religions

MDPI

Article

Master Nian念法師 as the "Westerner": Re-Establishing Orthodoxy in Chinese Abhidharma

Lu Huang

Department of Religion, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122, USA; lu.huang@temple.edu or luhuang85@outlook.com

Abstract: Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma treatises started to be carefully studied and commented on by monks in early medieval China with the translation of *hṛdaya* treatises, the **Aṣṭagrantha*, and the **Vibhāṣa*s. However, with the "new" translations undertaken by Xuanzang and his clique, these were regarded as "old" translations and the thoughts of these scholars were gradually marginalized. Examining a doctrinal debate in Puguang's *Jushe lun ji*, this article delves into the construction of authority by Xuanzang and his disciples in the field of Abhidharma. In this debate, Puguang criticizes Zhinian's viewpoint solely based on its similarity with the view of "westerners" (*xifang shi*). The evidence Puguang presents is a quote from the newly translated **Mahavibhāṣa*, which he uses to extol the value of Xuanzang's "new" translation. It shows how Xuanzang and his team use the orthodoxy constructed by Kashmiri Vaibhāsikas to justify their own authority. Their success comes at a sacrifice of diversity of Abhidharma studies in China.

Keywords: Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma; Kashimiri Vaibhāsikas; Xuanzang; Zhinian; twenty-two *indriya*s

1. Introduction

As the most famous pilgrim and monastic scholar in the history of Chinese Buddhism, Xuanzang's influence cannot be overestimated. Apart from his grand contributions, scholars have also pointed out that Xuanzang and his clique tend to laud the value of their "new" translations, while disparaging the so-called "old" translations (Barrett 1990; Greene 2017). Greene (2017), for instance, brings to light a Yogācāra-inflected Dunhuang manuscript from the late seventh century, wherein the author contests the sectarian intellectual identity forged by Xuanzang and his disciples (p. 5). This article, on the other hand, unveils fresh evidence of Xuanzang's polemics of "new" versus "old" translations within the field of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma.

In Puguang's *Annotations on the Commentary of the Treasury of Abhidharma* (Chinese, hereafter Chi.: *Jushe lun ji* 俱舍論記),[1] a certain Master Nian (Chi.: *Nian fashi* 念法師) is referenced on five separate occasions.[2] Despite referring to him as the "ancient sage" (Chi.: *gude* 古德), Puguang is notably critical of Master Nian's perspectives. There are different reasons for his criticism. Most prominently, on one occasion, Puguang contends that Master Nian's viewpoint is incorrect since it is similar to the views held by the "western masters" (Chi.: *xifang shi* 西方師), as opposed to the prevailing views in Kashmir. The identity of Master Nian, the contradictory treatment of him as both an esteemed "ancient sage" and a holder of incorrect views, as well as Puguang's stance in making these judgements, all serve as noteworthy aspects of inquiry. This paper will begin with a detailed examination of the debate on the list of the thirteen faculties (Sanskrit, hereafter Skt.: *indriya*) that are deemed to be essentials during the "path of seeing" (Skt.: *darśanamārga*) as discussed in the *Jushe lun ji*. This exploration aims to shed light on the reasons behind the stern attitude of Xuanzang and Puguang towards pre-Xuanzang Abhidharma monastic scholars, exemplified by Zhinian. This will reveal the construction of orthodoxy in the field of Abhidharma

check for updates

Citation: Huang, Lu. 2023. Master Nian念法師 as the "Westerner": Re-Establishing Orthodoxy in Chinese Abhidharma. *Religions* 14: 1217. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14101217

Academic Editor: Jinhua Chen

Received: 10 August 2023
Revised: 25 August 2023
Accepted: 1 September 2023
Published: 22 September 2023

Copyright: © 2023 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

in China, and how the authority of the Indian Sarvāstivāda school in Kashmir was leveraged by Xuanzang and his immediate disciples to validate the significance of Xuanzang's "new translation" (Skt.: *xinyi* 新譯).[3]

2. Discussions

2.1. Master Nian and Abhidharma Studies in China before Xuanzang

According to Puguang, Master Nian came from Wei 魏, a prefecture in Jizhou 冀州, which is in present-day Hebei.[4] Master Nian was proficient in the *Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions* (Skt.: **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*, hereafter **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*;[5] Chi.: *Za apitan xinlun* 雜阿毘曇心論).[6] Fabao's 法寶 *Explication of the Commentary on the Treasury of Abhidharma* (Chi.: *Jushe lun shu* 俱舍論疏)[7] also mentions Master Nian's expertise in Jiayan 迦延,[8] which likely refers to Kātyāyanīputra's *Treatise of Abhidharma with Eight Collections* (Skt.: **Abhidharmāṣṭagranthaśāstra*, hereafter **Aṣṭagrantha*; Chi.: *Apitan ba jiandu lun* 阿毘曇八犍度論). Given that the **Aṣṭagrantha* was translated in 383 CE, the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* was translated in the fifth century, and Master Nian lived before Xuanzang (602? – 664), Master Nian should have been active between the fifth and seventh centuries. Upon scrutinizing the scholarly monks of this era, "Master Nian" most likely refers to Zhinian 志念 (535–608), originally from Jizhou. He was renowned for his expertise in both the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* and the **Aṣṭagrantha*.

Biographical narratives of Zhinian can be found in Daoxuan's 道宣 (596–667 CE) *Extended Biographies of Eminent Monks* (Chi.: *Xu gao seng zhuan* 續高僧傳),[9] Tan'e's 曇噩 (1285–373 CE) *Newly Compiled Monk Biographies Categorized by the Six Pāramitās* (Chi.: *Xinxiu kefen liu xueseng zhuan* 新修科分六學僧傳),[10] and Yichu's (895?–968/977?) *Six Books of the Śākya Clan* (Chi.: *Shishi liutie* 釋氏六帖).[11] The latter two sources are relatively concise. Here I will focus on Daoxuan's account and address any discrepancies from the other two sources in footnotes, if applicable. According to Daoxuan:

> Shi Zhinian釋志念, whose secular surname was Chen陳, was a native of Xindu信都 in Jizhou冀州. His ancestors were descendants of the Chen Clan (whose famous ancestors include Chen Shi陳寔 and Chen Fan陳蕃) of Yingchuan潁川, and they lived in Heshuo河朔 (the northern part of the Yellow River) due to their official positions. Zhinian was pure in character, lofty in ambition, clear in spirit, and outstanding in talent. He was considering visiting more places. Eventually, he sought further teachings in capital Ye鄴 (now Handan, Heibei) after being fully ordained. Master Daochang 道長 (d.u.), who was well-versed in the *Treatise on the Great Perfection of Wisdom* (Skt.: **Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*; Chi.: *Da zhi du lun*大智度論) and was a role model for scholars. Zhinian brought his belongings and listened to his teachings for several years. Then he became as famous as the one on the seat. His virtues are equally noble with Yanli誕禮 (d.u.), Sengxiu僧休 (d.u.), and Faji法繼 (d.u.), who are all outstanding figures of that era.[12] However, he believed that the pursuit of knowledge should not cease until death. Thus, he traveled to various lecture halls, delved into profound teachings, and strived to explore the hidden and mysterious parts. He also visited master Daochong 道寵 (477?–573?) and learned the *Treatise of Ten Grounds* (Skt.: *Daśabhūmikaśāstra*; Chi.: *Shi di lun*十地論) from him. He was able to predict the end right after listening to the beginning, as if he had already read it before. Then he learned that there was a venerable monk named Huisong 慧嵩 (fl. 511–60) in the Western Qin, who has profound knowledge of the Lesser Vehicle and was revered as the "Confucius of the Abhidharma" (Chi.: *Pitan kongzi*毘曇孔子). Huisong's knowledge benefited the world and numerous followers gathered around him. Śramaṇas such as Daoyou道猷 (d.u.), Zhihong智洪 (d.u.), Huangjue晃覺 (d.u.), and Sanwei散魏 (d.u.) are the most excellent ones,[13] just like gems in the wisdom garden. Zhinian followed Huisong with deep admiration and reached new heights.[14]

After successfully completing his studies, Zhinian returned to his hometown. He was subsequently invited by Gao Guiyan 高歸彥 (?-562), the governor of Jizhou and a clan brother of the Northern Qi Emperor Gao Huan 高歡 (496-547), to deliver lectures at a dharma assembly. He was joined by Master Sengqiong 僧瓊 (d.u.).[15] Their lectures initially focused on the **Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* and later on the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*.[16] Zhinian continued to expound on these two treatises for over a decade until the onset of the persecution of Buddhism launched by Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou between 573 and 578.[17] It is important to highlight that during that specific time frame, Zhinian chose to renounce his monastic status, yet he persistently pursued his studies in Abhidharma.[18]

> Buddhism was revived and flourished when the Sui隋 dynasty was established. Zhinian made preparations for [re-]entering the monastic life as soon as the emperor encouraged people to become monks. Although he had mastered Kātyāyanīputra's **Aṣṭagrantha*, he never had the opportunity to explain it in detail. In the fourth year (584) of the Kaihuang開皇 era, he said to his younger monk brother Zhizhan (386?–533?), "I am the champion of the Lesser Vehicle and consider myself equal to an Arhat. However, the time has not yet come, so I will fold my wings for now."[19] Having benefited from Buddhist teachings before, Zhizhan was delighted to hear this. He reported it to master Mingyan明彥 (d.u.), a specialist of the **Tattvasiddhi* who had always respected Zhinian. Along with his disciple Honggai (d.u.) and more than three hundred others, he respectfully invited Zhinian to expound on the Heart Treatise.[20]

Daoxuan goes on to portray Zhinian as a master of the **Aṣṭagrantha*. On one occasion, Zhinian accurately completed some missing pages of an incomplete manuscript.

> For a long time, there was an error in the *Fundamental Sutra composed by Kātyāyanīputra* (*Jiayan benjing*迦延本經). Although many masters lectured on this treatise, no one had noticed that there were four missing pages in the section of karma (Skt.: **karmagrantha*; Chi.: *ye jiandu*業揵度).[21] Zhinian wrote out the missing part based on the context. It was consistent with the doctrinal and literary style of the previous work. Initially, [people were] not aware of this. Later, the manuscript that was transmitted in the south of the lower reaches of the Yangtze River was acquired and it turned out to be exactly the same with the missing part composed by Zhinian. Zhinian then gained a reputation as a person with unfathomable [wisdom].[22]

It should be noted that the so-called biographies are more likely to be hagiographies.[23] It may be somewhat exaggerated to claim that Zhinian completed the manuscript flawlessly. Nevertheless, this passage does demonstrate Zhinian's considerable knowledge in this treatise. It also further confirms that Jiayan迦延 refers to **Aṣṭagrantha*, since the section of karma is one of the eight sections (Skt.: *grantha*, Chi.: *jiandu*揵度) in the **Aṣṭagrantha*. The title "*Fundamental Sutra by Kātyāyanīputra*" also aligns with this text's position within the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma. Ryōgen Fukuhara proposed, based on the text's transliteration, that this work could potentially be the Gandhāran version of the text, which was later revised and Sanskritized by Kashmiri Vaibhāṣikas under the title **Jñānaprasthāna* (translated by Xuanzang under the title *Apidamo fazhi lun* 阿毗達磨發智論).[24] The Vaibhāṣikas viewed this text as the foundational treatise of the Sarvāstivāda and composed an extensive commentary on the **Jñānaprasthāna*. This results in the encyclopedic **Mahāvibhāṣa*, translated by Xuanzang in 656 CE (Willemen et al. 1998, p. 66).

During the period when Yang Liang 楊諒 (575–605), the half-brother of Emperor Yang of Sui (569–618), governed Jinyang 晉陽, he requested Zhinian to deliver lectures on treatises of both the Great and the Lesser Vehicles at the Da Xingguo Temple 大興國寺. During Yang Liang's rebellion, Zhinian retreated to his hometown.[25] Throughout his lifetime, Zhinian composed nine volumes of commentary on the **Aṣṭagrantha* and nine volumes of commentary on the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*. These texts were extensively studied during

that era. Zhinian also mentored hundreds of disciples, including Huixiu 慧休 (548–647)[26] and Daoji 道基 (576?–637/638).[27] From Huixiu's biography, it is evident that Zhinian also taught the **Vibhāṣa*.

> [Huixiu] followed Zhinian to study treatises of the Lesser Vehicle. He listened to the **Aṣṭagrantha*, the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, and the **Vibhāṣa* for several times. He thoroughly investigated their fundamental principles and understood their intrinsic attachments.[28] His understanding was clear and distinct. His practice was indeed sincere and strict. Zhinian said, "I have been lecturing on the Lesser Vehicle for many years. Now I meet this disciple. I believe it is not in vain." Huixiu then composed the *Profound Essay* (*Xuanzhang*玄章) and the *Exegetical Notes* (*Chaoshu*抄疏) for the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*.[29]

Zhinian's expertise in the *Vibhāṣa* is also highlighted in Huijing's 慧净(578–?) biography.

> There was a Buddhist scholar named Zhinian widely known in China. He was regarded by his contemporaries as being able to delve into every nook and cranny of the Lesser Vehicle. [Huijing] then followed him to study the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* and the **Vibhāṣa*.[30]

Prior to Xuanzang, Abhidharma texts most commonly mentioned in monks' biographies were the **Aṣṭagrantha*, the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, and the **Vibhāṣa*.[31] The pre-Xuanzang translations of the *Vibhāṣa* compendia, including the *Treatise of Commentary* (Skt.: **Vibhāṣāśāstra*; Chi.: *Piposha lun*鞞婆沙論)[32] and the *Treatise of Abhidharma commentary* (Skt.: **Abhidharmavibhāṣa*; Chi.: *Apitan piposha lun* 阿毘曇毘婆沙論),[33] were considered to be more comprehensive scholarly resources compared to the relatively succinct *Hṛdaya* treatise series.[34] Following Paramārtha's (499–569) translation of Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* and its auto-commentary into Chinese (completed in 568) under the title *Explanatory Treatise of the Treasury of Abhidharma* (Skt.: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*; Chi.: *Apidamo jushe shilun* 阿毘達磨俱舍釋論),[35] some of Zhinian's disciples had the opportunity to access this treatise. For instance, Huijing wrote thirty volumes of commentaries on the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* and later studied the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. His biographical accounts by Daoxuan reveal his awareness of sectarian polemics between Vaibhāṣikas and non-Vaibhāṣikas in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.[36] Daoyue 道嶽 (568–636) also initially studied the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* with Zhinian before studying Paramārtha's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.[37] The knowledge of Abhidharma would soon be disseminated, primarily through three of Zhinian's disciples, namely Huixiu, Daoji,[38] and Daoyue, to the young Xuanzang.

2.2. Zhinian, Xuanzang, and Puguang

Zhinian passed away in the fourth year (608) of the Daye reign (605–618) during the Sui dynasty. At that time, Xuanzang was only about six years old and probably had not met Zhinian. At least no extant evidence has documented this. However, Xuanzang would establish connections with several disciples of Zhinian later on. A few years later, Xuanzang resided in the Jingtu Temple alongside his sibling. This period marked the concluding years of the Daye reign, characterized by hardship in terms of both food and dharma. Upon discovering that Daoji, a disciple of Zhinian, was teaching in Chang'an, Xuanzang and his elder brother went there to pursue their studies under Daoji's guidance at the Zhuangyan Temple.[39] Xuanzang's wisdom, particularly his proficiency in the comprehensive discourse of Vibhāṣa and the intricate interpretations of the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, soon garnered the attention of Daoji.

> As for the extensive commentary of the **Vibhāṣa* and the profound meanings of the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, [Xuanzang] meticulously explored and studied them, digging into deep caves, and get to the root of the problems. However, this treatise had been widely studied after being transmitted to the east. There are over ten different commentaries. [Xuanzang] stored them within the treasure trove of the mind and could recite them naturally. [Dao]ji often looked at him

> and signed, saying: "I have traveled to so many lecture monasteries, but I have never seen a young man with such spiritual understanding as this one!"[40]

Later Xuanzang also studied the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* with Huixiu.

> The monk Huixiu privately taught [Xuanzang] the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* and the *Compendium of the Great Vehicle* (Skt.: **Mahāyānasamgraha*; Chi.: *She dacheng lun*攝大乘論), pointing out the subtle nuances, and skillfully indicating the main points. They continued for eight months tirelessly. Huixiu is amazed. He couldn't help but applaud and sigh in admiration, "You are truly an extraordinary person in this world!"[41]

He also studied the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* with Daoyue.

> The monk Daoyue specialized in the *Abhidharmakośabhāsya* and promoted Sarvāstivāda. He was able to comprehend all the key points. When he was spreading the teachings in the imperial city, he attracted a multitude of students. Xuanzang also studied with him… Since Xuanzang had not heard of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* before, he humbly sought Daoyue's guidance day and night. [Dao]yue noticed that Xuanzang was very diligent. His wisdom is as bright as the morning glow. Daoyue joyfully taught him without exhaustion.[42]

Daoji, Huixiu and Daoyue were students of Zhinian. After a comprehensive analysis of nearly all available literature, Xuanzang continued to feel dissatisfied. He lamented,

> I have traveled through the regions of Wu吳 and Shu蜀,[43] arrived in the territories of Zhao赵 and Wei 魏, and did not reach the domains of Zhouqin周秦. Whenever there is a lecture, I will attend. Although I have mastered all available texts and teachings, I still have no way to understand those that have not been transmitted here.[44]

Evidently, Xuanzang was discontented with existing texts and teachings, which spurred his expedition to India.

> [Xuanzang] arrived at the kingdom of Kashmir, which is commonly known as Jibin罽賓.[45] How did the Jibin country come into existence? [Xuanzang] observed its territory and found it similar to Jibin. Originally, it was the sea of a dragon. Later it was obtained by an Arhat and attracted a multitude of masters well-versed at the Tripiṭaka. Hence, their country was surrounded by mountains on all four sides, with a circumference of more than seven thousand *li*.[46] The entrance was narrow and cramped. The country has five thousand monks, most of whom studied the Lesser Vehicle. The country had great sages, famous monks, and superior craftsmen. [Xuan]zang went there to study the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the **Nyāyānusāra*, the **Hetuvidyā*, the **Śabdavidyā*, and the **Mahāvibhāṣa*.[47]

Throughout his travels, Xuanzang obtained several texts that were hitherto unavailable in China. For instance, the **Nyāyānusāra* is a treatise composed by Vaibhāṣika Samghabhadra as a counter-argument to Vasubandhu's non-Vaibhāṣika interpretations found in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.[48] The **Mahāvibhāṣa*, despite sharing the title *Vibhāṣa*, represents a new commentary from Kashmir on the **Jñānaprasthāna*. In the country of Cīnabhukti,[49] Xuanzang studied the **Samayapradīpikā*, also composed by Samghabhadra in order to establish Vaibhāṣika orthodoxy. Xuanzang also had the opportunity to study some of these Abhidharma texts with different teachers during his pilgrimage.[50] Upon his return to China, Xuanzang incorporated the translation of the newly accessible Abhidharma texts into his extensive translation project. He also retranslated the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. Puguang, a disciple and translation assistant to Xuanzang, is the most important transmitter of Xuanzang's Abhidharma teachings. According to Zanning 贊寧(919 – 1001),

> Shi Puguang, whose origins are unknown, was intelligent by nature. He chose the wood (a metaphor for his path or method) and asked to serve the Tripiṭaka Master Xuanzang. Puguang served Master Xuanzang with a diligent and dedi-

> cated heart, unmatched by his peers.… Initially, Xuanzang disliked the old translations of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* and believed that it had a lot of deficiencies. After obtaining the Sanskrit manuscript, Xuanzang re-translated it. He then secretly taught Puguang the oral teachings he received from the Vaibhāṣikas in western India. Thus, Puguang composed commentaries and provided interpretations.[51]

Puguang is situated at the juncture where various transmission lines intersect. Puguang can be linked back to Zhinian via three distinct transmission lines, specifically through three monks who have studied with Zhinian: Huixiu, Daoji, and Daoyue. All of them instructed Xuanzang, Puguang's direct mentor. As Xuanzang's most immediate Abhidharma disciple, Puguang had access to an extensive array of Abhidharma resources, including both written texts and oral instructions. These resources can be broadly categorized into five groups. The first group comprises the Abhidharma texts translated prior to Xuanzang, including the *Hṛdaya* series, the two *Vibhāṣa*s translated before Xuanzang, Paramārtha's translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and others. The second group includes the Abhidharma commentaries written by pre-Xuanzang Abhidharma specialists such as Zhinian. From Zhinian's biographical accounts, we know that he has authored nine volumes of commentary on the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*. These commentaries, although not extant now, might have still been available at Zhinian's time. The third group is constituted by the new translations produced by Xuanzang and his team, including the **Mahāvibhāṣa*, the **Nyāyānusāra*, the **Samayapradīpikā*, the newly translated *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, and others. The fourth group consists of the oral instructions disseminated through transmission lines in China. The fifth group includes the oral instructions Xuanzang received from Indian masters during his pilgrimage. Therefore, Puguang's Abhidharmic view is built upon the legacy of a previous generation of Chinese Abhidharma scholars, as well as the texts and oral instructions accessible to the 7th-century Indian Sarvāstivādins. Next, we will explore his different attitudes toward these different sources.

In the *Jushe lun ji*, Puguang references Zhinian's perspectives on five separate occasions. It is plausible that Puguang's understanding of Zhinian's viewpoints was acquired either through the social transmission of Zhinian's oral teachings or from the written works left by Zhinian. Zhinian commented on the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, and while his commentary is not extant today, it may still have been accessible during Puguang's era. Puguang's references to Zhinian are scattered throughout the *Jushe lun ji*. The first is a discussion of the thirteen faculties that are inevitably possessed during the path of seeing (Skt.: *darśanamārga*, Chi.: *jiandao*見道). The second case involves the smallest possible aggregation of particles (Skt.: *paramāṇu*; Chi.: *weiju*微聚). The third instance pertains to the controversy over the causal relationships between the pervasive mental factors (Skt.: *mahābhūmikadharmāḥ;* Chi.: *dadi fa*大地法) and the mind-king (Skt.: *citta*; Chi.: *xinwang* 心王). The fourth one is about senseless talk (Skt.: *sambhinnapralāpa*; Chi.: *zahui yu* 雜穢語) in the karma section. The fifth is about the knowledge of others' minds (Skt.: *paracittajñāna*; Chi.: *taxin zhi*他心智) in the knowledge section. On all five occasions, Zhinian's views are deemed outdated and incorrect. This article will use the discourse of the thirteen faculties during the path of seeing as a representative example.[52]

This discourse is positioned at the beginning of the instruction on the twenty-two *indriya*s, which exert power in various aspects. Following a comprehensive examination of the faculties' attributes and their acquisition process, Vasubandhu starts to discuss the possession of faculties. This involves an exploration of the interrelationships among various faculties, specifically, the possession of other faculties if certain faculties are possessed. For example, in the 17th verse of the chapter on faculties, Vasubandhu asserts, "The one who has neutrality, the life-force and the mind is necessarily endowed with/possessed of [these] three [as a group]." (Skt.: *upekṣajīvitamanoyukto'vaśyaṃ trayānvitaḥ;*[53] Chi.: 成就命意捨, 各定成就三).[54] This implies that if an individual possesses the faculty of neutral feeling, life-force, or mind, they must concurrently possess all three faculties. Vasubandhu continues to discuss the necessary possession of five faculties by an individual who has the faculty of pleasure or body, seven faculties by one who possesses the faculty of suffering,

eight faculties by one who possesses either the female or male faculty, and eleven faculties by one who possesses the faculty of having already known. He then explores the thirteen essential faculties possessed by an individual with the faculty of coming to know what is not yet known.

It is equivalent to say that an individual possesses the faculty of coming to know what is not yet known and that this individual is in the phase of the "path of seeing"— a period consisting of fifteen moments where the practitioner gains previously unknown insight.[55] This faculty is the foremost among the three uncontaminated faculties that come at the end of the list of twenty-two faculties. The verse posits that there are thirteen faculties that are necessarily possessed by a person possessing the faculty of coming to know what is not yet known. However, the translations of the auto-commentary by Paramārtha and Xuanzang present two slightly different lists of these thirteen essential faculties. As per Paramārtha,

> The verse is: *Ājñāsyāmīndriya* is associated with thirteen. Explanation: Which are the thirteen? They are the faculties of mind, life-force, and body; the female or male faculty; three faculties of sensation; five faculties of conviction and others. *Ājñāsyāmīndriya* is the thirteenth.[56]

However, according to Xuanzang,

> If *ājñāsyāmīndriya* is accomplished, thirteen faculties are necessarily accomplished. These are [faculties of] body, life-force, mind, pain, pleasure, joy, neutrality; five faculties of conviction and others; as well as the *ājñāsyāmīndriya* (itself).[57]

The primary distinction is that Paramārtha enumerates three faculties of sensations and the male or female faculty. In contrast, Xuanzang includes four faculties of sensations and entirely omits the male and female faculties. The Sanskrit version aligns with Xuanzang's enumeration.

> *Ājñāsyāmīndriya* is accompanied by thirteen. Which thirteen? The *indriya*s of thought, life, and body, four *indriya*s of sensation, the *indriya*s of conviction and others, as well as *ājñāsyāmīndriya* (itself). *ājñāsyāmīndriyopetas trayodaśabhir anvitaḥ/katamais trayodaśabhiḥ/ manojīvitakāyendriyaiḥ catasṛbhir vedanābhiḥ śraddhādibhir ājñāsyāmīndriyeṇa ca /*[58]

It is ambiguous whether Paramārtha altered the text during his translation or the Sanskrit manuscript he uses differs from Xuanzang's version. It is more certain that whether the female/male faculty should be included within the list of thirteen essential faculties had been a contentious issue. This controversy pertains to Sarvāstivādins' doctrine, which posits that those individuals devoid of a male/female faculty (Skt.: *avyañjanā*; Chi.: *wuxing*無形) or those possessing dual male/female faculties (Skt.: *ubhayavyañjanā*; Chi.: *erxing* 二形) are incapable of reaching the stage of the path of seeing. Sarvāstivādins assert that only individuals with one and only one binary male/female faculty can achieve this stage, implying that the binary female/male faculty is a prerequisite for anyone possessing the faculty of coming to know what is not yet known. However, both the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, accessible to Zhinian, and Xuanzang's translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, accessible to Puguang, exclude male/female faculties from the list of thirteen essentials. As per the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*,

> If *ājñāsyāmīndriya* is accomplished, thirteen faculties are necessarily accomplished. These are the [faculties of] body, life-force, mind, pain, pleasure, joy, neutrality; five faculties of conviction and others; as well as the *ājñāsyāmīndriya* (itself).[59]

This scholastic problem is addressed both by Zhinian and Puguang. In the *Jushe lun ji*, Puguang starts with an imagined interlocuter:

> Question: Will the female or male faculty be accomplished in the stage of path of seeing? If one of them is accomplished, why is it not mentioned? If not, how can the person enter the [stream of] noble ones?[60]

Rather than immediately offering his viewpoint on this matter, Puguang opts to first introduce Zhinian's interpretation. Considering that all of Zhinian's works are no longer extant, this serves as a precious resource that offers insight into the intellectual perspective of Zhinian, one of the most eminent Abhidharma scholars prior to Xuanzang.

> The ancient sage Master Nian says, "Although one of the two faculties, i.e., the female faculty and the male faculty, will definitely be accomplished during the path of seeing, when the male faculty is accomplished, the female faculty is not. When the female faculty is accomplished, the male faculty is not. Because it is not definite which one will be accomplished, neither is mentioned."[61]

We do not know where exactly Puguang learned the view of Zhinian. Did it come from Puguang's commentary on **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, or from oral instructions passed on through the transmission lines? Whatever the case, it offers an opportunity for us to learn about Zhinian's thought as well as Puguang's attitude towards it. From Zhinian's perspective, the absence of both female and male faculties from the list of thirteen essential faculties does not conflict with Sarvāstivādins' assertion that individuals lacking a male/female faculty cannot achieve the path of seeing. He contends that an individual who reaches the path of seeing still retains a single binary male/female faculty, either female or male. However, neither of these faculties is included in the list since we are not sure which one (male or female) will be possessed. While Puguang agrees with Zhinian regarding the list of thirteen essential faculties, he expresses dissatisfaction with Zhinian's rationale. Zhinian's argument for excluding the two male/female faculties from the list aligns with the views of non-Vaibhāṣikas, which subsequently becomes a point of critique for Puguang.

> The argument against the first view, which is presented by Master Nian: if it is because it is not definite which one of the male/female faculties will be possessed that neither of them are mentioned in the path of seeing, why does the 156th volume of the **Mahāvibhāṣa*, when discussing "the essential faculties for someone with both female faculty and male faculty", states, "for the past and the future, nine essentials; for the three periods, two essentials; for the present, four essentials. The nine essentials for the past and the future are the four sensations and the five skillful faculties starting from conviction. The two for the three periods are the mind and one of the sensations. The four at present are the male, female, body, and life-force. The other [faculties] may or may not be possessed, as discussed above. The western masters state, 'It should be said that there are ten essentials in the past and in the future, which are the five sensations and the five skillful faculties starting from conviction. There is only one essential in the three periods, [sensation if not considered as an essential] since it is not definite which sensation will be possessed.' The masters from Kashmir say, 'Although the name is not definite, the number is definite. There is definitely one sensation to be possessed. Therefore, here the number should be considered, rather than the name'"?[62]

According to Puguang, Zhinian asserts that the reason both female and male faculties are absent from the list of thirteen essentials is due to the uncertainty of which one will be possessed. Puguang presents a case from the newly translated **Mahāvibhāṣa*, arguing that such indeterminacy is only employed by Westerners in their reasoning. This case involves a disagreement between western masters and those from the kingdom of Kashmir regarding whether uncertainty can serve as a valid reason for excluding essentials. The debate also pertains to the number of essentials, but not during the path of seeing. Instead, it concerns the essentials for individuals possessing both female and male faculties. The three periods (Skt.: *traiyadhvika*; Chi.: *sanshi* 三世) refer to the past, the present, and the future. Western masters argue that there is only one essential for the three periods, due to the uncertainty of the sensation's name. However, Kashmiri masters assert that despite the uncertainty of which sensation will manifest, it is certain that one sensation will be possessed. Therefore, the "number" (*shu* 數) is of significance, rather than the "name" (*ming* 名). In the

**Mahāvibhāṣa*, "western masters" typically refer to the Sarvāstivādins located in regions to the west of Kashmir, such as Bactria and Gandhāra.[63] In an effort to maintain their authority, the Kashmiri Vaibhāṣikas dedicate considerable time in the **Mahāvibhāṣa* to critique the perspectives of the western masters. During the era of Vaibhāṣikas' compilation of the **Mahāvibhāṣa*, there was a pronounced level of sectarian self-awareness (Willemen et al. 1998, p. 173). Vaibhāṣikas' strategy of challenging the perspectives of western masters is crucial in maintaining their unique sectarian identity. This strategy was not as evident in the earlier texts which Zhinian was familiar with, but is prominent in more recently translated texts such as the **Mahāvibhāṣa*, the **Nyāyānusāra*, and the **Samayapradīpikā*.

Authority and authentication are always important elements of transmission stories in religions as a whole, and in early Medieval Chinese Buddhism in particular (Deeg 2016, p. 11). One of the major motivations for Xuanzang's pilgrimage was to correct the errors and contradictions in the texts translated before his time (Deeg 2016, p. 18.). Therefore, it is quite understandable that he would regard the manuscripts he brought back to be more credible than the Chinese translations and teachings he received before his pilgrimage. This attitude most likely also influenced his students, as can be seen in their unanimous praise of Xuanzang's "new translations" (*xinyi* 新譯) and a devaluation of the "old translations" (*jiuyi* 舊譯). As Eric Greece says, "That Xuanzang and his followers rejected the scriptural authority of anything but their own 'new translations,' a term they popularized to this end, was a trope that began to circulate widely by the end of Xuanzang's lifetime."[64] Similar to the Kashmiri Vaibhāṣikas, Xuanzang and his associates were fervently committed to preserving their unique intellectual identity. This was accomplished via two primary methods. First, Xuanzang and his adherents would contend that they have access to Indic texts of greater authority. Second, they would posit that their translations were more precise and significantly superior to earlier versions. Following their critique of the inaccuracies in Paramārtha's previous translation,[65] Puguang started to challenge Zhinian's argument, which was regarded as representing the standpoint of western masters.

> If Master Nian says, "Although one of the female and male faculties will necessarily be possessed during the path of seeing, they are not mentioned because it is indefinite which one will be possessed," this is the view of the western masters. According to the view in the kingdom of Kashmir, there should be fourteen essentials since the number is definitely fourteen. However, [the verse] says that there are thirteen. Thus, Zhinian's view is not reasonable. This is because he did not have the opportunity to see the new *Vibhāṣa*.[66]

In this context, Puguang appears to be flaunting his access to the newly translated *Vibhāṣa*, highlighting that Zhinian lacks this privilege. He criticizes Zhinian's viewpoint as "unreasonable" (*feili* 非理), associating it with western masters who are often criticized by Vaibāṣikas in sectarian debates, as evidenced in Vaibāṣika-authored works such as the **Mahavibhāṣa* and the **Nyāyānusāra*. However, Puguang does not provide any additional arguments to substantiate why this perspective is not reasonable. Rather, he implicitly assumes the authoritative status of the Kashmiri masters' viewpoint. Xuanzang's translation of the new *Vibhāṣa* is important since it provides new evidence of how the self-proclaimed "orthodox" Vaibāṣika viewpoint refutes viewpoints of non-Vaibāṣikas. Following his rebuttal of Zhinian's viewpoint, Puguang proposes a "correct perspective" (*zhengjie* 正解) quoted from the **Nyāyānusāra*.

Now the correct view is, "during the stage of the path of seeing, the male faculty and the female faculty might or might not be possessed. If possessed, either one of them is possessed. If not, it is the situation that the male or female faculty is abandoned when [faculties] are gradually abandoned from the bottom [of the body] to the top during the dying process. Therefore, the 150th volume of the *Mahavibhāṣa* explains the minimum faculties of those driven by the faith like this: 'the thirteen are the body, the life-force, the mind, the four sensations, the five faculties of conviction and so on, and one uncontaminated faculty. This is someone who enters the path of seeing after abandoning the defilements of

the desire realm during the gradual dying process.'"[67] The **Nyāyānusāra* is composed by Samghabhadra 眾賢to refute Vasubandhu's non-Vaibhāṣika stance. Samghabhadra states:

> If the faculty of coming to know what is not yet known is accomplished, there are thirteen essentials, i.e., the faculties of body, life-force, mind, pain, pleasure, joy, and neutrality, the five faculties of conviction and so on, and the faculty of coming to know what is not yet known. It is said that a person can attain the path of seeing in the process of dying because of the deep revulsion towards birth and death.[68]

This illustrates Puguang's, and likely Xuanzang's, favorable attitude towards texts embodying the Vaibhāṣika perspective, such as the **Mahāvibhāṣa* and the **Nyāyānusāra*, the orthodoxy of which is asserted by Vaibhāsikas themselves. In another case about the knowledge of knowing others' minds, Puguang also extols the view in the **Nyāyānusāra* to be the correct one, while criticizing the views of three pre-Xuanzang monastic scholars (Huang 2021). In contrast to their predecessors, Xuanzang and his disciples exhibit a heightened awareness of sectarianism within the Sarvāstivāda. They deliberately leverage the authority established by Vaibhāṣikas within Indian Sarvāstivāda to validate their own contributions in the transmission and translation of Abhidharma texts, as evidenced in this instance and others. Prior to his journey to India, Xuanzang was perplexed by disagreements among translated Indic texts and different interpretations offered by Chinese scholars. Specifically, in the field of Abhidharma, upon discovering a multitude of Vaibhāṣika texts claiming to be the sole orthodoxy, he naturally felt that many ongoing Abhidharma debates in China could be resolved using these new texts as a benchmark. Is it the reason why Puguang criticizes Zhinian? We cannot provide a definite answer with the limited evidence we have, but it is very likely that Puguang is using the sectarian view of the Kashmiri masters and Vaibhāṣika texts to extol their own status in Chinese Abhidharma studies.

3. Conclusions

This study focuses on a pre-Xuanzang monastic scholar, referred to as "Master Nian," who is frequently mentioned in the *Jushe lun ji*, a work attributed to Xuanzang's disciple Puguang. Given Puguang's simultaneous reverence and critique of this monastic scholar, it prompts the question of the monk's identity and the rationale behind Puguang's contradictory stance. After identifying "Master Nian" as Zhinian, an exploration of Zhinian's life and his expertise in Abhidharma texts was undertaken. As one of the most frequently referenced pre-Xuanzang Abhidharma masters in the *Jushe lun ji*, Zhinian demonstrated proficiency in nearly all translated Abhidharma texts available in the 6th-century China, such as the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*, the two earlier translated *Vibhāṣa*s, and the **Aṣṭagrantha*. He even authored volumes of commentary on the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*. Xuanzang's early Abhidharma education owes much to Zhinian, as three of his Abhidharma teachers, Huixiu, Daoji, and Daoyue, were all students of Zhinian.

However, the young Xuanzang was discontented with the teachings he received in China and sought to explore untranslated texts in India. During his pilgrimage, he gained access to many new texts. He also obtained new manuscripts for some texts that had earlier translations. There was a clear inclination among Xuanzang and his disciples to position Xuanzang's new translations as the most authoritative ones. Xuanzang's contribution in introducing both new texts and new translations was celebrated by his disciples, albeit at the expense of devaluing the so-called "old" translations and scholarly achievements of pre-Xuanzang monastic scholars, including Zhinian. Zhinian's opinion was marginalized by Xuanzang's disciple Puguang due solely to its association with the views held by western masters, the Sarvāstivādins residing in places to the west of Kashmir, such as Bactria and Gandhāra.

As part of the Kashmiri Vaibhāṣikas' strategy to present themselves as the sole authority within the Sarvāstivāda, they consistently downplayed the views of western masters in texts such as the **Mahāvibhāṣa* and the **Nyāyānusāra*. Compared to earlier texts, these texts represent a period when Vaibhāṣikas were advocating for their sectarian identity very

self-consciously. This self-promotion was used by Xuanzang and his team to fulfil their ambition to brand themselves as the discoverer of the true Buddhist authority, thanks to Xuanzang's grand pilgrimage. This is reflected in the case of the thirteen essentials during the path of the seeing. Zhinian's opinion is deemed as "unreasonable" merely because it aligns with the views of western masters instead of the masters from Kashmir. However, if we examine Abhidharma commentaries in other lineages, such as the *Essence of the Ocean of Abhidharma, a Commentary on the Treasury of Knowledge* (Tib.: *mngon pa mdzod kyi 'grel pa chos mngon rgya mtsho'i snying po*) compiled by the 9th Karmapa Wangchuk Dorje (1556–1603) in Tibet, it can be seen that the Karmapa shares the same opinion as Zhinian.[69] It can be inferred that Zhinian's opinion might simply be "another" opinion rather than the Other opinion that is definitively wrong. This is a case in which the Abhidharma showcases the construction of authority and orthodoxy during the process of transmission and translation (*chuanyi*傳譯) of Buddhist texts. Xuanzang and his disciples' claim of authority comes at a sacrifice of diversity in understanding Abhidharma Buddhism among Chinese Buddhists.

Funding: Publication of this article was funded by the Temple University Libraries Open Access Publishing Fund and the Temple University Department of Religion.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: This article has been much improved thanks to the comments, suggestions, and corrections of Marcus Bingenheimer, David Carpenter, Fu Xinyi, and the anonymous reviewers for *Religions*. Remaining flaws are entirely my own responsibility. I also wish to thank Wang Weihui and Ma Yifang for their help with some difficult phrases in Classical Chinese.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Abbreviations

T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭 et al. (1924–1932). 85 vols. Tōkyō: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊刻會 (CBETA version). Citations are indicated by the text number, followed by page, register (a, b, or c), and line number(s).

X *Shinsan Dainihon zokuzōkyō* 卍新纂大日本續藏經. Edited by Kawamura Kōshō 河村考照. (1975–1989). Printed by Kokusho kangyōkai 國書刊行會. Originally compiled by Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧 (1905–1912). Kyōtō: Zōkyō shoin 藏經書院 (CBETA version). Citations are indicated by the text number, followed by page, register (a, b, or c), and line number(s).

B *Dazang jing bubian* 大藏經補編. 1985. Edited by Lan Jifu 藍吉富; et al. 36 vols. Taipei: Huayu chubanshe 華宇出版社. Citations are indicated by the text number, followed by page, register (a, b, or c), and line number(s).

Notes

1 *Jushe lun ji* (T 41, no. 1821) is a Chinese commentary on Xuanzang's translation of Vasubandhu's *Commentary of the Treasury of Abhidharma* (Skt.: *Abhidharmakośabhāsya*), which is under the title *Apidamo jushe lun*. An earlier translation of this text is done by Paramārtha, under the title *Apidamo jushe shilun*. In *Jushe lun ji*, Paramārtha's translation is rendered as the "old translation" (*jiuyi*). Although traditionally attributed to Puguang, a disciple of Xuanzang (fl. 645–64), *Jushe lun ji* is more likely to be a compilation of Puguang's notes on Xuanzang's own Abhidharma lectures. For a more comprehensive discussion on Puguang and the *Jushe lun ji*, refer to Shi (2015).

2 See *Jushe lun ji*, T41, no. 1821, 68c10–17, 71a11–24, 115c15–22, 268a15–27, and 387b15–23, respectively.

3 For more studies on Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma before Xuanzang, see Willemen et al. (1998, pp. 126–31), Dessein (2010), Liu (2010), Willemen (2014), and Huang (2021).

4 In *Jushe lun ji*, he is occasionally mentioned as "Master Nian from Wei" (*Wei Nian Fashi*). The term "Wei" can refer to both the Northern Wei dynasty and the Wei prefecture in Hebei. However, in this particular context, it is more likely to indicate a place name, as his views are compared with those of "Master Song from Pengcheng" (*Pengcheng Song fashi*), where Pengcheng is also a place name. This title can also be found in the biography of Daojie 道傑 (573–627) in Daoxuan's *Extended Biographies of Eminent Monks* (*Xu gao seng zhuan* 續高僧傳) as well. See *Xu gao seng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 529b6–7: 又往倉冀魏念二論師所聽毘曇論.

5 The Sanskrit reconstruction of *Za apitan xinlun* is a subject of dispute among scholars, as it does not have an existing Sanskrit or Prakrit counterpart. The Sanskrit title has been a matter of debate, with Bart Dessein proposing **Samyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra* and Charles Willemen suggesting **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*. Willemen's suggestion is based on evidence from a Uigur translation of Sthiramati's *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkā Tattvārthānama*, as discussed by Kudara Kōgi. This article opts to use **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*. See Kudara (1982, p. 371) and Willemen (2008, pp. 48–49).

6 The *Catalogue of Scriptures* (Zhongjing mulu 眾經目錄, T 55, no. 2146, 142b20–25) mentions four translations of this treatise. The first is translated by Saṅghabhūti or Samghabhadra 僧伽跋澄 (d.u.) and Buddharakṣa 佛圖羅刹 (d.u.) under the title *Za apitan piposha* 雜阿毘曇毘婆沙, which was completed in 383 CE. *T* 55, no. 2145, 13. 99a25–b1. Yinshun argues that this text is actually a different translation of *Piposha lun* 鞞婆沙論 and was mistaken by Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518) as the **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*. Shi (2011, pp. 175–76). The second is translated by Samghavarman 僧伽跋摩 (d.u.) and Baoyun 寶雲 (376–449/450). Huijiao's (497–554) *Biographies of Eminent Monks* (Gaoseng zhuan 高僧傳, *T* 50, no. 2059, 342b27–c2) also mentions this translation. The third is by Buddhabhadra 佛馱跋陀羅 (359–429/430 CE) and Faxian 法顯 (338–423/424 CE). The fourth translation is by Īśvara 伊葉波羅 (d.u.) and Gunavarman 求那跋摩 (d.u.) initiated by Wang Zhongde 王仲德 (339–438?) in 426 (*T* 50, no. 2059, 341a23–26). The extant text in the *Taishō* Buddhist canon is the second version. There is also a Dunhuang manuscript (S. 996) extant, which was dated to 479 CE and corresponds to the end of the third chapter of Samghavarman's translation. Fujieda (1960), Willemen et al. (1998, p. 263). For evidence that Master Nian uses **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* to substantiate his points, see *Jushe lun ji*, *T* 41, no. 1821, 71a15–16.

7 Fabao is another disciple of Xuanzang.

8 *Jushe lun shu*, *T* 41, no. 1822, 525c25–26: 念法師既講迦延. Jiayan 迦延 refers to Kātyāyanīputra (ca.150BC), also known as Jiazhanyan zi 迦旃延子 or Jiaduoyanni zi迦多衍尼子 in the Chinese Buddhist canon. Both *Apitan ba jiandu lun* and *Apidamo fazhi lun* are attributed to Kātyāyanīputra. *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (T 55, no. 2154, 620b1–2) states that these two treatises are "different translations of the same manuscript" (*tongben yiyi* 同本異譯), compiled by Kātyāyanīputra around 300 years after the Buddha's Nirvana. However, according to the research of Fukuhara (1965, pp. 218–19), these two Chinese translations might have been based on different texts. The *Apitan ba jiandu lun*, translated by Samghadeva 僧伽提婆 and Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 in 383 CE, is based on the Gandhāran **Aṣṭagrantha*, while *Apidamo fazhi lun*, completed by Xuanzang's team in 660 CE, is based on the **Jñānaprasthāna*, a revised version of **Aṣṭagrantha* by Kashmiri Vaibhāṣikas. Also see Willemen et al. (1998, p. 75).

9 *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 508b27–509b18.

10 *Xinxiu kefen liu xuefen zhuan*, X 77, no. 1522, 266b24–c19.

11 *Shishi liutie*, B13, no. 79, 211a12–15.

12 There are various ways to punctuate the term 誕禮休繼 in the context. One approach is to interpret it as two individuals' names, namely Yanli 誕禮 and Xiuji 休繼. Alternatively, it can be understood as four individuals' names, namely Yan 誕, Li 禮, Xiu 休, and Ji 繼. Another passage in *Xu gaoseng zhuan* provides further insight, as it juxtaposes Yanli 誕禮, Sengxiu 僧休, and Faji 法繼 with Naoyi 牢宜 and Ruguo 儒果. Therefore, it can be inferred that Tanlixiuji 誕禮休繼 is an abbreviation for the names of three individuals, namely Yanli 誕禮, Sengxiu 僧休, and Faji 法繼. See *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 482c17: 僧休法繼誕禮牢宜儒果等是也.

13 Different from Daoxuan's account, Tan'e states that Zhinian wanted to follow Huisong to study but failed. *Xinxiu kefen liu xueseng zhuan*, X 77, no. 1522, 266c4–52: 其弟子有道猷、智洪、晃覺、散魏, 尤英俊, 念欲依之而不果。

14 *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 508b27–c18: 釋志念, 俗緣陳氏, 冀州信都人。其先潁川寔蕃之後胤也, 因官而居河朔焉。念氷清表志, 嶽峙澄神, 俊朗絕倫, 觀方在慮。爰至受具, 問道鄴都。有道長法師, 精通智論, 為學者之宗, 乃荷箱從聽經於數載, 便與當席擅名。所謂誕禮、休、繼等, 一期俊列, 連衡齊德。意謂解非滿抱終於蓋棺, 乃遊諸講肆, 備探沖奧, 務盡幽賾。又詣道寵法師, 學十地論, 聽始知終, 聞同先覽, 於即道王河北。流聞西秦有高昌國慧嵩法師, 統解小乘, 世號"毘曇孔子。" 學匡天下, 眾侶塵隨。沙門道猷、智洪、晃覺、散魏等, 並稱席中杞梓, 慧苑琳琅。念顧眄從之, 成名猷上。

15 Daoxuan states that Yan 彥, the Jizhou governor and "the Duke of Rencheng" (Rencheng Wang 任城王), who was also a sibling of the emperor, was a Buddhist. He organized a dharma assembly for Zhinian upon his return to his hometown. See *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 508c11–13: 時刺史任城王彥, 帝之介弟, 情附虛宗, 既屬念還, 為張法會。This aligns with the biographical accounts of Gao Guiyan 高歸彥 in secular history. See Li (1972, p. 51): 平秦王歸彥，字仁英，神武族弟也。乃拜太宰、冀州刺史。Gao Guiyan's Buddhist belief is not documented in official secular history but can be testified by a Buddhism statue he sponsored, which was discovered in Dingxian 定县 of Hebei in 1921. See Xue and Liu (2018). This statue is dated to the year 543. However, there is a discrepancy between Daoxuan's account and secular records regarding Gao Guiyan's title. In the *Book of Northern Qi*, Gao Guiyan is referred to as "the Duke of Pingqin" (Pingqin Wang 平秦王). The title of "the Duke of Rencheng" may be an error on Daoxuan's part.

16 *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 508c11–14.

17 For more details about Northern Zhou persecution, see Nomura (1968). Also see Tang (2011, pp. 301–6).

18 *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 508c10–21.

19 This is described in *Shishi liutie* as "Zhinian is equivalent to a superior" (*Zhinian qisheng* 志念齊聖). *Shishi liutie*, B 13, no. 79, 10. 211a12.

[20] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 508c21–27: 值隋國創興, 佛日還復。勅訪之始, 即預出家。而包蘊迦延, 未遑敷述。至開皇四年, 謂弟沙門志湛曰: "吾窮冠小乘, 自揣與羅漢齊鑣也。但時未至, 故且斂翮耳。湛夙餐法味, 欣其告及 以事達明彥法師。彥成實元緒, 素重念名, 與門人洪該等三百餘人, 躬事邀延, 闡開心論。The specific reference of the term "Heart Treatise" (*xin lun* 心論) remains ambiguous.

[21] The fourth section, known as the Section of karma, corresponds to the Section of Action (*xing jiandu* 行揵度) in the Taishō version.

[22] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 509a1–7: 至如迦延本經, 傳謬來久, 業揵度中脫落四紙。諸師講解曾無異尋, 念推測上下懸續其文, 理會詞聯皆符前作。初未之悟也。後江左傳本, 取勘遺蹤, 校念所作, 片無增減。時為不測之人焉。

[23] See Kieschnick (1997) for more discussions on medieval Chinese hagiography.

[24] See Willemen et al. (1998, p. 66). See Fukuhara (1965, pp. 218–19)

[25] *Xu gao seng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 509a27–b14. The support from Yang Liang can also be found in *Shiwen ji* 釋文紀, B 33, no. 192, 39. 779b8–14.

[26] For the death year of Huixiu, see *Cirun si guda lunshi Huixiu fashi keshi jide wen* 慈潤寺古大論師慧休法師刻石記德文, collected in Zhou and Zhao (2001). It is discussed first by Fumio Ōuchi 大內文雄 and then by Zhang Guye 張固也. Ōuchi (1997, pp. 287–355) and Zhang (2008, pp. 35–44).

[27] Daoji studied with Zhinian and also composed a written record of his life (*xingzhuang* 行狀) for Zhinian. See *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T50, no. 2060, p. 509b16-18: 益州福成寺道基法師, 慧解通徵, 祖習有所, 乃為之行狀, 援引今古, 文質存焉。Other disciples of Zhinian include Honggai 洪該 (d.u.), Fayi 法懿 (d.u.), Huaizheng 懷正 (d.u.), Daosheng 道深 (d.u.), Yuancan 圓粲 (d.u.), Shanzhu 善住 (d.u.), Huining 慧凝 (d.u.), Daozhao 道照 (d.u.), Mingru 明儒 (d.u.), Yuanchang 圓常 (d.u.), and Huizang 慧藏 (560?–656). *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 509a6–11.

[28] The majority of the Abhidharma scholars mentioned in this context were engaged in the study of both the Great Vehicle and Lesser Vehicle treatises. Huixiu, in particular, had the experience of initially learning Mahayana treatises before delving into these Abhidharma texts. Therefore, the concept of intrinsic attachment (*guzhi* 固執) could potentially be understood as the Sarvāstivādins' unwavering belief in the actual existence of phenomena, which is viewed as an attachment from the perspective of Mahayana Buddhism.

[29] *Xu gao seng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 544b18–22: 從志念法師受學小論, 迦、 雜、婆沙各聞數遍。窮其本支, 曉其固執。解既清迥, 行寔貞嚴。念曰: "餘講小乘, 歲序多矣。今乃值子, 諒不虛延。" 休即著雜心玄章、抄疏。

[30] *Xu gao seng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 442a6–8: 有志念論師, 馳名東夏, 時號窮小乘之巖穴也, 乃從聽習雜心、婆沙。

[31] See, for example, the biography of Huigong 慧恭 (520?–630?), *Xu gao seng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 686c14–16, Haishun 海順 (589–618), 524b27, and Jingsong 靖嵩 (537–614), 501b26.

[32] *Piposha lun*, T 28, no. 1547.

[33] *Apitan piposha lun*, T 28, no. 1546.

[34] T 28, no. 1550–1552.

[35] *Apitan piposha lun*, T 29, no. 1559.

[36] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 442b5-12: 自爾大小雙玩研味逾深，注述之餘尋繹無暇，却掃閑室統略舊宗，纘述雜心玄文，為三十卷。包括群典，籠罩古今，四遠英猷, 皆參沈隱。末又以俱舍所譯詞旨宏富，雖有陳迹, 未盡研求。乃無師獨悟，思擇名理，為之文疏三十餘卷。遂使經部妙義接紐明時，罽賓正宗傳芳季緒。

[37] Daoyue studied **Tattvasiddhi* and **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya* with Zhinian and Zhitong. See *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T50, no. 2060, p. 527b7-8: 後習成論雜心於志念、智通二師, 備窮根葉, 辭義斯盡。Later he aspired to study *Abhidharmakośabhāsya* and obtained Zhikai's 智愷 (518-568) written record of Paramārtha's oral teachings on *Abhidharmakośabhāsya*. See *Xu gaoseng zhuan*續高僧傳, T50, no. 2060, p. 527b28-c1: 果於廣州顯明寺, 獲俱舍疏本并十八部記, 并是凱師筆迹, 親承真諦口傳。

[38] Daoji, who was also well-versed in these texts, authored eight fascicles of the Profound Essay on **Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya*. *Xu gaoseng zhuan*., 532b27.

[39] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 446c24–29.

[40] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 447a6–7: 至於婆沙廣論、雜心玄義, 莫不鑿窮巖穴, 條疏本幹。然此論東被, 弘唱極繁, 章鈔異同, 計逾數十, 皆蘊結胸府, 聞持自然…基每顧而歎曰, "餘少遊講肆多矣, 未見少年神悟若斯人也!"

[41] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 447a26–b3: 沙門慧休 … 偏為獨講雜心、攝論。指摘纖隱, 曲示綱猷。相續八月, 領酬無厭。休又驚異, 絕歎撫掌而嗟曰, "希世若人, 爾其是也!"

[42] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, 447b3-12: 沙門道岳, 宗師俱舍, 闡弘有部, 包籠領袖, 吞納喉襟, 揚業帝城, 來儀群學, 乃又從焉…但為俱舍一論, 昔所未聞, 因爾伏膺, 曉夕諮請。岳審其殷至, 慧悟霞明, 樂說不窮。

[43] Wu and Shu are the names of two kingdoms that existed during the period of the Three Kingdoms (229–280 CE). The territory of Wu generally encompasses the southern regions of Jiangsu, the northern areas of Zhejiang, and Shanghai. On the other hand, the land of Shu corresponds to present-day Sichuan.

[44] *Xu gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2060, 447b16–18: 餘周流吳蜀，爰逮趙魏, 末及周秦。預有講筵, 率皆登踐。已布之言令, 雖蘊胸襟; 未吐之詞宗, 解籤無地。

[45] See Willemen (2014, pp. 255–56) for a discussion of the area of *Jibin* 罽賓.

[46] 1 *li* is roughly equivalent to 600 yards according to Wilkinson's manual on Chinese history. See Wilkinson (2017, p. 236).

[47] *Xu gao seng zhuan*, *T* 50, no. 2060, 449a5–11: 至迦濕彌羅國, 即此俗常傳罽賓是也。莫委罽賓由何而生? 觀其國[Read 國 with *Nan-song sixi zang* 南宋思溪藏 (1239)]域同罽賓耳。本是龍海羅漢取之, 引眾而住通三藏也。故其國境, 四面負山, 周七千餘裏, 門徑狹迮, 僧徒五千, 多學小乘。國有大德、名僧、勝匠, 奘就學俱舍、順正理、因明、聲明, 及大毘婆沙。

[48] I choose to follow Willemen, Dessein, and Cox to use the term Sarvāstivāda in a broader sense, rather than confining it to Vaibhāṣikas. This broader interpretation includes both Vaibhāṣikas and non-Vaibhāṣikas. For additional information, please refer to Willemen et al. (1998, p. 110).

[49] *Datang Da ci'en si sanzang fashi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, *T* 50, no. 2053, 232a25–29. Also, in *Xu gao seng zhuan*: *T* 50, no. 2060, 449a21–22, and in *Datang gu sanzang xuanzang fashi xingzhuang*大唐故三藏玄奘法師行狀, *T* 50, no. 2052, 215c9–10.

[50] For an examination of Xuanzang's exploration of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma in India, refer to the following sources: *Datang Da ci'en si sanzang fashi zhuan*, T 50, no. 2053, 232a25–b4; *Datang gu sanzang xuanzang fashi xingzhuang*, T 50, no. 2052, 215c9–13; and *Xuanzang sanzang shizizhuan congshu*, X 88, no. 1651, 370a16–19.

[51] *Song gaoseng zhuan*, T 50, no. 2061, 727a5–11: 釋普光, 未知何許人也。明敏為性, 爰擇其木, 請事三藏奘師, 勤恪之心, 同列靡及…初奘嫌古翻俱舍義多缺。然躬得梵本, 再譯真文, 乃密授光多是記憶西印薩婆多師口義, 光因著疏解判。

[52] For more research on the twenty-two *indriya*s in Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma, see Skilling (2012) and Brewster (2018).

[53] See *Abhidharmakośabhāsyaṃ of Vasubandhu*, p. 50.

[54] *Apidamo jushe lun*, T 29, no. 1558, 17c5.

[55] *Abhidharmakośabhāsyaṃ of Vasubandhu*, p. 352: *adṛṣṭadṛṣṭerdṛṅmārgastatra pañcadaśa kṣaṇāḥ.*

[56] *Apidamo jushe shi lun*, T 29, no. 1559, p. 177b12-14: 偈曰：未知欲知根，與十三相應。釋曰：何者為十三？謂意、命、身根, 女男根隨一，及三受根、信等五根，未知欲知根為第十三。

[57] *Apidamo jushe lun*, T 29, no. 1558, p. 18a12-13: 若成未知根，定成就十三，謂身、命、意、苦、樂、喜、捨、信等五根及未知根。

[58] See *Abhidharmakośabhāsyaṃ of Vasubandhu*, p. 51.

[59] *Za apitan xin lun*, T 28, no. 1552, 941b17–18: 若成未知根, 定成就十三，謂身、命、意、苦、樂、喜、捨、信等五根及未知根。

[60] *Jushe lun ji*, T 41, no. 1821, 68c8–10: 問：於見道中男、女二根隨成一不? 若言成者, 何故不說? 若不成者, 如何入聖?

[61] *Jushe lun ji*, 68c8–12: 古德念法師解云, 於見道中男、女二根雖定成一, 成男不成女, 成女不成男, 以不定故不說。

[62] *Jushe lun ji*, T 41, no. 1821, 68c25–69a5: 破第一念法師云: 若言男、女於見道中不定故不說者, 何故婆沙一百五十六云"若成就女、男二根定成就餘根"中云, "定成過去、未來九, 三世二, 現在四。過、未九者, 謂四受、信等五。三世二者, 謂意、一受。現在四者, 謂男、女、身、命, 餘不定如前說。西方師云, '應說過、未定成十。謂五受、信等五。三世定成一, 謂意。受名不定。' 故迦濕彌羅國諸師言, '名雖不定, 而數即定, 必有一受現在前。故此中說數不說名。'"

[63] Willemen, Dessein, and Cox, XII.

[64] See Greene (2017), p. 5.

[65] *Jushe lun ji*, T 41, no. 1821, 3. 68c7–8: 舊俱舍不說苦根, 男、女隨一者, 譯家謬矣。

[66] *Jushe lun ji*, T 41, no. 1821, 3. 69a16–20: 念法師若說男、女二根於見道雖定成一, 名以不定故不說者, 此是西方師義。若必成一者, 迦濕彌羅國義。說數定故, 應有十四。然說十三, 故說非理, 良由未見新婆沙也。

[67] *Jushe lun ji*, T 41, no. 1821, 3. 69b8–15: 今正解云: "於見道中, 男、女二根或有、或無。若有者, 隨成就一。若無者, 據從下漸捨男、女根說。所以無形能入聖者, 漸命終位, 深心猛利厭生死故, 能入見道。故婆沙一百五十解隨信行極少成十三根, '十三者身、命、意、四受, 信等五, 一無漏根，即離欲染漸命終位入見道者。'"

[68] *Apidamo shun zhengli lun*, T 29, no. 1562, 9.383a26–28: 若成未知根，定成就十三，謂身、命、意、苦、樂、喜、捨, 信等五根, 及未知根。漸命終位，傳說深心厭生死故，能入見道。

[69] The ninth Karmapa Wangchuk Dorje also provide indeterminacy (*ma smos pa*) as a reason to justify the exclusion of the female and male faculties. See Wangchuk Dorje (2003, p. 82): *kun shes byed pa'i dbang byed pa'i dbang ldan la / / bcu gsum dag dang ldan pa yin / / zhes pas bstan / kun shes byed pa'i dbang po dang ldan pa la nges par bcu gsum dag dang ldan pa yin te / yid srog lus lus yid mi bde las gzhan pa'i tshor ba bzhi dad sogs sogs lnga rang nyid rnams dang ldan pa'i phyir / 'di mthong lam pa yin pas pho mo'i dbang po gang rung zhig dang nges par ldan yang gang dang dang ldan ma nges pas 'dir ma smos pa yin no*

References

Primary Sources

Abhidharmakośabhāsyaṃ of Vasubandhu. Edited by Pralhad, Pradhan. Patnam: Jayasawal Research Institute, 1967.

Apitan piposha lun 阿毘曇毘婆沙論. Jia zhan yan zi迦旃延子 (d.u.) and five hundred Arhats. Translated by Fu tuo ba mo 浮陀跋摩 (d.u.) and Daotai道泰 (active in the fifth century). T 28, no. 1546.

Bei Qi Shu 北齊書 *[The Book of Northern Qi]*. Li, Baiyao 李百藥. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局, 1972.

Cirun si guda lunshi Huixiu fashi keshi jide wen 慈潤寺古大論師慧休法師刻石記德文. In Zhou and Zhao (2001).

Jushe lun ji 俱舍論記. Puguang 普光 (d.u.). T 41, no. 1821.

mNgon pa mdzod kyi 'grel pa chos mngon rgya mtsho'i snying po. Wangchuk Dorje (1556–1603). Sarnath, Varanasi, U.P: Vajra Vidya institute, 2003.

Piposha lun 鞞婆沙論. Shi tuo pan ni尸陀槃尼. Translated by Seng qie ba cheng僧伽跋澄 (active in the fourth century). T 28, no. 1547.
Shishi liutie 釋氏六帖. Yichu 義楚 (895?–968/977?). B13, no. 79.
Shiwen ji 釋文紀. Mei Dingzhou 梅鼎祚 (1549–1615). B 33, no. 192.
Xinxiu kefen liu xuefen zhuan 新修科分六學僧傳. 曇噩 (1285–373 CE). X 77, no. 1522.
Xu gao seng zhuan 續高僧傳. Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667). T 50, no. 2060.
Za apitan xin lun 雜阿毘曇心論. 法救 (d.u.). Translated by Seng qie ba mo 僧伽跋摩 (active in the third century). T 28, no. 1552.

Secondary Sources

Barrett, Timothy H. 1990. Kill the Patriarchs! *The Buddhist Forum* 1: 87–97.
Brewster, Ernest Billings. 2018. The Yoga of Dying: Xuanzang on the Nature of Death. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA.
Deeg, Max. 2016. Chinese Buddhists in Search of Authenticity in the Dharma. *The Eastern Buddhist* 45: 11–22.
Dessein, Bart. 2010. The Abhidharma School in China and the Chinese Version of Upaśānta's *Abhidharmahṛdayasūtra. *The Eastern Buddhist* 41: 49–69.
Fujieda, Akira 藤枝晃. 1960. Tonkō Shakyō No Jisugata 敦煌寫経の字すがた [The Form of the Characters of Dunhuang Manuscripts]. *Bokubi* 墨美 97: 1–40.
Fukuhara, Ryōgon 福原亮厳. 1965. *Ubu Abidatsumaronsho No Hattatsu* 有部阿毘達磨論書の発達. Kyōto: Nagata Bunshōdō.
Greene, Eric M. 2017. The Dust Contemplation. *The Eastern Buddhist* 48: 1–50.
Huang, Lu 黃露. 2021. From Huisong 慧嵩 (fl. 511–560) to Xuanzang 玄奘 (602?–664): The 'Borderland Complex' in the Transmission of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma. *Hualin International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 4: 202–39.
Kieschnick, John. 1997. *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
Kudara, Kōgi 百濟康義. 1982. Uiguru–Yaku Abhidharma Ronsho Ni Mieru Ronshi·Ronsho No Bonmei ウイグル訳アビダルマ論書に見える論師　論書の梵名 [Sanskrit Names of Ācāryas and Śāstras Found in Uigur Abhidharma Texts]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyu* 印度學佛教學研究 *[Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies]* 31: 371–74. [CrossRef]
Liu, Jianfeng 刘剑锋. 2010. Lun zaoqi zhongtu pitan xue de xingqi 论早期中土毗昙学的兴起——以思想史为中心的考察. *Zongjiao Xue Yanjiu* 宗教学研究 2: 90–92.
Nomura, Yōshō 野村耀昌. 1968. *Shūbu hōnan nokenkyū* 周武法難の研究 *[A Study on the Dharma Persecution during Northern Zhou]*. Tōkyō: Azuma Shuppansha.
Ōuchi, Fumio 大内文雄. 1997. *Hōzan reisen tera sekkutsu-tō mei no kenkyū* 寶山霊泉寺石窟塔銘の研究. 東方學報 69: 287–355.
Shi, Wuyin 釋悟殷. 2015. Puguang Jushe lunji de zhushu yu sixiang tese 普光《俱舍論記》的注疏與思想特色 [The Commentary and Thought of Puguang's *Jushe lun ji*]. *Xuanzang Foxue Yanjiu* 玄奘佛學研究 24: 133–68.
Shi, Yinshun 釋印順. 2011. *Shuo Yiqieyou Bu Weizhu De Lunshu Yu Lunshi Zhi Yanjiu* 說一切有部為主的論書與論師之研究 *[The Study of the Treatises and Masters of Sarvāstivāda]*. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局, pp. 175–76.
Skilling, Peter. 2012. Discourse on the Twenty-Two Faculties. Translated from Śamathadeva's Upāyikā-Tīkā. In *Dharmapravicaya: Aspects of Buddhist Studies, Essays in Honour of Professor Narayan Hemandas Samtani*. Edited by Lalji Shravak and Charles Willemen. Delhi: Buddhist World Press, pp. 399–434.
Tang, Yongtong 湯用彤. 2011. *Hanwei Liangji Nanbeichao Fojiaoshi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 *[The History of Buddhism in Dynasties of Han, Wei, Western Jin, Eastern Jin, and the Northern and Southern Dynasties]*. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
Wilkinson, Endymion. 2017. *Chinese History: A New Manual*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, for the Harvard–Yenching Institute.
Willemen, Charles. 2008. Kumārajīva's 'Explanatory Discourse' about Abhidharmic Literature. *International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 12: 37–83.
Willemen, Charles. 2014. Remarks about the History of the Sarvāstivāda Buddhism. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 1: 255–56.
Willemen, Charles, Bart Dessein, and Collet Cox. 1998. *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Leiden: Brill.
Xue, Xiaoyuan, and Bo Liu, eds. 2018. *Gao Guiyan Zaoxiang Ji/Zhongguo Mingbei Jingtuo Weikanben Jingxuan* 高歸彥造像記/中國名碑精拓未刊本精選 *[The Recordation of Statue Sponsored by Gao Guiyan/A Careful Section of Unpublished Famous Epigraphs and Rubbings]*. Beijing: Shang Wu Yin Shu Guan商務印書館.
Zhang, Guye 張固也. 2008. Tangchu gaoseng Huixiu jide wen kaoshi 唐初高僧慧休記德文考釋. *Wenxian* 文獻 4: 35–44.
Zhou, Shaoliang 周紹良, and Chao Zhao 趙超, eds. 2001. *Tangdai Muzhi Huibian Xuji* 唐代墓誌彙編續集. Shanghai: Shanghai Gu Ji Chu Ban She上海古籍出版社.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.