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FASCICLE ONE

Part One

Since the Sui and Tang, the lineage of Bodhidharma 達磨 has been promoted greatly, but scholastics have doubts about it. Many of them use the *Fu fazang zhuan* 付法藏傳 [Account of the Transmission of the Dharma Treasury] to raise questions. They say that this history lists only twenty-four generations up to the patriarch Simha 師子 and then ends. [They say that] what Bodhidharma inherited does not truly descend from the honored one Simha [and that] the so-called [Chan lineage of] twenty-eight [Indian] patriarchs is thus a deceptive story of later men. Chan [monks] sometimes quote the *Baolin zhuan* 寶林傳 [Record of Baolin [Temple]] to substantiate [this tradition], but the *Baolin zhuan* is also a Chan book. Accordingly, critics are scarcely inclined to accept it. With all this noisy squabbling, for generations there has been no way to set the matter straight. [773c10]

I was disquieted by this, and therefore I investigated the two [differing] accounts [of Indian patriarchs], wanting, with all humility, to determine the truth. In examining the so-called *Fu fazang zhuan*, [I find that] it was done in the Later Wei 後魏 (386–535). It appeared after the destruction of Buddhism in the [Taiping] Zhenjun 大平 真君 era (440–452), translated by the Indian monk Kiṅkara 吉迦夜.²

¹ In the following, italics indicate not only titles but also interlineal notes. Since these notes were written by Qisong himself, I have chosen not to relegate them to footnotes but to keep them in the text, identified by italics. Note also that the names of patriarchs are according to Yampolsky’s Sanskrit reconstructions (*The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, 8–9) unless otherwise noted.

I inspected the items in each of the accounts and [found] that there was some order to the generations of patriarchs. In examining the text, however, [I found that] the transmissions from masters to disciples, the countries from which they came, their surnames, and their clans were extremely muddled. Whatever is more detailed has been plucked from all the sections of the tripitaka and is not original [to this text]. Ordinarily, if one wishes to write a book describing a person and the generations before and after [him], he must verify the lineage from ancestors and father down to sons. Furthermore, the family name, clan, and place of the person as well as how his activities came about must be presented without the omission of the smallest detail so that later generations place their faith in it. Only then may it be called an historical account. [773c18]

Now although this book is called an “account,” these matters are always undetailed. For example, when it narrates the lives of the seven patriarchs Miccaka 彌遮迦多, Buddhanandi 佛陀難提, and the Elder Biluo 比羅長老 down to Vasubandhu 婆修槃陀, Manorhita 摩拏羅, Haklenayaśas 鴿勒那夜奢, and the arhat Simha, there is no mention of personal transmissions from master to disciple.3 As for the three patriarchs Buddhanandi, Haklenayaśas, and Simha, they are the most lacking in the description of predecessors. We do not see from whom they received [the transmission], and [in describing] the later generations to whom it was entrusted, the text says only, “…next transmitted to…next there was…there was also a certain bhiksú” and so forth. If, in the end, the transmission is neither clearly nor completely recounted, how is this adequate as an historical account? How could it appear credible to later generations? [773c26]

[The Fu fazang zhuan] tells of the bhiksú Simha, saying that the king of Kashmir had false views and because of this beheaded Simha with a sharp sword. From his head flowed no blood, only milk. The men who transmitted the dharma were, with this, cut off.4 I say this story really cannot be true. Let me attempt to comment on it. For instance, in the account of Mahākāśyapa, it says, “When the Buddha was about to pass into extinction, he said to Mahākāśyapa, ‘I am going to enter nirvāṇa. I entrust to you this profound dharma. In the future, you

3 A number of scholars have taken Elder Biluo to be Kapimala 迦比摩羅, but Maspero, seconded by Young, questions this and proposes Vīra instead (Maspero 141; Young 120).
4 Condenses the Fu fazang yinyuan zhuan, T. 2058.321c15–18.