

The Theoretical Foundations of Pure Land Buddhist Practice according to Tanluan

Roger Corless

Duke University (retired)

I. TANLUAN'S ANNOTATIONS TO THE TREATISE ON GOING TO BIRTH [IN THE PURE LAND]

ANNOTATIONS TO THE *GĀTHĀ on the Resolve to Be Born [in the Pure Land]* and the *Upadeśa on the Sūtras of Limitless Life*, the *Wuliangshou Jing Youbotische Yuansheng Ji Zhu* (無量壽經優婆提舍願生偈註, or, for short, *Annotations to the Treatise on Going to Birth [in the Pure Land]*, 往生論註, *Wangshenglun Zhu*) of Tanluan (曇鸞, traditionally 476–542 CE but more probably c. 488–554 CE)¹ is the earliest extant treatise on Pure Land theory and practice in the Chinese tradition. It is a commentary on the *Gāthā on the Resolve to Be Born [in the Pure Land]* and the *Upadeśa on the Sūtras of Limitless Life* (*Wuliangshou Jing Youboti-she Yuansheng Ji*, 無量壽經優波提舍願生偈), said to have been composed by Vasubandhu and translated by Bodhiruci.² Although Tanluan freely draws on references to Amitābha and Sukhāvātī in many sutras and *śāstras*, he concentrates on the smaller and larger *Sukhāvātīvyūha* and the so-called *Amitāyurdhyāna-sūtra* (more properly *Visualization [of Sukhāvātī] Sūtra*, 觀經, *Guan Jing*). He seems to have been the first to treat these three sutras as a unit, as if they were a single text, saying that the name *Amitāyus*, “Limitless Life,” is the embodiment, essence, or main theme of the three sutras.³

Tanluan's focus is on practice and, following the Vasubandhu text, he organizes his treatise under the heads of five “practice gates” (念門, *nianmen*, literally “recollection” or “meditation” gates)—bowing, praise, resolution, visualization, and turning-towards. He understands *men* (門, gate) not only in its metaphorical sense of a dharma teaching but also literally:

GATE means “entrance and exit.” It is like someone who, finding a gate, comes in and goes out without hindrance. The first four practices

are the ENTRANCE GATES to Sukhāvātī while the last practice is the EXIT GATE of compassionately teaching and transforming [beings].⁴

The exit gate (迴向門, *huixiang men*) is simultaneously understood as the practice of “turning over” (迴施, *huishi*) merit to beings while one is still in samsara, and “turning and [re-]entering” (迴入, *huiru*) samsara after one has attained birth in Sukhāvātī, “teaching and transforming all beings so that they all go together towards (向, *xiang*) the way (道, *bodhi*) of the Buddha.”⁵

All five gates are fairly standard practices. Bowing, repeatedly and often in unison, is a common liturgical exercise, and it is usually combined with praise, or chanting. The bodhisattva resolve (or vow), the distribution of merit, and the compassionate return of the high bodhisattva to samsara are found throughout the Mahayana. Visualization, although it came to be regarded as typical of Vajrayana, seems to have been a distinguishing feature of early Mahayana, and it has even been suggested that Mahayana arose in response to, or dependent upon, visions of the supposedly extinct buddhas.⁶

Where Tanluan is distinctive is in relating all this more or less exclusively to Amitābha Buddha and Sukhāvātī and in providing a firm scholarly base for later Pure Land practice. Visualizing Sukhāvātī and, especially, chanting Amitābha Buddha’s name are relatively simple practices that have been called (not always kindly) “devotional,” and we are sometimes left with the impression that they are not only simple but simplistic, based on fantasy and superstition. Tanluan shows us the dharmic profundity belied by this simplicity. For the purposes of this article, I will concentrate on Tanluan’s discussions of the theoretical basis for the effectiveness of the visualization of Sukhāvātī, the invocation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, faith, and reliance on other-power.

II. VISUALIZATION

Later Pure Land practice emphasizes the invocation of the name of Amitābha Buddha, but although Tanluan has something significant to say on this (as we shall see in the next section), he deals so extensively with visualization (觀察, *guan cha*) that it is not too much to say that *Wangshenglun Zhu* is a text on visualization.⁷ Although Tanluan bases himself, as he says, on the sutras, he does not write a

commentary on the sutras. There is nothing like the close adherence to the visualizations to Queen Vaidehī that we find, for example, in his near-contemporary Jingying Huiyuan (淨影慧遠, 523–592 CE).⁸ The structure of *Wangshenglun Zhu* is controlled entirely by the root text, or commentary, attributed to Vasubandhu. It seems that Tanluan is addressing an audience that he assumes has good knowledge of the three sutras but does not understand their inner meaning. He functions, in fact, like a dharma master giving instruction to a congregation of learned practitioner-disciples.

The most important aspect of Sukhāvātī, says Tanluan, and the reason why “mixing our minds with it” (to adapt a common Tibetan phrase) is an effective practice, is its purity (清淨, *qingjing*), which he calls a universal feature (總相, *zongxiang*) of the decorations (*vyūha*) of Sukhāvātī (T. 40.828a6).

At the beginning [of his career], the Bodhisattva Dharmākara, in the presence of the Buddha Lokeśvararāja, having awoken to the Calm Knowledge of Non-Arising (*anutpattikadharmakṣānti*), established at that moment what we call “Holy Seed Nature” (生種子, *shengzhongxing*), and in that Nature pronounced forty-eight Great Resolutions (*mahā-praṇidhāna*) by the practice of which he made this Land that we call Sukhāvātī to arise. This [Land] is what has been obtained with that [Nature] as cause, and because we say that the cause is in the effect, we call it its NATURE.⁹

Dharmākara, that is to say, made his bodhisattva resolution when he was at the eighth level (of the ten-level bodhisattva scheme according to the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*), the level at which one realizes that reality is fundamentally unarisen,¹⁰ and, firmly established in that mind, he caused Sukhāvātī to arise. This means that Sukhāvātī is “the product of non-production” (無生之無, *wusheng zhi sheng*, T. 40.838c20–21) and “the Realm of Non-Arising” (無生界, *wusheng jie*, T. 40.839b6), and as such it surpasses, or is transcendent to, the Dao (explained by Tanluan as the knowledge or causation-matrix, T. 40.828a16–18) of the triple-world (*trailokadhātu*).¹¹ This is why Sukhāvātī is called the Pure Land: it is pure not only in its appearance and delights, it is pure because it is removed from the impurity of *vikalpa*, it is the land of *sukha*,¹² the land where *duḥkha* does not exist—i.e., it is extra-samsaric. Yet, it is still “there” in some sense, it is not a phantasm, it is not merely an *upāya*—“it exists extra-phenomenally, and we call it ‘subtle.’”¹³

Really, that is all that needs to be said. If one grasps this point, everything else follows. Since it is axiomatic that Pure Mind cannot be sullied by ignorant mind, but on the contrary Pure Mind can purify ignorant mind (as emphasized, for example, in *The Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*), mixing one's (impure) mind with the purity of Sukhāvati will naturally transform the mind of the practitioner and lead it out of samsara. Tanluan gives various similes of this: it is like a wishing-jewel (*cintāmaṇi*) "whose nature resembles and accords with dharma" (i.e., it does not bestow samsaric goods, it leads out of samsara); it is like a bamboo tube that straightens a snake, which is naturally crooked, when it slithers inside; it is like the sea whose salty nature overwhelms the freshness of the waters of the rivers that empty into it; it is like the Bodhisattva Priyaṃkara, "who was so handsome that he gave rise to lust in people, yet whoever lusted after him, the [Mahāratnakūṭa] Sūtra says, was either reborn in [the Trāyastriṃśa] Heaven or made the bodhisattva resolution (*bodhicittotpāda*)."¹⁴

The practitioner need only aspire to birth in Sukhāvati, and the extra-samsaric nature of Sukhāvati will transform this dualistic craving into the realization of nonduality.

If a *cintāmaṇi* be wrapped in black or yellow cloth and cast into water, the water [says the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñā-pāramitā-sūtra*] becomes black or yellow in accordance with the color of the object. That pure buddha land has the peerless JEWEL of Amitābha Tathāgata wrapped in the CLOTH of the perfection of the merits of the innumerable decorations, and it is cast into the WATER of the mind of one who is to be born [into Sukhāvati]. How could this not convert one's false view of BIRTH into the wisdom of NO-BIRTH?¹⁵

Although Tanluan reserves his main discussion of entering Sukhāvati and returning to samsara to the fifth practice gate, he refers to these two aspects in regard to visualization. Understanding *vipaśyanā* as *guan* (觀, visualization) he says that it has two meanings: (1) Here and now (in samsara) one creates a mental representation (想, *xiang*) and BEHOLDS the three kinds of excellent decorations whose merits are in accordance with the truth; thus the practitioner obtains true merit and, one's merit being true, one certainly attains birth in that land. (2) Then, having been born in that pure land, one sees Amitābha Buddha. Bodhisattvas who have not yet achieved a purified mind certainly attain the dharma-body of the always-so (*samatādharmakāya*) and, together

with the bodhisattvas of purified mind and the bodhisattvas of the top levels, certainly attain quiescence in the always-so.¹⁶

This balanced reciprocity between contraction and expansion in Pure Land practice is central to Tanluan's explanation of why the practice is effective. In a famous (and famously obscure) passage called "The Purity Entering the Resolved Mind" (淨入願心, "Jingru yuanxin") he tells us that all the decorations (*vyūha*) flow back into the primary decoration of purity from which they have arisen, in the pure mind of Dharmākara Bodhisattva.¹⁷ Similarly, all the stanzas of the *gāthā* by Vasubandhu arise from and flow back into the one essential *pada* on purity with which the *gāthā* opens: "Thus, I gaze on the marks of that realm / Which surpasses the triple-world's Dao."¹⁸ The *gāthā* as a whole is the expanded mode (廣, *guang*), the first verse is the contracted mode (略, *lüe*), and the practitioner must be aware of both modes because this is the way reality is.

All buddhas and bodhisattvas have a double *dharmakāya*: first, the *dharmatā-dharmakāya*, second, the *upāya-dharmakāya*. The *upāya-dharmakāya* originates from *sheng* (生), the *dharmatā-dharmakāya*, and the *dharmatā-dharmakāya* emerges from *chu* (出), the *upāya-dharmakāya*. These two *dharmakāyas* are different but indivisible; they are one but not the same. Therefore, the co-inherence (相入, *xiangru*) of the expanded and contracted modes finds its unity in the word *dharma*. If bodhisattvas do not realize (知, *zhi*) the co-inherence of the explicate and implicate modes they can neither benefit themselves nor others.¹⁹

In a dense and even more obscure passage, Tanluan then tells us how this double but nondual *dharmakāya* is related to the nonduality of ignorance and wisdom, samsara and nirvana.

True knowledge is knowledge of the true marks. Because the true marks have no marks, true knowledge has no knowing. The unconditioned *dharmakāya* (無為法身, *wuwei fashen*) is the *dharmatā-dharmakāya*. Because *dharmatā* is quiescent, the *dharmakāya* has no marks. Because it has no marks, there is nothing that it does not mark: therefore, the [formless] *dharmakāya* is none other than the [*rūpakāya*] adorned with the [thirty-two] marks and [eighty] signs. Because it has no knowing, there is nothing that it does not know: therefore, true knowledge is the same as omniscience. If knowledge is classified as true it is clear that knowledge is neither created nor

uncreated. If the *dharmakāya* is categorized as unconditioned it is clear that the *dharmakāya* is neither with form nor formless.

[Objection:] This is a negation of a negation. How is it that this negated negation is not an affirmation? For, the lack of a negation is called an affirmation.

[Reply:] It does not depend on this, for we further negate the affirmation. We negate the affirmation and we negate the negation, up to hundreds of negations, until we reach the place of no analogies.²⁰

The structure of this argument is Mādhyamikan, relying upon a treatise by Seng Zhao (僧肇, 374–414 CE) on objectless knowing.²¹ Its content, however, is closer to Yogācāra. Tanluan combines the logic of Seng Zhao’s Mādhyamika (“true knowledge has no knowing”) with what we might call a proto-Yogācāra statement (“true knowledge is knowledge of the true marks”—a fully developed Yogācāra statement might be “true knowledge is knowledge of the hundred *dharmas*”) to produce a conclusion about the nonduality of the form and formless *buddhakāyas*. This allows him to recommend the practice of visualization, based on form and leading to formlessness, but to escape the charge that this is dualistic, since the visualization of the form-body is itself precisely the experience of formlessness—as the *Heart Sūtra* says, form and formlessness are nondual.²² The practitioner does not need to understand this subtlety, but one does, however, have to be *aware* of it—otherwise (as we shall see below, in the section on faith) one would not be practicing in accordance with the double *dharmakāya*.

These passages can perhaps be further understood on the basis of the mutuality, complementarity, or co-inherence of wisdom (*prajñā*) and compassion (*karuṇā*) in pure, or buddha, mind, according to which the wisdom aspect is the understanding of emptiness (*śūnyatā*) for one’s own benefit and the compassion aspect is the consequent activity in samsara for others’ benefit. This distinction is commonly made in Tibetan Buddhism in which, for example, two forms of *bodhicitta* are distinguished (ultimate, or the wisdom aspect, and relative, or the compassion aspect), and the Mādhyamika and Yogācāra systems are known respectively as the wisdom aspect and compassion aspect teachings. Tanluan does not explicitly use this categorization, but he seems to imply it by the way he structures the progress of the Pure Land practitioner. It begins with the compassion of Dharmākara Bodhisattva

that, united with the wisdom of understanding emptiness, produces the Pure Land.

[Vasubandhu says:]

As the right Dao, the greatly compassionate,
[Sukhāvātī] is sprung from transcendent good roots.

[Tanluan comments:]

This is the Great Dao that is always-so (*samatā*). The Dao that is always-so is called the right Dao (*samyaksambodhi*) because always-so is the essential mark (*sva-lakṣaṇa*) of all the *dharmas*. Because the *dharmas* are always-so, [Dharmākara Bodhisattva] proclaimed his intention in the always-so; because he proclaimed his intention in the always-so his Dao is always-so, and because his Dao is always-so his great compassion is always-so. Great compassion is the cause of the DAO of Buddha; therefore [Vasubandhu] says as the right Dao, the greatly compassionate.

Compassion may be based upon three things: it may be based upon beings, when it is called small compassion; it may be based upon the *dharmas*, when it is called medium compassion; it may be based upon nothing (無, *wu*), when it is called great compassion. Great compassion, then, is the same as TRANSCENDENT (*lokuttara*) GOOD, and because Sukhāvātī IS SPRUNG FROM great compassion, we say that GREAT COMPASSION is the ROOT of the Pure Land.

Therefore[Vasubandhu]says,ITISSPRUNGFROMTRANSCENDENT GOOD ROOTS.²³

When one is born in Sukhāvātī one attains the wisdom of the *dharmatā-dharmakāya* and the compassion of the *upāya-dharmakāya*, in the power of which one instantly returns to samsara to liberate beings although, in one's great wisdom, one knows that there are no beings to liberate.

The bodhisattvas [who return to samsara] observe that beings are ultimately nonexistent. Though they liberate limitless beings, in truth there is not a single being who is liberated. They make a show of liberating beings, it is like play.²⁴

Sukhāvātī is born from compassion, leads to wisdom, and produces compassion.

III. INVOCATION

The practice of invoking the name of Amitābha Buddha (念佛, *nianfo*) can be understood in the light, as it were, of the practice of visualization. As Sukhāvātī is a manifestation of the wisdom and compassion of Amitābha, so is his name.

[Vasubandhu says:]

AS THAT TATHĀGATA'S LIGHT IS THE IMAGE OF HIS WISDOM, SO HIS NAME IS [THE IMAGE] OF HIS ESSENCE. . . .

[Tanluan comments:]

[Amitābha's] light illumines the world in the ten directions without hindrance and is able to remove the ignorance (*avidyā*) and delusion (*moha*) of the beings in the ten directions. . . . The unimpeded light (*amitābhā*) of that *tathāgata*'s name [Amitābha] is able to disperse the ignorance of all beings and bring their [bodhisattva] resolution to completion.²⁵

It follows, then, that saying the name of Amitābha is “saying” wisdom. But, Tanluan allows an opponent to ask, is this not just a metaphor? Names denote things, they are arbitrary indicators, not the things themselves, and they cannot affect what they signify. In reply, Tanluan distinguishes between two forms of language. Ordinary words are “names that are other than things” (名異法, *ming yi fa*) and are indeed arbitrary.²⁶ But there are other words—Daoist spells, Buddhist mantras, and, especially, the names of buddhas and bodhisattvas—which are “names that are the same as things” (名即法, *ming ji fa*): these do indeed affect what they signify and, says Tanluan, we all know this because we have used them and experienced their power. Thus, saying “Amitābha” is invoking wisdom.²⁷ Using the simile of the wishing-jewel again, he illustrates how this works.

[The name of Amitābha] is like a clean *cintāmaṇi* that, when placed in muddy water, cleanses it. If, although muddied by the transgressions of immeasurable births and deaths, one hears of Amitābha Tathāgata, one attains non-arising, for the CLEAN JEWEL of the name is cast into one's muddied mind. By its constant repetition, one's transgressions disappear, one's mind is cleansed, and one goes to birth [in Sukhāvātī].²⁸

For Tanluan, the invocation of Amitābha is a mantra and, like a mantra, it must be repeated as often as possible so that it will gradually do its work.²⁹

IV. FAITH

Although the Amitābha mantra is powerful, it is not automatic. Just as sunlight is invisible if one's eyes are closed, and as water is unable to fecundate a stone because of its resistance, the practitioner needs to appropriate the wisdom-light of Amitābha by turning towards it and being open to it. This responsiveness is called *xin* (信) and is usually translated by that slippery English word "faith." Tanluan links true faith with true practice according to the double *dharmakāya*.

One may invoke the name, keeping it in mind and reciting it, yet ignorance may still persist and one's [bodhisattva] resolution is not perfected. Why? Because one does not [as Vasubandhu says] EXERCISE ACCORDING TO THE TRUTH, one is not IN THIS CORRESPONDENCE of the NAME and ESSENCE. How does one not exercise according to the truth and not be in this correspondence of the name and essence? We say that it is due to not knowing that the Tathāgata has both a true body (實相身, *shixiang shen*) and a body for creatures (為物身, *weiwu shen*).

Further, there are three ways of not being in this correspondence: (1) one's faith (信心, *xinxin*) is not genuine, it is not missing, yet [as Laozi says of the Spirit of the Valley] it "scarcely exists"; (2) one's faith is not unified, it does not have determination; (3) one's faith is not constant, there are gaps in one's recitation. These three are completely interdependent: because of faith not being genuine, one is without determination; being without determination, one's recitation is not continuous: again, if one's recitation is not continuous, one does not attain determined faith (信, *xin*); not attaining determined faith, one's heart-and-mind (心, *xin*) is not genuine. These three complementaries are what we call EXERCISING IN THIS CORRESPONDENCE ACCORDING TO THE TRUTH. Therefore, the Discourse Master (Vasubandhu) bases himself on the words WITH ONE MIND, I [take refuge, etc.].³⁰

This passage has been the subject of many interpretations, or shall we say educated guesses, but at the very least it seems to imply that one should commit oneself wholeheartedly, body and mind, to the uninterrupted practice of *nianfo*. Faith, then, for Tanluan, is not

so much belief, or even trust, it is more like faithfulness, remaining true to one's commitment. It is a *xin* that is compatible with Confucian meanings of the character.

Supposing one gets bored, forgets one's commitment, and gaps appear in one's chanting? Then, it seems, one should redouble one's visualization practice.

Visualizing the perfection of the decorations . . . one will be enabled to produce a true and pure faith and certainly be born in that buddha land of blessed peace.³¹

V. OTHER-POWER

Tanluan was the first Chinese dharma master to use the term that has come to be translated as *other-power* (他力, *tali*; Jpn. *tariki*). In order to pave the way for his advocacy of the way of easy practice of trust (*xin*) in the Buddha Amitābha, he tells us of the problems associated with the way of difficult practice, the chief of which is “There is only one's own power, one cannot rely on the power of another.”³² What he appears to mean is that there is no buddha whom he can take as a teacher. Tanluan is acutely aware not only of living well after the time of Buddha Śākyamuni's disappearance, but of being an inhabitant of non-Buddhist China. “There has never been a buddha amongst us,” he laments (*T.* 40.826b18). He discovers, however, after his meeting with Bodhiruci, that there is a buddha who, though no longer dwelling amongst humans, exists forever, like a Daoist Immortal, in a blessed paradise in the west, and in him he puts his trust.³³ He is minimally concerned, *pace* some of the later Pure Land teachers, with his *inability* to use his own power; he just seems to think it is foolish if, on hearing of the advantages of other-power, one still struggles along on one's own.

Here are some more similes of self-power and other-power. It is like someone who, because of being afraid of the three defilements (*rāga*, *dveṣa*, *moha*) receives the precepts (*vinaya*), and because of receiving the precepts is able to practice meditation, and because of meditation is able to exercise the supernormal powers, and because of the supernormal powers is able to play in the four corners of the world. Such is called self-power. Then again, it is like a lowly person who, instead of riding on a donkey, joins the procession of a world emperor (*cakravartin*) and rides through the air, playing in the four corners

of the world without hindrance. Such is called other-power. How fortunate! Future students will hear of other-power and they can ride upon it and produce the mind of faith! Do not rely on yourselves!³⁴

It is sometimes claimed that Tanluan's advocacy of other-power was a major departure from traditional Buddhism, and other-power came to be regarded, especially in Japan, as a distinctively Pure Land feature while the rest of Buddhism was characterized by reliance on self-power. If, however, self-power and other-power are viewed as intrinsically opposed, it needs to be explained how this is not a very un-Buddhist, dualistic position. In fact, it is possible to show that there is no form of Buddhism that can unequivocally and unambiguously be said to be committed to self-power practice.³⁵ Tanluan and his successors are merely on that end of the self–other spectrum in which they find that, having taken refuge in the Triple Jewel, their practice is assisted by something or someone beyond themselves.

The source of Amitābha's power is rooted in the resolutions he made when he was the Bodhisattva Dharmākara. As we have seen, Tanluan tells us that these resolutions, which are recorded in the *Larger Sukhāvāṭīvyūha*, were made at the eighth bodhisattva level. This is not only the level at which the calm knowledge of non-arising is obtained, it is a level of such power “that it is called the Stage of Perfection, of Birth, of Finality.”³⁶

The present lordly divine power of Amitābha Tathāgata originates from the forty-eight resolutions of Dharmākara Bodhisattva. His resolution was completed (成, *cheng*) by his power, and his power is perfected (就, *jiu*) by his resolution. The resolution was not vain and the power is not empty. His power and his resolution go together, in the final analysis they are not different, and therefore they are called perfection (成就, *chengjiu*).³⁷

That is to say, perhaps, that when reality is seen as it is, practice and attainment become nondual. This is a conclusion that is also reached, *mutatis mutandis*, by teachers in other Buddhist traditions, such as Sōtō Zen and rDzogs chen.³⁸

NOTES

1. T. 40.1819, 826a–844a. Note that *ji* (偈) is the Buddhist pronunciation of the character usually pronounced *jie*. See Robert Henry Mathews, *Mathews' Chinese-English Dictionary*, rev. American ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943), entry 775a.
2. T. 26.1524, 230c–233a.
3. *Fo minghao wei jingti* (佛名號為經體, T. 40.826b14).
4. T. 40.835a, 21–23.
5. T. 40.836a, 25–26.
6. P. M. Harrison, “Buddhānusmṛti in the Pratyutpanna-buddha-saṃmukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 9 (1978): 35–37.
7. Visualization is repeatedly referred to *passim*, and about sixty-one percent of the text (nearly thirty-three of the fifty-four columns in the *Taishō* edition—827c29–833c14, 836a28–841b3) is explicitly concerned with visualization.
8. Kenneth K. Tanaka, *The Dawn of Chinese Pure Land Buddhist Doctrine* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1990).
9. T. 40.828c1–4.
10. Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970; original ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1932), 290.
11. 勝過三界道, *sheng guo san jie tao*. T. 40.828a16.
12. The form *sukhā*, as found in the compound *Sukhāvati*, appears to be a Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit variant, which Edgerton ascribes to metrical considerations. Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1953), sub *sukhākarā*.
13. 出有而有曰微, *chu you er yo, yue wei*. T. 40.830a20.
14. T. 40.836b3–c5, 839c17–18, 828c5–6, 857a25–27. See also *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 168: As it is said in the *Upāyakaṣāya-sūtra*, concerning the love of the girl *Sṛīdakṣiṇottarā* for the Bodhisattva *Priyaṃkara*, “By the vow of *Priyaṃkara* the woman who should look on him with passionate mind would put off her womanhood and become a man, an exalted being. Behold, *Ānanda*, such are his qualities: by whom some beings go to hell, by the same, when he has brought them to birth amongst heroes, they fall into passion, they go to heaven, they become men” (*Śāntideva*, compiler, *Śikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine*, trans. Ceceil Bendall and W. H. D. Rouse [Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971; original ed. London: John Murray, 1922], 164f.).
15. T. 40.839a28–b3.

16. T. 40.836a9–15. The last phrase, 寂滅平等 (*jimie pingdeng*), appears to be a simile of nirvana.
17. The passage begins at T. 40.841b4.
18. T. 26 230c21, 觀彼世界相勝過三界道 (*guan bi shijie xiang shengguo sanjie dao*). This is my interpretation of the phrase 一法句 (*yi fa ju*), based on my understanding of T. 40.828a5–b1 and 838c10–15.
19. T. 40.841b12–17.
20. T. 40.841b21–c1.
21. 般若無知, “Banruo Wuzhi,” *Zhaolun 肇論* 3 (T. 45.153a–154c). English translation, Richard Robinson, “Prajñā Has No Knowing,” in *Early Mādhyamika in India and China* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), 212–221.
22. Tanluan does not quote the *Heart Sūtra* because, perhaps, it had not yet been written. Nattier has proposed that it was composed in Chinese c. 650 CE and was subsequently “backtranslated” into Sanskrit. Jan Nattier, “The *Heart Sūtra*: A Chinese Apocryphal Text?” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 15, no. 2 (1992): 153–223.
23. T. 40.828c10–18.
24. T. 40.843b25–27.
25. T. 40.835b13–20.
26. This position is recognizably Buddhist and is in opposition to Confucian *mingjiao* (名教) theory.
27. T. 40.835c2–17.
28. T. 40.839a25–28.
29. Tanluan’s explanation is in line with general Indian tradition as described by Jan Gonda, “The Indian Mantra,” *Oriens* 16 (1963): 244–297. “The mantras relating to the gods represent their essence—they are in a sense identical with them . . .” (p. 274). “The mantras constitute the spiritual body [of the divinity], as known to mind and ear, whereas the tangible and visible image is the manifestation for touch and sight” (p. 283). I am indebted to Richard Payne for alerting me to this valuable study.
30. T. 40.835b20–c2.
31. T. 40.839a20–21.
32. T. 40.826b5–6.
33. According to the *Xu Gao Seng Zhuan* (續高僧傳), Bodhiruci gave Tanluan a text or texts on Amitābha (ambiguously known as *Guan Jing*, *The Visualization Classic[s]*, which may or may not be the famous sutra of the same name) with

the words, “These are the formulae of the Greatest Immortal” (此大仙方, *ci Da Xian fang*, T. 50.470b29). Daoist themes control much of the structure, although not the content, of Tanluan’s work. See my “Tanluan: Taoist Sage and Buddhist Bodhisattva,” in *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society*, ed. David W. Chappell, *Buddhist and Taoist Studies II: Asian Studies at Hawaii*, no. 34 (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 36–45.

34. T. 40.844a21–27. The similes are quoted from the beginning of the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā-śāstra*.

35. See my “Self-Power Practice with Other-Power Attitude: An Interpretation of Mind in Shin Buddhism,” *The Pure Land*, n.s., 8–9 (December 1992): 166–205.

36. Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, 290.

37. T. 40.840a13–16.

38. See my “Beginning at the End: ‘No-Practice’ in Shin and Early rDzogs Chen,” *The Pure Land*, n.s., 12 (December 1995): 253–265.