

CHARLES WILLEMEN

## Remarks about the History of the Sarvāstivāda Buddhism

### Abstract

Study about the history of a specific Buddhist monastic lineage known as “Sarvāstivāda” based on an overview of the history of its literature.

**Keywords:** Sarvāstivāda, Buddhism, schism, Mahāyāna, Abhidharma, India, Gandhāra

All scholars agree that the Sarvāstivāda (“Proclaiming that Everything Exists”) Buddhism was strong in India’s north-western cultural area. All agree that there was the first and seminal schism between the Sthaviravāda and the Mahāsāṅghika. However, many questions still remain to be answered. For instance, when did the first schism take place? Where exactly in India’s north-western area? We know what the Theravāda tradition has to say, but this is the voice of just one Buddhist tradition.

### *Jibin* 罽賓

The Chinese term *Jibin* is used to designate the north-western cultural area of India. For many years it has been maintained by Buddhist scholars that it is a phonetic rendering of a Prakrit word for Kaśmīra. In 2009 Seishi Karashima wrote that *Jibin* is a Chinese phonetic rendering of Kaśpīra, a Gāndhārī form of Kaśmīra.<sup>1</sup> In 1993 Fumio Enomoto postulated that *Jibin* is a phonetic rendering of Kapiśa (Kāpiśī, Bagram).<sup>2</sup> Historians have long held a different view. In his article of 1996 János Harmatta said that in the seventh century *Jibin* denoted the Kapiśa-Gandhāra area.<sup>3</sup> For this opinion he relied on

<sup>1</sup> Karashima 2009: 56–57.

<sup>2</sup> Enomoto 1993: 265–266.

<sup>3</sup> Harmatta (1996) 1999: 371, 373–379.

Édouard Chavannes's work published in 1903. In this work Chavannes refers to the Song encyclopaedia *Ce fu yuan gui* (冊府元龜) of 1005–1013 A.D., which contains a list of areas subjected to the Türk *yabghu* of Tokharistan. One of those areas, by the way, is Fanyan guo (帆延國), which is the Chinese name for Bamiyan. In this encyclopedia *Jibin* is also mentioned.<sup>4</sup> In A. Herrmann's widely used historical atlas of China, published in 1935 (new edition 1966), *Jibin* is identified with Kapiśa on the map of China in Central Asia in 660 A.D.<sup>5</sup> In my publications<sup>6</sup> I maintain that *Jibin* originally was the Gandhāran cultural area, which included Bactria. The term is not a phonetic rendering, but actually refers to the area of Uḍḍiyāna (the Swat Valley) from where foreigners (*bin*, 賓) came with their esteemed cloths (blankets, *ji*, 罽).<sup>7</sup> The Chinese used the term to refer to foreigners who came from across the Karakorum Mountains. The term is found in the official *History of the Former Han* (206 B.C.–8 A.D.), which was completed around 120 A.D. The term *ji* (blanket) occurs in the explanation of the area of *Jibin*.<sup>8</sup> Thus the term *Jibin* precedes the introduction of Buddhism in China. The area of Uḍḍiyāna probably encompassed the region in which the so-called Gāndhārī *Dharmapada* was composed in the second century A.D. This text was found in Hotan (和田), and it is of Dharmaguptaka affiliation.<sup>9</sup> Even Xuanzang (玄奘, 602–664 A.D.), who travelled in India and Central Asia *circa* 629–645 A.D., still mentions the presence of Dharmaguptakas in Uḍḍiyāna. He also mentions the presence of Mahāsāṅghikas, Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyas, and Sarvāstivādins.<sup>10</sup>

The *Mahāvāṇija Jātaka* (Book XIV, *jātaka* 493) says: *kāsikāni ca vatthāni uddiyāne ca kambale* – “While Kāśī was famous for its silk, Uḍḍiyāna was famous for its blankets (*kambala*).” The term *ji* means *kambala*. In Buddhist texts translated into Chinese at a later period, the term *kambala* is represented by the term *he* (褐) or *hezi* (褐子). The area stretching beyond Uḍḍiyāna was Gandhāra. From the Gandhāran area there was relatively easy access to Hotan. During the Kuṣāṇa period, first to third century A.D.,<sup>11</sup> the route between Uḍḍiyāna and Hotan was frequently travelled. In the third century, Chinese (e.g. Zhu Shixing, 朱士行) went to Hotan to study Indian literature on the perfection of wisdom (*prajñāpāramitā*), which is of Mahāsāṅghika affiliation. Chinese were interested in this literature. Gandhāra was largely dominated by the Mahāsāṅghikas. The area to the west of the Khyber Pass was also part of the Gandhāran cultural area. Chinese know that area as Daxia (大夏). Chinese were inclined to think that their first

<sup>4</sup> Harmatta (1996) 1999: 371 n. 12. The author refers to É. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux. Recueillis et commentés, suivis de notes additionnelles*. (Présenté à l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg le 23 Août 1900.) Vol. 6. St. Petersburg, 1903.

<sup>5</sup> Herrmann 1966: 32.

<sup>6</sup> Willemen 1998: 83; 2008: 39; 2012a: 483.

<sup>7</sup> Willemen 2012a: 483.

<sup>8</sup> Hulswé 1979: 106, esp. n. 218.

<sup>9</sup> Edited by J. Brough in 1962. See Willemen 2013a, Introduction and n. 19.

<sup>10</sup> Li Rongxi 1996: 84.

<sup>11</sup> Golzio 2008: 89 presents a chronological table for the Kuṣāṇa period, from the first century to the middle of the third century A.D.

royal dynasty called Xia, moved westward when it came to an end in China in the eleventh century B.C.<sup>12</sup> Daxia, Greater Xia, may be translated as Bactria. It formed the western part of traditional *Jibin*, and it was mainly a Sarvāstivāda territory. But Puḍgalavāda,<sup>13</sup> Dharmaguptaka, Mahāsāṅghika, and others were also present there. From this area the Indians crossed over the Pamirs, called Onion Range, *Cong Ling* (蔥嶺) in Chinese, to Kashi (喀什, Kaxgar), and further to Kuqa (庫車). This road was much travelled e.g. in the fourth century. Such scholars as Saṅghadeva, Saṅghabhadra,<sup>14</sup> Kumārajīva, and Buddhābhadrā may have travelled east along this road. Traditional *Jibin* was the cultural area of Gandhāra. Its westernmost part, Bactria, was also the westernmost part of *Xiyu* (西域), the Western Regions, i.e. Central Asia, the area west of Dunhuang (敦煌). An Indian said to come from *Jibin* and from *Xiyu*, was a Bactrian.

During the reign of Kaniṣka (155–ca. 179 A.D.),<sup>15</sup> about 160–170 A.D., a Sarvāstivāda synod was held in Kaśmīra. This synod established a shorter *vinaya* and a new *abhidharma* in Sanskrit. In the Gandhāran cultural area was used Gandhārī language, written in Kharoṣṭhī script. Traditional Sarvāstivādins had a long *vinaya*, transmitted by Upagupta from Mathurā.<sup>16</sup> It contained many stories, *drṣṭāntas*, illustrating the rules. That is why the traditional Sarvāstivādins could be called Dārṣṭāntikas. Their new version of *vinaya*, devoid of most of the stories and much briefer, composed in Sanskrit, was called *Daśabhāṅavāra*, the *Vinaya in Ten Recitations* (十誦律 *Shi song lü*, T. XXIII 1435). The rules however remained unchanged. The main Gandhāran *abhidharma* text, the *Aṣṭagranthaśāstra* of Kātyāyanīputra, *Treatise with Eight Compositions* (八犍度論 *Ba jian du lun*, T. XXVI 1543), translated into Chinese by Saṅghadeva, was rewritten in Sanskrit and called *Jñānaprasthānaśāstra*, *Treatise: Development of Knowledge* (發智論 *Fa zhi lun*, T. XXVI 1544); it was translated into Chinese by Xuanzang in 657–660 A.D. So, a new *vibhāṣā*, or a commentary, was needed. This was the Sanskrit *Mahāvibhāṣāśāstra*, or *Treatise: Great Commentary* (大毗婆沙論 *Da piposha lun*, T. XXVII 1545). Therefore from now on, following the name of this text the new “orthodoxy” in Kaśmīra became known as

<sup>12</sup> One may also think of the Western Xia, Xi Xia, the Tanguts (1032–1227 A.D.). Not only the ancient Xia are supposed to have migrated westward, also the Qin (秦, 221–206 B.C.) were supposed to have done so.

<sup>13</sup> The “Personalists” are the Vātsīputrīyas, later known as Sāṃmitīyas. Saṅghadeva translated their *San fa du lun* (三法度論, *Tridharmakhaṇḍa(ka)śāstra*(?)), *Segments of the Three Factors*, into Chinese (T. XXV 1506). The three factors, *dharma*s, are: *guṇa* (qualities), *doṣa* (evil), *āśraya* (basis, i.e. the body). Each factor consists of three parts, forming an *abhidharma* with nine characteristics. The text was translated on Mt. Lu in 391 A.D., and inspired Sengyou’s (僧祐) *Hong ming ji* (弘明集, T. LII 2102, 34bc), where we read Huiyuan’s (慧遠) *San bao lun* (三報論), about the three kinds of retribution (Willemsen 2006 a:7; 2008: 37–38). Puḍgalavāda was quite strong in Bactria, with close links to Sarvāstivāda there. It was later even thought necessary to add a refutation of the *puḍgala* (person) as the ninth chapter of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, which was an elaboration of the Bactrian *Abhidharmahrdaya*.

<sup>14</sup> Sengqie Bacheng or Badeng (僧伽跋澄). The name means *Zhongxian* (眾賢), and it is not equivalent to Saṅghabhūti. He probably came to Chang’an from the area of Bactria about 380 A.D. He translated the *Udāna* (出曜經 *Chuyao jing*, T. IV 212) in 399 A.D., and the *Vibhāṣā(śāstra)* (鞞婆沙論 *Biposha(lun)*, T. XXVIII 1547), a commentary on the *Aṣṭagrantha*, in 383 A.D.

<sup>15</sup> Golzio 2008: 89.

<sup>16</sup> Lamotte 1988: 174.

Vaibhāṣika.<sup>17</sup> Six more existing texts, rewritten and eventually enlarged, were added to the *Jñānaprasthāna*, forming as it were its parts, *padas* or *pādas*. The term *pāda* or *pada* just means “part”, usually one fourth, but Xuanzang uses the term *zu* 足, which usually means “foot”, but which may mean also “part” (usually “one fourth”).<sup>18</sup> Because the *Mahāvibhāṣā* does not quote the *Dhātukāyaśāstra, Treatise: Corpus of Elements* (界身論 *Jie shen lun*, T. XXVI 1540), which belongs to those six parts, it seems that this text may have been completed later, perhaps in early third century(?).<sup>19</sup> The new “orthodoxy” of seven texts claimed that they were proclaimed by the Buddha (*buddhabhāṣita*) in heaven. The traditional Sarvāstivādins did not believe that. For them only the *sūtras* of the *āgamas* (traditions) were proclaimed by Buddha. That is why the term Sautrāntikas is used for them. The terms Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika go together like the compound *dharmavinaya*.<sup>20</sup> Throughout the history, however, the term Sarvāstivāda may be used, because their heterogeneous groups all agreed on *sarvāstivā*. But they did not agree what *sarvam* (‘everything’) and even *asti* (‘is’) really meant.<sup>21</sup> Thus, Sarvāstivādins were split into two main groups at the end of the second century A.D.: 1. new “orthodoxy” in Kaśmīra; and 2. heterogeneous groups of traditional Sarvāstivādins. The traditional groups were located in Gandhāra (Bactria) and in northern India (Magadha). Because Kaśmīra was the area of the “orthodoxy” in the north-west, it became a very prominent part of *Jibin*.<sup>22</sup> In China Sautrāntikas were *the* Sarvāstivādins. Their *abhidharmaśāstras* offered manuals instructing monks how to become an arhat. They followed the brief *Daśabhāṣanavāra*. That is why the term *Jingliang* (經量), Sautrāntika, is well known in China, whereas the Chinese term for Dārṣṭāntika, *Piyuzhe* (譬喻者), is much less known. The Vaibhāṣika *abhidharma* was brought to China by Xuanzang in the seventh century, just before it lost its position to the non-Vaibhāṣikas in India. Nālandā was under a non-Vaibhāṣika influence not only in the time of Xuanzang. About 700 A.D. Sarvāstivādins were united again, now they were also called Mūlasarvāstivādins. Their *vinaya* was very extensive as it contained numerous stories.<sup>23</sup> This *vinaya* had by then a very long development. Vaibhāṣikas now looked like one more group of traditionally

<sup>17</sup> Willemen 2008a: 39–41.

<sup>18</sup> Willemen 2008a: 47.

<sup>19</sup> Willemen 2008a: 46–47.

<sup>20</sup> Willemen 2008a: 45.

<sup>21</sup> Willemen 2008a: 41. Does “everything” mean all factors [*dharmā*]? If so, how many? Or does it mean all aggregates (*skandha*)? And what precisely means “is”: When? Present and past are relatively easy to understand but the future?

<sup>22</sup> Willemen 2008a: 71. Xuanzang uses *Jibin* for Kaśmīra, the area of Sarvāstivāda “orthodoxy” since the third century.

<sup>23</sup> The term Mūlasarvāstivāda appears after Xuanzang left India and before the arrival of Yijing (義淨), i.e. towards the end of the seventh century. The extensive Mūlasarvāstivāda *vinaya*, as it was preserved in e.g. Tibetan version, may be regarded as a continuation of the *vinaya* practiced by Dārṣṭāntikas. A long time has passed from Upagupta to the eighth century A.D. The bulky *vinaya* certainly was subject to a very long development. It should be reminded that the non-Vaibhāṣikas were by no means uniform.

heterogeneous Sarvāstivādins. This kind of Sarvāstivāda Buddhism spread to Tibet and then to Mongolia.

### The Basic Schism

The Theravāda tradition recognizes the second synod, *saṅgīti*, which took place in Vaiśālī. In fact, there was discord, but at the end there was no schism. The Theravāda tradition then mentions the third synod during Aśoka's reign (ca. 264–227 B.C.) in Pāṭaliputra. Only Sthaviras seem to have participated. The basic schism seems to have taken place before Aśoka and after the Vaiśālī synod. The schism seems to have taken place in Pāṭaliputra during the reign of Mahāpadma Nanda (ca. 340 B.C.).<sup>24</sup> A schism can only occur due to a disagreement about *vinaya* rules. But it is quite possible that there were considerable doctrinal differences in the *saṅgha*, which have led also to a *vinaya* disagreement. We do not know what kind of the doctrinal disagreements were at that time. We only have an idea of what happened later. One group, the Sthaviravāda, claimed the factors (*dharmas*) to be existent. This group had as its religious goal to become an arhat, and their texts taught a long road to arhatship, based on the four noble truths. Their teachings they said to come from Śāriputra. The other group, the Mahāsāṅghikas, emphasized the six perfections, and especially the perfection of wisdom, *prajñāpāramitā*. They proclaimed emptiness of all things and they strove for the perfect enlightenment of a Buddha. Their texts outlined even a longer path of realization to become a bodhisattva.<sup>25</sup> This group was in the majority. It seems that the sthaviras, or elders, wanted to keep the Order in unity by adding some minor rules to the *vinaya*, but the majority did not agree. In result there was a schism. W. Pachow's comparative study of the *prātimokṣas*, the basic set of rules for the monks, confirms that the *vinaya* of the Mahāsāṅghikas, as we have it in Chinese translation, is very old.<sup>26</sup> The Theravāda *vinaya* is ancient too.

The *Śāriputrapariṣchāsūtra*, or *Canonical Text about the Questions of Śāriputra* (舍利弗問經 *Shelifu wen jing*, T. XXIV 1465), which exists only in a Chinese version of the Eastern Jin (東晉, 317–420 A.D.), a text of Mahāsāṅghika affiliation, confirms that the Mahāsāṅghika *vinaya* is ancient. Thus, a *vinaya* disagreement directly led to the first schism, even though it may have been also the result of other disagreements. The Buddhist Theravāda tradition mentions that five points raised by a certain Mahādeva were the cause of the split, but it seems likely that a Mahādeva played a role in the further splitting up of Mahāsāṅghikas later in Andhra. Aśoka's synod was a Sthaviravāda synod. The winners during the synod called themselves Vibhajyavādins, analysts, or distinctionists. The Pudgalavāda Vātsīputrīyas had left the main group somewhat earlier. A. Bareau defined Vibhajyavādins as the non-Vātsīputrīya sthaviras who opposed Sarvāstivāda

<sup>24</sup> Willemen 2012b: 1.

<sup>25</sup> Willemen 2012b: 2–3. There is definitely a link between the path of an arhat (Sthaviravāda) and the path of a bodhisattva (originally Mahāsāṅghika).

<sup>26</sup> Willemen 2012b: 1, referring to research of Pachow 1955.

ideas.<sup>27</sup> Accordingly, meant are the later Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, and the Śrī Laṅka Theravādins. I have proposed that the Vibhajyavādins were called Mahīśāsakas, “converting or instructing the earth”, i.e. India, when they spread all over India, from Gandhāra to Śrī Laṅkā. Theravāda Buddhism was a conservative movement in Śrī Laṅkā, which reacted against the Mahīśāsakas, who were present on the island but who kept stronger position in south India. It also reacted against the views of the continental Mahāsāṅghikas.<sup>28</sup>

The Mahāsāṅghikas used the term Mahāyāna with regard to their form of Buddhism.<sup>29</sup> They regarded Mahākātyāyana as their ultimate source of wisdom.<sup>30</sup> The Mahāsāṅghika versus Sthaviravāda rivalry throughout the history of Buddhism is more important than the so-called Mahāyāna (Great Vehicle) – Hīnayāna (Lesser Vehicle) division. Both groups used successful ideas of their antagonists, a fact which can be observed in the meditation manuals, texts about the practice of yoga, *yogācāra*.<sup>31</sup> Asaṅga (second half of the fourth century) was a Mahīśāsaka monk who continued Gandhāran Sautrāntika *yogācāra*, adopting the Mahāsāṅghika Madhyamaka conception of emptiness. Sino-Japanese “Pure Land” Buddhism seems to have originated in Bactrian Sautrāntika circles, in reaction to the Lokottaravāda Mahāsāṅghika idea of a Buddha land, *Buddhakṣetra*.<sup>32</sup> Therefore there is also a Sarvāstivāda Mahāyāna. No wonder that the term Hīnayāna is far less frequent.

### Sarvāstivāda *Abhidharma*

During the synod in Kaśmīra (second half of the second century) the new Vaibhāṣika “orthodoxy” established a Sanskrit *abhidharma*, proclaimed by the Buddha, and consisting of seven (i.e. six plus one) texts.<sup>33</sup>

Puguang (普光, fl. 645–664 A.D.), a disciple of Xuanzang, gave the following information about the six parts (“feet”) of the “orthodox” Sarvāstivāda *abhidharma* in his commentary on Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* (俱舍論記 *Jushe lun ji*, T. XLI 1821, p. 8b26–c6). Puguang’s information probably comes from his master Xuanzang, who translated the Vaibhāṣika texts into Chinese:

1. *Saṅgītiparyāyapāda-śāstra* by Śāriputra (T. XXVI 1536, from 663 A.D.).
2. *Dharmaskandha*<sup>o</sup> by Mahāmaudgalyāyana (T. XXVI 1537, from 659 A.D.).

<sup>27</sup> Bareau 1955: 169, 206.

<sup>28</sup> Willemen 2012a: 481, 491.

<sup>29</sup> Willemen 2012b: 3, 10.

<sup>30</sup> Willemen 2008a: 67.

<sup>31</sup> Willemen 2012b: 8–11.

<sup>32</sup> The Lokottaravāda Mahāsāṅghikas may have developed the idea of Buddha fields, Buddha not being restricted to one earthly existence. In Gandhāra, the eastern part of traditional *Jibin*, the concept of Akṣobhya’s paradise *Abhirati* was developed. Immediately after that the Sarvāstivādins (and Puḍgalavādins) in Bactria, the western part of traditional *Jibin*, developed the concept of intermediate existence (*antarābhava*) as their paradise, Sukhāvātī, the so-called Pure Land. Already in Kuṣāṇa times both paradises occur side by side in the same texts. See Willemen 2013b.

<sup>33</sup> Lamotte 1988: 184–185.

3. *Prajñapti*° by Mahākātyāyana (T. XXVI 1538, not translated by Xuanzang).
4. *Vijñānakāya*° by Devaśarman (提婆設摩 Tipo Shemo. This is translated as *Tianji* 天寂, *Devaśama*?) (T. XXVI 1539, from 649 A.D.).
5. *Prakarāṇa*° by Vasumitra (T. XXVI 1542, from 660 A.D.).
6. *Dhātukāya*° by Vasumitra (T. XXVI 1540, from 663 A.D.).

According to Yaśomitra's (eighth century) *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* ad I.11 the *abhidharma* works were composed by the following authors: no. 1 by Mahākausthila, no. 2 by Śāriputra, no. 3 by Maudgalyāyana, no. 4 by Devaśarman, no. 5 by Vasumitra, and no. 6 by Pūrṇa.<sup>34</sup>

Xuanzang may not have had an Indian text of the *Prajñapti*°. The text catalogued in Taishō vol. XXVI no. 1538 is not a Vaibhāṣika text but the second chapter entitled *Kāraṇaprajñapti* of a text translated by Dharmapāla (963–1058 A.D.) and Weijing (惟淨) shortly after 1004 A.D. The Chinese text is equally of Mahāsāṅghika as of Sarvāstivāda affiliation.<sup>35</sup> The original Indian text supposedly had eight chapters, three of which exist in Tibetan translation, the rest is lost. Therefore, exceptionally T. 1538 is not a Vaibhāṣika text.<sup>36</sup> Puguang's information follows the Vaibhāṣika tradition (except for the *Prajñapti*°) whereas Yaśomitra follows the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition.

The basic text of the Vaibhāṣika "orthodoxy" is called *Jñānaprasthāna*, which is a rewritten Gandhāran *Aṣṭagrantha*.<sup>37</sup> The Gandhāran text had many commentaries called *Vibhāṣā*. Two of them exist in Chinese translation, viz. 1. *Biposha lun* (鞞婆沙論, T. XXVIII 1547), translated in 383 A.D. by Saṅghabhadra;<sup>38</sup> and 2. *Apitan piposha lun* (阿毗曇毗婆沙論, T. XXVIII 1546), translated in 439 A.D. by Buddhavarman. The new commentary on the *Jñānaprasthāna*, the Vaibhāṣika *Mahāvibhāṣā – Apidamo da piposha lun* (阿毗達磨大毘婆沙論, T. XXVII 1545), was translated by Xuanzang in 659 A.D. It may be added that the Indian non-Vaibhāṣika texts gradually have adapted to the "orthodoxy" from the third century on. This process may be noticed in the *Vibhāṣās* as well as in a non-Vaibhāṣika *Prakarāṇa*° (眾事分阿毗曇論 *Zhong shi fen apitan lun*, T. XXVI 1541), translated by Guṇabhadra and Bodhiyaśas in 443 A.D.

It is very likely that the non-Vaibhāṣikas also established a corpus comparable with the seven Vaibhāṣika *abhidharma* texts.<sup>39</sup> Harivarman's *Chengshi lun* (成實論, T. XXXII 1646) makes this clear.<sup>40</sup> Harivarman (ca.300 A.D.) was a brahmin from Central India

<sup>34</sup> Wogihara 1971: 11.

<sup>35</sup> This was established by Lin Li-kouang 1949: 137–144.

<sup>36</sup> Willemen 2008a: 60–62.

<sup>37</sup> Willemen 2008a: 43.

<sup>38</sup> See note 14; Willemen 2008a: 59.

<sup>39</sup> Willemen 2008a: 54–57.

<sup>40</sup> *Jñānakāya, Corpus of Knowledge*, (i.e. the *Aṣṭagrantha* and its additional parts), *Prodbhūtopadeśa, The Explanatory Discourse: (Corpus of Knowledge) Realized*. Willemen 2006b; 2008: 54–55. The Sanskrit title of the *Chengshi lun* is not *Tattvasiddhi-śāstra* or *Satyasiddhi*°.

who – as so many brahmins<sup>41</sup> – was converted to Sautrāntika Buddhism. He was a disciple of Kumāralāta. Kumāralāta (ca. 150 A.D.?) is the reputed first master, *mūlācārya*, of Sautrāntikas. Harivarman was his disciple in the sense that he has accepted his ideas. Harivarman later changed his ideas under the influence of a (Bahusrūtīya?) Mahāsāṅghika master. As a result of this development he composed his *Chengshi lun* (T. 1646). In it he mentioned the part named *Lokasthāna* (Loutan 樓炭), which is one of the six parts of the so-called *abhidharma* “with six parts (feet)”.<sup>42</sup> Also Dharmapriya (in China ca. 382–390 A.D.), a Sautrāntika who assisted Saṅghadeva to complete his translation of the *Aṣṭaḡrantha*, mentioned six parts (feet), evidently different from the six parts of the Vaibhāṣikas.<sup>43</sup>

There was another non-Vaibhāṣika group of *abhidharma* texts very popular in southern China. The basic text of this lineage is the *Abhidharmahṛdaya-śāstra, Treatise: Heart of the Abhidharma* (阿毘曇心論 *Apitan xin lun*, T. XXVIII 1550). The text was composed by Dharmasreṣṭhin, a man from the area of the river Vakṣu, and translated into Chinese by Saṅghadeva in 391 A.D.<sup>44</sup> The text comes from the Bactrian cultural area, maybe from the first century B.C., as proposed by E. Frauwallner in 1971.<sup>45</sup> This basic Bactrian text was commented upon more than once in the Gandhāran area. There is Upaśānta’s (third century) *Abhidharmahṛdaya* (阿毘曇心論經 *Apitan xin lun jing*, T. XXVIII 1551) translated into Chinese by Narendrayaśas in 563 A.D. Then there is a very influential commentary entitled *Miśrakābhidharmahṛdaya-śāstra, Treatise: Heart of the Abhidharma, With Miscellaneous Additions* (雜阿毘曇心論 *Za apitan xin lun*, T. XXVIII 1552), composed early in the fourth century by the Gandhāran Dharmatrāta and translated into Chinese by Saṅghavarman in 435 A.D. in Jiankang (Nanjing).<sup>46</sup> This text together with Saṅghadeva’s translation of the *Aṣṭaḡrantha* very rapidly became central for the Abhidharma School (毗曇宗 *Pitan Zong*) in southern China.<sup>47</sup> Finally there was Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, a work based on the *Miśraka*<sup>o</sup>, as T. Kimura has shown in 1922.<sup>48</sup> With the discovery of the Sanskrit original of the *Kośa*<sup>o</sup>, *Storehouse*

<sup>41</sup> Even in the time of the Buddha many converts were brahmins. This situation apparently did not change later (e.g. Aśvaghōṣa). It is even understandable that the Puḡgalavāda school came into existence as a result of this large number of brahmins, who saw in a *puḡgala* an alternative for *ātman*.

<sup>42</sup> Willemen 2008a: 55, 61. The *Lokasthānasūtra* (樓炭經 *Loutan jing*, T. I 23) is a cosmological text from 303 A.D., which presents a Mahāsāṅghika and a non-Vaibhāṣika tradition.

<sup>43</sup> Willemen 2008a: 55–56.

<sup>44</sup> The whole text was translated in Willemen 2006a. The text was first translated and studied in 1975 in Brussels, but a revised new introduction was offered in the new Indian edition. The 1975 edition is outdated. It is noteworthy that the name of Dharmasreṣṭhin is translated as *Fasheng* 法勝, Dharma-Excellence, while the term *abhidharma* is sometimes explained as *sheng* 勝 (*śreṣṭha*, excellent) *fa* 法 (*dharma*).

<sup>45</sup> Willemen 2006a: 3 n. 10, referring to E. Frauwallner’s research from 1971.

<sup>46</sup> Willemen 2008a: 48 again explains that the Sanskrit title of Dharmatrāta’s text is *Miśraka*<sup>o</sup>, not *Samyukta*<sup>o</sup>. This was established by Kudara Kōgi in 1982 and by Ryose Wataru in 1986. Yaśomitra mentions a *Miśrakakāra*, most likely Dharmatrāta; see Wogihara 1971: 251. The text mixes traditional non-Vaibhāṣika views of the *Abhidharmahṛdaya* with the “orthodox” Vaibhāṣika views. There are some additional parts in the text.

<sup>47</sup> Willemen 2008a: 49.

<sup>48</sup> Willemen 2006a: 2 n. 3, referring to research by Kimura Taiken from 1922.

[of *abhidharma*], we possess a complete Sanskrit *abhidharmic* text since its edition in 1967.<sup>49</sup> For the texts mentioned earlier we hardly have parts of an original Indian version. The Sanskrit titles and even the names of Indian authors were reconstructed on the basis of Chinese and other sources, e.g. Yaśomitra's *Vyākhyā*. The *Kośa*<sup>o</sup> was written by the Gandhāran Vasubandhu (ca. 350–430 A.D.),<sup>50</sup> and translated into Chinese by Paramārtha in 568 A.D. (阿毘達磨俱舍釋論 *Apidamo jushe shi lun*, T.XXIX 1559). This text replaced the *Miśraka*<sup>o</sup> in southern China and became the central text of the Chinese *Kośa* School. Xuanzang brought a new version of Paramārtha's text, namely *Apidamo jushe lun* (阿毘達磨俱舍論, T. XXIX 1558), in 651–654 A.D. This text became the central text of a new *Kośa* School in Chang'an, in the north. Chinese developments clearly show that the *abhidharma* there was of a Sautrāntika type, belonging to the Gandhāran cultural area. Vasubandhu's *Kośa*<sup>o</sup> was strongly opposed by the "orthodox" Vaibhāṣika master Saṅghabhadra (late fourth century?). He defended the "orthodoxy" in his treatise *Nyāyānusāra*(?), *Conforming to Correct Principles* (阿毘達磨順正理論 *Apidamo shun zhengli lun*, T. XXIX 1562), translated by Xuanzang in 653–654 A.D. He did the same in his *Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*(?), *Obvious Correct Principles of the Abhidharma* (阿毘達磨藏顯宗論 *Apidamo zang xian zong lun*, T. XXIX 1563), translated by Xuanzang in 651–652 A.D.<sup>51</sup>

There were, of course, many more non-Vaibhāṣika *abhidharma* texts, as for example *Abhidharmāmṛta(rasa)*(?)-*śāstra*, *Treatise: The Flavour of Immortality of the Abhidharma* (阿毘曇甘露味論 *Apitan ganlu wei lun*, T. XXVIII 1553), the work of Ghoṣaka; *Abhidharmāvātāra-śāstra*, *Treatise: Introduction to Abhidharma* (入阿毘達磨論 *Ru apidamo lun*, T. XXVIII 1554), the work of Skandhila(?). These texts were "about" (*abhi*<sup>o</sup>) the teaching, *dharma*, and therefore could be placed in an *Abhidharma* *piṭaka*. The Sautrāntikas also possessed this *Piṭaka*.

### More Sarvāstivāda Literature

In order to be somewhat more complete, I have to say that the Sarvāstivāda literature extended beyond the collections of *abhidharma* and *vinaya*. When the new *Daśabhāṇavāra* was established in Kaśmīra one can observe the beginning of independent extra-canonical *avadāna* or narrative literature. Kumāralāta's (middle second century A.D.?) *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* (大莊嚴論經 *Da zhuangyan lun jing*, T. IV 201), translated by Kumārajīva in 384–401 A.D., also known as *Dṛṣṭāntapañkti*, *Collection of Similes, Stories* (*dṛṣṭāntas*), is found at the beginning of this phenomenon.<sup>52</sup> Next there is the

<sup>49</sup> Pradhan 1967; second ed. 1975.

<sup>50</sup> Willemsen 2008a: 49, referring to F. Deleanu.

<sup>51</sup> Cox 1998: 242–249.

<sup>52</sup> As it has been shown by H. Lüders, this text is different from Aśvaghōṣa's *Sūtrālaṃkāraśāstra*. *Zhuangyan lun* (莊嚴論) is a direct translation of *kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*. Knowing that Aśvaghōṣa was a Sautrāntika influenced by Bahuśrutīya(?) Mahāśāṅghika ideas, the erroneous attribution may be understood. In many respects Harivarman,

early Chinese collection of one hundred stories known as *Avadānaśataka* (撰集百緣經 *Zhuanji bai yuan jing*, T. IV 200) attributed to Zhi Qian (支謙) from ca. 223–253 A.D.

Next I would like to mention the so-called *Udānavarga*. This text belongs to Sarvāstivāda *Dharmapada* literature. The *Dharmapada* is probably the best known Buddhist text in the world. Every Buddhist school, *nikāya* (Chinese *bu*) had one, and the non-Vaibhāṣika may have had more than one.<sup>53</sup> The so-called *Udānavarga* initially was a non-Vaibhāṣika *Dharmapada*, *Verses of the Law*, compiled by Dharmatrāta, a Gandhāran, in ca. 150 A.D.<sup>54</sup> To this versified *Dharmapada* stories were added, making it into a real *Udāna*. This text exists in Chinese translation by Saṅghabhadra from 399 A.D. (出曜經 *Chuyao (Udāna) jing*, T. IV 212). This text formed the sixth “member” (*aṅga*) of the Buddha’s word (*buddha-vacana*) as classified into twelve “members”, and later included into the *Kṣudrakapīṭaka*, which contained the “minor” texts. The *Chuyao jing (Udāna)* was a collection of *udānas*, or verses expressing intellectual joy,<sup>55</sup> put together into a text called *Udāna*. This is explained in the prose parts of the *Chuyao jing* itself. Later the stanzas, or *udānas*, were collected from this *Udāna* again to form a *Dharmapada* work known to us as *Udānavarga*, a collection of *udānas* from the “member” *Udāna*. Besides Sanskrit and Tibetan versions the so-called *Udānavarga* exists in Chinese version too. It is the work of Śāntideva<sup>56</sup> (Tian Xizai 天息災) from 985 A.D., entitled *A Collection of Important Odes of the Law* (法集要頌經 *Fa ji yao song jing*, T. IV 213). *Fa yao song* (法要頌), important odes of the law, means *Dharmapada*, and *ji* (集), collected, translates *°varga*. The text is of Mūlasarvāstivāda affiliation.<sup>57</sup>

Other non-Vaibhāṣika literature includes biographies of the Buddha – *Lalitavistara* and especially Aśvaghōṣa’s *Buddhacarita*. Aśvaghōṣa (ca.100 A.D.) may now be called a Sautrāntika (the word did not exist at that time) influenced by Bahuśrutīya(?) ideas. His text *In Praise of Buddha’s Acts* (佛所行讚 *Fo suoxing zan*, T. IV 192) counts twenty eight chapters in both the Tibetan and Chinese versions. In the Sanskrit original has been preserved only half of the text, namely fourteen chapters. Aśvaghōṣa’s Sanskrit poem belongs to the corpus of world literature. The Chinese version from 421 A.D. is rather a paraphrase of the contents made by Baoyun (寶雲). This version was translated by the present author in 2009, offering a readable English version which follows the Chinese original closer than Ōminami Ryūshō’s (大南龍昇) Japanese translation from 2002.<sup>58</sup>

Furthermore, some *Āgamas* belong to non-Vaibhāṣika Sarvāstivāda literature, viz. Saṅghadeva’s *Madhyamāgama* (中阿含經 *Zhong ahan jing*, T. I 26) and most likely also

a “disciple” of Kumāralāta, may be compared with Aśvaghōṣa. Note that Kumārajīva from Kuqa translated this non-Vaibhāṣika text before he arrived in Chang’an.

<sup>53</sup> Willemen 2012a: 485. Cf. Willemen 2013, Introduction.

<sup>54</sup> About Dharmatrāta see Lin Li-kouang 1949: 324–351.

<sup>55</sup> Lamotte 1988: 144.

<sup>56</sup> Lokesh Chandra established this name in 2010. See Willemen 2013, Introduction, n. 63.

<sup>57</sup> Willemen 2013a: Introduction.

<sup>58</sup> Ōminami Ryūshō (大南龍昇) has offered the latest Japanese translation of the Chinese *Buddhacarita* in 2002 in *Shin Kokuyaku Daizōkyō* (新國譯大藏經), Hon’enbu (本緣部) I: 125–426.

his *Ekottarikāgama* (增一阿含經 *Zengyi ahan jing*, T. II 125), completed in 398 A.D. The Tokharian Dharmanandin had begun the *Āgama* translations in 384 A.D. in northern China.<sup>59</sup>

An important part of the non-Vaibhāṣika literature present meditation manuals. They were especially popular in Bactrian circles. However, the whole Gandhāran cultural area has produced such manuals. One of such manuals, preserved in the Sanskrit original (incomplete) was edited by D. Schlingloff under the title *Yogalehrbuch* in 1964.<sup>60</sup> In China such manuals are often called “texts about the five gates to *dhyāna*” (*wu men chan* 五門禪). The Chinese texts usually add a Mahāsāṅghika, a Mahāyāna part.<sup>61</sup> Already An Shigao (Ashkani, 安世高), active in Luoyang (洛陽) ca. 148–170 A.D., brought out the *Yogācārabhūmi* (道地經 *Dao di jing*, T. XV 607), a treatise about the stages in the practice of yoga. His text agrees with a part of Saṅgharakṣa’s *Yogācārabhūmi*.<sup>62</sup> Shortly after An Shigao, Loujia Chen (婁迦讖, usually sanskritized as Lokakṣema)<sup>63</sup> translated in 179 A.D. in Luoyang the earliest known text about the perfection of wisdom (*prajñāpāramitā*), viz. the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*. He entitled his work *Daoxing (yogācāra) bore (prajñā) jing* (道行般若經, T. VIII 224) to show that this text is wholly devoted to different kinds of yoga practice.<sup>64</sup> The text introduces a (Gandhāran) Mahāsāṅghika, Mahāyāna type of yoga, as opposed to the Sautrāntika Savāstivāda one. But Sautrāntika practices were better known in China. Dharmarakṣa’s *Xiuxing dao di jing* (修行道地經, T. XV 606) from 284 A.D. offers a translation of Saṅgharakṣa’s text.<sup>65</sup> Immediately upon his arrival in Chang’an (長安) in 402 A.D. Kumārajīva (Jiomo Luoshi 鳩摩羅什) was asked to bring forward meditation techniques. He accordingly explained the method of concentration of sitting meditation in his *Zuochan sanmei jing* (坐禪三昧經, T. XV 614),<sup>66</sup> and also in the *Essential Explanation of the Way how to Meditate (Chan fa yao jie* 禪法要解, T. XV 616). More meditation manuals were attributed to Kumārajīva in the unreliable catalogue of Fei Zhangfang (費長房) from 597 A.D. (歷代三寶紀 *Lidai san bao ji*, T. XLIX 2034), as e.g. *Siwei lüeyao fa* (思惟略要法, T. XV 617),<sup>67</sup> which is a text of Mahāsāṅghika affiliation. Dharmamitra’s texts, viz. *Basic ways in Sūtras about*

<sup>59</sup> Willemen 2006a: 6–8.

<sup>60</sup> See Schlingloff 2006.

<sup>61</sup> Demiéville 1954: 349–351.

<sup>62</sup> An Shigao’s text offers chapters 1–5, 22, and 24 of Saṅgharakṣa’s text. Did An Shigao make a selection, or is this (part of) the original core of the text?

<sup>63</sup> Laukāṣṣina, as suggested by Lokesh Chandra, is also possible. Cf. Willemen 2004: 10 n. 27.

<sup>64</sup> Willemen 2008a: 42. Sthaviravāda term *prajñā*, wisdom, is always rendered by a “meaningful translation”, viz. *zhìhuì* (智慧), but Mahāsāṅghika “emptiness-wisdom” is rendered by a “sound translation”, viz. *panre/banre* 般若, later (certainly in the fifth century in southern China), however, pronounced *bo* (波) *re*. For this see Willemen 2011, esp. p. 149.

<sup>65</sup> Studied in Demiéville 1954.

<sup>66</sup> Immediately upon his arrival Kumārajīva was asked by Sengrui (僧叡) to teach the meditation techniques. The master explained T. 614 in about one week. For a translation see Yamabe and Sueki 2009.

<sup>67</sup> Translated in Willemen 2012b. The text is anonymous, but wrongly attributed to the famous Kumārajīva. The text is of Mahāsāṅghika affiliation, probably composed by Chinese monks in southern China in 430–440 A.D., based on the oral teaching of an Indian master (Dharmamitra?).

*the Five Gates of Dhyāna* (五門禪經要用法 *Wu men chan jing yao yong fa*, T. XV 619), as well as *Sūtra(s) about the Secret Essence of Dhyāna* (禪祕要(法)經 *Chan mi yao (fa) jing*, T. XV 613), actually were composed by Chinese monks in Jiankang (建康), who were listening to the teaching of Dharmamitra, a Mahāsāṅghika monk.<sup>68</sup> There is also Buddhahadra's text about the *dhyāna* of his master Buddhasena from Bactria, i.e. *Yogācārabhūmi* (修行道地 *Xiuxing dao di*, T. XV 618). This text has been given the erroneous title *Dharmatrāta's Dhyāna* (達摩多羅禪經 *Damo Duoluo chan jing*) by Fei Zhangfang.<sup>69</sup> Non-Vaibhāṣika meditation manuals deal with *yogācāra*, the practice of yoga. Because the Sautrāntikas used ideas of their antagonists, the Mahāsāṅghikas, their yoga techniques constantly developed into new forms. Asaṅga (second half of the fourth century) incorporated Mahāsāṅghika Madhyamaka ideas into his Gandhāran *yogācāra* work. But the importance of the non-Vaibhāṣikas is even greater when one realizes that "Pure Land" Buddhism most likely is Sautrāntika too. One can safely say that the Sarvāstivāda Sthaviravāda and Mahāsāṅghika ideas, often originating in the Gandhāran cultural area, really shaped East Asian Buddhism and what we know as the Mahāyāna movement.<sup>70</sup> Even Bodhidharma, the patriarch of Chan or Zen (禪), was born into a family of Gandhāran origin.<sup>71</sup>

## Bibliography

T. = Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō

Bureau, André. 1955. *Les sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*. Saigon: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.

Chavannes, Édouard. 1903. *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.

Cox, Collett. 1998. "Kaśmīra: Vaibhāṣika Orthodoxy." In: *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*. Charles Willemen, Bart Dessein, Collett Cox (eds.). Leiden: Brill: 138–254.

Demiéville, Paul. 1954. "Le *Yogācārabhūmi* de Saṅgharakṣa." In: *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 44: 339–436.

Dhammajoti, Bhikkhu K.L. 2004. *Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma*. Sri Lanka: Centre for Buddhist Studies.

Enomoto, Fumio (榎本文雄). 1993. "Keihin-Indo Bukkyō no Ichichūshinchi no Shozai (關東-印度佛教の一中心地の所在)." In: *Chi no Kaikō-Bukkyō to Kagaku* (知の邂逅-佛教と科学). Tsukamoto Keishō Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai (塚本啟祥教授還曆紀念論文集刊行會). Tōkyō: Kōsei (佼成) Publishing.

<sup>68</sup> Willemen 2012b: 6–7.

<sup>69</sup> Willemen 2013b: 19–20; 2012b: 8.

<sup>70</sup> For Sarvāstivāda Mahāyāna see Willemen 2013b ("Pure Land"); Willemen 2008a: 47–48; Willemen 2012b: 3 (Asaṅga's new *yogācāra*). One should, however, not forget that there was also a maritime route from east and south-east India via *Funan* (扶南) (mainly Cambodia) to southern China, from the third century A.D. until ca. 600 A.D. This route was overwhelmingly Mahāsāṅghika, but also influenced by Mahīśāsaka and Sarvāstivāda monks. See e.g. Willemen 2008b.

<sup>71</sup> Willemen 2013b n. 30. In *Jingde chuandeng lu* (*Keitoku dentō roku*) (景德傳燈錄, T. LI 2076, p. 217a9), from 1004 A.D., it is mentioned that his family comes from Xiangzhi (香至), Gandhavaī.

Golzio, Karl-Heinz. 2008. “Zur Datierung des Kuṣāṇa-Königs Kaniṣka I.” In: *Bauddha-sāhitya-stabakāvālī. Essays and Studies on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature dedicated to Claus Vogel by Colleagues, Students, and Friends*. Dragomir Dimitrov, Michael Hahn, Roland Steiner (eds.). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica 36: 79–91.

Harmatta, János. (1996)1999. “Tokharistan and Gandhara Under Western Türk Rule. Part One: History of the Regions.” In: *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*. B.A. Litvinsky, Zhang Guang-da, R. Shabani Samghabadi (eds.), III: 367–383. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Herrmann, Albert. (1935)1966. *An Historical Atlas of China*. Amsterdam: Djambatan N.V. Publishers & Cartographers.

Hulsewé, Anthony. 1979. *China in Central Asia. The Early Stage:125 B.C.–A.D.23*. Sinica Leidensia 14. Leiden: Brill.

Karashima, Seishi (幸島靜志). 2009. “Hanyi Fodian de yuyan yanjiu (漢譯佛典的語言研究).” In: Zhu Qingzhi (朱慶之), (comp.) *Fojiao Hanyu yanjiu (佛教漢語研究)*. Beijing (北京): Shangwu Yinshuguan (商務印書館): 33–74.

Lamotte, Étienne. 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism*. Transl. S. Boin-Webb. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. (1923–1931)1971. *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. 6 Vols. Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises.

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

Lin, Li-kouang. 1949. *L’Aide-Mémoire de la vraie loi. Introduction au compendium de la loi*. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient.

Ono, Genmyō (小野玄妙); Maruyama, Takao (丸山孝雄). 2000. *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten (佛書解説大辭典)*. Compact edition. Tōkyō (東京): Daitō Shuppansha (大東出版社).

Pradhan, Prahlad (ed.). 1967. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series VIII. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

Schlingloff, Dieter. 2006. *Ein buddhistisches Yogalehrbuch. Unveränderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe von 1964 unter Beigabe aller seither bekannt gewordenen Fragmente*. Ed. J-U. Hartmann und H-J. Röllicke. Düsseldorf: Haus der Japanischen Kultur.

Willemen, Charles. 1998. “New Ideas about Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma.” In: *The Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 10: 82–94.

Willemen, Charles. 2004. *From Where Did Zen Come? Dhyāna in the Early Buddhist Tradition*. Calgary: University of Calgary. Numata Lecture Series.

Willemen, Charles. 2006a. *The Essence of Scholasticism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Willemen, Charles. 2006b. “The Sanskrit Title of Harivarman’s *Chengshi Lun* 成實論 (T. 1646).” In: *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 4: 244–249.

Willemen, Charles. 2008a. “Kumārajīva’s ‘Explanatory Discourse’ about Abhidharmic Literature.” In: *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 12: 37–83(156–210).

Willemen, Charles. 2008b. “Buddhism’s Maritime Route to China. The Early Phase (Before 589 A.D.).” In: *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 6: 83–104.

Willemen, Charles. 2009. *Buddhacarita. In Praise of Buddha’s Acts*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.

Willemen, Charles. 2011. “Xuanzang and Paramārtha and *Prajñāpāramitā*’s Origin.” In: *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 9: 145–152.

Willemen, Charles. 2012a. “Mahīśāsaka. Some New Ideas.” In: *Dharmaṃpravacaya. Aspects of Buddhist Studies. Essays in Honour of N.H. Samtani*. Lalji ‘Shravak’ and Charles Willemen (eds.). Delhi: Buddhist World Press: 481–493.

Willemen, Charles. 2012b. *Outlining the Way to Reflect* (T. XV 617: *Siwei lüe yao fa* 思惟略要法). Mumbai: Somaiya Publications.

Willemen, Charles. 2013a. *A Collection of Important Odes of the Law*. Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies and BDK America.

Willemen, Charles. 2013b. "Early Yogācāra and Visualization (*Bhāvanā*).” In: *Wading into the Stream of Wisdom: Essays Honoring Leslie Kawamura*. Sarah Haynes and Michelle Sorensen (eds.). Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies and BDK America.

Wogihara, Unrai. 1971. *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yaśomitra*. Part I. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store.

Yamabe, Nobuyoshi; Sueki, Fumihiko. 2009. *The Sutra on the Contemplation of Sitting Meditation*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.