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I Survey of Sarvāstivāda Developments.

1. First Century B.C., Gandhāran Cultural Area.

When one mentions the word abhidharma in a Chinese context, one immediately thinks of sarvāstivāda abhidharma. Sarvāstivādins were the most influential school in India’s northwestern area, the area where Chinese Buddhism originates, but there were other schools with an abhidharma. The dharmaguptakas (Shelīfu Epitan Lun 舍利弗阿毘昙論 T. XXVIII 1548) and the pudgalavādins (Sanfa Du Lun 三法度論 T. XXV 1506), to name some important schools, had an abhidharma.¹ They all had it ultimately from

---

* - Much of this contribution is the result of developments which began in 1975, while studying the Abhidharmakōrāyana. In 1998 more ideas about sarvāstivāda abhidharma had taken shape. I am fully aware of the fact that much of what I say is still hypothetical. My main argument is that the whole picture, as it emerges, is coherent. The explanations “work”. May the process of action and reaction make the historical realities even clearer.

-I would like to express my gratitude to Saitō T., library staff of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies. His help was most valuable.

¹ Bareau 1955: 296; Lamotte 1988: 179-191. Also Page 1995: 7. Sautrāntika-dārśāntikas also had an Abhidharmapiṭaka, as is obvious in Dharmatrāta’s Chuyao (Udāna) Jing 出曜經 T. IV 212 (399 A.D.), p. 610 c 11-12, 645 b 25-26. To the three traditional Piṭakas, mentioned in the text (e.g. p. 680 a 17), a Kṣudrakapiṭaka, Bao Zu Zang 寶雑藏, Baozang meaning Piṭaka, is added. The contents of this Piṭaka are the 12 angas, the learning of a learned bhikṣu, as mentioned p. 643 b 25-c 11. The 12 are: 1. Qijing 契經 sutra; 2. Song 諨 geya; 3. Ji 記 vyakaraṇa; 4. Ji 僧 gāthā; 5. Yinyuan 因錄
Śāriputra, but for the dharmaguptakas Maudgalyāyana was very important too, and the vātsiputraīyas had their abhidharma in nine parts from Rāhula, who had received it from Śāriputra. It consisted of three factors, qualities, dharmas (guna, de 德, doṣa, e 惡, āśraya, yi 依), which were each subdivided in three sections, (zhen 真) du 度, khaṇḍa (ka). All sthāvirīya abhidharma comes from Śāriputra.

The first century B.C. must have been extremely important for the writing down of sthāvirīya literature, not only in the Gandhāran cultural area, but also in the deep South. The northwesterners used Gāndhārī (s) and wrote Kharoṣṭhī. This is attested by recent studies about Gandhāran dharmaguptaka manuscripts, but the whole Gandhāran area and its schools may have used it. The Chinese ancient translations, guyi 古譯, can be understood to be mainly based on Gāndhārī (s), either oral or textual.

When the Indian original language changed to mainly Sanskrit, jiuyi 舊譯, old translations, brought a change in Chinese terminology, from the time of Kumārajīva (344–413) till Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664). The latter just “improved” Paramārtha’s (499–569) terminology. The Gandhāran cultural area of the first century B.C. consists of Uḍḍiyāna or Udyāna, Gandhāra proper, and Bactria, Tokharistan, across the Khyber Pass. Khotan may be

---

2 Ono 2000: 110; Willemen 2006a: 7, note 28. The title of the text may have been Tridharmakhaṇḍaka, Segments of the Three Factors. For each dharma three khaṇḍas, making a total of 9 parts.

3 Limiting the use of Gāndhārī to just one northwestern school, the dharmaguptakas, does not make sense. Almost all ancient Chinese translations are based on the same northwestern Indian language(s). Sautrāntika abhidharma (yoga manuals) still remains to be identified among the many Gandhāran manuscripts. The absence of any finds does not mean it did not exist. See Salomon 1999.
included from the first century A.D., as mahāsāṃghika and sthāvirīya monks proceeded there. The Gandhāran cultural area of Gandhāra and Bactria was known as *jibin* 頌賓 in Chinese. This term probably is not a phonetic rendering of one area, Kapiša (Kāpišī, Begram), which is not even located within Gandhāra proper, or of Kaśmīra, which enters much later into the picture, but a term used by the Chinese for foreigners, *bin*, who came from across the Karakorum with their highly appreciated cloths, *ji* 頌. This last term is found in the dynastic history of the Former Han (206 B.C.-8 A.D., completed ca. 120 A.D.). The central area of these foreigners at that time can be understood as being Uḍḍiyāna and Gandhāra. That Gandhāran cultural area seems to have been mainly sthāvirīya, sarvāstivāda and dharmaguptaka, but also mahāsāṃghika. The sarvāstivāda abhidharma in the first century B.C. consisted mainly of the *Abhidharmahrdaya* and of the *Aṣṭagrāntha*. The Sanskrit title of the *Hṛdaya* (T. XXVIII 1550, 391 A.D.) is given in Qing Jixiang’s 慶吉祥 catalogue: *Zhiyuan Lu* 至元錄 (1285-1287). The author, Fasheng 法勝 Dharmaśreṣṭhin, is from Tokharistan, from the area of the river Vakṣu, upstream of the Oxus River. Because the *Aṣṭagrāntha* (T. XXVI 1543) knows the *Hṛdaya*, it was composed a little later. Kātyāyanīputra, mentioned as its author, rather was the compiler, transmitter. He probably composed the text while he was in Cīnabhukti, eastern Panjab. The Sanskrit title is attested by Paramārtha. In his biography of Vasubandhu he explains the title as *qielantuo* 伽蘭他, translating this as *jie* 結 “knot, composition (i.e. *jiezhuān* 結

---


5 *Ji* are precious woolen blankets and carpets. Hanyu Da Cidian: 1056, s.v. *ji* 頌. Hulsewē 1979: 106, esp. note 218, in the explanation about *jibin*.

6 Information about the *Hṛdaya*: Willemen 2006a: 1-10.

7 Li Rongxi 1996: 118-119; Cox 1998: 221-229; Willemen 2006a: 6. Kātyāyanā may be an Indian who later went to the Gandhāran area. See Paramārtha’s biography of Vasubandhu T. L 2049, p. 189 a 3-4.
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撰）”, and 節 “section”. Paramārtha explains the term *grantha*. Both the *Iṣṭdaya* and the *Aṣṭagrantha* were translated by Saṃghadeva, respectively in 391 A.D. on Mount Lu, and in 383 A.D., but completed in 390 in southern China. Saṃghadeva is also the translator of the *Sanfa Du Lun* in 391, where *du* means *zhendu* 真度, *khaṇḍa*(ka), segment, section, clearly different from *jiandu* 健度, Pārākṛt form of *grantha*. Saṃghadeva brought basic Gandhāran abhidharma texts to China. He knew the texts by heart. That is why he had to wait for another scholar from *Jībin*, Dharmapriya, to help him complete his translation of the *Aṣṭagrantha*. The *Iṣṭdaya* uses the fivefold division of factors, *dharmas*, apparently a sarvāstivāda idea which predates the *Pañcavastuka* as we know it. Vasumitra’s name (second century A.D.) is linked to one version, to the version of the first chapter of the *Prakaraṇapāda*, but the text existed in more than one version. An Shigao (active in China ca. 148-170 A.D.) is traditionally said to be the translator of another version, called *Epilan Wu Faxing Jing* 阿毘曇五法行經. T. XXVIII 1557, about five Buddhist (*fa*) modes, elements. The so-called five modes, *wu xing* 五行,

---

10 This text is most probably a revision of T. XXV 1505 Si Ehanmu Chao 四阿含暮抄, an abstract of the 4 *āgamas*, a text by Vasubhadra. translated by Kumārabuddhi. Willemen 2006a: 4, note 19; Mochizuki 1960-1963: 1656.
See T. LV 2145. Sengyou’s 僧祐 catalogue: *Chu Sanzang Ji Ji* 出三藏記集, p. 73 a 2-29, for Huiyuan’s 慧遠 (334-416) preface.
Saṃghadeva also completed the final rendering of the *Madhyamāgama* and of the *Ekottarikāgama*, i.e. T. I 26, and T. II 125, in 398 A.D., but the translating was begun by the Tokharian Dharmamandar in Chang’an in 384. Saṃghadeva brought śāṅkīya texts. He was a sautrāntika, most probably from Bactria. Sautrāntikas are known to be receptive to mahāsāṃghika influence. The sautrāntikas were very diverse. One must also keep in mind that there are many common views between dharmaguptakas and mahāsāṃghikas. See Tsukamoto 2004: 129.
12 Cox 1998: 212-216.
were a very popular concept at the end of the Later Han. This text adds a Buddhist version to the speculations. The Tibetan Facheng (active 832-ca. 865 A.D. in the Dunhuang area) brought another version: Sapoduozung Wu Shi Lun 薩婆多宗五事論, T. XXVIII 1556, in mūlasarvāstivāda times. Dharmatrāta (early fourth century) wrote a vibhāṣā, commentary, on Vasumitra’s Pañcavastu, translated by Xuanzang (T. XXVIII 1555). Early stages of the fivefold classification can be found in the Saṅgītiparīyāya (T. XXVI 1536) and in the Dharmaskandha (T. XXVI 1537). The text attributed to An Shigao does not mention any author. The Parthian Ashkani, phonetically rendered An Shigao, and Vasumitra of the Mahāvibhāṣā (T. XXVII 1545) both were active in the second century A.D.. The Gandhāran sarvāstivādins were very diverse. They used the same vinaya from Mathurā, and they all believed in sarvāstitva, but what sarvam, and evenasti really meant, was subject of debate. Their abhidharma was actually meant to be used for meditational practice. The Ḥṛdaya is a manual, teaching how to reach the stage of an arhat. The terms yogaśāra and yogāśārabhumi are quite common in Gandhāran circles. Early Chinese translations of such texts make this sufficiently clear. When the existing factors, dharmas, the object of

---

13 Not among the 16 texts considered to be certainly translated by An Shigao. Zürcher 1991: 297-298. The term fa (Buddhist) xing for vastu, however, makes the end of the Han very likely. See also Willemen 2006a: 14, note 59.
14 P. 989 b 2 for Vasumitra, author of a Pañcavastu. See also Cox 1998: 214.
15 Cox 1998: 216. For Saṅgītiparīyāya: Cox 1998: 177-181; For Dharmaskandha: Cox 1998: 181-189. The fact that Puguang 普光 mentions Maudgalyāyana as author of the Dharmaskandha may mean that a dharmaguptaka version was revised as the vaibhāṣika version. While Puguang gives Śāriputra as author of the vaibhāṣika Saṅgītiparīyāya, the mūlasarvāstivāda Yaśomitra mentions Mahākauśṭhila, a relative of Śāriputra, an experienced propagator of the doctrine, and one of the 10 great disciples of Buddha. Mochizuki 1960-1963: 4722-4723.
17 Dhammajoti 2004: 35 sq., esp. 42.
dharmapracīca, investigation of factors, which is prajñā,\textsuperscript{19} zhihui 智慧, wisdom, are said to be non-existent by the mahāsāṃghikas, the object of prajñā, bore 般 若, then becomes their emptiness. This happened in the Gandhāran cultural area. While the sarvāstivādins developed knowledge, jñāna, in their yoga, mahāsāṃghikas developed wisdom, prajñā. This can be seen in the first Chinese translation of the Aśṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, T. VIII 224, Daoxing Bore Jing 道行般若經, about yogacāra, daoxing, and prajñā. Notice the phonetic rendering for this new emptiness-prajñā. The first chapter of this text, translated by Lokakṣema in Luoyang in 179 A.D., soon after An Shigao, is called Yogacāra, Daoxing 道行.\textsuperscript{20} The Chinese translator gives a new title to the text, making it clear for a Chinese audience that the subject is a new kind of yogacāra, different from the jñānayoga of the sarvāstivādins. The oldest part, at least the first chapter, may date from the first century B.C.\textsuperscript{21} It seems that prajñāpāramitā texts quickly used Sanskrit,\textsuperscript{22} sooner than the texts of other schools of the Gandhāran cultural area. Thus distinguishing themselves

\textsuperscript{19} Willemen 2006a: 234.

\textsuperscript{20} The translator’s name (active ca. 170–190) is reconstructed as Laukāśaṇa by Lokesh Chandra. See Willemen 2004: 10, note 27. When the text was revised by Zhi Qian 支謙, early in the Wu 吳 dynasty, the title became a real translation of Mahāprajñāpāramitā, Da Ming Duowuji Jing 大明度無極經, T. VIII 225, and the first chapter was just called Xing 行 Caryā. T. 226, the work of Dharmapiya, is an abstract of T. 224. As Dharmapiya was a sūtraṃtika, he just repeated Yogacāra as the title of his first chapter. Kumārajīva’s title, T. 227, is Xiao Pin Boreboluo Mi Jing 小品般若波羅蜜經, the lesser version of the sūtra about prajñāpāramitā. He calls the first chapter: Initial, Chu 初 Chapter. In the Song translations of Dānapāla (T. 228. See Mochizuki 1960–1963, Vol. 8: 261, 265) and of Dharmabhadra (T. 229 Ratnagunasamccaya) of 991, the first chapter is Xing 行, Caryā.

Zürcher 1991: 298, influenced by Demiéville P. and Conze E., thinks the title of Lokakṣema’s text is borrowed from its first chapter.

\textsuperscript{21} Conze 1994: X.

Schmithausen 1977, investigates the first chapter.

\textsuperscript{22} Zacchetti 2005: 41, note 168.
from the śthāvirīyas? The use of Sanskrit and Brāhmī comes later for most Gandhārans. They were slow to adopt Sanskrit,\textsuperscript{23} even after the establishing of a new Sanskrit “orthodoxy” for the sarvāstivādins in the second century A.D.

2. Ca. 200 A.D.

During the reign of Kaniṣka II (ca. 158-176)\textsuperscript{24} a sarvāstivāda synod was held in Kaśmīra. It was decided to rewrite the most important Gandhāran text, the \textit{Aṣṭagrāntha}, in Sanskrit, making revisions. The text was now called \textit{Jñānapraśthāna}, T. XXVI 1544 \textit{Course} of \textit{Knowledge, Epidambo Fazhi Lun} 阿毘達磨發智論. The Chinese translation was made by Xuanzang in 657-660. The text was still Kātyāyanīputra’s. While the old translation of Saṃghadeva may be called \textit{kāya}, body, compilation or collection, with eight \textit{granthas}, each subdivided in \textit{vargas}, chapters, the new text is a real breathing body, \textit{śarīra},\textsuperscript{25} with eight \textit{skandhākas}, each subdivided in \textit{āśvāsakas}. In China the old terminology of Saṃghadeva’s text kept being used till the time of Xuanzang,

\textsuperscript{23} Willemen 2006d: 32-38. The example of the \textit{Udānavarga} is used to illustrate this development. The conclusion is that the ancient sarvāstivāda \textit{Dharmapada} was established as \textit{Udāna, aniga} 6 of a sautrāntika Kṣudrakapiṭaka, by Dharmatrāta in the second century, and that later the stanzas were collected again to form a \textit{Dharmapada}, finally known as the mūlasarvāstivāda \textit{Udānavarga}.


Kaniṣka I (134-156), son of Vīma Kadphises. Kaniṣka II (ca. 158-176), son of Vāsiṣka and grandson of Kaniṣka I. Kaniṣka III (234-?), reigning in Gandhāra and Mathurā.


\textsuperscript{26} This is Yaśomitra’s term. Wogihara 1971: 9.

One must keep in mind that the mūlasarvāstivādins seem more like vaibhāṣikas with some sautrāntika characteristics.
because that was the terminology of the only existing Chinese version. The *Aṣṭagrantha* had many *vibhāsās* in the Gandhāran area, as Daoan 道安 (312-385) and others inform us.²⁷ For the new Kāśmīra version the sarvāstivāda synod compiled a *Mahāvibhāṣā*, T. XXVII 1545, *Epidamo Da Piposha Lun* 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論. It was completed after the reign of Kaniṣka II.²⁸ An inserted note in Puguang’s 普光 *Jushe Lun Ji* 俱舍論記, T. XLI 1821, 655 A.D., a commentary on the Chinese translation of Vasubandhu’s *Kośabhāṣya*, calls the sarvāstivāda synod *poshahui* 婆沙會, *vibhāsa* gathering.²⁹ The revision of the *Aṣṭagrantha* and the compilation of a new “orthodox” *Mahāvibhāṣā* took many years, more than a generation. It is a fact that of all Kuśāṇa kings only the name of Kaniṣka is well known in Buddhist literature. Kaniṣka at least approved of the sarvāstivāda synod, which was supposed to end the Gandhāran diversity and to stop the new mahāyāna ideas. Buddhism was in the Kuśāṇa empire under Kaniṣka I (134–156), and, of course, much earlier. The *Jñānapraśthāna* and its *Mahāvibhāṣā* established a new, Sanskrit, vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy”, which was “Buddha’s word”, *Buddhabhāṣita*. Also the vinaya was revised and abbreviated to a Sanskrit *Daśabhāṇavāra, Shi Song Lū*

²⁷ In his preface to T. XXVIII 1547 Daoan 道安 mentions three names: Shituopan Shituopan 頓陀槃尼, Daxi 達悉, and Biluoni 輔羅尼. Other sources mention a *vibhāsa* of Manoratha, of Guṇaprabha, of Buddhādāsa, and of Pūrṇa. Cox 1998: 231.

²⁸ Kaniṣka (II) is mentioned in the *Mahāvibhāṣā*. Cox 1998: 232.

²⁹ T. 1821, p. 8 c 6. The gathering is not called *jieji* 結集, common term for *sangīti* but *hui* 會. *Hui* is also used for *sangīti*. It is a typical Japanese habit to refer to the *Mahāvibhāṣā* as “basha” 婆沙. It is unlikely that this phonetic rendering means vaibhāṣika. Those who took part in the gathering were sthāvīras, sarvāstivādins. They may have used non-sarvāstivāda texts (e.g. dharmaupakṣa) to revise. When Paramārtha in his biography of Vasubandhu (T. L 2049, p. 189 a 4-6; Dalia 2002: 41) says that 500 arhats and 500 bodhisattvas were convened, he means sautrāntika bodhisattvas. Pūrṇa was an arhat, and Vasumitra was called bodhisattva. Yaśomitra mentions Pūrṇa as the author of the *Dhātukāya* (Wogihara 1971: 11), not Vasumitra, as the “orthodox” does. It may be remembered that the *Dhātukāya* and chapter four of the vaibhāṣika *Prakāraṇa* are very similar.
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十誦律, T. XXIII 1435. *Avadānas* and *jātakas*, stories, illustrations, were removed, and a shorter vinaya was established by the Vaibhāṣikas. The new Vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy” was not readily accepted in the Gandhāran area, but the Gandhārans, called sautrāntikas ever since the Vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy”, gradually adapted their views to the Kāśmīra “orthodoxy”,30 also slowly adopting Sanskrit, certainly from Gupta times on (fourth century). The first sautrāntika ācārya, Kumāralāta, is mentioned in Dharmatrāta’s *Udāna, Chuyao jing* 出曜經 T. IV 212. This Dharmatrāta, one of the four masters of the *Mahāvibhāṣa*, lived in the second century. Kumāralāta may be a somewhat older contemporary of his.31 Dharmatrāta’s *Udāna* also informs us that *Udāna* is the name of *āṇga* six of the teaching in twelve *āṇgas*, members, the contents of a Kṣudrakapitaka, a fourth Piṭaka.32 Dharmatrāta is known to be a dārṣṭāntika. Dārṣṭāntikas are the sautrāntikas who kept using the old, long vinaya. Sautrāntika and dārṣṭāntika go together as the compound *dharmavi-naya*. From the end of the second century the sarvāstivādins were divided into

---

30 This is obvious in the commentaries on the main Gandhāran texts: *Aṣṭagrantha* and *Hydaya*. E.g. Buddhavarman’s *Vibhāṣa* (T. XXVII 1546) of 439. In this text it is so obvious that one has even thought it was a Gandhāran adaptation of the Kāśmīra text. Cox 1998: 235, 237. It is quite possible that there was more than one version of the *Aṣṭagrantha*. The commentaries on the Bactrian *Hydaya*, i.e. Upāsānta’s (3rd. century) *Hydaya*, but mainly Dharmatrāta’s (early 4th. century) *Miśraka*, show the same evolution. Willemen 2006a: 8-12.

31 T. IV 212, p. 638 b 13, does not give any more information about Kumāralāta’s time. About e.g. Aśvaghoṣa the text says (p. 613 c 21, 616 a 15, 626 a 1) that he is a person of the past (*xiri* 昔日). He is mentioned only a few times in the first chapter: *Aṇītyavarga*. Lin Li-kouang 1949: 303-305, in his remarks about the so-called *Aṇītyatāsutra* (T. XVII 801, by Yi jing 義浄 in 701 A.D.), known as *San Qi jing* 三契经, informs us that this text is mentioned in the *Mahāvibhāṣa* as *San Qi* 三契 (T. XXVII 1545, p. 153 c 19), and also in the mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya. Lin clearly says that the tripartite sūtra, *San Qi jing*, contains Aśvaghoṣa’s work. See also T. LXXXV 2912 *Wuchang San Qi jing* 無常三契經. Aśvaghoṣa’s influence (with a young Kaniṣka I?) is often said to be a reason why Sanskrit was used in the sarvāstivāda synod.

32 T. 212, p. 610 c 11-12, 643 b 25-e 11. See also note 1.
two: vaibhāṣikas and non-vaibhāṣikas, sautrāntika-dārśāntikas. The sarvāstivādins before the Mahāvibhāṣa were all-one might say-sautrāntikas. The sarvāstivādins in Central India, Madhyadeśa, also were non-vaibhāṣikas, eventually called sautrāntikas. E.g. Āśvaghoṣa. A characteristic of the non-vaibhāṣika sarvāstivādins is the fact that they were very eclectic in their meditational practices. They used mahāsāṃghika “emptiness”, and they used Buddhānusmiṃtes in their yogācāra. The sarvāstivāda synod was supposed to definitely “correct” the different sarvāstivāda views. More texts were revised and composed. The Mahāvibhāṣa explicitly quotes five of the so-called six “feet” of the Jñānapratisthāna. It does not attribute any quotation to the Dhātukāya, T. XXVI 1540 Epidamo Jieshen Zu Lun 阿毘達磨界身足論, translated by Xuanzang in 663. All other five “feet” are quoted, sometimes attesting more than one version, e.g. of the Prakaraṇa. Even if the fourth chapter of the vaibhāṣika Prakaraṇapāda is considered to be a version of a Dhātukāya, it still is probable that all six “feet” were established in Kaśmīra


The wumen chan 五門禪, fivefold dhyāna practice, actually a developed abhidharmicprayogamārga, preparatory path, of different masters, was very popular in the Gandhāran area ca. 400 A.D.

34 E.g. Buddhānusmiṃte, a teacher of Vasubandhu, used it in his yoga. See Dharmamitra’s T. XV 619 Wumen Chan jing Yaqiong Fa 五門禪經要用法 of 441. This brings the later anusmiṃte of Amitābha to mind. Is this later practice linked with the sarvāstivāda (and pudgalavāda) belief in an intermediate existence, antarābhava? Some sautrāntikas (esp. in the Bactrian area?) show affinities with pudgalavāda views. It was later even felt necessary by some to append a negation of the pudgala to Vasubandhu’s Kosābhāṣya.

35 Cox 1998: 207.

Puguang’s information about the six “feet” comes from Xuanzang. We are lucky to have this vaibhāṣika information, just before it disappeared in India itself. The information about the Prajñāpatipāda is an exception. Yaśomitra’s and Tibetan information is mūlasarvāstivāda.


For more than one version of the Dhātukāya: Cox 1998: 207. For 2 versions of the Jñānapratisthāna: Puguang T. XLI 1821, p. 8 c 7–9.
after the completion of the *Mahāvibhaṣā*. So, the six “feet” were a collection of revised, eventually enlarged texts. They were part of the “orthodoxy” in the early third century, it seems. At that time and later, certainly till Kumārajīva’s
time, they were a separate collection (*kāya*) of texts. páda, which may mean
“foot”, is often translated as *fen ㄆ*, part, by Paramārtha, who also uses *fen* to
translate *āṅga*, limb. A quarter of a stanza is a páda, or *pada*. Páda just means
“one fourth”. In Buddhist stanzas six pádas are no exception. So, six parts, feet,
constitute a whole, a collection, *kāya*, all by themselves. The six vaibhāṣika
parts, *satpáda* abhidharma, were most probably completed after the
*Mahāvibhaṣā*, early third century. The sarvāstivāda synod certainly lasted a
long time. The importance of this synod for sarvāstivāda history cannot be
exaggerated, but its texts were in China only with Xuanzang. Before that time
the vaibhāṣikas were not important in China. It may also be mentioned that
Kaśmīra became part of *Jibin* during the synod. Because Kaśmīra became the
area of the northwestern “orthodoxy”, *Jibin* may, certainly after 200 A.D., be
used for Kaśmīra, but not only for Kaśmīra. In China the area of *Jibin* remained
the whole northwestern area, of which Kaśmīra was an important part from
the third century on. While the Sanskrit sarvāstivāda “orthodoxy” was being
established in Kaśmīra, Nāgārjuna organized his madhyamaka in Andhra, a
mahāsāṃghika area. Ideas about emptiness, *śūnyatā*, had existed before in the
Gandhāran area, but Nāgārjuna established a mahāsāṃghika group, known to
us as *zhongguanpai* 中觀派, ca. 200 A.D.. This madhyamaka was a group
within the mahāsāṃghika *nikāya*, school, *bu* 部. In a comparable way a specific

---

37 Kumārajīva mentions a body and its meaning, i.e. *(Mahā)* *vibhaṣā*. The 6 “feet” are
mentioned quite separately. Harivarman does the same. See infra. Puguang, T. XLI 1821,
p. 8 c 10-11, says that later masters have established the 6 “feet” of the body
*jñānapraśthāna*. The 6 “feet” and a corpus seem to have separately existed for quite some
time.

38 It may be mentioned that the 6 “feet”, written in Sanskrit in Kaśmīra, remind one of
the 6 limbs of the *Veda*, i.e. the 6 *Vedāṅgas*. Sarvāstivādins develop knowledge, *jñāna*
(veda).
yogācāra group, yuqiexingpai 瑜伽行派 or weishipai 唯識派, consciousness-only group, was formed within the sautrāntika school, jingliang 經量 bu 部, in the fourth, fifth century. They continued the Gandhāran yogācāra tradition, this time taking in the mahāsāṃghika madhyamaka views. Sautrāntikas had been using “emptiness” in their yoga before. They still developed knowledge, jñāna, and they believed in an existing consciousness, viññāna.

3. Fourth till Seventh Century.

Early in the fourth century the Gandhāran Miśrakābhīdharmaḥdaya, T. XXVIII 1552 Za Epitan Xin Lun 雜阿毘昙心論, was composed by Dharmatrāta. The title is indeed Miśraka. Kudara Kōgi found this title in the Uigur translation of Sthiramati’s (470–55039) Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkā Tattvārthanāma in 1982.40 The Uigur translator translated from Chinese, but he used a text such as Yaśomitra’s Vyākhyā (eighth century), where a miśrakakāra41 is mentioned, most probably the author of our text. The title actually means that sautrāntika views are mixed with vaibhāṣika views. Sautrāntikas gradually adapted to the vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy”. Dharmatrāta, also the author of a commentary on Vasumitra’s version of a Pañcavastu,42

39 These dates are given by Nakamura (1980: 280, note 59), based on Ui Hakju’s research.
41 Wogihara 1971: 251.

If the Uigur translator did not find any information about the Sanskrit in e.g. Yaśomitra’s Vyākhyā, he had to guess. An example is Dharmavijaya for Fasheng 法勝, Dharmaśreṣṭhin. Kudara 1982: 373.

42 I.e. the version of the Pañcavastu as established by Vasumitra, 2nd. century. Dharmatrāta’s commentary T. XXVIII 1555 Wu Shi Piposha Lun, 五事 Pañcavastu 希婆沙 vibhaṣa 論, of 663. See Willemen 2006a: 10; Cox 1998: 213–216.
wrote this influential commentary on the Bactrian *Hṛdaya*. It was translated into Chinese by Samghavarman in 435 A.D., and quickly became a basic text for the Chinese abhidharma school, *pitanzong* 昇壇宗, a doctrinal school in southern China. The other central text of the school was the *Aṣṭāgrantha*. In the fifth century abhidharma in China was sautrāntika. When Vasubandhu (ca. 350–430), from Puruṣapura in Gandhāra, wrote his *kārikās*, they were well received in Kaśmīra, but when his *Bhāṣya* came out, it was obvious that he was a sautrāntika. For this work he used the *Miśraka*, going back to the Bactrian *Hṛdaya*, beyond the *Aṣṭāgrantha–Jñānaprasāthāna*. Samghabhadra's reaction in Kaśmīra was fierce. Soon after that, Vasubandhu continued his Gandhāran sautrāntika *yogācāra* tradition, the kind established by Asaṅga. Vasubandhu's *Kośabhāṣya* is an elaborate yoga manual, based on the *Hṛdaya*, a yoga manual. Asaṅga's work also fits in with the *yogācāra* tradition, which often mentions its inspiration from Maitreyā. When Paramārtha translated the *Kośabhāṣya* in 568 A.D., T. XXIX 1559 *Jushe Shi Lun* 俱舍釋論, this text was central for a *kośa* school in China, replacing the old abhidharma school. This Chinese development shows that the *Kośa* is indeed a continuation of the *Miśraka*, of sautrāntika abhidharma. In 654 A.D. Xuanzang brought out his version of the *Kośabhāṣya*, T. XXIX 1558, which replaced the text of Paramārtha. Later, in 793, this “new” *kośa* school merged with the *fajian* 法


45 Kimura 1974: 259 sq.. His complete works contain a reprint of his *Abidatsumaron no Kenkyū* 阿毘達磨論の研究 of 1922, esp. p. 297 sq.

46 Cox 1998: 240–249. Samghabhadra's *Nyāyānusāra*, *Shun Zhengli Lun* 順正理論, T. XXIX 1562, explains the “correct principles”. It is the best known of his texts, “correcting” Vasubandhu's *Kośabhāṣya*.
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Vasubandhu, and Paramārtha and Xuanzang, would have agreed. At the end of the seventh century the Kāśmīra “orthodoxy” disappeared, and old non-vaihāṣikas were renamed mūlasarvāstivādins. They continued dārśṭāntika vinaya, which, of course, had known a long evolution by then. Just as the commentaries on the Hṛdaya and the vibhāṣās on the Aṣṭagrantha grew ever closer to the vaihāṣika views, the old vinaya may have undergone a similar evolution. At the end of the seventh century all sarvāstivādins used Sanskrit. The mūlasarvāstivādins now look more like vaihāṣikas with some sautrāntika characteristics. Is this an important reason for the disappearance of the vaihāṣikas? They were absorbed into the majority of sarvāstivādins. Before the synod there just were sarvāstivādins. During and after the synod there was a split between Kāśmīra vaihāṣika “orthodoxy” and the majority of sarvāstivādins, Gandhāran and Central Indian sautrāntika-dārśṭāntikas, i.e. non-vaihāṣikas. At the end of the seventh century non-vaihāṣikas absorbed the vaihāṣikas and all were called mūlasarvāstivādins. Yaśomitra’s Vyākhyā is an example of this final development. The mūlasarvāstivādins later went to Tibet. Yaśomitra’s and Tibetan information about the sarvāstivāda abhidharma agree. If an

---

48 Sthiramati’s nirākāravāda cittamātra in Valabhi was brought to China by i.a. Paramārtha. This is the “old” cittamātra school, before Kuiji 法基 (632–682). It went to Korea at the end of the 7th century, where the pre-Xuanzang school was known as pópsōng, i.e. faxing 法性, dharmatā, Japanese Hosshō. Hosshō was in Nara Japan (710–784). The putative founder was Wŏnhyo. Dharmapāla’s (ca. 530–561) sakāravāda vijñānāvāda in Nālandā, faxiang 法相, Japanese hossō, was brought to China by Xuanzang, and to Korea by Chinpyo 真表 (fl. 740). There it was known as “new” pópsang. The terms “old” and “new” are used because Xuanzang’s faxiang is more recent than Paramārtha’s work. In Japan hossō is used during Nara, and hossō during Heian. See Willemen Charles. 2005. The Sutra “School” in Nara Japan. Numata Lecture Series. Calgary: University of Calgary; Idem 2006c: 122.

49 Willemen 2006d: 32.

50 He calls the Jñānaprasthāna sarīra, just as the vaihāṣikas did. Wogihara 1971: 9. Also Demiéville 1961: 461.
abhidharma text exists in Tibetan translation, one may reasonably assume at first that it is non-vaihāṣika. It is true that, just before it disappeared in India, Xuanzang introduced vaihāṣika abhidharma to China, and informed Puguang about it. The Prațñaptiśāstra is the exception. Finally, if one calls e.g. a fifth century text mūlasarvāstivāda, one actually means sautrāntika-dārśtāntika.

II Some Sources before Kumārajīva.

While all Gandhāran yogācārabhūmis, yoga manuals, texts about chanshu 禪數, dhyāna numbers, may be objects of study for information about early abhidharmic texts, some non-vaihāṣikas, even mahāsāṃghikas, deserve special attention.

1. An Shigao 安世高 (active ca. 148-170).51

Anxi 安息, Ashkani, is used for the Ashkanian Parthian empire, already during the Former Han. In the second century A.D. An was a surname, ethnicon, to designate people from that empire, West of the Oxus River.52

---


52 Anxi is a phonetic rendering for Ashkani. Pulleyblank 1991: 24, 330.

The first to investigate the surnames of “barbarians” in China, such as Zhu 張, Kang 康, Zhi 支, An 安, etc., in Chinese dynastic histories and in other Chinese literature, was Kuwabara J. in 1925. He says (Kuwabara 1925: 573, 612 etc.) the name An is associated with Bukhara in Sogdiana. Inspired by this study A. Forte investigated the surname An again in 1995. Recently, in 2007, Saitō T. has investigated the terms Anxi and An again. I quote from his conclusions (Saitō 2007: 31-32): “... while the land’Land of Anxi’ ... is well attested since the Former Han, the appellation’ Land of An’ ... seems to have come into existence around the middle of the 6th. century”. Further: “From the Later Han Dynasty to the Period of the Three Kingdoms ... (1st. century–3rd.
Taken together with the style, *zi* 字, Shigao, once again one sees a phonetic rendering for *Ashkani*. As is well known, Chinese sound-translations usually have some meaning too, as is the case with Shigao, "noblest in the world". His Chinese name is Qing 清, Pure. This name probably was given because of the importance of this concept in Zoroastrianism. But Buddhism was present in the eastern part of Parthia. While it is a fact that An Shigao translated sarvástivāda texts, he also brought out a version of a northwestern text century), the surname An … was used by people original from the Parthian Empire. Later on, it appears that Sogdians from Bukhara started to adopt the same surname. Such a situation … may go back as early as to the later half of the 5th century. Sogdians from Bukhara began to borrow the surname An for their convenience and declared themselves to be original from the Land of Anxi“.

Middle Iranian influence in China must have been considerable. Also the Chinese Zhu 竹, used for Indians, is a phonetic rendering of Iranian Hinduka. Pulleyblank 1991: 414.

For the Ashkanian Parthian Empire (247 B.C.–224 A.D.): See the contributions by A. D. H. Bivar and W. Watson in the *Cambridge History of Iran*, Part 3 (1) of 1983. The last king was Ardavan V, Artabanus V (216–224). The succeeding dynasty were the Sasanians. From that time on the term *Bosi*波斯, Persia, appears.

53 See note 16. *Shigao: shka–*.

54 In Zoroastrianism the energy of the creator, Ahura Mazda, is represented by fire and the sun, which are pure and radiant.

55 Harrison 1997: 261, 279–280. See also Vetter and Harrison 1998, for a study of T. I 150 a *Qi Chu San Guan Jing* 七處三觀經 *Saptasthānasūtra*. Further: Zucchetti 2002a: 92, note 104. Zürcher 1991: 297–298, lists 16 titles of texts, which are sure to be the work of An Shigao. Saṁgharākṣa’s *Yogacarabhumi*, T. XV 607, is among them. Saṁgharākṣa was a (sautrāntika) sarvāstivādin from Surāṣṭra, who is said to have been a teacher of a young Kaniṣka. See Willemen 2004: 10–12. Dharmarākṣa brought a second and larger version in 284 A.D., T. XV 606 *Xiuxing Daodi Jing* 修行道地經. The text seems to be mentioned in Dharmatrāta’s *Chuyao Jing*, T. IV 212, p. 655 c and 660 c. See Lin Li-kouang 1949: 322 sq. This *Yogacarabhumi* may have started with a core of about 7 chapters, expanded to 27. Later a mahāyāna appendix was added, chapters 28–30. Dharmarākṣa’s version seems to combine 2 of his texts (1–27, 28–30) into one. Is Saṁgharākṣa already responsible for the core? Or for its expansion?

Zucchetti 2002a: 74, note 4, says that the terminology of the earlier larger versions
which corresponds to chapter six of the Pāli *Petakopadesa*. This text may be of mahāsāṃghika affiliation, going back to Mahākāyāyana. It seems that An Shigao brought out texts which fitted in with the cultural environment of the late Han, a time of Daoist yoga and of the five modes, *wu xing*五行. An Shigao’s disciples preferred to call him bodhisattva. Stressing his mahāsāṃghika side? Wang Bangwei says: “… it is not unusual that masters ..., although they worked more on the texts of Hīnayāna than on those of Mahāyāna, are still followers of the latter”. All of An Shigao’s disciples are known to be followers of mahāyāna, and he himself brought out a text which fits in with mahāsāṃghika *upadeśa* literature. Kang Senghui 康僧會 (second half of the third century in southern China) is a prominent representative of his disciples. It must also be remembered that it is a very common Chinese habit to call excellent teachers bodhisattvas. Does this have anything to do with the existence of a Bodhisattvavipitaka, and eventually also a Dhāraṇīpiṭaka

---

56 Zacchetti 2002a.

57 Zacchetti 2002a: 94, says that An’s disciples considered T. XV 603 one of their main doctrinal sources.


59 Pulleyblank 1962: 247-248, gives some explanatory remarks about Kang. He says the term may come from Tokharian *kaŋka*, meaning “stone”, in a time when the Kangju 康居 people had close links with Dayuan 大宛, and with the Yuezhi 月支. Kangju is also connected with *kangjie* 戰羯 (or *Kamkar*?), the name by which the capital of Shih (Tashkend) is mentioned in 658 A.D. Čača for Tashkend is the Chinese *zhezhi* 柏枝, or *zhezhe* 柏折. Isogai and Yajima 2007: 147, note 27, propose *Kāŋgār*. The term *Kangju* occurs in 131 B.C. in China, in the history of the Former Han. Hulsewé 1979: 124, note 298. The Tashkend oasis along the middle Yaxartes seems to have been important in the 2nd. century B.C. The Chinese “Stone Country” is usually understood as Samarkand. Kuwabara 1925: 617. For the role of Samarkand in Tang China (7th. century and later): E. Schafer’s study of 1963 about the golden peaches (*kanaka*?) of Samarkand.
of the dharmaguptakas in the Gandhāran cultural area? A bodhisattva is, in this case, an excellent preacher, dharmabhānaka, making use of the mnemotechnic means called dhāraṇī. The vinaya of this school was very popular in China, much more and longer than in northwestern India, which may explain why this habit is not popular in India itself. Mahāsāṃghikas, who resemble dharmaguptakas in more ways than one, also had a Dhāraṇīpiṭaka. It is quite possible that a sauṭrāntika sarvāstivādin, influenced by mahāsāṃghika views, is called bodhisattva.

2. Harivarman (ca. 300).

Ilīs Jñānakāyaprodbhūtopadeśa, or just Prodbhūtopadesa, Chengshi Lun 成實論, T. XXXII 1646, Explanatory Discourse: The Corpus of Knowledge Realized, was translated by Kumārājīva in 412. It is the oldest source mentioning the abhidharma with six “feet”. Harivarman was a brāhmaṇa from Central India, converted to sauṭrāntika Buddhism. He is said to have been a follower of Kumāralāta. In Pāṭaliputra he was instructed about “emptiness” by a mahāsāṃghika master. Harivarman may be characterized as sauṭrāntika-bahuśrutīya, much in the same way as that other converted brāhmaṇa from

---

60 Dharmaguptaka is explained in Sengyou’s catalogue, T. LV 2145, p. 20 b 24, in the preface to the Dharmaguptakavinaya, as fuyin fazang 覆隱 (Skt. guhā) 法藏, covering over, hiding, guarding the storehouse of the law, a term which itself is used to translate dharmaguptaka. Sengyou translates fufa 覆法, guarding the law.

They had a Bodhisattvapiṭaka, and, some say, also a Dhāraṇīpiṭaka. See Bārū 1955: 296. All now lost. The bodhisattvas most probably are excellent teachers, dharmabhānaka, who use the mnemotechnic means of dhāraṇīs.

61 Dharmaguptakas disappeared in India in the 6th. century. Lamotte 1988: 538-539. Their influence in India itself can hardly be compared with their influence in China.

62 Bārū 1955: 296. They also had a Kṣudrakapiṭaka, containing vaipulyasūtras. Their Dhāraṇīpiṭaka may have contained mnemotechnic means for preachers. Dharmaguptakas and mahāsāṃghikas are often similar. Tsukamoto 2004: 129.

63 Willemen 2006b, explains the phonetic rendering of the title. For biographical
Central India, Aśvaghoṣa. *Chengshi Lun* mentions the part *Lokasthāna, Loutan* 樂說, of the six “feet”, the abhidharma with six “feet”, the six “feet” of the abhidharma.\(^{64}\) In all these cases the context makes it clear that the *Lokasthānasūtra* is meant. The contexts mention karmic retribution and rebirth in hell. The text also mentions a corpus of the abhidharma, referring to the *Aṣṭagrantha* and its explanation about how urges (*anusaya*) are developed by their object (*ālambana*) or by association (*samprayoga*). Harivarman mentions five Piṭakas, the three plus Kṣudrakapiṭaka and Bodhisattvapiṭaka.\(^{65}\) One should not be surprised when a sautrāntika is called bodhisattva.


Dharmapriya from *Jibin*, the Gandhāran cultural area, helped Saṃghadeva complete his translation of the *Aṣṭagrantha* in southern China in 390. He provided the *hetupratyavarga*, the part about causes and conditions, in the sixth *grantha*, *Indriyagrantha*. Saṃghadeva had forgotten that part. The postface to the text mentions the words of Dharmapriya: “The eight *granthas* are the frame!” One may also translate: “The *Aṣṭagrantha* is a corpus!”\(^{66}\) The postface continues: “There separately are six feet, about a million words. I, Dharmapriya, have recited two “feet”, as yet untranslated”. The length of the “feet” indicates that they were six. The *Lokasthānasūtra* and parts of a *Prakaraṇa* already existed in Chinese translation.\(^{67}\) The two “feet” recited by

---

\(^{64}\) T. XXXII 1646, p. 297 c 7, 300 b 28, 318 c 12.

\(^{65}\) T. XXXII 1646, p. 352 c 14–15.

\(^{66}\) Text of the postface: T. XXVI 1543, p. 887 a 19–25.

The term used for “frame” is *ti 體*. This term is used for the whole corporal frame, and/or for its constituent parts, limbs.

\(^{67}\) For *Lokasthānasūtra*: Infra.

An Shigao is said to have translated texts which, lost in Sengyou’s time, 518 A.D. (T. LV 2145, p. 6 a 3), may be linked with chapters 4 (*saptavastuka*) and 5 (*anusaya*) of
Dharmapriya must have been among the remaining four. So, both Harivarman and Dharmapriya mention a corpus, कृया, i.e. the आस्त्राण्तिक्ष. Dharmapriya, together with Zhu Fonian 竺佛念, had earlier brought out an abstract of the आस्तासाहस्रिकित्व, T. VIII 226 Mohe Bore Chao Jing 摩訶般若鈔經, namely thirteen chapters, closely following Lokâsena’s version, T. VIII 224. E.g. the first chapter is called योगाचार, Daoxing 道行, too.\(^6^8\) Daoan’s “Preface to an Abstract of the महाप्रायवणपरमितासुत्र” in Chang’an, mentions that in 382 he obtained a manuscript of a Larger Prajñāparamitāsūtra, and he had some scholars compare it with the existing Chinese translations.\(^6^9\) Dharmapriya was one of them. He “held the text”, offered by Kumārabuddhi,\(^7^0\) state preceptor of Midi 彌第, ruler of Anterior Jushi 車師前部, i.e. the area of Turfan. The resulting text does not exist now. Dharmapriya did not need a text to recite the आस्त्राण्तिक्ष and two of the yet untranslated “feet”. He apparently was a sāutrāntika, versed in western abhidharmic texts. Both Harivarman and Dharmapriya make it clear that sāutrāntikas also had a corpus, कृया, and six “feet”. They were most likely established during or soon after the vaibhāṣa “orthodoxy”. Their six “feet” were not the revised काश्मिर versions, as the Lokasthānasūtra makes clear,\(^7^1\) but later growing काश्मिर influence is quite probable. E.g. Prakaraṇa. The old translation of 443 by Guṇabhadra and his disciple, Bodhiyaśas, T. XXVI 1541 Zhongshi 眾事 (Prakaraṇa, many subjects, topics) Fen 分 (Pāda) Epitan 阿思毘 Lun 論,\(^a\) Prakaraṇa. See Cox 1998: 218. The title of An Shigao’s lost Saptavastu, Qi Fa (xing) jing 七法 (行) 經, and the title of T. XXVIII 1557, Wu Faxing Jing 五法行經, Pañcaavastu, attributed to An Shigao, go together. These apparently were texts which predate Vasumitra’s differing version of the Pañcaavastu, and of the Dhātukāya. Faxing 法行, Buddhist modes, points to the end of the Han, 2nd. century.\(^6^8\) See note 20.\(^6^9\) Daoan’s preface: T. LV 2145, p. 52 b 8-c 26.\(^7^0\) Willemen 2006a: 4, note 19.\(^7^1\) Lokasthāna and Prajñāaptipāda: Infra.
seems to be a Gandhāran version of the composite Kāśmīra text, as translated later by Xuanzang. T. XXVI 1542, Pinlei 品類 (kinds, classes) Zu 足 (Pāda) Lun 陸.\textsuperscript{72}

III Kumārajīva’s Mahāprajñāpāramitopadesa (T. XXV 1509), 402–February 1\textsuperscript{st}, 406 A.D.

This text is most likely composed by Kumārajīva himself.\textsuperscript{73} He started his work on this text immediately upon his arrival in Chang’an, February 8, 402.\textsuperscript{74} In two places he explains abhidharmic traditions: 1. p.70 a 6–22, b 8–11; 2. p.192 a 28–194 b 1.

1. P.70 a 6–22, b 8–11.\textsuperscript{75}

“Question: The abhidharma in eight granthas, the abhidharma in six parts, etc., where do they come from?

Answer: When Buddha was in the world, the law was not wronged. When the law was compiled for the first time after Buddha’s extinction, it was the same as when Buddha was alive. A hundred years after Buddha\textsuperscript{76} king Asoka

\textsuperscript{72} Explanation of Prakarana-pāda: Cox 1998: 212–221. For Sanskrit fragments: Schmithausen 2000.

\textsuperscript{73} Katō 1996: 56–57.

I presume that the name of Nāgārjuna was added by Kumārajīva out of respect for his spiritual master.

\textsuperscript{74} Ren Jiyu 1985: 761. Kumārajīva arrives in Chang’an on the 20th. day of the 12th. month of Hongshi 弘始 3.


\textsuperscript{76} I usually follow the variant readings of the so-called 3 editions: Sixi ed. 思溪 12th. century, Puning ed. 普寧 end 13th. century, Yongle 永樂 northern ed., 15th. century. These readings are almost always superior, also in most other texts I have read.
held a large five-yearly (pañcavārśika) gathering. Because the great masters of the law had differences in their explanatory discourses, there were names for the different schools (nikāya). The subsequent developments reached the brāhmaṇa man of the path called Kātyāyana. He was wise and his faculties were sharp. He had completely read the tripiṭaka, the scriptural texts and writings, both internal and external. He wanted to explain Buddha’s law, and so he made the eight granthas of the Jñānaprasthānasūtra. The first chapter is about the highest worldly factor (laukikāgradhāma). Later, disciples made a vibhāsa for those who came later and who could not completely understand the eight granthas. Some say that the eight chapters of the third part in the abhidharma in six parts, are called Lokasthānaprajñāptipāda (This is the Lokasthānasūtra, which is the third part among the six parts). It is the work of Maudgalyāyana. Four chapters of the eight chapters of the first part among the six parts, are the work of bodhisattva Vasumitra. Four chapters are the work of arhats in Kaśmīra. The remaining four parts are the work of masters of explanatory discourses. Some say that when Buddha was alive, Śāriputra made the abhidharma in order to explain Buddha’s words. Later the vātsiṭputrīya men of the path recited it. Until this day it is called Śāriputra’s abhidharma. When Buddha was alive, Mahākātyāyana explained Buddha’s words and made a peṭaka (The Chinese for peṭaka is “basket”). Until today it is followed by the masters of explanatory discourses in southern India... (70 b 8–11) three kinds of abhidharma: 1. The corpus of the abhidharma and its meaning, in brief said to be 320,000 words; 2. Six parts, in brief said to be 320,000 words; 3. Peṭaka, in brief said to be 320,000 words. This is the abhidharma”.

---

77 I.e. both Buddhist and non-Buddhist.
78 The text says Jībin, but for the vaibhāśikas this is Kaśmīra.
79 The 3 ed. read “five parts”, referring to the 5 other pādas. It seems that the intended message is that the four remaining pādas are not expanded to eight chapters. They are works of their original “authors”.
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In the Korean edition and in the Taishō edition the last sentence reads: “The peṭaka compares in detail all topics, [so that] they accord with each other by category. It is not abhidharma”\(^\text{80}\). This version makes it clear that peṭaka is different from abhidharma. The so-called three editions refer to all three kinds as three kinds of abhidharma.

Kumārajīva uses the existing Chinese terminology, when available. He uses *grantha* for *skandhaka*, because Saṃghadeva’s text was available. It is also true that he does not explicitly distinguish between the Kāśmīra “orthodoxy” and other sarvāstivādins. He uses *grantha* also for the Kāśmīra text, which he calls *sūtra*. After all, it was Buddha’s word in Kāśmīra. He uses *Fazhi* 發智 for the first time as a translation for *Jñānaprasthāṇa*. Kumārajīva mentions the schism during Aśoka (ca. 264–227 B.C.\(^\text{81}\)). I take it that a hundred years just means a long time, Buddha’s *parinirvāṇa* being ca. 483 B.C.\(^\text{82}\). Later, disciples made a *vibhāṣā*. There were many *vibhāṣās*. Kumārajīva uses the phonetic rendering *Biposha* 碧婆沙, which occurs in Saṃghabhadra’s translation in 383 of Shituopanni’s 屣陀槃尼 (Sitapāṇi or Śītapāṇi?) *Vibhāṣā*, T. XXVIII 1547. Again, Kumārajīva uses existing terminology. When he says: “Some say...”, he means the vaibhāṣikas. The so-called *Prajñāaptipāda*, the third *pāda*, apparently consisted of eight chapters and was called *Loka* (sthāna) *prajñāptipāda*. In Chinese there only exists a second chapter, known as *Kāraṇaprajñāpti*, made after 1004 A.D. by Dharmapāla\(^\text{83}\) (963–1058) and

---

\(^\text{80}\) Zacchetti 2002b: 77–79.

\(^\text{81}\) Narain 1994: 49.


\(^\text{83}\) He is the famous author of the Chinese *Hevajra* *tantra* in 1054–1055. T. XVIII 892. He
Weijing 惟浄, much later than the Tibetan version. The Tibetan contains three parts, known as: Loka, Kārana, and Karmaprajñāpīti. The Chinese, T. XXVI 1538 Shishe Lun 施設 (arrangement, prajñāpīti) 論, adds in an introductory note that the first part is missing in the original Sanskrit. The first part is called Lokaprajñāpīti in the Duijā 對法 (abhidharma) dalun 大論 (mahāśāstra). So, five parts of the eight parts are not transmitted. Lin Li-kouang has investigated the Shishe Lun, and he concludes that the text is just as mahāśāṅghika as it is sarvāstivāda. This agrees with the fact that Puguang mentions Mahākāśyāyana as the author of the version known to Xuanzang. Puguang had his information about the vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy” from Xuanzang, who actually may not have possessed a vaibhāṣika Prājñāpītādā. The mūlasarvāstivāda tradition mentions Maudgalyāyana as the author, just as Kumārajīva does. Why? There are four sūtras in the Chinese canon which are said to be four translations of the same text.

- Shiji Jing 世記經, The Scriptural Text: Explanation of the World. This is the last sūtra, n° 30, of the Chinese Dirghāgama, the work of Buddhayaśas from Jibin, and Zhu Fonian in 413 in Chang’an, T. 11 Chang Ehan Jing 長阿含經. This Dirghāgama is known to be dharmaguptaka. Knowing that Maudgalyāyana is linked with the dharmaguptakas, it is understandable that Kumārajīva and mūlasarvāstivādins give this name as the reputed author of a Lokaprajñāpīti. Ji in the title means jishuo 記說, explanation. This most probably means prajñāpīti, but a form of sthā (sthāna, ṭhāna, ṭhāna), or a compound (e.g. vyavasthāna), are not impossible. Is the title purposely

---


84 Explanation of Prājñāpītādā: Cox 1998: 189-197.
85 T. XXVI 1538, p. 514 a 19.
86 Lin Li-kouang 1949: 137-144.
87 Wogihara 1971: 9, 11. Yaśomitra’s information agrees with the Tibetan information.
88 Ren Jiyu 1985: 45-46.
ambiguous?

- Loutan Jing 樓炭經, T. I 23, translated in the time of emperor Hui 惠, 290-306 A.D. Loutan is a Prākrit form of Lokasthāna. This text mentions eighteen heavens in the material realm, just as Śrīlāta and Sthiramati do. Harivarman considers the text to be one of the sautrāntika “feet”. The note inserted in Kumārajīva’s Upadeśa may be the work of his disciple Sengrui 僧規. It clearly says this is the third of the six “feet”. Sengyou mentions Daoan’s catalogue of 374 A.D. as saying that there was a Loutan Jing of January 27, 303, in the first year of Taian of the Western Jin 西晉太安元年. This text was a part of vantulya, fangdeng 方等, literature, known to us as mahāyāna. In such context Mahākātyāyana is the likely source.

- Qishi Jing 起世經, T. I 24, The Scriptural Text: Origin of the World, translated by the Gandhāran Jñānagupta (526-600) in Luoyang just before his death. Qì means utthāna. Did the so-called Kāraṇaprajñāpti influence the title of this text?

- Qishi Yinben Jing 起世因本經, T. I 25, The Scriptural Text: Causal Base for the Origin of the World. It was brought out early in the seventh century in Luoyang by Dharmagupta. Yinben means sthāna. It seems the title was “corrected” back to Lokasthāna.

There further is Paramārtha’s (499-569) Lishe Epitan Lun 立世阿毘昙論, T. XXXII 1644, of 558 A.D., where lì means qìlì 起立, utthāna. Jñānagupta’s title comes about twenty-five years after Paramārtha’s text. One knows that in the second half of the sixth century the sautrāntika texts were influenced by Kāśmīra “orthodoxy”. It seems that at least the second of the eight chapters of a Prajñāptipāda, presently known as Kāraṇaprajñāpti, about causes, influenced the titles of cosmological texts. Paramārtha’s text counts eighteen heavens in the material realm, just as Śrīlāta and Sthiramati do. Lin Li-kouang thinks that

---

89 Lin Li-kouang 1949: 135, 144-146.
90 T. LV 2145, p. 8 c. 20.
Paramārtha’s text is a version similar to the *Loutan Jing*. He sees quite some mahāsāṃghika influence. Finally, it is noteworthy that the *li* in Paramārtha’s title, meaning *ulthāna*, is ambiguous enough to allow the possibility of *prajñāpti*.

When Kumārajīva mentions Maudgalyāyana as the author of the third *pāda*, this is because Maudgalyāyana is linked with dharmaguptaka cosmology. Combining all information the following picture emerges. The dharmaguptaka cosmology, as found in their *Dirghāgama*, going back to Maudgalyāyana, was used to establish a vaibhāṣika *Lokaprajñāptipāda*. This was expanded to eight chapters in Kaśmīra. Eight seems to be the right number for very important texts there (*Jñānaprasthāna, Prakaraṇapāda*). *Loutan Jing* belongs to a mahāsāṃghika-sautrāntika tradition, going back to Mahākātyāyana. Harivarman uses this text, but certainly not only he. Kumārajīva seems to combine both titles as *Loka* (*sthāna*) *prajñāpti*. The *Lokasthāna* was eventually also expanded to a *Prajñāptipāda* of eight chapters, probably influenced by the sarvāstivāda “orthodoxy”. Its second chapter is Dharmapāla’s translation. Paramārtha’s *Lishi Lun* continues the tradition of the *Loutan Jing*. In Xuanzang’s time the vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy” was nearing its end. The mahāsāṃghika-sautrāntika/mūlasarvāstivāda version, going back to Mahākātyāyana, was now the commonly used version. Xuanzang may not have possessed a vaibhāṣika version.

Kumārajīva tells us that the first *pāda* counts eight chapters, four of which are the work of Vasumitra. He does not say the first four chapters. This *pāda* is the *Prakaraṇa*. Bodhisattva Vasumitra probably was a (sautrāntika) sarvāstivādin, influenced by mahāsāṃghika views. He is the author of a rather polemical T. XXVIII 1549, *Zun Poxumi suo Ji Lun* 尊婆須蜜所集論, sometimes translated as *Āryavasumitra bodhisattvasamgiti*. The Chinese is the work of Saṃghabhadra in 384. Dharmatrāta (early fourth century) says that his

---

91 See note 89.
Pañcavastu is the work of Zunzhe. Kumārajīva says that four chapters of the Prakaraṇapāda (including the Pañcavastu, it seems) are his work. Some chapters of a Prakaraṇa may have been translated by An Shigao as separate texts, but they were lost by the sixth century. Kumārajīva may have known them. An inserted note in Puguang’s commentary says that the Vasumitra of the Prakaraṇapāda and of the Dhātukāya is different from the one of the vibhāṣā gathering. If so, then there were two Vasumitrās, both probably in the second century. But this information is not necessarily correct. A Vasumitra is also mentioned as the author of a Samayabheda-paracanacakra. T. XLIX 2032 Shiba Bu Lun, does not mention any author. It is a translated text wrongly attributed to either Paramārtha or to Kumārajīva. It agrees with chapter fifteen, second volume, of the Mañjuśrikāparipṛcchāsūtra.

---

92 Mochizuki 1960–1963: 2904–2906, distinguishes more than one Vasumitra. Yamada 1959: 391–403, investigates the name Vasumitra. Xuanzang informs us that Vasumitra wanted to gain buddhahood. Yet he was selected to preside at the synod in Kāśmīra. Li Rongxi 1996: 105. T. XVIII 1547, p. 434 a 3, Samghabhadra’s Viśhāṣā of 383 A.D., mentions 被須蜜経云 ... Vasumitra’s sūtra (Cox 1998: 154, note 49, says this is the Prakaraṇa). Vasumitra’s sūtras? A sūtra of Vasumitra? Different translations lead to different conclusions. When Paramārtha in his biography of Vaśubandhu, T. L 2049, p. 189 a 4–6, says that in jibin (Kāśmīra) 500 arhats and 500 bodhisattvas compiled the sarvavāsīvāda abhidharma, a sautrāntika Vasumitra bodhisattva was one of them. Vaśomitra’s mūlasarvavāśīvāda tradition does not mention Vasumitra as the author of the Dhātukāya, as the vaibhāṣikas do, but Pūrṇa, who played a role in the Kāśmīra synod. Tradition mentions a now lost Viśhāṣā by a Pūrṇa (Cox 1998: 231). Pūrṇa was not the great disciple and preacher Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra.

93 T. XLI 1821, p. 8 c 6.

Another inserted note, p. 8 c 3, says that the author of the Vijnānakāya is Tianji 天寂 in Chinese, i.e. Devakṣema. He reportedly wrote the text in Viśoka, between Śrāvastī and Mathurā. Cox 1998: 197. Vaśomitra calls him Devaśarman, just as the Uigur Tattvārtha does. Kudara 1982: 373. Are there 2 sanskritizations of 1 Prakrit name?
T. XIV 468, translated by Sengqiepoluo 僧伽婆羅 from Funan, in 518.\textsuperscript{94} This text does not mention an Indian author. The text is quite different from T. XLIX 2033, \textit{Bu Zhi Yi Lun} 部執異淵, attributed to Vasumitra and traditionally considered to be translated by Paramārtha, between 557–569 A.D., who, by the way, went to China via Funan. Did Paramārtha write his version, based on an earlier Indian text from Funan, and attribute it to Vasumitra? There is also a version by Xuanzang, T. XLIX 2031 \textit{Yi Buzong Lun Lun} 異部宗輪論, of 662 A.D. As so often, he “improves” Paramārtha’s Chinese. Xuanzang’s disciple, Kuijī 窺基 (632–682), used a presently unknown commentary on this text. It seems to me that Paramārtha, who is known to have written short texts himself, attributes this synopsis of the different schools to Vasumitra,\textsuperscript{95} a leading figure of the sarvāstivāda synod. Paramārtha attributes his \textit{Qi Xin Lun} 起信論, T. XXXII 1666 of 553, to Āśvaghoṣa.\textsuperscript{96} Paramārtha may have revised or even composed a Sanskrit text. The contents of the \textit{Qi Xin Lun} express his own belief. For his attributions he goes back to the sarvāstivāda synod. The (sautrāntika) sarvāstivāda-bahuśrutīya Āśvaghoṣa is linked in Buddhist history to a Kaniska (I?) and to

\textsuperscript{94} Sengqiepoluo: Infra.

The attribution of the \textit{Shiba Bu Lun} to Kumārajiva may be explained by the fact that the \textit{Maṇḍūṣrīpāramitācakṣa}, and also Sengqiepoluo’s T. VIII 233, \textit{Maṇḍūṣrīpāramitā Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra} (\textit{Saśāstra}), belong to \textit{prajñāpāramitā} literature. Masuda 1925: 5, identified \textit{Shiba Bu Lun} with \textit{Maṇḍūṣrīpāramitācakṣa} vol. 2. T. XIV 468, p. 501 a 18, chapter 15, called \textit{Fen Bu} 分部, about \textit{sanghabhed}. He finds his information in T. LX 2154, \textit{Kaiyuan Lu} 開元錄 (730 A.D.), p. 621 c 1–6, in an inserted note.

\textsuperscript{95} Cousins 1992: 28, feels that Paramārtha’s text, attributed to Vasumitra, was composed in the 3rd.-4th. century. He calls the text pseudo-Vasumitra. Masuda 1925: 5, 7–8, thinks that Vasumitra is the same as the one of the \textit{Mahāvibhāṣa}, 2nd. century.

\textsuperscript{96} Already in 1929 Demiéville established that this text was wrongly attributed to Āśvaghoṣa. Demiéville 1973: 1–8, esp. 75. A new Japanese edition of the \textit{Qi Xin Lun} was recently published by the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, Academic Frontier Project, as \textit{Bibliotheca Codicologica Nipponica} II, Tokyo 2007: \textit{Dasheng Qi Xin Lun} 大乘起信論.
the synod. The ideas of the Qi Xin Lun may have a sautrāntika origin. By the way, both Vasumitra and Aśvaghoṣa are known as (sautrāntika) bodhisattvas in China.

Kumārajīva informs us that four of the eight chapters of the Prakaraṇapāda are the work of arhats of Jibin, which, in this vaibhāṣika context, is the Kāśmīra part of Jibin. They apparently made a text of eight chapters, just as the Jñānapraṣṭhāna and the Prajñaptipāda. Kumārajīva only mentions the Kāśmīra texts which finally have eight chapters.

Furthermore, Kumārajīva clearly says that Śāriputra is the original authority for sthāvirīya abhidharma. Vātsiputra, who predate Aśoka, and their offshoot, the sāmmitīyas, had a considerable influence in China. They had six destinations, gatis. Their abhidharma was introduced by Saṃghadeva’s Sanfa Du Lun, a text which inspired Huiyuan’s San Bao Lun 三報論, on the three kinds of retribution, on Mount Lu. Kumārajīva mentions another exegetical tradition, going back to another of Buddha’s ten great disciples: Mahākātyāyana. This was not called abhidharma, “about the doctrine” – and dharma means sūtra-, but pēṭaka, “about the (Sūtra) pīṭaka”. Southern India certainly included Andhra, a mahāsāṃghika area, where Nāgārjuna organized his madhyamaka. Kumārajīva himself saw Nāgārjuna as his spiritual master. An explanatory discourse about the Piṭaka is called Peṭakopadeśa. Kumārajīva mentions three kinds, actually two kinds, of abhidharma: 1. The Jñānapraṣṭhāna corpus and its Mahāvibhāṣa; 2. The six “feet” or parts. The Kāśmīra texts are meant. Both kinds are equally long. Both are sarvāstivāda. Kumārajīva does not distinguish between Kāśmīra and Gandhāran sarvāstivādins. The final kind, called pēṭaka, is the mahāsāṃghika exegetical tradition, which, strictly speaking, is not called abhidharma.

97 Willemen 2006a: 7.
Kumārajīva gives a more detailed explanation of three kinds of scholasticism.

Kumārajīva mentions three ways of instruction (dharmaparyāya). He first mentions the mahāsāṃghika peṭaka way. The sarvāstivāda abhidharma way comes second. Kumārajīva studied in Kaśmīra, but ever since his return via Kashgar his convictions belonged to the mahāsāṃghika nikāya. He says upadeśas about the peṭaka way are (too) numerous. After all, he just believed in madhyamaka. The peṭaka way was very elaborate. The number of words, spoken equivalents for zi 字, aksaras, initially was enormous. Kumārajīva offers two ways or methods, gates, men 门, of explanation. Men, in this case, may mean such words as dvāra, vāra, hāra (mode of conveying\textsuperscript{98}). S. Zacchetti has established that the contents of the first “gate”, method, largely

\textsuperscript{98} Hinüber 1996: 78, using Nānamoli’s term.
correspond to the contents of the *Lakkhanañāra* of the Pāli *Petañapadesa*, or of the *Nettipakarana*. For the second “gate” he looks for a corresponding passage of the mentioned Pāli texts in the *Āvatthārā*.* Kumārajiva’s Sanskrit (or Prākrit in this passage?) original was different from the Pāli version. The “method based on characteristics” is translated as *sui xiang men* 随相門. *Sui*, often translating *anu*, may just mean “based on, according with, following”. The “method by opposition” is translated as *duizhi men* 對治門. *Duizhi* usually translates *pratīpākṣa*, antidote, but in this case it probably means *āvartana*, *āvarta*. *Nivartana* is attested, and *pratīpākṣa* also means “opposite”.

It is obvious that there was a pētaka exegetical tradition, most likely mahāsāṃghika, in which numerous *upadesas* were composed. O. von Hinüber, writing about the *Netti*, says:“The text ... was composed with the purpose of systematically developing methods for interpretation ... Thus it may be a manual for commentators ...”. Mahākātyāyana is called *suttavebhāṅgin*, “moulder of guide-lines”.


---

99 Zacchetti 2002b: 69–76. In the course of his study of Dharmarakṣa’s larger version of the *prajñāpāramitā*, this author apparently located in the *Petañapadesa* what Lamotte (1970: 1074, note 2) had earlier pointed out for the first time in 1949.


the brāhmaṇa Wei Zhinan 維祇難, Vighnānta (ka) (?).\textsuperscript{104} It was translated there by Zhu Jiangyan 竇將炎, and also by Zhi Qian,\textsuperscript{105} who most likely revised and enlarged it. This last text is a Dharmapada, enlarged with mainly chapters of a sarvāstivāda Dharmapada.\textsuperscript{106} For the jītuodao, Vīmuktimārga, Lun, authorship is attributed to Youbodisha 優波底沙, Upatiṣṭya, i.e. Śāriputra (?).\textsuperscript{107} It was translated in 515 in Yangdu 揚都 (Jiankang 建康, Nanjing) by Sengqiepoluo 僧伽婆羅 (460-524).\textsuperscript{108} An Indian equivalent may be Saṃghapāla, but Chinese translations are Zhongyang 習養 Saṃghavardhana (?) and, especially, Zhongkai 習釁 Saṃghavarman. Sengqiepoluo can be used for either one. He came from Funan 越南, Bnam, Vietnamese Phù Nam. In the fifth

\textsuperscript{104} T. XLIX 2034, p. 57 a 6, Fei Changfang’s 費長房 catalogue, translates the name as Zāng’ai 障礙, obstacle. Fei’s catalogue is reliable for the translation of Indian names.

\textsuperscript{105} Zhi Qian’s name is linked to two of the possible Pāli texts. See Sengyou’s catalogue T. LV 2145, p. 6 c 11-13, 29. It is not absolutely certain that the original of the texts was Pāli. Another form of Prākrit? The composite nature of T. 210 may be an indication of a Prākrit, common to all composing elements.

\textsuperscript{106} Willemen 1978: XVIII-XIX.

\textsuperscript{107} Taniwa 2001: 10, says that Mizuno Kōgen thinks the text was composed ca. 300 A.D..

Could this yogacāra (abhidharma) text be said to originate with Śāriputra, who initiated sthāviriya śāstras?

\textsuperscript{108} Biographical information in Mochizuki 1960-1963: 3044-3045. He studied abhidharma (yoga manuals ?) in his youth. Being ordained he studied vinaya, and left Funan. He went to Yangdu 揚都 (Jiankang 建康). He became a disciple of Guṇabhadra (394-468), nicknamed Mahāyāna. He apparently was no direct disciple of the master. In 503 the dhyāna master Mantuoluoxian 曼陀羅仙, Mandalavana (?), came from Funan, and they worked together for a while. Sengqiepoluo translated many texts between 506 and 520 in Yangdu. Most of his texts are mahāyāna (T. 233, 314, 358, 468, 659, 984, 1016). Besides T. 430 and 1491, he also supposedly brought out T. L 2043, Aśokarājasūtra, in 512. This text may be called saustrāntika. It mentions that gathās were collected from the Udāna (i.e. saustrāntika anga 6). Thus a Dharmapada was re-established, known to us as Udānavaṅga. Willemen 1978: XXII, and 2006d: 36.

The Vīmuktimārga can be characterized as an abhidharmic yoga manual, very common in northwestern India. Did the translator study this text in his youth in Funan?
century it was a very prosperous kingdom in Cambodia, the lower reaches of the Mekong River. Indian influence was very thorough there and Sanskrit was widely used. Sengqiepoluo studied there (abhidharma and vinaya), and then he went to China, Yangdu. From 506 till 520 he worked in Yangdu, where he died in 524. P. Demiéville has convincingly stated in 1953 that the Chinese *Vimuktimārga* does not have a Singhalese origin. He says the text was introduced in Śrī Laṅkā and used by the abhayagirivāsins. Buddhaghosa’s (ca. 370–450) *Visuddhimagga* is an enlarged version of this text, revised in a mahāvihāravāsa “orthodox” way. I suppose that the *Vimuktimārga* may well be mahīśāsaka. Mahīśāsakas were in Śrī Laṅkā, where Faxian 法顯 (340–420) obtained their vinaya, translated by the Jibin (Gandhāran cultural area) monk Fo Tuoshi 佛廂什, Buddhajīva, in Yangdu, in 424. The mahīśāsakas were in the northwestern area, an area known for its *yogācāra* manuals, and also in Śrī Laṅkā. The *Jietuodao Lun* is a *yogācāra* manual. Mahīśāsaka vinaya was very close to the theravāda vinaya. Circumstances indicate a mahīśāsaka affiliation for the Chinese *Vimuktimārga*, coming from

---


111 Faxian went to India in 399 A.D. to obtain vinaya texts. In Pāṭaliputra he obtained the *Mahāsāṃghikavinaya* and an abstract of a sarvāstivāda vinaya. In Śrī Laṅkā (410–412) he received the *Mahīśāsakavinaya*. The place where he obtained these texts is very relevant. After his return in 414 he translated the *Mahāsāṃghikavinaya*, his *magnum opus*, together with Buddhahadra, T. XXII 1425, in 416. See Mochizuki 1960–1963: 4588; Shih 1968: 108–115; Li Rongxi 2002: 157–214.

For the date of the Chinese *Mahīśāsakavinaya*: Sengyou’s catalogue T. LV 2145, 21 a 14.

112 T. XXII 1421 *Mishasaibu Hexi Wu Fen Lu* 彌沙塞部和雚五分律. For the strange addition *Hexi* Ono 2000: X p. 312, says that U. Wogihara explains these 2 syllables as phonetic renderings of *vahi*, meaning mahīś(a)saka, inserted at a later date.

113 For the existence of *yogācāra* texts in Śrī Laṅkā: Crosby 2005.

Funan. The text mentions Peṭakopadeśa, making it clear that mahīśāsakas were not immune to useful mahāsāṃghika ideas.\textsuperscript{115} T. 1462 is usually said to be a translation of the Pāli Samantapāsādikā. It was translated in 488 by Saṃghabhadra in Guangzhou,\textsuperscript{116} formerly also known as Panyū 番禺. Already in 1933 Nagai Makoto expressed doubts about Pāli being the language of the original of the Chinese text.\textsuperscript{117} Mizuno Kōgen in 1954 says that Shanjian means Pasādikā.\textsuperscript{118} However, vibhaṣa (not e.g. vibhāga) is a very northwestern term. A Chinese co-translator, Sengyi, 僧猗 or 慎禪, thought, as a Chinese monk in the fifth century would, that the text was a commentary on dharmaguptaka vinaya. A. Hirakawa developed this idea and he says that there is considerable dharmaguptaka influence.\textsuperscript{119} Added during the translation process? Furthermore, the Chinese mentions five āgamas. The mahīśāsakas had five āgamas.\textsuperscript{120} It is not impossible that the Chinese had a mahīśāsaka original from Funan, or beyond.\textsuperscript{121}


Saṃghabhadra was from Central Asia (Xiyū 西域). He went South, and from there to Guangzhou. It is known that mahīśāsakas were in northwestern India, in the Gandhāran cultural area, and also in Śrī Laṅkā.

\textsuperscript{117} Nagai 1975: 1.

\textsuperscript{118} Mizuno 1954: 20. He translates: “Good-looking”.

\textsuperscript{119} Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: L-LIII (LIX). These authors suppose that Saṃghabhadra was a dharmaguptaka monk. See also Mizuno 1954: 19.

\textsuperscript{120} 4 + Kṣudraka., certainly not theravāda. See Bareu 1955: 182. The Chinese mentions the 5: Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 9, 16. These authors consider this a mistake. They further say (p. 549, note 32) that the 6 poṣadha days agree with the mahīśāsaka vinaya.

\textsuperscript{121} Faxian obtained their vinaya in Śrī Laṅkā in 410–412. The southern branch of the mahīśāsakas was known to Buddhaghosa. Mahīśāsakas were in the Gandhāran area, in Uḍḍiyāna, in 490. Bareu 1955: 182–183. Also Paramārtha and Xuanzang speak of mahīśāsakas, and of later differentiated doctrines of the mahīśāsakas. Tsukamoto 2004: 127.
I would further like to mention a Netripada, mentioned in both Chinese translations of the Kosabhāṣya, and also in Paramārtha’s translation of the Sidi Lun 四諦論, T. XXXII 1647, of Vasuvarman. Paramārtha’s Kosabhāṣya says that bhadanta Upagupta made the Daoi Zu Lun 道理足論, Netripada,\textsuperscript{122} and that the vaibhāṣīka masters from Ji-bin (i.e. Kaśmīra, at the time the most important part of Ji-bin) had different opinions.\textsuperscript{123} Xuanzang’s Kosabhāṣya mentions a Limu Zu Lun 理目足論, Netripada, of Upagupta, which has different views from the vaibhāṣīka masters of Kaśmīra, Jiashimiluo 迦濕彌羅.\textsuperscript{124} Xuanzang uses the term li (netri) mu (netra, netri), “list of principles”. Zu means pada, or pāda. Buddhaghosa’s Visuddhimagga does not mention a Nettipakarana.\textsuperscript{125} Paramārtha’s Sidi Lun gives the same information as his Kosabhāṣya.\textsuperscript{126} This Netripada may have been a northern text, belonging to a mahāsāṃghika peṭaka tradition. The Chinese terms Zu Lun also convey the idea of “basic text”, reminding one of the six “feet”. This Netripada may have belonged to one group of northern mahāsāṃghikas, different from other similar groups, who had peṭakopadeśas. Kumārajīva says upadeśas were numerous. Paramārtha’s Sidi Lun shows considerable mahāsāṃghika influence. It mentions abhidharma and peṭakopadeśa side by side, as if

\textsuperscript{122} It is hard to believe that this Upagupta is the 5th. patriarch of sarvāstivādins, contemporary of Aśoka, who transmitted their vinaya in Mathurā. Huiyuan, who probably had his information from Buddhahadra, informs us that all five schools after Upagupta had their dhyāna texts (in Ji-bin ?). See Willemen 2004: 22, note 72. The mahāsāṃghikas were one such school. Is this the reason why Upagupta is mentioned here? Or is he rather a mahāsāṃghika Upagupta, contemporary with the sarvāstivāda synod (ca. 200 A.D.), who made a text with a title to match the sarvāstivāda “feet”?

\textsuperscript{123} T. XXIX 1559, p. 183 c 1-2.

\textsuperscript{124} T. XXIX 1558, p. 25 a 27.

\textsuperscript{125} Hinüber 1996: 125.

\textsuperscript{126} T. XXII 1647, p. 390 b 1.

\textsuperscript{127} T. XXXII 1647, p. 379 a 14, mentions abhidharma and peṭakopadeśa side by side. See also p. 381 b 15, 394 c 27. The term Zanglun 藩論, possibly Peṭakopadeśa, often occurs: p. 380 b 18-19, 382 b 16, 398 c 12. Śāriputra is often mentioned as the authority for
transcending the sectarian divide.\textsuperscript{127} It mentions the authority of Mahākātyāyana. It further says: “Sautrāntika masters also give this explanation”,\textsuperscript{128} as if the text itself were not sautrāntika. The least one can say is that the text presents views of different mahāsāṃghikas, and also of sautrāntikas.

b. P.192 c 8-9, c 20.

“Why the term abhidharma gate? Buddha himself has expounded the meaning of factors, or Buddha himself has expounded the names of factors and his disciples have made several collections explaining the meaning... Distinguishing the characteristics and the meanings one by one, this is\textsuperscript{129} called the abhidharma gate.”

After the pāṭhaka way, gate, Kumārajīva explains the way of sthāvirīya, especially of sarvāstivāda abhidharma. This is Buddha’s word, as in Kaśmīra, but he does not exclude the works of scholars, sautrāntika works.

c. P.192 c 21.

“The gate of emptiness means the emptiness of beings and the emptiness of factors”.\textsuperscript{130}

Kumārajīva does not begin the explanation of this way, gate, with the same introductory question as for the first two ways. After all, the two important exegetical traditions have been explained. Now follows an explanation which will lead to madhyamaka. Kumārajīva explains the two emptinesses in detail. This is an explanation of Buddhayaṇa, i.e. mahāyaṇa.

d. P.194 a 28-b 1.

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{127} T. XXXII 1647, p. 394 c 26, for Mahākātyāyana, and p. 396 a 28, for a sautrāntika view.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Varia lectio 3 editions.
\item \textsuperscript{130} I.e. jata. and dharmaśunyatā.
\end{footnotes}
“If one has not obtained the method of *prajñāpāramitā* and enters through the abhidharma gate, one falls into existence. If one enters through the gate of emptiness, one falls into non-existence. If one enters through the peṭaka gate, one falls into existence and non-existence.”

The *prajñāpāramitā* way is the middle way of madhyamaka. One falls neither into existence nor into non-existence. As already mentioned, madhyamaka is a specific group of mahāsāṃghikas in southern India, rivals of the vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy” to the North. But there were many kinds of mahāsāṃghikas, and numerous *Peṭakopadeśas*. Kumārajīva’s own text was a mādhyamika *Upadeśa*. One of his loyal disciples, Sengzhao 僧肇 (374–414), is traditionally said to have composed a *Baozang Lun* 寶藏論, T. XLV 1857.131 Whoever composed the text in China, the title means *Peṭakopadeśa* in Sanskrit, introducing a purely Chinese peṭaka way. As so often is the case, the “wrong” attribution occurred for a good reason.

By way of conclusion one may say that Kumārajīva informs us about the sarvāstivāda corpus and about the six “feet”. He mentions these two quite separately. The sthāvirīya exegetical tradition about the doctrine, which includes vātsīputrīyas, goes back to Śāriputra. There is another exegetical tradition, going back to Mahākātyāyana. This tradition is most probably mahāsāṃghika, and offers guide-lines for the interpretation of sūtras. It is the peṭaka tradition, in which numerous *Upadeśas*, explanatory discourses, were composed. The madhyamaka way, the middle path, holds the middle between the two extremes of existence (sarvāstivāda, śrāvakayāna) and non-existence (Buddhayāna). It is also different from peṭaka methods. It is one group within the mahāsāṃghika *nikāya*.

---

131 Mizuno 1961: 22–23, clearly says that this text is not by Sengzhao. The text existed prior to Xuanzang. Chan circles in Tang China are responsible for the attribution, which may have started with Zongmi 宗密 (780–841).
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