PACIFIC WORLD

Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies

Third Series Number 15
Fall 2013

Special Section:
Graduate Student Symposium

Guṇabhadra and Bodhidharma: Remarks about Their School Affiliation

Charles Willemen
International Buddhist College, Thailand

Guṇabhadra (394–468 CE) was a brahmin from Central India, Madhyadeśa, converted to Buddhism by the *Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya,*[1] a Sautrāntika *śāstra*, commenting on Dharmaśreṣṭhin's *Abhidharmahṛdaya*.[2] The author of the *Miśraka°* was a Gandhāran Dharmatrāta writing in the early fourth century. Guṇabhadra must have been converted early in the fifth century. Non-Vaibhāṣikas were receptive to Mahāsāṅghika developments, reacting to them. Mahāsāṅghikas reacted to Sthāvirīya developments too.

SARVĀSTIVĀDA

Sarvāstivāda (proclaiming that everything exists) is a term which may be used throughout the history of this school (*nikāya,* or *bu*, 部). They were very heterogeneous, but they all agreed on *sarvāstitva*. What *sarvam* (everything) and even *asti* (exists) really meant was debated among them. In the time of Kaniṣka I (155–ca. 179 CE[3]) a deep split occurred. A new Sarvāstivāda "orthodoxy" was established in Kaśmīra. It had an *Abhidharma* of seven Sanskrit texts, said to be proclaimed by Buddha in heaven, and a Sanskrit *Vinaya*, called *Daśabhāṇavāra*, "in ten recitations," having removed most of the illustrating stories, *dṛṣṭāntas,* of the traditional *Vinaya.*[4] Traditional Sarvāstivādins in northern India and in Jibin (罽賓, Uḍḍiyāna, Gandhāra, and also Bactria[5]), not agreeing with the *Abhidharma* of the new "orthodoxy," could now be called Sautrāntikas. Their first master (*mūlācārya*) was Kumāralāta (ca. 150 CE[6]). Using the traditional, long *Vinaya* from Mathurā, they were also called Dārṣṭāntikas.[7] Many modern scholars, discussing Sarvāstivāda Buddhism, normally reserve the term Sarvāstivāda for the new Vaibhāṣika "orthodoxy" in Kaśmīra. The non-Vaibhāṣikas gradually

accepted new "orthodox" ideas, as can be seen in the *vibhāṣās*[8] on the *Aṣṭagrantha* and in the commentaries on the *Abhidharmahṛdaya*.[9] By the end of the seventh century the term Mūlasarvāstivāda appears. Because they use the long *Vinaya*, they may be seen as a continuation of Dārṣṭāntikas.[10] Vaibhāṣikas now looked like just one more group of Sarvāstivādins.

Sthaviravāda[11] Buddhism spread from Madhyadeśa to traditional Jibin via Mathurā. Sarvāstivāda and Pudgalavāda (Vātsīputrīya/Sāṃmitīya) spread there. Vibhajyavādins, namely Mahīśāsakas,[12] went there too. Mahāsāṅghikas followed on the way to Gandhāra. Bactria became mainly Sthavira territory, namely Sarvāstivāda, Pudgalavāda, and Vibhajyavāda. Gandhāra became a mainly Mahāsāṅghika area, but the area close to the Khyber Pass was still Sthaviravāda. Sthaviras could still be seen in Uḍḍiyāna, to the north of Gandhāra proper.[13] From Uḍḍiyāna there was easy access to Hotan (和田), certainly during Kuṣāṇa times (first to third century CE[14]). I should immediately add that Mahāsāṅghikas were not unimportant in Bactria too, e.g., in Termez. In Madhyadeśa non-Vaibhāṣikas and Mahāsāṅghikas were quite numerous. Many brahmins converted to Buddhism there (even during the lifetime of the Buddha); for example, Harivarman (ca. 300 CE)[15] was converted to Kumāralāta's kind of Buddhism.

KARMIC SEEDS AND A TATHĀGATA EMBRYO

Ever since the first schism between the Sthaviras and Mahāsāṅghikas, both groups reacted to the developments of their antagonists. For example, it is quite possible that Nāgārjuna's Sanskrit southern Mahāsāṅghika Madhyamaka group must be seen in the context of the establishing of the new Vaibhāṣika "orthodoxy" to the north. Mahāsāṅghika emptiness and Prajñāpāramitā literature present in both Gandhāra and in Madhyadeśa seem to have resulted in the Sarvāstivāda belief in an existing *ālayavijñāna*, storehouse or receptacle-consciousness. The compilation of the *Saṅdhinirmocana-sūtra* is an early example of this development, which was composed no later than the third century.[16] The receptacle contained karmic seeds. The *Saṅdhinirmocana* may be seen as a non-Vaibhāṣika reaction to Mahāsāṅghika emptiness, becoming "Mahāyāna" in the process. But apparently Mahāsāṅghikas did not react to Cittamātra Buddhism. Asaṅga (late fourth century), a Mahīśāsaka monk, continued the traditional Yogācāra of Sarvāstivādins in his native Gandhāra.[17] Ever

since Kuṣāṇa times the so-called later Mahīśāsakas in Jibin were seen as a sub-group of Sarvāstivādins there.[18] Asaṅga took in Nāgārjuna's Mādhyamika ideas in his new Yogācāra, becoming "Mahāyāna" in the process. In Madhyadeśa the same rivalry must have taken place. Bactrian Sarvāstivādins seem to have known about a development from the idea of karmic seeds to a receptacle (*garbha*, womb) of an embryonic *tathāgata*. All living beings already have the buddha-nature (*foxing,* 佛性; *buddhagotra*),[19] but it is covered over by impurity. *Xing* (性) hardly ever translates *dhātu* (element; *jie*, 界). This Sautrāntika development is very easy to understand. It may have taken place early in the third century.[20] Mahāsāṅghikas accepted that all living beings can grow to full buddhahood, are potential buddhas. Buddhabhadra (359–429 CE), a Sautrāntika whose Buddhism has a Bactrian origin, translated the first *Tathāgatagarbha-sūtra* in 420 CE.[21] Is there, besides a natural development from seed to embryo, also a reaction to or an influence of popular Pudgalavāda ideas in Bactria (*pudgala, ātman*)? The *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, as translated by Dharmarddhin in 421 CE, has a second part which may be of non-Vaibhāṣika Sarvāstivāda origin.[22] Today one may call non-Vaibhāṣikas Mūlasarvāstivādins, but in the fifth century the term did not exist. They were called Sarvāstivādins, Sautrāntikas, or eventually Dārṣṭāntikas, depending on their use of the *Vinaya*. Around 400 CE the road from Bactria to Kuqa (庫車) and Guzang (姑藏; Liangzhou, 凉州; Wuwei, 武威) was well travelled. Around that time Kroraina (Loulan, 樓蘭) was deserted. Niya (Jingjue, 精絕) had been deserted a while earlier. The southern road was controlled by Shanshan (鄯善), which was annexed by Wei (魏) ca. 445 CE.[23] The southern road remained important because of the link of Uḍḍiyāna with Hotan and on to Tibet. But at the end of the fourth century and later many Indians went to China from Bactria, and Chinese went to India, i.e., to Bactria. I mention the Sautrāntikas Saṅghadeva, Buddhabhadra, and Saṅghabhadra.[24] The Indians left Jibin, the Western Regions (Xiyu, 西域), namely Bactria.[25] The *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* also seems to have travelled to China along this road. *Tathāgatagarbha* in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* is seen as the "true self," everlasting and pure, within all beings. Some non-Vaibhāṣika ideas in Bactria, e.g., belief in Avalokiteśvara, seem to have been taken up by Mahāsāṅghikas there, resulting in an *ekayāna*, unique vehicle.[26] The *dramatis personae* of such texts as the *Aṅgulimālīya-sūtra,* a *tathāgatagarbha* text, e.g., Mañjuśrī (of Gandhāran Mahāsāṅghika origin), are a clear indication. This *ekayāna*

can be seen in such texts as the *Lotus Sūtra* and the *Siwei lüeyao fa* (思惟略要法). This last text may have been written down by Chinese monks in Jiankang (建康), based on the instructions of a Bactrian Mahāsāṅghika monk there (Dharmamitra from Jibin, the Gandhāran area?).[27] The originally Sautrāntika *tathāgatagarbha* idea seems to have been immediately taken up by Mahāsāṅghikas. This *ekayāna* is also found in the Avanti area (Paramārtha, 499–569 CE),[28] and in Madhyadeśa. Because links between Bactria and southeastern India were quite frequent,[29] it is no surprise that Mahāsāṅghikas in Andhra accepted the *tathāgatagarbha* idea. The *Śrīmālāsiṃhanāda-sūtra* may well have been written there in the third century.[30] The term *ekayāna* was used by Mahāsāṅghikas who had assimilated Sautrāntika developments. Mahāsāṅghika Mahāyāna acknowledged the Sarvāstivāda contribution in the use of the term *ekayāna.*

A SARVĀSTIVĀDIN CALLED MAHĀYĀNA: GUṆABHADRA (394–468 CE)

Guṇabhadra's biography is found in Sengyou's (僧祐, 445–518 CE) *Chu sanzang ji ji* (出三藏記集, T. 55.2145:105b17–106b21). Sengyou, a *Vinaya* specialist in southern China, certainly was very familiar with what had recently happened to Guṇabhadra there. Also Huijiao's (慧皎, 497–554 CE) *Gaoseng zhuan* (高僧傳, ca. 530 CE, T. 50.2059:344a5–34a23), informs us about Guṇabhadra. In these biographies Guṇabhadra (Qiuna Batuoluo, 求那跋陀羅) is called Batuo (跋陀), omitting the *luo* from his "given name." He was a brahmin from Madhyadeśa converted to Sarvāstivāda Buddhism by Dharmatrāta's *Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya.* Many brahmins were converted to Sautrāntika Buddhism in northern India. He then also studied Mahāsāṅghika literature, namely Prajñāpāramitā and the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra.* He received the bodhisattva precepts. He probably sailed from the port of Tāmraliptī to Śrī Laṅkā, sailing along the coast of Andhra. He then set sail to Guangzhou (廣州), where he arrived in 435 CE. The following year he reached the capital of the Liu Song (劉宋, 420–479 CE), Yangdu (楊都), Jiankang (Nanjing, 南京). Emperor Wen (文, 424–453 CE) had the Chinese monks Huiyan (慧嚴) and Huiguan (慧觀) assist him. Guṇabhadra did not know Chinese. He made his most influential translations in Jiankang during the years 436–446 CE. Baoyun (寶雲, 376–449 CE) did most of the translating, and Huiguan wrote down the Chinese. Huiguan and Huiyan were quite interested in the *Lotus Sūtra*, a text which was popular in Jiankang.[31] They had become *ekayāna* believers. Guṇabhadra then

went to Jingzhou (荊州) and translated some more, assisted by Fayong (法勇). He stayed in Jingzhou for ten years. Sengyou (105c17–20) mentions eight titles of translations: *Wuyou wang* (無憂王), about Aśoka; *Guoqu xianzai yinguo* (過去現在因果); *Wuliangshou jing* (無量壽經), the smaller *Sukhāvatīvyūha*; *Nihuan jing* (泥洹經, *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*); *Yangjue Moluo jing* (央掘魔羅經, *Aṅgulimālīya-sūtra*); *Xiangxu jietuo jing* (相續解脫經, *Saṅdhinirmocana-sūtra*); *Ba jixiang jing* (八吉祥經); and *Diyiyi wu xiang lüe* (第一義五相略). Ren Jiyu says that in Jingzhou he brought out his work about the Pure Land and paradise.[32] In 454 CE his protector Liu Yixuan (劉義宣) attempted an ill-fated insurgency. This meant that the translation activities ended.

Sengyou brought out his famous and reliable catalogue, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (出三藏記集), in 515–518 CE, not long after Guṇabhadra had passed away. In it (T. 55.2145:12c19–13a4) he mentions thirteen titles of texts by Guṇabhadra. Four had already been lost so soon after his death. The thirteen titles are:

1. *Za ahan jing* (雜阿含經, *Saṃyuktāgama*, T. 2.99, fifty fascicles). This text is a non-Vaibhāṣika, Sautrāntika Sarvāstivāda version, brought out in 443 CE, in the temple called Waguan Si (瓦官寺), according to Zhisheng's *Kaiyuan lu* (智昇 開元錄, T. 55.2154:528a23–24) of 730 CE. Zhisheng mentions that the *Gaoseng zhuan* says that the text was translated in the Zhihuan Si (祇洹寺, Jetavana Temple) in the capital. Sengyou (105c13) also says that the text was translated in the Zhihuan Si. Zhisheng (T. 55.2154:528a23–24) mentions that the translation was made by Baoyun, based on the Sanskrit text brought back from Śrī Laṅkā (Sengyou, T. 55.2145:112a25–26) to China by Faxian.[33] Both Chinese monks had travelled together to Gandhāra.

2. *Da fa gu jing* (大法故經, *Mahābherīhāraka*, T. 9.270). A *tathāgatagarbha* text brought out in the Dong'an Si (東安寺).

3. *Shengman shizi hou yisheng da fangbian fangguang jing* (勝鬘師子吼一乘大方便方廣經, *Śrīmālāsiṃhanāda*, T. 12.353), a *tathāgatagarbha* text. Baoyun is responsible for the translation. Did Guṇabhadra pick up this *ekayāna* text on his way to Śrī Laṅkā?

4. *Ba jixiang jing* (八吉祥經, T. 14.430). This text was brought out in 452 CE in Jingzhou, says Zhisheng's *Kaiyuan lu* (T. 55.2154:528b21–22). Zhisheng mentions that this is the third translation, after Zhi Qian's *Ba jixiang shenzhou jing* (支謙 八吉祥神咒經, T. 14.427), and after Dharmarakṣa's *Ba yang shenzhou jing* (八陽神咒經, T. 14.428). *Shenzhou* seems to mean *dhāraṇī,* a term which is mentioned in the text,

namely *tuoluoni* (陀羅尼; 75b29).The short text may be of Gandhāran Mahāsāṅghika origin. It mentions eight buddhas, their names, and their fields (paradises) to the east.[34] The contents of the text certainly help explain its popularity in China, an eastern "paradise." Guṇabhadra's text has been wrongly attributed to Saṅghavarman (Sengqie Poluo, 僧伽婆羅, 460–524 CE),[35] a monk from Funan (扶南, mainly Cambodia). He was active in Jiankang during the years 506–520 CE, during the reign of Wu (武) of the Liang (梁). The postface in Sengyou's catalogue (T. 55.2145:68a2–8) mentions Guṇabhadra as the author.

5. *Lengqie abaduoluo bao jing* (楞伽阿跋多羅寶經, *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, T. 16.670). Its four fascicles were brought out in the Daochang Si (道場寺) in 443 CE. Baoyun translated and Huiguan wrote it down. This text combines storehouse-consciousness (*ālayavijñāna*) and the *tathāgatagarbha* idea. Storehouse-consciousness is translated "phonetically" as *aliye shi* (阿梨耶識) or *alaiye shi* (阿賴耶識), and "meaningfully" as *zang shi* (藏識), *zang* (藏) meaning storehouse or receptacle. *Zang* also is the translation of *garbha* in *tathāgatagarbha*. This Chinese translation of *garbha* obscures the meaning(s) of *garbha*.[36] While storehouse-consciousness remained Sautrāntika, *tathāgatagarbha* immediately became *ekayāna,* an originally Sautrāntika development assimilated by Mahāsāṅghikas. This text was the first translation. Fei Zhangfang's *Lidai sanbao ji* (費長房 歷代三寶紀, T. 40.2034:84b7 and 24) of 597 CE erroneously mentions a first, lost translation by Dharmarddhin. Sengyou does not mention this. Fei often attributes a translation of Baoyun to Dharmarddhin, e.g., Baoyun's *Buddhacarita* of 421 CE.[37] In Fei's catalogue Guṇabhadra is supposed to have translated seventy-eight titles. Zhisheng's *Kaiyuan lu* (T. 55.2154:523b25 and 528c21) reduces this number to fifty-two. The *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* is said by Nakamura Hajime, based on the work of D.T. Suzuki, to be compiled ca. 400 CE or in the fourth century. Did Guṇabhadra compose the text himself, having his own descent to Laṅkā in mind?[38] He certainly had the means, motive, and opportunity for this hypothesis. His educational background, writings, and social context points in that direction. Sengyou (T. 55.2145:106b16) says that all his life he was a vegetarian, as one should be according to the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra,* in which every sentient being has the buddha-nature. Guṇabhadra's own doctrinal background was Sautrāntika and *ekayāna*. There are quite some brahmanical elements in the text. Thinking of the supposed visits of the Buddha to the island, the text is set in the fortress of Rāvaṇa, *rākṣasa* king of Laṅkā, known from the

Rāmāyana. The Buddha instructs Mahāmati there. Sāṃkhya and other brahmanical schools are mentioned. If the brahmin Guṇabhadra did not compile the text himself, he certainly was very close. Because of this text he was sometimes considered the true last Indian patriarch of Chan (禪), who introduced Chan to China.[39] Early Chan became known as the Laṅkā school in China. Bodhidharma allegedly transmitted the four fascicles to his Chinese disciple Huike (慧可).There is a Tibetan translation based on Guṇabhadra's text, made by the bilingual Tibetan Chos'grub (active in Dunhuang ca. 832–865 CE in Mūlasarvāstivāda times), alias Facheng (法成).

6. *Yangjue Moluo jing* (央掘魔羅經, *Aṅgulimālīya-sūtra*, T. 2.120). A *tathāgatagarbha* text.

7. *Guoqu xianzai yinguo jing* (過去現在因果經, T. 3.189). Narrative literature, not found in the *āgamas.*

8. *Xiangxu jietuo jing* (相續解脫經, *Saṅdhinirmocana-sūtra,* T. 16.678), a partial and first Chinese version of the famous Cittamātra text, best known in Xuanzang's (玄奘) version, *Jie shen mi jing* (解深密經, T. 16.676).[40] As is so often the case, Xuanzang again translates a text previously brought out by Paramārtha, *Jie jie jing* (解節經, T. 16.677). This is a very early text about storehouse-consciousness. The final text was put together no later than 300 CE, but some material may be as early as the second century. Sautrāntikas believe that actions sow seeds in the mental continuum of a sentient being. This mental continuum continues through the lifetime. *Xiangxu* (相續) is this continuum (*saṅtati, saṅdhi*). *Jietuo* (解脫) means deliverance. Guṇabhadra knew this early Cittamātra text, not Asaṅga's Gandhāran Yogācāra.

9. *Diyiyi wu xiang lüe* (第一義五相略), one fascicle, further unknown to me. Zhisheng also mentions this text (T. 55.2154:528c20).

Sengyou further mentions four texts, already lost. They are: 10. *Shi liushier jian* (釋六十二見), apparently an abhidharmic text about sixty-two wrong views, also mentioned by Zhisheng (T. 55.2154:528c10). 11. *Nihuan jing* (泥洹經), a *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*. 12. *Wuliangshou jing* (無量壽經), one fascicle. Zhisheng (T. 55.2154:528b19) mentions that this text was the smaller *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, a second translation, after Kumārajīva's version to the north. Wuliangshou (無量壽, Amitāyus), indeed, is the southern term for Amitābha. Is there maybe confusion here because of the larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha* (*Wuliangshou jing*, 無量壽經), brought out in Jiankang by Baoyun in 421 CE? This text fits in with Guṇabhadra's Sautrāntika Buddhism. The Pure Land was of Bactrian Sautrāntika

origin.[41] Is Baoyun also the reason for the confusion concerning the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra,* a text being revised in Jiankang? 13. *Wuyou wang jing* (無憂王經), one fascicle, a text about King Aśoka, brought out in Jingzhou. The text is mentioned by Zhisheng (T. 55.2154:528c3). This king and his *stūpas* were used to promote Buddhism in southern China.[42]

The Taishō edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka contains twenty-eight titles of texts attributed to Guṇabhadra, many of them narratives linked with *āgamas*, which is quite normal for a Sautrāntika. These include, for example, *Yingwu jing* (鸚鵡經, T. 1.79) and *Bimosu jing* (髀摩肅經, T. 1.90), for the *Madhyamāgama*; and *Si ren chuxian shijian jing* (四人出現世間經, T. 2.127), *Shiyi xiangsi nian Rulai jing* (十一想思念如來經, T. 2.138), and *Asuda jing* (阿遫達經, T. 2.141) for the *Ekottarikāgama.*[43] *Dayi jing* (大意經, T. 3.177) is about Mahāmati, who received instruction in Laṅkā. There are texts about Pure Land (*Ba yiqie yezhang genben de sheng Jingtu shenzhou*, 拔一切業障根本得生淨土神咒, T. 12.368) and paradise (*Da fangguang bao qie jing,* 大方廣寶篋經, *Kāraṇḍakavyūha*, T. 14.462). More narrative literature includes *Mohejiaye* (or *Mohe Jiaye*) *du pin mu jing* (摩訶迦葉度貧母經, T. 14.497). *Shen Rier ben jing* (申日兒本經, T. 14.536) and *Lao mu nü liu ying jing* (老母女六英經, T. 14.560) are very doubtful, says Li An.[44] *Shi er toutuo jing* (十二頭陀經, T. 17.783), about ascetic practices, had some influence in Chan circles. It reminds one of Buddhabhadra's Yogācāra practices. The *Gaoseng zhuan* mentions that Guṇabhadra studied the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* in India. So does Sengyou (105b25–26). This text was translated to Chinese in 418–420/422 CE by Buddhabhadra in *Da fangguang Fo huayan jing* (大方廣佛華嚴經, T. 9.278). He translated a text brought from Hotan by the Tokharian Faling (法領), who was sent to Central Asia by Huiyuan (慧遠) to look for more literature.[45] Was this text, of Mahāsāṅghika affiliation, translated by Buddhabhadra because of his links with Huiyuan? Mahāsāṅghika Buddhism of Gandhāran origin was not Buddhabhadra's kind of Buddhism, even though he also helped translate Faxian's text of the *Mahāsāṅghikavinaya*, *Mohesengqi (or zhi) lü* (摩訶僧祇律, T. 22.1425). It is quite possible that Guṇabhadra's alleged links with Hotan and Mahāsāṅghika Buddhism can be explained by his earlier studies in Madhyadeśa, and by the previous activities of Buddhabhadra, who had passed away in 429 CE, and of his Chinese disciples in Jiankang. Also, T. 19.1013, *Anantuomuqu* (*Anantamukha,* 阿難陀目佉) *nihelituo* (or *tuo*, 尼呵離陀) *jing* (經), known as *Anantamukhanirhāradhāraṇī*, can be

explained in this context. Buddhabhadra also brought out his version, *Chusheng wuliang men chi jing* (出生無量門持經, T. 19.1012). What is the exact Sanskrit word for Guṇabhadra's *nihelituo* or *niheli tuo*? *Nirhāra (niheli) dhāraṇī (tuo)*? One may also consider a term such as *niḥsṛta* (*chusheng,* 出生). As a brahmin Guṇabhadra may have been familiar with *dhāraṇīs*. Sengyou (55.2145:105b20) mentions that in India he had studied *zhoushu* (咒術), which may be translated as *mantravidyā*. The text, *Wuliang men weimi chi jing* (無量門微密持經, T. 19.1011), was already in China with Zhi Qian in the third century. This short text was quite popular in China. Also Saṅghavarman (Sengqie Poluo, 僧伽婆羅) later brought a version, *Shelifu tuoluoni jing* (舍利弗陀羅尼經, T. 19.1016). There further are some titles, such as *Zui fu baoying jing* (罪福報應經, T. 17.747), *Shier pin shengsi jing* (十二品生死經, 17.753), and *Si pin xue fa jing* (四品學法經, T. 17.771), which deal with doctrinal matters. It may be remembered that for every erroneous attribution there is at least one reason. Finally there is *Zhongshi fen apitan lun* (眾事分阿毘曇論, *Prakaraṇapādaśāstra*, T. 26.1541), translated by Guṇabhadra and his disciple Bodhiyaśas in 443 CE. I have said that non-Vaibhāṣikas also had seven *abhidharma* texts, reacting to the "orthodoxy" in Kaśmīra. Their texts, of course, were not the Vaibhāṣika ones.[46] This text is one of them. In the days of Guṇabhadra Sautrāntikas already had grown doctrinally closer to the "orthodoxy."

From all this it has become very clear that Guṇabhadra was a Sautrāntika brahmin, familiar with *avadāna* literature and with *āgamas*. He was familiar with non-Vaibhāṣika *abhidharma* and with the latest developments within Sautrāntika circles (*ālayavijñāna* and *tathāgatagarbha*, Sukhāvatī). His Mahāsāṅghika background in India had made him a true believer of the buddha-nature idea, a true ekayānist. He even may have compiled the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* himself.

BODHIDHARMA (IN CHINA CA. 479, DIED CA. 530 CE)

Most sources say that Bodhidharma was the third son of "royalty" in South India. Daoxuan (道宣, 645 CE), Jingjue (淨覺, ca. 720 CE), and Du Fei (杜朏, ca. 710–720 CE) say that he was a brahmin,[47] but Daoyuan (道原, 1004 CE) says he was a *kṣatriya*.[48] Daoyuan also mentions that his family came from Xiangzhi (香至), Gandhavatī, i.e., the Gandhāran cultural area.[49] Tanlin (曇林, fl. 506–574 CE),[50] a disciple of Bodhidharma, says Bodhidharma came from South India, from Xiyu, the Western Regions.[51] Xiyu may be the westernmost part of Jibin, of the Gandhāran

cultural area, i.e., Bactria. So, Tanlin says his master came from South India, from Bactria. We know that Sasanians attacked Bactria in 442 CE. Fighting ended in 467 CE, but even before that time Sasanians had destroyed Termez, ca. 360–370 CE.[52] Furthermore, mid-fifth century Hephthalites were in Bactria.[53] The parents of Bodhidharma apparently left a troubled region and went south. He may have been a brahmin, but *kṣatriyas* are better known as traders. Yang Xuanzhi (楊衒之) writes in 547 CE that Bodhidharma was a westerner (*huren*, 胡人) from Persia, in the Western Regions.[54] Bodhidharma's family may well have been Persians from Bactria who went south. Links between Bactria and southeastern India had existed for centuries at the time.[55]

Bodhidharma travelled by sea to China, arriving there in Nanyue (南越), in Liu Song territory.[56] It is mentioned that his teaching met with opposition. He went north to northern Henan (河南) during the Northern Wei (北魏, 386–534 CE; the capital was initially Pingcheng, 平城, but from 495 CE it was Luoyang, 洛陽). He indeed crossed seas and mountains on his way to northern Henan. In the period 516–526 CE he may have visited the Yongning Si (永寧寺) in Luoyang.[57] He is said to have gone to the Shaolin Si (少林寺) on Song Shan (嵩山), and to have practiced "wall contemplation."[58] Songyun (宋雲), on his way back to Luoyang, reportedly met Bodhidharma in the "Onion Range" (Congling, 蔥嶺, Pamir). Songyun left Luoyang in 518 CE and returned in 522 CE.[59] Bodhidharma supposedly was on his way west. One should remember that his place of origin was Bactria. Bodhidharma may have died ca. 530 CE.[60] He is said to have passed on the four fascicles of Guṇabhadra's translation of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* to his disciple Huike (ca. 485–ca. 555 or 574 CE[61]).

SAUTRĀNTIKA-BASED TEACHING

Bodhidharma's Buddhism ultimately came from Bactria, the area of *tathāgatagarbha*. Because this idea was immediately taken up by Mahāsāṅghikas, as seen in their *Śrīmālāsiṃhanāda* in South India, this kind of Buddhism was called *ekayāna*, a Mahāsāṅghika term. Tanlin was a specialist in this text.[62] Guṇabhadra, who also left the south to travel to China, brought the combination of storehouse-consciousness and *ekayāna tathāgatagarbha* to China in his *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. It is quite understandable that his Buddhism and Bodhidharma's, coming from southern India, cannot be separated. Jingjue calls Guṇabhadra the first patriarch in China, but by far most scholars call Bodhidharma

the first patriarch. He was a man of practice, who apparently did not write or translate any text. When one looks at the lists of Chan patriarchs, it is striking that many names are of Sautrāntikas. The earliest list of Sautrāntika patriarchs can be found in Sengyou's catalogue (T. 55.2145:89a20–b30). Here one finds the names of fifty-three Sarvāstivāda patriarchs. The last few names make the link with Buddhabhadra and his teacher Buddhasena clear. The list of twenty-eight Indian Chan patriarchs, beginning with Kāśyapa, still mostly contains Sautrāntika names, even many Bactrians, such as Dhītika. The fact that Bodhidharma did not write anything himself made him quite acceptable to Shenhui (神會, 684–758 CE), the dissident who from 730 CE on attacked what he called Shenxiu's (神秀) Northern school.[63] His dissent was the beginning of the so-called Southern school, which favored the "Diamond Cutter," *Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra.* Kumārajīva's translation (*Jingang boreboluomi jing*, 金剛般若波羅蜜經, T. 8.235)[64] was quite influential at the time. Shenxiu and his disciples called their school the East Mountain Teaching, referring to Daoxin (道信, 580–651 CE) and Hongren (弘忍, 601–674 CE). So, the focus shifted to Mahāsāṅghika Prajñāpāramitā. One can see that the old Sthavira (Sautrāntika) versus Mahāsāṅghika dynamics were still active, even in China. The Chinese tradition that a school is not *Vinaya* based, but text based, helps explain the shift. Scholars have looked into the use of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* by the East Mountain school. But, as may be expected in a school which does not encourage scholarly learning at all, the use of this text has been seen as limited.

ACCESS VIA PRINCIPLE AND ACCESS VIA FOUR BEHAVIORS

This short text, *Er ru si xing lun* (二入四行論), was probably written by Tanlin, the scholarly disciple of Bodhidharma.[65] He may have written down the teaching of his master, informed by Huike. Tanlin then added his preface. Bodhidharma's disciples accepted this text as the core of the master's teaching.[66] The text explains the two accesses (*er ru*, 二入) of *li* (理), principle, and *xing* (行), practice or behavior. There are four behaviors, *si xing* (四行).

The text begins with an explanation of the "true nature" (*zhen xing,* 真性, *tattva*), i.e., the buddha-nature, the potential for buddhahood present in all sentient beings. In this passage "wall contemplation" is mentioned, meaning being "fixed in *śamatha*," tranquillity (*zhi*, 止).[67] This practice reminds one of Zhiyi's (智顗, 538–597 CE)

writings. *Śamatha* is a practice developing one's ability to focus on an object. Principle (true nature) is the ultimate reality underlying all phenomena.

Then follows an explanation of the four kinds of behavior:

1. The practice of retribution of enmity, *bao yuan xing* (報怨行), i.e., accepting all suffering as fruition of one's past evil.
2. The practice of going along with the conditions, *sui yuan xing* (隨緣行, *pratyaya*).
3. The practice of absence of any wish, *wu suoqiu xing* (無所求行). *Qiu* (求) means *iṣ°*, to wish. Wishes mean suffering.
4. The practice of accordance with the dharma, *chen fa xing* (稱法行), i.e., doing away with wrong thoughts and practicing the six perfections (*pāramitās*), understanding emptiness.

These four practices constitute *vipaśyanā* (*guan,* 觀, insight), explained as *prajñā, dharmapravicaya* (investigation of factors).

What is immediately striking is the resemblance with *wu men chan* (五門禪), "five gates *dhyāna*," but now *ru* (入), access, is used, not *men* (門), gate. *Wu men chan* is a traditional practice, very popular in China in the fifth century, but not only then. Five exercises are called gates to the first *dhyāna* of the material realm, *rūpadhātu*. They are known as a *prayogamārga*, path of preparatory application (*yoga* or *prayoga, fangbian*, 方便) in Sautrāntika *abhidharma*. Kumārajīva explained these Sautrāntika exercises in Chang'an in 402 CE, at the request of Sengrui (僧叡).[68] More relevant to the Buddhism of Bodhidharma is T. 15.618, Buddhabhadra's text about the teaching of his master in Bactria, Buddhasena. This text is called *Xiuxing dao di* (修行道地) or *Xiuxing fangbian* (修行方便), *Yogācārabhūmi,*[69] erroneously called *Sūtra about Dharmatrāta's Dhyāna* (*Damo Duoluo chan jing*, 達摩多羅禪經). *Fangbian* (方便) often just means *yoga* (effort, application) in old translations. *Yoga* is sometimes rendered as *dao* (道, path), too. The five exercises vary from master to master, but *aśubhabhāvanā*, contemplation of impurity, and *ānāpānasmṛti*, mindfulness to breathing in and out, are always there. Not so in Bodhidharma's teaching. Buddhabhadra does mention *maitrībhāvanā,* contemplation of friendliness, remedying hatred, *dveṣa*, and the contemplation of the chain of dependent origination, *pratītyasamutpāda*, remedying delusion or ignorance, *moha*. This agrees with the second practice of Bodhidharma's teaching. Bodhidharma's practices one, two, and three are about *dveṣa, moha*, and *lobha*, the three fundamental afflictions of hatred or enmity, ignorance or delusion,

and desire. The first practice tells us to look at our own past evil. Did Bodhidharma mention this first because he had been encountering opposition? He does not advocate the practice of friendliness. The fourth practice adds the practice of emptiness. The four practices and the first access can certainly be seen in the context of "five gates *dhyāna*." The five exercises have been used in different contexts. There is a series of three stages of the wise, *san xian* (三賢), made up of five contemplations to stop thoughts, *wu ting xin guan* (五停心觀), i.e., the five gates of preparatory application, plus contemplation of the common characteristics (*sāmānyalakṣaṇa*) of factors and contemplation of the particular characteristics of factors. There also is a path of seven applications (*yoga*), *qi fangbian* (七方便), namely, the just mentioned three plus the four wholesome roots (*kuśalamūla*).[70]

By way of conclusion I can say that Guṇabhadra's work introduced the basic ideas of Chan to South China. His Buddhism was Sautrāntika, as practiced in northern India. *Ālayavijñāna*, storehouse-consciousness, is a northern Sarvāstivāda development. *Tathāgatagarbha* may have started in traditional Jibin, especially in Bactria, quickly becoming *ekayāna*. Guṇabhadra combined both in his text of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. Bodhidharma, a man of Persian or of Bactrian origin, also left southern India for southern China, but he was active in northern Henan. His teaching definitely shows Sautrāntika influence. The East Mountain Teaching was traditionally known as the Laṅkā school. Shenhui later shifted the focus away from Sautrāntika practice to Mahāsāṅghika Prajñāpāramitā. The Sthavira versus Mahāsāṅghika split was still influential in Chinese developments in the eighth century.

NOTES

1. *Za apitan xin lun* (雜阿毘曇心論, T. 28.1552). This text is the work of a Gandhāran Dharmatrāta in the early fourth century. The Chinese version is by Saṅghavarman, Baoyun, and Huiguan, working in 434–435 CE (Charles Willemen, *The Essence of Scholasticism* [Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2006], 10–12). The title has been erroneously reconstructed as *Saṃyukta°*. Yaśomitra mentions a *miśrakakāra*, most likely Dharmatrāta; see Charles Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse about Abhidharmic Literature," *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 國際佛教學大學院大學研究紀要 12 (2008): 48 (145).

2. In *The Essence of Scholasticism*, Willemen studies and translates the text, *Apitan xin lun* (阿毘曇心論, T. 28.1550), as translated to Chinese by Saṅghadeva (Sengqie Tipo, 僧伽提婆) in 391 CE on Mt. Lu (廬山). Tanmo Shili (曇摩尸梨),

a phonetic rendering of the name of the composer, Fasheng (法勝), renders Dharmaśreṣṭhin (not Dharmaśrī), made to look like a real Chinese name. The title is, without any doubt, *Hṛdaya*, not *Sāra*.

3. Karl-Heinz Golzio, "Zur Datierung des Kuṣāṇa-Königs Kaniṣka I," in *Bauddhasāhityastabakāvalī: Essays and Studies on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature Dedicated to Claus Vogel by Colleagues, Students, and Friends,* ed. Dragomir Dimitrov, Michael Hahn, and Roland Steiner, Indica et Tibetica 36 (Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 2008), 89. The date of 127 CE for the beginning of the reign of Kaniṣka is no longer valid.

4. Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 43–47 (150–146).

5. For Jibin, see Charles Willemen, "Mahīśāsaka: Some New Ideas," in *Dharmapravicaya. Aspects of Buddhist Studies. Essays in Honour of N.H. Samtani*, ed. Lalji Shravak and Charles Willemen (Delhi: Buddhist World Press, 2012), 483.

6. Charles Willemen, *A Collection of Important Odes of the Law: The Chinese Udānavarga* (Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies and BDK America, 2013), 10.

7. Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 45 (148).

8. Saṅghabhadra's *Biposha (Vibhāṣā) lun* (髀婆沙論, T. 28.1547) of 383 CE, and Buddhavarman's *Apitan (Abhidharma) piposha (vibhāṣā) lun* (阿毘曇毘婆沙論, T. 28.1546) of 439 CE, are *vibhāṣās* on the Gandhāran *Aṣṭagranthaśāstra* (*Ba jiandu lun*, 八犍度論, T. 26.1543). *Apidamo da piposha lun* (阿毘達摩大毘婆沙論, T. 27.1545), the *Mahāvibhāṣā*, of Xuanzang's team in 659 CE is a *vibhāṣā* on the "orthodox" *Jñānaprasthānaśāstra* (*Fa zhi lun*, 發智論, T. 26.1544), in Kaśmīra.

9. Willemen, *Essence of Scholasticism*, 1, 8–12.

10. Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 50 (143).

11. The term is a Sanskritization of Theravāda, i.e., non-Mahāsāṅghika.

12. Willemen, "Mahīśāsaka: Some New Ideas," 487–490.

13. Rongxi Li, *The Great Tang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1996), 84.

14. Golzio, "Zur Datierung des Kuṣāṇa-Königs Kaniṣka I," 89.

15. See Charles Willemen, "The Sanskrit Title of Harivarman's *Chengshi Lun* 成實論 (T. 1646)," *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 4 (2006): 244–249, for the Sanskrit title of the *Chengshi lun* (成實論, T. 32.1646): *(Jñānakāya)prodbhūtopadeśa*.

16. John P. Keenan, *The Scripture on the Explication of Underlying Meaning* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2000), 1. A Tibetan translation exists, studied by Étienne Lamotte (*Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra: l'explication des mystères* [Louvain, Belgium: Bureaux du Recueil, and Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1935]) and by John Powers (*Wisdom of the*

Buddha: The Saṃdhinirmocana Mahāyāna Sūtra [Berkeley: Dharma Publishing, 1995]). One may presume that if a Tibetan version of an abhidharmic text exists, the text may be of Sautrāntika/Mūlasarvāstivāda origin.

17. Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 48 (145).

18. Willemen, "Mahīśāsaka: Some New Ideas," 489–490.

19. The term *foxing*, buddha-nature, appears a bit later than *tathāgatagarbha* in East Asia (William H. Grosnick, "The Tathāgatagarbha Sūtra," in *Buddhism in Practice*, ed. Donald S. Lopez [New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1995], 92). Sallie King offers a study of the *Treatise about Buddha-Nature* (*Foxing lun*, 佛性論, T. 31.1610), probably attributed to Vasubandhu by the author, the brahmin Paramārtha (499–569 CE), ca. 558 CE (Sallie B. King, *Buddha Nature* [Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991], 23–24). Paramārtha also explained the *Wushang yi jing* (*Anuttarāśraya-sūtra*(?), 無上依經, T. 15.669), based on the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes* [Hirakata: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980], 230n15, referring to J. Takasaki, *Bukkyō shishō ronshū* [Essays on the History of Buddhist Thought], *Presented to Professor Reimon Yūki on His Retirement from the Institute of Oriental Culture* [Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan-sha, 1964], 241–264). Paramārtha may also be responsible for the text of the *Qi xin lun* (起信論, T. 32.1666) of 553 CE, attributed by him to Aśvaghoṣa (Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 64 [129]). In this text, ignorance (*avidyā*) is the source of all existence, a quite Sarvāstivāda idea. Paramārtha is also said to be the translator of a text about the four noble truths, *Sidi lun* (四諦論, T. 32.1647), a text attributed to Vasuvarman. Was it brought from Funan or from southeastern India, because of the °varman? (See Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 71–72 [122–121].)

20. Grosnick, "The Tathāgatagarbha Sūtra," 92.

21. Michael Zimmermann, "The *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra*: Its Basic Structure and Relation to the Lotus Sūtra," in *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 1998*, Vol. 2 (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 1999), 145–146. Grosnick ("The Tathāgatagarbha Sūtra," 94–106) translates the text. About Buddhabhadra, see Marylin Martin Rhie, *Early Buddhist Art of China & Central Asia*, Vol. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 264–268; and Jiyu Ren 任繼愈, comp., *Zhongguo Fojiao Shi* 中國佛教史 (Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe 中國社會科學出版社, 1988), 140–142.

22. This text proclaims the reality of the true self (buddha-nature). The so-called northern version of Dharmarddhin (385–433 CE) in 421 CE in Guzang, *Da banniepan jing* (大般涅槃經, T. 12.374, forty fascicles), has a first part, which agrees with the six fascicles of Faxian's (法顯) text, *Da banniepan jing* (大般涅槃經, T. 12.376), translated in 416–418 CE by Baoyun and Buddhabhadra in

the Daochang Si in Jiankang, and a last part for which no Sanskrit fragment yet exists. It is in this part that one is informed about the buddha-nature in all living beings (Ren, *Zhongguo Fojiao Shi*, 138, 142–144). For Tanwu Chen (曇無讖, Dharmarddhin), see Charles Willemen, *The Chinese Buddhacarita: Complete Chinese-English Dictionary* (Delhi: Buddhist World Press, 2009), 10. Michael Radich (*How Ajātaśatru Was Reformed: The Domestication of "Ajase" and Stories in Buddhist History* [Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, 2011], 170) mentions the close links between this last part of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* and "Mūlasarvāstivāda" *Vinaya*, i.e., non-Vaibhāṣika Sarvāstivāda material. I would say that this (part of the) text probably has a Bactrian Sarvāstivāda origin. The northern version was reworked in southern China, Jiankang, in 453 CE, during the Liu Song by Huiyan, Huiguan, and Xie Lingyun (謝靈運): *Da banniepan jing* (大般涅槃經, T. 12.375, thirty-six fascicles). There are more Chinese texts of this sūtra. Jan Nattier (*A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han* 東漢 *and Three Kingdoms* 三國 *Periods* [Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2008], 126–127, 126n39) says that *Banniepan jing* (般涅槃經, T. 1.6) is a non-Mahāyāna text by Zhi Qian (支謙). *Fo banniepan jing* (佛般涅槃經, T. 1.5) is very closely related with T. 1.6.

23. From the mid-third to the mid-fifth centuries Shanshan (Piqan) controlled the southern route to Hotan. It ruled over Qiemo (Qarqan, 且末) and Jingjue (Niya, 精絕 or Minfeng, 民豐). The Northern Wei (北魏, 368–534 CE) annexed Shanshan ca. 445 CE. Songyun went to Central Asia during that time, early sixth century.

24. Li-kouang Lin (*Introduction au compendium de la loi: L'Aide-mémoire de la vraie loi* [Paris: Adrien- Maisonneuve, 1949], 178–179) mentions that based on Vassilief's research in Tibetan material, the names of Sarvāstivādins often ended in °bhadra, °mati, °śrī, °kīrti, etc., and names of Mahāsāṅghikas often ended in °mitra, °jñāna, °gupta, etc. The names of some Sthaviras ended in °deva, °ākara, °varman, etc.

25. The westernmost part of the Western Regions, Xiyu, was at the same time the westernmost part of Jibin, namely Bactria (Willemen, "Mahīśāsaka: Some New Ideas," 483–484). At the end of the fourth century Bactria was quite violent, when the Kidarites were establishing themselves. The Sasanians destroyed Termez in 360–370 CE. The Kidarites annexed Gandhāra ca. 400 CE. The Sasanians attacked Bactria from 442 till 467 CE, when they took all of Bactria. Kidarites were still in Gandhāra till the end of the fifth century. Kidarites, who were called Yuezhi (月支) in Chinese sources, saw themselves as the successors of the Kuṣāṇas. The situation in Bactria may certainly explain why Bactrians left, probably to China, but also to southern India. Monks usually followed trade routes and traders. See Ahmad Hasan Dani and

Boris Anatol'evich Litvinsky, "The Kushano-Sasanian Kingdom," in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Vol. III, ed. B. A. Litvinsky, Zhang Guang-da, and R. Shabani Samghabadi (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999), 104; and Evegenii Vladislavovich Zeimal, "The Kidarite Kingdom in Central Asia," in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Vol. III, ed. B. A. Litvinsky, Zhang Guang-da, and R. Shabani Samghabadi (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999), 121–127.

26. *Ekayāna* is translated as "unique vehicle" (*weiyi sheng*, 惟一乘). See Charles Willemen, *Outlining the Way to Reflect* 思惟略要法 *(T. XV 617)* (Mumbai: Somaiya Publications, 2012), 46.

27. Ibid., 16–17.

28. See note 19, above. Paramārtha most likely was a non-Vaibhāṣika Sarvāstivāda brahmin. He apparently believed in storehouse-consciousness and in *tathāgatagarbha*. *Tathāgatagarbha* assimilated by Mahāsāṅghikas is called *ekayāna*.

29. The Śātavāhana empire had extensive links with the Kuṣāṇa empire. Elizabeth Rosen Stone (*The Buddhist Art of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa* [Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994], 94–97) says that in the third century ivories went from Bagram to Andhra. Art and artists travelled from Bactria via Gandhāra to Mathurā and then further south, most likely from India's western coast along the rivers Godāvarī and Kṛṣṇā to Andhra, and then further south from there. It must be remembered that a road leads in two opposite directions.

30. For an English translation see Diana Y. Paul, *The Sutra of Queen Śrīmālā of the Lion's Roar* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2004). Alex Wayman ("The Mahāsāṃghika and the Tathāgatagarbha," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 1 [1978]: 36) says that the text as represented in the Chinese is of Mahāsāṅghika affiliation. He dates the text to the third century in Andhra, a predominantly Mahāsāṅghika area. I am convinced that the *tathāgatagarbha* idea arose in Bactria, quickly becoming *ekayāna,* and spreading south.

31. Willemen, *Outlining the Way to Reflect*, 12.

32. Ren, *Zhongguo Fojiao Shi*, 143.

33. Andrew Glass ("Guṇabhadra, Baoyun, and the Saṃyuktāgama," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31 [2008–2010]: 194–195) does not disagree. Faxian obtained an abstract (*chao,* 抄) of the *Sapoduo lü* (薩婆多律, *Sarvāstivāda Vinaya*) in Pāṭaliputra; see Sengyou, T. 55.2145:112a20. Being an abstract of this *Vinaya* in Madhyadeśa, the traditional, long *Vinaya* from Mathurā, not the Vaibhāṣika *Daśabhāṇavāra*, is meant. The rules of the Vaibhāṣika *Vinaya in Ten Recitations* were no different from the rules of the traditional, long Sautrāntika/Dārṣṭāntika *Vinaya*.

34. The eastern paradise(s) being Mahāsāṅghika (Charles Willemen, "Early

Yogācāra and Visualization [*Bhāvanā*]," in *Wading into the Stream of Wisdom: Essays Honoring Leslie Kawamura*, ed. Sarah Haynes and Michelle Sorensen [Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies and BDK America, 2013], 219–221).

35. Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 68–69 (125–124). The name has erroneously been said to be Saṅghapāla.

36. Grosnick ("The Tathāgatagarbha Sūtra," 92–93) elaborates on the meanings of the word *garbha*, mainly *womb* and *embryo*. The Chinese at the time seems to avoid the word *tai* (胎, womb). The word *zang* (藏) links *ālaya* to *garbha*.

37. Willemen, *The Chinese Buddhacarita*, 9–10.

38. Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism*, 231. Guṇabhadra probably had left from Tāmraliptī to Śrī Laṅkā, just as Saṅghamittā had done, carrying a branch of Gayā's bodhi tree. She was the sister of Mahinda, who had reached the island somewhat earlier. He was on the island during the reign of Devānaṃpiyatissa (ca. 250–210 BCE). Both, brother and sister, passed away during the reign of Uttiya (ca. 210–200 BCE); see Étienne Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, trans. S. Boin-Webb (Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste, 1988), 266–271. Sarvāstivādins, a Sthaviravāda school, were on the island where Guṇavarman obtained their *Saṃyuktāgama.*

39. Jingjue's (淨覺, 683–ca. 750 CE) *Lengqie shizi ji* (楞伽師資記, *Record of Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā [School]*, T. 85.2837; ca. 713–716 CE), a text which promotes the Laṅkāvatāra school of so-called Northern Chan, sees Guṇabhadra as the one who introduced Chan to China. Bodhidharma came later. Jingjue, follower of Shenxiu (神秀, 606?–706 CE) and Xuanze (玄賾), was from Luoyang, northern Henan, the area where Bodhidharma had been active (John McRea, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, Studies in East Asian Buddhism 3, Kuroda Institute [Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986], 88–91; and Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Vol. I: India and China*, trans. James W. Heisig and Paul Knitter [Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2008], 109–110). It may be remembered that Chan is an ancient "sound" translation for a Gāndhārī word. One may think of *jhāṇa* or *jhāna*. Chan is not an abbreviation of *channa* (禪那). The "*na*" is a later addition.

40. See note 16, above.

41. Willemen, "Early Yogācāra and Visualization (*Bhāvanā*)," 214–216, 221.

42. Willemen, *A Collection of Important Odes of the Law*, 12.

43. *Āgama* literature is expected from a Sautrāntika.

44. Li An 李安, "Qiuna Batuoluo (394–468)" 求那跋陀羅, in *Zhongguo Fojiao* 中國佛教, comp. by Zhongguo Fojiao Xiehui 中國佛教協會 (Beijing: Zhishi Chubanshe 知識出版社, 1982), s.v. 60.

45. Rhie (*Early Buddhist Art of China & Central Asia*, 264–268) translates the

biography of Buddhabhadra.

46. Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 56–57.

47. Daoxuan's (道宣, 596–667 CE) *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (續高僧傳, *Continued Biographies of Eminent Monks,* T. 50.2060:551b27), completed in 645 CE; Jingjue's (淨覺, 683–ca. 750 CE) *Lengqie shizi ji* (楞伽師資記, *Record of Masters and Disciples of the Laṅkā [School]*, T. 85.2837:1284c26–27, ca. 720 CE); and Du Fei's *Chuan fa bao ji* (杜朏 傳法寶紀, T. 80.2838:1291c6).

48. Daoyuan's *Jingde chuan deng lu* (景德傳燈錄), completed in 1004: T. 51.2076:217a10.

49. T. 51.2076:217a9. Willemen, *A Collection of Important Odes of the Law*, 7.

50. McRea, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, 23.

51. Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism*, 89.

52. Zeimal, "The Kidarite Kingdom in Central Asia," 125–127.

53. Boris Anatol'evich Litvinsky, "The Hephthalite Empire," in *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, Vol. III, ed. B. A. Litvinsky, Zhang Guang-da, and R. Shabani Samghabadi (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1999), 135.

54. Yang Xuanzhi's *Luoyang qielan ji* (洛陽伽藍記, T. 51.2092:1000b19–20; ca. 547 CE). This text often mentions *huren* (胡人), westerners, from the Western Regions, Xiyu. Even Uḍḍiyāna is seen as part of Xiyu (T. 51.2092:1015a13). The culture of Uḍḍiyāna and of Hotan was closely linked. An Indian was called *huren* (T. 51.2092:1017b11). Also a Persian was called *huren* (T. 51.2092:1012b21–22).

55. See note 29, above.

56. T. 50.2060:551b29; Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism*, 87.

57. McRea, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, 17. This magnificent temple was built in 516 and damaged by wind in 526 CE (John McRea, *Seeing through Zen: Encounter, Transformation, and Genealogy in Chinese Chan Buddhism* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003], 276n8).

58. Regarding "wall contemplation," see McRea, *Seeing through Zen*, 31. He says that the term, as used in Zhiyi's *Mohe zhiguan* (摩訶止觀), and as explained by Zhanran (湛然, 711–782 CE), may mean: "...fixed in *śamatha* or concentration meditation, without allowing the eight winds of good and bad fortune to influence one at all."

59. Ren, *Zhongguo Fojiao Shi*, 118–121. Songyun travelled from Luoyang to Shanshan, Hotan, Congling (Pamir), Bactria, Gandhāra, and back.

60. McRea, *Seeing through Zen*, 25.

61. McRea, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism,* 23.

62. Ibid., 23–24.

63. Ibid., 240.

64. About *banre/panre* (般若) I can say that Loujia Chen (婁迦讖, Lokakṣema or Laukākṣina, as suggested by Lokesh Chandra, "Closure of the Library Cave 17 of Tun-Huang," *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 3 [2002]: 59) in 179 CE translated the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (*Daoxing bore jing*, 道行般若經, T. 8.224) from Gāndhārī. His phonetic rendering was based on Prākrit. The pronunciation *bore* is based on Sanskrit *pra(jñā),* even written *bore* (波若), and certainly used in South China in the fifth century. During that time many Mahāsāṅghikas arrived on the shores of South China, coming from Funan and South India. Their emptiness-*prajñā* was always phonetically rendered, never translated with a "meaning" translation, *zhihui* (智慧). Sthaviravāda *prajñā*, *dharmapravicaya* (investigation of factors), is always translated with a "meaning" translation. See Willemen, "Kumārajīva's Explanatory Discourse," 42 (151); and Willemen, *Outlining the Way to Reflect,* 13, 33. Kumārajīva gives *pāramī*, not *pāramitā*, just as Loujia Chen and Dharmarakṣa's *Lotus Sūtra* do. Much later Xuanzang changes this to *boluomiduo* (波羅蜜多) in T. 5.220 of 663 CE.

65. Translated by McRea, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, 103–105, 29. For Chinese, see Daoxuan's *Xu gaoseng zhuan* (續高僧傳, T. 50.2060:551c8–23).

66. McRea, *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*, 28, 101.

67. Ibid., 31. This author noticed the relation between this text and traditional *śamatha* (tranquillity, *zhi*, 止) and *vipaśyanā* (insight, *guan*, 觀), or *samādhi* and *prajñā.*

68. Willemen, *Outlining the Way to Reflect,* 4–8 gives an overview of these meditation manuals.

69. Established by Li-kouang Lin, *Introduction au compendium de la loi*, 341–351.

70. A quick check of the relevant entries in Nakamura Hajime 中村元, *Bukkyōgo Daijiten* 佛教語大辭典 (Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki 東京書籍, 2000), 376, s.v. *gomonzen* (五門禪); 461, s.v. *sangen* (三賢); and 587, s.v. *shichi hōben* (七方便), will offer some literary sources. The path of preparatory application, including the term *ting xin* (停心), is explained in the oldest Sautrāntika *abhidharma,* namely the *Abhidharmahṛdaya*. See Willemen, *Essence of Scholasticism*, 119–123.