

## 0.1. The Purpose of the Study, and the Significance of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* within Buddhist Doctrinal History

The scope of this study is to investigate some of the essential ideas of the last creative phase of Indian Buddhism, namely the Yogācāra school, as presented in one of its earliest and most influential texts, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*.<sup>1</sup> The school of Yogācāra, which is sometimes referred to as the idealistic school of 'Consciousness-only' (Vijñāna-vāda), represents not only the highest point of Mahāyāna philosophy, but also a unique attempt to synthesize the best elements of both Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna doctrines, as one author puts it.<sup>2</sup>

The credit for this accomplishment goes usually to the two illustrious patriarchs of the school, the half-brothers Asaṅga and Vasubandhu, who initially followed the Sarvāstivāda (Hīnayāna) tradition. They lived some time between A.D. 359-450 in the north-western region of Gandhāra which has been, since the time of Alexander the Great, under strong Graeco-Roman influence, shown—according to certain writers—by the presence of Manichaeism and neo-Platonic elements in their works.<sup>3</sup> It is important to note, however, that these two brothers were rather late converts to, and interpreters of, a religious system which was already in existence all over India, not only in the northern regions, but in the more remote coastal areas of the South, as well.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, the findings of many scholars seem to converge toward a common belief, namely that between 100 B.C. and A.D. 200, the bulk of Mahāyāna Buddhist literature developed around the Āndra district of Southeast India, which was an apparent Mahāsaṅghika stronghold.<sup>5</sup> The most renowned Mahāyānist, Nāgārjuna (c. A.D. 150-250), the founder of the Mādhyamika school, was also born in the Āndhra district (near Śrī Parvata or Śrī Śailam) and lived most of his life there, according to his biography translated by Kumārajīva, in the fourth century.<sup>6</sup>

Aside from his own works, which influenced all subsequent Mahāyāna literature to some degree, he greatly contributed to the spread of the *Prajñā-pāramitā* corpus of writings among the Mahāsaṅghikan circles throughout the South. What all these early Mahāyāna scriptures had in common was a certain doctrinal core, at various levels of development, which revolved around such concepts as universal Voidness, a transcendental Buddha, the Bodhisattva stages, the Essence of Buddhahood, an intrinsically pure Mind, etcetera.<sup>7</sup> While there was no doctrinal agreement among the various Mahāsaṅghikan subsects (such as the Ekavyavahārika, Lokottaravāda, and Kukkuṭika), these concepts are found in the texts they all quoted: the *Avatamsaka*, *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, *Śrīmālādevī*, *Vimalakīrti*, *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, *Prajñāpāramitā*, and others.<sup>8</sup> The close doctrinal affinity between some of these texts (*Avatamsaka*, *Śrīmālādevī*, *Prajñāpāramitā* with regard to the Citta-mātra, Tathāgata-garbha, and Śūnyatā concepts, respectively) and the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, indicates in all likelihood a common cultural milieu, to say the least.

The very title of the text which constitutes the subject of this work (*Āryasaddharma-laṅkāvatāronāma-mahāyāna-sūtram*, or "A Mahāyāna scripture, called 'The descent into Laṅkā,' containing the noble orthodox teaching of Buddhism") suggests either South India or Ceylon as its origin. According to an old Pāli legend, dear to the southern Buddhists, the Buddha is said to have visited the island of Laṅkā three times during his preaching career. On the other hand, the name *Laṅkā* may also be taken in the metaphorical sense to symbolize a magical place (either a solitary island in the middle of the ocean, or a citadel on the peak of Mount Malaya) where beings larger than life, such as an omniscient, transcendental Buddha and the many-headed king of the *rākṣasas*, Rāvaṇa, meet for the purpose of hearing the doctrine of Enlightenment, as laid out in the first chapter of the book.<sup>9</sup>

The southern origin of the text may also be inferred from the fact that its first translators into Chinese, Dharmarakṣa and Guṇabhadra, came from central India, and were Law-Teachers of the *Tripiṭaka*, the southern (Theravāda/Hīnayāna) canon, who had—just like the two brothers in the North, Asaṅga and Vasubandhu—only recently joined the ranks of Mahāyāna converts.<sup>10</sup>

Conversions such as these were by no means uncommon, especially when southern Buddhists travelled to northern monastic centers of learning.<sup>11</sup> For example, the Tibetan historian Tāranātha (Kun-dga'-sniñ-po) mentions among the twelve *Tāntrika* teachers of Vikramaśīla in the eighth century a certain *ācārya* called Laṅkā-jayabhadra (or Jayabhadra from Laṅkā, or Ceylon; Tibetan: Laṅkā-

rgyal-bzañ). Having become a *bhikṣu paṇḍita*, versed in all the Śrāvaka *Piṭakas*, he went to Magadha, where he became a Mahāyānist and Tantric scholar, particularly of the Guhya-tantra school. Then he went back to the southern town of Koṅkana, where he preached Guhya-tantrayāna before finally establishing himself as the Tantra-cārya of Vikramaśīla.<sup>12</sup>

By that time (seventh-eighth century), the monastic university of Vikramaśīla (in the area of modern Bihar) had already become the hub of Buddhist missionary activity, as well as learning. It was from such places of high learning that the teachings of the Yogācāra school were first taken into China by the second (actually the first) Ch'an Patriarch, Bodhidharma, in the fifth century, and to Tibet by Padmasambhava in the seventh century, where it has survived up to modern times as one of the main strands of Tibetan Buddhism.

According to Chinese tradition, Bodhidharma is said to have received the teaching of the Laṅkāvatāra (later known as the Ch'an) school, directly from Guṇabhadra, the second of the four known translators of the *Sūtra*, and the alleged first patriarch of the school.<sup>13</sup> He is also believed to have written a commentary on the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, the *Leng-chia yao-i*, also known as *Ta-mo lun*.<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately, the life of Bodhidharma is shrouded in mystery—due partly to the scarcity of reliable evidence, and partly to the mythological embellishments added in later periods—as is the possible use of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* in the early history of Ch'an.<sup>15</sup> According to J. R. McRae, the following is known from Chinese sources:<sup>16</sup>

He was a native of South India, a Brahmin by birth and perhaps a member of the ruling family of some unknown and probably minor principality. He was a Mahāyānist and a meditation instructor who focused his proselytic efforts on the Lo-yang area. Other than these few remarks and what may be inferred from his *EJSHI* [*Erh-ju ssu-hsing lun* or *Treatise on the Two Entrances and Four Practices*, McRae's abbreviation, n.n.], nothing else can be said about him with any certainty.

As far as the transmission of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* itself, and the role it played in the subsequent development of the school, McRae points out two separate issues, namely (1) whether or not Bodhidharma and/or Hui-k'o (his first disciple and the second patriarch) actually used the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, and (2) the connection between this text and the Ch'an tradition descended from him.<sup>17</sup>

To answer the first question, McRae analyzes three references to the *Laṅkāvatāra* found in Hui-k'o's biography, as preserved in

Tao-hsüan's *Hsü Kao-seng-chuan* (*Biographies of Famous Buddhist Monks*, or *HKSC*, in short). For their relevance to our study, let us reproduce them here (in McRae's translation), as follows:<sup>18</sup>

- [1] In the beginning *Dhyāna* Master (Bodhi)dharma transmitted the four-fascicle *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra* to (Hui)-k'o, saying: "this *Sūtra* is the only one that is suitable for China. If you base your practice on it you will attain salvation." (Hui)-k'o single-mindedly imparted the mysterious principle (of the *Lañkāvatāra* to his students) just as it had been explained before (by Bodhidharma).
- [2] At the end of each of his sermons, (Hui)-k'o said: "(The understanding of) this *Sūtra* will become superficial after four generations. How utterly lamentable!"
- [3] Therefore the Masters Na and (Hui)-man always carried the four-fascicle (version of the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra* as the "essential (teaching) of the mind" (*hsin-yao*). They preach and practice it at every occasion, never varying from (the true understanding thereof) that had been bequeathed to them.

One can glean from these statements that the *Sūtra* was held in high regard during the early stage of its transmission into China. However, according to McRae's findings, "These three short statements appear quite out of context in the *Hsü Kao-seng-chuan*," and they may have been interpolated into the text of Hui-k'o's biography along with other biographical materials.<sup>19</sup>

Therefore, McRae concludes, the first issue cannot be definitively resolved, because "there is no direct evidence to suggest that Bodhidharma and Hui-k'o did in fact use the *Lañkāvatāra*." Indirect evidence would suggest that interest in the *Lañkāvatāra* peaked sometime between the sixth and seventh centuries, but waned after a short period. While it is conceivable, McRae argues further, that Bodhidharma and Hui-k'o were among the first Buddhists in China to make use of the text, it is quite certain that a final blow to its popularity was incurred by the career of Hsüan-tsang, who refused to permit lecturing on previously-translated scriptures, specifically the *Lañkāvatāra*.<sup>20</sup>

As far as the possibility of a real connection between the *Sūtra* and the later Ch'an tradition of the North is concerned, and of its use by the *Dhyāna* Masters of the North as a justification for the idea of sudden Enlightenment, after thoroughly researching the evidence,

McRae concludes:<sup>21</sup>

. . . The connection between the *Lañkāvatāra Sūtra* and the Northern School during the early eighth century was equally tenuous. Although this scripture apparently had some kind of mystical appeal to the followers of early Ch'an, there is no evidence that its contents had any impact on the development of the School.

However, our contention is that the impact of the text should not be judged exclusively by the specific references to it found in the works of one author or another, nor by the continuity of a single idea, such as that of sudden Enlightenment.

Rather, the *Sūtra's* influence should be judged in the context of the number of characteristic concepts it had in common with other related texts, as we have previously pointed out. That would explain why so many different schools of thought claimed relation to, and derived authority from the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra*. Since this text represents an attempt to gather many of the concepts floating freely, so to speak, in the South Indian Buddhist cultural milieu (such as Tathāgata-garbha and Ālaya-vijñāna, Śūnyatā and Dharmadhātu, Self-lessness and Self-realization), its insights and solutions fueled the inquisitiveness of the Chinese mind for a much longer time and at a much deeper level than the texts themselves would allow us to infer. One cannot but agree with Suzuki's assessment in this respect that "It is difficult to say how significant these characteristics of this text were to the earliest Ch'an figures."<sup>22</sup>

More recently, another scholar, Bernard Faure, after an impressive investigation of the lineage and doctrine of the northern Ch'an, gives us a more committed assessment, which concurs with the broader view regarding the influence of the text in China and beyond (see below). He says:<sup>23</sup>

The heterogeneity of the *Lañkāvatāra* thus allowed quite different currents of thought to harken back to this sūtra. While a master of the tradition of Hua-yen like Li T'ung-hsüan (635-730) could characterize it by the Yogācāra theories such as the "five dharmas" (*pañca-dharma*), the "three Self-natures" (*trisvabhāva*), the "eight vijñānas" and the "double absence of Self" (*nairātmya-dvaya-lakṣaṇa*), a representant of Ch'an like Yung-ming Yen-shou (904-975) retains of it only the emphasis given to "the spirit of the Buddha's words."

According to Faure, the divergent trends with regard to practice (sudden or gradual Enlightenment), just as those with regard to doctrine, can also be traced back to the *Lañkāvatāra*. He continues:<sup>24</sup>

On the practical level, the *Lañkāvatāra* provided the adepts of Ch'an with the notions of "suddenness" or the "dhyāna of the Tathāgata." Kuna Hōryu had already stressed that this sūtra was not as "gradualistic" as Shen-hui and his heirs proclaimed it to be. Hence, it is possible that the "masters of the northern dhyāna," amongst whom Chih-i, the patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai school, criticizes the excessive "suddenness" [doctrine, n.n.], and who claim their lineage from the *Lañkāvatāra*, are none other than the disciples of Bodhidharma. For Yanagida, the Ch'an of Bodhidharma and of Hui-k'o—whose *Sequence to Biographies* points out the specifics—is doubtless the "dhyāna of the Tathāgata" as defined by the *Lañkāvatāra*.

In conclusion, Faure aptly points out, all these divergent trends betray the myth of a purely spiritual search ("le myth d'un Ch'an 'angelique'," perpetuated by Suzuki and others), the search for a transcendental Truth uncontaminated by its relation with the molding agents of history, political and otherwise.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, one can say that, from the larger, historical perspective, dichotomies such as orthodoxy and heterodoxy, northern and southern, sudden and gradual (Enlightenment), reason and faith, scriptural knowledge and mystical insight, by themselves, prove the relative nature of any 'transcendental Truth' held by one school or another, at one time or another, based upon this text or the other.

Furthermore, it is important to remember in this context that there was another school in the study of the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra* beside the one transmitted by Bodhidharma and his followers of the northern (Ch'an) school of Buddhism. This was the school known as Yogācāra idealism, based upon Asaṅga's *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, whose lineage is still traceable today.<sup>26</sup> Since this school revolves around the *garbha* theory, as well as the system of the Eight Vijñānas (especially the *Ālaya-vijñāna*), the *Lañkāvatāra* has been used as one of its central authorities.<sup>27</sup> When these two concepts (Garbha and *Ālaya*) became combined under one theory of Citta-Mātra, as taught in the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, the *Lañkāvatāra* was even more eagerly sought by the followers of both schools.<sup>28</sup> Some of the commentaries on the treatise written by Asaṅga were in fact the work of obscure Zen Masters, such as Ch'ien and Shih.<sup>29</sup> Jikidō Takasaki's opinion is relevant in these matters and well worth quoting:<sup>30</sup>



The *Laṅkāvatāra* is actually a collection of various theories among Mahāyāna Buddhism, among which the *garbha* theory, and the Vijñānavāda are prominent, and these two are combined under the theory of *cittamātra* taught in the *Avatamsaka*. Later Vijñānavādins regarded the *Laṅkāvatāra* as one of the authorities, but in China it was respected by the followers of the *Avatamsaka* school as well, because of its exposition of the *cittamātra* and *garbha* theory. This is quite significant for determining the fate of the *garbha* theory, to which we will refer at the end of this introduction.

His assessment supports the point that the influence of the text went beyond its immediate transmission and use by a narrow circle of early followers of Bodhidharma's teachings.

Now, the first Chinese translation of the text is, unfortunately, lost, but we do know that it was done in A.D. 420 by Dharmaraksha, whose title was: "Master of the Law, Teacher of the Tripiṭaka, of Central India." It had four fasciculi and bore the simple title, *The Laṅka-Sūtra*. The second translation (which is, in fact, the first extant one), also in four fasciculi under the longer title, *The Laṅkāvatāra-Treasure-Sūtra*, was done by Guṇabhadra, as mentioned, in A.D. 443. Two more translations from "the same text" were subsequently attempted: one by the northern teacher Bodhiruci (criticized by Fa-tsang) in A.D. 513, and the other by Śikshānanda, between 700-714, with a preface by the Empress Tse-t'ien Wu-hou (and revised by Fa-tsang and others). These last two versions had, respectively, ten and seven fasciculi.

It was the fourth and last translation, entitled *The Mahāyāna Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, that was considered by Suzuki to be the best of all the Chinese versions, being the product of cooperative effort by both Chinese and Indian scholars.<sup>31</sup> However, the only extant commentaries by Chinese and Japanese scholars are based upon the older, and shortest translation in four fasciculi attributed to Guṇabhadra. One of the two extant Tibetan translations was also done from Guṇabhadra's version of the original Sanskrit. The origin and date of the other is, unfortunately, quite obscure.<sup>32</sup>

Most commentaries still extant are in Chinese, none in Sanskrit. There are altogether fifteen works dealing with the subject of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* in Chinese: two of the T'ang dynasty, four of the Sung dynasty, seven of the Ming dynasty, and two of the Ch'ing dynasty. One of the T'ang commentaries has received special attention among Japanese scholars. It was written by Fa-tsang as a comprehensive introduction to the study of the *Laṅkāvatāra* and

it represents, in Suzuki's opinion, the "most valuable literature ever written in connection with the sūtra."<sup>33</sup>

Incidentally, in as far as the Ch'an patriarchal tradition is concerned, one should also be aware of the occasional substitution of names, especially in Tibet, where, for instance, the lineage of a fifth century Kashmiri monk, Dharmatrāta, becomes Bodhidharma's lineage, while Bodhidharma himself becomes known as Bodhidharmatrāta. In China, too, the names of the early translators (Bodhiruci, Guṇabhadra and Bodhidharma) were often confused and biographical details easily transferred.<sup>34</sup>

In Japan, the *Sūtra* was known and studied from the Nara era in the eighth century, when owning or copying a Buddhist text was considered a deed of merit. However, it was not until the fourteenth century that the first commentary was written by a Zen monk called Kokwan Shiren (1278-1346). In this eighteen-fasciculi work, entitled *Butsugoshinron* (or, "Treatise on the Essence—or Heart—of the Buddha-teaching"), he undertook a division of the *Sūtra* into eighty-six sections, according to various topics that he distinguished in the text. Since he was also the author of a thirty-fasciculi history of Buddhism, known as *The Genko Shakusho*, his authority was respected by successive commentators, who maintained his topical division of the *Sūtra* as a useful frame of reference in analysing its contents. Thus, Tokugan Yōson's commentary, written in 1687, is considered to be an improved and expanded version of Kokwan's work.

A third Japanese book on the *Laṅkāvatāra* is *Ryōgakyō Kōyoku* by Kōken, mentioned by Seigai Omura and Gisho Nakano in the *Explanatory Notes* to the *Nihon Daizōkyō* (completed in 1921).<sup>35</sup> In addition, more recent Japanese studies are also referred to by Suzuki in his *Studies*, p. 65. They are: Sogen Yamakami's Japanese rendering of Śikshānanda's translation of A.D. 714 (the T'ang version in seven fasciculi); Shōshi Mitsui's brief exposition of the *Laṅkāvatāra* teaching; and Hōkei Idzumi's Japanese translation of the Nanjio edition of the Sanskrit original, which was used also by Suzuki for his own English translation.<sup>36</sup>

Aside from the Nanjio edition, which is the most complete and therefore most widely used one today, there are two other Sanskrit versions of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. The first was issued by the Buddhist Texts Publishing Society with an introductory note by Dr. Kaikyoku Watanabe entitled "Concerning the Original Text of the *Laṅkāvatāra* and Its Chinese Translations." The editor, the Reverend Shōshi Mitsui, also included a free rendition of the contents, referred to above. His edition was superseded by the Nanjio text of 1923, which mentions it as one of the sources consulted.<sup>37</sup>



A more recent edition, entitled *Saddharmalaṅkāvatārasūtra*, (Darbhanga: 1963), was put out by P. L. Vaidya, with an Introduction by S. Bagchi. Although I did not consult it during the writing of this book, it does not seem to add further material, since it is based on the same manuscript (No. 3 from the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts in the possession of the Asiatic Society of London) which was used, among other sources, by Nanjio.

In Nepal, the *Laṅkāvatāra* is still used as one of the nine principal Mahāyāna texts (the *Nava Grantha*) of Newari Buddhism. Along with the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, it represents the quintessential teachings of the Yogācāra school in what is, in fact, the last authentic survival of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism.<sup>38</sup>

Now, the relation between the *Laṅkāvatāra* and Zen (Ch'an) may be summarized thus: Bodhidharma brought from southern India the mystical outlook propounded by the *Ekayāna* school with its stress on meditation (*dhyāna*).<sup>39</sup> There is good reason to believe that he either knew about the *Sūtra* before returning to China, or he became acquainted with it from the writings of Guṇabhadra. At any rate, once familiar with the contents of the text, he felt inclined to emphasize its experiential, mystical side, rather than its doctrinal and metaphysical aspects. It is highly probable that certain statements found in the text caught his attention and guided his teachings. Such statements are found in abundance throughout the *Sūtra*; here are a few samples from chapter III, pages 194-97:<sup>40</sup>

Mahāmati, words (utterances) are dependent on letters, but meaning is not. (p. 194, ll. 1-2)

Mahāmati, a son or a daughter of a good family who conforms himself/herself to the letter (*vyañcana*) will ruin his/her (understanding of) the ultimate truth/reality, and will cause (others) to fail to recognize (the truth, *paramārtha*). (195, ll. 1-3)

Therefore, Mahāmati, let son or daughter of a good family take good heed not to get attached to words as being in perfect conformity with meaning, because (the meaning) of truth (does not come) from the letter.

You must not be misled by looking at the finger-tip. For instance, Mahāmati, when someone with his finger-tip points something to somebody, he (the latter) may mistake the finger-tip for the things to be pointed at. (196, ll. 4-8)

This is explained at length in the following paragraph (197, ll. 1-8):

Mahāmati, the meaning is pure [*vivikta*, lit., kept apart, separated, abstract, clear] and is the cause of Nirvāṇa. Words [*ruta*, utterance] are tied to discrimination [or imagination, *vikalpa*] and are the vehicle of transmigration (*Saṃsāra*). Moreover, Mahāmati, meaning is attained from the accumulation of much learning; and this much learning, Mahāmati, means to be experienced with meaning and not to be skillful with words.

Then, to be experienced with meaning means (to have) a view which is not at all affected by any philosophical school, and which will keep not only yourself but others as well from falling away (from truth). So is said, Mahāmati, that much learning is (conducive to) true meaning.

Therefore, let those (possessing much learning) be honored by him who is longing for meaning, while those acting in the opposite way to this, namely those who are attached to (the idea) that meaning is the same as the words, they are to be disregarded and shunned by truth-seekers.

The emphasis on the spirit rather than the letter of the scripture is very concisely expressed in the following verse which, perhaps, gave currency to the celebrated metaphor and most frequently quoted word of wisdom in the entire history of Zen Buddhism:<sup>41</sup>

As the immature observes the finger-tip and not the moon,  
so indeed those who cling to the letter (*akṣara*) do not see my  
truth [or essence, *tattva*].

Statements such as quoted above may very well have influenced Bodhidharma's general frame of interpretation of the Buddhist texts, including the *Laṅkāvatāra*, which in our time led Buddhologists like Suzuki and others to draw the following retrospective assessment:<sup>42</sup>

(If) all religious experience requires its intellectual interpretation, Zen, too, must have its philosophical background, which is found in the *Laṅkāvatāra* . . .

. . . The transcendental intuitionism of Zen and the teaching of Pratyātmagatigocara in the *Laṅkāvatāra* were what connected the two so closely.

If one accepts Suzuki's interpretation, the next step would be to say that whatever attracted a religious virtuoso like Bodhidharma to the study of this sūtra—be it the abandonment of reason, or

mystical experience—proved to be tantamount to “attaining the unattainable” for the great majority of his followers. This might explain why the study of the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra* after Fa-ch’ung (who was contemporary with Hung-jen, the fifth patriarch of Zen Buddhism), gradually fell into neglect, being replaced by that of the *Vajracchedikā*, a sūtra belonging to the *Prajñā-pāramitā* literature. Whether this change was due to textual and doctrinal difficulties, as Suzuki suggests,<sup>43</sup> or on account of the preferences and idiosyncracies of one master or another, as Bernard Faure discovered,<sup>44</sup> it is a complicated and difficult issue to decide, especially when, regretfully, one does not have access to the Chinese and Japanese sources. According to Suzuki, in the Preface to the Chin-shan edition, (Sung dynasty, 1085), Su Tung-pei wrote the following:<sup>45</sup>

The *Lañkāvatāra* is deep and unfathomable in meaning, and in style so terse and antique, that the reader finds it quite difficult to punctuate the sentences properly, not to say anything about his adequately understanding their ultimate spirit and meaning which go beyond the letter.

This was the reason why the sūtra grew scarce and it became almost impossible to get hold of a copy.

What both Faure and Suzuki seem to suggest is that once Zen became popular outside the small circle of early followers of the *Lañkāvatāra*, the pressure to favor the larger body of *Prajñā-pāramitā* literature, rather than relying exclusively upon a single authoritative text, increased.<sup>46</sup> In addition, the growing belief that for those endowed with unusual sharpness of mind, Buddhahood could be attained through a flash of insight, triggered by a mere gesture or pithy utterance, contributed to a general attitude of aloofness from all the written scriptures, characteristic of the late Zen followers.<sup>47</sup>