



ANVEṢANĀ

Journal of the Postgraduate Institute
of Pali and Buddhist Studies

Volume 17, Issue I, 2026



Experiencing the Whole Body (*Sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī*): Interpretative Differences between Theravāda and Selected Northern Buddhist Traditions in Breath Meditation

Ven. Li Yukun*

PhD research scholar in PGIPBS, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka.

Article Info

Keywords:

*Breathing Meditation,
sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī,
Theravāda Buddhism,
Northern Buddhism,
meditation interpretation*

*Corresponding author

E-mail address:

dunyu0619@gmail.com

ORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1946-3082>

Journal homepage:

anveshana.kln.ac.lk

ISSN:

1391-474X

E-ISSN:

3051-5726

Editor-in-Chief:

Ven. Prof. Miriswaththe
Wimalagnana

ABSTRACT

This paper takes the concept of sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī (“experiencing the whole body”) in the Ānāpānasati Sutta as an anchor point to examine the interpretative differences between Theravāda and some Selected Northern Buddhist traditions. Since the original canonical phrasing is brief and open-ended, it leaves ample room for the later interpretations. In the Theravāda (Southern) tradition, texts such as the Paṭisambhidāmagga, Vimuttimaggā, Visuddhimagga, etc. offer varying explanations, yet show a general tendency toward analytical clarification, increasing precision in meditation objects, and a strong emphasis on methodological operability. Notably, they consistently avoid interpreting “the whole body” as the diffusion of breath throughout the physical body. In contrast, Northern Buddhist sources—including Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma treatise, Madhyamaka and Yogācāra texts, as well as Tiantai literature—display a more integrative and constructive orientation. Their interpretations of “experiencing the whole body” often contain an integrative understanding of body, breath, and mind, and in some cases also include use of visualization. Although their theories are diverse, this shared trend indicates some potential common character in epistemological and methodological approaches. By comparing these traditions, this paper argues that the divergence in interpreting sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī reflects deeper differences in how meditative experience is structured: one emphasizing analytical observation of physical and mental phenomena, the other tending toward integration and construction. On this basis, the paper further raises an open question that whether it is possible to borrowing their approaches in contemporary meditation practice?

1. Introduction

Among the teachings of Buddhist meditation, mindfulness of breathing (*ānāpānasati*) has always occupied a unique and important position. In early texts such as the *Ānāpānasati-sutta*, it states: “I will breathe in experiencing the whole body...” (*sabbakāyapaṭisaṃvedī assasissāmīti sikkhati...*). What exactly does “whole body (*sabbakāya*)” refer to here? Is it the entire process of the breath itself, or the physical body of the practitioner? Or does it mean that the breath pervades the whole body? Or is it the whole *nāma-rūpa*? Furthermore, how is one to understand “experiencing the whole body (*sabbakāyapaṭisaṃvedī*)”? This seemingly subtle ambiguity is in fact a key point of breathing meditation. The commentarial traditions throughout history have offered different interpretations of it, and modern scholars and meditation practitioners have also paid attention to it, but so far, specialized studies that focus on this concept and compare the Southern and Northern traditions are still rare.

The starting point of this paper is a striking yet under-discussed phenomenon: in pre-Tang Northern Buddhist literature, including Sarvāstivāda texts, Indian Mahayana and Chinese Buddhist texts, “experiencing the whole body” is consistently understood as the awareness of the breath expanding throughout the entire body. In sharp contrast, in the Southern Theravada tradition, although texts such as the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, the *Vimuttimaggā*, the *Visuddhimaggā*, and commentaries like the *Papañcasūdanī* have diverse interpretations, they consistently avoid the view of experiencing the breath expanding throughout the entire body. This phenomenon is unlikely to be accidental. Therefore, this paper explores the following question: Why does the plural and complex Northern Buddhism show an accordant understanding on this issue, while the Theravada tradition, which also has internal differences, consistently exclude this interpretation? This paper approaches this question mainly from epistemological and methodological perspectives.

From the angle of Southern Buddhism, the interpretation of “experiencing the whole body” seemingly reflects an analytical character, and a tendency toward precision and operability. For example, the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, included in the *Khuddaka-nikāya* but possessing somewhat abhidhamma-like character, proposes that awareness expands from breathing to the entirety of *nāma* and *rūpa*; later, the *Vimuttimaggā* of the Abhayagiri tradition also analyzes “the whole body” as the *nāma*-body and *rūpa*-body; and by the time of Buddhaghosa’s *Visuddhimaggā* and the *Papañcasūdanī*, the stabilization of the meditation object and the clarity of steps become even more highlighted. This tendency may be supposed internally consistent with the analytical character of *vibhajjavāda*.

In contrast, although Northern Buddhism is more complex and doctrinally

diverse, it shows a coherent tone toward some kind of integration and construction in meditation approaches and doctrinal interpretation. Anchoring the concept of "experiencing the whole body", this paper examines texts ranging from Sarvāstivāda to Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, and Chinese Tiantai, etc., and tries to explore certain shared epistemological and methodological features. I suggest that this shared tendency may be related to the pivotal figure of Vasubandhu. His *Abhidharmakośa* enabled the entire Northern Buddhist intellectual sphere to share certain theoretical ideas and meditation methods, such as the approach of *adhimokṣa-manaskāra* (determinative conceptualization) in meditation, as well as the tendencies of integration and construction. After Northern Buddhism was transmitted into China, these integrative and constructive character became more obvious. In the Tiantai tradition discussed in this paper, the body, breath, and mind are treated as an inseparable field, and the breath and cosmic energy are also experienced as a whole.

In short, this paper takes the concept of "experiencing the whole body" as an anchor, and attempts to examine certain epistemological and methodological differences embodied in Southern and Northern Buddhism, through "seeing the large from the small", it provides an entry point for a deeper understanding of the textual and ideastical character of these traditions. On this basis, this paper also attempts to raise an open question: in contemporary meditation practice, is it possible to appropriately apply the meditation methods of Southern and Northern Buddhism? For example, in breath meditation, one may take the clear steps and operability provided by the *Visuddhimagga* as a foundation, while at the same time drawing the Tiantai understanding of the integrated relationship of body–breath–mind, thereby expanding the dimension of meditative experience. Of course, this assumption is just a possible direction for further discussion and practical reflection.

2. Literature Review

1. Textual Sources

This paper examines the *Anapanasati-sutta* (MN 118) and the *Kayagatasati-sutta* (MN 119) in the *Majjhima-nikāya*, as well as their parallel texts in the *Āgama*, such as *Samyukta-āgama* 803, and the "Ānāpāna Chapter" in volume seven of the *Ekottarika-āgama*, as the source texts for the concept of *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī*. The simple statement in these scriptures left big room for different interpretations in later commentarial traditions. In the Southern tradition, the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, which is included in the *Khuddaka-nikāya* but has somewhat abhidhamma character, proposes that awareness expands from mindfulness of breathing to the whole of *nāma* and *rūpa*; later, the *Vimuttimagga* of the Abhayagiri school also analyzes "the whole body" as *nāma*-body and *rūpa*-body, but places more emphasis on

the experience of bodily pleasure in meditation; and by the time of Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga* and the *Papañcasūdanī* and other commentaries, the stability of the meditation object and the clarity of the steps become more highlighted.

In contrast, Northern Buddhist literature (apart from the *Āgama* texts mentioned above) presents a significantly different interpretative path. This paper mainly examines the Sarvāstivāda texts: *Mahāvibhāṣā*, *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, and *Nyāyānusāra*; the Madhyamaka text *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*; the Yogācāra text *Yogācārabhūmi*; and texts such as the *Tattvasiddhi-śāstra* and the *Sūtra on the Samādhi of Sitting Meditation* (坐禪三昧經), which have both Śrāvaka and Mahayana characteristics. As for Chinese literature, this paper mainly examines the Tiantai text *Exposition of the Sequential Methods of the Dhyāna Pāramitā* (釋禪波羅密次第法門). In addition to the texts mentioned above, I also examine the *Abhidharmakośa* (俱舍論), the *Six Profound Dharma Gates* (六妙法門), and the *Samādhi Method of the Non-Contentious of All Dharma* (諸法無諍三昧法門), although these three texts do not directly have the content of the “sixteen modes (十六勝行),” they have detailed interpretation of breathing meditation.

2. Modern References

In the field of modern Buddhist study and meditation practice, research on the four *satipaṭṭhāna* in the Southern tradition is prosperous. Moreover, the practice of breathing has always been emphasized. This paper mainly focuses on reference materials that combine meditation practice and academic study. In the 1960s and 1970s, Nyanaponika (1962), Soma (1967), Bhikkhu Bodhi (1995), and others tended to conservatively inherit the perspective of the Southern commentarial tradition, therefore, we can see that their understanding of *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* aligns with the commentarial literature. But later, Bhikkhu Buddhadasa (1997) and Bhikkhu Anālayo (2019) proposed their new views on *sabbakāya*, and Anālayo (2019) has also given arguments on the interpretations of “experiencing the whole body” in both Southern and Northern texts.

Regarding the Northern part, Dhammajoti's (2008) article *The Sixteen-mode Mindfulness of Breathing* carefully compares the interpretations of each step of the sixteen modes in texts such as the *Sarvāstivāda Mahāvibhāṣā*, the *Abhidharmakośa*, the *Nyāyānusāra*, the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, as well as texts from other schools and Mahayana such as the *Śāriputrābhidharma*, the *Tattvasiddhi-śāstra*, and the *Yogācārabhūmi*. On the basis of such textual comparison, this paper further attempts to explore epistemological and methodological differences between Southern and Northern Buddhism. Another article by Dhammajoti (2007), *The Role of adhimokṣa in Meditation: The Sarvāstivāda Tradition*, discusses the application of visualization in

meditation in the context of the Sarvāstivāda, which also provides a reliable reference to analyze the differences between Southern and Northern Buddhism. In addition, Shi Daji's (2007) article *A Comparison between the Breathing Method in the Dīgha Nikāya's Mahāsatipatṭhāna-sutta and the Ānāpāna Method in the Yogācārabhūmi* questions whether experiencing the breath throughout the whole body would distract meditative absorption, and the author's reflections prompted to further examine and think about this issue. Furthermore, Zhou Rouhan's (2009) article *A Study on the Sixteen Steps of Ānāpānasamṛti 'Bodily Formation'* mainly studies the fourth step "calming the bodily formation." It has a close connection with the third step "experiencing the whole body" discussed in this paper. Since this paper involves texts from multiple traditions, it also refers to some studies by modern scholars on the doctrinal thought of these traditions, but since they are not directly related to the topic of this paper, they will not be listed one by one.

The research mentioned above provides valuable discussions on *ānāpānasati* from different textual and practical perspectives. However, they mainly focus on the teaching of *ānāpānasati* in individual traditions or comparative studies of meditation systems in a broader sense. That means, until now, few studies on *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* as a specific case to investigate how the concise teachings preserved in early Buddhism (*Nikāya* and *Āgama*) have developed into different interpretive frameworks in later Buddhist traditions.

3. Methodology

The methodology of this paper is mainly based on close textual reading and comparative analysis, and takes the concept of *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* as an anchor to trace the epistemological and methodological characteristics reflected in the texts. The specific use of texts can be seen in the "Literature review". In addition, this paper also appropriately employs a historical perspective to briefly introduce the background of the text. It examines how later Buddhist traditions interpret this concise instruction preserved in early Buddhist discourses. The analysis begins with the relevant *Nikāya* and *Āgama* passages as the common textual foundation, and then investigates their subsequent interpretations in Theravada and selected Northern Buddhist traditions.

4. Discussion

(1) The Statement of *Sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* in the *Nikāya* and *Āgama*

In the discourses on mindfulness of breathing, such as the *Ānāpānasati-sutta* and the *Kāyagatāsati-sutta*, there is a step called "*sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī*" (experiencing the whole body). In the *Ānāpānasati-sutta*, this is the third step among the sixteen modes: "They train like this: 'I'll breathe in experiencing the whole body.' They train like this: 'I'll breathe out experiencing the whole

body. (*‘sabbakāyapaṭisaṃvedī assasissāmī’ti sikkhati, ‘sabbakāyapaṭisaṃvedī passasissāmī’ti sikkhati.*) (MN 118). The parallel passages in the *Āgama*, such as *Samyukta-āgama* 803, state: “He is aware of the whole body when breathing in; he trains well in being aware of the whole body when breathing in...” (覺知一切身入息。於一切身入息善學...) (SA 803, T9: 206b). Similarly, the section on *Ānāpāna* of *Ekottara-āgama* says: “He completely observes the in-breath and out-breath of the whole body, and knows them all” (盡觀身體入息、出息，皆悉知之) (EA 17.1, T2: 582b). Whether in *Nikāya* or *Āgama*, these simple statements on “experiencing the whole body” have left ample room for interpretation by later commentarial traditions.

(2) The interpretation of *Sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* in the Southern Buddhism

In this paper, “Southern Buddhism” refers to the Theravada tradition centered on the Pali Canon and its commentarial tradition, upholding the lineage of vibhajjavāda, and developed in Sri Lanka. In terms of this context, the interpretation of *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* (“*The Path of Discrimination*,” hereafter PsM) is the most ambitious one among all the Buddhist literature I have seen, because it understands “*kāya*” (body) as both the *nāma-kāya* (mental body) and the *rūpa-kāya* (material body). That is to say, it includes both physiological and psychological phenomena. Moreover, PsM explains the concrete operation of *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* in a rather complex way.

In the chapter two, *Discourse on In-and-Out Breathing*, the text at the very beginning gives a decisive definition of “*kāya*”: “There are two kinds of body: the mental body and the material body.” (PsM 1.184). Among these, the mental body includes feeling (*vedanā*), perception (*saññā*), volition (*cetanā*), contact (*phassa*), attention (*manasikāra*), and all other mental formations, while the material body includes the four great elements and derived matter, as well as bodily formations such as in-breath and out-breath. It is worth noting that breathing is clearly classified as one of the material body. Therefore, *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* is not only awareness of the breathing process or the physical body, but an empirical understanding of the entire structure of the body and mind. When I describe it in this way, it undoubtedly carries two presupposed interpretations of “the whole body,” namely “the process of the breath itself” or “the physical body.” But in fact, these two interpretations appeared after the PsM. This makes me even more curious about the theoretical background of such radical interpretation of “experiencing the whole body” in the PsM. It elevates a seemingly body-contemplation step to the level of contemplating (rather than merely experiencing) the entire field of body and mind. How should such an ambitious practice goal be carried out? The PsM provides a method.

Here, it is organized into four steps according to the original content: First, taking the breath as the entry point. The practitioner proceeds according to long in-breath, long out-breath, short in-breath, short out-breath, and so on. This is consistent with the early Buddhist texts, that is to say, pay attention to the length of your breathing to gradually stabilize your body and mind. Next, continuing to attend to the breath, in order to enhance concentration, and accomplish “establishment of mindfulness” (*upaṭṭhāna sati*), that is, mindfulness stably rests on the object, making the object clearly present. This stage belongs to a typical structure of samatha. But the text does not specifically state whether the attainment of jhāna is required. The third step is the co-operative functioning of mindfulness and insight. It states in the text: “By means of the mindfulness and the knowledge, he realizes this body. (*Tāya satiyā tena ñāṇena te kāyā paṭiveditā honti.*)” (PsM I.184). This means mindfulness makes the object present, and then one should understand the object through discrimination and observation, and finally lead to direct realization (*abhisamaya*). The text lists fifteen kinds of “those who realize”, such as “one who knows realizes this body, one who sees realizes this body, one who observes realizes this body...” (PsM I, 183) This long list shows that “realizing this body” is a process of practice that encompasses faith, effort, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom, and spans multiple levels from sensory experience to direct knowing and full realization. The text further incorporates the practice of “experiencing the whole body” directly into the framework of the three trainings and the three purifications. That is to say, in the context of the PsM, *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* does not merely belong to the stage of concentration training, but is included in a complete system of practice that simultaneously encompasses morality, concentration, and wisdom, and its final orientation is toward the “knowledge of direct realization” (*paṭivedha-ñāṇa*).

In order to better grasp the interpretation of PsM, it is necessary to have a glimpse about the character of the text. Scholars generally agree that PsM stands in an intermediate position between the Sutta-piṭaka and the Abhidhamma Piṭaka. Although PsM is classified into *Khuddaka Nikāya*, Ronkin (2005) points out that PsM introduces new concepts and ideas that depart from the perspective of the *Nikāya*; at the same time, the way it explains these concepts has not yet become as consolidated as in the commentarial literature, and the ideas themselves are not fully developed, or remain in a latent state. Y. Karunadasa (2010), likewise, maintains that within the Sutta-piṭaka, the work that comes closest to the Abhidhamma, both in terms of content and methodology, is the PsM. A.K. Warder (1982), in his Introduction to Ñāṇamoli’s English translation, writes: “Of all the Pali texts, the PsM deals most elaborately with the topic of the universe, ‘formations’, dhammas, being ‘empty’”. Referring to the research of the scholars, we may be able to assume the textual character of PsM. Then, it is not surprising that it interprets kaya as the mental body and the physical body and places it into an analyzable

collection of dhamma-aggregates. This indeed reflects the trend of early doctrines developing towards systematization and classification.

In the *Vimuttimaggā*, the interpretation of “experiencing the whole body” has similarities with the PsM, but also shows clear differences. Like the PsM, the *Vimuttimaggā* also takes “body” as consisting of *nāma-rūpa*: “As for in-breath and out-breath, they are what is called the material body abiding in one place. The activity of in-breath and out-breath, together with mind and mental factors, is called the mental body. This material body and mental body, they are called the whole body. (出入息者，所謂一處住色身。出入息事心心數法名身。此色身名身，此謂一切身)” (T1648 32: 430a). Therefore, “the whole body” is likewise defined as the totality of psycho-physical phenomena. But what is different from the PsM is that the text defines “knowing the whole body” through two modes: “Through the absence of delusion, and through the objective reality of the phenomenon.” (不愚癡故、以事故). In the text, a question is raised like this: How does one know the whole body through non-delusion? The answer is: When a practitioner cultivates the concentration of mindfulness on breathing, the sensation of rapture and pleasure permeates and fulfills his body and mind; because this sensation of joy and pleasure fills the whole body, it becomes ‘knowing through non-delusion’ (問曰。雲何不愚癡知一切身。答曰。若坐禪人念安般定。身心喜樂觸成滿。由喜樂觸滿一切身成不愚癡。) (T1648 32: 430a). But the problem is that, according to the Anapanasati Sutta, experience of rapture (*pīti*) and experience of pleasure (*sukha*) occur after calming the bodily formation (*Passambhayaṃ kāyaśāṅkhāraṃ*). Their sequence in the sixteen modes is: experiencing the whole body — calming the bodily formation — experiencing rapture — experiencing pleasure. However, the *Vimuttimaggā* uses “experiencing the rapture and pleasure of the whole body and mind (or emphasizing the bodily aspect)” to explain “knowing the whole body,” which seems to be in conflict with the sequence of the sutta, that means if “experiencing the whole body” already involves experiencing bodily and mental rapture and pleasure, then calming the bodily formation would imply the ending of such feelings, and there should not be further experiencing of rapture and pleasure afterward. But we may also speculate in this way: perhaps the rapture and pleasure at the stage of “experiencing the whole body” in the *Vimuttimaggā* is only a kind of relatively coarse feeling, while the sense of rapture and pleasure that arise after calming the bodily formation may refer to the *jhāna* factors. However, this kind of assumption is also not self-consistent, because coarse lightness and pleasantness do not seem to be a kind of rapture and pleasure that pervades the whole body. In the *Kāyagatāsati Sutta*, there is a description of the first and second *jhāna*: “They drench, steep, fill, and spread their body with rapture and bliss born of seclusion. There’s no part of the body that’s not spread with rapture and bliss born of seclusion.” (MN 119; Bodhi 1995). That is to say, the “bodily and mental rapture and pleasure becoming filled”

in the *Vimuttimagga* is in fact more like this kind of jhanic state, and this then comes into conflict with the subsequent “calming the bodily formation” as well as “experiencing rapture” and “experiencing pleasure.”

Furthermore, according to the text, it is only when the sensation of rapture and pleasure permeates the entire body that the knowledge of the whole body truly becomes ‘non-deluded’—a realization of things as they truly are. Judging from the literal meaning, there seems to be a logical break in it, but the text does not provide further explanation. Moreover, this text has not received much attention in either the Southern or Northern traditions, and thus lacks later interpretations. Finally, the aim of this practice is clearly stated as: “Though there is a body, there is no being, no life” — that is, by seeing things as they truly are: that this body is merely a composite of the material body and the mental body, one dismantles the attachment to a substantial self (T1648 32: 430a).

As mentioned above, the PsM defines “the whole body” as the totality of “material body and mental body,” and the way of knowing mainly relies on the cooperation of mindfulness and knowledge, without especially emphasizing bodily sensation of rapture and pleasure. The *Vimuttimagga*, although inherits the dual framework of “material body and mental body,” it introduces at the operational level “the filling of rapture and pleasure” as a key condition for knowing the whole body. This shift may reflect a certain practical orientation of the Abhayagiri Vihara tradition: placing more emphasis on bodily sensation in meditation (such as rapture and pleasure) for the arising of insight.

In the instruction of mindfulness of breathing in the *Visuddhimagga* (“*The Path of Purification*”), the understanding of *abbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* is completely different from both the PsM and the *Vimuttimagga*. The text clearly limits *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* to the awareness of the “whole body of breath.” Here, “the whole body” is specifically explained as the “beginning, middle, and end” of each breath process (Vism 8.172; Ñāṇamoli 1991). That is to say, “body” becomes a process in the temporal dimension, rather than a body in the spatial sense or the psycho-physical body. Furthermore, the *Visuddhimagga*, by distinguishing the capacities of different practitioners (those who can only perceive the beginning, those who can only perceive the middle, those who can only perceive the end, and those who can perceive the whole process), emphasizes that the standard for achieving “experiencing the whole body” lies in whether one can continuously and clearly discern the entire dynamic process of the breath. Most importantly, the text explicitly states that at this stage, the practitioner’s mindfulness should always remain at the tip of the nose, and should not follow the breath into the body or out of the body, nor pursue or imagine it (Vism 8.175–178; Ñāṇamoli 1991). It is very clear that this method is easier to operate for the meditator.

But there is a very interesting point: although the *Visuddhimagga* frequently quotes the PsM when explaining the practice of mindfulness of breathing, while coming to “experiencing the whole body,” it neither cites nor refutes the PsM’s ambitious interpretation, but sets it aside quietly. Regarding the understanding of “experiencing the whole body” in the *Visuddhimagga*, Anālayo (2019) once argued that the earlier steps of knowing long breathing and short breathing already involve awareness of the whole breathing process, therefore, if we interpret according to the *Visuddhimagga*, it becomes repetitive. But I think that the earlier knowing of long and short breathing, as the initial step, is more coarse and single, in other words, it only focuses on the length of the breath. But as meditation deepens, the practitioner needs to contemplate the whole breathing process, and this process requires more concentration and awareness. Additionally, in *Papañcasūdanī* (the commentary on the MN; Ps III 141), especially the commentary on the *Ānāpānassati-sutta*, the understanding of “experiencing the whole body” is consistent with that of the *Visuddhimagga*. This is not surprising, because the Southern commentarial tradition was systematized in the hands of Buddhaghosa, and the Mahāvihāra interpretation of doctrine was established as the mainstream and transmitted down to the present day. In the modern period of the 1960s and 1970s, Nyanaponika (1962), Soma (1967), Bhikkhu Bodhi (1995), and other monkscholars within the modern Theravada background still follow this tradition in their understanding of *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī*. However, Bhikkhu Buddhādāsa and Bhikkhu Anālayo proposed their new views on this concept. In *Mindfulness with Breathing*, Buddhādāsa’s (1988) explanation of *sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* is based on a semantic reinterpretation of the word “kāya.” He emphasizes that “kāya” should not be narrowly understood as “physical body,” but should return to its Pāli original meaning—“group, heap, collection.” Based on this, he explains “*sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī*” as awareness of two kinds of “kāya”: one is the “breath-body,” that is, the breath as a group of dynamic processes; the other is the “flesh-body,” that is, the physical body composed of material elements. These two are not isolated from each other, but constitute a causal relationship: the breath-body, as a conditioning factor, continuously nourishes, supports, and influences the flesh-body, while the flesh-body manifests corresponding tension or calmness in accordance with the coarseness or subtlety of the breath. Within this framework, the core of “experiencing the whole body” is not, as in the *Visuddhimagga*, the complete awareness of a single object (the breath), nor is it the cognition of the whole *nāma*-body and *rūpa*-body as in the PsM, but rather the examination of the relationship between these two “body-groups.” However, Anālayo’s (2019) view is also different. This paper will later discuss his argument on this issue, towards the Southern *Visuddhimagga* interpretation and the Northern interpretation of “awareness of the breath pervading the whole body.” From the above survey of the interpretations on “experiencing the whole body” in the Theravada tradition, we can observe a very interesting phenomenon, that is, from beginning to end, none of them suggests experiencing the breath

pervading the whole physical body, and this is precisely the view found in Northern Buddhism.

(3) The interpretation of *Sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī* in the Northern Buddhism

The term "Northern Buddhism" as mentioned in this paper refers to the Buddhist tradition that was introduced to the ancient China via Northern India, Central Asia and the Western Regions, and was carried by classic Chinese translations. In terms of the time dimension, the scope of this paper's investigation is mainly limited to the period before the Tang Dynasty (before the middle of the 7th century AD), because by the Tang Dynasty, the process of Buddhist texts translation into Chinese had basically ended, and the main Chinese indigenous Buddhist sects had also basically taken shape. From the perspective of doctrinal origin, Northern Buddhism is not a single tradition but a complex that encompasses multiple Indian sectarian schools and Mahayana thoughts. This paper examines some of the representative texts such as the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā Śāstra* (大毗婆沙論), the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (俱舍論), the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* (大智度論), the *Yogācāra-bhūmi-śāstra* (瑜伽師地論), the *Tattvasiddhi* (成實論), and the *Dhyāna-samādhi-sūtra* (坐禪三昧經) and so on. These texts respectively come from the Sarvāstivāda school, the Mahayana Madhyamaka school, the Yogācāra school, and some transitional schools that moved from Śrāvakayāna toward the Mahayana. As for Chinese indigenous literature, it takes the most representative Tiantai school's Exposition of the *Gradual Method to the Dhyāna-pāramitā* (釋禪波羅密次第法門). Although these texts differ in thought and theory, they present an unison consistency in the interpretation of the important step in breath meditation, experiencing the whole body. That is, in the third stage of the sixteen modes of the *ānāpānasati*, awareness should extend from the area of nostril to the entire body, experiencing the breath-wind filling the pores and flowing throughout the body. Below, we will examine each of the above texts one by one and compare them with Southern Buddhism in an attempt to reveal the differences in epistemology and methodology between the two directions of Buddhist traditions. The Sarvāstivāda text *Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā-śāstra* (大毗婆沙論, Hereafter MVB), in a question-and-answer format, deeply explores the meditative principle of the transformation from "the tip of the nose" to "the entire body" in the practice of *ānāpānasati*. Here is the quotation:

Question: "One contemplates the breath entering through the nostrils and leaving through the nostrils, why then does the scripture say, 'I experience the whole body with the in-breath and out-breath'?" Answer: "When mindfulness of the breath has not yet been accomplished, one observes the in-breath and out-breath as they enter and leave through the nose. When mindfulness of the

breath has been accomplished, one observes the pores of the body, which are like the holes in a lotus root, and the breath-wind pervades them, entering and leaving everywhere.” Question: “If that is so, why is one not thereby distracted from concentration?” Answer: “Because both one’s aspiration and one’s effort have not yet faded. For example, when the Bodhisattva practised this observation, he did not emerge from concentration, and likewise because his aspiration and effort had not faded, there was no fault. The Venerable Vasumitra spoke thus: ‘Just as when one contemplates the body composed of all the great elements and derived forms, seeing it as impermanent, suffering, empty, and non-self, as a disease, a boil, an arrow, and impure, yet one does not abandon the perception of the breath, and so this is not called distracted from concentration – the same principle applies here.’” (MVB, T1545 27: 135c)

The text first raises a question that might also puzzle us: Since the object of observation is the breath entering and exiting through the nose, why does the scripture say “I feel the breath entering and exiting the entire body”? This issue actually reflects that the arguer has already presupposed that “the whole body” refers to breathing throughout the physical body. The answer in the text is that in the initial stage of mindfulness of breathing, the practitioner has not yet achieved a stable state of mindfulness, and thus can only observe the entry and exit of the breath around the nostrils. When the mindfulness is achieved and the depth of concentration reaches a certain level, the practitioner’s awareness will naturally expand from the nostrils to the entire body. At that time, he can observe that the pores of the entire body are as distinct as the roots of lotus roots, and the calm wind flows in and out through these pores. In other words, “being fully aware throughout the body” is not an initial object of meditation, but an experience that naturally emerges after the power of mindfulness matures.

The text then asks further: if awareness has already expanded to the whole body, why does the practitioner not thereby lose his meditative concentration? The modern scholar-monk Shi Daji, in his article *A Comparison of the Mindfulness of Breathing Method in the Dīgha Nikāya Mahāsatipatṭhāna-sutta and the Ānāpāna Method in the Yogācārabhūmi*, also paid attention to this question. He notes that the *Yogācārabhūmi* does not answer this question. However, we can see that already at the time of the MVB someone raised this doubt, and the MVB replies: because the practitioner’s aspiration and effort for this meditative approach have not yet faded, so even though the meditative object expands from the nostrils to the whole body, the mind still abides in the state of concentration and does not become scattered.

As for the Abhidharmanyāyānusāra-sāstra (阿毗達摩藏顯宗論, Hereafter

Ny) examined below, it also contains some noteworthy information. The passage reads:

What is the mark of the complete accomplishment of the mindfulness of breathing? It should be said thus: when the meditating practitioner fixes his mind and contemplates the breath as extremely subtle and slowly flowing. He imagines his whole body as a single tube with a single opening, and the breath-wind as a continuous string of pearls, unable to move the body or arouse body-consciousness, then the mindfulness of breathing should be considered accomplished. Another master says: when one's mastery has grown and one's task is accomplished, this mindfulness is called accomplished. (Ny, T1563 29: 948a)

This passage conveys an important point, that is the approach of *adhimokṣa* (determination / visualisation) in meditation. Here, one visualises the body as a tube and also visualises the breath-wind as a continuous string of pearl beads. This is a meditative method employed both by the Sarvāstivāda and by many Mahayana schools. Dharmajoti's (2009) study on *adhimokṣa* in Sarvāstivāda meditation further illustrates the importance of intentional mental engagement in Northern Buddhist meditation theory. This provides a useful perspective for understanding why the Sarvāstivāda interpretation of meditation experience differs from the Theravada commentarial emphasis on direct awareness of the meditation object. This paper will later discuss the differences in the understanding and use of *adhimokṣa* between the Southern and Northern Buddhist traditions. Next, we examine the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* (大智度論, Hereafter MPPU), the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* (瑜伽師地論, YBh), the *Satyasiddhi-śāstra* (成實論, SSt), and the *Dhyāna-samādhi-sūtra* (坐禪三昧經, DSS). The MPPU was composed by Nāgārjuna around the 2nd–3rd century. It was translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva (344–413 AD). From ancient times to the present, this text has held a significant position among all the schools of Chinese Buddhism. The Shichan of the Tiantai School discussed in this paper extensively quotes this text. The YBh was approximately compiled in the 4th or 5th century AD. It is said to be dictated by Maitreya and recorded by Asaṅga. It is the core doctrine of the Yogacara school and was translated into Chinese by the master Xuanzang in Tang Dynasty. The author of the SSt, Haravarman, is believed to have been a monk of the Sarvāstivāda school in the 3rd to 4th centuries AD. But later, influenced by the thoughts of Mahāsāṃghika and Mahayana, he made this treatise. Consequently, this treatise embodies characteristics of both Śrāvaka and Mahayana traditions. It was translated into China by Kumārajīva and had a big influence before the Sui Dynasty. The DSS, compiled by Kumārajīva, is a collection of the essential teachings of meditation masters from various schools in Northwest India. Therefore, this scripture also manifests the characteristics of the Śrāvaka and Mahayana, and it was very popular in China during the Northern and Southern Dynasties and even up to the Sui Dynasty.

The earliest Chinese Buddhist sect, the Tiantai School, also paid a lot of attention to this text. Although these four texts belong to different schools with different thoughts and their Chinese translations span from Kumarajiva (402-412 AD) to Xuanzang (about 648 AD), their interpretations of the “experiencing the whole body” display surprising consistency, jointly outlining the deep character of the epistemology and methodology of Northern Buddhism. Here are the passages on “experiencing the whole body” as found in the four texts mentioned above: “Contemplate the breath pervading the whole body.” (觀息遍身.) (MPPU, T1509 25: 142b);

“If one pays attention to the minute pores within the body, and the in-breath and out-breath pervade and enter into all the pores, and when, taking this as the object, one arouses *adhimokṣa*, then one makes the thought: ‘I experience the in-breath and out-breath pervading the whole body; now I can learn to experience the in-breath and out-breath pervading the whole body.’” (若緣身中微細孔穴，入息、出息周遍隨入諸毛孔中，緣此為境，起勝解時，便作念言：我於覺了遍身入息出息，我今能學覺了遍身入息出息.) (YBh, T1579 30: 433c) The term *adhimokṣa* which was mentioned in the Ny is also used in the YBh. Although there is no explicit description of visualisation as in the YBh, the possibility of visualisation cannot be excluded. The following is the quotation in the SS: “Experiencing the whole body’s means: the practitioner, through *adhimokṣa*, understands the body as empty, and then sees the wind moving in and out through all the pores.” (遍身者，行者信解身虛，則見一切毛孔風行出入.) (SS, T1646 32: 356a). This brief statement also conveys the notion of *adhimokṣa-manaskāra* (Attention through resolute belief). It does not say that the practitioner, after truly realising the body’s illusoriness, then sees the breath-wind moving in and out through all the pores. Rather, when the practitioner, through the power of visualization, firmly confirms that the body is empty, he then, within this cognitive context, sees the breath-wind moving in and out through all the pores. DSS gives a rather vivid description of “experiencing the whole body”:

He contemplates the breath pervading the whole body, and also contemplates the breath entering and leaving. He observes all the out-breaths and in-breaths within the body, and perceives that they reach throughout the body, even to the toes, pervading all the pores like water soaking into sand. When breathing out, he perceives that [the breath] reaches from the toes to the hair, pervading all the pores, also like water soaking into sand. It is like a bellows: when it fills, it is full both when air goes in and when it goes out; likewise, the wind entering and leaving through the mouth and nose is like that. He contemplates the whole body and sees where the wind goes – like the holes in a lotus root, like a fishnet. Moreover, he does not only observe the breath entering and leaving through the mouth and nose,

but also sees the breath entering and leaving through all the pores and the nine apertures. Therefore, he knows that the breath pervades the whole body, calms the bodily activities, and also contemplates the in-breath and out-breath. (DSS, T614 15: 274a–b)

The Tiantai school's *Exposition of the Sequential Methods of the Dhyāna Pāramitā* (釋禪波羅密次第法門, Hereafter *Shichan*) explains it as follows:

Knowing the breath pervading the whole body corresponds to the state of access concentration (*upacāra*). In the basic access concentration, one directly feels the body's form completely vanishing like empty space. However, at that time the body and breath actually exist, but because the insight has not established, one is not able to perceive them. Whereas, when the practitioner attains access concentration through the 'special excellent method' (特勝), he/she also experiences a feeling of total disappearance but then gradually feels the body as something like a cloud or a shadow, and perceives the in-and-out breath pervading the pores of the whole body. At that time the practitioner also knows the length of the breath and so on. He/She sees that the breath enters without accumulation and exits without dispersion, there is impermanence of arising and cessation. He/She realizes that the body is empty, false and unreal, and also knows that arising and ceasing do not abide even in an instant, and the three things (body, breath, and mind) come together, thus there is a state of samadhi. Since the three things are empty, there is no basis for certainty. Knowing that emptiness is also emptiness, one does not cling to it in certainty. One breaks through the basic access concentration, because it already contains the ways to let go of both craving (for meditation states) and over-striving. (Zhiyi, *Shichan*, T1965 46: 521c–522a)

In the text of *Shichan*, master Zhiyi distinguishes two kinds of access concentration: one is the "basic access concentration", the other is the access concentration that arises within the "special excellent" method (Zhiyi, *Shichan*, T1965 46: 521c–522a). The common feature of these two kinds of concentration is that the body and breath have already become extremely subtle. The difference, however, is that in the former, because there is no training in awareness ("the eye is not open"), one cannot perceive the existence of the subtle body and breath, but instead feels that the body and breathing have disappeared. This kind of concentration easily makes one crave the empty and ethereal feeling, or gives rise to laziness because one does not see the body. In the "special excellent" method, however, the practitioner can perceive that the body has not completely disappeared but manifests an existence like a cloud or a shadow – unreal yet present. More crucially, one can perceive the breath pervading the pores of the whole body, entering and leaving through all the pores, and at the same time he also knows the length

of the breath and so on. Moreover, one realizes that the body is empty, false and unreal, and also knows that arising and ceasing do not abide even in an instant, and the three things (body, breath, and mind) come together but they are all empty, therefore, there is no basis for certainty. There is a key point reflecting a characteristic of Tiantai meditative practice, that is treating “body, breath, and mind” as an indivisible whole. Based on the above textual analysis, one question deserves to be explored: why is it necessary to perceive the breath flowing through the whole body and moving in and out through the pores of skin? But before entering this question, let us first look at Anālayo’s (2019) argument against the view of “perceiving the breath pervading the whole body.” He believes that the third step should be “experiencing the whole physical body,” instead of “experiencing the breath flowing through the whole body.” At the same time, he points out that it is not the anatomical body but rather the energetic level of body perception. He uses an analogy with the third step of the second tetrad (contemplation of feeling), which is “experiencing mental activity”: executing this step does not require “experiencing the breath in mental activity.” By the same logic, the third step of the first tetrad (contemplation of the body) should not be understood as “experiencing the breath in the whole body.” He argues that the whole scheme of sixteen steps is: while maintaining basic awareness of the in-breath and out-breath, one shifts the main task to another object (the whole body, joy, pleasure, mental activity, etc.), rather than merging the breath into those objects. Anālayo’s (2019) view likely combines textual study with meditative practice, and therefore seems very valuable for reference. Slightly different from Anālayo’s interpretation, Zhou Rouhan (2020), in her article *A Study on the Sixteen Steps of Ānāpānasmṛti—“Bodily Formation”*, through a detailed examination of the definition of “bodily formation” (*kāya-saṃkhāra*) in the *Samyukta Āgama* (SA 568, T99 2: 150a), the *Abhidharmakośa* (AKB 7.14), and the *Śrāvakabhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (YBh, T1579 30: 433c–434a). She argues that the in-and-out breath itself constitutes the “bodily formation”. I will also attempt, from a textual perspective combined with meditative practice, to speculate why it is necessary to perceive the breath flowing through the whole body and moving in and out through the pores of skin.

First, it should be pointed out that the ānāpānasati method appears not only as the sixteen modes but also as the modes of counting, following, stopping, contemplating, returning, purifying, and so on. The step “experiencing the whole body” corresponds exactly to the step of “following” (隨). The *Shichan* and the *Six Subtle Dharma Approaches* (六妙法門) instruct “following the breath” as follows:

Cultivating following: abandoning the method of counting, one mindfully follows the breath as it goes in and out, the mind abiding on the object of breath without any scattering. This is called cultivating following. Second, when one corresponds with following, the

mind becomes gradually more subtle; one perceives the length of the breath, that the breath pervades the whole body as it goes in and out, and that they (the breath and the body) rely on each other spontaneously; one's thoughts become tranquil, still, and serene. This is called corresponding with following. (Liu Miao Fa Men, T1917 46: 662c)

From the above description we can see that at this stage, there is no need to deliberately track the specific flow of the breath through the whole body or to focus attention on the breath's movement in and out through the pores of skin. On the contrary, after the one-point (the nostrils) focused attention of the previous two stages, the body and mind have already become stable; but if one continues to maintain such focused attention, it is easy to become mentally fatigued. Therefore, the step of "experiencing the whole body" is to let one's mind become tranquil, still, and serene – that is, to relax a little – and to experience a feeling of openness and ease in which the breath freely enters and leaves the body. This can prepare the ground for the next step, "calming the bodily activities". According to the Northern Buddhist texts, another purpose of experiencing the breath pervading the whole body is to perceive the body as illusory and unreal. For example, the *Shichan* explains: "One sees that the in-breath does not accumulate, the out-breath does not disperse, they are impermanent, arising and ceasing; one feels the body as empty, false, and unreal, and also knows that arising and ceasing do not stay even for an instant." The SSt also states: "The practitioner, through *adhimokṣa*, understands the body as empty, and then sees the wind moving in and out through all the pores." Moreover, I personally think that this method is not actually incompatible with Anālayo's suggestion of perceiving the energetic level of the body (the wind element).

(4) Comparison of southern and northern traditions

Through the above comparison of the interpretative paths of this meditation step "experiencing the whole body" in Southern and Northern Buddhism, we can find some interesting phenomena. For instance, the understanding in Southern Buddhism on this issue clearly reflects its identity-based characteristic of "vibhajjavāda." That is, in meditation it emphasizes the direct observation and analysis of experiential phenomena. Although the interpretations in the PsM, the *Vimuttimaggā*, the *Visuddhimaggā* are not the same, these differences nevertheless show a clear tendency, that is, from a relatively open approach gradually moving toward the fixing of the meditation object, the precision of the steps, and a stronger operability.

In addition, among the Southern Buddhist texts examined here, although their views differ, in their understanding of "experiencing the whole body" they consistently become a kind of "complement set" of Northern Buddhism,

that is to say, they present a consistent position of exclusion: none of them interpret it as “awareness of the breath entering and leaving through the pores of the whole body.” I think this is also consistent with the character of vibhajjavāda. In contrast, Northern Buddhism presents a constructive and integrative epistemological and methodological approach. Although Northern Buddhism is more complex and diverse doctrinally, including Śrāvaka schools, Mahayana Madhyamaka, Yogācāra and so on, by anchoring on the concept of “experiencing the whole body,” we can observe certain shared features in epistemology and methodology. The reasons for this kind of shared tendency are another pretty broad and deep topic, and this paper does not go into a specialized study on it. But one aspect of the reasons is relatively clear, that is, the key figure of Vasubandhu, who may have played a pivotal role in it. He composed the *Abhidharmakośa*, a remarkable work of Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma, in his early period, and later turned to Mahayana and became one of the founders of the Yogācāra school. Later different schools, such as Yogācāra and Madhyamaka, could not avoid engaging with the *Abhidharmakośa*. This means that the whole Northern Buddhist scholarship shared certain theoretical ideas and meditation methods, such as the use of *adhimokṣa* (AKB 7.14, T1558 29: 118a–c) and the characteristics of integration and construction.

As for the use of *adhimokṣa*, Dharmajoti has a specialized article on this topic: *The Role of adhimokṣa in Meditation: The Sarvāstivāda Tradition*, which discusses the importance placed by the Sarvāstivāda on the use of visualization in meditation. In fact, in the Northern Buddhist texts examined in this paper, the interpretation of “experiencing the whole body” itself carries a tendency toward some kinds of visualization. However, in the Southern Abhidhamma system, *adhimokṣa* (Pāli: *adhimokkha*) is one of the occasional mental factors (*paṇṇāsa*), and its main function is confirmation, decision, or determination. But in the development of Northern Buddhism (especially from Sarvāstivāda to Yogācāra), two kinds of “attention” (作意) are distinguished, one is “real attention” (Skt. *attva-manaskāra*, 真實作意) and “*adhimokṣa*-based attention” (Skt. *adhimokṣa-manaskāra*, 勝解作意).” The latter carries the meaning of “visualization” or “constructing images through intention.” However, according to Northern texts, visualization-based attention is established on the basis of right view, so it is different from ordinary imagination or illusion. And this kind of method of visualization is precisely what Southern Buddhism opposes. In the *Visuddhimagga* and in the meditation teachings of modern Theravada teachers such as Mahāsi and Pa-Auk, it is clearly stated that any uses of visualization or imagination should be avoided. This divergence in meditation methods also partially explains why Southern Buddhism consistently excludes the method of awareness of the breath pervading the whole body, because that easily carries elements of visualization.

As for the tendency of integration and construction, after Northern Buddhism entered China, this characteristic became even more prominent, because it

highly accords with indigenous Chinese ideas such as the theory of “*qi* (炁)” and the ideology of the unity of nature and human (天人合一). In the Tiantai tradition discussed in this paper, body, breath, and mind are treated as an inseparable field, and the breath and cosmic energy are likewise experienced as a whole. This is completely different from the analytical character of Southern Buddhism. If Southern Buddhism achieves purification of view by analyzing *nāma* and *rūpa* phenomena as they really are, thereby removing attachment to “self” and “what belongs to self,” then how does Northern Buddhism achieve the dissolution of the self, since it likes to integration and construction? In fact, although *Madhyamaka* and *Yogācāra* in Mahayana have different underlying epistemological logics, both agree the illusory nature of the phenomenal world. That is to say, what we take to be the “real phenomenal world” and the “real self” are more like an experience in a dream. Pointing out this illusory nature and thereby dissolving attachment to the self is what Tiantai calls the “contemplation of emptiness of essence” (體空觀). Of course, there are also significant differences on this point between the *Sarvāstivāda* in Northern Buddhism and Mahayana Buddhism. The *Sarvāstivāda* is known for its detailed analysis of *dharma*s and *Abhidharma*-style argumentation, which can be compared with Southern Buddhism. But we can also see that its purpose of analysis and the result it leads to are not the same as in Southern Buddhism. For the latter, analysis itself is the direct means of liberation; but in the *Sarvāstivāda*, behind the analysis there is already presupposed an ontological framework of “the real existence of *dharma*s.” Therefore, the theory of the *Sarvāstivāda* was placed by the Tiantai school, which is good at integration, into the category of “*Tripitaka* teaching” (藏教).

Of course, we cannot summarize complex epistemological forms merely on the basis of limited textual materials, but this paper takes the concept of “experiencing the whole body” as an anchor, and attempts to examine certain epistemological and methodological differences embodied in Southern and Northern Buddhism, with the intention of “seeing the large through the small,” and providing an entry point for a deeper understanding of the textual character and intellectual trajectories of these traditions. At the same time, this study also hopes to provide some reference for dialogue and exchange between Southern and Northern Buddhism—whether in terms of mutual understanding at the academic level, or mutual learning at the practical level. On this basis, this paper also attempts to raise an open question: in terms of contemporary meditation practice, is it possible to appropriately integrate (again, integration) the meditation methods of Southern and Northern Buddhism? For example, in breathing meditation, one may take the clear steps and operability provided by the Southern Buddhism, while at the same time drawing on the Tiantai approach of contemplating the integrated relationship of “body–breath–mind,” thereby expanding the understanding of physical and mental dimensions. Of course, this is just a possible assumption for further discussion and practical reflection.

5. Conclusion

This paper takes the concept of Experiencing the Whole Body (*sabbakāya-paṭisaṃvedī*) as the anchor point, and through comparative reading of texts in the southern and northern Buddhism, attempts to demonstrate how seemingly minor interpretative differences in the steps of meditation reflect broader epistemological and methodological tendencies. On the one hand, while the southern tradition is diversifying internally, it is gradually moving towards more fixed observation objects, clearer procedural structures, and stronger operability, the texts consistently avoid interpreting "experiencing the whole body" as the awareness of breathing throughout the physical body. On the other hand, the northern tradition, despite the diversity of its doctrines, presents a more integrative and constructive direction, where the interpretation of "experiencing the entire body" often incorporates elements of visualization and overall structure.

Rather than merely regarding these differences as doctrinal disagreements, this paper suggests that they can be understood as reflection of different ways of meditation experiences: one tends to analyze and observe phenomena, and the other tends to construct and integrate the domain of experience. In this sense, *sabbakāya* is not only a professional term in meditation, but also an indicator of the deeper structural differences between the two traditions. Meanwhile, the purpose of this study is not to draw a definite conclusion about the superiority of any one method. On the contrary, it raises a further question: In contemporary meditation practice, is it possible to incorporate these two orientations into some form of dialogue or even partially integrate them? For instance, can the procedural clarity of the *Visuddhimagga* be combined with the overall sensitivity to the relationship between body, breath and mind in the northern tradition? This issue remains open. What is proposed here is a possible direction for further consideration rather than a solution proposition.

Abbreviations

<i>DSS</i>	Abhidharmasamaya-śāstra (《阿毗達摩顯宗論》)
<i>SRV</i>	Dhyānasamādhī-sūtra (《坐禪三昧經》)
<i>EA</i>	Ekottarika Āgama (《增壹阿含經》)
<i>MN</i>	Majjhima Nikāya (《中部》)
<i>MPPU</i>	Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra (《大智度論》)
<i>MVB</i>	Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā-śāstra (《大毗婆沙論》)
<i>PsM</i>	Paṭisambhidāmagga (《無礙解道》)
<i>SA</i>	Samyukta Āgama (《雜阿含經》)
<i>Skt.</i>	Sanskrit (梵語)
<i>Shichan</i>	《釋禪波羅密次第法門》
<i>SSt</i>	Satyasiddhi-śāstra / Tattvasiddhi (《成實論》)
<i>Vism</i>	Visuddhimagga (《清淨道論》)
<i>YBh</i>	Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra (《瑜伽師地論》)

References

Primary sources

- Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (阿毗達摩俱舍論). (n.d.) T1558, vol. 29.
- Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā-śāstra (阿毗達摩大毗婆沙論). (n.d.) T1545, vol. 27.
- Abhidharmanyāyānusāra-śāstra (阿毗達摩藏顯宗論). (n.d.) T1562, vol. 29.
- Bodhi, B. trans. (1995). *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications. (Includes translations of Ānāpānasati-sutta, MN 118; and Kāyagatāsati-sutta, MN 119, PTS edition).
- Dhyānasamādhi-sūtra (坐禪三昧經). (n.d.) T614, vol. 15.
- Ekottarika Āgama (增壹阿含經). (n.d.) T125, vol. 2.
- Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra (大智度論). (n.d.) T1509, vol. 25.
- Ñānamoli, B. trans. (1982). *The Path of Discrimination (Paṭisambhidā-magga)*. London: Pali Text Society. (PTS edition).
- Ñānamoli, B. trans. (1991). *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga)*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society. (PTS edition).
- Papañcasūdanī: Majjhima Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā*. (n.d.) PTS edition. London: Pali Text Society.
- Samyukta Āgama (雜阿含經). (n.d.) T99, vol. 2.
- Satyasiddhi-śāstra (成實論). (n.d.) T1646, vol. 32.
- Vimuttimagga (解脫道論). (n.d.) T1648, vol. 32.
- Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra (瑜伽師地論). (n.d.) T1579, vol. 30.
- Zhiyi (智顗). (567–570). *Exposition of the Sequential Methods of the Dhyāna Pāramitā* (釋禪波羅密次第法門). T1916, vol. 46.
- Zhiyi (智顗). (594). *The Six Profound Dharma Gates* (六妙法門). T1915, vol. 46.

Secondary Sources

- Anālayo, B. (2019). *Mindfulness of breathing: A practice guide and translations*. Cambridge: Windhorse Publications.
- Buddhadāsa Bhikkhu. (1997). *Mindfulness with breathing: A manual for serious beginners*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

-
- Dhammajoti, K. L. (2007). ‘The role of adhimokṣa in meditation: The Sarvāstivāda tradition’. *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, 5, pp. 1–23.
- Dhammajoti, K. L. (2008). ‘The sixteen-mode mindfulness of breathing’. *Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 6, pp. 31–88.
- Karunadasa, Y. (2010). *The Theravada Abhidhamma: Its inquiry into the nature of conditioned reality*. Hong Kong: Centre of Buddhist Studies, The University of Hong Kong.
- Ronkin, N. (2005). *Early Buddhist metaphysics: The making of a philosophical tradition*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Shi, D. (2007). ‘A comparison between the breathing method in the Dīgha Nikāya’s Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna Sutta and the Ānāpāna method in the Yogācārabhūmi’ [長部·大念處經觀息法與瑜伽師地論安般念法之比較]. *Journal of Faguan Studies* [法光學報], 18, pp. 45–78.
- Zhou, R. (2009). ‘A study on the sixteen steps of ānāpānasmṛti: “Bodily formation”’ [安般念十六勝行“身行”之研究]. *Yuan Kuang Journal of Buddhist Studies* [圓光佛學學報], 15, pp. 101–134.