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Abstract: Born in Gaochang 高昌 and already a specialist in the Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions (Skt. *Saṃyuktābhidharmabṛddhayāsāstra; Ch. Za apitan xin lun 雜阿毘曇心論) at a young age, Huisong was sent by his king to Northern China. Later, despite repeated invitations from the king of Gaochang, Huisong refused to return to his homeland, which he considered as ‘peripheral and barbaric’ (bianbi 邊鄙). Huisong’s determination to stay in China contributed to the transmission of Abhidharma. An examination of Huisong’s social network reveals that there are two lines that connect Huisong to Xuanzang. However, in the Study Notes on the Treasury of From Huisong 慧嵩 (fl. 511–560) to Xuanzang 玄奘 (602?–664):
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Abhidharma (*Jushe lun ji* 俱舍論記), a text compiled by Xuanzang’s student Puguang 普光 (fl. 645–664), the arguments of the two most significant figures on these lines of transmission were refuted with evidence from the Indian texts newly translated by Xuanzang. This shows not only the doctrinal linkage, but also the differences between Huisong and Xuanzang. While for Huisong China was indeed a center of Buddhist studies as opposed to the ‘barbaric’ Gaochang, Xuanzang and Puguang most likely regarded China as a Buddhist borderland as opposed to India. These ‘Borderland complexes’ motivated both scholarly exchange and the construction of religious orthodoxy.
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**I. Introduction**

It is well known that around 628, the Tang pilgrim Xuanzang arrived at Gaochang (in present–day Xinjiang) and was warmly received by Qu Wentai 麹文泰 (r. 619–640), the king of Gaochang.\(^1\) Less well known is the story of another monk, who traveled in the opposite direction around 100 years earlier,\(^2\) but shared a similar interest with Xuanzang in Abhidharma scholasticism. This monk, Huisong,\(^3\) was born in Gaochang, an oasis state on the northern

---


\(^2\) Most likely in 531. See the following section.

\(^3\) Huisong, the Abhidharma scholar, should not be confused with another Huisong 慧嵩 (362/420?–440/459?), who participated in the translation project of *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (*Da boniepan jing* 大般涅槃經) led by Dharmakṣema 曇無讖 (385–433). *Chu sanzang ji ji*, *T* no. 2145, 55: 14.103a28–b1. The Huisong from Gaochang has not been widely studied in modern scholarship. Lü Cheng 呂澂 (1896–1989) mentions Huisong’s contribution to Abhidharma...
route of the Silk Road.⁴

Gaochang, the former territory of the King of Anterior Jushi Kingdom (Jushi qian wang 車師前王),³ used to be administered by the Han Empire. It ranges two hundred li from east to west, five hundred li from south to north, and is surrounded by many great mountains. Some say that the Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (156 BCE–87 BCE) sent troops on a punitive expedition toward the west. Exhausted from the journey, the most fatigued soldiers thence settled [in Gaochang]. The terrain is high but spacious and has a large population. Therefore, it was named Gaochang [‘high and prosperous’]. Others say that there was a Gaochang Garrison⁷ (Gaochang lei 高昌)


⁵ This refers to the kingdom of Anterior Jushi kingdom (Jushi qianguo 車師前國). This kingdom is one of the eight kingdoms after the split of Gushi 姑師 at around 108 BCE. According to Wang Su 王素, Gushi was the name of the place before the split, while Jushi was used afterwards. This explains why there is no Jushi 車師 mentioned in Shiji 史記, but more occurrences of Jushi 車師 than Gushi 姑師 in Hanshu 漢書. For more detailed discussion of the political history of this area, see Wang, Gaochang Shi Gao, 5. Dani, History of Civilizations, 304. The author would like to thank Li Jiasheng for his help on Gaochang history.

⁶ Li, or the ‘Chinese mile’, is a traditional Chinese unit of distance. See Wilkinson, Chinese History, 237.

⁷ In 48 BCE, Emperor Yuan of Han 漢元帝 (75 BCE–July 8, 33 BCE)
Gaochang was a transportation hub between China and the Western Regions. The earliest known name of this region was Gushi, which split into eight small kingdoms during the reign of Emperor Wu of the Han. After a series of wars with the Xiongnu, the Han Empire finally seized control of the kingdom of Anterior Jushi (Jushi qianguo) in 60 BCE. During the Former Liang (317–376), a Gaochang Commandery (jun) was established in this region and governed consecutively by the Former Qin (350–394), the Later Liang (386–403), the Western Liang (400–421), and the Northern Liang (397–439). In 439, the Juqu rulers of the Northern Liang moved to Gaochang after being defeated by the Northern Wei (386–534). In 442, Juqu Wuhui assigned the Wuji Commandant to govern this place and built it as a military garrison. See Wang, Gaochang shigao, 1.

---

8 For Wuji Xiaowei, see Hulsewé, ‘China in Central Asia’, 79.
9 Beishi 97.3212.
10 Fozu tongji, T no. 2035, 49: 32.313a1–2: Thus, it is known that Yiwu, Gaochang, and Shanshan are all gates to the Western Regions (故知伊吾高昌鄯善並西域之門戶).
defeated the prefect of the Gaochang commandery and established the Great Liang, which existed until 460.\textsuperscript{11} These twin insights guide our attempt to extend Menander 1500 into an agent with its own intentionality.\textsuperscript{12}

Although the rulers of Gaochang were not ethnically Han Chinese,\textsuperscript{13} the influence of Chinese culture was always present due to a large Chinese population.\textsuperscript{14} When the Qu 麹 kings seized control of the land in 500,\textsuperscript{15} they followed the political structure of the Chinese state and Confucian statecraft.\textsuperscript{16} The impact of Chinese culture is reflected in the very beginning of Huisong’s biography:\textsuperscript{17}

Shi Huisong, whose clan and tribe are unknown, was a native of the Kingdom of Gaochang. This kingdom was where the Juqu princes of the [Northern] Liang sought shelter [in the 440s]. Therefore,

\textsuperscript{11} Zhang & Rong, ‘A Concise History’, 15–16.

\textsuperscript{12} How to define Chinese identity is a thorny question, since it is a synthesis of different regional cultures from ancient times. However, the Qin and Han dynasties did contribute to the formation of a shared Han identity. See Xu, ‘Huaxia lunshu’, 114. Ge, \textit{Lishi Zhongguo}, 10–14. Wang, \textit{Lishi jiyi}, 290.

\textsuperscript{13} Yang, ‘Lun Juqu Wuhei’, 80–83.

\textsuperscript{14} Zhang & Rong, ‘A Concise History’, 17.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, 14.

\textsuperscript{16} There are three versions of Huisong’s biographies: (1) ‘Qi Pengcheng shamen Shi Huisong zhuàn’ 齊彭城沙門釋慧嵩傳 in Daoxuan’s \textit{Xu Gaoseng zhuan}, T no. 2060, 50: 7.482c24–483a25; (2) Qi Huisong 齊慧嵩 in Tan’è’s 晃噩 (1285–1373) \textit{Xinxiu kefen liuxue seng zhuan}, X no. 1522, 77: 17.215b24–c15; (3) Huisong shengzhi 慧嵩生知 in Yishu’s 義楚 (895?–968/977?) \textit{Shishi liutie}, B no. 79, 13: 10.202a5–8. I will focus on the biography written by Daoxuan and use the other two as references. The biography by Daoxuan was first translated into English by Wang Xin. Here, I am presenting a more literal translation.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Wengui} 文軌 used to be the written language (\textit{wen} 文) and the transportation track (\textit{gui} 軌). Using the same written language and transportation track signifies the unification of a country. To state that Huisong’s family is familiar with ‘Huaxia zhi wengui 華夏之文軌’ is another way to describe their assimilation of \textit{Huaxia} culture.
Huisong’s ancestors knew how to write Chinese. Huisong entered the monastic life at an early age. Intelligent and quick to learn, he was able to understand the meaning of a text soon after opening the scroll. He immersed himself in Buddhist texts and was especially versed in the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra.* At that time, he was highly esteemed by his country. Huisong’s elder brother, who was a Confucian Erudite (*boshi* 博士) esteemed by the royal family, valued Confucian texts, but showed no interest in Buddhist doctrines. Impressed by Huisong’s brightness, the brother tried to persuade Huisong to return to secular life and offered to teach him moral norms. Huisong said, ‘The small wisdom of pedantic Confucian scholars is not worthy of learning. It is just rubbish. What else is there to talk about?’ [However,] Huisong’s brother kept interfering with [his study of Buddhism.] Once his brother asked him about the hidden meanings of the *Forest of Changes* (*Yilin* 易林). Huisong had not read secular books before, but could unpack the meaning of the text immediately after opening the scroll. His views were even better than previous interpretations. Although surprised, his brother...

---

18 *Za apitan xinlun* is not extant in Sanskrit or Prakrit. Scholars have debated its Sanskrit title. In Bart Dessein’s English translation, the Sanskrit title is rendered as *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra.* Charles Willemen posits that its Sanskrit title should be *Miśrakābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra,* with evidence from a Uigur translation of Sthiramati’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkā Tattvārthāna-ma* discussed by Kudara Kōgi. Since the discussion of the Sanskrit name of *Za apitan xinlun* is not the focus of current research, I choose to follow the more commonly used title *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra* with a footnote. See Dessein, ‘*Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra*’; Willemen, ‘Kumārajīva’s “Explanatory Discourse”’, 156–110. Kudara, ‘Uiguru-yaku Abhidharma’, 371.

19 *Xu Gaoseng zhuan,* T no. 2060, 50: 7.482c25–483a8. For a discussion of *Hua* 華/Xia 夏, *Han* and *Zhongguo* 中國, see Yang, *Becoming Zhongguo,* 34–37. In antiquity, *Hua* 華 and *Xia* 夏 were seldom combined. *Hua* 華 or *Xia* 夏 broadly refers to the civilizational identity that emerged in the Yellow River region. These two characters were later combined to *Huaxia* (such as Daoxuan’s usage in this paragraph) with the core state/states titled *Zhongguo,* meaning the ‘central country/countries). See Holcombe, ‘Chinese Identity’, 35.
still did not believe in the richness and profundity of Buddhism. Huisong then showed him an Abhidharma verse and asked for an explanation. He tried numerous interpretations. Some of them were completely erroneous. Huisong criticized them all and offered his own interpretation. His brother was suddenly awakened. He started to believe in Buddhism wholeheartedly and understood the profound doctrines. He then let Huisong travel and study freely.

Huisong’s family was thus to a degree Sinicized. Huisong’s brother was not only a devout follower of Confucianism, but also had the title of ‘Erdite’ (boshi 博士). The Forest of Changes (Yilin 易林), a divination book modelled on The Book of Changes (Yijing 易經), is full of themes such as ancient sage kings and Confucian virtues. The History of the Northern Dynasties also records that Chinese classics such as the Mao Commentary (Maoshi 毛詩), the Analects

20 The confidence that Chinese culture has the attractive power to assimilate ‘non-Chinese’ people, i.e., Sinification, is a distinctive feature of Chinese civilization. See Poo, Enemies of Civilization, 153.

21 As Charles Holcombe points out, the elites across East Asia shared a common literate culture during the period before the unification of China in Sui dynasty (581–618). See Holcombe, ‘Chinese Identity’, 32.

22 Tuoba is a subgroup of the Xianbei 鮮卑 people who speak a non-Chinese language that might have had some relationship with later Mongolic language. Shimunek, ‘Languages of Ancient Southern Mongolia and North China’, 415. For more on the Xianbei, see Holcombe, ‘The Xianbei’, 1–38; and Hu, ‘An Overview’, 95–164.
of Confucius (*Lunyu* 諫語), and the *Classic of Filial Piety* (*Xiaojing* 孝經) were all taught in schools of Gaochang despite using a non-Chinese Hu 胡 language. On the other hand, the Qu kings were also quite hospitable to Buddhism, at least on the surface. Not only was Huisong able to live a monastic life at a young age, but he was also officially sent by his king to Northern China, which was ruled by non-Chinese Tuoba 拓跋 kings at that time.  

Buddhist teachings were widespread during the last years of the Tuoba Wei. To promote Buddhism, the king of Gaochang sent Huisong and his younger brother to the [Wei] court along with envoys. [There] Huisong was highly esteemed by the Counselor-in-chief Gao Huan 高歡 (496–547). At that time, the Śāstra master Zhiyou (d.u.) was renowned for his outstanding intelligence. Huisong thus followed him to learn the *Abhidharma* and the *Chengshi [lun]*. Huisong was entrusted and given the task of taking lecture notes. He already gave talks when still a novice, and immediately ascended to the top seat after full ordination. He analyzed and explained the

---

23 This is a period when ethnic identities within China were very diverse. There were millions of people who lived inside China but maintained their distinct group identities. However, this is also a period with fair amount of cultural exchange and interactions. The Tuoba non-Chinese rulers, just like the Qu kings in Gaochang, also assimilated some Chinese culture because they had many Hua/Xia subjects. Chinese dominated the writing system. Even the funerary practice generally followed the customs in former Chinese dynasties. See Bai, *Wei Jin Nanbeichao*, 518. Tamura, ‘Chūgoku shijō’, 7. Bai, ‘Beichao’, 475–498.

24 This sentence is quoted by Mihashi Tokugen 御橋悳言 (1876–1950) in his commentary on *Chronicles of the Authentic Lineages of the Divine Emperors* (*Jinnō Shōtōki* 神皇正統記) as evidence of using *Shimen* 釋門 to represent *Fomen* 佛門. See Heike monogatari, ‘Jinnō Shōtōki Chūkai’, 155.

25 Gao Huan was a warlord and the highest official title he earned was Great Counselor-in-chief (*Da chengxiang* 大丞相). See Holcombe, ‘Chinese Shōgun’, 219.

26 There are some debates on the Sanskrit title of Harivarman’s *Treatise that Accomplishes Reality* (Skt. *ital; Ch. *Chengshi [lun]* 成實論). For a brief introduction, see Willemen, ‘The Sanskrit Title’. 
sūtras during assemblies, and even convinced intelligent opponents, who [afterwards] would come to prostrate and take refuge in him. After completing his studies and gaining great fame, his home country [Gaochang] invited him to return. Huisong said, ‘one as knowledgeable as I is not suited to such a peripheral and barbaric place’. He then traveled around Ye 鄴 [in southern Hebei] and Luo 洛 [in present-day Henan], with the wish to propagate the Way. Afterwards [the king of Gaochang] again requested [his return]. Huisong still refused to change his mind. The king of Gaochang then killed three generations of his family. Hearing this, Huisong told his followers, ‘Doesn’t the sūtra say that the three realms are impermanent and there is no pleasure in any existence. Everyone is constantly experiencing the eight kinds of suffering in the three destinations. Is that really surprising?’

It seems that Huisong was not hesitant to use pejorative terms such as ‘peripheral and barbaric’ (bianbi 邊鄙) to characterize his hometown. He was proud of his scholarly achievement in Buddhism and claimed that ‘one as knowledgeable as I is not suited to such a peripheral and barbaric place’. (以吾之博達, 義非邊鄙之所資也) This might have been a result of Gao Huan’s patronage to Buddhism and the scholastic atmosphere in Northern China, where he not only was able to study with Master Zhiyou, but also had vibrant debates with other Buddhists who harboured different opinions. Large groups of followers might have also contributed to his favorable attitude towards China.  

27 Xu Gaoseng zhuan, T no. 2060, 50: 7.483a8–19.  
28 According to Annals of the Qi (Qi benji 齊本紀) in The History of the
Unlike Xuanzang who travelled to India without permission, Huisiong was sent officially by the King of Gaochang to study Buddhism in the Northern Wei. On one hand, this indicates a favorable policy towards Buddhism, which is also evinced by the establishment of many Buddhist temples and a system of monastic officials. However, the king’s killing of three generations of Huisiong’s family betrays that Qu Jian might not have been a devout Buddhist. At the least, his fury at a subject openly disobeying his order trumped any Buddhist reservations about taking life. He was more likely using Buddhist monastics for political ends. As indicated by previous scholars, the non-Chinese rulers such as Qu kings in Gaochang and Tuoba in Wei may have been in intense competition, not only economically and militarily, but also culturally. Therefore, it is understandable

Northern Dynasties, Gao Huan became the prime minister (xiang 相) in the first year of Yongxi 永熙 reign (532–534). As stated in section ‘Record of Gaochang’ (Gaochang zhuan 高昌傳) of the Book of Wei (Wēishu 魏書), one year before Gao Huan became the prime minister, i.e., ‘in the first year of Putai 普泰 reign (531–532), Qu Jian sent envoys and paid tribute’ (普泰初, 堅遣使朝貢). Therefore, although Gaochang had sent envoys several times in the first half of the sixth century, the most likely time for Huisiong to have arrived in Luoyang was 531, since he met Gao Huan soon after. See Yao, ‘Shi lun Gaochang guo de fojiao yu fojiao jiaotuan’, 193.

30 Tang, ‘Xinchu Tulufan wenshu zhengli fajue jingguo ji wenshu jianjie’, 94.
31 The conflicts between Tuoba Wei and the garrisons in its northern frontier started in 523, which is also the reason for Gao Huan’s rise. See Holcombe, ‘Chinese Shōgun’, 220.
32 Liu, ‘Ethnicity and the Suppression of Buddhism in Fifth-Century North China’, 19. Whether Han 漢, Juqu 江渠, Qu 麴, or Tuoba 拓跋 can be characterized using the modern category of ‘ethnicity’ is a thorny question. Some scholars question the usefulness of the concept of ethnicity or doubt whether we could apply it to people in the steppes. The author is following Walter Pohl and Charles Holcombe that although ethnicity might not be able to precisely characterize the identities of Juqu, Qu, or Tuoba, it is still meaningful to ‘invoke something like a concept of ethnicity’ for better understanding of their group con-
that Qu Jian hoped to cultivate more local scholars not only in Chinese classics, but also in Buddhism, and was extremely angry when Huisong insisted on staying in Tuoba Wei.\textsuperscript{33}

In 550, Gao Huan’s heir Gao Yang 高洋 (526–559) declared himself Emperor of the Northern Qi (550–577) after deposing Yuan Shanjian 元善見 (524–551), the last emperor of the Eastern Wei (534–550).\textsuperscript{34} Huisong’s quick intelligence somehow offended the paramount monastic leader (shangtong 上統) when discussing Buddhist doctrines.\textsuperscript{35} This eventually led to him being dispatched to Xuzhou 徐州. As the monastic leader (sengtong 僧統) of Xuzhou, he continued to lecture in areas like Peng 彭 and Pei 沛,\textsuperscript{36} and even attracted followers in the regions of Jiangbiao 江表\textsuperscript{37} and Henan 河南.\textsuperscript{38}

In a way, Huisong’s trajectory is the opposite of that of Xuanzang. While Xuanzang was dissatisfied by the available textual resources in China and strove to seek the authentic message of Buddhism


\textsuperscript{33} Tuoba Wei is used here since it is not certain whether this incident happened during Northern Wei (386–534) or Eastern Wei (534–550).

\textsuperscript{34} Graff, \textit{Medieval Chinese Warfare}, 102; Tao, ‘Gao Huan fuzi bafu shulun’, 51. For more information about the ruling bloc of Eastern Wei and Northern Qi, see Wang, ‘Dong Wei, Bei Qi de tongzhi jituan’.

\textsuperscript{35} During the reign of Tianbao 天保 (550–559) in Northern Qi, ‘Ten monastic leaders’ (shibitong 十統) were established. The head of the ten was titled the paramount monastic leader (shangtong 上統), and this position was served by Fashang 法上 (495–580). See Zhao, \textit{Protection of The Dharma}, 21. This incident is mentioned in both Daoxuan and Tan’e’s account, but not in Yishu’s ‘Huisong sheng zhi’.

\textsuperscript{36} Peng 彭 refers to Pengcheng 彭城, a county (jun 郡) in Northern Qi. It is in current-day Xuzhou 徐州, Jiangsu. Pei 沛 is also a county, which is in Suzhou 宿州, Anhui.

\textsuperscript{37} Also known as Jiangnan 江南, it refers to the area to the south of Yangtze River in its broadest sense.

\textsuperscript{38} Henan 河南, which literally means ‘the south of the river’, refers to the middle and lower areas of the Yellow River.
in India, Huisong endeavored to study and preach Buddhism in China. Xuanzang, despite the hardships of the journey, launched his pilgrimage to the west. Huisong, despite the risk of losing his entire family, continued to live and teach in Chinese cities like Yecheng and Luoyang. From Xuanzang’s view, China might have been a borderland compared to India. Huisong, on the other hand, regarded Gaochang as a borderland compared to China. While Xuanzang’s ‘borderland complex’ eventually led to his pilgrimage and his vast
translation projects, Huisong’s decision to stay in China advanced the study of Abhidharma in the pre-Xuanzang period.

II. From Huisong to Xuanzang: transmission lines

Huisong died during the reign of Tianbao 天保 (550–559) in Xubu 徐部 (in present-day Jiangsu). Zhinian 志念 (535–608) is the only disciple mentioned in Huisong’s biography.\(^{43}\) Zhinian first studied Mahāyāna treatises such as *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra (Da zhidu lun 大智度論) and *Daśabhūmikasūtraśāstra (shidi jing lun 十地經論). Attracted by Huisong’s reputation as ‘the Confucius of Abhidharma’ (*Pitan Kongzi 毘曇孔子), he came to study with Huisong. Afterwards Zhinian became an expert in the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra and lectured frequently on this text. Among Zhinian’s numerous disciples, Huixiu 慧休 (548–646?) was essential for passing on the *Abhidharma teachings. Huixiu studied the *Abhidharmāṣṭagrantha, the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra, and the *Vibhāṣa\(^{44}\) with Zhinian.\(^{45}\)

\(^{43}\) Xu Gaoseng zhuan, T no. 2060, 50: 7.483a23–24.

\(^{44}\) There are three versions of *Vibhāṣas in Chinese translation. The first is the Treatise of the Commentary (Skt. *Vibhāṣaśāstra; Ch. Piposha lun 鞔婆沙論, T no. 1547, vol. 28) translated by Saṁghabhūti et al. in 383. See Gaoseng zhuan. T no. 50, 2059:1.328b08–10. Based on an ambiguous reference in the biography of Saṅghadeva, Willemen et al. point out that Saṅghadeva likely revised the translation. See Gaoseng zhuan, T no. 2059, 50: 1.329a6–7. Willemen, Dessein, and Cox, Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism, 232; The second is the Treatise of the Commentary of Abhidharma (Skt. *Abhidharmavibhāṣaśāstra; Ch. Apitan piposha lun 阿毘毘婆沙論, T no. 1546, vol. 28), translated by Buddhavarman (Fotuobamo 浮陀跋摩; 390/438?–440/489?) and Daotai 道泰 (373/426?–428/477?) between 437 and 439 in Liangzhou. The third is the Treatise of the Great Commentary of Abhidharma (Skt. *Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣaśāstra; Ch. Apidamo dapiposha lun 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論; T no. 1545, vol. 27), translated by Xuanzang during 657–660. For discussion of the Vibhāṣa compendia, Willemen, ‘Remarks’, 261; idem, ‘Sarvāstivāda’, 1077.
Huixiu became one of Xuanzang’s earliest Buddhist teachers and taught Xuanzang the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra, presumably with interpretations he had learned from his teacher Zhinian, who had studied the text under Huisong. In other words, according to this line of transmission, Xuanzang is a third-generation student of Huisong via Zhinian and Huixiu.

The second line of transmission goes from Huisong, via Daoyou 道猷 (d.u.), Jingsong 靖嵩 (537–614), and Daoji 道基 (576–637), to Xuanzang. Daoyou is mentioned as Huisong’s student in Zhinian’s biography. Later, Daoyou had an influential student, Jingsong, who studied the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra with him. Jingsong was also versed in the *Abhidharmāṣṭagrantha, the *Vibhaṣa, and the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra. Jingsong in turn passed on the knowledge of Abhidharma to Daoji, who wrote the Profound Meaning and Annotated Extract of *Saṃyuktābhidharmaśāstra (Zaxin xuanzhang bing chao 雜心玄章並抄), a commentary on the *Saṃyuktābhidharmaśāstra. Daoji was also one of the earliest Abhidharma teachers of Xuanzang. According to this line of transmission, then Xuanzang was a fourth-generation student of Huisong.

III. ‘Master Nian’ 念法師 and ‘Master Song’ 嵩法師 in the *Jushe lun ji 俱舍論記

The main text transmitted from Huisong to Xuanzang was the *Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra, a commentary on Dharmaśreṣṭhin’s Heart Treatise of the Abhidharma (Skt. *Abhidharmahṛdayaśāstra;

---

45 Xu Gaoeng zhuan, T no. 2060, 50: 15.544b18–19.
46 Ibid, 4.447a29.
49 Ibid, 10.502a23–24.
51 Ibid, 4.446c26–447a2.
Ch. *Apitan xinlun* (阿毘昙心論). It was written by the western Sarvāstivādins after the Vaibhāṣikas held a council in Kashmir and claimed to be the authority within Sarvāstivāda.\(^{52}\) Despite the Vaibhāṣikas’ continuous attack on the views of these ‘Western Masters’ (xisang shi 西方師), the ‘Western Masters’ continued to compile their own works, although gradually absorbing Vaibhāṣika views. The *Samyuktābhīṣṭharmabhṛdayaśāstra* was one of these works. It was widely studied by Chinese Abhidharma scholar-monks from the Northern and Southern dynasties (386–589) to the Sui dynasty (581–618).\(^{54}\) Other Abhidharma texts mentioned in these monks’ biographies include Gandhāran Kātyāyanīputra’s *Abhidharmāṣṭagrantha*, and its earlier commentary (the *Vibbāsas*).

This shows that monks on the lines from Huisong to Xuanzang were largely influenced by non–Vaibhāṣika texts, like the *Samyuktābhīṣṭharmabhṛdayaśāstra*, the *Abhidharmāṣṭagrantha*, and the early *Vibbāsas*. This dominance ended with Xuanzang’s journey to India, after which he and his team translated almost all important Vaibhāṣika Abhidharma texts, including five of the six ‘feet’ (*zu* 足),\(^{55}\)

\(^{52}\) This council is mentioned in Posoupandou fashi zhuan, *T* no. 2049, 50: 1.189a1–26; Da Tang Xiyu ji, *T* no. 51: 886b22–887a17. It is also mentioned in Tibetan sources such as *Bu ston chos 'byung*. Although there are some discrepancies in these accounts as regards to whether this is a council within Sarvāstivāda or among different schools, the first hypothesis is more possible according to Willemen, Dessein, and Cox, *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism*, 118.

\(^{53}\) This is viewed from the geographical location of Kashmir. The term ‘Western Master’ occurs in Vaibhāṣika works such as *Abhidharmamahāvibbāṣāśāstra*, *Abhidharmayāyānusāra*, or *Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā*. This title never occurs in *Abhidharmabhṛdayaśāstra* or *Samyuktābhīṣṭharmabhṛdayaśāstra*. For a few instances, see *Apidamo da piposha lun*, *T* no. 1545, 27: 43.223c21–22, 54. 279a4, 127.665c4.

\(^{54}\) For a generation discussion of scholar-monks studying *Samyuktābhīṣṭharmabhṛdayaśāstra* during this period, see Dessein, ‘The Abhidharma School’, 58–60.

\(^{55}\) The five ‘feet’ translated by Xuanzang and his team are *Saṅgītiparyāyapāda* (*T* no. 1536, vol. 26), *Dharmaskandhapāda* (*T* no. 1537, 26), *Vijñānakāyapāda*...
the ‘body’ (shen 身)—the Treatise on the Arising of Wisdom through the Abhidharma (Skt. \textit{Abhidharmajñānaprasthāna}, Ch. \textit{Apidamo Fazhi lun} 阿毘達磨發智論), as well as the Great Abhidharma Commentary (Skt. \textit{Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣāśāstra}; Ch. \textit{Apidamo da piposha lun} 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論), the Kashmiri commentary on the ‘body’. Xuanzang and his team also translated later Vaibhāṣika works such as the \textit{Abhidharma Treatise Conforming to the Correct Logic} (Skt. \textit{Abhidharmanayāyānusāra}; Ch. \textit{Apidamo sbun zhengli lun} 阿毘達磨順正理論) and the \textit{Abhidharma Treatise Illuminating Tenets} (Skt. \textit{Abhidharmasamayapradīpikā}; Ch. \textit{Apidamozang xianzong lun} 阿毘達磨藏顯宗論).

The translation of these works greatly enriched the intellectual landscape of Chinese Abhidharma scholasticism. Compared to the pre–Xuanzang period, they now had access to works in both the Vaibhāṣika and non–Vaibhāṣika traditions of Abhidharma, as well as to later works that recorded the debate among these subsects, such as \textit{The Treasury of the Abhidharma and Its (Auto) Commentary} (Skt. \textit{Abhidharmakośabhāṣya}; Ch. \textit{Apidamo jushe lun} 阿毘達磨俱舍論). Compared to Indian Sarvāstivāda scholars, they had additional access to Chinese Abhidharma commentaries by previous scholar–monks, who had been diligently compiling commentaries on works like the *\textit{Saṃyuktābhidharmahṛdayaśāstra}. This gave Xuanzang and his disciples the confidence to differentiate and judge the divergent views they found in the scriptures.

For instance, in the \textit{Jushe lun ji}, which is attributed to Xuanzang’s disciple Puguang but for the most part is a record of Xuanzang’s teachings on the \textit{Abhidharmakośabhāṣya}, the opinions of two


\[56\] This is recorded in Puguang’s biography. See \textit{Song Gaoseng zhuan}, T no. 2061, 50: 4.727a10–11: Xuanzang then secretly taught Puguang the oral teachings of Sarvāstivādins. Puguang was thus able to write the commentary (乃密授光, 多是記憶西印薩婆多師口義. 光因著疏解判). The author would like to thank Fu Xinyi for pointing out this sentence.
earlier Chinese Abhidharma scholars, i.e., ‘Master Nian’ (Zhinian) and ‘Master Song’ (Jingsong), are regularly cited and evaluated. Puguang’s record of these views as well as his judgments are precious materials for investigating the evolution of doctrinal understanding among Chinese Abhidharma scholars during the period from Huisong to Xuanzang.

An example is the debate concerning paracittajñāna (taxinzhi 他心智), the ability to read the thoughts of others. The corresponding excerpt of Abhidharmakośabhāṣya is from the ‘Chapter of the Exposition of the Cognitions’ (Jñānanirdeśa; ‘Fenbie zhi pin’ 分別智品). Below the Sanskrit (Skt.) version edited by Pradhan is given next to Paramārtha’s (Zhendi 真諦; 499–569) (Ch.–P) and Xuanzang’s (Ch.–X) translations.

Skt.: anāsravaṃ paracittajñānaṃ tathaiva | svasatyākāratvācaccaturākāramārgajñānatvāt |58
Ch.–P: 釋曰：無流他心智亦如此，由緣自諦行相故，亦成四行相，唯道智故.59
Ch.–X: 他心智中，若無漏者，唯有緣道四種行相，由此即是道智攝故; 60
Likewise,61 the uncontaminated (anāsrava)62 cognition of an-

57 Completed by Paramārtha in 562, The Treatise of the Commentary on the Treasury of Abhidharma (Apidamo jushe shilun 阿毘達磨俱舍釋論) is the first Chinese translation of Abhidharmakośabhāṣya.
59 Apidamo jushe shilun, T no. 1559, 29: 19. 286c26–27: The explanation is: the uncontaminated cognition of another’s thoughts is likewise. Since it grasps the modes of its own truth, it has four modes. This is because it is only constituted by the cognition of the path.
60 Apidamo jushe lün, T no. 1558, 29: 26.135c9–11: Among cognitions of another’s thoughts, those uncontaminated ones only grasp the four modes of the path. Therefore, they are constituted by the cognition of the path.
61 This refers to the former sentence that explains the modes of the cognitions of four noble truths respectively. Each cognition grasps the four modes of its own truth. For example, the cognition of the suffering grasps the four modes of
other’s thoughts has four modes. This is because of the mode (ākāra) of its own truth (satya), i.e., because it is constituted by the cognition of the path (mārga).

Skt.: samalaṃ punaḥ | jñeyasvalaṃ | ākāraṃ
Ch.–P: 復有垢, 如應知自相.
Ch.–X: 有漏自相

the truth of suffering, which are impermanence (anitya; wuchang 無常), unsatisfactoriness (duhkha; ku 苦), emptiness (śūnya; kong 空), and no-self (anātma; wuwo 無我). See Pradhan, ed., Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu, 343.

Pruden’s English version mistakes this to be contaminated. See Pruden, Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, 1099.

Ākāra has a rich history of meaning. In the context of Sarvāstivāda path theory, it refers to the sixteen modes of the four noble truths. For more discussion on the usage of this term, see Zhao, A Study of the Usages and Meanings of Ākāra in Abhidharma, 62–97.

Here Paramārtha translate svasatya literally as ‘zidi 自諦’, while Xuanzang translate it as ‘dao 道’ according to the context, since the ‘own truth’ (svasatya; zidi 自諦) of ‘uncontaminated cognition of another’s thoughts’ (anāsrava paracittajñāna; 無漏他心智) is ‘the truth of the path’ (mārgasatya; daodi 道諦). The four ‘modes’ (ākāra) of mārgasatya is ‘path’ (mārga; dao 道), ‘conformity’ (nyāyata; ru 如, ‘practice’ (pratipattita; xing 行), and ‘deliverance’ (nairyāṇikata; chu 出). See Pradhan, ed., Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu, 343.

This translation is based on the Sanskrit version with reference to the two Chinese translations as well as Pruden’s English translation. The author would like to thank David Carpenter for his comments on an earlier version of translation.


Apidamo jushe shilun, T no. 1559, 29: 19.286c27–28: Again, the contaminated (cognition of another’s thoughts) cognizes the specific characteristics of that to be known.

Again, the mode of the contaminated (cognition of another’s thoughts) consists of the specific characteristics of its object.\textsuperscript{69} Skt.: sāsravaṃ paracittajñānāṃ jñeyānāṃ cittacittānāṃ yat svalakṣaṇaṃ tadākārayati svalakṣaṇagrāhakatvāt \textsuperscript{70}

Ch.–P: 若有流他心智，是自所應知心及心法如。如彼相，思想亦爾，能取別相為境故。

Ch.–X: 若有漏者，取自所緣心心所法自相境故。如境自相，行相亦爾，故此非前十六所攝。\textsuperscript{71}

The contaminated cognition of another’s thoughts grasps the specific characteristics of its object, i.e., the mind and mental factors. Therefore, it [also] takes these specific characteristics for its mode.

Skt.: ubhayamapi tu ekaikadravyagocaram yadā cittāṃ gṛhṇāti na tadā cittānāṃ yadā vedanāṃ na tadā saṃjñānāmyevamādi \textsuperscript{73}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{69} Svalakṣaṇa refers to the characteristic unique to an individual dharma. See P. Pradhan, ed., \textit{Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu}, 341. svabhāva evaisāṃ svalakṣaṇam. Apidamo jusbe shilun, T no. 1559, 29: 16.271a7–8: 別相者是彼各各自性。Apidamo jusbe lun, T no. 1558, 29: 23. 118c22–23: 身受心法各別自性名為自相。For more discussion on svalakṣaṇa, see Cox, ‘From Category to Ontology’, 574–76.
\item \textsuperscript{70} Pradhan, ed., \textit{Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu}, 396L7–8.
\item \textsuperscript{71} Apidamo jusbe shilun, T no. 1559, 29: 19.286c28–287a1: As for the contaminated cognition of another’s thoughts, it consists of the mind and mental factors that it cognizes. Its modes are the same with the characteristics of those, since it takes specific characteristics as its object.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Apidamo jusbe lun, T no. 1558, 29: 26.135c11–13: As for contaminated cognition of another’s thoughts, it takes the specific characteristics of its object, i.e., the mind and mental factors. Its modes are the same with the specific characteristics of the object. Therefore, they are not constituted by the sixteen [modes] discussed above.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Pradhan, ed., \textit{Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu}, 396L8–10.
\end{itemize}
Ch.–P: 此二種，偈曰：緣一物為境。释曰：是時若緣心為境，不能緣心法為境。若緣受，不能緣想，如此等。⁷⁴

Ch.–X: 如是二種，於一切時，一念但緣一事為境，謂緣心時，不緣心所，緣受等時，不緣想等。⁷⁵

These two (either the uncontaminated cognition or the contaminated cognition) only take one thing (dravya) as its object (gocara) at a time. When it grasps the mind, it cannot grasp mental factors. When [it grasps] the feeling, it cannot grasp the perception, and so forth.

The main point that triggered the dispute was the question of whether the uncontaminated (anāsrava; wulou 無漏) cognition of another’s thoughts has four modes of the truth of the path (mārga-satyā; daodi 道諦). If this is the case, why can the contaminated (sāsrava; youlou 有漏) cognition of another’s thoughts not have the four modes of the truth of the suffering (duḥkha-satyā; kudi 苦諦) and the four modes of the truth of the origin of suffering (samudaya-satyā; jidi 集諦)?⁷⁶ This might have been a long-lasting debate in the field of Abhidharma at that time, since there were several different answers provided by Abhidharma scholars from the sixth to the seventh century. Puguang listed a few views here, by Master Yuan 遠法師,⁷⁷ Master Nian 念法師, and Master Song 嵩法師 respectively.

⁷⁴ *Apidamo jush e shilun*, T no. 1559, 29: 19.286c26–287a3: These two, the verse says: to take one thing as the object. The commentary says: when it takes the mind as the object, it cannot take mental factors as the object. If it grasps feeling, it cannot grasp perception, and so on.

⁷⁵ *Apidamo jush e lun*, T no. 1558, 29: 26.135c13–15: These two [cognitions] always only take one thing as the object at one time. This means: When grasping the mind, it does not grasp the mental factors; When grasping the feelings and so on, it does not grasp perception and so on.

⁷⁶ *Jushe lun ji*, T no.1821, 41: 26.387b8–11.

⁷⁷ Master Yuan most likely refers to Jingying Huiyuan 净影慧遠 (523–592).
To state past interpretations. First, as Master Yuan states, the cognition of the path (mārgajñāna; daozhi 道智) is the preparatory practice for reading other’s uncontaminated thoughts. Thus, the cognition of other’s uncontaminated thoughts has four modes of the path. The cognition of other’s contaminated thoughts does not need the cognition of the suffering (duḥkhajñāna; kuzhi 苦智) and the cognition of the origin of suffering (samudayajñāna; jizhi 集智) as preparatory practices. Therefore, it does not have the eight modes of suffering and so on.

Second, as Master Nian from Wei states, if the cognition of other’s uncontaminated thoughts has the four modes of the path, it can fully comprehend the activity (yong 用) of another’s thoughts. If the cognition of another’s contaminated thoughts does not grasp the eight modes of the suffering and the origin of suffering, it cannot comprehend the activity of another’s thoughts thoroughly. If it knows suffering, it does not know the origin of suffering. If it knows the origin of suffering, it does not know suffering. Thus, it does not take the eight modes of the suffering and the origin of suffering.

Third, as Master Song from Pengcheng says, the subject (nengyuan 能緣) and the object (suoyuan 所緣) should match in terms of principle (li 理) and activity (shi 事). Since the uncontaminated thoughts as the object contemplates the principle, the cognition of this mind also should contemplate the principle. Thus, the cognition of another’s uncontaminated mind takes the four modes of the path. Since the contaminated thought as the object contemplates the activity, the cognition of this thought also should contemplate the activity. Therefore, the cognition of another’s contaminated thoughts does not grasp the

---

78 Wei County 魏郡 is in current-day Hebei.
eight modes of the suffering and the origin of suffering. 第三, 彭城嵩法師云: ‘能緣所緣, 理事須等。所緣無漏心既是理觀, 能緣他心智還須作理觀知。故知他無漏心, 作道下四行相。所緣有漏心既是事觀, 能緣他心智還須事觀知, 故知他有漏心, 不作苦、集八行相’. 79

Two of the three masters mentioned here relate to Huisong. Master Nian from Wei (Wei nian fashi 魏念法師) refers to Zhinian, 80 Huisong’s immediate disciple, Master Song from Pengcheng (Pengcheng Song fashi 彭城嵩法師) most likely refers to Jingsong, 81 Huisong’s second-generation disciple. However, Puguang does not accept the views of these ‘ancient sages’ (gude 古德), and in the next part refutes all of them.

The Second is to show the mistakes of these views. First, to refute Master Yuan: Since it is stated in the Fundamental Treatise that the eight cognitions during the level of training (śaikṣa; youxue 有學) can serve as the similar and immediately antecedent conditions (sa-manantara–pratyaya; deng wujian yuan 等無間緣) for every single other, isn’t it contradictory to say that the cognition of the path is the preparatory practice for the cognition of another’s thoughts? Second, the argument against Master Nian: There are also four

80 As one of the leading scholars in Abhidharma in Sui dynasty, Zhinian is frequently mentioned in other monks’ biographies under the title Nian fashi 念法師 or Nian lunshi 念論師. For instance, in monk Daojie’s 道傑 (573–627) biography, it is mentioned that Daojie learned from the Wei ital Master Nian 魏念法師. In Zhinian’s biography, this monk Daojie is mentioned as Zhinian’s student. Xu Gaoseng zhuan, T no. 2060, 50: 529b6–7.
81 Although both have song in their name, Huisong is usually referred to as Master Huisong from Gaochang 高昌國慧嵩法師 (T no. 2060, 50: 11.508c7). The title Pengcheng Song fashi usually refers to Jingsong (T no. 1824, 42: 1.17c8; T no. 2061: 1.717a6–7). More evidence that Song fashi in Jushe lun ji refers to Jingsong is that his opinion always comes after Zhinian. Given the fact that Huisong is Zhinian’s master, it is not very possible that Puguang always states disciple’s opinion first and then the master’s opinion.
modes in the uncontaminated thoughts. Knowing only one mode is still not thorough. Thus, it should not take the modes of the Path. Third, the argument against Master Song. Since during the [stage of] contaminated warmth (ūṣman; nuan 煅)\[^{82}\] and others, [the meditator] contemplates the principle, the cognition of [this meditator’s] thoughts also should contemplate the principle. If one argues that [the meditator] is not really contemplating the principle but just contemplating something similar to the principle, the cognition of this meditator’s thoughts should also contemplate something similar to the principle, rather than contemplating the activity. 第二, 出過非者。一, 破遠法師云: ‘本論既言, “有學八智展轉相望, 皆容作等無間緣”, 而言道智他心加行, 奚不相違? ’ 二, 破魏念法師云: ‘無漏心上亦有四行, 知一非餘, 還不知盡, 應當不作道下行相’. 三, 破嵩法師云: ‘有漏煖等既作理觀, 能緣他心智亦作理觀. 若言非真理觀, 是似理觀, 亦應他心智作似理觀知, 非事觀知’.\[^{83}\]

This shows the growing ability of Xuanzang and his successors to question the positions of the previous generations of Chinese Abhidharma specialists, since they had access to a wider range of Indian texts. For instance, to criticize the view that the cognition of the path is the preparatory practice for the cognition of another’s mind, Puguang cites the Fundamental Treatise (benlun 本論). Oftentimes called the ‘Fundamental Treatise by Kātyāyanīputra’ (jiayan benlun 迦

\[^{82}\] This refers to the stage of warmth, the first stage of the four preparatory stages (prayoga; jiaxing wei 加行位). During this stage, the practitioner meditates on the sixteen modes of the four noble truths. See Pradhan, ed., Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu, 343L12–14: kleśendhanadahanasyāryamārgāgneḥ pūrvarūpatvāt | taccatuḥsatyagocaram | tadūṣmagatvā prākarṣiṇatvācaturṣa-tyālambanam |ṣoḍaśākāram. Apidamo jushe shilun, T no. 1559, 29: 16.271b21–24: 是能燒惑薪, 四聖道火前起相故, 故說名暖. 僧曰: 具四諦為境, 有十六種行. 釋曰: 此暖善根由位長故, 具緣四諦為境, 有十六行. Apidamo jusbelun, T no. 1558, 29: 23.119b24–27: 是能燒惑薪聖道火前相, 如火前相故名為煖. 此煖善根分位長故, 能具觀察四聖諦境, 及能具修十六行相. For a more detailed explanation on these stages, see Dhammajoti, ‘Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma’, 435–39.

\[^{83}\] Jushe lun ji, T no. 1821, 41: 26.387b23–c2.
Third, to state the right views. ... The second view: It is possible to contemplate [the object] in detail if the contemplation is cheerful. Thus, the cognition of another’s uncontaminated thoughts grasps the four modes of the path. When contemplating with disgust, one is willing to discard [the object] as a whole. Thus, the cognition of another’s contaminated mind does not grasp the eight modes

---


85. The predicate ‘newly translated’ (*xin fian* 新翻) constantly occurs in the writings of Xuanzang’s disciples. See, for example, *Apidamo da piposha lun*, T no. 1545, 27: 5a16–17. This might relate to Xuanzang’s critical attitude toward some of his predecessors. See Barrett, ‘Kill the Patriarchs’, 94–96.

86. Similar polemics between followers of Xuanzang’s ‘new’ teachings and those ‘old’ Chinese Buddhist exegetical traditions also happened in Yogācāra. See, for instance, *Weisbi erbi lun shuji*, T no. 1834, 43: 985b10. In *Yugie lun ji*, T no. 1828, 42: 520c21–22, there is evidence that scholars from the ‘old’ traditions criticize the ‘new’ translations. Eric M. Greene also provides evidence of such polemics from Dunhuang. See Greene, ‘The Dust Contemplation’, 2. The difference in the Abhidharma case here is that Jingsong and Zhinian had already died when Puguang was writing *Jushe lun ji*, and thus were unable to argue against Puguang.
of the suffering and the origin of suffering. As the seventy-third volume of the *Abhidharmayāyānusāra* says, the uncontaminated mind and mental states of another are subtle and superior. They are not the object of one’s contaminated cognition of another’s mind. This is true. What is the reason that one’s uncontaminated cognition of another’s mind cannot know another’s contaminated mind and mental states? When a uncontaminated cognition cognizes an contaminated object, the mode of the object is different from this cognition. This means that when the uncontaminated cognition contemplates an contaminated object, it always contemplates the disgusted activity in general. Therefore, it is certain that this cognition cannot contemplate another’s contaminated mind and mental states individually to become the cognition of another’s mind. This is because when uncontaminated cognitions\(^\text{87}\) cognize contaminated objects, they feel disgusted at the objects and would like to discard them as a whole rather than contemplating them individually. When contemplating uncontaminated thoughts, delight arises, and they would like to contemplate them both in general and individually. Seeing or hearing something unpleasant, one would discard it after a general glimpse rather than contemplate it individually. For a beloved object this is not the case. After seeing or hearing it in general, one would also like to contemplate it individually. Since it is impossible for the uncontaminated cognition to contemplate another’s contaminated thoughts individually, the uncontaminated cognition of another’s contaminated thought cannot arise. This is because the cognition of another’s thoughts always contemplates another’s mind and mental states individually...

\(^{87}\) Only uncontaminated (*anāsrava; wulou 無漏*) cognition can be called Noble (*ārya; sheng 聖*) Cognition. See Apidamo jushelun, *T* no. 1558, 29: 26. 134b24–25.
相，是故決定不能別緣他心。心所成他心智。以諸聖智緣有漏時，必於所緣深生厭背，樂總棄捨，不樂別觀。緣無漏時生欣樂故，既總觀已，亦樂別觀。如有見聞非所愛事，總緣便捨，不樂別緣。於所愛中則不如是。總見聞已，亦樂別緣。是故於他有漏心等，必無聖智一一別觀，成緣有漏心無漏他心智...”

Here, Puguang is quoting a passage from the *Abhidharmayāyānusāra*, a Vaibhāṣika text composed after the *Abhidharmaṭoṣa*. While questioning the views of past Chinese Abhidharma scholars, Puguang seems again to favor the newly translated Vaibhāṣika texts such as the *Abhidharma-jñānaprasthāna* and the *Abhidharmayāyānusāra*. In another case, Puguang explicitly criticizes Master Nian through a quotation from the *Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣaśāstra* and points out that Zhinian is following the view of Western Masters. Given the fact that these Indian texts themselves are the results of sectarian debates within the Sarvāstivāda School, Xuanzang and Puguang’s favorable attitude towards the Kashmiri Vaibhāṣikas reveals a different kind of borderland complex compared to that of Huisong. While Huisong regarded China as superior to his provincial hometown in Gaochang, Xuanzang, after his journey to the west, was more or less convinced of the authority of Indian Buddhists. Before his journey west, Xuanzang had studied Abhidharma texts with Huixiu and Daoji, both of whom can be traced back to an earlier generation of monks in China who specialized in Abhidharma. Nonetheless, he seemed to be less committed to that legacy, than to the new texts he brought back from India. Trying to use the standard of orthodoxy set up by Indian scholars to refute views of past Chinese masters not only reflects Xuanzang’s and Puguang’s doctrinal preference, but also how they perceived their home ‘borderland’ vis-à-vis an imagined ‘center’.

89 *Jushe lun ji*, T no. 1821, 41: 3.69a17.
FIG. 1 ‘Geographic Map of China to the East’ (Dong Zhengdan dili tu 東震旦地理圖) in Zhipan’s 志磐 (d. after 1269) *A General Record of the Buddha and Other Patriarchs* (*Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀). Huisong travelled from Gaochang (marked as Jushi 車師 on the map) to the east.  

90 *Fozu tongji*, T no. 2035, 49: 32.312.
FIG. 2 ‘Map of the five Indian States in the West’ (*Xitu Wuyin zhitu* 西土五印之圖) in Zhipan’s *Fozu tongji*. Xuanzang travelled through Gaochang to the west. ⁹¹

⁹¹ Ibid, 314.
The map was created using QGIS 3 on the open-source base map of Natural Earth, with data obtained from https://www.naturalearthdata.com/downloads/. The geographical coordinates of the places are acquired from Buddhist Studies Place Authority Databases (https://authority.dila.edu.tw/place/). The precise historical boundaries of these regions are not under current research. Therefore, only points are indicated here.

FIG. 3 Major places mentioned in this paper\textsuperscript{92}
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