sūtra* is considered the Buddha's word (Lopez, 1988:5).

Within the *Mahāyāna* doctrinal classification, the *Heart Sūtra* belongs to the Buddha's Second turning of the Wheel, the Emptiness period of *Dharma*, and most extant commentaries approach it from the perspective of the *Mādhyamika* doctrine of the Emptiness period (Chung, 1977:87). However, Wonch'uk interprets the *Heart Sūtra* from the *Yogācāra* perspective, and his *Commentary* therefore offers the reader a unique opportunity to examine the *Mādhyamika* doctrine of emptiness from the *Yogācāra* perspective.

2. The characteristics of Wonch'uk's *Commentary on the Heart Sūtra*

The most distinctive feature of Wonch'uk's *Commentary* lies in his scholarly foundation, which is rooted in the Buddha's "One vehicle (*Ekayāna*)", implying non-dualism, non-discrimination, and non-sectarianism. Wonch'uk criticizes the sectarian dogmatism of Chinese Buddhism⁸ and attempts to harmonize the complete corpus of *Mahāyāna* doctrine. On the one hand, he thoroughly investigates different views; on the other hand, he explains how the variant perspectives described in his text can actually be viewed as complementing one another. As his methodological instruments, Wonch'uk utilizes the Buddhist principles of skillful means and the Middle Way, as well as the East Asian hermeneutic concept of *t'i-yung* (essence-function), which he uses to integrate and harmonize sectarian views.⁹

In his *Commentary*, Wonch'uk employs the standard style of exegesis within the East Asian Buddhist tradition. His treatment of the *sūtra* is divided into the four traditional topics: (1) the causes and conditions that gave rise to the teaching; (2) a differentiation of the essence and doctrine of the *sūtra*; (3) an explanation of the title of the

8 In Chinese Buddhist tradition, along with the process of systemization and evaluation, while processing the translation and interpretation of the original Sanskrit Buddhist texts into Chinese, various groups splintered off into different sects, each of which upheld its own basic texts and doctrines as superior to others. Among these schools several, including the T'ien-tai, Hua-yen, Fa-hsiang, and Ch'an schools, developed their own system of doctrinal classification.

9 Views held by the *Hīnayāna* (i.e., the *Sarvāstivāda* and *Sautrāntika*) and *Mahāyāna* (i.e., *Mādhyamika* and *Yogācāra*: Old and New Chinese *Yogācāra*).

sūtra; (4) and an interpretation of the *sūtra* by analyzing its textual content. The first two topics conduct the reader in locating the *sūtra* within the overall hermeneutical context of Buddhist doctrines, while the second two attempt both linguistic and conceptual analysis of the *sūtra*, drawing on various Buddhist texts.

In discussing causes and conditions that gave rise to the teaching, his first topic, Wonch'uk adopts the *Yogācāra* classification of the Three Wheels of *Dharma*¹⁰ elucidated in *The Scripture on the Explication of Underlying Meaning (Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra)*. According to the *Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra*, during his career the Buddha, using his skillful means, turned the wheel of *Dharma* three times in response to the different inclinations and spiritual capacities of his audiences (T.16.693c-697c; Keenan, 2000:35-50). With the first turning of the *Dharma*-wheel the Buddha taught the Four Noble Truths (四聖諦, *āryāsatya*) to the disciples (*śrāvakas*), using the illustrations of birth and death, cause and effect, and *nirvāṇa* and *saṃsāra* to lead those who had not yet entered the *dharma* to enter it. However, since this *Dharma* focused on “existence”, it allowed the erroneous grasping at the self or *dharmas* taught by the early schools, which claimed to be the true interpreters of the Buddha's word (Skilton, 1994:122).

The grasping at existence in the first *Dharma*, which occasioned controversy and had to be interpreted, was counteracted by the second teaching, which consisted of the Perfection of Wisdom doctrine, emphasizing “nonexistence” or “the emptiness of self-nature (*svabhāva*)” (Conze, 1973:150). The second *Dharma*, given to the *bodhisattvas* of the *Mahāyāna* tradition, taught that “all things have no essence, no arising, and no passing away, and are essentially in cessation” (T.16.697a; Keenan, 2000:49). Based on the *Perfection of Wisdom sūtras (Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras)*, this teaching was formulated by *Nāgārjuna* of the *Mādhyamika* school to counter the view that things have an intrinsic self-nature. However, according to the *Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra*, it also occasioned controversy and had to be interpreted.

10 The Three Wheels of *Dharma* are “all-encompassing modalities of Buddha's teachings from the perspective of both time and tenets.”

Finally, the third wheel of the *Dharma* explained the truth of both existence and nonexistence for all three vehicles. Formulated by the *Yogācāra* school, this teaching emphasized the affirmation of existence or self in order to present a deeper understanding of the meaning of emptiness. It accepted the conventional existence of phenomena and focused on the primacy of mind and its role in perception. The *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* expounds that this *Dharma* is “the universal and supreme teaching of the Buddha and it did not contain any implicit meaning nor occasion any controversy” (T.16.697a; Keenan, 2000:49). Thus, the *Yogācāra* school presents this *Dharma* as a final resolution of the Buddha's teaching. The *Yogācāra* school serves as an antidote to the *Mādhyamika*, which can lead to a misplaced belief that things do not exist, as well as to other extreme views. It considers earlier Buddhist schools to have been confined to this kind of extremism during the first *Dharma* (Skilton, 1994:122). The interpretation of the three wheels of *Dharma* in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* implies that in the third *Dharma* the *Yogācāra* school succeeded the *Mādhyamika* school and appropriated the significance of its doctrines.

Unlike most Chinese sectarian scholars, who view the classification of the Three Wheels of *Dharma* as a means of ranking doctrines and proving their school's superiority, Wonch'uk does not limit himself to his own school's point of view; rather, he sees the problem in terms of the skillful means of the Buddha.¹¹ He regards the three *Dharmas* as equally important, and emphasizes that the eighty-four thousand

11 According to Nguyen, the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* states that the first two wheels of *Dharma* are of interpretable meaning (*neyartha*) whereas the third is of definitive meaning (*nitartha*) (T.16.697b). *Yogācāra* school regards the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, which is the third wheel of *Dharma*, as a definitive teaching because it uses the doctrine of three natures to thoroughly explain Buddhist doctrines from the perspective of both nonexistence and existence. Wonch'uk's contemporary K'uei chi of the Fa hsiang School designated the definitive meaning of the third wheel of *Dharma* as the supreme teaching. Yet, as opposed to K'uei chi's claim, Wonch'uk argues that whether a teaching is interpretable or definitive does not depend on the degree of profundity of the teaching expounded but on whether it is “manifest” or “hidden.” In his commentary on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, he elaborates that the first wheel of *Dharma* manifests existence and keeps nonexistence hidden; the second wheel of *Dharma* manifests nonexistence and keeps existence hidden; the third wheel of *Dharma* completely and explicitly manifests both existence and nonexistence. In addition, if within either wheel both existence and nonexistence are manifest through analysis, a *Dharma* wheel is of definitive meaning; if they are not sufficiently analyzed and are hidden, a doctrine is of interpretable meaning (Nguyen, 2001:31).

teachings in all *sūtras* are not of a hierarchical order but correspond to the different needs of sentient beings.¹² From this perspective, Wonch'uk attempts to integrate and harmonize different views including the difference between the *Mādhyamika* and *Yogācāra* doctrines. For instance, in his *Commentary*, Wonch'uk explains that the discernment of existence and emptiness in the *Yogācāra* theory of the Three Natures reaffirms Nāgārjuna's Middle Way.

Wonch'uk's second topic is the difference between the essence and the doctrine of the *Heart Sūtra*, a relationship he explicates in terms of the hermeneutic device of essence (*t'i*) and function (*yung*). He defines the *t'i* (體) as the core of the Buddha's actual teachings and the doctrine (宗, *tsung*) as that which has been expounded by the various Buddhist schools. First, Wonch'uk points out that the explications of the Buddha's teaching provided by the various schools are not the same; for instance, some of the early schools¹³ view the sound of the *sūtra* as *t'i*, while one of the *Mādhyamika* schools validates only sound, and yet another combines sound with name, phrase, and syllable. However, he argues that each of these teachings is based on the same truth, and therefore does not contradict the others.¹⁴ Second, Wonch'uk differentiates the various doctrines in accordance with illnesses, scriptures, and periods, but nevertheless, on the basis of the Buddha's One Mind (一心), views them as different means of leading people to enlightenment.

In his third and fourth topics, which are the linguistic and conceptual analysis of the *sūtra*, Wonch'uk begins with a detailed

12 The original text states: 八萬四千諸塵勞門。是故如來應病設藥。蘊等八萬四千法門由此一一隨其所應。… (T.33.543a25-27).

13 The doctrines of both the *Sarvāstivāda* and *Sautrāntika* schools view sound as the essence of the Buddha's teaching "since names, phrases, and syllables do not exist independently apart from sound" (T.33.543a9-11).

14 Wonch'uk explains in his commentary: "When [one] follows the real by means of the provisional, [one] uses sound as the essence [of communication] since, apart from sound, name, phrase, [and syllable] would not be distinguishable; when [one] follows the function [of communication] by means of the essence, names, etc. are considered the essence that can communicate the distinctions between the self-natures of all *dharma*s and hence these two are depended upon. The provisional and the real require each other; their interaction is called essence" (T.33.543a16-20).

explanation of the title; then he divides the *sūtra* into three parts. As he sees it, the first part, from “Kuan-zizai *Bodhisattva* … ” to “He crosses over all sufferings and calamities,” illustrates the contemplating wisdom; the second part, from “Śāriputra … ” to “there is no wisdom and no attainment,” illustrates the cognitive-object contemplated; the third part, from “because there is no attainment … ” to the end, illustrates the fruit attained. The parts, sections, divisions and segments that Wonch'uk delineates eventually lead to multiple levels of subheadings, so that even a small portion of the text becomes thoroughly involved in the broader interpretation which he establishes for the whole.¹⁵ His multi-leveled structure of the *Heart Sūtra* can be mapped out as follows:

1. Illustrating the contemplating wisdom:

- a) Indicating the contemplating person
“Kuan-zizai *Bodhisattva*”
- b) Illustrating the contemplating wisdom
 - (1) The essence of the contemplating wisdom;
“performs profoundly the Perfection of Wisdom”
 - (2) The function of the contemplating wisdom;
“[the *Bodhisattva*] illuminatingly sees that the five aggregates are all empty” --i) personal aims
“and crosses over all sufferings and calamities” --ii) altruistic aims

2. Illustrating the cognitive-object contemplated:

- a) Illustrating the nature of emptiness
 - (1) Indicating the person who is guided; “Śāriputra,”
 - (2) Illustrating the nature of emptiness
 - (2a) explaining the four statements by means of the

¹⁵ According to Robert Buswell this is a quint essentially East Asian form, deriving ultimately from indigenous exegetical traditions rather than Indian Buddhist models (Buswell, 2002:125).

aggregate of form;

“form is not different from emptiness, emptiness is not different from form, and form is emptiness, emptiness is form.”

(2b) interpreting that the other four aggregates all contain the four statements;

“The same is true with sensation, perception, mental formation, and consciousness.”

b) Illustrating the characteristics of emptiness

(1) Revealing the characteristics of emptiness by means of the six meanings;

“Śariputra, in that way, the characteristics of emptiness in all *dharma*s are neither originated nor annihilated, neither defiled nor purified, neither increasing nor decreasing.”

(2) Dispelling the attachment to the six teachings of *dharma* based on the characteristics of emptiness;

(2a) dispelling the attachment to the teaching on the five aggregates;

“Therefore, in emptiness there is no form, sensation, perception, mental formation, nor consciousness.”

(2b) dispelling the teaching on the twelve sense bases;

“There is no eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, mind; no form, sound, smell, taste, touchable, nor object of mind.”

(2c) dispelling the teaching on the eighteen realms;

“There is no eye-realm and, in this way, up to no realm of mind-consciousness.”

(2d) dispelling the teaching on the twelve limbs of dependent origination;

“There is no origination of ignorance, no extinction of ignorance, and, in this way, no origination of aging and death, and no extinction of aging and death.”

(2e) dispelling the teaching on the Four Noble Truths;

“There is no suffering, origination [of suffering], cessation [of suffering] or path [leading to liberation].”

(2f) dispelling the teaching on wisdom and abandonment;

“There is no wisdom and no attainment.”

3. Revealing the fruit attained:

a) Clarifying the fruit attained

(1) Illustrating the power of contemplation;

“Because there is no attainment, the *bodhisattvas* depend on the Perfection of Wisdom and, therefore, their minds are free from [mental] obstructions.”

(2) Revealing the fruit attained;

“Because [*bodhisattvas*] have no [mental] obstructions, they are without fear, free from perverted views and dreamlike thoughts, and achieve ultimate *nirvāṇa*.”

b) Demonstrating achievement by examples

(1) Elucidating the fruit attained;

“The Buddhas of the three times, [past, present, and future,] attain supreme, perfect enlightenment through relying on the Perfection of Wisdom.”

(2) Praising the excellence of the Perfection of Wisdom by means of its function

(2a) Interpreting the prose in detail;

“Therefore, one should know the Perfection of Wisdom as the great sacred *mantra*, the great illuminating *mantra*, the supreme *mantra*, and the unequalled *mantra*.” --i) elucidating the self-benefit.

“It can eliminate all sufferings, for it is true, not false.” --ii) illustrating the benefit to others.

(2b) Concluding the praise in eulogy

“Therefore, [the Kuan-zizai *Bodhisattva*] speaks the *Prajñāpāramitā mantra*: *gate gate pāragate pārasamgate bodhi svāhā*.”

Within this structure, Wonch'uk establishes his *Commentary* by referencing other scriptures, minimizing any significant input of his own. His discussion is closely tied to his textual sources, while utilizing

a methodology that relies on piecing together quotations from a wide array of sources.¹⁶ He refers to many different doctrines, i.e., the early Buddhist doctrines of the *Sarvāstivāda* and *Sautrāntika* and the *Mahāyāna* doctrines of the *Mādhyamika* and *Yogācāra*, including the Old and New *Yogācāra*; he uses 125 references from forty different *sūtras* and *śāstras*.¹⁷ In doing so, Wonch'uk not only explains and elaborates on various Buddhist terms and concepts, but also relates the scripture to the entirety of Buddhism. For his most frequent citations, such as the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論), the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra-śāstra* (佛地經論), the *Madhyamakakārikā* (中論), and the *Trimsatikā* (唯識三十頌), I rely on other English translations which have already been published. (For example, for the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, I refer to the *Three Texts on Consciousness Only*, translated by Francis H. Cook; for the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra-śāstra*, to *The Interpretation of the Buddha Land* by John P. Keenan.)

It is a nearly overwhelming task to traverse time and space to translate Wonch'uk's seventh century Chinese into current English. In his essay "The Task of the Translator," Walter Benjamin states that "A real translation is transparent; it does not cover the original, does not block its light, but allows the pure language which survives in different times and places and proves to possess an uncanny sustaining power" (Benjamin, 1939). Indeed, Benjamin's understanding illumines the Buddhist distinction between "live words (活句)" and "dead words (死句)"; words without meaning or words that are not attended with functioning are considered "dead words", whereas "live words" are alive because they constantly live in the mind and bodies of people.

16 Wonch'uk analytically dissects, section by section and word by word, the vast array of teachings and doctrines appearing in the text as a way of illustrating the diversity and originality of Buddhist doctrinal teachings.

17 These include the *Avalokiteśvara-sūtra* (*Kuan-yin san-mei ching*, 觀音三昧經), the *Sha-men lun* (沙門論), the *Tsan fo lun* (讚佛論), the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra-śāstra* (佛地經論), the *Śrāmana-sāstra*, the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* (瑜伽師地論), the *Abhidharmakosabhasya* (阿毘達磨俱舍論), the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論), the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra* (佛地論) the *Madhyamika-kārikā* (中論), the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* (解深密經), the *Pramāna-samuccaya* (集量論), the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (雜集論), the *Śrīamaladevī-sūtra*, the *Mahāyāna-Sūtrālamkāra* (大乘莊嚴論經), the *Trimsatikā* (唯識三十頌), the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra* (攝大乘論), the *Madhyantavibhaga* (辯中邊論), and the *Suvarna-prabhasa-sūtra* (金光明經), etc.

Wonch'uk, through his commentarial work, attempts to make the Word of the Buddha come alive in the present. In the same way, it is my challenge as translator to ensure that Wonch'uk's words come alive to contemporary readers in the West. This English translation of Wonch'uk's *Commentary on the Heart Sūtra* attempts to demonstrate that something universal and eternal, “the pure language”, remains alive today.

II. An English translation of the *Banyā paramitā simgyeong chan*

佛說般若波羅蜜多心經贊

A Commentary on the Buddha's Heart Sūtra (Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra)

沙門 測撰

Written by Buddhist monk Wonch'uk

[Introduction]

In interpreting the [Heart] *sūtra*, four aspects may be differentiated:

- [A.] the causes and conditions that gave rise to this teaching;
- [B.] differentiating the essence (體, *t'i*) and doctrine (宗, *tsung*) of the *sūtra*;
- [C.] explaining the title [of the *sūtra*];
- [D.] and interpreting the *sūtra* by analyzing its textual content.

[A.] The causes and conditions that gave rise to this teaching

I propose humbly that the perfect principle, mysterious and calm, wondrously cuts off the realms of existence and nonexistence. The characteristics of *dharma*s are extremely profound and able to transcend the superficial [expressions] of names and words. Yet this principle does not perform in fixed ways, so [the Buddha] expressed it in the two

scriptures [of *Hīnayāna* and *Mahāyāna*]. The actualizing of the response of the three bodies is the foundation on which the teaching is expounded. [In other words,] it could be said that when the spring water becomes clear, the reflection of the moon suddenly appears, and with the enemy's slightest move in the dark, the heavenly drum spontaneously beats itself. Yet, when responding to objects [at the conventional level], according to their abilities, the *Tathāgata* expounds the Three Wheels of *Dharma* to guide [sentient beings].

In order to guide those who have not yet entered the *Dharma* to enter it, at the Deer Park (Mṛgadāva) in Varanasi, [the Buddha] first unfolded the cause and effect of *saṃsāra* and *nirvāṇa*. This was the First Wheel of *Dharma*, [the teaching of] the Four Noble Truths. So that those who already were able to eliminate attachment to the view of self would be converted to *Mahāyāna*, on sixteen occasions, including at the Vulture Peak (Mount Gṛdhra-kūṭa), etc., [the Buddha] expounded the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*. This was the Second Wheel of *Dharma*, [the teaching of] “No-characteristics.” Although [followers of the Second Wheel of *Dharma*] gradually eliminate attachment to the view that *dharmas* have their own natures, they still remain unable to dispel attachment to emptiness itself. So, [the *Tathāgata*] expounds the Third Wheel, which is the definitive (*nītartha*) *Mahāyāna* teaching of the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, in the Pure and Impure Lands of the Lotus Flower Treasury Worlds (*Padmāgarbhālokādhatu*). [This Third teaching] reveals the principle of both emptiness and existence, and eliminates the two forms of extremist attachments to existence and nonexistence. This is exactly what gave rise to the teaching [of the *Heart Sūtra*].

[B.] Differentiating the essence (*t'i*) and the doctrine (*tsung*) [of the *sūtra*]

“Essence” refers to the core of the teachings that can be expounded with comprehensive clarity, whereas “doctrine” discloses the specifics of what have been expounded by the various teachings. However, the explications of the essence of the Buddha's teaching [given

by various schools] are not the same. The *Sarvāstivāda* school regards sound as the essence, because name, [phrase, and syllable] are neutral while sound is wholesome. According to the *Sautrāntika* school, the series [of names, phrases, and syllables] is provisionally designated as “sounds”, since names, phrases, [and syllables] do not exist independently apart from sound. The doctrines of the *Mahāyāna* schools [regarding the essence of the Buddha's teaching] are [also] not the same. A place [in the *Mahāyāna* scripture] claims only sound [for the essence of the teaching]; for example, the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśanā-sūtra* states that there is a certain buddha land in which sound becomes [the essential element of] the affairs of buddha. Another place takes only name, [phrase, and syllable] as the essence [of the teaching]; for instance, the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* states that the object of unobstructed cognition of *dharmas* is considered to be name, [phrase, and syllable]. Another place [in the *Mahāyāna* text] combines the [above] explanations of both sound and name, [phrase, and syllable]; for example, the *Dasabhūmikāsūtra-sāstra* states that one who listens to [the Buddha's teaching] depends on two things, namely, sound and name, [phrase, and syllable].

Why are there such differences between these doctrines? To definitively grasp the real, one follows the real by means of the provisional. [While we] all use sound and name, [phrase, and syllable] in order to [understand] the nature of the essence, nevertheless, each of these holy teachings is based on one meaning and therefore does not contradict the others. Why is this so? When [one] follows the real by means of the provisional, [one] uses sound as the essence [of communication] since name, phrase, [and syllable] would not be distinguishable apart from sound. When [one] follows the function [of communication] by means of the essence, name, [phrase, and syllable] are considered the essence that can communicate the distinctions between the self-natures of all *dharmas*. Thus these two are [both] depended upon. The provisional and the real require each other; their interaction is called “essence.” To try to follow one [without the other] would be a mistake, and an explanation [in that way] would not make

any sense. When one follows the mind by means of a cognitive object, one uses consciousness as the essence. Therefore, the *sūtras* [of the Third Wheel of *Dharma*] state that since all *dharmas* do not exist apart from consciousness, when one recovers the ultimate truth by embracing the illusion, one uses suchness as the essence. This is how the *Benevolent Kings Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra* describes the nature of all *dharmas*.

The doctrines of what have been expounded may be outlined using three categories: (1) specifying doctrines in accordance with illnesses [of sentient beings]; (2) disclosing doctrines according to specific scriptures; (3) differentiating doctrines according to periods.

(1) Specifying doctrines in accordance with illnesses [of sentient beings]: All sentient beings, due to ignorance, give rise to eighty-four thousand countless [kinds of] defilements including desire, anger, etc. So the *Tathāgata* prescribes medicines according to [their] illnesses, that is, the eighty-four thousand [kinds of] *Dharma* teachings, including [the teaching of five] aggregates. In this way, each of what is responded to by these [illnesses,] such as [the teachings of the five] aggregates (*skandhas*), [the twelve] bases (*āyatana*), [and the eighteen] elements (*dhātu*), etc., become the doctrines of what have been expounded.

(2) Disclosing doctrines according to specific scriptures: Although every scripture contains various teachings, when examining the main focus [of the scripture], each [doctrine] is differentiated in accordance with scripture. For instance, for the *Lotus Sūtra*, [the concept of] “One vehicle (*Ekayāna*)” is [its] doctrine; for the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśanā-sūtra*, [the notion of] “Non-duality” is [its] doctrine; according to the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtra*, the “Buddha nature” is [its] doctrine; and for the *Avatamsaka-Sūtra*, “the cause and effect of Saints” is [its] doctrine. [The doctrines of] other scriptures may be understood as above.

(3) Distinguishing doctrines according to periods: Although the scriptures of holy teaching are divided into a variety [of doctrines], from the perspective of period, they are distinguished by no more than three kinds [of doctrines]: those are, according to the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, the Four [Noble] Truths, No-characteristic, and

the definitive meaning of *Mahāyāna*. Now, for this scripture, [the *Heart Sūtra*,] among these [three] doctrines, “No-characteristic” is [its] doctrine.

[C.] Explaining the title of the *sūtra*

佛說般若波羅蜜多心經

“The Buddha expounds the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-Sūtra*.”

In explaining the title [of the *sūtra*], “the Buddha expounds” indicates the person who is able to expound. The Sanskrit word “buddha” is translated into “the awakened”, one who is equipped with both ultimate and worldly wisdom, who has accomplished enlightenment for both oneself and others, and who is, hence, a “buddha.” That [the Buddha] expounds the wondrous teaching and causes sentient beings to understand is called to “expound.” “*Prajñāpāramitā*” denotes the *dharma* which is expounded and is translated into “Wisdom by which [one can] arrive at the other shore (*nirvāṇa*)” in the [Chinese] language. The *Heart Sūtra* (*Hṛdaya-Sūtra*) correctly reveals the teaching that can be expounded. Among the organs of the body, the heart [or mind] is the foremost, and among the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras*, this teaching is the most precious. The name [of the *sūtra*] is established by following the metaphor, and therefore it is called the “*Heart* [*Sūtra*].”

“*Sūtra*” has a twofold meaning: to penetrate and to embrace. It means to penetrate into the meanings of [all] the doctrines to be communicated and to embrace all sentient beings that are to be saved. This is a dependent determinative compound (*tatpuruṣa*), concerning both the teachings that can be expounded and what has been expounded. The title is established by means of the *dharma* and the metaphor and, therefore, it is said that “The Buddha expounds the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-Sūtra*.”

[D.] Interpreting the *sūtra* by analyzing its textual content

觀自在菩薩**“Kuan-zizai (Avalokiteśvara) *Bodhisattva*”**

The *Heart [Sūtra]* is generally divided into three parts: The first part, [from “Kuan-zizai *Bodhisattva* … .” to “crosses over all sufferings and calamities”] clarifies the contemplating wisdom; the second part, from “Śariputra … ” [to “there is no wisdom, no attainment”] illustrates the cognitive-object contemplated; the last part, from “because there is no attainment” [to the end] reveals the fruit attained. There is no introduction or conclusion in this [*sūtra*]. Since [this text] selects the essential outlines from all the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras*, it has only the main chapter, without introduction and conclusion, just as the *Kuan-yin ching (Avalokiteśvara-sūtra)* is not composed of three sections.

[1. Illustrating the contemplating wisdom]**[a) Indicating the contemplating person]**

As for the “Kuan-zizai *Bodhisattva*”, the first part of [the *sūtra*], [that is, from “Kuan-zizai *Bodhisattva* … .” to “crosses over all sufferings and calamities”] may be subdivided in two [ways]: first, by indicating the person who can contemplate; second, by illustrating the essence of the contemplating wisdom. [The “Kuan-zizai *Bodhisattva*”] refers to the first [approach], to indicate the person who can contemplate. According to the old version of the translation [of the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras*], the Kuan-shi-yin is designated as the one who contemplates the sounds of the world. By calling the name of [Kuan-shi-yin] *Bodhisattva*, accompanied with verbal deeds, [sentient beings] are saved from all disasters. This is how the name is established and called Kuan-shi-yin. Yet the power to contemplate bodily and mental deeds is not revealed [in the name of Kuan-shi-yin]. However, the “Kuan-zizai” mentioned in this scripture refers to the one who internally realizes the twofold emptiness while externally contemplating the three deeds effortlessly and acting at his/her unrestricted discretion. Therefore [he/she] is named “Kuan-zizai.”

Now this *Bodhisattva*, who is truly in the last period of practice prior to guaranteed enlightenment as a cause of the fruit of buddhahood, has already become a Buddha. What could be the mistake in constructing [such a concept of a *bodhisattva*]? If this is such a *bodhisattva*, how is [this *bodhisattva*] comprehensively interpreted in the Kuan-yin san-mei [ching]? According to the [Kuan-yin san-mei] ching,

“The Buddha says to Ānanda that now I am telling you the real fact which is not untrue. I am aware that Kuan-shi-yin Bodhisattva was enlightened before me and that the epithets of the *Bodhisattva* were ‘*Śastādevamanusyānam*’, ‘*Tathāgata*’, ‘*Arhat*’, ‘*Samyak-sambuddha*’, ‘*Vidyācaranāsampanna*’, ‘*Sugata*’, ‘*Lokavid*’, ‘*Anuttara*’, ‘*Purusadamyāsāratha*’, and ‘*Bhagavan*’. At that time, I was a disciple of that Buddha [who was Kuan-shi-yin *Bodhisattva*] and an ascetic practitioner.”

If this is such a buddha, how is [this buddha] comprehensively interpreted in the *Avalokiteśvara-bodhisattva-mahāsthāmaprapta-bodhisattva-sūtra*? This *sūtra* states: “Good sons, although the life of Amitābha is infinite millions of *kalpas*, there must be an ultimate end and final enlightenment (*parinirvāṇa*).” It continues,

“Good sons, after the period of the true *dharma* of Amitābha Buddha has vanished, when a bright star [that might be Venus] appears after midnight, Avalokiteśvara *Bodhisattva*, sitting cross-legged under the *bodhi*-tree decorated with the seven treasures, will attain perfect supreme enlightenment and will be called the ‘Jewel Sign-Buddha (*Ratnaketu Tathāgata*)’ who fulfills the ten epithets and whose land is called ‘the majestic paradise ornamented with various jewels’ (Joongbo-Jangum).”

In addition, the *Larger Sukhāvāṭīvyūha-sūtra* states that the “Kuan-[shi]-yin *Bodhisattva* completes a *bodhisattva* practice in this land and, at the end of [his/her] life, will be incarnated in the buddhaland.” [On the one hand], it can be interpreted that since those [*sūtras*, i.e., the *Kuan-yin san-mei ching*, the *Avalokiteśvara-bodhisattva-mahāsthāmaprapta-bodhisattva-sūtra*, and the *Larger Sukhāvāṭīvyūha-sūtra*,] use the same name

of Kuan-[shi]-yin for different persons, their teachings do not contradict each other, just as all buddhas are called “Sun-and-Moon-Glow (*Candrasuryapradipa*)” in the *Lotus Sūtra*. [On the other hand], it also can be interpreted that there are two kinds of [bodies] in the Kuan-[shi]-yin: first, the true [body] and, second, the manifested [body]. The *Kuan-yin san-mei ching* [describes the Kuan-shi-yin] as the true body and the *Larger Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra* [describes the Kuan-shi-yin] as the manifested body. [Yet,] the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra-upadeśa* states, “Even though Śākyamuni Buddha was already enlightened a long time ago, he attained the characteristic of the manifested [body] and therefore, he is now becoming a Buddha.” Although there are two different interpretations, the latter (i.e., the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra-upadeśa*) is superior and does not contradict the principle of all the other holy teachings.

[b] Illustrating the contemplating wisdom]

[(1) The essence of the contemplating wisdom]

行深般若波羅蜜多時者

As for “**when performing profoundly the Perfection of Wisdom**”

The second [approach,] which illustrates the contemplating wisdom, is twofold: first, it clarifies the essence of the [contemplating] wisdom, and then it illustrates the function of the [contemplating] wisdom. This is [the former,] clarifying the essence of [the contemplating] wisdom.

“To perform”, which means to proceed, refers to the contemplating wisdom [of the *Bodhisattva*]. “Profound”, which means fathomlessly deep, has two kinds of [meanings]. One is the “profundity of performing.” [This means that] non-discriminative wisdom internally realizes the twofold emptiness, transcends all dualistic discriminations, and performs the absence of both subject and object. This is the characteristic of “performing”, and is therefore called “to perform profoundly” In this regard, the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* states that “[A *bodhisattva*] does not

perceive performing, nor perceive non-performing, therefore it is said that a *bodhisattva* profoundly performs the Perfection of Wisdom.” The other [meaning] is the “profundity of the cognitive-object”, that is to say, the principle of the twofold emptiness which is free from the marks of existence and nonexistence and cuts off all conceptual elaborations. [Thus,] non-discriminative wisdom realizes this profound cognitive-object; it is therefore said “to perform profoundly.”

Prajñā in Sanskrit is translated into “wisdom” [in Chinese]. *Pāra* means “the other shore” and *mitā* means “to arrive.” According to the order [of the Sanskrit language], it is written as “*prajñā pāra mitā* (智彼岸到)”; [yet,] according to [the syntax of the Chinese] language, [it is expressed] as “*prajñā mitā pāra* (智到彼岸)” which means “to arrive at the other shore by means of wisdom”, because wisdom causes obstructions to be cut off and [leads sentient beings] to arrive at *nirvāṇa*.

“When” denotes a temporal point. The *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* explains that “based on conditioned *dharmas*, temporal points are described provisionally, yet the calculation of time is not comprised in the realm of [the five] aggregates (*skandhas*), [twelve] sense bases (*āyatana*s), [and eighteen realms (*dhātu*)].” The *Śramaṇa-sāstra* also interprets [time] in the same way as [the *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*] and states that “caused by [conditioned] *dharma*, time is constructed provisionally and does not exist separately apart from [conditioned] *dharma*.” The *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* illustrates that “from the perspective of conditioned *dharma*, the division of before and after provisionally establishes the temporal points comprised in the mental formation of *dharmas* not associated with mind (*citta-viprayukta-samskāra-dharmas*).” The *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra* also states the same [as the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*], in that “the division of periods which is the *dharmas* not associated with mind or imagination are constructed.”

The meaning of “wisdom (*prajñā*)” is interpreted comprehensively in three ways, namely, [wisdom based on] word, [wisdom through] contemplation, and [the wisdom of] the characteristic of reality. In order to reveal [wisdom through] contemplation and to distinguish [the

wisdom of] the characteristic of reality, etc., [the *sūtra*] states that “when [the *Bodhisattva*] performs profoundly the Perfection of Wisdom” (In this context, the three kinds of *prajñā* should be explained).

[(2) The function of the contemplating wisdom]

[i] the fulfillment for one's own benefit as personal aim]

照見五蘊皆空者

As for “[*Kuan-zizai Bodhisattva*] illuminatingly sees that the five aggregates are all empty”

This illustrates the function of wisdom, which is twofold: first, for [the fulfillment of] one's own benefit [as personal aim], and second, for [the fulfillment of] others' benefit [as altruistic aim]. This [statement] clarifies the contemplation of emptiness, which is for [the fulfillment of] one's own benefit. In order to interpret this statement, the various [meanings of] contemplation will be explained first; only then, based on the previously [explained meanings of] contemplation, will the statement from the *sūtra* be interpreted.

As for the various meanings of “contemplation”, so to speak, the Buddha's teachings are so profound that they are originally of “one taste”; [however,] scholars who are not awakened yet advocate various opinions. In this regard, the World Honored One says, according to the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*, that

“The Buddha expounds to Myosaeng that, metaphorically, before entering the great ocean, all kinds of large and small rivers are different from each other in shape and quantity; [however,] once they enter the ocean, there is no difference in their shapes and quantities. Likewise, *bodhisattvas* who have not yet entered the great ocean of the *Tathāgata's* pure realm of ultimate reality differ from each other in terms of the quality and the degree of their wisdom. Yet, when [*bodhisattvas*] enter into the great ocean of the *Tathāgata's* pure realm of ultimate reality, they are not different from each other in terms of the quality and degree of their wisdom, and perfect a wisdom of

harmony based on ‘one taste.’”

Bandhuprabha interprets that “One thousand years ago, the Buddha-*Dharmas* were of ‘one taste’; [however], a thousand years later, there was a conflict between [the notions of] emptiness and existence.” One thousand years after the Buddha passed away, two *bodhisattvas* appeared at the same period in Kāñcīpura, in southern India; one was Bhāvaviveka and the other was Dharmapāla. In order to lead sentient beings to realize the Buddha-*Dharma*, they established the Emptiness School and the Existence School, and together accomplished the Buddha's intention. Bhāvaviveka emphasized emptiness by negating [the notion of] existence in order to let [sentient beings] eliminate the attachment to existence, while Dharmapāla established [the doctrine of] existence by negating [the notion of emptiness] in order to let [sentient beings] eliminate the attachment to emptiness. If so, emptiness does not contradict the principle that existence is emptiness, and no nonexistence [in other words, existence], does not contradict the teaching that emptiness is form. Both emptiness and existence confirm the twofold truth, and neither emptiness nor existence also confirms the Middle Path. What a great doctrine of Buddha-*Dharma*, isn't it?

Question: Is the conflict between existence and nonexistence in accordance with the Buddha's intention?

Answer: To be victorious [over the other's view] in debate by attaching to one's own view is to contradict the holy teachings [of the Buddha]. [Yet] the Buddha himself allowed the enlightened *Bodhisattvas* [to use the concept of existence and nonexistence]. Moreover, since the two *Bodhisattvas* [i.e., Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla] complement each other in helping sentient beings understand [the Buddha's teaching], how could they be against the Buddha's intention?

For this reason, here, two kinds of teachings of contemplation will be briefly enumerated. First, Bhāvaviveka established a teaching of contemplation based on the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtras* as well as the doctrine of Nāgārjuna. In other words, this teaching is about contemplating emptiness by dispelling the characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of all *dharmas*; it claims that all *dharmas* are totally empty, in that there is no arising and

no ceasing [but] originally stillness, [so that] self-nature is *nirvāṇa*. In this context, the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* says that “all conditioned *dharmas* are like a dream, illusion, bubble, shadow, dew, and a flash of lightning; they should be contemplated as such.” The *Viśeṣacinta-brahma-pariprccha-sūtra* also states that “when mind discriminates all *dharmas*, they are all incorrectly [viewed,] and when mind does not discriminate all *dharmas*, they are all correctly [viewed].” Also, the *Chung-lun* (*Mādhyamika-kārikā*) states that “if there were something non-empty, there should then be something empty. However, since [something] cannot obtain non-emptiness, how is it possible to obtain emptiness?” The *Chung-lun* adds that “All buddhas sometimes teach about ‘self’ and sometimes about ‘no-self’. According to the true nature of all *dharmas*, there is neither self nor no-self.” Thus, there is much good scriptural evidence, as [mentioned] above. In this regard, Bhāvaviveka explains in the *Karatalāratna* that “both true nature and conditioned *dharmas* are as empty as an illusion, and dependently arisen (*pratītyasamutpāda*), so unconditioned *dharma* does not exist and has never had an actual arising, like a sky-flower.”

Second, Dharmapāla established a teaching of contemplation based on the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, etc., as well as the doctrine of Maitreyanatha. This illustrates the teaching of the contemplation of emptiness by affirming consciousness-only and denying the cognitive object. It claims that all *dharmas* penetrate both existence and nonexistence; the imagined nature (*parikalpa*), which consists of delusion, is not the principle [of ultimate reality]; the dependent nature (*paratantra*) arises by causes and conditions and therefore exists; the perfected nature (*pariniṣpanna*), which has the principle [of ultimate reality], is not nonexistent. In this context, the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* states that, because of the imagined nature, it is said that all *dharmas* do not have self-nature. According to the *Mahāratnakūṭa-sūtra*, “If someone denies that all *dharmas* do not have self-nature, I would say that the person is not able to be guided.” The *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* states that “because of the imagined nature, *sūtras* which conform with the teaching of [the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*] illustrate that all *dharmas* do

not have self-nature.”

According to the verses of the *Madhyāntavibhāgābhāṣya*, “There exists the discrimination of the unreal; in [the discrimination of the unreal], there is no duality at all, but only emptiness; [yet] in this [emptiness], there also exists [the discrimination of the unreal]. Therefore, it is said that because all *dharma*s are neither empty nor non-empty and are both nonexistent and existent, this confirms the Middle Way.” There is much good scriptural evidence, as [cited] above. In this context, the *Treatise in Twenty Verses on Consciousness-Only (Vijñāptimātratā-Vimśatikā-kārikā)* states that “Realizing that all *dharma*s do not exist is not considered the attainment of the no-self of *dharma*s. Rather, complete realization of the no-self of all *dharma*s, in which ignorant sentient beings discriminate self-nature (*svabhāva*) with the imagined nature, is considered attainment of the no-self of *dharma*s.”

The explanation concerning “contemplation” is as stated above. Now [the main part of] the text shall be interpreted.

The five aggregates (*skandhas*) refer to the five [kinds of] aggregates of form, sensation, perception, mental formation, and consciousness. The forms of the [six] sense organs, [their six] objects (*viśaya*), and the [twelve] sense bases (*āyatana*s) can apprehend locations and have a characteristic of materiality; therefore they are called “form (*rūpa*).” The feelings of suffering and pleasure and of neither suffering nor pleasure connect with, respectively, unfavorable, favorable, and neutral realms; therefore, they are called “sensation (*vedanā*).” All consciousnesses, along with perception, recognize the distinction of objects, such as male, female, etc., and produce all ideas; therefore, they are called “perception (*saññā*).” The mind exercises mental functions, such as thought, etc., to create good deeds, etc.; this is called “mental formation (*samskāra*).” All consciousnesses, such as visual consciousness, etc., discern their objects; therefore, they are called “consciousness (*viñāna*).”

All five kinds [of aggregates] have the meaning of an accumulation; therefore, they are called “aggregates (*skandha*).” These

five aggregates consist of three kinds [of natures]: first, the imagined nature of the five aggregates, which is not a [true] principle but a delusion; second, the dependent nature of the five aggregates, which exists provisionally by causes and conditions; third, the perfected nature of the five aggregates, which is the principle of true reality. According to the *Madhyāntāvibhāga*, there are three kinds of aggregates, which are the imagined, the characteristic, and the *dharma*-nature; this [interpretation] is adopted from the new version of the translation. The *Treatise on the Eighteen Emptinesses (Aṣṭādaśasūnyatā-sāstra)* also explains [this] in the same way as [the *Madhyāntāvibhāga*], and therefore classifies [the aggregates] as of three kinds: the first is discrimination; the second is characteristic; and the third is suchness. Within these three kinds of five aggregates, each consists of the twofold emptiness, that is, the emptiness of sentient beings and of *dharma*. The emptiness of both kinds intends to reveal the principle to be realized, that is, the twofold emptiness of the above. There are two different interpretations of this [twofold] emptiness.

According to the doctrine of Bhāvaviveka, there are two interpretations. One claims that among the three [natures], the first two [namely, the imagined nature and the dependent nature] are to be negated, [but] not the perfected nature. In this regard, the *Chung-lun (Mādhyamaka-sāstra)* states that “*Dharmas* arisen by cause and condition are referred to as emptiness.” The other claims that the three natures of the five aggregates are all empty. In this regard, the *Karatalāratna* states that “Unconditioned *dharmas* do not exist and have never had an actual arising, like a sky-flower.” Accordingly, it should be understood that the perfected nature is also negated

According to the doctrine of Dharmapāla, among the three kinds of aggregates, only the imagined nature is negated in order to illustrate the nature of emptiness. Scriptural evidences are as described above [i.e. *Chung-lun* and *Karatalāratna*]. A version [of the *Heart Sūtra*] states that “[The *Bodhisattva*] illuminatingly sees that the five aggregates, etc., are all empty.” Although there are two different versions, the latter [that is, the new version] is the correct one because the word “etc.” is

found in the original Sanskrit scripture. [The meaning of] “etc.” described in the latter [version] should be understood based on [the doctrine of Dharmapāla].

[ii) the fulfillment for others' benefit (*parārtha*) as altruistic aim]

度一切苦厄者

As for “**crossing over all sufferings and calamities,**”

This statement illustrates the second function of wisdom, which is “[the fulfillment for] others' benefit [as altruistic aim].” There are three different [interpretations] for this part. One interprets that suffering is calamity; therefore, it is called “calamitous suffering (苦厄).” This corresponds to the appositional determinative compound (*karmadhāraya*) of the six-compound (*Sat-samasa*). There is no defiled *dharma* which is not suffering; therefore, the World Honored One expounds that the three realms [of *samsāra*] are all suffering. In this context, the teaching of suffering can be summed up in three kinds of suffering. Those are: “suffering produced by direct causes (*duhkha-duhkha*);” “suffering by loss or deprivation (*viparinama-duhkha*);” and “suffering by the passing or impermanence of all things (*samskāra-duhkha*).” Within these [sufferings], there are eight kinds [of suffering], namely, [the suffering of] birth, aging, sickness, death, being conjoined with what one dislikes, being disjoined from what one likes, not getting what one wants, and all grasping at [any of] the five *skandhas*. For more details of the *duhkha-duhkha*, each of the twenty-five kinds of existences consists of the four [kinds of] conditioned characteristics (*lakṣaṇas*), which are arising, abiding, changing and ceasing; thus, it becomes one hundred kinds of suffering. The twenty-five kinds of existences refer to the four levels of holy persons, the four evil destinies, the four states of the formless realm, the four states of meditations, *brahmā*, the six heavens of the desire realm, No-Thought Heaven, and *Anāgāmin*. Another interprets that “the suffering of calamity” refers to the four kinds of calamities,

i.e., greed, existence, point of view, and ignorance. These four kinds [of calamities] fetter all sentient beings and cause them to undergo various kinds of suffering, similar to putting a yoke on a carriage. When based on this interpretation, it is the suffering of the [four] calamities, therefore called “the suffering of calamity,” which corresponds to the dependent determinative compound (*tatpuruṣa*) of the six-compound (*sat-samāsa*). [Lastly,] the other interprets that each “suffering” and “calamity” is separately categorized, as the two interpretations of the above; therefore, it corresponds to the copulative compound (*dvandva*) of the six-compound (*sat-samāsa*).

[2. Illustrating the cognitive-object contemplated]

[a) Illustrating the nature of emptiness]

[(1) Indicating the person who is guided]

舍利子者

As for “Śāriputra”,

The second [part of the *sūtra*], from [“Śāriputra” ... to “there is no wisdom, no attainment,”] illustrates the realm of the cognitive-object contemplated. There are two approaches in this part: [a)] first, to illustrate the nature of emptiness by means of the four statements, [namely, “Form is not different from emptiness, emptiness is not different from form. Form is emptiness; emptiness is form.”]; [b)] second, to reveal the characteristics of emptiness based on the six meanings [namely, “non-originated, non-annihilated, non-defiled, non-purified, non-increasing, and non-decreasing”]. The first [approach, that is, to illustrate the nature of emptiness by means of the four statements] is twofold: (1) indicating the person who is guided, and (2) illustrating the nature of emptiness. [The “Śāriputra”] indicates the person [who is guided].

The Sanskrit term “Śāriputra” is rendered “she-li-fu-tuo-luo” [(奢利富多羅 or 舍利弗多羅) in Chinese characters]. “Śāri” is translated into “Ch'ü-yü bird” and “putra” refers to “son” [in Chinese]. A mother's eyes

are blue and clear, just like the eyes of the Ch'ü-yü bird. For this reason, [the son] is named after his mother and called "Ch'ü-yü." The *Ta Ming-tu ching* (*Aṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*) states that [śāriputra] is called "chiu-lu-tzu (鷺鷥子)" or "upadeśa (優婆提舍)," who is named after his father. The translation of ["śāriputra"] into "shen-tzu (身子)" in the old version is an incorrect one.

Question: [Since] this [teaching of] *prajñāpāramitā* is the *dharma* for the *bodhisattva*, why does the World Honored One preach not to the *bodhisattva* but to Śāriputra?

Answer: According to the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra*, "The person [named] Śāriputra attained ten thousand kinds of *samādhi* and surpassed the Buddha's other disciples in wisdom. In this sense, the World Honored One said that the entire wisdom of all sentient beings, excluding the World Honored One, is less than one-sixteenth of the wisdom and knowledge of Śāriputra. In addition, Śāriputra, at the mere age of eight, was excellent in reasoning and discourse containing his theories. In this regard, all contemporary scholars admired his unprecedented excellence and all people respected him regardless of their intelligence or age." The other stories about this are described in detail in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra*. Therefore, in the [*Heart Sūtra*], the Buddha preached to Śāriputra and intended to lead the *Hīnayāna* to the *Mahāyāna* as well.

[(2) Illustrating the nature of emptiness]

[(2a) explaining the four statements by means of the aggregate of form]

色不異空 空不異色 色即是空 空即是色者

As for "Form is not different from emptiness, emptiness is not different from form; form is emptiness, emptiness is form,"

This is to illustrate the nature of emptiness by means of the four statements. There are two approaches: first, to explain the four statements by means of the aggregate of form; then, to [interpret] that

[the other] four aggregates [i.e., sensation, perception, mental formation, and consciousness] all contain the four statements. This section is [the former], “to explain the four statements by means of the aggregate of form.” In interpreting the four statements, first of all, the nature of emptiness shall be explained. As differentiated earlier, emptiness is twofold: one is the emptiness of the sentient being, the other is the emptiness of *dharma*.

The emptiness of the sentient being which has been expounded consists of four kinds. (i) That there is no self to be attached to is called “emptiness;” accordingly, [emptiness] is not included in the numerical category of all *dharms*. Therefore, in the chapter on the *bodhisatto* stages in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, it is stated that “both conditioned and unconditioned are called existence, and neither a self nor that which belongs to a self is called nonexistence.” (ii) The suchness (*tathatā*) which is revealed by the emptiness of a sentient being has been expounded by emptiness and, therefore, is also called “emptiness.” (iii) [The emptiness of a sentient being refers to] the specific delusion about emptiness which is associated with the truth of suffering and, accordingly, takes the defiled five aggregates as its essence. In this context, chapter 6 of the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* states that “specific [delusion] about emptiness is no-self because it is associated with the truth of suffering.” (iv) The general emptiness which is associated with all *dharms* is no-self; it uses all *dharms* as its essence.

Thus, although various *sūtras* illustrate the four kinds of no-self of all *dharms*, according to the theory of the three natures it consists of three kinds, [not four kinds]: first, the emptiness of the imagined nature (*parikalpita-svābhāva*); second, the emptiness of the dependent nature (*paratantra-svābhāva*); and third, the emptiness of the perfected nature (*pariniṣpanna-svābhāva*). Each of these three natures becomes, in turn, the essence [of emptiness].

As for the four kinds of emptiness of *dharma*, although there is no proper scriptural evidence [for them], the four statements can be posited by referring to the principle [of the emptiness of *dharma*]. The three kinds of emptiness of *dharma* can be properly understood based

on the above [theory of the three natures]. For more detailed differentiation [of emptiness], there are eighteen kinds of emptiness, as described in the *Aṣṭādaśasūnyatā-sāstra*. In the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, it is described as sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, or twenty kinds of emptiness. The details are explained in the [*Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*].

Next, the four statements shall be interpreted, based on the three natures. Of the four statements, the first two, [“form is not different from emptiness, emptiness is not different from form”] indicate the main teaching of the doctrine [of No-characteristics], and the other two, [“form is emptiness, emptiness is form”] dispel doubts [created by the *Hīnayānist* view]. “Form is not different from emptiness” implies that worldly [truth] is not different from ultimate [truth]. “Emptiness is not different from form” implies that ultimate [truth] is not different from worldly [truth]. The latter [part of the two statements, “form is emptiness, emptiness is form,”] dispels doubts created by the [*Hīnayānist*] view. One might question whether [form and emptiness] are not different from each other, either because they depend on each other or because they are identical. In this regard, the teaching that “form is emptiness, emptiness is form” is expounded. [“Form is not different from emptiness”] is neither because they depend on each other, nor because they are identical.

With regard to these statements, there are two different interpretations among Indian scholars. First, according to Bhāvaviveka, form has three kinds of natures, namely the imagined nature, [the dependent nature, and the perfected nature]. Emptiness is able to dispel [its] nature, [so] the essence (*t'i*) [of emptiness] is not the three natures. Thus, to say that “form is emptiness” means that since the imagined nature is inherently nonexistence, it is referred to as emptiness; definitively, this emptiness does not mean that there is emptiness either. In this context, the *Chung-lun (Mādhyamika-kārikā)* states that “If there is a *dharma* that is not emptiness, there must be a *dharma* that is emptiness. In reality, there is no *dharma* that is not emptiness, so how could there be a *dharma* that is emptiness?” With regard to the emptiness of the other two natures [i.e., dependent nature

and perfected nature], it should be understood in accord with [the *Chung-lun*]. In order to eliminate the attachment to existence, [the *Chung-lun*] illustrates emptiness as such: the dependent nature, which is like an illusion and so forth, pursues conditions and therefore is empty; the perfected nature has never arisen, just like a sky-flower, and therefore is also empty in itself.

Another view [of the doctrine of *Bhāvaviveka*] additionally interprets that the first two natures [i.e. the imagined nature and the dependent nature] are to be negated, but not the perfected nature. Both [interpretations of] the doctrine [of *Bhāvaviveka*] agree to allow one to dispel the characteristics of existence and nonexistence and to cut off conceptual elaboration. Therefore, one may question whether form is identical with or different from emptiness. [If one considers that they, i.e., form and emptiness,] are identical to each other as one essence (*t'i*), one can become easily attached to oneness, and if [one considers that] their essences are different from each other, one can attach to their being different. Both oneness and difference [at the same time] would be contradictory to each other, wouldn't they? [Also], neither oneness nor difference would make a conceptual elaboration.

The differentiation of these four statements is interpreted in two different ways. One is from [the view of] both heretics and *Hīnayānists*: most of them, based on the superficial aspect, illustrate the four statements because the words “existence” and “nonexistence,” etc., depict that which is expounded. The other is from [the view of] *Mahāyānists*: [in this view,] the words “existence” and “nonexistence,” etc., are expounded *via negativa* because all *dharma*s are not expressible [in words]. Yet, all *dharma*s consist of two kinds of characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*), namely, “an own characteristic” and “a common characteristic.” An own characteristic is that which is obtainable merely through knowledge of direct perception (*prayakṣa*), not by provisional knowledge or words. Therefore, when it is obtained from that which is expounded by provisional knowledge or words, it is referred to as “a common characteristic,” as when one describes the color blue. The differences between the characteristics, such as those between stems and leaves,

etc., are recognizable only through direct perception; through provisional knowledge of names and words one can only expound common characteristics such as the appearance of the color blue. When describing [a shade of] blue, the description of “blue” is expressed by negating yellow, etc., which is not the correct [description of] the color blue; therefore, it is said to be expounded *via negativa*.

There are two different views on pursuing that which is expounded *via negativa*. First, according to the Bhāvaviveka school, the principle of the nature [of that which is expounded *via negativa*] can neither be designated by means of name nor be featured by means of characteristics; it is both taken apart yet non-attached, and put together yet not established. The scriptural evidence for this teaching of [Mahāyāna] should be referred to the above [view]. Second, according to the Dharmapāla school, in reality there are both worldly and ultimate principles, which are separate from names and words; but since ultimate nature is designated as opposed to worldly [nature,] it does not deny that which is expounded. A scholar of the Bhāvaviveka school also conforms to this view [of the Dharmapāla school]. In this context, Dharmapāla criticizes Bhāvaviveka in that if, based on ultimate nature, it is said that all *dharma*s are empty, [the effect is] to make a logical error of the “Ultimate mutual agreement.” Here, the difference [between the two schools] results from the fact that the doctrine of Bhāvaviveka denies the dependent nature, whereas [the doctrine of] Dharmapāla does not allow [to deny it]. As a consequence of this reasoning, in the doctrine of [the Bhāvaviveka school], it is claimed that words such as existence and nonexistence, etc. represent that which is expounded *via negativa* apart from the pitfalls of conceptual elaboration such as either oneness or difference. This is the end of the interpretation of the [four] statements based on the Bhāvaviveka school.

Second, to interpret the four statements according to the Dharmapāla [school], there are three kinds of form, that is, three natures of form; there are also three kinds of emptiness, [in other words,] the essence (*t'i*) [of emptiness] has three natures. In this regard, the *Bodhisattva* Asaṅga, in the *Madhyāntavibhāga-sāstra*, illustrates

the three kinds [of emptiness]: first, the emptiness of the absence of self-nature, because self-nature does not exist; second, the emptiness of other-nature, because it is different from its falsely grasped self-nature; and third, the emptiness of self-nature, because self-nature is revealed by the twofold emptiness [that is, the emptiness of both sentient beings and *dharma*].

(i) Based on the imagined nature of form as opposed to [the imagined nature of] emptiness, the four statements are [interpreted] in three ways:

(i-1) [Based on] the imagined nature of form as opposed to that of emptiness, the four statements may be explained. Forms such as sense organs or sense objects, etc., grasped by feelings, do not differ from the emptiness of the imagined, which is intrinsically nonexistent; therefore, it is said that “form is emptiness.” Emptiness which is intrinsically nonexistent exists based on feelings; therefore, it is said that “emptiness is form.” This is mutual immediacy of the same nature. It should be understood as above for the [other] two statements [i.e., “form is not different from emptiness, emptiness is not different from form,”] indicating the doctrine [of No-characteristics].

(i-2) The four statements may be explained [based on] the imagined nature of form as opposed to the dependent nature of emptiness. The real form which is imagined by relying on the dependent nature does not differ from the emptiness of the dependent nature which has no reality; therefore it is said that “form is emptiness.” Moreover, the false feeling that is grasped at the locus of this emptiness affirms that there is real form; therefore, it is said that “emptiness is form.” The [other] two statements indicating the doctrine [of No-characteristics] can also be understood this way. This is the mutual immediacy of different natures.

(i-3) The four statements may be explained [based on] the imagined nature of form as opposed to the perfected nature [of emptiness]. Real form which is grasped by the perfected nature does not differ from the emptiness of the self-nature of the perfected nature. Since real form grasps at the emptiness of self-nature, it is said that

“form is emptiness and emptiness is form.” The [other] two statements indicating the doctrine [of No-characteristics] can also be understood this way. This is the mutual immediacy of different essences (*t'i*), just as with the dependent nature.

(ii) The four statements may be [explained based on] the dependent nature of form as opposed to the emptiness of the other-nature. That is, form originated by condition does not differ from the dependent nature which is the emptiness of the other-nature. Since this nature of emptiness is matter, it is said that “form is emptiness and emptiness is form.” This is the mutual immediacy of the same nature. The [other] two statements indicating the doctrine [of No-characteristics] can be understood as above.

(iii) In addition, the four statements may be [interpreted] in two ways, [based on] the form which is originated by conditions as the dependent nature, as opposed to the emptiness of the two natures [i.e., imagined nature and perfected nature]. [First, the interpretation of the four statements] does not differ from the previous one [when based on the form which is originated by conditions as the dependent nature], as opposed to the emptiness of other-nature. [Second,] the four statements may also be [explained based on the form which is originated by conditions as the dependent nature], as opposed to the emptiness of self-nature; that is, the form which is originated by conditions takes suchness as its essence, and this nature of emptiness is not different from the dependent nature. In this regard, the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* states that “Therefore, this [perfected nature] and the dependent nature are neither different nor not-different, like the nature of impermanence, etc.” The *Madhyāntavibhāga-sāstra* also states that “There is only emptiness and even in this there is that.” As a consequence of this reasoning, both the dependent nature and the perfected nature are inseparable from each other; therefore, it is stated that “form is emptiness and emptiness is form.” This does not mean that because what is originated by conditions is empty, and thus mutually or immediately interrelated. Unless this is understood as such, it would result in a mistake that contradicts the doctrine [of No-characteristics].

Accordingly, this is the mutual immediacy of different natures. The [other] two statements about the doctrine [of No-characteristics] can also be understood in this way.

(iv) The four statements may be [explained based on] the perfected nature as opposed to the emptiness of self-nature. That is, because the perfected nature is the true nature of form arising from dependent nature, it is called “form,” and because it is that which is revealed by the twofold emptiness of both person and *dharma*, it is called the emptiness of the perfected nature. For this reason, it is said that “form is emptiness and emptiness is form.” This is the mutual immediacy of the same nature. The [other] two statements about the doctrine [of No-characteristics] can also be understood in this way.

[(2b) interpreting that the other four aggregates all contain the four statements]

受想行識 亦復如是者

As for “**The same is true with sensation, perception, mental formation, and consciousness**”

This [statement] is the second to suggest that [the other] four aggregates [i.e., sensation, perception, mental formation, and consciousness] all contain the four statements. With regard to the mutual immediacy of the four statements, it should be understood as above. For added understanding [of this statement], there are two different versions of the [Heart] *Sūtra*: one version [suggests] the same as above, and the other version [states] that the *sūtra* says that “The same is true with sensation, perception, mental formation, and consciousness, etc.” The “etc.” implies that the six kinds of skillful means, namely, [the five] *skandhas*, [the six] sense bases, the [eighteen] realms of existence, the [twelve limbs of] dependent origination, the Four [Noble] Truths, and *bodhi-nirvāṇa* are followed by the words [i.e., sensation, perception, mental formation, and consciousness] of the *sūtra*. Then, to grasp “the four aggregates, etc.,” is [to realize] that the rest of

the five teachings [i.e., six sense bases, the eighteen realms of existence, the twelve limbs of dependent origination, the Four Noble Truths, and *bodhi-nirvāṇa*] all contain the four statements; therefore, the word “etc.” is used. Each meaning of the six teachings will be clarified later.

[b) Illustrating the characteristics of emptiness]

[(1) Revealing the characteristics of emptiness by means of the six meanings]

舍利子 是諸法空相 不生不滅 不垢不淨 不增不減者

As for “Śāriputra, the characteristics of emptiness in all dharmas are neither originated nor annihilated, neither defiled nor purified, and neither increasing nor decreasing.”

In this [section], which is the second [approach, illustrating the cognitive-object contemplated,] the characteristics of emptiness are revealed by means of the six kinds of meanings, [i.e., neither originated nor annihilated, neither defiled nor purified, and neither increasing nor decreasing]. [To illustrate the characteristics of emptiness] is twofold: (1) to correctly reveal the characteristics of emptiness by means of the six meanings; (2) to dispel [attachment] to the six teachings of *dharma* [namely, six skillful means, i.e., five *skandhas*, six sense bases, the eighteen realms of existence, the twelve limbs of dependent origination, the Four Noble Truths, and *bodhi-nirvāṇa*] based on the characteristics of emptiness. In [the statement] revealing the six characteristics [of emptiness], “to Śāriputra” would be interpreted the same as above. The six characteristics [of emptiness] refer to “neither originated nor annihilated, neither defiled nor purified, and neither increasing nor decreasing.” Yet these six characteristics have been interpreted in two different ways in India: one was by Bhāvaviveka and the other by Dharmapāla.

According to the doctrine of Bhāvaviveka, the six characteristics [of emptiness] are interpreted as those that are originally nonexistent [but] now exist, called the “originated,” and those that temporarily

existed, [then] returned to nonexistence, called the “annihilated” (as described in *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*); the nature which is contaminated and impure is named the “defiled,” and that which is apart from the contaminated and defiled is called the “purified” (as described in various scriptures); to regard *dharmas* as possessing functions is called “increasing,” and to falsely imagine that *dharmas* can be destroyed is called “decreasing” (as described in *Mahāyānasamgraha*).

[These] three opposing pairs of the six characteristics are interpreted from three different viewpoints. One claims that this statement illustrates the three [pairs] by means of stages. In other words, because the true nature of emptiness is separate from all characteristics, prior to the path [to enlightenment], [the characteristic of emptiness] completely departs from the transmigration of origination and annihilation [in *samsāra*]. On the path [to enlightenment], [in the characteristic of emptiness,] there is neither defiled nor purified in both delusion and wisdom; and after the path [to enlightenment], [for the characteristic of emptiness,] the increase or decrease of both essence and function is permanently discarded. The other claims that this statement illustrates the three pairs by means of natures: the imagined nature (*parikalpitasvābhāva*) is originally nonexistent, so it is neither originated nor annihilated; the dependent nature (*paratantrasvābhāva*) is originated by following conditions, so it is neither defiled nor purified; the perfected nature (*pariṇiṣpannasvābhāva*) has never arisen, so it is neither increasing nor decreasing. Another claims that this [statement] explains that each of the three opposing pairs of the six characteristics penetrates to all [three] stages and [three] natures, because all of them dispel the three natures and remain in no [stage]. Among [these] three [interpretations], the last one is superior because it is in accord with the fundamental doctrine [of *Bhāvaviveka*]. According to the doctrine of Dharmapāla, there are many different real principles of the characteristic of emptiness, such as neither oneness nor difference and neither existence nor nonexistence, etc.

This *sūtra* also states that the three opposing pairs of the six [characteristics] means that both “originated” and “annihilated” are the

common characteristics (*sāmānya-lakṣaṇa*) of conditioned *dharma*s; both “defiled” and “purified” differentiate the self-nature of all *dharma*s; and both “increasing” and “decreasing” are said to reveal the meanings and functions of *dharma*s. The true principle of the three [pairs] of emptiness is interconnected with the existence of the six characteristics, and so what [this] *sūtra* intends to correctly reveal is the emptiness of self-nature. [This is] because the truth revealed by the twofold emptiness of both sentient being and *dharma* is interconnected with both delusion and awakening as that on which they depend.

[(2) Dispelling the attachment to the six teachings of *dharma* based on the characteristics of emptiness]

[(2a) dispelling the attachment to the teaching on the five aggregates]

是故 空中無色 無受想行識者

As for “**Therefore, in emptiness there is no form, sensation, perception, mental formation, nor consciousness,**”

In this [statement], which is the second [approach, illustrating the characteristics of emptiness], based on the above characteristics of emptiness, [attachment] to the six teachings of *dharma* is to be dispelled. There are six categories to dispelling [attachment] to the six teachings of *dharma*. This is, first, to dispel [attachment] to the teaching on the five aggregates. In other words, the emptiness of all *dharma*s contains six characteristics; therefore in emptiness, there is no *dharma* of the five aggregates. Each meaning of the five aggregates is the same as the one previously interpreted. The six teachings of *dharma* described here refer to that which reveals comprehensively both common and specific cognitive-objects of the two vehicles. Since the first three [teachings of *dharma*, i.e., the five aggregates, twelve sense fields, and eighteen realms of existence,] remain to reveal the nature of all *dharma*s, it is therefore said that they are called the common cognitive-objects of [all] three vehicles. Based on the nature of the

former [three teachings of] *dharmā*, the teachings of dependent origination, etc., [i.e., the Four Noble Truths, and *bodhi-nirvāna*] are specifically expounded according to the level of sentient beings; therefore, the latter three [teachings of *dharmā*] are called specific cognitive-objects. In this regard, the *Lotus Sūtra* describes that for hearers (*śrāvakas*), the teaching of the Four Noble Truths is expounded; for solitary realizers (*pratyekabuddhas*), the teaching of Dependent Origination is expounded; and for *bodhisattvas*, the teaching of the Six *pāramitās* is expounded.

[(2b) dispelling the teaching on the twelve sense bases (*āyatanas*)]

無眼耳鼻舌身意 無色聲香味觸法者

As for “**There is no eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, mind; no form, sound, smell, taste, touchables, nor object of mind,**”

This [statement], which is the second [section dispelling attachment to the six teachings of *dharmā*], is suggested to dispel [the teaching on] the twelve sense bases. Next, in order to briefly explain the meaning of the twelve sense bases, three aspects may be differentiated: (i) to clarify what gave rise to the teaching [of the twelve sense bases]; (ii) to interpret the names [of the twelve sense bases]; (iii) to disclose the nature of the essence [of the twelve sense bases].

[(i)] With regard to what gave rise to the teaching [of the twelve sense bases], there are two intentions: that is to say, to awaken [sentient beings] to enter the twofold emptiness of both sentient being and *dharmā*. To enter the emptiness of sentient being means, according to the *Treatise in Twenty Verses on Consciousness-Only (Vijñaptimātrata-Vimsatika-kārikā)*, “to stand on this teaching of the twelve sense bases, as it is expounded. In other words, if one thoroughly understands that the six consciousnesses are transformed from the six pairs of *dharma*s [i.e., the twelve sense bases], and that there is no perceiver or knower at all, then one will awaken to enter the [teaching

of] no-self of living beings.” To enter the emptiness of *dharmas* means that which is taught by dispelling the twelve sense bases reveals the principle of the emptiness [of *dharmas*]. With regard to the difference between Bhāvaviveka and Dharmapāla in dispelling [the teaching of the twelve sense bases], it should be speculated as per the above.

(ii) The name [of the twelve sense bases] will be interpreted generally first and then specifically. First, in clarifying the name of the twelve sense bases generally, the “twelve” indicates a number and the “sense bases” has the meaning of “produce and develop.” In other words, because both six sense organs and [six] cognitive-objects produce and develop all minds and their attributes, they are called “sense bases.” This is categorized in the numerical determinative compound (*dvigu*) of the six-compound (*sat-samsasa*). Next, [in interpreting] the names [of the twelve sense bases] specifically, the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*, Chapter 3, states as follows:

“By seeing repeatedly various forms and discarding what is seen, it is called ‘eye;’ by figuring this out repeatedly and being able to hear sound, it is called ‘ear;’ by figuring this out and being able to smell various scents, it is called ‘nose;’ by eliminating hunger, making speeches, making a calling, it is called ‘tongue;’ by having all sense organs respond and fill up, it is called ‘body.’ A foolish one, in the long darkness, struts, hides and protects him/herself, attaches to his/her own self and considers it as ‘mine’ and ‘myself;’ moreover, entire worlds are provisionally established by these [sense bases], all kinds of words and thoughts, such as human being, people, living being, living being with will, and learned-youth, etc.; therefore, this is called ‘thinking-mind (*manas-vijñāna*).”

...

“That which is materially countable, locatable, and increasable is called ‘form;’ that which accepts and rejects and adds different ideas is called ‘sound;’ that which is formless, without shape, and constantly moved by the wind is called ‘smell;’ that which can be tasted by tongue and frequently causes the suffering of sickness is called ‘taste;’ that which is able to be realized through body is called ‘touch;’ that which can be sustained ubiquitously and remembered solely by the

thinking-mind is called 'dharma.'"

(iii) In disclosing the essence [of the twelve sense bases], the visual organ is, as described in various scriptures [i.e., *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* and *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*], that which consists of the four gross elements on which the visual-consciousness is based. It takes pure form as its essence. Just like the description of the visual organ, the auditory organ consists of the four gross elements on which the auditory-consciousness is based and takes pure form as its essence. The mind-organ commonly uses the eighth [*ālaya*] consciousness as its essence.

According to the *Treatise on the Great Vehicle Abhidharma (Mahāyāna-Abhidharma-samuccaya)*, form consists of the four gross elements and takes its self-nature by means of the twenty-five kinds of phenomena perceived by the visual organ. These are blue, yellow, red, and white, long and short, square and round, roughness and delicateness, high and low, straight and crooked, light and shadow, bright and dark, cloud and smoke, dust and fog, invisible form and visible form, and form manifesting consistently and uniformly in space. Sound consists of eleven kinds: favorable sound and unfavorable sound; sounds consisting of mutually conflicting sounds; sounds caused by receiving the [four] gross elements; sounds caused by not receiving the four elements; sounds caused by fulfillment of the four elements; sounds formed together by the world; sounds established by being projected; sounds imagined by being attached; sounds inclusive of a saint's words; and sounds exclusive of a saint's words. Smell consists of six kinds: good smell; bad smell; neutral smell; smell arising together; combined smell; and variable smell. Taste consists of twelve kinds: bitter; sour; sweet; pungent; briny; insipid; favorable; unfavorable; consisting of mutually conflicting [kinds of tastes]; arising together; combined; and variable. Tactile qualities consist of twenty-six kinds: the four elements of body; smoothness and roughness; lightness and heaviness; softness; slowness; hastiness; coldness; hunger; thirst; impureness; satiety; powerfulness; inferiority; anguish; itch; stickiness; sickness; aging; death; tiredness; rest; and courage. In this way, the five

cognitive-objects are extensively described in the *Treatise on the Great Vehicle Abhidharma*; the similarities and differences of various treatises [on this subject] are described in the other chapter [of the *Treatise on the Great Vehicle Abhidharma*].

The sense base of mind takes its self-nature by means of eighty-two *dharma*s out of [a total of] one hundred *dharma*s. These are: fifty-one kinds of *dharma*s of mental functions; one [*dharma*] of form, that is, the form of the sense base of mind; twenty-four kinds of *dharma*s unassociated with mind; and six kinds of unconditioned [*dharma*s]. According to the *Treatise on the Great Vehicle Abhidharma*, etc., [the sense base of mind] takes its self-nature by means of eighty-eight *dharma*s: in other words, [in addition to the above,] the four kinds of the sense base of mind's forms and the two kinds of unconditioned [*dharma*s], as described [in the *Treatise on the Great Vehicle Abhidharma*]. The other aspects [of the twelve sense bases] are extensively explained in the other chapter [of the *Treatise on the Great Vehicle Abhidharma*].

[2c) dispelling the teaching on the eighteen realms]

無眼界 乃至無意識界者

As for “**There is no eye-realm and, in this way, up to no realm of mind-consciousness,**”

This [statement], which is the third [section on dispelling attachment to the six teachings of *dharma*], dispels [attachment to the teaching on] the eighteen realms. [To interpret] the eighteen realms, three aspects may be differentiated: (i) revealing what gave rise to the teaching [on the eighteen realms]; (ii) interpreting the name [of the eighteen realms]; (iii) disclosing the nature of the essence [of the eighteen realms].

(i) What gave rise to the teaching refers to the fact that the World Honored One teaches about the eighteen realms both to those who construct a self by attaching to forms and mind and to those who have an inferior spiritual level.

(ii) The name [of the eighteen realms] will be interpreted generally first and then specifically. [In interpreting] the name of the eighteen realms generally, “eighteen” indicates number and “realm” has the meaning of clan or species, because all *dharmas* consist of eighteen clans or species. This is [categorized] in the numerical determinative compound (*dvigu*) which can be understood as [explained] above. Next, [in interpreting] the names [of the eighteen realms] specifically, [the names of] the six sense-organs and six cognitive-objects are as explained in the discussion of the [twelve] sense bases. To name the six consciousnesses is twofold: one is that the “consciousness of form” and, in this way, up to the “consciousness of *dharmas*,” are named by following the [six] cognitive-objects, because to establish names by following the [six] cognitive-objects is in accord with the meanings of the [six] consciousnesses; the other is that the “visual consciousness” and, in this way, up to “mental consciousness,” are named by following the [six] sense-organs, because to establish names by following the [six] sense-organs fulfills the five kinds of meanings such as “support,” “expression,” and so forth. In other words, it is named “form-consciousness” because it is the consciousness of form and, in this way, it is named “mental consciousness” because it is the consciousness of mind. Therefore, it is categorized in the determinative compound (*tatpuruṣa*) of the six-compounds. The details are described extensively in the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, Chapter 5.

(iii) In clarifying [the nature of] the essence, the twelve elements such as eye, etc., are the same as those discussed [in the passage on the twelve] sense bases. The six consciousnesses such as visual [consciousness], etc., take their self-natures by means of their own names, which appear among the one hundred *dharmas*. The other aspects [of the eighteen realms] are extensively described in various treatises.

[(2d) dispelling the teaching on the twelve limbs of dependent origination (*pratīyāsamutpāda*)]

無無明 亦無無明盡 乃至無老死 亦無老死盡者

As for “**There is no [origination of] ignorance, no extinction of ignorance, and, in this way, up to no [origination of] aging and death, and no extinction of aging and death.**”

This [statement], which is the fourth [section on dispelling attachment to the six teachings on *dharmā*], is meant to dispel [attachment to] the teaching on [the twelve limbs of] dependent origination. However, there are two kinds of [ways to view] dependent origination: one is forward evolution (*pravṛtti*), and the other is reverse extermination (*pratiloma*). All actions (*karmas*) arise due to ignorance; furthermore, aging and death are conditioned by birth [or arising]. In this way, [sentient beings] transmigrate into the five destinies and the four kinds of birth. It is as if the beginning point of the phase of the full moon is not knowable. In the nature of emptiness, there is no such forward evolution; therefore, the [*Heart*] *Sūtra* illustrates that “there is no [origination of] ignorance, and in this way, up to no [origination of] aging and death.” The power of contemplating wisdom enables one to extinguish ignorance. Since ignorance is extinguished, all actions are also extinct. In this way, because birth is extinguished, aging and death are also extinct. This is to turn [the wheel] backward and return to *nirvāṇa*; therefore, it is called “reverse extermination.” In the nature of emptiness, there is no such reverse extermination; therefore, the [*Heart*] *Sūtra* also illustrates that “there is no extinction of ignorance and, in this way, up to no extinction of aging and death.”

What is the motivation to expound the teaching [on the twelve limbs of dependent origination] in the [*Heart*] *Sūtra*? While the *Lotus Sūtra* expounds [the teaching on] dependent origination for [those who] wish to attain the fruit of the solitary realizer (*pratyekabuddha*), the [*Heart*] *Sūtra* expounds the teaching in order to reveal the emptiness of *dharmā*. Nevertheless, [the teaching on] dependent origination should not be construed according to the common interpretation, and therefore, it will now be explained differentiating three aspects: (i) interpreting the name [of the twelve limbs of dependent origination]; (ii) disclosing the

essence [of the twelve limbs of dependent origination]; (iii) discarding and establishing [the twelve limbs of dependent origination].

[(i)] the name [of the twelve limbs of dependent origination] will be interpreted generally first and then specifically. In interpreting the name generally, “12 (twelve)” indicates the whole number which is [described] in the *Sūtras on Conditioned Arising*. Because each of these [twelve] elements (*aṅga*) is generated without being excluded and constantly arises according to their own conditions, it is called “dependent origination.” According to the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*, from the perspective of cause, it is called “conditioned enlightenment,” and from the perspective of result, it is called “conditioned origination.” In this name [of the twelve limbs of dependent origination], the doctrine is revealed by using number, and, therefore, it is categorized in the numerical determinative compound (*dvigu*) of the six-compounds.

Next, in disclosing specific names [of the twelve limbs], because, throughout the three time periods, [one] does not understand [reality] by attaching to cognitive-objects, which is called “ignorance” (*avidyā*); because the three activities, such as [the activity of being] wholesome, etc., are transmitted and generated, they are called “action” (*karma* or *samskāra*); the eight consciousnesses, such as visual consciousness, etc., recognize the realm of cognitive-objects, and therefore are called “consciousness” (*viññāna*); characteristics and forms present the appearance of matter, and therefore are called “name-and-form” (*nāma-rūpa*); the six sense-organs, such as the eye, etc., generate mind, etc., and are called the “six sense bases” (*ṣaḍ-āyatana*); the three tactile sensations, such as pain, etc., contact with the surface of objects, and therefore are called “contact” (*sparsa*); the three feelings, such as suffering, etc., feel favorable or unfavorable, etc., and are called “feeling” (*vedanā*); narcissistic attachments taint the view of self and are called “craving” (*trṣṇā*); the four kinds of clinging, such as greediness, etc., attach and cling to objects and are called “clinging” (*upādāna*); seeds, such as action and consciousness, etc., are able to engender birth, etc., and are therefore called “existence” (*bhāva*); the five *dharmas*, such as consciousness, etc., originate from nonexistence to existence, which is

called “birth” (*jāti*); these five *dharmas* [eventually] decay and are destroyed, which is therefore called “aging and death” (*jarā-marana*).

(ii) Disclosing the essence [of the twelve elements] is threefold: the first is to discriminate the projection into arising; the second is to correctly disclose the self-nature; the third is to differentiate present seeds.

[First,] discriminating the projection into arising: ignorance and action are called that which can project (*ākṣepaka*) because they are able to project the seeds of five results, such as consciousness, etc., [i.e., name and form, six bases, contact and feeling]; the five kinds of seeds, such as consciousness, etc., are called that which is projected (*ākṣepaka*) because they are projected by the former two elements, [i.e. ignorance and action]; the three described as craving, clinging and existence are called that-which-can-engender (*jānaka*) because they immediately engender future birth and aging and death; birth and aging and death are [called] those-that-are-engendered (*jānaka*) because they are immediately engendered by craving, clinging and existence.

[Second,] correctly disclosing the self-nature: that which can produce and directly summons the three actions, such as [the action of being] wholesome, etc., is the element of ignorance; that which is projected from [ignorance] is the essence of the element of action; that which immediately produces the seed of the eighth consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*) is the essence of the element of consciousness; the remaining causes [i.e., six sense bases, contact, and feeling], excluding the last three causes, are all categorized as the essence of the element of name-and-form, and the last three causes refer to each of the three [kinds of] seeds [i.e. craving, clinging, and existence]. An interpretation with regard to name-and-form is that it comprises the five kinds of seeds [i.e. the seeds of consciousness, name-and-form, six sense bases, contact, and feeling] for its self-nature, and according to their predominance, the other four kinds of seeds are established. In other words, the seed of *ālaya* [consciousness], which is called the element of consciousness, establishes the rest of the three seeds [i.e., six sense bases, contact, and feeling], and also, the six sense bases, etc., [i.e.,

contact and feeling] can nourish the six kinds of seeds, such as [the seed of] action.

Desire is called “craving.” Conditioned by craving, the four kinds of clinging, such as [the clinging to] desire, are also born as the essence of the element of clinging. These four kinds of clinging, according to the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*, Chapter 10, take desire caused by, respectively, the cognitive-object of all desires, the four views [of reality], the mistaken understanding of the precepts, and an illusory view of the self (*satkārya-drṣṭi*), as their essence. [Some] scriptures and treatises describe them either as the same as or different from the *Sūtras on Conditioned Arising*, etc. The six kinds of seeds, such as action, consciousness, [name-and-form, the six sense bases, contact, and feeling,] evolve when they nourish themselves; that is called “existence.” In the fruit of the *dharma* engendered by the five seeds, such as consciousness, [name-and-form, the six sense bases, contact, and feeling,] [everything] from intermediate existence (*antarā-bhava*) up to basic existence, is called the element of “birth,” as long as there is no deterioration; the state of deterioration is generally called “aging;” and the destruction of the body and the end of life are called “death.”

[Third,] to differentiate present seeds is twofold: one approach straightens their principle by means of the real, and the other approach explains [them] provisionally by following [their] characteristics. [According to the approach that] explains [them] provisionally by following [their] characteristics, each of [the twelve-limbed] elements penetrates to both seeds and manifestations. In this regard, the *Dasabhumikasūtrāsāstra* states that “ignorance is twofold: one is the aspect of the seed; the other is the aspect of its result. Up to aging and death also should be understood in this way.” [According to the approach that] straightens their principle by means of the real, both birth and aging and death are not seeds but merely manifestations; the six elements, such as consciousness, etc., [i.e., name-and-form, the six sense bases, contact, and feeling,] are not manifestations but merely seeds; and the elements of ignorance, action, craving and clinging all penetrate to both manifestations and seeds.

(iii) To discard or establish [the twelve elements] is threefold: first, to discard or establish all elements by means of universality and definitiveness; second, to differentiate all elements by means of unfolding and folding; third, to illustrate the similarity and difference of the elements by means of period and stage.

[First,] with regard to discarding or establishing the [twelve] elements [by means of universality and definitiveness], the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, Chapter 8 states as follows:

“Question: Why is the element of aging not established separately?

Answer: Because it does not definitely exist, it is attached to death to form an element.

Question: Why is sickness not an element?

Answer: Because it is not universal or definite [in causing rebirth]. Even though aging is not definite, it is universal, and for that reason it constitutes an element, because, with the exception of premature death, all sentient beings in the various realms, destinies, and forms of birth, undergo a decaying process.

Question: Even though name-and-form are not universal, why do they constitute an element?

Answer: They constitute an element because they are definite. Those born from wombs, eggs, and moisture definitely have name-and-form as long as their six organs are incomplete. Also, the element of name-and-form is universal. Even though beings in the realm of form, and those who are miraculously born, have the five sense organs when they first experience birth, still the organs do not yet function, and so, at that time, they are not designated as an element of the six sense bases. Even though beings definitely possess the mental faculty when first born in the formless realm, still they do not perceive clearly, so it is not called the mental organ.

Question: Why does craving constitute a separate element even though it does not exist universally? Is it because one born to an evil destiny does not experience craving?

Answer: It constitutes a separate element because it is definite and because those born in good destinies who do not seek nonexistence definitely experience craving.

Question: Does the non-returner necessarily not experience

craving?

Answer: Even though [the non-returners] do not experience craving [that nourishes rebirth], just as they [still] grasp, they definitely possess the seeds of craving. Also, craving is universal, because those born in evil destinies still crave their present selves and objects. Due to their not having craving that seek a body in the evil destinies, it is said by the scriptures that [craving] does not exist, but it is not completely nonexistent.”

Second, to discriminate [the twelve elements] by means of unfolding and folding is twofold: one distinguishes unfolding or folding from that which is projected into rebirth, and the other distinguishes unfolding or folding from that which is produced and nourished. According to the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, unfolding or folding can be distinguished] from that which is projected into rebirth [in this way:]

“What is the reason for establishing birth and aging and death as that which is engendered, and separately establishing the five elements of consciousness, etc., as that which is projected? Since in the causal state specific characteristics are difficult to know, the five elements [of consciousness, etc.,] must be separately established on the basis of [their future] results.”

Thus, the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*] describes, “Because the distinct characteristics of these result states are easy to recognize, the two elements [of birth and aging and death] are established generally in order to indicate the three kinds of sufferings.” According to the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, unfolding and folding] can be distinguished from that which is produced and nourished [in this way:]

“What is the reason for generally establishing ignorance for the production of action, and separately establishing craving and clinging for the state of nourishing action? Even though various afflictions are capable of producing and nourishing, the power of ignorance is predominant as such, and continues to increase when producing action because it fulfills eleven superior particularities, such as its objects, etc., as extensively discussed

in the [*Sūtra on the Primacy of the Dharma Gate Distinguishing Conditioned Arising*]. When nourishing action, the power of craving is especially predominant; it is described as craving because, like water, it can enrich and, in order to sprout, it must be watered repeatedly. Also, the two elements of craving and clinging are distinguished on the basis of the preliminary and subsequent parts [of the watering process]. The one [cause of action] of ignorance is established, in which there is no meaning of production through repetition.”

Third, the similarity and difference of [the elements] is illustrated in two ways, by means of period and stage: the first [way] illustrates the similarity and difference by means of stage, and the second illustrates the similarity and difference by means of period. Regarding whether the stages of [the twelve elements] are the same or different, the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*] holds that

“These [twelve] elements of dependent arising are all based on their own stages, but some actions that are produced depend on the ignorance of another [stage], just as ignorance of the lower [stage] produces the action of the upper stage. If it were otherwise, when one first subdued the impurity of a lower stage, the *samādhi* of the upper stage that had arisen would not be the element of the action, because the ignorance of that stage had not yet arisen.”

Regarding whether the periods of [the twelve elements] are the same or different, the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*] holds that

“These twelve elements which consist of the ten causes and the two results are not necessarily of the same period. Of the [ten] causes, between the first seven and craving, clinging, and becoming, some belong to different [periods] and some to identical ones. If each [group] is necessarily of the same period, in the case of [the last] two [i.e., birth and aging and death], the [middle] three [i.e., craving, clinging, and becoming], and the [rest of the first] seven, a single repetition of cause and effect in the twelve [elements] sufficiently reveals the karmic cycle and avoids nihilism and eternalism. There is really no

need to devise a double repetition [as the Lesser Vehicle does], or else one would have to go beyond those [two] and they would be extended endlessly [in infinite regression].”

It seems that [the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*], first, is based on its own doctrine of a single repetition of dependent arising and, then, criticizes the *Sarvāstivādin* doctrine of a double repetition of dependent arising. The other aspects [of the twelve limbs of dependent origination] are extensively described in the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*].

[(2e) dispelling the teaching on the Four Noble Truths]

無苦集滅道者

As for **“There is no suffering, origination [of suffering], cessation [of suffering], and the path [leading to liberation].”**

This [statement], which is the fifth [section on dispelling attachment to the six teachings of *dharma*], is meant to dispel [attachment to] the teaching of the Four Noble Truths. To what [purpose] is the teaching of the Four Noble Truths expounded? The *Lotus Sūtra* [states] that the Four Noble Truths should be expounded in order to save listeners (*śrāvakas*). [Yet,] in this [*Heart*] *Sūtra*, [attachment to] the Four Noble Truths is dispelled in order to reveal the emptiness of *dharma*. With regard to [the interpretation of] the Four Noble Truths, three aspects are differentiated: (i) Interpreting the name [of the four noble truths]; (ii) Disclosing the nature of essence [of the four noble truths]; and (iii) Discriminating the number of varieties [of meanings of the four noble truths].

[(i)] the name [of the four noble truths] will be interpreted generally first and then specifically. In explaining the name generally, “four” indicates the number [of the noble truths], while “truth” has two meanings: According to the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, one meaning is that the characteristics [of the four noble truths illustrated in the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*] are not separated from each other, and the other is that by separating from [the four noble truths one can] attain the

ultimate goal. Based on the previous [explanation], one can see that this is the numerical determinative compound (*dvigu*). To explain the name specifically means that the “truth” has four different [names:] “suffering;” “the origination of suffering;” “the cessation of suffering;” and “the path leading to the cessation of suffering.” That which consists of the three kinds of agonies is called “suffering;” it summons a later result and is therefore called “the origination of suffering;” the origination of suffering is exhausted and is therefore called “the cessation of suffering;” finally, it is able to eliminate and penetrate, and is therefore called “the path leading to the cessation of suffering.”

(ii) In disclosing the essence, [the essence of] “the truth of suffering” refers to the five aggregates which are defiled; that which can instigate the *karma* of delusion is [the essence of] “the truth of the origination of suffering;” “cessation resulting from the proper discrimination of *dharma*s through unconditioned wisdom” is the essence of “the truth of the cessation of suffering;” and [the essence of] “the truth of the path leading to the cessation of suffering” is the path which is sacred and unconditioned.

(iii) In discriminating the various [meanings of the four noble truths], there are either two or three [kinds of meanings, depending on perspective]. “Two kinds” means that one is the worldly [truth] and the other is the ultimate [truth]. Each of these truths contains the four truths described in the *Prakaranāryavāca-sāstra*, and therefore will not be discussed here in order to avoid confusion.

The *Śrīmāla-sūtra* also describes the two kinds [of meanings of the four noble truths]: the first is the constructed [four noble truths], and the second is the unconstructed [four noble truths]. [With regard to the constructed four noble truths,] due to the afflictive hindrances and the *karmas* produced by them, limited birth is instigated, and the fruit of that instigation is called “the truth of suffering;” that which instigates the *karma* of delusion is called “the origination of suffering;” that which exhausts those sufferings and the origination of suffering is called “the truth of the cessation of suffering;” and the wisdom that contemplates the emptiness of the sentient being is called “the truth of the path

leading to the cessation of suffering.” [With regard to the unconstructed four noble truths,] [based on] undefiled *karma* as a cause and ignorance as a condition, *karmic* retribution accompanied by the instigation of birth-by-transformation is “the truth of suffering;” that which is able to instigate the *karma* of delusion is called “the truth of the origination of suffering;” when those sufferings and the origination of suffering are exhausted, it is called “the truth of the cessation of suffering;” the wisdom that contemplates the emptiness of *dharma* is called “the truth of the path leading to the cessation of suffering.”

Question: Even though the attachment to *dharma* neither produces *karma* nor nourishes life unprosperously, and the noble path of the undefiled is neither the truth of suffering nor the truth of the origination of suffering, why does the [*Śrīmālā*] *Sūtra* say that the undefiled is a cause and ignorance is a condition?

Answer: According to the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, Chapter 8, because the attachment to *dharma* and the condition of producing its own result are cut off, it is said that the undefiled is a cause and ignorance is a condition. In the principle of truth, the earlier instigation of the *karma* of limited birth-and-death, and the fruit of that which is instigated, due to their self-producing power, transform superiorly and mysteriously, which is “the inconceivable transformation” described extensively in [the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*].

“Three kinds” [of meanings] refers to [the fact] that the two kinds of the four truths [i.e., the constructed and the unconstructed] both contain the three natures, namely, the imagined nature, [the dependent nature, and the perfected nature]. Since one can refer to both the *Madhyantāvibhanga* and Chapter 8 of the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, which explain the details, it is not necessary to discuss them here.

[(2f) dispelling the teaching on wisdom and abandonment]

無智亦無得者

As for “There is no wisdom and no attainment,”

This [statement], which is the sixth [section on dispelling attachment to the six teachings of *dharma*], is meant to dispel [attachment to] the teaching on wisdom and abandonment. To what [purpose] is the teaching on wisdom and abandonment expounded? According to the *Lotus Sūtra*, the *dharma* of the six perfections (*pāramitās*) is taught for all *bodhisattvas*. Here, in this [*Heart*] *Sūtra*, the teaching on wisdom and abandonment is dispelled in order to reveal the emptiness of *dharma*. However, the interpretation of wisdom and abandonment is twofold: one interpretation is that as the state of cause it is called wisdom or *prajñā*, and as the state of result it is called attainment or *bodhi*; the other interpretation is that *bodhi* denotes wisdom, and *nirvāṇa* refers to attainment. Although there are two interpretations, the latter is superior because all the *Prajñāpāramitā sūtras* dispel both *bodhi* and *nirvāṇa*. [The meanings of] *bodhi* and *nirvāṇa* shall be differentiated later.

[3. Revealing the fruit attained]

[a] Clarifying the fruit attained]

[(1) Illustrating the power of contemplation]

以無所得故 菩提薩埵 依般若波羅蜜多 故心無罣礙者

As for “Because there is no attainment, the *bodhisattvas* depend on the Perfection of Wisdom (*Prajñāpāramitā*), and therefore their minds are free from [mental] obstructions,”

From here [to the end], the third [part of the *sūtra*] reveals the fruit attained, which is twofold: first, to correctly clarify the fruit attained; second, to demonstrate the achievement through examples. The former, [to correctly clarify the fruit attained,] has two [approaches]: to illustrate that contemplation has [its own] power, and to reveal the fruit attained. This [passage discusses] the first [approach, illustrating the power of contemplation].

This [passage] is threefold: The first [section], “because there is

no attainment,” means to illustrate emptiness apart from [the six] characteristics, and the true principle of the nature of emptiness apart from the six teachings of *dharmā*. Revealing the former, [that is, both emptiness and the true principle of the nature of emptiness,] followed by the latter, [that is, being apart from both the six characteristics and the six teachings of *dharmā*,] affirms “no attainment.” In the second [section], “*bodhisattva*” refers to the one who converts through contemplation, as explained earlier. *Bodhi* denotes “awakening” and *sattva* means “sentient beings to be guided;” this means upwardly, to seek for *bodhi*, and downwardly, to lead sentient beings to enlightenment. Thus, one who cultivates the wisdom [of emptiness] and generates compassion [for sentient beings] is called a “*bodhisattva*.” The third [section], “[*bodhisattvas*] depend on the Perfection of Wisdom and therefore their minds are free from [mental] obstructions,” shows that contemplation has [its own] power. The translation of the name and the interpretation of the meaning [of contemplation] should be understood as above.

“*Prajñā*” denotes knowledge as well as wisdom in [the category of] specific objects. The word “mind” refers to a mind coextensive with wisdom, which is twofold: namely, nature and characteristic. [Mental] obstruction refers to the two hindrances of affliction and the known. From the general interpretation of the meaning, it is said that, because the true nature of the principle of emptiness is separate from the six characteristics, *bodhisattvas* who convert rely on contemplating wisdom, and [those whose] minds are coextensive with wisdom realize emptiness and cut off hindrances. This is different from [the idea] that both ordinary people and the two vehicles [i.e., *srāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*] who attach to existence realize the twofold emptiness internally and cut off the two hindrances [externally].

[(2) Revealing the fruit attained]

無罣礙故 無有恐怖 遠離顛倒夢想 究竟涅槃者

As for “because [*bodhisattvas*] have no [mental] obstructions, they

are without fear, free from perversions and dreamlike thoughts, and achieve ultimate nirvāṇa”

This [statement], which is the second [approach clarifying the fruit attained], is meant to reveal the fruit attained. A version [of the *Heart Sūtra*] states that “[they are] completely free from all perverted views and dreamlike thoughts.” Although there are two versions, the latter [in other words, the new version] is superior.

The fruit attained is fourfold: first, “because [*bodhisattvas*] have no [mental] obstructions, they are without fear,” means to be free from all fears. Fear (*bhaya*) is of five kinds: according to Chapter 2 of the *Buddhabhūmi-śāstra*, “The five kinds of fears are fear of mortality, fear of infamy, fear of death, fear of evil destiny, and fear of others. All of these five kinds of fears will be far away from the stage of attaining the pure and ultimate joy of mind (*āśaya*).”

Second, “being free from perversion (*viparyāsa*)” means to be free from perverted consequences, which are [respectively] of three, four, seven or eight [kinds]. The three [kinds of perversions] consist of thoughts (*samjñā*), views (*drṣṭi*), and [discriminating] mind (*citta*). The four [kinds of perversions] consist of [perverting] impermanence as permanence, suffering as happiness, impurity as purity, and no-self as self. The seven kinds of perversions are not different from [the combination of] the three and four kinds of perversions above. The eight kinds of perversions consist of the above four kinds with an additional four kinds: while the true principles of the fruit of Buddhahood are permanence, happiness, selfhood and purity, by attaching [to them they are perverted to] impermanence, selflessness, impurity and the inversion of happiness, which is suffering.

Third, “being free from dreamlike thoughts” means to be free from the fruits of dreamlike thoughts, which are the eight kinds of illusions. Because these [eight kinds of illusory] thoughts are like dreams, they are called “dreamlike thoughts.” The *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* designates the eight kinds of [illusory] discriminations and interprets their meanings [as follows]: because all sentient beings do not clearly

understand the nature of emptiness, that is, suchness (*tathatā*), as a causal effect, the three consequences can be originated: first, sense-organs and cognitive-objects; second, the view of self and self-conceit; third, desire, hatred and ignorance. Because of desire, [hatred, and ignorance,] all *karmas* can be created, sentient beings and surrounding worlds can be originated, and, in this way, the endless cycle of life and death (*saṃsāra*) is generated. For this reason, contemplating the emptiness of sentient beings and *dharmas*, together with investigations, eliminates the *karma* of delusion and [leads one] attain the great *bodhi*. In this regard, the meaning of the eight [kinds of illusory] discriminations is summarized in the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra*, Chapter 36, as follows: “Because all ignorant people do not clearly understand suchness when it is revealed as such, and instead pursue causal effects, the eight [kinds of illusory] discriminations transform and can produce the three consequences, which can create entire worlds of sentient beings and their surroundings.”

What are the eight kinds of [illusory] discriminations? (i) Self-nature (*svabhāva*): in entire *dharmas*, the discrimination of self-natures such as form and sound, etc. (ii) Particularity (*viśeṣa*): within this, the discrimination of what is visible and invisible, etc. (iii) Grasping general [object]: within this, based on [the discriminations of self-nature, such as] form and sound, etc., one constructs sentient being, self, house, army, or forest, etc. (iv) The discriminations of a self, and (v) what belongs to the self: these two discriminations are all defiled; by clinging to existence, the self [as “I”] or what belongs to the self [as “mine”] is constructed. (vi) The discrimination of what is favorable. (vii) [The discrimination of] what is unfavorable, and (viii) [the discrimination of] all mutual opposites, from which the discrimination of, respectively, wondrous, nonwondrous, both and neither of these, are created.

According to the interpretation of the *Tripitaka* [Master, Hsüan-tsang], the eight kinds [of illusory discriminations] all take as their self-nature the wisdom produced by the retribution of moral indeterminacy or that which can be investigated. To produce the three

consequences means that the first three [illusory] discriminations [i.e., self-nature, differentiation and attachment to grasping general object,] can create conceptual elaborations whose bases and objects are the six organs and six cognitive-objects. The middle two [illusory] discriminations [i.e., the discriminations of a self and what belongs to the self] can produce the view of self and self-conceit, and the last three [i.e., the discriminations of what is favorable, what is unfavorable, and all mutual opposites illusory discriminations,] produce desire, hatred and ignorance, respectively. It should be understood that by depending on bases and objects, [in other words, the six organs and six cognitive-objects,] the view of self and self-conceit are created, and by depending on the view of self and self-conceit, desire, hatred and ignorance are created. [Furthermore,] these three consequences can constitute the law of *saṃsāra*, which consists of sentient beings and their surrounding worlds. [Regarding] “contemplation,” including the four investigations, [they] are described in various treatises. According to the [Heart] *Sūtra*, it means that through wisdom (*prajñā*), [one] realizes the emptiness of *dharma* internally and is free from the perverted view that [generates] the eight illusory thoughts.

Fourth, “to achieve ultimate *nirvāṇa*” means to attain the fruit of *nirvāṇa*. To explain *nirvāṇa*, four aspects may be differentiated: (i) to interpret the name; (ii) to disclose the nature of the essence; (iii) [to delineate] the kinds [of *nirvāṇa*]; and (iv) to differentiate [*nirvāṇa*] through questions and answers.

(i) In interpreting the name, the old [version] called it *nirvāṇa* in Sanskrit or *niwon*, which may be translated as “tranquil extinction” in [the Chinese] language. Hsüan-tsang of T'ang China called it *parinirvāṇa*, which means “perfect stillness” because it is ultimately free from obstructions, *saṃsāra* and disturbances. Yet in order to preserve the name [used] in the old [version], it is called *nirvāṇa*.

(ii) In disclosing the [nature of] the essence, there are different views [in the early schools]. For the *Sarvāstivādin* school, *nirvāṇa*, both with remainder and without remainder, takes as its essence the “cessation resulting from the proper discrimination of *dharmas* through

unconditioned wisdom,” which has true self-nature. According to the *Sautrāntika* school, the stage wherein afflictions are extinguished is called *nirvāṇa* with remainder, and the stage wherein the fruits of suffering are extinguished is called *nirvāṇa* without remainder, which is not real but provisional. There are two interpretations of these [two types of *nirvāṇa*]: one is that they take the truth of cessation as their essence, because the stage in which the *karma* of delusion is extinguished is comprised in the truth of cessation; the other is that both [types of *nirvāṇa*] take their self-natures by means of the truth of the path leading to the cessation of suffering, because through the accomplishment of the path, delusions [and afflictions] are extinguished.

Now, in the *Mahāyāna* [teaching], there are [also] different views [about *nirvāṇa*]. Dharmarakṣema states that the four kinds of virtues are the branches [of *nirvāṇa*] and profundity is the root [of *nirvāṇa*]. The *Tripitaka* [Master], *Paramārtha* expounds that “The *Mahāyāna* teaches the four kinds of *nirvāṇa*; three of them are the fruits of the path, but [the *nirvāṇa* of] original pureness is not comprised in the fruit of the path.” [He] also expounds that *nirvāṇa* with no fixed abode takes both wisdom (*prajñā*) and great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*) for its self-nature. [However,] all these teachings cannot be discussed [here] at length. Now, the *Tripitaka* [Master, Hsüan-tsang] remarks that the four kinds of *nirvāṇa* take suchness (*tathatā*) as their essence. Therefore, the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, Chapter 10, states that the four kinds of *nirvāṇa* are “established based on the suchness that is free from obstacles.” In illustrating *nirvāṇa*, that the three elements of “*dharma*-body,” “*prajñā*,” and “liberation” achieve *nirvāṇa* means that wisdom, which is able to achieve [nirvāṇa], intends to achieve suchness, which is free from obstacles; it does not [mean] that wisdom, which is able to achieve [nirvāṇa], is the self-nature of [nirvāṇa].

The different types [of *nirvāṇa*] can be interpreted in two ways. One is that both the first [i.e., the *nirvāṇa* of original pureness] and the last [i.e., the *nirvāṇa* with no fixed abode] are suchness, and the two kinds in the middle [i.e., *nirvāṇa* with remainder and *nirvāṇa* without remainder] are comprised in the cessation of defilements through the

proper discrimination of *dharmas*. The other is that the first [*nirvāṇa*] is suchness and the other three [*nirvāṇa*] are comprised in the cessation of defilements through the proper discrimination of *dharmas*. Although there are two interpretations, the latter is in accord with the principle doctrine of Dharmapāla.

(iii) In differentiating the varieties [of *nirvāṇa*], there are, briefly, two kinds and, extensively, four kinds. Two kinds refer to “[*nirvāṇa*] that is pure by nature” and “[*nirvāṇa*] that is pure by skillful means.” The extensive four kinds refer to “[the *nirvāṇa* of] the original pureness,” “[*nirvāṇa*] with remainder,” “[*nirvāṇa*] without remainder” and “[*nirvāṇa*] with no fixed abode.” According to the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, Chapter 10, the meaning of *nirvāṇa* is divided into four kinds:

(iii-1) “*Nirvāṇa* that is originally pure by nature (*anādikālika-suddha-nirvāṇa*)” means that although it has adventitious defilements, it is nevertheless originally pure by nature, endowed with innumerable subtle and virtuous qualities realized only within by true saints, and essentially tranquil by nature—hence the name *nirvāṇa*.

(iii-2) “*Nirvāṇa* with remainder (*sopadhiseṣa-nirvāṇa*)” is true suchness detached from the obstacle of the afflictions. Even though the support for subtle suffering has not ended, still the obstacle has been eternally stilled—hence it is called *nirvāṇa*.

(iii-3) “*Nirvāṇa* without remainder (*nirupadhiseṣa-nirvāṇa*)” is true suchness detached from the suffering of *saṃsāra*. The afflictions have been exhausted, the remaining support is also extinguished, and the mass of suffering is eternally stilled—therefore it is called *nirvāṇa*.

(iii-4) “*Nirvāṇa* with no fixed abode (*apraṭiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*)” is true suchness detached from the obstacle of the known. It is always assisted by great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*) and wisdom (*prajñā*), and as a consequence one does not dwell in *saṃsāra* or *nirvāṇa*. Benefitting and gladdening sentient beings, it is eternal in quiescence—therefore it is called *nirvāṇa*.

All sentient beings possess the first [*nirvāṇa*]. Post-learners of the two vehicles may possess the first three. Only the World-Honored One can be said to possess [all] four.

(iv) [*Nirvāṇa* is differentiated] by questions and answers.

Question: How is it that the Sugata [i.e., the Buddha] has [*nirvāṇa*] with remainder (*upādhi*)?

Answer: Although he has no real support, it appears that he has it. Or, the support of suffering has been exhausted, so he is said to have [*nirvāṇa*] without remainder. Support which is not the [support of] suffering remains, so he is said to have [*nirvāṇa*] with remainder. Therefore the World-Honored One can be said to fulfill the four [kinds of *nirvāṇa*].

Question: If hearers (*śrāvakas*), etc., have [*nirvāṇa*] without remainder, why are there sources (such as the *Śrīmāladevī Sūtra*, etc.) which say that they do not have it?

Answer: A source (this also refers to the *Śrīmāladevī Sūtra*, etc.) says that they do not have *nirvāṇa* at all. Can it be that they also do not have [*nirvāṇa*] with remainder? Indeed, while both body and knowing [i.e., mind] exist in hearers (*śrāvakas*), etc., they still retain the obstacle of the known and, since the support of suffering [i.e., the body,] is not exhausted yet, the sense of perfect stillness remains obscure, so it is said that they do not have *nirvāṇa*. This does not mean that they are indeed devoid of *nirvāṇa* with remainder, the true principle of which is revealed by the exhaustion of the obstacle of the afflictions. At that time, they still have not realized perfect stillness without remainder and are therefore also said to not have [*nirvāṇa*] without remainder. It does not mean that later, when body and knowing have ceased, they will not have an end to the support of suffering and *nirvāṇa* without remainder. The details are described in the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*].

Question: Since all obstacles of the known do not instigate birth, how does one acquire [*nirvāṇa*] with no fixed abode by eliminating them?

Answer: [The obstacle of the known] is able to veil the true suchness of the emptiness of *dharmas* and, therefore, when they are eliminated, the principle of the emptiness of *dharmas* is revealed. This principle is [*nirvāṇa*] with no fixed abode because it prevents one from

abiding in two extremes [of *nirvāṇa* and *samsāra*].

Question: If the obstacle of the known also obstructs *nirvāṇa*, why does one not obtain cessation resulting from the proper discrimination of *dharmas* by eliminating it?

Answer: Because cessation resulting from the proper discrimination of *dharmas* is apart from bonds, and that [obstacle] does not bind one.

Question: That being so, does one acquire *nirvāṇa* by eliminating that [obstacle]?

Answer: Not all [forms of] *nirvāṇa* are comprised in cessation resulting from the proper discrimination of *dharmas*. Otherwise, [*nirvāṇa*] that is pure by nature would not be *nirvāṇa*. A scripture says also that it is comprised of cessation resulting from the proper discrimination of *dharmas*; the details are described in the [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*].

For other questions and answers, [the discussion] should be construed following the principle.

[b] Demonstrating achievement by examples]

[(1) Elucidating the fruit attained]

三世諸佛 依般若波羅蜜多故 得何耨多羅三藐三菩提者

As for “All Buddhas in the three periods, [past, present, and future,] through relying on the Perfection of Wisdom (*Prajñāpāramitā*), attain supreme, perfect enlightenment,”

From this [statement], which is the second [approach to revealing the fruit attained], achievement is demonstrated by examples. This is twofold: first, it elucidates the fruit attained; and second, it praises the superiority [of *prajñāpāramitā*] by means of its function. This [statement] corresponds to the first, [to elucidate the fruit attained]. The statement is divided into three parts.

[The first part,] “All Buddhas in the three periods,” illustrates the persons who attain the fruit. “The three periods” refers to the times of past, present, and future as conditioned *dharma*, which means, respectively, past existence, present existence, and future existence. Or,

“the three periods” refers to the *dharmas*, respectively, which will not exist, which are existing, and which have never previously existed. In this context, the three periods consists of three kinds: the three periods of seed; the three periods of principle; and the three periods of consciousness-only. The different doctrines regarding the three periods is described in their scriptures and should be construed following their principles. “Buddha” in Sanskrit is translated into “the awakened” who possesses the five qualities and therefore is named “Buddha.” According to the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*, these five qualities are: (i) possessing the two wisdoms (the wisdom of the all (*sarvajñājñāna*) and the wisdom of all the particulars (*sarvāākārajñatā*)); (ii) being free from the two obstacles ([the obstacles] of the afflictions, and of the known); (iii) attaining the two characteristics [of *dharmas*] (the *dharma* of the all and the *dharma* of all the particulars); (iv) fulfilling the two benefits (self-benefit and benefit for others); (v) fitting the two metaphors (metaphors of waking from a sleeping dream, and of the blossoming of a lotus flower). Thus, the being who fulfills these five qualities is called the “Buddha.”

The next part, “through relying on the Perfect Wisdom,” distinguishes the [contemplating] wisdom which is able to be attained. [This] can be understood similarly as above.

The last part, “attain supreme perfect enlightenment (*anuttarā-samyak-sambodhi*)” illustrates the fruit attained, that is, *bodhi*. The Sanskrit words [*anuttarā-samyak-sambodhi*] are transliterated as above, and there are different interpretations for this [passage]. One interprets that “*a* (阿)” means “none;” “*uttarā* (禰多羅)” refers to “the above;” “*sam* (三)” means “perfect;” “*yak* (藐)” denotes “truth;” “*sam* (三)” again means “perfect;” and “*bodhi* (菩提)” means “path.” In sum, it means “the supreme, perfect truth and perfect path.” Another interprets that “*a* (阿)” means “none;” “*uttarā* (禰多羅)” refers to “the above;” “*sam* (三)” denotes “perfect;” “*yak* (藐)” means “universal;” [the next] “*sam* (三)” indicates “to know;” and “*bodhi* (菩提)” means “enlightenment.” That principle wisdom perceives suchness refers to “perfect (正);” because discriminating wisdom perceives the ordinary world, it is said to be “universal;” that non-discriminating wisdom (*nirvikalpa-jñāna*) cuts off the

two kinds of ignorance is called “to know;” and that *bodhi* emerges from the state of sleeping dream refers to “awakening.” These four kinds of wisdoms are the essence of *bodhi* and are called “the supreme” because they surpass the fruit of the two vehicles [i.e., the vehicles of the disciples (*śrāvaka*) and the solitary buddhas (*pratyekabuddha*)].

Now, the *Tripitaka* [Master, Hsüan-tsang] of T'ang, interprets that “*a* (阿)” refers to “none;” “*uttarā* (禰多羅)” means “the above;” “*saṃ* (三)” denotes “perfect;” “*yak* (藐)” means “equal;” “*saṃ* (三)” again denotes “perfect;” and “*bodhi* (菩提)” means “enlightenment.” It is called “the supreme” because no *dharmas* can surpass it; it is said to be “perfectly equal” because it omnipresently knows both principle and phenomena; it is also called “perfect enlightenment” because it is free from delusion and illuminates truth; in other words, it is the supreme, perfectly equal, and perfect enlightenment.

Question: In regard to the fruit attained, which indicates the doctrine [of the *Heart Sūtra*], *nirvāṇa* is emphasized, but in the demonstration of the achievement through examples, only *bodhi* is described. Isn't it contradictory to accomplish cessation by means of enlightenment?

Answer: The principle of reality interpenetrates all; there is but one meaning definitively grasped by each of the two virtues of wisdom and abandonment.

Briefly reflecting on the meaning of *bodhi* revealed [by the two virtues], three aspects may be differentiated: (i) interpreting the name; (ii) disclosing the essence of the nature; (iii) differentiating the various aspects.

(i) Interpreting the name: *Bodhi* in Sanskrit is translated as “enlightenment;” there are three kinds of enlightenment, which correspond to the wisdom of the three vehicles. Now, this [*sūtra*] expounds the supreme *bodhi*, that is, both ultimate and worldly wisdoms that realize the twofold emptiness; therefore, it is called “enlightenment.”

(ii) There are two ways to disclose the essence [of *bodhi*]. The first is to disclose the essence by means of the real, in which the four

wisdoms are the nature [of *bodhi*]. In this regard, Chapter 10 of the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* states that *bodhi* consists in its essence of the classes of mind associated with the four kinds of wisdom. The second is to illustrate the characteristics [of *bodhi*] following the provisional, in which there are, briefly, three approaches: The first [approach] differentiates wisdom and abandonment; [*bodhi*] takes both the wisdom contemplating the twofold emptiness and the unconditioned attained by cutting off the two obstacles [of affliction and of the known] for its self-nature. In this regard, the *bodhisattva* stages of the *Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra* states that “The abandonment of the two [obstacles] and the wisdom [contemplating the twofold emptiness] are called *bodhi*.” In this [treatise], the abandonment of the two [hindrances] is called *bodhi* because it is the fruit of wisdom; illustrating the characteristics [of *bodhi*] following the provisional is also called wisdom. The second [approach] differentiates the three bodies; [*bodhi*] generally takes the three bodies for its self-nature. In this regard, the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra* states that “The excellent essence of wisdom is the three bodies.” According to [the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra*], the *Dharma*-body (*Dharmakāya*) is generally called wisdom because it represents the nature of wisdom and thus is named wisdom. The third [approach] differentiates the five *dharma*s; [*bodhi*] generally takes the five *dharma*s for its self-nature. [In this regard,] the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra* says that “There are five kinds of *dharma*s which comprise the stage of the great enlightenment, namely, the four wisdoms and the pure *dharma* realm (*dharma-dhātu*).” According to [the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*], suchness (*tathatā*) is the great enlightenment because it represents the nature of enlightenment; this is also stated in the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra*. According to the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra*, [*bodhi*] is called enlightenment because it is the cognitive-object of enlightenment. Therefore, [the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra*] states that the descriptions of both wisdom and the realm of wisdom are called *prajñā*.

(iii) To differentiate various aspects, first, the four wisdoms will be interpreted, and then the three bodies will be illustrated. Moreover, in explaining the four wisdoms, five aspects may be differentiated: (iii-1) the aspect of indicating the names and disclosing the essences [of the

four wisdoms]; (iii-2) the aspect of acquiring [the four] wisdoms through the transformation of the [eight] consciousnesses; (iii-3) the aspect of the mental activities associated with [the four wisdoms]; (iii-4) the aspect of discriminating the objective conditions [of the four wisdoms]; (iii-5) the aspect of acquiring the first appearance [of the class of mind associated with the four wisdoms].

(iii-1) The aspect of indicating the names and disclosing the essences [of the four wisdoms]:

First, the Great Perfect Mirror-Like Wisdom: as the multitudes of images are reflected by a perfect mirror, so the mirror-like wisdom of the *Tathāgata* reflects the multitudes of images of fields, cognitive-objects, and consciousnesses, and is named by pursuing the metaphor. It takes the class of mind associated with the eighth [*ālaya*] consciousness for its essence. There are eleven kinds of similes [of the Great Perfect Mirror-Like Wisdom] described in the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*.

Second, the Wisdom of Equality: all beings, including oneself and others, are completely equal. The name is established by pursuing its function and is called “the Wisdom of Equality.” There are ten kinds [of characteristics] described extensively in the [*Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*]. It takes the class of mind associated with the seventh [*manas*] consciousness as its essence.

Third, the Wonderful Observing Wisdom: mental activities associated with [the Wonderful Observing Wisdom] skillfully contemplate the distinctive and common characteristics of all *dharmas*. The name is established by pursuing its function, and called “the Wonderful Observing Wisdom.” There are ten kinds of similes [of the Wonderful Observing Wisdom] extensively interpreted in the [*Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*]. It takes the class of mind associated with the sixth consciousness as its essence.

Fourth, the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing: it creates the three actions [of body, speech and mind] and numerous transformations throughout worlds. It is also by pursuing its function named “the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing.” There are ten kinds of similes [of the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing] which are extensively described in the

[*Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*]. It takes the class of mind associated with the fifth consciousness as its essence.

(iii-2) [The aspect of] acquiring [the four] wisdoms by the transformation of the [eight] consciousnesses: according to chapter 3 of the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*, there are different interpretations by the two scholars. One interprets that “by the transformation of the eighth [*ālaya*] consciousness, the Great Perfect Mirror-Like Wisdom is acquired; by the transformation of the seventh consciousness, the Wisdom of Equality is acquired; by the transformation of the sixth consciousness, the Wonderful Observing Wisdom is acquired; and by the transformation of the [first] five consciousnesses, the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing is achieved.” The other interprets that “By the transformation of the sixth consciousness, the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing is acquired; by the transformation of the five sense consciousnesses, the Wonderful Observing Wisdom is acquired.” [However, the interpretation of the latter] does not make sense, because [both the consciousnesses and the wisdoms] are not in order; to cut off doubts by teaching *dharma*s is to extensively observe [all *dharma*s], because this is not a function of the [first] five [consciousnesses]. In the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra* of Asvabhāva, there are also two different interpretations; the details are extensively described there. The *Mahāyānasūtralamkāra* accords with the second interpretation of the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*; Chapter 10 of the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* is in accord with the first scholar's interpretation of the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*.

(iii-3) [The aspect of] mental activities associated with [the four wisdoms]: each of [the four wisdoms] is associated with the twenty-one kinds of the class of mind. These are the five pervasive functions, the five distinct states, and the eleven goodnesses, which are discussed in the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*.

(iii-4) [The aspect of] discriminating the objective conditions (*ālambana*) [of the four wisdoms:] according to the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*, there are two different interpretations of the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom,. One is that [the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom] has [only] suchness as its objective condition. The other is that [the Great Perfect

Mirror-like Wisdom] has generally entire *dharmas* as its objective condition. Although there are two interpretations, the latter is superior. The *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, Chapter 10, also illustrates the same [idea] as [the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*]. It is described in the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra* with further distinctions. Both the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra* and the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* have three interpretations of the Wisdom of Equality: one is that [the Wisdom of Equality] has only the purified eighth consciousness as its objective condition; another is that [the Wisdom of Equality] has only equal and true suchness as its objective condition; and yet another is that [the Wisdom of Equality] has the cognitive-objects of both the ultimate and the worldly as its object conditions. These are described in both [the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra* and the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*]. There is no disagreement that the Wonderful Observing Wisdom has entire cognitive-objects as its objective condition. There are two interpretations of the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing: one is that [the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing] has as its objective condition only the five kinds of present [perceiving] cognitive-objects; the other is that it has, universally, all *dharmas* in the three periods of [past, present, and future] as its objective condition. The latter [interpretation] is the correct one, as claimed in both [the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra* and the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*].

(iii-5) [The aspect of] discriminating the first appearance [of the class of mind associated with the four wisdoms]: according to the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*, [the class of mind associated with] the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom first appears when the diamond-like mind is present [in the *bodhisattva*]. The class of mind associated with the Wisdom of Equality appears for the first time in the first *bodhisattva* stage [of joy] when contemplation is first present. The class of mind associated with the Wonderful Observing Wisdom also exists for the first time in the first [*bodhisattva*] stage when contemplation is first present. There are two interpretations of [discriminating the first appearance of the class of mind associated with] the wisdom of all-accomplishing: one is that it appears above the first *bodhisattva* stage; the other is that it appears when one achieves buddhahood. The latter

is the correct interpretation, and is discussed extensively in the [*Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*]. According to the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, there are two interpretations of [discriminating the first appearance of the class of mind associated with] the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom: one is that it first appears when the diamond-like mind is present [in the bodhisattva]; the other is that it appears when one achieves buddhahood, which is the correct interpretation. [The *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*] interprets the rest of [of the three wisdoms] in the same way as the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*.

To explain the three bodies [of the Buddha], seven aspects may be differentiated: (i) interpreting the names [of the three bodies]; (ii) disclosing the essences [of the three bodies]; (iii) the five *dharma*s [i.e., the realm of the *Dharma* (*Dharma-dhātu*) and the four wisdoms] comprising the [three] bodies; (iv) the eternal or transient [of the three bodies]; (v) the sizes of [the three bodies and their lands]; (vi) what is common or uncommon [to the three bodies and their lands] for the beings who are to be guided; (vii) and the distinction between [the three bodies] and their supporting lands.

(i) Interpreting the names [of the three bodies]:

[The name] will be interpreted comprehensively first and then specifically. With regard to [the comprehensive interpretation of] the three bodies, “three” indicates the number [of quantity] and “body” has the three meanings, which are essence, support, and accumulation. In this regard, the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, Chapter 10, states that “Its meanings of essence, support, and accumulation are given the comprehensive name ‘body.’” The *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*, Chapter 7, also interprets [the name] the same way as [*Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*]. This is the numerical determinative compound (*divigu*) of the six-compounds. Next, with regard to the specific names [of the three bodies], the first is the “Essential *Dharma* Body (*Soābhāvika-kāya*),” because the essence of suchness never changes, it is named the “Essential Body;” because all virtues including power and fearlessness, etc., are supported by [this body], it is also called the “*Dharma* Body.” The second is the “Enjoyment Body (*Sambhoga-kāya*),” because it enables self and others to

obtain the enjoyment of innumerable great *dharma*s, it is called the “Enjoyment Body.” The last is the “Transformation Body (*Nirmāna-kāya*);” because [this body] benefits sentient beings and manifests innumerable transformations and affairs, it is called the “Transformation Body.”

(ii) Disclosing the essence [of the three bodies]:

The *Dharma* Body takes true suchness (*tathāgata*) as its essence, and the Enjoyment Body takes for its self-nature the four wisdoms, the virtue of personal benefit, and some virtues of transformation that manifest in the *bodhisattva* stages. The similarities and differences [of the three bodies] will be differentiated extensively in the discussion of the five *dharma*s.

(iii) The five *dharma*s [i.e., the realm of the *Dharma* (*Dharma-dhātu*) and the four wisdoms] comprising the [three] bodies:

According to the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*, there are two interpretations. One interpretation is that the first two [i.e., the realm of the *Dharma* and the Great Mirror-like Wisdom] comprise the Essential Body; the middle two kinds [i.e., the Wisdom of Equality and the Wondrous Observing Wisdom] comprise the Enjoyment Body; and the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing comprises the Transformation Body. The *sūtras* (such as the *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-sūtra* and the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*) describe true suchness as the *Dharma* Body. [The *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*] says that the Essential Body is acquired by transforming the *ālaya* consciousness, and the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom transforms the eighth consciousness so that [the Essential Body] is acquired; therefore, it is understood that the first two [i.e., the realm of the *Dharma* and the Great Mirror-like Wisdom] comprise the Essential Body. (As the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra* illustrates the attainment of the Essential Body, so both the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra* and the *Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra* state that the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom is acquired by transforming the eighth consciousness). These *sūtras* [i.e., the *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-sūtra* and the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*,] state that the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing generates various transformative activities. The *Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra* states that in entire realms, the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing manifests

the countless, immeasurable, and unimaginable kinds of transformations. In this context, it is understood that the last one [i.e. the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing] comprises the Transformation Body (again, refer to wherein it is described). The Wisdom of Equality, according to the treatises [i.e., the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra* and the *Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra*], in a pure land, manifests the countless bodies of a buddha in accordance with the dispositions of *bodhisattvas* (again, refer to wherein it is described). The Wondrous Observing Wisdom, also according to the treatises (such as the *Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra*), in the great assemblies [of *bodhisattvas*], can manifest entire masteries and preach *Dharma* to eliminate doubts. (As described in the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra*), it is also said that because the Enjoyment Body is acquired by transforming all consciousnesses, it is understood that the middle two kinds [i.e., the Wisdom of Equality and the Wondrous Observing Wisdom] comprise the Enjoyment Body. In addition, all three bodies of the Buddha comprise the excellence of wisdom among the ten meanings [of the three bodies], (namely, the excellence [of wisdom] described in the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra*). It is therefore understood that the three bodies are wholly made up of wisdom.

The other interpretation is that the first [the *dharma* of the five, i.e., the *Dharma-dhātu*] comprises the Essential Body; common beings associated with the four wisdoms and their self-natures, and some of the subtle characteristics manifested in *bodhisattvas* who have already entered the [ten] stages, comprise the Enjoyment Body; and some of the coarse characteristics and transformations manifested in *bodhisattvas* who have not yet entered the [ten] stages comprise the Transformation Body. In this regard, both *sūtras* [i.e., the *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-sūtra* and the *Buddhabhūmi-sūtra*] state that pure Suchness is the *Dharma* Body, and the *Chan-beul-lun* says that the *Dharma* Body of the *Tathāgata* is devoid of origination and cessation. From these descriptions, therefore, it can be understood that the *Dharma* Body is the pure realm of the *Dharma* (*Dharma-dhātu*). Likewise, the *Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra* states that the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom is the personal Enjoyment [Body] of

Buddha, and the *Mahāyānasamgraha-sāstra* states that the Enjoyment Body is acquired by transforming all evolving consciousnesses. However, when it is said that the *Dharma* Body is acquired by the transformation of the *ālaya* consciousness, it means that the purity supported by the *Dharma* Body is acquired when it is revealed by transforming the seed of the two hindrances in the eighth consciousness; it does not mean that the Great Perfect Mirror-like Wisdom is the *Dharma* Body.

In addition, the Enjoyment Body is of two kinds: one is the personal Enjoyment Body achieved by one's infinite practices throughout three immeasurable eons; the other is the Enjoyment Body for others, in which all *bodhisattvas* receive the enjoyment of *dharma*. Therefore, common beings associated with the four wisdoms and some of the transformations are the Enjoyment Body. Both scriptures and treatises state that the Transformation Body manifests innumerable characteristics in order to guide sentient beings who have not yet entered the [ten bodhisattva] stages. Because those [characteristics] are in the realm of sentient beings who have not yet entered the [ten] stages, it can be understood that these are not true virtues but rather the functions of transformation. Scriptures and treatises merely state that the Wisdom of All-Accomplishing can generate the activity of transformation, yet it is not the Transformation Body. However, although it is said that the three bodies comprise the excellence of wisdom, because the *Dharma* Body is supported by wisdom, and the Transformation Body is generated by wisdom, and therefore appears to resemble wisdom, it is not wrong to state that [the three bodies] are provisionally referred to as wisdom. The *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* does not differ from the above explanation, and therefore will not be redundantly described [here].

(iv) The eternal and transient [of the three bodies]:

Question: Both the Enjoyment [Body] and the Transformation [Body] already have [the natures of] origination and cessation. Then, why do the scriptures state that all bodies of the Buddha are eternal?

Answer: Because the *Dharma* Body which is the support of the two bodies [i.e., the Enjoyment Body and the Transformation Body] is eternal, they are inexhaustible in receiving the enjoyment of *dharmas*

and are endless in manifesting countless transformations. It is similar to eternally receiving enjoyments and being provided food, and therefore is said to be “eternal.” According to the *Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra*, “eternity” has three [meanings]: first, the eternity of original nature, that is to say, the Essential Body, because the original nature of this body is abiding; second, the eternity of endlessness, that is to say, the Enjoyment Body, because [this body] ceaselessly receives the enjoyment of *dharmas*; and third, the eternity of continuation, that is to say, the Transformation Body, because [this body] inexhaustibly manifests with repeated coming and going to guide [sentient beings]. The details are described in [the *Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra*].

(v) The sizes [of the three bodies and their lands]:

The Essential Body, like space, cannot be described in terms of large or small; yet, by means of the characteristic [of this body], it may be said that [this body] pervades everywhere. The Enjoyment Body has a substance which is formless and, because all formless *dharmas* are devoid of shape and quality, [this body] also cannot be described in terms of large or small. Yet, by means of the body that supports, or of the object of the known, it also can be said that [this body] pervades everywhere. Form is twofold: one is true form and the other is transforming form. True form results from practices throughout three immeasurable eons, is replete in the realm of the *Dharma*, and pervades the true Pure Land. It can be known only by buddhas. Transforming form, by the virtue of the power of compassion, manifests the innumerable bodies for the hosts of *bodhisattvas* who enter the great [ten] stages, and has no definite shape or quality. In order to guide [sentient beings] who have not yet entered the [ten] stages, it [also] manifests as the Transformation Body that penetrates both form and formlessness. Formlessness means no shape, therefore there is no size; form is indefinite, therefore it is in accordance with the being who is guided. The details are described in the [*Mahāyāna-Sūtralamkāra*].

(vi) What is common or uncommon [to the three bodies and their lands] for beings who are to be guided:

According to the *Buddhabhūmi-sāstra*, “Sentient beings who are to

be guided may be common to all *Tathāgatas* or not.” The *Buddhabhūmi-śāstra* illustrates this in three ways: one claims [that they are] only common because all virtues and wishes are the same, which is extensively described in [the *Buddhabhūmi-śāstra*]; another claims [that they are] uncommon because all kinds of sentient beings who are guided by the Buddha always generate, which is extensively described in [the *Buddhabhūmi-śāstra*]; [yet another claims] the correct meaning, which is that they are both common and uncommon [to all Buddhas], since it has been the nature of things from beginningless time [that all sentient beings are related to Buddhas by disposition], and either many are related to one [Buddha] or one is related to many, which is extensively described in [the *Buddhabhūmi-śāstra*]. [The position of] the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* is similar to the third interpretation and the matter should be understood in this manner.

(vii) The distinction between [bodies] and their supporting lands:

According to the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*, the body is of four kinds: the Essential Body the Enjoyment Body [which includes the Enjoyment Body for self-benefit and for others]; and the Transformation Body. The land is of four kinds: the land of the Essential [Body]; the land of the Enjoyment [Body] for self-benefit; the land of the Enjoyment [Body] for others; and the land of the Transformation [Body]. The above four bodies abide, respectively, in the four lands. Even though there is no distinction between the Essential Body and the land of the Essential [Body] as far as essence is concerned, nevertheless they are related to the *Dharmas* of the Buddha, because characteristics and nature differ, so that their meanings are described in terms of subject and object. The Transformation Body not only abides in the Pure Land but also corresponds to the impure land, [in other words, this world,] which is extensively described in [the *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*].

[(2) Praising the excellence of the Perfection of Wisdom by means of its function]

[(2a) Interpreting the prose in detail]

[i] elucidating the self-benefit]

故知 般若波羅蜜多 是大神祝 是大明呪 是無上呪 是無等等呪者

As for “**Therefore, one should know the Perfection of Wisdom (*Prajñāpāramitā*) as the great sacred *mantra*, the great illuminating *mantra*, the supreme *mantra*, and the unequalled *mantra*,**”

From here [to the end], the second [part of “demonstrating achievement by examples”], praises the excellence [of the Perfection of Wisdom] by means of its function; this has two approaches: the first approach is to interpret the prose in detail; and the second approach is to conclude the praise in eulogy. The first approach is twofold: to elucidate the self-benefit; and to illustrate the benefit for others. This [statement] is the first one [to elucidate the self-benefit]. What is called “*mantra*” refers to incantation; clearly speaking, it means that through wondrous wisdom, one realizes emptiness and cuts off [the two] obstacles. [Its] verbal expression requires a wondrous technique, and therefore to incant a *mantra* is to praise the excellence of its function. It is called “the great sacred *mantra*” because its mysterious function is unfathomable; it is called “the great illuminating *mantra*” because it dispels darkness and eliminates ignorance; it is called “the supreme [*mantra*]” because it surpasses [the wisdom of] the other two vehicles [of *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*]; it is repeatedly called “unequaled” because the Buddha's wisdom is impartial and transcends that of *bodhisattvas*.

(ii) illustrating the benefit to others]

能除一切苦 真實不虛者

As for “**It can eliminate all sufferings, for it is true, not false,**”

This [statement] is the second one, “to illustrate the function of the benefit to others.” The perfection of mysterious wisdom leads sentient beings to overcome the suffering of *samsāra* and attain the bliss of *nirvāṇa*. Since, from tongue to hair, every single word of [the

Buddha] is sincere, then how could his words concerning entire worlds be false? Therefore, [this] *sūtra* says that they are true words.

[(2b) Concluding the praise in eulogy]

故說般若波羅蜜多呪 卽說呪曰 揭諦揭諦 波羅揭諦 波羅僧揭諦 菩提莎婆呵者

As for “Therefore, [the *Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara*] speaks the *Prajñāpāramitā mantra: gate gate pāragate pārasamgate bodhi svāhā*”

This [statement] is the second [approach of praising the excellence of the Perfection of Wisdom by means of its function], concluding the praise in eulogy. This is twofold: the first part of the statement [i.e., “Therefore, the *Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara* speaks the *Prajñāpāramitāmantra*,”] introduces [the eulogy]; and the latter part of it [i.e., “*gate gate pāragate pārasamgate bodhi svāhā*”] correctly praise the eulogy. However, there are different interpretations of this eulogy. One interprets that this eulogy cannot be translated, as it has been transmitted from ancient days; this mantra, which represents the exact sounds of the mysterious Sanskrit verses, would lose its miraculous effects when translated; therefore, it must be preserved in Sanskrit. In addition, this mantra is preserved in Sanskrit just like the “*Bhagavat*” because [on the one hand] it cites various sacred names or spirits and, on the other hand, its words contain many meanings, since all *dharma*s have deeply profound meanings, and yet there are no appropriate words with which to translate them into Chinese. The other interpretation is that all *mantras* can be translated, such as the word “*namobuddhaya* (南無佛陀耶),” etc.

To interpret these verses of the eulogy, one may analyze them by dividing into three sections: The first section, “*gate gate*,” means “cross over, cross over,” which eulogizes the two characters “*banya* (般若, *prajñā*)” in the previous statement. It reveals that *prajñā* possesses the great capability of helping both oneself and others to cross over [the suffering of *samsāra*], and therefore it is said, “cross over, cross over.”

The second section, the verses “*pāra ...*,” [i.e., *pāragate pārasamgate bodhi*,] eulogizes “*pāramitā*.” This means to arrive at the other shore, which is *nirvāṇa*. [In terms of] the “*gate*,” which means to “cross over,” where does one arrive? It refers to the other shore to which one crosses over, and therefore it is called “*pāragate*.” “*Pāra*” is translated as above; “*samgate*” means to arrive at the ultimate. “*Bodhi*” refers to the essence of the other shore. The last [section], “*svāhā*,” means “quickly.” In other words, by means of the wondrous wisdom which has the function of supreme virtue, [one] is able to arrive quickly at the other shore of *bodhi*.

Another interpretation is that this eulogy has four verses which may be divided into two parts. The first two verses, [i.e., *gategate pāragate*,] praise the excellence [of the Perfection of Wisdom] by means of the *dharma*, and the other two verses [i.e., *pārasamgate bodhi svāhā*,] praise the excellence [of it] by means of the person. [In praising the excellence] by means of the *dharma*, the former is the cause, the latter is the fruit, and the repeated expression of “*gate*” refers to “excellent, excellent.” *Prajñā* at the stage of a cause fulfills the two kinds of excellent functions of self-benefit and benefit to others, and therefore it proclaims “excellent, excellent.” “*Pāragate*” means the excellence of the other shore. Because of “*prajñā*,” one can arrive at the excellent [other] shore of *nirvāṇa*, and therefore it proclaims “the excellence of the other shore.” From the perspective of praising [the excellence] of the person, the former is the cause and the latter is the fruit. “*Pārasamgate*” means the excellence of the practitioners of the other shore; it is praising the *bodhisattvas* of the one vehicle who are at the stage of cause and seek *nirvāṇa*. “*Bodhi svāhā*” denotes the ultimate realm of enlightenment; it praises the person who achieves the fruit of the [Buddha's] three bodies at the stage of results, and whose awakening of *dharma* is already fulfilled; this is called the ultimate realm of enlightenment. Alternatively, the four verses may praise the excellence of the three treasures: the first two verses, respectively, are understood to praise the *dharma* of practice and fruit; the third and fourth verses, respectively, are understood to praise practitioners and buddhas. Is this not so?

般若心經贊終

The end of the *Banya simgyeong chan* (the Commentary on the Heart Sūtra).

Glossary of Chinese Terms

(K=Korean, C=Chinese, J=Japanese, S=Sanskrit, P=Pali)

- Abhidharmakośābhāṣya (S) 阿毘達磨俱舍論
 Abhidharmasamuccaya (S) 阿毘達磨雜集論
 Ākṣepaka (S) 引
 Ālayavijñāna (S) 阿賴耶識, 阿黎耶識
 Amitābha (S) 阿彌陀佛
 Anādikālika-suddha-nirvāṇa (S) 自性清淨涅槃
 Aṅga (S) 支
 Antarā-bhava (S) 中陰, 中有
 Anuttarā-samyak-sambodhi (S) 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提,
 Anuttara (S) 無上士
 Apratiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa (S) 無住處涅槃
 Arhat (S) 應供
 Asaṅga (S) 無著
 Aṣṭādaśasūnyatā-sāstra (S) 十八空論
 Avalokiteśvara (S), Kuan-zizai (C) 觀自在
 Avataṃsaka-Sūtra (S) 大方廣佛華嚴經
 Avidyā (S) 無明
 Āyatana (S) 處
 Bandhuprabha (S) 親光
 Banya paramilda simgyeong chan (K) 般若波羅蜜多心經贊
 Bhāva (S) 有
 Bhāvaviveka (S) 清辨
 Bhagavan (S) 世尊
 Bodhisattvas (S) 菩薩
 Buddhabhūmi-sāstra (S) 佛地論
 Buddhabhūmi-sūtra-sāstra (S) 佛地經論

- Candrasuryapradipa (S) 日月燈明
 Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun (C) 成唯識論
 Citta (S) 心
 Dṛṣṭi (S) 見
 Daśabhūmikasūtra-śāstra (S) 十地經論
 Dhātu (S) 界
 Dharma (S) 法
 Dharmapāla (S) 護法
 Duhkha-duhkha (S) 苦苦
 Dvandva (S) 相違釋
 Ekayāna (S) 一乘
 Fa-hsiang (C) 法相
 Ḡḍhrakūṭa (S) 靈鷲山
 Hṛdaya-Sūtra (S) 心經
 Hinayāna (S) 小乘
 His-ming (C) 西明
 Hsüan-tsang (C) 玄奘
 Inwang banya gyeong so (K) 仁王般若經疏
 Jānaka (S) 能生
 Jāti (S) 生
 Jarā-marana (S) 老死
 Joongbo-Jangum (K) 衆寶莊嚴
 K'uei-chi (C) 窺基
 Kāñcīpura (S) 健至
 Kalpa (S) 劫波, 劫
 Karatalāratna (S) 大乘掌珍論
 Karmadhāraya (S) 持業釋
 Kuan-[shi]-yin (C) 觀[世]音
 Kuan-yin san-meī ching (C), Avalokiteśvara-sūtra (S) 觀音三昧經
 Kuan-zizai (C) 觀自在
 Lakṣaṇa (S) 相
 Lokavid (S) 世間解
 Mādhyamika (S) 中觀派
 Mādhyamika-kārikā (S), Chung-lun (C) 中論

- Madhyāntāvibhaga (S) 中邊分別論, 辯中邊論
 Madhyāntāvibhagabhāṣya (S) 中邊分別論頌
 Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtra (S) 大般涅槃經
 Mahāratnakūṭa-sūtra (S) 寶積經
 Mahāyāna (S) 大乘
 Mahāyāna-abhidharma-samuccaya (S) 大乘阿毘達磨集論
 Mahāyāna-sūtrālamkāra (S) 大乘莊嚴經論
 Mahāyāna-saṃparigraha-sāstra (S) 攝大乘論
 Maitreyaṇa (S) 彌勒
 Manas-vijñāna (S) 意識
 Mantra (S) 呪, 真言
 Mṛgadāva (S) 鹿野苑
 Nāgārjuna (S) 龍樹
 Nāma-rūpa (S) 名色
 Nitārtha (S) 了義
 Namobuddhaya (S) 南無佛陀耶
 Nirupadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa (S) 無餘涅槃
 Nirvāṇa (S) 涅槃
 Nirvikalpa-jñāna (S) 無分別智
 Padmāgarbhalokadhātu (S) 蓮華藏世界
 Parārtha (S) 利他
 Paratantra (S) 依他起性
 Parikalpa (S) 遍計所執
 Pariniṣpanna (S) 圓成實性
 Parinirvāṇa (S) 般涅槃
 Prajñā (S), Bāyā (K) 般若
 Prajñāpāramitā (S) 般若波羅蜜多
 Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra (S) 般若波羅蜜多心經
 Prakaraṇāryavāca-sāstra (S) 顯揚聖教論
 Pramāṇa-samuccaya (S) 集量論
 Pratītyasamutpāda (S) 緣起
 Pratiloma (S) 還滅
 Pratyekabuddha (S) 緣覺
 Pravṛtti (S) 流轉

- Purusadamyāsāratha (S) 調御丈夫
 Rūpa (S) 色
 Ratnaketu Tathāgat (S) 普光功德山王如來
 Ṣad-āyatana (S) 六入
 Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra-upadeśa (S) 妙法蓮華經論, 法華論
 Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra (S), Hae sim-mil gyeong (K) 解深密經
 Saṃsāra (S) 輪迴
 Samskāra (S) 行
 Samskāra-duhkha (S) 行苦
 Samyak-sambuddha (S) 正遍知
 Saññā (S) 想
 Śāriputra (S) 舍利弗, 舍利子
 Sarvākārājñāta (S) 一切種智
 Sarvajñajñāna (S) 一切智
 Sarvāstivāda (S) 說一切有部, 有部
 Śāstādevamanusyānām (S) 正法明
 Śāstra (S) 論
 Satkārya-drṣṭi (S) 薩迦耶見
 Sat-samasa (S) 六釋
 Sautrāntika (S) 輕量部
 She-li-fu-tuo-luo (S) 奢利富多羅, 舍利弗多羅
 Silla (K) 新羅
 Skandhas (S) 蘊
 Sopadhiṣeṣa-nirvāṇa (S) 有餘依涅槃
 Sparsa (S) 觸
 Śramaṇa-śāstra (S), Sha-men lun (C) 沙門論
 Śrāvakas (S) 聲聞
 Śrīmālā-sūtra (S) 勝鬘經
 Śūnyatā (S) 空
 Sugata (S) 善逝
 Sukhāvativyuha-sūtra (S) 無量壽經
 Sūtra (S) 經
 Suvarña-prabhāsa-sūtra (S) 金光明經
 Svabhāva (S) 性, 自性

- T'i (C) 體
 Tṛṣṇā (S) 愛
 Ta Ming-tu ching (C) 大明度經
 Tathāgata (S) 如來
 Tathatā (S) 如如
 Tatpuruṣa (S) 依主釋
 Trimśatikā (S) 唯識三十頌
 Tsung (C) 宗
 Upādāna (S) 取
 Upādhi (S) 餘
 Vedanā (S) 受
 Vedanā (S) 受
 Viśeṣa (S) 差別
 Viśeṣacinta-brahma-pariprccha-sūtra (S) 思益經
 Viśaya (S) 境,
 Vidyācaranāsampanna (S) 明行足
 Vijñāna (S) 識
 Vijñāptimatratā-Vimśatikā-kārikā (S) 唯識二十論
 Vimalakīrti-nirdeśanā-sūtra (S) 維摩詰所說經
 Viparināma-dukkha (S) 壞苦
 Viparyāsa (S) 顛倒夢想
 Wonch'uk (K) 圓測
 Yogācāra (S) 瑜伽, 唯識
 Yogācāra (S) 瑜伽行派
 Yogācārabhūmi-sāstra (S) 瑜伽師地論, 瑜伽論
 Yung (C) 用

Abbreviation

- T *Taishyō-shinsy-daizōkyō* (大正新修大藏經; Japanese Edition of Chinese *Tripitaka*). Tōkyō: Taishō-Issaikyō-Kankōkai.

References

- Sung-fu *Ta-chou Hsi-ming ssukuta-te Yuan-ts'e fa-shih fo she-li t'a-ming ping hsu*
(大周西明寺故大德圓測法師佛舍利塔銘扞序) in
Chin-shi ts'ui-pien. Dainihon zoku zokyo vol.I
- Wonch'uk *Banya paramilda simgyeong chan* (般若波羅蜜多
心經贊). T.33. No.1711.
- Benjamin, Walter
1939 "The Task of the Translator." *Illuminations: Essays
and Reflections*. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry
Zohn. New York: Schocken Books. 1969.
- Buswell,
Robert E, Jr.
2002 "Wŏnhyo and the Commentarial Genre in
Korean Buddhist Literature." *English Translation
of Complete Works of Wŏnhyo: Its Significance and
Issues in the Global Era*. Proceedings of the 2nd
International Conference on Wŏnhyo Studies.
Nov.11-13. Seoul: Dongguk Univ. Press.
- Chung,
Byung Cho
1977 "Wonch'uk ui *Banya Simgyeong Chan* Yon-ku
(The Study of Wonch'uk's *Commentary on the
Heart Sūtra*)." *The Journal of Korean Studies*. No.9,
Winter. Seoul: Il Ji Sa.
- Conze, Edward
1973 *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines
& its Verse Summary*. Trans. Bolinas. Four
Seasons Foundation.
- 1978 *Selected Sayings from the Perfection of Wisdom*.
chosen, arranged, and translated, Boulder, Co.
Prajna Press.
- Hwang,
Chang-geun
2000 *A Korean Yogācāra Monk in China: Won-Cheuk
and His Commentary on the Heart Sūtra*.
Ph.D Dissertation.
Michigan: Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Keenan, John P.
2000 *The Scripture on the Explication of Underlying
Meaning (Samdhinirmocana-sūtra. T.16. No.676)*.
Berkley: Numata Center.

-
- Kim, Young
Tae., and
Wu, Jung Sang
1976
Hankuk Bulgyosa (History of Korean Buddhism).
Seoul: Sinheung Publishing Co.
- Koh, Young-sup
1999
Moon-A Dea-sa. Seoul: Bulkyo-choonchu-sa.
- Lopez,
Donald S., Jr.
1988
The Heart Sūtra Explained.
New York: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Nguyen,
Cuong Tu
2001
“Eminent Korean Monks in Asia: Wonch'uk,
Wonch'uk's Life and Works.” *Moktak; A Korean
Buddhism Reader* Vol.1. No.1. New York:
- Oh, Hyung-keun
1991
“The Yogācāra-Vijñaptimātra Studies of Silla
Monks.” *Assimilation of Buddhism in Korea:
Religious Maturity and Innovation in the Silla
Dynasty*. Ed. Lewis Lancaster and C. S. Yu.
Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- Powers, John
1992
“Lost in China, Found in Tibet: How Wonch'uk
Became the Author of the Great Chinese
Commentary.” *Journal of the International
Association of Buddhist Studies*. Vol.15. No.1
- Skilton, Andrew
1994
A Concise History of Buddhism. Birmingham:
Windhorse Publication.